

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOGING-IN-PUBLICATION DATA

Hebrew, gender, and modernity : critical responses to Dvora Baron's fiction /
edited by Sheila Jelen and Shachar Pinsker.

p. cm. -- (Studies and texts in Jewish history and culture ; 14)

Includes English translations of three short stories by Devorah Baron.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 928-1-883053-95-1

1. Baron, Devorah, 1887-1956--Criticism and interpretation. I. Jelen, Sheila
E. II. Pinsker, Shachar. III. Baron, Devorah, 1887-1956. Selections. Hebrew.
2007.

PJ5053.B34Z68 2007

892.4'35--dc22

2006052272

STUDIES AND TEXTS
IN
JEWISH HISTORY AND CULTURE

The Joseph and Rebecca Meyerhoff Center
for Jewish Studies
University of Maryland



XIV

General Editor: Bernard D. Cooperman

Cover design by Catherine Lo.

The sketch of Dvora Baron on the cover is with the kind permission of the
Gnazim Archive in Ramat Aviv, Israel.

ISBN 928-1-883053-95-1

Copyright 2007. All rights reserved. This book may not be reproduced, in
whole or in part, in any form (beyond that copying permitted in Sections 107
and 108 of the U.S. Copyright Law and except by reviewers for the public
press), without written permission from the publisher, University Press of
Maryland, P.O. Box 34454, Bethesda, MD, 20827.

UNIVERSITY PRESS OF MARYLAND



**ALL WRITERS ARE JEWS,
ALL JEWS ARE MEN**
DVORA BARON AND
THE LITERATURE OF "THE UPROOTED"

Sheila E. Jelen

i.

Simon Halkin was the first critic to assign a unifying Hebrew name, "*talush*," translated literally as "uprooted," to the socially estranged, sexually frustrated, and self-deprecating protagonists of the prose fiction of the Modern Hebrew Renaissance.¹ He called Hebrew Renaissance literature "*sifrut ha-tehiyah vaha-temiyhah*," the literature of revival and perplexity, as a means of acknowledging this ever-present uprooted figure at its center.² More than just an alienated young protagonist conceived in keeping with the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century literary movement toward introversion, the *talush* is an alienated young male Jewish protagonist either in Europe or in Palestine at the turn of the twentieth century. Typically, the *talush* traverses various worlds, successfully settling in none. A would-be writer who often laments, paradoxically in writing, his inability to write, the *talush* is a scholar of traditional Jewish texts who has exchanged his Jewish religious library for a secular one—losing his taste for all scholarship in the process. He is a lonely mama's boy in search of female companionship, yet he always desires the woman he cannot have and ruins the life of the woman he can have but does not desire. The *talush* is often an "extern," a student-at-large, attempting (largely unsuccessfully because of Jewish quotas) to matriculate at a university. Alternately, he is a pioneer who realizes that he is not suited for physical labor or the life of the soil after he has immigrated to Palestine to join an agricultural collective.³ Distinguished by an inability to return to the traditional Jewish world he left behind and to fit into the secular European world he seeks to break into, the *talush* is literally uprooted from any collective identification. I would argue that Modern Hebrew Renaissance authors, in their fashioning of the *talush*, were attempting to reclaim from European culture the notion of "Jew" as an emblem of ambivalence and ambiguity.

Zygmunt Bauman provides an excellent introduction to the place of the "Jew" in modern European discourse in his argument that with the advent of modernity in Europe,

In the mobile world, the Jews were the most mobile of all; in the world of boundary-breaking, they broke most boundaries; in the world of melting solids they made everything, including themselves, into a formless plasma in which any form could be born, only to dissolve again. As the eponymous ghetto dwellers, the Jews were walking reminders of the still fresh and vivid memories of a stable, transparent caste society; among the first to be released from special laws and statutes, they were walking alarms alerting society to the arrival of the strange new world of the free for all.⁴

Jews, in other words, were not just a representation of otherness, but were ambivalence and incongruity incarnate.

