

Bearing Witness Fiction: The Suppression and Evolution of Second Generation Holocaust Literature

Dvir Abramovich

Holocaust and Heroism: The Official Version

From its inception in 1948, the nascent Israeli state adopted an official position towards the remembering of the Holocaust and its dead. Its chief concern was the articulation of a totalizing national version to the exclusion of all others. According to Yechaim Weitz, writing about the way individual voice was dissolved in the collective prism, the government of the day strove for an institutionalized, accepted position through its Holocaust and Heroism Memory Law.¹ In fact, the particular day of mourning chosen by the state to memorialize the murder of the six million Jews in Europe was not arbitrary. In the overall Zionist narrative, the Holocaust was ineluctably tied to other episodes and themes in both ancient and modern Jewish history, specifically the Passover and the War of Independence.² Holocaust and Heroism Day was scheduled to precede Memorial Day and Independence Day by a week in order to encourage the public's identification of the Holocaust as an event that triggered the coming into being of the state. Israelis saw the Holocaust as representing a 'death' that necessarily led to the symbolic 'revival' of the establishment of Israel. On the whole, the message hammered home to Israelis was that there existed a connection between those who lost their lives in the 1948 War and those liquidated in the camps: both were part of an holistic chain of catastrophes leading to the establishment of Israel.

Moreover, by allocating an official and central ceremony, the state promoted its overwhelmingly singular account, repressing at the same time the multiple and personal expressions of the survivors. And because Holocaust Day was clearly aligned with the anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto in 1943 — the quintessential exemplar of Jewish bravery and struggle during the War — the underlying association of the day (reflected in its title) was with an heroic occasion not shared by the majority of survivors.

So it was with the founding of the remembrance institution Yad Vashem in 1953. Named the Martyrdom and Heroism Remembrance Authority and designed to commemorate the bravery of Jews in Europe, Yad Vashem put the emphasis on valour. To a large extent, this action stifled real identification with and understanding of the world of the Diaspora Jews, for whom survival in the camps was as much an act of heroism as armed resistance.³ Lamentably, most Jews who either perished in occupied Europe or survived were viewed by native Israelis as passive weaklings who offered no resistance to the Nazis. Instead of affording the survivors the respite they so craved, as well as the opportunity for some psychological relief, the state and its natives dealt the self-esteem of the survivors a crushing blow. It followed that the Sabras, fresh from a precarious victory, placed a psychological distance between themselves and the remnant of the Diaspora, whom they condemned as representing all that the new Israeli must shun.⁴

There were other reasons for the silence of the survivors. First, because many felt guilty about having remained alive and distrusted their own memories of a universe so incongruous with standard human experience, they found there was no way they could open up a dialogue with Israelis whose human experience was far removed from their own. Secondly, most survivors felt that the hellfire they had been subjected to was far too personal to share, especially with those who were unsympathetic to their pain. Not wanting to be viewed as different, the newcomers chose silence as a means of healing and forgetting.

Moreover, the establishment of the state and the War of Independence were such intense and profound events that they overtook all others, including the Holocaust. An atmosphere of euphoria enveloped the survivors, who in their desire to belong to the Jewish state (which they saw as a triumph over their Nazi oppressors) assumed new identities and names, seeking to forge a new future for themselves. The desire of many of the survivors to rehabilitate themselves, 'to create new family ties as far as possible from the horrors of the Holocaust', was just as strong as their fear of 'reopening unhealed wounds'.⁵ On another front, attending to the needs of housing, food and settlement meant that there was very little time to dwell on the subject matter of the Holocaust. It was not surprising, therefore, that memorialization was confined to official state ceremonies.

More than all of this, however, Israeli dogma regarded the Diaspora with disdain. Indeed, according to Zionist thought, the events of the Holocaust served as evidence that the Jews of the Europe were actually responsible for their own fate.⁶ Young writers coming of age in the 1950s and 1960s felt an intense sense of shame towards, perhaps even alienation from, the millions who were exterminated. In their eyes, the War of Independence, in which the infant state repulsed the might of five Arab nations, served to reinforce the difference between Israel and the Diaspora.

