

CODRUȚA CUCEU

IDENTITY UNDER (Re)CONSTRUCTION.
THE JEWISH COMMUNITY FROM
TRANSYLVANIA BEFORE AND AFTER THE
SECOND WORLD WAR

Codruța Cuceu,
Researcher at „George
Bariț” Institute, Romanian
Academy of Sciences, Cluj,
Romania. E-mail:
codrutaliana@yahoo.com

Abstract: When talking about the identity of a certain community, we are inclined to appeal to essentialist, almost metaphysical notions. This often results in a unitary, deeply rooted and stable perception of the analyzed community. But this view is not always accurate enough, for it does not offer an account of a specific history. By offering a short history and a structural presentation of the Jewish community from Transylvania, before and shortly after the Second World War, our article's purpose is to overpass, by questioning, the shortcomings of an essentialist interpretation of the discussed community. Taking into account the long history of pogroms, applied anti-Semitism and persecutions on religious or ethnic grounds that took place along the 20th century, our work aims at depicting whether religion was and remained a major characteristic, i.e. an unique communal specificity in the re(creation) of Jewish identity in Transylvania, before and after the Second World War.

Key Words:
Jewish identity,
Transylvanian Jewry,
Second World War,
ghetto, Neolog Judaism,
Magyarization.

*“- What is left Jewish in a Jew who is neither religious,
nor nationalist and who does not know the language of the Bible?
-A lot”
(Norman Manea)¹*

From the point of view of the historical changes that have supervened in the becoming of the Jewish community from Transylvania, there are three events which entailed major structural changes within the assumed identity of this Transylvanian Jewry in the last two centuries: the emancipation of the Transylvanian Jewish community that emerged in the second half of the 19th Century and beginning of 20th Century², Transylvania's unification with Romania in 1918, and the ghettoization followed up by the Holocaust. It is futile to remark that the first as well as the second event mentioned above could have had mostly “organic” or structural effects in the self perception and representation of Jewish identity, whereas the third one rather imposed the destruction of Transylvanian Jewish community which called forth a rupture or a breach in what we call Jewish identity. One of the mainstream interpretations of the „emancipation” of Transylvanian Jewry was that it started as an abandonment of the process of „free” or „forced” Magyarization. Depending on the different types of reactions towards their own identity, the assimilation to the Hungarian community has been perceived by Transylvanian Jews either in a flexible, rather adaptable manner, or in a conservative one. For the Jews who considered Magyarization a free and

voluntary process, a forgetting of their original identity became inevitable, whereas for the Jews who viewed Magyarization as an imposed action, the strive to preserve their Jewish identity was relentless.

Different reactions to the essays to assimilate the Jews have been mentioned in historical works discussing the status of the Jews in modern times. Alienation, conversion, cosmopolitanism and self-hatred are the main categories that circumscribe the reaction of the Jews to their own identity. In counter-balance, new forms of assuming and affirming Jewish identity have arisen as a response to assimilation: the national-Zionism, *Troztjudentum*, and the return to Judaic religiosity.³

For Ernő Marton⁴, the emancipation of Transylvanian Jews amounts to a sort of individualization and self-acknowledgement. He states that „emancipation set forth the idea that there is no Jewish nation. Emancipation set the Jews free only as individuals not as people: Jewishness was deemed to mean nothing but a cult, not an ethnicity or nationality. But especially after the outbreak of war, the process of assimilation slowed down in its rhythm making room for a new form of Jewish self-consciousness. The Jews started to return to their roots. Assimilation became anachronistic.”⁵ Thus, in his view, the construction of identity does not stand upon resistance to a forceful, absorbing and often reductive religious, ethnic or political body. For Ernő Marton, relational as it is, this construction of identity is more likely a natural, positive process of self assertion, characteristic for a certain community among others. But this, one could add, is conditioned by freedom in the relationships with the others.

