**From “A City of the Dead” to *A City in Its Fullness*:**

**Evolving Depictions of Buczacz in the Long Agnonian Arc[[1]](#footnote-1)**

בא הרופא ומדבר עמו דברים שמעוררים את לבו. אף הם מעוררים לבו של הרופא והוא מספר ומוסיף. כמה שנים עשה הרופא בעירו, עשרים שנה, אבל דומה שאפילו אלף שנים אינן מספיקות לו לספר כל ענייניה. יש שחוזר על סיפוריו הראשונים ויש שמוסיף עליהם. אוניברסיטאות שלמד בהן, ערים וכרכים שעשה בהם, טיאטראות ובתי אופירה שראה, כאילו נמחו מלבו ובטלו, אבל עירו הקטנה חיה וקיימת והואיל וכך מספר היה עליה ועל אנשי עירו.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Cosmology, the study of the origin and evolution of the physical universe, posits that every observable thing in creation can be traced back to events that took place in the earliest moments immediately following the Big Bang. The seed for all material objects originated with the formation of the first light elements—hydrogen and helium—out of primordial energy during the first three minutes of creation, a theory popularized by the Nobel physicist Steven Weinberg.[[3]](#footnote-3)

Rarely can the roots of literary or artistic creations be analyzed with the same type of scientific precision. However, careful examination of the often overlooked early works of S.Y. Agnon offers crucial insight into the original “raw material” from which he crafted a literary universe over his long career. Agnon’s adolescent writing in Yiddish and Hebrew prior to his departure for *Erets Yisra'el* in 1908, aged twenty, are the “protons and neutrons” which he would rearrange in stories, novellas and novels, from the moment his career is conventionally considered to have begun, with his arrival in Jaffa, and up to and including material he was working on shortly before his death in 1970. As a young teenage author, whose ambition was outstripped only by his talent, Agnon already saw himself as the chronicler of his native Buczacz. Understanding the writings of young S.Y. Czaczkes (his name prior to adopting his pseudonym) is essential for understanding the mature author.[[4]](#footnote-4)

Agnon seems to have been self-conscious of the weaknesses in his early works, those published while still living in Galicia, and even some early material composed after his Aliyah. With time he came to moderate the excesses of his immature, romantic narrative voice, in favor of a style marked by “

ניכרת כתיבתו של עגנון באיפוק בלתי רגיל ובהיעדר כל פאתוס או רוממות לשון

a singular stillness, by an absence of pathos and exaltation… free from even a trace of expressionistic hysteria,” as described by Gershom Scholem, who noted the "השפעה עמוקה" of the “פיכחון הבלתי רגיל של לשון חז"ל” on Agnon’s writing.[[5]](#footnote-5) He certainly came to recognize that his strength was as a prosaist, not as a poet, and assessments of his adolescent verse (and its shortcomings) bear out the wisdom of this artistic choice. Indeed, A.M. Habermann’s bibliography of the early writings of Czaczkes, almost none of which were later included in the various editions of Collected Works, is a reader’s guide of material Agnon chose to leave behind.[[6]](#footnote-6)

In fact, in what seems to be a clear autobiographical projection, the אורח in אורח נטה ללון*—*returning to his home town as a now middle-aged, accomplished author—is embarrassed by Yeruham Hofshi’s declaiming the Guest’s early poetry. The doggerel’s cheesy rhymes such as *Shamayim* and *Yerushalayim*; *Kodesh* and *Hodesh*, etc., cause him to beg for the younger man’s silence:

השווה ירוחם שתי רגליו ועמד מלוא קומתו לפני והניח שתי ידיו על לבו וקרא בנעימה

אהבה נאמנה עד שאולה

נשבעתי לך באלהי השמים

כי כל אשר פה לי בגולה

אתן כפרך ירושלים.

אמרתי לירוחם, שתוק בן אדם, שתוק. ירוחם לא שתק, אלא הוסיף וקרא

גם חיי גם רוחי גם נשמתי

אתן בעדך עיר הקודש

בהקיץ ובחלום את ראש שמחתי

חגי ומשושי שבת וחודש.

אמרתי לירוחם, שתוק בן אדם, שתוק. ירוחם לא שתק, אלא הוסיף

וקרא קריה נשגבה עיר עולמים

אם מלכך אין בך ועמך עם עני

מראש ומקדם עד קץ הימים

קשר אדני בך את תקות השני.

אמרתי לו לירוחם, אם אינך שותק הריני מניחך והולך לי. לא השגיח בדברי וקרא

אם יאטר עלי פיו בור קברי

עם מתי עולם שוכני קברים

בשאול תחתית את עוזי וסברי

עיר לנו עז תפארת ערים.

