



Kent Academic Repository

Weiss, Vered (2015) *Oh Other Where Art Thou: Spatial Awareness in Hebrew and English Literature of the Nineteenth to Mid Twentieth Century*. Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) thesis, University of Kent,.

Downloaded from

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/47964/> The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

The version of record is available from

This document version

UNSPECIFIED

DOI for this version

Licence for this version

UNSPECIFIED

Additional information

Versions of research works

Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in *Title of Journal*, Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our [Take Down policy](https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies) (available from <https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies>).

Oh Other Where Art Thou:
Spatial Awareness in Hebrew and English Literature
of the Nineteenth to Mid Twentieth Century

A Thesis Submitted to the University of Kent at Canterbury in the subject of Comparative
Literature for the Degree of PhD.

Vered Weiss

Word count: 100018

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisors Professor Shane Weller and Doctor Axel Stähler for inviting me to read literature at the Comparative and World Literature Department at the University of Kent, Canterbury. I would like to warmly thank my PhD thesis examiners Professor Lucille Cairns and Doctor Anna Katharina Schaffner for their thorough and insightful comments. I am grateful for their engagement with my work, which made it more accurate and coherent. Additionally, I would like to thank The School of European Culture and Languages' administrative team, and particularly Jacqui Martlew for her kind assistance.

The process that led to the completion of the PhD thesis was rather long and convoluted, and there are many people whose contributions I wish to acknowledge. I would like to thank the many colleagues whose comments have made me consider and reconsider ideas and directions in my work, and if I fail to mention all the people I owe credit, I assure you I am nonetheless grateful. I wish to acknowledge the support of my friends and colleagues: Dr Yael Grushka-Cocaye, Dr Krista Bonello Rutter Giappone, Dr Angelos Evangelou, and Jo Pettitt, who have been true friends and colleagues, sharing ideas as well as laughs. I wish to acknowledge the invaluable support of my family, without whom I would not have made it thus far: my mother and father, Carmela and Shimon Weiss, who are not only supporting parents, but also my best friends, for always inspiring me to try harder; my sister Dana Weiss-Haklay and her wonderful family, my grandparents Bruna and Harry Rozzin, and my aunt Nina Ramon who are my joy and comfort. Finally, a massive thanks to Howard Bowman for not only being my best reader, but also my best friend and partner.

Contents

| | |
|---|-----|
| 1. Introduction | 4 |
| 1.1 Historical Contextualisation | 23 |
| 1.2 Theoretical Framework | 28 |
| 1.3 Terminology | 31 |
| 1.3.1 Spatial Awareness | 31 |
| 1.3.2 The Gothic | 36 |
| 1.3.3 The Monstrous Other | 40 |
| 1.3.4 Individual and Collective Identities | 43 |
| 1.3.5 The Modern Nation and Nationalism | 46 |
| 2. Territorial Tautology | 49 |
| 2.1 Introduction | 49 |
| 2.2 (Non)Autochthonous Origins | 55 |
| 2.3 Outdoor Horror | 75 |
| 2.4 Indoor Dread | 103 |
| 2.5 Exile | 129 |
| 2.6 Conclusion | 149 |
| 3. Myth Making | 154 |
| 3.1 Introduction | 154 |
| 3.2 (Re)making Myths | 162 |
| 3.2.1 Myths of Creation and Subversion | 162 |
| 3.2.2 Soul and Soil Redemption | 170 |
| 3.2.3 The Myth of the Vampire | 178 |
| 3.2.4 The Wandering Jew and his Avatars | 190 |
| 3.2.5 The myth of Hospitality | 199 |
| 3.3 Conclusion | 210 |
| 4. Linguistic Illuminations | 215 |
| 4.1 Introduction | 215 |
| 4.2 Linguistic Socialisation | 225 |
| 4.2.1 The Power of Speech | 225 |
| 4.2.2 The Right to Read | 241 |
| 4.3 A Note on Names | 265 |
| 4.4 Conclusion | 284 |
| 5. Conclusion | 288 |
| Bibliography | 293 |

And the LORD said unto Cain, Where is Abel thy brother? And he said, I know not: Am I my brother's keeper? And he said, What hast thou done? the voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground. And now art thou cursed from the earth, which hath opened her mouth to receive thy brother's blood from thy hand; When thou tillest the ground, it shall not henceforth yield unto thee her strength; a fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth. And Cain said unto the LORD, My punishment is greater than I can bear. Behold, thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the earth; and from thy face shall I be hid; and I shall be a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth; and it shall come to pass, that every one that findeth me shall slay me. And the LORD said unto him, Therefore whosoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him sevenfold. And the LORD set a mark upon Cain, lest any finding him should kill him. And Cain went out from the presence of the LORD, and dwelt in the land of Nod, on the east of Eden.

(Genesis 4: 9-16; *King James Bible*)

1. Introduction

From the end of the nineteenth to the mid-twentieth century, as the modern Jewish-Israeli nation was being formed, it required literary means to (re)construct individual and collective identities. While these new identities were being (re)constructed, British identities were subjected to alterations and reconfigurations as the British Empire was moving from its peak to its end. The reconsideration of these identities was based upon the relationship to space and the land. The sense of belonging to the land, or its lack, was explored in relation to questions of individual and collective identities.

Though distinct, modern Jewish-Israeli and British cultures share certain fundamental concepts and elements that originate from common ancient heritages. The Old Testament, or Hebrew Bible, on the one hand, and Greco-Roman mythology on the other, inform both modern cultures. While they share certain themes and perspectives, in other respects the two cultures diverge. The influences and counter influences between the two cultures are vast, and this thesis does not presume to encompass their entirety. The following analyses focus on similarities and differences in literary representations of perception of individual and collective identities, and the reconfiguration of concepts of sovereignty.

The failure of the Enlightenment with regard to the Jews led to them being ‘constructed in equivocal terms as both the embodiment of a transformable cultural Hebraism and, at the same time, as an unchanging racial “other”’ (Cheyette 1993: 5-6). In some respects, the assimilated Jew resembles what Homi Bhabha elucidates in his analyses of mimicry. The figure of the Jew functions within the discourse of mimicry inasmuch as it is ‘constructed around an ambivalence’ (Bhabha 1994: 88). Even as it embodies the quintessential Other, one of the main horrors of the figure of the Jew was its ability to assimilate.

The figure of the assimilated Jew bears certain similarities to the problem of colonial imitation. Like Bhabha's colonial subject, the Jew is a 'partial' and 'incomplete' subject (1994: 86). Yet, whereas Bhabha's mimicry is frightening because it conceals no presence or identity of the colonised (1994: 91), the Jew is twice as horrifying because he conceals an identity of an Other who is not colonised in a foreign land but is required to conceal his national identity on British (or European) soil.¹ The Jew is the embodiment of the colonial fear as he is the Other that has assimilated even while maintaining a certain Janus-faced, partial presence.

The image of the Jew functioned in British culture as an Other that resides within, and even while it is contained it harbours an unease regarding its hidden essence. According to Bryan Cheyette, 'race-thinking about the Jews was, in fact, a key ingredient in the emerging cultural identity of modern Britain' (1993: xi). The figure of the Jew in English literary tradition has a long and lively legacy of shifting meanings and identities, 'being made to occupy a range of contradictory discourses' (8). The attempts to marginalise Judaism and annex it into a Judeo-Christian tradition, inspected by Cheyette, reveal an anxious culture attempting to imperialise all Otherness into an all-encompassing British-ness.

In an ironic twist of history, the British and Jewish nations were destined to meet upon the soil of the Holy Land. Eitan Bar-Yosef's careful reading of the representations of

¹ In addition to the local nationality (e.g., British, French, German) the European Jews had their Jewishness as another national identity. The Jews are a nation inasmuch as they are a distinct group of people that share certain cultural traits, and that defines itself as a nation. While some conceptualisations of nationality and nationhood might appear more restrictive with regard to sovereignty, other definitions suggest nationalisms is not inherently spatially limited, and align concepts of nationhood with language and culture (Anderson 2002: 6; Habermas 2012: 282). The spatial constraint is a modern development, which has gained widespread acceptability since the French and American Revolutions (Habermas 2012: 281). Furthermore, '[t]hroughout the Middle Ages and into the twentieth century, most of the European world agreed that Jews constituted a distinct nation. This concept of nation does not require that a nation have neither a territory nor a government, but rather, it identifies, as a nation any distinct group of people with a common language and culture. Only in the nineteenth century did it become common to assume that each nation should have its own distinct government; this is the political philosophy of nationalism. In fact, Jews had a remarkable degree of self-government until the nineteenth century. So long as Jews lived in their ghettos, they were allowed to collect their own taxes, run their own courts, and otherwise behave as citizens of a landless and distinctly second-class Jewish nation' (The Jewish Virtual Library).

the encounter between the British Empire and the Holy Land reveals that the relationship towards Palestine carried a more religiously loaded language than with regard to other colonised regions. This language lingered on the landscape, particularly the religiously connoted areas, and unlike when discussing other territories, there was less discourse regarding the obvious political and strategic connotations of the territory. Bar-Yosef claims that in order to defend the colonisation of Palestine the British intelligentsia ‘continually blurred a series of stark oppositions – East/West, self/other – which underlie [Edward] Said’s work’ (2005: 8), presenting an appropriation of the Holy Land based upon the foundations of Christian theology. East and West in Hebrew and English traditions are similarly important, but have shifted in their meanings. The East in Jewish tradition was aligned with the yearning for the Holy Land, and the ultimate divine sovereignty, and in British culture with conquest and superstitious beliefs. Yet this is then complicated, as the East still carries the meaning of the ancient Jewish tradition for the British, and the new pejorative meaning seeps into the Hebrew culture. Yigal Schwartz outlines Hebrew literature in relation to what he terms ‘the passion vector’, the yearning in the direction of the location of the heart’s desire, from a clear direction for Zion (aligned with the East) to a yearning for the Diaspora (considered as Western) (Schwartz 2007: 19). The spatial directions are thus muddled, reflecting the philosophical confusion.

The special place the Holy Land has in British culture ‘offers an exceptionally forceful challenge to the binary logic, which Said traces in *Orientalism*’ (Bar-Yosef 2005: 8). The Holy Land provided the religious reason for the imperialistic enterprise in Palestine, and created an internalised oriental within the Western, English self as the British subject held s/he had the religious right to the Holy Land and therefore felt entitled to it by reasons of religion (Bar-Yosef 2005: 12). Moreover, Bar-Yosef claims Palestine played a ‘momentous role’ through ‘the biblical culture in the construction of Englishness’ (10). The years of mingling concepts led to a special affinity between the British and the

Jewish as the former felt they had the right to ‘give’ the land to the Jewish nation (182). This manifested in the Balfour declaration (1917), which implied that the British had the moral and legal right to endorse the Zionist endeavours in Palestine. The conclusion Bar-Yosef offers is that there are ‘tangible repercussions of the Mandate period, with which Israelis and Palestinians are still struggling today’ (17). These ramifications are evident in the literature of the early state. The unique attitude of the British toward Palestine-Israel rendered the territory at once a real and imaginary space. The Holy Land occupied a special place in the British imagination, allowing for the concept to be simultaneously homely and foreign, and therefore, uncanny.

The analyses in this thesis explore similarities and differences in Jewish (and later Jewish-Israeli) and British literary texts from the nineteenth to the mid-twentieth centuries. The comparison is based on two connections between the two cultures: the first is the shared mythical roots, and the second the spatial and historical connection between the two cultures in relation to (post)colonialism. The research examines literary means that convey and consider alterity, and the manner in which the location of the monstrous Other is indicative of the relationship of the respective imagined community and sovereignty. This investigation focuses on the employment of certain Gothic tropes, specifically the use of the setting as a means of exploring and expressing individual and collective identities. A connection between the British and Jewish cultures surfaces in nineteenth to mid-twentieth century literary use of Gothic elements.

Furthermore, the comparative analysis will show that the texts in Hebrew and English examined in this thesis similarly utilise Gothic tropes in order to explore concerns of modernity. While acknowledging the problematic essence of defining modernity, as each era perceives and conceptualises itself as new and modern in relation to the previous

era,² this thesis locates modernity from the onset of the Enlightenment, because ‘for the purposes of understanding the modern in the contemporary West, the Enlightenment marked a specific turning-point, one at which the modern consolidated its position as a highly valorised term’ (Punter 2007: 3). The Enlightenment, which emerged in the eighteenth century, attempted to explore the world empirically, refuting the existence of demons and ghosts, and offering a way of expressing and experiencing the world without the reliance upon religious doctrine.

Henri Lefebvre concedes that modernity is best regarded as ‘a fruitless attempt to achieve structure and coherence. Everything leads us to the conclusion that structures are being “deconstructed” even before they have gained a coherent internal stability’ (1962/2011: 187). One may, nonetheless, note several characteristics of modernity such as that ‘[a]nxiety, anguish and the feeling of loneliness are on the increase’ (189). Furthermore, it is important to note that modernity ‘is constantly searching for a definitive stability and coherence with reference to certain socio-political notions [...] these pivotal notions are of *class* and *nation*’ (187; emphasis in the original). These two notions are central to all the texts examined here. The texts provide literary examples of the way ‘[t]he contradictions of our modernity exacerbate the contradictions of pre-modernity (the nineteenth century) without shedding any light on them’ (Lefebvre 1962/2011: 229). The texts examined here are all modern inasmuch as they ‘take on the project of renewing literature out of the disclosure of new territories in language’ (Golomb Hoffman 1991: 3). Though they come from different cultural and historical backgrounds, as the comparison will show, they share an inherent tendency to engage with social critique. Specifically, this thesis suggests, the texts all engage with two of the main problems of modernity: the

² ‘What is or is not “modern” depends upon the beholder of the phenomenon as the Latin etymology of the word “modern” (modo) denotes: “just now” [...] Specific critics might then identify modern with secularism, or nationalism, or Marxism, etc. all with the inevitability that today’s modern is tomorrow’s ancient. One can handle these shifting perspectives only by maintaining the clear distinction between what E. D. Hirsch calls interpretation, i.e., the investigation of textual meaning, vs. criticism, i.e., the relevance to the reader of a specific period’ (Band 1988: 23-4).

shattering of identities as identified stable concepts, and the absurdity of sovereignty in the face of secularism.

With the advent of the Enlightenment, the notions of one's individual and collective identities as fixed and comprehensive were undermined. Once divine right to sovereignty is nullified, there is no justification for sovereignty (Derrida 2009: 77/116). As the constructed essence of nations and nationalism is exposed, nations' right to the land because of autochthony is revealed as likewise irrational (Smith 1995: 4-5). The mythology that might tie a nation to a place can no longer supply the required moral right, as the land, the earth, is humanity's. The arbitrary essence of a declaration of sovereignty remains as a horror that leads to violence.

Concurrent with the Enlightenment, Jewish communities in the Ashkenazi Diaspora began a parallel process of engagement with secular education. In many ways the Haskalah, which means education, is the Jewish equivalent of the Enlightenment, and attempted to provide an answer to the challenges of modernity (Bartal 1998: 20). The movement swept across European Jewry during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Western Enlightenment had a tremendous impact upon the Haskalah, and, though with divergences and nuances, both movements are linked with modernity (Bartal 1998: 18-20). Primarily as a secular rather than religious project, broadening the scope of education is one of the main aspects of modernity.

In addition to the historical and spatial connections between the British and the Jewish-Israeli nations, Arnold Band exposes a cultural literary connection. Band argues that the modern era in England should be of particular interest to students of Hebrew literature since it 'witnessed many of the early phenomena we usually associate with modernism: secularisation, enlightenment, industrialisation, urbanisation, the increase of literacy, democratisation' (1988: 3). In the context of Hebrew literature modernity is important because the Zionist project is inherently modern (Ohana 2012: 1). Even before

the prevalent tendency to depict Hebrew literature as modern, the modernisation of the Hebrew language links the literary production in Hebrew with modernity in a historical sense (Anidjar 2005: 277-8; Ohana 2012: 1-2). Furthermore, modern Jewish identities' fragmentation is evident in Hebrew literary production (Miron 1984: 49-50).

The important aspect of modernity's connection to the Enlightenment and Haskalah is that the literary Gothic is a reactionary movement that responds to these movements. Gothic tropes invite the reader to reconsider the moral validity of the projects of the Enlightenment and the Haskalah. Like the Gothic, which initially refers to that which is opposed to the Roman or Classical, 'the modern is not merely opposed to that which is "older than it", it is also opposed to the "classical"' (Punter 2007: 7). Additionally, David Punter notes the uncanny essence of the modern, and the modern's complex relation with the culturally foreign (9). Based upon these connections between the Gothic and the modern, the following readings show similarities between texts that were labelled Gothic and texts that were branded modern. These tensions become particularly evident when considering the texts' relationship with the producing culture's literary canon.

Whereas the texts in English that will be examined here were labelled as Gothic, subversive literature from the beginning and therefore first rejected and only later incorporated into the canon, the texts in Hebrew were not labelled as Gothic yet contain Gothic elements.³ The former appeared subversive while in fact they supported and substantiated many central normative ideas, such as gender roles and moral rights to states of sovereignty, and the latter seemed to endorse conventional notions while subtly

³ For instance, referring to *Dracula*, Ken Gelder notes that 'a veritable "academic industry" has built itself around this novel, growing exponentially in recent years and, in effect, canonising a popular novel which might otherwise have been dismissed as merely "sensationalist"' (1994: 65). Conversely, Bialik was celebrated as 'national poet' in his time (Klausner 1902/1950: 48), and later the validity of some of his work was subjected to criticism (Gluzman 2005: 17; Tzamiir 2009: 152; Hirshfeld 2011: 276). Writers that were initially embraced by the canon, like Agnon and then Yizhar, 'were less yielding to the socio-national dictates of the period and more intent on preserving the tradition of literary autonomy. Nevertheless, since they could not ignore the ideological narratives so common in general and literary circles, they manipulated them in such ways that their essential character underwent a complete metamorphosis' (Gertz 2000: 18).

subverting these cultural convictions. The texts that were labelled Gothic explore concerns relevant to (post)modern readership, and the modern texts contain Gothic tropes.

In order to explore and compare some of the literary engagements with these questions, this project juxtaposes nineteenth- and twentieth-century literature in English and Hebrew.⁴ The analysis compares the English novels *Frankenstein; or, The Modern Prometheus* by Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley (1818); Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre* (1847); Bram Stoker's *Dracula* (1897); Daphne du Maurier's *Rebecca* (1938); and, originating in the Jewish Ashkenazi Diaspora and in Palestine-Israel, the following texts in Hebrew: 'Be'ir Ha'harega' ('In the City of Slaughter') by Hayyim Nahman Bialik (Ukraine 1903); *The Golem and the Wondrous Deeds of the Maharal of Prague* by Yudl Rosenberg (Poland 1909); 'Mishael' by Y. D. Berkowitz (Poland 1910); 'Ha'adonit veHarochel' ('The Lady and the Peddler') (Palestine 1943), 'Avi Hashor' ('The Ox's Father') (Palestine 1945), 'Tehila' (Israel 1950), and 'Ad Hennah' ('Thus Far') (Israel 1952) by Shmuel Yosef Agnon; and *Khirbet Khizeh* (Israel 1949) by S. Yizhar. These texts were selected because they are canonical works of literature that exemplify and illustrate the claims of this project.⁵

The analysis of these texts has revealed three recurring elements to be crucial for the literary representation of the (re)construction of individual and collective identity: space, myth, and language. A common theme linking all the texts is the exploration of conceptualisations of space and land as imperative for the (re)construction of identities.

⁴ I refer to the texts in Hebrew as Hebrew literature because they participate in the processes of the (re)construction of the modern Jewish-Israeli identity, which, due to the endeavours of the Zionist movement, are intricately intertwined with the purported revival of the Hebrew language.

⁵ Though some of the texts in the Hebrew were not read previously as Gothic literature, Gothic elements in Agnon's work have been noted. For example, 'Helena of "The Lady and the Peddler"' ("Ha'Adonit ve-ha-rokhel") is not immediately identified as the vampire she is' (Fuchs 1983: 120). Also, Harold Fisch's examination of Gemulah, the demon-haunted wife of the antiquarian bookseller, Gamzu in 'Ido Ve'enam (Edo and Enam), 1950 (Fisch 1970: 49), who was brought 'from the far-off mountains of the east (Arabia? Asia Minor? Afghanistan?) to live in Jerusalem of about the year 1930' (49). In a manner reminiscent of the characters in Stoker's novel, 'every month on the night of the full-moon [Gemulah] rises in her sleep, leaves her home, and wanders about the city in a trance-like state'(49).

The psyche requires solid ground, both figuratively and literally, for the (re)construction of a stable identity. Myths nourish the (re)construction of personal and communal identities, creating individual and communal narratives. Finally, the interplay between literal and figurative concepts of identities and sovereignty is investigated in language.⁶ In particular, the analysis focuses on the ways in which the texts explore certain linguistic features, such as the power of the spoken and written word, as well as processes of naming, which play a vital role in the construction of identity. This dissertation is therefore divided into three parts exploring the function of these elements in the texts in a comparative analysis. The study will situate and interpret the texts as participants in the (re)construction of individual and collective identities.

The first part addresses aspects of the texts concerned with the re-examination of norms and notions whereby individual and collective identities are formed in relation to spatial awareness and the land. In order to examine the different elements which participate in such (re)construction of identities, I discern four basic spatial features, which are reflected in the four chapters of the first part as follows: the first chapter explores questions of authenticity, or autochthonous origins; the second chapter is dedicated to the connections between open spaces and processes of identity (re)construction; the third chapter considers the ways in which enclosed spaces and the home shape as well as reflect identities; and the fourth chapter focuses on issues of exile. These four dimensions, I argue, are the central features that participate in processes of identity (re)construction. The comparison of the manner in which these elements are portrayed in the texts reveals not only thematic similarities, but also parallels in technique, specifically in the usage of setting to depict and reflect on the connections between spatial awareness and the land, and identity.

⁶ Concepts, such as identities and sovereignty, will be further explained in the section dedicated to Terminology. For the purposes of the following analyses, sovereignty is the established link between the nation and its territory.

The human need for affirmation of identity is rooted in a necessity for confirmation of origins and connection to the land. Therefore, the first chapter is dedicated to questions of autochthonous origins, or authentic connections to the land. Whether a character is connected to the land or devoid of this link is crucial for the (re)construction of identity. The texts offer a variety of nuanced depictions of the question of origins, and the comparison between them reveals similarities as well as differences. For example, the comparison of *Golem* and *Frankenstein* reveals that even though both the Golem and Frankenstein's creature are manmade, and therefore their origins are unnatural, they have very different ties to the land. While the Golem is made of earth taken from the river bank outside the city of Prague, Frankenstein creates his monster from exhumed body parts from a graveyard in Ingolstadt. This reflects an acute difference in the two narratives' depiction of the monstrous Other's origins, its relationship to the land, and consequently its identity. Accordingly, whereas the portrayal of the monstrous Other in *Frankenstein* is alien, the depiction of the monstrous Other in the *Golem* is more complex, and less uncanny. The complete rejection of the monster in Wollstonecraft Shelley's novel reflects the (re)construction of individual and collective identity in a binary opposition to the Other, while Rosenberg's narrative implies a more intricate relationship which allows for more affinity with the Other. While the British, who were a sovereign imperialist nation could reject the Other, the Jews, who at the time were a nation without territory, could not. The location of the monstrous other in the texts is indicative of the place allocated for the Other in the community.

Once the importance of the connection to the land has been established, the next two chapters examine the effects of enclosed and open spaces upon the various characters' identities. Whether a character feels entrapped and restricted or is reluctant to venture to the great outdoors relates to this character's connection to the land, and has a profound effect upon the character's sense of individual and collective identity. Alongside the self /

other opposition, Risa Domb emphasises the importance of inside / outside dichotomy in the processes of identities (re)construction (1996: 6). Jane Eyre, for instance, is tormented by a sense of stifling restriction that pushes her to seek her fortune away from the orphanage, only to come to the haunted mansion at Thornfield. Similarly, the narrator in Agnon's 'Ad Hennah' is driven by a perpetual sense of unease, and feels his room offers no repose as it resembles the bowels of some hideous monster. In both narratives, the haunting or horrifying settings alongside the characters' restlessness propel the plot and define the characters' identities. Additionally, in both narratives the use of the haunting edifice alongside the restlessness signifies a lack of sovereignty. While for the British woman this is a lack of agency that originates from her gender and class restrictions, for the Jewish man it is a lack of national sovereignty; both narratives employ Gothic elements in order to express and explore these social boundaries.

The use of Gothic elements and locations in order to explore social conventions is a technique found throughout the four texts in English, all of which question the validity of imperialism. One finds tropes such as the ruined castle and fetid cellar in *Dracula*, or the attic in *Jane Eyre*, where the mad woman is kept, which shape and depict imperialism as the horror the narratives explore. While making use of similar tropes, in an inverted manner, Bialik's 'Be'ir Ha'harega' challenges the Jewish exilic condition, calling for a relocation of the Jews out of Europe. Bialik wrote the epic poem as a response to the Kishinev pogrom, and depicted it in a manner that provoked reaction, and served as leverage for the Zionist enterprise. The reader of 'Be'ir Ha'harega' is led through the horrors of the pogrom, and the poem is organised 'according to a series of physical sites through which the poet is moved – the attics, the cellars, the stables, the cemetery, the synagogues, and so on' (Mintz 1982: 291). These locations resemble the places where the Gothic novel locates the unspeakable horror. The Gothic depiction of space will later

resurface in Yizhar's *Khirbet Khizeh*, as the ruined village, which is an avatar of the ruined castle of the Gothic novel, and is anthropomorphised, becoming a horrific location.

The comparison of the texts in Hebrew and English reveals similarities in the manner in which the setting – be it geographical or architectural – is utilised in order to explore issues of identity. Like the Gothic, that projected the narrative onto an exotic landscape in order to explore racist xenophobic fears (Smith and Hughes 2003: 3), the works in Hebrew examined here defamiliarise the settings.⁷ The comparison reveals similarities in the techniques of defamiliarisation, and the manner by which the reader is invited – or required – to reconsider preconceived social norms and moral coda. This reconsideration leads to subtle shifts in the perception of *self* and *Other*.

The last chapter in the part dedicated to space functions as a mirror reflection of the first, since not only is the connection to the land imperative for the (re)construction of individual and collective identities, an exilic condition also has profound implications upon identity. The texts chosen for this chapter offer different perspectives on the ramifications of exilic condition, as while some characters feel an acute sense of displacement in exile, others are content with an exilic existence and are even discomforted when restored to the land that is presumably their homeland. For example, like the narrator in Agnon's 'Ad Henna', the narrator in du Maurier's *Rebecca* struggles to find serenity anywhere, be that in what is supposedly their homeland or in exile. Both characters are portrayed as anxious and pitiful yet sympathetic, and the reader follows them in their quest for home and comfort. Conversely, the characters that seek an exilic condition are depicted as vile and repugnant, as if their acceptance of that existence reveals a contemptible aspect of their

⁷ I refer to the concept of defamiliarisation, or *ostranye* or 'making strange' as formulated by Viktor Shklovsky in his essay 'Art as Technique' (1916), in which he asserts that 'in order to make us feel objects, in order to make the stone feel stony, man has been given the tool of art' (1929/1990: 6). Shklovsky outlines various ways to achieve the 'removal of [an] object from the sphere of automatised perception' (1929/1990: 6), several of which are employed by the different authors examined here, such as to describe a thing or incident as if it were perceived or happening for the first time, and not call it by its name; or to replace parts of a thing with names of parts of another thing.

nature. For example, Stoker's vampire, who wishes to immigrate to London in order to feed on the British population, and the old Rabbanit in Agnon's 'Tehila', who is neither happy nor grateful for her life in the Holy Land and yearns for her home in the Ashkenazi Diaspora, are both depicted as contemptible, vile and monstrous characters. Exile is presented as negative in the texts in Hebrew and English alike, reaffirming the conclusion of the first chapter that ties to the land are vital for the (re)creation of identity. Even though the Jewish-Israeli and British communities experienced opposite processes regarding colonialism, they perceived the notion of exile as equally intolerable.

Spatial images symbolise nationalism and national identity as well as the personal psyche (Gerson 2001: 189; Markman 1983: 35). In the texts examined here, the landscape and settings function as metaphors for the characters' psychological state and identities. It can also be a means to express and explore themes and concepts of Otherness and issues of colonialism. The mythical aspects of the settings reflect the notion that all the characters in these texts seek a home, or more precisely, the myth of a home. Spatial awareness and the crucial connection to the land do not spring directly from the soil, but are established through the narratives that individuals and whole communities (re)produce about certain territories. These narratives are the myths that bind people together and divide them from others.

Myths shape individual and collective identities in relation to the *self* and Other (Schöpflin 1997: 19-20), and connect them to the communal space and land while alienating them from other locations (Smith 1999: 16). Therefore, the next part is dedicated to myths. As noted above, the connections between Judaism and Christianity are intricate and convoluted, and this project does not presume to offer a full analysis of influences and counter-influences. However, it is worth noting some of the effects these links had upon literature that explores individual and collective identities, particularly in relation to sovereignty. The texts selected for this analysis rework certain myths that (re)produce

individual and collective identities, primarily in relation to gender roles and nationalism. In order to explore some of the mythical elements that participate in individual and collective identity (re)construction, the myth part focuses upon modern variations of five myths: adaptations of myths of creation and subversion; revisiting of myths of soul and soil redemption; myths of the vampire; the Wandering Jew and his avatars; and the employment of the myth of hospitality.

The first section focuses on similarities in the incorporation of some Judaic and Greco-Roman myths and the (re)creation of modern myths. Specifically this section explores usage of myths of creation and subversion. In *Frankenstein*, *Golem*, and 'Avi Hashor' a modern identity is (re)created. The texts modify ancient myths in order to explore some of the questions of modernity, such as processes of secularisation, and spatial awareness and the connection to land in light of the emergence of nationalism as a powerful aspect of individual and collective identities. While these identities differ, they are all (re)produced in light of ancient myths of creation and subversion.

In addition to similarities in use of myths of creation and subversion, the comparison reveals parallels in ways of reworking myths of soul and soil redemption. Myths of redemption often substitute or augment the salvation of the soul with the redemption of the land. The comparison of *Dracula*, 'Be'ir Ha'harega', *Khirbet Khizeh*, and 'Tehila' reveals parallels in the ways the texts utilise notions of redemption in order to investigate modern identities in relation to nationalism. Personal deliverance is connected to a collective redemption, as, for example, the team of men in *Dracula* save not only the women and men in the narrative but all British (and Western) civilisation, and the soldiers who supposedly redeem the land in *Khirbet Khizeh* are presumably doing so in the name of the Jewish nation. The texts in English and in Hebrew employ a similar mythology of soil and soul redemption in order to question the moral validity of colonialism.

The next section in the myth part is dedicated to an ancient creature, the vampire. The links between the figure of the vampire and the Jew have been acknowledged by critics such as Howard LeRoy Malchow, Judith Halberstam, Matthew Biberman, and Carol Margaret Davison. This affiliation between the figure of the Jew and the vampire leads to several readings of the texts examined here. For instance, the comparison of *Dracula* as a manifestation of anti-Semitism (Malchow 1996: 149-50; Halberstam 1996: 86) to the reversal of roles in Agnon's 'Ha'adonit veHarochel'. In Agnon's short story, the lady is the vampire that wishes to feed on the Jew's flesh. Though this narrative inverts the usual stereotypical roles of Jew and non-Jew it nonetheless reaffirms social boundaries. The social critique in this narrative is just as xenophobic as in the other texts, only here the racism is directed towards the non-Jewish community.

The links between the figure of the vampire and the Jew lead to the next section, which explores the characters in the texts as avatars of the figure of the Wandering Jew. From the depictions of the fugitive creature in *Frankenstein* and the vampire who seeks exile in *Dracula*, as well as the wandering peddler in Agnon's 'Ha'adonit veHarochel', via Jane Eyre's wandering in the moors, to the unnamed narrators in both 'Ad Hennah' and *Rebecca*, these characters are all homeless rejected Others. Both the soldiers and villagers in *Khirbet Khizeh* as well as Mishael are depicted as homeless, and while the Golem roams the streets of Prague, Tehila rambles through the alleys of Jerusalem.

The characters' wanderings highlight the need for a home as one of the fundamental human needs. These characters' quest for a home, moreover, functions metaphorically on both the individual and collective level. The reason for the pervasiveness of renditions of the figure of the Wandering Jew is that the British were preoccupied with notions of home and belonging in the context of colonialism. The Jewish nation was likewise grappling with notions of national home.

This leads to the final section in the myth part, which explores the myth of hospitality. One might note that till this point the term myth has been used in its meaning as a narrative a group of people produces about itself (Schöpflin 1997: 19), and in this section the term is used in its colloquial derogatory meaning of an unfounded notion. Relying upon Derrida's deconstruction of the concept of hospitality, this last section compares instances of alleged hospitality in some of the texts. In *Dracula*, for instance, the Count's apparent hospitality is soon revealed as an act of hostility, as the vampire invites Harker into his castle only to prey on him and use him for his diabolic plan. The lady's hospitality in Agnon's 'Ha'adonit veHarochel' is a ruse for her intention to feed upon him as she did on her previous husbands. Jane Eyre's aunt only takes the orphan in because she is obliged by a promise, but inside Gateshead she treats the young girl with hostile contempt. Conversely, the hospitable reaction the soldiers encounter in *Khirbet Khizeh* is a mockery of their own hostile intents, and in 'Avi Hashor' the insistence upon hospitality leads the old man's neighbour to commit an act of brutality and slaughter the old man's beloved ox. The close reading of the various examples of seemingly hospitable acts reveals the notion is, indeed, a myth. Furthermore, this myth (re)establishes notions of national sovereignty and xenophobia.

Whether they reaffirm social norms or undermine them, the various myths explored in the second part all operate within the linguistic sphere; the myths are transmitted and received through language. Therefore, the last part is dedicated to an examination of language in the texts. This last part is divided into three sections, which focus on different aspects of language. The first section examines the importance of speech for the assertion of identities. The second section is dedicated to representations of education and its role in the characters' identities. Education is an imperative aspect of language, as it is through education that some of the fundamental social facets of the connection between individual and collective identities are explored and established. As will become clear from the

examination of the texts, this is particularly important in relation to conceptualisations of sovereignty. The third section focuses on names in the texts, as well as the labelling of the texts themselves under one generic rubric or another. The comparison shows how these facets of language participate in processes of individual and collective identity (re)creation and the assertion of sovereignty.

Since sovereignty is asserted through speech, as just indicated, the first section is devoted to representations of speech. The characters' verbal abilities reveal their humanity – or its lack – as well as their social position. The characters' linguistic abilities reflect their capacity to become sovereign, as sovereignty is a specifically human trait linked with speech. Their individual identities are (re)constructed in relation to their linguistic aptitude, and hence in relation to their potential capability to become sovereign. The texts offer loquacious as well as silent characters. Their linguistic aptitude is tied with their social acceptance or rejection. Whereas the mute ox and Golem are a part of the Jewish community, the eloquent creature in *Frankenstein* and Jane Eyre are rejected. While the silence of the ox and Golem represents the Jewish community's lack of agency, the creature and Jane articulate their wish for social mobility and acceptance. Bertha Mason, one of the famously inarticulate characters and the ultimate subaltern, shares her incoherence with Mishael, the rejected Jewish boy. This link exposes both the feminisation of the Diaspora male Jew, and his existence as the subaltern upon European soil. The comparison illuminates how speech in both English and Hebrew texts reflects social concerns. Speech serves to highlight issues such as class mobility, feminism, and the ramifications of the colonialist enterprise.

In conjunction with speech, education and the written word are explored as markers of human and social boundaries. In the English and Hebrew texts alike the important role of education in the (re)construction of identity is reflected in the centrality of schooling in the texts. From the educational explosion in *Frankenstein* where everyone seems to be

learning, via Jane Eyre whose plotline revolves around schooling, or Mishael who is rejected because he does not have a scholarly inclination, to the educated soldiers in *Khirbet Khizeh* who are familiar with Bialik and Shakespeare – the texts all offer a reference to education as a significant aspect of the construction of individual and collective identities. The education of the various characters is indicative not only of their personal improvement, but of their communal heritage. The focus on education in these texts reflects its crucial role in the (re)construction of identity in relation to the community and the nation.

Another important aspect of identity that operates upon the linguistic plane is names. The next section in part three is dedicated to names of characters, the unnamed narrator, and territorial titling. By naming something or someone we bring it into light, and it becomes known and familiar. The names given to characters offer some indication of their personality. Moreover, these names – or their absence – reveal certain fears that are not overtly articulated. For example, while Frankenstein's creature remains an unnamed horror, the Golem is named after a biblical character, Joseph. The lack of the name in the former establishes the creature as the rejected monster, and the familiar and even meaningful name of the latter incorporates the Golem into the community. This difference is indicative of the two communities' relationship with the Other, as the British reject it while the Jewish allot a place for it within the community.

The language in the texts also (re)creates and consolidates collective identities, as the people who read the same texts share certain notions. The comparison of the connection between the nation and literature in the texts examined here reveals a similarity in the manner by which literature was harnessed in order to critique or support national agenda. While British Gothic literature was aligned with the rebellious notions of the French Revolution, and later a critique of imperialism, many of the Hebrew writers of the early twentieth century were associated with the Zionist enterprise.

Though coming from two distinct cultural backgrounds, the texts similarly utilise Gothic tropes in their depictions of space and landscape. The importance of spatial awareness and connection to the land for the (re)construction of identity is explored using Gothic tropes because the Gothic is engaged with the connection between settings and questions of identity. These questions of identity, which are inherently intertwined with spatial awareness and concepts of land and sovereignty, are explored in the texts in English and Hebrew in parallel ways. The investigation of the various locations of the monstrous Other in the texts reveals a number of unresolved issues regarding Otherness in society, specifically in relation to racial and gender identity and to sovereignty. Addressing these issues, this study as a whole suggests that Gothic elements are utilised in order to explore alterity in relation to questions of nationhood.

1.1 Historical Contextualisation

The texts examined here reach from the early nineteenth to the mid-twentieth century. They reflect some of the repercussions of the French Revolution (1789–1799), of the industrial and print revolutions (circa 1760–1840), and of the two world wars. These historical events, as well as many more, such as the Reform Act (1832) and the Slave Abolition Act (1833) in England resonate in some of the texts and inform the exploration of various issues of personal and collective identities, such as the right to personal freedom, agency, spatial awareness and land ownership.

The Ashkenazi Diaspora Jews were part of the European landscape while these processes took place. Until the Enlightenment and the Haskalah, which is the corresponding Jewish movement, the construction of Jewish identity in the Diaspora was in opposition to the non-Jewish tradition (Boyarin 1997: 1-2). However, while in the early days of the construction of the non-Hebraic and Hebraic cultures the Hebrew community sought to differentiate itself from Hellenistic culture, in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Europe certain streams of the Jewish community began to want to produce a new image that was to be more in accordance with non-Jewish traditions.

There were many attempts by the Enlightenment and the Haskalah to assimilate the European Jews or otherwise examine the Jews' exilic condition.⁸ The 1882 publication of *Auto-Emancipation!* by Leon Pinsker called for national rebirth and national distinction instead of assimilation. Indeed, the re-birth or re-naissance narrative is the predominant literary matrix at the heart of the Hebrew texts that were dedicated to the recreation of the Hebrew nation and its connection to the land (Schwartz 2007: 14). The discussion regarding the processes of assimilation or nationalism produced the distinction between

⁸ The Enlightenment is a European movement of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, which undermined the dominance of religion, and instead emphasised reason and individualism. The Haskalah is the parallel movement within the European Jewish intelligentsia. The Haskalah followed the Enlightenment, coming into prominence in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

the notions of the “old Jew” of Eastern Europe, and the “new Jew”, who would inhabit Israel.

The political movement that propelled these notions was Zionism.⁹ The movement’s name is derived from the name of the land, Zion. The ‘vehement opposition’ to the suggestion of Uganda as an alternative for the return to the biblical homeland is indicative of the importance of the land of Palestine-Israel for the movement’s conception of the rebuilding of the Hebrew nation (Zerubavel 1995: 2). The Zionist movement was replete with disagreements and debates regarding the politics and cultural identity of the movement and Jewish identity. However, most early Zionists agreed that ‘a sense of nationhood could only be cemented through shared national heroes, symbols, songs, and myths – that is, a national culture’ (Berkowitz 1996: 41). Eventually, the notions that the Jewish nation required a nation-state in Palestine became the consensus.

In order to achieve its goals, the movement required a formative narrative to unite the Jews. This narrative pertained predominantly to two issues: the land, and the image of the Jew. The rise of Zionism as a modern political movement was entwined with the question of national Jewish culture in the modern era (Hever 2007: 9). As Yael Zerubavel and Michael Berkowitz explain, the early Zionist movement attempted to create and define a new Jewish national and cultural identity (Zerubavel 1995: 12; Berkowitz 1996: 6). The movement harnessed ancient myths in order to (re)create a new modern myth of the new Jew. Relying upon the long Jewish tradition and rich culture, a new body of literature that depicted new identities was emerging.

Zionism perceived the Hebrew nation’s history in relation to the land, and divided the past into two main periods: Antiquity and Exile, the former being coloured in positive

⁹ Zionism is the national movement that endorses the settlement of Jews in the territory defined as the Land of Israel. The movement has had many divergencies since it gained shape in the late nineteenth century in Europe, and since the first Zionist congress, which was held in Basel in 1897.

tones while the latter was depicted as negative (Zerubavel 1995: 16). Zionism suggested that the exilic existence allowed for a deterioration of the nation's spirit because of the lack of the connection to the land (Zerubavel 1995: 18). The negative perception and presentation of exilic life 'turned from *shelilat ha-galut* (the repudiation of the state of living in exile) to *shelilat ha-gola* (the condemnation of the people who live in exile), the product of its demeaning and regressive lifestyle' (Zerubavel 1995: 19). One of the crucial aspects of the Zionist image of the exilic Jew is that it incorporated anti-Semitic stereotypes to support this negative portrayal (19). The conceptual old Jew was in many ways the internalisation of anti-Semitic notions. The monstrous depictions of the Jew was, in an ironic manner, adopted by the Zionist movement for its own purposes.

The Zionist movement constructed an image of a new active Jew as opposed to the old passive (persecuted) one (Zerubavel 1995: 12; Berkowitz 1996: 6; and Gluzman 2007: 68). Alongside practical political Zionism such as Herzl's, Max Nordau developed 'a psychophysical Zionism as a solution to the problem of Jewish degeneration' (Bar-Yosef 1996: 71). Basing his perspective on European stereotypes of Judaism as illness, 'Nordau argued that Zionism must cultivate what he called "a Judaism of the muscles," not the moral or intellectual capacities of the Jew (Bar-Yosef 1996: 71-2). The notions of the old Diaspora Jew and the new Jew, who will become the new Israeli, are part of Zionist discourse, and were used in order to encourage immigration to Palestine-Israel.

In order to battle the negative image of the Diaspora Jew, the movement appropriated scenes from the Old Testament, 'most of which attested to the imagined heroism, vitality, and romance of ancient Israel' (Berkowitz 1996: 131). These images advocated the idea of individual and collective redemption through the connection to the land by reviving ancient myths, as well as by (re)constructing the concept of the new Jew as farmer. As Yael Zerubavel explains, 'The highly negative image of the Jew of Exile was counterbalanced by the no less extreme positive image of the new native Hebrew, later

known by the nickname *Tsabar* (Sabra)' (1995: 26). The myth of the deformed Diaspora Jew was replaced with the myth of the vibrant Zionist body. These processes are reflected in literary explorations of modern Jewish identity.

In addition to long processes of reconfiguration of the Jewish and British identities in the Jewish Diaspora and the United Kingdom, the two cultural and national identities endured a period of spatial and historical proximity, as the Jewish-Israeli identity was (re)constructed in Palestine-Israel while the British had the Mandate in Palestine. The formation of the Jewish collective identity as a modern nation was intertwined with the British Mandate in Palestine. The end of the Mandate was a part of the end of the British imperialist enterprise, and was the foundation moment of the Israeli nation-state. While the two modern collective identities were formulated in spatial and historical contiguity, they experienced diverging processes of identity formation, which emerge also in literary representations.

The aftermath of the First World War brought Palestine under British rule. Between 1917 and 1948 the British tried to resolve the problematic situation that has persisted for nearly a century now. At the end of the imperial era, occupying Palestine-Israel brought neither financial nor strategic benefits (Segev 1999: 4); rather, it was a logistic and political burden. Tom Segev suggests that '[t]he British entered Palestine to defeat the Turks; they stayed there to keep it from the French; then they gave it to the Zionists because they loved "the Jews" even as they loathed them, at once admired and despised them, and above all feared them' (1999: 31). One of the crucial moments in the Jewish-British relationship is the Balfour declaration, which asserted that His Majesty's Government 'views with favour the aspiration of the Zionist Jews to establish a national home for the Jewish people in Palestine' (United Kingdom Foreign Office, November 2nd, 1917). This was the culmination of a long process of self-definition on the Jewish side, replete with many disagreements and various contradicting opinions, while the British were progressing

toward relinquishing the notion of imperialism. The Zionist movement struggled to populate the land with Jews, and to attain the rights to sovereignty over Palestine. The years of the Mandate saw many riots and high tension between the Arab and Jewish population. In February 1947, the British relinquished the Mandate for Palestine, and in November the United Nations voted for partition. In May 1948, David Ben Gurion declared the establishment of the nation-state of Israel.

1.2 Theoretical Framework

The base of the following analyses is Claude Lévi-Strauss' structuralist approach, which is 'the quest for the invariant, or for the invariant elements among superficial differences' (1978: 8). Gothic tropes, as well as structural similarities in the exploration of identities, are the shared or invariant elements among the diverse texts. Yet once analogies are unearthed, the analyses continue towards a deconstruction of what might at first appear similar, providing Derridian readings of the texts. The literary analysis exposes shared themes and narrative techniques, even while revealing certain differences within these similarities. Specifically, the readings outline nuanced similarities in the use of Gothic elements in order to explore the (re)construction of individual and collective identities.

The literary exploration relies upon the extensive body of work already conducted on several of the texts, from Gilbert and Gubar's (1979) seminal work on gender in the Gothic and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's (1985, 1988) ground-breaking postcolonial exploration of some of the English texts, to Michael Gluzman's (2005) investigation of gender in Hebrew literature and Ariel Hirshfeld's (2011) intimate readings of several of the texts in Hebrew. These readings inform this work which attempts to unpack some of the intricate and complex connections between the private and the political, the personal and the collective.

In order to consider the links between the individual and communal identities represented in the texts, this dissertation is based upon several sociological and philosophical theories in addition to these and many more literary analyses. Primarily, this work relies upon Anthony Smith's (1995) sociological theories on nationalism, specifically nationalism's heavy reliance upon mythologies for its production and preservation. As noted, Jacques Derrida's philosophical inquiries into the essence of identity and sovereignty (2009) are at the base of the reading this dissertation suggests. The following

reading of the Hebrew and English texts reveals similarities in a fundamental undermining and questioning of the validity of the concepts of identity and sovereignty.

In addition to the shared thematic exploration of issues of alterity, the links between the Hebrew and English literatures rest upon the historical and spatial connections between the two cultures. The Jews were a part of the British cultural space, and the figure of the Jew, and particularly the Wandering Jew, has played a fundamental role in the construction of British identity. The connections between British literature and Jewish themes have been acknowledged by Carol Margaret Davison, who suggests the image of the Jew was utilised in order to explore British identity (2004: 3). A certain aspect of the relationship between Jews and Britain is that while several other European countries had established specific anti-Semitic legislation, from the seventeenth century, when Jews were readmitted into the UK, they were subjected to the same kind of rules that applied to other minority groups. For example, the 1905 Alien Act restricted immigration without specifically targeting Jews. Though the Act might have been a direct response to the massive immigration of Jews from Russia and Eastern Europe, the letter of the Act does not refer explicitly to Jewish immigration. Yet, while the legislation did not target Jews, some of the literature of the long eighteenth century as well as that of the nineteenth to mid-twentieth century is replete with implicit anti-Semitic depictions.

Even while the historical context is taken into consideration, bearing in mind the manner by which they explore individual and collective identities, the texts are all read as modern. According to Maureen McLane, ‘one could quite reasonably date the crystallisation of “modernity” in Britain to the late eighteenth century’ (2000: 7). *Frankenstein; or, The Modern Prometheus*’s modern connection is revealed not only in its title, but in the way the narrative explores the plights of modernity (Hustis 2003: 845). Count Dracula is an embodiment of ancient fears that are altered and intensified by modernity (Yu 2006: 146). Gothic tropes, moreover, have persisted as dark undertones in

modernity (Botting 1996: 1). The texts are modern in their insistence upon an enquiry into the basic underpinnings of identities. As noted above, this analysis focuses on examinations of class and nation, which are the pivotal concerns of modernity (Lefebvre 1962/2011: 187). The themes examined here are relevant to the crisis of modernity, or what Thomas Hardy termed ‘the ache of modernism’, which has been cause for much anxiety as well as debate regarding its very essence, reverting many times to self-reflexivity and circular definition as ‘those qualities of life that, cumulatively, contain the drama of the crisis of modernity’ (Panichas 1987: 198). It is precisely the attempt to comprehend the significance of modernity for one’s identity that *is* the crisis of modernity. The reconfiguration of individual and collective identities as modern individual and collective identities is the cause and kernel of the crisis of modernity. The following examination focuses upon literary representations of attempts to come to terms with some of the social changes of the nineteenth and early twentieth-century, such as the effects of the industrial revolution and social mobility, in relation to British and Jewish-Israeli individual and collective identities.

1.3 Terminology

1.3.1 Spatial Awareness

A number of terms require attention and clarification for the purpose of the following literary analyses. One ought to note the subtle though important differentiation for the following analyses between “space”, “place”, and “land”. Space, as Foucault explains, is an active concept, as it takes the form of relations among sites (1967/1984: 2). Space is important in the following discussion precisely as an active participant in the (re)creation of identities, and the relations between identities and social conventions. The term “place” has a connotation of location, referring to open and enclosed spaces; and “land” is a ‘solid portion of the earth’s surface’ (OED). The term “place”, or more precisely Plato’s *khôra*, has been connected with otherness and an essential elusiveness (Derrida 1993/1995: 89). Already one can see how space and alterity are intricately intertwined.

This thesis explore a twofold tension between ‘space’ and ‘place’ as articulated by Yi-Fu Tuan (1977/200: 3-7), and ‘place’ and ‘Place’ as formulated by Gidon Aran and Zali Gurevitch (Aran and Gurevitch 1992: 22-74). The first set of tensions refers to a universal humanist need for home and belonging, the second refers to a more specific Jewish-Israeli set of concerns and issues. A conceptualization of ‘space’ and ‘place’ is crucial for the (re)construction of personal and national identities. The distinction between ‘space’ and ‘place’ suggests that “‘space’ is more abstract than ‘place’” (Tuan 1977/2001: 6). As Yi-Fu Tuan explains, ‘what begins as undifferentiated space becomes place as we get to know it better and endow it with value’ (6). Within Jewish-Israeli discourse, Gideon Aran and Zali Gurevitch draw a further distinction between ‘place’ and ‘Place,’ the former being the physical home and childhood landscape, and the latter the idea of ‘the Land,’ with its symbolic meaning represented in cultural artifacts (1992: 25). Aran and Gurevitch argue that for Jews the land is a medium for ‘The Place’ (1992: 37), which in Judaism is

synonymous with God (DeKoven 2006: xi). Referring to Aran and Gurevitz's conceptualisation of 'Place' and 'place,' Schwartz draws the following conclusion:

despite the enormous effort and the phenomenal objective successes, the Zionist endeavour down the generations, in its various areas of activity, has been accompanied with a sense of missed opportunity, an experience of broken dream, which is slowly turning into a kind of general agreement that there is, probably, an unbridgeable gap between our Place and our place.

(2014: 3)

Not only is this a grim conclusion, but it is also revealing of the crucial importance of spatial awareness for Jewish and Jewish-Israeli identities.

In Hebrew culture throughout the ages, the Land of Israel has been perceived and depicted as the centre, the homeland of the Jewish nation, and the role of the land in the Zionist narrative has been pivotal (Ben-Ari and Bilu 1997: 3-9). Yet Jews are not alone in framing place in this way. 'Human groups nearly everywhere tend to regard their own homeland as the centre of the world' (Tuan 1977/2001: 149). Rather than actual spatial indication, this conceptualization of centre relates to the attribution of a high value to the place. The problem of the tension between 'place' and 'space' is not unique to Jewish-Israelis, but the additional factor of the tension between 'place' and 'Place' is unique to Jewish-Israelis, because the Jew can live anywhere as part of a historically well-developed diaspora identity, whereas the Jewish-Israeli exists only by virtue of his relationship to Israel.

These concepts are even more difficult to grapple with in a literary sense, because literary space is conceptual (Wilson 1995: 215). Bearing this problem in mind, spatial awareness is here formulated as the characters' comprehension of and connection to the land, or their lack. The following discussions of the characters' spatial awareness will refer to the depictions of processes that outline and form tensions between personal and collective identities in relation to space and land. While the notions of "space" or "place" relate to spatial awareness in a broader sense, the majority of the following discussion of "land" relates to the characters' relationship to the land and the soil. The analysis probes space and place because '[t]he place is the base of identity, because in it the individual connects to the world, and through the world to his or herself' (Aran and Gurevitch 1992: 24). The initial spatial awareness, related to the land, the landscape of one's childhood, the home and first language are the base upon which one constructs identities. Spatial awareness is a fundamental need for the construction of identities.

Anthony Smith notes the importance of the properties of territory and the role of land for national identities, because of the importance of 'ancestral or sacred territory and the development of *ethnoscapes* – landscape endowed with poetic ethnic meaning through the historicisation of nature and the territorialisation of ethnic memories' (Smith 1999: 16). These aspects of identities are particularly important for the Jewish and Jewish-Israeli identities. For centuries, the Jewish nation has been marked by its homelessness, and with the thrust of the Zionist enterprise in the late nineteenth century, it has begun to grapple with the new and continually-forming Jewish-Israeli identities. The discourse of Jewish-Israeli identities is a reflection of and on the struggle for coherent identities, which is 'intensified by existential as well as political debates over territorialism and occupation' (Omer-Sherman 2006: x). As Jewish-Israeli identities are (re)constructed it becomes evident that a fragmentary essence is, in fact, the crux of these identities as a multiplicity that resists placement.

The troubled Jewish and later Jewish-Israeli experience of place is rooted both in contemporary political tensions and mythical conceptualisation of “place” in Jewish tradition. Place, or *makom*, in Hebrew tradition is a synonym for God (Derrida 1993/1995: 56-57; Mann 2006: xi). Furthermore, ‘*Ha-makom*, God is not only *THE* place, but place itself’ (DeKoven 2000: 12). The concept of “place” is a dense notion, especially in relation to the Jewish-Israeli discourse of identity. Aran and Gurevitch examine the notion of “place”, arguing that the Israeli experience does not have a complete, obvious identification between the Israeli and the land (1992: 22). According to Aran and Gurevitch, one of the central principles of Jewishness means that Jews are ‘never the owners of the place just as we are not the owners of our selves, the land is but an object and medium for ‘The Place’ [God] that has no measure’ (1992: 37). Thus even before exploring Gothic elements in the setting, one ought to note that the Jewish-Israeli space entails an important peculiarity, an essential strangeness.¹⁰ The Jewish-Israeli experience of place, especially in important aspects of the mythical expression from the bible to nowadays, is ambivalent, dialectic, paradoxical (Gurevitch 1992: 8). Aran and Gurevitch distinguish between “Place” and “place”. The “place” is the childhood landscape, the “Place” is an idea of “the Land” (1992: 25). Place, according to Aran and Gurevitch carries a special meaning for Jews. Though some of the readings in this thesis will be based on their argument, it will emerge that, as the Judaic and Christian cultures are, indeed, intricately connected, some of these complexities are shared by both traditions. Consequently, the literature in Hebrew and English explores similar themes related to the importance of place for the (re)construction of individual and collective identities.

The comparison between literary depictions of modern Jewish and British identities reveals a certain similarity. Both are (re)constructed as uncanny. In order to depict the Jews

¹⁰ In an earlier essay ‘The Other Side of Dialogue: On Making the Other Strange and the Experience of Otherness’ (1988), Gurevitch utilised Sklovsky’s concept of *ostranenyie*, or defamiliarization in order to establish ‘an idea of dialogue as an interplay of familiarity and strangeness’ (1180).

as at home in Palestine-Israel, ‘the fundamental “unhomeliness” of European Jews in Palestine had to be overcome, or at least downplayed. What was repressed by Zionism’s negation of exile surfaced within modern Hebrew culture as *das Unheimliche*, “the uncanny”’ (Mann 2006: 30). Being, in fact, alien in their new homeland the Ashkenazi Diaspora Jews in the early settlements in Palestine-Israel were, indeed, uncanny. Similarly, the British imperial experience yielded an essential uncanniness. The British were, indeed, alien upon the lands they were colonising. This produced an ‘imperial uncanny’, which is an unresolved anxiety directed at the combination of the character of the Other and the location (Collins 2005: 263). Even while they perceived the local population as the Other, in some manner, the British experienced themselves and the environment as uncanny. The Jews, in comparison, experienced their own Otherness upon the European soil, and then later as colonisers in Palestine-Israel.

Corresponding to the strangeness of the characters, the locations in the texts in Hebrew and English undergo processes of defamiliarisation. Whether by following the Gothic tradition of an exotification (Kilgour 1995: 82; Smith and Hughes 2003: 3; Bar Yosef 1996: 73-4), or aligning these literary techniques with a modern tradition of the portrayal of the setting as alien, strange (Band 1988: 3-24; Botting 1996: 9; Burke 2004: 25-39), the texts all utilise the setting in order to invite the reader to reconsider preconceived notions. By undermining the characters’ spatial stability the texts question the readers’ social conventions. Specifically, as the texts undermine spatial stability, they allow the reader to reconsider the readers’ place in society (e.g., gender roles, states of sovereignty). These processes subvert the role of the land in the construction of national identities, as well as the certainty of spatial awareness for the assertion of individual identities.

1.3.2 The Gothic

The use of the term Gothic here is typological rather than historical. The analysis will show similarities in the employment of Gothic tropes, such as the use of the setting and revisiting and revitalising myths in order to examine characters as well as social issues. The focus upon the settings stems from the fact that in Gothic literature ‘[t]he buildings are as important as the protagonists’ (Wright 2007: 36). The edifices and topography propel plot, reveal and (re)construct identities.

Considering the origins of the term Gothic might shed some light upon its initial meaning as a signifier of the rejection of the norms of the prevailing social order. The Visigoths were a Germanic tribe that was to some extent responsible for the downfall of the Roman Empire, and their name came to connote an antonym to Roman, with the implication of anticlassical (Wright 2007: 1). The term Gothic, relating to a genre or mode of writing, was transferred from architecture to political and literary discourses, and was initially attributed as a pejorative term to politics and novels that appeared to subvert in some manner the prevailing social order and its norms (Wright 2007: 1-2). The subversion of prevailing norms in the texts examined below is evident in their engagement with questions of the moral validity of colonialism and sovereignty, in their questioning or reaffirming of gender roles, and reconsidering of racial discrimination.

One of the early British philosophical reflections upon the Gothic was Edmund Burke’s *Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful* (1757). Aligning it with the sublime as a concept that combines pleasure and fear, Burke rejects the Gothic.¹¹ Reflecting primarily upon Gothic architecture, the Victorian art critic John Ruskin argues that innovative and even subversive elements are essential for all

¹¹ The links between beauty and fear and the ‘sublime’ have also been explored by Emanuel Kant in his *Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime* (1764), and later in his *Critique of Judgment* (1790), which spliced the “sublime” into categories: the mathematical, dynamical, noble, splendid, and terrifying. Both British and German philosophers, nevertheless, conceptualise the sublime in terms of boundaries, suggesting the sublime is that which is without or exceeds limits. The Kantian conceptualisation of the sublime will be noted for the following analysis of *Frankenstein*.

artistic exploration (1853/1921: 172). In addition, Ruskin inscribes the discussion of the Gothic into a scale of approximation, stressing that one can only speak of ‘a greater or lesser degree of *Gothicness*’ (150). In this early attempt to define the Gothic its unruly nature already emerges. Like modernity, the Gothic refuses stable definitions.

Acknowledging its elusive nature, Ruskin offers six characteristics of the Gothic in descending order of importance: Savageness (or Rudeness); Changefulness (or the Love of Change); Naturalism (or Love of Nature); Grottesqueness (or Disturbed Imagination); Rigidity (or Obstinacy); and Redundancy (or Generosity) (152). The most important element according to Ruskin, its Savageness, refers to national differences (153). Ruskin explains that ‘at the close of the so-called Dark Ages, the word Gothic became a term of unmitigated contempt, not unmixed with aversion’ (153), and argues for reclaiming this artistic aesthetics because imperfection is beautiful (169). Throughout his analysis, Ruskin presents the Gothic as a socially active concept that encourages one to rethink old assumptions and norms. Nonetheless, regardless of Ruskin’s attempts to reclaim the Gothic, or perhaps paradoxically due to this re-appropriation, the term remained a derogatory one, and continued to be used in relation to literature with reference to rejection or subversion of hegemony, social transgression, and subversion.

During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the Gothic novel proliferated (Kilgour 1995: 66, 73; Wright 2007: 1-2.). As noted, however, due to the contempt it elicited in the academic and literary circles of the time, in contemporary British politics the term Gothic was used to express scorn and repulsion (Schoene-Harwood 2000: 13-29). The two discourses, the political and literary, reinforced the perception of the Gothic as unsettling and harmful. The Gothic offered an aesthetic representation of political turmoil that was tied to the French Revolution, the industrial and mass-print revolutions, as well as internal political issues and social concerns (Kilgour 1995: 73). Furthermore, the Gothic has been linked with the colonial enterprise and its critique, social and racial anxieties, as

well as fears from the encounter with the Other that was colonised (Baldick 1987: 1; Smith and Hughes 2003: 1-4; Bugg 2005: 665; Craciun 2011: 470; Valente 2000: 632-634). The Gothic novel was the literary response to contemporary socio-political changes.

Yet, while David Punter asserts that the Gothic is, indeed, political (1996: 14), Elizabeth Napier claims that it is not essentially about politics, but is a conglomeration of frightening elements that result in a genre of imbalance (1987: 5). The Gothic is considered by some a category of prose fiction that flourished through the early nineteenth-century in which 'the locale was often a gloomy castle furnished with dungeons, subterranean passages, and sliding panels' (Abrams 2005: 117); however, as Abrams notes, many of the novels are now read 'as period pieces, but the best opened up to fiction the realm of the irrational and of the perverse impulses and nightmarish terrors that lie beneath the orderly surface of the civilised mind' (2005: 117-8). The Gothic itself, like many of its characters, is torn between conflicting ideas and it disturbs and unsettles preconceived notions. Nevertheless, Chris Baldick cautions that 'under the old Freudian dispensation, Gothic fiction could readily and often simply enough be diagnosed as an instance of the 'return of the repressed' (1987: 225). Baldick rejects criticism that suggests that novels are Gothic only in as much as they are subversive or transgressive, yet he acknowledges that these elements are an important part of the Gothic (225). Even though the following reading of some of the Gothic tropes in the texts examined here might reveal these texts are neither subversive nor transgressive, they nonetheless require the readers' attention as they engage with some of the fundamental social notions of *self* and *Other*.

Literary Gothic elements appear to subvert the prevailing norm and undermine preconceived notions of selfhood, even as they reiterate these very same notions. Like the Gothic, the Jewish Talmudic tradition is based on the continual questioning and reinvestigation of concepts and norms. In a sense, the Gothic and Jewish traditions are essentially similar in their tendency to reconsider prevailing norms. The connection Daniel

Boyarin draws between Freud's uncanny and the Jew (2008: 166) is one manifestation of this link. Both literary traditions are essentially Derridian in their use of deconstruction for the purpose of inquiry and reconsideration; specifically the concepts of self and Other are constantly invoked only to be deconstructed.

European literature of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries produced an abundance of monsters in texts, of which the most famous are Wollstonecraft Shelley's monster and Stoker's vampire. By undermining the supposed binary relationship between the monster and hero these texts explore the (re)construction of individual and collective identity. Daniel Boyarin argues that 'doubling of the self is endemic to the colonial psyche' (2008: 167), as images of self and Other elucidate how modern identities are (re)constructed. In Hebrew literature of the same period there appears to be a surprising dearth of monsters. The monster, it would seem, was left somewhere in the depth of mythical texts. Yet further scrutiny reveals that in Hebrew literature the monster is not lost but merely well-hidden. Whether it is Agnon's Wandering Jew, or the Arab and the robotic warriors in Yizhar's narratives, the monstrous Other is, indeed, present or perhaps is a presence in modern Hebrew literature. The modern Hebrew monstrous Other might appear more human than some of its English equivalent, as it is of a different kind of monstrous Othernessness, and it might be located closer to the socially acceptable; nevertheless, both in the Hebrew and in the English texts the monstrous Other delineates social boundaries.

The oscillation between the reiteration and rejection of norms draws the readers' attention to the problematic essence of some of these preconceived norms and concepts. These oscillations are reminiscent of the *khôra*, which 'oscillates between two types of oscillations: the double exclusion (*neither/ nor*) and the participation (*both this and that*)' (Derrida 1993/1995: 91; emphasis in the original). The Gothic genre and the concept of space share a fundamental instability. In fact, it might be argued that the Gothic, space, and modernity share this unstable essence.

The Gothic is a socially active genre and, in addition to its outwardly projected communal focus, it operates within the personal psychological realm as aid to redefining the boundaries of the *self* in relation to the Other. The Gothic outlines the borders and boundaries of whole communities towards other communities as well as the boundaries of each community towards its own Others within. The texts examined here utilise Gothic tropes such as the haunted – as well as haunting – edifice, and monsters – be those bestial, dehumanised or human-like. Both English and Hebrew texts use these elements in order to reconsider individual and collective identities. The similarities the following readings of the texts reveal between the Gothic and modern tropes, such as the fragmentation of the *self* and shattering of social norms ingrained in religiosity, suggest a (frightening) affinity between the Gothic horror of the fragmented *self* confronted with the Other and the crisis of modernity.

1.3.3 The Monstrous Other

In all the texts examined in this study, the characters are (re)constructed along the dichotomous lines of *self* and Other. These axes are reproduced in literature as the hero and the monster. The following discussion outlines various kinds of heroes, anti-heroes, and monstrous Others. All known cultures have some variation of a creature that embodies fears and outlines the borders and boundaries of what is considered socially accepted, '[i]ndeed, monsters arise with civilisation – with human self-consciousness' (Gilmore 2003: 5). While some scholars choose to confine the use of the term "monster" to 'supernatural, mythical, or magical products of the imagination' (Gilmore 2003: 6), this dissertation explores the interplay between the metaphor of the monstrous and the social location of the Other and therefore includes what David Gilmore claims are 'justifiably "monsters" in a metaphorical sense' (6). We create monsters that reflect and embody our

fears, and project these images upon the Other. Yet, when fears become a reality, we apply the literary term monster to describe what we cannot accept.

The etymological roots of the word ‘monster,’ something or someone to be shown and to warn against the wrongdoings of humanity (from Latin, *monstrare*; French, *montrer*; English, demonstrate), elucidate the monstrous as the signifier (and later symbol) of the boundaries of the socially acceptable and unacceptable (Baldick 1987: 110). The roots of the equivalent word in Hebrew (miph-lét-set) are vague and range from the root of the word for fear and abomination (א.ל.פ) to the roots of the Greek word phallus (*Babylon Talmud, Abodah Zarah (Idolatry) 44:71*). The first use of the word is in the Old Testament, in Kings I 16:13, in relation to the dethroning of the queen Maachah who had ‘made a monster for the idol’. The word has been interpreted as her having made a phallus-idol, or a phallus for the idol (*Babylon Talmud 44:71*). Following these etymological roots of the concept reveals that the monstrous pertains to fear and social transgression. Often the monster is located on the entrances to temples in order to guard knowledge sacred and profane, socially acceptable and rejected (e.g., the gorgon and sphinx). The monster is the social gatekeeper.

Stephen Bann traces an exploratory trend from as early as the sixteenth century that viewed the world anew as fertile grounds for making monstrosities (1994: 4), yet, the new world myths were (re)created in order to explain both the empirical and mythological worlds. The recent focus of *Comparative Critical Studies* (9:3; 2012) on hybrids and monsters reflects contemporary interest in the monstrous, and indeed, as the editors observe, ‘[a]ll authors [in the volume] see the presence of hybrids and monsters as characteristic of our contemporary world, and see them as inextricably linked to violence and conflict’ (249). Within postcolonial discourse, hybridity refers to the effects of synthesis upon identities and cultures of the colonised (Kristeva 1982: 132; Bhabha 1990: 4). Specifically, hybridity alters the different components that might have originally been

its parts in a way that makes it hard to discern and differentiate them from one another (Young 1994: 26). Monstrosity and hybridity are ancient notions that are nonetheless intricately connected to modern identities.

Yet, before one can appreciate concepts of social acceptance as well as individual or collective social otherness, one has to differentiate between the *self* and the Other. Jacques Lacan's concept of the Other is a part of a conceptualisation of the various stages the infant undergoes in the construction of the *self*, and which has been, since its articulation, attributed to the idea of the creation of the *self* in relation to the social Other. According to Lacanian theory, the infant reaches the 'mirror stage', in which it is capable of distinguishing his or her self in relation to the caregiver, and can thus construct, or begin to construct, the comprehension of a separate identity. The Lacanian Other is the signifier of that which constitutes our *self* in relation to society (Lacan 1966: 6). As explained above, in the literature considered here the *self* is represented as the hero, and the Other is the monster.

Within this theoretical framework of the *self* and the Other, Derrida notes, nevertheless, that 'the notion of the monster is rather difficult to deal with, to get hold on, to stabilise' (Derrida 1993/1995: 385). This thesis suggests that the monstrous Other is an *unheimliche* manifestation of the *self* and Other. The characters explored here are read as Derridian and Foucauldian monstrous Others because they delineate social boundaries even as they transgress and undermine these very social conventions. By recognising and rejecting the Others we (re)construct our identities, which are constantly reconfigured. As Michel Foucault's seminal work *Madness and Civilisation* (1964) revealed, modern ("enlightened") western civilisation relegates the mad, as well as the lepers, who were perceived as signs of divine wrath, to the margins of society (Foucault 1964/2001: 4). These were the rejected Others, which allowed for the rest of the community to (re)construct identities in relation to these defined and rejected groups. The identification

of the Jew with these marginalised Others can be traced back to medieval times in Europe. For example, at the front of Les Innocents cemetery in medieval Paris, the sign said: 'Beware of the company of the crazed, the Jew, and the leper' (Shoham-Steiner 2008: 27). The Others demonstrate and delineate social boundaries.

The literary explorations of monsters serve to unpack the complexities of collective identity as perceived and (re)constructed in opposition to the images of the socially construed Other. For example, Wollstonecraft Shelley's monster embodies racial otherness, as well as the proletariat (Flinn 1983: 24-26). Stoker's vampire represents capitalist threat (Moretti 1983: 84), as well as anti-Semitic stereotypes (Halberstam 1998: 86). In turn, the texts in Hebrew appropriate depictions of European Jewish Otherness in order to re-evaluate social norms, both inside and outside the Jewish community. Rosenberg's adaptation of the Golem narrative is one example, as the humanoid creature represents the problems of Ashkenazi Diaspora Jews' identities as the Others in the European lands. Though written in different times and places, the texts all use the characters in order to explore issues of modern identities and sovereignty.

