

NATIONAL SOLIDARITY, TOXIC NATIONALISM, EUROPEAN INNER EDGES: STENDHAL AND TOLSTOY IN MALRAUX'S *LES NOYERS DE L'ALTENBURG* AND LAMPEDUSA'S *IL GATTOPARDO*

John Burt Foster

George Mason University

317

In international surveys of broadly Western fiction from (say) Proust, Joyce, Faulkner, and Kafka to Nabokov, Calvino, García Márquez, and Coetzee, criticism tends to neglect figures whose work does not fit into a modernism-to-postmodern trajectory and who seem, as well, to have lacked a steady commitment to the novel. Such is the case with the two authors at the heart of this essay, André Malraux (1901-76) and Giuseppe di Lampedusa (1896-1957), whose fiction, though widely read and certainly worthy of serious attention, seems neither as innovative nor as influential as this twentieth-century mainstream. Given their efforts to recapture the feel of particular times and places, their emphasis on notable public events set in their historical context, and their less clearly adventurous narrative methods, it might be tempting to view them as neorealist throwbacks to the nineteenth century, notwithstanding Malraux's close ties to surrealism and to modern painting or Lampedusa's interest in psychoanalysis.

Lampedusa, moreover, waited until his final years to start writing fiction. His one novel *Il Gattopardo* (*The Leopard*, 1958) only appeared after his death, when it became a best-seller in Italy and a critical success. If Malraux, by contrast, gained a major reputation with the five novels from *Les Conquérants* (*The Conquerors*, 1928) to *L'Espoir* (*Man's Hope*, 1937), he eventually turned almost exclusively to politics, art criticism, and autobiography. He finished no more works of fiction, with *Les Noyers de l'Altenburg* (*The Walnut Trees of Altenburg*, 1943) representing just a first, severely

truncated part of a larger project to which Malraux never returned after World War II.¹

Despite this idiosyncratic status as final, even unique products of authors who were not career novelists, both *Les Noyers* and *Il Gattopardo* gain a new luster in light of current interest in the links between nationhood and the novel, associated above all with the work of Benedict Anderson. Writing mainly (though not exclusively) from a Western perspective rather than a postcolonial one, Malraux and Lampedusa engage with these issues by forcefully accentuating the negative, even toxic potential of national ideals in the first half of the twentieth century, once they entered the crucible of European fascism and total war. Yet at the same time, given both authors' marked allegiances to nineteenth-century fiction, they put this contemporary history into broader perspective by harking back to aspirations from that earlier period. Here a key role is played by allusions and other intertextual links to Stendhal's *La Chartreuse de Parme* (*The Charterhouse of Parma*, 1839) and Tolstoy's *Voyna i Mir* (*War and Peace*, 1867), with their hopeful glimpses of national feeling as a positive, life-enhancing force of communal solidarity. In their distinctive ways, therefore, Lampedusa and Malraux confirm the dual attitude toward the nation articulated so forcefully on the eve of World War II in W.H. Auden's elegy to William Butler Yeats, himself no stranger to the peaks and craters of national feeling: "And the living nations wait, / Each sequestered in its hate" (243). "Living" nationality can be a vital and healthy affirmation of human sociability; but "sequestered in...hate" it can cut people off from each other, even poison the very sources of fellow feeling.² In the last analysis, however, even as Malraux's and Lampedusa's novels dramatize this sharp duality by highlighting special borderline situations in the European system of nation-states, they suggest affinities between these "inner edges" of Europe and its imperial "outer edge." They thus serve to promote dialogue between comparative literature in a traditionally Eurocentric guise and the wider world of postcolonial studies.

★ ★ ★

To move from Lampedusa and Malraux back to Stendhal and Tolstoy retraces an intergenerational, cross-cultural itinerary which, in political-historical terms, juxtaposes two symbolic decades that epitomize sharply contrasting attitudes toward the nation-state. In the more distant nineteenth-century past, there are the triumphant 1860s, which can be treated as shorthand for the twelve-year period of European nation-formation running from the unification of most of Italy in 1859-60 to the founding of Bismarck's German Empire in 1871. On a broader, intercontinental scale, this long decade might also extend to the Meiji Restoration in Japan and definitely applies to what could be called the reunification of the United States after the Civil War. In the more recent past, however, there is the nationalistic exclusivity and rising

aggressiveness of the 1930s, still powerfully present for Lampedusa as he wrote *Il Gattopardo* in the 1950s. The key events of this decade would include the impotence and collapse of the League of Nations and, more pointedly, the Italian and German dictatorships that offered such sinister counterstatements to the national ideals of the 1860s. Here again we need to think of a long decade since, as we know, it was only in the early forties—at the very time when Malraux wrote his fragment of a novel—that the agonies of the thirties plumbed the depths.

Within this historical contrast, one sees how Malraux and Lampedusa could understand Stendhal's and Tolstoy's novels as complementary counterparts in memorably expressing the triumphant mood of the sixties. That decade, of course, was the time when Tolstoy actually wrote *War and Peace*; but there is good reason to associate the *Chartreuse* with those years as well, despite its composition in 1838. After all, Stendhal repeatedly insisted that he wrote for future generations, the first of which can reasonably be identified with the 1860s. Indeed, even though the *Chartreuse* dwells extensively on the frustrations of Italian patriotism after the Congress of Vienna, it includes vivid intimations of the urge for independence and unity that would be realized in 1859 and later.

319

Moreover, the well-known, explicit connection between Tolstoy's and Stendhal's novels bears directly on issues of national solidarity. Stendhal's brilliant chapters on the misadventures of his hero Fabrizio del Dongo³ at Waterloo helped inspire the battle scenes in *War and Peace*, a novel which responds, in Tolstoy's notoriously independent and opinionated way, to the nation building of the sixties. For Tolstoy, as he looked back from this decade at the early nineteenth century, Napoleon's defeat in Russia represented a victory for incipient national sentiment on the part of the Russian people, not an early portent of the Restoration mentality instituted in Vienna and upheld by the Holy Alliance. In this spirit, when he initiated the historical-essayistic treatises midway through *War and Peace* that have annoyed or disappointed so many readers, Tolstoy could state, "Tsar'—est' rab istorii" ("A king is history's slave.") Real history he could then define, in opposition to the discredited dynastic outlook, as "bessoznatel'naia, obshchaia, roevaia zhizn' chelovechestva" ("the unconscious, general, hive life of mankind"), that came to the fore in Russian resistance to Napoleon's Grand Army (*Sobranie* 6:11/*War* 537).⁴ In a more purely narrative mode, Tolstoy's hero Pierre Bezukhov seems by the end of the novel to be headed toward participation in the Decembrist revolt of 1825, Tolstoy's original subject for the novel that eventually became *War and Peace*.⁵ This failed attempt to liberalize the autocracy could, in turn, be understood as a harbinger for the still wider sense of possible nationhood, or "general hive life," implicit in the liberation of the serfs in 1861, shortly before Tolstoy began writing in earnest.

