

AGNON'S *BAYYA'AR UBA'IR*:  
A STUDY OF ARCHETYPES AND  
INDIVIDUATION

*By*

RAMI SHAPIRO

*Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati*

SINCE ITS publication in 1938, Agnon's *Bayya'ar uba'ir* has given rise to a host of interpretive commentaries that run the gamut of literary criticism. The majority of these, however, fall within two general categories: those concerned with content and context, and those concerned with linguistics and literary style.

Among the contextual critics, the works of Dov Sadan and Arnold Band are two of the most prominent. According to Sadan (1965), literature is a way of seeing and articulating the dynamics of human life. Along with law, religion, morality, and education, literature wrestles with life's absolutes, but unlike these, literature makes no pronouncements and issues no commands. Literature is more a mirror of life than a director of it. As such, literature allows us to view the realities of human existence in their least distorted form. In this regard, Sadan feels that the mirroring of society in *Bayya'ar uba'ir* is primarily concerned with an analysis of the criminal and his role in society, an analysis I shall take up shortly.

However, it is not so much Sadan's conclusions that are of importance, but his approach. For Sadan, the story is a realistic rendering of social functionings, and should therefore be dealt with in terms of plot dynamics, and the social milieu in which the story unfolds. In effect, the tale becomes a drama of socio-political configuration and conflict.

Such a rendering, of course, is what puts Sadan in the contextual camp, but this is not to say that all contextual analyses produce the same results. Arnold

Band (1968), for example, views *Bayya'ar uba'ir* not as an external struggle between law and outlaw, but as a more subtle confrontation with the allure of nature: the conflict between natural law and human convention.

Historically, *Bayya'ar uba'ir* is probably the most sophisticated of many attempts on the part of Hebrew prose writers to give literary expression to the confrontation with a natural landscape and all the emotions or thoughts it evokes. (Band, 1968, p. 234)

What makes Band a contextualist is that he too views the story as an external reality, a mirroring of overt collective and individual wrestlings with the allure of nature. In his analysis of the story, Band by no means ignores the subject of criminality which so fascinates Sadan, and, like Sadan, he too takes the events of the plot narrative at their face value. For the contextual analyst, the plot of a story is an external phenomenon portraying actual encounters between actual characters.

This reliance on plot realism effectively closes the door to any thought of possible surrealist or transrealist motivations and propositions. The contextualist is an externalist, a sociologist: the plot is happening "out there;" it is measurable, and the characters are expressing the dynamics of actual social forces. Understood in this way, *Bayya'ar uba'ir* is a meaningful and objective study in a "boy's education in the ways of the world" (Band, 1968, p. 236).

My disappointment with this type of analysis is rooted in the exclusivity of its sociology: there is more to Agnon than the mirroring of external social forces. *Bayya'ar uba'ir* is a multi-tiered work expressing not only social dynamics, but psychological motifs as well. This psychological dimension allows for a deeper understanding of the characters and plot, as each takes on symbolic, often archetypal roles (Shaked, 1976, p. 57).

This deepening of understanding, however, is not reserved to psychological renderings alone. The second category of analysis, marked by a concern with literary composition and structure, also deals with the story in a multi-dimensional fashion. In this category, A. L. Strauss (1961, pp. 135–148) presents one of the most complete arguments. Simply stated, Strauss' position is that the structure of the composition, not only its plot, helps to express the meaning of the story. In *Bayya'ar uba'ir*, the structure serves to negate established truths by involving the youth in hyperbolic situations, e.g. the breakdown of natural boundaries, and encounters with distortion, e.g., a Gentile employing a Jewish blessing. In fact, the story has its own structural integrity that is often at odds with objective, external logic, an integrity that plays on the reader and jars one into philosophic considerations not explicit in the plot events themselves.<sup>1</sup>

1. As we shall see with Strauss' analysis of the aged Gentile.

Strauss concludes his analysis of *Bayya'ar uḂa'ir* with a comment on the composition of the story that serves to further exemplify this "structuralist" position. The story, he says, has no clear external composition, a fact which reflects Agnon's understanding of the crumbling of tradition (Strauss, 1961, p. 153).

More than a crumbling of tradition can be grasped from Agnon's use of hyperbole, especially if one approaches the story on a psychological level. From this perspective, the lack of logical clarity may represent a crumbling of the ego's defenses against the unconscious, and a coming to terms with the "dark brother"<sup>2</sup> of the individual and collective psyche.

