

March 2002

**The Mythological Sabra and the Jewish Past:
Trauma, Memory, and Contested Identities**

Yael Zerubavel

Israel Studies

**Special Issue on Memory
Guest Editor, Michael Feige
Vol. 7, No. 2 (Summer 2002)**

Prof. Yael Zerubavel
Director
The Allen and Joan Bildner Center for the Study of Jewish Life
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
12 College Avenue, New Brunswick, NJ 08901
Tel. (732) 932-2033; fax (732) 932-3052
E-mail: yaelzeru@rci.rutgers.edu

Israelis' intense preoccupation with the examination of their collective identity has been highly pronounced since the early years of the Zionist settlement. This phenomenon should not be surprising for a young nation of immigrants that faces the challenge of establishing its distinct national identity. Since its early days, Zionist ideology has consciously engaged in articulating its attitude toward the Jewish past within the context of its national agenda and vision. The discursive construction of symbolic continuities and discontinuities between the past and the present has been a critical dimension of this process.

Zionism constructed a grand narrative in the tradition of the 19th century, rooted in the Enlightenment's idea of rationalism and progress. Its linear, teleological structure provides a sweeping and unifying interpretation of Jewish history from a secular national perspective and is based on a series of dichotomies: exile/ homeland, Jewish/Hebrew, persecution/ redemption. These ideological formulations were introduced and reinforced in the national Hebrew culture through multiple cultural channels, including educational texts, children's literature, plays, poems, fiction, art, holiday celebrations, official symbols and public ceremonies.

The figure of the "mythological Sabra," the new native Jew growing up in the Land of Israel, provided an ideal type rather than a realistic portrayal of the Hebrew youth, but as such it served as a powerful cultural construct. The mythological Sabra emerged as a self-image and an educational model for the socialization of the Hebrew youth and new immigrants. Since it was largely shaped in opposition to the prevailing Zionist stereotype of the exilic Jew (*yehudi galuti*), the mythological Sabra personified the desired rupture with the exilic past and its culture, a step that was deemed necessary in order to ensure the opening of a new era in Jewish history. ¹

A century has passed since the early Zionist immigration to Palestine but Israelis' passionate interest in their collective identity continues to be featured prominently in Israeli popular and scholarly discourse and attracts considerable public attention.² The transformations of Israeli identity in the face of significant internal and external processes of change has led to the critical examination of the secular national Zionist ethos of the late Yishuv and early state periods. The article sets out to explore the period of transition in which Israelis' felt a greater need to address the impact of traumatic ruptures within their individual and collective pasts. Through the analysis of four literary works published from the mid-1970s to the mid-1990s, this essay examines various strategies of coping with the ruptures introduced by the Zionist ideology and reinforced by the experience of traumas in the Holocaust and in Israeli wars and their effects on the construction of Israeli identity.

Zionism's dual attitude toward the past -- its advocated continuity and identification with the ancient past and its negative attitude toward the period of exile -- led to the formation of an overall narrative that is based on a major change of historical trajectory: a *decline narrative* that covered Jewish history from the "golden age" of Antiquity through exile and persecution until the end of the 19th century, and its replacement by a *progress narrative* beginning with the Zionist return to the ancient homeland and leading to national redemption.³ The rhetorical construction of a rupture between the period of exile and the Zionist national revival served as a key to the change from a regressive to a progressive historical narrative. The particular juncture of two major historical events -- the cataclysmic (the Holocaust) and the redemptive (the foundation of the State of Israel) -- fit the semiotic structure of the Zionist narrative and reinforced this constructed rupture.

