

Spiegelman Studies Part 1 of 2: *Maus*

Philip Smith*

Loughborough University

Abstract

Art Spiegelman is one of the most-discussed creators in Comic Book Studies. His Pulitzer-winning work *Maus* (1980 and 1991) was, alongside *The Dark Knight Returns* (1986) and *Watchmen* (1987), the catalyst to a sea change in the commercial and critical fortunes of the alternative comic book during the mid-1980s. It has been a landmark text in critical discourses on comics ever since. The purpose of this and its companion paper is to offer a synthesis and reinvestigation of both the existing critical literature on Spiegelman as well as, perhaps most importantly, the lacunae within that literature. The aims of these two papers, then, are two-fold: firstly, to establish where we have got to and, secondly, to suggest some directions for the future of Spiegelman scholarship. This, the first of the two papers, will be devoted to the richest vein of Spiegelman scholarship, on *Maus*.

Art Spiegelman is one of the most-discussed creators in Comic Book Studies. The *Bonner Online-Bibliographie Zur Comicforschung* lists almost 350 articles on Spiegelman which means that, within the field of Comics Studies, in terms of sheer quantity of critical interest, he is exceeded only by Alan Moore. His Pulitzer-winning work *Maus* (1980 and 1991) features regularly in book clubs, high school literature syllabi, as well as under- and post-graduate courses on both comics and Holocaust literature. This is hardly surprising; *Maus* was, alongside *The Dark Knight Returns* (1986) and *Watchmen* (1987), the catalyst to a sea change in the commercial and critical fortunes of the alternative comic book during the mid-1980s. It has been a landmark text in critical discourse on comics ever since.

The purpose of this and its companion paper is to offer a synthesis and reinvestigation of both the existing critical literature on Spiegelman as well as, perhaps most importantly, the lacunae within that literature. The aims of these two papers, then, are two-fold: firstly, to establish where we have got to and, secondly, to suggest some directions for the future of Spiegelman scholarship. This, the first of the two papers, will be devoted to the richest vein of Spiegelman scholarship, on *Maus*.

Maus dramatises a series of interviews which Spiegelman conducted with his father, Vladek Spiegelman, an Auschwitz survivor. Both the interview process and the story which Vladek Spiegelman's in-text incarnation tells are depicted. Famously, Spiegelman chose to use an animal allegory to tell the story, with Jews as mice, Germans as cats and Americans as dogs. Bella Brodzki's essay 'Breakdowns and Breakthroughs: Looking for Art in Young Spiegelman's Graphic Subjects' on the volume *Breakdowns* effectively sums up much of the criticism on Spiegelman (and, indeed, much of the formative stage of modern comics scholarship) in four words (including one contraction): 'it's all about *Maus*' (Brodzki 2011, 51). The overwhelming majority of critical work on Spiegelman has centred upon *Maus*, often to the point where other works have been read as lengthy appendices to his masterpiece.

The earliest examples of Spiegelman (and, specifically, *Maus*) criticism came from scholars working in disparate fields that included oral testimony (such as Joshua Brown's paper *Of Mice*

and Memory in 1988), and Jewish literary and artistic traditions (Adam Gopnik's *Comics and Catastrophe* in 1987), and later psychoanalytical branches of literary theory (Dominick LaCapra's *History and Memory after Auschwitz* in 1998). A notable spike in Spiegelman criticism occurred in 2003 following the publication of a dedicated volume of essays on the comic entitled *Art Spiegelman's 'Maus': Approaches to Art Spiegelman's Survivor's Tale of the Holocaust* which was edited by Deborah Geis. *Metamaus* (2011), which features interviews with Spiegelman and his family and Spiegelman's research materials and analysis as well as a DVD with a panel-by-panel commentary on *Maus*, has already elicited critical responses from Hillary Chute in 'Comics as Archives: Meta*Metamaus*' (2012) and Elizabeth Friedman in 'Spiegelman's magic box: *MetaMaus* and the archive of representation' (2012). *Metamaus* promises to usher in a second renaissance of *Maus* criticism.

This large body of academic work has involved more approaches than can be detailed individually in a brief overview. This paper will therefore seek to identify the central trends and motifs in *Maus* criticism that are of immediate relevance to this thesis, namely: the animal allegory, the figure of the second generation survivor, the importance of Trauma, the question of Anja's role in the text, the historiographical process which has informed *Maus*, verbal-visual tensions within the text and the matter of time. After introducing each of these themes, the relevant original contributions will be underscored, and the blind spots in each area of criticism will be highlighted.