This polarization — between an Israeli 'nature' and a Jewish 'nature' — enforced the exclusion of the victim's perspective from many of the stories at that time. The majority of stories focused exclusively on the heroic. Indeed, Israeli culture attempted to provide its post-Shoah generation with comforting images of heroic partisans as part of a code that integrated the Shoah within Zionism's own emplotted representation. For years the collectively shared, communal story of the Holocaust was one of a faceless mass of six million Jews, not of individuals who each had his or her own harrowing tale to narrate. The Shoah was compressed into the abstract number of six million, a generalizing model that,

shorn of distinct and individual narratives, continually erased the fragmentary nature of the atrocities.

The Breaking of the Silence

The change in attitude of the second generation novelists of the 1980s and 1990s can be traced to the Eichmann trial. It was the Eichmann trial that ruptured the Holocaust myth propagated by the state, as scores of young Israelis, amongst them the children of survivors, watched one witness after another tell his or her own story. Significantly, the Holocaust was transformed, albeit momentarily, from a national calamity into a personal one, endowing the horror tales with individual faces and instigating a wave of Holocaust scholarship. By the 1990s, the contempt of the 1960s and 1970s had given way to an unshaken respect for the victims, and a reconciliation between survivors and Israeli society was reached.

As Aharon Meged notes, the pulling down of the walls of silence in recent years can also be attributed to the overcoming by the survivors of the guilt and shame they felt for staying alive and their willingness to talk to others about the cruelty and hellfire they endured.⁷ This breaking of the silence also owes much to the coming of age of the survivors' children, whose writings cover issues facing those living with the aftermath of the Holocaust. Nurit Govrin elaborates on the sea change of the 1980s and 90s:

The silence and repression were replaced with dialogue. The second generation has become parents and is the same age of these parents 'then'. The first generation is growing old and the fear that soon it may be too late to speak is increasing. Now, there are those who are willing to listen and those who are willing to speak. The two generations were willing to embark on a journey together, which would make facing the trauma easier. In the main, the collective, vulgar accusations of 'as sheep to the slaughter' were replaced with a better capacity to understand the complex, horrible and impossible situations the people 'over there' had to endure. Now, the possibility of identifying with the victims, with their ability to survive, with

their ability to maintain their humanity and with the power to rebuild their life and family again has been formed.

For the most part, the foregrounding of the Holocaust in the novels of the master Zionist narrative during the state years betrayed what Eric Santner terms a 'narrative fetishism'. Santner distinguishes between 'narrative fetishism' and Freud's 'work of mourning' — both of which are story-telling stratagems designed to deal with a past which by its very nature repudiates any attempt at erasure. In the 'work of mourning', the experiential damage and trauma are integrated and expounded upon through a continual remembrance and reiteration of that very loss, both metaphorically and dialogically. It involves reconstituting the shock of the trauma by 'translating, troping and figuring loss'. In other words, the work of mourning expresses a willingness to incorporate the very event which gave rise to the trauma, without dissimulating its imprints and traces. In contradistinction, the 'narrative fetishism' of the dominant Zionist narrative is a 'strategy of undoing, in fantasy, the need for mourning by simulating a condition of intactness, typically by situating the site and origin of loss everywhere'; 'it releases one from the burden of having to reconstitute one's self-identity' by indefinitely postponing the past.¹⁰

This brings us to the problems created by such a choice. Rather than provide the individual with room for the recuperation and working through of the terrible pain, narrative fetishism offers a false sense of comfort that says that there never was a cause for anxiety. Its damaging effect is this: because traumatic anxiety is unrecovered and unmourned, communal identity is consequently not revitalized or regenerated as the past continues to overhang the suffering human self. It is only by telling and re-telling the story, and thereby transferring it to the next generation, that a 'working through the trauma' can be achieved. The juxtaposition of the two illustrates the extent to which 'narrative fetishism' was employed by society in aid of ideological objectives perpetuated by the state.

Santner suggests that the most effective way for post-Holocaust societies to work through the emotionally disabling consequences of Nazism and repair the 'protective shield of the psyche that has been punctured' is by a 'radical rethinking and reformulation of the very notions and boundaries and borderlines'; 'to shift one's theoretical, ethical and political attention to the psychic and social sites'.¹¹ This allows for the re-construction of group and personal identity within the dynamics of a homogenous national identity.

