INSTRUCTIONS TO LIBRARY FOR THESES AND PRIZE ESSAYS

Statement by Referee

(Not Necessary for Ph.D. Thesis)

AUTHOR Michael B. Eisenstat

TITLE "The Attitudes of Some Post-World War II American-Jewish Authors to Judaism as Reflected in Their Works"

TYPE OF THESIS: Ph.D. [ ] D.H.L. [ ] Rabbinic [X]
Master's [ ] Prize Essay [ ]

1) May (with revisions) be considered for Publication
( ) yes (✓) no

2) May circulate [✓]

3) Is restricted [ ]

17 Feb. 1967
Date

Stanley Chyet
Signature of Referee

Statement by Author

(Please consult with Librarian if copyright protection is desired.)

I understand that the Library may make a photocopy of my thesis for security purposes.

The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis. ( ) yes (✓) no

February 16, 1967
Date

Michael B. Eisenstat
Signature of Author

Library Record

Microfilmed _____
Date

_____
Signature of Library Staff Member

The Attitudes of Some Post-World War II American-Jewish Authors To Judaism as Reflected in Their Works

by

Michael B. Eisenstat

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for
the Degree of Master of Arts in Hebrew Letters
and Ordination

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion
February, 1967

Referee: Dr. Stanley Chyet

The Attitudes of Some Post-World War II
American-Jewish Authors to Judaism
as Reflected in Their Works

by Michael B. Eisenstat

DIGEST

Within these pages I have taken a sampling of some American Jewish authors for the period following World War II. I have attempted to show their attitudes towards a variety of things, Jewish in nature, as they become manifest in their fiction. To some extent, my judgments are subjective, but, wherever possible, I have attempted to exercise control over my judgments by using common critical methods.

This thesis deals with works by the following authors: Saul Bellow, Howard Fast, Leslie Fiedler, Norman Fruchter, Meyer Levin, Ludwig Lewisohn, Norman Mailer, Bernard Malamud, Philip Roth, Jerome Weidman, and Herman Wouk. Even in attempting to deal with these few men, so great has been their creative output that, in most cases, I was unable to deal with all of their work. I have dealt with as much of their work as was possible and as I thought relevant in presenting what I considered to be the main thrust of their work.

My division of this thesis is indicative of much of what I found within the Jewish attitudes of each author. They treated the problem or question of Jewish assimilation, their individual conceptions of the Jew - the Jewish stereo-

type, so to speak. The question of Selbsthass arose, too, in the examination of some writers; indeed, there are Jews who hate themselves because they are Jews, and this thinking and the reaction to it is to be seen in the work of some of the authors whose works are discussed in these pages. The Jew as a moral person and the whole matter of a Jewish system of ethics are discussed by some of the authors of my sampling, as is the area of Jewish peoplehood and Jewish family life.

Some authors reflect a particular fascination with particular Jewish institutions (I am using the word "institution" in the broadest sense) such as the holidays and ritual observance, the barmitzvah and the seder. Some of these authors are concerned with Jewish theology, and the question of the change in religious matters which has taken place in Judaism, as, for example, the result or impact of Reform Judaism. Finally, I deal with the attitude of these authors to Israel - Zionism.

In most instances, all of these authors do not discuss a given subject. In some cases, there may be a passing reference to a subject by an author in a book, and then no other mention of the subject. In such cases, I have not included the author in the discussion of the subject. It is not only unfair to base a judgment on the basis of one brief or vague remark, it is almost impossible to do so with any degree of accuracy, especially when one addresses oneself to so subjective an area as fiction.

The authors whose works comprise the subject material of this thesis are all individuals whose minds function differently not only as regards the creation of their fiction, both as regards their opinions on the matters outlined above. The diversity of style and opinion encountered in their works has made the researching of this thesis uncommonly challenging.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

There has been an American Literature since the time that the white man first settled on these shores, and the Jew has been here since the mid-1600's. It is strange in view of this, that the Jew's appearance in American Letters is relatively so recent. While there would be an occasional Jew appearing in a story, stories were never about Jews. Even books by Jewish authors had to deal with non-Jewish subject matter, if they were to sell. The complexion of American Letters has changed since that time. In the pages which follow this introduction, the fiction of several Jewish authors will be examined in terms of the Jewish content to be found therein. The authors are all Jews, and the works which are discussed in these pages are, for the most part, post-World War II, though an occasional work may have been written at the tail end of the War.

The reason I decided to deal with authors who have written since the War was not entirely arbitrary. Certainly, within the pages of any given thesis, one could not hope to cover the totality of post-World War II American-Jewish fiction, much less the totality of American Jewish fiction, so extensive has been the output of twentieth-century Jewish authors. To that degree, of course, the limitation of my topic was practical and arbitrary. However, the facts with regard to the slaughter of Jews in

Europe during World War II had such a tremendous impact on the Jewish consciousness that I was fairly sure that there would be a significant impact on the authors of American Jewish fiction. I thought that I would be dealing with a different genre of fiction by dealing with that fiction written since the War.

To Nancy, who sat at home
for so many months that I
might write this thesis.

Assimilationism

The problem of the assimilation of the Jew to his environment is very old. Certainly, one finds it even in the books of the Hebrew Bible. Ever since then, Jews have found assimilation to be a problem and a challenge, their attitude toward assimilation notwithstanding.

The problem finds expression in the work of many practitioners of fiction who are Jewish and who are also American. In the work of Ludwig Lewisohn, the author is quite adamant on the subject. He is very much against the total assimilation of Jews into the gentile culture to the extent that they fail to retain their Jewish identity. He is not seeking a ghetto for the Jews of today, but rather an honorable coexistence. Indeed, he is quite bitter about those Jews who have lost all sense of pride in being Jews, yet for one reason or another are not yet able to forsake Judaism formally and therefore denigrate it and seek to have as little to do with it as possible. In his book Breathe Upon These, his attitudes come through in a clear and precise manner. He writes the skeleton for the story through the eyes of an American-Christian family. He sets up Ada Burnett, the mother of two sons and wife to a burgeoning businessman, as the chief ethical focus. It is through her eyes that the author will convey much of his feeling.

Ada is giving a dinner for two Jewish refugees and is concerned with making them feel welcome and at home. She has heard that the couple, he a world renowned scientist and his wife, are Orthodox, and so Ada calls a Jewish family to learn how she might best go about preparing and serving dinner so as not to offend her guests in any way. In contrast to the genuineness of the enquiry is the reply by the Jew. Rather than give a direct reply, the Jew is interested only in making sure that the gentile does not think that "she" subscribes to such "primitive notions" of religion:

> Oh that. Well, I hardly know. You see, we think that all that sort of thing is so silly and old-fashioned and foreign. My mother 'might' know.
>
> It was Ada who was silent for a little. She didn't know just why she was ashamed for the woman...just then the voice came back, a little firmer, a little deeper, and broke into an embarassed laugh. 'It seems to me from what I've been told a long time ago, of course,...' and I 'believe,' but heaven knows I'm no authority...but surely a scientist like Dr. Dorfsohn wouldn't go to such lengths...[1]

The implication is clear. The assimilated Jew is made to seem infinitely weaker and of far less moral fibre than is the ethical focal point, Ada Burnett.

Ada's husband, Paul Burnett, a rather neutral person in terms of the story, also comments about the assimilated Jews with whom he has had contact. His morally neutral position is of some significance since

this detachedness enables the author to use him to put forth a rather uncontestable view. He says:

> We haven't got any better citizens than Arthur Cronbach and some of his crowd, fellows like Mannheimer and Jake Stone and Joel Hurwitz. Business and public interests they're O.K. One hundred percent. But come to anything personal - they're not themselves. Act as if they had something to hide. Act up to you somehow. Or they'll tell - some of 'em - Jewish jokes that put Jews in a bad light. Then if you haven't got the hide of a rhinocerous, you feel ashamed for them.[2]

The irony in the above quotation is very obvious. With it, Lewisohn is cutting the ground out from beneath the feet of those who are trying to assimilate. He shows how they seek an acceptance which they could get only by behaving as does the Christian, namely, by behaving with dignity and pride. By seeking to hide from one's true identity, and by assigning to that identity a shameful position, the Jew is caught in the reflection of the very shame he thinks he is escaping. Lewisohn is clearly negative to such Jews, their public spiritedness notwithstanding. While all men have the option of taking an active role in a modern kind of life, they can do so only if they have enough integrity to identify with their own kind. In the words of Jerome Goodman, a lawyer in Lewisohn's <u>In a Summer Season</u>: "You're born a Jew, you live as a Jew, you die as a Jew. No getting out from under...you're choosing just between being a good Jew or a bad one."[3]

ii.

While much of Meyer Levin's work touches upon the problem of assimilation, in Compulsion his attitude is expressed implicitly, for the most part, rather than explicitly. Compulsion is not a "Jewish" novel in the sense that it does not seek to treat the subjects as Jews though they were Jews in a generally accepted way (both being born of Jewish parents). What seemed to become ever more obvious was the way in which Judaism was ignored by the author. Levin seemed to say without words that in the case of Judd and Artie, Judaism broke down. It had played no active or positive role in their lives. No references are made to any kind of religious upbringing or training. The families are extremely wealthy and assimilated American German-Jewish families. The values of a religious tradition are not seen to come into play at all.

Artie and Judd are Nietzscheans. Here, Levin seems to give a less esoteric reference in that Nietzschean philosophy is quite generally regarded as antipathetic to the general spirit found within the Jewish continuum. Levin seems to say that if the values of Judaism had been imparted to these boys, then the philosophy of Nietzsche would not have had such a profound effect upon them. In effect, there was a "vacuum" within the minds and spirits of Artie and Judd left by an absence of Jewish

values. Into this vacuum rushed the destructive philosophy of Nietzsche.

However, one cannot in all fairness make a case for something on the basis of its not having appeared! Levin's other books do contain material which speaks to the problem of assimilation. His novel Eva is a case in point.

In an attempt to escape the Nazis, the novel's heroine flees her native village disguised as a Ukrainian peasant-girl. She is perfectly disguised as to dress, even to the wearing of a large cross. When her mother puts the cross around Eva's neck, Eva has mixed reactions:

> Still, this moment gave me a strange feeling... Their cross. It was as though some additional dreadful thing could happen to me if I were caught, even wearing their cross. But, after all, hadn't Jesus been a Jew too?[4]

Eva feels strange stepping out of her former identity, and even stranger stepping into a new one. She tries immediately to accept this new identity, psychologically, by rationalizing about Jesus' Jewishness. Yet she cannot, by the same token, accept it to the extent that she could feel comfortable about being a Christian without going through a reasoning process.

Levin, a fine story-teller, has enough sense of drama and enough insight into people to give his characters flexibility, and yet at the same time, give still more emphasis to his thesis. Gradually Eva goes through a

change of attitude toward her new identity. "There was a life surge within me, in my belly...like an organic discharge of love..."[5] Eva, a young girl, has come to experience the meaning of the freedom which assimilation into the Christian world can bring. It is a heady experience, and she rejoices in it, not fully comprehending the full import and weight of assimilation. But this understanding is not long in coming:

> ...religion [Christianity] ...when it helped people...I could respect it. But the conviction that I would never again be myself, Eva, a Jewish daughter, overcame me.[6]

Clearly, the message is that with maturity and understanding is the need for an honest identity. One must be oneself. The author has set the scene for this message, having first made the reader think that Eva was eager to assimilate. The author has used a "straw man" to emphasize his view.

Nor is Levin content to say his piece, once. He says it again and with greater force and greater irony, later on. In the person of Stashek, Levin paints the picture of the totally assimilated Polish Jew. He is not even circumcised. He says:

> Being Jewish. What did that mean?...In time, Jews would be absorbed...would merge with others. What good was there in keeping alive this separation?... For an outmoded religion, a cult in which no enlightened person believed? ...Let them disappear.[7]

He is also negative to any related Jewish thing---Zionism, for example. Having just finished his speech, he is assassinated by a Polish fanatic because Stashek is a Jew! The irony is clear! Levin makes use of the lesson taught by Hitler to world Jewry. One cannot assimilate. The view and attitude of Stashek is utterly discredited. The book concludes with Eva in a totally Jewish environment, Palestine, married to a Jewish husband. She has resumed what for her (and for Levin) is the only possible identity for a Jew - Jewish identity. Levin hammers home the point by the totality of Eva's identity with Judaism.

In The Stronghold, Levin again plays strongly on the anti-assimilation theme. Again, much of his message is put forth in the ironical vein. The Jew who seeks hardest to escape the Jewish label is the one to be most affected when it eventually comes to rest on him, as it inevitably does in the work of Levin. In this case, it is Paul Vered, the Jewish (but strong assimilationist) ex-premier of France, who comes to realize that he has to learn more about his Jewish heritage and to become closer to those Jews who have never sought to assimilate. He realizes that he is one with those very Jews just as he is at home with the assimilationist Jews and non-Jews among whom he moves.

iii.

In the work of Herman Wouk, the mood changes somewhat. He is very much a part of the "Establishment." (typifying the White-Anglo-Saxon Protestant mentality. His likes and dislikes are theirs. He does not reflect the minority or dissenting viewpoint.) His characters are all very modern and clearly recognizable in our contemporary society. And yet, he holds the line on the question of assimilation. His characters all flirt with the allure of becoming totally a part of the gentile world, but the hero or heroine never gives way. This attitude is reflected in the relationship of the two chief characters in Marjorie Morningstar. Marjorie comes from a rather traditional Jewish home. Her parents are modern thinking people; however, they allow Marjorie a free rein with money and with her very busy social life. Marjorie falls in love with Noel Airman - a very assimilated Saul Ehrmann. Not only Noel, but his whole family are very much removed from the Jewish scene. Noel is a truly sparkling character. He is talented, witty, charming, brilliant, etc. Marjorie is beautiful. The two fall in love, and Marjorie hopes for marriage. While Marjorie has the role of the pursuer and Noel that of the pursued, Wouk seems to be giving the reader the impression that it is Noel who has the proper perspective on assimilation. And yet, after Marjorie has allowed him to have his affair

with her, and after she follows Noel to Paris, it is Marjorie who finally emerges as the stronger character, ultimately rejecting Noel and all that he stands for. This she chooses to do from a position of strength, not defeat or weakness. Noel has come to the realization that he truly loves Marjorie and needs her and wants to marry her. He tells her so, and she refuses. Wouk fades Noel out of the scene at Marjorie's wedding. Noel is there in the crowd, looking on sadly. Marjorie marries Milton Schwartz and embraces a middle-class Jewish identity.

Norman Paperman, in Don't Stop the Carnival, is a very assimilated man. He is a fine raconteur, a judge of fine wine, and a very "charming" man. He is quite conscious of the fact that he is a Jew, but is not at all uncomfortable about this fact. It is not without interest that Paperman eventually emerges as the ethical focus in the novel. He comes to realize after the tragic death of one of the women whom he loves that one must be what one is. One cannot swap roles at will in life. Thus, if one is born a Jew, then one must learn to live as a Jew, and not seek to escape into another world. Norman Paperman symbolizes this "discovery" (though Wouk is not discovering it for himself, anew, but is allowing the reader to make the discovery with Paperman as the vehicle). Paperman has sought to change his life

by escaping to a Carribean island paradise. However, he discovers that he is not really a part of this kind of life, and although he does manage to defeat those forces which would defeat him on the island, he cannot defeat the forces within himself. He returns to New York and reassumes his former role. So Wouk depicts the Jew who would run from his Judaism and seek a new life outside the Jewish Pale. Wouk says that ultimately he must return to be true to himself.

iv.

Jerome Weidman's work presents the picture of a man who has struggled with the problem of the Jew who wishes to assimilate. Weidman's characters are usually strongly humanistic and anti-particularistic. (The main characters, at any rate.) Like the characters of Herman Wouk, they flirt with assimilation. But with Weidman's characters, the flirtation seems to be more frantic, much more serious. The reader realizes that more than a flirtation is involved. The characters are far too serious about what they are doing. They are not merely playing the coquette. Quite the reverse. It is the Weidman character which does the pursuing, and the pursuit is often so intense that the reader is sure that the line will be crossed and assimilation will take place. And to some extent, it does. In <u>The Enemy Camp</u>,

Weidman does seem to condone intermarriage, if he does not whole-heartedly advocate it. And yet, somehow, he does remain, ultimately and just barely, within the fold of Judaism. In this book, George Hurst, the hero who has married a Christian girl makes the statement to a Catholic friend and business client whose daughter is going to marry a Jewish boy that he "...will always feel like Joe Louis at an all white dinner."[8] George is saying this many years after his marriage; he is speaking about a fait accompli. The question which the reader must ask himself is: "If George had it to do over again, would he?"

The strong opponent of assimilationism is George's Aunt Tessie. She hates "shkutzim" with an unreasoning hatred. She refuses to have any contact with them, and has nothing but contempt for any Jew who has contact with them beyond the absolute minimum requirements of business. When George announces his intention to marry Mary Sherrod, Aunt Tessie drops dead after bitterly condemning him. Again the reader is left with a question in his mind. Is Weidman suggesting that one cannot shut oneself off from the outside world, that to do so means death? Or is he rather condemning George for having brought about the death of the person who has loved him more than anyone else, who has raised him and cared for him? This writer thinks that the balance is toward the

former. The direction of the story and its entire thrust seems to be in that direction. (However, literature is a subjective discipline, and more than one interpretation is often possible.)

Uncle Zisha also seems to support the assimilationist view. Uncle Zisha is Tessie's brother. He is utterly different from Tessie. He is a humanist who could not abide the ghetto of the Lower East Side. He moved out shortly after Tessie had brought him there from Europe. He is gregarious and kind; he is generous and is a thoroughly likable character. His idol is Justice Brandeis, and his great desire is that George should emulate him and go to law school. He is definitely a positive ethical character. He tells George about Tessie:

> She's afraid of the world...That's why she hates your friend Danny for going with shkutzim. She's afraid to come out of her hole and look at the rest of America... Don't be like my sister Tessie...Don't be afraid of the world. Don't be afraid of people. And you'll grow up like Judge Brandeis.[9]

However, lest the above be interpreted as being a middle-of-the-road statement, the Golden Mean between total assimilation and the complete isolation of Aunt Tessie, Uncle Zisha's words come back to George in a flashback:

> 'Don't hide,' Uncle Zisha had said. 'Don't dig a hole, don't make a private ghetto for yourself and creep into it, the way Aunt Tessie did. Do what your

> heart tells you, not your religion. It's more important to be a man than a Jew,' Uncle Zisha had said, "and without listening to your heart you'll never be a man.'[10]

This, then, is more than a general statement by a humanist. It has gone beyond the general and become pointedly specific. It does not merely accentuate the positive, but it does so at the expense of the particular, namely Judaism. It is to be noted that Uncle Zisha is speaking after Tessie's death and is actually telling George to go ahead with his plans to marry Mary Sherrod. He is recalling Uncle Zisha's words in an attempt to protect his marriage which suddenly seems to be headed toward disaster, and to give it an additional measure of strength which it never before possessed. Throughout the years, George's problem was connected in part to holding on to his Jewish identity and, in part, trying to move in a gentile world. Thus, by harkening to Uncle Zisha's advice, to let go of the hold on this Jewish identity, George is able to find happiness with his wife and his life: "...he was now free...to go to her [Mary] with no strings attached."[11]

In The Sound of Bow Bells, Sam Silver, the hero, is another very assimilated Jew. Of humble origins in Manhattan's Lower East Side, he has become the nation's most successful magazine writer, and in reaching this state he has left Judaism behind him. He has left Judaism

behind him not necessarily deliberately, but unquestionably. Sam came from an observant home: his father worshipped daily, and his mother kept a kosher household. Yet he has brought up his son Billy without any religious education whatsoever. Billy has reached the age of barmitzvah, yet Sam has made no provision for the ceremony. This precipitates a quarrel between Sam and his mother. In this book, it is Sam's mother who is the positive ethical character. She has an amazing ability to see to the heart of problems, as Sam has often marveled. In this case, she says in an accusing way:

> ...Papa and I we're still what we always were and what we'll always be. We're Jews. [Why don't you make a Bar Mitzvah for Billy?]
> Why should I?
> Because Billy is a Jew...maybe you forgot it, Sam, but Papa and I, we don't want Billy to forget it.[12]

At this point, it would seem that Weidman is at the same point at which he was in Enemy Camp. This is not the case, at all. In Bow Bells, the hero is tremendously discontented in fundamental ways. He began his career with great promise. It seemed as though he would become a great novelist. Instead, he has become a financial success, a serial writer for women's magazines. Those who had faith in his greater talent, and Sam himself, are disappointed in him. The genuinely creative spark seems to have gone out of him.