Funny Animals [sic]

One of the central concerns of *Maus* criticism is Spiegelman's controversial use of theriomorphism. In *Maus*, each racial or national group has its own designated animal identity: Jews are drawn as mice, Germans as cats, Poles as pigs and Americans as dogs. The close detail of Vladek's hands and Mandelbaum's feet not to mention the fact that the characters all stand upright, wear clothes and speak English, make it clear that (aside from the mouse tails on some characters) they are human from the neck down (Spiegelman 2003, 14 and 189). Some early critics such as Halkin (1992) and Harvey Pekar ('*Maus* and Other Topics' 1986) and later critics such as LaCapra (1998), Frank Cioffi ('Disturbing Comics: The Comics of Mleczko, Katchor, Crumb, and Spiegelman' 2001), Michaels (2006) and Orbán (2007) have expressed ethical objections to the propriety of this metaphor. With the exception of Halkin, these criticisms are preoccupied with the details of the execution rather than the approach *per se*. Pekar criticises Spiegelman for presenting an unflattering (or, at best, mixed) portrayal of Poles. He also objects to the use of what is deemed an unnecessarily emotive visual style, for an overemphasis on Vladek's personality flaws, and for Artie's insensitive treatment of his father. This demonstrates, one might suggest, a lack of sensitivity to the critical distinction between the one who is written and the one who writes, and a lack of awareness as to the irony at work in the allegory. Michaels accuses Spiegelman of dividing modern America's racial landscape into Jews and non-Jews and concomitantly homogenising all other ethnic groups into the category of 'dog'. Cioffi and Orbán both assert that the allegory becomes too familiar to serve as a useful critique of the ideological regime that it parodies. Only Halkin objects in principle to the choice of cats and mice. He contends that the fantastical nature of the allegory and the inherent 'limits' of the comic book medium should be grounds for *Maus* to be excluded from any school syllabus.

Halkin is in the minority with his negative assessment of animal allegory in *Maus*. Other critics have applauded Spiegelman's aesthetic choice and sought to explicate its significance. Gopnik (1987) is most frequently cited for his comparison between *Maus* and the use of the bird's head symbol in the Passover Haggadah. This religious parallel is extended by Young

(1988). Gopnik also compares the animal allegory to Disney comics, Picasso's *Guernica* (1937) and Goya's *The Horrors of War* (1810–1820). Spiegelman, in turn, discusses Gopnik's interpretation of *Maus* with Chute in *Metamaus* (see Spiegelman 2011, 116–117). One commonplace assertion that has emerged is effectively summarised by Andrew Loman in his book chapter 'That Mouse's Shadow: The canonization of Spiegelman's *Maus*': 'one of *Maus*'s cardinal ambitions is to disclose the inadequacy of its governing metaphor' (Loman 2010, 221). According to Brown (1988) and Miles Orvell ('Writing Posthistorically' 1992), Spiegelman performs a key facet of the fascist's racial worldview in order to demonstrate its poverty and perversity. Subsequent critics such as Andrea Liss (*Trespassing Through Shadows: Memory, Photography & the Holocaust* 1998), Mulman (2008), Candida Rifkind ('Drawn from Memory: Comics, Artists and Intergenerational Auto/biography' 2008), Alison Mandaville ('Tailing Violence: Gender, and the Father-Tail in Art Spiegelman's *Maus*' 2009) and Loman (2010) have succeeded mainly, and admirably, in further detailing the audacity and acuity of Spiegelman's allegory. The conceit of the self-erasing metaphor has given rise to some intriguing and innovative applications. Amy Hungerford ('Surviving Rego Park: Holocaust Theory from Art Spiegelman to Berel Lang' 1999), for example, uses *Maus* to address questions concerning the recruitment of 'new' Jews in American Jewish societies.

A further contention has been made by a number of critics that the 'funny animal' genre facilitates empathy with the victims. In *Maus*, the mice faces, unlike the cats, are almost featureless. The appearance of the cats in *Maus* is more varied than the mice. Stephen E. Tabachnick asserts that Spiegelman's 'drawings of cats emphasise their sharp teeth and hooded eyes, except when he shows a German prisoner in the camps' (Tabachnick 'Of Mice and Memory: the structure of Art Spiegelman's Graphic Novel of the Holocaust' 1993, 159). As Scott McCloud asserts, the simpler a cartoon, the more people it resembles thus allowing for greater empathy with the character (see McCloud 1994, 28–59). In 'Of Mice and Jews: Cartoons, Metaphors, and Children of the Holocaust Survivors in Recent Jewish Experience', David A. Gerber contends that the mice in *Maus* 'fall in love, have children, suffer pain and anguish, and are generally so human and vulnerable that their victimisation by cats appears constantly to be what Nazi anti-Semitism was: pure malice and depravity' (Gerber 1987, 175). In 'Art Spiegelman's *Maus*: Graphic Art and the Holocaust', Timothy Doherty contends that rather than othering the Jew with grotesquely detailed and animal-like features, the mouse faces are 'a medium that reverses the process of projection' (Doherty 1996, 77). To summarise these arguments in a single statement, the reader, in other words, is encouraged to see themselves as a mouse/Jew, thereby heightening the emotional impact of the text and further ridiculing Hitler's racial vision.

