

Multilingualism and Translation: A Case Study on Exile Periodicals (1933–1945)

Julija Boguna

Abstract: Exile journals have a fixed place in German-language Exile Studies, which is strongly influenced by literary history. New research projects on translation history, such as *Exil:Trans* (2019–2022) on German-speaking translators in exile (1933–1945), are in the vanguard of a re-evaluation of exile journals and their translation-historical potential, including questions of multilingualism. Who translated what in the journals, and how, and what can it tell us about translation under conditions of exile and the related approach to multilingualism?

Keywords: German exile (1933–1945), periodicals, literary and pragmatic translation

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7592/methis.v25i31-32.23321>

Introduction

Der Name der geplanten Zeitschrift war „Die Sammlung“. Ihr Ziel war es, ein literarisch-kulturpolitisches Organ zu werden, in dem die antifaschistischen, exilierten Autoren aller politischen Richtungen zu Wort kommen sollten. Der Plan, dem soeben gegründeten Buchverlag [Querido] eine Zeitschrift anzugliedern, reizte mich besonders. Mir war nämlich nur allzu bewußt, daß der neue Verlag, dem der reichsdeutsche Markt verschlossen war, nur eine sehr begrenzte Anzahl Autoren verlegen konnte, während eine monatlich erscheinende Zeitschrift etwa 150 Autoren im Jahr eine Publikationsmöglichkeit bieten könnte.¹ (Landshoff 1986, VI)

Fritz Landshoff, one of the most important German publishers of the (pre-)exile period with crucial roles in such publishing houses as Kiepenheuer Verlag, Querido Verlag, S. Fischer Verlag, wrote these words in the preface to the reprint of the exile periodical, *Die Sammlung*, which was founded in Amsterdam in 1933 under the editorship of Klaus Mann and with the support of the Dutch publisher Emanuel Querido. It is one of the most visible periodicals of the first exile phase. Literary heavyweights such as Lion Feuchtwanger, Heinrich Mann, Anna Seghers, Arnold Zweig, and Alfred Döblin are just a few of the key players associated with this widely known exile periodical. For

1 The title of the planned periodical was *Die Sammlung*. Its goal was to become a literary and cultural-political organ that would give voice to anti-fascist, exiled authors of all political persuasions. I was particularly interested in the plans to affiliate a periodical with the recently established publishing house [Querido]. I was all too aware that the new publishing house, which was excluded from the German Reich market, would only be able to bring out a very limited number of authors, whereas a monthly journal could offer a publication opportunity to about 150 authors a year. (Here and further the extended German quotes are translated by the author.)

me, however, this quote is less about *Die Sammlung* itself than about the obvious entanglement between literary exile production and periodical formats.

This entanglement is not new in German Exile Studies. Exile periodicals (1933–1945) are represented here particularly as the symbol of *the other Germany*. They are interpreted as an attempt to bundle heterogeneous groups and individuals, creating a public sphere of resistance. More than 400 periodicals have been systematically gathered and analysed so far (Maas 1990), in addition to which several reprints and depictions of individual periodicals (in certain countries of exile) were published (Enderle-Ristori 2012; Maas 1978; Roussel and Winckler 1992). A diachronic cross-section does not seem possible at all for the following reasons: periodicals are founded and quickly shut down; they are marked by infrastructural and financial precariousness; their journalistic orientation is shaped by Realpolitik and aesthetic alliances; they create publicity while remaining, in most cases, introverted in their communication. Yet they are more relevant for Exile Studies than it might appear at first glance: Periodicals offered an opportunity to publish for young authors and translators; publishers mostly worked with well-known authors, as anything else was too risky.

This resulting existential connection between periodical formats and exile literary production seems essential for the following considerations on the complicated and partially adversarial relationship between translation and multilingualism and could hopefully help to build a bridge to the format and topics of this special issue of *Methis*, which is predominantly framed by Literary Studies. To build this bridge, I will analyse some actors and institutions relevant to literary history while simultaneously debating the possibilities and limitations of integrating them as sources into the narratives of translation history. However, before we move on to the examples, some important research parameters will need to be clarified.

1. Framework, contexts and constraints

1.1. Studying Translation in Exile Periodicals

It is necessary to outline the *conceptual* framework (1) and the *methodological* (2) and *historical* (3) context, and address certain resulting *constraints* (4):

- (1) *Translation* is understood here as *translation proper* (Jakobson [1959] 2002), usually into German, i.e. it is not about translation as a metaphor (a migrant as a translated person, etc.), but about concrete interlingual transfer acts. *Language* is understood in all its *heteroglossic* diversity: Bakhtin's terminology should not obscure the fact that I am not primarily dwelling on literary texts. I predominantly examine pragmatic texts and literary derivatives such as poetological utterances and reflections on translation. Nevertheless, the view of language as a polyphonic and heteroglossic phenomenon can also be made fruitful for my object of study.

The *languages* are neither monolithic nor separate entities; the *first language* (or sometimes mother tongue) does not exclude the existence of other first languages. An illustration of this would be Klara Blum [Dschu Bailan], an exile author from Czernowitz (Buchowina) who spoke German, Ukrainian, Romanian, Yiddish, and Russian from childhood and translated from Chinese and Lithuanian and several other languages. She translated for exile periodicals (for example, for *Das Wort* in Moscow). In this way, German is understood here as one among several first languages in the context of pre-exile, into which translations are made from different exile languages.

