

Rabbi Dr. Jacob J. Schacter is University Professor of Jewish History and Jewish Thought and Senior Scholar at the Center for the Jewish Future, Yeshiva University

HOLOCAUST COMMEMORATION AND *TISH'A BE-AV*: THE DEBATE OVER “*YOM HA-SHO'A*”

Towards the end of November 1942, word reached the *Yishuv* in Israel for the first time about the full magnitude of the destruction of European Jewry that was by then well under way. Although from virtually the beginning of the war Jews in *Eretz Yisrael* had heard about the terrible deteriorating situation of their co-religionists in Europe, they partially discredited and dismissed those reports as rumor and exaggeration. It was only now, when a group of close to seventy eyewitnesses arrived from Europe, bearing first-hand testimony to the tragedy that was already unfolding, that they began to realize the enormity of the destruction. The horrible news of mass killings, death factories, live burials, and use of the fat of the dead for soap, among other atrocities, was now considered authoritative and reliable, and previous skepticism and doubt gave way to shocking acknowledgment and frightening acceptance. For the *Yishuv* in Israel, as well as for the world at large, there was no longer any doubt that a calculated, methodical, total, ruthless physical extermination and systematic genocide of the Jewish people was underway.

Reactions to this terrible news took different forms. On November 22, 1942, the Jewish Agency Executive, the highest governing political group of the *Yishuv*, met for the first time in a session devoted exclusively to the situation in Europe. It proposed a three-day period, beginning November 30, as days of “alarm, protest, and call to action” with the third day in particular, December 2, designated as a day devoted to prayer and fasting. And indeed, the newspapers reported that “a hun-

In memory of Rabbi Dr. Walter S. Wurzbarger whose combination of devoted rabbinic leadership, thoughtful sophisticated scholarship, exciting university-level teaching, and wide-ranging Jewish communal involvement served as an important personal role model for me. *Yehi zikhro barukh.*

dred thousand people participated” in memorial processions in different communities on those days. In addition, a month of mourning was established, from December 18, 1942 to January 16, 1943, with each Thursday set aside for fasting and prayer, although these later days were not as widely observed.¹ Shock waves continued to reverberate through the *Yishuv* throughout the first part of 1943.

The Chief Rabbinate of Israel assumed a major role in determining the nature of the religious reaction to this newly recognized reality. R. Yitshak Isaac ha-Levi Herzog, Ashkenazi Chief Rabbi since 1937, announced that December 2, 1942 / 23 Kislev 5703 would be a day of fasting and prayer (“*yom tsom gadol ve-evel kaved kelali*”) and he involved rabbis from many countries across the world—Egypt, Iran, Syria, Lebanon, Turkey, India, England, South Africa, Australia and America—to partner with him in this endeavor. On that day, a massive crowd of thousands, including several hundred rabbis led by the revered *Rebbe* of Gur, gathered first in the Hurvah Synagogue in Jerusalem’s Old City and then at the Kotel. They heard sounds of the shofar and recited prayers including verses from the Book of Lamentations and selections from the *Tish’a be-Av kinot*.²

It was around this time that R. Herzog paid a visit to R. Yitshak Ze’ev ha-Levi Soloveichik (known also as “Reb Velvel,” “the *Griz*,” and “the Brisker Rav”), son of the legendary R. Hayyim Soloveichik of Brisk and formidable Torah scholar in his own right, who had recently escaped from Europe and settled in Jerusalem.³ R. Herzog inquired whether R. Soloveichik would support the establishment of a “day of mourning (*yom evel*)” for the tragedy and destruction that was occurring in Europe. It is entirely possible that R. Herzog’s desire to gain broad support for his establishment of this one-time fast day of December 2 / 23 Kislev was what motivated him to approach R. Soloveichik. But he was to be disappointed. R. Soloveichik opposed R. Herzog’s initiative, basing his objection on a passage in one of the *kinot* recited on *Tish’a be-Av* dealing with the Crusades. The author of this *kina*, entitled “*Mi yiten roshi mayim*,” describes the devastation of the German communities of Speyer, Worms, and Mainz caused by the Crusaders at the end of the eleventh century. The *kina* is explicitly historical in orientation and notes the specific dates when the destruction of these Jewish communities took place: Speyer on the eighth of Iyyar, Worms on the twenty-third of that month and again on the first of Sivan, and Mainz two days later.⁴ Its author then addresses the question of why a *kina* about the destruction wrought by the Crusades is recited on

Tish'a be-Av if, as he just explicitly indicated, it did not occur on—or even within two months of—that day. His answer is clear and instructive: “Since one may not add a time [to commemorate] destruction and conflagration . . . therefore today [i.e., *Tish'a be-Av*] I will raise my cries of woe (*Ve-khi ein le-hosif mo'ed shever ve-tav'era . . . tachat ken ha-yom liviyati a'oreira*).”⁵ One cannot institute new days of commemoration for tragedies that followed the destructions of the Temples. There is one day in the Jewish calendar designated to commemorate Jewish tragedy and that day is *Tish'a be-Av*. Mourning for—and commemoration of—all subsequent Jewish tragedies are to take place on that date and on that date alone, wrote the author of this *kina*.⁶ As a result, argued R. Soloveichik, no special day of commemoration was established for the destruction wrought by the Crusaders; the appropriate day on which to remember this tragedy is *Tish'a be-Av*. He applied the principle delineated in this *kina* in the context of the Crusades to the situation he was facing in 1942-1943. On the basis of this statement, he concluded that establishing a special day of mourning for the growing number of Jews being exterminated in Europe would be inappropriate and contrary to Jewish tradition.⁷

This principle expressed in this *kina* is complicated and raises a series of questions, both per se as well as with regard to its application by R. Soloveichik to the events then unfolding in Europe:

1) Did the author of this *kina* really intend to establish his explanation justifying no fast day for the Crusades as a fundamental principle prohibiting for all time the establishment of any new additional days of commemoration for Jewish tragedy? Note that he uses the language of “*ein le-hosif*, one does not add,” and not “*asur le-hosif*, it is prohibited to add.” Is “*ein*” the poetic equivalent of the more halakhically resonant “*asur*” or did the author of the *kina* really mean to be more tentative and not write that, in fact, it is “*asur*” or prohibited by Jewish law?

2) Does the formulation of “*ein le-hosif*, one does not add,” reflect a reference to some pre-existent already accepted convention, i.e., it is already known and is already a norm of behavior that one simply does not add days of mourning? If so, what is the source for such an assertion? After all, *Tish'a be-Av* is not the only fast day in the Jewish calendar, and not even the only one associated with the destructions of the *batei mikdash*.⁸

3) There is ample evidence that a separate permanent fast day was, indeed, established, at least in the communities of Worms and Mayence, to commemorate the destruction wrought there by the Crusaders.⁹

4) According to R. Ephraim of Bonn, Rabbenu Tam established a permanent fast day on the twentieth of Sivan to commemorate the burning at the stake of over thirty Jews in Blois on that day in 1171, and even if that tradition may be questionable, there is no doubt that a fast day was established on that very day in 1650 to commemorate the widespread destruction caused by the Chmielnicki Massacres of 1648-1649 in Eastern Europe.¹⁰ Is this not a violation of the principle delineated here? Indeed, the late Jewish historian, Salo Baron, noted that the “legalistic” rationale presented in this Crusades *kina* “certainly was not a binding principle, as is attested not only by Jacob Tam’s action [in response to the Blois massacre], but also by the numerous local fasts and *purims*, observed in many countries through the ages.”¹¹

5) R. Soloveichik’s application of this principle to the situation he was confronting is problematic since it appears that R. Herzog was now suggesting only the establishment of a temporary, *ad hoc* fast day; only later (see below) was there talk about establishing a permanent fast day (“*le-dorot*”) to commemorate the victims of the Holocaust. Indeed, the establishment of temporary, *ad hoc*, fast days for different reasons has deep roots in Jewish tradition and, in fact, such days were instituted on a regular basis by the most respected rabbinic leaders even at this time, both before and during the war.¹² Why should R. Soloveichik have opposed a practice that has significant precedent in Jewish tradition?

6) Finally, the only source for the principle cited by R. Soloveichik was a statement in one of the *Tish’a be-Av kinos*, raising the question of how does a statement found in a liturgical context enjoy a legal status authoritative enough for determining normative halakhic or ritual behavior? Even if the decision regarding the first issue raised above is that the author of that text indeed did mean it to be halakhically authoritative, on what basis does it retain that status for future generations? Simply put, since when does a statement in a *kina* serve as a halakhic source?¹³

Of all the issues raised here, only the last one was explicitly acknowledged, and dismissed without explanation, by R. Soloveichik.¹⁴ In his view, *Tish’a be-Av* is the day, the only day, on which to commemorate Jewish tragedy, including the one that was unfolding in Europe before his eyes.

It is important to note that R. Soloveichik’s position on this matter was already formulated in 1942-1943, years before the founding of the State of Israel and its establishment of *Yom ha-Sho’a*. There is thus no basis for those who claim that his position was framed as a reaction to

TRADITION

the establishment of that day by the Knesset, the official governmental body of the Zionist State of Israel, out of a desire to totally dissociate his segment of the community from any involvement in an initiative spearheaded by secularists.¹⁵ While his opinion was, indeed, later invoked in opposition to the official Israeli government's establishment of *Yom ha-Sho'a*,¹⁶ this clearly was not the basis for R. Soloveichik's initial position. He was not objecting to *Yom ha-Sho'a*; he was objecting to the addition of any day of mourning to the Jewish calendar, on principled traditional grounds. In his opinion, after the destruction of the Temples and the establishment of *Tish'a be-Av*, Jews just don't establish new days of mourning, period. *Tish'a be-Av* is the day, the only day, on which to commemorate Jewish tragedy.

Indeed, this principle expressed—and, to the best of my knowledge, first formulated—by R. Soloveichik proved to be a very influential one in later generations, particularly in the context of Holocaust commemoration. After the war, the question moved from establishing a one-time *ad hoc* fast day for the destruction to establishing a ritually mandated permanent fast day to commemorate the unprecedented tragedy that had taken place. In a letter dated Spring of 1982, R. Moses Feinstein responded to a question posed to him as to why no fast day had as yet been established for the victims of the Holocaust. Echoing R. Soloveichik's reasoning he wrote:

With regard to the evil decrees which, because of our many sins, brought death to around six million [Jews] at the hands of the wicked Hitler and his cohorts, may their names be eradicated, it would have seemed appropriate to have established some designated day for fasting and prayer (“*eizeh yom kavu'a le-ta'anit u-leTefila*”). You wonder why nothing has yet been done [in this regard].

Behold, in the kinot which all Jews recite on *Tish'a be-Av* it is clearly stated why they did not establish a special day for fasting and mourning (“*yom meyuhad le-ta'anit u-leBekhiya*”) for the tragedies of the Crusades. These massacres occurred in all European countries, where the majority of the Jews lived and where many cities and villages were destroyed. This [tragedy] is known by the name, “The Year 1096.” In Palestine, as well, they killed many Jews. [The reason given for not establishing such a day was] because it is no longer permitted to establish an additional day for fasting and mourning (“*le-ta'anit u-leBekhi*”). It is therefore necessary to mention these tragedies in the elegies that are recited on *Tish'a be-Av* over the destruction of the Holy Temple.

For that very same reason one should also not establish a single special day for the tragedies that occurred in our time. These are included among all the tragedies that occurred during the course of this entire long *galut*.¹⁷

The genuine and legitimate need to mourn for and remember the victims of the Holocaust cannot justify the establishment of any new specially designated day of fasting and mourning for that purpose, wrote R. Feinstein. Although the victims of the Holocaust deserved all three, they were to be treated no differently that were the victims of the Crusades. Like their fellow martyrs at the end of the eleventh century, the day on which their martyrdom was to be remembered and mourned is to be *Tish'a be-Av*, and *Tish'a be-Av* alone.

Indeed, this rationale opposing the establishment of a fast day for the victims of the Holocaust articulated by R. Soloveichik and R. Feinstein was cited in a number of different sources.¹⁸ *Tish'a be-Av* is the day, the only day, on which to commemorate Jewish tragedy.

It is important to note two factors in connection with this rationale. First, the opposition expressed here was explicitly to the establishment of a fast day, whether *ad hoc* or permanent; nothing is mentioned about a “day of commemoration” which lacks any mandated normative ritual behavior.¹⁹ Second, once again, there is nothing here about anti-Zionism or distance from secularists; the opposition is framed purely on internal traditional grounds.

