Chapter II

Bernard Malamud
Chapter II

Bernard Malamud

Bernard Malamud was born and raised in Brooklyn, New York, the son of Russian-Jewish immigrants. His mother died when he was 14 years old, and he and his younger brother were raised by their father, who worked long hours running a small grocery. Malamud has said, “Their world taught me their values….the welfare of human beings, what makes a man function as a man. Theirs was a person-centered world, one that regarded the qualities of people.”

Throughout Malamud’s writing there is a clear humanistic orientation, a concern not with worldly success but with more abstract human values- love in particular. He highly admires selflessness and, in particular, the process of inner change and growth that can lead an individual from a limited perspective of total concern with self to one that sees the importance of that self as part of the human condition. Frequently, failure in the world in terms of acceptance and material success is seen as the prerequisite for inner, moral success. He probably felt that the American ideal of material achievement was inadequate, that it did not create moral individuals.
Malamud has usually been referred to as a Jewish-American writer. It is not a term he relished. He said, “I’m an American, I’m a Jew, and I write for all men..... I write about Jews, why I write about Jews because they set my imagination going... sometimes I make characters Jewish because I think I will understand them better as people, not because I am out to prove anything...” The basic reason for the resistance of Malamud and other authors (Bellow, Roth) to being classified in this way has to do with their feeling that they are being underrated as writers concerned with the human condition when they are assumed to be interested in only a subgroup of humanity. Of course these writers are certainly concerned with more than just one narrow group of people. Malamud’s work shows, and he has stated categorically, that his concern is with humanity and not with Jews alone: “I handle the Jew as a symbol of the tragic experience of man existentially. I try to see the Jew as universal man. Every man is Jew though he may not know it. The Jewish drama is a ....symbol of the fight for existence in the highest possible human terms. Jewish history is god’s gift of drama.” Malamud’s comment that “Every man is a Jew....” has led to a great amount of discussion concerning the underlying meanings in his fiction. He has seen his statement as “indicating how history, sooner or later, treats all men” Thus the Jews can be seen as exemplars of the injustices that eventually affect all human beings. Malamud presents them as everyman in his
attempt to cope with the pressures, human demands, and responsibilities of life. He also sees suffering as something that all humans must face; what they do with it determines the persons they become.

One critic is of the opinion that Malamud’s “definition of Jewishness includes such universal human virtues as moral obligation to one’s fellow man and the community; acceptance of responsibility; being involved in the suffering of others; and learning from one’s own suffering.” His attitude towards Jews and humanity can be briefly explained as that, “the Jew is humanity under the twin aspects of suffering and moral aspiration. Therefore any man who suffers greatly and also longs to be better than he is can be called a Jew.”

Malamud was greatly affected by World War II. He was not particularly concerned about his Jewishness until the events of the Holocaust, and said, “The rise of totalitarianism, the Second World War, and the situation of the Jews in Europe helped me to come to what I wanted to say as a writer.” He became convinced that he wanted to be a writer and began a study of Jewish history and culture. In 1958, in the early years of his career, he said, “the purpose of the writer….is to keep civilization from destroying itself.” Malamud said once, “I have a tragic sense of life …but it’s a source of stability, security. You’re not kidding yourself. If you have a sense of where the darkness is, you also
know where the light is. Life is a tragedy full of joy." Like Faulkner, Malamud sees humankind as enduring. He is a writer who believes that the human spirit may be capable of overcoming the pressures of the modern civilization that would destroy it. In Malamud’s writing we also see the idea of salvation through suffering.

Malamud’s novels like *The Assistant*, *The Fixer*, *The Natural* and his short stories collections like *The Magic Barrel* and Idiots First show in depth all the above mentioned ideas and thoughts of Malamud. Let’s discuss them in detail.

Although it is only Malamud’s second novel, *The Assistant* moves far beyond in skillfulness and carries a strong Jewish theme. Throughout the tale, he uses the image of the Jew and the ethics of the Judaism as a standard of behavior. The main characters, Frank Alpine and Morris Bober, carry the weight of the novel. Frank is shown to be imbibing “Jewish” values from Morris. With Morris’s death, Frank replaces him both in the store and in terms of having become an ethical man. At the end of the novel, Frank has himself circumcised and becomes a Jew, although in the metaphorical manner in which Malamud uses the term, Frank had already become one. Morris’s definition of Judaism is extremely broad. He tells Frank, “What I worry is to follow the Jewish Law…This means to do what is right, to be honest, to be good. This
means to other people. Our life is hard enough. Why should we hurt somebody else?” 15 Allen Guttmann observes that this definition “turns out to be remarkably like Immanuel Kant’s categorical imperative: to want for others what you want for yourself…” 16 Morris is saintly in a human rather than a strictly Jewish sense: “Morris’s Jewish Law is synonymous with Malamud’s secular moral code ….Becoming a Jew always refers to a secular, personal, inner struggle…” 17 Morris’s Jewishness is starkly contrasted with the values of modern America. The “Law” in America has different meaning. To Nat Pearl the law (not capitalized) offers a way to raise his social class and make money; to Morris the Law (always capitalized) has to do with morality and ethical conduct. The irony moves into paradox when we realize that “Morris’s failure is his success.” 18 It is because of his inability to succeed in the American business world that Morris is a moral and ethical success. Malamud seems to obliterate Morris; even Ida, Morris’ wife and Helen, his daughter think that although he was good, he was a failure: “He made himself a victim. He could, with a little more courage, have been more than he was.” 19 Even more than Morris, Frank is the primary protagonist of the novel, hence the title. His attitude toward Jews and Jewishness is a negative one for much of the novel until he realizes that, given his dual nature, one that is attracted both to crime and to the spiritual, he must choose the sacrifice and self-discipline that he sees in
Morris and assumes to be due to his Jewishness. Apart from the reference to Frank’s “crooked nose”; a typical Jewish identifying mark, there are quite significant hints in the early part of novel that give the idea of Frank’s future role. Morris offers Frank coffee and a roll for him with the milk cases: “Jesus, this is good bread,” 20 Frank says. Morris may be his Jesus at this point, a giver of bread and a Christ like figure who suffers for others, and he will become a living St. Francis of Assisi to Frank, someone who will teach him how to reject the moneyed values of America for those of an older culture that stresses love and responsibility for others. “Frank’s conversion is to human responsibility and selflessness; both show a rejection of the values of the American Dream.” 21 In the end it is Frank, Morris’s assistant and substitute son, who will replace his teacher in the store and minister to the needs of the Bober family and the neighborhood. “In The Assistant Malamud develops the themes more thoroughly that were discussed in his short stories, The Magic Barrel earlier: poverty as both moral teacher and grinding adversary; insights into the human heart occurring in the most unlikely settings; the importance of moral responsibility and human goodness over materialism; and the ever-present pressure of the past, with its mistakes, unavoidable disasters and unfulfilled dreams.” 22
**Imprisonment, suffering, redemption**

In an interview for the *Paris Review*, Malamud was asked about his frequent use of prison motif and he answered, “I use it as a metaphor for the dilemma of all men….A man has to construct, invent, his freedom. Imagination helps.”  