Translation and *Language* are intrinsically linked here; every statement on translation reveals a certain concept of language and vice versa. Translation history has a primarily instrumental view on languages, as it looks at textual transformations. This circumstance distinguishes translation history from the literary-historical and thus predominantly author-oriented tradition of German Exile Studies (1933–1945), where the discussion of language is more firmly linked to a separation into mother tongue and exile language(s), which in turn are shaped by the nationally framed concepts of literature. Exile here is often associated with the loss of language, thus identity and the switch of language (*Sprachwechsel*) is generally exemplified as a one-way street and usually refers to literary production, not everyday life, and questions of translation centre either around the phenomena of literary self-translation or translation as a metaphor of exile itself, such as Klaus Mann's *The Turning Point/Der Wendepunkt* or works and biographies of Anna Seghers, Vladimir Nabokov, Paul Celan, and Hilde Domin (cf. Bischoff et al. 2014; Krohn and Enderle-Ristori 2007; Utsch 2007). These methodological differences, however, do not reduce by any means the considerable value of sources already made accessible by literary history, which are reinterpreted for our translation historiographical purposes.

- (2) Within the conceptual framework of the Exil:Trans project² (2019–2022), on the results of which my following observations in this paper are based, the lives and works of translators persecuted by National Socialism are explored. To that end, researchers gather bio-bibliographical data on known or only identified translators putting this leading question into the foreground: WHO translated WHAT for WHOM and HOW? Based on these primary data, a problem-related evaluation takes place. I work with paratexts (prefaces and epilogues, reviews), translation-

2 The common denominator is German and Translation. The main emphasis is on translations into German, but we also examine knowledge transfer and translations of scientific texts into other languages, which often tells a different story of multilingualism and language switching. (For more detail see: <https://exiltrans.univie.ac.at/>.)

related poetological statements and texts on language policy, testimonies of everyday translation, and finally with the refusal of translation (*Null-Translation* or *zero-translation*³).

- (3) German-speaking exile, a precarious translational framework, is not to be understood by default in the sense of forced translation, but rather as a biographically rooted persecution. Though this exile has been over-researched in German Studies, translators are still not systematically included (only in the form of a brief mention by Fischer 2021, 787–816). This is due to a circumstance that also represents a methodological challenge: translatory work hardly fits into a preconceived job description. In many cases, taking up translating can often be combined with other occupations, or have a transitional quality. Such conditions result in an ambiguous empirical situation that makes the abovementioned absence of systematic inclusion and methodological challenge all the more palpable in the context of exile as translational actions and events often remain undocumented, untraced, and unmentioned, even more so if they do not concern independent translations. It is precisely in this context that the periodicals are of great interest not only for the assessment of new sources but also for the re-reading of sources already known in the abovementioned German Exile Studies. Much of the translated work was pre-printed in the periodicals, this sometimes being the only publication (Boguna 2022, 73–74). Periodicals are also being discovered as valuable sources for translation histories outside the field of the (German) Exile Studies (cf. Fóllica et al. 2020).
- (4) And finally, in the context of exile and considering the periodical format, translation-related questions can address multilingualism under specific *conceptual* constraints:
 - (a) The exile context is inherently multilingual and is further coined by communicative asymmetries. Multilingualism, which can be considered as *forced*, is a fundamental condition of exile and not merely an aesthetically motivated decision. For this reason, literary and pragmatic translation as well as journalistic and publishing translation as a hybrid format of the first two cannot be clearly separated from each other.
 - (b) *Translation* as a cultural practice implies coping with multilingualism in various forms. In this context, German-language exile periodicals, including the

3 According to Prunč, it is in zero translation that the ideological function of translation and the complexity of the translation process become most apparent (cf. Prunč 2000, 19).

literary ones, have a predominant inward communicative orientation, i.e. they primarily aim at consolidating a German-speaking readership, often beyond national borders of the exile countries. Multilingualism becomes visible or explicit through translation, or its refusal, only when a broader communicative offer outside the German-speaking Exile is to be made or when symbolic or literary speech acts are involved.

1.2. Exile Translation and Multilingualism

Multilingualism can be concealed in exile, but it is still inscribed in texts by opening up a space of reflection about languages (by referring to it) in which the tension between German (first language or mother tongue) and exile languages is expressed. But does dealing with translation also provide unambiguous answers for dealing with multilingualism? In answering this question, the bordering function of translation can also be recalled in relation to languages. According to Naoki Sakai, the unity of language “is represented always in relation to another unity” (Sakai 2012, 354–355). Thus bordering “precedes the border” (language or identity) and in that sense translation establishes and reinforces the perception of language borders per se (348). As a result, translation can be intentionally used to establish (linguistic) boundaries in exile, not just overcome them. Or as Sakai puts it:

So what corresponds to this bordering as far as language is concerned? Of course, it is translation. What I want to put forth here is that, at the level of schematism, translation comes prior to the determination of the language unities that translation is usually understood to bridge. Before the postulation of a national or ethnic language, there is translation. Just as there is transnationality before nationality. (Sakai 2012, 349)

Anne Benteler has already investigated multilingualism in the case of some exiled authors – Hilde Domin and Mascha Kaléko – in the context of literary communication in its function as an aesthetic device (Benteler 2019). In this paper, I would like to exclude such literary-aesthetic aspects but, at least partially, remain connected to the literary focus.