It is true, of course, that Stendhal was generally an admirer of Napoleon while Tolstoy was his relentless critic, yet even here there are intriguing affinities between their two novels. Thus Stendhal's personal experience of defeat in the Emperor's service did not actually take place at Waterloo but during the Russian campaign of

1812 that brings the military action of *War and Peace* to an end. And the first sentence of Tolstoy's novel reports a snide comment about Napoleon that alludes to his Italian background (even if Napoleon's birth came a year after Corsica's transfer from Genoa to France), which points up the very factor that fired Fabrizio's Bonapartism, and Stendhal's as well.⁶ Indeed, Napoleon's liminal position between France and Italy is a reverse image of Stendhal's own transcultural identity, which later supported Lampedusa's sense that the *Chartreuse* was essentially an Italian novel. As a Frenchman from Grenoble, Stendhal grew up on a road to Italy, eventually lived in that country for many years, and for his burial in Paris even ordered that his gravestone be italianized by replacing his French name of "Henri Beyle" with "Arrigo Beyle, Milanese."

Apart from their oblique but meaningful connections with the triumphant sixties, therefore, *War and Peace* and the *Chartreuse* complement each other very explicitly in their contrasting treatments of Napoleon. That the two topics are in fact closely related is shown by Stendhal's and Tolstoy's shared emphasis on Napoleon's ability to spark sublime moments of national feeling that anticipate the later period of nation building. For Stendhal he did so by direct action—not in France, however, but in northern Italy, where his victories as a young general unleashed the delirious summer of freedom that Stendhal evokes so enthusiastically in Chapter I of the *Chartreuse*. Contrary to his usual practice, this chapter bears the meaningful (and celebratory) title of "Milan en 1796." For Tolstoy the equivalent upsurge of national sentiment occurred, instead, in his own country's reaction *against* Napoleon. Thus the inhabitants of Moscow, in what the author presents as a spontaneous upsurge of popular feeling, prefer to let their city burn rather than submit to the older emperor's invading army. In Moscow as in Milan, accordingly, Napoleon's presence was the catalyst that suggested the potential for a fuller sense of nationhood to Stendhal and Tolstoy.

But Napoleon had this impact in two very different social environments, since Italy in the first half of the nineteenth century was a stateless nation, unlike the Russia of that time, which was a nationless state.⁷ In these complementary failures to achieve full nationhood, Italy and Russia differed markedly from post-1789 France, the country usually seen as the model for the modern nation-state, at least in Europe (e.g. Wiebe 12, 45-47). Since common usage tends to make "nation" and "state" into synonyms, historian Hugh Seton-Watson's distinction is a useful one: "A state is a legal and political organization...A nation is a community of people" (1). States that are not yet nations would thus be political units whose inhabitants lack a broad-based, deeply felt awareness of shared citizenship due to sharp divisions in language, religion, and/or social status. The language disputes and irredentist claims that marked the last years of the Habsburg Empire are probably the clearest example of this option; but Tolstoy's Russia, with its sharp ethnic and religious divisions and its newly emancipated serfs, is also an excellent case in point.⁸ In nations that lack states, however, a people's aspirations for a broader, more cohesive national com-

munity conflict with a political reality of mixed loyalties, limited civic horizons, and seemingly arbitrary jurisdictions. Here Stendhal's picture of Italy before unification, with its pendulum swings between French and Austrian influence, its multitude of jealously guarded frontiers, and its absurdly vainglorious princelings, is relevant; and of course a similar situation prevailed in large areas of Germany in the same period.

Italy's condition of stateless nationhood informs an apparently casual but ultimately decisive event in Chapter 11 of the *Chartreuse*. Fabrizio by this point seems to have lived down the disgrace of his youthful enthusiasm for Napoleon, but his passive acquiescence in the realities of Restoration Italy ends abruptly when he scuffles with Giletti, a traveling actor who is his rival for the affections of Marietta, an actress in the same company. When Fabrizio kills the man in self-defense, he flees the Principality of Parma, an act whose prudence soon becomes apparent when the incident is used against him for political purposes. Taking the actor's passport the better to conceal his identity, he crosses the Po into what was then Austrian territory and eventually makes his roundabout way to Bologna. But his adventure begins with an oddly detailed scene that must owe some of its power to Stendhal's having been declared *persona non grata* in Austrian territory many years earlier, and thus kept from making the same border-crossing in real life (as well as ever returning to his beloved Milan). In this scene Fabrizio must undergo routine questioning from the border guards, thus emphasizing the lived experience of Italy's political divisions; and though he does succeed in evading capture on this occasion, the respite turns out to be only temporary. Against the dead weight of Metternich's borders and the anti-national, dynastic statelets that they demarcate, even his spirit eventually flags, despite its affinities with the freer, even anarchic and excessive energies of Renaissance Italy.⁹ He will later return to Parma and to prison, not just once but twice, the second time voluntarily as a result of his overmastering love for Clélia Conti. Though Clélia is herself a patriot, the public, political dimensions of Fabrizio's story recede before the complexities of the inner life and his quest for happiness in love.

321

Italy's situation of stateless nationhood also stifles the untapped energies that in Stendhal's ebullient narrative seem to unite all Italians of good will. Both as a fugitive and later as a prisoner, an openhearted young nobleman like Fabrizio never fails to win the loyalty of commoners who are always ready to provide him with enthusiastic aid. Similar, though less frequent moments of deeply felt national solidarity or just plain humanity (which Stendhal, however, seems to consider a national trait of the Italians in contrast to the French) also mark the other major characters in the *Chartreuse*. Thus when Fabrizio's doting and irrepressible aunt Gina celebrates her revenge on Ernesto IV, the Prince of Parma responsible for her nephew's imprisonment, she does so with a party that unites the people on her estate in a spirit of extravagant festivity that recalls the delirium of Milan in 1796. Fabrizio's great love Clélia not only resembles him in winning the sympathy of servants and of pious, unworldly clerics, but like him is also deeply estranged from her father. But whereas

his father was an Old Regime Austrian loyalist, hers is a supposed liberal corrupted by power; Fabio Conti has in fact become the commandant of the redoubtable Farnese Tower, whose dungeons have long been the scourge of Parma's patriots. Even Count Mosca, Gina's lover and the prime minister of Parma, continues to cherish memories of his freer youth, pulls strings whenever possible to soften the oppression of the people, and manages the affairs of state so adroitly that the novel can end with a hyperbolic flourish, claiming that at long last "Les prisons de Parme étaient vides" ("The prisons of Parma were empty").