Weidman makes Sam's career turn about the axis of the barmitzvah. This issue provides the denouement for the story. Sam finds himself as a person, once again, and in so doing also finds that he has a great compulsion to have his son celebrate his barmitzvah. During the barmitzvah, Sam suddenly feels the creative, artistic urge return. This is a transparent statement by the author, who has appeared to have been strongly on the side of assimilation, that one may, indeed, accommodate himself to life in a Christian environment in America provided that he retains his ties to his Jewish heritage. It is essential that the Jew retain a sense of his identity in order to retain his integrity as a human being. This is very different from the view heretofore followed by Weidman and expressed by him through the mouth of Uncle Zisha (see above, p. 12) Weidman has come away from the position that in order to be a humanist one must forsake particularism. He has matured and has changed his view to that in order to be a humanist in the fullest sense, one must first be a particularist.

Thus, Weidman rejects his earlier assimilationist view and modifies it. He is still enamoured with the non-Jewish world, and still seeks all of its pleasures, but he will seek them as a Jew rather than as an integrated part of that world.

v.

Leslie Fiedler is the current angry man of American fiction. While he is not primarily concerned with American-Jewish assimilationism, nonetheless, in his flailing out at everything and anything, Fiedler manages to hit upon this subject.

In his trilogy, The Last Jew in America, in the novelette by that title, Moskowitz, the campus Jew of Lewis and Clarke University, attempts to recruit a minyan for Kol Nidrei at the request of his old and dear friend Louis Himmelfarb who is dying of cancer. Moskowitz approaches many of the assimilated Jews on and around campus: "But they just stared back blankly, those so called Jews from the Faculty - with their gentile wives, their Ph.D's, their button-down collars - answering him evasively..."[13]

Moskowitz presses them for an answer, embarrassed at even having to ask them to perform this mitzvah: "But their eyes answered him even before their lying mouths - their goyish eyes, bloodshot from last night's cocktail party."[14] The mood is obviously against these assimilated Jews. Every adjective used by Fiedler condemns them. Yet, it appears as though Fiedler believes that assimilation is not only bad, but is inevitable, for he has Moskowitz envisage a new role for himself: "...he could be for the descendents of vanished, incredible

Jews a Jew in real life, a terrible fact"!![15] By so doing, Moskowitz would be something that has disappeared or is at least largely disappearing: the Jew as he becomes ever more assimilated.

Apparently, Fiedler is sad to see the disappearance of the Jew as he loses his special identity and becomes one with gentile or "WASP" America. He is also angry. Moskowitz, again is his mouthpiece:

> ...he grew more indignant with each repetition...speaking in the tones of a God in whom...he did not believe. What makes you think you have the right to be the last Jew in America? Five thousand years of history you have no right to cancel out unilaterally.[16]

Thus, Fiedler feels that assimilation is an insult to history if for no other reason than that it is wrong.

vi.

Like Fiedler, Bernard Malamud is not principally concerned with the problem of assimilation, yet he too, cannot totally ignore it. In "Lady of the Lake" which appeared in his collection of short stories The Magic Barrel, a young man, Jewish, goes to an Italian resort area. His name is Henry Levin, but he decides to go by an alias which will free him from the stigma and burden of being a Jew. He becomes Henry R. Freeman. He meets a girl with whom he promptly falls in love. He thinks that she is Isabella del Dongo. In reality

she is the caretaker's daughter. Several times, she asks him whether he is Jewish and upon each occasion he is astounded (why should she keep asking him that?) and on each occasion he firmly denies it. He has made up his mind that this time, he will not allow being Jewish to stand in his way. Finally, the girl tells him that she is not really Isabella, but only the caretaker's daughter, a Jewess and a survivor of Buchenwald: "I can't marry you. We are Jews. My past is meaningful to me. I treasure what I suffered for."[17]

Henry is unable to reply - to make an affirmation of his Judaism at this time could earn him only contempt. Malamud seems to scorn the denial of Judaism in pursuit of assimilationist goals, and in fact says that he applauds the girl's stand. Not only ought one not seek to assimilate and lose one's identity, but one ought to be proud of one's identity.

In The Fixer, Yakov Bok seeks to leave the shtetl. He goes to the city of Kiev and pretends to be a Christian in a section of the city where Jews are forbidden. He is found out, and a charge of ritual murder is trumped up against him. He undergoes tremendous suffering, and finally, it is only the concerted effort of many Jews that saves him from rotting in anonymity. Again, the lesson is clear. There is grave danger in assimilation. Furthermore,

it cannot really be accomplished. The Jew must remain a Jew. He must remain with his own.

vii.

When Norman Mailer wrote The Naked and the Dead, certain of his attitudes toward Judaism or toward Jews became evident. While largely falling under the heading of "Selbsthass," which will be discussed in a subsequent chapter, this attitude has as a corollary a predisposition toward assimilation. Thus, it is not surprising to find in An American Dream, a hero (or anti-hero) named Stephen R. Rojak who is half Jewish and half Protestant. Only his gentile wife ever refers to him as a Jew. In no way does Rojak ever do anything that might be considered "Jewish," nor does he have association with Jews. His activities would be considered antipathetic to Judaism (as they would to Christianity, too, except that the things that he does are generally found done among Christians, traditionally, rather than among Jews.). He is a hard drinking, hard loving man, making the rounds of bedrooms. The fact that Rojak is a "Jewish-Protestant" seems to be Mailer's way of saying that he himself has nothing to say on the subject of Judaism. As Rojak is assimilated (i.e., a member of the Protestant establishment -- being "in" by having a taint of Jewishness) so is Mailer, and he leans towards that assimilation.

viii.

The attitude toward assimilation in Howard Fast's very beautiful book My Glorious Brothers, is patently clear. Through the story of the Maccabean struggle, he portrays the image of a people who value their individuality and their separateness. However, lest this sound like a mere description of a nation of long ago who fought for nationhood but value it no more on the basis of Jewish identity today, let the reader pick up the text. The love and devotion which the book was written with quickly give the lie to such a notion. Those Jews who had the courage and the strength to remain apart despite the tremendous force of the assimilationist urge are portrayed as monumental heroes. They are larger than life; they are braver, kinder, wiser than ordinary men of flesh and blood. And yet, while Fast's treatment of such persons makes them larger than life, his style is such that even as he makes them so extraordinary, he makes them men. They have faults and foibles. They are weak as other men are weak. Fast does not say, then, that only supermen can resist the forces of assimilation; men of flesh and blood can, too, if only they will.

In juxtaposition to these heroes, the Brothers Maccabee, Fast sets the Hellenized Jews. Instead of fighting bravely, they are holed up in a fortress in

Jerusalem, the wards of Assyria, sitting and cowering. They are afraid of their protectors, and they fear their own people. In attempting to assimilate, they have rather set themselves as an island apart. They have no real identity. In telling the Roman legate about those Jews who have continued to live in an assimilated Greco way, Simon ben Mattathias, the last of the Maccabees, through whose eyes most of the story is told, says: "They were Jews,' he said, his voice ringing loud enough for anyone within a score of paces to hear. 'They are scum today!'"[18] The passion and the ongoing quality of this entire book cannot help but induce the reader to consider this Howard Fast's point of view as regards the question of assimilation.

And again:

> ...there is so much a man can travel and no more, for when his belly is full of slavery and cruelty, he has to go away from the "nokri" and come to his own...

Is Fast not saying that it is only with one's own that one can relax and be oneself? Thus, Fast says that it is more than a question of integrity, but it is a question of survival as individuals. The Jew must remain a Jew in order to keep his sanity and his entire perspective as regards life and his place in the world.

In Moses, Prince of Egypt, Fast portrays the young Moses in the palace of Pharaoh. This is, of course, in

Moses' "pre-Jewish" period. In the novel, that which stands out is the way in which Moses is able to resist all those persons and forces which would shape him to their needs and desires. Even more striking is the fact that Moses is aware of how he could greatly profit by being like those who surround him. If he would but conform, then, with his natural attributes of strength, regal bearing, intelligence, etc., he would most easily ascend the throne of Egypt. Yet, Moses manages always to remain aloof from those who would swallow him up with their devices and schemes. Always, he remains Moses. He maintains his distinctive coloration, as it were, and thus even as a young man he becomes the potential leader of a people which is to remain ever apart. As Moses becomes qualified to lead the Israelites by virtue of his individuality and his ability to remain unassimilated, so ought the Jew to remain apart and unassimilated.

Indeed, Fast may well be saying that as Moses resisted the pressures to assimilate under the most positive conditions, so ought the Jew in the present resist the pressures to assimilate under present positive conditions.

Summary

Briefly, then, with the exception of Norman Mailer, all of the authors who have indicated some feeling with regard to the subject of Jewish assimilation have been negative toward it. Their reasons have varied from that of Leslie Fiedler who feels that for a Jew to assimilate is to ignore five thousand years of history, and that to do so is intrinsically wrong, to that of a Jerome Weidman who feels that that identity with which a person is born is an intrinsic and inalienable part of self, and that for the individual to annihilate the part of him that is "Jew," is to annihilate the self, in particular, the creative self.

Then there is Ludwig Lewisohn who is against the Jew losing his identity. He feels that the Jew is the embodiment of so much that is good and of benefit to mankind that in forsaking his identity, he will lose his drive toward these positive goals.

The others, Wouk, Malamud, Levin, and Fast fall more-or-less within these bounds. The exception is Norman Mailer. He alone, of those authors whose work has been studied for this survey, does not appear to be particularly concerned with the survival of the Jews as a distinct entity. Indeed, it would seem that he is negative to the question of Jewish survival. Mailer, himself, seems to have assimilated, having adopted the

values antipathetic to Judaism and burned his Jewish bridges behind him.

The Literary Conception of the Jew

One cannot help but notice the various roles in which one finds Jews in the several novels encompassed within the scope of this survey. This, of course, stems from the different conception of the Jew and his role in society and in the world on the part of the individual author. For some authors the conception of the Jew stems from his role in history, from the association of the Jew with his European background, a pariah. A discomfort about this association may be evinced by the author. On the other hand, the nostalgia for a past that has become romanticized with the passage of time may be the touchstone for the creative literary artist.

The author may look at the society which he knows from broad personal experience and cull it to form his own abstraction of the Jew, or he may have drawn a picture in his mind based on what he has heard.

In any event, no matter how the individual author has arrived at his particular view as regards the Jews, it is unquestionably a highly individual view as shall be illustrated in this chapter.

i.

Aside from the assimilationist Jews which he deplored so greatly, Lewisohn tends to depict the Jew

as a hero. Indeed, it appears that this need stems from the European holocaust, and the need to show the Christian world what they have done. If he can show the greatness of the Jew, then he feels that he will indeed exact penance from the world which sought to destroy him.

Lewisohn, for the most part, uses understatement to show the Jew in a favorable light. Dorfsohn is a world-renowned scientist, but he always behaves with the extreme modesty of a man who realizes how little his worth is. Lewisohn never depicts Dorfsohn as "blowing his own horn." It is always done by others in praise of him. Similarly, with his wife. She is not the unimportant Hausfrau which she seems to be. In Europe she was a physician. This fact comes out at the dinner given by the Burnetts, but it comes out so very much derek al gav, that it cannot help but catch the sophisticated reader's eye as being an example of Lewisohn's intended understatement. The Dorfsohn's behave with great modesty toward themselves and their own achievements, but this does not mean that they have nothing to say about other Jews. Throughout the dinner-party, which is in reality only a stage which Lewisohn has set to give Dorfsohn a backdrop against which to speak (to give Lewisohn a

proper setting to put forth his thesis on the Jews) Dorfsohn extolls the Jews as learned, sensitive, and intelligent human beings. He also lauds them for their loyalty and devotion to whichever country they have called home. He shows them to be innocent victims of the events which have befallen them. He feels their righteous anger for them (for the European Jews) and shows the horrible guilt of the entire civilized and cultured world for allowing such a thing to happen; he does not blame the Nazis alone.

To Lewisohn, then, the Jew is an intellectual superman, embracing all that which is fine and good in civilized man.

ii.

For Herman Wouk, there is no such thing as "a" place for the Jew in our society. To him, the Jew is as much an integral part of society as is the W.A.S.P. The Jew is a full-fledged member of the Establishment. In his most recent work, alone, it is possible to see how he has established the Jew in every walk of life. Norman Paperman is a successful Broadway agent. He is charming and cultured. Lester Atlas is the powerful and somewhat sinister businessman. The part of the young intellectual is played by Sheldon Klug. Wouk feels secure enough to poke fun at Sheldon, making

him a caricature of the young person with a fine mind, but misplaced values and a big mouth. Hazel is modern youth: she is bright, spoiled, and flighty. However, she is basically a "good kid." Bob Cohn is the idealistic young man. He is a Jewish "frogman." He is a genuine intellectual, but hides it, preferring to appear quite otherwise. Sheldon characterizes him:

> It's a stereotype that he affects... the existential hero that Hemingway popularized, the intellectual confining himself to the vocabulary and reference frame of an inarticulate roughneck...which is central to the American anti-intellectual ethos...[19]

All of these characters have two sides. As seen in the above quotation, Sheldon does have a good mind. However, he is also an obnoxious human being as is patently clear throughout the entire novel. Norman has many fine qualities, but he also suffers from human frailty, committing adultery. Hazel is flighty, but on occasion seems to show good sense. Atlas is a ruthless corporation raider, but he is also the one with creative ideas on how to run a resort hotel in the Caribbean. He is charming and good to his friends as well as merciless to his enemies.

In short, all of the characters in this book could be Catholic or Protestant as easily as Jewish. They just "happen" to be Jewish. Perhaps this is

because Wouk feels truer to life identifying with his own group (though he did a fine job in The Caine Mutiny without relying on a Jewish cast of characters). However, the fact that each of the characters could be of any religious background seems to indicate that Wouk feels very much a part of the Establishment. He fits in smoothly with it. A Jew is the same as a Christian in society.

Wouk's earlier work, Marjorie Morningstar, shows Wouk of this same opinion at an earlier date. While this is a more particularistic novel, in many ways, nonetheless, many of the characters could be Christian as well as Jewish. Judge Ehrmann is very much at home in the Christian world, and from his associations, one gets the impression that he moves freely in it. He is another character who could easily be a Christian, but who just happens to be Jewish. The group of young people with whom Marjorie socializes as a young girl are all the children of wealthy Jews, but were it not for their names, one would be completely at a loss to identify them as such. They are simply young people, like any other young people.

Summing up: to Herman Wouk, the Jew is an integrated member of American society with little or nothing to identify him from other members of the

society in which he moves. He is as much a part of it as is his Christian counterpart.

iii.

Jerome Weidman looks at Herman Wouk with a kind of envy. Wouk is convinced of what Weidman would like to believe in his heart to be true, namely, that the Jew is a homogeneous member of society. Weidman is striving toward such a position, but does not really believe that it is true. He goes so far as to admit that for some Jews it is true. However, most Jews are too self-conscious of being Jews to allow them to move uninhibitedly in society. They remain peripheral to society, outsiders looking in. "In," is the gentile world. The William Prager's have achieved this kind of "in" as far as George Hurst is concerned in The Enemy Camp:

> Even though the Pragers were Jews, in their home George always felt the way he used to feel as a kid when having forgotten for the moment his terror of the shkutzim he found himself... in front of Gerrity's or...when he was forced as an employee in the L.L. Parker mailroom to listen to Mr. Shumacher's jokes about heebs.[20]

When George enters their house, he feels that he has entered the home of Christians; he is an outsider who has been invited inside for a peek. He feels a kind of awe. He realizes that he is an outsider, a

man on the periphery and that the Prager family has somehow managed to crack the barrier.

In The Sound of Bow Bells, the image is the same. However, in the period of time that has lapsed between The Enemy Camp and this latter work, Weidman has made some steps forward, emotionally, toward coming inside. In the idiom of the day, he has "made it." He can now send his children to the schools of the wealthy gentiles. He no longer fears to mix with the "insiders," but is still very much conscious of the fact that he is mixing with them, yet is not, in reality, one of them.

iv.

Leslie Fiedler, like Jerome Weidman, conceives of the Jew as marginal to society. He moves in an orbit around society, but not in it. What is most interesting in Fiedler's conception is that this is the way it should be. He is not so naive as to think that this is the way things always are. However, when he is wrong, and he is most sensitive to these occasions, he is highly resentful! He wants things to conform to his pre-conceived paradigms. In The Second Stone, Clem berates with righteous anger his boyhood friend, Rabbi Mark Stone, whom he accuses of being a fraud and inauthentic:

> I'm the real Jew, too, Mark. The real Jew, Rabbi, if to be a Jew means to live on the margins of the world in failure and terror, to be in exile... you're righteous...I accuse you of being well-adjusted, you - you "goy."[21]

The irony of this outburst is immense, for Clem is a Christian! He has lived among Jews all his life, and even married a Jewess. But Fiedler has set him up as Mark's alter-ego as a mirror for the Jew. He gives back an unflattering reflection for he is an ethical focus. He has delivered the moral message or the author's conceptual image of what the Jew ought to be. This image is clearly not that of a Wouk, or even of a Weidman. For Fiedler, the proper place for the Jew is on the outskirts of society, and it is the place which the Jew should choose for himself.

v.

What is interesting to note is the fact that the Jew as conceived by Wouk, Weidman and Fiedler is a creature of the city. While this is never explicitly stated, it is conspicuously so. Only in Don't Stop the Carnival does Wouk present a character who becomes alienated from city life. Norman Paperman thinks that he will become an Islander in the Caribbean. After a year, he realizes that he is indeed a creature of the city and he hurries back

to New York. So, too, with Weidman and Fiedler. The city in which the characters find themselves varies: it may be New York, it may be Rome, it may even be a small city in the western part of the United States, but it is always a city. The Jew is not a farmer. He finds no mystique in the country.

With Howard Fast, the mood changes. It changes so noticeably that one cannot help but wonder whether Mr. Fast is indulging in "apologia." Of all the authors discussed in these pages, Howard Fast is the only one who portrays the Jew as being at home with and in nature. For Fast, the Jew is the non-urban man. Fast goes to considerable length to portray the Jew in nature in My Glorious Brothers. Simon is narrating the story; he says:

> We found the Adon and my brother John terracing. This way, from time immemorial the land came into being. We build a wall on a hillside and then fill it in with baskets of soil from the bottom lands.[22]

Here, then, is the Jew as farmer. One might possibly say that Fast is only making the Jew a farmer since at the time of which he writes, agriculture was the main occupation of the people. It is only for the sake of realism that Fast makes the Maccabees farmers. However, such is not the case. Fast puts them in the role of farmers to give them a certain air. As

farmers, they possess a certain solidity and permanence which they would not as merchants or in any other occupation.

In another passage: "...and then the evening was so cool and pleasant, the moon so round and bright, that I was loath to return, but sat myself under an olive tree where I could watch the moon and smell the clean sea breeze."[23] This is the Jew very much at home in the pastoral setting, far removed from his traditional setting of the city. Fast writes of the girl whom Simon and Judah loved: "She loved the land the way I loved it, the way a Jew can love the land and the fruit of it."[24]

In a narrative fashion, Simon (Fast's mouthpiece) tells the Roman legate about the Jews:

> We are the people of the Book, the Word and the Law; and in the Law itself it is written, "Thou shalt not hold a slave and have him ignorant." In a world where very few can read and write, the merest water carrier among us reads and writes...[25]

Fast is proud of the reputation that the Jews have as a learned people. It is something so important that the least among the Jews is taught it. This Fast views as a fact and as a source of pride. The fact that even among Jews, in certain areas and of certain times, illiteracy was rampant either escapes Fast's knowledge or he chooses to ignore it.

In a book dealing with the savage wars fought by his brothers, Simon says: "We are a people of peace...is it not written that three things are holier than others - Peace, Life, and Justice? There is no glory in war for us, and we alone have no mercenaries yet our patience is not endless."[26] Fast is again giving his conception of the Jew and possibly engaging in some more apologia. Is it not possible that Fast's Achilles' heel is the passivity of the Jews in the face of degradation and overwhelming slaughter? It is interesting to note that Fast's entire description of the Jews of Judea and of Judea itself is a perfect parallel to the Sabra and to Israel today. Perhaps he is setting the scene for the justification of Israel and the pride of the entire Jewish world in Israel. This is the subjective element in literature; ultimately, it is the individual reader who must decide. But unquestionably, Fast is proud of certain stereotyped characteristics of the Jew: men of the book, men of peace, men who respect wisdom. He longs for the accretion of certain other stereotypes -- the man at home with nature, and the man who shuns commerce: "Moses ben Aaron had travelled and seen things, a rare matter with us who are...not a people of commerce..."[27] As regards the Jew, then, Fast accentuates the positive and plays down the negative.

vi.