Daniel and Jonathan Boyarin trace this attitude toward the Jew back to Paul's doctrine of allegorical as opposed to literal genealogies. They explain that in his statement, "there is neither Greek nor Jew," Paul initiated a rhetoric of sameness that "deprived difference of the right to be different."⁵ Herein, according to them, lies the locus of Christianity's break from Judaism. The Jew was construed as particularly irrelevant in light of the push toward universalism and then threatening to that universalism as a metonymy for difference. The Jew came to be rendered in the abstract as a notional or mythical construct.⁶

Modernist and post-modernist thinkers and writers have picked up on what is, to Boyarin and Boyarin's mind, a millennial strain in thinking about Jewish difference within Christian culture. In Bauman's reading, Jewish difference is a product of the dawn of modernity in Europe. Max Silverman has summed up various positions in his overview of post-modern French philosophers' appropriation of the Jew:

According to Jean Luc Nancy the Jew is the allegorical marker of the interruption of myth and community; or, as Lyotard says more recently, the Jew is the challenge to the blind narcissism of the community, even the Jewish community. Ultimately these Jews are the marker of the unnameable, a reminder of what is forgotten or what is lacking in all representation, what cannot be spoken or named, since all representation is a form of forgetting.⁷

Silverman concludes by asking: "Are there alternative paths available in our postmodern landscape which neither allegorize nor essentialize the Jew?"⁸ Gillian Rose has called the post-modern attitude toward the Jew "the tyranny of the allegorizing of the Jew" and has described

a need to transform the trope of the Jew or the signifier Jew from a site for figures to a site for negotiation beyond the dichotomies of sameness and difference, universalism and particularism, reason and anti-reason, essentialism and relativism. It would imply defetishizing the Jew, conceiving of the Jew neither simply as an open-ended signifier nor as an unproblematic signified, but as a real hybrid between the two.⁹

The concern expressed by Gillian Rose, Max Silverman, and Jonathan and Daniel Boyarin about the universalization of Jews out of existence by creating a category of "the Jew" leads us to another aspect of the discourse of the Jew, particularly in *fin-de-siècle* Vienna, wherein Jewish ideals of masculinity corresponded with Western ideals of femininity.¹⁰

Ritchie Robertson has explained this concept of the feminized Jewish man with a detailed account of the different Jewish and non-Jewish writers and thinkers from the *fin de siècle* who contributed to the discourse of the "Jew" as feminized. In his 1869 book, *The Jewish Tribe*, Rabbi Adolf Jellinek, a distinguished Viennese rabbi, declared that Jews' imitative abilities, which, according to him, they share with women, guarantee that they will manage to adopt Western culture. Women and Jews, he argued, share a "quick and lively intellect, but are unsystematic, incoherent and digressive, receptive rather than original, and hence good at imitating others."¹¹ Otto Weininger, the Jewish author of the notorious book *Sex and Character* (1903), wove a vituperative pastiche of misogynist and anti-Semitic statements about the stupidity and insensitivity of women in general, and about the feminine nature of Jewish men in particular. Maximilian Harden, a Viennese Jewish journalist, claimed that, "just as Jews, though nominally in an inferior position, dominate the gentile world and take revenge for their mistreatment, so women can use marriage to dominate men and thus compensate for their nominal subjection."¹² Psychoanalyst Otto Rank argued in his "The Essence of Judaism" (1905) that "Jews are, so to speak, women among the nations and must join themselves to the masculine life source if they are to be productive."¹³

If Jewish men were feminized in order to rationalize the sense that Jews inverted all normative categories of identity, than how were women viewed within the Jewish community? To what extent would the voice of a woman, or even a discussion about real women in the context of the Jews as "feminized," upset the delicate balance of the abstract Jew as a virtual woman? Daniel Boyarin, a vocal proponent of the notion of the Jewish man as symbolically female in modern Europe, furnishes a fascinating example of how modern cultural criticism, in explicating the reduction of the real Jew to symbols and projections, continues to overlook those who are even further abstracted and essentialized.

