

Mal d'archive: On the Growth of Gunter Demnig's *Stolperstein*-Project

Abstract

In *Archive Fever*, Derrida opens a critical perspective on the status of the trace as that which remains with his reading of Gradiva, the Pompeian fantasy woman who is supposed to have left her singular toe-print in the ash of Vesuvius. This article returns to the figure of Gradiva as emblem for the non-coincidence of origin and trace, in order to outline the (increasingly troubling) archival aspects of Gunter Demnig's *Stolperstein*-project, a large-scale, decentralized memorial commemorating those deported under National Socialism. Returning to the site of a missed encounter, Demnig attempts to reinscribe the trace of those who vanished there. But as his project grows, it also shows signs of archive fever, betraying a desire to take possession of the trace of the other, and revealing how, as Derrida describes, the archive does not exist without the political control of memory.

In *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression* (1995), Derrida considers how the traces of psychoanalysis relate to a contemporary crisis of memory. He returns to two of Freud's case histories which have a peculiar relation to the past, real and imagined. After discussing *Moses and Monotheism* (1939), Derrida turns to the figure of Gradiva, the fictional, fantasy eponym of Wilhelm Jensen's 1903 novella, which Freud makes an example of his psychoanalytic method.¹ Gradiva's significance for the notion of the archive is captured in the cast of an iconic bas-relief, found in multiple reproductions and owned by Jensen and – famously – Freud, which shows a woman stepping 'splendidly' (DD 51). For Derrida, Gradiva is an emblem for the archive fever induced by the missed encounter between the origin and the trace, the *arkhē* and the archive. And she accordingly provokes in Jensen's protagonist (and Freud) the desire to reverse the effects of belatedness, to make the past coincide with

the present retroactively.² Through the figure of *Gradiva*, Derrida's discussion of the archive gives particular attention to the relation of the trace to an (always already lost) originary moment, and anticipates how, in thinking about the history of the twentieth century, the discourse of memory will give way to the discourse of the archive. Indeed, for Derrida, the archive fever affecting Jensen's novella and Freud's reading of it relates to 'the archive fever or disorder we are experiencing today, concerning (...) the great holocaustic tragedies of our modern history and historiography' (AF 90). According to Derrida, '[t]here is no political power without control of the archive, if not of memory', which is seen in 'the participation in and the access to the archive, its constitution, and its interpretation' (AF 4). After Auschwitz, this relates to the political control over the memory and archive of an attempt to eradicate the other. In the post-catastrophic archive, where only ash remains, the desire for control over the trace of the other is doubly troubled, destroying the very thing the archive claims to preserve (AF 94). Archive fever signals the struggle for 'absolute control over the archive of the other',³ which both defines and threatens Holocaust memory. This tension underlies the so-called memory culture that has developed in Germany as a response to the violence of National Socialism and can be understood in terms of the belated effects of that historical trauma in the present. The effects of archive fever can be seen in one memory project in particular: Gunter Demnig's *Stolpersteine*, or stumbling stones, are found in towns and cities across Germany and commemorate those who were persecuted under National Socialism. Demnig's project is demonstrably archival: it requires documentary research into the lives of deportees and then documents these fates itself. But in what follows I will show how, in its preoccupation with ideas of origin, trace and ownership, it also, increasingly, betrays a more troubled relationship to the archive. These concerns are embodied in, and here will be traced through, the figure of *Gradiva*.

Whilst visiting a museum, Jensen's archaeologist protagonist Norbert Hanold stumbles across the fragment of a bas-relief showing a woman striding forward. She lifts her dress slightly to reveal her foot, which is raised in a strikingly elegant manner. Hanold is so taken by this figure that he acquires a copy for his study. He wonders about the origin and destination of the woman, who is captured walking at once so lightly and assuredly. He gives her the name *Gradiva*, 'the girl who steps along', and imagines her crossing the streets of Pompeii via those peculiar lava stepping stones, which were supposed to aid dry passage and have since been excavated (DD 11). Beyond these speculations, Hanold is curious to know if the artist constructed the image of *Gradiva* on the model of a real woman. One night he dreams he is in Pompeii at the catastrophic eruption of Vesuvius in 79 AD and spies *Gradiva* walking through the falling volcanic ash. All too aware that her 'living reality' will soon be lost to him again, he tries to 'impress' the image on his mind.⁴ At the temple, *Gradiva* sits down, laying her head on the steps; despite Hanold's desperate attempts to warn her, she is consumed by ash. When he wakes, Hanold mourns for *Gradiva* 'as someone who was lost' (DD 13), and the bas-relief no longer serves as a means of animating his fantasies, but as a memorial tomb ('Gruftdenkmal').⁵ Hanold decides to travel to Pompeii, where *Gradiva* appears to him again, this time in a midday vision. At that moment, Hanold realizes he came to Italy specifically to find traces of this woman: 'And "traces" literally; for with her peculiar gait she must have left behind an imprint of her toes in the ashes distinct from all the rest' (quoted in DD 17 & 65). Although Hanold fails in this endeavour, he later encounters his childhood friend, Zoe Bertgang, and comes to understand her as the embodiment of his *Gradiva* fantasy.

