

(Not a) Conclusion

An Imaginative Universe

The Palestine brought forth in Nasrallah's linked series tears apart colonial and administrative logics and refashions their elements, reorienting constitutive parts, reshaping some, redefining others, and utterly reimagining how they fit together. In rewriting the nature of the relationships between space, time, and individuals in the service of telling the story of Palestine, Nasrallah works out a novel set of parameters for the representation of its lived experience outside of bounded space and linear time. His Palestine Project ultimately offers a new container for national relationships and allows, as nationally meaningful, many of the realities of Palestine that are informally or begrudgingly acknowledged but in practice marginalized—often because they threaten mainstream or dominant narratives. While the parts and chapters of the analysis presented here separated different structural elements of Nasrallah's representation, the elements, more broadly speaking, work in concert. Having looked at each element up close, this conclusion offers an opportunity to briefly explore how they can work together in a few different configurations.

This conclusion takes three examples. These are drawn from themes and ideas developed in the works of the Palestine Project and put in the larger context of political and historical discourse. Using the vocabulary set out in the preceding chapters, the first example shows how the Intifada can be read as a conceptual container much like the works of the Palestine Project. The Intifada, constituted by the action of individuals and communities that took up common cause across discrete locations, was held and claimed when useful by Palestinians in other times and places. It is—this reading will show—an example of a series, of *al-muthannā*, of delirium and the mobilization of the position of the balcony. The second example here is the Nakba. Thinking through the lens of the series/*al-muthannā*, with a view from the balcony and a sense of delirium, the many coexisting meaning

horizons of the Nakba can be reconciled. This vision of the Nakba can account for and witness as valid all the different harms associated with Palestinian dispossession. Finally, returning to the discursive field of literature and the study of Palestinian writing, the last example shows that the language of Nasrallah's linked series offers a vision of literary heritage that upends the national-genealogical approach to reading Arabic fiction. Instead of a field of writing set out in the same logical terms as that of the nation-state, the Palestine Project offers an expansive vision of literary influence that moves across and beyond national or temporal boundaries.

INTIFADA

Almost invisibly, the raging of the Second Intifada shaped the lives of characters in *Amina's Weddings* and *Under the Midmorning Sun*.¹ It was the reality of increased Israeli military repression and the attempt to remove any possible political actors from the streets that saw protagonist-hero Yasin's (re)arrest. This removal from the streets also allowed Salim to stage his monologue without its muse's permission. It was the Israeli invasion of Ramallah and its attempt to stifle Palestinian political leadership that provided a cover for Salim's murder of Yasin. In Gaza, it was the bullets exchanged by organized resistance and Israeli forces that killed Lamis, and nervous Israeli soldiers manning a checkpoint who gunned down the child whose death Lamis witnessed. That Amina and tens of other women could mourn a presumed dead husband/beloved/son/brother was because so many men were involved in the uprising and slept away from home to avoid capture. The lives of the characters across both novels are shaped by the context of repression and its mass refusal that marked the Intifadas. Not only did this context dictate the possibilities of the stories told and the lives of the characters, but in the background of the works the idea and function of the Intifada as a national phenomenon was being explored. A closer look shows how Intifada (as a phenomenon) operates in and through *al-muthannā*, functions as a series, opens a space of delirium, and offers a chance from the position of the balcony to challenge visible structures of oppression and limitation.

Where the analysis in chapter 2 looked at *Amina's Weddings* and *Under the Midmorning Sun* for the ways and means of developing relationships between individuals and community, this return to the works uses a now-established vocabulary to understand Intifada. In the same way that *al-muthannā* was developed through the example of twin sisters, then doubled characters, then collectives, civil rebellion and its violent suppression took shape as Intifada—one thing across twin geographies. This “thing,” this event, became available for a collective to claim and create meaning within/through. In the characters of Randa and Lamis, *Amina's Weddings* developed the idea of an indelible connection across discrete bodies. Lamis could be more than Lamis because after her death Randa could conjure her forth. The body left, but the entity that it created remained. The same can be said

of the making of Intifada: though the rising up against oppression happened in discrete sites in the West Bank and Gaza, the thing—the phenomenon—that was generated through this action was something that both (and indeed other) places (via the people in them) could claim.

