



Universidad Autónoma  
de Madrid

**Biblos-e Archivo**  
Repositorio Institucional UAM

**Repositorio Institucional de la Universidad Autónoma de Madrid**

<https://repositorio.uam.es>

Esta es la **versión de autor** del capítulo publicado en:  
This is an **author produced version** of a chapter published in:

G. Sánchez Canales, Jewish American Identity. Roth & Antisemitism.” Philip Roth in Context, edited by Maggie McKinley. Cambridge UP (2021): pp. 241-51

**Copyright:** © Cambridge University Press 2021

El acceso a la versión del editor puede requerir la suscripción del recurso  
Access to the published version may require subscription

## Part V: Jewish American Identity- Roth & Antisemitism

Gustavo Sánchez Canales

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.

### I.

This chapter looks at why Philip Roth has often been accused of antisemitism, that is to say, of “Jew-hatred.” Dennis Prager and Joseph Telushkin point out in *Why the Jews?* that this term “was coined in 1879 by Wilhelm Marr, an anti-Jewish spokesman in Germany, as a euphemistic substitute for *Judenhass*, Jew-hatred.”<sup>i</sup> Antisemitism as a synonym for “Jew-hatred” is the most widespread use of the word. There are scholars like Leonard Dinnerstein, however, who do not approach it as an extremist attitude or behavior toward the Jews. He employs this term “to denote hostile expressions toward, or negative behavior against, individuals or groups because of their Jewish faith or heritage.”<sup>ii</sup> I will take this definition as my point of departure to show that accusing Roth of displaying an anti-Semitic attitude is not an appropriate approach to his fiction.<sup>iii</sup>

When Dinnerstein examines the theme of antisemitism, he says that although it “has existed throughout American history... [o]nly after World War II did it emerge as a subject that most American Jews were willing to have explored”.<sup>iv</sup> Since the first accusations Roth received came after the publication of his first book, *Goodbye Columbus* (1959), this essay will focus on the period pointed out by Dinnerstein.

My aim is to divide this chapter into two parts. First, I will analyze Roth’s early novel *Portnoy’s Complaint* to demonstrate that accusing him of being a “Jew-hating” writer is simplistic. Second, through a study of *The Plot Against America*,<sup>vi</sup> I will show that this novel, a fictional version of Roosevelt’s 1940 election, is his depiction of a completely different America should the well-known American—and pro-Nazi—aviator Charles A. Lindbergh have been elected President of the US. Roth’s recreation of the grim American society under Lindbergh—which exudes worry and horror—demonstrates that a “Jew-hating”—“self-hating”—writer would never have come up with a novel like *Plot*.

## II.

Philip Roth, “surely among the most gifted of contemporary American writers,”<sup>vii</sup> is “perhaps the most critically significant and consistently controversial American writer of the past fifty years.”<sup>viii</sup> He has been defined as “the most gripping of writers,” whose “fiction is extraordinarily diverse,” and whose “distinctive voice” is “irreverent yet earnest, questioning yet authoritative, subtle and nuanced yet powerful and passionate.”<sup>ix</sup> As in the case of many talented writers, Roth’s fiction has been highly praised, but also extremely criticized. In the latter case, among other reasons, for his alleged misogyny, narcissism and “self-hatred.” This essay focuses on this issue in *Portnoy’s* and in *Plot*.

Books like *Goodbye, Columbus* and *Portnoy’s Complaint*, among others, have often been “accused of fostering distorted perceptions of American Jewish life.”<sup>x</sup> In “New Jewish Stereotypes,” Roth explains that he “was emailed [a New York Post clipping] by a woman demanding some explanation for the ‘anti-Semitism and self-hatred.’”<sup>xi</sup> In “Writing About Jews,” he also refers to the fact that, since the publication of *Goodbye Columbus*, they have been repeatedly “accusing me of being anti-Semitic and ‘self-hating.’” His critics, he holds, find his fiction “trivial and insulting... [and] such criticisms I make of Jews—or apparent criticism—is taken by anti-Semites as justification, as ‘fuel’ for their fires.”<sup>xii</sup> Irving Howe is right when he says that “*Portnoy’s Complaint* is not... an anti-Semitic book, though it contains plenty of contempt for Jewish life,”<sup>xiii</sup> which is what Roth’s fiction could reveal at worst.

