

BETWEEN DISAPPEARANCES: THE PERFORMANCE OF AFFECTIVE
ARCHIVING IN BRACHA L. ETTINGER'S *EURydICE* SERIES

by

Julia McMillan

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts

at

Dalhousie University
Halifax, Nova Scotia
December 2016

© Copyright by Julia McMillan, 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 2 READING GENDER AND THE HOLOCAUST	4
2.1 METHODOLOGY.....	7
CHAPTER 3 LOCATING EURYDICE.....	10
3.1 MATRIXIAL BORDERLINKING.....	15
CHAPTER 4 MAKING IMPRESSIONS: ARTWORKING THE ARCHIVE.....	19
4.1. MORE IMPRESSIONS: WITNESSING VISIONS IN THE ARCHIVES...28	
4.2 THE ARCHIVE: RECONSIDERED.....	32
4.3 THE ARCHIVE AND THE REPERTOIRE.....	34
CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION.....	39
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	42

ABSTRACT

Artist, philosopher, and psychoanalyst Bracha L. Ettinger's *Eurydice* painting series is built upon a practice of sustained aesthetic, psychological, and ethical engagement with archival photographs of the Holocaust. First begun in 1992 and now numbering over fifty, the paintings investigate the ways in which intergenerationally transmitted trauma interacts with and is made manifest through the female form. While much of the scholarship on the *Eurydice* series analyses the paintings formally and aesthetically, often alongside Ettinger's psychoanalytic theories of what she calls the matrixial gaze, this thesis examines the performative aspects of Ettinger's process of creation by exploring the ways in which Ettinger's process of "artworking" allows for an affective re-examination of traditional archival practices by situating the body within and as part of the archive.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My most heartfelt gratitude extends to the following people, without whom this thesis would not be possible:

First and foremost, to Dr. Dorota Glowacka for introducing me to Bracha Ettinger's work and for guiding me through the thesis process with patience, boundless insight, and deep generosity. Learning from and thinking alongside Dr. Glowacka's engagement with Ettinger's work has been a privilege.

To Dr. David Howard, my second reader, for his wealth of knowledge, stimulating conversation, and indefatigable desire to question and challenge dominantly accepted ideologies and perceived binaries.

To Dr. Bart Vautour, my third reader, for his thoughtful engagement with this thesis, and for his years of invaluable and generous mentorship.

To Dr. Carrie Dawson, for her wisdom and guidance.

To Dr. Erin Wunker, for the friendship and mentorship that has shaped me a thinker and as a person.

To Panda and Pi, my favourite Jack Russells, for the long walks and playfulness. Thanks also to Ron Huebert and Elizabeth Edwards for facilitating this friendship.

Finally, to Carrie, Elizabeth, Morgan, and Wes: Your love, support, and friendship has meant the world to me. I can't thank you enough.

Thank you, all.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

I have spent much of my time in the past year looking at archival photographs of the Holocaust. Part of me wants to say I have spent too much time looking because attaching faces and bodies to a history of genocide almost always feels like an unbearable task—like a repeated and unbearable loss. What is more unbearable, however, is the eventual numbness that allows me to look without feeling. When I become aware of this numbness, this unaffected looking, I think I have had enough. But then I look closer still, searching for these missing affects, and I'm able to trace the outline of different kind of loss. Looking harder, I become aware of the faces and bodies that are so often missing or misrepresented in these photographs, aware of whose histories I haven't learned. In these moments, I see that the absences in the photos demand my sustained attention, and I know then that I cannot say that I have spent too much time looking.

Artist, philosopher, and psychoanalyst Bracha L. Ettinger is well rehearsed in the practice of sustained looking. For Ettinger, looking (forwards, backwards, inwards, and outwards) is a form of critical praxis. As a feminist thinker and painter working from within and expanding upon Freudian and Lacanian psychoanalytic traditions, the act and concept of looking, or gazing (to use psychoanalytic language) is central to both her theoretical inquiries and her artistic practice; it is both the object and execution of her work. This interweaving of theory and practice is enacted in Ettinger's painting series *Eurydice*. The mixed-media paintings, first begun in 1992 and now numbering over fifty, engage in a prolonged search for the absent and mis/under-documented feminine subject in

established Shoah histories. Based in an artistic and psychological intervention staged through what Ettinger calls “artworking”¹—which, Griselda Pollock defines as a “specific overlay and interweave of psychoanalytic process and aesthetic process” (195)—the *Eurydice* series features re-worked archival photographs that capture, interrogate, and re-frame Holocaust studies by re-inscribing the female form and psyche into Holocaust narratives that have rendered women’s traumas invisible.

The paintings feature partial reproductions of personal and archival photographs scanned through a photocopier onto recycled paper. After photocopying the images repeatedly, Ettinger traces over sections of the images with paint and India ink to highlight specific parts of the original image. Each time she returns to the series, Ettinger locates spaces of loss and lack in the archive, which she then both amplifies and fills by etching new bodies, lines, stories, and sorrows into the extensive network of paintings. Her attention to these archival photographs is sustained and perhaps even sustainable through her tactile interventions into the photograph’s depicted histories. In her re-working of the original image, she is able to alter the way Shoah histories are represented by creating alternative documents and images that reflects upon and work through the multiple traumas inflicted upon Jewish women during the Holocaust. In her paintings, the absence or incomplete portrayal of the female form is shaped by the form, or sometimes

¹ The term “artworking” is part of Ettinger’s own psychoanalytic language used to articulate her theoretical thinking. Artworking, for Ettinger, is a method that incorporates both painting and writing and understands the two acts as inseparable. I therefore use this term throughout my thesis to discuss Ettinger’s theoretical and process-oriented approach to art-making.

formlessness, of the mythical figure of Eurydice. Her body lingers in each of Ettinger's paintings, appearing in abstract flashes of light and line, her eyes sometimes peering out at her viewers, her shape sometimes subsumed by shadows. For Ettinger, Eurydice “embodies a figure of the artist in the feminine”—elusive, yet ever present—and offers possibilities to “awaken a space for the rediffusion of unresolved traumas” (Ettinger quoted in Buci-Glucksmann 99). Eurydice’s recurring figure in the series is therefore used as an allegorical surrogate to reframe the (un/der)representations of Jewish women targeted under the Shoah as both “universal victims and figures of personal loss” (Vignault “Porous Space” 113). Through this radical re-presentation of Holocaust photography, the *Eurydices* investigates the ways in which spaces of unresolved intergenerational trauma interact with and are made manifest through the female form

CHAPTER 2 READING GENDER AND THE HOLOCAUST

Ettinger's feminist inquiry into Holocaust histories operates both within and alongside the work of many feminist scholars who, since the 1980s, have attempted to legitimize the field of feminist Holocaust studies. Myrna Goldenberg, Doris Bergen, Joan Ringelheim, Judith Tydor Baumel, Dorota Glowacka, Gisela Bock, Sarah Horowitz, and Wendy Lower—among many others—have taken dominant Holocaust narratives to task in an attempt to expose the complex and under-examined relationship between sexism and racism that underlie the Holocaust's ethnic cleansing mission and implementation. Whereas traditional Holocaust histories attempt to situate their investigations within Primo Levi's "grey zone²," feminist Holocaust studies expand the borders of grey zone to include subjects that had previously been left in the dark due to under-examination—namely women: their bodies, sexualities, friendships, losses, and survivals. Feminist Holocaust scholars acknowledge that the relationship between gender and the Holocaust cannot be underestimated because, as Doris Bergen writes "the line dividing insiders and outsiders, life and death, in German-occupied Europe ran directly through the bodies of women" (22). This intersectional approach to Holocaust studies hinges on the argument that the Holocaust has been largely and incorrectly read as a gender neutral event. This reading, feminist scholars contend, has dismissed or ignored the prevalence and significance of the gender-based forms of violence that were central to the Nazi genocidal mission, including forced sterilization and countless forms of sexual violation.