Literary Engagement

After prolonged silence, literary engagement with the Holocaust has entered what Geoffrey Hartman terms 'a period of obsession'¹² — an overwhelming confrontation that has denied closure to this dark moment, declaiming explicitly that memory and its preservation have not dimmed. As a host of theorists has observed, it is only in the last decade that Holocaust fiction has changed into a literary genre. 'With distance . . . has come the ability to confront at last the ugly, cruel and contagious abandonment of morality that erupted in the middle of the century and of a civilization emblematic of human progress', writes Gerald Jacob, 'with distance, too has come a willingness to engage the creative imagination with that same period of history in order to search for meaning, warning of consolation'.¹³ Hartman concurs:

the children and now grandchildren of the survivors, as well as those who have become witnesses by adoption (who have adopted themselves into the family of victims), seek a new way to deal with the massively depressing event. They cannot testify with the same sense of historical participation, for it did not happen to *them*. This does not lessen, however, a moral and psychological burden. Despite missing memories . . . they look for a legacy, or a strong identification with what has happened.¹⁴

As if awaking from a deep sleep, young Israeli writers have broken silence to create a body of work which details the

pain of the victims, along with that of their sons and daughters. Indeed, Aharon Megeed, himself a Holocaust novelist, calls the incredible preoccupation with the Holocaust in recent years an 'unpredicted phenomenon'.¹⁵ Invariably, this young generation includes in its intriguingly energetic and powerful constructions an element of auto-reflectivity, pointing towards the mechanics of representation and reminding us that writing about the Holocaust gnaws at the very heart of the phenomenon.

By not avoiding the pain of the past and not participating in the process of collective repression, these writers remind the national society of the function of memory. Alice L. Eckardt explicates the significance of remembering rather than denial:

memory and knowledge of the awful, the terrifying, or the shameful, can be a positive force in redeeming the future, even if the past can never be redeemed. It can motivate a community to seek out the origins of the attitudes and actions of which it is now both ashamed and afraid. It can redirect the concerns of a people to encompass those who were heretofore excluded or thought unworthy of concern.¹⁶

In a brilliant disquisition entitled *The Second Life of Holocaust Imagery*, Norma Rosen writes that the Holocaust literature of the second generation is 'a call to the imagination of a people to repair the work of reality — to recreate a destroyed world by infusing meaning into the very events that destroyed it — what else could be more moving?'¹⁷ She then goes on to explain the creative power of stories written by those she terms 'witnesses through the imagination', providing as they do keys to the awakening and experiencing of Jews and non-Jews unaffected by the trauma. Rosen cautions against turning away from an engagement with the Holocaust, despite the obstacles strewn along that road, urging writers and readers alike to open up a space in their consciousness for what she calls the 'second life' that stirs in us when we encounter intense images of the event:

entering into a state of being that for whatever reasons makes porous those membranes through which empathy passes, or deep memory with its peculiar 'thereness', so that we can move as far as it is given to us to do so, into the pain and hence the meaning of the Holocaust — that, too, is a kind of memorial.¹⁸

Most importantly, the novels exemplify an attempt to undermine and deconstruct predominant Israeli national assumptions about post-Shoah identity. Above all, these texts serve as testament to the fact that, within the domain of Israeli culture, literary representations of the Holocaust have now transcended generational, tribal or national limitations. Ideology has ceded authority to literature. Where before the state was the repository of collective memory, enlisting its institutions in the service of a single ideology that dictated the terms for local memory of a specific experience, this oppressive coherence no longer exists. The notion of an indisputable canon has been completely dismantled.

Hermeneutical studies of Holocaust fiction — or 'literary historiography' as it has been termed¹⁹ — have not only concentrated on the semiotic analysis of the poetic strategies and formal configurations by which genocide is represented, but have asked how these interpretations may affect the understanding of the Holocaust by subsequent generations. Despite the voluminous historical research amassed, it is, as Yosef Yerushalmi maintains, the 'novelist's crucible' that is shaping future Holocaust images, rather than the 'historian's anvil'.²⁰ Gabriel Josipovici concurs: 'Historians are . . . recognizing that writers of fiction have an important role to play here, giving voice to the partial and uncertain'.²¹ Indeed, Geoffrey Hartman has argued that aggregated Jewish memory of the Holocaust is in decline, and that a breach between history and narrative has occurred. Hartman feels, though, that novels, quietly obeying their own logic and unrestrained by ritual and practice, are able to investigate truths sometimes hidden by the historicity of the past: 'We have learned that stories cannot be abbreviated by an intellectual method, or foreclosed by spiritual hindsight'.²²

