

Previously published in the AFI Film Readers series
Edited by Charles Wolfe and Edward Branigan

New Media

Anna Everett and John T. Caldwell

Authorship and Film

David A. Gerstner and Janet Staiger

Westerns

Janet Walker

Masculinity

Peter Lehman

Violence and American Cinema

J. David Slocum

The Persistence of History

Vivian Sobchack

Home, Exile, Homeland

Hamid Naficy

Black Women Film and Video Artists

Jacqueline Bobo

The Revolution Wasn't Televised

Lynn Spigel and Michael Curtin

Classical Hollywood Comedy

Henry Jenkins and Kristine Brunovska Karnick

Disney Discourse

Eric Smoodin

Black American Cinema

Manthia Diawara

Film Theory Goes to the Movies

Jim Collins, Ava Preacher Collins, and Hilary Radner

Theorizing Documentary

Michael Renov

Sound Theory/Sound Practice

Rick Altman

Fabrications

Jane M. Gaines and Charlotte Herzog

Psychoanalysis and Cinema

E. Ann Kaplan

EAST EUROPEAN CINEMAS

EDITED BY

ANIKÓ IMRE

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
New York London

contents

list of illustrations	vii
acknowledgments	ix
introduction	xi
east european cinemas in new perspectives <i>anikó inre</i>	
part one: gender identity and representation	
1. second world-war and transnational feminist practices: agnieszka holland's <i>kobieta samotna (a woman alone)</i> <i>katarzyna marciniak</i>	3
2. what's in your head: history and nation in <i>ibolya fekete's</i> <i>boldse vita</i> and ghetto art's <i>making the walls come down</i> <i>marquerite waller</i>	21
3. playing the western eye: balkan masculinity and post-yugoslav war cinema <i>tomislav z. longinović</i>	35
4. the politics of representing gender in contemporary polish cinema and visual art <i>elżbieta h. oleksy</i>	49
5. voices from another world: feminine space and masculine intrusion in <i>sedmíkrásky</i> and <i>vražda ing. čerta</i> <i>petra hanáková</i>	63
part two: (post)modernist continuities	
6. somewhere in europe: exile and orphanage in post-world war II hungarian cinema <i>melinda szaloky</i>	81
7. global aesthetics and the serbian cinema of the 1990s <i>dašan i. bjelić</i>	103
8. traumatic memory, jewish identity: remapping the past in hungarian cinema <i>catherine nortugas</i>	121

Published in Great Britain by
Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
2 Park Square
Milton Park, Abingdon
Oxon OX14 4RN

Published in 2005 by
Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
270 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10016

© 2005 by Taylor & Francis Group, LLC
Routledge is an imprint of Taylor & Francis Group

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

International Standard Book Number-10: 0-415-97267-1 (Hardcover) 0-415-97268-X (Softcover)
International Standard Book Number-13: 978-0-415-97267-3 (Hardcover) 978-0-415-97268-0 (Softcover)

No part of this book may be reprinted, reproduced, transmitted, or utilized in any form by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying, microfilming, and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without written permission from the publishers.

Trademark Notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Catalog record is available from the Library of Congress

T&F informa

Taylor & Francis Group
is the Academic Division of T&F Informa plc.

Visit the Taylor & Francis Web site at
<http://www.taylorandfrancis.com>

and the Routledge Web site at
<http://www.routledge-ny.com>

traumatic

memory,

jewish

identity

e i g h t

remapping the past

in hungarian cinema

c a t h e r i n e p o r t u g e s

In the aftermath of 1989, the horizons of Hungarian cinema broadened to encompass representational styles and subjects that had been avoided, if not altogether suppressed through censorship, during the post-World War II decades. A compelling instance of this altered cinematic landscape is the foregrounding of ethnic, religious, and cultural identities, a practice discernible in films of the early 1990s and one that has continued to be embraced by filmmakers interested in moving beyond the allegorical "Aesopian" narratives of their cinematic predecessors. While questions of identity have always occupied a position of central importance and controversy in Hungarian history and culture, a specific cinematic language had been evolving in film production between 1945 and 1989, conjoining audiences and moving pictures in an unspoken complicity of mutual and reciprocal understanding with regard to politically and historically sensitive subjects. A number of postsocialist feature and documentary films attest to an insistent reframing of spaces of identity, extending and challenging contemporary discourses of Eastern and Central European

