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The Victorian

Ottoman Palestine (1517-1917) is an important historical epoch in the Zionist historiography. It is the time of the First Aliyah which refers to the immigration of the Jews from the diaspora to Palestine (1882-1903). Those years are the foundational ones of the Zionist colonial project in Palestine. A representation of part of this historical epoch is found in Alon Hilu’s The House of Rajani (2008). Though Hilu’s novel deviates from the Zionist grand narrative by representing the Palestinian voice and the Palestinians of Jaffa, it marginalises and deranges them. From this perspective, the paper seeks to prove that The House of Rajani is not different from the colonial, Zionist and Oriental narratives.

The novelist and playwright Alon Hilu (b 1972) was born in Jaffa to Syrian Jewish parents (Alon Hilu). His novel The House of Rajani won the Sapir Prize in 2009 which is the top literary prize in colonised Palestine (Alon Hilu). However, after two weeks of announcing the winner, the prize was withdrawn (Five Books v5). It is thought that the prize was withdrawn because the novel defamed the “holy” mission of “purchasing” land in Palestine during the years of the First Aliyah and of defiling the memory of the Zionist Polish pioneer Haim Kalvarisky (1868-1947). The House of Rajani was published in 2008 many years after the emergence of the Israeli “New Historians” which enabled Hilu to read part of their work. He actually situates himself within this wave and confesses that he has written this book after reading Benny Morris’s two books: Righteous Victims and The Palestinian Refugee Problem (Five Books v5). Acknowledging that he has read Morris’s books, but not any other new historian’s, sheds light on the ideology that he adopts in his book. In an interview published in Haaretz, Morris bluntly states: “[w]ithout the uprooting of the Palestinians, a Jewish state would not have arisen here” (qtd. in Shavit). Throughout his novel, Hilu agrees with Morris in that there were people in Palestine before 1948 but it was necessary to dispose of them because they do not fit in the “healthy”, “clean” and “ethical” new Jewish society.

Set in Jaffa city, The House of Rajani, originally, The House of Dajani, narrates the events of 1895; the first year of Kalvarisky’s life in Palestine. Kalvarisky, who is fictionally represented as Luminsky, is a much appreciated figure in the Zionist collective memory; his efforts in purchasing Palestinian land for the Zionist project are well known (Oppenheimer 383). The novel alternates between two narrative voices, the Jewish Zionist one of adult Luminsky and the Muslim Palestinian one of child Salah Dajani/Rajani.

Dangerous Barbaric Jaffa

The European White Jewish Luminsky’s first impression of the Palestinians at Jaffa port is close to any White coloniser’s. Luminsky is a typical early Zionist/olim who saw the Arabs as savages and primitive (Morris 43). Palestine is a land inhabited by savages that resemble the “unexpected, wild, and violent” (71) Africans in Joseph Conrad’s Heart of Darkness (1899). Hilu’s olim expresses his disgust and
The Victorian shock the moment he sets foot on Jaffa. Luminsky observes “Arabs drew their narrow boats alongside the ship and our deckhands tossed thick, coiled ropes to them, which the Arabs ascended rapidly in the manner of monkeys, their long, dark arms grasping them with rapid expertise. When they were nigh … one could see the ebony hue of their eyes, which sparkled like the skin of a moist black reptile” (Hilu 11). The Arabs’ characteristics, that Luminsky foregrounds, are animal-like. In the colonial discourse, the Other is always compared to animals and depicted as black-coloured barbarians (Kabbani 8, 14). The Africans in Conrad’s novel are equally represented as animals: “one of these creatures rose to his hands and knees, and went off on all-fours towards the river to drink” (45). Likening the Palestinians at the port to “reptiles” establishes their revulsive nature that causes the White Jew’s disgust of the Palestinian males throughout the narrative.