The Psychological Legacy

One issue concerning the manner in which the post-Holocaust generations inscribe historical event into literary record relates to their own experience: the second and third generations must contend with the retarding historical memory imposed on them during their years of education. For the post-war generation, the past of the survivors is a present freighted with a burdensome psychological legacy, the more so because the survivors feel an urgency about transmitting their tales so that they are recorded and not forgotten. We can see the pattern of this transmission — which psychologists have named 'the transgenerational transfer of trauma' — appearing in the life stories of the generation after the Shoah.

Not surprisingly, then, this psychological legacy is one of the principal themes of the second generation novelists. Intermingled with the terrors of the survivors in their fiction are their attempts to invoke a crisis of identity of their own and to transmute it into the collective narrative. Dinah Wardi, who coined the term 'memorial candles' to describe the responsibility that the children of Holocaust survivors were invested with by their parents, was one of the first psychotherapists to use group therapy in her treatment of a second generation carrying the burden of the suffering of the Holocaust victims on their shoulders. The children were aware from birth that they were assigned a special, surrogate role as their parents, through various avenues, transmitted their personal terror of the fate of relatives who had been murdered. The complex of feelings typical of the legatees, according to Wardi, included guilt, excessive anxiety, fear of separation and lack of independence.²³ It was no accident that they suffered psychological disturbances, exhibiting symptoms that mirrored their parents' pathology.

In seeing their children as extensions of themselves, the survivors fulfilled a need basic to personality and identity, without realizing that the children's own growth and ability to form their own particular identity was being thwarted. Wardi succinctly summarizes the message conveyed to the

survivor children by their parents: 'you are the continuing generation. Behind us are ruin and death and infinite emotional emptiness. It is your obligation and your privilege to . . . re-establish the vanished family and to fill the enormous physical and emotional void left by the Holocaust in our surrounding and in our heart'.²⁴

In his discussion of the dilemma in which the second generation finds itself, gazing at the screen of the past but unable to act, Alain Finkielkraut offers the following analysis: 'This murdered world moves me, haunts me, precisely because I am completely excluded from it. Instead of examining the past for images of myself, I search for what I am not, what it is now impossible for me to be. Far from ending my exile,²⁵ memory makes it deeper by making it more concretely felt'.

Writing the Unthinkable

How, then, has the second generation of Israeli novelists responded to the Shoah, and what are the ethical implications of the forms they have chosen? Any attempt to enter the heart of darkness of Nazi Germany and the destruction of European Jewry, as Saul Friedlander notes, challenges 'our traditional conceptual and representational categories'. Marching into the swamp of genocide compels the one who chooses to bear witness to the catastrophe to be aware of certain warning signs. Friedlander again:

this record should not be distorted or banalized by grossly inadequate representations . . . there are limits to representations which should not be but can easily be transgressed. What the characteristics of such a transgression are, however, is far more intractable than our definitions have so far been able to encompass.²⁶

Fundamental issues of accuracy — how words, which had lost their semblance of normality in Auschwitz, can hope to keep faith with the Holocaust — carry a special importance in this field of inquiry. Berel Lang remarks on the ethical

considerations at play when one examines the representation of evil in imaginative writing: 'It seems obvious to me that anything written now about the Nazi genocide against the Jews that is not primarily documentary, that does not uncover new information about the history of that singular event, requires special justification'.²⁷

Testing the 'limits of representation', stories take multivalent forms, sometimes adopting a mode of fantasy associated with postmodernism, one that blurs the boundaries dividing truth and fiction. In the wake of the rise and rise of postmodernism, both in prose and in literary hermeneutics, it is not unreasonable to ponder the role this aesthetic has played in expanding the cohabitation of art and the Shoah. Central to the postmodern position is the absolute denial of one 'narrative' or 'truth' or 'reality' within the whirlpool of ideas, constructs, and intertextual references. Postmodernism rejects as misguided the traditional struggle towards the accurate co-ordination of words and things (or ideas) of historical realism. This assumption of an ungraspable reality *ipso facto* liberates the writer from the need to depict precisely and faithfully the Shoah universe, clearing the path of obstacles and allowing the author to sketch his or her own ambiguous and wilfully evanescent map.