Certain themes and modes seem to capture the imagination of Bernard Malamud in his conception of the Jew. For Malamud, unquestionably, the Jew is a suffering creature. In The Assistant, this becomes clear quickly. Morris Bober is a poor grocer in a poor neighborhood. He is a man of shattered dreams brought to the grocery store by general circumstances. He ran away from the Russian Army only to become entombed in the grocery store. The grocery store business becomes always worse. The reader is constantly left with the impression that Morris must quit, that he can suffer no longer, that he cannot possibly continue to eke out an existence. Yet he sufferingly does. By strange circumstances Bober acquires an assistant, an Italian (Italian-American). He helps Morris greatly, but after a short while he realizes how bad things are. He and Morris get into many discussions. In one discussion Frank says to Morris concerning Jews: "[the Jew] that has got the biggest pain in the gut and can hold onto it the longest without running to the toilet is the best Jew."[28] Crudely expressed, but succinctly, is the idea that the essence of Judaism or Jewish existence is suffering. As the story continues, Frank, becoming ever more involved with the Bober family, gradually begins to suffer more and more. He assumes the burden of the

store and the support of the Bober family. Due to an indiscretion on his part, the love which had been blossoming between Frank and Helen, Bober's daughter, is crushed, and Frank sees Helen begin to go with another man. Soon, Frank is suffering as much if not more than Morris had ever suffered. The theme of the Jew as one who suffers is climaxed with the conclusion of the book:

> One day...Frank had himself circumcised... he dragged himself around with a pain between his legs. The pain enraged and inspired him. After Passover he became a Jew.[29]

But it is not in The Assistant, alone, that Malamud portrays the Jew as a suffering creature. Certainly Yakov Bok suffers immensely in The Fixer. His suffering is that of a martyr. Nor is it only Yakov Bok who suffers. Malamud leaves the definite impression that all of the Jews of Yakov's acquaintance are also suffering, his father-in-law, and even his unfaithful wife. Jews suffer. In The Jewbird, a story about a Jewish crow, there is suffering. While the bird constantly complains about "anti-Semiten," one does see that he really does suffer. He suffers from the anti-Semiten, but he suffers from old age too. The very personality of the Jewbird is that of someone who has suffered, who will suffer, who was meant to suffer.

In Take Pity, Mr. Rosen tries to help the suffering widow of a grocer and her children. She is in terrible straits and is, of course, suffering. She refuses help, and because of his inability to help because of her refusal, Rosen suffers, too. In The Bill, a grocery store is bought from a Jewish couple. The couple who buy it are Christians, and within a short time, they begin to suffer.

The image of the grocery store and suffering are oft-repeated images in Malamud's fiction.

In contrast to Howard Fast's image of the Jew in nature, Malamud joins the camp of those who find the Jew to be a city creature. Unlike the others who imply this by omission, Malamud states this position explicitly. On a rare occasion when Morris Bober leaves the grocery store: "He hadn't remembered that space provided so many ways to go...he had little love for nature. It gave nothing to a Jew."[30] In A New Life, S. Levin, the fugitive from the New York ghetto - flees to the coast of the north-western United States. The thought of becoming part of nature is so exciting to Levin that he can hardly sleep. He dreams that he is rejected by nature, that it says to him "Levin go home."[31] It is as though the dream were a summons back to the ghetto,

to the typical framework of the Jew. Indeed, Levin in rushing to embrace nature is not Malamud's conception of the typical Jew. The opening sentence conveys this message to the reader: "S. Levin, formerly a drunkard...got off the train at Marathon, Cascadia..."[32]

Yet, S. Levin is typical in one way of the normative Jew. He is marginal to society; he is the outsider looking in. Whether Malamud intended this one exception to enter into his picture of the otherwise atypical Jew is not important. What is important is that it correlates with the rest of the imagery regarding the Jew that has been used again and agin by Malamud.

vii.

The image of the Jew as one who suffers that is seen in the work of Bernard Malamud is seen also in the writings of Saul Bellow. In The Victim, Bellow plays with the image of suffering. Asa Leventhal, the central figure of the novel "...felt that the harshness of his life had disfigured him..."[33] And then "...Leventhal suddenly felt that he had been singled out to be the object of some freakish, insane process..."[34] Leventhal is then found by an old acquaintance, Allbee, who blames Leventhal for the

wreck Allbee has made of his own life. He begins to hound Leventhal, taking advantage of Leventhal's more charitable instincts. He constantly blames Leventhal for his misfortune. The image of the victim becomes a two-fold image. Both Leventhal and Allbee seem to be suffering. But there can be no doubt that Leventhal is suffering every bit as much as the so-called victim, Allbee. Leventhal constantly conjures up the image of suffering in conjunction with persecution. The history of the Jews is one of persecution, to him, and the corollary to persecution is suffering on the part of the persecuted.

When summoned by his boss, Leventhal thinks "Beard would probably send for him and call him down, ostensibly for some mistake which he would dig up."[35] There is implied in Leventhal's words, some hint on the part of the author that the Jew may also have a penchant for dreaming up persecution, and may possibly cause himself undue and unnecessary suffering. Indeed, Leventhal's friend Harkavy warns Leventhal about this trait:

> There isn't a thing he can do to you. Whatever you do, don't get ideas like that into your head. He can't persecute you. Now be careful. You have that tendency, boy, do you know that?

The characters in Bellow's second finest work The Adventures of Augie March suffer and are, of course, Jewish. They suffer because of the circumstances of their lives. They suffer because of inter-personal relationships. While many people suffer because of personal relationships, it is also true that they revel, that they exult. But Bellow's characters only suffer, with but a brief interlude, for purposes of dramatic relief.

Unquestionably the protagonist of Herzog, Moses Herzog, is a suffering man and a very Jewish man. Moses Herzog is buffeted about by persons who take advantage of his loving and credulous nature. He is a natural victim to mankind's spiritual predators. His wife is terribly cruel to him, not only as she cuckolds him (sending her lover to their home to pick up her diaphragm) but also in her general behavior toward him after the divorce (when Moses has been arrested for possession of a gun). She seeks to castrate him and to leave him with no respect for himself.

Interestingly, it is not only the sufferer who is the Jew, but often the one who inflicts the suffering. Jew tortures Jew in Herzog more than anyone. There seems to be something self-destructive in Bellow's conception of the Jew. Perhaps it is Bellow's opinion

that one who suffers must have some outlet for that suffering and that agony, and the best outlet is to act cruelly to those closest to him. This can be borne out in the relationship to Moses Herzog by his "friends." Yet Herzog, himself, who is the most Jewish of any of them, who suffers the most, does not inflict others with hurt out of his own sufferings. Herzog's lawyer says to him: "Well, when you suffer, you really suffer. You're a real, genuine old Jewish type..."[36]

Another rather well-defined image in Bellow's conception of the Jew is that of the wanderer. This is clear in both Augie March and Herzog. Augie is certainly a wanderer. He is always travelling. He is usually going because of someone else's desires. He goes to Canada, to Mexico, all over the United States, and eventually to Europe. Herzog, too, is a wanderer. His journeys have carried him all over the United States and Europe. In Herzog, the physical wandering is complemented by a Joycean type of wandering, as well, re-enforcing the image of the wanderer. Bellow has written Herzog on two levels: the level of temporal reality and the level of Stream of Conscious thinking. One is brought immediately to a consciousness of Joyce's Ulysses. Thus the image of the wanderer is inescapable. Augie and Herzog, while they seem to wander

about aimlessly at least on a physical level, are both wandering on an endless spiritual journey in quest of peace and solace in otherwise suffering-filled lives.

Summary

Various pictures or conceptions of the Jew emerge in the fiction of the authors who are concerned with the Jew as an individual. Thus, in the work of Wouk and Weidman, the picture of the Jew in relation to his society emerges. With the former the Jew is a comfortable part of that society while with the latter, the Jew is an outsider looking in and longing to be a comfortable member and a secure member of that society. Leslie Fiedler is unhappy with the Jew when he becomes too comfortable. The Jew, for Fiedler, is meant to remain the outsider, and ought not try to enter within the more exclusive center (which may or may not be of any value). For all of these men, the Jew is clearly an urban man. His place is in the city, not in the country; he is not at home with nature.

Howard Fast stands out from the rest of the authors surveyed in this chapter in that with his conception of the Jew, alone, is the Jew very much at home in nature. His man is not at all the city man. Fast shuns the image of the Jew as merchant to the world. The Jew is the farmer, the rural man who is at home in the fields and in the bosom of nature. He also portrays the Jew as the man who loves learning and justice, the people who pursue peace, yet will fight when pushed beyond

the bounds of patience.

Bernard Malamud and Saul Bellow conceive of the Jew, again, as the urban man. However, the most conspicuous part of their conception of the Jew is that of the sufferer. This personification of suffering is a dominant figure in their work. Of note, in Malamud's work, too, is the persistance of the Jew as grocer. The grocery store constantly recurs in his writings. It seems to be an image closely connected to and with suffering - a slow, gradual deletion of life.

While at first glance, it might appear as though several of Malamud's characters are also wanderers, it is not so. Yakov Bok in The Fixer, Arthur Fidelman in The Last Mohican and in Still Life, as well as S. Levin in A New Life are not really wanderers. They each make a journey, but do not wander in an aimless fashion as does the wanderer. One might conjecture that Malamud sees the Jew as always journeying to a promised land, but never quite finding it.

Bellow, in addition to conceiving of the Jew as a man who suffers greatly, sees the Jew as a wanderer. He is a physical wanderer and a spiritual wanderer, too, on an endless journey in quest of peace and solace.

Selbsthass

Judaism, irrespective of any particular form of it, is not a subject with which a Jewish author can deal in an entirely objective manner. Since it is a part of his identity and a part of his very being, or self, he is deprived of utter objectivity. His subjective feelings regarding the Jew and/or Judaism often break through into his writing and can be examined by the perceptive reader.

i.

In Compulsion, Meyer Levin recognizes Selbsthass as a definite factor contributing to the inner fury of Judd and Artie which led to the murder of Paulie Kessler. To Levin, self hatred is a sickness. Sam Silver, the young newspaper reporter (in reality, the young Meyer Levin), questions Willie Weiss, a medical student who had also been friendly with Judd and Artie about the personality of the boys, in particular that of Judd who seemed to be the sicker of the two having mutilated the corpse. Willie brings in the Jewish aspect of the case: "Wasn't that one of his conflicts? Didn't he have to obliterate the problem of being a Jew?"[37] Willie is referring to the fact that Judd had tried to destroy with acid the penis of Paulie Kessler.

Silver has felt horror all along at that part of the crime. Yet he grudgingly accepts Willie's explanation of that aspect of the crime. In effect, Levin, alias Silver, recognizes the built-in problem of being a Jew, the fact that such an identity will often bring about social rejection--Judd had been very upset about not having been able to join a gentile fraternity. Levin recognizes the fact that being Jewish can create problems. What is not mentioned, explicitly, however, is that being Jewish does not create problems of too great a magnitude for healthy persons. It is only in sick minds that the hatred of self as Jew becomes a big problem. Thus Levin says that Jewish Selbsthass is a part of a disease, a sickness. As such, he does not deplore it and berate those who hate themselves and others for being Jews, but can only shake his head sadly in recognition of the fact that Selbsthass exists, and pity those who are afflicted with the ailment.

ii.

In The Last Jew in America, Max Schultheis is not only a thoroughgoing assimilationist, he is also a self-hating Jew. Fiedler makes him a cruel and crude individual, certainly calculated to gain the reader's animosity and never his sympathy. This would

lead one to the conclusion that Fiedler is negative to Jewish self-hatred. However, with Fiedler, it is difficult to lay down hard and fast rules. He is so infinitely critical of the Jew who hates himself for being Jewish, and he is ardently critical of so many things "Jewish," that it is extremely difficult to tell, for certain, just what his viewpoint really is. Fiedler's nature is to be critical. All things that fall beneath the critical beam of his mind's eye are mercilessly exposed and are game for his critical skills. Thus his criticisms of Jews and things Jewish (to be discussed at greater length under "Jewish Institutions") are not actually evidences of Selbsthass, but are rather simply more meat for the grinder of his mind.

We have already discussed Fiedler's attitude toward assimilation, and it would seem that he does possess some pride and perhaps some grudging affection for Judaism, but this does not prevent him from being critical of Judaism, Jews or things Jewish. Indeed, if such criticism were to be accounted as evidence of Selbsthass, then most rabbis (at least most Reform rabbis) would be guilty. One must of necessity distinguish between the individual who criticizes out of hate and malice, and the individual who criticizes out of the desire to improve that to which he belongs and which he loves and of which he is a trifle proud. Fiedler falls into the latter category, lashing

out against those who criticize out of hatred, while reserving his own right to be bitterly and bitingly critical of that which he loves and wishes to improve.

iii.

While Jerome Weidman's work evidences a great tendency toward assimilation, stopping just short of the abyss, he reacts quite definitely to the subject of the self-hating Jew. The character of Ham (Hampton) Farnsworth, nee Irving Feuerknecht, in The Sound of Bow Bells is Weidman's self-hating Jew. Weidman depicts him as a "goy-hater." Farnsworth constantly berates Christians to their face and behind their backs, calling them by a variety of epithets, all connected in one way or another to their gentile status. He constantly harps on his own Jewishness, and his own Jewish superiority. Indeed, one of his business associates - a person not at all unkindly disposed to Jews, says to him: "Boy, Ham, you sure ride that Jewish thing into the ground."[38] Farnsworth has deeply internalized the frustrations - either real or imagined - that being a Jew has meant:

> I'll tell you what I've got to be sore about...I'll tell you what my complaint is...If I were not a Jew, if in addition to my ability and talent that one stupid card of race had fallen at birth for me as it fell for you...I would not be working for Alfred Trafalgar and Calder Singlenight, but those two pudding-headed slobs would be working for me - as shipping clerks.[39]

> If you're born a Jew, you're stuck with it...every day of our lives it is rubbed into us over and over again that it's the biggest disadvantage since the hairlip.[40]

To the query of whether being a Jew has hurt Sam Silver, the budding novelist-hero in this book, Farnsworth replies:

> You know God damn well how it's hurt him, you doubledealing little vontz of a shaygitz... He didn't win that contest because there were six judges in this effing contest, and only one of them is a Jew...[41]

Eventually, Sam comes to the realization that Farnsworth is a Jew-hating Jew. He tells Farnsworth: "I'd rather burn this manuscript than have it published by a Jew-hating animal like you."[42] Weidman, in this scene, has made Sam the ethical focus. He has portrayed Farnsworth ever more like the animal Sam accuses him of being. He has become ever more vulgar, ever more crude and unbearable. Thus Sam's accusation rings clear and true. Weidman possesses a contempt for the man who hates himself for being a Jew. This attitude is borne out by the earlier discussion of Weidman's attitude toward assimilation. He has flirted seriously with it, and then made a definite rejection of it as a viable possibility for meaningful living. He feels that a man must be what he is and learn to live fully and completely with that fact of his existence. Clearly, the self-hating Jew cannot do that. His life is a mockery and a never ending source of

bitterness for him. It is a sign of weakness, too, to blame all of one's misfortunes on the fact of being Jewish. Weidman seems to shiver at this picture of the torn and suffering man, wracked by the pains of his existence, and he turns away in disgust, compassionless.

iv.

From a seeming unanimity of negative opinion as regards Selbsthass on the part of those authors who deal with the subject or in whose works the subject is found, implicitly, the attitude switches with Norman Mailer. Mailer does not treat the subject objectively, but upon examination of the characters in his book The Naked and the Dead, much can be learned about his feelings as regards the Jew.

In dealing with Roth, one of two soldiers who are Jewish in the platoon, Norman Mailer begins with what seems to be a comment on the assimilationist Jew, but one soon realizes that assimilation is not what Mailer is really thinking about.

> Roth was irritated. Just because he was a Jew, too, they always assumed he felt the same way about things... The Jews worry too much about themselves.[43]

Roth fancies himself outside the group. He is a clerk and he feels that this places him above the category of the common soldier. Roth is a misfit in the army. He has no

ability to do physical labor, and for this reason he is constantly held in contempt by the other men in the platoon. He absorbs this attitude towards himself: "I'm no good at anything, he bleated to himself."[44] One cannot help but take note of the verb "bleated." It is a word which when used in terms of a man can only conjure up the picture of someone who is a good deal less than a man. He is a failure as a man. Secondly, when one character accuses another of being worthless, the reader can wonder whether this is merely a part of the dialogue, a cue, as it were, against which the person who is so accused can react. But in the case of Roth, the accused is making the affirmation of what everyone else has come to feel about him. The reader can only nod his head in agreement. Roth is, indeed, no good at anything. A similar instance of Mailer's attitude toward Roth is seen when Roth finds an injured bird, and the Polock asks to see it. Roth answers: "Leave it alone, it's frightened,"[45] Roth whined. Again, the reader is asked to note the choice of the verb. Why "whined?" Why not "said," or even "protested." "Whined" has a negative connotation; men do not whine. Sergeant Croft takes the bird from Roth: "Can I have it back, Sergeant?" Roth pleaded.[46] Again, the negative connotation is brought in by the use of a particular verb; why not "asked?" Croft's answer to Roth is to crush the bird in his hand. The symbolism here is not too obscure. Roth is castrated, or

emasculated. Roth is persistently shown as worthless among men. On the climb up Mt. Anaka, he becomes so weak that he cannot go any further. One of the men, Gallagher, whom Roth hates and who is hated in return says to him: "Get up you Jew bastard."[47] This proves to be a goad to Roth; he gets up and hurries forward. Is this to be Mailer's way of introducing a new Roth, a man with a resolute character? Unfortunately, it is not. Roth only hurries forward for a little while. The platoon comes to an abyss which it must jump across. The other men negotiate the maneuver successfully, but Roth does not, and he plunges to his death. Mailer has made Roth into an utter failure and has not redeemed him in any way.

Roth's other Jew is Joey Goldstein. Joey is different from Roth. Joey is capable, physically. He is not lazy. Is Mailer, then, giving another side to the Jewish pciture? Is Roth only an individual, not the model of the Jew? Is Joey going to erase the stain of the disgraceful Jew left by Roth? Again, unfortunately, no. When Wyman lets the anti-tank gun fall, Goldstein gets the blame. The men call him "Izzy." He never makes an attempt to defend himself. He is always unhappy because he is not popular. He is always thinking that people hate him because he is Jewish. Like Roth, he feels that he is superior to the others, but it does not serve to lessen his sense of hurt.

Mailer writes much regarding the sexual prowess of the other men of the platoon. But regarding Goldstein he writes only of his failure. Goldstein has married a woman who does not respond to him: "He dreads his tasteless isolated throe, knows suddenly that he cannot do it, cannot lie afterwards on his bed depressed with failure."[48] As he has done with Roth, so Mailer does with Goldstein; Goldstein is castrated. He is less than a man in Mailer's eyes.

General Cummings and Lieutenant Hearn are portrayed positively by the author. How much the more so when Hearn, who has grown tired of and disgusted with the constant tirade of anti-semitism which pours from the lips of Colonel Conn, tells off the Colonel in no uncertain terms. General Cummings defends Hearn. It appears as though Mailer, by having these two pro-ethical characters defend the Jew, is not really anti-Jewish in his feelings after all. Such is hardly the case. When the two men are alone, Cummings says to Hearn:

> There's a hard kernel of truth in many of the things he Conn says. As for example, 'All Jews are noisy'...They're not all noisy, of course, but there's an undue proportion of coarseness in that race...[49]

Thus, Mailer gives anti-Semitism the aura of intellectual respectability by taking it away from the realm of obscenity and coarseness which belongs to Conn, and putting it in the

realm of cultured and otherwise fine, respectable men, namely Cummings and Hearn.

There can hardly be a question that Mailer, unlike Fiedler, is no critic, that his jibes are armed with venom and that he has a passionate Jewish Selbsthass.

Summary

Those authors whose work is encompassed in this survey who, in some way, dealt with that aspect of Jewish consciousness known as self-hate or Selbsthass were all, with the exception of Norman Mailer, against such feeling on the part of the Jew. They either said so explicitly, or that message was conveyed in their work. There was evidence of dislike and contempt for those who were, indeed, self-hating Jews, or there was a rejection on the part of the author through his characters of this type of emotion.

Only in the work of Norman Mailer could one find an unmistakable Jewish self-hatred. His Jewish characters suffer degradation and emasculation at every turn. They are objects of contempt and disgust.

Ethics and Morals

A. Kindness

i.

A moral value which some authors find an intrinsic part of the Jew or of Judaism is kindness. In The Assistant, this kindness is seen in Morris Bober's attitude to Frankie Alpine. Bober allows Frank to live in the back of the store and to eat store food. He does this because he feels sorry for Frank who is such a miserable, dejected and rejected character.

It is most interesting to note how Frank, as he becomes ever more Jewish, is forced to show kindness; as he nears the day when he will convert, it is he who is showing kindness to the family of Morris Bober. They are no longer able to care for their own needs, and, in effect, it is he who is supporting them, just as he had been supported by them.

