

PALGRAVE STUDIES IN LANGUAGES AT WAR

Translating War

Literature and Memory in
France and Britain from
the 1940s to the 1960s



Angela Kershaw



Palgrave Studies in Languages at War

Series Editors

Hilary Footitt
University of Reading
Reading, UK

Michael Kelly
School of Humanities
University of Southampton
Southampton, UK

Languages play a crucial role in war, conflict and peacemaking: in intelligence gathering and evaluation, pre-deployment preparations, operations on the ground, regime-change, and supporting refugees and displaced persons. In the politics of war, languages have a dual impact: a public policy dimension, setting frameworks and expectations; and the lived experience of those 'on the ground', working with and meeting speakers of other languages.

This series intends to bring together books which deal with the role of languages in situations of conflict, including war, civil war, occupation, peace-keeping, peace-enforcement and humanitarian action in war zones. It will offer an interdisciplinary approach, drawing on applied linguistics, sociolinguistics, translation studies, intercultural communication, history, politics, international relations and cultural studies. Books in the series will explore specific conflict situations across a range of times and places, and specific language-related roles and activities, examining three contexts: languages and the military, meeting the other in war and peacemaking, and interpreting/translating in war.

More information about this series at
<http://www.palgrave.com/gp/series/14615>

Angela Kershaw

Translating War

Literature and Memory in France and
Britain from the 1940s to the 1960s

LEVERHULME
TRUST _____

palgrave
macmillan

Angela Kershaw
Department of Modern Languages
University of Birmingham
Birmingham, UK

Palgrave Studies in Languages at War
ISBN 978-3-319-92086-3 ISBN 978-3-319-92087-0 (eBook)
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-92087-0>

Library of Congress Control Number: 2018945198

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2019

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors, and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Cover image © Imperial War Museums (Art.IWM ART LD 1588)

Printed on acid-free paper

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer International Publishing AG part of Springer Nature.

The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

*For John Snape
Thou the sunrise, I the day!*

Acknowledgements

The collaborative nature of research and authorship has never been as apparent to me as it has over the course of this project, and I am pleased to be able to acknowledge here the help and support I have received from many people. Jean Rose, library manager at the Random House Group Archive and Library gave assistance with material on Joseph Kessel, and Sharon Rubin, permissions manager at Peters Fraser, and Dunlop literary agents, granted permission to consult material on Kessel in the Random House archive and assembled information for me held in the archives of Peters Fraser, and Dunlop on sales of Kessel's *Army of Shadows*. Joanna Prior, managing director at Penguin Books, granted permission to consult material on Kessel in the Penguin archive, and Hannah Lowery, archivist of the special collections at the University of Bristol, gave invaluable help in locating relevant material held there. My thanks to Anne Porter, Contracts and Permissions Assistant at Penguin Random House UK, for permission to quote this material. Kalinka Alvarez carried out very useful research for me in the Pantheon Books archives at the University of Columbia. Lynn A. Cowles did a far more detailed, organised, and efficient job of finding material on Kessel and Haakon Chevalier in the Knopf archive at the Harry Ransom Center, University of Texas, Austin, than I could ever have done myself. Sarah Connor-Bell and the document supply team at the University of Birmingham have been

tenacious, patient, and successful in sourcing hard-to-find editions of various novels.

Many academic colleagues have supported me in innumerable ways in the process of writing this book. Margaret Atack, Martyn Cornick, and Gaby Saldanha read my work in draft and gave me the benefit of their expertise through their insightful suggestions, always offered with care and tact, and I am immensely grateful to them. My thanks are due to Martyn for many stimulating conversations, reading suggestions, and the loan of a lot of books. Valerie Holman was tremendously generous in being willing to answer my many questions about British wartime publishing, and also read an early draft of what became the first two chapters of this book. I have benefited from many discussions at conferences and over dinner with Peter Davies and other members of the Holocaust and Translation Network, including Andrea Hammel, who invited me to present part of this work at Aberystwyth University. I have enjoyed and learned much from conversations with Béatrice Damamme-Gilbert about literature and the war. Susan Bassnett and Claire Gorrara supported this project from the outset. Natasha Rulyova identified the Tolstoy quotation cited at the beginning of Chap. 3 in the original Russian text for me, and Anissa Daoudi drew my attention to useful sources on the cultural environment of interwar Algiers.

The research on which this book is based was funded by Leverhulme Research Fellowship, which provided me with time away from teaching to focus on the project. My sincere thanks are due to Anna Grundy of the Leverhulme Trust, to Sheena Roberston, research support partner in the College of Arts and Law, University of Birmingham, and to Clodagh Brook and Stephen Forcer, my heads of department during the period of the fellowship and the completion of the book, for all their practical assistance in helping me to manage the project and my other academic commitments. This has been particularly important to me because of the difficult circumstances I found myself in almost as soon as the project began. A couple of months in, and again in 2016, I was diagnosed with cancer. The support I have received from the Leverhulme Trust and from the Department of Modern Languages at the University of Birmingham has been tremendous, and it is certain that this book would not have been completed without it. My thanks are also due to Beth Farrow at

Palgrave for her patience in awaiting the often-promised and several times delayed arrival of my manuscript. Many colleagues at Birmingham have generously helped out by covering teaching and supervisions and helping keep me cheerfully and positively focused on academic pursuits, including Claire Peters, Emma Tyler, Sarah Fishwick, Agnès Gower, Emma Wagstaff, Elliot Evans, Stephen Forcer, Martyn Cornick, Méлина Delmas, Svetlana Page, Hilary Brown, and Gaby Saldanha.

Finally, a personal note. As I have worked on this book, I have been supported by many friends and family who are, I am grateful to say, too numerous to name here. I particularly want to record my thanks for those who have been closest to me throughout: my parents, John and Irene Kershaw, Sarah Platt, Andrew Snape, Michael, Rachel, Katy and Helena Snape, and most of all, my husband, John Snape, who keeps me fixed on hope. Without his love, encouragement, and practical help and support in so many different ways, I could never have completed this book, and it is dedicated to him with deep gratitude and appreciation. In the words of Laurent Binet, or rather, those of his translator, Sam Taylor, in Binet's 2017 novel *The 7th Function of Language*: 'It is never too late to try to change the course of the story. And it may well be that the imaginary novelist has not yet made his decision'.

NOTE: Angela Kershaw died on 6 June 2018. She had finished responding to the copy editor's questions on the book and, with her husband John, had asked her friend and colleague, Martyn Cornick, to liaise with the publishers and to check the proofs when they arrived. Martyn unhesitatingly agreed. Angela was delighted by this and John is grateful beyond words for Martyn's generosity in putting aside his own work in order to proof-read the text and thereby to ensure that the book was published on time.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Zones of Hospitality	29
3	Translating the French Resistance in London and New York	67
4	The War Novel in the Post-War Years in France and Britain: Comparative Perspectives	119
5	The Goncourt Prize and the Second World War in France and Britain, 1945–51	165
6	Layers of Translation: Multilingualism in War and Holocaust Fiction	215
7	Conclusion	267

Appendix 1	279
Appendix 2	283
Index	289



1

Introduction

On 6 November 2017, in Paris, according to well-established tradition, the winners of the two most prestigious French literary prizes were announced almost simultaneously. The Goncourt prize was awarded to Eric Vuillard for *L'Ordre du jour*, a fictionalised account of events surrounding Hitler's Austrian *Anschluss*, and the Renaudot prize to Olivier Guez for *La Disparition de Josef Mengele*, a literary-historical investigation into the post-war life of the infamous physician of Auschwitz. Did the 2017 Renaudot committee realise, asked Florent Georgesco in *Le Monde*, that they had just completed the transformation of the annual ritual of the literary prize into a sort of coronation ceremony placing history on the throne of contemporary literature (Georgesco 2017)? But the dominance of the Second World War as a literary theme of prize-winning French fiction in 2017 was not new. Many commentators have noted a turning towards historical subjects in general and the Second World War in particular amongst twenty-first-century French novelists (Riglet 2010; Anon 2011). As *Le Figaro's* reviewer pointed out (Corty 2017), the 2017 prizewinners were the latest in a procession of contemporary Second World War novels to win literary prizes in France, often said to have been inaugurated by Jonathan Littel's *Les Bienveillantes* (prix Goncourt, 2006),

the story of the fictional SS officer Maximilien Aue, and also including Laurent Binet's *HHhH* (prix Goncourt du premier roman, 2010), that of the very real Reinhardt Heydrich, the 'butcher of Prague' and architect of the Nazi's 'final solution'. On the basis of these and other successful contemporary Second World War novels—including, amongst others, Philippe Grimbert's *Un secret* (prix Goncourt des lycéens 2004; grand prix des lectrices d'*Elle*, 2005), Sylvie Germain's *Magnus* (prix Goncourt des lycéens, 2005), Philippe Claudel's *Le Rapport de Brodeck* (prix Goncourt des lycéens, 2007), Boualem Sansal's *Le Village de l'Allemand ou le journal des frères Schiller* (grand prix RTL-Lire 2008; grand prix SGDL du roman 2008), Fabrice Humbert's *L'Origine de la violence* (prix Orange du livre 2009, prix Renaudot du livre de poche 2010), and Yannick Haenel's *Jan Karski* (prix Interallié, 2009; prix du roman FNAC, 2009)—there seems to be agreement that literature has a special role to play in representing the abominations of history. While fiction may not have the 'legitimacy' of testimony or history, Georgesco suggested, it can fill in the blanks that historiography can only leave to the imagination.

In Britain too, popular culture continues to retell the stories of the Second World War with an imaginative spin. On 13 July 2017, Christopher Nolan's film *Dunkirk* premiered at the Odeon Cinema, Leicester Square, in London, prior to its release in the UK, the USA, France, and the Netherlands the following week. Although it was filmed partly in France, and stages a Franco-British encounter, there can be no doubt that this film tells a thoroughly British tale, restating the classic national myth of the heroic role played by the 'little ships' in rescuing British soldiers trapped on the French beaches by the German advance. This did not escape the attention of French critics. For Jacques Mandelbaum, writing in *Le Monde*, the Battle of Dunkirk as Nolan portrayed it was 'une histoire purement anglaise', a purely English story (Mandelbaum 2017). Mandelbaum recognised Nolan's right to imagine Dunkirk through his own particular point of view, but contested the resulting historical distortion which in his view Nolan's film had operated:

Où sont, dans ce film, les 120 000 soldats français également évacués de Dunkerque? Où sont les 40 000 autres qui se sont sacrifiés pour défendre

la ville face à un ennemi supérieur en armes et en nombre? Où sont les membres de la première armée qui, abandonnés par leurs alliés estimant la partie perdue, empêchant néanmoins, à Lille, plusieurs divisions de la Wehrmacht de déferler sur Dunkerque? Où est même Dunkerque, à moitié détruite par les bombardements, mais rendue ici invisible?

[Where in this film are the 120,000 French soldiers who were also evacuated from Dunkirk? Where are the 40,000 others who sacrificed themselves to defend the town in the face of an enemy superior in arms and in men? Where are the members of the First Army who, abandoned by their allies who thought all was lost, nonetheless managed at Lille to prevent several Wehrmacht divisions from reaching Dunkirk? Where even is Dunkirk, half destroyed by the bombings, but here made invisible?]

This review is no freer than Nolan's film of national war myths, restating as it does the French myth of 'perfidious Albion' abandoning her ally in the hour of need. Mandelbaum's reaction to *Dunkirk* exemplifies the limits of Georgesco's celebration of the power of the imagination to communicate history. History can be fictionalised, but historical truth must not be compromised. The difficulty being, of course, that that 'truth' looks different according to which side of the Channel it is viewed from.

Debates in the press over the 2017 Goncourt and Renaudot prizewinners and Nolan's film, which attracted numerous nominations at the British Academy Film Awards, Golden Globe Awards, and Academy Awards, highlight both the continuing presence of the Second World War as a theme in contemporary culture in both France and Britain and the issues of historical accuracy, authenticity, and perspective that inevitably arise when historical events are conveyed to popular audiences through the media of fiction and film. These questions are well-trodden territory. Yet one interesting feature common to these successes of 2017, which has gone unremarked, is their translational aspect. Both Vuillard's and Guez's novels rely to a significant extent on foreign and translated sources and intertexts, such as the memoirs of the British foreign secretary Lord Halifax and of the Austrian chancellor Kurt Schuschnigg (Vuillard 2017, 31, 39–41), and those of the Hungarian Auschwitz survivor Miklós Nyiszli (Guez 2017, 114).¹ Vuillard suggests that '[t]el est l'art du récit que rien n'est innocent' [such is the art of storytelling that

nothing is innocent] (Vuillard 2017, 45): Would it not be reasonable to wonder about the implications of translating the words of the German, Austrian, and British politicians, and Mengele's thoughts and dreams, into French? Is translation here simply the necessary means of bringing Austrian and German experiences closer to French readers? On one level, this is true, and yet translation in these novels gives rise to a play of closeness and distance that may not be so innocent. Though the stories are told in French, the presence of the foreign in reviews of Vuillard's novel appears to have a distancing effect, with titles such as 'L'Allemagne au menu du Goncourt et du Renaudot' [Germany on the menu for the Goncourt and the Renaudot] (Gandillot 2017), 'Le nazisme en gants blancs' [Nazism in white gloves] (Sulser 2017a), and 'Le prix Goncourt couronne l'Anschluss en camera cachée' [Goncourt prize crowns the Anschluss with a hidden camera] (Sulser 2017b) marking the separation between the novel's subject and its place and language of publication. These reviewers' summaries of Vuillard's novel describe its accounts of Goering's meeting with Lord Halifax and Ribbentrop's with Churchill, but do not mention the French president Albert Lebrun, who also appears in the novel but not in the reviews. Likewise, reviews of Guez's novel drew the reader's attention to the 'South American dictators' such as Juan Perón and Alfredo Stroessner, who hid Mengele after the war, highlighting the research undertaken by Guez for the book in Buenos Aires, Paraguay, and Brazil (Corty 2017). In contrast to the linking of German perpetrator violence with France which Margaret Attack identifies in *Les Bienveillantes*, there is little sense here that Vuillard's and Guez's stories about foreign perpetrators of violence, massacres, and murders are 'placed [...] within and [claim] kinship to, French culture' (Attack 2018, 24). In Nolan's *Dunkirk*, by contrast, it is the absence of the foreign that is striking: Mandelbaum's comments are not without foundation. Since France is only minimally present, so is French, and there is but one single instance of translation in the film, though it is an interesting one. When the French soldier posing as 'Gibson' is forced to reveal his nationality, he says 'français, je suis français', which is immediately 'translated' by an English soldier as 'a Frog – a cowardly little queue-jumping Frog'. Those four French words and their domesticating gloss sum up one of the film's central dilemmas: Are the British soldiers really so different? Was the

Dunkirk evacuation a cowardly retreat or a victory of survival? Despite the returning soldiers' fears, the film is clear enough in its reassertion of the heroic British myth of Dunkirk, and in its lack of interest in France: the British conception of Dunkirk as a triumph of English pluck and resourcefulness is not seriously disturbed, and we never discover the fate of 'Gibson'. The place of the foreign in these representations poses some important questions. What does it mean when a nation that would capitulate to Hitler in June 1940 chooses to consecrate with one of its most prestigious literary prizes a novel about Austria's willingness to capitulate to the Third Reich in 1938? What does it mean when on the same day that same nation, which only formally recognised state complicity in the Holocaust in 1995,² consecrates a novel about the survival of one of Auschwitz's most notorious German war criminals? What does it mean for a British director to focus a representation of the French army at Dunkirk through a single soldier breaking rank and pretending to be English in order to escape the fate of his comrades? What do these cultural artefacts say about the contemporary working-out of national war memories?

This book offers the long view on such questions of literary history, translation, and national war memory, which are of ongoing contemporary relevance. It probes Delabastita's claim that 'no translation exists outside history, while hardly any historical reality exists without translation'. (Delabastita 2012, 248). For these questions did not suddenly arise in 2017, nor indeed even in the first two decades of the twenty-first century. Joseph Kessel's French Resistance classic *L'Armée des ombres*, written in London and first published in Algiers in 1943, may have validated the propaganda priorities of Kessel's British hosts, but it retained a fundamentally French perspective on the Occupation of France. That the Second World War was already strongly represented in French fiction of the immediate post-war years is clear from its dominance as a theme among the Goncourt prizewinners in the years 1944–49. Robert Merle's *Weekend à Zuydcoote* (prix Goncourt, 1949) told the story of Dunkirk from the French side, and would be followed in 1952 by Merle's *La Mort est mon métier*, whose central protagonist Rudolf Lang is a fictional recreation of the real commandant of Auschwitz, Rudolph Höss (Merle 1952). Nolan's *Dunkirk* repeats the story told in Leslie Norman's 1958 classic

film *Dunkirk*. And the Goncourt selection committee consecrated two important Holocaust novels which tell foreign—in these instances, Polish—war stories with the awarding of the prize to André Schwarz-Bart's *Le Dernier des Justes* in 1959 and to Anna Langfus's *Les Bagages de sable* in 1962. These earlier texts raise questions about the translational nature of cultural representations that are akin to those which arise in relation to the clutch of war films and novels that won prizes and awards in France and Britain in 2017. The centre of interest of this book is that play of difference and similarity, of distance and proximity, that is always already present in war fiction—because it concerns enemies and allies—and that is inevitably set in motion by translation, because translation represents the story of the other in the language of the self. The example of 'Dunkirk'—another instance of the 'succinct mnemonic forms' discussed by Astrid Erll in her account of 'travelling memory' (Erll 2011, 13)—suggests that shared history might be the most difficult to translate. This is because, as we shall see in Chaps. 2 and 3, the priorities of allies are never identical and so even 'inner ideological transfer' between members of the Allied Forces is politically fraught (Wolf 2017, 69). It is because different languages imply different literary histories and, therefore, set in motion different conceptions of how war can or should be represented in fiction (Chap. 4). It is because every reading experience is historically located in time and place, and so readers can only read someone else's history through the frame of their own (Chap. 5). And it is because reading foreign histories in another language might not be such an innocent literary practice as it first appears (Chap. 6). While distance offers the comfort of taking refuge in the exotic, proximity is disturbing because it threatens the boundaries between self and other.

Reading Translationally

This book puts into practice a method for approaching these questions of translation, transfer, and circulation. As a teacher of translation and of translation studies, in common with many text books on the subject, I often begin by discussing with students the idea of translation as both process and product. 'Reading translationally' incorporates consideration

of both, but goes beyond this binary to posit 'translation' as a reading practice. This book considers the process of translation insofar as it pays attention to the material and institutional factors which permit the creation and circulation of a translation. It considers translation as a product insofar as it examines text-level changes which occur between the source and target texts. However, as a work of literary history, it incorporates these methodologies into a broader concept of translation as a perspective on literary production. To read translationally is to combine a range of methodologies which keep translation in view in different ways. Chapters 2 and 3 draw on the concepts of the zone and of hospitality to examine the transnational origins of the source text (Chap. 2) and its multiple migrations both in its original language and in translation (Chap. 3). Close comparison of source and target texts in Chap. 3 reveals the ideological nature of diverse translational practices, both in cases where translational intervention is obvious and in those where it appears to be minimal. Chapter 4 is an exercise in comparative literary history informed by concepts of transcultural and prosthetic memory. Chapter 5 combines source text-target text comparison with reception study to investigate the implications for cultural memory of the way translation re-orientates texts to make them legible for audiences reading in different cultural environments. Chapter 6 uses close reading from the perspective of multilingualism to examine the presence and function of translation within the literary text, as well as to consider the implications of the multilingual source text for interlingual translation. Throughout, it has been my aim to find ways of keeping textual and contextual approaches simultaneously in play. This book is not a work of translation theory. It is a work of literary history that seeks to demonstrate in practice the validity and productiveness of reading translationally. I see this as a method sufficiently flexible to incorporate all of these approaches, and indeed, potentially, others not represented here. One of the aims of this book is to demonstrate that, when we begin to read translationally, much that is often occluded in literary history comes into view.

The concept of reading translationally is inspired by Bella Brodzki's insistence, in her 2007 study, *Can These Bones Live? Translation, Survival and Cultural Memory*, on the benefits of thinking 'translationally and transnationally' (Brodzki 2007, 98). Consonant with Brodzki's

approach, reading translationally relies on an understanding of translation as ‘a kind of critical and dynamic displacement’, a practice that ‘underwrite[s] all cultural transactions’ and ‘the mode by which various discourses read each other, locate their commonalities, and name their differences’ (Brodzki 2007, 2, 3). To read translationally is to understand translation not in its narrowest sense, as interlingual substitution, but in its broadest sense, as a social and cultural practice or, in Emily Apter’s words, ‘the source of an ambitious mandate for literary and social analysis’ and ‘a significant medium of subject re-formation and political change’ (Apter 2006, 11, 6). This, of course, is the perspective opened up in the late 1980s and 1990s by the paradigm shift in translation studies commonly referred to as the ‘cultural turn’, epitomised by Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere’s *Translation, History and Culture* (Bassnett and Lefevere 1990). Reading translationally is not a metaphor and it is not a synonym for what has more recently come to be termed ‘cultural translation’. Cultural translation is a phenomenon that may, but does not necessarily, include interlingual translation.³ Reading translationally never discards *actual translation*, that is, translation understood as contact between (at least) two different languages, even as it locates interlingual transfer as a practice that is inseparable from a wide range of other material, social, political, and textual operations.

Reading translationally, then, is a method that permits the writing of a different sort of literary history. It contributes to a comparative understanding of national histories insofar as these are mediated and communicated through fictionalised cultural representations. The traditional idea of literary history as the story of the literature of a single country has already given way to more flexible, comparative approaches. It nonetheless remains true, as Mario Valdés observes, that literary history cannot be separated from discourses of national identity because ‘all cultural artefacts are mediated by language and its use in the community of production and reception’, and writing takes place within established linguistic communities which have an identity to create, to preserve, or to reinvent (Valdés 2002, 66). However, literary history must now also recognise that literature is not limited to the linguistic community which produces it, because ‘language and, therefore,

linguistic communities are not self-contained' (Valdés 2002, 77). As Linda Hutcheon points out, while universities traditionally divided departments of language and literature along national lines, this is now changing, because 'in our global world the nation as a geographical, political, linguistic and cultural unit, is no longer the only possible focus of literary history' (Hutcheon 2002, 29). In the particular case of the discipline of French studies, recent years have seen a new focus on the transnational, which has embraced translation in various ways, both in curricula and in the research agenda.⁴ In an influential article first published in 2011 entitled 'Mobilizing French Studies', Charles Forsdick argues that the discipline can and must foreground 'the importance of ethnographic proximity and distance, mobility, translation and bicultural comparison' in order to produce graduates and researchers who are 'highly skilled negotiators of the hypercomplexity of the modern world' (Forsdick 2014, 258). In this article, Forsdick underscores the fact that both the national and the narrowly literary have been challenged as the primary objects of French studies, and consequently argues for 'an acknowledgement of the importance of mobility as a historical phenomenon, as an everyday practice, and as a figure of theoretical and epistemological importance' (Forsdick 2014, 264). While Forsdick's particular interest is in travel writing as an instance of textualised mobility, it is clear that translation is another crucial vector of literary mobility and that describing literary mobility is now an integral part of French literary history. Christie McDonald and Susan Suleiman's *French Global: A New Approach to Literary History* is one important manifestation of this shift. They place 'negotiations with otherness and boundary crossings at the very center of French literary history' (McDonald and Suleiman 2010, x), seeking not so much to recuperate the neglected voices of French literature, of which there are of course very many, but rather to look differently at what has always been in view, by adopting the perspectives of interconnections, mobilities, and multiplicities. Drawing explicitly on Hutcheon and Valdés's work (McDonald and Suleiman 2010, xvii), *French Global* seeks to redefine what French studies can be in a globalised, post-national cultural context. Reading French literature translationally can contribute to that project.

Translating War

The literary history of France and the Second World War is of course already well documented. All such studies agree that the experience of the war has been an obsession in post-war France, that the question is still not resolved in contemporary France, that fiction (including novels and films) has played and continues to play a crucial role in mediating war memories, and that the cultural production and the critical literature associated with the war in France is vast. What, then, is the purpose of adding another study to this existing literature? Taking its cue from the approach to French literary history recommended by Forsdick and practised by McDonald and Suleiman, *Translating War* offers a new perspective on texts that have already been established as significant to French cultural memory of 1940–44, that of translational mobility. The aim of this book is to look in a different way at a familiar, if highly contested, set of literary-historical narratives by viewing them through the lens of translation. The paucity of research on translation and the Second World War is nothing short of astonishing, given that, as Margaret Attack had already made clear in her 1989 study *Literature and the French Resistance*, it has long been recognised that France's war experience was highly dependent on the circulation of the written and spoken word:

The defeat of France in June 1940 left France divided both geographically and politically. All sides placed great importance on winning the battle for public opinion, and, with newspapers, books, radio, cinema and mass meetings, the Occupation was (and remained) a war of words and images long before armed conflict restarted. (Attack 1989, 3)

The value of comparative approaches to the study of war and culture has certainly been established; on the one hand, it is acknowledged that more research is needed, and, on the other, such studies as do exist rarely discuss translation to any significant extent. In their 2010 volume *Experience and Memory: The Second World War in Europe*, Jörg Echternkamp and Stefan Martens note that 'as yet, there are no cross-border historical comparisons on the European level or, for example, analyses of transnational images of war' and acknowledge that the comparative element of

their book is at the level of the collection rather than within the individual contributions (Echternkamp and Martens 2010, 260).⁵ Yet scholars such as Suleiman, Brodzki, and Apter have carved out a place for issues of language and translation in the context of representations of war. Suleiman applied the approach exemplified by *French Global* specifically to the example of the Second World War in her 2006 study *Crises of Memory and the Second World War*, in which she argues that ‘the memory of World War II, while nationally specific, transcends national boundaries’ because of ‘the global nature of the war’ and ‘the increasingly global presence of the Holocaust as a site of memory’ (Suleiman 2006, 2). In the introduction to their collection *Mnemosyne and Mars: Artistic and Cultural Representations of Twentieth-century Europe at War*, Peter Tame, Dominique Jeannerod, and Manuel Bragança suggest that ‘only an understanding of other nations’ memories can provide a real sense of identity at a transnational or European level’ (Tame et al. 2013, 6–7); and Jay Winter begins his foreword to the volume by underlining the fact that ‘[l]anguage frames memory, especially memories of war’ because different languages ‘have different lexicons both of memory and of war’ (Winter 2013, xiii). Yet very few of the contributions take these ideas to their logical conclusion to address explicitly issues of translation.⁶ Kate McLoughlin’s 2011 monograph *Authoring War: The Literary Representation of War from the Iliad to Iraq*, defined as a ‘transhistorical and cross-cultural study of war writing’, focuses on English-language texts and does not consider translation (McLoughlin 2011, 19, 20). The point made by Jean Boase-Beier, Peter Davies, Andrea Hammel, and Marion Winters in the introduction to their 2017 collection *Translating Holocaust Lives* remains true of the broader category of the Second World War writing: ‘theoretically founded studies of reception and translation history’ are missing from existing scholarship (Boase-Beier et al. 6). *Translating War* hopes to make a contribution to addressing that gap by using translation to examine instances where cultures of war have come into contact. If, as Winter suggests, language is the ‘decompression chamber’ of memory, what happens when those memories, already mediated through language in fictional representations, are remediated through interlingual translation? How does translation figure in ‘the growing trans-national project of writing the cultural history of war’ (Winter 2013, xiii, xv)?

Translating War is inspired and informed not only by comparative and cultural approaches to the study of war,⁷ but also by the ongoing rereading and re-evaluation of post-war fictional texts about France in the period 1940–44 and of the critical discourses that surround them.⁸ In France, Henry Rousso's classic account of the memorialisation of the French experience of 1940–44, *Le Syndrome de Vichy de 1944 à nos jours* (1987), has been extended and rethought, for example, by Olivier Wieviorka in *La Mémoire désunie. Le Souvenir politique des années sombres, de la Libération à nos jours* (2010), by Pierre Laborie in *Le Chagrin et le venin. Occupation. Résistance. Idées recues* (2011), and, specifically in relation to the Holocaust, by Francois Azouvi in *Le Mythe du grand silence. Auschwitz, les Français, la mémoire* (2012, revised and augmented in 2015), which builds on earlier work by Annette Wieviorka (*Déportation et génocide. Entre la mémoire et l'oubli* (1992) and *L'Ère du témoin* (1998)). In the UK, three important recent projects have driven this research agenda forward. The FRAnce roMan guErre (FRAME) project conducted by Margaret Attack and Christopher Lloyd on 'Narratives of the Second World War and Occupation in France 1939 to the present: Cultural Production and Narrative Identity' (2006–2010) (Attack and Lloyd n.d.) has undertaken a wide-ranging review of existing critical and historiographical approaches to the subject, challenging established ideas about the canon of French Second World War writing and reconsidering the evolution of French history and memory of the war by uncovering a large number of neglected and minor texts (Attack and Lloyd 2012b, 3). The project has resulted in a range of publications, including a special issue of *French Cultural Studies* entitled *War and Occupation 1940–44: Other Stories/Stories of Otherness*, edited by Attack, and Attack and Lloyd's 2012a collection *Framing Narratives of the Second World War and Occupation in France, 1939–2009*. This work has demonstrated that '[a]lthough the notion that from 1944 onwards the celebration of the Resistance and a nation united silenced all other views has obtained a wide credence, the reality could not have been more different': the truth is that, from the Liberation, celebratory Resistance narratives existed alongside a multiplicity of other stories which represented the less heroic aspects of the Occupation (Attack 2018, 12, 16–17). My particular interest in this book in the period from the 1943 to the beginning of the 1960s has been nourished by the work carried out by Attack and Lloyd.

Two further projects have stimulated and sustained my interest in the relationship between translation and the representation of war. Hilary Footitt's 'Languages at war: Policies and practices of language contacts in conflict', begun in 2009, has pioneered close attention to issues of language and translation in the study of the history and culture of war (Footitt *n.d.*). Addressing the question, 'Where is War and Culture Studies in 2016?', Footitt makes a strong argument for the relevance of translation studies to war and culture studies:

The discipline of War and Culture Studies surely has a particular insight into transnational contact zones which are, by definition, multivocal spaces in which identities are translated and communication attempted. I want to argue that these are fundamentally translational spaces, and that we would do well now to consciously incorporate the key notion of translation into our analyses. (Footitt 2016, 215)

As Footitt points out, '[t]he business of war has seldom been a monolingual one. Whether we choose to notice it or not, the "ground of war" is almost always a landscape marked deeply by languages' (Footitt 2012, 229). Translation is therefore 'vitaly constitutive of the transnational spaces of war and conflict, of the ways in which identities are constructed and exchanged in the transnationalism of war' (Footitt 2016, 216). This insight has also been explored in the case of Holocaust writing through the Holocaust and Translation Research Network founded in 2010 by Peter Davies, Jean Boase-Beier, Andrea Hammel, and Marion Winters. The aim of the network was to address the long-standing reluctance of Holocaust studies to take translation into account. As Davies remarks:

Texts by victims and survivors of Nazi persecution have been produced, translated, rewritten, remediated, lost, recovered, and received in a bewildering variety of languages and cultural contexts, and have taken extraordinary border-crossing journeys. Texts that have undergone dramatic transformations are read as if they are original, unmediated expressions of the writer's experience, and canons of Holocaust testimonies are constructed from translated texts: indeed, many texts have had a more significant influence in translation than in their original language. (Davies 2014, 161)

While, as the editors of *Translating Holocaust Lives*, a later volume resulting from the project, recognise, much remains to be done both to acknowledge and to understand the ways in which translation has contributed to the creation and dissemination of Holocaust knowledge, ‘it is becoming increasingly difficult for research into Holocaust testimony to ignore the issue of translation’ (Boase-Beier et al. 2017, 1). I hope that, in addition to offering new insights into the specific examples of French literature about the Second World War and the Holocaust examined here, this book will convince its readers that the importance of translation to the production and circulation of discourses about war can no longer be ignored.

All scholarship is defined to a significant extent by the particular position and disciplinary experience of the researcher. Because my own primary areas of expertise are French studies and translation studies, this book arose out of an interest in France as an exporting culture. Since the book concerns translation into English, it also seeks to revise our understanding of the receiving culture’s literary history by incorporating translation into the story of British war fiction. In this respect, in the interests of imposing coherence on a corpus of texts and of keeping the scope of the book within reasonable limits, a methodological decision had to be taken at the outset: whether to focus only on translated novels and their relationship to the receiving culture or to compare translated novels with domestic novels. I have chosen the former approach, though I do not ignore the fact that, while translated literature can productively be viewed as a literary field in its own right, as sociological approaches to translation have demonstrated (Wolf 2007), translated literature always exists within a dynamic interaction with domestic production. By focusing on the reception of translated novels, the emphasis is placed on post-war critical discourses which reveal dominant British perceptions of what war literature *could* and *should* be, rather than on what, in Britain, it actually was. This is an important question, since no clear definition of such a genre or corpus emerged in Britain in the post-war years. According to Malcolm Bradbury, ‘the Forties is for good reason the least remembered literary decade’ (Bradbury 2001, 211), and in 1987 Bradbury suggested that in stark contrast to the years 1900–1940—the years of modernism—no ‘clear picture’ had been formed of the 40 years since the war: ‘Our critical

records are slight, and our sense of the major directions at work uncertain. We are not yet sure who the major novelists and writers have been, nor what they represent, and though the period is filled with currents and counter-currents we do not really have a firm idea of how to map them' (Bradbury 1987, 88). DeCoste suggests that in Britain, 'the long-standing "invisibility" of Second World War fiction seems to have less to do with any actual paucity of works dealing with this conflict than it has with such works' "failure" to be the kind of war literature critics want' (DeCoste 2005, 7). Until the late 1980s, British war literature was therefore somewhat neglected in literary scholarship. Since then, a body of critical work on novels written during the war has emerged, including monographs by Alan Munton (1989), Adam Piette (1995), Mark Rawlinson (2000), Victoria Stewart (2006) and Marina MacKay (2007). Munton also devotes a chapter to post-war representations of the war (Munton 1989, 74–108), a topic which has been taken up in more recent works including Malcolm Smith's *Britain and 1940: History, Myth and Popular Memory* (2000), Mark Connolly's *We Can take It! Britain and the Memory of the Second World War* (2014; first published 2004), Victoria Stewart's *Narratives of Memory: British Writing of the 1940s* (2006), Gill Plain's *Literature of the 1940s: War, Postwar and 'Peace'* (2015), and in edited collections by Rod Mengham and N. H. Reeve (2001), Noakes and Pattinson (2013), and Petra Rau (2016). The Second World War therefore occupies a different position in British literary scholarship as compared with France. In France, the post-war years have been clearly mapped, with the *nouveau roman*, pioneered by writers such as Natalie Sarraute and Alain Robbe-Grillet, succeeding (and contesting) the meteoric rise to literary fame in the immediate post-war years of the existentialists Jean-Paul Sartre, Simone de Beauvoir and Albert Camus. Though very different in their approaches to literature, writing about the war was a significant aspect of both existentialism and the *nouveau roman* (Higgins 1996). As Atack and Lloyd remark, in the post-war years in France 'it is difficult to think of a major writer who has not addressed the issues of war and Occupation in some way' (Atack and Lloyd 2012b, 1). Also, studies of post-war British war memory tend not to be exclusively literary, reflecting the fact that film and, later, TV are generally seen as primarily responsible for constructing British cultural myths of the war. According to Mark

Connolly, '[t]he most potent mediator of the British version of the war was the cinema, in particular the on-screen reworking of the Second World War that occurred during the 1950s', though these were often based on novels and such representations were reinforced by fiction, autobiography, cartoons, and works of history (Connolly 2014, 198, 200; Smith 2000, 117–29). Of course, film is also crucial to the development of French war memory, as Rousso's *Le Syndrome de Vichy* demonstrates, but film is not the subject of this book.

These strands of scholarship within French studies, war and culture studies, Holocaust and translation studies, and British literary studies draw in various ways on frameworks derived from memory studies, and *Translating War* is no exception. There is now a vast theoretical literature on memory, with many nuanced discussions of terminological differences. I do not aim to add to the debates around nomenclature and definitions, but rather make use in the course of the book of the concepts which seem to me most useful to elucidate the particular question at hand. This book is interested in the 'cultural memory' of the Second World War, understood as 'the artefacts (texts, objects and symbols) by which memory is socialised, or, rather, by which memory is further socialised and mobilised' (Crownshaw 2011, 1). It is informed by what has been called the 'transcultural turn' in memory studies, which seeks to describe 'how memory, its materials and referents, might travel, meet, dialogue and collide with other itinerant memories' (Crownshaw 2011, 2).⁹ The concept of transcultural memory has prised the term 'culture' away from a purely national referent and 'the reification of culture as containment' and reinvented it in order to take account of the fact that 'culture' is dynamic and moves across national boundaries (Crownshaw 2011, 2). I follow Astrid Erll's understanding of the 'transcultural' in this context as 'phenomena which reach across and – eventually, as a result of the contemporary process of globalisation – also *beyond* cultures', as 'the incessant wandering of carriers, media, content, forms, and practices of memory, their continual 'travels' and ongoing transformations through time and space, across social, linguistic and political borders' (Erll 2011, 8, 11). I do not, however, embrace the implicit historical-chronological aspect of Erll's definition which suggests that cultural artefacts *first* 'reach across' and only *then*, thanks to the late twentieth-century development

of globalisation, exist '*beyond*' national cultures. For as Hilary Footitt has argued, the transnational spaces of the Second World War were already the products of crossnational mobility and were therefore characterised by linguistic plurality (Footitt 2016, 215–17). This sort of cultural mixing clearly predates globalisation. But Erll's approach is nonetheless useful, because, like Footitt's, it insists that analysis of contact zones requires an approach that goes beyond the comparative and, instead of confining itself to the nation state, 'explores meeting points and the passage or transfer of cultures, the circulation of ideas, the key categories of cultural travellers, and their overlapping cultural spaces' (Footitt 2016, 213). An emphasis on heterogeneity is similarly important in contemporary translation studies, because it is now recognised that the source text which travels across a linguistic border via interlingual translation is itself inevitably already the product of cultural contact. The 'original' is always already heterogeneous, because linguistic and cultural purity is a chimera (Brodzki 2007, 71–72; Kellman 2000, 21). This does not however render the national irrelevant, since, as Valdés's discussion of comparative literary history, cited earlier, makes clear, culture is mediated by national languages and originates within a given linguistic community. But it does suggest that the transcultural orientation in translation studies, memory studies, and war and culture studies alike needs to view 'across' and 'beyond' as existing in a synchronic rather than a diachronic relationship.

Scope of the Book

It will not have escaped the reader's attention that, despite my insistence on heterogeneity, this book's approach is both binary and comparative insofar as it considers translation from French into English. One reason for this is practical: French and English are the two languages and cultures in which I have expertise. I do not claim that my analysis is exhaustive, but recognise that the translation of French war fiction into English is only one aspect of a much wider nexus of international relationships within which the texts discussed are embedded. To explore fully the range of such relationships is far beyond the capacity of a single book or an

individual researcher. As Anthony Pym remarks, '[t]o accept incompleteness is to live with the researcher's subjectivity' (Pym 1998, 49), and I hope that this book will invite further analyses of French cultural representations of the Second World War, and indeed of other conflicts, that will take account of different linguistic and cultural perspectives. There are however good methodological reasons for combining attention to heterogeneity with the study of a specific case of contact between two nations. First, this approach keeps both movement *across* borders and cultural contact *beyond* borders in view, showing that the binary relationship that underlies interlingual translation from one language to another is never only dual. In Chaps. 2 and 3, we shall see that the trajectory of Kessel's *L'Armée des ombres* between France and England and between French and English also encompasses Algiers and New York. In Chaps. 4 and 5, we shall see that, given the long-standing cultural connections between France and England, translation between these languages mediates not absolute difference, but pre-existing contact and influence. In Chap. 6, we shall see that the source text that is translated often bears the traces of multiple languages and cultures which expand its frame of reference far beyond the binary of the dominant language of narration and the translating language. Secondly, contesting exclusively nation-centred approaches to the cultural history of war does not imply that the national no longer has any relevance. As Patrick Finney argues, 'the nation remains an important realm of mnemonic production and consumption, even if it now needs to be understood as always existing in relation to other levels and scales – the local, the transnational and the global' (Finney 2018, 5). As regards the specific case of France, Atack is right to insist on the importance of 'the Franco-French framework' in understanding the development and evolution of French war memories (Atack 2018, 11). But this does not mean that these memories are unconnected to Franco-British wartime interactions (Atack 2015, 738), nor indeed that they did not travel. There are therefore sound historical reasons for paying specific attention to the connections between cultural memory and Franco-British relationships during the Second World War. As Robert and Isabelle Tombs remark in *That Sweet Enemy: Britain and France: The History of a Love-Hate Relationship*, '[o]n 18 June 1940 the two nations' destinies intersected [...] The next five years would draw them closer than

ever before, but also create differences of emotion and memory that would mark them for the rest of the century and beyond' (Tombs and Tombs 2007, 540). There is a sense in which neither nation's war experience is fully comprehensible without reference to the other: De Gaulle's Free French depended on London's hospitality; the Special Operations Executive's activities in France were an important part of the British war effort; the BBC played a crucial role in disseminating propaganda to France; and while the French interior Resistance always knew that the Liberation would come from Britain and the USA, as it approached, the Allies recognised the military importance of the 'army of shadows' on the ground in mainland France. Understanding the detail of that closeness and those differences enhances our knowledge of both the French and the British war experiences, and this is something to which a translational approach to literary history can make a significant contribution.

The novels analysed in this study were published between 1943 and 1965. I begin with a text published during the war, because the construction of memory begins not when the events in question are over, but whilst they are happening. As Rousso remarks:

Contrary to established assumptions, the beginnings of memory are not to be found at the war's end. Memory is no longer understood as isolated – as an element detached from the actual history of the events. On the contrary, it has come to be understood as central to the events themselves and in this way makes sense of the direct connection between the actual experience and its memory. (Rousso 2010, 6)

The myths which crystallise out of cultural memory do not arise spontaneously, but are cumulative, developing out of existing representations. As Connolly describes, the heroic British myths of Dunkirk and the Battle of Britain exist not because these events were unprecedented, but because they seemed to illustrate aspects of the national psyche—standing alone, fighting against the odds—already well established in memorial discourses of previous historical events (Connolly 2014, 55–63). I end in the 1960s because the closing years of this decade saw what Attack calls a paradigm shift as regards the presence of the Occupation years in French culture, with the upheavals of May 1968 and the passing of the

wartime generation, symbolised by de Gaulle's death in 1971, ushering in a different era of complex and contested memories (Atack 2018, 17). The late 1950s and early 1960s saw a significant change in terms of the visibility and popularity of representations of the Holocaust such that this moment is generally seen as a turning point in the history of Holocaust memory, even though Holocaust representations were by no means absent in the immediate post-war period. Focusing the discussion of the period 1945–51 on 'war fiction' (Chap. 5) and that of the late 1950s and early 1960s on 'Holocaust fiction' (Chap. 6) therefore obeys, to a certain extent, the chronological development of post-war memory, but it also poses the potentially problematic question of treating 'war fiction' and 'Holocaust fiction' together. Some critics, such as Alvin Rosenfeld, have rejected this outright, on the bases that, in terms of representation, Holocaust writing is qualitatively different from war writing, the latter being understood simply as a thematic designation, and that, historically speaking, the Holocaust cannot and should not be considered as simply an aspect of the Second World War (Rosenfeld 1980, 12–20). Rosen points out in this context that Nazi anti-Semitism preceded the war, that the Holocaust unfolded in parallel to the war, and that it targeted civilians rather than the military (Rosen 2013, 2). Others, including Suleiman, argue that since the Holocaust is central to the European memory of the Second World War, the war cannot be understood without reference to the Holocaust (Suleiman 2006, 2–3). In the French context, it would make little sense to enforce a strict separation between 'war' writing and 'Holocaust' writing. The award of the Goncourt prize to a succession of war and Holocaust novels drew the Holocaust into the history of French war memory, and the memory of the Jewish deportations is inseparable from the traumatic memory of the French Occupation. Indeed, integrating the Holocaust into French war memory became 'the pressing issue of the moment' in France in the 1990s (Atack 2018, 22). The complex of events we now call the Holocaust must surely be seen as a, if not the, crucial example of a heterogeneous zone of war in the twentieth century, and, given the centrality of multilingualism to this heterogeneity, it is very important to the concerns of this study.

The first two chapters of *Translating War* trace the publication and translation history of Joseph Kessel's *L'Armée des ombres*. Apparently

commissioned by de Gaulle, and based on personal experience and testimonies of other Resistance fighters Kessel met in London, this book was the first substantial fictionalised account of the interior French Resistance to be published legally during the war. Chapter 2 explores the story of its publication in Algiers by Edmund Charlot in order to illustrate the significance of the international origins of the text and to examine the material and institutional structures which facilitated the publication and circulation of information from and about Occupied France during the war. Charlot's publication of Kessel illustrates the function of wartime Algiers as a transnational cultural space and a zone of hospitality for wartime writers without access to mainland France. Chapter 3 explores the profusion of editions, translations, and extracts from *L'Armée des ombres* published in London and New York between 1943 and 1945. The story of the book's multiple migrations in French and English shows how, thanks to the creation of émigré journals and publishing houses as well as through existing domestic publishing structures, these cities also functioned as zones of hospitality for exiled French writers and readers. The ideological nature of translation choices and domestic reception, even when translational transactions take place between allies, demonstrates the highly ambivalent nature of wartime hospitality. Chapter 4 turns to the post-war years to offer a comparative study of the conceptions of the war novel that were dominant in post-war France and Britain. This chapter sets out the aspects of the post-war British literary field which defined the reception of French war fiction in English translation. It asks why foreign war fiction should be of interest to domestic readers and suggests that translated fiction can function as a type of 'prosthetic memory' (Landsberg 2004). Chapter 5 then probes these questions through detailed analysis of the translation and reception of the five Goncourt-winning war novels published in France between 1944 and 1949 and in English translation between 1945 and 1951. It shows how word-level translation choices, abridgement, the addition of prefaces, and the discourses generated in press reviews relate to the contemporary British conception of the war novel and to British myths about the war. Chapter 6 returns to the question of the heterogeneous nature of the source text, already raised in Chap. 2, to consider it now from a textual rather than contextual point of view. Adopting the perspective of multilingualism,

the discussion first considers the implications of the presence of the translating language—English—in the French source text before looking at the more complex case of Holocaust novels by translingual writers in which multilingualism is used as an aesthetic resource to convey trauma. Whilst I do not wish to suggest that multilingualism can solve the problem of Holocaust representation, the examples of André Schwarz-Bart's *Le Dernier des Justes* and Anna Langfus's trilogy of novels suggest that both multilingualism and translation can play an important role in figuring the traumas of both destruction and survival.

Notes

1. Guez's novel has a substantial bibliography which includes several translations.
2. Jacques Chirac acknowledged the role of the French state in the Holocaust in a speech on 16 July 1995 at a ceremony commemorating the 'raffle du Vel d'hiver', the infamous round-up of French Jews which took place in Paris on 16–17 July 1942.
3. For an overview of the issues around the concept of cultural translation from a translation studies perspective, see Buden et al. (2009).
4. The Arts and Humanities Research Council's research theme 'Translating Cultures', as described on its website, illustrates the recent orientation towards translation within Modern Languages more generally, although the call makes it clear that "'Translation" is conceived in its broadest possible sense and relates not exclusively to processes that are interlingual but also, for example, to those that are intermedial or intercultural'.
5. This is also true of the *Cambridge Companion to the Literature of World War II*, which is international in scope but presents chapters focused on national case studies (MacKay 2009).
6. Two of the essays do deal with translation: Goldberg (2013) and Trubicka (2013).
7. On the 'cultural turn' in war studies, see for example Martin Evans's position piece in the inaugural volume of the *Journal of War & Culture Studies* (Evans 2007).
8. For example, Nettelbeck (1985), a substantial article which despite its title also covers the period before 1968, and monographs including Harris (1983), Atack (1989), Morris (1992), Cloonan (1999), Michel (2000),

Berkvam (2000), Lloyd (2003), Hamel (2006), Kitchen (2013), and Davis (2018).

9. On the 'transcultural turn' in memory studies, see for example Cesari and Rigney (2014) and Bond and Rapson (2014).

References

- Anon. 2011. La littérature n'a plus peur de parler fort. *Le Monde*, August 19.
- Apter, Emily. 2006. *The Translation Zone. A New Comparative Literature*. Princeton/Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Arts and Humanities Research Council. n.d. *Translating Cultures*. <http://www.ahrc.ac.uk/research/fundedthemesandprogrammes/themes/translatingcultures/>. Accessed 29 Jan 2018.
- Attack, Margaret. 1989. *Literature and the French Resistance: Cultural Politics and Narrative Forms 1940–1950*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- . ed. 2011. War and Occupation 1940–44: Other Stories/Stories of Otherness. *French Cultural Studies* 22 (3): 183–185.
- . 2015. Littérature de guerre. In *Encyclopedie de la Seconde Guerre Mondiale*, ed. Jean-François Muracciole and Guillaume Piketty, 733–739. Paris: Robert Laffont.
- . 2018. A Nation United? The Impossible Memory of War and Occupation in France. In *Remembering the Second World War*, ed. Patrick Finney, 11–29. London/New York: Routledge.
- Attack, Margaret, and Christopher Lloyd, eds. 2012a. *Framing Narratives of the Second World War and Occupation in France, 1939–2009*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- . 2012b. Introduction. In *Framing Narratives of the Second World War and Occupation in France, 1939–2009*, ed. Margaret Attack and Christopher Lloyd, 1–15. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- . n.d. FRAME (FRAnce roMan guErre). http://www.leeds.ac.uk/arts/info/125238/frame_france_roman_guerre. Accessed 30 Jan 2018.
- Azouvi, François. 2012. *Le mythe du Grand Silence. Auschwitz, les Français, la mémoire*. Paris: Fayard.
- Bassnett, Susan, and André Lefevere, eds. 1990. *Translation, History and Culture*. London: Pinter.
- Berkvam, Michael L. 2000. *Writing the Story of France in World War II*. New Orleans: University Press of the South.

- Binet, Laurent. 2010. *HHhH*. Paris: Grasset.
- Boase-Beier, Jean, Peter Davies, Andrea Hammel, and Marion Winters. 2017. Introduction. In *Translating Holocaust Lives*, ed. Jean Boase-Beier, Peter Davies, Andrea Hammel, and Marion Winters, 1–21. London: Bloomsbury.
- Bond, Lucy, and Jessica Rapson, eds. 2014. *The Transcultural Turn: Interrogating Memory Between and Beyond Borders*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Bradbury, Malcolm. 1987. *No, Not Bloomsbury*. London: André Deutsch.
- . 2001. *The Modern British Novel 1878–2001*. revised ed. London: Penguin.
- Brodzki, Bella. 2007. *Can These Bones Live? Translation, Survival and Cultural Memory*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Buden, Boris, Stefan Nowotny, Sherry Simon, Ashok Bery, and Michael Cronin. 2009. Translation Studies Forum: Cultural Translation: An Introduction to the Problem, and Responses. *Translation Studies* 2 (2): 196–219.
- Cesari, Chaira de, and Ann Rigney, eds. 2014. *Transnational Memory: Circulation, Articulation, Scales*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Claudel, Philippe. 2007. *Le Rapport de Brodeck*. Paris: Stock.
- Cloonan, William J. 1999. *The Writing of War: French and German Fiction and World War II*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- Connelly, Mark. 2014. *We Can Take It! Britain and the Memory of the Second World War*. 2nd ed. Abingdon/New York: Routledge.
- Corty, Bruno. 2017. Olivier Guez, priz Renaudot sur les traces de l'abominable Josef Mengele, *Le Figaro*, November 7.
- Crownshaw, Richard. 2011. Introduction. *Parallax* 17 (4): 1–3.
- Davies, Peter. 2014. Introduction. *Translation and Literature* 23: 161–169.
- Davis, Colin. 2018. *Traces of War. Interpreting Ethics and Trauma in Twentieth-Century French Writing*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- DeCoste, Damon Marcel. 2005. The Literary Response to the Second World War. In *A Companion to the British and Irish Novel 1945–2000*, ed. Brian W. Shaffer, 3–20. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Delabastita, Dirk. 2012. Response. Translation Studies Forum: Translation and History. *Translation Studies* 5 (2): 246–248.
- Echternkamp, Jörg, and Stefan Martens. 2010. The Meanings of the Second World War in Contemporary European History. In *Experience and Memory. The Second World War in Europe*, ed. Jörg Echternkamp and Stefan Martens, 245–269. New York/Oxford: Berghahn.
- Erll, Astrid. 2011. Travelling Memory. *Parallax* 17 (4): 4–18.
- Evans, Martin. 2007. Opening Up the Battlefield: War Studies and the Cultural Turn. *Journal of War & Culture Studies* 1 (1): 47–51.

- Finney, Patrick. 2018. Introduction. In *Remembering the Second World War*, ed. Patrick Finney, 1–8. London/New York: Routledge.
- Footitt, Hilary. 2012. Incorporating Languages into Histories of War: A Research Journey. *Translation Studies* 5 (2): 217–231.
- . 2016. War and Culture Studies in 2016: Putting ‘Translation’ into the Transnational? *Journal of War & Culture Studies* 9 (3): 209–221.
- . n.d. *Languages at War*. <https://www.reading.ac.uk/languages-at-war/lw-home.aspx>. Accessed 30 Jan 2018.
- Forsdick, Charles. 2014. Mobilizing French Studies. *Australian Journal of French Studies* 51 (2/3): 250–268.
- Gandillot, Thierry. 2017. L’Allemagne au menu du Goncourt et du Renaudot. *Les Echos*, November 7.
- Georgesco, Florent. 2017. Le prix Renaudot pour “La disparition de Josef Menegle”, d’Olivier Guez. *Le Monde*, November 8.
- Germain, Sylvie. 2005. *Magnus*. Paris: Albin Michel.
- Goldberg, Nancy Sloan. 2013. Nationalism, Sin and Redemption in Vicente Blasco Ibáñez’s *The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse* and Its American Film Adaptations. In *Mnemosyne and Mars: Artistic and Cultural Representations of Twentieth-Century Europe at War*, ed. Peter Tame, Dominique Jeannerod, and Manuel Bragança, 202–218. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Grimbert, Philippe. 2004. *Un Secret*. Paris: Grasset.
- Guez, Olivier. 2017. *La Disparition de Joseph Mengele*. Paris: Grasset.
- Haenel, Yannick. 2009. *Jan Karski*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Hamel, Yan. 2006. *La Bataille des mémoires. La seconde guerre mondiale et le roman français*. Montréal: Université de Montréal.
- Harris, Frederick J. 1983. *Encounters with Darkness: French and German Writers on World War II*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Higgins, Lynn A. 1996. *New Novel, New Wave, New Politics: Fiction and the Presentation of History in Postwar France*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Humbert, Fabrice. 2009. *L’Origine de la violence*. Paris: Editions le Passage.
- Hutcheon, Linda. 2002. Rethinking the National Model. In *Rethinking Literary History: A Dialogue on Theory*, ed. Linda Hutcheon and Mario Valdès, 3–49. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jacquet, Michel. 2000. *Une Occupation très romanesque: ironie et dérision dans le roman français de 1945 à nos jours*. Paris: Editions de la Bruyère.
- Kellman, Steven G. 2000. *The Translingual Imagination*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

- Kessel, Joseph. 1943. *L'Armée des ombres*. Algiers: Charlot.
- Kitchen, Ruth. 2013. *A Legacy of Shame: French Narratives of War and Occupation*. Oxford: Peter Lang.
- Laborie, Pierre. 2011. *Le Chagrin et le venin. Occupation. Résistance. Idées reçues*. Paris: Bayard.
- Landsberg, Alison. 2004. *Prosthetic Memory: The Transformation of American Remembrance in the Age of Mass Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Langfus, Anna. 1962. *Les Bagages de sable*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Little, Jonathan. 2006. *Les Bienveillantes*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Lloyd, Christopher. 2003. *Collaboration and Resistance in Occupied France*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- MacKay, Marina. 2007. *Modernism and World War II*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2009. *The Cambridge Companion to the Literature of World War II*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mandelbaum, Jacques. 2017. Un déluge de bombes hors sol, *Le Monde*, July 19.
- McDonald, Christie, and Susan Rubin Suleiman. 2010. Introduction: The National and the Global. In *French Global*, ed. Christie McDonald and Susan Suleiman, ix–xxi. New York: Columbia University Press.
- McLoughlin, Kate. 2011. *Authoring War. The Literary Representation of War from the Iliad to Iraq*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mengham, Rod, and N.H. Reeve, eds. 2001. *The Fiction of the 1940s: Stories of Survival*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Merle, Robert. 1949. *Weekend à Zuydcoote*. Paris: Gallimard.
- . 1952. *La Mort est mon métier*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Morris, Alan. 1992. *Collaboration and Resistance Reviewed: Writing the Mode Retro in Post-Gaullist France*. Oxford: Berg.
- Munton, Alan. 1989. *English Fiction of the Second World War*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Nettelbeck, Colin. 1985. Getting the Story Right. Narratives of World War II in Post-1968 France. *Journal of European Studies* 15 (2): 77–116.
- Noakes, Lucy, and Juliette Pattinson. 2013. Introduction: Keep Calm and Carry On. In *British Cultural Memory and the Second World War*, ed. Lucy Noakes and Juliette Pattinson, 1–24. London: Bloomsbury.
- Piette, Adam. 1995. *Imagination at War: British Fiction and Poetry 1939–1945*. London: Macmillan.
- Plain, Gill. 2015. *Literature of the 1940s. War, Postwar and 'Peace'*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- Pym, Anthony. 1998. *Method in Translation History*. Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.
- Rau, Petra, ed. 2016. *Long Shadows. The Second World War in British Fiction and Film*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Rawlinson, Mark. 2000. *British Writing of the Second World War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Riglet, Marc. 2010. La fiction au grand vent de l'histoire. *Lire*, May 1.
- Rosen, Alan, ed. 2013. *Literature of the Holocaust*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosenfeld, Alvin H. 1980. *A Double Dying: Reflections on Holocaust Literature*. Bloomington/London: Indiana University Press.
- Rouso, Henry. 1987. *Le syndrome de Vichy de 1944 à nos jours*. Paris: Seuil.
- . 2010. A New Perspective on the War. In *Experience and Memory. The Second World War in Europe*, ed. Jörg Echternkamp and Stefan Martens, 1–9. New York/Oxford: Berghahn.
- Sansal, Boualem. 2007. *Le Village de l'Allemand ou le Journal des frères Schiller*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Schwarz-Bart, André. 1959. *Le Dernier des Justes*. Paris: Seuil.
- Smith, Malcolm. 2000. *Britain and 1940: History, Myth and Popular Memory*. London: Routledge.
- Stewart, Victoria. 2006. *Narratives of Memory: British Writing of the 1940s*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Suleiman, Susan Rubin. 2006. *Crises of Memory and the Second World War*. Cambridge/London: Harvard University Press.
- Sulser, Éléonore. 2017a. Le nazisme en gants blancs. *Le Temps*, November 4.
- . 2017b. Le prix Goncourt couronne l'Anschluss en camera cachée. *Le Temps*, November 7.
- Tame, Peter, Dominique Jeannerod, and Manuel Bragança, eds. 2013. Introduction. In *Mnemosyne and Mars: Artistic and Cultural Representations of Twentieth-Century Europe at War*, ed. Peter Tame, Dominique Jeannerod, and Manuel Bragança, 1–7. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Tombs, Robert, and Isabelle Tombs. 2007. *That Sweet Enemy. Britain and France: The History of a Love-Hate Relationship*. London: Pimlico.
- Trubicka, Hanna. 2013. Identity and Modern War in Salt of the Earth by Joseph Wittlin. In *Mnemosyne and Mars: Artistic and Cultural Representations of Twentieth-Century Europe at War*, ed. Peter Tame, Dominique Jeannerod, and Manuel Bragança, 312–326. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

- Valdés, Mario. 2002. Rethinking the History of Literary History. In *Rethinking Literary History: A Dialogue on Theory*, ed. Linda Hutcheon and Mario Valdés, 63–115. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vuillard, Eric. 2017. *L'Ordre du jour*. Paris: Actes sud.
- Wiewiorka, Annette. 1992. *Déportation et génocide. Entre la mémoire et l'oubli*. Paris: Plon.
- . 1998. *L'Ère du témoin*. Paris: Plon.
- Wiewiorka, Olivier. 2010. *La Mémoire désunie. Le souvenir politique des années sombres, de la Libération à nos jours*. Paris: Seuil.
- Winter, Jay. 2013. Foreword: Language and Memory. In *Mnemosyne and Mars: Artistic and Cultural Representations of Twentieth-Century Europe at War*, ed. Peter Tame, Dominique Jeannerod, and Manuel Bragança, xiii–xix. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Wolf, Michaela. 2007. The Location of the “Translation Field”. Negotiating Borderlines Between Pierre Bourdieu and Homi Bhabha. In *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*, ed. Michaela Wolf and Alexandra Fukari, 109–119. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- . 2017. Response to: Sue Vice, Witnessing Complicity in English and French: Tatiana de Rosnay's *Sarah's Key* and *Elle s'appelait Sarah*. In *Translating Holocaust Lives*, ed. Jean Boase-Beier, Peter Davies, Andrea Hammel, and Marion Winters, 69–71. London: Bloomsbury.



2

Zones of Hospitality

This is how a mother explains the geography of the war and the Occupation to her nine-year-old son in Pascal Jardin's 1971 memoir *La Guerre à neuf ans* (Jardin 2005):

Mon chéri, Vichy est pour le moment la capitale politique de la France. Les Français qui refusent la collaboration avec l'Allemagne ont d'autres capitales, mais pas en France. L'une est en Afrique, à Alger, l'autre en Angleterre, à Londres. A Paris, le pouvoir administratif appartient aux Allemands. (Jardin 2005, 73)

[Darling, for the time being Vichy is the political capital of France. Frenchmen who have refused to collaborate have other capitals, but not in France. One is in Africa, in Algiers, the other in England, in London. In Paris, administrative power is in the hands of the Germans. (Jardin 1975, 53–54)]

Commenting on this passage, Michel Jacquet asks: 'Quel enfant aurait pu maîtriser un tel délire? Vers qui se tourner pour obtenir des explications plus satisfaisantes? Quelle foi pouvait-on avoir en un pays si prompt à se morceler?' [What child could cope with this sort of madness? Who

could he turn to for a more satisfactory explanation? What faith could be placed in a country so quick to fall to pieces?] (Jacquet 2000, 122). Jacquet reads Jardin's description of the geopolitical situation of occupied France as a delirium of territorial fragmentation. How indeed could faith in France be maintained in the midst of such apparent madness? This chapter considers the ways in which one French writer negotiated the geographical conundrums Jardin describes.

Joseph Kessel's *L'Armée des ombres*, first published in 1943, is a semi-fictionalised account of the activities of the French interior Resistance. Kessel's biographer Yves Courrière claims that it was the first such account to appear (Courrière 1985, 587). Christopher Lloyd identifies it, along with Vercors' *Le Silence de la mer*, as one of the 'first classic examples' of the Resistance novel (Lloyd 2003, 157).¹ From the point of view of both history and literary history, then, the importance of this text lies in its novelty as probably the first book length, legally published account of the Resistance on the ground in occupied France. Part of its interest lies in the way it constructs myths about the Resistance which formed the basis of post-war memories of the war. From the perspective of translation studies, Kessel's book presents a further source of interest insofar as it is a fine example of how translation participates in a range of literary and cultural practices addressed to 'non-professional' readers, practices André Lefevere grouped under the term 'rewriting' (Lefevere 2017). In the years 1943–45, *L'Armée des ombres* was disseminated very widely across a range of different material publications in three continents. First published in Algiers by Edmond Charlot, Kessel's text was not printed in Paris until 1945. Parts of it were translated into English by three different translators, and it was much anthologised, with extracts printed in various Algiers-based French reviews, French émigré publications in London and New York, and English publications in London. These processes of translation and rewriting directed Kessel's text towards a wide range of different readerships.

This chapter considers the implications of the international origins and circulation of this most French of French war books. It takes *L'Armée des ombres* as an example of the way in which Algiers functioned as a war-time translational zone of hospitality that permitted writers such as Kessel to publish works that could not be published legally in occupied France.

After defining the concept of the translational zone of hospitality, the chapter goes on to discuss Edmond Charlot's central role in French-language publishing in interwar and wartime Algiers. It then analyses the representation of place in Kessel's text. The chapter demonstrates how a book about France that was written in London was made possible by the material and cultural resources of Algiers. Algiers is not part of the story Kessel tells in *L'Armée des ombres*, but the colonial capital is nonetheless present in the text insofar as the material existence of *L'Armée des ombres* as a Resistance text in 1943 depended on it.

Border Crossings

The study of publishing is now recognised as an important component of translation studies. Gisèle Sapiro has made a strong case for the importance of studying the publication of translations from a sociological perspective inspired by Bourdieu's sociology of culture, and others have taken up this line of inquiry (Sapiro 2008). Maeve Olohan has noted the considerable untapped potential the study of editors and book history offers to enrich translation studies as a discipline (Olohan 2014, 18), and Karin Littau has made a case for the relevance of book history to a 'material history of translation' (Littau 2016, 88–90). Precisely because we cannot get inside the mind of the translator or publisher, it is important, as part of translation history, to pay attention to such biographical and contextual information as does exist in order to paint as complete a picture as possible of the production and circulation of translations. In Sherry Simon's words

Because the actual production of translated texts usually takes place in the removes of private space, we do not often visualise the work of translation or the travels that sustain it. That is why it is necessary to draw portraits of significant individuals who have played this role, to see them gathering information and making connections, moving across language zones, putting languages and texts into circulation, initiating encounters. (Simon 2012, 6)

The material contexts which facilitated the production and circulation of French texts outside of France during the latter part of the

Second World War and the forms and messages contained within those narrations are intimately related. As Littau points out, '[m]edia are not merely instruments with which writers or translators produce meanings; rather, they *set the framework within which something like meaning becomes possible at all*' (Littau 2016, 83, emphasis in original). Whilst it is generally recognised that '[p]ropaganda takes its effect not just through what it says, but also through how it is disseminated and where it is received' (Holman and Kelly 2000, 6), this is less easily acknowledged in relation to literature, the immaterial value of which, from an aesthetic perspective, is highly prized. But an awareness of the material contexts which enabled the first complete publication of *L'Armée des ombres* in French is crucial to understanding its symbolic importance.

Reading translationally begins with the source text. The complexities of a translation cannot be adequately understood without first grasping the complexities of the text which inspired it. *L'Armée des ombres* provides a particularly good example because of the large number of people and wide variety of publishing structures that were involved in its dissemination. Such complexity probably cannot be described exhaustively, not least because the precise motivations of the agents involved are not fully available to empirical analysis (Simeoni 1998, 30; Pym 1998, 118). Nonetheless, various translation scholars have sought to describe and theorise this type of complexity. For example, Douglas Robinson sees translation as "'governed" not by a single unitary mind, as in older rationalist models, but rather by a loose and rather chaotic collection of competing forces that somehow, despite their lack of rationalist organization, nevertheless manage to bring about coherent action', namely a translation (Robinson 2001, 194). In a similar vein, Anthony Pym has emphasised the value of mapping what he calls 'networks', encouraging scholars to describe the available evidence which shows how cultural products have been displaced and transferred across boundaries (Pym 1998, 91–92). Publishers, publishing houses, editors, and journals are important elements of the networks that allow texts to move. Taking account of the interventions and interactions of multiple human agents acting in relation to a wide range of social forces avoids the 'translational fallacy' that views the translator as the sole source of meaning of the translated text.

Studying publishing networks should not however result in replacing an overly simplistic notion of individual translatorial agency with a deterministic type of cultural sociology. Robinson's approach reminds us that although as literary historians we know the outcome of those movements and therefore when we describe them, we tend to make their traces look linear, at the time they were untidy and unpredictable.²

In paying such close attention to the publication history of *L'Armée des ombres*, I am following a research agenda prompted by Bourdieu's cultural sociology (e.g. Bourdieu 1983, 1999, 2008) and elaborated by Sapiro specifically in relation to translation. In the present and the following chapter, I will be working at what Sapiro calls the 'micro' level of such analysis, which focuses on a detailed investigation of the selection, translation, and publication of the work of a single author understood in the context of the constraints experienced by the agents involved in the process (including authors, translators, publishers, editors of reviews and journals, and reviewers) due to the relevant stakes in the contemporary cultural and political fields (Sapiro 2008, 163–64). This approach does not imply that Kessel's wartime peregrinations or his editors' publishing choices were certain to produce a particular result. A Bourdieusian reading of the sociological contexts of literary production accepts that human choices are simultaneously conscious and unconscious, free and constrained, socially and professionally determined, determining of future action and identity, but nonetheless the product of individual agency. One translation scholar has suggested that Bourdieu's concept of habitus is best understood as 'an inspiring general idea more than a concrete workable hypothesis' (Sela-Sheffy 2005, 3). If habitus inspires us to pay attention to the relationship between the specific contexts and agents involved in a given publication and the messages and legacy of such a text, then it has served a useful critical purpose. *L'Armée des ombres* was an innovation as probably the first novel to be published about the French interior Resistance, and it is therefore important from a historical point of view to try to understand how it came about. Even if, as Pym claims, the multiplicity of factors involved in the creation of a translation militate against unitary descriptions of cause and effect (Pym 1998, 144, 146), it is important to describe those factors, since this is a crucial aspect of textual interpretation.

L'Armée des ombres has not been the object of extensive academic interest, largely because, in common with Kessel's fictional output as a whole, it is perceived as 'popular' rather than 'literary' writing. By contrast, Vercors's association with the culturally prestigious Editions de Minuit publishing house (*Le Silence de la mer* was Minuit's first clandestine novel) has accrued a certain intellectual status to his novella, even if critics were, and remain, divided as to its literary qualities. Kessel's work has affinities with genres such as the adventure story and *reportage*, which has no doubt limited its attractiveness to literary scholars. Widely read at the time of its publication, adapted for cinema by Jean-Pierre Melville in 1969,³ and a significant point of reference for any discussion of narrative recreations of the French Resistance, *L'Armée des ombres* received less attention in the post-war period than *Le Silence de la mer*. The 1944 English translation by Haakon Chevalier was reprinted by Harborough Publishing after the war, but appears to have gone out of print in the early 1960s.⁴ However, *L'Armée des ombres* has recently benefitted from a new translation by Rainer J. Hanshe, published in 2017 by Contra Mundum Press in New York, a small publishers which specialises in works in translation by oppositional writers. Stuart Kendall provides a substantial introduction for this translation which makes a strong claim for the ongoing interest and importance of Kessel's book.

Subtitled in some editions as a 'Chronique de la résistance' [chronicle of the Resistance], *L'Armée des ombres* is characteristic of Kessel's journalistic approach to fiction, which was rooted in his commitment to action. Kessel was awarded the 'Croix de guerre' medal for service in both the First and the Second World Wars. Elected to the Académie française in 1962, his published work spans five decades from the 1920s to the 1960s and comprises a vast output of novels, journalism, and *grand reportage*. *L'Armée des ombres* dates from the period when, as a result of the Allied landings in North Africa in November 1942 (Operation Torch), the Nazi Occupation of France had been extended to the whole of the Hexagon, and Kessel, who was Jewish, of Russian heritage, and actively involved in the Resistance, had fled France for his own safety. Most, though significantly not all, of the book's action takes place in France, the exception being the lyrical fourth part, entitled 'Ces gens-là sont merveilleux' [These People are Wonderful], which describes a Free French dinner party in

London. Although the book was first published in Algiers, none of the action takes place there. According to Lloyd, this ‘work of Gaullist propaganda’ promotes the Resistance in a ‘straightforward fashion’ (Lloyd 2003, 161, 166). The book’s political thrust is certainly very clear: true France is embodied in the Resistance, the exploits of the interior Resistance are heroic and are supported by the vast majority of the French population, and, together, Charles de Gaulle’s Free French in London and the interior Resistance in France are an effective force against Nazi Germany. *L’Armée des ombres* seeks to mitigate the absurd territorial divisions Pascal Jardin describes by strongly affirming an argument about unity at a time when ‘there was no single entity which could be called “France”’ (Bell 1997, 27). In Kessel’s text, the whole French population appears united behind the struggle of the interior Resistance and, despite some niggles about arms and supplies, the Resistance is working in unity with de Gaulle’s Free French in London. The theme of unity is of course propagandistic: this is not an a posteriori reflection on the events of the Occupation but a militant contribution to the ongoing war effort on the cultural front. This is a book that sought to change people’s minds.