² As discussed in Levi's 1986 *The Drowned and the Saved*, the grey zone is an area of moral and ethical ambiguity that requires a rejection of the "Manichean tendency which shuns half-tints and complexities", and resorts to the black-and-white binary opposition(s) of 'friend' and 'enemy', 'good' and 'evil'" (22).

Indeed, traditional Holocaust scholarship has shied away from gender-based analyses for fear “that focusing on women draws attention away from the assault on all Jews,” or worse still, that “that feminist scholars instrumentalize the Holocaust for their own ends” (Bergen 17). However, as intersectional feminist methodologies become increasingly legitimized in academic discourse, feminist Holocaust studies now brush up against fewer allegations of this kind. Still, like their subjects of investigation, feminist inquiries into the Holocaust remain the fringes of dominant discourse. As Bergen points out, feminist Holocaust studies are viewed as a representation of “different voices”—that is, “voices that speak from, and for the most part to, a ‘separate sphere,’ removed from what count as the big questions in the field” (17).

Through her *Eurydice* painting series, Ettinger adds her voice—and I will argue, her body—to feminist interventions into Holocaust histories and archival art practices. Her paintings and art practice not only challenge the homogeneity of the Holocaust archive, they also re-frame and expand archival forms by working towards modes of performative and performed documentation that better represents gender-based violence, trauma, and feminine subjectivity. While much of the scholarship on the *Eurydice* series focuses on the paintings formally and aesthetically, often alongside Ettinger’s psychoanalytic theories of what she calls the matrixial gaze, I am most interested in examining the ritualistic and performative aspects of Ettinger’s process of creation. I contend that the re-diffusion and renegotiation of trauma that occurs within the *Eurydice* series does not begin or end in her paintings; it also extends in and through her own body—the body of a second-generation Holocaust survivor. My investigation is therefore rooted less in an

analysis of the paintings' aesthetic and symbolic significance, and more in an exploration of how Ettinger's artworking process throughout the *Eurydice* series engages in an affective performance of archival investigation and reparation. I maintain that through her rituals of collecting, manipulating, and re-contextualizing archival materials in her paintings, Ettinger, as the artist-archivist, involves and inserts her own body into the work as a means of performing a process of reckoning with intergenerational loss and mourning. This project therefore considers the ways in which Ettinger's creative process allows for an affective re-examination of traditional archival forms and practices by situating the feeling body both within and as part of the archive. I submit that through Ettinger's practice of artworking, female subjectivity becomes involved in a process of "working through"³ trauma that is both represented by and felt through the body (Freud 155). This process of working through, catalyzed by and mediated through the creation of the *Eurydice* series, is then relationally reflected back to the viewer⁴ through the re-worked archival subjects in the paintings.

³ Ettinger's psychoanalytic framework adopts Freud's insistence on the psychological economy of "working through," wherein patients recognize and become conversant with their resistance to psychological interpretation. Working through, in Freudian terms, is a process that requires duration, repetition, and elaboration of interpretations (Freud 155).

⁴ A significant lacuna in my engagement with Ettinger's work at this point is my lack of attention to Ettinger's viewers: who they are, how they read Ettinger's paintings, and what their connection to her subject matter might be. In a larger version of this paper, I would adopt a much more thorough approach to a consideration of her viewers in order to better grasp the outcome, reach, and reading of her relational practice. This kind of engagement would also allow me to integrate a consideration of class into my discussion of Ettinger's work—an element currently absent from my intersectional approach to her practice. To achieve this, an analysis of the social and historical reception of Ettinger's work through art criticism, gallery catalogues, critical reviews, etc would be required to make a differentiated argument around the multiple readings of Ettinger's art.

While my investigation is primarily focused on Ettinger's process—specifically in relation to archival practices—and largely excludes a close reading of her paintings, I acknowledge that her processes does not exist in isolation from her aesthetic output. Indeed, the symbolic and aesthetic significance of the *Eurydice* paintings, including both painting and their source photograph, is inherently linked to her performance of artworking: necessarily, the artist's affective attachment to the objects and images in her paintings inform and shape her process of writing, painting, thinking, and feeling, which then in turn inform the aesthetics of her paintings. It is therefore this reciprocal relationship between object/image and process that I aim to explore, while placing my emphasis on process rather than on the completed painting. This shift away from a consideration of the paintings as individual art objects is based in the belief that they are not, in fact, complete or individual objects; rather, they are part of an ongoing process of working through intergenerational trauma by way of artistic production. Ettinger's continual return to this series is a testimony to the ongoing nature of the process; the *Eurydices*, then cannot be read individually but must be read collectively, as series, and understood as links in an ongoing process and performance of artworking, archiving, and working through trauma.

2.1 METHODOLOGY

I draw on feminist applications of affect, archive, and performance theories to illustrate how Ettinger's artworking process expands the boundaries of archival investigation to

accommodate a gendered experience of trauma. In particular, I turn to Ann Cvetkovich's *An Archive of Feeling* to examine how the affective structures that constitute cultural experiences reproduce themselves through texts, and how these texts can then act as "repositories of feelings and emotions" (Cvetkovich 7). I borrow from Cvetkovich the assumption that because trauma is often considered unrepresentable, it poses particular challenges to conventional modes of archiving, and therefore demands new forms of archival expression (9). I pair Cvetkovich's methodologies with Sara Ahmed's work on affect and affective economies as a means of demonstrating how affective attachments circulate in and between objects, and consider how these attachments are made manifest in Holocaust archives. Finally, based on Diana Taylor's consideration of the archive and the repertoire, I theorize Ettinger's artworking as a repertoire performance through which the affective gestures, rituals, and repetitions that occur within her art practice make up an alternative trauma-based archive that is rooted in both artistic process and production.

While I map these theories onto Ettinger's artworking process, I acknowledge that her own network of feminist psychoanalytic theory is central to the process I now examine. I therefore do not attempt to analyze Ettinger's work in isolation from the complex theoretical position she occupies, but rather demonstrate how my theoretical model may complement her thinking by usefully expanding its application into the fields of performance, affect, and archive theories. I use her connection-based model of working through intergenerationally transmitted trauma, deemed matrixial borderlinking, as the foundation and framework for my exploration of an affective and process-based trauma archive. By combining these separate yet related theories, I aim to demonstrate how the

physical body—of the artist and later of her audience—and its affective attachments are involved in Ettinger's matrixial sphere through both the performative and affective aspects of artworking in the *Eurydice* series.

CHAPTER 3 LOCATING EURYDICE

Ettinger's own body, and the histories she carries with it as the daughter of Holocaust survivors, is both resolutely present in her paintings, yet paradoxically absent from them—much like the figure of Eurydice who haunts each of her pieces. In Greek mythology, Eurydice is an oak nymph and one of Apollo's three daughters. Most canonically, she is known as the wife of poet and musician Orpheus. As the myth goes, Eurydice, fleeing from the advances of Aristaeus the shepherd, is bitten by a snake and killed. Upon hearing the news of her death, a disconsolate and directionless Orpheus wanders aimlessly, playing his lyre and singing to his departed wife until the deities instruct him to go to the Underworld to retrieve Eurydice. Once there, Orpheus' sorrowful music persuades Hades and Persephone to release his wife to the land of the living—on the condition that he lead the way and not turn back to look at her until they reach the upper world. Orpheus dutifully obeys until he reaches the light of the living world, at which point he casts a glance behind his shoulder to check if Eurydice followed him still. But because Eurydice, unlike Orpheus, had not yet crossed the threshold from the world of ghosts into the world of the living, she is pulled immediately back into the underworld—summoned, as Vigneault puts it, “to a second death through the premature actions of Orpheus” (5). Eurydice is thus caught between disappearances, caught between life and death, and caught between presence and absence.

