In addition to the loss of lives, one of the catastrophic results of the Holocaust was the destruction of Yiddish culture in Europe. Yiddish speakers who managed to survive had to come to terms with the reality that the homeland of their culture had ceased to exist. Yiddish authors had to face the fact that their readership had almost entirely vanished. After the Holocaust, the choice to write in Yiddish meant making a statement about the Nazis’ failure to destroy the Yiddish language and its speakers. Chava Rosenfarb wrote about the dilemma of the post-Holocaust Yiddish writer:

I feel myself to be like anachronism wandering about a page of history on which I don’t belong. If writing is a lonely profession, the Yiddish writer’s loneliness has an additional dimension. His readership has perished. His language has gone up with the smoke of the crematoria. He or she creates in vacuum, almost without a readership, out of fidelity to a vanished language—as if to prove that Nazism did not succeed in extinguishing that language’s last breath, and that it is still alive.¹

The concept of being “still alive,” a term I borrow from the title of Holocaust survivor Ruth Klüger’s memoir,² refers to the comprehension that despite all of the pain, losses, suffering,
cruelty, and inhumanity, the desire to live and life itself could not be erased. Rosenfarb’s writings validate life, particularly the wish of Yiddish-speaking Canadian immigrants to survive, to live, and to come to terms with the past.

Rosenfarb was a Holocaust survivor and Yiddish writer. She was born in 1923 in Lodz, Poland. In 1944 she and her family were transported to Auschwitz, later to the camp Sasel near Hamburg, and then to Bergel-Belsen. In 1950 Rosenfarb immigrated to Canada. She penned poetry, short stories, novels, essays, and dramas. She wrote her first poems in the Lodz ghetto. However, she did not write prose until after the Holocaust, not because she “agreed with Adorno that there is no place for poetry after the Holocaust,” but because she did not believe it was possible to express her experiences in poetry. Concerning the trilogy The Tree of Life, Rosenfarb writes that “in telling my tale, I began to feel confined and restricted by the poetic form. [...] What I wanted to say was impossible to sing.”

The story “Edgeh’s nekome” (“Edgia’s Revenge”) was first published in Yiddish in Di goldene keyt (1989) and was translated to English by Goldie Morgenthaler in Found Treasures: Stories by Yiddish Women Writers (1994). The story also grapples with issues that are “impossible to sing.” As Morgenthaler states, Rosenfarb’s short stories explore the effects of Holocaust survivors’ migration to Canada. She “attempts a synthesis between her primary theme of the Holocaust and the Canadian milieu in which she finds herself, so that Canada becomes […] the land of the postscript, the country in which the survivors of the Holocaust play out the tragedy’s last act.”

This paper examines the construction of identity of the protagonist-narrator of “Edgia’s Revenge,” Rella, who was a kapo in the concentration camp Auschwitz. My analysis focuses on key junctures in Rella’s understanding of her identity. I focus on the dilemma of the Jewish kapo and the problem of simultaneously being a victim and a perpetrator. I argue that Rella’s struggle to forge a new identity after the immigration to Canada fails due to the constant presence of the past—the problem of
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all survivors that is amplified for the kapo. Rella finds salvation only in death, which she perceives as a reunion with the victims, the persecuted Jewish community.

The main character of the story “Edgia’s Revenge” is Rella, from whose perspective the story is written. She is a Holocaust survivor, Yiddish-speaker, and immigrant to Canada. Rella’s experience in the Holocaust was significantly influenced by her gender. The Jewish genocide—the deliberate, systematic extermination of Jews—is a unique event in history. The Nazis’ “Final Solution” called for the extermination of all Jews, regardless of origin, gender, class, or age. The Holocaust is usually viewed as gender neutral because the annihilation of the Jews was based on “race.” Therefore, gender was long ignored by scholars as an object for analysis in regard to the Holocaust. According to Ringelheim, “The connection between genocide and gender has been difficult to conceive for some; for others, it has been difficult to construct.”

However, feminist scholars have begun to emphasize women’s particular experiences in the Holocaust, claiming that the status of women was different from that of men. For instance, Roth has argued that “[t]he racism of Nazi ideology ultimately implied that the existence of Jewish families, and especially the Jewish women who mothered them, constituted a deadly obstacle to the racial purity and cultural superiority that Germany ‘deserved.’ Jewish women constituted that threat fundamentally because they could bear children.”

Mothers with children and pregnant women were often immediately sent to gas chambers. Therefore, feminist scholars of the Holocaust make the distinction between the experiences of women and men, pointing out that women had to face not only their Jewishness but also their gender and sexuality:

Jewish women and men experienced unrelieved suffering during the Holocaust, but Jewish women carried the burdens of sexual victimization, pregnancy, abortion, childbirth, killing of newborn babies in the camps to save the mothers, care of children, and many decisions about
separation from children. For Jewish women the Holocaust produced a set of experiences, responses, and memories that do not always parallel those of Jewish men.¹⁴