In fact, Intifada had already been established as *al-muthannā*, in what was retrospectively called the First Intifada. This, even more than the second (when the twin texts were set), was a phenomenon shaped by the actions of discrete communities who were connected in a common cause but not organizationally (or politically or geographically) linked.² In drawing attention to the repetition of the phenomenon, the language of the Palestine Project makes Intifada readable not only as *al-muthannā*, but as a series. Intifada is not a collection of discrete bodies/locations; it is something beyond time and place, and its power continues. Beyond the novels, we can see the mobilization of Intifada as a powerful phenomenon generated across and between discrete places and times. This phenomenon—like the identity of the hero—can be claimed as and when it serves the realization of the aims of citizens (as defined in part 3). Each time Intifada is claimed, the meaning of the phenomenon opens and expands further. But like the novels of the two linked series, the founding ideals and representations remain. The core ethos of collective action and demand for change remains (and remains powerful), even as the shape and function of its mobilization shifts. A brief look at mobilization illustrates the point.

By 2000, when the Second Intifada was declared, those who proclaimed it were very aware of the power of the word. This is perhaps what made the claim of a second so powerful: it invoked the power of people to disrupt systems of oppression and to effect a change in circumstance. Indeed, the collective action of the “First” Intifada not only forged strong community ties, mechanisms of withstanding and subverting Israeli military restrictions, and drew global attention to the damages to life and dignity that the military occupation perpetrated, but it was also credited with creating the pressure necessary to force a change in the status quo.³ This took the form of peace talks through the 1990s and into the 2000s. The Second Intifada has been interpreted as a mobilization of people demanding a revision of the problematic agreement that was produced by the never really concluded talks. Beyond a revision of the problematic peace deal, the Second Intifada would broaden the scope of Palestinian demands—not only against dispossession, occupation, and oppression at the hands of Israeli military forces backed up by an international community, but also the shape and form of Palestinian leadership that was created in the Oslo Accords. The meaning of Intifada expanded and yet did not really change at its core. This would not be the last time the idea was mobilized.

Most recently, Intifada was invoked to unite a long series of what Israeli and US media outlets called “lone wolf” knife attacks that took place between 2015 and 2016.⁴ Describing these instead as part of a “knife intifada” became a rhetorical way of drawing attention to the larger forces that pushed young men (and very

occasionally women) to act.⁵ It also put their actions on a collective plane instead of an individual one. These single acts could be, through Intifada, understood as a united reaction to the shifting methods of oppression and occupation. This is where Intifada becomes a tool of balconic perception. In the changed mobilization of the word (no longer describing direct and organized community action), a parallel change in the operation of delimiting power structures can be interpreted. In other words, if Intifada is a word describing a collective response to oppression, than the particulars of Intifada can also be used to understand the particulars of that oppression. Where in the 1980s Intifada was in principle a rising up against issues of taxation without representation and the sheer inequality of occupation through tax and labor strikes, as well as stone throwing and guerrilla tactics,⁶ the Second Intifada was a rising up against a changed set of circumstances. While it was called Intifada, the rising up of the 2000s was different.

The more explosive tactics of the Second Intifada drew attention to the increased militarization and separation of populations as well as the personal agony that sustained oppression produced across generations. If the children of the 1980s threw stones, the youth of the new millennium strapped explosives to their chests and walked into key sites of Israeli military control.⁷ These were different tactics to respond to different tools of oppression. The “knife intifada,” saw a wave of stabbings that one analyst described as “characterized by random individual action,” whose effectiveness was precisely in its random nature.⁸ Many of the knife carriers were killed during or shortly after the attacks, and some, anticipating the lethal response, had written notes to their families. These individual—yet also collective—moments of confrontation again speak to the changed context. In the mid-2010s Palestinians under Israeli occupation were subject to increased surveillance, segmentation, repression of political organization, and securitization. From collective action to using bodies as ordnances to wielding often simple kitchen knives—all of these were claimed as Intifada because they were each the same logical response to oppression. The sense was that no matter how tightly controlled Palestinians might be, ways and means of rising up would be found.