A moot point, however, is the addressee of the text. Exactly *whose* minds did Kessel want to change? Margaret Attack pointed out in 1989 that *L’Armée des ombres* was ‘published abroad’ and that ‘there are many signs in the text that its implied reader is the foreign audience it is seeking to inform’ (Attack 1989, 7). Anne Simonin highlighted the importance of the British and American contexts to the text’s political messages in an essay from 2011 which discusses the relationship of Kessel’s stories of the Resistance to historical fact (Simonin 2011). Apart from Simonin’s study, the ‘foreign’ aspects of the text have received no sustained critical attention since Attack made this observation more than 25 years ago. The present chapter and the next therefore seek to locate *L’Armée des ombres* as fully as possible by offering a detailed account of the text’s publication and translation history. This chapter examines the significance of the publication of *L’Armée des ombres* in the French colonial capital of Algiers. It explores the relationship between the material and symbolic importance of Algiers and Kessel’s desire to bring the message of the Resistance to a Francophone audience beyond France itself. Understanding the geographical locations and modes of publication that lie behind the publication of Kessel’s text

in 1943 not only sheds light on the meaning and significance of the work itself, but also provides an opportunity better to understand the publishing structures that facilitated the international dissemination of information about France's wartime experiences during the Occupation.

In the summer of 1939, Kessel was working as a journalist for Pierre Lazareff's *Paris-Soir*. When war was declared, he was mobilised, aged 41, but was quickly recalled to Paris by Lazareff to serve as a war correspondent, and therefore became a salaried member of the French Ministry of Information (MoI).⁵ At the beginning of June, Kessel obtained permission to travel to cover the Dunkirk evacuations. Having escaped capture by boarding a vessel bound for Folkestone, he returned to Paris where he published an article entitled 'Dunkerque', the last substantial piece of war reporting *Paris-Soir* was able to publish in the French capital (Kessel 2010, 133–43). On 10 June, the French government fled Paris for Bordeaux, and on 17 June Marshall Pétain declared to the French people that he had asked the enemy for an armistice. Believing that it was Pétain's intention to continue the war from Algiers, Kessel followed Lazareff to Lisbon, hoping ultimately to be able to reach North Africa. This proved impossible, and in any case the Pétain regime established itself at Vichy. Kessel returned to France on 6 September. The events of June 1940 had posed a serious dilemma for him. Unaware, like most of the French population, of de Gaulle's 18 June radio broadcast from London, Kessel, a veteran of the First World War, was initially supportive of Pétain, the 'hero of Verdun'. Not an instinctive Anglophile, Kessel was horrified by the sinking of the French fleet at Mers-El-Kébir at the beginning of July, and was therefore reluctant to align himself with Britain. He visited Vichy in the autumn of 1940 and received reassurances about his own position. But it soon became clear that, as a high-profile Jewish writer, he was in considerable danger. He found himself on the first Otto list of banned books, published in September 1940, and unable to cross back over the demarcation line to reach Paris. When the second Otto list prohibited all Jewish writers, Kessel's works were taken out of circulation from French libraries (Poulain 2013, 265). The year 1941 marked the end of Kessel's illusions about the Vichy regime. He joined the Resistance and, over the course of about a year, undertook missions for André Girard's Carte network, which was in direct contact with the British and was operating

around the Côte d'Azur.⁶ Having discovered that the local Gestapo and the French *milice* had identified him, Kessel escaped France in December 1942, reaching London via Barcelona and Lisbon in early January 1943. After three days of interrogation at the British Intelligence Service London Reception Centre for aliens, located at the Royal Victoria Patriotic School,⁷ Kessel went to the London headquarters of the Free French at Carlton Gardens, where he officially joined de Gaulle's Forces françaises libres. Courrière concludes that, as he left Carlton Gardens that day, Kessel was completely persuaded by Gaullism and would remain committed to it for the rest of his life (Courrière 1985, 573).

Deemed too old to participate in military operations, Kessel fought for France with his pen. He began work on the London-based Gaullist review *La Marseillaise* in February. In March he started to work with Charles Gombault, an old colleague from *Paris-Soir* who had become the editor-in-chief of *France*, the largest-circulation French-language newspaper in wartime England (Simonin 2011, 238–42; Courrière 1985, 574–75). During a meeting with de Gaulle, the leader of the Free French suggested to Kessel that the best way to serve his country would be to write a book about the Resistance. The book he wrote was *L'Armée des ombres* (Kessel 2006, 294; Courrière 1985, 573, 578; Simonin 2011, 238–44; Kendall 2017, xxxi). Carlton Gardens sent Kessel to Algiers in the spring of 1943, shortly after the formation of the Comité français de libération nationale (CFLN), the French Committee of National Liberation set up by de Gaulle and General Giraud, and it was during this trip that Kessel signed a contract with Edmond Charlot to publish *L'Armée des ombres*. He then returned to London, where he completed the manuscript. Between the spring and autumn of 1943, several extracts from the novel were published in London in both French and English in a variety of British and émigré publications. Extracts also appeared in the New York French émigré publication *France-Amérique* in October and December 1943. The full French text was published by Editions Charlot in Algiers in the autumn of 1943, the first edition comprising a print run of 600 copies (Puche 1995, 27, 75). Around the same time, Charlot printed an extract entitled 'Le Champ de tir' in *Fontaine* (Kessel 1943b), preceded by the text of 'Le Chant des partisans' (Kessel 1943c), a poem written by Kessel and his nephew and fellow author Maurice Druon, which, set to music,

would become the battle hymn of the French Resistance. Further extracts appeared in *Combat*, in October 1943, and *La Marseillaise*, in December 1943 and January 1944, which by this time were also being published in Algiers.⁸ In February 1944, Charlot reprinted a slightly expanded version of Kessel's preface to the text in the first edition of his review *L'Arche* (Kessel 1944).⁹

While the representation of France is crucial to the political and militant aspects of *L'Armée des ombres*, the 'foreign' locations where the book was written (London) and published (Algiers) are vital to its meaning and function. The war context determined the material conditions of the book's creation and dissemination, with the result that a literary text seeking to portray the Resistance in terms of French patriotism could only come into being thanks to the hospitality of France's allies and one of her overseas *départements*. In order to publish a book in French about the Resistance in 1943, Kessel was obliged to draw on the cultural resources of London and Algiers. The Nazi Occupation of France had produced comparable situations in the military and cultural domains. Fighting or writing for France meant either choosing clandestine activity, with the attendant risks of being caught or being ineffectual, or choosing to fight or write from outside of France, risking accusations of territorial desertion and compromise with Allies, who to some looked like the next potential occupiers.¹⁰ Kessel chose the latter option. *L'Armée des ombres* negotiates very carefully the representation of the French interior Resistance fighting for France on French territory and that of the external Resistance based in London. Kessel respects the notion of the ideological 'purity' of the internal Resistance whilst at the same time validating a positive relationship between the interior Resistance and de Gaulle's Free French in London. *L'Armée des ombres* might then be seen as a representation in microcosm of the dilemmas and constraints surrounding interior and exterior Resistance in the period November 1942 to the Liberation in August 1944. Ambiguities about the impact of this relationship on discourses of French national liberation were at the root of post-war attempts to reconstruct French national identity and of the much-discussed Gaullist *résistancialiste* myth which came to dominate French cultural production in the 1960s.¹¹

Zones of Hospitality

The very existence of *L'Armée des ombres* was a result of Kessel's ability to cross national borders. The book resulted from the triangulated wartime relationships between France, Britain, and Algeria, and its creation and publication were reliant on Kessel's ability to travel between these locations. *L'Armée des ombres*, therefore, illustrates the way in which wartime Algiers came to function as a transnational cultural space, specifically in the period between the successful Allied North African landings and the Liberation of France. Transnational cultural spaces of the Second World War were places of heightened translational activity, and we shall see in Chap. 3 that enhanced opportunities for the creation and publication of translations in London and New York facilitated and stimulated the publication in English of material originally written in the languages of occupied countries such as France. However, before considering these instances of interlingual translation, it is important to establish that the appearance of material *in French* was also dependent on the existence of transcultural spaces or 'zones'.

The concept of the 'zone' has been used in various ways in recent scholarship to describe the relationship between language and location and to highlight the fact that relationships between different languages are geographically situated. Two of the most influential zones are Mary Louise Pratt's 'contact zone' and Emily Apter's 'translation zone'. Pratt's concept of the 'contact zone' was developed in the context of a study of travel writing and colonial histories. Contact zones are 'social spaces where disparate cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in highly asymmetrical relations of domination and subordination' (Pratt 1992, 4). Such contact often implies linguistic struggles, as a result of which locations become divided along what Sherry Simon has called a 'linguistic faultline' (Simon 2012, xvii). Simon's study of bi- and multilingual cities has shown how the histories of particular locations are inscribed in their languages and in linguistic interactions and conflicts. Emily Apter draws the concept of translation very explicitly into her analyses of language and location. Apter's 'translation zones' are 'sites that are "in-translation", that is to say, belonging to no single, discrete language or single medium

of communication' (Apter 2006, 5–6). She defines the 'zone' as a space of critical engagement rather simply of cultural mixing:

In fastening on the term 'zone' as a theoretical mainstay, the intention has been to imagine a broad intellectual topography that is neither the property of a single nation, nor an amorphous condition associated with post-nationalism, but rather a zone of critical engagement that connects the 'I' and the 'n' of transLation and transNation. (Apter 2006, 5)

Apter cites 'theaters of war' as an example of the translation zone (Apter 2006, 6). Hilary Footitt also adopts the idea of the zone to describe the transnational spaces of war. Footitt points out that war inevitably produces 'translational contact zones which are, by definition, multivocal spaces in which identities are translated and communication attempted', arguing that it is crucial to incorporate explicitly 'the key notion of translation' into analyses of these zones (Footitt 2016, 215). Footitt's approach goes beyond the comparative study of separate national responses to war that remain rooted in the notion of the nation state, favouring instead a focus on the connections and networks that war creates across national boundaries (Footitt 2016, 212–13). Wartime Algiers—like London and New York—is an example of just such a translational contact zone that had a particular significance in relation to literary publishing. The existence of these translational contact zones was predicated on the movement of people. As a result of various types of mobility and migration occasioned by conflict, during the Second World War existing translation zones welcomed and hosted new writers, translators, and publishers. Whether as a result of forced or chosen exile, or in order to carry out military, political, or cultural war work, many intellectuals' experience of war included reliance on the hospitality of a foreign nation.

Bringing together these ideas of the zone as a transnational, translational, and migratory space, I define Algiers, London, and New York in the period 1942–44 as zones of hospitality. Judith Still defines hospitality as 'a *structure* that regulates relations between inside and outside'. In practice, '[s]omeone or ones, categorised as "outside", as not necessarily *by right* or legal contract, part of the "inside", is temporarily brought within' (Still 2010, 11). Hospitality concerns space and belonging, and it

is something that happens for a limited time only. This definition applies to the situation of those who fled occupied France and sought refuge in her colonies and overseas territories and *départements* or among her allies since, unlike many of their German counterparts, the French émigrés had no intention of staying (Fritsch-Estrangin 1969, 23).¹² Still emphasises both the short-term and situated aspects of hospitality: it is a ‘*temporary* sharing of space’ (Still 2010, 14, emphasis in original). Since hospitality is first and foremost a relationship between people, the concept of ‘territory’ has a figurative sense here: ‘[h]ospitality involves bringing the other into the territory of the self for a period of time’ (Still 2010, 125). Encountering the other is never straightforward and it cannot be achieved without a degree of resistance. Hospitality is challenging both ontologically (how individuals relate to guests) and politically (how nation states relate to exiles and immigrants), and both colonial and émigré contexts demonstrate ‘the ambiguity as well as the value of hospitality’ (Still 2010, 59).

Because of its colonial history, Algiers was already a contact zone according to Pratt’s definition. In an ironic territorial reversal, between the North African landings in 1942 and the Liberation of France in 1944, Algiers—materially separate from the Hexagon but defined administratively as French territory—became the capital of Free France. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, Algiers had become a divided city. The Casbah and the European town were two separate worlds linked only by a small number of cosmopolitan spaces, such as the place du Gouvernement, through which everyone passed (Jordi and Planche 1999b, 44–46). Composite rather than fully cosmopolitan (Jordi and Planche 1999a, 13; 1999b, 54), spatially segregated (Dunwoodie 1998, 215), Algiers became a ‘dual’ city in which language contact and conflict resulted from colonial history (Simon 2012, 3). Like any coloniser group, the French *pieds-noirs* might be viewed as unwelcome guests, since ‘the French made themselves at home at the expense of native Algerians regardless of the lack of any invitation’ (Still 2010, 38). The French made themselves at home in Algeria both materially and politically: the Europeanisation of Algiers through building projects was the material corollary of the administrative definition of Algeria as part of France, a *département*, not a *territoire d’outre-mer*, treated in exactly the same way

as the land constituting the Hexagon. Algiers was designed to be the archetypal French city outside of—but still an integral part of—France (Jordi and Planche 1999a, 17).

It was in this context that Algiers played a crucial role in hosting the French exterior Resistance during the Second World War. The political identity of wartime Algiers was fluid:

Capitale virtuelle d'une France résistante en juin 1940, puis place forte du vichysme en Afrique, théâtre d'évènements décisifs pour la suite de la guerre le 8 novembre 1942, et enfin vraie capitale de la France combattante rassemblée par le CFLN [Comité français de libération nationale] et le GPRF [Gouvernement provisoire de la République française] de juin 1943 à août 1944. (Jordi and Pervillé 1999, 11)

[Virtual capital of resisting France in June 1940, as well as the strong centre of Vichyism in Africa, theatre of events that would be decisive in the progress of the war after 8 November 1942, and finally the real capital of fighting France marshalled by the French Committee of National Liberation and the Provisional Government of the French Republic between June 1943 and August 1944.]

Algeria's ambivalent position as integral to France but separated from the mainland by the Mediterranean determined the country's experience of the war. Since Algiers was a French city outside of the Nazi-occupied zone, it was administered by the Vichy regime, which was fully operational there from the Autumn of 1940 (Cantier 1999, 30). Algeria's geographical position made Operation Torch both possible and successful. In the wake of the immediate military victory which followed the Allied North African landings on 8 November 1942, Algiers was transformed from a bastion of collaboration to the epicentre of Free France. De Gaulle arrived in Algiers on 30 May 1943, and the Comité français de libération nationale (CFLN), the French Committee of National Liberation, was established under de Gaulle and General Giraud. On 3 June 1944 the CFLN became the Gouvernement provisoire de la République française (GPRF), the Provisional Government of the French Republic, and was recalled to Paris at the end of August 1944 (Cantier 1999, 52, 60). Thus, between May 1943 and August 1944, Algiers was the 'home away from

home' of Free France. Unwelcome, during this period, in the homeland, the 'uninvited guests' redefined the colonial space of Algeria as not just part of France, but as France itself, and Algiers became a highly ambivalent zone of hospitality. The guests, who had already arrogated to themselves the mastery of hosting, took hospitality beyond its limits by erasing the territorial distinction between home and away (Still 2010, 239). It is worth recalling the etymological connotations of hospitality, which Derrida underlines: *hostis* suggests both host and enemy (Derrida and Dufourmantelle 2000, 4, 43–44). The substitution of Algiers for Paris in the period 1943–44 might be seen as an example of total hospitality, the Derridean Law of hospitality, or absolute welcoming, a relation which is strictly impossible because it collapses the same/other distinction, thereby turning hospitality into its opposite (Still 2010, 8–9, 14–15, 94; Derrida and Dufourmantelle 2000, 25, 75–79, 81, 147–48). For Algiers to become Paris both symbolically and effectively is an act of appropriation which contravenes the laws of hospitality according to which I invite you into my space without fearing that my space will become your space. Yet it still makes sense to speak of hospitality, since the situation was only temporary. De Gaulle made Algiers his home only until Paris could welcome him again and reassume its identity as the capital of a free, unoccupied nation. The political tensions created by such uses and abuses of hospitality would play themselves out in the painful process of decolonisation after the war.

Colonial and Vichy France can also be read as shameful examples of French inhospitality. As Still writes, '[t]he would-be hospitable French nation [...] have their share of guilty secrets, Algeria and Jews being names for some of them' (Still 2010, 177). In 1940, the nation of the Déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen, which in 1791 had welcomed Jews into the new French Republic as full citizens, made hospitality to Jews a crime, and Kessel, a foreign-born Jew, became an unwelcome guest in his adopted homeland (Still 2010, 236; Winock 2004, 11–27, 217–43). After the reinstatement in 1943 of the Crémieux decree which granted citizenship to Jews in French Algeria, North Africa offered a refuge to Kessel. Publishing in Algiers allowed Kessel, a Jew in exile from mainland France, to fulfil his desire that the first French book about the Resistance be published by a French publisher on French soil.

Nonetheless, the Crémieux decree starkly illustrates the limits of colonial hospitality. It was this same piece of legislation, promulgated in 1870, that barred Algerian Muslims from French citizenship.¹³

Edmond Charlot: From the *école d'Alger* to Literary Resistance

If translators have traditionally been written out of literary history, publishers have arguably suffered an even worse fate. And yet publishers have played a crucial role in both literary and translation history. In the period of independent or 'artisanal' publishing in the first half of the twentieth century (Schiffrin 1999, 7), before large commercial conglomerates dominated the industry, the personal engagement of the publisher in the selection of texts for his or her list was crucial to the dissemination of ideas. Edmond Charlot is an excellent example of the artisanal publisher whose role far exceeded the material production of the book as a commercial object. Pre-war Algiers was well equipped with established structures for publishing French-language literature, and Charlot was at the centre of these. His publishing career had begun in 1936 when, aged only 21, he founded a bookshop, 'Les Vraies Richesses'.¹⁴ Agnès Spiquel underlines the importance of the physical location of Les Vraies Richesses on the rue Charras, near the university and close to the office of the Maison de la Culture, one of a network of cultural centres created under the aegis of the French Communist Party (Spiquel 2016, 51–53). The bookshop's location in close proximity to other cultural institutions facilitated intellectual, artistic, and political exchanges. In the second half of the 1930s, a group of writers and intellectuals including Gabriel Audisio, Jean Grenier, Albert Camus, and Emmanuel Roblès formed around Charlot, and became known as the *école d'Alger*.

It was largely thanks to Charlot that a progressive, internationalist, and humanist strand had developed in the French-language literature of Algeria in the 1930s. Charlot's publishing venture had facilitated the development of a transcultural translation zone in pre-war Algiers. The younger generation of writers associated with the *école d'Alger*, including Camus and Roblès, drew on the ideas and works of Audisio and Grenier

to develop an inclusive, humanist concept of the Mediterranean (Omri 2005, 283–86). They viewed the Mediterranean ‘as a space of movement for people and ideas’ (Omri 2005, 294), though this was conceived in different ways by different thinkers. The idea of the ‘Mediterranean man’ developed by Audisio and, later, Camus, in opposition to the ideology of Algerianism, was a figure that ‘[cut] across (imperialist) national and cultural boundaries’ (Dunwoodie 1998, 176). On this view, the Mediterranean encompassed North Africa, southern France, Italy, and Spain and challenged the construction of Europe as centre and Algeria as periphery (Dunwoodie 1998, 177, 185, 180). For Camus, the Mediterranean signified diversity (Dunwoodie 1998, 184). During his time in Algiers, he sought to construct ‘a shared space of coexistence and communication, instead of a contested space’ (Dunwoodie 1998, 186), which we might call a translational zone of hospitality. The activities of what was also called the ‘bande à Charlot’ [Charlot’s band] (Dugas 2008, 11) lent Algiers the characteristics of a ‘translational’, rather than simply ‘bilingual’, city: a space ‘defined by an acute consciousness of cultural negotiations’ (Cronin and Simon 2014, 119–20).

Audisio’s 1935 work *Jeunesse de la Méditerranée* and Camus’s 1937 essay ‘La Culture indigène. La nouvelle culture méditerranéenne’, delivered as a speech at the inauguration of the Maison de la Culture, functioned as the manifestos of a group, centred on Charlot’s bookshop, that was committed to an anti-Algerianist notion of the Mediterranean and promoted ‘an expansive, hybrid outward-looking fraternity’ (Dunwoodie 1998, 210, 212). The first issues of Charlot’s review *Rivages*, directed by Camus, were emblematic of the transcultural ambitions of the group. Alongside local French-Algerian writers, they included other non-metropolitan French writers as well as Spanish and Italian contributions. Translation was an important aspect of Charlot’s publishing activities. Translation of contemporary literature into French was one of the founding principles of *Rivages* (Elefante 2016, 94), and an ambitious collection entitled ‘Les 5 continents’, directed by Philippe Soupault, aimed to publish works simultaneously in five languages (Puche 1995, 42–43). Charlot published some indigenous Algerian texts in a review entitled *Mithra*, as well as translations of Iraqi poetry in *Mithra*’s successor, *Fontaine*, in both cases presented by Max-Pol Fouchet, the journals’

editor (Elefante 2016, 94–96). But although he professed an interest in Arabic writing, Charlot claimed to have looked in vain for publishable texts (Puche 2007, 27). Naget Khadda ascribes this not to any reluctance on Charlot's part to enter into dialogue with indigenous writers, but rather to the cultural and physical segregation that characterised Algiers at that time (Khadda 2015, 23–28). As a result, the orientation of *Rivages* was, as Dunwoodie points out, fundamentally European (Dunwoodie 1998, 203). The language contact Charlot facilitated through his publishing activities was therefore primarily between French and other European languages rather than with indigenous languages and cultures.

The new Mediterranean humanism of the 1930s had its limits. For Dunwoodie, the recurrent metaphor of Algeria as a crossroads of civilisation suggests cultural contact, but avoids more radical notions of merging or *métissage* (Dunwoodie 1998, 188–89). The *école d'Alger*, insofar as it can be described as a coherent school of thought, did not constitute a serious challenge to the principles of French colonialism (Dunwoodie 284), tending rather to circumvent or sublimate the issue of colonial conflict in often ambiguous ways (Dunwoodie 301; Henry 2016, 42). For Dunwoodie, the only writer associated with the group to go as far as to articulate a notion of true hybridity in his novels was Roblès (Dunwoodie 1998, 285–301). By 1948, in *Les Hauteurs de la ville*, Roblès was able to include 'the subaltern voice' in his fiction, depicting the Arab as subject and portraying his protagonist, who is of mixed French-Arab origin, as 'a product of the contact zone' (Dunwoodie 1998, 287–88, 291). Roblès's text offers an interesting point of contrast with Kessel's, since it depicts Resistance activity in Algiers. The symbolic importance of Algeria in these two works is very different. For the French Algerian Roblès, writing in a post-war era that would be dominated by violent struggles for decolonisation, the war provided a context in which to explore hybrid identities forged by colonialism. Kessel, writing in 1943, was a French writer drawing on the resources of the colony in order to contribute to the liberation of the metropole. The publication of *L'Armée des ombres* in Algiers thus perpetuates the colonial hierarchy, perhaps also indicating the limits of the *école d'Alger*. Nonetheless, Kessel's contact with Charlot is an example of the way in which, through

the politico-cultural activity of literary publishing, the French Resistance was drawn into an already extant concept of progressive, international humanism located in French North Africa.

Charlot had been mobilised in 1939, but returned to Les Vraies Richesses after the fall of France. He was arrested and briefly imprisoned at the end of 1941 because of his Resistance connections. In November 1942, he was again mobilised and held office in the provisional government's MoI, working under Admiral Barjot in the propaganda section. After the fall of France and until November 1942, works published by Charlot were distributed in the Vichy zone by the Archat agency in Lyon. Once the whole of France was occupied, Charlot used his contacts in the provisional government to distribute his books via Allied channels to the Middle East, Lebanon, Egypt, and Portugal (Puche 1995, 23, 27). Charlot published a number of important Resistance works, including an edition of Vercors' *Le Silence de la mer* and Max-Pol Fouchet's review *Fontaine*, in which Kessel's 'Le Chant des partisans' and 'Le Champ de tir' appeared in 1943 (Kessel 1943a, b). Through his collaboration with Admiral Barjot on the wartime publishing imprint 'Editions France' and the series 'Les Livres de la France en guerre', Charlot reached audiences throughout the liberated territories (Puche 2007, 46–48). Thanks to his contacts with the Gaullist administration, by 1944 he was acting as the de facto official publisher of the Free French (Jaffeux 2016, 77). Kessel knew that in choosing to publish with Charlot in 1943, he was making a choice to write for an audience outside of France. Charlot's books had been unavailable to readers in the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris since 1941 because they were published outside of the occupied zone. From November 1942, Algiers was cut off from France and the only regions accessible to Charlot were those under Allied administration (Puche 1995, 23–27; Mollier 2004, 204; Puche 2007, 46–48). Nonetheless, publication with Charlot provided Kessel with practical and material advantages. The market for books in wartime Algiers was strong, and Charlot was at the centre of it (Cantier 1999, 46–47, 54). According to the French Algerian writer Jules Roy, Charlot was the gatekeeper of French-language culture in Algiers, but he was also an open door leading to a meaningful intellectual life in a location previously characterised by a stultifying cultural climate (Roy 1995, 7, 8–9). By publishing

with Charlot, Kessel was able to draw on this considerable cultural and intellectual capital. Algiers provided a vital publishing platform for writers such as Kessel, enabling them to disseminate their texts legally at a time when this was not possible in France.

Charlot's ultimate goal was to demonstrate that a publishing venture based in Algiers could have an influence in France. This is as clear from the orientation and development of the two reviews he launched during the war, *Fontaine* and *L'Arche* (Vignale 2016; Jaffeux 2016) as it is from his own recollections:

Le grand problème pour nous, dès le départ, c'était de ne pas nous limiter à l'Algérie mais d'atteindre les lecteurs de ce qu'on appelait la métropole. J'y suis arrivé seulement au moment de la guerre, juste avant 40. (Puche 2007, 28)

[The big problem for us from the start was to not limit ourselves to Algeria but to reach readers in what was called the metropole. I only managed it during the war, just before 1940.]

The translation zone of wartime Algiers functioned effectively for Charlot, enabling him to fulfil his literary ambition to be heard beyond Algeria. As well as *Fontaine* and *L'Arche*, war books such as *L'Armée des ombres* gave Charlot an international profile which he had found difficult to achieve before the war. It was the translation zone that ultimately led him to establish a branch of his publishing house in Paris. As Guy Basset aptly puts it, 'dans le sillage d'un Alger devenu capital de la France libre, il y eut aussi l'aventure parisienne' [in the wake of Algiers becoming the capital of Free France, there was also the Paris venture] (Basset 2004, 61). In 1945, having established himself in the newly liberated capital, Charlot was able to publish a Paris edition of *L'Armée des ombres*, in collaboration with the publishing house Julliard.¹⁵ Charlot was part of a younger generation of publishers who wanted to revitalise Parisian publishing after the war by creating a publishing industry purged of collaborators and offering intellectually serious works. Alongside Les Editions de Minuit and others, he positioned himself as one of those who had kept the flame of the Resistance alive (Mollier 2008, 136–37). He joined

'La fidélité française', an association of Resistance publishers formed in 1944 (Puche 1995, 30). Although his peripheral location had turned out to be symbolically advantageous—being in Algiers had provided the opportunity for him to become one of the leading French Resistance publishers—it turned out to be commercially disastrous. Unable to compete with the giants of French publishing which re-established themselves after the war, or indeed to overcome the practical problems of running the business from outside Europe, Charlot was forced to close his Parisian venture in 1950 (Mollier 2008, 151; 2016, 121–22).

Representing Place in *L'Armée des ombres*

L'Armée des ombres is composed of eight sequences recounting a variety of types of Resistance activity. The sequences are linked through the central character of Philippe Gerbier, a Resistance leader whose portrait Kessel based on various real-life Resistance figures including Gilbert Médéric-Védy, also known as Jacques Médéric, and Gilbert Renault, known as Colonel Rémy (Simonin 2011, 244). The reader first meets Gerbier in prison in France. With the help of the young communist Legrain, he escapes and rejoins the members of his Resistance cell in various operations. He visits London, and returns to France where he lives in hiding. He is again arrested and imprisoned, but is rescued in a dramatic operation by his Resistance comrades, led by Mathilde. The final sequence concerns the fate of Mathilde, whose portrait was based in part on Lucie Aubrac (Kendall 2017, xxxv). When Mathilde is picked up by the authorities, her comrades have to resolve the moral dilemma of whether or not she should be sacrificed because she has become a risk to the security of the Resistance cell. In the closing pages of the text Mathilde is shot by her comrades, who believe that she wishes to sacrifice herself for the greater cause of the Resistance. Apart from the sequence set in London, the action takes place entirely in mainland France. Nonetheless, the fact that the novel was written abroad and is directed at a readership located outside of France is obvious from the narrative strategies which construct the implied reader (Iser 1974, 1978).

These are the textual signs to which Attack refers and which reveal that *L'Armée des ombres* was written for a foreign audience (Attack 1989, 7). The repeated use of 'France' and its derivatives by Kessel and by the narrator in the preface and in the stories themselves indicate that the recipient of the text is not *in* France. The preface promises to deliver to the reader 'Des faits courants de la vie française' [contemporary facts about French life], to 'raconter la France' [tell the story of France], and to describe the experiences of 'des gens de France' [the people of France], all of which would be redundant for anyone who was actually there (Kessel 1943a, 7, 10, 11). The rhetorical repetition of 'la France' in the concluding paragraphs of the preface underlines this perspective. The fictional Philippe Gerbier, like the real Joseph Kessel, positions himself as a commentator who is able to reflect on the French from a position of external vantage. Describing the evolution of the Resistance, Gerbier writes that to begin with '[l]es Français n'étaient pas préparés, pas disposés à tuer' [the French were not prepared and not inclined to kill] but eventually, '[l]'homme primitif est reparu chez les Français' [primitive man reappeared among the French] (Kessel 1943a, 149). Even though this section is a (fictional) diary written by a (fictional) Resister, the first person plural—which would separate 'nous', the interior Resistance, from 'vous', the exiles—is conspicuously avoided. Kessel also constructs extended narrative pretexts for the exposition of facts about the activities and organisation of the Resistance. The most obvious of these is the character of Legrain, the young communist Gerbier meets in prison in the first section. Because his incarceration predates the formation of the Resistance, he occupies the same textual position as the implied reader outside of France as an addressee of Gerbier's narrative with no experience of the interior Resistance. A recurrent discourse of deterritorialisation creates unity between the events described and the implied reader outside of France. Because the Resistance is the opposite of the regime that controls the territory in which it is operating, its notion of 'homeland' is deterritorialised:

Et Legrain sur son grabat enflammé, dans l'obscurité étouffante, découvrait un pays tout neuf et enchanté, peuplé de combattants sans nombre, et sans armes, *une patrie d'amis sacrés, plus belle que ne le fut jamais patrie sur la terre*. La résistance était cette patrie. (Kessel 1943a, 44, my emphasis)

[And Legrain, on his makeshift bed, burning hot in the stifling darkness, was discovering a new and enchanted country, peopled with numberless fighters, without arms, a homeland of sacred friends, more beautiful than any homeland on earth. The Resistance was that homeland.]

J'ai senti qu'un ennemi tué par *nous qui n'avons ni uniforme, ni drapeau, ni territoire*, j'ai senti que le cadavre de cet ennemi-là était plus lourd, plus efficace dans les plateaux qui portent le destin des nations que tout un charnier sur un champ de bataille. (Kessel 1943a, 172, my emphasis)

[I felt that an enemy killed by us, who have neither uniform, nor flag, nor territory, I felt that the corpse of that enemy was weightier, more significant in the scales which hold the destiny of nations than a great massacre on a battlefield.]

True France is no longer a place but a movement—the Resistance—and as such it can include its supporters outside of France. Free France is severed from any territorial connection.

The significance of Kessel's residency in London can be detected in the work's thematic content. *L'Armée des ombres* combines heroic stories of the interior Resistance with an unambiguously positive account of the Allies. It is therefore remarkably consistent with the priorities of British propaganda disseminated to occupied France via the BBC: to boost French morale, to foster and support France's faith in Britain, to forge a close association between the two countries, and to convince the French that Britain's aim was to see France restored as a strong European power after the country's liberation (Chadwick 2015, 428–31). Kay Chadwick has demonstrated the extent to which BBC wartime broadcasting to France conveyed a positive representation of Britain's war effort as well as supporting the interior Resistance by relaying information about what was happening back to France (Chadwick 2015).¹⁶ Kessel is careful to sanction the Allied war effort overtly throughout his accounts of numerous acts of Resistance heroism taking place on French soil. For example, a French peasant woman declares that the right French attitude is one of hospitality to the British army ('Les soldats anglais sont chez eux dans toute bonne maison française' [The English soldiers are welcome in every true French home] (Kessel 1943a, 106)). England is presented as the only hope for the

occupied nations ('Quand tout semblait perdu, l'Angleterre a été le seul foyer d'espérance et de chaleur. C'était pour des millions d'Européens dans la nuit, le feu de la foi. Et tous ceux qui ont approché et approchent encore ce feu y prennent un reflet merveilleux' [When everything seemed lost, England was the only beacon of hope and warmth. For millions of Europeans, it was the fire of hope in the night. And all those who approached it and still approach it bathe in its marvellous light] (Kessel 1943a, 141)). And London is to Gerbier what Mecca is to an observant Muslim ('Chez les musulmans, le pèlerin qui s'est rendu à La Mecque porte le titre de Hadj, et un turban vert. Je suis un Hadj. J'ai droit au turban vert de l'Europe asservie' [Among Muslims, the pilgrim who has been to Mecca has the title of Hadj, and wears a green turban. I am a Hadj. I am entitled to wear the green turban of enslaved Europe] (Kessel 1943a, 141)). Kessel's work conveys the same messages as the BBC, but carries them to a different audience—a readership outside of occupied France—and on the basis of a different narrative—the story of France's own ongoing heroism. Yet alongside its consistently positive representation of the Allies, Kessel's narrative retains a fundamentally French perspective. As Simonin demonstrates, the book plays into a series of key debates that exceed the question of France's relationship with the Allies: the need to federate differing opinions within the French exile community; the profound Franco-French antagonism illustrated by the repression of the interior Resistance by the *French* police; the legitimisation of Free France as the legal government of the nation (Simonin 2011, 242, 246, 249–50). According to Footitt and Tobia, the BBC's foreign-language broadcasting during the war can be seen as the translation into the language of the occupied nations of a message that was fundamentally British (Footitt and Tobia 2013, 78). Kessel's book, though fully supportive of the Allied message, is not simply a translation of British propaganda disseminated via the medium of a French novel. It was written out of Kessel's commitment to, and experience of, both the interior French Resistance and de Gaulle's Free French.

Nonetheless, the fact that both the political message and the material existence of *L'Armée des ombres* constitute an affirmation of the politics and propaganda messages of the Allies (the book being written and, as we shall see in Chap. 3, also widely disseminated in London) complicates the 'structure of unity', which Margaret Attack identifies as characteristic

of the wartime French Resistance novel. Attack excludes Kessel's text from the category of 'novels of unity' because in her view the structure of the narrative relies not on an opposition between the Resistance and the enemy, but rather on an opposition between survival and failure to survive, to which other narrative features are subordinated (Attack 1989, 7, 140–41). If we take the foreign aspect of the text seriously, it becomes clear that the presence of the Allied perspective within the text also complicates the *structure* of unity, even though the *theme* of unity is very strong. On Attack's reading, French Resistance novels characteristically construct the enemy negatively as the absolute 'other' of the Resistance, and the unity of the Resistance is understood in national terms, which is to say that the Resistance is equated with France: 'The call to unity is the call to unite the nation' (Attack 1989, 57, 139). Kessel's call to unity includes another 'other', namely the British. His conception of the Resistance, as well as his material ability to write and publish a book about it, relies on the discursive and practical construction of unity between the interior Resistance, the Free French in London, and the British. As we shall see in Chap. 3, Kessel's message of unity between Churchill's Britain, de Gaulle's Free French, and the interior Resistance within France was a significant factor in the translation and dissemination of his work in English.

While the symbolic value of the interior Resistance was absolutely crucial to France both during and after the war, there is no doubt that the French population both inside France and in exile knew perfectly well that the military liberation of France would come from outside. Gerbier admits that the struggle of the interior Resistance is more important symbolically than materially, since 'la victoire est assurée même sans notre concours' [victory will come even without our participation] (Kessel 1943a, 173). Resistance, understood as the refusal of the Nazi Occupation and of the Vichy regime, meant working for the military liberation of France, which was unthinkable without the intervention of the Allies. Indeed, public opinion in France was generally supportive of the Allies, and increasingly so as the war progressed (Chadwick 2015, 437; Cornick 1994, 324, 328). And as the Liberation approached, the Allies ceased to view the Resistance as a dangerous political distraction as its military and intelligence utility on the ground became increasingly obvious. Raphaële Balu's research

using British and American archives has shown the extent to which, from as early as 1943, the Allies integrated the *maquis* into their military plans (Balu 2014). Diplomatic relations with Vichy had been severed, any hope of ‘turning’ Pétain’s regime had been abandoned, and by 1944 the Allies clearly recognised the strategic importance of the interior Resistance for the achievement of their military goals (Frank 1997, 75).¹⁷

L’Armée des ombres participates in the symbolic legitimisation of the interior Resistance as both authentically (because territorially) French and at the same time inseparable from the Allied war effort. The text therefore faces in two directions: legitimising the efforts of the Allies for a French readership and legitimising those of the interior Resistance for readers who had no possibility of any direct experience of it. Philip Bell has demonstrated on the basis of Mass Observation surveys from the period that, despite a marked deterioration of relations between Churchill and de Gaulle in 1943, British public opinion remained supportive of de Gaulle and the Resistance in this period (Bell 1998, 94–97). The BBC organised a French Night on Bastille Day in 1943, and the British government and the Free French jointly mounted a Resistance exhibition in the Autumn of 1943 (Tombs and Tombs 2007, 582). Kessel was swimming with the tide of both Allied and French opinion, and *L’Armée des ombres* targets its readerships very effectively. It reassures French émigrés that France is participating in her own liberation, acknowledges the symbiotic relationship between the Allies and the interior Resistance, and reassures the Allies that the French population and the interior Resistance are fully supportive of the Allied war effort. The book thus caters both for a French émigré readership reading in an Allied context, and, bearing in mind that a significant number of readers in the host community would have been able to read it in French even before it was translated,¹⁸ for an Allied readership sympathetic to the cause of the Resistance.

The Absent Presence of Algiers in *L’Armée des ombres*

Charlot’s publication of *L’Armée des ombres* in Algiers is crucial to the text’s identity as a Resistance text. Because Charlot was in a position to publish the complete work on Free French territory in the autumn of

1943, it was able to function as Resistance literature in the militant sense, that is, as part of the fight to liberate France from the occupiers. Although French editions also appeared in both New York and London, these were published later, in March 1944 and February 1945 respectively, by which time the key arguments defended in *L'Armée des ombres* had been overtaken by events. By the time the New York edition appeared, the potential military value of the interior Resistance was already broadly accepted by the Allies, and the London edition did not appear until well after the Liberation of France. Had the publication of *L'Armée des ombres* been delayed until the Occupation was over and it could appear in liberated Paris, it would have been a historical document giving an account of a past struggle. Like the 1945 edition of Elsa Triolet's Resistance stories *Le Premier accroc coûte deux cents francs*, considered in Chap. 5, it would have played into debates about the memory of the war, rather than addressing a readership still immersed in the events described. Insofar as it created a specific readership of French and French-speaking readers outside of France, publication by Charlot affected the message *L'Armée des ombres* sought to convey. Conversely, publishing *L'Armée des ombres* affected Charlot and his publishing house. It reinforced his own pro-Resistance ideological position. His professional choices in these years indicate that publishing material supportive of Free France was a deliberate strategy on Charlot's part (Masson 2016, 23, 24). This choice was consistent with the priorities he had established in the 1930s as a publisher of progressive literature addressing an international audience. Publishing Resistance literature in Algiers provided a springboard to publishing in liberated Paris.

Kessel does not mention Algiers in the text of *L'Armée des ombres*. Algiers is not part of the story he set out to tell. And yet, the signifier 'Alger' in the endpapers signifies the whole fertile, problematic, and contradictory history of Algiers as a French *département d'outre-mer* and as a wartime zone of hospitality. In Derridean terminology, Algiers becomes a *trace*, the element that is always contained within that which appears to be fully present and self-sufficient (Derrida 1976, 60–63; see also Davis 2018, 4). My argument here is the inverse of Davis's reading of Camus' *La Peste*, published in Paris in 1942 and depicting Algeria (Davis 2018, 65–79), in which he suggests that the murder of the Arab by Mersault bears the traces of the Holocaust which itself is absent from the text. In

the case of Kessel, it is not only, as a Saussurian reading might suggest, that 'France' and 'Algeria' are meaningful only in relation to each other and in their difference from each other, but rather that each term inevitably contains the other, as Derrida proposes.¹⁹ The representation of France in Kessel's text points not only to France itself but also to France's relationship to its colonial other. To conceptualise Algiers as a wartime zone of hospitality is not simply to reverse the metropole/colony hierarchy, but to demonstrate its instability. In one of his discussions of hospitality, Derrida argues that

in order to constitute the space of a habitable house and a home, you also need an opening, a door and windows, you have to give up a passage to the outside world [*l'étranger*]. There is no house or interior without a door or windows. The monad of home has to be hospitable in order to be *ipse*, itself at home, habitable at home in the relation of the self to itself. (Derrida and Dufourmantelle 2000, 61)

In 1943, both France and Algeria were living with the results of a forced entry into the space of home—France by the Germans, and Algeria by the French. In order to conceptualise itself as itself (*ipse*) during the Occupation, Free France was reliant on the colonial other which it had occupied since 1830. To continue to be 'itself at home' after the Nazi Occupation of the French homeland, Free France left home and installed itself in Algiers, which, as a colonial capital, was already both home and not-home. Thus, for a time, the territory of the colony functioned as the metropole. The publication of *L'Armée des ombres* in Algiers is emblematic not only of the inevitable presence of France in Algiers in the colonial situation, but also of Algiers in France, since Kessel's depiction of France in 1943 implies the material conditions of possibility of its publication in the colonial capital.

Reading *L'Armée des ombres* in relation to its material contexts of publication reveals an ambivalent play between territorialisation and deterritorialisation, which is the product of the territorial delirium Jacquet reads into the Pascal Jardin text with which we began. Whilst Algiers is materially and symbolically crucial to the identity of *L'Armée des ombres* as a French text—and its Frenchness is fundamental to its functions as both a

description of (guerrilla) resistance and an example of (cultural) resistance—the evocation of the French Resistance as deterritorialised is equally crucial to the creation of a discourse of unity connecting the author, the interior Resistance and the implied reader. Following the Derridean logic of both/and rather than the binary exclusivity of either/or, Algiers is both erased from and inserted into the book. Absent from the fictional narrative, Algiers is present through the crediting of Charlot on the cover and in the endpapers. Charlot’s—and by extension, Algiers’s—hosting of Kessel’s text is shot through with the ambivalences created not only by the war but also by France’s colonial history. There is evidence of symbolic colonial violence—Kessel erases his experience of wartime Algiers in favour of depictions of France and London—but also an affirmation of the significance of the colonial city as a zone of hospitality. The publication of the text in Algiers in 1943 is a recognition of the value of the colony as a translational space. In the specific context of 1943–44, publication in Algiers ascribes to the text a territorialised Frenchness that is symbolically essential. The translation zone of Algiers in 1943–44 propelled Charlot to Paris and a new role in the metropole, and added to Kessel’s already-lengthy list of literary credits the production of a major French Resistance work.

Notes

1. Whether or not the text can be described as a ‘novel’ is a moot point: it is not structured continuously, but rather is composed of a series of interconnected sequences.
2. Robinson’s argument begins with a rejection of the authority of authorial intentionality (Robinson 2001, 3–4). See also Kershaw (2014, 40). The ‘intentional fallacy’ was first discussed by Wimsatt and Beardsley in their 1972 essay ‘The Intentional Fallacy and the Affective Fallacy’.
3. On Melville’s film adaptation and its relevance to Resistance memory, see Atack (1999), and Vincendeau (2003, 77–96).
4. Sales of the Harborough edition dwindled through 1961, according to figures provided by Peters, Fraser, and Dunlop literary agents. A bilingual edition of Cyril Connolly’s 1944 translation of *Le Silence de la mer*

- was published in 1991 and reprinted in 2002 and is still available (Vercors 2002).
5. On Kessel's wartime experiences, see Courrière (1985, 515–617), Kessel (2006, 233–301), and Kendall (2017).
 6. On the Carte network, see Gildea (2015, 163–64), Courrière (1985, 554–55), and Kessel (2006, 244–47).
 7. On the London Reception Centre and Kessel's stay there, see Cornick (2013, 362–63), Footitt and Tobia (2013, 55–56), and Kessel (2006, 258–88).
 8. *La Marseillaise* was founded in London, and *Combat* began as clandestine publication in France. Both were published in Algiers once the city came under Free French control in 1943.
 9. On *Fontaine* and *L'Arche*, as well as Charlot's wartime publishing activities more generally, see Bokanowsky (1945). Simonin (2011, 252–53) lists publication details of most of the extracts, with the exception of *Combat*.
 10. Whilst in July of 1943 Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden had reassured the French, via the BBC, that her sovereignty would be restored after the war, Jan Smuts of the British War Cabinet suggested publicly that November that post-war France would disappear as a European power (Chadwick 2015, 436–37). Buton suggests that for Gaullists in the immediate post-war years, subjection to 'Anglo-Saxon powers' was feared as a 'mortal danger' (Buton 2007, 235). As Judt points out, 'With the exception of Germany and the heartland of the Soviet Union, every continental European state involved in World War Two was occupied at least twice: first by its enemies, then by the armies of liberation' (Judt 2010, 36).
 11. For a critical discussion of the uses and abuses of the term 'résistance', see Atack (2013, 2018).
 12. On the New York émigrés, see also Mehlman (2000), and Nettelbeck (1991).
 13. Derrida discusses the history of Jewish and Muslim citizenship in Algeria in Derrida and Dufourmantelle (2000, 141–47).
 14. The centenary of Charlot's birth in 2015 produced a clutch of publications which give a good overview of his life and work. These are listed on the 'Centenaire Edmond Charlot' website. See for example Dugas (2016) (proceedings of a conference held in September 2015) and Khadda (2015). For further biographical details, see Puche (1995, 15–34) and Puche (2007). On Charlot's cultural activities in Algiers, see

- Foxlee (2010, 68–74), Caduc (1999, 90–95), Rufat (2004), and Déjeux (1986).
15. On Charlot's move to Paris, see Mollier (2016).
 16. The role of the BBC in supporting the interior resistance is well documented in, for example, Crémieux-Brilhac (1975–76), Eck (1985), and Cornick (1994).
 17. See also Frank (2006), Albertelli (2013, 119), Tombs and Tombs (2007, 589).
 18. On the level of French-language competence in pre-war and wartime Britain, see Footitt and Tobia (2013, 12–16).
 19. For a clear and concise exposition of Derrida's reworking of Saussure and his concepts of *différance* and *trace*, see Spikes (1992, 334–38).

References

- Albertelli, Sébastien. 2013. The British, the Free French and the Resistance. In *Britain and France in Two World Wars: Truth, Myth and Memory*, ed. Robert Tombs and Emile Cabal, 119–136. London: Bloomsbury.
- Apter, Emily. 2006. *The Translation Zone: The New Comparative Literature*. Princeton/Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Atack, Margaret. 1989. *Literature and the French Resistance: Cultural Politics and Narrative Forms 1940–1950*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- . 1999. *L'Armée des ombres* and *Le Chagrin et la pitié*: Reconfigurations of Law, Legalities and the State in Post-1968 France. In *European Memories of the Second World War*, ed. Charles Burdett, Claire Gorrara, and Helmut Peitsch, 160–174. Oxford: Berghahn.
- . 2013. “Résistantialisme”, “Résistancialisme”: Resistance and the Politics of Memory. In *Mnemosyne and Mars. Artistic and Cultural Representations of Twentieth-century Europe at War*, ed. Peter Tame, Dominique Jeannerod, and Manuel Bragança, 59–74. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- . 2018. A Nation United? The Impossible Memory of War and Occupation in France. In *Remembering the Second World War*, ed. Patrick Finney, 11–29. London/New York: Routledge.
- Balu, Raphaële. 2014. The French Maquis and the Allies during the Second World War. In *France in an Era of Global War, 1914–1945. Occupation, Politics, Empire and Entanglements*, ed. Ludivine Broch and Alison Carrol, 192–209. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Basset, Guy. 2004. En compagnie d'Edmond (1915–2004). In *Bulletin d'information de la société des études camusiennes*, July, 61–64. <http://www.etudes-camusiennes.fr/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/bulletin071-juil2004.pdf>. Accessed 29 Apr 2017.
- Bell, P.M.H. 1997. *France and Britain 1940–1994: The Long Separation*. London/New York: Longman.
- . 1998. L'Opinion publique en Grande-Bretagne et le General de Gaulle (1940–1944). *Guerres mondiales et conflits contemporains* 190: 79–101.
- Boase-Beier, Jean, Peter Davies, Andrea Hammel, and Marion Winters. 2017. Introduction. In *Translating Holocaust Lives*, ed. Jean Boase-Beier, Peter Davies, Andrea Hammel, and Marion Winters, 1–21. London: Bloomsbury.
- Bokanowsky, Hélène. 1945. French Literature in Algiers. *Books Abroad* 19 (2): 125–130.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1983. The Field of Cultural production, or: The Economic World Reversed. *Poetics* 12 (4–5): 311–356.
- . 1999. *The Rules of Art*. Trans. Susan Emanuel. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- . 2008. A Conservative Revolution in Publishing. *Translation Studies* 1 (2): 123–153.
- Buton, Philippe. 2007. Occupation, Liberation, Purges: The Changing Landscape of French Memory. In *The Uncertain Foundation: France at the Liberation, 1944–47*, ed. Andrew Knapp, 234–249. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Caduc, Eveline. 1999. Une capitale culturelle. In *Alger 1860–1939. Le modèle ambigu du triomphe colonial*, ed. Jean-Jacques Jordi and Jean-Louis Planche, 74–100. Paris: Editions Autrement.
- Cantier, Jacques. 1999. 1939–1945: Une métropole coloniale en guerre. In *Alger 1940–1962. Le modèle ambigu du triomphe colonial*, ed. Jean-Jacques Jordi and Jean-Louis Planche, 16–61. Paris: Editions Autrement.
- Centenaire Edmond Charlot. Commémoration nationale 2015. <http://edmond-charlot100.monsite-orange.fr/>. Accessed 29 Apr 2017.
- Chadwick, Kay. 2015. Our Enemy's Enemy: Selling Britain to Occupied France on the BBC French Service. *Media History* 21 (4): 426–442.
- Cornick, Martyn. 1994. The BBC and the Propaganda War Against Occupied France: The Work of Emile Delavenay and the European Intelligence Department. *French History* 8 (3): 316–354.
- . 2013. “The First Bastion of the Resistance”: The Beginnings of the Free French in London, 1940–41. In *A History of the French in London: Liberty, Equality, Opportunity*, ed. Martyn Cornick and Debra Kelly, 343–372. London: Institute of Historical Research.

- Courrière, Yves. 1985. *Joseph Kessel, ou, sur la piste du lion*. Paris: Plon.
- Crémieux-Brilhac, J-L., ed. 1975–76. *Les Voix de la liberté: Ici Londres, 1940–1944*. 5 vols. Paris: La Documentation française.
- Cronin, Michael, and Sherry Simon. 2014. Introduction: The City as Translation Zone. *Translation Studies* 7 (2): 119–132.
- Davis, Colin. 2018. *Traces of War. Interpreting Ethics and Trauma in Twentieth-Century French Writing*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Déjeux, J. 1986. Alger capitale littéraire de 1940 à 1945. In *Paris et le phénomène des capitales littéraires: carrefour ou dialogue des cultures*, 515–523. Paris: Presses de l'Université de Paris-Sorbonne.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1976. *Of Grammatology*. Trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore/London: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Derrida, Jacques, and Anne Dufourmantelle. 2000. *Of Hospitality*. Trans. Rachel Bowlby. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Dugas, Guy. 2008. Vers un nouvel humanisme méditerranéen. In *La méditerranée de Audisio à Roy*, ed. Guy Dugas, 9–13. Houilles: Editions Manucius.
- , ed. 2016. *Edmond Charlot, passeur de culture*. Pézenas: Domens.
- Dunwoodie, Peter. 1998. *Writing French Algeria*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Eck, Hélène. 1985. *La Guerre des ondes. Histoire des radios de langues françaises pendant la Deuxième guerre mondiale*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- Elefante, Chiara. 2016. Edmond Charlot et l'“épreuve de l'étranger”. Traduction et traducteurs chez Edmond Charlot. In *Edmond Charlot, passeur de culture*, ed. Guy Dugas, 89–108. Pézenas: Domens.
- Footitt, Hilary. 2016. War and Culture Studies in 2016: Putting ‘Translation’ into the Transnational? *Journal of War & Culture Studies* 9 (3): 209–221.
- Footitt, Hilary, and Simona Tobia. 2013. *War Talk: Foreign Languages and the British War Effort in Europe, 1940–47*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Foxlee, Neil. 2010. *Albert Camus' 'The New Mediterranean Culture': A Text and Its Contexts*. Oxford: Peter Lang.
- Frank, Robert. 1997. ‘Identités résistantes et logiques alliées’. *Les Cahiers de l'Institut de l'histoire du temps présent* 37, *La Résistance et les Français: nouvelles approches*, 73–91.
- . 2006. La Résistance et les alliées. In *Dictionnaire historique de la résistance*, ed. François Marcot with Bruno Leroux and Christine Levisse-Touzé, 85–94. Paris: Robert Laffont.
- Fritsch-Estrangin, Guy. 1969. *New York entre de Gaulle et Pétain. Les Français aux Etats-Unis de 1940 à 1946*. Paris: Editions de la Table ronde.
- Gildea, Robert. 2015. *Fighters in the Shadows. A New History of the French Resistance*. London: Faber and Faber.

- Henry, Jean-Robert. 2016. Une Rupture avec la pensée algérieniste. In *Edmond Charlot, passeur de culture*, ed. Guy Dugas, 27–43. Pézenas: Editions Domens.
- Holman, Valerie, and Debra Kelly. 2000. Introduction. Myth and Metaphor: The Power of Propaganda in Twentieth-Century Warfare. In *France at War in the Twentieth Century: Propaganda, Myth and Metaphor*, ed. Valerie Holman and Debra Kelly, 1–14. Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Iser, Wolfgang. 1974. *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett*. Baltimore/London: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- . 1978. *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Jacquet, Michel. 2000. *Une Occupation très romanesque: ironie et dérision dans le roman français sur l'Occupation de 1945 à nos jours*. Paris: Editions la Bruyère.
- Jaffeux, Vincent. 2016. *L'Arche au milieu de la tempête: Naissance d'une revue algéroise dans la tourmente de la Seconde Guerre mondiale*. In *Edmond Charlot, passeur de culture*, ed. Guy Dugas, 73–87. Pézenas: Domens.
- Jardin, Pascal. 1975. *Vichy Boyhood: An Inside View of the Pétain Regime*. Trans. Jean Stewart. London: Faber.
- . 2005. *La Guerre à neuf ans*. Paris: Grasset.
- Jordi, Jean-Jacques, and Guy Pervillé. 1999. Prologue. In *Alger 1940–1962: Une ville en guerres*, ed. Jean-Jacques Jordi and Guy Pervillé, 10–13. Paris: Editions Autrement.
- Jordi, Jean-Jacques, and Jean-Louis Planche. 1999a. Prologue: Alger au temps de la France. In *Alger 1860–1939. Le modèle ambigu du triomphe colonial*, ed. Jean-Jacques Jordi and Jean-Louis Planche, 13–19. Paris: Editions Autrement.
- . 1999b. 1919–1939: Alger, espace de la France. In *Alger 1860–1939. Le modèle ambigu du triomphe colonial*, ed. Jean-Jacques Jordi and Jean-Louis Planche, 24–54. Paris: Editions Autrement.
- Judt, Tony. 2010. *Postwar: A History of Europe Since 1945*. London: Vintage Books.
- Kendall, Stuart. 2017. Introduction: When Fact Becomes Legend. In *L'Armée des ombres*, ed. Joseph Kessel, and Trans. Rainer J. Hanshe, i–lvii. New York/London/Melbourne: Contra Mundum Press.
- Kershaw, Angela. 2014. Complexity and Unpredictability in Cultural Flows: Two French Holocaust Novels in English Translation. *Translation Studies* 7 (1): 34–49.
- . 2017. Distant Stories, Belated Memories: Irène Némirovsky and Elisabeth Gille. In *Translating Holocaust Lives*, ed. Jean Boase-Beier, Peter

- Davies, Andrea Hammel, and Marion Winters, 199–215. London: Bloomsbury.
- Kessel, Joseph. 1943a. *L'Armée des ombres*. Alger: Charlot.
- . 1943b. Le Champ de tir. *Fontaine* 5 (30): 463–469.
- . 1943c. Les Partisans: Chant de la Libération. *Fontaine* 5 (30): 461–462.
- . 1944. Préface à un livre de guerre. *L'Arche*, February 1, 69–72.
- . 2006. *Ami, entends-tu...* Paris: La Table Ronde.
- . 2010. *L'Heure des châtements, Reportages 1938–1945*. Paris: Tallandier.
- . 2017. *Army of Shadows*. Trans. Rainer J. Hanshe and with an Introduction by Stuart Kendall. New York/London/Melbourne: Contra Mundum Press.
- Khadda, Kage. 2015. *Charlot, l'Homme-roi*. Pézenas: Domens.
- Lefevre, André. 2017. *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. 2nd ed. Abingdon/New York: Routledge.
- Littau, Karin. 2016. Translation and the Materialities of Communication. *Translation Studies* 9 (1): 82–96.
- Lloyd, Christopher. 2003. *Collaboration and Resistance in Occupied France: Representing Treason and Sacrifice*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Masson, Pierre. 2016. Tentative de portrait d'un jeune éditeur. In *Edmond Charlot, passeur de culture*, ed. Guy Dugas, 15–25. Pézenas: Editions Domens.
- Mehlman, Jeffrey. 2000. *Émigré New York: French Intellectuals in Wartime Manhattan, 1940–1944*. Baltimore/London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Mollier, Jean-Yves. 2004. Les Intellectuels et le système éditorial français pendant la Seconde guerre mondiale. In *Les Intellectuels et l'Occupation 1940–1944: Collaborer, partir, résister*, ed. Albrecht Betz and Stefan Martens, 200–217. Paris: Editions Autrement.
- . 2008. *Edition, presse et pouvoir en France au XXe siècle*. Paris: Fayard.
- . 2016. L'Édition française à la Libération: De la régénération à la résilience. In *Edmond Charlot, passeur de culture*, ed. Guy Dugas, 109–127. Pézenas: Editions Domens.
- Nettelbeck, Colin. 1991. *Forever French: Exile in the United States, 1939–1945*. New York/Oxford: Berg.
- Olohan, Maeve. 2014. History of Science and History of Translation: Disciplinary Commensurability? *The Translator* 20 (1): 9–25.
- Omri, Mohamed-Salah. 2005. History, Literature and Settler Colonialism in North Africa. *Modern Language Quarterly* 66 (3): 273–298.
- Poulain, Martine. 2013. *Livres pillés, lectures surveillées. Les bibliothèques françaises sous l'Occupation*. Paris: Gallimard.

- Pratt, Mary Louise. 1992. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London: Routledge.
- Puche, Michel. 1995. *Edmond Charlot, éditeur. Bibliographie commentée et illustrée*. Préface de Jules Roy. Pezenas: Domens.
- , ed. 2007. *Souvenirs d'Edmond Charlot. Entretiens avec Frédéric Jacques Temple*. Préface de Michel Puche. Pézenas: Domens.
- Pym, Anthony. 1998. *Method in Translation History*. Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.
- Robinson, Douglas. 2001. *Who Translates? Translator Subjectivities Beyond Reason*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Roblès, Emmanuel. 1948. *Les Hauteurs de la ville*. Paris: Charlot.
- Roy, Jules. 1995. Préface. In *Edmond Charlot, éditeur. Bibliographie commentée et illustrée*, ed. Michel Puche, 7–10. Pézenas: Domens.
- Rufat, Hélène. 2004. Entretien avec Edmond Charlot. *Bulletin d'information de la société des études camusiennes*, July, 65–67. <http://www.etudes-camusiennes.fr/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/bulletin071-juil2004.pdf>. Accessed 29 Apr 2017.
- Sapiro, Gisèle. 2008. Translation and the Field of Publishing. *Translation Studies* 1 (2): 154–166.
- Schiffirin, André. 1999. *L'Édition sans éditeurs*. Paris: La Fabrique-Éditions.
- Sela-Sheffy, Rakefet. 2005. How to Be a (Recognized) Translator: Rethinking Habitus, Norms, and the Field of Translation. *Targets* 17 (1): 1–26.
- Simeoni, Daniel. 1998. The Pivotal Status of the Translator's Habitus. *Targets* 10 (1): 1–39.
- Simon, Sherry. 2012. *Cities in Translation: Intersections of Language and Memory*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Simonin, Anne. 2011. La Résistance sans fiction: *L'Armée des ombres* (1943). In *Écrire sous l'Occupation. Du non-consentement à la Résistance: France-Belgique-Pologne 1940–1945*, ed. Bruno Curatolo and François Marcot, 233–253. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.
- Spikes, Michael P. 1992. Present Absence versus Absent Presence: Kripke Contra Derrida. *Soundings: An Interdisciplinary Journal* 75 (2–3): 333–355.
- Spiquel, Agnès. 2016. Le Contexte algérois de la naissance des Vraies Richesses. In *Edmond Charlot, passeur de culture*, ed. Guy Dugas, 45–58. Pézenas: Domens.
- Still, Judith. 2010. *Derrida and Hospitality: Theory and Practice*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Tombs, Robert, and Isabelle Tombs. 2007. *That Sweet Enemy. Britain and France: The History of a Love-Hate Relationship*. London: Pimlico.

- Vercors. 2002. *Le Silence de la mer/The Silence of the Sea*. Trans. Cyril Connolly and ed. James W. Brown and Lawrence D. Stokes. Oxford: Berg.
- Vignale, François. 2016. Fouchet, Fontaine, Charlot: résister à Alger. In *Edmond Charlot, passeur de culture*, ed. Guy Dugas, 61–71. Pézenas: Domens.
- Vincendeau, Jeanette. 2003. *Jean-Pierre Melville: An American in Paris*. London: British Film Institute.
- Wimsatt, W.K., and Monroe C. Beardsley. 1972. The Intentional Fallacy and the Affective Fallacy. In *20th Century Literary Criticism: A Reader*, ed. David Lodge, 333–358. London/New York: Longman.
- Winock, Michel. 2004. *La France et les juifs*. Paris: Seuil.



3

Translating the French Resistance in London and New York

In Chap. 2, we saw how Algiers functioned as a wartime translational zone of hospitality providing both the material and intellectual conditions which permitted the legal publication and circulation of Resistance texts such as Joseph Kessel's *L'Armée des ombres* during the Occupation of mainland France. Between the fall of France and the Liberation, French intellectual wartime emigration also transformed London and New York into translational zones of hospitality. In these cities, French émigrés sought to defend France by keeping its culture alive through the French language. In practical and material terms, this meant establishing French-language newspapers, journals, and publishing ventures on foreign soil. Their titles—*France*, *La France libre*, *La Voix de France*, *Pour la victoire*, *France-Amérique*—convey the territorial tensions from which they sprang: France, Free France, victorious France was speaking from outside the Hexagon and, to do so, depended on a relationship with another nation, signified by the hyphen linking France to America. The presence of French émigrés in London and New York also provided a context for the translation of contemporary French works into English. Translation gave the host population access to French works and French concerns.

But translation also opened up the possibility of manipulating the foreign text to serve domestic purposes. This chapter examines the dissemination of *L'Armée des ombres* in London and New York. Kessel's contribution to the London-based journal *La France libre* is considered to be an example of Franco-British cooperation that illustrates the ambiguities of British hospitality to the Free French. Analysis of the publication of Kessel's work in English translation in *Horizon* and *The Daily Express* probes the implications of the fact that translation functions as a form of political manipulation even between allies. The chapter then goes on to consider editorial and translatorial interventions in the two New York editions of *L'Armée des ombres* and to examine the reception of Kessel's book in the American press. These readings highlight the wide variety of meanings that accrued to Kessel's work because of the material forms and locations of its publication.

This chapter, like the previous one, is an exercise in translation history that places the agents of literary dissemination at its centre.¹ The translational readings offered here problematise the commonplace idea of the translator providing a conduit or bridge between cultures. Consonant with Emily Apter's conceptualisation of the translation zone as a space of critical engagement in *The Translation Zone* (Apter 2006, 5), my readings suggest that neither translator nor publisher should be idolised as figures of perfect altruism offering safe passage to texts migrating between cultures. Mediators they certainly are, but they deserve critical attention as people who, like authors, are personally invested in their texts. Responsible translation history must go beyond what Theo Hermans describes as the 'popular and persistent trope in the common understanding of translation, the trope of translating as overcoming barriers and subduing difference' (Hermans 2007, 150). Reading translationally reveals the extent to which the border crossings of Kessel's novel opened the door to ideological interventions by various agents involved in the production of the text. As in Chap. 2, biographical and contextual readings are set alongside textual analyses in order to examine translators', editors', and reviewers' engagements with Kessel's text. Translators and publishers are first and foremost readers who have particular connections to the works they translate or select. To be a reader is, for Judith Still, 'to be host and guest with respect to a text' (Still 2010, 51). And as Mary Louise Pratt suggests,

‘[t]he translator is always already in some way connected to the imaginative production to be translated; some relation across (historical or cultural) distance has brought the original into the translator’s purview, into the space of the translator’s desire’ (Pratt 2002, 30). This chapter examines the connections between Kessel’s text and his publishers and translators in Britain and the USA. How did three different translators play host and guest to Kessel’s novel? How did it come into their purview? Who was willing and able to publish Kessel in English in the period 1943–45, and how did his work relate to the intellectual, political and commercial agendas of its British and American publishers? These are some of the questions this chapter will seek to answer.

A Complex Publication History

The publication of *L’Armée des ombres* in Algiers by Charlot in the autumn of 1943 is only one element of this text’s complex international publishing history. Kessel’s work appeared in an astonishingly wide variety of formats between the summer of 1943 and the end of 1945. No fewer than six editions of the full text were published: four in French and two in English. Three full French-language editions followed the Charlot edition: one published by the Russian-born and nine French publisher Jacques Schiffrin in New York with Pantheon Books in March 1944 (Kessel 1944a; Loyer 2005, 100; Courrière 1985, 592), one by Penguin in London in February 1945 (Kessel 1945a), and one as a joint venture by Charlot and Julliard in post-Liberation Paris in the autumn of 1945 (Kessel 1945b; Courrière 1985, 613; Puche 1995, 75).² The novel was translated into English by Haakon Chevalier, an American university professor of French, and published in New York by Knopf on 19 June 1944 (Kessel 1944b).³ An English edition of this translation was published in London by The Cresset Press in November or December 1944 (Kessel 1944c).⁴

In addition to these six versions of the complete text, a profusion of extracts from the novel appeared in reviews in French and in English before and shortly after the war’s end in a variety of locations.⁵ The earliest publication in French appears to have been in London. The section

entitled 'L'Evasion' was published in the London Free French daily newspaper *France* in July 1943 (Kessel 1943l), with 'L'Embarquement pour Gibraltar' following in April 1944 (Kessel 1944g). 'Ces gens-là sont merveilleux' was printed anonymously in the July 1943 edition of *La Revue du monde libre*, a small-format journal produced in London by the Foreign Office Political Intelligence Department to be dropped over France by the Royal Air Force (RAF) (Kessel 1943k; Holman 2000a). Kessel's inclusion in this publication is particularly significant as it was the one channel of distribution through which at least part of his text could reach occupied France. In August and November 1943, 'Ces gens-là sont merveilleux' and 'L'Exécution' appeared in the London Free French monthly journal *La France libre* (Kessel 1943m, t). This explains the inclusion of Kessel's text in *La Revue du monde libre*, since the latter was largely composed of texts reprinted from this publication. Further extracts from the section of the novel comprising Philippe Gerbier's fictional notebook appeared in the English literary journal *Horizon* in October and November 1943 in a translation by the journal's editor, Cyril Connolly, under the titles 'Over the Water: Philippe Gerbier's Notebook – I' and 'Philippe Gerbier's Notebook – II' (Kessel 1943o, r).

Extracts from *L'Armée des ombres* were also published in North Africa and in the USA. In Algiers, as we saw in Chap. 2, Charlot published 'Le Champ de tir' in *Fontaine* in the late summer of 1943 (Kessel 1943n) and 'Préface à un livre de guerre' in *L'Arche* in February 1944 (Kessel 1944f). In addition to these, five extracts appeared in *Combat* in Algiers between October 1943 and January 1944, beginning with one entitled 'Il est ici' (Kessel 1943p) which did not make it into the final version of the book. *Combat* had begun life as a clandestine journal in France, but had moved its operation to Algiers after the city came under Free French control. Two further extracts were published in *La Marseillaise* in December 1943 (Kessel 1943v) and January 1944 (Kessel 1944d). By this time, *La Marseillaise*, which had been founded in London, was also being published in Cairo and Dakar. Kessel's work was therefore reaching readers in the Allied territories across North Africa. Extracts were also available to French readers in America before the full New York edition was published. Two extracts, one of which was 'Il est ici', appeared in *France-Amérique* in October and December 1943 (Kessel 1943q, x). Similarly,

the Charlot-Julliard edition of 1945 was preceded by the appearance of 'Champ de tir' in post-Liberation Paris in *Gavroche* in December 1944 (Kessel 1944j). These multiple publications and translations suggest the importance wartime publishers and journal editors in three continents accorded to *L'Armée des ombres* as a record of the French interior Resistance.

After the Liberation, extracts from *L'Armée des ombres* were anthologised in edited collections put together in order to bring writing from wartime France to a wider post-war readership. In 1945, the two extracts that had appeared in *La France libre* were published as 'Wonderful People' and 'The Execution' in a volume entitled *French Writing on English Soil* published in London by Sylvan Press (Kessel 1945c, d). This collection, which brought together a selection of texts that had appeared in *La France libre*, was edited and translated by the British broadcaster and academic J. G. Weightman. A similar sort of publication appeared in New York in 1946 edited by A. J. Liebling, a journalist on the *New Yorker*, and Eugene Jay Sheffer of Columbia University (Liebling and Sheffer 1946). Entitled *La République du silence*, this collection had an introduction in English but reprinted the selected texts in the original French, including 'L'Execution' and 'Le champ de tir' from *L'Armée des ombres* (Kessel 1946a, b). A further edition of the same collection with the texts in English appeared the following year, which reprinted the extracts from *L'Armée des ombres* from the 1944 Knopf translation under the titles 'The Execution' and 'The Rifle Range' (Kessel 1947a, b).

The topicality of Kessel's book is one reason for the number and variety of its appearances in print between 1943 and 1945. While Charlot's distribution channels in Allied territories would have facilitated the international circulation of the Algiers edition of *L'Armée des ombres*, it was thanks to émigré and English-language publications that Kessel's work reached a wide audience before the Liberation of France. Some extracts appeared even before the Charlot edition was published.⁶ As we saw in Chap. 2, the point of the book was to persuade readers of the validity and heroism of Gaullism and the activities of the interior French Resistance. To be effective, it was therefore crucial that the work reached as many readers as possible, and as quickly as possible. Correspondence between Kessel and Penguin about delays to the publication of the French version

show that Kessel viewed *L'Armée des ombres* as an intervention in contemporary events that would lose its *raison d'être* in a transformed political context. Kessel's English agent, A. D. Peters,⁷ had been corresponding with Penguin at least since the spring of 1944 about the French-language publication,⁸ but on 16 August, with the prospect of the Liberation now in very close view, Kessel wrote to Penguin himself:

Je pense que ce retard est très regrettable. Les événements actuels répondent à l'intérêt que peut l'offrir mon livre. Bientôt – et heureusement – il n'en sera plus de même.⁹

[I think this delay is most regrettable. Current events are directly related to the interest of my book. Soon – and happily – this will no longer be the case.]

