

INTRODUCTION

LAZARUS AND THE MODERN WORLD

MAX SILVERMAN

Concentrationary Art is the fourth and final book in a series on ‘the concentrationary’. In our previous books in this series – *Concentrationary Cinema*, *Concentrationary Memories* and *Concentrationary Imaginaries* – Griselda Pollock and I outlined a theory that has its origins in the thinking of a number of French (and German) survivors of the vast network of concentration camps in Germany and Austria during World War II (totalling more than 10,000 camps), especially the analysis of the structural significance of the camp system that David Rousset expounded in his book *L’Univers concentrationnaire* (1946). (For a fuller discussion, see our introductions to the three books mentioned above.)¹ In this volume, we would like to make a fuller case for the importance of ‘the concentrationary’ and, more specifically, the new theory of art based on it, as formulated by Mauthausen survivor Jean Cayrol, which he called ‘concentrationary art’ or ‘Lazarean art’. Cayrol formulated his concept of concentrationary art primarily in relation to literature; in this book, we will extend and develop the idea of the concentrationary, discuss Cayrol’s use of the figure of Lazarus to define this art, and highlight its links with other artistic practices, especially film and music, and contemporary cultural and social theories (such as theories of the everyday and critiques of modern forms of capitalism). We will also confirm the argument that runs through our whole series concerning the importance of Cayrol’s concentrationary aesthetic today and the need to distinguish it from broader discussions of art and the Holocaust.

Largely forgotten over the years, the work of Jean Cayrol has experienced a limited revival in the French-speaking world more recently, since his death in 2005 at the age of 93.² In 2007 some of his major works were brought together in one volume under the title *Oeuvre lazaréenne*, a conference on Cayrol took place in Rome in 2008, and a collection of essays appeared based on a conference on Cayrol held the following year in Bordeaux (Cayrol’s place of birth). The year 2009 also saw the appearance of probably the best work devoted to Cayrol’s Lazarean writing by Marie-Laure Basuyaux. Michel Pateau produced a biography of Cayrol in 2012 to complement the still-excellent earlier book on Cayrol’s life and work by Daniel Oster.³

Much of this recent work has reminded us of Cayrol's extraordinary biography and his extensive influence on French cultural practice and debates in the post-war period. He was a published poet before joining the resistance in 1941, was arrested (for the second time) in May 1942 and sent to an internment camp in Fresnes (France).⁴ In March 1943 he was deported to the notorious Mauthausen-Gusen concentration camp complex in Austria under the infamous *Nacht und Nebel* decree, designed to make political resisters to Nazism disappear into the 'night and fog'. It is his experience at Mauthausen-Gusen that forms the basis for Cayrol's key concept of the survivor as a 'revenant' from a state of death and will be at the heart of his ideas on concentrationary art.

On his return to France in 1945, Cayrol published in quick succession a collection of poems entitled *Poèmes de la nuit et du brouillard* (1946) and his first novel, *Je vivrai l'amour des autres* (1947), consisting of two parts, *On vous parle* and *Les Premiers Jours*. In the post-war period he stopped writing poetry (until 1969) and became a novelist, critic, essayist, filmmaker and editor. Through this prodigious output and his unflinching support of new writers and critics, he became one of the most important figures in post-war avant-garde culture and theory in France. In 1955 he wrote the narrated text for Alain Resnais's film on the camps, *Nuit et brouillard* (*Night and Fog*), and also worked with Resnais on *Muriel ou le temps d'un retour* (1962). In 1956 he established the journal *Écrire* at the Paris publishing house Editions du Seuil, whose principal aim was to foster young literary talent. It was the precursor to the better-known *Tel Quel* literary magazine that revolutionized theory in the 1960s.⁵ During this period, he championed figures such as Roland Barthes, Philippe Sollers, Marcelin Pleynet and Kateb Yacine (amongst many others) and was a significant influence on the development of the Nouveau Roman (though he was never considered one of its major practitioners).