This type of psychological analysis shall be employed in the following discussion of *Bayya'ar uḂa'ir*. Such an approach adds to, rather than contradicts, previous understandings of the story, for it does not deny the external events, but chooses to view them as outwardly projected formulations of inner psychic developments. The life of the psyche cannot find articulation without such projections: the ego needs a mirrored image of the unconscious which it can approach without loss of self-awareness (Jacobi, 1973, pp. 107f). Only in this way can any integration of psychic forces and personal growth occur. Myths, symbols, and dreams are just such mirrorings of the unconscious, and in approaching the characters of *Bayya'ar uḂa'ir* as symbolic representations of psychic dynamics one finds, as does Sadan, that literature is indeed a reflection of the human condition, internal as well as external. Viewed from the perspective of depth psychology, then, *Bayya'ar uḂa'ir* becomes a modern rendering of primordial motifs, the most central being the individual's encounter with the shadow side of self.

Because the shadow archetype is crucial to our understanding of this tale, it is advisable to take a moment and briefly explain Jung's notion of it, and its function within the totality of the individual personality.

According to Jung, the shadow is that grouping of repressed psychic forces that complements the ego and embodies all those personality traits that the conscious ego does not wish to acknowledge (Frey-Rohn, 1967, p. 170). Meeting one's shadow is considered essential to the first stage of personal maturation and individuation:

Everyone carries a shadow, and the less it is embodied in the individual's conscious life, the blacker and denser it is. . . . If the repressed tendencies, the

2. The psychological terminology employed in this essay is almost exclusively that of Carl Gustav Jung. For many this terminology may appear strange, and an attempt will be made to clarify matters in footnotes.

The use of the term "dark brother" is a good example of this. The term is synonymous with Jung's term "the shadow," that complex of repressed personality traits that is an unconscious complement to one's conscious ego.

shadow as I call them, were obviously evil, there would be no problem whatever. But the shadow is merely somewhat inferior, primitive unadapted, and awkward; not wholly bad. It even contains childish or primitive qualities which would in a way vitalize and embellish human existence. (Jung, 1974, pp. 76–78).

Encountering the shadow, then, is in fact an encounter of the ego with the unconscious, and it is precisely this type of encounter that shall occupy us in the inquiry into the meanings of *Bayya'ar uba'ir*. Agnon's use of a shadow figure is, of course, in line with a great literary tradition. Shakespeare's Caliban, the ugly beast-like slave of Prospero in *The Tempest*, Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*, Oscar Wilde's *The Fisherman and His Soul*, Stevenson's Mr. Hyde, Aldous Huxley's *Grey Eminence*, Faust's Mephisto, even the *golem* of Rabbi Loew of Prague are all instances of the shadow in literature. Just how Agnon employs the shadow and other archetypes will occupy us shortly. First, however, we must return to the story itself.

The plot of *Bayya'ar uba'ir* is quite simple. The protagonist is a youth at odds with the values and mores of his parents and their urban, halakhically-dominated culture. He dislikes yeshiva, work, and the city; the forest is his domain and refuge. The forest is a lush "Garden of Eden" nourished by a stream in which the boy bathes, allowing the heat of the sun to dry him when he emerges from the water.

In contrast to the open and alive forest, the city is locked tight in the grip of fear, for Franciszek, a murderer imprisoned by the townsfolk, has escaped and, so they think, is out for revenge. Their defenses are useless, however, and Franciszek easily slips in and out of the city at will, even to the extent of breaking into the judge's home, waking him, and telling him that there is no use worrying, for if revenge were his motive, no locked door or shuttered window could deter him. The mere fact that he has not taken revenge on the town should show the judge and the others that revenge is not Franciszek's aim.

Franciszek's bold behavior and his seeming lack of vengefulness transform him, in the minds of the townfolk, into a kind of Robin Hood figure. Many are willing to forget his crimes, and indeed find plausible excuses for his murderous past. Eventually, Franciszek becomes the ultimate outlaw, living in the forest, free of the city's restraints and mores.

Our protagonist, who also strives to be an outlaw free of society's petty concerns, continues his treks into the forest despite the fact that the forest is the home of Franciszek. On one walk the boy meets an aged Gentile, and converses with him at length. The old man tells the boy that he is a freed slave, and teaches him about a past Golden Age when no one had to look after one's own livelihood, for the masters provided for all of one's needs. All people were

happy then, yet evil still existed, and "brother could not live with brother in peace."