In *The Assistant* we are told in the beginning itself, “In a store you were entombed.”  

“The store becomes not only a testing ground for Morris’s ability to retain his moral behavior but also a training ground for Frank.”  

Morris tells Frank “a store is a prison.” But instead of running away Frank stays. Frank realizes that imprisonment is necessary if he is to achieve his moral and spiritual possibilities, particularly if he is to attempt to emulate his hero St. Francis. The store is Frank’s monastery. “…. Each act of suffering Bober and the rest of mankind strips away Frank’s worldliness…” Thus physical imprisonment is necessary if Frank wants to release himself from the imprisoning forces within him. It is, through suffering only, Malamud believes, human beings may develop morally. The man who climbs out of the grocer’s grave only look like Frank Alpine; he is really Morris reborn, a new Morris who will complete his mentor’s life. One can achieve redemption through suffering..

Malamud thus follows in the ancient Jewish tradition of prophets, Amos, Jeremiah, the Second Isaiah, who announces suffering to be the Jew’s special destiny, evidence of his unique covenant with God, proof of God’s
concern in that only those who are loved are chastised, and the means of the Jew’s peculiar awareness of his identity….  

In this sense, suffering may provide a meaning of life, placing the Jew in the context of the divine- or the divinely chosen. Morris does not seek out or enjoy suffering; he simply recognizes the human condition for what it is. Jews may suffer more than some others because they are Jews. (The theme of the Jews’ place in history being one that Malamud will explore at length in *The Fixer*). Morris understands however, that Jews do not possess a monopoly on suffering: it is a part of existence for everyone. The important thing is to take this unfortunate, unavoidable condition of life and turn it into something positive, something of worth to humanity. So, Morris adds, “I suffer for you…I mean you suffer for me.”  

That means we all are in the same situation and must have sympathy and compassion for each other. It is noteworthy that “Morris is the English equivalent for Moses…”  

Moses led the Israelites through forty years of suffering in the wilderness until they, without him, were able to enter the Promised Land. Although “the store” can hardly be called Promised Land, Frank is certainly better off morally, and possibly physically, at the end of the novel. Like Yasha Mazur at the close of Isaac Bashevis Singer’s Novel *The Magician of Lublin*, Frank has chosen entombment as being necessary for his redemption. He is as much a prisoner in the store, slaving his life away for Ida and Helen. Also he has himself circumcised
an act of self-punishment to atone for Helen’s rape as well as a ritual required for male converts to Judaism. We read that “The pain enraged and inspired him.” Frank sees quite accurately, that the store, “Jewishness,” and the Bobers are his last chance. The alternative for him is the road taken by Ward Minogue. We are left with the image of a man sitting alone in a cell like store, reading the Bible, and thinking of St. Francis. His redemption is complete.

In *The Natural* we again see Malamud telling: suffering as a possible means to moral growth. Possible because whether growth will take place depends on the attitude of the character. In Roy Hobbs case very little is learned. When Irene tells him the importance of suffering and that “suffering is what brings us toward happiness…” Roy answers, “… I am sick of all I have suffered.” When Malamud was asked about his attitude toward suffering in his work, he replied: “I’m against it but when it occurs why waste the experience?” This absolutely doesn’t mean that Malamud takes suffering lightly rather he takes it most seriously and uses it as a means to characterize his protagonists. As in most of Malamud’s works, the present can be understood only by appreciating the effects of the past. Roy is obsessed with the past, in particular with his youth. Malamud is implying in this story that somehow Roy must learn the importance of suffering for the sake of the
others and realize that it cannot be avoided. Life outside baseball, even with Memo, seems a blank to him. When he finally decides to try to reverse his decision to throw the game, it proves to be impossible, as it is too late. He recognizes that “I never did learn anything out of my past life, now I have to suffer again.” The final line of the novel reveals a beaten man. The conclusion of The Natural shows that Malamud was not yet ready to assert that salvation is achieved through suffering, responsibility, and love freely given.

The Fixer concerns the fate of Yakov Bok, a poor Jew in Tsarist Russia who undergoes great suffering during two-and-a-half years in prison. Although the story is based upon Mendel Beilis case; Malamud focused on, Bok’s thoughts, his experiences in his cell, and his personal development as a moral human being. This book stresses the heroic in a small man and, by implication, the essential value of all human beings. Through this story Malamud presents an accurate picture of the situation of the Jews in prerevolutionary Tsarist Russia. Shmuel tells Yakov that he is safer in the shtetl (Jewish village) as the tsar “doesn’t want poor Jews all over his land…” In the large cities, Jews are restricted to a few districts- readily available for a pogrom. Actually, it is the poverty and lack of opportunity that eventually drives Yakov to look for work outside the district, and to live in an area forbidden to Jews. Malamud interlinks
information about the historical setting with that relating to anti-Semitism and Christianity. There are a number of references to anti-Semitic folklore. Before Yakov even enters Kiev, the Dnieper boatman says that “Jews have hooves,” - a reference to the belief that Jews are devils. A boy follows Yakov, “poking his fingers up like horns over his head….” because the Bible stated that Moses had beans of light emanating from his forehead. Grubeshov tells Yakov that “in the Middle Ages Jewish men were said to menstruate”, a belief still held by some Russians, as the officials are waiting for Yakov to begin to “bleed”. With popular beliefs like these, it is easy to understand how the blood libel (the belief that Jews murder non-Jews for ritual purposes) could still be accepted as fact, for which the protagonist of the novel, Yakov has been falsely accused. The tsarist government desires to focus the wrath of the population on the Jews in order to remove pressure from itself for long-needed reforms.