Closely tied to the kindness of Morris Bober is his attitude to forgiveness. It is a positive moral virtue which we see reflected in the person of Morris Bober. After Frank has been with him for a little while, Frank discovers to his amazement that Morris has known for some time that Frank was one of the two men who held him up. But he has forgiven Frank, and in the course of the story, it is this act of forgiveness and kindness toward Frank that is the salvation of Bober's family. (One can almost see Malamud directing the

action with a slight sad smile.)

In his short story "The Mourners," Malamud again puts forth his thesis that a Jew is a kind person. In this case, however, he prefers to use a negative example. Kessler is a retired egg candler. He is also a cranky old man who manages to arouse the ire of the janitor to such a high pitch that the janitor convinces Gruber, the landlord, to evict him. After Kessler disregards the eviction notice, he is evicted by the city marshal. Aided by one German and an Italian family - his former neighbors - Kessler moves back in. When Gruber hears about it, he is furious and comes back. With much difficulty he gains entrance to Kessler's apartment only to find Kessler dressed as a mourner, mourning. Gruber cannot understand what is going on. He watches Kessler for some time before he gains insight into Kessler's mourning. Gruber realizes that Kessler is mourning for him, for Gruber! "Gruber then suffered unbearable remorse for the way he had treated the old man. At last he could stand it no longer. With a cry of shame he tore the sheet off Kessler's bed, and wrapping it around his bulk, sank heavily to the floor and became a mourner."[50]

Malamud seems to be saying that a Jew who is without compassion or kindness is no Jew at all, that he has lost his identity or is, in effect, dead. Gruber comes to this insight or recognition, and it brings him to mourn for himself.

Thus, by the artistic use of a negative example, Malamud illustrates, clearly, that for him, one of the most essential elements of Jewish morality is that of kindness.

ii.

Howard Fast also considers kindness to be an important element of Jewish morality. In My Glorious Brothers, there is an early emphasis on midas horachamim. Simon, the judge of the Hebrews, makes this clear in the case of the tanner whose slave has sought to escape. The tanner wants to brand his slave as punishment. But Simon does not allow him to do so. Their conversation is as follows:

> He'll go free in two years...even as the law says; and don't brand him.
>
> And the money I paid the caravan?
>
> Charge it to your own freedom, tanner... I've judged you tanner! How long ago was it that "you" slept in a lousy goatskin tent? How short is your memory? Is freedom something you can put on or take off... we who are Jews...meet all the adversity and hurt of life with that strange and holy phrase: "Once we were slaves in the land of Egypt."[51]

Two things can be seen from the above quotation: First, Simon did not impose any severe penalty on the slave. He judged him with mercy or kindness. Second, the quality of mercy on the part of the Jew stems from empathy. "We are kind and merciful to others because we know what it is to suffer." Such is Fast's reasoning as regards Jewish kindness.

Fast offers another example of the Jew as the kind person as opposed to the non-Jew who is without that quality. In Moses, Prince of Egypt, Moses notices one day during archery practice that the prince who is standing next to him is not aiming at the target, but is aiming at a slave child who is watching. Just in time, Moses pushes the prince so that he misses the child. When asked why he did it, why he cared to spare the child, he is unable to give a satisfactory explanation. Fast seems to say that Moses the Jew had within him the quality of mercy. Certainly, he was not brought up with this trait; he was brought up with the rest of the Princes of Egypt, and they were not brought up to care for the lives of the slaves. But Moses, who was in reality a Jew, had the quality of mercy or kindness as an intrinsic part of his moral character since he was a Jew.

iii.

Saul Bellow's two most important novels, The Adventures of Augie March and Herzog, both have heroes who are kind and sensitive men. Augie is a very sensitive and kind person. This can be seen in terms of his relationship to his brother Simon. Augie would rather suffer than cause his brother pain. Thus he is never resentful of all the many disservices done him by Simon. He always justifies his lack of desire for revenge by saying something like "I know how miserable

Simon must be feeling to have done such and such..." Augie's relationship with Grandma Lausch also illustrates his kindness. When Grandma becomes very old and her authority wanes, Simon becomes disrespectful towards her, but Augie always feels sorry for her and does not want to hurt her feelings. It is Augie who visits Grandma after her sons have sent her to an old-age home. He realizes that the sons never visit her and he worries about her becoming lonely.

Augie does not want his feeble-minded brother George to be sent to an institution because it will break his mother's heart. It is Augie who possesses the greatest sensitivity for her feelings. While Simon spends much money on his mother after he has become affluent, he always manages to make her feel worse, but Augie's manner is always kind. He never wants to hurt people. He is considerate and often winds up in an unenviable position because of his concern for the well-being of others.

Similarly, Moses Herzog. He is a kind man, and he is often the object of other persons' cruelty since he is so concerned for others that he forgets to protect himself. Love orients Herzog as it does Augie. They both have a huge capacity to love, and it is this capacity which manifests itself through an unwillingness to hurt others and a desire to believe that all men have only the good of others in mind. Moses Herzog allows his love for Madeleine to break up his

marriage to Daisy. Then he marries Madeleine, an absolutely destructive person who not only goes through enormous quantities of his money, but tortures him in many ways: she cuckolds him, and has the audacity to send her lover to pick up her diaphragm from the house (from right under Herzog's nose, as it were), estranges him from most of those persons on whom he formerly relied, etc. His love for his children prevents him from taking more decisive action to gain custody of them. It would mean exposing his children to the ordeal of a custody battle which would necessitate an open exposure of Madeleine's adulterous activities.

Love makes Moses do things impulsively, without thinking. He decides to paint a twenty-five dollar piano to send to his daughter in Chicago, from Massachusetts! He does not stop to think that he could buy a better piano, new, for less than the cost of shipping.[52] He loves his daughter and wants to do something for her.

Augie March goes wherever love takes him. He follows Thea Fenchel all over Mexico. His love for his brother involves him in an engagement. His love for a fellow human being in trouble forces the cancellation of the engagement (Augie helps a dear friend who is having an abortion and who almost dies on account of it. In the process, he is seen by a cousin of his fiancee who is very unfavorably disposed to Augie. The word is spread that Augie has been having

an affair, and the engagement comes to an end.)[53]

Thus, both Augie and Herzog walk around as the continual target for the aggressions of others who do not have the noble dispositions of these two heroes.

B. Honesty

i.

In The Assistant, Malamud seems to put an emphasis on honesty as an important Jewish moral value. Morris Bober was able to forgive Frank Alpine for having participated in a holdup when Frank was in desperate straits, but when he finds that Frank has been stealing on a regular basis from him after he has made his "confession," and has started out anew, Morris is unable to forgive him. Undoubtedly Morris is hurt by what he considers a betrayal of his trust by Frank, but more basic is Morris's outraged sense of honesty. He has never cheated his customers in all of his many years in business, and now, finding this source of dishonesty so near to him, he is completely outraged. It is after Frank is caught by Morris and is disgraced, that he begins his real progress toward becoming a Jew. It is as though Malamud is saying that honesty is, indeed, a necessary concomitant of being Jewish; it is a moral value that is essential for every Jew.

Among Malamud's collection of short stories The Magic Barrel, in "Lady of the Lake," the issue of honesty appears, too, in a form that is almost childlike in its simplicity. Henry Levin denies (tells a lie!) that he is Jewish and he loses the girl whom he loves. Childlike, but there is no denying the fact that the moral is there.

Out of The Magic Barrel, in "The Bill," great pain results when persons who have been trusted fail to fulfill their obligations. They have bought on credit, but when the time comes to pay their bill, they refuse to honor their obligation and the old people who have given them credit are forced out of business.

In The Fixer, Yakov Bok manages to keep a certain perspective on life, and by so doing is able to retain a deep sense of honesty. In jail for two years as he awaits an indictment on a charge of ritual murder, Yakov suffers manfully. He endures humiliating searches six times per day, he is placed in chains, his food is on occasion mildly poisoned in an attempt to weaken him so that he will be unable to continue his denial of the charges against him. However, his basic sense of honesty prevents him from ever "confessing," even when he is told by the prosecutor that he could end his suffering by confessing to the murder. An even better offer comes to him: he is to be given a pardon by the Tsar. A retired jurist comes to Yakov with this news, but Yakov is not pleased: "Pardoned as a criminal or pardoned as innocent?

...Yakov said he wanted a fair trial, not a pardon. If they ordered him to leave the prison without a trial they would have to shoot him first."[54] So Yakov continues to suffer. Suffering is less painful to him than confession to a crime which he did not commit.

ii.

While it is not his major concern--in that it does not appear frequently in his work--honesty is a positive moral value for Herman Wouk. In one of his most pleasant works, The City Boy, this moral value is illustrated. Herbie Bookbinder is the hero of the book. Herbie is the younger of two children in a traditional Jewish family in The Bronx. His sense of honesty and fair play are seen throughout the course of the book, in his relationship to his Hebrew teacher and in his relationship to his associates in camp. When Herbie deviates from the path of strict honesty, he precipitates a near disaster for his father's business interests. However, repentance is not without its reward. Herbie makes a full breast of things just in time to prevent disaster. His honesty has come to the fore and the business is saved. Herbie's reward is a good old-fashioned spanking for having made such a mess to begin with. Wouk is illustrating old-fashioned Jewish ethics. From the way in which the story is related, including Herbie's reaction to his "reward," it is clear that Wouk is applauding old-fashioned Jewish values,

honesty and punishment for infractions of this code.

It is interesting to note how Wouk depicts the characters who deviate from Herbie's code of honesty. At camp, Herbie becomes a great hero at the big carnival at the conclusion of the summer by virtue of his fertile imagination and tenacity in seeing through to the end the project which he has envisioned. The camp director, who is a chiseller and in Herbie's eyes very dishonest, is thrown into the lake and disgraced. One of the campers, a bully and a most insincere person, is also disgraced. Herbie, whose basic trait has always been honesty, is the hero, as is his cousin who has also been honest, faithful and sincere.

This novel is relatively uncomplicated, not dealing with great social issues nor with psychological problems. Thus, it gives Wouk the opportunity to tell a simple story and provides him with the opportunity to do some moralizing in a very delightful way. Honesty and sincerity are virtues which cannot be denied!

iii.

In the work of Jerome Weidman, honesty is important, but it is not an absolute as it was with Malamud or with Wouk. For Weidman it is important, but it can be shaded. In The Sound of Bow Bells, Sam Silver is often content to tell a "little lie" in order to get out of an unpleasant situation, or one which may involve hurting someone's feel-

ings. In such cases, the truth is not an absolute for him. But Weidman makes a distinction between little lies and big ones. While Sam is prone to these little lies, Jenny Broom has a penchant for telling huge lies with the purpose of self-gain. She is perfectly willing to destroy anyone who is in her way by lying or cheatingoor by any other means available to her as she struggles toward her ill-defined goals. Ultimately, Weidman paints her as a malevolent, destructive being. He has used her to personify those traits of character and that moral structure of which he disapproves. Sam's dishonesty took two forms. He told little lies and was dishonest to himself as regarded his identity and self-integrity. The latter type of dishonesty is strongly disapproved by the author (as discussed in Chapter I). The telling of little lies is not actually a deparate type of dishonesty; rather it is a manifestation of the latter, larger kind. With Sam's recognition of his problem, with his ceasing to be dishonest with himself, the reader is led to the belief that the little lies will also cease. Thus, Weidman's position seems to be that honesty is a positive moral virtue to be embraced.

The same theme is seen in Weidman's earlier work, The Enemy Camp. In this book, the great liar and cheat is Danny Shaw. He, too, will not let the truth stand in the way of his getting ahead. In the end, he is tripped up by some of the debris that he has left behind, while George Hurst who

has remained basically honest emerges with his "self" intact.

Weidman can be said to consider honesty to self and to others a primary moral virtue. He is willing to admit that Jews exist who are not found with this virtue. However, it is unmistakably clear, in that all his heroes do have it, that honesty is an important quality, one to be nurtured among Jews who do not possess it.

C. Sexual Morality

i.

Leslie Fiedler does not seem to find any degree of sexual morality among the Jews; at least it is not evident in his novels. In The Second Stone, Fiedler depicts the only Jewish woman who is present throughout the course of the story as being not at all hard to convince that she should be in bed with the friend of her husband.

In The Last Wasp in the World, Jewish women are depicted as being extemely sex-hungry, and extremely loose. Vincent Hazelbaker is the "last Wasp." He is a Pulitzer Prize winner who is married to a Jewish woman. At the wedding reception of the daughter of one of his former mistresses (a Jewess), where almost all of the guests are Jewish:

> ...he walked the room, patting and squeezing and stroking, sometimes kissing a shoulder or neck or cheek ...Tits nudged him as he passed, hips brushed against him, hands reached out as if by chance to fondle him...[55]

Fiedler seems to be accusing Jewish women in general of being a bunch of tramps. Perhaps the clearest example of this is Beatrice, the mother of the bride. She is so unabashedly "modern" (?) that she has always told people that her daughter's real father is Vincent. (In fact, this is not true.) She makes every effort to make people think that this is so, though she and Vincent were never married. In addition to being Vincent's mistress, Beatrice has been married three times. Thus Fiedler makes her a tramp even in regard to her married life. (She is legally promiscuous.)

Just after the wedding ceremony is over, Marjorie, the bride, comes over to Vincent, whom she thinks is her biological father, and proceeds to kiss him in a most undaughterly manner, deliberately trying to excite him. Soon after, as Vincent leaves the reception, one of his other mistresses - a Jewess - is waiting for him. They enter an alley and make love against the garbage cans. Later that night, his wife Beatrice and still another of his mistresses take him home, and the three of them make a party out of undressing him and putting him to bed.

Thus, Fiedler has shown Jewish womanhood to be thoroughly debased in a sexual-moral sense.

ii.

Jerome Weidman does not see much sexual morality among Jews, either. Jewish girls will sleep with boys before mar-

riage. In The Enemy Camp, George Hurst makes some discoveries:

> ...he suddenly realized that he could sleep with Miss Bucknell. He didn't know how he knew, any more than he had ever known the same thing in the past with other girls...an inner voice suddenly advising him that this particular chase was won...never before having embarked on a chase that involved a shickseh ...[56]

Thus, George has had experience with Jewish girls. Then, George finds out that his childhood sweetheart is a prostitute. In The Sound of Bow Bells, Jennie Broom, Sam Silver's sweetheart - mistress - wife - mistress, in that order, is a completely lewd person. She uses her body to get what she wants from whomever she wants it, whenever she wants. She is completely without scruples of any kind as regards sex. However, lest the reader think that Jennie is atypical, that inasmuch as she is such a villain, her actions are not to be considered as typical, the author introduces Rebecca Meissen, a sweet, lovely, young divorcee. She, also, has no qualms about sleeping with Sam who lives in the apartment below her own, just as soon as their sons go off to school, each day. She is depicted by Weidman as a good person. It is just that he does not see any degree of sexual morals among Jewish women (or men). Whether or not he actually disapproves, is another question. He does not actually seem to be condemnatory in his narration as was Fiedler. Rather, Weidman is cognizant of the state of sexual morals - or lack thereof - as opposed

to what the situation once was among Jews.

iii.

Bellow's women in Augie March and in Herzog, are not above sexual transgression. In Augie March, Thea Fenchel is a veritable nymphomaniac, though Bellow never tries to psychoanalyze her. To do so would be to destroy her value as a model for sexual impropriety. On the other hand, the Magnus girls manage to keep their virginity until marriage. Bellow points out that they are human, and that a long engagement is seen by their parents to be inadvisable, but they do manage to control themselves until then.

In Herzog, Madeleine, Herzog's wife, is shown to be a tramp. She slept with Moses with more thought of physical gratification than any thought of romantic love long before they were married. After they are married, she cuckolds him.

Both Augie and Moses Herzog and all of their religious male brethren can also be found involved in all kinds of illicit relationships. Thus, Bellow, too, recognizes the present state of Jewish sexual morals for what they are. He entertains no illusions regarding what they are. However, it is to be noted that more pain seems to come to those who engage in them than pleasure. Thea Fenchel and Augie both suffer because of the nature of their relationship. Moses Herzog and Madeleine are both tortured and bedevilled persons,

destroying (particularly Madeleine does so) rather than benefitting by lovemaking. Thus, it seems that while Bellow recognizes the present state of Jewish sexual morals, he does not sanction them.

iv.

With Herman Wouk the modd shifts, in part. In Marjorie Morningstar, Wouk gives the picture which one expects out of a traditional Jewish background regarding sexual attitudes. Marjorie's parents, though modern in many ways, still believe in bringing up their daughter with the traditional values as regards sex and marriage. While Marjorie retains the various ties to her tradition, she is able to remain a virgin, but in the course of the story, as she wanders into ever deeper waters, gradually abandoning her old values--kashrus for example--she comes ever closer to abandoning her previous stand on sex before marriage. Finally, she wanders beyond her depth and sleeps with Noel Airman. She has become the "modern woman," at that point. However, she recovers and becomes the kind of woman of whom one would never expect "that sort of thing." Wouk applauds the triumph of this old fashioned virtue - sexual morality.

In Don't Stop the Carnival, Norman Paperman is quite sure that his daughter is sleeping with Sheldon Klug. The thought is not terribly disturbing to him, despite the fact that he does not even approve of Sheldon. He gives the reader

the impression that maybe she (Hazel) will outgrow it. Paperman, himself, a little later in the novel, has very few qualms about cheating on his wife with a woman whom he knew many years ago. He is quite conscious of how furious his wife would be if she were to find out, but he is not sufficiently bothered to cease and desist.

Thus, Wouk is very much aware of the breakdown among Jews of sexual-moral standards, and while he does not seem to say that it is a good thing, nonetheless, he is not very strong in taking a stand against it. He simply recognizes that the breakdown has taken place as the Jew has become more and more an integral part of American society.

V.

Meyer Levin seems to look with favor on the old Jewish value of sexual morality. In Eva, it is a virtue that is constantly stressed. Eva comes from a little town. She tells about the way Jewish girls are viewed in her home town: "There's always been a saying with us - Jewish girls are the hardest to get."[57] Throughout most of the book, Eva manages to retain her virtue. The reader is ever aware that it is only because of her upbringing that she is able to find the strength to resist those who would pressure her into forsaking her moral values. It is only with the breakdown of all moral values in the world as it appears to Eva (because of the

seeming invincibility of the Nazis) that Eva becomes confused and no longer knows what is right and what is wrong. She gives in to a boy, but is sorry that she has. With her, the value remains unchanged. She was merely looking for meaning in a world which had ceased to have meaning. She quickly realizes that meaning is not to be found in illicit love affairs. Levin gets his point across. He looks with scorn upon those who pretend to find meaning in such affairs and condemns them. He is for the old-fashioned set of Jewish sexual-moral values.

vi.

In his frank novella "Goodbye Columbus," Philip Roth administers the coup de grâce to any remaining notions about Jewish sexual morality. In this story, Brenda Patimkin, the daughter of a wealthy middle-class Jewish family, and Neil Klugman, a scion of the Jewish lower middle classes, have an affair for the duration of a summer. While the illicit nature of their affair is clandestine, it is nevertheless brazen. The scene of their frequent coupling is the Patimkin house. They make love when the house is empty; they make love when the house is full, as, for example, in Brenda's bedroom after everyone has gone to sleep.

At no point in the story do they ever question or consider whether the nature of their relationship is "wrong." They are secretive only because they know that Brenda's parents would be opposed, as becomes evident when Brenda's mother discovers Brenda's diaphragm. Brenda's parents con-

sider it not only morally wrong, but a personal betrayal:

> I don't know what we ever did that you should reward us this way. We gave you a nice home and all the love and respect a child needs...
>
> About your friend I have no words. He is his parents' responsibility and I cannot imagine what kind of home life he had that he could act that way. Certainly that was a fine way to repay us for the hospitality we were nice enough to show him, a perfect stranger. That the two of you should be carrying on like that in our very house I will never in my life be able to understand. Times certainly have changed since I was a girl that this kind of thing could go on...You have broken your parents' hearts and you should know that.[58]

Mrs. Patimkin has put her finger on the very crux of the issue. What <u>was</u> unthinkable when she was a girl, is <u>perfectly</u> thinkable, now. The one thing that never interfered in the relationship of the two lovers was a feeling of guilt, of having been engaged in doing a wrong act. Even having been discovered, they feel no guilt. Neil is quite up to facing her parents. Brenda is up to facing them; she does not feel that she cannot go home, again. She just cannot go home with Neil. Is it that Brenda does feel guilt? Over her relations with Neil? No. Rather does she feel remorse at having hurt her parents. Rather does she make a pragmatic choice - she is but a college girl with expensive tastes. Neil is a librarian.

> I stopped; in Brenda's face there was positively no threat of tears; she looked, suddenly, solid and decisive...

"Well what are you going to do?" I asked.

"Nothing."

"Who are you going to bring home Thanksgiving - Linda?" I said, "or me?"

"Who <u>can</u> I bring home, Neil?"

"I don't know, who can you?"

"Neil, be realistic. After all this, can I bring you home? Can you see us all sitting around the table?"

