

The Designation of Hebrew as an Official Language
and Its Role in Establishing Israel in Motti Lerner's
Exile in Jerusalem

تسمية العبرية كلغة رسمية ودورها في إنشاء دولة إسرائيل في مسرحية
النفى في القدس لموتي لرنر

Dr. Doaa Esam Abdel-Hakeem
English language teacher
Faculty of Arts - Helwan University"

د. دعاء عصام عبد الحكيم
مدرس بقسم اللغة الإنجليزية
كلية الآداب - جامعة حلوان

Abstract

This research examines the play, *Exile in Jerusalem* (1989) written by the radical Israeli dramatist, Motti Lerner. The goal is to show that the early Zionist leaders, who adopted nationalist ideology, designated Hebrew as an official language to serve their project of establishing a nation in Palestine. The play is analyzed in the light of the theory of national socialism which early Zionists claimed to adopt though they disposed of the socialist principles in favor of nationalism. Probing into the characters of Else and Werner, the two non-Zionist Jewish characters in the play, reveals that both characters suffer from the imposed nationalist ideology exemplified in the enforcement of Hebrew as an official language. Else who resists any attempt at translating her German poems into Hebrew, loses her life as a result of hunger and coldness. Werner also leads a miserable life because he accepts to write an introduction in German to Else's poetry. The research reaches the conclusion that Israel has been built on an artificial culture illuminated in the revival of Hebrew language.

Key Words: Israeli theatre - Hebrew language – Nationalism – Zionism

The Designation of Hebrew as an Official Language and Its Role in Establishing Israel in Motti Lerner's *Exile in Jerusalem*

Introduction

Exile in Jerusalem (1989) was written by the Israeli radical dramatist, Motti Lerner for the Habima Theatre in Israel. Lerner was born, lived and married in Israel but he, quoting his own words, "felt that in many respects I do not always belong here. I cannot be part of the political and ideological process, which has not only created the occupation of Palestinian territories and the Palestinian people, but has also severely distorted the moral fabric of Israeli society" (Preface 371). The two-act play was criticized by the American Jewish dramatist, Ari Roth, as lacking the "political immediacy" (Firestone 42) the audience needed as the dramatic action takes place during the Second World War (1939-1945). However, Lerner makes it clear in his Preface that the "Israeli Jewish culture must be part of the world Jewish culture, which is being created in all continents: free, modern, progressive, and rich. It is a culture which stems from our traditional sources, but which must define new boundaries for the human experience in our time, boundaries which will contain the vast changes we are experiencing" (371-72). Therefore, the play is less concerned with historical events than with criticizing the nationalist ideology which affected the Zionist mind in the pre-state period to the present. Nelson Pressley explains that the play is a criticism of "the harsh dogmatism of early Zionists" (13) such as Ben-Gurion, a political leader in the labour movement which was influenced by the "nationalist currents in Europe" (*The Columbia Encyclopedia*). In his twelve-letter book, *Rome and Jerusalem* (1862), Moses Hess, a nineteenth-century German Jew, rejects the assimilation of Jews in Germany and calls for national socialism. He explains that "Judaism is rooted in the love of family; patriotism and nationalism are the flowers of its spirit, and the coming regenerated state of human society will be its ripe fruit." Jews, according to Hess, should not be part of the organic whole of the nations they live in; they should unite and act as a nation because Judaism "is primarily the expression of nationality whose history for thousand years coincides with the history of the development of a

humanity... ." In her introduction to Hess's book, Ami Isseroff alleges that Hess's "contribution, became important only, in retrospect, as the Zionist movement began to crystallize and generate an audience." In other words, Zionism might better be understood in the light of national socialism.

Besides, Zeev Sternhell, in his *The Founding Myths of Israel: Nationalism, Socialism, and the making of the Jewish State* (1992), argues that the early Zionists adopted the principles of Nationalist Socialism which "appeared in Europe in the last years of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth as an alternative to both Marxism and liberalism" (7). Sternhell adds the 'ist' because national socialism "has been contaminated by its association with the Nazis" (7) despite the fact that both Nazis and Zionists share the same principle "that society can function successfully, and therefore happily, only as an organism; that all parts benefit when each part performs the function for which it is best suited to produce a unified, single-purpose whole" ("What is National Socialism?") Nationalist Socialism, Sternhell proceeds, is "based on the idea of the nation as a cultural, historical and biological unit, or, figuratively, an extended family. The individual was regarded as an organic part of the whole, and the whole took precedence over the individual." (8) The Jewish Labour leaders alleged that they maintained the principles of both Nationalism and Socialism which Sternhell denies: "socialism lost its universal significance and became an essential tool in the process of building the nation-state. Thus, the universal values of socialism were subordinated to the particularistic values of nationalism" (Sternhell 7). Values such as equality and Justice were undermined in favour of "cultural, historical and intellectual and, finally, biological nationalism." (Sternhell 9) Criticizing his own society, Motti Lerner argues: "during the last 60 years, Israeli society has forgotten many of these values, and voices within Israel calling for justice are sometimes silenced." (Gener 43) Values such as "fundamentalism, racism and patriotism" (Gener 43) prevailed in the Israeli society. The designation of Hebrew as an official language in Palestine was a fundamental national project deployed by early Zionists to serve the nation-building goal. Assaf Likovski argues that "like many nationalist movements, some

Zionists sought to revive the Jewish cultural past. The best-known aspect of Zionist cultural activity was the revival of the Hebrew language... ." (128)

Exile in Jerusalem takes place in the occupied territories of Palestine under the British Mandate during World War II. It revolves around the last years in the life of the German Jewish poetess, Else Lasker Schuller who escaped the Nazi Germany to Palestine in 1939 and died there in 1945. That period of World War II was exceptionally significant for the nationalist project of the Zionists as "the history of Palestine during the Second World War can be seen in the light of events leading up to the end of the Mandate and the creation of a Jewish State." (Marlowe 165) The establishment of Israel "was seen as an evolutionary process conceived in the womb of the Mandate until such time as it would emerge by peaceful parturition from the Mandate." (Marlowe 166) The British mandate policies which favoured the "Zionist cause over Palestinian self-determination" (Farsoun 72), were "the sole external guarantee for the achievement of Zionist goals" (Finklestein 18). As far as reviving Hebrew is concerned, the British mandate helped Weizmann, the head of the Zionist Commission in 1918, to designate Hebrew as an official language along with Arabic and English though Jews, then, "constituted only 7% of the population and owned 1% of the land" (Al-Hassan 41).

The prominent figure known for reviving the Hebrew language is Eliezer Ben-Yehuda (1858-1922), a nineteenth-century Russian Jew who spent decades to prepare "the first modern dictionary of the Hebrew language which became the foundation of modern Hebrew lexicography." (Spolsky 59) Ben-Yehuda believed that "only a territorial national center can enhance the development of national culture and written language." (Kuzar 81) Therefore, he encouraged Jewish immigration to Palestine to increase the number of Jews. Furthermore, the *Yishuv*, the Jewish community in Palestine, which was entrusted by the government of the British mandate "for Jewish communal affairs" (Goldberg 304), established educational institutions teaching Hebrew and by 1930s, a group of Hebrew writers arrived in Palestine.