children, aged approximately five to eighteen and orphaned by the war or separated from their parents as the Russian Army was poised to overtake the country, band together and roam the countryside, foraging for food in untended farms and fields. The viewer witnesses the children's progressive experience of isolation and their eventual community of fellow beings, culminating in a guardedly optimistic vision of hope for human survival. The screenplay was written in 1945 by one of the earliest and most influential film theorists, Béla Balázs; two other major figures of Hungarian cinema, Károly Makk and Félix Máriássy, also contributed to what was to be one of the last postwar films to be released before the communist takeover of Hungary. In a style that Balázs called "fantastic realism," the opening sequences are set in the ruins of a fortress and wax museum. The camera performs a kind of ritual initiation in a lengthy orgasmic montage at once reminiscent of both Sergey Eisenstein and German expressionism, in which figures of childhood fantasy and horror, culminating in a menacing melting wax figure of Adolf Hitler, seem to come to life. As in many films that portray the consequences of traumatic wartime experience, the point of view is often that of a child or adolescent: here, a young boy trembles in fear as bombs explode just beyond his hiding place; in an earlier sequence, a traumatized girl witnesses firsthand the point-blank murder of her own father, crying out "Apá! (Father!)" Still other children survive the bombing of a home for delinquent children; although references to the possible Jewish origins of the protagonists are inscribed only indirectly, the entire film is dedicated to the "unknown children" who were victims of the war.

Among the earliest East European film cultures to devote substantial attention and industry funding to films about the deportation, ghettoization, and extermination of the region's Jewish populations during the Nazi occupation were those of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland. Films produced in those countries are often readable through the lens of socialist and communist ideological preoccupations, with their characteristic antifascist themes of resistance and their celebratory narratives of the values of international solidarity. Yet it is also often characteristic of these films produced, like *Valahol Európában*, immediately following the end of World War II (1947–49), that the complexity of presentation and the range of historical perspectives they embody demonstrate a marked sensitivity toward individual subjectivities. More than a decade later, between 1959 and 1968, a similar intensification of these qualities recurred, in tandem with the rise of student and worker movements of resistance, and, most notably, with the films of the Prague Spring in Czechoslovakia. Finally, toward the end of the 1980s, these qualities were again visible preceding the

An exploration of these tendencies is warranted at a time of sustained national reflection on Hungary's history and future identity. The country's accession to the European Union as one of its first East European members took place in May 2004, during a period when the sixtieth anniversary of the deportation of nearly a half million of the country's Jewish population was also being commemorated. At the same time, a new Holocaust Memorial Center was to be inaugurated in Budapest.¹ These and other related events have been accompanied by an outpouring of historical studies, gallery installations, published memoirs, newly released films, and academic conferences, which suggest an ongoing concern to reconcile individual and collective memory.

It is perhaps worthwhile, then, to revisit selected Hungarian films that, whether semiautobiographical or fictionalized, constitute an indispensable history of the intersections of film, historical trauma, and the Holocaust, in their interrogation of Jewish identity and—perhaps most important—the sources of the memories that are ultimately transmitted visually to subsequent generations.² We might well ask, for example, whether, and to what extent, viewers (and readers) born more than two decades after the end of World War II could be said to share a common archive of collective memory inherited or conveyed primarily from mass media representations rather than from more traditional Hungarian art film sources, published historical accounts, or volumes of collected autobiographical essays.³ While an empirical investigation of this question lies beyond the scope of this inquiry, we do well to incorporate such considerations in any assessment of the intergenerational influence of cinematic transmissions of history.⁴

