

Jewish Cultural Life in the Vilna Ghetto

David G. Roskies

Each Nazi ghetto was different, and each Nazi ghetto was the same. The historian's task is to reconstruct the life of each ghetto in relation to its past, specific surroundings, and chronology of destruction. In terms of size, location, demography, languages, and politics, Vilna was as different from Warsaw as Warsaw was from Lodz. Samuel Kassow, in his meticulous comparison of the two great ghetto diaries by Herman Kruk and Emanuel Ringelblum, has demonstrated that without knowledge of the Polish language (for example), one cannot understand the inner working of the Warsaw ghetto. In Vilna, by contrast, a knowledge of Yiddish and Hebrew is sufficient.¹

However, the various forms of Jewish self-expression in the Vilna ghetto were quite similar to those of other ghettos: theater and cabaret, concerts and choirs, sermons and communal prayer, eulogies, classes for children and adults, journalism, public lectures and colloquia, scholarship, sports, popular songs, epic and lyric poetry, the graphic arts, proclamations, and diaries. What is more astounding: the comprehensive scope of this list, a whole culture reconstituting itself in the face of total destruction; its internal coherence—the same forms everywhere—testifying to the extraordinary viability of Jewish culture throughout central and Eastern Europe; or the degree to which secular modes of self-expression so far outweighed the classical forms? Other than sermons and communal prayer, eulogies, and popular songs, these forms of self-expression had entered the culture of Yiddish-speaking Jews barely a century before—and some, such as sports and proclamations, much more recently than that.

THE COLLOQUIA OF JACOB GENS

Because the forms of self-expression were so numerous and varied, we are able to hear the many voices of the ghetto even when the source material is incomplete. Thus it is relatively easy to document the colloquia—held over a glass of tea—in the home of Jacob Gens. Here the leading ghetto intellectuals, all of them male, were invited by the ghetto chief to discuss the history and fate of the Jews. The formal lecture was generally followed by a heated discussion.

On one occasion the select group of invitees was so shaken by the latest news from Warsaw—the house-to-house arrest and execution of leading cultural activists on the night of April 17, 1942—that each spontaneously began to relive his own

miraculous survival during the horrific first months of the Nazi occupation. The third to speak was the twenty-nine-year-old poet Abrasha (Abraham) Sutzkever. He revealed to his fellow survivors how in the wake of the liquidation of Ghetto Two and the murder of his mother, he decided to commit suicide, and only the portentous reappearance of a crow stopped him from jumping to his death on the cobblestones below. Everyone in the orange-painted room had a similar trauma to relive.²

These colloquia are well documented because two of the regulars—Kruk and Zelig Kalmanovitsh—kept diaries, and where one diary has pages missing (as does Kruk for June 6–9, 1942), the other fills in the blanks.³ But even when the two diaries overlap, they do not necessarily tell the same story.

Unlike Kruk, the official ghetto chronicler who—according to his English-language editor Benjamin Harshav—made the most basic errors in the spelling of the Hebraic component of Yiddish, Kalmanovitsh kept his ghetto diary (replete with scriptural and rabbinical quotations cited from memory) in Hebrew; and whereas Kruk, the card-carrying Bundist (socialist), betrayed an open animus toward observant Jews, Kalmanovitsh deeply mourned the spiritual crisis of his pious brethren.⁴ In fact, were it not for Kalmanovitsh—the wartime voice of Vilna’s Orthodox community—Vilna’s claim to be called the Jerusalem of Lithuania would be altogether silent.

Despite his daily regimen sorting out Jewish books for the Germans to loot, his various commissions to translate Jewish scholarship into German, his proclivity to stay home, and his fifty-seven years, Kalmanovitsh made a point of attending services and even delivered the sermon himself on a few remarkable occasions. Thus in the fragment of his ghetto diary recently discovered in the Lithuanian Central Archive and published in 1997 both in its Hebrew original and Yiddish translation in the *YIVO-bleter*, Kalmanovitsh records the first public fast held in the ghetto, on the May 31, 1942, attended by 300 men and women—a huge crowd by ghetto standards—complete with a precis of the rabbi’s complicated sermon. Kruk makes no mention of this important milestone in the cultural life of the ghetto.

