



Rhetoric Contradictions in Modern Hebrew Literature: Shmuel Yosef Agnon's 'Between Two Cities' and 'From an Enemy to a Lover'

Dr. TaisierH Al-Azzam, Semitic and Oriental Languages department, college of Literature, Yarmouk University, Jordan, t_alhasan@yu.edu.jo

Dr. Mohammad Q Al-Nusirat, Semitic and Oriental Languages department, college of Literature, Yarmouk University, Jordan, mnusirat@yu.edu.jo

Abstract- The present study is a contrastive analysis of two stories written by Shmuel Joseph Agnon in the early 1940s. Whereas the first story, *"Between Two Cities"*, dramatizes the living conditions of the Jews in Europe during World War I, the second, *"From an Enemy to a Lover"*, downplays the crisis during that same period in mandate Palestine. Given our analysis of both stories, we claim that both stories are full of grandiloquent language, which disseminates and propagates the idea of a national homeland for the Jews. In the first story, *"Between Two Cities"*, the author presents factual events that serve at least two 'sinuous' goals: first, showing the injustice experienced by the Jews in the German homeland during some specific time; second, showing the Jew's dedication to serve the German homeland. However, when the author of the two stories moves from the position of the oppressed in Germany to the position of the oppressor in Mandate Palestine, as displayed in the second story, he uses pictorial and symbolic expressions that trivialize the crisis of "the other" (the Palestinians). Here, we never find the same rhetoric of the protagonist who has already been looking for shelter, experiencing psychological distress, and seeking comfort. Rather, he is displayed as someone easily challenging the wind in a few rounds and trying effortlessly to achieve his goal of building 'his home'. The author describes the invader as the legitimate owner of the home, thus moving from the position of being hostile to 'the state' to the position of an advocate of it. He even dares to call on the other to be a lover of 'the state and its new rulers', as if they have never been sworn enemies.

Keywords: *Between Two Cities*, *From Enemy to Lover*; Agnon, Katsnaw; Frankonia; Modern Hebrew literature, King of the Wind, Haskalah; Warmongers.

I. INTRODUCTION

This research uncovers the role that the Hebrew literature has played to serve its mandated duty during a particular period of time. The paper shows how the Hebrew literature prorogates the 'alleged moral' mission of Zionism –the ideology and nationalist movement that has espoused the establishment and support of a Jewish state. Being one of the most prominent advocates of Zionism in addition to being a central figure of modern Hebrew fiction (as a Nobel Prize laureate writer), Shmuel Joseph Agnon shares the task of disseminating the idea of liberating the Jews from the discrimination and persecution they experienced during their diaspora as well as re-establishing Jewish sovereignty in "the Promised Land of Israel".

Considering Agnon's *"Between Two Cities"* and *"From Enemy to Lover"*, we try to show how the author mixes facts with fiction (reality with fantasy) to conceal the real face of Zionism. We claim that the author adopts the ideology that justifies 'a malign means for a noble cause'. Agnon seems to adopt the belief that "the end justifies the means". However, his writings could easily reveal the sordid truth behind the mask of rights and liberties. By fair means or foul, his plan of action was mainly to disseminate thought among Jews (and probably among other people) with a unique perspective and special touch, thus propagating both nationalism and ideology.

To achieve this, the paper conducts a two-level analysis. At the first level, the researcher tries to shed light upon the elements of the story including, but not limited to, the plot, setting, images and characters, thus showing how the parts contribute to the whole. At the second level, we try to figure out the writer's point of

view (i.e. theme) by analyzing more than one piece of work for the same author. In this case, it becomes inevitable to consider other literary devices including, but not limited to, foreshadowing, irony and symbolism. Thus, whereas the first-level of analysis calls for showing local cohesion in one piece of work, the other calls for showing global cohesion of both texts. We try to show that Agnon has had “a change of heart”, as evident in the rhetorical style he uses in both stories. Whereas he tries in the first story ‘*Between Two Cities*’ to disseminate the rhetoric of “the poor and the oppressed”, he tries in the other story “*From Enemy to Lover*” to adopt the rhetoric of “the authoritarian and the oppressor”. In simple words, whereas Agnon seems to defend the rights of the voiceless and the underprivileged in the first story (mainly the Jews in Europe during that period of time), he seems to uphold the rights of the oppressor and the establishment (the Jews who have turned to be the heavy hitters overnight in the second).

In “*Between two cities*”, Agnon, like many other Jewish writers, displays the suffering, genocide, and hatred the Jews were experiencing at the time. Here, Agnon is a rebellious freedom-fighter (echoing the voice of the anti-establishmentarian). In “*From an Enemy to a Lover*”, on the other hand, he downplays the suffering of the Palestinians and calls on them to accept the status quo (echoing the voice of the establishmentarian). This probably has caused many critics to single out a rhetorical style characteristic of Agnon who has had clear prints in modern Hebrew literature. Therefore, we try to show that Agnon has not drifted far from the often-said belief that “one person's freedom fighter is another person's terrorist”. Concisely, we see the scenario that Agnon creates in “*Between Two Cities*” as one in which the Jews are the victims of the establishment (i.e. the German State). The image of the Jewish people is thus represented as that of the oppressed who should rebel against the oppressor i.e. the European people in general and German people in particular.

Following Campbell conference in 1905 and the fall of Ottoman empire¹, the state of Israel was created on a land already densely populated by the Palestinian Arabs – a major historical event that has had a major impact on the geopolitics of the region. The Jews are no longer “the poor and the oppressed” but the “the authoritarian and the oppressor”. In his second story “*From enemy to a lover*”, Agnon does not maintain the same rhetorical style of a rebellious “freedom fighter”, siding with the voiceless and the underprivileged. Rather, he tries to display the image of those Palestinians as a subversive group in a democratic society whose members are the powerful Jews of today. In other words, we find Agnon here adopting the antithesis: siding this time with the establishment (the State of Israel), creating another scenario in which the Palestinians are no more than occasional counter forces that should submit (even unwillingly) to the power brokers (The British and the Israelis then).

Ironically, the powerful Jews of today are not making a society which is moving towards political/religious/cultural pluralism – the call of the powerless Jews of yesterday. However, what is worth noting is that Agnon does not say that bluntly, but tries to recreate a literary positive image of the Jews of today, the similitude of which is what happens in “cowboy movies”, where you sympathize with the hero despite your knowing that he is the invader or the heavy hitter. All in all, we show here the dichotomy between what Agnon (the ruled) tries to say in “*Between Two Cities*” and what Agnon (the ruler) tries to say in “*From Enemy to Lover*”.

II. BIOGRAPHY AND WORKS OF THE WRITER

Shmuel Yosef Agnon was born in 1888 in Buchach in the eastern Galicia² province. Although his father, Shallum Mordechai Catchky, had had rabbinical training, he preferred to make a living by working in fur

Campbell: Henry Campbell-Bannerman assumed the presidency of Britain ministry in fifth December 1905-1908 died after a few days from leaving the presidency: he headed this conference in London. His meeting lasted until 1907, at the end of the conference he went out by a confidential Campbell document which considers one of the most dangerous documents emerged from the most dangerous conference happened for destroying Arab nation in general and Islamic in particular. Refer to: Al-Hamad, Jawad, Introduction to the Palestinian Issue, Amman, Middle East Studies Center, 1997, P.170.