Rella came to Auschwitz a virgin. In the camp she was sexually assaulted by the German criminal Albert, a supervisor of the women’s camp.¹⁵ Rella had thoughts of death and being killed when Albert trapped her behind a shack and raped her. Rella does not describe the rape graphically. She prefers euphemistic expressions, such as “he took me.” The “taking” of Rella’s body and virginity represents her objectification. Her subjectivity does not have a place within the relationship between her and Albert, nor does Jewish subjectivity have a place within a camp where all Jews are objects for extermination. Rella calls Albert a “god”: “Albert—mayn tevtonisher got! Er hot gekont ton mit mir vos er hot gevolt” (43; “Albert—my Teutonic god! He could do with me what he pleased”; 251). He represents for Rella the highest instance of power. He alone can influence life and death. The sexual relationship between the German Albert and the Jewish Rella is problematic because it was prohibited as Rassenschande,¹⁶ and Albert was well aware of this fact:¹⁷ “Ober er hot gut gevust, az er bageyt rasnshand. Dos hot im gevaylt un arntergeheytst [sic] zayn helishe libe tsu mir” (43; “My god Albert knew well enough that he was committing Rassenschande. But this amused him and added fuel to his hellish love for me”; 251). Albert’s amusement reflects not only his subconscious knowledge of his superiority as an Aryan, but also the playfulness of a criminal who commits a crime while sitting in a room full of police officers, certain that he cannot be caught. An image of hell (“fuel to his hellish love”) is evoked in several places concerning Albert. His power is projected not only in his Teutonic god-being, but also in his monstrosity. For Rella, Albert has demonic power to spread evil seeds. This is how his active powerful masculinity is perceived by Rella, who views herself as the passive female receiver of the seed: “Mayn got Albert hot oykh muberes gemakht mayn neshome mit a shed,
fun velkhn kh’hob nisht getort poter vern, vayl er iz geven mayn garantye far yedn tog lebn” (43; “My god Albert impregnated my soul with a demon which I did not dare exorcise because it guaranteed every single day of my life;” 251). The physical rape is raised here to a symbolic act of an undesired pregnancy with evil, through which Rella excuses her choice to become a kapo, implying that it was not really her wish. Not choice, but rather instinct or luck determined her fate: “Kh’hob gevolt iberlebn. Kh’hob zikh nisht oysgeklibn dem oyfn vi azoy dos tsu ton. Nisht geven keyn oyfanim fun velkhe oystsuklaybn. Mazl iz geven der iker. Der oyfn hot mikh oysgeklibn” (41; “I wanted to survive. I did not choose the means by which to do it. There were no choices to be made. Everything depended on luck. The means chose me”; 248).

While the symbolic pregnancy remains, the physical pregnancy as a result of the rape must be terminated: “Un nokh zeks khadoshim zayn in lager a fule kapo. Tsum glik. Vayl kh’hob geshvangert. Vi a kapo hob ikh gekont zikh frayer bavegn, un Albert hot gekont zen dertsu, az ikh zol poter vern fun der zakh” (43; “after six months in the camp I was made a full kapo. That was lucky, because I was pregnant. As a kapo I could move about freely, and Albert could arrange things so that I was soon rid of my problem”; 251). Becoming a kapo saved Rella. In the topsy-turvy world of the concentration camp, childbirth as an act that gives life was transformed into an act for which there is a death penalty. Therefore, pregnancy was not a happy event, but instead a problem for Rella. Under these circumstances, Rella does not view abortion as the killing of a child, but rather as the preservation of her life and the removal of the evil seed of the rapist.

The love Albert claims to feel toward Rella has an impact on her life. His words “Ich liebe dich” scare her because they might have been “spoken in an upside-down world, hav[ing] exactly the opposite meaning” (251; “di verter, aroysgezogte in an ibergekerter velt, nisht gehat a mol a kapoyerdkn meyn?”; 43) and perhaps because this affection might indicate that
she was like him. The experiences of Albert’s “hellish love,” the rape, the pregnancy, and the abortion, as well as Albert’s promise to marry her after the war, influence Rella’s identity and behavior. After the Holocaust experiences, she cannot love, marry, or have children. She does not believe in love and that she is worthy of love. Even what connects her to Lolek, a lover later in Canada, never becomes love:

_Rella gives up her pre-war identity. Her inability to love is a result of Albert’s perverse love for her. Her childlessness is the result of her rape, pregnancy, and abortion in Auschwitz, as well as the shame of the _kapo_ past and the fear of reproducing traitors. Therefore, the part of Rella’s womanhood that is associated with sexuality and the female body is erased from the field of possible sites for the development of Rella’s gender identity in Canada._

(I never married—not because I had no opportunities, and not because I had completely rid myself of romantic illusions, but because I did not want to have any children, so what would be the point? True, I would have liked to carry on the hereditary line of my family, but I was haunted by the fear that I might bring potential _kapos_ into the world—that’s how neurotic I was! My sexual encounters with men gave me little pleasure, but my loneliness would not permit me to give them up. 247)
When Rella was transported to Auschwitz, she was 19 years old. After the Holocaust, Rella tends to idealize the pre-war years, comparing her childhood to years of innocence and purity. Her identity was forged in a middle-class intellectual milieu, in which family was highly valued. When she immigrates to Canada after the war, she takes sleeping pills with her. The pills substitute for her lost family members and are ultimately an inferior substitute for the support that one’s family would normally offer:

(But in my knapsack I carried the twenty-five sleeping pills which the good doctor had given me. These pills were the only one possession that I brought with me to Canada from the European continent. They took the place of my parents, my grandparents, my sixteen-year-old brother and my ten-year-old sister, my darling Maniusha. They took the place of all my aunts, uncles, and cousins, of my first and only love. Sleeping pills became my life—and my death. And now they have become my only road back to innocence. 274)

Rella does not mention her father’s or mother’s profession. However, taking into consideration the facts that Rella
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goestoherhighschoolandherfamilyhasacook,itismightbe
assumedthatshewasbroughtupinanmiddle-classfamily. Itis
not evident from the text, but in general in pre-war years, iden-
tity roles were gendered in such families and each sex had its
own domain within which to realize these roles.19 Motherhood
was an inseparable part of female identity in Modern Europe.
Only after the war would Rella say that she is an emancipated
woman: “[I]kh hob zikh batrakht vi a fraye froy. Far der milk-
home volt men mikh ongerufn a farzesene” (60; “I considered
myself a liberated woman, although before the war I would have
been called an old maid”; 274). The war altered her concep-
tion of gendered norms. Before the war, the young Rella is
already prepared for the maternal role, having substituted as
a mother to her younger sister Maniusha: “Kh’hob shtark lib
gehat mayn shvesterl Manyushen, tsu vemen ikh bin geven vi
a tsveyte mame, vayl undzer muter iz geven a krenklekhe” (41;
“And I loved my litter sister Maniusha, to whom I was second
mother, since our own mother was sickly”; 248). Being second
mother to Maniusha plays an enormous role in the text. The
ten-year-old sister is a leitmotif: Rella saves one of the camp
inmates, Edgia, because Edgia’s eyes remind her of Maniusha’s
eyes, and the last sentence of the story is a vow not to betray
Maniusha again.