A secondary and certainly not mutually exclusive reading of the animal allegory focuses upon the extent to which Spiegelman's work has been informed by the use of theriomorphism in Disney cartoons and similar media. In this vein, one could cite the work of Orvell (1992) and Michael E. Staub ('The Shoah goes on and on: Remembrance and Representation in Art Spiegelman's *Maus*' 1995). It is worth noting, however, that some of the most ground-breaking work on *Maus* in more recent years, such as Erin McGlothlin ('No Time like the Present: Narrative and Time in Art Spiegelman, 2003), Victoria A. Elmwood ('A "Happy, Happy Ever After": The Transformation of Trauma Between Generations in Art Spiegelman's *Maus: A Survivor's Tale*' 2004) and Chute ('Literal Forms: Narrative Structures in *Maus*' 2005), has avoided the issue of theriomorphic characters and gravitated, instead, towards alternate aspects of Spiegelman's seminal work.

In terms of potential problematics within this sub-field, criticism which has focused upon the role of theriomorphism in *Maus* has often been riven by a contradiction. Critics have maintained, on the one hand, that Spiegelman's theriomorphic characters encourage

readerly empathy and emotional engagement, and on the other, that Spiegelman's work staunchly resists catharsis, closure and the possibility of understanding the Shoah victim's experience (a position championed by Geis, 2003).

The Second-generation Survivor

The second important turn in *Maus* criticism concerns the key figure of the second-generation survivor. One of the seminal works of scholarship on Spiegelman in this regard is Marianne Hirsch's *Family Frames: Photography, Narrative and, Postmemory* (1997). Hirsch interrogates the photographs which appear in *Maus* in relation to the concept of *postmemory*: the transmission of the parent's traumatic history to the second-generation survivor. Hirsch submits that '[p]ostmemory characterizes the experience of those who grow up dominated by narratives that preceded their birth, whose own belated stories are evacuated by the stories of the previous generation shaped by traumatic events that can be neither understood nor recreated' (Hirsch 1997, 22). The Artie of *Maus*, she contends, can be understood as a paradigmatic case history of the subject whose life and very identity is dominated by postmemory.

Hirsch's work is primarily based on literary sources rather than psychological studies of Holocaust survivors and their children. It is thus open to allegations of presenting a monolithic second-generation survivor experience which fails to capture the varied, and often conflicting ways in which second-generation survivors attempt to engage with questions of inherited trauma and family history. Without dismissing the importance of the postmemory model, some integration with existing research may offer a means by which we might advance Hirsch's thesis. Two such sources might include the work of Felice Zilberfein (1995) and Julia Dickson-Gomez (2002), both of whom have shown that the behaviour patterns of trauma victims can be transmitted to their children alongside a 'traumatised' world view. Carol Kidron's work with second- and third-generation survivors in Israel has shown that 'the majority rejected or critiqued the pathologizing construct of PTSD' (Kidron 2012, 272). Many (but certainly not all) did describe symptoms which broadly align with Hirsch's concept of postmemory: a 'silent nonpathological presence of the past [...] and fragmentary tales of survival' in their home-lives (Kidron 2012). A clinical understanding of the second-generation survivor's experience is still very limited. As with many aspects of trauma, the most that can be said is that a second-generation trauma survivor may show some or none of a range of characteristics to varying degrees of severity. Whilst, therefore, the concept of postmemory is compelling and often eminently applicable to *Maus*, it nonetheless offers a partial and in some respects problematic rendition of the second-generation survivor's experience as it appears in Spiegelman's work.