Even though in crystallizing the Jewish identity, the cultic element has been frequently used as an alternative to ethnicity, rather than being perceived as a root of ethnicity, the second representative event in the contemporary history of the discussed Jewish community, Transylvania's unification with Romania in 1918 has brought a revival of the ethnic valence in defining community bonds and identity. The most peculiar effect of the unification was that „within the framework of Greater Romania, Transylvanian Jewry wished to be considered apart not only from the Hungarian minority or the Romanian majority, but also from the Jews living in other historical Romanian provinces.”⁶ For a long time, the Jewish community from Transylvania declined its identity as Transylvanian.⁷ So in the inter-war period, „the adjustment of the Transylvanian Jews to the new political framework was not so easy, as reflected by the many forms of organization that mirrored the complexity of the Transylvanian Jewish society. A minority gathered around the Neolog Chief-rabbi of Oradea, Leopold Kecskeméti, chose the self definition as an exclusively confessional community”⁸.

In Transylvania, Jewish identity was traditionally built on and transmitted by the means of a mainly religious education. Thus, among the already existing “branches of the Judaic cult, there were, besides

Orthodoxy and the Sephardic community of Spanish origin, two other communities. One was called the Neolog community, of occidental rite and the other one was the status quo community.”⁹ “In 1932, there were 35 Neolog communities in Transylvania and new Orthodox (for instance, in Salonta in 1927) and Sephardic (in Cluj in 1921, in Sibiu in 1923) communities were also set up.”¹⁰ The Neolog community seems to have been a more liberal one, a reformative one in comparison to the orthodox one, because it brought some changes to the orthodox cult. It is hard to determine whether these changes meant the beginning of a process of secularization or they were rather pertaining to a process of modernization that came as a break with a rather religious tradition, or, if on the contrary, these changes represented an “aggiornamento”, i.e., the sign of a need for religious renewal. Often these religious renewals are necessary exactly for maintaining a religious identity in a world of perpetual change. Those changes brought to the orthodox cult could also have represented an attempt for a better integration and assimilation within the host community. Fact is that in Transylvania, the Neolog community was the best integrated and this integration was due, at least partially, to the practice of the cult in the more accessible languages of the host communities, i.e., Hungarian and Romanian.

The Transylvanian Jews aimed therefore at being recognized as a distinct national minority. Thereby, the process of recreating the Jewish identity must have been powerful, not only by a *voluntary segregation* of Transylvanian Jewish community, but also by reinforcing the Transylvanian Jew’s belief in their ethnic unity. Thus, on the 20th of November 1918, an organization called the National Union of Transylvanian Jewry was created to advocate the status of a national minority for the Jews located in this area. Oddly enough, in the inter-war period, “the Jewish question appears in the debates between Romanian and Hungarian nationalist circles which accused one another of anti-Semitism.”¹¹ Crossing through a sinuous process of integration, for Transylvanian Jews this “self imposed” segregation has rather a symbolic relevance which does not need to have straightaway a unifying correspondence within the community itself, for it is only the sign of the political request for minority rights which aimed at official political recognition. This political recognition of any minority equals to a given possibility and liberty to legitimately and officially affirm their difference. And that needs not only a symbolic guarantee, but also a juridical one, for identity does not restrict to self-representations and imagery but it also has a rather “dialogical” dimension. Hence, otherness is *sine qua non* in the process of constructing and affirming an identity.

But the most dramatic event in the history of Transylvanian Jewish community was, by far, the experience of ghettoization and of the Holocaust when the existence of the Jewish people was endangered. Of course, ghettoization and Holocaust, besides their ideological common

cause, imposed a common fate for almost all European Jewish communities and condemned European Judaism as a whole to destruction. The question of “territorial identity” was historically totally insignificant.