Cultural refinement, not religion, was central for Rella. She
loved poetry and could speak Polish and German, which she
learned in high school and at home from the family’s German
cook. The love for literature, theatre, art, and education, which
were valued in Rella’s childhood, would follow Rella through-
out the years in concentration camps and help to construct her
identity after the Holocaust in Canada. Culture would become
a form of purification for her, a tool by which she would try to
make a “bridge” between her childhood and post-war life.

Rella’s idealization of childhood and family is strongly
linked to nature. The memory of the country house and its near-
ness to nature prevents Rella from enjoying Canadian landscape
after immigration:
Ven es kumt tsu der Kanadisher natur-sheynkeyt bin ikh vi a daltonistke. Ikh kuk un ikh ze nisht. Beser far mir azoy. Di landschaft dermont mikh tsu shtark on der gegnt tsufusns fun di karpatnberg, vu ikh hob geflegt farbrengen mayne zumer-vakatsyes in di kinder-yorn. (83)

(When it came to the beauty of the Canadian landscape I might as well have been blind. I looked but I did not see. It was better for me that way. The landscape reminded me too strongly of the district that lies at the foot of the Carpathian Mountains, where I had used to spend summer vacations in my childhood. 307)

In Rella’s subconscious, the pre-war years become an idyll where culture, nature, and family coexist in harmony. Her childhood and adolescence represent happiness, a time in which everything was lucid and stable, where norms and roles were clear. This world defines what she will become: a cultured, tender woman, wife and mother.

The harmony of the world and the middle-class identity of the young woman is completely destroyed when Rella arrives in the concentration camp. Because there is no nature, culture, family, or other old norms and roles with which Rella can identify, she has to create a new identity within her normless new environment—that of a survivor. In the brutal reality of the concentration camp, only the fittest could survive. For Rella it means risking her life to save her life when she approaches Albert. According to Rella, becoming a kapo is not a choice but is fate. The concentration camp symbolizes for Rella an animalistic, brutal environment where only animal instincts, rather than culturally established roles, ethics, and morality matter.

Under these circumstances Rella learns that physical and mental power means physical survival—knowledge she did not have before the war. She comes to fully appreciate the significance of this power: “Ikh bin geven shtolts mit mayn Albertn, shtolts mit mayn pozitsye in dem malkhus fun toyt. In
Ekaterina Pirozhenko

katset hot dos vort ‘kapo’ aroysgerufn di forkht vos men hot far pristers, tsi pristerins, di hiters fun heylike fayern” (43; “I was proud of my position in the kingdom of death. In the camps, the word kapo elicited the kind of awe reserved in ancient times for the priests and priestesses who guarded the sacred flame”; 251). This comparison to ancient times refers, in Rella’s mind, to the world of pre-European culture and moral sensibility. The concept of demonism is added to the spiritual context of the past, since “Teutonic god Albert” impregnated her soul with a demon. According to Rella, her agency is subsumed by a demon, a dark power that participates in a murderous machinery. The demonic possession of her body is Rella’s way of rationalizing her being a kapo. By doing this, Rella disassociates from the responsibility of her action, the same strategy that Hannah Arendt describes in regard to Adolf Eichmann’s Jerusalem Trial and calls the “banality of evil”: “It was as though in those last minutes he [Eichmann] was summing up the lesson that this long course in human wickedness had taught us—the lesson of the fearsome, world-and-thought-defying banality of evil.”20

Ironically, Rella herself describes her actions as not banal when she later decides to end her life:

Ober ven es kumt tsum eygenem eyntsik-molikn gang, farshvindt di banalitet un m’iz shoyn gornisht glaykhgiltik. Ikh bin nisht keyn oysnam. Farkert, mayn geratevet lebn iz mir tayer. Ikh hob derfar batsolt mer vi andere nitsl-gevorene, batsolt mit mayn gevisn vi a tsulog. (39)

(But when it’s a question of one’s own personal one-time-only demise, then banality vanishes and so does indifference. I am no exception. On the contrary. My own salvaged life is precious to me. I have paid a higher price for it than other survivors did for theirs. I have paid for it with my conscience. 244)

Rella views herself as an individual with unique and personal experiences. In her interview with Ramona Koval for
Radio National, Rosenfarb protests and strongly dislikes the term “banality of evil.” She says:

> No I don’t like the expression banal, there’s nothing banal about life. Banality of evil—what does it mean? Sounds good but what does it mean? Evil is drama, evil is fighting, resisting an oppressor, resisting a power that attacks you. There is no banality in all that.\(^{21}\)

In a similar way, Rosenfarb interprets Eichmann as a tragic figure—“It’s tragic, it’s tragic. Eichmann represents drama of life, in a way, the drama of humanity”\(^{22}\)—Rella also sees herself as a tragic figure, referring to the fact that nobody talks about the tragedy of the Jewish kapo (256).

