

Rewriting the War? Rewrites, Editing and Versions in Women's Fiction about the 1948 War¹

Yael Levi-Hazan

Abstract

This article addresses three short stories about the 1948 Israeli War of Independence written by three Israeli writers: Yehudit Hendel's "The Sons' Grave" (1950), Amalia Kahana-Carmon's "Beer-Sheba, Capital of the Negev" (1966), and Shulamith Hareven's "Shakespeare" (1970). When they sought to publish their stories each one of these three writers faced refusal on the part of publishers and editors who demanded that they revise their stories. This demand was supposedly justified by poetic considerations but the discussion of the three stories and their different versions as well as the review of their critical reception in this article both prove that the demand for revisions stemmed from ideological considerations topped by a request that the three practically re-write in their stories the war history. Despite the editorial changes they did make, the three authors did not rewrite the war in these stories. On the contrary, the changes they made served to deepen the three's criticism of the war in ways that eluded the editors and critics. More specifically, these three women writers challenged the reception of women's literature in general and women's war literature in particular.

This article discusses three short stories by three central women writers of Modern Hebrew literature: Yehudit Hendel (1921-2014), Amalia Kahana-Carmon (b. 1926) and Shulamith Hareven (1930-2003). The three writers appear side by side in historiographical depictions of Hebrew literature, and their first stories serve as

¹ The article is based on a chapter from my PhD thesis centered on women's writing about the war in Hebrew literature. The work was written in the Hebrew Literature Department at Ben Gurion University of the Negev under the supervision of Prof. Iris Parush.

anchors of the very existence of Hebrew women's fiction² as well as of its blossoming in the 1980s.³ However, the critical acclaim the three enjoy tends to ignore the barriers they had to overcome in their early years of writing. The critics did not consider the similarities between the hurdles the three had to overcome, and never discussed these as representative of the difficulties involved in women's writing about war – a subject and discourse reserved almost exclusively for men.⁴ All three women wrote short stories about the 1948 War and have later re-edited them, publishing them in their new forms.⁵

In the early days of the State of Israel, Hebrew literature was considered to be in service of the national agenda, and literary expressions that were not aligned with the spirit of the times were not embraced. The centrality of the war in Israeli culture, a subject which excludes most women from direct participation, has left women to describe the war from the perspectives of wives and mothers, yet not as part of the

² Pnina Shirav. *Ktiva Lo Tama: Emdat Si'ah Veyitzugey Nashiyut Bitziroteyhen shel Yehudit Hendel, Amalia Kahana-Carmon VeRuth Almog* (Non-Innocent Writing: Discourse, Position and Female Representations in the Works of Yehudit Hendel, Amalia Kahana-Carmon and Ruth Almog). (Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad, 1998), 31.

³ Gershon Shaked. *Hasipporet Ha'ivrit 1880-1980* (Hebrew Fiction 1880-1980). Fifth Volume. (Tel Aviv and Jerusalem: Hakibbutz Hameuchad and Keter, 1998), 340.

⁴ I have intentionally avoided presenting a comparison between women's and men's war literature, as such a presentation could duplicate, even if unintentionally, the hierarchal power relations surrounding the war, which are typical of cultural discourse in general and literary discourse in particular. Under this balance of power, men's writing about war is more legitimate than is that of women, and some would say it is not even possible to discuss women's war literature without presenting a general discussion of war literature, i.e. literature written by men about the war. But then there is the danger that women's literary pieces dealing with war would once again be relegated to a 'secondary place,' as marginal, insignificant and contingent within the corpus of war literature. Therefore, women's war literature has been given center stage in this article, with the aim of presenting it as a worthwhile reading material deserving of in-depth research and scholarly attention, in light of the literary convention and cultural consensus according to which 'war is not women's business.'

⁵ Alongside these three writers, Netiva Ben-Yehuda should also be mentioned, as the Maarachot publishing house refused to publish the three chapters it had commissioned from her, which eventually appeared in her novel, *1948 – Between Calendars* (1981). However, as the original version was never published and there is no documentation of the changes made to it by Ben-Yehuda or others, it was not possible to examine the text as part of this work and therefore it will not be discussed here.

Israeli national experience, which was identified with fighting in the battlefields. It is interesting to note that this imperative of ‘staying behind and on the side’ was also imposed upon women who actively participated in the 1948 War, as was the case with the three writers discussed here: Hendel served in the IDF and participated in the 1948 War, Kahana-Carmon served as a signals operator in the Palmach’s Negev Brigade and participated in various operations during that war, including Operations Yoav (the conquest of Be’er Sheva), Horev and Ovda, and Hareven served as a combat paramedic in the Hagana’s Moria Battalion, and participated in the battles for Jerusalem and the conquest of Katamon.

While the three writers were able to give a first-hand account of the war, they were not considered legitimate witnesses and writers of it, as is evidenced by the changes Hendel and Kahana-Carmon were forced to make to their stories, as well as the changes Hareven made to hers.⁶ In this article I seek to demonstrate that, underlying the demand that poetic changes be made to the language and style of the stories to make them more fitting to the norms of the time, was in fact a national-thematic demand enlisted in service of the hegemony: to rewrite the war. In their stories, the three authors expressed notions about the 1948 War that the publishers, editors and critics had difficulties dealing with; these notions did not befit the spirit of the times nor did they follow the norms of war literature; they included the topics of bereavement, looting and moral criticism of the war. As a result, the three authors

⁶ In Hendel and Kahana-Carmon’s cases the publisher and editor took liberties without consulting or obtaining the authors’ consent. Once the latter were made aware of the changes and following negotiations, the authors edited their stories themselves. In Hareven’s case there is no evidence of editing being forced by the publisher or editor, but as I shall demonstrate, the literary critics expressed dissatisfaction with the story, and it is likely that this reaction affected Hareven when she edited her story.

later did seemingly rewrite the war, but this is a false impression; not only did they leave many traces of the original versions in their edited stories, but the changes they made support the spirit of their original stories and even strengthen it. Thus, the war was neither rewritten nor was criticism of it suspended or delayed. The representations of war as they appeared in the original versions of the stories were intensified, and the anti-war criticism actually deepened.

