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Consolation, commoration and closure are emotive processes widely enacted in the poetic construction of memorialisation, through elegiac forms. However, as Matthew Boswell asserts, ‘the victims of Nazism cannot be reached through traditional gestures of elegiac commemoration’,¹ which aim for public closure and private consolation. Thus, memorialisation of the Holocaust must necessarily diverge from the consolatory tradition of elegiac memorialisation. Memorialisation as a construction of continuum enacts the anxiety Susan Gubar explores, of the disaster and its hatred being ‘reborn at some sinister future time’.² This anxiety is a necessary continuum, with regard to Gubar’s statement that ‘the Holocaust is dying’;³ an infinite death in the present tense, a continuum of failure. Michael Longley and Geoffrey Hill express poetic awareness of the failure of traditional elegiac memorialisation, and the omnipresent nature of the Holocaust’s ‘dying’. Through a rejection of consolation, constructing infinite silence and absences, rejecting physical memorials, attempting to cultivate a continuing public memory, and enacting Nazi violence, Longley and Hill construct a memorialisation which continues. Due to the omnipresent nature of the disaster, and the failure of public memory and national memorials, the poetic construction of continuum is a necessary, inherent rejection of the consolatory tradition of elegiac memorialisation.

Longley memorialises victims of the Holocaust in an explicit rejection of the consolatory elegy. He speaks of a process of ‘protest’ enacted in his memorialisation, asserting that ‘there’s nothing consolatory about that’.⁴ Poetic protest of disaster attempts to ‘imagine every last bit of it, and [tries] to make sure it won’t happen again’,⁵ a process which aligns with Gubar’s continual ‘dying’ of the Holocaust. Anti-consolatory memorialisation acknowledges the trauma of the Holocaust’s continual presence; it cultivates a continuum, in contrast to enabling closure. Protest, here, ‘undermines conventional lyric memorialization that yearns for finality’;⁶ a construction which attempts a continuum of memory, whilst rejecting the implied triumph and finality present within physical memorials.

This process of consolatory rejection is displayed within ‘The Cairn at Dooaghtry’, a subversion of the public Holocaust memorial. Unlike built physical memorials which ‘stand for—or stand in for—that which they commemorate’,⁷ the cairn and Longley’s poetic construction assert Brendan Corcoran’s notion that ‘victims of catastrophe remain suspended in the world’.⁸ The ‘memorial to all of them’,⁹ child victims of the Irish Famine and the Holocaust alike, is a communal, un-finite and disintegrating existence. Upon line five, a list of three denotes this process of diminishment. The memorial begins as a ‘cairn’, a mound of stones formed for conscious memorial; it then becomes a ‘scree’, a sloping heap of rock denoting natural forces of weathering rather than intended memorialisation. Finally, it becomes a ‘landslide’: both significantly diminished in physicality, and a destructive continuing presence. Within this list, stress falls upon ‘cairn’, the repeated ‘scree’, and finally the spondaic foot of ‘landslide’, calling focal significance upon this process of diminishment, and the spondaic conclusory product. A landslide is a disastrous presence, the impact of which remains, much like the Holocaustic deaths, and the anxiety Susan Gubar explores, of the disaster and its hatred being ‘reborn at some sinister future time’. This anxiety is a necessary continuum, with regard to Gubar’s statement that ‘the Holocaust is dying’. An infinite death in the present tense, a continuum of failure. Michael Longley and Geoffrey Hill express poetic awareness of the failure of traditional elegiac memorialisation, and the omnipresent nature of the Holocaust’s ‘dying’. Through a rejection of consolation, constructing infinite silence and absences, rejecting physical memorials, attempting to cultivate a continuing public memory, and enacting Nazi violence, Longley and Hill construct a memorialisation which continues. Due to the omnipresent nature of the disaster, and the failure of public memory and national memorials, the poetic construction of continuum is a necessary, inherent rejection of the consolatory tradition of elegiac memorialisation.
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continual ‘dying’. This construction of both diminishment and continual existence mirrors the children who ‘lie under the cairn’. Utilising a verb in the present tense necessitates the continual presence of the victims, memorialised as ‘children’ rather than bodies. The children are dead, and their bodies do not exist under the cairn itself, yet the cairn’s presence enables a persisting memory: a continuum.

