



**LOVE'S WORK**  
**GILLIAN ROSE**

---

INTRODUCTION BY  
**MICHAEL WOOD**  
ALSO INCLUDING  
"IN MEMORIAM: GILLIAN ROSE"  
BY GEOFFREY HILL

---

GILLIAN ROSE (1947–1995), who is now recognized as one of the most important and influential critical thinkers of her time, was a British philosopher and writer. For many years she taught at Sussex University, drawing large numbers of research students, before she accepted a chair in social and political thought at Warwick University. Her major works, which ranged from Continental philosophy to Judaism, include *The Melancholy Science*, *Hegel Contra Sociology*, *Dialectic of Nihilism*, *The Broken Middle: Out of Our Ancient Society*, *Judaism and Modernity*, *Mourning Becomes the Law*, and *Paradiso*.

MICHAEL WOOD teaches at Princeton and is the author, most recently, of *Yeats and Violence*.

---

LOVE'S WORK  
*A Reckoning with Life*

GILLIAN ROSE

*Introduction by Michael Wood*



New York Review Books  
New York

# Contents

---

[Cover](#)

[Biographical Notes](#)

[Title Page](#)

[Introduction by Michael Wood](#)

[Love's Work](#)

[Epigraph](#)

[1](#)

[2](#)

[3](#)

[4](#)

[5](#)

[6](#)

[7](#)

[8](#)

["In Memoriam: Gillian Rose" by Geoffrey Hill](#)

[Copyright and More Information](#)

# Introduction

---

In December 1994 Gillian Rose gave an extraordinary lecture on time and death, closing with an intense reading of the Rilke sonnet that begins “Be ahead of all departures,” “*Sei allem Abschied voran*.” At that moment she had less than a year to live, and had already confounded her doctors’ predictions by remaining stubbornly and lucidly present to the world for longer than they had calculated. Lucidity, and indeed a certain elegant stubbornness, were her mark as a philosopher and person. Her friend Jay Bernstein reminded us in an obituary that for her, philosophy was never “abstract or abstruse”; more like a passion of the mind. Rose herself tells us in *Love’s Work* that studying philosophy at Oxford almost destroyed that passion—“the earnest stupidity of [her] schooling” was succeeded by “the deeper stupidity of reading philosophy at university”—but fortunately nothing could finally estrange her from what she called her *daemon*. During a year in New York she discovered contemporary Continental philosophy, and especially the thought of T.W. Adorno, on whom she wrote her first book, *The Melancholy Science* (1978). Important works followed—*Hegel Contra Sociology* (1981), *The Broken Middle* (1992), among others—and she became known as a philosopher who asked the hard questions and worked in several quite different intellectual registers. Her presiding figures were Hegel and Kierkegaard, and when I first met her she was deep in a long and endlessly articulate conversation about them with Stanley Cavell.

The lecture I mentioned began with simple daunting words, true of all of us, but peculiarly resonant in the context of Rose’s personal history: “I may die before my time.” What she called anachronism was not just her topic; it was a threat. To be properly early in Rilke’s sense is to know, among other things, that “death is not nothing.” The rest of the lecture evoked, with great patience and sorrowful understanding, the twin traditions of the baroque theater as defined by Benjamin and modern philosophy as represented especially by Heidegger, Levinas, and Blanchot, which have, in their very different ways, claimed that death is indeed nothing, “endless in its extermination of life,” as Rose puts it, and not susceptible to any sort of “inner relation” to its meaning.

What did Rose mean by that small word “may”? Did she think her doctors might be wrong? That she would after all, as she says she hopes at the end of *Love’s Work*, not be “deprived of old age,” and become a version of Agatha Christie’s Miss Marple (albeit, we should add, a Miss Marple who was the most strenuous of philosophical detectives)? No, but she believed that the entertaining of such thoughts was indispensable because, as she said in that same lecture, “the future is the time in which we may not be, and yet we must imagine we will have been.” We must imagine this even if—especially if—we are pretty sure we shall not be there; and we must do this precisely because of the implication of the rest of the opening sentence. We may miss our time, or we may not have one. “Before my time,” in this argument, doesn’t mean before my allotted span, whatever that might be; it means before I have understood and practiced the work of dying as I need to.

*Love’s Work* is itself part of this understanding and this practice. Written in 1993 and 1994, and published in 1995, before Rose died—the description on the original dust jacket evokes her in the present tense—the book was both a radical departure from her philosophical writing and a brilliant continuation of it by other means. In a chapter describing her illness and its failed treatments, she

speaks of the disagreements among her doctors, and says she “wanted control over the broadcasting any ambiguities.” She then glosses two meanings of the word “control,” the second of which illuminates the whole act of writing of which it is a part. Control means first the “ability to manage not to force, the compliance of others, to determine what others think and do.” The second sense of the word is “more elusive,” Rose says, but “saves my life and...may induce the relinquishing of ‘control’ in the first sense.”

When something untoward happens, some trauma or damage, whether inflicted by the commissions or omissions of others, or some cosmic force, one makes the initially unwelcome event one’s own inner occupation...In ill-health as in unhappy love, this is the hardest work: it requires taking in before letting be.

This is scarcely control at all anymore: just the deepest, bravest, most scrupulous sanity. It is, as the connection between health and love suggests, the work not just of survival but of moral flourishing. It saves life not because it avoids death but because it includes it—because it comprehends death “in the non-medical sense,” as doctors scarcely ever do.

For Rose learning how to die is inseparable from remembering how one has lived. She calls up the memory of a friend who died of AIDS, of a woman who survived cancer at the age of sixteen to live to the age of ninety-six, of another woman who “gave people, young and old, the courage to face the terrors of desire in themselves.” She takes us to Auschwitz and Krakow, to Jerusalem, to the grim and mind-narrowing Oxford of her student years, the chaotic, inquisitive New York of a later time, the Birmingham of her hospital. Here, for example, is her description of Dudley Road, surely worthy of any considerable novelist:

The Dudley Road is almost impassable, like certain precincts of American cities. Poverty from every decade of the century seems to have been dumped here: boarded-up shops selling gaudy sofas too hard to sit on, five female dummies with kohl eyes in cheap saris, dishevelled children out of school. Huge advertisement hoardings sail majestically through the filthy, screeching air, mocking the residents with their immaculate blandishments.

The work of love, for Rose, is what she calls her “life affair”: a matter of getting love wrong, and going on getting it wrong, but not only getting it wrong. And in this respect love is curiously like reason as Rose defines it: a matter of risk. “Reason, the critical criterion, is forever without ground.” And again, most powerfully, in her lucid definition of the philosophical modernity that is so often taken for something else, something slicker or shallower: “There is no rationality without *uncertain* grounds, without *relativism* of authority. Relativism of authority does not establish the authority of relativism: it opens reason to new claimants.”