This consideration inevitably raises the much-discussed psychodynamics of witnessing and testimony, remembering and forgetting, as attested to by the vast literature of spaces of Holocaust memory; for memorials, like films, are fraught with symbolic meaning, and can often become contested terrain, as became evident in debates around modalities of memorializing the trauma of September 11, 2001, in the United States. In order to open further spaces of debate, I will herein discuss films relating to the Holocaust as it was experienced in Hungary, selected in order, among other things, to consider the degree to which there may be differences between films written and directed by those who were firsthand witnesses, victims, or survivors, and those based on memoirs, archival materials, historical accounts, photographic documents or autobiographical novels, adapted or "translated" to another medium by others who may not have experienced these historical events firsthand; witnesses have been some of the most important resources for filmmaking and research in the postwar period.

One of the earliest films of this archive is *Valahol Európában* (Somewhere in

It might also be argued that for certain filmmakers, in addition to whatever personal motivation they might have experienced as Jews, former concentration camp prisoners, or both, the subject of the Holocaust was at the same time focalized during the 1960s as a means of articulating opposition to the diverse manifestations of totalitarianism in Eastern Europe. Equally pertinent is that fact that representation of the sequelae of the Holocaust and its traumatic history provided an opportunity to interrogate—in ways that might not necessarily be immediately threatened by the censor's stamp—such otherwise marginalized issues as the consequences of compliance with an existing authoritarian regime, and the psychological toll exacted by internal conflicts of conscience between an individual and her ideological world. At the same time, narratives of Holocaust memory enabled filmmakers to foreground the antihero as principal protagonist, a technique that has been taken up more recently, for instance, in the film production of Imre Kertész's semiautobiographical novel *Sorstalanság (Fateless)*, directed by Lajos Koltai in 2005. The attention given abroad to a number of film productions from the region also enabled their directors to continue to be actively engaged as filmmakers, even when their work was closely monitored by the Communist Party and the board of censors.⁶ An instance of such monitoring is Gyula Gazdag's influential film *Társasutazás (Package Tour)*, a 1984 documentary feature account of a group of Hungarian Jews who revisit the former concentration camps where they had been imprisoned; the film received little critical attention in Hungary following its release. According to the director, this avoidance was an indicator of the depth of resistance to his uncompromising insistence on recovering aspects of the formerly repressed history of Hungarian Jewry.⁷ By the end of the 1980s a number of formerly taboo subjects—not least the still fraught topic of the 1956 revolution—were accepted, even embraced by Hungarian audiences, together with such works as Péter Bacsó's satire of Stalinist terror *Órnyagos élet (Oh! Bloody Life)*, 1983) and Ferenc Kósa's *A mérkőzés (The Match)*, which was made in 1980 but not released until 1982). The latter, set in the spring of 1956, was the first Hungarian film to address everyday life on the streets of Pest during the uprising.

The special, coded language that developed between audiences and films in the mid-1960s managed to elude censors while including spectators, frequently drawing upon genres such as musical comedy and historical parable. New creative forms and personal styles evolved, many of which became classics that are readable today. Yet each successive cinematic generation in Hungary seems to speak a different language, progressively grounded in everyday life, while changing perceptions of Hungarian identity continue to find a place in Hungarian film. One of

a chilling, complex tale of wartime atrocity, and the most important work by András Kovács, one of the key figures in the new Hungarian cinema of the 1960s. The film is based on one of the darkest incidents in twentieth-century Hungarian history: in the winter of 1942, in the town of Újvidék (now Novi Sad, Serbia), the fascist Hungarian Army massacred over three thousand Jews and Serbs. Based on Tibor Csere's novel, *Hideg napok* figures four ex-soldiers in prison in 1946, awaiting trial for their role in those horrifying events. Each remembers in a way that minimizes his own culpability; Kovács uses flashbacks and a fragmented narrative to craft meditation on memory and responsibility reminiscent of Alain Resnais's *Hiroshima mon amour (Hiroshima My Love, 1959)* and *Muriel ou le temps d'un retour* (1963).

