

MEMORY STUDIES

The witness in the archive: Holocaust Studies/ Memory Studies

MARIANNE HIRSCH, Columbia University, USA
LEO SPITZER, Dartmouth College, USA

Abstract

What has Holocaust Studies brought to the study of memory, and, conversely, how has theoretical work on the Holocaust been inflected by Memory Studies? Focusing on witness testimony, we argue that the theoretical and philosophical efforts to grasp and define its contours have provoked a radical rethinking of the workings of memory and transmission: in particular, a foregrounding of embodiment, affect and silence. Yet we caution against a hyperbolic emphasis on trauma and the breakdown of speech. We find that the very aporias that have made the Holocaust a touchstone for the study of twentieth-century memory have engendered two distinctive interpretive uses of witness testimony – one linked to a troubling idiom of uniqueness and exceptionalism, potentially supporting nationalist and identity politics, the other, to cosmopolitan or transnational memory cultures able to sustain efforts towards the global attainment of human rights.

Key words

body, listening, silence, survivor, testimony, truth

'In the past half-century, two works have marked what can be called *conceptual breakthroughs* in our apprehension of the Holocaust', writes Shoshana Felman in her 2002 book *The Juridical Unconscious* (Felman, 2002: 106).¹ 'The first was Hannah Arendt's *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, which appeared in the United States in 1963 as a report on the Eichmann trial held in Israel in 1961. The second was the film *Shoah* by Claude Lanzmann, which first appeared in France in 1985.' These two works, Felman elaborates, changed 'the vocabulary of collective memory' – they added a '*new idiom* to the discourse on the Holocaust'. A new idiom, Felman might have said, to the discourse on memory more generally, for in the decades between the Eichmann trial, Lanzmann's *Shoah* and Felman's assessment, the Holocaust has in many ways shaped the discourse on collective, social and cultural memory, serving both as touchstone and paradigm.

For Felman, this new idiom, this 'shift[s] in our vocabularies of remembrance', is witness testimony. Witness testimony locates the possibility of grasping the Holocaust in 'the slippage between law and art' – between the closure brought by legal judgment, and the open-ended immediacy and presence preserved in a work of art.

Seeing the Eichmann trial, Arendt's book, and Lanzmann's *Shoah* as breakthrough texts in the discourses on memory of the last half century can help us define the provocations and challenges that the Holocaust has brought to Memory Studies, and to ask, conversely, how the notion of 'memory' and Memory Studies have shaped the contours of Holocaust Studies. Thus, the trajectory between the trial, the film, and Felman's book – one of many possible trajectories through which one might approach these questions – foregrounds and sharpens the fundamental contradiction brought by the centrality of witness testimony to cultural discourses about memory: the contradiction between the necessity, on the one hand, but also the impossibility of fully bearing witness to this particular traumatic past.² If our vocabulary of collective memory has had to shift over the last half century, it is precisely because of this aporia and the evidentiary, ethical and artistic crises it has spawned. These crises have indeed been at the heart of Memory Studies, bringing with them a concentration on the figure of the embodied witness, on trauma and transmission, and on the complex relationship between enunciation, listening, and truth.

In what follows, we look closely and critically at the contradictions at the core of Holocaust witness testimony. We argue that the theoretical and philosophical efforts to grasp and define these have provoked a radical rethinking of the workings of memory and transmission: in particular, a foregrounding of embodiment, affect, and silence. Yet we caution that a hyperbolic emphasis on trauma and the breakdown of speech has risked occluding the wealth of knowledge and information transmitted by thousands of witnesses who have been eager to testify to the victimization and persecution they have suffered. Indeed, we find that the very questions and aporias that have made the Holocaust a touchstone for the study of twentieth-century memory and catastrophe have engendered two distinctive interpretive uses of witness testimony – one linked to a troubling idiom of uniqueness and exceptionalism, potentially supporting nationalist and identity politics, the other to cosmopolitan or transnational memory cultures able to sustain efforts towards the global attainment of human rights.

THE WITNESS

Throughout *Eichmann in Jerusalem* (1994), Arendt evaluates, critically, different aspects of the trial. Among other objections, she contends that the trial should primarily have been about Adolf Eichmann and his crimes, and not, as it turned out to be, about the horrific suffering of the victims. 'Eichmann was on the stand from June 20 to July 24, or a total of thirty-three and a half sessions. Almost twice as many sessions, sixty-two out of a total of a hundred and twenty-one, were spent on a hundred prosecution witnesses who, country after country, told their tales of horror' (Arendt, 1994: 223). Arendt criticizes the selection of witnesses and the extensive hearing they received

(many volunteered, some had published books and were well-known). She finds the victim testimony to be distracting, extraneous to the judgment of the accused. Only one witness, Herschel Grynszpan, serves as a model for her in the 'simplicity', economy, and narrative skill with which he tells his story: it took him no more than 10 minutes to convey the 'needless destruction of twenty-seven years in less than twenty-four hours' (Arendt, 1994: 229). Listening to this witness 'one thought foolishly: Everyone, everyone should have his day in court. Only to find out, in the endless sessions that followed, how difficult it was to tell the story.' For Arendt, it takes righteousness, a 'purity of soul, an unmirrored, unreflected innocence of heart and mind' to testify in this way, but she finds that few possess the moral virtues requisite for such narrative simplicity and clarity (Arendt, 1994: 229).

Critics of Arendt, however, as well as other commentators on the trial, find its essence precisely in the space it provided for the voices and the embodied presence of the survivor-witnesses (Agamben, 1999: 17).³ If the Eichmann trial was revolutionary, a milestone in the history of Holocaust memory and memorialization, it is because it allowed for a collective story to emerge through individual victim testimonies and to gain, in Felman's terms, 'semantic authority' (Felman, 2002: 148). The authority, in fact, transcends those victims who were able to testify at the trial; it even transcends those who did not survive to tell their tale. Famously, Gideon Hausner, the prosecutor, opened his own address to the Israeli court not on behalf of the state he represented, but of 'six million prosecutors':

When I stand before you, judges of Israel, in this court, to accuse Adolf Eichmann, I do not stand alone. Here with me at this moment stand six million prosecutors. But alas, they cannot rise to level the finger of accusation in the direction of the glass dock and cry out 'I accuse against the man who sits there.... Their blood cries to Heaven, but their voice cannot be heard. Thus it falls to me to be their mouthpiece and to deliver the heinous accusation in their name. (Arendt, 1994, 260)

If the Nuremberg trial focused on the war criminals and left out the story of the victims, the Eichmann trial served as a corrective, foregrounding the unwieldy survivor narratives in the courtroom that so annoyed Arendt. Hausner later wrote:

It was mainly through the testimony of witnesses that the events could be reproduced in court, and thus conveyed to the people of Israel and to the world at large, in such a way that men would not recoil from the same narratives as from scalding steam, and so that it would not remain the fantastic, unbelievable apparition that emerges from Nazi documents. (Hausner, 1966: 292)