In the English-speaking world, Cayrol has received little scholarly attention, and even that has been limited largely to his contribution to *Nuit et brouillard*.⁶ It is no surprise, then, that the two essays that form the basis of his ideas on concentrationary art, 'Les Rêves lazareens' and 'Pour un romanesque lazareen', have never been translated into English. The former was first published in the journal *Les Temps Modernes* in 1948, the latter, under the title 'D'un Romanesque concentrationnaire', in the journal *Esprit* in 1949. They were republished together in 1950 under the title *Lazare parmi nous*.⁷ Written soon after the end of the war, the essays are based, in part, on Cayrol's own experience as a political prisoner in Mauthausen-Gusen, but also on his reflections on literature in the post-war world. This volume consists of the first English translations of these essays and is accompanied by six new essays that explore different aspects of Cayrol's theory and apply it to other cultural works.

Despite more recent interest in Cayrol in the French-speaking world, he is, nevertheless, still rarely mentioned in the context of the larger discussions about art and theory in the wake of the camps (and hardly ever in relation to theories of the novel).⁸ Theodor Adorno, Maurice Blanchot, Primo Levi, Elie Wiesel, Claude Lanzmann

and others have been consistently evoked in recent years and their views are widely known. We believe that Cayrol's notion of concentrationary art deserves to be considered alongside these views as a major contribution to these debates. We will suggest that Cayrol's ideas on concentrationary art offer a different (though sometimes overlapping) perspective to more widely known theories. An understanding of these two essays allows us to reconfigure the field that now goes under the name of 'art and the Holocaust' by challenging that category as a discrete entity unto itself and by reconnecting it with broader theory and practice. Beyond that, Cayrol's theory gives us a powerful way of reading the hidden forms of disfigured and transformed humanity in the world today. This volume is, therefore, both an exploration of Cayrol's theory of concentrationary art and a series of studies of its potential as a theoretical resource for the analysis of contemporary art and culture. In this introduction, I will first describe briefly the regime that Cayrol endured at the Mauthausen-Gusen concentration camp, then trace the main principles of concentrationary art that he formulated in the post-war period, primarily in *Lazare parmi nous*, but also in some of his other writings. Following this, I will place the notion of 'the concentrationary' within the broader post-war context of French social and cultural theory and practice. Finally, I will introduce the six new essays that make up the rest of this collection.

Mauthausen-Gusen Concentration Camp

Simply naming the camp is insufficient to convey the physical and mental torture endured in this complex. Situated twenty kilometres east of Linz, Mauthausen-Gusen was initiated in March 1938 after the annexation of Austria to the Third Reich and was only liberated on 5 May 1945 when 85,000 survivors were found. The death toll was calculated at a maximum of 325,000 and more recently at about 200,000. The name covers a complex of four core camps in the towns of Mauthausen (with three subcamps) and Sankt Georgen an der Gusen. These core camps were the headquarters of one of the largest slave labour camp complexes with a total of 100 subcamps: quarries, munitions factories, mines, arms manufacture and aircraft assembly plants, which were run by major industrial companies for a profit. This included the underground Steyr-Daimler-Puch company in which, we believe, Cayrol was forced to work.

In Nazi classifications of the camp system, Mauthausen-Gusen was ranked at Level III, meaning that this was intended to be the toughest regime invented specifically for the most significant and determined 'political enemies' of the regime. The special responsibility of this camp was 'extermination through labour' of the intelligentsia. While the camp was not an extermination camp, it disposed of the failing inmates who were starved and overworked to death by several means. At first, small numbers were sent to a euthanasia site at Schloss Hartheim (which appears in the film *Nuit et brouillard*); then prisoners' lives were ended by lethal injection to the heart and, as the numbers rose, by gas van and, finally, by Zyklon B in a specially built gas cham-