322 With *War and Peace* national aspirations emerge from the contrasting setting of a nationless state, an option that again is underlined with a border crossing, in this case one that is portrayed as geocultural as well as political. Near the end of the novel, in the wake of Napoleon's disastrous headlong retreat from Moscow, Tsar Alexander I orders the Russian army over the border in pursuit. "Vy spasli ne odnu Rossiui; vy spasli Evropu" ("You have not only saved Russia, you have saved Europe!") he tells his officers (7:230/1223). For Tolstoy, however, the decision to continue the campaign abroad violates the spirit of a war that, by this time, has deepened into a popular struggle of national defense. The personification of this war is General Kutuzov, whose wise passivity contrasts with Napoleon's impetuous activism, and who understands the advantages of Russia's vast spaces and harsh climate. With the crossing of the Russian border, therefore, Tolstoy can comment, again in the didactic manner of the historical asides that increasingly punctuate *War and Peace*, "Predstavitelii narodnoi voyny nichego ne ostavalos', krome smerti. I on umer" ("Nothing remained for the representative of the national war but to die, and Kutuzov died") (7:232/1224). In thus contrasting Alexander to his general, Tolstoy has pointed up Russia's position at the edge of Europe, perhaps even outside its geographical and cultural sphere.¹⁰ This ambiguity has nonetheless not prevented many Western readers of *War and Peace* from saluting it as a masterpiece of the Western canon, a judgment that mainly pays tribute to Tolstoy's genius but probably also reflects the novel's attractive vision of national solidarity, which as this incident suggests resists the impulse to dominate other nations. National feeling as portrayed in this novel need not seem threatening to readers from elsewhere.

If the tsar's disregard for his general suggests a state apparatus blind to powerful forces astir in the nation, similar splits between the two spheres, or (less abstractly) between the court and the people, mark many of the novel's personal dramas. One thinks, at the highest social levels, of the Tsar's top-down reformist minister Speransky and of the public-spirited Prince Andrey Bolkonsky's eventual disillusionment with him. There is also the marked contrast between the Petersburg and Moscow-based gentry, personified respectively by the corrupt, court-society Kuragins and the more down-to-earth Rostovs, whose daughter Natasha may attend grand balls but whose skill in peasant dances reveals sympathies more worthy of a national heroine.

At a level which at least potentially covers the nation as a whole and not just the gentry, we have Princess Mary's efforts to make common cause with her uncompre-

hending serfs, when the French invasion nears the Bolkonsky family estate after her father's death. Even more decisive is Pierre's fascination, while a prisoner of war, with his fellow prisoner, the peasant Platon Karatayev. At such moments the alienation from state and court of the most admirable gentry characters combines with a yearning for solidarity with the people to suggest the possibility for a broader sense of nationhood. Yet this yearning remains largely unrequited. Karataev dies during the French retreat, leaving Pierre with only his dream of the globe and its mystic intimation of unity: "Globus etot byl zhivoi, kolebliushchiisia shar, ne imeiushchii razmerov. Vsia poverkhnost' shara sostoiala iz kapel', plotno szhatykh mezhdu soboi. I kapli eti vse dvigalis', peremeshchalis'..." ("This globe was alive—a vibrating ball without fixed dimensions. Its whole surface consisted of drops closely pressed together, and all these drops moved and changed places...") (7:181-82/941). The experience of Princess Mary, the major character in the novel with the most pronounced spiritual nature, is even more difficult; she fails to sway the peasants, who lack all understanding of the national emergency and can only be put to rights by Nicholas Rostov, with his master's habit of firm command. Yet when Mary and Nicholas eventually marry, her influence does come to moderate his behavior, and Nicholas's estate becomes a microcosm of what a national community might be at its best: "...dolgo posle ego smerti v narode khranilas' nabozhnaia pamiat' ob ego upravleniia. 'Khoziain byl... Napered muzhitskoe, a potom svoe'" ("long after his death the memory of his administration was devoutly preserved among the people. 'He was a master...the peasants' affairs first and then his own'") (7:288/1013).

323

Scenes and situations like these give a more compelling novelistic authority, brought out in the lives of vividly individualized characters, to Tolstoy's historical narrative. As a result, experiences during the resistance to Napoleon at home, before the Russian army crossed the border to help establish Restoration Europe, anticipate the larger, more broadly national idea of community that Tolstoy could sense while writing in the 1860s. This idea, embedded in the Russian adjective "narodnyi" with its implications of both "nation" and "people," would gain new importance after the emancipation of the serfs,¹¹ with its most obvious political expression coming with the so-called *Narodniks* and the "going to the people" movement of the 1870s. But Tolstoy's personal commitment to peasant education in the years between *War and Peace* and *Anna Karenina* represents his own, typically unique response to desires for a broader national solidarity, one that would also be more authentic than the government's "official nationalism."¹²

* * *

Even though Malraux's and Lampedusa's novels were written in the 1940s and 50s, they belong to the toxic thirties by an imaginative logic that, in contrast to Tolstoy's and Stendhal's freer time of memory and hope, bypasses rigid historical chronology

by virtue of the drastically compressed time of trauma. Malraux, to be sure, has often been called a typical figure of the thirties; and it is tempting to see *L'Espoir*, his immediately preceding novel, as a twentieth-century update of Stendhal and Tolstoy. Thus the frustrating struggle, in the Restoration Italy of the *Chartreuse*, against a powerful array of anti-national forces has shifted to republican Spain during the Spanish Civil War. The almost instinctive upsurge of communal solidarity that in Tolstoy marks the Russian resistance to Napoleon reappears, in the novel's culminating episode, among some Spanish peasants who band together to rescue some downed aviators (389-412), though now—in jarring discord with Malraux's hopeful title—without *War and Peace's* promise of victory known in retrospect. But in Malraux's career both the attempt to revive the hopes of the triumphant sixties and an effort to respond to the agonizing thirties become even keener in *Les Noyers de l'Altenburg*.¹³

324 This novel approaches nation building by way of a desire for national renewal. Not only was it written during a deep crisis in one of Europe's oldest nation-states—indeed, the book opens with episodes from the French defeat by Nazi Germany in 1940—but it also coincides with a much-discussed shift in the author's sense of identity, from a roving internationalism in the twenties and thirties to republican patriotism and a close association with de Gaulle after World War II. In recognition of this later role, Malraux now lies in the Pantheon with other literary heroes of the French Republic like Rousseau, Hugo, and Zola.

In this context it is perhaps surprising that most of *Les Noyers* does not deal directly with France at all, but with events in the life of an Alsatian family before and during World War I, when that region was under German rule. To some extent, of course, the Nazi-occupied France of the early forties might be seen as a larger Alsace, although Malraux never makes this metaphor explicit. More obvious is his attention to an issue neglected by the triumphant nationalism of the sixties, the fact that the borders between the newly emergent nation-states were seldom obvious. Thus Malraux makes it clear in several ways that the members of his Alsatian family are neither exclusively French nor German in cultural identity. This duality appears in their very name, B-E-R-G-E-R, which can be read as either French (“Berzhay”) or German (“Berger”); and, of course, the French word “Noyers” jostles with the Germanic proper noun “Altenburg” in the novel's title. Malraux, I should add, was not himself of Alsatian heritage. But in dramatizing this form of interculturalism he could draw on experiences as an adult, mainly by way of his first wife, Clara Goldschmidt, who was a Frenchwoman of German Jewish background. *Les Noyers* thus sets the nationalistic border quarrels that plagued the thirties—the Free City of Danzig would be one notable example, and the Sudetenland another—in an historical perspective defined by the situation of the Alsace from 1871 to 1919, where one nation gained unity at another's expense in circumstances where the region's loyalties and identity were mixed or hard to determine.