It is interesting that R. Herzog explicitly rejected this interpretation of this *kina* and its application to a fast day for the Holocaust as presented by Rabbis Soloveichik, Feinstein, and others, and went so far as to allow even a permanent ritually mandated fast day (“*le-dorot*”) to be established in commemoration of the Holocaust. Towards the end of the war, on 16 Tevet 5705 (January 1, 1945), he responded to a question from R. Hizkiyahu Yosef Mishkovsky, inquiring as to “whether the scholars of our generation have the power and wherewithal to establish a fast day binding for all generations (*likbo'a yom ta'anit le-dorot*) to remember the days of the *Sho'a*.”²⁰ After marshalling all the evidence he thought was necessary in support of his ruling that, indeed, such an enactment was possible, R. Herzog addressed the issue of the precedent to the contrary raised by these words in the *kina*. In the postscript to his responsum on this issue, he wrote: “It has also been brought to my attention with regard to that which is said in the *kina* of “*Mi yiten roshi mayim*”. . . . From here there are those who want to deduce that one

cannot add a fast day. . . .” In an apparent reference to his conversation some two years earlier with R. Soloveitchik described above, R. Herzog noted that someone pointed out to him that no fast days should be added to the Jewish calendar in commemoration of any post-Temple destruction tragedies, based on this *kina*, thus providing a proof-text contrary to his conclusion that it was appropriate to establish precisely such a day to commemorate the destruction caused during the Holocaust. In response, R. Herzog presented an entirely different interpretation of this passage in the *kina*, suggesting that it not be understood as a blanket prohibition against adding separate days of fasting and mourning for new Jewish tragedies but rather that, based on the context, it refers to prohibiting expressions of sadness and mourning specifically on the holiday of *Shavu'ot*.²¹

The fact is, however, that R. Herzog's interpretation of this *kina* is clearly forced and not convincing. Indeed, the straightforward reading of this passage supports the interpretation of Rabbis Soloveichik, Feinstein, and others. Furthermore, although R. Herzog concluded that the establishment of a special fast day to commemorate the Holocaust was halakhically appropriate, he deferred from going ahead and actually establishing one. R. Herzog concluded his responsum with the following: “However, someone pointed out something in opposition to me saying, ‘The war is not yet over and, who knows, maybe that which occurred to us is *hevlei mashiach*. Therefore we should postpone the proposal until after [the end of] the war.’ This reasoning has merit and is worthy of consideration.” R. Herzog did not establish such a fast day then and, in fact, there is no evidence that he ever came back to it again before his death in July 1959.²²

After the war, discussions began in Israel as to what day would be best suited to be set aside to commemorate the Holocaust.²³ At first, the day of *Tish'a be-Av* played a significant role in the discussion. In the early 1950s, a proposal was circulated suggesting that, in fact, two days be set aside annually to remember the Holocaust, one corresponding to the day of the start of the Warsaw Ghetto uprising to commemorate the heroism displayed during the Holocaust and the other on *Tish'a be-Av*, the classic day of Jewish mourning.²⁴ Indeed, there had already been earlier associations between the Holocaust and *Tish'a be-Av*. Already in 1942, a special memorial prayer for the victims of the Holocaust was composed by the Chief Rabbinate of England and recited there on *Tish'a be-Av* of that year. Also, two days before that *Tish'a be-Av* (July 21, 1942), well over 20,000 people attended a rally in and around

Madison Square Garden in New York City addressed by New York Mayor Fiorello La Guardia and others to protest Nazi atrocities and on *Tish'a be-Av* itself the chaplain of the United States House of Representatives opened that day's session of the House with a prayer for the Jews who were being murdered.²⁵

The Chief Rabbinate of Israel also attempted to address the matter of Holocaust commemoration and, in a meeting of rabbis held under its auspices in the Hurvah Shul in the Old City of Jerusalem in March 1945 (Adar 5705), it decided to designate the last week in Adar as a one-time week of mourning for the victims of the Holocaust followed by a full fast day on *Erev Rosh Hodesh* Nisan.²⁶ More well known was the effort by the Chief Rabbinate to establish the fast day of *Asara be-Tevet* as "*Yom ha-Kaddish ha-Kelali*," a day to be set aside annually for the recital of *kaddish* by all those who did not know the date of the murder of their loved ones.²⁷

Ultimately, however, all these proposals, including the attempt to link Holocaust commemoration with *Tish'a be-Av*, were rejected and, first in 1951 and finally in 1959 when it became law, the twenty-seventh day of Nisan was designated by the Knesset as the day to commemorate the Holocaust.²⁸ This is not the place to explain how this particular day came to be chosen; indeed, not a single special event occurred on it that should have made it any more appropriate than any other day of the year to be designated for that purpose.²⁹ Some are under the mistaken impression that it marks the anniversary of the beginning of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising,³⁰ but that occurred on *Erev Pesah*, 14 Nisan.³¹ But, for various reasons (primarily as a political compromise between those who insisted that it be on or near the day of the beginning of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising and those who insisted that it not be on *Pesah* and preferably not even in the month of Nisan), it was so designated and, once that was the case, the issue arose as to the attitude of the traditional community to this day. The question now was not with regard to a ritually mandated and traditionally observed fast day; it was with regard to a "mere" day of commemoration and remembrance, devoid of any formally required religious or ritual practices.

Many rationales were—and continue to be—offered by segments of the traditional community in opposition to the establishment of *Yom ha-Sho'a* as a separate day of commemoration for the Holocaust. They include the following:

1) The Holocaust is not a unique event requiring its own separate day of commemoration. It is, rather, one more horrible tragedy to be

TRADITION

plotted along the continuum of other tragedies that befell the Jewish people throughout history. Although, indeed, more severe than the others, it is part of the same category of tragedies that includes the destruction of both Temples, the Ten Martyrs, the Crusades, and all other Jewish tragedies which are to be commemorated on *Tish'a be-Av*.

2) It is inappropriate to commemorate the Holocaust in Nisan, the month of redemption (“*hodesh ha-ge'ula*”), during which time the recital of *tabanun*, fasting, *hazkarat neshamot*, and eulogies are prohibited.

3) *Yom ha-Sho'a* is nothing more than the invention of the secular Zionist Knesset, and since when do secularists—and anti-religious ones at that—have any religious authority to establish a day, or anything for that matter, of even the slightest religious significance.

4) The official name of this day, *Yom ha-Sho'a ve-haGevura*, as well as its close proximity to the anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising preceding it, is offensive because it privileges armed resistance over more spiritual forms of heroism. Genuine Jewish heroism entails living a life of morality, optimism, and hope and maintaining a will to live with human decency in the face of the most unspeakable bestiality, lining up for hours to have one minute with a pair of *tefillin*, smuggling a *shofar* into concentration camps, sharing half a piece of bread with a starving barracks-mate, and more. These are examples of *real* Jewish heroism.

5) Its close proximity to *Yom ha-Atsma'ut* following it gives the offensive impression as if the Holocaust was a necessary prelude to the founding of the State of Israel.

6) No single once-a-year day of commemoration is necessary for a community that lives with the aftermath of the Holocaust and most appropriately commemorates it through Torah study and observance of *mitsvot* every day of the year.

7) A one day commemoration risks falling prey to the “Mother’s Day Syndrome,” where one day of focus masks three-hundred-and-fifty-three days of apathy and neglect.

8) The traditional Jewish response is not to sanctify the suffering but to focus on the rebuilding of the future.

9) The pain experienced on the single day designated to commemorate the Holocaust would be so sharp and deep that it would result in a major ongoing depression too intense to overcome. This would be contrary to Jewish tradition that places limitations on the mourning experience.

10) Finally, the form of commemoration mandated by Israeli law is alien to Jewish tradition. Secular ceremonies like halting public and pri-

vate transportation to listen to a two-minute siren, a moment of silence, lowering the flag to half-mast, and sad music are simply imitations of *goyishe* practices (“vapid ceremonies and vain rituals drawn from heathen idolatry”) and not appropriate and are, anyway, ineffective.³²

It is important to note an additional, theological, reason that also needs to be considered in explaining the rejection of *Yom ha-Sho'a* and the insistence on *Tish'a be-Av* as the day of Holocaust commemoration. Acknowledging that this tragedy was so horrible, so unique, so unprecedented, and so *sui generis* that it could not be subsumed under *Tish'a be-Av* and is therefore deserving of its own day of commemoration opens up the possibility that the age-old traditional “explanations” that had been presented in connection with *Tish'a be-Av* would not also be applicable to the Holocaust. For example, “*mipenei hata'einu galinu me-artsenu*,” the fundamental and oft-cited “explanation” or “justification” for Jewish tragedy, could not be used to “explain” the Holocaust. And, when familiar, time-tested “interpretations” of Jewish tragedy are no longer considered sufficient, the resultant challenge to one’s faith might become something too difficult to bear. In order to avoid—or, maybe, attempt to “solve”—the theological challenge posed by the Holocaust, it was much easier to subsume and absorb this tragedy—as horrible, unique, unprecedented, and *sui generis* as it was recognized to be—into previously established patterns and archetypes, allowing whatever “explanation” given to them to apply now as well. Such a conception, in which even the unprecedented was assigned a precedent, was a comfortable and reassuring one, allowing for the classical covenantal construct to remain intact in the face of potential discontinuity and even rupture. This continuity with the past helped avoid a crisis of faith in the present and helped provide great hope for the future.³³ Menachem Friedman expresses this point very clearly:

The significance of the Holocaust within the framework of Jewish history is as fraught with religious meaning as it is with political and social ramifications in the post-Holocaust Jewish society. If religious traditional historiography sees Auschwitz as part of Jewish history, it must be viewed within the traditional parameters of transgression and punishment. In this sense the Holocaust is a ‘punishment’ for the sins of the Jewish people, just as all calamities visited upon the Jewish people throughout its singular history are due to its sins and transgressions. . . . On the other hand, if Auschwitz is not part of Jewish history, it becomes a singular phenomenon on the historical-religious plane as well, a terrible divine secret with unfathomable meanings which we are neither able nor permitted to uncover.³⁴

TRADITION

Indeed, does not such a “terrible divine secret” become simply too difficult to bear? Is it not helpful to see all Jewish tragedy, including the Holocaust, in the context of *Tish’a be-Av*, even if such a perspective involves not a small measure of strain? For some, framing the tragedy this way is worth the price for not a small measure of consolation. For others, it is a price too high to pay with the result that consolation, at any level, remains elusive and maybe even impossible.

In any case, one of the most fundamental objections raised by some members of the traditionalist community to the establishment of *Yom ha-Sho’a* was—and is—the aversion to new days of mourning based on the wording of the above-cited *Tish’a be-Av kina*. The establishment of *Yom ha-Sho’a* flew in the face of centuries old Jewish practice and therefore needed to be rejected.³⁵

This position was forcefully and repeatedly articulated by R. Joseph B. Soloveitchik (“the Rav”), nephew of R. Yitshak Ze’ev ha-Levi Soloveichik, the Brisker Rav. From the late 1960s until the mid 1980s, the Rav would spend all or much of the day of *Tish’a be-Av* involved in the recitation and study of the *kinot*. I recently published a book presenting much of the Rav’s *Tish’a be-Av* teachings over the years.³⁶

One of the primary arguments the Rav made year in and year out was that *Tish’a be-Av* was meant not only to commemorate those events that took place on that day (see *Ta’anit* 26a-b and elsewhere), but that it was a day set aside to commemorate *all* Jewish tragedies, whether or not they were directly related to the destructions of the Temples and whether or not they actually occurred on that day. This explains the inclusion of references in the *kinot* of *Tish’a be-Av* to the exile of the Ten Tribes that predated the destruction of the first Temple and full *kinot* commemorating the murder of the Ten Martyrs, the destruction of German communities in the Rhine Valley by the Crusades at the end of the eleventh century, and the burning of wagon loads of sacred books in France towards the middle of the thirteenth century. It is appropriate to commemorate all of these events on *Tish’a be-Av*, taught R. Soloveitchik, on the one day designated to remember all the tragedies that were so much a part of the Jewish historical experience.³⁷

Clearly relevant here is the Holocaust of the twentieth century. The Rav felt very strongly that the commemoration of this major modern tragedy also needed to be merged with and included in the observance of *Tish’a be-Av*, and this on two levels. First, he felt that *Tish’a be-Av* was the *only* appropriate day on which to commemorate it; this was the day set aside to remember and mourn for all Jewish tragedies, including

the Holocaust. Second, the Rav took the even more extreme position, opposing the composition of any new *kinot* exclusively for the Holocaust even if they were meant to be recited only on *Tish'a be-Av*. The centuries-old *Tish'a be-Av kinot* were to be understood as relevant to the Holocaust as well.

The Rav voiced his opposition to the establishment of a separate day to commemorate the Holocaust almost every year during his recital and teaching of the *kinot*. When he came to the phrase in the *kina* beginning “*Mi yiten roshi mayim*” discussed above, where the author explains why he composed an elegy for the Jewish communities of Speyer, Worms, and Mainz destroyed by the Crusaders to be recited on *Tish'a be-Av* even though their destruction did not occur on, or near, that day, the Rav paused to explain that this objection to setting aside a separate day to commemorate the Crusades applies to the Holocaust as well. Directly following, though not quoting, his uncle’s position described above, the Rav considered a separate *Yom ha-Sho'a* inappropriate; in his view, the Holocaust, like all Jewish tragedies, should be commemorated only on *Tish'a be-Av*.³⁸

A number of rationales were mentioned earlier to explain the position of those opposed to the establishment of *Yom ha-Sho'a*. Only the first one was explicitly invoked by the Rav in his consideration of this matter. His objection was based exclusively on his conception of *Tish'a be-Av* as the appropriate day to commemorate all Jewish tragedy and, like his uncle, he based his opinion on the *kina* cited here.