While Arendt, and also Judge Landau, protested against the procession of witnesses – their unruly confusions, contradictions, and misrememberings – the prosecutor and subsequent commentators saw the 'picture' they 'paint', and the collective voice they assume, as the trial's most meaningful legacy. Indeed, it may be Arendt's very discomfort with witness testimony, and the contradictions it reveals, that move Felman to feature *Eichmann in Jerusalem* as in itself such a landmark text. Her conversation and disagreement with Arendt allow Felman to strengthen her claim that 'the Eichmann trial legally

creates a radically original and new event: not a rehearsal of a given story, but a groundbreaking narrative event that is itself historically and legally unprecedented' (Felman, 2002: 123). For Felman, this is the translation of private stories into one collective story that receives a legal hearing and public acknowledgement and validation (Felman, 2002: 152–3).⁴

At the center of this single collective story was the interrupted testimony of Yehiel Dinooor to which Felman devotes an entire chapter entitled 'A Ghost in the House of Justice'. Dinooor was a concentration camp survivor who had become a writer under the name of K-Zetnik, and who had published a number of works about what he called the 'planet Auschwitz'. [KZ is the German abbreviation for *Konzentrationslager*]. When asked about his 'pen name' by the prosecutor, K-Zetnik protested that it was not a pen name since he did not consider himself a writer of literature. Instead, echoing and transforming Hausner's proxy speech on behalf of 'six million prosecutors', K-Zetnik presents himself as a chronicler speaking in the name of and evoking all the concentration camp inmates, or 'K-Zetniks', from the 'planet Auschwitz' whose 'look', he said, 'was inside [his] eyes' (Felman, 2002: 148). The prosecutor's interruptions of the witness's evocation of these inmates, and his insistence on asking the witness a few direct questions about his experiences, provoked K-Zetnik to faint on the stand and be taken to the hospital where he fell into a coma for several weeks. While Arendt sees K-Zetnik's testimony as a case in her point against victim narratives, the Israeli poet Haim Gouri, who also covered the trial, asserts that in fainting, K-Zetnik 'in fact, ... said it all' (Gouri, 2004: 129). In Felman's terms, 'what K-Zetnik wants is not to prove but to transmit' (Felman, 2002: 143). Instead of describing him, as Arendt does, as a failed witness, Felman sees him as a terrified, retraumatized witness – one who, in the courtroom and in the encounter with Eichmann, returns to the 'other planet' and relives his horrific experiences there before the eyes of the world, collapsing the distance between present and past, between 'here' and 'over there'. In that sense, his lifeless body can be said to 'say it all'. As Gouri concludes, 'the things he added afterward would turn out to be merely superfluous detail' (Gouri, 2004: 129).

In fact, by inviting survivors to bear witness, the court seems to have made space for the fainting episode of K-Zetnik and even perhaps for the possibility that such an episode might complicate the given understanding of legal evidence. For Felman, it illustrates the 'slippage between law and art': it reflects that unspeakable and unrepresentable realm that stands outside of legal discourse and that can only be transmitted through the body language and the non-verbal performance of the traumatized witness. K-Zetnik's moment of collapse becomes a paradigm for the aporia of Holocaust testimony – the necessity and the impossibility of bearing witness to the 'planet Auschwitz'. Its 'testimonial power ... lay precisely in the pathos – the crying power – of its legal muteness', Felman asserts, and thus it attests to the new understanding of evidence and the new forms of listening and interpretation that the traumatized survivor of the Shoah has provoked (Felman, 2002: 153).

The disagreement between Arendt and Felman about the trial and their divergent interpretations of Dinooor's collapse reflects the shift in the dominant conception of Holocaust memory and representation in the last half-century. Indeed they stage the

encounter between 'history' and 'memory' in Holocaust Studies. The historian Annette Wieviorka locates this encounter in the shift in the function of testimony that comes with the Eichmann trial but that, in its aftermath, is relevant beyond the context of the law:

Testimony has changed direction. Print has been replaced by the tape recorder and the video camera. At the same time, the function of testimony has also changed. In the years following the war, the primary aim of testimony was knowledge – knowledge of the modalities of genocide and the deportation. Testimony had the status of an archival document. Today ... the purpose of testimony is no longer to obtain knowledge. Time has passed and the historian does not trust a memory in which the past has begun to blur and which has been enriched by various images since the survivor's return to freedom. The mission that has devolved to testimony is no longer to bear witness to inadequately known events, but to keep them before our eyes. Testimony is to be a means of transmission to future generations. (Wieviorka, 1994: 24).⁵

With the Eichmann trial, Wieviorka says, the witness becomes a 'bearer of history', an 'embodiment of memory (*un homme-mémoire*), attesting to the past and to the continuing presence of the past' (Wieviorka, 2006: 88). The 'bearer of history' illustrates the need for 'memory' to supplement 'history'. As Geoffrey Hartman writes: 'Survivor testimonies ... do not excel in providing *verités de fait* or positivist history. ... Their real strength lies in recording the psychological and emotional milieu of the struggle for survival, not only then, but also now.' For Hartman, 'the immediacy of these first-person accounts burns through the "cold storage of history." They give 'texture to memory or to images that otherwise would have only sentimental or informational impact. ... [Now] ... emotion and empathy accompany knowledge' (Hartman, 1996: 142, 138).

If the *main* function of testimony *now* is not to inform factually but to transmit affectively, it cannot do so by purely verbal means, whether oral or written. K-Zetnik's linguistic breakdown, and the telling nature of his physical collapse, suggest all that he could not express verbally within the frame and the idiom of the courtroom. Jean-François Lyotard has called this disjunction of idioms 'the differend': 'A case of a differend between two parties takes place when the "regulation" of the conflict that opposes them is done in the idiom of one of the parties while the wrong suffered by the other is not signified in that idiom' (Lyotard, 1988: 9). And Jacques Derrida has worked to uncouple the notion of 'bearing witness' from the notion of 'proof' that tends to 'divert' and 'contaminate' it, suggesting it 'appeals to the act of faith and is heterogeneous to producing proof' (Derrida, 2005: 75). In fainting, K-Zetnik performs that appeal and brings that other idiom, located in the memory of his body, before the eyes of the court, and he thus transmits another kind of knowledge, one that exceeds the 'facts' of his persecution. In his essay on the memoirs of Auschwitz survivor Charlotte Delbo, Thomas Trezise, echoing Lyotard on the *differend*, shows that 'the voice of testimony cannot fully coincide with itself torn as it is between the language of fact and the shattering of the very framework on which the intelligibility of such language relies' (Trezise, 2002: 7).⁶

The 'language of fact' offers information about the past, and can constitute legal evidence and archival documentation. It can also serve as a protective shield enabling survival. Charlotte Delbo distinguishes between two kinds of memory of trauma, the 'ordinary' intellectual memory, the memory connected to the thinking processes' from which she can *speak* of Auschwitz, and the 'deep memory' that 'preserves sensations, physical imprints,' 'the memory of the senses.' Delbo describes the elaborate ways in which she needs to shield herself from being re-engulfed by the deep memory and thus the immediacy and lasting presence of Auschwitz: 'Auschwitz is there, unalterable, precise, but enveloped in the skin of memory, an impermeable skin that isolates it from my present self. ... I live within a twofold being' (Delbo, 1990: 2–3).