As something that is redefined as it responds to shifting mechanisms of control and delimitation, when it is invoked, Intifada acts as a sort of pathway of delirium, or a ready orientation to Palestinian “being” in a context that so readily denies it. This is because Intifada is a calling out of power, and a way of concretely working to push this power back to make room for Palestinian trajectories. Of course, like all symbols—and similar to the discussions of the figure of the fighter and the hero-poet above—it is not a thing to inhabit. While Intifada has been invoked countless times over the years, it is not a permanent state and does not cover all actions of a person, a place, or a community at all times. It does not, on its own, realize Palestine or Palestinian being. It is adopted as and when it can effect change. Intifada is thus a series, with many beginnings and an ongoing story; something that can be mobilized beyond these spaces within which it takes shape; and something that can be invoked by Palestinians wherever they may be.

NAKBA

The Nakba is a trauma of multiplicities. While there are many different existing ways of articulating what it was, what it is, and what it means, none of these on their own is sufficient to communicate its scope and scale. This was made fully clear in the writing and reception of Nasrallah's *Eraser Child*. While *Time of White Horses* was praised as *the* story of the "tragedy of his people,"⁹ it was rather this earlier work that showed the hidden mechanisms of dispossession of Palestine. *Eraser Child* was the story of the Nakba as it had not yet been told. It was not the story of tents and refugees but of social and administrative failures. These failures are almost imperceptible when the story of the Nakba is told as one of dispossession, where families, like those in *Time of White Horses*, were left "curled up into a ball like an unclaimed bundle of clothes, a bundle that had found itself in a truck whose destination no one knew."¹⁰ In its focus on Fouad and the Arab Liberation Army, *Eraser Child* shifted representation of the Palestinian catastrophe. The Nakba, it showed, was not only something experienced by Palestinians; it was the result of structures well beyond Palestinian control. Reading the two texts as different ways of understanding what the Nakba was requires analysis from the position of the balcony—a simultaneous view of what the Nakba meant to Palestinians at the time and what was happening elsewhere that meant there was no one coming to protect them. This Nakba is both an experience (many experiences) and its architexts.

That the Nakba is many things at once is not in itself a new idea. In *The Palestine Nakba*, the historian Nur Masalha drew out four conceptual approaches to understanding the Nakba and how the word has taken on meaning.¹¹ Each different understanding has its own structure of meaning and therefore its own limitations to what can be included and how harm can be understood. Reading the many definitions, mobilizations, and understandings of Nakba through the terms of the Palestine Project, these limitations begin to dissolve. The idea of the series, and the stance of the balcony, can absorb different articulations of the meaning of the Nakba, make sense of their limitations, and see—like the story of Salwa—what all the texts have so far managed to leave out.

In Masalha's four definitions are understandings of catastrophe that fit into two dominant and familiar frameworks and two more open-ended models. First, the Nakba is understood as an event in a linear Palestinian history. As Masalha describes it in the first pages of his work, Nakba is "the turning point in the modern history of Palestine—that year over 500 villages and towns and a whole country and its people disappeared from international maps and dictionaries."¹² This construction presumes a linear history of Palestine from past to future that was violently disrupted. It allows one to imagine a present Palestine that had not been erased but makes less room for the many trajectories that Palestinians have journeyed (and would bring with them on an eventual return). Maurice Elbelini, in his work on Palestinian fiction written in English, Spanish, Hebrew, and Danish, has neatly drawn out some of the pitfalls of this structure of imagination.¹³ "We should

acknowledge the emergence of several epistemic Palestines,” he writes, and the problems of reconciling these into typical national (linear) frameworks.

Second, Masalha, citing Ilan Pape, recounts how Nakba was conceived and constructed to operate as a “counter [to] the moral weight” of the Holocaust.¹⁴ This meant articulating what happened in and around 1948 using the same narrative structure as that used to tell the story of the Holocaust. The two terms could then be used in conversation, comparing apples to apples. For example, both Ethel Manin and Elias Khoury—two of three non-Palestinians who have been hailed for writing *the* story of the Nakba—wrote about the massacre at Lydda.¹⁵ The destruction of the city, the massacre of hundreds of the population’s men, the creation of a ghetto, the looting of houses, the forcing of Palestinians to burn and bury their dead—this experience shares so many horrific hallmarks of the Holocaust that it is difficult not to make parallels.¹⁶ But this story of Lydda has been narrated more than other stories because it offers such a striking parallel. This way of structuring the Nakba narrative, however, limits the Nakba to something that happened (in the past tense). It papers over the many differences between the Nakba and the Holocaust, and it puts emphasis on a particular kind of Nakba experience. It also, as Bashir Bashir and Amos Goldberg write in their *Holocaust and the Nakba*, sets the stage for a “global clash between the two metanarratives.”¹⁷