This ideological framework gave rise to the *Zionist conversion paradigm* that links immigration to the Land of Israel with a vision of an accelerated and irreversible identity

change from exilic Jews to native Hebrews. Since Jewish immigrants to the Land of Israel (*olim*) are established as a distinct category denoting those who “return” from exile to their national “home,” they are considered as *reclaiming* their “natural” ancient/new native identity, a position that is validated by Israel’s “Law of Return.” By virtue of their distinct status, *olim* can be granted instant citizenship and do not need to face a liminal period inherent to the structure of rites of passage, which is commonly required from immigrants.⁴

The rupture introduced on an ideological level is easily reinforced by the immigrant experience. Immigration often entails the experience of uprooting, dislocation, and loss, and Jewish immigration to Palestine and later to Israel was typically triggered by persecution in the countries of origin. During the late Yishuv and early state periods, new immigrants were faced with the pressure to embrace Zionist views and values and to conform to the Zionist conversion paradigm. The new *olim* were expected to shed their foreignness by relinquishing their exilic languages and customs, adopt Hebrew names, speak Hebrew and avoid the use of their native tongues, and subscribe to the new society’s secular national ethos. Name changing became an important Zionist ritual, articulating the symbolic death of one’s exilic Jewish identity and its replacement by a native Hebrew name and identity. Doing away with one’s old name serves as a gesture of disidentification with a stigmatized identity or a discredited past.⁵ That it is interpreted as a ritual marker of a more profound identity transformation is clear from the analogy of this Zionist practice to the ritual conversion to Judaism, and perhaps no less significantly within this ideological context, is reminiscent of an old Jewish folk custom of changing the name of the severely sick in order to guarantee their recovery.⁶

The passage of time has provided a necessary distance for enabling Israelis to look back at their individual and collective past. Major shifts in Israel’s demographic, political, and economic life, the unexpected 1973 Yom Kippur War, and the subsequent breakdown of

Labor Zionism shook up many of the foundations of Israeli society and called for a critical re-examination of its social, cultural, and political premises. Marginalized groups, which had not conformed to the Israeli secular national ethos, such as Mizrahi Jews, Ultra-Orthodox Jews, Israeli Arabs, and women, have made strides toward a greater engagement in Israeli political life.

The collective trauma of the 1973 Yom Kippur War -- the unexpected attack, duration of the war, and the high number of casualties -- enhanced public consciousness to the long-term effects of the wars for individuals and the society as a whole. Since then, a growing body of research, media coverage, and literary and artistic works have focused on such topics as battle shock, coping with death and disabilities, bereaved families, public and private mourning practices, memorial books and commemorative ceremonies, museums and monuments.⁷ Israelis' first-hand experience of trauma in Israeli-Arab wars and the continuing conflict with the Palestinians heightened the anxiety over issues of death and survival and transformed Israelis attitude toward the Holocaust. In sharp contrast to the earlier attitude of psychological distancing that tended to associate the Holocaust with the "other" (i.e. the exilic Jew), Israelis began to display a growing interest in Holocaust history and commemoration and a stronger identification with its victims.⁸ The Holocaust has thus emerged as one of the most defining historical events in Israeli collective consciousness and as a key historical metaphor of Jewish vulnerability.

The tension between distancing and identification, suppression and obsession, in the Israeli attitude toward the Holocaust articulates the ambivalence toward the past that characterizes the post-traumatic syndrome. Since trauma (originally "wound" in Greek), assaults the individual with excess of stimuli that cannot be assimilated into familiar cognitive schemas, *traumatic memory* is dissociated from consciousness. As such it remains fragmented, incomprehensible, and resisting integration.⁹ Trauma survivors suffer from

varying degrees of dissociation, but even when the rupture is not complete, they often report on experiencing the doubling or the splitting of self.¹⁰ Yet the repression of the traumatic experience and the inability to integrate it also creates the necessity to re-live that past time and time again through flashbacks, nightmares or unconscious repetition of behavior patterns.¹¹ This duality in the attitude toward the past is the key to the four works that the present article examines.

