

Liliana Ruth Feierstein

## The Territories of Memory: Sefarad and Ashkenaz as Sites of Flourishing, Destruction, and Identity

*There is a land that does not appear on any map of the world, a strange, unknown land of almost unreal immensity, whose ever-changing frontiers span continents and cross oceans. It is the land of Yiddish. How many people claim this language as their own, from New York to Moscow, from Buenos Aires to Warsaw, from Jerusalem to Paris, from Melbourne to Johannesburg? Millions!*

*Chaim Sloves<sup>1</sup>*

You will not find the outlines of *Ashkenaz*<sup>2</sup> and *Sefarad* drawn on any map of Europe. And nevertheless, these *lands* have an existence that is determined by other geographic, historical, and political borders. They are, to apply a term of Michel Foucault's (1984) to them, *heterotopias* – spaces that are located in gaps “between” or on the fringes of traditional spaces and whose very existence questions the basic tenets of topography. At the same time they constitute *chronotopes*, since they are understood in historical and temporal dimensions that differ from the “chronological” national narratives, confronting them with a *different* concept of history. As Yerushalmi points out in connection with Jewish history: “(...) the rabbis seem to play with time as though with an accordion, expanding it and folding it at will (...) thus (in their writings) one constantly comes across incredible anachronisms” (Yerushalmi, 1982: 30).

The description given by Silvain and Minczeles of certain features of *Yiddishland* could also be applied to the profile of *Sefarad*: “The question is whether *Yiddishland* is a mythic country or not. It has no capital, no government, no

---

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in Silvain/Minczeles, 1999: 7.

<sup>2</sup> In this article I expand the concept of *Yiddishland* to embrace *Ashkenaz*, with the thought of being able to include in this cartography the German Jews and their descendants as well, who certainly belong to the Ashkenazic tradition, notwithstanding the fact that their language of cultural memory is not Yiddish but German.

ministers, offices, administration, or bureaucracy. It is a cultural concept emanating from Yiddish, a Jewish language spoken by around eleven million people on the eve of the Second World War. *Yiddishland* was, quite simply, *the place where Yiddish was spoken*. Around the Yiddish language there was *Yiddishkeit*, a pluralist cultural amalgam. *Yiddishland* was more than a country, it was an unknown continent" (Silvain/Minczeles 1999: 7).

Although in the traditional religious sense, Eretz Israel and more specifically Jerusalem are the sites of belonging and nostalgia, in the cultural memory of the Jewish people there developed concurrently the concepts of Ashkenaz and Sefarad – which in principle named concrete places with geographic locations, and which were transformed into virtual territories, whose fundamental importance for the formation of identity is not always perceived.<sup>3</sup> This article proposes to revisit these lands by considering them from the standpoint of three significant events that they both, in their own distinctive ways, experienced: (1) a "Golden Age," characterized by a flowering of their own culture, accompanied by a non-assimilationist integration, (2) destruction, and (3) transformation into sites of memory (*lieux de mémoire*).<sup>4</sup> On the basis of these periods, one can draw a "Jewish map" of Europe, starting from the history of these *sites of ours*, which allows us not only to remember the presence – still current – of their virtual existence, but also to counter Western European cartography with a counter-history (Foucault) or counter-geography drawn from their borders.

### Outlining the Past

Thinking about the cartography of these *lands of ours* involves understanding their similarities and differences: with a basis in the common tradition of Judaism,

---

<sup>3</sup> It is interesting to highlight the fact that, as Simja Sneh points out, the extension of a geographic concept to diverse cultural trends involving differences even in religious practices did not occur in every case: the territory of *Tzarfat* (France) remained a merely geographic designation. See Simja Sneh, 1976: 10.