Dinoor/K-Zetnik: the survivor-witness's two names reflect such a 'two-fold being'. Significantly, K-Zetnik's collapse occurred at the moment when he was questioned about his name. In objecting that his name is not a pseudonym, K-Zetnik insists on remaining inside his 'Auschwitz self' that is located in the body and outside speech. But, under what conditions, and in what mode, can the traumatized, desubjectified, dehumanized victim bear witness from inside the protective 'skin of memory?'⁷ When Shoshana Felman and Dori Laub write, in their book *Testimony*, that the Holocaust is 'an event without a witness' they elaborate precisely on this difficulty of being 'a witness to oneself' that, Laub insists, is 'central to the Holocaust experience' (Felman and Laub, 1992: 80). 'There was,' Laub continues, 'historically no witness to the Holocaust, either from outside or from inside the event' (Felman and Laub, 1992: 81). Laub argues that no one could bear witness from the outside, because Nazi ideology was so psychologically invasive and pernicious that 'no observer could remain untainted' and all external frames of reference disappeared (Felman and Laub, 1992: 81). Thus, what collapsed was the possibility of a victim addressing an Other – one uncontaminated by the magnitude of the event. Without the possibility of an implied listener, the dehumanized victim is unable to bear witness to him or herself, 'from the inside'. The paradox of the witness's 'I' is an essential element of the contradiction between the necessity and the impossibility of bearing witness to the Holocaust.

Claude Lanzmann's *Shoah* (2003[1985]), Felman's second paradigm-shifting work and one, as she shows, deeply influenced by the Eichmann trial, is precisely dedicated to making possible the act of witness 'from the inside', albeit in retrospect. Visually, its nine and a half hours exclude all archival footage in favor of the faces of surviving victims, bystanders and perpetrators, and of the places where the events of the Shoah took place. Pursuing most obsessively the actual machinery of extermination perpetrated by the Nazi regime, Lanzmann concentrates many of his interviews on the surviving members of the Sonderkommando, the special squads of Jewish prisoners who were forced to aid in the process of extermination, cleaning gas chambers and ovens, exhuming mass graves. These are the individuals whom Primo Levi called 'bearers of a horrendous secret' and it is this secret that Lanzmann, breaking through their protective shield of trauma, most wants them to reveal and to transmit to him and to his cinematic audience (Levi, 1989: 52).

Viewers of *Shoah* are often surprised at the detailed *factual* questions Lanzmann poses during his interviews; why, we wonder, for example, does he need to know

exactly how large the undressing room was or how many steps it took to walk to the gas chamber? In posing these kinds of factual questions to witness after witness, Lanzmann seems to be using testimony to elicit information, in the first sense that Wieviorka outlines. But the rehearsal of the minute facets of the extermination process may well serve another purpose altogether. Along with the invitation to repeat songs and sayings, to re-enact, bodily, the movements and gestures of the past and to remember its very details, Lanzmann is able to provoke the powerful kind of non-verbal bodily re-enactments the world witnessed from K-Zetnik at the Eichmann trial. There are a few uncanny moments in the film, during which survivor and bystander witnesses do not merely narrate the past but literally seem to be back inside it. Memory, here, gives way to what Lanzmann calls 'incarnation' (Chevrie and Le Roux, 2007).

The most disturbing and controversial example of this form of re-enactment is the testimony of Abraham Bomba, a barber who cut Jewish women's hair inside the gas chambers in Treblinka and who, in the film, is interviewed in a barber shop in Tel Aviv while cutting the hair of a male client. Bomba's hands repeat the familiar gestures of a barber cutting hair, while the filmmaker poses question after question to him about his memories of cutting the hair of groups of naked women shortly before they are gassed. 'How did it look, the gas chamber?' Lanzmann asks. 'Can you describe precisely' (Lanzmann, 1985: 112–13). When Bomba is then asked how he felt when he first saw the naked women entering the gas chamber, he resists the question: 'I felt that accordingly I got to do what they told me, to cut their hair in a way that it looked like the barber was doing his job for a woman' (Lanzmann, 1985: 114). Lanzmann pulls back, asks for more factual detail and suggests: 'Can you imitate how you did it?' before returning to his question about feelings and impressions. Bomba resists more directly on this second occasion: 'I tell you something. To have a feeling about that ... it was very hard to feel anything, because working there day and night between dead people, between bodies, your feelings disappeared, you were dead. You had no feeling at all' (Lanzmann, 1985: 116). But even as he protests against the discussion of feelings, Bomba begins to narrate the most searing story of all – the moment when the women from his own hometown entered the gas chamber and began talking to him. His narrative breaks down completely when he gets to the description of how a barber friend of his from his hometown met his own wife and sister in the gas chamber. Bomba describes this but then stops, insisting that 'it's too horrible'. As he ceases to speak, the camera closes in on his face scrutinizing it insistently. After a moment's pause, Lanzmann's prodding voice is heard saying: 'We have to do it ... We must go on' (Lanzmann, 1985: 117). The witness remains silent and withdraws into himself. His lips are dry, he licks them repeatedly, turning his tongue this way and that in his mouth. He then mutters a few inaudible and incomprehensible phrases in what could be Polish or Yiddish, looking down, shaking his head, and avoiding the camera. After what seems like a long while, he wipes his eyes, and continues talking about his friend and his wife and sister in his strongly accented English. But what, one might ask, could he say that his moments of desperate silence and pleading not to go on did not already convey?

Like K-Zetnik at the Eichmann trial, Abraham Bomba is able to bear witness 'from the inside' – literally from inside the gas chamber, and from inside his own 'Auschwitz self'.

But, for him, reaching into the depths of that place means ceasing to speak at all, at least for a few moments. One certainly wonders whether the 'friend' who met his wife and sister was not actually Bomba himself, and whether he can only remember that scene through the protective shields of projection and displacement – in the second person ('you were dead'), or the third ('a friend of mine'). When, in a recent seminar at the Museum of Jewish Heritage in New York, Claude Lanzmann ventured that 'the tears of Bomba are worth gold,' he clarified the values on which his project is based (Lanzmann, 2005). The *ultimate* truth, he implies, the *ultimate* act of witness, comes from inside the gas chamber and from the mute testimony of memory emerging from the body.