Another regular at Gens’s colloquia was Zemach Feldstein, the Hebrew pedagogue from Kovno and editor of the official Vilna ghetto bulletin. In marked contrast to the Warsaw ghetto, where every group—from the Communists to the Orthodox and anti-Zionist *Agudas Yisroel*—issued and distributed its own underground publication, there was no underground press in the Vilna ghetto except for an occasional mimeographed news bulletin distributed among members of the United

Partisans' Organization (FPO). Although an outsider, Feldstein was handpicked to edit the *Geto-yedies* on account of his impeccable German; the entire contents had to be translated into German before it could be published. Furthermore, Feldstein supported the survival-through-productive-labor strategy of the Jewish Council (*Judenrat*) and he was a born pedagogue.

In his weekly editorials, Feldstein adduced two sources of consolation: the *Judenrat*'s recent record at improving the quality of ghetto life and the Jewish historical record, both in Vilna and throughout the Jewish past.⁵ Three of the extant editorials are eulogies for the secular intelligentsia of Vilna's glory days: Dr. Zemach Szabad, who died in 1935 (issue #23, January 24, 1943); and Yankev Gerstein and Dr. Moyshe Heller (issues #7, October 4, 1942, and #13, November 16, 1942, respectively), who died in the ghetto. To be sure, there was something consoling in the very act of eulogizing individual great men in the midst of so much mass murder—all the more so when each man exemplified Vilna Jewry's cultural, philanthropic, and scientific achievements, which would never be forgotten.

Digging deeper still were those editorials that celebrated the cycle of the Jewish holidays, notably Feldstein's history lesson about the true meaning of Hanukkah. Here the modern Jewish pedagogue labored to dispel "the naive romantic attitude toward the military and political achievements of the Hasmoneans." The true legacy of Hanukkah, he averred, was encoded in the blessings that one recited over the candles: the absolute primacy of spirit over matter (issue #14, December 7, 1942).

Did Feldstein's editorial on the meaning of Hanukkah place him at the forefront of some pacifist fringe group or, worse yet, brand him a Nazi collaborator? How are we to explain the fact that in the Vilna ghetto, as distinct from Warsaw, the Jewish cultural enterprise—the library, theatrical performances, concerts, competitions, exhibitions, classes, public lectures, and soccer games—all took place under the aegis of the *Judenrat* or the Jewish Police? What are we to make of the presence at Gens's colloquia of Salk (Salek) Dessler and a Vienna Jew named Oberhardt, the hated chief officers of the Jewish Police and de facto rulers of the ghetto? How are we to judge the behavior of Gens himself? Why did he issue special rations to thirty-three "Members of the Cultural Department"⁶ and why, indeed, should this former Lithuanian Army officer have bothered convening colloquia in his home? Because his Christian wife and only daughter were hidden on the Aryan side and he had nothing better to do in the early evenings before the curfew?

THE DESTRUCTION OF EASTERN EUROPEAN JEWRY

The surviving members of the secular intelligentsia, who gathered in Gens's home and otherwise enjoyed special privileges, developed a three-pronged strategy. Alongside the daily effort to counteract apathy and anarchy by re-creating the prewar Jewish cultural network, they made elaborate plans to establish a ghetto museum (complete with a scale model and a detailed history) that was commissioned from the two honorary Vilner, Feldstein and Kruk. Jointly and severally, moreover, the secular intellectuals tried to comprehend what was happening to them in light of the distant past. After Feldstein lectured the group on Jews and Judaism, someone protested that by constantly touting Jewish genius, the Jews themselves had provoked the envy and hatred of the world.⁷ What wisdom, then, did the ghetto intelligentsia gain when taking the measure of history? Members of the older generation, led by veterans such as Feldstein and Kalmanovitsh, were struck by the continuities, whereas the youthful members of the FPO (Abba Kovner, Shmerke Kaczerginski, Sutzkever, Kruk, Leon Bernstein) began to understand that what was happening now had never happened before.

For Kalmanovitsh the destruction of Eastern European Jewry did not begin with the Holocaust; it culminated therein. The dress rehearsal had been the year-long Soviet occupation of Lithuania. Here, almost in its entirety, is Kalmanovitsh's diary entry for July 19, 1942, written against the psychological backdrop of great fear and expectation.⁸

God's purpose in destroying the community of Vilna was perhaps to hasten the redemption, to alert whomsoever might still be alerted that there is neither refuge nor hope for life in Exile. The Vilna community had served as a model and exemplar of a Jewish settlement in Exile with its own distinctive culture. Many, oh so many, did not perceive the net that lay hidden within this culture. And now the fortress of exilic Judaism has been breached, its temple has been destroyed forever.