Reading the singular figure of *Gradiva* as case history allows Freud to 'illuminate more general patterns of experience' on the model of psychoanalysis.⁶ Jensen's story

provides a paradigm for the workings of repression and the work of analysis as means of retrieval: Freud shows how the identity and origins Hanold constructs for Gradiva are not arbitrary, rather they are the displaced, distorted expression of repressed childhood desire, and the motif of archaeology functions exemplarily to symbolize the work of psychoanalysis; unearthing the repressed truth about Hanold's obsession with the bas-relief. Moreover, in analyzing the text, Freud is able to make his theories fundamental to Jensen's story, to put psychoanalysis before the narrative. In his own subsequent analysis of the analysis, Derrida explains how Freud wants to come closer to the origins of the Gradiva figure than either Jensen or Hanold and so betrays the archive fever affecting psychoanalysis: he describes how the analyst as archaeologist wants to unearth the truth, to let 'Stones talk!', but 'the very success of the dig must sign the effacement of the archivist' (AF 93). In trying to 'bring to light a more originary origin' (AF 97), Freud desires '[a]n archive without archive, where, suddenly indiscernible from the impression of its imprint, Gradiva's footstep speaks by itself! (AF 98).

But, Derrida explains, this 'desire for a return to the authentic and singular origin' (AF 85) can never be fulfilled. The archive is *not* the *arkhē*; it is the trace that remains ('the archive comes in the place of memory, at the point of [its] structural breakdown' (AF 11)). The archive is about a fantasy of origins, about that which is imagined about the coincidence of event and trace in the face of its impossibility. Jensen, Hanold and Freud seek an untraceable, undiscoverable origin,⁷ and precisely because the origins of this figure remain elusive, they become a matter of fantasy, a 'Pompeian fantasy' as Jensen has it. Hanold seeks the trace of Gradiva, but must realize that this 'will never be either memory or anamnesis as spontaneous, alive and internal experience' (AF 11). The archive is not the original, rather it is its 'type, the *typos*, the iterable letter or character' (AF 97): as

hypomnema, as 'mnemotechnical supplement or representative' the archive implies the 'possibility of (...) repetition, of reproduction, or of reimpression' (AF 11). Hanold is drawn to Gradiva because of the singularity of her image and the uniqueness of her gait, but this is compromised by the emergence of her living 'double' Zoe and by the logic of copy and reproduction that shapes the history of the actual bas-relief. As Eric Downing has shown, its availability in multiple copies cast from the original offers Freud (as well as Jensen and his protagonist) a surface for the projection of a fantasy image.⁸ Gradiva becomes the object of 'appropriative identities and the troubling exchanges between the fictional and the real, the copy and the original, and the prior and the subsequent' (AI 116). Thus, the archival desire for Gradiva, a desire shared by protagonist, author and analyst, is not merely a fantasy of origins, it is a fantasy of ownership (of the original, and, since this remains elusive, the trace).⁹ For Downing, Freud's analysis of Gradiva partakes of a cultural fantasy that uses archaeology as a means of constructing national identity: this is illustrated in the translation of Gradiva's name to mean the same as Bertgang (AI 125-6). Whilst Jensen introduces the name Gradiva as meaning (simply) 'the girl who steps along', when he establishes the equivalence with Zoe Bertgang, he adds the word 'glänzend', making Gradiva splendid or distinctive only in linking her identity to that of the German woman. The belated emergence of this word invests the figure of Gradiva with additional significance: the attachment to her splendid [glänzend] gait marks Gradiva as a fetish object, suggesting the 'Glanz auf der Nase' ('shine on the nose') which, through phonetic similarity to the English 'glance', functions as fetish for Freud's analysand in his essay on fetishism.¹⁰ Gradiva's distinctive quality, her 'glänzend' gait, is not original or inherent; rather, it is attributed to her when her name is read as the equivalent of another, which is to say, in the act of taking possession of her as German. Moreover, Zoe's relation to the trace Hanold imagines must remain (the toe print