Yehudit Hendel

“The great rift the war leaves behind has not been sufficiently dealt with”⁷

Hendel began writing around the time of the 1948 War, and her first stories relate to it,⁸ yet she does so by diverting the central plotline from the battlefield to the civilian home front, thus undermining the norms of the collectivist literature of the time. While the latter glorified the enlisted Zionist ‘Us,’ Hendel preferred the personal story over the national one, criticizing the power play between the center and the margins and focusing on the perspectives of ‘others’ at the fringes of society: Holocaust survivors, bereaved parents, widows, the homeless, the girlfriend of a shell shocked ex-soldier and others. Hendel was among the first to write about the trauma of bereavement during the early days of the state.

Yehudit Hendel’s story, "Kever Banim" (Sons’ Grave), from her book *Anashim Aherim Hem* (They Are Different) (1950), does not adhere to the

⁷ Yehudit Hendel, cited in Dalia Karpel, "Koha Shel Bdidut" (The Power of Loneliness: An Interview with Yehudit Hendel). *Haaretz* Haaretz. August 27th, 1999, 72.

⁸ Four of the seven stories in the first collection deal with the 1948 War and three out of the four deal with those injured at battle and the grief of losing loved ones.

conventions of bereavement or bereavement literature. This is not a story written by a grieving mother, nor was it written out of a sense of victimhood or righteousness, but rather out of a state of death within life. The book's first edition sold out quickly, yet the Sifriyat Poalim publishing house refused to issue a second edition. "I was practically boycotted," says Hendel. "They did everything to make it be forgotten. People don't know about this book, not even writers."⁹ Fifty years later, in 2000, a second edition of the book was published by Hakibbutz Hameuchad. The stories were updated and underwent some linguistic editing, yet these are not the primary changes that were made to the story, as I will show later on. The book's second edition was enthusiastically received by the critics, with warm reviews that were half a century overdue.

We do not have the story's original version as it was written by Hendel, nor do we have its second version with the changes made by the publishing house's editor, as these versions never saw print. The story was published only after undergoing a third editing by Hendel, as part of the collection *Anashim Aherim Hem*. Thus, Hendel recounts, "When I received the notes from the editor, I felt sick to my stomach. In my version the father remained broken. The editor had changed the ending so that the son comes home and everyone's happy and all's well that ends well. Of course I didn't agree to it."¹⁰ In the following discussion, I aim to show that despite the change that Hendel was forced to make to the ending of her story in order

⁹ Yehudit Hendel, cited in Yona Hadari-Ramaj, "Yehudit Hendel: Karano Lahem 'Sabonim'" (Yehudit Hendel: We Called Them 'Soaps'). *Iton* 77 102 (1988), 28.

¹⁰ Yehudit Hendel, cited in Yoni Livneh, "Guf Rishon Yahid" (First Person Singular: An Interview with Yehudit Hendel). *Yedioth Aharonoth*, Shiv'a Leilot, April 24th, 2009, 20.

to get it published, its spirit of anti-war criticism remained intact, and that this spirit was not suppressed, but was rather intensified.

At the heart of the story "Kever Banim" stands Yehoshua Dayam, a bereaved father whose twenty-year-old son, Yossi, was killed in the 1948 War, in the battle of Yechiam. The story begins in the early morning hours on the first day after the Shiv'a as the father, a moshavnik, leaves for his job of laying down water pipes. It ends on the evening of that same day, as he returns home. The story reaches its climax with a scene at the cemetery, in which the father kneels at his son's grave as the rain falls. This is a private moment of grief that is not part of a military or national ceremony. The image of the father at his son's grave was the final scene in the original version:

He breathed heavily and kneeled down to the earth, placed his hands on it and it shook like a leaf. A pungent smell arose from it. Thin rain hit the back of his neck and he pressed himself against the mound, which had turned blue with cold, as if it were a living body, and pressed his hands to it as if indeed it were a living body.

Suddenly, with a swift motion he took his coat off and flattened it upon the grave. He then stood up, looking at the forsaken grave covered by a coat.

All night gloom would hover over the grave.

He took a stone and placed it over the coat. Now the wind would not blow it away. Suddenly it occurred to him that Yossi was not buried alone here. Forty-two. A shiver went through him. Intense cold

coursed through his body and he bent down over the coat and held
the stone for a moment.

And the rain kept falling.¹¹

Concealed within the descriptive details of this scene is the perception that the father not only does not accept his son's death, but that he makes his son's body present, works on it and seeks to merge with it.¹² This can be seen through the double likening of the mound of earth to a "living body," the pressing of his hands upon it and the covering of this "body" with a coat. All these actions performed by the father upon the mound of his firstborn son's grave, which is like a "living body", will be repeated at the end of the story towards his youngest son. The scenes present opposites: one contains a dead body, an unprotected grave and a coat, while the other contains a living body, a child's bed and a blanket. This in fact illustrates the way in which the father internalizes his dead son's physicality,¹³ with his hand and body shaking with cold, as the mound, which is metonymic to the son's body, turns blue with cold.

¹¹ Yehudit Hendel, "Kever Banim" (Sons' Grave). In *Anashim Aherim Hem* (They Are Different). (Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad, 2000), 188. "These sentences are the stuff of great prose, written by one who was destined to become one of the great prosaists of Israeli literature," writes Dan Miron, *Hako'ah Hahalash: Itunim Basipporet shel Yehudit Hendel* (The Weak Force: Studies in the Prose of Yehudit Hendel). (Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad, 2002), 18.

¹² The prominence of the father's intimate and direct connection with his son's body, albeit buried and unattainable, is typical of the alternative representation of victims of war in women's poetry about the 1948 War, as noted by Hannan Hever, *Pit'om Mar'e Hamilhama: Le'umiut Ve'alimut Beshirat Shnot Ha'arba'im* (Suddenly, the Sight of War: Nationality and Violence in Hebrew Poetry of the 1940's). (Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad, 2001), 179-212.

¹³ On the topic of internalizing the 'other' in Hendel's work, Tamar Merin writes: "Dealing with the symbiotic aspect of the self-other relationship has accompanied Hendel since her early works; works that present recurring situations of voyeurism, imitation, identification and internalization of absent others whose presence endures within the living." "Ben Haminim Keven-Textualiyut: Dialog Ben-Mini Baproza Hanashit Ha'israelit" (Between the Sexes as Intertextuality: A Dialogue Between the Sexes in Israeli Women's Prose between the 1950s and 1970s), Doctoral Thesis. (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 2010), 67.