Even as Malraux focuses on a contested region that, without much need for explanation to a prospective French audience, epitomizes the fateful link between

the early triumphs and later agonies of nationalism, he makes a point of referring back to Tolstoy and Stendhal. In fact, he clearly feels that they both belong to the essential narrative heritage of the West, which in turn comprises a cultural space larger than any single nation. Thus on the eve of World War I, when a member of his Alsatian family named Vincent Berger returns home from a period of service in the Islamic world that came to a humiliating end in Afghanistan, he can pause before a bookshop window and think: “Goethe et Shakespeare et les autres, Stendhal, Tolstoï, Dickens, c’étaient les Mille et Une Nuits de l’Occident” (“Goethe and Shakespeare and others, Stendhal, Tolstoy, Dickens, these were the *Thousand and One Nights* of the West”) (678/94). Goethe and Shakespeare, we can assume, are there as representative national classics from countries other than France; but the names of the three novelists put the focus on nineteenth-century Western fiction. Our two novelists, moreover, had already cropped up in a lively debate about fiction that specifically linked the Tolstoy of *War and Peace* with Stendhal (674-75/88-9).¹⁴ And at the Altenburg priory, which has become the site of international colloquia hosted by another member of the Berger family, a photo of Tolstoy appears among an array of mainly French and German cultural icons (656/62), in part to signal the conferees’ aspiration toward wider intellectual horizons. (Soon afterwards these horizons widen still further, in a debate about culture between Vincent, with his sojourn in the Middle East, and an anthropologist who specializes in Africa.) Even more provocatively, Vincent has served as an adviser to a leader of the young Turks whose “jeunesse [et] élan...agirent...comme ceux de Bonaparte sur l’armée d’Italie” (“youth and dash made the same impression...as Bonaparte’s had made on the Italian army”) (648/51), thus recalling (from a more narrowly French viewpoint) Stendhal’s grand moment of incipient national consciousness in “Milan en 1796.” With this detail Malraux, who had already written about anti-colonial movements in Asia in novels like *La Condition humaine* (*Man’s Fate*, 1934), has shifted the experience of patriotic rebirth from Europe to the world at large, as if to acknowledge the broader, increasingly global reach of twentieth-century nationhood.

The main Alsatian part of Malraux’s novel culminates with a gas attack in World War I, which the author later confided was his real reason for writing the novel: “J’ai certainement écrit ce livre pour l’aventure, l’une des plus déconcertantes de l’Histoire, qui accompagna la première grande attaque où l’armée allemande employa les gaz, sur le front de la Vistule” (“I certainly wrote this book for the sake of the adventure, one of the most disconcerting in History, which accompanied the first great attack in which the German army made use of gas, on the Vistula front”) (*Noyers* 1631, my translation).¹⁵ In an actual event on the Eastern Front in 1915, some German soldiers, disregarding the frontiers set by flag, uniform, and language, not to mention the perils of war itself, broke ranks to try to relieve the ghastly sufferings of their poisoned counterparts on the Russian side. Although in his notes to *Les Noyers*, Marius-François Guyard has shown that Malraux largely elaborates on the eyewitness memoir of a German officer (1623-28),¹⁶ the scene gains new meanings in the

context of *Les Noyers*. Three issues in particular, all involving the charged topic of national boundaries, highlight the shift from national solidarity to toxic nationalism.

326 There is first the act of the soldiers, presented as highly contingent, which nonetheless shows that the utter devastation brought by the gas can unleash a deeper solidarity, based on what Malraux portrays as an instinctive loyalty to life, that sets limits to the powerful claims of nationhood. In the forthright words of one German soldier, “Non, l’homme n’est pas fait pour être moisi” (“No, man was not made to be mildewed”) (734/172). Second, there is the response of Vincent Berger himself, who is first a witness and then a participant in the mission to save the Russians. As an Alsatian, he had welcomed being sent to the Eastern Front because, he thought, Russian culture would mean nothing to someone with his Franco-German heritage, which would have made the Western Front unbearable. Under the pressure of the gas attack, however, he is overwhelmed by a sudden intuition: this foreign country rises up before him as a vital presence, as (to recall Auden’s phrase, cited earlier) a “living nation,” to be perceived not with hostility but with awe and a sense of gratitude toward previous generations:

Mon père sentait la Russie autour de lui, moins à cause des coupôles violettes et dorées, qu’à cause des très anciens pavés de cette place bosselée inégaux comme des galets...l’invincible passé russe était seul vivant dans le soir et le silence suspendu de la guerre...mon père ressentait la profondeur du monde slave jusqu’au Pacifique.

My father felt himself hemmed in by Russia, not so much because of the gold and purple cupolas, but because of the old pavements of the bulging square, uneven as shingle...the invincible Russian past was the only thing alive in the evening and the breathless silence of the war...my father was conscious of the depth of the Slav world, extending as far as the Pacific (705/132).

Here Malraux’s hero has crossed a border that transcends the dualities of his hotly contested region to reveal a larger world of more widely diversified cultural self-expression and awareness.

This sudden moment of insight, it should be stressed, is Tolstoyan on several distinct levels. As the revelation of a new culture’s possibilities, it recalls the effort to broaden one’s horizons implied by the iconography at the Altenburg, where Tolstoy’s picture appeared as an exotic item amid all the French and German culture heroes. In addition, of course, the gas attack takes place at a site that, as a result of the vast eastward vista suggested in the quoted passage, evokes Napoleon’s invasion of Russia in *War and Peace*.¹⁷ We are also reminded of that novel’s sense of Russian distinctiveness in contrast to the cultures of Western Europe. Most important of all, however, the character’s response reflects Tolstoy’s key aesthetic-communicative idea of “infectiousness.” As described in *What is Art?* (1898), but already implied in Tolstoy’s earlier fiction, this idea assumes that certain basic feelings from ordinary life as well as an overarching sense of human brotherhood are universally accessible, and under the right conditions will surface with the irresistible power of infectious good humor

or grief (*What is Art?* 226-62, Ch. 15-17). Hence it is significant that Vincent Berger's first intuition of Russia as an entity in its own right does not come from its distinctive church architecture but from the much simpler sensation of stepping on uneven paving stones, and that later he cannot help emulating the soldiers' frantic attempt to rescue the poisoned Russians. Indeed, it is only because such feelings arise unbidden from a realm beyond one's narrow egotistical circle, in this case from beyond one's culture or nation, that the experience portrayed by Malraux can even be possible. In this Tolstoyan context, of course, it is highly ironic that the infectious, life-sustaining solidarity that Berger experiences with the soldiers should have been triggered by the deadly infectiousness of toxic gas. This form of solidarity, reaching beyond its nineteenth-century locus in the nation to include all human life, has momentarily overcome the degeneration of national community into toxic nationalism.