To that end, I will examine literary exile periodicals amidst others like journals of Jewish migration in the following chapter and thus position exile literature and exile communication as a common translational and translingual discursive space. In doing so, I hope to extend the scope of questions posed by Multilingualism and Exile Studies. In view of the abundance of material, I will make restrictions and focus primarily on metatexts, translation-poetological or translation-reflexive statements (for example reviews, (language-)political texts, etc.) that mark the mentioned translational space

of reflection. Using selected examples from different periodicals, I will draw upon heterogeneous standpoints and possible uses of translation and thus hopefully figure out a meaningful approach to dealing with multilingualism including implications for the links between language, identity, and foreignness in its intrinsic entanglement with translation. In doing so, I will be moving constantly between the following categories, which sometimes merge into one another: *Persons – Texts/Language – Institutions (Periodicals in Exile)*. All the people and periodicals addressed have gone into exile, but at different times and to different countries (France, the Netherlands, Palestine, the Soviet Union, the USA). Each of my examples would have deserved a more profound presentation on its own, but my aim is different. I chose them because of the relatedness of the expressed views on translation or the ways of translating to issues of multilingualism and how to cope with the latter. It is precisely the sporadic selection and brief introduction that intends to illustrate the fundamental relevance and omnipresence of these issues in exile periodicals and thus shows the opportunities for new sources in Exile, Translation, and Multilingualism Studies. All translatory statements of the actors in this field will address the influence of multilingualism on their identity and socialisation and in that sense deal with the abovementioned *translational bordering*. In Gramling's sense, they are shaped and affected by multilingualism, brought into meaning by it, and at the same time they shape it personally, substantially through translation (cf. Gramling 2021).

2. Exile language stories⁴

2.1. Hans Jacob (1896–1961)

Hans Jacob represented a broad spectrum of translatory activities, with his literary translation, interpreting, and publishing translation being intertwined here (Jacob 1962; Müller 2017). Jacob grew up bilingual (German and French) and began very early, already at school, to work as a translator mainly from French, occasionally Italian (authors such as Rimbault, Marinetti, Molière), then as an interpreter for high Reich officials and the Foreign Office, and then in exile for periodicals and radio; he also translated and interpreted for classical conference formats. From 1933 Jacob lived in exile, first in France, and from 1939 in the USA. In French exile, he not only continued to work as an interpreter, but also as a journalist and editorial board member for the *Pariser Tageblatt*, the only German-speaking exile daily newspaper. After the end of WW II, he dedicated himself entirely to his position as chief interpreter at UNESCO in Paris, where he died in 1961. Jacob did not produce any literary translations after 1930.

⁴ Some considerations or basic data comes from the already published studies on translation in exile (*Aufbau und Orient* cf. Boguna 2022). The aspect of multilingualism, however, has not yet been dealt with.

His example can illuminate multilingualism and translation in several ways and serve as a good introduction to the different *bordering* techniques: In an essay for *Das Wort*,⁵ a Moscow literary magazine (1936–1939), Jacob reflects on translating from German at the time of National Socialism:

[. . .] es ist wohl möglich, bei der Übersetzung in eine andere Sprache, den Sprachwert oder vielmehr Sprachunwert des neuen Deutsch wiederzugeben, nicht aber die Substanz der Gesinnung, die in Klang und Form den eigentlichen Sprachcharakter entweicht und in den Schmutz zieht. Mit anderen Worten: die Übersetzung in eine andere Sprache „vermenschlicht“ ipso facto, veredelt das „Nazideutsch“.⁶ (Jacob 1938, 82)

Jacob not only ascribes a political dimension to translation, in this heteroglossia, he sets his own linguistic boundaries, but not *interlingual* ones. There is a meaningful *intra*lingual segregation concerning the German language itself. In other words, exile in its discursive self-portrayal as *the other Germany* is similar to speaking *the other German language*, i.e. language and identity are equally constructed. Jacob writes:

Gewisse Leute standen auf dem Standpunkt, man müsse, um von den Nazis verstanden zu werden, Nazi-deutsch schreiben und sprechen. [. . .] Die Auffassung [. . .] leuchtete mir nicht ein, ich widersprach. Die Nazis hatten die deutsche Sprache zu einem Militärjargon gemacht, und die deutsche Sprache hat sich davon heute noch nicht ganz freigemacht. Ich vertrat die Ansicht, daß schon die Sprache den Hörern klarmachen müsse, wer spreche, und daß wir „eine andere Sprache“ als die Nazis sprechen müßten.⁷ (Jacob 1962, 202)

Here, the political and philosophical aspect of translation comes to the surface. In these linguistic practices of segregation, the boundaries between people as individual speakers and institutions (periodicals in exile) become blurred. It is a collective, not an individual ethical decision-making. In what ways can we classify and describe such

5 *Das Wort* in Moscow has a much better infrastructure than most periodicals in exile. It has a permanent staff and a large number of freelance contributors. The journal is not only aimed at (political) exile; in the spirit of the Popular Front, it has an extroverted profile and a high circulation, which is barely attainable for the most periodicals.

6 [. . .] it is probably possible, when translating into another language, to reproduce the linguistic value or rather linguistic un-value of the new German, but not the substance of the spirit, which in sound and form desecrates the actual character of the language and drags it into the dirt. In other words, the translation into another language “humanises” ipso facto, refines the “Nazi German”.

7 Certain people had the opinion that one had to write and speak Nazi German in order to be understood by the Nazis. [. . .] The point of view [. . .] did not make sense to me, I disagreed. The Nazis had turned the German language into a military jargon, and the German language has not yet completely freed itself from this. I held the view that the language alone must make it clear to the audience who is actually speaking, and that we must be speaking “a different language” than the Nazis.

collective subjectivities and professional reflections? The talking collective subject is shaped by the definitory power of political categorisations, but the subject is not passive; instead, he or she co-creates the discourse by positioning him- or herself and thus reveals the discursive constructivity of linguistic affiliation, multilingualism, and monolingualism (cf. Busch 2013, 79). In this process, multilingualism does not remain abstract, it is an integral part of the concrete exile language situation, with blurring of the boundaries between mother tongue or first language and exile languages. In his autobiography, Jacob recounts a number of the working conditions at the *Pariser Tageblatt*:

Wir saßen in zwei kleinen Zimmern. Bernhard schrieb seine Artikel zu Hause, wir hielten ihn telefonisch über wichtige Nachrichten auf dem laufenden. Wir besaßen nur eine Schreibmaschine und schrieben die meisten Skripte mit der Hand. Es gab sprachliche Schwierigkeiten, die sich technisch auswirkten. Alle Nachrichten aus deutscher Quelle mußten aus dem Französischen zurückübersetzt werden, da wir keine direkte deutsche Nachrichtenquelle besaßen. So konnten wir deutsche Zitate nur selten getreu wiedergeben. Unsere Setzer kannten nur Jiddisch; es war eine Sisyphusarbeit, Korrektur zu lesen.⁸ (Jacob 1962, 185)

Jacob's notes make it clear that there are complex processes going on. These influence the homogeneity of cultural and linguistic space, i.e. the expected consistency of text and context: Source texts from the Third Reich are translated into French and handled again in France as original German-language texts. Consequently, a target-culture and target-language fixation (as in Descriptive Translation Studies) would not be purposeful for the historiography of exile, since target culture and language as well as source culture and working languages no longer represent binary oppositions. Pre-texts and target texts emerge from multi-directional language movements, and boundaries of their originality, let alone authenticity, become blurred.

2.2. *Die Sammlung* (1933–1935)

In the possibility of translation – not only in its impossibility, the refusal of the translatory act as *act de resistance*, as Hans Jacob describes it – a heteroglossic segregation (*bordering*) could be postulated through an *inter-* and *intra*lingual dialogical connection to other times and spaces (for example, the Antiquity). One of Heinz Wielek's contributions to the aforementioned exile periodical *Die Sammlung* is a pertinent example of the self-drawn bordering: Wilhelm Kweksilber (alias Heinz Wielek), a

8 We all sat in two small rooms. Bernhard wrote his articles at home, we kept him informed about important news by telephone. We possessed only a typewriter and wrote most of the scripts by hand. There were language difficulties, which had a technical impact. All news from German sources had to be translated back from French, since we had no immediate German news sources. Thus, we could rarely render German quotations accurately. Our typesetters knew only Yiddish; it was a Sisyphus task to do proofreading.

Jewish publicist who went into Dutch exile in 1933, reviews a translation from Third Reich German into Latin and sets a border to the German of the Third Reich, not only *intralingually* in relation to the German language of exile, but also *interlingually* in relation to Latin. The language of the Third Reich appears disconnected, anachronistic and incommensurable. This language is denied the possibility of communication, which is demonstrated by translation:

Ein Studienrat hat sich der hehren Aufgabe unterzogen, das Wessel-Lied ins Lateinische zu übertragen [. . .] Horst Wessel statt Horaz! [. . .] Und der gute Magister hat sogar herausgefunden, wie S.A. zu übersetzen sei: „Societas Adolphi“. Wenn Lächerlichkeit tötete...⁹ (Wielek 1934, 276)

This marking of the boundary also works in the opposite direction of a translation into German: In almost the same manner, Ernst Bloch, an exiled German philosopher, was equally critical of Josef Bernhart's translation of *Summe der Theologie*, saying that the translator's linguistically purist translation strategy led to Thomas Aquinas becoming "völkisch" (Bloch 1935, 166).

Language, literature and identity seem to be conceptually linked in exile; a positioning on translation reveals an attitude toward all three concepts. The identity of the Exiled is conceived through translation and language; according to Cronin, translation is indeed at the centre of any thinking about identity (cf. Cronin 2006, 1).

For Hermann Kesten, an influencing author of the Weimar period and the main representative of the "Neue Sachlichkeit" ("New Objectivity") who went into exile to France in 1933 and to the US in 1940, the translatory moment is the subversion of the appropriation of German literature by Nazi ideology. Through the underlined polyphony, literature is disentangled from the narrow categorisations of national language and thus forms the foundation of his identity:

Übersetzungen leiten alle grossen deutschen Epochen ein. An fremden Klassikern bildeten sich die deutschen Schriftsteller und wuchsen an ihnen empor. Die deutsche Literatur beginnt mit der gotischen Bibel-Übersetzung des Ulfilas. Die Bücher der alten Juden, Griechen und Römer haben in allen Perioden die deutsche Sprache emporgehoben. Die Bibel, Homer, die griechischen Tragiker, Philosophen und Historiker, die provençalische Ritterdichtung, die lateinischen Klassiker und Kirchenväter, Shakespeare, Dante, die Spanier, die Italiener, Franzosen, Russen, Skandinavien, sogar Indiens und Chinas Dichter und

⁹ A Studienrat [student councilor] has undertaken the noble task of translating the Wessel song into Latin [. . .] Horst Wessel instead of Horace! [. . .] And the good Magister even found out how to translate S.A.: "Societas Adolphi". If ridiculousness could kill...

Philosophen waren die großen Vorbilder und Lehrer der deutschen Poeten. Es hat niemals eine bedeutende literarische Richtung in Deutschland gegeben, die national, die „autark“ war.¹⁰ (Kesten 1934, 453)

Kesten goes even further and rejects the ethno-linguistic concept, writing “die Deutschen [schrieben im 10./11. Jahrhundert] lateinisch” and in the course of their history appropriated “Stoffe, Ideale, Methoden, Versformen, Gesinnungen, Ideen und Empfindungen aus fremden Epochen und fremden Ländern”¹¹ (Kesten 1934, 453–454). Kesten relates it explicitly to translation: “Alle deutschen Klassiker waren Meisterübersetzer”¹² (Kesten 1934, 454).