When dealing with so sensitive an historical phenomenon as the Holocaust, this practice obviously raises questions of authenticity or legitimacy.²⁸ Just why are the later generation Israeli prose writers shifting to the fantastic over the mimetic? Hanna Yaoz takes up this point:

The tendency toward the fantastic in second-generation writing can be explained by the fact that what the Nazis deviated from any former reality and pushed the imagination to the absurd, so that when we speak of the Holocaust the fantastic *is* real. The joining together of real and familiar facts acquires a reality of its own in the minds of the writer and reader precisely when it comes to the Holocaust, whose reality was so abnormal. Those who were not there — who write out of attraction and repulsion and who need to fill the blanks with the creative imagination — resort to fantastic realism much more than do Holocaust

survivors in order to close the gap between what is known and what is guessed, often on the thinnest factual grounds.²⁹

'It is precisely the Final Solution', Friedlander avers, 'which allows postmodernist thinking to question the validity of any totalizing view of history, or any reference to a definable metadiscourse, thus opening the way for a multiplicity of equally valid approaches'.

Friedlander, however, also warns of the dangers lurking within such theory: 'This very multiplicity . . . may lead to any aesthetic fantasy and once again runs counter to the need for establishing a stable truth as far as this past is concerned'.³⁰ Any author who chooses to write about the Holocaust *after* the Holocaust will inevitably consider the adequacy of the literary frameworks and criteria that were available *before* the Holocaust, and yet in rejecting them may seem to transgress the limits and violate the truth of the historical event. If we accept Lyotard's metaphor of the Holocaust as an earthquake that has obliterated all tools of measurement, we must acquiesce in the view that the event has shattered humanity's common sense and, along with it, conventional instruments of figuration.³¹

How, then, can an author appropriate the Holocaust for his or her aesthetic aims? And what modes of description can be created adequate to it? Central to this discussion is Hayden White's insistent questioning of the headlong pursuit of a single version of history set against the ethical demand that Holocaust narratives represent reality as it was. According to White's redefinition of the traditional frames of reference, the very nature of narrative requires the writer to make a choice from amongst an abundance of fictional forms, including certain technical, emplotting devices, certain languages and other ideological markers. In an historicist theory that bears a startling resemblance to postmodern poetics, White argues that there is no one objective standard that is superior to any other, and that the critical faculty engaged in assessing the 'reality' of any given instance is on tenuous ground. No less than postmodernism, White's historicism does away with the

requirements of authentic representation of the Holocaust and with the constraint on imaginative storytelling that was exercised on writers who felt obligated to remain faithful to the facts.

In asking whether or not the Final Solution and its evils impose absolute limits on writers of fiction, White argues that 'unless a story is presented as a literal presentation of real events, then the question of its truthfulness cannot be criticized as being either true or untrue to the facts of the matter'.³² White allows for the train of literary expression to traverse many stations on its journey of exploration and negates the idea of a single, overall account of the Shoah:

Our notion of what constitutes realistic representation must be revised to take account of experiences that are unique to our century and for which older modes of representation have proved inadequate . . . the best way to represent the Holocaust and the experience of it may well be by a kind of 'intransitive writing' which lays no claim to the kind of realism aspired to by the nineteenth century historians and writers.³³

Whilst postmodern and fantastic novels of the Shoah may be seen as subversive of the obdurate limits set by conservative theoreticians, the vertiginous points of views and multiple realities of such fictions expose the dangers of literary gymnastics. The problem is that the uneducated reader may be overwhelmed by the eclectic and dynamic flux of messages. More to the point, however, the pervasive fusion of allegory and anti-realism can have a paradoxically *dehumanizing* effect, inimical to the original intent of the story (a descent into the belly of the horror, designed to convey the terror wrought on the Jews and the terrible suffering of the victims).