²Galicia is a city located west of Ukraine currently. Refers to: ע'50. 1977. יבנה. תל-אביב. אתלס הסטורי לתולדות העמים וישראל. משה ברור ונפתלי קידמון.

industry. Following on his father's footsteps, Agnon went to Haider³ at the age of three to read Hebrew Haskalah⁴ books. Interestingly, he started writing poetry in Yiddish when he was still very young (Shaked, 1993, P. 8). His first Diwan⁵, so-called 'Small Hero', appeared in Hamestebyah magazine in Kraków city in 1904 under the supervision of Shamaun Mnajeem Lezr. During that period of time, he read many books and was influenced by Knut Hamsun's⁶ mode of thinking. Such influence was obvious in Agnon's literary productions. In 1908, he met Burner and immigrated from Vienna to Palestine and worked as a secretary in the Zionist council in Jaffa Hovevei Zion session (571'ט, 1959, שאגן).

'*The Suspended Women*' that acquired him the fame in Hebrew literature was the first story he wrote in Palestine. The story was published in Houmer magazine under the supervision of Shemoel Bin Taswoun. His story was called Agnon from which he acquired his pen name. His story 'The Twisted become Straight' was published in Heboeul Hataseer on nine consecutive days in January 1912. Considered a complete narrative text, the story was republished in an independent book. In 1912, he returned to Berlin and published a book entitled 'Haidish' with a special edition which was translated to the German language. All translations of his books were later printed in Youda Dar under the supervision of Martin Buber⁷.

Agnon stayed in Germany during all years of war. In 1924, he completed his story 'Motor'. In the meantime and thereafter, he wrote other stories, such as *the Intense Misery, the Visible and Invisible Stuff, the Writer's Legend*, and *Boleyn Legends* (1956). Some of his stories were printed in Warsaw, while others were printed in Berlin. After the war, he worked with Buber in producing other stories that were included in an anthology of Hebrew literature. During his stay in Germany, he kept moving between Berlin and Frankfurt until 1924 when he decided to return to Mandate Palestine and settled in Jerusalem for good. There, he wrote his famous story 'In the Peak of Her Youth' for which he received Bialik award of literature in 1934 and his book 'A Host Who Preferred Sleeping' for which he won Bialik award in 1940.

III. AGNON'S INTELLECTUAL LIFE

Agnon's writing has attracted extensive academic research that collectively characterize his writing as unique in terms of both form and content. Most critics of Agnon's works agree that he is a real romantic and a legitimate relic who seeks to show new aspects of Judaism in general and Hasidism (the Jewish religious sect noted for its religious conservatism and social seclusion) in particular. Agnon tries to reveal new sources in Midrash and rabbinical literature, as he adds them to Hasidic stories in which he sometimes uses religious pictures. His purpose lies, we believe, in trying to create unequalled artistic methods and skills that are related with strong love of Judaism (189-191'ט, 1998, עגנון). Agnon adds this archive material to create intrinsic affinity between himself and his primary heroes in a coherent and harmonious style close to the work performed by the heroes who feel psychological closeness with the concepts and their images (טדן, 1963, (שאגן, 1959), ע'170).

³Haider: the plural of it 'הדרי מתוקן' which is euphemism for the place in which the children in Bible sciences in all generations in different countries lived by sects and groups of Jewish which teach them Hebrew and other sciences that enforce the Jewish to know about calculation, Jewish history, and sometimes reading and writing by the language of the country they live in. Refer to: אברהם אבן-שושן, המלון העברי המרוכז, הוצאת קרית-ספר בע"מ, ירושלים, 1993, ע'205.

⁴Haskalah is a Hebrew word which means enlightening, used for indicating this well-known movement in western civilization. Also, it clarifies the trials made by thinker from Jewish sect members for applying the mode of thinking and Europe enlightenment on the members of Jewish groups. Refer to: El-Messiri Abdel Wahab, *The Encyclopedia of Jews, Jewish, and Zionism*, Beirut, Dar El-Shorouk, 2009, P.251.

⁵is a collection of poems by one author, usually excluding his or her long poems.

⁶Knut Hamsun is a Norwegian writer born in 1851 and died in 1952. He wrote 'Hunger' novel that is considered one of the literary masterpieces in twentieth century (Wikipedia, ar.m.wikipedia.org).

⁷Martin Buber: pantheistic German thinker, extremist in his pantheism, has an existential tendency. He did not believe in rabbinical Judaism nor in the necessity to apply Shari'a. He is considered one of the most important Jewish religious thinkers in twentieth century. Moreover, he is one of the Jewish Sufism advocates and one of the most important interpreters for the old testament. Refer to: El-Messiri, Abdel Wahab, 2009, previous reference, P.162. Al-azzam, Taisier, Language and Translation, Al-Azhar University, Volume 36, 2005, P.58.

This issue changes neither the form nor the content of Agnon's work as far as his perspective, means, and objectives are concerned. To illustrate, although Haskalah (Jewish Enlightenment) always tries to show professional and technical representation in formulating the topic (קלזנר, 1955, ע' 17) with the primary goal of integrating the Jews in surrounding societies optimally, Agnon cannot be read, we reckon, like a typical excited Hasidic but more of a critical sarcastic writer who knows the utter motives of his heroes. He always seeks areas of bitterness that are closely related with the case and the place. By making reference to generic manifestations, he looks committed to existentialism or reality (קורצווייל, 1967, ע' 119-121) when in fact he is religiously fanatic; hence his enthusiasm for "the Jewish cause" is almost fanatical. The two stories under current scrutiny constitute a *prima facie* case of ideology projection. We see him caught between two opposing ideologies: the ideology of the conquered in the first story vis-à-vis the ideology of the conqueror in the second. In other words, although the two stories are seemingly different, they are somehow intrinsically the same (שמן, 572). What is only unique about each story is his intriguing style of writing. The uniqueness in the two stories lies merely in the artistic cover that sticks with their committed national series which bluntly communicates the author's desperate desire to rule over "The promised Land". The initiative basis for popular stories or legends exist in most of his productions by strict instructions that do not affect the safety of the text. In other words, they are merely subtle clarifications for the message that exists in religious stories. The readers, perhaps naively, could believe he is telling the truth. After reading what is in Agnon's attaché case, readers end up with fairly ambivalent feelings simply because the man overstates his case but downplays the other's.

A

Although religious inclination is shown in the writings of many Hebrew writers, Agnon is probably the only Hebrew writer who follows Midrash and Biblical breeding strictly. Being rooted in legends, his style shows that he is a pious follower of the faith, never 'missing his prayers', so to speak, even in a literary text. For example, when he writes about the beauty of 'their city' (including the landscape, people, flora and fauna), he uses realistic, and possibly objective, terms, but when he writes about 'his alleged city' (Jerusalem), he describes it by the contents of the Book, thus portraying it philosophically and spiritually. His literary style is therefore appallingly naïve as he does not even try to get around the problem by building an extension (i.e. providing objective and spiritual description in both cases). His description of 'his proclaimed place' never falls short of dedicated calls to evoke the 'Judaism spirit', i.e. calling on Jews (his blue-eyed boys) to come and settle in Jerusalem, the place immortal in the biblical memory. As such, his description magnifies the reader's imagination even if it were the opposite. This indicates that he casts his unique orientation on the symbolic features in the two stories. On top of them lies the Jewish creed for coming to Torah city, David's city (ארזי שחר, 2004, ע' 13-23). All in all, Agnon's orientation is either black or white; he only sees a gray future stretch ahead of those adversaries to the Jewish cause.