Hendel reached a compromise with the editor, which included keeping the image of the coat on the grave at the price of adding a new ending intended to be read as an opposite and parallel ending to the original one. This is the new ending: After the father leaves the cemetery he goes home and undergoes a kind of purification, “The longing within him grew stronger than the pain, and the invisible fabric weaving all of life – linked the blue field with the people walking on the street and the woman approaching with a full basket.”¹⁴ This “invisible fabric,” which links fields – the battlefield, the cemetery and the agricultural field – with people and everyday life, seems to be the acceptance that death is a part of life. This is the essence of the resolution of grief, as described in clinical literature on the subject; that is to say, the ability of the grieving parent to integrate the son’s figure into his or her thoughts and feelings without disrupting his or her normal life.

The story in its edited version ends with the father returning home, entering the nursery where his little boy is sleeping and performing a familiar parental action: “He bent down over the bed and pressed his head to the cold headboard... he bent down once again and fixed the blanket that had fallen.”¹⁵ He does the same for his wife that same morning: “He carefully kneeled over to his wife’s bed and covered her exposed shoulder.”¹⁶ The father is characterized as one who accepts his role as protector of his family and one who seems to have chosen life. Indeed, this is the story’s final chord, which apparently satisfied the editor, as it is a pacified ending. However, I argue that in the fine details of the descriptions in the ‘corrected,’ edited

¹⁴ Yehudit Hendel, "Kever Banim," 189.

¹⁵ Ibid., 190.

¹⁶ Ibid., 181.

section of the text, are two situations which reveal the narrator's relationship to bereavement, and coincide with the image of the coat on the grave, which remains, in my view, the story's climax.

The first situation is the scene in which the father drives home from the cemetery and notices the woman with the basket in her hands and wonders "maybe her son, too."¹⁷ It is no coincidence that a sense of empathy arises within him towards the woman as he wonders whether she is a bereaved mother. His entire being is immersed in the realization that his son has died and is now buried in a cemetery, even as he is on his way home; for him, bereavement is the all-encompassing reality. He presses his forehead against the window as if he is seeking to get closer to that woman. Throughout the entire story, this is the only gesture of physical closeness he performs towards anyone other than his family. This image highlights the notion that empathy and the desire for closeness are blocked by the window pane, the barrier separating the bereft father from society, blocking any possibility for connection. This is evidenced by an earlier scene in the story, at the beginning of the day, when the father is welcomed by the other workers who have not seen him during the Shiva:

From every direction the workers came. One came up to comfort him and silently shook his hand and he nodded to him. The other workers also came up to shake his hand and he nodded to them as well.

¹⁷ Ibid., 189.

A man whose son was killed at the start of winter came up to him and stood beside him, hunched over. Yes, he said, and said nothing more. His shoulder absentmindedly touched his own and the two fathers looked at each other and then looked down again. The man again said, yes, feverishly moving his hand over his own, turned away and walked off.¹⁸

These situations describe the difficulty of bereaved parents in re-entering daily life and society.¹⁹ Among other things, this difficulty is typified in the story by the emergence of the discourse of grief, which contains silences, repetitions and disruptions. The body does the talking and conveys no less than words can in such a situation, even if the body stutters and even if it cannot offer comfort. Later on there is an attempt at dialogue between the father and another man, and the responses of this other man are marked as banal platitudes, such as “[i]t’s always the good ones who fall,”²⁰ as if to emphasize that there is nothing to say and no way to comfort. Or as Hendel herself put it, “The bigger the drama, the more I want to convey it through small utterances. The dialogues are seemingly insignificant. In fact, the central things are never spoken of. They are implied by the offhanded remarks people say... My

¹⁸ Ibid., 184.

¹⁹ Parents who have lost children in war experience difficulty with re-entering daily life and society, and it is certainly possible to assume they are affected by the trauma of secondary victimization, in addition to the initial trauma of losing their child, which is rooted in the social interactions following the loss. See Tamir Gilam, "Histaglut Le'orech Zman shel Horim Schuley Milhama Be'israel" (Adjustment Over Time of Bereaved Parents in Israel). In: *Ovdan Uschol Bahevra Ha'israelit* (Loss and Bereavement in Israeli Society). Ruth Malkinson, Shimshon Rubin and Eliezer Witztum (Eds.), (Jerusalem: Kana, 1993), 227.

²⁰ Yehudit Hendel, "Kever Banim," 189.

dialogues are always broken dialogues. What doesn't get said is more significant than what does."²¹

The second situation, in which the father stands beside his son's bed, fixes the blanket that had fallen and warms himself with his son's warmth, only lasts a "moment", no more: "he hid his cold hands in it [the blanket] for a moment."²² In the cemetery on the other hand, he does not go straight to the grave: "He did not go over to the grave, but paced back and forth, back and forth in the cemetery, his head facing the ground as if it were a heavy square. The wind whistled Haaaiiii raged Haaaaiiii and the storm rampaged over the entire plain. He paced back and forth, back and forth, tossing himself with the wind."²³ It is only when the rain starts falling that he approaches the grave. Here there is no source of heat with which he can warm himself; he is the one who needs to supply the heat – first with his hand and then with his coat:

He breathed heavily and kneeled down to the earth, placed his hands on it and it shook like a leaf. A pungent smell arose from it. Thin rain hit the back of his neck and he pressed himself against the mound, which had turned blue with cold, as if it were a living body, and pressed his hands to it as if it were a living body.

²¹ Yehudit Hendel, cited in Ya'acov Besser, "Leha'avir Dramot Gdolot Derech Zaviot Ktanot" (Conveying Big Dramas through Small Angles). *Davar Rishon*, May 10th, 1996, 13.

²² Yehudit Hendel, "Kever Banim," 190.

²³ *Ibid.*, 188.

Suddenly, with a swift motion he took his coat off and flattened it upon the grave.²⁴

A graphic break in the text immediately follows, further accentuating the cemetery scene, and a new section begins. The text does not state how long the visit to the cemetery lasts, but it is certainly longer than a moment, in light of the repetitive description of his pacing back and forth. Moreover, it seems this is not his last visit but the start of the father's private ritual at his son's grave. Hence, ending the story with the father's care for his youngest son does not dull the intensity of his grief and strong connection to his fallen son, and his desire to join him in death. Here it is worth mentioning the Jewish expression 'Beit Hachaim' – the House of the Living – a euphemism for describing a cemetery. In the context of this story, this expression beautifully illustrates that the cemetery is where those who are close to the dead feel alive, as they commune with their dead loved ones.