The person who emerges in this brief autobiography is fierce, difficult, vulnerable, and unrelenting in her will to hope and in her devotion to what she calls “the shared cares of the finite world.” When she writes, thinking of Proust (“*les vrais paradis sont les paradis qu’on a perdus*”), that “the only paradises cannot be those that are lost but those that are unlocked as a result of coercion, reluctance, cajolery and humiliation,” she is saying paradise is not a gift or an effect of grace but the end of a plan of work, and although no one works to get into an inferno, one might need to stay there for some time to perform various necessary labors.

Rose's epigraph to *Love's Work*—"Keep your mind in hell, and despair not"—is taken from the sayings of the Russian monk Staretz Silouan, and is glossed several times within the text. There is, for example, "the unhappiness of one who refuses to dwell in hell, and who lives, therefore, in the morose static despair." There is the moment when Rose describes herself as unhappy in love and refusing a consolation, including "the endlessly inventive love of my sisters." "Keep your mind in hell and," she says, without completing the sentence. Alternative healing, with what Rose regards as its false spirituality, is said to offer a "counsel of despair which would keep the mind out of hell."

Rose has done something wonderful with what seems to be the logic of the monk's precept. If you can weather hell, he appears to be saying, and not despair in the process, you will be saved. By contrast Rose turns hell into a staunch refusal of despair. To be afraid of hell is to lose all practical hope, to seek to avoid the dark violent moments that mark all real life. To inhabit hell, to keep one's mind there, is to find the hope that is not the opposite of devastation but its complement. Geoffrey Hill, in his poem "In Memoriam: Gillian Rose," suggests that "love's work" offers "a bleak ontology"; but it's bleak only if you downplay the love of life that continues in hell, and the principled refusal of despair that governs all of Rose's work. At the end of *Minima Moralia*, Adorno, on whom Rose wrote so well, asserts that "the only philosophy which can responsibly be practiced in the face of despair is the attempt to contemplate all things as they would present themselves from the standpoint of redemption." But even Adorno didn't manage to think of hell itself as redemption's home.

—MICHAEL WOOD

---

# Love's Work



---

*Keep your mind in hell,  
and despair not.*

STARETZ SILOUAN,  
1866–1938

My first meeting with Edna was inauspicious.

It was May 1991. I had just arrived in New York for the first time in five years, and had been met at Newark Airport in New Jersey by Jim. Unsure of what to expect, I first walked up at the barrier to the wrong man—to someone who looked like a caricature of Jim as I remembered him in good health: well over six foot tall, a mane of blue-black hair, thickset, welcoming. Suddenly aware of my wife's mistake, I stopped just short of an inept embrace. I stood my ground and then I saw him. His posture was as crumpled as the clothes he'd obviously slept in, his hair had turned gingerish and it rose from his head in wild clumps with bald patches in between. This uneven growth dominated his manner too, as I realised after one minute in the taxi heading towards Manhattan, which loomed in archetypal and mocking splendour ahead of us. My formerly laconic and witty friend had become loquacious and needy, addressing with urgent familiarity everyone we chanced to have dealings with over the next few days—taxi-drivers, bell-boys, waiters. And when he wasn't holding forth to those nearest to him, he issued a continuous, low, moaning sound, a piteous cradling for the inner, wounded being that, strangely, had surrendered to the publicity of the city streets. On Broadway, from Columbia University, where Jim's apartment was located on 111th Street, down to the Lincoln Center, where I went early morning swimming, I soon learnt to recognise multitudes like him: the old men in their forties, shrivelled, drained, mumbling across the intersections, icons of AIDS, amidst the bodified vibrancy of those striding to and from work and subways and stores.

By the time we reached Edna's apartment on West End Avenue, I was assailed by even more apprehensions. I felt uncomfortable meeting the two people who were offering me accommodation for the first time in the company of this unkempt and erratic being—my beloved friend—to visit whom, I then thought, was the whole purpose of my trip.

I needn't have worried, for each successive encounter proved as bizarre in its own way as the first. Gary, Edna's employer, was waiting in the foyer of 365 West End Avenue. I had been told that he was a private scholar, a man of means and intellect, meticulous and courteous. So he was: but I had not been told that he was afflicted with a long-term wasting disease that left him with uneven gait and hands locked in a rictus-like claw. Gary was utterly unfazed by Jim's doleful appearance and low pitched litany, for he was only too eager to communicate the essentials concerning Edna in the short space of time we would have between leaving the lobby and reaching her fifth-floor apartment via the elevator. I knew that Edna was Gary's secretary and was expecting a dapper, matronly woman, perhaps in her fifties. Edna, Gary hurriedly explained, was ninety-three years old. She had recently contracted cancer of the face; and, as a result of a prosthetic jaw, had had to relearn to speak. When I then handed Gary the litre of Laphroaig purchased at Duty Free, he exclaimed, "Please God, you're not bearing whisky as a gift for Edna!" In her eighties, Edna had secretly started drinking a bottle of Calvados every day, until she had had to be hospitalised, detoxified and warned that her octogenarian life was at risk from her newly acquired habit. Thus we were ushered into Edna's presence and, increasingly confused, I met my Intelligent Angel for the first time.

Edna took Jim on, greeting and welcoming us both as her immediate "Darlings," in a rasping but emphatic voice. She settled us into her huge high-backed armchairs, a legacy, she explained, of the outsize men in her family. In this family, it turns out, there are no surviving men, just Edna, her sixty-

eight-year-old retired mathematician daughter and her two granddaughters. Edna was diminutive amongst the heavy and ornate furniture; her tiny, wrinkled round face dominated by a false nose which lacked any cosmetic alleviation whatsoever. Smooth and artificially flesh-coloured, with thick spectacles perched on top, this proboscis could have come from a Christmas cracker. In the early mornings, when I emerged from my room on my way to swim, Edna would have already been installed in her reading chair for an hour or two. She would call out to me to enquire whether I would mind if she were not to put on her nose. By then, not only did I not notice the nose, but, if anything, I found the neat, oblong black hole in her face even more appealing.

Edna goes out to work for Gary seven days a week, taking the bus uptown, but often walking thirty or so blocks back downtown. She acts as Gary's hands, word-processing his scholarship and correspondence; he in turn acts as the guardian of her much less infirmities, lending support to her arm as they climb the stairs to the restaurant on Broadway and 112th Street where they take lunch daily.

Meeting this third extraordinarily afflicted person within the first hour of arriving in New York transformed the difficulties of the first two meetings. Edna and Jim were soon exchanging stories from New York music life. "I've taken part in New York music life since 1904," mused Edna. She would have been seven years old then. And I watched, not for the last time, the delight that flew between the fading forty-seven-year-old and the one full of ninety-three years.