Grubeshov predicts pogroms and massacres if Bok is acquitted. One of the results of this intense pressure is to make Yakov take upon his shoulders the historic destiny of Jewish people. Yakov thinks that “being a Jews meant being vulnerable to history, including its worst errors.” He spends long hours trying to answer that most unanswerable of questions: Why me? He is forced to consider the relationship of the individual to historical forces, one of the central issues in the novel. Bok achieves some understanding of these forces through the philosophy of
Baruch Spinoza, whose ideas also interest Bibikov. By not depending on God, man is freed to act: “His study of Spinoza has taught him that history is Necessity, Fate and Circumstance, but also that history can be altered, perhaps improved, by the free choices of men.” Spinoza helps Yakov understand that while he cannot opt out of history, he need not indeed must not remain its passive victim. In his imagined confrontation with the tsar, Yakov asks him why, he has “made out of this country a valley of bones…. You say you are kind and prove it with pogroms” “What Yakov has learned through his experience in prison and through Spinoza gives him the courage to imagine shooting the Tsar in the heart, the location of his greatest inadequacy.” Malamud has always believed in the possibility of moral growth. This indeed is a consistent theme in his fiction. Difficulties, obstacles, and suffering are what bring out in Malamud’s characters their potential as human beings:

A bad reading of my work would indicate that I’m writing about losers….One of my most important themes is a man’s hidden strength. I am very much interested in the resources of the spirit, the strength people don’t know they have until they are confronted with a crisis.

This statement expresses the attitude Malamud takes toward Yakov Bok. He removes one support after another from him until Yakov has nothing to rely on but the resources of his own spirit. In the end, these resources prove sufficient to allow him to grow in human as well as historical
understanding. At one point during his imprisonment, Yakov, “cursed history, anti-Semitism, fate, and even occasionally, the Jews” 46 But we eventually see him moving from this position to a point of understanding history and fate becoming a sufferer for the Jews and for humankind rather than cursing them. For moral growth to happen, Yakov himself an orphan, must become a father in his heart and in actuality not merely say that he is one. Becoming a father means that he will be responsible for the plight of other people and will have to extend his concern beyond himself. Even to the extent of having an outgoing love for all of suffering humanity. In reading the Hebrew Bible, Yakov becomes aware that “suffering…awakens repentance…” 47 He extends this feeling of responsibility to all the Jews: “He will protect them to the extent that he can. This is his covenant with himself ” 48 Thus he gives his suffering meaning and his life a purpose. In prison, his wife Raisl visits him and asks that he write a note stating that he is the father of her illegitimate son, Chaim. Now he can respond to her weeping because “he had learned about tears.” 49

In accepting the role, Yakov shows that he has moved far beyond his earlier self-centeredness. In accepting Raisl and her child, he also confirms his sense of oneness with his people, as her name is an anagram for Israel. 50
Yakov wants a fair trial, not a pardon; he does not want the Jewish community to be ridiculed by his false admission of guilt. Given his sufferings, this choice shows how much he has changed and is a telling comment on Malamud’s faith in the common man and his capacity for moral growth. An important part of Yakov’s growth into a man who feels responsibility toward others lies in his relationship to his own Jewishness, which at the beginning of the novel, he rejects. Through the course of the novel, he reattaches himself to the Jewish people, their past and destiny. He even expands his feelings to include humanity as a whole, moving from the particular to the universal.

Malamuds’ heroes leave one place for another in an attempt to be rid of what they see as a restrictive past. Roy Hobbs, Frank Alpine, S. Levin, and Yakov Bok all fit this pattern. “The problem is, they carry themselves with them, along with those elements of their past that they are so desirous of relinquishing; the past cannot be forsworn.” 51 “The desire to escape the past serves as a metaphor for the flights from responsibility in the present.” 52 Yakov’s new life is built upon a denial of who he really is. To collect his reward, he agrees to decorate Lebedev’s flat, without informing him that he is a Jew. This sin of omission is rationalized by him as, “After all, it’s only a job, I’m not selling my soul.” 53 In fact he is, though it takes him some time to realize
it. What he realizes soon after is that “he had stupidly pretended to be somebody he wasn’t, hoping it would create ‘opportunities’ had learned otherwise….” 54 Not accepting Jewishness, comes with a high price. Eventually, he sees that he cannot deny his Jewishness, as it is an inherent part of himself. Now he rejects God but not the Jews.

In the end what he believes in is the right of the Jewish people not to suffer merely because they are Jews. He puts on the cloak of the suffering Jew, who suffers for the world. This can be seen in his attitude toward Shmuel, Raisl (Israel) and the Russian prisoners of his dreams. It is not by accident that Bok means goat. Malamud has used Yakov as a representative of the Jewish people’s historical role as scapegoat, expanding this to include him as a symbol and spokesman for suffering humanity. In Yiddish, Bok also means a piece of iron, and this meaning reflects Yakov’s endurance. Shepsovich means son of a sheep. Yakov is thus a victim, but one who has within himself the ability to endure- like the Jewish people whom he symbolizes and the unjustly suffering for whom he speaks: “To be a Jewish to understand the suffering that God puts into the lives of all men. This understanding leads to goodness that must take the form of rach-mones, pity, for other men, for other Jews, even for oneself.” 55 Yakov, through his suffering, becomes Jewish in Malamud’s symbolic use of the term; also in the act of his taking on
responsibility for the fate of the Jewish people. Suffering has given him an understanding of the plight of those who suffer. Freedom in this novel, as in the previous three, consists of choosing selflessness over self-centeredness. Yakov imagines the dead Investigating Magistrate telling him that “the purpose of freedom is to create it for others.” Yakov’s struggle/stubbornness is also called as “grace under pressure” by one critic. The last thing Yakov does is accept his suffering gracefully—his very tenacity, his refusal to sign a confession even upon offers of freedom. There are also influences on the novel from the Jewish history of survival and endurance over the centuries and from the Hebrew Bible, particularly from Yakov’s namesake Jacob. “Like the biblical Jacob, Yakov comes to symbolize the Jewish people, both fulfilling Jacob’s prefiguration of the exiled Jew and serving as a twentieth-century symbol of one.” As Jacob eventually marries Rachel, so Yakov eventually accepts Raisl as his true wife. While The Fixer is set within a particular place and historical period, there are many foreshadowing of the Holocaust. Malamud uses the persecution of one Jew to illustrate the social attitudes that support such action and that would lead to the murder of millions of equally innocent people.