in the ash) is symbolic, not indexical. She is, then, a fetish object in another sense, covering over the fact that the trace as such is compromised by the force of the event to which it should bear witness: *Gradiva must have* left her unique toe print in the ash, but this trace was presumably erased shortly afterwards (in Hanold's dream, she walks through the volcanic rain before laying her head on the temple steps: if she is buried by ash, her toe prints must also be covered and erased; any imprint left in the space left by her body would be that made by her foot in a static, resting position, not her unusual gait). While the encounter with the archive confronts us with the non-coincidence of event and trace, the encounter with the post-catastrophic archive confronts us with the radical *absence* of trace, with the fact of its erasure. As Cathy Caruth remarks, 'at the origin of the figure of repression is the figure of a complete erasure which the metaphor of archaeology and the figure of repression itself bypasses, passes over, to pass on'.¹¹ If the archive is that (trace) which comes in the place of the lost origin; the post-catastrophic archive is that (*imagined* trace) which comes in the place of an erased trace.

[image]

William Cobbing, from *Gradiva Project* (2007) ©Freud Museum London

Archive Fever was first given as a lecture at the Freud Museum in London. The threshold status of Freud's house as museum allows Derrida to reflect on the difference between origin and trace, *arkhē* and archive: what is at stake in *Archive Fever* 'is situated precisely *between the two*' (AF 5). In 2007, artist William Cobbing installed in the museum grounds a manhole cover, specially cast with the image of the woman 'stepping splendidly', as part of his *Gradiva Project*.¹² Whilst Freud's own copy of the bas-relief hangs in his study, Cobbing's installation adopts a liminal position, reminding us of the passage from home to museum, 'from one institution to another', where 'archives take place' (AF 2-3). Moreover,

transposing Gradiva to the horizontal plane, it reminds us how the bas-relief becomes a memorial tomb for Hanold, an icon of mourning for the always already lost object. Yet Cobbing also questions the uniqueness of the Gradiva figure: here, the memorial tomb is a utilitarian, mass-produced object, something mundane to be stepped on or over. Cobbing's version of this figure, who Hanold imagines both caught up in, and retrieved from, a catastrophic moment, confronts us again, elsewhere, in reproduction, with a repressed past, with repressed desire. At once unremarkable and distinctive, familiar and strange, Cobbing's installation provokes a different encounter with the figure of Gradiva and the fantasy of origin and ownership it embodies. As such, it calls to mind the small brass plaques, so-called *Stolpersteine*, found in pavements across Germany and beyond. Like the Gradiva relief, *Stolpersteine* provoke an encounter with the repressed, traumatic past, and with the non-coincidence of these reminders with the event they commemorate. *Stolpersteine* might be understood through the Gradiva relief as an emblem of Derrida's archive fever, offering, in (the) place of a lost original, a surface for the projection of a fantasy image.

Stolpersteine are the work of German artist Gunter Demnig and form what is dubbed the world's largest decentralized memorial.¹³ This project can be seen, like the rest of Demnig's work, as *Aktionskunst*, reaching beyond the institutions of art into public spaces through its performative, political dimension.¹⁴ But with its increasing popularity, it has been aligned explicitly and emphatically with Germany's recent wave of memorial art.¹⁵ Demnig's plaques are inscribed with the name, dates and fate of those deported in the Third Reich. Set outside their last place of residence, they provoke an encounter with National Socialism in the midst of everyday life. The stones commemorate victims as individuals, attempting an act of restitution with the inscription 'Hier wohnte ...' (... lived here). Unlike Demnig's earlier work, which went relatively unnoticed, his *Stolpersteine* have gained huge

