Stony Brook University

Odd Man Out: Jewish Masculinity, Nationalism and the Novel

A Dissertation Presented

by

Jessica S. Stock

to

The Graduate School

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

English

Stony Brook University

May 2011

Stony Brook University

The Graduate School

Jessica S. Stock

We, the dissertation committee for the above candidate for the
Doctor of Philosophy degree,
Hereby recommend acceptance of this dissertation.

Adrienne Munich, Professor of English and Women's Studies, Stony Brook University
Dissertation Advisor

Celia Marshik, Associate Professor of English, Stony Brook University
Chairperson of Defense

Eric Haralson, Associate Professor of English, Stony Brook University

Heidi Kaufman, Associate Professor of English
Director of the Frank and Yetta Chaiken Center for Jewish Studies,
University of Delaware
Outside Member

This dissertation is accepted by the Graduate School.

Lawrence Martin
Dean of the Graduate School

Abstract of the Dissertation

Odd Man Out: Jewish Masculinity, Nationalism and the Novel

by

Jessica S. Stock

Doctor of Philosophy

in

English

Stony Brook University

2011

This dissertation examines Victorian attempts to order the place of Jews within the nation, and Modernism's figuring of the Jew as a signifier of difference. Jewish masculinity's fraught relationship with Western gender norms makes its representation particularly dynamic and useful in the context of nationalism. My dissertation reveals and reflects upon the gender politics of race, and how those politics create myths of nationalism. In the ever-widening field of Jewish Studies, my project answers the simple question of why Jewish masculinity played a developmental role in the shaping of the nation and the transnational novel. During a time when gender determined citizenship and national identity, Jewish masculinity signified and absorbed often contradictory racial, sexual, and political discourses. My project reclaims representations of Jewish men in order to better understand how they became the "odd men out."

The title "Odd Man Out" captures the ambivalent positions that the Jewish man occupies—"odd" denotes a marginal and perplexing national position, "odd man" plays with gender and racial assumptions, and "odd man out" places him in the discourse of difference which depends upon both disclosure and invisibility. My dissertation explores all of these discourses that form Jewish masculinity's representational ambivalence. Jewish masculinity facilitates in the establishment of the nineteenth-century nation, and in the twentieth-century deconstruction of the validity and fixity of the nation. Jewish masculinity reveals that gender and the nation, and the novels that unravel them, have *always* been fictions.

To Scott Chancellor
and
For my mother and father,
Nancy and Andy Stock

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments

This project would not have been possible without the guidance of my director, Adrienne Munich, who refused to let me slip into the Mississippi backwaters while writing my dissertation. Her warmth and encouragement helped me stay focused.

I owe a great debt to Celia Marshik, whose insights into *Ulysses* will forever be appreciated and remembered. Her closing remarks during our correspondence, “onward and upward,” always encouraged me.

Eric Haralson, who afforded me the opportunity to get my first publication—and on Henry James, no less—must be thanked. His belief in my work remains invaluable.

My sincere gratitude goes to Heidi Kaufman. Our phone conversations about Jewish Studies reinvigorated me and this project, the end of which would not have been possible without her help.

I wish to thank my professors who helped me attend Stony Brook University: Laura Doan, Susan Goodman, and Tim Spaulding. This journey began long ago when William Sequin introduced me to *Nightwood*.

The title of this dissertation was inspired by my father, Andrew Stock—the oddest man I know—and by my grandfather, Hyman Howard Stock, whose oddness has become folklore.

I write for my grandmother, Ethel Goldberg Stock, with whom I share a library and whose life inspires me.

In memory of my grandma, Marion Dertinger Terrell, who always encouraged me to get another degree and watch "The Golden Girls."

I want to thank my mother, Nancy Stock, who is my best friend. Her love and vibrancy continue to bring meaning to my life.

To my husband Scott Chancellor, who reads all that I write, who laughs at all of my jokes, and who deserves all of my love.

Introduction

Jewish Oddities

In "The Uncanny" (1919), Sigmund Freud writes of the "class of the frightening which leads back to what is known of old and long familiar" (1). The truly frightening is that which is recognizable by its proximity to the familiar, the normal: "this uncanny is in reality nothing new or alien, but something which is familiar and old—established in the mind and which has become alienated from it only through the process of repression" (1). Freud insists that the uncanny requires a certain amount of recognition and intimacy. He uses the example of missing limbs, an exceptionally disarming image at the end of World War I. Joining together opposing definitions, the strange is made possible by the familiar. But what if what should be familiar, like a nation or a home, becomes suddenly unfamiliar or odd?

The uncanny explains why upon Henry James's return after twenty-two years abroad he was disturbed by how much New York had changed. Debating the place of newly arrived Americans, James anxiously asks,

> Who and what is an alien, when it comes to that in a country peopled…by migrations? Which is the American by these scant measures?—which is *not* the alien…The great fact about his companions was that, foreign as they might be, newly inducted as they might be, they were *at home*….this very equality of condition …made the whole medium so strange…the 'ethnic' apparition again sit[s] like a skeleton at the feast. (*American* 125, 132)

That these ethnic apparitions sitting at the national table vaguely resembled James's fellow Americans would have only added to his discomfort—the uncanny frightens in its approximation to the familiar. As James walks the streets of New York, something odd had occurred. There were, he found, a lot of Jews living in New York. Repeatedly describing this turn-of-the-

twentieth-century tide of immigration in terms of a haunting "phantasmagoria," the alien presence destabilizes James's understanding of what should be familiar: his home and his country (133). The Jewish immigrants threw an uncanny light upon the nation that James now found so strange to narrate.

Freud states in *Moses and Monotheism* that Jews are despised not for their fundamental difference, but for a difference that is hard to define, making a "disagreeable, uncanny impression on others." (116). My project situates Freud's uncanny as part of a larger syndrome of Jewish representation, as illustrated by James's unnerving, serving as a critical answer to the simple question of why Victorians and Modernists were so fascinated by the figure of the Jew. At the crossroads of the uncanny, where the familiar depends upon the unfamiliar, stands the Jewish man—the embodiment of contradiction. Jewish masculinity's uncanny relation to dominant discourses makes the Jew a pivotal oddity in the shaping of nations and novels. Jewish masculinity's unique, peculiar, curious, and odd position within the nation has made it the darling of writers grappling with identity politics, and the pest of nations seeking to unify by eradicating differences.

Freud's essay on "The Uncanny" never mentions Jews, yet his concern with what makes the familiar *unfamiliar* intersects with the Jewish Question that existed in the background of his life and work. My project addresses the "Jewish Question" from outside the Jewish community by looking at the Anglo-American imagination and its fraught relationship with cultural difference. The "Jewish Question" asked, what were nations to do with a minority population that differed along lines of religion and race from a Christian norm? Just as nations were born, they began bemoaning their loss of national culture caused by changes in industry and economy

and by emancipation.[1] The "Jewish Question" changed throughout the nineteenth-century in England from a debate on enfranchisement to the Zionist movement of the late 1890s. And in America, the "Jewish Question" became part of the nativist panic caused by the increasingly diverse twentieth-century. Within the Anglo-American Jewish communities, the Jewish Question became a matter of citizenship and of maintaining cultural difference in light of assimilation. Outside of the Jewish community, the normative West puzzled over how to deal with a religiously "alien" culture that had, problematically, begotten Christianity.

This dissertation examines Victorian attempts to order the place of Jews within the nation and Modernism's figuring of the Jew as a signifier of difference. Jewish masculinity's fraught relationship with Western gender norms makes its representation particularly dynamic and useful in the context of nationalism. My dissertation reveals and reflects upon the gender politics of race and how those politics create myths of nationalism. As the nineteenth-century defined national identity and the twentieth-century rejected its limiting parameters, Jewish masculinity signified and absorbed often contradictory racial, sexual, and political discourses. In the ever-widening field of Jewish Studies, my project accounts for the transatlantic importance of the Jew to literature, specifically in his prismatic relevance to two nations (England and America) and two centuries (the nineteenth and twentieth). The figure of the Jew captivated both the Victorian and Modernist imagination by its peculiar, odd, and strange significations in what was a period of anxiously enforced normalcy. My project reclaims representations of Jewish men in order to

[1] The Revolutions of 1848 occurred across Europe as populations within Empires, such as the Austrian-Hungarian, embraced nationalist democracies. Most of the revolutions were unsuccessful, but they caused a sea-change in how people conceptualized themselves. Great Britain did not experience an 1848 revolution, but the political climate on the continent affected the English. In part these revolutions were fought off by the British government by passing enfranchisement laws in 1832.

better understand how they became the “odd men out,” and how their odd positions narrated the nation.

The title “Odd Man Out” captures the ambivalent positions that the Jewish man occupies—“odd” denotes a marginal and perplexing national position, “odd man” plays with gender and racial assumptions, and “odd man out” places him in the discourse of difference which depends upon both disclosure and invisibility. I explore all of these discourses that form Jewish masculinity’s representational ambivalence. Jewish masculinity facilitates in the establishment of the nineteenth-century nation and in the twentieth-century deconstruction of the validity and fixity of the nation. Jewish masculinity reveals that gender and the nation, and the novels that unravel them, have *always* been fictions.

The Curious Place of Jewish Studies

In the May 2010 issue of *PMLA*, Leslie Morris's "Placing and Displacing Jewish Studies: Notes on the Future of a Field" compared Jewish Studies to Venice, where iconic canals change and renew the city (764). Morris's choice of Venice as representative of the field of Jewish Studies is apt: it is Shylock's home and Bleistein's vacation destination. Venice represents a vast literary and cultural matrix much like the field of Jewish Studies, which Morris "places and displaces" as part of the Humanities' endless self-reflexive fascination with its position in the academy.[2] In similar fashion, *MELUS* placed a call for papers in 2010 for a special issue on "The Future of Jewish American Literary Studies." *MELUS* moves away from the European center of Jewish culture to the great American social experiment in which Jews actively

[2] Venice has also had the unfortunate problem of sinking into the ocean. There have been multiple reports of global warming’s effect on the city’s landscape.

participate. *PMLA*'s centering of Jewish Studies as a traditionally European enterprise (Morris is a German Literature professor) and *MELUS*'s American viewpoint indicate the transatlantic relationship that Jewish Studies has with literature and culture. That each publication is concerned with the "future" of Jewish Studies replicates the Jewish tradition's own endless concern with existence, place, and identity. After millennia of Diaspora, in the wake of the Holocaust, and through the daily crisis that is the existence of the Israeli state, it seems fitting for the field to be concerned for and preoccupied by its future.

The transatlantic relationship between European anti-Semitism and American race politics exposes the interdisciplinary nature of Jewish Studies and its centrality to literary studies. The portability of Jewish signification places Europe and America in dialogue, two Western cultural centers whose transatlantic contrasts, contradictions, and continuity enable a transnational understanding of the field. The interdisciplinary bent of Jewish studies owes a debt to the Diaspora and its shaping of Jewish culture in exile. For the purpose of my dissertation, transatlantic exile shapes Jewish masculinity by making it part of dominant Western culture, from the British Empire to American progress, yet at a remove from these national discourses which saw in exile and dispersion vulnerability and emasculation. Jewish masculinity, as I show throughout this dissertation, functioned as a fulcrum for measuring the unity of nation-states.

The Diaspora and exile produced an odd masculinity, which negotiated from a place of disempowerment, shaping Jewish culture's relationship with the defining discourses of the last two centuries. Most notably, Jewish studies' relationship with race and gender facilitates a more meaningful reading of difference by revealing its construction, pulling back the curtain of ideological and manufactured identity. The Boyarins' *Jews and Other Differences* explains the interplay between these discourses:

> The construction of racial categories is in fact a key topic driving research in cultural studies [and] is one of the current themes in cultural politics inspiring Jewish cultural studies. … The tortured question of whether Jews are "white" is shown to have a complex history—and that history in turn sheds light on the politics of identity and exclusion in American life. … A body of Jewish cultural studies that has investigated the construction of Jewish men as women [asks] "what room does the intense, anti-Semitic identification of male Jewish with 'woman' leave for Jewish women [and] in the implicit equation of Jews and women?" (xi, xv)

While Jewish studies uses this juncture of race, gender, and culture, my project explains how these indeterminate qualities associated with Jews enabled non-Jewish writers to use them as a pivot to look at national issues. My dissertation is and is not about Jews per se; rather, it is their representational currency, their unique position in the nation, their malleability as signifying subjects that have made them such suitable tropes for grappling with national identity.

My examination of Jewish masculinity arises from the literary canon's own fascination with the Jew whose indeterminate malleability fuels his literary reproduction. To some extent, my project comes from this authoritative literary tradition, and asks why established writers were so interested in the figure of the Jew. George Eliot's focus on Jewish culture in her last novel, the immense popularity of *Ivanhoe*, Wharton and James's engagement with the complexities of American ethnicity against the backdrop of genteel whiteness: why do these writers depict Jews, and specifically Jewish men, in their pursuit to understand Anglo-American nationalism? Juxtaposing canonic literary narratives and Jewish masculinity, this dissertation looks at how the textual Jew helped writers shape and define the nation.

The novel is particularly relevant to my study of Jewish representation because the rise of the novel correlates with the rise of the nation-state, as well as with as the emancipation of European Jewry and with Jewish immigration to the United States. The nineteenth-century, which saw multiple revolutions beget new countries, also witnessed the rising popularity and availability of the novel. The novel became a widely read genre within the lending library

system and was labeled corrosive to young female readers. The novel engaged multiple discourses emerging in the nineteenth century, from the rise of capitalism and race science to the role of women in cultural production. In this way, fiction has a different life from poetry or plays, and thus takes a central place in my study.

As Homi Bhabha argues, the novel narrates the nation: "nations, like narratives, lose their origins in the myths of time and only fully realize their horizons in the mind's eye. Such an image of the nation — or narration — might seem impossibly romantic and excessively metaphorical, but it is from those traditions of political thought and literary language that the nation emerges as a powerful historical idea in the west" (*Nation* 1). My dissertation looks at how representations of Jews reflect the mythical nation as a 'powerful historical idea,' and at how authors used/constructed the figure of the Jew to grapple with national concerns and anxieties of gender, race, and class. This trinity of signification, richly mined by literary critics, enters my project because I investigate how Jewish representation complicates and disrupts easy definitions of national belonging. In the singular figure of 'the Jew,' anxieties expressed in the nineteenth-century culminate in a modernist crisis. My topic spans two literary periods—the Victorian and the Modernist—and investigates how novels by Anglo-American writers represented Jewish figures in relation to the nation.

My examination of Jewish masculinity allows for a singular view into its construction; it also reflects a conceptual realignment of the novel and nation. Benedict Anderson notes that the modern nation is a cultural rather than a political category. Print culture—especially the novel—served as a means to imagine the national community; the novel writes the nation into existence. Anderson's *Imagined Communities* changed the way literary critics and historians saw the novel's aesthetic development of national consciousness:

> In Western Europe the eighteenth century marks not only the dawn of the age of nationalism but the dusk of religious modes of thought. The century of the Enlightenment, of rationalism, secularism, religious belief, the suffering which belief in part composes did not disappear. Disintegration of paradise: nothing makes fatality more arbitrary. Absurdity of salvation: nothing makes another style of continuity more necessary. What then was required was a secular transformation of fatality into continuity, contingency into meaning. As we shall see, few things were (are) better suited to this end than an idea of nation. (11)

Though the eighteenth-century conceives nationalism, the fears and anxieties of which Anderson speaks were fully born in the Victorian imagination. Poet Laureate Tennyson's "In Memoriam A.H.H." illustrates the clash between faith and science, and the pressure to find new ways to fashion continuity: " 'So careful of the type!?' but no./From scarped cliff and quarried stone/She cries, 'A thousand types are gone:/I care for nothing, all shall go'" (56). Tennyson's angst reflects how Victorians reckoned with the emerging consensus that the earth was far older and more complex than a Christian reading of Genesis allowed. Melancholia, loss, and nostalgia describe Victorian poetics; a profound longing to stem the darkness that technology, industrialization, and Darwinism had brought.

During the cultural creation of the nineteenth-century, the textual Jew's ambivalent positioning threatened the nation-state's textual creation. If the nation maintains continuity through the print-text— as Anderson argues— than the Jew had to be accounted for within the novel's pages. The textual Jew haunted the Victorian imagination in his ability to mimic Englishness under the guise of universalism, in his refusal to diminish difference through conversion, and in his ambivalent position within cultural production of the nation. "The Jew" became for the Victorians and turn-of-the-century Americans a disorderly figure during a social moment attempting to restore order and faith. The textual Jew is constructed as the weight of the past, the ineffable present, and the anxious future.

While Anderson' *Imagined Communities* blazed a new path in understanding the novel in relation to the nation, his argument supposes that a faith in Western nationalism correlates with the evolution of the novel form. The crisis that was the Great War, the inter-war period, and WWII changed the novel's relationship to the English and American nations. Faith was again shaken, but this time the cause was not God's irrelevance to science and industry, but the loss of confidence in the reasonableness of nationalism. The indeterminacy of the textual Jew, who so flustered the Victorian imagining of the nation, became a central figure to the modernist imagining of a fractured world.

The crisis of identity, which is certainly not unique to the Jewish people, has a special resonance in the context of the latest trends in literary scholarship: nationalism, race and ethnicity, Diaspora, and postcolonialism. Since Edward Said's *Orientalism*, critics have explored the complex relationship between literature and its reinforcement of inequitable power structures, whether along national, racial, or gendered lines. Said points out how the inequities wrought by imperialism manifest in fiction, creating a crisis of representation: "the relationship between Occident and Orient is a relationship of power, domination, of varying degrees of a complex hegemony. … The Orient was Orientalized not only because it was discovered to be 'Oriental' in all those ways considered common-place by an average nineteenth-century European, but also because it *could* be—that is, submitted to being—*made* Oriental" (5-6). The Orient is a vast imaginative plane spanning geographical and cultural regions as disparate as Japan and Egypt, China and Morocco. These regions collapsed and blurred in the European imagination, which created an Orient that was simply *not* the Occident, or a definitional absence that could be filled in with any culture or peoples to suit the European agenda.

Said's two realms of the Orient and the Occident, however, offers an insufficient map when applied to depictions of Jews, who are an incongruous fit in this binary construction of difference and power. By splitting the world in half, Said left unaddressed the singular representational conundrum of exiled Jews who occupied both Western and Eastern positions, and who were included and excluded in imperial projects as both agents and antigens. The paradoxical Jewish relationship to *Orientalism*'s critique of Western ideologies has been nuanced by Ivan Kalmar and Derek Penslar:

> Central to all debate on orientalism and the Jews is that, historically, Jews have been seen in the Western world variably and concurrently as occidental *and* oriental. … Orientalist representations of the Jews have always been at the very center of orientalist discourse … Strangely, perhaps one benefit of studying the Jews as a topic in orientalism may be discovering how much orientalism has been not only a modern Western or imperialist discourse, but also a 'politico-theological,' Christian one." (xii-xiv)

That nations felt pressure to account for their Jewish beginnings explains why Jews were seen as both occidental *and* oriental. My project looks at the discursive limits of labeling Anglo-American Jewry either occidental or oriental, and at how transatlantic writers from the early nineteenth century to the beginning of World War II used the pliable abstractions of textual Jews to comment upon their own nations and to critique identity politics. I use Jewish representation's odd inhabitance of both the orient and the occident to reveal how narrators created fictional geographies, imagined communities, and novel nations.

The field of Jewish Studies, perhaps emboldened by Said's groundbreaking recognition of power and representation, refined and extended his claims to better account for the figure of the Jew in Western Literature. Bryan Cheyette's *Constructions of 'the Jew' in English Literature and Society* and *Between 'Race' and Culture* argues that Said's binary split could not adequately account for Jewish difference in nineteenth and twentieth-century Anglo-American literature. Cheyette's "work wishes to problematize the reductive construction of a homogenous

'Western Judeo-Christian' culture in current theories of 'colonial discourse' which do not recognize the ambivalent position of 'the Jew' within a supposed 'common culture'" (4). In a move that corrects Said's displacement of Jews in *Orientalism* and one that brings Jewish Studies into proximity with postcolonialism, Cheyette reveals the complicated ways Jews inform the dominant culture, and simultaneously occupy a place of uncontainable difference. Cheyette's great contribution to the field of Jewish studies is his ability to separate the Jewish and Christian traditions. Appropriations of the Jewish Bible subjugate Jewish history to the rhetorical needs of Christian nations. By looking at both the roots of a Christian normative state as well as accounting for historicized Jewish subjectivity, Cheyette prevents Jewish Studies' own collapse and appropriation.

Heidi Kaufman examines the deeply conflicted relationship the English nation had with its Jewish roots in *English Origins, Jewish Discourse and the Nineteenth-Century British Novel* (2009), revealing the reticulated logic of an English discourse that attempted to remove Jews from the Old Testament and, in turn, from its own English[FIX} origins. Highlighting the importance of Jewish discourse to the shaping of English nationalism, Kaufman looks how nineteenth-century English novels addressed the "the awkward position of worshipping a Jewish man who belongs to another nationality, but whose religious identity unite[d] them as an Anglican nation" (1). Working against the homogenizing of a Judeo-Christian tradition that Cheyette warns of, Kaufman reveals how "British novels deployed a Jewish discourse to imagine English supremacy and chosen-ness—an act that, despite its troubling logic, played a powerful role in underwriting racial and imperial ideologies" (5). Kaufman explains how the yoking of Jews to Christians in an effort to justify English imperialism and nationalism simultaneously acknowledged and disavowed England's Jewish roots. I extend Kaufman's argument, showing

that Jews were odd birds in the national nest. Jewish masculinity had the uncanny ability to be recognizable and, yet, unfamiliar to those shaping national discourse, giving Jewish men a peculiar ability to unhinge homogenizing and normalizing impulses.

In a similar vein of placing the Jewish Question in the context of imperialism abroad and nationalism at home, Michael Ragussis casts the Jewish Question in terms of the conversion narrative, which had become increasingly popular as the nineteenth-century saw the British Empire swell:

> The debate over Jewish conversion became situated at the crossroads of a number of important social discourses and a number of national crises in England and on the Continent. Particularly with the rise of European nationalism and the spread of colonialism, 'the Jewish Question' began to assume central importance in the nineteenth century as different European nations sought the means to assimilate or expel 'foreign' populations at home and to convert and govern 'heathen' populations abroad (22).

In Ragussis's work, conversion is a specific discourse that played with the limits of citizenship and identity. Nation-states found it increasingly difficult to prevent ruptures caused by the colonial 'other' abroad, and in the case of the Jews, the internal 'other' at home.[3] At pains to move beyond simply cataloguing "a broad range of anti-Semitic stereotypes," Ragussis focuses on the conversion mania that gripped England from the 1790s to the 1870s, and on efforts to tidy up the boundaries of citizenship (1). Ragussis points out that English Christians aimed to redeem Jews by transforming them into English Protestants. Ragussis's insights into several cultural currents—such as ethnology, the Evangelical Revival, and the Hebraic beginnings of English nationalism—reveal how conversion narratives sought the erasure of difference in order to maintain a unified England: "the ideology of conversion was institutionalized…in a governmental system of assimilation that sought religious homogeneity as the basis of the

[3] Jonathan Boyarin highlights this external/internal difference in *The Unconverted Self: Jews, Indians, and the Identity of Christian Europe*, in which he argues that Jews were "both 'anterior' to Christendom and internal to it" (38).

nation-state" (23). Conversion ideology demonstrated the limitation of English tolerance by placing the Jew in the crossfire of contradictory English national narratives—a tolerant liberal state demanding religious cohesion. The conversion of the Jews during the nineteenth-century was most decidedly not a success and Ragussis's narrative contradicts England's claims to a tolerant national belonging. For the purposes of my project, Jewish masculinity, and its relationship to citizenship, dismantles the nation's homogenizing fiction, which could be unwritten by the presence of the "voluntary stranger."[4]

With America's experiment in nation building, there arose identity questions similar to those in Britain. Great influxes of immigrants from Eastern Europe and the residual effects of the forced migration of Africans made America a racially and ethnically diverse land. Unlike England, America had no official state religion; however, privilege was historically attended to whiteness and normative Christianity. Scholarship dealing with the indeterminacy of race, such as Matthew Frye Jacobson's *Whiteness of a Different Color*, reflects the importance of Jewish Studies to America's history and literary imagination. Jews and Jewish Studies occupy a singular mode of thought in American scholarship because of their relationship to whiteness. Daniel Itzkovitz articulates this odd position of American Jewry to American racism:

> Far from being the symbol of Americanness … Jewishness was thought to hover along the outskirts of an ever-unstable border of normativity. In particular, Jewish male identity was represented as both a disruption and a limit in the anxious construction of American notions of nationality, class, whiteness, masculinity, and culture. Jewishness came to define the limits of these categories because, in its disarticulation, the Jew often also seemed to slip back and forth into white Americanness … The Jewish male was American but foreign; white but racially other; consuming but nonproductive. (178)

[4] Matthew Arnold used the term "voluntary strangers" to describe English Jews (Ragussis 22). Interestingly, the world stranger mirrors many of Freud's claims that Jews were uncanny and un/familiar.

Jewish masculinity causes signifying slippage between black/white, man/woman, exile/home. Anglo-American representations of Jews depend upon the patrol of identity borders, creating a transatlantic representational crisis around the idea of 'the Jew.' The slipperiness of Jewish signification disrupts turn-of-the-century America's binary reading of race, in which Jews are not quite white. My dissertation demonstrates how Jewish masculinity broke down the binary of race and how its oddity made American writers rethink ethnicity and the American future.

The indeterminacy, slipperiness, and malleability of Jewish masculinity explains why so many writers chose to examine organizing hierarchies and institutions like nations and empires with the figure of the Jew. Jewish masculinity's plasticity comes from its voiding of meaning, allowing it to occupy seemingly contradictory concepts. This contradiction, however, does more to reveal than obscure what shapes meaning, and how things, people, and places are constructed. In Derrida's terms, Jews are the ultimate signifier of 'différance' or the infinite heterogeneous signs that govern meaning.[5] This dissertation, which in some ways is the chronological study of the novel at moments of national crisis, explains why novelists deployed the textual Jew's vast, and therefore empty, signification to explore issues of national identity.

This evacuation of meaning through the joining of opposites, which characterized Derrida's deconstruction, is at play in Cheyette's adoption of the term ambivalence for Jewish Studies. Ambivalence presents a fuller understanding of what the figure of 'the Jew' meant to transnational writers who were preoccupied by historical Jews' challenge to the universalist state. Cheyette explains the efficacy of the term ambivalence in relation to conceptions of the nation and citizenship:

[5] For more on Jacques Derrida's "différance" see his essay "Différance" which explains how opposites are united— they depend on each other integrally, thus, no presence without absence.

> This liberal inclusiveness however, is always ambivalent because it is buttressed by a spurious universalism which assumes that 'the Jew' will be transfigured in a higher realm. Within an increasingly exclusivist nation-state, that is, Jews are constructed in equivocal terms as both the embodiment of transformable cultural Hebraism and, at the same time, as an unchangeable racial 'other.' The stark doubleness of a semitic discourse will, in general terms, thus be seen to constitute 'the Jew' as encompassing the possibility of a new redemptive order as well as the degeneration of an untransfigured past. (Cheyette 5-6)

The nation-state, specifically in Cheyette's study England, depended upon the erasure of difference in order to redeem an ambivalent relationship with the Jewish presence. Correcting what had been the neglect of the figure of the Jew, Cheyette deploys the term ambivalence because it encompasses multiple discourses from deconstruction to orientalism.[6] Ambivalence is central to my work because it accounts for the discrepancies within Jewish representation, explaining how the same figure signifies in vastly different cultural moments. For example, ambivalence establishes how in one novel Jews are socialist agitators and, in another, greedy capitalists. Jewish representation had no ideological coherency, and my project shows the multiple ways Jewish masculinity disrupts national scripts.

The term ambivalence as theorized by Zygmunt Bauman and used by Cheyette encourages critics to historicize and particularize Jewish difference from modernity's other ills.[7] I argue that ambivalence accounts for Jewish masculinity's odd relationship to nationalism, which depends upon the suppression of difference and reliable categories. Ambivalence plays a central role in my work of deconstructing nationalism's fictions through Jewish masculinity.

---

[6] Before Cheyette's study, Jewish representation has been analyzed through archetypes—such as the wandering Jew, or the Judas character—and did not account for more complex representational relationships. For more on anti-Semitic stereotypes broken down by archetype, see Frank Felsenstain's *Anti-Semitic Stereotypes*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1995.

[7] For more on reading Jewish history as part of and particular to modernity, see *Modernity and the Holocaust* (2001).

Zygmunt Bauman addresses this discrepancy regarding the Jews within the European nation-state:

> The conceptual or notional "Jew" is not just another case of "heterophobia"—or the resentment of the different—but, instead a case study in "proteophobia" (that apprehension or anxiety caused by those that do not fall easily into established categories). Bauman's "Jew" is "ambivalence incarnate," the contradictory alter ego marking the orderly spatial and temporal boundaries of…Christian civilization. (Cheyette and Marcus 10)

The concerns of nineteenth century Jewish Studies, which sees the field starting at the Jew Bill of 1753 and ending with the Balfour Declaration of 1917, looks at how the figure of the Jew disrupted fixed categories and became a reflective surface for Anglo-American anxieties about an increasingly disorderly world. The delineation between binary difference versus the uncategorical space Jews occupied remains an important distinction for Jewish Studies because it allows the same imagined figure to embody multiple, contradictory positions. Cheyette, Ragussis, and Itzkovitz all support a reading of the ambivalent Jewish position in the nation—allowing Jews to be citizen outcasts, or odd men out. For the first three chapters of my dissertation, Jewish masculinity functions as a way to define the nations' boundaries in an effort to organize what was an increasingly disorganized, heterogeneous nation.

Jewish resistance to categories national, racial, and sexual places them outside of nation-building. The odd men out, the Jews, as Anne McClintock notes in *Imperial Leather*, belong to "the iconography of *domestic degeneracy* [which] was widely used to mediate the manifold contradictions in imperial hierarchy" (53). McClintock's argument that colonial politics abroad were revisited upon domestic outsiders highlights the particularity of Jews within the nation. In this way, assimilation in the metropolis touches upon mimicry in the colonies. The transnational phenomenon of the Jew as signifier of difference has its roots in ambivalence. Diasporic ambivalence defined in James Clifford's *Routes*, or in McClintock's terms, "domestic

degeneracy," is a "specific cosmopolitanism articulated by diaspora [in] constitutive tension with nation-state/assimilationist ideologies" (Clifford 25). I take these recent articulations of diaspora and contextualize them in relation to Jewish representation. My project traces how nineteenth-century representations of Jews gradually changed and evolved as the modern nation-state tested the limits of its validity. Arjun Appudurai connects the Diaspora to modernity, claiming "the diaspora is the order of things" (172). This dissertation looks at how writers used Jewish masculinity's ambivalent relationship to national discourses to reveal how nations and identities depend upon fictions.

The second part of this project explores Jewish masculinity and the Diasporic experience to look at modernist aesthetics. Jonathan Boyarin warns against the deracination of Diaspora and the subsequent effect of losing Jewish culture's long engagement with the term and the phenomenon:

> This broadened deployment of [diaspora] offers rich material for a reinvigoration of Jewish thought. Yet the converse is also true: analyses of non-Jewish diasporas will be most fruitful when they engage in dialogue with the specific Jewish context in which the term originated. … Evaluating diaspora entails acknowledging the ways that such identity is maintained through exclusion and oppression of internal others (especially women) and external others. (*Powers* 6-7)

Boyarin's concern that the Diaspora will lose its Jewish roots underscores its relevance to modernity—that so many peoples, writers, and discourses have adopted its use reinforces its relevance to literary studies. Jewish exile produced the ambivalence that confounded Victorian writers, but created an evocative figure for modernists to rewrite and disrupt worn concepts like nationalism. My last two chapters focus on the textual Jew's embodiment of a modernist zeitgeist captured by Yeats's "The Second Coming": "Things fall apart; the center cannot hold." Modernists, whose center was collapsing, found in the Jewish Diaspora a congruent narrative for their own displacement. I argue that much of modernism's aesthetic is better understood if put in

the frame of a specific history; the Jewish Diaspora functions as a departure point for exploring issues such as expatriatism, nationalism, and alienation.

In the aftermath of the British Empire, more peoples around the globe were dispersed, widening the definition of Diaspora. Aamir R. Mufti's *Enlightenment in the Colony: The Jewish Question and the Crisis of Postcolonial Culture* sees postcolonialism as an extension of the Jewish Question, which contains the roots of the colonial predicament. As Mufti makes clear, the European Jewish experience played with the limits of Enlightenment thought, nationalism, and modernity: "Abstract citizen subjectivity and national belonging constitute moments in the dialectic of modern selfhood, with the figure of the Jew coming to mark the inherent limit of *each* moment of identification, to mark the disruption of the categories of identity, becoming in the process the site of crisis and at its attempted containment" (39). Within this context, the Jewish Question is met with answers from Jews themselves who began to find a literary voice as modernism created aesthetic forms more conducive to the Jewish experience. As my last chapter highlights, the Jewish aesthetic response to the Jewish Question and the Diaspora approaches a postcolonial response as a minority within an increasingly hostile nation, a minority with an increasingly ambivalent citizenship.

Within modernism, Jews became a universal signifier of difference while maintaining cultural and representational distinctiveness. The Diaspora also signaled the prominence of the city to the modernist novel. Within the city, cosmopolitanism reenacted the drama of states whose power diminished in light of the emerging transnational and cosmopolitan belongings. Jews, associated with city life and its attendant ills, functioned as a way to explore difference and its relevance to the new imagining of community. My project accounts for how the Jew in the Victorian nation became the Jew in the Modernist city.

Jewish Masculinity and the Nation

Representations of Jewish men are burdened with the politics of citizenship. While gender determined citizenship and national identity in the nineteenth and early twentieth century, Jewish masculinity signified and absorbed often contradictory racial, sexual, and political discourses. My project contextualizes Jewish masculinity as part of the national fiction that portrayed Jewish men as the "odd men out." Jewish masculinity was a powerful narrative tool for the nation—odd enough to serve as a warning, but not too odd as to be unrecognizable.

As Daniel Boyarin notes in *Unheroic Conduct: the Rise of Heterosexuality and the Invention of the Jewish Man*, Jewish masculinity's facility to deconstruct gender emerges from its historical disempowerment and colonial exile. The historical roots of modern Jewish masculinity began after the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 CE signaled a seismic shift in Jewish practice and memory. Rabbis decided to revere a text—instead of a traditional land-based center, which often depends upon violence and subjugation—because the Torah was a portable way to unify a scattered people. The Torah and the condition of exile became the main focus of Jewish identity and gave a national textual coherence in light of dispersion. This transition from land to text, from violence to erudition made the Jews the people of the book thus creating an alternate masculinity: "the image of the ideal male as non-aggressive, not strong, not physically active is a positive product of the self-fashioning of rabbinic masculinity in a certain, very central, textual product of the culture, the Babylonian Talmud" (81).[8] Working from Boyarin's model, Jewish masculinity is depicted as an alternative spectrum on which to gauge and calibrate

[8] Boyarin's text looks specifically at Ashkenazi masculinity whose culture was indebted to the Diaspora and the Talmudic tradition to create its own unique subculture within Europe.

masculinity. While contrasting with more widely accepted notions of masculinity, I am not offering a binary reading of Jewish/Western masculinity, but positing that masculinities are best gauged on a continuum.[9] Removing Jewish men from a dialectical reading accommodates their ambivalent position within the nation-state. In this way, Jewish masculinity implicates gender and race in a discussion of nationalism and citizenship not otherwise offered by representations of women or other minority populations.

The representational significance and its prismatic meaning of the Jewish body began with Sander Gilman's groundbreaking *The Jew's Body*, which offers an eerie catalog of body parts and their attendant cultural history. Much like Freud's obsession with castration anxiety, recent scholarship from Eliza Slavet's indispensable *Racial Fever: Freud and the Jewish Question* to Jay Geller's *On Freud's Jewish Body: Mitigating Circumcisions* examine the circumcised Jewish penis as a phallic phantom haunting Western culture. All of these texts, however, have at their center Jewish masculinity's odd relationship to the sacred phallus. Freud long noted that the Jewish practice of circumcision inspired castration anxiety in men of the surrounding communities. Though circumcision is a cultural and religious act, it also marked the Jewish body as different or in Jay Geller's Freudian terms, something uncanny. Circumcision made Jewish men reminders of possible castration at the same time undercutting the sacred phallus's reification; "the uncanny is terrifying; it is something ghostlike. Ghosts or specters were among the figures by which Jews were represented. Second and more significant to this analysis, sometimes what motivates the terror is the uncanny object or experience's underlying

[9] This idea of a masculine continuum is indebted to Adrienne Rich's "Compulsory Heterosexuality and the Lesbian Continuum."

familiarity" (Geller 44).[10] Thus a reminder of the familiar haunting of castration, circumcision's desecration of the greatest symbolic source of Western power must have seemed very odd and uncanny indeed.

My project is formally concerned with Jewish masculinity and the Jewish body, but the place and role of women profoundly shapes my reading of Jewish representation. The male Jewish body has a long history of being labeled womanly. These claims began with the medieval accusation that Jewish men menstruated, evolving into a characterization of Jewish men as hysterical and neurotic.[11] Freud's mentor, Charcot attributed hysteria to Jewish inbreeding; Otto Weininger's *Sex and Character*, which was widely influential, set about to prove that Jews were women; Hans Blüher, Freud's German nationalist student, proposed that Jews were degenerate effiminates. The Jewish connection to women evolved into a wider discourse when homosexuality was pathologized in the late nineteenth-century. Daniel Boyarin, Daniel Itzkovitz, and Ann Pellegrini's collection *Queer Theory and the Jewish Question* brings new light to how anti-Semitism overlapped with homophobia.

Women play a crucial role in the construction of Jewish masculinity. Ann Pellegrini points out that the anti-Semitic, homophobic discussion of the Jewish body created an odd syllogism: "All Jews are womanly, but no women are Jews" (118). Anti-Semitism has at its core misogyny. To better understand anti-Semitism and Jewish culture itself, women's roles must be accounted for. There have been several critical correctives to the default position that Jews are men masquerading as women. Nadia Valman, Cynthia Scheinberg, and Maren Tova Linett focus

[10] It should be noted that Philip Roth's *The Human Stain* plays with this idea of Jews as ghosts; ironically it is an African-American professor passing as a Jew who invokes the word "spook" and is subsequently fired. Roth overlaps American racism and anti-Semitism to make a brutal commentary on identity politics in late twentieth-century America.
[11] For more on menstruation and Jewish men, see Sander Gilman's *The Jew's Body*.

on Jewish women's experiences adding yet another complex terrain to the field of Jewish Studies. Valman refocuses many of Cheyette's arguments along gender lines showing how Jewish women were represented in Victorian literature; Scheinberg corrects a normative reading of Christianity in the Victorian poetics; and Linett looks at the role of Jewish representation in modernist women's writing.

These critical examinations are invaluable to a full understanding of Jewish representation during the Victorian and Modernist periods. If citizenship is a male normative status and nationalism a masculine pursuit, then Jewish masculinity's relationship to these multiple discourses reveals the myths that defined the Victorian and Modernist eras. Jewish masculinity is a challenge to and a deconstruction of all the politics of culture. Jewish men and their labels as "women-men" give a unique vantage point to nationalism getting to the heart of its construction through other ideological machinations. With the evocative figure of the Jews, the myth of nations, of gender and sexuality, of Christian origins, of racial hierarchies, writers renegotiated the terms of these fictions.

The Victorians, for all of their storied repression, did indeed talk about sex and gender quite a bit.[12] Foucualt names four groups who were regulated by the pathologizing of sexuality in the nineteenth century: "the masturbating child of the bourgeoisie family, the 'hysterical woman,' the Malthusian couple, and the perverse adult" (Stoler 6). Chapters One, Two, and Three of my dissertation connect all four of these groups to Foucault's theories of biopower. That Jews are in some way linked to each discourse indicates the persistent imagining of Jews as agents of corruption as well as the interlocking dynamics of sexuality, racism, and nationalism.

[12] See Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick's *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (1985).

Foucault's work, in particular his *The History of Sexuality* and *The Order of Things*, provides the lexicon of sexual difference, power, and nationalism that I adopt.

I extend many of Foucault's arguments, incorporating race as part of the discourse of repression and focusing primarily on the Jew as the figure of difference, and on representations of masculinity and the Jewish male body. Laura Stoler's *Race and the Education of Desire* points out that Foucault created a theoretical vacuum by not addressing race directly as a site of biopower and colonial control. Stoler's book fills the void by addressing how race shadows Foucault's claims about sexuality, discourse, and power. She argues that race is a tandem force made more potent in combination with sexuality. Foucault's biopower does not explicitly account for race, but Stoler suggests that race is at play in every assertion Foucault makes about the relationship between colonizer and colonized, about the bourgeoisie family, and about power and sexuality. Extending Stoler's work on race and Foucault, I see overlaps with Jewish representation, the colonial 'other,' and the regulation of sexuality. Many of Foucault's insights about the colonies and sexuality inform my approach to Jewish representation in English—and eventually American—literature.

As the nineteenth-century progressed, Charles Darwin's theories changed the language of the "Jewish Question" from religious and cultural concerns to the category of race, which was seemingly immutable. Throughout the nineteenth century, the "Jewish Question" reflected long held anxieties about the precariousness of the "nation," and the national quest for affirmation or validation. With the Darwinian revolution, the Jewish Question moved beyond assimilation and citizenship to biological readings and (perceived) bodily differences. In Darwin's *Origin of the Species*, widely read by scientists and cultural critics alike, "On Natural Selection" states that "the Struggle for Existence [is] a large and metaphorical sense, including dependence of one

being on another" (1).[13] Gillian Beer argues that *Origin*, unlike other scientific tracts of the period, depended upon narrative and metaphor, thus conjoining literary and scientific discourse. Darwin has been misread by many; scholars often point to "survival of the fittest" as his lasting legacy, which is a more violent and absolutist doctrine than Darwin actually supplies.[14] This is important to note, as my dissertation often references the Victorian misuses and misinterpretations of Darwin. While many critics remember *laissez faire* capitalism as a cruel extension of Darwin's theories into the economic world, few remember his call for variation and plurality.[15] For Darwin, it was diversity that made a species stronger, a fact that eugenicists either glossed over or ignored as the nineteenth century drew to a close.

The unique attribute of Jewish representation was that Jews were displaced from their natal land— as biblically interpreted or as a socio-political Diaspora. The anatomist and philosopher Robert Knox conjectured on this discrepancy between Jewish nationalism and the Diasporic condition. In *The Races of Man* (1850), Knox struggled to reconcile the global Jewish presence, noting Jews in places as far flung as Amsterdam and Egypt, displayed Jewish racial homogeneity: "the real Jew had never altered since the earliest recorded period; that two hundred years at least before Christ they were perambulating Italy and Europe precisely as they do now" (131). The paradox of the Jewish predicament—that of a nation that is diasporic—represents a critical field where issues of national identity intersect with race and gender. With the increasing interest in race theory, Victorians saw Jews as not just fundamentally different because of religion, but because of race. This critical shift in the causes of anti-Semitism raised new issues

[13] See Gillian Beer's *Darwin's Plots: Evolutionary Narrative in Darwin, George Eliot and Nineteenth-Century Fiction.*
[14] Herbert Spencer was the first to use the term in *Principles of Biology* (1864).
[15] A quick glance at Darwin's subtitles in *Origin* include the terms "variation" and "hybridism." And Darwin warns that it is the isolation of a breeding group that inhibits evolution, not its diversity.

about Jews' place within the Empire, and in the "nation," be it British, American, or other. For my purposes, I examine how Jews, especially Jewish men, were represented and depicted by the nations to which they belonged.

Darwin's cousin Francis Galton, whose life and career paralleled his more famous relative, spent the latter part of his life working on theories of genetic inheritance. Galton's theories on populations and degeneracy took hold and captured the public imagination, replacing Darwin's prudent restraint with anxiety-inducing statistics that warned of the waning of the Saxon race. Galton's use of Darwin reframed evolution as part of national health: the elite needed to be "responsible for the profitable use of that which has been entrusted to [them]" (3). Eugenics, Galton announced, was "the science which deals with all influences that improve the inborn qualities of a race" (35). Galton's *Essays in Eugenics*, published two years before his death in 1911, mishandled many Darwinian concepts, and made genetics a British and American nationalist concern. Of particular interest to my dissertation is how Darwinism and its offspring, eugenics, influenced representation of Jews in literature. Though Darwin never connected his observations on the natural world to the nation, his writing influenced many Victorians. With the storm of race science, Darwinism, and a preoccupation with the health of the Empire, British or American, the late nineteenth century saw a reevaluation of what it meant to belong, whether in the nation or the novel. Jews emerged as favorite figures for engaging race, gender, and nation. While I do not focus directly on Darwin, his theories are imprinted on Victorians from George Eliot to Francis Galton.

While Darwin's theories presented a new perspective for the nineteenth-century, the World War became the early twentieth-century's horizon line, radically changing how writers narrated the nation. As writers began to recover from the World War, the textual Jew evolved

from a pariah to an evocative figure. The features of Jewishness that perplexed and provoked Victorian writers were the same ones embraced by the makers of modernism. Susan Stanford Friedman's "Definitional Excursions: The Meanings of Modern/Modernity/Modernism" lists a set of paradoxical definitions, each claiming an oppositional definition of modernism. Friedman's article clearly shows that modernism was multiple and varied, depending on the scholar, or novelist, or genre:

> Just what IS modernism in an exchange where the word means not just different things, but precisely opposite things? The opposition of meanings produced over time…morphs into a binary of oppositions existing across space…the stories represent a conjuncture of temporal and spatial oppositions. So. Let's move from storytelling to another kind of conjuncture: parataxis—the juxtaposition of things without providing connectives. *Parataxis*: a common aesthetic strategy in modernist writing and art, developed to disrupt and fragment conventional sequencing, causality, and perspective. *Parataxis*: the opposite of *hypotaxis* in linguistics, thus the opposite of hierarchical relationships of syntactic units. *Parataxis*: a mechanism of the "dream work" in Freud's grammar for the unconscious processes of disguised expression of the forbidden, indicating unresolved or conflicting desires. (494-495)

Friedman's revelation that modernist studies is awash with contradictory definitions illuminates how the textual Jew continued to be useful to writers as the century unfolded. Modernism's resistance to stable definitions found its correlative in the figure of the Jew who often occupied countervailing definitions within nationalist discourse. Universal liberalism, which was promoted in the nineteenth century as a way to unify increasingly disparate populations within state borders, did not help Jews as it demanded an erasure of difference in exchange for emancipation. These contending forces affected Jewish representation as the validity of the nation-state—at least the traditional European powers—dimmed in the wake of the Great War. As modernity transformed into modernism, the figure of the Jew changed accordingly to the representational needs of writers.

The Jew was in a unique position among other ethnic groups because of the imagined Jew's relationship with tradition and modernity, difference and assimilation. Jews were distinctive in their wanderings through Europe. While the Roma may have wandered, they were not foundational to Christianity, which removed them from the Victorian preoccupation with origins that evolved into a modernist embrace of *grande histoire*. The other disenfranchised group dominating the Victorian imagination was the Irish, who responded to English occupation with an outpouring of modernist innovation. The Irish, unlike the Jews, inhabited their own land; they were colonial subjects but not exilic ones. Jews evoke the minority predicament, whether as assimilated citizens or marked outcasts; at the same time, Judaism is foundational to Christianity, and thus to large currents in the evolution of Europe. These highly charged positions separate Jews from other minorities who have similar complaints about representation and self-narration, while adding another level of complexity to their role within the novel and nation. With this paradox in mind, my dissertation shows how the Victorian textual Jew evolved into a Modernist everyman whose alienation garnered him entrée into modernism's imagination.

Modernism realigned geographical identities, rejecting the isolating nationalism that had spurred the World War by creating new spaces and places to define itself. The syndrome for American writers manifested in a flood of expatriates going abroad. The Lost Generation located, if not found, themselves in Paris, France. Writers from other Western nations also found themselves in exile, notably James Joyce, who needed to leave Dublin in order to narrate his island home. The displacement of writers after the World War created a move from national consciousness toward cosmopolitanism. The turn toward the city (certainly the Harlem Renaissance encapsulates this migration from rural to urban) was a way to renegotiate the place of aesthetic innovation in a transnational, cosmopolitan setting. The figure of the Jew and his

associations with the city were yet another outcropping of Jewish particularity representing a cultural shift. Modernism found in the Jew a figure who could occupy the contradictory and ambivalent forces shaping the post-WWI era. Whether bridging nationalism and cosmopolitanism or embodying the alienation felt by so many, the figure of the Jew signaled this shift away from a cohesive narration toward fragmented self-conception. James Joyce and Djuna Barnes dealt with the transition from national cosmopolitanism found in *Ulysses* to global displacement found in *Nightwood.* Barnes revises many of Joyce's themes—both writers deal with the textual Jew, his relationship to history and the nation, and modernist alienation. While the Victorians looked at the Diaspora as proof of Jewish masculinity's failing, Modernists saw that it offered a new way to define national belonging by way of cosmopolitanism.

Novel Endings

Literary representations shape national identity. This statement was not always obvious in literary scholarship, with New Criticism insisting that the text within the boundary of the covers should the sole focus of interpretation. This prohibitive interpretive framework soon gave way to more dynamic perspectives about literature as the Derridian revolution produced feminist, Marxist, New Historicist, and postcolonial theory. Central to this new alignment in literary studies is Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities*, which argued that literature played a central role in the defining and the developing of national consciousness. *Imagined Communities*, amply referenced in this dissertation, provided literature with new interpretive scaffolding, as Anderson argues that texts existed outside the boundaries of the page, and served as a component, and shaper, of national imagination. Anderson defined the nation as a socio-political entity as much as a sentimental, cultural enterprise: "the nation: it is an imagined political

community—imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign. … Communities are to be distinguished, not by their falsity/genuineness, but by the style in which they are imagined" (6). The imaginative role fiction played in forming national consciousness helped create the modern nation-state where people were no longer united by a ruler or dynasty, but by an understanding of a nationalized quotidian culture. Print culture, and for my purposes the novel, obscured political hegemony in favor of sentiment; in this sense, nationalism is a profoundly romantic enterprise. The novel emerged as the preeminent 'style' in which the national imagination expressed itself. One needs only to turn to Eliot's *Middlemarch* to see the ways in which her depictions of the intricate webbing of English society serve to locate national concerns permeating her art.[16]

As transnational currents brought many of England's concerns to turn-of-the-century America's shores, the novel found new uses for the old tropes of Jewish representation. As the Great Tradition became increasingly tattered, its own construction and tenuous hold on order was revealed. The new cultural tide brought by war manifested in a modernist aesthetic that broke, fragmented, and reinvented the novel. The Victorian novel attempted to smooth the edges of the nation whose conservative narratology was threatened by ambivalent meanings or peoples; Bhabha explains that "an important feature of colonial discourse is its dependence on the concept of 'fixity' in the ideological construction of otherness. Fixity, as the sign of cultural/historical/racial difference in the discourse of colonialism, is a paradoxical mode of representation: it connotes rigidity and an unchanging order as well as disorder, degeneracy, and

[16] See "Mapping Identities: Literature, Nationalism, Colonialism" by Timothy J. Reiss in *American Literary History*, Vol. 4, No. 4 (Winter, 1992) 649-677 or "A Novel Sympathy: The Imagination of Community in George Eliot" by Forest Pyle in *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction*, Vol. 27, No. 1 (Autumn, 1993) 5-23for more on George Eliot's depictions of the local community shaping the nation.

daemonic repetition" (*Location* 94-95). My dissertation looks at the paradoxical tension of Jewish representation by first looking at Victorian attempts to order the place of Jews within the nation and, thus, better maintain the mythical community; and secondly, by tracing the modernist embrace of disorder and repetition with its fondness for the textual Jew. Certainly not all modernist writers (Ezra Pound, T.S. Eliot) used the textual Jew positively—but all modernists did see in the Jew a new perspective on nationalism. The novel was no longer central to a unified nation, but a way to write "history of the modern Western nation from the perspective of the nation's margin and the migrants' exile" (*Location* 200). Modernists disordered the novel to reflect the failure of nations and nationalism. This is modernism's break with representational 'fixity' and can be traced by *how* Jews are represented in novels. Jewish masculinity figures in the establishing of the nineteenth-century nation, and the twentieth-century novel reworks the textual Jew in order to deconstruct the validity and fixity of the nation. Jewish masculinity plays with the constructions of nation, gender, and race. It reveals that nationalism, masculinity, and novels have always been fictions.

Chapter 1: "*Ivanhoe*: Assimilation as Conquest"

In my first chapter, I deal exclusively with Sir Walter Scott's *Ivanhoe* (1820), which predates Darwinism and its attendant race theory. *Ivanhoe* presents a reading of Jewish culture *before* ethnography, Darwinism, and scientific racism collapsed character and biology, making Jewish difference an immutable fact. As Edward Beaseley notes in *The Victorian Reinvention of Race* definitions had been in flux and changing since the eighteenth century when concepts of genetic inheritance (pioneered by Linnaeus, Blumenbach and Lamarck) first germinated.[17] Scott

[17] I offer these three scientists, all of whom were born in the eighteenth century and who predated Darwin, Galton and Knox, in order to highlight how the concept of race did not spring fully formed from Darwinism. Instead, concepts evolved and were reinvented to suit particular

has an opportunity to represent Jewish culture not just as a Jewish *race* or a *genetic* inheritance. It is the 1850s conceit that "physical type [determines] the epiphenomena of culture. And it is the reinvention of racism in that sense—a way of dividing up the world into heritable colour-coded categories that predict culture, mentality, and human worth" that Scott's novel predates. After his *Waverly* success, Scott's *Ivanhoe* represents one of the first novels to feature Jewish characters—Isaac and Rebecca of York—whose lives intertwine with the Christian knights and royalty.[18] That Scott even included Jewish characters during a time when the reading public was thirsty for medieval tales of chivalry speaks to his interest in England's relation to history and to the national narrative being spun as Great Britain began its march toward global imperialism. Scott used Isaac and Rebecca as critiques of nation-building occurring circa the twelfth-century and the nation building occurring in 1820. Scott appraises English appropriation of his native Scotland and the greater Isles that were being consumed and rendered amorphous by England's expansion. In light of English nation building, Scott's novel depicts several variations on masculinity, from the pious Knight to the weak, elderly Patriarch. Scott's representation of gender presents Jewish masculinity as an alternative to assimilation, which Scott feared would happen to his native land as Scotland was absorbed into Great Britain. The Jewish characters reveal how cultures and peoples are maintained, and, I argue, offer a counter-reading to the accepted state-sanctioned violence that so often accompanied the creation and maintenance of a nation and an empire. Isaac and Rebecca remain the most culturally "pure," or unassimilated

---

political climates. For more on Victorian race theory and its origins in the eighteenth century, see Edward Beaseley's *The Victorian Reinvention of Race*. New York: Routeledge, 2010.

[18] Scott's 1830 Introduction to *Ivanhoe* acknowledges his *Waverly* success, noting that part of his legacy is the recording of Scottish dialect and culture. Yet *Ivanhoe*, focused on English history during the reign of Richard I, looks at how Jewish culture remains apart and distinct—unlike Scottish history—from its English hosts and neighbors. The interplay between these three nations is what is of interest to my chapter and Scott's own introduction.

and non-violent, characters in the novel. Scott couples the violent masculinity of knighthood with cultural dilution: it is Ivanhoe and Rowena whose cultures intermingle and blend as a result of conquest.