Therefore, in discussing ghettoization and Holocaust, it behooves us first to question the relation established between anti-Semitism and the delineation of Jewish identity. Poignant remarks were made regarding this indistinctiveness in treating Jewish communities which characterized modern anti-Semitism. For example Norman Manea talks about “the humiliation felt by the Jew when defined by a collective catastrophe”¹² But nevertheless, one of the simplest and most profound questions that come into mind in what regards this relation between anti-Semitism and the transformation of preservation of Jewish identity is “how could one establish and quantize the share or the infusion of anti-Semitism in the delineation of Jewish identity? Or the other way round?”¹³

If the identity of Transylvanian Jewish community cannot be delineated only by the restrictive idea of a territorial identity according to which geographical and political localization convey cultural and anthropological determinations, by the particularities of Transylvanian Jewish life during this tough period, or by the unique way in which Transylvanian Jews responded to oppression, those characteristics are sufficient and satisfactory for differentiating the Transylvanian Jewish community from other European Jewish communities.

Among the features that express Jewish identity in Transylvania around the Second World War, the concerted actions of resistance and of survival are worth to be mentioned. Efforts for organizing and creating a spiritual, moral and cultural resistance were made by all religious or laic Jewish institutions.¹⁴ If, at the beginning of the 20th Century, what defined Transylvanian Jewry was the strive for political recognition and the use of voluntary differentiation and segregation, even from other Jewish communities from the Romanian territory, as a political manifesto, the beginning of the ghettoization period brought along another kind of self imposed segregation.

Segregation seems to have been one of the hall-marks of the age-old Jewish identity, being rather imposed by other peoples and grievously and onerously perceived by the Jews, as it is stated in the Bible: “Behold, a people who dwells apart, And will not be reckoned among the nations” (*The Numbers*, 23, 9), whereas the assumed seclusion of certain Jewish communities is seldom experienced and interpreted as a “hidden pride, as the meaning of a yet unknown fate, as a privilege and seal of the state and quality of being chosen”.¹⁵ This particular interpretation could explain and avail an appeal of Transylvanian Jewish communities of the interwar period to one of the roots of Judaism, to one of its basic paradigms, i.e., God’s alliance with the people of Israel. In this respect, one could talk here about a Jewish identity viewed as indistinct from mosaic religion, from Judaism. Nonetheless, most of the times along history, the self isolation of

Jewish communities had the purpose of preventing external aggressions. This is also the case of mid 20th Century Transylvanian Jewry.

Albeit one is inclined to interpret the history of Transylvanian Jewish communities as a concatenation of privations, one cannot neglect the vitality of the Jewish spirit in its urge for resistance. By reinforcing cultural and religious, i.e., cultic activity, by educating the young generation within the spirit of Judaism a form of “intellectual neo-ghettoization”¹⁶ has arisen at that time. Besides their cultic role, the synagogues became at times cultural centers or were transformed into public spheres. This was not a practice particular only to Transylvanian Jewry. But without a real Jewish state until 1948 or, better put, inasmuch as its status was not politically recognized, the religious institutions of almost every European Jewish community also assumed organizational, administrative and even political functions. Yet, those institutions often played an important role in affirming the juridical status of the Jewish community in a certain region or country.

Assuming the methodological shortcomings of any memoirs, which pertain, of course, rather to oral history than to scientific argumentation or scientific statistical approaches, subjective assessments still remain emblematical for the shaping of a certain community's identity. Subjective assessments usually express chronicles and narratives which stand for the self awareness and image of certain communities. A so called “rapport à soi,”¹⁷ is always entailed by the concept of identity; it can be easily conveyed by such subjective narratives that count for the degree of reflexivity or for the dynamic of the endless search of a peculiar, always new and differentiated system of values that characterize a certain community. Moreover, for “imagining” the identity of a certain community, an infinite number of subjective opinions reflecting the perceptions of that particular community are necessary. Anthropological explanations are the ones that place the question of identity within the realm of collective representation and imagery: “it is a sort of virtual focal point which constitutes an indispensable reference point in explaining certain things, but it does not really exist as such”.¹⁸ Other important voices in the analysis of cultures state that: “identity besides representing a deposit of collective distinctive experience is, after all, a construction – it implies an effort of establishing opposite entities and ‘others’, whose reality is always subjected to continuous interpretation and reinterpretation of what is different from ‘us’”.¹⁹ Edward Said explains that “identity is not a static process, but rather a historical, social, intellectual and political one, which takes the form of a competition which implies individuals and institutions from all societies”.²⁰ Consequently, human identity is seen not only as being unnatural and instable but also as constructed and occasionally even invented.²¹