The heteroglossia of the German language, expressed via translation, extends not only to literary discourses, which should have a certain autonomy towards pragmatic fields of language application and practices, but also to publishing; an instance of it can be seen in a contribution by the editors of *Die Sammlung* giving an overview of Nazi newspapers:

Hattest du doch geschwiegen, deutsches Wort! Du erzählst es ja selbst: die Leute hören nicht mehr recht hin, wenn du ihn loslässt, deinen gleichgeschalteten Schwatz. Kannst du den Mund nicht halten, aus dem kein deutsches Wort mehr kommt, nur noch ein göbbelsches?¹³ (Die Redaktion 1935, 392)

Like Hans Jacob’s *bordering* and rejecting translation from “Nazi German” into other languages, a clear intralingual border is drawn here as well. Language goes hand in hand with identity, and the border (and thus distance) becomes tangible and expressible via the reference to translation.

2.3. *Orient* (1942–1943) and *Aufbau* (1934–2004): Two approaches to translation

Exile seems to function as a facilitator of consolidating tendencies between literary and publishing discursive fields. Here, a plurality of linguistic practices, discourses,

10 Translations initiate all major German epochs. German writers were educated on foreign classics and thrived on them. German literature begins with the Gothic translation of the Bible by Ulfilas. The books of the ancient Jews, Greeks and Romans have elevated the German language in all ages. The Bible, Homer, the Greek tragedians, philosophers and historians, the Provençal chivalric poetry, the Latin classics and church fathers, Shakespeare, Dante, the Spaniards, the Italians, the French, the Russians, the Scandinavians, even the Indian and Chinese poets and philosophers were the great paragons and teachers of the German poets. There has never been a significant literary movement in Germany that was national, that was “autonomous”.

11 The Germans wrote in Latin in the 10th/11th century. [They appropriated] themes, ideals, methods, verse forms, mind-sets, ideas and sentiments from foreign epochs and foreign countries.

12 All German Classics mastered the translation.

13 If only you had kept silent, German word! You say it yourself: the people don’t really listen anymore when you let it go, your *gleichgeschaltet* gibberish. Can’t you keep your mouth shut, from which no longer comes a German Wort, only one of Göbbels?

and voices is evident. This plurality reflects the recharting of the exiled German language in all its manifestations. A final example of a particular relationship between translation and multilingualism in this recharting comes from exile periodicals of Jewish migration, which, due to their general informative focus, cover everyday translations and a variety of pragmatic linguistic practices. This type of translation must be considered in addition to literary translational practices, otherwise, it cannot do justice to the diversity of multilingual practices in exile. Journalism is here the connecting link between the pragmatic and literary fields.

Orient appears for just under a year under the editorship of Wolfgang Yourgrau and Arnold Zweig in Palestine. Yourgrau, a physicist and journalist, and the already well-known author Zweig both emigrated to Palestine after 1933 via different routes. In total, there were just under 40 issues of their periodical. The weekly journal addresses Jewish readers in Palestine, being the voice of the Western Jewish immigration seeking to find its place in the multilingualism debates under the British Mandate:

Unsere Zeitschrift erscheint in deutscher Sprache. Zu dieser Tatsache könnten wir uns selbst die verschiedensten Kommentare und die schärfsten Polemiken liefern. Dieses Blatt soll den Leser erreichen, dem die Beherrschung der hebräischen Sprache für die Zeitdauer dieses Krieges ein unerreichbares Ziel bleiben wird. Wir wenden uns nur an diesen Kreis.¹⁴ (Yourgrau 1942a, 2)

Aufbau on the other hand is probably one of the best-known exile periodicals. It survived the exile years, transforming itself from a booklet of the German-Jewish Club into the most quoted foreign language paper in the American press, which existed until 2004. From a journalistic point of view, the periodical focuses on Jewish migrants. The *Aufbau* positions itself fundamentally as being well-integrated and in active political participation. Americanisation becomes a keyword; it aims at everyday omnipresent symbolic inscription.

A Jewish community across time and space is being imagined and ascribed as readership irrespective of the exile languages spoken. There are regular eyewitness reports from Shanghai, Palestine, Tangier, Maelstrom or Australia. Yet again, identity remains tied to the German language. Multilingualism is omnipresent but almost never explicit. However, the language switch is hardly ever addressed: Albert Einstein's contributions appear in English, and with other authors, too, one is always uncertain

14 Our journal is published in German. Regarding this fact, we could deliver ourselves the most diverse comments and the sharpest polemics. This journal is intended to reach the reader for whom the mastery of the Hebrew language will remain an unattainable goal for the duration of this war. We address only this circle.

whether their works are translations at all. The proportion of contributions in English remains insignificant over the years, accounting for less than 1%.

What about translation? How is it used and presented in the two abovementioned periodicals? Translation occurs in *Orient* as an almost exclusively nameless phenomenon, except in the rare advertising. Apart from isolated translations from the Soviet and English press, translation is further to be found in rare reviews or obituaries. The position of German as the language of the Western Jewish emigrants in relation to the Yiddish of the Eastern Jewish population who had immigrated a few decades earlier, in addition to the English of the British Mandate government, and Hebrew, became a potential source of conflict in wartime: German was the language of the enemy.

Numerous contributions argue against this ascription as an enemy language and thus cope with multilingualism by referring to translation. Walter Zadek's *Sprich Hebräisch – oder stirb!* (Zadek 1942) can serve as an example. In view of the outbursts at Arnold Zweig's lecture, which was held in German, Walter Zadek, a bookseller and well-known journalist of the Weimar Republic (*Berliner Tageblatt*) who also fled to Palestine, speaks of "Sprachfanatiker" and sums up as follows: "Einen guten Roman eines jüdischen Autors kann man jederzeit ins Hebräische übersetzen – er muss nur überhaupt geschrieben worden sein" (Zadek 1942, 16).¹⁵ A similar position can be found in Harry Obermayer's article *Basic English versus Esperanto* (Obermayer 1942), in which the identity-building function of language is fundamentally rejected and subordinated to communicative purposes: Basic English with its 850 main words is sufficient even for literary communication: "Uebersetzungen von Novellen und wissenschaftlicher Literatur zeigen die große Reichweite dieser Sprache [Basic Englisch]"¹⁶ (Obermayer 1942, 15). Finally, Yourgrau's view, which is mainly directed towards Palestine, remains a look back: In his contribution *Heimat oder Asyl*, he attests to the "deutsche Juden" a clear foreignness towards the country of exile (Yourgrau 1942b).