The literary works revolve around individuals who suffer from a traumatic response and explore their experience of conflicting pressures to forget and to remember the past, the relation between the Zionist and the Jewish pasts, the transformation of and the erasure of memories, and the invention and suppression of identities. In describing these processes, these works emphasize the state of crisis and convey the urgent need to find ways to cope with it. Literary works often produce complex and nuanced descriptions of cultural, social and psychological undercurrents that allow deeper understanding of those processes. In Israeli society writers played an important role in the construction of the foundations of the national Hebrew culture and even today they continue to be engaged in Israeli public and political life and enjoy the prestige of public figures.¹²

The four novels that this study addresses were published between 1975-1995: Hanoch Bartov's The Fabricator (1975), Amnon Jackont's Borrowed Time (1981), Yoram Kanyuk's The Last Jew (1981) and Michal Govrin's The Name (1995).¹³ The writers of these novels belong to two different generations, the older generation of the Yishuv's Hebrew youth (Bartov and Kanyuk) and the generation who was born around the foundation of the state (Jackont and Govrin). Although all these novels revolve around the theme of a transformed identity, the first two are essentially conceived as mysteries, and the two latter represent a more experimental turn in the construction of their narratives. Whereas the first three novels are written by male writers and focus on male characters in line with the gender-based image

of the Sabra, the choice of Govrin's novel reflects the recent rise of literature by and about Israeli women and represents a female character with a more individualistic and self-reflexive voice.¹⁴

The experience of ruptures and the challenge of integrating the past and the present described in these novels clearly applies to a much wider scope of social groups in Israel than they represent. Yet the issues that these works explore reach beyond these specific cases and their particular circumstances and their analysis suggests the possibility of reinterpreting them as national allegories. I hope that this essay will help shed light on the transformation of the once-homogenous Sabra identity into a growing range of emergent Israeli identities as Israelis continue to reconfigure their place within the collective drama of Jewish history as well as the current situation in the Middle East.

Postmemory, Contested Identities, and the Search for Redemption

Twenty years after the publication of The Fabricator, Michal Govrin's novel The Name explores the impact of the Holocaust on the identity formation of a young Israeli who is a second-generation survivor. A Sabra who was born and raised in Israel, she struggles with the shadows of the past that intrude on her life and sense of self. As a young girl of four, Amalia finds out from her aunt that she is named after her father's first wife, Mala, who died during the Holocaust, and that they share the nickname Malinka. The dead woman is introduced to the girl as an admired, legendary figure: "She was our angel. Our angel. Mala!" her aunt reveals to her. "You can't imagine how fantastic she was!" [E18, H22-23].³⁵ His sweetheart since childhood, Amalia's father married Mala who was a beautiful woman and an aspiring concert pianist, and who died as a proud Jew by committing suicide when taken by the Nazis.

The aunt's revelation about her father's unknown past follows the father's outburst at her for failing to demonstrate the same music talent that her namesake had. This incident imprints Mala's presence on Amalia's consciousness. From this point on, Mala becomes a secret but constant presence in her life. Having internalized the fragmented memories transmitted to her inadvertently by her parents and more directly by her aunt as her own, she adopts the image of Mala that becomes part of her inner world and own identity. This phenomenon is typical of second-generation Holocaust survivors, particularly those named after relatives who perished in the war.³⁶ Marianne Hirsch identifies this form of memory, based on "experiences they 'remember' only as the stories and images with which they grew up, but that are so powerful, so monumental, as to constitute memories in their own right," as

postmemory. As a result, “their own belated stories are displaced by the stories of the previous generation, shaped by traumatic events that they can neither understand nor recreate.”³⁷

Feeling overwhelmed by her role as a living monument, Amalia attempts to escape from the oppressive burden of her postmemory that continues to assault her sense of self and invade the present. “I told you,” she screams at her father as a young adult, “I don’t want any contact with your past, no contact, you understand?” [E54/H57]. Struggling to suppress her postmemory and separate herself from Mala, she goes through successive identity changes: Amalia, the daughter of European Holocaust survivors who live in serene Jerusalem, becomes Amy, a singer who performs in the free-spirited, Americanized clubs on Tel Aviv beach. When this identity change fails to rescue her from the grip of the past, she moves further away, leaving Tel Aviv for New York City, where she works as a photographer and lives in the Village.