אמר ירוחם, יודעני ששיר זה אינו חביב עליך, נשתבח טעמך ונמאסו עליך חרוזים ירושלים שמים, אבל אני אומר לך, שיר זה אינו נאה מטעם אחר, מטעם שהוא נכנס ללב ומענה את הנפש. [[7]](#footnote-7)

Agnon’s dismissal of his adolescent writing aside, there is value in turning our attention to a remarkable and largely overlooked item in the catalog of early works. This is the short piece, “*‘Ir Hametim*” (“The City of the Dead”), which appeared in the Lvov Hebrew newspaper, *Ha‘et*, on March 14, 1907, and was signed with the pseudonym *Ehad Min Ha‘ir* (which I presume was a salute to Ahad Ha‘am, as well as a claim of rootedness in the locale he was coming to document).[[8]](#footnote-8) The work is hard to categorize. It is a string of vignettes about the history of Buczacz, around 1,450 words long, presented as reportage of the type he had been publishing in Galician newspapers for about three years.

Had young Czaczkes entered the family fur trade, or the rabbinate (as his father and grandfather might have hoped), or if, God forbid, the ship carrying him to Jaffa’s shores had never reached its port, we would little note nor long remember “*‘Ir Hametim*.” The importance of this story, perhaps more than any other publication prior to the colossal success achieved early on with “*Agunot,*” first published in HaOmer in October 1908, is in the cataloging of a variety of themes and plots, in miniature, which Agnon would rework over the next sixty years, culminating with his monumental *‘Ir uMelo’ah*. The sheer artistry of “*Agunot*” (even in its first edition; it was substantially revised in 1921, then again when included in the Collected Works), is remarkably advanced relative to his pre-Aliyah works published only a number of months earlier. One wonders what—aside from the proverbial “air of *Erets Yisrael*”—caused such an accelerated maturation in the artist as a young man.

In February 1907, young Czaczkes answered the call of Gershom Bader[[9]](#footnote-9) to move to Lvov and serve as assistant editor at his newly launched *Ha‘et*, which styled itself as a thrice-weekly “political and literary newspaper.” Yitzhak Bakon observed that this short period in Agnon’s career marks the earliest emergence of what would later evolve into his distinctive “narrative voice.”[[10]](#footnote-10) Part of the assistant’s job must have been to provide much of the copy himself. As was common in small newspapers of the day, one writer would publish under a variety of pennames, to give the impression that a small paper with an even smaller staff was serviced by a team of journalists. (Ehad Min Ha‘ir was only one such pseudonym used by Czaczkes at that time.) However, *Ha‘et* was not long for the world, and after only six weeks, the newspaper went out of business. After his abbreviated stint in the “big city,” a center of Hebrew and Yiddish publishing and journalism, where he came into contact with literary circles unimaginable back home, it must have been a bitter disappointment to return to Buczacz, unpaid for his efforts, for Passover 1907. It is not surprising that he could not be kept down in the town after he’d seen grand Lvov, or in Arnold Band’s terms, “perhaps the contrast between the big city and the provincial town made him more aware of the failings of the latter.”[[11]](#footnote-11) Presumably this contributed to his decision to set out once again within a year—this time bound for the Land of Israel.

“*‘Ir Hametim*” was overlooked because the newspaper *Ha‘et* has remained largely unavailable to researchers. Having ceased publication after only a few weeks (only 20 issues were ever released), it disappeared from view. To the best of my knowledge the National Library of Israel possesses the only microfilm copy, and it is incomplete and of exceedingly poor quality. Band was the first scholar to discuss the piece, 57 years after its publication, and he reported that Agnon himself had brought it to his attention, telling him that it had aroused some controversy in Buczacz when published in 1907.[[12]](#footnote-12) Band cites the opening of “*‘Ir Hametim*,” quoting only the first two paragraphs (about 18% of the whole), with a brief discussion of its themes. Almost all subsequent writers who deal with the text do so second-hand through Band’s presentation of it.[[13]](#footnote-13) However, at least one print copy of the entire run of *Ha‘et* remains in existence—all twenty issues in a bound volume, property of S.Y. Agnon himself. Upon his death, this volume was gifted, along with his manuscripts, to the National Library of Israel, where it resides as part of the Agnon Archives. However, it remains uncataloged and unavailable to general researchers due to its extremely brittle state, so remains under the radar. Through the generosity of the archive’s legendary director emeritus, Mr. Rafi Weiser *z”l*, I came into possession of the complete text of “*‘Ir Hametim*.”