In a third aspect of borders and boundaries, however, at a level of creative clairvoyance that Malraux later found "haunting,"¹⁸ the "Russia" in this scene is actually Poland. Not only had Poland been erased as a nation for over a century in 1915, so that Malraux must locate his story with the phrase, "Bien que Bolgako fût en Pologne autrichienne" ("Although Bolgako was in Austrian Poland") (703/129); but of course it had again been erased, even more thoroughly than France itself, when *Les Noyers* was being written in the early forties. Moreover, beyond this multi-layered sense of evanescent borders, as a result of which a once independent state has become just another contested region between Germany and Russia, stands both the reader's and Malraux's even later knowledge of what actually occurred in this setting during the early forties. Given the Nazi program to obliterate a distinctive cultural space "to the East" and to use "gas warfare" of a drastic new kind against some of its people, the Alsatian hero's experience on the Eastern Front—and more broadly the very problem of being Alsatian in the wake of the nation-building 1860s, which culminated with the transfer of this region from France to Germany—might well seem a "haunting" premonition. The previous century's triumphant nationalism has turned toxic with a vengeance.

327

* * *

With *Il Gattopardo*, the link back to the 1860s is even clearer than in *Les Noyers*. Thus, although the novel is written from a mid-twentieth century perspective, most of its action takes place during the early sixties. The emphasis falls on the local impact, both in metropolitan Palermo and in the inland village of Donnafugata, of Garibaldi's victorious campaign in Sicily. This was the famous nation-building expedition of "i Mille" or "the thousand," now honored throughout Italy in the names of streets and squares, which pushed the unification of northern Italy southward to include the entire peninsula and the islands. Readers of Conrad's *Nostromo* will remember how the glamour and patriotic virtue of this moment survives in the char-

acter of Giorgio Viola, the old Garibaldino who has lived on into another, less heroic era. But in Lampedusa time has moved forward even more rapidly and treacherously than in Conrad: not only does an initial season-by-season narrative turn into a year-by-year one that then, in the last two chapters, leaps across quarter centuries to end in 1910, but a disillusioned narrator looks ahead ever more often to a more remote future, one that usually includes an acknowledgment of Mussolini's dictatorship.

This manipulation of time, which self-consciously places the triumphant sixties alongside the agonizing thirties, tends to ironize the moment of triumph in light of later experience. Thus not only are Garibaldi and his volunteers displaced by the markedly less populist House of Savoy, but his famous Redshirts can seem to prefigure the Fascist Blackshirts as well as several waves of Communists. As a result, Colonel Pallavicino, an official representative of the monarchy, can remark prophetically to Don Fabrizio, the grand Sicilian nobleman at the center of Lampedusa's novel, "Per il momento...delle camicie rosse non si parla più, ma se ne riparlerà. Quando saranno scomparse queste ne verranno altre di diverso colore; e poi di nuovo rosse" ("For the moment...no one mentions red shirts any more; but they'll be back again. When they've vanished, others of different colors will come; and then red ones once again") (*Gattopardo* 209/*Leopard* 270). Similarly, the arranged unanimity of the September 1860 plebiscite in which Sicilians voted to become Italians presages more sinister political juggling to come (109-11/134-36). Within this complex temporal pattern, the destruction of the aristocratic hero's ancestral palace in 1943, during the Allied invasion of Sicily which marked the beginning of the end for Mussolini, functions as a kind of apocalyptic end of time (200/258). Compared to Malraux's desolate vision of gas warfare in Poland, Lampedusa's bombed-out palace seems relatively modest, the tragedy of a once proud but declining family rather than a portent of awful things to come in a reprise of total war. Yet the underlying pattern is similar. The national hopes of the sixties have found a deeply disillusioning fulfillment in the hypernationalistic agonies of the thirties and early forties.

As with Malraux, the linkage between the two decades in the basic idea of *Il Gattopardo* is accompanied by a tribute to the Western narrative heritage, again with special attention to the nineteenth century. Thus Lampedusa can refer back to the sixties as "gli anni durante i quali, attraverso i romanzi si andavano formando quei miti letterari che ancor oggi dominano le menti europee" ("the years when novels were helping to form those literary myths which still dominate European minds today") (136/169). With historical precision, the passage goes on to single out Dickens, George Eliot, George Sand, and Flaubert, along with Dumas and Balzac. But it also takes pains to acknowledge that in any case most of these authors would have been unknown to Sicilians due to illiteracy, lack of curiosity, and censorship. However, Lampedusa's own favorites from this period definitely included Stendhal and Tolstoy, both of whom he apparently read in the original.¹⁹ And if his hero, Don Fabrizio, may just happen to share Fabrizio del Dongo's first name, it is telling that Lampedusa did write a critical study of Stendhal before beginning *Il Gattopardo*.

Tolstoy's presence in *Il Gattopardo* is less explicit, though Lampedusa did praise the Russian's handling of time in his study of Stendhal (*Lezioni* 46-7). But admirers of *War and Peace* will notice that Lampedusa's novel often reads like an artful Sicilian variation on Tolstoy. Two very different examples, first from the novel's public and then from its private sphere, will illustrate this point. On the one hand, there are Lampedusa's vignettes of how the Italian political class misconstrues popular feeling in Sicily and tries to manipulate it, just as Rostopchin, the governor of Moscow in 1812, fitfully tried to rally sentiment against Napoleon, without any influence on the upsurge of popular feeling that is already taking action on its own (6:314-17/928-31). Or, in private life, there is the key role of Don Fabrizio's daughter Concetta, the only character with a leading role through the entire novel, who misses the great love of her life and ends up never marrying. Her story thus corresponds (though with less resignation on Concetta's part) to that of the Rostovs' cousin Sonya, based in part on an unmarried distant relative of Tolstoy's, Tatiana Alexandrovna Ergolskaia, who, once he was orphaned, became a beloved surrogate mother. In the end, as we shall soon see, Lampedusa makes more of Concetta than Tolstoy did with Sonya, who becomes a self-sacrificing poor relation and enters spinsterhood without a hint of unexpected compensations such as befell Tolstoy's relative. More generally, of course, Lampedusa's approach to historical fiction, insofar as it places a richly detailed depiction of family memories and traditions against the backdrop of a decisive national event, directly recalls Tolstoy.

329

Once things have settled down after Garibaldi's expedition, Don Fabrizio welcomes some visitors from northern Italy, and the interactions that result serve to question the national idea that seemed so inspiring in the *Chartreuse*. One visitor, a Piedmontese, wishes to recruit this local notable for the new Italian Senate; the other, a Lombard, might want to marry his daughter. Both, we could say, are Stendhalian Italians who have entered a nominally Italian world beyond the actual ken of Stendhal, the self-styled "Milanese," for whom Italy stopped at Naples.²⁰ Clearly out of place in Sicily, Lampedusa's northern Italian characters are stymied, the lover because Concetta identifies so strongly with her local world that she cannot conceive of life elsewhere, the politician because her father distrusts the methods that have brought Sicily into Italy. In language that in advance bluntly, even offensively, overtrumps the historical vistas of most postcolonial criticism, the father comments: "noi siamo dei bianchi...quanto la regina d'Inghilterra; eppure da duemila cinquecento anni siamo colonia" ("We're as white...as the Queen of England; and yet for two thousand five hundred years we've been a colony") (161/205). Despite the inadequacy of these words to Syracuse as a metropolis in the ancient world, or to Palermo as a cultural crossroads under the Normans, not to mention Lampedusa's own mastery of Western fiction, their vehemence does express Don Fabrizio's real frustration with the way Italy achieved national unity and with Sicily's peripheral role within that nation.