In addition, the Rav took a strong position against the recitation of any new *kinot* written exclusively for the Holocaust. Here too, the rationales offered by those opposed to this practice were varied. They included:

1) The composition of *kinot* is of the highest spiritual order and no one is any longer on the level of those authentic rabbinic leaders (“*gedolei Yisrael ha-amitiyyim*”), blessed with exalted sanctity and piety, who were in a position to compose them in the past. In effect, the canon of *kinot* is closed to any further additions.

2) No one today has the linguistic or stylistic ability to capture the intensity of the destruction wrought during the Holocaust and the depths of the suffering felt by those who experienced it. In the face of such awesome and unspeakable tragedy, only silence is appropriate.

3) Even if one did have this ability, the tragedy was so enormous and overwhelming it could not possibly be fully and comprehensively described and, as a result, it is better not described at all.

TRADITION

4) Since great rabbinic leaders who survived the war, like R. Yosef Yitshak Schneerson and R. Isser Zalman Meltzer, did not compose *kinot*, and since almost all of *Gedolei Yisrael* opposed their composition, there must be a good reason not to do it even if we do not understand their rationale.

5) No one today has any authority to establish any new *takanot* affecting the entire Jewish people and possibly even only local communities.

6) There were countless tragedies that we Jews suffered throughout our history that did not merit having *kinot* written for them. Only great rabbinic authorities are in a position to determine which tragedies are worthy of *kinot* and we no longer have rabbis of such great stature.

7) Any alteration of tradition, however slight, is unacceptable because it sets a dangerous precedent.

8) All Jewish tragedies, including the Holocaust, stem from the fact that the *bet ha-mikdash* was destroyed; they are all extensions of the *hurban*. Indeed, the Book of *Eikha* describes events that occurred during the Holocaust as well. As a result, any specific *kinot* for the Holocaust would be unnecessary and superfluous.

9) Let us first make sure we recite already existing *kinot* before composing new ones.

10) There was one argument that even went so far as to suggest that the Holocaust was not worthy of new *kinot*.³⁹

The Rav framed his position opposing the recital of *kinot* specifically composed for the Holocaust, even if they were to be recited on *Tish'a be-Av*, in the context of the first of the objections mentioned above. He felt that no contemporary human being has the appropriate qualities of faith, soul, and experience indispensable for such a task. While teaching the *Kinot* on *Tish'a be-Av* he said:

An imitation of a *kina* was written for those killed by Hitler in the 1940s, and not badly written. Some rabbis in Eretz Yisrael accepted it, but I do not like it. I do not like new “prayers.” I cannot use it because, in my opinion, there is no one, no contemporary, who has all the qualities indispensable for writing prayers. I am always reluctant to accept new compositions; in general, I do not trust anyone who tells me he intends to compose a prayer. I do not believe in so-called liturgical creativity or creative liturgy. The Gemara (*Megila* 17b) says that “One hundred and twenty elders, among whom were many prophets,” wrote our Shemone Esre. Only they could write it.

Prayer is not just a hymn, but a copy of a conversation between *Ha-Kadosh Barukh Hu* and a human being. Who can write such a conversation? Only the Men of the Great Assembly and the prophets were able to do it. That is why we are so careful about every word in the *nusah ha-tefilla*, the text of the liturgy. . . .

I cannot trust others to do it. Not that I am suspicious. Not that I, God forbid, have anything against the author of a contemporary *kina*. I just do not believe that a contemporary has the inner ability, the faith, the depth, the sweep of experience, the ecstasy, and the *taharat ha-nefesh*, the purity of soul, that would authorize him or give him permission to write a *piyut*. I just do not believe that there is anyone today who is qualified to do this.⁴⁰

As a result, R. Soloveitchik insisted that when one reads the *kinot* about the Crusades, one should bear in mind that they relate not only to the devastation of the Rhine Valley Jewish communities in Germany at the end of the eleventh century, but also to the destruction of the Jewish communities of Vilna and Warsaw and the thousands of towns and villages throughout Europe where faithful, dedicated, and devoted Jews lived sacred lives committed to Torah and *mitsvot* and were murdered during the Second World War. He said:

Of course, there is no doubt that on Tish'ah be-Av we should recite a special *kina* for those who were killed by Hitler. In the last *hurban* we lost many more people than in the destruction of the first and second *Batei Mikdash*. Of course, the six million Jews deserve to be eulogized on Tish'ah be-Av. But we do so within the frame of reference of the *kinot* we already recite on that day. Instead of Vilna, we mention Worms or Mayence. It does not make much difference, because the scenes described and the words of despair, mourning, and grief are the same. One has in mind to remember and experience the catastrophe, the disaster, that occurred in the forties of the twentieth century within the frame of reference of what is described here as having taken place in the eleventh century. When we recite the *kinot* about Speyer, Mayence, and Worms, about the communities that were destroyed, the people exterminated and the *Gedolei Yisrael* killed by the Crusaders, we must remember that what is described there happened not only then, in 1096, but in the 1940s. Exactly the way Torah centers were destroyed in Germany in the time of the Crusades were the centers of Torah destroyed in Poland and Lithuania during the Hitler period. It happened throughout Europe, particularly in Central and Eastern Europe, Lithuania and White Russia. We need to see these *kinot* not only as a

TRADITION

eulogy for those killed in medieval German communities, but for everyone killed in Warsaw and Vilna and the hundreds and thousands of towns and villages where millions of faithful, devoted, and dedicated Jews lived a holy life, a sacred life, and a committed life, and where they were simply exterminated.⁴¹

It is interesting that R. Soloveitchik's position elicited different and unexpected reactions, both negative and positive. In an article published a few years ago, one of the Rav's grandchildren, R. Mosheh Lichtenstein, was critical of his grandfather's position. "It seems to me that the State acted correctly in not accepting the Rav's proposal," he wrote. He argued that direct unmediated contact with the brutality of the Holocaust via survivors still alive in significant numbers in the State of Israel cannot result in anything but setting aside a special day to commemorate it. Whether in reality the Holocaust is *sui generis* and "unique" or is fundamentally anchored in the millennia old Jewish experience of tragedy is, he argued, frankly irrelevant. As long as there are many survivors still alive in the State of Israel, the relationship of the State qua state to the Holocaust needs to be animated by emotions and feelings and not by objective, rational categories of thought. Hence, out of respect, empathy, and sensitivity to the feelings of the survivors, the Holocaust must be officially treated by the State as belonging to a category all by itself and a separate day set aside for its commemoration is a necessity. Yes, wrote R. Lichtenstein, the day may come when his grandfather's position might indeed be implemented but to do so now, even more than a half-century after the end of the war, would be premature; it would reflect a lack of awareness of the centrality of the Holocaust in contemporary Israeli life. At the present time, he argued, we are still too close to the event to subsume it under other, earlier tragedies far removed from that which occurred to so many of those who are alive today.⁴²

R. Lichtenstein began his critique of his grandfather's position with reference to the famous meeting in the summer of 1977 between the Rav and then Prime Minister Menachem Begin where they discussed the issue of commemorating *Yom ha-Sho'a* on *Tish'a be-Av*.⁴³ Of all the political leaders in Israel, Begin was probably the one for whom the Holocaust loomed the largest in his personal and political life. He invoked the Holocaust regularly in his public pronouncements and made it a, if not the, central cornerstone of his formulation of the national Israeli discourse during his many decades of public service.⁴⁴

He even went so far as to invoke the Holocaust in expressing his support for a law opposing the raising of pigs in Israel, noting that this huge tragedy that claimed the lives of his parents required him to remain true to the values of the Jewish tradition to which they were deeply committed.⁴⁵ In the words of his long-time secretary, Yehiel Kadishai, “The Holocaust played a major role in the forming of Begin’s political identity.”⁴⁶ It is therefore particularly interesting, in light of R. Lichtenstein’s critique, that it is none other than Menachem Begin who fully agreed with the Rav’s position. He was sworn in as Israel’s Prime Minister on June 20, 1977 and less than two months later acted to eliminate *Yom ha-Sho’a*, a day on which Israeli society had by then been commemorating the Holocaust for close to two decades, and to move the commemoration to the ancient day of *Tish’a be-Av*. In fact, in a speech delivered to the Knesset on August 2, 1977, shortly after returning from his trip to the United States during which he met with R. Soloveitchik, Begin claimed that he was the one who took the initiative to propose that *Yom ha-Sho’a* be observed on *Tish’a be-Av* and that the Rav supported his proposal.⁴⁷

In light of the central place the Holocaust occupied in Begin’s world view, it is hard to understand his position. In fact, Emil Fackenheim, who insisted upon the importance of keeping *Yom ha-Sho’a* separate from *Tish’a be-Av*, noted in an interview, that Begin’s position surprised him and suggested that “maybe he was pandering to the ultra-Orthodox.”⁴⁸ Some have suggested that it must be seen in the context of Begin’s more general ideology vis-à-vis the Labor Party and other political considerations of his.⁴⁹ Begin’s position requires a more careful analysis that is outside the purview of this article and the expertise of its author.⁵⁰

In any case, there was strong opposition to the Begin proposal and it never got off the ground. In a conversation (May 14, 2001), R. Aharon Lichtenstein told me that Begin convened a meeting in the Bet ha-Nasi of some sixty intellectuals to discuss switching *Yom ha-Sho’a* to *Tish’a be-Av* and not a single person present supported it. The arguments voiced against that proposal included: 1) If the day commemorating the Holocaust would be in the summertime, an important educational opportunity to teach about that horrible Jewish tragedy in the Israeli school system would be lost; 2) *Tish’a be-Av* would be swallowed up by *Yom ha-Sho’a*; 3) *Yom ha-Sho’a* would be swallowed up by *Tish’a be-Av*.⁵¹ In Israel and in the Diaspora, *Yom ha-Sho’a ve-haGevura* continues to be observed of the twenty-seventh of Nisan.

TRADITION

I conclude with some personal observations that I consider disturbing and upsetting.⁵² It would appear from my presentation that we are left with two days on which it is appropriate to remember and mourn for the Holocaust, the ancient day of *Tish'a be-Av* and the modern day of *Yom ha-Sho'a*. But, to my mind, we are left, in fact, with no days on which to remember and mourn for the Holocaust in any meaningful way. My experience over the last three decades has demonstrated to me that to do so on *Tish'a be-Av* sidelines the Holocaust in the shadow of the pre-eminent focus of that day on the destruction of the Temples and the diminution of *kevod Yisrael*. The reality is that *Tish'a be-Av* privileges the destruction of the Temples and their aftermath and the result is that even those who do add a special *kina* for the Holocaust, or do think or speak about Vilna when reading about Mainz, do so only tangentially and almost as an afterthought. What will motivate anyone to recite the optional Holocaust *kina* or remember pre-war Warsaw in a mere fifty years from now, or even less? The third of the three objections to the Begin proposal just presented has, I fear, proven true. *Yom ha-Sho'a* has indeed been swallowed up by *Tish'a be-Av*. The ashes of Auschwitz have been buried under the overwhelming focus on the *hurban*.

And, at the same time, I am sadly doubtful whether the twenty-seventh of Nisan observance of *Yom ha-Sho'a* will have any ultimate, lasting significance outside of the State of Israel, and even within it. Various “rituals of memory” have been suggested—and adopted—in recent years in an attempt to inhere the commemoration with a greater degree of substance and meaning. They include lighting candles, creating and attending commemorative services and “*Yom ha-Sho'a* seders” featuring the reading of *megilot* of testimony and lists of names of the victims, eating special food, wearing special dress, and even fasting.⁵³ But they have all remained optional and voluntary, and have failed to capture the imaginations of more than a handful of Jews. In truth, I have had the privilege of recently speaking at two Holocaust commemoration events, the Yom Hashoah commemoration in the Five Towns at Congregation Beth Sholom in New York in April, 2007 and the Opening Night Program of Holocaust Education Week in Toronto the following November. The first program drew around a thousand people and I’m told that approximately 25,000 people attend the over one hundred programs that comprise Toronto’s annual week-long commemoration. Nevertheless, I continue to suspect that more and more, communal commemorations are attended by less and less. The fact

remains that nothing formal was ever done to anchor the collective memory of one of the most horrific events—if not *the* most horrific—in Jewish history in the context of any religiously mandated ritual behavior, and I fear that we are already paying—and will continue to pay—a heavy price for this neglect. Even in Israel, where Holocaust commemoration is mandated by law, I fear that in a few generations it will lose its significance and am deeply concerned that in the not to distant future commemorative events will ring hollow and irrelevant. Despite the fact that the *kedoshim* surely deserve to be remembered for all time and despite our best intentions to assure that they will be, I unfortunately am not confident that a “*yom zikhron ve-evel meiyuhad*,” simply a day of mourning and remembering, will have a lasting place in the annual cycle of the Jewish calendar once the survivors—and I will add their grandchildren and even children—are gone.⁵⁴ In the end, I am deeply concerned that neither the ninth of Av nor the twenty-seventh of Nisan will serve as lasting memorials—*le-dorot*, for all future generations—for *ha-hasidim ve-ha-yesharim ve-ha-Temimim*, *kehillot ha-kodesh she-masru nafsham al kedushat Hashem* in the conflagration that consumed six million of our people some sixty to seventy years ago. *Hashem yinkom damam*.