In his Preface to *Exile in Jerusalem*, Motti Lerner mentions that the "main reason for my fascination" (371) of Else "was the realization that Else felt she was an exile in Jerusalem, her beloved city, just as I sometimes." (371) Else's major problem is due to her inability to sacrifice her individual needs for the sake of the nationalist claims of the Zionists' at the time. Therefore, she refuses any attempt at translating her German poems into Hebrew which signifies her rejection of the nationalist ideology of the early Zionists'.

In his *Hebrew and Zionism: A Discourse of Analytic Cultural Study* (2001), Ron Kuzar argues:

this language [Hebrew] had had no native speakers for some eighteen hundred years. To the extent that native speech is the benchmark of vitality, Hebrew was a dead language. Yiddish, a Judeo-German vernacular, was spoken by most *Ashkenazi* 'European' (lit. German) communities, primarily in Eastern Europe, which was the cradle of emergent national sentiment, but it was not the language of all Jews. The Jews of the Balkan countries, of Turkey, and of several other sephardi 'Mediterranean' (lit. Spanish) communities in the Middle East spoke Ladino, a Judeo-Spanish vernacular. Other Jews spoke either the local languages of their host communities, or Jewish dialects derived from them. (6)

Kuzar's argument indicates that Jews all over the world were not speaking Hebrew but other languages such as Yiddish and Ladino. In other words, reviving Hebrew had not been regarded as a national project because Zionism did not exist at the time. Kuzar's idea is augmented by Dr. Abd El Wahhab El-Mesery's argument:

Jews did not speak Hebrew except for a very short period. The language of the fathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (2100-120 B.C.) was a Semitic dialect, a mixture of Arabic and Aramaic. Hebrew was a Canaanitic dialect which was spoken by Jews only after their stay in Canaan (Palestine) (starting from 1250 B.C.). It also seems that Hebrew did not

work as a spoken language among Jews since the Babylonian Exile (567 B.C.). (330)

The Jews who were brought about from different countries to settle in Palestine did not share the same culture or speak the same language in the pre-state Israel. In other words, they could not form a nation because they did not share the "objective criteria" (McMahan 107) which distinguish a nation i.e. "a history of mutual association and common occupancy of the same territory, common ethnic origins, use of the same language... ." (McMahan 107) Therefore, the early Zionists endeavoured to *create* the necessary "objective criteria" to build a nation for Jews. In his *Nationalism and National Integration* (1989), Anthony H. Birch explains that one kind of nation-building "occurs when national governments take steps to reduce the impact of ethnic, religious or *linguistic* cleavages in society." (42-3) The "linguistic cleavages" enforce national governments to "designate an official language" (44) i.e. Hebrew as far as the Zionists were concerned. Therefore, this paper discusses the role of reviving the Hebrew language as revealed in Lerner's *Exile in Jerusalem*, in establishing Israel in 1948 in the light of the aforementioned theory of National Socialism.

In *Exile in Jerusalem*, the old-aged Jewish poetess, Else, who fled to Palestine against her will "with the dress on my back... I found this suitcase thrown away in Zurich. At the bus station" (1. 2. 1. 382), spent the last few years of her life in dire poverty to her death. Her companion in Palestine is Werner, another German Jewish refugee whose wretched situation is not far different from hers. The two characters share some aspects with absurd characters who are portrayed as waiting desperately for a savior who never comes. Similar to the "self-deluding vagabonds"(Hutchings 25), Estragon and Vladimir of *Waiting for Godot*, Else and Werner "fail to confront the reality of their futile situation, hoping and waiting pointlessly in an existential void, seeking an affirmation and a personal validation that can and will by definition certainly never come." (Hutchings 25) Like Vladimir and Estragon, the two exiled Jews are tied together facing a frustrating reality but their efforts to lead a better life always lead to nothing: "Frustrating though the presence of the other may often be for each,... (they) are ultimately

inseparable; each provides strength and distraction for the other, plus the consolation that comes when a burden is shared." (Hutchings 28) Before Else shows up, the opening extra-dialogical stage-direction, "a winter evening in 1939," (1. 1. 1. 373) creates a gloomy and a turbulent atmosphere. First, winter signifies coldness, depression, and even death as expressed in Else's poetry: "Winter played with Death in all the nests" (2. 4. 1. 396).

The year 1939 is another highly significant element in the play; it refers to the beginning of World War II and the issuing of the White Paper by the British Secretary of State, Malcolm MacDonald on May 17 which "proposed sharp limits on Jewish immigration by allowing only 10,000 Jewish immigrants per year for five years plus a total of 25,000 refugees. After the five years, no more immigration would be permitted without Arab Palestinians acquiescence." (Al-Hassan 54) The White Paper brought about a state of turbulence among all parties, the British, the Jews and the Palestinians which is signified, in the play, by the announcement of the curfew in the stage-direction in the opening scene: "*(They laugh. In the background British policemen can be heard announcing a curfew.)*" (1. 1. 1. 376)

The moment she shows up, Else is presented with a full description of her physical appearance wearing "a coat with a colorful kerchief around the collar and a hat. Upon closer inspection she turns out to have a small hump on her back that she tries to hide by means of the coat" (1. 1. 1. 373). The external appearance of a character serves as a sign-system: "by presenting his external appearance in a certain manner, the person fashions an image of himself." (Fischer-Lichte 85) Clothes are "a specific system for the generation of meaning, the units of which are formed by material, color, and form." (Fischer-Lichte 85) The detailed description of Else's physical appearance is significant as it points to her as an individual not as a member of the Jewish nation. She is a liberal Jewess whose personal needs have nothing to do with the goals of Zionism. Therefore, she wears bright colours to highlight her eagerness, as an individual, to attract attention: "Do you think he'll like my dress? (She opens her coat enough to see a bright red dress.) I also have a flaming green silk scarf with real peacock feathers...." (1. 1. 1. 374) The

winter clothes Else is dressed in also signify depression and a need for a shelter: "When we are miserable and depressed, we feel we need more clothes than when we are happy. Clothes are portable houses which have grown around us like the shell of a snail." (Fischer-Lichte 88) She also wears Werner's coat to protect her from coldness and loneliness: "(But Werner is already gone. She returns to the room and sits down. She is cold. She gets up and puts the coat on.) (1. 3. 1. 390) The small hump on her back is a sign of aging which intensifies her dejected condition.

Else's opening words are addressed to Werner, the first character to show up on stage. Werner is a thirty-eight German Jew who fled to Palestine in "roundabout ways" (1. 1. 1. 373); he travelled to France which he left on its occupation by Hitler. The "roundabout ways" Werner resorted to were due to the activation of the White Paper which "Zionists perceived ... as a British surrender to the Arabs and a sudden reversal of their support for a Jewish state." (Al-Hassan 55) Therefore, the Zionists helped Jewish refugees through "illegal immigration" (Marlowe 169) which, encouraged by the Jewish Agency, "started on a massive scale immediately after the immigration proposals of the White Paper had been reflected in the reduction of the six-monthly quotas." (Marlowe 169-70) In *Exile in Jerusalem*, no physical description of Werner is provided, but rather his gestural signs which are portrayed in detail: "...sits on a bench and eats his supper. He opens a tin of sardines, cuts slices of bread, and dips the bread in the oil with a flourish of table manners." (1. 1. 1. 373) The fact that his movements are of more importance than his appearance illuminates how he endeavours to act positively in Palestine and cope with the nationalist ideology prevalent there in which "blood ties, cultural ties linking members of the nation, the partnership in the total national effort, took precedence over the position of the individual in the production system." (Sternhell 8) Hence, the difference between Else and himself. While Else's refusal of translating her poems reflects her inability to adapt to the nationalist ideology in Palestine, Werner learns Hebrew and works hard at translating Else's poems. He says: "Professor Buber was quite enthusiastic about my translations. "Your command of Hebrew is impressive," he said to me... (He goes on typing.)" (1. 2. 1.