Eurydice's state of half-existence resonates with Ettinger, a second generation Shoah survivor, as a figure “emblematic of [her] generation” (Ettinger quoted in Glowacka 186).

Maurice Blanchot writes that “there is a void within [Eurydice] that constitutes her” (Blanchot quoted in Buci-Glucksman 100). Christie Buci-Glucksman describes this void as “an oscillating threshold from whence we attempt to bring back to life a ‘buried presence’, the void of a ‘distant contact’” (100). Indeed, Ettinger recognizes within her generation a similar desire to lessen the distance of contact with the “buried presence” of the past—a past that, for Ettinger, has been only half told, or in some cases told only through silences and absences. In her notebook she writes,

My parents are proud of their silence. It was their way of sparing others and their children from suffering. But in this silence, all was transmitted except the narrative. In silence nothing can be changed in the narrative, which hides itself. If being haunted is the direct testimony of repression, then the ceremony [of practicing art] is a testimony of testimony. (Ettinger quoted in Pollock 137)

Like Eurydice, Ettinger’s family history is caught in a perpetual state of half-existence; it is simultaneously erased by its unelucidated narrative and thrust into the present by its haunting impact on her family’s existence. Ettinger’s artistic practice is thus a way to come to terms with a history that she has never fully learned, but has nonetheless absorbed both consciously and unconsciously. Her practice is a way to bear witness to an unwitnessed history; a way to share in an unspoken yet transmitted trauma. Marianne Hirsch recognizes Ettinger’s feeling of intergenerationally transmitted trauma as an expression of what she calls “postmemory.” Hirsch explains that “postmemory describes the relationship that the generation after those who witnessed cultural or collective trauma bears to the experiences of those who came before, experiences that they ‘remember’ only by means of the stories, images, and behaviors among which they grew

up” (107). These experiences are transmitted to the next generation(s) “so deeply and affectively as to seem to constitute memories in their own right” (107). The term “postmemory attaches language to the almost uncanny presence of what Eva Hoffman identifies as a “deeply internalized but strangely unknown past” (Hoffman quoted in Hirsh 108). Unlike conventional understandings and definitions of memory, postmemory is not mediated by recollection but by “imaginative investment, projection, and creation” (107). Indeed, while “original” memories are inherently and notoriously unreliable in their reproduction of details and fact—especially where traumatic recollections are concerned—postmemories maintain an even more precarious balance between reality and imagination: they present themselves as “broken refrains” and “flashes of imagery” that communicates through the “language of the body” (Eva Hoffman quoted in Hirsch 108). But although postmemories are not cognitive reproductions of events witnessed first-hand, they are no less real. Postmemories, and the embodied but intangible traumas they transmit, shape the consciousness and lived experiences of second and third generation survivors of traumatic events; they inform the way recipients of postmemory move through the world and interact with their material surroundings.

Ettinger’s postmemories, like her family histories, are wordless narratives, transmitted in part through her silent dialogue with archival photographs. When looking at and working with the photographs she uses in her *Eurydice* paintings, her parents’ stories of silence are simultaneously amplified, illuminated, and replaced by her embodied postmemories and unarticulated (and unarticulable) intergenerational trauma. As Dorota Glowacka remarks, in both Ettinger’s critical writing as a psychoanalyst and in her career as an

artist, she has “been searching for the means of expressing the psychic wound that her parents’ trauma marked on her entire being and impressed on her art” (183). In the *Eurydice* series, the mythical figure becomes this means of expression: Eurydice is the form through which Ettinger may access, explore, and sometimes fight with this marked, yet unmarked trauma. In this way, Eurydice is the figure Ettinger chases, inhabits and becomes—or “metramorphosizes⁵” into, to borrow Ettinger’s language—as she moves through her material history in an attempt to build a visual narrative from the photographs she uses in her work (Ettinger *Matrix and Metramorphosis* 177). Eurydice’s recurring presence in Ettinger’s paintings, collaged and traced into the photocopied archival photographs, allows the artist to re-connect and revisit scenes of her family’s past, as Eurydice appears and disappears among images of Ettinger’s family in prewar Poland or images of the sites of mass murder where many of her relatives were killed. If this process of creation is transportive, then Eurydice is the vehicle through which Ettinger is able to access her past. In other words, Eurydice becomes the form through which Ettinger concretizes her postmemories through artistic production; she is the material manifestation of these intangible postmemories, which like Eurydice herself, are constantly caught between appearances and disappearances, between presence and absence. Ettinger therefore works with Eurydice’s body to understand and give shape to her own historical consciousness and historical memory. However, Eurydice is not a strictly autobiographical allegory; rather she performs the broader role of an allegorical

⁵ Metramorphosis, another one of Ettinger’s psychoanalytic neologisms, indicates the process of temporal connection within the dimension of the Matrix, where the I (self) and the non-I (Other) shift back and forth in a gesture of awareness and acceptance, linking together the artist and the viewer or subject in different times and places.

surrogate for members of second and third generation Shoah survivors. In this way, she acts as an artistic vessel for intergenerational investigation and reparation.

Ettinger's re-worked images, rooted in the archives but reaching into the present, mirror the liminal zones of half existence in which Eurydice and postmemories both reside. As Glowacka observes, "through these reworkings, the old photographs become infused with what French writer Henri Raczymow calls *la mémoire trouée* (memory shot through with holes); their surfaces, blotted with whiteness in the photocopied enlargements, are pierced by absence" (183). Indeed, the *Eurydices* are notable for their blank spaces, inconsistent swatches of paint, and blurry forms. Both aesthetically and conceptually, the series is built on a foundation of *les mémoires trouées*, with each reference photograph representing a violently incomplete, but also unknowable history. Ettinger's Eurydice figure fills these absences, while also opening up new ones. The absences and the spaces she opens, however, are distinctly feminine, and bear the mark of the feminine subjectivity that Ettinger carries in/on her own body. Specifically, the absences that appear in her re-worked images speak to and of the repeated instances of gender erasure both during and after the Shoah. Ettinger's paintings confront the subject of the absent female victim of the Shoah by drawing attention to "the collusion between the erasure of feminine sexual difference and the foreclosure of the Jewish difference in Western modernity" (183). Her artwork explores the multiple dissonances and marginalizations that occur in and between her complex identities as a Jewish woman artist and philosopher, while also proposing a radical re-framing of the way these identities

interact with one another and with dominant (and dominating) social and racial groups. As Griselda Pollock explains:

Ettinger allows intimacies to emerge between the predicament and possibility of both the feminine, and Europe's historic other, the Jewish people. . . . Both woman and Jew foil modernity's dreams of order by representing ambivalence—that which can neither be mastered nor assimilated to a phallic logic of the same, but must be rejected as Other. (Pollack quoted in Glowacka 183)

In the *Eurydice* series, these intimacies emerge specifically through the figure of Eurydice as she travels between past and present, directing her gaze both backwards and forwards. She embodies Ettinger's artistic inquiry as she eludes and defies phallic logic and modern order through her perpetual ambivalence. In classical mythology, Eurydice is not only Other in relation to Orpheus and the male creative genius, but is also Othered in relation to both the living and the dead; in her in-betweenness, Eurydice is an eternally embodied Other. It is therefore through this figure that Ettinger is able to merge a consideration of gender, Judaism, and trauma as she attempts to create a visual archive that better reflects female subjectivity in Shoah histories.