Filip Müller, one of the most verbally articulate witnesses in *Shoah* also breaks down and cries precisely at the moment when he tries to describe the people from his own hometown walking into the gas chambers. In despair, Müller decided to join them in death, but the women pushed him back out, demanding that he survive to bear witness. He can *tell* that story in the film, but he can powerfully *transmit* it through his moments of silence and through his hand gestures and tears.⁸

The disjunctions and non-coincidences that are at the heart of traumatic testimony, the location of the essence of Holocaust experience in the bodily wound, and thus in the deep embodied memory of the survivor, have shaped the debates about Holocaust memory and representation in the last decades.⁹ They account for a privileging of video testimony as the genre most able to communicate the sense memory of the survivor. Yet, problematically, they may also abstract the moments of muteness and collapse as those that most closely reveal the 'truth' of the event.¹⁰ Articulate promoters of video testimony such as Laurence Langer even believe that through the embodied presence of the survivor and the bodily re-enactment of the camp experience, this genre can give us a form of access to an 'unmediated truth' about the Holocaust or to 'the thing itself' (Langer, 1991: 39–76).¹¹ Video testimony includes narrative and bodily re-enactment and its interpreters often focus in greater detail on this latter dimension that written testimony fails to provide. The moments that best illustrate and represent embodied memory tend to be the moments where speech fails and where the distance between past and present seem to collapse. In these moments – moments such as Bomba's speechlessness or K-Zetnik's fainting – the body of the traumatized witness 'from the inside' seems closest to offering access to the unspeakable essence of trauma and its continuity in the present. But, when, in the process of analysis and reflection, we cite and repeat those moments, when we thus abstract them from the context of their appearance, we risk projecting too pervasive a structure of meaning unto them.

In these moments, the oral witness goes mute. We see the way this happens when Bomba's mouth literally runs out of sufficient saliva to go on producing words. Only after a few struggling moments, can Bomba put his 'Auschwitz self' back inside the protective skin of memory to continue his narrative. Our attention is riveted on the muteness and bodily affect. Such concentrated attention to the deep memory lodged in the body and to the unspoken and unspeakable dimensions of traumatic recall, can however, give rise to a troubling implication: that silence and muteness are more telling and forceful than verbal narratives. Muteness and the mute witness have thus acquired the status of

the 'true' and 'complete' witness to the Shoah, particularly through the influential, but, we find, deeply problematic argument of Giorgio Agamben in his *Remnants of Auschwitz*. For Agamben, the 'complete' witness, the only one who can give a true sense of what he calls 'Auschwitz' (Agamben refuses the term Holocaust or any other term, using only 'Auschwitz') is the 'Muselmann', who represents humanity at its limits (Agamben, 1999: 41–86).¹² In the camp, prisoners designated as 'Muselmänner' were the ones who ceased to be human beings, who gave up and knew that they would die. They are the walking corpses, the living dead, the bearers of 'bare life'. The 'Muselmann' is unbearable to look at, yet he is at the core of the camp, and thus at the core of what Agamben calls 'Auschwitz'. In Agamben's terms, the 'witness' is the remnant, the humanity that could not be destroyed, that survived the annihilation, but that cannot speak.

Agamben's argument is based on his reading of a passage in which Primo Levi, in his essay 'Shame', questions his own authority to bear witness to the reality of Auschwitz and the Nazi genocide:

My religious friend had told me that I survived so that I could bear witness. ... I must repeat: we, the survivors, are not the true witnesses. ... We survivors are not only an exiguous but also an anomalous minority: we are those who by their prevarications or abilities or good luck did not touch bottom. Those who did so, those who saw the Gorgon, have not returned to tell about it or have returned mute, but they are the "Muslims", the submerged, the complete witnesses, the ones whose deposition would have a general significance. ... We speak in their stead, by proxy. (Levi, 1989: 83–84)

Agamben's hyperbolic reflection stands in contrast to Levi's modest and understated disclaimer.¹³ While Levi specifies that the 'true' and 'complete' witness is the one who did not return because he was murdered, or because he was so traumatized as to return mute, Agamben collapses this distinction and concentrates on the broken and speechless figure of the 'Muselmann' as the only authoritative and 'complete witness'. It is this figure that embodies the 'aporia of Auschwitz' and provokes Agamben to work through the irreducible paradox of testimony: 'the one who cannot bear witness is the true witness, the absolute witness' (Agamben, 1999: 150). Who can bear witness for all those who can no longer testify on their own behalf, Primo Levi asks? In the Eichmann trial, the prosecutor stood before the court as the 'mouthpiece' of 'six million prosecutors' whose 'voices could no longer be heard'. Levi speaks 'in their stead, by proxy'. The ranting K-Zetnik was the proxy witness for those who did not survive to tell their tale. But Agamben's remnant is speechlessness itself: there is no proxy.

With the liminal figure of the mute, desubjectified, witness who can only testify outside language we reach not only the limit of the human, but also the limit of the historical and legal archive.¹⁴ Mute testimony, deep embodied memory, is not verifiable.¹⁵ It exceeds the boundaries of documents, records and other conventional forms of evidence. It shifts the transmission and knowledge of the past onto an entirely different register. Here, indeed, we reach what Agamben calls the 'aporia of Auschwitz', or the 'non-coincidence between facts and truth, between verification and comprehension' (Agamben, 1999: 12).

TRUTH AND TRUTHFULNESS

'Aujourd'hui, je ne suis pas sûre que ce que j'ai écrit soit vrai. Je suis sûre que c'est véridique', writes Charlotte Delbo in the epigram to *Aucun de nous ne reviendra* ('None of Us Will Return'), the first part of her memoir, *Auschwitz et après* (*Auschwitz and After*) (Delbo, 1995). It is a phrase she will repeat and use again in another work, *La Mémoire et les jours* (*Days and Memory*). But her English translator, Rosette Lamont, translates the sentence differently in the two volumes: 'Today, I am not sure that what I wrote is true. I am certain it is truthful' ('None of Us Will Return') and 'This is why I say today that while knowing perfectly well that it corresponds to the facts, I no longer know if it is real' (*Days and Memory*). In 'None of Us Will Return', Delbo's sectional title situates her testimonial account into a contradictory temporality and reality. The future tense suggests that it is written 'from the inside' where return indeed would have seemed impossible. The 'none' and the 'us' place the first person voice of the witness both under erasure and into a larger community of witnesses. Perhaps, she implies, none of them did, in fact, return and the present voice of testimony does not correspond to the past persona of the camp inmate, and even less so, to her pre-war self. With her epigram, Delbo, now firmly situated in the present of retrospection ('today'), profoundly qualifies the 'truth' of her utterance. But how? What is the difference between 'vrai' and 'véridique', or, in Lamont's translation, 'truth' and 'truthfulness?' On the one hand, Delbo could be saying that today, in the space of the 'after' (*Auschwitz and After*), she no longer recalls the exact facts, but that she is certain she is conveying a deeper truth about her camp experience, its essence, its deep memory. Lamont's first translation, distinguishing between truth and truthfulness, seems to support this meaning. On the other hand, Delbo may be saying the opposite, as the second translation suggests: today, she can convey the factual truth of her experience ('véridique') but, having encased Auschwitz in its protective skin, and being in the 'after,' she no longer can or wants to access the deep memory, the affective and traumatic reality of the past.

Delbo's ambiguity underscores the complicated status of truth that emerges from the focus on the figure of the survivor-witness 'from the inside.' When Hannah Arendt voices her impatience with the witnesses at the Eichmann trial, she questions their ability to distinguish, many years later, between things they might themselves have experienced and things they would have read or heard from others. In a court of law these factual distinctions are crucial ones. But they are also crucial to historians. Searching for 'historical truth' in oral testimony – factual accuracy that can be corroborated and not dismissed or denied – these historians are suspicious of testimonial narratives, of 'soft' evidence constructed in individual acts of recall.