A ritual exchange occurs between the Gentile and the boy that is repeated later in the story. The boy asks the old man if it will rain. He replies that the boy can trust him: it will not rain. Indeed there is no rain following the first encounter, but when the two meet a second time and the youth again relies on the old one's judgment, he finds that the Gentile has erred grievously. The rain that follows is a "wrathful rain" (*gišmey za'ap*) and threatens to drown the entire world.

The boy manages to return to the safety of his home, and waits out the days of the downpour in a kind of stupor. Eventually, however, the sky clears, and the youth returns to the forest. But the forest has changed. The joy and the light it once held are gone, the atmosphere is thick with humidity, and the ground is covered with worms and fungus.

It is this changed forest that becomes the scene of the boy's encounter with Franciszek. The latter demands to know whether the boy fears the forest, and the youth answers by repeating the old man's response to the identical query posed by the boy earlier: "What is there to fear, there are no wild animals."

Franciszek appears uneasy about the boy's presence. On the one hand, he fears that the youth will expose his whereabouts; on the other hand, he enjoys his company. Franciszek offers the boy a drink of gin, and the two become involved in an odd exchange: the boy blesses the liquor with the words *šhakkol nihya bidbaro* 'everything occurs according to God's will.' Franciszek demands that the lad teach him the blessing, but he cannot pronounce the Hebrew clearly, settling instead for a slurred "tchakel" (*šhakkol*). The drinking done, Franciszek makes the boy swear not to reveal his hiding place, and then departs.

Some days pass, and the youth again sets out for the forest. Before he has left the city, however, he comes upon a squadron of policemen who have captured Franciszek and are escorting him to prison. The boy runs through the crowd and exchanges glances with Franciszek, whose look tells the boy that he bears him no malice, and that he knows that his capture was not the boy's doing.

The arrest of Franciszek affects the town profoundly. The townspeople seem to have associated all death with Franciszek, and his capture rids them of the fear of death altogether. They have forgotten that death comes in many forms. They mill around in groups devising one horrible torture after another to afflict upon the now harmless Franciszek. In the end, a judge sentences Franciszek to death by hanging.

At the hanging, Franciszek refuses confession at the hands of a priest, and begins to mutter to himself "as if teaching his soul the language of the angels."

Franciszek's last word was the garbled blessing he had learned from the boy: *tchakel*. The townsfolk invent many meanings for the word, but only the

boy can decipher it. The resignation of Franciszek that indeed all is according to God's will is taken as a justification for his capture and death, and the story ends with the statement that this acceptance of his fate as God's will was indeed the complete confession of Franciszek, and thus his reintegration into society.

Ending the story thus, however, does not afford the reader any sense of resolution or completion. It is not enough that Franciszek confesses. Something more is intimated; the story demands interpretation. The methods of interpretation are, as we have seen, varied, yet most of them share a common ground: the conviction that the story is to be read as a real, external encounter between separate characters.

The weakness in this kind of approach is that it limits the depth of analysis. As a portrayal of dramatic encounters between a young man and his environment (both social and natural), the story has been given more than its share of analytic scrutiny, and I would not presume to add to the wealth of this material. As an articulation of inner, yet no less real, psychic encounters between aspects of self, however, *Bayya'ar uba'ir* is woefully lacking in critics and commentators. Hence, it is in this area that I shall attempt an analysis of the story, viewing it not only as a realistic portrayal of external events, but as a projection of psychic dynamics as well.

From this perspective, the very title of the tale foreshadows its entire message: the forest and the city, archetypal opposites, each struggling for control over the youth. The forest is the unstructured, fluid (especially during the rains) Garden of Eden: the youth's creative side, his unconscious.<sup>3</sup> The city, on the other hand, has all the trappings of ego: work, school, parents, obligations. The forest is where the Bible is read (the boy carries it with him to read on his excursions into the forest); the city is given over to the Talmud. The one is alive and in tune with the Divine, the other is dead, locked up, out of touch with God and His creation.