One response to this paradoxical side effect has been that several of those writers who sought a documentary link between their writings and the Holocaust have embraced a deepening of the element of verisimilitude, asserting the authenticity of several of their episodes and emphasizing the realistic authority of the novel. Perhaps, to quote James

Young, these writers are motivated by the fear that 'the rhetoricity of their literary medium inadvertently confers a fictiveness onto the events themselves'.³⁴

It has been argued that, despite the critical and testimonial surfeit generated by the Shoah and the relentless sword thrusting of the historians, there has yet to appear a redeeming text, comparable with the *Kabala* — a sensitive and intelligent novel of the Holocaust offering open space for independent and meaningful thought about the nightmare. Finding the proper mode for rewriting the unthinkable in modern literary terms and techniques remains, however, a difficult, perhaps insuperable challenge to the writer. Confecting a story of the authentic and the fanciful, the author risks the charge not only of ludic indifference, but also of manipulating the reader's emotions. (How far is the wordsmith who spins a tale out of the Holocaust with the aim of moving and exciting the reader benefiting from the victim's anguish?) In the meantime, the literary fabulous acts as a surrogate, conveying the central theme of mourning, of working through the inherited pain and trauma.

The main point, the second generation has declared, is that silence is not the only response to the Holocaust, and that to write poetry after Auschwitz is not barbaric, as Adorno's dictum suggests.³⁵ Instead, they see themselves as obligated to bear witness to what took place so that they can admit its category-rupturing facts into consciousness. Though we may have to concede that the Holocaust does reside in a realm which we cannot traverse or comprehend, still 'it would be irresponsible', argues L. Lawrence Langer, 'to allow our psychological and intellectual hesitation to estrange us from that misery. The only alternative, a complex and difficult one, is to find a way of making the inconceivable conceivable until it invades our consciousness without protest or dismay'.³⁶ It follows that the young writers needed to break with conventional narratives, even though it agitated those

who wished to limit the scope of contemporary Holocaust literary exploration. Even the noted Holocaust survivor and author Eli Wiesel, who fervently believes that only those who were there know what the Holocaust meant, has written that if one wishes to transmit and preserve the past for future generations, one cannot choose silence: 'we must use language. . . . We must evoke hope where there is none, and invent meaning where there is no meaning and formulate lessons for all of us to learn . . . the silence of memory would be a scandal'.³⁷ If we surrender to silence, Hans Magnus Enzensberger charges, if we undermine the transfiguration of suffering into art, then we are submitting to cynicism and, by inference, to the forces of evil that created Auschwitz.³⁸

NOTES

- ¹Yechaim Weitz, 'Political Dimension of Holocaust Memory in Israel During the 1950s' *Israel Affairs* 1:3 (Spring 1995), p. 133.
- ²Dov Handelman and Elihu Katz, 'State Ceremonies of Israel: Remembrance Day and Independence Day', in *Israeli Judaism*, ed. Shlomo Deshen, Charles S. Liebman, and Moshe Shoked (New Jersey, New Brunswick, 1995), p. 83.
- ³Dina Porat, 'Attitudes of the Young State of Israel toward the Holocaust and Its Survivors: A Debate over Identity and Values', in *New Perspectives on Israeli History: The Early Years of the State*, ed. Laurence J. Silberstein (New York and London: New York University Press, 1991), p. 157-174.
- ⁴Aaron Hass, *The Aftermath: Living with the Holocaust* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 18-19. See also, Ahron Appelfeld's gut wrenching account of the treatment he was subjected to upon arrival in Israel in his *Beyond Despair: Three Lectures and a Conversation with Philip Roth* (New York: Fromm International, 1994).
- ⁵Gila Ramras-Rauch, 'Introduction', *Facing the Holocaust: Selected Israeli Fiction*, ed. Gila Ramras-Rauch and Joseph Michman-Melkman (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1985), p. 122.