In *Heidegger and "the jews,"* Lyotard says, "what is most real about real jews is that Europe, in any case, does not know what to do with them: Christians demand their conversion, monarchs expel them; republics assimilate them; Nazis exterminate them."¹⁴ Boyarin and Boyarin respond in the following way:

Let us pause at the first here and test a paraphrase. How would it work if a man or a woman said, 'What is most real about real women is that men continually try to dominate them'? The condescension of Lyotard's statement immediately becomes evident.¹⁵

Boyarin and Boyarin are correct in suggesting that the patent absurdity of the latter statement furnishes a wonderful illustration of the patent absurdity of the former statement. Still, they themselves fall into the trap of designating some other "other" as an illustrative metonymy for the "others" under discussion. In the case of the modernist writer, the Jew is a stand-in for the poet-in-exile, and in the case of post-modern thinkers, the Jew is a stand-in for the "site on which unruly desire and ambivalence can, supposedly, be transformed into a coherent and univocal discourse." In this case, however, just as in the *fin-de-siècle* discourse on the Jew, women become a stand-in for "the Jew."¹⁶ Two questions arise out of this assumption. First, where are "real" women—non-metonymic, non-symbolic, non-allegorized—in all this? More important to this discussion, where are Jewish women in all this?

The writers of the Modern Hebrew Renaissance who crafted the *talush* and the critics of that literature who embraced him as an exemplum of a historical and cultural generation were perhaps responding to the figure of the Jew within European culture by figuring their own intrinsic variation on "the Jew." The *talush* was the Jews' "Jew." But as such, the female equivalent of the *talush*, a *tlushah*—even an acknowledgment of the female signifier buried deep beneath the monolithic maleness of the network of discourses on perceptions of the "Jew" in European culture—was completely absent. For example, Brenner, in his 1909 essay "Musings of an Author," presents his notion of the "*Dmut Diyokno shel ha-Tzair ha-Boded*" [portrait of the young lonely man] in modern Hebrew literature. He opens this essay in defense of the narrative quality of his work because his modernist aesthetic of interiority and fragmentation was called into question by many of his contemporary writers and critics. "If our mirror is not illuminating," he counters, "if it is broken, shattered, miniature, what can we do? We must look at our face even in miniature."¹⁷ The imperative of looking at "our face" in the mirror of the *talush* texts reflects his approach to the *talush* as a generationally representative figure that must yet be stylized in the most idiosyncratic, individualized way possible. The "young lonely men" that Brenner identifies in his own work and in the work of others surround themselves with female figures; they even idealize or demonize women as part of the standard characterization of the male *talush* as sexually frustrated and erotically stunted. But stylistic figuration of a female *tlushah* through interiority and psychological realism is virtually never attempted. This can be attributed to the nationalist, literary, and autobiographical dimensions consistently granted to the *talush* both by his creators and by his critics.

ii.

The *talush*-centered writings of the Modern Hebrew Renaissance tell the stories of young men going through the cultural shifts and emotional disruptions that were documented about a century earlier in the autobiographies of their predecessors, the writers of the Haskalah, the Jewish Enlightenment. This generation—born, as it were, on the deathbed of the Haskalah in the 1880s—belatedly underwent its own "apostasy" and its own escape from the *yeshiva* and the *shtetl*.¹⁸ Like their Haskalah predecessors, Modern Hebrew writers were discovering a secular Jewish literature within the context of their traditional upbringings and educations. They were clandestinely reading and writing Modern Hebrew in the garb of pious Jews, living at home with their pious families, and finally breaking violently, traumatically, and often unsuccessfully into the secular world of universities, publishing houses, and romantic love.

To what extent then does the literature of *tlushut* or uprootedness—endemic to Dvora Baron's generation of writers—exemplify the continuation of a traditional line of male scholarship and gender exclusivity? In other words, how are we to understand Hebrew Renaissance writers' sense that they were enacting a radical break—stylistically, psychologically, linguistically—from the Hebrew Haskalah literature that came before them? Furthermore, how did the sense of self-made literary acumen, of a departure from the traditional norms that had dominated Jewish literary expression for millennia, really assert itself when held under the magnifying glass of a Modern Hebrew *woman* writer?