Collectivization, as Teilhard de Chardin (1964, pp. 119 ff) implies, leads to hyper-personalization. The collective, the city, gives rise to the ego, and the very idea of civilization is rooted in the dialectic tension between center and periphery, city and forest, city and citizen. Yet the city needs the forest, the wilderness, to provide it with life and direction. In all religious traditions, the prophet, be it Moses, Mohammed, Jesus, Jeremiah, or Buddha, attains his vision in the wilderness, and then returns to revolutionize the city (the people).

In our story, however, the process of collectivization has reached a most advanced stage, and the protagonist is no longer concerned with saving the city, but in the more personal quest of seeking his own reintegration with the vision:

3. For a detailed look at the creative ego of the unconscious as it relates to art and society, see Neumann (1972, pp. 81–134).

the forest. Cities celebrate human power and involve individuals in the breakdown of the tribal structure, replacing it with the dominance of the individual ego. Given a close city environment (shuttered against Franciszek and the forest is the way that Agnon describes it), the ego is cut off from the whole, and begins to run amok, ending in a schizophrenic sense of alienation. To overcome this alienation the forest must become integrated into the city, i.e. the ego must accept its own shadow, its own unconscious.

With this in mind, it is hardly surprising that the major episodes of our tale take place in the forest, for the boy is in fact seeking himself in the primordial world of pre-ego creation. Of interest here is the stream that runs through the forest, and in which the boy bathes. The reference is clearly to the Garden of Eden, which also took its sustenance from a stream. Yet there may be more to the stream than a simple biblical reference. Water, according to C. G. Jung, is always an image of the unconscious' capacity for giving life. The youth's immersion in the stream, then, may indeed be an act of his reintroduction to the unconscious.

Immersion in water symbolizes a return to the pre-formal, a total regeneration, a new birth, for immersion means a dissolution of forms, a reintegration into the formlessness of pre-existence; and emerging from the water is a repetition of the act of creation in which form was first expressed. (Eliade, 1972, p. 188)

Such a return to the pre-formal is, of course, death. The child flees his past, sheds his city strictures, and emerges from the stream cleansed and free of past errors and mores.

In the Agnon story, immersion occurs in two ways: the human level of the youth's ablutions, and the cosmic level of the deluge that follows upon the second meeting between the boy and the old man. In this case too, however, death and rebirth are alluded to. The entire forest returns to the point of its origins. The rains so flood the forest that there is a mingling of the waters from above with those from below: *'ellu milləma'la və'ellu milləmaṭṭa*.

The reference here is to the second day of creation:

And God made the firmament, and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament (Gen 1:7).

And the great flood of Noah where the earth is deluged not only with rain, but with an uprising of the lower waters, the "springs of the great abyss." (Gen 7:11-12)

The forest had returned to its predivision state where all water (unconscious) and no firmament (discrimination, ego functions) existed. In this

egoless state, however, the boy was no more at home than in the ego-dominated city, and he is forced to flee for his life (the life he identifies with his sense of self, his ego) and take refuge back in the city.

What we have here is an expression of the bi-polar nature of any archetype (Jacobi, 1959, p. 95): water as a life-giver and life-taker. Indeed, as the youth tries to flee the forest and find succor in the shelter of his parents' home, he discovers that the "waters of the earth desire to swallow him."

This "earthly desire" is the polar opposite of the self-motivated immersion of the boy in the stream, and points up the darker side of even the most gracious archetype. The unconscious, here symbolized by the water, offers both salvation and destruction, succor and malevolence, rebirth and death. In fact, this is the message of the entire tale, for *Bayya'ar uba'ir* is certainly a drama of evil and innocence. I will return to this theme in more detail when I discuss the boy's encounter with Franciszek, but first we must take up the initial encounter the boy has with a human in the forest, the encounter with the aged Gentile.

Both Strauss and Shaked point out that the encounter with the old man is a structural anomaly, for the reader expects a confrontation with Franciszek. Even the youth reacts fearfully as if he too expected to meet the murderer. In his analysis of this meeting, however, Shaked finds more than mere coincidence.

Such meetings—Shaked called them "*happəgiša haggoralit*" 'fateful encounters'—are central to the dynamics of the psyche. That which appears to be coincidental, or even unreasonable, given the development of the plot up to this point (we have no foreknowledge of this freed slave), is, in fact, an expression of the psychological, dreamlike dimension of the encounter; a dimension that links the characters together, to the enrichment of both (Shaked, 1976, p. 60). If we are to take the psychological dimensions of the tale seriously, the anomalous nature of this meeting may well point to the meeting's total lack of external reality. In a sense, the meeting becomes a kind of dream.