-
- ⁶Hanna Yablonka, 'The Formation of Holocaust Consciousness in the State of Israel: The Early Days' in *Breaking Crystal: Writing and Memory After Auschwitz*, ed. Efraim Sicher (Urbana: University of Illinois, 1998), pp. 120-121.
- ⁷Aharon Megeed, 'I was Not There', in *Comprehending the Holocaust*, ed. Asher Cohen, Yoav Gelber and Charlotte Warüi (New York: Peter Lang, 1988), p. 98.
- ⁸Nurit Govrin, 'Kafo Alay Chaim Shel Acheret', in *Kova Zehuhit*, ed. Nava Semel (Tel Aviv: Sifriyat Hapoalim, 1985), p. 12-13.
- ⁹Eric Santner, 'History beyond the Pleasure Principle: Some thoughts on the Representation of Trauma', in *Probing the Limits of Representation: Nazism and the 'Final Solution'*, ed. Saul Friedlander (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992), pp. 143-154.
- ¹⁰Santner, 'History beyond the Pleasure Principle', p. 144.
- ¹¹Santner, 'History beyond the Pleasure Principle', pp. 152-3.
- ¹²Geoffrey H. Hartman, *The Longest Shadow: In the Aftermath of the Holocaust* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996), p. 29.
- ¹³Gerald Jacobs, 'The Jewish Literary Quarterly Awards', *Jewish Quarterly* 45: 1 (Spring 1998), p. 67.
- ¹⁴Hartman, *The Longest Shadow*, p. 8.
- ¹⁵Megeed, 'I was Not There', p. 97.
- ¹⁶Alice L. Eckardt, 'Memory: Blessing, Burden, or Curse? The Shoah as a Burning Memory', in her edition, *Burning Memory: Times of Testing and Reckoning* (Oxford: Pergamon, 1993), p. 4.
- ¹⁷Norma Rosen, *Accidents of Influence* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992), p. 47.
- ¹⁸Rosen, *Accidents of Influence*, p. 53.
- ¹⁹James E. Young, *Writing and Rewriting The Holocaust: Narrative and the Consequences of Interpretation* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988), p. 1.
- ²⁰Yosef Haim Yerushalmi, *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1989), p. 98.
- ²¹Gabriel Jospovici, 'Writing the Unwritable: A Debate On Holocaust Fiction', *Jewish Chronicle* 45:2 (Summer 1998), p. 12.
- ²²Hartman, *The Longest Shadow*, p. 29.

- ²³Dina Wardi, *Memorial Candles* (London & New York: Routledge, 1992), pp. 27-47.
- ²⁴Wardi, *Memorial Candles*, p. 30.
- ²⁵Alain Finkelkraut, *The Imaginary Jew* (London: University of Nebraska Press, 1994), p. 39.
- ²⁶Saul Friedlander (ed.), *Probing the Limits of Representation: Nazism and the 'Final Solution'* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992), p. 3.
- ²⁷Berel Lang, *Act and Idea in the Nazi Genocide* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1990), p. xi.
- ²⁸See, for example, David Hirsch, *The Destruction of Literature: Criticism after Auschwitz* (Hanover, N.H: University Press of New England, 1991).
- ²⁹Hanna Yaoz, 'Inherited Fear: Second Generation poets and Novelists in Israel', in *Breaking Crystal: Writing and Memory After Auschwitz*, ed. Efraim Sicher (Urbana: University of Illinois, 1998), p. 164.
- ³⁰Saul Friedlander, 'Trauma, Memory and Transference', in *Probing the Limits of Representation*, pp. 264, 263.
- ³¹Jean Francois Lyotard, *The Differend: Phrases in Dispute* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988), pp. 56-58.
- ³²Hayden White, 'Historical Emplotment and the Problem of Truth', in *Probing the Limits of Representation: Nazism and the 'Final Solution'*, ed. Friedlander, p. 53. See also Michael S. Roth's essay on White's and other historians' theses in his *The Ironist's Cage: Memory, Trauma and the Construction of History* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1995), pp. 1-15.
- ³³White, 'Historical Emplotment and the Problem of Truth', p. 50, 52.
- ³⁴Young, *Writing and Rewriting The Holocaust*, p. 51.
- ³⁵Theodor Adorno, 'Engagement', in *Gesammelte Schriften* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1974), p. 422.
- ³⁶L. Lawrence Langer, *Preempting the Holocaust* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1998), p. 65. See also Hartman's useful analysis of the power of words to express pain in his *Saving the Text: Literature/Derrida/Philosophy* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981), pp. 118-175.

³⁷Eli Wiesel, 'Some Questions That Remain Open', in *Comprehending the Holocaust*, ed. Asher Cohen, Yoav Gelber and Charlotte Wardi (Frankfurt and New York: Peter Lang, 1988) pp. 18-19.

³⁸As quoted in Langer, *Preempting the Holocaust*, p. 2.