1.3.4 Individual and Collective Identities

Since the following analyses explore certain similarities in the use of Gothic tropes for the (re)construction of individual and collective identities, in addition to refining the particular use of the Gothic as a literary term, a working definition of individual and collective identities is necessary. First, an important distinction has to be drawn between philosophical or social and literary conceptualisation of identities. Literature provides a platform for the exploration of identities and for the creation of new as well as reconstruction of old identities (Cave 1995: 103).

Individual identity is defined in relation to the perception of one's *self* as well as in relation to social affirmation of this identity (Schlenker 1985: 67). In order to discern the *self* one has to extricate a stable identity from a fluidity, fix one *self* at a certain moment in time and space, and then reconstruct it as a continuity. In addition to this initial paradox, in order to ascertain the individual *self* one has to disentangle this identity from society even as this very society then reaffirms the individual as such.

First and foremost, the construction of the *self* requires self-reflexivity (McIntosh 1995: 94). The *self* is an elusive concept that changed and evolved through the years. From the preliminary distinction between the divine, the animal, and the human, which goes back to Platonic and Aristotelian conceptualisation of the soul and mind, via Cartesian separation between the body and the mind, to the Kantian theory that posited an a priori, transcendent ego, the history of philosophy is a continual engagement with the definition and assertion of the concepts of the *self* and individual.

Adam Smith and David Hume argued that the individual should be studied as part of the society, and discussed the implications of 'communication, habit, customs, and sympathy' (Schlenker 1985: 3). The following literary analyses are based upon this line of social psychology, which suggests that the individual and society are inseparable and interdependent units (Schlenker 1985: 16). The individual can be better understood as part of social structures. Patrick Coy and Lynne Woehrle suggest that in order to create a collective identity 'there must be a synthesis of commonalities, and members need to notice how much more they are like the other members of the group than they are like people in a different group' (2000: 3). This definition requires not only individual assertion, but also the ability to recognise similar and dissimilar features in at least two groups.

As Smith explains, '[i]dentity operates on two levels, the individual and the collective' (1995: 130). Smith argues that 'while collective identities are composed of individual members, they are not reducible to an aggregate of individuals sharing a

particular cultural trait' (130). Smith perceives collective identities as possible affiliations, with which humans can identify simultaneously, which results in 'multiple identities' (1995: 130-1). Like Smith who suggests the discussion of 'multiple identities', in a similar attempt to grapple with the illusive notion of 'identity', Stuart Hall suggests that 'instead of thinking of identity as an already accomplished fact, which the new cultural practices then represent, we should think, instead, of identity as a 'production', which is never complete, always in process, and always constituted within, not outside, representation' (1989: 222). These identities, according to Hall, are not only in a constant state of reconfiguration, but are produced from 'the positions of enunciation' (1989: 222), and indeed, it is important one bears in mind the various points of enunciation that led to the production of the British and Jewish, and later Jewish Israeli texts explored in the following analyses.

The analyses of the texts show how the nations constitute and reassert themselves through literature even while the individual (re)constructs his or her identities in relation to these literary constructs. There seems to be a paradox, as the political and cultural arenas are supposedly separate yet are, in fact, analogous and complete each other (Tzamiir 2006: 32). The personal and collective are intertwined and co-dependent (Tzamiir 2006: 37), and 'the national subject that is created through literature – both in the single literary work and through processes of interpretation, evaluation and canonisation – is imprinted with the seal of the representational duality: the national subject has to both represent the nation and be represented in relation to it, that is be its role model' (Tzamiir 2006: 39). This circular process thus reaffirms the national collective identities that are (re)created upon individual (re)creations of identities, and vice versa. Relying upon these understandings of identities, along with their inherent complexities, this thesis focuses on the literary representations of individual and national collective identities of the British and of Jewish Israelis, analysing ethno-linguistic aspects of shared mythical tropes.

1.3.5 The Modern Nation and Nationalism

The following analysis probes the similarities and differences in the texts' exploration of spatial awareness in order to depict and reconsider British and Jewish-Israeli individual and collective identities. In the course of this analysis, notions of the British nation and the Jewish nation are implied, which require some explanation. Indeed, the very definition of a modern nation or nationalism requires attention. In 1882 Ernest Renan suggested that the modern nation state is not based on ethnic, religious, linguistic, cultural, or historical grounds, but upon large-scale solidarity 'a daily plebiscite, just as an individual's existence is a perpetual affirmation of life' (Renan 1882/1990: 19). Though Renan argued that none of the above mentioned elements comprise the modern nation, they are all participants in the (re)creation of national identities.

Benedict Anderson's influential study of nations and nationalism *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* (1983), exposes the fact that 'nation-ness, as well as nationalism, are cultural artefacts of a particular kind' (2002: 4). Anderson defines the nation as 'an imagined political community – and imagined is both inherently limited and sovereign' (6). Within Anderson's definition, both the British and Jewish (and later Jewish-Israeli) nations can be seen to come into existence as a result of complex processes of reassertion of individual and collective national identities. The main difference, of course, is that while the British nation was reaffirmed in relation to a defined territory that was to expand during the imperialist era, the Jewish nation was first reaffirmed in relation to shared ideology and a longing for a land, and only later redefined in relation to a certain territory. It is important to note that since the British were (re)constructing their identities in a Christian context, they too were defining their identities in relation to the Promised Land. This will soon be revealed as a crucial connection between the two national identities, particularly in light of twentieth-century political developments in Palestine-Israel.

There are several approaches to view modern nationalism, from perceiving it as a relic of ancient eras to understanding them as products of modernity (Smith 1995: 3-5). E. J. Hobsbawm examines the development of nations and nationalism in Europe during the nineteenth century, arguing that the modern sense of the word nationalism ‘is no older than the eighteenth century, give or take the odd predecessor’ (1991: 3). Arguing that ‘nations are linked by the chains of memory, myth and symbol to that widespread and enduring type of community, the *ethnie*’ (Smith 1995: 159; emphasis in the original), Smith suggests an approach that combines ancient ethnic and cultural links and processes of modernity to (re)create modern nations. The modern nation is simultaneously the product of modern social changes and of ancient ethnic and cultural ties.

Smith considers both the ‘ancient Jewish commonwealth under the Hasmoneans (Maccabees) and Herodians’ as well as the Anglo-Saxons under the term nation within the perennial viewpoint (1995: 53). Modern Jewish national identity can be perceived as either a unique phenomenon or a part of the European post French revolution national revival (Smith 1995: 1; Bar-Yosef 1996: 70). Modern Jewish national identity can be perceived as an ethno-religious diaspora nationalism,¹² which relies on ancient myths even as it reconfigures these narratives in order to (re)create a new identity (Smith 1995: 5-9). As noted above, David Ohana suggests that Zionism is inherently a modern project: first within the historical context as a movement of the past two hundred years, second as part of modernism with regard to aesthetic productivity, and third as a political movement that modernised the *yishuv* regarding social and economic categories (2012: 1). Following these conceptualisations, the (re)construction of Jewish nation can be fruitfully compared to the processes of reaffirmation of the British national identity.

¹² Diaspora nationalism might appear an oxymoronic phrase, and it is, in fact, somewhat counterintuitive, as it refers to nationalist notions of people who live in exile. The Jews continue to have a sense of a Jewish national identity even while in the various Diasporas (Rabinovitch 2012: ix; Shanes 2014: 1).

As the two communities (re)constructed their modern identity, both the British and Jewish intelligentsias were relying upon ideas that required the assumption of a free individual in order to establish the national subject as such.¹³ These notions were the outcome of the Enlightenment and its Jewish equivalent, the Haskalah, as well as the French Revolution. The national subject was based upon individual sovereignty, which led to the paradoxical reliance of the sense of national belonging upon individual authority (Hever 2007: 34). As noted above, in order for one to assert his or her national collective identity, one must first reaffirm the individual private identity. The paradox is typical of the establishment of the new national identity upon the torn heart principle, which is the rupture between universalism and national particularity (Hever 2007: 34). These paradoxes are at the heart of the texts examined here. Both the Hebrew and English texts utilise spatial metaphors in order to reevaluate the tensions between the individual and collective identities alongside moral queries ignited by these tensions.

¹³ A free subject is one who can operate in the political arena. This requires the establishment of this subject's ability to act upon the basis of freedom. There is a certain circularity here, as the free subjects are characterised by the very fact they can act upon their freedom. In a sense, the core of the problematic of freedom and the free subject is rooted in the problematic of free will. This issue is continually explored in Western philosophical debate as outlined in Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* (1781).

2. Territorial Tautology

2.1 Introduction

In the wake of theories of deconstruction, conceptions of ‘the nation’ and of ‘sovereignty’ have been recognised to be constructions. Both are, moreover, interdependent. Benedict Anderson’s seminal work *Imagined Communities* (1983/2002), exposes the fact that ‘nation-ness, as well as nationalism, are cultural artefacts of a particular kind’ (4). Anderson defines the nation as ‘an imagined political community – and imagined is both inherently limited and sovereign’ (6). The nation is a fiction invented in order to unify large disparate ethnic groups and to differentiate these from other ethnic groups (Smith 1995: 4-5).¹⁴ As noted above, sovereignty establishes a link between the nation and its territory. It is, in the words of Jacques Derrida, ‘a posited law, a thesis or a prosthesis, and not a natural given’ (2009: 77/116); as such, it ‘draws all its power, all its potency, i.e. its all-powerful nature, from this simulacrum-effect, this fiction- or representation-effect that is inherent and congenital to it, as it were co-originary’ (289/387). As a vehicle of the construction of individual and collective identities, literature participates in the construction of nationhood and sovereignty, both of which contribute to the formation of identities. Individual identity is defined in relation to the perception of one’s *self* as well as in relation to social affirmation of this identity (Schlenker 1985: 67). These identities are produced from ‘the positions of enunciation’ (Hall 1989: 222), and indeed, ‘[p]erhaps instead of thinking of identity as an already accomplished fact, which the new cultural practices then represent, we should think, instead, of identity as a “production”, which is never complete, always in process, and always constituted within, not outside, representation’ (Hall 1989: 222). Moreover, ‘the national subject that is created through literature – both in the single literary work and through processes of interpretation,

¹⁴ The nation state (at least of the nineteenth century) presupposes ethnic unity as opposed e.g. to the dynastic state. E. J. Hobsbawm perceives the nation as novelty and in opposition to conservativeness, examining the nation construction zeitgeist in Europe during the nineteenth century (1991: 3-5).

evaluation and canonisation – is imprinted with the seal of the representational duality: the national subject has to both represent the nation and be represented in relation to it, that is be its role model’ (Tzamir 2006: 39). Nations establish their identities through literature even while individuals (re)construct their selves in relation to these literary artefacts. The Gothic, more specifically, as a genre of subversive challenge to societal norms and of the spatial exploration of political as well as social unease and anxieties, occupies a pivotal position in the discourse on nationhood and sovereignty. Indeed, the literary use of Gothic tropes for the exploration and articulation of identities in relation to space and land promises to open new perspectives on the interrelation of sovereignty, nationhood, and identity. In particular, such tropes as the haunting home and the terrifying territory may serve to elaborate the link between space and constructions of identity. The texts discussed in this chapter originate in very different cultural and historical contexts and are written in different languages. They nevertheless demonstrate significant similarities in their extensive and elaborate use of spatial metaphors in relation to the construction of identities, the monstrous Other, and conceptions of sovereignty.

Sovereignty is established through verbal assertion, a declaration. It is, in effect, a speech-act. It is also a performative act that is frequently embedded in some form of ritual or ceremony.¹⁵ The etymology of the term, moreover, reveals that the concept of sovereignty evolved from relating to personal merit and command to encompassing legal and territorial claims.¹⁶ Rather than the mere exertion of power, it is therefore, as observed

¹⁵ In the Bible one finds references to the anointment of Saul by Samuel accompanied by a declaration of him as ‘nagid’ which translates as either captain or leader (Samuel I 10:1). This act comes as a response to the people’s cries that they wish for a king that will judge them like all the nations (Samuel I 8:5). The king is believed to be chosen by God due to personal virtues, as Saul is said to be ‘a mighty man of power [...] a choice young man, and a goodly, and there was not among the children of Israel a goodlier person than he’ (Samuel I 9:1-3) and is therefore sent to Samuel by God to become the king.

¹⁶ The etymological origins of the concept sovereignty relate to ‘[s]upremacy or pre-eminence in respect of excellence or efficacy’ (OED 1989). The initial meaning relates to qualities of personal merit and command, and only later does the term receive its connections to law and land as it comes to mean supremacy in respect of ‘power, domination, or rank; supreme dominion, authority, or rule’ or with regards to the ‘position, rank, or power of a supreme ruler or monarch; royal authority or dominion’ (OED 1989). The shift towards legal meanings that pertain to ‘[t]he supreme controlling power in communities not under monarchical government; absolute and independent authority’ (OED 1989) were based upon the initial moral and personal meanings, and still carried the original sense of virtue. Lastly the term came to signify ‘a

by Brian H. Bix, in fact a “social contract” (2004: 204) and as such it is situated within a moral and ethical system. Reflecting global modern political developments, in particular the creation of the nation state, sovereignty connotes since the late eighteenth century the legally defined and specified territorial rule over land and population, which is shared by the members of a nation as a political entity.

Of particular interest to my literary analysis is the significance of the word or, as Derrida has it, of the “fiction” in relation to the establishment and the continuous performative assertion of sovereignty. Not only does the reiterated speech-act which articulates the claim to sovereignty have its effect on the relation to the land because its utterance is at the same time a claim also to a specific territory; sovereignty, if real or imaginary, moreover generates narratives which envisage, explain or justify the connection it establishes between the nation and the land. In other words, the land itself, or perceptions and constructions of it, “fictions” of the land as it were, impact on the conception or “fiction” of sovereignty. Accordingly, the literary texts examined in this chapter are read here as narratives which engage with constructions of sovereignty and, by extrapolation, with constructions of identities in relation to ‘the land’. Moreover, their frequently mythopoetic character as well as their social, cultural, and political function suggest that they should be read *as* myths created with, or at the very least fulfilling, the purpose of regulating the interaction between constructions of sovereignty, (national) identity, and spatial constructions of territory.

Novels such as Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley’s *Frankenstein* and Bram Stoker’s *Dracula* or Charlotte Brontë’s *Jane Eyre* and Daphne du Maurier’s *Rebecca*, elaborate

territory under the rule of a sovereign or existing as an independent state’ (OED 1989), which is the most common use nowadays, but the concept still harbours all the previous meanings. Following these origins of the concept reveals how ‘sovereignty’ denotes moral and ethical issues that were attributed to persons who were land-owners. The sovereign had the right to own the land due to personal virtue. The initial ideas of supremacy attributed to sovereignty are then transferred to the monarch, and later impact the masses that will believe in the right to own the land, as well as the moral right to conquer and enlighten other nations. In Hebrew, the word for sovereignty רִיבוּנוּת *ribonut* derives from the same root as king or sovereign, and carries similar connotations as the word in English.

through their settings ‘myths’ of the monstrous Other and its dislocation. Without exception, if perhaps to different degrees, all of these narratives have entered the mainstream of English and European literature as well as public awareness and continue to have a significant impact on cultural production and self-reflexion both in the more narrowly defined context of British literature as well as on a global scale. The same phenomenon may be observed in the Modern Hebrew texts analysed in this chapter, if with an inverted perspective on the monstrous Other. Much less known beyond the immediate context of their production, these texts nevertheless had a strong influence on the development of a Jewish ‘national’ literature and the emergence of Israeli literature since 1948. Hayyim Nahman Bialik’s epic poem ‘Be’ir Ha’harega’ (‘In the City of Slaughter’), written in Ukraine in 1903, is particularly relevant in this context, as is Yudel Rosenberg’s *Nifla’ot haMaharal (The Golem and the Wondrous Deeds of the Maharal of Prague)* published in 1909 and written, like Y. D. Berkowitz’s short story ‘Mishael’ (1910), in Poland. Yet the phenomenon may be observed not only in these literary products of the Jewish diaspora but also in texts, which originated in Palestine or, after the establishment of the Israeli nation state in 1948, in Israel. These include Shmuel Yosef Agnon’s short stories ‘Ha’adonit veHarochel’ (The Lady and the Peddler), ‘Tehila’, ‘Avi Hashor’ (‘The Ox’s Father’), and ‘Ad Hennah’ (‘Thus Far’) as well as S. Yizhar’s highly contentious novella *Khirbet Khizeh*. In relation to these texts, the diasporic condition and its (theoretical) abolition with the creation of the State of Israel add a significant dimension to this discussion, because they initiated a change in perspective on Jewish and in particular Zionist notions of nationhood and emerging Jewish-Israeli identities. These emerging identities reflect and engage with the concept of the monstrous Other, as the Other within the *self*. The Other within the *self* being the “old Jew”, the perception of the diasporic Jew as decrepit, both physical and spiritually, which the Zionist enterprise tried to reject.¹⁷ The

¹⁷ Please see the Myth part for further exploration of the “old Jew” and “new Jew”.

historical development from diaspora nationalism to nationalism (though a new form of diaspora nationalism endures with the diaspora) is, moreover, as suggested in the introduction, an inversion of the historical development of the decline of the British Empire and decolonisation. The impact of both historical shifts is reflected in the corpus of texts analysed in this chapter. These in turn, as I would argue, articulate, and participate in the shaping of, a mind-set which defines the *self* (individual and collective) and its spatial awareness.

Indeed, all of the texts examined in this part reconsider the problematic of spatial awareness and sovereignty as the rule over land by dislocating and relocating their characters, and in the process they constantly reevaluate their relationship with the land. The exploration of the various spatial tropes assigned to the fictional characters illuminates a number of unresolved issues regarding Otherness in society, specifically in relation to sovereignty. Though the various characters dwell in different places, they share a certain restlessness imposed upon them because of their Otherness. The comparative analysis reveals that the monstrous Others – which, in the Foucauldian sense,¹⁸ may be the female, the orphan, and the Jew – all share the role of signifier of social conventions with regard to agency and sovereignty. Moreover, their physical location reflects their social relegation inasmuch as it denotes also a space of marginalisation. A very potent image of homelessness frequently employed in negotiations of national identity in British Gothic literature is that of the wandering Jew (Davison 2004: 2-3). Indeed, wandering characters in British Gothic fiction, such as the rejected monster in *Frankenstein* and the homeless orphan in *Jane Eyre* and *Rebecca*, are arguably in many ways avatars of this haunting

¹⁸ As noted in the Introduction, modern (“enlightened”) western civilisation relegates the mad, as well as the lepers, who were perceived as signs of divine wrath, to the margins of society (Foucault 1964/2001: 4). The identification of the Jew with these marginalised Others can be traced back to medieval times in Europe (Shoham-Steiner 27). Later analyses perceived how other marginalised minorities occupy similar locations – both culturally and spatially – in art and in politics. From Gilbert and Gubar (1979) who compare the orphan Jane Eyre to the mad Bertha Mason, to Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak critics Foucault and Deleuze’s critique of the sovereign subject and the problematic of representation of the subaltern (1988: 69-70). The Foucauldian perception of the role of the mad as spectacle (1964/2001: 65-6) is expanded to include other marginalised groups. These Others show and delineate social norms.

figure. As will become clear in the Myth section, the wanderings of Frankenstein's creature, Jane, and du Maurier's unnamed narrator share a certain restlessness with the Golem, Berkowitz's Mishael, and Agnon's characters, as well as Yizhar's soldiers. The inherent spatial anxiety these characters have in common reflects the similarities in their position as social outcasts, and role delineators of social boundaries.

Four basic spatial tropes appear to encompass the different parameters which play into the complexity of personal spatial awareness and collective identities in relation to the land as it emerges in literary (re)constructions of identity. The four chapters of this section are conceptualised accordingly. Notions of authenticity and autochthonous origins are explored in the first chapter. The second chapter enquires into (re)constructions of identities in open, outdoor spaces. In contrast to this, the third chapter investigates the ways in which indoor spaces shape and reflect identities. The fourth chapter, finally, examines issues of exile. The comparative analysis of the literary representation of these issues reveals a number of thematic similarities as well as parallel strategies of the use of the setting in order to portray and reflect on the connection between spatial awareness, the land, and (national) identities.

2.2 (Non)Autochthonous Origins

One of the most striking connections between nineteenth- to mid-twentieth century English and Hebrew literature is the preoccupation with questions of identity, and in particular with the problematic of origins in relation to land. As the British were engaged with sustaining and later relinquishing the imperial enterprise, they needed to reconsider the relationship to the land. In a similar manner, though from the opposite direction, the Jews too needed to re-evaluate their connection to the land as they embarked on the colonisation, or mass settlement,¹⁹ of Palestine in the latter half of the nineteenth century.²⁰ The literature of the two cultures reflect, and contribute to, the shaping of these antithetical processes in relation to the land.

¹⁹ A clarification of the use of the terms colonisation and settlement is required. The two concepts connote the action of people moving from one place to another in order to utilise additional resources. The difference is that colonisation is done under the presumption of the authority of a sovereign nation-state, and settlement is not necessarily conducted within such national context. Yet the Jews had a national identity even while in the Diaspora, and those who came to Palestine during the massive waves of emigration were encouraged by the Zionist leaders to emigrate with the full intention to appropriate the land in order to establish a sovereign nation state. Throughout the following analysis I will refer to Zionist colonisation and settlement in the context of the Zionist movement's conceptualisations of its credo. Specifically, this paper refers to Zionism as a "settler colonial" movement within the distinction between "colonial" and "settler colonial" approaches to the situation in Palestine-Israel (Veracini 2013: 27).

²⁰ Though there was a continuity of Jewish presence in Palestine, primarily in Jerusalem and Zfat, the modern settlement, or *yishuv*, commenced in 1881. The first wave of Jewish immigration (1881-1904) was the result of the Zionist enterprise, and included Jews from various places. Though many of the immigrants had social and political reasons to immigrate, 'the return to Zion played an important role in immigration to Palestine, [and] in the creation of settler colonies' (Ben-Porat 1991: 235). Once the new immigrants arrived, there were tensions between the "old *yishuv*" and "new *yishuv*", which reflected the Zionist wish to disassociate the desired image of the "new Jew" from the rejected figure of the "old Jew" (Kaniel, 1977: 3-4). While the "old *yishuv*" relied upon halukka funds (distribution of money from the Diaspora) one of the main benefactors of the "new *yishuv*" was Baron Edmond James de Rothschild. Though Rothschild's donations and support of the settlements received both positive and negative reactions due to the *yishuv*'s wish to 'conquer the work' (Giladi 1976: 60), until 1900, when he relinquished his endeavours to the JCA (Jewish Colonisation Association), Rothschild's massive contribution is unquestionable (Giladi 1976: 61). As Dan Giladi notes, in order to appreciate Rothschild's contribution one has to bear in mind the conditions in the land at the time, as well as that 'from the first wave of immigration from eastern Europe in 1882, the Kushta [Istanbul] government issued a decree that prohibited Jewish immigration to the land of Israel, as well as other decrees that prohibited the sale of land and property to Jews' (1976: 60). In comparison, Rothschild donated twenty times more than Hibat Zion and the BILU organisation (BILU is an acronym based on a verse from Isaiah 2:5 'Oh house of Jacob, come ye, and let us walk in the light of the Lord' (בית יעקב לכו ונלכה) (Giladi 1976: 61). While Rothschild's contribution was primarily financial, the BILU organisation focused on the social aspects of the Zionist enterprise, teaching Hebrew and promoting communal life and agricultural work (Giladi 1976: 61). Following the 1881 pogroms in Russia and Ukraine, the BILU organisation was founded, and was instrumental to the establishment of the *yishuv*, as well as responsible for much of the development of its socialist character.

The various characters' relationship with the land commences with the seemingly simple question of origins, of whether or not they are from this land. The quest for a sense of belonging – the feeling that you belong to the land and vice versa – requires first the assertion or refutation of the autochthonous connection to the land. The term *autochthonous*, like the largely synonymous *indigenous*, is problematic in the context of the study of nationalism as well as in political discourse.²¹ Even though both terms have been exhausted in sociological and legal discourses, and have elicited a large body of academic debate, they cannot be avoided in the following discussion. I have chosen the term autochthonous, because the following discussion focuses primarily on the connection between identities and the land, the soil itself. 'Autochthony posits a community member's birth from the very soil he inhabits, creating a privileged connection between an individual, his community, and the land' (Rader 2009: 2). The term, which is linked to the Greek mythology of a nation born from the land,²² draws attention precisely to the importance of the land itself in the (re)creation of individual and collective identities.²³

The connection to the land, both figuratively and literally, is, as I would argue, at the core of the texts I examine in this thesis. The literary characters reflect the problematic question of autochthonous origins, as well as the crucial impact of displacement upon the

²¹ The different definitions of authenticity in relation to colonialism have been matter for fierce debate (Anaya 2004: 4).

²² The myth is an ancient one: 'According to one of its myths, Athens imagined the genesis of its forebears as an unconsummated relationship (misconsummated, we might say) between Hephaestus and Athena. Born of the very soil that received Hephaestus's seed, Erechtheus became the primordial father of the Athenians' (Rader, 'And Whatever It Is, It Is You,' 4). The Greek myth of autochthonous roots 'entailed being born from the very earth or inhabiting it from time immemorial' (Rader, 'And Whatever It Is, It Is You,' 1). This myth is paradigmatic, and 'has provided the model for many nations up to the current day seeking to define their identities. [...] In a way this very question informs the sometimes chilling struggles of peoples the world over that have yet to cease even today—from Ingushetia and Ossetia in the Caucasus to Israel and Palestine in the Middle East' (Rader, 'And Whatever It Is, It Is You,' 1). The following use of the term autochthonous emphasises the connection to the land in mythical terms, even while acknowledging its problematic employment.

²³ Individual and collective identities are intricately intertwined. For the purposes of this discussion, individual identity is defined in relation to the perception of one's self as well as in relation to social affirmation of this identity (Schlenker 1985: 67). As Anthony Smith explains, '[i]dentity operates on two levels, the individual and the collective' (Smith 1995: 130). Like Smith who suggests the discussion of multiple identities, in a similar attempt to grapple with the illusive notion of identity, Stuart Hall suggests thinking of identities 'as a 'production,' which is never complete, always in process, and always constituted within, not outside, representation' (Hall 1989: 222).

construction of identities. These aspects of identity are particularly important for British and Jewish, as well as Jewish-Israeli identities. As Jewish-Israeli identity is (re)constructed it becomes evident that its fragmentary essence is, in fact, the crux of its identity as a multiplicity that resists placement. The discourse of Jewish-Israeli identity is a reflection of and on the struggle for a coherent identity, which is ‘intensified by existential as well as political debates over territorialism and occupation’ (Omer-Sherman 2006: x). As Barbara Mann explains, in order to depict the Jews as at home in Palestine-Israel, ‘the fundamental “unhomeliness” of European Jews in Palestine had to be overcome, or at least downplayed. What was repressed by Zionism’s negation of exile surfaced within modern Hebrew culture as *das Unheimliche*, “the uncanny”’ (Mann 2006: 30). Being, in fact, alien in their new homeland, the Ashkenazi Diaspora Jews in the early settlements in Palestine-Israel were, indeed, uncanny. Similarly, the British imperial experience yielded an essential uncanny essence. Joanna Collins explores representations of the uncanny in colonial writers, suggesting that the ‘imperial uncanny’ is the unresolved anxiety directed at the combination of the character of the Other and the location (Collins 2005: 263). Both the British and Jews were an uncanny presence on foreign land.

The sense of a lack of connection to the (home)land is one of the main themes explored in the texts examined here. While the Jews were trying to establish a connection to their homeland, the British were struggling with their alienation from the lands they had conquered or occupied as part of the imperialist enterprise. The result is that the texts in Hebrew and English alike reveal that the land, the homeland, and the home do not offer a sense of belonging.²⁴

One of the prominent nineteenth-century texts to explore themes of homelessness is Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley’s *Frankenstein; Or, The Modern Prometheus*. Indeed, the narrative of the monster composed of exhumed body parts introduces the quintessential

²⁴ See the Introduction for the subtle though important differentiation for this analyses between “space”, “place”, and “land”.

modern monstrous Other as a rejected creature forever wandering the earth in the futile search of kinship and a home. The novel has elicited a plethora of interpretations, and it explores a number of problems and anxieties originating in the imperial enterprise (Baldick 1987: 1; Bugg 2005: 656), the ensuing fears of the colonised Other, and abolitionist theories (Malchow 1996: 6-14). Linking the novel to social reconfiguration, Adriana Craciun moreover suggests that *Frankenstein* responded also to the 'post-Napoleonic climate of nationalistic hubris' (2011: 437). These various concerns all stem from the need for a solid grasp of the connection to the land.

The significance of the connection to the land in *Frankenstein* is evident first and foremost by the fact that the narrative is embedded within a quest for the North Pole. Also, both Walton and Frankenstein leave home and live in exile. Dislocation is a major theme in the novel. Yet of all the characters in *Frankenstein*, the creature is most dislocated. Throughout the novel the creature searches for a home and a sense of belonging. Its physical origins are exhumed body parts from a cemetery at Ingolstadt (*F*: 52). Thus the creature is essentially dislocated. From a British perspective, the creature is doubly foreign and Other because the provenance of its individual components is (presumably) not British. In this respect Frankenstein's creation is alien to Britons even before it becomes a criminal. The creature lacks a fundamental connection to the British (home)land.

Like Frankenstein's creature, Count Dracula is not British and is, indeed, un-British, as he wishes to devour the British. Yet, while the creature in *Frankenstein* lacks a valid and verified connection to British soil, the Count is intricately connected to a foreign land. Dracula is an aristocratic sovereign to his own land, a land that is exoticised from the British perspective. Moreover, the Count's very un-dead life depends on his ancestral land, and in order to rejuvenate after gorging on blood the Count must be interred in it for his regeneration. The vampire is thus doubly alien, due to its lack of connection to the British territory as well as its crucial reliance upon non-British soil.

Dracula tells the story of an Eastern European aristocratic vampire that plots to colonise and, quite literally, to devour the population of England. The novel was published in 1897, at a time when the British Empire was at its peak, and before its fall. Stoker was an Irishman who lived in London at a time when the Irish nation began its own national awakening and rejuvenation, and when socio-economic and political circumstances were about to transform both nations. Ireland was regarded as a ‘metropolitan colony’ of the British Empire, and ‘the Irish people found themselves at once agent and object, participant-victims, of Britain’s far-flung imperial mission’ (Valente 2000: 632). Stoker, as Joseph Valente suggests, utilised the Gothic in order to represent ‘a structurally determined ambivalence, even scepticism, towards the racial distinctions, social hierarchies, and political assumptions that inform the Anglo-Protestant literary heritage’ (2000: 634). Thus, Valente argues, *Dracula* is a novel of social criticism that explores the compliance of the Irish with the British imperial enterprise.

A particular connection between the homelands of Bram Stoker and Count Dracula has been observed by John Akeroyd, who notes that ‘Ireland and Romania lie at opposite corners of Europe. An obvious link is that both countries have well developed rural cultures and have only relatively recently escaped the embrace of adjacent domineering empires’ (2009: 22). Though the two places are culturally very different, they share a number of socio-political similarities and the choice of Romania for the location of the Count’s origins is hardly arbitrary. Moreover, as noted by Louis Warren, *Dracula* investigates questions of racial difference in that ‘the frontiers of racial encounter were invested with the possibility of degeneration and the necessity of race war’ (2002: 1127). This analysis exposes the importance of land to the exploration of race and nationality in the novel. The problems of race and nationality are intertwined, and with the rise of the nation-state racial differences manifest themselves in national issues.

On the literal level, Count Dracula comes from Transylvania to England searching for a new home – in fact, the vampire relocates in order to feed upon the British population – on a metaphorical level this has been read as a representation of fears of an Eastern invasion (Arata 1990: 627). The shift from the fear of the lower classes (the Other within) to the panic generated by the perceived menace of an Eastern invasion (the Other from outside) occurs as British society reconfigures itself internally and in the process requires a scapegoat for the unsettling experience of uncertainty and instability. As Fred Botting explains, it is a ‘need for a threat, for some great opposition to affirm one’s own position, establish an order that, tacitly at least, acknowledges its own internal instability’ (1991: 140). Botting further suggests that ‘the maintenance of a single, hierarchical binary opposition, the dependence on a single definite difference, requires constant renewal of a sense of unity that overcomes internal contradictions’ (140). The projected fear creates a monster that requires mastery and domination and thus perpetuates the supremacy of the ruling classes. The new social mobility within the kingdom led to the displacement of fears upon the foreigner, the ethnic Other.

In England, this displacement became a double-edged sword as the Other recognised as the Eastern Other was found within the borders of the country in the form of the Jew, who incorporated both social and ethnic Otherness.²⁵ The ‘many headed monster’ to which Botting refers (1991: 140) was easily and productively aligned with the Jew as the Janus-faced Other, the one who is and is not part of the British social fabric, and the one who embodies the Eastern threat from within and from without simultaneously.

The question at the heart of the novel is the importance of the connection to the land. The comfortable binary of foreign/familiar is undermined when the Count is relocated to England along with his boxes of ancestral land, while the international team

²⁵ The connection between the vampire and the figure of the anti-Semite Jew has been acknowledged by scholars such as Howard LeRoy Malchow, Judith Halberstam, Carol Margaret Davison, and Matthew Biberman. This will be further addressed in the part dedicated to myth.

of Western men in turn ventures to the East. The Other enters the homeland while the *self* is dislocated into the foreigner's land. The Count acknowledges the mixture of blood in his veins and links it to his sovereignty over the land. He says: '[w]e Szekelys have a right to be proud, for in our veins flows the blood of many brave races who fought as the lion fights, for lordship' (*D*: 41). It may be uncertain whether the Count was born of woman, but his existence is surely dependent on land. In a sense, he is continually reborn of the land each time he rejuvenates. Like Frankenstein's creature, the vampire is rejected because of his racial Otherness, which, in his case, is moreover specifically Eastern. The narrative expresses the fears of the imperial enterprise, as the far-flung arms of British imperialism might bring back some unwanted entities onto British land. As the novel progresses, we learn that the source of the Count's powers (supposedly) is the devil, and is associated with lineage and land. Dracula aligns his ancestry with the numerous warring peoples, rejecting his connection to the devil, asking: 'What devil or what witch was ever so great as Attila, whose blood is in these veins?' (*D*: 41). Later, however, Van Helsing draws the connection between the vampire and the devil. For example, after the team of men run the stake through Lucy's heart and decapitate her, Van Helsing says to Arthur that he may now kiss her, '[f]or she is not a grinning devil now, not any more a foul Thing for all eternity. No longer she is the devil's UnDead' (*D*: 260). The novel thus aligns evil and the attachment to land. An obsession with sovereignty is portrayed as erroneous and decadent. The need to be sovereign wherever you go is questioned, and metaphorically the imperialistic enterprise is doubly critiqued: once by the Eastern invasion and then again by the character of the Count. As noted above, Joseph Valente argues that *Dracula* is a critique of imperialism (2000: 632-4). British imperialism was based on racism, and Stoker's novel questions the premises upon which the enterprise was based.

Likewise, Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre* explores fears of the harmful effects of British imperialism. Spivak consequently reads the novel primarily as a critique of

imperialism (1985: 249-251). The obvious racial and national Other in the novel is Bertha Mason, Rochester's first wife, who is imprisoned in the attic. Bertha is not only mad, but also not English, and has neither rights nor any claim to connections to the land. She is the embodiment of the repressed fears of reverse colonisation. Bertha bites Rochester like a vampire (*JE*: 250), in a sense attempting to infect him with her Otherness. While Bertha has no claims to British origins, Jane Eyre is an English woman;²⁶ however, since Jane has been left destitute, she 'no longer has the birth rights' (*JE*: 21). Thus the novel seems to suggest that her status as a poor orphan deprives her of her entitlement to the land. It is as if the poor are not esteemed, and therefore are in some manner second rate citizens. The bildungsroman follows Jane Eyre as she (re)constructs her identity, from poor rejected orphan to land-bound married woman. The novel also outlines her constant search for a home, from Gateshead, via Lowood, through Thornfield, and Moor House, then Morton, and eventually Ferndean. Like Frankenstein and Dracula, Jane is a rejected Other searching for a home. The connection between Frankenstein's creature, the vampire, and the female subject comes also from the observation that anti-feminism and anti-Semitism are related ideologies. As Matthew Biberman explains, 'the conflation of femininity and Judaism is better understood as a distinct historical and psychological phenomenon, one that emerges in European culture during the Renaissance and then gradually acquired only the status of mythic truth' (2004: 1). The rejected Other in these literatures is either a manifestation of fears of racial otherness, or patriarchal doctrine.

Published nearly a hundred years after *Jane Eyre*, in 1938, du Maurier's *Rebecca* is in many ways 'a rewrite of *Jane Eyre* amidst a nostalgia for the waning of the British Empire and the decline of its aristocracy' (Light 1984: 7). However, specific differences suggest the shift of focus from a representation of the British imperial enterprise and its harmful effects to a consideration of the aftermath of the destructive repercussions of the

²⁶ Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar draw parallels between Jane and Bertha, suggesting the latter is the foil of the former (1979: 361-362).

anticipated fall of the Empire (Light 1984: 7). Like Jane Eyre, the unnamed narrator is an orphan, and the novel follows her restless wanderings, from Monte Carlo, via Manderley, the South Eastern English estate, to a self-imposed exile on an unnamed sun-ridden island; like Jane Eyre, *Rebecca*'s orphaned narrator is never at home. Her persistent insistence on obtaining Manderley and becoming its mistress is the result of her subconscious awareness of the crucial deficiency in her identity as the result of the lack of authenticated origins and a connection to land.

Without exception, the characters in the English novels discussed so far are restless Others. They are defined and determined by their search for a connection with the land and a home. The characters in the Hebrew texts yet to be examined similarly experience restlessness, as the narratives explore the question of autochthony, and various kinds of links to the land. In a sense, the characters in the Hebrew as well as the English texts are all manifestations of the figure of the Wandering Jew, the ancient rejected Other. As an inherently displaced entity, this figure was particularly productive for the literary exploration of the connection to the land, and of the importance of this connection for the (re)construction of personal and communal identities.²⁷

An example of the exploration of the connection to the land of the Ashkenazi Jewish diaspora is found in Yudl Rosenberg's adaptation of the legend of the Golem in *The Golem and the Wondrous Deeds of the Maharal of Prague*. The narrative relates the creation of the clay Golem for the protection of Jews from the blood libel.²⁸ The similarities between the *Golem* and *Frankenstein* warrant further consideration, as do the differences:

²⁷ The figure of the Wandering Jew will be further explored in the part dedicated to Myth, in the chapter 'The Wandering Jew and its Avatars'.

²⁸ Ironically, Rosenberg locates the narrative at a time and place where blood libels were actually not prevalent. Rosenberg attributes the creation of the Golem to the Maharal of Prague. The Maharal was the head rabbi of the Jews in Prague during the latter half of the sixteenth-century. (The Maharal is an acronym for 'my rabbi the rabbi Löw,' also known as the Rabbi Judah Löw Bezalel). He was a well-respected scholar within both the Jewish and non-Jewish communities, a renaissance man who studied natural philosophy alongside astrology and religious studies, and was even received by Emperor Rudolf II (Hillel J. Kieval, 'Pursuing the Golem of Prague: Jewish Culture and the Invention of a Tradition' *Modern Judaism* 17.1 (1997): 1-20, 4). Under the guidance and leadership of the Maharal, Jews and non-Jews lived peacefully together in Prague at a time when, under the rule of Rudolf II, the city was a cultural centre.

while in both narratives a scholar creates a humanoid creature, one is created from exhumed body parts, and the other of soil. Since the Golem is made of the soil of Prague, it is autochthonous to a land foreign to the Jews and thus is paradoxically autochthonous even while alien. The Golem is an embodiment of the dual existence of the Jews in exile; though feeling a profound connection to the land of their ancestral origins, the Jews in the Ashkenazi diaspora are by that time a part of the local scenery, and are in a sense hybrid creatures, part alien, part local.²⁹

The Golem is made from earth (the land) by a Jew, who has no autochthonous connection to this land, and the life it gains through the word, in some ways, reflects the notion of the portable homeland as it was observed by Heinrich Heine in his *Confessions* (1854).³⁰ It is like the speech act of a declaration of sovereignty, as the Maharal brings the Golem to life by uttering words from the scriptures. A Jewish myth suggests that ‘when the people of Israel went into exile, the Shekinah accompanied them as token that they were not entirely abandoned by God’ (Maier 1975: 21). The Shekinah is the feminine aspect of god, manifested in the Torah. Emanuel Maier suggests that ‘[t]he ethological concept of ‘movable territory’ may be applicable to Jewish mythological symbolism collected about the Torah, such as movable territory ‘developed as a symbolic substitute for the loss of territory’ (Maier 1975: 18). In Rosenberg’s narrative, the Maharal utilises the power of the Torah in order to obtain command over the land of Prague. The Golem is created through the employment of a speech-act based upon the word of the Torah, which is the ‘portable homeland’ that symbolises the Jews’ lack of territorial connection. The land from which the Golem was made is annexed – both figuratively and physically – to

²⁹ In postcolonial discourse the term ‘hybridity’ refers to the effects of synthesis upon the identities and cultures of the colonised (Kristeva 1982: 132; Bhabha 1990: 4). Moreover, hybridity changes the various components, making it virtually impossible to disentangle them from one another (Young 1995: 2–3, 17–19; Smith 1999: 26). Though they are dislocated, the term may be productively applied to the Jews in the Ashkenazi Diaspora, and even more so to the emerging Jewish-Israeli identities.

³⁰ Heine refers to the Jews as the long-enduring nation ‘who had preserved the Bible from the great conflagration of the sacred temple, and all through the middle ages carried it about with them like a portable fatherland, kept their treasure carefully concealed in their ghettos’ (*The Prose Writings of Heinrich Heine*: Project Gutenberg).

the Jews' territory as the Golem becomes part of the Jewish household and community. The land is manipulated through the word of the 'portable homeland'. Thus the creation of the Golem is an inversion and subversion of the Jews' lack of homeland by the employment of the portable homeland. This manoeuvre empowers the Jews even while they are in their precarious exilic condition.

The Golem is not considered "properly" Jewish, as it is not born naturally from a Jewish woman, and it is not even made from soil under Jewish sovereignty. However, it is nonetheless adopted as a member of the Jewish community. The creature's unique status renders it neither Jewish nor Gentile, and an elaborate set of rules and regulations is created especially for the Golem. At the same time, the Golem's non-Jewish yet also non-Gentile existence allows it to move between the Jewish and non-Jewish worlds, serving as a barrier between the two domains. The Golem literally embodies the Jewish exilic condition of dislocation. Even while they are part of the local landscape, the Jews are not autochthonous to the region – they do not belong to the land, which in turn does not belong to them. Rosenberg's version of the Golem narrative was published in Poland in 1909. As a product of the Ashkenazi Diaspora, the *Golem* examines the Jews' relationship to the land in exile and the relationship to the Jewish and non-Jewish territories in relation to a modern Jewish Ashkenazi Diaspora identity.³¹

Another text written in Poland in the following year 1910, Berkowitz's 'Mishael' is a portrayal of Jewish exilic life that explores the problematic of the Jewish and non-Jewish domains in the Ashkenazi Diaspora. Like Rosenberg, Berkowitz examines the stability and sustainability of social and spatial boundaries. In the *Golem*, a manoeuvre of spatial and linguistic appropriation leads to a tentative Jewish sovereignty in the heart of

³¹ Though Rosenberg, a Hasidic rabbi and Kabbalist, might not have been a Zionist, and had no known connections to Zionism, because it emphasizes the problems of the exilic condition in the Ashkenazi Diaspora and reiterates the legacy of the blood libel, the *Golem* may be considered to offer a supportive argument for the Zionist enterprise.

the Ashkenazi Diaspora. In 'Mishael' it is a rejected Jewish boy who has a strong connection to the land outside of the Jewish social jurisdiction.

The characters in this short story are all non-autochthonous. They are without exception 'displaced' Jews. Yet even in relation to this displaced community, which has no claims to the land, Mishael is an outcast. Mishael is rejected by his father, who is ashamed of his deformed and unscholarly son, and like Frankenstein who rejects his creation, and the villagers who chase Frankenstein's creature (*F*: 101), Mishael's father chases his son away with a rake (*M*: 5). It is precisely because Mishael has a connection to the land that he is rejected. The Jews in the Ashkenazi Diaspora had an ambivalent connection to their foster land because they yearned for the Holy Land, which they perceived as their origin and homeland.³² Since Mishael is unable to study, he does not share the collective notion of the Torah as the portable homeland. Instead, Mishael develops a connection to the foster land and to the soil. Like Brontë's protagonist, who wanders in the moors, wading 'knee-deep in its dark growth' (*JE*: 275), Mishael is described as coming out of the woods covered in mud (*M*: 5). The only place to which Mishael feels a connection, and feels at home, is the forest, the place where the people of the town, in turn, dare not enter. Like the Golem, Mishael is thus an embodiment of the complications of the Jews' (lack of) connection to the land in the Ashkenazi Diaspora.

Berkowitz was not the only Jewish writer of his time to engage with these questions of identities in relation to land. In fact, his work was a part of a growing body of literature that explored these issues. One of the best-known writers to address the question of modern Jewish identities was Nobel laureate Y. S. Agnon. Like the less known Berkowitz, Agnon wrote extensively about the Jewish Ashkenazi Diaspora (Shaked 1989: 15, 18-19, and

³² Hebrew literature can be categorised according to its articulation of the yearning for the land (Schwartz 2007: 19). This is partially due to the fact that Modern Hebrew literature evolved to some extent in the context of the Zionist project or its forerunners, and therefore demonstrates ideological coherence with regard to the relation of the land and the Jewish people which is ultimately derived from the Biblical notion of the Promised Land.

245). He created a number of fictional characters that offer a variety of perspectives on questions such as the connection to the host land and the Holy Land. In particular the problems of the dislocated Ashkenazi Diaspora Jewish community's connection to the land have been addressed in several of his works. In many of Agnon's texts land carries meaning both for the individual and for national identities.

In what follows, I will examine three narratives that represent three main issues or conditions in relation to the (re)creation of modern Jewish-Israeli identities: in 'Ad Hennah',³³ Agnon addresses the questions of the exilic condition as it is experienced by the Ashkenazi Diaspora; in 'Tehila', Agnon explores the ambiguous feelings of Jewish immigrants from the Ashkenazi Diaspora once they have settled in Palestine-Israel; and in 'Avi Hashor' ('The Ox's Father'), Agnon explores the moral legitimacy of the *yishuv* in Palestine-Israel.³⁴

The narrator in 'Ad Hennah' is an exilic, displaced figure. Born in the Ashkenazi Diaspora, he emigrated to Palestine-Israel only to return to Germany and then go back to Palestine-Israel. Like Frankenstein's creature, the narrator is searching for a home. Like Jane Eyre and her successor the narrator of *Rebecca*, he wanders between numerous locations. He travels from Palestine to Germany; from Berlin via Leipzig back to Berlin, where he continually searches for accommodation; he is in a perpetual search for a home. He says he finds being in Berlin hard, but that travelling to another town is even more difficult (*AH*: 7). The crux of the narrator's dilemma is his constant displacement.

Though it was written in Israel, 'Ad Hennah' explores the myth of the (Ashkenazi

³³ Though Hillel Halkin's translation of 'Ad Hennah' is 'To This Day,' the title might more accurately be rendered as 'Thus Far'. The difference is important, because in Hebrew the words convey both a chronological and a spatial meaning which is lost in Halkin's translation. The implication of the title is then that this marks the end of the Jews' wandering, in space as well as in time. This was the translation Esther Fuchs chose for her analysis of the text in 1983.

³⁴ It would seem that the reverse chronology of these texts as I have outlined them here might reflect Agnon's concerns. The burning issue of the legitimatisation of the *yishuv* at the height of the struggle for national independence during the Mandate period gave birth, with 'Avi Hashor,' to a short story that engages with precisely this issue. Yet only after the establishment of the Israeli nation-state did the writer engage further with issues of the Diaspora and Israeli identity in 'Tehila' and 'Ad Hennah'.

Diaspora) Wandering Jew. The narrator is searching for a home in Germany and in a nostalgic way in Palestine-Israel, which he left because of the Great War.³⁵ Even though it ends with *Aliya*,³⁶ the immigration to Palestine-Israel, 'Ad Henna' is what Ezrahi refers to as diversionary stories, imbedded in a 'series of detours and ostensibly authorised by hermeneutic procedures rather than by the dynamic of an inner-directed, autonomous narrative, ultimately describe[ing] a subversive circularity in their return to an exilic point of departure' (Ezrahi 2000: 28). Like in the texts in English, the reader follows the narrator in his spatial and psychological wanderings. The narrator is searching for both a real home and a conceptual one, as the narrative parallels the personal and communal search for a home. The narrator says that 'because he could not find a room abroad he had to return to Israel' (*AH*: 168).³⁷ At the very end of the novella, the narrator returns to Palestine-Israel, but his identity is yet to be fully formed in the future sovereign nation-state.

The novella 'Tehila' introduces the story of Tehila, whose hand was promised to Shraga a young boy when they were children. However, the groom's father appeared to be following the Chasidic movement, which at the time was considered a subversive interpretation of the Jewish religion, and therefore Tehila's father called off the marriage, did not ask for forgiveness, and Tehila married another man. Over the years Tehila suffers some misfortune (two of her children die and one converts) and she blames her calamities on her father's ill-conduct, and eventually she immigrates to Jerusalem.

The novella opens with a short sentence, 'There was one old woman in Jerusalem,' (*T*: 178) which in spite of its brevity includes the crucial connection between Tehila and

³⁵ Though the narrative refers to World War I the story has been read as a reckoning with World War II. Arnold Band reads the text as a narrative of constant return and dislocation (Band 1968: 347-57), as Z. J. Goodman explains, 'Ad Henna' is 'not the story of the First World War, it is, rather, a transposition, as in a dream of the Second World War onto the arena of the earlier war' (1988: 97).

³⁶ The word *aliya* means ascension, and based on its religious meaning of an ascension to the Holy Land is used in Zionist discourse to refer to waves of immigration to Palestine-Israel. The other side of this is the later references to Jewish Israelis who immigrate out of Israel as *yordim*, those who descent, adding a pejorative aspect to their action.

³⁷ בשביל שלא מצאתי חדר בהוצה לארץ הוכרתי לחזור לארץ ישראל

the Holy City. At this stage, we do not know her name or personal history, but only that the initial identification of the old woman we later get to know as Tehila is with the city. Though she was born in the Ashkenazi Diaspora, and is not an autochthonous part of the Holy Land, Tehila is depicted as having strong ties to the land because of her piety and virtuous character. While Tehila embraces the Holy Land, her foil, the character of the old Rabbanit longs for the Diaspora. Though neither is of the land, as they both immigrated from the Ashkenazi Diaspora, in order to emphasise the importance of a complete acceptance of the new connection to the land Agnon juxtaposes their characters' relation to the land.

The strongest connection to the land in this narrative is expressed in relation to Tehila's future burial. Tehila ensures her grave will be in the Mount of Olives, which, according to Jewish tradition, is the burial ground of the holy and righteous, and on judgment day all the saints will rise from the Mount of Olives. In a manner reminiscent of the rejuvenations of the vampire from his ancestral land Tehila dreams of a rebirth into the next world through the interment in her ancestral land. Though one character, the vampire, is the embodiment of the unholy and the other, Tehila, a righteous person, both require their ancestral land for resurrection. Both characters' identity (re)creation and existence hinges on their connection with their ancestral land.

The third Agnon text, 'Avi Hashor' (1948), addresses the questions of home and exile and autochthonous origins from a perspective that seeks to affirm Jewish legal and moral right over the land of Palestine-Israel. 'Avi Hashor' is a Hebrew translation of the Arabic Abu-Tor, which is the name of a neighbourhood in Jerusalem. The area has a unique history, as it is one of the first attempts at a hybrid neighbourhood in Jerusalem. During the time the story 'Avi Hashor' was written the neighbourhood was literally partitioned and divided between Jordan and the British Mandate for Palestine; today it is in Israel, and is an attempt at coexistence. One of the folk traditions related to the place suggests that

when Ṣalāḥ ad-Dīn placed the siege on Jerusalem one of his officers bragged that it will be so easy to conquer Jerusalem that he will be able to do it on an ox. Agnon's narrative offers an alternative myth. In 'Avi Hashor' the old man's name is *avi hashor*, 'the ox's father' which is the name of the place; hence, in a sense, the old man *is* the land. Agnon not only asserts the autochthonous origin of the old man, but affirms he is very land itself.

In addition to the linguistic appropriation of the land articulated through the name, the connection to the land in 'Avi Hashor' is through the ox, which is an animal that has been a part of the local landscape for millennia. The ox has been domesticated to become a farming animal, and has become a symbol of the connection to the land. In the story, the ox is a substitute for the old man's family, as he has neither children nor wife. Hence, the ox's father is perceived as autochthonous also through his familial relationship with the ox.

At the beginning of the story, the old man has a small house and field, and the ox (*AH*: 336). These will be violently taken from him, and then he will be compensated with other farm animals and many plots of land (*AH*: 442). The short story follows the old man, as his beloved ox saves the town from invaders only to be slaughtered by the old man's neighbour to feed the latter's wedding guests. The ox is dismembered by the old man's neighbour, who leaves the ox's horns protruding from the ground (*AH*: 439), creating a literal connection between the ox and the land that fortifies the metaphorical link. The autochthonous ox, which is the old man's substitute for family, functions as a legitimate connection to the land. By the end of the story many plots of land that are given to the old man by his neighbour in compensation for the loss of the ox reaffirm his moral and legal right to the land. Even though the old man has a home in the beginning, and the whole story is about the naming of the place after the old man and his ox, the story outlines a disturbing narrative of restlessness, and the temporary loss of the old man's home.

Whereas Agnon reinforces the Jewish connection and legitimate right to the land, Yizhar's text repudiates these claims, or at least offers some possible grounds for undermining the moral validity of the Jewish-Israeli conquest of the land, and more pointedly the manner by which it was conducted. *Khirbet Khizeh* presents the *sabra* male soldiers, who presumably were all born in the *yishuv* and according to this criterion would be considered natives, as invaders upon the land, misunderstanding both its simple beauty and immense grandeur.

While in 'Tehila' Agnon juxtaposes the two female characters in order to explore the connection to the land, in *Khirbet Khizeh* the contrast is between the Arab villagers and the Jewish soldiers. The soldiers are destroying the fields the villagers have been cultivating for centuries and up until recently. Gershon Shaked claims the Arab village was a part of Yizhar's beloved landscape, part of his sense of space and location, which Modern Zionist colonisation, or mass settlement, ruined, and that the land and its charms are part of an unattainable nostalgic past (2006: 12).³⁸ While the soldiers are depicted as detached from the land, as they trample over it, the Arab villagers are portrayed as unable to find shelter anywhere, as if the land refuses their plea for refuge. Neither the soldiers nor the villagers are harmoniously united with the land.

As mentioned, the conquering soldiers are, presumably, all *sabra*. The *sabra* is the Jew who was born in Palestine-Israel. One of the main symbols of the *sabra*, as well as the conquest is the cactus. The cactus, which was originally imported into the Mediterranean from South America, apart from being a part of the prevalent vegetation in the region, was the way by which the Arab farmers used to mark field ownership – similar to the way hedges are used in the UK. This plant, which defined the hold of the Arabs over their land, was later appropriated by the Israelis and became the symbol of the *sabra*. As Daniel

³⁸Also Uri Shoham suggests that the landscape and the Arab in Yizhar's text are a complex metaphor for an emotional principle that is the nostalgic longing for a lost childhood and innocence, which is represented in spatial metaphors of which the Arab is a part (1974: 340).

Lefkowitz explains, '[t]he classic symbol for [the] image of the Israeli Self is the sabra, which refers literally to the fruit of the prickly-pear cactus, and metaphorically to native-born Israelis. The metaphorical connection highlights the centrality of emotion: the sabra fruit-like native/ideal Israeli is said to be soft and sweet on the inside but rough and thorny on the outside' (Lefkowitz, 2001:181). Lefkowitz adds an important footnote to this definition saying '[i]t should be pointed out that sabra refers most naturally to Jewish Israelis. It would be infelicitous to apply that metaphor to Palestinians, even to citizens born in Israel after 1948' (188). In *Khirbet Khizeh*, the soldiers arrive at a cactus hedge and wish to have a small meal but are interrupted by the commander who provides elaborate explanations regarding the attack on the area and the village of Khirbet Khizeh. At the end of the instruction the troupes receive oranges (*KH*: 7-8). Not only is the orange is a symbol of the Jewish settlement in Palestine-Israel, the orchard is a recurrent symbol in Yizhar's work representing innocence (Shoham 1974: 334). The citrus is not an indigenous crop like the fig, carob, or date, but was imported by the Jews who returned during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries from Europe to settle in the land, and this citrus fruit has become a symbol of Israel. The juxtaposition of the sabra and the orange as symbols of the Jewish settlement in Palestine-Israel reveals the complexity of the soldiers' identity in relation to the land, where they are simultaneously invaders and natives. The plants as symbols of the problematic of autochthonous origins and sovereignty reflect the connection between identity and the land.

Yizhar's lyrical depictions of the land in *Khirbet Khizeh* can be read in relation to what Karen Grumberg terms depictions of 'Zionist places' in Hebrew literature. 'Zionist places' are places which 'provide physical and geographical expression of mainstream Zionist ideology' (Grumberg 2011: 6). Grumberg refers to the literary depictions of 'Zionist places' as participating in the affirmation of the Zionist enterprise, and even while Yizhar might be depicting the setting as 'Zionist places' in order to question the violence

of the Zionist enterprise, he is nonetheless operating within the same discourse. The soldiers crush uncultivated land as well as land that up till recently was cultivated by the villagers similarly, nullifying the villagers' labour and treating the entire land as wilderness. The soldiers' interaction with the land is depicted as a conquest of 'wilderness and chaos of the "uncivilised" space beyond' (Grumberg 2011: 6). Even while they are autochthonous, the soldiers in Yizhar's embody the Zionist endeavour to 'civilise' the 'wildernesses' through forceful conquest. These issues bear a striking resemblance to the problematic of the British imperialist endeavour to 'enculturate the world'.

While Gideon Aran and Zali Gurevitch draw a distinction between the universal and the Jewish-Israeli question of home and belonging (Aran and Gurevitch 1992: 24), the comparison of the texts in Hebrew and English reveals that there are similarities in the manner by which anxieties of exile and colonialism are explored.

As part of the investigation of the connection to the land, the texts explore issues of exile. All the main characters in these texts are in exile at some point or from some perspective: In *Frankenstein* the creature is forever exiled, and Stoker's Count attempts to move into exile. In *Jane Eyre* Bertha is in exile, and Max de Winter and his second wife end in exile in du Maurier's *Rebecca*. Berkowitz's 'Mishael' is set in a typical Eastern European Jewish exilic community, and the title of *The Golem and the Wondrous Deeds of the Maharal of Prague* gives away the narrative's exilic location. In Agnon's 'Ad Hennah' the narrator meanders between Palestine-Israel and Germany, and it is unclear where exile really is, and while Tehila embraces her new life in the Holy Land, the old Rabbanit misses her old home in the Ashkenazi exile. Even the stories that take place in Palestine-Israel treat issues of exile, as in 'Avi Hashor' the old man experiences the loss of his home, and the Palestinian commencement of exile is explored in Yizhar's *Khirbet Khizeh*.

Moreover, the comparative analysis reveals that not only are all these texts preoccupied with issues of home and exile, but that the characters share particular *kinds* of restless relationships with the home and land. The characters are all displaced and persecuted. Both Mishael and Frankenstein's creature are rejected by their makers or parents; and while both Jane and the narrator in *Rebecca* are rejected orphans, the Golem is adopted and embraced by the Jewish community. Because it is made of the soil of the foster land by the power of the 'portable homeland' the Golem is simultaneously autochthonous and alien. Thus it shares a complicated identity with the orphan Jane and the rejected Mishael. The need for ancestral earth for rejuvenation is shared by the demonic vampire and the saintly Tehila, as the former needs the earth in order to come back to its un-dead life and the latter wishes to be resurrected on the day of doom. While both feminine characters in 'Tehila' are not of the land, one connects to the land while the other rejects it, and though Jane and *Rebecca's* unnamed narrator are, indeed, British they lack agency and are alienated by the land. While the old man in 'Avi Hashor' has an intrinsic connection with the land, in Yizhar's text the autochthonous soldiers' connection and right to the land is undermined even as they conquer it. The texts all explore the connection to the land, because the sense of belonging to the land – and vice versa – is so vital for the construction of individual and collective identities. Both in English and Hebrew, these narratives explore the importance of the connection to the land through the validation or refutation of autochthonous origins and the intimate connection with the land for the (re)creation of identities.

2.3 Outdoor Horror

In addition to the common preoccupation with questions of autochthonous origins addressed in the previous chapter, the comparison of English and Hebrew texts of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries reveals similarities in the use of setting. The scenery in *Frankenstein*, *Dracula*, *Jane Eyre* and *Rebecca*, as well as ‘Be’ir Ha’harega’, ‘Mishael’, ‘Ha’adonit veHarochel’ ‘Ad Hennah’, and *Khirbet Khizeh* is utilised in order to explore the characters’ inner world and identities, as well as reconsider philosophical concepts and social norms.³⁹

Identities are inherently unstable (Hall 1989: 222), and correspondingly the literary exploration of both individual and collective identities requires a constant unsettling of the readers’ stable world-view. Since identities are intertwined with spatial awareness, this is achieved most productively through the unsettling of the setting. The result is a portrayal of the setting as perilous and precarious. The land is depicted as hostile, and instead of offering nurturing comfort and homey shelter, it is a vast barrenness that rejects the puny individuals. By defamiliarising the setting, the texts invite the reader to re-evaluate notions of *self* and Other. The texts examined here are literally set on unstable grounds, which leads to the readers’ reconsideration of their preconceived ideas regarding sovereignty, and their comprehension of individual and collective identities.

There is a complex connection between social and spatial aspects of identity and the notions of freedom and a free subject.⁴⁰ Historically, freedom of movement, as well as the freedom to own property, was denied slaves, women, and to a certain extent Jews.⁴¹

³⁹ As explained, for the purposes of this discussion, individual and collective identities are defined within the context of social philosophy as outlined by Barry Schlenker (1985), Anthony Smith (1995), and Stuart Hall (1989).

⁴⁰ As noted in the Introduction, a free subject is one who can operate in the political arena.

⁴¹ The British Parliament issued the Slavery Abolition Act in 1833, and though the Suffragette movement was active in the 1880s, only in 1918 did women get the right to vote in the UK. The English restricted Jews’ entry till 1654, when they were allowed back into the UK, and from then onwards the Jews in the UK were subjected to the same kind of rules that applied to other minority groups. For example, the 1905 Alien Act restricted immigration without specifically targeting Jews. Though the Act might have been a direct response to the massive immigration of Jews from Russia and Eastern Europe, the letter of the Act does not refer explicitly to Jewish immigration.

Such groups, which include the mad and the leper, delineate social norms and boundaries (Foucault 1964/2001: 4; Shoham-Steiner 2008: 27). Several of the characters examined here (e.g. Frankenstein's creature, Jane Eyre) occupy the same political space as these liminal groups.

The pivotal role of the setting in *Frankenstein* has been noted by critics, who have read it within the Miltonic tradition that re-examines mythical and biblical narratives (Lamb 1992: 303-19), as well as within the Romantic tradition (Smith 1994: 41). George Levine reads the space in the novel psychologically as the 'landscape of the hero's mind' (1973: 16). Levine suggests that 'even while it wanders across the Alps, from the northern islands of Scotland, to the frozen wastes of the Arctic, *Frankenstein* is a claustrophobic novel' (21). Levine argues that the novel 'presents us not with the landscape of the world but of a single mind' (21). Following these interpretations, the reading proposed here suggests the setting is not only a metaphor for the inner world of the characters, but also depicts tensions between personal and social identities, and the turbulence of the (re)construction of these identities in relation to social constraints.

The examination of individual and social identity in *Frankenstein* is achieved first by the juxtaposition between characters' movements, and the motivation for this mobility. While Frankenstein and Walton choose to go on their quests pursuing personal fulfilment, the creature commences its journey because it is rejected by its creator. It flees to the forest near Ingolstadt, and then is chased to the end of the world. This is a fundamental dissimilarity which is the result as well as reflection of the basic difference between the characters. While the two men wish to escape human society in order to set themselves apart as geniuses or great discoverers, the creature's only wish is to blend in, and integrate into human society with as little differentiation as possible. The men wish to become distinct; the creature wishes to become assimilated. Ironically, while Walton wishes to reach the North Pole in order to establish his social status, the creature is driven there in a

process of undermining his social acceptability. The North Pole, which may be read as a metonym for the end of the world, as well as the end of Reason, functions both on the literal and metaphorical level, as the characters operate in relation to its moral and spatial orientation.

As part of the investigation of the notions of Reason the *sublime* was a productive concept in Western philosophy. The sublime is the conflation of beauty and fear. The concept of the sublime is used here in relation to Edmund Burke's *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful* (1757). The *Enquiry* explores concepts of terror, horror, and the sublime, suggesting that terror is the kernel of the sublime, and that we experience pleasure in fear when it is presented at a sufficient distance. Burke argues that 'no passion [...] so effectually robs the mind of all its powers of acting and reasoning as fear; the Sublime makes reasoning impossible and is the antithesis of philosophical enquiry because it is always that which is in excess of any kind of limit or boundary' (1757/1998: xxi-xxii). Fear, Burke cautions, hinders freedom of thought.

The North Pole offers precisely the sublime combination of splendour and horror. Furthermore, the spatial distance from the West reflects the ideological rejection of Western Reason. Space and the land in *Frankenstein* are portrayed within the terms of the sublime from the very beginning, as Walton writes to his sister describing his thrill upon setting out on the expedition to forge a new path to the North Pole:

I am already far north of London, and as I walk in the streets of Petersburg, I feel a cold northern breeze play upon my cheeks, which braces my nerves and fills me with delight. Do you understand this feeling? This breeze, which has travelled from the regions towards which I am advancing, gives me a foretaste of those icy climes. Inspired by this wind of promise, my daydreams become

more fervent and vivid. I try in vain to be persuaded that the pole is the seat of frost and desolation; it ever presents itself to my imagination as the region of beauty and delight.

(*F*: 13)

Walton is lured by the sublime essence of the North Pole. He yearns for the prospect of a place that will offer an alternative to warmth and comfort; he longs for frost and desolation. Walton wants to undermine the stability of his spatial awareness in order to awaken his mind to question philosophical notions and social conventions. The social constraints of the home – both benign and malign – are relinquished in favour of some other kind of alternative Reason Walton hopes to discover. This Reason, he imagines, will offer a new kind of philosophy, as well as provide a reason, or meaning, for his life. The arctic landscape itself is not only devoid of human interference but allows for, and even invites, the abandonment of Reason. Walton describes a kind of deprivation of proper cognitive abilities because of the sublime essence of the place. There is a great promise of fear alongside beauty, which is the essence of the sublime.

In addition to Burke's sublime, the landscape in *Frankenstein* should also be read in light of the Kantian sublime. The Kantian sublime is similar to the feeling of great awe to which Burke refers, yet while Burke presents the feelings of fear as a dangerous aspect of the sublime because it might prevent the inspirational aspect of the sublime from acting upon the human soul, for Kant the sublime and the beautiful are not to be juxtaposed, but are distinct as they demarcate philosophical boundaries. Barbara Clair Freeman juxtaposes Kant's *Critique of Judgment* (1790) and Wollstonecraft Shelley's *Frankenstein* along the lines of philosophical and literary boundary shifting and questioning, suggesting that Kant questions the boundaries of thought and Wollstonecraft Shelley offers the literary manifestation of those queries. Thus, according to Freeman, they complement each other

philosophically, and anticipate Derridian deconstruction theories (1987: 191-2). The locations within the novel are an acknowledgment of the Kantian sublime as that which challenges Western thought. Knowledge in Western thought is perceived and constructed as a place one can reach and conquer, and Kant has a topographical view of knowledge (Freeman 1987: 197). Correspondingly, the transgression of these vistas is the undermining of Western thought. It is precisely Kant's spatial depiction of knowledge and thought that render this particular philosopher so apt for the analysis of Wollstonecraft Shelley's novel.

The Kantian sublime and Wollstonecraft Shelley's monster are, in fact, one and the same: the latter the representation of the former, and both participants in the constant flux of (re)construction and deconstruction of human boundaries. Following the locations of the creature along the narrative reveals the crucial part its (dis)location plays in its (re)creation as the racial and social Other. As Frankenstein and his creature travel from St. Petersburg to Geneva and Ingolstadt and via the sublime mountains of Switzerland back to England, Ireland, and finally the Arctic both explore not only the terrain but also their social position and individual identity.

Like *Frankenstein*, *Jane Eyre* outlines a narrative of rejection and constant dislocation: from Gateshead Hall via Lowood and Thornfield to Ferndean. Yet unlike the sublime setting of *Frankenstein*, in *Jane Eyre* we find the English landscape. The absence of sublime landscape marks the prevalence and sustainability of Reason, and Jane is shaped by her surroundings. Even though she will embark upon a turbulent journey, she will eventually be (re)incorporated into Western civilisation. While Frankenstein's creature will be forever rejected, Jane will find her way into societal acceptance. Conversely, the ultimate monstrous Other in *Jane Eyre*, Bertha, will be burned along with the British estate. The novel thus suggests a hierarchy of Otherness, in which the poor female British subject is rejected, but is nonetheless located above the colonised Other. The novel is primarily, as Spivak revealed, a critique of imperialism (1985: 251). Yet *Jane Eyre* is moreover a

Victorian bildungsroman that is also an odyssey. Like Odysseus, Jane wishes to return home, but, being a rejected, unloved poor orphan she does not have one, so alongside the construction of her identity she sets out to find or create a home for herself.

As noted earlier, Gilbert and Gubar have revealed the narrative is ‘a story of enclosure and escape’ (1979: 339). The tensions between the indoor and outdoor are the crux of the narrative, portraying the core dilemma Jane attempts to overcome as she tries to (re)construct her identity, relinquish her marginality and gain sovereignty and agency. The novel opens with the sentence ‘There was no possibility of taking a walk that day’ (*JE*: 5). Our first encounter with Jane is through her presentation of a negation of the possibility of outdoor activities. This negation relates to the possibilities of physical exercise, and is an ominous foreshadowing of her prospects as a poor female character. This opening sentence reflects the kernel of the narrative, as freedom and agency are precisely what Jane will seek throughout the novel. Like Frankenstein’s creature, Jane yearns for liberty and sovereignty.