3.1 MATRIXIAL BORDERLINKING

In Ettingerian terms, Eurydice represents a “matrixial” figure. In her theoretical writing, Ettinger frames her artistic interventions as “matrixial painting,” and develops a theory of painting in the feminine intended to disrupt masculine modes of art practice and memory transmission (Glowacka 184). Among other functions, Ettinger's matrixial painting

interrogates and re-frames the condition of the gaze in relation to female agency and subjectivity. Ettinger challenges the convention that while the gaze is construed as gender neutral in psychoanalytic theories, it is still theorized in relation to masculine structures, whereby “feminine difference shows up negatively, as a hole in the symbolic order (184). These holes present themselves in both the *Eurydice* series and in the archival material Ettinger works with through the interplay of line, abstraction, and reproduction. However, Ettinger, in both her *Eurydice* paintings and her writing, pushes against this symbolic order and fills these holes—these absences—with that she calls the “matrixial sphere” (Ettinger *Matrixial Borderspace* 124). This concept is positioned in opposition to the phallic symbolic, which is founded on the Oedipal (and male-centric) interpretation of the bond between mother and child. In the place of a divisive Oedipal drama, the matrixial is a “transsubjective psychic sphere” of collectivity, closeness, and togetherness in which fractured subjects continuously engage in what the artist calls “borderlinking” (Ettinger “Wit(h)nessing Trauma” 90). Ettinger writes that borderlinking is the process of “always joining-in-separating with/from the Other” (90). In other words, several partial subjects and their respective subjectivities repeatedly come together through their difference(s) and Otherness. These disparate, yet connected subjects, therefore co-exist in and through their difference(s). Indeed, as Ettinger writes, the encounters that occur through borderlinking “witness and account for co-emergence or co-fading of several subjects, partial subjects, partial objects and of their links with one another and with others’ traumatic Thing-events” (105). Borderlinking therefore represents not a cycle of completion whereby a fractured subject becomes whole, but rather a process of “building up/on” whereby multiple subjects share, build upon, and indeed “link” their subjective

experiences of trauma in order to create an expanded network of knowledge. In this sense, we can think of borderlinking as a continual process of advancement, whereby one part adds to another.

The witnessing of trauma through the/(an)other—what Ettinger calls “wit(h)nessing⁶”—embodies a “non-cognitive” form of knowledge, where witnessing occurs viscerally and affectively rather than through cognitive or learned processes (105). Through this “affective immersion” in the other’s trauma, the subject’s own “archaic trauma” is reflected and refracted, while simultaneously amplified and echoed (Glowacka 186). In a matrixial borderlinking, the subject experiences a distinctly feminine (re)connection/(re)cognition that Glowacka describes as, “an affective transcription of the erased memory of the missed encounter with the m/Other [Ettinger’s formulation]”(186). As Ettinger states, “[the matrixial effect] conveys traces of events that cannot be born and carried alone” (112). Through this matrixial encounter, the recovery of the forgotten event is then a shared experience of remembrance and potential reconciliation—a shared “flash of imagery” and a “repaired refrain” to repeat Hoffman’s language (Hoffman quoted in Hirsch 108). The matrixial effect is thus both intergenerational and shared among and between Others. Ettinger writes, “In a matrixial borderlinking, traces of trauma in me are not ‘purely’ mine. Not only am I concerned by my own wound, and not

⁶ Wit(h)nessing is a neologism coined by Ettinger that describes the process of witnessing an event in the matrixial borderlinking sphere as one that is always shared and experienced together with others.

only the encounter with the Other which is to me traumatic, but I am also concerned by the wound of the Other” (18).

CHAPTER 4 MAKING IMPRESSIONS: ARTWORKING THE ARCHIVE

The non-cognitive knowledge transferred through and built upon by matrixial borderlinking offers Ettinger possibilities to confront both her own wounds and the wounds of Others through the distinctly physical, affective, and performative processes of “artworking” in the *Eurydice* series. For Ettinger, artworking is about process as much as it is itself a process; it is an acknowledgement of the thoughts, gestures, utterances, and errors that occur within Ettinger’s writing and painting—and in artworking, neither can be construed as separate activities. Artworking is affiliated with Freud’s “insistence on the economy of psychological working-through” and is therefore a kind of prolonged performance of ethical engagement, wherein the artist remains “ethically attentive to herself and the otherness for which her process is making space” (Pollock 195). In this way, artworking is itself an ethical site of trans-subjective encounter where borderlinking may occur. By engaging with her materials and their subjects through painting, writing, thinking, and collecting, Ettinger encounters and makes space for “the otherness” of her subjects and prepares herself for wit(h)nessing through her materials. This process of creative and intellectual connection requires duration, repetition, and elaboration. As Ettinger puts it, “artworking, like psychoanalytical healing of long duration, is a compassionate encounter-event of prolonged generosity” (Ettinger “Copoesis” 705). Indeed, sustained commitment is integral to the process of artworking, as is demonstrated by the long-standing and repetitive production of Ettinger’s *Eurydice* paintings over the course of twenty-five years. As Pollack writes, “Working through takes time and needs the regular, open “trans-subjective” space for encounter to occur unpredictably while

always anticipated, hoped for and welcomed in an ethical stance” (195). It is thus through the practice of artworking that Ettinger devotes sustained attention to her subjects, to her Others, to her photographs.

I maintain that artworking is sustained not only psychologically and aesthetically, but also physically. The movements carried out through Ettinger’s body as she creates, collects, and builds upon her artwork and archival images become the physical manifestations of her psychological workings, the visible expression of her feelings, the vehicle for her aesthetic creations. Throughout the artworking process, Ettinger performs the routine and seemingly mundane and unremarkable movements of interacting with her materials: retrieving, collecting, touching, manipulating, tracing and painting. Although practical in their function, these movements are embedded with an affective poetry and performance of their own. They become ritualistic through their repetition, ceremonial in their remembrance. The choreography of artworking is thus not only a means to an aesthetic end; it is an affective end in and of itself. Through Ettinger’s physical encounters with her artistic and archival materials, affective reactions are ignited, felt, and performed through her body. The controlled yet creative, repetitive yet spontaneous, actions associated with artworking provide a physical script that Ettinger both creates and follows as a means of expressing and enacting her formerly indistinct trauma. These gestures become almost meditative as they assign order and repetition to uncontrolled expressions of intergenerational trauma. The product of artworking (i.e Ettinger’s paintings and writings) attach tangible (and specifically feminine) forms to these traumas while providing opportunities for wit(h)nessing and traumatic working through for the

artist and her audience. In this way, the physicality of artworking makes trauma, and its associated affects, generative rather than debilitating.

Artworking's physical component also provides the literal site of contact for borderlinking encounters in Ettinger's process. Marissa Vigneault has written extensively about the ways in which Ettinger's practice of artworking "incorporates her theoretical development of the matrix and metramorphosis into the act of painting" (xi). However, despite her emphasis on "the act" of painting, Vigneault's analysis focuses solely on the content of Ettinger's paintings and writings—particularly the "porous spaces" in the *Eurydice* series as analogous to the porous borders of the matrix (10). I take up Vigneault's line of thinking but shift her focus back to 'the act'—not just of painting, but of artworking as a whole process. I contend that while Vigneault is correct to identify the *Eurydice* series as a site of matrixial praxis, the matrixial process first begins with the body and its relationship to materials and to other bodies and then moves outward onto the paintings. Indeed, through her physically performative rituals of collecting, manipulating, and re-contextualizing archival photographs, Ettinger engages in a matrixial encounter with both the object (i.e. the photograph) and the mis/un(der)represented subjects depicted in the image. Later, when she has re-mixed the photographs and painted Eurydice onto their surface, she invites the viewer into the matrixial sphere through borderlinking. The process of remembrance is then broadened, and the traumas examined are multiplied. But before an audience is involved, Ettinger engages in an immersively affective, non-verbal, and non-cognitive conversation with her

chosen artifacts as she roots through the archives and begins re-working a chosen photograph.