Name changing represents a deliberate act of disociation (“disidentification”) with a discredited self and past, and as a ritual marker of a break with the past. Yet the protagonist’s attempts to create a formal rupture with her fragmented identity as Amalia/Mala and fashion herself in a new identity fail to achieve this goal. As the past continues to haunt her, she experiments with the opposite strategy of totally submerging herself in it by retracing Mala’s life. Amy-turned-Emily returns to Europe to recreate Mala’s past by documenting it in photographs, a project that is commissioned by Mr. Stein, a Holocaust survivor and a former admirer of Mala.

Stein acts as the spokesman of her parents’ generation as he echoes the traditional Jewish command to remember (*zakhor*) and demands her help in preserving the dead woman’s memory. “You, our second Malinka, you will bring Mala back to us, you!” [E58, H61]. To forget, he claims, is to let the Nazis succeed in demolishing the memory of the dead: “It can’t be that she won’t be anymore, do you understand? Can’t be. With beauty like hers,

only angels are born; they must not succeed in killing her memory, you understand!”

[E58/H60] Amalia hopes that the creation of a photo album about Mala’s life would free her from her role as a monument and free her to live her own life. When she realizes that this strategy too fails, her desperation drives her to a failed suicide.

Amalia’s last attempt is directed at another identity change when she adopts an Orthodox way of life and becomes *ba’alat tshuva*. Amalia’s wish to escape the past colludes with the religious paradigm taught by the rabbi who serves as her spiritual guide: “Remember that repentance is like death and rebirth,” he explains to her. “[...] One should not only keep away from sin but forget it completely, erase from memory the acts of the past” [F34/H37]. Amalia resorts often to this religious formula: “I am a different person and I am not the same one who sinned” [E12/H13], she tells herself as she struggles to reground her life and notion of self in the new route opened to her.

After two years of study in the Yeshiva, she moves to the outskirts of Jerusalem and devotes herself to the sacred craft of weaving prayer shawls (*talitot*) and a Torah curtain (*parochet*). The rabbi sees the completion of her repentance in raising a family with a young man whom he designates as her groom. On the verge of accepting his choice and in spite of her budding love for her fiancé, Amalia’s doubts about the possibility of redemption intensify as her memories of previous love affairs and identity changes increasingly invade the present. In the beginning, she blames Mala for undermining her efforts to comply with the religious conversion formula of erasing the past: “It’s not me, it’s not me, Rabbi, it’s her!” she cries out to her spiritual guide. “I tried, I tried to escape, to hide, I tried everything, even the name, her name, I changed once, twice, but she pursued me, Rabbi, even here! [...] It’s she who gets in the way of repentance, she won’t let me live in her death, she won’t ever forgive me...” [E42; 44H]. Later, however, she expresses doubts about the validity of the religious formula he presented to her: “But Rabbi! [...] It is impossible to escape like that... I can’t believe that it’s

possible to get up one day and say: This isn't me" [E195; H185] "How is it possible to forget, even if the memory is awful, even if it is a memory of sin? How is it possible to say: Be different, I am a different person and not the same one who sinned. These are just words, Rabbi, empty sophistry!" [E196/ H186]. Amalia sees the denial of memory as an act of betrayal of Mala, which ultimately she cannot accept.

As the past increasingly re-asserts itself into the present, Amalia becomes aware of the repeated behavior patterns that pervade her life and realizes that underneath her various identities she is one and the same person: "No more division. One and your name is one" [H167].³⁸ This realization contradicts the fundamental premise of the religious formula and Amalia deliberately uses it in order to subvert its meaning: "For I am the same person who sinned, I did not travel into exile from my home, and I did not change my name again, Amalia. That is the secret of the name woven into us, for *You are One and Your Name is One*" [E166/ H159]. The unity of her name and identity is thus linked to the unity the Name (God), which is reaffirmed in the prayer words she recites.