Better, perhaps, to understand these two ways of telling the Nakba through the lens of delirium. This makes room for the renegotiation of tropes, which then go from limiting to open-ended. Like the trope of the fighter or the mother of the martyr, these articulations of Nakba can be inhabited and mobilized to make the experience readable within dominant frameworks. These articulations are by all accounts true; they are just not complete and risk doing damage when they are understood to be the only way of articulating the Palestinian catastrophe. Delirium, further, must be engaged to see how these narratives are created as ways of making sense within (and speaking to) existing structures of power. One way of achieving this is through the device of the series. In seeing these two narrative types as examples of a larger whole, we can identify their generic structure, see that structure as a text in its own right, and understand that this structure and the story it tells are all part of a larger story called Nakba.

Other articulations of the Nakba innovate alternative structures of telling. As Masalha noted, Nakba has become what Pierre Nora called a “site of memory,” a focal point that collects diverse memories and can act as a site or location where remembrance—individual and collective—can take place.¹⁸ While Nora developed his idea around a physical site (Flanders fields, Auschwitz, the 9/11 monuments), Masalha claims that—much like Intifada above—Nakba as an idea (as a memory) has become a vessel for all kinds of different narratives, different experiences. In this articulation, every experience of Nakba is a valid one. Stories of massacre, of exodus, but also of remaining, of alienation, or feelings of guilt about what was not lost. Nakba in this sense of the term can incorporate multiplicity and remains—

like the idea of the series—open to collecting as-yet-unheard stories. This way of imagining deploys what has here has been called a *chronotope* of accumulation. Used to understand how places and times were taken up into the network of Palestine, stories of the Nakba are verified through that same paradigm of witness outlined in chapter 3. Something is part of the Nakba because Palestinians witness and acknowledge it to be so.

As a “site of memory,” the Nakba can also be understood as *al-muthannā*. The often-discrete experiences of different villages, cities, and geographies (inland vs. coastal, etc.) together generate a sense of the diversities of violence enacted and the different tactics of dispossession deployed across different strategically important (or not important but no less valid) locations. All of these different events, all of the experiences of them, constitute the larger notion of Nakba. The focus of Nakba as a site of memory, however, is a focus on events and experiences. The structures of power—that which made the dispossession of a People thinkable, and indeed achievable—are generally lost. Another open-ended notion of Nakba, however, puts precisely these structures in the spotlight. Citing Elias Khoury, the fourth articulation of Nakba that Masalha mentions in his work is the notion that catastrophe is ongoing.¹⁹ The forces that make Nakba possible, this way of thinking illuminates, are still in play—and they can be seen to have started well before 1948. European colonialism, racism, Zionism, ethnonationalism—all of these structures are what made it possible to dispossess Palestinians of their homes and villages, and they are structures that continue to do violence today.

Understanding Nakba as an ongoing process allows the architexts of Palestine’s destruction to be made visible. We can also begin to parse the relationships between these structures of power and understand how they worked at once together and for their own ends. This is where the story of Fouad and the Arab Liberation Army come in: corruption, misogyny, and the problem of a sense of inevitable victory all played—and in many ways have continue to play—a part in the ongoing dispossession of Palestinians. The danger here, of course, is that all violences become Nakba violences, and it is harder to trace and understand the long-term impact, indeed the compounding of harms, when they are all lumped together. For example, Salwa’s rape can be traced to some of the same forces that made the Nakba possible, but does calling her assault part of the Nakba obscure the particular harm she has experienced? When violence is seen as a process, the harms of its duration can be obscured. Ultimately, as Masalha observed, the meaning of the Nakba has been shaped by all of these different articulations. What using the language of Nasrallah’s linked series does is hold all of these different notions together, allowing insights of one to be read into, or alongside, another. It also allows the gaps of one structure of telling to be filled in by another and can read and evaluate different structures based on their relationship to power.