Upon full examination, we quickly assess the article’s significance: In it Agnon surveys a number of themes that would occupy him for years to come, some of which were part of the town’s indigenous folklore, others actual history, and presumably much drawn from his own imagination. As I hope to demonstrate in the coming pages, and as should be clear from a reading of “*‘Ir Hametim*” (appended in an annotated English translation below), these aspects of the story are recast in a more mature voice throughout Agnon’s later writings, culminating in *‘Ir uMelo’ah.*

Among the later works which inherit elements first presented in “*‘Ir Hametim*” are: The Gothic story “*Toitentants*” in Yiddish(probably written around the same time as “*‘Ir Hametim*”; in subsequent Hebrew iterations as “*Meholat Hamavet*” and “*Aggadat Hasofer*”; an array of short stories, such as “*Afar Erets Yisrael*,” “*Bimtsulot,*” “*Hupat Dodim*”; novellas *והיה העקוב למישור* and “*הנדח*”; *Sippur Pashut* (see especially chapter 15); *Oreah Nata Lalun*, in which the themes of physical and spiritual decay are brought to novel-length perfection; and, of course, more stories in *‘Ir uMelo’ah* than can be listed here. (The specific elements reprised in each work are enumerated below and in the annotations to “*‘Ir Hametim*.”) In a different, but perfectly applicable context, Gershon Shaked stated: This early work

"משמשת מעיו גרעין ליצירות מאוחרות, וטומנת בחובה התפתחויות המתגלות בשלבים מאוחרים ביצירתו: בחינת מועט המכיל את המרובה או בחינת סיפור-יסוד, שסיפורים מאוחרים יותר הם וריאציות עליו או טרנספורמציות ופיתוח מהופך שלו." [[14]](#footnote-14)

“*‘Ir Hametim*” begins with a description of the earliest Jewish graves in the town, and the omnipresence of death is presented as a macabre point of pride—Jews are literally dying to get into Buczacz. The obsession with graves as a sign of Buczacz’s “death urge,” leading to a type of eternal memorialization in the object of the grave, and basis for the connection of the residents to their town, is recycled in conversations of the Guest and his friend Schutzling, depicted powerfully in *A Guest for the Night*:

ואם אתה רוצה אומר לך, זוהי הטרגדיה שבחיי שאיני דר בשבוש. אמרתי לו, כל כך שבוש חביבה עליך? אמר שיצלינג, כשאדם רואה שאין מקום בעולם שחביב עליו הוא מרמה את עצמו ואומר שעירו חביבה עליו. ואתה, חביבה עליך שבוש? - אני? עדיין לא הרהרתי בזה. נטל חברי את ידי ואמר, אם כן אומר לך, כל חיבתך לארץ ישראל באה לך משבוש, מפני שאתה אוהב את עירך אתה אוהב את ארץ ישראל. - מניין לך שאני אוהב את שבוש? - ראיה אתה מבקש? אלמלא לא אהבת את שבוש כלום היית מטפל בה כל ימיך, כלום היית מחטט מצבות לגלות צפונות.[[15]](#footnote-15)

The morbid atmosphere is further marked by the halakhic question regarding ritual defilement of kohanim who walk the streets where death is underfoot at each turn.[[16]](#footnote-16) These sentiments reappear in the persons of Yona Toyber in *Sippur Pashut*  and Akavia Mazal of “*Bidmi Yamehah*”, both of whom fancy themselves historians of the town who know the bedrock of that history is in the graveyard.

“*‘Ir Hametim*” reports:

ועוד עד היום ישנו בעיר רחוב אחד, הנקרא בפי כל בשם "שוהל-גאס" [סמטת בית הכנסת], אף-על-פי שאין בו אף סימן של יהדות ויהודים. ואדרבה כשיהודי רוצה להתפרד קצת מאחיו, שוכר לו בית בסמטא זו. אבל כפי שאומרים היה פה בית-הכנסת גדול, ודורשי רשומות החליטו, כי במקום שעומד כעת בית-הכנסיה שלהם, באותו מקום עמד בית-הכנסת הגדול של היהיודים. כי קיר נטוי עדיין נשאר מבית-הכנסת היהודי ובית-תפלתם נבנה עליו, ולגדל צערו של הקיר הזה, שחללו את קדושתו נכפפה קמתו.

This desecrated synagogue makes “cameo” appearances in any number of stories; the old Jewish neighborhood now abandoned by members of the faith becomes the refuge for Jews wishing to live on the periphery, such as Yeruham and Rachel Hofshi (in *Oreah Nata Lalun*) and Akavia and Tirtza Mazal who are later joined by their housemaid, Blume Nacht (*Sippur Pashut*).

The banishment of a hasidic master by the town’s anti-hasidic leadership (among whom was counted Agnon’s maternal grandfather), is repurposed as the opening of “The Outcast,” setting that novella’s plot in motion. The late novel *בחנותו של מר לובלין* contains the surrealistic intrusion of old Mr. Jacob Stern, in a scene which could have been perfectly placed in Agnon’s *Sefer Hama‘asim* cycle of stories. Stern and the narrator sit in the empty Leipzig store in the final days of World War I reminiscing about their common Galician town. Recollecting the cemetery and an episode of the surprising discovery of two old graves, in a manner identical to “*‘Ir Hametim*,” sends them on an imaginative journey back to the unnamed “our town” (which reader’s immediately recognize as Buczacz)—one in which they are transported from Germany to Galicia and from present to nostalgic, idealized, and mythologized past. Once again, now at the opposite end of his career, Agnon depicts gravestones and morbidity as touchstones for memory, but over the ensuing decades his tone had shifted dramatically.