Further, ‘Ghetto’ calls upon the anti-consolatory within its failure to represent; a failure of memorialisation which becomes a necessary continuum. Jahan Ramazani considers the elegist’s role to ‘neither abandon the dead nor heal the living’; further understood through Brearton’s claim that ‘failure and paradox [are] at the heart of the elegiac mode’. Engaging with the elegised in an anti-consolatory manner involves a continuum of paradox: the dead must be infinitely un-abandoned, yet closure for the living, and thus, in turn, the dead, involves problematic finality. ‘Ghetto’ engages with this paradox: the speaker considers the vast numbers of the dead, yet only ‘can imagine one’. This envisaged child becomes an impossible continuum: ‘He turns into a little snowman and refuses to melt’. The fragility of life represented in the snowman metaphor illustrates a failure to save the child, and the simultaneous failure to memorialise sufficiently, within a continuum.

Longley’s anti-consolatory memorialisation further cultivates continuum through representing an omnipresent, infinite absence, configured through constructions of silence, which necessarily continue. ‘Terezín’ approaches the magnitude of silence, facing Brearton’s claim of ‘the paradoxical nature of memorialising through presence’. Longley asserts that the ‘brevity’ of ‘Terezín’s two lines allows the poem ‘to approach the condition of silence’ within the ‘momentous subject matter’, absence represented in the brevity of the poem asserts the silence of the scene, and further the incomprehensible loss. This absence is configured within formal interruptions, in the loss of conclusive regularity. The first line’s regular iambic hexameter is interrupted by an additional syllable upon the word ‘hundreds’. Interruption of regular metre dislocates the potential for closure, particularly through the interruptive word focusing on numerous largeness. Further, ‘room’ is repeated within one line in a stumbling manner, and half-rhyme patterns appear throughout, avoiding full rhyme entirely. Assonance of the first syllables of ‘room’ and ‘unison’ hint towards rhymic closure of the couplet. Yet, this is again interrupted by the final two syllables of ‘unison’. Furthermore, ‘Terezín’, ‘unison’ and ‘violin’ express cretic feet with half-rhymes, suggesting cyclical continuum through repetition, disallowing closure.

Formal interruptions construct a sense of unease, represented similarly through imagery and absence. Corcoran interprets ‘an uncanny sense of absence despite the haunted surplus of items’: absence is uneasily constructed through an excess of violins; excessive due to the deaths of their owners. This uneasy hollowness in absence is directly reflective of the Holocaustic death it represents, which, ‘like silence itself, resists containment’. Both the Holocaust memory and Longley’s constructed silence necessarily continue. Similarly, ‘Ghetto’ constructs uneasy absence within symbolic violins, highlighting that ‘Fingers leave shadows on a violin’. The impossible continual presence of a necessarily impermanent shadow represents the irretrievable death, imagined as a continuum.

Similarly to ‘Terezín’, ‘The Exhibit’ considers the paradox of absence within the process of memorialisation. Scott Brewster understands that rejecting the consolatory closure of traditional memorialisation regularly involves an elegy which ‘neither heals nor abandons the “missing” body’. Necessarily, the body remains continually present in the poetic world, disallowing bodily and emotional closure. In ‘The Exhibit’, the bodies of Holocaust victims are reanimated and subjected to a ‘forced “exhibition”’; an imagined continuum as an artistic spectacle within a gallery. The lyric voice, and voyeuristic observer, of the elegy is preoccupied with the absence apparent within the exhibition of the dead. The introductory personal pronoun ‘I’ is contrasted directly with the impersonal, othering use of
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The voice further considers the conditional, ‘would have been’ to imaginatively construct what is necessarily absent in the abuse. By displaying the dehumanised bodies within an exhibit, and necessitating their continuum in both physical existence and publicly accessible memory, images of absence become symbolic. Importantly within this exhibit, an act of searching for one’s lost ‘spectacles’ takes ‘an eternity’; the exhibition is an infinite continuum of the ‘most creaturely of gestures’ of the inaccessible dead. The construction of absence, here, enables a pervading sense of the condition of continuum: a Holocaust which is necessarily eternally ‘dying’.