<sup>4</sup> The concept *lieux de mémoire* (sites of memory) was developed by Pierre Nora to describe the concrete and metaphorical places from which a nation *constructs* its memory.

two distinct cultural memories are fashioned from various histories and geographies: a product of the Diaspora and of the relationship with the majority societies in which the communities are established. These relationships are woven in various processes and complex dynamics between competing forces, including dispersion and unity, *galut* [exile] and *gerush* [expulsion], exile and home (Yerushalmi, 1993). The two share, nevertheless, similar points of *crystallization* that give definitive expression to key events in their histories. They evoke both *golden ages*, in which there is an explosion of cultural productions (for Sefarad, the age of “Convivencia”; the flowering of Jewish culture in the “SHUM;”<sup>5</sup> and, subsequently, for all of Ashkenaz, the Haskalah [Jewish Enlightenment] movement), and also the most terrible *catastrophes* (for the Jewish people as a whole, the destruction of the Second Temple in Jerusalem; the expulsion of the Sephardim from the Iberian Peninsula; the pogroms and Crusades in Ashkenaz, as well as, on a level beyond all comparison, the *Shoah*). The question is how we are to construct from these memories an archaeology (Foucault) that not only includes the divisions, the sections, and the superpositions, but also recognizes the symbolic power that these events continue to exercise over our identity. An example of this is, as Yerushalmi himself emphasizes, the sorrow on Tisha B’Av, which is a condensation of the afflictions scattered throughout the history of the Jewish people (with the exception of the *Shoah*, whose incomparable magnitude requires a *distinct* time for remembering).<sup>6</sup> When we recall the expulsion from Jerusalem, from Toledo, from Berlin, what structural nucleus of Jewish memory is considered (sensed, remembered) in the complex superpositions and displacements of the separate individual sites – whether they be real or metaphorical?

On the other hand, it is necessary to think about the way in which these virtual territories function as sources of identity: self-definition as *Sephardic* or

---

<sup>5</sup> *Shum* (Hebrew for “garlic”) was the term used for the “Jewish heart” of Europe in the High Middle Ages, centered in the towns of Speyer, Worms, and Mainz (Shin, Vav, Mem).

<sup>6</sup> In relation to this sorrow, see also Haddad, 1990, Chapter 1.

*Ashkenazic* implies much more than a common or collective place of origin. In contrast to the *lieux de mémoire* of the great national narratives – like those described in the works on France by Pierre Nora (1984) and on Germany by Etienne François (2001) – here, perhaps, it is a question more of “small narratives” (in the sense of what Kafka called “small literatures”)<sup>7</sup> in which fragments of tales, melodies, gestures, sayings, books, and the smallest objects are the things that form the *goldene keit*, the fragile “golden chain” of continuity passed down by the Jewish people from generation to generation. Even though, with the Zionist movement and especially since the foundation of the State of Israel, Jewish identity is based on other symbols, be they a modern national discourse or the Hebrew language – which since then has burst the confines of the strictly religious and come to form part of daily life – these small fragmentary narratives continue to play an important role, though perhaps no longer such a visible one, now withdrawn into the shadows of everyday existence.

This article also seeks to stimulate thought about the new processes of ghettoization, depletion, and obliteration of these *lieux de mémoire* in the collective history of the non-Jewish majority societies, where an inversion of the real existence of Jewish life seems to be taking shape: The concrete spaces in which Jewish life used to be lived are now *empty* of it – but they are “folklorized” and reified, or objectivized, through an obsessive search for traces of that past. These artificial, stereotype-filled theatricalizations, which are performed in the regions of what once were Ashkenaz and Sefarad (such as the *Jewishworld* that now exists in the old Jewish quarter of Cracow or the tourist walks through “Jewish Toledo”), are the other side of the coin of processes that simultaneously negate or, to put it more precisely, *obliterate* the real hidden traces of Jewish thought in the majority cultures – such as the concealed Talmudic intertextuality

---

<sup>7</sup> See Deleuze/Guattari, 1996.

in *Don Quixote*<sup>8</sup> or the invisible presence of Maimonides' arguments in the works of Kant.<sup>9</sup>

### The Three Key Events

Returning to *our* lands and their histories, and without forgetting the (enormous) differences specific to each case and each culture, we might think of characterizing, as previously mentioned, three key events that involved structures and results that were similar in some way, namely:

### Flourishing or Golden Age

There are various phases in the history of Jewish communities in which, in their respective territories, despite the ever-present restrictions, Jews were able to feel relatively integrated and made spectacular contributions both within their own culture (for example, Maimonides, Rashi, Mendelssohn) and in the majority society (for example, Maimonides, Herman Cohen, Einstein). Yerushalmi (1993) describes the Sephardic "Golden Age" as characterized by a dialectic between *exile* and *home*: "one lived religiously in exile but existentially at home," a description that perhaps could also be applied, for example, to the "long century" of Jewish flourishing in Germany (1783-1933). The causes of this flourishing are found not only in the (somewhat) more tolerant policies of the majority societies at specific times and places (think, for example, of the figure of Alfonso the Wise), but also in the "cultural incorporation" of these places of exile to the point of feeling that they were, in some way, their own. It is incorporation that forms a central gesture of the Jewish people, as Levinas points out, in connection with the adoption of the Greek institution of the *Sanhedrin*: "The *abysses* that separate the messages open up, oddly as it may seem, in the *nuances* of the formulations, in the *modulations* of the voice that utters them."<sup>10</sup> This process of incorporation occurs from the level of the names on up (Toledo,

---

<sup>8</sup> See Baruch, 1988.

<sup>9</sup> See Sperling, 1991.

<sup>10</sup> Levinas, 1996: 133.

for example, was understood as *Toledot* or *Toletula*; according to a legend, *Ashkenaz* had its roots in an anagrammatic transposition of the letters – a very common mechanism in Jewish interpretive tradition – of the German name “Sachsen” [Saxony] to *Ashken*, a Biblical name that appears in Bereshit 10:3, etc.). The process is clearly seen in the creation of languages of their own (Ladino and Yiddish), for, although in both cases they take the local language as a basis, it was restructured and adapted through the incorporation of grammatical expressions and terms from Hebrew – just as they adopted the Hebrew system of writing, which made it impossible for non-Jews to read it. In general, a real *microcosm* of Jewish life develops in the *juderías* and *Judengassen*,<sup>11</sup> including not only religious and educational institutions, but also an autonomous system of justice of their own. Evidently the Jewish population was obliged to live confined to these “quarters,” but the interesting thing is precisely the cultural and autonomous development achieved in those very places. In short, it was a question of developing “Jewish spaces” in exile – let us recall here the assertion of Bruno Zevi (1974) that the Jewish people has an *existentialist* concept of space: a mezuzah converts any place into a Jewish space – what counts is the *experienced space*, and not the abstraction of the pure forms in themselves.

In these times of relatively peaceful living together, many Jewish intellectuals tried to initiate a dialogue with the majority cultures. The metaphor of the bridge can help us think about these processes, especially in the image of the translator (see *infra*).

---

<sup>11</sup> See Yerushalmi: 1993.

Expulsion and Inquisition (Sefarad)/Annihilation (Ashkenaz)

*"El Dió ke no mos traiga"* (Sephardic saying)<sup>12</sup>

*There is no document of civilization which at  
the same time is not a document of  
barbarism.*

*Walter Benjamin (1940)*

In both histories, the periods of flourishing were followed by a phase of radical destruction – embodied in the expulsion from the Iberian Peninsula and the Inquisition in one case, and in the Crusades, pogroms, and – centuries later – the Shoah in the other. Here two fundamental aspects of these processes might be considered:

- 1) The specter of homogeneity and the paranoiac fears – including extreme violence – that Jewish culture awakened in the respective majority societies (for example, the dispute on anti-Semitism – *Antisemitismusstreit* – at the University of Berlin in 1888).
- 2) The wounds that these experiences of exile (whether real or internal, as in the form of the *marranos* or the leading of a clandestine existence under the National Socialist regime) and annihilation inflicted on the cultural memory of the Jewish people. Intertwined by these scars, Jews try to find a meaning for what is inexplicable by tying it to other sorrows in the cultural memory – as Sander Gilman (1997) suggests, it is a small miracle that the survivors of the Shoah in the displaced persons' camps had the idea of referring to themselves as *She'erit ha-Pleitah*, "the surviving remnant": a historical concept used in tradition to refer to those who were left as *remnants* of the Babylonian exile and intended to return to

---

<sup>12</sup> *"May God not bring this upon us."* Traditional Sephardic saying used to distance oneself from the unspeakable tragedy (the expulsion).