Later, when I found myself alone with Edna, there were certain things which she was determined to make clear: "My marriage was not happy. My husband was disappointed with me. Although, when he died," she added, without a hint of triumph or rancour, "I was the only person permitted to attend his funeral. The nurses in the hospital had to assure him that they were 'Edna.'" And for good measure, she also insisted that she did not eat vegetables. Nor, as she showed me around the apartment and we entered her bedroom, had she painted the room pink as long as her husband was alive: "I don't want you to think that I made a man sleep in a pink room."

Edna believes in magic. One of the many books that she handed over to me after her early morning reading sessions was *The Secret Garden* by Frances Hodgson Burnett. And the magic in that book is, I think, the kind of magic which Edna believes in: the quiet and undramatic transmutation that can come out of plainness, ordinary hurt, mundane maladies and disappointments. Thus she lives, while Jim, locked in a fatal embrace with maternal dreams, "where everything," he groaned, in one of his rare moments of lucidity, "begins with 's'"—his mother's name was *Esther*—Jim had to die.

What Edna did not tell me then, did not tell me until several years later, after her ninety-sixth birthday, when Jim was long dead and my own circumstances had radically changed, was that she had first been diagnosed as having cancer when she was sixteen years old—in 1913. She graduated from Barnard College in 1917. How can that be—that someone with cancer since she was sixteen exudes such well-being at ninety-six? Could it be because she has lived sceptically? Sceptical equally of science and of faith, of politics and of love? She has certainly not lived a perfected life. She has not been *exceptional*. She has not loved herself or others unconditionally. She has been able to go on getting all more or less wrong, more or less all the time, all the nine and a half decades of the present century plus three years of the century before.

Now, of course, I believe that it was Edna whom I went back to New York to meet. Edna was Jim's parting gift to me. She is an annunciation, a message, very old and very new. Edna is, as she insists, my "home from home." Whereas the idea of the original home would arouse an agon of bitter ambivalence in me, the redoubled home has no colour or cathexis of pain inseparable from its welcome.

My journey to Auschwitz and east across Galicia to Bełżec on the border of the Ukraine did not affect me in the ways I had expected: it was the unexpected, rather, which provided the nodes of enigma that compressed incompatible and uncomprehended meanings together.

In my inaugural lecture as Professor of Social and Political Thought at Warwick in February 1993 I mentioned that I was one of a number of Jewish “intellectuals” chosen to advise the Polish Commission on the Future of Auschwitz. What vain posturing! Scientific status, superimposed on the even more dubious notions of cerebral and cultural ethnic identity! We were set up. Enticed to present ourselves as *consultants*, in effect, our participation was staged. Conscripted to restructure the meaning of “Auschwitz,” we were observed rather than observing, the objects of continuous Holocaust ethnography, of Holocaust folk law and lore.

On the train from Warsaw to Kraków, from the comfort of the first-class compartment, my attention was drawn to a man who stood all the way in the corridor. Tall and angular, with a gaunt, beak-like visage, he seemed to bear accumulated suffering with majesty, as if generations of poverty and loss had pared away all excess to reveal without guise his true nature.

At the banquet held several days later in the baroque ballroom of the Grand Hotel of Kraków, one of the favourite venues for Jewish wedding receptions, the evening was framed by the pastel stucco ceiling, tessellated floor and massive console mirrors. Gathered with our Polish counterparts, local dignitaries and intellectuals, we were served ample vodka to mask the absence of substantial food, a misplaced deference to the kosher scruples of the Jewish group. I found myself next to the intriguing stranger from the train. I discovered that he was a former aristocrat, like a large number of the assembled company, many of whom had spent the last forty years as art historians and curators, appointed custodians of their dispossessed familial palaces and mansions, with their sombre galleries of art and furniture.

My half-week in Poland had already taught me that I was in a land of martyred people, which harbours in its midst a still more martyred people—the Jews. No—the Jews are not *harboured*, but expelled into the borderless cemetery in the air, for the soil of death camps is cursed not consecrated ground, according to Halachah, Jewish law. From the tower of the Mariacki Church on the Rynek Główny, the largest market square in Europe, on to which the hotel abutted, night and day, on every hour, the air vibrates with the plangent tones of the trumpeter. The trumpeter’s long note, followed by two shorter notes of even lower pitch, to alarm the city of the enemy’s advance, stops abruptly as the Tartar arrow pierces his neck. Four times, once to each corner of the tower, this herald of martyrdom doles out his fatal music, so that, wherever you are, you hear the foreboding and fading echo of his remorseless courses of ruin. As I travelled across the country, I learnt that it is this ever-repeated martyrdom that serves as the calibration of daily clock time, broadcast at noon every day on the radio station.

I found it more congenial to respond to Polish suffering: I found no consolation of lamentation for the Jews. In the beech forests outside Tarnów, where 800 children and 1,000 old and infirm Jews were shot, the roughly marked mass graves are surrounded, mid-March, by masses of tiny white wood anemones, wind-flower and bird-song, and the audibly rising sap of the pearly trees, as if a fairy tale has taken place here. At the desolation of Bełżec, the first death camp, there were no survivors, and

there are no visitors today, just the freight trains thundering by in loud, rhythmic indifference. Nothing grows from this soil because 600,000 bodies were burnt out on the ground, which remains spongy with colourless grasses: nature is a death's head here. Six matt Soviet urns brood on the periphery of the camp, beyond which stretch spinneys of silver birches—the fairy fantasia even dares to hover on this horizon, too.

But I wept, I wept soft Polish tears for Count Potocki, not knowing, then, who he was. Later the same evening of the banquet, two colleagues and I were wandering around the centre of Kraków looking for a tavern that had been recommended to us. Suddenly we found ourselves by mistake in a courtyard in the presence of the ailing Count. We had stumbled into his old family town house, which he had just recovered after forty years. He invited us to share a glass of tea with him, and conducted us up a solid central stairwell with a cast-iron balustrade, which, he explained, had been installed by the Nazis, to the top floor, where he inhabited two small rooms crammed full of furniture, largely covered with dust sheets. George Wheeler, one of my companions, conservation consultant from the Metropolitan Museum in New York, was qualified to relish the magnificence of such casually strewn antiques, while I noticed the sadness of the Count and the many pills he was swallowing. His sons, he said, would now return from the States to enjoy their patrimony, and his grandchildren would run gleefully up and down the stairs. The second floor of the house, he told us, as he carefully poured the tea from the awkward teapot, had been the art gallery, where the family's collection of paintings had hung, "The third largest private collection in Europe." The collection has been the property of the state since 1945, and is now housed in the main public gallery in Warsaw. He spoke without rancour, indeed without emphasis, in his perfect English. He had been a pupil at Ampleforth School in North Yorkshire, and had scraped a living for the past forty years as a translator from English to Polish. One thing he respectfully bade me do, aware, I now believe, but without humiliating me, of my ignorance of Polish history and hence of his lineage, was to read Adam Zamoyski's *The Polish Way*. And that was how, much later, I discovered who he was.