"I can't if you can't, and I can if you can."

"They're still my parents. They did send me to the best schools, didn't they? They have given me everything I've wanted, haven't they?"[59]

Roth says, in effect, that sex is no longer a question of right or wrong. Such questions belong to the domain of the last generation. Free sexual expression is a fact in the generation born during World War II (or thereabouts). The story takes place in the late 1950's: Ron Patimkin, Brenda's brother had graduated in 1957.[60] It is a fact, and that fact is illustrated among the members of good Jewish families (the Patimkins are Orthodox Jews by affiliation, keep a kosher house and are active in Jewish organizations such as B'nai Brith and Hadassah.[61]

Roth himself never makes Brenda or Neil appear shoddy as a result of, or in conjunction with their relations. He seems to accept such behavior as perfectly normal and natural.

Summary

Bernard Malamud sees kindness as one of the chief moral characteristics of the Jew. This is quite compatible with his conception of the Jew as a suffering creature (discussed in a previous chapter) since one sees quite readily how suffering might dispose the sufferer toward compassion for those still less fortunate than himself.

Malamud also sees honesty as being essential to the moral and ethical makeup of the Jew. The liar and the cheat he holds in contempt. Honesty, he seems to say, whether in the form of business dealings or in the form of human relations, is the key to a happy life. The fact that people are unable to abide by such standards is the cause of much suffering in the world.

Like Malamud, Howard Fast considers kindness a necessary moral characteristic of the Jew. Fast considers the historical basis of Judaism's characteristic kindness to be the Egyptian enslavement.

Saul Bellow, too, recognizes the quality of mercy in the Jewish makeup. His protagonists are usually sensitive men who are troubled by the needs and hurts of others, and consequently become embroiled in the troubles of others.

Jerome Weidman and Herman Wouk both recognize the need for honesty. It plays a significant part in the work of Weidman. In the work of Herman Wouk, it is not quite so

pronounced, though present. Weidman's emphasis is on honesty to oneself and in relation to others.

Leslie Fiedler, Jerome Weidman, Saul Bellow, Herman Wouk and Meyer Levin all comment on the sexual morals of the Jew. Fiedler and Weidman conclude that among Jewish women there is no such thing as sexual morality, anymore. Fiedler is particularly damning in his appraisal, showing contempt and disgust for these women. Weidman is much less conemnatory, less critical and less cynical. Fiedler is less accepting of it than is Weidman, burlesqueing the characters who are so involved in illicit relationships, while Weidman deals with them more sympathetically.

Bellow, too, recognizes the change that has taken place among the Jews - both men and women - with respect to sexual morality. While he does not evince an approving mood in his work, he has come to accept the change. However, his great criticism of the change is that sex is now used as an instrument of pain and punishment by its practitioners.

Herman Wouk mildly disapproves of the change in Jewish sexual morals. He seems to feel that the traditional mode of behavior in this area was praiseworthy and should have been kept. He does not deny the fact that there has been a change, nevertheless.

Meyer Levin discusses Jewish sexual ethics. Unlike the other authors discussed in this chapter, Levin does not seem to have taken full cognizance of the great change among Jews

with respect to the problem of sex. His attitude is quite traditional. He considers sex to be part of a complete code of behavior, making sense in an ordered and otherwise moral society. He does recognize the fact that in a society without a moral code, the traditional attitudes toward sexual behavior will also break down.

Philip Roth looks upon Jewish sexual morality as, by and large, a thing of the past, but he evinces no regret for the passing of such a standard of conduct. He does not make it appear virtuous to refrain from illicit behavior; on the contrary, he makes such young love appear attractive, indeed.

Peoplehood

Often the Jewish people, or individual Jews, have been called "clannish," wanting little or nothing to do with outsiders. To help another member of this group, a Jew will go to great lengths; for an outsider, he will scarcely lift a finger. He will revel with his own kind; he will be a wallflower with outsiders. His heart will fill with joy and his chest swell with pride when he reads of an outstanding accomplishment by a Jew, and he will sneer in disgust and smart with disappointment in the event he hears something scandalous done by a Jew. All of the above things have been said about Jews, either by non-Jews or by Jews themselves. Often, things are taken out of context, regarding the Jew, and are distorted. In any event, the Jew who lives in two worlds - the Jewish and the secular - cannot help but be influenced by what he hears about himself - whether what he hears is said by other Jews, by friendly lips, or said by non-Jews, friendly or otherwise. The things that he hears ultimately find expression. With American-Jewish authors, one may expect to find traces of "peoplehood" in their writings.

i.

In the writings of Ludwig Lewisohn, it is abundantly clear that Lewisohn looks upon the world's Jewish population as something special. He does feel that he has a special

relationship with Jews that he does not have with non-Jews. Though Lewisohn's concern for the Jewish people began earlier, nevertheless, the experience of the Holocaust had a great impact on him, deepening and accentuating his feelings.

In Breathe Upon These, Lewisohn, through the mouth of Dorfsohn, A German-Jewish refugee scientist, shows his great feeling for world Jewry. He does not rail against the treatment of just "any" people, but against the treatment of "this" people, the Jewish people. It is obvious that he feels very strongly that any insult to the Jewish people is an insult to him, directly. His eloquence on the subject of Jewish accomplishment makes the reader very much aware that Lewisohn feels something special for the Jew, and is not simple speaking as a humanitarian for an oppressed people. Throughout the dinner party scene, Dorfsohn extolls the Jews as learned, sensitive, intelligent and productive people. He makes it clear that the Jews were wholly innocent of any acts which might have justified their being persecuted. He does not dwell on any one characteristic of the Jewish people long, skipping about as a man desperate to defend that which he holds dear, and is uncertain how to do it best. He defends on all fronts; he emphasizes the intelligence of Jews and emphasizes their patriotism. He is not concerned with the Jew as the individual, but the Jew as a collective unit. Thus, when he talks about individuals, it is only for the purpose of illustrating a point which he maintains is true

of all Jews. This contention may be best illustrated in Dorfsohn's description of Jewish patriotism. He uses himself and another scientist named Goldberger as examples:

> ...Germanized Jews like Goldberger who had almost forgotten that he was a Jew ...an ardent German patriot...[62]
>
> I am going to be an American citizen; I feel like one already.[63]

Lewisohn is saying that the Jew, all Jews, become immediately a loyal member of whatever country allows them to become citizens. In his pride for Jews and Jewish accomplishment, one can sense the swelling of Lewisohn's heart from that which appears upon the printed page. He is inescapably tied emotionally to the Jewish people and to the idea of Jewish peoplehood.

In In a Summer Season, Jerome Goodman, the ethically positive character, in his broad philosophical discourse upon the nature of Judaism touches upon the idea of Jewish peoplehood in relation to Israel: "...And there's the martryed people of Israel. You love that people and try to help..."[64]

Whether it is Jewish accomplishment or Jewish martyrdom or even Jewish religion (to be discussed in a subsequent chapter) which ties Lewisohn to k'lal Yisroel is difficult to say; it is probably a combination of all of these factors. But it is undeniable, no matter what the cause, that Lewisohn is very much tied to the Jewish people, and that the concept of a Jewish peoplehood is very real to him. The Jewish people are

more than just different persons who are members of the same religion.

ii.

Meyer Levin recognizes an entity known as the Jewish people, just as Lewisohn did. In The Stronghold, the hero, Paul Vered, is concerned about the label of the "chosen people." He feels a certain guilt about the label despite his attempts to rationalize it:

> True, it was meant spiritually; true, every primitive people had believed itself chosen by its God; true, the Jews had never attempted to subjugate others - and yet in his horror of arrogance this was the one accusation that touched home to him.[65]

Yes, he feels that this is the concept which unites the Jews, and it is something with which he is not at one. Yet, by the end of the novel, Vered, the assimilationist, the one who has sought to disassociate himself from such things, comes to the conclusion that there is more to his heritage than he thought, and he desires to become at one with those Jews who are more closely connected to that heritage. He has come to a sense of peoplehood through the horrors of the Nazi experience. Levin seems to suggest through the character of Paul Vered - a man of the civilized and cultured world - that the Jews have been welded into a cohesive unit by the horrors, pressures and revelations of the Nazi period.

Similarly, in Eva. Having braved the terrors of Nazi Europe, Eva has become a very different person. She is no

longer the gay, laughing girl who was able to move easily among gentiles as well as Jews. Because of her experiences, Eva is only able to find complete peace among Jews. She finds that because of the holocaust experience, the feeling of amiyut has become an essential part of her being which cannot be denied.

The very moving My Father's House conveys a similar message. Jewish children come to British Palestine following the end of World War II. Their experience has been such that only among their own people can they ever hope to lead normal, useful lives. They have been too traumatized by the horrors of others ever to want to live among them or ever to be able to live among them. Essential to their well-being is the feeling of belonging which Levin suggests can only come from total immersion among their own people. (This idea of living only among the Jewish people will be further touched on in a subsequent chapter on Zionism.) Levin seems to feel that such a separatism is justified under the circumstances, but more important to the subject at hand, he can definitely be said to recognize the existence of a Jewish peoplehood beyond that of a religious persuasion.

iii.

In Howard Fast's My Glorious Brothers, the idea of peoplehood is inescapable. Fast's spokesman, Simon, the last of the brothers Maccabee, begins so many phrases with "we are

people who..." He speaks as though there is unanimity of action and/or thought on almost every occasion. One would never expect an occasion to arise when Jew would fight Jew in civil war. The oft repeated "we are a people who..." lends a feeling of solidarity to the feeling of peoplehood. So strongly is the aspect of peoplehood emphasized, that Simon refers to the people - his spiritual mother - as a biological mother, as though there were, indeed, an umbilical cord connecting the Jew, yet unborn, with his people, making sure that by the time of birth, he would be completely steeped in a feeling for his people as the newborn infant instinctively knows his mother: "...how shall I know the people that birthed me and gave me sustenance?"[66]

Fast bases his feeling of peoplehood on several things. Common experience is the beginning of the peoplehood: "... we who are Jews...meet all the adversity and hurt of life with that strange and holy phrase: 'Once we were slaves in the land of Egypt.'"[67] A common history and a resultant and corollary desire for freedom binds the people: "We are a people who have had perhaps a little more than our share of misery..."[68] "We are a people of peace...is it not written that three things are holier than others - Peace, Life, and Justice? There is no glory in war for us..."[69]

Thus, the most noticeable aspect of Fast's attitude toward Judaism is his cognition of and feeling for the peoplehood, or his sense of <u>k'lal Yisroel</u>.

iv.

Surveying the work of Bernard Malamud even briefly, leads one to the conclusion that Malamud conceives of a Jewish peoplehood. A few things serve as the focal points for him. In one story he picks out one thing, in another story he finds something else on which to hang the garment of Jewish peoplehood. In "Lady of the Lake," Malamud uses the European holocaust as the cement which bonds Jews together into one people. The words of a young Jewess who has escaped death at Buchenwald convey a sense of peoplehood: "We are Jews. My past is meaningful to me. I treasure what I suffered for."[70] Certainly, suffering has been the lot of the Jew, both as individuals and as a group. Suffering, then, is another kind of cement binding the Jews together.

Also, in The Magic Barrel, in "The Last Mohican," peoplehood is described in terms of mutual responsibility. Each Jew has the responsibility of any and all other Jews. Their welfare is his concern. When young Arthur Fidelman is at his wits end in Rome because of the veritable persecution of a "schnorror" named Shimon Susskind, having been quite generous to him, he finally cries out:

> "Am I then responsible for you, Susskind?" "Who else? Susskind loudly replied...you are responsible. Because you are a man. Because you are a Jew, aren't you?" "Yes, goddamn it, but I'm not the only one in the whole wide world. Without prejudice, I refuse the obligation..."[71]

However, even as Fidelman renounces his obligation to Susskind, he takes out another dollar and hands it to Susskind! Thus Malamud undercuts Fidelman. "No," Malamud says. One cannot refuse the obligation. The Jews are bound together by a bond of mutual responsibility, implicitly, even as Susskind states it explicitly.

In Malamud's newest novel, The Fixer, Yakov Bok seeks to escape the ties of Jewish peoplehood. But when he lands so deeply in trouble that extrication seems utterly impossible, it is the Jewish people who band together to save him. Not only is it the Jews whom he knows, or even the Jews of all Russia, but help comes from all over the world, from wherever there are Jews. Jews acknowledge their responsibility to one another in time of trouble and suffering.

It is interesting to note that Lewisohn's characters and Fast's are of a piece in that they are types rather than individuals. Because of that factor, one derives a greater sense of peoplehood than one does from the writing of Bernard Malamud whose characters are much more individually stylized. Nevertheless, there is definitely a positive sense of peoplehood in his fiction. Malamud's Jewish characters have a rapport with one another that is not present between his Jewish characters and his non-Jewish characters, for example between Fidelman and his Italian mistress in "Still Life" (from the story collection Idiots First). They make love but have no

real relationship, nothing to say to one another! Witness the difference between the above and the relationship between Fidelman and Susskind; they have a rapport. They discuss - not necessarily amiably, but they talk and discuss. They have a common background though they have hardly met. This is what Malamud recognizes and on the basis of this recognition he can build individual characters who, nevertheless, convey a sense of peoplehood.

V.

While Fiedler does not seem to find much in the way of laudable material within Judaism, he does have an appreciation for the Jewish historical continuum. It is this continuum which binds Jew to Jew in the opinion of Fiedler. It is not God which is important to Fiedler, as Jacob Moskowitz, the hero, says in Last Jew, "five thousand years of history you have no right to cancel out unilaterally."[72] Max Schultheis, Fiedler's villain in the story, who would, indeed, unilaterally cancel out five thousand years of history, unexpectedly appears at a crucial moment in Moskowitz's life and rescues him from the Red hysteria which threatens him: "because of some presumed obligation of Jew to Jew which Jacob found especially offensive."[73] Now, whether Moskowitz or Fiedler find it meaningful or not, is not what is of importance here. What is important is that Fiedler does recognize that the

feeling of an obligation of Jew to Jew does exist among Jews. It exists among or between Jew and Jew, and not between Jew and non-Jew. Thus, while Fiedler condemns it or considers it unworthy of a people with five thousand years of history, nonetheless, he recognizes its existence. Fiedler seems to have a "blind spot" in that he does not realize that without the "presumed obligation of Jew to Jew," there would not, in all likelihood have been five thousand years of history, for if the Jew had not cared for his own, there would have been no one else to do it. But Fiedler does recognize the feeling of peoplehood among the Jews. The recognition is grudging, but it is recognition, nevertheless.

vi.

Jerome Weidman shows a great familiarity with the concept of Jewish peoplehood. Whether or not he feels a part of that peoplehood is something else again. In Enemy Camp, Aunt Tessie recognizes the world in terms of two camps: the Jewish and the non-Jewish or the "shkutzim." With the latter world there can be no contact, or at least no contact of a personal nature. Therefore, one's life is to be lived within a Jewish world, or among the Jewish people, indicating a kind of peoplehood. One cannot help but note that Aunt Tessie has hardly any personal life of her own outside of the young boy, George Hurst, whom she brings up. With the rest of the Jewish people she has no personal contact. There is no "at-

oneness" with the Jewish people. There is only separateness from non-Jewish people. George, when discussing with a client the subject of intermarriage, says that a Jew who marries out of his faith, when with his non-Jewish family "will always feel like Joe Louis at an all white dinner."[74] All he is saying is that a Jew cannot feel at home in the presence of non-Jews, but he never says that one is at home in the presence of his own people, the Jewish people. True, one might infer such an opinion; after all, it is a logical corollary. But Weidman never makes the statement. Indeed, in neither The Enemy Camp nor in The Sound of Bow Bells does Weidman ever leave the reader with a positive feeling of being at home with one's people. Both these novels deal with subject material apropos of such a statement by the author, but nowhere does such a statement ever appear. Only in the negative is the reader given glimpses as to the opinion of the author: with non-Jews you are not at one. Jewish peoplehood seems to be that which keeps the Jew from being at one with the Christian world, but does not offer him its own compensations.

vii.

Philip Roth evinces a rather equivocal attitude to Jewish peoplehood in his book Goodbye, Columbus. In the title story, Roth pictures Jews as belonging to particular organizations. They belong to certain country clubs - Jewish country clubs - and service organizations such as Hadassah

and B'nai Brith. Mrs. Patimkin asks Neil: "Is your mother in Hadassah?" "She was in Newark."..."Are you interested in joining B'nai Brith?...Ron [Mrs. Patimkin's son] is joining..."[75] There is nothing either pro or con in the above dialogue. It simply reflects the fact that middle-class Jews join organizations which take care of other Jews and almost insensibly embody a sense of Jewish kinship.

In "Defender of the Faith," another of Roth's short stories, he presents a different picture of Jewish peoplehood. The protagonist of this story, which takes place at an Army training camp during World War II, is Sergeant Nathan Marx. He is a combat veteran and a hero who has been given training duty in the United States. The "villain" is Private Sheldon Grossbart, a nineteen-year-old trainee. Grossbart is a disgusting opportunist, using others to pave the way for him to achieve whatever are his desires. When he finds out that Sergeant Marx is Jewish, he begins to play upon Marx's Jewish sentiments in order to obtain special privileges:

> I've got some relatives in St. Louis and they say they'll give me a whole Passover dinner if I can get down there. God, Sergeant, that'd mean an awful lot to me.
>
> No passes during basic, Grossbart....
>
> Ashamed, that's what you are. So you take it out on the rest of us. They say Hitler himself was half a Jew. Seeing this, I wouldn't doubt it!
>
> What are you trying to do with me, Grossbart? What are you after? You want me to give you special privileges, to change

> the food, to find out about your orders, to give you weekend passes.
>
> You even talk like a goy!...Is this a weekend pass I'm asking for? Is a Seder sacred or not?

The upshot of the conversation is that Marx gives passes to Grossbart and the two other Jewish boys who are in the outfit and for whom Grossbart pleads. Grossbart promises to bring the Sergeant a piece of gefilte fish. Upon their return, Grossbart thanks him and hands him a little paper bag:

> Grossbart...my gift?
>
> Oh, yes, Sergeant. Here, from all of us... It's egg roll.
>
> "Egg roll?" I accepted the bag and felt a damp grease spot on the bottom. I opened it, sure that Grossbart was joking...
>
> Your aunt served egg roll?
>
> She wasn't home.
>
> Grossbart, she invited you. You told me she invited you and your friends.
>
> I know. I just reread the letter. Next week.[76]

Is it possible that Grossbart has made an honest mistake? Not at all! This has been Grossbart's modus operandi throughout the story. He pleads not only for himself, but for the other Jewish boys. He is, indeed, the "defender of the faith." He has a ready line to counter anything that Sergeant Marx denies him: "Stop closing your heart to your own!"[77] The final straw is when Grossbart gets his orders changed. He has wheedled the information out of Marx that all of the trainees

are being sent to the Pacific. He had begged the information on behalf of one of the other Jewish trainees: "Last night I heard Mickey in the bed next to me. He was crying...he kept saying if he only knew where we were going..."[78] Then, when the orders come through, Grossbart has managed to be the only one not going to the Pacific, but rather to Fort Monmouth, New Jersey. He had become friendly with a Corporal Shulman, and managed to have his name put on the list for this exceptional post. Marx discovers this, and thinks:

> In fact, I could hear Grossbart the day he'd met Shulman, in the PX, or the bowling alley, or maybe even at services. "Glad to meet you. Where you from? Bronx? Me too!...Could you do something[?] Change something? Swindle, cheat, lie? We gotta help each other, you know...if the Jews in Germany..."[79]

Marx proceeds to get Sheldon back on the Pacific list. Sheldon finds out and brands Marx an anti-Semite.

The problem is not whether Roth is cognizant of Jewish peoplehood. Obviously he is. He obviously disapproves of using it to beg favors in the way Sheldon Grossbart has. The question is does he disapprove of Marx for having granted them? Marx has been a "mensch" all along. He is the "good guy." Is Roth saying that one should not be a good guy? Should a Jew not allow his feeling of Peoplehood enter into his dealing with other Jews, with Jews whom one is in the position to do a good turn? If the reader is to judge from the situation related above, one would say that Roth's answer

would be "no." One could say that Roth sees Jewish peoplehood as a device to gain access to exceptional treatment, to take advantage of others in a given situation. However, while Sergeant Marx realizes what kind of a person Grossbart is, he still has a certain warmth of feeling for the other two Jewish trainees; is it not Grossbart's plea on their behalf that gets Marx to give them all a pass for the seder? that gets Grossbart the information about where they will be shipped? It is!

Despite the fact that Grossbart has abused the privileges of being a "landsman," when he has made reference to the Jewish people, Marx has always felt compelled to honor the obligation of Jew to Jew. Thus Marx as the ethically positive person seems to give sanction to the idea of Jewish peoplehood on behalf of the author. The sanction is not without qualifications. The author does not approveof an unlimited obligation of Jew to Jew, and he frowns severely on the Jew who would take too great advantage of his fellow Jew based on the claim of Jewish peoplehood.