Jane’s journey from Thornfield Hall to Moor House is a formative passage, as she regains her humanity and her identity through her reconnection with nature (Gilbert and Gubar 1979: 363). Jane leaves Thornfield Hall and chooses to follow ‘a road [she] had never travelled, but often noticed, and wondered where it led’ (*JE*: 273). Like Walton, Jane chooses an uncertain, scary destiny, which is, nonetheless, her free choice. At first she feels nature loves her, and decides to spend the night outdoors (*JE*: 276). The orphaned child returns to the arms of Mother Nature as the only place that might offer comfort and consolation to the person who has no home. Like the brief moment of connection to the land and withdrawal from society in the forest experienced by Frankenstein’s creature (*F*: 98-101), on the moor Jane too feels a deep connection to the land and alienation from society (*JE*: 276-282). Moreover, both Jane’s and the creature’s experiences are a mixture of delight and pain. Even as it is cold and hungry, desolate and miserable, the creature

perceives the moonrise as delightful (*F*: 98-99). Likewise, nature seems to Jane ‘benign and good’ (*JE*: 276), though soon she wanders in the moors, wading ‘knee-deep in its dark growth’ (*JE*: 275), alone and depressed, hungry, cold, tired, and lonely (*JE*: 282). To neither character, though beautiful and marvellous, nature cannot offer comfort as what they yearn for is love and compassion. On the moor Jane inhabits the location of the monstrous Other, yet she is eventually led by a shimmering light to the house of the benign Rivers’ cottage and back to society. The wanderer is rewarded with a home, for the time being. The setting of the novel in the populated regions of the British Isles allows for the rejected orphan to find (or create) a home. Though the relationship with the land is ambivalent, ultimately the motherland embraces its poor female rejected Other.

As noted above, the unnamed narrator in *Rebecca* is in many ways an avatar of Jane Eyre, and like Jane she wishes to go back to a home she never had. The novel follows the unnamed narrator from Monte Carlo, via Manderley, the South Eastern English estate, to a self-imposed exile on an unnamed sun-ridden island. Whereas Jane finds a home in Britain, *Rebecca*’s unnamed narrator is exiled. The narrator’s continual migrations as well as her lack of origins portray her as a suspicious entity in the British social landscape which values established stable (and preferably noble) origins. Her eventual exile signifies the rejection of the poor orphan. In a sense, this is a step backwards with regard to social inclusivity in comparison to *Jane Eyre*. Once the imperial enterprise has been relinquished, the British require a new Other that would delineate social boundaries. The poor female subject appears to be the next in line of hierarchy after the colonised other, and therefore she is now more vehemently rejected.

Rebecca’s narrator is continuously rejected. In fact, like *Jane Eyre* *Rebecca* commences with the negation of the possibility of movement. The difference is that while Jane wished to go outside, the unnamed narrator wishes to enter a house. This difference notifies the reader of the shift in the social structure. The novel opens with the narrator’s

dream, in which Manderley is derelict, and she understands that ‘Nature had come into her own again, little by little, in her stealthy, insidious way had encroached upon the drive with long, tenacious fingers’ (*R*: 1). As she attempts to enter the house she is repelled by ‘beeches with white, naked limbs’ (1), tree branches ‘making an impediment to progress; the gnarled roots look[ing] like skeleton claws’ (2). What commences as nature’s anthropomorphism turns into its monstro-morphism, and from this moment onwards nature will be depicted as vicious, evil, and intent to harm the narrator. She thinks the ‘woods, always a menace even in the past, had triumphed in the end’ (*R*: 1), and she recognises ‘shrubs that had been landmarks [...] things of culture and grace’ (*R*: 2), which without cultivation ‘had gone native now, rearing to monster height without a bloom, black and ugly as the nameless parasites that grew beside them’ (2). Nature without culture is monstrous. As the novel unfolds, both the narrator and Maxim de Winter, her husband and owner of the property, lose in the battle over the house. The mansion functions as a metaphor for the social/racial/gender conflict within British society. While for Jane, Nature seemed like a loving mother, until she is led back to human comfort, like for Frankenstein’s creature, for *Rebecca*’s narrator nature is the very embodiment of social rejection.

House and plants function as metaphor for social struggle and individual identity throughout *Rebecca*. The rhododendron in the novel operates as a rich metaphor for the narrator’s perception of social and personal identity, and is a monstrous reminder of the previous Mrs de Winter. In her dream, *Rebecca*’s narrator imagines the rhododendrons as ‘twisted and entwined with bracken, and they had entered into alien marriage with a host of nameless shrubs, poor, bastard things that clung about their roots as though conscious of their spurious origin’ (*R*: 2-3). As Alison Light notes, the ‘English garden has been overrun by natives in a kind of horticulture anarchy in which the proper order of class, family and Empire has been flouted’ (1984: 12). The depiction of the plants reflects notions of purity of origin that might be tainted once mingled with impure breeds. As the narrator

comes from a lower social status, her marriage with Maxim might be seen as such a marriage. She perceives their marriage as a horror that is represented as a savage ‘alien’ monstrous alliance.

In reality, upon their arrival at the mansion Maxim asks her if she likes the rhododendrons and she says yes, uncertain whether she means it because she thought a rhododendron ‘was a homely, domestic thing, strictly conventional, mauve or pink. And these were monsters, rearing to the sky, massed like a battalion, too beautiful [...] too powerful; they were not plants at all’ (R: 72). Later we will learn that Rebecca had these rhododendrons planted, and they function as a constant reminder of her rooted presence. The plants are haunted, and represent the former mistress’ sovereignty over the land. The yearning for a connection to the land, to belong to the land and to have ownership over the land, is the kernel of the narrative. The settings are not simply the location of the action; rather, they are meaningful metaphors of the themes, even as they propel the plot, and define the characters.

The fourth text in English was selected because it is one of the most famous Gothic novels that exemplifies the importance of setting as literary device. The setting in Stoker’s *Dracula* is fundamental for the comprehension of plot and characters alike. As noted above, the novel probes fears of the racial and national Otherness (Botting 1991: 140), as well as the ‘reverse colonisation’ (Arata 1990: 627).⁴² The setting facilitates these explorations. Like *Frankenstein*, Stoker’s novel opens with a journey. *Dracula* commences with Jonathan Harker’s voyage to the East. He is to meet Count Dracula and finalize the Count’s acquisition of Carfax, an estate in London. As Harker embarks upon his journey, he experiences fear and awe, and his emotions are linked directly to the preconceived notions of East and West not only as directions, but as loci of cultural difference. The novel

⁴² Even though the vampire comes from Transylvania, which was not colonised by the British, the metaphor of the Other that comes from the East still resonates with fearsome notions of superstition and non-Christian traditions. Similarly, this term is applicable when considering the Jewish Other, which is perceived and depicted as a threat to the British nation.

suggests that the East is the location of superstition, and the West is the location of reason as well as religion.

Buda-Pesth seems a wonderful place, from the glimpse which I got of it from the train and the little I could walk through the streets. I feared to go very far from the station, as we had arrived late and would start as near the correct time as possible. The impression I had was that we were leaving the West and entering the East; the most western of splendid bridges over the Danube, which is here of noble width and depth, took us among the traditions of Turkish rule.

(D: 9)

The description is reminiscent of the beginning of a fairy-tale, locating the action far away in a 'wonderful' place. There is a distinct irony between the form of Harker's journal that suggests rigid authenticity and the content that sounds like a fairy-tale; the English man, who is imbued in the fairy-tales that were imported into England from France and Germany, now ventures further to the East. The text displaces the action, detaching it from the realm of logic to the land of wonder; the reader, along with Harker, already becomes more susceptible to marvels. Moreover, even at this early stage of the narrative, before Harker is subjected to any of the horrors he is to experience, he is not certain of what he sees, as he only has a 'glimpse' and gets an 'impression' of the place. Fear is introduced in a subtle manner, as Harker fears to stray too far lest he be left behind in this unknown land. From the beginning the story focuses on the effects of spatial dislocation upon the *self*, and the connection between the constructions of identity and spatial and psychic (dis)orientation.

Once the narrative undermines the readers' spatial and conceptual perception, the effects of the sublime landscape of the Carpathians leads to further unsettling and a sense

of fear. Dracula's castle, the abode of this sovereign, is perched on the very top of a terrible precipice (*D*: 38), surrounded by mountain tops 'with occasionally a deep rift where there is a chasm. Here and there are silver threads where the rivers wind in deep gorges through the forests' (38). This sublime landscape resembles several locations in *Frankenstein*, from the sublime Alps (*F*: 114), to the glaciers near the North Pole (*F*: 154). Like in *Frankenstein*, the monstrous Other is located where Reason ends. The boundaries of society are conceptually and spatially defined. The eventual defeat of the monster upon Eastern land is symbolic of alleged Western supremacy. The conquering of the monster in the sublime landscape is the ultimate assertion of Western philosophy.

Furthermore, not only is the setting unsettling, in *Dracula* the very land is depicted as blood-thirsty. The land, which revitalises the Count, who has to be interned in his ancestral land in order to rejuvenate, is a potent source of horror. As the Count explains:

Why, there is hardly a foot of soil in all this region that has not been enriched by the blood of men, patriots or invaders. In the old days there were stirring times, when the Austrian and the Hungarian came up in hordes, and the patriots went out to meet them, men and women, the aged and the children too, and waited their coming on the rocks above the passes, that they might sweep destruction on them with their artificial avalanches. When the invader was triumphant he found but little, for whatever there was had been sheltered in the friendly soil.

(*D*: 33)

This narrative of the land reveals the bloody history of the region. The Count affirms the rich bloodiness of the land, as different bloods and peoples are intermingled into the soil.

On the one hand, the soil is a passive participant in peoples' wars; on the other hand, the land itself is used in battle, as the local people would wait for the attackers on high points and use avalanches to their advantage. The land is the cause for spilling blood, accomplice in war crimes, and it absorbs the blood for its nourishment. Likewise, the Count's nourishment is blood and he is refreshed in the soil of the land of which he is sovereign. Land and blood are entwined as sources of life and death: the Count consumes blood and causes death as he is the un-dead; he also rests in the land; and the land consumes blood and gives life. The vampire is the literary embodiment of the horror of the entanglement of blood and land.

An exploration of the connection between blood and land and the figure of the vampire is Agnon's 'Ha'adonit veHarochel' ('The Lady and the Peddler'). While there is a relative dearth of obvious monstrous Others in Hebrew literature of the nineteenth to the mid twentieth century, this story explores the vampire lore with a particular twist. As will be further explained in the part dedicated to myth, the figure of the vampire has been read as a manifestation of anti-Semitism (Malchow 1996: 140; Halberstam 1996: 86; Matthew 2004: 161, 168). In Agnon's narrative, however, the anti-Semitic depiction of the vampire is reversed as the Jew is the victim of a non-Jewish vampiress.

'Ha'adonit veHarochel' is a story about a Jewish peddler, who, in his wanderings, arrives at the home of a non-Jewish lady, who happens to feed on her lovers. The story explores issues of intermarriages, and fears of the racial, religious, and national Otherness. Furthermore, on the larger metaphorical level, the lady and her home represent the host country, and the story cautions not only against mingling with the local non-Jewish communities, but against the very exilic condition of the Jewish Ashkenazi Diaspora. The tension between Nature and the home in the Ashkenazi Diaspora stem from the alliance of Nature with non-Jewish tradition (Boyarin 1997: 63; Miron 2000: xii). The Jewish home and territory was the Jewish haven, and allegedly provided protection from the non-Jewish

tradition outside. By building a synagogue and a Jewish bathhouse upon alien soil, ‘as well as burying their dead within it in the defined area of the Jewish cemetery, the shtetl people supposedly created their own tiny yidishe meluke (Jewish state, kingdom) in which Judaism reigned supreme’ (Miron 2000: xii).⁴³ Once one ventures outside, one is open to the harmful effect of Other ideas.

The story opens by establishing that the peddler is a wanderer by trade; he is the quintessential Wandering Jew.⁴⁴ As he arrives at the lady’s abode, ‘the sun had already set and he could no longer make out the road’ (*HH*: 210). Like in *Dracula*, the spatial disorientation is a metaphor for the character’s inner world. Yet, while in Stoker’s novel the juxtaposition is between perceptions of Western Reason and Christian religion on the one hand, and notions of the East as the locus of superstitious beliefs on the other, in Agnon’s narrative the spatial bewilderment reflects the fear of crossing between Jewish and Christian religions. The peddler tries to continue his journey, but as the dark sets he begins to be afraid (210). Then, in a scene reminiscent of Jane in the moor, the peddler sees a light shining. He follows the light, and reaches, again, the lady’s home (210). He asks her to allow him to stay for the night, and she – begrudgingly – grants permission (210). Here begins a narrative that outlines their slow progression from social and religious opponents, as he is a lowly Jewish peddler and she a Christian lady, to lovers. Though the lady ‘is not immediately identified as the vampire she is’ (Fuchs 1982/1983: 120), eventually, as he realises he is about to become her prey, the peddler decides to pray. Since there is a crucifix on the wall he goes outside to say his prayers (*HH*: 219). As he wanders away from her house, the depiction of the landscape is a reflection of him as lost in relation to Judaism:

⁴³ Shtetl is a small Jewish town in Yiddish.

⁴⁴ The figure of the Wandering Jew will be further explored in the part dedicated to myth, in the section ‘The Wandering Jew and its Avatars’.

That night was a winter night. The earth was covered with snow and the sky was congealed and turbid. He looked up to the sky and saw no spark of light; he looked to the ground and he could not make out his feet. Suddenly he saw himself as though imprisoned in a forest in the midst of the snow around him that was being covered over by new snow. And he himself was also being covered over.

(HH: 219)

The peddler has lost his religion. He feels trapped and lost, and the setting reflects his bewilderment as he literally looks up to the heaven for answers. In the end the lady does not feed on him, and he is saved. Instead, she accidentally stabs herself and dies of her wounds. The story suggests he is saved because he stepped outside from the non-Jewish house in order to say his prayers. Though he strayed from the Jewish religious path, he repents and returns to the righteous way.

While in ‘Ha’adonit Ve’harochel’ the Jew repents and is saved, in ‘Be’ir Ha’harega’ (‘In the City of Slaughter’) the slaughter is devastating. ‘Be’ir Ha’harega’ is one of two epic poems H. N. Bialik wrote as a response to the Kishinev pogrom.⁴⁵ The Kishinev pogrom broke out on April 19, 1903 and lasted for two days. Kishinev was then the capital of Bessarabia, a province of Belarus (now it is the capital of Moldova). During those two days 49 people were murdered and 495 were injured, 95 of them suffering severe injuries (Gluzman 2005: 16). Bialik was sent from Israel to Kishinev by the ‘Historical Committee’ that was created in order to explore ways to deal with the Jews’ predicament in the Ashkenazi Diaspora. Moreover, he was sent in order to collect evidence and interrogate the survivors, especially regarding any attempts at self-defence, the ‘crucial moments’, and the rapes (Gluzman 2005: 17). Bialik never wrote the report; instead, he

⁴⁵ The other poem is ‘Upon the Slaughter’.

wrote ‘Be’ir Ha’harega’.⁴⁶ The exilic condition of the Jews in the Ashkenazi Diaspora has led to many violent eruptions, yet this particular incident stirred a public discussion that marked a turning point in the active response of the Jewish community. Regardless of the recent information gleaned from Bialik’s many notes taken during his interviews of the victims,⁴⁷ the epic depicted the pogrom, a horror that was all too prevalent in the Ashkenazi Diaspora, in a manner that provoked reaction, and served as leverage for the Zionist enterprise. The epic offered a dark picture of the consequences of the exilic condition in the Ashkenazi Diaspora. The Jewish people, the epic suggested, needed a national home.

The epic commences with the words ‘arise and get thee’, which is a sarcastic allusion to the divine command Abraham was given to arise and go to the Promised Land (Genesis, 12:1-2). Bialik mocks both the divine covenant and the exilic condition of the Jews in the Ashkenazi Diaspora:

Arise and get thee to the town of slaughter and come to the yards, and with thine eyes thou shalt see and with thine hands thou shalt feel upon the fences and upon the trees and upon the stones and upon the plaster within the walls the blood clots and the hardened brains of the deceased.⁴⁸

(*BH*: 370)

The reader is ordered to come to the courtyards and experience the horror for himself.⁴⁹ The invasion of the home, first perpetrated by the offenders, is now reconstructed by the

⁴⁶ Initially, Bialik feared the Russian censor, and published a less scathing first version of the poem entitled ‘The Namirov Journey’, alluding to another Russian town where pogroms took place in 1648-9.

⁴⁷ While at the time it was published the depictions of the Jewish men’s passivity in Bialik’s poem shocked the Jewish community into action, recent scholarship suggests that Bialik’s condemnation of the victims was based on inaccuracies and withholding of information, and exposes his identification with the weak, seemingly effeminate position, of the victims (Gluzman 2005: 17; Tzamiir 2009: 152).

⁴⁸ קוים לך לך אל עיר ההרגה ובאת אל-התצרות
 ובעיניך תראה וביןך תמשש על-הגדרות
 ועל העצים ועל האבנים ועל-גבי טיח הפתלים
 את-הדם הקרוש ואת-המח הנקשה של-החללים

⁴⁹ The phrase in Hebrew addresses a male reader.

reader. The location is horrific, the whole place is covered with clotted blood and human remains. Yet the reader is compelled to travel through the horror. As the speaker leads the reader through the city, the experience is overwhelming:

Pause not upon this havoc; go thy way.
The perfumes will be wafted from the acacia bud
And half its blossoms will be feathers,
Whose smell is the smell of blood!
And, spiting thee, strange incense they will bring—
Banish thy loathing—all the beauty of the spring,
The thousand golden arrows of the sun,
Will flash upon thy malison;
The sevenfold rays of broken glass
Over thy sorrow joyously will pass,
For God called up the slaughter and the spring together, —
The slayer slew, the blossom burst, and it was sunny
weather!⁵⁰
(BH: 370)

The first phrase in this stanza can be translated as ‘pause not’, but can also mean that the destruction cannot be measured, as both words come from the same root. The horror cannot be contained and comprehended. Furthermore, the speaker juxtaposes the beauty of nature

— ולא-תעמד על-ההרס ועברת משם הדרך⁵⁰
ולקבלו השטים לנגדך וזלפו באפה בשמים
וציצייהו חצים נוצות וריחו כריח דמים
ועל-אפה ועל-תמתד תביא קטרות הנרה
את-עדנת האביב בלבבך — ולא-תהי לך לנרא
וברבבות חצי זקב פלח השמש בברך
ושבע קרנים מכל-רסיס זכוכית תשמחנה לאידך
כי-קרא אדני לאביב ולטבח גם-תחד
השמש ורחה, השטה פרחה והשוחט שחט

with the stench of the city; the horror of the slaughter is contrasted with the bliss of spring. The speaker leads the reader away, to where there are the blossoming flowers and trees of spring; yet mingled with the bliss of nature in all its glory is the smell of blood, and the reader, in spite of himself, is led into the acrid mixture. The location of the horror and the continuation of life are contrasted. Whereas Nature was depicted as a nurturing mother in *Jane Eyre*, here, like in *Dracula*, the land itself is tainted with blood.

The sun, the source of life, is here depicted as a harsh embodiment of divine wrath, or indifference. Like the vampire, the speaker finds the sun offensive. This is also similar to Frankenstein's creature's refrain from the sun rays. After the initial rejection, the creature escapes to the forest. The creature finds the sun-light too harsh for its sensitive eyes, and seeks the shade of the forest (*F*: 98). The forest, the darkness, which frightens the rest of the population, is the rejected Other's shelter and sanctuary.

For the bereaved Jew in Bialik's poem, however, there is no repose. At the end of an anguishing journey through the city of slaughter the speaker and guide of the journey orders the reader to flee to the desert:

What is thy business here, O son of man?

Rise, to the desert flee!

The cup of affliction thither bear with thee!

Talc thou thy soul, rend it in many a shred!

With impotent rage, thy heart deform!

Thy tear upon the barren boulders shed!

And send thy bitter cry into the storm!⁵¹

⁵¹ וְעַתָּה מֵה־לֵךְ פֹּה, בֶן־אָדָם, קוּם בְּרַח הַמִּדְבָּרָה
וְנִשְׂאֵת עִמָּךְ שְׂמֵה אֶת־כּוֹס הַיְגוּנִים
וְקִרְעֵת שֵׁם אֶת־נַפְשְׁךָ לַעֲשֵׂרָה קִרְעִים
וְאֶת־לִבְּךָ תִּתֵּן מֵאֲכָל לְתַרוּן אִיו־אוֹנִים
וְדַמְעֶתְךָ הַגְּדוּלָה הוֹרֵד שֵׁם עַל קִדְקִד הַסְּלָעִים
וְשִׁאֲגֶתְךָ הַמָּרָה שְׁלַח – וְחֹאבֵד בְּסַעֲרָה

The poem suggests that after the devastation, the only place left is the desolate barren desert. Ranen Omer-Sherman argues that ‘the desert becomes a metaphysical idea that is both a process and a place that raises compelling questions about justice and national identity’ (2006: x). According to Omer-Sherman, ‘the desert was a formidable presence in the moral vision of the Jewish prophets, a paradigm that would later prove intrinsic to some of Jewish literature’s most imaginative approaches to the ethical dimensions of exile and homecoming, dispossession and occupation’ (2006: 2). In a manner similar to the function of the sublime landscape in non-Jewish philosophy, the desert is both a location and a notion. The desert’s universality, Omer-Sherman argues, ‘serves as an urgent reminder to many Jewish writers that exile and alienation remain the essential human condition in spite of the ostensible transformations wrought by Zionism and other territorial nationalisms’ (2006: 2). Investigating ‘the implications of “non-place” for Zionist consolidation of space and territory’ (Omer-Sherman 2006: 4), Omer-Sherman states that like the forest and ice-bound desert in the European tradition, the desert in Hebrew literature rejects any sovereign other than God (2006: 3). This ‘non-place’ is the same location we found in *Frankenstein*, *Dracula*, and *Jane Eyre*. The ice-bound desert of the North Pole, and the sublime mountains, as well as the forest and the moor, and the desert, all allow for a reconsideration of social, moral, philosophical, and religious notions.

In addition to its function as a “non-place” similar to these other locations, in Jewish tradition the desert can signify several notions from a place in which communication with the spiritual is possible, to a massive burial ground, as for the old generation of Israelites who came from the Egyptian enslavement and were not permitted to enter the Promised Land. In Bialik’s epic poem, the desert is the alternative to the decay of the Ashkenazi Diaspora, and could simultaneously symbolise the yearning for the

Promised Land as well as a rejection of its solace. Also, perhaps the epic condemns the victims for their powerlessness and aligns their impotence with the barren desert.

The interpretation of the desert and particularly the tear at the end of the epic poem has varied from reading the desert as an emptiness whose essence is that it provides a place in which the addressee can cry, and the tear as a suppression of emotions (Miron 2005: 77), and their postponement (Hever 2005:66), to reading of the tear as an ‘abjection’ in the sense of Kristeva (Gluzman 2005: 34). Hamutal Tzamir reads the desert’s specific meaning as anchored in the Zionist imagination of the revival, in a generation that perceived itself as the desert generation, which is not destined to arrive at the Promised Land (2009: 159). Yet as Hirshfeld notes, the rage at the end of the poem is meant to induce action through emotional affection (2011: 286). The epic lends itself to these various readings, and even opens up the possibility of an anachronistic reading that foreshadows the subsequent calamities in Palestine-Israel. Bialik’s epic was instrumental in the Zionist move towards an active response to the problems of the Ashkenazi Diaspora, and the establishment of a Jewish national home.

The location of this national home was subject to heated debate, and is still cause for tensions, but it was, nonetheless, established in the region associated with the Promised Land.⁵² While the biblical Promised Land is a land of plenty – both agriculturally and as a promise of progeny – the land the speaker bequeaths to the reader is a sterile hostile desert. The reader is ordered to carry his ‘cup of affliction’ as this will be the only nourishment available, and the bitter tears are the only water offered in the desert. This metaphor of the rejected broken man condemned to the desert is a depiction of the battered Jew, who is sent to Palestine to repose from the horrors of Eastern Europe only to find a hostile land and more war and horrors. The Jew here is like Frankenstein’s creature, who is rejected and condemned to the ice-bound desert. The final line of the epic suggests a powerful albeit

⁵² The concept of the Promised Land will be further explored in the ‘Legendary Lands’ section in the Myth part.

impotent resolution, as the speaker orders the reader to roar, and then be lost in a storm. This image offers a duality, or ambivalence, as on the one hand the reader roars, which connotes a lion, brave and fierce; and on the other hand the reader and his roar are lost in a storm, the powerful element. Thus, the final conclusion is an ambivalent blend of bravery and impotence, which is manifested in the spatial metaphor.

This ambivalence was later reworked into S. Yizhar's landscape representations in *Khirbet Khizeh*. The Israeli Mediterranean natural environment and climate, with its mixture of blazing heat and cool serenity, which is aligned with the Arab presence in the text, is juxtaposed in Yizhar's narrative with the Israeli soldiers' warring presence. These depictions of nature in Yizhar's text have been read as colonialist appropriations of the land (Shoham 1974: 340). *Khirbet Khizeh* portrays the violent conquest of the land in the early years of the Israeli nation-state, depicting a small unit of soldiers as they perform the task of the expulsion of Arab villagers from a fictitious village. The soldiers as well as the Arabs are homeless, as the soldiers are not at home because they are in the process of violently establishing their home, and the Arabs are being banished from their homes.

In *Khirbet Khizeh*, Yizhar engages with the conventions of spatial description that were prevalent in Hebrew literature of the time. Yizhar's descriptions of landscape are presented 'from horizon to horizon and from mountain peaks to valleys' (Gertz 2000: 21). Yet, while other authors might have utilised these kinds of all-incompassing depictions in order to portray the land as it were dominated and controlled by the Jewish-Israeli viewer, Yizhar undermines this assertion, as 'not only is this landscape depicted as mere platitude, it also reflects the subjective moods of the protagonist' (21). Eventually, 'the progression of time of the outward level is accompanied by a halt or withdrawal of time at its internal level' (Gertz 2000: 22). Within Yizhar's speculative temporality of 1948-time, 'the empty Palestinian villages are not just testimony to a world that once existed and was then abruptly and violently cut short, paving the way for the post-1948 sovereign time of the

Israeli state; rather, they inhabit the space of Israel/Palestine during—and especially after—the fact’ (Setter 2012: 51). As Setter explains, Yizhar’s text shows that ‘it is precisely this “gaping emptiness screaming out,” neither pre-1948 populated villages nor post-1948 erased ones, that operates in the political space of Israel/Palestine’ (51). Uri Shoham and Gershon Shaked conceive the depictions of the landscape in Yizhar’s text as a nostalgic longing for a lost childhood and innocence, which modern Zionist settlement ruined (1974: 340; 2006: 12). Thus like *Frankenstein*, *Dracula*, and *Jane Eyre*, Yizhar’s has been read as a critique of colonialism. Also like in the texts in English, nature is juxtaposed with human endeavour. Referring to another short story by Yizhar, ‘The Prisoner’, written in 1949, Gil Anidjar and Hanan Hever note tensions between nature and the soldiers that are also present in *Khirbet Khizeh*. Anidjar and Hever identify the tension between Nature and the unnatural act of conquest as the core of the story (2002: 12; 2009: 273). The settings in *Khirbet Khizeh* function the ground for the violence both literally and metaphorically.

The first description of the land is a lyrical depiction of the beauty of the land on one bright winter day, as the soldiers go out, yet it shifts after they return from their horrid task:

One option is to tell the story in order, beginning with one clear day, one clear winter’s day, and describing in detail the departure and the journey, when the dirt paths were moistened by earlier rain, and the cactus hedges surrounding the citrus groves were burned by the sun and moist, their feet, as of old, licked by flocks of dense damp dark-green nettles, as the noonday gradually advanced, a pleasant unhurried noonday, which moved on as usual and turned into a darkening twilight chill, when it was all over, finished, done.⁵³

אפשר לספר כסדר. להתחיל ביום בהיר אחד, יום חורף בהיר אחד, ולדייק בתיאור היציאה והמסע, כשבילי-העפר⁵³ המרובצים בגשם תמול-שלשום, ומשוכות הפרדסים, שהיו שחומות ומלוחלחות ורגליהן, כמאז, מלוחכות עדרי סרפדים ירוקים

(KH: 7-8)

It appears as an idyllic depiction of the land, with the various greeneries and blessed coolness of the evening, but a closer examination reveals subtle hints foreshadowing the nationalistic violence. The ‘flocks of dense damp dark-green nettles’ seem to prey upon the muddied citrus trees, making the approach to the sweet fruit difficult and harmful.⁵⁴ While the citrus is not an indigenous crop like the fig, carob, or date, but was imported by the Jews who returned during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries from Europe to settle in the land, the nettles are indigenous, and have been in the land from the dawn of time. The local vegetation prevents the attainment of the fruit; or if it does not prevent access, it suggests the need for a bitter and bloody battle. The citrus fruit has become one of the Israeli symbols, and the barrier surrounding the sweet refreshing fruit serves as a metaphor for the complexity of the attainment of the land. Furthermore, as noted above, the cactus hedge is of great significance in this narrative, and in the narrative of the regional conflict.

As the story unfolds, we learn that the land offers neither comfort nor protection. As the villagers attempt to escape, the soldiers view their futile endeavour as ‘shadowy figures that moved in the open, and seemed to be in a hurry, but their haste was negated by the scale of the terrain; it was like the meaningless writhing of a worm’ (KH: 2008: 34).⁵⁵ The contrast between the puny human effort to escape and the immensity of the land, with its alleged infinite spatial possibilities of productivity and protection, reveals the narrator’s view of the overbearing power of the land over man. Referring to the escaping figures, the

וצפופים ורטובים – הלכו והיו צהרי-היום, צהרים נאים וענוגים-שהות, והתגלגלו כדרכם והיו לצינת בין-ערביים מתקדרים, כשהכל והמוגמר (Yizhar 1966: 43). (The reference to the cactus does not appear in this place in the Hebrew original but later in the narrative.)

⁵⁴ The orange is a symbol of the Jewish settlement in Palestine-Israel, and the orchard is a recurrent symbol in Yizhar’s work representing innocence (Shoham 1974: 334). The word for orchard in Hebrew, *pardes*, comes from an ancient Persian word meaning fenced in, and has the same root and origins as the word for paradise. The word for orange in Hebrew *tapuz* is an acronym for golden apple, which originated in the biblical phrase ‘A word fitly spoken is like apples of gold in pictures of silver’ (Proverbs 25:11).

⁵⁵ דמויות צללים שנעו במפולש ויתכן שנחפזו, אלא שהפזונם נתבטל בפני גודל השטח, והיה כמן פרכוס חסר-ערך של תולעת

narrator notes that ‘the earth could not contain them, unless they managed to get beyond those hills, beyond the horizon’ (34).⁵⁶ The land cannot contain the escaping villagers, and paradoxically they have to vanish off the face of this earth if they wish to survive. Like the creature in *Frankenstein*, the refugees are driven beyond the horizon, out of sight. Both Wollstonecraft Shelley and Yizhar’s narratives reveal the Other as rejected, and both texts offer a troubling sense of spatial awareness, a lack of comfort and stability inherent to the place.

The notion of land as inhospitable is likewise explored in Agnon’s ‘Ad Hennah’ (‘Thus Far’). The novella is a bewildering and even dizzying narrative of constant dislocation and homelessness. In his search for a home the narrator emigrates from Germany to Palestine-Israel, then travels from Palestine-Israel to Berlin, and after several detours in Germany, he returns to Palestine-Israel.

The novel is set upon the backdrop of the First World War, and depicts desolation and lack.⁵⁷ When the narrator returns to Germany he finds that he yearns for the warmth of the Mediterranean sun (*AH*: 6), but nature offers him no solace. As in the other texts examined here, the sun functions metaphorically. Yet whereas in Bialik it symbolised divine indifference, here it is a benign reminder of the Holy Land. In his many wanderings in Germany, the narrator arrives at his aunt’s house in Germany. Though he does not wish to impose upon her hospitality, she insists upon giving him a piece of goose liver as a present. This is a generous gift in times of war, and not wishing to offend her, the narrator takes the gift, even though he is, in fact, a vegetarian. Rena Lee explores Agnon’s vegetarianism, arguing it is set in relation to his engagement with the Jewish tradition and its culinary customs that prohibits consumption of non-Kosher meat, as well as the mixture of dairy and meat food (1993: 80). Agnon himself developed his vegetarianism over the

⁵⁶ והארץ אינה מכילה אותן, אלא אם כן יצליחו להגיע מעבר לגבעות האלה, מעבר לאופק הזה

⁵⁷ According to Nitza Ben-Dov, Agnon refers to the First World War while in fact he condemns the conduct of European Jew after the First World War and during the Second World War and the Holocaust (1991/2: 315-6).

years, and explored it in his work, and Naama Harel suggests his vegetarianism is also a form of resistance to the war (1993: Animal Rights Association). As the narrator goes along with the piece of goose liver he is soiled by the blood that drips from it, and notes that, though seeded with flowers, in the whole place there is not one green leaf that he might use to clean himself. Nature does not assist the narrator in the removal of the bloody stains. Like the blood-drenched soil in *Dracula*, and the blood-stained landscape in 'Be'ir Ha'harega', here too the land seems to drink the blood, almost like a vampire. Also, like in these texts the particular bloodiness of landscape symbolises national Otherness.

Throughout 'Ad Hennah', nature appears to be either hostile or indifferent to man's woes. In addition to the natural scenery, the urban setting is likewise hostile. Agnon uses the Berlin trees to signify the war, as well as man's puny artificial sense of sovereignty vs. God's immense all-encompassing sovereignty. The narrator notes that the dust-covered trees were planted by man, and war is man-made as well, adding 'man makes war, proliferating sorrow and grief, the tree of the field assists him and collaborates with him' (6).⁵⁸ The sentence offers several allusions that blend to create a new meaning which rests on previously established concepts and idioms. One allusion is to the 'tree of the field', referring to Deuteronomy 20:19, in which man is commanded to refrain from cutting the trees of the field during a siege in order to use them as rams, because the tree is a source of nurture. The phrase in the Hebrew literally states that 'man is the tree of the field', offering a rich metaphor of man as tree. Man is like a tree in the sense that he or she relies upon roots for nourishment; the tree requires sustenance and man needs knowledge and ideology. Agnon inverts the ancient metaphor to create a new twofold metaphor, as the trees create more sorrows for man by obstructing the warm sunshine with their dust laden branches, and simultaneously comfort man in his woes, as they offer some natural consolation in the grey city. While in the ancient myth the tree was used as an instrument

⁵⁸ עושה אדם מלחמה ומרבה צער ויסורים עץ השדה מסייעו ומשתתף עמו

of war, in Agnon's narrative the tree is a reminder of the war. By reminding the man of the war the tree brings sorrow; however, the tree is also a reminder of life and rejuvenation and comforts the person, who might yearn for better days in the future.

Moreover, the metaphor of the tree for man is a fascinating contradiction to the narrator's restless dislocated entity. The narrator is the Wandering Jew, constantly seeking the home that would provide him with both physical and spiritual nourishment, yet he longs to be a tree. The tragedy of the narrator is that he is fighting against a profound aspect of his identity; unable to accept his *self* as the Wandering Jew, he yearns for roots in solid ground. As noted above, he acknowledges that he finds being in Berlin hard, but that travelling to another town is even more difficult (*AH*: 7). The narrative outlines and explores the Ashkenazi Diaspora Jews' problematic connection to the land, and their inherent displacement.

The connection to the land, its ownership and possession, as well as its effect upon the (re)construction of individual and collective identities, are prominent themes in many of Agnon's works (Fisch 1970: 50; Halevi-Zwick 1989: 165; Aberbach 1994: 46). Yet Agnon was not the only Jewish author who tried to explore these issues. Though less familiar outside Israel, Berkowitz is one of Israel's well-known authors who engages with these themes. One of the narratives Berkowitz produced in the Diaspora is 'Mishael'. The young man in Berkowitz's eponymous story is rejected from his own village in the Ashkenazi Diaspora because of his socially unacceptable conduct. In fact, he is rejected because he has a strong connection to the local land of the Ashkenazi Diaspora.

The story begins with the location of Mishael in the streets of the town, alongside the brats, who might be Jewish or gentile: 'When you enter a street in a town in the summer, immediately you encounter this lad, who meddles all his days with a gang of barefoot little *sheygetz*,⁵⁹ chasing with them a flock of pigeons, flying and dipping in the clear quiet skies'

⁵⁹ The term 'sheygetz' can mean either naughty or gentile boys.

(25).⁶⁰ Mishael is an outsider, literally located outside, which implies he is also out of the Jewish male norm. The proper, or socially acceptable, location for a young Jewish man is indoors, inside the area of scholarly study of the Talmud. 'Indoors is the place of the (Jewish) male, while outdoors symbolises the world of gentiles with its threats and practices' (Boyarin 1997: 63). The very presence outdoors is, for a Jew, dangerous. It is as if by venturing outside he is already in the process of straying away from the Jewish tradition. Like in Agnon's 'Ha'adonit ve'Harochel' nature poses a threat to his very identity.

Mishael's character embodies the Other who outlines the boundaries of the socially accepted in the Ashkenazi Jewish Diaspora. Moreover, Mishael's liminal location symbolises the social location of the Jew in the Ashkenazi Diaspora. Following Mishael in the various locations he inhabits reveals his social location in the community. Mishael functions as delineator of the socially acceptable even as he participates in certain aspects of the communal activities. Thus, unlike Frankenstein's rejected creature, Mishael is marginalised yet kept on the very border of the society.

As noted above, Mishael is most comfortable in the forest. During the Hoshana Rabbah holiday, when he and his gang venture into the forest to get the willows for the rest of the town folk, Mishael has a brief moment of glory.⁶¹

The next morning, while blurry autumn clouds grey over the town and cold slight drizzly rain trickles and wets the soil, the gang arm themselves with knives and ropes and head for the forest, led by their leader Mishael [...] they trod barefoot in the mud, traversing reaped fields and empty vegetable gardens,

כשאתה נכנס בקיץ לרחובה של עיר, מיד אתה נתקל בבחור זה, המתעסק כל ימיו עם כנופיה של שקצים יחפים, מפריה עמם באוויר סיעה של יונים, המרחפות וטובלות ברחבי השמים השוקטים והבהירים

⁶¹ The Hoshana Rabbah, which literally means 'save us our lord', is a celebration of the Torah. The holiday is celebrated on the seventh (and last) day of the Sukkot holiday, which marks the Egyptian exodus. The custom is to circle with the scrolls in the synagogue, sound the shofar, and pray for salvation while holding the four species (hadas, arava, lulav and etrog). According to tradition, this is the very last chance a person has to redeem himself, and enter the divine book.

joyous in their run, like war-heroes rushing to battle [...] immediately they grovel in front of him, accept his command and appear as true lovers [...] the hoshana business is Mishael's every year, like some sort of hold, like a monopoly, forbidden to others' pleasure, and any stranger that approaches – shall be beaten to death. Oh beware any man from the outside who will dare in his audacity to enter the woods during the Succoth holidays with a knife in his hand!⁶²

(M: 28)

The Hoshana Rabbah holiday is the one occasion that reintroduces Mishael into society. Paradoxically, it is through Mishael's connection with the forest that he has a social role. Though he remains outdoors, during this holiday Mishael is allotted a place in the communal sphere, because he is the person who ventures into the forest to harvest the *hoshanot* for the prayers.⁶³ Like for Frankenstein's creature, the forest is a safe place for Mishael, who is otherwise a social outcast. A comparison to *Frankenstein* reveals that whereas the creature is rejected because of its racial otherness, Mishael is excluded in spite of his racial similarity. Mishael outlines the margins of the Jewish community from within, and the creature delineates the boundaries of the English society from outside. Nevertheless, both are relegated to the forest, which is the location of the social outcast, and delineates – both literally and metaphorically – the boundaries of society. Also, as noted above, Jane and Mishael are depicted in the wood and moor, and for both it is a passage into society. Yet whereas Jane will eventually be accepted, Mishael remains rejected.

⁶² למחרת בבקר, עת ענני-סתיו מטושטשים מאפירים על העיירה וגשם דק וקר רועף ומרטיב את האדמה, מזדיינים בני-החבורה בסכינים ובחבלים ויוצאים אל היער אחרי מפקדם מישאל [...] בוססים הם ברגליים יחפות בטיט-הוצות, עוברים שדות קצורים וגני-ירק מרוקנים, ששים במרוצתם, כגיבורי-חיל הרצים לקרב [...] מיד מתרפסים לפניו, מקבלים מרותו ונראים לו כאוהבים נאמנים [...] עסק ההושענות קבוע מדי שנה בשנה בידי מישאל כמין חזקה, כמין מונפול, האסור לאחרים בהנאה, וכל הזר הקרב – יוכה מכות-רצח. אוי לו לאדם מן החוץ, שירהיב עוזו בנפשו להיכנס ליער בחול-המועד של סוכות וסכין בידו!

⁶³ The *hoshanot* are willow branches that function as the symbolic offerings for the holiday.

In conclusion, the examination of the scenery in all these texts in Hebrew and English reveals similarities in the use of the setting. The setting function as means to explore and express inner social concerns, such as class and social position, as well as issues of sovereignty.

Furthermore, the comparison reveals a shared fear of nature. In all these narratives Nature offers great allure and potential harm. From the sublime landscape in *Frankenstein* and *Dracula*, via the despair of the moor in *Jane Eyre* and the horrific garden in *Rebecca*, the texts in English all depict Nature as a source of great dread. Likewise, in the texts in Hebrew Nature is depicted as horrific, blood-thirsty, inhospitable, and disconcerting. From the fears of straying away from the Jewish tradition explored through a spatial metaphor in 'Ha'adonit ve'Harochel' and 'Mishael', through the vampiric soil in 'Ad Hennah', to the barren land in *Khirbet Khizeh* and desolate desert in 'Be'ir ha'Harega'. Nature is portrayed as unsettling, spatially and conceptually. Whereas the examination of the texts in English suggests Nature's sublime essence is terrifying because it invokes fears that might limit the ability to reason at large, the texts in Hebrew consider Nature just as horrific, only here it is due to the danger of straying from Jewish tradition. Nonetheless, there is a greater similarity than difference, as both literatures fear the allegedly harmful effects of Nature upon cognition and identities. Nature is juxtaposed with culture, and functions as a spatial metaphor for the Other on a philosophical level. The fears expressed and explored in all the texts reveal that the land is not perceived and depicted as a source of comfort, but instead as hostile and even monstrous.

2.4 Indoor Dread

As outlined in the previous two chapters, one of the most prominent connections between nineteenth to mid-twentieth century English and Hebrew literature is the preoccupation with questions of identity in relation to land. Questions of the fluctuating definitions of individual and collective identities in relation to notions of the (home)land were explored in both literatures. The search for a home functions in the literatures of this era both as a metaphor for the personal search for identity, and as a larger metaphor for the communal search for national identity. The unease regarding the boundaries and essence of the homeland is portrayed by a sense of homelessness and dreadful homes.

The home, one might suggest, should offer one of the primary sheltered environments for the (re)construction of identities. The home is the place that one might associate with safety and comfort, the known and familiar, the *Heimlich*. Yet as Sigmund Freud's famous essay 'Das Unheimliche' (The Uncanny) (1919) revealed, the very notion of the secure, the known and familiar, harbours the possibility of the unknown and unfamiliar, and the unknown is frightening (220). Freud opened the door to a plethora of psychoanalytical analyses of Gothic literature, in which the various locations were read as metaphors for the characters' psychological state (Kilgour 1995: 108; Wright 2007: 97). While acknowledging the validity and importance of reading the home as a representation of an inner world, the following analysis attempts to retrieve the symbolic function of the home as, indeed, a home. The reason for this manoeuvre is to show that the homes in the texts examined here offer unstable and even hostile points of departure. The following readings reveal a systematic subversion of the notion of the home as stable and nurturing. The portrayals of the tangible homes in the texts are utilised as metaphors for the lack of a spiritually stable home. These individual precarious homes, one might argue, reflect a collective insecurity regarding the national identities of the British and Jewish-Israeli

nations. Consequently, we find that almost all the characters in the texts under examination here are in one way or another homeless.

From Frankenstein's creature in Wollstonecraft Shelley's famous Gothic novel that shares the pains of rejection with Brontës' Jane Eyre, Berkowitz's Mishael, and the narrator in *Rebecca*, to Stoker's infamous vampire that wishes to settle in London, and the peddler in Agnon's 'Ha'adonit veHarochel' ('The Lady and the Peddler'), and indeed most of Agnon's characters, like the narrator in 'Ad Henna' ('Thus Far'), and the old man in 'Avi Hashor' ('The Ox's Father'), or 'Tehila', and even the bewildered soldiers in Yizhar's *Khirbet Khizeh*, these characters are all searching for a home. The home is not just a place; rather, it is a sense of belonging. The home is 'both the tangible "exterior" and the psychic "interior"' (Tzami 2006:194), that is, the home operates in these texts both as concrete and symbolic. Issues of identity are explored in the texts through the relocation and dislocation of the characters in relation to the home. The texts all utilise the concept of the home in order to explore, support, or subvert social norms. All the characters are homeless in one way or another. Though they inhabit diverse spaces, because of their Otherness they are all located on the margins of society and exhibit similar tropes of restlessness.

One of the prominent British narratives of a homeless character is Wollstonecraft Shelley's *Frankenstein*. The creature is the quintessential modern rejected monstrous Other. As noted above, the novel outlines the wanderings of the creature across Europe, from the Swiss Alps to England, searching for his identity and a home. Whereas Frankenstein left a happy home in a lovely setting (*F*: 20), the creature's beginning is a horrible rejection from a gloomy laboratory. Frankenstein works on his creation in a cell-like laboratory, marginalising both himself and the creature. The location and description of the laboratory, 'in a solitary chamber, or rather cell, at the top of the house, and separated from all the other apartments by a gallery and staircase' (*F*: 52), places both Frankenstein and the creature outside the socially acceptable. By locating Frankenstein in these liminal

spaces, the text reinforces spatially his moral and social transgression, suggesting he is operating outside the socially acceptable both figuratively and literally. The role the creature plays as the monstrous Other in every respect – socially and psychologically – is evident through its location.

As noted in the previous chapter, after its escape (or banishment) from the laboratory, the creature enters the forest. The forest, which represents the unsocial and uncivilised, is the natural home for the monster. However, since the creature, though monstrous, is in many ways human, it yearns for communal comfort and leaves the forest seeking society. As it emerges from the forest, the creature is battered and expelled by the villagers. It finds refuge in the hovel adjoining the De Lacey's cottage, where its existence is even more marginalised as the unacknowledged servant of the poor social outcasts. The De Lacey's were deprived of their civil rights, land, and possessions; they are refugees, and the creature is thus socially located beneath them, not even permitted to share their communal familial comfort. The creature, nevertheless, perceives 'his' hovel as 'indeed a paradise compared to the bleak forest, his former residence, the rain-dropping branches, and dank earth' (*F*: 102). Rather than feel completely desolate, the creature prefers to be located below the lowest of all within the social structure: it relinquishes its freedom and true connection to the land for a socially constructed, limited and deprived, connection to society and dubious ownership of a place of its own. The narrative thus depicts the creature banished from the laboratory into the forest, then to a hovel adjoining the De Lacey's cottage, and eventually to the North Pole. The creature is forever homeless, and its final location is one of the most hostile places on earth, and what was considered the end of the known world. The North Pole, the ice-bound desert is the only home for the ultimate monstrous Other.

In comparison to the narrative of the creature, which explores the dwelling places of the racial other, *Jane Eyre* examines the issue of the other within the British community.

Charlotte Brontë's novel explores the trials and tribulations of the rejected orphan, engaging with the issue of the marginal homeless entity through numerous dislocations and relocations of the heroine. Furthermore, throughout the narrative, Jane is relegated to the margins of society within each home she inhabits. First at her aunt's house, Gateshead, where she is not permitted to partake in the life of her adopting family. Then at the Lowood Orphan Asylum, where she becomes a Foucauldian spectacle of the unwanted mischievous child. Later as a governess at Rochester's estate, Thornfield, Jane is not a full participant of the adult community. After they are married, Mr Rochester and Jane do not reside in Thornfield Hall, but are relegated to Ferndean Manor House. Jane is continually confronted with inhospitable homes, and her marginal social position is reflected in spatial metaphors.

Jane's marginality is established from the very beginning through a spatial metaphor. While her aunt and cousins are enjoying Victorian domestic bliss in the parlour, Jane is relegated to the adjoining room, where she takes a book and sits on the window ledge (*JE*: 5-7). As Spivak notes, by sitting cross legged on the window sill behind the curtain, 'Jane breaks the rules of the appropriate topography of withdrawal' (1985: 246). She withdraws even further into the text, and this specific location within the adjoining room is a refusal to conform to Victorian social norms even as Jane wishes to be socially accepted.

Following this initial rejection and alienation, Jane is further rejected by her aunt as, after she reacts violently to her cousin's verbal and physical abuse, she is taken kicking and screaming to the red room (*JE*: 9).⁶⁴ In this gloomy location Jane undergoes her formative mirror-stage, in which she establishes her identity as the rejected Other (*JE*: 11-14). As Jane glances into the mirror and perceives her images as an Other – like the elves from Bessie's children's tales – her malfunctioning mirror stage not only establishes her

⁶⁴ Jane will later find herself in another abusive relationship with Mr Rochester, possibly as a result of these initial abusive dysfunctional relationships during her formative years.

as an Other, but also undermines her spatial awareness. As Foucault explains, '[t]he mirror is, after all, a utopia, since it is a placeless place [...] But it is also a heterotopia in so far as the mirror does exist in reality, where it exerts a sort of counteraction on the position that I occupy' (1967/1984: 4). Jane constructs her identity as an Other in an Other space. The red room functions as a paradigm for the novel at large, as it establishes 'Jane's anomalous orphaned position in society, her enclosure in stultifying roles and houses, and her attempts to escape through flight, starvation, and [...] madness' (Gilbert and Gubar 1979: 341). The red room both forms and reflects Jane's identity.

Jane is then rejected again when she is expelled from Gateshead to the Lowood orphanage. The orphanage is a dreary place and Jane, who is not permitted to go anywhere and is not welcome at Gateshead, not even for the vacations, is a prisoner in Lowood. It is located on the outskirts of the community and is, of course, surrounded by a tall wall obscuring the view so that the horror inside cannot be seen from the outside, nor can the inmates see the world outside. Upon her arrival Jane sees the place in all its gloom. She describes the place thus:

I looked round the convent-like garden, and then up at the house – a large building, half of which seemed grey and old, the other half quite new. The new part, containing the schoolroom and dormitory, was lit by mullioned and latticed windows, which gave it a church-like aspect; a stone tablet over the door bore this inscription: – “Lowood Institution. – This portion was rebuilt A.D. –, by Naomi Brocklehurst, of Brocklehurst Hall, in this county.” “Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.” – St. Matt. v. 16. I read these words over and over again: I felt that an explanation belonged to them, and was unable fully to

penetrate their import. I was still pondering the signification of “Institution”.

(*JE*: 41)

The ‘convent-like garden’ and the ‘church-like aspect’ of the place reveal something of its reclusive nature, and while nuns and priests might choose to remove themselves from the community in order to concentrate on their relationship with god rather than with people, the children in Lowood are denied any choice. The house itself, ‘a large building, half of which seemed grey and old, the other half quite new’, is a classical Gothic edifice as it combines the old and the new, becoming in a sense like a monstrous hybrid, and the effect is an overall sense of dread.

Though Jane does not yet comprehend the meaning of the word “Institution”, the reader has a full understanding of her location – both physical and social – as the rejected orphan. The Other is locked up and removed from the rest of the community. The orphanage is a kind of Foucauldian ‘heterotopia of crisis’, a place where ‘all the other real sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted’ (1967/1984: 3). Furthermore, inside Lowood the pupils’ physical location reflects their internal social status. On the first day, Jane sees Helen Burns ‘dismissed in disgrace by Miss Scatcherd from a history class, and sent to stand in the middle of the large schoolroom’ (*JE*: 43). On the second day, Jane notes that Helen is moved down the class as a result of ‘some error of pronunciation, or some inattention to stops’ (*JE*: 44). The children’s location is determined by their academic achievements, and they are physically demoted when they fail academically. On the day of Mr Brocklehurst’s visit to Lowood, after her slate slides from her hand and breaks, Jane is placed upon a stool in front of all the school to be observed as a wicked child (*JE*: 55-6). She is the subject of a Foucauldian spectacle that presents her as a monster, which demonstrates her allegedly evil nature. Paradoxically, while Jane is moved from the margins to the centre, this transposition

renders her more marginal, as she is presented for all to witness how her criminal essence makes her a monster. Not only is Lowood Orphanage a horrid institution and monstrous edifice, it creates monsters by inscribing monstrosity into the identities of the orphans.

Jane eventually leaves Lowood to become the governess at Thornfield Hall. As noted by Gilbert and Gubar, the gloomy mansion is not ‘just another gothic trapping introduced by Charlotte Brontë to make her novel saleable’ (1979: 347); rather, ‘it is the house of Jane’s life, its floors and walls the architecture of her experience’ (347). It is a central episode because ‘in it Jane comes to womanhood’ (Rich 2001: 475). As Adrienne Rich notes, ‘Charlotte Brontë gives us an extremely detailed and poetically convincing vision of Thornfield’ (1979: 475), all which climaxes in a feminist manifesto (475). While Rich disregards the tour of the mansion, suggesting it is all unimportant, I would propose that it is, in fact, crucial for the understanding of some basic themes the novel explores. While the feminist manifesto is important, the setting is also significant, as the novel utilises the mansion and other locations in order to explore and embody psychological concepts as well as social issues. Thornfield, with its luxury and isolation is a metonymy for Rochester, whose character symbolises the upper classes; the mansion along with the mad woman in the attic are the remainder and reminder of the imperialist endeavour and its harmful results. The mansion is in many ways indicative of its master. The contrast between Jane, the poor orphan, and the landed aristocrat is echoed in the settings. The feminist manifesto in the novel is built, literally and metaphorically, upon the failure of imperialism. This is, in fact, a reflection of reality, as the feminist movement emerged and was likewise built upon abolitionist ideas of freedom and universal human rights.⁶⁵

Inside Thornfield Hall, during the parlour encounters with Rochester and other guests, Jane’s affection for the window seat as her domain resurfaces. She locates herself by the window, ‘taking care to stand on one side, so that, screened by the curtain, [she]

⁶⁵ As noted above, the British Parliament issued the Slavery Abolition Act in 1833, and though the Suffragette movement was active in the 1880s, only in 1918 did women get the right to vote in the UK.

could see without being seen' (*JE*: 141). In addition to the dishonest aspect of Jane's hiding, upon which Lisa Sternlieb focuses (1999: 464), Jane finds comfort and strength in the hidden seclusion. Because she is not the sovereign of the mansion and because this is not her home, Jane feels like a thief and gains a sense of empowerment from looking without being observed. The gaze is a form of conquest and subordination, and Jane is empowered by her quasi illicit gaze.

In order to establish her identity, Jane embarks upon a journey that takes her away from Thornfield Hall, via the moor to Moor House and a cottage at Morton only to return one day to the wrecks of the mansion. In these other homes Jane received some tender care, which provides her with a fuller comprehension of herself, preparing her, perhaps, to confront the ruin. As Jane approaches the location of the mansion she looks 'with timorous joy towards a stately house' (*JE*: 361), yet sees 'a blackened ruin' (361). Interestingly, Jane perceives the loss as a sort of comfort:

No need to cower behind a gate-post, indeed! – to peep up at chamber lattices, fearing life was astir behind them! No need to listen for doors opening – to fancy steps on the pavement or the gravel-walk! The lawn, the grounds were trodden and waste: the portal yawned void. The front was, as I had once seen it in a dream, but a well-like wall, very high and very fragile-looking, perforated with paneless windows: no roof, no battlements, no chimneys – all had crashed in.

(*JE*: 362)

Jane no longer has to be the thief who has no right to be the sovereign of the mansion, and in a sense she is relieved. This 'well-like wall' is horrific in its 'silence of death' (362), but it nevertheless frees Jane. Paradoxically, the complete destruction of the house of which

she wished to become mistress is the only way she might have a home. The hostility of the ruin, its complete lack of homeliness is the signifier of the possibility of Jane's attainment of her real home. Like Frankenstein's creature, as the monstrous Other she is entitled to sovereignty over that which is inhospitable to humans.

Gilbert and Gubar's 1979 analysis of *Jane Eyre* as constant tension between enclosure (or imprisonment) and escape (or freedom), suggests that the novel offers the fairy-tale's happy ending (339). This happy ending, however, is fabricated, as she chooses to relinquish her freedom in order to save Rochester. Jane's final home is as Mrs Rochester at Ferndean manor house. Ferndean manor is 'a building of considerable antiquity, moderate size, and no architectural pretensions, deep buried in a wood' (*JE*: 366). It is in this secluded unpretentious house that the rejected couple may dwell. At this point Rochester is a deformed diminished man, monstrous in appearance and half blind, and he and Jane together make a home in this house which is appropriate for their monstrous Otherness. Ferndean is a socially isolated dreary place, and as Gilbert and Gubar note, one wonders if Jane's 'rebellious feminism' does not 'compromise itself in this withdrawal' (1979: 369). Gilbert and Gubar try to find answers to this problem in other texts (369) and suggest that Brontë could not conceive of 'a society so drastically altered that the matured Jane and Rochester could really live in it' (370). Gilbert and Gubar note the only way Brontë could depict a new society in which Jane and Rochester might live together is through the natural setting in Ferndean (370). This secluded natural environment, Gilbert and Gubar argue, where 'nature, [is] unleashed from social restriction [...] is the goal of Jane's pilgrimage' (1979: 370). Jane does not seek the Celestial City but a natural paradise (370). Rather than accept these problematic reconciliations, when one confronts the problem Brontë's ending presents, the answer is that *Jane Eyre* is, actually, not the feminist treaty Gilbert and Gubar proclaim it to be, but a dual narrative that offers a tentative feminist exploration that eventually succumbs to the doctrine of female subordination that

prevailed in 1847, its date of publication. The spatial compromise in the secluded Ferndean reflects contemporary social restriction.

As a rewrite of *Jane Eyre*, *Rebecca* follows many of its predecessor's trajectories. Like *Jane Eyre*, *Rebecca* also ends with the poor orphan protagonist and her wealthy husband relegated to an isolated, socially removed location. Like *Jane Eyre*, *Rebecca* is a narrative of constant dislocation. *Rebecca* follows the narrator from Monte Carlo, via her failure to become the mistress of Manderley, the South Eastern English estate, as Max de Winter's new wife, and finally to their shared self-imposed exile on an unidentified island. The narrator's identity is connected to the lack of land and, like Jane's, is created through the negation of her sovereignty of the mansion, making her final exilic condition an expression of her dislocated identity. While *Frankenstein* has been read as a critique of imperialism (Baldick 1987: 1; Bugg 2005: 656), *Rebecca*, like *Jane Eyre* offers another level of critique of the treatment of the Other within the British Isles. This critique, however, is explored within the Gothic tradition that utilises the setting in order to propel plot and examine social issues.

While physically in Manderley, as well as in her dreams, the narrator constantly wanders (*R*: 196). For example, after the ball, during which she committed a huge *faux pas* by dressing up as the late Mrs De Winter did in the previous ball, she wanders round the house, as if in a daze, looking for Maxim (*R*: 264). Throughout the novel the narrator is lost in her own home (*R*: 103). Additionally, while Thornfield in *Jane Eyre* is troubled by Bertha, Rochester's mad wife, Manderley is haunted by Maxim's dead wife, Rebecca. Her presence is evident in the decoration, the artefacts, and the architecture. The house rejects the narrator, and, in order to prevent the narrator from gaining sovereignty over the house, like Thornfield, meets an ashen end. The narrator is never at home; she is forever homeless.

By the same token, Berkowitz's Mishael is homeless. Though both his parents are still alive, Mishael is like an orphan as he is *persona non grata* in his parents' house.

Mishael's father, a teacher and respectable member of the community, cannot allow the boy, who has no scholastic abilities, to enter his home, as he is a disgrace and an embarrassment. He therefore chases Mishael away from his home with a rake every morning (*M*: 26). Like Frankenstein's creature, Mishael is abominable in his maker's eyes. The Jewish society rejects this troubled boy, even while it allots him a place on the very limits of the community. Whereas Jane is rejected by her extended family because she is an orphan, Mishael is violently rejected by his father.

As Mishael and his companions return victorious from the forest, loaded with heavy packs of moist willow branches upon their shoulders,⁶⁶ the people of the town look out of their homes' windows at the gang walking by (*M*: 29).⁶⁷ The town's people are viewed from the outside-in, and while they are warm and dry, secure inside their homes, Mishael and his gang are in the rain, labouring with the wet willows. An interesting comparison reveals that while Jane looks into the warm home of the happy dwellers of Moor House who are unaware of her by the window (*JE*: 283), and Frankenstein's creature is adjunct to the oblivious De Lacey's (*F*: 102), Mishael is depicted from the inside to the outside, and he is the one that is not aware of being observed. This suggests Mishael delineates the boundary from within the Jewish community, while both Jane and the creatures outline the outer borders. This means that the poor orphan is aligned with the racial Other, a threat to the community's stability.

For a short time Mishael will be permitted to knock on people's doors and offer the *hoshanot*, and the wealthy man in town will even converse with Mishael regarding the goods. Yet, Rabbi Heim-Sheaiya, the *gvir*,⁶⁸ does not invite Mishael to enter the house, for as the custom during the Sukkoth holiday requires that the Jews dwell in sheds, so that they

⁶⁶ The Hoshanot are the willow branches that function as the symbolic offerings for the Hoshana Rabbah holiday.

⁶⁷ עוד באותו יום נשקפים אנשי העיירה בעד חלונות-בתיהם הגשומים ורואים את מישאל ובני-לויתו חוזרים מן היער, כשהם עמוסים על שכמם חבילות כבודות של ערבי-נחל לחות

⁶⁸ *Gvir* is the rich man in town. The root of the word is similar to man, and it entails also valour and great abilities.

remember the Israelites as they travelled to the Holy Land from Egypt, Mishael finds the *gvir* in his decorated Sukkah. The Sukkah is the symbolic commemoration of the nomadic state of the Israelites during the Egyptian exodus, and it is in this unstable fleeting home that Mishael finds his chance to shine. The narrative of the Egyptian exodus serves as a reminder of the Jews' exilic condition in the Ashkenazi Diaspora. Mishael, like the rest of the Jews in the story, might have a home, but it is not a real home, because they lack sovereignty. Though in a subtle manner, the narrative encourages the immigration from the Ashkenazi Diaspora.

While Mishael is briefly permitted into the house, for the sake of the *hoshanot*, he is only allowed to enter the hall (*M*: 30). The hall, the narrative suggests, is not really the home, and the wicked child might be permitted to dwell temporarily in this liminal area. As noted above, the Jewish home in the Ashkenazi Diaspora was perceived as Jewish territory in that it was ideologically differentiated from the non-Jewish space outside (Boyarin 1997: 63; Miron 2000: xii). Since, as previously explained, Mishael's very Jewishness is questioned, his presence in the Jewish home might jeopardise the home's safety for Jews.

At the end of the story, while his parents are at the synagogue, Mishael and his friends invade his parents' home (*M*: 32). They have a party and get thoroughly intoxicated. The reader can surmise that if the gang is still there when the couple returns from the synagogue they will be chased away, back to the streets and the forest where they dwell. Mishael's brief existence in his home is a criminal act, and his being there through theft only spells out his rejection.

Already the comparison of the texts show a similar use of the home motif in order to explore social concerns and issues of sovereignty. Additionally, all the characters explored thus far are in one way or another homeless orphans. Jane Eyre and *Rebecca's* unnamed narrator are both orphans; and like Frankenstein's creature Mishael is rejected

by its maker. Furthermore, all these characters have a problematic relationship with the home. They are either haunted or expelled by the various homes they inhabit. The texts all, moreover, offer a social critique of the location of the monstrous Other.

Like all these monstrous Others, Count Dracula is searching for a home, as he intends to immigrate to London. Yet, whereas the creature in *Frankenstein* is forever homeless, Stoker's vampire has a stately castle, and has been sovereign for centuries. His castle, however, is a crumbling, ancient, menacing edifice, positioned on the very end of a precipice, and its walls are, as he attests himself, broken (*D*: 35). Dracula's castle is a metaphor for the vampire's decadent and decrepit essence. Like Frankenstein's creature, the vampire is monstrous in a Foucauldian sense, and his home, which is located upon the margins of society, reflects his role as the delineator of the boundaries of humanity. Count Dracula's castle is an extension of the vampire's identity.

Once Harker arrives at the castle, waking from the troubled sleep of the journey, he perceives the castle as being of 'considerable size and as several dark ways led from it under great round arches, it perhaps seemed bigger than it really is' (*D*: 24). The first impression is simultaneously of great size and uncertainty regarding its dimensions: the castle itself is monstrous. We later learn from Van Helsing that the vampire needs its 'earth-home, his coffin-home, his hell-home, the place unhallowed' (*D*: 287) in order to rejuvenate, and cannot rest elsewhere. This suggests a similarity between the Briton and the vampire, as in British tradition 'every man's house is his castle' (Coke 1826), and his safe place. Likewise, the vampire is safe in his (home)land. Both the Briton and the vampire are secure in their home and homeland. The binary opposition between the Other and the British subject is blurred. Like *Frankenstein* and *Jane Eyre*, *Dracula* is a critique of imperialism.

As Harker explores the castle, he finds that, while it might be located upon a sublime landscape, it is, nonetheless, his prison. Like Jane in Lowood, Harker is

constricted. As he wanders through the house, his hysteria resembles the unnamed narrator in *Rebecca*'s narrative: 'Doors, doors, doors everywhere, and all locked and bolted. In no place save from the windows in the castle walls is there an available exit. The castle is a veritable prison, and I am a prisoner!' (38). The proliferation of locked and bolted doors suggests a vision of the frantic Harker going from one room to another, helpless and pitiful in his attempt to find an open exit. Harker's room is befittingly like a prison cell. Though the room in which he is to have many sleepless nights is 'a great bedroom well lighted and warmed' (*D*: 27), it has no windows and is essentially his jail cell. Harker acknowledges that the artefacts in the room 'must have been of fabulous value when they were made, for they are centuries old, though in excellent order' (*D*: 30). The evident wealth reminds him of what he has seen at Hampton Court, but he adds the caveat that they 'were worn and frayed and moth-eaten' (30). The idea of old wealth burdened with corruption is depicted through the setting. The decay of artefacts is indicative of the corruption of the aristocracy. The vampire's home is the location of decay and fear. In the same manner that Thornfield Hall was in many ways a representation of Rochester, Dracula's castle is indicative of the vampire's decay and decadence. One might argue that whereas in *Jane Eyre* the mansion illustrates the degenerative effect of imperialism upon the British, in *Dracula* the crumbling castle represents the destruction of the colonised Other. In both texts, however, the wrecked home is symbolic of the problems inherent to colonialism and sovereignty.

When Harker goes into what he believes to be the Count's room he finds the room empty, 'barely furnished with odd things, which seemed to have never been used' (*D*: 62). The only thing Harker finds is 'a great heap of gold in one corner, gold of all kinds, Roman, and British, and Austrian, and Hungarian, and Greek and Turkish money, covered with a film of dust, as though it had lain long in the ground' (*D*: 62). The lack of furniture serves to further dehumanise the Count, and the existence of gold instead of furnishings suggests the Count exchanges his humanity for wealth.

As Harker descends to the vaults, he finds the Count in one of the coffins that eventually will be shipped to England (*D*: 65). Harker discovers the secret: in order to rejuvenate Dracula has to sleep during the day in the land of his ancestors. For this reason, when the Count migrates to England he takes his land with him. The Count arranges for fifty boxes of the soil from his castle to be shipped to England, so that he will maintain his might and sovereignty. Whereas Frankenstein's creature never has a home, the vampire takes his home wherever he goes. The vampire's home is his grave; like the dead, the un-dead rest and find solace in the tomb.

The home which is a tomb is the setting for 'In the Town of Slaughter' by Hayyim Nahman Bialik (1904). The speaker in the epic poem, however, revisits a distinctly different ancestral tomb. Whereas for the vampire the tomb is a resting place, for the reader of 'Be'ir Ha'harega' the location of death leads to a call for action. Furthermore, while *Dracula* is a critique of imperialism, Bialik's epic was instrumental as an enticement to colonise Palestine-Israel (Gluzman 2005: 68). The horrors of the Kishinev pogrom lead the *yishuv* to the conclusion that action must be taken in order to bring about the mass exodus from the Ashkenazi Diaspora.

The reader of 'Be'ir Ha'harega' is led through the horrors of the pogrom, and the poem is organised 'according to a series of physical sites through which the poet is moved – the attics, the cellars, the stables, the cemetery, the synagogues, and so on' (Mintz 1982: 291). As Alan Mintz notes, '[i]n each unit the poet is instructed to inspect the traces of the pogrom and imagine its reality; he is encouraged to allow this imagining to fill him with wrath and fury, but he is enjoined from giving vent to these feelings and is instead moved to the next site' (1982: 291). The poem offers neither an emotional nor intellectual reconciliation with the dread; on the contrary, there is in Bialik's poem a ruthless insistence upon the reader seeing the various horrors. It travels through the wreckage of the city, via various locations:

Pass over the shattered hearth, attain the broken wall
 Whose burnt and barren brick, whose charred stones reveal
 The open mouths of such wounds, that no mending
 Shall ever mend, nor healing ever heal.⁶⁹
 (BH: 370)

The epic leads the reader to the deathly grounds of the Kishinev pogrom, demanding an intimate inspection of the horror. The text provides an elaborate inventory of the different places of ruin from the shattered hearth to the burnt and barren brick. The hearth is associated with the home, the heart of the household and the place where the family usually congregates for daily meals, special occasions, and the exchange of thoughts and feelings. The hearth here is shattered, as are the family and congregation. The kitchen, the place that would normally supply nourishment, heat, and warmth – both figuratively and literally – is barren. Instead of the mouths of the family members being full of nourishment the text offers the open mouth of the hearth as metaphor of the open wounds that cannot be healed.

Dov Landau and Ariel Hirshfeld note the cognitive dissonance between the serenity of the objects and edifices and the horror (2002: 158; 2011: 273). One could also perceive the personification of the stones and the attribution of the wounds to the walls as a metaphor for the victims' unappeasable wounds and the acquired callousness required for the survival of the ones who beheld the horror. Moreover, the wounded stone that was a silent witness to the atrocities functions as a metaphor for all who were there: the victims, the villains, and the survivors. The atrocities are engraved upon the stone and cannot be

⁶⁹ וְעִבְרַת עַל-הַכְּתוּלִים הַנְּקוּבִים וְעַל הַתַּנּוּרִים הַנִּתְצִיִּים
 בַּמָּקוֹם הַעֲמִיק קִרְקַר הַמַּפְזֵז, הַרְחִיב הַגְּדִיל הַחֹרִים
 מִחֲשׂוֹף הָאֶבֶן הַשְּׁתֻרָה וְעֹרוֹת הַלְּבָנָה הַשְּׁרוּפָה
 וְהֵם נִרְאִים כְּפִיּוֹת פְּתוּחִים שֶׁל-פְּצָעִים אֲנוּשִׁים וְשֹׁחֲרִים
 אֲשֶׁר אֵין לָהֶם תַּקְנָה עוֹד וְלֹא-תִהְיֶה לָהֶם תְּרוּפָה

erased just like they are forever inscribed in the minds of all who witnessed the horror. The setting is not only the place where the atrocity occurred, but also the embodiment of the people who experience it, and cannot detach their soul from the horror.

Bialik's narrative continues, relentlessly, to haul the reader through the various locations: from the yards to the sewers, and from the attics to the basements.

Unto the attic mount, upon thy feet and hands;

Behold the shadow of death among the shadows stands.