Although Rella becomes aware of her tragedy only after the liberation, in the concentration camp she seems rather comfortable with her kapo position, where her new identity is constructed in the closed space of the concentration camp. The camp was the universe: “Der nay-geboyrrener shed in mir hot mir gegeben a gefil fun frayheyt in ot der farshklafung, dos gefil, az a tog lebn iz a tog eybikeyt, az der katset iz der univers, un az fun danen firn keyn vegn nisht vayter” (44; “The newly born demon within me gave me a sense of freedom in the midst of slavery, a sense that one day of life was an eternity, that the concentration camp was the universe, and that there were no roads leading away from this”; 252). Because the world outside of the camp does not exist for Rella anymore and because Rella does not see any escape from the camp, she assimilates, accepting the rules of the new universe. Socialized into a society where slavery is the norm, Rella assumes and relishes the role of a “master.” The power gives her freedom, self respect, and pleasure. Calling the camp “universe,” “kingdom of death,” “slavery,” and the time in the camp “ancient” and “eternal,” Rella creates a new dimension of human social structure, where brutal survival strategies flourish and are dependent upon power distribution. Rationalizing her survival as a kapo, Rella says that everybody in the camp “had the potential to be a brute,
a thug, a murderer. When it comes to fighting for one’s own life, moral laws cease to exist” (252; “In ot der velt fun velkher kh’bin mit nisim aroysgekumen, hot yeder eyner gekont zayn a shleger, a retseyekh, a merder. Ven es kemt tsum shlogn zikh farn eygenem lebn, giltn nisht keyn moralishe gezetsn”; 44). Through the example of quarreling inmates fighting for Rella’s underwear, as well as their tributary reading of Rella’s facial expression, Rella offers the proof of the non-existence of morality, the inmates’ readiness to do everything possible in order to survive, and her own cyclical fluctuation between oppressor and oppressed in the camp.

The threat of Rella’s camp universe being destroyed makes her realize that the world with other roles outside of the camp still exists:

*Di luft hot genumen shmekn mit sof-milkhome. Ikh hob geshpirt, az mayn sof dernentert zikh oykh. Kh’hob moyre bakumen far dem vos di daytshn veln mit undz ton in letstn moment, un moyre bakumen far dem vos di katsetnikes veln ton mit undz, kapos, oyb mir veln derlebn di bafrayung.* (46)

(The smell of war’s end hung in the air. And I sensed that my end too was drawing near. I began to fear what the Germans might do to us in the last moments, and to fear as well what the prisoners might do to the *kapos* if we survived our liberation. 255)

This threat means the destruction of the socially constructed identity of a powerful *kapo*. Rella realizes the difficulty of her situation as an “in-between.” On the one hand, Rella was a victim and target of the Germans; on the other hand, Rella was a *kapo* and is now a target for her inmates. Facing the coming liberation means facing the split between Rella and her community. The new social structure brings her a new identity: that of traitor. Rather than feeling guilt, Rella feels disgust for herself and fear of hearing the word “*kapo,*” which stamps her
soul “like the mark of Cain” (253; “vi a Kayin-tseykh”; 45). The open gates of the concentration camp symbolize an open door for moral sensibility and for the Cain/betrayer identity of the person who did not stand by her own people.

In liberated Europe, Rella does not see a future for a former kapo. The constant fear of recognition and anxiety over possible finger-pointing eliminate the possibility of constructing a new life. Thus, Rella considers emigration to Canada as an escape from her kapo identity: “Vi gezogt, bin ikh geven gliklekhs ontsukumen in Kanade, vos ikh hob batракht vi a land vayt fun Got un vayt fun gevezene katsetnikes, vu ikh vel nisht zayn oysheshtelt oyf der sakone konfrontirt tsu vern mit an ongesh-pitstn vayzfinger” (47; “As I said, I was happy to emigrate to Canada, which I considered a land ‘far from God and from people’—by which I meant former concentration camp inmates—where I would be unlikely ever to be confronted by an accusing finger”; 256). Displacement to another continent is crucial for Rella. Life in surroundings where nobody knows her creates the opportunity to construct a completely new identity. Leaving family, friends, the community, and the past behind, she can become whoever she desires in her new world.

However, there remains a physical reminder of Rella’s past: the number that was tattooed on her skin when she entered the concentration camp. Hence, Rella’s first action in Canada is to erase the last physical evidence of her kapo past: “Mitn ershtn gelt vos ikh hob fardint, bin ikh avek un zikh gelozt aropnemen dem katset-numer fun mayn orem” (47; “With the first money I earned, I went to a plastic surgeon and asked him to remove the tattooed number from my forearm”; 257). Erasing the tattoo means erasing her past, thereby easing her assimilation into Canada. Rella believes that neither her past nor her private thoughts should matter to other people, and her physical appearance assumes a central importance: “Kedey zikh tsu filn zikherer bay zikh, hob ikh oykh gelozt mayn pasye far sheyner kleydung zikh tseblien. Kh’hob gehat a farlang zikh keseyder ibertsuton, baytn mayn oyszen, vern emets andersh” (49; “And in order to
feel still more secure, I became obsessed with beautiful clothes. I had an urge to be constantly changing my garments, rearranging my appearance”; 259). Trying new clothes and new appearances symbolizes Rella’s constant search for a new body and a new look to convey to others an external proxy identity. In addition, Rella concerns herself with the language. The wish to master English conveys Rella’s desire to become fully Canadian.