As for his characters, although Agnon tries to attribute to them special characteristics, such as anger, satisfaction, sadness, and happiness, he simplifies the case down to be a two-party adversarial politics (a naïve case of "them and us"), showing his protagonists as sympathetic characters and showing the antagonists (i.e. the winds) with false heroic qualities. We therefore dare to argue that Agnon is never seen as a writer who is public-spirited. For him, whereas Jews are spotless characters shown in his two stories in such a way that you are able to understand their feelings and the reasons for their actions (and so you like them), non-Jews are intentionally defamed (thus calling on them to compromise in the dispute even unwillingly). All in all, the whole description is just a charade. This is possibly because he manifests in his characters his concern to show his job as a rabbi who is primarily concerned with the welfare of his people. The humanitarian cause in his writing is only displayed in a Haskalah framework. (רפאל פטאי, 1956, ע' 199)

Adopting a reader-response criticism, a believer with a non-Judaic tradition would say that Agnon has missed the biblical wisdom "An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth". A non-believer, (e.g. an atheist or a freethinker) would at best say to Agnon, "Your story is good, but I beg your pardon to say it is apocryphal", or with less adversary criticism "It has no more than baseless allegations; you're putting your readers under false pretenses".

As for the psychological part, he calls for forming the future of his grief-stricken relatives (the Jews) a natural reality no more different than the stories and legends of the Jewish tradition. He often reverses the dialectical rhetoric upside down by increasing complications that raise ideological, sarcastic, and poetic concerns as well

as folkloric tales. He therefore combines faith with ideology, thus posing many complicated issues that are not restricted to the Jews in writing or composition (שאגן, 1959, ע' 573).

The most important feature in his writing is the strikingly unique poetic style - a realistic method that combines the individual with community. He summarizes his poetic style like this: "the calamity in modern Hebrew literature is that feelings proceed watching". However, during his stay in Germany, his style was reversed by having "watching proceed feelings". (האנצקלופדיה, 1988, ע' 730).

IV. RESEARCH BODY

Between Two Cities בין שתי ערים

The setting of the story

The story takes place in the city of Ktsnaw, which is located on Franconia Range. That location founded on a main road is divided into two parts. The market and commercial shops line the stately streets which are full of Jewish traders who seem to be going about their business according to the teachings of their religion. They only accept little profit to make a living and manage their daily affairs. The only thing they want in their lives is to worship The Lord according to Torah laws which they chant in their places of worship. The Lord had chosen the Israelites, a popular topic in rabbinic literature. The acceptance (and therefore distinction from others) had caused others to envy the Israelites for such a heavenly privilege. Homes are "lodged by" Jews who show affection and happiness in spite of their plight in getting their rights as legitimate residents. Jewish families are socially interdependent, cooperative and understanding.

In this story, the city's inhabitants are farmers, animal breeders, hunters, employees, teachers, and monks who have all farmed this fertile land and bred animals and poultry, etc. over years. During the war time, although the food is scarce throughout the country, the bounties are still abundant in the sprawling suburbs of this city. Therefore, hordes of tourists from the country and from other countries flocked to this city.

When World War I erupted, the German Jews defended the state as all men went into the battlefronts. Teenagers volunteered to go to the battlefield, too. The Jewish homes were therefore devoid of young men; only children, women, and old people stayed home. As a result, Jewish homes fell into serious depression because of the war news about the death and/or the injury of some relative(s). However, despite all the Jews' sacrifices in that war and despite their sparing their lifetime in public service to the nation, they were deprived of their rights by the German people as legitimate citizens.

In the meantime, hot mineral springs exploded in the vicinity of the city, about two thousand steps away from Ktsnaw, so the owners of neighboring lands set up hotel houses and chalets to receive tourist guests (whether they are German or non-German Jews) from inside and outside the country. The city started to be called the Resort. When the number of visitors increased, more facilities were built to serve them, so gardens were planted; streets were paved, cinemas and theaters for performing and singing were founded. The people of Ktsnaw started to frequent these facilities on holidays to watch musical concerts and attend lectures and to get news from the battlefields. Rabbis also came over from different places for treatment and relaxation, so people used to ask them about matters of their religion.

In Ktsnaw, the winter was very harsh as thunders and snows last for four months of the year. These severe weather conditions brought the tourism industry in the city to a halt, so tourists not only stopped flocking into the city at this time of the year, but also many local residents chose to travel to warmer places. During winter, people staying behind used to spend their time playing cards, frequenting pubs for fun, etc.

The writer, Shmuel Yosef Agnon, begins the story with a flashback to the hero's experiences in the war. Right from the starts, it seems obvious that he is not just describing the impact of First World II on the German people but trying to let the reader(s) look back at the situation from a new angle - the passion for retrieving

the Jewish lost identity as well as the circumstances of his sect in the society during the course of the war⁸. The writer communicates the ideas by focusing on his character, Shaletar, who escapes from Frankfurt seeking food in Ktsnaw. When the local people of the city knew that he is a Jewishteacher coming from Frankfurt, they rush to lend him a helping hand. For example, Golden Haymer, the owner of the chalet, hostshim and recommendsprovisions for him.However, he starts collecting food in all cunning ways to send to his wife who lives elsewhere.

This story of the teacher servesonly as an introduction to the main story of the sisters,Liesel and Margret, two characters whose ‘cock-and-bull story’ and hard-luck story, so to speak, is a fictionalized accountof the life of the Jews in Germany. The plot of the story is roughly like this: Beinga resident of Ktsnaw, Lieselfalls in love with Zeejfreedto whom she gets married; they choose, as a couple, to live in Offenbach city. When her husband dies in the war, she returns to Kitsnaw. With the help of her sister’s husband, she gets a job as a servant in a chalet, leaving her three children with her husband’s relatives to provide provision for them. However, because the job was exhausting, she cannot meet with her sister Margret who also lives in Ktsnaw. One day, she attends a requiem prayer with a Russian sect. At the end of that prayer, she says, “I have spoken with dead people, but was not able to speak with living people”. Upon hearing her words, her coworker asks, “Do you mean your sister Margret?” Lieselreplies,: “Yes”. Her co-worker generously offers to act on her behalf, saying “I will act in your behalf, thus go and visit her”. She sends to her sister to meet with her in the nearby forest, where she goes andwaits for her. Some women come to the forest for picnicking; they know her and call her by her old name (Ales); they comfort her that her sister Margret will come over, but she is late because she has to wait for her sick husband come home to look after her paralyzed son while she is out. Although she is despaired of ever arriving, her sister arrives late. The two sisters finally meet there. At this point, the author gives a detailed description of their meeting. As the author describes a meeting of two sisters who have been apart for too long, the description is full of emotional touches and extra warmth. He tries to show the sense of togetherness that is undoubtedly increased by separation. The meeting starts with the two daughters exchange hugs and kisses until they finally calm down to beginexchange news. As time passes quickly in such intimate meetings, the night begins to fall down on them. When darkness begins to fall, Lieselrises on her feet terrified because she is late to get to her co-worker who takes over her place at work now. The two sisters give each other a good-by hug, hoping to meet again on another Jewish festival. (עגנון, 1979, ע'78)