In The Triumph of Love, Hill considers both physical memorials and public memory as potential candidates for the cultivation of continuum, in an act of Holocaust memorialisation. Firstly, permanent, built memorials may be considered as a problematic continuum of triumph. Brearton asserts that through memorials, absence of the dead is ‘commemorated, and remembered, through presence’. Remembrance is an act aimed towards within both memorials and memory cultivated through the elegy. Yet, within the notion of commemoration through permanent presence, we may arrive at Hill’s declarative opening statement to section CXXXI: ‘Mourning registers as celebration’. This notion of celebratory mourning is illustrated in the closing of section CXXVIII, which expresses the paradox of mourning through memorials; a permanent continuum of attempted memory, which necessarily becomes engulfed with ‘conjurations of triumphs’. A seven syllable line, in a divergence from the otherwise regular decasyllabic lines surrounding it, closes with the alliterative spondaic foot ‘black bulk’. This focal harshness is modified by enjambment upon the next line, in the paradoxical juxtaposition ‘of light’, highlighting the paradoxical nature of celebratory mourning expressed within the physical structure of the memorial. Similarly, the ‘fields of the dead’ are modified and become ‘fields of preservation’; ‘dead’ and ‘preservation’ standing as direct oppositions within notions of continuum, yet also paradoxically similar. Preservation necessitates death, in which memory continuum requires something unchanging to memorialise. Here, language of paradox enables the impression, as outlined by Antony Rowland, that ‘attempts to remember the dead cannot entirely escape from the self-congratulatory pomp displayed by Constitution Arch’, and hence all war memorials since. Triumph, here, necessarily diverges from the anti-consolatory aim of Holocaust memorialisation, leaving physical memorials as a problematic attempt to cultivate continuum.

If an unchanging physical continuum proves to be dangerously celebratory, Brearton suggests that poetry may be an alternative site of mourning and memorialisation, whilst still constructing continuum. The memorial poem ‘embodies memory’, yet simultaneously ‘deconstructs itself in a process of forgetting, reaching towards its own non-existence’; the elegy acknowledges its own insufficiency of continuum, in contrast to the physical memorial’s rigid and unchanging continuum of existence. This is embodied in the closing statement of LXXVI: ‘a nation/ with so many memorials but no memory.’ The alliterative repetition of the ‘m’ sound aligns the ‘many memorials’ and ‘memory’ in a stumbling comparative gesture. A similarly between the words is highlighted, allowing a consideration of the difference between memorials and memory. Yet, Rowland further explores that ‘the dangers of glorious war memorials […] might apply to the elegy as much as public sculpture’, a self-conscious anxiety in Hill’s memorialisation. This danger of glory aligns with the traditional elegiac aims of closure, commemoration and consolation. Yet, Hill’s memorial construction of continuum aims towards rejecting this.

Further, the existence of memory itself, as displayed within poetry of memorialisation, now stands as an un-remembered memory, constructing a continuum of public presence. As Maurice Blanchot asserts, of literary memorialisation of global horrors: ‘whether it happens or not; it is the writing of the disaster’. Public memory, and its continuum, or failure to persist, is constructed by writing, and the simultaneous absences within writing. These necessarily ‘hypermediated experiences of memory’,
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inaccessible due to the poet not being a witness, must represent the anti-consolatory in order to successfully attempt to express ‘the immemorial’. \(^{32}\) The difficulty in aiming towards Blanchot’s notion of defying public ‘forgetfulness without memory’ \(^{33}\) is illustrated within section XXXI. Hill’s rejection of forgetting is understood as ‘revulsion against a poetics of healing’; \(^{34}\) emotional, cultural healing is represented as a literal ‘[s]cab’ \(^{35}\) aiming for closure and consolation through the physical attempt to heal. Scabs denote a healing which has begun, after trauma. However, the appropriated voice of Hill’s critics understands his anti-consolatory memorialisation as ‘[s]cab-picking’; recalling pain in order to reject finite closure. Spiteful, spat sibilance of the two-line poem expresses Hill’s act in grotesque imagery; a continual re-wounding which leaves the post-memory public ‘salted/ with the scurf’ of the ‘sores’ of the disaster. This act of small violence leaves Hill also an ‘old scab’; bearing post-memory wounds in an anti-consolatory continuum of a refusal to heal.