Constructing her new identity in the New World, Rella socializes with very carefully and selectively chosen people. Her friends share common values and interests, as well as a love for culture, literature, and theater. Culture is a “bridge” for them from their childhood to their new lives. They do not relate to the past; on the contrary they try to “effect a spiritual escape not only from the outmoded Jewish shtetl but also from the Jewish mentality that had once inhabited the East European metropolis” (259; “hobn mir zikh bamit tsu antloyfn mitt gayst nisht nor fun dem altn Yidishn shtetl, nor oykh fun der Yidisher mentalitet fun der amoliker Mizrekh-Eyropeyisher groysshtor”; 54). Rella and her friends have an incredible desire to look forward, to absorb everything new, and to try to fit into a modern society. The group is tied together by the general idea that the end of the Second World War is the beginning of a new age and of a completely new chain of events. Rella has a special position in the group not only because she is dominant within it, but also because her motivation to rid herself of her kapo identity is so strong that her assimilation into Canadian society proceeds more quickly. The speed of Rella’s adaptation becomes an issue of envy and admiration for her friend and lover Lolek:

“Du bist di eyntsike fun undz,—hot er mikh geloybt,—vos hot zikh fulkum aroyserisn fun undzer gaystikn geto.” Er flegt nispoel vern fun mayn oysgetseykhntn English, fun di nayste oysdrukn vos ikh hob banutst, un fun mayn stil fun kleydn zikh in der leitser mode. Mayne mayles fun a kameleon zaynen im shtark geven tsum hartsn.
“You are the only one of us,” he would compliment me, “who has completely freed herself from our spiritual ghetto.” He raved about my excellent English, my up-to-date expressions, and my fashionable style of dressing. My chameleon-like qualities pleased him no end. 275)

However, Rella’s assimilation and new identity are solely external. She notes, “Kh’bin geven vi yeder epl: sheyn un gezunt fun droysn, farfoylt un toyt ineveynik” (49; “I was like the proverbial apple, beautiful and healthy on the outside, wormy and rotten inside”; 259). This urge to assimilate “attempts to integrate the traumatic past into coping with the realities of present-day society,” 24 a hallmark of “survivor syndrome.” The sociologist Luchterhand points out:

The Nazi regime and its camps went far toward destroying the pre-camp identities of its victims. Thus a teenager whose family was destroyed and who had never worked, had no place in family or occupational role systems. In such instances there was rarely anyone in the home community who regarded the youth as a friend. Additionally, circumstances may have made him or her stateless. Lacking credentials or sponsors, the assumptions such person made about their personal place in the world were unconvincing to others and finally to themselves. Their condition was a kind of nonidentity. Their problem (paraphrasing Goffman) was somehow to manage this nonidentity and to place themselves in society. 25

In a sense, the nonidentity is based on a lack of orientations. As Luchterhand explains, young survivors escaped from slavery to freedom are often lacking responsibilities. They appreciate the presence and they are suspicious about the future. In Rosenfarb’s text, Rella also has a “nonidentity” after the war because she loses her family, youth, and her homeland, relocating to another continent.
Removing her tattoo does not have any impact on Rella’s inner life. She knows that she plays a role and that the performance of a new body does not work since she is aware that removing the tattoo from her body does not remove the mark of Cain from her soul. Rella’s body and soul are in discord. Her English is not perfect, and her pronunciation remains European, which prevents her from becoming a new person. She will learn to turn this for her advantage, ultimately using the accent to help her business flourish, calling her boutique “La boutique européen.” Even at the level of social life, Rella cannot distance herself from her old identity. Her friends are not just cultured and intelligent, but they are all immigrants from Europe—all Jews, and all Holocaust survivors—people who either survived in concentration camps or hid. Rella is able to socialize only with people who have similar experiences: Europeanism, Jewishness, victimhood, the Holocaust, survivor’s guilt, and the constant fear of the New World. The New World welcomes these immigrants and offered refuge. “Canada […] like blank paper patiently permits the survivors to impose their past on its present.”

Fear and the war experience have physical manifestations. Her psychological state has an enormous impact on Rella’s physical health. Rella suffers from insomnia, and even has nightmares and hallucinations. Even though Rella tries to build a new life and a new identity, she is not able to erase the memory of her years in the concentration camps. Two worlds overlap, and she seems to see all dogs as German shepherds, all men as SS men, all people as her former inmates. In her nightmares and psychological sufferings, her *kapo* identity does not necessarily become visible, but rather her identity as a Jewish victim in general. Constructing a new life is impossible because all characters, including Rella, wish to forget the past. In reality, however, they cannot, and they therefore suffer from the constant presence of the terrifying images their memories evoke. Only Rella’s friend Pavel seems able to see what is under the surface. He believes that Rella and her friends play roles and
do not want to face the truth that they do not fit into the New World and are alien there.