Jerusalem. In a chronologically dissonant sense but deriving from the same intertextual concept of history and memory, the remembrance of Auschwitz would be incorporated after 1945 in many *haggadot* after the account of the bondage in Egypt.<sup>13</sup> The sites and the experiences of destruction are mutually resignified in these reinscriptions and weavings of memory.

### Sefarad and Ashkenaz as Virtual Territories of Nostalgia and Identity

As a result of the destructive processes of the expulsions, Inquisition, and annihilation, real spaces were *emptied* of Jewish life. Most of the few who survived persecution took their culture, their experiences, and their memories – many in the form of the fragments mentioned previously, small symbolic objects: the key to a house, a siddur brought from Frankfurt or Vilna, a tallit, the scissors of the tailor from the shtetl, a photo – and left, handing them down later to the next generations, and with them the sense of loss and the grief as well. In this way, *Sefarad* and *Ashkenaz* were transformed into virtual places, fragile sources of identity extant only in an aroma or an accent. As in the exile after the destruction of the Second Temple in Jerusalem, where the Book (the Torah and later the Talmud) was made into a *portable homeland* (Heine, 1842) that offered a sense of belonging: a common soil where nothing could grow except words (Edmond Jabès). In writings and in languages (Yiddish, Ladino), in sayings and old melodies learned in an *aljama* [Jewish community or neighborhood] or a *cheder*, these territories of memory continue to live: pulses that can be heard only by the ears of those who grew up surrounded by that tenderness.

At the same time, as previously mentioned, some of the majority cultures of the countries where *Sefarad* and *Ashkenaz* used to exist before the destruction have entered upon a process of “museumization” in an obsessive search for “traces of Jewish life.” Both dynamics – the virtual existence of these territories in the Jewish

---

<sup>13</sup> See Yerushalmi, 1997.



memory, and the reification and expropriation of them in the spaces that once were home to Jews and were annihilated and *emptied* by the destruction – are developing in parallel fashion and with almost no points of contact. In the abyss between the two ways of enduring a terrible past, the question about the cause of the *radical evil* (Arendt) arises again: an evil that would seem to have struck the more violently, the more thoroughgoing the attempts (and the successes) at a non-assimilationist integration.

Revisiting the lands of Ashkenaz and Sefaraz by thinking of them as *lieux de mémoire* allows us to reconceptualize the Jewish people by incorporating those immensely significant small “remnants” in our memories. It is a search that opens up the possibility of a nonreductionist definition of Jewish identity that goes beyond the specifically religious or national aspect (Zionism). To perceive those fragments of identity in our educational work without idealizing or “folklorizing” them, simply by acknowledging them, can be a thrilling and enriching challenge – the Jewish people understood as a cultural memory shaped by tiny fragments that contain entire worlds.

#### A “Toolbox” for Thinking about Cultural Memory

Michel Foucault once described philosophy as a “toolbox for thinking.” Tracing the map of our territories of memory, drawing the outlines of Sefarad and Ashkenaz, is a challenge in which certain theoretical instruments can help us delineate roads and enrich the itineraries. As a suggested way of working on the events mentioned above, I would like to briefly describe three images that are part of a constellation of concepts developed in my own theoretical approach in order to try to understand these and other issues. They are complemented by an annotated bibliography.

1. Translation: A Bridge or a Dead End? (for thinking about the event of flourishing)

"Kol Haolam kulo, gesher tzar me'od  
..."<sup>14</sup>

Ivri (Hebrew) literally means "he who comes from the other side of the river," who crossed over it. It is no accident that the German verb *übersetzen* can be rendered as either "to translate" or "to cross" (for example, a river). *To transfer*, to carry from one shore to another, from one culture to another. Like traders (whom Georg Simmel describes as the *embodiment of the Stranger* in European history), translators bear in themselves the specific quality of *mobility*. They possess no soil of their own, they are not owners "(...) and here soil must be understood not only in its concrete physical sense, but also in a metaphorical one ..." (Simmel, 1908: 11). Roving between languages and cultures – a contemporary of Moses Mendelssohn described the translator as a tightrope acrobat – they are citizens of the *passages*: on both sides of the river, they are needed and they are distrusted at the same time.