The films of István Szabó—personal, sensitive, and historically inflected—are among the more important and resonant cinematic meditations on the dynamics of intergenerational trauma and Jewish identity. During the 1980s, Szabó's artistic production underwent a gradual yet dramatic change of direction. The Oscar-winning *Mephisto* (1981) is a compelling and convincing depiction of Nazi Germany from the point of view of an ambitious actor, played by the Austrian Klaus Maria Brandauer. A faithful rendition of the allegorical tradition that portrays the artist's relationship to a seductive but forbidding communist regime, the film's interpretation of the compromised yet tragic situation of the resistant or dissident intellectual is also a coded signal to Hungarian viewers, encouraging private readings of the film to a nation of historically aware viewers. *Redl Ezredes (Colonel Redl, 1985)* used the same actor in a narrative that chronicles the ascent within the army hierarchy of a part-Jewish officer, dissecting the savage inter-ethnic politics of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. A film of renowned visual panache, its dramatic power and intellectual distinction illuminate the insidious gradations of class, religion, and nationalist and ethnic hostility during the Habsburg era.

But perhaps the most powerful and original film of Szabó's career, encompassing as it does the working through of a multigenerational familial traumatic history, is *Apa (Father, 1966)*. A compelling interlocking set of fantasy, history, and filmic innovation, *Apa* is narrated from the point of view of a boy, Takó (András Bálint), who as an adult became active as a student in the uprising of 1956, to his father, and begins with the inscription, "I confront your failure, you who look human," echoing themes from Radványi's *Valahol Európában*. In one powerful scene, charged with the task of distributing a package of foodstuffs to needy pupils, a teacher asks his class of young boys how many have lost a father; nearly three-fourths of the class stand up in a mute yet evocative testimony to the toll of the war on Hungarian families, more

question of Jewish identity somewhat more directly when Takó, now a university student, takes a role as an extra in a film in which he is to play first a Jew rounded up by the Hungarian fascist Arrow Cross and then is made abruptly to switch roles by affixing the insignia of the enemy, in a telling directorial strategy for commenting subtly yet unforgettably on the generational consequences of war. The shooting of the film within a film concluded, Takó and his friends reflect on their parents' silence about the war and their own generation's ignorance of its psychological and cultural consequences. Takó accompanies a fellow student, Anni (they will subsequently become lovers); as they stroll along the Danube banks, Anni (Kati Solyom) assesses the impact of her own unarticulated Jewish identity in a remarkable monologue:

It's awful, you know. For years I denied that my father died in a concentration camp. I'd make up a story rather than admit I was Jewish. I finally realized the futility of it and I faced reality. I even went to Auschwitz with an excursion group and I took pictures. All I got were pictures of well-dressed tourists milling around. Sometimes I still feel ashamed and pretend not to be Jewish. I am Hungarian, am I not? The forgotten past of my ancestors doesn't count. And I can't overcome it. I want to be proud of that Jewish past for which my parents gave their lives. I simply can't behave normally. I just don't know where I belong, where I want to belong, what I am, or where I should belong. The Pope at last forgave the Jews for their sins. That means that they were guilty of crucifying Christ two thousand years ago. And those who twenty years ago let six million Jews be gassed and burned? How soon will they be absolved? You see how maddening this can be, and how idiotic this Auschwitz thing is! Part of me is there. My parents and relatives perished there. But I can't go on harping on it just to get sympathy. I feel ashamed for belonging to those who were slaughtered like sheep. I always feel as if I had to prove something. . . .

Through the confession of this young female protagonist, Szabó addresses a profoundly conflicted and ambivalent stance toward Jewish identity and assimilation shared, even today, by many Hungarians and particularly characteristic of Budapest's Jewish writers, artists, and intellectuals. It is all the more noteworthy that these wrenching words were produced in 1966, when such questions were far from commonly addressed in Hungarian or, for that matter, East-Central European