In each of his novels and through The Fixer, Malamud presents a protagonist who must eventually realize that the only way to achieve self-
respect and a measure of freedom is through selflessness and acceptance of responsibility for the needs of others. Roy Hobbs, Frank Alpine, Seymour Levin, and Yakov Bok all have to learn this lesson. Though he learns it too late, Roy does beat up the Judge and Gus and reject the bribe. Frank refuses to accept his fate and uses the Bober store to discipline himself in selflessness. Levin becomes political in his attempt to change the English Department, and takes responsibility for Pauline and her children. Yakov grows in compassion and finally no longer thinks solely of himself. Also, Yakov resists his suffering more strongly than do the other protagonists. Malamud retains his belief in the usefulness of suffering for changing people. And as we see this change is for the better. He has, however, made it clear that he does not like suffering and in The Fixer he has Yakov resist it to the point of dreaming of murder and revolution- no passive resignation here. All of Malamud’s protagonists sooner or later resist their fate; it would be wrong, for example, to consider Frank totally passive, since he battles to change himself, although he settles for a life that Yakov would certainly reject.

**Short Stories:**

Like novel writing Malamud is a master of the technique of short story writing. We get completely engrossed by the plot, the characters, and their lives. We recognize ourselves in his characters. And that is because they “show us ourselves an inch below the skin.” Though
almost all the characters are Jewish, it is not required to be Jewish to recognize oneself with them. That obviously because the stories are about humanity, compassion and being responsible for the mankind. The short stories of Malamud originally appeared in three collections, *The Magic Barrel, Idiots First* 60 and *Rembrandt’s Hat* 61. Almost all are tight spare stories that revolve around the relations of two or three characters. The themes are freedom, commitment, responsibility, and the bonds of love and hate that link man to man. Most stories take place in urban Jewish settings. Even in the stories which take place in Italy, the main characters are often Jewish.

In a story like “Angel Levine”, for example we see that the act of accepting responsibility should be mutual. Manischevitz, a tailor, is guilty merely of being man and Jew and also has trouble accepting God’s grace. Not because of pride but just because of a feeling that God cannot help him. When the angel sent by God turns out to be a hip-talking Negro, Manischevitz believes even less. And yet he goes to Harlem to remove the last doubt for the sake of his wife who is ill. There Levine looks even less like an angel but Manischevitz is convinced by the absurdity of the situation and thinks that Levine must be the angel sent by God. When Manischevitz believes, that is accepts the love that is offered, the black angel literally earns wings. It seems to regain heaven, even angels need
man’s faith. Manischevitz’s wife is recovered and we see in the end he telling his wife, “Believe me, there are Jews everywhere.” 62 “Every act in Malamud is mutual in this way. There are always two people involved, and if either fails, both fail.” 63 Man’s need for faith in self may be even more urgent is suggested in, “The Lady of the Lake”. Henry Levin in Italy for romance and a new life gives up his Jewish name and christens himself Henry Freeman. As Freeman he falls in love with the aristocratic lady, Isabella del Dongo. Believing that she is anti-Semite he thrice denies that he is Jewish. She then declares herself, Isabella della Seta, a Jewish death camp survivor who must remain loyal to her past. She actually was looking for someone to share her race’s suffering and her own. She fades into a lake-island mist. Levin-Freeman is left to ponder the price of self-denial and deception. Instead of freeing himself, Freeman only frees himself from his roots and his humanity. Two characters who ask no questions about love are Sobel, a shoemaker’s apprentice in “The First Seven Years” and Finkle in “The Magic Barrel.” In each case they are faced by fathers who have idealistic expectations for marriage. After firing Sobel to get him away from his daughter, Fled suffers a heart attack. “Most illnesses, especially heart attacks and headaches, are more moral than medical in Malamud.” 64 When Sobel goes back to work for him, Fled realizes that the purity of his love has been refined in the suffering of the concentration camps and allows him to finish his seven
year apprenticeship in both the shop and in his daughter’s heart. Salzman, a marriage broker in “The Magic Barrel”, dreams of finding a perfect mate for his customer Finkle. Finkle is the would-be-rabbi seeking a wife to improve his chances for a good congregation. The marriage broker wants only the best for him. He claims to keep his files in a barrel whose magic assures happiness. Although everything is a fraud, Salzman is appalled when Finkle chooses Salzman’s own daughter who is a prostitute. Salzman refusing to accept the magic of his profession chants the prayer for the dead signifying that the rabbinical student lost to the faith. Actually the reverse is true. By trusting in his love for another human being, Finkle has become ready to love God and man, and, therefore, will be worthy to be called rabbi at just the moment that Salzman stops thinking of him as a rabbi.

Most shocking to mind and memory, however, is the title story from the collection, “Idiots First.” It is a mini drama of Malamud’s themes of compassion, charity, and sacrifice. “It’s bizarre figures and events suggest that even divine fate may be humanized and life snatched (if briefly) from death.” 65 When a loving father races to put his idiot son on the day’s last train to California, it slowly dawns on the father that the man trying to stop him is no bill collector or social worker, but the Angel of Death. The reader is in Grand Central Station and in the realm of the
spirit at the same time. In the story “The Loan,” burnt loaves in a baker’s oven no longer resemble the corpses in Hitler’s incinerators; they are the corpses in Hitler’s incinerators.

Malamud can make anyone human. When a Jewish bird helps junior with his homework, it is not surprising because the bird sounds exactly like a helpful “Jewbird.” He talks homely wisdom, and fears anti-Semitism from one of its most dangerous sources- Jews who have forgotten what Judaism means. Henry Cohen hates the bird right from its arrival for its stinking fish-smell and Jewishness. Cohen’s son and wife however like the bird very much. As the hatred grows, Cohen invents dirty tricks of torture to force the bird out. One day when he is alone, Cohen flings the bird forcibly out into the dark night, throwing with it chances of his redemption. Next morning, finding the bird dead, when it was asked, “Who did it to you, Mr. Schwartz,” Cohen’s wife answers, “anti-semeets.” And thus the first words of the bird at Cohen’s house come true; they were: “Gevalt, a pogrom!”