Encounters of this sort are almost always revelatory, and in this case the message revealed deals with the bi-polarity and interconnectedness of freedom and dependence. The very fact that the old man is a freed slave points to his symbolic function as a personification of this message.

The forest is the refuge of freedom seekers. The youth escapes the restrictions of his culture by his frequent trips to the forest; Franciszek escapes the strictures of law by hiding there; and the old man, freed of his dependence on his master, takes up residence in the forest as a midpoint between dependence and autonomy. It is important to note, however, that the old man's freedom is of a passive sort, bestowed upon him, not won by him, as is the case with Franciszek and the youth.

According to Shaked, the old man's passivity is central to the message he conveys, for he prefers passive dependence (whether as a slave tied to his

masters, or a free man whose freedom depends on their good graces) to self-motivated independence. His calm fearlessness of the forest's dangers, and his reversal of the victim/victor role in his retelling of the Cain and Abel story attest to his belief in a pessimistic determinism. His freedom is rooted in apathy — he is free because he doesn't care, he has surrendered to the cosmic and human powers that be and need no longer concern himself with the quest for true autonomy.<sup>4</sup>

This dependent, deterministic attitude, which, we must remember, is a projection of the youth's own psyche, is, as Shaked notes, childlike, and represents only a step in the boy's encounter with levels of self. Shaked further states that this idyllic, almost magical reliance on others for one's being, neglects the mature understanding of the bi-polarity of freedom and dependence, a neglect that dooms one to a life of failure (Shaked, 1976, p. 60).

To point out the psychic drama and message of such coincidental meetings, however, does not exhaust the psychological depth of the character of the aged Gentile. On the contrary, it serves to encourage further search and analysis, for the Gentile is indeed a projection of the youth's subconscious, a projection clearly involved in archetypal motifs.

In this regard, it is almost superfluous to state that this old man is the archetypal Old Man of so many fables, for Agnon employs him directly. The Aged One become the boy's teacher, telling him of the Golden Age when all things were provided for without labor. Yet even then violence was manifest, and along with the wonders of bygone days, the boy is introduced to the concept of evil.

To say that Agnon uses the old man directly, however, is not to say that he simply plugs the archetype into his tale unchanged. On the contrary, this old man is not the pure wisdom giver of ancient lore. His role in this story, like the role of the waters, involves him in bi-polar functions — in both wisdom and folly, good and evil.

The old man is a freed slave, himself a juxtaposition of opposites. Of the two characteristics, the slave part is the more dominant, for the man is constantly grovelling, and his Golden Age was an age not of freedom, but of enlightened masters and contented serfs. The fact that he is a merger of slave and freeman makes the Gentile all the more congenial to the boy, for the youth, too, is part slave (city dweller) and part free (forest dweller).

It may well be, given the symbolic nature of the aged Gentile, that the old man serves as the youth's bridge between the forest and the city; the unconscious and the ego. The old slave had been a farmer, a tiller of the soil. As such,

4. For a more complete discussion on the nature of this determinism, see Shaked (1976, pp. 59ff).

he stands mid-way between the abandonment of earthroots through urbanization, and the total reliance on them in a return to primitivism. The old man mediates between a chaotic unconscious and a too tightly structured ego, allowing the boy to move cautiously from the known of the city to the unknown of the forest, an unknown personified most clearly in the character of Franciszek.

The bi-polarity of the old man is carried over into his recounting of the history of evil, for he tells the boy of how Abel slew Cain, a blatant reversal of mythic fact. The intent may be to portray the criminal as the ultimate victim of society, and thus foreshadow the death of Franciszek at the hands of the court,<sup>5</sup> but in any case, it involves the old man in the role of trickster: affecting the attitude of one type of role (the wise man) while peppering that role with intrusions of its polar opposite. The use of the old man as trickster is not out of context with the image of the Wise Old Man of mythology, for the freed slave does indeed expose the youth to the true nature of the forest (i.e. its capacity to destroy as well as create), but does so indirectly by misleading him about the coming flood rains.