Trauma

The concept of trauma has been an important area of concern in relation to *Maus* and Spiegelman's other work. Critics such as Alison Landsberg ('America, the Holocaust and the Mass Culture of Memory: Towards a Radical Politics of Empathy' 1997), Young (2000), Huyssen (2000) and Banner (2000) all identify symptoms of trauma (or the absence thereof) in Vladek's testimony. The standard approach among scholars has been to employ psychoanalytical criticism as a model for understanding trauma and other forms of psychological disturbance in Spiegelman's work. Such works of criticism deal primarily in analysis of recurring symbols and lexical choices in the text. Critics working in this area include Landsberg (1997), Hungerford (1999), Bosmajian (2003), Leventhal (1995), Levine (2003), Elmwood (2004) and Versluys (2009). Without wishing to dismiss the potential productivity of the psychoanalytical paradigm, a recurring flaw in this area is a tendency towards broad generalisations and

abstraction resulting in a misleadingly monolithic model of human experience often based solely upon literary and artistic texts as evidentiary material. Only a small number of academics who have studied *Maus* (Gerber (1987), for example, is noteworthy but now somewhat out of date) have utilised non-psychoanalytical models and drawn directly on clinical psychological case studies. There is, therefore, a rich area of criticism still to be explored by employing a diverse range of trauma models in relation to *Maus* (the kind of diversity which we have seen in relation to *In the Shadow of No Towers*).

Anja

A third main strand of *Maus* scholarship concerns the silencing of Anja, Artie's mother and Vladek's wife, whose suicide is documented in the text-within-the-text 'Prisoner on the Hell Planet'. This muting and indeed a general 'banishment of female voices' (Hirsch 1997, 35) in Artie's story has been approached by many critics, most notably Hirsch (1992, 1993), Liss (1998), Hamida Bosmajian ('The Orphaned Voice' 2003), Nancy K. Miller ('Cartoons of the Self: Portrait of the Artist as a Young Murderer, Art Spiegelman's *Maus*' 2003) and Elmwood (2004). The relative silence of female victims of the Shoah is a recurring and disturbing dimension of Holocaust representation. Gwyneth Bodger contends that '[t]he separation of women and men on arrival at the camps often meant that men were unaware of what happened to the women, and this separation also meant that women were quite simply not a part of men's Holocaust experiences' (Bodger 2007, 161). Vladek and Anja were afforded some rare opportunities to interact in Auschwitz, and as such, Vladek is able to tell Anja's story of internment albeit only in so far as it informs his own. Vladek's portrayal of his wife is, however, woefully incomplete. Elmwood contends that '[w]e only see Anja as an effect of Vladek's memory, in which she is painted as weak, frail, and naive, but also as eloquent and charming [...] Seen through Vladek's loving eyes, she is his charge, vaguely helpless, dangerously weak and in constant need of his care and protection' (Elmwood 2004, 709). Bosmajian proposes intriguingly that Anja's absent story offers Artie the hope which Vladek's narrative monopoly threatens to shatter. 'Anja might have been the dialogical partner who, unlike Vladek, would have understood her son' (Bosmajian 2003, 39).

The most damning instance of muzzling, for both Artie and many critics, lies in Vladek's decision to burn his deceased wife's diaries. The act of burning the diaries has been interpreted in a number of ways, most strikingly as a re-enactment of the Nazi act of burning books and people. In '*Maus* and the Bleeding of History', Levine describes the burning of Anja's diaries, in Artie's mind, as a 'repetition of the Holocaust' (Levine 2003, 79). Liss, similarly, contends that Artie 'transfers the crimes against humanity from the Nazis to his father' (Liss 1998, 58). The image of burning books is a complex and should be handled carefully. Spiegelman does not make any explicit connection between Vladek's act of burning books and that of the Nazis, and it seems improper to equate the burning of diaries (however cruelly such an act may sever the link between a mother and her son) to the systematic murder of millions of people. If we are to abandon the symbolism of book, burning then Staub (1995) offers a compelling alternative reading; that Vladek burned the diaries not to forget, but 'to force himself to hold fast to the burdens of his memory, and to imprison himself forever in that nightmare' (Staub 1995, 37).

Oral Testimony and the 'Wrestling Match'

A further major trend which can be identified in criticism of *Maus* is the status of the text as oral testimony and the construction of the work itself. Critics in this area document how Spiegelman

collected the primary materials for *Maus*, and how those materials have shaped the text. The key contributions in this regard are made by Brown (1988), Miller (2003) and, most recently, Rosemary V. Hathaway ('Reading Art Spiegelman's *Maus* as Postmodern Ethnography' 2011). Hathaway's classification situates *Maus* as a form of ethnography whilst acknowledging the self-effacing and genre-breaking nature of the text. Readers who wish to further explore Spiegelman's relationship with his father, Vladek Spiegelman, and the process of making *Maus* may also be interested in Lawrence Weschler (1988), Witek's Joseph 2007 interview collection and Spiegelman's own collection of interviews and notes in *Metamaus* (Spiegelman 2011).