“The Last Mohican” is again quite a haunting story. Fieldman an artist is followed by Susskind, a beggar. The talk between Susskind and Fieldman gives the reader goose bumps.

“….Am I responsible for you then, Susskind?”

“Who else?” Susskind loudly replied.
“…Why should I be”
“You know what responsibility means?”
“I think so.”
“Then you are responsible because you are a man. Because you are a Jew, aren’t you?" 68

Towards the end we realize that Susskind is actually every man’s conscience which follows him everywhere and questions his deeds.

So, even in his stories, Malamud emphasizes the same fact that being a member of mankind is enough to presume one’s responsibility for other man. The true spirit of compassion lies in the sense of responsibility of man for the fellow sufferer.

**Women Characters:**

Women, in Malamud fiction and stories appear with decreasing frequency and for shorter periods. This definitely is not because Malamud regards women as any less significant. It, in fact is the other way round. “…to some extent, the variety of women that appear in Malamud’s canon is the male’s archetypal projection of feminine dualism- life-giver and death-dealer, Lady of the Lake and Morgan Le Fay, Eve and Lilith, Earth Mother and Death Goddess.” 69

The mythological figure of the Universal Mother imputes to the cosmos the feminine attributes of the nourishing and protecting presence…She is the world creatrix, ever mother, ever virgin. She encompasses the encompassing, nourishes the nourishing and is
the life of everything that lives. She is also the death of everything that dies. The whole round of existence is accomplished within her sway from birth, through adolescence, maturity, and senescence to the grave. She is the womb and the tomb: the sow that eats her farrow....Woman in the picture language of mythology represents the totality of what can be known.  

So, on the one hand she is the means by which man is destroyed through his attachment to the world of objects (Memo Paris, Avis Fliss). On the other, she is the agent by which man is redeemed through love and suffering (Iris Lemon, Helen Bober). Malamud’s women function in a wider context. They have their own neurosis to contend with. They have the capacity to change their behavior and revise judgments. And, like the men, they are in the process of creating a self.

*The Natural* presents the most schematic model of Malamud’s definition of the feminine. Each of the three women that Malamud presents to the protagonist carries with her certain aspects of the myths and legends relevant to Roy Hobbs’s situation. It is actually Roy’s response to these three women that helps us to understand his character. They are Harriet Bird, Memo Paris, and Iris Lemon. Harriet Bird enters Roy’s train at a “desolate station” and proceeds to drop a rose, which Roy retrieves for her. The initial encounter with Harriet Bird, who is as the “twisted tree”  tells us the sinister and deadly landscape that the young
hero has to go through. She exposes the limitation in Roy’s personality. When she asks Roy what he wants to accomplish and Roy gives the answer and she replies, “Is that all?...Isn’t there something over and above earthly things- some more glorious meaning to one’s life and activities?” Her shooting of Roy in a ritualistic manner shows that she is simply destructive. It is an accurate observation that her “presence broods over the entire novel. As one who will destroy a hero rather than have him waste his gifts, she is the spiritual ancestor of the two women who will be rivals for Roy’s love. For this reason, Malamud puts the symbols for both the women-white roses for Iris, the hero nurturer, and a black-feathered hat for Memo the hero destroyer-in Harriet’s hotel room.” After Harriet the next important woman that Roy meets is Memo Paris, who takes on Harriet’s chastising role, but for very different reasons. Memo Paris is Pop Fisher’s niece and Bump Bailey’s mistress. This links her to both the ailing Fisher King (Pop) and the failed hero (Bump). “That Memo is attached to Bump and Pop foreshadows the negative role she will play in Roy’s life, that of destructive seductress who desires to destroy the hero not because he does not live up to the qualities of the heroes of legend but out of revenge and an inherent sterility in her nature.” Memo as is mentioned has a “sick breast”; sign of infertility as well as lack of motherly love and nurturing. Memo invites Roy and the rest of the team to a party the night before a very important
game. She piles more and more food onto Roy’s plate, but the more he
eats the hungrier he becomes. “Frequently the concrete expression of
maternal concern, food is, in this case, an ironic comment on the absence
of this feeling in Memo, which literally eats away Roy’s strength,
producing hollowness rather than satisfaction” 75 Memo takes Roy’s
weakness, plays upon them and destroys him. Memo’s destructive
qualities are clearly seen in her alliance with the Judge and Gus Sands.
She delivers the message from the Judge to Roy that will mean betrayal
of the team and final destruction of Roy’s hopes of greatness. She kisses
him when he agrees to collude with the judge, making it clearer that she
will stay with a man who has wealth. As her name suggests she is
memories of Paris; goddess of sterility and darkness. In one of the
instances we also see that Memo takes away from Roy the power of his
mythic childhood. Ultimately, Memo’s obsessive desire for revenge is
self-defeating. She finds that in spite of her hatred, she can not kill Roy
Hobbs and attempts suicide, to be rescued by the very man she destroyed.
“Memo as real woman and as a Morgan le Fay-Lilith figure plays a
central part in the realistic-allegorical nature of the novel.” 76 The next
and most important woman of Roy’s life is Iris Lemon. One critic sees
Iris as an “earth mother figure, Iris Lemon (both flower and fruit suggest
fertility and life)…..” 77 Steven J. Rubin notes that “Malamud’s women
are often presented as either saviors or destroyers. Nowhere is this
dichotomy more evident than in *The Natural*. It is Roy Hobbs’s fate, however, not be able to distinguish between the two.” 78 Memo is lust and the immediate gratification of the body; Iris is love and responsibility that the gifted individual has for others. Memo is self; Iris is selflessness. “Memo is a creator of illusions, Iris is all substance” 79 Roy understands none of this. Iris first appears in the novel when Roy notices her in the stands, a “black-haired woman, wearing a red dress….” 80, the direct opposite of Memo, with her red hair and black dress. As Memo is the evil knight destroyer- the Morgan le Fay figure- so Iris is depicted as the benevolent knight supporter- the Lady of the Lake figure. Iris is life – giving figure because she desires to bring out the best in Roy and gives of herself to do this. As she explains herself to Roy: “Because I hate to see a hero fail. There are so few of them ….Without heroes we’re all plain people and don’t know how far we can go” 81 It is clear too that we are meant to view Iris in mythic terms, virgin as well as mother. “For Malamud, it is this reproductive capacity that is the ultimate source of feminine strength and authority because it makes it possible for women to actually be, in the deepest physical sense, the force of human continuity, binding the past and the future, history and promise.” 82 Iris stands for maturity and understanding human capacity. Suffering, says Iris, educates. She explains:

“Experience makes good people better…”

76
“How does it do that?”
“Through their suffering.”
“I had enough of that,” he said in disgust.
“We have two lives, Roy, the life we learn with and the life we live with after that. Suffering is what brings us toward happiness” 83

Her attitude defining suffering as positive and redemptive has been shaped by her own distress. But Roy is unable to cope up with the fact of Iris’s age. She does not suit him because she demands responsibility and she is a grandmother; that would make him grandfather, and he is too egoistical to accept that. Iris is threatening because she serves as a reminder of the passage of time, the loss of youth, strength, virility and his chance at immortality. Iris’s faith in Roy shown by her standing up, is an important factor in Roy’s coming out of him slump and regaining his potency. But even when Roy becomes the savior of the Knights he refuses to accept her. He sees the truth of Iris’s existence when it is too late. And one more time, because of his own cupidity and naïve desires, enters into another round of suffering. Although by the novels’ end we see that the portraits of these two women become more ambiguous and complicated. Iris Lemon, a name implying hope, Womanly woman, symbol of maternal solicitude and tranquility, a Malamudian ideal of sorts, whose knowledge is the books message, is left to repeat her original sin – a second pregnancy that gives no sign of being redemptive. Her own observation that suffering, “teaches us to want the right things” 84 stands
quite ironic. She is very much likely to be deserted by Roy. On the other hand we see Memo; a seductive agent of debased culture has ceased to be the embodiment of evil. Instead she is shown as a troubled, suicidal girl. One critic rightly observes that

It is significant in this regard that in four of Malamud’s seven novels the female protagonists (Iris Lemon, Pauline Gilley, Raisl Bok and lastly Maud Dubin) find themselves pregnant by men not their husbands, or mothers with children needing legitimization, as if to underscore the anarchic potency of the woman’s generative drive.  

However if orderly society is required so is a proper family structure and therefore a paternal figure is also essential.

According to Malamud’s conservative vision if childbearing is the primal feminine act, then the acknowledgement of paternity actual or psychic, is the crucial masculine decision. That ensures perpetuation of the species, and survival of the civilization. “Malamud is under no illusions that the family is a liberating situation, or that rearing children is a fulfilling achievement; it is simply a moral necessity.” And in Malamud’s fiction it is the men who are particularly entrapped by this unavoidable responsibility. For women, biology is still destiny. So Malamud’s vision of woman is basically a conservative one. Whatever her discontents, however real her ambitions or justified her angers, a
woman’s primary purpose is still centered in the claims of biology. Her patterns of behavior are determined by the maternal instinct. Malamud’s women are most often searching for and appropriate, sensitive male with whom to create life or suitable environment in which to establish familial order, stability and permanence. Those women who chose to deny these factors—Memo Paris, Helen Bober at the beginning, or Etta in short story “Life is Better than Death”—face the neurotic distortion of personality.

Let us discuss the women of The Assistant; Ida Bober, Morris’s wife and their daughter Helen Bober, whose demands and expectations from their respective male counterparts give the real depth to the novel. Ida is a typical nagging, frightened ageing woman who is eager for safety and security at any price. Let the cost be her own soul or her daughter’s future. The functions she exists to perform are of wife and mother. These areas are her domain. Marriage and motherhood form the bases from which the Jewish woman can fulfill her ambitions and exercise her power. “It is she who rears the children—the hoped—for promise of better; it is she who transmits the rituals and customs that create the solidarity necessary for endurance; it is she who preserves the family in the face of persecution and hostility. Most of all, it is she who ensures survival.”

After going through what she has to being a less ambitious grocer’s wife she believes that her daughter must succeed in America by achieving the
shelter of a prosperous marriage. Ida is willing to go to any extent, including the dehumanizing materialist’s logic of her adopted country, to prevent Helen from repeating her mother’s mistakes by marrying hopelessness. She doesn’t like Gentile “Itelyner”, Frank. Her maternal concern is seen in the fact that she keeps on watching Frank. She is suspicious of anyone who may attack what little position and self-respect she has acquired. She is therefore hostile to the newcomer Frank Alpine on two accounts: as a stranger, he may steal money; and as a non-Jew, he might steal a more valuable piece of property, a key to the future, her daughter. And because Ida is wise in the ways of the American world, her prophesies have much accuracy. Unlike Morris she believes, “a business is a business” 88 She nags if Morris trusts enough to give credit. Her measurement of human worth is material possession. Through Ida’s character Malamud brings out the fact that how American way of life gives utmost importance to materialism and diminishes the value of true love. She measures potential husbands for Helen not by their value as human beings or their ability to love but by the money they have or might have. Nat Pearl will be “someday a rich lawer” 89 even “the stupe” Louis Karp is acceptable because he can offer financial security. And any quality in Helen, particularly her intelligence- “some people want their children to read more. I want you to read less” 90 - that reduces their marketability is condemned by Ida. After Morris’s death Ida softens; she
no longer has the guilt that she satisfied with a grocery store owner. And she no longer fears starving because Frank’s rent Helen’s salary and Rubin’s job. Helen Bober is however confused about her feminine identity. On the one hand she has her mother who expects her to follow traditional Jewish familial role as wife, mother and so on in a respectable family, and on the other she has America, a country which offers more than family to a woman and which expects a girl to follow her own dreams and aspirations rather than being confined to one role and one place. The present has trapped Helen with frustrated ambition and dreams: “I’d like to be doing something that feels useful- some kind of social work or may be teaching. I have no sense of accomplishment in what I’m doing now. Five o’clock comes and at last I go home. That’s about all I live for, I guess” 91 As a good daughter and well-trained woman, she is obsessively sacrificial. She realizes that she has to compensate for the death of her brother. To be educated according to Helen (and to Malamud) is to possess wisdom and understanding life. Helen desires education so that she may become a better person. It is this deprivation that Helen feels most strongly, and Frank Alpine realizes that it is the one gift he can offer that Helen can not return. Helen’s hesitancy, her lack of confidence, her doubts about the nature of her femaleness is most clearly revealed in her attitude toward sex. She absolutely does not like to be considered as an object, sexual or otherwise and is angered by
her treatment as commodity. As Memo uses her body to assert her powers; so does Helen, by not offering one to others, especially to Frank. For Frank physical act is affirmation of love whereas for Helen it is almost a total and permanent commitment. And when she comes to accept that she loves Frank; she becomes a victim of Frank’s rage whom she calls “uncircumcised dog” 92. This act of rape comes with a heavy price for Frank as Helen is absolutely not ready to accept him now when actually he is genuinely repenting for the same.