NOTES

My thanks to R. Reuven Bulka, Guest Editor of this issue, R. Kenneth Hain and Mr. Menachem Butler for their thoughtful comments and suggestions.

1. There is a large and growing literature on November 1942 as the turning point in the *Yishuv*'s perception of events that were unfolding in Europe. See, for example, Hava Wagman-Eshkoli, “*Emdat ha-Manbigut ha-Yehudit bi-Erets Yisrael le-Hatsalat Yehudei Eiropa*,” *Yalkut Moreshet* 24 (October 1977), 87-97; Dina Porat, *Hanhaga be-Milkud* (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1986), 23-67, expanded and translated into English as *The Blue and the Yellow Stars of David* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1990), 5-54. See too idem, “Palestinian Jewry and the Jewish Agency: Public Response to the Holocaust,” in *Vision and Conflict in the Holy Land*, ed. Richard I. Cohen (Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1985), 246-73; Tom Segev, *The Seventh Million: The Israelis and the Holocaust* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1993), 73-76; Yoav Gelber, “Zionist Policy and the Fate of European Jewry (1939-1942),” *Yad Vashem Studies* 13

(1979), 169-210; idem, "Zionist Policy and the Fate of European Jewry, 1943-1944," *Studies in Zionism* 7 (1983), 133-67; idem, "Yishuv," in Walter Laqueur, ed., *The Holocaust Encyclopedia* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001), 704; Yechiam Weitz, "The Yishuv's Response to the Destruction of European Jewry, 1942-1943," *Studies in Zionism* 8:2 (1987), 211-22; idem, "*Hebeitim be-Yahas ha-Yishuv ba-Arets el Sho'at Yehudei Eiropa, 1942-1943*," in *Nekudot Tazpiti: Tarbut ve-Hevra be-Erets Yisrael*, ed. Nurit Graetz (Tel Aviv: Ha-Universitah ha-Petuhah, 1988), 74-85; idem, "The Yishuv's Self-Image and the Reality of the Holocaust," *The Jerusalem Quarterly* 48 (1988), 73-87; Anita Shapira, *Land and Power: The Zionist Resort to Force, 1881-1948* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 39f.; Yechiam Weitz, "Revisionist Criticism of the Yishuv Leadership During the Holocaust," *Yad Vashem Studies* 23 (1993), 381; Dalia Ofer, "Israel," in *The World Reacts to the Holocaust*, ed. David S. Wyman (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), 848; Dina Porat and Yechiam Wertz, eds., *Bein Magen David le-Telai Tshov* (Jerusalem: Yad Vashem and Yad Yitshak Ben-Tsevi, 2002), 105-12; Dina Porat and Mordecai Naor, eds., *Ha-Itonut ha-Yehudit bi-Erets Yisrael Nokhah ha-Sho'a 1939-1945* (Tel-Aviv: Misrad ha-Bitahon, 2002), 35, 40, 47-48, 56, 102, 124, 125, 231, and more; Hava Eshkoli Wagman, *Bein Hatsala le-Geula: Ha-Tsiyonut ha-Datit bi-Erets Yisrael le-Nokhah ha-Sho'a* (Jerusalem: Yad Vashem, 2004), 255-63; Roni Stauber, *Ha-Lekah le-Dor* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben Zvi, 2000), 14-18. This book has recently been translated into English as *The Holocaust in Israeli Public Debate in the 1950s* (London and Portland: Vallentine Mitchell, 2007).

- For a transcript of the Jewish Agency Executive meeting of November 22 and the official notice it placed in the newspaper *Haaretz* on November 23, see Dina Porat and Yechiam Weitz, eds., *Bein Magen David le-Telai Zahav* (Jerusalem: Yad Vashem and Yad Yitshak Ben-Zvi, 2002), 105-103. See too Moshe Atiash, ed., *Sefer ha-Te'udot shel ha-Va'ad ha-Le'umi le-Keneset Yisrael be-Erets Yisrael 1918-1948* (Jerusalem: 1963), 330-35.
2. See Shmuel Avidor Hakohen, *Yahid be-Doro* (Jerusalem: Keter, 1980), 193-95; "Hakhrazat Agudat ha-Rabbanim," *Hapardes* 16:10 (January 1943), 3; "Kinus Rabbanei Erets Yisrael," *Hapardes* 16:10 (January 1943), 3-5; Moshe Prager, *Hurban Yisrael be-Eiropa* (Ein Harod: Hakibutz Hameuchad Ltd., 1947), 305; Yehudit Tydor Baumel, *Kol Bikhyot—ha-Sho'a ve-haTefila* (Jerusalem: Bar Ilan University, 1992), 54; Shabtai Teveth, *Ben-Gurion and the Holocaust* (New York, San Diego and London: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1996), 233. For a copy of the public announcement, see R. Yehudah Shaviv, "*Zikaron la-Sho'a*," in *Ha-Rabbanut ha-Rashit le-Yisrael: Shiv'im Shana le-Yisuda*, vol. 2, ed. Itamar Warhaftig and Shmuel Katz (Jerusalem: Heikhal Shlomo, 2002), 465. A typewritten copy of the Chief Rabbi's pronouncement with corrections in his handwriting is found in the R. Herzog Archives in Heikhal Shlomo in Jerusalem. My thanks to Mr. Yehuda Levi Aldima of Heikhal Shlomo and Professor Daniel Sperber for arranging for me to have access to it.

- Although a few studies have appeared on R. Herzog, his life and thought have yet to receive the attention they deserve. For two biographies of him, see Shmuel Avidor Hakohen, *Yahid be-Doro*, and Shaul Meizlish, *Rabbanut be-Sa'arat ha-Yamim* (Merhav: 1991). In addition, see Geulah bat Yehudah, "Yitzhak Isaac Halevy Herzog," and S. Zevin, "Isaac Herzog's Halakhic Decisions and Lectures," in *Men of the Spirit*, ed. Leo Jung (New York: Kymson Publishing Company, 1964), 123-45; Aharon Ben-Zion Shurin, *Keshet Gibborim* (Jerusalem: Mosad Harav Kook, 1964), 67-76; Joseph Safran, *Pirkei Iyun be-Toledot ha-Hinukh ha-Yehudi*, vol. 2 (Jerusalem: Mosad Ha-Rav Kook, 1986), 187-208; B. S. Jackson, ed., *The Halakhic Thought of R. Isaac Herzog (Jewish Law Association Studies V)* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991); Itamar Warhaftig, "Rabbi Herzog's Approach to Modernity," in *Engaging Modernity: Rabbinic Leaders and the Challenge of the Twentieth Century*, ed. Moshe Z. Sokol (Northvale and Jerusalem: Jason Aronson, 1997), 275-319; Yosef Ahituv, "*Levatav ha-Hilkhatiyim shel ha-Rav ha-Rashi Yitshak ha-Levi Herzog be-Esor ha-Rishon le-Tekumat Yisrael*," in Mordecai Bar-On, ed., *Etgar ha-Ribonut* (Jerusalem: Yad Yitshak Ben-Tsevi, 1999), 199-213. He is also the focus of a recent doctoral dissertation by Anat Navon, *Ben ha-Hiloni le-Mumar ha-Dat ba-Et ha-Hadashah: Mishmatam ha-Hilkhatit shel ha-Rabanim ha-Le'umiyim—Yitshak ha-Levi Herzog, B"Z Meir Uziel ve-Yehiel Yaakov Weinberg* (PhD diss., Ben Gurion University, 2005).
3. R. Soloveichik is the subject of a recently published three volume Hebrew biography. See Shimon Yosef Meller, "*Ha-Rav mi-Brisk:*" *Toldot Maran Ri"z ha-Levi*, vol. 1 (Jerusalem: Feldheim, 2003); vol. 2 (Jerusalem: Feldheim, 2004); vol. 3 (Jerusalem: Feldheim, 2006). The first volume has been translated into English as *The Brisker Rav* (Jerusalem and New York: Feldheim, 2007).
 4. Abraham Rosenfeld, *The Authorised Kinot for the Ninth of Av* (London: I. Labworth & Co., 1965), 133. This information is corroborated in the chronicles written about these events. See A. M. Haberman, *Sefer Gezerot Ashkenaz ve-Tsarfat* (Jerusalem: Tarshish Books, 1945), 25, 75; Shlomo Eidelberg, *The Jews and the Crusaders: The Hebrew Chronicles of the First and Second Crusades* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1977), 22, 23, 82-83.
 5. *The Authorised Kinot*, 134. For an interesting interpretation of this passage, see *She'elot u-Teshuvot Hatam Sofer, Orah Hayyim*, no. 159, s.v. *ve-ahar she-alu be-yadeinu*.
 6. Although there is some question about how much of the current text of this *kina* was included in its original version and how much was added later on, it appears that this passage belongs to its earliest strata. See Daniel Goldschmidt, *Seder ha-Kinot le-Tish'a be-Av* (Jerusalem: Mossad Ha-Rav Kook, 1968), 13.
 7. The meeting between Rabbis Herzog and Soloveichik and R. Soloveichik's position reportedly taken at that meeting is described in R. Moshe Sternbuch, *She'elot u-Teshuvot Teshuvot ve-Hanhagot*, vol. 2 (Jerusalem: Netivot ha-Torah ve-haHesed, 1989), 408, no. 721.

There is evidence that R. Soloveichik had personal respect for R. Her-

- zog although he was totally and unalterably opposed to considering the Chief Rabbinate in any capacity as a halakhic authority for the Jewish people. See Shimon Yosef Miller, *Uvdot ve-Hanhagot le-Beit Brisk*, vol. 2 (Jerusalem: 1999), 184-86. For their later disagreement over the chief rabbinate's *takana* changing the amount of money stipulated in the *ketuba*, see Shlomo Cohen, *Pe'er ha-Dor*, vol. 3 (Bnei Brak: Nezah, 1970), 124 n. 197.
8. For a list of post-*hurban* instituted fast days, see *Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim* 580.
 9. See the medieval and modern references to these fasts cited in David Wachtel, "The Ritual and Liturgical Commemoration of Two Medieval Persecutions" (MA Thesis, Columbia University, 1995). Although unpublished, this important essay continues to be cited in the scholarly literature on this subject. See Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, "Preface to the 1996 Edition," *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory* (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1996), xxvii-xxviii; Susan Einbinder, "The Jewish Martyrs of Blois," in *Medieval Hagiography: An Anthology*, ed. Thomas Head (New York and London: Routledge, 2001), 557 n. 40; idem, *A Beautiful Death* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2002), 57, 148, 208; Kenneth R. Stow, *Jewish Dogs: An Image and its Interpreters* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006), 101, 104, and elsewhere.

For a preliminary discussion of this issue, see Yitzchak (Eric) Zimmer, "Gezerot Tatn"u be-Sifrei ha-Minhagim bi-Yemei ha-Beinayyim u-vaEt ha-Hadasha: Yetsira ve-Hitpashtut shel Tekesei ha-Avelut," in *Yehudim Mul ha-Zelav*, ed. Yom Tov Asis, et al. (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 2000), 157-61.

10. For 1171, see R. Ephraim of Bonn in A. M. Habermann, *Sefer Gezerot Ashkenaz ve-Tsarfat*, 126; idem., *Sefer Zekhira: Selibot ve-Kinot* (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1970), 33. For doubts as to whether, in fact, Rabbenu Tam established this fast, see Wachtel, *ibid.* For the 1650 fast, see Nathan Nata Hannover, *Sefer Yeven Metsula* (Tel Aviv: Ha-Kibbutz ha-Meuhad, 1966), 78; R. Shabbetai Katz ("Shakh"), *Megilat Eifa*, in *Beit Yisrael bi-Polin*, vol. 2, ed. Yisrael Halpern (Jerusalem: Ha-Histadrut ha-Tsiyonit, 1954), 255; repr. (Toronto: Ozarenu, 1991), 117-18; Yisrael Halpern, ed., *Pinkas Vaad Arba Aratsot* (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1945), 77-78.