To ignore this initial process is to focus solely on the cognitive aspects of Ettinger's theories and to disregard the crucial moments of non-cognitive transfer that occur during the borderlinking process. I therefore turn to recent work in affect theory to think through the ways in which these non-cognitive processes are experienced: how they affect the physical body, how they interact with the objects around them, how they circulate between subjects. With the rise of the so-called "affective turn" in humanities scholarship in the last twenty years—a timeline roughly coinciding with the creation of Ettinger's *Eurydice* series—numerous strains of affect theory have emerged, with each one offering a slightly nuanced definition and application of affect. The term "affect" is derived from the Latin *affectus* or *adfectus* which, roughly translated to English, means passion or emotion⁷. Jill Bennett in her consideration of trauma, affect, and contemporary art describes affect as an embodied sensation and "a process of seeing feeling where feeling is both imagined and regenerated through an encounter with the artwork" (Bennett 41). For Teresa Brennan writing in *The Transmission of Affect*, affect is an energetic dimension and social phenomenon that is distinctly physiological in origin. By her definition, affect is biochemically interactive, intercommunicative and interpersonal; it is an occurrence where little differentiation exists between an individual and their

⁷ Stuart Hampshire gives a synopsis of Spinoza's main arguments in *Spinoza and Spinozism*

environment (Brennan 3). Much writing on affect and affect theory finds its roots in the writings of Spinoza, who also connects affect to the emotions and passions that preside over us as human beings. He maintains that individuals negotiate emotion and passion using ethical judgements and reasoning to achieve freedom, survival and happiness in their daily lives (Hamshire xi). My use of the term affect draws primary on Melissa Gregg and Gregory J. Seigworth's widely encompassing definition of affect and affect theory as outlined in *The Affect Theory Reader*. They write that:

Affect arises in the midst of inbetween-ness: in the capacities to act and be acted upon. Affect is an impingement or extrusion of a momentary or sometimes more sustained state of relation as well as the passage (and the duration of passage) of forces or intensities. That is, affect is found in those intensities that pass body to body (human, nonhuman, part-body, and otherwise), in those resonances that circulate about, between, and sometimes stick to bodies and world, and in the very passages or variations between these intensities and resonances themselves. (1)

It is no coincidence, I think, that Eurydice resides in a state of in-between-ness, and is—literally—passed between bodies, both her own (living and dead) and others (Hades and Orpheus). While Eurydice is not a metaphor for affective forces, she is an affective figure, and her presence in the context of Ettinger's paintings evokes affective responses from both artist and interlocutor. Eurydice's role in the matrixial borderlinking sphere provides an entry point—a threshold—for affect to circulate between subjects: between viewers, between artist and viewer, between artist and material.

It is the last relationship, that of artist and material, that I want to consider first. According to Bennett, “as the source of a poetics or an art, sense memory operates through the body to produce a kind of “seeing truth,” rather than “thinking truth,” registering the pain of memory as it is directly experienced, and communicating a level of bodily affect” (25-26). Bennett defines “sense memory” or deep memory as that which is “affective,” “nameless,” “unspeakable” and exists outside of memory proper. In this way, sense memory and postmemories are strikingly similar, and indeed, I contend that through Ettinger’s artworking process as she activates her sense memories and postmemories through her interaction with and re-working of archival photographs. This activation occurs initially through the relationship between touch and affect. In “Happy Objects,” Sara Ahmed writes that “we are moved by things. And in being moved, we make things” (33). I suggest that in her handlings of the archival materials that make up the *Eurydice* series, Ettinger develops an affective response to and connection with the objects she artworks that is felt through her body, which shapes the way she interacts with both the past and the present. Indeed, much like her parents’ silences, the photos leave an impression upon the artist that manifests in and through her body as a marked yet unmarked (post)memory of trauma. In *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*, Ahmed explains that touch is a powerful mediator of emotion—so much so that sensation and emotion cannot be easily separated (6). Touch is a vehicle of orientation towards an object, and emotions themselves, as Ahmed explains, are oriented towards objects⁸. She

⁸ While Ahmed’s use of the word “object” encompasses the broadest sense of the noun (with possible reference to any person, group, or thing), in this context I apply her usage specifically to material objects, artifacts, and archival documents.

writes that, “Emotions are intentional in the sense that they are “about” something: they involve a direction or orientation towards an object. The “aboutness” of emotions means they involve a stance on the world, or a way of apprehending the world. Emotions are both about objects, which they hence shape, are also shaped by contact with objects” (7). In this formulation, there is a reciprocal relationship between emotion and object. Emotional responses gravitate towards specific objects, and latent or extant feelings may find a resting place, a target, and a purpose within these objects. At the same time, these objects inform, incite, or evoke the nature of the subject’s emotions. This affective circulation, what Ahmed calls an “affective economy” (“Affective Economies” 121), shapes worldviews; it shapes both how objects are used for both practical and sentimental purposes, and it shapes how people interact with the world around them.

When Ettinger makes physical contact with the archival images she uses in her *Eurydice* series, her “stance on the world” is affected and altered as each image gives shape to a historical absence that has always been felt, but never materialized. In these images, the missing faces, bodies, and stories of women’s traumas during the Holocaust are evidenced through their lack. As a second-generation survivor, Ettinger is also aware that this lack lives unresolved in her own body, sometimes taking the form of a postmemory, sometimes as an indistinct feeling of loss and unarticulated disquietude. Ettinger’s body bears the mark of intergenerational trauma; it is a mark she carries with her, colouring her perception of her own world and history. Gregg and Seigworth write that “Affect marks a body’s belonging to a world of encounters or; a world’s belonging to a body of

encounters but also, in non-belonging, through all those far sadder (de)compositions of mutual in-compossibilities” (2). Ettinger, like Eurydice, occupies a space of inbetweenness, oscillating amongst “belonging” and “non-belonging,” while never quite sticking to either. In this way, like the subjects she artworks, Ettinger’s affects—the marks of intergenerationally transmitted traumas—remain largely invisible—that is, until they are moved to act. Indeed, according to Gregg and Seigworth, Freud claimed that affect does not so much reflect or think; affect acts (2). However, they qualify that Freud also believed these passages of affect persist in immediate adjacency to the moments of thought: “close enough that sensate tendrils constantly extend between unconscious (or, better, non-conscious) affect and conscious thought” (2). In practice, then, affect and cognition are never fully separable—if for no other reason than that thought is itself a body, embodied. They write that, “Cast forward by its open-ended in-betweenness, affect is integral to a body’s perpetual becoming (always becoming otherwise, however subtly, than what it already is” (2-3).

For Ettinger, to act is to artwork—and to artwork is to become, to connect, to find a space between disappearances. The act of artworking, beginning with Ettinger’s tactile interaction with her material objects, opens up the matrixial borderlinking sphere, and initiates the connection-based process of working through—among the self (the I) and Others (the non/I). This act, driven by affect and fueled by connectivity, begins with the affective connections and impressions formed between artist and material. Drawing on Hume’s usage of the word “impression,” Ahmed writes:

To form an impression might involve acts of perception and cognition as well as an emotion. But forming an impression also depends on how objects impress upon us. An impression can be an effect on the subject's feelings ('she made an impression'). It can be a belief ('to be under an impression'). It can be an imitation or an image ('to create an impression'). Or it can be a mark on the surface ('to leave an impression'). We need to remember the 'press' in an impression. It allows us to associate the experience of having an emotion with the very affect of one surface on another, an affect that leaves its mark or trace. (*The Cultural Politics of Emotions* 6)

The materials at the heart of Ettinger's *Eurydice* series are, as Ahmed puts it, reminders of the "press" in impressions. The paintings are layered with traces of the indigo dust left behind from repeated photocopying, covered with the impressions of brushwork, and marked by the pressing of photo onto canvas. Touch and impression are thus both the materials and the methods of Ettinger's artworking; they are both the catalyst and the product. After all, as Ahmed writes, "to receive an impression is to make an impression" ("Happy Objects" 37). But the paintings are not only made up of impressions; they also make an impression and leave an impression, while changing the impressions embedded in traditional Holocaust narratives.