But if we take a hard look we can see that it was necessary for the destruction to come from without. The fortress had already been destroyed and laid waste from within. Vilna had put up no resistance to the assimilation and the obliteration of the Jewish character, had not stood up to the spiritual destruction decreed by the Red conquerors.

The death of Rabbi Chaim Oyzer Grodzenski on the very day that the Reds entered Vilna . . . can serve as a symbolic sign. The funeral . . .

brought out tens of thousands of Jews—one might have thought it was a veritable demonstration of Vilna Jewry behind the hearse of its most distinguished son, the Vilna Gaon’s truest disciple, who displayed its honor and beauty for all the world to see; a last demonstration of Vilna’s Jewish spirit [*yiddishkeit*], a vain attempt to prove that it still lived. But this proved be its last manifestation.

(I confess that it wasn’t until I looked into Chaim-Oyzer’s archive that I apprehended a little something of his greatness.) Our world of freethinkers, separated from him by 10,000 walls, also gained sustenance from his glory, and lived thanks to this cracked vessel, which is to say, the cracked vessel of traditional Judaism. And together we were all of us smashed, as it is written [Isaiah 31:3], “the helper shall trip and the helped one shall fall” [“Oyzer” in Hebrew means “Helper”]. I do not know for certain, but I want so much to believe that somewhere, in the mystical recesses, somewhere in the depths of the true believers, those spiritual giants, a hidden protest lay burning, and that they were yet contemplating to carry out acts of sanctification of God’s name [*Kiddush Hashem*], [as it is written,] “The remnant of Israel shall do no wrong” [Zephania 3:13], save for those [of their number] who had succeeded in fleeing overseas. But from the outside—from the outside it appeared as if the Satanic Force had scored a complete and total victory, once and for all.

And later, when the full [Nazi] evil was revealed, and the decree of total annihilation was enacted in full—must we not admit that God, in his beneficence to the Jews of Vilna, reserved for them a beautiful death? [As David said to Gad,] “Let us fall into the hands of the LORD; and let me not fall into the hands of men” [2 Samuel 24:14]. A martyr’s death is preferable to becoming degenerate. And if the Old Synagogue was laid waste, and all that remained was a heap of stones and bare walls, is that not a better fate than that young profligates appear who desecrate her sacred objects and turn her into a theater or museum? For the very stone of these walls absorbed the prayers and sighs of our ancestors, their supplications for redemption, which ascend like an offering upon the altar. And we will be reminded of them whenever we long for the stones of our homeland, and we will take them into our hearts, and pass their memory on to our children and children’s children in our liberated Zion. And these undesecrated stones will serve as a memorial to our Exile, for their merit was not to have been desecrated through the hands of their own children, by those who had once built the walls, but rather, through the hands of a savage nation, acting as the emissary of God. May their sacred memory serve to sweeten and soften our hearts, to recall and to guide the way for the children of Abraham.

What we have here is a sermonic text, a traditional theodicy, an attempt to justify God's inscrutable (and hidden) plan. Why, asks Kalmanovitsh, did God allow the Covenantal Community of Vilna to be destroyed? Because the destruction in two stages would serve as a sign (1) that what was once a proud Jewish community was already rotting, crumbling from within, and (2) that future generations—unaware of this decay and left only with the detritus of the external destruction—would have something useful, even inspiring, to remember.

During the first stage, the Soviet conquest of Lithuania, there was a false ray of hope. The vast outpouring of grief at the funeral of Rabbi Grodzenski, which occurred (according to Kalmanovitsh) on the very day of the Soviet occupation, was a false portent of religious solidarity and steadfastness. In retrospect, however, this turned out to be the last such manifestation. It was a sign that Satan had already triumphed, for even religious Jewry—schooled in the ideal of Kiddush Hashem and bearing witness to God's name through acts of martyrdom—had capitulated.