In the 180 issues of *Aufbau* (1934–1941), translation also hardly occurs, at least explicitly, and is strongly dependent on language and function. Translations remain auxiliary, but only in relation to the English language. Translation is explicit in symbolic acts, where communication is expected to be authentic – for example in translating the poem by Emma Lazarus (*The New Colossus* 1883) which is engraved on the Statue of Liberty (Lazarus/Luitpold 1941). In the context of exile and the involvement of English, questions of aspired assimilation and bilingualism (German and English) seem to

¹⁵ "A good novel by a Jewish author can be translated into Hebrew at any time – it only has to have been written at all." – According to Zadek, one should wait for the next generation, which will naturally learn Hebrew (ibid.). Thus he takes a stand against forced nationalistic language policies.

¹⁶ Translations of novels and scientific literature show the wide range of this language [Basic English].

make translation obsolete. One might think it exists in *Aufbau* only in the private sphere, not in the public, where borders (and thus translation) are not supposed to exist. However, that is only in the case of English.

Elsewhere, translation is an indicator of perceived foreignness, alienation, thus marking the crossing of linguistic boundaries, as in texts from French, Czech, and especially Hebrew. Each translation from Hebrew is made explicit and each translator is named. Translation here is a signal of distance; this is implied, for instance, in the anonymous contribution to Moses Maimonides' memorial day: "Dies ist ein Teil unserer Tragik, – der Tragik des modernen Juden, insbesondere des modernen *deutschen* Juden: wir sind in jeder Literatur zu Hause, nur nicht in der jüdischen [. . .]"¹⁷ (Anonymous 1935, 1).

In conclusion, it can be said that translation did not play a significant role in the Palestinian or the US exile in view of the scarce findings (few translator names, implicit translation, etc.). Yet it still gives a glimpse of what exile and multilingualism-coping strategies might have to do with translation or the lack thereof. Translation was used by Jewish immigrants both as a sign of acculturation (*Aufbau*) and its refusal (*Orient*).

3. Conclusion

The mentioned examples (2.1, 2.2 and 2.3) deal with certain elements of the concrete linguistic conditions of German-speaking exile and are by no means all-encompassing. They should be understood merely as an introduction to the debate on the relationship between translation and multilingualism. This debate is unavoidably an inter- and transdisciplinary one (Exile Studies, Translation Studies, Literary Studies): sources already accessed in literary history (and German Exile Studies) need a reinterpretation, and entirely unknown bio-bibliographical data need to be extracted from exile periodicals and evaluated as historical sources.

Translation, in all its manifestations, can be understood here as overcoming or controlling a state of multilingualism conditioned by exile. The implications can be traced in relation to all linguistic fields, ranging from literary text production to everyday pragmatic speech acts. Moreover, translation can be interpreted here as regaining one's own subjectivity and control over (asymmetrical) multilingual settings and one's own language use, which subsequently lead to gaining more control over identity building. In this way, *language attrition* or *language maintenance* (Busch 2013, 66–67), both frequently employed topoi of exile literary historiography in its traditionally Man-

¹⁷ This is indeed part of our tragedy, – the tragedy of the modern Jew, especially of the modern *German* Jew: we are at home in every literature, just not in the Jewish one [. . .].

ichaeon division into bad (*attrition*) and good (*maintenance*), can be critically reflected and assessed in a nuanced way.

It is important to mention that literary actors (whether writers or journalists) may have their own specific approaches towards multilingualism and the forging of identity through language (here German) and thus towards translation. Here, national language conceptualisations and professional strategic considerations play a greater role than in the framework of other forms of migration. Nevertheless, their observations, so distinctly articulated and reflected specifically in the literary discourses through the handling of translation, can be transposed to non-literary discursive fields.

Different exile-specific multilingualism coping strategies became tangible (assimilation, refusal of integration, cultural reflexivity), which illustrates the complexity of the phenomenon of multilingualism. The urge to translate seems to be endogenous rather than exogenous, at least as far as identity (under multilingualism) is concerned (cf. Cronin 2006, 58). With reference to translation, the foreign, as well as self-attributed linguistic ascriptions (*bordering*), are negotiated both individually and collectively. In a certain way, these identificatory processes are often made possible by translation in the first place.

Translators (and translations) embody basic experiences of exile, insofar as being forced or bound to overcome linguistic and cultural foreignness, draws borders and shapes our understanding of language. How did translation shape the conception of the German language in multilingual exile? Did it have an impact on postwar German literature and beyond? It is not possible to provide a conclusive answer to these questions at this stage. Yet I am convinced of one thing: translation is insightful in that it always establishes and surpasses a border, it balances between simultaneous creation of similarity and difference, and it is instrumental in shaping the very concept of language. The latter aspect makes it particularly insightful for research into *Multilingualism* under and far beyond the notion of exile.