On the other hand, reflexivity in itself is a rather private, individual habitus, so that a hierarchy of importance or of value among different

particular and subjective opinions cannot be established. That is why any angle of reflection is relevant in shaping the identity of one's native or adoptive community. On the other hand, subjective narratives about one's own community are especially important for avoiding stereotypical external perceptions. The polymorphism of the concept of identity is all the more so explicit within what one calls Jewish identity. Some recognize it in mosaic religion, others in Judaic tradition; still others in Zionism, a few perceive it in Herder's theory of Volkgeist, several in language (Yiddish, Ladino, Hebrew) or in circumcision ("the vow that is graven in flesh") or in other body traits, or in collective destiny, common history, or in common memory. But unfortunately the anamnesis of common tragedy that succeeded Anti-Semitist attitudes brought to paroxysm, i.e., the Holocaust plays an important place in outlining Jewish identity in the second half of the 20th Century.²²

Some of these views on Jewish identity seem to claim that identity bears within itself, or it is based on something essential, originally, pre-existent or constitutive.

For example, this seems to be, in short, Herder's idea of Volkgeist, often criticized nowadays as "misty" or nebulous²³. Still, Herder initiated one of the most important directions of a national doctrine, that of ethno-cultural nation (*Kulturnation*). According to Herder, "humanity is the end of human nature; and, with this end, God has put their own fate into the hands of mankind."²⁴ In his view, there is nothing unplanned and unpredicted in history, and this fate has to be assumed by the human race as a right to form a certain kind of humanity, depending on how this humanity is being interpreted, and to follow a certain tradition.²⁵ This elementary unit which constitutes the aim or, in Herder's words, "the fate" of humanity is represented by the *nation* and it is organized around a *national soul* which comprehends religion, language, art. *Nation* means *unity*, a unity based on history, language, and religion, on culture. This kind of nation has a "natural" character which legitimates it to transcend any type of political organization.

In Herder's view, the unity of language, of religion, of historical destiny, constitutes the prime criteria in the process of shaping the identity of a certain community.

From this perspective, if there was something essential or natural in the identity of the Jews along history, for sure this essentialist identity would stand mainly in their religious and cultural tradition.

The idea of an original, rather natural form of organization is also assessed by Richard Handler when he differentiates between the concept of *nation* and that of *state* affirming that "a nation, is a human group that may or may not control its own state; while a state is a political, more rational, instrumental, power-concentrating organization that may or may not correspond to all of one, and only one, nation."²⁶ One of the strongest arguments which favor the symbolic guide marks and also the religious

roots of a certain identity is that assessed by Benedict Anderson who affirms that nation has, as a symbolic referent, an “imagined community”²⁷. People are part of their nation participating in an imaginary way. This feeling of strong community is built up and supported first of all by the legacy of religion and rituals.

Thus, in what concerns their historical destiny, the Jews had a long history of exile. Being spread all around the world, along their history, they could not have a geographical or a national identity. Therefore, the Torah represented the “portable homeland of the Jews”, as Heinrich Heine righteously affirmed. From this, one could speak about a de-localized, though unique Jewish identity. Therefore, many believe that “an irreligious Jew was not a Jew”²⁸ and that implies that “for the Jews, religion is not optional as for other ethnic communities”²⁹, that religion is or at least was not a matter of personal or communitarian choice; it was rather the main characteristic of the Jewish identity. This type of identity is, in a way, unrepeatable and especially distinctive, being the main element that contributes to the maintenance and survival of Jewish communities everywhere. Yet others who oppose this limitative interpretation which, as any generalizing assessment, reduces Jewish identity to religious belief and practice³⁰. Consequently, even though “for many centuries, the Hebraic faith and religion was identical with being Jewish”³¹, the post-Holocaust period brings about or reinforces a more homogenous, undifferentiated “negative Jewish identity”³² founded rather on the memory of a collective tragedy than on religious or cultic particularities. A radical change has been imprinted in the Jewish self perception after the Holocaust. Judaism operated traditionally with certain representations of divinity, viewing God as Creator, Redeemer, and Guide. But this representation has been questioned after the Holocaust. Hans Jonas for example reassumed the question that has definitively marked the Jewish identity: “what kind of God could have let happen those things that happened?”³³. God’s silence has been interpreted by Jonas as a sign of a turning point in the representation of divinity within Judaism.