Amalia Kahana-Carmon

"Every time I publish a new book, people approach it like generals who approach every new war with the same tools they forged for themselves in the previous war. And if these tools don't happen to work here they complain that this war is wrong."²⁵

Kahana-Carmon wrote her first story, "Hacherev Hamit'hapechet" (At Knife-Point) in 1954, and it was published by Masa in 1956. However it was only a decade later that she received critical acclaim. During the years 1961-1964 she searched in

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Amalia Kahana-Carmon, cited in Ya'acov Besser, "Amalia Kahana-Carmon: Lema'ase Hadvarim Nichravim Mea'zvam" (Amalia Kahana-Carmon: In Fact Things Write Themselves). *Al HaMishmar*, September 5th, 1994, 29

vain for a publisher for her first collection of short stories. In 1964 Sifriyat Poalim became interested in publishing the collection, but it was only in 1966 that it was actually published under the title *Bekfifa Achat* (Under One Roof), which included the story "Hacherev Hamit'hapechet" in its edited version, under the title "Be'er Sheva Birat Hanegev" (Be'er Sheva, Capital of the Negev). The collection was published after a drawn out process of judicial arbitration due to the editing the manuscript had undergone contrary to the author's expressed wishes.²⁶

The story is based on Kahana-Carmon's military service as a signals operator in the Palmach's Negev Brigade during the days of Operation Yoav – the conquest of Be'er Sheva. The story is mostly relayed in the third person, yet attached to the consciousness of Ilana, the main character.²⁷ In certain places the narrator's voice shifts into the first person, and this is significant at a time when the collective 'We' was extremely dominant, both as a literary norm and as a value of society. During the war Ilana undergoes two formative experiences relating to sexuality and death, following her encounter with Noah, the soldier who welcomes her upon her arrival to the Negev. Alongside this affair, she experiences the moral and existential difficulties brought on by the war. The story's ending flashes forward in time to Ilana's meeting with the Palmachniks who served with her.

When Ilana arrives in Be'er Sheva at the height of the battle over the city, Noah welcomes her and she is drawn to him and longs to feel the touch of his body.

²⁶ Lily Ratok. *Amalia Kahana-Carmon – Monographia* (Amalia Kahana-Carmon – A Monograph). (Tel Aviv: Sifriyat Poalim, 1986), 207.

²⁷ "In my work, even when it's supposedly not in the first person, it's also in the first person. Because the point of departure is always subjective. The point of departure is always that of the experiencing self," Kahana-Carmon said in an interview with Menachem Perry. "'I'm in exile. I've been in exile for many days,' but not in the geographical sense." *Iton 77* (1986), 82-83.

And in the story's original version: "Good god! – thought Ilana, and did not know what she was thinking about. What was this lump pressing and moving inside her? Her body, her obedient, tolerant body, was suddenly at the mercy of this stranger, dependent on him and his good graces. And none of it made sense. But her body wept and wept, a fool of a body, longing for attention, longing for meaning and magic."²⁸ Ratok argues that the author omitted this quote from the later version as it touched upon a topic that was taboo in her fiction at the time and was not typical of the vague and implied poetics Kahana-Carmon employed when describing sexuality in her works.²⁹ However, in my opinion, this omission emphasizes the power of Noah's act and its deviation from the boundaries of good taste, and it all serves as criticism of the disintegration of moral values that occurs during war. I believe the author preferred to highlight this aspect over Ilana's inner monologue, which deals with her desire for Noah.

Hints of Noah's animalism are interwoven throughout the story: "And here by the stable, Noah. Standing at the water trough and washing his face in the tap water"³⁰ and "hands too long, like a monkey's hands."³¹ Others also tend to associate Noah with negative events, for example: "It's a bad sign when Noah comes to the brigade headquarters."³² Thus, it appears the story asks us to interpret the sexual relationship it depicts as the satisfaction of sexual urges during wartime, utterly devoid of

²⁸ Amalia Kahana-Carmon. "Hacherev Hamit'hapechet" (At Knife-Point). In *Hasipporet Ha'israelit Bishnot Hashishim: Amalia Kahana-Carmon* (Israeli Fiction in the 1960s: Amalia Kahana-Carmon), Unit 9. (Tel Aviv: The Open University, 1983 [1956]), 105.

²⁹ Lily Ratok, *Amalia Kahana-Carmon – Monographia*, 20-21.

³⁰ Amalia Kahana-Carmon, "Be'er Sheva, Birat Hanegev" (Be'er Sheva, Capital of the Negev). In *Bekfifa Achat* (Under One Roof). (Tel Aviv: Sifriyat Poalim, 1966), 55.

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² *Ibid.*

romance. The sexual situation between Ilana and Noah is described in a very concentrated and minimal way, and there is an omission – the actual event is not described: “Ilana saw the flash of a row of bright teeth in the darkness of the tent and then, like a bird of prey, he plunged his head into the cleavage of her thin khaki shirt.”³³ The narrator does not continue to describe the situation; immediately following it is a graphic break in the text, which then moves on to another section, a description of the landscape. This omission is not coincidental. It serves to signify that there are situations that are confusing in terms of the question of consent, and not as was claimed in a critique in favor of the author, that “she does not delve deep in her writing where things are obvious.”³⁴ If indeed things were so obvious, interpretive readings would have realized and drawn focus to the obvious power relations arising from the description.

The critics categorically avoided referring to the sexual interaction between Ilana and Noah on their one night together as violent, and perhaps even as containing an element of coercion.³⁵ They ignored the animalistic description of the situation and endowed it with romantic meaning, choosing euphemisms to describe the relationship between the two: “the refined relationship,”³⁶ “the erotic encounter,”³⁷ Ilana’s “giving

³³ Ibid., 54.

³⁴ Yosef Oren. "Simhat Pgisha In Hasipur Hakazar: Amalia Kahana-Carman, 'Bekfifa Achat' (The Happiness of Meeting with the Short Story: Amalia Kahana-Carman, 'Under One Roof'). *Ha'uma* 20 (1967), 630. Oren praises Kahana-Carmon for her “self-discipline and mature writing” (ibid.) in describing the situation, as she did not, as he put it, “get sucked into” another description where it was unnecessary.