References

- Anonymous. 1935. "Maimonides. Zum 800-jährigen Gedenktag." *Aufbau* 1 (4): 1–2.
- Benteler, Anne. 2019. *Sprache im Exil. Mehrsprachigkeit und Übersetzung als literarische Verfahren bei Hilde Domin, Mascha Kaléko und Werner Lansburgh*. Berlin: J. B. Metzler.
- Bischoff, Doerte, Christoph Gabriel, and Esther Kilchmann, ed. 2014. *Sprache(n) im Exil*. (Exilforschung, 32). München: edition text + kritik.
- Bloch, Ernst. 1935. "Summe der Theologie von Thomas von Aquino." *Die Sammlung* 2 (3): 165–167.
- Boguna, Julija. 2022. "Das translatorische Profil von Exil-Zeitschriften (*Das Wort, Orient, Aufbau* und *Freies Deutschland*): Erkundungen auf fast unbekanntem Terrain." In *Translation und Exil*

(1933–1945) I. *Namen und Orte. Recherchen zur Geschichte des Übersetzens*, edited by Aleksey Tashinskiy, Julija Boguna und Tomasz Rozmyslowicz, 71–106. Berlin: Frank & Timme.

Busch, Brigitta. 2013. *Mehrsprachigkeit*. Wien: Facultas.wuv.

Cronin, Michael. 2006. *Translation and identity*. London; New York: Routledge.

Die Redaktion. 1935. "Zeitschriften in Deutschland." *Die Sammlung* 2 (7): 391–392.

Enderle-Ristori, Michaela, ed. 2012. *Traduire l'exil / Das Exil übersetzen. Textes, identités et histoire dans l'espace franco-allemand (1933–1945)*. Tours: Presses universitaires François-Rabelais.

Fischer, Ernst. 2021. *Geschichte des deutschen Buchhandels im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. Drittes Reich und Exil*. Teil 3: *Der Buchhandel im deutschsprachigen Exil 1933–1945*. Teilband 1. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Fólica, Laura, Diana Roig-Sanz, and Stefania Caristia, ed. 2020. *Literary translation in periodicals. Methodological challenges for a transnational approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gramling, David. 2021. *The invention of multilingualism*. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Jacob, Hans. 1938. "An ihrer Sprache sollt ihr sie erkennen. Die Gleichschaltung der deutschen Sprache." *Das Wort. Literarische Monatschrift* 3 (1): 81–86.

———. 1962. *Kind meiner Zeit. Lebenserinnerungen*. Köln, Berlin: Kiepenheuer & Witsch.

Jakobson, Roman. (1959) 2002. "On linguistic aspects of translation." In *The translation studies reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, 138–143. London: Routledge.

Kesten, Hermann. 1934. "Die deutsche Literatur." *Die Sammlung* 1 (9): 453–460.

Krohn, Claus-Dieter, and Michaela Enderle-Ristori, ed. 2007. *Übersetzung als transkultureller Prozess*. (Exilforschung, 25). Berlin: De Gruyter.

Landshoff, Fritz. 1986. "Vorwort." (Die Sammlung. Literarische Monatschrift unter dem Patronat von André Gide, Aldous Huxley, Heinrich Mann. Herausgegeben von Klaus Mann. Mit einem Vorwort von Friedrich H. Landshoff und einer Bibliographie von Reinhardt Gutsche. Reprint.) *Die Sammlung* 1 (1): V–XIII.

Lazarus, Emma, and Josef Luitpold, trans. 1941. "The New Colossus – Das Licht am Tor." *Aufbau* 7 (9): 24.

Maas, Lieselotte. 1978. *Deutsche Exilpresse in Lateinamerika*. Frankfurt am Main: Buchhändler-Vereinigung GmbH.

———. 1990. *Handbuch der deutschen Exilpresse 1933–1945*. Bd. 4: *Die Zeitungen des deutschen Exils in Europa von 1933 bis 1939*. München; Wien: Carl Hanser.

Müller, Olaf. 2017. "Hans Jacob." In *Germersheimer Übersetzerlexikon – UeLEX*. <http://uelex.de/uebersetzer/jacob-hans/>.

Obermayer, Harry. 1942. "Basic English contra Esperanto." *Orient* 3 (11): 14–17.

Prunč, Erich. 2000. "Vom Translationsbiedermeier zur Cyber-translation." *TEXTconTEXT* (14.1 = NF. 4.1.): 3–75. https://online.uni-graz.at/kfu_online/wbLdb2.downloadDocument?pLstNr=15804%20&pLstSchichtNr=3400765&pDocStoreNr=66957.

Roussel, Hélène, and Lutz Winckler, ed. 1992. *Deutsche Exilpresse und Frankreich (1933–1940)*. Bern: Lang.

Sakai, Naoki. 2012. "Heterolingual Address and Transnationality: Translation and Bordering." In *Worldwide. Archipels de la mondialisation, archipiélagos de la globalización*, edited by Ottmar Ette and Gesine Müller, 343–358. Madrid; Frankfurt: Iberoamericana; Vervuert.

Utsch, Susanne. 2007. *Sprachwechsel im Exil. Die "linguistische Metamorphose" von Klaus Mann*. Köln: Böhlau.

Wielek, Heinz. 1934. "Nazideutsche Jugenderziehung." *Die Sammlung* 1 (5): 274–276.

Yourgrau, Wolfgang. 1942a. "Auftakt." *Orient* 3 (1): 3–4.

———. 1942b. "Heimat oder Asyl." *Orient* 3 (27): 89–92.

Zadek, Walter. 1942. "Sprich Hebräisch – oder stirb!" *Orient* 3 (7): 15–17.