The particularities of each European Jewish community did not matter in the National-Socialist ideology, which treated all Jews regardless of their acquired identity. For National-Socialist ideology the only identity that counted was the “originary” and thereby common Jewish identity. Jewish communities that differed from each other, either for reasons of geographical placement, or on the ground of religious or cultural particularities, were not only forced to “forget” their unique identity, but after the Holocaust, the survivors of those communities were all also determined to assume again a common identity. This time, the hybrid of the common identity was no longer based on the same originary Jewish identity, but on the memory of that collective tragedy. After Holocaust, “the consciousness of the common fate became one of the main sources of the Jewish identity”³⁴ as well as a duty of perpetual remembrance.

This substitution of identity seems to be most peculiar to late 20th Century Jewish communities. For many Jews, Holocaust represented the milestone between a religiously defined Jewish identity and a “laic” identity.

In this respect, for many Jews, the mid 20th Century pogrom could have been symbolically equated with a process of secularization, interpreted as a process which separates the laic modern community from its more religious origins, or even from its own sacred beginnings. That is why, for many “traditional” communities, this secularization appeared as a leeway and, therefore, as a rather negative action.

The general question that arises here is whether religion was still able to remain, along the process of secularization, the main element in legitimating a certain minority’s attempt of maintaining or re-construct its identity. Consequently, a more particular question regarding the relevance of religiousness in delineating Jewish identity would arise after the experience of Holocaust.

It is hard to distinguish a unitary definition of the Jewish community’s identity from Transylvania, at least before and after the Second World War. On the one hand, after the Dictate of Vienna concluded by Germany and Italy on August 30, 1940, a geographical separation between Northern and Southern Transylvanian territories has occurred and, thus, the Transylvanian Jewish community was divided and set under different jurisdictions. Thus, the Northern part of Transylvania became a Hungarian territory and the Southern remained Romanian. On the other hand, in articulating the identity of the Jewish community from Transylvania from a temporal perspective, the borderline experience of deportation to the concentration camps separated the identity of the Jews before the Holocaust from the identity that has been reconstructed after on totally different coordinates. From an individual perspective, the Holocaust was life-transforming: there was “the life before and the life after. A life has been lost”³⁵. The loss of the one’s own life coincides here, metaphorically, with the loss of one’s own identity.

In Northern Transylvania, “the return to a Hungarian administration first meant the introduction of the anti-Jewish legislation in force in Hungary”. In 1938, a law which restricted to 20% the ratio of Jews accepted in public offices and liberal professions was released. Also, there was a restriction of the number of Jewish clerks, the Jews naturalized after July 1, 1914 lost their right to citizenship, in 1941, the bill of racial protection forbade mixed marriages and extramarital relations between Jews and non-Jews. From 1942, Jews could not own enterprises without a Christian co-proprietor.³⁶

Thereby, the process of segregation began by a severe violation of the community both in its public and in its private realms. In this way, the Jewish moral identity, formed within the community and created by relating to the people alike in the public or in an institutional sphere, has

been easily damaged. Still, the Jewish community from Transylvania proved resistance, because, in the period before the deportation, the Jews tried here at least to maintain their institutional system. There were “179 Orthodox, Neolog and Status-Quo Ante communities, with a network of charity (soup-kitchens, homes for the orphans, aged and poor) and religious institutions able to perpetuate a Jewish life in agreement to the traditional prescriptions and assist the needy.”³⁷