³⁵ The only one who did address this, even if by means of a general statement which does not reveal much, was Rivka Feldhay: “and between Noah and Ilana was a battle of the sexes.” "Drash Nashi" (A Feminine Midrash), *Teoria Ubikoret* 2 (1992), 86.

³⁶ Lily Ratok, *Amalia Kahana-Carmon – Monographia*, 20.

³⁷ Yosef Oren, "Simhat Pgisha In Hasipur Hakazar: Amalia Kahana-Carman, 'Bekfifa Achat'", 630.

of herself³⁸ to Noah and “their intense relationship, beyond what is described in the story, as some refer to Noah as ‘Ilana’s man.’”³⁹ But that night branded its impression on Ilana’s soul, and not because of the pleasure it afforded: “stroking the cat with her head bowed down, as if she were guilty. Noah put his hand out and also began to smoothen the cat’s fur. Ilana shuddered. She was as one who was bound.”⁴⁰ In the story’s original version, the phrase “as one who was stung”⁴¹ appeared. The change into “bound” seems to emphasize the coercion involved in the previous interaction between Noah and Ilana, now repeated and resonating as if written metonymically through the joint stroking of the cat. This night left its mark on Noah, too: “Among all the people, a mark shone on his forehead, like the Mark of Cain, like a frontlet between his eyes.”⁴² Had this been a lovers’ night of romance and pleasure, Ilana would not have seen it as the mark of a wrongdoing, of an awful deed.⁴³

Ilana’s experiences in the war undermine the binary dichotomy of ‘Us’ and ‘Them,’ traditionally characteristic of war stories. Thus, in the story: “The column crossed the country’s border. Aircrafts appeared. Ours? Theirs?”⁴⁴ Later on the ‘natural’ order seems to be restored when Ilana is told that “those same airplanes took

³⁸ Hannah Hartzig. "Amalia Kahana-Carmon." In *Hasipporet Ha'israelit Bishnot Hashishim*, 3.

³⁹ Yair Mazor, "Hamakom Bo Hasiporet Meshika Lashira: Shalosh Kriot Shen Ahat Besipurei Amalia Kahana-Carman, Ben-Ner and Oz" (Where Fiction Touches Poetry: Three Readings That Are One in the Stories of Kahana-Carmon, Ben-Ner and Oz), *Moznaim* Nun-Vav (1983), 46.

⁴⁰ Amalia Kahana-Carmon, "Be'er Sheva, Birat Hanegev," 56. Hartzig argues that Ilana apparently feels guilty for having given herself to Noah, and this guilt leads to shame, an inability to see things more simply or objectively and feelings that are unclear to Ilana and are articulated by the narrator ("Amalia Kahana-Carmon," 8). However, Hartzig does not follow this argument a step further and ask why Ilana felt “bound.”

⁴¹ Amalia Kahana-Carmon, "Hacherev Hamit'hapechet," 106.

⁴² Amalia Kahana-Carmon, "Be'er Sheva, Birat Hanegev," 56.

⁴³ Hartzig interprets the Mark of Cain on Noah’s forehead as his individuation as a deviant man condemned by those around him, and not that he is perceived that way by the protagonist ("Amalia Kahana-Carmon," 7). Again, the critique overlooks the possible violence in the relationship between Ilana and Noah and the latter’s signification as such following the act he committed towards her.

⁴⁴ Amalia Kahana-Carmon, "Be'er Sheva, Birat Hanegev," 57.

down our patrol aircraft. They shot burst of gunfire. The pilot was killed. Noah was killed with him,”⁴⁵ meaning the identity of the aircrafts and the soldiers is clear. However immediately after that Ilana goes back and experiences that same undermining of dichotomies. “The jeep zoomed across the black earth in the foreign land. Explosions momentarily lit up the night, renewed each time. Invisible aircrafts circled. Ours? Theirs?”⁴⁶ Throughout the entire story, the experience of war remains jolting and ambiguous, unable to bring the chaos occurring within it to some normalizing order.

The war continues to make its impressions even years later. In the story’s second version a frame narrative appears, in which Ilana, a married woman with a son, returns to Be’er Sheva, sits down at a restaurant and recalls the events of the war: “Ilana’s heart wrapped itself around her. She wanted to be in Tel Aviv, with her husband and child.”⁴⁷ The description of the people in the restaurant echoes the carnivalesque confusion and role reversal brought on by war: “Here there’s a big mirror along the restaurant. A merry bunch multiplied in it. The girls wearing the men’s hats with a wink. At a faraway table a woman is breastfeeding a big boy. Her husband pacing above her is skinny, a youth. In the bright light it all looks like portraits in the dark.”⁴⁸

Ratok argues that it is no coincidence that Kahana-Carmon, alongside many female Palmach fighters, accepts the edict and necessity of highlighting traditional femininity: being a wife and mother. This is because her image as a woman who

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 52.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 59.

participated in the war endangers her femininity and poses a threat to the male-dominated society. Only through marriage and motherhood can this threat be controlled.⁴⁹ Feldhay also sees Ilana's adult life as a compromise and concession: "she gave up the phallus in return for a husband and child, settled in Tel Aviv and forgot about Noah."⁵⁰

However, it is more interesting to examine how the acceptance of this edict changed in the edited story: Were any scenes omitted? Were the critical centers – Ilana and Noah's relationship, and her experiences of the war – absent from the edited story? The answers are no. Therefore it is possible to see the acceptance of the gender edict as Kahana-Carmon's sophisticated way of satisfying the critics without giving up the themes that were important to her. It may even be a covert type of criticism or sophisticated use of the "master's tools"⁵¹ in order to dismantle his house without him being aware of it. The duplication of the violence from the battlefield to Noah and Ilana's relationship heightens the narrator's criticism of the war and the severity of the moral degradation it leads to. In addition, the lyrical monologue, or comment, the sentence that succinctly summarizes the narrator's stance and feelings towards the war, remains unchanged in both versions of the story: "The war is a bad thing to be

⁴⁹ Lily Ratok. "Nashim Bemilhemet Ha'atzma'ut: Mitos Vezikaron" (Women in the War of Independence: Myth and Memory), *Sadan* Vol. 5. Hannah Naveh and Oded Menda-Levy (Eds.). (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 2002), 293. See Yigal Alon's words about accepting women into the Palmach: "A woman's natural limitations cannot be ignored, and when we come to train her and place her in different roles within the unit, let us not forget these soldiers' mission of motherhood." Yigal Alon. *Maarachot Hapalmach: Megamot Umaas* (The Wars of the Palmach, Trends and Actions). (Tel Aviv, Hakibbutz Hameuchad, 1965), 35-36.