382) He also "managed to translate my never-to-be published book on Goethe into Hebrew and I've begun to talk like him.... (2. 4. 1. 395)

Else's first words on beholding Werner are preceded by a stage direction that is rich in implication: "*testing to see if he speaks German*" which unfolds the illocutionary act of her utterance: "*Guten Abend?*" (1. 1. 1. 373) It is an expressive act combining greeting and questioning to reflect a need for solidarity. As a seventy-year old German woman, Else is not acquainted with Hebrew: "for immigrants who arrived during the mandate period, those who came from Austria, Germany, Hungary, and Turkey were less likely to use Hebrew." (Spolsky 67) In his turn-taking, Werner follows the rules of adjacency-pairs by returning the greeting. However, his utterance is also preceded by a clarifying stage-direction, (*Happily*) which reflects his reminiscence of the German culture. The indirect illocutionary act Werner performs through his German words "*guten Abend*" is showing solidarity. On realizing that Werner speaks German, Else, in a joyous manner, says: "I hope you are not the only creature in Jerusalem, *mein guten*, who can be spoken to in an intelligible language...." (1. 1. 1. 373) Else's use of diction reveals her feelings of alienation. She uses the word 'creature' instead of 'person' to intensify her inability to put up with the whole environment. Her use of the passive voice reflects the psychological barrier which separates her from her surroundings. The adjective 'intelligible' is an underestimation and a disrespect of the Hebrew language. In his turn-taking, Werner, violating the Gricean maxim of quality of telling the truth, sarcastically comments on Else's use of the word "creature": "Of course not, *meine Dame*. For the past hour I've been speaking German to these unfortunately mute sardines...." (1. 1. 1. 373) In his *Language as Social Action: Social Psychology and language Use* (2002), Thomas Holtgraves argues that "speakers violate a conversational maxim in order to intentionally convey a nonliteral meaning." (83) Werner violates the quality maxim to highlight the importance of Hebrew in Jerusalem. Therefore, he consolidates his argument by teaching Else a Hebrew word: "In Hebrew, by the way, you say *sardeen* too." (1. 1. 1. 373) He violates the maxim of relevance by providing an irrelevant answer to her inquiry to stress the necessity of learning Hebrew in Jerusalem. Holtgraves argues that "if the

violation is noted, the recipients engage in inferential processing as a means of explaining the violation." (83) Therefore, taking in Werner's message, Else violates the maxim of quantity by being non-informative: "That must be because they are Hebrew sardines... (*Chuckles*) (1. 1. 1. 373). She cynically refers to the hostile relationship between the German and the Jews by claiming that the sardines did not communicate with Werner in German because they are Hebrew. Werner proceeds in his argument to emphasize the Zionist concern for the Hebrew language. "You should know, *meine Dame*, that the public here thinks very highly of the Hebrew sardine. There are patriots who even claim it has the bouquet of smoked salmon... But the trees, unfortunately, they speak Hebrew here... (*He laughs in a shrill voice and opens his suitcase.*)" (1. 1. 1. 373) To think very highly of one's culture is elemental in nationalist countries which "manifests itself in a common language and a feeling of community and is further moulded by land and by history." (*Readings on Fascism* 65) It is worthy to note that Werner uses the verb "speak" to describe an inanimate object, "trees" in an exaggerated manner to show that:

in the case of Hebrew, the goal was reversed: to add spoken (L) functions to a language whose literacy status was already clear. Whereas the peoples mobilized by the European national movements could often be united by a common vernacular, the Jews were divided by theirs – but they could be united by appeals to the symbolic association of Hebrew with tradition and peoplehood. (Spolsky 58)

The absurd miserable life both characters lead in Palestine is due to the contrast between their liberal ideas and the nationalist ideology of the Zionists. Zeev Sternhell explains how the founders of Israel were opposing the liberal values in favour of nationalism:

Liberal values never took root in the founders' ideology, this was not the thinking of groups of young activists who came from areas where tribal nationalism ruled unchallenged. From their point of view, Zionism's justification was not that it provided the most rational or effective solution to the Jews' need for security.... Zionism was an operation to rescue the

nation and not an operation to rescue Jews as individuals.

(51)

Abiding by her personal self-esteem, Else gives no heed to the collective identity the nationalist Zionists call for. As an individual, she endeavours to appear, in Jerusalem, as the renowned German poetess she is despite the nationalist claims of the Zionists'. She asks Werner if he saw the mayor of Jerusalem who awaits her arrival: "He wrote that all of Jerusalem was looking forward to my arrival. I wouldn't want him to comb the streets for me." (1. 1. 1. 373) She violates the maxim of quality by not telling the truth in order to have a 'face' i.e. "a successful presentation of *any* identity." (Holtgraves 39) Naturally, her refusal of the Zionist call for a collective Jewish identity threatens her personal identity. In their article, "Applying Positioning Principles to a Theory of Collective Identity" (2003), Donald Taylor, Evelyne Bougie and Julie Caoutte argue that

while personal identity is the experienced core of the self, collective identity is the necessary context that allows an individual to develop a healthy sense of self. By a healthy self we refer to one that orients the individual to have effective interaction with his or her social environment. (197)

Therefore, Werner's sarcastic answer is a threat to Else's face: (With a hint of sarcasm) On a winter day like this..." (1. 1. 1. 373). In an attempt to 'save face' or "to have an identity that has been challenged" (Holtgraves 39), Else keeps violating the quality maxim: "He also asked me to dine with him in the town hall" (1. 1. 1. 374). It is worthy to note that Else's utterance about the mayor of Jerusalem (who was a Palestinian Muslim before 1948) reflects the liberal principle of racial tolerance which stands in a dire contrast with Zionism which is "flawed by ethnocentric nationalism." (Lutfy 104) In spite of the fact that Werner shares liberal values with Else, his answer, "These Levantines, *meine Dame*, are far from punctual..." (1. 1. 1. 373) reflects an acceptance of the nationalist intolerance of Jews towards other races. Such an acceptance is an attempt to keep up living in Jerusalem rather than swimming against the current.

While Werner is totally acquainted with the difficulties facing diaspora Jews in Jerusalem, Else lives in a realm of self-illusion. As a poetess of a "unique personality"(1. 3. 1. 389), she hopes she can live in Jerusalem writing poems in German while Werner writes an introduction about them. In a revealing dialogue, Else's self-deluding nature is contrasted to the realistic nature of Werner's:

WERNER. By all means... But look, Frau Schuller, I've no objections to

being your host, but perhaps we had better ask the landlord...

ELSE I'll compose a few poems, you'll write an article about them,

and my friend Professor Buber will publish it in the newspapers. You'll be the leading literary critic of the Levant! (1. 1. 3. 378).