Dan Miron, in his investigation of the group of women poets who distinguished themselves in Hebrew in Palestine in the 1920s points to the requisite poetics of modern Hebrew Renaissance poetry.¹⁹ A rich allusive network demonstrating engagement with traditional rabbinic texts and the revision of classical biblical tropes was a necessary criterion for inclusion in the canon. The women writers (as well as various men) who produced a minimalist poetry not redolent of the kind of maximalist intertextual self-consciousness typical of those poets who become secular writers in a *yeshiva* atmosphere were considered "scribblers" who could never quite make their voices heard among the giants of their generation, such as Hayyim Nachman Bialik or Saul Tzchernikhovsky.²⁰ It is clear that although the modern Hebrew poets viewed themselves as trailblazers for an entirely new poetic, an entirely new literary culture for modern Jews, they were, in effect, simply continuing an ancient scholarly tradition that had excluded women or other intellectual "undesirables" from the house of study and thus the ranks of legal and social power. Modern Hebrew literature, by this account, was simply a continuation of traditional Hebrew literature in that it was reserved for and transmitted by the privileged few.

In her work, Dvora Baron reacts to the *talush's* exclusive masculinity within a Jewish context, his femininity within a European cultural context, and his generational exemplarity within the context of the Modern Hebrew Renaissance. Baron's treatment of the *talush* brings into further relief the pragmatic ramifications of the modern Hebrew literary establishment's being not much more than the sum of its traditionalist parts. Engagement in secular studies and abdication of religious practice, although considered the most rebellious and taboo of activities on the part of a Jewish male, were not enough to break the *talush* from his past psychologically.

In her Sender Ziv trilogy (1910–1919), Baron thematizes the situation of her protagonist, Sender Ziv, *vis-à-vis* the textual cultures between which he hovers. In one particularly poignant instance, he sits in the house of his widowed landlady, hunched over a book, swaying back and forth like a Talmud student to heighten his concentration, while the children in the house cry from hunger and cold. Ziv is figured here as a surrogate father to this fatherless family. But he can do no better than the stereotypical Jewish scholar, preoccupied with texts to the point of oblivion as his wife and children suffer from poverty. In another instance, Sender Ziv receives a letter from his sister—mentioned both in "Chocolate" ("Shokolad," 1912) and in "The End of Sender Ziv" ("Kitzo shel Sender Ziv," 1919)—telling him that she and his mother cannot even afford to buy a tombstone for his father's grave, and asking him when he plans to return in order to contribute financially to their household. Ziv is cast in the role of the only male in a household of women, shirking his responsibilities to them in order to pursue his studies, like the classical Torah scholar who will pursue God at any cost. Relentless study leads only to the constant scramble of the scholar's support structure (i.e., his wife and children) to make do with less and less on a daily basis.

In Baron's "Exams" ("Behinot," 1910) confusion over the choice of one textual lifestyle, or one textual corpus, over another becomes fully realized in a lyrical passage in which the narrator muses on the material that he should be studying for his exams:

Who is this rising out of the desert supported by her lover? Her hair is like a flock of sheep, her teeth are like a flock rising up from its bath...who are you my beloved, my beauty, tell me....Do you not recognize me? Woe is me, here I am Tatyana, Pushkin's girl, Yevgeni Oneigin's lover. Ask the students in the last class at the gymnasium and they'll tell you about my unrequited love....²¹

The beloved of the biblical Song of Songs intersects with Pushkin's romantic heroine here. Later in the same passage, Lermontov and Byron are juxtaposed with the talmudic figure, Rabba; the laws of gravity with Alexander Macedon; crying babies with the landlord's ugly daughter in a wedding dress. A sustained chain of metonymic associations takes Sender Ziv from the Song of Songs to