4.1 MORE IMPRESSIONS: WITNESSING VISIONS IN THE ARCHIVES

Ahmed writes that, “To experience an object as being affective or sensational is to be directed not only towards an object, but to whatever is around that object, which includes what is behind an object, the conditions of its arrival” (“Happy Objects” 33). What, then, if an object emerges out of silence, out of a history pieced together by intuitive guesswork? What if both the provenance and the subject of the object is as difficult to locate and classify as the affects it elicits? What kind of impression is made when the object and its conditions of arrival are paradoxically intimately known and ultimately unknowable? Such is often the case with Holocaust archives, particularly with photographs like the ones Ettinger uses in the *Eurydice* series. While some of her photographs come from her own family and therefore have traceable subjects and provenance, the main photograph Ettinger works and re-works is has fewer answers. The photograph, with no known photographer or subjects, depicts a group of undressed women, some holding infants, waiting in a line before their execution in Mizocz, Ukraine⁹. The women in this photograph are unidentified—like the subjects of most

⁹ The photograph is now housed in The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum photo archive. The description of the photograph from the USHMM website states, “According to the Zentrale Stelle in Germany (Zst. II 204 AR 1218 / 70), these Jews were collected by the German Gendarmerie and Ukrainian Schutzmannschaft during the liquidation of the Mizocz ghetto, which held roughly 1 , 700 Jews. On the eve of the ghetto’s liquidation (13 October 1942), some of the inhabitants rose up against the Germans and were defeated after a short battle. The remaining members of the community were transported from the ghetto to this ravine in the Sdolbunov Gebietskommissariat , south of Rovno, where they were executed. Information regarding this action, including the photos, were acquired from a man named Hille, who was the Bezirks-Oberwachtmeister of the Gendarmerie at the time. Hille apparently gave the five photos (there were originally seven) to the company lawyer of a textile firm in Kunert, Czechoslovakia, where he worked as a doorman after the war. The Czech government

Holocaust photography, specifically and particularly female subjects. Photographs of women during the Holocaust, like the one Ettinger re-works of the execution at Mizcoz raise more questions than they answer as archival objects, and therefore paradoxically draw attention to a gap of knowledge and representation—an absence of feminine subjects and subjectivity—that become footnotes in the pages of dominantly recorded Holocaust histories.

And so the question remains: what kind of impression is formed by these images? What kind of affects do they elicit and what—if any—kind of memory or postmemory might they invoke? According to Jennifer Hansen-Glucklich, Holocaust artifacts have the ability to evoke what she refers to as a “witnessing vision” (Hansen-Glucklich 120). In her survey of Holocaust museum strategies of representation, she describes the ways in which “authentic artifacts” in museum exhibitions provide a way for museum audiences to witness the events of the Holocaust through objects that metonymically refer to their absent owners and their mortal remains (120). She argues that exhibited objects, like eyeglasses, shoes, or even human hair, “act as witnesses and bear testimony in the sense that they testify to the time and place whence they came. They belong to a different world, and thanks to their authentic presence, or ‘aura,’ [viewers] can come closer to that distant, vanished world through them” (120). Hansen-Glucklich likens Walter

confiscated the photos from the lawyer in 1946 and they subsequently became public. That the photos indeed show the shooting of Jews in connection with the liquidation of the ghetto was also confirmed by a statement of Gendarmerie-Gebietsfuehrer Josef Paur in 1961 .” See:
<http://digitalassets.ushmm.org/photoarchives/detail.aspx?id=1065461&search=&index=2>

Benjamin's concept of aura to Stephen Greenblatt's use of the word "wonder"¹⁰ which he defines as "the power of the object displayed to stop the viewer in his tracks, to convey an arresting sense of uniqueness, to evoke an exalted attention" (123). "Wonder" thus refers to a state of enchanted looking and feeling, which occurs "when the act of attention draws a circle around itself from which everything but the object is excluded, when intensity of regard blocks out all circumambient images, stills all murmuring voices" (123). It is through this stillness, through this sense of wonder, that witnessing occurs. The aura and authenticity of the object, coupled with its contextualized link to Holocaust victims, evokes affective responses from viewers, allowing them to imagine the previously unimaginable events of the Holocaust. The objects, then, not only stand in for the absent victim, but also transport the viewer to the past, thereby allowing them to (imaginatively) stand in the victim's place.

The photographs Ettinger uses in her artwork also evoke Hansen-Glucklich's "witnessing vision." In her notebook, Ettinger writes that, "As a child, I was a witness to witnesses. When I paint or when I listen, I am that too" (Ettinger quoted in Pollock 130). By physically engaging with these photographs through the processes of artworking (collecting, writing, painting, photocopying, tracing) Ettinger builds parallel relationships between herself and the images, and herself and her parents. In other words, the photographs are on the receiving end of a conversation Ettinger attempts to engage in

¹⁰ The notion of a "personal vibration" connects to Roland Barthes' proposition of the photographic punctum, an element of a photograph which appeals to a person based on personal emotion and experience; in other words, the punctum is the detail that pierces one deeply and leaves a lasting impression.

with her past through second-hand wit(t)nessing. But, like with her parents, Ettinger's dialogue with the photographs is built on silences. Hansen-Glucklich's insistence on a witnessing vision begs the question: a witness to whom? The answer, resoundingly, is a witness to "not her." Indeed, Hansen-Glucklich's analysis suggests that the stories about the horrors of the Holocaust, as represented through artifacts and photographs in the museum space, are gender neutral. She neglects a consideration of women's experiences or the ways in which they may or may not be represented in Holocaust museums. Instead, her emphasis on aura and objectivity treats every object equally, but this does not account for what Ringelheim calls women's "special burdens" and experiences of gendered violence (Ringelheim quoted in Jacobs 32). These stories are not often told in Holocaust museum memorials, and where and when they are, Janet Liebman Jacobs and Judith Tydor Baumel point out that women are still constructed in very particular ways—ways that rely on easily consumable gender stereotypes like the role of the mother or what Jacobs refers to as the "violated woman" (42). Ettinger, unlike Hansen-Glucklich, recognizes the ways in which witnessing can be divisive, rather than connective, and so engages in a process of wit(t)nessing with the feminine subjects or lack thereof in her photographs. Ettinger's wit(t)nessing, enacted through artworking, opens up possibilities for alternative forms of archives that better explore the nuances of feminine subjectivity and trauma, while drawing attention to the flaws in the conventional archive.