financing from international coproducers, thereby traversing the boundaries of traditionally circumscribed Hungarian national cinema, Szabó nonetheless continued to mine the intricacies of a distinctly Hungarian history, perhaps most ambitiously so in *A napfény ize* (*A Taste of Sunshine*, 1999), a multigenerational saga in English, which follows the fortunes of a Jewish family through the Habsburg Empire, the years of fascism, World War II, and the communist regimes, and narrated in modalities that engage a wide spectrum of spectators while addressing the complexities of collective memory. Here as in his earlier work, Szabó observes the impact of historical and political trauma on the identity of four generations of a single family in a story that reworks themes from his iconic mid-1960s film *Apa*. *A napfény ize*'s protagonist, Iván Sonnenschein (Ralph Fiennes), the family's last descendant, frames the film's narrative in voice-over, inflecting the story with his own individual perspective without disrupting its historical flow. The triptych structure begins in the mid-nineteenth century when, as a young boy, Iván's great-grandfather Emmanuel (David de Keyser) leaves home for the capital when his own father, the local village innkeeper, dies in an explosion in his own distillery. Emmanuel manages to take with him a black notebook containing his father's secret recipe for the herbal tonic Taste of Sunshine (the source of the film's Hungarian title, and a reference to assimilated Jews the Zwack family, makers of the famous digestive tonic Unicum) that eventually underwrites the Sonnenschein family's substantial fortune.

It is, I think, also useful to read *A napfény ize* as a testimonial to other long-repressed stories of Hungarian Jews, including *Apa*. This now-classic black-and-white film foregrounds a twenty-year period from the early 1940s to the early 1960s, following a complex and affecting flashback structure in which fact and imagination appear to commingle. Iván, the narrator of *A napfény ize*, finally has only his name to connect him to his family's past, for he is the baptized son of Jewish parents but has converted to Catholicism. Ultimately, in a gesture of identity reclamation and emotional linkage with the traumatic history of preceding generations of his Jewish ancestors, he takes back the family name, Sonnenschein, which had been officially changed to the more Hungarian-sounding Sors ("fate").⁸ The thematics of bearing witness to religious and ethnic oppression and extermination links *A napfény ize* to preceding films and opens new spaces for debate on Jewish identity across generations of Hungarian experience.⁹

A number of films of the 1990s have, whether directly or obliquely, invoked the Holocaust in Hungary: *Eszterházy* (*The Book of Esther*, 1990), directed by Krisztina Deák, focuses on Eva Heyman, the Hungarian Anne Frank, a thirteen-year-old Auschwitz victim whose diary was dis-

suggested that the diary had actually been written by Éva's grief-stricken mother, Esther, to atone for the fact that she had abandoned her child during the Nazi occupation to follow her second husband into exile. This young writer-director's debut feature—named Best First Film at the annual Hungarian Film Week in Budapest in 1990—draws on these events to fashion a harrowing portrait of the obsessive, guilt-ridden Esther, who returns after the war to search for her daughter, gradually comes to the realization that she has been killed, and succumbs to a downward spiral of self-destructiveness and despair.

Another distinguished woman director is Judit Elek, whose *Tutajások* (*Memoirs of a River*, 1990), the first post-1989 Franco-Hungarian feature coproduction to explicitly denounce Hungarian anti-Semitism and the first to be made from an explicitly Jewish viewpoint, focuses on the infamous Tiszaeszlár trial for “blood-libel” a century ago. It combines documentary sources, personal experience, and archival footage formerly off-limits to researchers but subsequently integrated with a script of her own, joining a substantial group of filmmakers who create a fusion of fiction and documentary from the point of view of protagonists who serve as witnesses.

An instance of this multigenerational approach is Péter Forgács's 1996 film *Az Örvény* (*Free Fall Oratorio*),¹⁰ the tenth segment of his epic multipart series, *Privát Magyarország* (*Private Hungary*), composed entirely of home movie and amateur footage contributed primarily by Hungarian families, some of whose “cameramen” shot continuously from the late 1920s to the early 1940s. Forgács's experimental style, implemented in collaboration with his colleague, the composer Tibor Szemző, has earned him international acclaim for work screened in prestigious venues, such as a 2002 installation at the Getty Museum in Los Angeles to accompany a multiscreen projection of his film *A dámai exodus* (*Danube Exodus*, 2001).