There in the dismal corner, there in the shadowy nook,

Multitudinous eyes will look

Upon thee from the sombre silence.⁷⁰

(*BH*: 371)

The exhaustive tour of horror suggests the scope of the devastation. The insistence on describing one location after the other illustrates the relentlessness of the perpetrators, who went on and on from one place to the next. The ghostly existence of the dead clings to the place, functioning as reminder and accusation the reader has to understand and cannot avoid. The silent eyes of the dead stare at the reader demanding without words an acknowledgement of the horror. The portrayal is Gothic and evocative, and the reader is gripped with a fear entangled with a sense of pleasure from the exquisite poetic effect. Bialik utilises Gothic techniques in order to unnerve the reader into a reconsideration of the Jewish condition.

The Jews maintained ambivalent feelings towards the exilic life, as on the one hand for centuries they idealised the Promised Land, and on the other the home they made in the

– ואֵל עֲלֵי־יָדַי הַגָּזוֹת תִּטְפֹּס וְנִצְבֹּתָ שָׁם בְּעֵלְטָה⁷⁰
עוֹד אֵימַת מֵרַח הַמָּוֶת בְּמִאֲפֵל הַדּוֹמָם שְׁטָה
וּמִכָּל-הַחוֹרִים הַעֲמוּמִים וּמִתּוֹךְ צִלְלֵי הַתְּנִיּוֹת
עֵינַיִם, רְאֵה, עֵינַיִם דּוֹמָם אֲלֵיךְ צוֹפִיּוֹת

host countries of the Ashkenazi diaspora had, indeed, become their home (Miron 2000: xii). These feelings were still very much occupying the minds of the poets and writers in Palestine, even long after the pogroms had been replaced by new horrors that were sweeping Europe. The European home, though shattered and inhospitable, was nonetheless still perceived nostalgically as home by many Jews, and the relationship with the new (home)land in Palestine-Israel was not yet established.

One of the most famous authors to examine these issues is Y. S Agnon. Agnon's personal narrative was in many ways a reflection of the national narrative of the Jewish nation (Shaked 1989: 6-7). As noted in the introduction, referring to *Sipur Pashut* (1935), Ruhama Elbag suggests that like in many of his novels, the spatial design reflects Agnon's ambivalent attitude towards his hometown and the process of his separation from it (2002: 178). This ambivalence is a recurring motif in his narratives and particularly of the texts examined here. As Sidra Ezrahi DeKoven notes, "[p]robably the purest representation of "return" and repossession in contemporary Hebrew literature – the one that comes closest to a perfect fit between places "Large" and "small" – can be found in the writings of S. Y. Agnon' (2000: 19).⁷¹ Agnon's work is a reflection of the tensions between the personal and collective within the processes of reconfiguration. His work illustrates even as it explores the intricacies of spatial dislocation that undermines the stability of identities.

In many of his works Agnon tries to negotiate the conflicts between the longing for the old home in the Ashkenazi Diaspora and the difficulties in the new home in Palestine-Israel. In works such as *Oreah natah lalun (A Guest for the Night)* (1939), and 'Ad Hennah' Agnon attempts to reconcile some of the tensions. Both narratives are set upon the backdrop of the First World War, and are an exploration of the Jews' relationship to home in the Ashkenazi Diaspora and in Palestine-Israel. Both outline the narrator's move from Palestine-Israel to the Ashkenazi Diaspora, and then back to Palestine-Israel. While critics

⁷¹ Ezrahi refers here to Aran and Gurevitch's articulation of "Place" and "place" (1992: 25), which is explored in the Introduction.

have examined the linguistic and autobiographical aspects of *Oreah natah lalun* (Golomb Hoffman 1991: 77), or the socio-economic aspects in 'Ad Hennah' (Fuchs 1982/1983: 126), and Zilla Jane Goodman argues that the narrator's homelessness is the result of feminine influence (1988: 90-4), the following analysis focuses on the spatial aspects and their importance in the exploration of the theme of home.

Like in Bialik's text, the setting is utilised as in the Gothic genre to propel plot and consider themes. The narrator is constantly relocated until eventually he realises he must return to Palestine. As elucidated earlier, while the texts in English offer a critique of imperialism, Agnon endorses the settlement in Palestine-Israel. Nitza Ben-Dov suggests the narrator's dwelling place is the most important aspect of the text and deserves examination both because of the multitude of words used to describe it and because of the author's choice to commence with that matter (1991/2: 301). The issue of dwellings soon unfolds as a principal, mental and destiny-related matter in the text (302). All the threads of the plot are entangled in the issue of dwellings, and the narrator's search for a home (302). The narrator's longing for a home is the kernel of the story. Yet even while he yearns for a home, he cannot find his peace indoors.

The unnamed narrator in 'Ad Hennah' is an exilic, constantly displaced figure. The narrator says he finds being in Berlin hard, but that travelling to another town is even more difficult (*AH*: 7). The crux of the narrator's dilemma is his intrinsic displacement. His soul yearns for another place and he cannot find a home where he is; however, he cannot find a home elsewhere either. In Berlin, the narrator finds himself confined to his room, which he describes as dark, damp, deprived of both air and light, and filled with dust (*AH*: 7). The narrator's home is inhospitable.

Throughout the narrative, the narrator in 'Ad Hennah' is tormented by such inhospitable monstrous rooms. For example, in his many wanderings in Berlin, the narrator dwells for a while in a room which he describes as long and narrow, and which 'resembles

the bowels of a wild beast that if it does not already exist ought to have come into existence by the shape of the room' (*AH*: 105).⁷² The narrator feels as if he is being digested by this monstrous room, implying that instead of being a place for repose and reconstruction, the room is the location of decomposition. The narrator perceives his room as the monstrous manifestation of his lack of agency. His lack of sovereignty is monstrous. Like in Bialik's epic poem, the lack of a home in a sovereign nation-state is dangerous.

This danger of the non-Jewish home is explored in another of Agnon's narratives. In Agnon's 'Ha'adonit veHarochel' ('The Lady and the Peddler'), the non-Jewish home is the locus of threat both spiritually and physically. Like 'Ad Hennah', here too we find a text that can be read as an enticement to immigrate to Palestine-Israel. As noted above, the narrative depicts the dangers in straying away from the Jewish tradition by utilising a spatial metaphor. The peddler is literally lost in the forest, suggesting he is wandering away from Judaism. Within this metaphorical system, the lady's house functions as a paradigmatic non-Jewish home.

The lady's abode is depicted as distinctly non-Jewish first and foremost by the fact of the lady's non-Jewishness. The home in Judaism is aligned with the woman, or wife. As Nitza Ben-Dov points out, Freud expanded upon the symbolism of the house and the room, suggesting the room symbolises woman; Ben-Dov adds that, regardless of Freud's analysis, the house as symbolic of woman is an ancient figure in Jewish literature (1992: 307). In 'Ha'adonit veHarochel' Agnon distorts this alignment, offering, a religious Jewish man's horror: a non-Jewish mistress of the house. Just as the Jewish house forms some kind of Jewish jurisdiction, the non-Jewish house is similarly the extension of the proprietor's religious tradition (Miron 2000: xii). The very essence of the lady's home poses a horrifying danger to the peddler.

⁷² חיה רעה, שאם אינה קיימת ראויה היתה שתתקיים לפי צורת החדר

The interior of the house is filled with horns hanging on the walls, and the narrator surmises it is a hunter's abode. 'From the many antlers hanging on the walls, it was clear that this was a hunter's house. Or perhaps it wasn't a hunter's house at all, and those antlers were simply hung up for decoration, as is the custom of the forest dwellers, who decorate their homes with the horns of wild animals' (*HH*: 211). While in 'Ad Hennah' the very room seemed like a wild beast, here, the walls are covered with their remains. The Jews use antlers to make the shofar, the instrument they use to call upon their God during prayers. The positioning of these items on the wall supports the conjecture this is not a Jewish home. Regardless of the reason for hanging the horns, they create a certain atmosphere in which killing is regarded as acceptable. This is a predator's lair.

While the peddler enjoys the lady's alleged hospitality, away from the elements, he moves from dwelling in the old barn, to the spare room, to the lady's chamber, and then back to the spare room before he escapes the lady's plan to feed on him. This migration inside the house is a metaphor for his moving further away from Jewish tradition and his eventual return to the Jewish faith. The house is like a black widow spider's trap into which the peddler enters, and out of which he comes out alive only due to a prayer and the return to Judaism. Like the vampire's abode, the lady's home is a death trap. Both abodes offer accommodation for the price of one's freedom and even life. Both sovereigns feed upon people, and both homes are an extension of their characteristics.

Agnon used this technique of the home as an extension or manifestation of the character in several of his works. Since he was predominantly preoccupied with questions of identity that are tied in with issues of the connection to the land and sovereignty, the use of the home as motif was particularly useful. One of his most renowned texts that suggests a direct link between character and home is 'Tehila'. As noted above, Tehila's character functions as symbolic representation of Jerusalem. Elbag notes the importance of Jerusalem, Agnon's home in Palestine-Israel, in Agnon's work, as Jerusalem, the Holy

City is the centre of Jewish faith (2002: 178). Tehila's virtue echoes the city's divine essence. Additionally the settings function as metonymic representations of the two female characters in the story: Tehila and the old Rabbanit. The two characters represent two opposite feelings in relation to the home in the Ashkenazi Diaspora and in Palestine-Israel. The women's rooms reflect their characters.

Juxtaposed to Tehila's benign, near angelic character, is the old Rabbanit, a bad-tempered creature, who is never pleased, and is nostalgic for her old home in the Ashkenazi Diaspora. While Tehila is sprightly and charitable, roving the city exercising her command over the alleys and the merchants, the Rabbanit is motionless in her sickbed. The old Rabbanit's yard is derelict and appears abandoned like the abode of some monstrous creature. The narrator comes to a yard, 'one of those yards that all who see doubt that a human lives there' (*T*: 179),⁷³ and ascends 'six or seven broken stairs'⁷⁴ to reach 'a crooked door' (179),⁷⁵ with a cat on the outside and a heap of rubbish on the inside (179).⁷⁶ The location is described as the residence of an ogre or witch, not a person. The narrator finds the Rabbanit slumped on her bed in a heap of bedcovers, angry, scared, and yearning for her old home in the Ashkenazi Diaspora (*T*: 179-180). The alignment of the yearning for the old Diaspora home with decadence is clear, and the narrative rejects this feeling of nostalgia as an illness that leads to a lonely, pitiful death.

As opposed to the old Rabbanit's lodgings, Tehila's room is immaculate. Her room is the room of a saintly person, almost a hermit (*T*: 192). Upon the table there are the Siddur and the Chomesh, and one more book (*T*: 192).⁷⁷ As the narrator enters Tehila's room, he finds her sitting by the table, and so not only is the room contrasted to the old Rabbanit's

⁷³ חצר אחת מאותן החצרות שכל הרואה אותן מפקפק אם דר שם אדם

⁷⁴ שש שבע מעלות שבורות

⁷⁵ דלת עקומה

⁷⁶ The word used for stairs in the Hebrew can also mean virtues, and is the word used to refer to the virtues required in order to enter the heavenly Jerusalem. Here, these are broken, and the ascent is far from heavenly.

⁷⁷ The *Siddur* (the 'arrangement', a book of prayer arranged for daily use) and the *Chomesh* (the 'Torah' or the initial five books of the Old Testament) are books of Jewish prayer.

room, Tehila is found sitting alert by her table while the old Rabbanit is slumped in her bed. On the second occasion the narrator comes to Tehila's room, he finds her and the room even more sparkling (*T*: 196-7). After Tehila dies, the narrator returns to her room to find that 'a peaceful silence was in the room, like in a prayer room after the prayer. And on the floor of the room were the remains of the water with which Tehila had been purified'⁷⁸ (*T*: 206). The room is a reflection of Tehila's pure existence as well as her solemn death.

Tehila's room is both a sacred place and tomb (Nave 1997: 14-5). The element of a tomb is exposed in the description of the room's thick walls, which separate her from the rest of the world (Nave 1997: 15). Tehila dies in the end of the narrative, and Arye Nave suggests that even while she was alive Tehila lived life as a living-dead with the dead-who-is-alive (15). Tehila, whose engagement to a young boy, Shraga, was annulled, is in a sense a death-bride who longs for her dead groom. Thus already one can perceive how her home is revealing of her essence. Tehila functions as a metaphor for the *shechina*, and appropriately inhabits a prayer-like chamber, furnished with the minimal necessities for a life of charity outside the home, and focused upon prayer inside the house. Like the vampire's, Tehila's abode is a tomb, and while the vampire is associated with the devil and Tehila with God, both characters share a distinct relationship of dependency with the rest of the living population. The vampire feeds *on* people while Tehila feeds *the* people.

Another connection between the saintly Tehila and the vile Dracula is in the importance they place upon their burial land. As noted above, both wish to be buried in their ancestral land in order to rejuvenate. Tehila makes all the arrangements for departure from this world, from the letter of forgiveness she wishes to present Shraga's spirit, to paying for her grave on the Mount of Olives. Tehila goes 'to confirm the contract of my

⁷⁸ מנוחת השקט היתה בחדר, כבחדר תפילה לאחר התפילה. ועל קרקע החדר ניגרו שיירי המים שטיהרו בהם את תהלה

eternal home' (*T*: 206),⁷⁹ which in Hebrew translates literally as the house of my world, reflecting the eternal state of death even as it suggests it is a passageway to the next world. Throughout her life Tehila was in constant movement, searching for peace, the only place she can find her final reconciliation is in her grave. Though she has reached the Promised Land, and has made her home in Jerusalem, the hub of the sacred, Tehila is not at home till she reaches her final home, which is her final rest, till the final Day of Atonement.

The connection of the Jews to the new national home was, indeed, problematic. Attempting to establish the connection and sovereign right to the land, Agnon wrote 'Avi Hashor'. As noted above, even while the story appropriates the land linguistically, it offers a troubling narrative of homelessness. The old man is under threat of losing his home when the city is attacked, and moves into a cave for a short period. Eventually, he is compensated with cattle for the loss of his beloved ox, as well as many plots of land. The old man, however, does not find a wife, and does not have children. As explained, in Jewish tradition a house is not a home. The most important aspect of a house, and the only one that can make it a home is a family. The Talmud aligns the home with the wife. One without the other is not complete; hence, though the old man might have a house, his house is not a home but an empty shell. Thus this narrative leaves the reader with a problematic value attribution.

The old man's solitude is not explained, and remains a mysterious element that nags on the reader's mind throughout the short narrative. Since the Jewish tradition considers marriage, procreation, and communal functions the most important aspects in a person's life, the old man's solitude locates him on the margins of the socially acceptable. As David Aberbach notes, Agnon's characters, 'for various reasons and to varying degrees, are deflected from normal heterosexual attachments and are inclined, for this reason, to forms of perversion which at times mirror the distortions and breakdown in the societies

⁷⁹ לאשר את החוזה על בית עולמי

in which they live' (1994: 45). 'Avi Hashor' offers a particularly disturbing narrative since even as the ox was a substitute for the family in the beginning, land eventually is substituted for both family and the beloved ox. The home in this short story is being substituted for by cattle and land, and yet is never really a home. We know nothing of this home except that it is small, and located in Jerusalem. The text suggests that the most important issue is the location of the house in the Holy Land, not its grandeur. The connection to the ancestral land and the divine is crucial for the old man's identity. The home, suggest Agnon, is in the Promised Land, and nothing else matters.

Whereas Agnon endorsed the appropriation of the land in 'Avi Hashor', a few years later S. Yizhar directed his criticism against the brutality of the conquest in *Khirbet Khizeh*. Yizhar's text describes a group of Israeli soldiers expelling Arab villagers from their homes. Even while the soldiers' task is to deport the villagers, disinherit them from their home and land, the soldiers themselves seem to trample the land as if it is not their beloved motherland. And as they destroy the villagers' home the soldiers dream of their own home away from the firing line, where a mother or lover awaits their safe return.

The home in *Khirbet Khizeh* is a troubled place, a place of horror. It does not offer protection, and as the men commence the attack and the machine-gun fires at the windows of a house, the narrator adds in parentheses that the house is plastered in 'pale blue Arab plaster', and that its shutter is green (*KH*: 57; 29).⁸⁰ According to superstition these colours protect from evil. The irony of the machine-gun firing at the blue plaster and green shutter thus suggests the futility of the colours in defending the villagers, and the failing of tradition. The villagers are then violently banished from their homes, becoming homeless refugees. As if to intensify the atrocity and make it more palpable, the narrator perceives the village as anthropomorphised, as the walls of the courts and alleyways seem to silently accuse him (*KH*: 26). The banishment from the home elicits rage not only from the people,

⁸⁰ סיד-כחלחל של ערבים

but from the edifice itself. Like in Bialik's epic, the stones are not only silent witnesses to the horror, but active accusers, demanding reparation. Yizhar confronts the new Israeli nation-state with an accusation of war crimes, of a shameful neglect of morality, offering his texts as a warning against the dangers of brutal conquest.

The examination of the various homes in these texts reveals striking resemblance in the use of the home motif in order to examine issues of social Otherness and sovereignty. Both literatures subvert and tamper with the initial assumption that a home should offer protection and comfort. The homely becomes the unhomely, the uncanny. The place that should offer a sense of familiarity is the location of uncertainty and horror. The homes in the texts in Hebrew and English alike offer neither shelter nor security; instead, they haunt, devour, or remain indifferent to the human need for comfort and protection. The characters that appear to have found a home have to relinquish either their social acceptability or their very lives in order to find solace. These inhospitable homes are a reflection of the characters' fragmented *self* that has neither anchor nor base upon which it might build. Furthermore, the engagement with the home as a recurring motif stems from the two cultures' need to reconsider the boundaries and essence of the national home. The conclusion from the comparison is that though the British and Jewish nations were attempting to reconsider the notion of a national home for opposite reasons, both literatures utilised the home as metaphor that allows the reconsideration of individual and collective identities. The home functions both as the personal home of the characters in the narrative and as a metaphor for the national home.

2.5 Exile

In *The Beast and the Sovereign*, Derrida notes the connection between sovereignty and exile as the core of the problem, as ‘the scene of exile, obviously, is consonant with the scene of the home’ (2009: 246/329). The lack of home is exile. Thus far the comparison of several British texts of the nineteenth to mid-twentieth century with their temporal equivalents in Hebrew reveals similarities in the preoccupation with themes of (home)land and identities. This final chapter will examine the fourth aspect I discern as significant in the analysis of the relationship between identities and spatial awareness. The importance of an alleged authentic connection to the land for the (re)creation of individual and collective identities has been explored here in the first chapter; now, we shall consider the effects of exile on some of the characters.

In *Frankenstein* the creature is forever exiled to the North Pole, and Stoker’s Count wishes to immigrate to London. In *Jane Eyre* Bertha is in exile in England, and Max de Winter and his second wife end in a self-imposed exile in du Maurier’s *Rebecca*. Berkowitz’s ‘Mishael’ is set in a typical Eastern European Jewish exilic community, Bialik’s epic explores the horrors that befell the Jewish community in the Ashkenazi exile, and the title of *The Golem and the Wondrous Deeds of the Maharal of Prague* gives away the narrative’s diasporic location. In Agnon’s narratives the issue is prominent, as in ‘Ha’adonit veHarochel’ the Jewish peddler is exposed to the dangers of life in exile, in ‘Ad Hennah’, before the narrator returns to Palestine, he goes to Germany where he (re)experiences his exilic condition, and while Tehila embraces her new life in the Holy Land, the old Rabbanit misses her old home in the Ashkenazi exile. Even the stories that take place in Palestine-Israel treat issues of exile, as in ‘Avi Hashor’ the old man fears the loss of his home and possible banishment, and the Palestinian commencement of exile is explored in Yizhar’s *Khirbet Khizeh*.

Exile is the negation of an autochthonous connection to the land. As mentioned above, the connection to the (home)land is crucial not only for the (re)creation of individual identities, as the person is intimately tied with his or her childhood landscape, but also for the (re)creation of the communal aspects of identity. Identity ‘operates on two levels, the individual and the collective’ (Smith 1995: 130).⁸¹ Properties of territory and the role of land are important for the assertion of nationalist identities (Smith 1999: 149). Antony Smith suggests that the terrain emerges as an ‘ethnoscape’, which relates to a particular ethnic community, or *ethnie*, when it provides the distinctive and indispensable setting for the events that shape the community (1999: 150). Smith argues for the importance of the development of ethnoscapas as ancestral or sacred territory that become meaningful through ‘the historicisation of nature and the territorialisation of ethnic memories’ (Smith 1999: 16). These ethnoscapas are explored and reproduced not only in political discourse, but in literature and art. Since ethnoscapas are crucial for the formation of an *ethnie*, the question arises of what effects the disruption of the (re)creation of ethnoscapas has upon an *ethnie*.

Significant events for both the British and Jewish nations occurred in exile. The various interactions with the colonised Other, which participate in the (re)creation of the British individual and collective identities, occurred far from the British Isles. Similarly, some of the most important events that shaped the Jewish and later Jewish-Israeli nation took place in exile. In fact, the various Jewish communities that emerged around the world (re)created the Jewish tradition. Furthermore, these communities formed a nation whose portable homeland in the form of the scriptures gave it for many years a unique position as a nation without universally recognised territorial sovereignty.

⁸¹ These two facets of identities are, furthermore, in constant flux, as identities are an ongoing construction, ‘which is never complete, always in process, and always constituted within, not outside, representation’ (Hall 1989: 222).

The very exilic condition of the Jewish nation was a major aspect in the very definition of this nation. The notion of the Torah as portable homeland (Heine 1854) refers to a Jewish myth that suggests that the Shekinah, the feminine aspect of God, accompanies the Jews in exile, ‘as token that they were not entirely abandoned by God’ (Maier 1975: 21). The Shekinah, which is the feminine aspect of God, manifests in the Torah. Hence, the Torah, the scroll or scriptures, ‘developed as a symbolic substitute for the loss of territory’ (Maier 1975: 18). For the Jews in exile, the book was the substitute for sovereignty.

The special relationship with the book as homeland is one of the reasons some might argue that the concept of exile is not identical with *galut*. Furthermore, though the meaning of the word *galut* is, indeed, exile, the meaning it conveys within the Jewish tradition and Jewish-Israeli culture is more loaded. The notion of the Jewish exile, the Jewish Diaspora, was a fundamental aspect of the Jewish identity. Even though the Jewish Diaspora has produced a rich philosophical and artistic cultural inheritance, the exilic condition is negative. Although by now many different discourses have adopted the notion of Diaspora, attributing some positive semantic connotation to the concept, the original Jewish Diaspora was overall regarded as pernicious.

The attribution of the concept of Diaspora to British expatriates, as well as many other migrant populations, which began with the boom of African American studies in the 1970s, appears to dilute the concept of some of its meaning (Defoix 2008: 1-3). The term came to connote dispersion, yet originally “diaspora” always meant the threat of dispersion facing the Hebrews if they failed to obey God’s will, and it applied almost exclusively to divine acts’ (Defoix 2008: 4). The use of the concept in relation to the Jewish Diaspora here refers both to its wider meaning as dispersion and the location of this scattering, but also specifically as a divine retaliation of the Jewish God.

As Adam Rubin explains, ‘the condition of exile had come to be identified with Jewishness itself’ (2005: 14). Yet with the advent of Jewish nationalism, it became a tainted notion that was identified with illness and abnormality. One of the main Zionist ideas was that nationhood would ‘normalise’ the Jews (Rubin 2005: 14), and would ‘end, once and for all, the “abnormality” that had tainted the Jews for the duration of their long exile and that had made their assimilation in Europe impossible’ (15). The Jewish exilic condition, which was for centuries one of the characteristics of Jewishness was vehemently rejected by the dominant parts of the Zionist movement.⁸² Alongside practical political Zionism such as Herzl’s, Max Nordau developed ‘a psychophysical Zionism as a solution to the problem of Jewish degeneration’ (Bar-Yosef 1996: 71). Basing his perspective on European stereotypes of Judaism as illness, ‘Nordau argued that Zionism must cultivate what he called “a Judaism of the muscles,” not the moral or intellectual capacities of the Jew’ (Bar-Yosef 1996: 71-2). The notions of the old Diaspora Jew and the new Jew, who will become the new Israeli, are part of Zionist discourse, and were used in order to encourage immigration to Palestine-Israel. In Palestine, the “new Jew” was to come upon the British colonialist subject.

The Jewish and British nations offer a problematic of exile as an interference with the processes of the (re)creation of individual and collective identities through the *ethnie*’s connection to the ethnoscape. Both modern nations were predominantly shaped by the very detachment from their ethnoscape. It is simultaneously one of the most intimate and communal feelings. One has particular feelings that connect him or her to the homeland, even while there is a sense of collective national identity.

An exploration of the possible problems of an exilic condition generally, and British imperialism specifically, is Wollstonecraft Shelley’s *Frankenstein*. The novel commences with Walton’s self-imposed exile and ends with the creature’s banishment.

⁸² As Rubin notes, there were fierce debates and disagreements regarding the validity of these nationalist ideas (2005: 15).

The exilic condition is central to the plot and themes of both the frame and embedded narratives. As John Bugg notes, the creature and Frankenstein's exilic conditions echo each other in a reversal of roles (2005: 663-4). The narrative concludes with 'a profound reversal: the Creature inscribes as natural the decree of Frankenstein's exile' (Bugg 2005: 665). The disconnection from the familiar place and land is the core of the narrative. Frankenstein and the creature's identities are juxtaposed only to reveal the similarities in their exilic condition and its malignant effects.

Drawing upon the connections and differences between the notion of 'nativity' and 'natality', McLane argues that 'the monster violates natality as a condition of human (and animal) existence; yet his development allows us to see how the new-comer, born or made, forces the society to articulate and redefine its understanding of "human" and "native"' (2000: 91). This connects to the earlier discussion of issues of autochthonous origins, and has further implications. 'One difference between monster and man appears in the different nativities of these figures, and in their relation to exile and emigration' (McLane 2000: 91). Whereas Frankenstein narrates his life from the point of 'a specific genealogy implicated in the state' (McLane 2000: 91), as he commences his narrative with the assertion 'I am by birth a Genevese' (*F*: 30), the creature does not have a nationalist affiliation it recognises. As McLane notes, the creature articulates this predicament, saying that for him all countries are similar as none are a homeland, and unlike Frankenstein, the creature has no 'familial, political or other territorial categories which provide him with techniques of authentication' (McLane 2000: 91). The monster 'exists as stateless creature who respects no European boundaries, even as his heterogeneous and formerly dead body violates species boundaries' (91). As McLane further explains, '[i]t is one of the exquisite ironies of the novel that Victor Frankenstein's first "exile" from home, his going to university in Ingolstadt, was instigated by his father, who thought that Victor 'should become acquainted with other customs than those of [his] native country' (2000: 92). As

Frankenstein attempts to reconcile his origins and exilic condition with his justifications for the creation of the monster, he reverts to a nostalgic perception of his home town, suggesting that a man would be happier ‘who believes his native town to be the world, than he who aspires to become greater than his nature will allow’ (*F*: 51). The monster later uses a similar terminology of “exile” and “nativity” referring to his ‘native wood’ (*F*: 116). Though distinctly different, as the creature is both ‘nativity’ and ‘natality’ in exile; ultimately, both Victor and the monster are exiles.

At the centre of *Frankenstein* we find yet more exilic characters, the De Lacey who are French expatriates on Swiss soil, as well as Safie, who escaped her Turkish homeland in order to follow her love. They are fugitives who were, as the creature later explains, condemned to ‘a perpetual exile from their native country’ (*F*: 105). Walton, Frankenstein, the creature, the De Lacey, and Safie are all in exile, yet for very different reasons. While Walton and Frankenstein share a self-imposed exile, Safie and the creature are condemned to exile against their will, and, while Walton and Frankenstein are immigrants who seek adventure and knowledge, both Safie and the creature are refugees who yearn for love. In addition to these literary exiles one might consider the Shelleys’ European exile because of their personal lives and ‘their radical politics’ (Craciun 2011: 459). The Frankensteinian narrative functions as fertile ground for the exploration of the exilic condition. One might also suggest the exilic condition itself created Frankenstein’s horrific creature as a manifestation of the torn self in exile. The creature is a (re)creation made of alien body parts, and its very existence is an embodiment of the (re)creation of identities in exile. The novel thus is a cautionary narrative against both the damages of exile, as well as the fundamental flaws of the notion of the nation-state as a dividing and malignant concept.

Like the Shelleys, who travelled across Europe, Stoker himself was an expatriate in London. The characters in *Dracula* are likewise subjected to various kinds and degrees

of exile. In a similar manner to Walton and Frankenstein, Harker leaves the safety of his homeland and ventures to the East out of his own accord. Though he starts out willingly, soon Harker becomes a prisoner in Count Dracula's castle, and his exilic condition deprives him first of his links to his homeland and loved ones, and eventually nearly costs him his life. The Count emigrates of his own volition as well, yet becomes a fugitive and attempts to escape back to the safety of his homeland. While Frankenstein's creature has no homeland to escape to, the vampire can retreat to the Carpathians. The exilic condition is painful for Harker, and while sought after by the monster, it is not its natural state either. The vampire has depleted his land of all its resources and has to colonise other lands in order to utilise new assets. The critique suggests that like the vampire the Brit explores outside his homeland due to the need for resources, and that this kind of exile is pernicious. As explained in the previous chapters, for the vampire land and blood are intermingled, and the narrative suggest the same implication for the Briton.

Since the Count requires his ancestral land for his rejuvenation, he transports fifty cases of earth to London. Hence, in fact the Count manages to be in exile without suffering the pains of the loss of his homeland, literally and metaphorically. Like the Jew, who carries his portable homeland with him wherever he goes, the Count takes his homeland with him when he migrates. Thus the inversion of exilic conditions is not equal; as the British subject is imprisoned in exile while the Eastern monster's exile is not whole. This unbalanced power structure will have to be resolved with the destruction of the monster, turning it into ashes in his homeland.

Another British subversion of the comfortable allocation of the exilic condition is found in de Maurier's *Rebecca*. This later narrative considers some of the consequences of the anticipated fall of the Empire (Light 1984: 7). There is a shift from the depiction of fears from outside alien forces to inner social concerns. No longer is the dreadful 'eastern invasion' (Arata 1990: 627) the focus of the narrative; rather, the alien within the British

society is the cause for worry. *Rebecca* depicts the poor female subject as the new alien, the new cause for concern.

While *Dracula* ends with the demolishing of the racial Other upon the alien soil, *Rebecca* allows for the British mansion to burn down while the social Other is exiled. This change reflects the socio-political processes that take place in the time gap between the two texts. While Stoker might have been read as a critique of imperialism, it also endorses it by reaffirming Western supremacy. De Maurier, conversely, depicts the crumbling British class system and suggests the exilic condition, or imperialism, is in some manner an erroneous escapist attempt to ignore British inner social problems. Even so, like *Frankenstein* and *Dracula*, the text shares a preoccupation with British anxieties regarding the problems of imperialism and class issues through the examination of exile.

The characters in *Rebecca* are continuously in flux. By the end of the novel, *Rebecca*'s narrator is 'many hundred miles away in an alien land' (*R*: 4). She wakes up from a nightmare, 'bewildered at that glittering sun, that hard, clean sky, so different from the soft moonlight of [her] dream' (*R*: 4). The connection between the 'alien marriage' (*R*: 2) among the plants in her previously depicted dream of Manderley and the alien land suggests her real location is a horror to her, and she wakes from a nightmare into a hellish reality. She is retelling her story from the exilic hotel where she and Maxim are staying. We know they are somewhere outside England by her reference to the English mail (*R*: 6), but we do not know their exact location. This non-specific exile suggests that anywhere that is not England is exile, and it makes no real difference whether it is Monte Carlo or the Spanish Riviera.

Furthermore, while in this hellish exile the unnamed narrator still keeps track of the mansion and the British homeland. The unnamed narrator misses England and Manderley, and she reads the papers for descriptions of Manderley's affairs trying to retain her imagined sovereignty over Manderley in her exilic state. She knows the 'name of every

owner of every British moor, yes – their tenants too’ (*R*: 7-8). Moreover, she knows ‘how many grouse are killed, how many partridge, how many head of deer [...] The state of the crops, the price of fat cattle’ (8). This detailed description portrays her as an exiled sovereign, who still wishes to sustain control over the land, and keeps track of the progress of the agricultural sector. The yearning for England is described as a longing for the land. Yet, the whole process, the yearning as well as accumulation of knowledge occurs in her mind, and the unnamed narrator does not share these thoughts even with Maxim. Rather than real, the land becomes a spiritual location.

As mentioned above, *Rebecca* is in many ways a revision of *Jane Eyre*. *Jane Eyre* explores the problems of imperialism predominantly through the character of Bertha Mason, Rochester’s mad Creole wife. In order to maintain a profitable hold on the Jamaican colony, Rochester is duped into marrying Bertha, who develops a mental illness. Like Frankenstein’s creature, Bertha is an embodiment of the horror of imperialism and of exile. Yet in addition to this obvious exiled character, the whole novel is haunted by exilic conditions. Rochester is in exile in Europe for a while because he cannot bare to be in his house which is haunted by his mad wife, and later St John sets out to an indefinite exile to peruse his religious calling, on his mission to “enlighten the heathen”. The narrative as a whole is preoccupied with the notion of exile.

The most notable exilic character in *Jane Eyre* might be Bertha, but Bertha is not the only exiled female character in the novel; Jane is also an exilic figure. As Roy Parama notes, ‘[t]he progress of Jane Eyre from dispossession to ownership commences at Gateshead. This is Jane’s initial home and her first introduction to life in the great house, where, in her status as illegal alien, she is consistently exiled from the communal fire and the socially significant space of the drawing room’ (1989: 715). She later is self-exiled to the moors and only after she finds her fortune and marries Rochester does she find a stable (if socially relegated) home. Though Jane is, indeed, a British subject, she is not a full

member of the community until she is secured with funds and a marital contract with a British man. Thus her gender and financial situation deprive her of a valid connection to her homeland. The juxtaposition between Bertha and Jane highlights the differences as well as similarities: while Bertha is imprisoned, Jane is allegedly free, yet a closer examination reveals the former is actually the rightful mistress of Thornfield Hall, and the latter has limited agency. Reading the text as continuous tension between imprisonment and freedom (Gilbert and Gubar 1979: 339) extenuates the fact that the two women are mirror reflections of each other, and both are in exile. The most frightening aspect of *Jane Eyre* is not the mad Creole woman in the attic, but the uncanny resemblance she bares to Jane, the Brit.

The issue of exile bares a closer connection to home in this novel, as the two female characters are both exiled in England. *Jane Eyre* is *Rebecca*'s predecessor, predominantly in the sense that the later text honed in on the inner social issues of gender and economic Otherness as its focus. Once there is less anxiety regarding the Other that might pose a threat from the colonies, the public finds other enemies within. These Others within, such as the poor and female subject, share a liminal social location with the Jews. As previously outlined, I am basing this connection upon the identification of the Jew with marginal groups such as the mad and leper (Shoham-Steiner 27). Like the poor and female subjects, these groups are markers of social restrictions (Foucault 1964/2001: 4). Furthermore, being second rate subjects these groups are in exile in what is allegedly their homeland. Exile in the homeland is a particularly problematic aspect of the exilic condition, because it creates unresolvable tensions between the individual and collective identities within the subject.

For millennia the Jews occupied an uncanny place in the European landscape: simultaneously an integral part of the social and communal scene and an alien entity that guards its identity from its surroundings. The Jewish history of exile can be measured from the ancient times of the second temple temporally, and all over the world spatially. Yet this

project focuses on the modern period and depictions of the Ashkenazi or Eastern European Jewish Diaspora. The Jews were in exile in the countries that for many were, in fact, the lands of their birth. Moreover, they were the racial ethnic Other even while they perceived the locals as the religious and ethnic Other. These tensions created fears of the Other as perceived from within and without.

One of Agnon's famous texts to engage with the fears of the racial and ethnic Other in the Ashkenazi Diaspora is 'Ha'adonit veHarochel' ('The Lady and the Peddler'). Though he wrote this story while already in Palestine, it explores the fear of racial and ethnic mingling that would lead to the loss of Judaism. This was of the greatest Ashkenazi Diaspora concerns. The story narrates the interaction between a Jewish peddler and a non-Jewish lady. As their relationship develops, the peddler slowly relinquishes the Jewish tradition, and stops observing Jewish kosher eating rules. The narrative suggests a deliberate process: 'And so passed one month and then two months, until he began to forget that he was a poor peddler and she a lady. She on her part forgot that he was a Jew or anything of the sort' (*HH*: 213). This depiction functions as a metaphor for the Jewish community, which slowly abandons its Judaic tradition and costumes. The danger, Agnon suggests, is that the abandonment of the rules and regulations leads to the loss of faith. In Judaic tradition, if one who has abandoned his faith, he or she is in response deserted by God. This is due to the reciprocal nature of the relationship between God and his people. While in *Dracula* the fear of "contamination" came from outside the motherland, here the threat is in the host country. The danger is still the Other, yet in Agnon's narrative the foreign land is, probably, the peddler's homeland.

As the Jews have been in the Eastern European exile for centuries, naturally communal and commercial relationships developed. The fear was that Jews would lose their unique tradition. Therefore, the Jews lived predominantly in ghettos or in the *shtetl*, the Jewish small town. The depiction of the *shtetl* has an important role in life and

imagination of the Jewish Ashkenazi Diaspora. For the Jews, the shtetl was simultaneously the location of nostalgic childhood memories and an idealised Jewish place:

The great writers of the latter part of the nineteenth century, clearly unperturbed by any need for total loyalty to the historical truth, created the “classical” literary shtetl as a pure, unalloyed, and undiluted Jewish “world” that had somehow been transplanted from an idealised Eretz Yisrael, an exilic Jerusalem, to the forests and steeps of the Slavic lands.

(Miron 2000: xi-xii)

As noted above, the Jews considered the Jewish town as a little Jewish state (Miron 2000: xii). Like the vampire they were, paradoxically, in exile while not really sensing a total lack of uprooted-ness. The Jew was, hence, a distinctive creature, both at home and not, and in a word, uncanny.

Some Jews lived in ghettos in the big cities, but others coexisted and intermingled with the local population. Examinations of the interactions between the host population and the Jews are prevalent in Agnon’s work, and particularly in ‘Ad Hennah’. This narrative of a quintessentially Wandering Jew follows the narrator from Palestine to Germany and back again, after we know he initially emigrated from Germany. The narrator and protagonist of the narrative is led by external forces, with him depicted as a rather feeble man, who is not in charge of his life. He is a modern antihero, somewhat weak in character, fragmented and dislocated. He is an antithesis to the “new Jew”.

Zionism had negated the exilic condition, which led to its resurgence as the uncanny in literature (Mann 2006: 30). While other writes ‘attempted to make their descriptions fit the Zionist ideal [Agnon] tempered his romantic heroes through irony; thus his heroes did not become saints of the Zionist ideal’ (Shaked 1989: 15). Agnon’s

characters are uncanny and even subversive (Aberbach 1994: 59). But above all, because of his acute sensitivity to the ambivalent relationship with the Ashkenazi Diaspora, Agnon has been recognised as the paradigmatic author of exile and return (Golomb Hoffman 1991: 87; Ezrahi DeKoven 2000: 19; Mann 2006: xvi). While some narratives that participate in the Zionist discourse depict a linear move, portrayed as an assert, toward the Promised Land, 'Ad Hennah' functions as one of the more complex diversionary narratives, 'imbedded by an infinite series of detours and ostensibly authorised by hermeneutic procedures rather than by the dynamic of an inner-directed, autonomous narrative, ultimately describe[ing] a subversive circularity in their return to an exilic point of departure' (Ezrahi 2000: 28). Even though it ends with the immigration to Palestine, 'Ad Hennah' is a problematic narrative of Aliya,⁸³ as not only is the protagonist continually dislocated within the German exile, but he finds it difficult to leave. Eventually the relationship with the two homelands – the Ashkenazi Diaspora and Palestine-Israel – remains ambivalent.

Moreover, this narrative questions the very notion of the homeland, and the narrator feels a great affiliation with Germany. When he comes to bid the German landlady and her two daughters farewell, the narrator notices their pots of cacti, and says that while here (in Germany) these plants are placed in pots and cared for, in his country no one bothers with cacti except in order to pluck them out (*AH*: 10). The metaphor of the sabra, the Jew who was born in Palestine-Israel, is subverted, as the Jew who is relocated or plucked out of the Israeli soil attempts to be planted in Germany, while the plants that represent the Sabra are nourished in pots in Germany. The inversion of the location of the plant reflects the dislocation of the person. The text poses a tentative question, suggesting that if the cacti are better cared for in exile, perhaps it would be wiser to remain in exile than to immigrate to a hot, inhospitable land. Along with the reader, the narrator wonders where exile is – in

⁸³ Aliya means ascension, and refers to immigration to Israel.

Germany, or Palestine. This sense of being in exile everywhere is shared by the narrator and Frankenstein's creature. Yet unlike the creature, which is doomed to be forever in exile, the unnamed narrator returns to his ancestral land. This land, however, is in fact a desert. Thus the two characters share a banishment to a hostile terrain. While in Germany the narrator is an inner exilic character, like Jane Eyre, in Palestine he feels like in real exile, like Frankenstein's creature.

Agnon's personal narrative was in many ways a reflection of the national narrative of the Jewish nation (Shaked 1989: 6-7), and his continual return to the Ashkenazi Diaspora as a theme reveals the national preoccupation with the exilic homeland. This longing for exile is a reversal of the historical longing for Zion. As noted earlier, Yigal Schwartz frames Hebrew literature from the yearning towards Zion to a yearning to the Diaspora (Schwartz 2007: 19). Agnon's work exemplifies these fluctuations by portraying a spatial and spiritual move toward Palestine-Israel and a pull in the exilic direction.

One of the most lucid examples of the tensions between the yearning for Zion and the pining for the Diaspora is in 'Tehila'. As noted above, while Tehila embraces the life in the Holy Land, the old Rabbanit longs for her exilic home. We learn that Tehila had left her family in the Eastern European exile, and we also know that one of her children was "lost" to Christianity. Thus the fears explored in 'Ha'adonit ve'Harocheh' materialise in Tehila's personal narrative. At the beginning of the story, the narrator has just returned to Palestine from the Ashkenazi exile where the old Rabbanit's grandson asked him to do a favour and purchase a heater for the old lady. The narrator comes to take care of this request, and as they discuss the heater the old Rabbanit reminisces about the heater she used to have in her old home in the Ashkenazi Diaspora (*T*: 180). She complains about the cold in Jerusalem, saying that while in the Ashkenazi Diaspora they say the Holy Land is a warm country she thinks it might only be hot for the wicked in hell (180). The old Rabbanit is nostalgic, and refuses to accept the need to embrace her life in the new land.

She is depicted as a negative character, sick and stationary, decadent and vile, and Tehila is an agile active person. The two female characters are the “new Jew” and the “old Jew”. They are compared in a manner reminiscent of the juxtaposition between Jane and Bertha in the sense that both are in exile. Yet whereas in Brontë’s novel Jane is merely acceptable in comparison to the much more horrific Bertha, in Agnon’s text the Rabbanit is depicted as monstrous while the analogous of Jane is nearly angelic. The reason Jane and Tehila are both more acceptable than their foils is that they eventually accept their place. Tehila embraces her place as a saintly “new” Jewish woman and Jane as the supportive wife to Rochester. Furthermore, by this eventual acceptance they are no longer in exile.

When the narrator revisits the old Rabbanit, asking how the heater is working, she says the heater she had in her old home abroad would give heat from the end of Sukkoth till the eve of Passover, ‘and would keep the heat on like the sun during Tammuz and one would find comfort in it, not like those heaters whose warmth is fleeting’ (*T*: 182).⁸⁴ Tammuz is the warmest of the summer Hebrew months, equivalent roughly to June-July. This is an interesting allusion to the month of Tammuz that draws upon biblical and Talmudic references to the exilic Jewish nation. The name Tammuz is mentioned in the Bible in Ezekiel 8:14 as part of the horrors revealed to the prophet as he is led in a psychic tour through Jerusalem, during which he is shown the wrongdoings of the Jews. The specific use of the name Tammuz refers to the transgressions of the Jews who worshiped the Babylonian idol of that name instead of the Hebrew god. The name of the month then is a reference to the Babylonian Diaspora, and highlights the nostalgic feelings of the old Rabbanit to her Diaspora home. The old Rabbanit misses her old Diaspora home while she is being less than righteous in Jerusalem, thus fulfilling the prophecy revealed to Ezekiel. The phrase in the biblical prophecy refers to the women weeping for Tammuz: ‘Then he brought me to the door of the gate of the Lord’s house which was towards the north; and,

⁸⁴ והיה מושך חום כחמה בתקופת תמוז והיו מוצאין בו נחת רוח, לא כאותם תנורים שהמימותם רגע

behold, there sat women weeping for Tammuz' (Ezekiel 8:14). Just as the women in the prophecy weep for Tammuz so does the old Rabbanit. In both the biblical and Agnon's texts the sin is committed in Jerusalem, as a transgression against the holy city. Longing for the Diaspora – be it Babylonian or European – is an insult to the benevolence of Jerusalem. The location of the sinners in Jerusalem (as opposed to sins committed outside of the city) is an additional offence against the Hebrew god and his holy city.

As he leaves the old Rabbanit's house, the narrator notes the never-ending masses of immigrants flooding the city (*T*: 183). He acknowledges their ethnic diversity as well as the fact that they 'have not yet found their place' (183). The narrative represents the Diaspora Jews as they come to Palestine in an attempt to find a home. The paragraph that follows is a pivotal scene that depicts the British Mandate soldiers at the Wall square. As they attempt to uphold the British Mandate law that does not allow for anyone to place a chair or stool in the square in front of the Wall, they knock a very old woman off her stool (*T*: 183). Tehila arrives and stares at the soldier until he retrieves the stool for the other old lady.

Agnon refers to the Balfour Declaration, as the narrator then approaches Tehila, saying 'the power of your eyes is better than all of England's promises, as England has given us the Balfour Declaration and lashes her clerks at us to no avail, and you my old one fixed your eye upon that bully and undid his evil plotting' (183).⁸⁵ Agnon's narrative refers to the declaration dismissively, suggesting the Jewish religious right to sovereignty over Jerusalem embodied by Tehila validates the declaration and not vice versa. Agnon's story merges with the Zionist narrative in providing Jews with entitlement to the land; yet while the Zionist narrative attributes it to the British declaration, Agnon attributes it to religious right.

⁸⁵ יפה כח עיניך מכל הבטחותיה של אנגליא, שאילו אנגליא נתנה לנו דקלרציא של בלפור ומשלחת בנו את פקידיה לבטלה, ואת זקנתי נתת עיניך באותו רשע ובטלת את מזימותיו הרעות

The sequence of these two scenes – the multitude of immigrants followed by the British presence in the Wall square – reminds the reader of the British sovereignty over the Holy Land alongside the displacement of the Jewish immigrants. The predicament of the immigrants is exacerbated, as not only were they persecuted in the countries from which they came, but they are also ill-treated in the Holy Land.

While Agnon undermines the Zionist narrative's modern nationalist attribution of the right to the land, supporting an alternative religious narrative, S. Yizhar acknowledges the Zionist role in the Palestinian exile. The narrator in *Khirbet Khizeh* explicitly acknowledges his role in sending the villagers to their exile. The portrayal of the villagers as a 'confused, obedient, groaning flock of sheep, unable to take stock of their situation' (*KK*: 94)⁸⁶ suggests a mass migration. The text then offers an allusion to the Passover *hagada*, the story of the Israelites' exodus from Egyptian exile. The irony is glaring, as in the Jewish text the Israelites leave exile for the Promised Land, and here the Arab villagers are heading to their exile. The text in Hebrew adds to the depiction the 'cattle that does not know how to ask questions'. This offers a direct allusion to one of the segments of the *hagada*, which is a fable of the four sons and their engagement with the holiday. The four sons represent the different kinds of Jews – one is clever, one is evil, one is ignorant, and the fourth does not know how to ask questions. For the benefit of the one who does not know how to ask questions, the scriptures decree that the *hagada* must be retold and elaborated upon every year. The allusion suggests a decree of commemoration of the Palestinian narrative. This also functions as an allusion to the infamous depiction of the Jews in the holocaust being led like lambs to the slaughter. Clearly, Yizhar undermines the validity of the Israeli conquest. *Khirbet Khizeh* also offer an allusion to Bialik's epic 'In the City of Slaughter'. As Nurith Gertz notes, 'Bialik's poem echoes throughout the story:

⁸⁶ צאן מבוהל וציייתן וחרישו ונאנח שאיננו יודע לשאול

The opening scene in the vegetable field recalls the vegetable garden in 'In the City of Death'. The tone in which the description guides the on looking narrator ('Don't spit in disgust, and avert your gaze, and flee from the scene', Yizher, 1949: 73) is the tone guiding the observer of the city in Bialik's poem. The call to Bialik's speaker ('Grit your teeth and melt away') reverberates in the behaviour of the narrator (who 'grits his teeth and clenches his fists'), and in that of the Arabs ('who grit their teeth in the silence', *ibid.*, 107). The hate building in the heart of Bialik's narrator like 'a snake in his pits' now surfaces as a 'viper in the heart' of the Arab child (*ibid.*, 107).

(Gertz 2000: 58)

The theme of exile continues to haunt Hebrew literature.⁸⁷ The figures and tropes of exile, which are all too known and familiar from the Diaspora, are now being mingled with the Arab refugees.

An additional allusion is a reference to Jeremiah calling to the old God 'atop the trucks of exile'⁸⁸ (*KK*: 105), which merges the old biblical exiles (both the Babylonian and Egyptian) with the modern Ashkenazi Diaspora. As the narrator looks at the refugees he realises that this is what exile looks like, and he is bewildered as he acknowledges that, though he was never in exile, the concept was infused into him through his education (*KK*: 107). This reaffirms the connection between the Jewish and Palestinian exilic condition as a shared horror.

The exilic condition is simultaneously the literal cause of and reflection on and representation of fragmented identity. It deprives one of the connection to the land, and leads to the disintegration of the personal and collective identity. While the Jews were able

⁸⁷ This theme remains prevalent in contemporary Hebrew literature (e.g., Amos Oz, Yehuda Amichai, and A. B. Yehoshua.

⁸⁸ מעל קרונות הגולה

to maintain the spiritual connection to the land through a metaphorical replacement and transference into the Torah, the modern identity of a nation state requires a territory on which the nation can establish its new identity. This leads to an identity crises, as first, the Jew has to reject his old exilic identity, then (re)create one that is based on the establishment of an Other as an exilic entity. Thus there is a double rejection of the exilic identity both as self and as Other.

The comparison of the treatment of exile in these texts in English and Hebrew provides some conclusions. Primarily, it reveals similarities in the use of the theme of exile in the exploration of tensions between individual and collective identities. It is important, however, to note the subtle differences in the kinds and levels of exile in the narratives. While they are all inherently preoccupied with issues of home and belonging, and particularly with exile, they display varieties of exilic conditions. While Frankenstein, Walton, Harker, and even Count Dracula are all exiles of their own free will, they all feel a tremendous unease when they venture out of their homeland. Similarly, while the unnamed narrator as well as both Tehila and the old Rabbanit immigrated of their own free will, they all experience difficulties. Paradoxically, however, in the texts in Hebrew the characters return to their alleged homeland, which is, in fact, experienced as an exile.

The character that best exemplifies the horror of exile is, of course, Frankenstein's creature, as it is banished to the timeless and infinite exile of the North Pole. Yet as noted above, the immigration to Palestine seems to the old Rabbanit like an exile to a cold barren desert. While both the creature and the old Rabbanit are exiled to a cold desert (or so it seems to the old Rabbanit) the de Winters are exiled to a sun-drenched location. On the one hand they are in exile of their own accord, but the truth might be that the social condition in Britain chases them away. Like *Frankenstein* and *Dracula*, 'Ha'hadonit ve'Harocheh' explores fears of racial and ethnic "contamination". While the texts in English consider it as reverse colonisation, the texts in Hebrew examine the concerns

regarding intermarriages in exile. At the core of these fears lurk anxieties regarding the racial Otherness and the connection to the homeland, which is the tangible aspect of the ethnic identity. From the fears of reverse colonisation to social mobility, the texts utilise the notion of exile to engage with the troubling notion of the importance of homeland for the (re)creation of individual and collective identities. The final text explored here closes the circle, as instead of fears of reverse colonisation, it portrays the horror of the occupation. In *Khirbet Khizeh* the monstrous Other becomes the self through the reversal in the exilic condition.

The differences and similarities in the kinds of exile suggest nuances in the kinds of concerns they represent: that is, fears of racial and social Otherness in relation to the homeland. The transference of fears from racial Otherness to social otherness are shared by the texts in Hebrew and English, yet whereas in the English the move is from attributing fear outward to racial Otherness to inner social Otherness, in Hebrew the fear moves to the figure of the “old Jew”. As a symbol of the decay of the Diaspora, the image of the exilic Jew was rejected by the *yishuv*. Fears of the Other resided then in the characters of the diasporic Jew. These narratives in English and Hebrew, nonetheless, utilise exile as a marker of the acceptable social and ethnic community. The various exilic conditions explore fears that were prevalent during the fluctuations and social upheavals of the nineteenth to mid-twentieth century in Britain. Yet the fundamental in-group/out-group dichotomy remains the propelling force.

2.6 Conclusion

The comparison of the engagement with connection to the land and spatial awareness in the texts examined here offers several conclusions. First and foremost, all the texts utilise spatial metaphors in order to explore issues of identity. Since identity is reliant upon spatial awareness, the settings in all the texts function as means to convey and re-examine various aspects of the British and Jewish-Israeli identities.

All the texts suggest that the claim for autochthonous origins is complex and problematic. *Frankenstein* and *The Golem* present creatures which are made of the land and yet paradoxically are non-autochthonous creatures; conversely, the ox in 'Avi Hashor' is autochthonous though not made of the land. Eventually, these narratives expose the fabricated and useless nature of an assertion or refutation of autochthonous origins. The problematic nature of the connection to the land is also productively explored through the figure of the vampire. The vampire in *Dracula* is intricately linked to its ancestral land, and takes it along upon travelling. Interestingly, this is precisely what the Jews have done for centuries, as everywhere they went they carry their Torah, which they perceive as a manifestation of the Shekinah, the divine sovereignty. The vampire, therefore, has been read as a metaphoric representation of the Jew. In an inversion of the anti-Semitic depiction of the Jew as a blood-sucking monster, in 'Ha'adonit ve'Harochel' Agnon warns the Jewish Diaspora of the harms of an exilic condition. In turn, however, it is Agnon's most saintly manifestation of the "new Jew" that resembles the vampire. Tehila, the righteous embodiment of the Shekinah has the desire to be buried in her ancestral land in order to be reborn into the next world, like the vampire. Thus, ironically, the figure of the vampire has come full circle to be linked with the Jew once more. It is through the reconnection to the land that the vampiric characteristics are reattributed to the Jew. Once the Jews return to their ancestral land they become, in some sense, vampiric. Indeed, it is the strong connection to ancestral land, or sovereignty, which allows the vampire to maintain the

power to be reborn forever. The very insistence upon a connection to ancestral land, one might argue, produces a blood sucking monster.

A claim for autochthony offers unsound grounds upon which one might (re)construct individual and collective identities. Consequently, it does not (re)produce whole and stable identities, and is insufficient as grounds for claims of sovereignty. In order to establish sovereignty one requires another claim to the land. Some options include legalisation through marriage, as in *Jane Eyre* and *Rebecca*, an agricultural connection to the land, and compensation for a moral injustice, as in the case of 'Avi Hashor', or land attained by blood as in the case of *Dracula* and *Khirbet Khizeh*. Eventually, none of the characters exhibit a benign autochthonous connection to the land, and none can claim a morally valid right to sovereignty.

The manifestations of difficulties in establishing and asserting an autochthonous origin in the two literatures are reflections of and upon the problematic connection of the Jewish and British nations' with the land during the nineteenth- and up to the mid-twentieth century. The two nations underwent opposite processes of colonisation and settlement, and the realisation of the inherent lack of a morally valid autochthonous connection to the land was experienced as a spatial identity crisis. The two nations were not secure in the (home)land, and consequently were not secure with regard to the national and individual identity.

Moreover, the analysis of the texts suggests that both cultures found that neither in the (home)land nor in exile could serenity be found. While the British were in a self-imposed exile in the colonies, the Jews were in a forced exile in the Diaspora. Nonetheless, their uncanny presence upon foreign soil was explored as a remarkably similar condition in the literature examined here. The theme is utilised in various ways, exploring different kinds of exile and exilic conditions; from migration to expulsion, and from fugitives to

colonisers. The texts, however, all focus on issues of home and belonging as essential components of identities.

The land itself becomes the metaphorical ground for the exploration of individual and collective identities. One finds similarities in the use of the land as dangerous and detrimental. The comparative analysis reveals a shared fear of Nature. In all the texts Nature is perceived and depicted as both enticing and dangerous. The portrayal of sublime landscape in texts in English, such as *Frankenstein* and *Dracula*, as cause for dread is similar to the representation of nature as hazardous and hostile in 'Be'ir ha'Harega', 'Ha'adonit ve'Harochel', 'Ad Hennah', and *Khirbet Khizeh*. The fear of Nature is, in fact, the metaphorical representation of the loss of religious and social norms. Nature is juxtaposed with culture. In the texts in English, nature is set in contrast to Western philosophy, and in the Hebrew narratives nature is in opposition to the Judaic tradition. Nonetheless, in both Hebrew and English nature is a source of harm associated with the person's cognitive capacities.

The complex question of spatial awareness and the connection to the land, as well as the paradoxes that this connection raises, are addressed in the texts from different angles; yet all the texts depict characters that are to varying degrees homeless. From the various orphans, such as Frankenstein's rejected creature, Jane Eyre, *Rebecca's* unnamed narrator, and, in a sense, Mishael, via the soldiers and refugees in Yizhar's texts, as well as several of Agnon's characters such as the poor peddler in 'Ha'adonit veHarochel', and the unnamed narrator in 'Ad Hennah', and even the great sovereign Count Dracula, all search for a home.

Furthermore, the homes these characters do inhabit are horrific inhospitable, unhomely places. As explained, the edifices function as metaphorical representations of characters, as well as themes. In both Hebrew and English texts the home is not the safe

haven, but a hostile hell. From the laboratory at the end of the staircase in *Frankenstein* and Count Dracula's castle, through the haunted mansions of Thornfield and Manderley, the texts in English all offer classic Gothic houses. Yet the comparison reveals that one finds similar horrors in Hebrew, from the bloody cellars and attics in 'Be'ir Ha'harega', via the monstrous room in 'Ad Hennah' to the shrieking walls in *Khirbet Khizeh*, the homes are likewise horrific locations. This similarity, I suggest, originates in the Gothic nature of the texts as narratives of social critique.

These parallels suggest there is a certain resemblance between the British and Jewish nations. Apart from the friction during the Mandate period, a deeper affinity is revealed. Both nations are preoccupied with sovereignty. As noted above, the reason is that these two nations were experiencing reverse developments with regard to sovereignty. Moreover, as noted in the Introduction, though the British and Jewish cultures seem to be disparate, they share deep roots.

Gidon Aran and Zali Gurevitch draw a distinction between the universal and the Jewish-Israeli question of home and belonging, arguing that 'whereas for the native the place dictates the thought, in Judaism the thought dictates the place' (1995: 24). Yet the comparison of the texts in Hebrew and English here examined reveals that there are similarities in the manner by which these texts explore anxieties produced by exile. As a result of the importance of spatial awareness, the sense of belonging to the land, and more specifically what is perceived as the homeland, once a character is dislocated something in its identity is undermined.

Emanuel Levinas contrasts the Greek and Hebraic traditions' relationship with home and otherness, noting that while Abraham leaves home never to return, Ulysses leaves home in order to return. However, Krzysztof Ziarek argues that the two are not simple opposites, as for Abraham there is no question of return to Ur (1994: 72). Trying to

resolve these tensions, Adrian Peperzak discerns between ‘the exodus of the just’ and “the odyssey of the hero” (Omer-Sherman 2006: 12). Eventually, even though the Greco-Roman and Judaic mythical traditions appear to have an oppositional relation to home and exile, both attribute a fundamental significance to the notion of the home as a mythical place of longing and yearning to the land.

The final conclusion I propose at this stage is that the texts’ extensive use of settings reveals something of their Gothic nature. The texts all utilise the setting in order to propel plot and create characters in the same manner as Gothic texts, and therefore should be read in relation to the Gothic literary tradition. Though the texts are not all read as Gothic literature proper, I suggest considering them within Ruskin’s spectrum of Gothicism (Ruskin 1853/1921: 150). The argument here is twofold: first, the texts all rely upon setting, land, concepts of home, and exile for the fundamental structure of plot and characters; second, since they all offer social critique, they share essential Gothic-ness.

3. Myth Making

3.1 Introduction

The modern study of myth has elicited a large body of study. Initially, a myth is ‘a traditional story, especially one concerning the early history of a people or explaining a natural or social phenomenon, and typically involving supernatural beings or events’ (OED). Yet myths can be also understood within a modern context, which suggests that ‘myths are not pre-rational or anti-rational states of mind typifying ancient or medieval times, but structures mediating modern thought and action’ (Ohana 2012: 2). Mythical elements are continually revisited as peoples reconfigure their identities. While Carl Jung outlines myth as an expression of collective unconscious archetypes (Jung 1981: 8), Claude Lévi-Strauss suggests myths are a ‘bricolage’ of ‘pre-constrained’ elements (1966: 19). The following investigation trails the post-Enlightenment approach that perceives myths as socially active narratives. First and foremost, this examination of literature reads the mythical elements in the texts in accordance with Lévi-Strauss’ methodology, which understands myths as a narrative that informs and shapes societies even as it reflects the human psyche (1981: 639). The following analyses focus on the metaphoric aspects of myth, which Lévi-Strauss perceived as most crucial (Overing 1997: 8). Based on Lévi-Strauss, Joanna Overing asserts that ‘myth is an exemplar of the work of the *unconscious* logical processes. However, the mediation of the great contradictions of life that myths express [such as] the social and the non-social, is all an illusion’ (1997: 4; emphasis in the original). Overing claims that the rationalist distinction between *logos* and *mythos* is still prevalent in considerations of myths, and that functionalism (i.e., contextualising myths within the daily social and political life of the community) allows for the myth to be perceived as one aspect of a wider social arena (7-8). Hence myths participate in the (re)construction of the individual and community.

Overing perceives the importance of myths in the way by which they ‘endow a people with their images of selfhood by stating sets of identity criteria for a people and a community’ (16). One ought to note the particular role of myths in the (re)creation of national identities:

Myth is one of the ways in which collectivities – in this context, more especially nations – establish and determine the foundations of their own being, their own systems of morality and values. In this sense, therefore, myth is a set of beliefs, usually put forth as a narrative, held by a community about itself[...] Through myth, boundaries are established within the community and also with respect to other communities.

(Schöpflin 1997: 19-20)

Furthermore, mythical narratives are particularly important for the differentiation between one collective and another (Overing 1997: 16). In a sense, myths are manifestations of processes of political differentiation and nationalism. For this study the conceptualisation of modern myth is as a narrative that participates in the creation and recreation of collective and individual identities.⁸⁹

Over the years there have been several approaches to the study of the connections between myths and nationalism. Myths of nationalism have been perceived as ‘a discourse that constantly shapes our consciousness and the way we constitute the meaning of the world’ (Özkirimli 2000: 4). Myths have been read as narratives of ‘primordialism’ and ‘perennialism’ that perceive the origin of the nation in kinship, ethnicity, and the genetic

⁸⁹ As noted in the Introduction, modernity is here aligned with Henri Lefebvre’s conceptualisation as a reflective process, and as an attempt to offer social and philosophical critique (1962/2011:1).

bases of human existence (Smith 1999: 4), as well as ‘continuous perennialism’, that suggests that ‘particular nations have existed for centuries, if not millennia’ (5). Mythical narratives have also been perceived as recurrent perennialism, which ‘claims that nations come and go, emerge and dissolve, only to reappear continually in different periods and continents’ (Smith 1999: 5). Modern approaches suggest the nation and nationalism are the products of modernity and print capitalism (Smith 1999: 6-8). Anthony Smith offers ethno-symbolism as an alternative to these various approaches. Ethno-symbolism acknowledges the importance of myths, memories, traditions, and symbols of ethnic heritage for nationalism, and that from these elements ‘the nation becomes more inclusive’ (9). Furthermore, ‘[t]hese cultural and historical elements also form the competing claims to territory, patrimony, and resources’ (9). As Smith asserts, ‘myths represent a means of adapting to rapid change, of mediating between an untenable but much-regretted religious tradition and an ardently-sought but often fearful social change and modernisation’ (84). Importantly, a shift in the role as well as social and cultural position of myth takes place between the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. With the advent of industrialisation and urbanisation the place of the individual in society was subject to meaningful alterations (Csapo 2005: 182). The following analysis focuses on modern myths, as they attempt to come to terms with the past even as they engage with the future.

The depictions of the various settings examined in the previous part participate in the (re)production of modern Jewish and British identities in relation to mythologies that are (re)constructed upon and in relation to real and mythical spaces. There are various kinds of nationalist myths: myths of territory, of redemption and suffering, of unjust treatment, election, military valour, rebirth and renewal, foundation, ethnogenesis and antiquity, as well as myths of kinship and shared descent (Schöpflin 1997: 28-34). The texts examined here engage with all of these to a certain extent, but primarily with myths of territory, of redemption and suffering, unjust treatment, creation, and kinship.

Both Jewish and British nations use myths in order to (re)construct national identities. The image of Jewish-Israeli society has been examined along the lines of several mythical narratives: “the few against the many, West versus East, ‘sons of light’ versus ‘sons of darkness’, and ‘a people that dwells alone’ against ‘the family of nations’” (Gertz 2000: 1). These narratives change in accordance with the changes in the Israeli society, and subversive literature such as Yizhar’s undermines the binaries constructed in the above-mentioned ideologies (2-3). Indeed, myths have been instrumental for the rebirth of national Jewish and later Jewish-Israeli identities (Ohana 2012: 29-122). Comparing the English and Israeli national mythologies, Smith reveals the following similarity:

In England, the radical tradition of Levellers, taken up the circle around Godwin and Blake [...] looked to the ancient Saxon liberties as their bulwark against foreign, i.e. Norman, usurpation (Hill 1958; Bindman 1977). And the radical socialist Zionist pioneers who went out to work the land in Palestine in the early years of this century, were equally inspired by a vision of egalitarian independence in ancient Davidic Israel or post-Exilic Judea under Ezra and Nehemiah (Elon 1971, ch. 8; Vital 1975).

(1999: 87)

The British and Jewish-Israeli cultures have produced modern national identities in similar ways. The connection to the land as the predominant aspect of the national identity is similar in the British and Jewish-Israeli identities. The similarities Smith identifies reveal not only the resemblances in the way British and Jewish modern political movements manipulated the connection to the land in order to fit their narratives, but also some of the deep ideological connections between the two cultures. Coming from the Abrahamic

tradition, the Jewish (and later Jewish-Israeli) and the British cultures' mythical narratives are intertwined and produce similar modern nationalistic myths.

Furthermore, I would suggest that myths are a reflection of and on individual and collective identities in relation to real and imaginary spaces. Myths are particularly important for the development of ethnoscaples (Smith 1999: 16), but also for the (re)construction of identities in relation to these ethnoscaples. In addition to the similarities in the employment of spatial metaphors, which were explored in the previous part, the comparison of several texts from the nineteenth- to mid-twentieth century in Hebrew and English shows parallels in the use of myths. In order to represent and explore the plagues of modernity, some of the texts examined here rework several myths found in the Greek, Roman, and Jewish traditions. In this part I will focus upon modern variations of five myths: adaptations of myths of creation and subversion; revisiting of myths of soul and soil redemption; myths of the vampire; the Wandering Jew and his avatars; and the employment of the myth of hospitality.

The first subsection is dedicated to revisions of myths of creation and subversion. The most obvious adaptations of creation myths are Marry Wollstonecraft Shelley's *Frankenstein* and Yudel Rosenberg's *Golem*. In both texts a humanoid creature is created. Yet whereas in *Frankenstein* this is an act of socio-religious subversion, in *Golem* the same act is a reaffirmation of divine sovereignty. Furthermore, and most important for this analysis, whereas Wollstonecraft Shelley's novel has been read as a critique of British imperialism (Baldick 1987: 1; Bugg 2005: 656), the comparison reveals that Rosenberg's narrative is, in fact, a subtle endorsement of the Zionist enterprise. Another text that revisits ancient myths of creation and subversion is Agnon's 'Avi Hashor', as the old man and his ox unite to create a Minotaur-like creature that reflects the "new Jew" and his new warring entity. In the three texts the ancient myths are revisited in order to reconsider issues of modern sovereignty and identities. As the modern British and Jewish and later Jewish-

Israeli identities are (re)constructed, the new myths come to reflect the opposite processes as the British relinquish the imperial enterprise and the Jews commence the mass settlement and colonisation of Palestine-Israel.

Similar processes are evident in reworking of myths of soul and soil redemption, upon which the second subsection focuses. Here we perceive parallels in the manipulation of notions of the Holy Land in Stoker's *Dracula*, Bialik's 'Be'ir Ha'harega' (In the City of Slaughter), Yizhar's *Khirbet Khizeh*, and Agnon's 'Tehila'. One of the links between Stoker's *Dracula* and Agnon's *Tehila* is revealed, as both wish to be buried in their ancestral land in the hope of rebirth. More important for this analysis, however, is the fact that both narratives are explorations of issues of sovereignty.

The comparison exposes some other resemblances in the employment of the Holy Land. Like the use of myths of creation and subversion examined in the previous subsection, here too the text in English offers a critique of colonialism while the texts in Hebrew, with the exception of Yizhar's narrative, endorse colonial settlement. This exception marks the early stirrings of post-Zionism and its critique of the Zionist enterprise.

In the following subsection we focus on myths of vampires that are reworked in some of the texts examined here. The two myths – vampires and soil and soul redemption – are linked as the vampire needs ancestral land for renewal. In both Jewish and Christian mythologies one comes across the notion of a rebirth from soil into the next world. The soul is redeemed from soil. Though soulless, the vampire is also reborn from its ancestral soil. The most obvious connection might be between Stoker's *Dracula* and Agnon's 'Ha'adonit ve'Harocheh'. While *Dracula* has been read as a critique of imperialism, Agnon's short story is a metaphor that encourages Jews to leave the Diaspora. In addition to this comparison, the analysis reveals vampiric moments in Bialik's epic. Like Agnon's text, here Bialik utilises the taboo of blood consumption in order to endorse Zionism.

The penultimate subsection examines literary manifestations of the Wandering Jew. The importance of this figure might be clear in the context of the Jewish nation and the Zionist narrative, yet one finds avatars of the figure of the Wandering Jew in the texts in English. The restlessness of all the characters examined in the previous part has already become clear, now we shall see how they can be read as adaptations of the figure of the Wandering Jew. The fact that they all share inherent traits of the rejected Other, and wander in search of a home and acceptance, suggests a similarity in the preoccupation with questions of morality and sovereignty that resurface in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in literature in English and Hebrew.

The wanderings in the texts in English are reminiscent of the myth of the Wandering Jew in the manner by which the characters are depicted as rejected, restless, Others. The connection between British and Jewish literatures in relation to this haunting figure has been noted (Davison 2004: 2-3), and indeed the main characters in the texts in English are all restless wanderers. Frankenstein's creature is the ultimate rejected Other, a descendant of Cain the murderer, who is condemned to roam the earth forever; Count Dracula is an Eastern immigrant whose uncanny resemblance to anti-Semitic depictions of Jews has been noted (Malchow 1996: 140); and both Brontë's and de Maurier's orphan female characters are poor homeless rejected Others. These characters share their constant displacement with the characters in the texts in Hebrew.