Then came the second stage, when God chose the Germans—the most savage nation—to be the rod of his wrath. After slaughtering every last Jew, Kalmanovitsh prophesied, the Germans would leave only the stones of the ruined Great Synagogue, heir to the Temple in Jerusalem. Because these stones were sacred, however, having absorbed the spiritual fervor of generations of pious Jews, these stones and the memory that they engendered would be revered by the Surviving Remnant of the Jewish people in the Land of Israel—the only place where a Jewish life would be reconstituted. Thus while the future hope of the Jewish people would derive from the spiritual greatness of Vilna, its utter degradation on the eve of the war will have been forgotten.

VOICES OF THE VILNA GHETTO

This diary entry is by no means unique in Kalmanovitsh's wartime writings and sermons. For anyone who cared to listen, he had been warning of the impending destruction since the late thirties, most forcefully in the pages of a remarkable journal, published in Paris, called *Afn sheydveg* (*At the Crossroads*). His was the commanding voice of the Vilna ghetto because it spoke with the moral and intellectual authority of the entire Jewish experience. He was the man whom Sutzkever immortalized as "The Prophet" while the ghetto walls were still standing. He was the man whose moral guidance Kovner sought out twice—and unbeknownst to his comrades-in-arms—before carrying out the first acts of armed resistance.⁹

The more Sutzkever and Kovner spoke from out of the Jewish past, and the more each of them fashioned a response to the Nazi onslaught out of the inherited fund of Jewish responses, the more their voices were hearkened to. Sutzkever became the poet laureate of the Vilna ghetto on the strength of his epic verse, a genre he perfected in the ghetto, each line steeled with an alloy of rage and sorrow. “The Grave Child,” the epic tale of a lone escapee from Ponar who sought refuge in the Jewish cemetery, there to give birth in an empty grave, was awarded first prize for poetry in July 1942 by the Union of Artists and Writers in the Vilna ghetto. Sutzkever’s most transhistoric poem “Kol Nidre,” a mythic retelling of the terrible Yom Kippur “Operation Free-of-Jews” (*Aktion Judenrein*) of 1941, was the subject of heated debate in Gens’s living room; later, on the strength of a handwritten copy that a partisan carried from the Lithuanian forest to Moscow, Abrasha and Freydke Sutzkever won passage to freedom.¹⁰

Skeptics will argue that this was false consolation since the ghetto was doomed anyway. Finding ancient analogies was no more than a mental exercise that fostered inaction. Yet when the calls to arms eventually came, they too resounded with ancient echoes, beginning with Kovner’s epoch-making proclamation of January 1, 1942, and culminating in Sutzkever’s epic poem “The Lead Plates at the Rom Press.” When the twenty-four-year-old Kovner read his proclamation to the members of the Marxist-Zionist Young Guard (*Hashomer Hatzair*) on that New Year’s Day, he did so in Hebrew (as well as Yiddish) so that his opening words (“Let us not be led like sheep to the slaughter”) would pack their biblical punch.¹¹ “*Kaseh lattevah yuval*” (“like a sheep being led to slaughter”) is a quotation from the Prophet Isaiah (53:3). And in his farewell to Vilna, retroactively dated September 12, 1943 (the day he left for the forest), in the final stanza of his poem, Sutzkever rhymed YERUSHALAYIM with BLAYEN and KLEZAYIN. He perceived a direct and powerful link between the destruction of *Jerusalem*, the *lead* plates of the Vilna Talmud (the greatest intellectual achievement of Diaspora Jewry), and the *weapons* wielded by the Vilna partisans in their desperate last stand against the Germans.¹²

By using Orthodox Jews as the sole measure of Jewish solidarity and self-sacrifice, Kalmanovitsh had issued a savage indictment, yet the language and theological tenor of his own writings bore witness to a cultural consolidation that was taking hold within the ranks of the secular intelligentsia. After absorbing the initial shock of ghettoization, which in Vilna was preceded by the mechanized mass killings

of men, women, and children chosen at random, the surviving ghetto elite—social workers, scholars, poets, actors, artists—responded to the radical diminution of Jewish space with a renewed emphasis on Jewish time. That is why Gens convened colloquia in his home; why Feldstein marked each and every Jewish holiday with a special editorial; why Kruk reread Ansky's *Khurbn Galitsye*, the famous chronicle of Jewish suffering during the First World War; and why the longest waiting list in the ghetto library was for Tolstoy's *War and Peace*. *War and Peace* itself was situated both inside and out—inside, because after the one hundred thousandth book had been borrowed from the ghetto library, a great public celebration was held to mark the occasion, proof positive that the Jews were still to be considered the “People of the Book”; outside, because when the library staff was commissioned to study reading habits in the Vilna ghetto, it was revealed that the vast majority preferred reading Russian and Polish to Yiddish and Hebrew. Zionists and Yiddishists alike saw this as a bad omen.¹³