Pauline Gilley, from A New Life 93 seems to have all those things which can satisfy a Malamudian woman, at least apparently. Husband who has a job of considerable societal importance; two children to satisfy her maternal concern; and a home with best environment. But the reality is different; the husband is sterile in more than one ways; the children are adopted and difficult, subject to frequent illness. So Pauline is in search of an identity that can encompass both her feminine impulses and her personal needs. Levin notices her flaw, limiting her womanhood: “She had pinned a rose to her poor chest. Why not two, he thought, one for each flat side?... It did bother a bit, the observer conscious that nature had cheated where it hurt most.” 94 For Malamud, breasts have a nurturing, comforting, maternal significance as we have seen in the descriptions of Iris, Memo, Helen, and of Avis Fliss, whose large, but shapeless and
scarred breasts so disappoint and pain Levin. Pauline’s flat chest symbolizes her restricted capacity for mothering and also the lack of fulfillment in a barren marriage. Like Helen for Frank Alpine, Pauline may not be a particularly selfless or admirable person with whom Levin should fall in love. But for Malamud rather than the person it is the feeling of love that is much more important: “We realize that it is not so much these particular women that Malamud is interested in presenting as worthy of so much sacrifice. Yet they represent possible objects for the love that Frank and Levin come to believe in— an unselfish love…” 

Pauline’s name before marriage is also a curious one: Pauline Josephson, an odd combination of male-female names and status. Both Gilley and Levin use Pauline in order to support their private illusions and public deceptions. Gilley is very much aware of Pauline’s faults, and her unhappiness still he wishes the marriage to continue. Levin wants Pauline because she represents LOVE. Her sexual Fatigue is also an ultimate denial of her femininity. Even after she gets a new life by marrying Levin, it is clear that her role will be a traditional one, centering around the family.

The women of The Fixer and The Tenants, Raisl Bok and Irene Bell, present interesting variations of Malamudian woman. We see them actually for a relatively shorter period, although their presence is felt
through the memories of their male counterparts. But they share some basic similarities with their fictional sisters. Both are intelligent malcontent, unhappy not with the roles they are meant to play but with a disintegrating culture that can no longer sustain the values those roles represent in the midst of chaos. “They are consistently, and often angrily, perceived as disappointed or ungrateful by the men in their lives.” 97 Yakov Bok confesses to Raisl, “I was afraid of you. I never met anybody so dissatisfied. I am a limited man. What could I promise you?” 98 Of his white mistress, Irene Bell, Willie Spearmint/Bill Spear says that, “she’s a dissatisfied chick both with herself and you if you let her, and nothing much you tell her sets her right in her self-confidence….” 99 And like Pauline, the two women are very much aware of their shortcomings, particularly their familial and maternal functions. Raisl and Irene, more than presented in earlier novels, are treated by their men as objects to be used for male satisfaction or as property contracted for and owned.

In both the novels moral and ethical dilemmas are illustrated almost allegorically by the central female character. The problem of the Jew’s connection to his people’s history is embodied in the wandering Raisl, a name that is an anagram of Israel as James Mellard has pointed out.100 It is also remarkable that these women abandon their men when they no longer seem capable of fulfilling their responsibilities within the
traditional zone. Raisl leaves Bok only after it is clear that she can not
have a child by him, to become pregnant thus satisfying the basic
feminine impulse. She returns only when an acknowledgement of
paternity is necessary for the child and for Yakov’s growth. Irene also
demanding family, children life departs. The goodbye note reads, “No
book is as important as me” 101 Raisl Bok is part of the same orthodoxy
that has conditioned Ida Bober. Judaism has trained her for wifehood and
motherhood and for very little else. Raisl’s selfhood is dependent on
husband and children, so that in marrying Yakov she expects to find self.
Once a wife, secure in position sanctioned by her society, Raisl urges Bok
to leave Russia because it is unsafe environment to create a family. Of
course it is Raisl who is sterile; it is Raisl who is to blame for the failure
of their lives. When Raisl runs away, Yakov is convinced that it is with a
goy. She indeed bears a child, but is forced to return to the shtetl for
survival where “they blame me for your fate….The child will think his
name is bastard”. 102 And as Yakov has shaved a beard, Raisl no longer
wears a wig, revealing her true identity. In prison Raisl haunts him in
dreams not so much as nagging wife but as a victim of pogroms and
persecution. She has ceased to be simply Raisl but has become gradually
identified with the fate of ever-suffering Jews. By accepting Raisl he
accepts his Jewishness in the deepest sense. And by admitting paternity
he re-enters life, for his son is Chaim, Hebrew word meaning life. So
Raisl becomes a force which leads Yakov to accept his true identity. In this respect she is like Isabella del Dongo/della Seta, “The Lady of the Lake”, false aristocrat and a true Jew, whose function is to force Henry Levin/Freeman to confront his rejected past. Although in this case there is a failure because Isabella and love disappear permanently from Levin/Freeman’s life.