Eventually, we wished him good-night and began to descend the massive flights of stairs. The climb up had audibly shortened his breathing and he apologised for not accompanying us down and out into the polluted night air of Kraków. He remained stationed at the top of the stairwell, leaning on the heavy balustrade and watching silently as his visitors made their way down. It took an eternity to retrace that Nazi monument, and he didn't take his eyes from us. Was he remembering his wife who had not lived to enjoy the return? Or anticipating the excited cries of his grandchildren? Or thinking back over the history of Poland, in which his ancestors had played so many decisive parts—as politicians, diplomats, poets and artists, and, above all and always, as owners of large estates worked by serfs? Yet I wept for this ruined and restored Pole—to my surprise, for I understood perfectly well that this reallocation of private property is designed to create a species of investment, lure capital back from the States and from elsewhere in the diaspora. Such investment will finally demote limitless aristocratic seeming to the limits of bourgeois effecting and procuring.

"Heschel'er Riddell Kalasheen Bandit." I love the sputter and beat of these words, with the accent falling on the ultimate syllable: Heschel'ér Riddéll Kalashéén Bandít. This was the curse my paternal grandmother would hurl at her husband when she was angry with him. She had frequent cause to be angry. She underwent fifteen pregnancies between 1899 and 1918, eleven live births, two babies smothered accidentally in her bed, and innumerable abortions. To this day, my father is not sure whether Mrs Pollock, who visited regularly once a year, was the midwife or the abortionist: the moans and shrieks from behind closed doors were such a regular season of family life. "Heschel'er" is the

Yiddish diminutive for “Heschel,” “Harry”—if you must. “Riddell,” the family surname, changed hopefully to “Stone” to improve the family’s Lancashire credentials. “Kalasheen” is the Yiddish version of Kalisz, the mid-Polish city from which the paternal family originates. “Bandit” international: it means “You bandit!”

My father tells this story with obsessive relish, repeating his mother’s words and rhythm. They suggest an almost saving humour: “You are incorrigible, but I must love you.” By comparison, in my mother’s family I find only devastation, made doubly demonic and destructive by the diversion of vast amounts of psychic energy devoted to its denial. Yet, when we were children, we were inducted without preliminaries into the mysteries. My mother said, “Grandma would kill German babies.” “Why would Grandma kill German babies?” “Because the Germans killed Jewish babies.”

My mother was brought up by a woman—her mother, my grandmother—who was the only surviving member of her family. When Grandma was nineteen and Grandpa seventeen years old, they had run away from Łódź, also in mid-Poland, to Germany to marry, against the wishes of the families which belonged to different communities, Misnagdic and Hasidic. After their marriage, they followed Grandpa’s family and emigrated to London. Between August 1939, when she and my grandfather last holidayed, as they did annually, in Łódź, and 1949, when Cousin Gutta came and told my grandparents that she, a remote cousin, was the only one left, fifty members of Grandma’s family were killed—the children bayoneted first in front of their parents. Nowadays, my mother denies this; she denies that it happened and she denies that her mother suffered from it, so deep is her own unresolved suffering. This denial and unexamined suffering are two of the main reasons for her almost jovial unhappiness—the unhappiness of one who refuses to dwell in hell, and who lives, therefore, in the most static despair.

My God-forsaken families—from Kalisz and Łódź to Treblinka, but also to the East End of Manchester, Cheetham Hill Road, and to the East End of London, Whitechapel Road.

Yvette and I planned to visit Jerusalem together, where she was born and grew up. I very much wanted to go to Israel with Yvette, who was teaching me biblical and modern Hebrew, capital and cursive script. But she died before we could realise our dreams.

Once I arrived late for a taxi at Yvette's flat in Harrington Road, Brighton. The flat was perched high above a vociferous fire-escape, which I always tried to dampen on ascending in order to surprise her. On this occasion I'd booked the taxi to fetch me from her place, since I wanted to deliver a volume to her and then fly on somewhere else. My mind went completely blank when the impatient driver remarked blandly, "There was an old woman at the address you gave me. She didn't know anything about a taxi." An "old woman"? Who? Yvette? Preposterous!

While I copied out Rilke's *Elegies* for Yvette, Yvette sent me Yeats's "John Kinsella's Lament for Mrs Mary Moore":

*no one other knows what pleasures man  
finds at table or in bed.*

What shall I do for pretty girls  
now my Old Bawd is dead?

I suppose Yvette's looks could be misleading, for she was canny and crafty enough to disappear into the environment when it suited her purpose. From the moment that, unobserved, I first noticed and watched her, as she paced up and down the platform at Preston Park Station in Brighton, I knew that I was in the presence of a superior being. Green tights, a shapeless dark skirt and a mop of nondescript grey hair were but transparent media for the piercing intelligence in evident amused communication with itself, and warranting, on each turn at both ends of the platform, a grim but irrepressible smile which spread slowly over her bare, unmade-up, delicate features.

This lucid apparition came to me many times— crossing the Level in Brighton, in the corridors of the School of European Studies, as well as frequently at that same station platform—before I found myself being introduced to her at Julius Carlebach's home, and the supernatural being began to acquire a measure of the natural.

That evening at Julius's was memorable for another reason. It was the occasion of my initiation into the anti-supernatural character of Judaism: into how *non-belief in God* defines Judaism and how it changes in that compass registers the varieties of Jewish modernity. The more liberal Judaism becomes, the less the orientation by Halachah, the law, and the greater the emphasis on individual faith in God. Julius sat at the head of the table in a dining-room which was museum and mausoleum of the Carlebach family's distinguished and dreadful history. Portraits of his ancestors presided. Between Solomon Carlebach, Rabbi of Lübeck, Julius's grandfather, mentioned in Thomas Mann's *Dr Faustus*, and Julius's cousin, Shlomo Carlebach, the singing Rabbi of Manhattan's Upper West Side, Julius's father, Joseph Carlebach, the famous Rabbi of Hamburg, accompanied his congregation from Hamburg to their death outside Riga, with his wife and the four youngest of their nine children. The square in Hamburg where his synagogue stood has recently been renamed Carlebach Platz. In his acceptance speech in Hamburg, when Julius received the honour on behalf of his family, he pointed out to his audience that they were assembled in the same school hall where he had stood, a fifteen-

year-old schoolboy, on 10 November 1938, the day after *Kristallnacht*, when the Gestapo came and told the children that they had four weeks to leave Germany. “You could hear people collapse internally,” Julius commented on his adult audience. What happened to those children?

At dinner, Julius explained, “An Orthodox Jew doesn’t have to worry about whether he believes in God or not. As long as he observes the law.” Subsequently, I became familiar with the notorious and inscrutable Midrash: “Would that they would forsake Me, but obey my Torah.” When we parted that evening, Yvette and I had agreed that I would visit her.