Pushkin, from rabbinics to Romantic poetry, and finally from ancient world history to contemporary domestic anxiety. The mixture of primary texts within Sender's Ziv's mind and his reduction of all of it to the mundane details of daily life point to the paradoxical seamlessness of his transition from the traditional Jewish scholarly world he has escaped and the modern European intellectual world he has chosen. At the same time, the situation of the traditional Jewish scholar in a domestic quagmire is intimated in the figure of the *talush* studying his new holy texts not in his wife's kitchen, but in a non-Jewish landlady's who, like a wife in her own way, is waiting for his room and board payment.

The intertextuality of Baron's "The End of Sender Ziv," "Exams," and "Chocolate," effected through the consistent presence of the extern/*talush* Sender Ziv, is a gesture on Baron's part toward the unity of the *talush* figure as it was regarded in the work of her contemporaries. Sender Ziv displays all the characteristics seen in the work of Baron's Hebrew literary peers. He is painfully shy, effeminate and sickly, and engages in *nakranut*, a term defined by Yirmiyahu Feierman, the *talush* in Brenner's "In Winter" (1903) as excessive introspection. The nature of the subjectivity, the *nakranut* of the narrator of "Exams," is challenged by Baron as she develops a parodic version of a man thinking, for the length of three pages, "lo ikhpat li" [I don't care].²² He also spends more time thinking about the prospect of failing his exams than he spends studying for them.

iii.

Shmuel Wersses, in a descriptive essay entitled "Portrait of the *Maskil* as a Young Man" about the autobiographical literature of the Haskalah, points to common thematic elements that populated those texts:

The struggles and doubts of young men trying to realize the Haskalah's ideals are reflected in the biographical, autobiographical, and memoir-style compositions and epistolary literature of the period, and also in fictional form, in stories, novels, satire, and epic poetry. Certain motifs are repeated again and again in different contexts.²³

As in the autobiographical literature of the Haskalah, during the period of the Modern Hebrew Renaissance, the universe of Hebrew *belles lettres* was so small that a closed system between readers and writers guaranteed a certain incestuous identification between writers, between readers and writers, and between readers of this literature. Although today we may read overt similarities of theme and/or style as a gesture toward a certain convention or genre, during the Modern Hebrew Renaissance these similarities served to reinforce a predilection toward identification of those works with the biography of the generation reading them and, of necessity, with the generation writing them. The need for readers to understand Modern Hebrew Renaissance literature as being autobio-

graphic despite the works' explicit fictionality (through their adoption of contemporary European literary conventions of psychological realism) reflected a need for a generation to read about its own process of modernization, migration, and disillusion. These narratives came to be read not merely as the autobiographies of individuals or of a literary generation, but as the autobiography of an entire generation.

Georges Gusdorf, one of the earliest theoreticians of autobiography, describes the genre as a "concern peculiar to Western man." He says that, "throughout most of human history, the individual does not oppose himself to all others; he does not feel himself to exist outside of others and still less against others....The important unit is never the isolated being."²⁴ Although Gusdorf limits his definitions of autobiography to those works that declare themselves as autobiography, his point is well taken in the context of Hebrew literary culture at the turn of the twentieth century. Literary expression in Hebrew until the modern period, with the exception of the medieval Hebrew poets in Spain, was discursive rather than self-declarative. Though individual speakers are acknowledged and identified throughout the rabbinic corpus (Talmud and Midrash), this is done in order to allow for the historicization of the text as well as to facilitate legislation. Certain generations of rabbis are always deferred to in legal rulings, as are certain individuals. Thus the necessity of "attributing" rabbinic statements to their rightful owners, a critical value in the culture of rabbinic literature, does not grow out of a culture that prioritizes the individual voices of authorship or literary inspiration. Individual voices in rabbinic literature are, rather, only the pragmatic tools for legal discourse.²⁵