In *‘Ir uMelo’ah* that church on Shul-gas takes on a mystical air as the walls of the once grand synagogue weep.[[17]](#footnote-17) The legend of the jealous and vain Count who erects Buczacz’s monumental Town Hall then murders the master builder “so that he would never be able to construct such a building anywhere else” is spun into one of *‘Ir uMelo’ah*’s most well-known tales: a Judaized Icarus myth of the builder Theodor (known as Fedor), which also generates the origin myths of the nearby Fedor Hill, later the site of the mass extermination of thousands of Jews at the hands of the Nazis, the resting place of at least 13,670 martyrs in fourteen mass graves. In doing so, the kernel of the story from “*‘Ir Hametim*” takes on mythical depth as it foreshadows the final destruction, and casts an eerily prescient light on Agnon’s depiction of a town riddled with unmarked graves.[[18]](#footnote-18)

It must, however, be noted that aside from the shift in tone between “*‘Ir Hametim*” and these later works which bear resonance with that 1907 text (and these are but a sample of the intratextual links within his writing), there is an even more striking difference. “*‘Ir Hametim*” is marked by an almost complete absence of the intertextual matrix for which Agnon was famous—his Hebrew prose being a richly woven tapestry of allusions and word-plays to rabbinic literature. This intertextuality, which later becomes almost the very subject of his writing, was not yet in place in the earliest publications.[[19]](#footnote-19)

The most significant *intra*textual connection between “*‘Ir Hametim*” and Agnon’s later writing is situated at the very end of the piece. The main part of the concluding vignette reads:

אחד מן המיסדים את החסידות בבוטשאטש היה גדול גם בתורה, אביו של האיש יעקעלע, אשר נתלה אח"כ במצות ראש הקהלה.

יעקעלע זה, בן החסיד הראשון שבעיר, נהרג לפני שמונים ושתים שנה באשמת גנבה, שחשדוהו ובשעה שהעלוהו לגרדום, אמר לו הפקיד, שהיה יהודי מומר מטשרנוביץ: "תן תודה בשם אלהי ישראל"[[20]](#footnote-20) והוא הודה על הרבה ממעשיו, אבל על אדות הגנבה אמר, כי אינו חייב כלום. וגם רגע אחד בטרם כרכו את צוארו בחבל אמר כי העון הזה לא נמצא בו.

ובאמת נהרג האיש הזה מפני חמת ראש-הקהל שהיתה לו טינא עליו, ויתירא ממנו. וימים אחדים אחר שנתלה, באה פקודת הקיסר, לפטרו מכל ענש, אבל כבר היה הדבר אחר למעשה.

ובאותו יום שהוציאו את יעקעלע לגרדום, נסעו כל "בני העיר" מן העיר ויתהלכו בבכיה בשדות וביערים, ויפרשו את ידיהם כלפי העיר, ויאמרו: "ידינו לא שפכו את הדם הזה!"[[21]](#footnote-21) – [ויהי נס את נפשם, להביא "עגלה ערופה", אלא שיראו את חמתו של ראש-הקהלה].[[22]](#footnote-22)

This passage is a précis of what would become two parallel stories, “Yekele *Nusah Ehad*” and “Yekele *Nusah Aher*,” published posthumously in *‘Ir uMelo’ah*.[[23]](#footnote-23) Agnon’s daughter and literary executor, Emunah Yaron, discovered the manuscripts for these stories among her father’s files for the work in progress. Unable to determine which was meant to be the final version, she made the unconventional decision to publish them both, assigning them the subtitles “*Nusah Ehad*” and “*Nusah Aher*.” In preparing the English edition of *‘Ir uMelo’ah,* Alan Mintz, James S. Diamond and I decided to style the translated titles with roman numerals. This is a decision I now regret, because the use of numbering inadvertently telegraphs a sense of sequence, that version I was the draft, later revised as version II. In light of comparison to the much earlier source material in “*‘Ir Hametim*” I now believe that the opposite is true, as I will demonstrate momentarily. I should state that Mrs. Yaron’s decision at the time was perfectly reasonable—neither manuscript is a first draft, as is clear from the minimal amount of correction and revision on each, both were rewritten by Agnon in his own hand in preparation for later typing, and appear to have been transcribed around the same time, on identical paper stock. Both are titled “Yekele,” with no subtitle or indication of which was intended for publication.