In the final analysis, however, his grievances against the outside world coexist

with an inner sense of superiority and pride. In this case, the comforts of a strong regional identity outweigh the drawbacks of marginality. Or, as Don Fabrizio puts it, because our vanity is stronger than our misery (166/212), we Sicilians suffer from a “una terrificante insularità di animo” (“terrifying insularity of mind”) (164/208). Islands, by the geographical fatalism that earlier in the novel gave decisive power to Sicilian sunlight, possess tenacious borders of their own. In experiential terms, this insularity leads to the life-long deadlock of a Concetta, who wants the love of someone temperamentally different from herself yet cannot help spurning it indignantly when it comes her way. Only as the novel ends some fifty years later, when she learns that her cousin Tancredi’s somewhat racy story about breaking into a nunnery during Garibaldi’s campaign was perhaps just an invention and that her barbed comment in retaliation had opened the way for her rival Angelica, does she realize she had missed her chance.²¹ Moreover, if readers think to dismiss these attitudes as the whims of provincial aristocrats, Lampedusa adds a chapter that shows a similar pride in the impoverished peasantry (186/240), in which the family priest Father Pirrone arranges a marriage between his niece Angelina and her seducer Santino. In Lampedusa’s disillusioned backward view, more than the false solidarities of a manipulated plebiscite or even of Mussolini’s Fascisti have undermined the nation. Peripheral regions like Sicily have a deep cultural authority of their own, one that clearly means more than the artificial dynastic borders criss-crossed by Fabrizio del Dongo. As a result, Lampedusa’s Sicily resists Garibaldi’s hopeful vision of an Italy that, once united, would become a cohesive nation-state.

★ ★ ★

No doubt the critiques of national feeling so powerfully novelized in *Les Noyers* and *Il Gattopardo* correspond to the sentiments that have promoted Europe’s increasing integration since World War II. This essay, in seeking to revive interest in these novels from outside the twentieth-century mainstream, has emphasized their pivotal role in registering nationalism’s shifting fortunes from the 1860s to the 1930s. In the intertextual background of both works, the *Chartreuse* and *War and Peace* offer eloquent reminders of earlier ideals of national community even as their sharp contrast with the narrative present suggests how badly nationalism had come to fail. In even broader intercultural terms, however, we are now in position to see how the seemingly Eurocentric bias of this kind of comparative analysis opens up into the wider vistas of postcolonial studies.

It is striking that all four novelists, Stendhal and Tolstoy no less than Malraux and Lampedusa, draw attention to one or another feature of what can be called modern Europe’s “inner edge.” By this term I mean those areas within the European land-mass broadly defined that in some way were not, or at least not yet, fully absorbed into the system of sovereign, culturally distinct nation-states that began to emerge

after the French revolution and became dominant by the later nineteenth century. As a result of this liminal status, these areas resist being labeled as Eurocentric as straightforwardly as countries with overseas empires like Spain, France, England, or the Netherlands. In fact, Europe's inner edge often has affinities with areas at the other, more obvious edge of the European international system. This imperial *outer* edge, of course, has been the arena for postcolonial criticism.

As the phrase "inner edge" suggests, the concept can refer to the imperial phenomenon of "inner colonization," as seen in the Anglicization of Ireland or the attempted Magyarization of the former Hungarian borderlands. But the inner edge takes many other forms, several of which may be seen in Stendhal and Tolstoy. Thus the Risorgimento Italy of the *Chartreuse*, as a stateless nation divided internally by boundaries maintained from abroad, looks ahead to the arbitrary territorial divisions in the overseas colonies, especially in Africa and the Caribbean. The Russian Empire in *War and Peace*, as a nationless state, resembles the far-flung colonial regimes of the West, with the result that Anderson, no doubt with a certain ironic pleasure, can even compare the realm of the tsars to that of Queen Victoria (88-94). Moreover, in Tolstoy's special view of things, this Russia broke faith with an incipient, potentially non-Western sense of nationhood when it intervened as a great power in the affairs of post-Napoleonic Europe.²² Alexander's project of "saving" Europe reinforced Peter the Great's project of westernizing Russia, thereby elevating a country sometimes belittled as a realm of Scythians, Tartars, or Cossacks to an influential place on Europe's inner edge.

331

Other inner edges figure in Malraux and Lampedusa when, in a transition that anticipates later developments, they introduce the complicating factor of regional identity.²³ On this issue one can certainly find options that permit fruitful interaction between distinctive cultures, such as the Swiss cantons or the Scotland envisioned in Scott's novels. But with the emphasis that *Il Gattopardo* or *Les Noyers* puts on weaknesses or crises in the national idea, situations of deadlock or confrontation prevail. Lampedusa's Sicily, like the Basque district in Spain or like Ireland under British rule, typifies one possibility, that of peripheral regionality. Cherished local differences rooted in insularity are reinforced by the island's marginality within the nation or even, in Don Fabrizio's irritated outburst, in a Europe whose center has moved from the Mediterranean to the North Atlantic. Thus to have been historically "inside," yet now to be clearly "outside" amounts to being demoted to a place on the inner edge that is the converse of Russia's choice to move inward. Malraux's Alsace is the classic example of a contested region, which, far from languishing in Sicilian peripheral neglect, becomes a flash point among major powers in the nation-state system. Epitomizing that system's failure to acknowledge cultural options omitted from its grid of identities, it has affinities with partitioned Poland among Austria, Russia, and Prussia/Germany. At the outer edge, it mirrors the imperial conflicts over previously uncolonized areas, such as France's rivalry with England for Egypt, Russia's with England on the Northwest Frontier of the Indian subcontinent, or (more briefly)

France's with Germany for Morocco.

These European inner edges share two key national experiences with the colonized and postcolonial "outer edge." For one thing, the moment of national self-recognition, whether from inside an established state like the Russian Empire or throughout a fragmented national space like Italy, corresponds to the independence and revival movements in the overseas European colonies. As Anderson stresses, however, major differences do distinguish the forms of national feeling that arose throughout Europe in the wake of Napoleon from both the earlier "creole pioneers" in the North and South American independence movements and the "last wave" nationalism of twentieth-century decolonization. Secondly, the moment of toxic agony in the thirties and early forties parallels what Said has called "an appalling pathology of power" among certain postcolonial ruling elites (230), though Wiebe does warn, in a concluding survey of our current situation, that nationalism may no longer be so decisive in an age of transnational capitalism and growing religious passions.