Because of the delay—caused by a backlog at the Scottish printers who were also dealing with official government publications because of the bombing in London¹⁰—only the serialised extracts appeared in London before the Liberation. In America, things had moved more swiftly: the French and English New York editions were published in the spring and early summer of 1944, thus, before the Liberation. The book's topicality also explains its inclusion in the post-war anthologies. Although a work of fiction, its ambition to document the activities of the Resistance as they were happening made it suitable for inclusion in publications which appeared in the early post-war years with the aim of constructing the memory of France's war.

French Intellectual Resistance in London

This is not the place to rehearse in detail the history of the Free French in London, which has been amply documented (e.g. in Bell 1974; Crémieux-Brilhac 1996; Atkin 2003; Murraciale 2009; Albertelli 2010; Kelly 2013; Cornick 2013; Drake 2013; Gildea 2015, 106–29). It is well known that de Gaulle worked hard to establish his independence from his British hosts, despite—and because of—his material and symbolic dependence

on them, and that Britain and her Allies worked just as hard to try to contain their unruly guest. De Gaulle's struggle for France's independence was made all the more intense by his dependence on Britain, something he found difficult to digest (Frank 2006, 86; Tombs and Tombs 2007, 569). While De Gaulle experienced British hospitality as a 'yoke', London was the 'life support system' of the Resistance (Bell 1997, 34). Part of that life support system were the various cultural institutions and publications working to keep true—free—French culture alive. The importance of cultural activity to the Allied war effort bears repeating. As Martyn Cornick remarks, '[i]t was recognised that maintaining the cultural effort was of crucial importance because, as many were to insist in the coming months, France was considered vital to the continuation of Western civilisation' (Cornick 2013, 350). British writers and politicians alike expressed this view. In 1940 the Francophile English novelist Charles Morgan described France as 'an idea necessary to civilization' (Bell 1997, 23; Holman 2000c, 54).¹¹ In 1941, in the pages of *La France libre* and in her closing speech to the international PEN congress on 'Literature and the World after the War', Storm Jameson emphasised the central role of Anglo-French cultural affinities in the construction of post-war European culture (Birkett 2009, 213–14). In 1943, T. S. Eliot likewise argued that a close association between French and English writers was crucial to the maintaining of European civilisation (cited in Holman 2000b, 211).¹² And in 1945, the Labour Foreign secretary Ernest Bevin told the House of Commons that France's 'history, culture and civilising influence' were much more important than her recent defeat (Bell 1997, 72). Two of the key publications that fulfilled this cultural mission were *La France libre*, the monthly journal of the Institut français, edited by André Labarthe and Raymond Aron, which published intellectual work of high quality, and *France*, the daily newspaper run by Charles Gombault, Pierre Comert, and Louis Lévy and published under the auspices of the Association des Français de Grande-Bretagne.¹³ Both were successful, with high circulation figures. While their mission was obviously to promote resistance, they were not direct emanations of Carlton Gardens and their editors were not in total sympathy with Gaullist politics. *France's* editorial team was left-leaning and suspicious of de Gaulle's political aspirations, whilst *La France libre* evolved towards a more neutral stance on Gaullist politics.

London's hospitality to the Free French exiles took various forms. It depended in part on existing French networks. The long-standing London community of émigrés provided support: the Association des Français de Grande-Bretagne and the French Institute on which *France* and *La France libre* depended were French organisations, and these journals had French staff (Tombs and Tombs 2007, 574; Cornick 2013, 349; Crémieux-Brilhac 1996, 190–95; Callu 2010; Morelle 2010). By providing the possibility of freedom of expression in French, these publications catered not only to strictly political and intellectual needs, but also to affective and social ones such as the maintaining of wartime morale, the connection with the language of the homeland, and the creation of community. Language was vital to the émigré communities: as Still remarks, 'forcing the other to speak my language even as they ask for asylum is hardly hospitable' (Still 2010, 19; Derrida and Dufourmantelle 2000, 15–16). However, all this was made possible only by the support and financing of French organisations and publications by the British government, which implied at least some control by the hosts. The French Institute was part-funded by Britain once it could no longer access funds from France. *La France libre* received crucial support from the Ministry of Information (MoI) in the form of an adequate supply of paper, and its distribution to French residents across the world was carried out by the Foreign Office and the British Council (Holman 2000c, 52–53; 2005, 211; 2008, 106; McLeod 1982, 122). Like the French broadcasters of 'Les Français parlent aux Français' who were employed not by de Gaulle but by the BBC, the staff of *France* were under the authority of the MoI (Bell 1974, 295–96). Undoubtedly, this material cooperation was reflected in intellectual cooperation, and *France* and *La France libre* functioned as fora for cultural exchange and dialogue. British intellectuals participated in *La France libre*'s founding call for expressions of interest, and *France*'s offices soon became a place of exchange for British and American journalists who came to discuss the situation in France (Cornick 2013, 355; Holman 2000c, 53; Gombault 1982, 36). But the French guests were ultimately operating within a framework that was to a significant extent defined and controlled by their hosts. Also important to London's hosting of French culture was a significant strain of Francophilia amongst London's literati, notably personified by Cyril Connolly, whose legendary adoration of France manifested itself in the publication in

Horizon of an enormous volume of articles about and from France in the war years and immediately afterwards.¹⁴ As well as publishing Kessel and a range of other Resistance prose writers, *Horizon* championed Resistance poetry, publishing examples in French by Louis Aragon and Paul Eluard. *Horizon* distributed Aragon's *Les Yeux d'Elsa*, collaborated with *La France libre* to publish his *Le Crève-cœur*, and was the distributor for Charlot's review *Fontaine* (Lewis 1998, 377). Connolly also made the first English translation of Vercors' *Le Silence de la mer*.¹⁵ Connolly's support for French Resistance writers was so extensive that it won him the award of the Légion d'honneur (Shelden 1989, 177).

These publications are the material traces of a model of hospitality that differs significantly from the situation in Algiers, discussed in Chap. 2. Wartime London as a zone of hospitality was not beset by colonial tensions, but it was characterised by the ambiguities and complexities of the structure and the material practices of hospitality. On the surface, Britain's hosting of the European resistance movements looks like a relationship of hospitality as we understand it in the day-to-day sense: the welcoming of people who enter our space needing both material shelter and moral support. But whilst shelter is initially offered to the refugee without the expectation of anything in return, such hospitality does not exclude the possibility of 'payback' (Still 2010, 17). The British motivation in hosting the European resistance was based on national interest as much as on altruism and a sense of international responsibility, the prior motivation being to win the war in order to protect Britain from the German aggressor, and it was for this reason that the MoI supported exile organisations and publications.¹⁶ Hospitality is by definition an ambivalent structure and a difficult practice which produces tensions and contradictions. This is why the concept offers a useful way of understanding the interrelated empathies and conflicts that characterised wartime translation zones. Hospitality can be as difficult to receive as to give, especially when the guest is accustomed to acting as host. A commitment to offer a safe haven from tyranny and the defence of the universal right to freedom and equality lies at the heart of French republicanism (Still 2010, 30). As one of Jean-Louis Curtis's characters proclaims in the 1947 war novel *Les Forêts de la nuit*, considered in Chap. 5, '[l]'hospitalité est une vieille tradition française' [hospitality is an old French tradition] (Curtis 1947, 241). Reading the Occupation as

the forcing of France to occupy the dominated position of the guest who is expected to play by the host's rules goes some way towards explaining why the experience was so terribly traumatic, since to be a guest is in this respect contrary to the very definition of French national identity. We should not expect intercultural and interlingual exchange, even among those fighting on the same side, to be free of conflict. Arthur Koestler described England as 'the enemy of our enemies' who 'perhaps one day [...] may become our ally' (Koestler 2006, 250), and Jean-Paul Sartre remarked that 'not the least of our troubles was that temptation to hate you' (Jean-Paul Sartre, quoted in Suleiman 2006, 24). As Sherry Simon points out, '[t]ranslations are rarely neutral events in a placid field of encounter' (Simon 2012, 3). Kessel's case is an excellent example of both the opportunities and difficulties presented by both French-language publishing and translation from French to English in wartime London.

Kessel and the British Literary Press: *La France libre*, *Horizon*, and the *Daily Express*

Kessel made quite a splash in the London press when he first arrived in England. According to his biographer, he became *the* Free French writer of the moment (Courrière 1985, 576). *France* devoted its front page to an eye-catching announcement of Kessel's arrival in London on 27 February 1943, and Kessel contributed several articles to *France*, some of which were picked up by the British press. Kessel's presence in the London literary field in 1943 took various forms, and I shall examine three examples: the publication of 'Ces gens-là sont merveilleux' in *La France libre* and subsequently in *La Revue du monde libre* and in *French Writing on English Soil*; the translation of extracts from 'Philippe Gerbier's Notebook' by Cyril Connolly in *Horizon*; and the publication of a translation of one of Kessel's articles from *France* in the *Daily Express*.

La France Libre

Franco-British cooperation is doubly inscribed into 'Ces gens-là sont merveilleux' since the material publication of the text is an example of

exactly what it depicts. The episode concerns a Free French dinner party where members of the interior Resistance are hosted by a British socialite who has been fostering Franco-British understanding through her *salon* since the days of the Entente Cordiale (Kessel 1943m, 265). By publishing this text in *La France libre*, Kessel was both documenting the relationship between the interior Resistance and London and participating in that relationship by using a Free French organ to disseminate his writing. A key theme in this episode is the ambivalence of British hospitality. At the sumptuous party, the first-person narrator, who is an active member of the Resistance bearing a strong resemblance to Kessel himself,¹⁷ feels morally compromised because he is enjoying pleasant surroundings and good food while his compatriots in France are facing danger and scarcity. The narrator reconciles his inner conflict by imaginatively bringing the suffering members of the interior Resistance into the space of London hospitality, the better to honour their sacrifices:

Je me trouvai enfin à l'aise dans le salon de Belgrave Square, parmi les lambris somptueux et les lances tremblantes des bougies qui se multipliaient magiquement dans les profonds miroirs. Et je pus ouvrir cette pièce et son luxe et sa tranquillité à ces petits coiffeurs, à ces étudiants, à cette Mathilde, à ce fils de famille disgracié. Et je les aimais – encore d'avantage – d'être là, traqués, mal vêtus, sous-nourris, transis et ternes avec le mystère humble et sacré de leur courage. (Kessel 1943m, 271)¹⁸

[I finally felt at ease in the room in Belgrave Square, amid the sumptuous panelling and the flickering candles which were magically reflected back again and again in the mirrors. And I could open that room and its luxury and its tranquillity to those little hairdressers, to those students, to Mathilde, to that disgraced son of the bourgeoisie. And I loved them – I loved them even more – for being there, badly clothed, under-nourished, numb with cold and dejected with the humble and sacred mystery of their courage.]

The topographical language of this passage is ambiguous: since the Resisters are clearly not literally present in London, the phrase 'ouvrir cette pièce' is purely symbolic and amplifies the discourse on deterritorialisation which, as we saw in Chap. 2, is characteristic of Kessel's account of the Resistance. By depicting a French narrator who finds accepting

British hospitality morally and politically troubling when comfort and safety are denied to those still fighting in France, Kessel articulates, but, crucially, rejects, potential accusations of compromise, self-preservation, and even desertion against those who spent the war outside of France. In line with the overall message of *L'Armée des ombres*, British hospitality is strongly validated here as an integral element of resistance understood in terms of unity and of Franco-British cooperation. Being an émigré is condoned, and the message is reinforced by the material context of publication.

The publication of 'Ces gens-là sont merveilleux' in *La France libre* resulted in the appearance of two further versions: in French in *La Revue du monde libre* in 1943 (Kessel 1943k) and in English in J. G. Weightman's collection *French Writing on English Soil* in 1945 (Kessel 1945c, d). The selection of this text by the Political Warfare Executive (PWE)—the secret wartime propaganda arm of the Foreign Office—for inclusion in the *Revue du monde libre* is proof that the image of British hospitality it contains was perceived to be supportive of Allied propaganda destined for occupied France.¹⁹ That PWE was aware of the sensitivity of the question of British hospitality to the Free French is equally clear from certain changes and excisions made to the *Revue du monde libre* version relating to the representation of food. References to the abundance and quality of the food enjoyed by the narrator in London are either omitted or attenuated: for example, the table which is 'servie magifiquement' [a magnificent spread] in the *France libre* version is simply 'bien servie' [a good spread] in *La Revue du monde libre* (Kessel 1943k, 40; 1943m, 265); a description of the British as 'ce peuple bien nourri, bien vêtu et si tranquille' [this well-fed, well-dressed and calm population] is absent; and a description of the narrator's interlocutor who stops talking for a moment to 's'abandonner à sa gourmandise en toute liberté, plénitude et innocence' [to indulge himself freely, fully and innocently] is also missing (Kessel 1943m, 268; 1943k, 42). Kay Chadwick's research into the discourse on food in BBC propaganda to occupied France and PWE's policy on this has demonstrated just how contentious the issue of food became as the war progressed. Throughout 1942 and 1943, Vichy's information minister Philippe Henriot was suggesting in radio broadcasts and newspaper articles that the blame for France's dire food situation should

be laid at the feet of the British. Specifically, in April 1942, Henriot had suggested that ‘well fed by the British, the French in London had forgotten those who suffered at home’ (Chadwick 2017, 99). The changes to the representation of food in *Revue du monde libre* version of ‘Ces gens-là sont merveilleux’ must be a direct response to this issue. If ‘Ces gens-là sont merveilleux’ was to legitimise British hospitality for the French in occupied France, it was clearly imprudent to overemphasise the material benefits of that hospitality in a text destined for a French readership suffering significant privation. In drawing Kessel’s text into the propaganda war with Vichy France, PWE needed to ensure that it contained no material that could be used against Britain by the other side. Whilst the transfer of ‘Ces gens-là sont merveilleux’ from London to occupied France is an example of what might be termed ‘inner ideological transfer’ (Wolf 2017, 69), since the text was circulating between the Allies, this does not mean that it could circulate without ideological intervention. In the pages of the *Revue du monde libre*, PWE and the RAF provided occupied France with French literature written by a hero of the interior Resistance, but in an edited form which ensured it was fully aligned with Britain’s propaganda priorities.

Two English translations of ‘Ces gens là sont merveilleux’ appeared in print within about a year of each other, one in the full text translated by Haakon Chevalier, first published in New York in June 1944 (Kessel 1944b), and one in Weightman’s *French Writing on English Soil*, published in London in 1945 (Kessel 1945c). These are translations of different source texts, since Chevalier translated the Schiffrin version while Weightman translated the *France libre* version. The publication of the extract in the Weightman collection occasioned a further shift in function which is illustrated not so much by the variants between the two translations, but rather by the paratextual apparatus Weightman provided for the post-war English reader. Weightman had been involved in Franco-British operations during the war as one of a minority of English native speakers who worked as announcers in French for the BBC (McLeod 1982, 6; Harvey 2008; Footitt and Tobia 2013, 74). After the war, he worked as a broadcaster, journalist, and academic, lecturing in French at Kings College, London, in the 1950s before being appointed to a Chair at Westfield College in 1963. Commenting in the Preface to

French Writing on English Soil on his criteria for choosing the texts in the collection, Weightman wrote:

They have been selected, in the first place, because they seem to have some permanent merit, and secondly because they throw some light on France and the French in the great crisis through which they have been, and still are, passing. It is hoped that the English reader who cannot cope with French in the original will find here some answer to the many questions he must have asked himself about France during the last five years. (Weightman 1945, 7)

In the immediate post-war period, the function of these texts, ‘the first accounts of French mentality during the war’ (Weightman 1945, 7), was to give the British an insight into the trauma their nearest neighbours had just lived through. The collection was concluded by Jean-Paul Sartre’s essay ‘Paris under the Occupation’, which had first appeared in *La France libre* in December 1944. The texts were presented by Weightman not in terms of their propaganda value, which was ephemeral and, in 1945, obviously obsolete, but as having lasting aesthetic value. As such, ‘Wonderful People’ became emblematic of the continuation of French culture even under such difficult circumstances. While ‘Ces-gens là sont merveilleux’ was an intervention in a live political question, ‘Wonderful People’ was a means of educating English readers about France’s war experiences. Weightman’s reference to the ‘great crisis’ which France is *still* experiencing suggests that the shift from propaganda to memory is not a straightforward instance of depoliticisation. The memory of the war was fundamental to the question of France’s post-war identity, and the Francophone and Francophile Weightman clearly hoped that a better understanding of France’s war on Britain’s part would have a positive effect on post-war reconstruction.

Comparing these three versions of ‘Ces gens-là sont merveilleux’ demonstrates that, as André Lefevere argues in his now classic study *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, translation interacts with other forms of rewriting, such as anthologisation, and that all forms of rewriting change the function of a given text. Manipulation serves power²⁰: we can see from these examples how rewriting serves specific

political agendas. Thanks to the variety of the forms of its dissemination, Kessel's 'Ces gens-là sont merveilleux' was able to validate the Allied discourse on British hospitality for the exiled French; to reinforce British French-language propaganda directed at those in occupied France; and to contribute to British understanding of France's war as the events passed from experience into memory.

Horizon

When Cyril Connolly published his translations of 'Phillipe Gerbier's Notebook' in *Horizon* in the autumn of 1943, he, like PWE and Weightman, had a particular end in view. His intention was to convey the daily violence of the European war to an English readership which was, in his view, insufficiently aware of the atrocities taking place beyond the British Isles. In his editorial preface, Connolly presented the extracts as examples of 'well-written and well-authenticated accounts of the reign of terror over the water' and announced the topic that interested him most: 'To the normal fears of peacetime, fear of losing one's job, property, social position, popularity, youth, health, etc., the Nazis have added the oldest and most terrible fear of all, that of torture' (Connolly 1943b, 221–22). He therefore chose extracts describing Gerbier's constantly renewed efforts to evade capture by the Nazis and Vichy, Gerbier's discovery of the existence of a Nazi torture chamber in a local hotel, a Resistance raid to free three comrades who have been arrested and have experienced a Nazi camp, and the imprisonment of the Resisters Lemasque and Felix which culminates in the torture and murder of the latter by the Gestapo. Connolly's interest in torture can be detected not only at the level of his selection of the texts, but also at the level of his lexical choices. On two occasions, he uses the word 'torture' in his translation where another word would be a more obvious choice: to translate 'tourment', in the context of an incident in a French concentration camp at Chateaubriant, and to translate 'terreur', in the context of assassinations of German soldiers by the Resistance and Nazi reprisals (Kessel 1943a, 180, 198; 1943r, 323, 332). Indeed, Haakon Chevalier's translation has 'torment' and 'terror' (Kessel 1944b, 101, 113). Connolly's anthologisation and translation

choices combine to draw *L'Armée des ombres* into the particular debate which Connolly highlighted as *Horizon's* theme that month.

The theme of torture in Kessel's book was further underscored by the presentation of the extracts alongside an excerpt from Arthur Koestler's novel *Arrival and Departure* entitled 'The Mixed Transport'.²¹ First published by Jonathan Cape in 1943, this novel was the third in a trilogy of which the second instalment, *Darkness at Noon*, a denunciation of the Soviet show trials of the 1930s, is the most famous. Koestler, a Hungarian Jewish exile who had escaped from France to London via North Africa and Lisbon in late 1940, was already well known to British readers (Saunders 2017, 62–63). A Mass Observation report identified *Scum of the Earth*, Koestler's account of his experiences in France between 1939 and 1940, as one of the most borrowed and most enjoyed titles in 1942 (Holman 2008, 52–53), and in 1943 he had won *Horizon's* readers' prize for an article on the RAF pilot and writer Richard Hillary (Lewis 1998, 376). 'The Mixed Transport' describes the deportation, selection and gassing of Jews in Poland. It was partly based on first-hand information communicated to Koestler by Jan Karski, the Polish émigré credited with being the first to attempt to draw the Allies' attention to what would become known as the Holocaust (Baron 2000; Cesarani 1998, 203; Wood and Jankowski 1994, 179). The appearance of Koestler's text in *Horizon* provoked controversy. The novelist Phyllis Bottome praised Koestler's intervention, but Osbert Sitwell questioned its veracity, prompting Koestler to respond in an angry article for the *New York Times* entitled 'On Disbelieving Atrocities' (Cesarani 1998, 208–209). Connolly supported Koestler because he believed it was part of *Horizon's* mission to 'put across the true horror of conditions in Europe' for an audience that had not experienced occupation (Connolly 1943a, 149). 'It is', Connolly says, 'very difficult in England to realise how intense is the onslaught across the Channel against the human body and the individual soul', and he describes 'an almost universal castration complex that makes us refuse to face the facts of torture' and 'an animal instinct for ignoring the suffering which does not concern us'. He therefore offered both Koestler's and Kessel's texts to British readers as important 'atrocious stories' which, even if they provoked scepticism, must not be ignored (Connolly 1943b, 222).

Connolly's choice of two works of autobiographical fiction to fulfil this purpose is of course indicative of the primarily literary orientation of *Horizon*, but it is also testament to the perceived power of imaginative literature to function as a soft form of political intervention in wartime Britain. As Valerie Holman's study of British wartime publishing demonstrates, both government and those involved in the publishing industry strongly believed in the propaganda value of culture and the power of books and literature to 'change readers and lead to victory' (Holman 2000a; 2008, 4). The MoI was convinced that cultural publications could contribute to the British war effort by boosting morale and disseminating propaganda discretely (Holman 2008, 105). PWE's dissemination of the *Revue du monde libre* is another important example. The advantages of fiction were twofold: literary writing has greater longevity than journalism, and its political content is not overtly propagandistic (Holman 2008, 95, 102).²² However, ascribing a propaganda function to literature clearly opens the door to manipulation through rewriting. Connolly, like PWE, was willing to host Kessel's text, but, in so doing, transformed it better to align it with his own agenda. Whilst the transformation is not exactly a betrayal of Kessel's original, the translator's intervention stands in tension with Connolly's emphasis on the authenticity of both Kessel's and Koestler's texts which he highlighted in his editorial as an important aspect of their value.

The Daily Express

It was not only by publishing extracts from *L'Armée des ombres* that Kessel made a name for himself in the wartime London press. As well as working on his novel, Kessel wrote and published a significant number of articles which appeared in both French and English. One such article, 'Quand les enfants de France chantent "Tipperary"' (Kessel 1943g), one of seven articles Kessel contributed to *France* during March and into April of 1943,²³ appeared in the *Daily Express* as "'The R.A.F. came to get you, not me", said the wounded French worker to the German' on 11 March 1943 (Kessel 1943f). Here, translatorial intervention is extensive: the (unidentified²⁴) translator frequently resorts to summary, addition

and omission. The article uses three anecdotes to prove to Kessel's London readers that the French in France do not detest the English, and that the perception in London that they do is a fabrication of Nazi and Vichy radio propaganda. The second concerns 'un agent secret Anglais' [an English secret agent] whose parachute comes down in a French peasant's garden and who in the *Daily Express* version is somewhat improbably transformed into 'a French-speaking English R.A.F. pilot'. This was probably an instance of censorship: under the Defence Regulations, the publication of military information that could affect the conduct of the war was prohibited, so it is not surprising that references to parachute drops and secret agents which hinted at the activities of the Special Operations Executive (SOE) should be deemed too sensitive for publication (Holman 2000c; 2008, 92). Indeed, the *Revue du monde libre* version of 'Ces gens-là sont merveilleux' also omits a reference to the return of a Resister to France (Kessel 1943k, 42; 1943m, 269), and Connolly omits references to the parachuting of British personnel into France in his translations of 'Philippe Gerbier's Notebook' by excising several whole paragraphs and by using euphemisms (e.g. Kessel 1943a, 144; 1943o, 228).

Translation is one of the discursive forms through which censorship operates (Kuhiwczak et al. 2011; Billiani 2009), and these examples are instances of self-censorship. British wartime press and publishing censorship was voluntary and functioned on the basis of advice given to editors and publishers. Committed to defending freedom in the face of totalitarianism, the British authorities balked at forms of censorship that would appear anti-democratic, and, as a result, editors and publishers were left to interpret the guidance provided by the government for themselves, which inevitably produced inconsistencies (Holman 2005, 200; 2008, 48, 93–99, 248). It is interesting to note that the reference to the parachutist was not removed from 'Quand les enfants de France chantent "Tipperary"' when it appeared in French in the newspaper *France*. This suggests that sensitive information excised in the host language could circulate in a foreign language—even one that many members of the host culture could read. In their analysis of BBC foreign language broadcasting, Footitt and Tobia describe how the British 'sought to present a common and consistent message, a message which was originally conceived and written in English – an English-written master text – and subsequently translated

into each foreign language' (Footitt and Tobia 2013, 78). They also made use of the material that originated in the exile community and in its languages, which was modified in translation. However, comparing English translations of Free French texts with their French source texts suggests that the circulation in London of foreign-language material emanating from the governments in exile constituted a challenge to the British government's attempts to control the flow of information about the war.

In the *Daily Express* article, the most obvious example of translational manipulation is the title. The French version, 'Quand les enfants de France chantent "Tipperary"', suggests a sharing of culture and focuses on affect rather than ideology by evoking French children singing an English song. The English version, "'The R.A.F. came to get you, not me", said the wounded French worker to the German', is an overt and unambiguous validation of the Allied bombing of occupied France and an intervention in the debate about the civilian casualties which resulted. Specifically, the 'wounded French worker' addresses the problem of French casualties of the Allied bombing of the Renault factory at Billancourt on the outskirts of Paris on 3 March 1942. This event had posed a significant challenge to the BBC, which sought to justify the bombing and to present the casualties as victims of the Germans rather than the Allies, countering the extensive Vichy propaganda resulting from the raid that suggested that the RAF were targeting French civilians (Chadwick 2015, 434–45; Knapp 2014, 241–73). The argument in defence of the RAF is already present in Kessel's article, but it is significant that the translation places it in the most prominent position possible: the title. In the article, when two French-speaking German soldiers suggest that the English are responsible for the French worker's injuries, the wounded Frenchman retorts: 'Ce n'est pas pour nous que les Anglais sont venus, mais pour vous' (translated in the *Daily Express* as 'The English didn't come for me, but for you'), and he goes off on his stretcher shouting 'Vive l'Angleterre!' [Long live England!] (Kessel 1943f, g). Kessel also addresses the question of French casualties of Allied bombs in *L'Armée des ombres*. In the novel, the raid in question is the subsequent bombing of the Renault factories by the Americans in April 1943 (Knapp 2014, 90–98). The scene in *L'Armée des ombres* takes place in the Paris metro and the worker's attitude is validated as an act of patriotic resistance by the gift of a Cross of Lorraine:

Le lendemain du bombardement des usines Renault par les Américains, nous avons entendu dans le métro un ouvrier de ces mêmes usines, et qui avait le bras en écharpe, jubiler ouvertement des résultats du raid. Mon compagnon a glissé quelque chose dans la main valide de l'ouvrier. C'était une croix de Lorraine. (Kessel 1943a, 181)

[The day after the bombing of the Renault factories by the Americans, in the metro we heard a worker from those factories, who had his arm in a sling, openly rejoicing over the results of the raid. My companion slipped something into the worker's uninjured hand. It was a cross of Lorraine.]

The translation of the body of the article in the *Daily Express* reinforces the message contained in its title through an addition to the conclusion where Kessel reaffirms French 'tendresse' ('warm feeling') and 'amitié' ('friendship') for the English: 'Je connais cent autres faits de cette nature, et de plus héroïques et de plus romanesques' (Kessel 1943g) becomes 'I know many stories of this sort. Every day Frenchmen risk their lives in many ways to help the British' (Kessel 1943f, my emphasis). As in the case of Connolly's emphasis on torture and the *Revue du monde libre's* removal of references to the abundance of good food in London, the translated article refocuses the message of the source text the better to align it with the target publication's priorities. The *Daily Express* had reported the success of Bomber Command's raid on the Renault factory in a light-hearted and celebratory tone under the title 'A Night out in Paris' on 5 March 1942 (Knapp 2013, 46). This is not to say that the translation of Kessel's article contradicts the basic premise of his message about the Resistance. Rather, the multiple versions of Kessel's fictional and journalistic texts work together to repeat the key message of unity we have already identified as central to *L'Armée des ombres*. Nonetheless, the profusion of textual variants in both English and French which resulted from the intervention in the publishing process of several agents with subtly different priorities suggests that a veneer of unity was being applied over a base that was split along political faultlines. Reading translationally shows that the priorities of the British hosts and their French guests could never be completely identical.

The multiple publications and translations of Kessel's work in London reveal a great deal about the nature of the relationship between the British hosts and their Free French guests. The MoI's role in publications such as

La France libre shows that hosting is not an exclusively altruistic practice but is determined by self-interest and power relations. ‘Ces gens-là sont merveilleux’ demonstrates that hospitality is traumatic even for the guest who is convinced of its necessity and value. That this trauma remains unresolved even to this day becomes clear from the comparison of accounts of the London Free French publications in the work of contemporary British and French historians. Bell states categorically that ‘*France* was founded and financed by the Ministry of Information, and remained under its authority’ (Bell 1974, 296), and Tim Brooks describes the small-format version of *La France libre* as ‘undeniably British’ in origin (Brooks 2007, 134). While French accounts do refer to MoI subsidies, they pass over the question of MoI control, preferring instead to emphasise the defining role of French intellectuals—Charles Gombault, Pierre Comert, Louis Lévy, André Labarthe and Raymond Aron—in the creation of these publications. In contrast to Bell’s account, the *Dictionnaire de la France libre* affirms that *France* ‘voit le jour sous l’impulsion de trois journalistes proches de la gauche parlementaire avant la guerre’ [was created by three journalists close to the parliamentary left before the war] and makes no mention of the MoI (Callu 2010; see also Crémieux-Brilhac 1996, 190–95). Reading Free French texts translationally expands our understanding of the frequently anomalous nature of British censorship and shows that translation shifts redefine ideological priorities even in cases of ‘inner ideological transfer’. Even the compliant guest (text) is forced to conform to the rules of the host (culture). The translation zone is a zone of *critical* engagement: is a generous space which hosts the foreign, but it does so on its own terms.

***The Army of Shadows* in New York: Jacques Schiffrin, Haakon Chevalier, and Kessel’s American Reception**

Kessel had rejected the possibility of American emigration in the autumn of 1940. His brother Georges secured a visa and escaped to the USA in September, but Kessel wrote to him before his departure to explain that he had decided to return from Lisbon, where he had fled after Pétain signed the armistice with Hitler, to France (Courrière 1985, 540–41). As

matters turned out, Kessel found himself in America in the last weeks of 1943 under very different circumstances. In London, he had met with the cinema impresario André Bernstein, whom he had known since the mid-1930s. Bernstein, now Carlton Gardens' press officer and *France's* theatre critic and publicity man, had accompanied Kessel on his trip to Algiers in the spring of 1943 (Courrière 1985, 572, 585–56). Bernstein sold the film rights for *L'Armée des ombres* to the British film production company Two Cities, which produced, amongst other titles, the classic morale-boosting war film *In Which We Serve* (1942). The project resulted in a further trip to Algiers to secure the support of Free France for the film, followed by a trip to Hollywood, to negotiate a possible co-production between Free France and America. Since this was an official visit, Kessel travelled diplomatic class. The film project came to nothing, but the trip was not fruitless, since it resulted in an American publishing contract for the French version of *L'Armée des ombres* (Courrière 1985, 590–93). An English translation of the whole text by Haakon Chevalier, published by Knopf, would follow.

Jacques Schiffrin

The American French-language edition of *L'Armée des ombres* resulted from Kessel's meeting the émigré publisher Jacques Schiffrin in New York during his trip in the last weeks of 1943. They were already at least indirectly acquainted, Kessel having worked with Jacques' brother Simon Schiffrin in the mid-1930s on the talking film adaptation of his First World War novel *L'Equipage* (Courrière 1985, 592, 447–48). Schiffrin, a Russian Jew, had emigrated to Paris after the First World War, and in 1936 began to work for the prestigious publishing house Gallimard, which then took over the esteemed scholarly series known as the Editions de la Pleïade which Schiffrin had founded. In 1940, Schiffrin was dismissed from his post at Gallimard because he was Jewish. He fled south and escaped from France to the USA in the Spring of 1941 with the help of the American Francophile expatriate Varian Fry (Schiffrin 1999, 15–22). In New York, Schiffrin first began to publish French works in a collection under his own name, then collaborated with the German

Jewish émigré publisher Kurt Wolff, who had also escaped occupied France thanks to Varian Fry, having previously fled Germany for Paris in 1933 (Edelman 2009). Together they published French- and German-language titles under the aegis of Pantheon Books. The exile Schiffrin, not unlike the *pied-noir* Charlot, is an example of the reversibility of the concept of *hôte*, which in French means both host and guest (Still 2010, 167–71; Derrida and Dufourmantelle 2000, 125). As a guest in America with a complex cultural and linguistic background, Schiffrin was well placed to host foreign-language texts in an Anglophone context. John B. Hench suggests that émigrés such as Schiffrin had a ‘disproportionately high impact’ on American cultural and intellectual life, introducing ‘new and different standards of literary taste, cosmopolitanism, and strong links with major players and institutions in the Old World’ (Hench 2010, 16, 18). It is not an overstatement to claim that this generation of émigré guests/hosts revolutionised the publishing industry and that their capacity to do so was closely related to their identity as ‘transnational thinkers’ and ‘world citizens’:

they did not feel bound to publish only in the English language. Internationalists all, they saw nothing unusual in having Russian books translated into English by Jewish Russian emigrants to Israel or in having children’s books co-published with a Czechoslovak printer/publisher. They all spoke at least two other languages, and sometimes four or five. (Graham 2009, 209)

Like those of Charlot in Algiers, the publishing activities of expatriates in America in the interwar and wartime periods were characterised by intellectual hospitality. What particularly distinguished their contribution was their conception of the publisher’s role as an intellectual partner to the writer. Émigré publishers were pro-active in their search for new and interesting works because they considered themselves to hold a serious cultural responsibility and were experts in the topics their lists covered. So much more than commercial businessmen—though they certainly were entrepreneurial—they were ‘active participants at the front-lines of intellectual activity and knowledge creation’ (Abel 2009, 5). One of the specialities of Schiffrin’s wartime collection was to make

French Resistance texts available to French émigré readers. As well as *L'Armée des ombres*, he published Louis Aragon's poetry and Vercors' *Le Silence de la mer* (Loyer 2005, 100).²⁵

Schiffirin's edition of *L'Armée des ombres* is yet another example of the ways in which rewriting orients texts towards the dominant ideological priorities of the host country. This is evident from a series of alterations to the novel's preface.²⁶ In the Charlot and Penguin editions, Kessel's rejection of Pétain is complete and unambiguous: 'Plus rien n'est valable de l'ordre imposé par l'ennemi et par le Maréchal. Plus rien ne compte. Plus rien n'est vrai' [Nothing of the regime imposed by the enemy and by the Marshall is valid. Nothing counts anymore. Nothing is true anymore] (Kessel 1943a, 10; 1945a, 6). In the Schiffirin edition, this section is omitted, and the only reference to Vichy is more concise and politically neutral: 'A la surface, Vichy continue de jouer un gouvernement' [On the surface, Vichy continues to play at being a government] (Kessel 1944a, 10). This latter sentence, which is not in the prefaces to the Charlot or Penguin editions, does appear in the version of the preface published by Charlot in *L'Arche*, but here the sense is quite different because the passage just cited from the Charlot edition which begins 'Plus rien n'est valable...' is also included (Kessel 1944f, 71). In the *L'Arche* version, therefore, the notion that Vichy is a puppet government reinforces the idea stated previously that the Nazi regime and the Vichy regime are equivalent and are both illegitimate. By contrast, in the Schiffirin edition, which only contains the idea of Vichy as a puppet government, the identification of Pétain with the enemy is avoided and the emphatic repetition of 'plus rien n'est valable'/'plus rien ne compte'/'plus rien n'est vrai' is omitted. Given that the French version published by Penguin in 1945 carries the same preface as the Charlot edition, and that the Schiffirin edition appeared in March 1944, seven months before the USA was finally persuaded to recognise de Gaulle as France's legitimate leader in October 1944, it is difficult not to read the reference to Vichy in the Schiffirin preface in relation to the unbroken diplomatic relationship between the USA and the Vichy regime. In the Schiffirin preface (and therefore also in the Knopf translation), the idea that Vichy continues, even if only superficially and in the form of a charade, to be the government of France marks America's ongoing suspicion of Free France, Roosevelt's famous

antipathy towards de Gaulle, and the consequently belated formal recognition of de Gaulle's provisional government by the Allies (Bell 1997, 51–54; Knapp 2007, 211–21; Loyer 2005, 172–74; Nettelbeck 1991, 167–76).

The Schiffrin preface also contains some significant additions. In the Schiffrin and *L'Arche* versions, the documentary function of the novel is emphasised over its aesthetic qualities when Kessel states that his motivation in writing was simply the need to describe the Resistance: 'Il faut que quelque chose soit dit de la Résistance française, même si cela est dit pauvrement' [Something must be said about the French Resistance, even if it is poorly said] (Kessel 1944a, 9; 1944f, 71). The impossibility of appropriate expression is linked to the mythological character of the Resistance:

Et je sais que je n'ai pas eu le don de dire comme il le fallait cet unique état de grâce, ce passage de tout un peuple dans la pureté souterraine, comme les sources invisibles qui filtrent au flanc du coteau... (Kessel 1944a, 11; 1944f, 72)

[And I know that I have not had the gift of describing as it should be described this unique state of grace, this passage of a whole people into underground purity, like the invisible springs which flow up through the hillside...]

This identification of the members of the interior Resistance with French territory—they are like the pure springs which flow beneath the French soil—concludes an expanded section in the Schiffrin preface, which is not in the *L'Arche* version, in which two additional paragraphs describe 'ces Français aimables, faciles à vivre et tellement satisfaits de leur terre et tellement civilisés' [these amiable French, who are easy to live with and are so content with their land and so civilised] who are now in concentration camps or facing firing squads or torture but still do not yield to the enemy, and French women, reputedly 'frivolous' but now admired even by their executioners as liaison agents and organisers of many heroic acts of resistance. This hyperbolic validation of the interior Resistance is set alongside a concluding section which validates London as the place where Kessel has truly understood the Resistance: 'c'est à

Londres que j'ai eu les clartés les plus vives sur la Résistance française' [It is in London that I have been most vividly enlightened about the French Resistance] (Kessel 1944a, 11). The Schiffrin preface ends with an evocation of the 'Ces gens-là sont merveilleux' section of the text, indicating its pivotal role in the narrative. The contrast between the luxurious environment of the Free French dinner party and the dangerous situations the Resisters will face when they return to France is highlighted. London is now described as 'le croisement, le carrefour des destinées les plus singulières de la France' [the intersection, the crossroads of France's strangest destinies] (Kessel 1944a, 11), suggesting a resolution of territorial contradictions and ambivalences in this section of the novel, discussed in Chap. 2. The Schiffrin preface thus restates and reinforces the synthesis of the (mythologised) interior Resistance and the Allied war effort led by the British, while making an apparent concession to American political sensibilities about Pétain and de Gaulle. Published in March 1944, the Schiffrin edition appeared well before the Liberation of France and must therefore be understood as an intervention into the ongoing political and military struggle.

Haakon Chevalier

The English translation of *L'Armée des ombres* by Haakon Chevalier appears to have resulted from a combination of political and literary commitments, personal connections and happenstance. Chevalier had started his career in the French department of the University of California at Berkeley in the late 1920s, specialising in contemporary left-wing literature, of which he became a prolific critic and translator. Chevalier endorsed leftist French political literature (*littérature engagée*), arguing that men become fully human only through solidarity and collective action, and that a literature characterised by vitality is one that recognises and fosters solidarity within a contemporary social context and rejects individualist introspection (e.g. Chevalier 1936, 1943). Chevalier was a great advocate of André Malraux, welcoming his Spanish Civil War novel *L'Espoir* as evidence of a shift in French literature from individualism to 'a conception of freedom as the product of collective experience'

(Chevalier 1940, 37, 46). At Berkeley, Chevalier attended Communist Party meetings, raised money for leftist causes, participated in rallies in support of Republican Spain, was actively involved in union politics, helping to found a branch of the American Federation of Teachers, and worked with the College Faculties Committee of the Communist Party of California (Herken 2002, 29–32). There is no doubt then that Chevalier was a man of the left. He described his politics of the later 1930s as ‘animated by a candid faith in the efficacy of reason and persuasion, in the operation of democratic processes and in the ultimate triumph of justice’ and maintained that ‘[i]n a world in which evil forces exerted their cruel sway, we held high the banner of justice, freedom and equality, asserted the sanctity of human rights and proclaimed the cause of peace’ (Chevalier 1966, 19).

During a visit to Paris in 1933, Chevalier met leading left-wing French writers including Malraux, Aragon, and André Gide, which prompted him to translate Malraux’s *La Condition humaine* and Aragon’s *Les Cloches de Bâle*, and on a return visit in 1936 he met French union and communist leaders (Chevalier 1966, 7–9). During the war, he met French exiled intellectuals in New York, and began to translate their work (Chevalier 1966, 36–40). In addition to *Army of Shadows*, in 1944 Chevalier also translated works by Denis de Rougement (*The Devil’s Share*, also published by Pantheon), André Maurois (*Seven Faces of Love*, published by Didier), Salvador Dali (*Hidden Faces*, published by The Dial Press), and Jules Romains (Chevalier translated a new author’s introduction to *Death of a Nobody*, published by Knopf). Chevalier thus played a significant role in the transmission of French exile literature to an Anglophone audience in the zone of hospitality in New York during the war years. This role depended not only on his function as a translator, but also on his academic and political interests. He is a good example of what Reine Meylaerts calls the ‘multipositionality’ of the translator. Meylaerts points out that a translatorial habitus is rarely singular, since translators generally also fulfil other, related functions in the literary field (Meylaerts 2013). This is equally true of Cyril Connolly and J. G. Weightman, who translated Kessel in London. Bringing *Army of Shadows* to an American readership was part of a variegated pattern of literary activity undertaken by Chavelier, stemming from his interest in progressive contemporary

French literature as a teacher and literary critic as well as a translator. It was thanks to a particular constellation of political and intellectual interests and experiences, as well as his bilingualism, that Chevalier was well positioned to help popularise French cultural resistance to Nazism and Vichy amongst American readers.

Though Chevalier has received very little attention for his work as a writer and translator, he is famous for his role in what became known as the 'Chevalier Affair'. This was an important episode in the story of the FBI's suspicions about the political sympathies of the nuclear scientist Robert Oppenheimer, who was accused of being involved in Soviet espionage. Colleagues at Berkeley in the 1930s, Chevalier and Oppenheimer's shared left-wing commitments underpinned their friendship.²⁷ The FBI, who knew of their communist connections, had first become seriously interested in Oppenheimer's politics in March 1941. From this moment, the question of Oppenheimer's security clearance dominated the history of the development of the nuclear bomb in the USA. In August 1943, Oppenheimer told the US head of counter-intelligence Boris Pash that he had been approached by Soviet agents for nuclear secrets. In December, in an interview with Colonel Leslie Groves, the military head of the Manhattan Project, Oppenheimer claimed that Chevalier had acted as a go-between linking Soviet agents to American nuclear scientists, an idea which Chevalier himself dismissed as a 'cock and bull story' (Herken 2002, 107–115; Chevalier 1966, 144). Chevalier maintained that although he had been approached by the British communist scientist George Eltenton, he did not believe the approach to be serious and in any case had answered him with 'an unqualified "No"' (Herken 2002, 161; Chevalier 1966, 52–55). No further action was taken, but when Oppenheimer was called before a Personnel Security Board hearing in April 1954, the Affair was key to the proceedings. Chevalier himself was not called to testify, but vehemently denied in the press that he ever approached Oppenheimer for secrets. As a result of the hearing, Oppenheimer was declared to be a security risk and his clearance was not renewed. The hearing underscored, but did not resolve, the question of Chevalier's possible connections with wartime nuclear espionage. By this time, Chevalier had emigrated to France in order to escape both an unhappy marriage and the climate of anti-communist persecution in

post-war America (Herken 2002, 286–97, 229–30). He believed the ‘Chevalier Affair’ had blocked his academic career in the USA (Chevalier 1966, 78–84).²⁸

The series of events that led to the Chevalier Affair began around the time Chevalier was translating Kessel. Chevalier had taken a sabbatical from Berkeley in July 1943 and was sent to New York by the West Coast Office of War Information (Herken 2002, 55; 79, 93–94). It is for this reason that an experienced literary translator with an academic interest in contemporary French literature was in New York at the time Schiffrin was preparing to publish *L'Armée des ombres*. In New York, Chevalier recalled, he ‘saw so many people [...] that it is hard to remember them all’, but he did remember translating Kessel whilst he was working for various magazines and publishers. He also recalled meeting Pierre Lazareff, Kessel’s former boss on *Paris-Soir* (Chevalier 1966, 55–58). Chevalier’s political and aesthetic interests were certainly consonant with a book advocating unity between the Free French and the non-aligned and communist interior Resistance. It is reasonable therefore to imagine that Chevalier’s willingness to translate Kessel had an activist dimension. In the spring of 1943, Chevalier had written to his son that he did not wish to remain ‘a bystander’, but wanted to retain ‘some freedom of action’ in order to use his skills effectively for the war effort (cited in Herken 2002, 79). Literary translation may have offered Chevalier the opportunity for activism on the cultural front without compromising his intellectual freedom. Chevalier translated *L'Armée des ombres* for the prestigious American publisher Knopf.²⁹ Founded in 1915 and owned by husband-and-wife partnership Alfred and Blanche Knopf, the firm had always had an internationalist orientation and a strong interest in foreign fiction. This aspect of the business was spearheaded by Blanche, who had a particular interest in French literature and secured rights for works by Albert Camus, Simone de Beauvoir, and Jean-Paul Sartre as well as other important contemporary French novelists (Hench 2010, 163–64).

Chevalier’s translation of Kessel demonstrates that a translator’s personal political commitments are not necessarily manifested in politically or ideologically motivated interventionist translation strategies at the textual level. *Army of Shadows* presents a direct contrast with the examples of manipulation we have identified in the publication and translation of

Kessel's work in the London publications. Chevalier's is a close translation in which little if any obvious ideological manipulation is in evidence. He does not, for example, take the opportunity to highlight or amplify Kessel's depictions of the positive contributions of communists to the Resistance. The activist dimension of Chevalier's translation activity manifested itself in his choice of texts rather than his choice of words. As Maria Tymoczko points out, translation is an act as well as a text (Tymoczko 2006, 455). And as Chesterman suggests, the translator's 'telos', or personal motivations, includes not only their political ideology and ethics but the reasons why they work in a certain field and translate a certain text (Chesterman 2009, 17). Bringing a particular text into a particular language at a particular time is an ideological practice even in the absence of 'shockingly apparent' translation shifts, omissions, or additions (Tymoczko 2006, 446). The ideological nature of translation is not limited to lexical alterations, such as the omission or substitution of sexual references in translations of *Lysistrata* or the attenuation of negative references to Germans in Anneliese Schütz's translation of Anne Frank's diary, which Lefevere discusses (Lefevere 2017, 31–32, 50). Chevalier's political commitment to the cause of French Resistance was made manifest in the sheer volume of French exile literature he translated in 1944.

This is not to suggest that Chevalier is invisible in *The Army of Shadows*. The translator's visibility is highlighted in cases where more than one translation of a source text exists, since different translations always contain numerous lexical and syntactical differences. As Hermans says, 'a translation [...] will always have a translator's presence, and therefore a translator's subject position, inscribed in it' (Hermans 2007, 27). In *Army of Shadows*, Chevalier's subject positions as an American and as a literary critic are much more evident than his position as a communist fellow-traveller. Certain Americanisms are obvious if we compare his translation with Weightman's: for example, where Chevalier has, 'For two cents he would have posted the paper in his window', Weightman chooses, 'He was almost ready to stick it up in his window' (Kessel 1944b, 68; 1945c, 52). More interesting is the similarity between Chevalier's translation choices and his later novelistic style, which suggests that for him translation functioned as an apprenticeship to novel writing.³⁰ His first novel, *For Us The Living*, was published in 1949, by which time Chevalier had a

substantial track record of translations behind him. The book is a crime thriller with a strongly leftist orientation conveyed through the background of American academia and the labour movement of the 1930s. Affinities between Chevalier's translational style and his fiction writing are evident in the way he treats accounts of violence by vigilante characters. In Connolly's translation, Felix's description of killing two SS officers with the help of two local men is implausibly polite, and the retention of a term in French implies an educated readership:

'It was a *nice bit of work*,' said Felix, 'but to *speak frankly*, *my heart wasn't quite in it*. These *swine* had really got some *courage*. And that look when they understood me *nearly turned my stomach*. We hid our arms and those of the S.S. and went to have a coffee in the bistro where the Boches were going. I wondered how my postman and harness-maker would react, because I still *feel sick* myself, though I've seen some bad business. Well, as for them, *they took their coffee quietly* and began to snore on the *banquette*.' (Kessel 1943o, 240, my emphasis)

In comparison, Chevalier's slang-ridden American reads more like hardboiled crime fiction:

'It was a *clean job*,' said Felix, 'but *between you and me*, it *sort of upset me*. Those *bastards* really had *guts*. And that look they gave when they realised what was up *sort of hit me in the stomach*. We hid our arms and those of the S.S. and went and had coffee in the bistro where the Boches were going. I wondered how the postman and the harness-maker would react because I myself, though I have seen some pretty bad things, still felt a little *yellow about the gills*. Well, by Jove, *they swallowed the black juice perfectly calmly* and before long they were both snoring on the *bench*'. (Kessel 1944b, 101, my emphasis)

In a prison scene in *For Us The Living*, O'Doul describes how he 'bumped off this American Express wise-guy', using a string of slang expressions of the type Chevalier places in Felix's mouth in the passage just cited:

Religious *bastard*, too. Got a fine funeral. Bet his old woman *paid pretty* for it. [...] I just meant *to wing him*. I shoulda known he couldn'a done nothin'

with that there *gat*, even if he'd a pointed it straight at me. (Chevalier 1949, 215, my emphasis)

Perhaps it was partly through translation that Chevalier developed an ability to mark social identities plausibly through direct speech, a skill which would serve him well when he came to write fiction directly in English. Certainly, a line of development can be traced from Chevalier's endorsements of left-wing French political fiction in his literary criticism of the 1930s, through his translation work, and on into his own committed fiction written in the post-war years. Indeed, one contemporary reviewer of *For Us the Living* titled his article 'Trials of Translator Turned Novelist' (Spinks 1949). While this is not the place to explore Chevalier's novels in detail, it is worth noting that his multipositionality as a teacher, critic, writer and translator lends a cultural and aesthetic significance to *Army of Shadows* which far exceeds the question which interests us here, that of the international circulation of fictional representations of France's experience of the Occupation. The repercussions of the wartime translation zones were diverse and by no means limited to the war years.

Kessel's American Reception

Whilst ideological manipulation is not a significant feature of Chevalier's translation, the same cannot be said for the book's reception. It was in paratextual material that the most significant ideological manipulations of Kessel's novel took place in America. We have already identified an instance of paratextual rewriting in the preface to Schiffrin's French-language edition. Reviewers of the novel and its translation also rewrote the text in relation to the ideological priorities of the host country. The New York translational zone of hospitality was perhaps even more ideologically fraught than that of London. There were significant divergences of political opinion between the New York French émigrés: as Nettelbeck observes, 'their stormy and vitriolic squabbles would become legendary' (Nettelbeck 1991, 4; see also 163–80). New York French-language journals developed in an uneasy and sometimes openly conflictual relationship with Gaullist politics. *Pour la victoire* was spearheaded by Geneviève

Tabouis, who was by no means a Gaullist, but this publication nevertheless functioned for a period as ‘a Free French mouthpiece’ and ‘a significant extension of de Gaulle’s London Network’ (Nettelbeck 1991, 79). Despite this, *France-Amérique* was created in the Spring of 1943 as a Gaullist organ in opposition to *Pour la victoire* (Nettelbeck 1991, 166). Schiffrin began to advertise *L’Armée des ombres* in *Pour la victoire* from 1 January 1944, and it featured in Schiffrin’s advertisements throughout that year and on in to 1945. The book’s publication was announced in *France-Amérique* on 21 May 1944.

The dates of publication of the Schiffrin edition and the Knopf translation in the spring and early summer of 1944 meant that the novel was reviewed in the weeks following the D-Day landings on 6 June and was discussed in detail in the press as Operation Overlord progressed. Kessel’s novel was therefore drawn into the political controversies occasioned by the Allied Liberation of France. Reviews dating from May and into mid-June in both exile and domestic publications raised the contentious issue of the Allies’ relationship with de Gaulle and the interior Resistance, with critics using the novel as an opportunity to contest hostility to de Gaulle and suspicion about the Resistance:

On a honte d’avoir à prouver encore et contre des Français que la Résistance a choisi de Gaulle pour la représenter. La mort de Médéric,³¹ venu de France à l’Assemblée d’Alger, parti d’Alger pour la torture, devrait clore le débat qui n’existe qu’à l’étranger. (P.A.W. 1944)

[It is shameful that we have to prove yet again, and against French opinions, that the Resistance has chosen de Gaulle as its representative. The death of Médéric, who came from France to the Assembly in Algiers and then left Algiers to face torture, should end this debate which only exists abroad.]

In this review from *France-Amérique*, *L’Armée des ombres* is defined as a text which addresses a foreign debate—the question of de Gaulle’s legitimacy as the leader of the Resistance—that is irrelevant on French soil. This review turns the novel into a response to the political disagreements with which the French exile community in New York was riven. Reviewing

the translation in the *New York Herald* on 19 June, Lewis Gannett addressed the same question from the American perspective:

And though Mr Kessel nowhere writes politics, the American reader can hardly forget that he is writing of that De Gaullist France which our government still cold-shoulders. (Gannett 1944)

Orville Prescott's review of the translation in the *New York Times*, also on 19 June, makes the same point, highlighting the heroism of the French who are still defending their territory:

And it is with such heroes that the United States and British Governments have not yet been able to reach an official agreement as to the conduct of the war that is once again being waged by armies not of shadows upon their soil. (Prescott 1944)

As events progressed, the reviewers' discourse changed. Writing in the *Chicago Daily Law Bulletin* of 27 June, Johnnie Doe recommends *Army of Shadows* to those 'who would like to know how it is that the French resistance movement is organised to assist the Allied invasion' (Doe 1944). In July, reviewers began to link Kessel's novel explicitly to Eisenhower's special communiqué of 17 June 1944, which highlighted the effective contributions of the sabotage activities of the 'Army of the French Forces of the Interior' to the Liberation (Eisenhower 1944). The *St Louis Star Times* and the *Chicago Sun* explained that the 'Army of Shadows' was 'the French underground (le maquis) which, according to a recent special communiqué [*sic*] from Gen. Eisenhower's headquarters, has rendered us signal services during the invasion' (Anon 1944; Joesten 1944).³² Obviously keen to stress the topicality of Kessel's book, Knopf quoted Eisenhower's communiqué prominently under the heading 'French Resistance as it Really Is' in a full-page advertisement for the novel which appeared at the end of July (Knopf 1944). With the shift in the Allied attitude to the interior Resistance, the function of Kessel's novel in the American press changed from contestation to affirmation.

Orville Prescott's review of *Army of Shadows* in the *New York Times* also points to the emerging Cold War politics of the USA. Prescott strongly

implied that American anti-communism was threatening to obstruct the war effort by hampering Allied cooperation with the interior Resistance.³³ After a thoroughly positive account of Kessel's book and the heroism of the French Resistance, the final third of Prescott's review, entitled 'Communist Discipline Stern', positively highlights the communists' contribution to the Resistance. Communists are 'the most expert at secret organization' and display 'ironclad' discipline (Prescott 1944). Other reviewers made passing reference to the communist Resistance, notably by quoting Gabriel Péri's famous affirmation that 'We are building tomorrows that will sing', which Gerbier quotes to Legrain in the novel (Kessel 1944b, 19; Rolo 1944; Gannet 1944), and by quoting the Baron who tells Gerbier that he prefers 'une France rouge à une France qui rougit' [a red France to a blushing France] (Kessel 1944b, 79; Boyle 1944; Joesten 1944; Gruin 1944; Sapleter 1944). However, when the *New York Times* printed a translation of one of Kessel's articles in August 1944, American anti-communism appears to have prompted an instance of censorship. Kessel's 'Return to Paris: Thoughts of a Frenchman as he flew over the city that is the very symbol of liberty' (27 August 1944) (Kessel 1944i) is a translation of 'Paris, la source des libertés humaines', published in *France* in London three days later (30 August 1944) (Kessel 1944h). The French text concludes with a series of anecdotes illustrating Resistance heroism amongst people from a wide range of backgrounds: a butcher-boy, a baron, a Jewish landlord, a student, an elderly Frenchwoman, and, finally, a communist. The *New York Times* version omits the anecdote about the communist. Whatever the views expressed by its chief book reviewer in June 1944, the *New York Times* evidently felt it necessary at the end of August to censor Kessel's depiction of a communist as the symbol of human liberty. It is doubtless significant that Prescott's review, which celebrates the communist Resistance and contests American anti-communism, predates the Liberation of Paris by more than two months, whilst Kessel's 'Return to Paris' appeared in the immediate aftermath of the Liberation when attention was turning to post-war reconstruction and the battle lines of the Cold War were already being sketched.

Indeed, later reviews show that *Army of Shadows* was drawn into many different partisan debates about the political character and status of

liberated France. In September 1944, the *Jewish Frontier's* reviewer Harry Salpeter used Kessel's novel to affirm a discourse of widespread popular Resistance heroism. The exploits Kessel describes are, he says, 'the bone and fibre of a France that has redeemed the treachery of leaders who, in their infirmity and venality, believed there was no alternative to cringing surrender' (Salpeter 1944). Writing in the communist *People's World* in November 1944, Andree Coleman noted a resurgence of interest in Kessel's novel. She found reassurance in its pages that France would resist the threat of a military dictatorship under de Gaulle, justified by what, in her view, Americans tended to see as France's 'over-gratitude to a military leader' and the country's history of 'Bonapartist dictatorships'. In this obviously partisan review, communist resistance on the ground is seen as a counter to a possible Gaullist 'dictatorship' (Coleman 1944). These reviews—like Weightman's anthologisation of extracts from the novel in London in 1945—demonstrate that the significance of *Army of Shadows* was not exhausted once its militant function had been rendered obsolete by the passing of time. The reviews and the translation of Kessel's article in the *New York Times* show that the politics of both translatorial and critical intervention is complex and dynamic, because it depends on the vagaries of history.

Returning Home to Paris

After almost two years of international migrations between July 1943 and February 1945, *L'Armée des ombres* was finally published in liberated Paris in the autumn of 1945. Kessel had returned to France in October 1944, where he resumed his career as a writer and journalist in the transformed context of post-Liberation France (Courrière 1985, 608–12). Edmond Charlot also arrived in Paris in late 1944 with the ambition to play a role in the reconstruction of French publishing. His catalogue of Resistance fiction included Kessel and Vercors. It is with a brief comparison of the fates of *L'Armée des ombres* and *Le Silence de la mer* that I should like to conclude. Their publication histories are similar. After its initial clandestine publication in France in February 1942 in *Les Lettres françaises*, *Le Silence de la mer* was published in French in London in 1943 by Les

Cahiers du Silence with a preface by Maurice Druon, Joseph Kessel's nephew, and by Editions Penguin in 1946.³⁴ Cyril Connolly translated it into English under the title *Put Out The Light*, published by Macmillan in April 1944 (Holman 2008, 224). The theme of silence is embodied in the novella's two protagonists who resist the German officer's presence in their home by refusing to speak to him. *Le Silence de la mer* provoked contrasting responses amongst wartime readers. It was celebrated in both the French underground press and in London as proof of the continued vibrancy of French cultural production (Bowles 2014; Sheldon 1989, 125; Holman 2008, 224). *France* reviewed it as a masterpiece and a fine example of French cultural resistance (Anon 1943). But when Charlot published it in Algiers, communists called for him to be punished for having published a fascist book (Puche 2007, 63–64). In the London leftist weekly *The Tribune*, Koestler dismissed it as being 'of no service to the French case' and a distraction from 'the real problems which we shall have to face' (Koestler 1964a), and in New York in *Pour la victoire*, Ilya Ehrenbourg condemned it as supportive of a Vichyite ideology of *attentisme* (Ehrenbourg 1944; Bowles 2014, 74–75). The polemic continued in *Pour la victoire*, with Schiffrin, who was also Vercors' American publisher, defending the book's credentials as a clandestine publication (Schiffrin 1944). The debate centred on the value of the passive resistance of ordinary French men and women, such as the uncle and niece in Vercors' story, when faced with the Nazi presence on their territory and even in their homes. It posed a fundamental question: How should the French respond to this ultimate contravention of the laws of hospitality?

Kessel's portrait of resistance is diametrically opposed to that of Vercors. In *L'Armée des ombres*, those involved in active, armed resistance meet the violence of imposed and unwelcome hosting with violence in return. The value placed by readers on these different conceptions of resistance was entirely contingent on the shifting political situation. Brett Bowles argues that '[a]s the D-Day landings approached and mobilizing armed resistance became strategically and politically crucial for the Free French, Vercors' story progressively lost its value' (Bowles 2014, 74). As Vercors' text fell out of favour in the Anglophone zones of hospitality, Kessel's celebration of armed resistance gained value because it provided a literary account of the war which reinforced the Allied military strategy

of cooperation with the French interior Resistance. Yet, while the perceived ideological ambivalence of Vercors' text posed problems for wartime readers, it has almost certainly ensured its international appeal since. According to Bowles:

Between 1944 and 1948, the story was translated into seventeen foreign languages and reportedly sold a million copies worldwide, which suggests that it helped clear the conscience not only of France's silent civilian majority who avoided both active collaboration and resistance, but also of numerous other nations that were also wrestling with the ethical ambiguities of their own wartime conduct. (Bowles 2014, 76)

Kessel's uncompromising portrait of Resistance heroism was less appealing in the post-war period. UNESCO's *World Bibliography of Translation*, the *Index Translationum*, contains more than 50 references to *Le Silence de la mer*, compared with only four for *L'Armée des ombres*.³⁵ Kessel's text has not enjoyed the literary status or international circulation of *Le Silence de la mer*. Yet, studying the material conditions of its publication and translation reveals a great deal about the relationship between occupied France and the translational zones of hospitality provided by Algiers, London and New York in the latter years of the Second World War. Sherry Simon contends that cities in translation 'exhibit the seams and sutures of history' (Simon 2012, xix). *L'Armée des ombres* is a thread that connects France to these three wartime cities. Its complex publication history shows just how much comes into view once we begin to read translationally.

Notes

1. Pym (1998) advocates a focus on real human translators, and Chesterman (2009) proposes 'translator studies' as a discrete area of research. For recent theoretical engagements with the subject, see O'Sullivan (2012), Rundle (2014), and Munday (2014).
2. The Charlot/Juliard edition carries the date of 1943, following the French practice of printing the original date of publication in the end papers, but it did not appear until 1945.

3. In *The New York Times*, 17 June 1944, a note under the rubric 'Books-Authors' announced that the publication had been brought forward from 26 to 19 June.
4. The translation was advertised in the *Times Literary Supplement* in November 1944. A further British edition appeared in the 1950s with Harborough Publishing Company. The date of publication of the Harborough reprint is unclear. Sales figures provided by Peters, Fraser and Dunlop Literary Agents give data for 1959 and 1961; however, Harborough ceased trading in 1954 (Holland 1993, 26; website of Harry Ransom Center, 'Firms out of Business').
5. For a chronological summary of these, see Appendix 1. There are no accessible archives which would allow the complete publication history of the text to be traced with absolute certainty. See also Simonin (2011, 234 n.8, 236, 252–53).
6. According to Courrière (1985, 589), Kessel completed the text in September 1943.
7. On A. D. Peters (1892–1973), see Sissons (2005) and obituaries published in *The Times* (Anon 1973a) and *The Bookseller* (Anon 1973b).
8. Letter from Eunice E Frost of Penguin Books Limited to A. D. Peters, 28 April 1944; letter from A. D. Peters to Eunice Frost, 4 May 1944. University of Bristol Special Collections, DM 1819/40/1 Editions Penguin.
9. Letter from Joseph Kessel to Allen Lane, 16 August 1944. University of Bristol Special Collections, DM 1819/40/1 Editions Penguin.
10. Letter from Eunice Frost to Joseph Kessel, 22 August 1944. University of Bristol Special Collections, DM 1819/40/1 Editions Penguin.
11. According to Holman, the phrase occurs in the title of an article Morgan published in *La France libre*.
12. Holman is quoting an article by Eliot published in the French-language literary journal *Aguedal*, based in Rabat.
13. On these publications, see Gombault (1982), Crémieux-Brilhac (1996, 190–95), Holman (2000c, 52–56), Cornick (2013, 355–56), Drake (2013, 378–83).
14. On the representation of France in *Horizon*, see Murat (2008) and Rapoport (2009).
15. The 1944 Macmillan edition of Connolly's translation, published in London, was entitled *Put out the Light*, whilst the New York edition of the same translation was entitled *The Silence of the Sea*.
16. On the MoI and wartime publishing, see Holman (2008, particularly 90–117).

17. The identification of Kessel with the narrator is encouraged since there is no paratextual indication that the text is part of a longer or a fictional work, as there is in *Horizon*, and since Kessel's name appears at the end of the extract.
18. The 1963 Plon paperback edition of *L'Armée des ombres* has 'parmi nous' (Kessel 1963, 119) whereas the earlier editions (Kessel 1943a, 134; 1945b, 119) have 'd'être là', as in this source. 'Parmi nous' [among us] further reinforces the idea that the French Resisters are somehow present in London.
19. On PWE, see Garnett (2002); on the *Revue du monde libre*, see Holman (2000a). I should like to record my thanks to Valerie Holman for her very helpful clarifications about the publishing activities of PWE.
20. Bassnet and Lefevre, general editors' preface, vii.
21. *Arrival and Departure* (1943) was the first novel Koestler wrote directly in English, though he had already written his 1941 memoir *Scum of the Earth* in English (Koestler 1999, 192; 2006, 7). 'Le transport mixte', a translation of 'The Mixed Transport' into French by Héléne Bokanowski, appeared alongside 'Le Champ de tir' from *L'Armée des ombres* in *Fontaine* in 1943. The coincidence is not surprising, since Connolly was *Fontaine's* British distributor. As noted in Chap. 2, Bokanowski published an account of wartime French-language publishing in Algiers in *Books Abroad*, a publication of the University of Oklahoma. Wife of the Free French Resister and Gaullist politician Michel Maurice-Bokanowski and niece of the Viennese-born art collector Alphonse Kann, Héléne Bokanowski, née Kann, also translated Virginia Woolf's *A Haunted House and Other Short Stories* as *La Maison hantée* for Charlot in 1946.
22. Hench (2010) makes the same argument regarding America's attitude to wartime book publishing as a form of propaganda.
23. Kessel (1943b, c, e, g, h, i, j). These articles preceded the serialisation of extracts from *L'Armée des ombres* in *France*: 'L'Evasion' was announced on 9 July and 'L'Embarquement pour Gibraltar' followed in April 1944. Kessel's final contribution to the paper was an article entitled 'Paris, la source des libertés humaines' (Kessel 1944h), published on 30 August 1944 with an announcement that the text would appear simultaneously in the *New York Times*. Another article from *France*, 'Comment est mort le maréchal Pétain' (Kessel 1943e), had appeared in *Evening Standard* on 5 March as 'How Marshal Pétain Died' with a byline identifying Kessel as 'the famous French novelist who has just arrived in this country from France' (Kessel 1943d).

24. It can be assumed that Kessel did not make the translation himself, since the newspaper's editor wrote to him saying that he hoped Kessel liked the translation (Courrière 1985, 576 n.1).
25. Schiffrin was not the only publisher making French-language material available in New York during the war. The Maison française had been established in 1934 and had its own publishing arm and Brentano's and Didier began publishing in French in 1941. See Loyer (2005, 97–98), Nettelbeck (1991, 57–65), Hench (2010, 176–77).
26. Unfortunately, no evidence appears to have survived that would shed light on the genesis of this preface. I should like to record my thanks to Kalinka Alvarez for carrying out research for me into this question in the Pantheon Books archives at the University of Columbia. See also Simonin (2011, 235 n.10).
27. Herken (2002) discusses the Chevalier Affair in detail, and the following account is based on this source and on Chevalier (1966). The Affair is also covered in the key texts which tell the Oppenheimer story: see, for example, Jungk (1958) and Monk (2012). For a short summary, see Starr (2002, 317–23). Chevalier worked as an interpreter during the Nuremberg trials, and is discussed in Gaiba (1998) and Baigorri-Jalón (2014).
28. According to Herken, '[Chevalier] had long been aware that his fortunes at the University were on the wane. His department chairman had informed him that he should look for a teaching job elsewhere', the implication being that his left-wing politics were becoming more and more unacceptable to the University (Herken 2002, 79).
29. The Knopf archives contain very little material relating to Chevalier's translation of Kessel, other than press clippings of reviews. I should like to record my thanks to Lynn A. Cowles for carrying out research for me in these archives at the Harry Ransom Center, University of Texas, Austin.
30. The effect of translational practice on creative writing in the mother tongue remains an under-researched area. Studies of multilingualism and literature, such as Taylor-Batty (2013), have begun to investigate the topic and research on translation and creativity such as Perteghella and Loffredo (2006) and analyses of self translation such as Kippur (2015) raise contiguous issues.
31. Médéric (Gilbert Médéric-Védy), an active resistant, was nominated by de Gaulle in Algiers as a member of the provisional consultative assembly in November 1943. Arrested in Paris in March 1944, he committed suicide by poison during interrogation. See Simonin (2011, 244.)

32. The quoted text is identical in the two reviews.
33. Whether or not this was actually true is a moot point. Balu's research on the *maquis*, based on Allied archives, suggests that neither the Americans nor the British made any distinction between communist and non-communist groups. Balu concludes that 'immediate military needs prevailed over political considerations' (Balu 2014, 199).
34. On the publication of the Cahiers du silence series in wartime London, see Tolansky (1985).
35. These figures include reprints and cannot be taken to be complete. The online database of the *Index Translationum* covers 1979–2009 (see http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/ev.php-URL_ID=7810&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html). Hard copies for 1948–1979 were consulted (the *Index* was suspended between 1940 and 1947).

References

- Abel, Richard. 2009. Introduction: The Impact of European Expatriate Bookmen in the Book Trades of Britain and America. In *Immigrant Publishers: The Impact of Expatriate Publishers in Britain and America in the 20th Century*, ed. Richard Abel and Gordon Graham, 1–8. New Brunswick/London: Transaction Publishers.
- Albertelli, Sébastien. 2010. *Atlas de la France libre*. Paris: Autrement.
- Anon. 1943. *Le Silence de la mer* par Vercors. *France*, July 10.
- . 1944. Books. St Louis Star Times, July 13, 1944. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc, Records, Box 1225, Folder 21: *Army of Shadows*, Clippings, 1944, Harry Ransom Center.
- . 1973a. Mr A.D. Peters. A Talented Literary Agent. *The Times*, February 5, 14.
- . 1973b. A.D. Peters 1892–1973. *The Bookseller*, February 10, 408–410.
- Apter, Emily. 2006. *The Translation Zone: The New Comparative Literature*. Princeton/Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Atkin, Nicholas. 2003. *The Forgotten French: Exiles in the British Isles, 1940–44*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Baigorri-Jalón, Jesús. 2014. *From Paris to Nuremberg: The Birth of Conference Interpreting*. Trans. H. Mikkelsen and B.S. Olsen. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Balu, Raphaële. 2014. The French Maquis and the Allies During the Second World War. In *France in an Era of Global War, 1914–1945. Occupation*,

- Politics, Empire and Entanglements*, ed. Ludivine Broch and Alison Carrol, 192–209. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Baron, F. 2000. The “Myth” and Reality of Rescue from the Holocaust: The Karski-Koestler and Vrba-Wetzlet Reports. *Yearbook of the Research Centre for German and Austrian Exile Studies* 2: 171–208.
- Bassnet, Susan, and André Lefevere. 2017. General Editors’ Preface. In *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, ed. André Lefevere, 2nd ed., vii. Abingdon/New York: Routledge.
- Bell, P.M.H. 1974. *A Certain Eventuality: Britain and the Fall of France*. London: Saxon House.
- . 1997. *France and Britain 1940–1994: The Long Separation*. London/New York: Longman.
- Billiani, Francesca. 2009. Censorship. In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, ed. Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha, 2nd ed., 28–31. London/New York: Routledge.
- Birkett, Jennifer. 2009. *Margaret Storm Jameson: A Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bokanowsky, Hélène. 1945. French Literature in Algiers. *Books Abroad* 19 (2): 125–130.
- Bowles, Brett. 2014. Résistance Oblige? Historiography, Memory, and the Evolution of *Le Silence de la mer*, 1942–2012. *French Politics, Culture & Society* 32 (1): 68–100.
- Boyle, Kay. 1944. Where the National Hero Is an Outlaw. *New York Herald Tribune*, June 18, 1944. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc, Records, Box 1225, Folder 21: *Army of Shadows*, Clippings, 1944, Harry Ransom Center.
- Brooks, Tim. 2007. *British Propaganda to France, 1940–1944: Machinery, Method and Message*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Callu, Agnès. 2010. France. In *Dictionnaire de la France libre*, ed. Francois Broche and Jean-François Muracciole, 631. Paris: Robert Laffont.
- Cesarani, David. 1998. *Arthur Koestler, The Homeless Mind*. London: William Heineman.
- Chadwick, Kay. 2015. Our Enemy’s Enemy: Selling Britain to Occupied France on the BBC French Service. *Media History* 21 (4): 426–442.
- . 2017. An Appetite for Argument: Radio Propaganda and Food in Occupied France. *French History* 31 (1): 85–106.
- Chesterman, Andrew. 2009. The Name and Nature of Translator Studies. *Hermes – Journal of Language and Communication Studies* 42: 13–22.
- Chevalier, Haakon. 1936. A Letter to Jules Romains. *The New Republic*, November 4, 89: 24–25.