ber. Other forms of mass or individual execution included icy water sprayed on naked prisoners in freezing weather until they froze to death or being drowned in barrels of water. Beating and hanging were also used. Progressive reduction of food rations was systematically used in conjunction with excessive work, such as forcing the emaciated prisoners to carry 50-kilogram stones up the full length of the 184-step stone staircase (known as the Stairs of Death) out of the quarry. During the period 1940–42, the average inmate weighed 40 kilograms while engaged in heavy industrial labour twelve hours a day. The average life expectancy of an inmate was six months, and by 1945 it was reduced to three. The majority of the inmates were Poles, Republican Spaniards, Soviet prisoners of war and resistance fighters from many parts of Europe. Some Jewish prisoners were sent there for slave labour (2,760 in total, until 1944 when Hungarian Jews and then prisoners from Auschwitz arrived, creating a total in 1945 of 29,500). According to the figures given by the Holocaust Encyclopedia of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 197,464 prisoners passed through the camp, of whom 95,000 died and, of these, 14,000 were Jewish.

Cayrol was sent to the camps at Gusen as a young man, where he was set to work on road and railway construction. Driven to contemplate suicide by the torture of hunger and hard labour, he was given some extra rations by a German Catholic priest, Johann Gruber, who had been imprisoned by the Third Reich since 1938. Gruber had access to outside support that enabled him to obtain food that he then distributed within the camp. He also had Cayrol moved to an indoor job working as an inspector in the Steyr-Daimler-Puch factory. Gruber was brutally tortured to death when his organization that smuggled information about Gusen out of the camp was discovered by the SS in 1944. The encounter with Gruber, and being brought back to 'life', is, biographically, one of the sources of the concept of the Lazarean, although it is important to stress how Cayrol developed the concept beyond his immediate experience. The sustained torture systematically practised in the camp, and the spectacular acts of violent cruelty, are the foundations for the imaginative world that Cayrol inhabited during incarceration and in the wake of the camp experience, despite the surface appearance of regained normality in the post-war world.

Concentrationary, or Lazarean, Art⁹

As Griselda Pollock and I have argued in the earlier books in this series, the transformed reality of the post-war world that Cayrol refers to in the preface to *Lazare parmi nous* is founded on the notion of the persistence of what Rousset called the 'concentrationary universe'. Rousset's definition of the concentrationary emphasizes both its novelty, in terms of a disfigurement of humanity, and its connections with the world beyond the camp. Rousset warns us of the potential reappearance of a phenomenon that is now latent in our everyday reality, because, far from belonging to another world that has no links with our own, it has grown out of the familiar soil of Western capitalism and continues to flourish in this terrain:

⁹Concentrationary Art: Jean Cayrol, the Lazarean and the Everyday in Post-war Film, Literature, Music and the Visual Arts" Edited by Griselda Pollock and Max Silverman. <http://berghahnbooks.com/title/PollockArt>

Germany interpreted, with an originality in keeping with her history, the crisis that led her to the concentrationary universe. But the existence and the mechanism of that crisis were inherent in the economic and social foundations of capitalism and imperialism. Under a new guise, similar effects may reappear tomorrow. There remains therefore a very specific war to be waged. The lessons learned from the concentration camps provide a marvellous arsenal for that war.¹⁰

In the preface to *Lazare parmi nous*, Cayrol repeats both Rousset's warning and his vision of the proximity of 'normal' and concentrationary life. Despite the fact that the war finished only a few years before, the events were already being forgotten and giving way to what Cayrol describes as 'the astonishing frivolity of the modern world' (29).¹¹ The present, however, bears 'the traces of an event which many have sought to relegate to the ruins of contemporary history' (29). These traces must be identified and made visible. The decision to republish the essays under a new title is, therefore, not only to warn us to 'watch out' and 'be on our guard', 'lest we forget', but also to reveal 'the concentrationary or Lazarean *proliferation* that has occurred in the soft humus of daily life' (30–31). Here, then, we have two of the major principles underpinning and defining Cayrol's idea of concentrationary art: art as a reminder and warning against forgetting, and art that can draw together the concentrationary reality and the post-war world of renewed 'normality' to show their interconnections.