My analysis of *Ivanhoe* is largely indebted to several critical examinations of Jewish masculinity. Daniel Boyarin's *Unheroic Conduct: The Rise of Heterosexuality and the Invention of the Jewish Man* emerged as invaluable to my first chapter; his insights into how Jewish culture itself ran counter to Western concepts of masculinity provides many of the theoretical underpinnings upon which my reading depends. *Unheroic Conduct* points out that John Ruskin articulated gender expectations of the era, which were represented as deviant from or in contrast to Jewish masculinity: "the man's power is active, progressive, defensive. He is eminently the doer, the creator, the discoverer, the defender. …[He has] energy for adventure, for war and for conquest" (Ruskin qtd in Boyarin 3). In Ruskin's synopsis all other genders and sexualities were seen as deviant from the white, English male whose mark of masculinity was his ability to conquer. Though Ruskin post-dates Scott's *Ivanhoe*, Boyarin's point that Jewish masculinity problematized a binary reading of gender frames my argument by showing how Jewish masculinity was a way to explore national issues through race and gender.

Chapter 2: "The Poetics of Departure"

My second chapter focuses on George Eliot's *Daniel Deronda* and on Anthony Trollope's *The Prime Minister*. Both of these texts respond to the "Jewish Question" while integrating evolutionary theory into their representations of Jewish characters. This chapter explores the scientific trends of the nineteenth-century and the influence of those trends on national politics and Jewish representation. For my purposes, I look at the two main Jewish figures in relation to the realist novel, the Victorian preoccupation with degeneracy and

evolution, and the construction of national identity. I demonstrate how Jewish masculinity functions in both novels, while showing how these very masculinities relate to and reinscribe nineteenth-century nationalist ideologies. Depictions of Jewish characters in each of these novels depend largely on the racial science of the time, including evolution theory, physiognomy, and race hierarchy, which coalesced to mark the Jewish male body as deviant and effeminate. Trollope and Eliot use the Jewish male body as a platform to explore issues of English nationalism. The first two chapters clearly link concepts of nationalism with concepts of masculinity and race in an effort to show how Jewish men presented a unique body of signification within English literature of the nineteenth century.

Chapter 3: " 'The Jewish Question' or Will You Marry Me?"

By the turn of the century, Darwinism had begotten Sexology. Concern over the national health morphed into a preoccupation with marriage, which was seen as the last bastion against the degeneration of the national body. While novels had frequently incorporated the marriage plot, near the end of the nineteenth century they became increasingly more interested in marriage in relation to demographic and economic changes. Eugenics, which emphasized genetics and a biological reading of identity, depended largely on economics. Henry James's *The Golden Bowl* and Edith Wharton's *The House of Mirth* contain marriage plots that intersect with national health. My third chapter moves across the Atlantic to explore the ways in which Jewish men figured in the oeuvres of James and Wharton, two authors who consistently used the American ingénue as central to their critique of American cultural practices. The Jewish Question takes on new life with the Americans who use it as a way to explore the Woman Question. Much like Foucault's Malthusian couple, marriage and reproduction become national concerns, and a means to regulate individual behavior and private acts for the maintenance of the state.

George Mosse's *Nationalism and Sexuality* draws from *The History of Sexuality* to probe how nations use art and literature to regulate social behavior, namely marriage and procreation. Mosse argues that nations used marginalized sexualities and peoples to define the center. Though he devoted only one chapter to racial difference, Mosse's assertion that regulating behavior has long been the policy of nations informs my focus on Jewish representation by non-Jewish authors as a way to define, investigate, and question their nations' enforcement of borders, whether political or cultural. Looking at the fall of Lily Bart in *The House of Mirth* and the rise of Maggie Verver in *The Golden Bowl*, this chapter extends the many arguments made about gender, race, and nationalism in the works of Wharton and James. I show how the figure of the Jew represents the changing culture of capitalism, considering at the same time the evolving role of women within in a capitalist economy. I also explore America's preoccupation with ethnicity. Continuing with the premise that studying Jewish representation by non-Jewish writers can facilitate understanding nationalism's anxieties and concerns, we see that James and Wharton's Jewish characters reveal far more than their rather "small" roles in the novel would otherwise indicate.

Chapter 4: "Joyce and Barnes: Modernism, Modernity, and Jewish Identity"

My dissertation demonstrates how literature's figuring of the Jew changed as the needs of nations and narrators evolved. As the Victorian novel morphed into the modernist experiment, and as the legitimacy of nations diminished after the First World War, the figure of the Jew brought new representational vitality. No longer a boundary marker for a coherent nation-state, the imagined Jew became a reflective figure who assumed a more complex role in Modernism. Maren Tova Linett speaks of this evolution in *Modernism, Feminism, and Jewishness;* "the most basic use of Jewish characters in modernist literature [were] as mirrors to reflect some

characteristic—often alienation—of the non-Jewish characters" (22). The change from peripheral figure of difference to alienated everyman reflects the changing national and literary consciousness of the early twentieth century.

The remainder of the dissertation works from the premise that after the First World War, representations of Jews changed. My fourth chapter, which focuses on James Joyce's *Ulysses* and Djuna Barnes's *Nightwood*, puts the preceding three chapters in the context of a modernist response to Victorian modernity. As Tamar Garb writes, "in the conditions of modernity the Nation subsumed all its citizens into the formation of a shared, secular culture, it proclaimed this under the rubric of the 'Rights of Man,' an apparently universal slogan" (25). Modernism was a new generation's response to a jaded world that had lost its faith in the covenant between individual citizen and patria. Modernism's alienated artist questioned these universals of a secular-state. They structure political and cultural identity as unstable and uncontainable, with each novel presenting characters marginalized by a dominant culture. Joyce and Barnes respond to the cultural currents running through the nineteenth-century—nationalism; the bourgeoisie; a faith in science and religion—by revealing just how corrosive universal culture could be when it eradicated individual consciousness and artistry.

The figure of the Jew plays particularly well for modernist understandings of self and society. If the modernist artist is by definition alienated, dispossessed, and homeless, then the figure of the Jew had long been used to represent such predicaments. *The Jew in the Text: Modernity and the Construction of Identity* argues that the figure of the Jew represented a conflicted transition from old to new, or from tradition to modernity (Garb 25). If modernist artists were going to grapple with these issues, there was a figure already established and in dialogue with many of the discourses they found so troubling about their Victorian forbearers:

the Jew. Conceptually, the Jew became the alienated everyman who cropped up after the World War offering artists a recognizable tradition to work from and rewrite. The Harlem Renaissance saw in the figure of the Jew a sympathetic and symmetrical existence as witnessed in Jean Toomer's *Cane.* And Willa Cather's *The Professor's House* investigates the cost of an American empire with the Jewish Louie Maresellus. The Jewish figure occupies contradictory spaces and concepts; from these discrepancies and gaps, modernism(s) flourished. The malleability and representational expansiveness of the mythic, imagined Jew helped create high Modernism's aesthetic.[19] Joyce's *Ulysses* and Barnes's *Nightwood* are classic "high" modernist texts, which depict Jews as representative citizens of failing nations.

Chapter 5: "Jewish Modernism in 1939"

My dissertation up to this point relies upon representations of Jews by Christian writers to understand the novel in its national context. The mythic Jew, the Jewish figure, the imagined Jew: these are all names I and other critics give to indicate that these are not subjects of their own creation. In light of the massive repercussions of nineteenth-century racism, imperialism, and nationalism, my dissertation ends with three Jewish writers. I look at Sigmund Freud, Gertrude Stein, and Walter Benjamin, and specifically at their works from 1939: *Moses and Monotheism*, *Paris France*, and *Theses on the Philosophy of History*. 1939 marked the final breakdown of a liberal society in Germany. The Nuremburg laws had been implemented, which signaled a climax to Victorian-era race theory. Many Jewish writers and intellectuals, meanwhile, were being deported or were emigrating. My last chapter, "Jewish Modernism in 1939," starts with the crisis of fascism, nationalism's ugliest child, and functions as a counter-reading, or rather Jewish response, to the preceding chapters. Using Benjamin as a conceptual

[19] Cheyette uses the term mythic to illustrate that "the Jew" was not a historical subject but a fictionalized concept.

bridge between Freud and Stein, this chapter attempts to see all three authors as refashioning their Jewish culture into a Modernist aesthetic in reply to the political and social upheaval each experienced in 1939. I argue that the modernist aesthetic owes a great deal to rabbinic tradition with its polyvocal interrogation of fragments (it is regrettable that T.S. Eliot did not study Torah). Using Benjamin's "The Storyteller" and "Theses on the Philosophy of History," I explore the ethical implications of Freud's rewriting of Jewish history and Stein's radical incorporation of rabbinic thought in *Paris France* as well as in some of her shorter works of the late 1930s.

***

My dissertation investigates how Jewish representation functioned in the novel as the modern nation-state was created. The chosen texts and dates create an evolutionary timeline of Jewish representation from the beginnings of the nineteenth-century to the start of World War II. My focus is primarily on representations of Jewish masculinity's oddity and how novelists represented Jews in light of changes to national identities and shifting racial and sexual politics. Perceptions of Jewish masculinity remain important to the study of Victorian and Modernist Literature because it signifies in multiple, prismatic ways. As my dissertation will show, Jews occupy a unique space and place in transatlantic literature; they are at once part of and apart from Western culture, liberalism, and modernity. The "Jewish Question" in many ways is the modern question of belonging and identity.

Chapter 1

Ivanhoe: Assimilation as Conquest

Isaac of York cuts an odd figure among *Ivanhoe*'s burly Saxons and violent Templar Knights: "Isaac thus stood an outcast in the present society, like his people among nations, looking in vain for welcome or resting place" (65). The image of Isaac alone, shivering in a cold hall surrounded by gruff, inhospitable Saxons introduces the importance of national belonging (if the hall is the nation, Isaac certainly is the odd man out) and cultural integrity (Isaac's fortitude to sustain such isolation protects his culture). In a novel about forging the English empire, and about the fallout from the Crusades—Cedric disinherits Ivanhoe because of his sojourn to Palestine—the Jewish presence, and, in particular, Isaac's, serves as a counterpoint to the other masculinities masquerading through the text. Scott's understanding of nationalism shapes his representation of Isaac and, in a larger sense, Jewish masculinity. At *Ivanhoe*'s core is the question of identity, assimilation, and violence; Scott's portrayal of Jewish masculinity subverts these three components of nation-building by offering an alternative understanding of collective belonging that would contrast with the nineteenth-century's glorification of English origins and its implications for Scott's own nation, Scotland.

In Chapter V of *Ivanhoe*, Sir Walter Scott quotes Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice*'s "Hath not a Jew eyes?" to introduce Isaac of York and announce his arrival at Cedric's castle (63). *Ivanhoe*, written sixty-six years after the Jew Bill of 1753, which would have given a small Sephardic community citizenship, continues in the Shakespearean tradition, and in turn the

English literary tradition, of inquiring about the humanity of Jews.[20] The reference to Shylock, who demanded a pound of flesh for payment, invokes medieval blood libel, and makes *Ivanhoe* the next installment in the saga of Jewish representation.[21] Allusions to *The Merchant of Venice* entrench *Ivanhoe* in a specific literary history; however, Scott revises this inheritance. Judith Lewin's article "Jewish Heritage and Secular Inheritance in Walter Scott's *Ivanhoe*" highlights the narrative differences between the father-daughter dyads of Shylock and Jessica, Isaac and Rebecca: "Jessica betrays her father, Shylock, runs away with her lover, converts, and robs her father's house. … Rebecca's behavior is precisely the opposite: she gives away the casket and jewels, she accompanies her father into exile, and abandons her love and her country" (28). Scott, using the two daughters' divergent moral paths, reworks Jessica's faults through Rebecca's integrity.

While Rebecca went on to be most beloved in the Anglo-American imagination, her father's role has yielded less popular praise and critical concern.[22] *Ivanhoe*'s Isaac revises the Shylock archetype—which would seem to bode well for Jewish representation. The novel, however, offers an unsatisfactory ending. Much like Shylock's conversion off-stage at play's end, Isaac's journey begins at the end of *Ivanhoe* with his departure for Grenada, Spain. Isaac's refusal to assimilate and his subsequent exodus highlights how differently Jewish masculinity had to be constructed and performed by Jews and non-Jews alike. Shakespeare's iconic

[20] The Jewish Naturalization Act of 1753 would have given a small number of Jews the ability to solicit parliament for naturalized citizenship. The bill was brought down in the House of Commons and created a public outcry.
[21] For more on medieval blood libel and the Shylock character, see Frank Felsenstein's *Anti-Semitic Stereotypes*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1995.
[22] Public interest in Rebecca persisted well after the publication *Ivanhoe*. In 1883, C. Bowyer Vaux's play adaptation, *Rebecca and Rowena; or, The Triumph of Israel* appeared, and even Elizabeth Taylor's portrayal of Rebecca in the1952 film adaptation sparked another wave of interest in the Jewess.

depiction of Jewish masculinity, specifically Shylock's relationship to money, pride, and his family, jettisons into my main concern of Scott's leveraging of Jewish masculinity to explore his views on national identity.

Ivanhoe's reception was overwhelmingly positive, and its engagement with Jewish characters sparked widespread interest. The *Ivanhoe* factory produced multiple stage productions, spinoffs ending with an Ivanhoe & Rebecca marriage, as well as making Scott a transnational name.[23] America embraced *Ivanhoe* for its fashioning of nationhood. *Ivanhoe* also became a reference for Southern men performing a regional chivalric code.[24] Two Ministers (Gladstone and Blair) and several MPs have named *Ivanhoe* as their favorite novel, citing its depiction of national life as inspiration for their careers in politics (Windscheffel 71). The novel is indisputably part of England's national consciousness. Scott, however, was far trickier than these uncomplicated receptions indicate. *Ivanhoe*'s popular success does not diminish Scott's subversive politics. That he was able to write an admired novel for his neighbors to the South and his cousins across the Atlantic, while critiquing national chauvinism is a testament to his craft. The man who began his career with *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border* and grew up on "the stories of the warfare between the Scots and the English, as ancient as the middle ages, and as recent as the Jacobite rebellion of 1745, the last attempt of the Stuarts to reassert their claim to the throne of England," executed his own literary invasion (Damrosch 918).

---

[23] The novel was so popular William Makepeace Thackeray wrote a parody, *Rebecca and Rowena* (1850) in an effort to mock audience demand for a Rebecca and Ivanhoe marriage. For more on *Ivanhoe* stage productions during the nineteenth century, see Jeff S. Daily's *Sir Arthur Sullivan's Grand Opera Ivanhoe and Its Musical Precursors: Adaptations of Sir Walter Scott's Novel for the Stage, 1819-1891*. Edwin Mellen Press, 2008.

[24] For more on *Ivanhoe*'s influence on America's Southern Literature, see Grace Warren Landrum's "Sir Walter Scott and His Literary Rivals in the Old South" *American Literature*. 2.3 (November 1930): 256-276.

When Sir Walter Scott published *Ivanhoe* in December of 1819, he was best known for his *Waverly* Novels. In his 1830 introduction to *Ivanhoe,* Scott remarked that "Scottish manners, Scottish dialect, the Scottish characters of note, being those with which the author is most intimately and familiarly acquainted, were the groundwork upon which he had hitherto relied for giving effect to his narrative" (3). Scott's literary achievement began in Scotland on the periphery of the British Isles. When Scott decided to write a novel about English history, it signaled both a literary and political shift and a challenge to the dominant culture of England. As Ian Duncan notes in his introduction to *Ivanhoe*, "like a literary version of the Conqueror, Scott has achieved the most effective Scottish invasion of England since the Union, and reversed the relations between imperial centre and province" (vii). *Ivanhoe* challenged the imperial center of London to reassess the way the English formed national identity, while subverting the concept of a national character. As a Scot, the author of *Ivanhoe* was able to observe the making of England and the English from a remove, and, in turn, grasp the ways ideologies obscured historical truths and fabricated historical narratives as a way of shaping the present.

Scott's position as a cultural and political outsider increased his awareness of how the dominant culture constructed alien populations. For Scott, a nation's history needed to include those who did not fit neatly into racial and religious categories. Scott was keenly aware of his placement within history and the precarious cultural position Scotland maintained as part of unified Britain.[25] His dedicatory epistle explains that "still the severer antiquary may think, that, by thus intermingling fiction with truth, I am polluting the well of history with modern

[25] Sir Walter Scott's personal letters reveal an antiquarian obsessed with Scotland's legacy and culture. In an 1818 letter, Scott writes that "the spirit of the Scotch at the union clung fondly to these emblems and to soothe their jealousy it was specially provided by an article of the union that the regalia should never be removed under any pretext from the Kingdom of Scotland" (http://www.walterscott.lib.ed.ac.uk/etexts/etexts/letters5.PDF).

inventions" (17). Scott undercut the accepted truth of a unified England by polluting his novels with minority populations whose presence disrupted a coherent reading of the nation. *Ivanhoe* is as much about the violent fabrication of history as it is a 'historical novel.' The Jews in *Ivanhoe* become markers of difference and reveal just how England constructs national history. Specifically, Scott uses Jewish characters to highlight the violence of forging a nation, whether it is the violence of assimilation, war, or expulsion.

Historical novels, such as *Ivanhoe*, are water markers not of the time period fictionalized, but of the moment of composition. Richard Maxwell's *Inundations of Time: A Definition of Scott's Originality* states

> As an evocation of the thirteenth century *Ivanhoe* is worthless, but it remains an object of considerable historical value, evoking the years that followed the Napoleonic Wars in its reconstruction of late Norman England. Scott, then, *is* a historian, but only in the sense that he lives under the sway of passing fashions and expresses their meanings. To put this another way, he is a historian because he is subject to history and capable of externalizing his subjection. (421)

Ivanhoe's fictional account of England's origins speaks not to historical accuracy, but to a critique of the origin myth and its endorsement of national identity. Sir Walter Scott uses England's interest in the middle ages, the Crusades, and chivalry as a means of exploring the country's current predicament. [26] Specifically, *Ivanhoe* continues a dialogue started by Edmund Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, which chastises revolutionary zeal as contrary to a nation's health: "You had all these advantages in your ancient states, but you chose to act as if you had never been molded into civil society and had everything to begin anew. You began ill, because you began by despising everything that belonged to you" (31). Burke constructs revolution as a rejection of a nation's past, a rejection that leads to poorly developed societies.

[26] *Ivanhoe* ends in 1194 when Richard I returns from the Third Crusades. However, England's fascination with the Middle Ages during the 19th century extends beyond *Ivanhoe*'s dates.

Revolution is then a rejection of history, but continuity with the past and the embrace of history leads to national pride and development.

Ivanhoe challenges the Burkian tradition of history, which saw "the present as an unbroken transmission of political and social institutions…ethical habits and moral dispositions. Whether national character or constitution was in question, the full understanding of the value of such present institutions was contingent on recognizing their origins in the past and conceiving of their survival as a process of deliberate transmission" (Lee 539). While *Ivanhoe* was published thirty years after Edmund Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, the issue of national identity still concerned England. After the French Revolution, Napoleon's nationalism took the form of an aggressive imperialism. The defeat of Napoleon did little to allay anxieties about what it meant to be English.

The two watershed moments in English nationalism were the Norman Conquest and the French Revolution. Many nineteenth-century writers and thinkers found comfort in idealizing the Middle Ages, a period that represented the birth of English identity. Burke takes great care in *Reflections* to depict the age of chivalry as an ideal time for England and humanity:

> But the age of chivalry is gone. That of sophisters, economists; and calculators has succeeded; and the glory of Europe is extinguished forever. Never, never more shall we behold that generous loyalty to rank and sex, that proud submission, that dignified obedience, that subordination of the heart which kept alive, even in servitude itself, the spirit of an exalted freedom. The unbought grace of life, the cheap defense of nations, the nurse of manly sentiment and heroic enterprise, is gone! It is gone, that sensibility of principle, that chastity of honor which felt a stain like a wound, which inspired courage whilst it mitigated ferocity, which ennobled whatever it touched, and under which vice itself lost half its evil by losing all its grossness.

From the violence of the Norman Conquest and the Battle of Hastings arose an English consciousness that in Burke's estimation was scripted and elegant. There would be no dishonor as long as the code of honor was maintained. Burke's vision of chivalry promoted individual

complacency of station and place: chivalry works because it encodes and prescribes. For Burke, chivalry was a system of manners that enabled individual men to perform with "manly sentiment" and "heroic enterprise" based on status and place. Men were happily confined to their station, gender, and religion. However, Burke's faith in the past does not account for those who differed from the national discourse.[27]

Grappling with the weight of Burke's 1790 claims, writers at the beginning of the nineteenth-century was asked "what is an Englishman?"[28] Burke's *Reflections* constructed Englishness as part of a historical inheritance whose precedence was set in ancient times; the past played an integral role in shaping the present and future. Burke makes it clear that the English revolution of 1688 differed from the French Revolution in that it "was made to preserve our *ancient*, indisputable laws and liberties and that *ancient* constitution of government which is our only security for law and liberty" (27). In this way, the construction of English identity was a conservative enterprise, as it is with most nationalist ideologies. Billie Melman's *Claiming the Nation's Past: The Invention of an Anglo-Saxon Tradition* argues that "the term 'conservative' is used in a rather broad and inclusive manner, and denotes an attitude or a temper rather than an

[27] Edmund Burke was a conservative in the sense that he valued tradition, believing change should come about slowly and obediently. However, he was not blind to the perils of colonialism, which his idealization of the chivalric code might lead us to believe. On the one hand, Burke believed that English moral sentiment could civilize anyone (liberalism); on the other, that the English way was the best (conservative). My reading of his *Reflections* is to establish how English authors idealized medieval England in order to explain England's Imperial role. Burke's parliamentary career demonstrates his deep understanding of conservative and liberal ideas; he was a staunch critic of colonial power when it undermined and corrupted what he saw as English exceptionalism and moral providence.

[28] David Castronovo's *The English Gentleman: Images and Ideals in Literature in Society* traces how the definition of gentleman changed throughout the 19th century. By definition the term "Gentleman" or "well-born man" excluded those who were racially and religiously different. In this sense a "gentleman" is by definition a white, Anglican Englishman. This will become of particular importance to my work with George Eliot's *Daniel Deronda*, in which the title character must struggle with his Jewish heritage and his status as a gentleman.

political creed or filiation. It is anti-modernist, paternalist, ruralist and nationalist" (577). Responding to Burke's conservatism, the historical novel *Ivanhoe* works hard to challenge and subvert England's easy reliance on the past as a means to explain the present. *Ivanhoe* challenges a "discourse that enjoined all classes to draw on an undivided cultural inheritance in order to reenact the triumphs of ages remote in time" (Lee 539).[29] Scott's perspective from Edinburgh allowed him to see just how England's nationalist discourse forced out people who did not contribute to its unified history.

After the Edinburgh publication of *Ivanhoe* in December of 1819, articles began appearing in *The London Magazine* addressing the novel's cultural and racial themes. [30] *Ivanhoe*, a radical shift for Scott as he veered away from his homeland, explores English origins, and inspired some very pointed articles meant to diminish Scott's indictment of England's past. In an 1821 article "Jews, Scotchmen, Quakers and other Imperfect Sympathies," Elia criticizes these three groups, who at first seem a disjointed assembly.[31] However, in light of *Ivanhoe*'s literary significance the three groups merge into a single threat to English nationalism.

The article attempts to discredit the Scots, claiming that "their intellectual wardrobe (to confess fairly) has few whole pieces in it. They are content with fragments and scattered pieces of Truth" (152). The capitalization of Truth signals the author's belief in a uniform reality, one

[29] Lee argues that Scott's antiquarian novels work against an undivided, uninterrupted transmission of national culture. By reviving the past, Scott subverts England's self-narration. Lee's argument focuses on Scott's *The Antiquary*, supplying critical context to my own argument. My chapter extends Lee's argument and focuses upon *Ivanhoe* and its subversion of English national identity by its inclusion of Jewish characters.

[30] Scott finished *Ivanhoe* in November of 1819 and the novel was published in Edinburgh on December 18, 1819. Because of paper shortages and storms, its London publication was delayed until December 31, 1819 though the novel bears an 1820 publication date.

[31]The 1821 article was published under the pen name Elia; however, it was well known that Charles Lamb frequently published in "The London Magazine" under this nom de plume.

that does not include division (perhaps from an angry Scotland?). Continuing in this dismissive vein, Elia reveals just how much Scott's novel disrupted an Englishman's self-definition:

> But I have always found that a true Scot resents your admiration of his compatriot [Robert Burns] even more that he would your contempt of him. He latter he imputes your "imperfect acquaintance with many of the words which he uses;" and the same objection makes it a presumption in you to suppose that you can admire him. I have a great mind to give up Burns. There is certainly a bragging spirit of generosity, a swaggering assertion of independence, and *all that*, in his writings. (154)

The author colonially appropriates another country's poet, claiming that the Scot's imperfect acquaintance with Burns removes him Scotland and his distinct language. Scotland may have joined the Union in 1707 but its national identity did not disappear with the treaty.[32] The article alludes to Hume's history of England, suggesting that Scotland threatened England's self-conception (154). Hume's *The History of England* "was part of a tradition of Scottish writers who took as their project the revision of English historiography […] it emphatically proclaimed its freedom from English partisanship" (Ragussis *Figures* 110). Hume's history, along with Scott's fictionalized novel, become a source of anxiety for *The London Magazine* critic's view of English history.

Lamb's English literary establishment lumped Scots and Jews together, arguing that the two formed an "imperfect sympathy" of poorly formed culture. The author despises the Scot for his independence and the Jew because he blurs racial and national boundaries: "I boldly confess

[32] In January of 1820, John Scott, the editor of the Times Magazine began a feud with Blackwood's, after the magazine made comments about the validity of Cockneys in literature. The exchange exceeded a degree of anger expected between two competing magazines, becoming a regional argument about the intellectual supremacy of Edinburgh over London. Sir Walter Scott and Charles Lamb privately corresponded as early as 1818 when Scott invited the young Englishman to visit Scotland. Lamb declined, eventually had lunch with Scott, and concluded a poor opinion of the *Waverly* novels. In light of the attacks between the two magazines, Lamb's distaste for Scott's work, and the cultural regionalism of the time, the "Scot" mentioned in Lamb's essay might be one of many, but there is good evidence to suggest it was indeed Sir Walter Scott.

that I do not relish the approximation of Jew and Christian, which has become so fashionable […] I do not understand these half-convertites. Jews christianizing—Christians judaizing—puzzles me" (154). The author blames "liberality" and "the light of a nineteenth century" (Lamb 154) for bringing Christians and Jews into proximity—and even worse, the difference between the two groups has diminished. The author sees Jewish and Christian history as separate with clearly defined differences. Interestingly it is not the imagined Jew who causes anxiety, but the blurring, mixing, and graying of difference of the "half-convertites." The Jewish presence in England challenges the connection between nation and religion, disabling a purist reading of an Anglican England.

The Quakers, like the Jews, disrupt national identity. While Quakers are not racialized, as in the case of the Jews, they threaten the nation by their belief in non-violence. In essence, the Quaker will not bear arms for his country. This refusal to fight or support violence places the Quaker outside of national discourse—nationalism is rarely non-violent. This explains the author's distrust for an otherwise amiable group: "When I am ruffled or disturbed by an occurrence, the sight, or quiet voice of a Quaker acts upon me as a ventilator, lightening the air, and taking off a load from the bosom. But I cannot like the Quakers" (155). Read in tandem with the criticism of the Scot and Jew, the Quaker becomes the last piece in the puzzle of what threatens a nation. The Scot refuses an easy assimilation; the Jew blurs racial and cultural distinctions; the Quaker questions the violence of nationalism. The article addresses many of the points raised by *Ivanhoe* and it is no surprise that it appears a year after the book's publication.

Ivanhoe prompted contemporary debate regarding national character and belonging. Other articles followed "Jews, Scotchmen, Quakers and other Imperfect Sympathies," discussing

Ivanhoe's relevance to England's self-image.[33] Though *Ivanhoe* was a very popular novel, the article illustrates just how much a fictional tract could challenge the national dialogue. *Ivanhoe* becomes a flash point for the national debate because it debunks the twelfth century as the foundation of a unified England by showing just how war, violence, and assimilation mold society. Georg Lukács's *The Historical Novel* argues that Scott's novel brings to the forefront how history shapes individual men; Scott's sweeping scope of history encompass all the ways a people develop and change:

> It was the French Revolution, the revolutionary wars, and the rise and fall of Napoleon, which for the first time made history a *mass experience*, and moreover on a European scale […] Now if experiences such as these are linked with the knowledge that similar upheavals are taking place all over the world, this must enormously strengthen the feeling first that there is such a thing as history, that it is an uninterrupted process of changes and finally that it has a direct effect upon the life of every individual. (Lukács 23)

Interest in the twelfth century gave England a way to unify around an imagined past and shared cultural origin. In the wake of the French Revolution, communal history became a way of homogenizing a politically fractured England.

Ivanhoe demythologizes a unified past void of racial and ethnic splinters. It is the Jewish people—not the Normans and Anglo-Saxons—who embody the unity that the nineteenth century was desperately trying to establish. In *Ivanhoe*, the Jewish Isaac and Rebecca represent the greatest challenge to an idealization of the twelfth century and chivalry. Scott's *Ivanhoe* works against Burkian ideals of a continuous history by including counter-narratives, which subvert a

[33] Late in the summer of 1820, The London Magazine published, "Historico-Critical Inquiry in the Origin of the Rosicrucians and the Free Masons," which declared that the first free-masons, or Templar Knights, were Protestants, not "Papists" and that the secret society could never admit Jews, who were deemed "the enemies of Christ." The Times Magazine, unlike Blackwood's, consistently had articles dealing with the more controversial elements of *Ivanhoe*, such as Rebecca's ability to inter-marry, Bois-Guilbert's desire for Rebecca in light of his Templar Knighthood, and the place of pre-Christian peoples within the nation.

grand English narrative. Isaac and Rebecca in *Ivanhoe* are emblematic of the problems and perils of over investment in a nationalist discourse dependent upon a false sense of religion and history. Michael Ragussis states in *Figures of Conversion* that Scott "attacks the conventional formulations of English history (as continuous) and English identity (as pure) […] Scott envisions history as the record of difference" (100). While Ragussis concentrates on the threat of conversion's cultural effect on dominant culture, Scott's characters invert the rhetoric. It is Isaac and Rebecca who resist England's monolithic framing of history and expose its inherent violence by refusing to convert.

Scott positions himself as an outsider to English history, questioning "why the author of the Scottish Novels, as they were then exclusively termed, should be desirous to make an experiment on a subject purely English" (5). Scott answered his own dedicatory epistle's question, claiming that it is outside observers who illuminate the past because they are the least invested in it. For Scott, place *becomes* perception, and the English need a rogue Scot to explain history:

> If you describe him [the English reader] a set of wild manners, and a state of primitive society existing in the Highlands of Scotland, he is much disposed to acquiesce in the truth of what is asserted […] But the same worthy person, when placed in his own snug parlour, and surrounded by all the comforts of an Englishman's fireside, is not half so much disposed to believe that his own ancestors led a very different life from him; that the shattered tower, which now forms a vista from his window, once held a baron who would have hung him up at his own door without any form of trial. (16)

The "snugness" experienced by the English reader turns to "smugness." England's past contains only glory, not injustice. Scott's epistle chips away at the national delusion that heralded chivalry without seeing the barbarism of barons. The epistle playfully prods English readers to recognize themselves in a past that is not fair or democratic, revealing how national identity distorts perceptions.

The Middle Ages became England's national index, which helped answer the pressing question of "Who are we?" in the face of cultural upheaval. Scott realized that idealizing the Middle Ages and the Chivalric Code placed many people/s in an awkward position. With the Eighteenth and Nineteenth centuries' interest in the Middle Ages, the past then became English, Christian and masculine. In Scott's hands, *Ivanhoe* becomes a warning to the developing national ethos and cautions against ideologies that partake in oppressive, limiting systems of identity. Scott opens *Ivanhoe* with a reminder to the reader that England has had many conquerors, and that no people or religion has nativist claims:

> Hundreds of broad-headed, short-stemmed, wide-branched oaks, which had witnessed perhaps the stately march of the Roman soldiery, flung their gnarled arms over a thick carpet of the most delicious green sward […] A considerable open space, in the midst of this glade, seemed formerly to have been dedicated to the rites of Druidical superstition; for, on the summit of a hillock, so regular as to seem artificial, there still remained part of a circle of rough unhewn stones, of large dimensions. Seven stood upright; the rest had been dislodge from their places, probably by the zeal of some convert to Christianity (27-28).

Scott intertwines the natural topography with the national landscape. Refuting the supposition that the natural world, the countryside defines English identity—later popularized by William Cobbett's *Rural Rides*—Scott takes back the land from its romanticized narrative, offering a history that takes root before the Norman Conquest and Christianity. In his description of the landscape, Scott undercuts the notion that the land belongs to a specific people. The setting of *Ivanhoe* dismantles "a loyalty to, and veneration of, territories or places—real or imagined. The national geography defining England is central to the development of national identity" (Melman 577). Scott is especially subversive in neutralizing the geographical importance to the development of English nationalism by reminding readers that the land was there before the national religion of Christianity. Romans and Druids had all occupied England before

Christianity was introduced. In *Ivanhoe*, the land does not support Burkian historical continuity and is inhabited by multiple peoples.

Scott represents history as a series of clashes that facilitate change and progress, not a natural progression. English, Scott reminds his readers, comes from Norman and Anglo-Saxon languages and represents a fusion of the two embattled cultures:

> In short, French was the language of honour, of chivalry, and even of justice, while the far more manly and expressive Anglo-Saxon was abandoned to the use of rustics and hinds […] The necessary intercourse between the lords of the soil, and those oppressed inferior beings by whom that soil was cultivated, accessioned the gradual formation of a dialect, compounded betwixt the French and the Anglo-Saxon, in which they could render themselves mutually intelligible to each other; and from this necessity arose by degrees the structure of our present English language. (27)

Language, like history, is not static. The foundations of language and states are in flux and it is this constant movement which brings about the present. For Scott, without the blending, diluting, and merging of the Norman and Anglo-Saxon languages, English would not exist. England, which is now held together by a common language and therefore, must recognize its polyphonic development. England is racially and culturally mixed and cannot be sliced up according to Norman and Saxon influences: "the Norman Conquest became the most important event in English historiography because it was the event by which the appeal to history was consistently used to establish national identity" (Ragussis 196). The constant weaving of Norman and Anglo-Saxon influences demonstrates Scott's recognition of the Norman Conquest without conceding cultural victory for either side. He contends that both nations took root and shaped England and does not privilege the Saxon part in order to bolster England's self-construction. Georg Lukács sees Scott's fusion as a 'middle ground:'

> He attempts by fathoming historically the whole English development to find a 'middle way' for himself between the warring extremes. He finds in English history the consolation that the most violent vicissitudes of class struggle have always calmed down into a glorious 'middle way'. Thus, out of the struggle of the Saxons and Normans arose

> the English nation, neither Saxon nor Norman […] The conception of English history in the novels of Scott thus gives a perspective (though not explicitly) of future development in its author's sense. (32)

While Lukács is right to argue that Scott's blending of cultures is a middle ground and a positivist view of history, only the Normans and Saxons are factored into this reading. Lukács does not address the Jewish population either in *Ivanhoe* or of the nineteenth century. If Scott was pointing out the positives of a Norman-Saxon fusion, he counters with the alienated Jewish community. There is no fusion or acceptance, whether in the fictionalized twelfth century or with contemporary Anglo-Jewry. The Jewish Question was still alive centuries later, showing that English nationalism had yet to account for its Jewish constituents. Heidi Kaufman's *English Origins, Jewish Discourse* sees the tension between acknowledging England's past (whether Norman, or in her argument, Jewish) with the still inchoate ideology of race: "the version of England that appeared in nineteenth-century novels was more than just a political, religious, or geographical constructions; it is also…presented as a racial nation with a Jewish past" (5). Kaufman's study shows how complicated Jewish discourse became for England during the nineteenth-century because it attempted to reconcile the competing ideologies of race and religion. I see, however, Scott's depictions of the Jewish nation as neither religious nor racial, but a cultural reading of inheritance—one that depends upon each generations acknowledgement of the past. As with Isaac and Rebecca, Scott's cultural memory protects Scotland from English appropriation.

Scott's description of the landscape and language of England gestures toward a hybrid culture that does not have a definite inheritor.[34] While the Normans and the Anglo-Saxons fight

[34]Heidi Kaufman's *English Origins, Jewish Discourse* argues that *Ivanhoe* is replete with border crossings that illustrate the permeability of a unified English nation; "In turning to England's medieval past, Scott includes numerous descriptions of heavy walls, doors, and partitions, most

for authority over the nation, they are unified in their dislike of the Jews. For as much as Scott shows that England's history is a blend of cultures, he is quick to show that the Jews in the Middle Ages as well as the nineteenth century occupy a liminal space. The Normans and the Anglo-Saxons eventually intermarry, rally around Christianity, and forge a national identity based as much on religion as on language. Though the knights might fight for control over England, there is an underlying filial connection: both groups fight for Christianity and can always find a common ground in the crusades. Scott stresses that Christian unity develops at the expense of Jewish persecution:

> There was no race existing on the earth, in the air, or the waters, who were the object of such an intermitting, general, and relentless persecution as the Jews of this period [….] Norman, Saxon, Dane, and Briton, however adverse these races were to each other, contended which should look with greatest detestation upon a people, whom it was accounted a point of religion to hate, to revile, to despise, to plunder, and to persecute. (81)

Scott criticizes national/racial unity by pointing out how it inevitably creates an "other" to persecute. Christians, whether Saxon or Norman, can use the Jewish body as point of contrast. The Jews are different from the gentiles in both religion and nation. The Jewish population can never find solace the fervor of the crusades, nor can they 'fight' for nationhood and affirm their masculinity. The Jews of *Ivanhoe* are markedly different from the Christian characters in that they are not warriors or knights.

Nadia Valman's reading of *Ivanhoe* in *The Jewess in Nineteenth-Century British Literary Culture* does not account for the Jewish characters' violent experience during England's unification. In Valman's reading, conversion and assimilation are not violent struggles, but a

---

of which fail to achieve their purpose of preventing outsiders from entering" (27). Kaufman's argument that cultural, national borders are represented in Scott's description of old England bolsters the concept that the land belongs *naturally* to no one. Instead, as Kaufman argues, borders must be maintained, built, and defended.

means to usher in an enlightened culture: “Rebecca’s refusal to convert in order to enter the secular progressive temporality of the English nation suggests that despite the ethic of tolerance that she expounds to Ivanhoe, as a Jew she finally remains hostile to ‘liberality of principle’ and incapable of change” (31). Valman’s reading of Norman-Saxon unity morphs into a Christian normative state that makes Jews abnormal. There is no “secular progressive temporality.” In order for Rebecca to stay in the new “tolerant” England, she must convert. While conversion may be voluntary, it is often forced and violent. In a horrible twist of victim as perpetuator, Valman writes, “dissenting from the atmosphere of rational compromise and civic development at the novel’s close, Rebecca maintains that her difference from Rowena’s remains absolute and cannot be transcended, either by allegiance to the nation or by sisterhood” (30).

Valman reads Scott’s novel as a testimony to assimilation and cultural blending, missing his warning that the past is often lost through cultural compromise. Ivanhoe’s father, Cedric, who disinherits his son for lack of national allegiance, articulates the colonial condition;

> We made these strangers our bosom friends, our confidential servants; we borrowed their artists and their arts, and despised the honest simplicity and hardihood with which our brave ancestors supported themselves, and we became enervated by Normal arts long ere we fell under Norman Arms. (227)

For Cedric, more than just pride is lost after the Norman Conquest. Cultural memory—the art of a people, how a people remembers its forbearers—are forgotten under a new ruler. The cultural loss is made doubly painful as Cedric observes his own people devaluing their art, judging Norman art better. Internalized subjugation is a colonial predicament, not a “secular progressive temporality” as Valman contends. Scott’s argues that assimilation is yet another form of violence, which erases the past as the conquest moves forward. For Rebecca, like Cedric, the path to assimilation is a path littered with lost cultures. To become an English national, Rebecca must become a Christian and betray her Jewish faith. The fault lies not with Rebecca, but with a

nation that depends on religion as a means to unify what are in fact disparate cultures. Scott's repeated reminders of England's diverse, pre-Christian past (remember the Druids from the novel's open) makes clear that unification based on religion is another form of violent assimilation.

Rebecca is all too aware at the end of *Ivanhoe* just how dependent nationalism is on violence and persecution of a minority population. Throughout the novel, Rebecca rejects several offers to convert but in all instances she would rather be burned to death or banished than convert to Christianity. It is not that Rebecca "demonstrates an 'obstinate' and archaic racial pride," (30) as Valman contends, but rather that she is aware that a new nation will be even more dependent on persecution to unify a population. Explaining her predicament to Rowena, Rebecca defends her heritage as well as her departure: "the people of England are a fierce race, quarrelling ever with their neighbors or among themselves, and ready to plunge the sword into the bowels of each other. Such is not safe abode for the children of my people […] Not in a land of war and blood, surrounded by hostile neighbours, and distracted by internal factions, can Israel hope to rest during her wanderings" (500). Rebecca connects the Diaspora to violence perpetrated by hostile nations who cannot account for the Jewish presence. The wandering Jew, in Scott's heroic rendition of Rebecca, becomes a counter-weight against the balance of English power—and serves as a reminder to Scotland that hostile neighbors do not make egalitarian nations.

In *Ivanhoe* young Jewish men are conspicuously absent—they are nowhere to be found. When Rebecca needs a knight she notes, "it ill beseemeth the Jewish damsel to speak of battle or of war" (317). While this is in part due to the compulsory Christianity of knighthood, it belies her deeper assumption that Jewish men are non-violent. Rebecca connects war with a homeland

noting that “the sound of the trumpet wakes Judah no longer, and her despised children are now but the unresisting victims of hostile and military oppression” (317). Instead Jewish men do not fight but participate in medicine and money lending. Throughout *Ivanhoe* the Jewish characters are called upon to heal their Christian neighbors: “The aid of the Jewish physicians was not the less eagerly sought after, though a general belief prevailed among the Christians, that the Jewish Rabbins were deeply acquainted with the occult sciences, and particularly with the cabalistical art, which had its name and origin in the studies of the sages of Israel” (295). Rebecca aids Ivanhoe in his recovery so that he may join the battle, but she cannot claim his protection. In fact, her ability to help the wounded knight is part of her culture—medicine and healing are distinctly Jewish tasks in *Ivanhoe*.

Diasporic Jews foster a culture of the book and not the sword, but compounding their landless statues were laws barring them from ownership. Land, along with culture, becomes the basis of nationalism. To some degree if there is no land there is no violence. The economic system bars Jews from entering into a nationalist discourse based on landownership: “ ‘Thou hast spoken the Jew,’ said Rebecca, ‘as the persecution of such as thou art has made him. Heaven in ire had driven him from his country, but industry has opened to him the only road to power and to influence, which oppression has left unbarred’ ” (433). It is this predicament that forces Jewish men into other fields of business, namely that of money lending, which Scott touches upon several times in *Ivanhoe*. National belonging then becomes a problem if Jewish men cannot fight or own land. There are no young, virile Jewish men in part because the narrative does not need them to represent the Jewish nation. In a system that offers few viable choices for Jewish men, Rebecca’s historical explanation for the construction of Jewish masculinity softens

her father's image as a mere money lender. In 1819, Scott does the cultural work of refuting the Shylock archetype still prevalent in his own time.

The tension surrounding landlessness plays out in one of the most virulent anti-Semitic claims of usury. An article titled *Ancient State of the Jews in England* in the May 1820 edition of *The London Magazine* concentrates solely on how the Jews entered England and their means of remaining in the country. What is evident from the article is that the anonymous author wants to make clear that English Jews *bought*, not fought, their way in: "For William I is commonly reported, by historians, to have brought them into the island in consideration of a sum of money. Whether or not the Jews paid for their admission into England, they owed the power of existing here, wretched as their condition was, to the feeling of selfish interest on the part of the monarchs who supported them against the enmity of the people" (505). Jews entered England under an economic contract—the monarchs needed their money, so Jews were allowed in the kingdom. Printed little more than six months after the publication of *Ivanhoe*, the author of the *Ancient State of the Jews in England* wanted readers to understand that the Jewish population was not entitled to land or citizenship because they did not fight. It was a "sum of money" that gained them entrance, causing the "enmity of the people." The general population found the Jewish fee a contradiction in belonging. Forging a national identity depends on male violence, the key force in forming a nation; by proposing that economics brought Jews to England, the author invalidates their claims to citizenship.

History progresses by merging cultures, peoples, and ideas; Scott ironically makes the Jewish nation the least changed and most unified. Because of their socio-economic positions, they cannot assimilate through war and violence. Oddly, only warring enemies are granted the reward of assimilation. The centrality of male violence in the construction of nations excludes

Jews, and Scott indicates that Isaac is allowed to stay in York because of his money: "By my faith,' said Wamba, 'it would seem the Templars love the Jews' inheritance better than they do their company" (63). Wamba, the Saxon serf, sees the feudal aristocracy's dependence on Jews. Economic dependence separates Jews from the other struggling classes in that it takes Jews out of a landed society. Society forced Jews into usury, removing them from the land and, in turn, they cannot participate in the founding of nations. Scott's positioning of the Jewish characters in *Ivanhoe* ties land to nationalism, asking readers to decide where Jews belong in England. The article *Ancient State of the Jews in England* demonstrates the economic position and social relevance of Jews in 1820: "The business which was thus thrown principally into the hands of the Jews, was no doubt one of the main causes which prevented the prejudices against them from being mitigated or annihilated" (509). The anonymous author explains England's anti-Semitism in economic terms. The Jews cannot be part of the creating of England because they do not hold ties to the land or the people.

The author expresses sympathy at the Jewish predicament in England, explaining their apparent avarice as a protective measure against persecution:

> The circumstances of the Jews being the principal, and at times the only money dealers in England, as well as in some other European countries, seems to have arisen, not alone from the wish which a people so oppressed must have naturally felt, to hold property of a nature which might easily be concealed, or transported from place to place, but also from the absurd ideas of the times respecting the interest of money. (508)

Scott disables the historic anti-Semitic archetype of the wandering Jew by explaining that it is a result of historical restrictions on Jewish land rights and the effect of the Diaspora. Money's portability and Jewish mobility played an important part in the creation of a Jewish lending class. Scott neutralizes both the Shylock and wandering Jew stereotypes. For Scott Jewish lending and

Jewish mobility are the results of dispersion and displacement brought about by their continual minority status within kingdoms, states, or nations.

During the middle ages several biblical passages were combined to justify the folklore of the wandering Jew (Felsenstein 58). From a complex web of European folklore emerges an understanding that wandering punishes the Jewish rejection of Christ. Frank Felsenstein argues that the persistence of the wandering Jew and its "endurance through many centuries of Christian folklore, even to the present day, may be seen as a popular reflection of a theological impulse in Christianity to come to terms or at least to define the relationship with its own paternity" (58). Scott situates Isaac's wandering, not in terms of punishment, but in terms of state sanctioned discrimination meant to obscure Jewish ties to Christian lands, history, and origins. Scott places the wandering Jew in a historical context, demonstrating that Isaac's marginal status is a result of political and social strategies, not divine punishment. Scott removes divine providence or destiny from England's abuse of its Jews. By revealing the historical mistreatment of Jews, Scott subverts a naturalized reading of the British Empire. Scott saves Jewish history from English misappropriation, and, in turn, defends Scotland from a similar fate. Nations depend upon myths—like the wandering Jew or a unified British people—to justify, define, and promote themselves.

Because of their alien status, Jews found protection under economic auspices. The portability of money compensated Jews for the lack of land and ownership. Jews could not maintain traditional ties to a nation, such as language, religion, and land, so economics stabilized their community in non-native lands. Scott portrays Isaac as an outcast who depends on the good will of his neighbors and whose tentative position within the community is based on his economic prosperity and his inability to fight for himself:

> He [Isaac] had large boots lined with fur, and a belt around his waist, which sustained a small knife, together with a case for writing materials, but no weapon. He wore a high square yellow cap of a peculiar fashion, assigned to his nation to distinguish them from Christians, and which he doffed with great humility […] While Isaac thus stood an outcast in the present society, like his people among the nations, looking in vain for welcome or resting place, the pilgrim who sat by the chimney took compassion upon him […] (64-5)

Scott connects Isaac's lack of a weapon with the Jewish predicament in foreign nations. In contrast with the Normans and Saxons, whose positions are maintained by force and violence, the Jewish nation depends on "writing materials" and money to maintain their social position. Much like the clothing that distinguished the Jew from the Gentile, the absence of weaponry indicates an alien status and a dependence on other men's compassion for protection.

Because of his age and race, Isaac hires mercenaries to escort and protect him. Isaac can only hope that his purchased protection will serve its purpose; he depends on money to buy the loyalty of people. Several times in *Ivanhoe* hired men abandon Isaac, and his vulnerability is revealed as the protection of money diminishes in the face of real, physical danger:

> [Isaac] was at length able to explain, that he had hired a body-guard of six men at Ashby […] This party had undertaken to escort him as far as Doncaster. They had come thus far in safety; but having received information from a wood-cutter that there was a strong band of outlaws lying in wait in the woods before them, Isaac's mercenaries had not only taken flight, but had carried off with them the horses […] and left the Jew and his daughter without the means either of defense or of retreat. (206).

Not only does Isaac not carry a weapon, he cannot protect his own daughter. Because of the Jewish people's alien state within a larger nation, they cannot fight or use violence as a means of defense. Violence is reserved for knights and countrymen who protect and belong to the state. Esther Schor argues in "Scott's Hebraic Historicism" "the ambiguity of the Jews' allegiances within the English scene was compounded by a greater ambiguity of identity: While not liable to expulsion, Jews maintained until the mid-nineteenth century an ambiguous state as 'endenized' subjects— something like resident aliens" (115). The chivalric code, which placed women as

emblems of the state, prohibits Isaac from defending them. He is at once too old, too Jewish and too rich to justify violent actions within a feudal, Christian state. Isaac's precarious position as a Jew illustrates that unprivileged men within a state-sanctioned hierarchy cannot imagine protecting their immediate responsibility, their family.

In a novel filled with violence masquerading as the masculine ideal, Isaac's inability to defend his daughter becomes yet another mark of his difference. Not only does his dependence on money feminize him by removing him from Norman-Saxon masculinity, but he is depicted as emotional, and this emotion is made foreign by Scott: "Isaac listened with tolerable composure while Ben Samuel read the letter, and then again resumed the gestures and exclamations of *Oriental* sorrow, tearing his garments, besprinkling his head with dust, and ejaculating, 'My daughter! my daughter! flesh of my flesh, and bone of my bone!'" (423, italics mine). Isaac's grief is characterized as *oriental* for its emotive paternal love. Scott reminds readers of Isaac's difference by marginalizing his response—it is oriental—and making it a departure from the English standard of masculinity, which is composure, restraint, and stoicism; Isaac's performance of masculinity demonstrates only a "tolerable composure" during his oriental lament.[35]

[35] The term lament brings me to another revealing allusion in Scott's repetition of "My daughter! my daughter." While Ian Duncan's endnotes highlight that Isaac's speech "echoes Adam's salutation of Eve, Genesis 2:23" (Duncan 573), I think Duncan misses the other allusion, of David's lament for his son Absalom. While there are certainly parallels to Adam's speech, this single connection depends on gender (Adam=Isaac, Eve=Rebecca) putting the father and daughter relationship in an uncomfortable, sexual dyad. In this respect the allusion to David's cry works better. David's speech is depicted as an emotional outpouring by the King (or as Scott might put it, King David is acting very oriental): "The king was shaken. He went up to the upper chamber of the gateway and wept, moaning these words as he went, 'My son Absalom! O my son, my Absalom! If only I had died instead of you! O Absalom, my son, my son" (*The Jewish Study Bible* 653). Certainly David's lament is just as overwrought with grief as Isaac's and the patriarchs realize their grave loss. Each man views the loss of his child as a loss for the Jewish nation. Isaac sees his daughter as the future of his people and it is that death he laments. Isaac is

Scott's use of the term "oriental" places Isaac's difference in a broader context, one that accounts for his marginalization in England and as a global figure of difference. What purpose does it serve for Scott to characterize Isaac's lament as "oriental?" Throughout the novel, Scott's depictions of Isaac have been fair—if there is a critique of his character Scott places it in a wider context—so the term "oriental" serves a political purpose, or the politicizing of origins. As Heidi Kaufman wisely notes "the historical filiation of Jewish and Christian culture that negates, once again, the possibility of a division between categories of East and West" (63). To Christians, Isaac represents the orient, yet he also represents the beginnings of Christianity. Christian and national identifications depend upon the simultaneous recognition and rejection of Isaac. Likewise, the Knights want desperately to reclaim the Holy Land at the same time they need to distance themselves from Jews and their "oriental" sorrow. Scott warns this is what the English do in their imperial march: appropriate or repress differences that complicate their own readings of identity. While the setting of *Ivanhoe* is the middle ages, a time when Christian knights attempted to colonize the Holy Land and reclaim it for Christianity, Scott witnessed England's nineteenth-century march to power and global expansion. Scott sees in Isaac another appropriated discourse used to discard historical truths and remake England's history in its own imagining.

Scott, who calls Isaac's sorrow oriental, packs father and daughter off to Moorish Spain, and sends the Templars to fight in Palestine, maps the overlap of occident and orient. By placing Jewry in both the Orient and the Occident, Scott complicates a reading of the novel within an

---

putting Rebecca into a larger context, not just as a daughter, but an agent of the future and their culture's future.

East/West split. Edward Said's binary use of the term "Orientalism," precludes an understanding of Jewish positioning within orientalist discourse. Said defines *Orientalism*:

> Taking the late eighteenth century as a very roughly defined starting point Orientalism can be discussed and analyzed as the corporate institution for dealing with the Orient—dealing with it by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it, settling it, ruling over it: in short, Orientalism as a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient […] European culture gained in strength and identity by setting itself off against the Orient as a sort of surrogate and even underground self. (3)

With Said's historical underpinning, Scott's description of Isaac's "oriental sorrow" speaks to Western expectations of masculinity and how racial and cultural difference were used to highlight the West's superiority—specifically in the task of nation building. While Said rightfully indicts Western hegemony for its abstraction of a people, his text does not account for difference within varying "Orientalisms" with respect to nation building, violence, and masculinity.

Unlike Said's reading of orientalism as a "dominating" structuring of East and West, Isaac's presence in England complicates an easy explication of Jewish difference. Isaac's sorrow is so disturbing because of its proximity to the knights both psychologically and spatially. Suzanne Akbari notes that "medieval attempts to define the nature of non-Christians and, by their exclusion, to define Christian identity. Jewish identity was used as a template to delineate both what features might be embraced as prefigurations of Christian identity, and what features must necessarily be excluded from the imagined community" (33). If European culture gained in strength by its authority over the Orient, as Said argues, Isaac's odd placement within this discourse disrupts such an authority. Isaac's cry is heard round the oriental world—it is the return of the repressed, of Christianity's roots in Judaism, which the Christian knights would rather obscure than recognize. Heidi Kaufman articulates a similar problem when she asks how

"to imagine English identity in such a way that draws from Jewish history…while simultaneously averting the threatening implications of this alignment for a racialized construction of English identity" (65). Christian knights are at once attracted and repulsed by the orient. The knights are attracted to the sacredness of the Holy Land, yet are symmetrically repulsed by Isaac's Jewish difference as witnessed through his lament. If the knights are to reclaim the Holy Land, will they then have to account for their own orientalized masculinity?