Knowing he cannot lead a free life in a nationalist community, Werner should ask the landlord if Else could share the room with him. Else's liberal character, reflected in her use of singular pronouns, cannot put up with Werner's fears. Therefore, she provides an irrelevant answer to Werner's suggestion talking about what they may achieve together in the future. While Werner is afraid of the present reality, Else talks about the future as reflected in her triple use of the future tense. The contrast is augmented as Else mentions that her son Paul, who died ten years before, is going to illustrate the book with his drawings.

ELSE. .I'm willing to publish a whole book for you. A big book, bound in fragrant leather...My little son Paul will illustrate it with lovely spring flowers. (1. 1. 3. 378)

Else's violation of the quality maxim by not telling the truth about her son, emphasizes her state of self-delusion. Werner's answer is an attempt to draw her back to reality: "(startled) Paul? But he's... (mumbles)...over ten year ago..." (1. 1. 3. 378) However, Else, insisting on deceiving herself adds: "Such gentle young boys never die, Werner... (In a torrent of words) He'll illustrate it and you'll add your notes in the corners..." (1. 1. 3. 378)

According to the Zionist biased nationalist ideology, immigrants should not abide by their native language; instead, they "had to learn Hebrew and find work" (Divine 11). Such a problem is explained by Werner in a significant dialogue with Else:

WERNER. (Weakening) We're in Jerusalem, not Berlin.

In Jerusalem you can only publish books in

Hebrew...

ELSE. In Hebrew?

WERNER. I stopped writing in German the day I left Germany.

ELSE. Werner...

WERNER. I refuse to be at the mercy of their language any more, Frau

Schuler...

ELSE. (*Taking a looseleaf notebook with a few pages from her*

suitcase) And what am I supposed to do with these poems?

Tear them up? I don't have any other language. (*She kisses the*

pages and holds them out to him). God has sent me to you with a treasure that only comes the way of a chosen few.

WERNER. (*He hesitates at first to look at the poems but then cannot*

restrain himself. His face lights up as he reads them.) New poems! If you have no objection, I'll try to translate them. I write Hebrew better than I speak it... (1. 1. 3. 379)

In his non-informative statement: "We're in Jerusalem, not Berlin," Werner implies that on leaving Germany, a Jew should dispose of the German culture and abide by the newly acquired Jewish one. Adding information to his previous statement, "In Jerusalem you can only publish books in Hebrew...", Werner expresses, not his own point of view, but rather the Zionists' ideology which he endeavours to adapt himself to: "because Zionists believed the land of Israel to be their historic homeland, they expected Jewish immigrants to Palestine to fit in instantly and without problems." (Divine 19) Werner's utterance might better be

understood in the light of the 'positioning' theory by Rom Harré and Fathali Moghaddam which distinguishes between "those actions that were logically possible and those that were socially possible for any social actor at any moment in the flux of social life." (Harré; Moghaddam 4-5) Accordingly, writing poetry in German is logically possible but it is, no doubt, impossible socially because it opposes the nationalist thought of the Zionist leaders. Being a liberal Jewess who believes that the "choice of language actualizes a distinctive human right" (Breslauer 55), Else is unable to take in such a nationalist view. She provides a short question, "In Hebrew?" implying both her lack of understanding and her inability to "fit in instantly". Besides, poetry is an important means of spreading culture, which should be, according to Zionists, the Zionist culture:

Zionist culture would be disseminated in Hebrew and would enable Jews to withstand the onslaughts of modernity without losing their identity. The union of people, however small in numbers, and on their ancestral land, as the base for the revival of language was critical for Zionism and for Jewish survival. (Divine 37)

Unlike Else, Werner strives to cope with or rather to submit to the Zionist logic; therefore, he declares he stopped writing in German the moment he left Germany. Interrupting Else's turn-taking, Werner flouts the maxim of quality by not telling the truth: "I refuse to be at the mercy of their language any more". Had Werner been allowed to write in German, he would, undoubtedly, have done joyfully. He confesses at the end of the play that he is German:

I'm German, just like everyone says I am. I'm as German as the German butcher's shop and the German grocer in the German grocery and the German barman in the German beer cellar. I never had any other home or language. If they'd have accepted me in their party, I'd have marched in the streets with them, and sieg-heiled with them, and burned synagogues and stoned Jews with them... I would have clubbed you just like they did... . (2. 5. 3. 408)

The different outlooks of both Else and Werner are reflected in their succeeding utterances. Else provides two questions which reflect her desperate condition: "And what am I supposed to do with these poems? Tear them up? She added an assertive statement: "I don't have any other language" to stress her helplessness. Her use of the subject pronoun in singular twice reflects her liberal spirit; she is only concerned with her individual needs not with the nationalist goals of the Zionists'. Her mimic and gestural signs as indicated in the stage-directions, express her love for her poems being written in German; she is "fanatical about the German language because it is the tool in which the poet sculpted her lyrical works." (Pressley 13) Werner, on the other hand, expresses his desire to translate her new poems into Hebrew. He barely earns living through selling perfumes and he lives in a poor room which he even leaves to a more miserable one. Therefore, he is ready to translate Else's poem into Hebrew to lead a more comfortable life.

Though Else is allowed to recite some of her poems in a German synagogue, few audiences attend. Besides, Werner has to violate the maxim of quality by claiming that Else writes patriotic poetry which promotes Zionism and condemns Nazism:

It is a great honor and pleasure to present you with our
renowned
poet who will read us a selection of her latest poetry, written in
defiance of the Fuhrer and his murderous henchmen.
(1. 1. 4. 380)

Truth is revealed as Else recites three of her poems replete with *individual* suffering and lacking in nationalist sentiment. For example, her first poem "my mother" reads: "The candle burns on my table / All night long for my mother / For my mother... ." (1. 2. 4. 380) The use of the possessive subject pronoun "my" in each line expresses individual sadness. The topic of the poem is also personal; it is the loss of one's mother who signifies protection and kindness. The first synagogue scene is a turning point in Else's life; it is the last stage of her self-illusion in which she talks nonsense to the mayor of Jerusalem claiming she saw King David in the bus stop:

Mister Mayor. How is Your Grace? I have something wonderful and precious to tell you. . . . On our way here we stopped to rest at the number fifteen bus stop, Werner and I – and who do you think was sitting on the other side of me? . . . King David! None other than King David in person, isn't that so, Werner?... (1. 1. 4. 381)

Else violates all the Gricean maxims of conversation by not telling the truth, being over-informative, being irrelevant and not being brief. Such violations reflect the realm of illusion Else creates for herself in order to live in Jerusalem. As she lives in a state of self-illusion, Else acts in the present synagogue scene (which will turn to the opposite in the second synagogue scene) in a playful and childlike way. In the following scene, Else is faced with a shocking reality i.e. the books she wrote are not available in Jerusalem:

ELSE. (*Alarmed*) There must be someone in this country who has a book of mine.

WERNER. Maybe in a second-hand bookshop...

ELSE. Someone has to have my books!

WERNER. (*Hesitantly*) Of course. I'll go and look tomorrow-

ELSE. (Interrupting him) you'll go and look this moment and you'll keep

On looking until you find them! They're being burned right now in

Germany, huge piles of them, hundreds of poems going up in flames! (She starts to leave and returns.) I want to know the truth,

Werner. I have written poems in my life, haven't I? Nineteen books...I haven't suddenly woken up from a dream, have I?...