Failing to achieve redemption through splitting or suppressing the past, she nurtures an alternative solution that her fiancé's mystical rabbi raises: to commit a sacrificial act of atonement and martyrdom that would restore unity to herself as well as to the broken, fragmented world (*tikkun olam*). Death will thus bring about a personal and a collective redemption, a total merging of the past and the present, history and memory, Man and God. It will allow her ultimate fusion with Mala who committed suicide in the camp. In contrast to those past attempts (Mala's and her own) of "anomic suicide", this interpretation suggests "altruistic suicide" that is committed for the society's benefit.³⁹

Toward the end of the novel, however, Amalia realizes the impossibility of the total perfection that she seeks: the imperfection of faith, of her sacrificial death, and even of God himself. Amalia succeeds in completing the tasks that she set out to do in preparation for her

final act: the weaving of the Torah curtain and the writing of a confession. The novel ends enigmatically, as the Shabbat enters, and we do not know if the heroine will pursue her secret plan to throw herself off the cliff wrapped in her finished Torah curtain or, following her realization, will emerge out of this process reaffirmed in her search for an integrated life and self.

The novel text is thus Amalia's own written confession. Her decision to write it follows her various hesitant attempts to confess her past to her rabbi and to her fiancé, attempts that were harshly cut off, thereby denying her the opportunity to integrate her past and present. Her writing thus becomes an act of defiance against the silence imposed on her, a religious act of repentance and purification before death, and a therapeutic process of gaining insight into her traumatized postmemory and the ruptures that she has endured. Amalia's confession, following St. Augustine's model, serves at one and the same time as an autobiography, a testimony about life's secrets and passions before receiving faith, a diary, a prayer, an engagement with theological and mystical issues, and the text of a novel. By putting together the broken segments of her fractured self, her therapeutic journey represents an alternative, private version of *tikkun olam*.

Written over a period of forty days within the "Sefirah period" (i.e., the counting of the days of the Omer, the fifty days that separate Passover and Shavuot), the writing of the confession represents a double movement in time: a linear movement that is manifested in historical time and in her daily countdown toward the completion of her weaving and her life, and a circular movement of reliving various layers of her past. This duality is reflected in period of the Sefirah itself, which proceeds in a linear fashion through the counting of days but also represents a cyclical return to the nation's mythical past. The heroine-narrator's physical engagement in weaving at the time of her writing becomes a metaphor for this

double movement and her effort to tie together the loose, torn threads of her fragmented life and consciousness.

The text reflects the heroine's state of inner agitation and mirrors the fragmentation of her identity and memory. Although Amalia is the narrator, the splitting of her consciousness becomes evident in the sudden shifts between the first, second, and third singular pronouns: "But now, how shall *I* claim to confess with clean hands about *you*, about the fear that impelled *you* to start stretching the warp of the prayer shawls despite what happened last night? [...] and from the blur, once again *she* bursts onto the hotel roof with *her* crazy singing, and flounces out to the path going down from the walls. *You* turned *your* head away in pain; hadn't *you* done everything to wipe those hours out of *yourself*, as Rabbi Israel Gothelf instructed, and here *she*, the impure one, the errant one, stirs in *you* again [...]" [E21-22/H26, emphasis added]. Elsewhere, her use of the plural pronoun articulates the co-consciousness of Mala/Amalia, and at one point Mala takes over the narrator's role as she addresses Amalia in the second person: "And how close *we* are now, *Amalia*, how dear to *me* is the light of the bonfire catching fire in *your* hair [...] as if *I and not you* will go tonight like last year into the crowd..." [E139/134H, emphases added].⁴⁰ The gaps produced by these abrupt shifts, by broken phrases, and dividing lines within the text represent the ruptures and gaps within the narrator's consciousness.