Ivanhoe represents the Orient with Jewish difference at home and difference abroad. While Jewish difference is on full display within England's borders, difference also lurks on the perimeter of its emerging empire in Palestine. Palestine punctuates the text in key points: it is the land that draws the knights of *Ivanhoe* away, becoming a place where they can prove their manhood and their national loyalty. At the same time it gives very different European cultures a space to unify in opposition to an "alien" threat. The Crusades "normandize" Ivanhoe, causing his father, Cedric, to be disgusted with the Palestinian quest:

> "Palestine!" repeated the Saxon; "Palestine! How many ears are turned to the tales which dissolute crusaders, or hypocritical pilgrims, bring from that fatal land! […] The son who has disobeyed me is no longer mine; nor will I concern myself more for his fate that for that of the most worthless among the millions that are ever shaped the cross on their shoulder, rushed into excess and blood-guiltiness, and called it an accomplishment of the will of God. (54)

Ivanhoe disobeyed his father by going to Palestine, which entailed following a Norman king. While Palestine becomes a proving ground for knights, Cedric sees it as part of the erasure of his own culture. Throughout the novel, Cedric is greatly concerned that Saxon royalty stay pure and not marry Normans. Ivanhoe's journey to Palestine becomes an act of assimilation—Normans and Saxons join together to fight the enemy, subordinating differences to the external difference of "the Orient."

Both of these types of representations—difference from within the nation and an external difference —speak to how nations are forged and kept through violence, whether physical or imaginative. Jewish difference becomes critical for defining England's emerging nationalism, as well as "the idea of Europe, a collective notion of identifying 'us' Europeans as against all 'those' non-Europeans, and indeed it can be argued that the major component in European culture is precisely what made that culture hegemonic both in and outside Europe: the idea of European identity as a superior one in comparison with all the non-European peoples and cultures" (Said 7). But what I argue makes "the Jew" so disruptive to this inside/outside bifurcation that Said sets up, is that Jews live within host nations, are a nation, and yet challenge nationalism by their own cultural cohesiveness in light of their landlessness. These paradoxes and tensions drive the representation of Isaac, specifically in *Ivanhoe*'s depictions of Western masculinity.

And perhaps therein lies the answer to the ambivalence with which Jews are regarded by Western culture: they are nationalism's unattainable ideal, existing despite the violence used to convert, assimilate, or eradicate them. Isaac, in contrast to the Norman and Saxon characters, maintains his culture by accepting his difference and not assimilating. Scott depicts Isaac's "passive resistance" (231) as an alternative form of strength and masculinity. It his mind, and not the sword, that aids Isaac in his moment of peril:

> And thus it is probable, that the Jews, by the very frequency of their fear on all occasions had their minds in some degree prepared for every effort of tyranny which could be practiced on them; so that no aggression, when it had taken place, could bring with it that surprise which is the most disabling quality of terror. Neither was it the first time that Isaac had been placed in circumstances so dangerous. He had therefore experience to guide him, as well as hope, that he might again, as formerly, be delivered as a prey from the fowler. Above all, he had upon his side the unyielding obstinacy of his nation, and that unbending resolution, with which Israelites have been frequently known to submit to the uttermost evils which power and violence can inflict upon them, rather than gratify their oppressors by granting their demands. (231)

Mental preparation and hope enable Isaac to withstand the torture of Front-de-Boeuf's dungeon. In contrast with the novel's other men, Isaac does not participate in violence and he remains unchanged by the war around him. Jewish masculinity effectively maintains cultural cohesion by rejecting the highly stylized, chivalric masculinity performed by Ivanhoe and the other Knights. Instead Western masculinity's violence leads to intermarriage and an assimilated Saxon culture, while the non-violent father and daughter must leave England in order to maintain their culture. While Rebecca also has her father's "unyielding obstinacy" she suffers the double jeopardy of being Jewish and a woman in a violent, Christian culture. That the physical component of masculinity is absent from the Jewish people is apparent from Rebecca's request for a Knight to defend her honor. Rebecca cannot ask a Jewish male because Knights are by definition Christian, and conspicuously missing from *Ivanhoe* are young, virile Jewish males. Rebecca cannot turn to her own people for defense. Gary Dyer's "Chivalry and the Romantic Novel" states that chivalry "entails monopolizing the defense of women in order to serve men's interests. No one is surprised to read of men asserting that they and others like them (of their class, their nation, their race, and so on) are especially qualified or inclined to protect women, and it is axiomatic today that such claims serve to legitimate their domination of women and of other men" (431-2). The inability to defend women, especially those within a family, undermines the patriarchy, which is the micro-representation of the nation. Isaac's emasculation in Western cultural norms springs from his inability act as a protective father or an active citizen of England. The fact he is unable to physically dominate other men and provide protection for his daughter removes him further from English national identity.

If control over women's bodies is a way to found and maintain a nation, the Jewish people do not participate in this ideology. The Jewish people cannot participate in statehood

because there is no male founder or protector; thus, Rebecca is at the mercy of Christian Knights. The battle for Rebecca between Bois-Guilbert and Ivanhoe depicts two different ways women's bodies, and in this case the Jewish female body, reinscribe notions of nation and identity. Scott depicts these men's desire and suppression of desire as ways national identity is maintained. Nineteenth-century readers were keenly interested in the character of Rebecca, and in Scott's 1830 introduction had explain why he did not marry her to Ivanhoe as many romantic conventions would have insisted:

> The character of the fair Jewess found so much favour in the eyes of some fair readers, that the writer was censured, because, when arranging the fates of the characters of the drama, he had not assigned the hand of Wilfred to Rebecca, rather than the less interesting Rowena. But, not to mention that the prejudices of the age rendered such an union almost impossible, the author may, in passing observe, that he thinks a character of highly virtuous and loft stamp, is degraded rather than exalted by an attempt to reward virtue with temporal prosperity. (12)

Readers' obsession with Rebecca indicates that the future of Anglo-Jewry still intrigued the romantic, as well as the national, imagination. At the turn of the nineteenth-century heroines *were* rewarded with temporal prosperity because they were virtuous—think of Jane Austen's novels—and Scott's resistance to marrying off Rebecca subverts the English novel's traditional trajectory. He rejects English national belonging as the greatest prize for Rebecca and challenges England to redefine itself. Unlike Rowena, who compromises by marrying a Saxon with Norman etiquette, Rebecca refuses to marry a gentile even at the threat of rape and death. It is the Jewish woman who does not marry, does not assimilate, who maintains the racial and cultural purity of her people. This is not to say that Jewish exclusionary practices are themselves healthy or by choice, but rather that Scott is challenging England to recognize the many ways its purity is tainted with intermarriages, war, and the addition of other states (such as Scotland in the Union of 1707).

Bois-Guilbert asks Rebecca to become his wife and help him attain more power: “Our mailed step shall ascend their throne—our gauntlet shall wrench the scepter from their ripe. Not even the reign of your vainly—expected Messiah offers such power to your dispersed tribes as my ambition may aim at. I have sought but a kindred spirit to share it, and I have found such in thee” (257). Bois-Guilbert contrasts his plans with those of Rebecca’s faith, indicating that the individual gentile’s ambition will surpass the Messiah’s. Bois-Guilbert invokes their respective nations in order to convince Rebecca to leave her people and become powerful. However, Rebecca refuses to marry Bois-Guilbert, and he threatens her with violence: “I have hitherto spoken mildly to thee, but now my language shall be that of a conqueror. Thou art the captive of my bow and spear—subject to my will by the laws of all nations; nor will I abate an inch of my right, or abstain from taking by violence what thou refusest to entreaty or necessity” (253). The “laws of all nations” dictates how a man can rightfully treat a woman, in this case the threat of rape is equivalent to conquering a land.

The same language and mentality explains aggressive nations, which are justified if a national agenda is carried out. However, Rebecca refuses to be conquered, preferring death to forced marriage. She clearly states this preference to her ‘knight’: “I take my stand. Remain where thou art, and if thou shalt attempt to diminish by one step the distance now between us, thou shalt see that the Jewish maiden will rather trust her soul with God, than her honour to the Templar!” (255). Scott reminds readers that Rebecca is a “Jewish maiden” right at the point where she chooses death over rape. Rebecca will not allow her body to be used by Bois-Guilbert, maintaining her dignity as well as the boundary between the Jews and gentiles. Rebecca’s refusal to marry Bois-Guilbert represents the Jewish people’s refusal to assimilate. Oddly, it is the nation of usurers, healers, and rabbis who refuse to be assimilated via marriage or

conquest. It is the unassimilated, oppressed Jews who maintain their culture and national memory. With the Jewish Rebecca, Scott comments that women's bodies perform either the annihilation or preservation of a national identity, allowing the Jewish woman to remain within her culture and tribe and not suffer the distress of a forced assimilation.

While Bois-Guilbert threatens Rebecca with violence and force, he at least recognizes the system that oppresses her: "England,— Europe, —is not the world. There are spheres in which we may act, ample enough even for my ambition. We will go to Palestine, where Conrade […] a friend free as myself from the doting scruples which fetter our free-born reason […] rather than endure the scorn of the bigots whom we contemn.—I will form new paths to greatness" (431). Palestine again emerges as a place to forge a new identity, much like the returning Crusaders had done. Because power will be determined by "free-born reason" and not national belonging, Bois-Guilbert thinks he has found a land where he can be with Rebecca without sacrificing his ambitions. Bois-Guilbert, a celebrated Templar, sees beyond his country's and order's limitations and hopes for a post- national identity: " 'Will future ages believe that such stupid bigotry ever existed!' said Bois-Guilbert (397). For the "villain" of the novel, his world view is progressive, seeing beyond England's shores and beyond parochial stereotypes. Scott gives some of the best lines in the novel to the villain of French descent, indicating that perhaps our golden haired Ivanhoe is a parody of English nationalism and greatness. In this way, Bois-Guilbert's global understanding removes him from the national rhetoric and commenting upon an idealized England.

Though Bois-Guilbert sees English nationalism's limitations, he is not quite ready to disavow his heritage for Rebecca. Scott uses the Templar as a prime example of ambivalence and national belonging. Bois-Guilbert struggles to reconcile loyalty to one's people (as with

Rebecca) and a merit-based society (as with Bois-Guilbert's personal feats in war). He wants Rebecca to renounce her people, yet it is this very loyalty that makes her so attractive. Rebecca becomes for the Templar a site of contention, of unresolved longing: "For, proud as thou art, thou has in me found thy match […] would to Heaven that we had never met, or that thou hadst been noble in birth and Christian in faith!—Nay, by Heaven! When I gaze on thee, and think when and how we are next to meet, I could even wish myself one of thine own degraded nation; my hand conversant with ingots and shekels, instead of spear and shield" (433). Bois-Guilbert recognizes that assimilation for Rebecca is an act of violence against her own nation, and he struggles to find a place where they both belong. His postmodern reading of nationalism represents the future that cannot yet be a reality. In fact, Scott represents this deep ambivalence in Bois-Guilbert's death: "Unscathed by the lance of his enemy, he had died a victim to the violence of his own contending passions" (490). Bois-Guilbert's contending passion his love of Rebecca: how to incorporate an alien population into national culture while still respecting that culture's difference? It is a question that would continue to haunt England—and even today remains a question in light of a multi-ethnic world.

Bois-Guilbert wishes to marry Rebecca, but Ivanhoe, whom the Jewess secretly admires, cannot fathom marrying her. Ivanhoe does not have the imagination or the understanding of society to recognize his desire for Rebecca. Instead, he represents not the impulse to marry and assimilate the alien Jew, but a nation that has solved the Jewish Question. Ivanhoe marries Rowena and the "marriage of two individuals as a pledge of the future peace and harmony betwixt two races, which, since that period, have been so completely mingled, that the distinction has become wholly invisible […]for as the two nations mixed in society and formed intermarriages with each other, the Normans abated their scorn, and the Saxons were refined

from their rusticity" (498). Scott problematizes this seemingly happy ending, and England "is not allowed to suppress the still unresolved question of another race's future in England- that of the Jews" (Ragussis 202). Scott reminds readers that Rebecca and Isaac's fate is not a happy one. Rebecca does not marry a Saxon or Norman; rather, she leaves England for Grenada. Sadly, we realize that Rebecca and Isaac will leave England only to face the Spanish Inquisition. The Jews cannot escape persecution, and Rebecca notes that, "I may not change the faith of my fathers like a garment unsuited to the climate in which I seek to dwell, and unhappy, lady, I will not be" (501). It is the Jewish characters who do not participate in violence and conquest who remain the most culturally pure. Rebecca's predicament contrasts with Rowena's whose marriage to Ivanhoe causes cultural erasure. Scott refuses an easy finale and points to the cultural "invisibility" that will happen when the Norman and Saxon cultures merge.

The marriage should happily close the novel, but Scott continues to question the cost of founding and maintaining a nation. *Ivanhoe* ends with the title character thinking about Rebecca: "Yet it would be enquiring too curiously to ask, whether the recollection of Rebecca's beauty and magnanimity did not recur to his mind more frequently than the fair descendant of Alfred altogether have approved" (502). Rebecca haunts Ivanhoe just as the Jewish Question challenged England's definitions on race, nation, and identity. Scott refuses an easy answer and challenges the English myth of a unified past and inheritance. As a Scot, *Ivanhoe*'s author sees the peril of assimilation through conquest and losing one's culture. In the wake of the French Revolution and in the flurry of English nationalism, Scott uses the Jewish Question to question the cost of national identity.

Chapter 2

The Politics of Departure: Jewish Masculinity and the Nation

The preceding chapter on *Ivanhoe* introduced many of the themes this project engages: the construction of ethnicity, masculinity, and national belonging. *Ivanhoe* ends when Isaac and Rebecca leave the pages of the narrative and the shores of England. The father and daughter sail for Grenada, beginning a troubling trend of Jewish departure in British literature, specifically in the works of George Eliot and Anthony Trollope. Departure may just be a continuation of the Diaspora—an essential part of Jewish identity before the state of Israel made what was Biblical metaphor a reality.[36] However, the "departing" of Jewish characters from the work of Eliot and Trollope demonstrates that by 1876 the imaginative space given to textual Jews had not evolved since *Ivanhoe*'s popular rendering. All three works result in the same ending for fictional and historical Jews: they must leave England.

This chapter examines Trollope and Eliot's depiction of Jewish masculinity and national identity, in an effort to see their novels on a continuum of Jewish departure. Both novels speak to historical events surrounding their composition. Their serialization occurred from 1875-1876 while Benjamin Disraeli negotiated the Suez Canal project, which gave Britain a foothold in the Middle East and opened up important trade routes, at the same time igniting questions about Jewish loyalty. During the canal's acquisition, which was financed by Baron Nathan Rothschild, Prime Minister Disraeli was referred to as a "shylock" and a "money lender," accused of lining

[36] Seders, the annual Passover dinner and ceremony, end with the prayer, "Next year in Jerusalem." Since the destruction of the Second Temple, most Jews have not lived in Jerusalem, making this phrase an injunction to remember Jerusalem, the moral ideal it represents, and the unity of the Jewish people. Most Jews say this as a metaphorical prayer, rather than a request to return to the geographical Jerusalem. This reading is supported by Psalm 137 during the Babylonian exile: "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning."

the pockets of "Jewish Banks." [37] The negative reactions to the exchange brought up old, yet still circulating, anti-Semitic tropes. I bring up Disraeli, who visited the Middle East in the 1830s and wrote of Zionism long before the concept popularly existed, in order to show how his policies reflected the zeitgeist of the period: the Jewish Question was intimately tied to the English Empire.[38]

While Disraeli is not the focus of this chapter, Eliot and Trollope's engagement with many of the issues and themes he tackled as a writer and as a politician surface in *Daniel Deronda* and *The Prime Minister.* Disraeli's place within the occident (as the Prime Minister of an expansionist England) and his oriental positioning (as a man of Jewish descent imagining and identifying with the distant Holy Land) garnered him an ambivalent reception from his peers.[39] Heidi Kaufman's analysis of a Punch cartoon best captures Disraeli's unnerving presence, in which he is depicted as "a cuckoo Jew with an oversized head, flaunts the very traits that rendered Disraeli a troubling figure among many of his contemporaries. Disraeli appears to be both a strangely shaped other and a true or legitimate insider. However, the artist's deployment of size in this image signals tensions raised by the inclusion of a Jewish figure" (20). The nest image grounds Kaufman's work and I would like to extend her analysis by suggesting that Disraeli was indeed an odd bird to both Trollope and Eliot. Disraeli's ability to occupy both English and Jewish discourses destabilized the national imagination—he was recognizable, yet odd enough to make the English uneasy. His oddness, I argue, framed many of Eliot's and

---

[37] For more on Disraeli's reputation after the Suez Canal purchase, see Bernard Glassman's *Benjamin Disraeli: The Fabricated Jew in Myth and Memory* (2002).
[38] For more on Disraeli's politics and travels, see Andrea Dworkin's Scapegoat: the Jews, Israel and Women's Liberation (2000).
[39] For more on Disraeli's fashioning of his orientalism, see Ivan Kalmar's "Benjamin Disraeli, Romantic Orientalism" in *Comparative Studies in Society and History*. 47.2 (April 2005): 348-371.

Trollope's depictions of Jewish masculinity, forcing both writers to account for the oddity of Disraeli and Jews in general. Disraeli, who was such an important political figure during the composition of both *The Prime Minister* and *Daniel Deronda*, framed Trollope and Eliot's rendering of Jewish men. Their depictions in part were informed by Disraeli's own Jewish masculinity at home and at play in the English nation, and this chapter takes as its departure point Trollope and Eliot's uses of Jewish masculinity in their own formulations of national identity.

Trollope's *Autobiography* refers to Disraeli as an "audacious conjurer," and categorizes the Prime Minister's political career as a bold deceit (225). Describing Disraeli, who was baptized at the age of 12, Trollope uses a term that offers a wider critique of the Jewish position within England—that of secrecy. Michael Ragussis's *Figures of Conversion* describes the political and literary moment of the 1870s:

> The idea of the Jew as an imposter, epitomized in the view of Disraeli as an accomplished actor, became a popular way of "up-dating" in Victorian England the historical idea of the Iberian crypto-Jew. The ideas of imposture and theatricality, and their function in representing Jewish identity, reached their fullest articulation in the fiction of Trollope and Eliot. (236)

Trollope uses the trope of secrecy in his depiction of Ferdinand Lopez, while Eliot's *Daniel Deronda* revises the same trope for a more idealized representation of the title character. Eliot, not surprisingly based on her fondness for Judaism, saw in Disraeli not a conjurer, but an icon of the shared heritage between the English and the Jews.[40] Ragussis's work on the two novels grounds my chapter; however, I extend many of his claims by looking at Jewish masculinity in the context of the 1870s' preoccupation with the Jewish Question. In this light, Eliot's novel precludes many of its noble aims by its representation of the title character's masculinity;

[40] For more on Disraeli's Hebraic inheritance and George Eliot's use of Jewish history, see Heidi Kaufman's *English Origins, Jewish Discourse.*

Trollope's complex portrait of ambition and failure undermines his distaste for Disraeli and, perhaps, Jews in general.

Trollope's *The Prime Minister* and Eliot's *Daniel Deronda* were both published in 1876 inviting comparisons of the two novels and leading critics to label *Daniel Deronda* as "pro-Jewish" while leaving Trollope's novel to hold the title of "anti-Semitic." What is interesting is that this quick synopsis of Eliot's *Daniel Deronda* continues today among scholars. In fact, Alan T. Levenson's "Writing the Philosemitic Novel*: Daniel Deronda* Revisited" (2008) categorically reinforces this reading. Levenson reads Eliot's *Daniel Deronda* as "her growing rejection of English anti-Semitism (including Anthony Trollope's)" (131). Eliot and Trollope are read as oppositional, and Trollope's works become anti-Semitism *par excellence*. In contrast to this reading, I see Eliot's idealization (and her rejection of her realist roots) as far more damaging and fraught than Trollope's rendering of his Jewish character, Ferdinand Lopez. Instead, Trollope circumvents an easy, binary condemnation of Lopez's character by avoiding extremes of good and evil that were so often used to depict Jews and other minorities.[41] This chapter looks at the incompleteness of such critical summations, particularly those that consider Eliot's philosemitism, and how themes in *The Prime Minister* work toward the same conclusion of

---

[41] This is particularly true of Charles Dickens' novels *Oliver Twist* and *Our Mutual Friend*. While the former, in the character of Fagan, proliferates the image of the evil, red-headed Jew, which harkens all the way back to Judas and his subsequent depictions in art and literature, *Our Mutual Friend* seeks to counteract this extreme depiction of Jewishness with extreme goodness. With *Our Mutual Friend*, Dickens attempts to right his wrong with his Jewish character, Riah, who many scholars read as a refutation of Fagin's evil and the "Shylock" narrative. For more on this subject see Deborah Heller's . "The Outcast as Villain and Victim: Jews in Dickens's *Oliver Twist* and *Our Mutual Friend*," in *Jewish Presences in English Literature*, ed. Derek Cohen and Deborah Heller. Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP, 1990 and Susan Meyer's "Antisemitism and Social critique in Dickens's *Oliver Twist.*" Victorian Literature and Culture (2005) 33: 239-252.

Daniel Deronda.[42] I hope to reveal the hidden sympathy and symmetry between these two texts in their treatment of Jews and nationalism.

As I will explain in detail below, *Daniel Deronda* deviates from Eliot's earlier realist novels by depicting the title character in impossible and emasculating terms, undercutting the reality of a future Jewish state, as well as his place within England's borders. Patrick Brantlinger's "Nations and Novels: Disraeli, George Eliot, and Orientalism," notes that Eliot's realism slips into a romanticism, which (I argue) undercuts the possibility of a Jewish state: "Eliot's last major work belongs to the vast category of social realism, although her treatment of the theme of nationalism paradoxically moves in the direction of utopian romance" (256). In George Eliot's hands, the philo-semitism that many Victorian Jews applauded and the liberalism that critics attribute to George Eliot become a death sentence for Anglo-Jewry as it offered a surreal future, not a validated imagined community. Jews in *Daniel Deronda* are the ideal to be learned from but they do not belong to the English nation. Jewish nationalism, solidarity, and cultural cohesiveness provide a positive model for English nationalism that, in turn, displaces Jews from the text and the nation.

Trollope, who has been criticized for his anti-Semitism, conservatism, and general stodginess, offers a more realist reading of Jewish masculinity and national belonging than Eliot. Trollope's realist depiction of Lopez and the underpinnings of English society create a more complex character. Lopez is then a meditation not on the ideal Jew, but an authentic character navigating a hierarchal, exclusionary society—though in the end Lopez must leave the

[42] Few critics offer a straight reading of Eliot's philosemitism; most recognize that philo- is clearly linked to anti-Semitism. However, critics do not attribute the same generosity of reading to Trollope's novels, which I argue make a more palatable and imaginable world for Anglo-Jewry. For a recent study on Eliot's philosemitism, see Alan Levenson's "Writing the philosemitic novel: Daniel Deronda revisited." In *Prooftexts: A Journal of Jewish Literary History*. 28.2 (2008): 129-156.

boundaries of the novel and the nation. Trollope's understanding of the British Empire, articulated in his travelogues, indicate a writer grappling with the contradictions of difference in the nineteenth-century. As the following chapter will show, I use Trollope's depiction of Jewish masculinity as a fulcrum to weigh out his anxieties about England's changing cultural background. Neither novel can contain the figure of the Jew, and, in the end, remove him from the narrative. For my purposes, I consider the two main Jewish figures in relation to the realist novel, the Victorian preoccupation with degeneracy and evolution, and the construction of national identity. I will illustrate how Jewish masculinity functions in both novels and how these masculinities relate to and reinscribe national ideologies of the nineteenth-century.

Daniel Deronda: Such a Nice Jewish Boy

George Eliot's *Daniel Deronda* deals with national identity through its Jewish plot, depicting a people who have maintained a cultural cohesiveness despite having no official state or borders. Reina Lewis's *Gendering Orientalism* states that *Daniel Deronda* "offered a devastating critique of English society seen as degenerating and regressive, by holding up a Jew, the Daniel of the title, as an emblem of an ancient but thriving Jewish culture to which England should look for inspiration" (191). *Daniel Deronda,* Eliot's final novel, reflects upon the future of England, which is coupled with the future of the Jews. The governing reasons for Daniel's commitment to his Jewish identity deal with concepts of heredity and destiny and, in turn, the meaning of being English. While critical history suggests we halve the novel's plot, this vivisection would restrict the cultural osmosis Eliot sought—that English identity depends upon Jewish History. Heidi Kaufman's *English Origins, Jewish Discourse* warns against reading

Eliot's *Impressions of Theophrastus Such* in the same way: "Reading *Impressions* as a text that divides Jewish and English history is to miss Eliot's point and to reproduce the problem she exposes in this text of imagining the Jews as a site of difference, or 'peculiar' to English Christian culture" (132).

Eliot's last two major works, *Daniel Deronda* and *Theophrastus,* claim in part that the past intertwines with the future. As Gillian Beer effectively argues in *Darwin's Plots,* "*Daniel Deronda* is a novel haunted by the future, that purest and most taxing realm of fiction" (169). But what the future holds, as Beer's chapter illuminates, depends largely on its origin.[43] The past cannot be dead because it still holds sway over the present and more prophetically, the future. *Impressions* contends that "it is the living force of sentiment in common which makes a national consciousness" (147). A shared past is a shared culture; a combination that produces a successful nation that will persist into the future. This inversion of past as future places the figure of the Jew in a unique position to act as a mediator for the English future. Theophrastus posits that the originators of Western culture were the Greeks and the Hebrews. A Greek and Hebrew past was popularized by Matthew Arnold's *Culture and Anarchy*; however, Eliot's Theophrastus makes a blunter argument about origin, culture and the state; "that there is a free modern Greece is due—through all infiltration of other than Greek blood--to the presence of ancient Greece in the consciousness of European men" (*Impressions* 144). Greek culture is separated from ethnic origin: "Thanks chiefly to the divine gift of a memory which inspires the moments with a past, a present, and a future, and gives the sense of a corporate existence that raises men" (*Impressions* 144). In comparison, the Hebrew past has been incorporated into

[43] Origin or "hidden" origin was a constant and popular theme throughout Victorian Literature. The title character in Dickens' *Oliver Twist* (1838) has moral fortitude because of his high birth; the title character in M. E. Braddon's *Lady Audley's Secret* (1862) is destroyed by attempting to escape her origin and fate.

European consciousness in the form of Christianity at the same time that the Jewish people, written out of the present, are alive to their own cultural past, present, and future. They are the historic past embodied in the present and are not as easily assimilated as a distant Greek connection. Paradoxically, Jews are at once modern and historic; dead and alive. This unique position challenges and interrogates the idea of nationalism and national belonging.

The Victorians saw the Jewish question as asking "whether and how the particularity of the Jew might be assimilated to, or alternatively accommodated by, a project conceived as modern in its pretensions to universality" (Anderson 39). The nineteenth century's obsession with nation building brought the Jewish Question to the forefront of English politics. Eliot saw in the Jewish Question an answer to her own concerns about England's future. In "Daniel Deronda and the Politics of Nationalism," Marc Wohlfarth claims that "English society, she [Eliot] believed, had reached a turning point where it could no longer rely on the automatism of moral and political reflexes; it was threatened by decadence and an aesthetic cosmopolitan culture devoid of moral direction" (189). Eliot's last two works, *Daniel Deronda* and *Impressions*, construct Jewish culture as the ideal of nationalism in its connection to the past, its respect for community, and its exclusiveness of practice. In light of the ever expanding empire, Eliot's idealized Judaism was an antidote to England's blurry boundaries: "The time is not come for cosmopolitanism to be highly virtuous, any more than for communism to suffice for social energy. I am not bound to feel for a Chinaman as I feel for my fellow-countryman" (*Impressions* 147). As the Empire stretched the limits of the globe, Eliot wanted the English to have a national memory, even practice chauvinism, in order to protect against cosmopolitan liberalism.

Eliot's interest in Jewish culture heightened after her 1854 visit to Germany where she studied the works of Lessing and Heine (Baker 31). German Jewish literature and philosophy

offered Eliot a new language to express her views on tradition, community, and identity. Eliot's German visit resulted in several reviews of Heinrich Heine's work, which she praised for its belief in a common humanity and its contention that "the Jew was a symbol of the universal struggle for advanced ideas" (Baker 39). By connecting with German and Jewish philosophy, Eliot's work turned away from depicting the best of England, as in *Adam Bede* and *Silas Marner*, and the Jews "were held up as a healthier alter ego" (Lewis 199). This idealization (even fetishization) of Judaism removes Jews from contemporary culture by disavowing their existence in the present. *Impressions* relegates Jewish culture to the past that marks the beginning of Christianity; the Old in relation to the New Testament: "From whatever point of view the writings of the Old Testament may be regarded, the picture they present of a national development is of high interest and specialty, nor can their historic momentousness be much affected by any varieties of theory as to the relation they bear to the New Testament or to the rise and constitution of Christianity" (*Impressions* 148-149). Eliot offers Jewish history as a pivot to Christian and English society, placing Jews in the awkward position of the "historical" while still living as a contemporary people facing political and social stigma.

Eliot's interest in German Jewish philosophy continued for the remainder of her life inspiring and preparing her for *Daniel Deronda*. For Eliot, Jewish history became the answer to how England could maintain its culture, and it served as a roadmap for a new English nationalism:

> There is more likeness than contrast between the way we English got our island and the way the Israelites got Canaan […] And the just sympathy and admiration which we give to our ancestors who resisted the oppressive acts of our native kings, and by resisting rescued or won for us the best part of our civil and religious liberties--is it justly to be withheld from those brave and steadfast men of Jewish race who fought and died […] and by resisting rescued the nationality which was the very hearth of our own religion? (150-1)

Eliot saw Jewish culture as an ideal community that maintained its national heritage and offered England a parallel history on which to base its own developing national identity. Unto the Jews Eliot thrusts her greatest hopes for England and nationalism while simultaneously disabling a Jewish reality (or nation, which we will see with *Daniel Deronda*) and, as Reina Lewis argues, Eliot "denies the reality of loss (here of Englishness) either by displacing the anxiety producing (Jewish) object into a more comfortable form (Judaism […]), or by disavowing its existence altogether (Judaism purified into Christianity)" (198). It is this paradox of reification and disavowal that makes Eliot's nationalism so dangerous for Anglo-Jewry and to the fictional Daniel Deronda. Nationalism is good for all people, but not all people can be part of England's nationalism. As with cosmopolitanism, Eliot argues that not everyone in the British Empire can be English (as is the case with her Chinaman), but she recognizes the universal desire for national belonging: "We should recognize a corresponding attachment to nationality as legitimate in every other people, and understand that its absence is a privation of the greatest good" (*Impressions* 147). National belonging is a universal ideal felt by all peoples, but universality turns into exclusivity as Eliot denies Englishness to those outside her "Island Kingdom." This tension between the liberal, universal ideal and the exclusive, exceptional nation reveals the underlying tension in *Daniel Deronda*.

There were two political schools of thought pertaining to Jewish belonging in England: the Conversion model and the Ethnographic model.[44] Michael Ragussis's *Figures of Conversion*

[44] For the purposes of this chapter, I place the anthropological and ethnographic model of race under the same rubric. What is important is that the Conversion model depends on a monogenesis view of humanity: we all come from a Christian, Biblical beginning starting with Adam. This Conversion model is indebted to Dr. James Cowles Prichard whose ideas dominated the first half of the nineteenth century in England until they were challenged by the polygenesis school, which held a degenerationist view of racial/cultural difference. What is important to note about the Conversion model is the "commitment to monogenism, Prichard felt, indicated that the

sees the Jewish Question in Victorian England becoming the "Culture of Conversion." England became increasingly interested in the Jewish question and public debates raged about the religious, social, and political status of Jews. In 1809 the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews and in 1842 the British Society for the Propagation of the Gospel among the Jews were founded. Ragussis sees the creation of these two institutions as emblematic of England's concern and how the Jewish Questions shaped English national identity. Citing an explosion of conversion novels, such as *The Converted Jewess: A Memoir of Maria* (1846) or *Leila Ada, the Jewish Convert: An Authentic Memoir* (1855), Ragussis "examine[s] the nineteenth-century novel's dialogue with a specific tradition of historical discourse that used the figure of conversion to define English national identity" (11).[45] The Jewish Question was part of the social and literary consciousness. The conversion narrative that was popular before the primacy of ethnography and Darwinism couched Jewish conversion as a progress toward a unified nation. Brian Cheyette argues that the preoccupation with converting Jews (and the belief that they should be converted) represents a "liberal inclusiveness [that] is always ambivalent because it is buttressed by a spurious universalism which assumes that 'the Jew' will be transfigured in a higher realm" (5). George Eliot embraced a vague universalism during the 1840s when Jewish emancipation and voting rights were a pressing topic. As Alan T.

---

height reached by Christian civilization created a task for Victorians--the mission of spreading Western Culture, so that gradually all peoples would be brought into the orbit of Christian 'civilization'" (McKay 46). The Polygenist School, however, believed that people were not descended from a common ancestor. In this model, genetics, breeding, and mate selection could lead to a degenerate society. Polygenist thought predated Darwin's *The Origin of Species* (1859) but quickly adopted Darwin's scientific ideas into a racial framework. The Monogenesis/Conversion model posited that all people could become more Western and Christian, regardless of skin color, language, or culture. Christianity was a universal solvent.

[45] Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice* ends with the forced conversion of Shylock. However, Shylock's conversion takes place after the play is finished and is not the central struggle of the play.

Levenson argues in his article "Writing the Philosemitic Novel: *Daniel Deronda* Revisited," "[Eliot] was a believer in the typical liberal assimilationist solution to the Jewish Question. Her position is neither especially philosemitic nor especially anti-Semitic in the context of the times" (131). This viewpoint was still viable during the 1840s when the cultural revolution of Evolutionary Darwinism had yet to be felt. However, Eliot's universal liberalism morphed as the century progressed, and her depiction of Daniel Deronda undercuts the philosemitism many scholars claim for her.

While conversion societies concentrated on making Jews accept English Protestantism, the emerging science of ethnography saw conversion as impossible. For Victorian scientists, Jews were not just a different religion but a different race. Robert Knox's *Races of Men* (1850), among others, contributed to the belief that Jews were a separate people based on both physiology and religion.[46] No longer were Jews different because of culture and religion, but because of hereditary and genetics. This type of "scientific" thinking transformed the Jewish question from a conversion narrative (*how* could Jews be assimilated into Christian England?) into an ethnographic model (*could* Jews be assimilated into England?). Because of their proximity to and participation in English culture and their historical and religious connection to Christianity, Jews occupied a singular position in the English imagination; one that incorporated all the discourses on race, culture, and nationalism.[47] By making Jews racial and cultural 'others,' the English were better able to define themselves. Exploring the Jewish question meant

[46] Gobineau's *Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races* (1853-1855) also popularized race typology. Unfortunately Gobineau (unlike Knox) remains in circulation among white supremacist groups.

[47] Another group similarly abused by England was the Irish. The Irish and Jews suffered the brutality of English imperialism, but the Irish represent a different case because they had a tangible island home. The English were an occupying force in Ireland, whereas Jewish assimilation generally occurred in England.

better defining the nature of Englishness, and as George Eliot writes in *Impressions*, "We have to consider who are the stifled people and who the stiflers before we can be sure of our ground" (160). In defining the Jewish people, the English were, in turn, evaluating themselves.

Impression's "The Modern Hep," in context of the period it was written, is amazingly positive for the Jewish cause. However, its affirmation of 'nationhood' curtails Jewish acceptance in England. Eliot's praise of Jewish difference eventually excludes Jews from English Nationalism. The rhetoric of pride coupled with imperialism created a perilous environment, and Eliot notes, "We [the English] do not call ourselves a dispersed and punished people: we are a colonizing people, and it is we who have punished others" (*Impressions* 146). While an ironic observation about English imperialism, it illustrates the perils of nationalism when used by an already empowered nation. "The Modern Hep!" characterizes nationalism as a violent pursuit dependent on traditional tropes of masculinity. In light of Eliot's characterization of nationalism and imperialism, her depiction of Daniel Deronda rings false and unrealistic. In *Impressions* the characteristics attributed to successful nation builders are not given to Daniel. In the context of Eliot's *Impressions* argument, the creation of *Daniel Deronda* and its prophetic Zionism becomes troubling.

Daniel Deronda intertwines Jewish and English narratives to illustrate the interconnectivity of these two cultures and show how this connection could be used for the modern pursuit of nation building. In a response to a review by Rabbi David Kaufman, Eliot admired his "clear perception of the relation between the presentation of the Jewish element and those of the English social life" (qt. in Baker 5). For Eliot, *Daniel Deronda* did not contain two competing narratives but was a unified whole, the Jewish part answering questions contained within Gwendolyn's English narrative. England's consciousness was in crisis, and the country

confronting an economic shift "from a land-based economy and social hierarchy to a market driven capitalist society" (Henry 111). In light of the social turmoil brought by the collapse of the traditional class system in England, Eliot sought a new method to maintain and construct the nation's identity.

Eliot uses Jewish history to theorize English nationalism, but there is a reality gap in maintaining a unified England and establishing a Jewish state. Daniel's quest to found a Jewish state is unrealistic in its rendering by Eliot and its historical context, in which Zionism's goals and aims were not fully conceptualized. Near the end of the novel, Daniel explains to Gwendolyn his reason for leaving England and his new national fervor:

> The idea that I am possessed with is that of restoring a political existence to my people, making them a nation again, giving them a national centre, such as the English have, though they too are scattered over the face of the globe. That is a task which presents itself to me as a duty: I am resolved to begin it, however feebly. I am resolved to devote my life to it. (803)

Daniel explicitly compares the English Empire to the Jewish Diaspora. Each people needs a definitive nation in order to maintain its unique culture. Though Daniel draws parallels between the English and Jewish people, he does not investigate the history that led to the 'scattering' of each people. The English Empire's colonization of the globe represents imperialist conquest, while the Jewish dispersion was caused by oppressive acts.[48] Daniel does not register these differences or their implications for his own life as a Jew. While the book constructs parallels between the English and Jewish national causes, it does not unpack the difficulties of the Jewish question. The causes of English and Jewish global dispersion are quite different. English colonial conquest and Jewish exile cannot be used as points of sympathy. This critical mischaracterization Eliot makes in an attempt to show English debt to Jewish culture dooms

[48] The Roman Empire caused the destruction of the Second Temple and occupied what is modern day Israel and Palestine.

Daniel. While Eliot pays tribute to her Jewish inheritance, but Jewish political existence is not analogous to England's.

Throughout the novel, Eliot depicts Daniel as different from the other men in the novel. Specifically, Daniel's interactions with women render him outside the typical male discourse of the period. In a scene with Lady Pentreath and Gwendolyn, Daniel remains with the women to talk, thus separating himself from the male company. As Daniel enters the drawing-room, he asks "'Shall I be acceptable?' he said. 'Perhaps I had better go back and look for the others. I suppose they are in the billiard room.'"(435). Lady Pentreath replies: "'No, no; stay where you are […] They were all getting tired of me; let us hear what *you* have to say'" (435). Daniel remains in the drawing-room signaling that he is more interested in the company of women than the masculine world of the billiard room. Removed from the homosocial circle, Daniel occupies an indeterminate space between billiard and drawing room, between men and women. His gender performance deviates from the normalized male circle, and Daniel's socializing with the women signals his boundary crossing of English gender system. Moreover, Daniel's odd relationship with Gwendolyn depicts him more as an ethical eunuch than a legitimate male suitor.

While at Eton, Daniel's male peers commented that " 'Daniel would have been first rate if he had had more ambition' […] But how could a fellow push his way properly when he objected to swop for his own advantage, knocked under by choice when he was within an inch of victory […] [he] would rather be a calf than the butcher" (*Daniel* 178). The image of the calf and the butcher invokes Leviticus, thus placing an emphasis on Daniel's Jewish ancestry to explain his lack of aggression. The calf and butcher is an allusion to Leviticus 4:20 "And he shall do to the calf as he did to the calf of the sin-offering, so shall it be done; and the priest shall make

atonement for them, and the trespass shall be forgiven them." Daniel prefers to be sacrificed, indicating his unassuming, deferential nature. Unfortunately Eliot is not subverting gentile masculinity by lauding Jewish masculinity.[49] Eliot writes in *Impressions* that nation building, to be successful, must be violent: "But since we have been fortunate enough to keep the island-home they won for us, and have been on the whole a prosperous people, rather continuing the plan of invading and spoiling other lands than being forced to beg for shelter in them, nobody has reproached us" (146). Part of England's prosperity has been its ability to conquer. By depicting Daniel as a victim incapable of physical victory, Eliot reinforces racial stereotypes of Jewish male inadequacy. Eliot wants to construct an ideal nationalism with the Jewish plot, but she reinforces constructions of race and gender by depicting Daniel as emasculated, and incapable of a successful national mission.

Daniel Deronda's theme of national identity contains an underlying tension between Daniel Deronda's quest and Eliot's decision to consistently gender Daniel as feminine and describe him, at least by Victorian standards, in emasculating terms. Daniel's mission and Daniel's character appear irreconcilable, revealing that the Zionist dream of *Daniel Deronda* in fact deals with England's own issues of identity and nationhood. Eliot uses Jewish culture to investigate identity while reinscribing Jewish stereotypes. Daniel as "nation builder" appears as a major fallacy in light of the tension between his characterization and Victorian theories on race, identity, and nation. *Daniel Deronda* points to Jewish culture as a framework for maintaining

[49] Daniel Boyarin's *Unheroic Conduct: The Rise of Heterosexuality and the Invention of the Jewish Man* covers the history of Jewish masculinity and how it differed from gentile masculinity in its emphasis on learning and non-violence. While Jewish masculinity resisted the dominant culture's definitions of masculinity, Boyarin notes that this changed in the nineteenth-century, when "homosexuality" was defined as a neurosis, which changed the way Jews defined themselves. In short, Jewish masculinity had long been antithetical to Christian masculinity.

national identity, but the rhetoric used to highlight "Jewish unity" is the same rhetoric that justifies Jewish persecution and expulsion.

Daniel concerns himself with issues of identity and the future of his people, the same dilemmas England dealt with outside of fiction. But the power differential between Jews and Christians in England complicates Eliot's description of Daniel. The project of nation building was a decidedly masculine pursuit: whether it came to scripting social policy or fighting wars, strict gender boundaries lay at the heart of nationalism. Robert Knox's *The Races of Men: A Fragment* connects nationhood with masculinity: "Wanderers, then, by nature--unwarlike--they [Jews] never could acquire a fixed home or abode […] for the question always returns, why were they a dispersed race? And why are they now a dispersed race? No sane person doubts their power to seize Judea if they thought fit" (205-211). Knox connects 'unwarlike' behavior with the Jews' failure to regain a homeland, making their dispersion a physical and psychological inadequacy. Though not alone in his conviction, Knox popularized the sentiment that Jewish male inadequacy led to the Diaspora.

Knox makes clear that any respectable race of men would use force to regain their homeland. Masculinity matters when founding nations, but Eliot consistently uses gendered language to depict both Daniel and Mordecai:

> In ten minutes the two men, with as intense a consciousness as if they had been two undeclared lovers, felt themselves alone in the small gas-lit book shop […] (495)
> --
> […] Mordecai to his usual gentle self: he was not able to speak again at present, but with a maternal action he drew the curly head towards him and pressed it tenderly again his breast. (478)

Eliot's use of homoerotic and maternal imagery when describing Daniel and Mordecai unwittingly reinforces Knox's point. Describing two Jewish men in a novel in part about nationalism with a term like 'maternal' and as 'undeclared lovers' undercuts Eliot's support of

Jewish nationalism. She can develop a Jewish nationalist ethos because inevitably it is not a threat to England. Every description that disassociates Daniel from the standard Victorian male diminishes the reality of Jewish nationalism. His story becomes a parable for English nationalism because Jewish men are racialized as illegitimate leaders and incapable aggressors. Because they are minorities in a text that deals with difference, Daniel and Mordecai bear the burden of representation. Eliot inadvertently bolsters Knox's arguments by her description of the two characters, which harks back to Knox's crude assessment of the Diaspora. The Jews do not have a homeland, and neither do Daniel and Mordecai, for they are incapable of war and of exerting power.

Daniel and Mordecai's relationship undercuts a realist reading of the novel and, as Sarah Gates explains in " 'A Difference of Native Language': Gender, Genre, and Realism in *Daniel Deronda*," their relationship "cannot be comprehended realistically, but only as a leap of faith that is alien to an empirical understanding of human intercourse. The hero that results from the mystical infusion of this divine Mordecai into Daniel comes from a people who could still be perceived as living in a culture that had yet to perform the epic task of founding a nation" (701-2). What is striking about Gates' explanation of the unrealistic, incomprehensible nature of the Jewish part is that she labels it within the genre of epic. Mordecai's recognition of Daniel as Jewish is now read as part of a spiritual quest, rather than Eliot's use of racial physiognomy of the times. Whether *Daniel Deronda* is an epic or a realist novel will change how these narrative twists are seen. Mordecai sets out to find a Jewish man to fulfill his ideal for a national Jewish type:

> He must glorify the possibilities of the Jew, not sit and wander as Mordecai did […] Sensitive to physical characteristics, he had, both abroad and in England, looked at pictures as well as men, and in a vacant hour he had sometimes lingered in the National

> Gallery in search of paintings which might feed his hopefulness with grave and noble types of the human form, such as might well belong to men of his own race. (472)

That Mordecai searches for his “ideal Jew” using the popular science of type and race complicates Gates's reading of Daniel as epic hero. For if we are to understand Mordecai's motivation for being attracted to Daniel (as Gates claims we cannot) we must recognize the language of race and type that was so popular during the late nineteenth-century. Mordecai’s investment in human ideals and types represents more of Victorian race than the Hebrew scripture that he studies. Just as Mordecai looked for the perfect Jewish type (finding it in Daniel), Victorian ethnographers were also searching for perfect examples of ethnic types.

Daniel Novak's "A Model Jew: 'Literary Photographs' and the Jewish Body in *Daniel Deronda*" places Eliot's novel, not in the genre of epic, but squarely in the genre of realism, one reinforced by the emerging field of photography and race science:

> By placing *Daniel Deronda* in the context of a specific technology of photographic realism and scientific practice, I intend to explore an element of Victorian realism that continues to puzzle its readers--typology and the typological or 'statistical person.' I want to suggest that what Galton describes as a 'pictorial average' of a group, a typical body, free of the 'peculiarities' of the individual, offers a photographic embodiment of the aesthetics and ethics of racial difference, as represented in *Daniel Deronda* and *The Impressions of Theophrastus Such.* (60)

Novak should place the “statistical” person as part of the late Victorian realist novel, which saw the external body as an accurate reflection of the soul. Mordecai depends on an idealized type to recognize Daniel, which runs counter to the incomprehensible recognition Gates claims for the older Jewish man. Instead, Daniel is recognizably Jewish, firmly placing his depiction in the realistic tradition. Placing *Daniel Deronda* under the umbrella of "epic" elides the unviable nature of Daniel's quest (to found a nation) and, thus, produces a falsely positive reading to the ending of the novel.

Eliot's idealizing of Daniel prompts another main criticism of the novel: the implausible characterization of the title character. Early criticism labeled Daniel unbelievable; Henry James famously described him as a "dreadful prig."[50] Daniel's priggishness comes from his goodness: he is relentlessly egoless, generous, and sympathetic. In contrast, Gwendolyn, whose narrative represents a decaying gentry, is more engaging; another Eliot installment of the young woman's bildungsroman.[51] In part Gwendolyn is so intriguing for her shortcomings, unlike Daniel, whose unbelievable decency makes him unengaging. Gwendolyn suffers from the weight of Daniel's goodness, and her conscience is provoked with each of his glances:

> Her eyes met Deronda's, and instead of averting them as she would have desired to do, she was unpleasantly conscious that they were arrested--how long? The darting sense that he was measuring her and looking down on her as an inferior, that he was of different quality from the human dross around her […] was examining her as a specimen of a lower order. (10)

This dynamic continues throughout the novel as Gwendolyn sees in Daniel a moral integrity that she yearns to understand and possess. While Daniel's goodness might be a refreshing antidote to the anti-Semitic depictions of Jews in literature, his two-dimensional characterization subverts a realist reading, creating an imaginative space without real application.

Eliot aligns goodness and nationalism with the "good" Jews of the text—the ones who envision leaving England are rewarded, while the more problematic Jewish characters, such as the Cohen family, are depicted as too cosmopolitan and not concerned with Jewish nationalism. The Cohen family's commercial ties separate them from Daniel and Herr Klezmer, the Jewish musician who marries a Gentile woman. Daniel and Klezmer both possess a certain education;

---

[50] James, "Daniel Deronda: A Conversation," *Atlantic Monthly,* Dec. 1876

[51] John M. Picker's "George Eliot and the Sequel Question," *New Literary History* 37.2 (2006) 361-388 does an excellent job of tracing the reception of the novel's "two halves." F.R. Leavis cited the Jewish part of the novel as "the bad part" and suggested that "there is nothing to do but cut it away" (361). This was a common response from those outside the Jewish community.

Daniel is a gentleman and Klezmer, a renowned musician. The two Jewish characters contrast sharply with the Cohens who were among "the commoner unconverted Jews" and Ezra Cohen being "the most unpoetic Jew [Daniel] had ever met with in book or life" (709 & 391). The family operates a small pawn shop, contrasting with Daniel's refinement (we later learn he is Sephardic) and Klezmer's poetic bearing as a Jewish musician.

Eliot's depictions of Jews in the novel are diverse, offering several depictions of Jewish masculinity. Cynthia Scheinberg argues that these multiple representations are part of Eliot's ethical revision:

> The varied cast of Jewish characters…is one way Eliot refuses to reduce the notion of Jewish difference to a set of issues about religious, textual, or racial identity; instead, this infiltration of Jewishness at almost every of the novel suggests Eliot sought to highlight a set of important issues Jewish identity raises for modern Christian culture" (819).

Eliot's inclusion of multiple Jewish masculinities serves to avoid an essential reading of Jewish identity. However, my interest is in Daniel's masculinity and identity because it is he who vows to serve in the nationalist cause. The Cohen family is happy in their East end home and Klezmer will enjoy married life. Eliot specifically bequeaths the responsibility of nationalism and the desire for a homeland to Daniel.

Of all the Jewish characters, Daniel best approximates English identity and his assimilation from English gentleman to Jewish man reverses the usual trajectory. Eliot reserves the nationalist task for Daniel alone. Eliot makes a clear connection between the refined Jews and the will to find a homeland. Daniel considers himself an English gentleman despite his newly discovered inheritance, and he chooses to pursue his identity in terms of ethnicity:

> The effect of my education can never be done away with. The Christian sympathies in which my mind was reared can never die out of me […] But I consider it my duty--it is the impulse of my feeling--to identify myself, as far as possible, with my hereditary people, and if I can see any work to be done for them that I can give my soul and hand to I shall choose to do it. (661).

The effects of his education may be the realization that to be Jewish is not to be English. In a weird twist of prophetic nationalism, Daniel validates his English upbringing by embracing Judaism. He knows he must turn away from his English education because he knows he cannot partake of that nationalist ideology. Instead, he privileges race over upbringing and transforms Judaism into a duty. Through his transformation, Eliot shows how important national identity is to the individual: Daniel changes his life simply by being informed that he *is* a Jew.

Daniel's declaration of Jewish identity and subsequent embrace of his heritage helps maintain the racial boundaries upon which nationalism depended. Invested in a racial and cultural reading of nationalism, Daniel rejects his English roots as forged, though he does not reject the morals of his upbringing. Instead of his English upbringing, Daniel sees his authentic self as Jewish dependent on a historical past and an imagined future. Daniel authenticates his Jewish identity first with a declaration, "And you were right. I am a Jew" (747), and later with a written record of his new identity: "'And it is not only that I am a Jew,' Deronda went on […] My grandfather Daniel Charisi, preserved manuscripts, family records stretching far back […] I possess the chest containing them, with his own papers'" (*Daniel Deronda* 748). And so Daniel is Jewish because he has papers to prove it. [52] Remarkably, this revelation about origin is never questioned, and his new identity obeys the laws of race and nation. His Jewishness is at once invented and quite real. Anne McClintock captures the paradox of identity, race, and nationalism: "nations are not simply phantasmagoria of the mind but are historical practices through which social difference is both invented and performed" (353). Daniel follows the rules of society and culture, and Eliot's idea of community is maintained.

[52] On a personal note, when Daniel reveals to Mirah and Mordecai that he *is* Jewish because he has *paperwork*, I burst out laughing. In the same manner that Oscar Wilde declared, "one must have a heart of stone to read the death of little Nell without laughing," I, too, had to have a heart of stone not to laugh at Daniel's revelatory paperwork.

Deborah Cohen argues in "Who Was Who? Race and Jews in Turn-of-the-Century Britain" that race figured more prominently the more assimilation took place:

> It takes the case of British Jews to argue that racial categories could arise as a response to the apparent similarities, as well as the perceived differences, between Jews and other Britons […] Notions of race, I will argue, emerged in part as a consequence of assimilation, delimiting difference in a nation where formal legal barriers to Jewish integration had been eliminated […] My purpose is to examine the paradox[:] on the one hand, widespread agreement that Jews constituted a race; on the other hand, frank acknowledgment of the virtual impossibility of telling them apart from other Britons. (461-62)

In this way, Daniel affirms his goodness by obeying the boundary between race and nation. Daniel is not trying to assimilate or break down barriers but to honor the system that brought him up by obeying it and leaving England.[53] Part of the trouble with Eliot's ending is that to be a good Jew is to be a departing Jew. Eliot closely ties race and national identity thus creating a social paradox for the novel's Jews. As Susan Meyer points out in "'Safely to Their Own Borders': Proto-Zionism, Feminism, and Nationalism in *Daniel Deronda*,"

> [The] novel by no means idealized Jews. Instead, what this novel idealizes is the 'refined' Jew--the world is used repeatedly to describe Mirah and Mordecai. With Daniel, whom we have believed to be an English gentleman's son, the use of the word is unnecessary, because the word signifies a purging of the impurities of Jewishness: a 'refined' Jew is one who has become more like the English. (746)

In becoming more English, 'refined' Jews comply with the rhetoric of nationalism, a rhetoric that seeks unity through homogenization. If they are 'good, refined' Jews they will leave England and find another home. By extolling Jewish nationalism, Eliot is encouraging a Jewish migration out of England. The rhetoric of destiny and nationalism eventually leads to expulsion or departure.