While in Rosenberg's adaptation of the Golem, the humanoid creature wanders the streets of Prague in order to protect the Jews from persecution, in Berkowitz's narrative Mishael roves the streets of his hometown trying to sell the willow branches for the Hoshana Raba festival. Another merchant is Agnon's peddler, who travels in the forest, eventually stumbling upon the lair of the vampire. Agnon's texts offer another perspective upon the myth of the Wandering Jew as a personal and communal inability to create a stable identity, as all his characters seek a home. The manipulation of the anti-Semitic

depiction of the Wandering Jew was a part of the Zionist endeavour to delegitimise the Ashkenazi Jewish Diaspora, and encourage immigration to Palestine-Israel (Zerubavel 1995: 12; Berkowitz 1996: 6; and Gluzman 2007: 68). While Bialik's epic is a cry for the construction of a national home, Yizhar undermines the Zionist narrative of the redemption of the land. In the texts – both in Hebrew and English – one finds fragmented individuals that share complex issues with regard to sovereignty, which is an essential component of identity.

As noted in the previous part, the texts all explore myths of national identity. Questions regarding morality and sovereignty lead to the question of hospitality. In the last subsection we shall see how the problematic notion of hospitality invites the reader in some of the texts to reconsider preconceived notions regarding sovereignty. This subsection compares instances of alleged hospitality in *Jane Eyre*, *Dracula*, and *Rebecca*, as well as in 'Mishael', Ha'adonit ve'Harochel', Avi Hashor' 'Ad Hennah', and *Khirbet Khizeh*. The analysis of these texts shows how the contradictory essence of hospitality leads to harmful misunderstandings. On the personal and collective level, misuse of the notion of hospitality can lead to disastrous outcomes.

These five myths – creation and subversion; soul and soil redemption; the vampire; the Wandering Jew; and hospitality – I suggest, are utilised similarly in some of the texts of the nineteenth- to mid-twentieth century literatures in Hebrew and English in order to reconsider individual and collective identities in light of modern concerns and sovereignty. Through explicit and implicit allusions, the texts modify ancient myths in a manner that exposes a twofold query: first, whether or not modernity offers any explanation or answers to ancient questions regarding humanity's morality; and second, how do we resolve new moral queries modernity might impose.

3.2 (Re)making Myths

3.2.1 Myths of Creation and Subversion

One of the most prevalent primordial myths is that of creation. As outlined in the previous part, for both nations and individuals, one of the first questions is one of origin. From the biblical narrative of the divine breath infused into the earth (Genesis 1:27) to post-modern science fiction,⁹⁰ one finds narratives that participate in the (re)construction of personal and communal identities through myths of creation. The following analysis will explore three texts in Hebrew and English that manipulate myths of creation and transgression in order to reconsider and (re)create modern national identities. Specifically, Wollstonecraft Shelley's *Frankenstein*, Rosenberg's *The Golem*, and Agnon's 'Avi Hashor' rework ancient myths of creation and subversion in order to re-evaluate modern identities in relation to sovereignty. The similarity in the use of ancient myths, I suggest, is both the result of the shared roots of the two nations, and a reflection of parallel problems these nations confront in the modern era.

One of the famous texts of creation is Wollstonecraft Shelley's *Frankenstein*. The title of the book clearly reveals its connection to Greek mythology. In the ancient Greek narrative, Prometheus stole the secret of fire from the gods and gave it to the humans, and was severely punished, as he was condemned to be chained to a rock for all eternity while his liver is eaten by an eagle (Ruffell 2012: 13). The novel explores human hubris, the desire for knowledge and divine power (Levine 1973: 17-8). The novel also refers to biblical mythologies, as well as to Milton's reworking of myths of creation (Lamb 1992: 303). The reason for this revisiting of myths is that the novel is an attempt to offer a philosophical analysis of modern concerns. Specifically, the novel engages with fears

⁹⁰ For example, *Prometheus*, a 2012 science fiction film directed by Ridley Scott and written by Jon Spaihts and Damon Lindelof is a reworking of the Promethean myths (both the Greek and of Wollstonecraft Shelley) alongside Christian dogma.

stemming from the imperial enterprise (Baldick 1987: 1; Bugg 2005: 656). These fears were particularly pertinent as they were concurrent and conflated with abolitionist theories (Malchow 1996: 6-14). Whereas an ancient conquering nation, such as the Romans or the Greeks, might have exalted their conquests, the modern conqueror has to come to terms with a cognitive dissonance between the acknowledgement of the equality of human kind and the inequality of the process of colonial conquest.

In addition to the myth of creation in the text, the creation of *Frankenstein* itself has by now become a modern myth. Wollstonecraft Shelley obtained the idea from a discussion of Robert Darwin's findings (Levine 1973: 17).⁹¹ This discussion took place between herself, Lord Byron, Percy Shelley, and John William Polidori on the picturesque shores of Lake Geneva in Switzerland. In the Preface to the novel, the reader learns of the ghost story contest between the party people, and the nightmare that was the basis for the novel. The troubling question of origins is at the heart of the text (Baldick 1987: 1; Malchow 1996: 17). As Baldick asserts, *Frankenstein* 'enjoys a status which appears to literary criticism as an anomaly, a scandal: it is a modern myth' (1987: 1). The novel is the myth of the creation of modern man, haunted by his imperialist past and xenophobia, driven into an ice-bound desert of desolation. In Wollstonecraft Shelley's novel, the creation myth, originally a wonderful divine endeavour, becomes an abomination in the hands of mere mortals.

A similar reworking of the narrative of the myth of creation is the story of *The Golem* by Yudel Rosenberg. The connection between the two texts is clear, as in both a humanoid creature is created by a scholar, and though there is no valid indication that Wollstonecraft Shelley was familiar with the Golem myths, the *Golem* is perceived as *Frankenstein's* precursor (Kieval 2000: 97). Like *Frankenstein*, the *Golem* is a story about

⁹¹ Though the book by Charles Darwin *On the Origin of Species* is published only in 1859, Darwin is acknowledged in the author's introduction. The experiments of the father (Robert) with eye movement were known at the time and Wollstonecraft Shelley is most probably referring to these earlier experiments.

a humanoid creature created in an unnatural manner. Yet, while the creature in *Frankenstein* is an abomination, the Golem is a part of the Jewish tradition, and functions as a reaffirmation of man's faith, piety and creativity alongside God's benevolence and sovereignty. While *Frankenstein* explores the myth of creation under the guise of the wish for the betterment of humanity, the *Golem* explores this myth for purposes of protection.

Over the centuries the legend of the Golem underwent many revisions,⁹² but it has its origin in a *Babylonian Talmud* story about two rabbis who created a calf for the Shabbat meal and a Golem in order to practice and exhibit their piety (Kieval 1997: 1).⁹³ In 1909 Yudl Rosenberg, a Warsaw Hasidic rabbi, adapted the ancient myth, recreating a modern myth of an active Jewish response to persecution. Rosenberg attributes the creation of the Golem to the Maharal of Prague.⁹⁴ Though the creation of Golems has been attributed to several other renowned Jewish scholars, the legend has been most firmly linked with the Maharal (Shaviv 2011: 95). Yet Yehuda Shaviv claims that there is no correlation between the image of the Maharal and the legend of the Golem (2011: 95), suggesting that a great injustice has been done to the image of the Maharal, who should be remembered as one of the great thinkers of Judaism (2011: 96). The Maharal was the head rabbi of the Jews in Prague during the latter half of the sixteenth century. He was a well-respected scholar within both the Jewish and non-Jewish communities, a Renaissance man who studied natural philosophy alongside astrology and religious studies, and was received by Emperor Rudolf II (Kieval 1997: 4). Under the guidance and leadership of the Maharal, Jews and non-Jews lived peacefully together in Prague at a time when the city was a cultural centre. The Maharal apparently did not experiment in practical Kabbalah. He was a leader of the

⁹² From versions such as David Wisniewski's (1996), in which the Golem ends up buried under *gniza* texts (the Jewish tradition does not allow discarding of written text because the word is sacred, so Jews keep damaged/redundant text in huge archives that no one visits), to this clip <http://vimeo.com/5248526>, that locates the hip Golem in twenty-first century Brooklyn.

⁹³ Although the reference to the *Book of Creation* places the story after the closing of the Talmud, the story is attributed to the rabbis (Levinat 1990: 3)

⁹⁴ The Maharal is an acronym for 'my rabbi the rabbi Löw', also known as the Rabbi Judah Löw Bezael.

European Talmudic academies, an innovative reformer in Jewish education and law, and a central figure in the spiritual life of Eastern European Jewry (Kieval 1997: 4). The Maharal wrote extensively about issues of nationalism and sovereignty in his work,⁹⁵ which ‘contains remarkable contemplation on Israel’s place among the nations of the world, the nature of nationality and national distinctiveness, the dilemma of exile, and the promise of redemption’ (Kieval 1997: 4). The Maharal was perceived as a leader of the Jewish minority, as a nation among other nations. Thus, the attribution of the legend to him suggests the text should be read within nationalist a context. The Golem, in fact, is an early variant of the “new Jew”.

One of the most powerful and productive myths of the Zionist movement is the “new Jew”. As noted previously, the exilic condition of the Jews was perceived as unhealthy, a disease (Rubin 2005: 14-5). Considering Nordau’s notion of “a Judaism of the muscles,” one can see how the *Golem* reworks ancient Judeo-Christian myths even as it participates in the creation of the modern myth of identity of the “new Jew”, who is willing and able to defend his people.

Whereas the British nation appeared to (re)create an image of the modern man weighed down by his imperialist burden, the modern Jewish nation attempted to (re)construct the modern Jew as a muscular free man. While *Frankenstein* offers a critique of imperialism, the *Golem* is in fact a subtle reinforcement of the Zionist idea. While both *Golem* and *Frankenstein* rework similar narratives of creation, one is a critique of colonialism, and the other offers a supportive argument for the Zionist enterprise. The Promethean myth has been productively incorporated into the Zionist discourse through ‘Promethean messianism’ (Ohana 2010: 143-5; Ohana 2012: 27). More precisely, it is the

⁹⁵ *Tiferet Yisrael* (The Glory of Israel) *Be'er Ha-Gola* (The Well of Exile) *Netzah Ysrael* (The Eternity of Israel) and *Gevurot Ha-Shem* (The Might of the Lord).

modern Promethean myth which was productive in the (re)creation of the new Jewish identities. The Zionist project sought to (re)create a new subject by “enlightening” the “old Jew” and settling in Palestine. The aim was to (re)create a new subject, the “new Jew”, or the “new Israeli” under the sovereignty of the Jewish nation-state. Modernity itself has been linked with (post)colonisation, as a metaphorical colonisation of the past, and silencing of Other voices (Symes 2011: 716-8). The connection between processes of colonisation, the Enlightenment, and modernity rises from the notion that, in some manner, modernity is depicted and perceived as an improvement upon human condition. It is the idea of “enlightening the heathen” that is at the heart of the colonial project. To (re)create them as better humans by subjugating them and turning them into subjects of the colonising sovereign nation. In a similar manner, one might suggest, the modernisation of the “old Jew” is a form of colonisation, perpetrated by the “new Jew”.

Another text that revisits ancient myths in order to support the Zionist enterprise is Agnon’s ‘Avi Hashor’. Yet whereas *Frankenstein* and *Golem* explore myths of creation through the production of a humanoid creature, the creation in Agnon’s short story is a metaphorical construction of the “new Jew”, who was to be formed through the redemption of the land. In ‘Avi Hashor’ one finds an engagement with the question of the Jew as warrior. Most of Agnon’s characters do not conform to the Zionist ideal of the “new Jew”, and ‘his heroes did not become saints of the Zionist ideal’ (Shaked 1989: 15). ‘Avi Hashor’ has not received much attention.

As previously described, the story tells of an old man whose ox was substitute for family. One day, when the city is raided by enemies, the old man mounts the ox, and they charge into the city, ramming the enemy and saving the city (*AH*: 337). At this climactic moment of the story the old man is united with the ox and is transformed into a minotaur-like creature. As outlined earlier, the ox is autochthonous as it is of the land and farms the land, and by the unification with the ox the old man is fused with the land. The allegorical

unification of the ox and the old man, as the reunion with the land, reflects Agnon's exploration of a yearning for connection with the land, as well as its redemption. The minotaur-like creature, which is comprised of man and ox for protection, redeems and appropriates the land. This new mythology appears to support the Zionist enterprise, and it participates in constructions of the national identity of the sovereign new Jew as courageous and warring. Like the Golem, this "new Jew" is problematic, as he relies upon bestial force in order to assert his identity and sovereignty. Instead of following the Jewish tradition of the intellectual resolution of conflict, the old man and his ox use brutish strength.

Following the seemingly glorious act of heroism, however, the old man's neighbour slaughters the old man's ox in order to feed guests. Though the story concludes with a superficially happy ending, as the old man receives many lands and cattle as compensation for his loss, the reader is left with an uneasy feeling, because the compensation is for what was the old man's family. The suggestion that a number of plots of land and cattle should be a substitute for the old man's familial loss echoes both the biblical narrative of Job, and the modern compensations for the Holocaust. In both the biblical myth and the historical narrative the notion of compensation is problematic. The "new Jew" is required to receive the land as compensation for the loss of lives. The (re)construction of the modern Jewish identity as part of a sovereign nation state requires a problematic moral manoeuvre.

In the process of (re)creating the new Jewish identity, 'Avi Hashor' reworks several old oxen myths whose mythical origins can be traced back both to Jewish and Greek mythology. Agnon's literary background included not only ancient and modern Jewish literary tradition, but also world literature, from Germanic and French to Nordic (Shaked 1989: 2, 23, 38, 43, and 44-6). 'In the geographical sense of culture, Buczacz and the Second Aliya left their mark on Agnon's work; but in the literary sense of culture, Agnon

is a product of the mixture of Jewish and European cultures' (Shaked 1989: 23). In fact, according to Shaked, 'despite his admiration for classical Jewish texts, Agnon was unconsciously bound to the classical Greek tradition in which there is a preference for the visual over states of mind' (1898: 48). Found both in the Greek and Roman mythologies, the Minotaur is part man, part bull. The hybrid creature was the fruit of the copulation of Pasiphaë with the bull (Ovid: 301-3). The Minotaur was the result of two sins: first Minos' defiance of the decree and then Pasiphaë's copulation with the bull. The former is a sin against the gods; the latter a moral transgression. This dual transgression resonates in Wollstonecraft Shelley's novel, and as mentioned earlier, as *Frankenstein's* precursor Rosenber's *Golem* also engages with these theological queries of transgression and conformity.

While in the Greek and Roman mythical traditions the copulation between man and beast was a sinful and abominable union that illustrated the wrath of the gods, it was nonetheless a part of the mythical tradition. The Jewish tradition does not permit any union of beast and man, and the negation of such a union is connected to the conquest, and later redemption of the land. When the Israelites settle in the Promised Land, God warns them to steer away from the *moloch*, a bull-like god that existed in the Canaanite culture. In one of the references, as part of elaborate rules and regulations regarding copulation, we find a decree that forbids the insemination of the *moloch* (Leviticus 18:21). The *moloch* is connected to sovereignty on several levels: first, linguistically as it is linked to the word for king, the sovereign;⁹⁶ second, as the king of kings decrees it an abomination; third, the rejection of the *moloch* is part of the rules and regulations given to the Israelites as part of the preparations for the conquest of the Promised Land.

Reading Agnon's narrative as the union of the old man and the ox suggests a

⁹⁶ The word in Hebrew *moloch*, comes from the same root as king, *melech*. The word king is one of the names for the Jewish God, which is equivalent to another, *ribbon*, which derives from the same root as the word for sovereignty, *ribonut*.

subversion of Jewish conventions. Though David Aberbach suggests that '[c]ertain obscure features in [...] Agnon become clearer if the possibility of latent deviance, homosexuality in particular, is taken into account' (1994: 59), I am somewhat reluctant to suggest Agnon meant to explore issues of bestiality in 'Avi Hashor'. Agnon was a religious Jewish man, and such scandalous subversion of the Jewish tradition seems unlikely to have been his intention. Therefore, though the story lends itself to this interpretation, one might consider an alternative reading, which suggests the ox represents the old man's holy sacrifice for the redemption of the land, a substitute for the ram Abraham sacrificed, which was itself a substitute for the son.

Bearing in mind the connections to ancient myths, Agnon's short story should be read within the Zionist discourse, and in relation to the perception of Jewish exilic identity. The old man becomes a Minotaur-like creature because this abominable brutish character is the embodiment of the new Jewish sovereign identity. The processes of (re)creation of new Jewish identities in Palestine-Israel involved the rejection of the image of the exilic Jew, as well as an incorporation of non-Jewish myths, figures, and identities.

One finds a connection between the Jewish and British cultural identities once the unification in Agnon's story is read within Homi Bhabha's notions of hybridity. As noted earlier, in postcolonial discourse hybridity refers to the effects of synthesis upon identities and cultures of the colonised (Kristeva 1982: 132; Bhabha 1990: 4). Specifically, hybridity alters the different components of the original, making it difficult to discern and differentiate them from one another (Young 1994: 26). As mentioned in the Introduction, the Victorian and Diaspora Jewish cultures were in some respect oppositional (Boyarin 1997: 1-2). The Jews occupied a particular location as delineators of social boundaries. The Jews' racial Otherness was 'a key ingredient in the emerging cultural identity of modern Britain' (Cheyette 1993: xi). Even while the Jews and British had a long history together upon British soil, this relationship reaches another stage in the reunion of the two

cultures in the Holy Land. The British Mandate for Palestine was in effect when ‘Avi Hashor’ was written, and the incorporation of non-Jewish mythological elements could be read as a subtle merging and engagement with alien ideas of bravery. Furthermore, the text offers a metaphorical representation of the very concept of hybridity, as the unification of the old man and his ox are an embodiment of the Jews’ hybridity.

The three texts explored here thus far manipulate ancient myths of creation and transgression in order to (re)create new identities and new mythologies. Whereas *Frankenstein* revisits the Greek Promethean myth in order to undermine British colonialism, ‘Avi Hashor’ alludes to the Minotaur in order to reinforce the Zionist enterprise, and by resurrecting ancient Jewish myths the *Golem* similarly supports Zionist ideals. The texts thus rework ancient myths in order to reconsider and (re)create modern identities.

3.2.2 Soul and Soil Redemption

As outlined in the previous chapters, the (re)construction of personal and collective identities is intricately linked with land and, consequently with myths of soul and soil redemption. These myths are represented both in modern nationalist and religious myths (Smith 1999: 9, 84). Redemption is one of the main themes in the Judeo-Christian tradition (Kimelman 1988/1989: 165), and a major theme in Zionism (Shaked 1989: 244-5; Bar Yosef 1996: 72). From the moment God tests Abraham by ordering him to sacrifice his son, Isaac, to the Christian belief that God has sent His son, Jesus, to redeem humanity, the Judeo-Christian tradition is replete with acts of sacrifice and redemption. Some of the texts examined here reveal similarities in the use of notions of soul and soil redemption in relation to modern questions of individual and collective identities and issues of sovereignty. Specifically, this analysis will engage with Stoker’s *Dracula*, Bialik’s ‘Be’ir

Ha'harega' (In the City of Slaughter), Yizhar's *Khirbet Khizeh*, and Agnon's 'Tehila'. The comparison will reveal similarities in the use of myths of soil and soul redemption, which operate in the texts in relation to the (re)construction of individual and collective identities.

As delineated in the Introduction, one of the reasons the British provided for colonising Palestine, and specifically Jerusalem which was depicted as part of the Holy Land, was in order to redeem the land (Segev 1999: 4). Eitan Bar-Yosef juxtaposes representations of the Holy Land in England and in Palestine, suggesting that there are various 'cross-exchanges between the imperial project of exploring, representing, and eventually conquering Palestine and between the long tradition of internalising those central biblical images – 'Promised Land', 'Chosen People', 'Zion' – and applying them to England and the English' (2005: 4). Bar-Yosef identifies 'a unique sense of ambivalence towards the imperial desire to possess the land' (4) within the British approach, detecting the distinctive position the Holy Land, Palestine, has within the imperial enterprise. In the following analysis we will examine some of the literary representations of these ambivalences, as well as similarities in the exploration of the problems of emigration and colonisation.

The Holy Land is the quintessential imaginary land. It is the territory that according to the Hebrew Bible was promised to Abraham. The actual territory has been subject to many interpretations, as the initial biblical reference is 'from the river of Egypt to the great river, the Euphrates' (Genesis 15:18), which would locate it between the river Nile at the heart of nowadays' Egypt in the West, and the Euphrates in the East, a river that runs through modern Turkey, Syria, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Kuwait. The land in the biblical promise is not circumscribed by northern and southern boundaries, leaving this imaginary map open to even further expansion, both literally and metaphorically. According to the narrative, God says that the land is the place of the Canaanites, Hittites, Amorites, Perizzites, Hivites and Jebusites, acknowledging the place is currently occupied by other nations (Genesis 15:

20-1), and promises to Abraham that his descendants will subjugate these peoples as well as conquer the land.

A revisiting of the Abrahamic narrative that has become in itself a foundational myth is Bialik's epic, 'Be'ir Ha'harega'. As mentioned above, Bialik wrote the epic as a response to the Kishinev Pogrom (1903). It was Bialik's attempt to stir the *yishuv* in Palestine into action, and the Diaspora Jews to immigrate. It was a cry not only for national action but for a fundamental reconfiguration of Jewish individual and collective identity. As noted previously, Michael Gluzman asserts that the pogrom in Kishinev is perceived in Jewish culture research as a turning point in the attitude of Hebrew culture towards the question of Jewish identity, and as a crucial moment in the creation of the concepts of the "old" and "new" Jews (Gluzman 2007: 68). Nonetheless, Gluzman reveals Bialik's doubts regarding the Zionist identity categories (Gluzman 2007: 69), suggesting the epic exposes an identity crisis that challenges the simplistic dichotomies between the "old Jew" and the "new Jew" (Gluzman 2007: 70). The epic is simultaneously a consolidation of the concepts and a rejection of the "old Jew" without offering a valid alternative.⁹⁷

Yet, Bialik relies upon the ancient Jewish myth of the Promised Land only to subvert it in a resounding renunciation of God and His might. The epic opens with the command to 'arise and go now to the city of slaughter' (*BH*: 370),⁹⁸ echoing God's command to Abraham to leave his home and country Ur (Genesis, 12:1-2).⁹⁹ This biblical command is the formative moment of the Hebrew nation; it is the moment that God promises to provide land, progeny, and many blessings to Abraham, if only Abraham will

⁹⁷ When the epic was published the representations of the Jewish men's ineptitude in the face of their attackers shook the Jewish community. However, recent scholarship reveals that Bialik's denunciation of the victims was based on inaccuracies and concealment of information (Gluzman 2005: 17; Tzmir 2009: 152; Hirshfeld 2011: 276). Gluzman suggests Bialik misrepresented the facts in order to promote the rejection of the concepts of the old Jew and fortify the necessity of the creation of the myth of the new Jew (2005: 17).

⁹⁸ קום לך לך אל עיר ההרגה

⁹⁹ Avraham is at this point still Avram.

go from his land, his native soil, and his fatherland (Genesis 12:1-3). By using the phrase 'arise and go' Bialik is connecting the ancient myth to the contemporary state of Jews in the Ashkenazi Diaspora. Actually, Bialik offers the reverse of the biblical promise of prosperity as the epic reveals the modern evidence of devastation. Bialik is making an ironic use of the basis of the Jewish tradition and its nationhood, yet demands the abandonment of the Jewish exilic condition.

As noted earlier, exile is a fundamental aspect of Jewish tradition. First, according to the Hebrew Bible, Abraham, the national forefather establishes his identity as such precisely through his exilic condition. Following the initial promise to Abraham, the Israelites live on the land for some time; yet, due to their bad moral conduct and rejection of God's law, God punishes them with famine, and they are banished to the Egyptian exile. The whole Bible is, in fact, a narrative of perpetual restlessness (Gurevitch 1992: 29), and Jewish tradition can be outlined in relation to journeys that 'originate either in the biblical myths of punishment or quest or in the historic memories and legends of the destruction of the Temples in Jerusalem' (Ezrahi 2000: 27). The Jewish mythology, which bears significantly upon Christian and British narratives, is predominantly constructed in relation to the exile and the Holy Land.

As a significant part of the Holy, or Promised Land, Jerusalem has a unique place, and it is sacred to all three monotheistic religions. It is the location where, according to Jewish mythology, Abraham went to sacrifice his son (Genesis 22:1-20). The ascension of the prophet Elijah to heaven is linked with Jerusalem as well (Kings II 2:2), as the city is considered a pathway to heaven. In the Old Testament, Ezekiel prophesizes of the city and its glory, as well as the many sins that precede the arrival of the messiah. Jewish tradition outlines the notions of the Earthly Jerusalem and the Heavenly Jerusalem, as one is the tangible city in Palestine-Israel and the other an imaginary space. Imaginary and real spaces can coexist (Soja 1996: 10), and in Jewish tradition Jerusalem forms a complete

unity which is under the sovereignty of God. Also, Jerusalem is the location of the *shechina*, the feminine aspect of God. The *shechina*, which literally translates as *dwelling*, represents the compassionate facet of God.

One finds representations of the Promised Land and particularly of Jerusalem in texts in English as well as in Hebrew (Jeffery 1994: 1). William Blake's 'Jerusalem' (originally titled, 'And did those feet in ancient time'; 1808), is one of the most famous examples of the appropriation of Jewish symbolism and beliefs into British Christianity, and modern British identities. One use of Jerusalem symbolism in British literature is found in *Dracula*. In Stoker's famous novel, Count Dracula immigrates to London, along with fifty cases of his ancestral land. When Harker interviews the porters who carried the Count's coffins full of earth into Carfax, the porter reports that the place reeked, adding 'that yer might 'ave smelled ole Jerusalem in it' (*D*: 272). Apart from the implicit anti-Semitic remark, the attribution of old Jerusalem to the vampire's lair links the monster to the Promised Land. In the process of reverse colonisation, the Count brings his land into England, creating a false, foul Jerusalem. This subversion of the mythical position of the holy city, suggesting it is the locus of the devil rather than God, reworks the mythological attributes of the city into the myth of the vampire as well as the myth of the British Empire. The three narratives, the Judeo-Christian religious, the mythical monstrous, and the modern imperialistic intermingle, blurring the boundaries between myth and reality. The vampire is eventually vanquished upon his ancestral land, and the British woman – who is the embodiment and symbol of the motherland – is redeemed. The redemption of the British soul is achieved upon foreign soil. Comparing Stoker's novel to Bialik's epic reveals that whereas *Dracula* was part of a literary enterprise that encouraged Jewish settlement in Palestine, the British imperial enterprise is critiqued in the 'Be'ir Ha'harega'. Nonetheless, even while it critiques British imperialism, the novel affirms Western

supremacy. Both texts employ the symbolic notions of the Promised Land in order to engage with issues of modern sovereignty.

Another text that engages with Jerusalem in its exploration of modern sovereignty is Agnon's 'Tehila'. As noted in previous chapters, in this novella Agnon juxtaposes the British Mandate's legal hold of Jerusalem with the Jewish religious right to sovereignty. The text refers explicitly to the Balfour Declaration (1926), dismissing it in the face of Tehila's powerful gaze (*T*: 183). Tehila's character is aligned with the *schechina*, and thus Agnon's narrative supports the Jewish right to the land not due to modern nationalism, but through religious decree. While the Zionist narrative claims the Jews have the right to the land because of the promise in the Balfour Declaration, Agnon attributes the valid hold due to divine promise.

In many Hebrew texts, and particularly in Agnon's work Jerusalem is first and foremost the symbol of Jewish tradition, the mysterious Holy City (Shaked 1989: 243; Mann 2006: 121-2). Jerusalem has been for millennia both a real city and an imaginary locus of symbolic mythology. As noted earlier, the Jewish belief is that one who is buried in the Mount of Olives will be resurrected on the final day of doom.¹⁰⁰ Tehila arranges for her burial in the Mount of Olive in the hope of rebirth. Thus like the vampire, she wishes to be interred in her ancestral land in order to be raised from the dead. Yet while in Stoker's text we found a profane Jerusalem, in Agnon's novella Jerusalem is depicted as the holy city, the dwelling place of the *schechina*. This might suggest that the land is benign only as long as it remains in its original location, and that transporting it leads to its decay into malign soil, which breeds evils like the ungodly vampire. A further ramification is that the "portable territory", the Jewish Torah, might have similarly lead to the Jewish decay in the diaspora. If the Holy Scriptures are an embodiment of the connection to the land through

¹⁰⁰ The first mention of the Mount of Olives occurs in Samuel II 30:15, when David laments the possibility of the loss of his sovereignty as Absalom contrives to overthrow him.

the shechina, the dislocation of this most benign dwelling could lead to its decrepitude. The right place for the shechina is in the Holy Land, in a stationary state, and not wandering the earth in the form of the scroll. This wrong state of the shechina leads to the decadence of the people. This resonates with the Zionist perspective of the exilic condition as degenerate. The Zionists argued for the need for a connection with the real land in order to avoid decadence (Bar Yosef 1996: 68; Ben-Porat 1991: 253). The mythology of the land as means for rebirth and resurrection lends itself to the exploration of British imperialism as well as the Jewish re-appropriation of the Holy Land.

The Zionist narrative of the appropriation of the land was a well-developed mythology. Alongside the “new Jew”, Zionism propelled the notion of the redemption of the land, *ge'ulat ha'adamah*, and the concept of the cultivation of the wilderness (Grumberg 2011: 6). Karen Grumberg suggests that there are depictions of “Zionist places” in Hebrew literature, which ‘provide physical and geographical expression of mainstream Zionist ideology. These places are defined against the perceived wilderness and chaos of the “uncivilised” space beyond’ (2011: 6). While the biblical narrative acknowledged the presence of many other peoples, the Canaanites, Hittites, Amorites, etc., the Zionist narrative ignored the people living on the land, and spoke only of the redemption of the land, which would lead to an elevation of the soul (Kellerman 1996: 371). The Zionist narrative presented ‘a positive process of “making the desert bloom” and “conquering the wilderness”’ (Kellerman 1996: 371). The land was depicted as barren, and the settlers were redeeming it even while they were obtaining their own salvation.

The notion of the redemption of the land was extensively explored in literature. S. Yizhar’s great uncle, Moshe Smilansky, wrote narratives like *Sipur ge'ulat ha-adamah ba-Arets mi-pi 'ed re'iyah* (The Story of the Land Redemption from an Eye Witness) (1944), which supported the Zionist enterprise. Yizhar himself, was not as unequivocal regarding the Zionist conquest, and primarily the ways it was conducted. The land in Yizhar’s

Khirbet Khizeh is depicted as the mythical Promised Land, and his narrative acknowledges the local inhabitants. Therefore, his text questions the moral validity of the modern Jewish-Israeli nation state conquest of this territory. *Khirbet Khizeh* is the most prominent example of a narrative that undermines or questions the national narrative generally, and the 1948 war specifically (Gertz 200: 46). As previously discussed, in *Khirbet Khizeh* one finds that the idyllic depictions of the fields, the hills, and the valleys are juxtaposed with the brutal trampling of the soldiers' feet. Much like the cognitive dissonance experienced by the British colonialists, and explored in various texts of the era such as Wollstonecraft Shelley's *Frankenstein*, the soldiers in Yizhar's novella find it difficult to come to terms with the brutish act of conquest. The acknowledgment of human equality is conflated with the unjust act of conquest and subjugation.

Khirbet Khizeh was written just a few months after the 1948 war, and the moral issues raised were just stirring up a public debate that would continue to trouble the Israeli nation (Govrin 2001: 108). As Nurit Govrin notes, by leaving the novella open-ended Yizhar reiterated the dilemma between two kinds of right (or justice), highlighting the moral questions that exist in the Jewish-Arab relationship (2001: 106). Furthermore, Shaul Setter argues that *Khirbet Khizeh* 'already writes the Nakba as an event of return' that will continue to haunt the Israeli culture (2012: 50). Yizhar's narrative depicts a violent conquest, and the story suggests this might lead to personal and communal degradation. This line of argument participates in post-Zionist discourse, which questions the validity of the Zionist narrative. The fact that Yizhar's narratives participate in this discourse is particularly interesting because in addition to being one of Israel's renowned writers, Yizhar was a member of the Israeli Knesset. Yizhar was first and foremost an educator, who held various posts as Professor of Education, and offered some resistance to the Zionist narrative, even while he was in office. Arguably, he was used as a cultural fig leaf, meant to cover the uncomfortable feelings regarding the violence of the 1948 conquest of

the land and the expulsion of the local inhabitants. Yizhar might have conceived the story as a critique of the expulsion of the Arab population from villages during the 1948 war, but he nevertheless mythologises the narrative even as he attempted to subvert the Zionist narrative of the restoration and redemption of a barren land. Just as *Frankenstein* and *Dracula* offered social critique even while they reiterated the very social structures they were critiquing, Yizhar's narrative is appropriated by the canon, and is depleted of its bite.¹⁰¹

The comparison of the texts reveals similarities in the incorporation of ancient myths of soul and soil redemption in order to (re)create myths and explore modern concerns. Specifically, the texts in English and in Hebrew utilise similar mythology in order to question the moral validity of colonialism. The demonic vampire and the angelic Tehila both wish to be buried in their ancestral land in order to be reborn, and the Holy Land is referred to in both Bialik's and Yizhar's narratives, yet while in the former there is a call for settlement as a continuation of divine promise, the latter questions the validity of the Jewish right to the land. The two nations were undergoing opposite processes, as the British were moving away from colonialism and the Jews were commencing a mass immigration and colonisation project, and the literatures exhibit parallel use of myths of soil and soul redemption.

3.2.3 The Myth of the Vampire

Intertwined with myths of soil and soul redemption are myths of the vampire. The fact that the vampire requires his ancestral land for rejuvenation is a metaphor of the creature's

¹⁰¹ One might add that the Zionist myth of the redemption of the land and the ancient Jewish myth are further entangled with the narrative of the twentieth-century Holocaust. Anita Shapira refers to the Holocaust as well as biblical references in Yizhar's texts, detecting in them the conflict between the two moral systems – basic humanism and national values (2002: 50). Growing up alongside Arab farmers and brought up to believe in humanist values, Yizhar was confronted with a moral dilemma as the violence broke out (Shapira 2002: 50).

connection to land as its source of power. The myth of the vampire is as ancient as civilisation. Evidence of vampiric creatures can be traced in ancient Greece and Rome (Beresford 2008: 19). One of the first vampire figures depicted in recorded culture is a feminine figure, Lilith. The first mention of a Lilith-like character is in the Epic of Gilgamesh. ‘The Lillu was one of four demons belonging to a vampire or incubi-succubae class’ (Patai 1964: 295). While Lilith was a well-developed entity in the Assyrian and Babylonian cultures, as well as in the Talmudic and Kabbalistic periods (295), the only biblical reference that might be linked with her image is in Isaiah’s description of the day of vengeance (296). Lilith was depicted as beautiful, but also a barren harlot and a vampire (296).¹⁰² In addition to these characteristics of Lilith, which developed during the Talmudic period, Kabbalistic mysticism established her relationship with God. Around the thirteenth century her image is portrayed in greater detail, including for example the narrative of her creation. In one version she is created at the same time God creates Adam, only ‘instead of using clean earth which was the substance of Adam’s body, He – for reasons unknown – took filth and impure sediments from the earth, and out of these He formed a female’ (300). This myth links the vampire myth to the land in the very creation of the unclean monster out of filthy dirt.

Even though the myth of the vampire, like the monster, is as ancient as humanity itself, there are local historical socio-political reasons for resurfacing of particular myths (Gilmore 2003: 63). David Gilmore suggests that the ‘age of Enlightenment’, while it might have attempted to maintain the non-existence of monsters (in literature as well as in reality) led to the opposite reaction of massive witch hunts (2003: 63). European churches attempted to abolish any references to monsters, and this deflection of attention to social scapegoats was perhaps a deliberate political manoeuvre of the Church in order to assert

¹⁰² These notions of the female vampire were developed in the eighteenth and nineteenth-century Gothic literature, in texts such as Gautier’s ‘La Morte Amoureuse’ (1836) and Le Fanu’s ‘Carmilla’ (1871).

its dominance over the (Christian as well as non-Christian) population (Gilmore 2003: 63). The Jews were among the marginalised communities, and an easy target for persecution.

The vampire made its way from folklore into literature, and flourished there during the nineteenth century. One of the first adaptations of the vampire myth in English literature was John William Polidori's *The Vampyre* (1819). 'Polidori's tale was in essence the first "vampire story", drawing on elements that were present in folklore, to which were added other ideas, such as the vampire being an aristocratic member of society' (Beresford 2008: 116). In this narrative one finds the first connection between the redemption of the soul and the land, as the protagonist 'had been tormented by a vampyre, but had found a way to rid himself of the evil, by eating some of the earth out of the vampyre's grave' (Polidori: xx). In order to assuage the wrath of evil some form of land salvation is required. In time, Polidori's *The Vampyre* inspired Stoker's *Dracula* and its depiction of Count Dracula as the monster that wishes to feed on humanity (Olorenshaw 1994: 158). Whereas 'Polidori's vampire is still a petty feudal lord forced to travel round Europe startling young ladies for the miserable purpose of *surviving* [...] Dracula, by contrast, is a rational entrepreneur who invests his gold to expand his dominion: to conquer the city of London' (Moretti 1983/1988: 84; emphasis in the original). The ancient myth, like the vampire itself, has been resurrected, reinvented in order to explore and express modern fears of reverse colonialism and capitalism.

Within Derridian deconstruction theories Stoker's vampire highlights the links between the beast and sovereign. Derrida notes the 'troubling resemblance' between the beast and the sovereign as beings that are "without laws" or "above laws" (2009: 18/40). Derrida's argument undermines the differentiation between the beast and the sovereign. Furthermore, Derrida suggests that the 'beast, criminal, and sovereign have a troubling resemblance [...] a worrying familiarity, an unheimliche, uncanny reciprocal haunting' (17/39). Since Dracula is both sovereign and beast, even while it is neither human nor

divine, I would suggest Derrida's observations are useful for the understanding of Stoker's vampire.

All vampires are horrifying; however, the vampire in Stoker's narrative is a specific character that has its roots in reality. Count Dracula looks human though he has the consciousness of a beast and the capacity to contaminate humanity while bearing an ancient name of great historical significance (Olorenshaw 1994: 158). In order to create and rekindle the myth of the vampire, Stoker manipulated Vlad the Impaler's mythical status and created a new myth. The historical character on whom Dracula is based is 'Vlad III Dracul, voivod or prince of Wallachia, better known as Vlad the Impaler (Vlad Tepes) or simply Dracula' (Akeroyd 2009: 22). The historical Vlad's 'blood-soaked struggle against Ottoman Turks, Hungarians and his own nobility [which] had passed into legend even within his lifetime' (22) served to augment the ferocity of the fictional vampire. The legends of Vlad the Impaler offer the perfect foundation for the myth of Dracula.

Dracula refers to the historical Vlad through Van Helsing's focalisation, as he tells the team about their foe. Van Helsing has asked a friend from Buda-Pesth to research Dracula, and found that he is, indeed, a descendent of the fearsome Vlad the Impaler (*D*: 287-8). Van Helsing says this is 'the cleverest and the most cunning, as well as the bravest of the sons of the "land beyond the forest" [...] The Draculas were, says Arminius, a great and noble race, though now and again were scions who were held by their coevals to have had dealings with the Evil One' (288). The myth of Vlad and the myth of the vampire are thus amalgamated, and the boundary between fact and fiction is blurred. Ironically, while the fictional Count Dracula has an aversion to the cross, the historical Vlad was a fierce fighter for the cross and the Orthodox Church, a member of the order of the dragon, and a religious Christian who fought the Turks as he tried to repel the Ottoman Empire (Akeroyd 2009: 23). This aversion to the cross is, nonetheless, one of several likenesses shared by the vampire and the stereotypical anti-Semitic depiction of the Jew.

The various connections between the vampire and the figure of the Jew have been acknowledged by critics such as Howard LeRoy Malchow, Judith Halberstam, Matthew Biberman, and Carol Margaret Davison. Malchow argues that subliminal themes of moral corruption and gender inversion that previously might have signified to the Protestant British an abnormal Roman Catholicism, ‘wander away from this nearly exhausted locus in order to confirm more powerful late-Victorian prejudices – homophobia and anti-Semitism’ (1996: 140). Additionally, *Dracula* explores fears of ‘reverse colonialism’ (Arata 1990: 621), which suggest the colonised Other might return to Great Britain with a vengeance. This sheds light upon the complex relations between the Jews and British, as the Jews, who were the Other within – the Other that can “pass” – were also perceived as a threat of reverse colonialism, usually attached to the colonised Other. The fear of the invasion – both racial and financial – by the Jews, who were running away from the Tsar’s persecutions during the late eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries into England, gave birth to a wave of xenophobia, which found its literary representation. The repulsion of the vampire is a literary manifestation of the fear of the Jew.

Specifically with regard to the figure of the Jew, Malchow argues that ‘[l]ike Dracula, “the Jew” can take a variety of forms. He can be both eternal threat and eternal victim, Judas and the Wandering Jew Ahasuerus, capitalist and sweated proletarian, masculine roué and feminised homosexual, black and white’ (149-50). Malchow outlines the links between Count Dracula and the Jew, adding that though not known for being an anti-Semite himself Stoker might have been influenced by anti-Semitic prejudice (154-64).¹⁰³ The resemblances between the Count and the stereotypical Jew are striking.

Halberstam notes that the vampire, ‘with his peculiar physique, his parasitical desires, his aversion to the cross and to all the trappings of Christianity, his blood-sucking

¹⁰³ The (perverse) sexualities in *Dracula* have been noted by numerous critiques, such as Franco Moretti (1983/1988); Christopher Craft (1990); Ken Gelder (1994); and David Punter (1996).

attacks, and his avaricious relation to money resemble[s] stereotypical anti-Semite nineteenth-century representations of the Jew' (1996: 86). Moreover, the Jew poses a threat to social structures as it undermines social stability. Whether the Jew is rich or poor he destabilises social classes, because if the Jew is poor he might become a burden on society, and if the Jew is rich he might undermine the ruling classes' status. As Halberstam explains, 'connections in the narrative between blood and gold, race and sex, sexuality and ethnicity confirmed [the] sense that the anti-Semite Jew and Stoker's vampire [bear] more than a family resemblance' (1996: 86). Like the literary vampire, the figure of the stereotypical Jew embodied the ignoble, greedy, cowardly Other that was attempting to penetrate England.

Responding to Halberstam's analysis, Biberman draws a distinction between anti-Semitic depictions of the 'Jew-sissy' and the 'Jew-devil', suggesting that both Frankenstein's creature and Dracula are the latter (2004: 161, 168). While Biberman contests Halberstam's argument that one of the characteristics that suggest Dracula is a representation of the anti-Semitic figure of the Jew is his femininity (Halberstam 1996: 92), I tend to agree with Halberstam for various reasons: first, the origins of the vampire myth align it with the feminine; second, the Count's preference to keep indoors links him to the ideal of Jewish masculinity, which is effeminate within Victorian discourse;¹⁰⁴ and third, though the Count takes women, he also takes men, as when he asserts that Harker is his, telling the three vampiresses: "How dare you touch him, any of you? How dare you cast eyes on him when I had forbidden it? Back, I tell you all! This man belongs to me!" (D: 53), which suggests a homosexual tendency that is often attributed to effeminate men.

Davison outlines the development of vampires' characters in British Gothic literature as representations of the fear of the Judaisation of Britain (2004: 104-5). Count

¹⁰⁴ While Victorian culture valorised the active male and passive female, the early modern Ashkenazi culture promoted the opposite gender roles (Boyarin 1997: 3).

Dracula ‘threatens to Judaize Christian Britons by way of his very infectious bite’ (144).¹⁰⁵ One ought to note that *Dracula* was published in 1897, the same year Herzl established political Zionism, and ‘Zionism was conceived, according to Hannah Arendt, as an answer or “counter-ideology” to anti-Semitism’ (Davison 2004: 131). Revealing the (perhaps unintended and unconscious) ‘uncanny vampire-imperialist affinity’ (143), Davison reads *Dracula* as the representation and exploration of British anti-Semitic fears (127-57), suggesting that the vampire was an embodiment of these fears.

Over the years and throughout Europe, though not specifically in England, the various fears regarding Jews gave birth to the blood libel, which is a concocted story that slandered the Jew. The Jew would be framed for a murder he or she did not commit. The stories suggested that Jews required the blood of Christian children for ritual purposes. These stories surfaced and subsided over the centuries all over Europe (Eban 1972: 241). In the modern era the narrative of the actual drinking of blood was replaced by acts of treason and national sabotage. Being without sovereignty in host countries, the Jews were easy scapegoats for sensitive national issues.¹⁰⁶ The replacement of the blood libel with accusations of treason could originate in the connection between blood and land, which stems from the association between the myths of creation from the land and the birth from woman. The motherland metaphorically bleeds when betrayed, and the Jew is then the blood sucking monster that feeds on her blood.

¹⁰⁵ As noted above, (footnote 38), though *Dracula* comes from Transylvania, which was not colonised by the British, the metaphor of the racial Other that might “contaminate” the British is reworked here in relation to Jewish Otherness, which was portrayed as a threat to the British nation. Though Judaism is a non-missionary religion, many British Jews were mostly assimilated, and intermarriage offers a “threat” of racial contamination.

¹⁰⁶ A famous instance of the blood libel was the so-called Damascus Affair. In 1840, a Catholic priest disappeared in Damascus and a Jew was blamed and arrested (241). In 1894, The Dreyfus Affair shook France as Alfred Dreyfus was charged and convicted of treason only to be found innocent (Eban 1972: 249-252). The affair stirred attention in England as well as, because of the involvement of Moses Montefiore, a prominent British banker and philanthropist, who influenced the sultan Abdülmeceid I to issue a decree that would arrest the spread of blood libels in the Ottoman Empire.

The origins of the blood libel are here important, since there is in Judaism a specific restriction regarding any intake of blood, and elaborate rules and regulations as to how the animal ought to be slaughtered in order to prevent any possibility of blood consumption (Leviticus 7:27; Deuteronomy 12:23).¹⁰⁷ Paradoxically, the non-Jewish community chose precisely the blood for its incriminating narratives against the Jews. One might conjecture that it is deliberately related to this restriction as it differentiates the Jews and non-Jews.

Bearing this in mind, the following scene of the rape and slaughter of the women in Bialik's epic 'Be'ir Ha'harega' becomes more complex:

And you ascended from there and came into the dark cellars

The place where the virtuous damsels of your people were sullied between the tools,

Woman after woman under seven gentiles

The daughter in front of her mother and the mother in front of her daughter

Before slaughter and while being slaughtered and after the slaughter

And with your hand feel the filthy pillow case and the reddened pillow

Wild boars' dwelling place and the beasts' carnal house

With an axe dripping with steaming hot blood in their hands

And do not fail to see in the corner of that dark angle

Under that ledge and behind that barrel

¹⁰⁷ There is a later incident of cannibalism, in which during a siege and drought two women agree to eat their children, and, indeed, eat one, yet the other is hidden by his mother. The scriptures are clear regarding the breach of taboo in this case, and depict it as abnormal and a sign of great depravity in the people (Kings II 6:25-29).

Laid husbands, grooms, brothers, peaking from the holes

As holy corpses convulsed under the flesh of donkeys

Suffocating in their turpitude and swallowing their throat's blood

And as a man sharing his bread the loathsome gentile shared their flesh

Laid in their shame and did not move and did not stir

And their eyes did not pluck out and their minds did not lose

And perhaps even each man to himself then prayed in his heart

Dear God, make a miracle and let not the harm come onto me.

And those who lived through their devastation and woke from their blood

And found their lives had been defiled and the light of their world had been
obliterated

Worldly defilements, filth of body and soul, inside and out

And ascended their husbands from their hole and ran to the house of God

And blessed the miracles in the almighty God's name that delivered them

And the priests amongst them went out and asked their rabbi

“Rabbi! My wife, what is she? Permitted or forbidden?”

And all went back to custom, all went back in line.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁸ וַיִּרְדּוּ מִשָּׁם וּבָאוּ אֶל-תּוֹךְ הַמְּרִתְפִים הָאֵפְלִים,
מִקּוֹם נִטְמְאוּ בְּנוֹת עַמּוֹד הַקְּשָׁרוֹת בֵּין הַכְּלִים
אִשָּׁה אִשָּׁה אַחַת תַּחַת שְׂבָעָה שְׂבָעָה עֲרָלִים
הַבַּת לְעֵינֵי אִמָּה וְהָאֵם לְעֵינֵי בָתָהּ
לִפְנֵי שְׂחִיטָה וּבִשְׂעֵת שְׂחִיטָה וּלְאַחַר שְׂחִיטָה
וּבְנִדּוֹד תַּמְשֵׁשׂ אֶת-הַכֶּסֶת הַמְּטַנְנֶפֶת וְאֶת-הַכָּר הַמְּאֲדָם
מִרְבִּץ חֲזִירֵי נֶעֱר וּמִרְבַּעַת סוּסֵי אֲדָם
עִם-קֶרְדָּם מִטְּפֹטֵף דָּם רוֹתַח בְּגָדָם
וּרְאָה גַם-רְאָה: בְּאֵפְלַת אוֹתָהּ נְוִית
תַּחַת מְדוּכָת מִצָּה זוֹ וּמִאֲחֹרֵי אוֹתָהּ חֲבִית

As the women choke on their own blood they transgress the prohibition regarding blood consumption. The women thus become profane even while they are being assaulted. The horror is then augmented as the men wonder if this renders their wives prohibited under Jewish law. The Jewish men in Bialik's epic are not heroes like the team of Western men in *Dracula*. These Jewish men are portrayed as heinous, as they cower in the pigsty watching their wives and daughters being violated, they become as loathsome as the monsters that ravish the women. The location of the Jewish men defines them as lowly vermin even while the non-Jewish men are depicted as beasts. There are no heroes here, only monsters.

The consumption of blood is considered as social transgression both in Bialik and in Stoker's novel, and is similarly linked with sovereignty and sexual transgression. Once Mina comprehends what the Count has done to her, she calls out that she is 'unclean', that even God shuns her, and that she must not kiss her husband (*D*: 353). Like the women in Bialik's epic poem, the raped woman is profane. The social transgression is also the religious one, and the taboo is similar in both texts. Once she is 'unclean', Mina cannot touch her husband. Thus, in both *Dracula* and 'Be'ir Ha'harega' the consumption of blood leads to social rejection, as the one who drinks blood is forbidden.

שָׁכְבוּ בְּעֵלִים, חֲתָנִים, אָחִים, הִצִּיצוּ מִן-הַחֹרֵרִים
בְּפֶרֶךְ גִּוִּיּוֹת קְדוֹשׁוֹת תַּחַת בֶּשֶׂר חַמּוּרִים
נִחְנָקוֹת בְּטַמְאָתָן וּמַעֲלֵעוֹת דָּם צֹנְאָרָן
– וּכְחֵלֶק אִישׁ פֶּת-כָּגוֹ חֵלֶק מֵתַעֵב גּוֹי בִּשְׂרָן
שָׁכְבוּ בְּבִשְׂתָן וַיֵּרְאוּ – וְלֹא נָעוּ וְלֹא זָעוּ
– וְאֵת-עֵינֵיהֶם לֹא-נִקְרוּ וּמִדַּעְתָּם לֹא יָצְאוּ
:וְאוֹלֵי גַם-אִישׁ לְנַפְשׁוֹ אִזּוֹ הִתְפַּלֵּל בְּלִבּוֹ
רַבּוֹנוֹ שֶׁל-עוֹלָם, עֲשֵׂה נֶס – וְאֵלֵי הַרְעֵה לֹא-תִבֹּא
– וְאֵלֵה אֲשֶׁר חָיו מִטַּמְאָתָן וְהִקְיִצוּ מִדָּמָן
וְהִנֵּה שָׁקְצוּ כָל-חַיֵּיהֶן וְנִטְמָא אֹרַח עוֹלָמָן

¹⁰⁹ My translation.

The woman, symbolic of the land, is under threat. This is a dual fear that ought to be further clarified: it is a fear first, of racial contamination through sexual reproduction; and second, of spatial invasion as the Other enters the British soil. In Bialik's epic the woman functions as symbolic of the land as well; however, since there is no real motherland under threat, the defilement of the woman remains the ultimate threat. The lack of the land is transferred to the relinquishing and abandonment of the woman. The men have no real land to fight over, and remain impotent and passive. While in *Dracula* the team of Western men save the woman from the vampire's racial contamination, in 'Be'ir Ha'harega' the women are raped and slaughtered. The comparison of the texts suggests that notions of male bravery are intertwined with issues of sovereignty. Moreover, the texts in both Hebrew and English rework the productive metaphorical figure of the vampire in order to reconsider the relationship between the Jewish and British individual and collective identities.

A connection between vampire lore and the Jew in Bialik's epic has been noted by Hirshfeld, who compares Bialik's later reference in the epic to the Jewish nation as beggars to a similar metaphor in Agnon's 'Ha'adonit ve'Harochel' ('The Lady and the Peddler') (2011: 286). Hirshfeld's comparison suggests both references function as a satiric expression meant to establish value and caution against the coercions of the Jewish community in the Ashkenazi Diaspora (2011: 286). As mentioned in previous chapters, in 'Ha'adonit ve'Harochel' the Jew is the peddler who is the prey of the vampiric lady (Lee 1993: 150). Agnon offers an inversion of the alignment of the vampire figure with anti-Semitic depictions of Jews, suggesting the Jews' exilic condition places them in great danger. Specifically, the danger is of intermarriage and the loss of the Jewish identity. Furthermore, as noted earlier, the reciprocal relationship between the Jew and his God suggests that if the person forsakes the faith and tradition, divinity has no obligation to protect him or her, and the person is cut out from the Book of Life forever.

‘Ha’adonit ve’Harochel’ returns to the origins of the myth of the vampire as a feminine figure, who has no children. Yet the vampire in Agnon’s narrative is pleasant, and once she agrees to let the peddler into her home she does all she can to delight and feed him. At the centre of the story one finds a great engagement with food. Food is one of the most important aspects of Jewish life (Diemling and Ray 2014: 125), predominantly because it requires specific kinds and treatments of food, and is a clear delineator of socio-religious boundaries. The issue of the consumption of non-kosher foods is at the heart of the narrative, and we receive detailed descriptions of the various non-kosher foods the lady prepares and the peddler eats (*HH*: 213). The question of eating non-kosher food is intertwined with the sexual romantic relationship between the two, who share a bed out of wedlock, and here to the notions of consumption of blood and sexual depravity are linked.

Helen, the lady, is not immediately identified as the vampire she is (Fuchs 1982/1983: 120), but soon the reader alongside Josef, the peddler, realises what her true nature entails. Once the peddler confronts her, the lady actually acknowledges her true nature saying – half jokingly – ‘I drink men’s blood and I eat human flesh’ (*HH*: 214). This is a clear reference to the Christian practice of the Eucharist. The Eucharist ritual follows the words attributed to Christ during the last supper, suggesting his blood and body are the means of the new covenant (Matthew 26:28; Mark 14:24). There is in the Christian tradition a dispute regarding the sacrament and its interpretation, and the figure of the vampire has been read as a manifestation of the dispute. Jean-Louis Schefer draws attention to possible connections between Eucharistic and vampirism legends and the legacy of Byzantium (1994: 179). According to Schefer, the issue of blood consumption relates to the narrative of the rift between the Catholic and Orthodox churches. Schefer views *Dracula* as a representation of religious conflicts that resurface towards the end of the Victorian era (1994: 184). Furthermore, Schefer argues that the iconodules spread tales of Jews responsible for profanation of sacred objects resulting in the ‘bleeding’ of the objects

(Schefer 1994: 185, 6). Schefer's examination reveals that '[t]he profaners of the host are, for the Latins, the Orientals: Jews and 'New Greeks' from after the schism' (Schefer 1994: 187). Thus, the Jewish entity was depicted as entwined in this bloody dispute between East and West from the onset, and as a consequence of this interweave in the legends of vampirism as well.

The reason these issues re-emerge at end of the nineteenth and early twentieth century is because of the concerns regarding the condition of the Jewish communities in exile on the one hand, and the reappearance of issues of dominance over land, or imperialism, on the other. British imperialism brought with it the resurgence of fears from racial and religious contamination, and the surge in pogroms and then the Second World War clarified the precarious state of Diaspora Jewry. The Jews who have meandered all over Europe have come under severe threat of annihilation.

3.2.4 The Wandering Jew and his Avatars

One of the striking connections between Hebrew and English cultures is the prevalence of the figure of the Wandering Jew and his avatars in both literary traditions. The figure of the Wandering Jew was productive for the (re)construction of both Jewish and later Jewish-Israeli identities as well as modern British identity. This figure finds its avatars in texts in Hebrew and English alike. Some of the early explicit engagements with this figure in English are Thomas Percy and Percy Shelley's *The Wandering Jew* (1765 and 1877, respectively) as well as Charles Maturin's *Melmoth the Wanderer* (1820).

The myth of the Wandering Jew has had many representations in literature – some overt; many more subtly exploring this literarily productive character. This myth hinges on one of the strongest taboos in human culture – siblicide – on the one hand, and one of the greatest fears – homelessness – on the other hand. The myth suggests that because of

the primordial sin of killing his brother the Jew is condemned to homelessness. One version of the myth aligns the sin with the first siblicide in the Hebrew Bible. In the biblical narrative, after Cain kills Abel, God banishes Cain from the land with the decree that he will forever be a nomad, a fugitive and vagabond (Genesis 4:11-13). When Cain expresses his fear of human vengeance, God elucidates that only He has the right for retribution, and places a mark upon Cain so that all who attempt to kill him will be subjected to seven-fold divine wrath (Genesis 4:14-16). This myth has been aligned with the image of the exilic Jew. The Jews were a nomadic, restless entity, simultaneously like all humankind, yet distinctly different, and, as the religious Jews consider themselves the chosen people, allegedly protected by divine decree. A later avatar of this figure is the accursed Jew who taunted Christ, and was doomed to roam the earth as punishment, and Jews' homelessness was perceived as the result of their refusal to accept Christianity as the Truth (Gaer 1961: 75-8; Davison 2004: 87-9). Hence the Jews have been linked with the image of the primal murderer as well as the one who rejected the new Christian religion. This dual alignment offers an extremely negative image of the Jew. In fact, this depicts the Jew as a monstrous villain.

The modern avatars of the Wandering Jew replace the classical dichotomy of the monster and the hero with a more nuanced tension between monstrous antiheroes and heroic monsters. Unlike the classical hero, who exhibited extraordinary qualities of valour and charisma, '[i]nstead of manifesting largeness, dignity, power, or heroism, the anti-hero is petty, ignominious, passive' (Abrams and Harpham 2005: 12). According to Daniel Boyarin, this image is important in the context of the (re)construction of Jewish identities, because the construction of Jewish identity in the Diaspora was in opposition to the non-Jewish tradition (1997: 1-2). Hence, if the non-Jewish hero was an athletic courageous character, the Jewish counter figure was a timid feeble oddity. While Victorian culture valorised the active male and passive female, the early modern Ashkenazi culture

promoted the opposite gender roles (Boyarin 1997: 3). Whereas Boyarin emphasises the differences between the two cultures, I would like to shed some light upon certain similarities. Primarily, there is the obvious connection between the male characters in Hebrew and the female characters in English literature. But there are also more subtle but important similarities between some of the male heroes in both literatures. We shall soon see the prevalence of the wandering antihero, the quintessential modern character, in the texts examined here, both in Hebrew and English.

The following analysis focuses on a particular kind of antihero which is widespread in both literatures. This is a specific kind of modern antihero, which might be less than a hero in his personality, but is very much like the ancient heroes with regard to his restlessness. Both Hebrew and English literatures of the modern era are replete with restless entities. We find characters such as Joyce's Leopold Bloom in *Ulysses* as well as Agnon's unnamed narrator in 'Ad Hennah' wandering. These two examples represent the Greek and Hebraic narratives of exile and homelessness (Omer-Sherman 2006: 12). As Bloom and Agnon's narrator attempt to (re)construct meaningful individual and collective identities in a world that has been depleted of meaning, they wander in search of identities.

In addition to various explicit explorations of the figure of the Wandering Jew, in the texts in English examined here one comes across characters, which, in many respects, are adaptations of the figure of the Wandering Jew. The clear example being Count Dracula. As noted above, the Count in *Dracula* has been read as an embodiment of anti-Semitic notions (Malchow 1996: 140; Halberstam 1996: 86; Biberman 2004: 161, 168; and Davison 2004: 127-57). The Count not only exhibits some characteristics that render him suspiciously Jewish, but also travels from the East to the West. In relation to Count Dracula's search for the hidden gold on the eve of St George's Day, Davison suggests that 'increasingly, secular anti-Semitic stereotypes were being grafted onto the Wandering Jew in British Gothic literature' (Davison 2004: 128). Dracula is a literary representation of the

Wandering Jew. Moreover, he is a monster that has to migrate because it has depleted the resources in its territory.

Along with the Count as an avatar of the Wandering Jew, another figure that makes an appearance in the novel linked with wandering is the gypsy. As the Count attempts to travel, his departure is facilitated by the gypsies (*D*: 58, 443). The vampire's mobility is hence linked with the restless gypsies. In addition to the vampire's horror as such, his connection to the gypsies confirms fears regarding this nomadic people, reaffirming old myths regarding the gypsies as the abductors of children. The vampire and the gypsy have a bond that renders both even more horrifying. This connection suggests an affiliation between the Jew and the gypsy.

Though not a direct reference to the figure of the Wandering Jew, the mythologising of the gypsy is an exploration of this image in English literature. The gypsies have been linked with the Jews as both are nomadic tribes that pose various (imagined) threats to the population, from witchcraft to child abduction (Malchow 1996: 161). In addition to *Dracula*, the gypsy makes several significant appearances in *Jane Eyre*. After the red-room incident, Bessie sits by Jane's bed singing about a poor orphan child who is sent away to the moors (*JE*: 17-18). Jane connects her social situation as a poor orphan child with that of the gypsy, and the gypsy's nomadic nature will to some extent be her fate. As disease inhabits Lowood yet leaves Jane unharmed, she is allowed to go outside and is permitted to 'ramble in the wood, like gipsies, from morning till night' (*JE*: 65). Later Mrs Fairfax will tell Jane that she doubts Mr Rochester will ever settle down in Thornfield (*JE*:109), and Mr Rochester's extensive travels, both in the colonies and in Europe, present him as a nobleman with a stable estate, who is, in fact, a gypsy at heart. When we eventually meet a person who is presumably a gypsy, it is, indeed, Mr Rochester in disguise, using the ruse in order to learn the truth from the various people under his roof (*JE*: 165-175). The gypsy is depicted as a figure not to be trusted, an unstable creature that

has no roots, and therefore no allegiances. This figure is, however, the true character of both the novel's protagonist and her lover. This suggests that even while the British might put on the appearance of stability, the characters examined here represent them as nomads at heart. Thus in a subtle manner the novel links the core of British identities with the rejected Other.

Jane Eyre is a rejected orphan who yearns for a home. Jane travels from Gateshead Hall to Lowood, and then from Thornfield to Ferndean. As noted above, the novel is a bildungsroman that is also an odyssey. Jane longs to return to a home she never had, and has to (re)construct a home along with her identities. Along the way, Jane's very humanity is constantly undermined, as she is referred to as 'bad animal', 'rat', 'half fairy, half imp', 'witch', 'elf' (*JE*: 7, 8, 11, 104, 127) etc. Indeed, she is torn between constructions of her identity based upon myths of the angel and the monster (Gilbert and Gubar 1979: 812). Jane's identity is thus comprised of her alienation from humanity and her spatial restlessness. Jane's own avatar in *Rebecca* is similarly a reincarnation of the figure of a marginal nomad. The protagonists in both in *Jane Eyre* and *Rebecca* are female depictions of the wandering rejected Other. The connection between the protagonists and the figure of the Wandering Jew suggests that like other marginal groups in the forming modern British social structure, the figure of the poor female orphan was a concern to be reckoned with, a problem that has to be addressed.

The most obvious British avatars of the Wandering Jew explored here is the miserable creature in *Frankenstein*. The creature is clearly an avatar of the wretched castaway, as he is not only rejected by his maker but is, indeed, a murderer being chased in the name of vengeance. Yet both Frankenstein and Walton also travel the earth in a most unhappy manner, mirroring the creature's desolation. Like *Dracula*, *Jane Eyre* and *Rebecca*, the narrative outlines extensive traveling from St. Petersburg via Geneva and Ingolstadt through Switzerland and England, Ireland, and finally the Arctic. Within the

context a critique of imperialism, Frankenstein's character reflects the unease of the British once faced with the possible monstrous outcome of imperialism. Both man and his creature, his doppelganger, wander all over Europe, and both are, in fact, avatars of the rejected wandering Other.

Whereas *Frankenstein* offers excellent examples of British literary reworking of the figure of the Wandering Jew, the most obvious example of a modern avatar of this image in the Hebrew texts is the narrator in Agnon's 'Ad Hennah'. The narrator had emigrated from Germany to Palestine-Israel, and then travels from Palestine-Israel to Germany, where he wanders from Berlin to Leipzig and another imaginary town called Grima, then back to Berlin, and from there back to Jaffa. As noted previously, the narrator's constant wandering is the crux of the story (Ben-Dov 1991/2: 301-2). The name of the fictitious town Grima, where the dead doctor Levi's books await the narrator's salvation, means cause, which suggests that he is caused to continually wander as he searches for the books and a home for himself. He is passive even as he is constantly in motion.

As mentioned above, most of Agnon's characters did not conform to the Zionist ideal hero of the muscular assertive "new Jew" (Shaked 1989: 15). In fact, quite the opposite, as most of his characters are modern antiheroes. Specifically, most of his heroes are wandering antiheroes. The narrator in 'Ad Hennah' is depicted as a passive anti-hero, who tries to assimilate in German society, but is rejected and is caused to travel the land in search of a home. The narrative's 'homodiegetic' mode of writing is characteristic of Agnon's work (Ezrahi 2000: 84), and depicts a fundamentally lonely identity. Moreover, as mentioned earlier, Agnon's personal narrative reflected the Jewish national narrative (Shaked 1989: 6-7). There are two interesting aspects of this parallel: first, there is the hero's 'two aimless movements: the narrator-hero's journey within the city of Berlin from rented room to rented room and his trips between cities to Leipzig and its surroundings to

save Mr Levi's library' (Shaked 1989: 111); second there is the meta movement back and forth between Germany and Palestine-Israel. The narrative outlines wandering in the Diaspora itself as well as wandering in relation to Palestine-Israel. The character illustrates human estrangement in the setting that functions as synecdoche for German society during the First World War – 'women without men and families that have been dismembered' (Shaked 1989: 111). His final immigration to the Holy Land suggests a rejection of this secular modernity. He is excluded from the non-Jewish community, and does not connect with the local Jewish community. The character is a bewildered Wandering Jew.

A comparison between the narrator in 'Ad Hennah' and Frankenstein reveals similarities between these two characters. While one finds depictions of British and Western bravery in *Dracula*, Victor Frankenstein is a character that offers a reconsideration of the simple dichotomous alignment of hero vs. monster. The inadequate and incompetent reaction Frankenstein exhibits upon encounters with his creature is indicative of his un-heroic character, and his ineptitude. He remembers his initial recoiling from his creature as 'breathless horror and disgust' (*F*: 55), and his reaction is to retreat to his chamber, '[u]nable to endure the aspect of the being [he] had created' (55). Frankenstein rushes out of the room, and though at first he is unable to sleep, he eventually throws himself on his bed, in his clothes, 'endeavouring to seek a few moments of forgetfulness' (55). Throughout the novel Frankenstein attempts to overcome this initial response, yet finds it a challenge he cannot conquer, and the creature escapes.

Unlike a classical hero, Frankenstein is fretful, fearful, and does not vanquish the monster. If the heroes in Stoker's novel reiterated the social and national identity of the Western man, Wollstonecraft Shelley's anti-hero questions the validity of this Western hero. In many respects, Frankenstein resembles the stereotypical Ashkenazi Diaspora Jewish male. The fundamental inadequacy is the inability to maintain his control over his

creation, which is a metaphoric representation of the colonised Other. Hence the crux of the matter is the inability to maintain sovereignty.

In the middle of 'Ad Hennah', after many wanderings, the narrator acknowledges his predicament and inadequacy, which is a similar problem with holding on to a place. The narrator says the heart of the matter is the tale of a man who has neither home nor room, a man who had allowed for the place he had to slip away because he thought it was unsuitable (*AH*: 89).¹¹⁰ The crux of the story is man's homelessness. As he searches for a place to stay in Berlin he remembers his room in Jaffa, a small chamber with a balcony and trees in the garden (*AH*: 89). The description is almost identical to the room he had in Berlin prior to his departure to Grima, albeit painted in the rosy colours of nostalgia. The narrator contemplates that the reason for his predicament is that he left Israel, and God is angry with him for abandoning His land, and therefore in turn abandons him – his repentance will then also be his salvation (*AH*: 90). The depiction of the stereotypical Jew, a homeless wanderer, can be productively harnessed by the Zionist narrative that beckons Jews to return to the Holy Land. The nature of the Jew as wanderer is depicted as detrimental, and the remedy is the establishment of a new identity upon the Promised Land. Even though the Zionist narrative appeared to reject the image of the exilic Jew, Hebrew literature did not discard it entirely; actually, this image played a crucial role in the (re)construction of modern Jewish identities. In fact, this figure was manipulated by the Zionist narrative in order to endorse immigration to Palestine-Israel.

Like in the texts in English, the Hebrew literature utilises the figure of the Wandering Jew in order to explore individual and collective identities. From the *Golem*, whose eponymous creature walks the streets of Prague, via the rejected boy in 'Mishael', who dwells in the woods and on the streets, via Agnon's various characters, who are all

מעשה אדם שאין לו לא בית ולא חדר, שהמקום שהיה לו הניח והמקום שמצר נשמט לו מידו¹¹⁰

searching for a home, to Yizhar's warring soldiers in *Khirbet Khizeh* – these are all wanderers.

As explained in previous chapters, while the Jews were attempting to shed the skin of the figure of the exilic Jew, the British were in the process of relinquishing their identities as the colonisers. These processes were (re)shaping modern British identities, and the move towards settlement in Palestine-Israel was likewise (re)establishing modern Jewish and later Jewish-Israeli identities. The comparison of the texts examined here reveals a complex picture, as the figure of the Wandering Jew has been productive in the (re)creation of both modern Jewish and British identities. The characters explored are all avatars of the Wandering Jew, from the obvious examples in Agnon's text to the more hidden ones in Brontë's. Not only is Stoker's vampire the typical Wandering Jew, but his character is linked with the gypsy, whose presence in Brontë's novel highlights certain connections between the Brit and the nomad. Lastly, the two characters in Wollstonecraft Shelley's text are both miserable wanderers, cast away by both creator and society. In their inherent restlessness and identities as the rejected Other these characters share some of the basic traits of the Wandering Jew. In both literatures the figure is utilised in the processes of reconciliation of identities and modern concerns.