Cayrol uses different metaphors to describe this invisible reality, or hidden face, of our normal lives. The concentrationary reality has 'grown up clandestinely' like a 'frozen river which flows through the very heart of our world'; it 'has lived on in multiple repercussions, difficult as these are to trace' (29–30). By using the figure of Lazarus (he who has experienced death and returns to the land of the living) and bringing him into contact with 'us' (those who know nothing of this world) in the title *Lazare parmi nous*, Cayrol explicitly evokes the theme of a hidden presence from elsewhere that inhabits our everyday lives in the here and now and has transformed our everyday reality. Lazarus might look like us but, beneath his 'normal' appearance, lies a terrible truth. Concentrationary art is therefore premised on the idea of the present as haunted by a past that has not passed, the present as hiding another reality that is present but not visible, the notion of 'doubling' that captures this uncanny co-presence of the normal and the strange in the post-war world, the breakdown of the separation between the concentrationary universe and the normal world (and, consequently, a redefinition of the idea of the concentrationary itself), and the protean nature of the concentrationary universe that is present in the most unlikely of places. As Cayrol says, '[a]nd whose idea was it anyway to think for an instant that the Camps remain unchanging, in spite of the passage of time, the changing seasons and hopes?' (51).

The notion of 'doubling' is most apparent in the concentrationary dream. In one sense, dreams have become the only means of defence for the camp prisoner against the terrible reality of concentrationary life, which is itself a form of 'unreality'. In the

dream, the prisoner finds a retreat and a form of solace and salvation: ‘a dream was like an almond that no one was to crack. Inside, immaculate and intact, hid the secret which allowed some to survive, along with a strange explanation of their salvation’ (34). Yet, in another sense, the retreat that the dream affords is founded not on the safety of a world uncontaminated by the horrors of the camp but on a sense of confusion in which the frontier between the two worlds has broken down:

We attempted to exist in two universes which contradicted and deformed one another: the savage and incoherent universe of the Concentration Camp was seen in a certain light because we still had one foot in the real world thanks to the subterfuge of our memory and our dreams; and the real world to which we aspired, when in contact with concentrationary reality, took on a mysterious and confused ardour and flung us back into the extreme scenes of our reveries. (37)

Cayrol talks of a ‘double version’, of the ‘waking dream’, ‘the living dead’ and ‘this double existence’: ‘Even at this stage, an impression of dual reality [‘dédoublément’] was taking shape in these prison dreams, an impression that was to become a permanent state of mind for the prisoner’ (39). Dreams are, then, not so much a separate world but rather they mingle with the prisoner’s waking life to create a strange, composite world. It is the world of the waking dream that allows the prisoner to be both present and absent at the same time, here and elsewhere, and therefore curiously absent from the very rigours that he was forced to undergo every day: ‘These iridescent night time perspectives were superimposed on his everyday existence and gave him the possibility of being “elsewhere”, to be with others without being like others’ (34). Concentrationary reality is, above all, not set apart from the world of the everyday – that is, a descent into a hell that bears no mark of the world from which the prisoner has come – but normality disfigured and ‘made strange’ so that the prisoner exists in a hinterland between different states: ‘We ended up, as a result of this internal rupture between two universes, living equally *between* two universes, without ever completely joining them, and this left us even more, and perhaps evermore, feeling as though we were *wavering*, in a state of mental vagrancy and rootlessness’ (37).