⁵⁰ Rivka Feldhay, "Drash Nashi," 86.

⁵¹ Inspired by Audre Lorde: "the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house," translated to Hebrew by Edna Gorni. *Lilmod Feminism: Mikra'a* (Learning Feminism: A Reader). Dalit Baum, Dliila Amir, Ronna Brayer-Garb, Yaffa Berlovitz, Deborah Greniman, Sharon Halevi, Dina Haruvi and Sylvia Fogiel-Bijaoui, (Eds.). (Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad, 2006), 192.

tortured by.”⁵² It took a considerable amount of courage to make such a declaration in the 1950s,⁵³ writes Ratok. I wish to add that it took a considerable amount of courage to edit the story and insist on keeping this sentence also in the 1960s, especially when spoken by a Palmachnik woman.

Shulamith Hareven

“Because in war it’s not the papers that are fighting, but human beings, and they are scared, terrified, at times hungry, at times filled with vengeance, and often they make grave errors”⁵⁴

Hareven’s story which will be discussed here was published in three versions throughout her life. The first version was published under the title "Echad Be'mai Acher" (A Different First of May) in the daily newspaper *Al HaMishmar* at the end of April, 1960. The second version was published under the title "Shakespeare" and appeared in Hareven’s second collection of stories, *Reshut Netuna* (Permission Granted) (1970) and the third version appeared in her last book, which was published about a year before she died, titled *Yamim Rabim, Autobiographia* (Many Days, An Autobiography) (2002). It seems the time of publication for each of the various versions was not coincidental, and attests to the story being exemplary of Hareven’s path, and of the literary and personal transformations she underwent. Throughout the years of her work as both an author and a publicist, Hareven progressively leaned away from militarism, and her national-political views, while remaining Zionist,

⁵² Amalia Kahana-Carmon, "Hacherev Hamit'hapechet," 107; *Bekfifa Achat*, 57.

⁵³ Lily Ratok, "Nashim Bemilhemet Ha'atzma'ut: Mitos Vezikaron," 292.

⁵⁴ Shulamith Hareven, *Yamim Rabim: Autobiographia* (Many Days: An Autobiography). (Tel Aviv: Babel, 2002), 136.

gravitated further and further to the left, in favor of ending the occupation and advocating co-existence between Israelis and Palestinians.

Hareven's story is based on her experiences as a combat paramedic in the Hagana during the conquest of the Katamon neighborhood in Jerusalem in the 1948 War. As the neighborhood was being conquered, soldiers – Hareven among them – entered one of the villas belonging to an Arab family who had fled and left all their belongings behind. The soldiers looted and plundered the house, and Hareven came across a volume of Shakespeare's sonnets in the son's room, which she took with her. Here, as in the case of the later version of Kahana-Carmon's "Be'er Sheva, Birat Hanegev," a frame story appears, in which the adult narrator who now has a family of her own meets the villa's owner 21 years later, following Israel's conquest of East Jerusalem in 1967. However the encounter does not go well; the narrator is met with resistance, turns in her tracks and walks away.

The story's first version is a type of reportage⁵⁵ of the events surrounding the conquest of Katamon, events in which the author herself participated. Writing in this genre enabled Hareven to voice the experience of a woman who 'was there' and can attest to what took place in the first person. Thus, she undermines the norms of the genre, as most reportages of the war are authored by men, since they are the ones who typically fight in the battlefield. Moreover, the reportage is considered a genre at the margins of canonical literature, yet around the 1948 War this genre became

⁵⁵ Yael Balaban writes that the text seems to be a "documentary account" (Yael Balaban, *Kolot Rabim: Kri'a Basipporet shel Shulamith Hareven* [Many Voices: Reading Shulamith Hareven's Fiction], Doctoral Thesis. [Be'er Sheva: Ben Gurion University of the Negev, 2013], 116). However, in my opinion, the text's genre should be accurately classified as a 'reportage.' This is especially important in light of the norms of the genre of the reportage as they were shaped around 1948, and in light of Hareven's deviation from them.

prominent among well-known authors and poets, such as Nathan Alterman, Haim Gouri, Shlomo Tanai, Moshe Shamir, Zrubavel Gilad and others, as well as among journalists such as Uri Avnery and Amos Elon.⁵⁶ Writing in the reportage genre enabled Hareven to stand against the ‘masters of war’ and against the readers, and to present in a newspaper a difficult and disturbing story, which did not receive the attention it deserved. However, perhaps it is precisely because of this that such a story did in fact get published in a newspaper, get adapted into a short story a decade later, appear in print in a collection of stories and finally find its place within Hareven’s autobiographical book summarizing her life’s work. By using the reportage genre Hareven managed to relay content dealing with the evils of war, which was mostly absent from reportages by male writers.⁵⁷

It is generally possible to argue that the events described in the story’s first version ("Echad Be'mai Acher,"1960) became more extreme in its second version ("Shakespeare," 1970). It seems the years that had passed and the Six Day War heightened the author’s critical perspective. The soldiers’ initial actions in the conquered space are those of appropriation and theft.⁵⁸ Thus, in the first version: “They set the tables in the evening in the courtyard of the monastery... and the meal

⁵⁶ For an expanded discussion of poets as ‘reporters’ see Hannan Hever, *Pit'om Mar'e Hamilhama*, 157-162.

⁵⁷ The following was written in the introduction to a book of reportages written around 1948: “concealing the suffering, the sweat and the blood while presenting the clarity of battle, dedication and strength of founders.” "Beikvot Lohamim: Mivhar Reportagim Meet Sophrei Tzva Hahagana Virshimot Medivrei Yeshuvim bama'aracha" (Following the Fighters: A Selection of Reportages by Israeli Defense Writers and Impressions from the Days of Settlements in Battle). (Merchavia: Sifriyat Poalim, Hakibbutz Ha'artzi Hashomer Hatsa'ir, 1949), 1.