Yvette’s dowdy and unselfconscious bearing was unable to conceal her visceral vocation as the Lover—not the Beloved: she was predator not prey. I had picked this up immediately that first time I spied on her from my station hide-out. The main room of her small granny-flat was furnished so that it conjured the atmosphere of Jerusalem’s Ben Yehuda Street. Teeming with colourful artifacts, against the backdrop of the holy city, it re-created in miniature the bazaars of Eastern Europe, displaying the wares of so many destroyed folk cultures. From every available space, photographs of Yvette’s five children and ten grandchildren listed tenderly towards her. We invariably sat opposite each other at the solid table by the window, high above the tree-lined road, and Yvette expounded to me her philosophy of love. Yvette was sixty-five years old when I first began to get to know her, and she had concurrently, three lovers:

*That lively lad most pleased me  
All that with me lay?  
In answer that I gave my soul  
I had loved in misery,  
I had great pleasure with a lad  
That I loved bodily.*

*Laughing from his arms I laughed  
I think his passion such  
I fancied that I gave a soul  
I had but our bodies touch,  
I had laughed upon his breast to think  
I had as much as gave as much.*

When I protested at this ceremony of lust, Yvette’s reply was prepared: Yeats’s “Last Confession” was elaborated by Swinburne:

*For thorns go as deep as a rose’s,  
And love is more cruel than lust.*

Yvette described my idea of creative closeness in relationships as a “total” and, by implication, totalitarian attitude. However, she insisted that while the number of her former lovers was too great to count, she had only been in love five times. This was an important distinction to her, and she appreciated having it confirmed by Miriam, her youngest child and only daughter.

Yvette was formidably well read. She had been married to an academic who taught English at the Open University, but now, in the mid-1980s, she was working as a secretary at the University of Sussex. Yvette regularly attended lectures and conferences, and she always posed with studied diffidence the most well-aimed critical questions, which presupposed her command of whatever



literature was at stake. She was, however, deeply Francophile, and her staples were Proust—she reread *A la Recherche* in its entirety, once a year, in her antique, slightly foxed Pléiade edition— and Maupassant, all the passages and stories expurgated from school editions. She also had a sly but ardent passion for the novels of Ivy Compton-Burnett. And these authors, whom she inhabited knowing them to be both enticing and rebarbative, were the source and confirmation of her philosophy of human relationships.

One Sunday, with the rain singing out of the secular silence, I met Yvette by chance walking in the unusually deserted Preston Park. We recognised each other with pleasure from afar. Yvette came up close to me and put her hand on my arm. I already knew that her daughter, Miriam, after years of not being able to conceive, including an ectopic pregnancy, with the consequent loss of one of her fallopian tubes, was now, at long last, expecting. Yvette said in a factual and unemotional tone of voice, “I have cancer of the breast. I have to wait for an operation.” She paused to gauge my response, which was guided by her evident dispassion, and then she added, “Miriam and I are now two ladies-in-waiting.”

Yvette was divorced from her husband. It had been he who had initiated the decisive break after they had had five children together. Yvette stressed that the shock of their unanticipated separation did not derive from the closeness of their tumultuous family life, but from the fact that their partnership had always sustained much extra-marital activity on both sides. Several small children would be deposited in the coping hands of Nanny as Yvette snatched a furtive and hurried rendezvous with her current liaison. “I loved my man,” she would defiantly assert of her former husband. Although she felt that she and her daughter Miriam, in particular, had been utterly deserted by him, she refused to rewrite history. Coming from a family in which my mother divorced both of her husbands, and, in addition, denied that she ever loved them, I found Yvette’s aggressive vulnerability refreshing.

Yvette was the most enthusiastic and inventive grandmother. She couldn’t spend enough time with her grandchildren, and she was especially close to Miriam’s two children, who lived downstairs in the main body of the spacious Victorian house that Yvette had bequeathed to her daughter. She frequently visited her favourite son and his wife in Southampton with their older children. Another son would visit from London with his Sephardi wife and their two children, and the remaining two sons lived in Israel and Australia.

Yvette was completely devoted to pleasure without guilt. This was what made her such an attentive and encouraging confidante. She would listen with rapt attention to my confessions of pain and rage but invariably dismiss my scruples, overcoming the nihilism of the emotions by affirming the validity of every tortuous and torturing desire. Although I was thus tutored by her, I watched with squeamish propriety as Yvette playfully squeezed her three-year-old grandson’s balls and penis. “Aren’t children meant to emerge to independence with a residue of resentment from the fact that it is the mother who accidentally arouses but explicitly forbids genital pleasure?” I ventured with theoretical pedantry in remembrance of Freud, and of the narrow border between child care and child abuse. Yvette positively relished my staid inhibitions, which she dismissed airily as contrary to the universal and sacred spirit of lust. A Grand Mother indeed.

In the far, dark corner of Yvette’s main room there stood a heavy veneered chest of drawers with a pride of family photographs jostling on top. The three bottom compartments of this tallboy were jammed full with pornographic material, which, one day, after I’d known her for quite a while, Yvette showed to me. The photographs were almost entirely of women, clad in enough to titillate, and revealing proud genitals in various *contrapposto* positions. Yvette possessed very little male pornography, not because it is less available, but because it didn’t interest her.

When I remarked one day, in a different context, that I couldn't reconcile her grandmother's identity with her prodigious sexuality, she looked sadly and wisely at me as the one corrupted by unnatural practices: "Have you forgotten the connection between sex and children?" She was, of course, partly right.

Yvette's inexhaustible animus could be traced to her unsentimental disapproval of her own mother as a mother and as an Israeli. According to Yvette, her mother, now in her nineties and living in her home in Jerusalem, had barred her children from loving or esteeming their father. Yvette's infinite fury at this ban had bestowed on her the lifelong celebration of lustful love. This vocation was inseparable from the rage at her mother, but also, and deeper still, it was inseparable from her secret concurrence with her mother concerning the intellectual inferiority of the male. Her contempt was overlaid, and therefore indiscernible to the untrained eye, with a much more explicit contempt for the resentful ruses of preyed-upon females.

To capture her distance from her mother as an Israeli, Yvette gives over the narrative voice to her for the space of a story. Yvette had, after all, run away in her early twenties with a one-legged Englishman, a "goy," as she would say. I cannot find a published version of this jumble tale, but one probably exists in Hebrew or Yiddish.

*A LEGEND ABOUT THE BAAL SHEM TOV (BESHT)—  
THE BEARER OF A GOOD NAME*

*In the remote Polish village where he lived, there is a widow—shall we call her Katrilevska for she is not Jewish. She has several mouths to feed and is hopeless and helpless. A coarse-looking peasant enters her hovel and ascertains her needs. First, he brings her firewood, fills up her stove and lights it. Then he goes back, returning with two pails of water on his shoulders and now she can boil some coffee. Lastly he brings her a warm loaf. All this at 4 a.m., and all the while the peasant hums a song in a foreign tongue, but it is very sweet. He bids her farewell and disappears. It is the Besht, and he was humming tehilim, and was back in his house just after 4 a.m., in time to pray shakhrith.*

The crucial thing is that Yvette's mother recited this story with disapprobation—or, I wonder, was it heard with disdain by the young Israeli children?