Analysis

Although Agnon starts off his story with a relatively detailed description of his citylocated in German Bayern district on the heights of Franconia, the literary discourse is directed to the Jewish and Non-Jewish readers despite the fact that the characters are mainly Jewish. In order to attract larger audience, the writer of the story tries to heightentension among the crowd by raising the Jewish case from an emotional perspective. The readers’passions are immediately aroused when he says:

בלשכנעלהיהודיםשמתחילתהמלחמהבחוליסומחופזיםהיולהגןעלארצם. כל שהגיע לשנות שירות נקרא למערכות המלחמה, וכל שעדין לא מלאו שנותיו הלך מעצמו

(English: *Since the beginning of the war, the Jews are eager to defend their country (i.e. Germany) which calls upon anyone who reaches the military age to willingly join the military service, and those who have not reached the age of recruitment has volunteered to go).*

He not only stresses this point but also shows that the Jews who are not at the age of recruitment should have on their own share in the war ”(שם, ע'81). In other words, the Jewsare dying for the cause of the German nation; he says:“ לא נשתיירו שם מן היהודים אלא נשים ותינוקות וזקנים וקצת בעל בתים שהעיר צריכה להם (English: *only*

⁸These days in which Agnon wrote his noes of the story to describe the Jewish status after World War 1 that was going behind the scenes between the victorious states in the first war by forming national state for Jews the Zionists leaders and intellectuals know their literary roes. The writer NaifelParyer says describing the stance of allies: I think Arab allies asked others for ignoring their claims and it will be more beneficial for allies to divide Arab world and govern the parts in which English and French people had special interest. Refer to: Al-Hoot, Bayan Nwehed.

women, children, old people, and those badly needed at home remained from Jewish people (שם)). He therefore complains when saying: “ ירדה מרה שחורה על הקהלה שכל הבחורים יצאו ממנה (שם). This suggests that the writer is the spokesperson of the collective sect who would want to say: in spite of announcing affiliation to the German state, Jewish citizens moan with pain what has happened to them because of this affiliation. The idea is shown in the unique style of Agnon who communicates the Jewish literary heritage (e.g. Song of Songs in (שה-ש ה4)). The bitterness of the first verse (258'ע, קונקורדנציה) is clear when Liesel meets with her sister 'Margret'; he voices his concerns like this: “ באה ליזל והתפללה עמהם. לאחר התפילה דיברה עם עצמה ואמרה עם המתים כבר דיברתי ואיימתי אדבר עם החיים. שמעה חברתה ואמרה אם מבקשת את לראות את אחותך לכי אצלה ואני אעשה את עבודתך (Lazielsays, “ I was able to speak with the dead, but I was not able to speak with the living. Her co-worker heard what Liesel said, and immediately replied: Go to see her and I will do your job” (87'ע, שם)). A Jew's commitment to help the others is very evident in this scenario.

The author makes the meeting in the forest between the two sisters very emotional with a gradual build-up of suspense throughout the meeting. He shows how Liesel has lost her husband in the battles; how she has lost her three children; how she has become a servant in a sanctuary, etc. On the other hand, he shows how Margret has lost her only son who has become paralyzed in the battlefield. The words of her sick husband go like this:

“ עמדה ליזל ביער שרגילה היתה בנעוריה ללקוט בו פטריות ותותים האילנות הזקינו הרבה, ואף האילנות הבחורים שנולדו שלאחר שיצאה לאופנבאך אף הם הגדילו. כאן ביער זה היתה ליזל מטיילת עם זיגפריד שלה וכאן בין האילנות הירוקים גילה לה את אהבתו. עבשו עצמותיו מרקיבות בארץ רחוקה ואינה יודעת היכן קברו. אף שלושת ילדיה רחוקים ממנה ומיום שהלכה לקצנאו לא ראתה אותם. אין לה כאן אלא מרגרט אחותה.

(English: Standing there, Liesel starts to recall her memories in the forest where she used to collect mushrooms and berries. Now she sees how the same trees have become old and how the small trees that were grown after she went out to Offenbach city to live in after her marriage have also become big and old. In this same forest, Liesel recalls how she was strolling with her boyfriend Zejfred and how he confessed his love to her among the green trees. She regrets that his bones are now buried in a distant place, but she knows nothing about his grave. Not only does she recall the memories of the past, but also pulls along the bitterness of the present: her children are not with her; she has not seen them since her arrival to Kitsnaw; she has no one with her except her sister Margret” (88'ע, שם)).

As critics of the story, we see the story events like “plea bargaining”, i.e. admitting a less serious crime so as not to be charged with a more serious one. The author admits the Jews' commitment to the German cause, but he regrets the destruction of the Jewish nation. What this means is that the author pleads for 'help', 'mercy', etc., but more importantly “not guilty”. Such dramatization, we reckon, is not far from the saying “it's easy to be wise after the event”.

The author narrates the events of the meeting and describes the physical setting in an eloquent style of writing that is loaded with emotional plea. For example, when Liesel arrives to the forest with the other members of the sects who have gone out only for strolling, she does not find her sister and waits for her impatiently until she is almost downhearted. However, she says “I have sent a stranger to inform you!” What the writer actually means is that the stranger cannot be trusted with a Jewish cause.

The author describes the meeting scene emotionally: crying, hugging and kissing for long time. He says,

לאחר שניגבו דמעותיה של זו הביטו זו על זו ואמרו מה יש לבכות? ושוב התחילו בכוח. לסוף פרשו מן החבורה וישבו כאחת והתחילו מספרות זו עם זו,

(English: After wiping one another's mixed tears of regret/remorse, happiness/sadness, etc. they ask, “Why are we crying?”, but they cry again. When they stop hugging each other, they sit very close to each other talking about back stories” (e.g. Liesel's husband who died in war, his children, etc.) and goes on (the only son of Margret, Mores, who has become paralyzed after his legs were amputated, the working conditions in the chalet, etc.) (88'ע, שם)).

Using the words of the two sisters in that meeting, the writer moves on to dramatize the ramifications and knock-on effects of the war on the sect; they speak about the ration cards and tax calculations imposed by the authorities (שם); he says

ועוד דיברו על כרטיסי המזון ועל חשבונות שלמיסים ועל חללה שלהרשות שבולעת את הכל .

At the end of the meeting, they discover that they have spent time saying nothing more than letting their inner feelings out. Whenever one of them wants to tell her sister about one calamity, the other comes with another bigger calamity (שם, ע'89). All they did is communicate their ration of problems.

Using the words of the heroine, the writer seems to communicate the Judaic doctrine of self-deprecation and therefore self-denial. For example, here seems very nervous when one of the sisters says, הייתי מרגיט בואי עמי, אבל מי יטפל בבני? שמא בעלי שהוא חצי מת?, *(English: "if the angel of death comes and calls on me; she says, Margret come with me, I will accept his invitation, but who will take care of my son? And my husband Ales is half dead?"*) (שם, ע'90). The writer is trying to say that although the heroine prefers death, she'd choose to delay it because of her son and husband. In other words, she chooses to live not for the sake of living but as a means of sacrifice for others.