public attention. Yet these earlier projects are important, showing the enduring but complex role trace and archive play for the artist. Demnig uses scattered forms and residues evoke the aftermath of nuclear disaster in *Hiroshima – Ground Zero* (1968), and his *Gebackene Menschen* (1975–7), cowering human figures cast in dough and ‘baked’; suggest a disturbing take on the famous casts of victims made at Pompeii.¹⁶ In the 1980s Demnig began making his ‘mobile sculptures’ (GD), in which he journeyed across Germany, France and the UK, using strange contraptions to leave an impermanent trace – blood, whitewash, chalk and so-called scent trails. As well as allowing the artist to explore ideas of trace and inscription, these laborious projects functioned as a kind of signature, marking and demarcating his tests of physical endurance as performance artist or even record breaker (his ‘scent-trails’, *Duftmarken Kassel-Paris* (1980) entered the Guinness Book of Records as the longest artwork).¹⁷ Demnig’s transition to metal allowed him to fix rather than simply leave passing traces.¹⁸ Working in this more permanent mode, he not only recorded traces of the past, but reinscribed the laws that determine the course of history: Demnig’s brass plaque, *Himmler Befehl (Himmler’s Order)* (1992), a formal and conceptual precursor to *Stolpersteine*, confronts those passing Cologne’s City Hall with the racial law that condemned non-Aryans to the camps.

Stolpersteine were originally Demnig’s contribution to *Größenwahn. Kunstprojekte für Europa*, a European project inviting impossibly ambitious concepts for political art, which, as such, were never supposed to be realized.¹⁹ Demnig, however, did go on to make his stones, first in 1994 in Cologne to commemorate Roma and Sinti deportees, and then in 1996 as part of project which sought alternatives to Berlin’s much-maligned Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe, at the time, still in its fitful planning stage.²⁰ Demnig laid a few *Stolpersteine* in a clandestine action that was supposed to resist the authority and

anonymity of a single, centralized monument. But even as part of this physical intervention, Demnig's stones remained *conceptual* art. His idea suggested a corrective to commissioned memorials, but could not be fully realized: even if the identities and addresses of all victims could be ascertained (essentially an impossible scenario), Demnig could never set six million stones in his lifetime. *Stolpersteine* had caught people's attention, however, and Demnig was persuaded to take up the project again in 2000. Since then it has grown beyond expectation with more than 45,000 stones in over 1000 towns and cities across Europe. *Stolpersteine* have certainly encountered resistance, notoriously in Munich, where they are not allowed on municipal property, and in the former East, where right-wing extremism has a stronger presence; but the project has become unexpectedly popular.²¹ Spurred on by this positive response, Demnig has committed himself to the (partial) realization of his project, and has been awarded several prestigious prizes for his dedication to the work of 'coming to terms with' Germany's recent past. Demnig's efforts are, for many, commendable, but recent newspaper articles marking the twentieth anniversary of *Stolpersteine* have been more critical.²² Clearly attached to his superlative status as the most wide(ly)spread artist in Europe,²³ Demnig's commitment to this impossible feat of physical and emotional endurance might be understood in the context (and as the climax) of his earlier art which pushed him to the limits of artistic performance.

Demnig's *Stolperstein*-project is archival in two obvious senses, and as such, implicated in the politics of memory as Derrida describes (AF 4). Each stone requires archival research, initially undertaken by Demnig, but now the task of so-called 'Paten' (sponsors). These are often relatives, but also increasingly local people with no personal connection to named individuals, which questions who this project is in fact for.²⁴ Many German cities now have citizens' initiatives which work with local archives to coordinate research for

Stolpersteine, and online databases, searchable by name or street, provide information about the stones laid to-date.²⁵ Thus, as the project grows, *Stolpersteine* are being read as a kind of atlas or archive of deportation, but since they are only instigated by individuals and laid according to Demnig's availability, this is misleading. The stones might be more accurately and usefully seen as archiving the development of Germany's memory culture. They show which local governments have accepted Demnig's project and indicate the willingness of, and even expectation felt by, particular communities to engage with the project as a now socially sanctioned mode of commemorating Germany's Nazi past.