- . 1940. André Malraux: The Return of the Hero. *The Kenyon Review* 2 (1): 35–46.
- . 1943. French Literature Before Two Wars: Two Attitudes: 1914 and 1939. *The French Review* 16 (3): 197–205.
- . 1949. *For Us The Living*. London: Secker and Warburg.
- . 1966. *Oppenheimer: The Story of a Friendship*. London: André Deutsch.
- Coleman, Andree. 1944. “Army of Shadows” Still Timely Report on France. *People’s World* (San Francisco), November 15, 1944. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc, Records, Box 1225, Folder 21: *Army of Shadows*, Clippings, 1944, Harry Ransom Center.
- Connolly, Cyril. 1943a. Comment. *Horizon*, September, 8 (45): 149.
- . 1943b. Comment. *Horizon*, October, 8 (46): 221–22.
- Cornick, Martyn. 2013. “The First Bastion of the Resistance”: The Beginnings of the Free French in London, 1940–41. In *A History of the French in London: Liberty, Equality, Opportunity*, ed. Martyn Cornick and Debra Kelly, 343–372. London: Institute of Historical Research.
- Courrière, Yves. 1985. *Joseph Kessel, ou, sur la piste du lion*. Paris: Plon.
- Crémieux-Brilhac, Jean-Louis. 1996. *La France libre: de l’Appel du 18 juin à la Libération*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Curtis, Jean-Louis. 1947. *Les Forêts de la nuit*. Paris: Editions J’ai Lu.
- Derrida, Jacques, and Anne Dufourmantelle. 2000. *Of Hospitality*. Trans. R. Bowlby. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Doe, Johnnie. 1944. Of This and That. The Factual Story of French Resistance Under the Lorraine Cross. *Chicago Daily Law Bulletin*, June 27, 1944. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc, Records, Box 1225, Folder 21: *Army of Shadows*, Clippings, 1944, Harry Ransom Center.
- Drake, David. 2013. Raymond Aron and La France libre (June 1940–September 1944). In *A History of the French in London: Liberty, Equality, Opportunity*, ed. Martyn Cornick and Debra Kelly, 373–390. London: Institute of Historical Research.
- Edelman, Hendrik. 2009. Kurt Wolf and Jacques Schffrin: Two Publishing Giants Start over in America. In *Immigrant Publishers: The Impact of Expatriate Publishers in Britain and America in the 20th Century*, ed. Richard Abel and Gordon Graham, 185–195. New Brunswick/London: Transaction Publishers.
- Ehrenbourg, Ilya. 1944. A propos du “Silence de la mer”. *Pour la victoire*, June 17.
- Eisenhower, General Dwight D. 1944. Special Communiqué No. 1, June 17, 1944. Accessed 24 Jan 2017. <http://cdm15999.contentdm.oclc.org/cdm/ref/collection/EisenhowerCommuniques/id/652>
- Footitt, Hilary, and Simona Tobia. 2013. *War Talk: Foreign Languages and the British War Effort in Europe, 1940–47*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Frank, Robert. 2006. La Résistance et les alliées. In *Dictionnaire historique de la résistance*, ed. François Marcot, Bruno Leroux, and Christine Levisse-Touzé, 85–94. Paris: Robert Laffont.
- Gaiba, Francesca. 1998. *The Origins of Simultaneous Interpretation. The Nuremberg Trial*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Gannet, Lewis. 1944. 'Books and Things'. *New York Herald*, June 14, 1944. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc, Records, Box 1225, Folder 21: *Army of Shadows*, Clippings, 1944, Harry Ransom Center.
- Garnett, David. 2002. *The Secret History of PWE. The Political Warfare Executive, 1939–1945*. London: St. Ermin's Press.
- Gildea, Robert. 2015. *Fighters in the Shadows. A New History of the French Resistance*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Gombault, Charles. 1982. *Un Journal, une Aventure*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Graham, Gordon. 2009. Epilogue. In *Immigrant Publishers: The Impact of Expatriate Publishers in Britain and America in the 20th Century*, ed. Richard Abel and Gordon Graham, 207–211. New Brunswick/London: Transaction Publishers.
- Gruin, Frederick. 1944. The Substance in the Shadows. *The Saturday Review*, July 1, 1944. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc, Records, Box 1225, Folder 21: *Army of Shadows*, Clippings, 1944, Harry Ransom Center.
- Harry Ransom Center. Firms Out of Business. Accessed 6 Feb 2018. http://norman.hrc.utexas.edu/Watch/fob_search_results_next.cfm?FOBFirmName=L&FOBNote=&locSTARTROW=71
- Harvey, Simon. 2008. Weightman, John George (1915–2004). In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford University Press. Accessed 6 Jan 2017. Online Edition, January 2008. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/94002>
- Hench, John B. 2010. *Books as Weapons: Propaganda, Publishing and the Battle for Global Markets in the Era of World War II*. Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press.
- Herken, Gregg. 2002. *Brotherhood of the Bomb: The Tangled Lives and Loyalties of Robert Oppenheimer, Ernest Lawrence, and Edward Teller*. New York: Holt Paperbacks.
- Hermans, Theo. 2007. *The Conference of the Tongues*. Manchester/Kinderhook: St Jerome Publishing.
- Holland, Steve. 1993. *The Mushroom Jungle. A History of Postwar Paperback Publishing*. Westbury: Zeon Books.
- Holman, Valérie. 2000a. Air-Borne Culture: Propaganda Leaflets over Occupied France in the Second World War. In *Free Print and Non-commercial Publishing Since 1700*, ed. James Ravel, 194–221. Aldershot: Ashgate.

- . 2000b. Imagined Readers Overseas: Publishing for France and Her Colonies in the 1940s. *Australian Journal of French Studies* 37 (2): 203–223.
- . 2000c. The Impact of War: British Publishers and French Publications 1940–1944. *Publishing History* 48: 41–65.
- . 2005. Carefully Concealed Connections: The Ministry of Information and British Publishing, 1939–1946. *Book History* 8: 197–226.
- . 2008. Print for Victory. In *Book Publishing in England, 1939–1945*. London: British Library.
- Joesten, Joachim. 1944. Heroism and Ruthlessness of French Underground. *Chicago Sun Book Week*, July 2, 1944. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc, Records, Box 1225, Folder 21: *Army of Shadows*, Clippings, 1944, Harry Ransom Center.
- Judt, Tony. 2010. *Postwar: A History of Europe Since 1945*. London: Vintage Books.
- Jungk, Robert. 1958. *Brighter Than a Thousand Suns: The Moral and Political History of the Atomic Scientists*. Trans. J. Cleugh. London: Victor Gollancz and Rupert Hart-Davis.
- Kelly, Debra. 2013. Mapping the Free French in London: Places, Spaces, Traces. In *A History of the French in London: Liberty, Equality, Opportunity*, ed. Martyn Cornick and Debra Kelly, 303–341. London: Institute of Historical Research.
- Kessel, Joseph. 1943a. *L'Armée des ombres*. Algiers: Charlot.
- . 1943b. Ce matin-là, Marseille se couvrit d'énormes poteaux indicateurs: 'Nach Cannebière'. *France*, March 4.
- . 1943c. Marseille, la cité débonnaire, était pleine d'une tristesse morose et d'une farouche hostilité. *France*, March 5.
- . 1943d. How Marshal Petain Died. *The Evening Standard*, March 5.
- . 1943e. Comment est mort le maréchal Pétain. *France*, March 6.
- . 1943f. "The R.A.F. Came to Get You, Not Me", Said the Wounded French Worker to the German. *Daily Express*, March 11.
- . 1943g. Quand les enfants de France chantent "Tipperary". *France*, March 11.
- . 1943h. Ce matin-là, à l'aube, il n'y avait plus d'armée française. *France*, March 24.
- . 1943i. Il montra une ancre en laine rouge et dit: "Voilà tout ce qui reste de la marine française". *France*, March 25.
- . 1943j. Ces Français viennent de se battre en Tunisie. *France*, April 10.
- . 1943k. Ces gens-là sont merveilleux. *La Revue du monde libre*, July, 7: 40–44.

- . 1943l. L'Évasion. *France*, July 12, 13, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21 and 22.
- . 1943m. Ces gens-là sont merveilleux. *La France libre*, August 16, 6 (34): 265–272.
- . 1943n. Le Champ de tir. *Fontaine*, 5 (30): 463–469.
- . 1943o. Over the Water: Philippe Gerbier's Notebook – I. *Horizon*, October, 8 (46): 225–243.
- . 1943p. Il est ici. *Combat*, October 31, 3.
- . 1943q. Il est ici. *France-Amérique*, October 31, 6.
- . 1943r. Philippe Gerbier's Notebook – II. *Horizon* 8 (47): 320–332.
- . 1943s. La Résistance. *Combat*, November 7, 7.
- . 1943t. L'Exécution. *La France libre* 7 (37): 44–50.
- . 1943u. Le Champ de tir. *Combat*, November 21, 7.
- . 1943v. Une veillée de l'âge hitlérienne. *La Marseillaise*, December 4, 5.
- . 1943w. L'Exécution. *Combat*, December 5, 4.
- . 1943x. Une veillée de l'âge hitlérienne. *France-Amérique*, December 26, 3.
- . 1944a. *L'Armée des ombres*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- . 1944b. *Army of Shadows*. Trans. H. Chevalier. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- . 1944c. *Army of Shadows*. Trans. H. Chevalier. London: The Cresset Press.
- . 1944d. Les Notes de Philippe Gerbier. Scènes vécues de la Résistance par Joseph Kessel. *La Marseillaise*, January 8, 6.
- . 1944e. La Fille de Mathilde. *Combat*, January 9 and 16, 5, 7.
- . 1944f. Préface à un livre de guerre. *L'Arche*, February 1, 69–72.
- . 1944g. L'Embarquement pour Gibraltar. *France*, April 21, 22 and 25 and May 4.
- . 1944h. Paris, la source des libertés humaines. *France*, August 30.
- . 1944i. Return to Paris: Thoughts of a Frenchman as He Flew over the City That Is the Very Symbol of Liberty. *New York Times*, August 27.
- . 1944j. Champ de tir. *Gavroche*, December 7, 15.
- . 1945a. *L'Armée des ombres*. London: Editions Penguin.
- . 1945b. *L'Armée des ombres*. Paris: Charlot et Juliard.
- . 1945c. Wonderful People. In *French Writing on English Soil. A Choice of French Writing Published in London Between November 1940 and June 1944*, ed. and Trans. J.G. Weightman, 50–59. London: Sylvan Press.
- . 1945d. The Execution. In *French Writing on English Soil. A Choice of French Writing Published in London Between November 1940 and June 1944*, ed. and Trans. J.G. Weightman, 75–83. London: Sylvan Press.

- . 1946a. L'Execution. In *La République du Silence. The Story of French Resistance*, ed. A.J. Liebling and Eugene A. Sheffer, 255–270. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- . 1946b. Le Champ de tir. In *La République du Silence. The Story of French Resistance*, ed. A.J. Liebling and Eugene A. Sheffer, 270–276. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- . 1947a. The Execution. In *The Republic of Silence*, ed. A.J. Liebling, 283–295. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- . 1947b. The Rifle Range. In *The Republic of Silence*, ed. A.J. Liebling, 295–301. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- . 1963. *L'Armée des ombres*. Paris: Plon.
- . 2010. *L'Heure des châtiments, Reportages 1938–1945*. Paris: Tallandier.
- . 2017. *Army of Shadows*. Trans. R.J. Hanshe and with an Introduction by Stuart Kendall. New York/London/Melbourne: Contra Mundum Press.
- Kippur, Sara. 2015. *Writing It Twice. Self-Translation and the Making of World Literature*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Knapp, Andrew. 2007. The Half-Open Window: France and Britain, 1944–47. In *The Uncertain Foundation: France at the Liberation, 1944–47*, ed. Andrew Knapp, 207–233. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- . 2013. The Allied Bombing Offensive in the British Media, 1942–45. In *Liberal Democracies at War: Conflict and Representation*, ed. Andrew Knapp and Hilary Footitt, 39–66. London: Bloomsbury.
- . 2014. *Les Français sous les bombes alliées*. Paris: Tallandier.
- Knopf, Alfred A. 1944. Army of Shadows by Joseph Kessel. Full Page advertisement in *Chicago Sun Book Week*, 30 July 1944. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc, Records, Box 1225, Folder 21: Army of Shadows, Clippings, 1944, Harry Ransom Center.
- Koestler, Arthur. 1943a. Le Transport mixte. Trans. H. Bokanowski. *Fontaine*, 5 (30): 470–480.
- . 1943b. The Mixed Transport. *Horizon* 8 (46): 244–252.
- . 1964a. French 'Flu'. In *The Yogi and the Commissar*, 21–27. London: Jonathan Cape.
- . 1964b. On Disbelieving Atrocities. In *The Yogi and the Commissar*, 94–99. London: Jonathan Cape.
- . 1999. *Arrival and Departure*. London: Vintage Classics.
- . 2006. *Scum of the Earth*. London: Eland.
- Kuhiwczak, Piotre, Denise Merkle, and Ilan Stavans. 2011. Translation Studies Forum: Translation and Censorship. *Translation Studies* 4 (3): 358–373.
- Lefevre, André. 2017. *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. 2nd ed. Abingdon/New York: Routledge.

- Lewis, Jeremy. 1998. *Cyril Connolly: A Life*. London: Pimlico.
- Liebling, A.J. ed. 1947. *The Republic of Silence*. Trans. R. Guthrie and Others. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- Liebling, A.J., and Eugene A. Sheffer, eds. 1946. *La République du Silence. The Story of French Resistance*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- Loyer, Emmanuelle. 2005. *Paris à New York: Intellectuels et artistes français en exil 1940–1947*. Paris: Grasset.
- McLeod, Enid. 1982. *Living Twice*. London: Hutchinson Benham.
- Meylaerts, Reine. 2013. The Multiple Lives of Translators. *TTR: Traduction, terminologie, rédaction* 26 (2): 103–128.
- Monk, Ray. 2012. *Inside the Centre: The Life of J. Robert Oppenheimer*. London: Jonathon Cape.
- Morelle, Chantal. 2010. La France libre. In *Dictionnaire de la France libre*, ed. Francois Broche and Jean-François Muracciole, 636–637. Paris: Robert Laffont.
- Munday, Jeremy. 2014. Using Primary Sources to Produce a Microhistory of Translation and Translators: Theoretical and Methodological Concerns. *The Translator* 20 (1): 64–80.
- Murat, Jean-Christophe. 2008. Enemies of Commitment? France and French Culture in Cyril Connolly's *Horizon* "Comments" (1939–1949). In *Right/Left/Right: Revolving Commitments. France and Britain 1929–1950*, ed. Stan Smith and Jennifer Birkett, 173–185. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Muracciole, Jean-François. 2009. *Les Français Libres: l'autre résistance*. Paris: Tallandier.
- Nettelbeck, Colin. 1991. *Forever French: Exile in the United States, 1939–1945*. New York/Oxford: Berg.
- O'Sullivan, Carol, ed. 2012. *Rethinking Methods in Translation History*, *Translation Studies* 5 (2), Special Issue. Abingdon: Routledge.
- P.A.W. 1944. Chronique des livres: Joseph Kessel – "L'Armée des ombres" (Chronique de la résistance). *France-Amérique*. June 11.
- Perteghella, Manuela, and Eugenia Loffredo, eds. 2006. *Translation and Creativity. Perspectives on Creative Writing and Translation Studies*. London/ New York: Continuum.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. 2002. "The Traffic in Meaning: Translation, Contagion, Infiltration," *Profession* (Fall 2002): 25–36.
- Prescott, Orville. 1944. Books of the Times. *New York Times*, June 19, 1944. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc, Records, Box 1225, Folder 21: *Army of Shadows*, Clippings, 1944, Harry Ransom Center.

- Puche, Michel. 1995. Edmond Charlot, éditeur. *Bibliographie commentée et illustrée*. Préface de Jules Roy. Pezenas: Domens.
- , ed. 2007. *Souvenirs d'Edmond Charlot. Entretiens avec Frédéric Jacques Temple*. Préface de Michel Puche. Pézenas: Domens.
- Pym, Anthony. 1998. *Method in Translation History*. Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.
- Rapoport, Michel. 2009. The Penguin New Writing, Horizon et la France (1940–1945). *Synergies Royaume-Uni et Irlande* 2: 145–154.
- Rolo, Charles. 1944. The Killers. *New York Times*, June 25, 1944. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc, Records, Box 1225, Folder 21: *Army of Shadows*, Clippings, 1944, Harry Ransom Center.
- Rundle, Christopher. 2014. *Theories and Methodologies of Translation History*, The Translator 20 (1), Special Issue. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Salpeter, Harry. 1944. France Underground. *Jewish Frontier*, September 1944. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc, Records, Box 1225, Folder 21: *Army of Shadows*, Clippings, 1944, Harry Ransom Center.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. 1945. Paris Under the Occupation. In *French Writing on English Soil. A choice of French Writing Published in London Between November 1940 and June 1944*, ed. and Trans. J.G. Weightman, 122–134. London: Sylvan Press.
- Saunders, Edward. 2017. *Arthur Koestler*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Schiffirin, Jacques. 1944. A propos du “Silence de la mer”: Une lettre de l'Editeur Jacques Schiffirin. *Pour la victoire*. June 24.
- Schiffirin, André. 1999. *L'Edition sans éditeurs*. La Fabrique-Editions.
- Shelden, Michael. 1989. *Friends of Promise: Cyril Connolly and the World of Horizon*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Simon, Sherry. 2012. *Cities in Translation: Intersections of Language and Memory*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Simonin, Anne. 2011. La Résistance Sans Fiction: *L'Armée des ombres* (1943). In *Écrire sous l'Occupation. Du Non-consentement à la Résistance: France-Belgique-Pologne 1940–1945*, ed. Bruno Curatolo and François Marcot, 233–253. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.
- Sissons, Michael. 2005. Peters, Augustus Dudley (1892–1973). In *Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford University Press. Accessed 24 Jan 2017. Online Edition, January 2005. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/31541>
- Spinks, Brian. 1949. Trials of a Translator Turned Novelist. *Houston Post*, January 16, 1949. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc, Records, Box 1193, Folder 1: Chevalier, Haakon – *For Us the Living*, Clippings, 1948–1949, Harry Ransom Center.

- Starr, Kevin. 2002. *Embattled Dreams: California in War and Peace, 1940–1950*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Still, Judith. 2010. *Derrida and Hospitality: Theory and Practice*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Suleiman, Susan Rubin. 2006. *Crises of Memory and the Second World War*. Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press.
- Taylor-Batty, Juliette. 2013. *Multilingualism in Modernist Fiction*. Basingstoke/London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tolansky, Ethel. 1985. Les Cahiers du Silence. In *Vichy France and the Resistance: Culture and Ideology*, ed. Roderick Kedward and Roger Austin, 222–231. London/Sidney: Croom Helm.
- Tombs, Robert, and Isabelle Tombs. 2007. *That Sweet Enemy. Britain and France: The History of a Love-Hate Relationship*. London: Pimlico.
- Tymoczko, Maria. 2006. Translation: Ethics, Ideology, Action. *The Massachusetts Review* 47 (3): 442–461.
- Vercors. 2002. *The Silence of the Sea/Le Silence de la mer*. Trans. C. Connolly and ed. James W. Brown and Lawrence D. Stokes. New York/Oxford: Berg.
- Vercors, *Put Out the Light*. 1944. Trans. C. Connolly. London: Macmillan & Co.
- Weightman, J.G., ed. and trans. 1945. *French Writing on English Soil. A Choice of French Writing Published in London Between November 1940 and June 1944*. London: Sylvan Press.
- Wolf, Michaela. 2017. Response to: Sue Vice, Witnessing Complicity in English and French: Tatiana de Rosnay's *Sarah's Key* and *Elle s'appelait Sarah*. In *Translating Holocaust Lives*, ed. Jean Boase-Beier, Peter Davies, Andrea Hammel, and Marion Winters, 69–71. London: Bloomsbury.
- Wood, E. Thomas, and Stanisław M. Jankowski. 1994. *Karski: How One Man Tried to Stop the Holocaust*. New York: Wiley.

Archive Sources

- Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. Archive, Harry Ransom Center, University of Austin, Texas.
- Pantheon Books records, 1944–1968, Columbia Archives, University of Columbia.
- Peters Fraser and Dunlop Literary Agents, London.
- The Penguin Archive, University of Bristol Special Collections.



4

The War Novel in the Post-War Years in France and Britain: Comparative Perspectives

A moment of participation and projected remembrance in Simone de Beauvoir's 1945 Resistance novel *Le Sang des autres* encapsulates the dual perspective of the war novel in the immediate post-war period:

Un moment elle resta immobile au milieu du silence, puis elle se mit à marcher vers l'Étoile. Tout était là: les maisons, les boutiques, les arbres. Mais les hommes avaient été anéantis: personne pour ouvrir les magasins condamnés, personne pour se promener dans les rues, pour reconstruire un lendemain, pour se rappeler le passé. (Beauvoir 1945, 24)

[For a moment she remained motionless in the midst of the silence, than [*sic*] she began to walk towards the Étoile. Everything was still there; the houses, the shops, the trees. But every human being had been annihilated; there was no one to open the closed shops, no one to walk in the streets, to rebuild a tomorrow, to remember the past. (Beauvoir 1990, 205)]

Returning to occupied Paris in 1940 after experiencing the fall of France and the resulting exodus of the populations of the north and east, Hélène walks down the avenue de la Grande Armée towards the Place de l'Étoile and the Arc de Triomphe, that dominant icon of French war memory, tracing the route Charles de Gaulle would take for his victory parade of 26

August 1944. This is a moment of dramatic irony which engages readers' memories of later events of which the characters cannot be aware. Hélène's thoughts turn to the future as she muses on the necessity—and the difficulty—of remembering the events she is living through, and on the relationship between remembrance and reconstruction. Who will remember occupied Paris? How will Parisians rebuild their future? The task of the post-war war novel was both retrospective and prospective: to fill the voids of memory by documenting the recent experience of war, and to reimagine the war in its relationship to the present and to the future.

To understand the function of the translated French war novel in post-war Britain, it is important to pay attention to the context in which such texts were published as well as to the ways in which they were translated and the reception they received. This chapter therefore offers a comparative reading of the literary environments of France and Britain in the aftermath of the war, demonstrating how the war as a topic for literature functioned in relation to narratives about literary and cultural reconstruction—and decline. It examines discourses about the war novel in Britain and France in the immediate post-war period between 1945 and 1951. Historical periodisation is always to an extent artificial, but these years do have a certain coherence. They saw the dismantling of the political structures of war and the beginnings of the organisation of European peace. People displaced by the war were repatriated between 1945 and 1946, and the period 1948–51 saw a massive migration of European Jews to the new state of Israel (Judt 2010, 29–30, 32). In 1951, the two organisations formed in the immediate aftermath of the war to assist refugees, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) and the International Refugee Organisation (IRO), were replaced by the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (Judt 2010, 32). The most famous trials of Nazi war criminals took place between 1945 and 1946 in Nuremberg, but other trials continued after this date and the final executions in Germany took place in June 1951 (Judt 2010, 53–54). The Marshall Plan, a response to the European crisis of 1947, came to an end in 1951, by which time Europe had begun to establish federal institutions such as the Council of Europe (1949), which issued the European Convention on Human Rights in 1950, and the European Coal and Steel Community, established in 1951 thanks to the Schuman Plan (Judt

2010, 96, 155–57). By this time, the wartime Grand Alliance between Britain, the USA, and the USSR had definitively unravelled. The Western Allies established a West German state in 1948, and Stalin's response resulted in the Berlin Blockade and airlifts of June 1948–May 1949 (Judt 2010, 145–47). The USSR extended its control over Eastern Europe, notably taking control of Czechoslovakia in February 1948 (Judt 2010, 133–39). Between 1947 and 1952, Albania, Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and the GDR all acquired Soviet-style constitutions (Judt 2010, 167). In these years, the Cold War gradually replaced the hot one of 1939–45.

In Britain, the years 1945–51 correspond to the term of the post-war Labour government, a period often characterised as years of austerity. Both culturally and politically, things were coming to an end, and things were beginning. 1950 saw the demise of both Cyril Connolly's *Horizon* and John Lehmann's *Penguin New Writing*, influential literary journals which had begun publication during the war. The year 1951 was the year of the Festival of Britain and the beginning of a new feeling of optimism after a long, drawn-out period of significant material privation (Judt 2010, 163). In France, the shift is less clear-cut but the turn of the decade nonetheless marked a period of change. For Simone de Beauvoir, the post-war finally finished ending in 1952 (Atack 1989, 7; Beauvoir 1963, 357). That year saw a protracted debate over the possibility of a total amnesty for all those French subject to prosecution for crimes of collaboration with their Nazi occupiers. Those condemned to 'national indignity' or a prison sentence of less than 15 years had been amnestied in 1951, and a further amnesty law was passed in July 1953 resulting in the release from prison of all but the most serious offenders (Rouso 1990, 66–71). Marshall Pétain had died of old age, still incarcerated, in 1951. The *épuration* (purge trials) was over, indicating a shift from revenge to reconciliation. It was in this context that the prestigious *Nouvelle Revue Française*, compromised by collaboration with the Nazis, was relaunched in 1953 (Cornick 2000). According to Margaret Atack, the cultural shift had already come in 1950, with a turning away from the political literature popularised by Sartre and the existentialists and an embracing of the literary experimentalism of the *nouveau roman* (Atack 1989, 7–8; 2010, 76–77). Younger writers vied for dominance as the older generation of French literary giants were passing. André Gide passed away in 1951.

Literature, Memory, Translation

In the preceding two chapters, we have considered militant war fiction, that is, fiction written during the events it depicts and conceived as a form of action. Militant fiction can become memorial fiction thanks to new modes of publication and transmission: 1945 saw the republication of Kessel's *L'Armée des ombres* and Vercors' *Le Silence de la mer* and the appearance of Elsa Triolet's collection of clandestinely published Resistance stories, *Le Premier accroc coûte deux cents francs*.¹ However, such republication entails a significant shift in function, since wartime and post-war war novels are very different phenomena. They are, nonetheless, connected. Post-war myths have their roots in wartime ones, and conceptions of the relationship between war and writing that were dominant during the war conditioned the way war was written about after the war. The process of representation is cumulative, and contemporary memories of the war have been generated from both wartime and post-war representations. As Mark Connolly remarks, '[t]he essentials of the British Second World War we know today were put together between 1939 and 1960. Our contemporary conception of the war is the result of a strange fusion of images produced in wartime and reactions to a glut of post-war remembrances' (Connolly 2014, 198). However as Alan Munton points out, it is obvious but crucial that writing literature about war once the outcome is known is a very different project from writing literature about war as it is happening:

Fiction about the war written after it was over has a quite different structure. Once the outcome is known the experience of the entire war is open to interpretation in ways not previously possible. Post-war fiction is most characteristically structured on a large scale [...] The scale often implies that the war can now be seen in epic terms; but heroic deeds, the usual subject of epic, do not in fact predominate. These fictions are often about disillusionment with war, discovering in it futility or emptiness. (Munton 1989, 21–22)

Representations of war as futile and empty are of course inimical to most militant wartime fiction. The present chapter and Chaps. 5 and 6 are concerned with novels written after the end of the hostilities. In

the post-war years, writers and critics alike debated the question of how the war could and should be treated in post-war fiction. The answers differed significantly in Britain and France.

War writing constructs an image of war primarily, though not exclusively, for a national readership. That readership is defined to a significant extent by language, although this cannot be taken for granted since language and nation do not correlate straightforwardly. Linguistic, geographical, and historical differences, significant though they are, do not mean that 'war writing' as a general category is not a legitimate focus of study, as Kate McLoughlin's 2011 study *Authoring War* has demonstrated (McLoughlin 2011, 13–16). Her 'transhistorical and cross-cultural study of war writing' has the ambition to show 'how writers from different periods and countries have found common solutions to common difficulties' in writing about war (McLoughlin 2011, 19). However, the book's self-confessed bias is towards English-language texts and translation is not one of its concerns (McLoughlin 2011, 20). McLoughlin cites Prince Andreï Bolkonsky's reception at Brünn in Tolstoy's *War and Peace*, in the 1957 English translation by Rosemary Edmonds, as an example of how 'news-giving' is represented in the war novel, but the passage discussed is also a good illustration of some of the questions posed by translation. Prince Andreï feels as 'welcome as a dog in a game of skittles' (McLoughlin 2011, 21), an expression which jars with unfamiliarity for the English reader because it is a literal translation of a phrase that appears in French in the original Russian text.² The expression carries the weight of different linguistic histories: the widespread use of French by the Russian political and social elite in the nineteenth century, and Rosemary Edmonds' decision to refuse an eruption of French and to choose instead a foreignised monolingual translation. Later in her study, McLoughlin highlights conflict's affinity with land, remarking that '[l]and is what is fought for: conquered, defended, loved' (McLoughlin 2011, 86–87). The corollary of this for war writing must surely be the special affinity between land and language, even if that relationship does not necessarily imply monolingualism, as the example from Tolstoy illustrates. War is, by definition, both international in scope and profoundly national in significance, which begs the question of what happens when war writing is translated. War is an integral part of the development of national identity,

particularly in immediate post-war periods when national reconstruction is high on the agenda. Literary history tells us that translated works of historical fiction, such as *War and Peace*, or Walter Scott's *Waverley* novels, discussed by Siobhan Brownlie, have been of wide and sustained interest to an international audience (Brownlie 2016, 109–23). Indeed, it has been claimed that literary works play a privileged role in arousing interest in other nations' histories (Brownlie 110; citing Rigney 2004, 2010). But the significant shifts in both representation and readership which the translation of historical and, specifically, war fiction entail have not yet been studied at any length.

This is a question which should be of central interest to those concerned with what has variously been termed 'transnational', 'transcultural', or 'cosmopolitan' memory. Such studies focus on the international construction and circulation of memories of traumatic historical events, including war, but few make explicit or sustained reference to the fact, let alone the detail, of interlingual transfer. Works such as Apter's *The Translation Zone*, Brodsky's *Can These Bones Live?*, Simon's *Cities in Translation* and Suleiman's *Crises of Memory and the Second World War* are notable exceptions. In mainstream theoretical memory studies, attention to language has been sparse. Daniel Levy and Natan Sznaider's influential account of the emergence of a 'cosmopolitan' memory of the Holocaust prizes the concept of 'collective' memory from the nationally bounded models which they identify in the work of Maurice Halbwachs and Pierre Nora (Levy and Sznaider 2002). They are interested in the centrality of the Holocaust to 'the general European memory' of the Second World War, arguing that '[t]he cosmopolitanization of Holocaust memories [...] involves the formation of nation-specific and nation-transcending commonalities' (Levy and Sznaider 2002, 100, 92). In a globalised culture, the Holocaust is remembered far beyond the 'ethnic and national boundaries' which defined the events themselves, those of the European Jewry and Nazi Germany in the period 1941–45. Levy and Sznaider do not however consider that the notion of a 'general European memory' and the creation of 'nation-transcending' representations are inevitably predicated on interlingual translation and the complex transformations this entails. In their longer study *The Holocaust and Memory in the Global Age*, passing reference is made to translation, for example in relation to the

Americanisation and universalisation of Anne Frank's diary in its English and German versions, or the translation from Hebrew of the Eichmann trial on American television. But the focus here is on cultural adaptation and detailed analysis of interlingual transformations is not one of the authors' methodological tools (Levy and Sznajder 2006, 60–63, 109–11). Astrid Erll's 2011 essay on 'Travelling Memory' defines 'transcultural memory' as a '*research perspective* [...] directed towards mnemonic processes unfolding *across* and *beyond* cultures' [emphasis in original], but 'translation' and its correlates only feature here as a metaphorical term to describe film adaptations of novels and the 'translation' of 'translocal mnemonic forms and practices' into local contexts (Erll 2011, 9, 11, 14–15). Similarly, in Aleida Assman's 2014 essay on 'Transnational Memories', 'translation' (always in scare quotes!) means forms of cultural transfer which may or may not include interlingual translation (this is not specified) (Assman 2014, 547, 550).

Surveys of this type of scholarship are similarly silent on the question of interlingual transfer. Lucy Bond and Jessica Rapson's 2014 volume on *The Transcultural Turn: Interrogating Memory Between and Beyond Borders* mentions the transcending of linguistic borders alongside political, ethnic, and religious ones, yet their survey of academic disciplines that have been concerned with the transcultural covers history, human rights, literary studies, political philosophy, sociology, and travel and tourism, but not translation studies (Bond and Rapson 2014). Memory theorists are very aware of the potential pitfalls as well as the advantages of what are variously termed 'transnational', 'transcultural', or 'cosmopolitan' approaches. Susannah Radstone points out the dangers of attempting to produce 'a fully "globalizable" version of memory studies' since, as she demonstrates, both the academic discipline of memory studies and memory itself are 'always located', being 'specific to [their] site of production and practice' (Radstone 2011, 114). A failure to acknowledge the locatedness of memory threatens to entrench either a well-meaning, liberal, optimistic underplaying of difference or a globalised discourse that seeks to deny difference and assert homogeneity (Rothberg 2014, 653). Paying attention to language and the mediations of translation is one way to avoid these pitfalls whilst acknowledging the reality that memory *does* travel. The term 'translation' is beginning to crop up in analyses such as

those by Susannah Radstone and Michael Rothberg,³ but more detailed studies of how the practice of interlingual translation relates to memory are still urgently needed. Siobhan Brownlie's *Mapping Memory in Translation* is the first substantial work to attempt a systematic overview of the multiple connections between memory and translation. Her book offers both an elucidation of a range of theoretical concepts from memory studies research, including national, transnational, and cosmopolitan memory, and a series of illustrative examples demonstrating how interlingual translation relates to the various concepts discussed.⁴

We should not of course expect the translation practices which underlie transnational memories to be neutral, precisely because of the *located* nature of war memory and the importance of this. As Brownlie points out, '[s]haredness does not mean sameness of understanding or manifestation' (Brownlie 2016, 108). We have seen in the preceding chapters that the politics of location, and therefore of hospitality, during wartime are highly complex. We should expect translation between French and English in the particular context of the memory of the Second World War to be fraught, given the very different memories of the war that came to dominance in post-war France and Britain. France's memory of the war has been politically contentious, non-consensual, and ambiguous, while Britain has seen her war role in terms of a heroic struggle against the odds for a cause that would ultimately be fully justified. Though British historians such as Angus Calder (1969), Nicholas Harman (1980), Clive Ponting (1990), and Sonia Rose (2003) have contested the dominant myths about the British war experience, positive discourses about British war heroism and about unity and solidarity on the home front have circulated consistently in popular culture, and continue to do so (Connolly 2004, 1–25). Key events of the war have been remembered very differently in Britain and France. The fall of France is a particularly telling example. Here, the enormous difference in national memories is succinctly illustrated by a translation shift, as David Reynolds has pointed out. When the French publishers Plon brought out a translation of Churchill's memoirs in 1949, they made only one change to the volume titles: *Their Finest Hour* became *L'Heure tragique* (Reynolds 2013, 205). From the historian's perspective, French and British memories of 1940 are entirely separate, the myths surrounding the Dunkirk evacuations

having crystallised into French images of ‘perfidious Albion’ and British ones of the ‘Dunkirk spirit’:

In short then, there were two incompatible variants of the ‘1940 syndrome’, neither of which acknowledged the existence of the other. They both implied distinct interpretations of the post-war world and drew on fundamentally different historical experiences of the period from 1940 to 1944. The British and French have each remembered their own experiences but have singularly failed to place these alongside those of the other. (Frank 2013, 182, 184)

‘Dunkirk’—or ‘Dunkerque’—is an example of what Astrid Erll calls ‘succinct mnemonic forms’ which she claims to be ‘eminently transportable’ (her examples are Exodus, the Somme, and the fall of the Berlin wall (Erll 2011, 13)). Transportable they may be, but we need to pay very close attention to the significant transformations that transportation entails. The story conjured up by ‘Dunkirk’ for the British is not the same as the one the French associate with ‘Dunkerque’.⁵ If it is open to translation, literary history can reveal moments where apparently separate national memories have in fact come together. The English translation of Robert Merle’s 1949 *Weekend à Zuydcoote*, a novel about the Dunkirk evacuations, considered in Chap. 5, is a case in point. It is the contention of this chapter—and indeed of *Translating War* as a whole—that reading literature translationally can make a significant contribution to a transnational understanding of history and memory. One answer to Erll’s question, ‘How does memory ‘travel’?’ is: through interlingual translation (Erll 2011, 12). A translational analysis of cultural products is one way of achieving a comparative analysis of the memory of the Second World War.

France and Britain, 1945–51

Although France and Britain were allies in 1939–45, the experience of war in the two countries was obviously very different. Historians of English literature cite Britain’s particular experience of the Second World War as the defining context for post-war literary production

(e.g. Bradbury 1987, 97–98; Munton 1989, 12). Post-war English literature was not faced with the challenge of assimilating and digesting a traumatic history of defeat, Occupation, collaboration, Resistance and direct complicity in the Holocaust; yet while Britain had emerged victorious from the war, it was economically depleted and faced the decline of its imperial power. David Reynolds sees the summer of 1940 as the defining moment which not only marked the fundamental divergence of French and British experiences of war—Britain fended off invasion and France was occupied—but also operated as ‘the fulcrum of the twentieth century’ which changed the course of European history (Reynolds 2013, 199). According to Reynolds, ‘Britain’s global turn to what Churchill called the “English-speaking world” reflected deeper disenchantment with France after the debacle of 1940’. Reynolds describes how Britain turned towards America as a powerful partner in world affairs, leaving France to pursue a new relationship with Germany in the context of European integration (Reynolds 2013, 200–201; see also Knapp 2007, 222–25). Cyril Connolly, the Francophile editor of *Horizon*, expressed precisely this view in July 1941: ‘Since Dunkirk we have seen the end of the political and military decadence of England. Whatever residue of complacency, sloth and inefficiency there may be left, England is now a great power, and able to stand for something in the world again. When the war is over we shall live in an Anglo-American world’ (Connolly 1941, 5). In the immediate aftermath of the war, Britain enjoyed the prestige of victory and the continuity of political structures which had withstood the war. With the election of the Labour government in 1945, the nation looked forward to the creation of a new social order in the shape of a welfare state based on the Beveridge Report, first published in 1942. However, post-war Britain was not the ‘New Jerusalem’ of popular myth. As Judt remarks, it is often pointed out ‘that proud, victorious Great Britain seemed somehow tighter, poorer, grayer and grimmer than any of the erstwhile defeated, occupied and ravished lands across the water’ (Judt 2010, 162). Britain’s pride and optimism were tempered by exhaustion, ongoing rationing, and restrictions and a slow economic recovery, and the glow of victory did not last. France, by contrast, had to integrate the

humiliation of defeat and liberation by foreign powers into her national story, as well as reconciling internal divisions between collaborators and Resisters and also within these groups. The war had destroyed the French Third Republic, necessitating the creation and installation of new political structures (Bell 1997, 68–71). France tottered on the brink of civil war as communists and Gaullists vied to capitalise on their wartime credentials in a struggle to determine the political identity of post-war France.

Andrew Knapp has characterised Franco-British relations in the period of the ‘long liberation’ of 1944–47 as a ‘half-open window’ (Knapp 2007). These were the years in which there was considerable willingness amongst the political elites on both sides of the Channel to forge a close relationship between France and Britain. Harold Macmillan, Duff Cooper, Anthony Eden, and Ernest Bevin all supported closer Franco-British ties (Knapp 2007, 209). This political context suggests the existence of a more general climate of opinion propitious for cultural exchange. However, Knapp describes a whole range of bilateral and international obstacles that ultimately prevented the realisation of ‘a special Anglo-French relationship’. The symbolically named Treaty of Dunkirk of 1947 between France and Britain indicated the willingness of the two countries to cooperate, but it was quickly overtaken by larger political configurations enshrined in the Brussels Treaty of 1948 and the NATO Treaty of 1949 (Knapp 2007, 207, 213). As Robert and Isabelle Tombs explain, the different war experiences of the two countries inevitably marked them in different ways, and affected their post-war relationship. Britain was left with ‘a durable sense of pride and unity, perhaps combined with a tendency to complacency and self-delusion’, while France experienced ‘a mixture of pride and shame amounting to a chip on its collective shoulder; festering internal divisions; but also a willingness to change its ways’ (Tombs and Tombs 2007, 599). As Britain and France struggled to reconstruct and redefine their post-war identities through both cooperation and opposition, the balance began to shift, particularly in perceptions of intellectual life. In Britain, continuity started to look like stasis and stagnation, while in France, the commitment to change began to produce results in the shape of intellectual and artistic innovation. As Malcolm Bradbury points out, ‘[i]n countries that had been

defeated or occupied (that included most of Europe) and were still in crisis, or in some cases ceased to exist, the intellectual, cultural and moral tradition of literature and the arts had to be constructed afresh' (Bradbury 2001, 260), and this presented an opportunity as well as a challenge. The process of reconstruction arguably proved more productive in the long term than the satisfaction of winning the war, in the cultural sphere at least. Bell suggests that '[a]t some stage in the late 1950s and early 1960s, the spirit of self-confidence crossed the Channel, leaving Britain and settling in France' (Bell 1997, 6).

The war that appeared to have destroyed France produced a newly fertile cultural environment, but in Britain, literary journalists bemoaned a lack of novelty and constructed a narrative of intellectual decline. The literary magazines *Penguin New Writing* and *Horizon* contained protracted discussions about the future of the English novel and the disappointing output of British writers since the 1930s. In December 1944, addressing the question, 'What are *Penguin New Writing's* post-war plans?', John Lehmann hoped for an improvement in the quality of British literature, wishfully lamenting, '[i]f only it were as simple in modern civilization to produce an improved type of poet as it is a television set or a tank' (Lehmann 1944, 7). In the following edition, Philip Toynbee, discussing 'The Decline and Future of the English Novel', hoped for literary regeneration and a 'new renaissance' (Toynbee 1945, 139). When V. S. Pritchett returned to the question in 1947, he referred to the 'long silence of English novelists during the eight paralysed years since Munich', explaining that '[w]hat we have meant to convey during the last 25 years by the words "the future of the novel", was our doubt whether the novel had any future at all' (Pritchett 1947, 102). Due in some measure to Cyril Connolly's famously pessimistic take on English culture, in *Horizon* examples of this discourse on English literary decline abound. In 1944, Connolly declared that '*Horizon's* first five years have witnessed a decline in all the arts' (Connolly 1944b, 367), and his pessimism did not abate in peacetime: marking *Horizon's* 100th edition in 1948, he made exactly the same claim about its first eight (Connolly 1948, 233). More interesting is Connolly's explanation of the situation in England compared with that of France in 1944, which is worth quoting at length:

In England writers have been exhausted by total war. Although it is Hitler who is responsible for this exhaustion, it is the State which appears as their enemy, for it is the State which continues to drain them by demanding new efforts. Consequently the attitude of our most valuable writers becomes one of anarchist passive resistance. In France there was no total war, but the Germans were in direct command. Instead of the State becoming the enemy (for Vichy was too weak for that) there was a military tyranny to be opposed. The attitude of writers therefore was not one of anarchic sulking but of fraternal conspiracy against the oppressor. And in the case of most writers their leisure and privacy were not interfered with. The French writers are still fighting an ideological war, they have retained the freshness found among English writers during the Spanish crisis (a red Christmas to you, General Franco), they have been hungry, but they have not been worn out by long hours, air-raids and propaganda work. We on the other hand who have neither starved nor been tortured, have never had our liberation, our moment of glory. (Connolly 1944b, 367–68)

This ‘fraternal conspiracy against the oppressor’, to which Connolly ascribes the strength of French wartime writing, is perhaps another way of describing the ‘structure of unity’ Margaret Atack identifies in French Resistance writing, discussed in Chap. 2 (Atack 1989). Connolly’s emphasis on the material and ideological differences between British and French literary cultures as the two countries emerged from the war is highly apposite.

Two particularly significant differences marked the literary environments of post-war France and Britain. First, literary historians have tended towards the view that no single identifiable movement or style dominated British post-war fiction (Bradbury 2001, 277), and as a result, as Alan Munton puts it, ‘[i]n its literary aspect the war has disappeared into an Orwellian memory hole’ (Munton 1989, 4). Indeed, the novelist and critic P. H. Newby had pointed this out in 1951, remarking (with much satisfaction) that British contemporary writing is ‘largely innocent of movements or “schools”’ and therefore ‘hard to classify’ (Newby 1951, 37). D. J. Taylor describes the post-war period as one in which ‘domestic writing defies easy categorisation’ (Taylor 1993, xix–xx), and Malcolm Bradbury (writing in 1987) speaks of the 1940s as an ‘obscure’ decade marking ‘a vacancy in recent cultural history’ (Bradbury 1987, 99; see

also Rau 2016b, 8). More recently, critics have attempted to rediscover and rehabilitate post-war British writing: Bradbury highlights the modernism of Lawrence Durrell and Malcolm Lowry (Bradbury 2001, 306–12), and Plain pays detailed attention to novels by, amongst others, Henry Green, Elizabeth Bowen, Alexander Baron, Stevie Smith, Nigel Balchin, Rose Macauley, Marghanita Laski, and Margery Allingham (Plain 2015; see also Piette 2009; Mengham and Reeve 2001). Nonetheless, Plain concludes that the 1940s remain ‘difficult to integrate into the narrative of twentieth-century British literature’ (Plain 2015, 270). By contrast, post-war French culture immediately became synonymous with the rise of existentialism, the movement which would dominate post-war French culture and which gained in both intellectual and political impetus due to its main exponents’ experiences of the war. Secondly, in Britain, no identifiable new generation of writers emerged in the wake of the war to match the meteoric rise to literary fame of the writers associated with existentialism: Jean-Paul Sartre, Simone de Beauvoir, and Albert Camus. In April 1947, Connolly was just one of a number of critics to bemoan the fact that ‘no new crop of novelists’ had emerged since the war (Connolly 1947a, 154), and in *Horizon’s* penultimate number he cited the impossibility of finding new writers to publish as one reason for the journal’s imminent demise (Connolly 1949, 285). Unfavourable comparisons were made not only with France, but also with Germany and the USA (Bradbury 1987, 98–99; 2001, 272). The most influential post-war British writers such as E. M. Forster and George Orwell were of an older literary generation, their careers already well established between the wars (Bradbury 2001, 281). P. H. Newby observed in 1951 that the best post-war novelists had made their reputations before 1939: not only Evelyn Waugh, but also Elizabeth Bowen, Ivy Compton-Burnett, Joyce Carey, Henry Green, Graham Greene, L. P. Hartley, and V. S. Pritchett (Newby 1951, 29). This feature of British literary production in the later 1940s was linked to the unpropitious material conditions of literature in Britain both during and immediately after the war. During the war, because of paper shortages, it had been illegal to start a new magazine (Shelden 1989, 48). Strict paper rationing for extant publications meant that books and journals sold out easily, removing publishers’ motivation to promote new authors and making it very difficult for new writers to get

established (Munton 1989, 5; Holman 2008, 63–90). Connolly reckoned that the wartime *Horizon* could publish virtually anything and still sell out, and he bemoaned the continuing post-war austerity as a ‘deterrent to aesthetic adventure’ (Shelden 1989, 102, 179). In France, however, the complete reinvention of publishing structures after 1944 due to the suppression of collaborationist journals and publishing houses and their replacement by publications and imprints associated with the Resistance, such as Les Editions de Minuit and Charlot, as well as the renaissance of the major prestigious publishing houses, including Gallimard, provided more propitious material conditions for literary innovation (Sapiro 1999, 589–92).⁶ Conscious of the enduring prestige of French culture abroad, French writers and cultural journalists sought actively to showcase and to develop French literary culture as a way of restoring the international status of their recently defeated nation (Cornick 2000, 28–30). Presenting ‘The Literary Situation in France’ to *Horizon*’s readers in November 1944, Philip Toynbee highlighted the ‘effervescence of Paris’, its ‘intoxication’, ‘ecstasy’, and ‘madness’, contrasting Marianne now ‘dazzled by the metaphorical radiance of freedom’ to ‘poor, war-weary, unliberated London’. ‘For an Englishman’, he wrote, ‘it is both humiliating and invigorating to discover that the creative energy of French writers has easily defied four years of clumsy Teutonic interdiction’ (Toynbee 1944, 295–96). The careers of the existentialists, though begun in the late 1930s, were made in the post-war years and are inextricably associated with French post-war intellectual recovery and prestige, of which Sartre’s journal *Les Temps modernes* is only the most internationally famous example. The post-war Goncourt prizewinning novels considered in Chap. 5 were by writers at the beginning of their literary careers.

Writing the War

The roots of the conceptions of war writing that gained traction in the British and French literary fields after the war can be traced back to ideas about the function and perceived value of literature that were operative during the war. In wartime Britain, there had been a conception of culture

as war work, but it was a very far cry from the politically engaged forms of both poetic and documentary war writing published clandestinely, covertly, or legally in France or Algiers. In Britain, the idea of mobilising the creative writer simply would not stick. While the politically disengaged *Horizon* saw the conservation of 'the essential features of the heritage of Western Humanism' as part of its remit (Connolly 1950, 360; see also Bradbury 1987, 81; Murat 2008, 173), and Connolly had continued strongly to affirm the necessity of culture in wartime, he was highly sceptical of the value of writing *about* the war (Shelden 1989, 5). Indeed, in 'The Ivory Shelter', published in the *New Statesman* in October 1939, he had declared that 'the one excellent counsel I could give to writers would be: keep off the war' (Connolly 1939, 482). Connolly's argument in this article was based on a rejection of 1930s' left-wing literature, which he viewed as both politically ineffectual and aesthetically inferior. Now that the government had taken over the cause of anti-Fascism, he suggested, with palpable relief, writers were free to return to aesthetic concerns. This line of argument leads to Connolly's characteristically witty *envoi*: 'War is a tin-can tied to the tail of civilisation, it is also an opportunity for the artist to give us nothing but the best, and to stop his ears' (Connolly 1939, 483). Connolly was not alone in these views. P. H. Newby agreed that the political novel, 'that unhappy phase in English writing', had ended as the war began (Newby 1951, 40). In his 1951 autobiography, Stephen Spender remarked of Battle of Britain pilots reading *Horizon* that '[i]t is right to say that the service they required of my generation was that we should create', but he argued against a 'time-bound' literature and in favour of writing that 'resisted the imprisoning preoccupation of this age with its own time' (Spender 1977, 292–93, 287). In direct contrast, as Atack describes, in clandestine publications such as *Poésie* which appeared in occupied France, art itself was mobilised via a discourse that posited creativity as the opposite of Nazi barbarity and therefore as a weapon and a direct intervention in the events of the present (Atack 1989, 93–95; 2015, 736). Spender had defended a similar argument to the one articulated in his autobiography in an essay entitled 'The Creative Arts in Our Time', one of his 'Books and the War' series published in *Horizon* between January 1941 and June 1942. Here he maintained that the task of the artist was a productive reconciliation of the present and the past which

resisted both a choking of the present by the past and a cutting-off of the present from the past (Spender 1941, 137). In this essay, Spender firmly rejects the idea of art as propaganda, insisting that the artist must bear witness to the truth without positioning himself as 'an arbiter, a dictator, a philosopher or a scientist' and must allow the reader to 'draw their own conclusions' (Spender 1941, 133). Nonetheless, both Connolly and Spender were signatories to the 'Why Not War Writers?' manifesto published in *Horizon* in October 1941, which demanded that novel writing should be a reserved wartime occupation. An analogy was drawn with visual representation: the British government had mobilised war photographers, whose role was documentary, and war artists, whose role was aesthetic, yet among writers only journalists were mobilised. The manifesto argued that 'creative writers should be used to interpret the war world so that cultural unity is re-established and war effort emotionally co-ordinated' (Calder-Marshall et al. 1941, 238). However, the plea fell on deaf ears, and became, in Connolly's words, '*Horizon's* most lost of lost causes' (Connolly 1943a, 74).

The feeling amongst critics that Britain's novelists should be producing war literature in some form was tempered by the lingering idea that the British literary tradition was not a propitious environment for its development. In an excoriating survey of British war books published in *Horizon* in December 1941, Tom Harrisson suggested that the 'techniques and themes' deployed by British novelists before the war were inadequate for the depiction of the 'total' and 'colossal' drama of war: 'It is difficult', he says, 'for them to ignore the war altogether, but even more difficult to work it into the familiar patterns of the family novel or the reporter's diary. Thus while many interesting and informative war books have been written, on the whole it is fair to say that the stuff has been lousy, a lot of it phoney' (Harrisson 1941, 436). The following May, Alex Comfort cited Britain's island identity as a reason for English novelists' inability to depict the war in its European context after the model of Tolstoy or Zola, arguing that this made it 'impossible [...] for an undefeated England to provide the outlook and the material for any novel of the stature of *War and Peace* or "La Débâcle"' (Comfort 1942, 359). In the autumn of 1943, the publisher Hamish Hamilton abandoned his plan to award a prize to the best new English war novel for lack of any

suitable candidates (Hench 2010, 28). Looking back over the war years from the vantage point of 1945 in 'The Decline and Future of the English Novel', Philip Toynbee argued that the attempt by writers who had experienced the war to depict it was 'far outside the natural tradition and development of English novelists' (Toynbee 1945, 132–33).

As both Comfort's and Toynbee's comments imply, the type of war literature produced was related not only to national literary traditions, but also to the different war experiences of Britain and France. The 'war' in 'war literature' clearly has national specificities. The militant war writing that was produced in France had no obvious equivalent in Britain; French novelists addressed the local themes of Occupation, collaboration, Resistance, and Liberation, whereas, according to Harrison's survey, British war writers treated evacuation, the Blitz, espionage, and peace as well as producing 'R.A.F. books' and 'Dunkirk books' (Harrison 1941, 418–19). The war at home is strongly represented in both literatures, though for different reasons: in France because of the situation of Occupation, and in Britain because writers eschewed the model of war writing as the literature of the disillusioned soldier that they had inherited from the literature of the First World War (Decoste 4; see also Atack 2015, 736–37). Important British war novels that narrate aspects of the war other than fighting were written both during and after the hostilities, such as Henry Green's *Caught* (1943) and *Back* (1946) and Elizabeth Bowen's *The Heat of the Day* (1948), and these have entered the canon of British war writing being constructed in recent scholarship alongside military stories such as H. E. Bates' *Fair Stood the Wind for France* (1944), Alexander Baron's *From the City, From the Plough* (1948), or Evelyn Waugh's *Sword of Honour* trilogy (1952–61), which, though rooted in the soldier's experience, is also about very much more than the fighting war. Equally, amongst the Goncourt prizewinning novels we shall consider in Chap. 5, both the military and the home front are represented: there are two novels about the Occupation but also one about Dunkirk and one about the experiences of a French prisoner of war (POW).

British critics writing in the second half of the 1940s and into the 1950s were virtually unanimous in their view that good literature had little, if anything, to do with the war (Plain 2015, 18; Stewart 2006, 132–34). Henry Reed made this argument in his contribution to a British

Council survey of national culture published under the title *The Arts in Britain*. In his 1946 essay, entitled *The Novel Since 1939*, Reed decried the willingness of contemporary writers to ‘face the music’ of ‘present-day life’, ‘and even to swell its noise’, arguing that war is not a propitious context for aesthetic progress since ‘problems of style, technique and angle are not usually solvable in conditions of energetic strain’ (Reed 1946, 30, 32).⁷ He suggested that ‘[d]uring the war years, if a young novelist has been conscious of the fact that *writing* is itself a problem, his tendency has frequently been to write in the staccato manner of the early Hemingway’, which is not a compliment given that Reed has already described the effect of so many writers falling into ‘the brawny arms of Mr. Ernest Hemingway’ as ‘catastrophic’ (Reed 1946, 32, 11). In a similar vein, Cyril Connolly had bemoaned war writer’s tendency to submit ‘derivative pastiches of Hemingway’ to *Horizon* (Connolly 1944a, 5). Surveying *The Novel, 1945–1950* in a later iteration of the same British Council series, P. H. Newby came to similar conclusions. He claimed that ‘[n]o good English novel has appeared since 1945 to paint the horrors of war’, and suggested that ‘far from the war having provided rich material for the writer it is more likely that it has acted as a curb to the imagination’ (Newby 1951, 13, 14).

As well as doubting the capacity of British literary traditions to generate war writing, contemporary British commentators were sceptical about readers’ appetite for it. For Reed, reading about the war was not a rewarding experience, since ‘[w]ar is a quotidian nightmare, and to read most war books is to share the nightmare and nothing else’ (Reed 1946, 31). In 1943, John Lehmann had wondered: ‘Will people try to forget the war the moment the armistice is signed? Will an interval of several years have to elapse before they want to read anything about it again?’ (Lehmann 1943, 7). The early years of the war had seen a marked increase in the market for serious, educational culture, but as the post-war arrived, this was replaced by a dominant taste for escapist, entertaining literature such as historical novels, crime fiction, and the classics (Plain 2015, 12; 2016). The acme of a wartime ‘Penguin-educated’ audience that was ‘prepared to work for its enjoyment’ (Hewison 1988, 183, cited in Plain 2015, 22) was perhaps the soldier who ‘goes into battle with a shelf of Penguin books and a tin of butter’ (Plain 2015, 131). But 1945 brought a slump

in sales of Penguin ‘Specials’, and Mass Observation’s 1944 report *Books and the Public* suggested the British public did not want to read about the war they had just lived through (Plain 2015, 143–44). Nonetheless, in 1945, Lehmann hoped that good British war writing would now emerge:

I would like to express my hope that some of the writers in uniform, whose prose we have had the pleasure of publishing [...] will soon be returning home and able to devote themselves to the longer and more creative works their stories from the battlefields so tantalizingly promised. (Lehmann 1945, 7)

But by 1946, Lehmann was once again expressing his scepticism about the market for the British war book, and though he hoped the war experiences of the fighting generation might yet make their way into literature, he echoed Spender’s view that good war writing should transcend the direct circumstances of its composition:

I would take a bet that most of them have the notes for a war book or an escape book in their pockets. And I hope they have the luck to finish and find an enthusiastic publisher for them before the public refuses to read anything more about what the world was like between 1938 and 1945; or better still, the wisdom to let their experiences form the compost for poetry and novels of a wider and more generally valid scope. (Lehmann 1946, 7)

Given the perceived absence of demand which worried Lehmann, combined with the feeling that English literature should not be too closely tied to contemporary events, it is not surprising that the war novel failed to emerge in post-war Britain as a recognisable literary genre.

British commentators who still held out hope for ‘good’ war literature in the post-war years looked to Europe. In ‘The Decline and Future of the English Novel’, Philip Toynbee stated that ‘on the *English* novel the impact of this deadly struggle has not been a happy one’ (Toynbee 1945, 133, emphasis in original). Citing Arthur Koestler’s suggestion that ‘the novelist of the future will be he [sic] who has most completely participated in the contemporary struggle, the airman, the underground worker, the commando’, he judges Koestler’s *Darkness at Noon*, a novel about the Stalinist purges and show trials which draws on the author’s experience of incarceration in Spain during the

civil war, to be 'one of the most brilliant, thoughtful and humane novels of the last five years' (Toynbee 1945, 133). Toynbee believed that the issues of the modern world required 'a novelist in the grand manner', but concluded that in England, '[w]e do not possess one' (Toynbee 1945, 134). Also in 1945, Spender argued that '[t]here is a case to be made out for maintaining that great literature is impossible in our time. The great periods seem to be those in which the writer can identify himself with some generally held belief which is also an effective historic force. Such a belief would be one on which a whole society, or a large section of society, acted; as we find in the Renaissance in Italy, and amongst the Elizabethans in England, before and after the French Revolution in France, and perhaps recently in parts of Europe during the German occupation', presumably including France (Spender 1945, 155). These comments echoed the points Connolly had made in *Horizon* the previous year, quoted above, about the 'anarchist passive resistance' of English writers compared with the 'fraternal conspiracy' and 'freshness' of French writers. Amongst broadly Europhile and specifically Francophile British literary opinion-formers, the belief that aesthetically worthwhile war writing would come from abroad indicates an openness to foreign literature, both in its original language, since many of the British intellectual elite were competent at least in French, and in translation.

The situation in France could hardly have been more different. In his essay on the Goncourt prize, Olivier Boura suggests that war in general and the two world wars in particular constitute *the* French literary subject *par excellence*:

C'est le grand sujet, la guerre. L'inépuisable fonds de commerce de nos mémoires. La plaie toujours ouverte. La source à demi cachée, jamais tarie. Le drame essentiel. Notre passion inavouable, aussi, de vieux peuple militaire.

Deux, dont on parle. Les grandes, les mondiales. Guerres justes, à ce qu'on dit. Effroyables, mais morales, malgré tout. Lisibles, donc. (Boura 2003, 57)

[War is the great subject. The inexhaustible stock in trade of our memories. The still open wound. The half-hidden spring that never dries up. The essential drama. The guilty passion of an ancient military people.

There are two which we speak of. The great ones, the world ones. Just wars, it is said. Appalling, but moral, despite everything. Legible, therefore.]

Far from being a curb on the writer's imagination, war, Boura argues, has been one of French literature's most fundamental and enduring sources of inspiration. Interwar French literature offered a rich store of neo-naturalist, social novels based on real events on which post-war novelists could draw to represent the war they had just experienced. Surveying the French novel in 1945, Jean-Yves Tadié points to a continuity of form and style linking the post-war novel of recent history to pre-war models (Tadié 2004). As we have seen, French writers had confronted the Occupation by mobilising literature as part of the fight. The militant character of much French Second World War writing was closely connected to the recent heritage of 1930s politically committed literature, which was much more developed in France than in Britain. France's emblematic war poet Louis Aragon, a communist and the husband of Elsa Triolet, had been at the centre of discussions about French socialist realism in the 1930s; and the conception of intellectual responsibility and committed literature expounded by Sartre in his editorial for the first number of *Les Temps modernes*—first published in English translation in *Horizon* in May 1945, six months before its publication in France (Shelden 1989, 124)—was influenced by Sartre's interwar friendship with the communist writer Paul Nizan, a leading theorist and practitioner of 'revolutionary' literature in the 1930s. That French war writing was perceived to be a real and effective contribution to the war effort is indicated by the fact that it was treated as such both during the war, by the Nazi occupiers, who were more than ready to execute those involved in cultural resistance, and during the post-war purge trials, under which collaborating French writers and journalists were tried and in some cases executed.

Whilst the heritage of 1930s social and political literature and of militant wartime writing is clearly perceptible in post-war French war writing, post-war writers did not simply imitate pre-war or wartime modes of writing, but engaged in a critical dialogue with this heritage. Roger Vailland's 1945 communist Resistance novel *Drôle de jeu* is a case in

point, as Christopher Lloyd's analysis of the text suggests. Alongside its didactic elements, reminiscent of 1930s *littérature engagée*, the novel contains an ironic discourse on literary writing which calls the French tradition of political literature into question. As Lloyd points out, the 'funny game' of the title refers not only to the Resistance itself but also to the creation of a literary text about the Resistance (Lloyd 2003, 157–63). Vailland's novel, written during the Liberation, is characterised by a much greater degree of ironic distance than Kessel's wartime *L'Armée des ombres*. Sartre was trying to find a form for the committed novel that did not replicate the interwar *roman à thèse* (didactic political fiction), and Camus drew on the form of allegory in his 1947 novel *La Peste* to engage with the question of totalitarianism. More 'middlebrow' writers, such as those who won the Goncourt prize, were often writing less about the war itself than about politicised representations of the war. Michel Jacquet's study of ironic representations of the Occupation in French literature of the post-war years suggests that as much as caricaturing particular types of behaviour during the war, such writers sought to undermine politically partisan representations of France as heroically resisting the enemy, representations that were characteristic of the discourse of both the communist left and Gaullism. This produced deliberately disengaged fiction, such as Jean-Louis Bory's *Mon village à l'heure allemande*, the 1945 Goncourt prizewinner, in which all sides are ridiculed. It also produced a different type of political fiction, such as Jean-Louis Curtis' *Les Forêts de la nuit*, which won the 1947 Goncourt prize, which expressed disappointment at the failures of the promises the leftist/communist Resistance seemed to hold out for post-war French reconstruction. In the more intellectualised sector of the literary field, the *nouveau roman*, which followed and contested existentialism as the dominant post-war French literary movement, had its roots in an attempt to write the war in all its complexity, as Lynn A. Higgins's study *New Novel, New Wave, New Politics* demonstrated (Higgins 1996). Writers of the *nouveau roman* such as Marguerite Duras, Claude Simon, and Alain Robbe-Grillet disrupted the narrative forms on which both existentialist literature and 1930s *littérature engagée* relied, such as characterisation and referentiality, in order to produce a type of writing about the war that was self-consciously different from committed fiction.

It is then by no means the case that all post-war French literary engagements with the Second World War are tales of heroism asserting positive views of Frenchness on the basis of the nation's ultimate liberation from the Nazis and from Vichy. France's experience of the war had been far too conflictual and traumatic for any easy consensus to emerge. While post-war French war writing was influenced both by committed literature of the 1930s and by Resistance literature from the period 1940–44, it is certainly not the case that all or even most post-war French novelists wrote books that celebrated the French Resistance. As Margaret Atack has consistently and convincingly argued, the notion that nothing in French cultural representations of the war contested the Gaullist myth of France as a nation of resistance until 1968 is based on a misreading of Henry Rousso's 'Vichy syndrome':

One of the most intriguing aspects of French cultural history since the 1980s is the immovability of the idea that silence about the 'difficult' aspects of the occupation governed the discussion and representation of the Resistance for decades, from the founding moment of de Gaulle's Hôtel de Ville speech in August 1944, even though this is flying in the face of the evidence. (Atack 2013, 61; see also Atack 2018)

As Atack points out, Rousso's claim in *Le Syndrome de Vichy* that de Gaulle's 1944 speech functioned as the basis for the *résistancialiste* myth is a description not of the 1940s but of the 1960s, a period in which the Resistance was indeed instrumentalised in the service of a discourse on national unity. By contrast:

From 1944 onwards, there is a multiplicity of narratives, in essays, fictions, films, political essays, journalism, narratives of political rhetoric and narratives of the institutional processes of government and the law across which the resistance is simultaneously celebrated, defended and denounced. (Atack 2013, 62–63; see also Atack 2008, 2010)

As Atack's *Literature and the French Resistance* (1989) and later works by Colin Nettelbeck (1985), Alan Morris (1992), Michael Berkvam (2000), and Michel Jacquet (2000) have all clearly demonstrated, the Goncourt prizewinners are part of a larger corpus of novels which provide

ample evidence that French writers of the later 1940s were neither silent about the Occupation and collaboration, nor complicit in a reading of the war exclusively in terms of a heroic discourse of resistance (see also Bowles 2014; Mouré 2014). These novels are part of a wider memorial context spanning the second half of the 1940s to the 1960s that was far from homogeneous (Laborie 2011, 62–63). And neither, therefore, is it correct to assent to what Pierre Laborie in his 2011 study *Le chagrin et le venin* calls the ‘new vulgate’, which, he argues, has become dominant since the 1970s, and according to which the history of France’s war can only be remembered via a discourse of complicity, opportunism, and *attentisme*. Both the earlier doxa of *résistancialisme* and the more recent one of total collective amnesia and general culpability are simplifications (Laborie 2011, 68–72). French novels of the later 1940s present a complex view of the Occupation, the Resistance and collaboration, and this is as true of the novels of Sartre, Beauvoir, and Camus which sanction the Resistance as it is of the Goncourt prizewinners which probe its darker aspects.

Such significant differences in the literary history and contemporary perception of the relationship between war and fiction in Britain and France inevitably impacted on the ways in which French war fiction could be received in Britain. The example of existentialist war fiction is instructive here. Surveying the reception of twentieth-century French fiction in English translation, Marilyn Gaddis Rose suggests that Sartre, Beauvoir, and Camus ‘were particularly influential in the decades following World War II’ (Gaddis Rose 2000, 287). Colin Davis remarks that ‘[i]n literary terms, the war was a fantastic opportunity for Sartre and Beauvoir: it gave them lots to write about’ (Davis 2018, 53), and Susan Suleiman suggests that Sartre’s worldwide fame as a post-war intellectual had its roots in his representations of the war in various genres. Sartre’s analyses of the war experience were disseminated in both Britain and America as soon as the Occupation ended. In December 1944, ‘Paris sous l’Occupation’ appeared in London in *La France libre*, and in September 1945, ‘Qu’est-ce qu’un collaborateur?’ appeared in New York in *La République française*. (Suleiman 2006, 13–35). Sartre and Beauvoir’s war novels, published in Paris in 1945, were reviewed at length in *Horizon* by Sonia Brownell (the future Sonia Orwell) in January 1946, before

their translations appeared. Brownell seems to have appreciated the first two volumes of *Les Chemins de la liberté* as war books, but not as philosophical fiction. Of Sartre's treatment of the war in *L'Age de raison* and *Le Sursis*, she says: 'We owe a debt of gratitude to M. Sartre, for he has attempted to give back stature to the novel by drawing his characters against a larger background and by facing up to moral problems through them, thus breaking away from the too prevalent tendency in fiction to concentrate on an exquisite sensibility without bothering to base it on anything' (Brownell 1946, 69). Brownell's criteria for fiction of 'stature' recall Alex Comfort's remarks about the historical scope of Tolstoy and Zola. However, Brownell did not respond positively to the philosophical content of Sartre's fiction: 'But the trouble with *Les Chemins de la liberté*, so far, is that the philosophy is incompletely integrated and so the book is liable to fail as a work of art [...] Although he is writing about a group of people, they rapidly become marionettes twitched around on the strings of his philosophy' (Brownell 1946, 69). Beauvoir's *Le Sang des autres* was an even worse case: 'if in Sartre's novel the philosophy tends to be incompletely integrated, Madame de Beauvoir has simply made no attempt at all at integration' (Brownell 1946, 70). Brownell was distracted by the novel's somewhat cumbersome existentialist framework, remarking that '[i]t would be fascinating to find out how often the words 'j'existe', 'existence' etc., were used in proportion to any other' (Brownell 1946, 71).⁸

Brownell's response to *Les Chemins de la liberté* and *Le Sang des autres* displays the British resistance to didactic fiction that we have already identified in writings by Cyril Connolly, P. H. Newby, and even the left-sympathising Stephen Spender. British critics did not, on the whole, share Haakon Chevalier's enthusiasm for French-committed literature. Henry Reed's *The Novel Since 1939* provides another telling example of British resistance to literary *engagement*. Here Reed declared himself to be concerned with 'the fate of the novel at the hands of the serious practitioner as distinct from the writer who caverlierly uses the novel for the distillation of political or philosophical ideas', stating that whilst some sort of philosophical or political world view inevitably 'emerges' from good literature, it should not 'stand there for the novel to drape itself around' (Reed 1946, 7). One target of his irony was French existentialism. Reed

was pleased that English fiction was dominated by individuals rather than by ‘tendencies’, and, with palpable relief, placed existentialism, along with socialist realism, outwith contemporary English literature:

Many of our novelists are socialists, almost all of them are realists; I am glad of both of these things, but I am more glad that we have no “socialist realists”. And though beside the novels of Miss Compton-Burnett “existentialism” sounds like the merry chanting of a troupe of Boy Scouts, we have no existentialists pure and simple. (Reed 1946, 38)

In a similar vein, in ‘The Decline and Future of the English Novel’, Toynbee had argued that the politicisation of literature in the 1930s was ‘wholly extraneous’ to the English novel (Toynbee 1945, 132–33). The previous year (1944), discussing ‘The Literary Situation in France’, Toynbee rejected French Resistance fiction on the basis that it was more about politics than literature. He opposed ‘the social-realist tradition of the pre-war years’ to “pure” literature’, and rated Resistance fiction as ‘low in literary importance’ because it was ‘primarily combatant’ (Toynbee 1944, 302, 296). An objection to politically partisan literature also characterises Anthony Powell’s review of *The Reprieve*, Eric Sutton’s 1947 translation of Sartre’s *Le Sursis*,⁹ in the *Times Literary Supplement* in January 1948. Sartre’s ‘historical method’ is criticised for drawing simplistic oppositions between political opponents in the manner of children’s books about Cavaliers and Roundheads:

In *The Reprieve* Chamberlain is a doddering old man; France anxious to repudiate her responsibilities; Britain no better; the Soviet Union staunch to the last. M Sartre gives us no hint that in a year’s time his Communist, Brunet, will be applauding the Russo-German pact, a weakness, surely, in the objective treatment which the book appears to claim. (Powell 1948a, 21)

Contemporary productions of Sartre’s plays drew comparable responses from British critics, as Benedict O’Donohoe’s analysis of their reception in London and New York has shown (O’Donohoe 2001). In July 1947, the *Times*, *Spectator* and *New Statesman* found Sartre’s direct depiction of torture in *Men Without Shadows* hard to take, and Peter Fleming, reviewing *Dirty Hands* in the *Spectator* in August 1948, found the play’s value to

lie not in its depiction of contemporary events but rather in whatever survived of the play after these were forgotten (O'Donohoe 2001, 4, 6). Here also we can detect a British preference for the aesthetic and the enduring over the political and the current. This is also manifest in Powell's review of Stewart Gilbert's 1948 translation of Camus's *The Plague*, which he appreciated as a neo-romantic novel displaying affinities with the work of Edgar Allan Poe (Powell 1948b). Gerard Hopkins' 1950 translation of the third volume of Sartre's trilogy, *Iron in the Soul*, fared a little better in the reviews than had *The Reprieve*. Julian Symons appreciated the way Sartre created 'a passionate, powerful, ironic analysis of the psychology of defeat' by tracing the reactions of various groups of characters; for Symons, this made for 'a profound, subtle and terrifying piece of writing' (Symons 1950, 513). V. S. Pritchett liked this novel better than Sartre's previous works, concluding that 'it remarkably conveys the intensity of contemporary history', but nonetheless classifying it as 'a novel of the higher journalism' (Pritchett 1950, 6–7), a phrase that is suggestive of British resistance to novelists writing directly about events.