⁵⁸ In his article, "Arachim Tzvai'im Umusar Lehima Bapalmach" (Military Values and Combat Morality in the Palmach), Motti Shalem writes: “The most prominent characteristic of behavior deviating from the required norms was the ‘pilfering’ phenomenon.” *Palmach: Shtei Shibolim Veherev* (Palmach: Sheaves and Sword). Yechiam Weitz (Ed.). (Tel Aviv: Ministry of Defense, 2000), 262.

was excellent. Someone had found an old music-machine, one that played music with a perforated cylinder, and it had an Arab song on it. One of the platoon commanders brought some pigeons from a coop he had found. We devoured them.”⁵⁹ Later on, a type of justification appears: “We were dirt poor, we were tired, we were hungry and wolfish; and at our feet was the wealthiest neighborhood in Jerusalem, the bowels of its wardrobes and drawers displayed in front of our eyes.”⁶⁰ In the story’s second and third version these actions are described in greater detail, the descriptions are more active and the tone is more critical: “That morning we pounced on the abandoned, very affluent neighborhood, like a pack of young and hungry wolves... We found beds of onions and parsley. We ripped the onions out of the earth and ate... We were like children, and the adults had forfeited everything to us, left us the house to do with as we please. We opened fridges and cupboards. We gorged ourselves.”⁶¹

The story’s various versions reveal a trend towards more elaborated descriptions of the looting and vandalizing of the Arab villa by the soldiers who had taken it over. In the story’s first version it was written: “Moustaches were drawn on all the statues in all the gardens,”⁶² while in the second version the description was expanded to include the narrator’s own actions: “Menashe could not tolerate, so he said, the face of the woman-statue on the stairs, between the two stories of the house, and drew a moustache on it. I joined him and added some anatomical details.”⁶³

⁵⁹Shulamith Hareven. "Echad Be'mai Acher" (A Different First of May). *Al HaMishmar*, April 29th, 1960, 2.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ Shulamith Hareven. "Shakespeare." In *Reshut Netuna* (Permission Granted). (Tel Aviv: Massada, 1970), 68-69.

⁶² Shulamith Hareven, "Echad Be'mai Acher," 3.

⁶³ Shulamith Hareven, "Shakespeare," 70.

Hareven presents herself as ‘one of the guys’ and as one who is capable of being “more of a man than any man,”⁶⁴ writes Berlovitz, surely referring to this scene as well, in which the narrator is even more extreme in her sexist behavior than the man is.

However, it is interesting to note that elsewhere in the story there is an opposite example, in which the narrator deliberately does not participate in a scene which ridicules women. In the first version: “We didn’t take much other than mementos or shoes,”⁶⁵ without any specification. In the second version this act is detailed and includes an explanation and additional ridiculing of the lady of the manor: “Then someone had the idea of swapping shoes. All of our shoes were very worn out... Moshe’s feet were small and only the embroidered sandals of Madam Bishara fitted him, and he wore them. Reuven wore high-heels and they both bowed to each other, with much pomp and grandeur.”⁶⁶ In the third version the narrator is approached and asked if she would like Madam Bishara’s sandals, and in response, “I grimaced and walked away from there.”⁶⁷ In the later version the author attests to her reservations about certain acts and her attempt to maintain her individuality even within the Palmachnik ‘Us,’ which considered pilfering and ‘swiping’ to be a common and acceptable form of behavior. Out of the juxtaposition of these two scenes – the narrator's defacement of the statue and her refusal to take the sandals –

⁶⁴ Yaffa Berlovitz. "Behipus Ahar Ha'atzmi-Yelidi: Maft'e'ah Le'iyun Bitzirata shel Shulamith Hareven" (In Search of the Native-Self: A Legend for Approaching Shulamith Hareven's Works). *Iyunim Betkumat Israel* 21 (2011), 93.

⁶⁵ Shulamith Hareven, "Echad Be'mai Acher," 3.

⁶⁶ Shulamith Hareven, "Shakespeare," 70.

⁶⁷ Shulamith Hareven, *Yamim Rabim*, 81.

emerges a complex picture that includes gender identification on the one hand, and serving as an accomplice to the pillaging on the other.

In the story's first version the banishing and fleeing of the Arabs on the night before the conquest of the Katamon neighborhood are initially described in an impersonal mode, as if no one was performing the banishment and no one was being banished, as if it were a passive act of cleansing and purification: "The neighborhood had not yet been completely purified."⁶⁸ However, later on it becomes clear that those who were banished not only had an identity, but that the narrator also knew them, and in those pages the act of fleeing is described in more personal and active terms: "the citizens – among them families we knew, our friends, our acquaintances, our five-o'clock-tea-drinking companions – fled."⁶⁹ The narrator is greatly troubled by the evacuation of the neighborhood: "Now the streets were desolate... Katamon was a paradise abandoned... we wandered through the empty Katamon. It was abandoned. It was defeated."⁷⁰ In the story's last version, the act of leaving is described by the narrator with empathy and sorrow for what will return no more: "The night before it was deserted by the residents with that same spasm of panic, the spasm of an inevitable mistake, which paralyzed and then froze the face of the city for many years to come."⁷¹ As the story is told in retrospect, 21 years after the events had taken

⁶⁸ Shulamith Hareven, "Echad Be'mai Acher," 3. In her last interview Hareven condemned this 'language laundering,' saying: "When you're talking about people, you can't use terms like 'elimination' or 'purification'" (cited in Shiri Lev-Ari, "Eshet Yamim Rabim" [A Woman of Many Days] [Eulogy to Shulamith Hareven]. *Haaretz* Galleria, November 27th, 2003).

⁶⁹ Shulamith Hareven, "Echad Be'mai Acher," 3.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Shulamith Hareven, "Shakespeare," 68.

place, the narrator can report the outcome of that fleeing, adding another layer to the original story.