Eliot makes a clear distinction between 'refined' Jews and 'traditional' Jews. Nationalistic Jews are acceptable because their intention is to leave England--they are a threat to English

[53] We will see the opposite reaction from Trollope's Ferdinand Lopez in the second half of this chapter.

culture. The departure of Daniel and his new wife, Mirah, represents the ideal answer to the Jewish Question. However, Mrs. Meyrick hopes that Mirah will assimilate and that "the intensity of Mirah's feeling about Judaism would slowly subside" (*Deronda* 567). Rejecting assimilation, Mirah insists on marrying another Jew in an embrace of the rhetoric of national purity. Because of Mirah's refinement, the Meyrick's tolerate her dedication as it guarantees she will maintain the borders between Jewish and English culture. As a jealous Daniel points out to Hans, "you are only preparing misery for yourself […] She would not marry a Christian, even if she loved him. Have you heard her--of course you have--heard her speak of her people and her religion?"(462). Mirah will not assimilate, nor will she 'spread' her beliefs by marrying a gentile. By insisting on cultural cohesiveness with her husband, Mirah does not threaten English culture, and is allowed to remain 'refined.' Mirah and Daniel stay 'good' Jews by leaving England, and indeed Jewish nationalism becomes a tidy reason for all the Jews to leave.

Daniel Deronda contains the dangerous rhetoric of nationalism and ethnography. By portraying Daniel as an ineffective leader, Eliot removes the reality of a Jewish state. Daniel's character is unrealistic, and his goal of founding a nation seems unrealistic as well; his developing Zionism and Jewish identity remain unthreatening as long as Daniel continues to be described in effeminate, unrealistic, and racialized terms. Eliot wants to depict the perfect Jewish 'type' so that her understanding of English nationalism will be accepted. For Eliot, English nationalism should imitate Jewish nationalism. But embracing this rhetoric places Jews outside both discourses. Daniel and Mirah's departure from England is not the picture of a triumphant couple but of two Jews who accepted English concepts of identity. Eliot's novel ends with an eerie sensation that Daniel and Mirah will encounter the same nationalist rhetoric in every 'home' they attempt to make.

The Rise and Fall of Ferdinand Lopez

In contrast to Deronda's departure at the end of Eliot's 1876 novel, Anthony Trollope's *The Prime Minister* explores what happens to a Jewish character who attempts to assimilate and develop his English identity. Ferdinand Lopez, who is characterized by his hazy, yet decidedly Jewish background, enters England's upper political and social circles.[54] The novel chronicles the rise and precipitous fall of Lopez. That Ferdinand Lopez presumes to enter into English society with no family name, history, or wealth demonstrates his confidence and determination; the fact that he is violently excluded from this society demonstrates the limitations of such a venture.[55] Trollope's novel, published the same year as *Daniel Deronda*, exhibits the author's style of an "earthy [and] rigorous psychological realism" that renders an accurate portrait of a man's quest for social acceptance (Anderson *Modernity* 510). Trollope's realism gives Lopez's character the psychological breadth to truly explore societal and national boundaries, and in a most realistic fashion, the novel comes up with no clear or comfortable answers.

Trollope's ambivalence has long been noted by scholars, and I believe it to be one of the most engaging aspects of his fiction. He has no consistent ideology and vacillates between condemning characters' actions while recognizing the social causes of those very actions. As noted in 1959 by John Hagan, "Throughout the whole of his body of his work instinctive and emotional conservatism continually clashes with what he felt was the more rational, utilitarian, and liberal bent of his temperament; and, these two opposing forces never being reconciled, there

[54]Though Ferdinand Lopez never declares himself a Jew, unlike his counterpart Daniel Deronda, he is repeatedly referred to as “a Portuguese Jew,” “a greasy Jew adventurer,” “a nasty Jew-looking man” and “Jew-boy.” Along with Trollope’s colorful reminders, critics identify him as a Jewish character.

[55] In a burgeoning stock market economy, the English were making money off of venture capital. In the novel, however, only Lopez is punished for bad business practices, held responsible for failed holdings, and unfairly maligned for the same dealings as his English peers.

is often engendered in vital areas of his fiction uncertainty and ambiguity to a very high degree" (2). While those "vital areas" have changed over the decades of literary criticism, Hagan's overarching point, that Trollope had conflicting ideas about society and self, remains true. Bryan Cheyette locates this ambivalence in Trollope's "trying to 'balance' opposed forces in Victorian liberalism which wanted to both extend a reformist, universalizing State, and, at the same time, maintain a parliament nation whose values were rooted in the past" (*Constructions* 25). Cheyette's observations about the contending forces seated at the heart of Trollope's fiction, speaks to my larger argument that Trollope's fiction makes a case for universal liberalism, while acknowledging the improbability of achieving such a state during the height of the British Empire. The tension between a secular state and a nation founded upon tradition (religion, language) tightens as Lopez attempts to scale the social walls. For my purposes, I am interested in Trollope's ambivalence toward Ferdinand Lopez and what this says about Jewish representation and nationalism.

My paper looks at how the expansion of the British Empire coupled with Trollope's ambivalent relationship to national identity, informed his representation of foreignness in his novels, specifically in *The Prime Minister*. Trollope's biography overlaps with his fictional creation, Ferdinand Lopez. They both failed at a political life as members of parliament; both worked tirelessly to better their social and economic station in light of English class nepotism. At the same time Trollope gives Lopez some of his personal history, he uses the character to mock Disraeli. Writing of his Prime Minister, Trollope wrote in an 1876 letter, "To my thinking Disraeli is the meanest cuss we have ever had in this country" (*Letters* 669). The depiction of Lopez teases at Trollope's biography while ridiculing Disraeli's character as a man of grasping ambition. Trollope combines his personal history with characteristics of Disraeli to create an

uncanny doppelganger. I bring up these narrative overlaps of Trollope's life to his fictional characters in order to show how the writer explored his rather ambivalent feelings about Englishness in his novels. Trollope was a man of contending passions, and his works and letters indicate a man struggling to reconcile progressive ideals to conservative inclinations.

Before discussing the novel proper, I would like briefly to show how many of Trollope's ideas about social enfranchisement began not in England, but in America. By reading aspects of Trollope's travelogue *North America* and its recording of class and race differences, the potential social change depicted in *The Prime Minister* and its failure better explain Trollope's ambivalent feelings about a progressive liberalism. Trollope's record of North America anticipates many of the social and economic arguments that would preoccupy his 1876 novel.

In *North America* Trollope extols America's insistence on universal education as one of the great strengths of the country. He is quick to note that this universal access has degraded class boundaries. In a scene from *The Prime Minister*, Plantagenet Palliser, the sitting PM, sneers at exactly this type of interaction caused by "the Liberal" who has "conceived of the idea of lessening distances,--of bringing the coachman and the duke nearer together" (584). Like most of Trollope's politics his views on education were complicated. He certainly looked with caution upon the liberalizing effect education had on social conduct in America; however, in 1868 he ran on the Liberal platform of universal education—an ill-fated run that dashed his dreams of becoming a Liberal MP. His ambivalent views were instead played out in his increasingly political novels of the 1870s where he attempted to reconcile the dueling impulses of stability and progress.

Lying beneath equal access to education—at least in the Northern states—was the freely circulating market economy where the new routes of capital reflect the remapping of social and

political boundaries. Trollope makes an economic argument about equality and uses a word that in the last twenty-years has become a progressive catch phrase: cosmopolitan. While describing New York he uses the word cosmopolitan but not in its most recent iteration:

> In no other city is there a population so mixed and cosmopolitan in their modes of life. And yet in no other city that I have seen are there such strong and ever-visible characteristics of the social and political bearings of the nation to which it belongs…That it is pre-eminently American is its glory or its disgrace—as men of different ways of thinking may decide upon it. Free institutions, general education, and the ascendancy of the dollars are the words written on every pavestone along Fifth Avenue…Every man can vote, and values the privilege. (182)

The description of New York brings into full relief the contending forces driving Trollope's evaluation of America's social experiment. At the heart of Trollope's critique is the way money functions to disrupt old hierarchies and create a more populist definition of national belonging. Cosmopolitan New York was a place where social institutions and inalienable rights erased difference. Capitalism, democracy, and education all, when uncompromised, serve to level claims of title, rank, and privilege.

Lauren Goodlad writes in her recent PMLA article that "Trollope's works remind us that from a Victorian perspective, the word *cosmopolitan* was more likely to evoke the impersonal structures of capitalism and imperialism than an ethos of tolerance, world citizenship, and multiculturalism" (439). New York's cosmopolitanism was not so much a dazzling display of democracy but a lack of demarcation for maintaining traditional practices and structures. Combining these observations of New York's cosmopolitanism with Trollope's distaste for Disraeli, who the character Ferdinand Lopez is based upon, paints a picture of a writer both respectful of a self-made man and resentful of the tasteless social climber. With the Jew, Trollope found the perfect figure to embody his ambivalent reactions to changing English culture.

This break down in distinction, taste, and class surfaces over and over again in his later novels, which are preoccupied with money. In a scene from *The Prime Minister* that again echoes the description of New York, Trollope's Ferdinand Lopez embodies the forces erasing social and class difference. Lopez is not an Englishman and the novel alludes several times to his Jewish ancestry. He stands and fails for parliament and marries the genteel Emily Wharton. Here is a description given of Lopez by his rival: "He's too clever, too cosmopolitan,--a sort of man whitewashed of all prejudices, who wouldn't mind whether he ate horseflesh or beef if horseflesh were as good as beef, and never had an association in his life" (141). The cosmopolitan becomes a man devoid of traditions defining taste, or social context. This "too clever" aesthetic enables Lopez to navigate the London social scene with chameleon like grace. Newly earned wealth, Trollope cautions, makes possible a dangerous cultural relativism.

As a self-characterized "advanced Conservative Liberal," Trollope's ambivalence about a social mobility enabled by greater economic opportunities comes into relief with his depictions of Jews.[56] The tension between the universal state and traditional nation is played out with the figure of the Jew particularly as they are tied to the stock market, speculation, and credit. Money enabled Jewish businessmen to compete on the economic and social market. Trollope recorded these social changes and presented a figure of Ferdinand Lopez whose ethnicity and employment as a man of business challenged traditional readings of money and national belonging. As much as economics played to diminish class boundaries, it also disturbed racial readings of national identities or the primacy of the English gentleman.

In the opening scene of *The Prime Minister* Trollope introduces Lopez as a "gentleman." Lopez's appearance on the first page and as the title character of the first chapter signals his

[56] Frank Kermode, "Introduction" in *The Prime Minister*, by Anthony Trollope (New York: Penguin, 2002) xvii.

prominence in the narrative, and specifically his importance to Victorian social theory that was incorporating the new sciences of anthropology and ethnography. The significance of origins (those pesky beginnings that no character can escape) is firmly established:

> It is certainly of service to a man to know who were his grandfathers and who were his grandmothers if he entertain an ambition to move in the upper circles of society, and also of service to be able to speak of them as of persons who were themselves somebody in their time […] but while the struggle is going on, with the conviction strong upon the struggler that he cannot be altogether successful unless he be esteemed a gentleman, not to be ashamed, not to conceal the old family circumstances, not at any rate to be silent, is difficult. (9)

Trollope introduces the main source of tension in the novel: ancestry and inheritance. In order to break into "upper circles" a past must be supplied; the lack of a past can prove difficult and damaging to aspiring social climbers. This opening sentence connects belonging, whether social or national, to a past. The sense of past and people proves extremely powerful and throughout the entire novel Lopez must account for its absence. The personal past becomes part of the historical fabric of a nation and, in consequence, to be without forbearers is to be without a nation. This definition of nationalism was popularized and promoted by the French theorist Ernest Renan, whose essay, “What is a Nation?” sparked debate among his contemporaries; "Of all the cults, that of the ancestors is the most legitimate, for the ancestors have made us what we are. A heroic past, great men, glory […] this is the social capital upon which one bases a national idea" (Renan 19). Lopez lacks social capital and tries to obtain it with the only capital he has access to: money.

Money, however much you have of it, cannot complete the social definition of a 'gentleman'. Trollope acknowledges the need for a past and particularizes it in terms of breeding: "It was admitted on all sides that Ferdinand Lopez was a 'gentleman'. Johnson says that any other derivation of this difficult word than that which causes it to signify 'a man of ancestry' is

whimsical" (10). Here is the tug and pull of Trollope's characterization of Lopez—he is and is not a gentleman. When read within Johnson's classical definition of ancestry, a gentleman must be well bred in the most basic way: both his parents must be of good breeding themselves. Trollope quickly sees however that this definition does not encapsulate or explain Lopez's ascent to upper society, for which the text must account.

Because of his minority status, Lopez becomes astute at mimicking upper class modes of dress and speech. His mimicry is a protective measure as well as a gesture of assimilation. Trollope cannot simply represent Lopez as an evil interloper (though I think the lesser of his angels wants to) because he recognizes the fragile predicament in which Lopez finds himself and perhaps more importantly, the fragility of a class system that can so easily be mimicked. In Hommi Bhabba's definition "the menace of mimicry is its double vision which in disclosing the ambivalence of colonial discourse also disrupts its authority. And it is a double vision that is a result of what I've described as the partial representation/ recognition of the colonial object" (Bhabha 85). The power of mimicry normally reserved for the colonial subject abroad works in London, which became increasingly diverse as the Empire's colonial enterprises came home.

Lopez's donning of Englishness affirms and subverts at the same time. His recognition of the system destabilizes the notion of the English gentleman as an organic truth. Trollope details just how Lopez has fashioned himself an English gentleman:

> His very tailor regarded him as being simply extravagant in the number of his coats and trousers, and his friends looked upon him as one of those fortunate beings to whose nature belongs a facility of being well dressed, or almost an impossibility of being ill dressed […] but never, at any moment […] was he dressed otherwise than with perfect care. Money and time did it, but folk thought that it grew with him, as did his hair and his nails (12-13)

Trying to connect being a 'gentleman' to familial relationships and blood lines, and discrediting Lopez's claim to the title of 'gentleman,' Trollope reveals how constructed the identity of a

'gentleman' is. By having a good tailor and paying fastidious attention to dress, Lopez becomes a gentleman. While Trollope will spend the remainder of the book trying to discredit this reading and return the term 'gentleman' back to its racial origins, the slippery space between identity and difference has already been opened. Bhabba's insights into how colonialism works in the Empire function similarly for Lopez, a Jew, trying to become English. As Anne McClintock eloquently argues in *Imperial Leather*:

> Imperialism is not something that happened elsewhere--a disagreeable fact of history external to Western identity. Rather, imperialism and the invention of race were fundamental aspects of Western, industrial modernity. The invention of race in the urban metropoles […] became central not only to the self-definition of the middle class, but also to the policing of the 'dangerous classes': the working class, the Irish, Jews, prostitutes, feminists, gays and lesbians, criminals, the militant crowd and so on. (50)

Because Jews, among others, were able to climb the social ladder by mid-century, race was invented to curtail this upward movement. Lopez's mimicry of the 'gentleman' destabilizes the fixity of race, revealing that it can be obfuscated if one is properly dressed and behaves well. Instead, Trollope's rendering of Lopez disconnects race from class, and the author of *The Prime Minister* will spend the remainder of the book trying to reconnect them.

Trollope's racializing of Lopez heightens as the character wins the hand of the genteel Emily Wharton. Lopez enters the Wharton family through marriage, perhaps the ultimate act of assimilation and mimicry. The father of the bride, Mr. Abel Wharton, Q.C., does not accept his future son-in-law because of his suspect origins:

> "I confess that I am one, consider that like should marry like. I should wish to see my daughter marry--not only in my own sphere, neither higher nor lower--but with someone of my own class […] To tell you the truth I know nothing about you. I don't know who your father was,--whether he was an Englishman, whether he was a Christian […] not even whether he was a gentleman […] I shall never willingly give my daughter to anyone who is not the son of an English gentleman. It may be a prejudice, but that is my feeling" (31).

In this fraught exchange, Mr. Wharton, whose values are reflective of his social sphere, combines and confuses class, race, religion, and nationality--all of which come under fire because of Lopez's Jewish heritage. Mr. Wharton wants to protect his daughter's happiness, and he does not want to be embarrassed by having Lopez in the family. Wharton's concern is twofold, and readers get a glimpse of Wharton's true thoughts:

> He had not explained to the man as he would wish to have done, that it was monstrous and out of the question that a daughter of the Whartons, one of the oldest families in England, should be given to a friendless Portuguese--a probable Jew […] Then he remembered that sooner or later his girl would have at least £60,000, a fact which no human being but himself was aware. Would it not be well that somebody should be made aware of it, so that his girl might have the chance of suitors preferable to this swarthy son of Judah? (34-35)

Wharton's internal monologue connects Emily, his money, and their family name and places them in a circulating economy where each is exchanged for another. If her income of £60,000 is revealed, there will be more suitors to try their hand and Wharton might be able to "buy out" Lopez. This economic model of love, marriage, and wealth was not unusual in Victorian fiction. As Kathy Alexis Psomiades states in "Heterosexual Exchange and Other Victorian Fictions: *The Eustace Diamonds* and Victorian Anthropology," "women circulate in heterosexual exchange in the same way that commodities circulate in capitalist exchange [with] relations between men as the true force between struggles over goods and struggles over women, we draw upon theoretical approaches that heterosexuality and capitalism as homologous social structures" (93). "Selling" Emily to Lopez would not only lower her value within society, but the whole family's value.

Mr. Wharton, as the owner of his daughter's hand, connects both money and race in his quest to find a more suitable husband. Lopez's marginal position (he is friendless, a Jew, and not English) places him outside of both social and national borders. If he is the "swarthy son of

Judah," Wharton ties marriage to race and race to nation. Lopez does not belong with Emily because he belongs in "Judah," to one of the twelve tribes of Israel who lived in the north, and not to England. In one rhetorical move, Wharton has removed Lopez from England's national past (and future) and exiled him to a state that does not exist. The Jew is placed within the realm of the historic past (Judah) and therefore has no claim on the national present (England). Lopez in contrast hopes that his marriage to Emily will place him within England and raise him from obscurity.

Just as Lopez challenges what he can become and be in society, Emily exerts her individualism by challenging her father's edicts and marrying a socially unacceptable husband. Emily's choice of Ferdinand gestures toward the nineteenth-century's changing economy that was moving away from a landed gentry system to a capitalist system. These changes were reflected in marriage: "The Victorian story of heterosexual exchange in which we as cultural critics share is just this story of the supplanting of a society organized by kinship and alliance by a society of individual units who act as independent agents in the market" (Psomiades 98-9). Emily rejects the kinship model by refusing Arthur Fletcher, who is her equal in birth and class. Arthur is the model Englishman with close ties to the Wharton family. The reaction to Emily's marriage to Lopez is swift and cruel, and she is ousted from her long standing social network. Her extended family outright rejects her because she did not follow gender and class expectations:

> Among these duties, the chiefest of them incumbent on females was that of so restraining their affections that they should never damage the good cause by leaving it. They might marry within the pale,--or remain single, as might be their lot […] But to love one below herself, a man without a father, a foreigner, a black Portuguese Jew, merely because he had a bright eye, and a hook nose, and a glib tongue--that a girl from the Whartons should do this--! It was so unnatural to Mrs. Fletcher that it would be hardly possible to her to be civil to the girl. (*PM* 136)

Emily's marriage to Lopez transgresses the boundaries of class, race, and gender. That Emily is even interested in Lopez sexualizes her; she is moving outside heteronormative customs of her father's property and acting on her desire. Mrs. Fletcher's rationale for Emily's "unnatural" behavior is her lack of "restraint," a word loaded with sexual overtones. Marrying a Jew was a racial transgression, and race is never far from sex and desire. Her invocation of "the pale" links race and sex as part of a national discourse indicating that Emily has not maintained her family's boundaries or the state's. [57] *Race and the Education of Desire*, by Ann Stoler, explores the intersections of these categories and how "fundamentally bourgeois identity has been tied to notions of being 'European' and being 'white' and how sexual prescriptions served to secure and delineate the authentic, first-class citizens of the nation-state" (11). With Lopez as her husband, Emily does not uphold her 'female duty' by policing her own sexuality and safeguarding future generations.

Because Emily is unable to control her desire and marry the proper English gentleman (Arthur Fletcher) her moral conduct becomes suspect: "Fancy a girl like Emily Wharton […] throwing over a fellow like Arthur for a greasy, black foreigner" (*PM* 142). The Jew in this formula becomes the "blackness" to Emily's besmirched "whiteness." By marrying Lopez, Emily disrupts the link of marriage and morality. She can no longer be considered a lady because she has revealed her libidinal feelings. It is Lopez's race that sexualizes Emily, making her more the fallen woman than the angel in the house. The angel/whore dichotomy was pervasive during this time, as "both feminist campaigners and the ideologues of Victorian respectability placed much emphasis on the value and importance of rigorous and well-defined moral standards as a

[57] The two most famous "pales" were the Pale of Settlement in Eastern Russia notorious for pogroms and the English Pale in the 14th and 15th century that marked England's boundaries from Gaelic Ireland. The fact that Irish and Jews are linked by this reference to "pale" is especially interesting for a discussion on race in Victorian England.

means of ordering society […] The keynote of nineteenth-century English attitudes is the passivity and reluctant sexuality of women, or at least of respectable women" (Levine 128-9). Respectability, morality, and whiteness all play a part in Emily's expulsion from polite society. The undercurrent of sexuality compounds her transgression of marrying a Jewish man. In order for her to marry such a man, Emily must be immoral. Arthur Fletcher's mother succinctly speaks for herself, her family, and her nation when she exclaims, " 'Mean Slut!' she once said, speaking of Emily […] For the girl, to her thinking had been mean and had been a slut. She had not known,--so Mrs. Fletcher thought,--what birth and blood required of her" (*PM* 282). Mrs. Fletcher slanders Emily because she has failed to properly select a mate. Working off of common tropes presented in *The Descent of Man* (1871), in *The Prime Minister*, Darwinian ideas of selection and degeneration play a key role in Emily's ostracism. Her marriage has not improved society, instead it contributed to the problem of 'degeneration' as Emily dilutes her "birth and blood."

Emily's sexuality is thus deviant. As George Mosse argued in *Nationalism and Sexuality* "Woman was the embodiment of respectability; even as defender and protector of her people she was assimilated to her traditional roles as woman and mother, the custodian of tradition […] Woman as a preindustrial symbol suggested innocence and chastity, a kind of moral rigor directed against modernity" (97-8). Emily's marriage to Lopez is a harbinger of modernity rather than a bulwark against it. Much of the venom directed at Emily is her rejection of traditional, Victorian modes of gender and family. She is no longer the keeper of tradition, but she does not fully leave behind the traditional role of woman. Much like Trollope's ambivalence to change, Emily cannot fully commit to her modern enterprise and fully engage her husband as an equal.

Instead, after their marriage she yearns for a more traditional separation of hearth and home from work and industry. Lopez does not share this sensibility; he sees his wife as an equal partner in marriage. They are to be a team in trying to get Emily's inheritance.

Here the play between modernity and tradition comes into full relief as the couple cannot agree on how to define their partnership. Lopez has no qualms about talking money with his wife and expects her aid in obtaining her inheritance. Emily sees these discussions as humiliating her and diminishing her husband's role as masculine provider:

> [Emily] must be taught the great importance of money,--not in a gripping, hard-fisted, prosaic spirit; but that she might participate in that feeling of his own which had in it so much that was grand […] But she must learn that the enjoyment of these things must be built upon a conviction that the most important pursuit in the world was the acquiring of money. (215)
>
> ---
>
> There was something in her husband's elation which was distasteful to her. Could it be that reverses of fortune with reference to moderate sums of money […] would always affect him in the same way? Was it not almost unmanly, or at any rate was it not undignified? (225)

Lopez's financial worries and ambitions are revealed to his wife. He breaks the boundary of home and work that was vital to the Victorian domestic structure. Emily, in turn, cannot deal with this disruption of tradition (unusual since she married a Jewish man against her father's wishes) and wants to maintain her place as a lady of the home. Lopez's relationship to money diminishes Emily's status as a lady, and she realizes that having married Lopez she has forfeited the privileges of economic innocence so necessary to maintaining the definition of a lady. For Emily, Lopez's actions emasculate him, and his Jewishness changes his gender expectations. Lopez is outside the usual inheritance system, unlike his rival Arthur Fletcher, who would have already been given Emily's inheritance. Because he is Jewish Lopez must act distastefully in order to get the money that is rightfully his by marriage. Money emasculates and racializes Lopez in his wife's eyes, but ironically it is only because he is Jewish that Lopez must scheme.

Trollope is ungenerous in his descriptions of Lopez, but he does accurately portray the social system that disenfranchises. As we will see at the end of his life, Lopez is literally obliterated by the system and expelled from the narrative.

A man's relationship with money says much about his character in *The Prime Minister*: Lopez quests for it because he is denied it; Arthur does not think of it because he has it. In the same paragraph that declares Lopez a "gentleman," we learn what he does for a living: "He had been on the Stock Exchange, and still in some manner, not clearly understood by his friends, did business in the City" (11). Much like Lopez's familial beginnings, how he makes his money and where it comes from remain murky throughout the novel. Trollope clearly links origins of self and origins of money as similar ways to interpret a man. Paul Delany's "Land, Money, and the Jews in the Later Trollope" connects ancestry to two things: blood and land. In an economic model based on kinship and land ownership, which defined England until the industrial era, identity was defined by connections of blood and land:

> *Identity* proposes that people are most real and knowable through their ancestral attachment to a tract of land, an attachment signified by possession of a name that goes with the property. Conversely, those separated from the land are evanescent and unreliable. The landowning classes therefore deserve to be the very soul or essence of the English nation; their opposite is the Jews, a people without land, country, or stability of name. Yet the Jews also epitomize, for Trollope, a different and specially modern kind of identity, one that springs from full-blown assertive individualism. (765-66)

In this light, how Lopez makes his money and where he comes from connect in the nexus of an English landed gentry system that rejects his wanderings and landless wealth. Lopez challenges this class system because he separates money and identity from land ownership.

Because he owns nothing, Lopez's connection to England is tenuous. Instead, Lopez speculates on money and the future, which is befitting for a Jewish man who can never fully belong. Arthur Fletcher, Lopez's foil throughout the book, describes this predicament: "Like

others of his family, he thought ill of Lopez, believing the man to be an adventurer, one who would too probably fall into misfortune, however high he might now seem to hold his head. He was certainly a man not standing on the solid basis of land, or of Three per Cents,--those solidities to which such as the Whartons and Fletchers are wont to trust" (282). Lopez does not belong to England because he does not own land or participate in the national economy with Three per Cents.[58] Lopez has no "solid" connection to land, family, or nation. Instead his money has no solid basis in reality, one that bolsters the Whartons and Fletchers. These two families trust the nation because they are invested in it with their lands and money.

While Lopez's money might garner him the title of 'gentleman,' however begrudgingly by the narrator, his predicament is particularly representative of his status as a Jewish minority in England. Hannah Arendt's invaluable *The Origins of Totalitarianism* sees Jewish vulnerability in their statelessness: "Nowhere and at no time after the destruction of the temple did Jews possess their own territory and their own state; they always depended for their physical existence upon the protection of non-Jewish authorities" (xiii). Lopez must seek acceptance English society, all the while knowing he is dependent on it for protection. In the end, Lopez has no real power, even with money, because he does not have the protection of land. His landlessness (or statelessness for all Jews) renders him weak and dependent, a position that will destroy him.

Disconnected from land and from family, Lopez is isolated in his own self-creation: "He had been as though he had been created self-sufficient, independent of mother's milk or father's money" (19). When all economic avenues are exhausted in England, Lopez decides to go to

[58] The "Three per Cents" was the interest paid on investments in the Funds. "The combination of a powerful empire and the Industrial Revolution created a stock of wealth owned by the propertied classes that transformed Britain. The consol, a long-term liability of the British government paying an average of about 3 percent, displaced land as Britain's primary asset" (Makin *Should Americans Save More?*).

Guatemala where he hopes that his fortunes will turn: "Under those circumstances I must leave England, and try my fortune in Central America […] If I cannot succeed in this country I must go elsewhere" (421). He cannot make it in the epicenter of Empire, London, and chooses to go to Guatemala and try his hand in the colonies. Lopez's move to leave England highlights the usefulness of the colonies to rewrite personal history. Lopez is excluded from England's wealth at home, but abroad he would have a better chance. Benedict Anderson points out that this departure from London to the far reaches of Empire "permitted sizeable numbers of bourgeois and petty bourgeois to play aristocrat off center court: i.e. anywhere in the empire except home" (137). Lopez recognizes that he cannot escape his race and class while in England, but will be more likely to do so the closer he gets to the colonies. Lopez's identity is flexible, even global, transcending national boundaries.

Lopez's identity, in the end, proves too modern, too independent. In contrast to the "solid" basis of English wealth, Lopez's wealth evaporates. In the end, he chooses suicide—throwing himself at an oncoming train—as a way to escape his surreal existence: "he walked down before the flying engine--and in a moment had been knocked into bloody atoms" (520). Unlike the "solid" wealth of the English nation, Lopez's life was unstable—caught between two worlds: traditional England and Modern England. David Feldman defines modernity as "a set of economic, social and political changes in Europe which are clearly, if unevenly, detectable from the eighteenth century. These include the advances of urban growth and industrialization [and] of secularization and plurality within civil society […]" (171). These social and political changes of modernity consumed Lopez. Modernity literally crushes Lopez as the past and the future converge upon him. He dies nameless and disconnected from the world. Trollope emphasizes the abrupt departure of Lopez; it is almost shocking to read:

> It seemed as though the man had been careful to carry with him no record of identity, the nature of which would permit it to outlive the crash of the train. No card was found, no scrap of paper with his name; and it was discovered at last that when he left the house on the fatal morning he had been careful to dress himself in shirt and socks, with handkerchief and collar that had been newly purchased for his proposed journey and which bore no mark. The fragments of his body set identity at defiance, and even his watch had been crumpled into ashes. (523-4)

Lopez's death is outside of time and place; he belongs nowhere even in death. In an instant Lopez is gone, completely obliterated from the narrative and nation.

Both *Daniel Deronda* and *The Prime Minister* end with the Jewish characters departing. In contrast to Daniel, whose papers and Jewish identity strengthen his reality and purpose, Lopez is a lost and ethereal figure. Oddly, Lopez's violent death is a more fitting description of the Jewish predicament than Eliot's *Daniel Deronda* where the title character is given a heroic departure. Lopez, though obliterated into "bloody atoms" better represents the future struggles of Jews in England. Trollope's attempt at assimilation is a more realistic future for Anglo-Jewry than Eliot's search for a romantic Zion. Lopez tries to maneuver through a changing society and reap the benefits of an emerging individualism. But he does not succeed. His progress is halted, by and large, because he is a Jew. Trollope's depiction of Jews reconciles the genre of Victorian realism to its encounter with Modernity. Only because Lopez ventured to leave his Jewish roots behind does he get punished. But this is the paradox of nineteenth-century Jewry: "The birth and growth of modern antisemitism has been accompanied by and interconnected with Jewish assimilation, the secularization and withering away of the old religious and spiritual values of Judaism" (Arendt *Origins* 7).

Trollope anticipates modernity's trope of an unsettled identity. We will see where this assimilation and secularization takes us in the next chapter on Henry James and Edith Wharton

who use Jewish masculinity as a means of looking at national culture and women's place within it.

Chapter 3

"The Jewish Question" or Will You Marry Me?

My last two chapters looked at Jewish masculinity's relationship to English national identity. While using Jewish masculinity as a way to approach the ever changing terrain of national belonging, in this chapter I focus on how Edith Wharton and Henry James's representations of women intersect with images of Jewish masculinity. This chapter continues the critical examination of how the Jewish Question overlaps with the Woman Question.[59] Tracking the fall of Lily Bart in *The House of Mirth* and the rise of Maggie Verver in *The Golden Bowl*, my chapter extends the many arguments made about gender, race, and nationalism in the works of Wharton and James, arguing that the figure of the Jew represents the changing and unknowable future that preoccupied these two American authors. In this way, I see the Jewish characters in *The House of Mirth* and *The Golden Bowl* playing a central role in Lily Bart and Maggie Verver's encounters with modernity and the nation.

The future, represented by Maggie Verver and Lily Bart's respective lives, is no longer grounded in tradition and community (as is common in realist fiction) but one defined by a narrative interiority that grapples with a fractured and disjunctive identity. I look at how the Jewish characters in *The House of Mirth* and *The Golden Bowl* help Lily and Maggie ascertain the limits of their gendered roles: the Jewish men puncture the texts at the moment each woman must decide her fate. The Jewish characters in *The House of Mirth* and *The Golden Bowl* help the central female characters map out their place in marriage, and in a larger context, the nation.

---

[59] Discussed below, Wendy Brown's *Regulating Aversion* most recently linked the two Questions. Christina Crosby's *The Ends of History: Victorians and "The Woman Question"* New York: Routledge, 1991 also connects the status of women to the portrayal of Jews.

Who and how these women marry (or who/how they do not) turns on their interaction with the Jewish figure. While there has been much work done on marriage in Wharton and James, few have noted how Jewish characters are centrifugal forces in the women's decisions, pressuring them to act at crucial moments in their lives. In this chapter, I will look at how Simon Rosedale's proposal to Lily Bart seals her fate as a commodity and how meeting a Jewish antiquarian changes Maggie's views on wealth and empire. Of interest is how Jewish men are situated in these texts as flashpoints for Christian women's lives, changing their views on marriage and national belonging according to their encounter with Jewish masculinity and ethnicity.

Wendy Brown's *Regulating Aversion* looks at the political ramifications of tolerance in Western, post-Enlightenment culture, which subsumed difference into a state-run national discourse.[60] Her chapter, "Tolerance as Supplement: The 'Jewish Question' and the 'Woman Question'" compares Jewish emancipation to women's emancipation revealing that, "for whatever the difference in the mechanisms and putative bases for disenfranchisement, both exclusions were justified by an imagined difference from the figure of universal man at the heart of the emerging European constitutional political orders" (49). Like many critiques of post-Enlightenment universality, Brown locates the discourse of 'tolerance' as yet another phase in liberalism's quest to contain (even eradicate) difference.[61] For Brown, the discourse of tolerance

[60] For an earlier study on tolerance, universal culture, and the post-Enlightenment , see Herbert Marcuse's *Repressive Tolerance* Berkeley: Commune, 1965. Brown's essay updates several of Marcuse's claims, including his declaration that, "tolerance strengthens the tyranny of the majority."

[61] This of course is the scope of my own chapter: to look at how liberalism constructed the "Jew" and "Woman." By no means is this the total net effect of post-Enlightenment thought. Any survey of the colonized world (Africa after the Berlin Conference of 1884; British exploitation of the Indian sub-continent) or the American South would reveal just how vast and destructive universal liberalism could be to individual people/s. I also realize that the construction of "Woman" traverses race and ethnic lines for women are the majority minority contained within every society, every nation, and every religion. Brown looks at how Western women's equality

at once controls the site of difference while acknowledging its inability to be completely assimilated into the nation-state. In this formulation, Brown contends that Jews and women are the similarly "divided subject born with modernity" (65). Within this framework, Jews and women similarly experience the binaries of Western thought—"particular/universal, subjective/objective, private/public, civic/political, religious/secular, bourgeois/citizen"—that are "gathered under a universalizing political rubric" (65). Brown's explanation of the state's harnessing, and in some ways producing, the modern condition links women and Jews: women are equal in public space but are controlled by private, heterosexual structures of subordination while Jews are given public emancipation but must be tolerated for their private beliefs and racialized bodies. By applying Brown's insights, appearances of Jews in literary texts (especially as marginal characters) can serve as a hub of signification for the more central characters. What remains important from Brown's chapter is that the Jewish and Woman question merge revealing the limitations of universalism.

During the composition of *The House of Mirth* (1905) and *The Golden Bowl* (1904), Wharton and James witnessed a radical shift in American demographics. *The American Scene* records James's response to, among many things, the increase in Jewish immigration. Describing Ellis Island, James imagines an encounter between a countryman and these new arrivals:

> For those who can see it, in his face, the outward sign of the new chill in his heart. So is stamped, for detection, the questionably privileged person who has had an apparition, seen a ghost in his supposedly safe old house…The after-sense of that acute experience, however, I myself found, was by no means to be brushed away; I felt it grow and grow, on the contrary…this affirmed claim of the alien, however, immeasurably alien, to share in one's supreme relation was everywhere the fixed element…One's supreme relation, as one had always put it, was one's relation to one's country. (85)

---

movement paralleled the discourse of Jewish emancipation and it is from this point that I depart into my own analysis of Wharton and James.

James's description of the Jewish immigrants brings to mind Freud's essay "The Uncanny," in which, he argues that the uncanny frightens by being familiar (1). That James compares the immigrants to ghosts haunting his home illustrates that alarm inspired by these new Americans. James, haunted by the arriving ghosts, must synthesize his national culture, his "the supreme relation" with the new aliens. Not surprisingly, James and Wharton's novels measure the familiar in contrast with the alien by using the figure of the Jew. Jonathan Freedman argues that "the Jew is also that border or boundary figure that calls into question the viability of any model of racial, national, and cultural identity" (*Temple* 45). For James and Wharton, the Jew became an odd alien who disrupted what had been a "supreme" relationship with their country, breaking down the once reliable border between race and nation.

James spent October of 1904 with his friend, Edith Wharton, who was drafting *The House of Mirth*, discussing the cultural sea-change in America. *The House of Mirth* (1905) and *The Golden Bowl* (1906) contain Jewish characters who serve as critiques of the new cultural order in America. Lily and Maggie have vastly different fates after their encounter with "the Jew," making these two novels a dynamic pair. Their proximity in composition and publication highlights their mutual engagement with similar cultural currents: immigration, democratization of capital/ism, suffrage. While there have been many readings of James and Wharton that take into account imperialism and ethnicity, the literary phenomenon of "the Jew" in these texts mediates Lily and Maggie's self-realization, and in a larger context, their relationship with modernity and the nation.[62]

[62] For a lengthy study on James and nationalism see Sara Blair's *Henry James and the Writing of Race and Nation* and for James, Modernity, and Anti-Semitism see Jonathan Freedman's *The Temple of Culture*. For work on Wharton and modernity see Jennifer Haytock's *Edith Wharton*

Lily Bart's House of Mirth: For Sale and Forsaken

The idea that America was changing at the turn of the twentieth century—moving away from the static social hierarchy of Wharton's upbringing—has been documented by countless critics, historians, and her contemporaries (Henry James, who is covered later in this chapter, noted the sea change in *The American Scene*). Wharton's autobiography, *A Backward Glance*, described modernity as the move away from conservative traditionalism that privileged an upper-crust at the pinnacle of culture and decorum: "The really vital change is that, in my youth, the Americans of the original States, who in moments of crisis still shaped the national point of view, were the heirs of an old European culture" (6). "The original States," seats of Wharton's national culture, were firmly entrenched in European custom. Wharton seeks to legitimize her views on national culture by firmly placing her social set in an imagined past: she contextualizes her youth as part national history. Benedict Anderson explains this rhetorical move in *Imagined Communities*: "Nationalism has to be understood by aligning it, not with self-consciously held political ideologies, but with the larger cultural systems that preceded it, out of which—as well as against which—it came into being" (12). Wharton's nationalism (and the framing of her youth/narrative) depends upon a European past. This genesis claims American culture for the original Americans (themselves immigrants) by placing their immigration outside of the historical past while maintaining ties to the continent. Wharton's construction of the national past erases indigenous claims of "origin" (i.e. Native Americans who occupied the first States) and places recent immigrants outside of national culture. American culture in Wharton's

---

and the Conversations of Literary Modernism and for Wharton, race, and nationalism see Jennie A. Kassanoff's *Edith Wharton and the Politics of Race*.

formulation is one informed by race (original Europeans) and the resulting culture from this racial inheritance (they are now the original Americans). The white, wealthy patriarch was firmly in charge during Wharton's youth and it is this generational difference she finds most striking in her biography. While Wharton credits the World War, Christopher Gair argues that modern change was happening before 1914 in the shape of "rapid technological transformation [and] a massive increase in immigration from Eastern Europe" (350). For Wharton, modernity (represented as advancements in technology and a changing population) changed the national culture.

Preoccupation with the changing national culture is never far from Wharton's configuring of her patrician past and, in turn, the racial make-up of America. Published in 1934, *A Backward Glance* chronicles Wharton's literary development which included her readings of Charles Darwin's *The Origin of Species*. The Darwinian evolution influenced Wharton and many scholars note its effect on her writing.[63] Wharton refers to nineteenth-century evolutionary science as a "wonder-world" that inspired "an over-whelming sense of cosmic vastness" (94). A constant theme throughout the biography is the shift from idyllic childhood (one filled with nature & nannies) to a disjunctive present filled with uncertainty. Wharton attributes many of these changes in culture to a changing racial make-up, or as she puts it, "breeding" (52). The concept of breeding is fraught with indetermination because it does not differentiate between learned and inherited behaviors. The tension between racial and cultural inheritance is constant: "Bringing up in those days was based on what was called 'good breeding.' One was polite, considerate of others, careful of the accepted formulas, because such were the principles of the well-bred. And probably the regard of my parents for the niceties of speech was part of their breeding" (52).

[63] See Paul Ohler's *Edith Wharton's Evolutionary Conception : Darwinian Allegory in Her Major Novels*.

One can see Wharton's use of Darwin in these descriptions of culture and race; however, her use of 'formulas' belies a biological truth to social mores. Like many of her contemporaries she used Darwinism to explain social construction—a rhetorical move that obscured the complexity of modern life—reflected in *The House of Mirth*. Breeding, if marred by a changing culture, cannot shield the well-bred from degeneration.[64] This logical gap becomes increasingly evident in Lily Bart's life as she suffers under the weight of being well-bred but ill-placed in the social order. During the same time Wharton was grappling with this problem, anthropology was working on its own formula for race and culture.

Reading *A Backward Glance* with this history in mind, Wharton's ambivalence to a changing America enters a larger discourse on the meaning of national character in light of the large influx of new peoples, "races," and cultures. Wharton's biography responds to new developments in cultural anthropology popularized by Franz Boas, who separated racial and cultural characteristics.[65] Boas, the father of American Anthropology, spent most of his career trying to separate race from a biological definition, arguing that race was a construct of the human mind and not a scientific fact.[66] The scientific racism of the late 19th and early 20th century did not account for difference in terms of culture, and Boas argued forcefully that anthropology was a social process. Boas's *Anthropology and Modern Life* (1928) tried to

---

[64] This emphasis on speech reminds me of Henry James' similar views on speech and 'breeding' expressed in some of his book reviews, newspaper articles, and, of course, his novels. I will touch upon this later in the chapter when discussing Maggie's relationship to language.

[65] Boas was Assistant Curator of Ethnology at the American Museum of Natural History from 1896-1905, where he pioneered the group life display that presented cultures and peoples in their natural and cultural settings, illustrating that peoples all over the world—regardless of skull size, race, or height—were equally engaged and capable of producing art and maintaining communities. He was a pioneer in his field and his work, as it still is today, would have been available for Wharton's view.

[66] George Stocking's essay, "Franz Boas and the Culture Concept in Historical Perspective," in *Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology*, traces Boas contributions to Anthropology and how his views on culture changed the way we think about race.

assuage American anxieties over the changing population: "In America particularly, fears are being expressed of the intermixture of the races, of a modification or deterioration of national character on the account of the influx of new types into the population of our country" (18-19). His 1928 book attempted to diminish America's preoccupation with immigration and its effect on national culture, by challenging anthropology's dependence on a racialized body to explain culture.[67] In this context Lily Bart's struggle questions what happens when the social economy of one's race is no longer profitable. Lily is indeed of a certain pedigree but she increasingly lacks the wealth that usually accompanies her breeding. The question in the novel becomes how to maintain that bridge between race and culture, in light of changing definitions represented by Boas and the new economy of democratizing capital.

Since the inception of cultural studies and postcolonial theory, criticism of *The House of Mirth* has accounted for race through literary criticism's class, race, and gender trinity. Irene C. Goldman's 1993 "The *Perfect* Jew and *The House of Mirth*: A Study in Point of View," which closes with a request to "open the doors to full conversation on the depiction of Jews and other ethnic minorities in literary works," was one of the first articles to deal with the character Simon Rosedale (34). Goldman's request has been partially fulfilled by many critics, except for the crucial difference between race and culture. If we are to heed Franz Boas and separate race from culture (which most critics fail to do in their analysis of Rosedale and turn-of-the-century race science), we see that the Jewish Rosedale functions beyond a simple contrast to Lily's genteel world, but rather serves as an example of another set of cultural values. Wharton cannot calculate this gap between race and culture: much of the ambivalence surrounding Simon Rosedale's characterization derives from this impasse. Unready to shrug off the constraints of nineteenth-

[67] Boas' career is characterized by this investigation of culture. His student, Zora Neale Hurston, would continue this tradition in her own anthropological studies.

century race science, and unwilling to embrace the Boas school's reconfiguring of culture, Wharton's depiction of Simon Rosedale remains ambivalent.

When readers meet Lily Bart, she is standing, bewildered, in the train station debating where she should go and what she should do to pass the time. Having missed her connection, she is caught in the gap between public and private space and, as a woman, has no appropriate place to go. The trains, shuttling her back and forth between vacation homes and New York City, ground *The House of Mirth* in America's unfolding modernity and Lily's uncertain place within it. She is at once dependent on the trains for transport, yet oddly removed from the rougher aspects of public travel: the common purpose of the station leaves Lily Bart dislocated. Indeed, throughout the novel, she stands apart from the masses between spaces and places, as she does in this initial scene. Her love interest, Lawrence Selden, remarks that "If she had appeared to be catching a train, he might have inferred that he had come on her in the act of transition between one and another of the country houses […] She stood apart from the crowd, letting it drift by her to the platform or the street" (3). Wharton sets up Lily's predicament within the first few paces of the novel: she is alone, she is a woman, and she is in public.

The train station, much like her social life, is under constant observation; she is part of the spectacle of both public and private space.[68] In this opening scene Lawrence Selden does the looking and turns Lily into a specimen of type, rather than an individual he has known for eleven years:

---

[68] Ruth Bernard Yeazell's "The Conspicuous Wasting of Lily Bart" makes a similar remark about Selden's role as observer: "Few fictional heroines have been as consistently under observation as Lily Bart, and few heroes have proved such consistent observers as Lawrence Selden" (713) in ELH 59 (1992): 713-734.

> Was it possible that she belonged to the same race? The dinginess, the crudity of this average section of womanhood made him feel how highly specialized she was … He had a confused sense that she must have cost a great deal to make, that a great many dully and ugly people must, in some mysterious way, have been sacrificed to produce her. (5)

The public/private nature of Selden's appraisal of Lily introduces the major themes and tensions of the novel: Lily's whiteness is superimposed upon the dingy mass (race and class), Lily's place in the economy (gender and class), and Lily's dependence upon all of these factors to maintain her position in society. Selden struggles to define Lily's place within a bustling and changing America. His language is one of a detached scientist—he describes her in anthropological terms, emphasizing that she is a specimen. Selden connects her racial type to economics but does not relate to her position or identify with her even though their social predicaments are similar.

Selden's gender enables him to play the observer while excusing him from the social conscription that so affects Lily's performance. Selden's gaze is one of "admiring spectatorship" and he "preserved a certain detachment, a happy air of viewing the show objectively, of having points of contact outside the great gilt cage in which they were all huddled…How alluring the world outside the cage appeared to Lily, as she heard its door clang on her" (68, 54). His detachment as a spectator and freedom as an observer constitute male privilege; the gilt cage cannot trap Selden because he can live outside it. While there are other characters in the novel who observe and gaze upon Lily—her downfall comes from women's reports—Wharton emphasizes Selden's detachment from social politics. Wharton describes Selden's relationship in clinical, rational terms. During the most intimate scene between Selden and Lily, he is described as a scientist and Lily exclaims, "you're so sure of me that you can amuse yourself with experiments" (72). Their complicated relationship stems from Lily's identification with and admiration of Selden, but he is unable, for all his scientific observation, to reciprocate the recognition.

After seeing each other in the train station, Lily finds refuge by enjoying a cup of tea in Selden's flat located in the Benedick—a name that signals the perks of bachelorhood. Lily is instantly aware that Selden has the pleasure of a room of his own: "How delicious to have a place like this all to one's self! What a miserable thing it is to be a woman" (7). Lily connects space and privacy to masculine identity. Throughout the novel, Lily is observed, dependent, and rarely alone; a fate Selden escapes because of his gender. Lily circulates in polite society and on the marriage market--she is forever moving without a place to rest. Selden and Lily are in similar situations—both are poorer than their friends and have few relatives—but gender shapes how they must react to these conditions.[69] Selden's apartment is his place to relax, read and live without having to perform for wealthier friends. Selden, surrounded by his books, is aligned with rational observation. Wharton opens the novel with Selden's scientific assessment of Lily; his choice of reading material highlights his role as observer. Selden's library contains Jean de La Bruyère's satirical sketches of the French court, reflecting his penchant for satirical deconstruction of high-society. Selden is allowed an ironic detachment—he is often rewarded for his aloofness—but Lily is not afforded such escape. Lily, whose insights are just as keen, must perform for the same society, moving and performing without a place to rest (a sure sign of privilege).[70] Wharton places Lily between the world of moving modernity and the world of a static place and privilege.

[69] For more on gender dynamics in *The House of Mirth*, see Patrick Mullen's "The Aesthetics of Self-Management: Intelligence, Capital, and *The House of Mirth*" Novel: A Forum on Fiction; 42.1 (Spring 2009): 40-61.

[70] I use "perform" in the context of Judith Butler's *Gender Trouble*, which sees gender as a performance, not an essential, biological identity or destiny.

Lily's displacement is highlighted when Simon Rosedale sees her leaving Selden's apartment in the building he owns. In a series of descriptions, Wharton connects Lily's movements with her downfall, as well as Simon Rosedale's ability to *see* her:

> Mr. Rosedale stood scanning her with interest and approval. He was a plump rosy man of the blond Jewish type, with smart fitting London clothes fitting him like upholstery, and small sidelong eyes which gave him the air of appraising people as if they were bric-a-brac. He glanced up interrogatively at the porch of the Benedick … Why must a girl pay so dearly for her least escape from routine? … This one, at any rate, was going to cost her rather more than she could afford … He had his race's accuracy in the appraisal of values, and to be seen walking down the platform at the crowded afternoon hour in the company of Miss Lily Bart would have been money in his pocket, as he might have phrased it. (15)

Rosedale quickly ascertains that Lily is lying about why she has been into the Benedick. Wharton attributes this to his "race," connecting Simon's ability to see and read Lily to his Jewishness. Wharton places Rosedale's assessment of Lily's worth in an economic model, crudely conflating his racial difference with economic acumen. In Wharton's schema, Rosedale values Lily as a commodity; she is "money in his pocket." Looking at Jewishness in light of economic stereotypes and the rampant association of Jews with exploitation and capital/ism obscures Rosedale's ability to *see* because he is outside the system that contains Lily. While Rosedale quickly catches Lily in a lie, he also recognizes the forces that prompt her to lie. If Rosedale gazes upon Lily as a commodity, he is also aware of the economic system circulating her. On this point, Meredith Goldsmith warns that Rosedale is not just "a representation of class anxieties" but that he constitutes "a nonnormative sexual and gendered challenge to the white heterosexual and reproductive body politics" (375). Reading Rosedale's interest in Lily as merely an extension of his class consciousness (or the class anxiety of Lily and/or Wharton) elides the culture that produced Rosedale. While many compare Lily to a commodity, I argue that Rosedale's Jewishness makes him sympathetic to her self-fashioning and to his role as a buyer. Excluded from polite circles, Rosedale's sole entrée into society becomes money. Unlike

the Gentile men of the novel (Gus, Lawrence), Rosedale cannot depend on a system designed for his welfare. If Lily circulates as a commodity in this economic system, then Rosedale operates as a compulsory buyer: "Rosedale, with that mixture of artistic sensibility and business astuteness which characterizes his race, had instantly gravitated toward Miss Bart. She understood his motives, for her own course was guided by as nice calculations" (16). Rosedale and Lily's calculations are similarly defined because of their difference (race and gender). While the other characters of the novel calculate and focus on money, Rosedale and Lily's respective shortcomings prostrate them to the social market.[71]

Lily's visit to Selden's apartment and her encounter with Rosedale are linked, as are the two men. While critics have noted the triangulation of desire between Lily, Selden, and Simon, I see the two men's oppositional coupling as a way to look at race and how it affects Lily's reception and rejection of modernity.[72] Both men have similar designs on Lily but they court her in vastly different ways indicating that Wharton's concern is not just temperament, but also ethnicity and culture. Recent criticism has emphasized Wharton's use of race to define Simon Rosedale, yet racial typology is insufficient to completely understand Rosedale. There are many *cultural* reasons for Rosedale's *difference*. As illustrated by my previous two chapters and a flood of research by other critics, the figure of the Jew is a site of deep ambivalence and

[71] Wai-Chee Dimock's "Debasing Exchange: Edith Wharton's *The House of Mirth*" PMLA 100. 5 (October 1985): 783-792 gives an in depth look at each character's calculations and jockeying for social position. Every character in this novel calculates and schemes; however, it is only Simon and Lily who are forthright in their calculations with each other.

[72] For more on the triangulation of desire in *The House of Mirth* see Lori Harrison-Kahan's "'Queer Myself for Good and All': *The House of Mirth* and the Functions of Lily's Whiteness". Harrison-Kahan's argument uses two different triads: Simon, Selden, Lily & Selden, Lily, Gerty. Each triangle represents the different tensions of racial and queer coding.

contradictory meaning.[73] Critics see Wharton's depiction of Simon Rosedale as a reflection of race theory, national anxiety, nativist panic, arguing that these preoccupations of the early 20th century can be seen in *The House of Mirth*; however, their arguments cannot simply be about a crisis of representation. While Simon Rosedale's depiction is grounded in these histrionics, his depiction also comes from Jewish culture itself.

Rosedale's position outside the power structure enables him to see Lily's fragile position. Wharton, compelled to racialize Rosedale, cannot avoid seeing the positive results of his position. The knowledge he gains about Lily is only available to him because he is Jewish. Daniel Boyarin points out that this insight is "the product of a kind of knowledge perhaps available only to the (relatively) powerless" (*Unheroic* 81). Often times Jewish stereotypes are grounded in Jewish culture and its construction of masculinity (or as I refer to it "Jewish masculinity"). Boyarin's *Unheroic Conduct: The Rise of Heterosexuality and the Invention of the Jewish Man* contrasts Jewish masculinity with the dominant culture's version of Jews displaced after the Diaspora.[74] Jewish stereotypes are not just based on racial and cultural coding by the dominant culture, but are the product of a Jewish culture that defines masculinity quite differently:

> The dominant strain within European culture, in contrast, continues to this day to interpret activity, domination, and aggressiveness as 'manly' and gentleness and passivity as emasculate or effeminate … I argue that the early modern Ashkenazic traditional ideal Jewish male, 'unmanned' but not desexualized, has something compelling to offer us in our current moment of search for a feminist reconstruction of male subjectivity. (2)

---

[73] Perhaps the most lengthy study on ambivalence and the figure of the Jew is Zygmunt Bauman's *Modernity and Ambivalence* and *Modernity and the Holocaust*. While Bauman works off of Sartre's rendering of ambivalence (or in Sartre's term, viscosity), Bauman reads the Jew as a perennial 'stranger' in national discourse.

[74] Boyarin's *Unheroic Conduct* is an exhaustive study of Jewish masculinity from the Diaspora to the end of the 20th century. For my purposes, I look at late 19th and 20th century representations.