A typical mistake made when one approaches Roth’s novels is precisely not to read them as fiction. Therefore, any interpretation of his novels and short stories from an autobiographical perspective is flawed. Debra Shostak has unambiguously said that “[f]iction is not autobiography... many readers have read his work as autobiographical at best, narcissistic at worst.”<sup>xiv</sup> This distinction is essential to understand that “[t]he art of impersonation is the foundation of Roth’s fiction of counterlives.”<sup>xv</sup> Roth himself has also stated that works like *Goodbye Columbus* and *Portnoy’s Complaint* are not confessional because he has nothing to confess. He is clear enough about the use of the terms “confessional” and “autobiographical” when he claims that they “constitute yet another obstacle between the reader and the work... by strengthening the temptation, all too strong in a distracted audience anyway, to trivialize fiction by turning it into gossip.”<sup>xvi</sup>

Roth could be accused of many things, but not of “trivializ[ing] fiction”—let alone of antisemitism nor of displaying anti-Semitic attitudes. Roth hits the nail on the head in an interview with Martha McGregor when, at one point, he takes “Defender of the Faith” as a case in point. He says that “the story is by no means about the Jews. It’s about individuals who happen to be

Jews.”<sup>xvii</sup> To put it differently, Roth’s early works—those of the late 1950s, 1960s and 1970s—were written by “a highly skilled satirist”<sup>xviii</sup> whose target—I find—is the American individual as an epitome of the contemporary human being. This can be confirmed when asked about his satirical approach to Jewish urban life. He replies: “I can’t deny I have feelings of anger and censure as a human being and a Jew, although I would say this is not particularly a Jewish problem, but an American problem.”<sup>xix</sup> To me, this is particularly true in Portnoy’s case.

*Portnoy’s Complaint* tells the monologue of Alexander Portnoy, a teenage American Jew, to his psychiatrist, Dr. Spielvogel. As defined on the first page, “Portnoy’s Complaint [is a] disorder in which strongly-felt ethical and altruistic impulses are perpetually warring with extreme sexual longings, often of a perverse nature.”<sup>xx</sup> And Spielvogel explains that “[a]cts of exhibitionism, voyeurism, fetishism, auto-eroticism and oral coitus are plentiful; as a consequence of the patient’s ‘morality’, however, neither fantasy nor acts issues in genuine sexual gratification, but rather in overriding feelings of shame and dread of retribution, particularly in the form of castration.”<sup>xxi</sup>

For instance, in “WHACKING OFF” Alexander gives an account of his adolescent years, a time of his life “half... spent locked behind the bathroom door.”<sup>xxii</sup> During those years, Portnoy felt an unrestrained need to masturbate at all times. He recalls one day when he went to a Saturday afternoon movie with his friends. At one point, he left them to buy a refreshment. Then, he suddenly felt the need to “wind up in a distant balcony seat, squirting my seed into the empty wrapper from a Mounds bar.”<sup>xxiii</sup> Alex’s act is known as “Onanism,” after the biblical Onan’s, which, according to the *Book of Genesis (Bereshit)*, caused divine anger.