Julija Boguna – born in Riga, is a Research Associate at the Department of Translation, Linguistics and Cultural Studies in the Intercultural German Studies Unit in Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz. Her research interests include German-Baltic cultural history, translation history (18th–20th centuries), nation-building, and exile periodicals and their relationship to translation.

e-mail: boguna[at]uni-mainz.de

Mitmekeelsus ja tõlge: juhtumiuuring pagulasperioodikast (1933–1945)

Julija Boguna

Võtmesõnad: saksakeelne pagulus aastatel 1933–1945, perioodilised väljaanded, kirjanduslik ja tarbetõlge

Tõlkimine kui keeltevaheline suhtlusakt on üks kultuurilisi aluspraktikaid ning seda on võimalik kasutada eri eesmärkidel mitmesugustes kontekstides. Tõlge on alati ajalooline nähtus ning seda saab uurida üksnes sellisel moel. Pagulus kui tegevusraam pakub tõlkega seoses arvukaid võimalusi, sest seostub keele- ja kultuuriipiiride ületamisega sunnitud mobiilsuse tingimustes. Saksakeelne eksiil aastatel 1933–1945 ei ole erandiks ning selle mitmesuguseid tahke on uuritud enam kui 70 aastat, eriti kirjandusloo kontekstis. Kuni viimase ajani mängis tõlge sellises teadustöös üksnes marginaalset rolli. On tehtud mõningaid uurimusi paguluse keeleliste aspektide kohta, mis on puudutanud ka tõlkega seotud teemasid, nagu näiteks keelevahetus või tuntud autorite enesetõlkimine. Kuid tõlget kasutati sageli migratsiooniprotsessis tõlgituks osutumise metafoorina või siis piirduti kirjandusloominguga, nt selliste autorite puhul nagu Klaus Mann, Paul Celan, Hilde Domin jr. Tõlke või tõlkimise pragmaatiliste aspektide tegevusena, mis on kirjandusliku autoriloominguga võrdne, kuid seisab sellest eraldi, ei pööratud tavaliselt tähelepanu, nagu ka ajakirjanduslikule ja teadustõlkele.

Projekt „Exil:Trans“ (2019–2022) oli esimene katse täita seda uurimislünka saksa keelt kõnelevate pagulaste osas. Projektis uuriti Saksamaalt põgenenud isikute tõlkealast tegutsemist. Võimalik, et need inimesed jõudsid tõlkimise juurde üksnes maapao kaudu või pärast seda. Tegu ei olnud ainuüksi kirjanikega, vaid ka ajakirjanike ja teadlastega ning ka kunstnike, arstide ja paljude teiste valdkondade esindajatega. Projekti osana vaadeldi ka tarbetõlke (argitõlke) aspekte. Materjali otsimisel osutus väga viljakaks pagulasperioodika. Perioodiliste väljaannete kaudu tuli päevavalgele palju materjali: avaldamata teoseid (tõlkeid), tundmatuid tõlkijaid, kelle hulgas oli ka tuntud kirjanikke. Projekti raames viidi läbi alusuuringuid, kogudes biobibliograafilisi baasandmeid: KES tõlkis maapaos MIDA ja KUIDAS? Eespool mainitud eksiiliuuringute, s.t maapaole pühendatud ajaloolis-kirjanduslike käsitluste tulemused pakuvad olulist sissevaadet sellesse teemasse. Siiski tuleb need autori- ja lähtekultuurikesksed andmed ümber tõlgendada tõlkelooliste küsimuste valguses.

Paguluses toimuva tõlkimisega seonduvas mängib alati rolli mitmekeelsus. Ometi ei ole selle poole kuni viimase ajani eksplitsiitselt pöördutud. Käesolev artikkel esindab katset uurida mitmekeelsuse esinemisviise pagulaste tõlketegevustes. Sel eesmärgil analüüsitakse ajakirjandusest leitud tõlkijate, kirjastajate ning kirjanike tõlketemaalisi arvamused. Lisaks kasutatakse kvantitatiivseid meetodeid: koostatakse perioodiliste väljaannete individuaalsed tõlkeprofiilid ning kogutakse kokku kõik tõlked saksa keelde (kuupäev, koht, number), vastavate tõlkijate nimed ja lähtekeeled. Mõlemat meetodit kasutades püütakse vastata järgmistele küsimustele: kuidas tegeldi mitmekeelsusega, kas seda käsitleti ning esitati tõlkega seoses eksplitsiitselt? Milliseid strateegiaid ning tegevusvorme tõlkimisel rakendati? Kuidas kasutati tõlget maapao mitmekeelsetele kontekstidele reageerides, millistele identifitseerimisnõuetele selle abil vastati?

Teadlikult kasutatakse ruumis ja ajas hajusaid näiteid – kirjandusajakiri Wort Moskvas (Nõukogude Liit), nädalaleht Orient Haifas (Palestiina), ajaleht Aufbau New Yorgis (USA), ajaleht Pariser Tageb-

latt (Prantsusmaa), kirjandusajakiri Die Sammlung Amsterdams (Madalmaad). Vaadeldavad tekstid ja perioodilised väljaanded ilmusid saksakeelse eksiili eri staadiumides ning kohtades. Ilmnes, et tõlke kohtlemise ja kasutamise kaudu töötasid pagulased välja väga erinevaid mitmekeelsusega toimetulemise strateegiaid. Need ulatusid tõlkimast keeldumisest intensiivse tõlketegevuseni ning neid kasutati nii valitsevatest mitmekeelsustingimustest eraldumiseks kui ka nendega lõimumiseks.

Artiklis ei esitata süstemaatilist ülevaadet, vaid soovitakse algatada diskussiooni ning rõhutada perioodikaväljaannete käsitlemise olulisust mitmekeelsuse uurimisel kirjandus- ja tõlkeloos.

Julija Boguna on sündinud Riias; Mainzi Johannes Gutenbergi ülikooli kultuuridevahelise saksa uuringute valdkonna tõlke-, keele- ja kultuuriuuringute osakonna teadur. Tema uurimishuvide hulka kuuluvad baltisaksa kultuurilugu, 18.–19. sajandi tõlkelugu, rahvuste kujunemine ning eksiilperioodika ja selle suhe tõlkimisega.

e-post: boguna[at]uni-mainz.de