With this in mind, a straight racial reading of Rosedale inadequately accounts for his role in the novel for Rosedale represents not only a different culture, but in a more prophetic way, the cultural future of America. Rosedale serves as a parallel possibility to the other masculinities in the text. His culture (and the stereotypes about him) contrasts with the other men in the novel—all of whom represent some form of Western masculinity—specifically his rival, Lawrence Selden. Wharton's ambivalent portrayal of Rosedale anticipates Modernism's interrogation of national belonging defined by gender and race.

Wharton's ambivalence about Jewish masculinity is unavoidable in this excerpt: Rosedale is at once unattractive because of his racial stereotype *and* the only character in the novel who can empathize with and understand Lily's predicament. His alienated vantage point enables Rosedale to comprehend Lily's ambitions, and like her he is in constant movement. Lily is portrayed as standing in Grand Central; she is jostled about on a moving train; she tries to find space at a crowded wedding. In a series of images, Wharton establishes Lily as an unplaced person.[75] Rosedale's émigré status to New York Society mirrors Lily's transitional one.[76] Their meeting is defined by movement: Lily bumps into Rosedale after descending a flight of stairs. Much like Rosedale's, Lily's place in society is unstable and insecure. Selden has access to society without being beholden to it; Rosedale struggles to obtain access, "with the slow unalterable persistency…[Rosedale] was making his way through the dense mass of social

[75] I use the term "unplaced" to illustrate that Lily's status can easily be corrected by marriage; whereas Rosedale's displacement has racial, cultural, and historical causes that must be accounted for.

[76] Many critics have noted Rosedale's association with German and Eastern European Jewry, who largely immigrated to the United States during the nineteenth century. Meredith Goldsmith associates Rosedale with both groups: "Confounding stereotypes associated with Jews, the narrator links Rosedale both to Eastern European Jews who were often racialized as Oriental, as Rosedale is with his "sidelong eyes"… and to the second-generation German-Jewish elite, frequently cast as blond with Anglicized names" (376-7).

antagonisms" (240). Seen in this light, it is fitting that the unplaced Lily runs into the displaced Rosedale.

The insight Rosedale has into Lily's predicament is highlighted by Selden's miscalculation of it. Selden proposes an alternative set of values for Lily to invest in and thus escape her commodification. During their Sunday outing (a walk that ends Lily's chance of marrying into money), Selden invites her to live her life like his own, inviting her into his *republic*:

> 'My idea of success,' he said, 'is personal freedom.'
> 'Freedom? Freedom from worries?'
> "From everything--from money, from poverty, from ease and anxiety, from all the material accidents. To keep a kind of republic of the spirit--that's what I call success.' (68)

Selden's republic seemingly offers Lily an alternative to money as the sole form of satisfaction and security. This republic, however, is imagined; he does not account for real life vicissitudes. By placing Lily's future in imagined space, Selden reveals Lily's shortcomings but offers her no way out. Like the opening scene in the novel, Selden's gaze penetrates Lily, leaving her uneasy and upset with what he makes her see:

> 'What a miserable future you foresee for me!'
> 'Well--have you not foreseen it for yourself?' […]
> 'Often and often' she said. 'But it looks so much darker when you show it to me! […] Why do you do this to me?' she cried. 'Why do you make the things I have chosen seem hateful to me, if you have nothing to give me instead?'
> 'No, I have nothing to give you instead,' he said.' (68)

Again, Selden watches Lily and "foresees" her but he does not understand her actions. While Selden *foresees* doom in Lily's future, he does not *see* the trajectory of the fate or *see* its causes. By foreseeing, Selden forsakes Lily. His republic is an island isolated from the restrictions placed on women. Lily's asking for what he can *give* to her reveals her lack of agency outside his *republic*, as well as her inability to inhabit it. Selden refuses to see gender as a significant

factor with which Lily must contend. He masks the privilege of his *republic* by proposing that Lily join it when she does not have the means to do so. The creation of Selden's republic and his reading of the world (and Lily) depend on the invisible ideology of gender. Selden cannot see Lily because he fails to see the systems that trap her. As Karen A. Callaghan writes in "Symbolic Violence and Race," "Modern forms of social control must appear to be unobtrusive, politically neutral, and clearly lacking any brute coercion. In other words, societies that purport to practice pluralism can justify only forms of control that appear to preserve the integrity of individualism and personal freedom" (65). Selden's position within the power structure precludes any insight into Lily's agency (or lack thereof) and his republic merely reinscribes the social order. While many critics draw attention to Rosedale's "race," few have noted how the ideology of whiteness functions for Selden and how his whiteness colors how he sees (or cannot see!) Lily's plight.[77] Lori Harrison-Kahan's " 'Queer Myself for Good and All': *The House of Mirth* and the Fictions of Lily's Whiteness" emphasizes Lily's performance of race and gender, acknowledges how Jewishness changes Rosedale's perspective, and even revels in Gerty's homoerotic friendship with Lily; however, she fails to see how whiteness (the invisible race?) effects Selden's actions, as she claims that he "recognizes the constraining effects of Lily's femininity when he examines her intently" (35). Selden is not sympathetic to Lily's position, and his ironic examination of her (which cannot be confused with recognition) is one of cataloguing and reinscription. He does not deconstruct or challenge her femininity but is instead blind to its effect of barring her

[77] See Mike Hill's edited collection, *Whiteness: A Critical Reader*, in which he argues that whiteness's power comes from its invisibility.

entrance into his republic. Selden is blinded by his whiteness and gender, and he cannot see that the system sustaining him is the same one crushing Lily.[78]

Selden controls Lily by invoking the privileges or race and gender. Even when they are apart, his gaze and judgment follow Lily; "the revelation to Selden of precisely the part of her life which she most wished him to ignore—increased her longing for shelter, for escape from such humiliating contingencies…which kept her in an attitude of uneasy alertness toward every possibility of life" (97). Michel Foucault's *Discipline and Punish* describes how modern punishment went from a violent, physical experience (i.e. the body) to a form of social mind control. Though Selden is not physically aggressive, his claiming of privilege mimics that state's claims to normalize and patrol behavior. In this way, when Selden reproaches Lily for living with Mrs. Hatch (a woman of lower-standing) he is concerned with her transgression and not for her welfare. As long as Lily's fall remains invisible to Selden, it is not a problem. Only when her movements are made public does he see a sullying of her purity as a privileged, white woman. While critics have noted that Lily is a racial specimen, few have noted how Selden patrols social borders. He serves as a corrective for all of Lily's behaviors he deems unacceptable. Selden represents the harshest form of Western masculinity because he masquerades as a detached observer, a rational scientist. But his observations and judgments against Lily are loaded with the privileges of gender and race that he benefits from as a well-to-do white man. Upon finding Lily living with a woman of lesser character (why she is of "lesser" character remains murky to a contemporary reader), Selden orders her to leave Mrs. Hatch's company. Selden's power over Lily depends on her sense of shame--he exposes her choices as crude and places her in the

[78] Here the invisibility of privilege facilitates Selden's misreading of Lily's predicament. As Mike Hill's Introduction to *Whiteness: a Critical Reader* (1997) explains, white privilege is "as invisible as dominant, to be an essential feature of everyday life and yet unaccountable" (2).

framework of fallen woman. When Lily asks what right he has to judge her, he replies, "my right to make that is simply the universal right of a man to enlighten a woman when he sees her unconsciously placed in a false position" (280). Again, Selden retreats into his invisible privilege claiming that his concern is "universal," a word that obscures the particular, and its invocation suggests that whiteness and masculinity are the norm. Lily's need for money (and a proper husband) signals that she is falling not just from the expectations placed on her by her gender but those that correspond to her race. Selden abandons Lily when she most needs him, and comes back to reprimand her only when her fallen station becomes public knowledge. Selden's anger stems not from watching the woman he loves fall but seeing her fall publicly.

There have been several readings of Selden's misinterpretation of Lily, with critics often comparing Selden and Rosedale as two competing options--one representing "truth" and the other a crass materialism. Meredith Goldsmith's "The Year of the Rose: Jewish Masculinity in *The House of Mirth*" inadequately accounts for Selden's relationship with Lily and sees it only as a counterpoint to Rosedale's Jewishness. Goldsmith sees Rosedale's proposal as an acknowledgement of the "vulgar importance of money" while reading Selden's tentative marriage proposal as a "pastoral scene … in which Selden offers her a marriage based on love, rather than money" (379). The love Selden offers Lily is an attempt to disengage her from material and social reality, an act Lily cannot follow without a marriage proposal. Lily, in an effort to make Selden aware of her vulnerability asks him, “Why do you make the things I have chosen seem hateful to me, if you have nothing to give me instead?” (72). Lily reiterates that entrance into the republic requires Selden’s help, which she subtly alludes to with the verb *give*. Unlike his rival Rosedale, Selden does not see the world as a complicated network of signification. Throughout the novel, Selden leads Lily away from the compromise of bad

marriages, but in the end traps her by his gendered reading. He liberates her to affirm his own reading of the world, but never takes into account the world's reading of Lily.

Selden's ideal republic cannot hold up under the weight of his own prejudices. He decides not to formally ask for Lily's hand upon seeing her come out of Gus Trenor's apartment. Lily, in constant movement, is observed fleeing from Gus Trenor's sexual violence. Taking the scene at face value, Selden does not ask Lily to marry him nor does he ask her to explain. Much like his imagined republic, Selden formulates his own truth about Lily. Selden's reticence and his unwillingness to probe into an unfortunate situation stand in stark contrast to his Jewish rival, Rosedale. For all of Selden's ideals and idealization of Lily, he fails to see her at the very moment his insight is most needed. He does not propose for exactly the same reason Lily cannot discredit the usefulness of money: gender. In contrast to Rosedale, whose Jewish identity allows him to see and understand Lily, Selden's racial identity reinscribes the social hierarchy he claims to disdain. Wharton emphasizes Selden's racial excellence: "It was, moreover, one of his gifts to look his part; to have a height which lifted his head above the crowd, and the keenly-modeled dark features which, in a land of amorphous types, gave him the air of belonging to a more specialized race, of carrying the impress of a concentrated past" (65). Tall, dark, and handsome, Selden fails Lily precisely because of these physical attributes. His body curtails his insight, and his life of privilege renders him blind to Lily's reality: his advice merely reinforces the social order. Ironically, his racial attributes preclude his ability to see, much as Rosedale's race enables his in sight. Wharton sets up an inversion of racial typology: it is the "glossy" Jew who understands Lily; the traditional hero is clueless.

The ability to speak freely and to tell the truth is an elusive standard in *The House of Mirth*. There are numerous innuendos, hidden letters, slippery connotations, and hazy

communications upon which the plot turns. In fact, frank discourse between a man and a woman happens in the scenes when Simone Rosedale and Lily Bart discuss a possible marriage. They are not romantic moments in the text, but they are revitalizing. During Lily and Simon's conversations there is an energy and space created by their dialogue that is missing from other exchanges in the novel. When Simon initially proposes to Lily, the word "truth" is uttered several times throughout the chapter, and the narrator states that "after the tissue of social falsehoods in which she had so long moved it was refreshing to step into the open daylight of an avowed expediency" (256). The "refreshing daylight" of Rosedale's treatment contrasts with Selden's imagined *republic*. Rosedale offers Lily a way out of her situation and gives her agency. It is Lily who has the power to reinstate herself in society and Lily who gets to choose to take this step. By speaking directly to Lily, Rosedale avoids infantilizing or trivializing her, remaking her the purchaser of her future, not just a commodity in it: "For this *is* partly my affair, you see--at least, it depends on you to make it so. Let's look the situation straight in the eye" (258). Rosedale and Lily are equal actors in their affair and Rosedale signals to Lily that he sees her as an equal player and an equal partner. This time the male gaze does not idealize or distance Lily but sees her in totality. She is an individual functioning in a larger system, which Rosedale acknowledges. He is willing to engage Lily directly and in turn, his eyes see the truth about her and her predicament.

Rosedale is trying to enter polite society (a marriage to Lily might help him) just as Lily is being removed from it (she has no suitors and her relevance as Ms. Bart is waning). Rosedale and Lily meet while he is rising in and she is falling from elite society. Lily's last attempt to find a foothold in the social terrain comes when she reminds Rosedale of his proposal and he rejects her. While critics have pointed to this moment as proof of Rosedale's crass commodification of

Lily, they leave out another important motivation for Rosedale's rejection: jealousy.[79] While he initially refuses to renew his suit because "the situation has changed" and Lily is no longer "as desirable a match," Rosedale states that he would like to marry Lily if she leverages Selden and Bertha's love letters to enter back into polite society. Rosedale repeatedly states that he is "speaking the truth" and that a "little plain speaking" would help resolve Lily's situation. But what triggers the close of the discussion is not Lily's skepticism with Rosedale's plan, but her reluctance to hurt Selden. Rosedale angrily revokes his suit in light of Lily's protection of Selden and the love it demonstrates: "'Now what on earth does that mean? I thought we understood each other!' he exclaimed; and to her murmur of "Ah, we do *now,*' he retorted with a sudden burst of violence: 'I suppose it's because the letters are to *him*, then? Well, I'll be damned if I see what thanks you've got from him!'" (260). Rosedale does not want to lose the social grip he struggled so hard to attain by marrying Lily. But he ends the conversation not because she is no longer a valuable "commodity," but because in his eyes she has offered irrefutable proof of loving another man—and a man who is ungrateful and unknowing of her dedication. For Rosedale, it is this injustice of love that sends him into a violent fit that ends with him rescinding the proposal. In their last scene together, Rosedale *still* wants to marry Lily, but it is she who cannot bring herself to terms with Rosedale's desire for revenge and subsequent marriage to him:

> Lily perceiving all this, understood that he would marry her at once, on the sole condition of a reconciliation with Mrs. Dorset; and the temptation was the less easy to put aside because, little by little, circumstances were breaking down her dislike for Rosedale. The dislike, indeed, sill subsisted; but it was penetrated by here and there by the perception of mitigating qualities in him: a certain gross kindliness, a rather helpless fidelity to sentiment, which seems to be struggling through the hard surface of his material ambitions. (300)

[79]See again Wai-Chee Dimock's "Debasing Exchange: Edith Wharton's *The House of Mirth*" and Meredith Goldsmith's "The Year of the Rose: Jewish Masculinity in *The House of Mirth*."

That Lily and Simon never do marry is a testament to their unwavering codes. Lily will not use public space or Selden's reputation to redeem herself; Rosedale will not sacrifice his social standing in light of a redemptive alternative. The two are more in sympathy with each other, their circumstances more parallel than any other two characters in the novel.

While Rosedale is able to assess Lily's situation clearly because of his own outsider status, Lily's position is one of expulsion and not assimilation. Her ordeal is put into similar language found much later in Modernist texts concerning alienation and modern society: "A hum of shrill voices reverberated against the low ceiling, leaving Lily shut out in a little circle of silence. She felt a sudden pang of profound loneliness…Lily alone was stranded in a great waste of disoccupation" (302). Rosedale represents a new, dynamic modernity, one that causes Lily to fail in the emerging social economy or to survive in the traditional market. She recognizes her indeterminate place within two systems; "I was just a screw or a cog in the great machine I called life, and when I dropped out of it I found I was of no use anywhere else. What can one do when one finds that one only fits into one hole?" (308).

Lily's expulsion is contingent upon her lack of marriage prospects and by the fact that society is rendering her type, or race, obsolete. Lily is described as a specimen, as over-specialized, signaling that her racial and social relevance are in decline. She is not degenerating, but she is becoming extinct as a viable type in a changing New York: "Inherited tendencies had combined with early training to make her the highly specialized product she was: an organism as helpless out of its narrow range as the sea anemone torn from the rock. She had been fashioned to adorn and delight; to what other end does nature round the rose-leaf and paint the hummingbird's breast?" (301). Oddly, Lily is placed in nature at the same time Wharton argues that her society "trained" her to be a "decorative organism." Wharton's description of Lily

emphasizes the blurred lines of race and culture that were still being worked out at the turn-of-the-century.

Scholars have argued that Lily is a racial specimen of perfect type. Jennie A. Kassanoff's "Extinction, Taxidermy, Tableaux Vivants: Staging Race and Class in *The House of Mirth*" traces the images of Lily, arguing that "Wharton's choreography suspends Lily in a moment of arrested dynamism: fixed in the first of her many tableaux of racialized stasis" (64). Kassanoff captures the paradox of Lily's predicament: hovering somewhere between life and death. While Kassanoff shows the similarities of the tableaux vivant to taxidermy, I see Lily's state of suspended animation signifying her inability to incorporate herself into the new modern world characterized by changing social markers. The one thing Lily has left at the end of the novel (and what we learn is also the end of her life) is her racial inheritance. In this way, Lily's choice *not* to marry Rosedale is one steeped in racial identification as well as a denial of modernity. As Kassanoff explains, Lily's "racial status is reassuringly immutable. Race becomes an essentialist--if deeply problematic--answer to the cultural vulnerabilities of class and gender" (61). In this framework, the only fixed marker of belonging is race. Despite Lily's poverty and public disgrace, she still possesses her racialized body.

Rosedale and Selden's respective relationships with Lily offer two different readings of her identity. Selden is focused on an ideal Lily, the "real" Lily, who embodies the finer points of breeding and taste. For Selden, her beauty is a reflection of her inner-being with mind and body in harmony. During Lily's tableaux-vivant, Selden reveals how he interprets Lily's beauty and being: "The noble buoyancy of her attitude … revealed the touch of poetry in her beauty that Selden always felt in her presence, yet lost the sense of when he was not with her. … For the first time he seemed to see before him the real Lily Bart, divested of the trivialities of her little world,

and catching for a moment a note of that eternal harmony of which her beauty was a part " (135). Selden places Lily in a classical, pastoral tradition in which beauty is a reflection of nature perfected. Selden functions in a post-Enlightenment, yet pre-Modern, framework that Michel Foucault describes in *The Order of Things* as the "ethical valorization of nature … the possibility of classifying living beings … holding that all nature can be accommodated within a taxonomy" (126). Selden's belief that he can locate the "real" Lily connotes a traditional reading of identity; one that reinforces a hierarchy of knowledge and places her within a set of rules and expectations. In Selden's essentialist reading, identity is not a fractured, changing, and unknowable self. Rather, it can be located, in harmony with nature, and uncontaminated by social forces.

While Selden remains stuck in a traditional pastoral, his rival reinvents himself and destabilizes social categories. Rosedale, because he is Jewish, is able to see the interlocking systems of race, gender, and class that destroy Lily. It is not until Lily's death that Selden is able to see the same systems: "He saw that all the conditions of life had conspired to keep them apart; since his very detachment from the external influences which swayed her had increased his spiritual fastidiousness" (329). His "detachment from the external influences" is wholly dependent on his privilege; Selden does not see that the external world embraces him while excluding Lily. The ideology of gender, race, and class are invisible to Selden--only after the death of Lily Bart does he begin to notice these material pressures. Lily's death was caused by the external pressures of a modern world, revealing the falsity of all her "options": a remaking of herself outside of class privilege (i.e. employed outside the home) or outside of race privilege as Simon Rosedale's wife. She did not fit Selden's ideal, and yet was not ready to participate in Rosedale's modern identity because it was dislodged from racial privilege.

If Selden represents an antiquated traditionalism based on knowable truths, then Rosedale represents an unsettled modernity. Lily cannot choose either of these cultural moments to live in, leaving her to seek an escape in sleep or death. Rosedale's marriage proposal strengthens Lily's resolve not to degenerate any further. She does not accept his proposal, setting out to resurrect her self-respect by freeing herself from racial impurity (marriage to Rosedale) and sexual impurity (repaying Gus Trenor). In the end, Lily chooses death rather than marriage to a Jew or a distortion of her ethics. And though she dies, she has saved the one thing left unblemished by her fall: she has remained a Lily, a specimen of whiteness. Selden's remarks at the end of the book mark himself and Lily as specimens. They have refused to evolve and in their eyes, refused to degenerate: "It was this moment of love, this fleeting victory over themselves, which had kept them from atrophy and extinction; which, in her, had reached out to him in every struggle again the influence of her surroundings" (329). Selden, unlike Rosedale, is only able to express his love for Lily in death when she can be completely controlled by his imagining of her.

Selden and Rosedale are opposing representations of Wharton's confrontation with a changing American landscape. Just as she is pulled by the allure of racial purity and a static society (Selden), she must also acknowledge the coming modernity and all that it offers (Rosedale). While Rosedale is often described in unpleasing terms (glossy, red, puffy), he is also humanized and made kindly (protective, fatherly, warm). The tension throughout the novel lies in the difference between race and culture and how Wharton struggles to define each. Wharton is torn between competing definitions, which colors her complex and contradictory rendering of Rosedale. Her ambivalence is embodied by Lily's conflict with the past and future, tradition and modernity, racial identity and self-preservation. In her rejection of Simon Rosedale, Lily refuses

to embrace a new identity removed from racial lineage and to marry a Jew. To marry the Jewish Rosedale would mean that Lily had forsaken her world order, one that she would rather maintain in death than dismantle in life. Lily's death is triggered by the Jewish Rosedale's proposal and Lawrence Selden's judgment and subsequent rejection. In these two characters we see how identity imagines itself and blurs the bounds of race and culture.

Maggie's Golden Bowl

Jews appear only a few times in *The Golden Bowl* making their presence seem at once random and calculated. It is possible to write on *The Golden Bowl* without ever mentioning that the unnamed antiquarian and the antique dealer are Jewish. Even though the story links a Jew to the title object's existence and sale, this connection often escapes critical notice. Brenda Austin-Smith writes that the golden bowl's

> power to attract significance, to mean so many different things to so many readers of this story, would seem to confirm its tropological status as symbol *par excellence*…The bowl is not a symbol in the conventional sense…nor does the bowl's association with other cultural symbols successfully underwrite its signifying functions, since the world of the novel is one in which cultural meanings are in flux, subject to contingencies or aesthetic, monetary, and sexual value. (53)

As with Austin-Smith's interpretation of the bowl, each character in the novel responds differently to the Jews, creating a signification so vast that the Jew is at once a trope brimming with meaning and an empty symbol whose meaning diminishes as he circulates within the novel. The slipperiness of the bowl's meaning correlates with Jewish masculinity's resistance to convention or definition. How then do we account for the Jewish characters in *The Golden Bowl* while maintaining a critical stance toward such a vast, open symbolic landscape? My analysis of the Jew as a floating signifier, marks it as a modern construct navigating the evolving the nation-

state. Focusing on the representations of Jewish masculinity in James's *The Golden Bowl* reveals the larger meanings of cultural production and the nation. [80]

Returning to the United States in 1904, James found a changed America where immigration and expansionism were swelling the national boundaries.[81] Henry James's last novel synthesizes representation of Jews and the de/construction of empire, nationalism, and economics. *The Golden Bowl* engages these concerns using tropes of Jewish representation. The peril and paradox of Jewish signification in *The Golden Bowl* drives the story, with the plot turning on Amerigo and Maggie's differing interpretations of the bowl and its dealer. I am particularly concerned with Maggie and Amerigo's interactions with the Jewish antiquarian whose appearance in the novel disrupts the couple's marriage. Though Jews in *The Golden Bowl* appear only a few times, their presence relates to the couplings that are central to the novel's plot. The Jewish antiquarian who brokers the bowl embodies James's concern with American cultural reproduction.

Amerigo and Charlotte are the first couple to encounter the Jewish antiquarian in *The Golden Bowl*. Charlotte engineers a morning alone with Amerigo with the pretense of shopping for Maggie's wedding present. The couple is in fact deciding how to proceed with their relationship after the Prince's marriage. Their rendezvous is secretive, with the scene establishing the private nature of the affair in contrast to the Prince's public marriage to Maggie. Musings about the affair and marriage center on Amerigo's cultural and racial heritage which he sees as conflicting with his "inward state":

> He was intelligent enough to feel quite humble, to wish not to be in the least hard or voracious, not to insist on his own side of the bargain, to warn himself in short against arrogance and greed … Personally, he considered, he hadn't the vices in question--and

[80] See Sara Blair's *Henry James and the Writing of Race and Nation.*
[81] *The American Scene* offers James' literary and aesthetic response to the new America.

> that was so much to the good. His race, on the other hand, had had them handsomely enough, and he was somehow full of his race. Its presence in him was like the consciousness of some inexpugnable scent in which his clothes, his whole person, his hands and the hair of his head, might have been steeped in some chemical bath…What was this so important step he had just taken but the desire for some new history that should, so far as possible, contradict, and even if need be flatly dishonour, the old?...He perfectly recognized…that the material for the making had to be Mr. Verver's millions. (51-52)

Amerigo uses race to explain his affair (he is compelled by his ancestral vices) and to justify his marriage (Verver money will beget a new future, yet diminish Amerigo's personal past). Combining race and culture in Amerigo, James gestures toward the external factors for cultural production: money. While James might use race as a means to explain personality and type, race is not independent of economic production. Money is needed to have cultural and racial influence over the future; Amerigo's choice of bride indicates that he realizes what he is lacking and how newly acquired money will reinvent him and his past.

As Amerigo passes by Bloomsbury shops filled with antiques and relics, the past looms:

> He had strayed simply enough into Bond Street, where his imagination, working at comparatively short range, caused him now and then to stop before a window in which objects massive and lumpish, silver and gold, in the forms to which precious stones contribute, or in leather, steel, brass, applied to a hundred uses and abuses, were as tumbled together as if, in the insolence of Empire, they had been the loot of far-off victories. (43)

Empires and cultures rise and fall. The spoils become sad reminders to Amerigo (as well as to the reader) that cultural greatness is just as ephemeral as the people who create it. Amerigo is caught in this gap between the past greatness of his Roman heritage and his present predicament of historical irrelevance.

James links Amerigo's economic dependence on American money to his heritage, describing him as if "he had been some old embossed coin, of a purity of gold no longer used, stamped with glorious arms, mediaeval, wonderful, of which the 'worth' in mere modern change,

sovereigns and half-crowns, would be great enough but as to which, since there were finer ways of using it, such taking to pieces was superfluous" (56). James's language indicates that Amerigo is too refined--too embossed--to navigate the modern world. Instead, he enters into a modern economy as a relic to be conspicuously consumed by the newly rich, newly founded nations. The British Empire's acquisition of spoils mirrors Maggie's purchase of Amerigo—that fact he is superfluous makes him all the more emblematic of Verver wealth.

James places Amerigo's social status in terms of race: he is well-bred to the point of being unviable. In contrast, Adam is viable in the modern world and he excels at making money, establishing his country's culture in the form of his museum, and advancing his offspring's future. Put in evolutionary terms, Adam Verver is thriving while Amerigo verges on extinction. Even Adam's last name, Verver, denotes a vibrating energy and nerve in one dynamic surname. Amerigo, as his name indicates, recognizes that the modern world suits Adam as he describes himself and his new father-in-law:

> I'm like a chicken, at best, chopped up and smothered in sauce; cooked down as a *crème de volaille*, with half the parts left out. Your father's the natural fowl running about the *basse-cour*. His feathers, his movements, his sounds--those are the parts that, with me, are left out. (46)

Adam's prosperity derives from his unadulterated vigor. He has not been corrupted by an over-weaning culture, whereas Amerigo and his people have been too gently-bred. They are richly sauced chickens that are missing the vital parts. Much like pedigreed dogs, Amerigo suffers from his lineage and his insular heritage proves detrimental to his personal liveliness.

Amerigo markets himself as a relic of the past and in this way becomes the empire's newest loot in the form of a museum piece for the Verver collection. While the past's spoils might be jumbled about in British shops, James signals that there is a new empire on the horizon: America. It is the Americans Maggie and Adam Verver who collect antiques, and it is new

American money that purchases the Prince. Maggie, during their courtship, refers to the Prince as a "*morceau de musée*" purchased by her father for "part of his collection…one of the things that can only be got over here. You're a rarity, an object of beauty, an object of price" (49). Cast as a museum piece, the Prince is rendered decorative by his wife--his worth deriving from his link to the past. He is essentially unusable in the modern world except for what he signifies of the past and what he can signify about Adam Verver's wealth.

Maggie makes Amerigo into an object of art signaling that her wealth can purchase cultural artifacts in the form of people. As Guy Davidson's "Ornamental Identity: Commodity Fetishism, Masculinity, and Sexuality in *The Golden Bowl*" argues, *The Golden Bowl* is a departure from James's previous works because it is the male body that is exchanged and commodified, while Maggie wields the power of the patriarch through her father's money (35). Davidson's article applies Feminist Marxist and fetish theories but fails to note that the Jewish antiquarian is directly involved in the exchanges examined in *The Golden Bowl*. Many of Davidson's insights into the text could be further illuminated by accounting for the Jewish shopkeeper's ethnicity and how it shades Amerigo's commodification. While Davidson is right to argue that "commodity fetishism and masculine identity have ramifications for the novel's more general treatment of gender relations and sexual desire," (26) his argument would have been stronger if he had considered Jewish masculinity and the racializing of the shopkeeper. By the time Amerigo encounters the Jewish antiquarian, he has been reminded that his glorious past is irrelevant save for its value on the antiquities market. The reminder colors Amerigo's reaction to the Jewish antiquarian, underscoring his status in the larger world and how his ideas about race and culture differ from his wife's.

Amerigo's class consciousness blinds him to the shopkeeper's presence. Charlotte notes Amerigo's inability to see the shopkeeper: "Charlotte had more than once, from other days, noted, for his advantage, her consciousness of how, below a certain social plane, he never *saw*. One kind of shopman was just like another to him--which was oddly inconsequent on the part of a mind that where it did notice noticed so much" (114). Amerigo misses the shopkeeper because of his ingrained classism, as well as his inability to recognize himself as part of the shopkeeper's trade. As earlier established in the novel, Amerigo is the ultimate museum piece and he denies the Jewish dealer's existence in part to cloak his own vulnerability as a commodity. Amerigo forcefully proclaims to Charlotte that "A crack's a crack--and an omen's an omen" (123). Amerigo's interpretation of the bowl's crack foreshadows his own affair with Charlotte and deceit of Maggie. Maggie has purchased Amerigo, who contains a secret flaw. Amerigo has misgivings over the bowl and the dealer because he identifies with the object and resents the person selling it.

Privileged by his class, Amerigo does not need to see the person behind the counter. In contrast to Amerigo, Charlotte remarks on the shopkeeper's "extraordinary pair of eyes," and that "the man himself was the greatest curiosity they had looked at" (113, 114). In a shop filled with antiques and valuables, the Jew incites Charlotte's curiosity. His ability to *see* preoccupies Charlotte, who attributes to him an uncanny ability to decipher meaning. Like Amerigo, Charlotte will marry for money and become another acquisition to the Verver Empire. Her objectification parallels Amerigo's but without the privilege of his class or lineage. She humanizes the shopkeeper enough to realize that his presence records their outing, lending the shopkeeper an agency that Amerigo denies. Noting that "Yes, he'll remember us," Charlotte realizes that the shopkeeper can testify to their secret outing. Though attributing to him an

agency that is usually the bastion of the upper-class, Charlotte makes assumptions about the shopkeeper's ethnicity, nationality, and even language. Assuming that their speaking Italian obscures the purpose of their visit—"It was a comfort to her that their foreign tongue covered what they said"—Charlotte and Amerigo are shocked when the Jewish shopkeeper replies to them in Italian (116). The Jewish shopkeeper in an instant destabilizes their world view by removing language from national affiliation. Instead of speaking the language of England where his shop is located, or the language of his religion, the shopkeeper's polyglot tongue performs a modern destabilization of meaning. The Prince and his mistress can no longer connect national belonging to language or as Charlotte notes, "It has no reference" (116). The Jewish shopkeeper becomes a modern figure unrecognizable to Charlotte and Amerigo. For all their worldliness, they prove provincial in defining the parameters of identity.

The shopkeeper threatens the Prince's understanding of the world. Amerigo is content to use his racial background to explain his identity and choices. The Jew then destabilizes race, culture, and identity rendering the Prince's self-conception outmoded. The Prince frantically tries to reassert his identity--to stabilize the signification--and questions the shopkeeper:

> 'You're Italian then, are you?'
> But the reply came in English. 'Oh dear no.'
> 'You're English?'
> To which the answer was this time, with a smile, in briefest Italian. 'Che!' The dealer waived the question. (118)

The Prince wants to nationalize the Jew's identity and prescribe to him a homeland that will explain his existence. But history's wandering Jew refuses such a limited affiliation choosing to remain global and indeterminate. London is the epicenter of the British Empire and the Jew's resistance to being pinned down to language or nation reflects a radical modernity. As characterized by Terry Eagleton and Frederic Jameson, "colonialism is a process of radical

dispossession. A colonized people is without a specific history…without a specific language" (*Nationalism* 10). Modernism, at least in the framework of Marxism, is an aesthetic response to this dispossession. The Jewish shopkeeper's versatility in language represents his transnational bearing in which national identity stands dislocated from the spoken word. The Jew is associated with the modernist trope of the inadequacy of language. Alienated from dominant culture, the antiquarian resists traditional definitions of national belonging. Amerigo's uneasy encounter with the Jew reflects the empire's unraveling; the Jew's resistance to definition reflects modernity.[82]

The antique dealer trades in culture informed by market interest: the more oppressive the defunct empire, the greater the relic's value, which is created by the market, not something intrinsic in the artifact. Trading in artifacts, the Jewish shopkeeper reminds Amerigo of his fragility as a commodity. For those who deal in the past, cultures must be preserved, protected, and created. Jewish trade in culture preserves it at the same time subverting its innate value. The Jew does not lose his sense of culture without national borders. Instead, his sense of culture is heightened: "he likes his things - he loves them … and it isn't only - it isn't perhaps even at all - that he loves to sell them. I think he would love to keep them if he could; and he prefers at any rate to sell them to the right people" (114). James argues that for culture and art to succeed they must transcend national boundaries that limit their grasp and insight. "The right people" need to govern the cultural market. Art transcends national boundaries, forming a global culture might seem a positive step if "the right people" have dominion; but as John Carlos Rowe points out in "Henry James and Globalization," "James makes the more serious point that the new influence of

[82]When Amerigo and Charlotte encounter the antiquarian in his Bloomsbury shop, they do not explicitly identify him as Jewish. When they recall their outing later in the novel, however, each refers to the shopkeeper as "a swindling Jew," thus coding the initial encounter with new meaning.

art will be global in scope and political in its effects….James consistently implicates culture in the work of imperial expansion and domination" (208). The golden bowl, whose symbolism is constantly shifting, becomes an ill-omen of empire that makes art a political and cultural construction.

Having been characterized as a museum piece by his wife, the Prince's visit to the antiquarian triggers a sense of uneasiness. Following the question of national origin, the antiquarian reveals the golden bowl to the couple: "He handled it with tenderness, with ceremony, making a place for it on a small satin mat. 'My Golden Bowl,' he observed - and it sounded on his lips as if it said everything" (118). The Prince is immediately repulsed by the bowl as he "shifted his position again, regarded it from a distance" (119). While Charlotte converses with the antique dealer, the Prince is restless, and he eventually leaves the shop to get fresh air (119-120). While Rowe is right to argue that cultural hegemony is an outcropping of Western colonialism, Amerigo's uneasiness about the bowl's representation in this system is twofold: his family was central to the imperial system and Amerigo is now a curiosity of it. Amerigo's uneasiness defines his relationship to the new power structure. James anticipates the modern, global worldview by showing "the long view of history in which nation-states have emerged and claimed discrete and competitive authorities only by ignoring their common origins and motives" (Rowe 209). Amerigo's distaste for the dealer and his bowl generates from self-recognition. He sees himself in the imperial system and how he is implicated by it—Italy, now a relic of cultural imperialism, was once like the British and American Empires.

The bowl reveals the violent underpinning of imperialism and cultural expansion. Amerigo, who states, "I saw the object itself. It told its story…Of course it's exquisite. That's the danger" sees the bowl in a larger ideological system (123). Its production and sale depend upon

historical violence, and its crack reminds Amerigo of his individual relation to empire. Recognizing the bowl's crack, Amerigo indicts the bowl and its dealer: "I saw before I went out. It was because I saw that I did go out. I didn't want to have another scene with you before that rascal" (122). The "rascal" refuses to let Amerigo disavow his past's violence or his present vulnerability. Charlotte comments on the Jewish shopkeeper's watchfulness: "I doubt if either of us have ever been so well looked at before…he has his way; for that way of saying nothing with his lips while pressing you so with his face, which shows how he knows you feel it" (114). The Jewish shopkeeper's race and gender come into play in this configuration. Unlike Amerigo's heritage, the antiquarian's culture is one defined by displacement. Because of the Diaspora and its subsequent effect on Jewish culture, the antiquarian represents a culture that is not dependent on land or conquest to maintain a nation. Instead, as the relics he sells suggest, memory and a common history unify global Jewry. The antiquarian's relationship to his Jewish roots sharply differs from Amerigo's. In contrast to the small Jewish man lovingly selling his artifacts, Amerigo's masculinity and racial background is decidedly imperial.

Maggie's reason for marrying the Prince relates directly to this construction of masculinity: "It was the generations behind you, the follies and the crimes, the plunder and the waste - the wicked Pope, the monster most of all, whom so many of the volumes in your family library are about" (47). Amerigo's past and tradition relate directly to the war, plunder, and violence wrought by imperialism. However, the greatest monster in this configuration is the Pope, which indicates that all forms of imperialism, including the Roman Catholic Church and religion in general, manifest violence. In this schema, conversion is a result of, and faith is encouraged by, violence. Jewish masculinity—as seen with the shopkeeper—idealizes cultural and artistic achievement while removing the violence associated with maintaining nation-states

and political hegemony. James presents Jewish identity as an alternative to the Euro-Christian construction of masculinity. If John Rowe's contention that "James links…Christianity's complicity in Eurecolonialism, and the Enlightenment's dream of the 'new man' to remind us of a history we repeat precisely because we won't remember its horrors," is correct, then the Jewish antiquarian's preservation of antiquities serves as a reminder of this past violence (205). Instead of the trade being a purely capitalist pursuit (the shopkeeper does make money off of these exchanges), the Jew also records and emphasizes the past.

The preservation of past spoils causes Amerigo to leave the curio shop, reminding him that he is also a curiosity available for purchase. Both Amerigo and the curious shopkeeper are relics of the past; however, Jonathan Freedman explains that "the Prince thus represents an image of the unassimilated, unassimilable alien—a noble, indeed thoroughly distinguished, version of that figure, but one whose full integration into the Anglo-Saxon sphere is at least as questionable as that of the Eastern European Jews who were entering London's East End or New York's Lower East side in such extraordinary number at that very moment" (*Temple* 136). Though more common, the shopkeeper reminds the Prince of his own stately degeneration and imperial irrelevance. The commonality between the two men produces in Amerigo an uncanny recognition that abruptly forces him from the shop. What makes Amerigo uncomfortable is his identification with the "rascal," for both men depend upon the commodification and exchange of long defunct cultures.

The Jewish shopkeeper reminds Amerigo of his irrelevance on the world stage; the cracked bowl—the ever changing signifier—might be in this guise Amerigo himself. His wife's encounter with the Jew, however, reveals her new role in an American Empire. James scholarship has long noted the author's rendering of women's lives as metaphors for larger

cultural concerns. Depending on the political moment, critics have read James' women as extensions of larger issues external to the narrative. Maggie Verver, in particular, has been read as representing America's national culture and its emergence as a Western power. Jessica Berman's "Feminizing the Nation: Woman as Culture Icon in Late James" links Maggie Verver to James's concern about America's national culture: "Only when writing about or for women, does James make the risk so clear: America stands teetering at the edge of cultural nationhood…James's writings from his 1904-5 American journey bring into unusually sharp focus the dependence of the discourse of nationality on the redefinition of American womanhood" (60). Using Berman's framework, Maggie Verver embodies a new America in which her marriage serves a critical juncture in her own identity as well as the nation's. Maggie's marriage is at the center of *The Golden Bowl* with the plot turning on the realization of her husband's affair and her ability to reclaim Amerigo (or America?) as her own.

Unlike Amerigo's relationship with a moribund Empire, Maggie's nation is nascent with industry, colonial power, and population. Maggie is aligned with modernity and a dynamic future:

> She had images, like that, that were drawn from steamers and trains, from a familiarity with 'lines', a command of 'own' cars, from an experience of continents and seas, that [Amerigo] was unable yet to emulate; from vast modern machineries and facilities whose acquaintance he had still to make, but as to which it was part of the interest of his situation as it stood that he could, quite without wincing, feel his future likely to bristle with them. (51)

The modern world is open to Maggie; her money enables her to own its signs--cars, steamers, machines. She relates to industry and enterprise in a way that the Prince has yet to understand. Critical to Maggie's embrace of modernity is mobility; Maggie's movements are not contained by national boundaries--she can easily sail across the ocean. In contrast with her husband's

status as an embossed coin or museum piece, Maggie actively bustles through the modern world. She has the confidence of newly acquired power and money, but her vision is incomplete.

While the trappings of modernity are at Maggie's disposal, she does not have the self-reflexive or ironic identity associated with the modern concept of the individual. Maggie's self-concept and her nation's debut on the global stage reflect the embryonic stages of self-consciousness. America and Maggie are just learning of their power. The Prince juxtaposes his royal, deceased past with America's economic prowess:

> It showed for that matter how little one of his race could escape after all from history. What was it but history, and of *their* kind very much, to have the assurance of the enjoyment of more money than the palace-builder himself could have dreamed of? This was the element that bore him up and into which Maggie scattered, on occasion, her exquisite colouring drops. They were of the colour - of what on earth? Of what but the extraordinary American good faith? They were the colour of her innocence. (48)

American innocence is contingent upon the guarantee of wealth. For Amerigo's ancestor to build a palace or empire required money, power, and rank. Yet the Ververs have created their own empire without aristocratic trappings, giving their wealth an element of populism that belies economic hegemony. Wealthy Americans remain innocent and romantic about their place in history because they do not examine the benefits of their empire. In "The Golden Fruit: Innocence and Imperialism in *The Golden Bowl*" Stuart Burrows argues that "the Prince believes the Ververs' purchasing power has come to constitute history itself…In Book One, gold allows the Ververs to shape the past to their own needs" (105). Shaping history to their needs allows the Ververs to maintain their innocence, as history never contradicts them. They have the ability to rewrite the past, much in the way that Maggie will rewrite her husband's affair to her benefit.

The Ververs' happiness is dependent on romanticizing their country's rise to power. Romanticizing becomes a form of amnesia, which allows Maggie to remake the world to her liking. Amerigo reacts to Maggie's innocence:

'You Americans are almost incredibly romantic.'
'Of course we are. That's just what makes everything so nice for us.' (48)

The 'niceness of empire' is contingent upon a willful forgetting.[83] Americans can fashion their innocence because they do not continue to confront the violent mapping of America by European Imperialism (Amerigo Vespucci is the Prince's namesake) or that American wealth is generated by inequity. Maggie does not place herself in a larger system of economic domination and instead of seeing the whole system at work, concentrates on only the good parts. She claims that "I've divided my faith into water-tight compartments. We must manage not to sink" (51). Maggie's identity is not at play in the larger world. She compartmentalizes identity as a way to shore up her romantic innocence, which allows her to maintain privilege without actively seeking it.

Maggie's innocence serves as an ideological apparatus: maintaining power while denying reality. Amerigo, at first, thinks he must shield his wife from his affair so as to maintain her innocence; later in the novel, Maggie refashions this innocence to gain control over her husband. To strengthen the link between American innocence, empire, and race, James references Edgar Allan Poe's *The Narrative of Arthur Gordon Pym*. Amerigo's retelling of the Poe novel highlights the "thickness of white air" and the "dazzling curtain of light" (57). James plays with images of whiteness in that text, signaling that Amerigo's reflection on his wife's innocence has racial undertones. James intuits (nearly a hundred-years before Toni Morrison) the racial implications of the Poe story and how race was used in American history and literature to define whiteness and its privileges while maintaining America's innocence.[84] Amerigo picks up on the

[83]Benedict Anderson's *Imagine Communities* touches upon nationalism's engineering of memory. A national past must be re/created in order to supply a limitless future.
[84]Toni Morrison's *Playing in the Dark* remapped American literature tracing its use of the black other (American Africanism) as a way to define whiteness. Morrison defined literary whiteness

violence underlying American self-fashioning. Innocence becomes a way to cloak the darker ramifications of American history: "a great white curtain…producing where [it] hung a darkness intended and ominous" (56). Working with gothic conventions perfected by Poe, James warns against an American innocence that hides a violent history and future.

If Maggie is innocent it is because she has yet to harness her own power. In an exchange with Amerigo, who teases Maggie about his status as a museum object, she demonstrates her ignorance of their economic relationship:

> 'I see. I have the great sign of it,' he had risked - 'that I cost a lot of money.'
> 'I haven't the least idea,' she had gravely answered, 'what you cost' - and he had quite adored for the moment her way of saying it. He had felt even for the moment vulgar. (49)

In Maggie's telling, Amerigo is a gift whose cost does not need to be calculated. Though Maggie objectifies the Prince, she does not commodify him. Instead, she fetishizes him, placing him in a Freudian paradigm, not an economic one. While Maggie sees the Prince as part of her father's museum collection, she does not connect her possession of him to money. Her desire remains in the realm of the personal: she takes pride in possessing the Prince without commodifying him. Maggie's innocence about economics and empire begins to erode only when she begins to understand Amerigo's relationship with Charlotte.

The Jewish antiquarian, who has an equally curious effect upon Maggie, changes her worldview. He is the same shopkeeper of Amerigo's earlier adventures and the vendor of the golden bowl. In contrast with Amerigo's ambivalent reaction, Maggie's introduction to the Jewish shopkeeper is couched in positive terms. In a book filled with characters searching for understanding and knowledge, Maggie's encounter with the Jewish antiquarian affects her insight and knowledge about herself, her husband, and her power. The golden bowl brings together

---

as innocence, freedom, masculinity, and individuality which was juxtaposed against the black body.

Maggie's personal life with capitalism's public venture; the bowl is the "place where the public and private, the domestic and the political, merge: the economy" (Freedman 2). When the distance between public and private collapses and the bowl's origins are revealed by the Jewish vendor, Maggie falls from innocence.

Because she realizes what the golden bowl means, Maggie's worldview shatters. Fanny Assingham observes this change in Maggie's tenor, commenting that "I can't describe my impression--you'd have had it for yourself. And the only thing that ever *can* be the matter with Maggie is that. By 'that' I mean her beginning to doubt. To doubt, for the first time … of her wonderful little judgment of her wonderful little world" (307). The golden bowl and its curator shake Maggie's innocence by revealing her husband's affair, and the implications it has for her marriage. But Maggie's "little" judgment changes because she gains sexual knowledge (she finally realizes she desires and misses her husband) while also learning about power structures: empires, economies, marriages. Before, she was innocent or naïve of her place within these larger systems, the golden bowl punctures her worldview. Maggie changes how she thinks and acts in the text. Her "little world" becomes a much larger one that accounts for the power of money.

The golden bowl and the Jewish antiquarian shift Maggie's reading of the world from a Freudian model of fetishism to a Marxist fetishism model that incorporates not just her personal desires and displacements, but the economic and imperial power of her wealth. Until Maggie's revelation about the golden bowl, she spent most of her time with her father and did not note her husband's frequent absences from her life. Maggie's preoccupation with her father and son displaced her desire for Amerigo: "she dresses really, Maggie does, as much for her father - and she always did - as for her husband or for herself. She has her room in his house very much as

she had it before she was married -- and just as the boy has quite a second nursery there" (302). Maggie's innocence about her power and her father's money is predicated on her ignorance of her husband's affair. To admit one, she would have to confront the other, and she chooses her paternal relationship over the marital in order to maintain a prelapsarian innocence with Adam.[85]

Maggie's innocence is predicated on not knowing of Amerigo's affair. Fanny Assingham quips that in order for Maggie to understand her role in the world, she will have to acknowledge what she can't imagine:

> Maggie was the creature in the world to whom a wrong thing could least be communicated. It was as if her imagination had been closed to it, her sense altogether sealed … to what's called Evil--with a very big E: for the first time in her life. To the discovery of it, to the knowledge of it, to the crude experience of it … It will make her ... understand one or two things in the world … to show her a little where she is. (311)

To emerge as a player on a larger stage (the world), Maggie must confront unpleasant truths about her marriage, but by doing this she gains a wider scope of power. Maggie's grasp of her own power begins when she chooses to go out alone on the London streets. Her small adventure leads her to the antiquarian's shop where she purchases the bowl. Her journey to his shop is described in terms of self-discovery: "she had done really just for the harmless amusement of taking her way alone. She had known she should find herself … in a sort of exalted state, under the influence of which a walk through the London streets would be exactly what would suit her best; an independent ramble" (431). We find Maggie in the same place as her husband had been at the start of the novel. Instead of an illicit meeting, however, Maggie's outing involves finding freedom and observing the world unfolding around her. She is specifically searching for the

[85] Maggie's father's name (Adam) bolsters a reading of Maggie's innocence and fall. James frequently uses Edenic imagery in *The Golden Bowl*, which puts a strange spin on the father/daughter relationship. Adam is also described as innocent and inhabiting an Eden. In fact, Maggie's other concern after recapturing her Prince is to maintain her father's innocence about the affair.

shop in Bloomsbury, and her stroll among the antiquities makes her "more at her ease than for months and month before; she didn't know why, but her time at the Museum had, oddly, done it; it was as if she hadn't come into so many noble and beautiful associations, nor secured them also for her boy, secured them even for her father" (432). Unlike Amerigo's uneasy reception of empire's artifacts, Maggie's exploration of the museum collection and the Bloomsbury shops put her at ease. She is acquiring antiques for her father, establishing a continuity of empire; her son will inherit these antiquities and continue the Verver Empire.

Maggie buys the golden bowl from "a queer little foreign man who had shown her a number of things" (433). Interestingly, readers are not privy to Maggie's discussion in the shop with the foreign man, adding to his oddity and signifying potential. For such an undefined character, his oddness has a disproportionate effect upon Amerigo, Charlotte, and, lastly, Maggie. The Jewish antiquarian queers Maggie's views because he blurs public and private space. Maggie observes that, "It's not my having gone into the place at the end of four years that make the strangeness of the coincidence; for don't such chances as that in London easily occur? The strangeness…is in what my purchase was to represent to me after I had got it home; which value came" (459-460). The object changes value and meaning upon entering the home, and for the first time Maggie sees her purchasing power outside the domestic space. When the antiquarian enters "downstairs--in the little red room" and observes "the few photographs," he punctures the seal between home and empire (460-461). From the photographs, the shopkeeper recalls Amerigo and Charlotte's visit years earlier. Each venue of identity becomes permeable; Maggie is unable to keep her personal life at a remove from her public wealth. The Jew brings the larger apparatus of economics directly into Maggie's drawing room, forcing her to confront the bowl's meaning and her husband's infidelity.

Just as Maggie realizes her economic power (she can buy whatever antique she likes; she overpays for the bowl), she discerns the nature of Amerigo and Charlotte's relationship. Maggie's interpretation of the bowl changes her future, while signifying her new understanding of power: "Then it all depends on the bowl? I mean your future does?" (440). Indeed, Maggie's future depends on how she interprets the bowl and, subsequently, her relationship to Amerigo. Maggie is "waking up to…the truth that all the while she really *hasn't* had [Amerigo]….and it was long since anything had been so sweet to her as the particular quantity suddenly given by her present emotion to the sense of possession" (310/339). Because the bowl reminds her of public (the curio shop) and private (her home) spheres, Maggie's personal desire to possess her husband is realized via her public status as an American heiress. It is not until the golden bowl comes into focus that Maggie wants to *have* Amerigo, to *possess* him. The golden bowl symbolizes empire and Maggie's economic power in the world.[86] Maggie's interpretation of the bowl becomes a modern maneuver as it "anticipates the kind of intrusion of economic strategizing into the precincts of private life that is the hallmark of [modernity's] discursive moment" (Freedman "What Maggie Knew" 9).

It is not until Maggie buys the golden bowl and realizes its significance that she begins to exert control over Amerigo. Not only does she engineer a coup over Charlotte, but she makes Amerigo conspire against Charlotte, creating a new matrix of knowledge with Maggie. If Amerigo represents "racial and cultural degeneracy" as Jonathan Freedman argues, then Maggie's reigning in of Amerigo amounts to a realignment of racial and cultural reproduction (477). In this way, the Jewish antiquarian acts as a conduit for change; he mediates the golden bowl (an artifact of empire) and reveals its meaning to Maggie. Freedman argues that the Jewish

[86]While the meaning of the golden bowl is vast within the novel, its meaning becomes more so when read in light of James George Frazer's *The Golden Bough*.

antiquarian "contribute[s] to the process of degeneration, not that of regeneration […] The Prince thus represents an image of the unassimilated, unassimilable alien" (481-482). I would point out, however, that Maggie's interaction with the Jewish antiquarian leads to Amerigo's assimilation into an American hegemony. Part of Amerigo's reintegration into their marriage is Maggie's insistence that he recognize her knowledge of the affair, as well as the power she has over him: "that was what acted on him, this iteration of her knowledge, into the question of the validity of the various bearings of which he couldn't on the spot trust himself…he couldn't help betraying if only as a consequence of the effect of the word itself, her repeated distinct 'know, know,' on his nerves" (463). Maggie 'knows' about the affair, but in broader terms she knows how the world works and the influence that money has in it. Maggie's recognition of an economic, imperial system, the restructuring of her husband's identity, and the dismantling of her innocence all point "to the quality of James's novel that brings it closer to the world-view of economic-driven modernity than nineteenth-century novelists" (Freedman "What Maggie Knew" 3). Without her Jewish antiquarian, Maggie would have remained an innocent 19th-century construct of womanhood; instead, she becomes a modern performer of her public and private identity.

Liesl Olson argues in " 'Under the Lids of Jerusalem:' The Guised Role of Jewishness in Henry James' *The Golden Bowl*," that "an overdetermined symbol, the bowl suggests sexuality gone awry--how a person, a human vessel, can be given or received. As vendor of the bowl, the Jew is the vessel through which these relationships are perverted" (668). But if you look at the progression of events in the novel, the Jewish shopkeeper does not "pervert" relationships; he reveals their operating systems. The Jewish shopkeeper brokers in antiquities and spoils, reflecting how Maggie obtained the Prince through purchase and power. Maggie's innocence is shattered because of the Jewish shopkeeper and she attributes to him her change: "As the little

man in the shop. He did for me more than he knew--I owe it to him…I can only think of him as kind, for he had nothing to gain" (460). If the golden bowl is a floating signifier whose definition changes according to who purchases it, Maggie decides to define it and use it to her advantage. In a similar way, the curious, little Jewish man is himself a floating signifier, queering meaning for each character.

Even after its material demise, the golden bowl functions for Maggie as a source of power and knowledge. Her true power over Amerigo manifests not in an economic threat, but an ideological one. In the ultimate reshaping of an individual to fit an empire, Maggie changes the way Amerigo sees the world. The book closes with Maggie's triumph over Charlotte and her husband. What haunts the novel is not the "queer" shopkeeper, but Maggie's control of Amerigo:

> He tried, too clearly, to please her--to meet her in her own way; but with the result only that, close to her, face kept before him, his hands holding her shoulders, his whole act enclosing her, he presently echoed: ' "See"? I see nothing but *you*.' And the truth of it had with this force after a moment so strangely lighted his eyes that as for pity and dread of them she buried her own head in his breast. (580)

Maggie asserts her will and becomes the focus of her husband's gaze. Like Europe looking toward America, Maggie has stepped forth as the new modern woman, the new modern nation. She will control what and whom she pleases, indicating that self-knowledge and a loss of innocence will characterize the new century. And it is the Jewish figure who ushers in this new era. Maggie uses knowledge to her advantage to win back her erring husband. In this way, James's last complete novel ends with a heroine who chooses her own power and empire over another's, a turn from innocence towards a more modern, self-reflexive identity. Maggie's encounter with the Jewish antiquarian ushers in modernity and the fluidity of social and national boundaries.