All these resistance attempts were restricted once with the introduction of the distinctive mark, the yellow star, and with the beginning of the process of concentration of Jews in ghettos in 1944. The idea of ghetto was conceived as a kind of pogrom and it was never perceived by the Jews from Transylvania with nostalgia for a closed and protective space. The officials of the time viewed the gathering of the Jews in 13 central ghettos merely as a preparation for an easier deportation to the concentration camps and as an attempt to destroy a half of a millennium of history of building and reaching a Jewish identity within the Transylvanian framework. In a letter written by the French chargé d'affaires in Budapest, Charmasse, and addressed on the 1st of July 1944 to the president of the Government, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Pierre Laval, it is stated: “We hereby think fit to note that the ghettos in the province have been created in conditions of discomfort and lack of hygiene which outbalance any imagination. Taken from their homes without any luggage, men, women, children, old men have been imprisoned by thousands in places with ring fence, usually former brick plants, where they do not have other refuge except the sheds used for drying the bricks. The place is so crammed that most of them cannot even shelter in these barns. Somewhere else, an eye witness told me he had seen a ghetto in a grove, which was surrounded by barbed wire; crowded in this “zoo” (as my interlocutor put it), the Jews lack shelter and medical care.”³⁸ This letter stands as an official report showing the oppression of Jews in North Transylvania, after the German intervention in 19th of March 1944.³⁹

Between 1940 and 1941 many anti-Semitic legislative measures similar to those taken in Northern Transylvania were taken in Southern Transylvania. However, the political reasons were a bit different because the aim was a so called policy of “economic Romanization”⁴⁰ put into practice by Marshal Antonescu. This procedure of “economic” purification continued with means of restrictions and persecutions against the Jews. That meant that most, though not all, of the Jewish proprieties were taken over by the Romanian state. A sudden elimination of the “Jewish element” from the national economy would have caused a severe economic crisis. Likewise, in 1940, the Federation of the Jewish Communities was dissolved and replaced in 1942 with a so called Jews’ Central⁴¹, which was more of a regulating and supervising institution which darkened the communication between Romanian and Jewish authorities and worsened the segregation.

Thus, the autonomy of the Jewish community was damaged and so was their identity.

In 1942 the imminence of the political yield to the German pressures to put into practice the “final solution” of deporting the Jewish population to the concentration camps threatened severely. But as the general situation in the Second World War balanced in favor of the United Nations, Antonescu’s policy aimed at securing “a more favorable position in the post war negotiations”⁴². This depended also of a more adequate, human position towards the Jewish communities. The Romanian solution to the Jewish question was to offer the permission to leave for Palestine. But in spite of all these official measures, the emigration process was quite slow and it hid, in fact, an attempt of eliminating the Jews from the country.

In spite of these “purification” policies, the communities from Southern Transylvania tried to preserve, as much as they could, their institutions and above all, their rituals and cult, i.e., their identity.

In brief, the 20th Century Transylvanian Jewish history is, probably similar to the histories of other Jewish communities from Europe, a history characterized by a flaw in their identity, a history determined by a failure in the dialogue among different religious or ethnical identities. It is a memory of a rather negative reflection or mirroring of the Jewish identity in the eyes of the “other”. Therefore, the particularities of Transylvanian Jewish identity stand mostly in the cultic and cultural practices of the Jewish communities within the Transylvanian geographical and historical space. These practices proved to be powerful and relevant enough to emphasize this identity.

Bibliography:

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London and New York: Verso, 1991.

Benbassa, Esther and Attias, Jean-Christophe. *Evreul și celălalt*. Bucharest: Est-Samuel Tastet Editeur, 2005.

Benjamin, Lya. “Supraviețuirea ca Rezistență.” In *Permanențe și rupturi în Istoria Evreilor din România, secolele XIX –XX*, edited by Carol Iancu. București: Hasefer, 2006.

Benjamin, Lya. “The determinants of Jewish Identity in Inter-War Transylvania.” *Studia Iudaica* V (1996): 69.

Cuceu, Codruța. Review of Nicolae Kallós. *A dialogue on Jewish identity, Holocaust, and Communism as personal Experiences*, ed. by Sandu Frunză. *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies*, 10 (2005): 250-252. <http://www.jsri.ro>

Fackenheim, Emil L. *God's Presence in History: Jewish Affirmations and Philosophical Reflections*. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1972.