As he continues to portray the barbaric nature of the Palestinians, Luminsky records a violent incident that concurs with the viewpoint of the Zionist forefather and chairman of The Jewish National Fund Max Bodenheimer (1865-1940). Luminsky observes that “one [Arab] bashing the other's head, and the man falling to the ground, blood flowing from his cracked skull and fluid from his brain seeping into the blazing earth” (Hilu 12-13). Violence and vulgarity are found in Bodenheimer’s description of Jaffa; it is “a forlorn island of urbanised barbarism” (Hillman 7). Intensifying the collective violent image of the Palestinians, Luminsky presents this scene as an everyday occurrence and chooses to be silent about the Palestinians’ reaction to such a violent action. Accordingly, this scene justifies “rescuing” the land of milk and honey from the hands of its brutal inhabitants.

Seeing the house of Rajani for the first time, Luminsky believes that it is a beautiful “deserted” house: “a capacious Arab home ... The magnificence of its past was clearly discernable in the elegant, rounded veranda decorated with tiles festooned with Arab lettering” (Hilu 47). Entering the house, Luminsky records: “when I opened [the door] I found myself in a long and narrow corridor lined with dusty old red drapes and all manner of daggers and lances and spears affixed to the walls, no sunlight or candlelight on hand to dissipate the thick, silent darkness” (Hilu 48-9). The corridor is merely a passage that symbolises the years the Zionists will go through until they colonise Palestine. This corridor is lined up with daggers and spears which symbolise the dangers that the Zionists will encounter on the hands of the Palestinians which further intensifies the violent nature of the Palestinians that the narrative foregrounds. The sunlight that this place is in need of is expected to be granted by the domination of the “enlightened” White European Jews over Palestine.

Demeaning the Palestinian Women

The representation of the Palestinian women reflects Hilu’s patriarchal colonial ideology. The colonial discourse has always depicted Eastern women as “the living rewards that white men could, if they wish to, reap” (Kabbani 51). Luminsky’s third diary entry is a manifestation of the White European Jew conquering and certainly reaping the Arab Muslim women. The Palestinian women here do not stand for
Palestine, because the land does not belong to them, but certainly conquering these women represents conquering their race which foreshadows the narrative’s future events and establishes the power relation from the beginning of the novel. A perennial motif that runs throughout the writings of the Westerns about the Orient is the association between the Orient and sex. As Edward Said (1935-2003) maintains in *Orientalism*, oriental women “are usually the creatures of a male power-fantasy. They express unlimited sensuality … and … they are willing” (207). Kuchuk Hanem was one of these women that were discussed in the Orientalist accounts of the French novelist Gustave Flaubert’s (1821-1880). Kuchuk Hanem is an Egyptian almeh: a term used to describe women dancers who also work as prostitutes (Said 186). Luminsky, like Flaubert, assumes authority over women of his desire and dominates them through sexual activity and by means of denying them their voice and agency.

In fact, the East was represented, in the Oriental discourse, as a land “where sexual desires could be gratified to the hilt” (Kabbani 16). Thus, the first encounter between the readers and the Palestinian women is in the “small houses and cabins painted pink” (Hilu 14) in which prostitutes were engaged in sexual activities to gratify men. These prostitutes “stirred desire for intercourse with their enormous, quivering breasts dripping with milk and honey” (Hilu 15); describing their breasts as “dripping with milk and honey” amalgamates the two images of women and land as Palestine is described in the Torah as “land flowing with milk and honey” (Ex. 3:9), suggesting that to conquer these women is to conquer the land they inhabit. Equating women and land is an ancient metaphor: since the beginning of the colonial expansion and beyond, women bodies acquire a different status that is of symbolising the land (Loomba 152).

Flaubert concludes, based on his supposed knowledge of one prostitute, that all the Oriental women do not differentiate between one man and another (Said 187). The White Jew follows the same generalisation; all the Palestinian women are prostitutes. The first time Luminsky sees Afifa Rajani, he thinks “[p]erhaps she was a harlot” (Hilu 33). Alluring to the Oriental thought that believes that Muslim women “spent their time in sexual preparation […] and in sexual intrigue” (Kabbani 26), Luminsky believes that Afifa seduces him and leads him inside her house. He sees that Afifa’s “eyes were mischievous, summoning a man to lightheadedness and debauchery” (Hilu 33). This description resembles the description of one of the native women in Conrad’s novel “[s]he was savage and superb, wild-eyed and magnificent” (89), which suggests the “dangerous” carnal female temptation that Non-European women possess. The choice of the name “Afifa” is highly ironical; it is synonymous in Arabic to the “virtuous one” (Almaany); virtue is usually linked to honour that is closely related to sexual activities in the Arab culture. Throughout the course of the narrative, Afifa proves to be the opposite of the connotation of her name.