But *Stolpersteine* can also be understood in the broader, conceptual terms of the archive outlined by Derrida through the figure of Gradiva. According to Derrida's reading of Freud reading Jensen, Gradiva is an emblem for the (impossible) desire to witness the coincidence of event and trace, and as such for the belatedness that marks all our encounters with the archive. Hanold's dream fulfills the wish 'understandable in any archaeologist, to have been present as an eyewitness' at the catastrophe he came too late to see (DD 93). Contemporary German memory culture is increasingly determined by the desire of subsequent generations to understand that which they came too late to witness. By setting a trace outside the home of deportees, Demnig attempts the reinstatement of that encounter. Yet as supplement and prosthesis, the artist's trace, made belatedly, can never coincide with the lives of those to whom it refers: '[t]he faithful memory of such a singularity can only be given over to the spectre' (AF 100). Those who witnessed this moment are precisely those who were deported. Gradiva's distinctive gait means she must have left a unique trace in the ground, yet this, covered by the ash of Pompeii and only ever made in Hanold's dream, remains elusive; he must content himself with the cast taken from the bas-relief and made in multiple copies. *Stolpersteine* mark where these traces should be,

but also that there are no traces, that the body that left the trace was displaced to, and in most cases destroyed in, the camps. In this sense, *Stolpersteine* might even function, like the Gradiva figure, as a kind of fetish object to cover over the impossibility of witness, the impossible coincidence of event and trace. Demnig's earlier *Himmler Befehl*, meanwhile, does not try to come close to the origin as traumatic event, rather, by reinscribing the law that condemned millions to death, exposes the 'archontic principle of the archive, which in itself presupposes not the originary *arkhē* but the nomological *arkhē* of the law' (AF 95). As such, it is perhaps a more meaningful reflection on the significance of the archive for Holocaust memory.

Unlike the stepping stones of Pompeii which cause Gradiva to walk with her distinctive gait and which have been unearthed subsequently, *Stolpersteine* are not the finds of an archaeological dig. They are the symbolic markers *that* something has been brought to light – evidence of a former resident's deportation. Demnig's stones function as a kind of archaeological *substitute*, which, to use Freud's psycho-archaeological metaphor, are supposed to speak to us: 'Stones talk!' But with whose voice? As in the Gradiva narrative, the fantasy of origins underlying *Stolpersteine* is also a fantasy of ownership, in which victim identities are appropriated by the artist for his project. The named individual is reduced to the format and formula designed by Demnig. Indeed, this inscription, made by hand, also functions as a kind of signature for the artist, who effaces the identity of the named victim even as he (re)inscribes it.²⁶ Demnig aims to make a mark with his *Stolpersteine* (('Zeichen setzen' (GD)), but this gesture is also one of leaving *his* mark and is fundamental to his artistic project as a whole. His *Brandmarken* (*Branding*) (1983) uses a cauterizing iron to sear a woman's shoe with the artist's name and date: 'DEM NIG 83'.²⁷ This industrialized signature is itself a signature of Demnig's work used to sign and date other

projects, but the violent gesture of its imprinting looks forward to Demnig stamping text onto his *Stolperstein* plaques. The artist's mark seared on the underside of a shoe also anticipates how, walking over his stones, the public will also be branded with his signature. *Brandmarken* refers back to Demnig's earlier *Duftmarken*, but it also denotes the act of branding and connotes the branding of camp inmates (something *Stolpersteine* aim to counter by using the *names* of victims (GD)). Whilst Demnig is all too aware of the dangers of replicating the gestures of fascism, his project threatens to do so nonetheless. Initially, he insisted on fashioning and setting each stone himself as a way of avoiding the kind of production-line process which ultimately characterized the Nazi fabrication of corpses. But in her carefully observed documentary, Dörte Franke shows how, in the face of unprecedented demand, manufacturing the stones has become something of a conveyor-belt industry after all.²⁸

Stolpersteine are supposed to commemorate victims as individuals, but these markers of identity are, like the figure of Grädiva, caught between the exceptional and the uniform, singularity and ubiquity. And as in Freud's case study, this 'double character' questions how the uniform can be used to show the exceptional without compromising or violating its singularity.²⁹ The name inscribed on each *Stolpersteine* marks it as unique, but as fates are repeated – 'deported to Theresienstadt', 'murdered in Auschwitz' – and similarities between 'typical' names appear, individual identities merge to form a more clichéd image of the (Jewish) victim. Like the archive, *Stolpersteine* come in the place of memory, at the point of its structural breakdown (AF 11). And as the bas-relief serves Hanold as a means of speculating on and fantasizing the identity of Grädiva, Demnig's stones, with their few data about the individual – named, but not known – allow for the construction of a victim identity on the model familiar to the passing or commissioning