He echoes this feeling, again, in "Eli, the Fanatic," another of the stories in Goodbye, Columbus. Eli Peck is a Jewish attorney representing a group of Jews in a suburban community. They have hired him to get Leo Tzureff, a European refugee, and his Yeshiva to move. Eli appeals to Mr. Tzureff to move, or at least to get the chief messenger boy to stop dressing in ghetto clothing as it is embarrassing to those

Jews who live in a comfortably assimilated state with their Protestant neighbors. Tzureff is quite unyielding. He recognizes in Eli a man who has a sense of peoplehood, who does not truly represent the feelings of his group. Eli becomes very deeply involved, emotionally, and eventually cracks under the strain; he has a nervous breakdown.

Again, Roth might be saying here that too much is demanded by the entity which we call Jewish peoplehood. Its demands are too costly; it is too liable to become selfish and opportunistic. While such is not always the case, there is always the danger of the demands outstripping the ability of the individual to give, and Jewish peoplehood can become a parasitic and crippling master.

Summary

Lewisohn and Levin both have very definite and positive attitudes as regards the subject of Jewish peoplehood. To each of these men, there is a definite connection between the Jew of the past and the Jew of the present. They feel that the connection transcends boundaries as well as time. Jews are bound together by the fact that they are Jews. Lewisohn sees the connection in terms of accomplishment and in terms of constructive intelligence. The Jew is useful and contributes to whatever society he belongs. The Jew is also a warm, sensitive human being. Levin feels strongly about the peoplehood of the Jews because of their collective experience in history. He thinks that the totality of the world's treatment of the Jew has forged him into a single unit, thinking and reacting in the same way. History has caused the Jewish people to evolve to its present state.

Howard Fast looks to the historical past as the basis for Jewish peoplehood. He proclaims the basis to lie in the Egyptian enslavement. Ever since that time, Jewish reaction to problems can be found to relate to that experience. He has a k'lal Yisroel attitude. He stands with all Jews in relationship to the outside world.

Bernard Malamud identifies Jewish peoplehood as the collective suffering which is the fate and portion of the Jew to experience and suffer. He also recognizes the aspect of mutual dependence and responsibility of Jew upon and to

Jew. A Jew is not allowed to shirk this responsibility. He himself is responsible for the fate of every other Jew. He also believes that there exists between Jews, a rapport that is not present between Jew and gentile.

Leslie Fiedler thinks that there is little, today, to justify Jewish peoplehood. Only in the Jewish past is there that which justifies the Jew. He considers the five thousand years of Jewish history to be very important, and it is for the sake of that history that the Jew should retain his identity as a member of the Jewish people. Fiedler does not recognize many of the other things which seem to bind Jew to Jew, such as mutual responsibility.

Jerome Weidman recognizes the reality of the concept of a Jewish peoplehood. He believes that only in the company of one's own people, for example, the Jews, can one feel fully at ease. He does not think that this is a particularly good thing, but recognizes it to be the reality of life.

Whether positive or negative in their reaction, it is clear that practically all of the authors covered in this survey recognize the existence of a feeling among Jews of peoplehood, a relationship existent, not found between Jew and non-Jew.

Philip Roth recognizes the fact that Jews feel a sense of peoplehood toward one another. While he does not completely condemn such relationships, he seems to see within them the possibility for a certain evil. He seems to feel

that by imposing upon one's sense of Jewish peoplehood, a Jew can take unfair advantage of another Jew, and that often he will expect privileges that he has no right to receive, but will try to get simply because another Jew is in a position to help him obtain such privileges. Such a situation Roth considers to be bad, and is, therefore, not overly fond of the notion of Jewish peoplehood.

Family

A characteristic of Jews has been a strong and close-knit family life. Today, sociologists praise it, and mourn its apparent demise. Non-Jews have often marvelled at it, and Jews, especially young Jews, have often rebelled against the strong allegiance which the family demanded. Being such a central institution of the Jewish people, it could scarcely escape the attention or remain outside of the consciousness of the American Jewish author.

i.

Norman Fruchter, an author whose work has not been mentioned previously in this thesis, comments very elegiacally on this subject in Coat Upon a Stick. Against the background of changing generations, Fruchter paints a picture of sadness and torn emotions, the tearing which can only come from within, and which can only be produced by one's own family.

An old man who lives alone is deeply angry with his son who chooses to live in a modern way. The anger is so great that it turns to contempt and a desire to drive the son away, rather than to draw him close. And yet the son loves his aged father, and tries to understand him. The father is rigidly Orthodox, and his son respects his father's belief, though he cannot live that way himself. The fact that he understands his father's disappointment in him, and that he

understands his father's way of belief, does not lessen the hurt that he feels in his father's rejection of him. The father is a proud and stubborn old man and absolutely refuses to take anything from his son. He is very poor and while his son is not rich, he is comfortable enough so that he could help his father, and comfortable enough so that he does not breathe a sigh of relief when his father refuses to accept help. The old man is very much aware of the hurt and pain which he causes his son by refusing his help. He uses his rejection as a weapon with which to hurt his son. It is cruel because it is deliberate. And yet, it is undeniable that the old man's desire to hurt his son stems from the fact that he deeply loves him. He feels rejected by his son because the son refuses to live according to the old ways which the father embraces. Clearly, the family situation produces pain. Yet Fruchter never implies that the situation could or should be otherwise; that is, he never implies that because of the intrinsic ability of the family situation to produce pain, it should be abandoned. No, indeed! Fruchter recognizes the situation, describes it in his book, and says "that's the way it is." The wife of the son is unable to stand the situation existing between her husband and his father, and refuses to go with him to visit his father. Fruchter recognizes her reasoning, and does not actually blame her. On the other hand, he very subtly shows her to be shirking her responsibility to the institution of the family.

He seems to say that if you are a Jew you have family responsibility. Responsibility need not be pleasant, but then who ever said that it had to be? It is a part of life and one cannot run from it - from either responsibility, in general, or the family, in particular.

ii.

Meyer Levin presents more than one picture of Jewish family life. In Eva, he presents what has come to be known as Jewish family life, a stereotype of a closeknit, warm, loving family. There is lots of fussing over the children; there is much scolding and much loving. As Eva tells her story, even the forms of address are indicative of the type of relationship which existed within her family. Her parents are never "Mother and Father." They are always addressed as "Mama and Papa." There is not the aloofness which the former set of addresses produce, but rather the closeness produced by the latter. Throughout her period of hiding, Eva always recalls scenes of her family together. The memory of these scenes are always warm and tender; for Eva they always evoke a feeling of warm nostalgia.

Similarly in My Father's House. In Palestine, when refugee children are brought to the kibbutzim they are made to feel part of a Jewish family. The kibbutz acts as a family substitute for the families which the children have left and/or lost in Europe. It is assumed, on the part of the author,

that all of the children have left the same kind of home - warm and loving.

By contrast, Levin depicts a different kind of Jewish family life in Compulsion. The families of Judd and Artie are much more aloof. These are rich Jews whom Levin seems to consider a people apart. The family feeling when the boys are on trial seems to be that of standing by them because they bear the family name. There does not appear to be concern for them as individuals who are beloved members of the family. Levin quite obviously is not in sympathy with this latter kind of family situation. The lack of warm familial relationships, he considers an element rather foreign to Judaism.

iii.

Saul Bellow exhibits in his writing the influence of Jewish family life. In Augie March, there is a family life and there are family ties, though they are not always firm ties nor is there always a warm and happy family life. The ties which bind Augie, and his brother, Simon, and his mother are strong. There is a definite loyalty between them; particularly so on Augie's part. Augie is always concerned with their feelings and also with the feelings and well-being of his idiot brother, Georgie. With Simon, this latter tie is non-existent. It is Augie who goes to visit Georgie no matter where he is. The fact that Georgie is usually in an

institution that is not easily accessible does not stop him. Simon, on the other hand, looks upon Georgie only as an idiot, not as a brother. The only family life that Augie or any of the above-mentioned characters have known is with one another. A boarder, Grandma Lausch, has served as the matriarch of this family, their own mother being a very simple-minded woman herself. However, when the woman gets old, Simon is most anxious to get rid of her. He uses the excuse that she is too much of a burden on their mother, but in reality, he has no feeling for the old woman who has been the mainstay of their family life, guiding them through numerous perils which were wont to visit the poor during the Depression. Augie is won over by Simon, but purely on the basis of his mother's well-being. Augie does have feeling for Grandma Lausch. It is he who visits her in the old-age home. Not only does Simon not do so, but Grandma's real sons never visit her. It is they who have made the decision to send her to the home. They have never wanted her to live with them at any time, even before she became old and senile. Bellow shows his disapproval of them, making them seem cold and heartless. Simon, too, is not looked upon with approval by Bellow. It is only Augie who is sensitive to the wants and feelings of his family, that Bellow smiles on. Simon is aware that his mother has certain material needs, and is willing to provide them for her, but he does so more in the way of self-aggrandizement than because he cares for her.

While much goes on in the Einhorn family of which Augie seems to disapprove, nonetheless, his description shows that these people do have family feeling, and he evinces from the reader the feeling that it would be wonderful if he, Augie, could be so blessed.

While Augie is interested in having a family life and a more solid family, it is most significant that when he is offered a family "on a silver platter," as it were, he refuses. A wealthy man and woman want to adopt him. However, his loyalty to his own family makes him refuse the offer. It is significant, also, that the family situation which he was offered was not the warm, loving, Jewish type of family situation. Rather, it was of the cold, gentile, aloof variety. (N.B. that this is a stereotype in the Jewish mind of the gentile family, not that the stereotype is necessarily accurate, or that it is a product on only this thesis writer's mind.) Augie feels that one cannot simply jump right into a family situation that is not one's own.

It is also interesting to note Augie's comment on what Bateshaw, a ship's carpenter, says about his own father. (Bateshaw reviles his own father) Augie says "He didn't respect his old father. I didn't approve of that. I'm willing to believe old Bateshaw was a tyrant, a miser, a terrible man. Nevertheless he was the fellow's father."[80] Ironically, neither Augie nor his brothers ever knew their father. He had never married their mother; they have no great

reason to give respect for the institution of fatherhood, yet they have been brought up with the traditional Jewish respect for the father of the household.

The picture Bellow describes of the Magnus family is a compromise between the warm, happy, Jewish family, the loosely tied and not terribly respectable March family, and the cold, aloof family life which Meyer Levin described in Compulsion. It seems to be less prejudiced than Levin's picture. The Magnus family is very wealthy, and they are conscious of the family name and reputation; however, they are still human beings with human feelings. Indeed, they seem to possess that which the March boys never had in the way of family. Augie, a veritable symbol of independence, is quite willing to become a member of that august body. Since Augie is the book's ethical hero, Bellow may be said to give his approval to the Magnus family institution. They are definitely Jewish, with the flames, passions, and characters found in a well-balanced family.

In Herzog, Bellow mentions the family institution, again. Moses Herzog, beset with the tremendous domestic problems of his own, as an adult, constantly harks back to his youth, and the warm memories of a happy childhood.

Herzog often thinks of his family and the stories connected with far-removed relatives. He is well-versed in his family's history, showing a strong regard for "the family." Herzog is very much aware of the value of a family upbringing.

He is most unhappy about his domestic situation. Not only does it deprive him of a decent life, but "It was painful to his Jewish family feelings, that his children should be growing up without him."[81] Herzog has a feeling for the family structure and is aware of where his place within that structure is.

Clearly, then, Bellow is very much aware of that Jewish ethnic characteristic known as "the family." It is a source of comfort and strength, and as such it is viewed most favorably by Bellow.

iv.

Herman Wouk makes many references to family situations. In The City Boy, Wouk describes a Jewish family situation. The children fight, the overworked mama has neither time nor energy to handle them, but the threat of "wait till Papa comes home," is sufficient to handle the situation. The father who is loved, is also respected. The family answers to him. He is fair, but he is the dispenser of justice as Herbie, the young hero, finds out. Papa can be expected to dispense justice with a firm hand. The father dominates the family; he is the sole breadwinner. While the mother plays an important role in the running of the household, there is never any doubt as to who is really boss.

In Marjorie Morningstar, the family, plays a central role in the story. The members of Marjorie's family do more

than merely provide the background against which Marjorie can shine. In this story, Marjorie's mother is dominant in the family circle. It is she who decides the course of the family's destiny. The father has a rather shadowy existence, making appearances from time to time. As he did in The City Boy, Wouk depicts brother and sister - Marjorie and her brother as frequently quarrelling but coming to a deeper appreciation of one another as they grow up. Marjorie, as a young girl, frequently finds her family to be in her way. She looks upon it as old-fashioned. And yet, as she grows older, she encounters situations which cause her tremendous pain, and it is her family which provides the strength and support which she so badly needs. Most obvious is the time when Marjorie's lover, Noel Airman, leaves her. Marjorie is utterly broken-hearted and distraught. Her family which had always been ready to criticize her and bring her "down to earth" on the occasions when she became too high and mighty, now becomes understanding and quickly enfolds her in order to comfort her. Her father who had constantly complained about the amount of money she had been accustomed to spending now thinks nothing of providing a steamship ticket for her so that she may go after Noel.

The family is the group with whom one must be at times of joy. The seder is a family affair. There may be outside guests invited, but if all of the family is not there, the affair loses its special joy. Each member is appreciated

by the family for his special qualities, whether or not the quality is particularly admirable or not. "The Uncle," is a family institution. He is not criticized for being a glutton - though he is not praised for it, either. He is simply recognized for it. After he is dead, he is missed for it, too.

Wouk does not pretend that the Jewish family represents a kind of panacea, where everything is peace and joy and love. Quite the contrary. While he considers the family something special, he does not pretend that within the family circle all members love one another and that pettiness disappears. At the barmitzvah of Marjorie's brother, family pettiness and politics are seen at their worst. Certain relatives are given good seats at the reception dinner, while certain others are placed behind poles. Those who are slighted are not at all oblivious to the insult. They are very much aware of their position in relation to other members of the family and are most sensitive to insult. Indeed, an argument erupts because of the seating arrangements!

However, with all the pettiness and politics, Wouk does recognize the very central role which the family plays in Jewish life, and he is quite willing to give it its due.

V.

Jerome Weidman provides an interesting contrast with respect to his description of Jewish family life. For him,

the family is far less central to the life of the Jew. In The Enemy Camp, George Hurst is brought up by a woman who adopts him. He is brought up on the Lower East Side, in an atmosphere of traditional Judaism. Yet George has not absorbed the traditional family feeling. True, he did not have much of a family, only Aunt Tessie, the woman who raised him. But Bellow's Augie March did not have a father, and he had respect for fatherhood.[82] George might have thought more about Aunt Tessie, he might have valued her even more since she had given him the only family love that he had ever known. Yet occasions arise when George gives her scarcely any consideration whatsoever. When he and Dora Dienst decide to marry, George does not go running to tell Aunt Tessie. He is not even concerned sufficiently for her feelings to invite her to be present. He says to Dora, "We can write her from Brigantine Beach...I guess we better make it a telegram..."[83] Similarly, when he is urgently summoned to Albany by Aunt Tessie on an emergency visit, he can hardly wait to leave once he has gotten there - despite the fact that Tessie's brother is at death's door; (Zisha, her brother had been very good to George, too, and had loved him). Later when George is about to be married to Mary Sherrod, a shickseh, he tells Aunt Tessie. He knows that this is against everything that she stood for. He does not try to break it to her gently, or to mitigate what he is doing (in all fairness, it must be admitted that George may have considered it

impossible to mitigate such an act, anyhow). He allows his words to have their full impact on Aunt Tessie, in no way trying to spare her. Aunt Tessie curses George and drops dead on the spot. Weidman does not go to the trouble of any description of George's remorse - if, indeed, there was any. Certainly, there is no sign of deep regret on George's part. He has no consideration for the little family he had.

The only sign of close family life comes with the Kneichtbreit family. George goes with Mary Sherrod to do an interview with this man. They are actually seeking to expose him as a villainous man who deals in diseased poultry. His family is present when George and Mary arrive and they remain present throughout the interview. They exhibit all of the warm characteristics of Jewish family life. Weidman seems to undercut them, and all that they stand for in this respect, in that the reader is aware that they are being investigated for selling and misrepresenting to the unsuspecting public diseased chickens.

In The Sound of Bow Bells, Sam Silver, the hero, does have parents. The mother is a very dominant parent, but nevertheless, Sam is brought up in the midst of a loving, well-adjusted family situation. Yet, as an adult, Sam is able to almost completely sever his ties with his parents. He dreads the phone calls from his mother (he never calls her) and resents terribly the encroachment upon his time that his rare visits to visit them make. He is not selfish

with them in terms of money, only in terms of giving them of himself. Even with regard to his son Billy, is Sam unwilling to allow his parents naches. His parents want him to have his son barmitzvahed, and Sam refuses. Many first generation American Jewish children rebelled against tradition, but how many rebelled to the extent that they would not barmitzvah their child "for mama and papa"? (He does barmitzvah Billy finally but not for the sake of his parents.) Thus, it appears that Weidman has some definite feelings of alienation from the traditional picture of the Jewish family. With it all, Weidman is not unaware of this element in his writing. Sam Silver asks himself:

> How long would he have to bear the guilt of his and his parents' utterly incompatible ways of life?...Was he the first son in history who had grown away from his parents? The answer which was of course no, did not drown out the silent but piercing wail of pain in the reply his mother did not have to make: he was the son who had grown away from her.[84]

Weidman recognizes the problem of the difference between generations, but in no way does he seek to show how the pain might be lessened, how love might provide some emollient for a parent's pain. Family considerations, and the family institution, while they appear in Weidman's work, and have made their impression on him are not viewed favorably.

vi.

The characters in Roth's fiction do not seem to have an overwhelming family attachment. Brenda Patimkin, in "Goodbye

Columbus," is very fond of vilifying her mother:

> I can't even think of her as my mother. She hates me. Other girls, when they pack in September, at least their mothers help them. Not mine. She'll be busy sharpening pencils for Julie's pencil box while I'm carrying my trunk around upstairs. And it's so obvious why. It's practically a case study.
>
> Why?
>
> She's jealous. It's so corny I'm ashamed to say it...[85]

Her comment as regards her father also leaves something to be desired in the realm of family feeling: "He's not too smart but he's sweet at least...Oh, I'm tired of talking about them...and how awful it is."[86] Her sense of loyalty is obviously not so strong that she will not talk about them, freely.

Neil, the hero in this novella, lives with his aunt and uncle. His parents are in Arizona because of their asthma. When Brenda asks why he is not with them, why he stays in Manhattan with his aunt, he replies, "I'm not a child...I just can't go wherever my parents are."[87] At the end of the book, Brenda asks Neil to meet her in Boston over the High Holidays. Neil's parents are coming in from Arizona for that short time, but he decides to go to see Brenda with no pangs of conscience about not seeing them. His aunt enquires as to what she should tell his mother when she comes. He replies that he will tell her and for Aunt Gladys not to get upset.

Similarly in his more recent work, Letting Go, Gabe Wallach loves his widower father, but finds it painful to talk

with him on the telephone when his father calls long-distance. His father has to beseech him to come home on vacations from college as the son has no inclination to do so himself. He finds it uncomfortable to be with his father. He finds that he has nothing in common with him, blood relationship notwithstanding. To his father who has called him from New York he says "...these phone calls are driving me nuts..."[88]

Since Gabe's mother died, his father has had a greater dependency on him. Gabe's reaction is: "I had finally to tell him...that I was not his wife or his mother, but his son."[89] Now it is reasonable for Gabe to make such a statement; it is psychologically sound. However, one might expect such a stand from a person who had already given greatly of himself, and who finally had to draw a line. But when Gabe says "finally," he has not given of himself. He has not tried to be a source of comfort to his father. His father is terribly lonely and wants Gabe to come home for Thanksgiving. It is only be begging, pleading and wheedling that he finally wins a "maybe" from Gabe: "Look, what's wrong with going back to Harvard? At least I'll expect you Thanksgiving, huh?" "...I can't promise." "I never asked for promises, Gabe. Just try. Just meet me halfway."[90]

This is not to say that Gabe has no feeling for his father, whatsoever. He does go home Thanksgiving. And he does make some effort to make his father less lonely. But the effort has been grudging. Also, Gabe does not seem to

recognize that one can enable one's parent to feel good by allowing him to do something for his child. When Gabe's father wants to send him a check for plane fare, Gabe tries to refuse:

> I'll send you a check for the plane.
>
> Why don't you hold off until I see.
>
> It's only a check.
>
> I've got two checks I haven't even cashed yet.
>
> Cash them. You want to foul up my bank statements? he asked gaily.
>
> I just don't need all that money, that's all...
>
> Will it kill you to cash them? he asked. I send them off; it makes me feel good...you cash those checks. Is that too big a favor to ask?