The grounding of the narrative in the *Sefirah* period provides a subtext for Amalia's private journey in search of redemption. Encoded in national memory as the period representing the Exodus from Egypt, the trials of wandering in the desert, and culminating in the giving of the Torah in Mount Sinai, it provides a redemptive formula that frames Amalia's own story. Although the *Sefirah* extends fifty days, the confession is written over a forty-day period, thereby creating an analogy with the forty days and nights which Moses spent on Mount Sinai in preparation for the giving of the Torah [Exodus 34:28] and Amalia's

preparation for her sacrificial act. This subtext becomes more explicit when her fiancé explains his refusal to look at her photographs of Mala by making an allusion to Exodus: “Each of us, it seems, has to leave his dead in the desert, Amalia,” to which she whispers in reply: “I’ll stay behind with the dead in the desert” [E239/ H226]. Although at this point she articulates her belief that she will die before “entering the Promised Land,” the grounding of her confession in this highly charged mythical formula of death and rebirth, slavery and redemption, resists the closure of suicide. The possibility of “alternative redemption”⁴¹ remains, at the end, deliberately ambiguous.

Amalya’s search, rooted in her personal (hi)story, demonstrates the rejection of both the Zionist and the religious conversion formulae that construct a redemptive narrative based on a rupture with the past and therefore deprived of memory. The possibility of suppressing or erasing the past is short lived and is bound to undermine the lives of individuals as well as the society. Contrary to the expectations that the mythological Sabra would represent the counter-image of the persecuted exilic Jew, the Israeli re-emerges as mirroring earlier Jewish generations and internalizing their traumatic past. Like David Grossman’s See: Under Love,⁴² The Name highlights the impact of the postmemory of the Holocaust on native Israelis, the second generation of Holocaust survivors, for whom the trauma of the past becomes an integral part of their present. It shows how the second generation’s borrowed memories and nightmarish fantasies continue to reshape the present and turn the Holocaust from the experience of the “other,” the exilic Jew, to becoming Israelis’ collective past. The struggle at this point is directed at the opposite direction predicted by the Zionist narrative, namely, to separate between the Sabra’s postmemory of the traumatic Jewish past and the reality of the present.

Notes

* I would like to thank Berel Lang and Eviatar Zerubavel for their careful reading and thoughtful comments on an earlier draft. I am also grateful to Jonathan Goldberg, Carolyn Williams, Elin Diamond, Jeffrey Shandler, and other members of the Rutgers Center for the Critical Analysis of Contemporary Culture's seminar on "The Performance of Culture" for a most helpful discussion of the paper I presented at the seminar.

¹ The new native was called the "New Jew," "New Hebrew," "*Eretz Yisraeli*," and "Sabra" (*Tsabar*). In referring to the ideal image of the new native of the 1930s-1960s, I will be using the term "Sabra" which ultimately emerged as the predominant one. On the early construction of the new Hebrew, see Rachel Elboim-Dror, "He is Emerging from within Us, the New Hebrew: On the Subculture of Youth of the First Aliyah," *Alpayim* 12 (1969): 104-35. See also Avraham Shapira, "On the Spiritual Rootlessness and Circumscription to the 'Here and Now' in the Sabra World View," in Dan Urian and Ephraim Karsh, eds. *In Search of Identity: Jewish Aspects in Israeli Culture*, London: Frank Cass, 1999, 103-31. For a sociological study of the Sabra, see Oz Almog, *The Sabra: The Creation of the New Jew*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000 [originally Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1997].

² It is impossible to encompass here the vast literature on the subject of Israeli identity. Among recent scholarly and popular works on this subject are Anita Shapira, *New Jews, Old Jews*. Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1997 (H); Yair Auron, *Jewish-Israeli Identity*. Tel Aviv: Sifriat Poalim, 1993 (H); Charles S. Liebman and Eliahue Katz, eds. *The Jewishness of Israelis*. Albany: SUNY, 1997; Azmi Bishara, ed. *Between "I" and "We": The Construction of Identities and Israeli Identity*. Jerusalem: Van Leer & Hakhibutz Hameuchad, 1999 (H). Recently a new popular series "The Israelis" has been established by one of the major Hebrew publishers. Two of their recent publications include Tom Segev, *The New Zionists*. Jerusalem: Keter, 2000 (H); Baruch Kimmerling, *The End of Ashkenazi Hegemony*. Jerusalem: Keter, 2001 (H).