Despite these objections, the war fiction of Sartre, Beauvoir, and Camus found enthusiastic readers in Britain. British interest in existentialist fiction derived from the perception that contemporary French literature was much more exciting than British writing. In his 1955 autobiography, John Lehmann describes how, when he first read Sartre in the 1930s, 'the impact on my imagination was terrific' (Lehmann 1955, 250). Cyril Connolly believed that in Britain 'there was nothing to compare with the interest and enthusiasm that the recent works of Sartre and Camus had generated in Paris' (Shelden 1989, 125; see also Murat 2008). Reviewing *Horizon's* contribution to English literary life in its last number in 1950, Connolly wrote that 'we became a display window for Sartre and Camus and the French writers' (Connolly 1950, 360), and, indeed, their work was very well represented and discussed in detail in the journal. As already noted, the May 1945 issue, which was entirely devoted to 'News out of France', included Sartre's 'The Case for Responsible Literature', a translation of the editorial to the inaugural number of *Les Temps modernes* (Sartre 1945), and in November 1949 Beauvoir contributed a long article on Montherlant (Beauvoir 1949). A. J. Ayer discussed the philosophical ideas of Sartre and Camus in his 'Novelist Philosophers' series in the summer of

1945 and the spring of 1946 (Ayer 1945, 1946). Sartre's *The Reprieve* and Camus' *The Plague*, both published by Hamish Hamilton, were repeatedly advertised in *Horizon* in 1948 with ringing endorsements from Stephen Spender, André Gide, and Arthur Koestler, hailing Camus as the 'greatest' of France's 'three vital writers', alongside Sartre and Malraux. *Horizon's* survey of books from 1947, which aimed to indicate 'which books some of our best critics have derived satisfaction from' had excluded foreign books, but Connolly noted that had this not been the case, 'Camus's *La Peste* would probably have topped the list' (Connolly 1947b, 365). Herbert Read mentioned Sartre's *Age of Reason* in his response, though he had read it earlier in French (Connolly 1947b, 369).

The reception of existentialist war fiction in Britain in the post-war years is indicative of the ambivalence of British critics towards the literature of their nearest continental neighbours. On the one hand, critics responded with marked scepticism to the philosophical and political didacticism of Sartre and Beauvoir's novels. However, the fact that tendentious literature was not valued highly in the British literary field did not prevent English critics from engaging positively with the work of Sartre, Beauvoir and Camus. They obviously recognised the importance of these writers, and some found the buzz they were creating in post-war France to be infectious. While critics certainly did not propose that the existentialists be taken as role models for the development of English literature, there is no doubt that reviews of their fiction formed part of an ongoing debate in the post-war British literary press about how the war could or should be written about.

War, Fiction, and National Identity

As Connolly noted in 1944 in the *Horizon* editorial quoted earlier, after the Liberation French writers were 'still fighting an ideological war'. That war soon became *une guerre franco-française*, an internecine war waged within France as the functional unity of the war years collapsed to reveal the conflicts amongst different factions of both the Resistance and collaboration, as well as between them. Parts of the interior Resistance were openly hostile to the political programme de Gaulle had elaborated from

Algiers; Gaullists, moderates, and right-wingers alike feared the strength of the French Communist Party, which also sought to capitalise on its Resistance credentials; Gaullists and Communists each claimed to represent the 'true' France of the Resistance. Those who had supported Vichy in any way were viewed by both groups as traitors, and purge trials were established to rid France of those perceived to be its internal enemies. The *épuration* ranged from local lynchings in the days immediately following the Liberation, most famously exemplified by the shaving of the heads of women believed to have slept with the enemy, to the formal trials of the Vichy regime's political leaders and its intellectual supporters, a process that continued until amnesties were declared in 1952. But the *épuration* failed to achieve any sort of consensus, with some of Vichy's most ardent opponents contesting its perceived excesses and injustices (Atack 1989, 164–67; Judt 2010, 42–43, 46–51). In this context, it is hardly surprising that the post-war French war novel, including existentialist literature, was 'concerned above all to demonstrate the ambiguity of the times' (Atack 1989, 167). As Atack demonstrates, the ideological content of French post-war representations of the Occupation was focused on the many ambiguities within the categories of 'resistance' and 'enemy' rather than on the opposition between them. The Goncourt prizewinners considered in Chap. 5 are typical of many post-war French novels in which 'the divisions and conflicts of the *épuration* constitute the ending towards which all the narrative tends' (Atack 1989, 190–91).

Both defeat and victory occasioned important processes of reflection on national identity. Despite the experience of successfully 'pulling together' to defeat the enemy, and despite the Labour landslide victory in the 1945 General Election, Britain did not emerge from the war with a straightforward sense of national identity. In her landmark study *Which People's War?*, Sonia Rose argues that even if there was a continuing sense of national unity in Britain, this did not rely on a homogeneous or unequivocal conception of what 'Britishness' meant (Rose 2003, 290). Although 1945–50 was the period of Labour's hopeful struggle to build its New Jerusalem, these years were also characterised by a discourse of national decline since the defeated nations enjoyed higher post-war living standards than Britain (Ramsden 2010, 43; Judt 2010, 162). Plain cites post-war economic problems as evidence that 'Britain, or at least the

concept of the British nation that had shaped the pre-war years, certainly did not 'win' the postwar' (Plain 2015, 185). The experience of defeat led France to reflect deeply on the meaning of national unity and identity. As Malcolm Smith has suggested, '[p]ostwar France and Italy went through a period of cultural adjustment much more radical than anything going on in postwar Britain, because those nations had to confront their pasts and define their futures in a much more serious way than a Britain relatively complacent in victory' (Smith 2000, 140). To quote Judt:

The British experienced World War Two as a moment of national reconciliation and rallying together, rather than as a corrosive rent in the fabric of the state and nation, which was how it was remembered across the Channel. In France the war had revealed everything that was wrong with the nation's political culture; in Britain it had seemed to confirm everything that was right and good about national institutions and habits. (Judt 2010, 160–61)

Olivier Wieviorka's political history of French war memory, *La Mémoire désunie*, has demonstrated just how hard the French state worked to build a specific conception of Frenchness on the foundation of the experience of the war. The immediate priority of French governments' post-war 'memory policy' was to heal the nation's wounds and offer a plausible and acceptable narrative of France's dark years, and de Gaulle's discursive construction of a heroic France during the period of the Provisional Government at least had the merit of coherence (Wieviorka 2010, 18, 42). The conception of French national identity constructed by the state in the immediate post-war years was neither universally accepted nor historically correct, but it was clear and it was functional, even if it also provoked dissent. While the state's role in constructing a public memory of the war was significant, it could not control how individuals and groups remembered, and official measures such as decorating France's heroes with the Croix de la Libération and the Médaille de la Résistance or the organisation of commemorative events could only function in dialogue with deregulated cultural representations of the war, such as are to be found in the fiction of the period. Whilst de Gaulle's reading of the war was consistent, the war memories that emerged in France were fragmented, politicised and conflictual (Wieviorka 2010, 23). Post-war reflections on national identity in France

and Britain stood in very different relationships to literature. France was highly conflicted about her role in the war, but French writers emerged from it with a clear sense that the war must be written about, and they had the tools at hand to do so. Post-war Britain was proud of her heroic role in the war, if rather uncertain about what this victory really meant for British national identity, and British writers were unclear as to how, or even if, they should write about it.

Given that a central function of the war novel is to contribute to explorations and constructions of national identity, the answer to the question of why war books should be of interest to readers in other countries is far from obvious. Why should we be interested in reading other people's war stories? The uses to which readers put translated war fiction vary considerably depending on the nature and location of the events being narrated and the specific time and place of reception. Reading *War and Peace* in Rosemary Edmonds' translation in 1957 is a very different prospect from reading, say, Irène Némirovsky's Tolstoy-inspired and posthumously published Occupation novel *Suite française* in Sandra Smith's 2007 translation (Némirovsky 2007), which is different again from the reading experience this novel might have provided had it been published immediately after the war. This is why it is important to consider specific examples in clearly defined times and places. In Britain in the second half of the 1940s, three key factors defined the context of reception of the French war novel. First, as we have seen, leading literary opinion-formers such as Connolly and Lehmann were generally open to Europe and were enthusiastic Francophiles. Lehmann describes in his autobiography how he was inspired to create *New Writing* by the French anti-fascist intellectuals of interwar France, and how he scoured French and German books and magazines looking for works he could publish in translation (Lehmann 1955, 232, 235). Secondly, those opinion-formers believed strongly in the desirability of international cultural exchange for post-war reconstruction. The 'Why Not War Writers' manifesto argued that 'there should be a free cultural interchange of creative writers, to establish during the war the international understanding that is the chief aim of peace'; and its third demand was: 'The international exchange of writers to be encouraged and accelerated' (Calder-Marshall et al. 1941, 238). This is the sort of (admittedly idealistic) argument that lay behind the flourishing of

comparative literature as a discipline, particularly in the USA, in the wake of the Second World War (Siebers 1995, 195–96). Thirdly, translated fiction could provide an opportunity for British readers to gain access to a side of the war they had not seen and could barely imagine. We saw in Chap. 3 that J. G. Weightman's *French Writing on English Soil* and Connolly's publication of Kessel in *Horizon* were designed to fulfil precisely this function. Stephen Spender evoked the impossibility of imagining occupied France in his autobiography:

Even in the minds of those who knew them well, France and other continental countries had become mental concepts only, areas in our minds where incredible things happened [...] Even today, *France under the Occupation* remains to me an idea only, to which I can attach little reality, a hallucinated vision of folly, betrayal and despairing courage. So that, if some French friend begins to speak of his life during those years, I stare at him as though expecting to see him change into a different person. (Spender 1977, 284–85, emphasis in original)

An intensification of Franco-British cultural exchanges in the immediate aftermath of the war bears witness to the British desire to compensate for this imaginative deficit. Intellectuals such as Connolly had the opportunity to travel to France in the months following the Liberation to try to understand for themselves what the French war experience had been like (Shelden 1989, 122–25). Enid McLeod reports a 'cultural explosion' in London in 1945 as the French writers celebrated by *Horizon* were once again able to cross the Channel. McLeod describes a French Embassy initiative which brought professional French women over to Britain to tell audiences in the provinces what life had been like in occupied France (McLeod 1982, 133–34). But not everyone could travel or attend these events, and the written word also had its part to play in revealing the European war experience to the British. English novelists did not themselves write many war books about Europe (Munton 1989, 12).¹⁰ In 1947, Lehmann described 'the well-drilled, well-bombed, well-brow-beaten Englishman, trailing clouds of official forms like chains behind him, ready to jump into a line whenever anyone shouts "Queue up!"' as someone who 'finds it difficult at first to look into the minds of Europeans

whose experiences during the war were so different from his own, and so various amongst themselves'. Lehmann therefore saw *Penguin New Writing's* post-war task as being to 'equip ourselves to understand what is going on in the European mind' and 'to interpret the new movements and new creative ideas which have sprung up across the Channel; to compare them with our ideas, to profit from them or to reject them by serious and unprejudiced standards, relating them to wider conceptions of the European tradition'. To do so, Lehmann said, it would be necessary to 'increase the proportion of translations and critical essays which have a wider scope' (Lehmann 1947, 7–8). Lehmann's point was not simply that the British were curious about what had gone on in wartime Europe. More importantly, he was suggesting that the adequate development of English intellectual life in the post-war world depended on a critical engagement with those aspects of the European war experience that had no equivalent in Britain.

British interest in French war stories must also be understood in relation to the proximity between French and British culture which we touched upon in Chap. 3. During the war, British intellectuals and politicians alike expressed the notion that British and French culture arose out of a single civilisation (Bell 1997, 62). France is England's nearest neighbour, geographically and culturally, and French has traditionally been the first foreign language of the educated English. Franco-British exchange is therefore both crucial and inevitable, and engagement with French culture is a constitutive part of English culture itself. Literary historians have documented this cultural interpenetration. In their collection *The Literary Channel: The Inter-National Invention of the Novel*, Margaret Cohen and Carolyn Denver suggest that the emergence of the novel as a genre between the late seventeenth and early nineteenth centuries was a product not so much of influence between two discrete national literatures but rather of a 'cross-Channel literary zone', a liminal, hybrid literary space connecting the literary fields of France and Britain (Cohen and Denver 2002, 2). In an introduction to a collection of essays on *Franco-British Cultural Exchanges, 1880–1940*, Andrew Radford and Victoria Reid demonstrate that the late nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century comprised a period of enhanced Franco-British cultural exchange during which 'the manifold movements

of people, textual and visual representations, conceptual ploys and commercial initiatives' across the Channel underpinned a modernist aesthetic that frequently transgressed national borders as well as artistic boundaries (Radford and Reid 2010, 3).¹¹ Contemporary critics were certainly aware of the existence of a Franco-English cultural space. In an essay on 'French and English Cultural Relations' first published in *Horizon* in June 1943 (Connolly 1943b), reprinted in French in *La Revue du monde libre* in July 1943 (notably in the same issue as Joseph Kessel's 'Ces gens-là sont merveilleux') as 'Relations culturelles franco-anglaises' (Connolly 1943c), and reprinted again in his essay collection *The Condemned Playground* in 1945 (Connolly 1945), Cyril Connolly affirmed the existence of an 'Anglo-French culture' which relied on constructive mutual influence. Comparing Betjeman and La Bruyère, he suggested:

In these two passages (and many other examples could have been chosen) it seems to me that we see the difference between the cultures of the two countries, the characteristic of English literature being Imagination, of French, Intellect; the vice of the one Unreality, and of the other Sterility, and both requiring the intervention of each other's influences, the interplay of each other's masterpieces, so that the luxuriance of the Anglo-Saxon intermingles with the lucidity of the Gallo-Latin and both are fortified. (Connolly 1945, 80)

Both French/English difference and French–English contact are here viewed as productive for the development of each nation's culture. This optimistic vision of harmonious cultural exchange is deeply rooted in Connolly's Francophilia, but it nonetheless represents a very real belief in a certain kinship between French and English culture that was widely shared. We shall see in Chap. 5 that two of the Goncourt-winning French war novels that were translated into English were already marked by the influence of English culture: Jean-Louis Curtis and Robert Merle were both academic Anglicists, and their knowledge of the English language and of English literature is clearly perceptible in their fiction. As translation scholars now widely recognise, the 'original' is never unproblematically monocultural, nor even monolingual. Translation, for Bella Brodzki, mediates 'between the irreducible particular and the false universal'; it is

a textual practice that ‘foregrounds the mutability, intertextuality, and alterity inherent in every literary event’ (Brodzki 2007, 14–15). Therefore, we must ask, ‘what if the origin(al) is always already heterogeneous?’ (Brodzki 2007, 72). Approaches to translation which draw on deconstruction problematise the idea of a unitary source text or source language. Derrida has taught us that ‘in the very tongue of the original narrative there is a translation, a sort of transfer’, because language itself is not self-identical (Derrida 1985, 172). Translation mediates not between cultural monads, but between different configurations of hybridity.

War Fiction as Prosthetic Memory

The translated war novel is a complex cultural artefact which acts as a vehicle for the generation and circulation of transnational memories. Its compensatory function—allowing readers to experience wars or aspects of wars they did not themselves live through—might be understood as an instance of ‘prosthetic memory’.¹² Alison Landsberg coined this term in her 2004 study of the same title, subtitled *The Transformation of American Remembrance in the Age of Mass Culture*, which examines ways in which people are affected by ‘memories’ of events (her examples are immigration, slavery, and the Holocaust) they have not actually experienced. Landsberg argues that in an age of mass and commoditised culture, technologies such as films and experiential museums create memories that are shared across spatial and temporal borders and exceed the cognitive apprehension of history (Landsberg 2004, 8, 2, 18). Prosthetic memory, then, is more than just knowing about the past. The examples Landsberg considers all concern historical situations in which kinship relations were broken, such as in the case of families of Holocaust victims, necessitating the creation of ‘alternative methods for the transmission and dissemination of memories’ to replace direct transmission within the family (Landsberg 2004, 2). Given the situation of wartime France and Britain as allies, the presence of the French government in exile in London, and the perception we have identified in 1940s Britain of the existence of close cultural ties between France and Britain, it is legitimate to conceive of the relationship between the two nations as one

of kinship. Like siblings, France and Britain have, historically, defined their identities through conflict as well as proximity, as both academic historical studies, such as Linda Colley's *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707–1837* (Colley 1992), and more popular titles, such as Stephen Clarke's *1000 Years of Annoying the French* (Clarke 2010), have demonstrated. The separation of mainland France from Britain in the period 1940–44 might then be seen as a rupture requiring intra-generational transmission of memories between siblings or peers (Landsberg 2004, 84). Unlike Marianne Hirsch's concept of 'postmemory' (Hirsch 1997), prosthetic memory does not only occur between generations but also within them. The usefulness of the concept of prosthetic memory for the analysis of translated literature seems to me to lie in an aspect of the notion that is somewhat underdeveloped in Landsberg's account. Although she claims that '*Prosthetic Memory* theorizes the production and dissemination of memories that have no direct connection to a person's lived past and yet *are essential to the production and articulation of subjectivity*' (Landsberg 2004, 20, my emphasis), more attention is devoted to the technologies of transmission and their political and ethical implications than to the psychological implication of the physical metaphor of the prosthesis. In her discussion of the 1908 film *The Thieving Hand*, in which a beggar's prosthetic arm 'remembers' its previous criminal owner and continues to steal, the prosthesis is interpreted by Landsberg primarily in economic terms. It is 'a commodity that can be purchased by anyone with the means', and Landsberg sees it as a signifier of the beggar's class identity (Landsberg 2004, 27, 36). Somewhat masked by Landsberg's insistence on commoditisation is the fact that individuals only use prostheses, be they purchased or gifted, when something that is crucial to their bodily functioning is missing. Prosthetic memories are not then 'equally available to all'—after all, you can only wear a prosthetic arm if one of your own is missing (Landsberg 2004, 27). It is need that distinguishes prosthetic memory from historical knowledge. Prosthetic memories are created only in cases of psychological need, where there is a psychic gap resulting from a perceived 'missed' experience which threatens to compromise the satisfactory formation or development of an individual's identity. The implication of John Lehmann's comments, quoted earlier, about Britain's need to look into

the minds of Europeans in order to perceive their war experience, is that, at a national level, the formation of prosthetic memories was crucial to the proper development of the collective British post-war mentality. Translated war fiction had a vital role to play as a prosthesis replacing those aspects of the Allied war which the British did not experience directly. However, as analysis of the translated Goncourt prizewinners will show, translation not only facilitates, but also complicates, the formation and transmission of prosthetic memories.

Notes

1. Vercors' *Le Silence de la mer* was much reprinted after the war. Les Éditions de Minuit reprinted it in 1945, 1946, and 1948. A cinema adaptation by Jean-Pierre Melville was released in 1949.
2. '—Ils m'ont reçu avec ma nouvelle, comme un chien dans un jeu de quilles' (Tolstoy 1968, 229).
3. For example, Radstone (2011) evokes 'possibilities for transmission and translation' (114) and Rothberg (2014) points out that 'The forms of dialogue, connection and translation that take place in multi-directional encounters do not take place on an even playing field' (655).
4. See also Deane-Cox (2013, 2014, 2016).
5. For a concise overview of the development of French and English historiographical approaches to the Second World War since 1944, see Footitt (2012).
6. Sapiro points out however the imbalance of power created by the policy of granting rationed paper supplies to publishing houses in proportion to their pre-war production, which disadvantaged newcomers such as Charlot and Minuit (Sapiro 1999, 591).
7. This 43-page pamphlet was the fourth in the British Council's series 'The Arts in Britain'.
8. See Davis (1998, 35–36, 41) on the critical reception of *Le Sang des autres* as a didactic text and Davis (2018, 49–115) for a recent discussion of the presence of the war in the writings of Sartre, Beauvoir, and Camus. Beauvoir's *Le Sang des autres* was translated into English by Yvonne Moyse and Roger Senhouse for Secker & Warburg as *The Blood of Others* in 1948 (Beauvoir 1990). See Potter (2010).
9. Eric Sutton also translated Sartre's *L'Age de raison* (*The Age of Reason*), and both were published by Hamish Hamilton in 1947 (Sartre 1947a, b).

10. As regards France, there are some notable exceptions, such as Neville Shute's *The Pied Piper* (1942), Storm Jameson's *Cloudless May* (1943), and H.E. Bates' *Fair Stood the Wind for France* (1944).
11. On Franco-British exchange and modernism, see also Caws and Bird Wright (2000).
12. In their introduction to *British Cultural Memory and the Second World War*, Noakes and Pattinson refer to Landsberg's idea of 'prosthetic memory' but do not pursue its relevance for war writing in detail (Noakes and Pattinson 2013, 8–9). Sharon Deane-Cox has recently analysed prosthetic memory and translation via an examination of translated audio-guides at the Oradour-sur-Glane memorial in the Limousin region of France (Deane-Cox 2014). See also Brownlie (2016, 184).

References

- Apter, Emily. 2006. *The Translation Zone: The New Comparative Literature*. Princeton/Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Assmann, Aleida. 2014. Transnational Memories. *European Review* 22 (4): 546–556.
- Atack, Margaret. 1989. *Literature and the French Resistance: Cultural Politics and Narrative Forms 1940–1950*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- . 2008. Sins, Crimes and Guilty Passions in France's Stories of War and Occupation. *Journal of War and Culture Studies* 1 (1): 79–90.
- . 2010. Representing the Occupation in the Novel of the 1950s: *Ne jugez pas*. *Cincinnati Romance Review* 29: 76–88.
- . 2013. "Résistantialisme", "Résistancialisme": Resistance and the Politics of Memory. In *Mnemosyne and Mars Artistic and Cultural Representations of Twentieth-Century Europe at War*, ed. Peter Tame, Dominique Jeannerod, and Manuel Bragança, 59–74. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- . 2015. Littérature de guerre. In *Encyclopedie de la Seconde Guerre Mondiale*, ed. Jean-François Muracciole and Guillaume Picketty, 733–739. Paris: Robert Laffont.
- . 2018. A Nation United? The Impossible Memory of War and Occupation in France. In *Remembering the Second World War*, ed. Patrick Finney, 11–29. London/New York: Routledge.
- Atack, Margaret, and Christopher Lloyd. 2012. Introduction. In *Framing Narratives of the Second World War and Occupation in France, 1939–2009*, ed.

- Margaret Atack and Christopher Lloyd, 1–15. Manchester/New York: Manchester University Press.
- Ayer, A.J. 1945. Novelist-Philosophers V – Jean-Paul Sartre. *Horizon*, July, Vol. 12 (67): 12–26 and August, Vol. 12 (68): 101–110.
- . 1946. Novelist-Philosophers VIII – Albert Camus. *Horizon* 13 (75): 155–168.
- Beauvoir, Simone de. 1945. *Le Sang des autres*. Paris: Gallimard.
- . 1949. Novelist-Philosophers XV – Montherlant, Trans. S. Brownell. *Horizon* 20 (119): 292–307.
- . 1963. *La Force des choses*. Vol. I. Paris: Gallimard.
- . 1990. *The Blood of Others*. Trans. Y. Moyses and R. Sennhouse. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Bell, P.M.H. 1997. *Britain and France 1940–1994: The Long Separation*. London/New York: Longman.
- Berkvam, M.L. 2000. *Writing the Story of France in World War II: Literature and Memory 1942–1958*. New Orleans: University Press of the South.
- Bond, Lucy, and Jessica Rapson. 2014. Introduction. In *The Transcultural Turn: Interrogating Memory Between and Beyond Borders*, ed. Lucy Bond and Jessica Rapson, xi–xli. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.
- Boura, Olivier. 2003. *Un Siècle de Goncourt*. Paris: Arléa.
- Bowles, Brett, ed. 2014. *Representations, History and Wartime France. French Politics, Culture & Society* 32.1.
- Bradbury, Malcolm. 1987. *No, Not Bloomsbury*. London: André Deutsch.
- . 2001. *The Modern British Novel 1878–2001*. revised ed. London: Penguin.
- Brodzki, Bella. 2007. *Can These Bones Live? Translation, Survival and Cultural Memory*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Brownell, Sonia. 1946. Some Recent French Books. *Horizon* 13 (73): 66–71.
- Brownlie, Siobhan. 2016. *Mapping Memory in Translation*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Calder, Angus. 1969. *The People's War. Britain 1939–1945*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Calder-Marshall, Arthur, Cyril Connolly, Bonamy Dobrée, Tom Harrison, Arthur Koestler, Alun Lewis, George Orwell, and Stephen Spender. 1941. Why Not War Writers? A Manifesto. *Horizon* 4 (22): 236–239.
- Caws, Mary Ann, and Sarah Bird Wright. 2000. *Bloomsbury and France: Art and Friends*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Clarke, Stephen. 2010. *1000 Years of Annoying the French*. London: Black Swan.

- Cohen, Margaret, and Carolyn Denver. 2002. Introduction. In *The Literary Channel: The Inter-National Invention of the Novel*, ed. Margaret Cohen and Carolyn Denver, 1–34. Princeton/Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Colley, Linda. 1992. *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707–1837*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Comfort, Alex. 1942. On Interpreting the War. *Horizon* 5 (29): 358–362.
- Connelly, Mark. 2014. *We Can Take It! Britain and the Memory of the Second World War*. 2nd ed. Routledge: Abingdon/New York.
- Connolly, Cyril. 1939. The Ivory Shelter. *The New Statesman and Nation*, October 7, 482–483.
- . 1941. Comment. *Horizon* 4 (19): 5–8.
- . 1943a. Comment. *Horizon* 7 (38): 74–75.
- . 1943b. French-English Cultural Relations. *Horizon* 8 (42): 373–385.
- . 1943c. Relations culturelles franco-anglaises. *La Revue du monde libre*, No. 7, July, 20–26.
- . 1944a. Comment. *Horizon* 9 (49): 5–6.
- . 1944b. Comment. *Horizon* 10 (60): 367–369.
- . 1945. French-English Cultural Relations. In *The Condemned Playground*, 76–89. London: Routledge.
- . 1947a. Comment. *Horizon* 15 (87): 151–154.
- . 1947b. Twenty-One Answers. *Horizon* 16 (96): 365–369.
- . 1948. Comment. *Horizon* 17 (100): 232–235.
- . 1949. Comment. *Horizon* 20 (119): 285–286.
- . 1950. Comment, *Horizon*, December 1949–January 1950, Vol. 20, Nos. 120–121: 359–362.
- Connolly, Mark. 2004. *We Can Take It! Britain and the Memory of the Second World War*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Cornick, Martyn. 2000. Reconciling France: Jean Paulhan and the “Nouvelle Revue Française”, 1953. *South Central Review* 17 (4): 26–44.
- Davis, Colin. 2018. *Traces of War. Interpreting Ethics and Trauma in Twentieth-Century French Writing*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- DeCoste, Damon Marcel. 2005. The Literary Response to the Second World War. In *A Companion to the British and Irish Novel 1945–2000*, ed. Brian W. Shaffer, 3–20. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Davis, Colin. 1998. Simone de Beauvoir’s *Le Sang des autres* and the Ethics of Failure. *Modern Language Review* 93 (1): 35–47.
- Deane-Cox, Sharon. 2013. The Translator as Secondary Witness: Mediating Memory in Antelme’s *L’Espèce humaine*. *Translation Studies* 6 (3): 309–323.

- . 2014. Remembering Oradour-sur-Glane: Collective Memory in Translation. *Translation and Literature* 23 (2): 272–283.
- . 2016. Retranslating Rousset: English-Language Mediations of *L'Univers concentrationnaire*. *Testimony Between History and Memory* 123: 56–68.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1985. Des Tours de Babel. Trans. J.F. Graham. In *Différance in Translation*, ed. Joseph F. Graham, 165–207. Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press.
- Erll, Astrid. 2011. Travelling Memory. *Parallax* 17 (4): 4–18.
- Frank, Robert. 2013. The Second World War Through French and British Eyes. In *Britain and France in Two World Wars: Truth, Myth and Memory*, ed. Robert Tombs and Emile Chabal, 179–191. London: Bloomsbury.
- Footitt, Hilary. 2012. The Liberal Way of War? French Representations of the Allies, 1944–2008. In *Framing Narratives of the Second World War and Occupation in France, 1939–2009*, ed. Margaret Attack and Christopher Lloyd, 194–203. Manchester/New York: University of Manchester Press.
- Gaddis Rose, Marilyn. 2000. Twentieth-Century French Fiction. In *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, ed. Peter France, 287–292. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harman, Nicholas. 1980. *Dunkirk: The Necessary Myth*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Harrison, Tom. 1941. War Books. *Horizon* 4 (24): 416–437.
- Hench, John B. 2010. *Books as Weapons: Propaganda, Publishing and the Battle for Global Markets in the Era of World War II*. Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press.
- Hewison, Robert. 1988. *Under Siege: Literary Life in London, 1939–1945*. London: Methuen.
- Higgins, Lynn A. 1996. *New Novel, New Wave, New Politics: Fiction and the Representation of History in Postwar France*. Lincoln/London: University of Nebraska Press.
- Hirsch, Marianne. 1997. *Family Frames: Photography, Narrative, and Postmemory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Holman, Valérie. 2008. Print for Victory. In *Book Publishing in England, 1939–1945*. London: British Library.
- Jaquet, Michel. 2000. *Une Occupation très romanesque. Ironie et dérision dans le roman français sur l'Occupation de 1945 à nos jours*. Paris: Editions de la Bruyère.
- Judt, Tony. 2010. *Postwar: A History of Europe Since 1945*. London: Vintage Books.

- Knapp, Andrew. 2007. The Half-Open Window: France and Britain, 1944–47. In *The Uncertain Foundation: France at the Liberation, 1944–47*, ed. Andrew Knapp, 207–233. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kynaston, David. 2007. *Austerity Britain, 1945–1951*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Laborie, Pierre. 2011. *Le Chagrin et le venin. La France sous l'Occupation, mémoire et idées recues*. Paris: Bayard.
- Landsberg, Alison. 2004. *Prosthetic Memory: The Transformation of American Remembrance in the Age of Mass Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lehmann, John. 1943. Foreword. *Penguin New Writing* 18: 7–8.
- . 1944. Foreword. *Penguin New Writing* 22: 7–8.
- . 1945. Foreword. *Penguin New Writing* 25: 7.
- . 1946. Foreword. *Penguin New Writing* 28: 7–8.
- . 1947. Foreword. *Penguin New Writing* 29: 7–8.
- . 1955. *The Whispering Gallery. Autobiography I*. London: Longmans, Green and Co.
- Levy, Daniel, and Natan Sznaider. 2002. Memory Unbound: The Holocaust and the Formation of Cosmopolitan Memory. *European Journal of Social Theory* 5 (1): 87–106.
- . 2006. *The Holocaust and Memory in the Global Age*. Trans. A. Oksiloff. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Lloyd, Christopher. 2003. *Collaboration and Resistance in Occupied France: Representing Treason and Sacrifice*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- McLeod, Enid. 1982. *Living Twice. Memoirs*. London: Hutchinson Benham.
- McLoughlin, Kate. 2011. *Authoring War. The Literary Representation of War from the Iliad to Iraq*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mengham, Rod, and N.H. Reeve, eds. 2001. *The Fiction of the 1940s: Stories of Survival*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Morris, Alan. 1992. *Collaboration and Resistance Reviewed. Writers and the Mode rétro in Post-Gaullist France*. Oxford: Berg.
- Mouré, Kenneth. 2014. Black Market Fictions: *Au bon beurre, La Traversée de Paris* and the Black Market in France. *French Politics, Culture & Society* 32 (1): 47–67.
- Munton, Alan. 1989. *English Fiction of the Second World War*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Murat, Jean-Christophe. 2008. Enemies of Commitment? France and French Culture in Cyril Connolly's Horizon "Comments" (1939–1949). In *Right/Left/Right: Revolving Commitments. France and Britain 1929–1950*, ed.

- Jennifer Birkett and Stan Smith, 173–185. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Némirovsky, Irène. 2007. *Suite française*. Trans. S. Smith. London: Chatto and Windus.
- Nettelbeck, Colin. 1985. Getting the Story Right: Narratives of World War II in Post-68 France. *Journal of European Studies* 15 (2): 77–116.
- Newby, P.H. 1951. *The Novel, 1945–1950*. London: Longmans, Green & Co.
- Noakes, Lucy and Pattinson, Juliette. 2013. Introduction: Keep Calm and Carry On. In *British Cultural Memory and the Second World War*, Lucy Noakes and Juliette Pattinson, 1–24. London: Bloomsbury.
- O'Donohoe, Benedict. 2001. Dramatically Different: The Reception of Sartre's Theatre in London and New York. *Sartre Studies International* 7 (1): 1–18.
- Piette, Adam. 2009. *The Literary Cold War 1945 to Vietnam*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Plain, Gill. 2015. *Literature of the 1940s: War, Postwar and 'Peace'*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- . 2016. Escaping 1945: Popular Fiction and the End of the War. In *Long Shadows. The Second World War in British Fiction and Film*, ed. Petra Rau, 33–56. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Ponting, Clive. 1990. *1940: Myth and Reality*. London: Hamish Hamilton.
- Powell, Anthony. 1948a. Condemned to Be Free. *Times Literary Supplement*, January 10.
- . 1948b. Plague in Oran. *Times Literary Supplement*, September 4.
- Potter, Jane. 2010. Warburg, Fredric John (1898–1981). In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press. Online Edition, May. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/47448>. Accessed 16 Feb 2017.
- Pritchett, V.S. 1947. The Future of Fiction. *Penguin New Writing* 32: 102–111.
- . 1950. *Iron in the Soul* by Jean-Paul Sartre. *The Bookman*, July/August, 6–7.
- Radford, Andrew, and Victoria Reid. 2010. Introduction: Channel Vision. In *Franco-British Cultural Exchanges, 1880–1940. Channel Packets*, ed. Andrew Radford and Victoria Reid, 1–16. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Radstone, Susannah. 2011. What Place Is This? Transcultural Memory and the Locations of Memory Studies. *Parallax* 17 (4): 109–123.
- Ramsden, John. 2010. Myths and Realities of the “People's War” in Britain. In *Experience and Memory: The Second World War in Europe*, ed. Jörg Echternkamp and Stefan Martens, 40–50. Oxford: Berghahn.
- Rau, Petra. 2016a. *Long Shadows. The Second World War in British Fiction and Film*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

- . 2016b. Introduction: Long Shadows and Blind Spots. In *Long Shadows. The Second World War in British Fiction and Film*, ed. Petra Rau, 3–32. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Reed, Henry. 1946. *The Novel Since 1939*. London: Longmans, Green & Co.
- Reynolds, David. 2013. France, Britain and the Narrative of Two World Wars. In *Britain and France in Two World Wars: Truth, Myth and Memory*, ed. Robert Tombs and Emile Chabal, 193–210. London: Bloomsbury.
- Rigney, Ann. 2004. Portable Monuments: Literature, Cultural Memory and the Case of Jeanie Deans. *Poetics Today* 25 (2): 361–396.
- . 2010. The Dynamics of Remembrance: Texts Between Monumentality and Morphing. In *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies*, ed. Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nünning, 345–353. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Rose, Sonia O. 2003. *Which People's War? National Identity and Citizenship in Wartime Britain 1939–1945*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rothberg, Michael. 2014. Afterword: Locating Transnational Memory. *European Review* 22 (4): 652–656.
- Roussou, Henry. 1990. *Le Syndrome de Vichy de 1944 à nos jours*. 2nd ed. Paris: Seuil.
- Sapiro, Gisèle. 1999. *La Guerre des écrivains: 1940–1953*. Paris: Fayard.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. 1945. *The Case for Responsible Literature*. Trans. Natalia Galitzine. *Horizon*, May, 11 (65): 307–312.
- . 1947a. *The Age of Reason*. Trans. E. Sutton. London: Hamish Hamilton.
- . 1947b. *The Reprieve*. Trans. E. Sutton. London: Hamish Hamilton.
- . 1950. *Iron in the Soul*. Trans. G. Hopkins. London: Hamish Hamilton.
- Shelden, Michael. 1989. *Friends of Promise. Cyril Connolly and the World of Horizon*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Siebers, Tobin. 1995. Sincerely Yours. In *Comparative Literature in the Age of Multiculturalism*, ed. Charles Bernheimer, 195–203. Baltimore/London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Smith, Malcolm. 2000. *Britain and 1940: History, Myth and Popular Memory*. London: Routledge.
- Spender, Stephen. 1941. The Creative Arts in Our Time. *Penguin New Writing* 6: 125–137.
- . 1945. Prescriptions for a Modern Masterpiece. *Penguin New Writing* 24: 147–156.
- . 1977. *World Within World*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Stewart, Victoria. 2006. *Narratives of Memory: British Writing of the 1940s*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Suleiman, Susan. 2006. *Crises of Memory and the Second World War*. Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press.
- Symons, Julian. 1950. The Defeated. *Times Literary Supplement*, August 18.
- Tadié, Jean-Yves. 2004. Romans de 1945. In *L'Année 1945. Actes du colloque de Paris IV-Sorbonne*, ed. Alain Hubert and Michel Murat, 261–267. Paris: Honoré Champion.
- Taylor, D.J. 1993. *After the War: The Novel and England Since 1945*. London: Chatto and Windus.
- Tolstoy, Leo. 1968. *Voina i mir*. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura.
- Tombs, Robert, and Isabelle Tombs. 2007. *That Sweet Enemy. Britain and France: The History of a Love-Hate Relationship*. London: Pimlico.
- Toynbee, Philip. 1944. The Literary Situation in France. *Horizon* 10 (59): 295–311.
- . 1945. The Decline and Future of the English Novel. *Penguin New Writing* 23: 127–139.
- Wieviorka, Olivier. 2010. *La Mémoire désunie. Le souvenir politique des années sombres, de la Libération à nos jours*. Paris: Seuil.



5

The Goncourt Prize and the Second World War in France and Britain, 1945–51

The differing perceptions of translation that lie behind the following comments by literary reviewers, writing in December 1950 and January 1951, suggest the inherent complexity of the relationship between translated literature and war memory:

Translations of foreign novels naturally form a distinguished group since they are the pick of Continental publishing. (Isaacs 1950)

French into English, generally speaking, won't go. Whatever purists like to say, it is a special case; while other languages are fairly docile, French resists all the time. So it is never comfortable to be dealing with a French novel. In English garb they all seem indefinably a little queer; and this peculiarity may be interpreted as not coming off, or from a different bias, as distinction of the highest kind. One can't quite think away the twist, and judge the book itself – not even when the substance is completely approachable. (John 1951)

These critics perceive translated literature as distinguished, representing the very best of European fiction, but also as peculiar. Translation from French is the means by which the English reader gains access to the

cream of the literary writing of Britain's nearest continental neighbour, and a disguise or costume that might fail to convince. The prestige of the translated text is a given, but the fact of interlingual transfer always threatens to disturb. In this chapter we shall see that while the translated French war novel in the immediate post-war years facilitated the creation of transcultural memories of the Second World War, translation significantly affected the content and meaning of those memories. The French war novel in Britain had an important prosthetic memorial function (Landsberg 2004) that was motivated by perceived cultural and psychological need. However, the texts that reached English readers were affected not only by the need for exchange with France, but also by domestic priorities that resulted in reinterpretations of the expression of French war experience in relation to dominant British discourses of war memory.

The Goncourt Prize and the Second World War

If, as the *Observer's* critic cited above claimed in his literary review of the year 1950 (and as more recent critics have continued to suggest (e.g. Casanova 2004), translation per se indicates prestige, then the translated prize-winning novel is doubly consecrated. The *prix Goncourt* is the oldest, most prestigious, most influential, and most internationally recognised of the French literary prizes (Assouline 2013, 16). Goncourt prizewinning novels have already been designated as significant in the domestic literary field and are likely to be commercially successful abroad, and therefore the motivation for publishing a translation is obvious. In France, the 'Goncourt effect' is a well-known cultural phenomenon which brings an enormous increase in popular readership, critical commentary, and significant media coverage and leads to translations into many languages (Boura 2003, 53). Almost every post-war Goncourt prizewinner has been translated into English (Assouline 2013, 79). The study of the Goncourt is especially useful for the analysis of cultural memory since it is awarded to novels people are interested in reading at the time they are published (Assouline 2013, 20). The Goncourt is about present importance rather than durability: one witty historian has

described it as the ‘Beaujolais nouveau’ of fiction (Boura 2003, 3). The Goncourt prizewinners therefore allow the literary historian to perceive the sensibilities of the French reading population at a given moment in the nation’s history (Boura 2003, 14).

In accordance with its penchant for novels with contemporary significance, the Goncourt prize was deliberately used by its jury of writers to honour and commemorate French wartime sacrifices in both the First and the Second World Wars. The award of the 1914 prize, delayed and reserved for a combatant writer, was awarded to Adrien Bertrand’s *L’Appel du sol* in 1916, the same year Henri Barbusse’s iconic combat novel *Le Feu* won the prize (Boura 2003, 48–49, 59). The prize for 1940, reserved for a French prisoner of war (POW), was awarded to Francis Ambrière for *Les Grandes Vacances* in 1946 (Boura 2003, 156). Seven Goncourts were therefore awarded in the period 1944–49, and of these, five were war novels. The other two, Jean-Jacques Gautier’s *Histoire d’un fait divers* (1946) and Maurice Druon’s *Les Grandes Familles* (1948), though not directly about the war, were written by another former POW and a member of the Resistance respectively. Druon, Joseph Kessel’s nephew and joint author with his uncle of the ‘Chant des partisans’, was involved with the BBC in London during the war and also wrote the preface to the London edition of Vercors’ *Le Silence de la mer*. It is then beyond doubt that the war was the dominant theme of the immediate post-war Goncourt winners. These novels constructed a textual space in which the memory of the war began to be worked out. Indeed, the five novels discussed in this chapter address the main themes of French cultural memory of the Second World War subsequently identified by historians. Robert Tombs defines these as Occupation, collaboration, Resistance, and Liberation (Tombs 2013, 12), and to these we can add the fall of France, or what Robert Frank has called the ‘1940 syndrome’ (Frank 2013, 181–84). Elsa Triolet’s *Le Premier Accroc coûte deux cents francs* (1945) recounts stories of the interior Resistance. Jean-Louis Bory’s *Mon village à l’heure allemande* (1945) and Jean-Louis Curtis’ *Les forêts de la nuit* (1947) deal with the Occupation and collaboration in provincial France. Robert Merle’s *Weekend à Zuydcoote* (1949) recounts the French view of the Dunkirk evacuations, and Francis Ambrière’s *Les Grandes Vacances* (1946) describes how French POWs experienced captivity and liberation.

These five novels appeared in English translation in London over four years between 1948 and 1951.¹ The first to appear was Bory's *French Village*, published by Dennis Dobson in 1948 (Bory 1948). In 1949, Hutchinson International Authors produced a reprint of Triolet's *A Fine of Two Hundred Francs* (Triolet 1949) which had already appeared in New York in 1947 published by Reynal & Hitchcock (Triolet 1947). In 1950, John Lehmann, consonant with his active interest in translated fiction, discussed in Chap. 4, published both Curtis's *The Forests of the Night* (Curtis 1950) and Merle's *Weekend at Zuydcoote* (Merle 1950). Ambrière's *The Exiled*, published in London by Staples Press in 1951 (Ambrière 1951), was an abridged retranslation, the work having already been published as *The Long Holiday* in Chicago in 1948 (Ambrière 1948). Both publicity for and reviews of these books highlighted their status as prize-winners, which indicates why they were translated. This chapter does not seek to survey all instances of translations of French war fiction into English in the post-war years, and it does not address the almost certainly unanswerable question of why certain French war books were published in translation and others not. Rather, its aims are to present a snapshot of diverse post-war representations of the French war experience, to study different types of translational intervention, and to examine their repercussions. It is precisely because the motivation for translation is obvious that I have chosen to focus on the Goncourt prizewinners. The award of the prize lends the corpus a degree of coherence as regards both French writers' use of literature to assimilate and digest the trauma of the war years and British interest in French fiction in the period.

In order to evaluate the function of the translated texts in the British literary field, both textual and paratextual manipulations are examined in this chapter. The relationship between manipulation and reception is approached by surveying the critical discourse on the novels in the contemporary British cultural press. Analysing reception through published reviews is of course artificial, since 'real' readers' views are unlikely to correspond precisely to those of reviewers, who are 'professional' readers. However, reviews constitute a discourse on reading that is part of the reading experience (Hall 2009), and translation criticism is a form of rewriting that influences the status and meaning of the translated text (Lefevere 2017). Reception is a crucial to an understanding of the rela-

tionship between literature and cultural memory, though an individual's particular response cannot be taken as generally representative any more than a single text can be said to represent 'national' memory, since a multiplicity of memories are generated and perpetuated by different communities (Connolly 2014, 3; Rigney 2010, 350; Suleiman 2006, 13). In practical terms, published reviews are now the only way to glimpse the responses of contemporary readers. They are useful insofar as they act as vehicles for the dominant views of the time, whether these are affirmed or contested, and give an insight into the types of meaning and value that accrued to particular texts.

Elsa Triolet: Unpicking the Red Thread

When the 1944 Goncourt prize was awarded to Elsa Triolet at the beginning of July 1945, the writer and critic Paul Léautaud wittily described it as 'un prix cousu de fil rouge' (cited in Assouline 2013, 65), punning on the French expression *cousu de fil blanc* (literally, stitched with white thread), which means that something is obvious or highly predictable. This prize, according to Léautaud, was stitched with red thread—it was predictably political. The purpose of this Goncourt, he suggested, was to honour the communist interior Resistance. Triolet, Russian by birth and the wife of Louis Aragon, one of France's leading communists, was a communist sympathiser and an active Resister who had worked for the clandestine press and carried out missions in the south of France. Léautaud's view was widely shared—the 1945 Goncourt was generally interpreted as an acknowledgement of the far left's dominance in the Resistance and therefore as an act of homage to the French communist party. It was also seen as an attempt by the Goncourt jurors to rehabilitate the legitimacy of the prize. The awards of 1941, 1942, and 1943 had been conservative choices, to say the least, and some jury members were tainted by collaboration: two were in prison, one had been suspended from the jury, and a fourth had withdrawn voluntarily (Eychart 1994, 204–206; Cavani 2004, 128; Boura 2003, 172; Sapiro 1999, 629–34). Triolet herself recognised, and thereby reinforced, the political character of the prize by telling one interviewer that the honour really belonged not

to her but to the Resistance, and by declaring in the leftist *Ce Soir* that she was grateful for the Goncourt because of the subject rather than the literary merits of her book (Cavani 2004, 133; Eychart 1994, 202). The French press interpreted the book as a work of testimony bearing witness to the activities of the Resistance, despite Triolet's protestations about its fictionality (Eychart 1994, 208–11).

Triolet's war writing, like Kessel's in *L'Armée des ombres*, began as militant literature, written and published as part of the fight to liberate France. The heritage of French political literature, discussed in Chap. 4, lies behind her literary resistance. Whilst Triolet rejected the dogmatism of 1930s socialist realism, she was a central figure of the Parisian literary left in the 1930s, not least due to her personal connection with Aragon.² Two of the short stories collected in *Le Premier Accroc coûte deux cents francs* had originally appeared clandestinely during the Occupation. The first, 'Les Amants d'Avignon', was published in a collection by Les Éditions de Minuit in October 1943, and an extract from the third, 'Cahiers enterrés sous un pêcher', entitled 'Les Voyageurs fantastiques', appeared in *Les Lettres françaises* in May 1944. The second story, 'La Vie privée ou Alexis Slavsky, artiste peintre' is dated September 1943 and the final, title story was written in Paris in November 1944, after the Liberation. The publication of the collection in 1945 fundamentally changed the function of the stories, since they now became post-war texts. The transition from the Occupation to the Liberation and finally to the post-war entailed a corresponding literary shift from the combat novel—such as *L'Armée des ombres*—with its strongly militant and unambiguous ideological message, to the novel of memory, books which began to represent the complexity and ambiguity of the war years in relation to the present and to the future. As we saw in Chap. 2, Attack describes this shift as a structural difference between 'novels of unity', which oppose the united Resistance to 'the enemy', and 'novels of ambiguity', which convey the social and moral confusion and pessimism of the post-war years (Attack 1989). Triolet's stories lend themselves better than *L'Armée des ombres* to post-war conceptions of the war novel as memorial rather than militant insofar as they probe the psychological motivations of the Resisters more deeply than does Kessel's book. Less of an action-packed adventure tale than *L'Armée des ombres*, Triolet's

stories are nonetheless characterised by the ideological unity characteristic of the combat novel, as Attack has demonstrated (Attack 1989, 42, 78, 160; 1990). But Triolet's interest in the effects of individuals' circumstances and choices on their personal identities also opens up the possibility of post-war readings in terms of ambiguity. Juliette, the central character of 'Les Amants d'Avignon', can be read both as a Resistance heroine and as a woman in love, and the two longest stories, 'La Vie privée ou Alexis Slavsky, peintre' and 'Cahiers enterrés sous un pêcher', shift the narrative centre of interest from the plane of action to that of characterisation. As Triolet herself pointed out, the central interest of Alexis Slavsky as a character is his relationship to art, not politics; politics is secondary to, and dependant on, his total commitment to his painting, and this entails a significant degree of ambiguity as regards the evaluation of his political choices (Triolet 1965b, 18; Attack 1989, 133–34, n.52). *Le Premier Accroc coûte deux cents francs* is a transitional text bearing narrative markers of both wartime and post-war writing. Its consecration by the Goncourt jury marked France's evolution from the war to the post-war. The shift from militancy to memory was recognised by contemporary French reviewers. Emile Henriot hailed it as a 'romanesque mémorial'—a literary memorial—and critics received the book in terms of the emerging cultural memory of the war (cited in Eychart 1994, 211).

Like Haakon Chevalier's translation of Kessel, Francis Golffing's translation of Triolet is generally non-interventionist.³ The most significant omission in the translation was identified, though not explained, by Helena Lewis in her introduction to the 1986 Virago reprint of the translation (Lewis 1986a, xiii; see also Lewis 1986b, 390). It concerns the designation of the French communist party (PCF) as 'le parti des fusillés', a slogan adopted by the PCF after the Liberation which, according to Triolet's 1965 preface to the book, derived from her story (Triolet 1965b, 14). Whether or not the phrase did actually originate with Triolet, it was a highly recognisable one which connected the legitimacy of the PCF with the heroism of the interior Resistance. In the French version of 'Les Amants d'Avignon', the following exchange occurs between the doctor who is hiding Juliette after a narrow escape from the Gestapo, and Juliette's lover and fellow resister Célestin:

- Autre chose: j'ai vu le communiste que tu m'as envoyé, ils sont gonflés, ces gars-là. On a combiné quelque chose ensemble.
- Oui... Après la guerre, il faudra compter avec eux, on ne pourra pas gouverner le pays sans le parti des fusillés. (Triolet 1965a, 80)

['One other thing: I saw the communist you sent me. They've got some nerve, those boys. We fixed something up together']

['Yes... after the war, they'll be a force to be reckoned with. The country won't be governed without the party of the executed.']

The omission of this passage from the translation looks like an ideological excision to avoid the contentious political idea that post-war France could not be governed without the communists (Triolet 1947, 65; 1949, 65). If so, it is not part of any overall strategy to divest the text of references to communism, since others survive elsewhere in the translation in both English-language editions. There is however one interesting difference between the US edition of 1947 and the UK edition of 1949. Alexis Slavsky's Russian friend Gordeenko has an unshakeable ('inébranlable') faith in the Russians, which is described in the French text as 'contagieuse', translated literally as 'contagious' in the American edition, but altered to 'heartening' in the later British Hutchinson edition (Triolet 1947, 149; 1949, 141; 1965a, 182). Was this change purely stylistic, or does it have any political significance? While no documents have survived that would answer this question with any certainty,⁴ it is tempting to hypothesise that after dramatic demonstrations of Soviet ambitions such as the Prague coup of 1948 and the Berlin blockade of 1948–49, the British publisher deemed it unacceptable or unwise to describe communism as 'contagious'.

The award of the Goncourt to Triolet was not widely covered in either the British or the American press in 1945. The *Times* of July 3 carried a brief report of the previous day's literary event in Paris under the title 'Prix Goncourt Won by a Woman', also mentioning that Triolet had written the book in hiding under the Occupation, that she had been born in Moscow, and that she was the wife of the communist writer Aragon (Anon 1945; see also Cavani 2004, 131; Sapiro 1999, 631–32).⁵ The *New York Times* made no mention of the book in 1945, but in 1946 in an

excoriating review of Triolet's *The White Charger*, Orville Prescott unflatteringly suggested that the award of the Goncourt the previous year must have been 'for patriotic rather than for literary reasons' (Prescott 1946). Prescott's euphemism again suggests a political reading which downplays Triolet's literary talents and highlights the perceived ideological motivations of the Goncourt jurors. Reviews of *A Fine of Two Hundred Francs* on both sides of the Atlantic engaged more productively with the question of how to write about the war. In these reviews, the post-war preference for representations of the war in terms of moral ambiguity rather than heroism and ideological clarity emerges clearly. Nona Balakian of the *New York Times* emphasised the way in which Triolet had 'dissected the psychology' of the figure of the Resister and judged the book to be 'an extraordinarily convincing panorama of occupied France with its fears and corruptions, its anxieties and humiliations' (Balakian 1947). Helen Elisabeth Scott's review in the *Times Literary Supplement* focused on the non-Resister Alexis Slavsky as 'a striking revelation of the sense of boredom, nervousness, confusion and waste which the Occupation must have given to so many ordinary Frenchmen' (Scott 1949). Philip Toynbee had obviously approached the book with low expectations. Though he conceded that there was 'remarkably little political crudity' in Triolet's book, for him it nevertheless failed on literary criteria (Toynbee 1949). Toynbee's review reprises his rejection of French Resistance fiction in his 1944 essay 'The Literary Situation in France' (Toynbee 1944) as too political and too closely based on events, insofar as he finds himself uninterested in the characters and left with only 'a vivid journalist's picture of France under the Germans' (Toynbee 1949). Triolet was not Toynbee's idea of the great European war novelist he believed the future needed.

Comparing the French critical response in 1945 with American and British reviews from 1947 to 1949, a striking political shift appears. While for French readers the Goncourt prize had defined Triolet as a communist writer (Eychart 1994, 208), none of the reviews of the translation I have located make any mention of communism. Translational omissions alone cannot be said to explain this depoliticised reception of Triolet's book in English. Sensitivity about positive representations of communism were doubtless common to translators, editors, and reviewers alike in the USA in 1947 and in the UK in 1949: the role of the PCF

in France's post-liberation provisional government and its electoral success in 1945 and 1946, which made it, briefly, the country's largest political party, certainly concerned both America and Britain, and the USSR was pursuing expansionist policies in eastern Europe at this time (Beavor and Cooper 1994, 238–47, 253–57, 287–89; Judt 2010, 66, 79, 88, 167, 212; Knapp 2007, 214). However, the depoliticisation of *A Fine of Two Hundred Francs* is more paratextual than textual. Cold War anti-communism may or may not explain the changes to the translation, but the omission or attenuation of a couple of references to communism is not sufficient to change fundamentally the political character of the novel. Rather, the reviews of *A Fine of Two Hundred Francs* illustrate the shift from militancy to memory that we have already discussed. Commentators in 1947 and 1949 were more interested in the ambiguities of memory which literature conveyed than they were in the certainties of ideology. By the time the translations appeared, the time for militancy in the war novel was past and had been replaced by the need to reflect on the complexities and uncertainties of the war years. Subsequent Goncourt winners provided differing explorations of those complexities.

Jean-Louis Bory: A French Village Outside of Time

Jean-Louis Bory was part of the generation of French writers who began their literary careers in the wake of the war. He turned 26 in 1944, and *Mon village à l'heure allemande*, written between May and July of that year, was his first novel. The Goncourt of 1945, announced on 10 December, was the first truly post-war prize. Since the award of the 1944 Goncourt to Triolet on 2 July 1945, the political structures of post-war France had begun to be assembled. In August, Marshall Pétain had been condemned to death, though his sentence was commuted to life imprisonment, and in October his first minister Pierre Laval and the head of the notorious *milice* Joseph Darnand had been executed (Beavor and Cooper 1994, 184–96). Also in October, legislative elections created the Constituent Assembly that would establish the French Fourth Republic

in 1946 (Beever and Cooper 1994, 253–54). As the Occupation slipped from the present into the past, with new political configurations being legitimised and old scores being settled, it is not surprising that a novel probing the ambiguities and complexities of daily life under the Occupation should have captured the attention of the Goncourt jurors and of French readers. Lacking the comforting affirmation of Resistance heroism that Triolet's book had offered, Bory's story of petty rivalries and violent confrontations in the fictional occupied village of Jumainville caught the post-war mood:

Mais le succès de *Mon village* tient d'abord au fait que beaucoup de Français y ont retrouvé l'atmosphère particulière de l'Occupation – et c'était pour eux comme un dernier pied-de-nez à ces souvenirs roses et noirs. L'intelligence de Bory est d'avoir fait de son Jumainville fictif le paradigme de tous les villages français: une minorité de résistants (les jeunes, surtout), une minorité de collabos (les notables aisés, principalement), des élus mous et indécis (le maire, son conseil) et le gros de la population qui courbe l'échine, attentiste. (Garcia 1991, 22)

[But the success of *Mon village* was primarily due to the fact that for many French people, it recreated the very particular atmosphere of the Occupation. For them it was like a final encounter with some rosy memories and with some darker ones. Bory cleverly made his fictitious Jumainville into a paradigm of all French villages, with a minority of resisters (especially amongst the young), a minority of collaborators (mainly the well-off and well-respected), weak and indecisive politicians (the mayor and his council) and a generally spineless population content to wait-and-see.]

Unlike *Le Premier Accroc coûte deux cents francs*, *Mon village à l'heure allemande* offers no clear ideological framework through which the events of the war might be comprehended. Bory was not a communist, though he was close to the party and hoped that the Resistance would lead to revolution in post-Liberation France (Garcia 1991, 64–65). Whilst Berkvam reads the novel's final images of a red rosebush and a red dawn as indicative of Bory's political colour (Berkvam 2000, 136), Bory was not a writer of politically committed fiction (Garcia 1991, 119). *Mon village à l'heure allemande* does not deploy the narrative techniques of

littérature engagée. It is not a strictly realist novel, since a statue, a dog, and the village itself are all given narrative voices, and one human character narrates her own death. Rather than proposing any unitary political message, Bory uses irony, cynicism, caricature, and grotesque humour to reveal the fundamentally absurd and contradictory nature of the situation of occupation (Jacquet 2000, 27).

Bory marshals a large cast of characters from the village, showing how the war provides an opportunity to work out existing tensions and conflicts with neighbours and family. The novel creates an impression of shifting moral ground by constantly requiring the reader to revise their view of events as more information is revealed. This is particularly evident in Bory's representation of the Resistance. At the outset, the reader is led to believe that the Resistance is nothing but a band of thugs compromised in the black market, the daubing of graffiti on a local shopkeeper's premises, and the looting and fouling of a farm. But the Resistance is ultimately rehabilitated when it turns out that a single dissident individual was responsible for these crimes, and it is granted military and political legitimacy when three German soldiers are shot in the wake of an American bombing raid during the Liberation. In this novel, the nastiest enemy is the French *milice*, Vichy's paramilitary police, which, according to the village itself, is worse than the Germans (Bory 1945, 326–28). The Germans are annoying and stupid, but it is the *milice*, personified by Auguste, that is really dangerous, and its members are carefully distinguished from the local *gendarmes*, who protect the villagers.⁶ However, the novel refuses to limit 'collaboration' to the sickening violence of the *milice*, also depicting many everyday petty crimes of collusion with the enemy. Although the Resistance members turn out to be heroes rather than bandits, their actions suggest the necessity of dirty action over clean idealism. The novel fully exploits the many absurdities created by the situation of Occupation. Denise pulls faces at a picture of Hitler whilst she is sleeping with Nazi soldiers, and when the neighbouring village of Fignes is bombed by the American liberators, M. Davrinches wryly remarks: 'J'ai tout perdu. Et je suis pour les Américains. Alors?' ['I have lost everything. And I am on the side of the Americans. Strange!'] (Bory 1945, 235; 1948, 260). Bory's novel is a manifestation of the shift away from the unity of the militant wartime novel to the ambiguity of the

novel of memory. Whilst Triolet's introduction of ambiguity at the level of psychology in *Le Premier Accroc coûte deux cents francs* left scope for the preservation of the myth of a nation *en résistance*, Bory's account of the moral ambiguity of individuals' choices and behaviour under the Occupation blew that myth apart.

Bory's novel was published in English in 1948 by Dennis Dobson in a translation by D. P. and P. J. Waley. Reviewers praised the translation: one remarked that the translation was 'good' (Bloomfield 1948) and another that it seemed 'very well done' (Newby 1948). Indeed, Bory's slang style is rendered without it sounding prissy. The graffiti daubed on the shop of the collaborator *Lècheur* uses crude rhyming puns on his name, which are replicated in English:

Lèche-cul, lèche-bottes, Lècheur,
 Salaud, attends ton heure
 Salaud, lèche-bottes, lèche-cul,
 Lècheur, tu seras pendu. (Bory 1945, 21, 43)

Lècheur, licker, lick their boots and bums,
 You'll be sorry, you swine, when your last hour comes
 Lick their boots and bums, Lècheur,
 You'll be hanged, you filthy cur. (Bory 1948, 19, 36)

The wordplay on which various epithets ascribed by the characters to each other are based is rendered imaginatively: the teacher's nickname 'Pisse-la-Craie' is rendered as 'Chalk-Piddler' and the promiscuous Germaine, called 'Cuisse-Hospitalière', is 'Ever-Ready'. Germaine's mocking of the Germans' attempts to speak French are marked in the translation:

Ça, c'est de la Gestapo, de l'essence de fumier.
 – Barlez vrançais. Nous le barlons, dit-il.
 Je t'embouse, mon mignon.
 Il me demande:
 – Née à Chaumainville?

Je dis:

– Oui.

En moi-même: “Oui, mon salaud; à Jumainville, France. Et si tu cours aussi vite qu’elle t’emboûse, la Germaine, t’es champion de course à pied, mon choli.” (Bory 1945, 173)

This is the Gestapo, concentrated filth.

‘Zbeak Vrench. We zbeak it’.

I spit on you, my friend.

‘Porn at Chumainville?’ he asks me.

I say ‘Yes’.

To myself: yes, you bastard, at Jumainville, France. And if you can run as fast as Germaine can spit on you, you’re a champion runner, my vriend. (Bory 1948, 141)

The translation contains many such creative solutions to the problem of conveying the linguistic humour of the source text.

Dennis Dobson did not market Bory’s novel as a war book. The translated title, *French Village*, made no reference to the war, which had the dual advantage of leaving the subject vague and avoiding the need to translate the pun: ‘à l’heure allemande’ refers both to the period of the German Occupation and to the fact that the occupied French were obliged to set their clocks to German time. Bory’s depiction of a typical French village under the Occupation became, in English, a depiction of a typical French village at any moment the reader might care to imagine. The publisher’s advance publicity did not connect the village with the war:

This novel is far removed from the traditional pastoral idylls. The author digs deep below the surface of rustic life, and shows us his village swarming with life like an ant-hill. Each tiny movement is observed, heightening the tension and creating an explosive compression which compels interest from the first page to the last. (Dobson 1948a, b)

Dobson’s marketing strategy was consistent with the dominant view, discussed in Chap. 4, that post-war British readers’ appetite for war literature was limited. It is not therefore surprising that several reviewers

stressed the book's general themes over its specific historical context. For K. John, the novel was not 'a story of occupation' but rather, the Occupation was 'the medium of vision', and he thus presented the war as a vehicle for the exploration of more enduring issues (John 1949). Angela Milne, writing in the *Observer*, went further, claiming that the novel 'is not primarily a war book' but rather 'a picture of all the French villages that ever were'. Again the war is seen as a catalyst for the exploration of deeper themes: 'all the rich oddities of character to be expected of French rural life are here' (Milne 1948). These reviews bear out the views of opinion-forming English critics such as Cyril Connolly and Stephen Spender, who believed that the war book should be an attempt to understand the underlying implications of events rather than a form of documentary writing imprisoned in its own time. English reviewers aligned Bory's novel with the view of war writing expressed by Connolly in *Horizon*: Bory had apparently managed to 'stop his ears' and resist simply transcribing the rattle of the 'tin-can of war tied to civilisation's tail' (Connolly 1939, 483).

Several reviewers suggested that Bory's book was worth reading despite the fact that it was about the war. John referred to a degree of market saturation with 'stories of the Occupation – from many countries, but especially from France', but thought that Bory's book did not 'simply add to the list' (John 1949). P. H. Newby, whose study *The Novel 1945–1950* (1951) would begin with chapters on 'The Post-War Setting' and 'The Impact of War', reviewed *French Village* alongside Alexander Baron's army tale *From the City, from the Plough*, noting that these were 'boldly and bravely the kind of war book that (we are told) the booksellers have become rather shy of handling' (Newby 1948). Dobson's advertisement for *French Village* bears this out, and, in a similar vein, Jonathan Cape's advertisement for a 1949 reprint of *From the City, from the Plough* quoted a somewhat double-edged endorsement from the *Observer*: 'Bored with war? You will not be bored with Mr. Baron' (Cape 1949). Newby remarked that 'the clash of arms' is not generally able to 'supply themes to arouse the greatest enthusiasm in the book-buying public', but nonetheless went on to review both novels positively. He praised Bory's style and the translation, and Bory's ability to write with detachment about events that occurred so close in time to the novel's composition.

Newby's characteristically British reticence about documentary fiction is clear in his judgement of the book as 'not a piece of journalism but a work of art'. The final lines of the review open out onto the more general theme of the village, once more expanding the novel's interest beyond its specific subject (Newby 1948).

The source text and its translation thus functioned very differently in their respective literary fields. In French, *Mon village à l'heure allemande* allowed those who had experienced the Occupation directly to begin to process some highly ambivalent and potentially compromising experiences. In English, *French Village* functioned as a model for the successful treatment of the war in literature because it was deemed to exceed the limitations of its subject matter. British reviewers who appreciated the merits of Bory's fiction aligned the novel with dominant post-war English conceptions of the war novel by suggesting that its themes were of general significance. Textual changes and the critical discourse around the novel were mutually reinforcing. The dominant metaliterary discourse in the cultural press suggesting that readers were unreceptive to 'the war book' probably produced the translation shift we have noted between the French and English titles, and the translated title prompted universalising interpretations on the part of critics. All translation, by definition, mediates between sameness and difference, and the need to assimilate the experience of the other into the self is always in tension with the need to make foreign experience comprehensible. The assimilation by post-war British readers of literary fiction of the French experience of occupation was necessarily in tension with the dominant structures of the receiving literary field. In the case of *French Village*, the particular, though by no means lost, was subordinated to the universal.

Jean-Louis Curtis: French-English Cultural Relations

Jean-Louis Curtis was a product of the cultural proximity between France and England which prompted Cyril Connolly to write his essay on 'French-English Cultural Relations'. Indeed, Curtis may well have been familiar with it, as he was an enthusiastic reader of Connolly (Curtis

1985, 119, 121, 169). Born Jean-Louis Lafitte in 1917, the author's Anglicised pen name was derived from the American Curtiss planes he flew in 1940 (Roy 1971, 11, 13). He had had his first direct experience of England in 1937 when he took up a post as a teaching assistant in Bradford, before moving to London where he taught whilst finishing a thesis on Aldous Huxley (Roy 1971, 12; Curtis 1985, 70). As well as writing fiction, Curtis translated a wide variety of works of English literature into French, from Shakespeare to Philip Toynbee. In his autobiography, he affirms a strongly bicultural identity:

Fidèle à ma gémellité stellaire je serais partagé entre ma famille littéraire française et une vaste parentèle anglo-saxonne, adoptée, elle aussi, avec enthousiasme. J'aurais deux patries et deux cultures. (Curtis 1985: 51)

[Faithful to my star sign, Gemini, I would be torn between my French literary family and many Anglo-Saxon ties of kindred which I also adopted with enthusiasm. I would have two homelands and two cultures].

Curtis felt that his 'seconde patrie linguistique, sentimentale et littéraire' [second linguistic, emotional and literary homeland] predated his French cultural identity, remarking that '[a]u début de mon séjour en Angleterre, l'imprégnation anglaise fut quasiment foudroyante. C'était vraiment une patrie antérieure que j'eus l'impression de retrouver' [At the beginning of my stay in England, I was almost overwhelmingly saturated with Englishness. I really had the impression of rediscovering a previous homeland] (Curtis 1985, 74, 75). He describes his writing as impregnated with the English language. English words, he says, often come to him first, and he must seek a French equivalent; he scours his writing for remaining traces of Anglicisms which he sometimes retains for stylistic reasons (Curtis 1985, 75). In a passage strikingly reminiscent of Connolly's comparison of Betjeman and La Bruyère, quoted in Chap. 4, Curtis describes in personal terms the sort of cultural interpenetration that scholars have termed a 'cross-Channel literary zone' (Cohen and Denver 2002; Radford and Reid 2010):

J'ai beau être ou me croire cartésien, avoir le culte de la logique et du bon sens, adorer la clarté du discours, ne trouver rien de plus beau qu'un vers de

Racine, une période de Bossuet, une épigramme de Voltaire, je me sens simultanément assez britannique dans une certaine façon de prendre mes distances par rapport à ce que je raconte, de rester volontairement en deçà de l'expression appuyée, de laisser planer un doute sur mes intentions – bref, dans un ensemble de particularités mentales ou stylistiques qui semblent être le propre des auteurs anglais plutôt que des français, et que je me suis appropriées, non par volonté d'imitation, mais par imprégnation spontanée, née d'affinités profondes. (Curtis 1985, 76)

[However much I am or believe myself to be Cartesian, revere logic and good sense, love clear discourse, find nothing more beautiful than a line of Racine, one of Bossuet's well balanced sentences, one of Voltaire's epigrams, at the same time I feel rather British in the way I keep my distance from what I am writing about, resist emphatic expressions, leave a margin of doubt as to my intentions – in short, in a collection of mental or stylistic characteristics which seem to belong to English rather than French writers, and which I have appropriated, not in order to imitate them, but out of a spontaneous saturation, resulting from deep affinities.]