~

We will see the figure of the Jew develop as proto-Modernism evolves into the High Modernism of James Joyce and Djuna Barnes, whose depictions of Jews expand on the many tropes already established by the previous three chapters. Joyce and Barnes do not relegate the Jew to the narrative margin, but use the Jew as a central figure and exemplar of Modernism's anxieties and hopes. The new focus of these modernist novels is the cosmopolitan metropolis and the disintegrating empire. The Jew represents the fractured, disparate identities within and outside these borders. Joyce and Barnes's novels bring the Jew, the global, the displaced, and the fractured into full focus. I read Joyce and Barnes's positive portrayal of the Jew as representative of the modernist condition.

Chapter 4

Joyce and Barnes: Modernism, Modernity, and Jewish Identity

In a special issue of *Modern Fiction Studies*, Maren Linett encourages critics to see "the importance of Jewishness as a category through which…modernist writers engaged with racial and cultural difference" (249). The issue is replete with scholarship connecting Jewishness to the making of Modernism, and I extend her central claim that the idea of the "Jew" was a productive site for exploring the limitations of nations and national identity.[87] Recent post-colonial scholarship has renovated the way modernisms are defined, giving new voice and theoretical language to national, racial, and gender differences. Joyce scholarship has repositioned *Ulysses* as "semi-colonial," valued for its challenge to British imperialism as much as its modernist innovation (Walkowitz 55).[88] Before Joyce's recasting as a post-colonial subaltern, critics had similarly examined Djuna Barnes's subversive politics as aesthetic innovation. From the start, Barnes scholarship accounted for sexual and racial differences. Labeling her literature as "lesbian" fiction, this critical reception has at times cost Barnes a more significant place in the Modernist canon while underscoring her importance to a more prismatic modernism.[89] Accounting for political and cultural difference within multiple modernisms has recently mutated

---

[87] For more on Modernity and Jewish representation, see *The Jew in the Text: Modernity and the Construction of Identity*. Eds. Linda Nochlin and Tamar Garb. New York: Thames and Hudson, 1995. One of the first texts to link Jewish representation to the creation of modern identity, the compilation is replete with foundational scholarship.

[88] For more on Joyce in a post-colonial framework, see Vincent J. Cheng's *Joyce, Race, and Empire*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1995. Cheng's work is a watershed mark in Joyce scholarship precipitating a shift away from seeing Joyce as solely a modernist innovator to Joyce as political agent.

[89] Bonnie Kime Scott's *Refiguring Modernism*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1995 changed the way modernism was defined, helping to establish Barnes's *Nightwood* as a high-modernist text that dealt with modernity's cosmopolitan and diverse reality.

into an exploration of Jewish difference, and it is from this present critical moment that I consider James Joyce and Djuna Barnes whose novels, *Ulysses* and *Nightwood*, investigate national identities and how these identities transform aesthetics; in particular, their use of the Jewish man, whose body and identity figures for the larger aesthetic concerns of modernism and the socio-cultural changes of modernity.

In his 1907 speech "Ireland, Island of Saints and Sages," Joyce defined nationalism as a "convenient fiction like so many others to which the scalpels of present-day scientists have given the coup de grace" (166). Nationalism was a fiction turned into a universal truth by the use of science, and Joyce emphasizes that the writer's task is to deconstruct Western culture's central terms such as race, nation, and gender. For Joyce, the artist's challenge is to distill meaning from multiple fictions—for to invest in nothing would be a nihilist conceit as well as an artistic abandonment. Joyce chooses Jewish identity and the Jewish body as the site of reenacting, deconstructing, and rewriting fictions. In *Ulysses*, the Jewish Leopold Bloom and the artist Stephen Dedalus's union negotiates place and identity outside of a restrictive nationalism. In a novel whose setting is as much a character as the people who inhabit it, Joyce highlights the differences between a parochial nationalism and a cosmopolitan understanding of belonging.[90] While Joyce's 1907 speech defines nationalism as a "convenient fiction," his novel offers an antidote for the solipsism of his island nation. Offering Dublin as a site for modernity's exploration of nationalism, Joyce's main characters, Stephen Dedalus and Leopold Bloom,

[90] While definitions of cosmopolitanism vary greatly, my use of the term relies on an ethical and cultural definition that sees potential in difference and acceptance of hybrid identities. This chapter concentrates on two novels whose urban settings play a critical role in developing a cosmopolitan aesthetic; however, I reject notions that urban geographies are a prerequisite for cosmopolitan thinking. For example, Paul Gilroy's *The Black Atlantic* poignantly argues that forced Atlantic crossings, the slave ship, and the coasts of three continents created a modernist cosmopolitanism.

struggle to rework their environment as a cosmopolitan incorporation of otherness. Joyce answers Amanda Anderson's theoretical problem of reconciling cosmopolitanism's relationship to universalism of "how we might best combine the critique of partial or false universals with the pursuit of those emancipatory ideals associated with traditional universalism." (265). The critical balance of the cosmopolitan with the national, and the individual to the group, connects Stephen's aesthetic problems to Bloom's socio-political struggles. Joyce avoids a nationalism that hides behind false universals, and instead chooses to follow Leopold Bloom's journey through the quotidian, particularizing his difference, mostly defined by his Jewish identity, as a way to shape Ireland's cultural modernity.

Dublin's relationship with modernity was an unhurried courtship. Historians have noted that the city was slow to industrialize and still had epidemic poverty by turn of the twentieth century. In 1904, the setting of *Ulysses* and the beginning of Joyce's exile, marked a period of Irish transition. Eavan Boland's "James Joyce: the Mystery of Inheritance," describes Dublin:

> A city which had begun the [20th] century, in Joyce's formative period, in a strange corridor between Victorian gentility and Irish nationalism…The reason Joyce has been such a vivid presence…is not because he was an extraordinary or outlandish Dubliner, but because he was an entirely recognizable one…Joyce's great testament to the city—and the potent enactment of history it came out of—was to leave it there in his work—restless living, a place of doubt and process. (13-14)

Between nationalism's "convenient fiction" and Dublin's developmental years, Joyce saw a future Ireland freed from its colonial past and parochial pride. For all of Joyce's remapping of Dublin, rewriting of the Odyssey, and critiquing of Ireland's political, cultural and economic shortcomings, rested a faith in cosmopolitanism nationalism. Joyce, who needed to leave Dublin in order to narrate it, found an exiled compatriot who could remain in the novel's city: Leopold Bloom. Bloom's odd position within Ireland and as Stephen's guide enabled Joyce to create an alienated figure within the city. Himself exiled in France, Joyce planted Bloom in his stead in

order to represent the potential for a cosmopolitan aesthetic. Joyce used Bloom's relationship to the city and its culture as another way to bring the alien, the strange, and the odd to Dublin and *Ulysses*. In the character of Bloom, Joyce imported cosmopolitanism to Dublin, and, in turn, mapped Ireland's path to freedom from colonial servitude and isolation to a modern national identity.

Like Joyce, Barnes represents Jewish experience as a way to deconstruct the politics and aesthetics of nationalism. *Nightwood* asks, what becomes of history's truths when they are coded upon a people? In her descriptions of Felix, Barnes subverts many Western tenants of belonging, whether sexual, national, or racial. Her subversion is dependent upon the male Jewish body which, as she depicts it, contains all of the confluences of Western anxiety. Barnes structures *Nightwood* as a diasporic trespassing—there is no centralizing Dublin—with her Jewish characters displaced upon a world stage that cannot yet incorporate difference. Perhaps because she was named after Djalma in Eugène Sue's *The Wandering Jew*, Barnes made wandering and exile constant themes in her work. Identifying with the odd, displaced figure, the outcast Barnes adopted the Jew as an articulation of own her alienation.[91] Barnes's encounter with authority—whether from her father's abusive patriarchy or a dysfunctional lesbian relationship she could neither legally sanctify or emotionally escape—led her to embrace the Paris nightlife, completely rejecting any form of establishment. By creating alternative, marginal societies within a cosmopolitan framework, *Nightwood*'s alienation is a threat to a hegemonic Western culture and a disavowal of nationalism's efficacy.

The absence of a controlling center, whether cultural or geographical, comments upon the pitfalls of national boundaries; the Jewish characters in *Ulysses* and *Nightwood* are "shaped by a

[91] For more on Djuna Barnes's life see Louise DeSalvo's *Conceived with Malice*. In it Barnes's childhood sexual abuse and her destructive affair with Thelma Wood are chronicled.

concern with diaspora, deterritialization, and the irregularity of the ties between nations, ideologies, and social movements" (18 Appadurai). For Joyce, who wrote *Ulysses* while Ireland struggled for independence and published it after the World War, a cosmopolitan nationalism had the potential to unlock Ireland's colonial past. For Barnes, the ties between nations and communities were too irregular, too capricious to offer any solace to the globally displaced. As Jane Marcus noted, Barnes's "*Nightwood* makes a modernism of marginality" (147). Marginal modernism's aesthetic responded to the post-WWI socio-political climate, which in Barnes's schema had decayed and rotted. Focusing on the figure of the Jew and his relationship to cosmopolitanism and displacement the two texts demonstrate the evolution of this evocative figure's relationship to nationalism and its discontents.

Scholars have long noted Barnes's debt to Joyce; Catherine Whitely's recent work on the aesthetics of excess and excrement in *Finnegans Wake* and *Nightwood* stresses Joyce's influence on Barnes. These two writers remain central to the deconstruction of national belonging and personal identity by means of their figuration of the Jewish male. This chapter focuses primarily on *Ulysses*, seeing Barnes's *Nightwood* as a response to and an extension of Joyce's Jewish representation. While Joyce uses Leopold Bloom to explore the limitations and possibilities for Irish nationalism, Barnes's concern is more post-national and depicts radical alienation as an epistemological category. The full scope of this chapter derives from one question: why do Barnes and Joyce choose the male Jewish body and experience to emphasize modernist alienation and the problematics of nationalism? Grafting all of Western history's tensions onto the Jewish body was not unique to Modernism, as I have noted earlier; however, Joyce and Barnes each imagine the Jewish body as emblematic of difference. The Jew in their texts becomes the ethnic and cultural embodiment of modernist alienation. Joyce and Barnes present

the Jew as a figure identified with alienation and national disenfranchisement—two modernist aesthetic principles, and two results of modernity itself.

Odd Wanderers

At the start of *Ulysses*, Stephen Dedalus hopes that Ireland—his birthplace and aesthetic home—will gain independence from its colonial past and develop its own national art and politics. Art and national independence intertwine in "Telemachus," where Stephen reworks Irish national identity. The colonial dyad of English paternalism and Irish dependence is defined by Stephen: "It is a symbol of Irish art. The cracked lookinglass of a servant" (6). England's occupation and exploitation of Ireland has led to a colonial predicament: Ireland can only imagine itself as reflected in the colonizer's mirror, a dilemma that embitters Stephen and drives most of his thoughts throughout *Ulysses*. "Telemachus" serves in many ways to establish the post-colonial reworking Ireland must achieve before it can emerge as a true producer of independent art. Stephen yearns for Ireland to nationalize, and he characterizes this process as a move away from external pressures most strongly represented by English Imperialism and Roman Catholicism. As Stephen bluntly puts it, "I am the servant of two masters…an English and an Italian…The Imperial British state…and the holy Roman catholic and apostolic church" (20). Stephen's quest for an acceptable cultural inheritance—he is in "search of a father" (18)—veers away from his imported religion, as well as the primacy of the English to Irish identity.

If in search for a cultural father Stephen rejects his English and Italian masters, he simultaneously refuses a blind allegiance to Irish art. This struggle between Irish nationalism and cosmopolitanism fuels many of the most indeterminate scenes in *Ulysses*, making it

increasingly difficult to pin Joyce to any one ideological movement. In the same chapter that stresses the colonial exploitation of Ireland by England and the imperial impulses of the Catholic Church, as well as how both of these structures retard Ireland's progress into the modern world, Stephen yearns for an inheritance that goes beyond Irish regionalism.[92] His last name indicates that part of the Stephen's aesthetic renaissance will be transnational—reaching beyond the Island's shoreline to make himself anew. Stephen, the reflective, sensitive artist becomes the repository of multiple cultural legacies.

Joyce signals that there are several inheritances that need to be unlocked from the vaults and used for Irish rejuvenation. Joyce twice calls attention to the Jewish presence in the opening chapter signaling that a strong Jewish current runs through *Ulysses*. On the same page that Stephen declares his concerns for Ireland, he sees "a deaf gardener, aproned, masked with Matthew Arnold's face" (7). While Joyce is not advocating an adoption of Victorian Liberalism advanced in Arnold's *Culture and Anarchy*, his allusion to the masked "Matthew Arnold" gestures toward Hebraism, situating it as part of traditional Western culture; at the same time, the masked and aproned mower produces a parody of the great Victorian work.[93] Arnold advocated for a universalizing state that would subsume and erase difference; it would take the cultural contributions of "Hebraism" while erasing contemporary Jewish individualism. *Culture and Anarchy* became a rhetorical move to preserve the historical Jew, while eradicating the perceived racial particularity of Jews living in England whose presence compromise Arnoldian insistence on a unified, national culture. Arnold was unable to reconcile the ambivalent relation between a universalizing state and cultural autonomy. Joyce, in a modernist maneuver, kills his Victorian

[92] Stuart Gilbert notes that Stephen "refuses to cringe to the narrow patriots who surround him and to exploit the sentimentalism in favour with the Dublin literary movement" (101).
[93] By the time Joyce was writing *Ulysses*, he owned a copy of Arnold's *Culture and Anarchy* (Davison 106).

forbearer while redefining the framing devices in *Culture and Anarchy* that would remain useful to a cosmopolitan, anti-imperialist literature. While Joyce does not define the "Hebraic" in Arnold's racialized terms, he presents the "Hebraic" tradition in a modernist context, which we will see throughout this chapter.

The second mention of Jews in "Telemachus" comes when Haines, an Englishman, attempts to justify his presence in Ireland to Stephen: "Of course I'm a Britisher, Haines' voice said, and I feel as one. I don't want to see my country fall into the hands of German jews either. That's our national problem, I'm afraid just now" (21). Haines, in an effort to befriend Stephen, tries to locate a common enemy. The Jews become both a national haunting—the English will be controlled by them—as well as a global phenomenon that the Irish should fear. With a colonial relationship existing between Haines and Stephen—the Englishman is wealthy and has occupied Stephen's tower—the Jews are invoked to diminish the gap between the two young men by creating a mutual religious, cultural, and socio-political problem.

The concept of a Jewish conspiracy against national integrity is reiterated in "Nestor," which Stephen calmly rebukes. As in "Telemachus" the perceived peril is articulated by a character who threatens Stephen's autonomy: the schoolmaster, Mr. Deasy. Like Haines whose status as an Englishman represents one of Stephen's masters, Mr. Deasy's small mindedness imperils Irish growth. The school becomes another site for the diminishment of Irish ambition as Mr. Deasy promotes a colonial parochialism. And from the mouths of these two men, representative of two historical threats to Irish nationalism, comes the most banal anti-Semitic prejudice. Mr. Deasy also claims a global Jewish threat to the English nation: "England is in the hands of the jews. In all the highest places: her finance, her press. And they are the signs of national decay…Old England is dying…They sinned against the light, Mr. Deasy said gravely.

And you can see the darkness in their eyes. And that is why they are wanderers on the earth to this day" (33-34). Wandering is the curse the Jews must bear because of their sins: "Their eyes knew the years of wandering and, patient, knew the dishonors of their flesh" (34). [94] While Deasy's charge of blood libel and licentiousness is an old charge against the Jews, Stephen subverts Jewish particularity to these sins by responding with a universal question, "Who has not?" (34). Stephen refuses Deasy's interpretation, instead reading Jewish history as representative of all history. Their wanderings, their disgrace, and their dishonor are not particular to a small tribe, but to all: "History, Stephen said, is a nightmare from which I am trying to wake" (34). Joyce proposes that the problems of the modern state or the modern artist cannot simply be placed on some historical scapegoat. He layers his rejection of anti-Semitism while embracing the aesthetics that the Jewish Diaspora created: wandering, alienated people.

The two men who threaten Irish progress—Haines, the Englishman, and Deasy, the school master—articulate common anti-Semitic slurs. It is no coincidence that Joyce shows that embracing these two colonial predicaments likens to anti-Jewish prejudice, which obscures and transfers the real problems of Irish national identity onto a minority group, "the Jews." Instead, Ireland needs to move away from English colonialism, which was promoted in the school system and is gestured toward in Deasy's Protestantism, and embrace a more secular cultural inheritance: "Averroes and Moses Maimonides, dark men in mien and movement, flashing in their mocking mirrors the obscure soul of the world, a darkness shining in brightness which brightness could not comprehend" (28). In a metonymic reference to intellectual secularism, Joyce mentions a Muslim philosopher and a rabbi who promoted Aristotelian thought. Both

[94] While Jews have been a diasporic people since the sacking of the Second Temple, Mr. Deasy's claim that wandering is a punishment for Jewish sin comes from medieval Christian folklore that tells of a Jewish spectator who laughed at Jesus as on his way to the cross.

Averroes and Maimonides espoused an intellectual secularism that responded to religious darkness while still maintaining their faith. Maimonides, the rabbi, combines Hellenic and Hebraic traditions in his ethical treatises. Joyce's elliptical referencing of these two men challenges a uniform reading of history by presenting a more multicultural past. By the time we encounter Bloom in "Calypso," Joyce has pointed out how Bloom's heritage will play a part in Stephen's evolution as an artist and thinker.

Joyce carefully develops Stephen's connection to Jewish culture before meeting Leopold Bloom, the main Jewish character in *Ulysses*.[95] The fact that *Ulysses* uses Odysseus's journey as a structural element, and that Stephen and Bloom are in constant movement throughout the novel, indicate the salience of the wandering motif. The trope of the wandering Jew takes on a modernist viewpoint, and Joyce updates this stock figure in Western literature. It is a trope that Djuna Barnes plays with in *Nightwood*. While Stephen searches for a new cultural paternity—finding it to some extent with the Jewish Bloom—Barnes mocks the entire idea of paternity or origins with her Jewish figures, Felix and Guido Volkbein. Like *Ulysses*, *Nightwood*'s themes and structure are dependent upon Jewish underpinnings: what Jews represent in Western thought and how modernity has changed the image of the Jew. Lara Trubowitz argues, Jews become a narratological category through their cultural signification as wanderers.[96] As Joyce does in the opening chapters of *Ulysses*, Barnes introduces Jews as central to understanding the major

[95] Bloom has Jewish ancestry and is not part of Catholic Ireland. When I characterize Bloom as Jewish I do so along similar lines as Gary Martin Levine's claim that "Bloom's Jewish cultural capital is a broad mixture of both nominalist religious traditions and the internal response to the history of dispersion and persecution" (165).

[96] Lara Trubowitz's "In Search of 'the Jew' in Djuna Barnes's *Nightwood*: Jewishness, Antisemistism, Structure, and Style" explains that Barnes "transforms Jews from a racial or religious group into a narratological category, turning qualities [Barnes] describes as distinctly Jewish into traits that can be given to non-Jews, even given to the narrative of *Nightwood* itself" (312).

themes of her novel. She presents Jews as the embodiment of modernity's displacement, dislocation, and alienation. Unlike the cultural legacy Joyce encourages Stephen to understand, Barnes presents Jews as a bi-product of history's march toward modernity.

Nightwood, as many critics have noted, is a novel whose center is on the margin.[97] It contains characters not found in pre-modernist novels—ones coded neither Jewish nor queer, but rather *explicitly depicted* as such. In a novel that contains a lesbian puritan, a gay transvestite Irishman, and sundry other odd characters, Felix Volkbein's Jewishness might seem tame. It is, however, at the center of what it means to be marginalized or isolated. Barnes's novel contends that a disjointed identity is a universal condition, that writing the Jewish experience is to read the historical record. In making Jewish identity the prototype for modernist alienation, Barnes reveals the violence of history's progress. Barnes is careful to depict Felix's relationship with self and history as one steeped in violent upheavals:

> He was alone, apart and single. A race that has fled its generations from city to city has not found the necessary time for the accumulation of that toughness which produces ribaldry, nor, after the crucifixion of its ideas, enough forgetfulness in twenty centuries to create legend…The Christian traffic in retribution has made the Jew's history a commodity; it is the medium through which he receives, at the necessary moment, the serum of his own past that he may offer it again as his blood (10).

Jewish history is characterized by a sense of absence, a perpetual state of loss that has its roots in the Hebrew Bible. Jewish history, at least as described by Barnes, resembles a traumatic event that is never forgotten or recovered from. Volkbein's trauma derives from a psychic estrangement felt by Jews ("alone, apart, and single") that is caused by the Jewish body, which contains a biological mechanism ("his blood") for a cultural phenomenon. Barnes intertwines the Jewish body and Jewish history: the perception of and the "crucifixion" of the historical Jew

[97] See Victoria L. Smith's "A Story Beside(s) Itself: The Language of Loss in Djuna Barnes's *Nightwood*," in which she argues that the novel concerns itself with "representation in general for those consigned to the margins of culture" (194).

are inseparable. Missing from Barnes's version of Jewish history are traditional associations with forging nationhood: toughness, legend, collective amnesia, violence. By the time *Nightwood* grapples with these issues, WWI has already ravaged much of Europe's landscape, as well as many of its cultural convictions. For Barnes, the forces that persecuted the Volkbein family are still present, suggesting that these traits of nation building in some way led to World War I. Jewish history contained the chronic ruptures and displacements before modernity brought these traits to society at large. The endurance of this cultural heritage becomes not a particularity, but a theoretical way to look at all of Westernized nations after the World War.

Barnes opens *Nightwood* with an account of the wandering Jew, Felix Volkbein, who is the novel's main Jewish character, whose background imbues the story with a patina of national, sexual, and racial anxiety that Barnes harnesses to deconstruct history and nationalism. In this way, Felix's experience of history becomes a universal conundrum; eventually, all of the characters experience similar pangs of alienation and isolation. In order to build toward this modernist convention, Barnes uses the trope of the wandering Jew:[98]

> What had formed Felix from the date of his birth to his coming to thirty was unknown to the world, for the step of the wandering Jew is in every son. No matter where and when you meet him you feel that he has come from some place—no matter from what place he has come—some country that he has devoured rather than has been nourished on but cannot inherit, for the Jew seems to be everywhere from nowhere. When Felix's name was mentioned, three or more person would swear to having seen him the week before in three different countries simultaneously. (*Nightwood* 7)

The depiction of Felix's origins reiterates trends in early twentieth-century anti-Semitism: the biological inheritance of cultural characteristics ("the step…is in every son"), questions of national belonging ("some country he has devoured") and the paranoia of a global Jewish conspiracy ("three different countries simultaneously"). Barnes's rehearsing of anti-Jewish

[98] For more on the wandering Jew and his relevance to Western literature, see G.K. Anderson's *The Wandering Jew.*

rhetoric reveals and subverts the specter of Jewishness haunting nation-formation. In Felix's description there is a tinge of the unreal and a note of the sublime—he occupies an anachronistic space in which he is more concept than character. In the same moment that he is displaced and alienated from the present, he is also at a timeless impasse. By depicting him as such, Barnes makes the Jewish Diaspora a metonymic conceit for modernist alienation—the Jewish "every son" becomes the Modernist "everyone."

While Barnes's depiction of Felix takes on a global perspective, Joyce's Bloom deals with identity within a fixed nation: Ireland. Among concerns with the upcoming funeral and his wife's infidelity, Bloom struggles to situate himself in an island nation whose history is informed by its geography. Joyce presents two ways to define a nation: land ownership vs. cultural memory. The more traditional interpretation of national belonging derives from land ownership and the tangible connection to soil: "Purchase vast sandy tracks form Turkish government and plant with eucalyptus trees…You pay eight marks and they plant a dunam of land for you with olives, oranges, almonds or citrons…Every year you get a sending of the crop. Your name entered for life as owner in the book of the union…Nothing doing. Still an idea behind it" (61). For a man of Jewish heritage living in Ireland and who owns no land, the idea of owning land in Palestine becomes a fantasy.[99] Within this description of land, Joyce describes an alternative to Bloom's Irish exile: he imagines being in the Promised Land and being written into the book of life. Joyce's choice of crops (almonds, lemons, olives) echoes the mythical East of sensual pleasures. Bloom, if he wants to join the "union" may hire workers to plant and harvest, while he

[99] Marylin Reizbaum's *James Joyce's Judaic Other* notes that "*Die Welt* was the most likely place for Joyce to have encountered the advertisement of Agudath Netaim, the Turkish-based planting company selling land in Palestine in 1905" (21). Edwin W. Williams also traces the roots for Joyce's reference to Aguduth Netaim in his article, "Agendath Netaim: Promised Land or Waste Land" in *Modern Fiction Studies,* Volume 32, Number 2, Summer 1986: 228-235.

enjoys the exotic fruits of another's labor. It is a classic imperialist dream that does not come true for Bloom.

Instead, land as the basis for nationalist revival is dismissed as a fantasy. Figured as a Moses who never reaches Canaan, Bloom's dream of a homeland is rendered impossible. Like the wandering cloud Bloom observes in the sky, he remains the modern man without stable home or land.[100] Wandering, the Jewish experience recorded in the Hebrew Bible, is every bit a modern predicament. "It seems possible…that the persecuted errantry, the wandering of the Jews, may have reinforced their sense of identity far more than their present settling in the land of Palestine. Being exiled Jews turned into a vocation of errantry, their point of reference an ideal land whose power may, in fact, have been undermined by concrete land (a territory), chosen and conquered" (Glissant 20). Bloom's imagining of Palestine highlights the discrepancy of a dispersed population idealizing an imagined place versus a material existence within a nation state. Bloom's movements throughout the day are characterized by his ability to imagine multiple realities and viewpoints; errantry and wandering underwrite Bloom's imagination and engagement with Dublin. He never does buy any land, nor does he ever experience a sense of belonging in the Irish union—the country to which he is loyal but remains alien from its people and traditions.

Joyce, however, does not let the desire for land replace culture. Bloom rejects a literal enactment of Zionism but sees instead the "idea behind it." This gap between physical national belonging through land ties, and national belonging through shared cultural ideas, becomes a major theme of *Ulysses*. Land becomes tangible proof of national belonging, but Bloom presents

[100] The cloud that Bloom looks upon while contemplating Zionism is the same one that Stephen observes. Before they meet, Joyce establishes that Bloom and Stephen see and suffer the world similarly.

another sense of identity, one informed by a shared past: "A dead sea in a dead land, grey and old. Old now. It bore the oldest, the first race…The oldest people. Wandered far away over all the earth, captivity to captivity, multiplying, dying, being born everywhere. It lay there now. Now it could be no more. Dead: an old woman's: the grey sunken cunt of the world. Desolation" (61). Defining nations in relation to land is a defunct conceit. It is no longer productive as the "grey sunken cunt" signals and has been replaced by a modern sense of identity: Diaspora alongside collective consciousness. A people "born everywhere" who remain attached to a cultural past disconnects national identity from land ownership. By unlacing the concepts of race, land, and nation, Joyce challenges late nineteenth-century definitions of national identity.[101] The Gorgon knot of signification—or the fiction of nationalism—is challenged by a Jewish history that maintains a sense of an imagined past while its people are dispersed globally.

While Bloom's musings about Palestine reveal myth making surrounding national identity, Joyce also uses his connections to Jewish history to redefine how gender plays out in nationalism—specifically Irish nationalism. The wandering Jew is a trope of modernity in that he is dislocated from place; he is also modern because he upsets traditional notions of masculinity, virility, and nationalism. Owning, maintaining, and patrolling land promotes and depends upon a violent version of masculinity. Joyce presents the landless Bloom as an alternative to normative representations of Irish masculinity and nationalism. Just as wandering marks him as both modern and Jewish, his gender performance assumes a more progressive, self-reflexive version of masculinity than many of his Irish peers. If nationalism is the "whole complex of beliefs, assumptions, habits, representations, and practices" as Michael Billig defines in *Banal Nationalism*, Bloom fails at the most basic rituals of Irish masculinity (6). In this way,

[101] The creation of Israel in 1948 complicates this reading of the Diaspora, land, and cultural cohesion.

Bloom's day becomes an act of renegotiating Irish masculinity, and each time Bloom finds himself misunderstood, misinterpreted, or misjudged he is outside of Irish national culture. Joyce takes care to have Bloom attend a funeral, to frequent a pub, and visit a brothel. Each of these places contains within it rituals that reveal Irish identity and gender expectations. Bloom has trouble properly enacting these rituals of nationalism and masculinity, which reveals an alternative script to understanding self and state.[102]

During the "Hades" episode, Bloom's alienation from his peers becomes painfully evident. In the carriage ride to the funeral Bloom struggles to participate in the conversation. He continually misses social cues and misunderstands Catholicism. As Neil Levi argues in "'See that Straw? That's a Straw': Anti-Semitism and Narrative Form in *Ulysses*," Bloom's presence in Irish male circles disrupts traditional ideas of community: "what we might call a 'modernity effect,' is also brought about in the life of organic communities by the appearance of the stranger" (382). While Levi concentrates on Jewish representation and capitalism, his insistence that Bloom's presence in the novel is an effect of modernity, as well as a harbinger of it, functions similarly to my arguments about masculinity and national belonging. While the men in the carriage ignore or gloss over Bloom's comments, his presence is enough to signal a shift away from homogenous culture—Joyce depicts a changing societal structure caused by forced migration, intermarriage, and immigration. Every social gaff and uncomfortable silence Bloom generates is a marker of modernity that disrupts identities steeped in gender and nation codification.

[102] Stephen also has trouble enacting mourning rituals in "Telemachus." However, his inability to properly grieve for his mother comes from stubbornness and immaturity, not necessarily a lack of masculinity. Stephen also understands Catholic mourning rituals and chooses not to enact them.

In response to some thinly veiled anti-Semitic comments made by Mr. Cunningham and Mr. Power, Bloom eagerly joins the conversation, attempting to tell an anti-Semitic anecdote himself. Being able to tell a good story becomes a mark of Irish masculinity and of national belonging. That Mr. Power "collaps[es] in laughter" at the man who is "of the tribe of Reuben" signals that difference is a source of tension and that telling jokes and stories mends fractures created by the appearance of a stranger (92/93). In order to restore order and normalcy as it is disrupted by the Jew, the men participate in a ribaldry that reinstates group cohesion. Bloom, however, is not able to rejoin the brotherly community created in the carriage: "Mr. Bloom began to speak with sudden eagerness to his companions' faces" (94). Bloom's eagerness comes from an anxiety that he does not belong to this circle of men whose humor and cultural references do not translate. His outsider status draws the reader's attention to the construction of culture. Narrative is a way to organize history and reinscribe culture; as Anne Kane argues in "Reconstructing Culture in Historical Explanation:" "narratives are stories that embody symbolic meaning and codes of understanding; through 'storytelling' meaning is publicly shared, contested, and reconstructed" (314). Bloom cannot convey meaning to his Irish peers who constantly interrupt his attempts at conversation. Most of Bloom's sentences trail off with ellipses, which signal that he has been cut short or ignored. Furthermore, the construction "yes, but" marks his sentences as detracting from the metanarrative flowing around him. Bloom's narrative style is one of alienation; he is the "but" in the carriage making difference visible and palpable.

Jewish difference and alienation aided Modernist depictions of the world as fractured. Barnes extends the concept of Jewish alienation as central to modernity. She plays with similar social ostracism—much as Joyce does with Bloom. Barnes's character Felix is often prostrate to his companions and history, experiencing the absurdity of his own social ineptitude. Felix

frantically responds to Matthew O'Connor's claim of delivering Nora Flood: "Felix…broke into uncontrollable laughter, and though this occurrence troubled him the rest of his life he was never able to explain himself…This only added to the Baron's torment. He began waving his hands, saying 'Oh, please! please!'…staring at the floor, deeply embarrassed to find himself doing so" (19). Felix's anxiety, his nervous laughter in the face of the Doctor's unnerving associative speech, becomes an articulation of the fractured sense of self wrought by modernity. Felix, like no other character in *Nightwood*, scavenges the past to explain his displacement. He is certain that "to pay homage to our past is the only gesture that also includes the future" (39). He wanders Europe looking for aristocratic greatness, finding instead a transvestite doctor. The absurdity of Felix's worship of European history (he has a fabricated pedigree) and his inability to process Matthew's chatter all lead to his isolation. Or as Dr. O'Connor explains it, "There's something missing and whole about the Baron Felix" (26). Barnes weaves together history's effect on the present, at the same time dismissing it as a way to define the self. Felix's quest to prove his lineage serves only to erase him from the present; he becomes missing and whole simultaneously. The creation/erasure of Jewishness becomes representative of all modernity. While his role for the remainder of the novel is limited, the paradox he represents—missing/whole; creation/erasure—becomes integral to understanding the novel's theme of displacement and wandering.

Much like Bloom's attempt to belong to his Irish community through participation in ritual—he attends a funeral and a mass—Felix attempts to belong by worshipping a system that rejects him. By reifying lineage he expels himself from history:

> From the mingled passions that made up his past, out of a diversity of bloods, from the crux of a thousand impossible situations, Felix had become the accumulated and single—the embarrassed. His embarrassment took the form of an obsession for what he termed 'Old Europe': aristocracy, nobility, royalty…With the fury of a fanatic he hunted down

> his own disqualification…He felt that the great past might mend a little if he bowed low enough, if he succumbed and gave homage. (9)

In Felix's construction, history is a trauma suffered by generations yet experienced by individuals. The 'embarrassed' Jew in history has become the alienated modernist; in an effort to assimilate his identity and experiences with his history, Felix revisits the site of his own expulsion—reliving the trauma of history through his relentless appropriation of it. Of course, this is not a possible feat for a single man, but his desire to reformulate history, to make it new, speaks to Barnes's view of modernist experimentation as a dismissal of Western hegemony that would see each of *Nightwoo*d's characters as undesirable.

Felix's cult fascination with history affects his performance of gender; Barnes figures his awkwardness as a way to disrupt traditional binaries. Barnes's depiction of the Jewish Felix is not philosemitic; rather it revels in the indeterminacy that Jewishness represents for traditional definitions of belonging. Felix's attempts at the gentlemanly and the aristocratic fail, so he, instead, offers up a new interpretation of gender, one more blended and not contingent on absolute extremes: "He was usually seen walking or driving alone, dressed as if expecting to participate in some great event, though there was no function in the world for which he could be said to be properly garbed; wishing to be correct at any moment, he was tailored in part for the evening and in part for the day" (8). Being forced to participate in the world as a perpetual outsider allows Felix greater breadth of dress and movement. He is never quite right, but by the time we meet him in 1920, after the Great War has ravaged Europe, his disjointed performance seems fitting. He is an outsider in a world that has lost its center. And Barnes presents him, along with his compatriots of difference (Matthew, Nora, Robin), as universal types of post-WWI culture.

While Barnes subsumes Jewish particularity into a modern predicament, Joyce presents Jewish masculinity as a corrective for an Irish masculinity imbued with violence and misogyny. Bloom's missteps in Irish male circles mark him as different. The carriage ride anticipates the most anti-Semitic moments in *Ulysses* when the Citizen of "Cyclops" gripes about Irish masculinity, violence, and national belonging. Bloom's narrative style is seen as alien and his presence at the pub ignites a nationalism steeped in race and gender conformity. The "Cyclops" episode weaves together phallic symbolism (it references circumcision), blindness (the title itself as well as the street sweep gouging out an eye), race (the importance of sport to the nation; Jews as strangers), and masculinity (a homosocial pub). Joyce makes explicit that myopia is caused by an over-emphasis on the phallic signifier; the episode is the most explicit critique of Irish masculinity and nationalism in the text.

Critics have noted that "Cyclops" is ripe with anxiety about how masculinity works within a colonial, occupied Ireland. James Valente's "The Double-Bind of Irish Manhood" traces the evolving definition of manhood in Victorian and Edwardian England and how these concepts were used to reinforce colonial rule in Ireland by defining Irish masculinity as either insufficient (there were unable to resist English occupation) or excessive (Irish masculinity was too violent, aggressive and thus lacked manly restraint) (106). While this type of post-colonial excavation of "Cyclops" is invaluable to the study of Joyce's work, Valente's argument glosses over Bloom's significance in this colonial structure. If we are to accept that the Citizen is a reproduction of a violent masculinity caused by colonial rule, then we must account for Bloom's Jewishness. In order to look at Irish masculinity along the axis of race, Bloom's heritage must be accounted for and worked into an interpretation of the Citizen's Irish masculinity. Joyce uses the Citizen to simultaneously comment on Irish constructions of masculinity, and on how England's

colonialism influences these constructions; his inclusion of Bloom, and his Jewish references motions to a cosmopolitan impulse of multiplicity even within a colonial city. Extending Homi Bhabha's argument on mimicry and colonial rule, Valente notes the Citizen's reproduction of the colonial power structure that devalues/redefines Irish masculinity: "With all of its historical contingency, this dynamic most closely approximates the theoretical paradigm of colonial power known as 'mimicry,' wherein the subaltern inevitably confirms his or her difference from metropolitan norms" (106). Bloom becomes Joyce's refutation of a hyper-violent masculinity, offering an alternative to Irish masculinity as well as a meditation on alienation and what it means to belong to a nation or a group. Bloom's movements through Dublin— traversing normative male space such as the pub—disrupt a facile colonizer/colonized dyad that justifies and encourages an Irish masculinity that bolsters English domination and truncates any political change.

As with the carriage ride, Bloom enters the pub and immediately misses the social cues and customs of the drinking house. When offered a drink, he demurs, causing the men to comment: "Bloom saying he wouldn't and couldn't and excuse him no offence and all to that and then he said well he'd just take a cigar. Gob, he's a prudent member and no mistake" (304).[103] Joyce puns on the phallus, as Bloom's drinking habits and his penis are labeled 'prudent.' In a pub where most of the men drink too much, Bloom's abstemiousness disrupts the fraternity and marks him as outside pub culture. Joyce links Bloom's foreignness to his phallic signification. His prudence feminizes his "member" and thus sets him apart from the pub culture. David Lloyd points out in "'Dubliners,' Masculinity, and Temperance Nationalism," "that drinking practices remain a critical site for the performance of Irish masculinity and ethnicity" (133). Bloom's

[103] Bloom declines a drink with Stephen in "Oxen in the Sun." In this scene Bloom does not join the male social group of medical students in drink or in the conversation about women's roles.

actions in the pub mediate these definitions of national belonging through his subversion of gender and race expectations.[104]

Bloom's self-exclusion from pub culture rankles the Citizen who notes that difference is not merely a cultural but also a physical state. The Citizen, in turn, begins ascribing to Bloom stereotypes that foster his outsider status. Bloom's not drinking or buying rounds translate into a physical difference that the Citizen ascribes to his Jewishness. The misstep in pub culture spirals into a biological reading of Bloom's difference, which culminates in a canine whose primal nose can “smell” Bloom’s non-Irish identity. Through these series of interpretations, the men at the pub mark Bloom's body. They postulate that Jews smell differently, and thus act differently: "I'm told those Jewies does have a sort of queer odour coming off them for dogs about I don't know what all deterrent effect and so forth and so on" (304). For the men in the bar, the body serves as a discernable site of difference: it can be smelled. Joyce's use of Jewish stereotypes emphasizes the uselessness of a malformed masculinity—and the ridiculousness of using a dog's olfactory capacity as proof of racial difference.[105]

After the Citizen asserts that Jews smell differently, the conversation in the pub turns to circumcision and then to erections caused by hangings. Circumcision in 1904 Ireland was a singularly Jewish ritual and the synthesis of all three of these events—circumcision, erections, hangings—link death to a Jewish phallus, indicating a non-productive measure of culture. In this triangulation of anxiety, the Jewish phallus becomes a defilement of the sacred phallus; the Jewish covenant marks Jewish men, making what is a ritual (one is not *born* with a circumcised

[104] It is worth noting that Bloom's father in the "Circe" episode reproaches his son with "I told you not to go with drunken goy ever" (437), indicating that drinking in a pub is not a Jewish pastime.

[105] The idea of a Jewish smell resurfaces later in the "Circe" episode when Dr. Punch Costello states that "the *fetor judaicus* is most perceptible" (493).

penis) into a corporeal, racial difference. In a Lamarckian reproduction of culture, the male Jewish body has for centuries caused anxiety. Jay Geller's *On Freud's Jewish Body: Mitigating Circumcisions* argues that the male Jewish body is interpreted by Christians as disavowal of male privilege and identity: "Thus [the Jewish male's] attempted entry into the public sphere poses a grave threat to a society determined by the maintenance of definite gender roles and stereotypes as much as by ethnic and racial difference" (105). The Jewish body's circumcision refutes the logic of the phallus causing castration anxiety, a fear synonymous with death. Bloom's arrival in the Irish pub disrupts the male body and its attending privilege, one of the last bastions of colonial Irish masculinity. When Bloom attempts to deal with castration anxiety with secular observation and rationalism ("That can be explained by science" (304)), he is mocked by his peers:

> And then he starts with his jawbreakers about phenomenon and science and this phenomenon and the other phenomenon. The distinguished scientist Herr Professor Luitpold Blumenduft tendered medical evidence to the effect…to instantaneously facilitate the flow of blood to that part of the human anatomy known as the penis or male organ. (305)

Bloom's approach to erections caused by hanging is scientific and disengaged, while the adversarial Citizen wants to relate it to the glory of Irish nationalists. The anonymous narrator of "Cyclops" connects Bloom's conversation style to his foreignness by using German titles and Germanic patronymics as a way to signal that Bloom's approach is alien. Instead, the men want to pontificate about history without regard to science or rational explanations.

The Citizen's concern for national health reinvests in the past to free Ireland. Joyce's depiction of the Citizen captures major trends in early twentieth-century Irish revival politics, which emphasized a reclaiming of the Irish past in order to culturally and linguistically separate from the English. Though a cultural project, the Gaelic revival encouraged a racialized and

gendered reading of national belonging, and in effect, privileged the male Irish body as representative of Ireland.[106] The Gaelic Revival adopts the vocabulary of turn-of-the-century body politics that emphasized a muscular Christian over a degenerate, feminized Jewish body.[107] In an episode that stresses phallic symbolism, the emphasis on the male body and its relation to the nation depends upon what the Jewish body represents. Joyce associates circumcision with castration anxiety, feminization, and emasculation, contrasting with the Christian body. Sander Gilman writes in *The Jew's Body*, "The difference of the Jewish body is absolute within the Western tradition; its counter-image (from the comments of Paul, Eusebius, and Origen on the 'meaning' of circumcision) is the 'Christian' body which eventually becomes secularized into the 'German' or 'English' body with the rise of the modern body politic" (38). Gilman's quotation illustrates a major, and disturbing, trend in Irish nationalism: the appropriation of racial hegemony to reinstate Irish freedom in an effort to create a body politic or a modern nation. In this paradigm the Citizen's insistence on Gaelic nationalism depends upon asserting Irish difference against another group, which in this episode becomes the "Jew," the Jewish body, and Bloom.

Bloom's presence in the bar disrupts a racial reading of national belonging that the Citizen advocates in response to Bloom's disturbance of a purist reading of Irish origination:

> On the revival of ancient Gaelic sports and the importance of physical culture, as understood in ancient Greece and ancient Rome and ancient Ireland, for the development of the race…for the resuscitation of the ancient Gaelic sports and pastimes, practiced

[106] See Sara Brady's "The Gaelic Games, Gender, and Migration" which demonstrates that "the creation in 1884 of the Gaelic Athletic Association (GAA) contributed to a larger Irish nationalist effort at the turn of the twentieth century to distinguish Ireland from Britain through language, literature, drama, and other expressive culture" (28).

[107] Perhaps the most famous case of this type of structural anti-Semitism was Otto Weininger's *Sex and Character*, published in 1903, which became a global phenomenon and helped fuel ideas about the Jewish body and Judaism as degenerate and feminine.

> morning and evening by Finn MacCool, as calculated to revive the best traditions of manly strength and power handed down to us from ancient ages. (317)

In a legitimizing maneuver, the Citizen places Ireland and its history alongside ancient Greece and Rome, arguing that physical activity develops racial, thus national, strength. Several anxieties produce this investment in the physical revival: fears of degeneration and colonial emasculation. Referencing a time before English occupation, the Citizen emphasizes Ireland's sovereignty. Ireland's past is glorious, replete with physical prowess and legend. The mention of Finn MacCool, an epic figure whose name means white or bright, appeals to a literary national identity, and Joyce has the Citizen articulate the progression from denizen legend to racial nation. Locked within the Citizen's insistence on physical health, however, is a fear that Ireland is diluting its native population with alien influences: "Saint Patrick would want to land again…after allowing things like that to contaminate our shores" (338). A weak Irish body enables England's occupation. This logic leads the Citizen to view Bloom's Citizenship as an indicator of decay and colonial vulnerability. Instead of a mighty nation led by strong, bright men it has become a land of feminine prostration to the much more powerful England; Bloom's ethnicity becomes a reminder of this colonial predicament.

With the idea that hybridity weakens Ireland, the men in the bar question Bloom's loyalty. In a time of national stress, when the Irish nation is attempting to solidify and gain independence from England, a perceived outsider such as Bloom heightens concerns about national purity and a cohesive past. The complexity of Bloom's position within the nation induces anxiety rather than an inclusive cosmopolitanism. Able to differentiate between race and culture, Bloom considers himself an Irishman; Ireland is his home:

> "A nation? Says Bloom. A nation is the same people living in the same place...
> —What is your nation if I may ask, says the Citizen.
> —Ireland, says Bloom. I was born here. Ireland….

> —And I belong to a race too, says Bloom, that is hated and persecuted. Also now. This very moment. This very instant…
> —Are you talking about the new Jerusalem? says the Citizen.
> —I'm talking about injustice, says Bloom.
> —Right, says John Wyse. Stand up to it then with force like men…
> —But it's no use, says [Bloom]. Force, hatred, history, all that. That's not life for men and women, insult and hatred. And everybody knows that it's the very opposite of that that is really life…Love, says Bloom.
> (331-333).

In Bloom's analysis, the lines between race and culture and the national and the global blur; he is able to occupy two identities at once, Irish and Jewish.[108] Being Jewish does not preclude his identification with Ireland. Instead, he sees political oppression as a global phenomenon, to which all peoples can relate to and unite against. Fighting injustice, Bloom proposes, can be the new unifying culture for people of all races and nations. Bloom's concept of justice and secular unity is not comprehended by the Citizen or John Wyse, who see in his speech the opportunity for violence. For the men in the bar, injustice needs to be met with force, an assertion of masculinity through violence that Bloom rejects as both gendered (he has women's lives in mind) and unproductive (love will provide a better life). Instead of life, love, and culture aligning, violence, hate, and race form an anguished trinity, which reinstates the structure of oppression found in colonialism and misogyny.[109]

The effects of alcohol on Ireland are well-documented in *Ulysses*—Joyce sees alcoholism as a national response to colonial disenfranchisement. If Bloom asserts that love is the answer

---

[108] "This very moment. This very instant…" may refer to two anti-Semitic outbreaks that precede Bloomsday. First, the 1903 Moroccan massacres of Jews, which was widely reported in Irish and American newspapers. Second, the Limerick riots in 1904, which were also widely covered in Irish newspapers. It would not be a stretch for Bloom to know of one or both—and certainly Joyce was aware of these violent events.

[109] Joyce had explored the limitation of violence as a means to freedom in his 1898 essay "Force." In "Force" he explores the paradox of achieving freedom through force, and many of Joyce's arguments in this essay anticipate Bloom's arguments in *Ulysses*. See "Force" in *James Joyce: The Critical Writings* edited by Ellsworth Mason and Richard Ellman. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1989: 17-24.

while enjoying a cigar, his Irish peers' see the pub as a space for affirming their national and gender identity. That is not to say that Joyce advocated temperance—his mockery of Bloom's romantic conceits indicates he does not—but there is an element that alcohol is corrosive to national health. Bloom's temperance mirrors the national temperance movement's emphasis on a sober Ireland: "Ireland sober is Ireland free" (311). Freedom comes from rejecting a colonial masculinity that produces dysfunctional men and, in turn, families. The abuse of women and the abuse of alcohol are connected: they are the effects of colonization on a marginalized male population. In particular, masculinity and drunkenness cause domestic pain as recounted by Gerty MacDowell in "Nausica":

> Had her father only avoided the clutches of the demon drink…that vile decoction which has ruined so many hearths and homes had cast its shadow over her childhood days. Nay, she had even witnessed in the home circle deeds of violence caused by intemperance and had seen her own father, forget himself completely for if there was one thing of all things that Gerty knew it was the man who lifts his hand to a woman save in the way of kindness deserves to be branded as the lowest of the low. (354).

Gerty MacDowell's childhood abuse and Bloom's alienation are seen as twinned outcomes of a failed culture. Domestic violence corresponds to anti-Semitic prejudice; Gerty and Bloom share a similar place in a colonial system that renders them powerless.

Bloom's difference gives him special insight into gender inequities in Ireland. Reworking late 19th century ideas about race and sex, Bloom's sensitivity towards women originates in his Jewishness. In a reclaiming of Jewish difference, Joyce offers an alternative masculinity that overlaps and merges with femininity. Disrupting the gender binaries that Irish nationalism depends upon—think of the gendered pub space, the sexual mores of Catholicism—Bloom becomes an interpreter of Irish femininity and its discontents because he is barred from the privileges of Irish masculinity. John Hoberman notes a similar phenomenon in Viennese Jews who redefined masculinity in light of pervasive discrimination: "Jewish men struggled to achieve

a viable male identity in the face of anti-Semitic folklore and discriminatory practices that limited Jewish access to privileged male venues" (142). Joyce situates Bloom within a matrix of power and prejudice; Bloom experiences his Jewishness in terms of discrimination (as revealed in "Cyclops"), while his otherness enables his understanding of alternating forms of alienation. This "Jewish male predicament" in the hands of Joyce becomes a positive reinterpretation of gender, and like Stephen Dedalus's sensitivity as an artist, Bloom's heightened sensitivity drives much of *Ulysses*'s pathos and modernist alienation.[110]

Bloom visits Mina Purefoy in the hospital while she is in labor, where he connects with Stephen Dedalus. Joyce portrays Bloom's visit to Mina as yet another indication of his difference. His Jewish heritage, his alienated role in the text, his sympathy for women's experiences, all tie him to Mina's travails: "Of Israel's folk was that man that on earth wandering far had fared. Stark ruth of man his errand that him lone led till that house" (385). Bloom's visit is likened to his wandering, which is both a modernist negotiation of place as well as a validation of Jewish experience. In a chapter that explores men's generative power as thinkers and artists, Bloom's visit offers a nuanced masculinity that can incorporate women's experiences without appropriating them.

The ward also serves as a meeting point for Bloom and Stephen: "Leopold that had of his body no manchild for an heir looked upon his friend's son and was shut up in sorrow for his forepassed happiness and as sad as he was that heim failed a son of such gentle courage…so grieved he also in no less measure for young Stephen for that he lived riotously with those wastrels and murdered his goods with whores" (390-391). Joyce complicates Bloom's adoption

[110] The term "Jewish Male Predicament" is borrowed from John M. Hoberman's *Otto Weininger and the Critique of Jewish Masculinity*. This predicament as described by Hoberman translates well to *Ulysses* where Bloom experiences the same stereotyping as Weininger attributed to Viennese Jewry.

of Stephen by staging it in a maternity ward, shifting a father/son biological inheritance to a psychic paternity. Their connection attaches itself to a vast signification that the hospital's maternity ward represents. They are beginning their journey together as a father/son dyad, as well as exhibiting their difference from the homosocial circle of medical students who represent a patriarchal invasion of female space. This personal connection between Stephen and Bloom is developed through its connection to a vast public, national cultural matrix that both men problematize and question. Bloom's visit to the hospital is itself a rejection of a patriarchal culture that views women's labor as a service rendered rather than a personal struggle. Bloom's empathy for Mina Purefoy contrasts starkly with the medical students who vacillate between disparaging women's experiences and analyzing them with clinical detachment. The medical students' comments counter Bloom's sensitivity as a mourning father. By placing Bloom and Stephen in a maternity ward, Joyce subverts Irish conceptions of male generative power. As Robert Spoo notes in *James Joyce and the Language of History*, "though pushed to the margins, female experience is an 'other' that conditions and circulates within the male discourses of the episode, yet it is only one manifestation of this marginalized other" (148). Bloom's presence in the hospital ward connects him to women's experience of a radical subject/object split. The medical students' dismissal of Mina Purefoy's suffering negates her humanity in similar ways that Bloom's individuality is undermined by the Citizen in "Cyclops." Joyce carefully connects Bloom with female space and subjectivity, indicating that Bloom operates as an outsider in *Ulysses* and offers insight into other marginalized experiences.

Ulysses frequently deals with fatherhood, patriarchy, and inheritance, and Stephen's own relationship with his father signals that paternity is often an aggressive act. However, Bloom's relationship to his child and his emotional torture over the loss of his son, Rudy, disrupts this

reading and offers a more intimate look at loss and how it can be experienced outside of gender norms. In the "Circe" episode, which is the theater of the repressed, Bloom is pregnant and cries out, "O, I so want to be a mother" (494). Bloom copes with Rudy's loss by imagining himself pregnant, capable of regenerating his son (in the same scene he bears eight boys). Just as Bloom's visit to the maternity ward aligns Bloom with female experience, his mourning for his son Rudy is rendered in gendered terms.

In a similar reworking of fatherhood and subjectivity, Barnes depicts Felix Volkbein as a nurturing father in contrast to his wife, Robin, who rejects motherhood. Characterized by her persistent wanderings and alignment with nature, Robin has no consciousness of culture; she has "the troubling structure of the born somnambule, who lives in two worlds—meet of child and desperado. Like a painting by the *douanier* Rousseau, she seemed to lie in a jungle trapped in a drawing room" (35). Many critics have noted Robin's alignment with nature and the primitive; working from this conceit, Felix is the inverse: he is imitative of high culture (though not necessarily good at it) and seeks to occupy a privileged, European space. Karen Kaivola argues that the 'primitive' is an important element in deconstructing *Nightwood*, stating that "Jews, Africans, and women are thus positioned very early in *Nightwood* as exotic outsiders by virtue of their association with the primitive" (173). But her analysis does not account for Felix, whose difference does not originate in the 'primitive,' but stems from his role as cultural and ethnic alien. If Robin represents a pre-cultural past, Felix represents a cultural past entrenched in a specific social history, Jewish history, and not a natural history. This move affords Barnes the space to explore maternity/paternity as a product of both culture and nature.