Gyémánt, Ladislau. "The Romanian Jewry: Historical Destiny, Tolerance, Integration, Marginalisation". *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies*, 3 (2002): 85-98. <http://www.jsri.ro>

Gyémánt, Ladislau. *Evreii din Transilvania*. Cluj-Napoca: Centre for Transylvanian Studies, Romanian Cultural Institute, 2004.

Handler, Richard. "Nationalism and the Politics of Culture in Quebec." In *New Directions in Anthropological Writing: History, Poetics, Cultural Criticism*, edited by E. George and James Clifford Marcus. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988.

Herder, Johann Gottfried. *Outlines of a Philosophy of the History of Man*. London: Printed for J. Johnson by L. Hansard, 1803.

Iancu, Carol. *Shoah în România. Evreii în timpul regimului Antonescu (1940-1944)*. Iași: Polirom, 2001.

Jonas, Hans. "God After Auschwitz". In *Holocaust Theology. A Reader*, edited by Dan Cohn-Sherbok. New York: New York University Press, 2002.

Kallós, Nicolae. *Crâmpeli de viață din secolul XX. Un dialog despre evreitate, holocaust și comunism ca experiențe personale*, ed. de Sandu Frunză. Iași: Editura Fundației Axis, 2003.

Katz, Steven T. *The Holocaust in Historical Context. The Holocaust and Mass Death before the Modern Age*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude, "L'identité. Séminaire interdisciplinaire 1974-75". In *Dicționarul alterității și al relațiilor interculturale*, edited by Gilles Ferréol and Guy Jucquois. Iași: Polirom, 2005.

Manea, Norman. *Întoarcerea Huliganului*. Iași: Polirom Publishing House, 1999.

Mendes-Flohr, Paul R. and Reinhartz Jehuda, eds., *The Jew in the Modern World. A documentary History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.

Oișteanu, Andrei. "Identitate evreiască și antisemitism." Paper presented at the international conference The Hebrew Identity and Anti-Semitism in

Central and South Eastern Europe, Goethe Institut, Bucharest, Romania, December 9-11, 2002.

Rorty, Richard. *Pragmatism și Filosofie Post-Nietzscheană. Eseuri Filosofice II*. Bucharest: Univers Publishing House, 2000.

Rubenstein, Richard L. *After Auschwitz*. New York: The Bobs-Merrill Company, 1966.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism. Concepțiile occidentale despre Orient*. Timișoara: Amarcord Publishing House, 2001.

Notes

¹ Norman Manea, *Întoarcerea Huliganului* (Iași: Polirom Publishing House, 1999), 212.

² Lyà Benjamin, "The determinants of Jewish Identity in Inter-War Transylvania," *Studia Iudaica* V (1996): 69.

³ Paul R. Mendes-Flohr and Jehuda Reinhardt, eds., *The Jew in the Modern World. A documentary History*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), 215.

⁴ One of the members of the Jewish Council (Judenrat) of the ghetto from Cluj, who, along with Rabbi Mozes Weinberger, Rabbi Akiba Glasner and Fischer, was entrusted, from the beginning of the ghettoization of the Jews from the Transylvanian city of Cluj, with administrative matters.

⁵ Benjamin, "The determinants of Jewish Identity in Inter-War Transylvania," 6.

⁶ Benjamin, "The determinants of Jewish Identity in Inter-War Transylvania," 71.

⁷ Nicolae Kallós, *Crâmpeii de viață din secolul XX. Un dialog despre evreitate, holocaust și comunism ca experiențe personale* (Iași: Editura Fundației Axis, 2003), 105. See also Codruța Cuceu, review of Nicolae Kallós. *A dialogue on Jewish identity, Holocaust, and Communism as personal Experiences* ed. by Sandu Frunză, *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies*, 10 (2005): 250-252. <http://www.jsri.ro>

⁸ Ladislau Gyémánt, *Evreii din Transilvania*, (Cluj-Napoca: Centre for Transylvanian Studies, Romanian Cultural Institute, 2004), 250. See also Ladislau Gyémánt, "The Romanian Jewry: Historical Destiny, Tolerance, Integration, Marginalisation", *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies*, 3 (2002): 85-98. <http://www.jsri.ro>

⁹ Kallós, 10.