One of the prominent changes between the versions is the identity of the main character, the narrator. In the first version the narrator speaks in the first person and is identified as a woman and as Hareven herself. In the second version the narrator is a man, a soldier named Uri⁷² and in the third version the narrator is once again a woman speaking in the first person. Why did Hareven change the personal pronouns in the different versions? One could argue that Hareven used the perspective of a male character to mark her acceptance of the edict according to which war experiences are to be described through the consciousness and experiences of a man. It is possible that Hareven was afraid of being identified with the story's protagonist and the act he commits due to her biographical proximity to the events described, and therefore chose to employ a distancing device, as if those events pertained to another character. However, she eventually returned to the first person, identifying herself with the story's protagonist: "When people live through a historical period and participate in the activity and work of the time, whether to a large or small extent, the difference becomes blurred, and at different points in time the 'I' and the 'We' become identical," Hareven wrote in the introduction to her book, *Many Days, An Autobiography*, adding, "and only after many days, the person returns to his own

⁷² Yaffa Berlovitz shows that from her early days as a writer Hareven tended to talk about herself through monologues of the living-dead brother, for example, in "My Brother's Poem" and "My Brother's Prayer," from the poem "My Brother and the Making of Tents," which was published in Hareven's first book of poems, *Poems from the Street Corner*, pp. 143-144 (Yaffa Berlovitz, "Behipus Ahar Ha'atzmi-Yelidi," 100).

skin, and then, maybe, is also able to give an account of certain events, as one who can claim ‘I was there.’”⁷³

It is possible to argue that finding the volume of Shakespeare’s sonnets in the house of an Arab is a reminder of the fact that cultural products can be universal and all-encompassing, blurring and even cancelling out inter-cultural differences such as Jewish/Arab, conqueror/conquered.⁷⁴ However, cultural products, while they may be relatively universal, raise questions pertaining to property and ownership, and therefore also pertaining to their uses. Objects have a history and meaning that is entwined with those of the people who used and loved them, and therefore “objects and people create a type of integrated unit and cannot be separated from each other without pain.”⁷⁵ And indeed, the volume of Shakespeare’s sonnets, more than serving as a status symbol of education and social class that enables common ground between Arabs and Jews, is an object bearing the history of both peoples, and this is not a symmetrical history but one of separation rather than sharing.

“To this day I can’t walk down the street and get a whiff of that perfume without seeing in front of my eyes that strange candlelit night with its flood of vermouth, the mountains of pillows and duvets, the smell of lilies and that perfume we all smelled of,”⁷⁶ Hareven writes in the story’s first version. And indeed, this story refused to leave her and even seemed to force itself upon her. Perhaps this is why Hareven chose to edit it and include it in her important collection of stories, and then

⁷³ Shulamith Hareven, *Yamim Rabim*, 3-4.

⁷⁴ As put forth by Yael Balaban, *Kolot Rabim*, 116.

⁷⁵ Lydia Flem, *How I Emptied My Parents’ House*. Hebrew Translation: Keren Shemesh. (Tel Aviv: Resling, 2007 [2004]).

⁷⁶ Shulamith Hareven, "Echad Be'mai Acher," 3.

later even in her autobiographical collection, out of a desire not to make it disappear, but on the contrary, to allow it to be read over the years by critical eyes. This may be especially true in light of the reviews the story had received, reviews which reflected a dichotomous and biased worldview far removed from the complexity Hareven attempted to outline in her story: “The protagonist in the story ‘Shakespeare’ gets a taste of disappointment and failure: after the Six Day War he wishes to return a book by Shakespeare to the Arab in whose abandoned house in Jerusalem he found it during the War of Independence. But the bitter Arab does not understand this gesture coming from the sensitive Jew and voices harsh claims about everything he had lost in the war, everything that had been taken from him. And the well-intentioned Jew turns in his tracks and walks away, embarrassed and troubled.”⁷⁷

One critic even argued that there was no correlation between the investment in character specification and descriptions and the ending and outcome of the story, and that it would have been preferable for Hareven not to include the story in her collection.⁷⁸ This unsatisfying outcome, to which the critic presumably referred, is an ending with no closure, an ending that leaves the reader with questions that hang in the air: Can there be a resolution? And what is the resolution? However, it seems that this was precisely the author’s intention, and that more than a lack of artistic success in writing a proper ending, there is a thick allusion to the lack of success of both nations in terms of the relationship between the two peoples.

⁷⁷ Mordechai Avishai. "Hayei Mashber Besipureha Shel Shulamith Hareven" (A Life of Crisis in Hareven’s Stories). *Ma’ariv*, May 22nd, 1970, 31.

⁷⁸ Aviv Ekroni. "Reshut Netuna" (Permission Granted). *Al HaMishmar* June 19th, 1970, 7.

Later critics were also not pleased with the story's ending. When Yaffa Berlovitz briefly relays the story's plot and arrives at its ending, she writes: "the rest of the story is irrelevant to the matter at hand."⁷⁹ It is unclear why Berlovitz does not present the ending, as it is an integral part of presenting the story, even when paraphrasing it. The story's ending presents themes that are difficult to deal with: the conquest, the pillage, the banishment and the ongoing conflict; it seems that Berlovitz, like other critics, preferred not to deal with these issues or with their implications, not just in terms of the past events described but also in terms of our own present reality.

"I think of my political involvement as well as my military service as a citizen,"⁸⁰ Hareven says of herself, and this is an important statement also in regards to Hendel and Kahana-Carmon, especially in light of their ability to describe 'unflattering' events about the war and their participation and actions in it, when they are no longer obligated to the military institution. In this article I sought to show how editing changes made to the three authors' stories about the 1948 War supported their stance towards the war and did not deviate from it, while the demand to rewrite their stories was in fact a demand to rewrite the war according to the hegemonic national ideology. Of course this demand was not explicit, yet it contained a concealed statement. By seemingly acquiescing to this demand, the three writers managed to 'slip under the radar' of the publishers, the editors and the critics, and turn "the song

⁷⁹ Yaffa Berlovitz, "Behipus Ahar Ha'atzmi-Yelidi," 94.

⁸⁰ Henry Mietkiewicz. "More to Israeli Life than Politics." *The Toronto Star* October 16th, 1992, C11.

of the bats,”⁸¹ which cannot be fully heard by the critics into a powerful instrument. This song continues to echo throughout our homeland to this day, due to the unfortunate fact that the wars have not yet ended – neither the war between the two peoples on the battlefield, nor the war between the sexes in the literary field.

⁸¹ In the 1980s, Kahana-Carmon published five essays about women’s literature in Hebrew, the last of which was titled "Shirat Ha'atalefim Bime'ufam" (The Singing of the Bats in Flight) (*Moznaim Samech-Dalet* 3-4 [1989], 3-7). In this essay she presents in critical light the standards of Hebrew fiction, dominated by the masculine model, which renders the feminine experience minor and marginal, “the singing of the bats” which cannot be heard by male writers.