(1:2. 1. 383)

The stage-direction preceding Else's first utterance makes clear that she begins to realize the truth about her *exile* in Jerusalem. Her use of indices is revealing as she calls Palestine "*this* country" which indicates her feeling of otherness. She performs an indirect speech act in which "the intended illocutionary point is often different from the literal illocutionary point" (Holtgraves 21): "There must be someone in this

country who has a book of mine." The literal illocutionary act is an assertive while the intended is a directive, a question directed to Werner about the truth of her statement. In his turn-taking, Werner, though abiding by the maxims of conversation, reveals that Else's poetry is undervalued in Jerusalem so that it might only be found in a second-hand shop. In the beginning of her state of disillusionment, Else violates the maxim of quantity through repetition: "Someone has to have my books!" The stage direction preceding Werner's answer (*Hesitantly*) opposes his words, "of course" which is also contrasted with his previous utterance "maybe". Werner is afraid lest Else cannot put up with reality; therefore, he tries to reassure her and performs an act of promise that he will search for books the following day. Else, who proceeds in discovering reality, provides two consecutive directives ordering Werner to search for her books that very moment as she believes that her books were burnt in Germany. Then she provides the most significant statement in the whole scene; "I want to know the truth... ." For the first time she decides to pursue the truth; it is this statement which indicates that she has become an exile in Jerusalem. From this point on she has to face the shocking truth.

Else's feeling of exile in Palestine is later illuminated in her speech with Werner which reflects her dejection:

ELSE. I'm an old woman, Werner. I can't wait any longer...I want to go *home*...

WERNER. (*Holding her hands*) You have no home. The home you had is destroyed...

ELSE. It's hard for me here, Werner. (1. 3. 3. 394)

The word "home", for Else, signifies Germany because it is the country where she was born and lived for seventy years. Significantly, Else yearns to leave Palestine which the Zionists believe to be *the* home for all Jews. The word "home" as referring to Palestine is inherent in the definition of Zionism as "the national movement for the return of the Jewish people to their homeland and the resumption of Jewish sovereignty in the Land of Israel." (Sizer 17) Palestine, therefore, is a

place for "the ingathering of the exiles." (Aviv, and Shneer, 10-11) Besides, the word "home" as referring to Palestine is mentioned in the Balfour Declaration addressed to the Jewish tycoon, Lord Rothschild:

His Majesty's Government views with favour the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of that object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done, which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of the existing non-Jewish Communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country. (Sizer 64)

Else's concept of "home" as the place she was born and lived in is far different from that of the Zionists', the fact which opens to question the Jews' right to occupy Palestine; is Palestine the home for those Jews brought from different countries or for its Arab citizens who were born and lived in it? Werner's usage of "home" is, however, different from that of Else's; he refers to the symbolic rather than the physical connotation of the word: "You have no home. The home you had is destroyed... ." Germany is not what he refers to, but security, stability, memory and emotion which he and Else miss in Palestine. Werner criticizes the Zionists who alleged that the Holy Land grants Jews the aforementioned values: "place and home were not just about territory but also involved memory, myth, and emotion." (Aviv, and Shneer 10) Dr. El-Mesery also argues: "Zionists claim that Palestine which they call *Eretz Israel* or the Promised Land... is the centre of the Jewish sentiment and the spot where Jews are spiritually oriented when they were unable to settle in it." (78) Similar to Else, Werner expresses his dire disappointment at leading a poor life in Palestine: "Frau Schuller, for three years I've been running around the streets of this city selling perfume. Is that what I came here for? (1. 3. 3. 393)

Though Zionism is secular in nature, Zionists had to revive their holy language, Hebrew, to be a symbol of their land:

Hebrew has been the sacred language of the Jewish people – the language of its religion, culture and civilization. It has

been, in sum, the language of Judaism and intimately identified with the national and religious experiences of the Jewish people throughout the generations. The Jewish people can no more be dissociated from their own spiritual identity – Judaism." (Chomsky 3)

Secular Zionists made use of the 'sacred' language always spoken by religious people to build their nation. Worthy of note is the fact that the German poetess, Else, in *Exile in Jerusalem* was only allowed to recite her German poetry in a German synagogue: "Werner turns to the audience as if it were gathered in the German synagogue in Jerusalem for a poetry recital by Else-Lasker-Schuller" (1. 2. 1. 380). In other words, Hebrew replaced other languages in everyday life; it was no more confined to synagogues or spoken by a religious elite.

Both Else and Werner feel exiled in Palestine as they were forced to leave Germany in the Second World War; they suffer from "political and emotional isolation." (Pressley 13) Both were assimilated Jews in Germany, the fact which was resisted by the Zionists:

efforts to reshape German Jewry were largely based on the long-standing critique of assimilation. German Jews, some of them argued, had gone too far in attempting to be Germans and had almost completely abandoned their Jewish identity. Now that they could no longer be Germans, they ought to become Jews again. (Edelheit 7)

Both Jewish characters could not forget their Diaspora life which Zionists endeavored to uproot: "rejecting the Diaspora was so strong an article of Zionist faith that even when the principle was being flouted, it never ceased being invoked." (Divine 8) Agnon, a German Jew like Else and Werner who left Germany before them and settled in Jerusalem epitomizes the Zionist hatred for assimilated Jews. Agnon who never appears on stage, is mentioned by Else as she begs Werner to go to him to bring back some of her old books. Such a nationalist character who exits only in language, stands in contrast to both liberal Jews. Werner mentions a criticism he once wrote about Agnon in Germany which almost ruined the latter's literary career: "I once wrote a piece for *Literarische Welt* in

which I said that Agnon's books about the black-garbed Jews of the shtetl are millstones about the neck of the modern Jew... ." (1. 2. 2. 385) Werner who speaks the mind of the author rejects Agnon's adherence to the Jewish culture of the shtetl exemplified in the "black-garbed Jews" believing that the modern Jew should be part of the world Jewish culture. Therefore, Agnon, Werner proceeds: "can't abide people like us. I once heard him say that we turned a blind eye to Nazism and sold our souls to the devil just to go on sitting in the cafés of Berlin... To him I'm an assimilated Jew who married a goy, and I can go on pounding these pavements, selling perfume for the rest of my life... ." (1. 2. 2. 385) It is significant to note that Agnon's view moves in line with Hess's argument about national socialism in his fourth letter: "the 'new' Jew, who denies the existence of the Jewish nationality, is not only a deserter in the religious sense, but is also a traitor to his people, his race and even to his family."

As a Jewess, Else hates Hitler who persecuted Jews calling him "Hitlerhousepainter" (1. 1. 1. 376) as he believed "he whitewashed" all the dirt from Germany i.e. Jews. However, as a liberal person, she cannot abide by the nationalist rules which force her to dispose of the German culture she acquired; she is unwilling to and incapable of making the Zionist link between Hebrew and the Jewish identity i.e. that "Hebrew was a central symbol for the awakening and maintenance of national sentiment." (Spolsky 72) Werner warns her that "nobody in this country is going to read poetry in the language abused by the housepainter... ." (1. 2. 3. 387) However, she violently rejects any attempt of translating her poems into Hebrew:

ELSE. (*Angrily*) I'm not letting anyone touch my poems...

WERNER. (*Incredulously*) And just how do you expect anyone to read them?