In a segment from his 1996 work, the spectator witnesses an extraordinary approach to the psychology and aesthetics of memory, created by the juxtaposition of text and image, sound and silence. The imposition of the Jewish Laws on the lives of affluent Hungarian citizens of Jewish origin is rendered through an operatic voice reciting the consequences of those laws, which progressively deprived Jews and others of their livelihood and, ultimately, of their lives. Forgács selects a talented amateur motion-picture photographer from an upper-middle-class Jewish family, György Pető (born in Szeged in 1906), the cameraman of this 8-millimeter footage taken in the 1930s, to suggest how deeply and thoroughly most Hungarian Jews, many of them nonobservant of Judaism, were integrated and assimilated into the idea and practice of national identity. Most considered themselves to be

that they could be perceived as the other, the enemy, by their own compatriots. This intertextual video archaeology thus functions also as an investigation akin to seeing in color a past we have only seen in black and white, through its seamless interweaving of images and text, letters and diaries, official records and archival documents. Forgács's mesmerizing films are multifaceted texts that surpass what history, biography, and memoir alone can deliver, thanks to a layered documentation designed from diverse angles—rich, detailed, and vivid image narratives, in which artifacts from many sources are uncovered and then crafted into a study of society in its complexities, variations, and gaps of memory, perhaps closer in density to a novelistic project than anything else.

Forgács's works include *A dámai exodus*; *Bibó Breviárium* (*A Bibó Reader*, 2002; a prize-winning Hungarian entry in the 2002 Cannes Film Festival), and *Püspök kertje* (*The Bishop's Garden*, 2003; awarded the prize for best documentary at the Thirty-Fourth Annual Hungarian Film Week). In each case, footage from family-made home movies is combined with archival material discovered on occasion by chance, the final product being the fruit of titanic labor and innovative juxtapositions of diaries, journals, amateur footage, and intertitles. These films juxtapose the body of the individual to that of history, the joyous poses of children and their parents, the boisterous family dinners and motorboat outings, taking the air at an outdoor café, and poetic shots of Forgács's lover, Éva, taking a bath. From today's perspective, the shadow of the Holocaust hovers over every frame, most acutely during the happy times. This daring juxtaposition is at times arduous, often audacious and always fascinating. A cinéaste without a camera, so to speak, Péter Forgács works directly on the body of the film stock itself, which becomes in his hands the body of history, the necessary space of memory of his people, his fellow Hungarians, Jews and Gentiles alike. For these bodies imprinted on the screen continue to challenge and defy official (nationalist) discourse recited by voices off in an incantatory, repetitive function that awakens the spectator to conflicting realities, intergenerational experiences, and interpretations. That the director has been working successfully on this principle for more than a dozen years is evident in that his work—by its very composition and perseverance—manages to resist the ravages of time in ways that few artists have achieved. His narrative is connected to the evaporating memory of the self, the natural loss of memory, the individual's ways of remembering as well as forgetting and self-censoring, and the distance between remembrance and the filmic event, mood, or situation.¹¹

In a radically opposite mode, those familiar with Steven Spielberg's *Schindler's List* may recall controversies and debates following its release in

boundaries of decency in Holocaust representations that had been rigorously promoted by filmmakers such as Claude Lanzmann, whose 1985 documentary *Shoah* was a landmark film of the genre, establishing parameters for future cinematic reconsiderations of the Holocaust. Lanzmann and others accused Spielberg of humanizing the Holocaust by deploying Hollywood techniques that “domesticated,” by rendering approachable and ordinary what some writers and critics judged to be sacred and therefore unrepresentable.¹²