The image of the "Lady Bountiful" is made clear not only in her behavior towards people but also towards other creatures in the forest. For example, after speaking about the paralyzed son and the sick husband, the heroine is displayed as an animal activist: "מה הקול הזה שאני שומעת כל היום? הציידים הללו כל היום הם יורים בלי הפסקה." *(English: What is that sound that I hear all the day? Those hunters do not stop shooting fire all day long. Woe to the Goy⁹, woe to the Goy, their hands do not stop killing the living; they even conspire to kill birds"*) (שם, ע'90)¹⁰. The simple message one could get is that animals, in the word of a Jew, deserve recognition and protection. This causes one to ask if Agnon keeps putting the basic interests of the his adversaries in Mandate Palestine in "From an Enemy to a Lover" on an equal footing with the basic interests of nonhuman beings (e.g. animals) in "Between two cities" in Germany?

Paradoxes in "Between Two Cities"

The plot of the story revolves around visible/apparent/primary vis-à-vis invisible/hidden/secondary characters. The primary characters, represented by German and non-German Jews, have a positive role in all scenes of the story. The secondary characters, represented by non-Jews, are not only displayed negatively but they only appear in few scenes referentially and collectively. This suggests that a Jew represents the conscience of the first human being, but a non-Jew represents these secondary creatures, which he calls Gentiles (גויים), who should be held responsible for all the calamities that have befallen the Jews. What clearly characterizes the climax of the discourse is the vividness of the images of the Jewish character: The Jews give because they are Jewish; they even fall in debt to give; non-Jews do not give. כל שכן בימים הרעים שנשתנו פני גויים הרעים שנתנו פני גויים, *(English: during these difficult period the Jews' neighbors turned their back to the Jews, i.e. their treatment got worse)*. The author is obviously saying that although the Jews donate their money, send their children to war, etc., the Germans have shown their dissatisfaction towards them (e.g. "אבל כל יהודי שיש לו - *adissatisfaction that has been crystalized by the draconian measures which keep every Jew under surveillance*" (שם, ע'86)). The Jews show complete affiliation and generosity, the German people react with an iron hand in a velvet glove.

A cold-heartedness of the German people is shown by the author in the story of a youthful Jew who volunteers to be conscripted. Although he is under the age of recruitment, they send him to the battlefield where he gets wounded. The wounded youthful conscript gets admitted to hospital for only two months when they send him again to the battlefield where his legs get amputated. This time, he is sent to stay in his

⁹The word "Goy" is used here to refer to "Non-Jews"

¹⁰In that time, he started to apply Balfour Declaration by Goy allies on top of them Britain, and they started to execute Balfour Declaration regarding establishing national home for Jewish people in Palestine and Britain will exert all its efforts to facilitate achieving this purpose. Provided understanding clearly that he will not work in a place that might change the civil and religious rights attributed by non-Jewish sects in Palestine. Al-Hoot, Bayan Nwehed. *Leaderships and Political Institutions in Palestine. 1917-1948, Palestinian Studies. Beirut. 1986, P.74.*

mother's house without support (or even the least amount of attention or care). (שם) “ הקהלה הקטנה שכל “ מה הקול הזה שאני שומעת כל היום? הציידים הללו כל היום הם יורים בלי הפסק. אוי הגויים, הגויים, אם אין “ מה הקול הזה שאני שומעת כל היום? הציידים הללו כל היום הם יורים בלי הפסק. אוי הגויים, הגויים, אם אין “ (מספיקים בידיהם להרוג בני אדם מתנכלים הם לחיות ועופות להרוג אותם). No one, we believe, would mess the message of the author that the birds are the Jews and the hunters are the Germans. Using Liesel's words

“מההקולהשאנישומעתכלהיום? הציידים הללו כל היום הם יורים בלי הפסק אוי הגויים הגויים, אם אין מספיקים בידיהם להרוג בני אדם מתנכלים הם לחיות ועופות להרוג אותם ,

and her action:

מפני קול עוף פצוע שצד הצייד. לבסוף סילקה ידיה מאזניה ונענעה אותן דרך יאוש”

the author tries to show that the others are just cold-hearted killers. The idea is symbolically stressed when the sisters get to talk about ration cards, tax calculations and authorities behavior: No one would deny that the author is a prolific writer with critical views which to the critic are no more than a prolix style that has done nothing except selling color-prejudiced, ethnocentric, one-sided reporting of the case. Hence, the morals of one partner has been approved only by denying the morals of the other. One of the sister frankly says it when hearing the shooting by the hunters : “ woe to the others”. The question that arises immediately is: what if the other were speaking?

The author displays the German people as if they have never established schools, paved roads, opened hospitals, established gardens and national facilities that would serve the Jews. Throughout the whole story, the author never makes a single compliment for the nation among which the Jews have lived for centuries. Not only this, but the writer suggests that the Germans are untrusted people. For example, when Liesel feels depressed because her sister's late arrival, she starts to blame herself that she has sent her the message through a German: “ הרי היא שלחה על ידי גוי להודיע למרגריט שהיא פינתה עצמה בשבילה לשתים שלוש שעות “ *she has sent the message with a German to inform Margret that she has devoted herself for two or three hours*” (שם, ע' 88). Here, she uses the third person pronoun, blaming herself that she has arranged the date through “the others”. What is worthy of note here is that she, as a person of morals, does not feel that she owes “the foreigner” an apology when Margret shows up. The fact of the matter is that the messenger from “the others” turns to be honest in conveying the message to her sister.

מאויב לאוהב, From an Enemy to a Lover

The events of the story

The events of this fictional story take place in Jerusalem during the British mandate of Palestine in World war II, the time when Israel was declared a state. At Talpiot¹¹, ל פיית, At Talpiot¹¹. The hero (or the protagonist) visits this city and describes it as a dispersed city with fresh-air, empty of people and full of trees. The place is displayed as a property of the archangel Mickael, who has dispersed his slaves/servants and commanders all across the mountains, hills and valleys. One day, as the hero is strolling, the wind presents itself to him and says, “What are you doing here?” He replies, “I am strolling”. The wind pushes him to the ground and strips off his clothes. As the protagonist has no means to react, he returns to the city. However, after a while, he feels depressed and decides to go back to the same place. This time he takes stakes and clothes and pitches his tent there. Although supported by poles and ropes, the wind shows itself again to him and says, “What is that tent for?”. The protagonist laughs and tells the wind, “It is a tent”. The wind topples it down to the ground. Feeling depressed again, the protagonist goes back to the city where he decides to build a small house to be a shelter from the wind. He brings stones and branches and builds a small house for himself. After that, he says, “when I complete it, the king of the wind will come and ask me, “What is it?” I'll tell him “A small house”.

¹¹An area in South-West Jerusalem refers to: ע"ש יצחק רבין. 6, it locates on the land of Arab alSawahira, the map of the old Palestine, Jerusalem city: www.google.com/maps/search.

The wind stretches its hand to the door and breaks it, climbs to the roof and destroys it, pushes the man down to the ground and scatters the house stones all over the place. However, the protagonist this time does not laugh and insists on building a house that can stand against the wind. The protagonist consults the builders, brings strong woods, and builds a new house on strong foundations. When the building is erected, the protagonist starts plowing the land nearby and removing the stones and rocks. Then he brings the seedlings and plants them until they have grown and become like a garden.