This dialectic between inside and out points to a sea change in the Jewish response to modernity. Since the end of the eighteenth century, the defining dream of the Jewish future was the dream of emancipation. For the Jews of Europe, that dream came to an end in the Nazi ghettos. Even without knowing that their elimination from the European body politic had only just begun, the specter of real ghetto walls guarded day and night was traumatic since emancipation had been predicated on the ideal of open space, of a political, civic, economic, and cultural landscape devoid of all boundaries. Jewish merchants, bankers, actors, lawyers, and laborers had imagined that neutral spaces would open up for them to inhabit alongside their neighbors. Now the urban landscape was everywhere divided between the “Jewish quarter” and the “Aryan side.” Enlisting the tools of modernity, forms of self-expression that they had only recently learned to master, the purveyors of Jewish culture in the Vilna ghetto reached back and within in order to prepare for the final hour.¹⁴

CONCLUSION: PUBLIC MEMORY

How much of this cultural activity survived in postwar public memory? A dozen theater songs, without their attendant scripts, a few partisan hymns, Kovner's call to arms, and a few diaries and memoirs. That the condemned ghetto Jews performed concerts and produced artwork and their children wrote poetry the world would learn through the story of Terezin. Why should this be so? Perhaps because the surviving Yiddish speakers were either silenced (in the Soviet Union), subjected to state

ensorship (in communist Poland), stigmatized (in the nascent State of Israel), or sentimentalized (in the United States). Or perhaps it was easier to transmit that part of wartime culture that seemed to require the least amount of decoding—children’s drawings and poems. The purpose of postwar memory of the ghettos was outreach; by privileging those forms of self-expression that were most universally accessible, the hope was to break down the ethnic, cultural, religious, and linguistic boundaries that had defined the ghettos.

Eventually, thanks to a growing body of available translations, it was discovered that the Vilna ghetto had distinguished itself in literary and theatrical production of a very high order; thus the most comprehensive anthology of Holocaust literature to date, Lawrence Langer’s *Art from the Ashes*, allots ample space to Vilna.¹⁵ Here Sutzkever occupies a place of honor among only six poets whom Langer deems to have successfully found “a form for chaos by including chaos as part of the form.” What this baroque formulation already tells us, however, is that Sutzkever will not be represented by the rhymed and metered, neoclassical epic verse that made him the poet laureate of the ghetto, by the poems that disassembled the unfolding horror into its recognizable, archetypal parts, but only by those poems that fit Langer’s formula, that successfully render “chaos” in radically individual terms. For the Holocaust to bear meaning in Langer’s scheme, it must stand alone, outside the annals of historical catastrophe and outside the purview of European and Jewish culture.

Langer’s anthology includes one full-length play, the longest selection by far: the translation and adaptation from Hebrew of Joshua Sobol’s *Ghetto* (1983). Inspired by the Yiddish cabaret theater in the Vilna ghetto, Sobol adopts the familiar play-within-a-play technique through which, in Langer’s words, the audience is invited “to experience simultaneously history as performance and performance as history.” Langer should have written “history as political propaganda and performance as historical perversion,” for what Sobol has done is to turn the Zionist revisionist Gens into a Likud party functionary and the Bundist chronicler Kruk into the humane alternative to the exercise of raw power (i.e., a stand-in for Yitzhak Rabin).

As for the actors and directors of the ghetto theater, Sobol has them performing throughout for the special—and obscene—pleasure of Nazi officer Bruno Kittel. Who actually performed before the chief executioner of Vilna Jewry and used the theater as a means of currying favor with the outside world? Was it Kasriel Broyde? Shabse Bliacher? Leyb Rosental or his daughter Khayele? Or was it perhaps the Israeli

playwright Sobol, who revised the play for its German-language debut in 1984 and then again for its English-language audience, the latter time complete with new songs written by Broadway lyricist Sheldon Harnick?¹⁶ Small wonder that when Sobol was doing research for this play, Sutzkever would not let him in the door.