Afifa is oppressed on various levels; she’s denied her voice, she’s always depicted as “unclean” and she becomes mentally sick by the end of the narrative. She is subjugated to the authority and the male gaze of both Luminsky and her own son Salah. Salah and Luminsky have what Said called “intellectual authority” (19) over
Afifa; they speak on her behalf throughout the entire narrative. Violating the privacy of his mother, Salah “beheld the strangest sight: from between her legs there fell a wad of many strips of cloth, their dull whiteness stained black with heavy bleeding” (Hilu 111). Menstruation blood in Judaism signifies impurity and filthiness. According to the Talmud, Afifa is a Niddah which literally means the excluded one and accordingly she is impure for seven days (Jewish Virtual Library). Moreover, according to the Torah “whoever toucheth [a Niddah] shall be unclean until the even. And everything she lieth upon in her impurity shall be unclean; everything also that she sitteth upon shall be unclean” (emphasis added) (Lev. 15:19-21); thus, the whole scene that Salah witnesses is unclean. Menstruation blood is an ugly thing, ugliness is defilement, it is also a deviation from the socially acceptable and it surpasses the clean (Bray); Afifa is ugly and deviated from the Jewish social norms. The stain of Afifa’s blood is not fresh, but a black one that comes from inside her body signifying her corrupted inner self that is beyond repair.

Being exposed by her own son breaches the mother-son relation on many levels. It makes Salah a conspirator with Luminsky to expose his mother and places Saleh as the voyeur of his mother. In this sense, Afifa is subjugated to Luminsky’s sexual and colonial powers and to her son’s oppressive male gaze. The narrative maintains the domination of Salah’s male authority over his mother until the end. Salah continues to impose his obscure gaze and writes: “I watched her remove her clothing and, below her breasts, and beneath the round navel that protruded slightly, there was a dense, triangular thicket of black hair, and the blood flowed from it like a battered child running for its life … the odour was fetid, that of a life cut short by a dagger or sword … I retched from the bottom of my soul” (Hilu 111). This pornographic scene is emphasised by Afifa’s naked breasts and pubic hair relating her to the prostitutes that were subjugated to Luminsky’s gaze and to his phallic power in the beginning of the narrative. Describing the odour as “fetid” corresponds with the image of the Orients as “filthy” in the colonial discourse. Salah’s resembling the smell to a “life cut short” foreshadows the assumption of killing of his father at the hands of his mother. Consequently, the narrative establishes beyond doubt that Afifa is an irrevocable loathed prostitute. Such characters cannot repent; they are doomed to eternal suffering and misery. Salah’s final comment aligns him with Luminsky who was disgusted from the Palestinians at the port of Jaffa, thus, establishing his superiority over his mother.

Afifa does not fit either morally or mentally in the future Jewish colonial society. She becomes literally filthy and delirious with suicidal tendencies by the end of the narrative. Salah records that his mother sleeps “on her bed of excrement and urine” (Hilu 225). This is another scene in which Afifa is described as being unclean. Afifa’s whole body and bed are enclosed in filth; thus, in a future Zionist state that is based on religious purity, Afifa does not have a place. Afifa suffers from an intrinsic feeling of filthiness that she constantly tries to dispose of. She has a compulsive behaviour of constantly washing her hands that is recorded by Salah and Luminsky alike: she “hastened to the basin and washed her hands, rubbing them vigorously” (Hilu 133). This compulsive symptom is Afifa’s conscious mind trying to deal with...
or rather unable to deal with the loss of an object (Edwards and Williams) which is, in this case, the land. Her hand is significant because she confesses that she “handed [the land’s deed] over to the pernicious angel” (Hilu 202); the “sin” of giving the land away to Luminsky is what Afifa tries to atone for. Being unable to reach cleanliness, Afifa “disrobed … and … shouted, To the river! … to bathe there and be rid of the impurity, for ants and scorpions were crawling across her skin and making their terrible scampering noises” (Hilu 199). The river is a symbol of cleanliness and the means to attain purgation to her unforgivable sin. This has developed later to suicidal attempts; Salah writes “[m]other whispered to me in a seductive, misleading voice, Salah … bring me a knife so that I may peel an apple … and she bawled and said, Salah, my sins weigh heavily upon me” (Hilu 202).