In *An Archive of Feeling*, Ann Cvetkovich also recognizes the need for an archive of trauma. She explains that, “Trauma challenges common understandings of what constitutes an archive. Because trauma can be unspeakable and unrepresentable and because it is marked by forgetting and dissociation, it often seems to leave behind no records at all” (7). Cvetkovich raises questions that Ettinger’s work simultaneously asks and answers: how can we document an affect, an emotion, a memory? How can we document trauma specifically? And following Ahmed’s assertion that emotions and circulate continuously through objects, but do not reside in them, then where can we locate trauma—especially and specifically feminine trauma—in the archive? Cvetkovich contends that because trauma is often characterized by the very lack of an established record, the concept of the archive must be re-evaluated and expanded upon. She writes that:

Trauma puts pressure on conventional forms of documentation, representation, and commemoration, giving rise to the new genres of expression, such as testimony, and new forms of monuments, rituals, and performances that can call into being collective witnesses and publics. It thus demands an unusual archive, whose materials, in pointing to trauma’s ephemerality, are themselves frequently ephemeral. Trauma’s archive incorporates personal memories, which can be recorded in oral and visual testimonies, memoirs, letters, and journals. The memory of trauma is

embedded not just in narrative but in material artifacts, which can range from photographs to objects whose relation with trauma might seem arbitrary but for the fact that they are invested with emotional, even sentimental, value. (Cvetkovich 14)

For second-generation survivors of traumatic experiences, postmemories might also be embedded in material artifacts, like Ettinger's archival source photos, and these postmemories then elicit the emotions that circulate between subject and object, as well as—and perhaps more importantly—in the intersubjective space between subjects. For Cvetkovich, memory evokes emotion, which shapes itself into affective states that may take on different forms as the individual's association with that memory changes. Cvetkovich acknowledges that although emotions do not themselves rest in objects, memories do. These memories, despite their intangibility, can be archival materials in an archive of feelings. These memories, attached to objects, thus evoke affective responses and attachments, which therefore can be acted upon and performed through the body. Importantly, the performance of memory through action and/or emotion can also be part of the archive. In this way, Cvetkovich's trauma archive expands upon the role of the object by understanding that its function and the way people use and interact with it can itself be a manifestation and documentation of trauma. Therefore, through Ettinger's performed, repetitive, and deliberate physical contact with archival images via artworking, Ettinger begins to work through the lack and trauma that resides in her own body as a second generation Shoah survivor by moving these affective absences from her body, through an object, and onto canvas. Through her movements, she builds an

affective archive—an archive built not on subjective records disguised as objective or “authentic” truth, but rather an archive of and for complex and intertwined feelings.

4.3 THE ARCHIVE AND THE REPERTOIRE

The performance of memory and traumatic working through, which Ettinger enacts through her interactions with her archival materials, can be understood as a form of embodied knowledge that Diana Taylor calls “the repertoire.” Taylor theorizes the repertoire both alongside and in opposition to the archive, defining it as a “non archival act of transfer” (*The Archive and the Repertoire* 20). Ettinger’s affective archive, created by both her artworking process and her *Eurydice* paintings, can be viewed as both a documentary and performative space and concept. Indeed, if we trace the etymological root of the word archive, as both Jacques Derrida and Taylor have done, we can see that the archive is, itself, performative. In “Archive Fever,” Derrida writes that “archive” derives from the etymological root *arkhe*, which “names at once the commencement and the commandment” and “apparently coordinates two principles in one: the principle according to nature or history, there where things commence—physical, historical, or ontological principle—but also the principle according to law, there where men and gods command, there where authority and social orders are exercised” (1). This description paradoxically situates the archive as both a space and an object: it both contains and commands—it is both an object and an action, both material and performative. However, Derrida looks deeper into the archive’s etymological roots and discovers that an even earlier root is the Greek *arkeion*, which initially refers to a “house, a domicile, an

address, the residence of the superior magistrates, the *archons*, those who commanded” (1). According to Derrida, the *archons*, “the citizens who thus held and signified political power were considered to possess the right to make or to represent the laws” (1). Official documents then came to be stored at the archons’ homes, their *archivum*, due to their publicly recognized authority. Their access to and claim of these documents enabled archons to become the main interpreters of these texts, as well as their authors. Thus, historically, the archive has been both controlled and collected by those in power. Diana Taylor, following the same etymology, therefore suggests that, “by shifting the dictionary entries into syntactical arrangement, we might conclude that the archive, from the beginning, sustains power” (19).

However, Derrida writes that “the concept of the archive shelters itself...it shelters itself from this memory which it shelters: which comes down to saying it forgets it” (2). In other words, the archive is forever involved in the seemingly contradictory process of conserving and containing the past as a total historical record, while at the same time allowing the “Otherness” of a force or forces outside of that record to come within and to unsettle that record and disrupt that guiding ambition (Derrida 9). From time to time “a multitude of possible external forces – from hostile armies, to looters, to fire, to bad cataloguers, to changing social attitudes over what is valued, to the sheer overwhelming volume of material waiting to be accorded access, threaten to change it—or on occasions, to tear it apart altogether” (Hetherington 18). In this way, the condition of possibility for the archive, if we follow Derrida’s argument, is to always exist, but to exist in a state of doubt involving both endless recovery and record, while simultaneously engaging in an

act of erasure and revision (17). Indeed, the archive—as space and concept—erases its origins as text and action, while at same time ostensibly persevering and recording them. The archive, then, is not static—as either an object or a concept. It is constantly in flux, shaped by social, political, and technological forces. Information is constantly omitted or forgotten, and these kinds of information generally do not fit within existing archival forms and models. If the archive cannot or does not accommodate a particular kind of information or mode of scholarship, then it is effectively excluded from the historical record.

As outlined above and demonstrated by the *Eurydice* series, with Holocaust archives, it is especially important to consider both what is and is not included, and when and why these inclusions or omissions occurred. And while Ettinger's material archive does indeed provide insights into these questions of inclusions and exclusions, we might also consider what is omitted from the archive more generally. What kinds of information is excluded from current archival forms and practices? The answer, according to Taylor, is performative or nonscripted forms of knowledge. She writes that:

Colonial epistemology has privileged writing to the extent that nonscripted forms of knowing have been equated with disappearance....The ethnographer's aim, both in the sixteenth and early twentieth centuries, was to make visible—through writing—the ways of life that had disappeared from view, went unremarked, where there was no writing. (“Performance and/as History” 72)

While Taylor here signals writing as the ultimate record, photography also fits into this archival model, though perhaps even more problematically because photographs often

require even more subjective interpretation. However, valuing the text—in the broad sense of the term—as a static document denies the performative aspects of these recorded acts. The behaviours and feelings depicted through text—not simply their descriptions as documented in writing or through photography—are exempt from the archive because the dimensions of the archive cannot capture them. The repertoire, according to Taylor, can fill this archival and representational gap. It enacts “embodied memory: performances, gestures, orality, movement, dance, singing—in short, all those acts usually thought of as ephemeral, nonreproducible knowledge” (20). While Ettinger’s *Eurydice* paintings are born out of the archive, and are themselves archivable objects, the way she produces her artwork is non archival; in other words, performativity is non-archival—but it is, according to both Taylor and Cvetkovich, a valuable form of knowledge that merits sustained critical, academic, and aesthetic attention. But as Taylor writes, the archive and the repertoire are not mutually exclusive entities: “they have both always been important sources of information, both exceeding the limitations of the other, in literate and semiliterate societies. They usually work in tandem and they work alongside other systems of transmission” (21).

Significantly, the repertoire requires presence: “people participate in the production and reproduction of knowledge by ‘being there,’ being part of the transmission” (20). In the repertoire, “multiple forms of embodied acts are always present, though in a constant state of againness. They reconstitute themselves, transmitting communal memories, histories, and values from one group or generation to the next” (21). In her art-making, Ettinger cultivates this state of againness. Her repetitive process and her continual return

to the archive and the studio represent a sustained engagement with her past that is *enacted* as well as produced. By obsessively collecting, altering, and re-contextualizing archival materials through art-working, Ettinger crafts a repertoire performance to fill the silences where her own oral history was not communicated. The repeated movements of her body as an artist-archivist therefore forge a connection with her past that allows her to move beyond the silences of her parents' generation. Through her physical interactions with archival objects, the artist gives shape to her intergenerationally transmitted trauma by locating and marking the form of Eurydice in her photographs. In this way, Ettinger inscribes both her own body and the female form into a history that has neglected to consider embodied female experiences. Therefore, Ettinger, as repertoire performer, an archivist, and an artist, enacts a radical intervention into the very institution of the archive by performing an affective re-examination of traditional archival practices by situating the body within, and as part of, the archive. In this way, her practice does not merely reproduce the traditional, staid, and patriarchal form of the archive, but rather considers alternative archival forms that better explore and make space for multiple intersubjective experiences that have traditionally been excluded, marginalized, or ignored in traditional archival forms and practices.

CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION

This leaves one more impression to investigate more fully: the impression of and on the artist's body, created not only by and through the trauma which resides marked yet unmarked upon her body, but by the impressions, both literal and figurative, made by and upon her by the materials, her process, and her paintings. What impression does the body make on the archive and vice versa? What can that do for feminist Holocaust studies? For feminine subjectivity and psychological working through? We turn here once again to borderlinking, to complete or rather add to the chain of subjects integrated in the reconciliatory process. Borderlinking, if and when we involve the body, is not only a sustained process of connectivity, but in some ways it is both a repertoire performance and an archive: it is felt and enacted, and recorded (incompletely, necessarily) in the *Eurydice* series. The chain of impressions built into Ettinger's artworking are the material traces of borderlinking encounters, which act as the product of the performed process and allow for a network of traumatic recognition to occur between and among subjects. Indeed, in Ettinger's artworking, there exists a reciprocal relationship of impressions between the artist and the artwork. First, the archival photographs leave a postmemorial impression on Ettinger's perception of herself and her past by triggering a postmemory of her unmarked, embodied, and intergenerational trauma. The photographs, through Ettinger's physical and affective orientation towards them, open up and awaken a space within her body and psyche for the exploration of these traumas through artworking. Ettinger then embraces and moves into this space by returning the photograph's gaze and accepting its invitation for a change of impression. She takes this invitation literally and

begins to work through and over her source photographs to trace the shape of Eurydice onto the holes and absences reflected by the photograph's narrative shortcomings, which she recognizes as the holes and absences within her own memory and documented history.

When the painting is presented to the public, the viewers are invited into the matrixial sphere. As they look at Ettinger's work, identifying the fragments of recognizable and unrecognizable archival material, they meet Eurydice's gaze, trace her lineage back through Ettinger's own, and enter into an ethical encounter-event upon which to analyse, confront, and re-evaluate the trauma of the Holocaust, while acknowledging the trauma that resides within themselves. Each part of the process—from artist, to photograph, to print, to charcoal line, to canvas, to gallery space, to viewer, to consciousness—is a link in the borderlinking chain of connectivity. Each part, even objects made significant through affective attachment, bears a history and a trauma of its own that becomes part of an enduring and repetitive process of psychic working through in an effort to recognize the wounds of Others. It is an attempt to recognize that while the wounds of the Holocaust are ongoing—particularly for those always-already marginalized subjects made more vulnerable during genocide—so too are the efforts of recognition and working through; of healing the psychic and physical lines severed by forced sterilization and mass-murder. The loss of these generative lines, in particular through the M/other's body, are re-visited through borderlinking, through the *Eurydices*, through Ettinger, through artworking, through her materials, through her body. They are also re-visited and felt through our own bodies—the interlocutor's body—as our affective attachments urge

us to act, to feel, to perform our own traumas, while remembering and indeed re-framing the traumas that reside in each us after the Holocaust.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahmed, Sara. "Affective Economies." *Social Text* 22.2 (2004): 117-139. Print.
- . *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. New York: Routledge, 2004. Print.
- . "Happy Objects." *The Affect Theory Reader*. Ed. Melissa Gregg and Gregory J. Seigworth. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2010. 31-51. Print.
- Barthes, Roland. *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography*. Translated by Richard Howard. New York: Hill and Wang, 1981. Print.
- Benjamin, Walter. *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*. Ed. J. A. Underwood. London: Penguin, 2008. Print.
- Bennett, Jill. *Empathic Vision: Affect, Trauma, and Contemporary Art*. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 2005. Print.
- Bergen, Doris L. "What Do Studies of Women, Gender, and Sexuality Contribute to Understanding the Holocaust?" *Different Horrors, Same Hell: Gender and the Holocaust*. Ed. Myrna Goldenberg and Amy H. Shapiro. Seattle: U of Washington, 2013. 16-36. Print.
- Brennan, Teresa. *The Transmission of Affect*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2004. Print.
- Buci-Glucksmann, Christine. "The Eurydices." *Parallax* 5.1 (1999): 99-102. Print.
- Cvetkovich, Ann. *An Archive of Feelings: Trauma, Sexuality, and Lesbian Public Cultures*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2003. Print.
- Derrida, Jacques, and Eric Prenowitz. "Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression." *Diacritics* Summer 25.2 (1995): 9-63. Print.

- Ettinger, Bracha L. *Bracha Lichtenberg Ettinger: Artworking, 1985-1999*. Brussels: Palais Des Beaux-Arts, 2000. Print.
- . "Copoesis." *Framework X Ephemera X 5* (2005): 703-13. Web. 20 Nov. 2015.
- . "Matrix and Metramorphosis," *Differences* 4.3 (1992): 176-208
- . *The Matrixial Borderspace*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota, 2006. Print.
- . "Wit(h)nessing Trauma and the Matrixial Gaze: From Phantasm to Trauma, from Phallic Structure to Matrixial Sphere." *Parallax* 7.1 (2005): 89-114. Web. 27 Nov. 2015.
- Ettinger, Bracha L, M. Catherine De. Zegher, Griselda Pollock, Rosi Huhn, and Verhaeghe. *Art as Compassion: Bracha L. Ettinger*. Brussels: ASA, 2011. Print.
- Freud, Sigmund. "Remembering, Repeating and Working-Through (Further Recommendations on the Technique of Psycho-analysis II)". *Standard Edition* 12 (1950): 145-157. Web. 3 Sept. 2016.
- Glowacka, Dorota. *Disappearing Traces: Holocaust Testimonials, Ethics, and Aesthetics*. Seattle: U of Washington, 2012. Print.
- Gregg, Melissa, and Gregory J. Seigworth. *The Affect Theory Reader*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2010. Print.
- Hampshire, Stuart. *Spinoza and Spinozism*. Oxford: Clarendon, 2005. Print.
- Hansen-Glucklich, Jennifer. "'We Are the Last Witnesses': Artifacts, Aura, and Authenticity." *Holocaust Memory Reframed: Museums and the Challenges of Representation*. New Jersey: Rutgers UP, 2014. 119-43. Print.

- Hetherington, Kevin. "Rhythm and Noise: The City, Memory and the Archive." *The Sociological Review* 61 (2013): 17-33. Print.
- Hirsch, Marianne. *The Generation of Postmemory: Writing and Visual Culture after the Holocaust*. New York: Columbia UP, 2012. Print.
- Levi, Primo. *The Drowned and the Saved*. New York: Vintage International, 1989. Print.
- "Naked Jewish Women, Some of Whom Are Holding Infants, Wait in a Line before Their Execution by Ukrainian Auxilliary Police." *United States Holocaust Memorial Museum Photo Archives*. United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. Web.<http://digitalassets.ushmm.org/photoarchives/detail.aspx?id=1065461&search=&index=2>
- Phelan, Peggy. *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Taylor, Diana. *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas*. Durham: Duke UP, 2003. Print.
- . "Performance and/as History." *TDR* 50.1 (Spring 2006): 67-86
- Vignault, Marissa B. *Expanding Spaces and Porous Borders in the Artworking of Bracha L. Ettinger*. Diss. Bryn Mawr College, October 2009.
- . "The Porous Space of Bracha L. Ettinger's Eurydices." *Contemporary Art and Classical Myth*. Ed. Isabelle Loring Wallace, Jennie Hirsh. Farham: Ashgate Publishing, 2011. 111-135. Print.