A similar debate took place when the Hungarian writer Imre Kertész was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature in 2002 for his novel *Sorstalanság* (*Fateless*), originally published in 1975, and the first Hungarian-language novel ever to win the Nobel Prize. During the 1970s, after a long period of repression and silence, Holocaust memory returned gradually to the public scene in Hungary, primarily in the form of literary texts produced by a generation of writers who had personally experienced this persecution as adolescents, including Sándor Márai (1996), Elie Wiesel (1960), Magda Dénes (1997), and Ernő Szép (1994). Among them was Imre Kertész; in “Dark Shadow,” an essay from his collection *A Holocaust mint kultúra* (1993), he suggests that “nothing would [appear to] be simpler than to collect, name and evaluate those Hungarian literary works that were born under the direct or indirect influence of the Holocaust. . . . However, in my view, that is not the problem. The problem, dear listeners, is the imagination. To be more precise: to what extent is the imagination capable of coping with the fact of the Holocaust? How can the imagination take in, receive the Holocaust, and, because of this receptive imagination, to what extent has the Holocaust become part of our ethical life and ethical culture? . . . This is what we must talk about.”¹³ According to the Nobel committee, *Sorstalanság* is a novel that “upholds the fragile experience of the individual against the barbaric arbitrariness of history” and that admittedly has drawn upon the “barbaric arbitrariness” of his own tragic experience as a fifteen-year-old Hungarian Jew in Auschwitz.

Director Lajos Koltai’s vision invites comparison with the visual strategies of other recent large-scale Holocaust-centered films such as Roman Polanski’s *The Pianist* (2002), based on the memoirs of Ladislav Szpúlman, a young musician in the Warsaw Ghetto. That film’s star, Adrien Brody, won an Oscar for best actor, as did Polanski himself for best director at the 2003 Academy Awards for a work that also addresses Polanski’s own experience as a child of the Holocaust.¹⁴ The case of *Fateless* is complex, involving as it does on the one hand a witness/victim—Kertész, the writer and screenwriter—and a non-witness, Lajos Koltai, the director/translator.¹⁵

While *Fateless* was praised by the Nobel Academy, the book’s “lack of moral indignation” was also considered disturbing, a response that perhaps has more than a little to do with its specifically Central European metalanguage, a style that resists deconstruction and interpretation by readers who might not benefit from the requisite comparative cultural context. Indeed, Kertész might well have been anticipating this aspect of the academy’s response in an interview broadcast on Hungarian radio in 1991 when he declared,

“I was not brought up as an observant Jew and I did not become a believer later on; at the same time, I find that Judaism is an absolutely decisive moment of my life, one I am attached to because, on account of it, I lived through a great moral test. But is it possible to rise above the experiences one lives through in such a way that we don’t exclude them and at the same time manage to transpose them to a universal level? . . . My country has yet to face up to the skeleton in the closet, namely awareness of the issue of the Holocaust, which has not yet taken root in Hungarian culture, and those writing about it [still] stand on the sidelines. . . . I think it is a success if my book has made even a slight contribution to this process.”¹⁶

A significant gesture toward the ongoing process of reinscribing Hungarian Holocaust memory after such a long period of repression was made by the Hungarian Motion Picture Foundation’s February 2003 decision to provide funding for a film adaptation of *Sorstalanság*—the very foundation that, two years earlier, had allocated the majority of its budget to productions considered by many to be ultranationalist epics, such as Csaba Káel’s *Bánk Bán* (Bánk Bán, 2003) and Géza Bereményi’s *Hídember* (*The Bridgeman*, 2003). The production in fact marks the directorial debut of Lajos Koltai, the renowned cinematographer and veteran of more than seventy features, including such distinguished films as István Szabó’s Oscar-winning feature *Méphisto* (1982) as well as his Oscar-nominated *Bizalom* (*Confidence*, 1984), *Redl Erzsédes* (*Colonel Redl*), *Hanuszen* (1988), *Meeting Venus*, (1991), *Taking Sides* (1999), and *A napfény íze* (*A Taste of Sunshine*, 1999).¹⁷ Although Koltai has no personal connection to the Holocaust, he was selected by his close friend, Imre Kertész, to direct this major production, which narrates a young adolescent’s experience as a survivor.