Afifa does not confess that she has had an illicit relationship with Luminsky; it is only Salah and Luminsky who claim so. Salah’s discovery of the illicit relationship between Luminsky and his mother is doubted as he sees them as a “vision”. He records “I saw this vision (emphasis added), of Mother's bare thighs dripping with sweat, and her deep moans, and above all this, rising and falling, up and down and up and down … the angel Gabriel's two naked buttocks” (Hilu 104). It is hard to tell whether Salah tells the truth or this is merely the work of his own imagination because of his literary talent that is established from the beginning of the narrative. In fact, he uses the word “vision” to describe the sexual scene between his mother and Luminsky. It seems that the narrative is obsessed with presenting Afifa as an immoral adulteress. She is punished for being “immoral” following the colonial ideology: Eastern women “were … to be used sexually, and if it could be suggested that they were inherently licentious, then they could be exploited with no qualms whatsoever” (Kabbani 51).

Conquering the Land

Luminsky sets to “discover” the land while figuratively and literally laying bare its owner Afifa. The whole novel revolves around two intermingling aims: conquering Afifa and the Rajani Estate. Having access to the Rajani estate, Luminsky invites himself to take a tour around the house to investigate the nature of the land that he plans to “cultivate”. Luminsky “knelt down to take up a handful of earth in order to assess its quality … The earth of La Maison Rajani was lush and fertile, the finest, choicest land [he] had come across in all the Land of Israel” (Hilu 47); hence, he is tempted to steal it from its rightful owners. However, Luminsky cannot help but observe the negligence of such a fertile land: “The grounds of the estate were densely populated with fruit and trees too closely congregated, and tall weeds grew beside them. Juicy fruits hung from the trees, shiny with colour, but much was rotten and still more had fallen and lay rotting in muddy puddles, prey for hordes of fruit flies … I rose, heartened, to tour the estate” (Hilu 47). Being “heartened”, Luminsky, justifies his determined attempts to “save” the land. Here Luminsky agrees with two other Zionist forefathers: Alfred Nossig (1864-1943) and Franz Oppenheimer (1864- 1943)
The Victorian

who saw the necessity of “reviving” and “regaining” the land of milk and honey (cited in Hillman 8). Part of the colonial ideology that Luminsky adopts is the claim to “civilise” the wasteland and save it from the aboriginal people who are inferiors and aliens (Hillman 3). Consequently, in case of resistance of either its owners or tenants, it is mandatory to take action against them for the wellbeing of the land and as a punishment for mistreating the land.

In the colonial discourse “sexual and colonial relationships become analogous to each other” (Loomba 151); Luminsky decides to secure Afifa’s consent of their sexual relationship as a way of penetrating her land. Palestine was the focus of sexual desire for the Zionist pioneers; the land was imagined as a virgin that is enthusiastically awaiting for the Yishuv to penetrate and fertilise it (Sand 223). Luminsky tests Afifa as he tests the land; he “place[s] [his] fingers on [Afifa’s] thigh … She [does] not remove them” (Hilu 56) which concludes, for him, her consent of their sexual relationship. In this sense, he is following the viewpoint of the Palestinian Jewish leader Yitzhak Epstein (1862-1943), who called the Zionists to gain the consent of the Arabs before the colonial expansion (Morris 57). However, Afifa’s alleged consent does not grant him, as he expected, her consent to sell the Rajani Estate. Salah witnesses Luminsky’s constant attempts to get hold of the estate’s Kushan (deed) that Luminsky is silent about in his diary. Salah records:

Mother … told [Luminsky] … that the tenant farmers had broken free of her control … and sobs leaped from her throat as she pleaded with him to help her … [to which he answers] You know my condition for assisting you, and she said, That is a condition I can never agree to, to which he replied … If you do not do as I demand, I will leave at once, never to return … for if not I shall tell the world that you are a whoring adulteress … [Luminsky] overturned her trousseau … and he emptied all of it … and all the while he bellowed in a way I had never imagined possible, Where have you hidden the kushan? to which he added a curse- sharmuta, whore (Hilu 115-6, 122).