public. In 2012, an exhibition of photographs showed responses (of principally Jewish relatives) to stones around Hamburg. Where, in the exhibition title, 'Stolpersteine und ihre Angehörigen' (Stolpersteine and Their Relatives), the possessive pronoun relates to the *Stolpersteine*, the stone take the place of the victim, and the use of the third person makes both the memorials and the family members the object of the (presumably largely non-Jewish) German gaze. The photographs reinforce this effect: as a series they reveal a uniformity of response and posture, which seems to condense into an image of the Jewish mourner to be viewed by the German audience.³⁰ *Stolpersteine* were also used to evoke a clichéd image of the Jewish victim on the German soap opera *Lindenstraße*, when, in a guest appearance, Demnig set plaques for one of the character's former Jewish neighbours.³¹ The use of Demnig's project for the commemoration of fictional identities questions its claim to remember victims as individuals. Even more problematic is the appropriation of *Stolpersteine* for fictional identities: in 2014, Margarita Broich, the new star of Germany's popular detective series *Tatort*, chose to name her character after the *Stolperstein* outside her apartment. Demnig condemned the decision, saying it was inappropriate to make this link between a real victim and a fictional character,³² but arguably Demnig also appropriates and instrumentalizes the names of victims for his own artistic project.

As *Gräfin* is distinctive for her splendid (glänzend) gait and ownership of one of the copies of her cast was a marker of a group identity,³³ so *Stolpersteine* have the potential to function as a mark of distinction, showing the community as engaging with the legacy of the past. Where the project has been rejected, authorities have criticized its propensity to select and distinguish: Munich's mayor has questioned which victims would be chosen for commemoration and according to which criteria; and before the stones were permitted in Leipzig, they were seen to be redolent of the Hollywood Walk of Fame.³⁴ Demnig's

procedure for setting his stones is short and perfunctory, but communities make this more of a ceremony with flowers, candles and speeches, which, as well as honoring the victim, arguably also 'certifies' the local connections to the Nazi past. Press coverage often describes how the stones make the traces of the past shine (glänzen),³⁵ and local people form so-called cleaning groups to ensure they continue to do so. Such gestures, whilst surely well-intentioned, indicate a more compulsive element to people's engagement with the past (obsessive gestures of removing dirt suggesting the desire to be purged of guilt), played out through commemorative projects. In 2013 a high-profile celebrity cleaning event was organized in Berlin to coincide with the anniversary of the November Pogrom, raising questions about who or what is being given prominence and in whose name.³⁶ The significance of this occasion also heightened the strange, but seemingly unacknowledged, sense in which such gestures mirror physically the posture of Jews forced to scrub the streets of Vienna in 1938, an image immortalized in Alfred Hrdlicka's controversial *Monument against War and Fascism*.³⁷

In 2010, Demnig was invited to display his stones in a dedicated room of the German pavilion at the Shanghai Expo.³⁸ But what or who was being exhibited here? Demnig, his project, the victims? How did Demnig choose the selection to be displayed? And what exactly was being shown as exemplarily German? The stones, the names, or the active engagement with the Nazi past?³⁹ *Stolpersteine* are, indeed, a key example of the memorial projects of the Berlin Republic that respond to the imperative to remember the National Socialist past, but as the initiative grows, they are also an example of the more problematic aspects of Germany's memory culture. These can be seen as the manifestation of Derrida's archive fever, of the 'troubled and (...) troubling' position of the archive in relation to the missed encounter (AF 90). Through the figure of Gradiva, Derrida describes the (impossible) desire

to witness the event, to see origin and trace as they still coincide, and through Freud's analysis, shows how the desire for the original gives way to the desire for possession of the trace that remains (a trace which can be reinscribed, repeated). The obsession with the image of Gradiva allows Jensen, Hanold and Freud to project onto her a fantasy of the desired object – the real woman who underlies the image. The encounter with Gradiva in *Archive Fever*, and again in the installation by William Cobbing on the threshold to the Freud Museum, allows for a reevaluation of Demnig's project as troubled by the archive, by the desire to reinstate traces of a missed encounter at the origin. Demnig uses his infinitely replicable format to show something singular, but as the stones are seen as part of his project they merge to form a more clichéd, familiar image of the (Jewish) victim. Offering an opportunity for leave-taking so often refused, *Stolpersteine* have been applauded by Jewish communities and relatives, but where 'sponsors' have no personal connection to the person named on the stone, the project becomes more questionable. Created as part of local initiatives to recover the traces of those once excluded from the community, and then made part of regular or symbolic cleaning initiatives, these stones become an emblem of a 'victim' who is made 'glänzend' in the eyes of the 'perpetrator', the other is symbolically reinstated in the community and the dirt of Nazi history removed in a gesture of cathartic exertion.⁴⁰