What Curtis describes here is not influence between two separate cultures, but rather a writing that is generated out of what he calls 'deep affinities' that already connect French and English culture.

Curtis's autobiographical essay *Une éducation d'écrivain* is testament to Curtis's literary self-reflexivity. Here, he declared that the real subject of his novels was the novel itself (Curtis 1985, 143). It is clear from the foreword to the first edition of *Les Forêts de la nuit*, which already has a rather ironic tone, that the text was an engagement with the way Curtis perceived contemporary novelists to be using fiction to remember the war:

D'aucuns pourraient s'étonner que, dans une peinture qui semble parfois viser au général, la réalité héroïque des années 1940–1944 ait été laissée dans un arrière-plan un peu indistinct.

Beaucoup de livres, depuis la fin de la guerre, ont montré et exalté ceux dont le combat a sauvé l'honneur et contribué à la victoire. Je n'aurais rien ajouté à ces ouvrages. Et d'ailleurs, mon propos était différent. (Curtis 1947a, 5)⁷

[Some readers may be surprised to find the heroic reality of 1940–1944 forming a rather blurred background to a picture that occasionally sets out to embrace the entire subject.

Since the end of the war, many books have been written to describe and exalt those combatants who saved the honour of France and contributed to the final victory. I have nothing to add to these works, and furthermore, my intentions were different.]

As noted in Chap. 4, French novelists who sought to question the mythologisation of the Resistance were engaging as much with the representation of history as with the events themselves, as Michel Jacquet's analysis of post-war French war fiction has shown (Jacquet 2000, 32). Though Curtis acknowledges the 'heroic reality' of the years 1940–44, the novel's perspective is deeply rooted in the moment of its composition rather than in the years it depicts. Published in 1947 during the first year of the Fourth Republic, *Les Forêts de la nuit* expresses disillusionment with the failure of the revolutionary political opportunity France had been presented with in 1944. As Berkvam notes, the novel contests both 'de Gaulle's official version of history' and 'the communist memory of the martyred *parti des fusillés*' (Berkvam 2000, 156). Curtis described his literary priority as 'debunking', using the English term, and identified his main targets as affectation or snobbery, fashionable leftism, ideological deceptions, and clichéd liberal ideas (Curtis 1985, 142–43). In *Les Forêts de la nuit*, the Resistance is thoroughly debunked via the characters of Francis de Balansun, Jean de Lavancourt, and Justin Darricade. Francis's resistance is idealistic but futile, Jean's is fatally compromised by his personal concerns, and Darricade's is self-interested and corrupt. Francis dies helping people to cross the demarcation line illegally, but his death is pointless and contributes nothing to the fight against the Germans. He is denounced by one of the villagers and murdered by a local gang of youths operating as a self-appointed pseudo-*milice*. Jean escapes to England to fight with de Gaulle's Free French, but deliberately crashes his Spitfire on learning of his fiancé's infidelity. The local Resistance leader Justin Darricade is a former member of the right-wing Croix-de-feu league who only carries out the least dangerous operations. He is a 'provincial Machiavelli' ['ce Machiavel'] with his eye on a post-war political career

(Curtis 1947b, 186; 1950, 219). The novel also covers a wide spectrum of collaboration, from sickening violence (the local gang working against the Resistance carry out torture and murder) to inertia (the mediocre and self-indulgent Gérard Delahaye only stops writing for the collaborationist *La Gerbe* when the woman he loves humiliates him over it) to incomprehension (Monsieur de Balansun is easily converted from his faith in Pétain to faith in the Resistance). The novel mercilessly reveals the hypocrisy of all the characters who, at the Liberation, conceal their wartime compromises behind the cockades and crosses of Lorraine which they put on as soon as the Germans depart (Curtis 1947b, 399; 1950, 330). In the long final section which extends the story into 1946, the Resistance disintegrates into political manoeuvring and in-fighting. France is on the brink of civil war and the fate that awaits the nation is ‘the continuation of a status quo of injustice and mediocrity’ [‘la continuation d’un *statu quo* d’injustice et de médiocrité’] (Curtis 1947b, 345; 1950, 416). No red dawn is in view at the end of this novel. Curtis gave literary form to the political disillusionment that Bory, who got to know Curtis around this time, would come to share by 1947 (Garcia 1991, 64–65, 67, 114–15). There is no trace here of the *engagement* of the existentialists; indeed, they were the fashionable left that Curtis sought to debunk. As Jacquet remarks, in the case of Curtis, irony replaces engagement, and ‘derision is the barrier that prevents the narrator from spilling over into facile condemnation or accommodation’ (Jacquet 2000, 157). Curtis suggests that since all sectors of French society have been compromised by their wartime actions and attitudes, the future is bleak.

For one reviewer at least, Curtis’s saturation with English culture facilitated this French war novel’s cross-Channel journey. In the review quoted at the beginning of this chapter, K. John suggested that, thanks to ‘all its English sympathies and echoes’, the novel was a ‘near-exception’ to the general rule that French literature was untranslatable (John 1951, 25). The novel’s title is derived from William Blake, whose poetry Curtis felt was fundamental to his literary development (Curtis 1985, 76–81). Blake’s ‘Tiger, tiger, burning bright/In the forests of the night...’ is cited, in English, as an epigram to the novel. Curtis believed intertextuality to be a fundamental aspect of a writer’s selfhood, suggesting that ‘[s]i nos livres naissent de notre nuit, ils naissent aussi d’autres livres’ [if our books

are born out of our darkness, they are also born out of other books] and that '[l]'aveu des influences est d'abord un aveu de soi-même' [admitting one's influences is first of all an admission of oneself] (Curtis 1985, 87). The intertextual network of *Les Forêts de la nuit*, which includes overt references to Sherlock Holmes, Fennimore Cooper and *Paradise Lost*, certainly reveals Curtis's bicultural identity (Curtis 1947b, 33, 53, 88). English is used in the source text, for example by Héléne de Balansun, as an affectation and to annoy the Germans, and by an English airman whose incorrect French gives him away (Curtis 1947b, 113, 237–41, 202–205).

Perhaps taking her cue from these irruptions of the translating language within the source text, the translator, Nora Wydenbruck, adopts domesticating strategies that are sometimes rather incongruous. 'The National Trust' replaces 'les Beaux-Arts', 'Home Office' replaces 'les Affaires intérieures', and 'Tony Lumpkins' translates 'jeunes godelureaux' (Curtis 1947b, 12, 215, 49; 1950, 15, 183, 44). Markedly English idiomatic expressions recur, such as 'general topsy-turvydom', 'full of beans', 'an ancient light o' love', and 'hobbledehoy' (Curtis 1950, 108, 163, 183, 188). Cultural transpositions occur in both the translation and the reviews which import representational categories specific to English interwar and wartime culture into the target text. For example, Héléne, described by Curtis as 'un specimen de surprise-party de 1944', becomes 'the "bright young thing" of 1944' (Curtis 1947b, 386; 1950, 305). There are multiple cultural criss-crossings here: Curtis uses the English term to represent a French *milieu* which Berkvam suggests is that of the *zazous*, the Parisian youth movement of the war years (Berkvam 2000, 145), and Wydenbruck introduces an additional intertextual connection into the translation by evoking Evelyn Waugh (an author with whose work Curtis was familiar (Curtis 1985, 75)). The *Manchester Guardian's* critic picked up the representation of Philippe Arréguy as a 'spiv', suggesting that this owed something to the author's familiarity with Aldous Huxley (Bloomfield 1950b). The term 'spiv' in the English version translates 'des petits margoulins du marché noir', and is in fact connected to another of Curtis's English references, though the reviewer is unlikely to have compared source and target texts to discover this. These boys 's'habillent chez Simpson et ont tout d'un jeune lord anglais', which Wydenbruck

renders as ‘little spivs, working on the Black Market, who dress at Simpsons and get themselves up like young English lords’ (Curtis 1947a, 103; 1950, 89). Neither transposition is equivalent, since the Bright Young Things were a phenomenon of the 1920s rather than the war years, and the English spiv was a sympathetic and comic figure (such as Ted Purvis in the 1944 film *Waterloo Road* or Flash Harry in the 1950s *Saint Trinian’s* films (Connolly 2014, 159)), whilst Curtis’s black marketeers are much more sinister.

As we saw in Chap. 4, the translation’s publisher, John Lehmann, believed strongly in the power of literary translation both to reveal the European war experience to the British and to enrich British post-war cultural reconstruction. Accordingly, and in direct contrast with Dennis Dobson, Lehmann marketed this Goncourt prizewinner explicitly as a war book. His adverts described it as ‘a powerful and deeply moving novel of France during the German occupation’ (Lehmann 1950). That many reviewers received this highly domesticated translation as an authentic account of the French war experience is perhaps testament to the power of literary marketing. According to the *Times Literary Supplement*, Curtis had made the most of the possibilities of historical perspective to give ‘a really comprehensive, dispassionate survey of the effect of those times on French men and women of all classes and creeds’ (Folliot and McLaren-Ross 1951), and Edmund Blunden felt that, having read it, ‘a phase of French history variously affecting the lives of certain families and individuals had been truly revealed to me’ (Blunden 1950). However, other reviews reprised the sort of discussion we saw in the case of Bory, in which the subject of war was universalised and war literature focusing on the deeper implications rather than the immediate political significance of events was valorised. Paul Bloomfield found *The Forests of the Night* to be ‘[a] fine and unsensational book, shedding light on the natures of many of the sorts and kinds that make the world’ (Bloomfield 1950b). Despite the novel’s obviously political ending, most British critics thought Curtis had produced a balanced, not to say apolitical, depiction of the war. Bloomfield found it ‘[v]ery clever – but with no twisting of the reader’s arm to rub it in’ (Bloomfield 1950b). Lionel Hale thought Curtis was ‘without illusion yet with a controlled sympathy’ and ‘ironical without cynicism’ (Hale 1950), and K. John said

that Curtis had resisted ‘wav[ing] a flag’ (John 1951). The dominant British view that literature should avoid the expression of overt political opinions was contradicted by John Raymond in *The New Statesman and Nation* who was disappointed by Curtis’s refusal of a politically engaged account of the Occupation and concluded that ‘on such a theme as the Occupation, one demands that degree of “commitment” that M. Sartre has so rightly led us to expect’ (Raymond 1950). As we saw in Chap. 4, most British critics were less enthusiastic than Raymond about the ‘committed’ aspect of Sartre’s fiction. Reviews of *The Forests of the Night* were overwhelmingly positive, Raymond’s criticism notwithstanding, and though their views were not unanimous there is a perceptible contrast with the universalising reception of Bory’s *French Village*. Comments such as Blunden’s suggest that Curtis’s novel succeeded better than Bory’s in helping English readers to attach some reality to the idea of occupied France. His novel appears to have helped at least some English readers to go beyond the sort of vague and abstract notions of the French war experience which Stephen Spender would describe in his 1951 autobiography as ‘a hallucinated vision of folly, betrayal and despairing courage’ (Spender 1977, 284–85).

Robert Merle: ‘An Excursion to Hell’

The 1949 Goncourt winner, Robert Merle’s *Weekend à Zuydcoote*, depicts a shared Franco-British wartime experience. The Dunkirk evacuations of 26 May–4 June 1940 have been described as an example of ‘the strained interconnectedness of French and British history’ (Tombs and Tombs 2007, 566). Dunkirk was a ‘contact zone’, a transnational space of war inhabited by French and British forces (Footitt 2016), and the events have played central but contrasting roles in the construction of French and British war memories. France remembers Dunkirk as an act of betrayal by ‘perfidious Albion’, the traditional enemy, a retreat symbolising desertion and abandonment. Britain has sanctified the ‘Dunkirk spirit’ as an example of a characteristically British ability to ‘go it alone’, to improvise, and to snatch victory from the jaws of disaster. In the words of Robert Tombs, ‘Dunkirk is, for the British, the most moving epic in

their history', a crucial myth 'for an island people', but for the French it meant 'being abandoned by the British to face defeat alone' (Tombs and Tombs 2007, 552–53). Penny Summerfield has suggested that British accounts of Dunkirk, such as Churchill's speech to the House of Commons on 4 June, give the view from the sea, with the Channel protecting the island nation from the enemy and the Royal Navy and the merchant seamen volunteers in what would be immortalised as their 'little ships' carrying the British Expeditionary Force (BEF) home from France to safety (Summerfield 2010, 796). Merle's novel provides a view from the land which shows what the situation looked like from the opposite shore. It therefore poses a very different set of challenges for translation into English compared with the texts of Triolet, Bory, and Curtis, since these novels showed British readers aspects of the French war of which they had no experience and therefore a much more limited range of domestic representations to draw on.

The subject Merle chose for his novel is not a popular one in France. It is rare to find representations of Dunkirk in French culture, and it has not attracted very much attention from historians (Alexander 2013, 102–103).⁸ Hilary Footitt has suggested that French historiography of the war is characterised by a 'syndrome des anglo-saxons': between the 1940s and the 1980s, French historians 'left whatever the Americans and British had been doing as something entirely separate which should rightfully be discussed by their own, largely military, historians', and it was not until the de-officialisation of the historical narrative in the post-Gaullist era that an international perspective began to creep in (Footitt 2012, 196). The FRAnce roMan guErre (FRAME) database of French fictional representations of the war and the Occupation lists only one other French novel about Operation Dynamo—René Brest's *La Couronne d'orties*—which was published in 1959, ten years after Merle's book and almost two decades after the events (Atack and Lloyd n.d.). French cinematic representations are similarly rare. As Rachel Langford has shown, the 1964 adaptation of *Weekend à Zuydcoote* by Henri Verneuil is one of only a handful of post-war French Second World War combat films (Langford 2013). It would, by contrast, be difficult to overestimate the presence and status of Dunkirk in British cultural representations of the war, whether in literature or in film. From Gun Buster's *Return* via

Dunkirk (1940) to Ian McEwan's *Atonement* (2001) via Elleston Trevor's *The Big Pick-Up* (1955) or John Harris's *Ride out the Storm* (1975), and in many war films of which the most famous is Ealing Studio's 1958 classic *Dunkirk* and the most recent Christopher Nolan's 2017 *Dunkirk*, popular cultural representations have contributed to the elaboration of a heroic British national memory of Dunkirk.⁹ War films of the 1950s and the 1960s played a particularly important role in cementing the myth of Dunkirk in the British psyche, to the extent that the Dunkirk experience became a metonym for the British war experience as a whole (Reynolds 2013, 205). And the British war experience has in turn become a metonym for Britishness itself. According to Mark Connolly, '[t]he myth of Dunkirk and the 'Dunkirk Spirit' have become vital to our self-perceptions, for they underline and confirm our sense of apartness, of otherness, of self-reliance and insularity, of coolness under tremendous pressure, of surviving against the odds' (Connolly 2014, 54). Summerfield shows how the British Dunkirk myth has been constructed out of competing discourses. On her reading, Churchill's emphasis on the role of the Royal Navy and the Royal Air Force is at odds with J. B. Priestley's 'people's war' discourse which highlighted the bravery of civilians who deployed the 'little ships' (Summerfield 2010). Nonetheless, there is consensus across these representations around the centrality of Dunkirk to the British war effort and the perception of the heroic and successful nature of the operation. Churchill's speech to the House of Commons and Priestley's description of Dunkirk in his BBC Radio programme *Postscripts* the following day reinvented disaster and defeat as deliverance and victory:

When, a week ago today, I asked the House to fix this afternoon as the occasion for a statement, I feared it would be my hard lot to announce the greatest military disaster in our long history.

[...]

A miracle of deliverance, achieved by valour, by perseverance, by perfect discipline, by faultless service, by resource, by skill, by unconquerable fidelity, is manifest to us all. The enemy was hurled back by the retreating British and French troops.

[...]

We must be very careful not to assign to this deliverance the attributes of a victory. Wars are not won by evacuations. But there was a victory inside this deliverance, which should be noted. (Churchill 1974, 6226, 6227, 6228)

And our great-grandchildren, when they learn how we began this War by snatching glory out of defeat, and then swept on to victory, may also learn how the little holiday steamers made an excursion to hell and came back glorious. (Priestley 1940, 4)

Merle's excursion to hell did not end with a glorious return.

Weekend à Zuydcoote was Merle's first novel. Like Curtis, Merle was an academic Anglicist with experience of living in Britain. In 1926 at the age of 18, he went to Hampstead to work as a private tutor, where he formed a relationship with his employer, Elsie Kirby. She helped him financially to take up a teaching post in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1931 as part of his studies. Merle went on to do research on Byron and Oscar Wilde and obtained a university teaching post at Rennes in 1944. As well as writing fiction, he translated Webster's *The White Devil* and Erskine Caldwell's *Journeyman* into French. Mobilised in 1939, he served as an interpreter for the British Army, and in January 1940 was sent to north east France. *Weekend à Zuydcoote* is based on events he had experienced. Merle was not evacuated by the British from Dunkirk and was taken prisoner, spending time in POW camps in Dortmund and Stalack. One of the last French prisoners to benefit from the possibility of repatriation, he was returned to France in 1943, where he began work on his novel. *Weekend à Zuydcoote* was substantially completed by the autumn of 1944, but Merle delayed publication until 1948. With the support of Raymond Queneau, Gallimard took the novel which appeared in the spring of 1949. It won the Goncourt by nine votes to one, and was an enormous success, with huge sales in France and translations into several languages (Merle 2008, 128–29, 136–37, 141–44).

The novel recounts two days in the lives of four French soldiers caught at Bray-Dunes during the Dunkirk evacuations. The central character Maillat, who, like Merle, speaks fluent English, attempts but fails to embark on an English ship, which is subsequently bombed. He fails to

persuade an English soldier he has befriended to jump to safety from the burning ship. One of his comrades, the sympathetic Alexandre, is killed by a stray shell when he goes out from their makeshift camp to get water. Maillat witnesses the rape of a French girl in her home by two French soldiers, and shoots both of them, but subsequently rapes her himself. When he later returns to her house, which she is refusing to leave, it is bombed, killing them both. This is not, then, a story of military heroism. The novel graphically conveys the violent chaos and disorder of the evacuations. The English military's attempt to sort French from English troops by yelling 'Anglais à droite! Français à gauche!' is ludicrously ineffectual, the English military calmly and incongruously drink tea amid the chaos, and Maillat never finds out whether the embarkation permit Captain Feery gives him is an example of English generosity or of sardonic deception (Merle 1949, 69, 79–83, 81). Yet Merle's novel is not strongly marked by Franco-English hostility. Indeed, reporting the award of the Goncourt in the *Sunday Times* before the appearance of the translation, Nancy Mitford remarked that the novel is 'funny about the English in just the way they like, mocking but affectionate' (Mitford 1950). Merle depicts the absurd, anti-heroic situation of both the French and the British armies. The most positive characters, Maillat and Alexandre, die pointlessly and randomly, while the profiteer, Dhéry, and the coward, the priest Pierson, survive. Maillat lives through one bombing raid by hiding in a garage, only to die in another. Chance alone had saved him from the shell that killed Alexandre, who went to fetch water when it was Maillat's turn. None of the novel's deaths has any redemptory meaning. Merle's biographer (the novelist's son) links Merle's depictions of absurd deaths to the early losses of his father, sister, and brother (Merle 2008, 34, 74). While Merle's refusal to depict the war in terms of heroic and redemptive death is characteristic of later rather than immediate post-war depictions of war, it is important to bear in mind that his novel also emerged from personal experiences which predated the war, and that it was written in 1944. Merle's perception of the absurdity of death and war certainly predated 1948, but his decision to delay the publication of his novel suggests that he was sensitive to the cultural context in which it would appear.

The publication by John Lehmann of the English translation by Kathleen Rebillon-Lambley in the spring of 1950 preceded by only a

couple of months the tenth-anniversary commemorations of the Dunkirk evacuations. The commemorations had a high profile in that year, with veterans returning to the beaches (Connolly 2014, 89). The novel's appearance was contemporaneous with a flurry of interest in Dunkirk in Britain from 1950 which followed a lull in the immediate post-war years (Summerfield 2010, 796). Reading the literary history of Dunkirk translationally shows that Elleston Trevor's 1955 *The Big Pick-Up* was not in fact the first novel published in English to depict Operation Dynamo 'in terms of blood, sweat, and machismo, including violence against women': *Weekend at Zuydcoote* had included all of these five years earlier and had supplied a critical discourse on the events in a popular genre eight years before the British film *Dunkirk* (Summerfield 2010, 799, 804). In France, both the style and theme of the novel had provoked something of a scandal, with commentators objecting to the crudity of the language Merle uses to convey the soldiers' speech and claiming that the depiction of the events was unpatriotic since it failed to bear witness to the heroic sacrifices of the French army. The Association Nationale des Anciens Combattants de Dunkerque [the National Association of Dunkirk Veterans] made a complaint on the basis that the novel's title inappropriately linked the events of Dunkirk with the idea of leisure and fun. As Boura remarks, 'Merle grattait le fonds du puits et ce qui remontait à la surface ne sentait pas bon, n'était guère encourageant' [Merle was scraping the bottom of the well and what floated to the surface did not smell good and was not very encouraging], but nonetheless, *Weekend à Zuydcoote* was much more successful over the long term than Triolet's politically more 'worthy' book (Boura 2003, 73; see also Assouline 2013, 73–75; Kopp 2012, 60–61). It was also the most widely reviewed of the Goncourt prize-winning war novels in English.

Weekend at Zuydcoote prompted considerably more comments on translation from reviewers than the other Goncourt prizewinners, the issue being the difficulty of rendering Merle's obscenities and slang. The rape scene is one of several examples of the translator's coyness (the underlined section is omitted in the translation):

- Lui répons pas! hurla la petite gouape. Il va t'avoir. Le laisse pas causer! Rentre-lui dedans, je te dis! Et tout de suite!

Il piétinait de fureur. Le géant paraissait hésiter. Maillat baissa les yeux un quart de seconde, et tout d'un coup il aperçut le sexe de l'homme à découvert. Il pendait hors de la braguette comiquement. Il avait l'air nu et désarmé comme un espèce de gros ver blafard. Maillat releva les yeux aussitôt. (Merle 1949, 170)

['Don't answer him,' shrieked the little hooligan. 'Don't let him talk you round, Paul! Don't let him get round you! Pitch into him, I tell you. Go for him at once!'

He danced up and down in his fury. The giant seemed to hesitate. Maillat glanced down for the fraction of a second, and suddenly he saw the man's nakedness. Maillat raised his eyes at once. (Merle 1950, 178)]

[... he saw the man's uncovered penis. It was hanging out of his fly, comically. It looked naked and disarmed like some sort of fat, pale worm.]

J. D. Scott of the *New Statesman* proclaimed that the translation 'drove me to the original'. According to Scott, Merle's 'tough dialogue' gets 'an English version which seems to be groping rather hopelessly for a covering of English gentility', and 'some of the bad words remain, but with the air of being spoken by an elderly lady under an anaesthetic' (Scott 1950). The inclusion of translation examples in this review, taken from this episode, including the rendering of 'cette pourriture' [this piece of shit] as 'the mangy dog', shows that reviewers did sometimes resort to detailed comparisons between source and target texts, and that they could assume readers had enough knowledge of French to make sense of the comparison. Peter Quennell of the *Daily Mail* '[did] not envy the English translator', who had not solved the problem of translating 'Gallic soldier-slang'; in her translation, he remarked, their speech was 'neither wholly English nor recognisably French but has a flavouring of both tongues' (Quennell 1950). Writing in *The Bookman*, Daniel George felt that 'it is hardly to be expected that all the literary qualities of the novel which won the *Prix Goncourt* in 1949 would survive in translation', but thought the novel's 'dramatic power' had been retained (George 1950).¹⁰

Several reviewers attempted to align Merle's novel with the British myth of Dunkirk. The *Tatler and Bystander's* review is the most egregious example of such paratextual manipulation. Describing the 'maddeningly slow dribble' of the evacuations, Sean Fielding claimed that 'the British Expeditionary Force [...] are prepared to take any French soldiery who

care to join them', which is both historically inaccurate and a complete misrepresentation of the events of the novel (Fielding 1950). Other reviewers restated the Dunkirk myth of the 'little ships' with a little more respect for accuracy. K. John described the French soldiers, who can only 'watch the Tommies queuing for the little boats' (John 1950); Lettice Cooper described the waiting Royal Navy and the 'flotilla of small boats' (Cooper 1950); Daniel George drew readers' attention to the myth by using quotation marks: 'Maillat [...] persuades a British officer to take him on one of the "little ships"' (George 1950). The reviews construct a dichotomy opposing English military superiority to French inferiority. Fielding placed repeated emphasis on France as a demoralised and defeated nation, portraying Merle's book as an attempt to describe 'the nodal point of the malaise that so widely afflicted his country at the time of which he writes' and Maillat's course of action as 'the course of stricken France' (Fielding 1950). Bloomfield remarked in the *Manchester Guardian* that 'M. Merle writes as one who has finished digesting the unpalatable bitter fruit of 1940s crop' (Bloomfield 1950a). As Mark Connolly observes, the British are not in the habit of sanctioning the attempts by either foreign or domestic commentators to diminish the three iconic British war glories represented by Dunkirk, the Battle of Britain, and the Blitz (Connolly 2014, 55). While British post-war fiction obviously did explore the absurdity of war in considerable detail, most famously in the novels of Evelyn Waugh, reviews of *Weekend at Zuydcoote* suggest a strong resistance to portraying one of the central planks of the myth of British war heroism in these terms. The imperative to affirm the national myth of Dunkirk in a depiction of this wartime contact zone by a writer from the opposite shore was strong, and it is clear from the reviews that Merle's French viewpoint was not to be allowed to call into question the British reading of Operation Dynamo.

Merle shares with Bory and Curtis an emphasis on the absurdity of war. However, since their subject matter was the French civilian experience, their novels did not threaten the construction of British myths of wartime heroism. Restatements of the heroic myth of Dunkirk in reviews of Merle ensured that British critics' enthusiasm for his novel's literary qualities did not equate to a sanctioning of its potentially disturbing message—that the British experience of Dunkirk was equally as absurd as the

French. As well as overt manipulations, critics also protected the British understanding of Dunkirk by reading Merle's novel as a depiction of war in general. John suggested that '[a] week-end is enough to represent the whole war, and war as such' (John 1950), and George viewed the novel as 'a successful attempt to compress into two or three days the tragedy of the whole war' (George 1950). Comparisons with Norman Mailer's 1948 war novel about the Philippines campaign, *The Naked and the Dead*, which had also caused a scandal because it used obscene language and described violent misogyny and anti-heroic military deaths, deflected the focus away from the particular example of Dunkirk (Wyndham 1950; Quennell 1950). These are examples of what McLoughlin calls the 'synecdochic function' in war writing, which frequently resorts to the depiction of detail in order to make the enormity of the horror of war comprehensible (McLoughlin 2011, 52, 67–82). In the reviews of Merle, synecdoche functions to assert a generalising interpretation of a novel, the specific content of which threatened one of the central elements of the British national myth of war heroism.

Francis Ambrière: 'So This Is History'

The representation of war offered by Francis Ambrière in his POW memoir *Les Grandes Vacances* is diametrically opposed to that of Merle. In Ambrière's account of the fall of France, which he calls the 'Eunuch's War', war in the abstract retains a strongly positive value. The deaths of his comrades signify heroic sacrifice and France's survival:

Et pourtant, chaque jour, parmi l'indifférence générale, quelques bon gars qui l'avaient rêvée virile, et qui la prenaient au sérieux, donnaient vainement leur peau dans un accrochage de corps francs sur la Bliess [...] le soir, quand surgissait derrière mon poste, d'un chemin caché aux vues ennemies, la voiture qui ramenait leurs cadavres, leur passage m'était moins un deuil qu'un réconfort: car ces morts étaient ceux qui faisaient vivre mon pays, et au milieu de cette dérision il me restait leur exemple où prendre appui. (Ambrière 1946, 22)

[But nevertheless, every day, amid the general indifference, a few good men who had dreamed of a virile war, and who took it seriously, gave their lives in vain in an engagement between detached units on the Bliess river [...] In the evening, when from behind my post, from a path hidden from the enemy's sight, the cart emerged carrying their bodies, the sight of them going past was more a comfort than a grief: for these dead were the ones who made sure my country would live, and in the middle of this derision, I still had their example to fall back on.]

This vignette could not be more different from the grotesque depiction of a naked woman's corpse thrown onto a cart and with her skirt riding up through which Merle connotes the 'derision' of war in the opening pages¹¹ of *Weekend à Zuydcoote*:

Maillat entendit un bruit de roues sur les pavés et au même instant un petit charretton, poussé par un biffin, débouchait sur sa droite. Une femme y était étendue, jambes en avant. Sa robe, retroussée presque jusqu'au ventre, laissait voir deux cuisses roses et grasses qui, à chaque mouvement du charretton, tremblaient dans une espèce de danse obscène. (Merle 1949, 9)

[Maillat heard the noise of wheels on the cobbles and, at the same moment, a small handcart pushed by an infantryman came into sight on his right. On it lay a woman, her legs poking forward. Her dress, bunched up almost to her waist, displayed two plump pink thighs that danced a sort of obscene jig at every movement of the cart. (Merle 1950, 10)]

Unlike Merle, whose shockingly absurd image encapsulates the theme of futility which dominates the novel as a whole, Ambrière uses the same image of a cart carrying the dead to preserve the heroic integrity of the French soldiers which is affirmed throughout *Les Grandes Vacances*. The dead are an inspiration for the surviving soldiers, and the defeat occurs despite their efforts: Ambrière ascribes responsibility for the fall of France to the weakness of the military hierarchy and the proto-collaborationist French press of the 1930s (Ambrière 1946, 28, 18–19). Even after six years of abominable, blind, and cowardly mechanised warfare, Ambrière still believes that war in the abstract is virile and dynamic (Ambrière 1946, 16). 'So this is History', he tells himself, likening the defeat of

1940 to '[t]he flight from Egypt, the scattering of Varus's legions, the aftermath of Pavia, the retreat from Sedan'. And yet '[b]eneath the naked event' he still marvels 'to discover a certain bitter grandeur' [Voilà ce que c'est que l'Histoire. La fuite des Hébreux quittant l'Égypte, les légions des Varus dispersées, le lendemain de Pavie, la retraite après Sedan [...] Sous la nudité de l'événement, il y avait une grandeur amère que je m'émerveillais de découvrir'] (Ambrière 1946, 31–32; 1951, 27–28).

Ambrière's memoir was an overt attempt to counter 'la honteuse légende de la captivité agréable et dorée' ['the shameful legend of a captivity spent in pleasurable luxury'] which circulated both during and after the war in France (Ambrière 1946, 129; 1951, 101). POWs did not fare well in France's post-war memorial culture, since they constituted a reminder of the nation's defeat (Buton 2007, 239–40; see also Fishman 1991; Lloyd 2013). However, far from blaming the captured soldiers for France's defeat, Ambrière constructs the French POW experience in terms of resistance. This idea is initially articulated through the 'fraternal sympathy' of the civilians who witness the prisoners being marched through Alsace: a café owner provides refreshment, a woman throws flowers, and another hangs up her washing so it resembles a tricolour (Ambrière 1946, 33–37). A woman who insults the Germans in a thick Alsatian dialect is a metonym of the French nation, 'la France elle-même qui nous accompagnât vers notre exil' [France herself walking with us towards our exile] (Ambrière 1946, 37). These spontaneous acts of solidarity are reminiscent of Kessel's portrait of a nation *en résistance* in *L'Armée des ombres*. Incarceration is identified with resistance and revolt since the inmates of Oberwesel, where Ambrière is first imprisoned, are all men who have either attempted escape or refused war work, and Ambrière's transfer to the Kobjercyn camp is a result of his refusal to cooperate with his captors (Ambrière 1946, 106). Active resistance in the camp consists in subverting the postal system by getting messages into outgoing letters after they have passed the censor, sending out illicit parcels, and receiving banned items. In this way, POWs were able to maintain contact with the interior Resistance within France (Ambrière 1946, 112–13). They also set up a newspaper to counter Nazi and Vichy propaganda. Its title, *L'An quarante*, which plays on the French expression *s'en foutre* or, slightly more politely, *s'en moquer comme de l'an quarante*, which

means to not care two hoots about something, reinvents the defeat of 1940 in terms of resistance. Ambrière believed it was the most overtly anti-Nazi contraband camp newspaper (Ambrière 1946, 114–17). In Kobjercyn, Ambrière is appointed as an official ‘purchaser’ and so is able to bring all manner of banned items from the local village into the camp (Ambrière 1946, 319, 324). Ambrière also recounts various escape attempts which are presented as affirmations of ‘notre qualité d’hommes libres’ [‘our status as free men’] even though the prisoners are recaptured (Ambrière 1946, 80; 1951, 64). Attempted escape is interpreted as means of expressing fraternity with the armed Resistance inside France (Ambrière 1946, 220–21). Ambrière does depict collaboration in the form of opportunistic co-operation between some French POWs and their captors, but by maintaining that the real traitors [‘les vrais traîtres’] were immediately released to go and work directly for the Nazis, he reinforces his description of all remaining POWs in terms of resistance (Ambrière 1946, 127). The prisoners Ambrière associates with are Gaullists sustained in their captivity by the knowledge that ‘il exist[ait] encore de par le monde, même réduite à un faible noyau, une France qui ne renonçait pas, une France combattante, une France libre’ [‘somewhere in the world, even if reduced to a mere handful of men, there was a France which had not surrendered, a free and fighting France’] (Ambrière 1946, 133, 136–37; 1951, 106). In passages such as these, Ambrière links the POWs to de Gaulle, the Free French, and the interior Resistance, locating acts of sabotage and indiscipline in the camps within a continuum of French resistance. Rawlinson observes that POW texts characteristically attempt to link the POW experience to war narratives that exceed the walls of the prison camp (Rawlinson 2000, 183–84). The Resistance narrative Ambrière drew on to depict and interpret his incarceration was, as we shall see, compromised in translation.

Ambrière’s memoir exists in two English versions, one American and one British. Ziff-Davies published Elaine P. Halperin’s translation, *The Long Holiday*, in Chicago in 1948 (Ambrière 1948), and the Staples Press brought out a different translation by Erik de Mauny, entitled *The Exiled*, in London in 1951 (Ambrière 1951). De Mauny’s translation is extensively abridged (the indication in the endpapers that it is ‘slightly abridged’ is a significant understatement), with whole paragraphs and longer pas-

sages omitted. The abridgement is not neutral, since the excisions tend to attenuate Ambrière's representation of the POW experience in terms of resistance. For example, the account of the solidarity of the people of Alsace is omitted, as is the anecdote about the woman shouting insults at the Germans who is presented by Ambrière as an embodiment of France (Ambrière 1951, 29, 31). A rather Sartrean interpretation of the French experience of defeat in 1940 in terms of contingency, freedom, and choice is similarly excised: 'Aux jours noirs de l'été 1940, dans la débâcle générale, aucun Français n'a pu élire la place où le tourbillon l'emportait. Mais là où le sort l'avait jeté, chacun pouvait demeurer fidèle à sa vocation d'homme libre; chacun, quel que fût son lot, s'est trouvé en posture de choisir, et, très exactement, en face de la révolte ou de la complicité' [In the dark days of the summer of 1940, in the general debacle, no Frenchman could choose the place where the whirlwind would deposit him. But wherever fate threw him down, each could remain true to his vocation as a free man; each, whatever his lot, found himself confronted with a choice, and, quite specifically, confronted with revolt or complicity] (Ambrière 1946, 273; 1951, 182). Even more strikingly, in the chapter on Kobjercyn, where Ambrière describes hearing via the BBC on the camp's clandestine radio the announcement that Free France and the Allies were working in co-operation with the interior Resistance, his clear statement of the myth of autonomous French self-liberation is omitted: 'Ainsi la France se libérait elle-même, c'était les nôtres qui, sur notre propre sol, se levaient les armes à la main' [Thus France liberated herself; it was our own, who, on our own soil, arose, bearing arms] (Ambrière 1946, 331; 1951, 217).¹²

The translation does not only subtract from the original. It also adds to it in the form of paratextual material. In the English version, Ambrière's original preface in which he dedicates his work to his French comrades is replaced by an introduction by Erik de Mauny. These are the dramatic opening lines:

June 1940. The ripening summer suddenly alive with rumours of disaster, a whole people holding its breath as the intolerable suspense lengthened, history slowing down like a dying man's heartbeat. And then the unbelievable happening; the little ships returning from the murderous haze of Dunkirk; the reprieve.

But even as the survivors stepped ashore, on the other side of the channel many thousands of men were beginning the long, slow trek into Germany. (Mauny 1951, 7)

This account of Dunkirk—told from the English perspective, both figuratively and geographically—which occupies a privileged position at the beginning of the introduction, redefines Ambrière's text in terms of the British myth of the 'little ships'. An English myth therefore replaces a French one—textual excisions attenuate the French myth of Resistance, while a paratextual insertion frames the translation in terms of one of the main planks of British heroic war memory. De Mauny does refer to Ambrière as one of the 'intransigents', 'that small but chosen band who resisted every pressure, whether from the Nazis or their fellow-prisoners, right to the end', but this comes later and, furthermore, stresses the exceptionality rather than the typicality of Ambrière's resistance (Mauny 1951, 10). British reviews confirm that Ambrière's assertion of the myth of almost universal resistance amongst the French was lost in translation. The *Times Literary Supplement* suggested that, cut off from France and fed Pétainist propaganda, 'every French captive carried the seeds of collaboration' (Anon 1951), and the *Manchester Guardian* highlighted the 'omnipresence' of Vichy propaganda in the camps (T.C.P.F 1951). Like the British translation, the American edition is strongly reframed in terms of the dominant domestic war memory. A preface by Ambrière himself bearing the title 'To My American Readers' situates the text in terms of a Frenchman's 'friendship and gratitude' and his recognition that 'it was thanks to the uniform of the American GIs that one beautiful day, in April 1945, the symbol of liberty appeared' (Ambrière 1948, vii–viii). Again a domestic myth, this time of America as Europe's sole liberator, appears in a privileged position, here as the final words of the dedication. This myth is reinforced in the American translation by an excision in the final section of the text which describes the liberation of the POW camps. Instead of waiting for the GIs to arrive, Ambrière and four of his comrades decide to escape. The English edition renders the account in full, but the American edition edits out Ambrière's explanation that they cannot bear the idea of playing no part in their own liberation:

Il nous était intolérable de penser que la liberté nous serait rendue sans que nous y fussions pour rien; car la liberté n'est pas un don qu'on reçoive inerte, c'est un privilège, et qui se conquiert. (Ambrière 1946, 366)

[We could not bear to think that our freedom would be given back to us without the least effort on our part: for freedom is not a gift to be accepted passively, it is a privilege that must be won. (Ambrière 1951, 235)

Liberty is not a gift to receive passively, but a privilege to fight for. (Ambrière 1948, 240)]

In both editions, paratextual material interacts with textual excisions to connect the foreign text overtly with the dominant national war memory of the receiving culture.

However, particularly in the case of the American edition of Ambrière's memoir, realigning the translated text with the dominant domestic war memory introduces a degree of incoherence. The 'symbol of liberty' Ambrière discusses in the preface is much less flatteringly portrayed in the text itself. When the Americans arrive, bringing food in abundance, Ambrière is disgusted by the discarded half-consumed tins of food and packets of biscuits, chocolate, cigarettes, and chewing gum the Jeeps leave in their wake. For Ambrière, this is an insult to the privations Europe has suffered in the previous five years. In a passage that remains intact in both translations, Ambrière satirises America, likening this detritus to 'une réclame géante de la jeune Amérique parmi les peuples affamés de la vieille Europe' ['a giant advertisement of young America for the edification of the starving people of old Europe'; 'a huge advertisement for young America among the famished peoples of old Europe'] (Ambrière 1946, 371; 1948, 245; 1951, 239). There is little international solidarity in the contact zone of the liberation, which is depicted as confused and disordered. The liberating army has no clear instructions regarding the provision of food for the freed French prisoners. A week passes before the French authorities arrive. There are chaotic scenes in Mannheim as, in contrast to the swift evacuation of English and American prisoners by air, the French authorities try to evacuate 2,000 displaced civilians alongside the military prisoners by road and rail

(Ambrière 1946, 374–76). However, while the French officials appear incompetent, once the French prisoners finally embark on the journey home, a patriotic French discourse is reasserted. Ambrière's memoir comes full circle, both geographically and symbolically, as he returns to France via the same route he had left in 1940 to be greeted by waving French women and the fraternal cries of Lattre de Tassigny's new French army. The text's conclusion is in tension with the extensive textual and paratextual domesticating strategies employed in the translations, since Ambrière leaves the reader with an image of freedom and solidarity that is exclusively French.

Despite the apparent success of *Les Grandes Vacances* in France—Ambrière claimed that it had sold 200,000 copies in less than a year and had been read by more than two million people (Ambrière 1948, vii)—the British reception of the translation, which was advertised as an 'unvarnished' and 'stark' depiction of 'the true but scarcely credible life of French prisoners-of-war' (Staples Press 1951), was more limited than that of the other Goncourts considered in this chapter. This may be because the text did not correspond to what British readers in 1951 had come to expect of the POW narrative. The *Times Literary Supplement* remarked that Ambrière's book provided 'a sharp corrective' to the tendency of British POW novels and memoirs to represent captivity in terms of escape:

But for the most part it is the bold and cheerful spirits who kept themselves whole in captivity by never ceasing to dig or bluff themselves out of it: it is these who provide the record. British readers (at least those without family reasons for knowing the contrary) have every encouragement to identify the prisoner of war with the escapist. (Anon 1951)

The *Manchester Guardian's* critic also noted that 'it contains little about escaping' (T.C.F.P. 1951). Discussions of British war writing have highlighted the fact that post-war depictions of POWs in popular culture were almost exclusively escape stories (Rawlinson 2000, 167–204; Connolly 2014, 232–34). *The Exiled* appeared two years after Eric Williams's *The Wooden Horse*, the film version of which was a huge success in 1950, and in the same year as Paul Brickhill's bestseller *The Great*

Escape. Rawlinson notes a shift from the documentation of prison life in the immediate aftermath of the war to the telling of exciting escape stories as the post-war progressed (Rawlinson 2000, 179). By the time *The Exiled* was published in 1951, it was therefore out of step with the dominant British conception of POW writing. Furthermore, the potential prosthetic memorial appeal of *The Exiled* in the British literary field was probably limited. Rawlinson's analysis suggests that British POW writing functioned ambivalently as a representation of the European war experience. On the one hand, British POW experience had the potential to offer a different—continental—perspective that exceeded the domestic war experience thanks to the prisoner's contact with European prisoners or, if he escaped, European civilians: 'the prisoner's access to European realities constitutes the possibility of revisionary interpretations of the war rather than a reinforced insularity' (Rawlinson 2000, 176). However, Rawlinson concludes that the British post-war construction of the POW was ultimately 'conservative' and 'parochial' (Rawlinson 2000, 204). Rather than fully exploiting these possibilities of openness to 'foreign' experiences and interpretations, British POW narratives drew instead on more familiar tropes, notably that of the public school. POW stories often portrayed incarceration as a repetition of the boarding school experience and escape as a schoolboy prank, as if the Germans were twittish schoolmasters to be outwitted. For Rawlinson, the school trope was a means by which British writers resisted engaging directly with the reality of the European war. Such representations reflect 'the impercipient about occupied Europe amongst British writers determined to find analogues of totalitarian institutions and oppression in their own childhood and wartime experience' (Rawlinson 2000, 186–87). The translation of Ambrière's book suggests that neither domestic nor translated POW narratives were to be allowed to challenge the national myths on which British war memory was being constructed by the end of the first post-war decade. Domestic texts used familiar narrative tropes to inscribe 'foreign' experience within the confines of domestic experience, and the paratextual framing of translated texts oriented 'foreign' stories to encourage the validation of dominant national memorial themes.

Transcultural Memory?

The English translations of the Goncourt prizewinners we have discussed demonstrate that the translation of national memory in the form of fictionalised representations of war produces transcultural memory understood as ‘shared border-crossing knowledge of past events and people’ (Brownlie 2016, 15). Translation is one of the ways in which the cultural memory of the war, manifested in fiction, ‘wander[s]’ and is ‘transform[ed]’ through time and space, across social, linguistic and political borders’ (Erl 2011, 8, 11). Reviewers’ comments, such as Blunden’s remark that thanks to Curtis’s novel, a period of French history had ‘truly been revealed’ to him (Blunden 1950) suggest that reading these books did allow British readers to experience a personal and empathetic connection with the French war experience, and that these translated works therefore functioned as a type of prosthetic memory (Landsberg 2004, 2, 24). However, as Landberg points out, memory is about ‘negotiating a relationship to the past’, and ‘prosthetic memories do not erase differences or construct common origins’ (Landsberg 2004, 4, 9). Such memorial negotiation is not straightforward assimilation. Brownlie concludes that ‘translations are instrumental in creating transnational memory, shared knowledge of the past and of cultural items’ but that, at the same time, translation produces ‘transformation in line with local specificities’ and the result is therefore ‘shared transnational memory with national inflections’ (Brownlie 2016, 123, 125). The nature and extent of the ‘national inflections’ we have observed in the translation of French war fiction into English in the immediate post-war years are sufficient to call that ‘sharedness’ into question. The problem is that, as Brownlie observes, ‘arguably the most important function of memory is to uphold the cohesion and identity of the group, since communities are constructed in large measure by a collective conception of their past’ (Brownlie 2016, 106). In the immediate post-war period, when national reconstruction was a priority and the trauma of the war still so recent, translated war fiction tended to reinforce national myths rather than facilitating a type of transcultural memory open to different interpretations of the war experience.

The emergence of transcultural memories of the war through reading and criticism of the French Goncourt prizewinners we have studied in this chapter was often reliant on strategies of generalisation and universalisation. The motivations and behaviour of Triolet's Resisters and the inhabitants of Bory's French village were understood by British critics as archetypal, and were loosened from their ideological specificity within the context of the French Occupation by translational omissions such as 'le parti des fusillés' and 'à l'heure allemande'. Since the dominant British conception of war fiction rejected a focus on specific events and overt political evaluations in favour of a literature capable of drawing out underlying significance, the pull towards universalising interpretations was doubly strong. In the British context, universalisation was a type of domestication, and if a by-product was a sense of cosmopolitan solidarity with the French who had experienced the Occupation, this was produced thanks to critical discourses which affirmed the literary acceptability of the translated text in relation to the domestic values through which British readers were willing to assimilate the French war experience.

Curtis's *The Forests of the Night* illustrates translation's capacity both to divide languages and cultures and to bridge that divide (Brownlie 2016, 10). The 'deep affinities' between French and British culture out of which Curtis claimed his writing arose suggest that the source text was already transcultural, yet the presence in the text of elements of the translating language appear to have prompted a domesticating translation that is in places so incongruous as to call attention to difference rather than mitigating it. Curtis, like Merle, was the product of a contact zone between France and Britain that predated the events depicted in the novels. The earlier transcultural experience of these writers is perceptible in their fictional accounts of wartime contact zones, and it is interesting to note that the two Goncourt-winning novels written by French Anglicists received the most positive responses from British critics. Whilst Curtis's saturation with English culture may have enhanced the prosthetic function of *The Forests of the Night*, facilitating memorial travelling both across and between cultures (Erl 2011, 9, 11, 14–15) via a translation that functioned as a revelation of recent French history at least for one English critic, it was precisely his openness to the foreign that made him seem so continental to another. In an obituary of Curtis for the *Independent* in

1995, James Kirkup described him as ‘everything the British distrust in a writer. Multi-talented, versatile, international in cultural and social concern’, and he recalled how, reading Curtis in 1947, he had admired his ‘classic, spare, elegant style with its serious wit and wide-ranging diversity of themes’, a welcome change from ‘the starchy British literary diet’ (Kirkup 1995). It appears that the success of *The Forests of the Night* as a prosthetic and transcultural memorial text in Britain was also a result of Curtis’s ability to negotiate between the two cultural affiliations he claimed as his own.

The existence of a specific contact zone linking source and target cultures does not imply straightforward translatability. Where the contact zone forms a significant portion of the narrative, as in Merle’s depiction of Dunkirk and Ambrière’s depiction of the liberation of the POW camps by the Allies, strategies of cultural transposition come into play. In the case of Merle’s and Ambrière’s novels, there is substantial evidence of cultural appropriation through translational interventions such as excision and paratextual reframing.¹³ Such appropriation contests the foreign national memory, displacing it by restating the domestic national myth. National reorientation can sometimes slide into misreading. Incredibly, given that the refusal of the British to evacuate French and British troops together from Dunkirk in 1940 is central to Merle’s novel, Paul Bloomfield felt able to write that ‘though [Merle] has hesitated to offer us a happy ending we can read his book without self-searching’ (Bloomfield 1950a). The displacement of the French memory of Dunkirk by the British one is similarly evident in Daniel George’s remark that ‘[t]o read [*Weekend at Zuydcoote*] is no pleasure, but it is almost a duty, lest we forget’ (George 1950). Here Merle’s novel is made to fulfil a domestic memorial function through the invocation of the quintessentially British memorial formula *lest we forget*. Domestic appropriation can occur even when a text is framed by an assertion of ethical solidarity based on shared memory. In his preface ‘To My American Readers’, Ambrière writes: ‘I firmly believe that these common memories will, ultimately, help to engender better understanding among people and the establishment of international relations based on greater justice and mutual comprehension’ (Ambrière 1948, vii). Yet rather than promoting ‘cosmopolitan’ memory, understood as ‘shared memorial knowledge’ oriented towards global solidarity

(Brownlie 2016, 17, 183), Ambrière's translated text juxtaposes incompatible national memories. The myth of America as Europe's liberator is in tension with the representation of America as the source of a damaging post-war consumerist culture; the British myth of a 'heroic retreat' from Dunkirk is in tension with the French myth of self-liberation that is restated in military terms in the novel's closing pages. Susannah Radstone is right to observe that memory is simultaneously located and mobile (Radstone 2011, 113–14). The cultural memory of the Second World War is not bounded by nation or language. However, memories cannot circulate innocently, without transformation. Different transformations occur depending on the memorial content that is moving. In the immediate post-war period, for very understandable reasons, translated war fiction resorted to universalisation and domestication in order to protect national memories even as it gave English readers access to foreign experiences of the war. Whatever the ambitions of Europhiles such as John Lehmann, Stephen Spender, or Cyril Connolly, the examples of the Goncourt prizewinners suggest that foreign war literature was not allowed to disturb the dominant domestic mythologies on which British war memory was being constructed.

The very existence of these translated texts is evidence of the fact that publishers such as Lehmann put their desire for post-war cultural exchange into practice, and the reviews show that opinion-formers were interested in drawing foreign texts into a debate about what the war meant and how it could and should be written about in literature. However, alongside a genuine curiosity about the foreign, there was also parochialism and resistance to receiving the foreign on its own terms. This resulted in translational transformations both in the texts themselves and in the paratextual discourses surrounding them. The object that fulfils a prosthetic memorial function in the target culture—the translated text—is necessarily different from the one it replaces (Landsberg 2004). A prosthesis is not a transplant, and the French war experience could not simply be grafted onto the British psyche. A prosthesis is different in form and substance from an absent limb or organ, just as a translation is a representation in a different language of an absent text. A prosthesis is a disguise that performs the functions of something that is missing. When its difference from its host becomes obvious—as in Landsberg's example

of the prosthetic arm in the film *The Thieving Hand* (Landsberg 2004, 25–28)—the results can be disturbing. Similarly, as the critic K. John suggested in the quotation with which we began, the ‘garb’ of translation risks seeming ‘a little queer’ (John 1951). In the English translations of the post-war Goncourts that ‘queerness’ is a manifestation of the instability of the boundaries that both connect and divide French and British war memories.

Notes

1. Druon’s *Les Grandes Familles* was published as *The Rise of Simon Lachaume* in 1952, translated by Edward Fitzgerald (Druon 1952). Gautier’s *Histoire d’un fait divers* does not appear to have been translated into English.
2. On Triolet’s conception of the relationship between literature and politics, see Lewis (1986b).
3. The translator’s name is absent from all three editions (Triolet 1947, 1949, 1986), but Golffing is identified as the translator in the *Library of Congress Catalog of Copyright Entries*, 424.
4. Files for the Hutchinson International Authors series are held by Penguin Random House UK, but according to correspondence with the library in July 2016, no drafts or papers, other than contracts, relating to *A Fine of Two Hundred Francs* have survived.
5. As various commentators have noted, it was significant that the Goncourt jury awarded the prize to a woman in the same year that French women voted for the first time.
6. On literary representations of the *milice* in post-war French novels, including *Mon village à l’heure allemande*, see Grégoire (2007).
7. This ‘Avertissement’ appears in the first edition of *Les Forêts de la nuit* but is not included in the subsequent paperback J’ai lu edition.
8. For a recent study, see however Duquesne (2017).
9. On British cultural memory of Dunkirk, see Summerfield (2010), Alexander (2013), Connolly (2014, 54–90), and Munton (1989, 38–41). For a comparative reading of the events that also pays attention to their role in national memory, see Bell (1997, 8–26).
10. Marghanita Laski, atypically, thought the book ‘most excellently translated’ (Laski 1950).

11. The English translation begins with a scene in a tobacconist's shop which is not in either the first edition or the paperback reprint of the French text (Merle 1950, 7–9). I have been unable to establish the provenance of this section of the English text.
12. These passages are present in the American version (Ambrière 1948, 17–20, 178, 214).
13. Brownlie (2016, 109–23) discusses excision and reframing in translations of Walter Scott.

References

- Alexander, Martin. 2013. Dunkirk in Military Operations, Myths and Memories. In *Britain and France in Two World Wars: Truth, Myth and Memory*, ed. Robert Tombs and Emile Chabal, 94–118. London: Bloomsbury.
- Ambrière, Francis. 1946. *Les Grandes Vacances*. Paris: Les Editions de la nouvelle France.
- . 1948. *The Long Holiday*. Trans. E.P. Halperin. Chicago: Ziff-Davis Publishing Company.
- . 1951. *The Exiled*. Trans. E. de Mauny. London/New York: Staples Press.
- Anon. 1945. Prix Goncourt Won by a Woman. *The Times*, July 3, 4.
- . 1951. Strength Through Suffering. *Times Literary Supplement*, October 19, 658.
- Assouline, Pierre. 2013. *Du côté de chez Drouant. Cent dix ans de vie littéraire chez les Goncourt*. Paris: Gallimard/France Culture.
- Attack, Margaret. 1989. *Literature and the French Resistance: Cultural Politics and Narrative Forms 1940–1950*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- . 1990. Narratives of Disruption 1940–1944. *French Cultural Studies* 1 (3): 233–246.
- Attack, Margaret, and Christopher Lloyd. n.d. FRAME (FRAnce roMan guErre). http://www.leeds.ac.uk/arts/info/125238/frame_france_roman_guerre. Accessed 30 Jan 2018.
- Balakian, Nona. 1947. Three Short Novelettes of Life in the Maquis. *New York Times*, October 12.
- Beevor, Antony, and Artemis Cooper. 1994. *Paris After the Liberation: 1944–1949*. London: Penguin.
- Bell, P.M.H. 1997. *Britain and France 1940–1994: The Long Separation*. London/New York: Longman.

- Berkvam, M.L. 2000. *Writing the Story of France in World War II: Literature and Memory 1942–1958*. New Orleans: University Press of the South.
- Bloomfield, Paul. 1948. New Novels. *Manchester Guardian*, April 23, 3.
- . 1950a. New Fiction. *Manchester Guardian*, April 21, 4.
- . 1950b. New Novels. *Manchester Guardian*, December 1, 4.
- Blunden, Edmund. 1950. The Forests of the Night by Jean-Louis Curtis. *The Bookman Annual*, December, 7.
- Bory, Jean-Louis. 1945. *Mon village à l'heure allemande*. Paris: Flammarion.
- . 1948. *French Village*. Trans. D.P. and P.J. Waley. London: Dennis Dobson.
- Boura, Olivier. 2003. *Un Siècle de Goncourt*. Paris: Arléa.
- Brownlie, Siobhan. 2016. *Mapping Memory in Translation*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Buton, Philippe. 2007. Occupation, Liberation, Purges: The Changing Landscape of French Memory. In *The Uncertain Foundation: France at the Liberation, 1944–47*, ed. Andrew Knapp, 234–249. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cape, Jonathan. 1949. Advertisement for Alexander Baron, *From the City, From the Plough*. *The Observer*, June 19, 7.
- Casanova, Pascale. 2004. *The World Republic of Letters*. Trans. M.B. Debevoise. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cavani, Jane. 2004. Elsa Triolet et le prix Goncourt 1944: consécration littéraire ou expédient politique? In *Prix Goncourt 1903–2003: essais critiques*, ed. Katherine Ashley, 125–138. Oxford: Peter Lang.
- Churchill, Winston S. 1974. In *His Complete Speeches, 1897–1963*, ed. Robert Rhodes James, vol. 6, 1935–1942. New York: Chelsea House Publishers.
- Cohen, Margaret, and Carolyn Denver, eds. 2002. *The Literary Channel: The Inter-National Invention of the Novel*. Princeton/Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Connelly, Mark. 2014. *We Can Take It! Britain and the Memory of the Second World War*. 2nd ed. Abingdon/New York: Routledge.
- Connolly, Cyril. 1939. The Ivory Shelter. *The New Statesman and Nation*, October 7, 482–483.
- . 1945. French-English Cultural Relations. In *The Condemned Playground*, 76–89. London: Routledge.
- Cooper, Lettice. 1950. Best Novel of the Last War. *Yorkshire Post*, April 21, 2.
- Curtis, Jean-Louis. 1947a. Avertissement. In *Les forêts de la nuit*, ed. Jean-Louis Curtis, vol. 5. Paris: Julliard.
- . 1947b. *Les Forêts de la nuit*. Paris: Julliard, Editions J'ai lu.

- . 1950. *The Forests of the Night*. Trans. N. Wydenbruck. London: John Lehmann.
- . 1985. *Une éducation d'écrivain*. Paris: Flammarion.
- Dobson, Dennis. 1948a. Advertisement for Jean-Louis Bory, *French Village*. *Times Literary Supplement*, March 27, 170.
- . 1948b. Advertisement for Jean-Louis Bory, *French Village*. *The Observer*, May 2, 3.
- Druon, Maurice. 1948. *Les Grandes Familles*. Paris: Julliard.
- . 1952. *The Rise of Simon Lachaume*. Trans. E. Fitzgerald. London: Staples Press.
- Duquesne, Jacques. 2017. *Dunkerque 1940: une tragédie française*. Paris: Flammarion.
- Erl, Astrid. 2011. Travelling Memory. *Parallax* 17 (4): 4–18.
- Eychart, Marie-Thérèse. 1994. Réception du prix Goncourt 1944: Elsa Triolet ou la constitution d'une légende. *Recherches croisées Aragon/Elsa Triolet* 5: 197–228.
- Fielding, Sean. 1950. A Great Novel. *Tatler and Bystander*, April 26, 202–203.
- Fishman, Sarah. 1991. Grand Delusions: The Unintended Consequences of Vichy France's Prisoner of War Propaganda. *Journal of Contemporary History* 26 (2): 229–254.
- Folliot, B.J.M., and Maclaren-Ross, Julian. 1951. Changing Fortunes. *The Times Literary Supplement*, January 12, 17.
- Footitt, Hilary. 2012. The Liberal Way of War? French Representations of the Allies, 1944–2008. In *Framing Narratives of the Second World War and Occupation in France, 1939–2009*, ed. Margaret Attack and Christopher Lloyd, 194–203. Manchester/New York: University of Manchester Press.
- . 2016. War and Culture Studies in 2016: Putting 'Translation' into the Transnational? *Journal of War & Culture Studies* 9 (3): 209–221.
- Frank, Robert. 2013. The Second World War Through French and British Eyes. In *Britain and France in Two World Wars: Truth, Myth and Memory*, ed. Robert Tombs and Emile Chabal, 179–191. London: Bloomsbury.
- Garcia, Daniel. 1991. *Jean-Louis Bory, 1919–1979*. Paris: Flammarion.
- Gautier, Jean-Jacques. 1946. *Histoire d'un fait divers*. Paris: Julliard.
- George, Daniel. 1950. *Weekend at Zuydcoote* by Robert Merle. *The Bookman*, April, 7.
- Grégoire, Vincent. 2007. Sous le signe du gamma: le rôle de la milice de Vichy dans la littérature de l'immédiate après-guerre. *Symposium* 61 (2): 117–135.
- Hale, Lionel. 1950. New Novels. *The Observer*, November 26, 7.

- Hall, Geoff. 2009. Texts, Readers – and Real Readers. *Language and Literature* 18 (3): 331–337.
- Isaacs, J. 1950. Books of the Year, I: Fiction and Poetry. *The Observer*, December 31.
- Jacquet, Michel. 2000. *Une Occupation très romanesque. Ironie et dérision dans le roman français sur l'Occupation de 1945 à nos jours*. Paris: Editions de la Bruyère.
- John, K. 1949. Fiction of the Week. *Illustrated London News*, April 2, 458.
- . 1950. Fiction of the Week. *Illustrated London News*, May 13, 756.
- . 1951. Fiction of the Week. *Illustrated London News*, January 6, 25.
- Judt, Tony. 2010. *Postwar: A History of Europe Since 1945*. London: Vintage Books.
- Kirkup, James. 1995. Obituary: Jean-Louis Curtis. *The Independent*, November 14. <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/people/obituary-jean-louis-curtis-1581910.html>. Accessed 4 July 2016.
- Knapp, Andrew. 2007. The Half-Open Window: France and Britain, 1944–47. In *The Uncertain Foundation: France at the Liberation, 1944–47*, ed. Andrew Knapp, 207–233. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kopp, Robert. 2012. *Un Siècle de Goncourt*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Landsberg, Alison. 2004. *Prosthetic Memory: The Transformation of American Remembrance in the Age of Mass Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Langford, Rachel. 2013. Revenant(s) de guerre?: Spectres of Decolonization in the French Second World War Combat Film. *French Studies* 67 (3): 355–370.
- Laski, Marghanita. 1950. New Novels, *The Spectator*, April 14, 514–516.
- Lefevere, André. 2017. *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. 2nd ed. Abingdon/New York: Routledge.
- Lehmann, John. 1950. Advertisement for Jean-Louis Curtis, *The Forests of the Night*. *Times Literary Supplement*, November 24, 739.
- Lewis, Helena. 1986a. Introduction. In *A Fine of Two Hundred Francs*, ed. Elsa Triolet. London: Virago.
- . 1986b. Elsa Triolet: The Politics of a Committed Writer. *Women's Studies International Forum* 9 (4): 385–394.
- Library of Congress Catalog of Copyright Entries*, Third Series, Volume 1, Part 1A, Number 1, Books, January–June 1947, 424. https://books.google.co.uk/books/about/Catalog_of_Copyright_Entries_Third_Serie.html?id=QD4hAQAAIAAJ&redir_esc=y. Accessed 2 Mar 2018.

- Lloyd, Christopher. 2013. Enduring Captivity: French POW Narratives of World War II. *Journal of War & Culture Studies* 6: 24–39.
- Mauny, Erik de. 1951. Introduction. In *The Exiled* Francis Ambrière, 7–12. London: Staples Press.
- McLoughlin, Kate. 2011. Authoring War. *The Literary Representation of War from the Iliad to Iraq*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Merle, Robert. 1949. *Weekend à Zuydcoote*. Paris: Gallimard.
- . 1950. *Weekend at Zuydcoote*. Trans. K. Rebillon-Lambley. London: John Lehmann.
- Merle, Pierre. 2008. *Robert Merle: Une vie de passions*. La Tour-d'Aigues: Editions de l'aube.
- Milne, Angela. 1948. Over There. *The Observer*, May 9.
- Mitford, Nancy. 1950. A Paris Windfall. *Sunday Times*, January 8.
- Munton, Alan. 1989. *English Fiction of the Second World War*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Newby, P.H. 1948. New Novels. *The New Statesman and Nation*, May 29, 440–441.
- Potter, Stephen. 1948. New Books: Flesh That Doesn't Creep. *News Chronicle*, April 22, 2.
- Prescott, Orville. 1946. Books of the Times. *New York Times*, December 31.
- Priestley, J.B. 1940. *Postscripts*. London/Toronto: William Heinemann Ltd.
- Quennell, Peter. 1950. Prize Novel Survives a Channel Trip. *Daily Mail*, April 29, 4.
- Radford, Andrew, and Victoria Reid, eds. 2010. *Franco-British Cultural Exchanges, 1880–1940. Channel Packets*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Radstone, Susannah. 2011. What Place Is This? Transcultural Memory and the Locations of Memory Studies. *Parallax* 17 (4): 109–123.
- Rawlinson, Mark. 2000. *British Writing of the Second World War*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Raymond, John. 1950. New Novels. *The New Statesman and Nation*, December 16, 629–630.
- Reynolds, David. 2013. France, Britain and the Narrative of Two World Wars. In *Britain and France in Two World Wars: Truth, Myth and Memory*, ed. Robert Tombs and Emile Chabal, 193–210. London: Bloomsbury.
- Rigney, Ann. 2010. The Dynamics of Remembrance: Texts Between Monumentality and Morphing. In *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies*, ed. Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nünning, 345–353. Berlin: De Gruyter.

- Roy, Paulette. 1971. *Jean-Louis Curtis romancier*. Paris: Julliard.
- Sapiro, Gisèle. 1999. *La Guerre des écrivains: 1940–1953*. Paris: Fayard.
- Scott, Helen Elisabeth. 1949. Journey's End. *Times Literary Supplement*, May 27, 341.
- Scott, J.D. 1950. New Novels. *New Statesman and Nation*, May 6, 523–524.
- Spender, Stephen. 1977. *World Within World*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Staples Press. 1951. Advertisement for Francis Ambrière, *The Exiled*. *Times Literary Supplement*, June 8, 353.
- Suleiman, Susan. 2006. *Crises of Memory and the Second World War*. Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press.
- Summerfield, Penny. 2010. Dunkirk and the Popular Memory of Britain at War, 1940–1958. *Journal of Contemporary History* 45 (4): 788–811.
- T.C.F.P. 1951. French Prisoner. *The Manchester Guardian*, October 9, 4.
- Tombs, Robert. 2013. Two Great Peoples. In *Britain and France in Two World Wars: Truth, Myth and Memory*, ed. Robert Tombs and Emile Chabal, 1–16. London: Bloomsbury.
- Tombs, Robert, and Isabelle Tombs. 2007. *That Sweet Enemy. Britain and France: The History of a Love-Hate Relationship*. London: Pimlico.
- Toynbee, Philip. 1944. The Literary Situation in France. *Horizon* 10 (59): 295–311.
- . 1949. New Novels. *The New Statesman and Nation*, June 18, 650.
- Triolet, Elsa. 1947. *A Fine of Two Hundred Francs*. Trans. F. Golffing. New York: Reynal & Hitchcock.
- . 1949. *A Fine of Two Hundred Francs*. Trans. F. Golffing. London: Hutchinson International Authors.
- . 1965a. *Le Premier Accroc coûte deux cent francs*. Paris: Denoël.
- . 1965b. Préface à la clandestinité. In *Le Premier Accroc coûte deux cents francs* by Elsa Triolet, 9–26. Paris: Denoël.
- . 1986. *A Fine of Two Hundred Francs*. Trans. F. Golffing and with an Introduction by Helena Lewis. London: Virago.
- Wyndham, Francis. 1950. New Novels. *The Observer*, April 23, 7.



6

Layers of Translation: Multilingualism in War and Holocaust Fiction

Jan Karski's mission to testify to the Allies about the extermination of Polish Jews is often discussed in relation to the Allied inability, or refusal, to confront the truth of the Holocaust before the liberation of the camps in 1945. We saw in Chap. 3 that Karski's evidence prompted Arthur Koestler to write an essay 'On Disbelieving Atrocities' (Koestler 1964). As Mark Rawlinson puts it in a study of British culture and the Holocaust, Karski's story poses an uncomfortable question: 'Did people not listen, or was the message unbelievable?' (Rawlinson 1996, 1). Less often remarked upon is the complexity of the linguistic transactions which first brought Karski's testimony to public attention, and which have facilitated his presence in recent European Holocaust memory. The version of Karski's testimony broadcast on the BBC in 1943 as *Jewish Massacre* was written and read out by Koestler, who had met Karski in London in November 1942 (Cesarani 1998, 202–203). Thus the testimony of the Pole Karski was transmitted in English by a polyglot Hungarian¹ whose wartime fictional trilogy had begun with two covert translations from German: *The Gladiators* (1939) and *Darkness at Noon* (1940).² The book in which Karski gave an account of his experiences originally appeared in English as *Story of a Secret State* in the USA in 1944, published by Houghton

Mifflin, and in Britain in 1945, published by Hodder & Stoughton. But Karski's mother tongue was, of course, Polish, and at that stage in his life he was not fluent in English. The English version was the result of a collaboration between Karski and his Polish-English bilingual secretary, who translated parts of the book directly into English as Karski was dictating it to her in a mixture of Polish and English (Wood and Jankowski 1994, 226).³ The English text is then already partly a covert translation and the French version, which first appeared in 1948 under the title *Mon témoignage devant le monde: histoire d'un état secret*, a translation of a translation. Recent re-editions of Karski's book have reversed this translational trajectory, with material being brought to English readers from French. According to a 'Note on the Text', which precedes the revised version of *Story of a Secret State* published by Penguin in 2011 (Karski 2011), this new edition is 'supplemented with translations of additional material provided by the author in 1999 for the Polish edition'; however, those translations, by Sandra Smith, are in fact from the revised French edition published in 2010 (Karski 2010). It was largely Karski's participation in Claude Lanzmann's seminal film *Shoah* that brought him back into the public eye in the 1980s. Lanzmann interviewed Karski in 1978 and included around 40 minutes of the footage in the final version of the film released in 1985 (Wood and Jankowski 1994, 253–55). Their conversation takes place in English, and it is obvious from the men's accents and turns of phrase that both are speaking in a language that is foreign to them. The interview is an act of simultaneous self-interpretation from two different source languages.⁴ In a further instance of what André Lefevere terms rewriting (Lefevere 2017), in 2009 Yannick Haenel published a controversial novel in French about Karski which draws heavily on the Lanzmann interview. In this novel, which has not, to my knowledge, appeared in English, Haenel translates Karski's 'anglais d'émigrant polonais' [the English of a Polish emigrant], his 'anglais international' [international English], into French, preserving the original language of the interview by including a smattering of English quotations (Haenel 2009, 17). Both the initial transmission of Karski's testimony and his ongoing memorialisation illustrate the extent to which the circulation of discourses about the war and the Holocaust relies on hidden translational processes and on multilingual rewritings.