The need for a home, both on the metaphorical and literal levels, is one of the crucial aspects of human individual and collective identity. The figure of the Wandering Jew functions as an embodiment of social and racial distinction, and British literature is replete with representations of this restless Other. The reason for the prevalence of this image is that while the British nation was moving away from defining its identity as colonisers, they were preoccupied with notions of home and belonging.

3.2.5 The myth of Hospitality

In addition to the various myths mentioned above, the texts examined here engage with the notion of hospitality, which is, as we soon will see, a myth. Notably, till now the term myth has been used here in its meaning as ‘a set of beliefs, usually put forth as a narrative, held by a community about itself’ (Schöpflin 1997: 19); in this subsection, the colloquial pejorative attribution of myth as a groundless notion will be utilised. More precisely, the following reading will explore hospitality as a myth in the sense that it functions as a narrative we tell ourselves in order to create and explain certain social conventions, such as politeness, propriety, and national sovereignty. The reason both literatures are preoccupied with issues of hospitality is because the British encroached upon various nations’ hospitality while the British were engaged in the imperialist endeavour, and the Jews in turn also found themselves intruders upon the land of Palestine-Israel.

The Oxford English Dictionary suggests that hospitality is ‘[t]he act or practice of being hospitable; the reception and entertainment of guests, visitors, or strangers, with liberality and goodwill’. In monotheistic religious discourse hospitality is a crucial sacred decree. The Judeo-Christian tradition is replete with instances of hospitality (e.g., Peter 4:9), and the most famous biblical instance is Abraham’s generous hospitality (Genesis 18). In the biblical narrative, Abraham is depicted sitting outside his tent, when he perceives in the distance strangers approaching. Abraham is excited about the guests and goes out of his way to offer the best hospitality. He does not follow the decree for hospitality as part of a religious act but is emotionally involved in the act of generosity (Cohen 2006). Islam also requires hospitality as one of the fundamental aspects of righteous religious conduct (Qur’an 4.36-37). Derrida suggests that in Islam, even more than in the Judeo-Christian tradition, hospitality presents itself as ‘a religion, an ethics, and a culture’ (2002: 365). In the ancient world, the act of hospitality would have been crucial,

as travelling would involve great risk, and the chance of replenishing substances and getting some rest would have been imperative.

Derrida's exploration of the term hospitality is central to the following discussion. As Gil Anidjar suggests in his 'Note on Hospitality', the thread of hospitality can be traced throughout Derrida's work (2002: 356). In 'On Hospitality' Derrida explores some of the etymological and philosophical aspects of the term, undermining the validity of the concept. Throughout 'On Hospitality' Derrida refers to (or plays with) the concepts of substitution and of the hostage in order to investigate the nature of hospitality. This playfulness does not work once the term is conceived in Hebrew, as the term *hakhnasat orkhim*, which literally means 'letting guests in', does not carry the same etymological meaning as the term 'hospitality'. One ought to note further that Derrida's deconstructions of hospitality have been subjected to criticism, primarily because Derrida employs his deconstructionist techniques upon the terms in their Latin origin even while he is exploring the concepts within the Arab Islamic tradition (Achrafi 2006: 478). Ahmed Achrafi detects a clear orientalist approach to Arab Islamic aspects of hospitality in Derrida's analysis of the concept (504). Nonetheless, or even more so, because of this problematic perspective towards the notion of hospitality, the readings Derrida offers are fascinating as they arguably expose an occidental perspective. This very perspective is at the heart of the texts examined here and therefore important for their understanding.

Derrida maintains that '*on the one hand*, hospitality must wait, extend itself toward the other, extend to the other gifts, the site, the shelter and the cover [...] *on the other hand*, the opposite is also nevertheless true, simultaneously and irrepressibly true: to be hospitable is to let oneself be overtaken' (2002: 360-1; emphasis in the original). Derrida continues this discussion later in *The Beast and the Sovereign* (2009) in a 'classical biblical scene, a classical Middle Eastern scene' in relation to water (241/322). Derrida questions the basis of hospitality, arguing that hospitality requires the simultaneous assertion and a

complete relinquishing of sovereignty (244-5/327-8). The result is a virtual impossibility of hospitality (2006: 3-4). The conclusion that can be drawn from Derrida's examination of hospitality, is that the idea that one is happy to invite the Other into one's home out of some benevolence, is a myth. This concern is explored in literature, and in the texts examined here one finds several instances of hospitality, which actually are revealed as acts of hostility.

The most famous literary character with regard to hospitality is, of course, the vampire. Though later in the novel Van Helsing establishes the requirement for hospitality towards the vampire, saying it has to be invited into one's home, the first act of hospitality in Stoker's *Dracula* is by the Count, who invites Harker most courteously:

“Welcome to my house! Enter freely and of your own free will!” He made no motion of stepping to meet me, but stood like a statue, as though his gesture of welcome had fixed him into stone. The instant, however, that I had stepped over the threshold, he moved impulsively forward, and holding out his hand grasped mine with a strength which made me wince, an effect which was not lessened by the fact that it seemed cold as ice, more like the hand of a dead than a living man.

(*D*: 26)

The Count invites Harker, establishing the latter's presence as a guest, and expecting him to behave accordingly. As a guest, Harker ought to respect the Count's wishes and privacy, while the Count is supposed to provide shelter and provisions. Raphael Ingelbien suggests that the Count's 'deserted and draughty dwelling calls to mind the condition of an aristocracy which had already fallen on hard times by the 1890s, when Ascendancy land

ownership and the income landlords could derive from rents were being reduced by legal reforms' (2004: 1095). Ingelbien argues that '[a]lthough impoverished, this aristocrat still cultivates a hospitality on which many Ascendancy families [...] continued to pride themselves' (1095). The Count is compelled by his aristocratic breeding to offer hospitality. Even if this hospitality will soon be revealed as an act of hostility, the presumption for magnificence of conduct remains an ironic residue of past glory and propriety.

According to the Count's perspective, it is Harker who first breeches the contract of hospitality when he attempts to sneak letters through the band of Szgany, gypsies, who camp under the castle. Harker is unaware of the bonds between the Count and the gypsies, until the Count returns to the castle with the letters, which the Szgany gave to the Count. When he notices the letter in shorthand the Count is enraged, saying it is 'a vile thing, an outrage upon friendship and hospitality!' (*D*: 56). In a sense, once Harker breeches the implicit contracts of hospitality, the Count no longer has to maintain his responsibilities as host.

There are several incidents of hospitality found in the novel. The *Pall Mall Gazette* journalist reports of the zoo-keeper's hospitality, as the latter establishes his dominion by acts of hospitality (*D*: 165). Also, when Harker comes to investigate the delivery of the boxes of soil at the Billington solicitors' company 'They are hospitable, with true Yorkshire hospitality, give a guest everything and leave him to do as he likes' (*D*: 271). Within Britain, Yorkshire is renowned for both its hospitality and business shrewdness (*The Folk-Lore Record*: 175). This facilitates an irony, as even while Harker enjoys it, the vampire has taken advantage of the same hospitality. Hospitality, hence, is depicted as a double-edged sword.

The various instances of hospitality in *Dracula* are all questionable and problematic, and are not out of sheer benevolence. What might appear as an act of

hospitality is soon revealed as either an act of selfishness, or of hostility. The metaphorical meaning of the issues of hospitality in Stoker's novel suggest an unease with regard to the moral validity of British imperialism. The novel questions the notion of the moral right to "enlighten the heathen" that presupposes the Other's hospitality.

Whereas Stoker offers a cautionary text that warns against the potential harms of imperialism, Agnon's 'Ha'adonit ve'Harochel' ('The Lady and the Peddler') offers a warning regarding the condition of the Jewish Ashkenazi Diaspora. The comparison of the exploration of the notion of hospitality in the two texts reveals similarities as well as important differences. Both are narratives of the vampire lore, and in both a man enjoys a certain hospitality in a vampire's lair. Once this initial similarity is acknowledged, however, one notes the various differences. Whereas in Stoker's novel Harker travels specifically in order to come to Count Dracula (*D*: 7), in Agnon's short story the peddler happens to come upon the lady's house in his wanderings (*HH*: 209). This is a significant difference, as while Count Dracula is obligated to offer hospitality because he invited Harker, the lady has no such responsibility. Also, the services that Harker offers as the representative of the solicitors' company are sought after by the Count, and the peddler is giving the lady a "cold call" with his merchandise, which she has no interest to purchase.

After the peddler persuades the lady to buy something – notably she chooses a knife – he wanders in the wood, till he stumbles upon her house again. The peddler asks the lady to allow him to stay for the night, and at first she refuses. Once again, this is a crucial difference as the Count invites Harker most graciously (*D*: 26). Though the lady is supposedly of noble descent she does not share the Count's inherent need for formalities. Eventually, the lady consents to let the peddler spend the night in the old barn (*HH*: 210). Again, this is in opposition to the luxurious room allotted for Harker in the castle.

Here begins a peculiar relationship between the lady and the peddler. The peddler moves from his barn dwellings to the spare room, then to the lady's room, and to sharing

her bed (*HH*: 213). Furthermore, during his stay at her house, she cooks for him and, he enjoys all of these aspects of her hospitality (*HH*: 213). The lady bestows her hospitality with regard to her home, as well as herself. The peddler thus forsakes his religion. The peddler feels contented in the lady's house, he is comfortable, well fed, warm and dry. One needs to note that it is forbidden according to Judaism to share a bed with a non-Jew, and to eat non-Kosher food. The metaphorical meaning is that the lady is the reason and means for him to stray from Judaism. Agnon inverts the roles of predator and victim in order to suggest that the seemingly comfortable situation in the Ashkenazi Diaspora is, in fact, a dangerous condition that will deplete the Jews of their faith, and eventually might cost them their lives. Thus the lady's hospitality is actually an act of hostility.

A similar representation of hospitality which is, in fact, implicitly an act of hostility is found in *Jane Eyre*. Mrs Reed had promised Mr Reed, Jane's uncle, upon his deathbed that she would care for Jane. Yet even while she professes to offer a home for the orphaned Jane, this shelter is a hostile environment, and the apparent hospitality is replete with unkindness. From the constant abuse by John Reed, Jane's cousin, to the absence of love from any other member of the family, Jane encounters antagonism. Furthermore, not only does Mrs Reed offer Jane abuse under her roof, but she soon sends her away, relinquishing any form of future hospitality and kindness, as Jane is not even permitted to come back from Lowood orphanage during the holidays. As noted earlier, *Jane Eyre* moves toward an exploration of Britain's inner problems of the poor and female subjects, and the lack of hospitality here is a marker of these concerns.

Like Jane, who is rejected by her kin, Mishael is not welcome in his parents' home. The only place one might expect not to have to rely upon acts of hospitality is one's familial home, yet like Jane, even in his home Mishael is rejected. As mentioned earlier, the apparently hospitable *gvir*, who invites Mishel to his *sukkah* only does so in order to haggle over the price of the *hoshanot*. This act of hospitality takes place in the transitory shed and

not the permanent home. Actually, the *gvir* is so outraged by the insolence of Mishael's appearance in his *sukkah* while he is immersed in his holy scriptures, that he nearly has some kind of fit. After repeatedly asking Mihsael what business he has being there, and sending him to the kitchen, the *gvir* 'abruptly gets up from his seat, rising to his full stature, shaking all over, blinking with his mad eyes' (*M:32*), and calls his wife, ordering her to give him some wine, and rid him of Mishael. The act of hospitality causes the *gvir* great unease. It is, nonetheless, a *mitzvah*, a Jewish decree, to show hospitality over the Jewish holidays, and thus the *gvir* is earning a *mitzvah* by allowing Mishael to come into his *sukkah*. Hence once again, even when one encounters acts of explicit hospitality, underneath the surface there lays hostility and an ulterior motive. The importance of hospitality as part of religious practice is linked with the transient position in the *sukkah* which is a reminder of the precarious position of the Jews in the Diaspora. The engagement with the myth of hospitality functions to remind the Jews of the need to reconsider their situation.

While 'Mishael', like 'Ha'adonit ve'Harochel', warns against the dangers of exilic condition, in 'Avi Hashor' Agnon engages with the myth of hospitality in order to re-establish the moral validity of the *yishuv* in Palestine-Israel.¹¹¹ The myth of hospitality is explored explicitly, as when the old man's neighbour requires more food for his (second) wedding celebration he slaughters the old man's ox. Hence, in order to fulfil the decree for hospitality the neighbour is willing to violate the moral decrees of honesty and good neighbouring. Even while the Qur'an decrees that one has to bestow generosity upon 'the neighbour who is of kin, and to the neighbour who is a stranger' (Qur'an 4.36), in Agnon's narrative the neighbour seems to be partial in his distribution of generosity.¹¹² First, we do not hear that the old man was even invited to the celebration, which would be a kind gesture

¹¹¹ Rena Lee compares 'Ha'adonit Ve'harochel' and 'Avi Ha'shor' along the lines of the connection between the woman and the consumption of meat (1993: 84).

¹¹² Though we do not know the neighbour's religion, the custom of marrying an additional wife is not common in contemporary Jewish tradition.

towards an elderly lonely neighbour; and then the neighbour takes the old man's ox without asking permission, and in spite of the fact that the ox means the world to the old man. The party, which could have been the perfect opportunity for the neighbour to practice proper hospitality turns into the opposite. The neighbour eventually recognises his mistake, and offers the old man many plots of land and cattle as compensation for the breach of sacred hospitality. As Achmati notes, Derrida claims that 'there *is* no hospitality, but hospitality is already corrupt, which amounts to an assertion of the ontological priority of sin and defect; very un-Islamic' (2006: 500; emphasis in the original). The Islamic tradition emphasises the importance of hospitality, and the neighbour's sin is great, hence the abundant retribution. The neighbour committed the sin of vanity, unwilling to admit the limitations of his financial abilities at the moment of the wedding, and erred by offering an unsubstantiated overabundant hospitality.

Whereas in 'Avi Hashor' the notion of hospitality is examined in order to legitimise the Jewish settlement in Palestine-Israel, in *Rebecca* the problematic of excessive hospitality is explored in order to reconsider inner social issues. Like its predecessor *Jane Eyre*, *Rebecca* is concerned with the shift from fears from outside invasion to concerns of social mobility. The issue is addressed in the fancy dress episode. The idea of the fancy dress ball comes up when the narrator and Maxim are entertaining some guests, and as the unnamed narrator feels they have 'an invasion of visitors' (*R*: 214) one Sunday. The idea is thrust upon her and she feels 'bombarded at once' (*R*: 216). The entire issue of the fancy dress ball is depicted as an assault upon her and her fragile sovereignty. The narrator fears she might let Maxim down, and goes along with the idea (*R*: 217). She cannot find a suitable idea for her dress, and Mrs Danvers, the fearsome housekeeper, convinces her to wear a costume which turns out to be a copy of the one Rebecca had worn in the previous ball, and the horrified Maxim orders her to take it off (*R*: 240). The costume causes

catastrophic offense, and the text suggests the code of hospitality might be the sole realm of nobility. The act of hospitality, once again, is revealed as hostile.

Similarly, in Agnon's 'Ad Hennah' the narrator is continuously plagued with visitors, who bother him, ask for his money, and prevent him from returning to work on his essay. Brigitte Shcimerman, the beautiful ex-actress, invites the narrator to lunch in Leipzig (*AH*: 13) and later insists he stays another day at her nursing home in Lünenfeld (*AH*: 51). In Grima, a grocer invites the narrator to join him for a meal. Here, the narrator says that even if the grocer had not invited him, he would have had to invite himself, because he had forgotten his ration notes, and could not have obtained food unless someone showed him hospitality (*AH*: 32). The code of hospitality is warped as the grocer invites the narrator, who then responds by compelling the grocer to invite him, or even invites himself. Conversely, upon his return from Grima the narrator passes Mettle's house and does not enter 'in order not to burden him'¹¹³ (*AH*: 35). In Lünenfeld, though the narrator has been invited to dine with Brigitte Shcimerman, he goes to visit his aunt who insists upon preparing him a meal, but she lacks food and has neither oil nor fuel to heat and prepare a meal (*AH*: 40). Upon his departure, his aunt gives him a goose's liver, and seeing her joy at being able to give him such a great gift, the narrator does not tell her that he is a vegetarian (*AH*: 43). Thus, the extravagant gift appears to be wasted upon the narrator. The aunt's hospitality is futile. The narrative is replete with incidents that allow Agnon to explore different aspects of hospitality, which reveal its ridiculous paradoxical essence. Moreover, the depletion of the benevolent aspect of hospitality exposes it as a façade of lies that conceal a basic lack of trust, and the constant need for reestablishment of authority, control, and power. Eventually, it is clear that acts of alleged hospitality are manipulations made in order to reaffirm sovereignty.

¹¹³ כדי לא להטריח עליו

An exploration of issues of sovereignty unfolds in 'Ad Henna' in a seemingly insignificant scene. As the narrator sits on a park bench, he notes some children playing and as he walks away one of the kids tells him he is a bad man (*AH*: 35). It turns out the narrator had accidentally entered the round circle the child had drawn in the soil as part of his game. The narrator asks the child to believe him that he is not a bad man, and offers to draw an even bigger circle than the one the child drew, but the child is then distracted by a dog passing by (*AH*: 36). This little incident serves as a metaphor for the need for spatial delineation. The child's game of defining and defending territories from the evil intruder is the reflection of a similar play on the larger national scale. The difference, of course, is that the child does not kill the narrator for intruding upon his territory; nevertheless, the child defines the narrator as a 'bad man', the evil Other, who has invaded his territory. The territorial definition attributes value to the narrator's actions: he is evil because he has invaded the child's territory.

The problematic of territorial invasion and hospitality is at the heart of Yizhar's *Khirbet Khizeh*. Whereas Agnon visited concepts of hospitality in order to reaffirm the Jews' right to the land, Yizhar considers the same notions with the opposite result of undermining the moral validity of the Jewish conquest. Hospitality, which is usually thought of as benevolent, seems to backfire in Yizhar's novella. Moreover, *Khirbet Khizeh* explores the act of banishment, which is the exact opposite of hospitality. Ironically, the soldiers violently enter the village even while the villagers display hospitality. An old man the soldiers encounter in one of the courtyards seems to be waiting for their arrival and rises up to greet them ceremoniously, as if they are his guests (*KH*: 62-3). The soldiers ignore his greetings and push him aside telling him to be quiet. Another respectable looking old man approaches the soldiers 'with one hand on his chest and the other extended in front of him in a gesture of courteous request, in a polite manner that both sides would surely

recognise as the basis for dialogue, as appropriate to honoured interlocutors' (*KH*: 76-7),¹¹⁴ but the soldiers tell him to stay in his place until he is called upon. The villagers' hospitality is met with the soldiers' brutality.

Conversely, the villagers in Wollstonecraft Shelley's novel violently reject the creature, which approaches them with benevolent intents. As the creature departs from the forest and enters the village, it is met with an acute absence of hospitality. The whole village is roused; some flee, some attack the creature (*F*: 101). Later, as soon as the De Laceys encounter the creature, they too banish it violently (*F*: 130). People's inhospitable reaction to the creature drives it away, till the only region he may inhabit is the North Pole. Ironically, the inhospitable climate of the North Pole is the only place that is hospitable enough to permit the creature to stay. Wollstonecraft's novel suggests that the human notion of hospitality is, in fact, not a true well-meaning concept, and that once a real Other approaches, the human instinct overrides any decree of polite kindness, and fear leads to the rejection of the Other.

The comparison reveals that while some of the texts engage with the concept in order to explore individual identities and others to assert collective identities, they all utilise the concept in order to consider the tension between these identities. The paradoxical essence of hospitality allows for it to be misused and misunderstood. Since it can be an affirmation of the sovereignty of the one bestowing it upon the other, hospitality may result in catastrophe and destruction. Since it cannot be maintained, the inevitable breach of hospitality results in hostility.

¹¹⁴ כשידו האחת על חזהו והאחרת שלוחה לפניו בבקשת תשומת-לב, במן גינוני-נימוס ששני הצדדים מן הראוי שיודו בו וכבדים כבסיס לכל משא-ומתן, וכיאה לנכבדים

3.3 Conclusion

The comparison of the texts reveals similarities in the reworking of myths. These parallels are the result of the Hebraic and English shared cultural origins. Primarily, the productive engagement with territorial myths, myths of restless wandering and homecoming, as well as myths of creation are explored in the texts examined here. The opposite processes of the British and Jewish nations in relation to sovereignty are explored in the texts through the engagement with ancient myths. In the process, modern myths of identities are formed.

The five mythical elements that were chosen: myths of creation and subversion; soul and soil redemption; the vampire; the Wandering Jew; and hospitality all bear upon the tensions between individual and collective identities. The comparison of *Frankenstein*, *Jane Eyre*, *Dracula* and *Rebecca* to 'Be'ir Ha'harega', *Golem* 'Mishael' 'Ha'adonit veHarochel', 'Avi Hashor', 'Tehila', 'Ad Hennah' and *Khirbet Khizeh* shows similarities in use of myths in order to (re)create modern myths and individual and collective identities.

The connections between *Frankenstein* and *Golem* show similarities as well as differences in the adaptation of the myths of creation and subversion. The fact that the two texts engage with these myths suggests the two literatures reflect similar concerns with regard to (re)creation of identities in relation to sovereignty. These concerns are likewise explored in 'Avi Hashor'. The three texts revisit ancient myths in an attempt to (re)construct modern identities that rely upon traditional roots. The opposite processes with regard to sovereignty of the British and Jewish nations are reflected in the parallel use of the mythology.

As part of the explorations of identities the important role of the land in the (re)creation of identities leads to the revisiting of myths of soul and soil redemption. The correspondences in the use of the Holy Land in *Dracula* 'Be'ir Ha'harega' *Khirbet Khizeh* and 'Tehila' are not only striking, but reveal the deep roots shared by the British and Jewish

nations. The important difference, however, is that whereas *Dracula* manipulates notions of the Holy Land to critique British imperialism, the texts in Hebrew work with it as a positive notion to endorse colonial settlement. The exception to this is, as stated above, Yizhar's narrative, which has been read as one of the first post-Zionist critiques.

Myths of soil and soul redemption are intricately connected to the mythology of the vampire. In addition to the inversion of the role of the vampire and its anti-Semitic connotations, the comparison between 'Ha'adonit ve'Harochel' and *Dracula* shows the opposite use of this figure regarding issues of sovereignty. Whereas *Dracula* has been read as a critique of colonialism, 'Ha'adonit ve'Harochel' encourages Jews to depart from the Diaspora. The analysis of the figure of the vampire in the modern texts exposes another troubling appearance of blood consumption in 'Be'ir Ha'harega', as the women who are being raped and murdered suffocate on their own blood. Like Agnon's story Bialik's epic manipulates the horror of the taboo in order to validate Zionism.

The endorsement of the Zionist enterprise relied upon the appropriation and manipulation of another myth – that of the Wandering Jew. Even while rejecting this image, the figure participated in the Zionist narrative. Most importantly, this very image also participated in the reconsideration of modern British identities. The previous part has established the constant wanderings of all the various characters, and here we see the mythical origin of this restlessness. The use of this figure by both literary traditions reflects a parallel in the anxiety associated with questions of morality and sovereignty. These concerns are some of the main British and Jewish anxieties of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

These concerns lead to the question of hospitality. The comparison shows the prevalence of instances of alleged hospitality in several texts, which highlights the problematic essence of hospitality. The obsession with the issue of hospitality stems from the anxieties the British imperial project elicited on the one hand, and the colonial project

the Zionists commenced on the other. These mythical elements are found in both literatures, and impact both Jewish and British identities.

One of the interesting connections between the Jewish and British identities is that the former was in many ways a significant aspect of the latter's (re)construction. As explained in the previous chapter, the Jews' racial Otherness was 'a key ingredient in the emerging cultural identity of modern Britain' (Cheyette 1993: xi). Furthermore, as noted in the Introduction, the failure of the Enlightenment to (re)construct the Jews led to them being 'constructed in equivocal terms as both the embodiment of a transformable cultural Hebraism and, at the same time, as an unchanging racial "other"' (Cheyette 1993: 5-6). In a way, the exilic Jew resembles Homi Bhabha's elucidations of mimicry. Particularly, inasmuch as the Jew is 'constructed around an ambivalence' (Bhabha 1994: 88). The Jew's Janus-faced entity produces itself as a continual slippage, an excess, a difference. Paradoxically, even as it embodied the quintessential Other, one of the main horrors of the figure of the Jew was its ability to assimilate. The complications of the figure of the Jew bear certain similarities to the problem of colonial imitation. Both are produced within 'a discursive process by which the excess or slippage produced by the ambivalence of mimicry (almost the same, but not quite) does not merely "rupture" the discourse, but becomes transformed into an uncertainty which fixes the colonial subject as a "partial" presence' (Bhabha 1994: 86). Like Bhabha's colonial subject, the Jew's mimicry is 'at once resemblance and menace' (86). Yet, whereas Bhabha's mimicry is frightening because it conceals no presence or identity of the colonised (1994: 91), the Jew is more horrifying because he conceals an identity of an Other who is not colonised in a foreign land but is required to conceal his identity on British (or European) soil. The Jews' particular and unique relationship with land made them an even more unsettling entity. The uncanny presence of the Jew as the Other that appears to try to assimilate even while

maintaining an essential alien identity is one of the connections between the monster and the Jew, as both delineate boundaries.

The myths explored here are weaved into the fabric of the texts, and the readers are not even wholly aware of their presence. Therefore the readers might not be aware of the effects the manipulations of these myths might have upon perception and (re)production of various notions. These manipulations and the social aspects of myths that were explored in this part operate within language. The linguistic aspects of the myth have been investigated to reveal the importance of the place allocated to this type of narrative within culture. Drawing upon the Saussurian structure of language, Roland Barthes suggests that myth is a 'signification' or 'form' (1972: 109-10) that explains 'the falsely obvious' (111), because 'driven to having either to unveil or to liquidate the concept, it will *naturalise* it [and] transform history into nature' (129; emphasis in the original). Modern myths operate within the reader to produce meanings that appear natural though they are manufactured. While the concepts of the modern nation-state and of sovereignty are culturally and historically contingent, the mythologising of these notions creates codes that read as natural or primordial. The modern myths explored here naturalise concepts such as the Wandering Jew, hospitality, and the modern British and Jewish identities as (re)created in relation to sovereignty. These ideas become part of individual and collective identity, as the reader appropriates these notions, perceiving them as having been part of his or her identity even before the initial encounter with these ideas.

The materials of the myth 'presuppose a signifying consciousness' (Barthes 1972: 110), and in myths the linguistic signifier becomes the sign. Barthes' conceptualisation of the double-layered structure suggests that myth functions within a '*metalanguage*', as we use the mythical language to explain the more complex and elusive, compact, culturally loaded signifiers of our linguistic system. This structure might seem circular, as we use a linguistic system in order to elucidate linguistic signifiers, and that is precisely the point

regarding the function of myths, which offer this circular system that re-establishes preconceived notions that they might appear to be challenging. Now, it is necessary to acknowledge the importance of the role of the language itself in the processes of (re)creation of individual and collective identities.

4. Linguistic Illuminations

4.1 Introduction

Language has long been perceived as the constitutor of the human *per se*, and the delineator of the boundaries between the human and non-human. It is a twofold differentiation between beast and humanity on the one hand, and between humankind and God on the other. The beast cannot speak, and God is not comprehensible for humankind (Derrida 2009: 17-18). Though there are subtleties to these binary oppositions between the *self* and the Other, the Other in literature is many times either mute or linguistically different. The lack of communication between the *self* and the Other is one of the primary reasons for fear and, as the analyses here reveal, fears that have been established upon the mythical and territorial aspects of the narrative are reinforced by linguistic Otherness. These mythical, territorial, and linguistic borders outline and (re)construct the nationalist *self* and Other. Language is of paramount importance for the (re)construction of personal and collective identity.

Though communication as such is by no means unique to humanity, language as a means to differentiate between various human groups is one of the most notable human features. Alongside racial and socio-economic reasons, linguistic Otherness is one of the main categories of in-group out-group discrimination (Tajfel 1970: 96). Whereas racial and socio-economic motives reflect prejudices regarding exterior appearances and social conditions, the linguistic difference actually hinders understanding between groups and people. Furthermore, as language is the tip of the cultural iceberg, linguistic dissimilarity might reflect deeper cultural differences, which may manifest in diverse value systems. Therefore, I suggest, linguistic strangeness or Otherness is more complex and more important than other criteria for in-group out-group tensions. Whether it is a different language, or a strange use of one's own language, such as dialect, linguistic Otherness

reveals a profound difference.

Modern study of linguistics is founded upon the work of Ferdinand de Saussure. Saussure distinguished between the “sign”, which is the word, and the “referent”, which is the thing to which the sign referred, stressing that the “sign” itself can be divided into the “signifier”, which is the sound image, and a mental image which is signified. Saussure perceived and outlined language as an abstract set of rules, and argued that ‘the structure of language was determined from within language itself, by relation to its parts’ (Csapo 2005: 186). Language is structural, interconnected, and dependent upon this interconnectivity. In addition to denotative links between words, language has connotative aspects, as there are meanings that operate unconsciously and semi-consciously (Csapo 2005: 187). The approach that Saussure took and the model he outlined influenced not only linguistics, but cultural studies, anthropology, and literary studies (Csapo 2005: 188). Literature is here perceived as a participant in an overarching system of cultural meaning.¹¹⁵

We investigate the essence of language as the delineator of identity using language, and thereby it becomes the locus of philosophical debate as well as meta-philosophical inquiries. The study of languages in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries reinforced the growing feeling in Europe that ‘perhaps’ European civilisation was neither the best nor the only one – and probably not the oldest (Anderson 1983/2002: 70). While ‘the idea that a particular script-language offered privileged access to ontological truth’ (34) was losing grip over the minds of the British with regards to Latin, the Jewish community still adhered to the belief that Hebrew gave access to Truth.¹¹⁶ This aspect of the tensions regarding

¹¹⁵ This thesis incorporates both Saussure’s and Derrida’s ideas, even though the former is linked with structuralism and the latter with post-structuralism. There is only an apparent conflict here, as even while accepting the fundamental approach to language as a symbolic system, this thesis explores linguistic productivity. Furthermore, the divergences between the two are not unambiguous, and have been subject to various interpretations (Daylight 2011: 2).

¹¹⁶ Hebrew was perceived as the holy language, and the Diaspora Jews spoke Yiddish or Ladino amongst themselves, distinguishing themselves linguistically from the non-Jews.

linguistic supremacy is crucial for the comparison of texts in Hebrew and English of the nineteenth- and up to the mid-twentieth century. Concurrent with the previously mentioned opposite political processes, as the British were re-evaluating the colonial enterprise and moving towards non-imperialism, and the Jews were commencing the mass immigration to Palestine-Israel, the two cultures were experiencing opposite linguistic processes. While the British community was establishing the non-religiously oriented English language as a valid language for not only mundane but also spiritual and philosophical inquiries, the Jewish, and later Jewish-Israeli, communities were exploring the possibility of developing the holy language for daily use.¹¹⁷

One of the most spectacular achievements of the Zionist enterprise is the rejuvenation of the Hebrew language (Domb 2006: 1). Hebrew, in a sense, is a Frankensteinian monster, resurrected and reconstructed from various kinds of linguistic traditions. The success of this process, evident in contemporary Israeli culture, was achieved not only through the insistence of the pro-Hebrew streams in Zionism, but in spite of vehement disapproval of its validity and possible attainment from pro-Yiddish divisions within the movement. The 1913 ‘Language War’ ended with a triumph for the pro-Hebrew teachers, who were supported by the Socialist Zionist settlers of the Second Aliya,¹¹⁸ as the use of European languages in Jewish schools was abolished, and Hebrew was established as the main language of instruction (Zerubavel 1995: 30). Though ‘the concept of the “revival of the Hebrew language” is not accurate, nor is the celebration of the “rebirth” of modern Hebrew in conjunction with Eliezer Ben-Yehuda’s immigration to Palestine in 1881 [...] Zionism presented a new insistence upon full-scale “revival” of the ancient tongue with a more pronounced nationalist bent, and adjusted the past accordingly’ (Zerubavel 1995: 30). Since the European languages (primarily Yiddish) were in many

¹¹⁷ English has been used for both religious and non-religious purposes before the nineteenth century, yet it is with the thrust of the mass-print revolution, along with the industrial revolution, that this process gains it modern momentum.

¹¹⁸ As explained earlier, *aliya* means ascension, and refers to immigration to Israel.

ways linked with the Ashkenazi Diaspora, which was deemed degenerate, the Zionist movement succeeded in implementing Hebrew as a new language for what has been conceptualised as the “new Jew”.

Instrumental to the Zionist revival of Hebrew, and to its specific colours and character, are Agnon and Bialik (Miron 1984: 61). While Dan Miron labels the work of Agnon and Bialik as Jewish literature rather than Hebrew literature (1984: 59), the analyses offered in this thesis suggest their work should be read as a part of Hebrew literature precisely because it participates in the Zionist discourse. The engagement with issues of the Zionist project – whether in support or condemnation – is still an acknowledgement of this movement’s importance. While Jewish literature might be concerned with the Jewish identity in the world, Hebrew literature tends to focus upon the particular qualms and concerns of the Jewish settlement in Palestine-Israel. Bialik and Agnon are respectively renowned as the national poet and author of the Israeli nation (Bar-Yosef 1996: 67; Shaked 1989: 6-7). When Ariel Hirschfeld invites the reader to go beyond the nationalist readings of Bialik (2011: 11), he is striving against a long tradition that viewed Bialik as, indeed, the national poet.

Both Agnon and Bialik were Zionists in their own fashion, and both had strong connections to the Jewish-Hebrew heritage. Both are famous for their distinctly unique style and use of the Hebrew language (Bakon 1983: 22-42; Shaked 1989: 44; Breuer 2009: 216-7; Hirshfeld 2011: 19-20). Agnon’s work is notable for his idiosyncratic use of language. It is comprised of various Hebrew forms, from the biblical Hebrew via the Hebrew of the Mishnah and the Talmud, and the mediaeval Hebrew of the great poets, the classical Israeli poetry (which might include poets such as Lea Goldberg and Rachel Bluwstein, and is distinct from later poetry written by poets such as David Avidan or Yona Wolach), as well as the Hasidic tales of the Ashkenazi Diaspora to the new literary Hebrew

of Mendele Mocher Sforim,¹¹⁹ which Agnon termed the *nosach*, the template (Hirshfeld 2011: 19-20).¹²⁰ The ‘nosach relies upon the Hebrew of the Ancient Sages, constantly incorporating fragments of biblical and Midrashic sentences creating a rich texture replete with hints and layers (Hirshfeld 2011: 20). The *nosach* is the base of Agnon’s style, and the medium from which his literary world grows (20). Agnon chose to align his work with *Chazal* language,¹²¹ which is a mythical base for the Jewish tradition. His deep understanding of both the Talmudic and biblical languages, of their similarities and differences, allowed him to translate biblical phrases into Talmudic language (Breuer 2009: 216-7). Agnon’s language is a ‘multi-vocal language, in which each detail conveys echoes and resonances and primordial memories’ (Hirshfeld 2011: 14). It is a unique language that connects the ancient Jewish tradition and modern Jewish life in Palestine-Israel.

Agnon and Bialik had, however, subtle albeit important differences in their relationship with the Hebrew language. Bialik perceived his works as acts of deliverance of the Torah and Jewish mythology from the Jewish religious atmosphere and translating them into modern culture, using the holy language for both the political and the more intimate, personal; for Agnon, conversely, the Torah and Talmud never ceased to be the holy word of God (Halevi-Zwick 1989: 157-8). Their relationship with the Hebrew language highlights a certain difference in their approach to the Zionist enterprise. While Bialik perceived Zionism as a part of the worldwide movement towards nationalism, Agnon viewed the Jews’ re-appropriation of Palestine-Israel as a part of the Jews’

¹¹⁹ Mendele Mocher Sforim, which means Mendele the books’ seller, is the pen name of Sholem Yankev Abramovich.

¹²⁰ The word *nosach* in Hebrew means format, or version, and comes from the root relating to articulation and lawful rules and regulations.

¹²¹ *Chazal* is an acronym of *chachameinu zichram livracha* which is ‘our wise-men bless their memory’, the sages. This refers to Talmud and Mishna, which are the books of Jewish law. These books contain elaborate discussions regarding the various aspects of Jewish life, offering the rules and regulations each Jew has to know and obey.

continuous hold over the land under divine right. These two approaches were, and still are, the two main ways Zionism is perceived.

The adaptation of Hebrew to modern use was a process that involved not only battles regarding the very use of the language, but also with regard to its character. Eric Hobsbawm claims that ‘national languages’ are ‘usually attempts to devise a standardised idiom out of a multiplicity of actual spoken idioms [...] the main problem in their construction being usually, which dialect to choose as the base for the standardised homogenised language’ (1991: 54). In the case of Hebrew the choice was made between the Ashkenazi and Sephardic pronunciations. As part of the attempts to negate the Ashkenazi Diaspora and its degenerate stereotypical depiction, the choice was made in favour of the Sephardic pronunciation. Basing his argument on Anderson, Hobsbawm concludes that language is not the main component in the creation of ‘proto-nationalism’, but became important in the modern conceptualisation of nationality (Hobsbawm 1991: 59). The Hebrew that is now spoken by Israelis marks their national identity.

The fact that ‘the British Mandate in 1919 accepted Hebrew as one of the three official languages of Palestine, at a time when the number of people speaking Hebrew as an everyday language was less than 20,000’ (Hobsbawm 1991: 111) helped to leverage it into becoming the language of the Jewish-Israeli nation-state.¹²² Hebrew was to become one of the main elements of the Jewish-Israeli nation-state, for all who came to settle in Palestine were in command of at least a minimum of Hebrew, and there was a great attempt to ensure that no other language was used in daily life between Jews.¹²³ The Hebrew revival reveals a link between ideology, memory, Jewish identities and language (Domb 2006: 1). It was to become a part of the myth-making of Jewish modern nationalism.

¹²² Based on the Mandatory law the official languages in Israel are Hebrew and Arabic.

¹²³ While the *yishuv* might have been predominantly Hebrew speaking there always were (and still are) pockets of Orthodox Jews who speak in other languages such as Yiddish so as not to defile the holy tongue.

It is in Hebrew that in 1948 David Ben Gurion declared the establishment of a sovereign national home for the Jewish people in Palestine-Israel. Sovereignty is achieved through the speech act of a declaration, and ‘from the start the nation was conceived in language’ (Anderson 2002: 145). Furthermore, in order to create a mythology of the nation-state linguistic manipulations that legitimise sovereignty are produced. The distinction Anderson draws between language and nation in the case of the British (Anderson 2002: 41) suggests that for British culture, linguistic abilities do not necessarily constitute grounds for sovereignty. Anderson draws a differentiation between state and national languages (2002: 41), arguing that English is a state language (41). While the rise of vernaculars such as English or French might have made their own ‘contribution to the decline of the imagined community of Christendom’ (42), the use of Yiddish, German, Russian, or Polish did no such thing for Jewishness. Anderson claims that the interaction between capitalism and the mass print revolution made imagined communities possible (43). Print served the Jewish imagined community in a similar way to the other imagined communities; however, while the elements Anderson describes (i.e., the interaction between capitalism, print, and linguistic diversity) were, according to him, new to the various communities, the Jewish imagined community gained shape by these elements, reinforcing the sense of nation-ness long before the mass print revolution. The ‘unified fields of exchange and communication’ (44) below Hebrew and above vernaculars (e.g., Yiddish and Ladino) served to reinforce the awareness of many other Jews who lived far away. The ‘new fixity’ (44) Anderson describes was, again, not new to the Jewish community that has been reading the same scripts for millennia. The use of Hebrew was forbidden for daily use – as it is the holy language – and the assimilation into the host community was encouraged. This could have created a reverse process, but in fact it served to still distinguish the Jews from the host population, as they spoke Yiddish or Ladino amongst themselves and Spanish, German, or Polish in the public sphere. Thus the Hebrew

and English are different with regard to the importance of language for the attainment of sovereignty and national identity.

Language is explored in the texts examined here from several angles: first, as it reflects the above mentioned discussion of the limits and definitions of what is human, as becomes apparent through readings of linguistic articulation and pedagogical perspectives; second, as it reproduces various discourses (e.g., the propagation of xenophobia, or reestablishment of normative gender roles); and third, as it functions as the arena in which sovereignty is asserted or denied (e.g., by naming, or otherwise establishing command). These aspects are examined in the two chapters: the first chapter is dedicated to linguistic socialisation, and is divided into an examination of speech and an analysis of education; the second chapter examines the importance of naming for the (re)construction of identities.

In the texts examined here, the characters' linguistic abilities are linked with their (lack of) sovereignty in a sometimes contradictory, manner: though Frankenstein's creature gains articulation, it gains sovereignty over nothing but the North Pole wilderness; the mute Golem has its allotted place in the Maharal's household as an annexed territory of the outskirts of Prague; and the ox shares a mute (misunderstood) language with the old man who receives land as substitute for the ox. While Count Dracula's eloquence reflects both his aristocratic lineage and his hunger for further imperialistic aspirations, Jane Eyre's eloquence renders her monstrous, because she defies the silent submissive role allocated to women, and Daphne du Maurier's unnamed narrator's silences are indicative of her longing for an unattainable sovereignty. In the texts of Agnon, Bialik, and Yizhar, various biblical and Talmudic allusions serve to explore issues of sovereignty. Also, shifts between different kinds of language and linguistic registers, such as from modern Israeli Hebrew to Talmudic or biblical language, also emphasise the importance of language for the assertion of sovereignty. The texts explore sovereignty through different linguistic avenues, as in

the written and spoken aspects of the characters' command over land and their attainment of personal agency.

Comparing various novels and short stories, as well as an epic, this study is informed by Mikhail Bakhtin's work, primarily his assertion regarding the centrality of the novel in modernity, as 'it best of all reflects the tendencies of a new world still in the making; it is, after all, the only genre born of this new world and in total affinity with it' (1975/2006: 7). Yet in addition to the novel, the short story is also a modern form. Also, many novels commenced their journey as instalments in newspapers, which were read as short narratives within a whole novel. Though one might be tempted to suggest that the novel is the literary form of the coloniser, and short story or other short formats are the genre of minor literature; there is not sufficient evidence to support such claims. The novel, and particularly the Gothic novel, has been linked with the reconfiguration of modern nationalism and colonialism (Spivak 1985; Baldick 1987; Azin 1993; Smith and Hughes 2003; Bugg 2005; Valente 2000; and Craciun 2011). Yet, the short story and other short literary forms such as the poem, epic, or novella have not been associated with the colonised or (post)colonialism. While acknowledging the productive possibilities of reading short stories as part of 'minor literature' (Awadalla and March-Russell 2013: 5), Maggie Awadalla and Paul March-Russell suggest that the short story's relative marginality in relation to the novel might be connected to tendencies to label literature as high or low culture (5). Awadalla and March-Russell note that the short story is '[s]imultaneously a product of mass and minority culture' (4), hence even as they link the short story and post-colonialism, it appears there is nothing particularly postcolonial about the short story as genre. Nevertheless, because of practical constraints (e.g., funding and

accessibility) the short story is more prevalent in spatially dispersed and forming communities, such as the Jewish and Jewish-Israeli community.¹²⁴

Furthermore, the reading of all the texts – short stories, novels, as well as Bialik’s epic – relies on Bakhtin’s claim that ‘[o]nly polyglossia fully frees consciousness from the tyranny of its own language and its own myth of language’ (1975/2006: 61). The texts all incorporate different discourses and language registers, various jargon and semantic connections. The amalgamation of languages, discourses, as well as register and jargon renders the texts themselves as monstrous creations. Furthermore, as Brottman observes, ‘[w]here M.M. Bakhtin thirty years earlier regarded the text as a composition of polyglot layers and codes, Barthes in 1973 considered not only the text but also the reader or consumer of that text as similarly composed of a series of polyglot layers and codes’ (2007: 122). The contemporary reader of the texts examined here engages with notions of selfhood from a different point of view, thus constructing his or her (post)modern individual and collective identities within the interaction of the texts and a different (and ever-changing) constructed reality. The following analyses consider the reading of the texts a part of a continual dialectic that (re)constructs individual and collective identities.

¹²⁴ The Gothic is useful for explorations of national identities within both major and minor literatures (Mehtonen and Savolainen 2013).

4.2 Linguistic Socialisation

4.2.1 The Power of Speech

The power of speech is phenomenal, and it effects individuals and whole nations. Throughout history one finds that great orators have succeeded in mobilising nations, making tremendous changes for better or worse. It is through speech that one might declare sovereignty. Sovereignty, however, is ‘a posited law, a thesis or a prosthesis, and not a natural given’ (Derrida 2009: 77/116), and literature participates in its (re)construction as natural. As stated earlier, during the nineteenth and up till the mid twentieth centuries, the British and Jewish nations underwent opposite processes with regard to sovereignty that are reflected in the literature of the time. The comparison of the use of speech as a metaphor for individual and collective relationships to sovereignty reveals similarities as well as differences between the English and Hebrew texts examined here. The texts are preoccupied with language and speech as means for (re)creation of individual and collective identities. As the vocal manifestation of language, speech plays a significant role in the exploration of various issues of identity. In the 1950s Jacques Lacan emphasised the importance of speech as an exchange within the symbolic order, which allows for a connection between humans (Lacan 1988: 142). The reading offered here follows Lacan’s trajectory as it focuses upon the importance of speech for processes of socialisation.

The importance of speech in *Frankenstein* has been observed as a delineator of the boundaries of the human, as well as a manner of demarcation of cultural difference, and means for communication (Brooks 1993; Malchow 1993 & 1996; Bugg 2004). The humanoid creature made from exhumed body parts learns to speak, and later relates the lonely journey of its existence. This process outlines the creature’s move from a Lacanian real to symbolic order. Language is both means and object in this process of (re)creation of the creature’s identities. The creature’s journey is a metaphor for all human move from

the real to symbolic order, a move which brings the joy of communication at the expense of the loss of some inexplicable innocence.

A Lacanian reading of *Frankenstein* suggests that the monstrosity may ultimately ‘rest with the reader’ because of the ‘metonymic movement of desire through the narrative signifying chain’ (Brooks 1995: 96). The reader encounters a sense of lack of resolution on several levels, and as Peter Brooks suggests, is left with ‘a residue of desire for meaning’ (1995: 96). The space inhabited by deconstruction to which Fred Botting refers in his Derridian reading of *Frankenstein* (1991: 154) is the location of an inherently divided and threatened space of the possibilities that harbour an overflow of binary movements, or multiple possibilities of (lack of) meanings. *Frankenstein* offers a complex allegory of the nineteenth-century British relationship to the displaced silenced Other, and as Jerrold E. Hogle explains, the creature is also the displaced regarding language (1980: 221). The novel pushes boundaries of philosophical and social conventions demanding that the reader re-evaluates preconceived notions of identity in relation to language.

Read through William Godwin’s dictum that argues that literature is the locus of the demarcation between the human and non-human, ‘the trajectory of Frankenstein’s creature offers a parable of pedagogic failure – specifically a failure in the promise of the humanities, in letters as a route to humanisation’ (McLane 2000: 84). The creature remains outside human society in spite of its extreme eloquence and literacy.

The novel, nonetheless, is replete with language acquisition. Brooks observes the explosion of languages in the De Lacey cottage when Safie arrives, referring to a ‘well-ordered Babel’ (1993: 87), as ‘we have lessons in French offered to an Arab, in the context of what we know to be a German-speaking region, the whole rendered for us in English’ (87). One ought to note that the languages represented here are Western, while Safie’s Eastern language is silenced. As mentioned earlier, the novel has been read within postcolonial discourse (Baldick 1987: 1; Malchow 1996: 6-14; Bugg 2005: 656), and its

linguistic acquisition should be read within this context. The European imperialist project conquers Safie the Turk and annexes her completely, physically, culturally, and linguistically. The novel marks the creature as an ultimate Other in a racial nationalist context.

As in the previous chapters, the similarities between *Frankenstein* and *Golem* beckon consideration. In both we find a humanoid creature created by a scholar. Yet whereas Wollstonecraft Shelley's creature becomes exceptionally articulate yet is not embraced by the community, Rosenberg's Golem, though mute, is socially accepted even while it is marginalised. As explained earlier, the differences in the spatial location of the creatures as well as their social position are a reflection of the British and Jewish nations' condition. The allegorical function of Frankenstein's creature is as a representative of fears of social mobility (Botting 1991: 140) and the negative effects of imperialism (Baldick 1987: 1; Bugg 2005: 656). The Golem, conversely, is a representation of the Jews in the Ashkenazi Diaspora, who have neither sovereignty nor a homeland at the time of the publication of the Rosenberg's text. Whereas the British declare their hold over many countries, the Jews can declare their sovereignty over none. The two creatures' linguistic abilities is a reflection of the two nations' states of sovereignty.

It is of vital importance then to note that the Golem is created through the power of speech. As mentioned earlier, the creation of a Golem is acceptable within the Jewish tradition (Levinat 1990: 3; Kieval 1997: 4), and is performed as a religious ritual 'in which a Rabbi recites thousands of Hebrew alphabetic permutations; the letters themselves embody the spiritual and physical energy that constructs life' (Covino 1996: 356). Thus speech, like in the biblical myth of creation, is what breathes life into clay. In Rosenberg's narrative, moreover, the Golem is created in order to defend against the blood libels. Speech is both literally and figuratively empowering.

While the story presents the Kabbalah as an acceptable part of the Jewish tradition, there have been – and still are – debates and disagreements regarding its validity. The Kabbalah, which literally means acceptance or receiving, is a mystical sect of Judaism. The definitions vary, but broadly speaking it is a mystical philosophy that utilises words in order to bring things into existence or action. For example, words bring about the creation of a Golem, as they infuse the clay with the spark of life. In Rosenberg’s *Golem* the Maharal uses the *Book of Creation (Sefer Yetzirah)* as his guide in the creation of the golem. As J. Lawton Winslade notes, the Golem is ‘a particularly fantastic example of how the Hebrew mystical philosophy and practice of Kabbalah utilises words that, in an Austinian performative sense, “do some-thing”’ (2000: 85). Though in Rosenberg’s narrative there is no mention of the specific letters or words used in order to create the Golem, Curt Levinat (the translator and editor) provides the Talmudic reference in which Rava creates a man with the help of the *Book of Creation* (2007: xiv). According to Levinat, Rashi, the renowned French critic, explains that the method involves ‘reciting the proper combination of letters of God’s name. Another is inserting God’s name into the Golem’s mouth or affixing it to his forehead’ (xiv). In Rosenberg’s version, however, ‘the Golem is vivified by three rabbis marching around him seven times while saying various names of God in special Kabbalistic permutations’ (2007: xv).¹²⁵ Levinat also mentions ‘another dramatic method of giving life’ (xv), by inserting into the mouth of the Golem the word truth, which is another name of God (xv). In Hebrew the word truth is comprised of three letters, transliterated as *emet*, and when the first is removed the word *met* remains, which means dead, thus killing, or deactivating the Golem (xv). Thus the word truth (*emet*) gives life and by omitting one letter (the first in the Hebrew alphabet) the word becomes dead (*met*), and kills. This emphasises the perceived power of the word.

¹²⁵ This is an allusion to the Battle of Jericho, in which the priests were ordered by God to circle the seven times on the seventh day in order to save the city from the enemy (Joshua 6: 16).

The word *golem* means lump of clay, unformed material, and also mute and fool. The origins of the word are from the Old Testament (Psalm 139:16) where the verse suggests that God can see a person's soul even when the person is still in formation, in the mother's womb, not yet a person, but a promise and potential of a person. It is also the word for the cocoon of a butterfly, which relates to its potentiality to transform into something else. All these meanings are present in the Golem, as it is made of clay, cannot speak, is not very bright, and has the ability to change from an inanimate to an animate and from a benevolent to a malevolent creature.

The tension between the Golem's linguistic creation and its own lack of speech is also significant. Apart from the fact that speech can arguably differentiate the human and non-human, the Golem's muteness has social ramifications upon the Golem's rights and ability to participate in political activities (Covino 1996: 361). This, I suggest, is also a reflection of and upon the situation of Jews in the Diaspora, and their limited abilities to participate in political activities. While historical accounts suggest that the Maharal had been accepted by Emperor Rudolf II (Kieval 1997: 4), in Rosenberg's narrative the Maharal has the power of speech only within the Jewish community, and annexes the non-Jewish soil into the Jewish realm.

The Golem is accepted by the Jewish community subsequent to the Maharal's decree. The Maharal is the leader of the community, and his rulings dictate its conduct. The explanation the Maharal gives for the appearance of the Golem in his household is that he came across a mute simpleton on his way to prayer, felt sorry for him and took him home as a second *shamash*; however, he forbids members of his household to use it for 'domestic purposes' (*G*: 37). This is an odd caveat for a *shamash*, and the acceptance of this decree highlights the Maharal's unchallenged leadership.

The Golem's character is depicted as that of a mute, a fool and simpleton. This is linked to and reflected in its location within the household. It is noted that it used to sit 'in

a corner of the court-room at the edge of a table resting his head on his hands [...] the people called him Yossele the Golem, while some named him Yossele the mute' (G: 38). The Golem is the tolerated, though taunted, silent Other. It is treated as a mute, and is an acceptable part of the community. The Golem's status is regulated by clear judicial rulings within the Jewish tradition, and it is treated much as a mute or mentally impaired person would have been at the time.

Over the centuries, the Jewish community has produced elaborate rules and regulations regarding the various Others within it, and the text suggests the Maharal manipulated the Jewish social apparatus so that the Golem is accepted as a mute, (perhaps) intellectually impaired person. In Jewish tradition, a number of handicaps, such as blindness, deafness, and muteness carried specific legal and religious categories (Shoham-Steiner 2008: 200).¹²⁶ Up till the modern era, it was believed that congenital deafness hinders cognitive abilities, and 'the deaf were often labelled as "deaf and dumb," and therefore fell under the legal definition of the idiot who requires the legal guardianship of an adult' (Shoham-Steiner 2008: 200). The complexities of the Jewish rulings regarding the handicapped reflect the Jewish communities' attempts to keep the Other within. This insistence on incorporation is noticeable in the rules and regulations regarding the blind, who, although lacking in one of the five senses and missing a part of the knowledge of the world, can still communicate with people, and the principle of thought in their personality was not considered as nullified (Shoham-Steiner 2008: 200). This incorporation, however, was problematic with regard to the deaf and dumb, who were deemed incapable of comprehension and full cognition (200). Jewish social apparatus allocates certain permissible social functions to such individuals, and insures the deaf are legally

¹²⁶ Additionally, the Jewish tradition has elaborate rules and regulations regarding the people who may not engage in the offering processes at the temple. In the Mishnah, Sefer Avodah, the rules regarding the ones who are deemed unfit for the work of God one finds references to people with any kind of damage or was in contact with any un-kosher element cannot be associated with the worship of God (הלכות פסולי (המוקדשין פרק יח).

represented. The Golem is treated by the Jewish religious apparatus almost as a deaf and dumb person.

Rosenberg provides a list of (nineteen) rulings regarding the Golem, allegedly written by Yitzchok ben Shimshon Ha-Cohen as he heard them from the Maharal (*G*: 187-195). One rule says that ‘according to the law, the Golem is not obliged to perform any of the mitzvahs, even those incumbent upon a woman and a slave. But for the sake of appearances the Maharal orders the Golem to obey several mitzvahs for everyone to see’ (*G*: 187).¹²⁷ Thus, while located socially beneath women or slaves, the Golem nonetheless has its place within the social apparatus as ascribed to him by the Maharal. Thus unlike Frankenstein’s creature, which is rejected by society, the Golem has a place at the bottom of the Jewish social order.

Like the Golem, the ox in Agnon’s ‘Avi Hashor’ has an allocated social role. Again, like the Golem, though the ox is mute, it functions as a servant. The beast, moreover, functions not only as a domestic but as the old man’s substitute for family, and shares a special kind of language with him. As mentioned earlier, Agnon’s characters have been read as sexual deviants (Aberbach 1994: 45), and the text offers subtle suggestions of an intimate connection between the man and the ox. Apart from the fact that the old man is called *Avi Hashor*, which means literally the ox’s father, one of the moments that suggests the relationship between the ox and the old man might be intimate is the scene of their communication. Unlike the hostile relationship between Frankenstein and his creature, here we see an emotional love connection between master and servant. As the town is raided, the old man hides in the cave, and the ox attempts to lure him from his hiding place in order to vanquish the enemy, but neither knows the other’s language (*AH*: 336). The narrator tells us the ox ‘hints with its tongue that which its mouth cannot say’ (*AH*: 336).¹²⁸

¹²⁷ A mitzvah is a Jewish decree.

¹²⁸ רמז לו בלשונו מה שאין פיו יכול להגיד

Agnon's playful game with the words 'language' or 'tongue', and 'mouth' is active in the Hebrew as well as in English and offers an amusing picture of the ox using its mouth and tongue to express what it cannot articulate. In a sense, it appears to speak to the old man even while it is mute. The ox, like the land, is silent, and the narrator vocalises the old man's interpretation of the behaviour of the ox, 'the ox beheld him like a lover beholds his lover, and rattled its tongue. If we were to translate this into human language, it would translate thus: my soul I shall give to save thy soul, my master, my intentions are entirely for you and for your well-being' (AH: 337).¹²⁹ The lovers' language suggests there might be more to the relationship between the old man and the ox, which would imply both bestiality and, as the old man is the ox's father, incest. The insinuation of social transgression is mild, though latently present. The ox functions as substitute for wife and children, and in spite of its muteness has a special communication with the old man. The comparison with the *Golem* suggests that as the mute Golem represents the situation of the Jews in the Ashkenazi Diaspora, the ox now signifies the connection to the Holy Land. 'Avi Hashor' was written at the time of the British Mandate for Palestine, and Gershon Shaked goes as far as to label 'Avi Hashor' as 'historical chronicle' (1989: 169). As other Agnon works, which have been read as allegories,¹³⁰ 'Avi Hashor' may, and indeed ought to, be read as an allegory. The ox in the short story may be read as the allegorised *yishuv* in Palestine, perceived as mute yet powerful. Additionally, the mute ox serves as an allegory for redemption of the Holy Land, and can be seen as a *tikun*, a religious amendment, for the sin of golden calf, which the Israelites worshiped in the desert, or the diaspora. Like the ox, the *yishuv* was to a great extent silent, or felt like it had no clear voice, with which to cry out against the pogroms and later the Holocaust. I propose reading the story allegorically, suggesting the language of love between the old man and the ox is

הביט עליו השור כאוהב שמביט באוהבו וקשקש לו בלשונו. אם אנו מתרגמים את הדבר ללשון בני אדם כך תרגומו,¹²⁹ נפשי תחתך אדוני אם לא לטובתך אני מתכוון

¹³⁰ For example, Fisch reads *Sipur Pashut* as 'a kind of allegory for the historical pilgrimage of the house of Israel' (1970: 53).

the call of the land to its owner to come and do battle in order to redeem the land and save it from an enemy. The comparison of *Frankenstein*, *Golem*, and 'Avi Hashor' reveals some of the connections between the mute characters and the states of sovereignty of the producing culture. Frankenstein's creature's eloquence is the return of the repressed fears of the colonised Other, and the silence of the Golem is a manifestation of the Diaspora Jews' lack of political agency. The ox's language of love represents Agnon's notions of the love between the Holy Land and the Jewish people.

The connection between the nation and the land has been productively depicted as a romantic relationship, as an extension of the love between the people and their God: as in, for example, the allegorical interpretations of Song of Songs as an ode to the love of God. In both the Jewish and Christian traditions femininity is intricately intertwined with land and consequently sovereignty.

The links between femininity and speech within the Judaic and Christian traditions exhibit certain similarities as well as differences. Though the issue has been and still is cause for debate, the Jewish scriptures decree that a woman's voice is forbidden, as it might seduce the man and lure him away from his religious studies (*Masekhet Berakhot* 24a). The Talmud logic suggests that in order to ensure the safe abstention from sin, a man must not hear a woman's voice. Though this renunciation is limited to the voice of song, and not regular speech, it is, nevertheless, noted that one must have no intention to take pleasure from a woman's voice. The female role in Jewish tradition is limited, and overall the woman must not undermine her husband's rulings. Since sovereignty is asserted through speech, these limitations upon women's ability to make their voice heard hinder their chances to obtain sovereignty.

The question of the female role and voice in relation to sovereignty is addressed in Agnon's 'Tehila'. Though the short story was written after the establishment of Israel in 1948, it refers explicitly to the British Mandate and the Jews' right to the land. As

mentioned before, during the scene near the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem, Tehila stares at the British soldier till he permits an old lady to keep her stool in place, in spite of the Mandatory law that prohibits such sitting arrangements by the Wall (*T*: 183). Thus even within the constraints of feminine linguistic limitations Tehila finds a way to convey her sovereignty over Jerusalem. Tehila represents the Jewish nation, and as explained earlier, through her character Agnon asserts the Jewish nation's right to sovereignty due to divine credence rather than because of international law.

Tehila is an educated woman, and when she speaks she is eloquent. As a response to the narrator's request to talk about herself, Tehila says she used to prattle as a child, but as she grew up learned to hold her tongue, because she was told that if she 'wasted' all her speech too soon she might shorten her life (*T*: 185). This has the air of a fairy-tale, but reflects a phrase from the *Babylonian Talmud* 'silence becomes the wise let alone the fools' (Psachim 99:1),¹³¹ which is based on the biblical phrase 'Even a fool, when he holdeth his peace, is counted wise: and he that shutteth his lips esteemed a man of understanding' (Proverbs 17:28).¹³² The Jewish tradition encourages people to remain silent, as that is a safeguard for wisdom. While language is at the heart of the Jewish tradition, it nevertheless valorises silence. Though this caveat does not refer specifically to women, since Tehila is a female character, Agnon's text reinforces this decree explicitly with regard to women.

Whereas in 'Avi Hashor' the ox, which functions as substitute for wife and family, 'prattled on in a language of love', here Tehila restrains herself. Agnon grants the mute ox language while depriving the female character from linguistic freedom. Bearing in mind the correlations between these characters and land, the insistence upon silence here suggests a different role for the female in the context of the nationalist narrative. While the ox encouraged the old man to go into battle in order to defend the land, even while she

¹³¹ (פסחים צט א) יפה שתיקה לחכמים קל וחומר לטפשים

¹³² גם אָויל מִחַרִּישׁ חָכָם יִחַשֵׁב אִטָּם שְׁפֹתָיו נְבוֹן

might be intricately linked with the land, the woman must hold her tongue. Tehila, however, finds a way to assert her sovereignty through an appropriation of the gaze.

Tehila's character is aligned with the *shechina*, the feminine aspect of God. As explained earlier, the word *shechina* means dwelling. Tehila not only dwells in Jerusalem like the mythical *shechina* but is also compassionate and charitable like the feminine facet of divinity. Tehila's character, however, has been read as heretical as well (Nave 1997: 9-14). Arye Nave reveals heretical trends in Tehila's conduct, such as seeking death in order to reunite with her lover, and the absence of god's name from the last part of the story, which support the suggestion that Tehila is, in fact, rebelling against god (1997: 14). Whether she is saintly or sacrilegious, her preference for silence can be perceived both as an integral part of Jewish tradition and a revolt against its conventions. Her silence is thus not an obligation but a choice within the boundaries of tradition.

One ought to consider in comparison to Tehila's desire to be mute even while her silence roars the Jewish nation's right for sovereignty Jane Eyre's struggle for independence and freedom of speech. As will soon become clear, the two characters' relationship with speech reflects some of the British and Jewish cultures attempts to explore sovereignty and agency. *Jane Eyre* has been read as a feminist manifesto (Gilbert and Gubar 1979) as well as a critique of imperialism (Spivak 1985). Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar examine the bildungsroman and Bertha's character at length, relating to her silence as a reflection of the silencing of the racial Other (1979: 361). Reading *Jane Eyre* as a critique of the imperialist enterprise that silences the subaltern (Spivak 1985: 245), suggests that Jane is an inward embodiment of the subaltern within the British society. Gilbert and Gubar draw the parallels between Jane and Bertha as both are in some way portrayed as monstrous Others (1979: 362). Yet, Jane too is labelled as an Other because of her linguistic abilities; however, while Bertha's Otherness is reflected by her silence (actually, she groans, hence not silent but inarticulate), Jane's Otherness is linked

throughout the narrative with her acute linguistic abilities. While she is deprived of financial and social capacities, Jane has remarkable intellectual abilities that manifest primarily in her command of the English language.¹³³ Language as the marker of social status as well as mere humanity renders Jane's unique Otherness more disturbing as she overcomes her social Otherness *by* her use of language. Like Frankenstein's creature, Jane's great abilities of articulateness are depicted as monstrous. Hence whereas Bertha's inability to communicate portray her as a monstrous Other, Jane's eloquence renders her monstrous. Language, as this demonstrates, delineates social boundaries, specifically male, British supremacist boundaries that exclude the foreign and the poor female alike.

In the first scene of the novel, Jane is told that she is to be separated from the rest of the family until her aunt hears from Bessie, or could discover by her own observation, that Jane was 'endeavouring in good earnest to acquire a more sociable and childlike disposition, a more attractive and sprightly manner – something lighter, franker, more natural, as it were' (*JE*: 5). Jane asks what Bessie, the servant, claims she had done to deserve rejection, and her aunt retorts she does not appreciate 'cavillers or questioners' (*JE*: 5) and adds: 'besides, there is something truly forbidding in a child taking up her elders in that manner. Be seated somewhere; and until you can speak pleasantly, remain silent' (*JE*: 5). The message is clear – good little girls are silent and docile. Before Jane has had a chance to speak she is silenced. The Othering of Jane along linguistic lines commences as she is denied the privileges of communal sociality as well as speech.

Lisa Steinlieb argues that 'Jane's narrative does not trace the development of her voice but rather the movement from her sulking, unproductive silences at Gateshead to her cultivated silences at Lowood and beyond' (1999: 458). Jane often acknowledges she is more silent than loquacious, admitting she 'indeed, talked comparatively little' (*JE*: 125).

¹³³ Jane also has remarkable command of French, however that capacity, though useful, is not as esteemed.

The young woman's silence could be manipulated to deprive her of her will and agency, as when St John answers in her place that she should come to India with him, and help him with the colonial enterprise. Whereas Tehila remains silent even while asserting her sovereignty, Jane has to assert her agency through language. Jane becomes an extremely articulate woman with a clear voice and opinion, which she expresses at the time and place of her choice, eventually rejecting St John in order to reunite with Rochester.

The comparison of the two characters – Jane and Tehila – in relation to their speech reflects a distinctly different approach of the Jewish and British nations' relation to sovereignty. Whereas the British declared sovereign hold of the colonies, by the time of the publication of 'Tehila' the Jews had declared their sovereignty over Israel. The text in English offers a critique of imperialism while the text in Hebrew endorses emigration and colonisation. Furthermore, Jane's struggle to speak is a metaphor for the internal fight for rights of women within the British nation, and Tehila's silence suggests Agnon's reliance upon divinity for the vindication of the Jews' right to sovereignty.

Considering the connection between gender roles and the expectations regarding speech, Berkowitz's 'Mishael' (1910) offers an interesting exploration of Jewish tradition. Set in a typical Jewish town or village in the Ashkenazi Diaspora, the short story examines a breach in the "proper" social allocations and gender roles. Whereas Jane and Tehila are both articulate women, Mishael is barely intelligible. Explained in previous chapters, the role of Jewish male as an academic was pivotal (Boyarin 1997: 23) and Mishael's lack of cognitive abilities is a serious problem. In a manner, he reminds the reader of the mute Golem. The important difference, however, is that whereas the Golem was socially accepted in spite of its inability to articulate, Mishael is rejected because of his linguistic limitations. The two characters are nonetheless similar, in the sense that like the Golem, which occupied the place of the marginalised Other, Mishael is also allotted a place on the very margins of the community.

Though at one point of the story he manages to haggle with the *gvir* over the cost of the *hoshaanoth*,¹³⁴ this dialogue is laboured, and Mishael stutters and stammers along the way. The story is replete with his feeble attempts to speak, and it ends with him crying and howling, losing his dignity and humanity. After they sell the *hoshanot*, Mishael and his gang purchase food and wine and feast on their earnings, become completely intoxicated, and are degraded into a beast-like stupor. He becomes '[a] howling monster, a drunken monster'.¹³⁵ As the party becomes quite drunk, the cries of happiness turn into cries of misery and loneliness, until the story ends with Mishael weeping for his misfortune:

Pray! Dear God! Save our souls! Plea...ea...ease! And suddenly Mishael begins weeping. At first it appears to his friends, he is only joking around, to make things happier. However, this weeping grows stronger, until it becomes a prolonged cry like the cry of a calf that has been separated from its mother and is being led to slaughter. Mishael lies on the bench with his face down, twisting his face, scratching his head with both hands out of desperation and mumbles as if to himself, crying like a calf in a strange cry, seeping down his throat and nose.

What? What do they want from me? What has that killer, may he become sick, done to me? With a log he hit my face, with a log... killer that he is... I had two... two eyes... healthy, beautiful... handsome... a man! I could have taken a fine bride, received a dowry... pray with a Talith... and now, who will take me? scoundrel that I am, barefoot, with torn trousers... for ever I will walk

¹³⁴ The *hoshaanoth* are the willow branches for the prayer of the Hoshana Rabbah, a Jewish holiday.

¹³⁵ (*The Tempest*: Act II scene 2)

around like this, until I go under... Alone, as lonely as a stone... and with one eye... only one eye... bah...ha...ha!...¹³⁶

(M: 35)

The passage closes the story, reaffirming the role of Mishael as the outcast, the monstrous Other. The narrative does not supply information with regard to his cognitive abilities prior to the assault that made him lose his ear and eye, and the reader may conclude that he was made into the monster he is now as a result of the attack. According to Mishael's perception of his identity, he has become less than the man he might have been because of the wrongdoing. He is transformed into a beast, crying first 'like a calf', then uttering a 'strange cry' no longer identifiable. The move from the congregation's prayers to Mishael's cry dislocates him from the community and places him first as rebel or outcast, because he is not with the congregation praying for atonement, then the cry is described as one of an animal, and then the text suggests it is even weirder, and Mishael becomes an inarticulate monster. The last word he utters is not even a word, but an inarticulate sound befitting a monster.

Comparing the use of speech in 'Mishael' to *Jane Eyre* and *Frankenstein* reveals once again how speech functions as a synecdoche for humanity. As Mishael drifts further away from the community his speech becomes like a beast or monster. He resembles Bertha, and occupies the social location of the monstrous Other. The reader remembers the story is set in the Ashkenazi Diaspora, which means the Jewish community was not able

אנא ! אל-נא ! הושע-נא ! והושיעה נא-א-א-א ! ופתאום מתחיל מישאל להתייפח. מתחילה נדמה לחבריו, כי רק צחוק¹³⁶ עושה להם מפקדם, להרבות השמחה. אלא שהתייפחות זו מוסיפה והולכת, עד שהיא נעשית לגעייה ממושכת, כגעייתו של עגל, ייאוש אותו לשחיתה. מוטל מישאל על הספסל ופניו למטה, מעקם פרצופו, מגרד ראשו בשתי ידיו מתוך ומובילים שהפרידו מעל אמו מה? מה הם דורשים ממני? מה עשה לי הרוצח, יבוא מר וטוען כאילו לעצמו, גועה בבכייה משונה, המחלחלת בתוך גרונו וחוטמו. יפה תואר... בן-אדם! על פני, בבול עץ... רוצח שכמותו... שתיים היו לי... שתי עיניים... בריאות, יפות... חולירע עליו? בעץ הכה שכמותי, יחף, במכנסיים קרועים... עד עולם אתה לך יכולתי לקחת כלה נאה, לקבל נדוניה... להתפלל בטלית... ועתה מי יקחני? פוחח... ובעין אחת... רק בעין אחת... בוהואאו!... לבדי, גלמוד כאבן... כך, עד שארד לקבר...

to reject the monstrous Other, like the villagers banish Frankenstein's creature. The Jewish community were themselves the Other, and therefore had to allocate a place for the Other within the boundaries of the congregation. Speech, nonetheless, delineates the boundaries between the self and the Other, the human and non-human.