The idea that *Maus* should be inclusive of, rather than drawn from, the elements and processes which framed its construction was the driving factor behind the creation of the *Maus* CD ROM in 1994 and the *Metamaus* DVD in 2011. By examining the process behind the making of *Maus*, we become aware of the fact that, for example, Spiegelman organised his father's story into a coherent narrative so that within *Maus*, Vladek's story is told directly. The relationship between *Maus* and the interviews from which it is constructed raises the question of genre definition. *Maus* skirts the boundaries between different genres: fiction and non-fiction, underground comics, biography, autobiography and oral testimony. Spiegelman stated that the *New York Times* classification of *Maus* as fiction made him 'queasy' (Spiegelman 1999, 16). In a letter to the newspaper, he famously wrote 'I know that by delineating people with animal heads I've raised problems of taxonomy for you. Could you consider adding a special "Nonfiction/Mice" category to your list?' (Spiegelman 1999, 16). In response to this taxonomical indeterminacy, Whitlock has coined the term 'autography' to describe *Maus* and similar long-form comics of an autobiographical nature (see Whitlock 2007). Hathaway proposes that *Maus* is best understood as 'postmodern ethnography' (Hathaway 2011). That, in 2015, the debate is still ongoing attests to the critical importance and aesthetic, historical and political complexities raised by *Maus*.

The question of historiographical research, authenticity, and the distinction between the one who is written and the one who writes *within the text itself* is also of central importance in all *Maus* criticism. The conflict between Vladek and Artie is often deemed to be decisive. In this regard, several critics have viewed *Maus* as a combative encounter between two narrators: Rick Iadonisi in 'Bleeding History and Owning His [Father's] Story: *Maus* and Collaborative Autobiography', for example, describes the creation of the narrative as a 'wrestling match' (Iadonisi 1994, 52) and Elmwood closes her essay by describing Artie's position as one of 'narrative control and dominance' (Elmwood 2004, 716).

The question of the tension between Artie and Vladek brings us to another core concern in *Maus* criticism, namely, the relations between another fractious and possibly fictitious opposition: words and images. In Chute's terms, '*Maus* often works with the friction of verbal and visual discourse; the cartoonist has both at his disposal, and so he can preserve his father's language while drawing against it' (Chute 2012, online). Artie's role as illustrator of the main narrative allows him a means to comment on the content of Vladek's story as it is being told and thus, Gillian Banner argues, 'allude to the alternative version' buried within Vladek's memory. Whilst Vladek's testimony as narrator appears, within the text, to have been transcribed practically *verbatim*, Banner submits that the narrative application of the artwork extends beyond the simple visual realisation of the text thus offering a form of polymodality unique to the medium of sequential art (Banner 2000, 133). The most-discussed moment from the text in this regard occurs on page 214, where the reader is alternately presented with an image of prisoners marching past an orchestra, and after Vladek's insistence that there was no such orchestra, the same procession is located directly underneath the original panel, otherwise identical, but with the band obscured. It is through such metanarrative insertions and interventions that Artie is able to comment imagistically upon Vladek's verbal narration.

Time

This final recurring concern in *Maus* scholarship concerns the mapping of the relationships between the narrative layers in *Maus*. According to many critics, Spiegelman's text is primarily *about time*. The blurring of time in *Maus* (described elegantly by Iadonisi as 'temporal seepage' (Iadonisi 1994, 45)), has been documented by LaCapra (1998), Witek (1989), Orvell (1992), Hungerford (1999), Huyssen (2000), Cioffi (2001), McGlothlin (2003), Carlin (2005) and Chute (2005, 2009, 2010 and 2012). Spiegelman does not necessarily seek to demolish distinctions between time periods; the Artie who reels off dates in the 'Time Flies' sequence is 'hyper-invested in the issue of temporality' (McGlothlin 2003, 193). Despite his efforts, however, the narrative levels of *Maus* often intersect thematically with the past informing the present and the present shaping the telling of the past. Typically, this takes place in subtle ways.

[a] careful counterpoint of the frame narrative against the inner one: after Vladek talks about having to clean out stables for the Germans, he orders his son to clean up the cigarette ash on the carpet; talking about the jewels he used while hiding to barter for comestible goods, Vladek leads his son to the Rego Park bank where his safe deposit box holds his papers and valuables (Orvell 1992, 119).