Belonging to a cultural minority is often linked with multilingualism. The concepts of "bridge" and "passage" are strongly present in Jewish history and thought (from the metaphor of the *gesher* in the old song to the philosophical concept of Walter Benjamin's *Passages*). Translations, which many times were accompanied by a desire for integration and for contribution to the majority cultures—from the Toledo School of Translators to the attempts in Berlin (the German-language versions of the Torah and the Psalms by Mendelssohn himself and later by Rosenzweig-Buber)—were interpreted in their respective eras as *bridges*. After the destructions, it was possible to ask whether they were not *dead ends* instead. Just as it is claimed that the translator should be invisible in the text, that nothing of him should remain (Venutti, 1987), many of these translations,

---

<sup>14</sup> "The whole world is a narrow bridge .."

their authors, and their entire people were almost exterminated in a physical and metaphysical sense.

2. Borders and Boundaries (for thinking about the processes of destruction)

*He said: "Everything requires a fence." Someone asked him: "What kind of fence?" He answered: "Truth." Someone asked him: "What is the fence of truth?" He answered "Faith." Someone asked him: "What is the fence of faith?" He replied: "To live without fear."*

*Shlomo (Solomon) ibn Gabirol*

The experience of the border, the frontier, the boundary, is inherent in Jewish tradition. Both in a religious sense and a philosophical sense, Judaism is established through borders and boundaries: from the *mezuzah* that marks every Jewish space, to the Talmud's "fence around the Torah," to the temporal frontier of the *Havdalah*. If we recall that *Ha'makom* (the Place) is one of the names of G-d, we ought not forget that another of his names – as Perla Sneh reminds us – is *Ha'mavdil* – he who divides: not only earth from heaven and light from darkness, but "above all *bein kodesh le'chol*, the sacred from the profane" (Sneh, 2001: 1).

On the other hand, the historical memory of the Jewish people has collected, through the centuries, an enormous quantity of experiences related to boundaries in the various processes of social exclusion: from the yellow patch of the Middle Ages and the walls of the medieval *ghettos* to the *Judensterne* and the walls of the concentration camps. These borders were usually set up by the "outside" and forced the Jewish population to live on the margin of the majority society. In other cases, these borders or *passages* are found within a city or a village, for example in the entrances to synagogues or Jewish schools (think of the actual passage formed by the security controls). Boundaries, thresholds, and passages that determined what was inside and what was outside were

established between the Jewish spaces and the rest of the society over the course of the centuries, in both material and symbolic ways.

Reflecting on the concepts of *border*, *threshold*, and *passage* in their various senses, we can not only wonder which ones define our lands of memory and identity (the laws of kashrut? a mezuzah? an accent?), but also understand the segregation processes of the majority societies and the marks those processes left on our history and thinking.

3. The Portable Homeland: The Book as a Territory (to provide a passport to our cultural memory)

*I nailed this name, which is so dear to me, on the doorpost of my book, and thus it became more homelike and protected for me. Our books, too, must have their mezuzes.*<sup>15</sup>

Heinrich Heine

After the destruction of the Second Temple – as Gerard Haddad (1990) reminds us – a new concept of the Jewish people arises. Rabbi Yochanan ben Zakkai asked the Roman emperor for permission to open a school in Iavne for studying the Torah, which must never close, *not even for the rebuilding of the Temple*. Sigmund Freud recognized the incredible importance of this gesture: at that time – he once wrote – the building of the *invisible edifice of Judaism* began.<sup>16</sup> A book in place of a territory; from that time on the Jewish people began to live in their writings.

In the dialectic between exile and home, the Book always remained a kind of common homeland – and with each experience of a new exile, new dimensions were incorporated in this territory – up to the time of the Shoah, when the

---

<sup>15</sup> Quote from a letter from Heinrich Heine to E. Gans in 1825. *Mezuzes*: Yiddish plural of “mezuzah.”

<sup>16</sup> See Haddad, 1990: 38 ff., and Liliana Ruth Feierstein, 2002a.