Onan, as narrated in chapter 38 of *Genesis*, was the second son to Y’hudah, and brother of Y’hudah’s firstborn Er, who “was evil from Adonai’s perspective, so Adonai killed him.”<sup>xxiv</sup> Y’hudah told Onan to go and sleep with Tamar, Er’s wife, so that she could get pregnant. In this way, the line of descent could continue. However, Onan disobeyed his father and “he spilled the semen on the ground, so as not to give his brother offspring.”<sup>xxv</sup> This action “was evil from Adonai’s perspective, so he killed him too.”<sup>xxvi</sup>

Although in *Genesis* Onanism is conducive to its practitioner’s death, the *Book of Leviticus (Vayikrah)*, which includes legal and ritual practices, refers to it as “discharge from his body” and is described as “unclean.” Washing oneself in water is the prescribed way to remove that uncleanness. More specifically, verse 16 says that “[i]f a man has a seminal emission, he is to bathe his entire body in water; he will be unclean until evening.”<sup>xxvii</sup> In spite of the biblical account in *Genesis*, Onanism does not seem to be a “deadly sin”: Onan’s actual crime was his refusal to sire a son on his dead brother’s behalf. If his action was not sinful, what then could account for many (Jewish) readers’ displeasure? Something that does not work in Roth’s favor is

that Alexander performs his action on a Saturday afternoon—or Sabbath (“rest”)—the holy day in Judaism reserved for prayer. However, taking this scene as a case in point of Roth’s alleged antisemitism is far-fetched.

Another scene that has probably led many readers to vent their anger on him is when Alex remembers how he “bought one afternoon at a butcher shop and... violated behind a billboard in the way to a bar mitvah lesson.”<sup>xxviii</sup> As in the case of his onanistic act, what could have infuriated many readers is Roth’s allusion to the *bar mitvah*, the male Jewish coming-of-age ceremony. Prior to it, parents hold responsibility for their children’s actions. After the ceremony, the children, who have become adults, bear sole responsibility for their actions. This is what 13-year-old Portnoy does. His decision entails breaking with his parents’ religion.

In one scene in “THE JEWISH BLUES,” Portnoy’s parents, who are attending a synagogue service, expect their children Alexander and Hannah to accompany them. However, Alex shows no intention “to set foot inside a synagogue for fifteen minutes.”<sup>xxix</sup> Apart from this, he refuses to change his clothes into a more appropriate outfit: “to put a tie on and a jacket on and a pair of trousers and a clean shirt.”<sup>xxx</sup> It is Rosh Hashanah, the Jewish New Year, and as such the first of a series of holy days of the year. His refusal to wear other clothes than the shirt he is wearing and a pair of Levis symbolizes his complete assimilation and, therefore, his break with his parents’ faith. Alex’s father breaks into tears after Alex tells him “I don’t believe in God and I don’t believe in the Jewish religion—They’re all lies... There is no such thing as God, and there never was.”<sup>xxxi</sup> Portnoy’s apostasy is clear. If, according to the bar mitzvah precept Alex is responsible for his acts, he is free not to attend the Sabbath service with his parents and Hannah.

The scenes above help me show that what (Jewish) readers have often found outrageous—in their view, a proof of Roth’s antisemitism and/or self-hatred—should be interpreted as rebellion, as Roth’s alter ego’s desire to break with what he refers to as “that inheritance of terror that I bring with me out of my ridiculous past!”<sup>xxxii</sup> In my opinion, “rebellion”—“to be left alone”<sup>xxxiii</sup>—is what Alex displays because Roth does not “write out of traditional self-hatred, for the true agent of such self-hatred is always indissolubly linked with Jewish past and present.”<sup>xxxiv</sup>

There is another scene that many Jews in general and rabbis in particular are likely to find outrageous. At one point, Roth introduces rabbi Warshaw. In an *ad hominem* attack on the rabbi, he is described as “a fat, pompous, impatient fraud, with an absolutely grotesque superiority complex.”<sup>xxxv</sup> Van den Oever alludes to Marie Syrkin’s “The Fun of Self-Abuse,” a review of *Portnoy’s Complaint*, which the reviewer defines as an “anti-Semitic novel.”<sup>xxxvi</sup> Oever, who completely disagrees, explains that he “instead respond[s] with an amused smile when Alexander makes light of the Jewish community,” among other reasons, because “Alexander identifies as a Jew, refers to the Jewish community as ‘we’, and at times targets himself/his younger self.” He

finds that “the jokes alternate with both loving and serious moments that make for a surprisingly complex portrayal of Jewish life in midcentury America.”<sup>xxxvii</sup>