I am working on an article dealing more comprehensively with the fast of the twentieth of Sivan and the traditional impulse of subsuming one catastrophe under another. For some of my preliminary thoughts on that subject, particularly in the context of the Holocaust, see my (and Judith Tydor Baumel's) "The Ninety-Three Bais Yaakov Girls of Cracow: History or Typology?," in *Reverence, Righteousness, and Rahamanut: Essays in Memory of Rabbi Dr. Leo Jung*, ed. Jacob J. Schacter (Northvale and London: Jason Aronson, 1992), 109-111.

11. Salo Wittmayer Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, vol. 4 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1957), 145.
12. See, for example, the fast days instituted by the Agudat ha-Rabbanim of America in 1935 (see "Yom Tsom," *Hapardes* 9:6 [September 1935], 9), 1938 (see "Le-Tsom le-Teshuva u-Tefila u-Tsedaka," *Hapardes* 12:9

[December 1938], 3), 1943 (see “*Hakbrizat Agudat ha-Rabbanim*,” *Hapardes* 16:10 [January, 1943], 3. See too R. Avraham Mordecai Alter, Rebbe of Gur, *Osef Mikhtavim u-Devarim* (Warsaw: 1937), 90, no. 80; repr. (Kiryat Noar: Jerusalem, 1967), 99-100, no. 80; R. Shlomo Zalman Ehrenreich, *Sefer Iggerot Lehem Shlomo* (Brooklyn: Hevra Mefitsei Torah mi-Mishpahat Kol Aryeh, 1994), 262-63. In 1929 R. Hayyim Ozer Grodzinski sought the support of R. Avraham Yitshak Hakohen Kook for a fast day that he was proposing together with the Hafets Hayyim and the then Lubavitcher Rebbe. See R. Hayyim Ozer Grodzinski, *Abiezer* (Tel Aviv: Bet ha-Yetomim Diskin, 1941), 7. For a fast day called by R. Yosef Hayyim Sonnenfeld to protest an action taken by R. Kook, see R. Moshe Leiter, “*Me-Arkhyono shel HRH”G RM”Ts Jung z”l*,” *Hadarom* 23 (Nisan 1966), 162-63.

For a fast day instituted on 5 Tevet 5703 (December 13, 1942) by the Chief Rabbinate of England, see Yehudit T. Baumel, *Kol Bikhyot*, 55. For the fast day observed both in the United States and Israel on 28 Adar 5704 (March 23, 1944), see “*Le-Tsom le-Bekhi u-le-Misped*,” *Hapardes* 18:1 (April 1944), 2; Yehudit T. Baumel, *Kol Bikhyot*, 57. For a fast day instituted by the Chief Rabbinate of Israel on April 23, 1944, see Hava Eshkoli Wagman, *Bein Hatsala le-Geula*, 264-65.

Other fast days were instituted throughout the years leading up to and during World War II in association with *Yom Kippur Katan*. See “*Ta’anit Tsibbur u-Maha’a Gedola*,” *Hapardes* 7:1 (April 1933), 2-3; “*Tsoma Rabba*,” *Hapardes* 15:3 (June 1941), 2; “*Ta’anit Tsibbur Olami*,” *Hapardes* 16:6 (September 1942), 3-4 for a fast called for *Erev Rosh Hodesh Elul*, 1942 by R. Herzog in *Erets Yisrael*, Chief Rabbi Joseph H. Hertz and R. Yehezkel Abramsky in England, and rabbis in South America and throughout Europe. See also “*Hakbrizat Agudat ha-Rabbanim le-Teshuva u-le-Tefila u-le-Tsedaka*,” *Hapardes* 14:3 (June 1940), 2; “*Ta’anit Tsibbur Olami al ha-Hurban ha-Yehudi*,” *Hapardes* 18:12 (March 1945), 2-4; R. Yehudah Shaviv, “*Zikaron la-Sho’a*,” 447-48; Yehudit T. Baumel, *Kol Bikhyot*, 34-37, 41-60, 123-24, 138. For much earlier examples, see R. Shlomo Yosef Zevin, *Ma-Mo’adim ba-Halakhah* (Tel-Aviv: Avraham Tsiyoni, 1955), 339.

The note in R. Avrohom Chaim Feuer and R. Avie Gold, *The Complete Tishah B’Av Service* (Brooklyn: Mesorah Publications, Ltd., 1993), 270 states that R. Yitshak Ze’ev Soloveitchik was approached when “many sought to establish a new day of national mourning to commemorate *Churban Europa*.” This “new day” was meant to be only a temporary, *ad-hoc* fast day.

13. The question of using non-strictly-halakhic sources to determine (or justify) religious behavior is the subject of debate between scholars regarding the appropriateness of Jews taking their own lives and even killing others during the massacres of the First Crusade, precisely the event which elicited the *kina* under discussion here. For the position in favor, see Avraham Grossman, “*Shorashav shel Kiddush Hashem be-Ashkenaz ha-Keduma*,” in *Kedushat ha-Hayyim ve-Hiruf ha-Nefesh: Kovets Ma’amarim le-Zikhro shel Amir Yekutiel*, eds. Yeshayahu Gafni and Aviezer Ravitzky (Jerusalem: Merkaz Zalman Shazar le-Toledot Yisrael, 1993), 105-19; idem., “The

Cultural and Social Background of Jewish Martyrdom in Germany in 1096,” in Alfred Haverkamp, ed., *Juden und Christen zur Zeit der Kreuzzuge* (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1999), 73-86. There, however, the sources in question are more midrashic and aggadic in nature and not strictly liturgical poetry.

14. *She'elot u-Teshuvot Teshuvot ve-Hanbagot*, *ibid.*
15. See, for example, Moshe M. Shulzinger, *Sefer Peninei Rabbeinu ha-Gri"z* (Zikhron Meir, 1992), 29, and the position of R. Immanuel Jakobovits in Michael Shashar, *Ha-Rav ha-Lord* (Jerusalem: Hoza'at Shashar, 1996), 71. It is interesting that elsewhere R. Jakobovits ascribed the position of R. Soloveichik to “the fear that the suggested innovation may eventually be appropriated in a secular format.” This more nuanced formulation is closer to the truth but it still misses the mark. R. Jakobovits's position is found in the same article printed in three different places. See his “Religious Responses to the Holocaust: Retrospect and Prospect,” *L'Eylah* 25 (April 1988), 3; “Some Personal, Theological and Religious Responses to the Holocaust,” *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 3:4 (1988), 374; “Some Personal, Theological and Religious Responses to the Holocaust,” in *Remembering for the Future*, vol. 3, eds. Yehuda Bauer, Alice Eckhart, et al. (Oxford and New York: Pergamon Press, 1989), 2488.

For more on R. Soloveichik's position, see Shlomo Cohen, 124 n. 197; R. Yitshak Mirsky, *Hegyonai Halakha*, vol. 2 (Jerusalem: A. Ratner, 1997), 139-40.

16. See, for example, *She'elot u-Teshuvot Teshuvot ve-Hanbagot*, *ibid.*
17. R. Moshe Feinstein, “*Bi-Devar Kevi'at Yom Ta'anit le-Kedoshei ha-Sho'a*,” *Am ha-Tora* 2:10 (1985), 17-18; reprinted in R. Moshe Hershtler, ed., *Sefer Halakha u-Refu'a*, vol. 5 (Jerusalem: Regensberg Institute, 1987), 74; reprinted again with a slightly different title (“*Be-Ta'am she-lo Tiknu Yom Kavvu'a le-Ta'anit u-Tefila le-Zekher Harugei ha-Sho'a*”) and a few additional words in *Igerot Moshe, Yoreh De'ah*, vol. 4 (Jerusalem: Noble Book Press Corp., 1996), 289, no. 57:11.
18. See R. Yitshak Yedidya Frankel in *Yad Vashem News* 2 (1970), 4; R. Menachem M. Kasher, “*Hatsa'a li-Kevo'a Zikhron ha-Sho'a be-Tet be-Av*,” *Noam* 19 (1977), 373; R. Meir Amsel, “*He'arat ha-Orekh*,” *Hamaor* 33:5 (1981), 8; “*Kina Al Hurban Am Yisrael be-Shenot 5699-5705*,” *Kerem Shlomo* 7:9 (Tammuz-Av 1984), 7 n. 4; R. Shmuel Tuvyah Stern, “*Yom ha-Sho'a le-Or ha-Halakha*,” *Hapardes* 59:10 (June 1985), 12; reprinted, *Shu"t ha-Shavit* 7 (Brooklyn: Balshon Printing, 1987), 9-10, no. 4; Zvi A. Yehuda, “*Madu'a Hitnaged Hazon Ish le-Kevi'at Yom Evel le-Zekher ha-Sho'a*,” *Hadoar* 71:13 (May 1, 1992), 9-10; R. Avrohom Chaim Feuer and R. Avi Gold, *The Complete Tishah B'Av Service*, 270; R. Y. Goldstein, *She'elot u-Teshuvot Ohel Yisakhar* (Jerusalem: 1990), 77, no. 40.
19. The issue of a specifically designated fast day for the Holocaust was also addressed—and rejected—by the Hazon Ish on different grounds. See Hazon Ish, *Kovets Igerot* (Jerusalem: Ha-Mesorah, 1955), 113-14, no. 97; Shlomo Cohen, *Pe'er ha-Dor*, 123-25. The letter was reprinted in R. Elhanan Wasserman, *Ikveta de-Meshiha* (Zeirei Agudat Yisrael: 1962), 66-

67. For a critique and analysis of the Hazon Ish's position, outside the scope of this article since his objection is unrelated to the *Tish'a be-Av kina* precedent under discussion here, see R. Aryeh Leib Spitz, "Al Devar Kevi'at Yom Ta'anit al Harugei ha-Hurban Hy"d," *Hamaor* 33:5 (May-June 1981), 13-17; Lawrence Kaplan, "The Hazon Ish: Haredi Critic of Traditional Orthodoxy," in *The Uses of Tradition: Jewish Continuity in the Modern Era*, ed. Jack Wertheimer (New York and Jerusalem: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1992), 166-67; Binyamin Brown, *Ha-Hazon Ish: Halakha, Emuna ve-Hevra bi-Pesakav ha-Boletim be-Erets Yisrael* (5693-5714) (PhD diss., Hebrew University, 2003), Appendix 28, pp. 499-506.

The Hazon Ish's position was cited by R. Simha Elberg, "Zikbron la-Sho'a – Ma ve-Eikh," *Hapardes* 59:3 (November 1984), 2-3; idem, "Yom ha-Sho'a ve-haYizkor shel Yahadut ha-Tora," *Hapardes* 61:8 (May 1987), 2; R. Yitshak Yaakov Weiss, *She'elot u-Teshuvot Minhat Yitshak*, vol. 10 (Jerusalem: Minhat Yitshak, 1993), 25, no. 10, end; R. Y. Goldstein, *She'elot u-Teshuvot Ohel Yisakhar*, p. 77, no. 40; p. 80, no. 42.

See too R. Aryeh Leib Baron, "Kevi'at Yom Zikkaron le-Zekher ha-Kedoshim al pi Ru'ah ha-Tora," in *Sefer Yisamah Hayyim* (Jerusalem: 1987), 124, no. 41. It is interesting that R. Baron first published an article by that name in *Or ha-Mizrah* 30:2 (Tevet 1982), 101-02, where he concluded that a "yom zikkaron" was appropriate. When he reprinted it in his responsa collection five years later, he added a paragraph indicating that he was informed that the Hazon Ish was opposed and that if this was the case, the ruling of this great rabbi needs to be followed. It is important to note, however, that the Hazon Ish too never addressed the issue of a "yom zikkaron," only a "yom ta'anit." I plan on dealing with the Hazon Ish's position in my forthcoming article (see above, n. 10).

20. For R. Herzog's relationship with R. Mishkovsky, see *Yahid be-Doro*, 212; For pictures of them together, see Shaul Meizlish, *Rabbanut be-Sa'arat ha-Yamim*, 69, 77; Shimon Yosef Meller, "Ha-Rav mi-Brisk," vol. 2, 505.
21. See his *She'elot u-Teshuvot Heikhal Yitshak, Orach Hayyim* (Jerusalem: 1972), 155, no. 61; reprinted, *Pesakim u-Ktavim: She'elot u-Teshuvot be-Dinei Orach Hayyim*, vol. 2 (Jerusalem: 1989), 438, no. 99. For other responsa by R. Herzog relevant to Holocaust commemoration, even the establishment of a limited fast day, see *Pesakim u-Ktavim*, 439-40, no. 100; *Heikhal Yitshak, Even ha-Ezer*, vol. 1 (Jerusalem: Haivri, 1960), 156, no. 28.