Thus, during his first encounter with the youth, the old man is a creature at home in the forest, fearless of its dangers. As such, he appears as a model to the boy's imagination, and earns the youth's trust by correctly predicting the weather — a magical art known only to the Wise. His second appearance, however, is marred, for he comes into the forest with a pot of cooked meat.<sup>6</sup> Clearly, cooked victuals are a city-dweller's device, and carrying it into the forest is a violation of the sanctity of the place. When asked to predict the weather a second time, the old man errs and the flood ensues. But this is no simple mistake of meteorological judgment; it was not a light drizzle that the aged one failed to predict, but a deadly deluge that changes the very character of the forest itself. The gravity of the error leads one to suspect that the old man was deliberately misleading the boy (as he did with the recounting of history) in order, perhaps, to involve the lad in a higher truth: the bi-polarity of all things and the shadow side of self.

In fact, this is often the case with archetypal figures, for they too possess a shadow side which involves them in opposing behavioral traits. The old man in our story is the boy's shadow side projected outward.<sup>7</sup> The boy is young, the man is old; the boy is Jewish, the man is Gentile; the boy is master (*'adoni na'or*), the man is a slave. The encounter with this man is the initial meeting

5. It may, however, point to the old man's pessimistic determinism; a belief that evil is inherent in life, and that ultimately it matters little as to who killed whom. See Shaked (1976, p. 59).

6. Strauss believes that the food is meant for Franciszek, thus identifying the two. Psychologically, this is true, since both characters are projections of the boy's shadow side.

7. For more on shadow projection see Jacobi (1973, pp. 113ff).

with evil and the shadow. It is not only that the old man tells the boy about the first murder, he actually perpetrates evil upon the youth by falsifying history (Abel slaying Cain), and lying about the impending danger of flood rains.

This encounter, however, is only the beginning, for the shadow is refined further in the figure of Franciszek, whom Strauss (1961, p. 15) calls the master of the dark, wild side of nature.

Where the old man's superficial kindness and wisdom concealed a streak of evil, Franciszek's gruff and evil exterior masked a kind of fondness for the boy, and a playfulness with the townsfolk (clearly shown in his nocturnal visit to the judge, and recognized by the townsfolk in their mythologizing of Franciszek into a Robin Hood-like character.) This intermingling of character traits is in line with the bi-polarity of archetypal figures, and is a clearer exposition of the message foreshadowed in the title of the story, i.e. the interrelatedness of opposites.

The opening scenes of this tale explain things from the boy's point of view. Everything is black and white: Bible versus Talmud, forest versus city, ego versus unconscious. Had the awareness of the youth not progressed, the story would have better been called *The Forest or the City*, replacing the conjunctive with the disjunctive. Yet the plot proceeds to make plain the overwhelming fact that archetypes are not static, but fluid, their individual boundaries often giving way to an overlapping of images and feeling tones.<sup>8</sup> Thus we find throughout the tale that both forest and city constantly invade one another. The opening scene has the forest at odds with the city, the boy fleeing the latter to take refuge in the former. For the youth the divisions are clear: forest and city, unconscious and ego, individual freedom and civic duty. But this clear dichotomy does not last, and the plot moves swiftly into an arena where the forest at first penetrates and threatens the city (Franciszek the forest dweller's breach of the city's defenses and his visit to the judge), and then the city invades the forest (the old man with his pot of cooked meat). The opening motif of the forest invading the city is the dominant theme, and is backed up with the forest's attempt to overrun the city via the flood. The final scene, however, is a variation on this theme, and hints at a profound change in perspective, for it shows Franciszek once again entering the city (as in the initial invasion by the forest), but this time, he does so under city guard. Hence, the city triumphs over the forest, the coercive power of the ego (exemplified by the police) over the Robin Hood imagination of the unconscious.

The point is that both ego and unconscious lack fixed boundaries, the one often spilling over into the other. In this tale, the "spilling over" occurs literally in the flood episode, and figuratively in the easy access Franciszek has

8. For a discussion of archetypal contrasts and overlap, see Elstein (1970, pp. 182-83).

to city life. Given this perspective, what is the teaching that the boy learns from all this? Is there a resolution and integration of ego and unconscious, city and forest?

The answer is found in the youth's reaction to the changed, post-flood forest. Previously, the forest offered succor and freedom, joyously proclaiming God's creation (through the psalms and singing of frogs, psalms more beautiful than any King David could have written). The post-flood forest is, however, a cold, damp, fungus-covered place which inhibits the boy from taking off his shoes, as was his custom, and coming into direct contact with the forest. He no longer bathes in the stream, walks barefoot among the trees, nor sits on the grass. To dwell in a holy place one must remove one's shoes, but here the boy leaves his shoes on and becomes more of a tourist than a dweller among the trees. Originally, as Sadan points out, the boy was attracted to the forest by a sense of wholeness with it (*šəlemut*) but that selfless unity has given way to the functional dualism of increasing individuation.