The wind attacks the new house trying to destroy it again, but finds it too strong to be demolished again. Instead, the wind attacks the trees. Although they bend, they withstand air attacks. The wind then gets the idea that the situation is now different. When the protagonist moves there, he makes a boudoir/lounge/parlour to relax during free time. The wind starts to visit the protagonist every now and then. As he starts to like the company, the protagonist asks him to bring nice winds in his next visits, so it does. By the end of the story, the writer shows that both the protagonist and the winds start to act like neighbors; the protagonist likes the wind and expects the winds to like him as well (עגנון, 1971, ע'תפ).

Analysis

The writer makes up a fairy tale that describes the establishment of a new country as part of a political project. Although symbolic, the writer wants his story to be read as a real story. It is obvious from the title "*From an Enemy to a Lover*" that the writer is determined to turn his enemy to a lover even forcibly. Does he not say that his enemy tries to defend his properties? Does the wind not try to prevent him from building his humble home? What the writer basically tries to communicate is that the Jew's attempts to settle in Palestine over time has finally succeeded¹² by bamboozling the governing authorities at the time. It only succeeds when the needy people (i.e. the Jews) seek the help of the expert on how to build the house on strong foundations. This is what they have actually done by conniving with colonial countries since the beginning of the eighteenth century¹³.

The Jews have offered their services to those colonial countries in exchange for establishing a Jewish state in mandate Palestine. What is worth noting is that the author does not maintain the same logic that has driven him into presenting the events and facts in other works (i.e. *Between Two Cities*), where he presents real description of the setting of the events (i.e. World War I). In such work, the author provides details about the war and its ramifications on Jews as he sees, feels, and imagines these events. It is therefore realistic literature. However, the writer here is the hero of a fairy tale. Neither the events nor the characters appear on the scene. They are all symbolic: the winds stand for the adversaries of the Jews (namely the Palestinians and Arabs). The hero of the story is the outsider ego Zionist Jew who searches for a wide-open country with moderate temperature and fertile soil. It is Talpiot located at the western suburbs of Jerusalem. It is the main part that stands for the whole country. It is the capital of the country that the newcomers plan to build.

On the other hand, the king of wind stands for the Palestinian people under the British mandate. Although the king of the wind represents strength and disorder, it is a misleading symbol; hence the fact of the matter is that the Palestinian is the weakest partner under British colonization that has deprived him of his basic rights, thus making him unable to defend himself against outsiders (or the newcomer Jews). The mandate has denied the Palestinian citizen to hold any weapons including daggers and kitchen knives. In the meantime,

¹²He took over Suleiman the Magnificent in 1537AD, and allowed the persecuted Jewish in Europe and those who escaped from Andalusia to live in Islamic countries except Jerusalem. However, this situation did not impress Jewish who are eager to return to Palestine. The first regulation appeared in 1665AD by the Jewish man called Tsefe Shabate, which was the first Jewish movement in Turkey. He started to gather and organize Turkish Jews. He started to ask Jews for returning to Palestine. After that, the regulation asked for going out from the violent demonstration in Turkey. Thus, he ordered to eradicate this movement violently, but when the head of the movement saw how they have been oppressed, he ordered his followers to do like what their Jewish peers in Europe when they announced their Christianity. They announced their Islam and a new Jewish underground movement known as "Jewish Dönmeh". The businessmen rushed to penetrate in senior positions. They reached the highest rank in Ottoman country positions. Refer to: Swedan, Tareq, Palestine depicted history, Kuwait, Intellectual Creativity. 2ed, 2004, P. 199.

¹³In 4/4/1799 and during the siege of Acre, Napoleon Bonaparte issued a decision about allowing the Jewish to settle in France he meant the Jewish aid to him. Indeed, the Jews supported him in Europe and the rest countries of the world. He was the first one who promised Jews to settle in Palestine (the same reference, P.202).

the mandate has allowed Zionist organizations to bring in all types of developed weapon from different resources. With the approval of the mandate government, a new political body for the Jews on Palestine land has been established according to a confidential international agreement¹⁴. What this basically means is that the writer has twisted the facts. Through this literary work, the writer displays the intruder as the builder and the insider as the aggressor. To the writer, the Zionist represents the outsider as the civilized who feel sympathetic with the others, but displays the behavior of the insider as very cruel or violent, showing no feelings for others. This is surely a fallacy that falls outside the boundaries of a literary work, hence it is mainly politically-oriented.

Right from the very beginning, the title "*From Enemy to Lover*" creates a misleading impression. The title is truly deceptive; the events and descriptions are really dubious; the statements are misleading and some downright mendacious; and the writer is surely devious. The work itself is therefore intellectually dishonest but only sugar-coated. It is a down-and-dirty literary campaign. To the naïve reader, it is crystal clear right from the beginning who the writer wants to be taken as the enemy and who to be taken as the lover. At best, this work is an emotionally charged plea, but in his heart of hearts the writer knows that his intentions are not sincere.

"עד שלא נבנתה תלפיות היה מלך הרוחות מושל שם בכל הארץ, וכל שריו ועבדיו רוחות עזים וקשים יושבים שם. *Before the establishment of Talpiot, the king of the wind is the governor of Palestine. His princes and slaves are strong and rough winds living there*" (עגנון, 1971, ע'תפ). The questions that arise here are: Where was the beloved before the establishment of Talpiot? Who are the princes of winds roaming the hills, valleys and mountains? Are they the peasants, nomadic herdsmen living in spite of the death?

Amos Oz, for example, has described those people in his stories; he has been creative in describing their sickness, poverty, and their weakness irrespective of their true characteristics of Bedouins (e.g. betrayal and deception) (עוז, 1975, ע'26). Also, S Yizhar describes "Khribet Khize חרבת חזעה when the peasants have escaped from their villages when attacked by the Israeli army with appalling brutality. Also, he has been creative in describing their escape against heavily armed combatants and in describing the soldiers' behavior towards the children, the women and the elderly (יזר, 1989, ע'42-78). The questions that he would raise are: Where is that king whose citizens escape from the Israelis? Why does he escape? Why does he not take revenge?

Look at him protesting when Amos Oz says: "באילו להם בלבד ניתנה ארץ", *as if their country were given to them only*" (שם). The addressees here are the Palestine and Arab citizens. Suppose that this earth were given to you, the fact of the matter is that you have not been born, lived, or lived here. In other words, they are citizens being displaced into it, but who on earth would allow killing or displacing them?

ראיתי שאיני יכול לדון עם מי שתקיף ממני והלכתי לי,

(I saw myself that I cannot compete with those who could beat me, so I decided to go)

It is possible that the writer wants to say that the king of winds, their peasants, their poor Bedouins, are insolvents of power.

This time, he would probably like to communicate to the Zionist Jewish reader the idea that the initiator has to be strong enough to meet all possible challenges. In other words, he wants to say that we must build a strong entity that could stand all thunderstorms, however strong they might be. The persistence of the discourse indicates that he has settled in the fatherland despite the will of its current owners (i.e. the wind that exist but do not own), thus echoing the statement of the founder of the Zionist movement: "a land¹⁵ without owners for

¹⁴ Sykes-Picot Agreement 10 March 1916: it occurred after the completion of the correspondence with McMahon-Hussein i.e. after the existence of Arab besides the allies in World War I and British guarantees concerning the independence of Arab countries. Arab did not in that time that allies have shared their countries. After Arab revolution after the issuance of agreement resolution less than the June 10, 1916. Nwayhed, Bayan, *Leaderships and Institutions in Palestine*, 2ed., 1986, P. 71.