Something of how this combined approach functions can be seen when we read Nasrallah’s linked series as *the* story of the Nakba (instead of just *Time of*

White Horses, as critics have tended to do). Looking at the cumulative project, the Nakba takes on a more delicate texture. For example, we might say that Fouad introduces structures of power that perpetrated the Nakba and have been hitherto unaccounted for; these are structures we see again generations later in the story of Yasin when he “returns” to Ramallah. The story of the village of Hadia and its destruction shows how forces of dispossession reached at least into the Ottoman era in its linear historical-style narrative, while Salwa shows how the harms of dispossession can ripple across time, creating vulnerabilities that leave Palestine and Palestinians open to new harms. The Balconies, for their part, explore the new, old, and persisting structures of harm that Palestinians are faced with on a daily basis—some the same forces as those that allowed the Nakba to happen, others novel powers that perpetrate new harms. The Balconies make visible the relationships between these structures of harm (new and old), allowing for a more precise tracing of the ongoing Nakba and its linked forms of violence.

LITERARY HERITAGE

Tucked in the back matter of the Palestine Comedies is a ten-line quote of sorts from Ibn Manẓūr’s thirteenth-century *Lisān al-‘arab*.²⁰ The lines are set out in the shape of a poem and given the title, “Of *al-Malhāt* and Its Roots.” Each line presents one of the meanings of words stemming from the root *l-h-w*.²¹ *L-h-w* is the foundation of the word *malhāt* (comedies, as in the Palestine Comedies), but in different forms and conjugations, it takes on a host of other meanings. The entry is credited to the *Lisān al-‘arab*, a compendium that collected all known references to a root and its words from across religious, historical, juridical, and poetic texts. The twenty-volume work is seen as an authority on the meaning of words. In citing the *Lisān al-‘arab*, the back matter of the Palestine Comedies gives an authoritative definition of just what the project means by “comedies.” In the most basic sense, given the series title “The Palestine Comedies,” this is also defining Palestine—or at least the elements of Palestine that the series will touch on. The excerpt and its definitions do define Palestine (in a sense, as a reading shows below), but the *Lisān* excerpt is a fake: it is not a direct quote. This definition is based on a traditional authority of language that is in fact a rewritten version of that authoritative text. The site of authority is thus obscured. And this is precisely the point. The example offers a rewriting of tradition and a redefinition of the ways and means of relationships between texts, so that any author can call on any set of works and claim these as their literary heritage. A close reading shows how.

The Palestine Comedies’ ten-line back matter is closer to a total rewriting of the *Lisān al-‘arab* entry for *l-h-w*. It takes the six pages of text from the *Lisān* and narrowly selects eight usages that boil down to four definitions, or components, of the term: comedies as Nasrallah defines it means love (*ḥubb*), distraction (*gha-fal*), complete attachment (*lā yufāriq*), and “a gift” (*‘aṭiyya*). This is Palestine, the

intimacy goes, a beloved, something not to be distracted from, something to form a complete attachment to, “the best and most generous of any giving.” In this sense it is rather straightforward. But to get here Nasrallah has entirely rewritten a source text of Arabic literary heritage. This rewriting forges an idea of literary tradition that breaks with existing formulations and rescripts the relationship between (and indeed the authority of) the literary past and its imagined relationship to the present. The lines and a translation are as follows:

في الملهاة وجذورها
لها بالشيء، لهوا: أولع به.
لها، لهما عن: إذا سلوت عنه وتركت ذكره وإذا غفلت عنه.
ولها المرأة إلى حديث المرأة أنست به وأعجبها. قال تعالى (لاهي قلوبهم) أي متشغلة عما يدعون إليه.
وقال (وأنت عنه تلهي) أي تتشغل وتلهوا: أي لها بعضهم ببعض.
ولهوت به أحبته. والإنسان اللاهي إلى الشيء الذي لا يفارقه.
وقال: لاهي الشيء أي دانه وقاربه ولاهي الغلام الفطام إذا دنا منه.
واللهوة واللهية: العطية. وقيل: أفضل العطايا وأجزلها

To be distracted by something
To be impassioned by it
If you forget it and cease to mention it, and if you turn a blind eye and neglect it
A woman is entertained with the goings-on of women: She is amused and absorbed
by it
God almighty said: (their hearts are distracted from what they are asked to do)
And he said: To him, you pretend to be busy
They are occupied with each other
I loved him.
The person who is *lāhī* towards something, is inseparable from it.
Someone [can] *lāhā* an object: To bring it closer
The boy is getting closer to weaning
An offering. And it is said that it is the best and most generous of any giving

Just what these new relationships are will now be a familiar pattern. Reading literary history through the tools of the Palestine Project opens closed narratives. The closed narrative in this case is the linear and retrospective story told of Palestinian (and Arabic and much of “world”) literature. In all cases, the literary past of a nation or a language is presented as a relentless march forward, moving from oral poetry to prose to the short story to the novel. This development happens in either linguistic or national silos. It is the Palestinian silo, where folk poetry gave way to the short story, that was slowly moving toward the novel when the Nakba interrupted the process. Here the story takes its familiar turn, and authors of the Nakba generation were charged with writing the way back to the homeland and reconstituting a Palestinian people in exile—something later generations were understood to be unable to achieve. It is this broad-strokes narrative that made Nasrallah and his work invisible in the first place, lost between the Nakba and the post-Oslo generations.