Sending Alexander, an assimilated American Jew,<sup>xxxviii</sup> to Israel is better understood in light of Roth’s aforementioned explanation “this is not particularly a Jewish problem, but an American problem.”<sup>xxxix</sup> In “In Exile”—a reference to “galut” or Jewish diaspora—Portnoy travels to Jerusalem, a place to which he refers as “*Eretz Yisroel*”<sup>xl</sup>—“Land of Israel” or “Promised Land.” At the core of this idea is the importance of Israel as the “Jewish home” traditionally expressed every Passover Seder as “Next year in Jerusalem.” Therefore, “returning”—*aliyah* in Hebrew—is inherent to the idea of homeland.<sup>xli</sup> When he looks around, he feels that “I am in a Jewish country. In this country, everybody is Jewish.”<sup>xlii</sup> While in Israel Alex has sexual intercourse with two Israeli women. One of them, Naomi refers to him as “a self-hating Jew.”<sup>xliii</sup> Alex has seen himself as someone “frightened, defensive, self-deprecating, unmanned and corrupted by life in the gentile world.”<sup>xliv</sup> “Anti-Semitism,” Debra Shostak points out, “is the phenomenon that makes the Jew in the Diaspora visible to himself as well as to others who view him as ‘other.’”<sup>xlv</sup> An American Jew like Alex is the perfect epitome.

### III.

In *The Plot Against America*, Roth presents a counterversion of the 1940 presidential campaign. One of the changes he had to make was replace Wendell Willkies, the historical Republican nominee, for Charles A. Lindbergh. In Roth’s story, Lindbergh defeated Roosevelt in his career for a third presidential term, an unprecedented victory in the History of the US. In this way, the infamous anti-Semite aviator Charles Lindbergh became the new President. In Wirth-Nesher’s explanation, “a Lindbergh presidency is imaginary, but the anti-Semitism of the real historical Lindbergh was not, nor was the movement toward his nomination within the Republican party.”<sup>xlvi</sup> Undoubtedly, Lindbergh’s victory would have initiated an era of terror and persecution of the American Jews. How did Roth come up with such a plot?

In “My Uchronia” Roth explains his strategies to create a novel like *Plot*. He opens his essay saying that in December of 2000, he was reading the proofs of Arthur Schlesinger’s autobiography. Roth had a keen interest in the description of the events of the late 1930s and the 1940s in the US. At one point, he writes, “[i]n his autobiography, I came upon a sentence in which Schlesinger remarks that there were some Republican isolationists who wanted to run Lindbergh for president in 1940.”<sup>xlvii</sup> This reference triggered his idea of writing a counterhistory of that event. He says “[t]hat’s all there was, that one sentence with its reference to Lindbergh and a

single fact about his political prominence that I'd not known. It made me think, 'What if they had'?"<sup>xlvi</sup> Roth explains that this change is what he calls "a uchronia."<sup>xlvi</sup> His choice of Lindbergh was, among other reasons, because the aviator, "a genuine widespread anti-Semitic threat," was "a socio-political force in the 1930s and '40s... distinguished not solely by his isolationism but by his racist attitude toward Jews."<sup>l</sup> Roth is fully aware of the radical changes he had to include in his narrative. He hastens to write that "[t]he real Lindbergh did, in fact, give just such an inflammatory speech on September 11, 1941, at a Des Moines America first rally."<sup>li</sup> However, in *Plot*, "to suit the fictional time-scheme, I move the speech back to the previous year, but I don't alter either its content or its impact."<sup>lii</sup> Roth explains in his "Preface" that "...what nonfiction I have written has arisen mainly from a provocation—responding to the charges of anti-Semitism and Jewish hatred—or to answer a request for an interview by a serious periodical."<sup>liii</sup> In *The Ghost Writer* (1979), Nathan Zuckerman receives a letter from Judge Leopold Wapter who wrote a letter of recommendation to support Zuckerman's application for the University of Chicago. After reading Zuckerman's story "Higher Education," the judge asks him a number of questions, one of which is particularly tricky. He asks Nathan whether he would have written such a story if he had lived in Nazi Germany in the 1930s. In "Interview with *Le Nouvel Observateur*," Roth refers to this issue in these terms: "For however much I may loathe anti-Semitism, however enraged I may be when faced with the slightest real manifestation of it, however much I might wish to console its victims, my job in a work of fiction is not to offer consolation to Jewish sufferers or to mount an attack upon their persecutors or to make the Jewish case to the undecided."<sup>liv</sup>