*zecher-bicher* (books in remembrance of the dead, or memorial books) constituted symbolic cemeteries for those who lacked even a grave.<sup>17</sup>

Heine's notion of the portable homeland can be used above all for thinking about the third phase, the virtual existence of Sefarad and Ashkenaz, whose presence we can find in an immense quantity of writings of various sorts: literary, personal (letters, diaries, autobiographies), religious (sidurim, haggadot, etc.), musical (scores), and many others.

\*A Palace of Little Nails and Pebbles

(...) *La tomí por la mano*

*Al banco la lleví*

*Llorando me dezía*

*N'on te olvides de mí.*

*Sephardic song (fragment)*<sup>18</sup>

*You throw me a question and laugh:*

*Is Yiddish a language, by chance?*

*And I? What can I say in reply!*

*I glance at a book on my knees*

*And suddenly I'm no longer here;*

*I'm off as if borne on wings.*

*A paragraph from our past;*

*Countless generations*

*Assembled little nails and pebbles here.*

*A pebble from the mountain, another from the valley,*

*A little nail from the market, another from the street,*

*Bequeathing us a palace.*

*Zishe Vaimper: "Idish" (fragment)*

---

<sup>17</sup> See Kugelmass and Boyarin, 1998, and Liliana Ruth Feierstein, 2002b.

<sup>18</sup> (...) *I took her by the hand/And brought her to the bench/Sobbing, she said to me/Don't ever forget me.* Quoted in Matilde Bensignor, 2004.

In her article “Der mantl,” Lois Barr takes up the metaphor of an old Yiddish song, “*hob ich a mantl fun fartsaytiken shtof*” (I have an ancient overcoat), in which the singer tells us that “from his overcoat he has made a jacket, from the jacket a vest, from the vest a pocket, from the pocket a *yarmulke*, and from the *yarmulke* a *gornisht*, a nothing. Then the singer stops singing, and there is applause. When the applause stops, the singer goes on with his song in order to reveal what he makes of the ‘nothing’: a *liedl*, a little song.”<sup>19</sup> That is what happened with our lands: Sefarad and Ashkenaz, once cloaks with an enormous surface area and real physical existence, were transformed in accordance with the circumstances, frayed by history, taking other forms but always with us, sheltering us from the surrounding cold: a palace built with little nails and pebbles that, much like the “nothing,” sustains us in a melody that condenses our memory of centuries.

\*Words That Give Us Wings: A Map of the Bibliography on This Subject

How does one draw a map of memory? Within the scope of this article, it is not possible to provide a detailed discussion of the different authors and the theories they devised about the nature of collective and cultural memories – nevertheless, I would like to mention some of them, so that the reader will know where to look for them, and they can help us, along with the above-mentioned images, to think of roads.

Maurice Halbwachs, a pioneering Jewish sociologist in this field who was killed at Buchenwald, bequeathed to us some of the first works on this topic and, above all, the *question* as to the structure of cultural memories. Pierre Nora, as I have already mentioned, created the concept of *lieux de mémoire* in 1984 – although tied to the analysis of the “great nations” -- a concept that had to be adapted

---

<sup>19</sup> Baar, Lois, 2004:25

by Judaizing it. Michel Foucault (1969) and Jacques Derrida (1995), basing their opinions on previous works by Sigmund Freud, write about the *archive*, an idea that can enrich our analysis of the processes of shaping these cultural memories: What and how do we deposit in archives? What shapes the archives of our collective memory? In the now-classic work *Zakhor!* Yerushalmi (1982) broaches the subject of the specific problem of the tensions between history and memory in Judaism.

The complex case of the memories that were repressed or nourished secretly, as in the case of the marranos in Spain, can be worked on by starting with an almost-forgotten text dated 1531, by the crypto-Jewish philosopher Juan Luis Vives, *De causis corruptarum artium*, in which he describes memory as “a house full of treasures of things realized” and in its intertextuality plays with the figure of *Ezra Hasofer* (the scribe). It is not only an exceptional document about remembrance, but also a manifesto for the conservation of that subdued memory.