When Haskalah personalities began writing their autobiographies, they were, as described by Gusdorf, looking in the mirror as if for the first time. "The primitive," says Gusdorf, "who has not been forewarned is frightened of his reflection in the mirror, just as he is terrified by a photographic or motion picture image."²⁶ Regardless of Gusdorf's problematic use of the term "primitive," he uses metaphors that recur again and again, both in the discourse of the Modern Hebrew Renaissance, and particularly in the work of Baron. The mirror and the photographic image poignantly describe the reflexive nature of modern autobiographical expressions, or modern fictional expressions of the self that are predicated on autobiographical models. As if for the first time, modern Hebrew Haskalah writers were trying to write about the world in a way that empowered the self. The speakers of texts—the authors, the narrators—needed to be acknowledged because they had never before declared themselves as artists. The fear, though, and the shock of that initial declaration of the self, that initial witnessing of the experience of the self, whether in autobiography or in fiction modeled upon the psychological rhythms of autobiography governed the literature of the

period. The elation of that initial self-revelation can lead to a certain entrenchment in the self, and a heightened fear of the other.

Carolyn Heilburn, in her analysis of Gusdorf's rhetoric about each man discovering his singularity at a certain, relatively late, point in Western history, argues that Gusdorf includes, in truth, only men.²⁷ She says,

In earlier times, Gusdorf points out, in those periods and places where the 'singularity of each individual life' had not yet evolved, there was no autobiography. Inadvertently he thus describes women's existence as it continued down to the day before yesterday, certainly until long after the period in which men found their 'singularity.'²⁸

So in Modern Hebrew literary culture, with women's belated arrival, where did Baron's fiction fit in? One of the major concerns that contemporary critics express about the place of Baron's work in the canon of the Modern Hebrew Renaissance is the over-eagerness to read her work as being autobiographic. Autobiographical reception of her work, on the one hand, would affiliate her quite strongly with her peers, because their works were understood almost in strictly autobiographical terms. On the other hand, the so-called autobiography expressed in Baron's work was not, by and large, identifiable with others produced in her generation. Therefore, Baron's autobiographical overtones were not included in a closed system of resemblances such as the one described by Wersses. With the exception of her *talush* trilogy, which deals specifically with the culture of Jewish "external" students in Eastern Europe, Baron's "autobiographical" works were understood to be totally idiosyncratic, totally female, and totally divorced from the ethos of her generation. Autobiographical readings of Baron's work, therefore, served to obscure her literary affiliations with larger European movements. But because her stories were thematically different from those of her peers, her supposedly autobiographical overtones were, with few exceptions, viewed not as the expression of a generation undergoing modernization, migration, and cultural transition. Rather, they were seen as the isolated autobiographical expression of a woman.

The *talush* was irremediably gendered. Simply put, he had to be male because he was seen as the collective expression of a generation of *yeshiva* students struggling to become modern. Women, barred from the *yeshiva* world, could not share the biography of the *talush*. Most important, the *talush* had to be male because all the ideologies that formed him, the notion of the pre-modern and Christian "Jew," the *fin-de-siècle* feminized "Jew," and the modernist "Jew," were all male types. Although he was feminized he was never actually female. So, on the one hand, women were implied in his identity; on the other, real women never had to be invoked or acknowledged because they were free-floating signifiers of Jewish otherness.

A critical question that has never been asked about the *talush* is whether he need necessarily be figured as male. The term *tlushah*, the feminine inflection of *talush*, is not found anywhere in the critical or primary literature. In many classic *talush* texts, notably in Brenner's *In Winter* (1903) and in Berdishevsky's *A Raven Flies* (1900), the *talush* exists alongside a female counterpart. Critics have read these women as mere projections of the male *talush* or as the object of his desire, but never as a *tlushah* in her own right.

In her study of Jewish women writers in Czarist Russia, Carole Balin reflects on the reluctance of the Jewish intelligentsia to employ the feminine noun "*maskilah*" to describe women active in the *Haskalah* and to parallel the term "*maskil*" broadly used for male *Haskalah* activists.