The split inside Rella is a split between present and past, which is characteristic of a survivor’s identity. Psychiatrist Robert Jay Lifton defines a survivor as “one who has encountered, been exposed to, or witnessed death, and has himself or herself remained alive.” Lifton explains the survivor’s identity providing examples of the Holocaust, Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the Vietnam War, and the Buffalo Creek flood of 1972 survivors. Yet, Lifton suggests that the Holocaust survivors share similar psychological responses due to their memories of the past death immersion. Lifton differentiates five psychological themes relevant to a survivor’s psyche: death imprint (indelible images), death guilt, psychic numbing, suspicion of counterfeit nurturance, and struggle for meaning. The death imprint is the trace that the experience or witnessing of death leaves in the psyche of the survivor. The experienced past evokes indelible images of killing, suffering, annihilation, and absurd forms of death. “The survivor may feel stuck in time, unable to move beyond that imagery, or may find it a source of death-haunted knowledge.” The indelible images remain in the survivors’ memory as bright, clear, and detailed (for example, they can remember the smoke of the gas chambers). Taking into consideration the concept of the death imprint, we can see that Rella in “Edgia’s Revenge” suffers of indelible images that are represented by her nightmares and daydreams of SS men, inmates, dogs, the separation from her sister, and the rape. Lifton calls the second category of the survivors’ identity death guilt, which is understood as the self-questioning of why the person survived while others died. Death guilt is unthinkable without indelible imagery that evokes the survivors’ memory of their “inactivation—helplessness—within the death imagery, of their inability to act in a way they would ordinary have thought appropriate.” Because the survivors think and feel that they could have done something physically back then to save others but they did not cause them the feeling of debt and responsibility toward the
dead. In Rosenfarb’s text, *death guilt* is very obviously present in Pavel’s case. He cannot forgive himself for not saving the life of his wife and child. Rella’s *death guilt* is exacerbated by her *kapo* position. The third category of the survivor syndrome is *psychic numbing* that means “the diminished capacity to feel,” which culminates when one, for example, becomes a “*muselman*” (“living corpse”) in a concentration camp. According to Lifton, *psychic numbing* is a way of adapting and coping with the extreme brutality and one of the forms of self-protection. The survivors claim very often that they could survive because they did not feel anything. Projecting the idea of psychic numbing to Rosenfarb’s text, we can see that Rella uses this strategy of self-defense in the concentration camp. She is emotionally detached from the everyday death, which allows her not only to survive but also to participate in killing, functioning as a *kapo*. Yet, the *psychic numbing* partially outlasts the camp. Rella claims that she is not able to love and to feel beauty. The loss of feelings is not coping or self-defending anymore, rather it is a sign of despair and of psychological trauma. Lifton’s fourth category of the survivor syndrome—*suspicion of counterfeit nurturance*—is a “survivor’s sense of a counterfeit universe.” Counterfeiting reflects not only moral inversion in concentration camps but also a feeling of falseness after the war. For instance, Rella points out that there were other norms in the camp, that it was a topsy-turvy world. The experiences of the world with another kind of logic generate Rella’s feeling of counterfeit world in Canada. Rella knows that she is also false, acting as if she was “normal.” In fact, all of the characters of the story have the feeling of falseness in Canada. They socialize among themselves because other people cannot understand what the friends went through. The last theme—*struggle for meaning*—refers to the categories of justice and morality:

Survivors of Nazi death camps have been called “collectors of justice.” They seek something beyond economic or social restitution—something closer to acknowledgement of crimes
committed against them and punishment of those responsible—in order to reestablish at least the semblance of a moral universe.\textsuperscript{32}

Rella judges herself for being responsible for participating in committing crime and then punishes herself with a death sentence. Rella reserves the right to judge and punish herself.

“Edgia’s Revenge” is a story about victims. All of the characters—Lolek, Pavel, Edgia, and Rella—are Holocaust survivors. However, the notion of victimhood is problematized; even among seemingly obvious victims, the question is raised regarding who is a victim and who is a perpetrator. Rella is a victim of the Germans; however, she is also a perpetrator because she was a kapo. Lolek, Rella, and their friends humiliate Edgia in everyday life, debasing her to the status of a cook, a washerwoman, a servant, and a maid, thereby making her their victim. Edgia becomes Rella’s emotional oppressor because she generates the fear of potential betrayal. Rella believes that Edgia uses her “weakness” to subordinate Lolek, binding him to her. According to Rella, Edgia’s weakness has a passive-aggressive destructive power, which is why she suggests that Lolek leaves Edgia: “[V]olt zikher gezinter geven, az du zolst avek fun ir. Keyn shum mentsh hot nisht keyn rekht tsu farsamen dos lebn fun a tsveytn mentshn. Zi makht dokh a tel fun dir. Kh’ze dos befeyresh. Zi sakt dir unter di fligl” (71; “[I]t would certainly be better to leave her. No person has the right to poison the life of another. She is destroying you. I can see it clearly. She clips your wings”; 289). After Lolek’s death, Edgia changes, radically imitating Rella’s behavior. She plays the self-confident, intelligent woman. There is no trace of the oppressed, dehumanized, subservient wife. In the relationship between Pavel and Edgia, reversed gender roles are established. Now Edgia is the breadwinner and Pavel is the housekeeper, servant, and object of Edgia’s aggressive jokes. It seems that the past follows all the characters, and the suffering and the victimization of the past lead the characters to torture others in the present. In this way, the individual’s existence as perpetrator and victim overlaps.
In order to enhance the theme of victimhood, Rosenfarb uses a cross as a symbol for the relationship between Edgia and Rella. The Cross symbol is connected to notions of commemoration. Edgia and Rella always remember their past. However, their relationship is missing salvation and forgiveness. In the following dialogue with Rella, Edgia notices for the first time that the crucifix is lacking Jesus:

“Zest dem tseylem dortn? Sheyn, ha? Nor mir dakh zikh, az es felt im epes. Tref vos.”

“a Yezus!”—hob ikh oysgerufn un zikh krum tselakht.

Zi hot tsugeshoklt mtn kepl.

“yo, a Yezus. Yeder tseylem muz hobn zayn Yezus, un yeder Yezus muz hobn tseylem. Farshteyst, Rela? Der tseylem iz di shayle un der Yezus iz di tshuve. Ikh red zikh ayn, az ikh bin oykh aza tseylem un ikh trog oyf zikh a Yezus.” (69)

(“Do you see that cross up there? Beautiful, isn’t it? But I have the impression it’s missing something. Guess what?”