Yvette had two major recurrences of cancer before she died. After the first, relatively minor operation, a nip in the breast, which she valiantly displayed to select visitors, and several courses of chemotherapy, Yvette fell *in love*—in love, according to her own criterion—hopelessly and helplessly in love. But no Besht ever came to save her or even to console her. The object of this serious passion was thirty years her junior, a colleague of my generation. Clever, charming, promiscuous and superficial, he enjoyed Yvette's friendship, but was genuinely disconcerted by her remorseless ardour. Yvette was monstrous: she pursued him with myriad love letters, phone calls, messages pinned to his door, unsolicited visitations. I taunted her, "Yvette, if you were a man, your actions would be seen as gross harassment." On a later occasion, her violent blandishments unabated, I asked her, archly, what she would do with him, were he, miraculously, to succumb? Yvette replied without a fraction of hesitation, "I would chew him up and spit him out."

A whole generation of young women and men were bereaved by Yvette's death. She made new friends up to the end, and she gave people, young and old, her courage to face the terrors of desire for themselves and to ease off the unstable alleviation of attributing to the Beloved our desire for the

terrors. She could impart this wisdom because it grew out of the folly that she was still endlessly contesting in herself. And the cure for an unhappy love affair was always the pleasures of the ensuing one.

Yvette practised the *ars moriendi*; I had long known that she would. The day before she died, her spirit intact, she listened with a look of beatitude on her simplified face to the story that I had brought with me from Leamington Spa, where I had just moved, to the Brighton hospice, where she lay in a room that formed a hard crystal of light, exposed to the raucous and merciless spring. It was a long story, and when I had finished relating it to her, and had sat quietly with her for several hours, she finally spoke out of the suffused silence, "You are now going to leave." Then, in her own way, she gave me her blessing: "You know how I feel. You know how I feel. Nothing has changed. Nothing has changed. All the very best. All the very best." I bent over her and kissed her on the lips several times, her lips reaching mine each time before mine touched hers.

Among the many pieces of unlined file paper, cut into thirds and covered with Yvette's old-fashioned typewriting, I found another fragment of Swinburne:

*om too much love of living,  
From hope and fear set free,  
I thank with brief thanksgiving  
Whatever gods may be*

*That no man lives for ever,  
That dead men rise up never;  
That even the weariest river  
Winds somewhere safe to sea.*

I believe that I did in some sense visit Israel with Yvette, that through knowing her, I somehow reached the soul of that land of blessings and curses.

New York. Auschwitz. Jerusalem. My three Cities of Death: where I have been drawn time and time again over the last five years. My dead, dead Jim. Yvette across her civil wars. My numbered but nameless dead in Poland. Dearest, doughty Edna.

These lives, these deaths, like mine, come to me on the analogy from Plato between *the soul* and *the city*: the souls across the century, and the cities across the centuries.

Taking afternoon tea in the local, balmy Sunday park, surrounded by complaisant and complacent young families, the shallow waters of the duck pond idling in front of us, my sister Jacqueline, who had been working on Sylvia Plath and Anne Sexton, took a deep breath and announced: "I've had enough of mad girls."

I was never an innocent child. I was for ever accompanied by four wicked and energetic Particle secret and clever companions, who never allowed me any inhuman innocence of beginning, and who kept me prodigiously busy. These imps were called “Im,” “A,” “Di” and “Dys”: “Im-migration,” “Atheism,” “Di-voce,” “Dys-lexia.” Dyslexia, the last of these genies, is really the first: for, by discovering from very early on that the desert of stony words could be made to bloom, that I could channel what I could not overcome, I acquired a puckish strategy for enchanting the agents of adversity. The fourth disability could be made to germinate the other three.

In Jerusalem, Paul Mendes-Flohr’s son, Itamar, is so profoundly dyslexic that, at the age of twelve he cannot read a single word in any of the three languages which he speaks fluently: Hebrew, American-English and Arabic. Rita, his mother, is a Sephardi Jew from Curaçao, hence the “Mendes” in the family name. His father, Paul, is an American Jew. Itamar bears five names: his parents’ amalgamated surname, and three given names, one Israeli, one Arabic, one English.

Itamar’s parents, secular Zionists, are pro-Palestinian and active in the peace movement. Rita, his mother, architect and artist, stands daily in the roaring midday sun, dressed in heavy, black, long garments, with other women, mostly Ashkenazim, members of the protest movement “The Black Palestinian Women.” They expect the insults hurled from marauding bands of right-wing youths, who also congregate in the square. Itamar’s father, Paul, hosts a group of Arab intellectuals and Israeli academics who assemble weekly at the American Colony Hotel, situated between the Damascus Gate and Herod’s Gate, the one location in Arab East Jerusalem where you see vehicles parked next to each other, some with Israeli and some with Arab numberplates. Paul, who combines his political activities with being Professor of German-Jewish Intellectual History at the Hebrew University, has lost the sight in one of his eyes by neglecting to procure any treatment for a detached retina.

Dyslexia in a Jewish child is fraught with significance. For childhood is the preparation for the reading of the portion of the law at thirteen, the bar mitzvah, when the child becomes an adult, “a son of the law.” In Itamar’s case, I suspect, as in mine, the inability to read is a blind protestantism, an unconscious rebellion, against the law, the tradition of the fathers, and against the precipitous fortunes of the family. The stuttering in the face of the Written Word enacts a mimesis of the embattled and shattered truth of father and family. The confusion of names marks the child with the stigmata of the fantasised identity which he cannot assume—and so he stumbles against its central asylum, the written names of the law.

My conviction that I harboured secret, malign and crafty powers was encouraged by the adult treatment of me as a well wound-up mechanical toy that perversely refused to work. The emotional and symbolic meaning of my dyslexia was overlaid and obscured by several physical disabilities which received a lot of attention.

Quite recently I was propelled out of an optician’s chair with the impetus of primitive and long forgotten despair, when the optician remarked to me casually that I have a “lazy” eye. On recovering my equilibrium and equanimity, I had it explained to me that the epithet “lazy” is employed to render the nature of a squint intelligible to children. I riposted that this vicious metaphor can only be heard by a child as a harsh, personal judgement on her very being, on her good intentions and on her willingness to collaborate. Since the defect in my vision and the defect in my comprehension of words

on the page were not distinguished from each other, the pronouncement “lazy” tore down through me and made me determined, once I learnt to read, never to rest in the work of deciphering dangerous and difficult scripts.