As the twinned stories grew from the seed in “*‘Ir Hametim*” the issue around which their common plot revolves becomes the challenge to Jewish legal authority once Galicia comes under Austrian rule with the first Partition of Poland in 1772. Aside from ritual matters still adjudicated by a local Beit Din, rabbinic authority, or the power of the Jewish communal leadership headed by a *parnas*, authority had been largely ceded to and usurped by the civil authorities. This results in the question: How do you solve a problem like Yekele? How can the Jewish community rein in an insolent youth or a juvenile delinquent, especially an orphan without parents to have guided him in his growing up? The most significant transformation that the story undergoes from 1907 to its expanded versions published in 1973 is the identification of the anonymous r*osh ha-kahal* or *parnas* as none other than Reb Yisrael Shlomo—a character from Agnon’s *הכנסת כלה*, described by Dan Miron as that novel’s “

אחת הדוגמאות השלימות ביותר בספרות העברית של עיצוב פתולוגיה נרקיסית על גוניה הדקים והנסתרים ביותר

.” Yosef Dan said, “

דומה שקשה חמצוא ב'הכנסת כלה' דמות כה שלילית כר' ישראל שלמה, שעגנון אינו מציירה בצבעים שליליים בולטים, אלא כביכול שותף הוא לציבור הנכנע לקיסמו ולעשרו של ר' ישראל שלמה, ומספר שבחו, אלא שהקורא חייב להבין עד היכן הדברים מגיעים.

”[[24]](#footnote-24) This legendary *parnas* of Buczacz is the “hero” of three long stories in *The Bridal Canopy* (Book I, chapters 11-13), told as “stories within the story” as he is now long dead, but related to the assembled listeners by his namesake, another Yisrael Shlomo (just one more example of “doppelgänging” for which that novel is famous). The most important of these stories, “*Mehamat Hametsik,*”[[25]](#footnote-25) has been called the best precursor to Agnon’s later stories collected in *‘Ir uMelo’ah*.[[26]](#footnote-26) If so, then it draws attention to the first appearance of its main character in “*‘Ir Hametim*” and further strengthens the importance of that early work as being connected to the late *magnum opus*. The novella is a kind of Agnonized “Pygmalion” story, in which Yisrael Shlomo, in a cruel practical joke, attempts to pass off a poor, young ignoramus as a learned scholar and marriage prospect for the daughter of his rival. In the end Yisrael Shlomo is hoisted on his own petard when the unlettered fellow has improved himself from the time spent as an “imposter” in the beit midrash, and by the time the wedding arrives he has, in fact, been transformed into an authentic, fêted *talmid hakham*!

“*Mehamat Hametsik*” opens with a portrait of the *parnas* as a highhanded, thin-skinned communal leader who subjects his opponents (if they are sufficiently lower class that he can get away with it) to humiliation via public punishment. In this case a young man has been placed outdoors in the pillory on a freezing-cold winter day. Such punishment was deemed appropriate for the “crime” of public insolence (*hutzpah*) toward the wealthy head of the town. This characteristic is instantly recognizable to us from its earliest kernel in “*‘Ir Hametim*” and in its later reappearance in the “Yekele” stories.[[27]](#footnote-27)

In the “Yekele” stories the confrontation between the *parnas* and the delinquent remains the focus. Yekele is suspected, presumably falsely, of a robbery and attempted murder, leading to his execution which conveniently ameliorates Yisrael Shlomo’s egotistical annoyance at the young whippersnapper’s presence. Among the essential differences between the two versions of the story is that Yekele is the center of his own story in *Nusah Ehad*; Yisrael Shlomo is the focus of *Nusah Aher*. In both, however, we encounter, in Mintz’s synopsis, “the story, in short, of a lopsided duel between a powerful oligarch and a boy who refuses to acknowledge his authority. Cowed and enfeebled, the community fails to play a mediating role in the confrontation.”[[28]](#footnote-28)

The salient plot differences between the two versions of the story are as follows: In *Nusah Ehad* Yisrael Shlomo passively enables Yekele’s execution through silence; in *Nusah Aher* Yisrael Shlomo plays a more active role, he moves “quickly to bring the matter to the attention of the regional judges, and he was not satisfied until they condemned Yekele to the gallows.” In *Nusah Ehad* the whole town, and we the readers, are aware that Yekele was present at a communal celebration of the Burial Society during the crimes of which he is accused, giving him a solid alibi against claims that he was the perpetrator; in *Nusah Aher* his whereabouts on the night in question are unclear.

*Nusah Aher* contains a lengthy roster of the many charitable institutions in the town, over twenty organizations which care for the sick, clothe the orphans, feed the needy, and the like. It comprises approximately one-third of the story, and in honesty, it taxes the reader’s patience. Agnon’s purpose in describing these charities was to highlight the gap between Buczacz’s ideals and their execution in practice, shining the spotlight on the spilling of innocent blood because of the egos and arrogance of the wealthy and the inability or unwillingness of the townsmen to push back against such wickedness.[[29]](#footnote-29) This section is completely absent from *Nusah Ehad*.

In *Nusah Aher* the hangman imported from out-of-town to carry out the execution is an apostate Jew, an element missing from version I of the story

In *Nusah Ehad* the townsmen go to the outskirts to proclaim “ידינו לא שפכו את הדם הזה ועינינו לא ראו” while Yekele’s body is being lowered from the gallows, at which point “

בא רץ משרי בית המשפט שבעיר סטניסלב ובידו כתב לממונה מטעם הקיסר וכתוב עליו שאין לו עליו על יעקילי בנו של משה משפט מות.