*The Tenants* presents a complex triangle. Irene Bell without ego of her own becomes whatever men want her to be. As she says, “I wanted to act mainly so that I could skip being myself.” To Willie she is “my true bitch” a part of the white world he can control and use. Bill Spear sees all women as exploitable “meat”; women being the single minority group over whom everyone and anyone can exercise power. He neglects to introduce Irene by name the first time she meets Harry Lesser. She realizes that by depriving her of a name, he deprives her of a self. Willie utilizes Irene’s body at his convenience, and ignores her when he is writing because she drains his vigor. And she is to be dismissed when her white womanhood makes her an awkward possession. But to lose her, especially to the white Jew, the published writer Lesser, means a great humiliation. For Willie, Irene’s black hair has been dyed blond, the nails bitten to the quick, her eyebrows plucked out, a living stereotype. And he is quite capable of beating her, since she belongs to him. Like Willie,
Harry also utilizes Irene’s body at his conveniences, and ignores her when he is writing, because she saps his vitality. Now Irene changes herself as per Harry’s demands- hair back to original color, nails grown, eyebrows back. Both Willie and Harry perceive Irene as an embodiment of their respective fantasies of woman. Whatever her complexes, doubts and insecurities are, Irene, however, is a person of great strength. Even if she does not like what she sees, she knows and understands herself. In fact, she knows and understands both Willie and Harry, why they want her and why they need her. She is the only character in any of the novels until Dubin’s Lives to have undergone psychoanalysis. She is grateful to Willie for what he has done for her, is upset at having hurt him, but is quite capable of leaving him for Lesser. By the time she enters the relationship with Lesser, she knows what she wants: a family, children, a home. And when Harry is busy again she leaves him too for San Francisco and a new life. The world of the artist or failed artist has no room in it for living.

So finally we can say in Iska Alter’s words that “Malamud’s women are motivated by a conservative vision of the feminine experience and a conventional definition of their roles in society: a woman’s function is to create and preserve the family as primary social unit” And though they are unhappy and dissatisfied with these roles they know that they do
not have any other alternative or that society has the same expectations from them which if they fulfill, they will get some recognition in it.

But at the same time we realize that Malamud’s women even if they are traditional are quite impressive and that they do have personality and thinking power of their own. In fact it is the women of these novels that give us a perfect understanding of the characters of their male counterparts. It is the response, denial or acceptance of these women which are the guiding force of male’s actions and decisions. Leslie Field in his speech, “Bernard Malamud and the Marginal Jew,” suggested,

Malamud’s roots are Jewish roots. The original soil nurtures a writer in such a way that in any age his writing is immersed in that which concerns Jews most directly. Transplanted, the writer may become a hybrid. His Jew of the Torah, the Law, the rabbinical teachings may become the Jew of general humanism, of universalism. In fact his Jew may become indistinguishable from the non-Jew as he becomes homogenized in a larger, non-Jewish world. He may emerge as Everyman as his identification with his own peoples’ overriding concerns becomes peripheral or marginal.  

For some critics Malamud wants to use the Jewish milieu without paying the price of dealing with the reality of modern Jewish experience.

In the last few decades the Jew has become a special sort of symbol; a cultural symbol upon which Malamud’s work depends on
rather heavily. In recent years there has been wide discussion of this changed attitude. This is used to give an explanation for the dramatic increase in the popularity of Jewish writers since World War II. Sheldon Norman Grebstein’s observation in this connection is, “In the Western imagination the Jew had always played a special role as wizard, magician, possessor of secret knowledge, but never before, until Auschwitz and Buchenwald, had such moral authority been conferred upon him. From hated, feared, or ridiculed figure, lurking on the fringes of the culture, he was transformed into the Man Who Suffered, Everyman.”\textsuperscript{109} We can say that Malamud has dramatized the Jew as moral doppelganger to the American. Jews and Americans have this characterization in common historically: they worry. Both are prone to constant self-examination. Both to tend to be moralistic and tend to see life, symbolically and allegorically. In Old Testament terms- it is the struggle in man between good and evil, the struggle to fulfill a prophesized destiny. Much of the prejudice against Jews came not so much from religious hostility (the cries of “You killed our Christ!” which Leslie Fielder remembers from childhood). It also comes from the fact that they were seen as ultimate possessors of American Dream. The stereotype before World War II was largely one of acquisitiveness. The Jews will a place for themselves, acquire money, goods, and status. They become the archetypal immoral materialists. And now they have become
the archetypal moralists. Being a Jew is being a nice human being; responsible and caring.

Self-discovery, that too through suffering is central to Malmud’s fiction. Ben Siegel in his paper, “Through a Glass Darkly: Bernard Malamud’s Painful Views of the Self” seems to suggest that Malamud insists throughout his work that “no matter how pathetic or foolish, the individual can, by suffering, compassion and self-scrutiny…..assert his humanity.” 110 Siegel also states that “Mostly beleaguered Jews clinging to dignity and self-respect, they shuffle between dark,… ‘Naturalized’ rather than ‘assimilated,’….determined to be heard, they share an inflected, idiomatic Yiddish-English and the melancholy discovery that America, the Golden Land, has not ended their exile.” 111 Entering the New Eden does not end the exile of the spirit; change in outside circumstances alone will not work. Man takes his prison with him, and the only way out is through “self-discovery”, becoming more human than before.

As discussed before Malamud’s most common motif is imprisonment- usually self- suffocation of the soul. But the broader and more fundamental obligation is to be fully a mensh. As Morris Bober says, “…to be a Jew all you need is a good heart.” 112 In an attempt to identify the Jewish writer and Jewish writing, Josephine Knopp talks of a code of menshleykhayt or humanity or of man’s “basic goodness as being
an important criterion in the Jewish novel.” She associates this code with a few important writers including Eli Wiesel, Isaac Bashevis Singer, Saul Bellow and Bernard Malamud. 113

What is significant about Malamud’s heroes is that they begin as ordinary men – often even less than ordinary men. Most of his characters have to discover their own moral law; which is a responsibility. Each man must determine his responsibility for himself and then for others. Malamud’s characters are soldiers on a moral battlefield. His Heroes like Yakov, are the downtrodden of the world, and yet they must prove that they have greater moral strength than their oppressors. Unlike the heroes of Greek or Shakespearean plays, they begin at the bottom. Suffering, commitment and responsibility are the hallmarks of Malamud’s heroes. They are men who start with nothing.

Malamud’s world is generally a very dark, naturalistic world wherein nearly everything is determined. But there is one thing in such a world that is not totally determined, and that is the human spirit. A new life is possible in this New World, but only on the inside. People can change. This may be the most important thing Malamud has to say. And is it is a profoundly religious thing to offer. If we try to pretend to be other than what we are, we wind up like Henry Levin in “The Lady of the Lake,” embracing “only a moonlit stone,” a beautiful dream devoid of
human warmth. If we depend on appearances, we will surely lose the spirit, as Manischevitz loses his angel in *Angel Levine*. Susskind follows us all, wherever we may go. Beware of the Last Mohican. To his question we must answer, “Yes I am a man. Yes I am a Jew. Yes, I am responsible.”
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