In this sense, the aforementioned critics maintain, Artie chronicles Vladek both verbalising and acting out his past, thereby creating an emotional and symbolic continuum. Approaching this temporal structure, Iadonisi acknowledges aspects of the narrative structure and recognises the existence of multiple 'Arties'. He proposes that '[t]he different representations in *Maus* can be plotted on a graph, with a vertical hierarchy moving from Art the mouse, to Art the person behind the mouse mask, to Spiegelman the producer of the published text' (Iadonisi 1994, 50). In a similar vein, Tabachnick (1993) asserts that *Maus* has three narrative layers: the *künstlerroman*, the *bildungsroman* and the epic. One might note here that these map onto generic codes in which the first two refer to separate selves which Artie adopts in the framing narrative, rather than distinct narrative frames. Other critics have followed this line of inquiry. Rifkind, citing McGlothlin, also asserts that '[t]here are at least three levels of narrative in the *Maus* volumes' (Rifkind 2008, 402). Whilst critics are clearly invested in the distinction between narrative layers, only McGlothlin has attempted to offer a map.

McGlothlin (2003) distinguishes deftly between the narrative layers in *Maus* in relation to Gérard Genette's terms 'story', 'discourse' and 'narration' (or 'inner', 'middle' and 'outer'). McGlothlin places the 'Time Flies' sequence and the scene from Artie's childhood which opens *Maus* on the same narrative level (signalled in both instances by the adoption of lower-case text). McGlothlin's taxonomy allows her to analyse the function of each layer in relation to the others: specifically the way in which the outer layer observes and comments upon the other two. Her analysis offers a significant step forwards in our understanding of the structure of *Maus*. It is at least partially incomplete, however, in that it omits the *Prisoner on the Hell Planet* episode which features in the volume.

It is important, in this regard, to acknowledge the distinction between the diegetic characters and their extradiegetic incarnations. Whilst most critics recognise that Artie, the in-text writer of *Maus*, is distinct from Spiegelman, the convention has been to read the character of Vladek as a somewhat transparent rendition of Vladek Spiegelman, Spiegelman's father, and not to differentiate between the older Vladek, who narrates, and his younger incarnation, who is narrated.

The Future of *Maus* Criticism

Within the last few years, two works by Spiegelman have been published: *Metamaus* in 2011 and *Co-Mix* in 2013. Comic scholars have also seen new works of Spiegelman scholarship such as

those by Friedman (2012), Alan Gibbs (2012), Christina Meyer (2012), Chute (2013) and Bredehoft (2014). Spiegelman continues to be one of the most-discussed figures in comic book studies.

There are, potentially, many more readings still to be mined from Spiegelman's most iconic work. *Metamaus* offers the potential for further interventions, particularly in regard to *Maus* as oral testimony. *Maus* is such a profound work that its full depths have yet to be plumbed. To offer one example, *Maus* might productively be read as gothic fiction. Several critics employ a gothic vocabulary in their readings of *Maus*. LaCapra contends when Vladek calls Artie by his deceased brother's name that he (Vladek) is 'making his son the host for a revenant' (LaCapra 1998, 156). Mandaville contends that in *Maus* 'each photo [...] raises a spectre' (Mandaville 2009, 2280). LaCapra further describes the characters in *Prisoner on the Hell Planet* as 'ghoulish' (LaCapra 1998, 159). Liss contends that 'Richeau's photograph both taunts Art's guilt and haunts him with despair' (Liss 1998, 58). Whilst horror may be a marginal genre in *Maus*, Spiegelman is not insensitive to the role of gothic horror in processing the trauma of World War II. He reads E. C. Comics' explicitly violent horror comics as 'an unconscious post-war attempt to assimilate the atrocities of Auschwitz and Hiroshima' (Spiegelman 1999, 80).

Short Biography

Philip Smith obtained his PhD from Loughborough University in 2014. His work has been published in *The Journal of Graphic Novels and Comics*, *Literature Compass*, *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, *International Journal of Comics Art*, *The Journal of European Studies*, *Asian Theatre Journal*, *Comics Forum*, *Slayage* and *The Journal of Popular Culture*. He blogs for The Hooded Utilitarian. He is co-editor of *Firefly Revisited* (Rowman and Littlefield) and the author of the forthcoming book *Reading Art Spiegelman* (Routledge). He teaches in Dubai.

Note

* Correspondence: Philip Smith, Loughborough University, Loughborough, Leicestershire, UK. Email: philipsmithgraduate@gmail.com