332 Even more striking than these affinities, however, is the caveat implied by Malraux's emphasis on Vincent Berger's service with the young Turks in *Les Noyers*. In making an Alsatian victim of national fulfillment an activist for nationalist aspirations outside Europe, Malraux suggests a larger point, that inner and outer edges can develop at cross purposes. Thus the decade of triumphant nationalism on the inner edge in the 1860s came just before the revival of imperial expansion at the outer edge, most notably in the "scramble for Africa," so that by 1900 there were far fewer independent nations outside Europe. By the same token, the decade of toxic agony witnessed the transfer back to Europe of harsh methods pioneered on the outer edge, as Hannah Arendt has noted in comparing Conrad's Kurtz to the dictators of the 1930s (185-97). This decade also came just before post-war decolonization, when national movements on the outer edge gained recognition just as confidence in nationalism bottomed out at home. In this regard Malraux is both historically accurate and prescient in depicting an Alsatian with ambivalent loyalties at home who nonetheless works for a national movement outside Europe.

On inner and outer edges alike, therefore, national feeling swings between extremes, from the inspired solidarity and sense of liberation in Stendhal and Tolstoy that parallels the colonial struggle for independence to the disillusionment or the lacerating mood of crisis in Lampedusa and Malraux that resembles situations of postcolonial malaise. In the intertextual quadrilateral among our novelists, of course, these contrasting options spiral downward into the toxic thirties. Thus Sonya, the spinster cousin upstaged by the two happy families at the close of *War and Peace*, is replaced by Concetta. She too is foiled in her love for a cousin but plays a bigger role in *Il Gattopardo*, where her failure to marry corresponds to Sicily's isolation in a newly united and nationally assertive Italy. Or the attractive youthful potential of Stendhal's Fabrizio (until the very end, when he withdraws to the hitherto unexplained charterhouse in the novel's title) gives way to the slowly building, then accelerating decline of Lampedusa's once leopard-like Fabrizio, culminating

with the anticipated bombing of the family palace during World War II. In tracing this estrangement and decline back to Garibaldi's celebrated expedition southward (and doing so, moreover, just before the centennial of that nation-building event), Lampedusa subjects the initial enthusiasms and false pieties of national feeling to complex irony.

The Malraux of *Les Noyers* was writing in a defeated and partitioned country, one that was occupied by a neighboring rival, just as the Alsace had been several generations before and as Poland had been less than a year earlier. This France stood at a far remove from its triumphant origins as a nation-state or from the patriotic exuberance of Stendhal's Milan in 1796. In these circumstances it is easy to see why Malraux should focus (quite wishfully, as he and the world would soon discover) on an inspirational event with Tolstoyan overtones. Revealing a deep need for life-affirming solidarity beyond the limits of a nation turned agent of extermination, the soldiers' desperate response to the gas attack seeks, with apocalyptic urgency, to resist toxic nationalism.

333

Protest so impassioned from a novelist about to cast his lot with De Gaulle and with his defiant renewal of national feeling contrasts sharply with the disillusionment of a Lampedusa, whose hero could survey two and a half millennia of Sicily's supposed futility with such weary fatalism. Yet despite their distinctive vantage points on Europe's inner edge, both authors choose to hark back to Stendhal's and Tolstoy's masterpieces in order to give a sharper profile to their renditions of the manipulated or degraded state of once vibrant national ideals. In the process they reveal that intra-European relationships of this kind, which have been the traditional province of comparative literature, can nonetheless possess affinities with the overseas and intercontinental concerns of postcolonial studies. At least on the terrain of nationalism and the novel, comparatists and postcolonialists should be prepared to acknowledge this counterpoint between Europe's inner and outer edges.

NOTES

1. Begun after the fall and partition of France in 1940, *Les Noyers* initially appeared in Switzerland in 1943 as the first part of a longer work announced under the title of *La Lutte avec l'ange*. Reissued after the war with a notice alleging that the Gestapo had destroyed the rest of the manuscript, it never received as much attention as Malraux's other novels, though it did become a source for key passages in his semi-autobiographical writings a quarter century later. Only in 1996, in the new Pléiade edition of Malraux's works, was it reprinted for the first time since 1962.
2. See Wiebe for a wide-ranging and thought-provoking account of nationalism that stresses its positive, community-enhancing features as well as its rivalry with democracy and socialism, its main competitors as political ideologies from 1789 to 1989. Since comparative literary study in its current form originated in the wake of the events treated in Malraux's and Lampedusa's novels, it has tended to emphasize nationalism's negative aspects without giving sufficient credit to its more positive possibilities.

3. To emphasize the link with Lampedusa's hero Don Fabrizio, I have re-italianized the name that appears in Stendhal's French text as Fabrice del Dongo.
4. The two sets of references to quotations from Tolstoy cite their location in the Russian original (*Sobranie*), followed (after a slash) by the corresponding page numbers in the Norton Critical Edition (*War*).
5. See Feuer's study of Tolstoy's creative process, which argues throughout for significant connections between Tolstoy's circumstances as he wrote and the historical past portrayed in *War and Peace*. In her account of the novel's composition, the earliest stages (which dated back to 1856) were more defensively aristocratic than the final version, which reflects Tolstoy's generally positive response to the intervening emancipation of the serfs. Not only had he served in his district as a mediator between former serfs and masters in cases where he usually took the side of the peasants, but he also "had carried out a practical, and successful, reform of his own, in his Iasnaia Poliana school" (199). In identifying Tolstoy's basic position in *War and Peace* as "spiritual populism" rather than full democratic feeling (145, 215-16), Feuer reaches a conclusion that brings out the importance of a form of national solidarity that, as envisioned by someone with Tolstoy's generous temperament, seems exceptionally benign.
6. The remark, made in French at an aristocratic Petersburg salon, contemptuously uses the Italian form of Napoleon's last name: "Eh bien, mon prince, Gènes et Lucques ne sont plus que des apanages, des pomest'ia, de la famille Buonaparte" ("Well, Prince, so Genoa and Lucca are now just family estates, just *pomestia*, of the Buonapartes") (Tolstoy, *Sobranie* 4:7; *War* 3).
7. As Sarközy has noted, the contrast between states without nations and nations without states dates back at least as far as the nineteenth-century Italian patriot Luigi Settembrini (whose last name was later recycled by Thomas Mann to designate the advocate of a gentle form of nationalism in *The Magic Mountain*).
8. Anderson (86-88) brings out the difference between true nationhood, which is "always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship" (7), and the top-down, state-sponsored "official nationalism" of the nineteenth-century Russian Empire. Alluding to the first efforts to develop this policy in the 1830s, he also comments on how premature they were "in an age when half the 'nation' was still serfs, and more than half spoke a mother tongue other than Russian" (87).
9. Fabrizio's startling swings of fortune often echo the youthful life of Alessandro Farnese (1468-1549), the future Pope Paul III. See, for example, the translation of passages that Stendhal had copied from an Italian chronicle devoted to Farnese and used as a source for the *Chartreuse* (Stendhal 481-96).
10. For a full discussion of the nineteenth-century's ambiguous attitudes towards Russia's position on Western Europe's Eastern frontier, see Malia.
11. "Narodnyi" is the same adjective that Tolstoy used in associating the term "national war" with Kutuzov, as cited in a previous paragraph.
12. Compare Anderson's comment, cited above in endnote 8.
13. Further references to this novel will appear parenthetically in the text, first to the French original, then (after a slash) to the English version.
14. The discussion centers on what kind of knowledge novels provide. But after invoking "le Tolstoï de *Guerre et Paix*, Stendhal, Montaigne, Meredith peut-être, Dostoevski surtout" ("the Tolstoy of *War and Peace*, Stendhal, Montaigne, Meredith perhaps, Dostoevsky certainly"), the speaker sharpens his focus: "Stendhal, Tolstoï, attention!" ("Stendhal, Tolstoy, careful now!") (674-75/88-9). This essay's task, it could be said, is to understand the full implications of this last, slogan-like phrase as it applies to Malraux himself as well as to Lampedusa. Notice, however, that even as Malraux's character links Stendhal and Tolstoy, he fails to mention Flaubert, whose *Éducation sentimentale* also appeared in the 1860s. But despite its contemporaneity with *War and Peace*, the sardonic view of national possibility in Flaubert's handling of France's short-lived Second Republic, in contrast to the flashes of hopefulness in Stendhal's Italy or the Russia of *War and Peace*, probably explains its absence from