The connections forged between *maskilim* and female Hebraists neither elevated any single woman writer of Hebrew to the vanguard of the *Haskalah* nor defined her as a *maskilah*. In fact, the designations used by the *maskilim* for a woman writing in Hebrew may be revealing. As in other patriarchal structures, masculinity was conflated with the universal and the unmarked, while femininity attracted ambivalence and attention as the "other." A woman writing in Hebrew received the appellation *almah maskilah* (enlightened maiden), *bat maskelet* (enlightened daughter), or *ishah maskelet* (enlightened woman). That is, an adjectival form (*maskelet*) was employed rather than the corresponding feminine noun for *maskil*—*maskilah*.²⁹

Balin's observation about the total absence of a *maskilah* in the discourse of the Jewish Enlightenment illuminates the absence of a *tlushah* in the literary discourse of the Modern Hebrew Renaissance. The difference between a *tlushah* and a woman who is simply forlorn is the difference between a social and literary type and a state of being. In naming a woman a *maskilah* or a *tlushah* one must commit to acknowledging a movement, or a trend. But women were viewed as marginal to the turmoil of Jewish modernization during the period of *Haskalah* and Modern Hebrew Renaissance. Even when women were linked to a trend in Jewish secularization during the *Haskalah*, their active pursuit of non-Jewish partners and education was viewed as a symptom, not a statement. No one gave women abandoning the world of traditional practice and intellectual restriction and embarking on a path of secularization a distinct and unifying name. But what's in a name? What are the advantages and disadvantages of distinguishing female counterparts and/or equivalents to male types, either literary or social? Is the lack of a *maskilah* or *tlushah* a form of concession to the compulsory male universal? Or perhaps implicit in the absence of female grammatical equivalents to these central types in European Jewish modernity we can detect a form of resistance to the reductive notion that male types must necessarily have corresponding female ones.

Notes

1. Simon Halkin, *Mavo le-Sifrut Ivrit* [Introduction to Hebrew fiction] (Jerusalem: Mifal haShikhpul, 1958). For a synopsis of Halkin's typology of the different *tlushim*, see Nurit Govrin, *Telishut ve-Hithadshut: ha-Siporet ha-Torit ba-Golah u-ve-Eretz Yisra'el be-Reishit ha-Mei'ah ha-20* [Alienation and regeneration: Hebrew fiction in the Diaspora and Eretz-Israel in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries] (Tel Aviv: Ministry of Defense, 1985), 20–30.

2. On Halkin's use of this phrase, see Dan Miron, *Bodedim be-Mo'adam* [When loners come together] (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1987), 9. Also, see Govrin, *Alienation*, 12. The first story to designate the *talush* as a character type was Y. D. Berkowitz's (1885–1967) "*Talush*" (1904). In the story a young physician, Doctor Veinik, who has left his impoverished family behind in order to seek an education and a professional career, becomes integrated into the Jewish middle class. But he finds that he no longer has a "home" to which he can return now that he has achieved his professional goals and attained the social rank toward which he has long aspired. He is called to his dying brother's bedside and is shocked by the squalor he sees—a squalor he cannot in any way ameliorate. At the same time, he accompanies the daughter of a colleague to the theater and is disgusted by the vapidness of her conversation and concerns. His own sense of self is completely uprooted—caught between cultures and sensibilities. Berkowitz's "*Talush*" names a phenomenon, or a character type, that had already come to be identified as the biography of a literary generation. Y. D. Berkowitz, "*Talush*," in *Sipurim* [Stories] (Cracow: Yosef Fisher, 1909), 1–18.

3. See, for example, Joseph Hayim Brenner, *Breakdown and Bereavement: A Novel*, trans. Hillel Halkin (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1971), or S. Y. Agnon, *Only Yesterday*, trans. Barbara Harshav (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).

4. Zygmunt Bauman, "Allosemitism: Premodern, Modern, Postmodern" in *Modernity, Culture and "the Jew,"* ed. Bryan Cheyette and Laura Marcus (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), 149–150.