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to the Leverhulme Trust for its support, to Andrew Webber and Mary Cosgrove for their feedback, and to Irmela von der Lühe who, as my mentor on a scholarship from the Studienstiftung des Abgeordnetenhauses von Berlin, first made me aware of the *Stolpersteine*.

¹ Sigmund Freud, 'Delusions and Dreams in Jensen's *Gradiva*', in The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, edited by James Strachey et al (London: Vintage, 2001), vol. 9, 1–96; hereafter DD.

² Jacques Derrida, Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression, translated by Eric Prenowitz (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 97–101; hereafter AF.

³ John D. Caputo, The Prayers and Tears of Jacques Derrida (Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1997), 263–80 (265).

⁴ Wilhelm Jensen, Gradiva. A Pompeiian Fancy, translated by Helen M. Downey (London: Allen and Unwin, 1921), 20–1.

⁵ Sigmund Freud, Der Wahn und die Träume in W. Jensens 'Gradiva' (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 2003), 137.

⁶ Andrew J. Webber, 'The Case Study', in A Concise Companion to Psychoanalysis, Literature and Culture, edited by Laura Markus and Anghi Mukherjee (Blackwell, 2014). I am grateful to the author for allowing me access to the manuscript prior to publication.

⁷ Gisela Steinlechner, Juliane Vogel, 'Vorwort', in Freuds pompejanische Muse: Beiträge zu Wilhelm Jensens Novelle 'Gradiva', edited by Michael Rohrwasser, Gisela Steinlechner, Juliane Vogel, Christiane Zintzen (Vienna: Sonderzahl, 1996), 7–13 (8).

⁸ Eric Downing, After Images: Photography, Archaeology and Psychoanalysis and the Tradition of Bildung (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2006), 129; hereafter AI.

⁹ After Images, 113.

¹⁰ Freud, 'Fetishism', Standard Edition, vol. 21, 152–9 (152).

¹¹ Cathy Caruth, 'After the End: Psychoanalysis and the Ashes of History', lecture given at the University of Cambridge 10 March 2011 and accessed here:

<http://www.sms.cam.ac.uk/media/1117625;jsessionid=29A23D67E258865AB1A20980A07EECAC>

Caruth speculates that there is an absent body at the site of the catastrophe, that the ash that preserves Gradiva is the ash that incinerates her. However, the heat of the eruption of Vesuvius at Pompeii, unlike at Herculaneum, did not cremate the bodies, rather these would have decomposed subsequently (Paul Roberts, Life and Death at Pompeii and Herculaneum (London: British Museum Press, 2013)).

¹² See William Cobbing, Gradiva Project (Camden Arts Centre, 2007).

¹³ DVD blurb, Stolperstein, directed by Dörte Franke (Hanfgarn & Ufer, 2008).

¹⁴ 'Gunter Demnig im Gespräch mit Uta Franke' <http://www.stolpersteine-elmsborn.de/artikel/demnig/demnig.htm>, consulted 30 November 2012; hereafter GD.

¹⁵ See *Memorialization in Germany since 1945*, edited by Bill Niven and Chloe Paver (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

¹⁶ See the artist's website: <http://www.gunterdemnig.de/>, consulted 10 October 2013.

¹⁷ See artist's website. This was allegedly an ironic swipe at the art industry (Andreas Nefzger, 'Der Spurenleger', *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 7 February 2014, <http://www.faz.net/aktuell/gesellschaft/menschen/stolpersteine-der-spurenleger-12788525.html>, consulted 6 May 2014).

¹⁸ 'Wie der Künstler Gunter Demnig gegen das Vergessen arbeitet', *Neue Osnabrücker Zeitung*, 19 April 2013, <http://www.noz.de/deutschland-welt/medien/artikel/1323/2004-wojo-interview-demnig>, consulted 30 October 2013.