Historical and critical neglect of the linguistic, and specifically translational, questions raised by the transmission of Jan Karski's testimony is an example of a generalised resistance to acknowledging the crucial role translation has played in the transmission of knowledge about the Holocaust. This point was addressed more than ten years ago by Naomi Seidman in a chapter of her study of Jewish-Christian translational relations entitled *Faithful Renderings*, where she treats 'translation as a crucial component of Holocaust testimony' against the prevailing critical tendency not to recognise translation in this context (Seidman 2006, 204–205). Ten years before that, Susan Suleiman had remarked on the lack of attention paid to issues of translation in relation to Holocaust representation (Suleiman 1996b, 398). But it is only recently that substantial research has begun to probe the complex relationships between Holocaust writing and translation, notably in the UK: in a special issue of *Literature & Translation* edited by Peter Davies entitled *Holocaust Testimony and Translation* (Davies 2014); in *Translating Holocaust Literature*, edited by Peter Arnds (Arnds 2016b); in *Translating Holocaust Lives*, edited by Jean Boase-Beier, Peter Davies, Andrea Hammel, and Marion Winters (Boase-Beier et al. 2017b); in Dorota Glowacka's *Disappearing Traces: Holocaust Testimonials, Ethics, and Aesthetics* (Glowacka 2012); and in Peter Davies's *Witness Between Languages: The Translation of Holocaust Testimonies in Context* (Davies 2018). I share one of the central aims of this research, which is to move on from the critical position that either ignores translation in relation to the Holocaust or acknowledges it only as a problem. The present chapter seeks not only to enrich ongoing research on Holocaust writing and translation with further examples—though this is important and valuable in itself—but also to emphasise some of the ways in which the translation of war and Holocaust fiction exceeds the binary structure of source/target. The multilingual nature of the Holocaust and of the Second World War has produced texts that are constituted by multilingualism and therefore pose particular problems for interlingual translation. The translational complexity of the transmission of Karski's testimony is just one example of the fact that discourses of the war and the Holocaust, be they testimonial or fictional, are frequently underpinned by translational complexity. My argument in this chapter is not just that Holocaust discourse relies on

translation for transmission, but that Holocaust discourse is characterised by layers of translation. When we start to talk about a binary translational relationship, about the translation of a source text into a target language, it is very likely that the source text in question will itself already be translational in some important respect. We misread not only by failing to acknowledge that both war and Holocaust memory travel through translation, but also by failing to recognise the translational nature of 'original' works. This chapter begins by illustrating the issues posed by literary multilingualism using examples from some of the war novels we have already encountered in this book. It then goes on to outline a framework for analysing multilingualism in the more complex case of Holocaust fiction that depicts exile or emigration.⁵ The readings which follow apply this framework to the work of two French novelists of Polish-Jewish origin who, like the authors considered in the previous chapter, were winners of the French Goncourt prize: André Schwarz-Bart and Anna Langfus.

Translating the Multilingual Spaces of War

Literary multilingualism takes a variety of forms. In common with most studies of the subject, this chapter considers the presence of different languages within a single text. Other types of multilingualism include a national literature, such as that of Canada or the Iberian peninsula, or the *œuvre* of a single individual, such as that of Arthur Koestler or Elsa Triolet, comprising texts written in more than one language (Stratford 2008, 459–60). Multilingualism is an important narrative resource for authors of war fiction seeking to convey to their readers a sense of the linguistic diversity that characterises transnational wartime contact zones. Given that French war writers are obviously quite likely to describe encounters with English-speaking Allied personnel, a recurrent problem for translation into English is the embedding of the translating language in the source text. As various commentators have noted, in such cases the linguistic variation of the source text tends to be lost or attenuated in the target text (Grutman 2006, 22).⁶ To address this problem, translators often have little choice but to adopt self-reflexive translation strategies

resulting in what Theo Hermans has called 'performative self-contradiction' (Hermans 1996, 27) or 'metatranslative self-reflection' (Hermans 2007, 51) whereby the translator becomes visible and the reader's suspension of disbelief is interrupted. Such strategies call attention to the nature of the text as a translation.

This type of multilingualism occurs in some of the texts we have already examined. For example, in Jean-Louis Curtis's *Les Forêts de la nuit*, English is used in the French text when Jacques encounters a downed English airman. The translation resorts to adding metatranslative explanations such as 'and said, after about a minute, in English', 'and replied in the same language', and 'he added, in English, and then reverted to his own language again' to show that it is by suddenly switching to English that Jacques lets 'Guélin' know he has guessed his true identity. A further translation problem is created when Jacques remarks on Guélin's anglicised French. Here, the translator maintains the multilingualism of the source text by transferring the Englishman's incorrect French directly so that Jacques's helpful linguistic corrections still make sense, even if the transfer of the impersonal French construction 'on' makes him sound like a pedantic schoolteacher: 'One says *'inspirer confiance'* and not *'inspirer avec de la confiance'*,' he tells Guélin (Curtis 1947, 237–41; 1950, 202–205, emphasis in original). In *Weekend à Zuydcoote*, Robert Merle uses a combination of multilingualism and metatranslative explanation to show the French reader that Maillat's conversations with the English military are taking place in English. When Maillat addresses Captain Gabet, the narrator specifies that he is speaking English even though the narrating language is obviously French ('– Savez-vous, demanda-t-il en anglais, si on embarque des Français ici?'). However, when Maillat completes a quotation from Shakespeare that Gabet has half forgotten, the line appears directly in English. Merle also uses anglicised French for both characters' speech. Maillat's 'Pourriez-vous me dire...' suggests 'Could you tell me...' and conveys Maillat's knowledge of the linguistic codes of English politeness, whilst Gabet's 'cette damnée conscription' and 'J'ai bien peur que non' suggest the characteristically English expressions 'this damned conscription' and 'I'm afraid not'. All of this is of course redundant in the English translation, because now the language of the conversation matches the language of narration (Merle 1949, 69–74; 1950, 72–78). A few

pages later, during another conversation that takes place intradiegetically in English, Merle makes multilingual wordplay with an English batman's mispronunciation of 'Monsieur'. When Maillat asks him whether Captain Feery is about, he replies, 'Non, Messié, il est à son mess', and the joke is amplified in the batman's next two comments: 'Ce n'est pas un très joli mess, dit l'homme [...] In fact, dit l'homme, it's pretty messy'. The translation maintains the transliteration of 'messié', though without the upper case 'M', but resorts here, as in several other places, to a footnote after the batman's response 'As a matter of fact, it's a pretty messy mess' informing the reader that the source text uses English (Merle 1949, 82; 1950, 85). The batman's pronunciation is an example of the 'funny foreigner' convention,⁷ specifically, the Englishman abroad. He is further ridiculed when he pronounces 'guerre' as "guéeu" comme une dyptongue' or, in the translation, "gué-eu" as if there were two syllables' (Merle 1949, 82; 1950, 84). Here direct transcription of the French maintains the humour at least for the English reader with some knowledge of French.

As we can see from these examples, multilingualism is difficult to manage in translation, and can provoke cumbersome, self-reflexive solutions such as footnotes or in-text explanations. However, the refusal of multilingualism in translation can result in incongruity. One significant example is the case of references to coded messages transmitted by the BBC to France in French. The BBC obviously transmitted the phrase 'les flageolets de Soissons sont brûlés' and not 'the beans of Soissons have been burnt', as we read in the translation of Curtis's novel (Curtis 1947, 227; 1950, 193). A more consequential example is the title of Elsa Triolet's 1945 collection of Resistance stories. 'Le premier accroc coûte deux cents francs' was the code phrase used to announce the Normandy landings and, like the example of the beans, is therefore strictly untranslatable because its denotative meaning is irrelevant. The translator's refusal of a multilingual solution when the phrase occurs at the end of the final story in Triolet's collection introduces incongruity, since the assertion that 'on June 6 the message "A fine of two hundred francs for the first rip" announced the first landing' is simply incorrect (Triolet 1947, 312).⁸ Here, because it is the French linguistic signs themselves that constitute the message, rather than their meaning, the only plausible solution would be a multilingual one.

Such examples are not uncommon and could be multiplied. They are all, basically, instances of translation loss, be it informational or stylistic (or both). In turning my attention to writers who narrate the experience of emigration in a language other than their mother tongue, I want to do more than simply identify a series of examples in which a multilingual source text poses a translation problem. While I shall not ignore the implications of multilingualism for translation and the effects of translators' choices when faced with such problems, the central concern of this chapter is the function of multilingualism and translation within the source text. Scholarship on translation and Holocaust writing is now beginning to acknowledge the crucial importance for translational analysis of a nuanced understanding of the complexities of the reader's relationship with the source text (Kershaw 2017), and of the multilingualism that often either underlies or is overtly present in these texts (Boase-Beier et al. 2017a, 4, 16). My starting point is the insight, articulated in various analyses of literary multilingualism, that a writer's choice to use more than one language in a text or, conversely, to avoid doing so when the situation being narrated logically calls for it, is about very much more than just conveying information.⁹ My readings of Schwarz-Bart and Langfus's novels focus on the mimetic representation of multilingual encounters and realities, or, as Juliette Taylor-Batty puts it in her insightful and stimulating study *Multilingualism in Modernist Fiction*, on 'textual multilingualism', or its avoidance, as a way of representing 'polylingual reality' (Taylor-Batty 2013, 6). The underlying issue, which we have seen exemplified in the novels of Curtis, Merle, and Triolet, is a common one in fiction. What happens when the language of narration does not match that of the location of the action? What happens when the convention that a novel should be written in one language comes up against the need to represent situations in which a plurality of languages are used? Many texts are, as Rebecca Walkowitz notes, '*written as translations*' insofar as they '[pretend] to take place in a language other than the one in which they have, in fact, been composed' (Walkowitz 2015, 4, emphasis in original). Readers commonly suspend their disbelief every time they read a book set in a country other than one where the language they are reading in is spoken. But when we begin to interrogate our acceptance of Schwarz-Bart's and Langfus's use of French to tell stories that take place in Poland

and Germany as well as in France, we begin to realise that a mismatch between what Antoine Berman calls 'surface' and 'underlying' languages can produce complex textual effects (Berman 2000, 296). Since translation by its very nature calls attention to language, translation heightens our awareness that readers commonly take for granted something which might not in fact go without saying. In the cases of the French war novels we have considered above, the problem is one of proximity: the same two languages are implicated in source and target, but the foreign/domestic binary is reversed in the translation.¹⁰ In Schwarz-Bart and Langfus's fiction, the problem is one of distance, since their novels draw on Yiddish, Hebrew, Polish, and German as well as the main narrating language, French. When we read these novels in English, we are doubly distanced, linguistically speaking, from these underlying languages which were already foreign to the French-language reader.

Schwarz-Bart and Langfus were distanced from the narrating language of their novels since they wrote fiction in a language that was not their mother tongue. Given their linguistic heritage, both can be described as translingual writers. Translingual writers, according to Steven Kellman's definition, are 'authors who write in more than one language or at least in a language other than their primary one' (Kellman 2000, 8; see also Kellman 2003, ix).¹¹ Kellman further distinguishes between 'ambilinguals'—such as Koestler or Triolet—who write different works in different languages, and 'monolingual translinguals', who write in a single literary language that is not their mother tongue or dominant language (Kellman 2000, 19). In Kellman's terminology, Schwarz-Bart and Langfus are monolingual translinguals, though the designation is unfortunate for our purposes in the sense that, as Kellman himself points out, literature by translingual writers often bears the traces of other, heritage languages, and, in any case, there is no such thing as linguistic purity. However, as Kellman's discussion of two contrasting narratives of Jewish migration by Mary Antin and Eva Hoffman suggests, a translingual identity does not necessarily imply the embracing of multilingual textual strategies. Antin's *The Promised Land*, first published in 1912, tends towards linguistic homogeneity in order to affirm a fully assimilated identity, while Hoffman's *Lost in Translation* (1989) contains many reflections on the linguistic challenges of emigration (Kellman 2000, 60–67). The literary

multilingualism of Schwarz-Bart and Langfus is of course closely connected to their identities as translingual writers, but this is not to say that translingualism inevitably produces literary multilingualism. In this chapter, my focus will be on the implications of textual multilingualism rather than on the biographical aspects of translingualism.

The Beginnings of the French Holocaust Novel

André Schwarz-Bart (1928–2006) was born in France as Abraham Szwarcbart to Jewish parents who had emigrated from Poland four years previously.¹² His first language was Yiddish, and he learned French somewhat unsystematically through his schooling, which was interrupted by the outbreak of war. He finally gained his baccalaureate in 1948 and began but did not complete studies in philosophy at the Sorbonne, returning in 1950 to study ethics and sociology and perfecting his French. Schwarz-Bart published three novels in French in his lifetime, two of which were written in collaboration with his Guadeloupean wife Simone Schwarz-Bart. An unfinished fourth novel, *L'Étoile du matin*, was published posthumously in 2009 (Schwarz-Bart 2009) and translated into English by Julie Rose as *The Morning Star* in 2011 (Schwarz-Bart 2011). *Le Dernier des Justes*, which won the Goncourt prize in 1959, was translated into English in 1961 by Stephen Becker and found a place 'on the bookshelves of every North London Jewish home in the 1960s and 1970s' (Stonebridge 2014, 28). The description of Schwarz-Bart on the dust jacket of the English translation of *The Last of the Just* as 'a young man of 28, largely self-educated, working as a porter in the great vegetable market of *Les Halles* in Paris, whose French was learned in the streets' is something of an exaggeration, but it does have the merit of underlining his linguistic heritage (Schwarz-Bart 1961). Only three years later, another novel by a Polish Jew won the Goncourt. Anna Langfus (1920–66) was born Anna-Regina Szternfinkiel in Lublin. Langfus had moved to Belgium to study engineering in the autumn of 1938, but was visiting her family in Lublin in 1939 when war broke out (Potel 2014, 42–49, 60, 140). She emigrated to France in 1946, having escaped the ghettos in Lublin and Warsaw, participated in the Polish Resistance, and survived

incarceration in the Płońsk concentration camp. Langfus, who was from an assimilated middle-class Jewish family, was educated in Polish, which was her first language. She learned French at school and lived and studied for a year in French-speaking Belgium. Her biographer, Jean-Yves Potel, suggests that, while French clearly was a foreign language for her, in interviews she tended to exaggerate her lack of knowledge of the language when she had first arrived in France (Potel 2014, 141–42, 179). Langfus published her first novel in French, *Le Sel et le soufre*, in 1960, followed by the Goncourt prizewinning *Les Bagages de sable* in 1962 and a third and final novel, *Saute, Barbara*, in 1965. The first two novels were translated into English by Peter Wiles as *The Whole Land Brimstone* (1962) and *The Lost Shore* (1963) and received a positive reception¹³; the third has not to my knowledge been translated into English. Both Schwarz-Bart and Langfus had tragically close connections to the Holocaust and wrote fiction with a loose autobiographical basis. Schwarz-Bart was interned in Paris during the war and subsequently joined the Jewish communist Resistance aged only 13. His parents and other members of his family died in deportation. Langfus was the only member of her immediate family to survive the Holocaust. Her first husband Jakub Rajs was arrested by the Gestapo and shot when his Jewish identity was discovered. Other family members including her parents and parents-in-law died in deportation.

While they were not in fact the first to write French Holocaust fiction, Schwarz-Bart and Langfus were part of the first generation of French-language writers to reach a wide audience with books about the Holocaust, notably thanks to the award of literary prizes (Levy 2000, 52–53).¹⁴ *Le Dernier des Justes* is often described as the first French Holocaust novel, but it would be more accurate to describe both Schwarz-Bart's and Langfus's works amongst the first French Holocaust novels to receive significant popular reception (Sicher 2005, 30; Kaufmann 2006, 68; Azouvi 2012, 165). The Holocaust had been the subject of many works of both testimony and fiction in France before 1959. As Annette Wieviorka has shown, in the immediate aftermath of the war and the Liberation, there was no shortage in France of testimonies bearing witness to the horrors of deportation and camps (Wieviorka 1992, 167–90; 1998, 12, 17–19). And as François Azouvi has argued, the idea of a generalised silence about

the Holocaust in France in the post-war years is a myth (Azouvi 2012). If publishers soon became reluctant to publish concentration camp testimonies, this was not due to any unwillingness on the part of survivors to bear witness, but to a perceived market saturation and to the idea that readers, though not necessarily the survivors themselves, wanted to move on from the tragedies which were already considered to be well documented in 1946 (Wieviorka 1992, 174). Any 'silence' during the Cold War period over the Jewish deportations was a question of the attitude of those in a position to listen rather than of those in a position to speak: as Rawlinson's discussion of Karski similarly suggests, speaking did not necessarily imply hearing, and listening did not necessarily imply believing (Rawlinson 1996). Azouvi surveys a range of novels published in the post-war period which addressed the Holocaust in more or less detail (Azouvi 2012, 129–82). Marianne Schreiber's *La Passion de Miriam Bloch* (1947) did not make much of an impact, whereas David Rousset's *Les Jours de notre mort* (1947), a fictionalised version of material already published in his concentration camp testimony *L'Univers concentrationnaire* in 1946, did establish itself as an important work. Robert Merle's *La Mort est mon métier* (Merle 1952), which portrays a fictionalised version of the commandant of Auschwitz, Rudolph Höss, in the central protagonist Rudolf Lang, was a popular, if not critical, success in 1952; and the Goncourt prizewinning novels by Pierre Gascar (*Le Temps des morts*, 1953) and Roger Ikor (*Les Eaux mêlées*, 1955) made oblique allusions to the Holocaust. Translated texts such as Anne Frank's diary, published in French in 1950, and John Hersey's *The Wall*, an American novel about the Warsaw Ghetto published in French as *La Muraille* in 1952 (with a preface by Joseph Kessel) also reached a wide audience well before what Azouvi describes as the explosion of interest in the Holocaust at the end of the 1950s. The publication of Elie Wiesel's *La Nuit* in French in 1958 and in English as *Night* in 1960 marked the beginning of a period of international publication, translation, and circulation of Holocaust discourse which is still ongoing (Seidman 2006, 199–200). While Schwarz-Bart and Langfus's novels were not exactly the first of their kind, the award of the Goncourt has conferred on these texts the character of what Anne Rigney calls stabilisers—memorable literary texts which become points of reference for later representations (Rigney 2010, 350; see also

Boura 2003, 213–16 and Assouline 2013, 98–101, 102–104).¹⁵ These novels are widely recognised as important landmarks in the development of the transmission of a specifically Jewish memory of the Holocaust both in France and more widely. It is not insignificant that they appeared almost exactly contemporaneously with the Eichmann trial of 1961 (Wieviorka 1992, 19; 1998, 81–87). These were the years in which a specifically Jewish memory of the Holocaust was gaining increasing prominence in a variety of types of discourse.

But before jumping to the conclusion that Schwarz-Bart and Langfus's novels are evidence of a sudden willingness on the part of France to assimilate the national trauma of complicity in the genocide, a note of caution must be sounded, for, as is now well known, it was only in 1995 on the occasion of the commemoration of the 'Vel d'hiver' roundup of Jews in Paris on 16–17 July 1942 that the then French president Jacques Chirac publically acknowledged state responsibility for the deportation and deaths of Jews from France. The racially specific nature of the deportation of Jews from France has been described as a 'memory lapse' in national commemorations until the early 1960s: despite the availability of plenty of relevant information, official French commemoration of the phenomenon of deportation focused not on Jewish deaths in Auschwitz but on political prisoners and those who had protested against the Occupation (Buton 2007, 240). This is not to say that Jewish deaths in deportation were not commemorated in France at all. Azouvi suggests that though the French state was more interested in Resisters than Jews, it was not exclusively interested in Resisters. Specifically, Jewish commemorations did take place, such as the transfer of ashes from Auschwitz-Birkenau to the Père-Lachaise cemetery in Paris in June 1946, the erection of a commemorative monument at the Synagogue de la Victoire in February 1949, and the creation of what would eventually become the Mémorial de la Shoah, including the Tombeau du martyr juif inconnu [the Tomb of the unknown Jewish martyr], begun in 1953 and inaugurated in 1956 (Azouvi 2012, 63, 69–75). By contrast, the Mémorial des martyrs de la Déportation, inaugurated in Paris in 1962, the year Langfus's novel won the Goncourt, is typical of Gaullist-era commemorative practices which did not distinguish between victims of racial persecution and the deportation of Resisters and tended to highlight the latter and occlude the persecution

of Jews. In the words of Jeffrey Mehlman, 'surveying the monument, one might suspect that Hitler's principal targets were existentialists and surrealists' (Mehlman 2013, 177; see also Wiewiorka 2010, 154, 164–65).

In this historical and memorial context, it is plausible to suggest that the focus in both Schwarz-Bart's and Langfus's novels on the experience of Polish rather than French Jews functioned as a screen memory facilitating a certain degree of engagement with the trauma of the Holocaust while protecting French cultural memory from the full truth of national complicity. The anti-Semitism Langfus dissects in her novels is Polish, not French: the exploitation of Jewish victims by their Polish 'rescuers' in *Le Sel et le souffre* is particularly bitter (Langfus 1960, 121–37; 1962a, b, 120–37), and anti-Semitism is rife amongst the female Polish prisoners with whom Maria is incarcerated at Płońsk (Langfus 1960, 236–37, 243, 247; 1961, 240–41, 247–48, 252). The Lévy's story of exile in *Le Dernier des Justes* is preceded by the young Mardochée's experience of Polish peasants' anti-Semitism in pre-First World War Poland (Schwarz-Bart 1959, 44–48; 1961, 36–40) and precipitated by a Russian pogrom (Schwarz-Bart 1959, 84–93; 1961, 76–84). The story of the family's experiences of anti-Semitism in 1930s Germany occupies the most space in the novel (Chaps. 4, 5, 6, and 7), and, in Paris, the guards who persecute and torture Ernie Lévy in the Drancy holding camp are German. It is also perhaps not irrelevant that Schwarz-Bart himself was not only a Jewish victim but also a member of the interior French Resistance, whose wartime sacrifices France found much easier to commemorate. The transcultural perspectives of both novels which, as we shall see, call forth various multilingual narrative strategies in the texts, simultaneously encourage and resist engagement with the French national past. By using French to tell stories of Polish anti-Jewish persecution that would have been unspeakable in Polish literature at the time, given the almost total erasure of the story of Jewish persecution in post-war Poland (Michlic and Melchior 2013, 412–14), these novels participate in the marginalisation of the story of French complicity. In translation, these novels have a dual function insofar as they document for the non-French reader not only the wartime experiences of Polish Jews, which is the ostensible subject of the stories, but also the development of France's attempt to come to terms with its own wartime traumas.

The Languages of Holocaust Fiction

Schwarz-Bart's and Langfus's novels have mostly been discussed not in terms of their transnational origins or their multilingual characteristics but in relation to the debate over the acceptability or otherwise of fictionalising the Holocaust.¹⁶ This is typical of critical approaches to Holocaust writing more generally. Critics have, to be sure, often recognised the fact that the corpus constituting 'Holocaust literature' is a multilingual one. Alvin Rosenfeld remarks in the introduction to his 1980 study *A Double Dying: Reflections on Holocaust Literature* that '[p]erhaps the first thing to recognise about Holocaust literature is that it is an international literature', but this does not prevent him from discussing Schwarz-Bart (and a host of other writers) in English translation without taking account of the fact that the words quoted are those of a translator (Rosenfeld 1980, 6, 168ff, 186).¹⁷ In a similar vein, in the introduction to her study *By Words Alone: The Holocaust in Literature*, published in the same year, Sidra DeKoven Ezrahi argues that Holocaust literature is not a national but 'primarily a transnational literature' (Ezrahi 1980, 13). On such a reading, 'the French Holocaust novel' is not a meaningful category, since Holocaust literature is viewed as a genre that transcends the inconvenient fact that novels are generally written, if not unilingually, then at least in a single dominant language. American scholars writing in the 1980s who were trying to establish a corpus of Holocaust literature were certainly not reading translationally. The discourse has changed somewhat in more recent scholarship, and a more obviously comparative perspective is emerging. But this does not necessarily result in analyses of multilingualism or translation. In the introduction to his 2013 collection *Literature of the Holocaust*, Rosen remarks that 'the languages in which the story of the Holocaust is told shape the story that emerges', and indeed the volume's central (and longest) section comprises chapters which address Holocaust literature in particular national and/or linguistic contexts (Rosen 2013a, 8). A sense of the cultural specificities of Holocaust discourse is conveyed by these chapters; however, Rosen's observation that 'literature aims to make the language conspicuous' relates not to language choice and variation but to issues of poetics. The use of figurative language is discussed in Rosen's introduction in relation to the opposition between Holocaust

history and Holocaust fiction, but as in the earlier scholarship mentioned above, the examples given (from works by Peretz Opoczynski, Paul Celan, and Elie Wiesel) are cited in English translation without comment on their linguistic origins (Rosen 2013a, 2–3).

The refusal to recognise translation in discussions of Holocaust writing is much more than a simple oversight. In a phrase that is rather alarming to a translation studies scholar, Ezrahi suggests that ‘the interchangeability of language seems to be a specific characteristic of the massive displacement of the Holocaust experience’ (Ezrahi 1980, 12–13). What she means, of course, is that the autobiographical experience of Holocaust writers forced them to change languages, which is undoubtedly true. However, the underlying implication of her formulation—that languages are straightforwardly interchangeable—is also borne out by her description of translanguing writers, including Langfus, as ‘displaced persons who remained after the war without specific cultural citizenship, exchanging their native tongue, *but not their vocabulary of experience*, for the language of their adopted country’ (Ezrahi 1980, 12, my emphasis). Indeed, some translanguing writers—including, notably, Vladimir Nabokov—have affirmed the idea that their experience of the world is not determined by an individual language but is outside of or beyond language (Kellman 2000, 27, 46–48, 58). In common with many critics of Holocaust writing, Ezrahi’s understanding of the genre relies on this idea of an invariant experience lying beneath linguistic variation. This illustrates a tension between Holocaust studies and translation studies. Holocaust scholars tend to focus on commonalities of experience, a concern which is linked to questions of authenticity that are both ethically and politically fraught.¹⁸ One reason why issues around the possibility/impossibility and acceptability/unacceptability of representing the Holocaust have dominated discussions of Holocaust writing, particularly in relation to fiction, since the 1980s is that the idea of an authentic Holocaust experience separate from its expression in language is hard to displace. But for translation studies, the idea that languages could be in any sense ‘interchangeable’ is anathema. A translational approach to Holocaust representation tends towards what is known as the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, according to which the language or languages we speak determine the nature and limits of what we can know and understand (Kellman 2000,

35, 46, 50). Translation studies is interested precisely in the implications of the *incommensurability* of languages and therefore embraces, at least to some degree, a constructivist perspective that views the relationship of the human subject to a specific language as fundamental to the possibility and nature of the expression of that subject's experience. To read translationally is to insist that national—for our purposes, French—Holocaust fiction *is* different both from Holocaust fiction written in other languages and from translated Holocaust fiction.

Translational analysis of multilingualism must then also recognise the 'metavalue' of languages, that is, their particular ethical and political connotations. Language choice is performative as well as communicative, 'doing something with words rather than merely communicating information' (Seidman 2006, 4), and it is never neutral (Rosen 2005, 3; Kellman 2000, 35). French is a significant language of Holocaust representation simply in terms of volume. By the early 1970s, in Cynthia Haft's estimation, several hundred French authors had addressed the topic (Haft 1973, 11). In Mehlman's view, post-war French literature developed into 'a kind of Holocaust memorial project' (Mehlman 2013, 174). The reasons for this relate to the difficulty in post-Holocaust France of assimilating the complex history of France's attitude to Jews. If the relationship between French literature and the Holocaust is 'fraught with danger' (Mehlman 2013, 87), this is because it channels both a history of universalist philosemitism—the nation of the Déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen emancipated Jews in 1791—and a brand of French nationalist anti-Semitism which predated the advent of National Socialism and was not simply grafted from Germany (Winock 2004, 11–27, 141–52). The relationship between the French language and Holocaust representation is therefore inevitably a fractured one. French is the language of historical hospitality to Jews, but it is also that of Holocaust victims and of perpetrators, and it is the language in which many important works of Holocaust testimony and memory have been written. For example, the fact that Elie Wiesel, one of the best-known European Holocaust writers, first became famous in French confers a certain status on the French language as a primary language of Holocaust representation (Mehlman 2013, 177–79).

Schwarz-Bart and Langfus chose to write in French, but their texts also put other languages into play, specifically Yiddish, Hebrew, German, and

Polish. These languages stand in differing relationships to Holocaust representation.¹⁹ The status of Yiddish, Elie Wiesel's first language, as the authentic language of Jewish expression is a tragic one, since the Yiddish language and its culture were effectively destroyed by the Holocaust (Rosen 2005, 9, 89).²⁰ Yiddish occupies the position of the vernacular in relation to Hebrew, the language of Jewish ritual and of the sacred. From the beginnings of the rabbinic period, Hebrew has been seen 'as a holy tongue, as the language of creation, as the original language of humankind, as the messianic language, as an emblem of national identification' (Seidman 2006, 24; see also Ezrahi 1980, 11–14). The language of scholarship, Hebrew is associated with the creation of the state of Israel after the war and therefore signifies both the Jewish past and the Jewish future (Rosen 2005, 188, 214 n.17). Much critical attention has been paid to German as the language of the perpetrators. The need to describe the unprecedented realities of the Holocaust gave rise to a new vocabulary variously dubbed 'Nazi-Deutsch' and 'Lagerjargon' (Ezrahi 1980, 11; Rosenfeld 1980, 129–53).²¹ Primo Levi famously discussed the significance of competence in German amongst deportees in his essay 'Communicating' (Levi 1989). George Steiner argued, controversially, in a 1959 essay entitled 'The Hollow Miracle', that '[s]omething immensely destructive' had happened to the German language (Steiner 1967, 117), while post-war poets such as Paul Celan embraced the challenge of conveying the memory of the Holocaust in the language of the perpetrators. As a language of pre-war European Jewish assimilation, Polish connotes the rejection of Yiddish and thus of a specifically Jewish culture. Polish was the language of ethnically Catholic Poles, the country's pre-war Jewish population mostly identifying with Yiddish. Being a 'Polish Jew' did not necessarily imply the use of Polish (Perrin 2011). The relationship between the Polish language and Holocaust representation is inseparable from the complex and conflicted history of Holocaust memory in post-war Poland (see Michlic and Melchior 2013).²² Polish is the language of a (non-Jewish) population occupied by two powers—the Soviets and the Nazis—and persecuted by the Nazis in the name of 'Germanisation' (Michlic and Melchior 406–407). The recognition that the history of the Holocaust in Poland also includes Polish perpetrators has been, and continues to be, extremely difficult, because it contradicts the established national narratives of Poles as either victims, heroic rescuers of Jews, or,

at worst, bystanders (Michlic and Melchior 422–26). The country's difficulty in coming to terms with the truth about the 'shameful aspects of Polish-Jewish relations' (Michlic and Melchior 2013, 412) is indicated, for example, by the lateness of publication in Polish of works of Holocaust testimony originally written in that language (Glowacka 2012, 75). Jan Karski's *Story of a Secret State* is a case in point. Although some memoirs were published in the second half of the 1950s which gave a more nuanced picture of wartime Polish-Jewish relations, the 1960s brought censorship of such texts (Michlic and Melchior 2013, 141–16). Whilst there is no doubt that the persecution of Jews was silenced and excluded from public memory in Poland (Michlic and Melchior 413–14), the Holocaust did have a presence in post-war Polish language literature: for example, Zygmunt Bauman discusses the work of two Jewish writers, Adolf Rudnicki and Julian Strykowski, who chose Polish as their language of literary expression (Bauman 1996; see also Rosen 2005, 126–27; Ezrahi 1980, 223 n.28). Also, towards the end of the war, with the liberation of the ghettos in view, some Jewish victims had resorted to what Seidman calls 'Yiddish-Polish self-translation', writing testimony in Polish in the hopes that the truth of the persecution would thereby be communicated beyond the community of the victims themselves (Seidman 2006, 201–202).

The status of English in relation to Holocaust representation is much less straightforward than is often acknowledged. Since English was neither the language of the victim nor of the perpetrator, it has been viewed as a neutral language of Holocaust representation. However, in *Sounds of Defiance: The Holocaust, Multilingualism and the Problem of English* Rosen demonstrates the complexities belied by this idea. He takes the title of his study from the Jewish-Austrian-British refugee writer Jakov Lind's characterisation of English as the 'sound of defiance' even for those listeners to the BBC who could not understand the messages being transmitted (Rosen 2005, 13; Ezrahi 1980, 12). Yet as Rosen points out, as the language of the liberators, the supposed 'neutrality' of English has specific political connotations. 'Wartime English', which was 'a fusion of military and liberal idiom', conveyed the ideals of democracy and the hope of liberation but also the arrogance of mastery and the threat of post-war domination (Rosen 2005, 13, 188–89). In more recent years—specifi-

cally, since the latter decades of the twentieth century—English, as the hegemonic language of globally circulating cultural products, is inevitably associated with mass and popular-cultural representations of the Holocaust which some critics have found ethically problematic. While the ever-increasing presence of the Holocaust in popular culture mitigates against forgetting, it also poses the danger of reducing the events to a source of popular entertainment or banal forms of moralising. Alvin Rosenfeld imagines ‘a time when the Jewish catastrophe under Hitler will be reduced to the status of a grisly horror show or a modern-day passion play, the immense historical and moral weight of the Nazi crimes whittled down into the familiar categories of a Sunday school sermon or conventional box-office spectacle’ (Rosenfeld 2011, 9). Of course, it is not only in English that this threat is present, though Rosenfeld relates his comments particularly to American culture (Rosenfeld 2011, 8). Neither should we conflate English-language Holocaust representations with an unsophisticated idea of globalisation as cultural homogenisation or Americanisation (Yildiz 2012, 186–87). As Levy and Sznajder’s analysis of cosmopolitan memory suggests, with the creation of global ‘memoriscapes’, ‘[t]he Holocaust does not become one totalizing signifier containing the same meanings for everyone’ (Levy and Sznajder 2006, 11). Reading translationally offers a means of understanding the differences in meaning which arise when national and ethnic memories are transformed by global encounters (Levy and Sznajder 2006, 3). It is an approach that recognises the vital role played by linguistic variations and transformations when representations circulate transnationally.

Multilingualism and the Representation of Historical Trauma

Many well-known Holocaust writers produced texts with obviously multilingual characteristics, and several productive discussions of multilingualism and Holocaust representation have been published, for example in response to the works of Primo Levi, Elie Wiesel, and, more recently, Jorge Semprun. The role of languages other than Italian in Levi’s work, and the role of translation both within and of his texts, have been quite

widely discussed (e.g. in Lepschy and Lepschy 2007; Alexander 2007). Reflection on language has been shown to fulfil a variety of functions in Levi's *œuvre*. Translation has been equated with resistance, for example when in *If This is a Man* Levi translates Dante for a fellow prisoner, while the multilingual chaos of Auschwitz is seen to convey the incommunicability of the horror (Rastier 2015; Fletcher 2016). Naomi Seidman has discussed the Yiddish 'original' of Wiesel's *La Nuit*, published in 1956 in Buenos Aires (Seidman 1996, 2006, 216–36). Seidman reads *La Nuit* as a covert translation and as a 'second original', and is primarily interested in the ethical issues posed by the transformation of the Yiddish text into a French classic under the watchful eye of the Catholic novelist François Mauriac. Sara Kippur has considered language choice and the functions of multilingualism in the work of Jorge Semprun, whose *œuvre* comprises texts written originally in French and in Spanish (Kippur 2015, 69–100).²³ Kippur demonstrates how language choice *between* Semprun's texts is connected to multilingual and translational writing strategies *within* those texts. She finds in Semprun both a call to recognise the need for translation as mediation in a fractured Europe, and a recognition of the limits and indeed the failure of translation which inevitably compromises the linguistic 'authenticity' of the original. Such studies demonstrate that multilingualism does not stand in a straightforwardly positive relationship to Holocaust representation. Multilingualism does not provide the answer to the question of whether or how the Holocaust can be represented. Levi equates Babel with incommunicability; the French framing of Wiesel's testimony is ethically fraught; Semprun's *œuvre* suggests both the need for and the failure of translation.

The relationships between language, trauma, and displacement are highly unstable. Derrida associates mourning for lost loved ones with mourning for a lost language: "Displaced persons", exiles, those who are deported, expelled, rootless, nomads, all share two sources of sighs, two nostalgias: their dead ones and their language' (Derrida and Dufourmantelle 2000, 87). Kearney, glossing Ricoeur, sees the work of translation as the making-foreign of the translating language and the domestication of the other within a language that is both foreign and hospitable to the stranger: '[w]e are called to make our language put on the stranger's clothes at the same time as we invite the stranger to step

into the fabric of our own speech' (Kearney 2006, xvi). As any translational contact inevitably proves, making the foreign comprehensible in domestic terms always involves both loss and gain. The multilingualism that results from displacement can figure both trauma and creativity, both the loss of home and the gift of hospitality (Suleiman 1996a, 1). Multilingualism may 'restore and recuperate loss and memory', but, equally, it may 'liberate from and challenge the mother tongue' (Yildiz 2012, 20). The choice to bear witness in a foreign language may or may not protect the subject from trauma through the effect of linguistic distancing (Rosen 2005, 11–13; Glowacka 2012, 66–67). Multilingualism can be a resource for creativity, as the modernists discovered, but it is also a trope of trauma, when linguistic fracturing conveys the fracturing of identity, and an index of loss, when code-switching conveys nostalgia for a lost homeland and lost loved ones. As Yasemin Yildiz maintains, multilingualism is not 'a straightforward expression of multiplicity', but rather 'a *malleable form* that can be put to different, and contradictory uses' (Yildiz 2012, 24). It is not because literary multilingualism solves the problem of Holocaust representation that it is important to study it. To be sure, multilingualism is an aesthetic resource on which many writers seeking to represent the Holocaust have drawn, but it is also part of the problem of representation and part of the trauma of the Holocaust experience itself.

The analysis of literary multilingualism requires the reader to pay attention to narrative strategies that often go unnoticed in the normal reading experience. For this, a framework is required that will allow relevant examples to be identified. A useful typology of fictional multilingualism was proposed by Meir Sternberg in a 1981 article entitled 'Polylingualism as Reality and Translation as Mimesis' (Sternberg 1981).²⁴ As the article's title suggests, translation is central to Sternberg's understanding of literary multilingualism, which he calls 'translational mimesis'. Sternberg identifies three 'drastic procedures' used in fiction which respond to the need for the mimetic representation of multilingualism. 'Referential restriction' consists in limiting the narration to events that take place within the confines of the language of narration. A French novel with French characters set exclusively in France avoids the problem of multilingualism. 'Vehicular matching' is the presence of a

foreign language in a novel wherever the narrative requires it. Here, French is used to convey French speech even if the main narrating language of the novel is not French, as in Tolstoy's *War and Peace*. The opposite of vehicular matching is the 'homogenising convention' which requires the reader simply to ignore any mismatch between the narrating language and the linguistic reality being narrated. Here, the reader of a French novel set partly or wholly in England pretends that the French words they are reading represent a conversation taking place in English. These, says Sternberg, are extreme positions and each 'either demands or sacrifices too much' (Sternberg 1981, 225). He therefore goes on to identify four types of 'mimetic compromise' which are more often found in practice. 'Selective reproduction' is the intermittent presence of foreign-language elements to suggest that a character is speaking another language. Yannick Haenel does this to indicate Jan Karski's use of English, as does Curtis in the conversation between Jacques and Guélin and Merle in the conversations between Maillat and the English military. 'Verbal transposition' is the use of non-standard forms of the narrating language to give the impression that the character is speaking in another language. Merle adopts this strategy when he ridicules the batman's French pronunciation. 'Conceptual reflection' is the description or evocation in the narrating language of cultural features of the foreign environment in order to give an impression of cultural difference. Merle uses conceptual reflection when he describes Maillat's attempt to respond to Gabet's compliment about his facility in English in the way an Englishman would—via self-deprecation: 'j'arrive tout juste à balbutier quelques mots' ['I just manage to stammer a few words'] (Merle 1949, 70; 1950, 73). Finally, 'explicit attribution' is an overt narratorial statement which defines the language of expression for the reader. For example, Merle's narrator tells the reader that when Captain Gabet shouts 'Anglais à droite! Français à gauche!' in an attempt to sort out the soldiers on the beach, he does so 'en anglais d'abord, puis en français' ['first in English, then in French'] (Merle 1949, 69; 1950, 72). Here the French words in the original and the English in the translation signify both French and English utterances.

The purpose of the typology is not just identification: the point is to provide a tool to analyse the functions of literary multilingualism. These vary contextually—a given type of translational mimesis can perform a

variety of functions (Sternberg 1981, 233). For Sternberg, multilingualism per se is value-neutral; as Taylor-Batty points out, depending on its context, literary multilingualism can function positively or negatively, constituting either a problem or a solution (Taylor-Batty 2013, 39–40). In the following discussion of Schwarz-Bart and Langfus's novels, I deploy Sternberg's terminology to identify and analyse the functions of different types of multilingualism and their relation to Holocaust representation. My focus will be on the implications of the mimetic uses of multilingualism in these novels. Because of the situations they depict, both writers have to find solutions to the technical problem of how to narrate polylingual realities. My contention, however, is that the significance of their choices exceeds the practical and technical necessity of conveying to the reader the fact that, intradiegetically, different languages are implicated in their stories. Neither Schwarz-Bart nor Langfus use multilingualism purely as a means of aesthetic experimentation or innovation, as in the case of high modernists such as James Joyce or T. S. Eliot, who, in Taylor-Batty's words, produced 'gratuitously stylised representation of a unilingual reality' where foreign words have a formal rather than referential significance (Taylor-Batty 2013, 6). The Goncourt prizewinners are not examples of stylistic experimentation: they are accessible realist novels. Nonetheless, even when it is a mimetic rather than a poetic choice, the use of multilingualism to represent polylingual reality has aesthetic, ethical, and political effects (Delabastita and Grutman 2005, 12–13). So too does the avoidance of multilingualism where the narrative would logically require it. Following Taylor-Batty, and in accordance with Sternberg's framework, I view any non-correlation between the linguistic reality described in the novel and the dominant language of the narration as inherently translational.²⁵ When writers ask readers to imagine that characters are speaking in a language other than that of the narration, they perform a type of pseudo-translation which implies a fictional source text. My discussion of Schwarz-Bart and Langfus therefore encompasses analysis of the functions of both non-translation and translation as strategies of literary multilingualism. Non-translation self-evidently provokes an encounter with the foreign on the part of the reader. But so too does translation. Merle's use of anglicised French to convey English speech is a good example which quite obviously invites the French reader with even

rudimentary English to ‘hear’ the words that have been ‘translated’. Susan Suleiman has evoked this sort of imaginary source text in a discussion of Holocaust memoirs by Hungarian survivors written in English. As a heritage speaker of Hungarian, Suleiman says that when she reads English dialogue in such works, she finds herself ‘trying to reconstitute the original words, as they must have been stated then, before “translation”’ (Suleiman 1996b, 408).²⁶ Even when the author erases multilingualism, the reader is in a position to reinstate it, either maximally, as in the case of a reader such as Suleiman who has access to the language in question, or minimally, as in the case of the monolingual reader who is aware that what they are reading is a linguistic fiction mediated through another language.

While I am not suggesting that multilingualism offers a straightforward answer to the problem of Holocaust representation, I do want to highlight its potential to engage the observant and willing reader in a type of reading that is active, critical, and engaged. Following Yildiz, I am suggesting that a ‘critical multilingualism’ offers the possibility of a progressive form of representation, though this is a promise without guarantees (Yildiz 2012, 29). It is in this sense that multilingualism in Holocaust writing has the potential to address some of the representational problems explored by Michael Rothberg in his seminal study *Traumatic Realism*. For Rothberg, the ‘three fundamental demands’ made by Holocaust representation are documentation, reflection on the formal limits of representation, and the ‘risky public circulation of discourse on the events’ (Rothberg 2000, 7). Multilingualism and translation are crucial to all of these. Yet although Rothberg draws on many translated examples, translation is not a theme in his book. Documenting the Holocaust means documenting a multilingual reality. This inevitably strains at the limits of representation, in the case of novels at least, insofar as literary norms require that a text should be written in a dominant language and, if it is to reach a mainstream audience, that it should not excessively frustrate the monolingual reader’s comprehension. The ‘risk’ of international circulation is the risk of translation as intervention, which we have already seen in operation in the novels we have discussed in previous chapters. Rothberg argues that ‘[t]he ambivalence that surrounds the question of realism and the Holocaust arises from the contradictory nature of the demands for documentation and self-reflexivity

made on the literary genre by the historical event' (Rothberg 2000, 99). What I want to suggest via the examples of Schwarz-Bart and Langfus is that translational mimesis in Holocaust fiction functions as a form of 'traumatic realism' insofar as it is an attempt to produce mimetic documentation—to represent a polylingual reality realistically—which calls attention to language as the means of representation and is therefore inherently self-reflexive. Further, the production of a target text through interlingual translation might also be said to satisfy the twin demands for realism and self-reflexivity since translation seeks to represent an alternative linguistic reality 'faithfully' whilst calling the readers' attention to the impossibility of faithfulness, for example through eruptions of 'performative self-contradiction' (Hermans 1996, 27). As Rothberg points out, 'the desire for realism and referentiality is one of the defining features of the study of the Holocaust' and 'a commitment to documentation and realistic discourse has come to hold an almost sacred position in confrontations with genocide' (Rothberg 2000, 99). Translation inevitably complicates realism and referentiality by calling attention to the mode of transmission and, thanks to its nature as intervention and interpretation, by raising issues of authenticity. Instead of seeing this as a drawback, we might instead consider it to be an advantage. Rothberg argues that '[i]nstead of understanding the traumatic realist project as an attempt to reflect the traumatic event in an act of passive mimesis [...] traumatic realism is an attempt to produce the traumatic event as an object of knowledge and to program and thus transform its readers so that they are forced to acknowledge their relationship to posttraumatic culture' (Rothberg 2000, 103). I should now like to turn to an examination of the novels of Schwarz-Bart and Langfus to consider some of the ways in which translational mimesis might respond to this call.

André Schwarz-Bart: Translation as Survival in *Le Dernier des Justes*

Schwarz-Bart's *Le Dernier des Justes* is often seen as an iconic French Holocaust novel, but the insufficiency of French to tell the story Schwarz-Bart seeks to convey is rarely remarked upon. It is however obvious from

the title that the novel is a translational work. ‘Justes’ is a translation of a Hebrew term, transliterated in the novel and its English translation as ‘lamed-waf’, which refers to the 36 just men of Jewish legend chosen by God to bear the world’s suffering and to sacrifice themselves as martyrs (Berenbaum and Skolnik 2007, 445–46).²⁷ Schwarz-Bart’s rewriting of the legend in the first chapter weaves together historical, mythical, fictional, and Talmudic sources to create a genealogy for his fictional hero Ernie Lévy, the last in a bloodline of just men whose ancestry the novel traces back to the massacre of the Jews of York in the twelfth century.²⁸ In this novel, as the title suggests, Hebrew is an underlying language which plays a central role as the language of Jewish suffering through the ages which, controversially, Schwarz-Bart represents as a continuum beginning with the medieval pogroms and culminating in the Holocaust.

The importance of language, and particularly of Hebrew, to the story being told is suggested by recurrent representations of its materiality. Hebrew is the language of the Lévy’s family story of the just men, the transmission of which provides both the structure of the plot and the novel’s ethical, theological, and political argument. The story is contained within a huge leather-bound volume, and Ernie’s grandfather Mardochée Lévy explains to his future wife Judith that ‘*chez nous, avant de se marier, un homme doit recopier le livre de notre famille, toute l’histoire des Lévy pour la donner à lire à ses enfants*’ [‘among *us*, before he marries, a man must recopy the book of our family, the whole history of the Levys, to give it to his children to read’] (Schwarz-Bart 1959, 62; 1961, 54, emphasis in original). Passing on the story requires the physical act of writing and the transmission of the Hebrew language down the generations of Yiddish-speaking Lévyys, which in Ernie’s case also takes a physical form:

Il [Mardochée] avait fait venir de Pologne un alphabet hébraïque en relief, il initia l’angelot par la voie ancestrale qui est douce et attrayante, qui est la bouche: enduits de miel, les caractères en bois de rose étaient tout bonnement remis à sucer au jeune étudiant de la Loi. Plus tard, quand Ernie fut en mesure de lire des bouts de phrase, Mardochée les lui remit moulées sur des gâteaux pour lesquels Judith, de son côté, déployait toute sa science. (Schwarz-Bart 1959, 147)

[From Poland he had sent for a Hebrew alphabet in relief; he initiated the little angel through the mouth, that ancestral method which is so sweet and pleasant; covered with honey, the rosewood characters were simply given to the young student of the Law to suck. Later on, when Ernie was capable of reading brief phrases, Mordecai offered them moulded on cakes, in the making of which Judith deployed all her cleverness. (Schwarz-Bart 1961, 138)]

Ernie's embodiment of the just man begins with him literally eating the Hebrew language. The account of Ernie's death—a rare fictional depiction of the gas chambers from the inside—is a counterpart to the beginning of his career as a lamed-waf insofar as the materiality of Hebrew is once again evoked. The Shema prayer which arises from the gas chambers of Auschwitz and is transliterated in Hebrew in both the French and English versions is described as 'le vieux poème d'amour qu'ils traçaient en lettres de sang sur la dure écorce terrestre' ['the old love poem which the Jews traced in letters of blood on the earth's hard crust'] (Schwarz-Bart 1959, 423–24; 1961, 407). Before he dies, Ernie remembers Mardochee's recitation of the legend of Rabbi Chanina ben Teradion, who was wrapped in the scrolls of the Torah before being burned by the Romans. With a note of optimism that some readers have found difficult to accept, Ernie imagines that though the scrolls burn, the letters take wing and fly away, suggesting that, ultimately, the Hebrew language, the Torah, and the Jews themselves transcend their material destruction. In the novel's final paragraph, the narrator imagines that even though Ernie Lévy has died six million times over, he is still alive, somewhere, somehow... (Schwarz-Bart 1959, 425; 1961, 409). Thus, it is through a representation of language as at once a material object, an embodied activity, and an abstract entity that Schwarz-Bart figures the tragedy of destruction and the possibility of survival.

Multiple languages are implicated in this novel because it is a story of exile. While it has been suggested by one critic that 'like Kafka with German, Schwarz-Bart kneads the French language with a fine-fingered Jewish idiom' (Stonebridge 2014, 29), the third-person narratorial voice purporting to tell the story of his friend Ernie is plausibly French throughout. However, the relationship between the language of narration and the

language of the location narrated shifts, since the action begins in Poland and moves to Germany and then to France before concluding in Auschwitz. A range of narrative strategies is used to deal with the resulting need for translational mimesis. The homogenising convention is dominant, but it is often tempered with explicit attribution and occasionally with selective reproduction. Overt reference to language usually functions to indicate the outsider identity of the Lévy family. The young Mardocheé speaks ‘en son polonais hésitant’ [‘in his hesitant Polish’] to the Polish farm workers who physically attack him on a pretext because he is Jewish (Schwarz-Bart 1959, 46; 1961, 38). When, after their move to Germany, Ernie wins prizes at school, he mimics his teachers’ congratulations in a German that is both scholarly and Yiddishised (Schwarz-Bart 1959, 151; 1961, 141). In France, his ‘strange accent’ betrays both his origins and his experience of exile, ‘with the fleeting vowels of Yiddish rivalling the slow German palatals’ [‘son accent étrange, où les voyelles fugaces du yiddish le disputaient aux lentes palatales allemandes’] (Schwarz-Bart 1961, 300; 1959, 314). Characters’ speech is mostly rendered in standard French without verbal transposition,²⁹ though selective reproduction is used. An interesting example is Mme Tuszynski’s defiance of the Nazis who attack the synagogue in Stillenstadt. She first addresses them in a mixture of Yiddish and German, but then demonstrates her perfect command of their language to insult them:

– *Was vhill thryb von uns, s’écriait-elle en son allemand contaminé de yiddish, que voulez-vous de nous, dites ce que nous vous avons fait?*
[...]

Quand elle fut à toucher du doigt le nazi en uniforme, elle lui lança à la face, pesant chaque mot, en parfait allemand:

– *Vous cuirez tous pour l’éternité! Oui, oui, oui, vous cuirez...*
(Schwarz-Bart 1959, 184–85)

[‘*Was vhill thryb von uns,*’ she screamed in her bastard German-Yiddish, ‘what do you want with us, what have we ever done to you?’]

[...]

When she was an arm’s length from the Nazi leader, she flung at his face, weighing each word, in perfect German: ‘You’ll roast for all eternity! yes, yes, yes, you’ll roast!’ (Schwarz-Bart 1961, 172–73)]

Mme Tuszynski here plays on both an ethnically distinct and a fully assimilated linguistic identity, the former connoting the Jews as victims and the latter claiming equality with the oppressor and therefore the possibility of resistance. It is noteworthy that, whilst the French text distinguishes typographically between the Yiddish and German words, the English conflates these into a single undifferentiated foreign utterance. Selective reproduction of German is not used in this passage for Mme Tuszynski's 'perfect German', but it does occur elsewhere in the text to convey Nazi violence and persecution. When the Nazi teacher takes over Ernie's class, he says 'Heil, Hitler' and refers to the 'Führer' in both the French and the English texts, and his 'selection' of the Jewish children occurs directly in German followed by an embedded translation: 'Die Hunde, die Neger und die Juden austreten!... Que les chiens, les nègres et les juifs sortent des rangs!...' ['Die Hunde, die Neger und die Juden, austreten! Dogs, Negroes, and Jews step forward!'] (Schwarz-Bart 1959, 252–54; 1961, 237–39). The narrative voice uses the same strategy to refer to the Nazi extermination programme: 'Les Allemands atteignirent un tel point de perfection dans la "Vernichtungswissenschaft", la science du massacre, l'art d'exterminer' ['The Germans reached such perfection in *Vernichtungswissenschaft*, the science of massacre, the art of extermination'] (Schwarz-Bart 1959, 397; 1961, 381). Here the presence of two embedded translations for the single German term *Vernichtungswissenschaft* lends weight to the suggestion made by Ezrahi, amongst others, that the vocabulary of Nazism is 'untranslatable' (Ezrahi 1980, 10; see also Arnds 2016a, 7–8), since no single equivalent can be found. Setting the refusal of selective reproduction in the case of Mme Tuszynski's 'perfect German' against its deployment in the case of the Nazi teacher, it is immediately obvious that the German language is associated with the perpetrators and that the victims are distanced from it. The German language is not placed directly in the mouths of the victims. Likewise, in Auschwitz, when Ernie murmurs in German to Dr Mengele that he is ill and cannot work, explicit attribution is used and his words are represented in French in the source text and in English in the translation (Schwarz-Bart 1959, 421; 1961, 404–405).

Towards the end of the novel, when Ernie returns to the Paris Association of the Elders of Zemyock during the Occupation, the func-

tion of Yiddish as the language of Jewish solidarity in the face of persecution comes clearly into focus. In a tiny room in the Jewish Marais district, Ernie finds four Elders in hiding, wearing the yellow star. Language immediately signifies an exile identity: three of them cannot really speak French and pronounce the word ‘Monsieur’ as ‘mossieu’, ‘moussi’, and ‘missiou’. It is only when Ernie speaks to them in Yiddish that they realise he is not a Frenchman come to arrest them but a fellow Polish Jew seeking refuge (Schwarz-Bart 1959, 345–54; 1961, 331–39). The scene is reminiscent of the one Seidman describes at the beginning of *Faithful Renderings* in which her father, a French-speaking Polish Jew, addresses a crowd of Jewish refugees in Paris shortly after the Liberation (Seidman 2006, 1–2). In Seidman’s story, her father reassures the Jews in Yiddish that they need not be afraid. He then ‘translates’ his words to the watching French *gendarmes*, telling them that he said to the Jews that all free men have a homeland in France. This mistranslation flatters the *gendarmes*’ sentimental patriotism, and so the Yiddish-French intermediary has satisfied both his audiences. In the novel, there is no French-speaking onlooker requiring a translation. But in both scenes, France represents a danger, albeit of a different nature: of deportation and death, during the Occupation, and of the refusal of hospitality, at the Liberation. Ernie’s utterance ‘*Je vous en supplie...*’ [*I beg of you*], foreignised using italics in both the French and English versions and explicitly attributed as Yiddish, functions like Seidman’s ‘Jews, don’t be afraid’ to establish common cause in the face of external threat. As the story moves inexorably towards Ernie’s deportation from France, Yiddish recurs as the language of Jewish solidarity, notably to establish Ernie’s relationship with Golda; to communicate with Golda on the streets of Paris about the yellow star and about Christian anti-Semitism without fear of being overheard and understood; and to comfort the children in the transport on the way to Auschwitz (Schwarz-Bart 1959, 357, 365, 367, 411–12; 1961, 342, 349, 351, 395–96). While Hebrew features strongly in the novel as an affirmation of Jewish identity, as we have seen, it is through the vernacular Yiddish that solidarity is enacted in practice.

In this novel as in many other Holocaust texts, language breaks down in the face of extreme horror. When the Nazis attack and humiliate Mme Tuszynski, Ernie realises that the only sound coming out of his mouth is

a wordless scream (Schwarz-Bart 1959, 185; 1961, 173). When Ernie discovers that Golda has been taken from her apartment in Paris, only the broken remains of her harmonica express the violence that has just taken place (Schwarz-Bart 1959, 375; 1961, 359–60). In the transport, Ernie knows that nothing he can say has any meaning; he can only comfort Golda with the Biblical rhythms of his speech, and eventually becomes incapable of any sort of verbal expression (Schwarz-Bart 1959, 411, 416; 1961, 394, 400). Faced with the need to narrate the text's appalling conclusion, the narrative voice also falters, and he admits that 'Je suis tellement las que ma plume ne peut plus écrire' ['I am so weary that my pen can no longer write'] (Schwarz-Bart 1959, 420; 1961, 404). Yet in the novel's final pages, it is not the breakdown of language but rather the trope of translation that figures the problem of Holocaust representation:

De ses bras moribonds, il étreignit le corps de Golda en un geste déjà inconscient de protection aimante, et c'est dans cette posture que les trouva une demi-heure plus tard l'équipe du Sonderkommando chargée de brûler les Juifs au four crématoire. Il en fut ainsi de millions, qui passèrent de l'état de *Luftmensch* à celui de *Luft*. Je ne traduirai pas. (Schwarz-Bart 1959, 424)

[With dying arms he embraced Golda's body in an already unconscious gesture of loving protection, and they were found in this position half an hour later by the team of Sonderkommando responsible for burning the Jews in the crematory ovens. And so it was for millions, who from *Luftmensch* became *Luft*. I shall not translate. (Schwarz-Bart 1961, 408)]

In a novel that, as we have seen, makes extensive use of translational narrative strategies, such an overt statement of the refusal to translate is significant. Specifically, it enacts the need for self-reflexive forms of representation in which the reader is actively engaged through the distancing effect of multilingualism. Let us note that the narrator does not say that translation is impossible, but that he is choosing not to translate. That choice throws to the reader a challenge that has strong affinities with Rothberg's traumatic realism. If the narrator will not translate, the reader must, if comprehension is to be sustained. This is not an attempt to frustrate comprehension, as in some forms of modernist poetics. The narrator

knows that the reader can infer the meaning of *Luftmensch* and *Luft*. Rather, this multilingual utterance allows the narrator to document the reality of the Holocaust whilst forcing the reader who is momentarily alienated by the eruption of German to experience for themselves the difficulty of finding the words to do so: by translating. For what is translation if not reflection on language? It is not then the case that all narrative forms ultimately fail in the face of horror in this text (Cohen 2014, 23). Rather than the breakdown of language, translation remains. In Schwarz-Bart's novel, the technical problem of the documentation of polylingual realities through translational mimesis, which acquires a political dimension as the story of exile and persecution progresses, ultimately figures in—even if it cannot resolve—the fundamental question of the representability or otherwise of the Holocaust.

Anna Langfus: Translating the Survivor's Experience

Anna Langfus's relationship to French differed from that of André Schwarz-Bart. Schwarz-Bart was born in France, and though French was not his first language, it was the language of his country of birth and residence. The play of languages in *Le Dernier des Justes* accommodates the author's heritage languages within the dominant language of the literary market for which he was writing. Langfus emigrated to France in 1946 at the age of 26, and only then adopted French as her literary language. For Langfus, emigration was a choice made in adulthood, as a consequence of the war, and writing in French was a deliberate rejection of her native country and mother tongue. Indeed, the extent of Langfus's rejection of Polish is untypical of exile or emigrant writers. She spoke French at home with her second husband, Aron Langfus, even though he was also a native speaker of Polish, and they did not teach Polish to their daughter (Potel 2014, 178–80). The Langfus family's resistance to the preservation of their heritage languages in emigration finds a clear counterpart in Langfus's literature.

Critics with an interest in translation have defined the work of exile or emigrant writers writing in a non-native tongue as inherently transla-

tional. The definition of translanguing writing as translational relates not to the biographical relationship of the author to a particular language, but rather to the nature and identity of the text. It does not imply that exile writers always think, or even write drafts, in one language which they would then ‘translate’ into another. On the contrary, Suleiman sees their works as “‘in translation’ from the start, with *no original*” (Suleiman 1996b, 401, my emphasis). Chantal Wright, drawing on Yildiz’s work on the ‘postmonolingual condition’, suggests that both Holocaust writing and exile writing are ‘transnational entities that exist within the “monolingual paradigm”’, and argues that ‘[e]xile writing deconstructs the notion that a text is unproblematically the product of one culture and language, and indeed of one writer, in a manner which broadens the understanding and treatment of source texts within Translation Studies’ (Wright 2017, 146). According to Wright, ‘the separation of language and culture and the collapse of linguistic hierarchies that occurs in exophony (writing outside the mother tongue) destabilize the source text and privilege the translated, that is target, text’ (Wright 2017, 146). We shall see that the variation between the surface and underlying languages in Langfus’s *œuvre* produces source texts that are indeed, from the perspective of translational mimesis, highly unstable.

All three of Langfus’s novels rely on a first person narrator whose mother tongue is Polish. In the first, *Le Sel et le soufre*, the narrating language is unconnected to the culture narrated since the action is set entirely in Poland and French is not implicated in the action. This novel recounts the wartime experiences of a young Polish Jew, known only by her Polonised pseudonym ‘Maria’, who, like Langfus herself, escapes the ghetto, goes into hiding, participates in the Resistance, is arrested, imprisoned, and, finally, returns to her home town when the war is over.³⁰ In her subsequent novels, Langfus tried out different relationships between the narrating language and the language of the reality being narrated. Though the second novel makes no direct reference to the first, *Les Bagages de sable* is a kind of a sequel to *Le Sel et le soufre* insofar as it recounts the experiences in post-war France of a character who calls herself Maria. This novel describes the inability of the traumatised survivor-émigrée to communicate her wartime experiences to others and her consequent inability to reconstruct her identity. In *Les Bagages de sable*,

the narrating language corresponds to the location of the action, since the novel is set in France. *Saute, Barbara*, like *Le Dernier des Justes*, moves between locations, the action being set in Germany and France, which complicates translational mimesis. Michael, traumatised by the execution of his wife and daughter by the Nazis, abducts a German child from Berlin and attempts to make a life with her in Paris, pretending to himself and to others that she is his daughter Barbara.

In stark contrast to *Le Dernier des Justes*, there are few references to language in Langfus's novels. Indeed, once one begins to read from the perspective of multilingualism, it appears that Langfus deliberately avoids making reference to language where it might reasonably be expected. Instances of selective reproduction and explicit attribution do occur in all three texts, but they are far from systematic. German terms are occasionally used, as in *Le Dernier des Justes*, to connote the violence of the Nazi perpetrators, and the narrative sometimes comments on the intradiegetic language of communication between protagonists. However, the homogenising convention dominates, and when there is no explicit attribution, which is frequently the case, the reader is left to infer the language being spoken. For example, in exchanges with German characters, such as when the family home is first raided and when Maria is stopped in the street in the ghetto without papers, the reader must assume that the French words represent a conversation taking place intradiegetically in German (Langfus 1960, 26, 55; 1962a, 25–26, 54). It is only about half-way through *Le Sel et le soufre* that we are told explicitly that Maria speaks German. When a Nazi soldier asks her to read what his fiancée has written on a photograph, she tells him that she cannot read German, but then reports to the reader that 'Il est très étonné. Comment est-ce possible? Je le parle si bien' ['He was astonished. How could that be? I spoke it so well'] (Langfus 1960, 158; 1962a, 158). Elsewhere in the novel, the underlying language is left unclear. We know, for example, that the Nazi officer Vic, who discovers Maria and her husband hiding in the forest, speaks Polish with an accent, but in their subsequent interactions with him, the language of communication is not specified. It could therefore be Polish, since we know he speaks it, or German, which is more plausible in scenes where other German officers are present (Langfus 1960, 141; 1962a, 141).

In conversations between Polish characters, the reader logically assumes the French words represent conversations taking place intradiegetically in Polish. But this is sometimes complicated in translation. In one scene where in the French text Maria reflects on the fact that a fellow Polish prisoner has addressed her as ‘Madame’, the French term is reproduced in the English translation (Langfus 1960, 213–14; 1962a, 212–13). In French, this is a straightforward instance of the homogenising convention. But in the translation, the retention of the French term has an extradiegetic function, referring the reader to the fact that they are reading a book about Poland that has been translated from French. If the choice to write in a foreign language is viewed as a means of creating distance between the witness and the traumatic event, then, following Ellen S. Fine’s interpretation of Langfus’s narratives as dependent on distancing, it could be argued that translation here enhances a distancing procedure already employed in the source text (though Fine does not specifically discuss Langfus’s choice to write in French) (Fine 1993). French distances the reader from Poland, and English doubles the distance. In fact, this instance of selective reproduction occurs in a scene which Fine analyses as an instance of another type of distancing. Imprisoned in separate cells, Maria and her husband are unable to communicate until the prisoner in the cell between them offers to relay their words through the walls (Langfus 1960, 211–25; 1962a, 211–24). This is a scene of intralingual translation in which communication happens via an intermediary, and Fine suggests that it is precisely this distanced form of communication that allows Maria to begin to articulate her trauma (Fine 1993, 105–106). On this reading, the retention of ‘Madame’ in the translation adds yet another layer of distancing. But for the English reader, there is a further, extradiegetic, element, which is that ‘Madame’ documents Langfus’s identity as a translingual writer and the role of *Les Bagages de sable* as an example of French Holocaust memory. The presence of the French word ‘Madame’ in this scene in *The Whole Land Brimstone* functions in the same way as the designation of *The Lost Shore* as the ‘Prix Goncourt 1962’ on the front cover of the translation and the remark on the back flap pointing out that ‘Anna Langfus’s achievement is all the more impressive considering that French is not her native tongue’. In *The Whole Land Brimstone*, ‘Madame’ is an instance of ‘performative

self-contradiction' (Hermans 1996, 27) which draws the English reader into a dual relationship with the text as both an attempt on Langfus's part to address the trauma of the Holocaust in Poland and a manifestation of France's traumatic relationship with its own national past. Both of these traumas are foreign to the English reader.

In another key scene in *Les Bagages de sable*, intradiegetic instability around translational mimesis plays an important role in relation to the thematics of trauma. Maria meets a stranger who defines himself as foreign, that is, not French, by making reference to his accent, and it soon becomes obvious that he is also Polish (Langfus 1962b, 127; 1963, 147). Because of the reference to accent, we know that in this scene the characters are speaking French. In a subsequent scene in which the unnamed man takes Maria to a club, it is not at all clear whether they speak Polish or French together. In the French text, either possibility is narratively plausible (Langfus 1962b, 137ff, 144). Given that the man has already remarked on his lack of facility in French and that their conversation is about their experiences of resistance and imprisonment in Poland during the war, it might be logical to assume that they are speaking in their common mother tongue and in the language in which they experienced the events. The impression that they are speaking Polish is reinforced when Maria imagines that the man's dead daughter is with them and hears her say 'Je m'appelle Wanda Malewska', words which Wanda must have uttered in Polish (Langfus 1962b, 143–44). This is not however the interpretation implied by the English translation, which once again uses a French form of address. The translation excludes the possibility of Polish by having Maria address the man as 'Monsieur', thus resolving the intradiegetic linguistic instability of the French text by leading the reader to suppose that the conversation takes place in French (Langfus 1963, 165). This is unfortunate, since the scene is key to the novel's interrogation of the difficulty of communicating traumatic experience and the effect of this on the construction of post-traumatic subjectivity. As Friedmann suggests, this scene reinforces Maria's choice of silence over communication, since her embryonic relationship with the Polish man with whom she has been able to discuss her past for the first time is destroyed by the arrival of the French woman Gisèle (Friedmann 2007, 129–30). In the French text, the relationship between language

choice and the expression of trauma is unstable. Are we to conclude that Gisèle's arrival ends a privileged moment of communication that took place in the language of suffering? Or does the lack of any indication of linguistic transition suggest that trauma is being articulated in a foreign language? Fine's analysis of distancing in Langfus's *œuvre* might suggest the latter (Fine 1993). Yet in this novel, this seems to be the less likely reading, since Maria's conversation with a fellow Pole is the only occasion on which she is able to talk about her past: here it is proximity rather than distance that facilitates the expression of trauma. But the point is that we do not know. In the French text, ambiguity around the language being spoken deepens the novel's problematisation of communication, while in the translation, the choice of a multilingual solution reduces unresolved multilingual possibilities present in the source text.

In Langfus's third novel, *Saute, Barbara*, the homogenising convention is taken to the extreme with the result that narrative plausibility is strained. The novel opens in Berlin in the weeks following the end of the war where individuals of many nationalities are awaiting repatriation. The first-person narrator Michael is initially identified only as a soldier from a 'victorious army', and we later learn that he spent time in the 'maquis' (Langfus 1965b, 8, 17). The use of the specifically French term 'maquis' here instead of the more general term 'resistance' obfuscates Michael's nationality, and it is only after 80 pages that it is finally confirmed beyond doubt, when he has arrived in Paris and is being interviewed by the authorities, that he is Polish (Langfus 1965b, 82). Once again, explicit attribution in passages where a change of language appears logical is often absent. The opening stream of consciousness, which extends to 14 pages, is eventually broken when Michael converses with the German child, Minna, whom he then abducts as a substitute for his dead daughter Barbara. Without any indication of linguistic transition, French represents the interior monologue of a Polish man and his exchange with Minna/Barbara, which must take place in German. Similarly, when Michael converses with three refugees of different nationalities (French, Italian, and Russian), there is no indication of what their common language might be. After several pages of dialogue, we are told in passing that Michael makes a remark to the Russian in Russian—which implies that up to that point they have been speaking a different

language (Langfus 1965b, 38). The linguistic situation becomes little clearer when the action moves to Paris. The reader learns that Minna/Barbara cannot communicate with Michael's French landlady who looks after her, and is told through explicit attribution that Michael talks to her in German (Langfus 1965b, 121). But in a later exchange, when Michael returns home from work and addresses first his landlady and then Minna/Barbara, no linguistic transition from French to German is specified (Langfus 1965b, 149). Eventually Minna/Barbara absorbs French and Michael speculates that she will soon have forgotten her native German (Langfus 1965b, 121, 175). After his engagement to his French boss's daughter, Michael and Minna/Barbara move in with the family, and the reader must assume that the characters converse in their only common language—French (Langfus 1965b, 231). But does Michael also continue to speak to the child in German? Can she still speak German when he ultimately returns her to Berlin? None of this is made clear. For the plot to work, the reader must infer that Michael speaks Polish, German, Russian, and French fluently. Furthermore, the question of Minna/Barbara's language is crucial. Since none of the other characters suspect that Minna is not in fact Barbara, the reader is required to believe that they accept that Michael's Polish daughter speaks only German, and no Polish at all. The only explanation offered for this is the rather vague one Michael gives in Russian to his fellow refugee—that Minna/Barbara has lived for three years with 'other people' since the death of her mother (Langfus 1965b, 38). It is not of course uncommon for authors to ignore the logical implications of multilingual realities in fiction. As the editors of one collection on literary multilingualism point out, Phileas Fogg and Jean Passepartout 'abolish' Babel when they go around the world with no apparent need for an interpreter (Yllera 2016, 11). Yet as Taylor-Batty suggests in her discussion of the ambiguous representation of languages in Jean Rhys's fiction, a lack of clarity around language use by bi- or multilingual characters in fiction is nonetheless 'unsettling' (Taylor-Batty 2013, 105). The foregoing analysis of translational mimesis in Langfus's fiction reveals a significant degree of representational instability at the heart of her novels.