A contrast to this depiction of the human turned monstrous through in-articulation is the extremely articulate vampire. Whereas Mishael's lack of linguistic abilities renders him more monstrous, Count Dracula is horrifying because his eloquence hides his monstrosity. Like Frankenstein's creature and Jane, Dracula's speech disturbs the notions of the silent Other. The Count attempts to achieve a high level of proficiency in English in order to blend in in London. When the two converse, Harker compliments the Count on his excellent command of English. Yet, Dracula says that had he been in London he would be immediately recognised as a stranger (*D*: 31), adding that he is respected in his own land because of his nobility, but that in London he is unknown, and might not be respected if he was perceived as a foreigner (*D*: 31). The Count seeks the command of linguistic abilities so that he should blend in in London in order to prey on the population from within. Language here is the tool for the subordination of the British nation to this (old) new master from the East. The fear of the Count's attempt to assimilate is a reflection of the fear of the assimilated Jew, as the idea that a Jew could be indistinguishable from the British amalgamates the threat from the notion of an Eastern Invasion and the problem of identity (Malchow 1996: 163). *Dracula* is 'a narrative of reverse colonisation' (Arata 1990: 623), and as Arata explains, '[b]efore Dracula successfully invades the spaces of his victims' bodies or land, he first invades the spaces of their knowledge' (1990: 634). Language in *Dracula* is the means for the commencement of colonisation. Whereas in 'Avi Hashor' the language of love between the ox and the old man was the endorsement of processes of fierce battle over land, here language acquisition is the very means for

infiltration. Speech, nonetheless, is an active participant in the establishment of sovereignty.

The various characters' linguistic abilities reflect their social status and humanity or lack of it. While both the Golem and the ox, though mute, are embraced by the community; Frankenstein's creature, Dracula, and Jane, though extremely articulate are rejected. In fact, one might even suggest that their linguistic abilities render them even more monstrous. Mishael's linguistic deficiency, like Bertha's, makes him monstrous. Language participates in the demarcation of these characters as a monstrous Other, which is located outside the social apparatus, relegated to the social margins. The speech of the female Other is similar to the racial and social other and has to be regulated. Even Tehila's speech has to be regulated, because if she spoke too much she would lose her status as the righteous woman, and would be allotted the location of the Other woman. Speech, the articulation of thoughts and emotions is a very powerful aspect of the human, and as the texts explore the boundaries of the human they examine the limits of language. Furthermore, as a result of its role and delineator of social and humanistic boundaries, speech as the facilitator of sovereignty functions in the various texts as means to engage with the states of sovereignty of the producing culture.

4.2.2 The Right to Read

Language, particularly reading and writing, are considered by some as one of the means for differentiation between the human and non-human. In fact, one might suggest that since '[n]o other species on the planet uses language or writing' (Mehta 2011), it is actually one of the few measures one might employ to discern and define the human as such. In the previous chapter the focus was upon the literary representation of speech as means to convey and examine issues of humanity and sovereignty; now we shall see how literary

depictions of the lettered languages and education are utilised in order to consider the limits of the human, as well as social boundaries. The texts examined here show a particular preoccupation with education for two reasons: first, as part of an ongoing desire to explore and define humanity, and second as a means for social differentiation within humanity. That is, the ability to read and write draws the line between diverse cultures and even divides classes and gender roles within the same culture. Specifically, the texts reflect the role of education in British and Jewish cultures during the nineteenth- and up till the mid-twentieth century.

With the spread of ideas of the Enlightenment, for our purposes predominantly the introduction of secularism and individualism (Schmidt 1996: 8-14), the importance of education as means for social instruction became significant for men and women across Europe (Richardson 2008: 184). Due to the seeping in of ideas of Enlightenment, Jewish communities in the Ashkenazi Diaspora began a parallel process of engagement with secular education. Concurrent to the Enlightenment the Jews were experiencing the revolution of the *Haskalah*, the Jewish Enlightenment (Pelli 2012: 9). Western Enlightenment had a tremendous impact upon the *Haskalah* (Pelli 2012: 10), and, though with divergences and nuances, both movements are linked with modernity (Pelli 2012: 9; Barnett 2003: 2). Primarily as a secular rather than religious project, broadening the scope of education is one of the main aspects of modernity. The idea is that one might enrich one's world while attaining a greater understanding of the world in which one might act in a meaningful manner. This, as the texts examined here reveal, is indeed a powerful notion. These processes were shaping the British and Jewish nations at a period of tremendous upheaval. Alongside the triple revolutions – the French, industrial, and mass print revolutions – the battle between Reason and Religion was to be a major aspect of the reconfiguration of the two nations. Most important for this study is that the renunciation

of religion as the overarching answer to all questions leaves the question regarding the right to sovereignty unresolved.

The significance of the written letter as a transmitter of information, as well as a metaphor for culture is explored in various ways. The texts utilise the written word as metaphor in order to investigate the essence of culture and the human, specifically in relation to questions of sovereignty.

The importance of language in *Frankenstein* has been noted in the previous chapter. As Maureen McLane notes, '[t]he letter proliferates in *Frankenstein*. Not only does *Frankenstein* suggest that linguistic acquisition is the facilitator of social acceptance, the creature conceives of language not only as oral exchange but rather as literate (lettered) speech' (McLane 2000: 97). McLane suggests that the dedication of the novel to Wollstonecraft Shelley's father (William Godwin) could be understood as a critique of his assertion that literature 'forms the grand demarcation between the human and the animal kingdoms' in *Of an Early Taste for Reading* (1797) (2000: 84). Frankenstein's creature's engagement with literature undermines Godwin's dictum, revealing that Godwin presupposes an educable human subject (McLane 2000: 84). Furthermore, this subject has to qualify as human within the British beliefs that consider particular gender, class, and race as human for the purposes of advancement and education. Furthermore, John Bugg observes the importance of Wollstonecraft Shelley's concern with education 'especially the engagement of *Frankenstein* with race and empire in two of its narratives of education: the education of the Creature and the (other) education of Victor Frankenstein' (2005: 657). Pedagogical concerns are vital to the novel's progression as a means to define and (re)construct human individuality in relation to sovereignty.

The creature acquires his linguistic education even while he is introduced to imperialism, as Felix reads to Safie from Volney's *Ruins of Empire* (Bugg 2005: 662). Volney's *Ruins of Empire* presents a particular kind of linguistic indoctrination – one

infused with nationalism. Furthermore, the creature reads Milton's *Paradise Lost* (originally written in English), Plutarch's *Lives* (originally written in Greek), Goethe's *Sorrows of Young Werther*, (originally written in German), yet there is no mention of these texts having been translated (McLane 2000: 96). McLane notes that the creature's education is 'a typically "European" – or perhaps Romantically eclecticising – gesture' (96).¹³⁷ McLane's observations highlight the requirement not only for linguistic abilities, but for specifically European nationalist linguistic capabilities. This is important as the creature attempts to enter society as an acceptable Western European human being, not as a colonised Other.

Like Frankenstein's creature, Count Dracula endeavours to educate himself in an attempt to enter Western society. The difference, of course, is that whereas the creature wishes to enter society in search for love and companionship, the vampire is searching for nourishment. Both are, nonetheless, competent autodidacts, and both are also rejected by humanity. While in the castle, Harker notes the Count has in his library 'a vast number of English books, whole shelves full of them, and bound volumes of magazines and newspapers' (*D*: 30). The Count's self-education represents his attempt at linguistic adaptation that might lead to cultural and eventual racial assimilation. The books provide a window into the culture, and the vampire metaphorically already consumes the British by consuming their literature. As explained in the previous chapter, the horror of the Count's effort to assimilate is a reflection of the fear of the assimilated Jew, as well as the Eastern Invasion (Malchow 1996: 163; Arata 1990: 623). The Count's command of English is a metaphor for his control over Britain. The lettered word is used metaphorically as means to conquer and devour.

¹³⁷ The literature of the Zionist movement can be read in relation to Romanticism, and even though it was overshadowed by practical political Zionism, 'Romantic Zionism emerged after the events of 1881 in the movement and literature of *Hibat Tzion*, side by side with practical Zionism' (Bar-Yosef 1996: 68).

Like in Wollstonecraft Shelley's novel, the power of the word is one of the main themes in Stoker's narrative. When Harker writes in short hand to his wife he draws the connection between himself, an imaginary maiden, and modernity (*D*: 18). Stoker's novel suggests that modernity vanquishes prejudices only if it acknowledges the important power of the past (Brindle 2014: 3). As Robert Olorenshaw notes, in *Dracula*, 'along with garlic, crucifixes, and wafers, the typewriter is part of the panoply of weapons needed to destroy the vampire' (1994: 175). It is through the letter that Mina learns of the monster, and can fend against its horror. The connection between gender roles and the written word are significant (Thomas 2012: 182), and though she is female, the written word is Mina's strength, and as her role as a kind of secretary she is, in her manner, instrumental to the defeat of the vampire. The power of the written word in *Dracula* is exercised in order to propel plot, and eventually vanquish the monster.

Count Dracula is also engaged in letter production and reception, and the first encounter between Harker and Dracula is when the former delivers the letter from his employers (2012: 181). As Kate Thomas observes, while Franco Moretti argues that we are only privy to the letter communication between the British subjects (Moretti 1983/1988: 77), we actually have several notes from Quincy Morris and Van Helsing (2012: 181). The important exclusion, of course, is Count Dracula. The letter is predominantly a window into the British and Western mind, and excludes non-Western points of view. The reader is denied an opportunity to enter the monster's mind, and the vampire in Stoker's novel remains a rejected monstrous Other. The equivalent of the touching narrative of the creature in Wollstonecraft Shelley's novel is not available in Stoker's narrative. The omission of the monster's narrative dehumanises it further. The power of the word is thus acknowledged, as an account of the vampire's perspective might transform the readers' perception of the monster.

The power of the word as transformative is also explored in *Jane Eyre*, as the novel appears to suggest the protagonist utilises her education as social leverage. Though Jane is human, her humanity, as noted earlier, is constantly challenged and undermined. The novel proposes that it is through her education that Jane solidifies her humanity. Like in *Frankenstein*, contemporary debates regarding the connection between education and humanity are explored in *Jane Eyre*. Also, like in Wollstonecraft Shelley's novel, Brontë's novel is inconclusive regarding the simplistic alignments of education and humanity. Bernard Paris argues that *Jane Eyre* is a novel of education and vindication (1997: 144). He claims that in the education pattern, Jane is rewarded 'because she triumphs over her own passionate nature' (1997:150). This suggests that her education is, in fact, the subjugation of her nature to social doctrine. There is no broadening of horizons here; rather, a limitation of emotional outburst. Early reviews of *Jane Eyre* regarded it as blasphemous and subversive (Gilbert 1977: 779). This rebelliousness was, according to Sandra Gilbert, horrifying not only because it undermined social norms, but because it defied Christian doctrine of female subjectivity (1977: 780). Thus education in *Jane Eyre* is perceived in the context of socialisation, and societal indoctrination. These readings focus on social interaction as the means for education, because the novel actually questions the perception of conventional education as a socialising tool. *Jane Eyre*, it would seem, outlines the move of a poor orphan female from social exclusion to acceptance. While it appears the move is facilitated by education, in fact her final acceptance is through her inheritance and marriage to Rochester. The novel, I propose, operates under a false premise that suggests that education can indeed offer social leverage, and a closer examination exposes the novel's depiction of education as an escapist endeavour.

Jane finds her comfort from social exclusion in literature, and when she is relegated to the breakfast room, which contains a bookcase, she soon takes a book (*JE*: 5). The scene of Jane reading behind the curtain establishes her Otherness as inherently intertwined with

spatial relegation and language. As Spivak notes, Jane reads the pictures and the reader becomes her accomplice (1985: 246). This scene occurs in the first chapter of the novel, thus from the outset the text undermines the opposite correlation between education and otherness.

As mentioned above, Jane is hit by her cousin with a book; adding twofold insult to injury, she is hit with the very book she was reading (*JE*: 8). As Gilbert and Gubar note, like Brontë and her peers, Jane is exposed to misogynistic literature (1979: 821), and her authorship, as manifested in the novel, is a struggle against the ‘double bind’ of Victorian hegemony (1979: 824). The importance of the right to read is emphasised at the beginning of the novel, as it is one of the main themes the narrative explores. Everyone in the novel seems to be reading, including the fake-gypsy Mr. Rochester (*JE*: 165), the phony Miss Ingram (*JE*: 167), and Jane acquires her first friend, Helen, through the agency of a book (*JE*: 40-1). The written word is linked with various aspects of each of these characters, and the novel suggests that though reading might offer an avenue for improvement (or escape) it does not necessarily provide every person with good virtues.

Jane’s education in the Lowood Orphanage is comprised not only of her studies, but of her socialisation, her introduction to the class system which is one of the fundamental aspects of British society. The two are intricately intertwined. The students in Lowood are organised physically according to their social place within the institution, which is determined according to their academic achievements and behaviour (*JE*: 43-44). The students gain a profound understanding of the British class system through a physical experience of relegation or promotion, which is the result of their pedagogical and personal achievements. These achievements are categorised and determined by Mr Brocklehurst, the institution’s head master. Mr Brocklehurst is depicted as a monstrous stony black pillar, reminiscent of the big bad wolf from the fairy tale (*JE*: 47). He is, indeed, a harsh man, and as a result of her fear of him Jane drops her slate on the day of his visit to Lowood. As

mentioned earlier, after she breaks the slate Jane is placed upon a stool in the middle of the school to be perceived as a naughty child (*JE*: 55-6). Her education consists of some actual studies, and a great deal of social indoctrination.

As opposed to Brocklehurst's harsh introduction into the class system, in Miss Temple's apartment Jane and Helen are tenderly greeted, engage in pleasant conversation, and are even given proper tea, with toast and cake (*JE*: 59-61). This contradiction between the cruel Brocklehurst and kind Temple is linked with their constructed gender roles – the cruel male vs. the nurturing female – as well as their understanding of the role of education. Whereas Brocklehurst considers education a manner for the subjugation of his wards, Temple considers it her duty to encourage her pupils. Miss Temple is the one who provides Jane with her important lessons of social conduct, which will be imperative for her role later as governess at Rochester Hall. Moreover, these lessons will be crucial as Jane will eventually marry Rochester. *Jane Eyre* is a novel of education (Dunn 2001: 389). Yet, while it might appear that education can offer social leverage, in fact finance and social connections are the real means for social mobility.

In *Rebecca*, *Jane Eyre*'s successor the class system is literally and figuratively inscribed in scripture. The issue of handwriting and the style of one's hand first emerge when the unnamed narrator opens Maxim's poetry book and reads the dedication from Rebecca to Max on its title-page. The narrator observes the 'curious slanting hand' (*R*: 36) that will constantly haunt her (*R*: 47). The unnamed narrator notes the 'little blob of ink' (*R*: 36) that mars the opposite page, 'as though the writer, in impatience, had shaken her pen to make the ink flow freely. And then as it bubbled through the nib, it came a little thick, so that the name Rebecca stood out black and strong, the tall and sloping R dwarfing the other letters' (*R*: 36). The handwriting functions as a metaphor for the person, as the unnamed narrator is insecure and feels as if Rebecca's strong presence dwarfs her own. The handwriting is not only a reminder of the previous woman, but also of the crucial class

difference between the two female figures. The unnamed narrator comes from a lower social background, and the writing functions in her mind as a reminder of her inadequacy. She will later see this hand on every pigeonhole in the desk in the morning room at Manderley, and on the note that would ultimately exonerate Maxim from the murder. Thus this very hand will eventually incriminate its owner, proving the severity of Rebecca's depravity. Metaphorically, the writing is the reminder and remainder of the degeneracy of British aristocracy. The comparison of the power of writing in *Jane Eyre* and *Rebecca* shows how the former outlines the Victorian concerns with education as means for social mobility, the latter, conversely, depicts the waning of these fears from social mobility. As suggested earlier, however, since both narratives actually (re)introduce the protagonists into society through finance and marriage, one might argue that both are only concerned with writing and education as a peripheral addition to the real means for social mobility.

Even as the Victorians introduced schools, and set a lot of store by literature and education in the colonial context, precisely so as to protect the established order, they were also concerned that widespread education might facilitate social mobility (Botting 1991: 140). While these processes were in place within the British society, the Ashkenazi Jewish tradition considered education the most important aspect of life for Jewish men. Jewish women, conversely, were encouraged to study just enough in order to know their prayers and be savvy with regards to commerce, but were excluded from Talmud study (Boyarin 1997: 179, 318). These educational requirements of the Jewish community, as well as subtle processes of their subversion, are reflected in Agnon's 'Tehila'.

Tehila reads out a daily quota of Psalms (*T*: 184-5) as part of the Jewish tradition that decrees that a Jew must think of the Lord's word day and night, as ordered in Joshua 1:8: 'This book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth; but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that though mayest observe to do according to all that is written therein: for

then though shalt make thy way prosperous, and then though shalt have wisdom'.¹³⁸ Language, literature, and the Torah are at the core of the Jewish religion. Moreover, the Hebrew language, as the holy language, has been a significant connection between the Jewish diaspora and the Holy Land. As mentioned earlier, the Jewish nation has been known as the nation of the book, as they carried the Torah as their portable homeland, and it was believed that God had accompanied his chosen people in the form of the scroll (Maier 1975: 18-21). The written word is thus one of the most significant aspects of Jewish identities. The importance of the connection between the Holy Land and the Hebrew word in Agnon's work has been noted. Harold Fisch suggests reading 'registered letters [as] the notion of a written scripture – a Torah, which holds within it the guarantee of the bond linking God with Israel' (1970:52). Language is a symbolic link to God and the land. Whereas in *Dracula* education was a key to entry into British community and land, in 'Tehila' the word offers admittance into the Promised Land and the next world. The previous comparisons between these two characters (i.e. both wish to be interned in their ancestral land for rejuvenation) renders this additional link important, as it solidifies the connection between the saintly Tehila and devilish Dracula.

Like in *Dracula*, the connection between modernity and the lettered word is noted. When the narrator and Tehila commence the writing of the redemptive letter of forgiveness that Tehila intends to take to her grave, she tells the narrator that she will speak to him Yiddish, and he will write in 'the holy language',¹³⁹ adding that she heard 'that they teach the girls to speak and write in the holy language' (*T*: 194).¹⁴⁰ This is a modern innovative approach to the education of women in the Jewish community, which occurs once the Jews are in the Holy Land.

לא-ימוש ספר התורה הזה מפיד והגית בו יומם וליילה למען תשמור לעשות ככל הכתוב בו כי-אז תצליח את דרכך ואז תשכיל

¹³⁹ לשון הקודש

¹⁴⁰ שמלמדין את הבנות לדבר ולכתוב בלשון הקודש

Tehila is, indeed, a well-educated woman, who had the privilege of the finest schooling provided for Jewish girls in the Ashkenazi Diaspora.¹⁴¹ She can read the prayers she has to say in order to complete her verbal Mitzvoth, and is familiar with the biblical narratives that provide the base for the Jewish tradition. While Frankenstein's creature and the vampire were utilising education in order to enter society, Tehila is already a part of the community, and for her education is a part of her very being. There is something similar in the escapist approach to literature shared by Jane and Tehila. Jane uses literature to escape her social relegation, and Tehila attempts to redeem herself through the letter. While education was central to *Jane Eyre* as the novel explored the power of education as social leverage, in 'Tehila' education is paramount for the very identity of the protagonist as a Jewish woman.

Even while the story 'Tehila' suggests that it is due to divine decree that the Jews have the right to settle in Palestine-Israel, as the earlier reading of the scene next to the Wailing Wall explained, there are nonetheless subtle subversions of aspects of the Jewish tradition. Agnon allows Tehila, one of his most pious characters, to introduce delicate disobedient, or pioneering ideas, regarding the education of Jewish women. Though Tehila is a woman, and as noted, overall women were excluded from the study of the Talmud, she inherits her father's books, and appears to be well versed in the scriptures. This is not explained in the narrative, and the reader may conjecture as to the reasons. The only explanation we are given is the fact that her brothers gave the books up, and when she came to Palestine-Israel she brought them along (*T*: 198). Nevertheless, a clue is provided in the fact that her father used to write the dates of each baby's birth in the *chomesh* which,

¹⁴¹ Tehila is familiar with *Pirkai Avot*, the ninth chapter of the *Nezikin* book, which is the fourth of the six books of the *Mishnah*, and the one that deals with moral conduct. This is the chapter that offers words of wisdom from the old scholars, and refers to daily conduct and morality; in the Ashkenazi tradition it is read in the synagogue during the six weeks between Passover and Shavuot. Tehila has had the proper Jewish upbringing that introduced her to the moral teachings of the Jewish tradition; however, like the majority of Jewish girls, she did not attend *yeshiva*, where the rest of the *Mishnah* is read and explored in depth.

according to some traditions, would be sacrilege, as one must neither add nor subtract words from the Holy Scriptures. The scriptural written word is the word of God, and to alter it in any manner might be interpreted as a rebellious act. As mentioned before, Tehila's character has been suspected of heresy (Nave 1997: 14). The fact that she has her father's books could suggest both an ardent embrace of Judaism as well as a subversive act. As mentioned above, Agnon was a religious Jew, and it is with great caution that one might suggest these interpretations.

Heretical doctrine, nonetheless, is integrated into the narrative. According to the old Rabbanit, Tehila's daughter had converted her religion (*T*: 189). Tehila, conversely says that an evil spirit had possessed her daughter (*T*: 203). Tehila tells the narrator that she had foreign (i.e. non-Jewish) teachers in her household, and that her daughter used to be invited to the teachers' homes. The reader can surmise that her daughter had, indeed, converted as a result of the daughter's broad, even liberal, education. The reason for Tehila's labelling her daughter's conversion as the possession of an evil spirit could be, as Nave suggests, an attempt to relinquish Tehila's responsibility for the daughter's fate (1997: 20). Regardless of Tehila's responsibility, however, the text suggests that it is probably because of the introduction to non-Jewish education that the daughter has left the Jewish tradition. As noted earlier, the move away from Judaism is considered tragic in Jewish tradition, because it is believed that once a person abandons the faith, God will forsake the person, and in the next Day of Atonement this person will be erased from the Book of Life. It is as if the person died, and though there are various rulings regarding the issue, in some cases the traditional *Kaddish* – the final prayer – will not be said for this person (*Be'mar'e Ha'bazaqu*: 150).¹⁴² This is the harshest condemnation in the Jewish tradition. The text suggests that opening up to secular education is a dangerous endeavour. Whereas in *Jane Eyre* education was depicted as a means for social advancement, here it

¹⁴² *Sanhedrin* (34: 71)

is a deadly path to oblivion. Education in the text in English was a marker of class difference, and therefore a means for social mobility. In the Hebrew text it is likewise a marker of social difference, only here it is the difference between Jewish and non-Jewish traditions. The transition between the Jewish and non-Jewish cultures is not considered favourably, to say the least. Hence like in *Jane Eyre*, education in 'Tehila' is thus linked with rebellion and subversion.

While Tehila's daughter is a pariah because she has (presumably) left the Jewish tradition in favour of the non-Jewish tradition through the route of education, Mishael is an outcast because he cannot conform to Jewish academic demands. As explained earlier, the Ashkenazi Jewish Diaspora male was expected to be a scholar, who is well-versed in the Jewish scriptures. The ideal Jewish male was a '*Yeshiva-Bokhur* (the man devoting his life to the study of Torah) (Boyarin 1997: 23). Mishael, however, is not an academic, to say the least. The Jewish community offered an alternative to the academic route. If one was not inclined to study, he could still be a *Mentsh* (Boyarin 1997: 23). *Mentsh* means 'man' in Yiddish, and is a concept that connotes humanity and compassion. In a sense, Jewish men had the option to choose between being a scholar, which was the notion of an elevated man, and that of a normal human being. Mishael, however, has difficulties fitting this alternative criteria as well. In addition to his lack of scholarly abilities, as the result of a fight, Mishael lost his right eye and the earlobe of his left ear and became deformed (*M*: 25-6). He is not the *Edelkayt*, (literally, "nobility," but in Yiddish "gentleness and delicacy") which was another Jewish ideal male (Boyarin 1997: 23), and has not exhibited compassion and a gentle manner.

As a result of these deficiencies, Mishael is *persona non grata* in his parents' home, and his father, who teaches young children the Torah, chases him away from his home with a rake every morning (*M*: 26). His father, an educator and respectable member of the community, cannot allow for the brat to enter his home, as he is a disgrace and an

embarrassment. As the story unfolds, the narrator reveals that once his parents realised he was unable to study they sent him to learn a trade, but he was passed on between various tradesmen, who all gave up on him, until he was left alone to roam free (*M*: 25-6). The narrative suggests Mishael has been freed, indeed, emancipated from cultural commitments. As explained earlier, he is rejected from the Jewish community because he does not conform to the academic requirements, as well as because of his intimate connection to the foreign soil.

The story opens with a description of Mishael which questions his existence as a human being and establishes him as the Other that is located outdoors:

During the rest of the days of the year he does not even count as human at all, but just as a loose and lonesome lad, mean and with a lowly loathsome personality, whose hand is in every business and who makes everyone else's business his own. When you enter a street in a town in the summer, immediately you encounter this lad, who meddles all his days with a gang of barefoot little *sheygetz*, chasing with them a flock of pigeons, flying and dipping in the clear quiet skies. Mishael is a Jewish name, taken from the Bible. Yet from the time the Jews have existed in the world there has not been called such an odd name in Israel, until the Holy One summoned such a wild one to the townspeople. How old Mishael is not a soul knows. All remember him for ages in his self and character, which change neither during the summer nor during the winter. The same wild walk, the same raggedy worn-out torn wear, the same filthy shirt, open where the chest is, the same rope, used instead of a

belt on his waist, and the same bare feet, submerged in the streets' mud and filth.¹⁴³

(M: 25)

The first encounter with Mishael constructs him as an Other, and aligns him with the wild character of the rejected son of Abraham, Ishmael. The lack of proper Jewish education leads to the questioning of his very identity as a Jew. Furthermore, the absence of education diminishes him, and even undermines his very humanity. Whereas Tehila's daughter (and perhaps also Tehila herself) was rebelling against the Jewish tradition, Mishael is an outsider against his wish. He consorts with the brats whose Jewishness is questionable, the gang of *sheygetz*,¹⁴⁴ wandering barefoot in the mud, a savage-like creature utterly opposed to the normative Jewish community's expectations and social conduct. Thus, just as in *Frankenstein* and *Dracula*, as well as in *Jane Eyre* and *Rebecca*, education is utilised as a marker of human society. There is one nuance, though, as *Jane Eyre* questions formal education as a means for socialisation, and 'Mishael' suggests it is precisely formal

בשאר ימות השנה אין הוא נחשב בגדר בן-אדם כלל, אלא סתם בחור נעזב ומשולח¹⁴³ לנפשו, נבזה וחדל אישים, שידו בכל ויד כל בו. כשאתה נכנס בקיץ לרחובה של עיר מיד אתה נתקל בבחור זה, המתעסק כל ימיו עם כנופיה של שקצים יחפים, מפריח עמם באוויר סיעה של יונים, המרחפות וטובלות ברחבי השמים השוקטים והבהירים מישאל שם יהודי הוא, לקוח מן החומש. ואולם מזמן שהיהודים קיימים בעולם לא נקרא עדיין שם משונה כזה בישראל, עד שזימן הקדוש-ברוך-הוא לבני העיירה פרא-אדם זה. בן כמה שנים מישאל, אין שום בריה יודעת. הכל זוכרים אותו זה עידן ועידינים בצלמו ובדמותו, שאינם משתנים לא בימי הקיץ ולא בימי החורף אותו ההילוך הפרוע, אותו הלבוש הקרוע והבלוי, אותה הכותונת המזוהמה, הפתוחה במקום החזה, אותו החבל, המשמש לו במקום הגורה על מותניו, ואותן הרגלים היחפות, הבוססות בטיט-חוצות

¹⁴⁴ The noun *sheygetz* has several meanings: first, in the biblical sense one finds the *sheygetz*, or in the biblical origin *sheketz*, is a detested thing, an abomination. It is mentioned many times as an abomination, for example, the first reference is within the detailed decrees regarding the prohibition of eating non-kosher foods, as the phrase says 'ונפש כי תגע בכל טמא בטמאת אדם או בבהמה טמאה או בכל שקץ טמא ואכל מבשר זבח השלמים' (Moreover the soul that shall touch any unclean thing, as the uncleanness of man, or any unclean beast, or any abominable unclean thing, and eat of the sacrifice of peace offerings, which pertain unto the Lord, even that soul shall be cut off from his people)' (Leviticus 7:21). The 'abominable unclean thing' is the *sheketz*, which later became the *sheygetz* in the Ashkenazi pronunciation. In Yiddish it came to denote some little devil, and later became a term of endearment for a naughty child. Nonetheless, literally in Yiddish it means a non-Jewish boy. The origin of the term harbours the excommunication of the person who has anything to do with an abomination, and furthermore, that person shall be 'cut off from his people' if there is an attempt to eat of the 'sacrifice of peace offerings, which pertain unto the Lord'. This 'sacrifice of peace offerings' could be read as one of the four species that the Jews offer on Sukkoth, which will later be the primary occupation Mishael undertakes. Thus, the narrative ultimately suggests Mishael cannot attain redemption under the law of the Jews.

education that is missing in order for Mishael to become an integral part of the Jewish community.

Education is likewise used as a marker of social identities in *Khirbet Khizeh*. The various characters of the soldiers in *Khirbet Khizeh* are represented by their professions, intellect, and the books they read. The narrative describes the soldiers as several types of people including one photographer, a simpleton, and educated men, who are familiar with ‘Horace and Isaiah the prophet and Hayyim Nachman Bialik and also Shakespeare’ (*KH*: 121-2). The blending of the ancient Roman tradition along with ancient Jewish, and modern Hebrew and English traditions suggests a wide acquaintance with art and philosophy. One might infer that some of these soldiers, since they are familiar with great works of art and philosophy struggle with the ramifications of their possible moral transgression as soldiers. Also, it amalgamates Jewish and non-Jewish European traditions, a mixture advocated by some Zionists. The linguistic cultural association of the soldiers and the great masterpieces and artists implies an elevation of mind that the soldiers are denied because of the war. Like Frankenstein’s creature, the soldiers have had the privilege of education and indoctrination into the high moral values of Western culture, yet like the creature they cannot escape the violence that becomes their reality.

As noted earlier, following the 1948 war *Khirbet Khizeh* was one of the first Israeli texts to question the moral validity of the Zionist narrative (Govrin 2001: 108). Like *Frankenstein* and *Dracula*, which have been read as critiques of colonialism (Baldick 1987: 1; Smith and Hughes 2003: 1-4; Bugg 2005: 665; Craciun 2011: 470; Valente 2000: 632-634), *Khirbet Khizeh* questions the Jewish-Israeli conquest of the land.

Furthermore, since the Zionist enterprise attempted to establish the nation-state as a specifically Jewish nation-state, Yizhar directs his arrows at the Jewish tradition. Since the word is the foundation of the Jewish tradition, the narrator is constantly preoccupied with the power of the word. The narrator is aware of the fact that narratives (re)create the

perception of reality, and is perplexed with regard to the narration of the story. Yizhar is well aware of the power of (re)creation of any narrative, and his narrative is undermining the validity of the Zionist narrative.

The narrator starts with a validation of the events, as if the reader might not be sure the horror really happened, and then ends the first paragraph with a ponderous statement regarding the need to narrate the story; the second paragraph commences with the suggestion of telling the story according to some order, but ends with the conclusion of the action as if the story has already been told. The narrator then provides the following third paragraph:

Another and possibly better option, however, would be to begin differently, and to mention straight away what had been the purpose of that entire day from the start, “operational order” number such and such, on such and such day of the month, in the margin of which, in the final section that was simply entitled “miscellaneous,” it said, in a short line and a half, that although the mission must be executed decisively and precisely, whatever happened, “no violent outbursts or disorderly conduct” – it said – “would be permitted,” which only indicated straightaway that there was something amiss, that anything was possible (and even planned and foreseen), and that one couldn’t evaluate this straightforward final clause before returning to the opening and also scanning the noteworthy clause entitled “information,” which immediately warned of the mounting danger of “infiltrators,” “terrorist cells,” and (in a wonderful turn of phrase) “operatives dispatched on hostile missions,” but also the subsequent and even more noteworthy clause, which explicitly stated, “assemble the inhabitants of the area extending from point x (see attached map) to point y (see same map) – load them onto transports, and convey them across our lines; blow

up the stone houses, and burn the huts; detain the youths and the suspects, and clear the area of ‘hostile forces,’” and so on and so-forth that it was obvious how many good and honest hopes were being invested in those who were being sent out to implement all this “burn-blow-up-imprison-load-convey,” who would burn blow up imprison load and convey with such courtesy and with restraint born of true culture, and this would be a sign of a wind of change, of decent upbringing, and, perhaps, even of the Jewish soul, the great Jewish soul.¹⁴⁵

(KH: 8-9)

The whole paragraph is comprised of two very longwinded sentences, replete with sarcastic remarks and uttered in a frantically ironic manner. The narrator comments on the literary value of the order, and quotes what he deems to be especially interesting phrases. For example, when he notes (in parenthesis) that the phrase “operatives dispatched on hostile missions” is ‘a wonderful turn of phrase’ the sarcasm seems to ooze out of the page, illustrating the narrator’s sense of disgust with and absurdity of these expressions. Attaching adjectives like ‘noteworthy’, which in the Hebrew is ‘respectable’ or even ‘honoured’, to the section that demands the expulsion of the population serves to further emphasise the sarcastic tone of the paragraph.

אולם, אפשר, מוטב לפתוח אחרת ולהזכיר מיד את זו אשר מלכתחילה היתה תכלית כל אותו היום. אותה “פקודת-¹⁴⁵ המבצע” מספר כך-וכך, בכך-וכך לחודש, ואשר בשוליה, בסעיף אחרון, המכונה סתמית “שונות”, היה אמור על-פני שורה וחצי, שאם-כי יש לבצע את המשימה בהחלטיות ובדייקנות, הרי, מכל מקום, “אין להרשות התפרצויות – כך היה כתוב – והתנהגות פרועה”, וזה בא ללמדך מיד, כי יש דברים בגו, ושהכל יתכן (ואם זאת, מתוכן וצפוי מראש). ואין להעריך נכונה סיפא נכוחה זו אלא לאחר שתחזור אל הרישא, ותסקור גם את הסעיף הנכבד “ידיעות”, שהתריע מיד על סכנה מתעצמת של “מסתננים” ושל “גרעיני כנופיות”, ושל (זה יופי של ביטוי) “שליחים במשימות אויבות”; וגם את הסעיף שלאחריו, הנכבד ממנו, שהיה מדבר בפירוש על כך שיש “לאסוף את התושבים מנקודה פלוגית (עיין במפה המצורפת) ועד לנקודה פלוגית (עיין באותה מפה) – להעמיס על המכוניות ולהעבירם מעבר לקווינו; לפוצץ את בתי-האבן ולשרוף את בקתות החומר; לאסור את הצעירים ואת החשודים, ולטהר את השטח מ”כוחות עוינים” וגומר וגומר – שכן עתה יסתבר בכמה הרבה תקוות טובות ונכוחות נטענו היוצאים כשהושם עליהם כל ה”לשרוף-לפוצץ-לאסור-להעמיס-ולשלה” הזה שיקומו וישרפו ויפוצצו ויאסרו ויעמיסו וישלחו ברוב דרך-ארץ ומתוך מתינות שבתרבות דווקא, וזה לך אות לרוחות מנשבות, לחינוך טוב ושמא גם לנשמה היהודית, זו הגדולה

In addition to the mock literary exploration and evaluation of the order, the text subjects it to a mock-*midrash*. A *Midrash* is the rabbinic lesson. The text utilises rabbinic language, such as: ‘that comes to teach you’,¹⁴⁶ which is a rabbinic phrase used at the end of the *Midrash*. Also, the narrator uses the Talmudic words the *seifa* and *reisha*,¹⁴⁷ which mean ‘ending’ and ‘beginning’ in Babylonian Aramaic. The particular use of these words within the phrase that means ‘there is no knowing whether the end result is right, unless one reverts to the commencement’,¹⁴⁸ suggests a specific form of a Halacha principle that utilises the *psic risha*, which is a ruling that refers to an action that will cause a forbidden action, and is therefore itself forbidden. It is a complex ruling that attempts to guard people from following ruling that might lead them to perform a sin, or otherwise deviate from proper moral and legal conduct. In the context of the story the command to “burn-blow-up-imprison-load-convey” is presented as a *psic risha* ruling, one that would lead to an unintended sin, and therefore, one should not follow this ruling. The *psic risha* is a problematic ruling, yet it provides an avenue for people to repent once they understand the ruling is leading them astray. It is, nevertheless, imperative that the person will have been led astray while he did not intend to sin; if the person intended to commit the transgression, he or she will not be exempt.

By utilising Talmudic languages and phrases the text ironically suggests that the lecture given by the officer would teach the soldiers something about morality, and in order to push the sarcasm even further, in case someone missed the subtler tones of the beginning of the paragraph, the end of the paragraph is a clear outcry against the absurdity of the decree that requires violence under the cloak of cultured and even moral conduct. The paragraph ends with the mock-revelation that the men are required to perform all the acts of burning, blowing-up, imprisoning, loading and conveying ‘with such courtesy and with

¹⁴⁶ בא ללמדך

¹⁴⁷ רישא, סיפא

¹⁴⁸ ואין להעריך נכונה סיפא נכונה זו אלא לאחר שתחזור אל הרישא

restraint born of true culture, and [that] this would be a sign of a wind of change, of decent upbringing, and, perhaps, even of the Jewish soul, the great Jewish soul'. The narrator suggests that the myth of the 'great Jewish soul' is being manipulated in order to give credence to the expulsion.

As the narrative progresses, when the men pass a field the narrator imagines 'a hand inscribing sternly, "Will not be harvested"', and wearily crossing the entire field and its neighbour, and passing over the fallow, and the plough, and being swallowed up by a faint shudder among the hills' (*KH*: 91).¹⁴⁹ The narrator imagines the divine hand condemning the land to be barren. The Jewish tradition attributes tremendous power to the written word, and the action is thus explicit and irreversible.

The power of the word is, indeed, one of the main themes in Hebrew literature. Specifically in relation to issues of sovereignty and the formation of modern Jewish identities. Comparing the engagement with the power of the word in Yizhar's *Khirbet Khizeh* to Agnon's 'Ad Hennah' and 'Avi Hashor' will reveal the difference in the two authors' approach to the Zionist project of colonisation and the (re)construction of individual and collective identities. The two authors' work exposes some of the inner conflicts of the Jewish nation, as it commences its modern existence as a sovereign nation state.

In 'Ad Hennah' the written word is the cause and catalyst of events, as the narrator is requested to leave Berlin in order to assist with the books Dr Levi left his widow. It is as a result of his quest for these books, moreover, that he will eventually return to Palestine-Israel and establish his home there. Since, as in other Agnon texts, here too the narrative reflects both the personal and communal (Shaked 1989: 6-7), this suggests that the Jewish

פיסת-יד שרשמה שם בשרירות "לא-ייקצר", ועברה ביעף את כל השדה ואת שכנו, וחלפה על הבור, ועל החריש,¹⁴⁹ ונבלעה בסימור כלשהו בגבעות

nation was displaced in the Diaspora, and should return to its land. The narrator's journeys back and forth from Berlin to Palestine-Israel are both a literal representation of Agnon's actual travels, and a metaphorical depiction of the communal problems of letting go of the European past.

The novella ends with the narrator returning to Israel, and Dr Levi's books being sent to the house he is building there. Dr Levi's widow, who immigrates to Israel as well, doesn't know what to do with her late husband's books, and so the narrator agrees to build two extra rooms for the books in his new house. The narrator acknowledges that the house he has finally found in the land of Israel is intricately bound to the books, saying, 'he knows that it was not due to his own virtue that he had attained the house, but through the virtue of Dr Levi's books that needed a house' (*AH*: 169-70).¹⁵⁰ The story suggests that the narrative of the housing of the Jew is the story of the reconnection of the language and the land, and its emergence and rebirth as a vital modern language. The Jew, from Agnon's perspective, has the right to the land because of the books. The Jewish nation has the right to the land because of its literary heritage.

In 'Avi Hashor', however, Agnon offers a slightly different justification for the Jewish settlement. In this short story Agnon (re)constructs the myth of the place, Abu Tor, a neighbourhood in nowadays Jerusalem, basing the Jewish right to the land on morality. The narrative, nonetheless, travels through a literary avenue in order for the truth to be revealed. The story of the old man and his ox reaches a climactic moment at the beginning of the third chapter (which is the middle of the story, hence the heart of the narrative). After several nights of torment as the old man hears the cries of his beloved ox, even though the ox had been slaughtered, the old man goes to consult his Jewish friend (*AH*: 339). This is the first time religion is explicitly mentioned in this story. The reason for bringing up

¹⁵⁰ יודע שלא מחמת עצמו זכה לבית, אלא מחמת ספריו של הדוקטור לוי שצריכים לבית

issues of religion is when something beyond reason occurs. The rupture of the natural leads the old man to seek the assistance of his Jewish friend, as if the Jew holds the secrets of natural philosophy. The reader wonders for the first time to which religion the old man belongs and, based on phrases and the cries to God in the Jewish formula 'see the salvation of the Lord that the Lord hath done for us',¹⁵¹ concludes that he most probably is Jewish.¹⁵² The battle between Reason and Religion, which we have witnessed in texts in English such as *Dracula*, is here likewise the battle over land. While Stoker's novel has been read as a critique of imperialism (Valente 2000: 632-4), however, 'Avi Hashor' is an endorsement of Zionist colonialism. The old man's ox had been slaughtered by his neighbour, who then compensates the old man with land and cattle.

The Jew advises the old man to seek the advice of the wise 'Docsostos, the writer from Kiryat Sefer,¹⁵³ who was removed from his craft, because he used to write charms of healing verses, we shall go to him for he is a deeds-man, he might tell you something'¹⁵⁴ (AH: 339-40). The *docsostos* is that part of an animal's skin which is used for the scroll on which the scriptures are written. Over the years there has been great controversy regarding the *docsostos*; most rulings deem it flawed for writing the Torah, and say it can only be used for secular purposes. The controversy surrounding the occult in Jewish tradition is represented by naming Docsostos one who was rejected from the mainstream religious apparatus because he was dabbling in the occult. At the house of this dubious character, when the old man touches the severed horns the howling is heard, and Docsostos tells the old man the horns are calling their owner. Though Docsostos might have utilised the

¹⁵¹ ראו את ישועת השם שעשה לנו השם באויבינו

¹⁵² This omission of the religion of the old man might cause doubts regarding possible subversive reading of the text, and as Ezrahi points, critics have had doubts regarding possible ironic tones in Agnon's work (Ezrahi 2004: 115).

¹⁵³ The name of the place translates as 'the town of book'.

¹⁵⁴ חכם אחד דוכסוסטוס הסופר מקרית ספר שהעבירוהו מאומנותו, מפני שהיה כותב קמיעין של פסוקים להתרפאות בהם, נלך אצלו שהוא בעל מעשים, אפשר שיזדקק לך ויאמר לך דבר

written word against the decrees of Jewish tradition, in this narrative he reveals the truth and propels the plot further leading to the resolution of the mystery.

Like in 'Tehila', 'Avi Hashor' links extensive knowledge that goes beyond the norm with subversion. Yet whereas in 'Tehila' it was non-Jewish tradition that led to the exclusion of a person from the Jewish community, here it is a particular set of Jewish scholarly endeavours that are not regarded favourably. The rejection of a particular kind of education is similar to the depiction of Frankenstein's education. In addition to the creature's education in Wollstonecraft Shelley's novel, one ought to consider Frankenstein himself, whose scientific hubris is central to the narrative. After a relatively happy childhood in Geneva, Frankenstein leaves his home to become a student in Ingolstadt. Frankenstein's education in natural philosophy is presented as erroneous, as it leads to the horrific outcome of the creation of the monster. The language Frankenstein wishes to acquire is the language of science, a language that will in some manner transcend his national identity, and hence become a part of his transgression. Likewise, in 'Avi Hashor' Docsostos has taken an erroneous path with his scholarly endeavours, and it therefore ostracised.

This leads to the conclusion that education is not always regarded as a benign or constructive element. Education can be perceived as detrimental, and even lethal. The comparison of *Frankenstein*, *Jane Eyre*, *Dracula*, and *Rebecca* in English to the Hebrew 'Mishael', 'Avi Hashor', 'Tehila', 'Ad Hennah', and *Khirbet Khizeh* reveals similarities in the depiction of education as sign and signifier of social boundaries. The texts uphold the word as significant for the recreation of both individual and national identities. The word inscribes, both literally and metaphorically, the identity upon one's mind. Education and literacy are major themes in all the texts examined here. The role of education as social marker in 'Tehila' and *Khirbet Khizeh* is similar to the way it is used in *Jane Eyre* and *Rebecca*, and the centrality of the lettered word to propel plot in 'Ad Hennah' is equivalent

to the role of letters in *Frankenstein* and *Dracula*. Beyond the preoccupation with literacy and education as means for social identification, these texts all engage with the importance of literature regarding issues of sovereignty. As the previous chapters show, the texts explore problems of modern identities specifically in relation to sovereignty, and these texts all operate – some quite explicitly – as narratives that form and inform the (re)construction of modern British and Jewish and Jewish-Israeli individual and collective identities.

4.3 A Note on Names

Names are the way we identify and (re)construct identities. By giving someone a name we provide him or her with an identity. Naming something, moreover, dispels its unknown potentially chaotic essence. We fear what we cannot define, and a name gives the illusion of a stable principle. By noting these processes we might for a brief moment acknowledge the importance as well as restrictiveness of naming. This last chapter will, therefore, explore the productive use of names of characters (or their absence) and places in some of the texts examined in this thesis.

Names, as Derrida elucidates, are intricately connected with social and political responsibility (1993/1995: 15-18). This is a twofold claim, first for the responsibility in the act of labelling someone or something, and second the responsibility to respond to a name, or, conversely not to respond to the name. Derrida further stresses that 'a name should only be given to whom (or to what) deserves it and calls for it' (1993/1995: 91). This suggests a reciprocal relationship between the name and what is being named. Stuart Hall suggests that 'identities are the names we give to the different ways we are positioned by, and position ourselves within, the narratives of the past' (1996: 112). One of the ways for us to assert identity, authority, agency, and sovereignty is by naming. The declaration of a name for an entity, as well as a place, is the linguistic aspect of the psychological appropriation, which can then be accepted (or rejected) as legally binding. Hence, processes of naming, and perhaps even more so their lack, are indicative of procedures of appropriation of identities, concepts, and territory.

Furthermore, by labelling a work of art, be that modern, surrealist, Gothic, or any other generic name, we place certain constraints upon the work of art. Here again Derrida cautions against the slippery essence of the genre and the discourse (1993/1995: 91). Once the work of art, in this case literature, has been labelled as one genre or another the reader will attribute certain traits associated with that genre to the specific text. The debate

regarding the definition of various literary genres, as well as the definition of the term genre itself is vast, and there is hardly space to enter into it here. Suffice to state that a literary genre is a kind of literature (Gray 1992:127), and to mention the major genres, such as epic, tragedy, lyric, comedy and satire (Cuddon 1999: 342). As explained in the Introduction, the literary Gothic, was first used as a pejorative term attributed to politics and novels that seemed to subvert the dominant social order (Wright 2007: 1-2; Schoene-Harwood 2000: 13-29). The Gothic, moreover, has been associated with modern nationalism and colonialism (Spivak 1985; Baldick 1987; Azin 1993; Smith and Hughes 2003; Bugg 2005; Valente 2000; and Craciun 2011). The twenty-first century reader might find it difficult to read a text with Gothic tropes and not align it with nationalism and a critique of colonialism.

Similarly, the texts written in Hebrew during the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century have been aligned with the Zionist enterprise. First, as Dan Miron explains, there was the linguistic choice between Hebrew and Yiddish, and a Jewish writer had to ‘opt for a certain national ideology, which directed him towards participation in one Jewish literature or another’ (1984: 51). If a Jewish author chose to write in Hebrew, he or she was perceived as a supporter of Zionism, because the revival of the Hebrew language was associated with the Zionist enterprise. Miron argues for a fundamental difference between the Hebrew literature and other national literatures, suggesting the Hebrew and Yiddish literatures pulled in different ideological directions (1984: 51). Following the ‘Language War’ of the early twentieth century, however, the victorious Hebrew was established as the language of the emerging modern Jewish identity in Palestine-Israel (Zerubavel 1995: 30). From the consolidation of Hebrew as the language of Jewish identities flowed a stream of literatures, and nowadays Hebrew literature includes non-Zionist as well as anti-Zionist texts (Miron 1984: 51). Even by its negation, the fact that Hebrew literature encompasses these variants of considerations of Zionism reflects these

texts' participation in the nationalist discourse. In a Foucauldian sense, Hebrew literature is a part of the larger discourse of nationalism. The comparison of the texts in English and Hebrew here shows that they are similarly participants in nationalist discourses. Whether they endorse or critique nationalist notions, the texts examined here propagate the very idea of nationalism as means for the (re)creation of individual and collective identities.

Before delving into the meaning of names in the texts, a couple of names of the authors require brief attention. Shmuel Yosef Agnon is the penname of Shmuel Yosef Halevi Czaczkes. Agnon did not assume this name immediately upon his immigration to Palestine-Israel, but after the publication of his first story 'Agunut' in 1908. His penname is derived from the title of the story. The word *agunot* literally means anchored, and the word refers to women who are not allowed to be remarried because their husbands are either lost in action but not yet declared dead, or in cases in which their husbands do not wish to grant them a legal divorce. These women are in legal limbo, as they are neither widows nor divorcees, and therefore they cannot remarry, and any child they bear will be considered illegal under these rulings of the Jewish tradition. Referring to this appropriation of Agnon's name, Shaked claims Agnon represents his generation's great neurosis – the inseparable ties to the Diaspora mother and the inability to create a real whole fruitful connection with the new society in Israel (1989: 13). Shaked suggests that Agnon felt that certain ties with the Diaspora were still binding, and the separation was never quite complete. These themes of constant questioning of the connections to the Ashkenazi Diaspora are characteristic of most of Agnon's works.

Referring to Agnon's name, Shaked notes that giving a name based upon an action is a familiar technique in Jewish literature (1989: 13). Even though the name itself, Agnon, connotes an ambivalence towards the Ashkenazi Diaspora, the Hebrew name was a means for the rejection of the Diaspora identity. Agnon wrote in Yiddish and Hebrew while he lived in Buczacz, but never again wrote in Yiddish after leaving Buczacz (Shaked 1989:

4). The shift is significant as a linguistic marker of the new Jewish identity. The “new Jew” was thus linguistically (re)created.

One of the famous writers that was, indeed, acknowledged as a Hebrew writer, even ‘the most talented and essentially “Hebrew” among the young Israeli-born writers’ (Miron 1984: 59), is S. Yizhar. He used a penname, as his real name was Yizhar Smilansky. He was born in Palestine in 1916, and his family did not change their name. As mentioned earlier, Yizhar’s great uncle, Moshe Smilansky was one of the prominent figures of the first Aliya, and Yizhar was very likely familiar with his uncle’s work (Rosen 2007). Yizhar only assumed his penname after it was coined by Yitzhak Lamdan in 1938, upon the publication of his first short story ‘Ephraim Khozer le Alfalfa’ (Ephraim Goes Back to Alfalfa). The word *yizhar* is the future tense of the word to glow, meaning ‘will glow’ or ‘will shine’. This assumption of a supposedly more Hebrew-sounding name signalled a new Hebrew identity. Yizhar is one of the renowned writers of ‘the so called native generation, who entered the literary scene during the 1940s [and] kept their distance from Agnon both thematically and structurally’ (Shaked 1989: 250). The sabra writers attempted to create a singularly new literary identity. For Yizhar, this identity was a paradox, as he was criticising the brutality of the Israeli soldiers’ conduct even while in office as a minister in the Israeli Knesset.

Yizhar’s work was appropriated by the Zionist narrative regardless of its critique. As suggested earlier, this association of the texts with a certain nationalist narrative is one of the connections between the Hebrew and English texts examined here. Whereas *Frankenstein* and *Dracula* offered critiques of British Imperialism even while they reiterate the very social structures they are critiquing, Yizhar’s narrative was appropriated by the canon, even while it attempted to critique Zionist violence.

This is, indeed, one of the connections between the Hebrew and English texts of the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century, as the literary Gothic is regarded

predominantly as a subversive genre, yet the examination of the canonical Gothic texts *Frankenstein*, *Dracula*, *Jane Eyre*, and *Rebecca* reveals they actually only give the appearance of subversion. In fact, even while *Frankenstein* and *Dracula* seem to undermine the inadequacies of imperialism, eventually they reaffirm the supremacy of Western culture. In *Dracula* the destruction of the monster upon its territory re-establishes Western dominance, and in *Frankenstein* the linguistic indoctrination into Western culture similarly reaffirms the centrality of Western culture. In *Jane Eyre* and *Rebecca* it is patriarchy and financial dominance that only appear to be subverted when in fact the narratives reaffirm these doctrines' control over the female subject.

The female authors – Wollstonecraft Shelley, Brontë, and du Maurier – have all been read as feminist writers (Spivak 1985: 244, 254; Light 1984:11). The texts invite the reader to reconsider the role of female subjects in their communities. The authors, correspondingly, are regarded as pioneer feminists. One of the obvious feminists is Wollstonecraft Shelley, who was the daughter of Mary Wollstonecraft and William Godwin, both renowned philosophers. She was later married to the poet and philosopher Percy Bysshe Shelley. These prominent figures had an influence upon her and her work, and the insistence upon noting both her surnames is in order to acknowledge these links. Her awareness of the importance of female and human rights might have led her to write one of the most shocking novels of all times. The most horrifying aspect of the novel, one might argue, is the lack of female presence in the narrative.

Though *Frankenstein* has been read as a feminist text, the absence of female presence in the text is glaring. The female absent-presence of Walton's sister emphasises the lack of a productive femaleness (Cottom 1980: 63). Walton sends the letters to his sister, who exists outside the literary action, and whose femininity is taboo. The lack of female presence is linked with issues of sovereignty. Several critics tied feminist readings of *Frankenstein* to post-colonial readings, suggesting that the patriarchal individual is in a

sense responsible for imperialism, and therefore accountable for the alienating cultural ground that spawned this Gothic revolt (Spivak 1985: 247; Mellor 2003: 17). The link between the absent female figure and nationalism reflects the notion of male productivity through nationalism. This idea allows for the creation of a race or people without the female. This perception is at the root of the idea of the “new Jew”, as well as other alleged better or improved people.

Frankenstein’s creature is one of the most notoriously unnamed literary characters. This is one of the most significant aspect of its identity. More precisely, this is a crucial aspect of its dramatic search for identity. The need for an identity is one of the most basic and profound of human needs, and the fact the creature exhibits this desire renders it painfully human. The creature, nevertheless, remains unnamed, and is referred to as ‘abhorrent monster’, ‘devil’, and ‘fiend’ (*F*: 95). The creature’s lack of identity can be a metaphor for human relentless search for identities. Furthermore, one might argue that the creature remains unnamed as a metaphorical representation of the colonised Other, whose identity is overtaken by the coloniser. For Franco Moretti, the monster is denied name and identity because it represents the proletariat, and ‘[l]ike the proletariat, he is a collective and artificial creature’ (1983/1988: 85). Eventually, the lack of name is significant precisely in its metaphorical productivity. The creature is simultaneously everyman and no man, both *self* and Other. This is the text’s greatest philosophical achievement, and the kernel of its horror.

From a Lacanian perspective the name is imperative, as it is crucial for the establishment of the symbolic order (Lacan 1997: 218). The legislative and prohibitive functions of the name are at the core of the symbolic order. Whereas Peter Brooks’ Lacanian reading of *Frankenstein* suggests that the reader is left with the desire for meaning (1993: 96), for Robert Olorenshaw Frankenstein’s creature is not a ‘typical Lacanian subject’ and is ‘unnarratable’ (1994: 167). It therefore ‘cannot cross over from

an order determined by the specular to an order determined by language, that is, the creature cannot be recognised, identified or circulate as proper name in the discourse of the Other because the creature is unnamable' (167). Olorenshaw contends that the creature is excluded from the symbolic order of language because it cannot be contained in the narrative (167). The creature, however, is a fictional creation, and therefore the order of language for it is the literary one, not the real order; hence, the tensions are between the literary and the literal or, in Lacanian terminology, the symbolic and the real (167). After its education, the creature comprehends that it is excluded from both the symbolic and real orders because it is the unnamable (167). This ultimate Other cannot participate, penetrate, or become a part of the symbolic order.

While Frankenstein's creature has no name, as it has no place among humanity, the Golem, as noted above, has a clear legal position, and a name. Along with the spatial incorporation, the naming of this Other integrates it into the socially acceptable and deconstructs it as an Other. The reason is that by naming things we appropriate them and declare our dominance over their essence. While in the Talmud story the Golem is nameless, in Rosenberg's rendition the Maharal and his household give it a name:

And because the Golem always sat in a corner of the court-room at the edge of a table resting his head on his hands, looking indeed like an unfinished vessel, lacking wisdom and understanding nothing and not worrying about a thing under the sun, the people called him Yossele the Golem, while some named him Yossele the mute.

(G: 38)

The Golem in Rosenberg's narrative has a name, Yossele, which is the endearment form of Yosef (or Josef). The Maharal names the Golem Yosef, and explains to it the reason for its creation, as protector of the Jewish community. The Golem thus becomes a (vital) part of the Jewish community. The name not only divests the Golem of its frightful Otherness but familiarises it as part of the Jewish tradition. The name Yosef is an allusion to the biblical character that, hated by his brothers for being their father, Yacob's, favourite, was thrown into a well and sold into Egypt. Later the Israelites were enslaved to the Egyptians and suffered the first exile, and since that era the Jewish tradition instructs that one should be aware and considerate towards the misfortunes of the Other – the widow, foreigner, and the slave (Genesis 37:1 – Exodus 13:19). The origins of the rulings regarding these Others (the widow, foreigner, and the slave) (Jeremiah 7) are alluded to in Rosenberg's narrative. Though it is an Other, the Golem is embraced by the community. Moreover, by attributing to the Golem this particular name, the text alludes to the Egyptian exodus, perhaps suggesting another exodus is required, only this time from the Ashkenazi Diaspora.

The use of the name Josef as a reminder of the Jewish exilic condition, and furthermore as a call for the abandonment of the Ashkenazi Diaspora is likewise employed by Agnon in 'Ha'adonit veHarochel'. The short story was first published in 1943, in the collection 'Sa'ar' edited by Jacob Fichman, and later as part of the collection of all Agnon works in 1952. The volume within the collection was entitled 'Samuch Ve'Nireh', which relates to traditional reading of scriptures (Urbach 1978: 198). The collection collates stories that engage with issues of personal and communal identities, and the connection between these two aspects of one's identity.

As mentioned above, 'Ha'adonit veHarochel' is Agnon's allegorical exploration of the dangers of intermarriage posed by the Jews' exilic condition. The names of the two characters Josef and Helen, are clear allusions to Judaic and Hellenistic, or non-Hebraic traditions. Their names, however, are not revealed immediately; rather, only after the

peddler and lady have become very close, and after they shared her non-kosher food as well as her bed, does the narrative provide their names (*HH*: 214). They become intimately known to each other and the reader at the same time, and the indication is the revelation of their names.

Characters' names are significant in all Agnon's work (Shaked 1989: 118), and Helen and Josef's names are particularly meaningful. Shaked argues that in addition to the names symbolising Hellenism and Judaism, 'Josef is an avatar of Josef de la Reina, a Kabbalistic hero who struggles with the powers of darkness, specifically with the demonic power of Lilith. Helena represents Greece, or Helen of Troy whose face launched a thousand ships, as well as the figure of Lilith' (Shaked 1989: 119). One might also make the connection to the biblical Josef, whose name relates to the Golem. In comparison to the Golem, indeed, who protected the Jews from the dangers of life in the Ashkenazi Diaspora, Agnon's Josef here embodies the perils of exilic condition. The two Josef characters, Agnon's and Rosenberg's, offer opposite possibilities for the Jews in the European exile.

Thus names are utilised in all the texts thus far examined *Frankenstein*, *Golem* and 'Ha'adonit veHarochel' as markers of human and social boundaries. The comparison of use of names in *Golem* and *Frankenstein* reveals the difference in the two creatures' function. Whereas the Golem functions as an embodiment of the Ashkenazi Diaspora Jews' buds of modern nationalism, Frankenstein's creature represents the colonised Other. The use of the name Josef in *Golem* and 'Ha'adonit veHarochel' signifies Jewish tradition, and the exilic condition. Names, or their lack, offer metaphorical meaning in relation to humanity and identity.

Bearing this in mind, it is striking that even though the protagonist of Brontë's narrative is a young woman who has a name, which is the name of the novel, her character's humanity is constantly undermined. In the novel, Jane Eyre is referred to as 'fiend' (*JE*:

23; 197), 'elf' (*JE*: 208; 222), and 'monster' (*JE*: 226). While the Golem is accepted in spite of its Otherness, Jane is rejected regardless of her humanity. Whereas Frankenstein's creature remains a horror that is located outside human comprehension, and therefore unnamed, the Golem is named and accepted, and Jane's name is discarded as she is dehumanised. Gilbert and Gubar propose Jane's name is suggestive of her plainness and her social insignificance as she is 'invisible as air, the heir to nothing, secretly choking with ire' (1979: 342). Though this might be valid, the text also lends itself well to Spivak's reading, which argues that the links between the two subalterns – the colonised Other and the female subject – renders both rejected Others (1985: 247-51). The fact that Bertha is burned down along with Thornfield is a blazing depiction of the obliteration of the colonised Other. The reason for the rejection of Jane's name stems precisely from her alignment with the colonised Other. The rejection of Jane's name, her identity as an individual, add a poignant twist to the previous analysis offered here of Jane's linguistic abilities. Jane Eyre, though human and named, is relegated to the realm of horror.

As in previous chapters, Jane Eyre's character invites the comparison to Tehila. Both female characters are capable individuals who succeed in a patriarchal world, in spite, and perhaps because of their rebellious characters. Though Jane is clearly a rebel (Gilbert 1977: 779), and Tehila might appear to accord with tradition while undermining doctrines (Nave 1997: 14), both have been read as nonconformists. The comparison of their names, and the meaning of their names in the texts confirms these understandings of their characters. While Jane a common British name, connoting perhaps a certain plainness, the name Tehila, apart from meaning fame, connotes the renown of Jerusalem. It is, moreover, a direct reference to Psalms, which is *Tehilim* in Hebrew. The book of Psalms praises the Lord, and Agnon's story praises the woman, who is an embodiment of the city, which is the dwelling place of the feminine aspect of the Lord. Moreover, Psalms is constantly evoked through the numerous allusions and specific quotes, and, as noted above, Tehila

reads it daily. While Jane's name is indicative of her lack of agency and sovereignty, Tehila's name reflects the opposite, as she has command over the Holy City. The two characters' names, Jane and Tehila, are thus opposites with regard to their cultural associations. The fact that Jane is outright rebellious while Tehila hides her revolt is in opposition to their names. Jane is rebellious in spite of the fact that her name suggests mainstream conformity, and Tehila undermines Jewish doctrine even while her name connotes great piety.

Names in the Jewish tradition are always meaningful. Throughout the biblical narrative names always come with an explanation.¹⁵⁵ Therefore, the reader is not surprised when 'Mishael' commences with an acknowledgment of the importance of Mishael's name, as well as an explicit explanation of its relevance to the story. The narrator notes that his name is 'a Jewish name, taken from the Bible. Yet from the time the Jews have existed in the world there has not been called such an odd name in Israel, until the Holy One summoned such a wild one to the townspeople' (*M*: 25). The name, Mishael, is a legitimate name for a Jewish boy. It is one of the names mentioned as part of the ancestry of Levite families, who were responsible for ritualistic worship of God (Exudes 6:22). It is also the name of one of the three wise and pure boys (Hananiah, Daniel, and Mishael) who were chosen to dwell in the court of Nebuchadnezzar, the Babylonian king. They refused to eat of the court's (non-kosher) food, and were thrown into the furnace for refusing to conform to idolatry. Miraculously, however, instead of burning themselves, their guards were smouldered while the boys were seen walking within the flames amongst the angels of God (Daniel 1-3). Over the years, the Jewish tradition added many stories to embellish

¹⁵⁵ One exception to this rule is Samson the Hero. His name connotes the sun, as in Hebrew it can be read as a conflation of the words sun שמש and virility "און". This reflects the problematic connection his character has to sun-worshippers and other non-Hebraic characters and values. While most biblical names are justified and explained his name remains unexplained. One reason could be to avoid the clear references to the sun worshipping that align him with idolatry (Zakovitch 1982: 70). Nevertheless, as David Grossman notes, there are great similarities between Samson and other "sun heroes" such as Hercules, Perseus, Prometheus, and Mopsus (Grossman 2005: 45).

this original narrative, elevating and glorifying the acts of faith performed by Mishael and his companions. The name itself has been praised and connotes the utmost pious and self-sacrificing of acts in the name of faith and God.

While the biblical Mishael was a devout, bright, flawless young boy, Mishael, as the story soon reveals, is a tainted, lowly lad, who has little if any interest in the Jewish faith apart from his annual financial gain from the sale of the *hoshaanot*.¹⁵⁶ The contrast between the extreme piety the name connotes and Mishael's complete inadequacy offers an acute irony. Additionally, the subtle allusion to the Babylonian exile is a reminder of the exilic situation of the Jewish characters in the narrative. The complacency of the town people to their exilic condition renders all longing for the Holy Land peculiar, and while there is no explicit reference to the Holy Land, the name Mishael and the character's complete incompetence reflect the local community, and their degenerate condition. Mishael's name, hence, is a reminder of the Jews' exilic condition. Like the Golem, whose name Yossele was an allusion to the Egyptian exile, Mishael is a reminder of the Babylonian exile. The names of these characters remind the readers of the precarious condition of the Jews in the Ashkenazi Diaspora, and function as subtle prompts for action.

The names in these texts function as means to convey various themes, especially the problematic nature of the assertion of sovereignty through language. Though Jane is named she is often referred to by other non-human names, and she struggles to affirm her identity and agency. The juxtaposition of Jane and Tehila exposes their names' roles as signifiers of their characters, as one struggles to obtain agency and the other rules over Jerusalem. While Frankenstein's creature remains nameless and without identity and sovereignty, the Golem is named and establishes a certain level of identity and even agency. The two Josef characters, as well as Mishael reflect the problematic nature of the

¹⁵⁶ As mentioned earlier, the *hoshanot* are the willow branches that function as the symbolic offerings for the Hoshana Rabbah holiday.

Diaspora exilic existence, and their names function as a call for the affirmation of a new sovereignty.

This leads to the second aspect of naming that will be discussed here, as one of the ways to assert sovereignty over a place is by naming, or renaming. There are many famous cities that had several names over the years: Istanbul was Constantinople, and before that it was called Byzantium; St. Petersburg was called Leningrad, and before that it was called Petrograd; and Jerusalem, which is also known as Al-Quds, was called Ilea Capitolina as well as Yvus and Ir'Shalem. Naming a place is the linguistic side of its appropriation.

As mentioned earlier, Derrida draws the attention to Plato's notions of the place, *khôra*, as a slippery concept that is neither sensible nor intelligible even while it is both (1993/1995: 89). The very essence of the place resists the name, yet participates in the symbolic order. Names of places in literature are therefore twice as problematic as fictional places, and then when literature refers to a place that exists in our familiar landscape the result is a profound disturbance of the literary and real realms. The names of places in the texts examined here reflect attempts to establish sovereignty by linguistic appropriation. Additionally, fictional names of places may convey meaning, supporting a thematic exploration.

The importance of names of places in *Jane Eyre* has been noted by Gilbert and Gubar, who observe that the novel is 'a kind of mythical progress from one significantly named place to another' (1979: 342). From Gateshead, which means the commencement of her journey as in gates-head; via Marsh End, which is the end of her wandering upon the marshes as the rejected creature, also known as Moor House, which is a place where she moors as she prepares for the rest of her journey; through Thornfield, which is, indeed, a thorny field Jane has to traverse; to Ferndean, a fern green earthly Eden for her and Rochester. Since Jane is Bertha Mason's double, her strive for agency mirrors the

colonised Other's lack of sovereignty. The meaningful names serve not only to inform the reader of the significance of the place for the protagonist, but also to propel the plot.

By the same token, Grima in Agnon's 'Ad Hennah' is crucial, as it is the town where the widow of Dr Levi resides, and from which the narrator is required to collect the doctor's books. As Zilla Jane Goodman notes, though the town Grima is briefly visited, its name, meaning *cause* in Hebrew, is indicative of its function as it propels the narrative (1988: 80). Taking the assertion that the place is the cause of the narrative further suggests that the cause of the story too is the place. Furthermore, as the books are at the core of this causation, the books are, in fact, the real cause of the action. Since the books are the reason for the narrator's return to Palestine-Israel, this leads to the conclusion that the books and the place are the cause for the return to the holy land.

In 'Avi Hashor' Agnon takes the place as cause and reason for the narrative even further. The story commences with the name of the place: 'A place there is in Jerusalem, and it is called the father of the ox. And why is it called the father of the ox, for a deed that was done' (*AH*: 336).¹⁵⁷ The name of the place 'Avi Hashor' – 'The Ox's Father' – is the story, and vice versa. As mentioned earlier, 'Avi Hashor' is a Hebrew translation of the Arabic Abu-Tor, which is the name of a neighbourhood in Jerusalem. The area has a unique history, as it is one of the first attempts at hybrid neighbourhoods in Jerusalem. It is situated on the outskirts of the city, and is the signifier of the border between countries, cultures, and peoples. One of the folk traditions related to the place suggests that when Ṣalāḥ ad-Dīn placed the siege on Jerusalem one of his officers bragged that it will be so easy to conquer Jerusalem that he will be able to do it on an ox. During the time the story 'Avi Hashor' was written the neighbourhood was literally partitioned and divided between Jordan and the British Mandate for Palestine; today it is in Israel, and witnesses an attempt

¹⁵⁷ מקום אחד יש בירושלים ונקרא אבי השור. ולמה נקרא אבי השור אם אתם רוצים אספר לכם על שום מעשה שהיה

at coexistence.

The opening passage elaborates upon the connections between the old man and the ox as a substitute for his family, and concludes that ‘his neighbours called that old man the father of the ox, for the sake of his ox’ (AH: 336).¹⁵⁸ As in many traditions, the person may be named after his son, as his son will bring him glory.¹⁵⁹ The old man has an ox for a son: a monstrous abomination if it was taken literally, and even figuratively it still is not socially acceptable. The Hebrew word for ox *shor* (as opposed to bull) has two interesting attributes: first, the behaviour of the animal towards the old man aligns with the more easy-going castrated animal; and second, there is a possible projection of the castrated bull as metaphor for both the old man who has no family and the Jewish people.