It is perhaps fitting, then, that this last example suggests a vision of literary heritage that breaks down the lines and silos. For this vision is as expansive as the Palestine that Nasrallah's works imagined: it is composed of countless spaces, times, and agents. In this model, literary movements do not develop in lines, do not draw on texts produced only in one language, place, or time. While the relationships—real and through reading—forged between Palestinian and Arab writers and texts remain valid, and an important point of reference, this is, as it were, as one series in a project containing several. Literary heritage, like the excerpt from the *Lisān al-ʿarab*, is instead a carefully selected amalgamation of traces and influences—both imposed and specially identified—from a host of possible (and available) sources. Literature in this figuration exists in something like what Kristeva in her theory of intertextuality described as a sort of literary ether.²² For Kristeva this was the idea of a sort of oxygen that writers breathed that held in it the traces of every literary utterance that came before. Breathing this air, she wrote, meant that every work was in a sense intertextual because it recirculated all that which came before. The vision here is almost as expansive.

In the works of the Palestine Project Nasrallah demonstrates the operation of this vision of literary heritage. He quite literally put the works he was breathing on the pages of the novels, like when Salwa was browsing the shelves of her teacher, or as the reader encounters the lines of Xuedou's tenth-century Chinese poem, or when Fouad recalls reading *Gulliver's Travels*, or al-Duktūr's Brecht. Add to this Nasrallah's claim as the inheritor of Habibi, Jabra, and Kanafani and his use of news images from Abu Ghraib and video stills from *Forrest Gump*. The literary heritage—the works of the ether—on display in the novels is diverse across time, genre, and space. Also brought through are the architexts of many of these global texts. The world that Kanafani or Jabra or Habibi wrote—the structures of power, the contexts of writing—is claimed in the works of the Palestine Project just as much as the themes and tropes of these authors' works. In a different way, it is also the world that produced the images at Abu Ghraib that forms this literary heritage. The violence of 9/11 and Abu Ghraib, as *Balcony of Delirium* so clearly showed, is in the air—and it must (the project intimates) be accounted for.

Beginning with Kristeva's notion of a sort of literary ether as a way of imagining intertextuality, imagining this reconfigured literary heritage might also lean on Walter Benjamin's idea of the constellation. In Benjamin's figuration of relationships, discrete happenings—phenomena that are independent of each other—can be read together and understood to have formed something larger than its parts.²³ The constellation is what allows particular happenings (or in this case, particular texts) across space and time to be understood as elements of a singular phenomenon. Like the Big Dipper, which can be picked out amid billions of stars in the night sky, Nasrallah is part of a literary heritage that is more like a universe—a universe from which texts are chosen or imposed and brought into conversation to tell a larger story. Literary heritage in Nasrallah's works (as indeed Palestine)

operate like a constellation: forces and experiences gathered together out of so many stars in the sky.

Nasrallah, then, gives tools for redefining the spheres of criticism that leave him neglected as an author. His works make their own case for inclusion in a much-expanded sense of not only Palestinian writing but also Palestine. This literary language, and the imaginative universe that it conjures forth, makes it very difficult to criticize the author for his prolificacy. For in this vision of Palestine, one must keep writing. And as perhaps a relief for the reader, one must not—because almost by concept one cannot—read it all, for this Palestine is as infinite as Borges's Library of Babel. To be complete, the Palestine Project must write all formulations of experience, across all of Palestine's locations, and grapple with every single structure of power that limits life, dignity, and freedom. It is, perhaps, enough to know that this is the Palestine for which the linked series create imaginative space. Of course, even if, one day, the series do come to a close, the literary universe that takes shape within them can continue to proliferate through the exercise of the citizen writer, whose work it is to persist in the observation and collection of texts of the nation.