³ For a further discussion of the Zionist construction of the past, see Yael Zerubavel, *Recovered Roots: Collective Memory and the Making of Israeli National Tradition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995. On the concepts of "progress narratives" and "decline narratives," see Eviatar Zerubavel, *Time Maps: The Social Typology of the Past*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, forthcoming, 2002. On the different structures of historical narratives, see Hayden White, *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978, and *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.

⁴ Arnold Van Gennep, *The Rites of Passage*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960; Victor W. Turner, *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-structure*. Hammondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1974.

⁵ See Erving Goffman, *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. Englewood Cliff: Prentice Hall, 1963, 92. Paul Antze, "Telling Stories, Making Selves: Memory and Identity in Multiple Personality Disorder," in his and Michael Lambek, eds. *Tense Past: Cultural Essays in Trauma and Memory*. New York: Routledge, 1996, 1996, 15.

⁶ Changing the name of severely sick people is attributed to the belief that a new name will confuse the angel of death. See Joshua Trachtenberg, *Jewish Magic and Superstition: A Study in Folk Religion*. NY: Atheneum, 1970, 203-206.

⁷ To mention a few examples from studies published in those years: Emmanuel Sivan, *The 1948 Generation: Myth, Profile, Memory*. Tel Aviv: Ministry of Defense, 1991 (H); Hannah Naveh, *Captives of Mourning: Perspective of Mourning in Hebrew Literature*. Tel Aviv: Hakhibutz Hameuchad, 1993 (H); Ruth Malkinson, Simon Rubin, and Eliezer Witztum, eds. *Loss and bereavement in Jewish Society in Israel*. Jerusalem: Cana, 1993 (h); Ilana Shamir, *Commemoration and Remembrance*. Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1996 (H).

⁸ Yair Auron, *Jewish-Israeli Identity*. Sifriat Poalim, 1993, 70-77 (H); Charles S. Liebman and Eliezer Don-Yehiya, *Civil Religion in Israel*. University of California Press, 137-51; Yael Zerubavel, "The Death of Memory and the Memory of Death: Masada and the Holocaust as Historical Metaphors," in *Representations* 45 (Winter 1994): 72-100 and *Alpayim* 10 (1994): 42-67.

⁹ Sigmund Freud, *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*. NY: W.W. Norton & Co, 1961, 9-10, 33-39; on

Pierre Janet's concepts, "traumatic memory" and "narrative memory," [Les médications psychologiques, 3 vols. Aris. Societe Pierre Janet] see also Judith Lewis Herman, Trauma and Recovery. NY: Basic Books, 1992, 34-35, 37; Van der Kolk, A. Bessel and Onno van der Hart, "The Intrusive Past: The Flexibility of Memory and the Engraving of Trauma," in Cathy Caruth, Trauma: Explorations in Memory. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995, 159-60, and Ruth Reys, Trauma: A Genealogy. University of Chicago Press, 2000, 83-119.

¹⁰ "Auschwitz is there, fixed and unchangeable, but wrapped in the impervious skin of memory that segregates itself from the present 'me'," Delbo writes, and another survivor, Sally H., says: "I'm thinking of it now how I split myself. That it wasn't *me* there. It just wasn't me. I was somebody else." quoted in Lawrence L. Langer, Holocaust Testimonies: The Ruins of Memory. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991, 48, 5 respectively; see also Lawrence more extensive discussion of "anguished memory," in particular 48-57; Herman, Trauma and Recovery, 103-10; Lifton, The Broken Connection: On Death and the Continuity of Life. NY: Simon & Schuter, 1979, 163-78, and in his interview with Caruth in her Trauma, 137.