this discussion.

15. This entire scene reappears in Malraux's free-form autobiography, *Le Miroir des limbes* (789-817).
16. Guyard identifies the source as Max Wild's *Mes aventures dans le service secret, 1914-1918*, known to Malraux in this French translation. Guyard also indicates that use of this highly toxic gas was abandoned several weeks later after an unexpected change in wind led to a massive poisoning of German troops.
17. Conor Cruise O'Brien, in fact, has called this entire portion of the novel "Tolstoyan," in the course of proposing a four-fold scheme of interpretation that opens with Lawrence of Arabia (the part devoted to Vincent Berger in the Middle East), turns to Nietzsche (the debate about culture at the Altenburg abbey) and then shifts in this episode to Tolstoy, and ends with Pascal (Malraux, *Walnut Trees* xx).
18. "lorsque j'écrivais sur les camps [meaning the Nazi death camps], j'étais hanté par la fin des *Noyers de l'Altenburg*" ("When I wrote about the camps, I was haunted by the end of *The Walnut Trees of Altenburg*") (*Noyers* 1631, my translation).
19. Colquhoun mentions them first of all, along with Flaubert, Proust, Mann, and Dickens, as such special favorites that Lampedusa studied them in their original languages (26). French of course was the usual second language for Italians of Lampedusa's social class, while his wife was a Latvian from Riga who knew Russian.
20. In his book on *Stendhal*, Lampedusa praised the author's familiarity with Milan, Bologna, Florence, Venice, Rome, and Naples, then quoted his acid comment: "au delà de Naples c'est l'Empire des Turcs; l'Italie est finie" (*Lezioni* 28).
21. For this chain of incidents, see *Il Gattopardo/The Leopard* 82-84/98-100, 87-88/104-05, 241-43/312-14.
22. For more on issues of geocultural positioning involving *War and Peace*, see Foster, "Show Me."
23. See Foster, *Nations*, for a survey of regionalist movements in late twentieth-century Western Europe. In ironic confirmation of changes in the national idea subsequent to the authors covered in this essay, this collection discusses regional entities like Scotland or the Basque country under the heading of "nations without states."

WORKS CITED

- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. ed. London: Verso: 1991.
- Arendt, Hannah. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. Cleveland: World Publishing, 1958.
- Auden, W.H. "In Memory of W.B. Yeats." In *The English Auden: Poems, Essays and Dramatic Writings, 1927-1939*. Ed. Edward Mendelson. New York: Random House, 1977. 241-43.
- Colquhoun, Archibald. "Giuseppe di Lampedusa: A Note by the Translator." In *Two Stories and a Memory*. By Giuseppe di Lampedusa. Trans. Archibald Colquhoun. Intro. E.M. Forster. New York: Pantheon, 1962. 19-39.
- Feuer, Kathryn B. *The Genesis of War and Peace*. Ed. Robyn Feuer Miller and Donna Tussing Orwin. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1996.
- Foster, Charles, ed. *Nations without States: Ethnic Minorities in Western Europe*.

New York: Praeger, 1980.

Foster, John Burt, Jr. "‘Show Me the Zulu Tolstoy’: A Russian Classic Between ‘First’ and ‘Third’ Worlds." Forum on Slavic Identities. Ed. Edith Clowes and John Foster. *Slavic and East European Journal* 45.2 (Summer 2002): 260-74.

Malia, Martin E. *Russia under Western Eyes: From the Bronze Horseman to the Lenin Mausoleum*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard UP, 1999.

Malraux, André. *L’Espoir. Oeuvres complètes, tome II*. Intro. Michel Autrand. Ed. Marius-François Guyard, Maurice Larès, and François Trécourt with the participation of Noël Burchin. Paris: Pléiade, 1996. 1-433, 1305-1582.

_____. *Le Miroir des Limbes. Oeuvres complètes, tome III*. Intro. Marius-François Guyard. Ed. Marius-François Guyard with the collaboration of Jean-Claude Larrat and François Trécourt. Paris: Pléiade, 1996. 1-909, 1119-1291.

336 _____. *Les Noyers de l’Altenburg. Oeuvres complètes, tome II*. Intro. Michel Autrand. Ed. Marius-François Guyard, Maurice Larès, and François Trécourt with the participation of Noël Burchin. Paris: Pléiade, 1996. 617-767, 1607-66.

_____. *The Walnut Trees of Altenburg*. Trans. A. W. Fielding. Foreword by Conor Cruise O’Brien. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992.

Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Knopf, 1993.

Sarközy, Péter. "Qu’est-ce qu’une littérature nationale aujourd’hui en Europe Centrale—les littératures des minorités." Section on General Identity Construction, Triennial Conference of the International Comparative Literature Association. Leiden, The Netherlands, 17 August 1997.

Seton-Watson, Hugh. *Nations and States: An Enquiry into the Origins of Nations and the Politics of Nationalism*. London: Methuen, 1977.

Stendhal (Henri Beyle). *La Chartreuse de Parme*. Ed. Henri Martineau. Paris: Garnier, 1961.

Tolstoy, L.N. *Sobranie Sochinenii v Dvadtsati Tomakh*. Ed. N.N. Akopovaia, et. al. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoi Izdatel’stvo Khudozhestvennoi Literatury, 1962.

_____. *War and Peace*. Trans. Aylmer Maude. Ed. George Gibian. 2nd ed. New York: Norton, 1996.

_____. *What is Art? and Essays on Art*. Trans. Aylmer Maude. London: Oxford UP, 1962.

Tomasi di Lampedusa, Giuseppe. *Il Gattopardo*. Milano: Feltrinelli, 1974.

_____. *The Leopard*. Trans. Archibald Colquhoun. New York: Pantheon, 1983.

_____. *Lezioni su Stendhal*. Palermo: Sellerio, 1977.

Wiebe, Robert H. *Who We Are: A History of Popular Nationalism*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2002.