“She nodded. “Yes, Jesus. Every cross should have its Jesus, and every Jesus should have his cross. Do you understand, Rella? The cross is the question and Jesus is the answer. Sometimes I believe that I am just such a cross and that I carry my Jesus on my back.” 286)

Edgia refers to the cross on the top of Mount Royal on the island of Montreal. The symbolism of Jesus and the cross is rather complex. The crucified Jesus is the main religious symbol of Christianity and symbolizes the fulfillment of scripture, the redemption of sinful humans, and salvation through death. The cross itself might symbolize any burden in general, the physical and emotional burden of suffering. In Rosenfarb’s text, the
cross is missing Jesus and the characters are compared to the cross and also to Jesus carrying the cross. Each of them has his/her own burden. For Lolek, Edgia is his burden/cross: “Kh’bin a pakhdn. Kh’vil zi nisht hobn oyfn gevisn. Zi vet dokh keyn eyn tog nisht oyshaltn on mir. Zi iz mayn hoyker, farshteystn mikh, un ikh muz im trogn” (71; “I’m a coward. I don’t want to have her on my conscience. She would never be able to survive a single day without me. She is the cross that I must bear”); 289).

For Edgia, Pavel is her cross. In the constellation of Rella and Edgia, Rella is Jesus because she saved Edgia’s life; however, Edgia might also be Jesus because she is the representation of Rella’s humanity. Both women are burdens to each other since they remind each other of the unpleasant past they must bear.

Edgia’s attitude toward Jesus and the cross is contradictory. Once, she complained to Lolek that there are Jesuses but there is no place for them on Earth. Lolek says:

\[
Zi kholemt fun a tsayt, ven ale Yezuses veln arop fun di tslomim, veln vern astronoytn un zikh avetktsien oif di andere planetn. Vayl do, oif der erd, pasn zey zikh shlekht arayn, az nisht-vilndik, tuen zey op groyse shodns, un az derfar makht men zey far geter. \text{(70)}
\]

([S]he is dreaming of a time when all the world’s Jesuses will climb down from their crosses, become astronauts, and move to other planets. Because here on earth they don’t fit in properly, and they do great harm without meaning to, and for this reason they are idolized. 287)

This sentence probably refers to Edgia’s attitude toward Rella. Rella saved her life, yet her presence tortures Edgia, so she does “harm without meaning it.” On the other hand, Edgia also speaks about the cross without Jesus, which follows her everywhere. Edgia believes that if she could hang a Jesus on the cross, it would leave her alone (303).

The title of the story is “Edgia’s Revenge.” Since the story is written from Rella’s perspective, it is Rella who sees
the development and the end of the relationship between the two women as vengeance. What happened between Rella and Edgia in the camp is very important for both women. During roll call, when women were selected for gas chambers, Rella was faced with a dilemma of two extremes: on the one hand, as a kapo she was supposed to make sure that all women went to selection; on the other hand, as a human being she has the opportunity to save the life of one woman—Edgia. Hiding a person means resisting the Nazis. In the concentration camp, any resistance could lead to death. Not only Edgia’s life but also Rella’s life comes under threat. Thereafter, saving Edgia’s life represents Rella’s “one and only heroic act in the camps” (255; “mayn eyntsikn heroishn akt in katset”; 46), and her action rises “to the level of self-sacrifice” (261; “mayn oyfheybn zikh tsu der madreyge fun mesires-nefesh”; 51). To prove that she did not completely lose her “essential goodness,” “kindness,” and “humanity” under conditions where there was no place for them is very important for Rella. The knowledge of a single moment of her humanity gives her strength to live and legitimizes her existence as a human being. Therefore, Rella needs Edgia as living evidence of her humanity. The relationship is based on a double dependency: Edgia is tied to Rella because she survived thanks to Rella, and Rella is tied to Edgia because she symbolizes her “one and only moment of humanity, of kindness” (261). The poisonous relationship is, however, exacerbated by the pledge Edgia gives to Rella: to never say that Rella was a kapo and saved Edgia’s life. Rella wants this pledge in order to keep her kapo position unknown. Of course, Rella could have never seen Edgia again, and it is a coincidence that two women meet each other after the war in a clothes shop in Canada. Rella does not have to speak to Edgia, but she approaches her nonetheless. What draws Rella to Edgia is a feeling of guilt and a subconscious wish of being discovered and incriminated. She says:

_Ikh bin farblibn tayvedik tsugebundn tsum lebn, un hob keseyder geflirtevet mitn toyt. Ikh hob nor gevart oyf dem moment, az emets zol oysshrayen_
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mir in ponem arayn: “ikh ken dikh! Du bist geven a kapo!”

Ot der zelbstmerderisher impuls hot mikh gehaltn tsugebundn tsu Edzshen. Fun ir hob ikh dervart tsu hern ot dem oysgeshrey. (45)

(I have remained passionately attached to life, while constantly flirting with death, all the while waiting for the moment when someone would exclaim: “I know you! You were a kapo!” This same suicidal impulse has kept me attached to Edgia. It was from her that I expected to hear the accusation. 253)