Throughout his career Roth was criticized for displaying anti-Semitic feelings. In Spargo's accurate explanation, "[n]othing irked Roth more... than the overt move made by many of his Jewish critics and readers... of repeatedly comparing the effects of his work to Nazi propaganda."<sup>lv</sup> My main point here is precisely to show that if those accusations were right, he would have never written a book like *Plot*. A counterversion written by an American Jew like Roth is not so far-fetched. Jews had begun to serve the Roosevelt administration during the late 1930s: this administration and the American-Jewish community had common enemies—right-winged, pro-Nazi organizations. All of them had well-grounded reasons to oppose these organizations which, supporting the cause of Nazi Germany, were clearly anti-Semitic. Ginsberg rightly claims that "[a] pattern of close cooperation between Jewish organizations and national security agencies also developed during the years before the war. During the 1930s, the Anti-Defamation League engaged in an active and extensive program of surveillance directed against pro-German and isolationist groups, organizations and prominent individuals."<sup>lvi</sup> Therefore, Lindbergh's not unlikely victory would have contributed to an ever-increasing hostility against the Jews, something masterly depicted in *Plot*. As Ginsberg explains in "The Failure of Anti-

Semitism in the 1930s,” a key reason for this could be that “[s]ome American businessmen and industrialists, fiercely opposed to New Deal domestic programs, were at least willing to toy with the idea of an American equivalent of Hitler or Mussolini to replace the hated President Roosevelt.”<sup>lvii</sup> As usually happens when a country goes through rough times—the 1930s with the New Deal policies in the US—there was an increasing feeling of frustration to the extent that many Americans felt so desperate that they began to be receptive to populist policies. Political demagogues typically tell citizens what they want to hear. The 1930s America was not an exception in this respect. Once again, as Ginsberg says, “[t]his made anti-Semitism a powerful and effective weapon of mass mobilization.”<sup>lviii</sup> He adds: “More than one hundred anti-Semitic organizations were founded between 1933 and 1941.”<sup>lix</sup> Luckily, however, pro-Nazi antisemitism was defeated during the New Deal years.

Regarded in light of the fact above, Lindbergh’s victory is not far-fetched. His Naziphilia can be better understood in light of Volkman’s account of this period written three decades before the publication of *Plot*. Before entering World War II in 1941, Volkman explains, there had been a public debate summarized in two clear-cut positions: the so-called “interventionists” and the “American Firsters.” While the former, who regarded Hitler as a threat to civilization, thought that the US were the only power capable of stopping the Nazi menace, the latter argued that America did not have to be involved in a European war. President Roosevelt headed the former; the latter had the infamous aviator as one of its most prominent advocates. Lindbergh went to Germany, where he received a medal from Hermann Göring. This helps understand why the narrator says that “[i]n the course of five visits... he was ceremoniously decorated in the name of the Führer, and he expressed quite openly his high regard for Hitler.”<sup>lx</sup> No wonder that the young protagonist shows his love for Roosevelt and his hate for Lindbergh. Apart from this, when Roth recreates the atmosphere that would have pervaded the American society under Lindbergh’s presidency, he alludes to “[t]he intoxicant of anti-Semitism” that he “came to imagine.”<sup>lxi</sup>

As explained above, throughout *Plot* Roth fictionalizes what would have happened in the US should Lindbergh have won the election, a scenario similar to the one lived through in pre-Holocaust Europe. The following two years after Lindbergh’s election would have been by no means easier for American Jews as can be deduced from the title of the last two chapters: “October 1942. Bad Days” and “October 1942. Perpetual Fear.”