Roth does not seem to find the same essence in the family structure that was common in the generation which preceded him. He recognizes family feeling in others, but they do not seem to speak for him.

Thus, either intentionally or unintentionally, Gabe has a great deal of trouble trying to give pleasure to his father. There is an inability to communicate on a sympathetic level; there is no empathy.

Summary

Norman Fruchter and Jerome Weidman both recognize the strength of family attachment and both realize the potentiality for hurt which derives from the severance of close family ties. While Fruchter recognizes the situation for what it is and with unhappiness and pain concludes that it can be no other way, especially in the case of parents who are of another world in terms of time, Weidman is of the opinion that one must live one's own life, and if that entails cutting the ties that bind, then so be it and no regrets.

Levin and Bellow are both cognizant that among Jews, there is more than one type of family life. It is not always warm and laughing. It is not always the ample bosom filled with love. Sometimes it is a cold relationship. But the cold relationship between members of a family is not a good thing. Both men recognize the stereotype Jewish family - the relationship of love, anger and laughter as being preferable and desirable.

Herman Wouk conceives of the Jewish family in terms of fighting brothers and sisters, strong parental figures, a lot of food, a lot of cousins, and a lot of love. To Wouk, it is a necessary ingredient in the life of a Jew, a healthy ingredient. The family is a source of comfort and strength when called upon to provide for a wounded member, and it is also a court with many judges who must be satisfied when a

member behaves in a way inconsistent with the generally accepted standards of the family. The family by virtue of its ability to "take the wind out of one's sails," is also a link with reality, dispensing its own kind of <u>musar</u> in the form of disapproval.

Thus, all of the above authors recognize the element of family life within the Jewish framework, and come to grips with it.

Religious Conceptions

A. Theology and Jewish Organization

i.

While Ludwig Lewisohn has written of the position of the Jew in society, he does not do so at the expense of neglecting the specific area of religion. In his novel In a Summer Season, the question is raised regarding religion: "It did get people very far generation after generation. Are we so different? Maybe it needs a new interpretation."[91] This statement is not made with respect to Judaism, necessarily. It has been made by a Protestant, and is only meant generally.

Jerome Goodman, the attorney of the hero, and a Jew, having made several statements condemning those Jews who do not support the State of Israel and who do not belong to synagogues, takes a slightly different tone with regard to belief:

> Belief? A man believes what he can. Judaism consists in doing - in certain acts which sanctify life, which make life human and worthy of a creature made in God's image.[92]

Goodman is a very ethically positive figure. He is the protector of the hero against the persecution of the hero's wife and her lawyers; the reader finds him moral, and sympathetic. When he speaks, one is prone to accept what he has to say. His words smack of an Orthodox position, of the "mitzvah system of salvation."

The hero, after much soul-searching comes to the conclusion regarding God that "he who seeks Him has found Him; he who needs Him knows Him..."[93] (Felix, the hero, is not Jewish, but it does not seem to matter; his statements are broad enough to be taken in either a Jewish or a Christian context.) As to organized religion, in general, Felix says: "Dare we even have a Church? I don't know...at this moment any organization...has an element of evil. Yet we can't get along without it."[94]

Felix has made this statement against the backdrop of thoughts regarding the Hitler-Stalin excesses. It also comes from the tortured thoughts of a man struggling to find meaning in life and in the world. He has suffered the persecutions of his wife and her lawyers, and he is very much humbled. He comes to the conclusion that modern man is "standin' in the need of prayer."[95]

Thus it is clear that Lewisohn is an advocate of religion. It is also clear that while he recognizes that religious institutions are but the products and extensions of mortal man, nonetheless, they have become indispensable to man. He needs them, but he must be on his guard lest the institution slip from the pedestal on which man sets it.

ii.

The religious world of which Norman Fruchter writes is that of strict Orthodoxy. In the synagogue around which much

of the action of Coat Upon a Stick revolves; the rabbi is a modern man, much younger than his congregation of old men. He is also a very sympathetic person, one with whom the reader can identify and whom the reader can respect. He tries to comfort the old men and to solve their problems - or help them to see their problems in such a light as will enable the men, themselves, to solve them. One of the old men has taken it upon himself to act as a kind of prophet. Necessarily, this puts him out of touch with the rest of the congregation; the congregation is not used to prophetic religion. The old man is ostracized, and the rabbi tries to set things on a more even keel, again. He counsels the old man:

> And that's what Judaism's all about, Zitomer. We bind each man with so many laws, so many commandments, so many rituals and observances, that the whole of his waking hours is taken up with doing, and he lives in a world with all the questions answered and no pauses for thinking. Because ninety-nine men out of every hundred are afraid to think, Zitomer, and for these men Judaism is a way of life.[96]

Zitomer, this apparent renegade, is not convinced that the rabbi is correct. He has become obsessed with the idea that only the Ten Commandments are really important. He is a real hero. In his old age, he has become a prophet. He is willing to risk the condemnation and scorn of his peers to spread this word - indeed, he has even given such a sermon from the pulpit when he asked special permission. As a result of the sermon and his continued speaking about his view, he

has been denied membership in the synagogue. For Zitomer, the essence of Judaism is living by the biblical Ten Commandments. He contends that the rest of the ritual is meaningless, at best superfluous. When he says this to the rabbi, the rabbi replies: "The other things we do as Jews, the rituals we observe, the holidays we keep, the prayers are every bit as important. If we only lived by the Ten Commandments, there would be nothing Jewish about us."[97]

Fruchter has juxtaposed two extremes, Orthodox Judaism and Ethical Monotheism. What the rabbi has said is true. The Ten Commandments provide an excellent skeleton on which to hang the flesh of a formal religion. Fruchter does not provide an alternative to Orthodoxy as a viable form of Judaism. It is only Orthodoxy or no Judaism at all.

Fruchter seems to have reached an impasse, then. He no longer seems satisfied with the Orthodoxy which he has always known, but he has not discovered anything to take its place. He seems to want to take a step in the direction of Reform, of biblical religion, a more simplistic religion, but seems to be unaware of its existence. Only a vague idea of Reform seems to exist for him, but not the reality.

iii.

In a book which does not deal substantially with Jews, a great deal can be learned about the religious conceptions

of Herman Wouk. In The Caine Mutiny, one gets a good, clear insight into the orthodox preferences of its author. The revelation comes after the climax of the book. The court martial of Steve Maryk is over. He has been aquitted. At the court martial, the various irrational acts of Captain Queeg had been brought to light and discussed. It was on the basis of Queeg's irrationality that Maryk had assumed command of the Caine, and it is because of these same acts that Maryk is aquitted. Then, at the victory party held to celebrate the aquittal, Barney Greenwald, the book's only Jew and Maryk's brilliant defense counsel, makes a little speech. He is slightly drunk, but despite the drunken thickening of the tongue, the meaning of his words is clear.

> ...if I wrote a war novel I'd try to make a hero out of Old Yellowstain [Queeg] ... while I was studying law 'n' old Keefer here was writing his play for the Theatre Guild, and Willie here was playing on the fields of Prinshton, all that time these birds we call regulars - these stupid Prussians, in the Navy and the Army - were manning guns...Can't stop a Nazi with a law book...and...a year and a half before I was any good, who was keeping Mama out of the soap dish? Captain Queeg.[98]

Now Greenwald has shown clearly at the court martial that Queeg was definitely irrational, unfit to continue at his post. Here, he defends Queeg; he makes a hero out of him. Wouk is defending absolute authority and saying: despite what we know rationally, despite the fact that we see things that make us question, we must forget our doubts and

accept that authority, unconditionally! Indeed, despite the fact that Maryk has been aquitted, officially, he is given a very poor position, afterwards. For all intensive purposes, his promising career is ended. By questioning absolute authority he has sinned and must be punished. One may imagine the tones of an angry God speaking to Job: "Where were you when I laid the foundations of the earth...then who are you to question Me..."

Just as Queeg, the symbol of irrational authority, is treated unkindly, as a demonic force against whom one can only rebel, so is the Orthodox structure treated in Marjorie Morningstar. Such a statement must be qualified, immediately. Queeg is villified, but he is also made into a kind of hero-martyr (see above). In Morningstar, the villain of Orthodoxy is rather ill-defined. It is there; Marjorie's family is Orthodox. In the barmitzvah scene, and in at least one wedding scene (Marsha, Marjorie's friend's wedding) there is a rather broad treatment of Orthodoxy. It is hard to lay one's finger on specific things, but in general, it seems as though Wouk says that there is too much Jew and not enough Judaism connected with Orthodox ceremony. It is allowed to get out of hand; it becomes grotesque.[99] Yet, when he is finished rebelling - either against Queeg, or against the gaucheries of the barmitzvah, he concludes that despite their irrationality, the authority which they possess is binding, andoone must submit to that authority.

Wouk's Morgenstern family of Marjorie Morningstar is also a traditional family. Theirs is a kosher home, and they are at least nominally Orthodox. Similarly the Bookbinder family in The City Boy. These are the families with whom Wouk permits an intimacy between character and reader. These are the people he knows. Even the Paperman family of Don't Stop the Carnival are of an Orthodox background, though not at all observant in their own lives. Still, they have not officially gone over to the Reform camp.

iv.

While it is difficult to say just what kind of Judaism Leslie Fiedler favors, it is patently clear that he does not favor Reform. He gives every indication of holding it in contempt. In The Second Stone, Fiedler takes Rabbi Mark Stone, identifies him specifically as a Reform rabbi, and proceeds to make him into an absolute fool. He locates the rabbi in Rome for purposes of heading a ridiculous convention dealing with "love," cuckolds him, and in general makes him appear as phony, superficial and insincere as it is possible to do. Fiedler refers to Mark Stone as the head of a "Reformed Seminary."[100] Either Fiedler has so little interest in Reform that hehhas not even taken the trouble to find out its proper name, or he is deliberately using an improper nomenclature for some satiric purpose.

Apparently, Fiedler is more familiar with Orthodoxy than with Reform, for he makes many a passing reference to traditional prayers not found in the Reform liturgy as for example: "Thank Thee O Lord God King of the Universe for not having made me, in addition to being a "goy," a woman."[101] Clem, the protagonist, a Christian by birth but married to a Jewess, has made the above statement. His wife writes to him about what is happening in their family circle back in the United States: "We're good Jews these days...for Mama's sake and because a child needs some kind of security - let her revolt later, on her own time..."[102] Fiedler seems to be saying that a religion that provides the security of definite answers is what people need, if indeed, they do need religion, at all. He necessarily excludes Reform at this juncture, since, by definition, it does not provide absolute answers.

In "The Last Wasp in the World," Fiedler again picks on the rabbi as a special target. This time, he does not specifically identify him as Reform, by name, but his allusions seem to point in that direction. At the wedding reception, the rabbi talks to the hero, Vincent Hazelbaker:

> One must settle in the end for pleasing oneself...as I need scarcely tell a Pulitzer Prize-winning poet." He smiled up into Vin's eyes, his melancholy face very close..."Oneself - and to be sure, one's God." Was there a tone of apology as he said the final word?" [The rabbi then mentions his activity in the field of Civil Rights] At this evocation of Civil Rights, his face lit up with a glow as it had not at the earlier mention of God.[103]

Fiedler makes the rabbi fawn all over the gentile poet. He also mocks the rabbi for not being true to what Fiedler considers to be the proper aim of the rabbinate, but that he diverts himself with things that are not his proper concern. It is well-known that the Reform rabbinate has been active in the field of Civil Rights, to the complete overshadowing of the other branches of American Judaism. Therefore, it is quite likely that Fiedler is again making fun of the Reform movement - at least of the Reform rabbinate. Certainly, the reference to the rabbi's reaction to the word "God," can only refer to the Reform movement and the current dispute going on regarding it in Reform circles.

Fiedler definitely strikes out quite violently against Reform, but has nothing positive to say about any other type of Judaism, either.

v.

Jerome Weidman knows only Orthodox Judaism and is not particularly fond of it or loyal to it. Certainly his constant forays outside Judaism (Judaism of any kind, how much the more so Orthodoxy) in the form of intermarriage and a great hesitancy to have his son barmitzvahed (Enemy Camp and Bow Bells, respectively) are indicative of a breaking away. While the reader sees the breaking away process, he does not see Weidman replacing his Orthodoxy with anything else. He does not attempt to become a Christian, and nothing is ever mentioned about Reform in those of his works included in this

survey. Weidman seems to have taken the position of the "Jew-in-name-only" who is found in such great numbers in American society. He has not gone so far that he ignores milestone events such as barmitzvah. These he needs to observe in order to preserve his identity as a Jew, something which he feels he needs to do (see Chapter I). But in terms of having a meaningful religion, Weidman has rejected Orthodoxy and has not taken up any other formal mode of Judaism (or any other form of religion).*

vi.

Unlike Jerome Weidman, Saul Bellow has not chosen to indicate a disenchantment with religion in his fiction. He treats the subject of religion very seriously. Dangling Man is not what one could call a "Jewish" book. Neither its characters nor its content are Jewish. It deals with a young man who is in a state of limbo because of his draft status during World War II. At the very end of the book he manages to have his status changed; he will soon be called up. His immediate future is thus assured. He is no longer in the terrible state of limbo and uncertainty which has been tormenting

---

*The reader of this paper is cautioned to remember that all statements such as the one to which your attention is drawn are made purely on the subjective judgment of the writer of this thesis based on what he finds in the work of particular authors. It is possible that this judgment will prove erroneous and bear no resemblance to the way in which the author actually lives and practices his religion (or anything else).

him for almost two years. He has been "1-A" for this entire period, and consequently has been unable to obtain work. His wife has worked and he has been able to relax, to loaf. He finds that he is unable to cope with an utter lack of responsibility, with complete freedom. He goes morally and spiritually downhill.

When at last he is assured of being called up in the immediate future he gives a joyous shout of relief:

> Hurray for regular hours!
> And for the supervision of the spirit!
> Long live regimentation![104]

Admittedly, religion has not been the subject matter of this novel. Bellow has been discussing the moral pitfalls of the draft system. However, the above quotation does provide a hint to the way in which his mind operates. He says that man cannot handle complete freedom. He needs to have guidelines. He needs to be told what to do, at least to a certain point. This kind of thinking brings to mind the statement of the rabbi in Fruchter's Coat Upon a Stick that men are afraid to think and that for these men, Judaism is a way of life.[105] The ordinary man is unable to make all his own decisions. He needs the guidelines that an Orthodox religion provides. Joseph, who is the "dangling man," says just that:

> I am no longer to be held accountable for myself; I am grateful for that. I am in other hands, relieved of self-determination, freedom cancelled.[106]

While one could argue that this is not a really valid description of Jewish orthodoxy, that a man is accountable

for himself in Jewish orthodoxy, nonetheless, the character in this novel is not a philosopher, not a student of religion. He is merely looking for a sense of stability, and this is something which any orthodoxy does provide. The parallels are not perfect, but there is an indication that Bellow is leaning toward Orthodox Judaism from what can be inferred from the novel.

The Victim does not represent a departure from an Orthodox way of thinking. In this book, Allbee, the Christian who imagines himself persecuted by Leventhal, the Jew, says to Leventhal that he thinks according to the Jewish view. He is referring to Leventhal's opinion that Allbee got what he had coming to him. He says that the Jew thinks in terms of cause and effect, like Job's friends. "If you are good, you will be rewarded; if you are bad, you will be punished."

Allbee does not agree. But one must try to see what is happening in terms of the author's thoughts. Allbee seems to have a distorted picture of things. Certainly, Bellow has not been using him to express the opinion of the author up until now. Quite the opposite. However, in this case, Allbee is correct. The reader is aware that Leventhal has been thinking that Allbee deserved what he had gotten. But Leventhal also thinks: "He liked to think 'human' meant accountable in spite of many weaknesses."[107] This statement seems to modify the quotation from Dangling Man (about personal responsibility), and also puts Bellow more firmly within the

camp of an educated and understanding Orthodoxy. In other words, Allbee was expressing Bellow's viewpoint when he described Leventhal's way of thinking as being that of causal.

The Adventures of Augie March finds Bellow waxing more philosophical than in his previous works. He delves more deeply into the nature of man and his religion. In this book, Bellow makes a strong and definite statement on determinism. It is made specifically about Augie, but is such a broad statement with such far reaching ramifications that it can hardly be meant by Bellow to pertain to Augie alone. Willie Einhorn, is talking to Augie. Augie has previously told the reader how brilliant Willie is, thus setting Willie up as an authority; his statements are to be regarded as important and meaningful. He says:

> All of a sudden I catch on to something about you. You've got opposition in you. You don't slide through everything. You just make it look so.
>
> This was the first time that anyone had told me anything like the truth about myself. That as he said, I did have opposition in me, and great desire to offer resistance and to say "No!" which was as clear as could be,...No, I didn't want to be...determined. I never had accepted determination and wouldn't become what other people wanted to make of me.[108]

Bellow believes that man is not determined, that he has the ability to do with his life whatever he will. Certainly, this is a statement about the nature of man, and the nature of the kind of religion in which the author believes (or does

not believe). It is a general statement, however, and does not indicate a preference for a liberal or an orthodox religion. A further statement, general in nature, is made as to the meaning of life. Augie affirms life. Despite many miseries and unhappy experiences, he never gives way to contemplating suicide as did his brother, Simon, when Simon's love affair ended so unhappily. Augie thinks:

> Death discredits. Survival is the whole success. The voice of the dead goes away. There isn't any memory. The power that's established fills the earth and destiny is whatever survives, so whatever is, is right.[109]

While Augie has made this statement as a statement on the nature of success, it might also be an affirmation of life, in general, of the here and now, and also, an affirmation of Judaism which has continued to survive.

In a lengthy monologue, Augie discourses on man's relationship to the universe. He says that striving puts one out of harmony with the universe. If man stops striving against the natural harmony of the universe, the following will be the result:

> He will be brought into focus. He will live with true joy. Even his pains will be joy if they are true...Death will not be terrible to him if life is not. The embrace of other true people will take away his dread of fast change and short life.[110]

Is Bellow not saying that meaning in the universe can come about only when man relates to his fellow man, (for with

whom else does he strive?)? There seems to have entered into Bellow's religio-philosophico thinking an element of Buberian "I-Thouism." One finds meaning in life by enjoying meaningful relationships with other persons. Then, the fears of living fall away.

Mintouchian, a man of seemingly vast wisdom who helps Augie find stability in life tells him:

> You must take your chance on what you are. And you can't sit still. I know this double poser, that if you make a move you may lose but if you sit still you will decay. But what will you lose? You will not invent better than God or nature or turn yourself into the man who lacks no gift or development before you make the move. This is not given us.[111]

Mintouchian seems to advocate a positive kind of outlook. It is also positive religion. This is certainly a Jewish view, but as to the particular <u>type</u> of Judaism, one cannot say.

In <u>Herzog</u>, Bellow again becomes more specific in some of his religious references. In addition to general discussions about Christianity, Nietzsche, Hegel, and Buber, etc., he makes a specific reference to a personal God:

> "In my grief did I know what I was doing?" noted Herzog on a separate page, as he waited for the elevator. "Providence," he added, "takes care of the faithful. I sensed that I would meet such a person. I have had terrific luck." Luck was many times underscored.[112]

Herzog is operating under the notion that there is a God who

watches over him, and is, indeed, the source of his "luck." It is not really luck that he has, but rather the beneficence of God.

Sandor Himmelstein, Herzog's attorney, talks to him. In a sentimental moment he says with great sincerity: "We'll find an orthodox shul - enough of this Temple junk...you and me, a pair of old-time Jews."[113] The man who has just made this suggestion is a twisted (physically and emotionally) man. He has been shown by Bellow to be a cruel person. He has just finished browbeating Moses Herzog, cruelly. He has also been helping Moses' cruel and often paranoid wife, Madeleine, harm Herzog, when in fact, he was supposed to be representing Moses. Is the reader supposed to take him seriously, then, when he suggests to Herzog that the two of them go to shul together? At first thought, certainly not. Yet Bellow has deliberately introduced a change in mood when Himmelstein makes the suggestion. Himmelstein has gone from cruelty and fraud to warmth and sincerity. He has deliberately mocked that which he publicly holds to be correct and modern, and attempted to return to that which he has obviously left far behind. However, Herzog does not accept Himmelstein's invitation. In fact, he ignores it, and at that very moment realizes how Himmelstein has been misrepresenting him, all along! If Bellow is still following the generally accepted pattern (which he has seemed to follow in his other works) of letting characters - depending on whether or not they are ethically

positive - speak for the author, then one would have to reject Himmelstein's suggestion as being that view which the author holds. However, if this is the case, then Bellow has come to a new religious position - different from the one to which he has seemingly subscribed, in his earlier works. It appears that Bellow examines many of the great religious and philosophical theories, but ultimately relies on his past sentiments and concludes that there remains in man a certain need for a spot void of utter rationalism. It is because of this need that Bellow can remain within the Orthodox camp: Herzog concludes his theological and intellectual journey with the words "Thou movest me";[114] it is my opinion that he speaks for Bellow.