Robin's radical rejection of her child—she screams "I didn't want him!" and is found "about to dash it down"—refutes any naturalizing of maternity or the completion of self through

other (48, 49). Robin's difference derives from her bisexuality and her rejection of domestic space and roles. If she is the "beast turning human," her place in the natural world is not related to her role as mother (37). Barnes insists that there is nothing natural about maternity or motherhood; instead, it is a learned behavior reinforced by society. But this is not enough for Barnes—a simple rejection of motherhood as natural would be too simple—and she goes a step further by making Felix a far more suitable parent and nurturer than his wife. Felix's competency as a father correlates with his difference as a Jew, with Barnes implying that Felix's heightened empathy for his child is the result of this particular masculinity. Felix's gender performance inverts expectations in that he is the maternal, unerotic partner in the marriage; Barnes describes him as "racially incapable of abandon," experiencing "unaccountable apprehension. The sensuality in [Robin's] hands frightened him" (38/42). Felix is an un-erotic and un-masculine figure, who is, at the same time, the only character in the novel caring for a child. In this sense, Felix's capacity as father springs from his hyper-cultured, hyper-evolved sensibility. Felix's identity taps into ideas that were operating at the time that Jews were degenerate because they had become too modernized and specialized. George Mosse's *Nationalism and Sexuality* notes that racist ideology at the turn of the century labeled Jewish masculinity a "surrender to modernity" that produced nervous, hysterical men (136). Felix's son is not a healthy reconciliation of his natural mother or his over-sensitive father: "the child was small, a boy, and sad. It slept too much in a quivering palsy of nerves; it made few voluntary movements; it whimpered" (48). In Barnes's hands, Jewish masculinity becomes a negative outcropping of modernity. It is at once inauthentic, imitative, degenerate, and asexual and, in Barnes's contortion of cultural norms, Felix's love for his child becomes a product of these deficiencies.

These tropes of Jewishness also appear in the "Circe" episode of *Ulysses*, which critics cite as an influence on *Nightwood*'s style and structure. Contained within "Circe" is Joyce's interpretation of Jewishness and national belonging, which tends to be far more deconstructive than Barnes's representations of Jewishness. From the maternity hospital, Stephen and Bloom visit a brothel that doubles as a theater for gender performance, sexuality, and the interplay between the two. The "Circe" episode of *Ulysses* uses its theatrical structure to stress the performative nature of gender and, in turn, deconstruct ways in which identities are formed. While "Oxen in the Sun" draws attention to the ways male power and female reproduction stifle and mirror, respectively, artistic creation, the "Circe" episode explores Bloom's alienation in terms of public performance (this is a theatrical episode) and personal identity (the play is Bloom's nightmare). In light of Stephen's proclamation in "Telemachus" that history is a nightmare, the "Circe" episode becomes Bloom's interpretation of how history converges upon the self and helps shape individual identity, which calls attention to the intersections of private/public; individual/collective; memory/history. "Metempsychosis" links Bloom's Jewishness to historical threads that he never encountered firsthand. History becomes a part of personal memory, fuelling Bloom's dark, fractured nightmare, which readers connect to events outside the text's parameters. "Circe" retreats into Bloom's unconscious while insisting that this psychic world that improvises and revises his day simultaneously accounts for the historical and cultural record. It is no coincidence that the episode occurs in nighttown—the margins of acceptable Dublin society—and involves Bloom's acting out his neuroses. That "Circe" is a chapter about anxieties is an understatement; it explores the complex field of play between sexuality, ethnicity, and nationalism. The structure of "Circe"—it is a performance; it is a surreal dream/nightmare; it is a play—all contribute to the sense of ambiguity that defines this

episode. Bloom's alienation plays out in this episode in which his sexuality, national identity, and Jewishness converge. And it is in this dream state that the psychic connections between Bloom and Stephen are made explicit.

At the beginning of the "Circe" episode, two night watchmen survey Bloom's dream, which establishes that the nightmare play will be performed in front of an audience, whether by a regulatory body or an observing reader. Unlike the nightwatch who stand guard over Bloom's thoughts, readers are privy to what has led to many of Bloom's fantasies; they are foreshadowed in the text proper, as well as being allusions to external social history. Because Joyce encourages us to make associative links about Bloom's thoughts, "Circe" is a combined performance of Bloom's personal experience and the readers' collective memory. The opening of "Circe" contains a surveillance element (represented by the English watchmen) and a carnivalesque (the idiot, the pygmy woman, and a disheveled prostitute) that links the margins and the center as interdependent. Kimberly Devlin traces the use of regulatory vision, concentrating on its use in "Circe," seeing the watchmen as "enforcers of moral law (no obscene letter writing), civic law (no public defecation), and—by extension—cultural law (no ideological idiosyncrasies): they ensure a 'proper' interpellation in a colonialist, classist, racist, and sexist order" (54). While Devlin works from the historical fact that Dublin was the most policed zone in the United Kingdom, I would like to extend her argument to the pseudo-scientific ideologies circulating at this time that justified the occupation, surveillance, and regulation of Ireland by connecting it to a specifically Jewish experience of difference.[111] Bloom's anxieties all spring from this double-colonized relationship he has as Jewish and Irish.

[111] Devlin opens her article with the historical fact that "Dublin and other Irish cities constituted the most heavily policed zones of the United Kingdom" (45) citing Joseph O'Brien's book *"Dear, Dirty Dublin": A City in Distress, 1899-1916*. Berkley: U of California P, 1982.

The trial sequence in "Circe" touches upon several major theories on sex and race that were used to justify the occupation of Ireland and the treatment of British Jews as truncated Citizens. Richard Ellmann's biography on Joyce claims that Otto Weininger's *Sex and Character* influenced the characterization of Bloom and his relationship with women.[112] Though Marilyn Reizbaum points out that Ellmanns' assertions are not founded on any documentation that Joyce actually read the widely popular Weininger, the claim is justified by the commercial success and global dialogue that Weininger's work produced. It is Dr. Mulligan who diagnoses Bloom as a "finished example of the new womanly man…he is about to have a baby" (493-494). The idea that Jews were a third sex was common in the 1880s and 90s. The myth of the Jewish man who can menstruate and/or give birth represented the confluence of several major trends in scientific thinking. In what follows, I quote Boyarin because he artfully sums up what enabled this Jewish "womanly man" to be fixed in the cultural imagination. Boyarin argues that there were "three deeply intertwined cultural events: the racialization/gendering of anti-Semitism, the fin de siècle production of sexualities, including the 'homosexual,' and the sharp increase in contemporary Christian homophobic discourse" (208-209). Bloom's pregnancy in the "Circe" episode combines these cultural imaginings, and Joyce suggests that the same rhetoric used to make Jewish men into women was used to encourage a misshapen masculinity in Ireland. The idea of birth and artistic productivity is already established in the "Oxen in the Sun" episode, so Bloom's pregnancy is not an indictment of his alternative masculinity, but rather an affirmation of his difference. Joyce suggests that masculinity need not be a destructive force, but a productive one that reshapes the national and cultural terrain.

[112] See Richard Ellmann's *James Joyce*. New York: Oxford UP, 1982: 477.

Bloom's pregnancy, a biological impossibility, becomes a creative alternative; however, in "Scylla and Charybdis" Stephen explains paternity's destructive force upon creation and art. In this episode Stephen's views creation—biological and artistic—as a violent debt at once continually owed and denied, "Paternity may be a legal fiction" (207). Stephen suggests Shakespeare fathered himself in an attempt to escape the anxiety of influence ("he was and felt himself the father of his race") by renouncing his position as son (208). In his characteristically confident manner, Stephen aligns himself with Shakespeare, rejects the Irish Literary Renaissance, and disavows paternity and, in turn, national art. Joyce complicates this reading of self-fathering by including several references to Jews and an appearance by Bloom at the end of the episode. In an episode replete with literary forefathers, the Jew, whose own contributions to Western society are often elided by a normative Christian linear reading of the "Old" and "New" testaments, becomes the greatest victim of an anxiety of influence.[113]

Bloom, as he does throughout *Ulysses*, rewrites paternity, not as a violent act but as a dialogical inheritance. Stuart Gilbert writes that the "Scylla and Charybdis" episode employs a dialectic technique; however, the dialogic method works equally as well. The dialogical method—popularized by Bakhtin— describes a Judaic engagement with texts of intergenerational Talmudic dialogues that value all contributions. In contrast with the dialectic method of linear thought where one idea overthrows another—much like a son overthrowing his father—the dialogic method presents creation as a continual renewal, not a violent paternity. In the national library surrounded by the creators of Western civilization, Stephen argues "fatherhood, in the sense of conscious begetting, is unknown to man. It is a mystical estate."

[113] The father-son relationship between Judaism and Christianity was noted by Freud in *Moses and Monotheism*, which asserts that the son must violently overthrow his father. For Freud this configuration explains historical anti-Semitism.

Bloom who acts as Stephen's father-guide in *Ulysses* rewrites Western literary inheritance by presenting paternity as an emotional engagement with the past and future. "The wandering jew," as Buck Mulligan mockingly labels Bloom, is connected to artistic creation both as a literary forefather and present example of cosmopolitan identity (217). Stephen must grapple with what it means to be a son, to have a cultural inheritance, and to have an aesthetic mission that will shape the future. Joyce reiterates that Bloom's difference offers the way forward as Ireland negotiates its relationship with its many fathers—whether the English nation, the Roman-Catholic church, or Western literature.

From the mouth of J.J. O'Molloy, who first appears in "Aeolus," comes a reiteration of Bloom's racial and gender difference. Like the Citizen before him, O'Molloy's interrogation of Bloom depends upon binaries of native/alien and man/woman, attributing Bloom's alleged disrespect of Mary Driscoll to his status as a "poor foreign immigrant…hereditary…the alleged guilty occurrence being quite permitted in my client's native place…that he is of Mongolian extraction and irresponsible for his actions" (463). Joyce depicts Bloom as part of the exotic orient while mimicking arguments found in British propaganda meant to explain the global subjugation of non-English peoples. Bloom's alleged "Mongolian" heritage makes him not responsible for his actions. This logic harkens back to the British colonization of both China and India, which the English justified in similar terms—that the Indians and Chinese were racially incapable of self-government. An idea made popular by such ethnographers as Sir Richard Burton, the British Empire believed racial backgrounds had corresponding systems of government. Self-government and nation building were iconic moments of masculinity, and in the hands of ethnographers, subjugated men were feminized in order to explain and justify their colonial predicament. In what was a widely popular travel log published in 1886, Burton's *The*

Sotadic Zone anticipates and enables many of Weininger's assertions about race and gender. Burton, like Weininger, gendered racial difference: there is "a moral difference between the male and female races of history, so I suspect a mixed physical temperament effected by the manifold subtle influences masses together in the world climate" (Burton 204). Burton was one of the first to conflate racial difference as a legible gender difference, and this nebulous understanding of personal and group identities proved fruitful for reinforcing the imperial hierarchy within and outside of England. It is clear that Joyce was familiar with these early explanations of colonial oppression; they were widely disseminated and accepted. Joyce, by making Bloom Jewish, brings to the forefront the use of science to explain political injustice. Bloom's ethnicity is not just an interesting twist, but a comment on Ireland's colonial predicament, the scientific racism propounding Irish degeneracy, and the construction of Irish masculinity in response to these discourses. O'Molloy's description of Bloom engages the same ideology used to fight against Home Rule. With O'Molloy's reenactment of colonial discourse—his mimicry of the English—he convicts Bloom while reinforcing his own servitude. In dramatic form, Bloom acts out his internalized alienation, while his lascar costume reinforces his subservient role within the British Empire. In the course of a single page, Joyce demonstrates how what we now call orientalism, scientific racism, and imperialism worked in tandem to harness and exploit these concepts.

As Bloom is increasingly made into an ethnic caricature, his crimes against Irish women increase; Mrs. Bellingham accuses him of staring at her "peerless globes" and of being a spanking fetishist. While these accusations have a certain humor to them— Bloom's sincere insistence that "refined birching…stimulate[s] the circulation" is a quirky blend of high and low humor—the underlying historical violence of the scene tempers such a reading. Instead, Mrs. Bellingham's calls to "Thrash the mongrel…geld him. Vivisect him" allude to both the

terrorizing of black men in the US South (gelding or castration was a popular addition to lynching) and to continental sexology that thought the body was a decipherable text. Her desire for a vivisection and her belief that a thorough inspection of Bloom's body will reveal some organic truth echoes the work of sexologists such as Cesare Lombroso, Sir Burton, and Weininger.[114] The accusation of sexual violence links the Irish and Jews; Joyce invokes a classic case of paranoia, ethnicity, and national health by his reference to the Whitechapel murders. The allusion of Jack the Ripper by the First Watch makes explicit the connection between racial and sexual degeneracy.[115] The accusation of sexual violence links the Irish and Jews. Both Jewish and Irish immigrants were accused of the Whitechapel murders, and the location itself was a space in which the two immigrant groups struggled.[116] Joyce chooses these broad allusions to create an atmosphere in "Circe" that encourages sympathies between the Irish and Jewish predicaments, while maintaining an ironic distance about the fictions circulating about Bloom and minorities. Though the image of the Ripper indicates that Bloom's sins are sexual or violent, his jury accuses him of having "no fixed abode" and being "a perfect stranger" (470/472). Bloom's sexual deviance connects with his status as a wanderer, an outsider. These escalating accusations from sexual deviant to alien within Ireland join Bloom's masculinity and ethnicity.

---

[114] As Siobahn Somerville argues in the introduction to race in *Sexology Uncensored*, "behind anatomical measurements lay the assumption that the body was a legible text, with various keys or languages available to reading its symbolic code" (202).

[115] For a lengthy exploration of the "Jewish" Jack the Ripper, see Sander Gilman's chapter, "The Jewish Murderer: Jack the Ripper, Race, and Gender" in *The Jews' Body* (New York: Routledge, 1991): 104-127.

[116] During the mid-nineteenth century Irish immigrants settled in the White Chapel area of London. Along with Irish immigrants, a large population of Eastern European Jews settled the area. Many of the women murdered by Jack the Ripper had Irish names, reinforcing the vulnerability of the immigrant population of White Chapel and adding yet another brutal turn in England’s colonial history.

Bloom's moderate nationalism that we witnessed earlier in the "Cyclops" episode morphs into a delusion of founding a nation called "Bloomusalem" where Bloom fashions himself the savior of the Irish and a beloved social reformer: "My beloved subjects, a new era is about to dawn. I, Bloom, tell you verily it is even now at hand. Yea, on the word of a Bloom, ye shall ere long enter into the golden city which is to be, the new Bloomusalem in the Nova Hibernia of the future" (484). Bloom's desire to found a new nation is a fantasy within his nightmare. In an episode that feminizes Bloom, his fantastical role as Moses of Ireland replaces his sexual indeterminacy with a traditionally masculine role model. Moses becomes an antidote to Bloom's Jewish anxiety; he wants to usher in an age of "reform of municipal morals and the plain ten commandments. New worlds for old. Union of all, jew Moslem and gentile…Esperanto the universal brotherhood. No more patriotism of barspongers and dropsical imposters. Free money, free love and a free lay church in a free lay state" (490). A new Ireland that incorporates all cultures by reforming its parochialism will become a free state. Bloom is called "the world's greatest reformer" by the crowds in his dream and he embraces Parnell, thus literalizing the connection between Jewish emancipation and Irish Home Rule. As Bloom states: "(*Embraces John Howard Parnell.*) We thank you from our heart, John, for this right royal welcome to green Erin, the promised land of our common ancestors" (483). Bloom's temperate nationalism, as depicted in "Cyclops," along with his revision of gender expectations through his Jewish masculinity, suggests what Joyce saw as an alternative to the violent nationalism that gripped Ireland. Neil Davison's "Cyclops," Sinn Féin, and "The Jew": An Historical Reconsideration" traces Joyce's increasing distaste for the Sinn Féin movement, noting that initially he supported its maxims: "This support stemmed in part from two key notions which Joyce had inherited from his Home Rule background: neither the Church nor British Liberalism bring about independence,

and only a leader with the charisma and intelligence of a Parnell could unify the Irish people through non-violent measures" (246). While Davison offers a thorough reading of "Cyclops," he does not connect Joyce's views on nationalism and masculinity in the "Circe" episode. By reading the two episodes in concert, Joyce's views on Irish nationalism and masculinity become clearer; Bloom's Mosaic fantasy becomes a reinvestment in Parnell's non-violent reform and in its deviation from the standard depictions and performances of Irish masculinity. The figuring of Parnell as an Irish Moses is made explicit in Joyce's 1912 essay "The Shade of Parnell" written after the third Home Rule Bill passed: "the extraordinary personality of a leader who, without forensic gifts or any original political talent, forced the greatest English politicians to carry out his orders; and, like another Moses, led a turbulent and unstable people from the house of shame to the verge of the Promised Land" (225). Interestingly, Joyce sees Parnell's physical and emotional difference as part of his skilful leadership. In terms that anticipate Bloom's performance of masculinity, Joyce argues that "Parnell defies critical analysis. He had a speech defect and a delicate physique; he was ignorant of the history of his native land; his short and fragmentary speeches lacked eloquence, poetry, and humour; his cold and formal bearing separated him from his own colleagues; he was a Protestant" (225). Parnell's difference becomes the source of his power, with Joyce encouraging a reclamation of such masculinity in the quest for national independence. Parnell and Bloom overlap, and it is here that Joyce plays with and pushes the limits of identity, asking readers to see non-violent, nationalist movements as viable options. In doing so, Joyce extends the definition of what it is to be a man and how definitions of masculinity directly influence national culture and independence.

If Bloom's ultimate fantasy is to be an Irish Moses, Stephen's reality is similar. Stephen struggles to balance the pressure of using his talents for the betterment of his people with

maintaining artistic integrity. His artistry and mastery of language become the tools by which he can, as he states in "Circe," "kill the priest and the king" (589). Just like the two masters who Stephen struggles against in "Telemachus," Ireland must rid itself of the Church and the English in order to become autonomous. Bloom's dreams relate to Stephen's expectations to be a Mosaic figure for his people. In "Aeolus," Stephen is urged by the editor to "write something for me…Something with bite in it. You can do it. I see it in your face. *In the lexicon of youth*…Put us all into it" (135). To write an editorial that encompasses the feelings of all Dubliners is not a task Stephen accepts for it requires that he temper his artistic inspiration to meet the needs of a nationalist cause. As Stephen is asked to sublimate his individual art to a national cause he becomes a reluctant Moses called upon to lead his people. Much like the youthful Moses invoked later in the chapter by John F. Taylor, Stephen's role as a mosaic figure melds the enslavement of the Hebrews in Egypt with the colonial occupation of the Irish.[117] Writing and language connect in the "Aeolus" chapter as a non-violent means of obtaining Irish independence. The consistent use of Passover and Mosaic images brings Stephen and Bloom closer in sympathy than the other Irish men soliciting Stephen's editorial. As Steven Connor argues, this demand for speech or an address of national concern plagues both Stephen and Bloom:

> It will become evident that the concern with national or cultural identity in the novel, a concern that manifests itself particularly, of course, with the relations between Irishness and Jewishness, is focused interestingly in a number of occasions or situations in which the addressive function of language—speaking, calling, appealing *to* certain persons—is to the fore. I will suggest that recognizing and acknowledging cultural identity is in *Ulysses* very often a matter of being summoned into it by certain kinds of address, especially public address, which my be inviting or (as is more usually the case in *Ulysses*) hostile (220).

[117] In a recounting of John F. Taylor's speech, it is purported he said, "I stood in ancient Egypt and that I was listening to the speech of some highpriest of that land addressed to the youthful Moses….I heard his words and their meaning was revealed to me" (*Ulysses* 142).

In the editorial room of the newspaper, the importance of speaking one's difference and writing one's independence is made explicit. The best means to national independence is consistently speaking out in newspapers and public forums. This literary pursuit of nationalism replaces the violence of Sinn Féin with Stephen's artistic inclinations and the new cultural inheritance he will find in Bloom's paternity.

While *Ulysses* presents art as a means to national independence, *Nightwood* disavows culture and nationalism entirely. Guido and Felix, who fetishize the past's relics, appear for the last time in "Where the Tree Falls." Guido has become a trembling neurotic who visits palaces and churches: "as time passed it became increasingly evident that [Guido], if born to anything, had been born to holy decay. Mentally deficient and emotionally excessive, an addict to death" (107). High European culture has destroyed the father and son; their temperaments reflect the failings of the church and the nation contained within the "declining houses" they revere (107). Father and son are left wandering in search of aristocracy, hoping to resurrect a failed past. Felix and Guido embody modernist alienation: neither history nor religion can offer solace. History, in Barnes's hands and according to the Doctor, is the record of national failings: "Our faulty racial memory is fathered by fear. Destiny and history are untidy; we fear memory of that disorder" (118). Barnes's previous descriptions of Felix and Guido highlight their Jewishness, connecting history to this heritage. However, this last scene expands cultural decay to all civilizations; the memory of violence, fear, and disorder haunts everyone. The novel ends without resolution, while positioning Felix's Jewish body as the modernist body.

Reading *Ulysses* and *Nightwood* together reveals Modernism's complex relationship with Jewishness. Modernism's preoccupation with nationalism, sexuality, and cultural identity made the Jewish body, in particular the male body, a salient trope. While *Ulysses* was written before

Nightwood, each novel remains significant to the other: Joyce's influence can be felt throughout most of twentieth-century literature, and Barnes's depictions of Jews and homosexuals in *Nightwood* play with and extend many of Joyce's points about marginalized subjectivities. The Jewish body, a compelling figure in Modernist literature, remains an intriguing part of exploring the politics and the aesthetics of the literary period.

Chapter 5

Jewish Modernism in 1939

My last chapter addresses Homi Bhabha's declaration that “We need another time of *writing* that will be able to inscribe the ambivalent and chiasmatic intersections of time and place that constitute the problematic ‘modern’ experience of the western nation. How does one write the nation's modernity as the event of the everyday and the advent of the epochal?" ("DissemiNation" 293). If narration is the mechanism by which nations are formed and maintained, as the anthology *Nation and Narration* argues, the Jewish Diaspora and Jewish memory occupy a peculiar place in the forming of the Western nation-state. While my previous chapters have demonstrated ways that novelists used the figure of the Jew to create and critique their nations, I turn now to three Jewish writers, Sigmund Freud, Walter Benjamin, and Gertrude Stein, whose relationship to time and memory speaks to the paradox of modernity and nationalism that Bhabha captures. These writers’ works merge the quotidian with the epic toll of living as Jews in Hitler's Europe. Freud, Benjamin, and Stein employ what I call *Jewish modernism*, or a response to particular facets of modernity as informed by a Hebraic cultural past. This chapter examines the influence of a Jewish inheritance on Freud, Stein, and Benjamin, while exploring how their shared cultural heritage emerges in their works. I focus on writings produced and/or published in 1939; a year that marks a crisis for Jews that the impending war and heightened persecution signal. Looking at Benjamin's "Theses on the Philosophy of History," Freud's *Moses and Monotheism*, and Stein's *Paris France*, I explore each writer's Jewish ethical legacy: how each text fashions a contemporary response rooted in the Hebraic tradition, to an epic crisis emerging from more than two thousand years of Hellenistic thought

that will soon culminate in the Holocaust that Benjamin, Freud, and Stein so hauntingly anticipate. The previous chapters explored how Jews were represented by non-Jewish writers examining developments as far-reaching as global capitalism, Darwinism, and nationalism. Jews in texts such as Scott's *Ivanhoe* and Joyce's *Ulysses* show how crucially the Jewish figure—in particular the Jewish male—functions in modernity's literary imagination while hailing so many of the epoch's preeminent concerns.[118] As I have shown, Jewish characters figure heavily in evolving societies bereft of stable signifiers such as class, race, and gender. With this last chapter, however, it is time to let Jewish writers represent themselves while *they* grapple with the events leading up to World War II.

Yosef Yerushalmi famously synopsizes that Judaism's "injunction to remember [was] only in Israel and nowhere else [a] religious imperative of an entire people" (*Zakhor* 416). I would like briefly to define Jewish memory as a starting point for my analysis of Freud, Benjamin, and Stein. The injunction to remember is both a religious imperative and a means by which to navigate in, and make sense of, the present moment. Memory, in the Jewish tradition, functions as a mode of cognition by preserving the meaning of history while promoting an ethics that is profoundly ahistorical and nonlinear.[119] In Jewish memory, meaning is always at a crisis point, manifesting itself in textual discourse (the Talmud), which is in a perpetual state of revision. Meaning is never fixed in Jewish memory or ethics.[120] Perhaps this seems intuitive to

[118] For more on Jewish representation and Modernism see Maren Tova Linett's . *Modernism, Feminism, and Jewishness.* New York: Cambridge UP, 2007.
[119] While there are several Jewish traditions from Sephardic to Ashkenazi, or the Babylonian to the Jerusalem Talmud, the injunction to remember unifies global Jewry. All Jews, regardless of cultural background or denomination are responsible for maintaining Jewish memory.
[120] To remember is an ethical injunction in Judaism. "Jewish Memory" is not a genetic inheritance, but an intergenerational mode of thinking that privileges the act of remembering *as* a religious ritual. One needs only to attend a Seder to hear the injunction to remember presented

a generation of scholars who have nursed themselves upon Derridian deconstruction, but to lose sight of the rabbinic origins of much of our contemporary theory limits our understanding of Jewish writers' aesthetic presentation of an ethical tradition.[121] If we recognize the genesis of radical uncertainty coupled with the Jewish obsession with interpretation then we may better understand how seemingly dissimilar genres and authors are linked.[122]

Jewish memory stands in opposition to a linear construction of time, one that is firmly entrenched in Greek and (then) Christian traditions which insist that meaning is teleological and history progressive. Understanding how memory functions in Hebrew thought, as well as how it shapes Jewish culture, illuminates the *Jewish* counter to non-Jewish nineteenth-century characterizations and representations of Judaism. All three of our Jewish writers engage nineteenth-century social theory and philosophy that describes Judaism as an unthinking, unenlightened adherence to written law. Matthew Arnold's *Culture and Anarchy*, which seeks to define Hebraism's edict to follow law in contrast with Hellenism's preoccupation with external truth, encapsulates what has mostly been a misreading of Jewish philosophy. Jewish philosophy is not a blind adherence to immutable law as Matthew Arnold, Hegel, and Kant argued.[123] This

---

as an ethical act by Jews. For more on Jewish Memory, see Yerushalmi's *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory*. Seattle: U of Washington P, 1989.

[121] I am here indebted to Susan A. Handelman's *The Slayers of Moses: The Emergence of Rabbinic Interpretation in Modern Literary Theory*, which traces how Jewish religious thought (from Mt. Sinai, the destruction of the Second Temple, to the present) has influenced contemporary literary criticism from Derrida and Lacan to Harold Bloom.

[122] How we shape history through memory has profound ethical implications. This concept was secularized by Maurice Halbwachs's *On Collective Memory*, which argued that collective memory was selective and therefore had ethical implications for the sociology of knowledge. Any recent criticism that "reclaims" the past works from Halbwach, who was informed by Judaism's injunction to remember.

[123]Matthew Arnold's *Culture and Anarchy* stated that "the uppermost idea with Hebraism is conduct and obedience…The governing idea of Hellenism is spontaneity of consciousness; that of Hebraism, strictness of conscience" (76-77). Arnold's characterization of Jews as law-bound has its origins in the teachings of Paul the Apostle, who privileged absolute faith—realized

insistence on Jewish philosophy as retrogressive depends on an over-emphasis of the written portion of Mosaic Law, also known as the Hebrew Bible, or the "Old" Testament. Nineteenth-century philosophy emphasized the "old" aspect of the Hebrew Bible, seeing its basic insistence on following God's commandments as too literal, stifling, and anti-philosophical. In an effort to promote the "newness" of the Christian interpretation of scripture, nineteenth-century philosophy ignored the oral tradition of Mosaic law, or the injunction to remake the Torah anew.[124] Nineteenth-century philosophy removed all vitality from Judaism by defining it only by the written Torah, rather than the oral Talmud, which is ever-changing, reflexive, and contextual. The vitality and aesthetic potential in the oral Talmud allowed Benjamin, Stein, and Freud to write against the dominant paradigm of linear, Christian culture.

---

through the consciousness of Jesus—to works, conduct, obedience to law. Paul felt that neither Jews nor gentiles were compelled to adhere to Jewish law. In a Hellenic break from Judaism, Paul, newly converted to Christianity, claimed the Hebrew God to be universal (as revealed through his son), rather than particular to the Jews; this appeal to the universal signals one of the crucial breaks between Hebraic and Hellenic thought, one that Paul, via his conversion, inaugurates. For more on Hebrew and Greek thinking, see Handelman, *Slayers* (1982); Boman, *Hebrew Thought Compared With Greek* (1960). According to Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit* (1807) "every cultural form makes some true, genuine contribution to world history (and the world Spirit), after which it is sublated (*aufgehoben)* and disappears from the historical scene" (Yovel xii). In Hegelian dialectics, the Jewish contribution is relegated to the past, while contemporary Jewry remains obsolete and unconnected to the present. Kant, likewise, believed that Judaism adhered to formal laws at the expense of universalism and spiritualism—the two main facets he claimed for religion. Christianity had obtained these two conceits, while Judaism remained a nationalist, particularized code of ethics. Kant's *The Critique of Reason* posits that Judaism's faith in the law is secondary to Christianity's spiritual faith. Arnold, Hegel, and Kant all relegate Judaism to the past and do not deal with Jews as people; instead, Judaism functions as a mirror for Christianity's evolution. For more on Kant and Hegel's views on Judaism see Yirmiyahu Yovel's *Dark Riddle: Hegel, Nietzsche, and the Jews*.

[124] In defense of nineteenth-century philosophy, the rejection of the oral portion of the Torah has always been the major rift between Christians and Jews. Christians believe only in the written portion of the Torah, the Hebrew Bible, seeing it as the fulfillment of the word in the body of Christ. This ‘fulfillment’ curtails interpretation and fixes meaning, which is most un-rabbinic. Paul the Apostle, not Jesus, was responsible for the split of Written from Oral Torah.

It is here that we find the intersection of memory and nationalism and its relevance to modernity. The three works I look at attempt to make sense of an exceptional present; by 1939, Hitler was in power, fascism was rampant, and the deportations of Jews to concentration camps was underway. These incidents and atrocities were not created in a vacuum, nor can they be dismissed as 'evil.' Instead, the rise of nationalism and the nation-state during the nineteenth-century coincides with a remaking of memory—the creation of the nation state is founded upon a mythic collective memory.[125] Yerushalmi connects the rise of the nation state with "the golden age of European historiography," or when historians were writing their nations into existence.[126] With the rise of the nation-state, Jewish memory became an impediment to emancipation and full citizenship; Yerushalmi argues, "Europe was demanding of the Jews alone that, as a condition for their emancipation, they cease to regard themselves as a nation and redefine themselves in purely religious terms" (*Zakhor* 88). Jewish memory endangered a secular, universalist state's reimagining of itself. The Jews were asked to forget so that each nation-state could remember a mythic past. And in this way, all three of our writers were emancipated—they were all citizens of their respective countries; nationalism reformulated Jewish memory for Jews and non-Jews as Jewish history, where it could be safely relegated to a dead past, with no claim on the present. The stipulation to forget Jewish memory as the cost for emancipation was widely debated within and without the Jewish communities of Europe. Julius Wellhausen, German theology scholar, argued that "the so-called emancipation of the Jews must inevitably lead to the extinction of Judaism wherever the process is extended beyond the political to the social sphere"

[125] By now Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities* has made this point and is widely accepted.

[126] My first chapter on Scott's *Ivanhoe* highlights this remaking of the past in order to create a cohesive national identity. The rise of historiography in many ways inspires Scott's ironic reworking of nationalism.

(*Prolegomena* 486). He also argues that the Jews fabricated their history (everything pre-destruction of the first Temple, more or less). His thesis is that Jewish history is thus fraudulent, and that now (the 1870s) is the time to sweep it away, for Jews to assimilate, or become extinct. Wellhausen's views were popular during the nineteenth-century during which Hegelian dialectics rendered, "post-Christian Jewish life as a dead repetition of meaningless existence." (Yovel xiii). Jews who still practiced Judaism, or obeyed the injunction to remember, were forestalling progress. Hitler takes this to its "logical" conclusion, arguing that since Jewish assimilation is impossible, their extinction is unavoidable. German philosophy and Protestantism's insistence on the progressive nature of history, visualized as a march away from the origins of Christianity, situated Judaism as an obsolete religion and Jews temporally displaced in the present. Many Jewish thinkers answered nineteenth century anti-Semitism with emancipation and assimilation, confining their Jewish legacy to history's past, not Jewish memory's present. And perhaps without modernity hitting a critical, cruel mass in the Holocaust, Freud, Stein, and Benjamin could have maintained the lines between nation and religion, each performing a diasporic cosmopolitanism.

Jewish assimilation blended multiple, even opposing, identities, embracing what would now be labeled cosmopolitanism. In particular, Freud, Benjamin, and Stein's families were part of this cultural phenomenon that began during the mid-nineteenth century. This cultural milieu, what I call diasporic cosmopolitanism, prepared Jewish writers and thinkers to view their identities as hybrid and independent of fixed categories—a move that rejected the certainty of nineteenth-century philosophy for the improvisation of modernist aesthetics. Amanda Anderson's "Cosmopolitanism, Universalism and the Divided Legacies of Modernity" states "there is of course a term that throughout its long philosophical, aesthetic, and political history

has been used to denote cultivated detachment from restrictive forms of identity, and that term is *cosmopolitanism*" (266). By this definition, Stein's expatriotism, Freud's scientific psychology, and Benjamin's messianic Marxism all qualify as cosmopolitan. None adhere to restrictive identity politics and it is not until their later works that they engage Jewish cultural legacy. Benjamin was exceptional; he engaged Jewish mysticism while identifying as both a Marxist and an Anarchist. If cosmopolitanism is a freeing form of self-identification, it is also a political aesthetic that is receptive to difference. Cosmopolitanism is by definition dependent upon multiplicity and hybridity; it rejects nationalism's uniformity: "diasporic cultures unsettle conventional conceptions of ethnicity and identity" (Anderson 273). Consisting of Jews living abroad (such as Stein), or living in Europe as emancipated citizens (Benjamin and Freud), the Jewish Diaspora disrupted manufactured feelings of national sentiment, forcing Jews and gentiles to reevaluate what it meant to belong within a nation-state and how to incorporate difference into a universalist liberalism.

By 1939 many thinkers and artists were overtly critical of fascism and nationalism. If Jews during this time were being made to suffer their difference through a curtailing of their rights, it was also a time when Jewish memory had the potential to combat fascism and modernity's insistence upon unifying narratives (*Grande Histoire*), origins, and determinacy (Friedman 497).[127] Homi Bhabha identifies these Modernist trends as part of Western literature's quest to justify its existence: "Western tradition['s] demand for a literary tradition, a history, is

[127] Susan Stanford Friedman's "Defintional Excursions: The Meanings of Modern/Modernity/Modernism" highlights some of the parts of Modernity/Modernism that tended toward fascism. Notice this idea of the "Grande Histoire" correlates very well with T.S. Eliot's aesthetic principles, which have been widely understood as anti-Semitic and anti-cosmopolitan. For more on Eliot's obsession with a unifying narrative and fixity, see Maud Ellmann's "The Imaginary Jew: T.S. Eliot and Ezra Pound" in Cheyette's *Between 'Race' and Culture* (1996).

put exactly in the same historicist and realist terms—the familiar quest for an origin that will authorize a beginning" ("Representation" 96). Bhabha positions postcolonial theory as an antidote to the "collusion between historicism and realism," and narrative and nation (96). Working against what he sees as an injurious Western literary tradition, Bhabha proposes his critical alternative:

> There is however, another way of raising the issue of the representation of the colonial subject…It proposes that the category of literature, as of its history, is necessary and thoroughly mediated: that its reality is not given but produced; its meanings transformative, historical, and relational rather than revelatory; its continuity and coherence underscored by division and difference. This other view demands quite another notion of the historical inscription of literature and entails a critique of representation as simply given. (96)

Framed in this way, postcolonial theory works against the Hellenizing trends of the West. If meaning is not given but produced, Bhabha has effectively dismissed the notion of *logos*, or the idea that there is an *external* truth found in nature. Instead, he posits that history and meaning are made and mediated by perspective and experience. Though he does not acknowledge this inheritance, Bhabha, as are most postcolonial theorists, is firmly indebted to rabbinic tradition and its radical uncertainty of meaning and insistence on context. Susan Handelman's reading of rabbinic thought highlights the affinities that rabbinic and postcolonial thinking share: "The avoidance of a spatial and temporal logic of structure that is essentially linear and sequential; the rejection of the notion of the finality of each discrete portion of the text; and the destruction of the unity or integrity of that as maintained by a series of genealogical connections" (*Slayers* 142). Rabbinic interpretation is politically and aesthetically postcolonial: it rejects teleology, linear time, conceptions of progress, and the stability of the sign and signified, and instead sees time and memory as cyclical and associative.

I bring these two traditions together to show how Freud, Stein, and Benjamin mined Jewish aesthetic tradition to create what amounts to a postcolonial (or rabbinic) critique and rejection of the political climate of 1939. Unsettling nationalism by using a rabbinic interpretation of time executes many of the same goals Bhabha proposes for postcolonial theory. It is no coincidence that at a time when European Jewry was in crisis, Jewish writers, who had never directly engaged Jewish memory as part of their aesthetic, suddenly employ rabbinic, Jewish thought. Fascism insists upon biological unity as foundational to the nation-state and the validity of geographical and racial origins to unify. Global Jewry, however, does not fit within this paradigm, as Jews are marked as both racial and cultural outsiders. If, as Benedict Anderson and Edward Said have argued, the nation, for all its newness, must find a historical origin within the mythical past, Jews and Jewish culture rupture this tidy reading of time and place.[128]

I read Freud, Benjamin, and Stein as postcolonials who deconstruct power dynamics while exposing as fraudulent the foundations upon which nation-states oppress, colonize, and silence minority opposition.[129] Each writer explicitly mentions Germany's national (read: destructive, anti-Semitic) agenda. Hitler's Germany was the logical culmination of nineteenth-century philosophy: linear progressive history, a faith in an external truth, and a belief in the

[128] See Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities* and Edward Said's *Beginnings*.
[129] For more on how post-colonialism interacts with the "Jewish Question" see Aamir R. Mufti's *Enlightenment in the Colony: The Jewish Question and the Crisis of Postcolonial Culture*, which argues that the Jewish experience in Europe reflected many of the same power dynamics found in colonial India. In the most literal sense, the Jewish Diaspora was caused by Roman occupation and colonization in 63BCE when Pompey conquered Israel and put it under Roman jurisprudence and administration. While this captures the narrow, literal definition of "post-colonial," I am more interested in how nationalism and minority populations depend on each other for definitional scaffolding, not a strict chronological history of colonization, de-colonization, and emerging statehood that characterized post-1960s nationalization. The Jewish experience, along with its post-colonial roots, must also account for assimilation and secularization, which are tied to a liberal universalism.

efficacy of science. By understanding the intersections between the rabbinic tradition, postcolonial theory, and the politics of both, Walter Benjamin's “The Storyteller” and “Theses on the Philosophy of History” help decipher Sigmund Freud's enigmatic *Moses and Monotheism*; Benjamin and Freud, meanwhile, each interrogate the cultural motives behind the frenzied rise of Nazism that threatens to exterminate European Jewry.

Freud's *Moses and Monotheism* represents a shift in Freud's work—one that sought to reinterpret a specific cultural inheritance. Freud's first title, *The Man Moses: An Historical Novel*, indicates that his imagination would be filling in the historical gaps; he states in Part II that the book was based on "psychological probabilities and lacked objective proof" (17). While his title character might be known through biblical history, Freud would be revising and reimagining the prophet. Freud started *Moses and Monotheism* in 1934, already suffering from oral cancer and watching his freedom deteriorate. I argue that Freud is indeed trying to tell a deeply personal story in an attempt to explain the present. The timeline of *Moses and Monotheism* supports such a reading: a month after the Nazis burned Sigmund Freud's books, he planned the monograph for *Moses and Monotheism*, while the day he finished the book, Freud wrote his last will and testament (Blum 119). The figure of Moses played a crucial role in Freud's work and imagination—the most well-known work example being his essay on Michelangelo's Moses.

Freud's return to the Hebrew prophet, while indicating a continued fascination with Mosaic myth, also signals a direct engagement with Jewish history, culture, and memory that is unique in the Freud canon. In particular, Freud's revision of the Moses story coincides with his own exodus from Vienna at the end of his life. Benjamin's "The Storyteller" remarks that death often brings about a life's story: "Just as a sequence of images is set in motion inside a man as his

life comes to an end—unfolding the views of himself under which he has encountered himself without being aware of it—suddenly…the unforgettable emerges and imparts to everything that concerned him…Death is the sanction of everything that the storyteller can tell" (94). Freud's revision of the Moses story functions as his encounter with his past, specifically his Jewish inheritance, which he all but ignored in his professional life.[130] No longer willing to ignore his cultural legacy, Freud experiences what Benjamin describes as the "unforgettable." Moses is more than a simple return of the repressed: he is representative of *all* Jewish memory.

That Freud revised the Moses story as a means to cope with the traumatic events suffered at the end of his life has been covered by Cathy Caruth's "Unclaimed Experience: Trauma and the Possibility of History," which notes that with trauma "we can begin to recognize the possibility of a history which is no longer straightforwardly referential" (182). While Caruth is right to situate *Moses and Monotheism* as a method of reliving the trauma of anti-Semitism, Freud's trauma lies in his use of Moses in reclaiming and revising of history with his use of Moses. What Caruth characterizes as the "no longer straightforwardly referential," Benjamin would define as Messianic time. It is not enough to see *Moses and Monotheism* as a working through of trauma. We must also look at what Freud's contemporary Walter Benjamin was saying about memory and ethics to understand that Freud's revising of Moses was a critique of contemporary anti-Semitism. In "Theses on the Philosophy of History," written in January 1940, Benjamin defines messianic time's role in an ethical engagement with the present: "The past carries with it a temporal index by which it is referred to redemption. There is a secret agreement

[130] Freud's professional silence on Judaism was very likely an act of self-preservation. He feared that if psychoanalysis was labeled a "Jewish science" the wider scientific world would not validate it. This anxiety is reflected in a letter in which Freud compared himself to Moses and his disciple, Jung, to Joseph. Freud initially was excited about the prospect of the gentile Jung spreading and validating psychoanalysis. For more on Freud and Jung's relationship see Yerushalmi's *Freud's Moses* (1991).

between past generations and the present one. Our coming was expected on earth. Like every generation that preceded us, we have been endowed with a *weak* Messianic power, a power to which the past has a claim" (254). Benjamin's description of Messianic time figures memory as part of redemption. Moses plays a unique role in Jewish history as he brings the tradition of remembering through the Torah. In particular, the Passover ceremony, which includes Exodus, figures as a yearly return to the text, to the memory of enslavement and freedom. Moses is thus vital to both Messianic time and Jewish tradition. His is a story of remembrance, whether in the form of Exodus or in the oral Torah tradition, which insists that each generation reinterpret and refashion Mosaic Law. In this way Jewish history is not a linear tradition but one of associations and returns.

Both Freud and Benjamin are skeptical of a linear notion of history. Their characterization of contemporary events, and of how they are situated in history, contains a critique of the past as well as a conception of memory that is firmly seated in Jewish tradition. Writing before his departure from Vienna in 1938, Freud sets out the peril of a linear historical memory: "We live in very remarkable times. We find with astonishment that progress has concluded an alliance with barbarism…It is a real weight off the heart to find, in the case of the German people, that retrogression into all but prehistoric barbarism can come to pass independently of any progressive idea" (66-67). He rejects linear historical progression, insisting that just because barbarism is the current result of history, it is not the ethical one; it is instead a "retrogression" and an "astonishment." Freud is subverting a dialectical reading of time by insisting that the current barbarism is all that has come to pass compressed into one horrific present. Freud's words are hauntingly similar to Benjamin's, whose "Theses on the Philosophy of History" echoes many of Freud's concerns. Benjamin warns against being "astonished" by the

rise of Nazism and fascism: "Then we shall clearly realize that it is our task to bring about a real state of emergency, and this will improve our position in the struggle against Fascism. One reason why Fascism has a chance is that in the name of progress its opponents treat it as a historical norm. The current amazement that the things we are experiencing are 'still' possible in the twentieth century is *not* philosophical" (257). Benjamin radicalizes time by insisting that the present has no greater ethical claim than the past. To treat the present in such a way is to normalize barbarism and fascism. Instead, Benjamin suggests that the present is a state of emergency that must clearly struggle against the linear procession of time's own validation. Both of these quotes from Freud and Benjamin are indebted to a particularly Jewish concept of time and memory. Though neither explicitly mentions this debt, they are conceptually linked to Messianic time and the Mosaic law of return and revision.

Freud's revision of Moses is in keeping with Jewish tradition, though some of his major claims might at first seem injurious to it. Upon learning of *Moses and Monotheism*'s central claim that Moses was an Egyptian, many Jewish scholars reacted angrily, seeing Freud's engagement with the topic as poorly timed and damaging. Yosef Yerushalmi traces the critical reception of *Moses and Monotheism* that accused Freud of self-loathing and internalized anti-Semitism. A.S. Yahuda's famously begged Freud not to publish the book, seeing it as a "hatred of Israel" (Yerushalmi *Freud's* 113) These fears at first seem warranted if *Moses and Monotheism* is read as a narrowly focused psychological document. But Freud's purpose was far greater and more political. In light of Benjamin's explicit denouncement of fascism and its overlap with Freud's critique of German nationalism, *Moses and Monotheism* is concerned with preserving Jewish culture during a time when it was seemingly in its twilight.

Why would Freud decide to write a document that would strip Jewish history of its greatest leader? The opening sentence of the text demonstrates Freud's awareness that his revision of Moses would be damaging to Jews during a time when they most needed a hero: "To deny a people a man whom it praises as the greatest of sons is not a deed to be undertaken lightheartedly. No consideration, however, will move me to set aside truth in favor of supposed national interests" (3). But if we look closer and read *Moses and Monotheism* in its own historical context, the rise of Nazism and its emphasis on race and a biological definition of "volk," Freud is performing a brilliant sleight of hand. By making Moses an Egyptian while maintaining his contribution to Judaism, Freud has removed the genetic fallacy while maintaining Jewish cultural integrity. At a moment in history when Jews were being persecuted because of their race, and nationalism was being defined in accordance with biological belonging, Freud's insistence that the greatest Jewish hero, Moses, was not in fact a Jew, destabilizes a biological or corporeal reading of Jewishness. *Moses and Monotheism* deconstructs the myth of origins by voiding the biological imperative while validating the cultural mandate—how we remember the past—as paramount to living an ethical present.

Working from the same anxious present, Benjamin's "Theses" emphasizes the importance of memory as a means to counteract linear progress: "The concept of the historical progress of mankind cannot be sundered from the concept of it progression through homogeneous, empty time…History is the subject of a structure whose site is not homogenous, empty time, but time filled by the presence of the now" (261). Benjamin's configuring counteracts accepted versions of history that are considered progressive by the very fact that they have arrived. The present, which he describes as a Messianic now, accounts for all that has led up to and created it. Using forceful, violent images, such as "to blast open the continuum of history," "the continuum of

history explode[s]," Benjamin rails against forgetting and of reading history as a linear "bead on a rosary" (262,261,263). Benjamin rejected a manifest history that justifies itself as progress, deconstructing linear time, and, in turn, its relationship to memory. Insisting that there are chips of Messianic time in the present, he argues that history is not a series of isolated events but a constellation that *only* memory can imbue with purpose and resonance. Benjamin's conception of history, tethered to remembrance, is particularly indebted to Jewish culture and rabbinic tradition.[131] It is through remembrance—recall the annual reading of Passover Exodus in Jewish homes—that Jews are able to maintain their culture while resisting the ideology of progress which, at the time of "Theses," was advocating the demise of the Jewish people.[132] If the mechanism of people hood is memory, and culture is maintained through a collective remembrance, Jews are then the people of their own memory; this concept contrasts purposefully with Hitler's concepts of "volk," which hinged largely on biological unity.

Benjamin's reading of Messianic time and Freud's reading of Moses each revise, rework, and subvert racialized conceptions of the Jewish body and culture. Instead of having a linear or biological model of time ("empty time"), Benjamin presents us with a present dependent upon and including a past that is based on the word and law of God. Freud, meanwhile, removes Moses from a genetic transference of Judaism while maintaining the prophet's importance to a Judaism based on a faith in culture. Both Benjamin and Freud disembody Jewish history─removing it from the discourse of Darwin, biological determinism, and racism (the fuel

[131] Walter Benjamin was raised in an assimilated German-Jewish family. As an adult, Benjamin corresponded with Gershom Scholem on Jewish mysticism, with the former incorporating many of his views on Judaism into his Marxism. Benjamin synthesized his religious background with political and social causes leading Terry Eagleton to nickname him, the “Marxist Rabbi.” It is widely accepted and recorded that Judaism played a profound role in Benjamin’s life and works.
[132] Of the three writers, Benjamin was the most involved in the Talmudic tradition and studied Kabbalah with the Jewish mystic, Gerschom Scholem.

to the Nazi's fire)—while maintaining Jewish culture's autonomy and independence. Both Freud and Benjamin have managed to universalize Jewish history (if Moses is not the ideal "Jew" then who is?) while particularizing Jewish culture.

Because of Benjamin, I am able to see the historical pressures that caused Freud to revise Moses once more before dying. Deuteronomy 32:7 implores us to "Remember the days of old, consider the years of ages past." Freud in his last work is fulfilling this mandate to remember and reconsider. From this command springs a revised Moses ready for the present crisis, ready to "blast open the continuum of history." Freud defines Moses as a great man because of "his personality and through the idea for which he stands" (139). Freud's revision of Moses as an Egyptian does not erode the foundation of Jewish history, because it is founded not upon blood, but an "idea," a culture:

> We know that Moses had given the Jews the proud feeling of being God's chosen people; by dematerializing God a new, valuable contribution was made to the secret treasure of the people. The Jews preserved their inclination towards spiritual interests. The political misfortune of the nation taught them to appreciate the only possession they had retained, their written records, at its true value. (147)

As Benjamin imagined, the coming of the Messiah would "break open the continuum," so Freud similarly imbued Moses to redeem the Jewish people. By making them once more the people of memory and the book, removing Jewish legacy from Hitler's grasp, Freud and Benjamin preserve Jewish culture.

In the hall of 20 Maresfield Gardens, Freud's London home, there is a pen and ink sketch of Moses, the wind pushing him forward in time as he holds the Ten Commandments.[133] It is not recorded any photos from his Vienna residence, as the sketch was a late addition to Freud's life,

[133] The pen and ink sketch is a reproduction/interpretation of Rembrandt's *Moses Breaks the Tablets of the Law* (ca. 1655). While doing research at the Freud museum I asked the curator, Keith Davies, about the print. He claimed the print was given to Freud while living in London and was not recorded as part of the Vienna home inventory.

obtained after arriving in England. *Moses and Monotheism*, which Freud completed in London, presents Freud's formal engagement with Jewish history as the Nazis and the SS terrorize the Freud family. Freud's pen and ink of Moses correlates with Benjamin's angel of history. The two images are part of one constellation, each presenting Freud and Benjamin's conceptions of memory and its importance to Jewish culture. While Benjamin's references to Talmudic and Messianic tradition are well accepted, Freud's debt seems to be more tenuous. But as his last book and the pen and ink sketch indicate, the Moses narrative and the compulsion to remember played a profound role for Freud, and by recasting him Freud recharges the redemptive powers, and the moral imperative of the Mosaic covenant, in the face of catastrophe. Just as Benjamin's angel awaits the future by turning toward the past, so does Freud's Moses. If the foundation of hope is remembrance, then Freud's revising of Moses is *his* contribution to the present crisis, the contemporary moment. And in the words of Benjamin, "For every second of time was the strait gate through which the Messiah might enter" ("Theses" 264).

Freud's relationship to Moses inspired him in his later years, Benjamin found similar solace in a 1920 painting by Paul Klee titled *Angelus Novus*. Like the Moses sketch in Freud's London home, it served as an allegory for Benjamin's philosophy on time and history. The Angel of History is based on the Klee painting that Benjamin took with him during his escape from occupied Germany. The Angel appears in "Theses on the Philosophy of History," which was written after Benjamin's release from an internment camp in France and just before his suicide in Spain. The following excerpt from "Theses" signals the impact of Jewish legacy on Benjaminian thought, and on his critique of modernity:

> There is a painting by Klee called *Angelus Novus*. It shows an angel who seems about to move away from something he stares at. His eyes are wide, his mouth is open, his wings are spread. This is how the angel of history must look. His face is turned toward the past. Where a chain of events appears before *us, he* sees one single catastrophe, which keeps

> piling wreckage upon wreckage and hurls it at his feet. The angel would like to stay, awaken the dead, and make whole what has been smashed. But a storm is blowing from Paradise and has got caught in his wings; it is so strong that the angel can no longer close them. This storm drives him irresistibly into the future to which his back is turned, while the pile of debris before him grows toward the sky. What we call progress is *this* storm. (256)

For Benjamin, the angel of history's moral obligation is to "make whole what has been smashed." The idea of a *fragmented* world is in entrenched in a rabbinic interpretation of history that sees all events as interconnected, associative, and without regard to linear chronology. The Angel of History's painful flight is tethered to his inability to stop and interpret the past—he would like to stay, but he cannot. Instead, the implication is that only memory has the cognitive power to make whole the fragments, the smashed pieces of the world, and to order the chaos. For Benjamin, history takes its ethical turn as it morphs into memory. Handelman situates this revolution from history to memory as an act indebted to rabbinic thought: "memory…is an act of *compression* which releases an otherwise unavailable meaning. In Jewish historiography, similarly, the ancient rabbis used the interpretive technique of compression and anachronistic simultaneity to construct their own species of dialectical images, to give meaning to a history" (*Fragments* 150). Benjamin's Angel supports the fulfillment of the Jewish mandate to remember. Again, Benjamin is working against what would have been the intellectual climate of 1939 Germany, which was indebted to nineteenth century philosophy and saw time as linear. The Angel experiences the physical and psychic pain of investing in such a reading of time. History imbued with meaning becomes a memory that transcends progress's lethal march.

What is so startling about this exegesis on history is Benjamin's metaphoric poignancy. Jurgen Habermas spoke of Benjamin's lyrical vitality, describing "Theses" as "among the most moving testimonies to the Jewish spirit" (34). However, it is the prediction of the Angel of History that is so striking, moving, and so *Jewish*. In an anachronistic move, Benjamin

anticipates and connects the wreckage of history to the destruction of the Holocaust. The image of the storm creating a "pile of debris [that] grows toward the sky" is haunting when we consider that in a few short years the pile growing toward the sky will in fact be the victims of the Nazi genocide: Jews, in greatest number, but also homosexuals, communists, anarchists, clerics—anyone who did not belong to the German (Aryan) political/ideological imaginary. Benjamin's Angel embodies his concept of time and memory; he is moving along the horizontal axis of linear "History" while simultaneously observing the vertical axis, a pile of wreckage that becomes the totality of individual trauma. Every aspect of experiencing the present is put into a broader, more meaningful scope; Benjamin sees individual experiences as part of the collective. The intersection of history and memory encompasses all quadrants of catastrophe.