Addressing the historical validity of testimonial rendering, the psychoanalyst Donald Spence has clarified a difference between what he has called 'narrative' truth and 'historical' or factual truth. 'Narrative truth' derives from an act of memory and is shaped by circumstances in the present moment in which it is remembered:

[it] can be defined as the criterion we use to decide when a certain experience has been captured to our satisfaction; it depends on continuity and closure and the

extent to which the fit of the pieces takes on an aesthetic finality. Narrative truth is what we have in mind when we say that ... a given explanation carries conviction.... (Spence, 1982: 31)

In contrast, 'historical truth' is time-bound and is dedicated to the strict observance of correspondence rules; our aim is to come as close as possible to what 'really' happened:

[W]e must have some assurance that the pieces being fitted into the puzzle also belong to a certain time and place and that this belonging can be corroborated in some systematic manner. (Spence, 1982: 32)

This disjunction is sometimes described as defining the difference between 'history' and 'memory' and the conflicts in Holocaust Studies between some historians, on the one hand, and psychoanalysts, literary and cultural scholars, on the other.¹⁶ But the testimony of the survivor-witness 'from the inside' may exceed this distinction altogether. Not only may it get the facts wrong, but it can also resist a coherent story in which the pieces fit together and come to closure. It thus posits the question: is there a form of truth that is neither 'narrative' nor 'historical?'

Dori Laub's example of this excess has become iconic in discussions of truth and witnessing. Laub cites the testimony of a woman who witnessed the failed uprising by Auschwitz prisoners in October, 1944. At one moment in her account, he notes, the distance between past and present disappears: 'She was fully there. "All of a sudden," she said, 'we saw four chimneys going up in flames, exploding. The flames shot into the sky, people were running. It was unbelievable"' (Felman and Laub, 1992: 59).¹⁷ Laub then outlines the debate between historians and psychoanalysts watching the woman's testimony at a conference. The historians dismissed it for its inaccuracy: they stressed that only one chimney was blown up during the Auschwitz uprising and that her mistake invalidated her account of events. But the psychoanalyst who had interviewed the woman, Dori Laub himself, suggested that she was testifying to a different form of truth altogether:

not to the number of chimneys blown up, but to something else, more radical, more crucial: the reality of an unimaginable occurrence.... The event itself was almost inconceivable. The woman testified to an event that broke the all compelling frame of Auschwitz, where Jewish armed revolts just did not happen and had no place. She testified to the breakage of a framework. (Felman and Laub, 1992: 60)¹⁸

With the centrality of the survivor-witness in the discourses on Holocaust memory, many historians have come to appreciate not only the compelling nature of 'narrative truth', but also this dimension that emerges in Laub's example. Laub's notion of 'truth' stresses aspects of historical experience that are affective, subjective, submerged, even silent – feelings, perceptions, apprehensions, misapprehensions and 'deep memories' that (certainly in the case of the Holocaust) are impacted by trauma. Unlike the positivist historians quoted by Laub, many historians, oral historians of the Holocaust, in particular, have found that testimonies, such as the factually inaccurate account of the

witness interviewed by Laub, can tell them more about the *meaning* of an event, and about the process of its recall in the present, than about the event itself. Indeed, they are aware of the emotional dynamics of traumatic recall and forgetting, and to the dialogic nature of oral history – of the listener’s or interviewer’s impact on the telling.¹⁹ In taking into account an affective dimension and the meaning of an event for the teller herself, historians are expanding the notion of truth and are coming to a deeper, more encompassing historical understanding of what we might now think of as an embodied form of ‘truthfulness’. The challenge that such historians still face, of course, is how to defend this enlarged notion of truth, without opening the door to revisionism and denial.

LISTENING AND TRANSMISSION

The argument between the psychoanalyst and the historians in Laub’s account is an argument about listening to the survivor-witness ‘from the inside’. The historians know too much, Laub suggests, and their knowledge (of the number of chimneys that blew up, for example, of the betrayal by the Polish underground, or of the squashing of the rebellion and the gassing of the resistance) blocks their willingness to listen to what, beyond the factual, the woman’s testimony might have transmitted to them. The psychoanalyst, on the other hand, does not let his own historical knowledge interfere with the act of listening. He is trained to perceive that the witness does more than to give information about the past, however accurate or inaccurate. The witness ‘from the inside’ relives the experience and the good listener has to be there with her as she is doing so. The woman Laub interviewed, returned to the implausible moment of resistance and thus, in Laub’s elaboration, ‘a dazzling, brilliant moment from the past swept through the frozen stillness of the muted, grave-like landscape with dashing meteoric speed, exploding it into a shower of sights and sounds’ (Felman and Laub, 1992: 59). In Laub’s vivid terms, the woman’s testimony enabled the gates of Auschwitz to open again and to allow her listeners in to witness the improbable moment of rebellion, the ‘breakage of the frame, that her very testimony was now reenacting’ (Felman and Laub, 1992: 63). In other words, Laub suggests that the woman communicates a more essential truth beyond the limits of her words to the one who knows how to listen psychoanalytically: the truth of her enunciation lies in the affect she projects and provokes in her listeners.²⁰

Laub has written eloquently about the responsibilities of listening to oral testimony. In response to Primo Levi’s recurring nightmare in Auschwitz in which Levi returns home and tries to tell his story, only to have his sister and other listeners get up from the table and leave, Laub writes: ‘if one talks about the trauma without being truly heard or truly listened to, the telling might itself be lived as a return of the trauma – a *re-experiencing of the event itself*’ (Felman & Laub, 1992: 67). ‘True’ hearing, ‘true’ listening is then, by implication, a listening for the emotional affective embodied truth of the witness’s story. This *psychoanalytic* listening places the listener themselves at risk: ‘there is a need for a tremendous libidinal investment in those interview situations. ... Testimony is the

narrative's address to hearing; for only when the survivor knows he is being heard will he stop to hear – and listen to – himself' (Felman & Laub, 1992: 70–1).

In becoming a privileged genre promising access to the embodied memory of the survivor-witness, oral and video testimony have redefined the act of listening as 'secondary witnessing' and have placed enormous burdens on the interviewer. Video testimonies show that memory and testimony are acts in the present, not present accounts of the past. They show how memory enters language, and how it changes in the process. They show how an event lives on, how it acquires, keeps and changes its meaning and its legacy. They show how the witness changes in the process of telling, or re-living. Listeners must hear silence, absence, hesitation and resistance. They must look and listen, comparing bodily with verbal messages. They must allow the testimony to move, haunt and endanger them; they must allow it to inhabit them, without appropriating or owning it. Theorists of testimony have spent a good deal of effort to define the fine line between good listening and appropriation.²¹

But there is more. Geoffrey Hartman and Dori Laub have argued that if the victim has been dehumanized by the camp experience, has lost the 'you' who enables the 'I' to speak, those who listen to witness testimony have the capacity to restore the victim's humanity and identity. While empathic listening can actually be therapeutic, therefore, 'bad listening' – listening that does not take on the responsibility of providing the 'you' necessary to restoring the 'I' – can re-traumatize the witness. Some of our previous examples seem to corroborate this warning: K-Zetnik fainted and went into a coma when the judge interrupted his account and tried to ask specific questions. Abraham Bomba is re-traumatized before our eyes when Lanzmann asks him about his feelings and enjoins him to go into the part of the story Bomba had so carefully encased in a protective shield. For both these listeners, testimony served a purpose beyond the healing of the witness. And both, paradoxically, provoke an enactment of trauma – a mute witnessing – that succeeds in transmitting some quality of the 'inside'. For more distant spectators and listeners, therapeutic listening and the powerful transmission of affect and body memory seem to be at odds.