¹⁰ Gyémánt, "Evreii din Transilvania," 259.

¹¹ Gyémánt, "Evreii din Transilvania," 72.

¹² Manea, 209-234.

¹³ Andrei Oișteanu, "Identitate evreiască și antisemitism" (paper presented at the interational conference The Hebrew Identity and Anti-Semitism in Central and South Eastern Europe, Goethe Institut, Bucharest, Romania, december 9-11, 2002).

¹⁴ Lyà Benjamin, "Supraviețuirea ca Rezistență," in *Permanențe și rupturi în Istoria Evreilor din România, secolele XIX-XX*, ed. Carol Iancu (București: Hasefer, 2006), 239.

¹⁵ Esther Benbassa and Jean-Christophe Attias, *Evreul și celălalt* (Bucharest: Est-Samuel Tastet Editeur, 2005), 81.

- ¹⁶ Benjamin, "Supraviețuirea ca Rezistență," 241.
- ¹⁷ Richard Rorty, *Pragmatism și Filosofie Post- Nietzscheană. Eseuri Filosofice II*, (Bucharest: Univers Publishing House, 2000) 304.
- ¹⁸ Claude Lévi-Strauss, "L'identité. Séminaire interdisciplinaire 1974-75", in ed. Gilles Ferréol and Guy Jucquois, *Dictionarul alterității și al relațiilor interculturale*, (Iași: Polirom, 2005), 328-338.
- ¹⁹ Edward W. Said, *Orientalism. Concepțiile occidentale despre Orient* (Timișoara: Amarcord Publishing House, 2001), 341.
- ²⁰ Said, 342.
- ²¹ Said, 342.
- ²² Oișteanu, 14.
- ²³ Oișteanu, 14.
- ²⁴ Johann Gottfried Herder, *Outlines of a Philosophy of the History of Man*, (London: Printed for J. Johnson by L. Hansard, 1803), 270.
- ²⁵ Herder, 271.
- ²⁶ Richard Handler, "Nationalism and the Politics of Culture in Quebec," in *New Directions in Anthropological Writing: History, Poetics, Cultural Criticism*, ed. E. George and James Clifford Marcus (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988), 7.
- ²⁷ See Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London and New York: Verso, 1991).
- ²⁸ Kallós, 105.
- ²⁹ Kallós, 105.
- ³⁰ Manea, 209-234.
- ³¹ Kallós, 105.
- ³² Oișteanu, 11.
- ³³ Hans Jonas, "God After Auschwitz", in ed. Dan Cohn-Sherbok, *Holocaust Theology. A Reader*, (New York: New York University Press, 2002), 138-140. On rethinking Judaism and Jewish identity see also: Richard L. Rubenstein, *After Auschwitz* (New York: The Bobs-Merrill Company, 1966), Emil L. Fackenheim, *God's Presence in History: Jewish Affirmations and Philosophical Reflections* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1972), Steven T. Katz, *The Holocaust in Historical Context. The Holocaust and Mass death before the Modern Age*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).
- ³⁴ Jonas, 138-140.
- ³⁵ Kallós, 59.
- ³⁶ Gyémánt, "Evreii din Transilvania," 269.
- ³⁷ Gyémánt, "Evreii din Transilvania," 271.
- ³⁸ Carol Iancu, *Shoah în România. Evreii în timpul regimului Antonescu (1940-1944)*, (Iași: Polirom, 2001), 185.
- ³⁹ Iancu, 50.
- ⁴⁰ Gyémánt, "Evreii din Transilvania," 275.
- ⁴¹ Gyémánt, "Evreii din Transilvania," 276.
- ⁴² Gyémánt, "Evreii din Transilvania," 277.