B. Ritual

i.

Certain of the authors discussed in this thesis react more definitely to specific rituals than do others. The rituals or ceremonies which are most frequently mentioned are the barmitzvah, the seder, and the wedding.

Herman Wouk reacts very positively to the traditional Jewish holiday observances. In Marjorie Morningstar, this is quite clear. Marjorie, who at the time of her brother's barmitzvah is not at a very sympathetic age, is very moved at the occasion of his becoming a man. Wouk makes sure that the

reader will have no doubt in his mind that the occasion is very solemn and important. It is for this reason that he makes Marjorie appear so impressed.

The Passover seder is treated in much the same way by Wouk. Marjorie invites Noel Airman to the family seder. Noel is very much assimilated, but Wouk portrays him as being respectful toward the ceremonial meal. Despite the fuss made by the children, the reader cannot help but come away aware of Wouk's warm feeling for this ritual. Lest the reader have any doubt, Wouk sets up a "straw man." At the seder, one of the nieces by marriage, Millie Saperstein becomes very upset. Her son, Neville, whom she has been raising "by the book," and who is obviously a most neurotic child, throwing temper tantrums, unable to get along with any of his many cousins, etc., is behaving impossibly. She forces her husband to get up with her and to leave the seder, saying: "It's all this primitive magic and symbolism and Hebrew he's being exposed to. It upsets his nerves. He's been brought up rationally...this poppycock disturbs him deeply."[115] It is very apparent to the reader that the only thing wrong with the child is the way he has been brought up, (according to the book) and a neurotic mother. Wouk is not only pro-seder, he is advocating all that the seder stands for: something that goes beyond rational understanding. He thinks that the child is in need of religion and its symbolism.

Certain related aspects of Jewish ceremony are burlesqued by Wouk, showing a disapproval. The orgiastic aspects of weddings and barmitzvahs are made to appear most unattractive. The eating and lack of good taste are made most contemptible by the author, but he does not connect these gaucheries with the ceremony or ritual itself.

ii.

Leslie Fiedler is far less sympathetic to Jewish ritual. In "The Last Wasp in the World," he fastens upon the wedding reception rather than on the wedding as the more central thing. The reception he transforms into a sexual orgy. He emphasizes only the vulgar and the crude. He all but calls the bride a tramp, and he refers to the rabbi as "the beardless rabbi...who gathered his campy praying shawl about him...picked at some theatrical agency..."[116]

In The Second Stone, the hero's wife writes to him:

> We're good Jews these days...for Mama's sake and because a child needs some kind of security...We even had a Seder this Passover - with Papa stumbling over the Hebrew and me trying to explain...that it's all symbolic...of man's struggle for freedom - everyone uncomfortable and bored...[117]

Thus, Fiedler burlesques the seder, too. He makes everything about it appear inauthentic: the Hebrew is blunderingly rendered, the explanation of the ceremony seems forced, and it is appreciated by nobody. Thus, the seder seems with-

out any value, despite the fact that these people have celebrated it for a certain value: to give the young daughter a sense of security. Surely, Fiedler does not mean to imply that security is to be equated with boredom! He is simply saying that the seder was without value, and that the way in which it was carried out was ridiculous.

Fiedler is either very antagonistic to Jewish ritual, or finds that any beauty or meaning which it might have has been completely glossed over by an inability to perform the rituals with proper skill and dignity or by the encroachment of all the side show aspects which invariably attach themselves to the ceremony, as for example the festivities at the Jewish wedding.

iii.

Jerome Weidman seems to find certain ceremonies important for their value as moments when a man can renew his identity as a Jew. Certainly, in The Sound of Bow Bells the barmitzvah ceremony serves this purpose. The Jew can afford to live as a non-Jew (as an "American") as long as he has ceremonies every now and then to remind him that he is a Jew. At such moments, he finds that he gains new insight into himself, and feels that he is more of a total person. On occasions such as the barmitzvah, there is a great emotional release which Weidman seems to find very satisfying. This seems to be the chief value of such

ceremonies: to provide the release for a special kind of emotion.

Summary

Ludwig Lewisohn is a firm advocate of theistic religion. He concludes that man needs a religion in which he can pray to a God who will listen. His God concept conforms to that of the God of Orthodoxy.

As regards the religious institution, he is in doubt: he recognizes its shortcomings, the fact that it is but a frail extension of that frailest of creatures, man, and is consequently frail, itself. It is subject to all the evil within man, and au contraire, can be made to reflect the greatness within man. Because man is so dependent upon the religious structure, and its accompanying organizations, it must continue to exist. It must be carefully watched so that it does not become tyrannical.

Norman Fruchter writes about a strict Orthodox Judaism. He understands what it is about, but finds it to be incompatible with the modern world. He recognizes that Orthodoxy comprises an entire way of life, but he feels that such a life belongs to an older generation. The only alternative which he sees is a religion based on only the Ten Commandments. He recognizes the fact that such a religion would not be "Jewish," and he is thus left with nothing at all other than a sad nostalgia caused by the different viewpoint of different generations as regards the nature of religion.

Herman Wouk has accepted Orthodox Judaism in the modern world. He feels that there need not be a completely rational explanation for man as regards the nature of God's absolute authority. Man is too insignificant to know the nature of God. Wouk looks with great favor on Jewish ritual. He finds a solemn majesty in celebrations such as barmitzvah. He contends that rituals that go beyond the totally rational are healthy for people. Symbolism and the non-rational have a place in the life of the modern Jew.

Leslie Fiedler condemns Reform Judaism as being inauthentic and "phony." He has special venom for the Reform rabbinate, contending that they find no meaning in the fields of endeavor which rightly concern them and that they must, therefore, move into areas which are not truly valid for them, such as Civil Rights. While Fiedler scoffs at Reform, he does not find anything positive to say about any other kind of Judaism, either. All that he seems to find valid about Judaism is that it has five thousand years of history. Of what value that history is, he does not say. He finds no apparent value in Jewish ritual observance. He conemns the orgiastic eating practices that attend the Jewish wedding, and the pitiful bumbling that accompanies the conducting of the seder.

Jerome Weidman is familiar with Orthodox Judaism, and while he finds it without particular meaning in everyday life, nonetheless, he finds meaning in some of its ritual

observances. The ritual celebrations such as barmitzvah provide the Jew with an opportunity to reorient himself in terms of his identity. Such moments serve as emotional outlets, too, which Weidman finds to be a healthy thing.

Saul Bellow finds meaning within the Orthodox framework. He is cognizant of other forms of Judaism, but prefers Orthodoxy. More than any of the other writers discussed in this survey, Bellow explores the nature of religion. He finds meaning in a certain regimentation and in the certainty which an orthodoxy provides. He does believe that man is the master of his own destiny and that he is accountable for his actions. He is very positive toward life, affirming it despite the agonies encountered in the process of living. The reason for living is life, itself. Having examined many religious theories, Bellow - through the eyes and person of Moses Herzog - concludes that "Thou movest me." Despite the appeal of the intellect to move in other directions, Bellow ultimately prefers Orthodox Judaism.

He does not dwell at length on any of the Jewish ritual observances, but it may be inferred from his positive attitude toward Orthodoxy, thathe is in favor of ritual and ceremony and that he finds meaning in them.

Zionism

The element of Zionism has seldom been lacking in the Jewish consciousness. Since this survey deals with the period of time following World War II, (or at the earliest, the final years of the War) when Jewish settlement in Palestine was a reality, and with the period just before and just after the establishment of the State of Israel up until the present time, it would be strange, indeed, if the subject did not appear in at least some of the works surveyed.

i.

Lewisohn looks upon the land of Palestine in Breathe Upon These as an absolute necessity for those Jews who were torn from the fabric of a normal existence in Europe. He understands how these people feel, that they could never hope to return to Europe to lead a normal life. It is an emotional impossibility. The only hope for these people to resume any semblance of a normal life is to emigrate to Israel. He is very bitter about those governments who for political reasons refused to facilitate the Jews entering into Palestine after they had escaped the German ovens.

Lewisohn is saying that all Jews cannot help but be affected by the creation of the State of Israel, and cannot be but proud and willing to help. He does not mention any-

thing about all Jews having an obligation to go there to live, or even to visit, only to be proud, to love, and to help.

ii.

Meyer Levin is strongly Zionistic. In his beautiful My Father's House, he pictures Israel (still mandatory Palestine then) as being a mother who stands with open arms, gathering in all her suffering and scattered children. These Jews, refugees from Europe, are all members of one family, in Levin's eyes, and they should all dwell under one roof. They have been apart too long. Levin makes use of the statue of the Madonna and Child of Jerusalem to symbolize Mother Israel collecting all her scattered children. Levin considers Palestine an absolute necessity for Jewry.

In Eva, written years after the establishment of the Jewish state, the heroine, Eva, after the harrowing escapes she has had in Europe, is able to find peace in Israel, among Jews in a Jewish country.

While Levin mentions the necessity of a Jewish state for the sake of those Jews who suffered in Europe and who escaped, he does not imply that Jews from America need to go to Israel. His theme is Israel as a center of love and Jewish peoplehood. He does not seem to be concerned about the relationship between the Jews of the Galut and the Jews in Israel, or between the former and the State of Israel.

iii.

In his fine book My Glorious Brothers, Fast draws a picture of Israel at the time of the Maccabean revolt that bears a startling resemblance to the Israel of this time. His novel is written with great pride in the Israel of yesteryear. He glorifies the farmer-Jew who is at home in nature, who loves peace, but who values freedom even more. This is the Jew who can be pushed only so far, and no further. Then Fast's Jew will lay down his plowshare and his pruning hook, and will pick up the sword and the spear.

He lauds the Jew of the Maccabean period as a lover of learning. While he exaggerates the level of learning among the Jews of that period, he is not amiss in expressing the emphasis on it in Jewish tradition.

In effect, what Fast has done is to draw a picture of modern Israel. The Jew has become a farmer, once again, and he has risen to the necessity of fighting for his freedom after years of suffering under a tyrannical yoke. Fast looks at the level of learning which is the highest in the Middle East and he is proud. The Jew is the farmer, at home in nature, no longer estranged from it, no longer the "luftmensch," but now the equal of anyone. The fact that the Jew has a country makes this possible. Thus, Fast is very pro-Israel. He thinks that the position of Israel enables all Jews to hold their heads up with pride.

iv.

Bernard Malamud and Leslie Fiedler make only passing remarks as regards Israel. In "The Last Mohican," Fidelman tells Susskind that he should either go back to Israel where he is a citizen, or to get a job with an Israeli firm in Italy (where they happen to be at the moment). Malamud seems to take Israel simply as an established fact. Fidelman makes his remarks in the same tone which he might use about France or the U.S.A. There is no particular emotional quality present.

In "The Last Jew in America," Moskowitz reflects over the character of Max Schultheis, a very assimilated Jew (with overtones of self-hate). While Max seeks to remain apart from anything of a Jewish nature, there is an exception:

> On the other hand, Max had made a contribution to the United Jewish Appeal every year since the establishment of the State of Israel: twenty-five hundred dollars...[118]

Fiedler is acknowledging the impact that the establishment of the State of Israel has had upon even the most marginal of Jews, as exemplified by Max Schultheis.

Since Fiedler has been excoriating Max for his assimilationist attitude, all along, and since this generosity on the part of Max represents a departure or a contrast from his usual behavior, one may infer that Fiedler is uttering a positive note. Perhaps Fiedler even approves of Israel

if for no other reason than for bringing Jews back to the point where they will identify with something Jewish, or themselves as Jews. Beyond this, Fiedler does not go.

Summary

Without exception, the authors included in this survey who have in any way discussed Israel, were positive in their reaction, differing only in degree, and in their reasons. Lewisohn and Levin both conceive of Israel as a necessary homeland and place of refuge for Jews who have suffered in Europe. It is their contention, particularly that of Levin, that it is only within such a totally Jewish framework that the refugee Jew can hope to resume a normal life. Lewisohn is not quite so adamant on that point, recognizing that there are Jews who will be able to resume a normal life in places besides Israel. But he does agree that for some Jews, only Israel can serve as home.

Howard Fast and Leslie Fiedler see in Israel a great source of pride and status for the Jew - no matter where he lives. The establishment of the State of Israel allows the Jew to feel that he is on an equal par with other ethnic and national groups. Fast, in particular, emphasizes the changed character of the Jew as he now appears to the world and to himself. No longer the "second-hand-goods-salesmen-of-the-world," he has achieved the stature of a citizen of the world and can hold his head up with pride - because of the State of Israel and the opportunity with which it has provided the Jew.

Bernard Malamud views Israel as an established fact, as he would view any sovereign nation of the world. In his only reference to it, he evinces no particular emotion.

NOTES

1. Ludwig Lewisohn, Breathe Upon These, pp. 55-56.
2. Ibid., pp. 57-58.
3. Lewisohn, In a Summer Season, p. 185.
4. Meyer Levin, Eva, pp. 5-6.
5. Ibid., p. 31.
6. Ibid., p. 41.
7. Ibid., pp. 279-280.
8. Jerome Weidman, The Enemy Camp, p. 92.
9. Ibid., p. 162.
10. Ibid., pp. 560 - 561.
11. Ibid., p. 561.
12. Weidman, The Sound of Bow Bells, p. 194.
13. Leslie Fiedler, The Last Jew in America, p. 11.
14. Ibid., p. 18.
15. Ibid., p. 12.
16. Ibid., p. 48.
17. Ibid., p. 132.
18. Howard Fast, My Glorious Brothers, p. 18.
19. Herman Wouk, Don't Stop the Carnival, pp. 315 - 316.
20. Weidman, The Enemy Camp, p. 406.
21. Fiedler, The Second Stone, p. 252.
22. Fast, My Glorious Brothers, p. 27.
23. Ibid., p. 64.
24. Ibid., p. 64.
25. Ibid., p. 53.

26. Ibid., p. 76.
27. Ibid., p. 65.
28. Bernard Malamud, Two Novels by Bernard Malamud - The Assistant, p. 290.
29. Ibid., p. 438.
30. Ibid., p. 401.
31. Malamud, A New Life, p. 24.
32. Ibid., p. 3.
33. Saul Bellow, The Victim, p. 16.
34. Ibid., p. 31.
35. Ibid., p. 37.
36. Bellow, Herzog, p. 84.
37. Levin, Compulsion, p. 488.
38. Weidman, The Sound of Bow Bells, p. 291.
39. Ibid., p. 291.
40. Ibid., p. 293.
41. Ibid., p. 294.
42. Ibid., p. 429.
43. Norman Mailer, The Naked and the Dead, p. 54.
44. Ibid., p. 472.
45. Ibid., p. 528.
46. Ibid.
47. Ibid., p. 661.
48. Ibid., p. 490.
49. Ibid., p. 82.
50. Malamud, "The Mourners" - The Magic Barrel, p. 26.
51. Fast, My Glorious Brothers, pp. 7, 8, 10.

52. Bellow, Herzog, p. 330.
53. Bellow, Augie March, p. 280.
54. Malamud, The Fixer, p. 294.
55. Fiedler, "The Last Wasp in the World" - The Last Jew in America, p. 62.
56. Weidman, The Enemy Camp, p. 450.
57. Levin, Eva, p. 121.
58. Philip Roth, Goodbye Columbus, p. 129.
59. Ibid., pp. 133 - 134.
60. Ibid., p. 105.
61. Ibid., pp. 86 - 87.
62. Lewisohn, Breathe Upon These, pp. 87 - 88.
63. Ibid., p. 199.
64. Lewisohn, In a Summer Season, p. 185.
65. Levin, The Stronghold, p. 107.
66. Fast, My Glorious Brothers, p. 202.
67. Ibid., p. 10.
68. Ibid., p. 57.
69. Ibid., p. 76.
70. Malamud, "Lady of the Lake" - The Magic Barrel, p. 132.
71. Malamud, "The Last Mohican" - Ibid., pp. 165 - 166.
72. Fiedler, Last Jew, p. 18.
73. Ibid., p. 24.
74. Weidman, The Enemy Camp, p. 92.
75. Roth, Goodbye Columbus, p. 86 - 87.
76. Roth, "Defender of the Faith" - Goodbye Columbus, pp. 195 - 196.

77. Ibid., p. 189.
78. Ibid., p. 194.
79. Ibid., p. 198.
80. Bellow, Augie March, p. 497.
81. Bellow, Herzog, p. 23.
82. Bellow, Augie March, p. 77.
83. Weidman, The Enemy Camp, p. 371.
84. Weidman, The Sound of Bow Bells, p. 62.
85. Roth, Goodbye Columbus, p. 25.
86. Ibid., p. 26.
87. Ibid., p. 50.
88. Roth, Letting Go, p. 18.
89. Ibid., p. 19.
90. Ibid., pp. 19 - 20.
91. Lewisohn, In a Summer Season, p. 37.
92. Ibid., p. 185.
93. Ibid., p. 214.
94. Ibid.
95. Ibid., p. 215.
96. Norman Fruchter, Coat Upon a Stick, p. 40.
97. Ibid., p. 91.
98. Wouk, The Caine Mutiny, pp. 446 - 447.
99. Wouk, Marjorie Morningstar, p. 101.
100. Fiedler, The Second Stone, p. 23.
101. Ibid., p. 40.
102. Ibid., p. 225.

103. Ibid., p. 56.

104. Bellow, Dangling Man, p. 191.

105. Fruchter, Coat Upon a Stick, p. 88.

106. Ibid.

107. Bellow, The Victim, p. 154.

108. Bellow, Augie March, p. 455.

109. Ibid., p. 417.

110. Ibid., p. 455.

111. Ibid., p. 485.

112. Bellow, Herzog, p. 25.

113. Ibid., p. 91.

114. Ibid., p. 340.

115. Wouk, Marjorie Morningstar, p. 309.

116. Fiedler, "The Last Wasp in the World" - The Last Jew in America, p. 53 - 54.

117. Fiedler, The Second Stone, p. 225.

118. Fiedler, "The Last Jew in America" - The Last Jew in America, p. 19.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Saul Bellow, The Adventures of Augie March, Viking Press, Compass Books Edition, New York: 1960, (first published 1949).

_____, Dangling Man, Vanguard Press, New York: 1944.

_____, Henderson, the Rain King, Viking Press, New York: 1959.

_____, Herzog, Viking Press Inc., New York: 1964.

_____, Seize the Day, Viking Press Inc., New York: 1956.

_____, The Victim, The Vanguard Press Inc., New York: 1947.

Henry Berkowitz, Boot Camp, Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1948.

Howard Fast, Moses, Prince of Egypt, Crown Publishers Inc., New York: 1958.

_____, My Glorious Brothers, Little, Brown and Co., Boston: 1948.

_____, Silas Timberman, Blue Heron Press Inc., New York: 1954.

Leslie Fiedler, The Last Jew in America, Stein and Day: New York: 1966.

_____, The Second Stone, Stein and Day, New York: 1963.

Norman Fruchter, Coat Upon a Stick, Eyre and Spottiswoode Ltd., London: 1962.

Meyer Levin, Compulsion, Simon&Schuster Inc., New York: 1956.

_____, Eva, Cardinal Edition, Pocket Books Inc., New York: 1960.

_____, My Father's House, Viking Press, New York: 1947.

_____, The Stronghold, Simon and Schuster, New York: 1965.

Ludwig Lewisohn, Breathe Upon These, Bobbs Merrill Co., New York: 1944.

_____, The Case of Mr. Crump, Farrar, Straus and Co., New York: 1947.

_____, In a Summer Season, Farrar, Straus, and Co., New York: 1955.

Norman Mailer, An American Dream, Dial Press, New York: 1965.

_____, The Naked and the Dead, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York: 1948.

Bernard Malamud, The Assistant, Random House, New York: 1957.

_____, The Fixer, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, New York: 1966.

_____, Idiots First, Farrar, Straus and Co., New York: 1963.

_____, The Magic Barrel, Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia: 1958.

_____, The Natural, Random House, New York: 1952.

_____, A New Life, Farrar, Straus, and Cudahy, New York: 1961.

Philip Roth, Letting Go, Random House, New York: 1962.

_____, Goodbye, Columbus and Five Short Stories, Meridian Fiction, New York: 1960.

Jerome Weidman, The Enemy Camp, Random House, New York: 1958.

_____, The Sound of Bow Bells, Random House, New York: 1962.

_____, Before You Go, Random House, New York: 1960.

Herman Wouk, The Caine Mutiny, Doubleday and Co. Inc., Garden City: 1951.

_____, The City Boy, Doubleday and Co. Inc., Garden City: 1952.

_____, Don't Stop the Carnival, Doubleday and Co. Inc., Garden City: 1965.

_____, Marjorie Morningstar, Doubleday and Co. Inc., Garden City, 1955.