.” In *Nusah Aher* the tardy stay of execution arrives after “לא היו ימים מרובים” (from an unspecified court).

A half-century after “*‘Ir Hametim*” was published it seems clear that Agnon had that copy of *Ha‘et* in front of him as he sat down to compose what would become the two versions of “Yekele.” In light of these textual differences it becomes clear that what we titled in English “Yekele II” is in fact Agnon’s first iteration, his initial version of an expanded Yekele tale on the skeleton outlined in the concluding section of “*‘Ir Hametim*.” He spun the 1907 version of the story, only a few short paragraphs, into “*Nusah Aher*” (totaling 3,754 words in Hebrew). A perusal of “*‘Ir Hametim*” shows a high level of correspondence between that early text and details in “*Nusah Aher*,” including, among others: Yisrael Shlomo’s more activist position in the story; the identification of the hangman as an apostate; the arrival of the court messenger a few days after Yekele’s death (instead of having the horses gallop up as he’s being lowered from the noose). In the rewriting of the story as (what we titled in English) “Yekele I,” we witness a tightening of the text (it weighs in at only 2,662 words). Agnon excised the lengthy listing of the charitable associations, aware no doubt of how it slowed the story’s pace. The drama is heightened by the arrival of the messenger just a moment too late to spare Yekele’s neck (instead of “לא היו ימים מרובים but not on the very same day”). These are the types of revisions for which Agnon was famous, polishing his prose toward greater artistry. Perhaps, most significantly, “*Nusah Ehad*” elevates the rascal’s role as the victim, unsympathetic a character as he may be. Only in this version do we the readers know he is indubitably innocent of the crime for which he swings.[[30]](#footnote-30) This resonates perfectly with the themes of the section of *עיר ומלואה* in which the story is situated. Compare Yekele (in *Nusah Ehad*) to Dan in the neighboring story, “*Hane’elam*”. They are both expositions on the theme of how the communal authorities misuse the limited autonomy and power granted to them under their non-Jewish hosts to police members, and “neutralize” young men (through the noose or military conscription) who have become “inconvenient.” To accomplish this the “Yekele” story had to evolve with the boy at the center (Yisrael Shlomo, who has his own “star turn” in *הכנסת כלה*, appears here in a supporting role, either as a character or mere typology). Interestingly, “*Hane’elam*” contains a different variety of a “second version,” in which the tale is recounted through the point of view of the Polish noblewoman, the story’s villain, in an account appended to the main narrative.

I am further convinced that “*Nusah Ehad*” was Agnon’s intended telling of the tale for public consumption when we consider one other story, wholly overlooked in any analysis of “Yekele.” In that portion of *עיר ומלואה* which contains our story, “הנעלם,” and others, we find a brief, interstitial section entitled “*שבחה של עירנו*”.[[31]](#footnote-31) It is part of a cycle of short stories in Book III entitled “תהפוכות הזמן” which portray the city in decline. In passing, the narrator summarizes the plot of “Yekele,” telling us that it is “a story he has written in detail, in his possession in manuscript.” In other words, “*Shivhah shel ‘Irenu*” post-dates “Yekele,” but its plot summary aligns completely with our “*Nusah Ehad*.” The narrator concludes the rehearsal of the story with: “

אבל אוסיף כאן, **לאחר שהורידו את יעקילי מעץ התלייה** [זאת אומרת, באותו יום, ולא כפי המסופר בנוסח אחר] בא רץ שלוח מבית המשפט הגדול של **סטניסלוב** [השם סטניסלב מופיע אך ורק בנוסח אחד] והביא כתבים לשופטי בית המשפט שבבוטשאטש שבדקו שרי בית המשפט העליון את דינו של יעקילי ומצאו אותו נקי מאותו עון.

This latter recounting of the “*Nusah Ehad*” plot confirms the final trajectory of the story begun in “*‘Ir Hametim*.”

Taken as a whole, the presence of these many foreshadowings of later works in the adolescent “*‘Ir Hametim*” testifies to how long Agnon carried these stories in his mind throughout his life. It also undermines the common notion that only late in his career, with the compositions which would become *עיר ומלואה*, did he make the conscious decision to undertake his chronicling. The awareness that his home town was on the verge of collapse, spiritually as well as physically, and the impulse to document Buczacz in literature was obviously deeply rooted in his childhood experience. In fact, from his first years as a writer he had already set this as one of his areas of focus, although his narrative voice would mature, and indeed, sharply transition, over the ensuing decades. In 1956, when his published output had slackened, he answered Baruch Kurzweil’s inquiry as to where he was focusing his energy with: “בונה אני עיר – את בוטשאטש!”[[32]](#footnote-32) Alan Mintz carefully observed that this statement was the “proprietary stamp of a veteran writer who writes using an established repertoire of modernist techniques. Reimagining Buczacz through the filter of this imagination that abandons nothing from the toolkit of modernism must of necessity mean creating something new, a new city. The bricks and mortar may be taken from the historical record, but the building will be a new creation. No other writer in modern Jewish culture has attempted a project of similar scope or ambition.”[[33]](#footnote-33)