Works Cited

- Banner, Gillian. *Holocaust Literature: Schulz, Levi, Spiegelman and the Memory of the Offence*. London: Vallentine Mitchell, 2000. Print.
- Bodger, Gwyneth. *Critical Comparative Approaches to Testimonial Literature Emergent from the Holocaust and the Atomic Bombings*. Diss: University of Sheffield, 2007. Print.
- Bosmajian, Hamida. 'The Orphaned Voice'. *Art Spiegelman's 'Maus': Approaches to Art Spiegelman's Survivor's Tale of the Holocaust*. Ed. Geis Deborah. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2003. 26–43. Print.
- Bredehoft, Thomas A. *The Visible Text: Textual Production and Reproduction from Beowulf to Maus*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2014. Print.
- Brodzki, Bella. 'Breakdowns and Breakthroughs: Looking for Art in Young Spiegelman'. *Graphic Subjects: Critical Essays on Autobiography and Graphic Novels*. Ed. Michael A Chaney. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2011. 51–8. Print.
- Brown, Joshua. 'Of Mice and Memory'. *Oral History Review* 12.1 (1988): 91–109. Print.
- Carlin, John. *Masters of American Comics*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005. Print.
- Chute, Hillary. 'Literal Forms: Narrative Structures in *Maus*'. *Indy Magazine*, 23 December 2005. Accessed 22 March 2013. www.indyworld.com/indy. Online.
- . 'Comics as Archives: Meta*Metamaus*'. Hemispheric Institute 9:1–2 2012. Accessed 22 March 2013. <http://hemisphericinstitute.org/hemi/en/e-miserica-91/chute>. Online.
- Cioffi, Frank L. 'Disturbing Comics: The Comics of Mleczko, Katchor, Crumb, and Spiegelman'. *The Language of Comics: Word and Image*. Ed. Varnum, Robin and Gibbons, Christina T. Jackson. University Press of Mississippi, 2001. Print.

- Dickson-Gomez, Julia. 'The Sound of Barking Dogs: Violence and Terror Among Salvadoran Families in the Postwar'. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly* 16.4 (2002): 415–38. Print.
- Doherty, Timothy. 'Art Spiegelman's *Maus*: Graphic Art and the Holocaust'. *American Literature* 68.1 (1996): 69–84. Print.
- Elmwood, Victoria. 'A "Happy, Happy Ever After": The Transformation of Trauma Between Generations in Art Spiegelman's *Maus: A Survivor's Tale*'. *Biography* 27.4 (2004): 691–720. Print.
- Friedman, Elizabeth R. 'Spiegelman's Magic Box: MetaMaus and the Archive of Representation'. *Studies in Comics* 3.2 (2012): 275–91. Print.
- Geis, Deborah R. 'Introduction'. *Considering Maus: Approaches to Art Spiegelman's "Survivor's Tale" of the Holocaust*. Ed. Geis Deborah. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2003. 1–11. Print.
- Gerber, David A. 'Of Mice and Jews: Cartoons, Metaphors, and Children of the Holocaust Survivors in Recent Jewish Experience'. *American Jewish History* 77.1 (1987): 159–75. Print.
- Gibbs, Alan. *Contemporary American Trauma Narratives*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012. Print.
- Gopnik, Adam. 'Comics and Catastrophe'. *New Republic* (1987): 29–34. Print.
- Halkin, Hillel. 'Inhuman Comedy'. *Commentary* 93.2 (1992): 56. Print.
- Hathaway, Rosemary V. 'Reading Art Spiegelman's *Maus* as Postmodern Ethnography'. *Journal of Folklore Research* 48.3 (2011): 249–67. Print.
- Hirsch, Marianne. *Family Frames: Photography, Narrative and, Postmemory*. Boston: Harvard University Press, 1997. Print.
- Hungerford, Amy. 'Surviving Rego Park: Holocaust Theory from Art Spiegelman to Berel Lang'. *The Americanization of the Holocaust*. Ed. Flanzbaum. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1999. 102–24. Print.
- Huyssen, Andreas. 'Of Mice and Mimesis: Reading Spiegelman with Adorno'. *New German Critique* 81 (2000): 65–82. Print.
- Iadonisi, Rick. 'Bleeding History and Owning His [Father's] Story: Maus and Collaborative Autobiography'. *College English Association Critic* 57.1 (1994): 41–56. Print.
- Kidron, Carol A. 'Alterity and the Particular Limits of Universalism: Comparing Jewish-Israeli Holocaust and Canadian-Cambodian Genocide Legacies'. *Current Anthropology* 53.6 (2012): 723–54. Print.
- LaCapra, Dominick. *History and Memory after Auschwitz*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998. Print.
- Landsberg, Alison. 'America, the Holocaust and the Mass Culture of Memory: Towards a Radical Politics of Empathy'. *New German Critique* 71 (1997): 63–86. Print.
- Leventhal, Robert S. 'Art Spiegelman's *MAUS*: Working-Through The Trauma of the Holocaust'. *Responses*, 1995. Accessed 22 March 2013. <http://www2.iath.virginia.edu/holocaust/spiegelman.html>. Online.
- Levine, Michael G. 'Maus and the Bleeding of History'. *Considering Maus: Approaches to Art Spiegelman's "Survivor's Tale" of the Holocaust*. Ed. Geis Deborah R. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2003. 63–104. Print.
- Liss, Andrea. *Trespassing Through Shadows: Memory, Photography and the Holocaust*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998. Print.
- Loman, Andrew. 'That Mouse's Shadow: The canonization of Spiegelman's *Maus*'. *The Rise of the American Comics Artist: Creators and Contexts*. Ed. Williams, Paul and Lyons, James. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2010. 210–34. Print.
- Mandaville, Alison. 'Tailing Violence: Gender, and the Father-Tail in Art Spiegelman's *Maus*'. *Pacific Coast Philology* 44.2 (2009): 216–48. Print.
- McCloud, Scott. *Understanding Comics: The Invisible Art*. New York: HarperCollins, 1994. Print.
- McGlothlin, Erin. 'No Time Like the Present: Narrative and Time in Art Spiegelman's "Maus"'. *Narrative* 11.2 (2003): 177–98. Print.
- Meyer, Christina. 'Putting it into Boxes: Framing Art Spiegelman's *In the Shadow of No Towers*'. *Amerikastudien / American Studies* 55.3 (2012): 479–94. Print.
- Michaels, Walter Benn. 'Plots Against America: Neoliberalism and Antiracism'. *American Literary History* 18.2 (2006): 288–302. Print.
- Miller, Nancy K. 'Cartoons of the Self: Portrait of the Artist as a Young Murderer, Art Spiegelman's *Maus*'. *Considering Maus: Approaches to Art Spiegelman's "Survivor's Tale" of the Holocaust*. Ed. Geis Deborah. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2003. 44–59. Print.
- Mulman, Lisa Naomi. 'A Tale of Two Mice'. *The Jewish Graphic Novel*. Ed. Baskind, Samantha and Omer-Sherman, Ranen. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2008. Print.
- Orbán, Katalin. 'Trauma and Visuality: Art Spiegelman's *Maus* and *In the Shadow of No Towers*'. *Representations* 97 (2007): 57–89. Print.
- Pekar, Harvey. 'Maus and Other Topics'. *Comics Journal* 113 (1986): 54–57. Print.
- Orvell, Miles. 'Writing Posthistorically'. *American Literary History* 1992 4.1 110–28. Print.
- Rifkind, Candida. 'Drawn from Memory: Comics, Artists and Intergenerational Auto/biography'. *Canadian Review of American Studies* 38.3 (2008): 399–427. Print.
- Spiegelman, Art. *Comix, Essays, Graphics, and Scraps*. Editore-La Centrale dell'Arte, 1999. Print.
- . *The Complete Maus*. London: Penguin Books, 2003. Print.
- . *In the Shadow of No Towers*. New York: Pantheon Books, 2004. Print.
- . *Breakdowns*. New York: Pantheon, 2008. Print.