For it is Sutzkever and the rapidly thinning ranks of the Vilna “compatriots” (*landslayt*) who model the responsible way to study Jewish cultural life in the Vilna ghetto: not from the outside in, with trendy notions of “chaos” and “performance” or (worse yet) with a gross political agenda, but from the inside out. To do so requires thorough mastery of a rigorous mental curriculum, because the Jewish cultural response was specifically designed to plumb the depths of the Jewish past, to counteract the radical diminution of neutral space with the total emancipation of Jewish time.

NOTES

1. Samuel David Kassow, "Vilna and Warsaw, Two Ghetto Diaries: Herman Kruk and Emanuel Ringelblum," in *Holocaust Chronicles: Individualizing the Holocaust through Diaries and Other Contemporaneous Personal Accounts*, ed. Robert Moses Shapiro (Hoboken, NJ: KTAV, 1999), pp. 171–215.
2. Zelig Kalmanovitsh, "Togbukh fun vilner geto (fragment)," ed. Shalom Luria, trans. Abraham Novershtern, *YIVO-bleter* 3 (1997), pp. 58–59 (entry for June 7, 1942). That Gens's apartment was painted orange I learned from a conversation with Samuel Bak.
3. Except for the recently discovered "fragment," the whole of Kalmanovitsh's Hebrew diary was published as *Yoman begeto Vilna ukhtavim miha`izavon shenimtsa baharisot*, ed. Shalom Luria (Tel Aviv: Moreshet and Sifriat Hapoalim, 1977).
4. On Herman Kruk, see Benjamin Harshav, "Introduction: Herman Kruk's Holocaust Writings," in *The Last Days of the Jerusalem of Lithuania: Chronicles from the Vilna Ghetto and the Camps, 1939–1944*, trans. Barbara Harshav (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, in association with YIVO, 2002), pp. xl–li. On Kruk's misspellings, see p. l.
5. "Tsum moment: Dr. Tsemakh Feldshteyns editoryaln in vilner geto, 1942–1943," *YIVO-bleter* 3 (1997), pp. 114–205. Like the Lodz Ghetto Archive, the surviving part of the Vilna Ghetto Archive was split into three parts after the war and is now located in the Lithuanian Central Archive, YIVO, and the Moreshet Archives in Israel. Thus the issues of the *Geto-yediyes* that I reported as missing are actually deposited in the Moreshet Archives.
6. Sutzkever-Kaczerginski Archive, file 343.
7. Kalmanovitsh, "Togbukh (fragment)," pp. 51, 83 (entry for May 27, 1942). The page numbers refer to the Hebrew original and Yiddish translation, respectively.
8. Kalmanovitsh, "Togbukh (fragment)," pp. 76–78, 102–103 (entry for July 19, 1942). The page numbers refer to the Hebrew original and Yiddish translation, respectively.

9. See David G. Roskies, *Against the Apocalypse: Responses to Catastrophe in Modern Jewish Culture* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1984), pp. 4–5, 196–97, 244.

10. *Ibid.*, chap. 9.

11. See Abba Kovner, “Nisayon rishon lehagid,” *Yalkut Moreshet* 16 (1973), p. 11, where the precise wording is “*lo nuval katson latevah.*” A much longer Yiddish version of this summons to resistance, of unknown provenance but also originating from within the ranks of the Zionist underground, is translated by Lucy S. Dawidowicz in *A Holocaust Reader* (New York: Behrman House, 1976), pp. 334–36.

12. For the bilingual text, see Abraham Sutzkever, “The Lead Plates at the Rom Press,” trans. Neal Kozodoy, in *The Penguin Book of Modern Yiddish Verse*, ed. Irving Howe, Ruth R. Wisse, and Khone Shmeruk (New York: Viking, 1987), pp. 678–79. On the composition of the poem, see Roskies, *Against the Apocalypse*, pp. 250–52.

13. See Feldstein’s editorial “Durkhgeleyent hundert toyznt bikher,” *Geto-yedies* 17 (December 14, 1942), and Kruk’s entry for December 13, 1942.

14. See Jacob Katz, *Tradition and Crisis: Jewish Society at the End of the Middle Ages* (New York: Schocken, 1971), chap. 24.

15. Lawrence L. Langer, *Art from the Ashes: A Holocaust Anthology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).

16. See the definitive Hebrew version of the playscript, *Geto*, 2nd ed. (Tel Aviv: Or-Am, 1992).