#### IV.



I started this essay citing *Why the Jews?* The chapter entitled “Non-Jewish Jews and Antisemitism”<sup>lxii</sup> is an in-depth analysis of those Jews who “have contributed to intense Jew-hatred.”<sup>lxiii</sup> Roth is not included in the list of twelve well-known writers and intellectuals. Prager and Telushkin refer to these as “radical non-Jewish Jews”—among others, Marx, Trotsky, Rosa Luxemburg and, more recently, Norman G. Finkelstein and Noam Chomsky—because they “feel rooted in anything Jewish, religious or national” and are often associated “with revolutionary doctrines and social upheaval.”<sup>lxiv</sup> Any attentive, unprejudiced reader of Roth’s books realizes that accusing him of being a “radical non Jewish Jew”—i.e. an anti-Semite, a self-hating Jew—is out of the question.

---

## Notes

<sup>i</sup> I follow Prager and Telushkin in the spelling “antisemitism,” who for their part have adopted this spelling proposed by the historian James Parker. He believes that “[t]he term [anti-Semitism] is a misnomer, of course, since it has nothing to do with Semites” (*Why the Jews? The Reason for Antisemitism, the Most Accurate Predictor of Human Evil*. New York, London, Toronto, Sydney & New Delhi: Touchstone, 2016), p. 199; in *A Legacy of Hate. Anti-Semitism in America* (New York, London, Toronto & Sydney: Franklin Watts, 1982), p. 8 Ernest Volkman also briefly addresses this issue.

<sup>ii</sup> Leonard Dinnerstein, *Antisemitism in America*. New York & Oxford: Oxford UP, 1994: ix.

<sup>iii</sup> For reasons of space, I cannot address antisemitism from a historical perspective. For a comprehensive study, see Dennis Prager and Joseph Telushkin, *Why the Jews?*; among others, consult also Karen Armstrong, *Holy War. The Crusades and Their Impact on Today's World*. New York: Anchor Books, 2001: 76-118.

<sup>iv</sup> Leonard Dinnerstein: viii.

<sup>v</sup> Philip Roth, *Portnoy's Complaint*. New York: Random House, 1969.

<sup>vi</sup> Philip Roth, *The Plot Against America*. Boston & New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2004.

<sup>vii</sup> George J. Searles (ed.), *Conversations with Philip Roth*. Jackson & London: University P of Mississippi, 1992: ix.

<sup>viii</sup> Timothy Parrish (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Philip Roth*. Cambridge UP, 2007: 1.

<sup>ix</sup> David Brauner, *Philip Roth*. Manchester & New York: Manchester UP, 2007: 1-2.

<sup>x</sup> George J. Searles, *Conversations*: ix; in *Philip Roth*: 27-33 David Brauner examines the issue of antisemitism and self-hatred in *The Ghost Writer*, *Zuckerman Unbound*, *The Anatomy Lesson* and *The Prague Orgy*; for an analysis of antisemitism in Roth's "On the Air," see Debra Shostak, *Philip Roth—Countertexts, Counterlives*. U of South Carolina P, 2004: 77-82.

<sup>xi</sup> Philip Roth, *Why Write. Collected Nonfiction 1960-2013*. New York: The Library of America, 2017: 41; for an explanation of this issue, see R. Clifton Spargo, "How Telling: Irving Howe, Roth's Early Career, and the Dialectic of Impersonation in *The Anatomy Lesson*," *Philip Roth Studies*, 5.2 (Fall 2009): 258.

<sup>xii</sup> *Why Write*: 50.

<sup>xiii</sup> Irving Howe, "Philip Roth Reconsidered," *Commentary* (December 1972): 76.

<sup>xiv</sup> Shostak:8.

<sup>xv</sup> *Ibid.*, 8.