Another unusual application of this passage in the *kina* is cited in the name of R. Abraham Isaac Hakohen Kook who allegedly referred it to rule that the fast day for a *sefer Torah* that fell on *Rosh Hodesh* Tammuz should be postponed to the seventeenth of that month. After all, "Ve-khi ein le-hosif mo'ed shever ve-tav'erah." See R. Moshe Zvi Neriyah, *Mo'adei ha-Ra'ayah* (Jerusalem: Moriah, 1982), 549-50; summarized in English in Pesach Jaffe, *Celebration of the Soul: The Holidays in the Life and Thought of Rabbi Avraham Yitzchak Kook* (Jerusalem: Genesis Jerusalem Press, 1992), 261.

22. The view of the Holocaust as being part of the process leading to the ultimate redemption was a very popular one. Among those who shared—and

share—this view are: R. Moshe Avigdor Amiel, R. Isser Zalman Melzer, R. Elhanan Wasserman, R. Zalman Sorotskin, R. Yechezkel Sarna, R. Eliyahu Eliezer Dessler, R. Kalonymous Kalman Shapiro, R. Joseph Isaac Schneerson, R. Yissakhar Shlomo Teichtal, R. Tsevi Yehuda Kook, R. Yitshak Meir Levine, R. Reuven Katz, R. Eliezer Silver, R. Yaakov Moshe Charlop, R. Ben-Zion Halberstamm of Bobov, R. Eliyahu Lapian, R. Binyamin Mendelson, R. Jacob Rosenheim, R. Simcha Elberg, R. Yitshak Isaac Sher, R. Shalom Noah Brazovski of Slonim, R. Shear Yashuv Cohen, R. Israel Rosenberg, R. Shlomo Zalman Unsorfer, R. Moshe Yonah ha-Levi Zweig, R. Yisrael Shapira, R. Ephraim Sokolover, R. Yechezkiah Fish of Matislak, R. Yitshak Eizik Weiss, R. Eliezer Ben-Zion Bruk, R. Nossan Spiegelglas, R. Hayyim Yisrael Tzimmerman, R. Barukh Marcus, R. Aharon ha-Levi Peteshnik, Gedaliah Bublick, R. Shlomo Cohen, R. Yehuda Ashkenazi, and R. Shlomo Aviner.

There is a large and growing literature on this subject. See many of the articles by Gershon Greenberg that deal with this issue: “Orthodox Theological Responses to *Kristallnacht*: Chayyim Ozer Grodzensky (‘Achiezer’) and Elchonon Wasserman,” *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 3:4 (1988), 431-41; “From *Hurban* to Redemption: Orthodox Jewish Thought in the Munich Area, 1945-1948,” *Simon Wiesenthal Center Annual* 6 (1989), 104; “Myth and Catastrophe in Simha Elberg’s Religious Thought,” *Tradition* 26:1 (1991), 39-64; “Mahane Israel—Lubavitch 1940-1945: Actively Responding to *Khurban*,” in *Bearing Witness to the Holocaust 1939-1989*, ed. Alan L. Berger (Lewiston, Queenston and Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1991), 141-63; “Redemption After Holocaust According to Mahane Israel—Lubavitch 1940-1945,” *Modern Judaism* 12:1 (1992), 61-84; “The Sect of Catastrophe: Mahane Israel-Lubavitch 1940-1945,” in *Jewish Sects, Religious Movements, and Political Parties*, ed. Menachem Mor (Omaha: Creighton University Press, 1992), 165-84; “Assimilation as Churban According to Wartime American Orthodoxy (Chabad Chassidism),” in *Jewish Assimilation, Acculturation and Accommodation: Past Traditions, Current Issues and Future Prospects*, ed. Menachem Mor (Lanham, Md, New York, and London: University Press of America, 1992), 161-77; “Foundations for Orthodox Jewish Theological Response to the Holocaust: 1936-1939,” in *Burning Memory: Times of Testing and Reckoning*, ed. Alice L. Eckardt (Oxford and New York: Pergamon Press, 1993), 71-94; “Rabbi Moshe Avigdor Amiel’s Religious Response to the Holocaust,” in *Proceedings of the Eleventh World Congress of Jewish Studies C:II* (Jerusalem: 1994), 98; “Sovereignty as Catastrophe: Jakob Rosenheim’s *Hurban Weltanschauung*,” *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 8:2 (1994), 202-24; “Ontic Division and Religious Survival: Wartime Palestinian Orthodoxy and the Holocaust (Hurban),” *Modern Judaism* 14 (1994), 21-61; “A Musar Response to the Holocaust: Yechezkel Sarna’s *Le’teshuva Ule’tekuma* of 4 December 1944,” *The Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 7 (1997), 101-138; “HA’GRA’s Apocalyptic Expectations and 1947 Religious Responses to the Holocaust: Harlap and Tsimrman,” in *The Gaon of Vilnius and the Annals of Jewish Culture* (Vilnius: Vilnius University Publishing House, 1998), 240;

“Yehudah Leb Gerst’s Religious ‘Ascent’ Through the Holocaust,” *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 13:1 (1999), 64; “Elhanan Wasserman’s Response to the Growing Catastrophe in Europe: The Role of Ha’gra and Hofets Hayim Upon His Thought,” *The Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 10 (2000), 171-204; “Wartime American Orthodoxy and the Holocaust: Mizrahi and Agudat Israel Religious Responses,” *Mikhael* 15 (2000), 59-92; “The Suffering of the Righteous According to Shlomo Zalman Unsodfer of Bratislava, 1939-1944,” in *Remembering for the Future: The Holocaust in an Age of Genocide*, vol. 1, ed. John K. Roth, Elisabeth Maxwell and Margot Levy (Hampshire and New York: Palgrave, 2001), 422-38; “Orthodox Religious Thought,” in *The Holocaust Encyclopedia*, ed. Walter Laqueur (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001), 459; “The Holocaust Apocalypse of Ya’akov Moshe Harlap,” *Jewish Studies* 41 (2002), 5-14. Most recently see Greenberg’s collection of “Ultra-Orthodox Responses during and following the War,” in *Wrestling with God: Jewish Theological Responses during and after the Holocaust*, ed. Steven T. Katz, et al. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 9-201.

See also R. Isser Zalman Melzer, *Sefer Even ha-Azel*, vol. 4 (Jerusalem: 1945), introduction; R. Eliyahu Lopian, *Sefer Lev Eliyahu* (Jerusalem: 1972), 77; R. Moshe Yonah Halevi Zweig, *Sefer Ohel Moshe*, vol. 1 (Jerusalem: 1949), introduction; Gershon C. Bacon, “Birth Pangs of the Messiah: The Reflections of Two Polish Rabbis on Their Era,” *Studies in Contemporary Jewry* 7 (1991), 86-99; Eliezer Schweid, “An Ethical-Theological Response to the Holocaust as it was Evolving: The Teachings of Rabbi Eliahu Eliezer Dessler,” *Henoch* 17:1-2 (1995), 171-95; Shmuel Avidor Hakohen, *Yahid be-Doro*, 120; Mendel Pickarz, *Hasidut Polin: Magamot Ra’ayoniyot bein Shetei ha-Milhamot u-biGezeirot 5700-5705 (Ha-Sho’a)* (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1990), 318, 335-38, 396-97; Nehemia Polen, *The Holy Fire: The Teachings of Rabbi Kalonymus Kalman Shapira, the Rebbe of the Warsaw Ghetto* (Northvale and London: Jason Aronson Inc., 1994), 111-13; Eliezer Schweid, “*Ha-Hazara bi-Teshuva ke-Teguva Haredit la-Sho’a*,” *Kivrunim Hadashim* 6 (2002), 38, 51; Aviezer Ravitzky, *Messianism, Zionism, and Jewish Religious Radicalism* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 127, 195; Yoel Schwartz and Yitzchak Goldstein, *Ha-Sho’a* (Jerusalem: Davar, 1987), 89-95; trans. as *Shoah* (Brooklyn: Mesorah Publications, 1990), 92-98; R. Shalom Noah Brazovski, *Ha-Haruga Alekha* (Jerusalem: Makhon Emunah ve-Da’at, 1988), 27-29, 47; Pesach Schindler, “*Tikkun* as Response to Tragedy: *Em Habanim Smecha* of Rabbi Yissakhar Shlomo Teichtal–Budapest, 1943,” *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 4:4 (1959), 416; idem, *Hasidic Responses to the Holocaust in the Light of Hasidic Thought* (Hoboken: Ktav Publishing, 1990), 37-42, 49f; R. Yitshak Mirsky, *Hegyonai Halakhah*, vol. 2, 140-41; Menachem Friedman, “The Haredim and the Holocaust,” *The Jerusalem Quarterly* 53 (1990), 110-12; R. Shear Yashuv Cohen, “*Hester Panim be-Sho’a Mul ha-Nisim ha-Geluyim bi-Doreinu*,” in *Ets Avot: Kiddush Hashem be-Sho’a be-Hagut be-Halakhah u-be-Aggada* (Jerusalem: Yad Ramah, 1993), 20-

22; Kimmy Caplan, “*Ha-Hevra ha-Haredit be-Yisrael ve-Yahasah la-Sho’a—Kri’a Hadasha*,” *Alpayim* 17 (1999), 199; idem, “The Holocaust in Contemporary Israeli Haredi Popular Religion,” *Modern Judaism* 22 (2002), 154; idem, *Be-Sod ha-Si’ah ha-Haredi* (Jerusalem: Merkaz Zalman Shazar, 2007), 138-96; Yosef Roth, “*Ha-Goral ha-Yehudi ve-haSho’a*,” in *Ets Avot: Kiddush Hashem ba-Sho’a be-Hagut ba-Halakhah u-vaAgada* (Jerusalem: Yad Ramah, 1993), 64-65; Hava Eshkoli Wagon, *Bein Hatsala Le-Geula*, 208-12; Shaul Weber, “*Teguvat Bnei-Akiva le-Sho’a ve-Hishtakfuta be-Itonut ha-Tenu’a*,” in D. Porat and M. Naor, eds., *Ha-Itonut be-Yehudit*, 209-26; Yishai Rosen-Tsevi, “*Ha-Hole ha-Medume – Tsiduk ha-Sho’a bi-Mishmat ha-Rav Tsevi Yehuda Kook ve-Hugo*,” *Tarbut Demokratit* 6 (2002), 182f; Mordecai Meir, “*Hilulat ha-Admo*”r she-Hafkha le-Yom Zikaron le-Sho’a Etsel Hasidei Slonim,” *Hama’ayan* 48:2 (Tevet 5768), 69; Esther Farbstein, *Be-Seter Ra’am* (Jerusalem: Mosad Ha-Rav Kook, 2002), 422, 470-71. This book has recently been translated into English by Deborah Stern as *Hidden in Thunder: Perspectives on Faith, Halakhah and Leadership During the Holocaust* (Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook, 2007).

Also relevant here is material analyzed in Eliezer Schweid, *Bein Hurban le-Yeshu’a: Teguvot shel Hagut Haredit la-Sho’a bi-Zemanah* (Tel Aviv: Ha-Kibbutz ha-Meuhad, 1994). See the harsh critique of the book by Mendel Pickarz, “*Bein ha-Emet be-Ma’arumeha le-vein ha-Emet ha-Menahemet*,” *Jewish Studies* 35 (1995), 155-68, and a defense by Gershon Greenberg, “Consoling Truth: Eliezer Schweid’s *Ben Hurban le-Yeshu’ah*: A Review Essay,” *Modern Judaism* 17 (1997), 297-311.

R. Herzog himself already expressed such a sentiment at the beginning of the war. See Shmuel Avidor Hakohen, *Yabid be-Doro*, 169, and he returned to it again in 1948 (248, 256).

It is, however, very important to note that the framing of the Holocaust in the context of messianism did not mean the same thing to all those who made that connection. See Mendel Pickarz, *Hasidut Polin*, 379.

23. For various dates suggested (2 Nissan, April 19, 4 Iyyar, 20 Sivan, September 1, 27 Tevet), see H. J. Zimmels, *The Echo of the Nazi Holocaust in Rabbinic Literature* (Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 1977), 156-58; Dan Michman, “The Impact of the Holocaust on Religious Jewry,” in *Major Changes Within the Jewish People in the Wake of the Holocaust*, ed. Yisrael Gutman (Jerusalem: Yad Vashem, 1996), 674 n. 34; Dalia Ofer, “The Strength of Remembrance: Commemorating the Holocaust During the First Decade of Israel,” *Jewish Social Studies* 6:2 (Winter 2000), 31-32; R. Stauber, *Ha-Lekah Le-Dor*, 48-60; Yehudit T. Baumel, *Kol Bikhyot*, 64-65.
24. Dalia Ofer, “The Strength of Remembrance,” 34; Roni Stauber, *Ha-Lekah le-Dor*, 49, 50.
25. David S. Wyman, *The Abandonment of the Jews: America and the Holocaust, 1941-1945* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1984), 24-25; Yehudit T. Baumel, *Kol Bikhyot*, pp. 52-53.
26. R. Yehudah Shaviv, “*Zikaron la-Sho’a*,” *Ha-Rabbanut ha-Rashit le-Yisrael*, 447-48.