It is obvious that male colonial power represented in Luminsky is exerted over Afifa. Afifa’s pleading is a manifestation of Spivak’s “White men saving brown women from brown men” (33). Afifa can do nothing but to sob and plead to the colonial power to save her from her own people. This quote further emphasises Luminsky’s manipulative power and constant trials to force Afifa to grant him the land, which contradicts the values of the Zionist forefathers that the Zionist narrative propagates. It seems that Luminsky’s final threat, which is related to honour, is the main factor behind Afifa’s surrender to his threats, as honour is much cherished in Arab culture. Luminsky’s outburst that “the estate is his, his for ever and ever” (Hilu 176) reinforces the assumption that is prevalent in the Zionist grand narrative that denies the Palestinians’ right to the land.

Presenting a Feeble Palestinian Counter Narrative
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The only narrative voice that defies Luminsky’s is Salah’s. The colonial writings have always shown that the European male is associated with adulthood, civilisation and rationality, while the non-Europeans are always attributed with primitiveness, childlike behaviour and madness (Loomba 137-8); Salah is not only an embodiment of the non-European characteristics, but also he is madly in love with Luminsky.

In Hilu’s perception, Salah is a dirty Palestinian boy; Salah confesses “I despise my feeble image, whose clothes are ragged and stained and tattered and smeared with excrement” (Hilu 43). Though Salah belongs to the upper-class and masters the French language, he is still a filthy Arab, which emphasises that all the Palestinians are filthy no matter how rich and educated they are. Making a sick child narrate the Palestinian side of the story is manifold: the Palestinians are psychologically unstable, they might be imagining the atrocities of 1948, they are as naïve as children, they are weak and will eventually perish with their “invented” story.

Though Salah speaks more than once about the doomed future of the Palestinians, he, like his mother, does not have intellectual authority over most of his prophecies. In fact, Luminsky tells Salah’s prophecies five times in comparison to Salah’s mastering his own narrative three times only. Moreover, Salah’s prophecies are revealed as episodes like the symptoms of a psychological ailment. The first time the narrative mentions Salah’s prophecies is in the form of hallucinations out of being feverish; according to Luminsky’s records, Afifa tells him that Salah “was burning with fever and talking nonsense about some strange war and disaster and destruction” (Hilu 56). Salah reveals his own prophecies among the mysterious “wavelets of the biara” (60); thus, associating his prophecies with supernatural and certainly unreal images. Salah is instantly transformed from a child to a fortuneteller that foresees the future through water; he records: “I see our Arab brethren fleeing for their lives towards thin-skinned skiffs and citrus groves while behind them pots are left bubbling and simmering on hot coals” (Hilu 60); prophecies that come true in the Palestinian narrative of the Nakba. Then Luminsky fully masters the narrative and reports one of Salah’s prophecies that are dominated by the phallic power: “the unyielding vanquishers will slaughter the Arabs by swords and will strip them of their homes and raze their villages and throw salt on the wounded earth” (Hilu 84). This part actually praises the Zionists by describing them as uncompromising conquerors, the action of slaughtering links the Arabs to animals and the “sword” to the phallic power; thus, continuing the image of the male Zionist dominance over the Palestinian female one. The tone is embedded with admiration; enemies are not usually described as “unyielding vanquisher” by the defeated group. Continuing with the phallic image, Salah prophesises the erection of three towers in currently colonised Jaffa in the place of the Rajani Estate; Luminsky reports: “one day in the future [the Jews] will build three towers on its land, all very tall, their heads in the heavens” (Hilu 129). These three towers actually symbolise Luminsky’s success in dominating and colonising Afifa and Palestine respectively. It is not only that Luminsky possesses the phallus in the narrative, but also all the Zionist Jews do as represented in erecting three phallic symbols standing for penetrating and possessing Palestine.
Salah sees that Luminsky is “the bright look of innocence, the white dove of peace, magical, heavenly light” (Fanon 189). Though being certain of his vicious nature, Salah does not stop his overflowing love towards Luminsky. This love has been established since the beginning of the narrative and seals its end as well. Identifying with Leila, the protagonist of his fictional writing, Salah writes personified as Leila: “I am gnawed away longing for the love of my life, so handsome is he, blue-eyed … not a Christian or Muslim … he is tall … his eyes wiser than wisdom itself … my golden-haired beloved” (Hilu 34-35). This corresponds with Salah’s description of Luminsky the moment he sees him: “his curly golden hair and … his blue eyes, those repositories of goodness and wisdom … his smallest finger more precious to me than my own body” (Hilu 37).