The uncoupling of my wandering eye and my wandering mind did not finally occur until I was seven years old. I woke up in a hospital bed to find myself in the unaccustomed presence of both my father and my mother, which made me immediately aware, before I’d fully regained consciousness, that something very important and serious was happening to me. A row ensued between the two of them as to whether I should be permitted to eat or not. I cannot remember whose view prevailed, but I do remember being fed mashed banana, which I promptly vomited up. Meanwhile, the operation to correct the squint was successful, and now I could concentrate on learning to read.

Reading, however, did not interest me. With a persistent, dreary ache, my habit of sounding out words backwards, of not seeing sense in the unit of conjoint letters, gave me the dull conviction that I was a closed creature where reading was concerned. The special teacher, to whose house I was taken unwillingly every day after school, her voluminous, unified breast bolstered on the table next to the tall glass of cold milk and the plate of dry, predictable biscuits, did not seem a likely anagoge into the recalcitrant mysteries which possessed only a dubious claim on my soul.

The only paradises cannot be those that are lost, but those that are unlocked as a result of coercion, reluctance, cajolery and humiliation, their thresholds crossed without calm prescience, or any preliminary perspicacity. Reading was never just reading: it became the repository of my inner self-relation: the discovery, simultaneous with the suddenly sculpted and composed words, of distance from and deviousness towards myself as well as others. My disastrous Judaism of fathers and family transmogrified into a personal, protestant inwardness and independence. Yet, as with the varieties of historical Protestantism, progenitor of modernity, the independence gained from the protest against illegitimate traditional authority comes at the cost of the incessant anxiety of autonomy. Chronically beset with inner turmoil, the individual may nevertheless become roguishly adept at directing and managing the world to her own ends. Little did I realise then how often I would make the return journey from protestantism to Judaism.

On my sixteenth birthday I changed my surname by deed poll from “Stone” to “Rose,” from my father’s name to my stepfather’s name. From one heteronym to another: for, if “Stone” substituted for the Polish-Jewish “Riddell,” then “Rose,” English Rose, masked German-Jewish “Rosenthal,” valley of roses, one of the many horticultural names arbitrarily adopted on emancipation by a people whose God is absent from nature. This violent act of self-assertion, which was the culmination of seven years of impatient waiting, served as my bat mitzvah, my confirmation as daughter of the law. It represented the end of my legal childhood, during which the conditions of my father’s access had been established by frequently challenged Orders of the Court. Now I could decide on the pattern of communication and on our “access” to each other. My prematurely adult self-image was, however, severely dented soon after this *rite de passage*. I discovered, to my disgust, on personal supplication for my birth certificate at the Public Record Office in Chancery Lane in order to apply for my first passport under my new name, that I was officially, in law, at the age of sixteen—worldly, voluptuous and scholarly as I fancied myself—an INFANT SPINSTER.

I did not, of course, control any of the consequences of my action. My father responded rapidly to my change of name by officially disowning me. As a result, I did not see him between the ages of sixteen and twenty-one. The Name: the Name. A rose is [not] a rose is [not] a rose is [not] a rose. And it was Gertrude Stein who formulated the positive version of that liturgy—*Stein*, a “Stone,” no less.

During a three-year period, when, a Lecturer at the University of Sussex, I was working on the German schools of neo-Kantianism, the dry and dusty volumes of epistemology evacuated from the entrails of the British Library, I purchased my first property. It was a modest, two-bedroomed flat in a characterless modern block with shaky foundations in Stoke Newington, the only part of London that I could afford. I worked three days a week in the British Library and commuted to Brighton on the other two. In Stoke Newington I gradually discovered that I was dwelling among a community of Hasidic Jews, the Lubavitch Habad. "Gradually discovered" because, while the men are instantly recognisable in their late eighteenth-century gaberdines, summer and winter, with their square beaver hats and long ringlets hanging down over each ear, flanking their pallid, earnest faces, it takes longer to identify the women and children. They have a superficial appearance of normality, which is all the more estranging in its radical deviation from the working-class norm, in this outer ring of London, to which the underground does not extend. On marriage, women belonging to this sect shave their heads, and from then on they wear a wig, called a *sheitl*, which means "parting," so named because of the parting of the line of absence of hair, in this lugubrious concession to the cosmetic. They bear a child annually in violation of the commandment to copulate every Sabbath eve, and to refrain during and after menstruation, when the women immerse themselves in the *mikveh*, the public ritual bath. The limbs of these children are completely covered up, arms and legs hidden by gravid garments, whatever the season or temperature of the air. At night I could imagine that I was a *flâneur* in Middle European straits of High German, French and Italian, as well as Yiddish and Hebrew, would percolate from the street through the open windows of my flat. And on those days when, my own hair unwashed, I dashed to the launderette in the local parade of shops, with a chiffon scarf covering my head, my face scrubbed and unmade-up, I would be greeted and treated as a member. This involved cultivating a passing talent for altercation: arguing for priority in drying my linen, because *my* plane was leaving for the Holy Land half an hour earlier than the transport of my adversary.

I did not realise how deeply I had become accustomed to this neighbourhood iconography of the holy community, living in the midst of that peculiarly dense piety of popular Kabbalah, which enjoins the men—and only the men—to return the divine sparks to the creator in ritual song and dance, until one day, looking out of the window of the flat, I saw a wedding party arrive at the block of flats on the opposite side of the road. Not an Hasidic wedding, an ordinary English wedding. What struck me at once was the lightness of the vision: slender young bridesmaids in short white muslin dresses with loose bare limbs, the adults attired in the pastel hues of matrimonial finery, and the commingling of the sexes in easy high spirits, all on their way from the church ceremony to the jollifications of the reception. My disinterested perception of this happy procession was brusquely interrupted by the loud irruption of a subhuman howling, the source of which was unlocatable. It was howling as if from a dark, dank cave, where some deformed brute had been chained and tempted since time immemorial. The howling did not cease even after the last of the wedding party had disappeared from view.

It was I who was howling, in utter dissociation from myself, the paroxysm provoked by the vivacious contrast between the environing Judaism and this epiphany of protestants, the customary laborious everydayness broken by the moment of marriage, the cloaks of the clandestine pious cleaved by the costumes of those weightless, redeemed beings. To this day, I cannot go to family weddings.