But what, in fact, *is* being transmitted in those moments of fainting, muteness or collapse? What does it mean to say that in fainting K-Zetnik said it all? That Bomba's tears are 'worth gold?' What narratives, what memories, does the figure of the survivor-witness from the inside support, and what are the stakes of these narratives? We would suggest that the moments of mute or traumatized witness that have become so paradigmatic in recent discussion are so open to interpretation and projection that, outside the narrow framework of the psychoanalytic encounter, they preclude therapeutic restorative listening in favor of ascription and appropriation.

UNIQUENESS AND COMPARABILITY IN GLOBAL TIME

This conclusion leads us back to the point where we began, Hannah Arendt's critique of the Eichmann trial and her misgivings about witness testimony. But we want to consider another aspect of her argument – her belief that Eichmann should not have been

tried in Israel but before an international court; that his crimes were committed *against humanity* and not merely against *the Jewish people*. The focus on anti-Semitism and the endless repetition of crimes against Jews throughout history, she argues, relativizes and detracts from Eichmann's particular and unprecedented crimes. Felman considers Arendt's view jurisprudentially conservative. But, from our post-Rwanda, post-Balkan, mid-Darfur perspective, is not Arendt's call for a permanent international criminal court, and for an understanding of genocide as a crime against humanity, remarkably prescient and progressive (Arendt, 1994: 261–79)?²²

Arendt's position anticipates two key perspectives in Holocaust Studies: one viewing the Holocaust as the worst act of anti-Semitism, and therefore principally as a crime against the Jews; the other as the worst act of racism, and, as such, as a crime against humanity. In this regard, the testimony of victims, especially as manifested in speechlessness/muteness and in bodily projection, can lend itself to interpretations that directly or indirectly support one or the other of these viewpoints. The figure of the muted, traumatized survivor – the 'Musselman', Ka-Zetnik, or Bomba, for example – largely communicating through affect and not words, can become a screen on which the listener/interpreter can project various meanings. Witness testimony from the inside can thus be appropriated and used to undergird the image of Jewish extreme victimization that fuels nationalist and identity politics. Indeed, as Arendt observes regarding the Eichmann trial, Holocaust memory, through spoken and unspoken witness testimony, served to enhance the process of nation-building in the new Israeli state. It was employed to present a Zionist narrative before a 'hostile world' and to collectivize Jewish identity.²³ If, in this memory discourse, the Holocaust appears as unique and incomparable, it is not by way of a historical argument that points out its unprecedented elements, but on an affective level that contemplates and 'co-owns' the immeasurable suffering of its Jewish victims. Calling attention to the increasing currency of the unspeakability trope is thus to lift Holocaust memory out of this new discourse of uniqueness.²⁴

Certainly Holocaust memory may also serve a different purpose in our age of globalization. As Daniel Levy and Natan Sznaider have written, perhaps too optimistically, it may 'provide the foundations for a new cosmopolitan memory... transcending ethnic and national boundaries' (Levy and Sznaider, 2006: 4). Shifting focus from the national to the cosmopolitan, and rejecting the claim, largely implicit in Pierre Nora's influential work *Les Lieux de mémoire (Realms of Memory)* (Nora, 2006), that the nation state is the 'sole possible (and imaginable) source for the articulation of authentic collective memories', they argue that representations of the Holocaust can impart 'authentic feelings' and 'collective memory' on a global level (Levy and Sznaider, 2006: 32). Memories of the Holocaust – or of representations of this event in spoken and unspoken testimony – can thus 'facilitate the formation of transnational memory cultures, which in turn, have the potential to become the cultural foundation for global human rights politics' (Levy and Sznaider, 2006: 4). In so doing, Levy and Sznaider write:

the cosmopolitanization of Holocaust memory does not imply some progressive universalism subject to a unified interpretation. The Holocaust does not become one totalizing signifier containing the same meaning for everyone. Rather its meanings

evolve from the encounter of global interpretations and local sensibilities. The cosmopolitanization of Holocaust memories thus involves the formation of nation-specific and nation-transcending commonalities. (Levy and Sznajder, 2006: 11, 12)

Muteness in the aftermath of trauma, the affect that emerges through testimony – these are the human elements of survival that can become the links between the diverse catastrophes of our time. And yet, as we have seen, powerful affect may also lend itself to hyperbolic discourses. A cosmopolitan memory of the Holocaust, we would suggest, incorporating the responsibility of perpetrators, the complicity of bystanders and the willingness of their descendants to claim the legacy of a traumatic past, could interrupt such usage victim suffering. Expanding Holocaust memory and de-contextualizing it from its European specificity – turning *the Holocaust* into a *holocaust*, as Levy and Sznajder propose, moreover – can thus only be achieved if the uniqueness and exceptionalism attributed to its victim suffering for nationalist ends is abandoned and the field of memory is broadened to include other victims, other perpetrators and other bystanders involved in acts of mass violence and persecution. Such an expansion does not in any sense aim to diminish or relativize the experiences and suffering of European Holocaust survivors, or to detract from the vast evidentiary and moral contribution their spoken as well as muted and bodily testimony has provided and continues to provide for us. On the contrary, its goal would be to incorporate these memories into an enlarged global arena, making room for additional, local, regional, national and transnational, testimonies about slavery, colonialism, genocide and subordination. These diverse scenes of memory and testimony, and their role in activist and legal struggles for remembrance, recognition, restitution and justice – in South Africa, Rwanda, the Hague, Argentina, Chile and Guatemala, for example – offer a political urgency for memory and testimony that reflect back to Holocaust remembrance and inscribe it into today's global language of human rights. It is here that we can find the influence of transnational Memory Studies on Holocaust Studies.

Such a broadened, universalized, archive of memory, consisting of witness testimony and other primary and secondary sources, may then indeed permit us to apply the future-oriented-lessons that many have derived from the Holocaust more globally. Truly responding to the ethical provocation that witness testimony has transmitted and conveyed across generations and political boundaries would then entail our determined and collective efforts to prevent or to stop genocide and ethnic cleansing from being committed yet again.

Acknowledgements

This article was written following an invitation from Susannah Radstone and Bill Schwarz to contribute to their forthcoming volume *Mapping Memory*. We thank them for the invitation, their editorial suggestions, and the challenging question they posed to us: What has Holocaust Studies brought to Memory Studies and how, conversely, has Memory Studies inflected Holocaust Studies? We are also grateful to members of the Columbia Cultural Memory Colloquium and the Seminar on the Age of the Witness at CUNY Graduate Center for their excellent suggestions on earlier versions of this article.