¹⁵ A claim promoted by the leaders of Zionist movement such as Theodor Herzl the most of humanitarian disasters occurred from twentieth century resulted from this claim such as Palestinian displacement, and the writer is one of them, refer to: [wiki https://ar.m.wikipedia.org](https://ar.m.wikipedia.org)

people who do not have a land". This literary work is thus the exact translation of the political theory: "אמרתיללבי, איאתהרואהשאיאפשרלנולחזורלמקום שגרשוני משם. ומה שאי אפשר הרי אי אפשר. ואילו לבי דעה אחרת" (English: *I told myself is it possible to return to the place that I got expelled from, but in my heart there was another idea "if thousand times I told myself I will not return, my heart would tell thousand times it is possible (שם, תפא)*). The hero speaks on behalf of the writer: *I told my heart don't you see that we could not (אי אפשר לנו, no we could not)*. Although he uses the singular pronoun, he insinuates that Jews were taken out from Jerusalem during the period of Roman Titus after the revolution of Bar Kokhba¹⁶. This could be a possible explanation simply because Agnon, the writer, is fond of making reference to those historical events in his writings. Until this moment, the Palestinian is homeless, weak stalker, living in an emerging state that has all political, military and economic potentials. Therefore, there is no point in making comparisons, but the writer still touches upon the old image of the exhausted woman in the Song of Songs (שה"ש 4ה). He seeks to attract the reader's attention by means of logical fallacies that change all the facts even if they breach the whole human rules; "לאאשבחאתביתי, כי, " (English: *I do not praise my house because it is small nor feel embarrassed that there are other houses better than it; my house is small, but it is a place for a humble human like me (שם)*). What he wants to say is that the only imperfection in this house is its small size. The reference here is to the trial of Bar Kokhba revolt in Jerusalem in 164 AD.

One main point of departure here is that this time the protagonist does not smile and decides not to return to the city (as he did in previous times), but rather goes to Al-Qatan – clear reference to the scattered Jewish people. He says: "לסוף אירעו דברים שלא נתנו לי לחזור לעיר. רבצתי בין המשפתיים ולא ידעתי מה אעשה. לחזור לעיר אי אפשר, " (English: *Eventually I am able to return to the city and then to Talpiot since the winds have moved me and prevented me from setting up a tent or building a house*). The question he surely has in mind then is: "What house do I want?". In the following quote, we find some description of the house he wants. "מה טעם לא עמד בפני הרוח, מפני שאירעו שם, לחזור לתלפיות אי אפשר...לבנות לי בית קטן והרי אף הוא לא עמד בפני הרוח (English: *but what is the purpose if being unable to face the wind by small and weak? If it were big and strong, then it will survive*); he adds further clarifications along the following lines: Deepening the basics, consulting specialists in all domains, and planting gardens in the fertile soil "לקחתי לי עצים חזקים וקורות ואבנים " (English: *I took strong wood, walls, big stones, and building material from cement. Also, I hired skillful workers and watched their job day and night. I was right when I have deepened the basics (שם, תפב)*).

As the winds (the antagonist) could not put it out now, he desperately suggests friendship. The irony is that the writer says, "I love him and I think he loves me". This probably an echo of what Oz in his story "The Bedouin and the Snake, הנוודים והצפע" tries to say: successful negotiations with the Arabs can be only conducted provided you keep them weak.

כיון שעמד הבית בא הרוח והקיש על התריסים. שאלתי מי מקיש כאן על חלוני? שחק ואמר שכן. אמרתי לו מה מבקש שכן משכנו בליל סועה וסער? צחק ואמר שכן בא לברך את שכנו לחנוכת הבית. אמרתי לו וכי דרכו של שכן לבוא בעד החלונים כגנב? בא והקיש על הדלת. אמרתי לו

After the house has been finished, the wind comes as I gallop along the balconies. I ask, "who comes to the balconies and knocks my window?" He laughs and says, "A neighbor". I reply, "Why would a neighbor ask his neighbor at this time?" He says, "the neighbor wants to bless his neighbor's new house". I reply, "Why would a neighbor knock the door like a thief? Come to the door". He knocks at the door. I say to him, "Come in". He says, "The door is closed". I reply, "I am afraid of the flu". T tell him: " המתן לי עד שתצא החמה ואפתח לך , wait me until the sun rises and I will be able to open to you" (שם).

¹⁶Bar Kokhba: Aramic word means Ibn Al-Najem, it has an obvious Messianic indication. In other words, it is the name called by the Rabbi Akiva ben Yosef Ali Saimon, the revolt leader of the second Jewish against Roman, by considering him as Guurti, refer to: Al-Massere, Abd Al-Wahab. The Encyclopedia of Jews, Jewish, and Judaism, Cairo, Dar Al-Shorouq, Sed., 1Part, 2003, P.424.

Contradictions in "מאוייב לאוהב",

The first contradiction can be easily detected in the title "*From Enemy to Lover*" - the same protagonist is an enemy in one place and a lover in another. The plot revolves around either changing status or brainwashing - changing a sworn enemy to a beloved friend. The use of puns is the most important feature of the language of the discourse. Confusion is likely to be caused when the writer deliberately changes roles - describing the strong as weak and describing the weak as strong. All of which provides a clearly defined message about the role of literature in communicating ideological stances.

At the global level, the writer seems to lay aside a whole series of key historical events at the time (e.g. the weakness of Ottoman empire, the two World Wars, etc.). The story takes place in Jerusalem while Jewish immigrants were flocking from Europe to Mandate Palestine. This is manifest in the protagonist's simple trip to Talpiot. What is weird, however, is deliberate 'exit-strategy' not to make a single reference to the powers that have secured his arrival there, nor does he make reference to the then-current powers that have challenged his arrival (i.e. the owners of the country). Rather, he just makes it the story of a person who has become depressed in his country because of some life troubles. Walking in a fresh-air, cool weather on a new vast land, he decides to build a house: "פעם אחת נודמנתי לשם, ראיתי שהמקום נאה והאוויר צח והרקיע תכלת טהורה והארץ (English: *I have once been invited there, I found that the place is beautiful, fresh-air, blue sky, and wide land. I went for a walk there, but the wind hurt me*" (עגנון, 1971, ע'תפ-תפב). The author does not mention, even in passing, the historical facts back then. Even the layman would know the century has witnessed consecutive immigrations of the Jews from all corners of the world towards Palestine as part of the treaty signed by the victorious Allied powers to partition the Ottoman Empire properties. Many people still recall that Sykes-Picot Agreement was presided by UK Prime Minister Campbell for a group of European countries leaders to partition the Arab world regions among the colonial powers. Almost all people still recall that Palestine fell under the control of Britain that abided to provide for the necessary conditions for Jewish immigration from all parts of the world to Mandate Palestine. The writer reduces the whole matter to just an invitation to the place as a coincidence.

At the local level, the writer trivializes the challenge by making it a story of a protagonist who gets the feeling of attachment to a place where he decides to build a small house without facing formidable adversary. The writer provides a brief narrative of the building of the house (first built as a tent, then from concrete and steel). After some attempts, neither the wind nor his soldiers can shake the building or to cause any damage to it because it has been built from cement and steel. The writer makes it clear that this is the only reason that has made the king of wind accept the new neighbor even unwillingly. Not only this, but the kind of windshyly comes to him asking for his friendship:

כון שעמד הבית בא הרוח והקיש על התריסים. שאלתי מי מקיש כאן על חלונאי? שחק ואמר, שכן. אמרתי לו, מה מבקש שכן משכיני בליל סועה וסער? צחק ואמר, שכן בא לברך את שכני לחנוכת הבית,

(English: *when the house was founded, the wind blew permeating the balconies. I asked: "Who knocks my window?" He laughed and said a neighbor. I said, "What are you asking for in this stormy night?" He laughed and said, "A neighbor came to his neighbor congratulating him because of his living in a house"* (שם, ע'תפמ).