ELSE. I've been a Hebrew poet all my life. My poems are already in Hebrew.

WERNER. Agnon knows they're full of Hebraic symbols. But he was referring to the actual language in which they are written...

ELSE. My poems are Hebrew poems. I will not start patching and cobbling them now... (1. 2. 3. 386-87)

The stage-direction preceding Else's first utterance, '*Angrily*' reflects her inability to accept reality. Her first utterance is a threat; she will not allow Werner or any other person to translate her poems. Werner exclaims against her violent reaction as it is inevitable to translate her poems in order to keep up living in Palestine. Else, in her turn, provides an informative statement referring to herself as a Hebrew poet who writes Hebrew poems though they are written in German. Else plays upon the word "Hebrew"; she does not mean "the Semitic language of the Hebrews" (*Oxford Concise English Dictionary*) but "the old-fashioned term for Jew." In other words, by describing herself as a Jewish poet and her poems as Jewish poems, she adheres to her Jewish identity.

However, she refuses the Zionist belief that "language provides an essential cultural marker distinguishing one group from another, and the right of the culture to survive outweighs the rights of the individual to personal freedom." (Breslauer 55) Therefore, Else's disillusionment is bitterly expressed in her opinion about Jews living in Palestine. She accuses Werner of trying to deceive her like all Jews in Jerusalem: "but you've deceived me... you've betrayed me like all other Jews in Jerusalem. The day will yet come when you'll tear out my soul to get some appointment at the university... (*She finishes packing her suitcase.*)" (1. 3. 3. 393) In other words, Else realizes that Jews living in Palestine, particularly Zionists who pretends to help refugees live well in Jerusalem, merely make use of them for their own sake. Historically, "In December 1935, David Ben- Gurion declared: "We must give a Zionist response to the catastrophe faced by German Jewry – to turn this disaster into an opportunity to develop our country, to save the lives and property of the Jews of Germany for the sake of Zion." (Allan 47) Zionists signed also an agreement with the Nazis "which directed Jewish immigration

from Germany to Palestine where they became settlers and the German authority allowed them to take with them a great deal of their money." (El-Mesery 81) In *Exile in Jerusalem*, Else feels disappointed in the Holy Land because her suffering in Germany is made use of to serve Zionist targets:

it is unquestionable that the persecution and destruction of Jewish life in Europe by Nazi Germany and its allies and events subsequent to World War II played a major role in accelerating the creation of Israel as an independent state, both from within and from without. From within, Jewish presence in the land was augmented by the massive arrival of refugees who had survived the war and death camps; and from without, the same tragic events contributed to the nearly universal readiness in 1948 to create a Jewish alongside a Palestinian state. (Erlich 1329)

Therefore, Else as a liberal Jewish poetess declares that those Jews do not deserve to live in Jerusalem; it is only fit for poets: "Jerusalem should have been entrusted to poets, not to ordinary Jews." (1. 3. 3. 394) Werner also confesses that Jews in Palestine do not care for either Else or her poetry: "there are no angels on Jaffa Street. There are nothing but petty, narrow-minded Jews who care only for patriotic marches... It's time you faced up to it. No one out there cares about you or your poems... ." (2. 5. 1. 403) In other words, both Else and Werner do not accept the nationalist view of the Zionists' which takes no heed of the individual's welfare; they believe in the liberal concept of a "society-people" rather than the nationalist concept of a "community-people":

Liberalism gave rise to the concept of a "society-people" (*Gesellschaftsvolk*) which consisted of a sum of individuals, each of whom was supposed to have an inherent significance and to play his own independent part in the political life of the nation. National Socialism, on the other hand, has developed the concept of the "community-people" (*Gemeinschaftsvolk*) which functions as a uniform whole. (*Readings on Fascism* 65-6)

The concept of the "community people" deprives Jews of assuming their individual demands which should be undermined in favour of the national goals. Such a belief is concurrent with Moses Hess argument that "as long as the Jew endeavours to deny his nationality, while at the same time he is unable to deny his individual existence, . . . his false position must daily become intolerable."

Insisting on pursuing her individual dreams, Else manages, at last, to publish one of her books in German which Werner happily receives:

ELSE. Doctor Spitzer at Tarshish Books is putting out a volume of my new poems. Your introduction will be the golden bridge which the pilgrims cross to the *true Promised Land*. (*She hands him the manuscript.*)

WERNER. (*Looking at it with emotion*) My Blue Piano...
And

Spitzer is going to publish it like this... in German?

ELSE. (*Excitedly*) *Ja, Ja*... In German... . (2. 4. 1. 396)

The above conversation stands in contrast to an aforementioned one about the Hebrew language in which Else was angry and Werner was disappointed. In the current situation, both characters are happy as reflected in the stage directions preceding their utterances: "Looking at it with emotion" and "Excitedly." Significantly Else maintains the positive face of Werner's by her complementing words: "Your introduction will be the golden bridge which the pilgrims cross to the *true Promised Land*." Publishing Else's poems in German while Werner writes an introduction about them provides the two exiled Jews with hope that they may live in Palestine without disposing of their German culture. This is symbolized in the food prepared by Werner:

WERNER. Doesn't that smell good? I've fried the croutons, and in a

minute we'll have a good German soup made from good Jewish

onions. This is a celebration. It's not every day a new book gets published here. (2. 4. 3. 400)

The combination of the German soup and the Jewish onions signifies the acceptance of the German culture in Jerusalem which makes the two German Jews happy. However, their happiness does not last as an article by a Polish Jew is written attacking Else and calling her German poems "The German Invasion of Palestine. Last week I came across a book of German poems by a new immigrant called Else Lasker-Muller." (2. 4. 1. 402) Commenting on the writer's written language, Werner says: "Muller!" The fact that the writer misspells Else's name illuminates that he is not acquainted with the renowned poetess and not interested in the content of her poems: "He doesn't write anything about your poems. They're in German and this fool refuses to look at a Gothic letter." (2. 4. 1. 402) Werner quotes from the article: "Are we so lacking treasures of our own that we must rummage in the garbage thrown out by the anti-Semites?" (2. 4. 1. 402) The nationalist tone of the writer's question is reflected in the use of the subject pronoun "we" and the possessive "our" which is contrasted with Else's excessive use of 'I' and 'my'. The illocutionary act of the writer's utterance is a rejection of Else's German poetry. Diction of insult such as "garbage", "thrown out" and "anti-Semites" is meant to create a certain perlocutionary act i.e. the arousal of nationalist sentiment. Criticizing the nationalist tone of the article, Werner bitterly comments: "We ran away from one nationalism to fall into the clutches of another!" (2. 5. 1. 402). It is worthy of note that one of the principles of National Socialism which both Zionists and Nazis adopt is 'people':

A people is determined by a number of different factors: by racial derivation and by the character of its land, by language and other forms of life, by religion and history, but also by the common consciousness of its solidarity and by its common will to unity. (*Readings on Fascism* 63)

According to the above concept of "a people", both Else and Werner do not belong to the German people. Therefore, Werner

complains of that national socialist ideology which excluded them from their German citizenship: "We were driven out of Germany because we're Jews, and here the door is slammed in our face because we're Germans." (2. 4. 1. 402) In its twenty-five point program (February 24, 1920), the Nazi party referred to Jews as non-German:

Only a member of the community [Volksgenosse] can be a citizen. Only a person with German blood, regardless of his religious adherence, can be a member of the community. No Jew may therefore be a member of the community. (Hilberg 32)

The nationalism which Werner complains of "divides people into "us" and "them". And it always defines itself against some enemy "other." It is about dividing people not uniting them." ("Nationalism Is about Division" 8) Werner's comparison between Nazi and Zionist nationalism might be better understood in El-Mesery's argument:

Zionists and anti-Zionists agree on refusing assimilation...
. Anti-Zionists regard the Jew as an organic character who cannot be contained in the society. If he is contained, he will become like bacteria which cause the erosion and the curding of the society. Those Jews who claimed they were assimilated are, according to this view, the most dangerous Jewish elements because they become, in name, part of the society in which they settle. In reality, however, they are, consciously or unconsciously, a strange body like a malignant cell which causes its decline and erosion. Therefore, the only solution for the Jewish question, according to this view, is the Zionist solution i.e. sending out Jews to a place of their own. (64)

El-Mesery makes it clear that both Nazis and nationalist Jews reject the fusion of Jews in other societies as they would be regarded as strangers of great danger. Moses Hess, in this regard, argues:

The European nations have always considered the existence of the Jews in the midst as an anomaly. We shall always remain strangers among the nations. They may

tolerate us and even grant us emancipation, but they will never respect us as long as we place the principle *ubi bene ibi patria* [where it is good, there is the homeland] above our own great national memories.

As a non-Zionist liberal Jew, Werner accepted to be an assimilated Jew in Germany and hoped to be treated as a German citizen. Therefore, he bitterly complains: "we were exiled here against our will, and we're not wanted here either." (2. 4. 1. 402)

Else's frustration reaches its peak in the second synagogue scene as she is supposed to recite some of her poetry once again. The major difference between the previous synagogue scene and the current one is that Else becomes quite assured that there is no hope of leading a happy life in Jerusalem. Therefore, she cannot hide her disappointment at the very few number of audiences: "(she bows to the audience, desperately trying to hide her disappointment at its small size.)" (2. 5. 2. 404) Her sadness is highly illuminated in the contrast between her words and her actions. She violates the quality maxim saying:

When I think of Jerusalem and all the people in it, I say to myself:

how happy I am to be with you all! How good and cozy you may

make me feel! How much love you shower on me! If only two

or three more of you could have come tonight ... And now I'll

begin. (She opens her book... (She looks at the audience, still

unable to accept how small it is.) (2. 5. 2. 404)

Her disappointment prevents her from completing her poem and she threatens her positive face by talking nonsense which makes Werner stop her many times: "when in the presence of others, one's face is on display and subject to various threats; consequently it must be maintained." (Holtgraves 39) Therefore, Werner provides some utterances to save her face:

WERNER. Frau Schuller... I think you had better start reading...

WERNER. Please, can you start reading?

WERNER. Frau Schuller...perhaps you need to rest a bit...

WERNER. Frau Schuller... Perhaps you'd like to sit down for a minute.

(2. 5. 2. 405-6)

Werner abides by the politeness principles to save the positive as well as the negative faces of Else's. Else's positive face is threatened as she talks nonsense instead of reading her poem. Therefore, Werner advises her to start reading. Besides, Werner uses polite rather than direct forms of request to "lessen threats to one's autonomy" (Holtgraves 45) i.e. to maintain Else's negative face. His first directive is conveyed politely in an "attempt to lessen coercion." (Holtgraves 45) He uses a statement instead of a question which begins with "I think". Though the request is clear, the polite form gives the recipient i.e. Else "an option, it indicates some respect of the hearer's freedom to be unimpeded." (Holtgraves 43) As Else proceeds in talking nonsense, Werner moves a step forward using a more direct form of a directive i.e. posing a polite question starting with "can you" and preceded by "please". He asks her to read her poem. Sensing that she is out of control, he changes his attitude; instead of persuading her to read her poems and save her positive face, he threatens both her negative and positive faces by asking her to "rest a bit." Her negative face is threatened because of the orderly tone of Werner's statement. Her positive face is threatened as the illocutionary force of Werner's request is a reproach of her attitude. He also resorts to unspecified words so as not to appear as impinging on Else such as "rest" and "a bit". Last, Werner dispenses of the unspecified words to a more to the point statement such as "sit down for a minute". Such a specification bears a great deal of insult as the orderly tone becomes louder. Therefore, unable to put up with her frustration and Werner's attempt to control her, Else yells at her only companion in Jerusalem:

ELSE. (Venting all her frustration on him) Let go of me, you pig... I

haven't finished... you're driving away my audience... it's
your fault
no one came.... (2. 5. 2. 406)

Unlike her previous words of compliment, Else threatens the positive face of Werner's in the presence of her audience by means of insults and criticism. She abides by Grice's maxims of manner and quantity by being direct and brief with no heed of the politeness principles.

In the final scene, Else whose words put an end to Werner's attempts to keep up living in Jerusalem, sums up her suffering in the language problem: "this whole city is full of crazy people speaking a foreign language I can't understand..." (2. 6. 1. 411). She dies physically from hunger and coldness and psychologically from humiliation as she is stoned by the children of Jerusalem:

(she runs into some children who taunt her.) No, no. Let me be, children. Let me be... Goddie? Coo-coo... Where are you? I said let me be, you little bastards... (Stones begin to fly at her. She tries to protect herself. Her forehead is bleeding.) Not with the stones of Jerusalem, you bastards, not with the stones of Jerusalem! She tries to flee but cannot walk. She collapses and starts to crawl.)
(2. 6. 1. 412)

There is a contrast between the red colour of Else's dress in the opening scene which signifies life and the red colour of her blood which signifies death. Besides, her actions such as "tries to protect herself", "tries to flee" "collapses" and "starts to crawl" reflect weakness and helplessness. Werner's prophesy about Jerusalem in the opening scene that it is a place of death not life comes true at the end as he suggests: "All that's left in the caves of Jerusalem, *meine Dame*, is crumbling bones. This city is the biggest graveyard in the world" (1. 1. 1. 374).

Else's tragic end reveals the destructive impact of imposing a nationalist policy on the Jews immigrating from different countries. The designation of Hebrew as an official language before World War II was one of the major imposed nationalist projects which led to the

establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine. Hebrew replaced the mother tongue of immigrant Jews and a new culture was intentionally created as prerequisites for building the Jewish state. The link between building the nation and creating a common culture was emphasized by the nationalist politicians in the pre-state Israel such as Ben Gurion who believed that they "cannot develop a normal and comprehensive culture in exile" (Sternhell 48). Therefore, the hundred thousands of immigrants who were brought about in waves to Palestine had to learn Hebrew and dispense with their original language. In sum, early Zionists built their nation on an *artificial* culture which was *created* for political needs: "the contradictions inherent in Zionism created a "culture" of duplicity leading to outright lies and the fabrication of myths resulting from a profound phobia of illegitimacy" (Lutfy 104). Furthermore, the nationalist project which designated Hebrew as an official language is contrasted to the liberal principles adopted by some diaspora Jews who were less concerned with nationalism than with their individual needs. In *Exile in Jerusalem*, Else's suffering is due to her rejection of the nationalist goals of the Zionists' which are not better than that of the Nazis'; both are a "glorification of prejudice and myth" (*Columbia Encyclopedia*), their mainstays were "the doctrines of racial inequality" and their "constant theme was nationalist expansion" (*Columbia Encyclopedia*). Else who resists the translation of her poems into Hebrew wretchedly dies while Werner who tries, in vain, to cope with the Zionists' nationalism, has to face poverty and loneliness. In other words, liberal Jews who did not believe in nationalist goals led a miserable life despite the Balfour Declaration which promised them a national home in Palestine.