¹¹ Trauma is described as "the response to an unexpected or overwhelming violent event or events that are not fully grasped as they occur, but return later in repeated flashbacks, nightmares, and other repetitive phenomena." Cathy Caruth, Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, History. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996, 3, 91. As Robert Jay Lifton observes, "... in the case of severe trauma, we can say that there has been an important break in the life line that can leave one permanently engaged in either repair or the acquisition of a new twine" (The Broken Connection, 176).

¹² Some of Israeli major writers who belong to the Hebrew youth of the Yishuv period, such as S. Yizhar, Hanoeh Bartov, Aharon Megged and Amos Kenan, have published, in addition to the literary works, newspaper articles or books of essays on current political and social issues. Prominent writers of younger generations, including Amos Oz and A.B. Yehoshua, Yitzhak Laor and David Grossman, have followed this tradition.

¹³ Hanoeh Bartov, The Fabricator [Ha-Badai]. Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1975; Amnon Jackont's Borrowed Time [Pesek Zeman]. Tel Aviv: Am Oved in 1982; Yoram Kanyuk's The Last Jew. Tel Aviv: Hakibutz Hameuchad & Sifriat Poalim, 1981; and Michal Govrin, The Name [Ha-Shem]. Tel Aviv: Hakibutz Hameuchad, 1995. English translation by Barbara Harshav, NY: Riverhead Books, 1998.

¹⁴ On the issue of gender and the Sabra image and on women's writing in Israel see Yael S. Feldman, No Room of Their Own: Israeli Women's Fiction. NY: Columbia University Press, 1999.

¹⁵ Micha Shalev, With His Own Hands. Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1961, new edition 1971, 9 (H). On the

³⁵ Quotes in this article draw on Harshav's English translation, and indicate the corresponding pages in the original Hebrew text.

³⁶ For an extensive discussion of the syndrome of second-generation from a psychological perspective, see Dina Wardi, Memorial Candles: Dialogue with Second Generation Holocaust Survivors. Jerusalem: Keter, (H) [year missing].

³⁷ Marianne Hirsch. "Projected Memory: Holocaust Photographs in Person and Public Fantasy," in Bal Mieke, Jonathan Crewe, and Leo Spitzer, eds. Acts of Memory: Cultural Recall in the Present. Hanover: University Press of New England, 1999, 8.

³⁸ I deviated in this case from Harshav's translation of this phrase as "no more distinction" since the Hebrew word Govrin uses, *hiluk*, which means "division" serves better to imply her splitting of her self.

³⁹ Emile Durkheim, , Suicide: A Study in Sociology. Free Press, 1951.

⁴⁰ On that occasion, Amalia describes herself as remaining "outside the fence," [E157/H151], a stranger in the midst of the celebrating crowd, including her fiancé, and she escapes from there and from him. Ironically, this was the night which Amalia's fiancé defines as their engagement and in which they are physically united, but it signals the beginning of the breakdown of their future union as a husband and wife.

⁴¹ Rachel Feldhay Brenner, "On Two Options of Redemption: *See: Under Love* and *The Name*," Alpayim 20 (2000): 149-68 (H).

⁴² David Grossman, See: Under Love. Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad, 1986; English translation by Betsy Rosenberg. NY: Farrar Straus Giroux, 1989.

⁴³ Continuity with Jewish tradition was clearly preserved in the symbolic domain in such key areas as the language, the calendar of holidays, and in the creation of national symbols and myths. Although some of their forms and their interpretation were subject to change, this is quite different than generating totally new, secular symbolic system that has no relations to Jewish tradition. For analysis of this dialectic between new and old, see Liebman & Don Yehiya, Civil Religion, and Zerubavel, Recovered Roots.

⁴⁴ See also Anita Shapira's observation that the image of the "Palmachnik," the mythological Sabra *par excellence*, represented only a minority of Hebrew youth and was anachronistic by the time it was fully formed ("From the Palmach Generation to the Candle Children: Changing Patterns in Israeli Identity," Partisan Review 4 (2000): 623).