Notes

- 1 As the author, with Dori Laub, of *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and History* (1992), Felman has been a primary voice in defining what Annette Wieviorka has called 'the era of witness'. See Wieviorka (1998, 2006).
- 2 Among other possible trajectories we could have chosen are: visuality and especially photography as privileged media of memory; the acute interest in museums and memorials as media of history and memory; and the challenges of intergenerational transmission of traumatic histories, or what we have termed 'postmemory'. Each of these trajectories would have led us to explore the connections between Holocaust Studies and the larger field of memory. Certainly a key factor motivating our choice of testimony as the topic to pursue is its important role in the new truth commissions that have increasingly come to serve as vehicles of transitional justice in the aftermath of catastrophe on a global scale a related argument about Holocaust testimony see LaCapra, 2009, Chapter 3.
- 3 In *Remnants of Auschwitz* (1999), Agamben distinguishes between two kind of witnesses, one emerging from the Latin notion of *testis* (based on the third party, *terstis*), is one who observes but does not live through the event; the other, the *superstes*, is the one who has lived through something and bears witness to it. Our discussion of witnessing in this article concerns the *superstes*, the survivor-witness.
- 4 Felman objects to Susan Sontag's provocative reference to the Eichmann trial as 'the most interesting and moving work of art of the past ten years', arguing: 'There is at least one crucial difference between an event of law and an event of art ...: a work of art cannot sentence to death. A trial, unlike art, is grounded in the sanctioned legal violence it has the power (and sometimes the duty) to enact.' For Sontag's reference see her 'Reflections on the Deputy' (Sontag, 1964: 118).
- 5 See also *The Era of Witness* (Wieviorka, 2006).
- 6 See also the distinction between 'bearing witness' and 'giving testimony' made by Michael Bernard-Donals and Richard Glejzer (2001).
- 7 For a provocative discussion of the structure of the 'I' testifying to Holocaust trauma, see Thomas Trezise (2001: 57ff). See especially his discussion of Charlotte Delbo 's paradoxical statement, 'I died in Auschwitz but no one knows it,' (2001: 59).
- 8 See Patricia Yaeger on the disjunction between speech and the body in testimony in her 'Testimony without Intimacy' (2006: 416–22).
- 9 As Sidra deKoven Ezrahi has written in 'Representing Auschwitz', (1996–97) these debates revolve around questions of authority and authenticity. In the dominant desire to get as close as possible to the heart of the abyss, the 'black hole' of Auschwitz, certain voices, certain sites and certain genres have gained greater authority over others. In what Ezrahi terms the 'static or absolutist' approach to representing the Holocaust, as opposed to a more 'dynamic or relativist' one, the Holocaust is conceptualized as a series of concentric circles with Auschwitz and the gas chamber – unreachable, immobile and ultimately incomprehensible – at the center.
- 10 In contrast, witnesses invariably apologize for breaking down during their testimony. Most try hard to maintain composure, to tell stories, provide information and, indeed, 'truth'.
- 11 Bernard-Donals and Glejzer (2001) echo this formulation.

- 12 For a critical discussion of the term 'Muselmann' in Agamben, see Gil Anidjar (2003: 140–9).
- 13 See Dominick LaCapra (2004: 160–7; 144–94) for a critique of Agamben's 'Muselmann' argument and a more encompassing critique of *Remnants of Auschwitz*. Also see the critique by Claudine Kahan and Philippe Mesnard (2001).
- 14 For Agamben the notion of archive needs to be redefined to accommodate the 'unsayable' (1999: 144).
- 15 See Derrida's distinction between 'bearing witness' and 'proof' in 'The Poetics and Politics of Witnessing' (2005: 75).
- 16 For an example of this conflict see the chapter 'Narrative Desire: The "Aubrac Affair" and National Memory of the French Resistance' in Susan Rubin Suleiman (2006: 46–61).
- 17 In a recent critical reading of Laub's essay, Thomas Trezise cites the actual testimony and, in his response, Laub concurs with the quote: 'The men, we saw the gates, yes, the gates open, men running from there and the four crematoria at one time blew up.' See Thomas Trezise, (2008: 39). Also see Dori Laub's response in the same journal (forthcoming).
- 18 As Janet Walker comments on this testimony and its interpretation: 'Laub's unconventional point is that the register of reality testified to here is not just empirical but abstract. Mistaken memories also testify, here to the 'breakage of the frame' (Walker, 2003: 108–9).
- 19 In this regard, see especially the work of James Young on 'received history' (2002) and of Dominick LaCapra on 'transference' (1994).
- 20 In his critical analysis of Laub's debate with the historians, Thomas Trezise (2008) takes him to task precisely for his reliance on the lens of clinical psychotherapy, which leads him to 'selective listening', 'imagination', 'exaggeration', and 'mythmaking'. After watching three testimonies on which Laub's analysis might have been based, Trezise finds that none of them project the extreme change of affect highlighted in Laub's interpretation. In his response, Laub claims the psychoanalytic process of counter-transference that emerges in the 'intimate dialogue' of testimony and thus his own counter-transferential responses and recollections as a form of interpretive *evidence*. These led him, in this case, to 'replac[e] the manifest text (of the testimony) with its latent meaning' (Laub, forthcoming). Laub thus insists on testimony as a psychoanalytic encounter, whereas Trezise sees testimony as a 'generic hybrid' that 'requires for its reception a plurality of interpretive frameworks' (2008: 31).
- 21 See Dominick LaCapra's useful discussion of 'empathic unsettlement,' as opposed to 'surrogate victimhood' (1994, 1998). Also see Kaja Silverman's (1996) distinction between 'idiopathic' and 'heteropathic' identification, and Marianne Hirsch (1999) on postmemory as a non-appropriative form of identification
- 22 For her elaboration of this call, see Arendt (1994: 261–279).
- 23 'It is necessary that our youth remember what happened to the Jewish people. We want them to know the most tragic facts in our history': Arendt quotes the Israeli David Ben Gurion's comment about the function of the Eichmann trial (Arendt, 1994: 10).
- 24 See Michael Rothberg's recent work on 'multidirectional memory' (2004, 2006) and his forthcoming book *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization*. See also, recent work on how the invocation of a transnational Holocaust memory can serve as a screen memory in local scenes of catastrophe, for example, Neil Levi, (2007).