For the opposite case -- the repression in the memory of the dominant cultures of the contributions of Jewish life in their midst – the work of Sigmund Freud, especially the articles “A Note upon a ‘Mystic Writing-Pad’” (1925) and “Repression” (1915) offer a fruitful basis for analysis. The texts that marked the debate about the “cultures of remembrance,” such as “Textures of Memory” (Young, 1933) and “The Longest Shadow: In the Aftermath of the Holocaust” (Hartmann, 1966), and that are centered specifically on the subject matter of the Shoah can help us consider more concentrated work on that topic.

The manner in which sites are imbued with cultural memory is determined by one’s own concept of time, space, and history. Walter Benjamin’s (1940) philosophy of history offers an alternative Jewish conception of history – it is understood in a messianic, fragmentary, and achronological way. It is a text that

allows us to rethink our own way of constructing cultural memory and resignifies the fragments of memories that shape it.

For the general image of the translator and his role, one can return to the ideas of Lawrence Venutti (1987) on the translator's *invisibility* – a strange state into which Jewish cultural production not infrequently is transmuted. The phenomenon of translation itself, that is, of the various relationships between languages, was brilliantly analyzed by Walter Benjamin (1925), George Steiner (1975), and Jacques Derrida (1985) – both as a general theory and from the Jewish perspective.

The sociological aspects of otherness and exclusion can be worked on with the brief and now classic pioneering essay by Georg Simmel, "Exkurs über den Fremden" (Essay about the Stranger, 1908), which raises both the issue of the general relationships between majorities and minorities, and the specific case of the Jews as traders in European history. One of the characteristics that Simmel brings out is, as has already been mentioned, their *Bodenlosigkeit* (not belonging to a territory) – a concept that later was reworked by Max Weber in the idea of the *pariah people* and was taken up again by Hannah Arendt in her history of anti-Semitism. The works of the architect Bruno Zevi (1974) can be used to understand the concept and the historicization of space in Judaism.



## Selected Bibliography on This Topic

- Arendt, Hannah (1966): *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, New York.
- Barr, Lois (2004): "Der mantl: los restos de idish en la novela contemporánea argentina" [The Coat: Remnants of Yiddish in the Modern Argentine Novel]. In: Ricardo Feierstein/Steve Sadow (eds.): *Recreando la cultura judeoargentina 2* [Recreating Judeo-Argentine Culture], Buenos Aires.
- Baruch, Bernard (1988): *Una página del Talmud en el Quijote* [A Page of the Talmud in Don Quixote], San José.
- Benjamin, Walter (1925)\*: *Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers* [The Task of the Translator]
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1940)\*: *Über den Begriff der Geschichte* [On the Concept of History].
- Bensignor, Matilde (2004): *De Miel y Milagros (Evocaciones Sefardies)* [Of Honey and Miracles (Sephardic Evocations)], Buenos Aires.
- Boehlich, Walter, ed. (1965): *Der Berliner Antisemitismusstreit* [The Berlin Dispute on Anti-Semitism], Frankfurt.
- Derrida, Jacques (1995): *Mal d'Archive. Une impression freudienne* [Archive Fever. A Freudian Impression], Paris.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1996): *Le monolinguisme de l'autre ou la prothèse d'origine* [The Monolingualism of the Other, or The Prosthesis of Origin], Paris.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari (1996): *Kafka: pour une littérature mineure* [Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature], Paris.
- Feierstein, Liliana Ruth (2002a): "Nor er redt nish arois kein Vort" [But He Doesn't Say a Single Word]. In: *Jewish Quarterly Studies*, London (also on this same webpage).
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2002b): "The Portable Homeland: The Book as Territory." In: Daniel Mayer-Dinkgräfe, ed.: *European Culture in a Changing World: Between Nationalism and Globalism*, Aberystwyth.

Foucault, Michel (1969): *L'archéologie du savoir* [The Archeology of Knowledge], Paris.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1984): *Des espaces autres* [Of Other Spaces], Paris.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1997): "Il faut défendre la société" [Society Must Be Defended], Paris.