Similarly to Hill’s ‘[s]cab-picking’, The Triumph of Love further expresses a poetic enactment of violence to enable a memorial continuum, in an attempt to avert returning scenarios. This enactment of violence is born of an anxiety that ‘postwar generations seem to have unlearned the lessons’ \(^{36}\) against hatred expressed after the disaster. Firstly, section XIII illustrates Gubar’s understanding that ‘the Holocaust lament rarely contains a single dead person, but instead a murdered people’. \(^{37}\) A focus upon the uncountable many constructs an infinite continuum of suffering, and Hill utilises this to dehumanise Holocaust victims in an enactment of unending violence. Calling upon violence within memorialisation necessarily aims towards a continuum of memory, through which the violence may be reimagined, in an attempt to necessitate the impossibility of a rebirth of the disaster. Section XIII imposes a continuum of memory through permanence of physical existence of victim’s bodies. By forcing the bodies to be ‘accepted/ as civic concrete, reinforceable/ base cinderblocks’ \(^{38}\) they exist in a continuum as debased objects. Further, these objects become the building blocks by which physical spaces are constructed. The deaths become permanently omnipresent within the way the physical world is built, a metaphor for the Holocaust’s continual ‘dying’; for traumatic memory permanence.

Further, section XX explicitly calls upon Nazi voices to enact a violence similarly concerned with continuum: the construction of an eternity of suffering within a necessarily unchanging photograph. Violence is enacted through the construction of Nazi subjectivity, when faced with human suffering. Again, the repeated impersonal use of ‘that’ \(^{39}\) to refer to a Jewish victim displays a complete dehumanisation. Further, subjectivity is illustrated upon viewing the photograph, in which the Nazi voice describes the human burning ‘in a composed manner’. Warped subjectivity here displays the enabling of a continuum of violence: understanding the human torture as ‘composed’ is an act of dehumanising violence within itself. By constructing this voice of subjectivity, Hill warns against allowing this dehumanisation to continue or become reborn.

Further illustrating the continuum of this suffering, use of the twice repeated, ‘for ever’ necessitates a pause between the two words, lost if the lexical choice ‘forever’ were given instead. Metrically, ‘forever’ may be scanned with speed as a cretic foot, or alternatively, a syllable may be lost by scanning an iamb. Yet, within the two iambic lines given, and the separation of the word, ‘for ever’ interrupts regularity with a closing antibacchiuss foot. This called metrical focus and necessitated pace modification illuminates the importance of the eternity of suffering. Calling upon Nazi voices in order to re-enact violence committed aims towards necessitating a continuum of memory, equally represented through constructions of the continuum of objectified bodies and suffering depicted in a photograph.

To conclude, Michael Longley and Geoffrey Hill elegise inaccessible Holocaustic deaths through a necessary modification of the memorial process of the elegy itself; an acknowledgement of the Holocaust’s ‘dying’. This modification involves a rejection of the consolatory, commemorative and closure-focused elegiac tradition, through which a construction of continuum enables a memorialisation which continues, but does not aim to heal. Longley’s memorialisation understands the necessary continuum of poetic constructions of silence and absence, an act which constantly defies the consolatory tradition of the elegy. He illustrates both the failure of inaccessible memory and physical attempts to memorialise, in self-conscious elegiac forms. Hill’s memorialisation similarly acknowledges
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the problematic nature to the continuum of a physical memorial, which often too closely denotes triumph and celebratory mourning. Within elegiac forms, the alternative to physical continuum is a continuing public memory, constructed through the existence of poetry, and a close exploration of the nature of post-memory memorialisation. Further, memorialised continuum is enacted by Hill through constructions of Nazi violence within elegiac forms. Both Longley and Hill ‘refuse the closure, rebirth, and substitution traditional in the elegiac genre, lest they seem to impose sense and purpose on mass murder’,\(^{40}\) a process essentially anti-consolatory and un-finite, aiming towards necessitating the impossibility of a rebirth of the disaster.
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