<sup>xvi</sup> Alan Finkelkraut, "The Ghosts of Roth." *Conversations with Philip Roth*: 122. See Debra Shostak, *Philip Roth*; and David Brauner, *Philip Roth*: 9-11.

<sup>xvii</sup> Martha McGregor, "The NBA Winner Talks Back." *Conversations with Philip Roth*: 1. For an analysis of "Defender of the Faith" as "an anti-Semitic Stereotype," see Philip Roth, *Why Write*: 56-64; George J. Searles, *Conversations*: 1, 38-39, 64-65, 195-196, 244-246.

<sup>xviii</sup> Spargo: 253.

<sup>xix</sup> Searles: 2.

<sup>xx</sup> Roth, *Portnoy's*: u.p.

<sup>xxi</sup> *Ibid.*, u.p. For a detailed account of Alex's sexual awakening, see *Portnoy's*: 78-184.

<sup>xxii</sup> *Ibid.*, 17.

<sup>xxiii</sup> *Ibid.*, 18.

<sup>xxiv</sup> Gen 38: 7.

<sup>xxv</sup> Gen 38: 9.

<sup>xxvi</sup> Gen 38: 10.

<sup>xxvii</sup> Lev 15: 16.

<sup>xxviii</sup> *Portnoy's*: 19.

<sup>xxix</sup> *Ibid.*, 60.

<sup>xxx</sup> *Ibid.*, 60.

<sup>xxxi</sup> *Ibid.*, 61-62.

<sup>xxxii</sup> *Ibid.*, 160.

<sup>xxxiii</sup> Howe: 76.

- 
- xxxiv Howe., 76.
- xxxv *Portnoy's*: 73.
- xxxvi Spargo: 260.
- xxxvii Roel van den Oever, *Mama's Boy: Momism and Homophobia in Postwar American Culture*. New York: Palgrave, 2012: 163.
- xxxviii Victoria Aarons addresses this theme in "Eli the Fanatic." See "Is It 'Good-for-the-Jews or No-Good-for-the-Jews'?: Philip Roth's Registry of Jewish Consciousness," *Shofar*, 19.1 (Fall 2000): 18.
- xxxix McGregor: 2.
- xl *Portnoy's*: 245.
- xli Consult Shostak: 108-110.
- xlii *Portnoy's*: 253.
- xliii *Ibid.*, 265.
- xliv *Ibid.*, 265. For a study of *Portnoy's* as a masculine construction of the self-deprecating Alex, consult Maggie McKinley, *Masculinity and the Paradox of Violence in American Fiction 1950-1970*. New York & London: Bloomsbury, 2015: 143-154.
- xlvi *Philip Roth*: 77
- xlvi Hana Wirth-Nesher, "Roth's Autobiographical Writings." *The Cambridge Companion to Philip Roth*: 170.
- xlvi *Why Write*: 336.
- xlvi *Ibid.*, 336.
- xlvi *Ibid.*, 339.
- l *Ibid.*, 339.
- li *Ibid.*, 340.
- lii *Ibid.*, 340. See "A True Chronology of the Major Figures" in *Plot*: 364-391. Lindbergh's Des Moines speech is included in *Plot*: 385-390.
- liii *Ibid.*, xi-xii.
- liv Philip Roth, "Interview with *Nouvel Observateur*." *Reading Myself and Others*. London: Vintage Books, 2007 [1975]: 109.
- lv Spargo: 264.
- lvi Benjamin Ginsberg, *The Fatal Embrace. Jews and the State*. Chicago & London: The U of Chicago P, 1993: 110. For an analysis of the anti-Nazi coalition in the US during the late 1930s, see Ginsberg: 108-112.
- lvii *Ibid.*, 116.
- lviii *Ibid.*, 117.
- lix *Ibid.*, 117.
- lx *Plot*: 6.
- lxi *Ibid.*, 10.
- lxii *Why the Jews?*: 42-55.
- lxiii *Ibid.*, 42.
- lxiv *Ibid.*, 42-43,