Benjamin's "Theses on the Philosophy of History" is largely a critique of the darker forces of nationalism and its legitimization of violence. Warning against linear progress and the storms of history, Benjamin decries nationalism's destructive march. Refusing to interpret the present along the horizontal axis that is acceptable history, Benjamin suggests that complete understanding depends upon an interpretive memory, one that accounts for the vertical "pile" of human experience. This concept of memory and time, entrenched in a Jewish tradition, anticipates and predates Bhabha's rallying call for "social movements [to] disperse the homogenous, visual time of the horizontal society [and] give the nonsequential energy of lived historical memory and subjectivity its appropriate narrative authority" ("DissemiNation" 293). Notions of progress impede subjectivity by subsuming experience into a grand narrative that serves only the already powerful. The obliteration of human experience into a national narrative serves to reinforce the norm, forcefully creating an objectivity that does not exist. Benjamin refutes the violent obliteration caused by the historical record, while refusing to excuse the living

for participating in destructive progress: “there is no document of civilization which is not at the same time a document of barbarism” (256). Benjamin’s skepticism about progress renders invalid what was the dominant culture’s insistence that all of history was progressive. The ideology of progress, which was used to justify Germany’s march to war and genocide during the 1930s, sprang from a German philosophical tradition that saw the nation as an extension of an external truth. Hannah Arendt sees Benjamin’s Angel of History as an allegory for the forces of modernity that would manifest in the Holocaust: "This process of never-ending accumulation of power necessary for the protection of never-ending accumulation of capital determined the 'progressive' ideology of the late nineteenth century and foreshadowed the rise of imperialism" (*Totalitarianism* 143). The oppressive currents that started in the nineteenth century found new paths in the twentieth; they are founded upon progressive ideologies that justify all actions by relegating them to a past that need not be analyzed, contextualized, or accounted for. As long as the nation, the government or the corporation can move forward, it is progress. Benjamin’s “Theses” affirms the importance of Jewish thought to an ethical historical record, subverts the legitimizing maneuvers of nationalism, and offers hope in the form of a redemptive memory. All three of these parts contribute to a protest against the political and social upheaval Benjamin lived through as German Jew who died an exiled refugee. Benjamin responded to his diasporic predicament by harvesting his Jewish heritage, searching for a tradition that would explain the painful present.

As with Freud and Benjamin, Stein’s conception of time and memory emerges out of her Jewish heritage. Memory and time play a crucial role in *Paris France,* which was written during the "Phony War," when Germany had invaded Poland in September of 1939 and France, in return, declared war yet did not fight. Stein's *Paris France* captures this uncanny window in

European, particularly French, history, which created a domestic sense of war before actual combat had begun. *Paris France,* a work that has been called a love letter to France, could very well be characterized as a memoir, and, in turn, the function of memory plays a profound role in developing the text's sense of the disjointed present, an experience of time that was attributed to the experience of war (on the battle *and* home front) shaping a central aesthetic characteristic of high-modernism. Time and memory are not universal but are informed by tradition and culture. It is at this intersection—of recording French life and testing the limits of memory—that *Paris France* reveals its debt to Stein's Jewish background.

Stein wrote in *Paris France* that "I cannot write too much upon how necessary it is to be completely conservative that is particularly traditional in order to be free" (38). Capturing the totality of Stein's innovations, the quote reconciles opposing forces in Stein's work: her respect for tradition countered by her modernist aesthetic (which, it should be noted, she all but invented).[134] The tradition working to make Stein 'free,' however, is less modern than Jewish or put another way, it is a Hebraic, rabbinic modernism. John Whittier-Ferguson's "Stein in Time: History, Manuscripts, and Memory," argues that Stein "proves doggedly resistant to our customary gambits [of] temporal framing. She forces us to scrutinize the assumptions underwriting our historiographic practices…Stein energetically and ingeniously displaces both politics and history from a great deal of her work" (116-117). This resistance to "temporal framing," the underlying multiplicity of all words and writing, and the repositioning of history and politics, all of which Whittier-Ferguson rightfully claims for Stein, spring from a rabbinic tradition—the Talmudic fascination with repetition and the dialogic. The Talmud, which

[134] Stein's style was highly idiosyncratic, repetitive, and playful. She was one of the first writers to experiment with stream of consciousness and be influenced by abstract art. For more on Stein's contribution to modernism, see Ulla Dydo's *Gertrude Stein: The Language that Rises 1923-1934.* Evanston: Northwestern UP, 2003.

examines “proximity, substitution, responsibility, exposure, [and] signification,” sees “repetition [as] part parodic doubling, an off-centering displacement…attempt[ing] to express the overflow of the infinite” (Handelman *Fragments* 180). Stein’s apparently enigmatic aesthetic is in fact a maneuvering within longstanding rabbinic (and Jewish cultural) tradition. Jewish tradition fosters Stein’s penchant for repetition, as well as her resistance to temporal framing. Meaning through repetition, or marking time with multiple iterations of the same word, is as much Steinian trope as rabbinic tradition. Each word is placed in time (to repeat is to locate in a sequence) while paradoxically remaining independent from its context and surrounding words. Stein’s famous “Rose is a rose is a rose is a rose,” from *Geography and Plays* (1922) captures this paradox; the rose is in its absolute form with each repetition, yet the meaning changes with each incantation, situated anew and remade in its sameness.

Through repetition, Stein forces readers to confront language's undependability: how easily it can be harnessed to shape lives and create a sense of belonging. Drawing attention to the construction of identity allows Stein to deconstruct what had been a largely corrosive force, as I will later show, in the nineteenth and well into the twentieth century: nationalism. “Land of Nations,” also in *Geography and Plays*, argues that a country forms its identity in the repetition of its collective narrative; the nation is spoken into existence: “Then we have a country. Let us imagine the country. A country with a wait and wait by me and wait by me and always always always always wait and wait by me. This is the country I have mentioned. It means to be with us” (407). The act of imagining creates the 'always' that nations depend upon for validation. The combination of "wait" and "always" underscores the nation's dependence upon the complex construction of time to maintain unity. Stein's paradox of waiting for the always (how do you wait for what should already be 'always'?) premeditates Bhabha's critique of nationalism.

Through repetition, Stein shows how nations construct time through language, thus subverting and revealing what Bhabha calls, "the homogenous, visual time of the horizontal society" that nations depend upon to maintain a semblance of cohesion ("DissemiNation" 292). Stein's instruction to "wait" with her "always" bridges this gap between the quotidian and the immemorial past to create a national awareness of time and space. Stein's repetition draws attention to the construction of the temporality of the national narrative—the glorious past reenacted in the mundane present—by making words conspicuous. Stein's repetition fulfills what Homi Bhabha describes as "the distracting presence of another temporality that disturbs the contemporaneity of the national present" ("DissemiNation 295). Stein's aesthetic is a bridge between rabbinic tradition and postcolonial theory, both of which deconstruct time, space, and place.

Existence through repetition, and freedom in renewal, are classic Stein maneuvers. While Whittier-Ferguson argues that "her sense of history can only be understood if we approach those subjects by way of her extensive and complex considerations of the faculty of memory and the practice of forgetting," I argue that Stein's repetition is part of a complex web of remembering, categorically not a forgetting, that remakes the image, the word, the event ("Stein in Time" 121). Stein's repetition and her insistence on remembering explains her views on nationalism; it is a constant remembering of tradition—much like the country created through a collective memory found in "Land of Nations:" "always wait by me…It means to be with us." Individual autonomy, "by me," is maintained at the same time the "always" of memory creates the "us" of a country. It is a decidedly antifascist statement: the individual carries the weight of memory, and it is the individual who is responsible for the ethical imagining of the collective.

I would like to extend Whittier-Ferguson's argument to argue that Stein's insistence on reframing time and narrative works from a rabbinic tradition that sees memory as a mode of cognition, and as an ethical practice. Handelman, who traces Jewish thought and influence on modern and postmodern literary theory, describes rabbinic memory as "the prime agent in the recontextualization, citability, and 'transmissibility' of the past...The novelist, like the philosopher, then, practices the art of memory as a way of transforming objects" (*Fragments* 150). Read through Handelman's lens, Stein's repetition of words comes from the Talmudic tradition, which places a redemptive power in the recontextualizing of the Hebrew Bible for each generation's contemporary conundrum. This is how tradition frees words from a fixed meaning; words are remade through reinterpretation.

In a 1926 interview, Stein explained how her writing resisted a narrative structure that read like "fish on a line" (*Transatlantic*). "Fish on a line" anticipates Benjamin's "beads on a rosary;" both images work against linear constructions of time and memory ("Theses" 263). Stein, like Benjamin and Bhabha, rails against empty, homogenous time. Stein's writing resists linear progression, reflecting the rabbinic compression of time that allows writers to expose meaning. Like oral Torah, which explains, elaborates, and interprets, words, for Stein, are not singular events and do not have a fixed meaning. Handelman sees this as the rabbinic view that "written scriptures are intentionally incomplete and are meant to be accompanied and supplemented by the oral Torah…The text and its interpretation, then are not seen as two separate entities, but as twin aspects of the same revelation" (*Slayers* 31). Stein's writing follows in this tradition; her repetition of words both fragments and expands meaning.

The multiplicity of meaning is a constant theme in *Paris France*: "the fourteenth of July he said, the fall of the Bastille, quelle masquerade. I can give no impression of the word

masquerade as it came out of him. I realised what a feeble word the English word spelled just the same really was" (77). The context, the accent, the event all contribute to the meaning of *masquerade*, a word that becomes diverse and new for Stein upon hearing a Frenchman speak it into life. The power of this word spoken once in French—as we read "quelle masquerade" we hear the French pronunciation—and written in English, "spelled just the same" is an altogether new meaning. Stein draws attention to the arbitrary signification of language, and how this influences how we think of ourselves in context and words.

Since the publication of Amy Feinstein's PMLA "Little Known Documents" (2001), which introduced scholars to "The Modern Jew Who Has Given up the Faith of His Fathers Can Reasonably and Consistently Believe in Isolation," (1896) Stein's Jewish identity has received increased critical scrutiny. Barbara Will followed Feinstein's revelation with "Gertrude Stein and Zionism" (2005), which featured a close reading of Stein's "The Reverie of the Zionist" (1920) and its connection to Zionism and nationalism. Though little of Stein's work directly engages her Jewish identity, these two works explicitly addressing Jewish politics are peaks in a topography that I argue has always been shaped by Stein's Jewish background.[135] I am, however, here less interested in works that directly reference Jewish identity than the works that use a Jewish aesthetic, what I have here called a "rabbinic tradition," to create a distinct articulation of modernism and the deconstruction of nationalism.

Stein's early work supports a racial reading of identity; the influence of Otto Weininger's *Sex and Character* on *Q.E.D.* is well documented, while the Melanctha portion of *Three Lives*

[135] Scholars have noted Stein's interest in Otto Weininger's *Sex and Character*, which influenced her depiction of a lesbian couple in *Q.E.D* (1903).

supports an essentialist reading of race.[136] Stein's move away from race is also a shift from nineteenth century imaginings of the human body as legible. In *Paris France* Stein quips that "a background of unreality ... was very necessary for anybody having to create the twentieth century. The nineteenth century knew just what to do with each man but the twentieth century inevitably was not to know and so Paris was the place to be" (13). The certitude of nineteenth century race science becomes increasingly distasteful to Stein as both her aesthetic and understanding of identity evolves. In *Paris France* there are modernist works of art scattered throughout from an abstracted skyline to a Buddha resembling Stein (9, 121). Stein's love of abstract art, her friendship with Picasso, and her patronage all gesture to a radical aesthetic that understood that the sign was indeed separate from the signifier. There was no intrinsic meaning even in the most material of objects. Stein is profoundly anti-mimetic: "anything in a painting that imitates air is illustration and not art" (*Paris* 4). In order to fulfill this anti-mimetic multiplicity, Stein had to move beyond a biological reading of race—to indicate a concept that collapsed external and internal reality—and move toward identity as performance, as multiple and fragmented as a Picasso painting. Similarly, Freud's *Moses and Monotheism* insisted that the "dematerializing of God anew" led to the strength and ingenuity of Jewish thought, Stein uses the same cultural legacy to write against mimetic art, and more importantly, its insidious attack on identity.

Hellenistic and then Christian thought is highly mimetic starting with Paul the Apostle's charter for Christianity.[137] Elizabeth Castelli argues in *Imitating Paul: A Discourse of Power*

[136] Leo and Gertrude Stein purchased *Sex and Character* in the winter of 1907. For more on Stein's use of Weininger, see Leon Katz's "Weininger and the Making of Americans."
[137] A central concern for Paulinian Christianity is "sameness" or being *like* Jesus. Paul promoted a unitary Christianity that reached for the eradication of difference. For more on this interpretive framework, see Castelli.

that in spite of Paul's Jewish origins, his movement towards mimesis "was not a prevailing Jewish notion. No term parallel to imitation of God, assimilation to God, or following God appears in the Hebrew Bible" (78). Mosaic law prohibits the representation of God; Jewish art has long reflected this tendency toward abstraction, which encourages multiple interpretations as it simultaneously respects the spiritual, intellectual importance of God. Freud's *Moses and Monotheism* similarly emphasized the importance of a disembodied God resistant to representation: "There is only one God, unique omnipotent, unapproachable. The sight of his countenance cannot be borne; one must not make an image of him, nor even breathe his name" (18). This resistance to an embodied God is part of Mosaic law, but its relevance to Freud and Stein takes on new urgency in light of the emerging body politics of fascism. The Jewish prohibition on recreating God's image became a rhetorical and philosophical counter to the persecution of Jews, who were depicted frequently and repeatedly as diseased bodies corrupting a healthy nation-state.[138] Barbara Johnson's *Moses and Multiculturalism* sees the prohibition against representing God as foundational to Jewish aesthetics, which differed from Hellenism, and, in turn, Christianity:

> The difference lies in the theories of language as *imitation* and language as *creation*. For the rabbinic tradition, the text itself is divine, and man's duty is to interpret it. For the Western philosophical tradition, the text is mimetic of something that lies behind it. Rabbinic interpretations surround the text with more and more text; philosophy tries to find the unity behind the multiplicity. The Aristotelians think of truth as a noun; rabbinic interpreters, as a narrative. Christianity added fuel to the search for unity and the denigration of multiplicity. (65)

The outcry against mimesis —codified by the Talmud commandment not to represent God— demonstrates both Freud and Stein's desire to counter-act what they saw as Hitler's destruction of

[138] For more on the Jewish body as diseased see Sander Gilman's *The Jew's Body* and Mosse's *Nationalism and Sexuality*. My previous chapters have covered the "diseased Jewish body" at length.

cultural difference through the promotion of an archetypal body. The Jewish aesthetic, profoundly anti-mimetic, stands in stark contrast to the German political climate that found truth and culture written upon the body.

Working against the tide of fascism, Stein's aesthetics drew attention to the *constructions* of art, literature, and peoples. Art and nationalism collide in *Paris France*:

> As always art is the pulse of the nation. I was just thinking of a good title for an art book. From Bismark to Hitler, any one can see that since 1870 and to 1939 Germany has had no art…That is the state of a nation when there is no art that is natural to the nation, you know there is something wrong. Ever since Germany has been an empire there has been nothing…The state of being an empire was not a healthy state. (63)

Stein warns that art reflects national health. Germany, since becoming an empire, has made no contributions to art. Ideological pressure, such as a nationalist discourse that insists upon a homogenized volk, prohibits artistic innovation. George Mosse's chapter, "The Rediscovery of the Human Body," in *Nationalism and Sexuality*, illustrates the importance of the body to the German nationalist movement that began with Bismark and culminated with Hitler's idealized Aryan body (48-65). In contrast to Bismark and the subsequent idealization of the Aryan body, Freud, in *Moses and Monotheism*, discounts the cultural importance of the body; "the preference which through two thousand years the Jews have given to spiritual endeavor has, of course, had its effect; it has helped to build a dike against brutality and the inclination to violence which are usually found where athletic development becomes the ideal of the people" (147). *Moses and Monotheism* and *Paris France* are responding to the same political moment by writing against German culture's emphasis on a perfected human body, which has its origins in mimesis rather than metonymy—the Hellenistic, Christian tradition rather than the Jewish tradition.

For Stein the growth of a mimetic faith in human perfectibility was dangerous to nations as well as to individuals who did not represent the ideal. Art that mimics performs an ideological

function that oppresses individuals by subsuming them in a bodily, originary, linear truth. Rejecting the stifling art of empire and nationalism, Stein insists upon the multiplicity of identity. Stein's modernism and her experience of modernity anticipate many of Bhabha's claims about representation and colonialism suggesting that Jews living in Europe suffered under an analogous political and psychological weight to that of the colonial subject:

> [Representation] requires an end to the collusion of historicism and realism by unseating the Transcendental subject, the *origin* of writing as linear time consciousness. It denies teleology, the natural and necessary unfolding of meaning and consciousness, by conceiving of writing as a signifying practice. That is to say a process which conceives of meaning as a systemic production within determinate institutions and systems of representation—ideological, historical, aesthetic, political. It is crucial for our purposes that this does not permit meaning to be recuperable through a direct referent to the 'origins' of mimetic reflection. ("Representation" 98)

Stein's revolt against mimesis and origins correlates with her rejection of race as a marker of identity.[139] Resisting representation was not a simple aesthetic practice to Stein but a philosophical rejection of certainty that created an unhealthy nation.

By the time Stein wrote *Paris France*, she had repudiated many of her earlier claims to race essentialism, even going as far as to say that Jews were able to have a profound sense of national belonging outside of their identification as Jews.[140] As her 1920 poem "Reverie of a Zionist" urges, "Don't talk about race. Race is disgusting if you don't love your country" (94). Contained within this poem is Stein's critique of Zionism's claim to speak for all Jews. Her resistance to a monolithic reading of global Jewry operates in her earliest essay "The Modern Jew," which cautions that "if one asks a number of Jews to tell what the Jewish Faith really

---

[139] For more on Stein's evolving definition of race and race's importance to the Modernist project, see Laura Doyle's "The Flat, the Round, and Gertrude Stein: Race and the Shape of Modern(ist) History." *Modernism/Modernity* 7.2 (2000) 249-271.

[140] Stein's views on race evolved as she moved away from her medical training, which encouraged a biological reading of race. However, if we take Laura Doyle's definition of race as a "narrative," a claim heavily indebted to Said's *Beginnings*, Stein's resistance to narration becomes a disavowal of racial narratology.

means, he gets answers as diverse as are the number of the questioned" (423). Battling against homogenized identities, Stein uses "Reverie" as a way to insist that all groups are made of individuals. Barbara Will argues that "Reverie" is "a text that consistently problematizes the idea of *voice* as something coherent or unified or even consistent" (440). By insisting on individual voice and identity, while still maintaining culture's role in this development, Stein pushes the limits of both the psychological self and the sociological collective.

Amy Feinstein argues that the arc of Stein's "writing about Jews moved from a racial to a performative understanding of Jewish identity; and the latter behavioral identification is what one finds in *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas*" ("Gertrude Stein" 48). Stein's views on art support a non-referential relativity; where external and internal do not always work in harmony, and identity remains breathtakingly enigmatic. In her *Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas*, Stein defines her aesthetic: "She always was, she always is, tormented by the problem of the external and the internal…after all the human being essentially is not paintable" (112). Stein's believed it impossible for human identity to be painted, narrated, or described fostered a sense that all identifications, whether national, religious, or aesthetic, were volatile and unstable, with the individual and the collective in constant dialogue. Stein's turn in the latter half of her life to a performative reading of Jewishness correlates with her participation in World War I and her survival of World War II. Feinstein notes that the move away from a racialized reading distanced Stein from late nineteenth-century scientists who presumed "that race correlated completely with nation. The Jewish people were considered to be a nation without a homeland, and this disjuncture of people and place troubled Social Darwinists" (49). The Jewish Diaspora, the global disjuncture of people and place, became an experience of cosmopolitanism and expatriatism that helped shaped Stein's work. If Stein spent her "writing life considering how

often a single subject comprises contradictory states of being, reflecting on the plural and uncertain ways we occupy any temporally located moment," then her Jewish identity would support a multiple reading of affiliations and identifications (Whittier-Ferguson "Liberation" 410).

Rarely mentioning her Jewish identity explicitly, Stein's experience as part of this Diaspora (coupled with her expatriatism) vitally influenced her writing. Though Stein considered herself a secular Jew, she was well-versed in the Hebrew Bible, as the multiple allusions in "The Modern Jew" attest.[141] Jewish literature across the millennia has been preoccupied by exile, producing an aesthetic that deals with the effect of displacement and the fracturing of identity. Judaism affirms the sanctity of the text over the sanctity of place. The Hebrew Bible has proven sacredly mobile: by its edicts and teachings the Jews have fostered nationhood regardless of geographic displacement or dispersal. This mobility, and the ability to imbue any dwelling with a meaningful existence, is an irrevocable part of Jewish identity and aesthetic. Jews have experienced the modern sensation of exile since antiquity. The tradition of exile and displacement, and the immediacy of understanding this position, infuse the Steinian aesthetic.

Stein's Jewish background contributed to a peculiar sense of both place and identity. As Amir Eshel argues in "Cosmopolitanism and Searching for the Sacred Space in Jewish Literature,"

> While rejecting the essentialist trap of viewing Jews as the mere carriers of mythological, biblical "genes" that condition their beliefs and literature in regard to place, I believe that examining the ways in which Jewish writers depict, imagine, and transgress *topoi*—that

[141] Stein's 1896 essay, "The Modern Jew Who Has Given Up the Faith of His Fathers Can Reasonably and Consistently Believe in Isolation" references passages from Genesis, Exodus, and Deuteronomy. Stein demonstrates a Biblical literacy that would be in keeping with her Jewish educational and cultural heritage.

> is, the ways they unfold spatial metaphors, metonymies, and allegories of places—can reveal major aspects and shifts in Jewish culture's notion of human existence and space. (124)

The place Stein chose to encounter *herself* was France, and her depictions of France reflect a particular Jewish literary inheritance. Stein's emphasis on time and timelessness, space and displacement, and the whole and the fragmented, all support a Jewish understanding of meaning and identity fostered by exile. Her understanding of place finds its roots in this Jewish tradition of exile: "After all everybody, that is, everybody who writes is interested in living inside themselves. That is why writers have to have two countries, the one where they belong and the one in which they live really. The second one is romantic, it is separate from themselves, it is not real but it is really there" (*Paris* 2). The real emanates from within, but the realness of living inside oneself is made possible by an externalized reality, the "really there." While many scholars have argued that America was the country Stein left to really live somewhere else, I offer an alternative expatriatism: as a Jew, she was *already* expatriated. Even as an American, Stein was an expatriate because of her Jewish legacy.[142] Expatriatism and exile have always been the Jewish experience. The Diaspora, exile, of living in a country but not "belonging" there is a Jewish phenomenon encoded on Stein's cosmopolitanism.[143]

---

[142] The Stein family moved frequently. First, Gertrude's parents emigrated from Germany, moving to Pennsylvania. After Gertrude's birth, the family moved to Austria for several years and finally settled in Oakland, California.

[143] Let me be clear that I am not indulging in the genetic fallacy where there is a Jewish gene that *makes* someone a Jew or *think* as a Jew. However, I am certain that Jewish culture passes certain anxieties, fears, and hopes through ritual and tradition, such as Passover. Even in secular Jewish homes, this *remembering* of displacement bears on the social, political, and aesthetic consciousness of Jews. That the Jews are the people of the book at once makes them a nation while undercutting a racial reading—the texts you read make you Jewish. There are of course other factors that determine Jewish identity: assimilation, conversion, internalized anti-Semitism. However, my paper argues that a Jewish tradition *is* discernable among these three highly educated, textual Jewish authors.

Contemporary postcolonial critics have supported cosmopolitanism as an answer to the myopic nationalist rhetoric that led to the endless wars of the twentieth-century. Kwame Anthony Appiah, addressing criticisms of cosmopolitanism as a rootless existence, argues that respect of cultural particularities maintains heterogeneous societies (91). Appiah introduces the "cosmopolitan patriot" who is "attached to a home of his or her own, with its own cultural particularities, but taking pleasure from the presence of other, different, places that are home to other, different, people. The cosmopolitan also imagines that in such a world not everyone will find it best to stay in a natal patria" (91). Using Stein's famous line from *Paris France* that "America is my country and Paris is my hometown," Appiah situates Stein at the beginning of a global trend of migration and adaptation. Appiah rightfully claims Stein as a cosmopolitan patriot; however, I would add a third clause to Stein's famous aphorism: Judaism is her tradition. While there have been many diasporas throughout the centuries, the Jews are peculiar in that their religion and customs support a wandering that is rooted in a shared culture and an ethics that practices and encourages multiplicity and difference. In essence, Appiah's cosmopolitan patriot, one who reconciles the global with the regional, the customary with the liberal, had already shaped Stein's aesthetic. Stein embraced cosmopolitanism: she was a Jewish American woman living in France with her partner, Alice B. Toklas, where they had a vibrant international salon. Her parlor and her art collection reflected Stein's ability to, as Appiah urges, reconcile the local culture with a cosmopolitan ethics of openness.

Focusing on World War II and its implications for global Jewry, Stein's *Paris France* is an exploration of memory and identity, of how remembrance plays a large role in how one interacts with the external world and defines ethics. If, as I have shown, repetition renews and destabilizes meaning, and performance is an ambivalent act, which reinforces as it deconstructs,

then Stein's modernist innovations are indebted to a rabbinic tradition. Performance combined with repetition becomes a function of memory and identity. Stein's aesthetics are dependent on these two concepts—people, just like words, are multiple and infinite in their meanings. *Paris France*, however, is very clear as to what should be performed, repeated, and remembered. Though performance and repetition produce a radical uncertainty—nothing about identity is stable—Stein insists that memory functions as a way to ethically engage with this uncertainty and multiplicity: "I once more realize that a war brings you in contact with so much and so many and at the same time concentrates your isolation…Well war does make one realize the march of centuries and the succession of generations" (*Paris* 72). Like Benjamin's "pile of wreckage," Stein's understanding of time is multidimensional; it incorporates the linear axis—"march of generations"—with the horizontal axis of daily, multiple experiences—"so much and so many." Her understanding of temporality captures the uncertainty of 1939 France; like Benjamin's construction of Messianic time, the present is not separate from the past but is the sum total of everything that has come before.

Nowhere is time's malleability made more apparent than *Paris France*'s Helen Button vignette, where a little girl must reconcile her daily life with the external pressures of living in the shadows of war. Time and memory, and how Helen interacts with her environment, echoes the isolation and multiplicity of modernity. In Stein's depiction of 1939 France, time is broken down into cycles, patterns, and repetitions. The only sense of time that comforts Helen is the daily, the seasonal, the cyclical. The curé d'Ars comforts Helen, telling her that the war "would only last for a time a very short time just long enough to turn an omelette. And this was comforting" (88). War's scope and its duration are incomprehensible. Instead, the curé must mark time through a daily movement, the making of an omelette, in order for Helen to

understand. War disconcerts, as is patently evident in *Paris France*; Stein marks it, furthermore, by either/or contractions: "It was really war time…war time here and there and everywhere…war-time was over" (92). During these changes of war/not-war, Helen observes the seasons and weather:

> But most she liked that he said that the day would come when the women would plough the ground and plant the wheat but the men would do the harvesting…they would be back again to do the harvesting, it was war-time but they would be back again…She heard weather, she heard water she heard snow, she heard water everywhere, it was that kind of weather. She heard snow around she nearly heard the moon and she heard the rain and she heard the mountains…(87-90)

The endless cycle of nature, culture, and people's daily lives collide with the modernist experience. While "Modernity itself is characterized in part, of course, by a changed sense of *time* in which the 'modern,' the present, is set against the ancient, the past—and past loses its authority, power, and value," Stein illustrates that there is another marker of temporality that is unchangeable (Handelman *Fragments* 153). By defining time in cultural terms (harvesting) and cyclical (rain, snow) Stein resists a linear time line. Whittier-Ferguson notes that these passages are "imbued with the rhythms of Ecclesiastes [and] Stein's sentences inflexibly connect the French with the earth" ("Liberation" 411). Adding to Whittier-Ferguson's observation of Stein's use of the Hebrew Bible as a source of temporal framing, I would go further. Time, especially for those experiencing a trauma, does not make sense through cause and effect; rather, it is repetitive and outside the grasp of history. Stein's depiction of Helen in *Paris France* relates trauma to memory: "Helen did not really see it but she told herself about it" (90). Unable to deal directly with the present, Helen mediates her experience at a remove. Powerless against a horrific present, she "tells" her experience using language to make sense of the incongruity of war, strangely disembodying herself from the present or any chronological marker.

Stein's embrace of the cyclical is strikingly rabbinic. Using the circle instead of the line to represent time, rabbinic scholars dealt with geographical upheaval, social injustice, and political, cultural, and individual trauma by creating a time that resisted the present as separate from the past, or a present as part of an "evolved" history.[144] Instead, time in *Paris France* reflects the trauma of war while resisting war's historicity: "what trauma has to tell us—the historical and personal truth it transmits—is intricately bound up with its refusal of historical boundaries; that its truth is bound up with its crisis of truth" ("Introduction" Caruth 8). What Stein emphasizes about war and fascism is not uniqueness but repetitiveness: "I have a kind of feeling that every century is like that, certainly the nineteenth century was and the twentieth, the other centuries probably were too. What is true in one century is pretty certainly true of all of them. So here we are in the twentieth century at the moment when the century begins to be ready for civilising" (*Paris* 93). Like Benjamin and Freud's construction of time and memory in the face of traumatic events, Stein sees the present as a crisis point—"the moment" when it *could* become civilized—while the past is irredeemably present—"true of all of them." The crisis of memory and representation, trauma and time are all bound together by a Jewish tradition that found in exile and destruction constant hope in revision.

Paris France is more than a love letter; it is a call to war, a call to save what Stein saw as civilization: individual identity at free play with collective tradition. At risk for Stein, if fascism

[144]While rabbis rarely come to a consensus, their method remains constant. When the Second Temple was destroyed Judaism became a text based religion, expanding and recording the oral tradition. Since then, rabbis have engaged various Jewish texts from the Talmud to the Torah. However, their method has remained the same: dialogue with the past in an ever expanding present. The rabbinic method, if not individual rabbinical conclusions, remains cyclical, dialogic (not dialectic), and recursive. For more on the rabbinic method and its relation to time, see Susan Handelman's *Fragments of Redemption: Jewish Thought & Literary Theory in Benjamin, Scholem, and Levinas.* Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1991.

spread and France became occupied, was the loss of civilization. Declaring that war should be fought only to protect freedom and tradition, Stein closes her book with a plea to stop the spread of a homogenous national culture, or fascism, that disregarded the individual and mocked tradition: “this book is dedicated to France and England who are to do what is the necessary thing to do, they are going to civilise the twentieth century and make it be a time when anybody can be free, free to be civilized and to be” (120). Stein's call echoes Benjamin and Freud's warnings against "barbarism," a term they both used to describe the political state in 1939. What is perhaps so telling about Freud, Benjamin, and Stein's later works is that they are *so* Jewish and that from one to the other we are reminded of how dire are their pleas, how prophetic their fears. All three anticipated the global march to war and the human wreckage that would lay in its wake by renewing Jewish traditions and remembrance to fight off the holocaust that was 1939 Europe, and to cry out against the Holocaust to come.

Works Cited

Akbari, Suzanne Conklin. “Placing the Jews in Late Medieval Literature.” *Orientalism and the Jews*. Eds. Ivan Kalmar and Derek Penslar. Lebanon: Brandeis UP, 2005: 32-50.

Anderson, Amanda. "Trollope's Modernity." ELH 74 (2007) 509-534.
---."George Eliot and the Jewish Question." The Yale Journal of Criticism 10.1 (1997) 39-61.
---."Cosmopolitanism, Universalism, and the Divided Legacies of Modernity." *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling beyond the Nation*. Eds. Pheng Cheah, and Bruce Robbins. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998: 265-289.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso, 1983.

Anderson, G.K. *The Wandering Jew*. Providence: Brown UP, 1965.

“Ancient State of the Jews in England.” London Magazine. May 1820: 503. Print.

Appiah, Kwame Anthony. "Cosmopolitan Patriots." *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*. Eds. Pheng Cheah & Bruce Robbins. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1998. 91-116.

Appadurai, Arjun. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1996.

Arendt, Hannah. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt Brace &Co., 1948/1979.

Arnold, Matthew. *Culture and Anarchy*. London, 1869.

Austin-Smith, Brenda. "The Counterfeit Symbol in Henry James's *The Golden Bowl*." The Henry James Review 25.1 (2004) 52-66.

Baker, William. *George Eliot and Judaism*. Salzburg: University of Salzburg, 1975.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Modernity and the Holocaust*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2001

Beaseley, Edward. *The Victorian Reinvention of Race: New Racisms and the Problem of Grouping in the Human Sciences*. New York: Routledge, 2010.

Beer, Gillian. *Darwin's Plots: Evolutionary Narrative in Darwin, George Eliot and Nineteenth-Century Fiction*. 2nd Edition. New York: Cambridge UP, 2000.

Benjamin, Walter. 1939. "Theses on the Philosophy of History" & "The Storyteller." Trans. Harry Zohn. *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections*. New York: Schocken Books, 1968.

Berman, Jessica. "Feminizing the Nation: Woman as Cultural Icon in Late James." The Henry James Review 17.1 (1996): 58-76.

Bhabha, Homi. "Representation and the Colonial Text: A Critical Exploration of Some Forms of Mimeticism." *The Theory of Reading*. Ed. Frank Gloversmith. Sussex: Harvester Press, 1984. 93-122.
---. "DissemiNation." *Nation and Narration*. Ed. Homi Bhabha. New York: Routledge, 1990. 291-322.
---. *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1994.

Billig, Michael. *Banal Nationalism*. London: Sage, 1995.

Blum, Harold P. "Freud and the Figure of Moses: The Moses of Freud." *Reading Freud's Reading*. Eds. Gilman et al. New York: New York UP, 1994.

Blair, Sara. *Henry James and the Writing of Race and Nation*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1996.

Boas, Franz. *Anthropology and Modern Life*. New York: Dover Publications, 1987; orig. 1928.

Boland, Eavan. "James Joyce: The Mystery of Inheritance." *Tran cultural Joyce*. Ed. Karen Lawrence. New York: Cambridge UP, 1998.

Bomana, Thornier. *Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek.* New York: Norton, 1960.

Boyrain, Daniel. *Unheroic Conduct: The Rise of Heterosexuality and the Invention of the Jewish Man*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1997.
---. and Jonathan Boyarin. *Jews and Other Differences: the New Jewish Cultural Studies*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1997.
---. and Jonathan Boyarin. *Powers of Diaspora: Two Essay on the Relevance of Jewish Culture*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2002.
---. and Ann Pellegrini and Daniel Itzkovitz. *Queer Theory and the Jewish Question*. New York: Columbia UP, 2004.

Boyarin, Jonathan. *The Unconverted Self: Jews, Indians, and the Identity of Christian Europe.* Chicago: Chicago UP, 2009.

Brady, Sara. "Home and Away: The Gaelic Games, Gender, and Migration." New Hibernia Review. 11.3 Fómhar/Autumn 2007): 28-43

Brantlinger, Patrick. "Nations and Novels: Disraeli, George Eliot, and Orientalism." Victorian Studies. 35.3 (Spring 1992): 255-275.

Brown, Wendy. *Regulating Aversion: Tolerance in the Age of Identity and Empire*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2006.

Burke, Edmund. *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1987; orig. 1790.

Burrows, Stuart. "The Golden Fruit: Innocence and Imperialism in *The Golden Bowl*." The Henry James Review 21.2 (2000): 95-114.

Burton, Richard. "The Sotadic Zone." *Sexology Uncensored: The Documents of Sexual Science*. Eds. Lucy Bland and Laura Doan. Cambridge: Polity, 1998: 203-204.

Callaghan, Karen A. "Symbolic Violence and Race." *Postmodernism and Race*. Ed. Eric Mark Kramer. Westport: Praeger, 1997: 65-78.

Caruth, Cathy. "Unclaimed Experience: Trauma and the Possibility of History." Yale French Studies 79 (1991):181-192.
---."Introduction." *Trauma: Explorations in Memory*. Ed. Cathy Caruth. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1995: 3-12.

Castelli, Elizabeth A. *Imitating Paul: A Discourse of Power*. Louisville: John Knox Press, 1991.

Cheyette, Bryan. *Constructions of 'the Jew' in English Literature and Society*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1993.
---.and Laura Marcus. "Introduction." *Culture, Modernity, and "the Jew."* Eds.Cheytte Bryan and Laura Marcus. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1998: 1-22.

Cohen, Deborah. "Who Was Who? Race and Jews in Turn-of-the-Century Britain." Journal of British Studies 41 (October 2002): 460-483.

Cheng, Vincent J. *Joyce, Race, and Empire*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1995.

Clifford, James. *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Boston: Harvard UP, 1997.

Crosby, Christina. *The Ends of History: Victorians and the "Woman Question."* New York: Routledge, 1991.

Daily, S. Jeff. *Sir Arthur Sullivan's Grand Opera Ivanhoe and Its Musical Precursors: Adaptations of Sir Walter Scott's Novel for the Stage, 1819-1891*. New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 2008.

Darwin, Charles. *The Origin of Species*. New York: Penguin, 1985; orig. 1859.

Davidson, Guy. "Ornamental Identity: Commodity Fetishism, Masculinity, and Sexuality in *The Golden Bowl*." The Henry James Review 28.1 (2007): 26-42.

Davison, Neil. "Cyclops," Sinn Féin, and "The Jew": An Historical Reconsideration." Journal of Modern Literature 19.2 (Fall 1995): 245-258.

Delany, Paul. "Land, Money, and the Jews in the Later Trollope." Studies in English Literature 1500-1900. 32.4 (Autumn 1992): 765-787.

Derrida, Jacques. *Writing and Difference*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1980.

Devlin, Kimberly J. "Bloom and the Police: Regulatory Vision and Visions in *Ulysses*." NOVEL. Fall (1995): 45-62.

Desalvo, Louise. *Conceived with Malice: Literature as Revenge in the Lives and Works of Virginia and Leonard Woolf, D.H. Lawrence, Djuna Barnes, and Henry Miller.* New York: Penguin, 1994.

Dimock, Wai-Chee. "Debasing Exchange: Edith Wharton's *The House of Mirth*" PMLA 100. 5 (October 1985): 783-792.

Duncan, Ian. Introduction. *Ivanhoe*. By Sir Walter Scott. New York: Oxford, 1996. vii-xxvi.

Dydo, Ulla E. *Gertrude Stein: The Language that Rises: 1923-1934*. Evanston: Northwestern UP, 2003.

Dyer, Gary. "Irresolute Ravishers and the Sexual Economy of Chivalry in the Romantic Novel." Nineteenth-Century Literature. 55.3: 340-368.

Dworkin, Andrea. *Scapegoat: the Jews, Israel, and Women's Liberation*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000.

Eliot, George. *Daniel Deronda*. New York: Penguin, 1995; orig. 1876.
---.*Impressions of Theophrastus Such*. Iowa City: UP of Iowa, 1994; orig. 1879.

Ellmann, Maud. "The Imaginary Jew: T.S. Eliot and Ezra Pound." *Between 'Race' and Culture: Representations of 'the Jew' in English and American Literature.* Ed. Bryan Cheyette. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1996: 84-101.

Eshel, Amir. "Cosmopolitanism and Searching for the Sacred Space in Jewish Literature." Jewish Social Studies, New Series, 9.3 (2003): 121-138.

Feinstein, Amy. "Little Known Documents." PMLA. 116.2 (2001): 416-428.
---."Gertrude Stein, Alice Toklas, and Albert Barnes: Looking Like a Jew in *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas*." Shofar: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Jewish Studies. 25.3 (2007): 47-60.

Felsenstein, Frank. *Anti-Semitic Stereotypes: a Paradigm of Otherness in English Popular Culture, 1660-1830.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1995.

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality, Volume I: an Introduction.* New York: Vintage, 1990.

Frazer, James George. *The Golden Bough*. New York: Oxford UP, 1994; orig. 1890.

Freedman, Jonathan. "What Maggie Knew: Game Theory, *The Golden Bowl*, and the Possibilities of Aesthetic Knowledge." Cambridge Quarterly. 37 (2008): 98-114.
---.*The Temple of Culture*. New York: Oxford UP, 2002
---."The Poetics of Cultural Decline: Degeneracy, Assimilation, and the Jew in James's *The Golden Bowl*." American Literary History. 7 (1995): 477-499.

Freud, Sigmund. *Moses and Monotheism*. Trans. Katherine Jones. New York: Vintage Books, 1967; orig. 1939.
---. *The Uncanny*. March 30, 2011. San Diego State University. March 21, 2011. http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/~amtower/uncanny.html. orig. 1919.

Friedman, Susan Stanford. "Definitional Excursions: The Meanings of Modern/Modernity/Modernism." Modernism/Modernity 8.3 (2001): 493-513.

Gair, Christopher. "The Crumbling Structure of 'Appearances': Representation and Authenticity in *The House of Mirth* and *The Custom of the Country*." MFS 43.2 (1997) 349-373.

Garb, Tamar. "Modernity, Identity, and Textuality." *The Jew in the Text: Modernity and the Construction of Identity*. Eds. Tamar Garb and Linda Nochlin. London: Thames and Hudson, 1995: 20-30.

Gates, Sarah. " 'A Difference of Native Language': Gender, Genre, and Realism in *Daniel Deronda*." ELH 68.3 (Fall 2001): 699-724.

Geller, Jay. *On Freud's Jewish Body: Mitigating Circumcisions*. New York: Fordham UP, 2007.

Gilbert, Stuart. *James Joyce's Ulysses*. New York: Vintage, 1955. Orig. 1930.

Gilman, Sander L. *The Jew's Body*. New York: Routledge, 1991.

Glassman, Bernard. *Benjamin Disraeli: The Fabricated Jew in Myth and Memory.* Lanham: UP of America, 2002.

Glissant, Edourd. *Poetics of Relation* Trans. Betsey Wing Ann Arbor UofM press, 1997; Orig. 1990.

Goldman, Irene C. "The Perfect Jew and *The House of Mirth*: A Study in Point of View." *Edith Wharton's The House of Mirth: A Casebook*. Ed. Carol J. Singley. New York: Oxford UP, 1993. 25-36.

Goldsmith, Meredith. "The Year of the Rose: Jewish Masculinity in *The House of Mirth*." MFS 51.2 (Summer 2005): 374-392.

Goodlad, Lauren. “Trollopian ‘Foreign Policy’: Rootedness and Cosmopolitanism in the Mid-Victorian Global Imaginary.” PMLA 124.2 (March 2009): 437-454.

Habermas, Jürgen. "The German Idealism of the Jewish Philosophers." *Philosophical-Political Profiles*. Ed. Frederick G. Lawrence. Cambridge: MIT, 1985.

Hagan, John. "The Divided Mind of Anthony Trollope." Nineteenth-Century Fiction 14.1 (June 1959): 1-26.

Handelman, Susan A. *Slayers of Moses: The Emergence of Rabbinic Interpretation in Modern Literary Theory*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1983.
---.*Fragments of Redemption: Jewish Thought & Literary Theory in Benjamin, Scholem, and Levinas.* Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1991.

Harrison-Kahan, Lori. "'Queer Myself for Good and All:' *The House of Mirth* and the Fictions of Lily's Whiteness." Legacy 21.1 (2004): 34-49.

Haytock, Jennifer. *Edith Wharton and the Conversations of Literary Modernism*. New York: Palgrave, 2008.

Henry, Nancy. *George Eliot and the British Empire*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2002.

Hill, Mike. “Introduction.” *Whiteness: a Critical Reader*. Ed. Mike Hill. New York: New York UP, 1997: 1-20.

Hoberman, John M. “Otto Weininger and the Critique of Jewish Masculinity.” *Jews and Gender: Responses to Otto Weininger*. Eds. Nancy Harrowed and Barbara Hyams. Philadelphia: Temple UP, 1995.

Itzkovitz, Daniel. “Secret Temples.” *Jews and Other Differences*. Eds. Daniel and Jonathan Boyarin. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1997: 176-202.

Jacobson, Matthew Frye. *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race*. Boston: Harvard UP, 1999.

James, Henry. *The American Scene*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1968; orig. 1907.
---.*The Golden Bowl*. New York: Penguin, 1987; orig. 1904.

Johnson, Barbara. *Moses and Multiculturalism*. Berkeley: U of California P, 2010.

Joyce, James. "Ireland, Island of Saints and Sages." *The Critical Writings*. Ed. Ellsworth Mason and Richard Ellmann. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1989; orig. 1907.

—."The Shade of Parnell." *The Critical Writings*. Ed. Ellsworth Mason and Richard Ellmann. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1989; orig. 1912
—. *Ulysses*. New York: Vintage International Edition, 1990; orig. 1922.

Kaivola, Karen. "The 'beast turning human': Constructions of the 'Primitive' in *Nightwood*. Review of Contemporary Fiction 13.3 (Fall 1993): 172-185.

Kalmar, Ivan. "Benjamin Disraeli, Romantic Orientalism" Comparative Studies in Society and History. 47.2 (April 2005): 348-371.
---. and Derek Penslar. *Orientalism and the Jews*. Waltham: Brandeis UP, 2004.

Kane, Anne. "Reconstructing Culture in Historical Explanation: Narratives as Cultural Structure and Practice." History and Theory. 39 (October 2000): 311-330.

Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason*, 1787.

Kassanoff, Jennie A. "Extinction, Taxidermy, Tableaux Vivants: Staging Race and Class in *The House of Mirth*." PMLA 115 (JAN 2000): 60-74.

Kaufman, Heidi. *English Origins, Jewish Discourse, and the Nineteenth-Century British Novel:Reflections on a Nested Nation.* University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 2009.

Kermode, Frank. "Introduction." *The Prime Minister*. New York: Penguin, 2002: xvii.

Knox, Robert. *The Races of Men: A Fragment*. London: Renshaw, 1850.

Landrum, Grace Warren. "Sir Walter Scott and His Literary Rivals in the Old South" American Literature. 2.3 (November 1930): 256-276.

Lamb, Charles. "Jews, Quakers, and Scotchmen, and Other Imperfect Sympathies." London Magazine. August 1821: 152. Print.

Lee, Yoon Sun. "A Divided Inheritance: Scott's Antiquarian Novel and the British Nation." ELH. 64.2 (1997): 537-567.

Levenson, Alan T. "Writing the Philosemitic Novel: *Daniel Deronda* Revisted." PROOFTEXTS 28 (2008): 129-156.

Levi, Neil. "'See that Straw? That's a Straw': Anti-Semitism and Narrative Form in *Ulysses.*" Modernism/Modernity. 9.3 (2002): 375-388.

Levine, Gary Martin. *The Merchant of Modernism: The Economic Jew in Anglo-American Literature, 1864-1939.* New York: Routledge, 2002.

Levine, Phillipa. *Victorian Feminism 1850-1900*. Tampa: UP of Florida, 1989.

Lewin, Judith. "Jewish Heritage and Secular Inheritance in Walter Scott's *Ivanhoe*." ANQ 19.1 (Winter 2006): 27-32.

Lewis, Reina. *Gendering Orientalism: Race, Femininity, and Representation*. New York: Routledge, 1996.

Linett, Maren. "Introduction: Modernism's Jews/Jewish Modernism." *Modern Fiction Studies*. 51.2 (2005): 249-257.

---. *Modernism, Feminism, and Jewishness.* New York: Cambridge UP, 2007.

Lloyd, David. "*Dubliners*, Masculinity, and Temperance Nationalism." Eds. Derek Attridge and Marjorie Howes. *Semicolonial Joyce*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2000: 128-149.

Lukács, Georg. *The Historical Novel*. Trans. Hannah and Stanley Mitchell. London: Merlin Press, 1962.

Makin, John L. "Should Americans Save More?" *AEI Online*. http://www.aei.org/outlook/22024.

Marcus, Jane. "Laughing at Leviticus: 'Nightwood' as Woman's Circus Epic." Cultural Critique.13(Autumn 1989): 143-190.

Marcuse, Herbert. *Repressive Tolerance* Berkeley: Commune, 1965.

Maxwell, Richard. "Inundations of Time: A Definition of Scott's Originality." ELH: 68.2 (Summer 2001): 419-468.

Melman, Billie. "Claiming the Nation's Past: The Invention of an Anglo-Saxon Tradition." Journal of Contemporary History. 26.3/4 (1991): 575-595.

McClintock, Anne. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*. New York: Routledge, 1995.

Meyer, Susan. " 'Safely to Their Own Borders': Proto-Zionism, Feminism, and Nationalism in *Daniel Deronda*." ELH 60 (1993): 733-758.

Morris, Leslie. "Placing and Displacing Jewish Studies: Notes on the Future of a Field." PMLA. 125.3 (2010): 764-773.

Mosse, George. *Nationalism and Respectability*. New York: Howard Fertig, 1985.

Novak, Daniel. "A Model Jew: 'Literary Photographs' and the Jewish Body in *Daniel Deronda*." Representations. 85 (Winter 2004): 58-97.

Ohler, Paul. *Edith Wharton's Evolutionary Conception : Darwinian Allegory in Her*

Major Novels. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Olson, Liesl M. "'Under the Lids of Jerusalem:' The Guised Role of Jewishness in Henry James's *The Golden Bowl*." *MFS* 49.4 (2003): 660-686.

Pellegrini, Ann. "Whiteface Performances: 'Race,' Gender, and Jewish Bodies." *Jews and Other Differences.* Eds. Daniel and Jonathan Boyarin. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1997:108-149.

Psomiades, Alexis. "Heterosexual Exchange and Other Victorian Fictions: *The Eustace Diamonds* and Victorian Anthropology." NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction 33.1 (Autumn 1999): 93-118.

Pyle, Forest. "A Novel Sympathy: The Imagination of Community in George Eliot." NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction. 27. 1 (Autumn 1993): 5-23

Ragussis, Michael. *Figures of Conversion: 'The Jewish Question' & English National Identity.* Durham: Duke UP, 1995.

Reiss, Timothy J. "Mapping Identities: Literature, Nationalism, Colonialism" Literary History. 4. 4 (Winter 1992): 649-677.

Reizbaum, Marilyn. *James Joyce's Judaic Other*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1999

Renan, Ernest. "What is a Nation?" *Nation and Narration*. Ed. Homi Bhabha. New York: Routledge, 1990.

Rich, Adrienne. "Compulsory Heterosexuality and the Lesbian Experience." *The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader*. New York: Routledge, 1993: 227-254.

Roth, Philip. *The Human Stain*. New York: Vintage, 2001.

Rowe, John Carlos. "Henry James and Globalization." The Henry James Review 24.3 (2003): 205-214.
---."Henry James and the United States." The Henry James Review 27.3 (2006): 228-236.

Said, Edward. *Beginnings: Intention and Method.* New York: Columbia UP, 2004.

Scheinberg, Cynthia. " 'The Beloved Ideas Made Flesh:' Daniel Deronda and Jewish Poetics." ELH. 77 (2010): 813-839

Schor, Esther. "Scott's Hebraic Historicism." *British Romanticism and the Jews: History, Culture, Literature.* Ed. Sheila A. Spector. New York: Palgrave, 2002: 105-120.

Scott, Bonnie Kime. *Refiguring Modernism, Volume 1: Women of 1928*. Bloomington:

Indiana UP, 1995.

Scott, Sir Walter. *Ivanhoe*. New York: Oxford, 1996; orig. 1820.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire.* New York: Columbia UP, 1985.

Slavet, Eliza. *Racial Fever: Freud and the Jewish Question.* New York: Fordham UP, 2009.

Smith, Victoria L. "A Story beside(s) Itself: The Language of Loss in Djuna Barnes's Nightwood." PMLA 114. 2 (1999): 194-206.

Somerville, Siobhan. "Race: An Introduction." *Sexology Uncensored: The Documents of Sexual Science.* Eds. Lucy Bland and Laura Doan. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1999: 201-203.

Spoo, Robert. *James Joyce and the Language of History: Dedalus's Nightmare*. New York: Oxford UP, 1994.

Stein, Gertrude. "The Modern Jew Who Has Given Up the Faith of His Fathers Can Reasonably and Consistently Believe in Isolation" 1896. "Little Known Documents." PMLA. 116.2 (2001): 416-428.
---."Reverie of a Zionist." 1920. *The Yale Edition of the Unpublished Writings of Gertrude Stein: Painted lace, and other pieces, 1914-1937*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2008.
---.*Geography and Plays*. Boston: The Four Seas Press, 1922.
---.*The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas.* 1933. *The Selected Writings of Gertrude Stein*. New York: Vintage, 1990: 1-238.
---.*Paris France*. New York: Liveright, 1940.
---."Transatlantic Interview─1946" *Gertrude Stein: A Primer for the Gradual Understanding of Gertrude Stein.* Ed. Robert Bartlett Haas. Los Angeles: Black Sparrow Press, 1971: 11-36.

Stocking, George. *Victorian Anthropology*. New York: The Free Press, 1987.
---. *Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology*. New York: Free Press, 1968.

Stoler, Ann Laura. *Race and the Education of Desire*. Durham: Duke UP, 1995.

Trollope, Anthony. *The Prime Minister*. New York: Penguin, 1994; orig. 1876.
---.*Autobiography*. New York: Dodd, Mead, & Co., 1912.
---.*The Letters of Anthony Trollope, Vol. 1.* Ed. N. John Hall. Stanford: Stanford, UP: 1983.
---.*North America*. London: Chapman & Hall: 1862.

Trubowitz, Lara. "In Search of 'the Jew' in Djuna Barnes's Nightwood: Jewishness, Antisemitism, Structure, and Style." MFS Modern Fiction Studies 51.2 (Summer 2005): 311-334.

Valente, Joseph. "'Neither fish nor flesh'; or how 'Cyclops' stages the double-bind if Irish Manhood." Eds. Derek Attridge and Marjorie Howes. *Semicolonial Joyce*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2000: 96-127.

Valman, Nadia. *The Jewess in Nineteenth-Century British Literary Culture.* New York: Cambridge UP, 2007.

Walkowitz, Rebecca L. *Cosmopolitan Style: Modernism beyond the Nation.* New York: Colombia UP, 2006.

Wellhausen, Julius. *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*. United States: Forgotten Books, 1885.

Wharton, Edith. *The House of Mirth*. New York: Penguin, 1905.
---.*A Backward Glance*. New York: Appleton-Century Company, 1934.

Whittier-Ferguson, John. "Stein in Time: History, Manuscripts, and Memory." Modernism/Modernity 6.1 (1999): 115-151.
---."The Liberation of Gertrude Stein: War and Writing." Modernism/Modernity 8.3 (2001): 405-428.

Windscheffel, Ruth Clayton. "Gladstone and Scott: Family, Identity, and Nation." The Scottish Historical Review. LXXVI. 221 (April 2007): 69-75

Will, Barbara. "Gertrude Stein and Zionism." MFS Modern Fiction Studies 51.2 (2005): 437-455.

Wohlfarth, Marc E. "*Daniel Deronda* and the Politics of Nationalism." Nineteenth-Century Literature 53.

Yeazell, Ruth Bernard. "The Conspicuous Wasting of Lily Bart." ELH 59 (1992): 713-734.

Yerushalmi, Yosef Hayim. *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory*. Seattle: U of Washington P, 1989.
---.*Freud's Moses: Judaism Terminable and Interminable*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1991.

Yovel, Yirmiyahu. *Dark Riddle: Hegel, Nietzsche, and the Jews*. University Park: U of Pennsylvania P, 1998.