This break with the forest signifies a strengthening of the boy's ego, and his ability to discriminate between the totality of the unconscious and the limited space of self. The experience of the "I" and the "not-I" allows for the refining of the shadow projection which is involved in the Franciszek encounter. This meeting includes two "liturgical" settings. The first is the youth's response to Franciszek's query about the dangers of walking alone in the forest. The boy repeats verbatim the words of his first shadow teacher, the old Gentile; a shadow's response to a shadow's query, fair enough, and Franciszek is satisfied.

The second setting is the blessing the boy offers over the liquor. The blessing is formulaic, theologically significant, ego-directed, and city-learned. Where the first litany was from the shadow side to the shadow side, the second was clearly a response from the ego. As such, it throws Franciszek off-balance. He had never heard it before, and is eager to learn it. The ego instructs the shadow, but the shadow cannot master the blessing.

In the final scene where Franciszek repeats the blessing in response to his impending death at the hand of the court (the ego at its most discriminating, most logical, anti-forest state), Agnon is again demonstrating the fluidity of shadow and self. For the shadow's response to the ego's power and triumph is not some magical conjuring, but the very blessing it learned from the ego to begin with.

The use of the blessing here, as well as the import of its message (i.e. all is according to God's will) leads one to suspect that some sense of integration of ego and shadow has occurred. The shadow is now under the control of the ego, and although there is an initial euphoria that leads to the forgetting of the depth and complexity of the shadow and the unconscious (i.e. the townsfolk forget

that there are dangers other than Franciszek), the boy recognizes the fact that the euphoria is misplaced. He seems to guess that an unbridled unconscious is threatening and evil, for it tries to swallow up one's sense of self identity. Yet, he knows too, that the shadow is never fully mastered by the ego.

In short, then, *Bayya'ar uḅa'ir* is an archetypal tale of growth and individuation. The child flees from the restricting ego of the city to the free-flowing unconscious splendor of the forest. There he revels in the life-giving springs, only to discover that there is no rebirth without death, no life-giving waters without deadly torrents and floods.

His escape from the forest, his taking refuge in the city, are his catalyst to growth and self-awareness. He chooses self-identity over self-negation, the shuttered city to the undifferentiating flood. Now that he has seen the dark side of the forest, he must meet the dark side of the self: Franciszek the shadow. This too he accomplishes, and Franciszek becomes a prisoner of the self-conscious super-ego of the city's court, leaving the boy free to develop his identity further, knowing that there are other deaths (shadows, threats of self-negation), but that these too are functions of God's will: the path of individuation.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agnon, S. Y. 1938. "Bayya'ar uḅa'ir." *Ha'arets*, April 15.
- Band, A. 1968. *Nostalgia and Nightmare: A Study in the Fiction of S. Y. Agnon*. Los Angeles.
- Eliade, M. 1972. *Patterns of Comparative Religions*. New York.
- Elstein, Y. 1970. *'Iggulim v'əyošer: 'al haccura hammahzorit bassippur*. Jerusalem.
- Frey-Rohn, L. 1967. "Evil from the Psychological Point of View." *Studies in Jungian Thought: Evil*, pp. 151–200. Ed. J. Hillman. Evanston.
- Jacobi, J. 1959. *Complex, Archetype, Symbol*. New York.
- . 1973. *The Psychology of C. G. Jung*. New Haven.
- Jung, C. G. 1974. *Psychology and Religion. (Collected Works, vol. XI)*. Princeton.
- Neumann, E. 1972. *Art and the Creative Unconscious*. Princeton.
- Sadan, D. 1965. "Šəloša sippurim usəḅibeyhem." *Moznayim* 21 (44), 4-5:354-362.
- Shaked, G. 1976. *'Omanut hassippur šel 'Agnon*. Jerusalem.
- Strauss, A. L. 1961. "'Bayya'ar uḅa'ir' lašay 'Agnon." *Bədarkey siprut*, pp. 135–148. Jerusalem.
- Teilhard de Chardin. 1964. *The Future of Man*. New York.