This suicidal impulse is what Rella calls “flirtation with death,” which characterizes many of Rella’s actions: her approaching of Albert, the saving of Edgia’s life, the friendship with Edgia, the sexual relationship with Edgia’s husband Lolek, and her narration, which is in effect a suicide note. Rella tells the story explaining why she has decided to commit suicide. Life and death become, in this case, strongly connected to each other; guilt and self-loathing turn out to be unbearable for Rella. The struggle for a new identity reveals itself as a theatrical performance not only for others, but mostly for herself. The perpetual pretending and the concealing of her identity as both survivor and kapo under the facade of a successful, cultured, and intelligent woman make Rella weary and exhausted. The mask is unnecessary after Edgia has disappeared from her life, and Rella understands that she has to face her guilt. According to Rella, her own desire to put an end to her life is Edgia’s victory and an act of vengeance. From Rella’s perspective, Edgia’s revenge comes by making Rella convict herself: “[Edzshe] hot keyn mol nisht ongetsilt dem bashuldikn vayzfinger oyf mir, un dermit hot zi mikh gelozt filn in ale mayne ramakh-eyvrim, az ikh muz aleyn ontsiln dem finger oyf zikh, un oysrufn tsu ale veltn: ikh bin geven a kapo! Dos iz Edzshes nekome in mir” (86; “[Edgia] had never pointed an accusing finger at me, and so she left me with the feeling that I must point the finger at
myself, that I must let all the world know that I was a *kapo*. This was Edgia’s revenge”; 310). Rella judges herself, willingly sentencing herself to death. She wants to return to the camp, the scene of her crime. The adjustment of coming back to the kingdom of death where her family and her people died, where she was supposed to die, reflect Rella’s final acceptance of her Jewishness and of her belonging to the Jewish community. Her survivor’s guilt reflects someone who mentally and emotionally never left the camp. Rella’s self-judgment is the acceptance of responsibility, which is an aspect of the *death-guilt*: part of *death-guilt* is “the survivor’s sense of debt to the dead and responsibility toward them.”\(^{33}\) The saving of someone else through self-sacrifice leads back to the crucifix-Jesus problem. Without Edgia in her life, Rella does not have a “Jesus” and salvation. The only one redemption is in death. The last sentence of the story—“*Ikh nem on mayn shvesterl, Manyushen, bay der hant un zog ir tsu, az ikh vel zi mer keyn mol nisht farrain*” (87; “I take the hand of my little sister Maniusha and promise her that I will never betray her again”; 310)—is a vow to never separate from her own people like Cain—or a *kapo*—again, which means a reunion with her own people in death.

Rella views the tragedy of the Jewish *kapo* as being “in-between.” Her identity is split. She is a perpetrator and a victim at the same time. Trying to escape from her past and erase her identity as betrayer, Rella immigrates to Canada, where she struggles for a completely new identity under new circumstances. However, her efforts fail—as did those of the other survivors in her circle. For them “the present, not the past, is a foreign country, they are haunted by their Holocaust experiences, but haunted in all the diverse and individual ways that make one human being different from another.”\(^{34}\) Rella’s survivor’s guilt and the impossibility of another salvation lead her to commit suicide. She sees salvation only in death, which she perceives as a reconnection to her Jewishness, her family, and her childhood identity.
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Endnotes


4 Chava Rosenfarb, “Feminism and Yiddish Literature: A Personal Approach,” 224.


10 Although, I am aware of the importance of the constellation of characters, in particular the relationship between the male characters and Edgia, this exceeds the scope of this paper.


For instance, in her article “Reproduction and Resistance during the Holocaust,” Kellenbach writes: “Once the Final Solution had been initiated Jewish mothers seem to have been targeted for extermination with a special vengeance. Although there have been no large scale studies of the comparative survival rates of men and women, and of mothers in particular, anecdotal evidence and Joan Ringelheim’s analysis of transport lists by gender, point to the conclusion that mothers were singled out for killing by the Nazis, and they died in disproportionately higher numbers […] When transports arrived in Auschwitz-Birkenau, mothers with small children were invariable sent straight to the gas chambers rather than being admitted into the women’s camp, the latter offering a small chance of survival. Furthermore, in many camps there were special selections intended to search out pregnant women.” Katharina von Kellenbach, “Reproduction and Resistance during the Holocaust,” in *Women and the Holocaust: Narrative and Representation*, Studies in the Shoah v. 22, ed. Esther Fuchs (Lanham; New York; Oxford: University Press of America, 1999), 20.


Rella describes the rape as follows: “The same bleak pre-down he came up to me at our work place. He caught hold of my arm, and without saying a word, dragged me to the far end of the sand field which surrounded us. There, behind a shack, stood a mountain of broken lorries, one stacked on top of the other. I was certain that he was about to kill me. He pushed me into an overturned lorry, and there he took me.” Chava Rosenfarb, “Edgia’s Revenge,” 250.

Regarding *Rassenschande*, for instance, Heinemann writes: “The raping of Jewish women was forbidden for the same reason as intermarriage. It was considered *Rassenschande*, race defilement, a contamination of ‘Aryan’ blood. ‘The Law for the Protection of German blood and German Honor’ of September 15, 1935, promised imprisonment, hard labor, or transfer to the war front for sexual relations between Jews and ‘Aryans.’ However, evidence suggests that rape did occur, perhaps due to the delay or irregularity of punishment.” Marlene E. Heinemann, *Gender and Destiny: Women Writers and the Holocaust* (New York; Westport, Connecticut; London: Greenwood Press, 1986), 15.
Because Albert is already in a concentration camp, the danger of harsher punishment is not an issue. Langer, analyzing testimonies of women Holocaust survivors, writes in her article *Gendered Suffering?* that women faced an uncontrolled destruction of their gender identities and what they viewed as their natural roles “when giving birth and killing at the same time became the rule rather than the exception.” The experience of suffering was also gendered experience. Lawrence L. Langer, “Gendered Suffering?” in *Women in the Holocaust*, ed. Dalia Ofer and Lenore J. Weitzman (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1998), 356.

For instance, Hyman comments on gendered roles: “Modern bourgeois culture prescribed distinct gender roles. Men were responsible for work in the public sphere, by earning a living or governing society; women were slated for work in the domestic sphere, primarily the management of the household and the rearing of children. Men confronted the stresses of the marketplace; women created a sheltering environment ideally free from stress. Men and women were considered temperamentally suited for their different roles, with men endowed by nature with rationality and physical and mental strength and women with tenderness and spirituality.” Paula E. Hyman, “Gender and the Jewish Family in Modern Europe,” in *Women in the Holocaust*, ed. Dalia Ofer and Lenore J. Weitzman (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1998), 27.
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