Salah has always called Luminsky “angel Gabriel” who has “beautiful golden curls” (Hilu 33) that will “cure” (56) his ailments. This shows Hilu’s contempt of Islam and the Muslims. Calling Luminsky Gabriel, by Muslim Salah, shows that Salah expects revelation and enlightenment from Luminsky. The Archangel Gabriel, in Islam, is the angel who was sent to Prophet Muhammed by God to impose upon him “the duty of leading mankind out of the welter of sin, error and ignorance into the light of Guidance, Truth and Knowledge” (Razwy). By the same token, Prophet Muhammed is personified as Salah and Luminsky represents Gabriel that is sent by God to enlighten Salah’s road and delivers His message to people. Calling Luminsky angel Gabriel reinforces the religious motif that runs throughout this narrative. Salah’s conception is ironical because the person that Salah thought of as a saviour is in fact the destroyer.

Salah’s disturbed self is reflected on his perception of and behaviour towards Luminsky. When the colonised subject with a weak psychic structure comes in contact with the white man, “one observes a collapse of the ego. The black man stops behaving as an actional person. The goal of his behaviour will be the Other (in the guise of the white man), for The Other alone can give him worth” (Fanon 154). The ending of the narrative and of Salah’s life prove the previous; though Luminsky kills his father, dominates his mother, and usurps his estate, Salah perceives him as his saviour. Salah writes the good angel shall be the hero of the story, the first among heroes and lovers in this plot, and he will walk the holy earth proudly and vanquish his enemies, beheading them, and how lucky I am to have taken refuge under his wings and been swept up in the embrace of his arms, and how lucky I am that he came to this estate to beautify it and return (emphasis added) it to its comeliness and brightness (Hilu 213).

The plot that Salah talks about foreshadows the fall of Palestine; the so called “enemies” are the Palestinians. This is an image of a self-hating pacified Arab who alienates himself from his Self and aligns with the Other. Salah realises the “truth” after various futile resistance attempts. Salah’s stand is ironical; he wrongly identifies with the coloniser and alienates himself from his own people. What could be a more
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bitter end to the main Palestinian character in the novel? The “return” that Salah refers to alludes to the times of Jewish rule of Palestine (920 BC- 597 BC) (Jewish Virtual Library) and significantly acknowledges the confession of the Palestinians of the so-called Jewish right to the land. Salah dies by the end of the narrative but only after internally reconciling with his oppressor symbolising that the presence of the Jews inside Palestine is eventually to be appreciated even if the Palestinians have to pay their lives for it. Salah does not only accept that Luminsky would colonise Palestine, but, like Herzl’s Reschid Bey, he also welcomes the coloniser to Palestine and realises the good fortune that bestows him when Luminsky saves him.

In conclusion, Hilu succeeded to represent the Palestinian narrative of pre-Nakba Palestine and managed to condemn all the Palestinians. The House of Rajani agrees with the colonial discourse in representing the East as barbarian. It further concurs with the Oriental discourse in representing the Palestinian women as either prostitutes or adulteresses. The only Palestinian voice in the narrative can never be trusted; Salah is a psychologically disturbed child with fertile imagination. Hilu partially reflects Moris’s thought that sees that though the Zionists took the land by force and destroyed the lives of Palestinians, the Palestinians deserve such a treatment for neglecting the land and for being “inferior” to the White Jewish coloniser.
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