The camp experience of ‘living equally *between* two universes’ and the ‘state of mental vagrancy’ that this produces is a lesson to be learnt for the post-war world. The task of concentrationary literature is to capture this disfigured reality of the present (‘[h]uman disfigurement has been taken to extremes and it falls to us to recognize its corpses’ [58]), this feeling of floating between universes, this sense of doubling and ‘rootlessness’. It will be ‘a concentrationary realism for every scene of our private lives’, a literature not of the camps but of today’s ‘concentrationary everyday reality’ (49). At the heart of this literature will be a new hero/antihero who will not be based on ‘traditional psychology’ but will be the fractured ‘Lazarean being . . . who lives on two distinct planes, distinct but nevertheless joined by an invisible thread, the plane of terror, and the plane of exaltation, that of exhilaration and that of detachment’

(53). Solitude will be his defining trait and his fate, 'as though a judge had condemned him to a life of the most horrifying solitude, a desolate solitude, in which any human face seems forbidden' (54). He will be present and distant, fearful in the calmest of situations, alert but distracted, always split between different states:

Overall, the Lazarean hero is never where he seems. He must make enormous efforts to *think* he is there and not elsewhere, for he has lived in a world located nowhere, whose borders are undefined, for they are the borders of death. He is ever suspicious of the place where he has just arrived. (61)

The Lazarean character of the new literature is a haunted being but will also haunt others as he penetrates their separate space and casts a shadow over their frivolous lives: 'This uprooted man, in the grips of the untiring indigence that haunts the world, can only live through others, and is very good at speaking for others who seek to deny their own agony' (62).

Cayrol's vision in these essays is ambivalent: a new literature is needed to reveal the haunted nature of the human in the wake of the camps but as a means of resisting its presence and giving us back a sense of the human that has been forever tainted. The realm of objects can play a central role in opening up the camp that the world has become and allowing us to see again:

The things that form part of his fragile heritage to him possess a presence and exceptional intensity and rarity that sometimes even the living do not. . . . Thus, the realm of objects will play an attentive and meticulous role in Lazarean literature. It will have its own passage of time, its own emotions, passions, and reticence, and it will sometimes function as an escape from solitude, an opening into the world of others, like "eyes" . . . The object next to a human being may prove more revealing and accessible than the being itself. (61)

As Roland Barthes remarks in an early article on Cayrol, 'Cayrol's objects are not at all personalized but nevertheless produce a particular sort of affectivity; a warmth emanates from them and they constitute a refuge in the way that a big city can comfort a frightened man'.¹² In his essay in this volume, Patrick French cites Barthes's later distinction, in his essay 'The World as Object' ('Le monde-objet'), between Cayrol's 'non-proprietary engagement' with objects and the 'ownership' of objects displayed in Dutch still-life painting.¹³ The post-war world is a place of objectification, illusion and the commodification (and hence dehumanization) of everyday life. However, by defamiliarizing the 'object-ness' of the world and rediscovering the sociality and human contact that adheres to objects, art will see through this veil of mystification to remind us of human affectivity and freedom. Cayrol adapts his surrealist background – 'I was a surrealist at eleven years old' ('J'ai été surréaliste à onze ans') – and post-war Marxism to reformulate a political poetics in the wake of the camps.¹⁴

In terms of the obvious Christian connotations of the use of the figure of Lazarus as the path to a new humanity, it is surprising that Cayrol's own Christianity is not more prominent in the essays than it is. True, he refers to 'thorns' and 'stigmata'; however, Cayrol's Lazarus rarely invokes the biblical scene: 'It can be noted that in this world I am attempting to describe, the face of Christ does not appear; the Lazarean only possesses the Camp's pain, this pain that veils him in ambiguity and shrouds him in equivocation' (59). And even when he refers explicitly to 'a literature of mercy that saves man' (62) at the end of the essay on Lazarean literature, it is not so much in terms of a Christian sense of mercy, more as a tool for the revelation of disaster and the apocalypse of history. There is more Walter Benjamin and Bertolt Brecht here than Christian resurrection. Catherine Coquio observes that '[f]or Cayrol, Lazarus is no longer the man whom Jesus brought back to life but the forever solitary individual who, fated to live and die twice, has been dispossessed of both his life *and* his death', and describes concentrationary art as 'more poetic than religious' ('plus poétique que religieuse'). Similarly, Basuyaux notes that Cayrol's essay on Lazarean literature should be seen as a secularized version of what may have been lived on a more religious plane.¹⁵ Cayrol's use of the Lazarus story is, then, less a Christian parable of resurrection as a depiction of the transformation of humanity and the modern world in the wake of the camps and the presence of death in life.¹⁶