This last point has become clearer especially in this past decade as *‘Ir uMelo’ah* has begun to receive the level of critical attention it deserves, in no small measure thanks to the scholarly work of Mintz. *‘Ir uMelo’ah* was Agnon’s epic literary memorial to Buczacz. Published in 1973, the book was largely overlooked—partially due to the bad timing of appearing on the eve of the Yom Kippur War, but more so due to the lack of appetite of that generation’s Hebrew readers for “old world” stories.[[34]](#footnote-34) Nevertheless, Emunah Yaron asserted that “

לדעתי 'עיר ומלואה' הוא הספר הטוב והחשוב מכל הספרים שהוצאתי... אפשר גם לקרוא את הספר כפי שאבא התכוון, כמצבה ליהדות פולין שנספצה בשואה.[[35]](#footnote-35)

However, the arc of writing from “*‘Ir Hametim*” to *‘Ir uMelo’ah* is long, and it bends toward nostalgia, creativity, and memorialization. Agnon’s early writings are marked by a harsh, critical eye, spotlighting hypocrisy and deception, especially financial and social injustice. Consider the short story “*Ger Tsedek*,” written around the same time as “*‘Ir Hametim*,” in which a crafty Jew disguises himself as a Russian prince converted to Judaism to defraud the entire community.[[36]](#footnote-36) Only as Agnon matured is his focus on physical poverty (which admittedly remains ever-present in his writing) overtaken by a portrayal of the spiritual poverty of Buczacz, as a synecdoche of Jewry writ-large.

The cynical feel of “*‘Ir Hametim*” is palpable. Compare it to another relatively early work, “Old and Young Together,” which was first published in 1920, but set in Buczacz in 1907 (the very year “*‘Ir Hametim*” is written).[[37]](#footnote-37) This story, Agnon’s first substantial literary treatment of his Galician youth, presents a satirized depiction of an array of personalities, institutions, and issues of the day. Among the objects of his humor (which fluctuates from gentle mocking to acerbic biting) are the pompous windbags who pass as Zionist leaders, and the cowardice behind their words; the internecine fighting about the purposes of Zionism (whether to ameliorate Jewish suffering in Europe or to build a new Jewish settlement in Palestine); literary figures with inflated egos; the Yiddish vs. Hebrew language wars; arrogance, ignorance, and hypocrisy of rabbis, *hasidim*, and *maskilim* alike; and the perennial penchant for Jews to act as their own worst enemies despite the external threats of anti-Semitism. And yet the reader still senses the love for the world coming under critique at the tip of the author’s pen. In addition, perhaps for the first time, his critique is not pitched exclusively toward the town. The narrator, Hemdat (universally understood to be Agnon’s autobiographical projection of himself into his fictional universe), is himself the target of the novella’s scorn. His self-depiction introduces a well-intentioned youth, hungry for fame, yet seemingly incapable of any effective action. An ancillary cause for self-flagellation is his depiction of the generational divide represented by the conflict between himself and both his father and grandfather, who disapprove of his lax religious commitments and his Zionist affiliations. Hemdat’s desire to gain glory as a writer, like that of his author-creator, prevents the fulfillment of his family’s aspirations for him as a Torah scholar and rabbi. *A Simple Story*, similarly set in Buczacz/Szibucz of the first decade of the twentieth century, serves as an additional example of the more muted criticism diluted with nostalgia, conveying the warmth he feels for the town. Dr. Langsam’s longing for the *alte heim*, cited in the epigraph above, could have been written by Agnon about himself (in fact, I presume it was).

A penchant for self-mockery (especially by a middle-aged writer of his adolescent self), does not imply that as he aged Agnon lost or abandoned his critical perspective on his home town. This was an authorial voice not available to a teenager unable to feel nostalgia for a town he had not yet left! Agnon departed Buczacz at age twenty, and aside from two very brief visits, he essentially never returned—yet his literary imagination is never far from the home town, as if to say, “you can take the boy out of Buczacz, but you can’t take the Buczacz out of the boy.” Similar observations can and have been made about other great novelists: Mark Twain, Joyce, Faulker, and Philip Roth all come to mind. Aharon Appelfeld’s appreciation for what he learned as a young author from Agnon expresses this quite precisely:

רוב בני דורי הכריעו אחרת. בכוח רב הדחיקו את עברם והכחידו אותו. אני לא בא, חס ושלום, בטענות אליהם. אני מבין אותם עד עמקי נפשי. אני, על כל פנים, לא ידעתי משום-מה להיטמע בהוויה הארצישראלית. אני הלכתי, אם תרצו נסוגותי, אל עצמי.