5. Jonathan Boyarin and Daniel Boyarin, "Diaspora: Generation and the Ground of Jewish Identity," *Critical Inquiry* 19 (Summer 1993): 697.

6. Bauman, "Allosemitism," 151.

7. *Ibid.*

8. Max Silverman, "Refiguring 'the Jew' in France," in *Modernity, Culture and "the Jew,"* 198.

9. Gillian Rose, *Judaism and Modernity: Philosophical Essays* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993), 200, 205.

10. Daniel Boyarin, *Unheroic Conduct: The Rise of Heterosexuality and the Invention of the Jewish Man* (Berkeley: University of California, 1997).

11. Quoted in Ritchie Robertson, "Historicizing Weininger: The Nineteenth-Century German Image of the Feminized Jew," in *Modernity, Culture and "the Jew,"* 27.

12. Robertson, *ibid.* Friedrich Nietzsche similarly compares the adaptability of women and Jews in *Joyful Wisdom* (New York: Ungar, 1960).

13. Otto Rank, "The Essence of Judaism," quoted in Robertson, "Historicizing Weininger," 34.

14. Boyarin and Boyarin, "Diaspora," 700.

15. Jean-Françoise Lyotard, *Heiddeger and "the Jews"* (Minneapolis: Minnesota Press, 1990), 3; Boyarin and Boyarin, "Diaspora," 700.

16. Silverman, "Refiguring," 197.
17. Y. H. Brenner, "mi-Hirhure Sofer" [Musings of an author] in *Kol Kitve Y.H. Brenner* [Collected writings of Y. H. Brenner], vol. 2 (Tel Aviv: ha-Kibbutz ha-Me'uchad, 1960), 241.
18. For an excellent book-length discussion of this generation in terms of "apostasy" and "escape" see Alan Mintz, *Banished from Their Father's Table: Loss of Faith and Hebrew Autobiography* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1989).
19. Dan Miron, *Imahot Meyasdot Ahayot Horgot* [Founding mothers, adopted sisters] (Tel Aviv: ha-Kibbutz ha-Me'uchad, 1991).
20. See Michael Gluzman, *The Politics of Canonicity: Lines of Resistance in Modernist Hebrew Poetry* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003).
21. Dvora Baron, "Behinot" [Exams] in *Parshiyot Mukdamot* [Early tales], eds. Nurit Govrin and Avner Holtzman (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1988), 499.
22. *Ibid.*, 492–495.
23. Shmuel Wersses, "Portrait of the Maskil as a Young Man," in *New Perspectives on the Haskalah*, ed. Shmuel Feiner and David Sorkin (Oxford: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2001), 128.
24. Georges Gusdorf, "Conditions and Limits of Autobiography," in *Autobiography: Essays Theoretical and Critical*, ed. James Olney (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980), 29–30.
25. According to traditional views of the Bible, God is said to be the omniscient author of the Five Books of Moses. Alternative authors, such as those traditionally held to be responsible for the composition of the books of Jeremiah, Isaiah, Psalms, Samuel, Ecclesiastes, and Kings, are seen as having written their books through divine inspiration, as authorial extensions of God. The figure of King David, warrior and poet, musician and lover, is the closest the ancient biblical tradition comes to attributing creative authorship within the modern romantically conceived purview of "individual talent." Even so, midrashic traditions try severely to circumscribe the scope of David's independent inspiration and individual literary skill, in deference to the fundamental principle of the entire Bible having been revealed at Sinai, either through direct divine dictation to Moses, or through divine inspiration.
26. Gusdorf, "Conditions and Limits," 33.
27. Carolyn G. Heilbrun, "Non-Autobiographies of 'Privileged' Women: England and America," in *Lifelines: Theorizing Women's Autobiography* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988), 66.
28. *Ibid.*
29. Carole Balin, *To Reveal Our Hearts: Jewish Woman Writers in Tzarist Russia* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 2000), 18–19.

**SELECTED WORKS OF DVORA BARON
IN TRANSLATION**