27. See Yom Tov Levinsky, ed., *Sefer ha-Mo'adim*, vol. 8 (Tel Aviv: Dvir, 1962), 93-95; R. K. P. Tkhursh, "Hiyyuv ha-'Kadish ha-Kelali' le-Zekher ha-Nispim ha-Sho'a," *Shana be-Shana* (5729), 131-40; Irving Greenberg, *The Jewish Way: Living the Holidays* (New York and London: Summit Books, 1988), 329-30; R. Yeshayah A. Steinberger, "Asara be-Tevet, Yom ha-Sho'a she-Hafakh le-Yom ha-Kadish ha-Kelali," *Shana be-Shana* (5751), 378-85; idem., "Asara be-Tevet ke-Yom ha-Sho'a," *Shana be-Shana* (5752), 311-20; Yehudit Tydor Baumel, "Zikbron Olam: Tefilot ve-Yemei Evel le-Ahar ha-Sho'a le-Zekher Korbanot ha-Sho'a," *Sinai* 101 (1988), 172; idem., *Kol Bikhyot*, 66-68, 154; Roni Stauber, *Ha-Lekah le-Dor*, 52-60, 141; R. Yehudah Shaviv, "Zikkaron la-Sho'a," *Ha-Rabbanut ha-Rashit le-Yisrael*, 449-51; Shmuel Katz, "Ha-Rabbanut ha-Rashit u-Ma'arekhet ha-Hinukh ha-Dati," in *Ha-Rabbanut ha-Rashit le-Yisrael*, 639-42.
28. See *Divrei ha-Kenesset* 9 (April 12, 1951), 1655-1657; 24 (June 18, 1958), 2118-2119, 2123-2124; 26 (March 10, 1959), 1385-1390; (April 8, 1959), 1992-1993, 2019; March 27, 1961; State of Israel, *Sefer ha-Hukim* 280 (April 17, 1959), 112. For a partial English translation of R. Mordechai Nurock's historic Knesset speech on April 12, 1951 recommending this day as "*Yom ha-Sho'a ve-haGevura*," see Zev Garber, "Dating the Shoah: In Your Blood Shall You Live," in Alan I. Berger, ed., *Bearing Witness to the Holocaust*, 294-98.

However, even then the link to *Tish'a be-Av* was not totally lost. The "*Seder Tefila*" composed by the Chief Rabbinate to be recited on the 27th of Nisan in 1951 included *kinot* traditionally recited on *Tish'a be-Av*. See Yehudit T. Baumel, *Kol Bikhyot*, 155-57 (the date 1951 for this prayer is given in the Table of Contents).

29. For more on the establishment of *Yom ha-Sho'a ve-haGevura* by the Israeli Knesset, see Charles S. Liebman and Eliezer Don-Yehiya, *Civil Religion in Israel* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), 101-107; James E. Young, "When a Day Remembers: A Performative History of *Yom ha-Shoah*," *History and Memory* 2:2 (1990), 54-75; Saul Friedlander, "The Shoah Between Memory and History," *The Jerusalem Quarterly* 53 (1990), 115-26; Yehudit T. Baumel, *Kol Bikhyot*, 65-68; Tom Segev, *The Seventh Million*, 436-40; D. Ofer, "The Strength of Remembrance," 36; Eliezer Don-Yehiya, "Memory and Political Culture: Israeli Society and the Holocaust," *Studies in Contemporary Jewry* 9 (1993), 148-49; Hanna Yablonka, "*Ma Lizkor ve-Keitsad? Nitsolei ha-Sho'a ve-Izuv Yedi'atah*," in *Idan ha-Tsiyonut*, ed. Anita Shapira, Jehuda Reinharz and Jay Harris (Jerusalem: Merkaz Zalman Shazar, 2000), 305-13; Roni Stauber, *Ha-Lekah le-Dor*, 56-60; Yair Zabari, "*Yom ha-Zikkaron le-Sho'a u-leGevurah*," in *Zeman Yehudi Hadash: Tarbut Yehudit be-Idan Hiloni* (Jerusalem: Keter, Sifriyat Pozen le-Tarbut Yehudit, 2007), 397-400.

I have twice been privileged to obtain permission to have access to the Knesset archives and examine the old yellowed pages containing the minutes of the meetings of the Knesset subcommittee charged with the responsibility of determining the nature of the official Israeli government commemoration of the Holocaust. I plan on publishing the results of that inquiry in the near future.

30. See, most recently, Samuel C. Heilman, *Sliding to the Right: The Contest for the Future of American Jewish Orthodoxy* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 2006), 318, n. 29. See too Dina Porat, "Attitudes of the Young State of Israel toward the Holocaust and Its Survivors: A Debate over Identity and Value," in Dina Porat, *Israeli Society, the Holocaust and its Survivors* (London and Portland: Vallentine Mitchell, 2008), 347, "on 27 Nisan, the date on which the fiercest battles in the Warsaw ghetto occurred." This is simply not the case.
31. The Warsaw Ghetto Uprising began on April 19, 1943 (*Erev Pesah*) and lasted almost a month, until May 15-16. See Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1967), 323-26. For the events that occurred on 27 Nisan that year (May 2), see Israel Gutman, *Resistance: The Warsaw Ghetto Uprising* (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1994), 237-38; Yisrael Gutman, *The Jews of Warsaw, 1939-1943: Ghetto, Underground, Revolt* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982), 391, 393, 394.

In any case, whatever happened on the twenty-seventh of Nisan was not in any way significant enough to justify that day being chosen as *the* day to commemorate the Holocaust.

32. For the quote, see Y. Ben Israel in *Hamodia* (2 Iyyar 5711 / May 8, 1951), 2, cited in Ruth Ebenstein, "Remembered Through Rejection: *Yom HaShoah* in the Ashkenazi Haredi Daily Press, 1950-2000," *Israel Studies* 8:3 (Fall, 2003), 147.

For expressions of all of these anti-*Yom ha-Sho'a* sentiments, see Chaim Feuerman and Yaakov Feitman, "Holocaust," *The Jewish Observer* 12:8 (October 1977), 3-9; Yaakov Feitman, "Reviewing a Shiur: Rabbi Hutner's 'Holocaust' Seminar," *The Jewish Observer* 12:10 (January 1978), 11-14; reprinted in Nisson Wolpin, ed., *A Path Through the Ages* (New York, 1986), 39-55; Nisson Wolpin, "Thank You, Elie Wiesel," *The Jewish Observer* 14:8 (April 1980), 49-50; reprinted, "Focus of Remembering," in *A Path Through the Ages*, 280-82; R. Meir Amsel, "*He'arat ha-Orekh*," 18; Joseph Friedenson, "Heroics and 'Remembrance'—a New Jewish Religion?," *The Jewish Observer* 17:1 (May-June 1983), 7-8; reprinted in *A Path Through the Ages*, 283-86; Nisson Wolpin, "Who Will do the Teaching?," *ibid.*, 12; R. Dovid Cohen, "The Focus of Remembering," *The Jewish Observer* 18:4 (March 1985), 9; reprinted in *A Path Through the Ages*, 270-71; R. Nossou Scherman, "Reflections on Remembrance," *The Jewish Observer* 18:6 (May 1985), 20-22; R. Simha Elberg, "*A Yom Zikaron nokh di Kedoshim*," *Algemeiner Journal* (March 14, 1980), 15; *idem.*, "*Zikhron la-Sho'a—Ma ve-Eikh?*," 2-5; *idem.*, "*Yom ha-Sho'a ve-haYizkor shel Yehadut ha-Torah*," *Hapardes* 61:8 (May 1987), 2-3; R. Elazar Halevi Shulsinger, *Al Mishkenot ha-Ro'im* (Bnei Berak: Ramat Aharon, 1988), 202-03; R. Tsevi Hershler, "*Lizkor Mashma'o gam lo Lishko'ah! . . .*," *Ha-Mahane ha-Haredi* 475-476 (24 Nisan 5750), 9; "*Yom ha-Sho'a veba-Gevura mi-Sod ha-Hofshim be-Hekhsher 'Haredim*," *Ha-Ma'or* 37:2 (March-April 1985), 34; R. Yisrael Rosen, "*Kinot Sho'a be-Tish'a Be-Av*," *Zohar* 7 (2001), 101; R. Jonathan Sacks, *Tradition in an Untraditional Age: Essays on Modern Jewish Thought* (London: Valentine, Mitchell, 1990),

152-53; Ruth Ebenstein, "Remembered Through Rejection," 142-43, 147-48, 158. See also Arye Edrei, "Holocaust Memorial: A Paradigm of Competing Memories in the Religious and Secular Societies in Israel," in Doron Mendels, ed., *On Memory: An Interdisciplinary Approach* (Oxford and Bern: Peter Lang, 2007), 37-100; Yotvat Weil, "*Ha-Sho'a* Kevar Lo Tabu," *Erets Aheret* 41 (August-October, 2007), 51-52.

For discussion of these sources, see Yehudit Tydor Baumel, "*Zikbron Olam: Tefilot ve-Yemei Eivel le-Ahar ha-Sho'a le-Zekher Korbanot ha-Sho'a*," 278-80, 282-84; idem, *Kol Bikhyot*, 71, 77-82; Joel Wolowelsky, "Book Review of *The Jewish Way* by Irving Greenberg," *American Jewish History* 78:4 (June 1989), 566-68; idem., "Observing Yom Hasho'a," *Tradition* 24:4 (Summer 1989), 46-58; Ruth Ebenstein, "Remembered Through Rejection," 141-67, esp. 148. For an exceptionally sharp and harsh critique of this position—one that I believe is formulated using far too extreme language, see R. Yom Tov ha-Levi Schwarz, *Einayim Lir'ot* (New York, 1997), 116-26; trans. and ed. by R. Avraham Leib Schwarz as *Eyes to See: Recovering Ethical Torah Principles Lost in the Holocaust* (Jerusalem and New York: Urim Publications, 2004), 167-85. My thanks to R. Chaim Rapoport for bringing this book to my attention.

See also R. Yehudah Herzl Henkin, "*Al Devar Yom ha-Zikkaron le-Hurban Eirova va-haIm Hakhameha Ta'u be-Hanhaga*," *Hamaor* 42:1 (September-October 1988), 11-14; "*Yom ha-Zikkaron le-Hurban Yabadut Eirova ve-haIm Hakhameha Ta'u be-Hanhaga*," *Shana be-Shana* (1991), 291-310; reprinted, *Benei Banim*, vol. 2 (Jerusalem: Defus Zur, 1992), 82-94, no. 23.

For the prohibition of forms of mourning during the month of Nisan, see *Shulhan Arukh, Orach Hayyim* 429:2, *Mishnah Berurah*, ad loc, 429:8.

I am not addressing the issue of the form that many *Yom ha-Sho'a* commemorations take that many in the traditional community find inappropriate. A number of traditionalists sometimes mistakenly mix objection to the nature of typical community-wide *Yom ha-Sho'a* commemorations (non-Orthodox involvement, movies, poetry readings, women singers) with objection to the establishment of the day per se. The fundamental objection to *Yom ha-Sho'a* discussed here had nothing to do with the form its commemoration was taking—and takes—in the community at large; it had everything to do with the very idea of establishing any day to commemorate Jewish tragedy apart from *Tish'a be-Av*, even for so great a tragedy as the Holocaust, and even if the form of the commemoration was fully in compliance with traditional halakhic guidelines and sensibilities. Rabbis Yitshak Ze'ev Soloveitchik and Moshe Feinstein, for example, were not questioning how *Yom ha-Sho'a* was being commemorated; they were questioning the very existence of *Yom ha-Sho'a* itself.

33. See my article cited above, n. 10, pp. 109-11.

34. Menachem Friedman, "The Haredim and the Holocaust," *The Jerusalem Quarterly* 53 (Winter 1990), 86-87. This suggestion is also made by Binyamin Brown, *Ha-Hazon Ish*, 432. Arye Edrei's rejection of Brown ("Holocaust Memorial," 53-54) is unconvincing. In general, his thoughtful article underestimates the power of this theological argument.

35. See the sources cited above, nn. 16-19, 32.

It is interesting that R. Yehiel Yaakov Weinberg addressed only the issue of establishing “a special day of mourning and memory” (“*yom zikkaron ve-evel meyuhad*”) and felt that it should be designated for the Holocaust. See his *She’elot u-Teshuvot Seridei Esh 2* (Jerusalem: Mosad Ha-Rav Kook, 1977), no. 2:30. He did not address the issue of a fast day at all. See Marc B. Shapiro, *Between the Yeshiva World and Modern Orthodoxy: The Life and Works of Rabbi Jehiel Jacob Weinberg, 1884-1966* (London and Portland: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 1999), 207.

36. See R. Joseph B. Soloveitchik, *The Lord is Righteous in All His Ways: Reflections on the Tish’ah be-Av Kinot*, ed. Jacob J. Schacter (Jersey City: Ktav Publishing House, 2006).