Works Cited

- Al-Hasan, Hasan Afif. *Israel or Palestine? Is the Two-State Solution Already Dead? A Political and Military History of the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict*. New York: Algora Publishing, 2010.
- Allan, C. "Jews and Israel: The Politicization of the Holocaust; Examining the Uses and Abuses of Its Legacy." *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*. November 1998, 47.
- Apter, Michael. "Motivational Styles and Positioning Theory." Ed. Harré and Moghaddam.
- Avineri, Sholmo. *The Making of Modern Zionism: Intellectual Origins of the Jewish State*. New York: Basic Book, 1981.
- Aviv, Caryn, and David Shneer. *New Jews: The End of the Jewish Diaspora*. New York & London: New York University Press, 2005.
- Band, Arnold J. *Studies in Modern Jewish Literature*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 2003.
- Birch, Anthony H. *Nationalism and National Integration*. London: Unwin Hyman, 1989.
- Breslauer, S. Daniel. "Language as a Human Right: The Ideology of Eastern European Zionists in the Early Twentieth Century." *Hebrew Studies Journal*. 1995, 55+.
- Chomsky, William. *Hebrew: The Eternal Language*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1957.
- Columbia Encyclopedia*. 6th ed. Columbia University Press, 2014.
- Dinur, Ben Zion. *Israel and the Diaspora*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1969.
- Divine, Donna Robinson. *Exiled in the Homeland: Zionism and the Return to Mandate Palestine*. University of Texas Press: Austin, TX, 2009.
- Edelheit, Abraham J. *The Yishuv in the Shadow of the Holocaust: Zionist Politics and Rescue Aliya, 1933-1939*. Boulder, Co: Westview Press, 1996.

- El- Mesery, Abd El Wahhab. *The Encyclopedia of Jews, Judaism and Zionism*. (Trans.) Doaa Essam. Cairo: Dar Al Shorouk, Vol. 1. 2003.
- Erlich, H. Shmuel. "Letter from Jerusalem." *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*. December 91. 6, (2010): 13294.
- Es-Shamy, Rashad A. *The Israeli Jewish Character and the Aggressive Spirit*. (Trans.) Doaa Essam. Kuwait: Alam El Ma'refa, 1986.
- Farsoun, Samih K, and Christina E Zacharia. *Palestine and the Palestinians*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1997.
- Finkelstein, Norman G. *Image and Reality of the Israel-Palestine Conflict*. London: Verso, 1995.
- Firestone, Lonni. "Ari Roth Heated Dialogue: Theatre J's Honcho Just Wants Keep the Conversation Going – And Nothing Gets People Talking Like Plays from, and about, the Middle East." *American Theatre*. 29. 2. Feb. (2012): 42.
- Fischer-Lichte, Erika. *The Semiotics of Theatre*. Trans. Jeremy Gains, and Doris. L. Jones, Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1983.
- Gasiorowski, Mark, ed. *The Government and Politics of the Middle East and North Africa*. 7th edn. Boulder: Westview Press, 2014.
- Gener, Randy. "4 Positions on Cultural Sanctions: Theatre Practitioners Offer Their Views on a Call to Boycott Israel." *American Theatre*. May-June 25. 5. (2008): 40+
- Goldberg, David. "State of Israel." *The Government and Politics of the Middle East and North Africa*. 7th edn. Mark Gasiorowski ed. Boulder: Westview Press, 2014.
- Goldscheider, Calvin. "Creating a New Society: Immigration, Nation-Building, and Ethnicity in Israel." *Harvard International Review*. Spring 20. 2 (1988): 64.
- Harré, Rom, and Fathali Moghaddam, eds. *The Self and Others: Positioning Individuals and Groups in Personal, Political, and Cultural Contexts*. Westport: Praeger, 2003.
- Hilberg, Paul. *The Destruction of the European Jews*. Vol. 1. New York: Holmes and Meir, 1985.

- Holtgraves, Thomas. *Language as Social Action: Social Psychology and Language Use*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2002.
- Hutchings, William. *Samuel Beckett's Waiting for Godot: A Reference Guide*. London: Westpost CT, 2005.
- Kuzar, Ron. *Hebrew and Zionism: A Discourse of Analytic Cultural Study*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2001.
- Lerner, Motti. Preface. *Exile in Jerusalem*. In *Nine Contemporary Jewish Plays*. Ellen Schiff and Michael Posnik (eds.). Austin: University of Texas Press, 2005.
- Likhovski, Assaf. *Law and Identity in Mandate Palestine*. Chapel Hill, NC University of North Carolina, 2006.
- Lutfy, Ramsis G. "Rosemary Radford Ruether and Herman J. Ruether, The Wrath of Jonah: The Crisis of Religious Nationalism in the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict." *Arab Studies Quarterly* (ASQ). Summer (2003): 104+.
- Marlowe, John. *The State of Pilate: An Account of the Palestinian Mandate*. London: The Cresset Press, 1959.
- McMahan, Jeff. "The Limits of National Partiality" McKim, and McMahan.
- McKim, Robert, and Jeff McMahan, eds. *The Morality of Nationalism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- "Nationalism Is About Division.. the SNP Offer Only a Failed Dream That Never Delivers for the People." *Daily Record*. April 2,(2014), 8.
- Oxford Concise English Dictionary*. 10th ed. Ed. Judy Pearsall. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Pressley, Nelson. "'Exile' Reveals Poetic Stanger in a Strange Land." *The Washington Times*. May 14 (1998): 13.
- Readings on Fascism and National Socialism*. Selected by Members of the Department of Philosophy University of Colorado. Athens: Swallow Press, 1984.
- Sizer, Stephen. *Christian Zionism: Road-map to Armageddon?* Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 2004.
- Spolsky, Bernard, and Robert L. Cooper. *The Languages of Jerusalem*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

Sternhell, Zeev. *The Founding Myths of Israel: Nationalism, Socialism, and the making of the Jewish State*. Trans. David Maisel. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.

Taylor, Donald, Evelyne Bougie, and Julie Caoutte. "Applying Positioning Principles to a Theory of Collective Identity" Harré and Moghaddam.

Wettstein, Howard (ed.) *Diasporas and Exiles: Varieties of Jewish Identity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

- - - . "Coming to Terms with Exile." Wettstein.

Web Publications

Hess, Moses. "Rome and Jerusalem." (1862). *Zionism and Israel- Documents and Texts*. n.p. 2005. Web. 11

March. 2016. <http://www.zionism-israel.com/hdoc/Moses_Hess_Rome_and_Jerusalem.htm

Iseroff, Ami. Introduction. "Rome and Jerusalem." By Moses Hess. http://www.zionismontheworld.org/Moses_Hess_Rome_and_Jerusalem.htm

"What is National Socialism." New Order. 2014. Web. March 12. <<http://www.theneworder.org/national->