In spite of the simplicity in presenting the story to be part of the children's curricula, the writer seems to be communicating to the younger Jewish generations that Israel is established on strong foundations, the only condition that keeps its survival in the midst of the strong disordered forces (the winds). We dare to say that the writer uses literature routes for communicating dishonesty of the sequence of historical events, initiated by simple visits, aiming to put on the grounds the project of Herzl¹⁷ through a novel entitled "The Sate of the

¹⁷Herzl: Theodor Herzl 2 MAY 1860-104 Austro-Hungarian Jewish journalist, the founder of contemporary political Zionism. He was born in Budapest and died in Eldach, Austria. He received a learning equal to the spirit of the Jewish German enlightenment prevalent in this period, the Christian western nature is predominant in its rigidity until 1878. His family moved in the same year to Vienna. He directly enrolled the faculty of law until he obtained a doctorate in 1884, and then he worked after a short period in Vienna and Salzburg courts and then he moved towards

Jews, מדינת היהודים". The theme is therefore that the neighbor comes to seek friendship (and blesses the establishment of the new house) only after his failure to destroy it ¹⁸.

V. THE FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

By pulling the rhetoric of the two stories together, the current analysis is a modest attempt in which the authors dare Agnon to meet the challenge of his own thought. The main argument is like this: The events of the two stories would tell us that the writer of both stories is xenophobic (i.e. fears foreigners, their customs, their religions, etc.). He does not mention in his stories any of "the others" positively, but accuses "them" as being either brutal killers or sworn enemies. The events of the two stories would tell us that the writer is a racist. He only shows the humanitarian aspects in the Jewish sect who to them are the only people of principle (e.g. the heroine's refusal of bird hunting).

The writer uses puns to obscure the literary image of establishing his city at the expense of the misery of others. Although he refuses the killing of birds, he accepts expelling indigenous people out of their homes. In Agnon's mind, desire and power are interchangeable.

The two stories are no exception of the Hebrew literature which serves only the Jewish cause: the making of a country; it is the implementation of a plan in a time-bound program. It starts off with a literary piece of work to an actual political project i.e. Hebrew literature is vested with specific political agenda, thus becoming like a code only deciphered by the people who should implement it on the grounds. For example, in his short story "*From an Enemy to a lover*", the writer chooses Talpiot located now in eastern Jerusalem as the setting of his story. The simple message that he wants to communicate is that the entire Jerusalem is the capital of Israel. The story tries to re-enforce the idea that the entire Palestine does not have a place for another people; it is only a homeland for the Jews – the current status quo which was imagined by Agnon a hundred years ago.

REFERENCES

1. Arazi Shazar. *Following Lost Love*, Hemed Books, Yedioth Ahronoth, Sheffer Ltd., Israel, 2004
2. Avraham Ibn Shushan. *The Concentrated Hebrew Hotel*, Kiryat Sefer Publishing Ltd., Jerusalem 1999,
3. Sha'anani, Avraham. *The Hotel of Modern Hebrew and General Literature*, Tel Aviv, Yavne, 1959.
4. Oz, Amos. *Lands of the Jackal*, Keter Publishing, Jerusalem, 197
5. Ibn Shushan, Avraham. *The New Concordance*, Tel Aviv, Am Toved Ltd., 2000
6. *The Hebrew Encyclopedia*, Clalit, Volume Twenty-Five, Poalim Library Publishing, Jerusalem, 1988
7. Bar-Adon, Aharon. *Shi Agnon and the Revival of the Hebrew Language*, Bilik Institute, Jerusalem, 1977
8. Mansour, facilitators. *Reading of the Modern Hebrew Literature for the Advanced*, New York Publishing, 1971
9. Moshe Beror and Naftali Kadmon. *A historical atlas of the history of the peoples and Israel*. Tel Aviv. Yavne, 1977
10. Map of the national project Cross-Israel Road via Messi 6, named after Yitzhak Rabin
11. Anvil, Bear. *Between Law and Account*, Dvir Publishing, Tel Aviv, 1963
12. Agnon, Shmuel Yosef. *These and These*, Schocken Publishing, Jerusalem and Tel Aviv, 1971
13. Agnon, Shmuel Yosef. *Near and See*, Schocken, Jerusalem and Tel Aviv, 1979
14. Agnon, Sh. *Orih Neta Lalon*, Schocken Publishing, Jerusalem and Tel Aviv, 1998
15. Klausner, Joseph. *A Brief History of Modern Hebrew Literature*, Yosef Sherbarak Publishing Ltd., Tel Aviv, 1955.
16. Five Pentateuchs of the Torah, the sage Meir Halevi, in the year "Tirzah" 4, Isaiah 17 2.

literature and composition. He published a set of philosophical stories in 1885. Also, he wrote a number of theatres that did not have great success. Refer to: <https://ar.wikipedia.org/wiki/>.

¹⁸Giboun Teske says addressing the Zionist: all people were at fault (Goeem) and you are the only right one. It is not essential nor correct and you cannot imagine for one minute that your enemy is right and you are wrong. Refer: Hamou, Abd Al-Majeed. *Jewish Massacres and Zionist terrorism*, Al-Awal, Damascus, 2003, P 13.

17. Rupel, Petai and ZviWalmut, *The Selection of the Story of Eretz Israel*, Reuven Mess Publishing, Jerusalem, 1956
18. Kurzweil, Baruch. *Our New Literature Continuation or Revolution*, Shochan Publishing, Jerusalem and Tel Aviv, 1967.
19. El-Messiri, Abdel Wahab (2009). *The Encyclopedia of Jewish and Judaism*, Cairo, Dar El-Shorouk.
20. Shahak, Israel andMezvinsky, Norton.(1999). *Jewish Fundamentalism in Israel*, Translated by Naser Afifi "AlusulyehAlyahooeh fi Israel, 2004
21. Cairo, Dar El-Shorouq.
22. Danzoul, Albero. (2004)*Judaism and Other Religions: An Orthodox perspective*. Translated by Mari Sharstan, "Al-yahudiyahwal-ghyriyah fi mintharalyahud".Alawa'el, Damascus, 2004.
23. Al-Hout, Bayan Nwihed. (1986)*Al-qiyadaatwal-mu'sasaatalsiyasiyah fi filsteen, 1917-1948*. The Institution of Palestinian Studies, Biuret.
24. Hamou, Abd Al-Majee/ (2003). *Almajaziralyahuudiyahwal-irhaabalsuhyuniAlawael*, Damascus.
25. Al-Swedan, Tareq Mohammad, (2004). *Filisteenattareekhalmusawar*. (2nd ed.) Al-Ibda' alfikri, Kuwait.
26. Al-Azam, Tayseer (2005). *Athawarah 'ala athawarahalyahudiyahbadat fi ikhla' ghooshgatteef*.*Translation and Language Journal*, Al-Azhar University, Volume 36.