מבחינה זו, ולא רק מבחינה זו, שימש לי עגנון דוגמה ומופת. מעגנון למדתי שאדם יכול לקחת את עיר מולדתו לכל מקום ולחיות בה חיים מלאים. עיר מולדת אינה עניין שבגאוגרפיה סטטית. זאת ועוד: אתה יכול להרחיב את גבולותיה או להגביהה למרום. עגנון אִכְלס את עירו בכל מה שיצר העם היהודי במאתיים השנים האחרונות. כמו כל סופר בעל שיעור קומה לא כתב זיכרונות על עירו. במילים אחרות: לא מה שהייתה אלא מה שראוי שתהיה. ועוד לימד אותי: העבר, גם הקשה ביותר, אינו מום או בושה אלא מִכְרה חיים.[[38]](#footnote-38)

All this suggests that Agnon had to “leave his country and his homeland and his city and ascended to the Land of Israel to build it from its destruction and to be rebuilt by it,” so that he could turn his attention back to that city of Buczacz to rebuild it in literature. Dov Sadan observed that “

ההבדל ממה שהיה ידוע לו על העיר, בשבתה בו, ומה שנודע לו עליה, כל שאר ימיו, שעקב בהם תולדותיה, הוא כהבדל בין שלולית-הדעת ונהרה." [[39]](#footnote-39)

We might amend this statement to read: It is akin to the difference between “A City of the Dead” and *A City in Its Fullness*.

This is not to say that Agnon ever abandoned his critique, nor was he unable to retain his cynicism, as he aged. Indeed, *‘Ir uMelo’ah* is awash in such social criticism, bordering on outright indictment of the communal leadership and the corrosive effects of vanity and power on Jewish life. Among the objects of particular concern are the oppression of the poor, and the gap between the town’s expressed ideals as a religious community versus its sometime shoddy application in practice—or the widening chasm between ideal Buczacz and real “Szibucz.” The book bears a dedication to a city that “was full of Torah, wisdom, love, piety, life, grace, kindness and charity”; its content often tells a different tale (alternatively with acid or good humor). The essential difference between early and later career was how Agnon learned to temper the youthful critique. He did this out of artistic impulse: writers who cannot evolve past the persona and voice crafted by their teenage narrators tend not to be recognized by the Nobel Committee. But it was also a desire to be neither a shill for the Old World, nor attempt to deconstruct it. The proclivity of an author to venerate or alternatively satirize a world he depicts does not in and of itself indicate his stance vis-à-vis that world. In the case of Agnon, it was neither one nor the other, rather a desire to simultaneously skewer and sacrilize, and in so doing ask what that world of the past has to say to the present and future.

Agnon expressed pride in his ability to walk this careful line, especially as it distinguished him (in his own mind at least) from earlier giants of Jewish literature, figures he often saw as role models against whom to compete:

ראה גא מה שעשיתי מהבטלן ר' יודיל חסיד בסיפורי הגדול, "הכגסת כלה". הרי עשיתי ממנו אדם מן הישוב שיש בו חן וגם מעשיות מסויימת לפי דרכו. היו סופרינו האחרים עושים מטיפוט כזה? מנדלי היה עושה אותו למגוחך לשם עיוות ועקיצה, ושלום-עליכם היה משתמש בו לשם צחוק תמים. אני המתקתי את המרירות שבבטלנותו של ר' יודיל ויישבתי את המגוחך עד שהבטלן נעשה אדם שלם. אבל טוב היה יותר לוּא לא היינו בטלנים.[[40]](#footnote-40)

Agnon’s particular mode of balancing the critical and the self-critical with the nostalgic was, in his own eyes, part of what set him apart from other authors. He saw himself as an inextricable part of both the good and the bad that was Buczacz’s reality and legacy. Many have wondered at what it was that made him so successful and well-received in Jaffa and Jerusalem of the Second Aliyah, as well as in the early state, despite his focus on the old world of Eastern Europe. Perhaps it was precisely these intertwined threads of the self-consciously self-critical and the respectful distance which made him acceptable to his early readers.

Agnon’s long career can be traced as an arc, from youthful, almost cynical focus on death and decay, to a more mature and creative form of writing. With tragic irony, this later voice was surely informed by the knowledge of Buczacz’s final destruction, but was already formed prior to the Holocaust. The unripe narrator of “A City of the Dead” had to give way to enable the formation of the canon of Agnon’s work, leading to the culminating project that took shape in *‘Ir uMelo’ah.* Because Alan Mintz viscerally understood the power of Jewish literature and culture as a reviving force in Jewish life, he recognized

Agnon’s creative achievement in his ate masterpiece, *‘Ir uMelo’ah*, produced a lens through which we may examine and reevaluate the long arc of his entire literary output, reading it ass as an, in Alan Mintz’s words, an “imaginative chronicle…. [A]n alternative to forms of memorialization that brought destruction and loss to the forefront. For Agnon the path was not lamentation, martyrology, theodicy, or conventional forms of consolation but the re-creation in words of what was lost in fact.”[[41]](#footnote-41)
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