¹⁹ Gunter Demnig, 'Projekt Stolperstein', in *Größenwahn. Kunstprojekte für Europa*, edited by Gabriele Lindinger and Karlheinz Schmid (Regensburg: Lindinger + Schmid, 1993), 60–1. The illustrations show the finished *Himmler Gesetz*-stone and Demnig at work as he lays it. In this guise, the project would also commemorate more recent violence, but since its public and media appropriation, serves exclusively to commemorate the victims of National Socialism.

²⁰ http://www.germangalleries.com/NGBK/Bakunin-ein_Denkmal.html, consulted 15 November 2012.

²¹ For accounts of the *Stolperstein*-project, see Michael Imort, 'Stumbling Blocks: A Decentralized Memorial to Holocaust Victims', in *Memorialization in Germany*, 233–42 and Margaret Ewing, 'The Unexpected Encounter: Confronting Holocaust Memory in the Streets of Post-Wall Berlin', in *Rhetoric, Remembrance and Visual Form: Sighting Memory*, edited by Anne Teresa Demo, Bradford Vivian (New York and Abingdon: 2012), 33–48.

²² See 'Der Spurenleger' and Thorsten Schmitz, 'Ausgebucht', *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 23 April 2014, p. 3

²³ 'Ausgebucht'.

²⁴ The project website encourages sponsors to make contact with living relatives, but in so doing presumes the two groups are mutually exclusive (<http://www.stolpersteine.eu/technik/>, consulted 28 November 2013).

²⁵ <http://www.themenportal.de/kultur/mit-online-stolpersteinen-gegen-das-vergessen-89091>, consulted 15 April 2012.

²⁶ Demnig identifies with his project to such an extent that he sees himself as *Stolperstein* ('ich bin der Stolperstein') ('Ausgebucht').

²⁷ <http://www.gunterdemnig.de/#index.php?id=53>, consulted 10 October 2013.

²⁸ Stolperstein. Demnig's single-handedness has since proved unsustainable and he currently works with a small team ('Wie der Künstler gegen das Vergessen arbeitet').

²⁹ 'The Case History'.

³⁰ Gunter Demnig, 'Stolpersteine als soziale Skulptur', in Gesche-M. Cordes, Stolpersteine und Angehörige (Herzogenrath: Murken-Altrogge, 2012), 236-7 (236).

³¹ The stones were then displayed in Munich's Jewish Museum

(http://www.lindenstrasse.de/Information/Panorama/_2011/Ausstellung_JuedischesMuseumMuenchen.jsp consulted 20 November 2011).

³² 'Selma Jacobi', Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 20 March 2014,

<http://www.faz.net/aktuell/feuilleton/tatort-name-selma-jacobi-12856098.html> consulted 22 March 2014.

³³ After Images, 126.

³⁴ 'Steine, die wehtun', Der Spiegel, 28 June 2004; <http://www.goethe.de/kue/bku/thm/idd/de78940.html>, consulted 12 April 2012.

³⁵ See for example, 'Glänzende Spuren der Erinnerung',

http://www.kunstmarkt.com/pagesmag/kunst/id253746-/ausstellungen_berichtdetail.html?q=%20

consulted 28 November 2012.

³⁶ <http://www.suedkurier.de/nachrichten/panorama/leute-themensk/Wunderbares-Projekt-Jauch-und-Raabe-putzen-Stolpersteine;art1015351,6441600,PRINT?FRAME=64> consulted 20 November 2013.

³⁷ See Matti Bunzl, 'On the Politics and Semantics of Austrian Memory: Vienna's Monument against War and Fascism', History and Memory, 7 (2) (1995), 7-40.

³⁸ Helmut Matt, "'Better City, better [sic] Life", die Expo 2010 in Shanghai, 21 April 2010, <http://frankfurt.china-consulate.org/det/zg/t687430.htm> consulted 12 October 2012.

³⁹ Exporting *Stolpersteine* as an artefact of Germany's 'exemplary' memory culture reveals the kind of discomfort or discontent Aleida Assmann has recently identified (Das neue Unbehagen an der Erinnerungskultur. Eine Intervention (Munich: Beck, 2013)).

⁴⁰ 'Aktivisten schrubben braunen Dreck weg', <http://www.derwesten.de/staedte/duisburg/aktivisten-schrubben-braunen-dreck-weg-id7527457.html>, consulted 30 January 2013.