References

- Agamben, Giorgio (1999) *Remnants of Auschwitz: The Witness and the Archive*, trans. Daniel Heller-Roazen. New York: Zone Books.
- Anidjar, Gil (2003) *The Jew, the Arab: A History of the Enemy*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Arendt, Hannah (1994) *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil*. New York: Penguin.
- Bernard-Donals, Michael and Richard Glejzer (2001) *Between Witness and Testimony: The Holocaust and the Limits of Representation*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Chevrie, Marc and Hervé Le Roux (2007) 'Site and Speech: An Interview with Claude Lanzmann', trans. Stuart Liebman, in Stuart Liebman (ed.) *Claude Lanzmann's Shoah: A Casebook*, pp. 35–50. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Delbo, Charlotte (1990) *Days and Memory*, trans. Rosette Lamont. Marlboro, VT: The Marlboro Press.
- Delbo, Charlotte (1995) *Auschwitz and After*, trans. Rosette Lamont. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Derrida, Jacques (2005) 'The Poetics and Politics of Witnessing', in Thomas Dutoit and Outi Pasanen (eds) *Sovereignities in Question: The Poetics of Paul Celan*, pp. 65–96. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Ezrahi, Sidra deKoven (1996–97) 'Representing Auschwitz', *History and Memory* 7(2): 120–53.
- Felman, Shoshana (2002) *The Juridical Unconscious: Trials and Traumas in the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Felman, Shoshana and Dori Laub, eds (1992) *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and History*. New York: Routledge.
- Gouri, Haim (2004) *Facing the Glass Booth: The Jerusalem Trial of Adolf Eichmann*, trans. Michael Swirsky. Detroit: Wayne State Press.
- Hartman, Geoffrey (1996) 'Learning from Survivors: The Yale Testimony Project', in *The Longest Shadow: In the Aftermath of the Holocaust*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Hausner, Gideon (1966) *Justice in Jerusalem*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Hirsch, Marianne (1999) 'Projected Memory: Holocaust Photographs in Personal and Public Fantasy,' in Mieke Bal, Jonathan Crewe and Leo Spitzer (eds) *Acts of Memory: Cultural Recall in the Present*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.
- Kahan, Claudine and Philippe Mesnard (2001) *Giorgio Agamben à l'épreuve d'Auschwitz*. Paris: Éditions Kimé.
- LaCapra, Dominick (1994) *Representing the Holocaust: History, Theory, Trauma*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- LaCapra, Dominick (1998) *History and Memory after Auschwitz*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- LaCapra, Dominick (2004) *History in Transit: Experience, Identity, Critical Theory*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- LaCapra, Dominick (2009) *History and its Limits: Human, Animal, Violence*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Langer, Laurence (1991) *Holocaust Testimonies: The Ruins of Memory*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Lanzmann, Claude (1985) *Shoah: An Oral History of the Holocaust. The Complete Text of the Film by Claude Lanzmann*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Lanzmann, Claude (2003[1985]) *Shoah*. Paris: Les Films Aleph; New York: New Yorker Films Artwork.
- Lanzmann, Claude (2005) Seminar at the Museum of Jewish Heritage, New York, 23 September.
- Laub, Dori (forthcoming) 'On Holocaust Testimony and its "Reception" within its Own Frame as a Process in its Own Right: A Response to "Between History and Psychoanalysis" by Thomas Trezise', *History & Memory*.

- Levi, Neil (2007) "'No Sensible Comparison?'" The Place of the Holocaust in Australia's History Wars', *History and Memory* 19(1): 124–56.
- Levi, Primo (1989) *The Drowned and the Saved*, trans. Raymond Rosenthal. New York: Vintage Books.
- Levy, Daniel and Natan Sznaider (2006) *Holocaust and Memory in the Golden Age*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Lyotard, Jean-François (1988) *The Differend: Phrases in Dispute*, trans. Georges Van Den Abbeele. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Nora, Pierre (2006) *Realms of Memory: Rethinking the French Past*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Rothberg, Michael (2004) 'The Work of Testimony in the Age of Decolonization: *Chronicle of a Summer*, Cinema Verité, and the Emergence of the Holocaust Survivor', *PMLA* 119: 1237–46.
- Rothberg, Michael (2006) 'Between Auschwitz and Algeria: Multidirectional Memory and the Counterpublic Witness', *Critical Inquiry* 33(1): 158–84.
- Rothberg, Michael (forthcoming) *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization*.
- Silverman, Kaja (1996) *The Threshold of the Visible World*. New York: Routledge.
- Suleiman, Susan Rubin (2006) *Crises of Memory and the Second World War*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sontag, Susan (1964) 'Reflections on The Deputy', in Eric Bentley (ed.) *The Storm over The Deputy*. New York: Grove Press.
- Spence, Donald P. (1982) *Narrative Truth and Historical Truth: Meaning and Interpretation in Psychoanalysis*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Trezise, Thomas (2001) 'Unspeakable', *The Yale Journal of Criticism* 14(1): 38–63.
- Trezise, Thomas (2002) 'The Question of Community in Charlotte Delbo's Auschwitz and After', *Modern Language Notes* 117(4): 858–86.
- Trezise, Thomas (2008) 'Between History and Psychoanalysis: A Case Study in the Reception of Holocaust Survivor Testimony', *History & Memory* 20(1): 7–47.
- Walker, Janet (2003) 'The Traumatic Paradox: Autobiographical Documentary and the Psychology of Memory', in Katharine Hodgkin and Susannah Radstone (eds) *Contested Pasts: The Politics of Memory*, pp. 104–19. London: Routledge.
- Wieviorka, Annette (1994) 'On Testimony', in Geoffrey Hartman (ed.) *Holocaust Remembrance: The Shapes of Memory*, pp. 23–32. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Wieviorka, Annette (1998) *L'Ere du témoin*. Paris: Plon.
- Wieviorka, Annette (2006) *The Era of the Witness*, trans. Jared Stark. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Yaeger, Patricia (2006) 'Testimony without Intimacy', *Poetics Today* 27(2): 399–422.
- Young, James E. (2002) 'Toward a Received History of the Holocaust', *History and Theory: Studies in the Philosophy of History* 35(4): 21–43.

MARIANNE HIRSCH is Professor of English and Comparative Literature at Columbia University, USA and Co-Director of the Institute for Research on Women and Gender. Her most recent publications are *Family Frames: Photography, Narrative, and Postmemory* (Harvard University Press, 1997), *The Familial Gaze* (University Press of New England, 1998), the co-edited *Teaching the Representation of the Holocaust* (Modern Language Association, 2004) and special issue of *Signs* on

'Gender and Cultural Memory'. She is currently completing *The Generation of Postmemory*. The book she co-authored with Leo Spitzer, *Ghosts of Home: The Afterlife of Czernowitz in Jewish Memory*, is forthcoming from the University of California Press in 2009. Address: 602 Philosophy Hall, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027, USA. [email: Mh2349@columbia.edu]

LEO SPITZER is the Kathe Tappe Vernon Professor of History Emeritus at Dartmouth College, USA and Visiting Professor of History at Columbia University. His books include *Lives in Between: Assimilation and Marginality in Austria, Brazil and West Africa* (Cambridge University Press, 1989), *Hotel Bolivia: The Culture of Memory in a Refuge from Nazism* (Hill & Wang, 1998) and the co-edited *Acts Of Memory: Cultural Recall in the Present* (University Press of New England, 1998). He is also co-author, with Marianne Hirsch, of *Ghosts of Home: The Afterlife of Czernowitz in Jewish Memory*, forthcoming in 2009. Address: 6107 Carson Hall, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH 03755, USA. [email: Ls2307@columbia.edu]