For earlier descriptions and presentations of both the experience and content of the Rav’s *Tish’a be-Av kinot* teaching, see my “Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik zt”l on the Tisha B’Av Kinos,” *Jewish Action* 54:4 (Summer 5754 / 1994), 8-12; R. L. Arzi, “*Ha-Gaon R’ Yosef Ber Soloveitchik Zogt 8 Sha’ah Kinos in Boston*,” *Algemeiner Journal* (August 5, 1977), 9; idem, “*Kinos mit ha-Gaon R’ Yosef Dov Soloveitchik in Boston*,” *Algemeiner Journal* (September 1, 1978), 13-14; idem, “*Be-Kinot Im ha-Ga’on R. Y. D. Soloveitchik*,” *Shana be-shana* (1982), 320-26; Ephraim Rokeach, “*Hagigim mi-Torat ha-GRY*”D Soloveitchik zt”l,” *Shema’atin* 115-16 (1994), 147; *Mesorah* 11 (September, 1995), 51; 15 (October, 1998), 33-38; Aaron Rakeffet-Rothkoff, *The Rav: The World of Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik*, vol. 1 (Ktav Publishing House, 1999), 142-43, 261-62; R. Hershel Schachter, “*Mi-Peninei Rabbenu, z”l*,” *Beit Yitshak* 28 (1996), 20; *Mi-Peninei ha-Rav* (Jerusalem: Flatbush Beth Hamedrosh, 2001), 116; R. Mikhel Zalman Shurkin, *Sefer Harerei Kedem*, vol. 2 (Jerusalem: Le-Or, 2004), 305-12; See also www.613.org/rav.html.

Earlier presentations of the Rav’s Torah related to *Tish’a be-Av* in general can be found in *Shi’urim le-Zekher Abba Mari z”l* (Jerusalem: 1983), 55-56; reprinted, (Jerusalem: 2002), 69-70; *Mesorah* 1 (1989), 18-22; 3 (1990), 41; 5 (1991), 21-22; 6 (1991), 22-23, 25-33; 7 (1992), 19, 22-23; 9 (1994), 86-88; 11 (1995), 29-30, 49-51; 12 (1996), 61; 14 (1997), 15-19; 15 (1998), 29-32, 38-47; R. Elyakim Koenigsberg, *Shi’urei Ha-Rav al Inyanei Aveilut ve-Tish’a be-Av* (Jerusalem: Mesorah, 2000); R. Mikhel Zalman Shurkin, *Sefer Harerei Kedem*, vol. 2, 276-304.

37. See *The Lord is Righteous in All His Ways*, 211-27; *Mesorah* 6 (1991), 31.

38. See *The Lord is Righteous in All His Ways*, 299-301. The Rav rejected not only a special fast day for the Holocaust but also a separate day of mourning for it. See R. L. Arzi, “*Be-‘Kinot’ im ha-Gaon RY*”D Soloveitchik,” 324-25; Irving Greenberg, *The Jewish Way*, 335-36; Jacob J. Schacter, “Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik on the Tisha B’Av Kinos,” 11-12; R. Hershel Schachter, *Nefesh ha-Rav*, 197-98; idem., *Mi-Peninei ha-Rav*, 116.

The other source cited by R. Soloveitchik in favor of subsuming all Jewish tragedy, including the Holocaust, under *Tish’a be-Av*, is the statement by “Rashi” to 2 Chronicles 35:25. See *The Lord is Righteous in All*

- His Ways*, 203, and R. Hershel Schachter, *Mi-Peninei ha-Rav*, 116. It was also cited by R. Menahem Kasher, “*Hatsa’a le-Kevo’a Zikbron ha-Sho’a be-Tet be-Av*,” 373; R. Avrohom Chaim Feuer and R. Avi Gold, *The Complete Tishah B’Av Service*, 270; “*Kina al Hurban Am Yisrael be-Shenot 5699-5705*,” *Kerem Shlomo* 7:9, 7 n. 4; R. Y. Goldstein, *She’elot u-Teshuvot Ohel Yisakhar*, 80, no. 41; 82, no. 42.
39. For all these opinions, see Mordechai Mayer, “*Zekhor Na ha-Bekhiyot be-Tehom ha-Geviyot: Kinot le-Zekher ha-Sho’a*,” *Akdamos* 9 (2000), 77-99, esp. 88-94. This article was expanded and reprinted as a booklet including the texts of some of these specially composed Holocaust *kinot*. See M. Mayer, *Zekhor ha-Na’akot ve-Ra’ash ha-Ze’akot: Kinot le-Tish’a be-Av le-Zekher ha-Sho’a* (Jerusalem: 2004), esp. 20-30. See also R. Michael Avraham, “*Tikun Kinot la-Sho’a*,” *Zohar* 8 (2001), 183-89; R. Yaakov Ariel, “*Kanonizatsiya shel ha-Kinot*,” *Zohar* 9 (2002), 157; R. Moshe Sternbuch, *She’elot u-Teshuvot Teshuvot ve-Hanhagot* (Jerusalem: 1986), 117, no. 330; Y. T. Baumel, “*Zikbron Olam*,” 280-82; idem, *Kol Bikhyot*, 19, 83, 95; Dan Michman, “The Impact of the Holocaust on Religious Jewry,” 674-79; Arye Edrei, “Holocaust Memorial,” 45-46. The following sources should be added to those cited in Mayer’s booklet: R. Yaakov Ariel, *She’elot u-Teshuvot Be-Ohola shel Torah*, vol. 2 (Kfar Darom: Makhon ha-Torah ve-haArets, 2000), 17 (in favor of adding a *kina*); R. Yitshak Isaac Halevi Herzog, in S. A. Hakohen, *Yahid be-Doro*, 220-21, and S. Meizlish, *Rabbanut be-Sa’arat ha-Yamim*, 80-83 (for a *kina* he composed for the Holocaust); H. J. Zimmels, *The Echo of the Nazi Holocaust*, 159-60; Leo Trepp, “Toward a ‘S’liyah’ on the Holocaust,” *Judaism* 35:3 (Summer, 1986), 344-50; Yisrael Melamed, “*Kina al ha-Sho’a*,” *Shana be-Shana* (1992), 473; “*Al Devar Kinot le-Zekher ha-Hurban*,” *Hamaor* 45:6 (Menahem Av-Elul 1992), 22-24; R. Y. Schwartz and R. Y. Goldstein, *Ha-Sho’a* (Jerusalem: Davar, 1987), 288; R. Yehudah Shaviv, 449; R. Yom Tov Lipmann Heller, *Megilat Eiva*, ed. J. Wreschner (Jerusalem, 1999), 128, note; R. Shlomo Zalman Auerbach, *Halikhot Shlomo* (Jerusalem: Yeshivat Halikhot Shlomo, 1999), 229, n. 72; R. Moshe Kahlenberg, *Yedei Moshe* (Jerusalem: Michlalah –Jerusalem College), 234-38, most recently analyzed in Esther Farbstein, “Sermons Speak History: Rabbinic Dilemmas in Internment Between Metz and Auschwitz,” *Modern Judaism* 27:2 (May 2007), 156-58.
40. *The Lord is Righteous in All His Ways*, 298-99.
41. Ibid., 291-92. See also R. L. Arzi, “*Be-Kinot Im ha-Ga’on RY”D Soloveitchik*,” 324-25; Jacob J. Schacter, “Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik on the Tisha B’Av Kinos,” 11-12; Arye Edrei, “Holocaust Memorial,” 83-85.
- For another context for the Rav’s opposition to the composition of “prayers for special occasions,” see Walter Wurzbarger, “Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik as *Posek* of Post-Modern Orthodoxy,” *Tradition* 29:1 (1994), 6; reprinted in Marc D. Angel, ed., *Exploring the Thought of Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik* (Hoboken: Ktav Publishing, 1997), 5.
42. R. Moshe Lichtenstein, “*Bakho et asher Asa Lekha Amalek*,” in *Torah mi-Tsiyon: Kovets Ma’amarim le-Zikbro shel Dr. Moshe Green z”l*, ed. Aviad Hakohen (Jerusalem, 2002), 155-56. This article was translated into Eng-

TRADITION

lish in *Milin Havivin: Beloved Words 2* (June 2006), 25-41. See pp. 34-35.

For another criticism of the Rav's position, see M. Meir, "*Zekhor Na ha-Bekhiyot*," 89 nn. 46, 47.

43. It is interesting that R. Lichtenstein writes (p. 155) that Begin came to visit his grandfather. According to Gertrude Hirschler and Lester S. Eckman, *Menahem Begin: From Freedom Fighter to Statesman* (New York: Shengold Publishers, 1979), 297, the Rav visited Begin in his Waldorf-Astoria Hotel suite.
44. See Moshe Zak, "*Ha-Am ha-Yehudi ve-haSho'a be-Mishnato ha-Medinit shel Menahem Begin*," *Gesher* 38 (1992), 49-56; Hanna Yablonka, "The Formation of Holocaust Consciousness in the State of Israel: The Early Days," in *Breaking Crystal: Writing and Memory after Auschwitz*, ed. Efraim Sicher (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1998), 129-33.
45. See Ofer Grossbard, *Menahem Begin: Deyokno shel Manbig* (Tel Aviv: Resling, 2006), 145-46.
46. Hanna Torok Yablonka, "The Commander of the 'Yizkor' Order: Herut, Holocaust, and Survivors," in *Israel: The First Decade of Independence*, eds. S. Ilan Troen and Noah Lucas (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995), 224. See also Tom Segev, *The Seventh Million*, 225-26, 396-404, 411.
47. *Divrei Knesset* (August 2, 1977), 566.

Gideon Hausner, who spoke against the proposal at that session in the Knesset, also made reference to the Prime Minister's conversation with the Rav. See *Divrei Knesset*, 564.

It is interesting to note the following reconstruction of Begin's position in R. Yitzchok Alster, "Remembering the Rosh Yeshiva: 25 Years Since the Passing of Hagaon Harav Yitzchok Hutner zt"l," *The Jewish Observer* 38:10 (December 2005), 30: "When Prime Minister Begin visited the *Moetzes Gedolei Hatorah* in the home of R. Moshe Feinstein zt"l, the *Rosh Yeshiva* asked him to transfer *Yom Hashoah* to *Tisha BeAv*. He agreed, but upon his return to Israel, he was unable to garner support for the necessary legislation." In the Knesset discussion there is no reference to this meeting, only to the one between Begin and R. Soloveitchik.

On the Begin proposal, see Haim Shachter, "Should Tisha B'Av and Yom HaShoa Be Combined?," *Jewish Digest* (1978), 77-78; Saul Friedlander, "Roundtable Discussion," in Berel Lang, ed., *Writing and the Holocaust* (New York and London: Holmes & Meier, 1988), 288.

Note that Dr. Ismar Schorsch, former Chancellor of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, also favored commemorating the Holocaust on *Tish'a be-Av*. See his "A Day Set Aside by God," *JTS Magazine* 8:3 (Spring 1999), 8-9.

48. "An Interview with Emil Fackenheim," *New Traditions* 3 (1986), 30.
49. Tom Segev, *The Seventh Million*, 440.
50. See also Gertrude Hirschler and Lester S. Eckman, *Menahem Begin: From Freedom Fighter to Statesman*, 300.
51. See also an English translation of negative reaction of the governing council of Yad Vashem published in *The Jewish Observer* 12:8 (October 1977), 9.

52. I want to thank Ms. Rena Donin Schlusel whose thoughtful e-mail exchange with me about this subject motivated me to add this concluding portion of my article.
53. See R. Irving Greenberg, *The Jewish Way*, 341-68; Noah Golinkin, "How Should We Commemorate the Shoah in our Homes?," *Moment* 14:4 (June 1989), 30-35; Joseph C. Kaplan, "Yom hashoah as orthodox commemoration," *Sh'ma* 22/431 (April 3, 1992), 85-87; R. Avi Weiss, *Haggadah for the Yom HaShoah Seder* (New York: Amcha and Jonas Publishing, 2000); Jonathan Mark, "Giving Roots to Memory: Yom HaShoah Haggadah offers rituals to fortify Holy Day," *The New York Jewish Week* (April 28, 2000), 12; Sheldon Gordon. "Movement Creates Shoah Scroll To Ritualize Holocaust Holiday," *Forward* (May 9, 2003), 1; *Megillat Hashoah—The Shoah Scroll* (Jerusalem: Schechter Institute of Jewish Studies, 2004); Joe Berkofsky, "As Yom Hashoah gains traction, debate grows over how to mark it," *JTA* (April 12, 2004).
54. Regretfully, I do not share the optimism of R. Irving Greenberg who asserted around a decade ago that Yom ha-Sho'a will "absolutely" become " a major holiday." See Shalom Freedman, *Living in the Image of God* (Jerusalem and Northvale: Jason Aronson Inc., 1998), 247.