François, Etienne, and Hagen Schulze, eds. (2001): *Deutsche Erinnerungsorte* [German Sites of Memory], Munich.

Gil, José (1985): *La escuela de Traductores de Toledo y los colaboradores judíos* [The School of Translators of Toledo and the Jewish Participants], Toledo.

Gilman, Sander, and Jack Zipes (1997): *Yale Companion to Jewish Writing and Thought in German Culture, 1096-1966*, New Haven.

Halbwachs, Maurice (1950): *La mémoire collective* [On Collective Memory], Paris.

Haddad, Gérard (1990): *L'enfant illégitime. Sources talmudiques de la psychoanalyse* [The Illegitimate Child. The Beginnings of Psychoanalysis in the Talmud], Paris.

Hartman, Geoffrey (1996): *The Longest Shadow. In the Aftermath of the Holocaust*, Bloomington.

Hassoun, Jacques (1996): *Los contrabandistas de la memoria* [The Smugglers of Memory], Buenos Aires.

Hobsbawm, Eric, and Terence Ranger, eds. (1999): *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge.

Itzigsohn, José (1988): *Tras huellas de Ashkenaz* [In Search of Traces of Ashkenaz], Buenos Aires.

Kugelmass, Jack, and Jonathan Boyarin (1998): *From a Ruined Garden: The Memorial Book of Polish Jewry*, New York.

Levinas, Emmanuel (1968): *Quatre lectures talmudiques* [Four Talmudic Readings], Paris.

Mate, Reyes (1997): *Memoria de Occidente: actualidad de pensadores judíos olvidados* [Memory of the West: Contemporaneity of Forgotten Jewish Thinkers], Barcelona.

Menendez Pelayo, Marcelino (1956): *Historia de los heterodoxos españoles* [History of the Spanish Heretics], Madrid.

Nora, Pierre, ed. (1992): *Les lieux de mémoire* [The Sites of Memory], Paris.

ORT Argentina (1992): *Por los caminos de Sefarad* [On the Roads of Sefarad], Buenos Aires.

Poliakov, Leon (1977): *Histoire de l'antisémitisme* [History of Anti-Semitism], Paris.

Roth, Cecil (1940): "Marranos and Racial Antisemitism: A Study in Parallels." In: *Jewish Social Studies II*, 239-248.

Simmel, Georg (1908\*): *Exkurs über den Fremden*.

Silvain, Gérard, and Henri Minczeles (1999): *Yiddishland*, Paris.

Sneh, Perla (2001): "La impureza como huella" [Impurity as a Trace]. In: *Nadja*, No. 3, Rosario.

Sperling, Diana (1991): *La metafísica del espejo. Kant y el judaísmo* [The Metaphysics of the Mirror. Kant and Judaism], Buenos Aires.

Steiner, George (1975): *After Babel. Aspects of Language and Translation*, Oxford.

Toker, Eliahu, ed. (1981): *El resplandor de la palabra judía* [The Splendor of the Jewish Word], Buenos Aires.

Venutti, Lawrence (1995): *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation*, London.

Vidal-Naquet, Pierre (1996): *Los judíos, la memoria y el presente* [The Jews, Memory, and the Present], Mexico.

Vogel Etti, Andrew (1994): *Speaking Silences: Stillness and Voice in Modern and Jewish Tradition*, London.

Yerushalmi, Yosef Hayim (1982): *Zakhor, Jewish History, and Jewish Memory*, Washington, D.C.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1997): *Haggadah and History*, The Jewish Publication Society.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1993): *Ein Feld in Anatot. Versuche über jüdische Geschichte* [A Field in Anatot. Essays on Jewish History], Berlin.

\_\_\_\_\_ et al. (1989): *Usos del olvido* [The Uses of Forgetting], Buenos Aires.

Young, James (1993): *Textures of Memory*, New Haven.

Zevi, Bruno (1974): "El judaísmo y la concepción espacio-temporal en el Arte" [Judaism and the Space-Time Concept in Art]. In: Ricardo Feierstein/Steve Sadow, eds.: *Recreando la cultura judeoargentina 2* [Recreating Judeo-Argentine Culture 2], Buenos Aires, 2004.