- . *Metamaus*. New York: Pantheon, 2011. Print.
- Staub, Michael E. 'The Shoah Goes on and on: Remembrance and Representation in Art Spiegelman's *Maus*'. *MELUS* 20.3 (1995): 33–46. Print.
- Tabachnick, Stephen E. 'Of Mice and Memory: the Structure of Art Spiegelman's Graphic Novel of the Holocaust'. *Word & Image* 9.2 (1993): 154–62. Print.
- Versluys, K. 'Art Spiegelman's *In the Shadow of No Towers*: 9–11 and the Representation of Trauma.' *MFS Modern Fiction Studies* 52.4 (2009): 980–1003.
- . *Out of the Blue*. Bognor Regis: Columbia University, 2009. Print.
- Weschler, Lawrence. 'Art's father, Vladék's son'. *Shapinsky's Karma, Bogg's Bills*. North Point, 1988. 53–68. Print.
- Whitlock, G. *Soft Weapons: Autobiography in Transit*. University of Chicago Press, 2007.
- Witek, Joseph. 'History and Talking Animals: Art Spiegelman's *Maus*'. *Comic Books as History: the Art of Jack Jackson, Art Spiegelman and Harvey Pekar*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1989. Print.
- ed. *Art Spiegelman Conversations*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2007. Print.
- Young, James E. *Writing and Rewriting the Holocaust: Narrative and the Consequences of Interpretation*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988. Print.
- . *At Memory's Edge: After-Images of the Holocaust in Contemporary Art and Architecture*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000. Print.
- Zilberfein, Felice. 'Children of Holocaust Survivors: Separation Obstacles, Attachments and Anxiety'. *A Global Perspective on Working with Holocaust Survivors and the Second Generation*. Ed. Lemberger, J. Jerusalem: JDC-Brookdale Institute, Amcha, 1995. 413–22. Print.