It was when I was living in Stoke Newington that I finally passed my driving test. I had overcome not only the fundamental lack of co-ordination between my mind and the mechanics of the motor vehicle, but, I discovered here, too, a much deeper inhibition. I see in my mind's eye that no man's-land which I had had to cross from the security of home, harbouring my mother, stepfather and sisters, to my father's car, parked and waiting at a tangent to the house. My sister and I, obliged by

court to spend one weekend afternoon a fortnight with my father, would be driven somewhere by him for a few hours, usually to the cartoon cinema, situated in Terminal One at London Airport. The battles waged between my father and myself took place, however, in his mystical chariot. Wheel within wheels and full of dreadful eyes, the enthroned Almighty chastised his prophet Ezekiel for his abject rebellion. Sitting in the front passenger seat, I was wrathfully and precisely informed that I had broken the fifth commandment to honour (not *to love*, note) my father as well as my mother. Indeed, I had measured palm against his palm, fingers against his fingers, I was told that I was the bearer of hands with the magnitude of a man. I think my resistance finally broke one Saturday afternoon, when my father told me, by way of explaining my beloved stepmother's unusual absence, that it was my wickedness that had caused her to lose the child that she had been carrying—the little brother I had craved, living, as I did, in a world of sisters.

Court case after court case contesting the conditions of access followed these traumatising interviews. And, to my increasing horror, my devilish powers grew apace out of the demonising of my father. How many children find that their fear and hatred of a parent can actually land that parent in court, defending himself against charges brought on the child's initiative? What happens to children who split off their ambivalence about their parent and neatly personify it in two separate characters—the wicked father and the good stepfather? This long and perilous upbringing spoilt my imagination, my ability to distinguish between fantasy and reality, to be able to feel murderous in the confidence that I would never commit the foul act. It ruined my capacity to tolerate highly charged yet contradictory emotions about the same person, and not to isolate the dangerous aspects exclusively in one person.

This is the source of my excessive spirituality, my screwtape obsession with disembodied truth. How do I know what my father said to me? Over the years, I have asked him and my stepmother again and again whether they really did tell me that I was responsible in effect for the miscarriage of a foetus too immature for its sex to be formed. They always respond with great loving kindness, yet, and here's the rub, I can never remember what they reply to my mythical question. No matter how many times I ask them, and no matter how hard I try, I cannot recall the answer.

After one especially bitter court case, I learnt from Ann, our long-standing, resident mother's helper and adopted member of the family, that the judge had pronounced: "A plague on both your houses." This surreptitious knowledge, smuggled in to me, of something not right on both sides, must have saved me by restoring a sense of unresolvable truth, by putting a disturbing and fuzzy paradox in the place of stern and unequivocal judgement. But to this day, I do not care to drive a car.

My overcharged gnostic imagination continues to embellish the Manichaean opposition between my fathers. Doctors of medicine, they are equally disaffected Jews. I do not use the conventional term "assimilated," because it fails to capture the energetic alienation from traditional Judaism which informs the modern Jew, and which accentuates adopted characteristics—the dour and abrasive Yorkshireman, the horse-mad Irishman, full of the blarney.

On the two Passover *Seder* nights at my maternal grandparents', in the interstices of the assembly company's chanting of the Hebrew, my father tenaciously polices solecisms of grammar and pronunciation in the halting conversations which take place between the adults and the children. English with frequent lapses into Yiddish. My grandparents, who move easily between Yiddish, Polish, Russian, Hebrew and French (the last of these languages specially acquired for their frequent holidays at the gaming tables of Cannes and Nice), are indifferent and heavily accented speakers of English. They find my father's strictures burdensome and offensive, and they persist in the macaronic medley of tongues.

When my stepfather replaces my father at *Seder* nights, the stakes are raised. In the place of policeman, we have a comedian. Irving intones the Haggadah in the dutifully monotonous mumble of a son of the law. The patriarch, my grandfather, presides at the head of the long table, laden with all the traditional signs and symbols. The youngest male child, my cousin, whose question, “Why is this night different from all the other nights?” begins the holy recital, sits on one side of him; the eldest female child, myself, who, at the appointed time, opens the front door for Elijah, so that the angel of death should pass over the house, sits on the other side of him. In the course of the service, which has its high points in the hide and seek of the coins in the matzo, but also its *longueurs*, Irving interjects into the steady flow of the Hebrew a stream of very Anglo-Saxon obscenities. Grandpa pretends not to hear and continues expressionless in his recitation. For the children, the exquisite pain begins of trying to suppress their hilarity. The acceleration of these depredations is as predictable as the order of the service itself. Grandpa starts to threaten disapproval by the most subtle expressions of discomfort, while the young people increasingly fail to suffocate their mix of consternation and glee at the wholesome transgression. Eventually—how long can we hold out?—Grandpa pauses and feigns long suffering exasperation, the children collapse in merriment, and Irving makes a show of contrition.

The contrast between my father’s strict, clipped conformity to the Queen’s English and my stepfather’s love of the underside of the language, pronounced with a Dublin lilt, gives you the difference of character and temperament: the stern eye versus the eye moist with humour and illicit pleasure; the one, doctor of medicine turned stockbroker, devoted to the professional accumulation of wealth, who gives nothing away; the other, doctor of medicine and compulsive gambler, reckless and profligate, who carelessly loses everything. The stone and the rose. In my thirties, as my elective apprenticeship in Judaism deepened, I approached my father and urged him to give me a five-volume set of the Bible with the Commentary of Rashi, the great medieval philosopher and Talmudist. He explained to him that it is traditional for a Jewish father to give the set of five volumes to his son. My sister Diana, who overheard my request, commented in a factual tone of voice, “Asking our father for something is like trying to get blood out of a stone.” Nevertheless, he obtained the set for me and inscribed it with his blessing for his strange eldest daughter of the law, who takes the son’s part, to Irving brings peonies, *Pfingstrosen*, Pentecostal roses, magnified blooms of the early summer harvest, the eternal in the fleeting benison.

*worship the King all glorious above;  
gratefully sing his power and his love;  
O shield and defender, the Ancient of Days,  
adorned in splendour and girded with praise.*

*tell of his might, O sing of his grace,  
whose robe is the light, whose canopy space;  
O chariots of wrath the deep thunder-clouds form,  
and dark is his path on the wings of the storm.*

*Thou earth with its store of wonders untold,  
mighty, thy power hath founded of old;  
thou hast established it fast by a changeless decree,  
and round it hath cast, like a mantle, the sea.*



- [The Silent Murder \(An Elizabethan Murder Mystery\) pdf, azw \(kindle\)](#)
- [read online The Theory of Governance and Other Miscellaneous Papers: 1921-1938 \(The Collected Works of Eric Voegelin, Volume 32\) pdf, azw \(kindle\)](#)
- [download Algebra Success in 20 Minutes a Day \(2nd Edition\) for free](#)
- [download The Ever-Blooming Flower Garden: A Blueprint for Continuous Color](#)
  
- <http://wind-in-herleshausen.de/?freebooks/Loser-s-Town.pdf>
- <http://musor.ruspb.info/?library/Sauces--Classical-and-Contemporary-Sauce-Making.pdf>
- <http://berttrotman.com/library/Happy-Mutant-Baby-Pills.pdf>
- <http://cambridgebrass.com/?freebooks/The-Ever-Blooming-Flower-Garden--A-Blueprint-for-Continuous-Color.pdf>