Both documentary and narrative features have proved to be powerful means of enacting memory and mourning, enabling filmmakers and viewers alike to engage in processes of working through trauma. Both

are forms of witnessing and testimony, and both are capable of addressing voyeurism, violence, comedy, and propaganda, as well as historical research. Since 1989, Hungarian cinema has undergone dramatic and traumatic changes in, among many other aspects, filmmakers' sense of obligation with respect to their audiences. The past fifteen years since the fall of the Berlin Wall have witnessed the return of the history of Hungarian Jews to the center of the cinematic stage through ambitious historical frescoes as well as intimate, moving narratives, retrospective mappings onto the topography of cinematic representations that sustain the intergenerational work of memory.

notes

1. Over ten thousand visitors arrived at the Center during the first three days, when it remained open day and night: "This heinous crime was committed against Hungarians by Hungarians," said Prime Minister Péter Medgyessy in his opening remarks, a historical official acceptance of Hungarian responsibility for the death of over a half million Hungarians during the Holocaust. See the official website of the Center: www.hkde.hu.
2. In this category I would include István Szabó's *Ápa* (Father, 1966), Zoltán Fábri's *Két Félidő a Fokóban* (Two Half-Times in Hell, 1961); and András Kovács's *Hűség Napok* (Cold Days, 1966).
3. I thank Anikó Imre for her insightful articulation of this aspect of generationally based visual source material.
4. See Catherine Portuges, "Intergenerational Memory: Transmitting the Past in Hungarian Cinema," *Spectator* 23, no. 2 (2003): 44–52.
5. See Hanno Loewy, "The Mother of All Holocaust Films? Wanda Jakubowska's Auschwitz Trilogy," *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television* 24, no. 2 (2004): p. 200.
6. *Ibid.*
7. Gyula Gazdag has generously discussed with me his views on this subject and on the evolving state of Hungarian cinema from 1989 to the present. Társasutazás is now in the collection of the U.S. Holocaust Museum in Washington, D.C.
8. Szabó's own original family name is said also to have been Sonnenschein.
9. Catherine Portuges, "István Szabó's Sunshine," *Cinéaste* 27, no. 1 (2000): 56–57.
10. Az Örvény premiered at the Old Synagogue in Szeged, Hungary, in 1996, with live music and voice by director/narrator Péter Forgács, composer/conductor Tibor Szemző, soprano and violinist Ildikó Fodor; tenor László Keringer, and sound engineer Zoltán Regénye. Its U.S. debut took place in 1998 at the San Francisco Jewish Film Festival.
11. Author's personal conversations, screenings, and dialogues with Péter Forgács, Budapest and Los Angeles, 1998–2004.
12. It is worth noting that the sharp increase in the volume of international production of films pertaining to the Holocaust may in fact be in part attributable to the 1993 release of *Schindler's List*; among other factors, public debate surrounding the film led to the creation of Spielberg's Survivors of the Shoah Visual History Foundation, which has since become a major

site of international archival, oral history, film, videotape, and digital research and preservation.

13. Imre Kertész, "Dark Shadow" (1993), reprinted in *Contemporary Jewish Writing in Hungary: An Anthology*, ed. Susan Rubin Suleiman and Éva Forgács (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2003), 171.
14. Polanski first discovered *The Pianist* when it was republished in Polish in 1998 under its new title, two years before the author's death: "I had searched for decades for a model parallel to my life, which I couldn't film myself. . . . Szpilman's book was the text I was waiting for—a testimony of human endurance in the face of death, a tribute to the power of music and the will to live, and a story told without the desire for revenge." Roman Polanski, quoted in Catherine Portuges, "Review of *The Pianist*," *American Historical Review* (2003): 108: 2. Through Szpilman's book, Polanski could finally represent the trauma he, too, had suffered.
15. Joshua Hirsch develops this distinction in his chapter on posttraumatic autobiography in *Afterimage: Film, Trauma and the Holocaust* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2004), 112 ff.
16. Imre Kertész, quoted in Alan Riding, "Nobel for Hungarian Writer Who Survived the Death Camps," *New York Times*, October 11, 2002.
17. A documentary film, *Költai Napló* (Koltai Diary), produced in Hungary in February 2004 by András Muhi, contains a montage of these films, for which Koltai was cinematographer.