The dominance of the homogenising convention in Langfus's fiction relates both to the author's rejection of Polish and to her conception of

the Holocaust novel. As we noted above, it is by no means certain that the choice to write in a different language will necessarily protect the subject from trauma. But the extent of Langfus's rejection of Polish, and her tendency to exaggerate her lack of fluency in French when she first arrived in Paris suggest that writing in a language that was not her own did contribute to the distance Langfus felt was necessary to allow her to bear witness to her experience in writing. In a 1961 article and again in a lecture delivered in 1963, Langfus argued that 'plus une réalité est horrible, plus une situation est anormale, plus la distance doit être grande qui permet de la comprendre dans sa vérité' [the more horrible a reality, the more abnormal a situation, the greater the distance must be to allow its truth to be understood] (Langfus 1993, 46).³¹ Langfus did not mention her choice of French in this lecture, but remarked in an interview that the constraints of writing in a foreign language made her style more precise because of the increased reflection required as compared with writing in one's mother tongue (Potel 2014, 177; Langfus 1965a, 49–50). Potel concludes that Langfus's choice of French was more than just a practical question, and more even than a linguistic and cultural rupture: he describes it as 'renunciation' and 'repression' (Potel 2014, 180). Biographical research by Potel and others has strongly suggested that Langfus's decision to leave Poland was motivated by her view of the complicity of Poles in the massacre of Jews and by what she perceived as the widespread nature of Polish anti-Semitism (Potel 2014, 135). Polish had become the language of the murder of her family and the decimation of her homeland, the language in which, in a phrase uttered by Michael's daughter before her brutal death, each word means fear (Langfus 1965b, 124). Her adoption of the French language and of both French culture and nationality—she and her husband were naturalised in the period between the submission of the manuscript of *Le Sel et le souffre* and its publication (Potel 2014, 181)—was part of her attempt to rid herself of the burden of her traumatic past. Potel concludes that this attempt was unsuccessful (Potel 2011). Langfus believed that all language was inadequate to represent the full truth of the extremity of horror that she had witnessed (Langfus 1993, 46, 48). This was the reason that she rejected testimonial writing in favour of fiction, which allowed her to separate her narrative persona from her testimonial persona (Fine 1993, 96–97). She

found fiction to be a more appropriate form than testimony for Holocaust writing because it allowed her to acknowledge that the suffering was not simply individual, was not hers alone, and because for her, authenticity depended on what she termed ‘transposition’ (Langfus 1993, 43; see also Potel 2014, 172–75). The story of the real Anna Langfus was unspeakable; that of the fictional Maria could be spoken. Paying close attention to multilingualism in Langfus’s novels suggests that the translational aspects of her fiction played a significant role in the creation of the narrative distance she needed to write about the Holocaust. Langfus’s avoidance of multilingualism and the consequent instability of translational mimesis in her novels appear to have been a translational strategy which allowed her to convey her Polish experience through the twin intermediaries of French and of fiction. The instability of translational mimesis in Langfus’s novels establishes distance between the events and the narration not so much because the narrating language is French rather than Polish, but because of the metalinguistic reflection provoked in the attentive reader by the dominance of the homogenising convention. Once again we see that translational forms of representation serve the purpose of ‘traumatic realism’ by problematising representation even as it is enacted.

The Ambivalence of Multilingualism

This chapter has shown that multilingualism and translation are important resources for traumatic realism. However, as we have seen, it is not only a matter of writers using foreign languages to invoke the polylingual realities of persecution, deportation, and the camps. Multilingualism and translation play into the ethical and poetic structures of Holocaust novels in different ways. The layering of translation in Holocaust representation is a recurrent feature of such texts, yet the functions of multilingualism and translation vary, as we have seen in the illustrative examples of André Schwarz-Bart and Anna Langfus. In Langfus’s novels, the dominance of the homogenising convention and the fundamental instability of translational mimesis signify the existential trauma of survivorship. Her novels are primarily inward-looking: here the translational prose of a translingual writer conveys the inability of the individual survivor to reconstruct a viable subjectivity in the wake of trauma. In Schwarz-Bart’s *Le Dernier*

des Justes by contrast, translational mimesis conveys the potential for solidarity implied by the articulation of collective identities. Ultimately, translation here figures the possibility of representation and of survival, despite everything.

My argument is not, however, an identitarian one. What is important is not so much that each language signifies a particular identity, nor that the corpus of ‘Holocaust fiction’ includes works written in many different languages, though both of these things are true. What I want to emphasise is the ways in which the layering of translation in these works allows them to transcend the national literatures to which their dominant language of expression binds them. Alan Rosen labels Holocaust literature as ‘world literature’ in the very first words of *Literature of the Holocaust* (Rosen 2013a, 1). For me, Holocaust literature is ‘world literature’ not because it has no local affiliation, nor indeed, as in David Damrosch’s definition, because it circulates in translation (Damrosch 2003)—though it obviously does—but because it problematises the notion of a national literature even whilst participating in it. Like the novels Walkowitz describes as ‘born-translated’, Holocaust novels ‘are not produced from nowhere for everywhere’ (Walkowitz 2015, 20). There *is* a French Holocaust novel. Reading for multilingualism and translation suggests that Holocaust literature has strong affinities with the concept of the born-translated novel which exceeds the national because it ‘approaches translation as medium and origin rather than as afterthought’, because translation functions thematically, structurally, and conceptually, and because it contains reflection on translation (Walkowitz 2015, 4, 6). The translation that we find *within* Holocaust fiction calls for a particular type of reading. As in Rothberg’s model of ‘traumatic realism’, it requires an active, questioning response.

In an influential study of world literature provocatively entitled *Against World Literature*, Emily Apter posited ‘untranslatability’ as an attempt to avoid both ‘reflexive endorsement of cultural equivalence and substitutability’ and ‘the celebration of nationally and ethnically branded “differences” that have been niche-marketed as commercialised “identities”’ (Apter 2013, 2). Whether we accept Apter’s insistence on untranslatability, or prefer David Bellos’s insistence that anything that can be said can be translated (Bellos 2011, 146–56), Apter’s point is important for a reading of Holocaust literature as world literature.³² The commonalities

of experience that connect Holocaust literature do not make texts written in different languages straightforwardly interchangeable, but nor does linguistic difference confine them to national traditions understood as ethnically discrete entities. Apter discusses the example of Tolstoy's use of French in *War and Peace*, which Sternberg also cites as an example of maximal selective reproduction of a foreign language in fiction (Sternberg 1981, 225–26). Such translational mimesis may or may not be 'translatable'—this depends on one's view of translatability/untranslatability—but it certainly calls attention to the implications of interlingual representation in both source and target text in ways that call on the reader to reflect both on the limits of literary nationalism and of representation itself. And yet, interlingual translation might, paradoxically, also threaten to return the translational text to its national context. In the case of the Goncourt prizewinning novels we have studied in this chapter, the award of the prize strengthens the national affiliation of the translingual writer *as French*, and translation into English inevitably transforms these prizewinners into representative examples of *French* literature. This is achieved through paratextual designations which are themselves multilingual. The cover of *The Last of the Just* carries the strapline 'Perhaps the greatest novel yet to win LE PRIX GONCOURT', and Langfus's novel is similarly designated on the cover as '*The Lost Shore* PRIX GONCOURT 1962'. Using 'prix' for 'prize'—in upper case—is an exoticising strategy which emphasises Frenchness over translingualism. But even the book covers are unstable, since both Schwarz-Bart and Langfus are identified paratextually as non-native speakers of French. As Yildiz's study of the 'postmonolingual condition' demonstrates, multilingual practices always exist in tension with the dominant monolingual paradigm (Yildiz 2012, 5, 14). These Goncourt texts and their paratexts demonstrate the ambivalence of multilingualism as a textual strategy capable of both reinforcing and exploding ethnically branded difference.

Notes

1. Koestler was educated in Hungarian but spoke German at home with his Austrian mother, and was raised with help from French and English governesses (Saunders 2017, 16–17).

2. The discovery of a German version of *Darkness at Noon* was made by Matthias Wessel in 2015 (Scammell 2016; Saunders 2017, 61).
3. 'In the space of a few weeks, she typed roughly 1000 pages of text—sometimes taking dictation in English, sometimes in Polish, and sometimes simultaneously translating from Polish to English as Jan spoke. Since her English was better than Karski's, she reworded his thoughts when he spoke that language' (Wood and Jankowski, 226). Wood and Jankowski go on to discuss the role of Karski's publisher in adapting his text for the perceived needs of its American audience (226–29). See also Haenel (2009, 140, 145).
4. On language and translation in Lanzmann's *Shoah*, see for example Furman (1995), Stoicea (2006), Glowacka (2012, 79–82).
5. I shall not go into detail about the difference between these terms: though it is of course important, it is not central to my discussion. For an overview of the issues, see Boase-Beier et al. (2017a, 2).
6. Delabastita and Grutman evoke the example of the use of French in D. H. Lawrence's *Women in Love*, which is completely lost in the French translation of the novel (Delabastita and Grutman 2005, 27).
7. Taylor-Batty (2013) discusses the 'funny foreigner' convention in English literature (59–61). Given that Merle was an Anglicist, his use of this trope might be seen as a further reversal since he would certainly have been familiar with English examples.
8. The meaning of the phrase is explained in the preface to the 1986 Virago reprint of the translation (Lewis 1986, xiii).
9. Delabastita and Grutman (2005) provide a useful overview of the subject.
10. For a discussion of this problem in relation to the Franco-English writer Tatiana de Rosnay's Holocaust novel *Sarah's Key/Elle s'appelait Sarah*, see Vice (2017).
11. Terminology varies. Isabelle de Courtivron's *Lives in Translation* collects essays by writers who would correspond to Kellman's definition, but are termed 'bilingual' (Courtivron 2003).
12. For further biographical details, see Stonebridge (2014, 29–30), Kaufmann (1986, 15–18; 2006).
13. For example in the *Times Literary Supplement*: see Anon (1962) and Johnson (1963).
14. *Le sel et le soufre* won the Charles Veillon prize in 1961.
15. Francine Kaufmann summarises the reception of *Le dernier des Justes* and the polemic it provoked in her obituary of Schwarz-Bart (Kaufmann 2006).

16. There is a vast literature on this topic. See for example Haft (1973), Horowitz (1997), Langer (1975), Rosen (2013b), Rosenfeld (1980), Schwartz (1971), Vice (2000), and Wardi (1986).
17. On one occasion, in his discussion of Rolf Hochhuth's play *The Deputy*, written originally in German, Rosenfeld does present both source and target text (Rosenfeld 1980, 140–41).
18. On the problem of authenticity in relation to the acknowledgement of translation, see Boase-Beier et al. (2017a, 3–4, 6).
19. Accessible general discussions of the question of the relationship of different languages to Holocaust writing are to be found in Rosen (2005) and Seidman (2006). See also Ezrahi (1980, 10–15). Rosen's *Literature of the Holocaust* contains essays on Holocaust literature in Italian, German, Hebrew, Yiddish, Russian, English, Polish, Hungarian, and French (Rosen 2013a, b).
20. Seidman (2006) discusses post-war Yiddish-language literature at 243–75. See also Rosenfeld (1980, 115–26). Potel (2014) discusses the cultivation of Yiddish-language culture in post-war Paris at 179; 224.
21. Haft lists examples of 'deportees' vocabulary' in both German and French and 'Nazi and SS terminology' (Haft 1973, 196–210).
22. Despite its title, this essay provides a comprehensive overview of Polish Holocaust memory from the war years to the present.
23. See also Ursula Tidd's discussion of bilingualism as openness to the Other in Semprun's writing on Buchenwald (Tidd 2014, 20–23, 99–101, 140–41), (Suleiman 2006, 132–58), Brodzki (2007, 147–89).
24. Taylor-Batty (2013) and Suleiman (1996b) both draw on Sternberg's framework. Other critics have also addressed similar issues. For example, Berman 2000 discusses the tendency of translation to efface literary multilingualism, and Bakhtin discusses 'the study of specific images of languages and styles', using the example of Pushkin's Eugene Onegin, in his essay 'From the Prehistory of Novelistic Discourse' (Bakhtin 1981, 41–83 (49–51)).
25. Here I follow, for example, Taylor-Batty's discussion of the translational nature of Katherine Mansfield's English stories about France (Taylor-Batty 2013, 67–79).
26. Boase-Beier et al. (2017a, 15) make the same point in relation to Alison Owings' literal translations of German women's testimony into English in her 1993 book *Frauen*.
27. The Hebrew letters symbolise the number 36: lamed (30) and vav (6). The word is more often transliterated as 'lamed-vav', or 'lamedvovnik' in

Yiddish. In the wake of discussion of the legend provoked by Schwarz-Bart's novel, the Jewish scholar Gershom Scholem published an essay explaining its history entitled 'The Tradition of the Thirty-Six Hidden Just Men' (Scholem 1971).

28. On the sources of the novel, see Davison (1995) and Kaufmann (1986). The question of sources provoked what became known as the 'affaire Schwarz-Bart' on the novel's publication in 1959, when the author was accused of plagiarism and historical inaccuracies.
29. There is one example of the extended use of non-standard language (in both the French and the English versions) to convey an accent, but this relates to the rural German of a local peasant boy rather than to Hebrew or Yiddish (Schwarz-Bart 1959, 219–21; 1961, 207–209).
30. As Potel's biography of Langfus demonstrates (Potel 2014), despite the obvious autobiographical sources of Langfus's fiction, there are significant differences between her life and her novels, and her texts cannot be taken as straightforwardly testimonial.
31. This lecture was given to the Jewish women's organisation WIZO in March 1963. It reprises comments Langfus had already published in a contribution to the French Jewish monthly magazine *L'Arche* in 1961 (Langfus 1961, 33).
32. Apter discusses Bellos's argument in *Against World Literature* (Apter 2013, 19–20). Walkowitz interrogates Apter's concept of untranslatability in *Born Translated* (Walkowitz 2015, 31–39).

References

- Alexander, Zaia. 2007. Primo Levi and Translation. In *The Cambridge Companion to Primo Levi*, ed. Robert S.C. Gordon, 155–169. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Anon. 1962. Other New Novels. *Times Literary Supplement*, April 6, 237.
- Apter, Emily. 2013. *Against World Literature: On the Politics of Untranslatability*. London/New York: Verso.
- Arnds, Peter. 2016a. Introduction. In *Translating Holocaust Literature*, ed. Peter Arnds, 7–12. Gottingen: V&R unipress.
- , ed. 2016b. *Translating Holocaust Literature*. Gottingen: V&R unipress.
- Assouline, Pierre. 2013. *Du côté de chez Drouant. Cent dix ans de vie littéraire chez les Goncourt*. Paris: Gallimard/France Culture.

- Azouvi, Francois. 2012. *Le Mythe du grand Silence. Auschwitz, les Français, la mémoire*. Paris: Fayard.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination*, ed. Michael Holquist and Trans. C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. 1996. Assimilation into Exile. In *Exile and Creativity: Signposts, Travelers, Outsiders, Backward Glances*, ed. Susan Rubin Suleiman, 321–352. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Bellos, David. 2011. *Is That a Fish in your Ear? Translation and the Meaning of Everything*. New York: Faber and Faber.
- Berenbaum, Michael, and Fred Skolnik, eds. 2007. *Encyclopaedia Judaica*. Vol. 12. 2nd ed. Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA.
- Berman, Antoine. 2000. Translation and the Trials of the Foreign. Trans. L. Venuti. In *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti, 285–297. London/New York: Routledge.
- Boase-Beier, Jean, Peter Davies, Andrea Hammel, and Marion Winters. 2017a. Introduction. In *Translating Holocaust Lives*, ed. Jean Boase-Beier, Peter Davies, Andrea Hammel, and Marion Winters, 1–21. London: Bloomsbury.
- Boase-Beier, Jean, Peter Davies, Andrea Hammel, and Marion Winters, eds. 2017b. *Translating Holocaust Lives*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Boura, Olivier. 2003. *Un Siècle de Goncourt*. Paris: Arléa.
- Brodzki, Bella. 2007. *Can These Bones Live? Translation, Survival and Cultural Memory*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Buton, Philippe. 2007. Occupation, Liberation, Purges: The Changing Landscape of French Memory. In *The Uncertain Foundation: France at the Liberation, 1944–47*, ed. Andrew Knapp, 234–249. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cesarani, David. 1998. *Arthur Koestler: The Homeless Mind*. London: William Heineman.
- Cohen, Josh. 2014. “No Room for Truth”: On the Precariousness of Life and Narrative in The Last of the Just. *European Judaism* 47 (7): 15–25.
- Courtivron, Isabelle de, ed. 2003. *Lives in Translation. Bilingual Writers on Identity and Creativity*. New York/Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Curtis, Jean-Louis. 1947. *Les Forêts de la nuit*. Paris: Julliard, Editions J’ai lu.
- . 1950. *The Forests of the Night*. Trans. N. Wydenbruck. London: John Lehmann.
- Damrosch, David. 2003. *What Is World Literature?* Princeton/Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Davies, Peter, ed. 2014. *Holocaust Testimony and Translation*, Special Issue of Translation and Literature, 23 (2). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- . 2018. *Witness Between Languages: The Translation of Holocaust Testimonies in Context*. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer.
- Davison, Neil R. 1995. Inside the Shoah: Narrative, Documentation and Schwarz-Bart's *The Last of the Just*. *Clio* 24 (3): 291–322.
- Delabastita, Dirk, and Rainier Grutman. 2005. Introduction: Fictional Representations of Multilingualism and Translation. *Fictionalising Translation and Multilingualism*, Special Issue of *Linguistica Antverpiensa*, New Series, 4: 11–34.
- Derrida, Jacques, and Anne Dufourmantelle. 2000. *Of Hospitality*. Trans. R. Bowlby. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Ezrahi, Sidra DeKoven. 1980. *By Words Alone: The Holocaust in Literature*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Fine, Ellen S. 1993. Le Témoin comme romancier: Anna Langfus et le problème de la Distance. *Pardès* 17: 93–109.
- Fletcher, Alana. 2016. Transforming Subjectivity: *Se questo è un uomo* in Translation and Adaptation. In *Translating Holocaust Literature*, ed. Peter Arnds, 33–44. Gottingen: V&R unipress.
- Friedmann, Joë. 2007. *Langages du désastre. Robert Antelme, Anna Langfus, Andre Schwarz-Bart, Jorge Semprun, Elie Wiesel*. Saint-Genouph: Librairie Nizet.
- Furman, Nelly. 1995. The Languages of Pain in Shoah. In *Auschwitz and After: Race, Culture, and "the Jewish Question" in France*, ed. Lawrence D. Kritzman, 299–312. New York/London: Routledge.
- Glowacka, Dorota. 2012. *Disappearing Traces. Holocaust Testimonials, Ethics, and Aesthetics*. Seattle/London: University of Washington Press.
- Grutman, Rainier. 2006. Refraction and Recognition. Literary Multilingualism in Translation. *Targets* 181: 17–47.
- Haenel, Yannick. 2009. *Jan Karski*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Haft, Cynthia. 1973. *The Theme of Nazi Concentration Camps in French Literature*. The Hague: Mouton & Co.
- Hermans, Theo. 1996. The Translator's Voice in Translated Narrative. *Targets* 8 (1): 23–48.
- . 2007. *The Conference of the Tongues*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Horowitz, Sarah. 1997. *Voicing the Void? Muteness and Memory in Holocaust Fiction*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Johnson, Marigold. 1963. Displaced Persons. *Times Literary Supplement*, November 1, 881.
- Karski, Jan. 2010. *Mon témoignage devant le monde. Histoire d'un état clandestin*. Translation Revised and Completed by Francine Gervais-Francelle. Paris: Robert Laffont.

- . 2011. *Story of Secret State. My Report to the World*. Translation of New Material by Sandra Smith. London: Penguin.
- Kaufmann, Francine. 1986. *Pour relire Le Dernier des justes: Réflexions sur la Shoah*. Paris: Meridiens Klincksieck.
- . 2006. André Schwarz-Bart, la lumière d'une étoile morte. *Les Temps modernes* 641: 64–73.
- Kearney, Richard. 2006. Introduction: Ricoeur's Philosophy of Translation. In *On Translation by Paul Ricoeur*, vii–vxx. London/New York: Routledge.
- Kellman, Steven G. 2000. *The Translingual Imagination*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- ., ed. 2003. *Switching Languages. Translingual Writers Reflect on Their Craft*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Kershaw, Angela. 2017. Distant Stories, Belated Memories: Irène Némirovsky and Elisabeth Gille. In *Translating Holocaust Lives*, ed. Jean Boase-Beier, Peter Davies, Andrea Hammel, and Marion Winters, 199–215. London: Bloomsbury.
- Kippur, Sara. 2015. *Writing It Twice. Self-Translation and the Making of World Literature*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Koestler, Arthur. 1964. On Disbelieving Atrocities. In *The Yogi and the Commissar*, 94–99. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Lang, Berel, ed. 1988. *Writing and the Holocaust*. New York: Holmes & Meier.
- Langer, Lawrence L. 1975. *The Holocaust and the Literary Imagination*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.
- Langfus, Anna. 1960. *Le Sel et le soufre*. Paris: Gallimard.
- . 1961. Il ne suffit pas d'être sincère pour être vrai. *L'Arche: le mensuel du Judaïsme français* 50: 32–33.
- . 1962a. *The Whole Land Brimstone*. Trans. P. Wiles. London: Collins.
- . 1962b. *Les Bagages de sable*. Paris: Gallimard.
- . 1963. *The Lost Shore*. Trans. P. Wiles. London: Collins.
- . 1965a. Entretien. *La Nouvelle critique*, June, 45–50.
- . 1965b. *Saute, Barbara*. Paris: Gallimard.
- . 1993. Un cri ne s'imprime pas. *Les nouveaux cahiers* 115: 42–48.
- Lefevre, André. 2017. *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. 2nd ed. Abingdon/New York: Routledge.
- Lepschy, Anna Laura, and Giulio Lepschy. 2007. Primo Levi's Languages. In *The Cambridge Companion to Primo Levi*, ed. Robert S.C. Gordon, 121–136. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levi, Primo. 1989. Communicating. In *The Drowned and the Saved*. Trans. R. Rosenthal, 68–82. London: Abacus.

- Levy, Clara. 2000. La Guerre dans les textes littéraires d'Anna Langfus: la mise à distance de l'expérience. *L'Esprit créateur* 40 (2): 52–60.
- Levy, Daniel, and Nathan Sznajder. 2006. *The Holocaust and Memory in the Global Age*. Trans. A. Oksiloff. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Lewis, Helena. 1986. Introduction. In *A Fine of Two Hundred Francs*, ed. Elsa Triolet. London: Virago.
- Mehlman, Jeffrey. 2013. French Literature and the Holocaust. In *Literature of the Holocaust*, ed. Alan Rosen, 174–190. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Merle, Robert. 1949. *Weekend à Zuydcoote*. Paris: Gallimard.
- . 1950. *Weekend at Zuydcoote*. Trans. K. Rebillon-Lambley. London: John Lehmann.
- . 1952. *La Mort est mon métier*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Michlic, Joanna Beata, and Małgorzata Melchior. 2013. The Memory of the Holocaust in Post-1989 Poland. In *Bringing the Dark Past to Light. The Reception of the Holocaust in Postcommunist Europe*, ed. and with an Introduction by John-Paul Himka and Joanna Beata Michlic, 403–450. Lincoln/London: University of Nebraska Press.
- Patterson, David. 2013. Wartime Victim Writing in Western Europe. In *Literature of the Holocaust*, ed. Alan Rosen, 33–47. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Perrin, Alban. 2011. Comment devient-on français quand on est juif et polonais? *Les Juifs polonais en France et en Israël, Bulletin du centre de recherche français à Jérusalem* 22, n.p. <https://bcrfj.revues.org/6451>. Accessed 19 Sep 2017.
- Potel, Jean-Yves. 2011. La Pologne d'Anna Langfus. *Les Juifs polonais en France et en Israël, Bulletin du centre de recherche français à Jérusalem* 22, n.p. <https://bcrfj.revues.org/6451>. Accessed 19 Sep 2017.
- . 2014. *Les Disparitions d'Anna Langfus*. Paris: Les éditions noir sur blanc.
- Rastier, François. 2015. Primo Levi et la langue allemande. In *Écrire en langues: littérature et plurilinguisme*, ed. Olga Anokhina and François Rastier, 93–101. Paris: Editions des archives contemporaines.
- Rawlinson, Mark. 1996. This Other War: British Culture and the Holocaust. *Cambridge Quarterly* 25 (1): 1–25.
- Rigney, Ann. 2010. The Dynamics of Remembrance: Texts Between Monumentality and Morphing. In *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies*, ed. Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nünning, 345–353. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Rosen, Alan. 2005. *Sounds of Defiance. The Holocaust, Multilingualism and the Problem of English*. Lincoln/London: University of Nebraska Press.

- . 2013a. Introduction. In *Literature of the Holocaust*, ed. Alan Rosen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- , ed. 2013b. *Literature of the Holocaust*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosenfeld, Alvin H. 1980. *A Double Dying: Reflections on Holocaust Literature*. Bloomington/London: Indiana University Press.
- . 2011. *The End of the Holocaust*. Bloomington/London: Indiana University Press.
- Rothberg, Michael. 2000. *Traumatic Realism: The Demands of Holocaust Realism*. Minneapolis/London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Saunders, Edward. 2017. *Arthur Koestler*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Scammell, Michael. 2016. A Different “Darkness at Noon”. *New York Review of Books*, April 7, 2016. <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/2016/04/07/a-different-darkness-at-noon/?printpage=true>. Accessed 11 Aug 2017.
- Scholem, Gershom. 1971. The Tradition of the Thirty-Six Hidden Just Men. Trans. M.A. Meyer. In *The Messianic Idea in Judaism and Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality*, ed. Gershom Scholem, 251–256. New York: Schocken Books.
- Schwartz, Daniel R. 1971. *Imagining the Holocaust*. New York: St Martin’s Press.
- Schwarz-Bart, André. 1959. *Le Dernier des Justes*. Paris: Seuil.
- . 1961. *The Last of the Just*. Trans. S.D. Becker. London: Secker and Warburg.
- . 2009. *L’Étoile du matin*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.
- . 2011. *The Morning Star*. Trans. J. Rose. New York/London: Overlook Duckworth.
- Seidman, Naomi. 1996. Elie Wiesel and the Scandal of Jewish Rage. *Jewish Social Studies, New Series* 3 (1): 1–19.
- . 2006. *Faithful Renderings. Jewish-Christian Difference and the Politics of Translation*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Sicher, Efraim. 2005. *The Holocaust Novel*. New York/London: Routledge.
- Steiner, George. 1967. The Hollow Miracle. In *Language and Silence: Essays on Language, Literature and the Inhuman*, ed. George Steiner, 117–132. London: Faber and Faber.
- Sternberg, Meir. 1981. Polylingualism as Reality and Translation as Mimesis. *Poetics Today* 2 (4): 221–239.
- Stoicea, Gabriela. 2006. The Difficulties of Verbalizing Trauma: Translation and the Economy of Loss in Claude Lanzmann’s *Shoah*. *Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association* 39 (2): 43–53.

- Stonebridge, Lyndsey. 2014. *The Last of the Just*: An Untimely Novel for Our Times. *European Judaism* 47 (7): 26–40.
- Stratford, Madeleine. 2008. Au tour de Babel! Les défis multiples du multilinguisme. *Meta* 53 (3): 457–470.
- Suleiman, Susan Rubin. 1996a. Introduction. In *Exile and Creativity: Signposts, Travelers, Outsiders, Backward Glances*, ed. Susan Rubin Suleiman, 1–6. Durham: Duke University Press.
- . 1996b. Monuments in a Foreign Tongue: On Reading Holocaust Memoirs by Emigrants. In *Exile and Creativity: Signposts, Travelers, Outsiders, Backward Glances*, ed. Susan Rubin Suleiman, 397–417. Durham: Duke University Press.
- . 2006. *Crises of Memory and the Second World War*. Cambridge/London: Harvard University Press.
- Taylor-Batty, Juliette. 2013. *Multilingualism in Modernist Fiction*. Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tidd, Ursula. 2014. *Jorge Semprún. Writing the European Other*. London: Legenda.
- Triplet, Elsa. 1947. *A Fine of Two Hundred Francs*. Trans. F. Golfing. New York: Reynal & Hitchcock.
- . 1986. *A Fine of Two Hundred Francs*. Trans. F. Golfing and with an Introduction by Helena Lewis. London: Virago.
- Vice, Sue. 2000. *Holocaust Fiction*. London: Routledge.
- . 2017. Witnessing Complicity in English and French: Tatiana de Rosnay's Sarah's Key and Elle s'appelait Sarah. In *Translating Holocaust Lives*, ed. Jean Boase-Beier, Peter Davies, Andrea Hammel, and Marion Winters, 49–67. London: Bloomsbury.
- Walkowitz, Rebecca. 2015. *Born Translated: The Contemporary Novel in an Age of World Literature*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wardi, Charlotte. 1986. *Le Génocide dans la fiction romanesque*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Wieviorka, Annette. 1992. *Déportation et génocide. Entre la mémoire et l'oubli*. Paris: Plon.
- . 1998. *L'Ère du témoin*. Paris: Plon.
- Wieviorka, Olivier. 2010. *La Mémoire désunie. Le souvenir politique des années sombres de la Libération à nos jours*. Paris: Seuil.
- Winock, Michel. 2004. *La France et les juifs*. Paris: Seuil.
- Wood, E. Thomas, and Stanisław M. Jankowski. 1994. *Karski: How One Man Tried to Stop the Holocaust*. New York: Wiley.

- Wright, Chantal. 2017. Response to: Andrea Hammel, Translating Cultures and Languages: Exile Writers Between German and English. In *Translating Holocaust Lives*, ed. Jean Boase-Beier, Peter Davies, Andrea Hammel, and Marion Winters, 145–148. London: Bloomsbury.
- Yildiz, Yasemin. 2012. *Beyond the Mother Tongue: The Postmonolingual Condition*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Yllera, Alicia. 2016. Introduction. In *Plurilinguisme dans la littérature française*, ed. Alicia Yllera and Julian Muela Ezquerra, 7–18. Bern/Berlin/Brussels/Frankfurt am Main/New York/Oxford/Vienna: Peter Lang.



7

Conclusion

Throughout *Translating War*, it has been my aim to show that reading narratives of the Second World War translationally brings into view aspects of the cultural history of war that are hidden by exclusively national approaches, and that the translational contact that is part of that history is, in Emily Apter's words, 'a zone of critical engagement' (Apter 2006, 5). As Brodzki argues, '[i]t would be difficult to overstate the role of translation in shaping history, culture, and memory' (Brodzki 2007, 9). My readings have adopted a variety of perspectives that take mobility, interconnectedness, and heterogeneity into account, all of which have been grounded in the practice of interlingual translation. They have demonstrated that when we approach translation as a critical practice, we see that its function is not simply to domesticate the foreign, nor indeed to exoticise it, nor yet to provide some ideal, shared, hybrid space where differences are harmoniously resolved. Translation is a complex and dynamic form of cultural negotiation. Its meanings change according to the interests and priorities of the agents that become involved in its processes, and the relationships figured by its outcomes could be plotted along a scale ranging from the hostility of enemies to the welcoming hospitality of friends. It is in this sense that I understand translation as a

critical practice: as the play of difference and similarity, of distance and proximity, relying neither on total acceptance nor on total rejection, but constantly mediating between these extremes.

The zone of engagement that is the precondition of translation is not a metaphor but a real space composed of living people, institutions, and material cultural objects. The example of the multiple modes of publication and circulation of Joseph Kessel's *L'Armée des ombres* across three continents illustrates the significance of networks and agents to textual mobility. In this instance, because of the specific wartime situation at the time of its publication, mobility was the *sine qua non* of the very existence of the source text, a book which was the product of two wartime translational zones of hospitality—London and Algiers. The significance of these cities to Kessel's text is more than simply as a practical solution to the wartime inability of writers like Kessel to access French publishing structures. The text is connected in different ways to the locations it traversed: it was the cultural heritage of 1930s' Algiers as a contact zone that placed Edmond Charlot in a position to publish Kessel's book; the symbolism of Algiers as a colonial capital inevitably pervades the text despite its absence from the plot; the ambivalent wartime hospitality of London to the exiled French is clearly written into the narrative. The example of Kessel demonstrates the value of studying translational zones of hospitality in order to understand how they facilitate, but also complicate, textual mobility. The multiple translations of Kessel's text into English and its dissemination in French in Occupied France by the Ministry of Information (MoI) in *La Revue du monde libre* demonstrate that what Wolf calls 'inner ideological transfer' (Wolf 2017, 69), that is, transfer between allies who purportedly share the same political priorities, as opposed to transfer between political opponents, is not neutral, and that translational zones of hospitality host the foreign on their own terms. Translational transformations take place through a variety of interrelated modes of rewriting, of which interlingual translation is just one. Other textual practices, such as editing, anthologising, prefacing, and reviewing, combine with translation *per se* to reorient the text for its new readers. This becomes abundantly clear when we bring New York into the picture, where translational interventions, such as the preface to the French-language Schiffrin edition of *L'Armée des ombres* and the responses

of reviewers to both the French text and its English translation, obeyed different ideological imperatives. A translational reading of Free French texts published in London that incorporates detailed source text/target text comparison reveals the subtle but significant manipulations to which French material was subjected to align it with very specific British propaganda priorities. And even those intellectual opinion-formers who saw themselves as above ideological partisanship, such as Cyril Connolly, used interventionist strategies that placed a particular spin on Kessel's work. Yet at the same time, and in the same place, Kessel's texts were circulating in their original French, though also mediated through the material forms of their publication—in London, the émigré journals *France* and *La France libre* and domestic foreign language publishing by Penguin—with the result that different meanings were circulating simultaneously and the messages getting out were not completely controlled by organisations such as the MoI. It is quite astonishing that the work of a single writer whose own political agenda was not even particularly contentious to the Allies should be used in such a variety of different ways. Kessel's case suggests that a systematic translational reading of Free French texts—and indeed of texts originating in the communities and languages of the other European governments in exile on London—would reveal a great deal about the relationships between the Allies and their guests.

Considering the American context raises the question of translator biography in the fascinating person of Haakon Chevalier. Translation history offers many instances of much more egregious mismatches between the ideological priorities of the translator and those of the source text than those I have discussed in relation to Kessel. Such cases are frequently studied because the resulting omissions, alterations, or rewritings offer striking, sometimes even shocking, material for translational analysis. Conversely, examples of sympathetic translatorial interventions also abound, where a translator enhances or even exaggerates the ideological content of a text, the politics of which he or she is in sympathy with. Chevalier's translation of Kessel does neither. Though he was a man of the left, and certainly further to the left than Kessel, Chevalier's *Army of Shadows* is overall a non-interventionist translation. Chevalier's case demonstrates that a translator's politics do not correlate directly with their word-level translation choices: a translator with strong ideological commitments may choose not to make

these manifest in their translation, for a variety of reasons. This does not mean that a non-interventionist translation is uninteresting, nor indeed that what Bourdieu would call their habitus is not perceptible in their translation; rather, it suggests that the range of questions we ask of translator biography should remain broad. Andrew Chesterman suggests taking account of the 'telos' of the translator (as opposed to the 'skopos' of the text), which includes 'the reasons why they work in this field in general, and also the reasons why they translate a given text' in order to understand 'their attitudes and personal goals and ethics' (Chesterman 2009, 17), and this implies paying attention to what Reine Meylaerts calls multipositionality (Meylaerts 2013). Taking the whole range of Chevalier's activities as an academic, activist, literary critic, and, subsequently, author into account shows that translating Kessel was a channeling of his specific political and literary interests and experiences. Chevalier's contact with Kessel's text connects *Army of Shadows* to a surprisingly far-reaching network of other texts, individuals, and events, including the FBI's suspicions about the politics of Chevalier's friend Robert Oppenheimer. Once again, we see how much comes into view once we read even a single text translationally. But *Translating War* is not only a work of translator biography. This is just one possible methodology and I have not sought to apply it in all chapters. To compensate in a minimal way for the resulting absence of attention to translator biography in the later chapters, brief details of all the translators whose work is discussed in this book can be found in Appendix 2. This appendix is both a means of recognising their contribution to the literary history of French war fiction and a place marker for possible openings for future research.

Reading translationally also involves understanding the various contexts in which the different agents of translational activity work. The 'zone of critical engagement' created by the relationships between translational agents and the environments in which they act is complex. Once we take account of the fact that texts, translators, and readers are embedded in networks, we see that no translation can be the result either of a single translating voice or of a straightforward binary relationship between source text and target text, author and translator. This is what Douglas Robinson is at pains to convey in his broad-ranging study *Who Translates?:*

translators are not autonomous individuals producing translations like omnipotent gods out of the fullness of their (textual, cultural, economic, psychosocial) world-mastery, but parts of larger translation or translatorial agencies, in a broad philosophical sense of “agency” that sometimes overlaps, but is not coterminous, with the legal sense. Translators in and as these agencies channel the voices and writings and ideas and knowhow and plans and desires of *other people* – bits and pieces of cultural and technical expertise, meanings, authorial/translational/editorial skills, various cooperative and competitive economic motives, and so on – *from* various sources, *through* their own bodies, *to* various targets, users, ends. (Robinson 2001, 187)

Robinson ‘deliberately [empties] the act of writing (whether by an “original author” or a translator) of authority, specifically the authority of intentionality’ (Robinson 2001, 3–4). He puts in its place the concepts of ‘pandemonium subjectivity’ or ‘disaggregated agency’, according to which a writer or a translator is constantly in dialogue with inner voices and real external interlocutors, dialogues which produce the text (Robinson 2001, 64–66). That multiply determined text is then received by readers who integrate it into their own internal and external dialogues concerning the literary characteristics of the source and target cultures. Chapter 4 argued that three key factors determined the reception of French war fiction in English. First, the Francophilia of British intellectuals such as Cyril Connolly and John Lehmann provided a context for importation. Secondly, according to these British cultural opinion-formers, post-war British cultural reconstruction would be enhanced by international cultural exchange. The positive interest of British intellectuals in French literary culture remained in tension with the significant differences between their idea of ‘good’ war literature and the French view, and cultural exchange was not to be predicated on any straightforward adoption of foreign models: their enthusiasm for things French was certainly a critical engagement. Thirdly, French war fiction was seen as a means of giving British readers access to a side of the war that was beyond their direct experience, and in this sense it fulfilled a prosthetic memorial function (Landsberg 2004). All of these factors came into play against the background of a keen awareness of the existence of a long-standing ‘cross-Channel literary

zone' (Cohen and Denver 2002, 2), as exemplified by Connolly's 1943 essay on 'French and English Cultural Relations' (Connolly 1945). Translation of war fiction *across* the Channel took place in the context of existing mutual contact and influence *between* France and Britain. This history of cultural proximity did not, however, mean that translation across the French-English linguistic border was uncontentious. While the awareness of a shared Franco-English cultural space helped create a context of positive interest in French war fiction, the meeting of texts through translation did not take place 'in a placid field of encounter' but rather in a dynamic field in which these novels helped both to 'sustain' and to 'transform social and literary interrelations' (Simon 2012, 3).

The fact that translation both draws on and creates a meeting place that transcends national boundaries does not mean that the national is overcome or becomes somehow irrelevant. This emerges very clearly from close reading of the translation and reception of the post-war Goncourt prizewinning novels. In France, these war books by Elsa Triolet, Jean-Louis Bory, Jean-Louis Curtis, Robert Merle, and Francis Ambrière allowed readers to explore a range of different aspects of the trauma of the war and the Occupation. In Britain, translation produced complex discourses which set the specificities of the French war experience alongside universal themes of war on the one hand and the dominant myths of British war heroism on the other. In Triolet's *A Fine of Two Hundred Francs* and Ambrière's *The Exiled*, omissions depoliticise the text by attenuating references to communism (Triolet) and to the Resistance (Ambrière), thereby removing at least some aspects of the books' ideological specificity and shifting the focus towards the general rather than the particular. Thanks to its title, publicity straplines, and, consequently, its reviews, Bory's *French Village* was presented to English readers as a novel about an archetypal French rural community rather than specifically as a war novel. The heroic myth of the 'little ships' of Dunkirk made its way into the British preface of Ambrière's prisoner of war memoir despite a very tenuous connection to the book's subject. Reviewers of Merle's *Weekend at Zuydcoote* framed the novel in terms of the British reading of Dunkirk as a success, with some stretching of historical accuracy to exaggerate British willingness to evacuate French soldiers, which was a gross misrepresentation of Merle's account of the events in the

novel. The translation and reception of the post-war Goncourts bears out Siobhan Brownlie's findings in *Mapping Memory in Translation*, which, though based on the analysis of a very different set of texts, also demonstrates that while translations do enable the creation of transnational memory, they retain strong traces of the national (Brownlie 2016, 15, 119–20, 123). The various transformations we have observed in the translations complicate—but do not invalidate—the notion of translation as a form of prosthetic memory (Landsberg 2004). It is crucial to bear in mind that a prosthesis is not a transplant, but always some form of disguise. By its very definition, translation introduces difference even whilst it poses as the same. As Ricoeur puts it, 'the original will not be duplicated by another original' because translation is 'equivalence without identity' (Ricoeur 5, 22, 34). When difference relates to contentious aspects of memory that are closely linked to national identity, such as war, we should expect conflict to arise. Translated fiction cannot produce a simple or consensual transnational memory of war, because it is always a struggle between potentially competing national memories: its terrain of encounter is never, in Simon's words, a placid field.

This is as true of texts which are in some way transnational in origin as it is of texts which are more obviously tied to a single location. Chapter 6 considered two French-language translangued writers of Polish heritage whose novels are characterised in different ways by multilingualism. These books are, in an important sense, written out of a transnational historical and cultural space. In *Le Dernier des Justes*, André Schwarz-Bart makes room for Hebrew, Yiddish, and German within the dominant language of narration. Anna Langfus, by contrast, evacuates other languages from her fiction through translational writing strategies that often render the intradiegetic logic of language use by particular characters unstable. We can, nonetheless, speak of multilingualism in both cases: in *Le Dernier des Justes*, foreign words are present, while in Langfus's novels, foreign dialogue is implied behind the French through which it is rendered in the text. One of the effects of multilingualism in these novels is to call attention to representation itself, engaging the reader in active reading strategies which involve encounters with both the foreign and translation and which have affinities with what Michael Rothberg calls 'traumatic realism' (Rothberg 2000). As works of Holocaust fiction depicting experiences

that transcend the national, these novels use multilingualism and translation to represent both the historical reality and the individual and collective trauma of the genocide. That within the space of four years the Goncourt jury consecrated two stories that highlight Polish wartime anti-Semitism suggests the ambivalence of France's emerging willingness in the late 1950s and early 1960s to confront its own complicity in the persecution of the Jews. Although France is implicated in these stories, the persecution and trauma they recount originate abroad. As often happens when multilingualism is translated, interlingual translation threatens to reduce the heterogeneity of these novels. A significant effect of this is to return them to the national. The—French—strapline on the covers of the English translations *The Last of the Just* (Schwarz-Bart) and *The Lost Shore* (Langfus) designating them as winners of the 'prix Goncourt' define these works as French books for the English readership, linking them paratextually first and foremost to French war memory rather than to the persecution of Jews in Poland. Yasemin Yildiz's conceptualisation of the 'postmonolingual condition' expresses this tension between multilingualism and the 'monolingual paradigm'. The 'postmonolingual' is 'a field of tension in which the monolingual paradigm continues to assert itself and multilingual practices persist or reemerge' (Yildiz 2012, 5). Multilingualism is certainly promising as a progressive textual practice that can challenge the 'relativist' and fundamentally essentialist idea of an exclusively binary relationship between ethnic and linguistic identity (Yildiz 2012, 8–9). But there is no guarantee that this will be its result, not only because the effects of multilingualism depend on the form it takes in particular cases, as Yildiz argues (Yildiz 2012, 25, 29), but also because other textual practices, such as translation, can intervene and alter those effects.

If, therefore, as Brownlie argues, translations enable the creation of transnational memory whilst also displaying 'national inflections' (Brownlie 2016, 15), we must then ask ourselves to what extent the 'shared knowledge of the past and of cultural items' (Brownlie 2016, 123) they create is really shared. As in the recent example of Christopher Nolan's film *Dunkirk*, discussed in the Introduction, the translational aspects of Robert Merle's *Weekend at Zuydcoote* suggest that when a shared history is so very contentious, interlingual translation can function to keep national memories separate as much as to bring them

together. We should therefore be wary of an optimistic, idealised representation of translation as, in Theo Hermans' words, a means of 'overcoming barriers and subduing difference' (Hermans 2007, 150). It may be true, as Richard Kearney suggests in relation to Ricoeur's notion of translation as 'interlinguistic hospitality', that 'it is only when we translate our own wounds into the language of strangers and retranslate the wounds of strangers into our own language that healing and reconciliation can take place' (Kearney 2006, xx). But healing and reconciliation do not necessarily result from translation. Dorota Glowacka's understanding of translation as 'bearing witness' relies on a similarly optimistic equation of translation with an openness to alterity, though she is appropriately cautious when she suggests that '[b]y facilitating passages between languages and positing the goal of communicability, translation thus *has a potential* to resist discriminatory forms of speech and encourage national languages to confront their own political investments and mechanisms of exclusion' (Glowacka 2012, 17, my emphasis). While Ricoeur is surely correct to point out that translation presupposes an initial curiosity about the other (Ricoeur 2006, 32), we must always keep the highly contingent nature of its results in play. As Glowacka says of translation, and as Yildiz argues in relation to multilingualism, it is a question of the *potential* of these textual practices, not their nature. Translation is not inherently ethical. It *can* facilitate engaged, active reading practices that accommodate difference, but does not always do so. It *can* make a significant contribution to a transnational understanding of history and memory, but it must be recognised that since, in Brownlie's words, 'sharedness does not mean sameness of understanding or manifestation' (Brownlie 2016, 108), the possibility of conflict is always present. Ricoeur accepts that in the Freudian 'work of translation', resistance to the foreign doubles curiosity, and that translation is agonistic (Ricoeur 2006, 5, 10). Yet Ricoeur's 'linguistic hospitality' is an *overcoming* of resistance and conflict: the 'work of translation' is an overcoming of fear and hatred of the foreign, the creation of a place 'where the pleasure of dwelling in the other's language is balanced by the pleasure of receiving the foreign word at home, in one's own welcoming house' (Ricoeur 2006, 23, 10). The translations of war fiction studied in this book suggest that the Derridean figure of hospitality is a more apt

description of translation than Ricoeur's 'linguistic hospitality'. Derrida plays with the dual etymological connotations of *hostis* as both host and enemy in order to posit hospitality as an ambivalent structure that always threatens to collapse into its opposite (Derrida and Dufourmantelle 2000, 4, 43–44). Derridean hospitality can therefore accommodate both the potential of translation as openness and the risk of translation as hostility.

As *Translating War* has illustrated, the history of translation contains many examples of both hospitality and hostility. Both are to be found in the literary history of French fiction of the Second World War. *Translating War* has argued that reading for translation is a means of creating a productive and progressive dialogue about that history. Brodzki concludes the final chapter of *Can These Bones Live?* with the following words:

To respond to the vocative dimension of translation, in the spirit of Benjamin and Derrida, is to recognize the primacy and dynamism of difference in language and history. To attend to the effects of translation's call is to pursue a way that is redemptive, but never triumphalist, to find in every turn of phrase the overture to another. (Brodzki 2007 189)

It would be idealistic to imagine that translation per se is redemptive. What is important is the way we *respond* to translation, that we *attend* to its effects: that we read translationally.

References

- Apter, Emily. 2006. *The Translation Zone. A New Comparative Literature*. Princeton/Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Brodzki, Bella. 2007. *Can These Bones Live? Translation, Survival and Cultural Memory*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Brownlie, Siobhan. 2016. *Mapping Memory in Translation*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chesterman, Andrew. 2009. The Name and Nature of Translator Studies. *Hermes – Journal of Language and Communication Studies* 42: 13–22.
- Cohen, Margaret, and Carolyn Denver. 2002. Introduction. In *The Literary Channel: The Inter-National Invention of the Novel*, ed. Margaret Cohen and Carolyn Denver, 1–34. Princeton/Oxford: Princeton University Press.

- Connolly, Cyril. 1945. French-English Cultural Relations. In *The Condemned Playground*, 76–89. London: Routledge.
- Derrida, Jacques, and Anne Dufourmantelle. 2000. *Of Hospitality*. Trans. Rachel Bowlby. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Glowacka, Dorota. 2012. *Disappearing Traces. Holocaust Testimonials, Ethics, and Aesthetics*. Seattle/London: University of Washington Press.
- Hermans, Theo. 2007. *The Conference of the Tongues*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Kearney, Richard. 2006. Introduction: Ricoeur's Philosophy of Translation. In *On Translation*, ed. Paul Ricoeur, vii–vxx. London/New York: Routledge.
- Landsberg, Alison. 2004. *Prosthetic Memory: The Transformation of American Remembrance in the Age of Mass Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Meylaerts, Reine. 2013. The Multiple Lives of Translators. *TTR: Traduction, terminologie, rédaction* 26 (2): 103–128.
- Ricoeur, Paul. 2006. *On Translation*. Trans. Eileen Brennan and with an Introduction by Richard Kearney. London/New York: Routledge.
- Robinson, Douglas. 2001. *Who Translates? Translator Subjectivities Beyond Reason*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Rothberg, Michael. 2000. *Traumatic Realism: The Demands of Holocaust Realism*. Minneapolis/London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Simon, Sherry. 2012. *Cities in Translation: Intersections of Language and Memory*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Wolf, Michaela. 2017. Response to: Sue Vice, Witnessing Complicity in English and French: Tatiana de Rosnay's *Sarah's Key* and *Elle s'appelait Sarah*. In *Translating Holocaust Lives*, ed. Jean Boase-Beier, Peter Davies, Andrea Hammel, and Marion Winters, 69–71. London: Bloomsbury.
- Yildiz, Yasemin. 2012. *Beyond the Mother Tongue: The Postmonolingual Condition*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Appendix 1

Publication History of Joseph Kessel, *L'Armée des ombres* (Chronological Summary)

Date	Publisher/publication	Location	Title	Language	Translator
12 July 1943, continued 13, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, and 22 July	France	London	'L'Evasion'	French	—
July 1943	<i>La Revue du monde libre</i> , No. 7	London	'Ces gens-là sont merveilleux'	French	—
16 August 1943	<i>La France libre</i> , Vol. 6, No. 34	London	'Ces gens-là sont merveilleux'	French	—
Late summer/autumn 1943	<i>Fontaine</i> , Vol. 5, No. 30	Algiers	'Le Champ de tir'	French	—
Autumn 1943	Editions Charlot	Algiers	<i>L'Armée des ombres</i>	French	—
October 1943	<i>Horizon</i> , Vol. 8, No. 46	London	'Over the Water: Philippe Gerbier's Notebook—'	English	Cyril Connolly
31 October 1943	<i>Combat</i>	Algiers	'Il est ici' ^a	French	—
31 October 1943	<i>France-Amérique</i>	New York	'Il est ici' ^a	French	—
November 1943	<i>Horizon</i> , Vol. 8, No. 47	London	'Philippe Gerbier's Notebook – II'	English	Cyril Connolly
7 November 1943	<i>Combat</i>	Algiers	'La Résistance'	French	—
15 November 1943	<i>La France libre</i> , Vol. 7, No. 37	London	'L'Exécution'	French	—
21 November 1943	<i>Combat</i>	Algiers	'Le Champ de tir'	French	—
4 December 1943	<i>La Marseillaise</i>	London, Cairo and Dakar	'Une veillée de l'âge hitlérienne'	French	—
5 December 1943	<i>Combat</i>	Algiers	'L'Exécution'	French	—
26 December 1943	<i>France-Amérique</i>	New York	'Une veillée de l'âge hitlérienne'	French	—
8 January 1944	<i>La Marseillaise</i>	London, Cairo and Dakar	'Les Notes de Philippe Gerbier. Scènes vécues de la Résistance par Joseph Kessel'	French	—

9 and 16 January 1944	<i>Combat</i>	Algiers	'La Fille de Mathilde'	French	–
1 February 1944	<i>L'Arche</i>	Algiers	'Préface à un livre de guerre'	French	–
March 1944	Pantheon Books (Jacques Schiffrin)	New York	<i>L'Armée des ombres</i>	French	–
21 April 1944, continued 22 and 25 April and 4 May	<i>France</i>	London	'Embarquement pour Gibraltar'	French	–
June 1944	Knopf	New York	<i>Army of Shadows</i>	English	Haakon Chevalier
November/December 1944	Cresset Press	London	<i>Army of Shadows</i>	English	Haakon Chevalier
7 December 1944	<i>Gavroche</i>	Paris	'Champ de tir'	French	–
February 1945	Éditions Penguin	London	<i>L'Armée des ombres</i>	French	–
1945	<i>French Writing on English Soil</i> (Sylvan Press)	London	'Wonderful People' and 'The Execution'	English	J. G. Weightman
Autumn 1945	Charlot/Julliard	Paris	<i>L'Armée des ombres</i>	French	–
1946	<i>La République du Silence</i> (Harcourt, Brace and Company)	New York	'L'Execution' and 'Le Champ de tir'	French	–
1947	<i>The Republic of Silence</i> (Harcourt, Brace and Company)	New York	'The Execution' and 'The Rifle Range'	English	Haakon Chevalier
2017	Contra Mundum Press	New York, London and Melbourne	<i>Army of Shadows</i>	English	Rainer J. Hanshe

^aNot included in full published version of the novel

Appendix 2

The Translators

Becker, Stephen (André Schwarz-Bart, *The Last of the Just*, 1961)

Stephen Becker (1927–1999) was a successful American popular novelist and teacher who wrote adventure stories. He was a graduate of Harvard and also studied in China and France. On the publication of *The Season of the Stranger*, set in China, the *Times Literary Supplement* of 31 August 1951 remarked that the 24-year-old Becker ‘has been hailed in America as a major discovery’. Becker would go on to have a long career as a writer and translator, notably with his Far East Trilogy comprising *The Chinese Bandit* (1975), *The Last Mandarin* (1979), and *The Blue-Eyed Shan* (1982). He translated Elie Wiesel (*The Town Beyond the Wall*, 1967; *The Forgotten*, 1995), Romain Gary (*The Colours of Day*, 1953), and André Malraux (*The Conquerors*, 1976).

Chevalier, Haakon (Joseph Kessel, *Army of Shadows*, 1944)

Haakon Chevalier (1901–1985), who was of French and Norwegian descent, was an academic, translator and novelist who began his career at

the University of California, Berkeley, in the 1920s. Committed to left-wing politics, he had an academic interest in contemporary French committed literature, particularly the work of André Malraux. He translated a large number of contemporary French novels, including works by André Malraux, Louis Aragon, Salvador Dalí, Vladimir Pozner, André Maurois, Denis de Rougemont, and Vercors. He published his first novel, *For Us the Living*, in 1949. After becoming embroiled in the question of the nuclear scientist Robert J. Oppenheimer's possible connections with the Soviets, Chevalier settled in France in 1950. He later published two works based on the Oppenheimer story: *The Man Who Would Be God* (1959) and *Oppenheimer, the Story of a Friendship* (1965).

Connolly, Cyril (Extracts from Joseph Kessel, *Army of Shadows*, 1943)

The literary critic, essayist, and publisher Cyril Connolly (1903–74) played a significant role in bringing contemporary French literature to English readers in the middle years of the twentieth century. His literary influential journal *Horizon*, which appeared from late 1939 to early 1950, published the work of the leading contemporary French writers in English translation and many essays by British critics on the French literary scene. Connolly was the first English translator of Vercors' *Le Silence de la mer* and was awarded the Legion of Honour in recognition of his support for French writers during the war.

de Mauny, Erik (Francis Ambrière, *The Exiled*, 1951)

An English-born writer, critic, and journalist of French descent, Erik de Mauny (1920–97) would become famous in the 1960s as BBC's first post-war resident correspondent in Moscow. De Mauny, who had a degree in Russian, was a prolific translator from French in the 1950s and 1960s, translating both works of fiction and of literary criticism. As well as translating Sartre's *Portrait of the Anti-Semite* in 1948 and Irène Némirovsky's *Life of Chekhov* in 1950, he also translated works by the poet Pierre Emmanuel and the novelist André Chamson.

Gilbert, Stewart (Albert Camus, *The Plague*, 1948)

Stewart Gilbert (1883–1969) became a prolific translator from French after serving in the Civil Service in India and as a judge in Burma. As well as works by Camus, Sartre, Malraux, and others, he assisted in the translation of James Joyce's *Ulysses* and produced the first full English translation of Roger Martin du Gard's eight-volume *roman-fleuve*, *The Thibaults*, published 1939–41.

Golfing, Francis (Elsa Triolet, *A Fine of Two Hundred Francs*, 1947)

Born in Vienna, Francis Golfing (1910–2012) emigrated to the USA in 1941, where he married the poet Barbara Gibbs. He was a poet, artist, and academic as well as a translator and was fluent in German, Spanish, Italian, and French. In 1979, he published a volume of poetry in translation from French, German, Italian, and Spanish by various authors, entitled *Likenesses*. He also translated the poetry and prose of the German poet Johannes Bobrowski and translated Nietzsche's *The Birth of Tragedy* and *On The Genealogy of Morals*.

Hopkins, Gerard (Jean-Paul Sartre, *Iron in the Soul*, 1950)

Gerard Hopkins (1892–1961) was a nephew of the poet Gerard Manley Hopkins. An author and translator, he translated Roger Vailland's *Drôle de jeu* as *Playing With Fire* (1948), Marc Bloch's *Strange Defeat* (1949), Flaubert's *Madame Bovary* (1948), Zola's *The Dram Shop* (1951), and works by, amongst many others, Proust, Baudelaire, Balzac, Jules Romains, André Maurois, François Mauriac, and Romain Gary.

Moyse, Yvonne and Senhouse, Roger (Simone de Beauvoir, *The Blood of Others*, 1948)

Roger Senhouse (1899–1970) was associated with the Bloomsbury group and was part owner of the publishing house Secker & Warburg, which he and Fredric Warburg purchased from Martin Secker in 1935. In the 1950s, the firm published an edition of the works of Colette for which Senhouse translated various novels. Yvonne Moyse (dates

unknown) was an editor and author as well as a translator: she published a novel entitled *The Fighting Fantastic* in 1929. Moyse and Senhouse also translated Beauvoir's *She Came to Stay* (1949) and David Rousset's *L'Univers concentrationnaire* as *A World Apart...* in 1951.

Rebillon-Lambley, Kathleen (Robert Merle, *Weekend at Zuydcoote*, 1950)

Kathleen Rebillon-Lambley (dates unknown) was an academic early modernist. She published *The Teaching and Cultivation of the French Language in England during Tudor and Stuart Times* with Manchester University Press in 1920 and contributed an essay on 'Shakespeare's Knowledge of French' to a 1932 Festschrift for Professor Léon Emile Kastner, professor of French language and literature at the University of Manchester, entitled *A Miscellany of Studies in Romance Languages and Literatures*. In this period she also began translating French fiction, mostly of the nineteenth century. She published a collection of translated French short stories in 1933 for Oxford University Press's Worlds' Classics series, and published Balzac's *La Grande Bretèche* as *Portrait of a Lady* in 1947.

Sutton, Eric (Jean-Paul Sartre, *The Age of Reason*, 1947, and *The Reprieve*, 1947)

Eric Sutton (dates unknown) was a prolific translator from French, German, and Italian who began his career in the 1920s. He translated the work of many important twentieth-century writers including André Maurois, François Mauriac, Thomas, and Heinrich Mann and Hans Fallada.

Waley, Daniel Philip and Waley, Pamela (Jean-Louis Bory, *French Village*, 1948)

Daniel Philip Waley (1921–2017) and Pamela Joan Griffiths (1921–2017) married in 1945. Daniel graduated from King's College, Cambridge, in 1946 and in 1949 would take up a post as a lecturer in Medieval History at the London School of Economics. He became a well-known and highly

respected medievalist and held a professorship at the LSE in the early 1970s. He subsequently became keeper of manuscripts at the British Museum and the British Library. Pamela Joan Waley researched and taught Hispanic Studies at Westfield College, University of London, and translated from Italian, Spanish, and Catalan. Bory's novel appears to be the couple's only literary translation and their only translation from French.

Weightman, John George (Extracts from Joseph Kessel, *Army of Shadows*, 1945)

J. G. Weightman (1915–2004) was an academic, broadcaster, journalist, and translator. After gaining a degree in French from King's College, Newcastle, he joined the BBC World Service in 1939 as a translator and newsreader, and made a significant contribution to the BBC's French-Language broadcasting during the war. He worked for the BBC in Paris after the war, which allowed him to bring the works of contemporary French writers and intellectuals to British audiences. He took up a lectureship at King's College, London in 1950 and a chair in French language and literature at Westfield College in 1963. With his wife Doreen, he was a three-time winner of the Scott Moncrieff Prize for translation (Jean Guéhenno, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, (1967); Claude Levi-Strauss, *From Honey to Ashes* and *Tristes Tropiques* (1974); Claude Levi-Strauss, *The Origin of Table Manners* (1979)).

Wiles, Peter (Anna Langfus, *The Whole Land Brimstone* (1962) and *The Lost Shore* (1963))

Peter Wiles (dates unknown; not to be confused with his contemporary, the economist and LSE professor Peter John de la Fosse Wiles) was listed in the *Times Literary Supplement* of 14 January 1965 as one of Secker and Warburg's 'distinguished translators'. The following year, he won the Scott Moncrieff Prize for his translation of Roger Vailland's *A Young Trout* (1966), and, in 1967, was awarded an Arts Council Bursars of the State grant for translation. He translated a 1960 Resistance novel by Gil Buhet as *Mamizelle Bon Voyage* (1960), Pitor Rawicz's Holocaust novel *Blood for*

the Sky (1964; reprinted in a revised version by Anthony Rudolf in 2004) and the Vichy collaborator Jacques Benoist-Méchin's *Sixty Days that Shook the West: The Fall of France, 1940* (1963). He also translated works by, amongst others, Henry de Montherlant, Claude Roy, Françoise Sagan, and Jean Lacouture. His translations were frequently reviewed in the *Times Literary Supplement*.

Wydebruck, Nora (Jean-Louis Curtis, *The Forests of the Night*, 1950)

Nora Wydenbruck (1894–1959) had a mixed linguistic and cultural background. She was born in London in the 1890s to Austrian parents: her father, Christoph Anton Graf von Wydenbruck, who married Countess Marie von Fugger-Babenhausen, was at this time first secretary of the Austrian embassy. Wydenbruck grew up speaking German, English, and French and lived in Austria before emigrating to London in 1926 where she married the artist Alfons Purtscher. The couple took British citizenship in 1933. Wydebruck corresponded with the poet Rainer Maria Rilke, who was known to her husband. She published her own poetry and woodcuts as well as works of historical biography and fiction and an autobiography entitled *My Two Worlds* (1956). She translated Rilke and Paul Morand into English, T. S. Eliot into German, and Graham Greene and Vita Sackville-West into French.

Index¹

A

Ambrière, Francis, 167, 168,
195–203, 206, 207, 272, 284
Aragon, Louis, 75, 90, 93, 140, 169,
170, 172, 284
Aron, Raymond, 73, 87
Association des Français de Grande-
Bretagne, 74
Aubrac, Lucy, 49
Audisio, Gabriel, 44, 45
Auschwitz, 1, 3, 5, 12, 225–227,
234, 241–244

B

Baron, Alexander, 132, 136, 179
Bates, H.E., 136, 157n10
BBC, 19, 51, 52, 54, 74, 78, 79, 84,
85, 167, 189, 199, 215, 220,
232

Beauvoir, Simone de, 15, 95, 119,
121, 132, 142–147, 285,
286
Becker, Stephen, 223, 283
Bernstein, André, 88
Blake, William, 184
Bory, Jean-Louis, 141, 167, 168,
174–180, 184, 186–188, 194,
205, 272, 287
Bottome, Phyllis, 82
Bourdieu, Pierre, 31, 33, 270
Bowen, Elizabeth, 132, 136

C

Camus, Albert, 15, 44–46, 95, 132,
140–147, 285
Celan, Paul, 229, 231
Censorship, 84, 87, 101, 232
Chant des partisans, 37, 47, 167

¹Note: Page numbers followed by ‘n’ refer to notes.

- Charlot, Edmond
 publishes *L'Armée des ombres*, 21,
 30, 37, 54, 55, 69, 70, 268
 publishing activities in Algiers, 30,
 31, 44–49, 70, 71, 75, 89, 104
 publishing activities in Paris,
 48–49, 57, 102, 133
- Chevalier, Haakon, 34, 69, 79, 81,
 87–102, 144, 171, 269–270,
 283, 284
- Churchill, Winston, 4, 53, 54, 126,
 128, 188, 189
- Collaboration, 29, 42, 104, 121,
 128, 133, 136, 143, 147, 167,
 169, 176, 184, 198, 200
- Comert, Pierre, 73, 87
- Communism, 44, 49, 50, 93, 101,
 129, 140–141, 145, 148,
 169–175, 183, 224, 272
- Connolly, Cyril, 70, 74, 75, 81, 82,
 86, 93, 97, 103, 105n15,
 106n21, 121, 128, 130–137,
 139, 144, 146, 147, 150, 151,
 153, 178–180, 207, 269, 271,
 272, 284
- Cultural memory, 7, 10, 16, 18, 19,
 166–169, 171, 204, 207
- Cultural translation, 8
- Curtis, Jean-Louis, 75, 141, 153–154,
 167, 180–187, 190, 204, 205,
 219–222, 236, 272, 288
- D**
- Dali, Salvador, 93, 284
- de Gaulle, General Charles, 35–38,
 42, 43, 52–54, 72–74, 90–92,
 99, 102, 107n31, 119, 142,
 147, 149, 183, 198
- Derrida, Jacques, 43, 55, 56, 74, 89,
 154, 234, 276
- Dobson, Dennis, 168, 177–180,
 186
- Druon, Maurice, 37, 103, 167,
 208n1
- Dunkirk, 2, 3, 5, 6, 19, 36,
 126–127, 136, 167, 187–195,
 199–200, 206–207, 272
- Duras, Marguerite, 141
- E**
- École d'Alger*, 44, 46
- Editions de Minuit, 34, 48, 133, 170
- Ehrenbourg, Ilya, 103
- Eichmann trial, 125, 226
- Eliot, T. S., 73, 105n12, 237, 288
- Eluard, Paul, 75
- F**
- Fouchet, Max-Pol, 45, 47
- Frank, Anne, 125, 225
- Fry, Varian, 88, 89
- G**
- Gascar, Pierre, 225
- Gautier, Jean-Jacques, 167
- Gide, André, 93, 121, 147
- Gilbert, Stewart, 146, 285
- Golffing, Francis, 171–172, 285
- Gombault, Charles, 37, 73, 74, 87,
 105n13
- Goncourt prize, 1, 4, 5, 20, 21, 133,
 136, 139, 141–143, 148, 156,
 166–174, 186–195, 204–208,
 218, 223–226, 237, 249, 256

Green, Henry, 132, 136
 Grenier, Jean, 44
 Guez, Olivier, 1, 3, 4

H

Haenel, Yannick, 216, 236
 Henriot, Philippe, 78, 79
 Holocaust, 5, 6, 12–14, 16, 20, 22,
 82, 124, 128, 154, 215–218,
 221, 223–239, 244–246, 249,
 250, 252–255, 273
 Hopkins, Gerard, 146, 285
 Hospitality, 7, 19, 21, 30, 31,
 39–44, 51, 55–57, 67, 68,
 73–75, 77–79, 81, 87, 89, 93,
 98, 103, 104, 230, 235, 244,
 267, 268, 275, 276

I

Ikor, Roger, 225
 Institut français (French Institute),
 73

J

Jameson, Margaret Storm, 73, 157n10
 Jardin, Pascal, 29, 30, 35, 56

K

Karski, Jan, 82, 215–218, 225, 232,
 236
 Kessel, Joseph, 170, 197
 correspondence with Penguin, 71,
 72
L'Armée des ombres, 5, 18, 20, 21,
 30–31, 33–38, 46, 49–57,

122, 141, 170, 197, 268–269,
 283, 287

preface to John Hersey's *La
 Muraille*, 225
 presence in American wartime
 press, 98–102
 presence in London wartime
 press, 76, 83–87, 151,
 268–269
 returns to France, 102
 travels to America, 87–88
 war experiences, 35–38, 47, 48
 Knopf, Alfred and Blanche, 93, 95,
 100
 Koestler, Arthur, 76, 82, 83, 103,
 138, 147, 215, 218, 222

L

Labarthe, André, 73, 87
 Langfus, Anna, 6, 22, 218, 223–227,
 229, 236–239, 246–254, 256,
 273–274, 287
 Lanzmann, Claude, 215–218
 Lazareff, Pierre, 36
 Lehmann, John, 121, 130, 137, 138,
 146, 150–152, 155, 168, 186,
 191, 207
 Levi, Primo, 231, 233, 234
 Lévy, Louis, 73, 87
 Littell, Jonathan, *Les Bienveillantes*, 1,
 4

M

Mailer, Norman, 194–195
 Malraux, André, 92, 93, 147, 284,
 285
 Mauny, Erik de, 198–201, 284

Mauriac, François, 234, 285, 286
 Maurois, André, 93, 284–286
 Médéric-Védy, Gilbert (Jacques Médéric), 49, 99–100
 Melville, Jean-Pierre, 34, 156n1
 Merle, Robert, 5, 127, 153–154, 167, 168, 187–195, 205–208, 219–222, 225, 235–238, 272, 274, 286
 Ministry of Information (MoI), 74, 75, 83, 86, 87
 Morgan, Charles, 73
 Moysse, Yvonne, 156n8, 285, 286

N

Némirovsky, Irène, 150, 284
 Nolan, Christopher, 2–5, 189, 274
Nouveau roman, 15, 121, 141

O

Operation Torch (Allied North African landings), 34, 39, 41, 42
 Oppenheimer, Robert, 94–95, 270, 284

P

Penguin publishers, 69, 71, 103, 121, 130, 137, 138, 152, 216, 269
 Pétain, Marshall Philippe, 36, 54, 87, 90, 92, 121, 174, 184, 200
 Political Warfare Executive (PWE), 78–79, 81, 83
 Priestley, J. B., 189, 190

Propaganda, 5, 19, 35, 47, 51, 52, 78–86, 131, 135, 197, 200
 Prosthetic memory, 7, 21, 166, 203–208, 271–273

R

Rebillon-Lambley, Kathleen, 191–195, 286
 Renault, Gilbert (Colonel Rémy), 49
 Resistance
 Edmond Charlot's participation in, 46, 47, 55
 Free French, 21, 35, 37, 38, 42, 43, 52–54, 76–79, 92, 95, 148, 183–184, 198, 272
 French interior Resistance, 19, 21, 30, 33, 35, 38, 50–57, 71, 91, 92, 95, 99–101, 147, 167, 169, 171, 174–177, 183–184, 197–201, 223, 227, 272
 Joseph Kessel's participation in, 34, 35, 37
 Polish resistance, 223, 244, 248, 250–252
 resistance memory, 12, 38, 140–143, 227
 resistance publications in London, 72–76
 resistance writing, 30, 33, 35, 43, 47, 49, 53, 55, 91, 96, 97, 102–104, 119, 122, 131, 133, 140, 145, 169, 184, 220
 Ricoeur, Paul, 234, 273–276
 Robbe-Grillet, Alain, 15, 141
 Roblès, Emmanuel, 44, 46
 Romains, Jules, 93, 285

Roosevelt, Franklin D., 90
 Rougemont, Denis de, 93, 284
 Roy, Jules, 47

S

Sarraute, Natalie, 15
 Sartre, Jean-Paul, 15, 76, 80, 95,
 121, 132, 133, 140–147, 187,
 199, 284, 285
 Schiffrin, Jacques, 69, 88–92, 95, 98,
 99, 103, 268
 Schwarz-Bart, André, 6, 22, 218,
 223–232, 236–246, 254–256,
 273–274, 283
 Scott, Walter, 124
 Semprun, Jorge, 233, 234
 Senhouse, Roger, 156n8, 285, 286
 Simon, Claude, 141
 Sitwell, Osbert, 82
 Soupault, Philippe, 45
 Spender, Stephen, 134, 135, 138, 139,
 144, 147, 151, 179, 187, 207
 Sutton, Eric, 145, 156n9, 286

T

Tabouis, Geneviève, 98–99
 Tolstoy, Leo, 123, 135, 144, 150,
 236, 256
 Transcultural memory, 16, 124–127,
 166, 169–171, 227

Translingualism, 223, 229, 247, 249,
 254, 256, 273
 Traumatic realism (Rothberg), 239,
 244–246, 254, 255, 273
 Triolet, Elsa, 55, 122, 140, 167–178,
 188, 192, 205, 218, 220–222,
 272, 285

V

Vailland, Roger, 140, 141, 285,
 287
 Vercors, 30, 34, 47, 75, 90,
 102–104, 122, 167, 284
 Vuillard, Eric, 1, 3, 4

W

Waley, Daniel, 177–180, 286
 Waley, Pamela, 177–178, 287
 Waugh, Evelyn, 132, 136, 185, 194
 Weightman, J. G., 71, 78–82, 93,
 96, 102, 151, 287
 Wiesel, Elie, 225, 229–231, 233,
 234
 Wiles, Peter, 224, 287
 Wolf, Kurt, 89
 Wydenbruck, Nora, 185–187, 288

Z

Zola, Emile, 135, 144, 285