The move from being referred to as ‘the old man’ to ‘the ox’s father’ establishes the old man’s spatial and linguistic sovereignty. The name of the man is the name of the place. The linguistic appropriation of the place is completed even before the story is told. After the heroic act in which the ox saves the town from raiders the narrator explains: ‘and they called that place the father of the ox, for the sake of the old man and his ox. And still the place and its name exist’ (AH: 337).¹⁶⁰ The narrative reiterates that this occurs through a speech act.

Thus, by translating the place’s name into its Hebrew equivalent Agnon appropriates the territory first linguistically. Then, the old man in the story is known as the ox’s father, hence he *is* the place. Moreover, Agnon’s alternative narrative as an explanation for the name of the neighbourhood is a narrative of appropriation. Finally, the

¹⁵⁸ היו שכניו קוראים לאותו זקן אבי השור, על שם שורו

¹⁵⁹ In fact, Dracula is the son of Dracul. Count Dracula’s name has been cause for some speculation, and in addition to the link to the historical Vlad III Dracul mentioned above (Akeroyd 2009: 22), Bob Curran suggests it comes from the Irish: ‘[i]n Irish, droch fhoula (pronounced droc’ola) means “bad” or “tainted blood” and whilst it is now taken to refer to “blood feuds” between persons or families, it may have a far older connotation’ (2000: 15). The name reflects both the malevolent nature of the Count and also connotes the issue of familial and hence territorial disputes.

¹⁶⁰ על שם הזקן ושורו וקראו למקום הזה אבי השור ועדיין אותו מקום קיים ושמו קיים

story hinges on the land being ceded to the old man in compensation for the wrongful slaughter of his animal; allegorically, it suggests that the land is a token redressing damages done to the Jews.

While Agnon manipulates the name of a real place in Jerusalem in order to validate the Jewish settlement in Palestine-Israel, Yizhar invents the name of a fictitious place in order to undermine the legality and moral legitimacy of the Israeli conquest. There is a climactic moment of linguistic absurdity in *Khirbet Khizeh*, when, after the soldiers have already blasted, bombed, set fire and more, one of the men, Shlomo asks, “what’s this place called anyway?”¹⁶¹ and someone answers “Khirbet Khizeh” (*KH: 77*).¹⁶² This moment seems to be taken out of a play for the theatre of the absurd, in which the characters operate in a world devoid of meaning and with comprehension of neither their actions nor their morality. As mentioned above, the name is not of a real place in Palestine-Israel, but is a concoction comprised of the word *khirbet*,¹⁶³ which is the term for remains, ruins, or demolished site of a town, or otherwise previously humanly constructed and populated place; and *Khizeh*,¹⁶⁴ which has no real meaning. The word *khirbe*¹⁶⁵ comes from the root to demolish.¹⁶⁶ It is also the root for the word sword and weapon, and the premise is that usually a place is demolished by an act of violence.¹⁶⁷ The title of the novella indicates its mythical function through the linguistic play, as it is an Arabic-sounding non-existent village. Yizhar creates an Arab location upon the imagined plateau. Additionally, the first part of the name Khirbet means ruins in Arabic, thus the translation of the title is the ruins of Khizeh. The linguistic connection between the Hebrew and Arabic, allows for the

¹⁶¹ מה בעצם שם המקום הזה?

¹⁶² חרבת חזעה

¹⁶³ חרבה

¹⁶⁴ חזעה

¹⁶⁵ חרבה

¹⁶⁶ ח.ר.ב.

¹⁶⁷ The word is also used to refer to a place that was destroyed due to natural disaster, but the concept nevertheless harbours notions of violent destruction. The word חזעה has no real meaning in Hebrew, but it is close in sound to the word זועה which is horror. The name thus sounds like it means the ruins of horror, and indeed the story narrates the horror of the ruin of the displacement of the Palestinian people.

meaning of destruction to resonate in both languages. The non-existent Arab village is ruined. The ruined edifice is utilised in Gothic literature in order to symbolise both the shattered inner world of the characters and the instability of the social apparatus (Kilgour 1995: 66). Here, equally, the ruined village reflects the devastation of both people and moral values.

Giving names to objects and places appropriates them, turns them into signifiers and charges them with meaning. The narrative we construct of our identity is inherently linked to the stories we tell of the land we feel we belong to, or that we feel belongs to us. The texts use this linguistic link in order to highlight the importance of the land for our identities. Therefore, it is important to note the prevalence of unnamed narrators.

Though the texts come from different literary genres there are certain narrative strategies shared by some. Several of the narrators are unnamed, and remain so to the end of their narratives.¹⁶⁸ The texts employ this narrative strategy because they explore similar issues of personal and collective identities in relation to states of sovereignty and levels of agency. The unnamed narrators are all socially marginalised characters. The narrator in du Maurier's text is a lower-class orphan, in Agnon's 'Ad Hennah' the narrator is the wandering Jew,¹⁶⁹ and the narrator in Yizhar's *Khirbet Khizeh* is rejected because of his moral convictions. These Others are searching for social recognition as well as a secure place that would allow them to construct an identity. The personal identity crisis is then paralleled with the larger collective identity crisis. The narrator's inability to construct a personal identity reflects the collective crisis. The narrative technique is thus imperative for the exploration of major themes in these texts.

¹⁶⁸ Though there are hints about their names, there is never a full disclosure.

¹⁶⁹ Harold Fisch has explored the narrator in Agnon, suggesting that the narrator's many 'chance encounters with mendicants, burghers, students of the law, functionaries of all kinds, the poor and the rich, provide the opportunity for an endless series of reminiscences, legends, moral tales, and even beast-fables' (Fisch 1970: 49). Fisch is referring here to *Hakhnasat Kala* (The Bridal Canopy), 1921; however, the pattern is similar in 'Ad Hennah', as the hero's journey in search of a home takes him through the various locations in the story.

The lack of the basic identifier of the narrator is a constant reminder of his or her identity crisis. By confronting the reader with an unnamed narrator the text compels the reader to acknowledge the problematic essence of personal identity. In addition to its reflection of the lack of identity, the anonymity of the narrators retains a certain distance from the reader, preventing full identification and, in a sense, Othering the narrator as a non-existent individual. As the reader cannot identify with the narrator he or she becomes an Other. Paradoxically, the namelessness of the narrator can also render an easier affiliation with the narrator and the story. The fact that there is no name associated with the narrator might allow some readers to feel more likely to identify with the narrative.

The conclusion from the comparison of the use of names in the texts, as well as generic labelling of the texts themselves suggests there are several similarities between the texts in English and Hebrew examined here. The use of names in order to convey meaning is significant in both English and Hebrew. From the lack of names to the profoundly meaningful, names are crucial for these texts. The nameless creature in *Frankenstein* offers a striking contrast to the Golem, as the former is nameless and rejected while the latter is, indeed, named and embraced. The names in 'Ha'adonit veHarochel' are symbolic representations of the Jewish and non-Jewish traditions, and the names of Jane and Tehila are likewise significant for the comprehension of their characters' function, as is Mishael's name. The various nameless narrators in *Rebecca*, 'Ad Hennah', and *Khirbet Khizeh* simultaneously estrange the narrator and allow for a stronger identification with the narrative.

Furthermore, in both Hebrew and English texts we see how the generic appropriation effects the reading of the texts as participants of cultural discourses. Previous readings of *Frankenstein*, *Jane Eyre*, *Dracula*, and *Rebecca* within post-colonial and feminist discourses might obscure the texts ambivalence. A close reading, however, reveals that even while they might appear to critique British imperialism they in some ways

reiterate its premises. Similarly, even while they participate in feminist discourse the texts struggle to maintain feminist notions. Corresponding to these tensions between the generic label and authorship, even while Agnon and Bialik wrote in Hebrew, their work was not always accepted as part of the Hebrew literary world. Paradoxically, they are nonetheless the most renowned writers of the Hebrew language. Furthermore, the Zionist discourse appropriates both authors' work as well as Yizhar's work, even while Agnon and Bialik were distinctly different in their approach to Zionism, and Yizhar directed his critique toward the Israeli government. Labelling a text fixates it in the mind of the readers within a particular genre or discourse, and the readers then need to read against preconceived notions of the text.

4.4 Conclusion

The comparison of the use of language in the texts explored in this thesis leads to several conclusions. First, as language is the means for the assertion of sovereignty, speech emerges as a significant aspect of the narratives. The characters' communication skills serve as a reflection of and on their agency, and by extrapolation of the states of sovereignty of the producing culture, as well as the inner social structures. These characters' linguistic abilities also reveal the way these cultures perceive and (re)construct their notions of human and social boundaries. Characters such as the mute ox and Golem are symbolic representations of Jewish community, its lack of sovereignty and subaltern condition. These characters are a part of the Jewish community, which allots a place for them within the social apparatus. Conversely, in the texts in English one finds several characters with impressive linguistic abilities such as Frankenstein's creature, Jane Eyre, and Count Dracula. These articulate characters have several functions: both Jane and the creature embody fears of social mobility; the creature, however, is also a metaphor for the fears of the colonised Other. Count Dracula, like the creature, is a metaphor for the fears of the harms of imperialism, and all three characters reflect the anxieties of social reconfiguration. In a sense, the power of speech is emphasised by the fears from these characters.

One important observation is the similarities in the linguistic abilities and silence of female (and feminised) characters in Hebrew and English. While Jane insists upon voicing herself, and suffers social rejection, in order to remain a part of the community Tehila chooses to remain silent, even though she might have linguistic abilities. Bertha Mason is one of the most famously inarticulate female characters in literature. She represents the subaltern, both female and colonised. She is the ultimate female monstrous Other. Bertha's linguistic deficiencies resemble Mishael's. This comparison reveals not only the feminisation of the Diaspora male Jew, but his place as the subaltern upon

European soil. The comparison shows how the texts in both English and Hebrew use speech to reflect social concerns. Whether it is class mobility, feminism, or the ramifications of the colonialist enterprise, it is through speech that social groups might endeavour to change the norm.

In conjunction to the importance of speech as means for social reconfiguration, the texts all acknowledge the crucial part education plays in socialisation. While the texts in Hebrew and English similarly recognise the fundamental role of schooling, the comparison between the ways education is depicted reveals a crucial difference. Whereas in the texts in English education is portrayed as a dangerous means for social mobility, in the texts in Hebrew it is represented as an integral part of communal existence. In *Frankenstein*, *Jane Eyre*, and *Dracula*, education is used by the monstrous Other as means to enter human society. Even the unnamed narrator in *Rebecca* attempts to educate herself in the ways of the upper classes. Conversely, for Tehila, Mishael, the unnamed narrator in 'Ad Hennah' and even the soldiers in *Khirbet Khizeh*, literature is a way of life, without which their very identities are shattered. This comparison shows that for both British and the Jewish communities, education is considered as a way to attain social acceptance.

The last feature subjected for comparison in this thesis was the literary use of names in order to convey meaning, and the effects of labelling the texts under generic rubrics. These two aspects of naming – as by labelling we name, and by naming we label – are revealed as significant for the reading of the texts examined here. First, because the texts are all canonical texts –with the exception of 'Avi Hashor' – they have been subjected to numerous readings, which have an effect upon the reader. One cannot enter a reading of *Frankenstein*, *Jane Eyre*, *Dracula*, or *Rebecca* without bearing in mind their location within feminist and post-colonial discourses. Likewise, Agnon, Bialik, Yizhar, and even the slightly less familiar Berkowitz have been appropriated by the Zionist discourse. To disentangle these canonical texts from the grasp of previous readings, however, liberates

them, allowing for a fresh consideration of their functions. Once the generic presuppositions are reconsidered, some of the previous readings are revealed as problematic. For example, while *Jane Eyre* had been acclaimed as a feminist treaty, a close reading reveals Jane is eventually reintroduced into society through financial means and marriage. Similarly, while *Dracula* has been read as a critique of imperialism, the fact the Western team vanquishes the monster on Eastern soil reaffirms notions of Western supremacy. The rereading of the texts in Hebrew also sheds new light upon them, offering fresh considerations. For instance, Agnon's work has been regarded as focused upon the concerns of Jewish people in modernity, and the reconfiguration of Judaism in the modern era. The readings of his texts here shows he was, indeed, concerned with these issues, but also with the problems of the Jewish nation as a modern sovereign nation-state.

In addition to the labelling of the texts themselves, the names of characters and places within the texts is significant. Naming is important as a formative act for the individual, and an appropriative act with regard to places. In several texts one finds the use of the unnamed narrator functions simultaneously to estrange and familiarise the reader with the narrative. This dual action – on the one hand making it easier for the reader to empathise, and on the other distancing the reader – allows for the reader to constantly reconsider the social role of the narrator. This continuous tension invites the reader to re-evaluate the social structure and the situation, reconsidering the place allotted for the narrator within these circumstances. While we find several unnamed narrators, we also encounter many characters whose name is meaningful. For example, in both *Golem* and 'Ha'adonit veHarochel' the use of the name Yosef is a reminder of the Jewish exile, and like Mishael these names serve to prompt the Jews to leave the Ashkenazi Diaspora. Jane and Tehila are also meaningful, and hint towards the characters' individualities.

The final aspect of naming is most significant for this thesis. The names we give to places is the way we appropriate them. The texts show this by providing meaningful names

to places, as well as names that propel plot and define characters. Jane Eyre's journey from her commencement at Gateshead, via her thorny time at Thornfield and her mooring at Moor House, leads her to her fern filled Eden at Ferndean. Thus the names of places reveal their essence, and direct the plot. Similarly, the name of the town Grima in 'Ad Hennah' literally means causation, and it is, indeed, the place that causes the narrator to commence his journey. The most obvious example of the importance of the name of the place is, of course, 'Avi Hashor'. The name of the old man is the name of the place, which gives the story its title. Furthermore, in 'Avi Hashor' we find the linguistic appropriation of the place provides a new myth of the origin of the name of the place.

The comparison of the use of language in the texts examined here exposes the similarities as well as differences in the employment of language as metaphor for humanity and social boundaries. Furthermore, the differences only serve to highlight the fundamental similarities as the Hebrew and English texts alike acknowledge the importance of language as symbol and signifier of human and social as such.

5. Conclusion

Modern British and Jewish identities share some fundamental notions, particularly with regard to nationalism and sovereignty. The literature of the two nations reflects these links, as well as the places where the Jewish and British cultures diverge. The analysis offered here exposed the role of literature in the (re)construction of modern British and Jewish as well as Jewish-Israeli individual and collective identities. Furthermore, the analysis of literature in Hebrew and English examined here unmasked the constructed and artificial nature of sovereignty. It reaffirmed sovereignty is ‘a posited law, a thesis or a prosthesis, and not a natural given’ (Derrida 2009: 77/116). In fact, this analysis revealed how sovereignty ‘draws all its power, all its potency, i.e. its all-powerful nature, from this simulacrum-effect, this fiction- or representation-effect that is inherent and congenital to it, as it were co-originary’ (289/387). The literature examined here reflects the fabricated essence of sovereignty even while it participates in its reconstitution.

The comparison of several canonical works of Hebrew and English literature of the nineteenth- to mid-twentieth century revealed how the texts re-evaluate the challenging concepts of individual and collective identities and sovereignty. The narratives offer various perspectives on the connection between issues of sovereignty and identities. They all, nonetheless, exhibit similar use of spatial and linguistic metaphors as well as adaptations of mythologies in order to reconsider these issues of identities in relation to sovereignty.

During the nineteenth and up till the middle of the twentieth century the British were engaged with and later relinquishing the imperialist enterprise. At the same time and in a parallel fashion though from the opposite direction, the Jews were commencing mass settlement and colonisation in Palestine-Israel. Both communities found it necessary to re-examine the connection to the territories they were occupying and colonising. The

comparison of the texts showed similarities in the ways they reveal how the two cultures were experiencing and reflecting upon these socio-political processes.

The thesis exposed three main elements shared by the texts: a preoccupation with land and spatial awareness, adaptations of myths, and the exploration of language as delineator of philosophical and social boundaries. These three elements work together in the texts to probe the essence of modern British and Jewish identities in relation to sovereignty.

The comparison of the texts' engagement with spatial awareness revealed that they all utilise spatial metaphors in order to explore issues of identity. One of the striking examples is the similarities in the use of non-places to delineate social boundaries and their transgression. The forest and ice-bound desert in *Frankenstein*, the sublime mountains in *Dracula*, and the moor in *Jane Eyre* are used in a similar manner to the way the forest in 'Ha'adonit veHarochel', and the desert in 'Be'ir Haharega' are used to signify social boundaries. The settings in the texts express and reconsider aspects of British and Jewish-Israeli identities. Furthermore, the texts all expose the problematic of a claim for autochthony. For example, the constructed essence of both the Golem and Frankenstein's creature are metaphors for the problematic of autochthony. These complexities are reflections of and on the difficulties in the Jewish and British nations' relationship with the land during the nineteenth and up to the mid-twentieth century. The two nations underwent opposed processes of colonisation, and the comprehension of the lack of a morally valid autochthonous connection to the land was experienced as a spatial identity crisis.

The complex question of spatial awareness and the connection to the land, in addition to the paradoxes that this connection creates, are addressed in the texts from various perspectives, but all the texts portray characters that are to varying degrees homeless. Moreover, the homes in the texts are horrific, inhospitable, unhomey places.

From the haunted mansion in *Jane Eyre* to the monstrous room in ‘Ad Hennah’, the home in these narratives is not a place of solace. Finally, the texts all offer social critique, particularly with regard to issues of identities and sovereignty, and utilise the settings to propel plot and define characters, and therefore exhibit a certain Gothic essence.

The comparison of the texts also revealed similarities in the reworking of myths. The comparison between the employment of myths of creation and subversion revealed that the British and Jewish modern identities were similarly explored through the revising of ancient myths. In order to (re)create modern identities the texts revisit myths of creation and subversion. The obvious example is, of course, *Frankenstein* and *Golem*, as in both a humanoid creature is created, then the comparison of these two narratives to ‘Avi Hashor’ exposes the way they all manipulate ancient myths in order to reconstruct modern identities. In *Frankenstein* modern British identities are considered in relation to the potential harms of colonialism, *Golem*, conversely, endorses colonialism and a modern militant Jewish entity, which is then taken further in the brutish force of an ox in Agnon’s narrative.

The comparison of the reworking of myths of soul and soil redemption likewise exposed the profound connections common to the British and Jewish nations. Both nations consider these myths as meaningful for the (re)creation of individual and collective identities. This fundamental link explains the employment of the figures of the vampire and the Wandering Jew in both literary traditions. For instance, the comparison revealed the unexpected affinity between the saintly Tehila and the demonic Dracula, as both wish to be buried in their ancestral land in order to be reborn. Also, the main characters in all the texts examined in this thesis are restless or homeless, and are in many ways avatars of the Wandering Jew. From the ultimate rejection of Frankenstein’s creature to Jane Eyre’s more subtle though poignant rejection, in the texts in English, to the wandering Golem and the narrator in ‘Ad Hennah’. These two figures, the vampire and Wandering Jew, function

simultaneously as markers of the boundaries of society, and to emphasise the importance of the connection to the land.

The importance of the connection to the land for both traditions, furthermore, originates in the shared myth of the Abrahamic tradition. The myth of hospitality, which is so central in both Judaism and Christianity, is prevalent in the texts in English and Hebrew alike. The analyses exposed a thread of allegedly hospitable instances. From Dracula's invitation to his castle of death to the Arab villager's hospitable gesture in *Khirbet Khizeh*, the notion of hospitality is undermined. In addition to questioning the validity of hospitality itself, the texts undermine the presupposition of sovereignty, which is required for the act of hospitality.

The last part, dedicated to language, shed light upon similarities and differences in the role of language for social demarcation. Language is imperative as the means for assertion of sovereignty. Therefore, the various characters' linguistic abilities function as a reflection of and on their states of sovereignty, and by extrapolation of the producing culture. Moreover, language reveals the two cultures' perceptions of human and social boundaries. Education is depicted in both the Hebrew and English texts as crucial for processes of socialisation. The comparison showed an important difference, however, in the role of language for the British and Jewish nations. Whereas in the texts in English education is perceived as a means for social mobility, in the Hebrew texts it is simply a way of life. While Jane Eyre attempts to use her education as leverage, the narrator in 'Ad Hennah' explores linguistic roots as nourishment. In both traditions, nonetheless, language is crucial for the (re)construction of identities.

This thesis re-establishes the inherent links between the Jewish and British cultures, which manifest in similar use of spatial metaphors and ancient myths for the exploration of the angst modernity. These similarities stem not only from the cultural connection, but

are the result of the two nations' preoccupation with sovereignty at an era when they underwent opposite processes of immigration and colonisation. Both literatures utilise Gothic tropes because the Gothic is a genre that is predominantly engaged with social critique and spatial awareness. The interplay between space, myth, and language is exposed as fundamental for the (re)construction of identities in relation to spatial awareness. These issues continue to be relevant in contemporary discussions of identities.

Bibliography

- Aberbach, David. 1994. 'Fantasies of Deviance in Mendele and Agnon'. *AJS Review* 19.1: 45-60.
- Abrams, M.H. 2005. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 8th Edition. Boston: Thompson.
- Achrati, Ahmad. 2006. 'Deconstruction, Ethics and Islam'. *Arabica* 53.4: 472-510.
- Agnon, Shmuel Yosef. 2009 (1952). *To This Day (Ad Hennah)*. Trans. Hillel Halkin. London: The Toby Press.
- Agnon, Shmuel Yosef. 1977 (1945). 'Avi Hashor'. *Ad Hennah*. Seventh Volume. Tel-Aviv: Schocken Publishing House.
- Agnon, Shmuel Yosef. 1977 (1950). 'Tehila'. *Ad Hennah*. Seventh Volume. Tel-Aviv: Schocken Publishing House.
- Agnon, Shmuel Yosef. 1977 (1952). 'Ad Hennah'. *Ad Hennah*. Seventh Volume. Tel-Aviv: Schocken Publishing House.
- Aguirre, Manuel. 1993. 'The Riddle of Sovereignty'. *The Modern Language Review* 88.2: 273-282.
- Akeroyd, John. 2009. 'The Historical Dracula: Monster or Machiavellian Prince?' *History Ireland* 17.2: 21-24.
- Almog, Shmuel, Jehuda Reinharz, and Anita Shapira. 1998. *Zionism and Religion*. New Hampshire: University Press of New England.
- Alter, Robert. 1975. Introduction to S. Yizhar 'The Prisoner'. *Modern Hebrew Literature*. Behrman House.
- Anaya, S. James. 2004. *Indigenous Peoples in International Law*. 2nd ed. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

- Anderson, Benedict. 2002 (1983). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev Ed. New York: Verso.
- Andrews, S. G. 1971. 'Shelley, Medwin, and "The Wandering Jew"'. *Keats-Shelley Journal* 20: 78-86.
- Anidjar, Gil. 2002. 'Tatters of Human Existence: S. Yizhar and the Holocaust'. *Theory and Criticism* 21: 9-17.
- Anidjar, Gil. 2005. 'Literary History and Hebrew Modernity'. *Comparative Literature Studies* 42.4: 277-296.
- Anidjar, Gil. 2008. *Semites: Race, Religion, Literature*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. 2001. 'Liberalism, Individualism, and Identity'. *Critical Theory* 27.2: 305-32.
- Arata, Stephen D. 1990. 'The Occidental Tourist: *Dracula* and the Anxiety of Reverse Colonization'. *Victorian Studies: A Journal of the Humanities, Arts and Sciences* 33.4: 621-645.
- Aran, Gideon and Gurevitch, Zali. 1992. 'Al Hamakom' (Of the Place). *On Israeli and Jewish Place*. Tel Aviv: Am Oved Publishers, pp. 22-74.
- Asing, Nili. 2005. "'Interfering Gleams" and "Blazing Grail": Figurative Language in "Midnight Convoy" By S. Yizhar'. *Criticism and Interpretation* 38: 41-45.
- Austin, John. 1832. *The Province of Jurisprudence Determined*. Ed. John Murray, London: The University of London.
<http://www.heinonline.org.chain.kent.ac.uk/HOL/Page?handle=hein.beal/poj0001&id=1&size=2&collection=beal&index=beal/poj#1> (accessed 14 August 2013).
- Avsey, Ignat. 1999. 'The Gothic in Dostoyevsky and Gogol: The English Connection'. *The*

- Gothic-Fantastic in Nineteenth-Century Russian Literature*. Ed. Neil Cornwell. Amsterdam; Atlanta: Rodopi, pp. 211-235.
- Awadalla, Maggie, and Paul March-Russell. 2013. *The Postcolonial Short Story: Contemporary Essays*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Azim, Firdous. 1993. *The Colonial Rise of the Novel*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich. 2006 (1975). *The Dialogic Imagination*. Ed. J. Michael Holquist, Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakon, Yitzhak. 1983. *The Prosody of Bialik's Poetry*. Beer-Sheva: Ben Gurion University Press.
- Baldick, Chris. 1987. In *Frankenstein's Shadow: Myth, Monstrosity, and Nineteenth Century Writing*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Band, Arnold J. 1988. 'The Beginnings of Modern Hebrew Literature: Perspectives on "Modernity"''. *AJS Review* 13.1: 1-26.
- Band, Arnold. 1968. *Nostalgia and Nightmare: a Study in the Fiction of S. Y. Agnon*. California: University of California Press Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Barnett, S. J. 2003. *The Enlightenment and Religion: The Myths of Modernity*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Bartal, Israel. 1998. 'Responses to Modernity: Haskalah, Orthodoxy, and Nationalism in Eastern Europe'. *Zionism and Religion*. Ed. Shmuel Almog, Jehuda Reinharz, and Anita Shapira. New Hampshire: University Press of New England.
- Barthes, Roland. 1972. *Mythologies*. Trans. Annette Lavers. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Barton, Carlin A. 1993. *The Sorrows of the Ancient Romans: the Gladiator and the*

Monster. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Bar-Yosef, Eitan. 2005. *The Holy Land in English Culture 1799-1917: Palestine and the Questions of Orientalism*. New York: Clarendon Oxford University Press.

Bar-Yosef, Hamutal. 1996. 'De-Romanticized Zionism in Modern Hebrew Literature'. *Modern Judaism* 16.1: 67-79.

Ben-Ari, Eyal and Yoram Bilu. 1997. *Grasping Land: Space and Place in Contemporary Israeli Discourse and Experience*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Ben-Dov, Niza. 1987. 'Dreams and Human Destiny in Ad Hena'. *Prooftexts: A Journal of Jewish Literary History* 7: 53-63.

Ben-Dov, Nitza. 1991/2. 'About a Room, a Train Garment and Meal in Agnon's To This Day: A Psychoanalytical Approach to the Novel'. *Dapim Lemechkar Besifrut* 8: 301-318.

Ben-Dov, Nitza. 2006. *Ve-Hi Tehilatekha: Studies in the works of S. Y. Agnon, A. B. Yehoshua, and Amos Oz*. Tel Aviv: Schocken.

Ben-Porat, Amir. 1991. 'Immigration, Proletarianization, and Deproletarianization: A Case Study of the Jewish Working Class in Palestine, 1882-1914'. *Theory and Society* 20.2: 233-258.

Ben Yishay, A.Z. 1960. 'Y. D. Berkowitz: The First Laureate of Hebrew Literature (Upon His Arrival at the Age of 75)'. <http://jpress.org.il/Default/Scripting/ArticleWin.asp?From=Archive&Skin=TAUHe&BaseHref=DAV/1960/10/28&EntityId=Ar00700&ViewMode=HTML> (accessed 14 August 2013).

Beresford, Matthew. 2008. *From Demons to Dracula: The Creation of the Modern Vampire Myth*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

- Berkowitz, Michael. 1996. *Zionist Culture and West European Jewry before the First World War*. Chapel Hill; London: University of North Carolina Press.
- Berkowitz, Yitzhak Dov. 1926. 'Mishael'. *Sipurim Nivcharim (Selected Stories)*. Tel Aviv: Dvir Press.
- Bhabha, Homi K. 1990. *Nation and Narration*. London: Routledge.
- Bhabha, Homi. 1990. 'Third Space: An Interview with Homi Bhabha'. *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*. Ed. J. Rutherford, London: Lawrence & Wishart, pp. 207-21.
- Bialik, H.N. 1961 (1903). 'BeIr haHarega' (In the City of Slaughter). *Complete Poetic Works of Hayyim Nahman Bialik: Poems, Songs and Hymns, Epics*. Tel Aviv: Dvir.
- Biberman, Matthew. 2004. *Masculinity, Anti-semitism and Early Modern English Literature: From the Satanic to the Effeminate Jew (Women and Gender in the Early Modern World)*. Hampshire United Kingdom: Ashgate Publishing.
- Bienstock Anolik, Ruth. 2001. 'Appropriating the Golem, Possessing the Dybbuk: Female Retellings of Jewish Tales'. *Modern Language Studies* 31.2: 39-55.
- Bix, Brian H. 2004. *A Dictionary of Legal Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bottigheimer, Ruth B. 1982. 'Tale Spinners: Submerged Voices in Grimm's Fairy Tales'. *New German Critique* 27: 141-150.
- Bottigheimer, Ruth B. 1985. 'One Fairy Story Too Many: The Brothers Grimm and Their Tales by John M. Ellis; Fairy Tales and the Art of Subversion: The Classical Genre for Children and the Process of Civilization by Jack Zipes; The Trials and Tribulations of Little Red Riding Hood: Versions of the Tale in Sociocultural Context by Jack Zipes; Die Geschichte vom Rotkäppchen: Ursprünge, Analysen, Parodien eines Märchens by Hans Ritz'. *The German Quarterly* 58.1: 144-147.

- Botting, Fred. 1991. *Making Monstrous: Frankenstein, Criticism, Theory*. New York: Manchester University Press.
- Botting, Fred. 1995. Introduction in *Frankenstein. Frankenstein: Contemporary Critical Essays*. Ed. Fred Botting. London: Macmillan Press.
- Botting, Fred. 1996. *Gothic*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Boyarin, Daniel. 1997. *Unheroic Conduct*. California: University of California press.
- Boyarin, Daniel et al. 2003. *Queer Theory and the Jewish Question*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Brazel, Hillel. 1986. *C. N. Bialik S. Y. Agnon: Research and Commentary*. Tel Aviv, Israel: Yachdav Press.
- Breuer, John. 2009. 'The Hidden Biblical Foundation in Agnon's Language'. *Jerusalem Research in Hebrew Literature* 23. Ed. Ariel Hirschfeld, Hannan Hever, and Yehoshua Levinson. Jerusalem: Magnes.
- Brindle, Kym. 2014. *Epistolary Encounters in Neo-Victorian Fiction: Diaries and Letters*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Brontë, Charlotte. 2001 (1847). *Jane Eyre*. New York: Norton & Company.
- Brooks, Peter. 1995. 'What is a Monster?' *Frankenstein: Contemporary Critical Essays*. Ed. Fred Botting. London: Macmillan Press.
- Brottman, Mikita. 2007. *The Aesthetics of Human Environments*. Ed Arnold Berleant and Allen Carlson. Peterborough, Ont: Broadview Press.
- Brown, Marshall. 2003. 'Frankenstein: A Child's Tale'. *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction* 36.2: 145-175.
- Bugg, John. 2005. "'Master of their language": Education and Exile in Mary Shelley's

Frankenstein'. *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68.4: 655-666.

Bukovec, Predrag. 2012. 'East and South-East European Jews in the 19th and 20th Centuries'. *EGO: European History Online*; published by the Leibniz Institute of European History (IEG). <http://www.ieg-ego.eu/bukovecp-2011-en> (accessed 3 April 2014).

Burke, Edmund. 1790. 'Reflections on the Revolution in France'. http://www.constitution.org/eb/rev_fran.htm (accessed 14 August 2013).

Burke, Edmund. 1998 (1757). *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burke, Peter. 2004. 'Frontiers of the Monstrous: Perceiving national Character in Early Modern Europe'. *Monstrous Bodies/Political Monstrosities in Early Modern Europe*. Ed. Laura Lunger Knoppers and Joan B. Landes. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Butler, Marilyn. 1993. 'Introduction to the 1818 Text of *Frankenstein or The Modern Prometheus*'. New York: Oxford University Press.

Carroll, Noël. 1987. 'The Nature of Horror'. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 46.1: 51-59.

Cave, Terence. 1995. 'Fictional Identities'. *Identity: Essays Based on Herbert Spencer Lectures Given in the University of Oxford*. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press.

Cheyette, Bryan. 1993. *Constructions of 'the Jew' in English Literature and Society: Racial Representations, 1875-1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, Jeffery, M. 2006. 'Abraham's Hospitality'. *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 34.3: 168-172.

Cohen, Jeffrey Jerome. 1996. *Monster Theory: Reading Culture*. Ed. Cohen, Jeffrey

Jerome. Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press.

Coke, Sir Edward. 1826. *Sendil's Case*. Trin 25 Eliz.

http://www.heinonline.org.chain.kent.ac.uk/HOL/Page?handle=hein.beal/reporcoke0004&div=10&collection=beal&set_as_cursor=6&men_tab=srchresults&terms=aman#78 (accessed 14 August 2013).

Collins, Joanna. 2005. 'The Imperial Uncanny: mis-oriented and mysterious in writings of colonial spaces'. Diss. U Kent.

Cottom, Daniel. 1980. 'Frankenstein and the Monster of Representation'. *SubStance* 9.3: 60-71.

Covino, William A. 1996. 'Grammars of Transgression: Golems, Cyborgs, and Mutants'. *Rhetoric Review* 14.2: 355-373.

Coy, Patrick G. and Lynne M. Woehrl. 2000. *Social Conflicts and Collective Identities*. Lanham, Md.; Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Craciun, Adriana. 2011. 'Writing the Disaster: Franklin and Frankenstein'. *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 65.4: 433-480.

Craft, Christopher. 1984. "'Kiss Me with those Red Lips'": Gender and Inversion in Bram Stoker's *Dracula*. *Representations* 8: 107-133.

Csapo, Eric. 2005. *Theories of Mythologies*. Malden USA; Oxford UK; Carlton Australia: Blackwell Publishing.

Cuddon, J. A. 1999. *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. London: Penguin: 1999.

Curran, Bob. 2000. 'Was Dracula an Irishman?' *History Ireland* 8.2: 12-15.

- Davison, Carol Margaret. 2004. *Anti-Semitism and British Gothic Literature*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Day, Gail. 1999. 'Allegory: Between Deconstruction and Dialectics'. *Oxford Art Journal* 22.1: 105-118.
- Daylight, Russell. 2011. *What If Derrida was Wrong about Saussure?*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Domb, Risa. 1995. *Home Thoughts from Abroad: Distant Visions of Israel in Contemporary Hebrew Fiction*. Portland, Oregon: Vallentine Mitchell.
- Domb, Risa. 2006. *Identity and Modern Israeli Literature*. Portland: Vallentine Mitchell.
- Dufoix, Stephane. 2008. *Diasporas*. Trans. William Rodamor. Berkeley: University of California Press. <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/soton/docDetail.action?docID=10229946> (accessed 24 June)
- Derrida, Jacques. 1995 (1993). *On the Name*. Ed. Thomas Dutoit. Trans. David Wood, John P. Leavey, Jr., and Ian McLeod. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Derrida, Jacque. 1995. *Points... Interviews, 1974-1994 (Meridian: Crossing Aesthetics)*. Ed. Elisabeth Weber. Trans. Peggy Kamuf et al. California: Stanford University Press.
- Derrida, Jacques and Anne Dufourmantelle. 2000 (1997). *Of Hospitality*. Trans. Rachel Bowlby. Stanford California: Stanford University Press.
- Derrida, Jacques. 2002. *Acts of Religion*. Routledge: London.
- Derrida, Jacques and David Wills. 2002. 'The Animal That Therefore I Am'. *Critical Inquiry* 28. 2: 369-418.
- Derrida, Jacques. 2009. *The Beast and the Sovereign*. Ed. Michael Lisse, Marie-Louise

- Mallet, and Ginette Michaud. Trans. Geoffrey Bennington. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Diemling, Maria and Larry Ray. 2014. 'Where Do You Draw the Line: Negotiating Kashrut and Jewish Identity in a Small British Reform Community'. *Food, Culture & Society* 17. 1: 125-142.
- Du Maurier, Daphne. 2003 (1938). *Rebecca*. London: Virago Press.
- Dunn, Richard J. 2001. 'Charlotte Bronte as Student, Governess, and Teacher'. *Jane Eyre*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Eban, Abba. 1972. *My People: The Story of the Jews*. Tel Aviv: Boostan Mod Enterprises & Bitan.
- Elbug, Ruhama. 2002. 'Buczacz in Sipur Pashut a Model of Agnon's Design of Space'. *Criticism and Interpretation: Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Culture* 35-36 - Bialik and Agnon 167-183.
- Eretz Hemdah Organisation. Be'mar'e Ha'bazaqu. <http://eretzhemdah.org/Data/UploadedFiles/FtpUserFiles/Books/shotBemarehH/5.pdf> (accessed 12 August 2014)
- Ettinger, Shmuel. 1969. *The History of the People Israel: In the New Era*. Tel Aviv: Dvir.
- Even-Shoshan, Avraham. 1960. *The Concordance for the Poetry of H. N. Bialik*. Ed. A. Even-shoshan. Kiryat-Sefer: Jerusalem.
- Ezrahi DeKoven, Sidra. 2000. *Booking Passage: Exile and Homecoming in the Modern Jewish Imagination*. Berkeley; Los Angeles; London: University of California Press.
- Ezrahi, Sidra DeKoven. 2004. 'Sentient Dogs, Liberated Rams, and Talking Asses: Agnon's Biblical Zoo or Rereading Tmol Shilshom'. *AJS* 28.1: 105-135.

- Fisch, Harold. 1970. 'The Dreaming Narrator in S. Y. Agnon'. *Novel: A Forum on Fiction* 4.1: 49-68.
- Fletcher, A. 1964. *Allegory: The Theory of a Symbolic Mode*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 2001 (1964). *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. Oxford: Routledge Classics.
- Foucault, Michel. 1984 (1967). 'Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias'. Trans. Jay Miskowiec. *Architecture /Mouvement/ Continuité*.
<http://web.mit.edu/allanmc/www/foucault1.pdf> (Acceded 29 October 2013).
- Foucault, Michel. 2002 (1969). *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge.
- Freeburg Kees, Lara. 2005. "'Sympathy" in Jane Eyre'. *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 45.4: 873-897.
- Freedman, Jonathan. 1998. 'Angels, Monsters, and Jews: Intersections of Queer and Jewish Identity in Kushner's Angels in America'. *PMLA* 113.1: 90-102.
- Freeman, Barbara Clair. 1987. 'Frankenstein with Kant: A Theory of Monstrosity or Monstrosity of Theory'. *SubStance* 16.1: 21-31.
- Freud, Sigmund. 1973 (1919). 'The Uncanny'. *Abstracts of The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Ed. Carrie Lee Rothgeb. New York: International University Press.
- Fuchs, Esther. 1983 (1982). 'Ironic Characterization in the Works of S. Y. Agnon'. *AJS* 7/8: 101-128.
- Gaer, Joseph. 1961. *The Legend of the Wandering Jew*. New York: The New American Library of World Literature.

- Gelder, Ken. 1994. *Reading the Vampire*. Routledge: London.
- Gerson, Judith M. 2001. 'In between States: National Identity Practices among German Jewish Immigrants'. *Political Psychology* 22.1: 179-198.
- Gertz, Nurith. 2000. *Myths in Israeli Culture: Captives of a Dream*. Portland Oregon: Vallentine Mitchell.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1991. *Modernity and Self-identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Giladi, Dan. 1976. 'The Baron, the Administrators and the First Settlements in the Land of Israel – Re-evaluation'. *Cathedra* 2: 59-68.
- Gilbert, Sandra M. 1977. 'Plain Jane's Progress'. *Signs* 2.4: 779-804.
- Gilbert, Sandra M., and Susan Gubar. 1979. *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Gilmore, David D. 2003. *Monsters: Evil beings, Mythical beasts, and all Manner of Imaginary Terrors*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Glinert, Lewis. 2001. 'Golem! The Making of a Modern Myth'. *Symposium: a quarterly journal in modern literatures* 55.2: 78-94.
- Gluzman Michael et al. 2005. *In the City of Slaughter – A Visit at Twilight: Bialik's Poem A Century After*. Ed. Dan Miron. Tel Aviv: Resling.
- Gluzman, Michael. 2007. *The Zionist Body: Nationalism, Gender, and sexuality in Modern Hebrew Literature*. Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad Publishing House.
- Goldin, Judah. 1976. 'Toward a Profile of the Tanna, Aqiba ben Joseph'. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 96.1: 38-56.

- Golomb Hoffman, Anne. 1991. *Between Exile and Return: S. Y. Agnon and the Drama of Writing*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Goodman, Zilla Jane. 1988. 'Words and their meaning: On Linguistic and Tonal Density in Agnon's Writing'. *Agnon: Text and Context in English Translation: A Multi-Disciplinary Curriculum, Bibliographies, and Selected Syllabi*. Ed. Leon I. Yudkin. New York: Marcus Wiener Publishing.
- Goshen Gottstein, Alon. 1994. 'The Body as Image of God in Rabbinic Literature'. *The Harvard Theological Review* 87.2: 171-195.
- Govrin, Nurit. 2001. 'The Prisoner's Plot as an Open Moral Question'. *Am Vesefer* 82.1: 98-114.
- Gray, Martin. 1992. *A Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Beirut and Harlow: Longman York Press.
- Grossman, David. 2005. *Lions' Honey: The Myth of Samson*. Tel Aviv: Canongate Books. Pen Publishing's book publishing, and Yediot Ahronot, Hemed Books.
- Grumberg, Karen. 2011. *Place and Identity in Contemporary Hebrew Literature*. New York: Syracuse University Press.
- Gurevitch, Z. D. 1988. 'The Other Side of Dialogue: On Making the Other Strange and the Experience of Otherness'. *American Journal of Sociology* 93.5: 1179-1199.
- Gurevitch, Zali. 1992. *On Israeli and Jewish Place*. Tel Aviv: Am Oved Publishers.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 2012. 'The European Nation State. Its Achievements and Its Limitations. On the Past and Future of Sovereignty and Citizenship'. In *Mapping the Nation*. Verso: New York, pp. 281-294.
- Halberstam, Judith. 1996. *Skin Shows: Gothic Horror and the Technologies of Monsters*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press.

- Halberstam, Judith. 1998. *Female Masculinity*. Durham, North Carolina; London: Duke University Press.
- Halevi-Zwick, Judith. 1989. *Agnon in Context: An Intrinsic Approach to his Work*. Tel Aviv: Papyrus Publishing House.
- Hall, Stuart. 1996. 'Cultural Identity and Diaspora'. *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory: A Reader*. Ed. Padmini Mongia. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Hall, Stuart. 1989. 'Cultural Identity and Cinematic Representation'. *Framework* 36: 222-237.
- Harbord, Janet. 1996. 'Between Identification and Desire: Rereading "Rebecca"'. *Feminist Review* 53: 95-107.
- Harel, Naama. 1993. 'A Meatless Story: of Agnon's Relationship to Meat, Vegetarianism, and Animals'. *Anonymous: Animal Rights Association* <http://anonymous.org.il/art113.html> (accessed 8 June 2014).
- Heine, Heinrich. 1854. 'Confessions'. *The Prose Writings of Heinrich Heine*. Project Gutenberg. <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/37478/37478-h/37478-h.htm> (accessed 1 April 2014)
- Hever, Hannan. 2009. 'Akhrayut wumerkhav be'Ha'sahvoy me'et S Yizhar' (Responsibility and Space in The Prisoner by S Yizhar). *Mehkarei Yerushalayim Besifrut Ivrit* 23: 273-278.
- Hever, Hannan. 2007. *The Narrative and the Nation: Critical Readings in the Canon of Hebrew Literature*. Tel-Aviv: Resling Publishing.
- Hirshfeld, Ariel. 2011. *Reading S.Y. Agnon*. Tel Aviv: Achuzat Bayit Publishing House.
- Hirshfeld, Ariel. 2011. *The Tuned Harp*. Tel Aviv: Am Oved.

- Hobsbawm, E. J. 1991. *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hogle, Jerrold E. 1980. 'Otherness in Frankenstein: The Confinement/Autonomy of Fabrication'. *Frankenstein: Contemporary Critical Essays*. Ed. Fred Botting. London: Macmillan Press.
- Horner, Avril and Sue Zlosnik. 2000. 'Daphne du Maurier and Gothic Signature: Rebecca as Vamp(ire)'. *Body Matters: Feminism, Textuality, Corporeality*. Ed. Avril Horner, Angela Keane. United Kingdom: Manchester University Press.
- Hustis, Harriet. 2003. 'Responsible Creativity and the "Modernity" of Mary Shelley's Prometheus'. *Studies in English Literature* 43.4: 845-858.
- Ingelbien, Raphael. 2003. 'Gothic Genealogies: "Dracula", "Bowen's Court", and Anglo-Irish Psychology'. *ELH* 70.4: 1089-1105.
- Jung, C. G. 1971. *Psychological Types: or The Psychology of Individuation*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Jung, C.G. 1981. *The Archetypes and The Collective Unconscious: Collected Works of C. G. Jung*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Kagan, Zipora. 1989. 'Oreah Nata Lalun: Between Code and Key'. *Dappim Lemehkar Besifrut* 5/6: 29-42.
- Kaniel, Yehoshua. 1977. 'The Terms 'Old Yishuv' and 'New Yishuv' in the Eyes of the Generation (1882-1914) and in the Eyes of History'. *Cathedra* 6: 3-19.
- Kant, Immanuel. 1781. *The Critique of Pure Reason*. Translated by J. M. D. Meiklejohn. An Electronic Classics Series Publication.
<http://www2.hn.psu.edu/faculty/jmanis/kant/Critique-Pure-Reason.pdf> (accessed 5 April 2014)

- Kellerman, Aharon. 1996. 'Settlement Myth and Settlement Activity: Interrelationships in the Zionist Land of Israel'. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, New Series* 21.2: 363-378.
- Kieval, Hillel J. 1997. 'Pursuing the Golem of Prague: Jewish Culture and the Invention of a Tradition'. *Modern Judaism* 17.1: 1-20.
- Kieval, Hillel J. 2000. *Languages of Community: The Jewish Experience in the Czech Lands*. Los Angeles; London: University of California Press.
- Kilgour, Maggie. 1995. *The Rise of the Gothic Novel*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Kimelman, Reuven. 1989 (1988). 'The Daily 'Amidah and the Rhetoric of Redemption'. *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, 79.2/3: 165-197.
- Klausner, Yosef. 1950 (1902). *Bialik Ve-Shirat Hayav (Bialik and His Life Poetry)*. Tel-Aviv: Dvir.
- Klier, John D. 1997. 'The Myth of Zion Among East European Jewry'. *Myths and Nationhood*. Ed. Geoffrey Hosking and George Schöpflin. London: Hurst, in association with the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London, pp. 170-181.
- Knapp, Bettina L. 1990. 'Yizhar's "Midnight Convoy:" Wheels, Circles, Eyes: The Dynamics of the Feminine Principle as Eros/Logos'. *Modern Language Studies* 20.3: 58-66.
- Kristeva, Julia. 1982. *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*. Trans. Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kristeva, Julia. 2000. *Crisis of the European Subject*. Translated by Susan Fairfield. New York: Other Press.
- Kurzweil, Baruch. 1962. *Essays on Shmuel Yosef Agnon's Fiction*. Tel Aviv: Shoken.

- Lacan, Jacques. 1977. 'The mirror stage as formative of the function of the *I* as revealed in psychoanalytic experience: delivered at the 16th International Congress of Psychoanalysis, Zurich, July 17, 1949'. *Ecrits*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. United Kingdom: Tavistock.
- Lacan, Jacques. 1988. *The Seminar. Book I. Freud's Papers on Technique, 1953-54*. Ed. Jacques-Alain Miller. Trans. John Forrester. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lamb, John B. 1992. 'Mary Shelley's Frankenstein and Milton's Monstrous Myth'. *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 47.3: 303-319.
- Landau, Dov. 2002. 'Author's Intention' in Agnon's Work. *Criticism and Interpretation: Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Culture* 35-36 - Bialik and Agnon: 147-167.
- Landow, George P. 1980. *Victorian Types, Victorian Shadows: Biblical Typology in Victorian Literature, Art, and Thought*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Lang, Bernhard. 2004. 'Women's Work, Household and Property in Two Mediterranean Societies: A Comparative Essay on Proverbs XXXI 10-31'. *Vetus Testamentum* 54.2: 188-207.
- Laor, Dan. 1994. 'Zionuto Shel Agnon' (The Zionism of Agnon). *Ha'Zionut* 18: 213-245.
- Leavis, Q. D. 1966. *Brontë, Charlotte, 1816-1855*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Lee, Rena. 1993. *Agnon and Vegetarianism: Studies in the Works of Shai Agnon from the Vegetarian Standpoint*. Tel Aviv: Reshafim.
- Lefkowitz, Daniel. 2001. 'Negotiated and Mediated Meanings: Ethnicity and Politics in Israeli Newspapers'. *Anthropological Quarterly* 74.4: 179-189.

- Lefebvre, Henri. 2011 (1962). *Introduction to Modernity*. Trans. John Moore. London; New York: Verso.
- Levinas, Emanuel. 1999. *Alterity and Transcendence*. Trans. Michael B. Smith. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Levinas, Emanuel. 1990. *Nine Talmudic Readings*. Trans. Annette Aronowicz. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Levine, George. 1973. 'Frankenstein and the Tradition of Realism'. *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction* 7.1: 14-30.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1966. *The Savage Mind*. Ed. Julian Pit-Rivers and Ernest Glenner. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1978. *Myth and Meaning*. London: Routledge & K. Paul.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1981. *Mythologiques, Vol 4. (An Introduction to the Science of Mythology, Vol 4: The Naked Man)*. New York: University Of Chicago Press.
- Light, Alison. 1984. 'Returning to Manderley': Romance fiction, Female Sexuality, and Class'. *Feminist Review* 16: 7-25.
- Lindsay, A. D. 1923/1924. 'Sovereignty'. *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 24: 235-254.
- Linn, Johnnie B. III and Rezneat M. Darnell. 1978. 'A Reaffirmation of Independence'. *BioScience* 28.1: 4-5.
- Löw, Yehuda (Maharal). 1579. *Tiferet Yisrael (The Glory of Israel)*. Prague.
- Löw, Yehuda (Maharal). 1579. *Be'er Ha-Gola (The Well of Exile)*. Prague.
- Löw, Yehuda (Maharal). 1579. *Netzah Ysrael (The Eternity of Israel)*. Prague.
- Löw, Yehuda (Maharal). 1579. *Gevurot Ha-Shem (The Might of the Lord)*. Prague.

- M. H. Abrams and Geoffrey Galt Harpham. 2005. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Boston, Massachusetts; London: Thomson, Wadsworth.
- Maier, Emanuel. 1975. 'Torah as Movable Territory'. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 65.1: 18-23.
- Malchow, H. L. 1993. 'Frankenstein's Monster and Images of Race in Nineteenth-Century Britain'. *Past & Present* 139: 90-130.
- Malchow, Howard L. 1996. *Gothic Images of Race in Nineteenth-Century Britain*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Mann, Barbara E. 2006. *A place in History: Modernism, Tel Aviv, and the Creation of Jewish Urban Space*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Marcus, Sharon. 1995. 'The Profession of the Author: Abstraction, Advertising, and Jane Eyre'. *PMLA* 110.2: 206-219.
- Markman, Roberta Hoffman. 1983. 'The Fairy Tale: An Introduction to Literature and the Creative Process'. *College English* 45.1: 31-45.
- Martin, Robert B. 1966. *Charlotte Brontë's Novels: The Accents of Persuasion*. New York: Norton.
- McLane, Maureen N. 2000. *Romanticism and the Human Sciences: Poetry, Population, and the Discourse of the Species*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McIntosh, Donald. 1995. *Self, Person, World: The Interplay of Conscious and Unconscious in Human Life*. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.
- Mehta, Aalok. 2011. 'Language and the Brain: What Makes Us Human'.
<http://www.brainfacts.org/sensing-thinking-behaving/language/articles/2011/language-and-the-brain-what-makes-us-human/>
 (accessed 9 August 2014)

- Mehtonen, P.M. and Matti Savolainen. 2013. *Gothic Topographies: Language, Nation Building and 'Race'*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing.
- Mellor K. Anne. 2003. 'Making a Monster: an introduction to Frankenstein'. *Cambridge Companion to Mary Shelley*. Ed. Esther Schor. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Millhauser, Milton. 1946. 'The Noble Savage in Mary Shelley's Frankenstein'. *Notes and Queries* 190.12: 248-250.
- Mintz, Alan. 1982. 'The Russian Pogroms in Hebrew Literature and the Subversion of the Martyrological'. *AJS Review* 7.8: 263-300.
- Miron, Dan. 1984. 'Modern Hebrew Literature: Zionist Perspectives and Israeli Realities'. *Prooftexts* 4.1: 49-69.
- Miron, Dan. 1996. *Histaklut Berav Necher*. Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad.
- Miron, Dan. 2000. *The Image of the Shtetl and Other Studies of Modern Jewish Literary Imagination*. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press.
- Moore Cross, Frank Jr. 1964. 'The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judaeen Desert'. *The Harvard Theological Review* 57.4: 281-299.
- Moretti, Franco. 1988 (1983). *Signs Taken For Wonders: Essays on the Sociology of Literary Forms*. London: Verso.
- Moretti, Franco. 1999. *Atlas of the European Novel, 1800-1900*. London; New York: Verso.
- Mufti, Aamir. 2007. *Enlightenment in the Colony: the Jewish Question and the Crisis of Postcolonial Culture*. Princeton New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

- Nave, Arye. 1997. 'Tehila – Ha'moredet Hakdosha' (Tehila – The Holy Rebel)'. *Bamikhla* 9: 33-7.
- Norrie, Alan W. 2010. *Dialectic and Difference: Dialectical Critical Realism and the Grounds of Justice*. London: Routledge.
- Oates, Joyce Carol. 1984. 'Frankenstein's Fallen Angel'. *Critical Inquiry* 10.3: 543-554.
- O' Flinn, Paul. 1995. 'Production and Reproduction'. *Frankenstein. Frankenstein: Contemporary Critical Essays*. Ed. Fred Botting. London: Macmillan Press.
- Ohana, David. 2010. *Political Theologies in the Holy Land: Israeli Messianism and Its Critics*. New York: Routledge.
- Ohana, David. 2012. *Modernism and Zionism*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Olorenshaw, Robert. 1994. 'Narrating the Monster: From Marry Shelley to Bram Stoker'. *Frankenstein: Creation and Monstrosity*. Ed. Stephen Bann. United Kingdom: Reaktion Books.
- Omer-Sherman, Ranen. 2006. *Israel in Exile: Jewish Writing and the Desert*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Overing, Joanna. 1997. 'The Role of Myth: An Anthropological Perspective'. *Myths and Nationhood*. London: Hurst, in association with the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London, pp. 1-19.
- Oxford English Dictionary. Online Second Edition 1989.
- Özkirimli, Umut. 2000. *Theories of Nationalism: A Critical Introduction*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, London.
- Page, W. Judith. 2004. *Imperfect Sympathies: Jew and Judaism in British Romantic Literature and Culture*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Paris, Bernard J. 1997. *Imagined Human Beings: A Psychological Approach to Character and Conflict in Literature*. New York: New York University press.
- Patai, Raphael. 1964. 'Lilith'. *The Journal of American Folklore* 77.306: 295-314.
- Paulson, Ronald. 1981. 'Gothic Fiction and the French Revolution'. *ELH* 48.3: 532-554.
- Paxson, James J. and Jeanne P. Brownlow. 1993. 'Excavating Epochal Allegory'. *PMLA* 108.5: 1175-1176.
- Peleg, Yaron. 2003. 'The Critic as a Dialectical Zionist'. *Prooftexts* 23.3: 382-396.
- Peles, Yedidia. 1975. 'Iyunim Be'Haadonit Ve'Harokhel Le'Agnon'. *Aley Siakh* 2: 13-27.
- Pelli, Moshe. 2012. *Haskalah and Beyond: The Reception of the Hebrew Enlightenment and the Emergence of Haskalah Judaism*. Plymouth UK: University Press of America.
- Peterson, M. Jeanne. 1984. 'No Angels in the House: The Victorian Myth and the Paget Women'. *The American Historical Review* 89.3: 677-708.
- Phillips, Adam. 1998. Introduction to *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*. *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Polidori, John William. 1819. *The vampyre; A Tale*. London: Sherwood, Neely, and Jones.
- Punter, David. 1996. *The Literature of Terror: A History of Gothic Fictions from 1765 to the Present Day, Vol. 1: The Gothic Tradition*. Routledge: London.
- Rader, Richard. 2009. "'And Whatever It Is, It Is You": The Autochthonous Self in Aeschylus's Seven Against Thebes'. *Arethusa* 42.1: 1-44.
- Rabinovitch, Simon. 2012. *Jews and Diaspora Nationalism: Writings on Jewish Peoplehood in Europe and the United States*. New England: Brandeis.

- Regelson, Abraham. Y. D. Berkowitz: The Short Story Master. http://benyehuda.org/regelson/berkowicz_short_story.html (accessed 14 August 2013).
- Renan, Ernest. 1990 (1882). 'Qu'est-ce qu'une nation?' (What is a Nation?). *Nation and Narration*. London: Routledge, pp. 8-23.
- Rescher, Nicholas. 1977. *Dialectics: A Controversy-Oriented Approach to the Theory of Knowledge*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Rich, Adrienne. 2001 (1979). 'Jane Eyre: The Temptations of a Motherless Woman'. *Jane Eyre*. Ed. Richard J. Dunn. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Richardson, Sarah. 2008. 'Politics and Gender'. *A Companion to Nineteenth-Century Britain*. Ed. Chris Williams. Blackwell Publishing: Oxford.
- Riquelme, John Paul. 2008. *Gothic and Modernism: Essaying Dark Literary Modernity*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Rose, Jacqueline. 2011. 'Rereading: Khirbet Khizeh by S Yizhar'. *The Guardian*, 12 March. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/books/2011/mar/12/rereading-jacqueline-rose-khirbet-khizeh> (accessed 14 August 2013).
- Rosen, Baruch. 2007. 'Things that S. Yizhar Borrowed from Moshe Smilansky: From Where did Yizhar Inherit his story "The Manure Heap"'. *Haaretz* <http://www.haaretz.co.il/literature/1.1445604> (accessed 16 August 2013).
- Rosenberg, Yudl. 2007 (1909). *The Golem and the Wondrous Deeds of the Maharal of Prague*. Trans. And Ed. Curt Levinat. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Roy, Parama. 1989. 'Unaccommodated Woman and the Poetics of Property in *Jane Eyre*'. *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 29.4: 713-727.

- Rubin, Adam. 2005. 'Hebrew Folklore and the Problem of Exile'. *Modern Judaism* 25.1: 62-83.
- Ruffell, Ian. 2012. *Aeschylus: Prometheus Bound*. Bristol Classical Press: Great Brittan.
- Ruskin, John. 1912 (1853). 'The Nature of Gothic.' *The Stones of Venice*. Second Edition. London: George Allen & Sons.
- Sadan, Dov. 1978. *Al Shay Agnon*. Tel Aviv: Hakibutz Hameuchad.
- Said, W. Edward. 2003. *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Books.
- Salisbury, Jay D. 2001. 'Gothic and Romantic Wandering: The Epistemology of Oscillation'. *Gothic Studies* 3.1: 45-59.
- Schefer, Jean-Louis. 1994. 'The Bread and the Blood'. *Frankenstein: Creation and Monstrosity*. Ed. Stephen Bann. United Kingdom: Reaktion Books.
- Schlenker, Barry R. 1985. *The Self and Social Life*. New York; London: McGraw-Hill.
- Schmidt, James. 1996. *What is Enlightenment: Eighteenth-century Answers and Twentieth-century Questions*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press.
- Schöpflin, George. 1997. 'The Functions of Myth and a Taxonomy of Myths.' *Myths and Nationhood*. London: Hurst, in association with the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London, pp. 19-36.
- Schöpflin, George, and Geoffrey A. Hosking. 1997. *Myths and Nationhood*. London: Hurst, in association with the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London.
- Schoene-Harwood, Berthold. 2000. *Mary Shelly Frankenstein: A Reader's Guide to Essential Criticism*. London: Icon Books.

- Schwartz, Yigal. 2007. *Do You Know the Land Where the Lemon Blooms*. Tel Aviv: Zmora-Bitan.
- Schwartz, Yigal. 2014. *The Zionist Paradox: Hebrew Literature and Israeli Identity*. Waltham, Massachusetts: Brandeis University Press.
- Scott, Walter. 1928 (1910). *Lives of the Novelists*. London: J.M. Dent.
- Segev, Tom. 1999. *One Palestine, Complete: Jews and Arabs Under the British Mandate*. Trans. Haim Watzman. New York: First Owl Books.
- Setter, Shaul. 2012. 'The Time That Returns: Speculative Temporality in S. Yizhar's 1948'. *Jewish Social Studies* 18.3: 38-54.
- Shaked, Gershon. 1989. *Shmuel Yosef Agnon: A Revolutionary Traditionalist*. New York: New York University Press.
- Shaked, Gershon. 1989. *Agnon - A Writer With a Thousand Faces*. Israel: Hakibbutz Hameuchad.
- Shaked, Gershon. 2006. 'Shavui Be' *Khirbet Khizeh*' (A Prisoner in *Khirbet Khizeh*). *Eretz Akheret* 35: 12-3.
- Shalev, Mordechai. 1972. 'Embrace and Sadism in *Khirbet Khizeh*'. *S. Yizhar A Selection of Critical Essays on his Writing*. Tel Aviv, Israel: Am Oved Publishers.
- Shalom Peretz, Yoel. 'Earthly Jerusalem and the heavenly Jerusalem, and in-between'. Teachers' Enrichment – Literature. The Division of Planning and Development of Educational Programs: The Ministry of Education, The State of Israel. http://www.education.gov.il/tochniyot_limudim/sifrut/asi14006.htm (accessed 14 August 2013).
- Shamir, Ziva. 2013. *Zephyrs: Bialik Against Herzl and His Followers ('The Young Hebrews')*. Israel: Safra Publishing House & Hakibbutz Hameuchad.

- Shanes, Joshua. 2014. *Diaspora Nationalism and Jewish Identity in Habsburg Galicia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shapira, Anita. 2002. 'Khirbet Khizah – Between Remembrance and Forgetting'. *Mekhrim Be'sifrut Ivrit* 5.1: 45-97
- Shapiro, Arnold. 1968. 'In Defense of Jane Eyre'. *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 8.4: 681-698.
- Sharan, Shlomo. 2001. 'Zionism, the Post-Zionists and Myth: A Critique'. *ACPR Policy Paper No. 134*. <http://www.acpr.org.il/pp/pp134-sharan-E.pdf> (accessed 14 August 2013).
- Shaviv, Yehuda. 2011. 'Agadat hagolem shnikrekha bidmuto shel hamaharal. (The Legend of the Golem that has been Entangled in the Image of the Maharal)'. *Yeda Am: Bama Lefolclor Yehudi* 71.2: 95-9.
- Shepkaru, Shmuel. 1999. 'From after Death to Afterlife: Martyrdom and Its Recompense'. *AJS Review* 24.1: 1-44.
- Shilo, Elchanan. 2011. *The Kabbalah in the Workd of S. Y. Agnon*. Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press.
- Shklovsky, Viktor. 1990 (1929). *Theory of Prose*. Trans. Benjamin Sher. Dalkey Archive Prose: Elmwood Illinois, USA.
- Shoham, Uri. 1974. 'Ha'arava Haptukha, Hapardes hasagur Vehakfar Haaravi. (The Open Prairie, the Closed Orchard, and the Arab Village). *Siman Kria* 3-4: 336-46.
- Shoham-Steiner, Ephraim. 2008. *Involuntary Marginals: Marginal Individuals in Medieval Northern European Jewish Society*. Jerusalem: The Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History.
- Shohat, Ella. 1996. 'Notes on the Post-Colonial'. *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory: A*

- Reader*. Ed. Padmini Mongia. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Smith, Anthony. 1995. 'The formation of National Identity'. *Identity: Essays Based on Herbert Spencer Lectures Given in the University of Oxford*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, Anthony D. 1995. *Nations and Nationalism in a Global Era*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Smith, Anthony D. 1999. *Myths and Memories of the Nation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, Andrew and Hughes, William. 2003. *Empire and the Gothic: The Politics of Genre*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Soja, Edward W. 1996. *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-imagined Places*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Spencer, Kathleen L. 1992. 'Purity and Danger: Dracula, the Urban Gothic, and the Late Victorian Degeneracy Crisis'. *ELH* 59.1: 197-225.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1988. 'Can the Subaltern Speak?' *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Ed. Cary Nelson, Lawrence Grossberg. Champaign, Illinois: University of Illinois Press.
- Spivak, Gyatari Chakravotry. 1985. 'Three Woman's Texts and a Critique of Imperialism'. *Critical Inquiry* 12.1: 243-261.
- Staliunas, Darius. 2007. *Making Russians: Meaning and Practice of Russification in Lithuania and Belarus after 1863*. Amsterdam; New York: Rodopi.
- Sternlieb, Lisa. 1999. 'Jane Eyre: "Hazarding Confidences"'. *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 53.4: 452-479.

- Stevenson, John Allen. 1988. 'A Vampire in the Mirror: The Sexuality of Dracula'. *PMLA* 103.2: 139-149.
- Stewart, Bruce. 1999. 'Bram Stoker's Dracula: Possessed by the Spirit of the Nation?' *Irish University Review* 29.2: 238-255.
- Stoker, Bram. 1994 (1898). *Dracula*. London: Penguin.
- Sullivan, Paula. 1978. 'Fairy Tale Elements in Jane Eyre'. *The Journal of Popular Culture* 12.1: 61-74.
- Tajfel, Henri. 1970. 'Experiments in Intergroup Discrimination'. *Scientific American* 223: 96-102.
- Tajfel, Henri. 1974. 'Social Identity and Intergroup Behaviour'. *Social Science Information* 13: 65-93.
- The Jewish Virtual Library. 'Judaism: Are Jews a Nation or a Religion?'. <http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/Judaism/jewnation.html> (accessed 24 January 2015).
- Thomas, Kate. 2012. *Postal Pleasures: Sex, Scandal, and Victorian Letters*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tsemach, Adi. 1968. 'On the Philosophy of History in Two of Agnon's Late Stories: "Edo and Enam" and "Forevermore"'. *Hasifrut* 1-2: 378-85.
- Tuan, Yi-Fu. 1977(2001). *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*. Minneapolis: University Of Minnesota Press.
- Tzami, Hamutal. 2009. 'Lilith, Eve, and the Libidinal Economy of Bialik and his Generation'. *Mehkareim Yerushalayim Besifrut Ivrit* 23: 165-214.
- Tzami, Hamutal. 2005. *In the Name of the Land: Nationalism, Subjectivity, and gender in*

- the Israeli Poetry of the Statehood Generation*. Jerusalem: Keter Books; and Beer Sheva: Ben-Gurion University Press.
- Urbach, Ephraim Elimelech. 1978. 'Perakim Shel "Sefer ha'Medina" wu'Mekomam betokh "Samukh Ve'nireh"' (Chapters of "The Naiton's Book" and their Place in "Samukh ve'Nieh"). *Shay Agnon: Mekhkarim ve'Teudot*. Ed. Gershon Sgaked and Rafael Wisser. Tel Aviv: Mosad Bialik, pp 195-226.
- Ungerfeld, Moshe. 1967. 'Between Bialik and Berkowitz'. *Maznayim* 25.1: 15-20.
- Valente, Joseph. 2000. 'Double Born: Bram Stoker and the Metrocolonial Gothic'. *Modern Fiction Studies* 46.3: 632-45.
- Veracini, Lorenzo. 2013. 'The Other Shift: Settler Colonialism, Israel, and the Occupation'. *Journal of Palestine Studies* 42.2: 26-42.
- Warren, Louis S. 2002. 'Buffalo Bill Meets Dracula: William F. Cody, Bram Stoker, and the Frontiers of Racial Decay'. *The American Historical Review* 107.4: 1124-1157.
- Werses, Samuel. 1971. *Sipur VeShorsho (Story and its Source)*. Ramat Gan: Masada.
- Werses, Samuel. 1994. *Relations between Jews and Poles in S.Y. Agnon's work*. Israel: Magnes Press.
- Werses, Shmuel. 2000. *S. Y. Agnon Literally: Studies of his Writing*. Israel: Bialik Institute.
- White, Dennis L. 1971. 'The Poetics of Horror: More than Meets the Eye'. *Cinema Journal* 10.2: 1-18.
- Wicke, Jennifer. 1992. Vampiric Typewriting: Dracula and Its Media. *ELH* 59.2: 467-493.
- Wilson, Rawdon. 1995. 'The Metamorphoses of Fictional Space: Magical Realism'. *Magical Realism: Theory, History, Community*. Ed. Lois Parkinson Zamora, Wendy B. Faris. Durham, N.C.; London: Duke University Press, pp. 209-233.

- Wilt, Judith. 1995. 'Recent Studies in the Nineteenth Century'. *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 35.4: 807-862.
- Winslade J. Lawton. 2000. 'Techno-Kabbalah: The Performative Language of Magick and the Production of Occult'. *TDR* 44.2: 84-100.
- Williams, Bernard. 1995. 'Identity and Identities'. *Identity: Essays Based on Herbert Spencer Lectures Given in the University of Oxford*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wisniewski, David. 1996. *Golem*. New York: Clarion Books.
- Wittkower, Rudolf. 1977. *Allegory and the Migration of Symbols*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Wright, Angela. 2007. *Gothic Fiction: A Reader's Guide to Essential Criticism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wollstonecraft Shelley, Mary. 1994 (1818). *Frankenstein: Or, the Modern Prometheus*. Berkshire: Penguin Popular Classics.
- Yizhar, S. 1966 (1949). *Khirbet Khizeh. Arbaa Sipurim*. Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad.
- Yizhar, S. 2008 (1949). *Khirbet Khizeh*. Trans. Nicholas de Lange. Jerusalem: Ibis Editions and Zmora Bitan Publishers.
- Yizhar, S. 1966 (1949). 'The Prisoner'. *Modern Hebrew Literature*. Trans. Robert Alter.
- Yizhar, S. 1983. Kerem Navot and the Problem of Judea and Shomron. *Iton 77*: 47-8.
- Yoder, Christine Roy. 2003. 'The Woman of Substance (אשת־היל): A Socioeconomic Reading of Proverbs 31:10-31'. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 122.3: 427-447.
- Young, Robert. 1994. *Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture, and Race*. London: Routledge.
- Yu, Eric Kwan-Wai. 2006. 'Productive Fear: Labor, Sexuality, and Mimicry in Bram

Stoker's *Dracula*'. *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 48.2: 145-170.

Zakovitch, Yair. 1982. *The Life of Samson (Judges 13–16): A Critical-Literary Analysis*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press.

Zerubavel, Yael. 1995. *Recovered Roots: Collective Memory and the Making of Israeli National Tradition*. Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press.

Ziarek, Krzysztof. 1994. *Inflected Language: Toward a Hermeneutics of Nearness; Heidegger, Levinas, Stevens, Celan*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Zlosnik, Sue. 2004. 'Home is the sailor, home from sea': Robert Louis Stevenson and the End of Wandering'. *The Yearbook of English Studies* 34: 240-252.