A Concentrationary Style

If we broaden the perspective of the ideas expressed in *Lazare parmi nous*, we can see more clearly how Cayrol's concentrationary art differs from other theories of art in the wake of the camps and, especially, from what has come to be known (much later) as Holocaust art. The fact that 'the concentrationary' refers to a human condition – or 'anthropological mutation' ('mutation anthropologique'), as Jean-Pierre Salgas describes it – rather than life in the camps, and affects us all rather than simply the prisoners of concentration camps is a clear indication that this is not a literature of survivor testimony.¹⁷ Although, in the two essays, Cayrol cites the personal experience of fellow deportees as examples of Lazarean literature, the art that he then goes on to describe is not an account of that experience and therefore does not give rise (at least directly) to the accompanying questions around trauma, testimony, truth and the ineffable. Concentrationary art is not testimony but a certain type of literature.

Yet it is not even a literature of the camps. Often it has nothing explicitly to do with life in the camps. Cayrol's own novels did not, on the whole, deal directly with his own experience of being a prisoner in Mauthausen. Basuyaux makes precisely this point and distinguishes Cayrol from other 'concentrationary' writers with whom he is often associated, such as Robert Antelme, David Rousset, Pierre Daix, André Schwarz-Bart or Primo Levi, for whom testimony was central:

As opposed to these authors, J. Cayrol has never written 'his' testimony of the camps. Neither do his fictions nor his essays have a literal relation to this experience. This essential point prevents us from seeing these texts in the same way as other testimonies.¹⁸

In an earlier article, Marc Bertrand had already suggested that Cayrol defines the relationship between the camps and literature not in terms of testimonial experience but in terms of the disfiguring of humanity that took place there:

The symbolic figure of Lazarus is not an abstraction, it emerges from the lived experience of the concentration camps. However, it is not an explicit testimony of the horror of the camps . . . The interest and importance of Cayrol's work comes from the fact that, from the outset, it transposes, in the most accurate and lasting form, a particular historical event that Cayrol called *THE OUTRAGE* inflicted on the contemporary human condition. Lazarean art was 'directly born out of such human convulsion, out of a catastrophe that shook the very foundations of our conscience' (49). Moreover, what adds an extra dimension to the Lazarean narrative is neither its unique reference to the concentrationary, nor the problems of Lazarus's reinsertion into a miraculously rediscovered life. Infused with the heightened sensitivity of the spectre, the world of the *Return* quickly appears as one that is disfigured by the major tics of the concentrationary universe. 'More than ever, it reeks of the concentrationary', wrote Jean Cayrol; 'concentrationary influence and anxiety are growing ceaselessly, not only in their uninterrupted effects . . . but even more in the European and even worldwide psyche' (49).¹⁹

Concentrationary art must respond to the way the present is haunted by a catastrophic past, what Peter Kuon refers to as 'a concentrationary imprint on humanity which cannot be erased'.²⁰ Jean-Louis Déotte also describes Cayrol's ambition as an attempt to create an art that will register not the experience of survivors but that of a whole society: 'It is the post-totalitarian era which is itself the survivor . . . [Cayrol] proposes that we have all entered into a new world that of the Lazarean'.²¹

In Cayrol's vision, concentrationary art will therefore eschew the testimonial experience of survivors of the camps and will, instead, be a new literature that can register the event as an 'aftershock' or as 'the existence of a post-war camp, a camp of the present, which includes all aspects of everyday life'.²² Cayrol's idea of concentrationary art is, above all, a style that attempts to capture (or at least gesture to) the disfigurement of humanity (that 'mutation anthropologique') that took place (though not uniquely) in the concentration camps. In 'Pour un romanescque lazareen', Cayrol clearly expresses this search for a particular style that would capture the strangeness of the post-war world in the wake of the camps:

When considering the kind of life on the fringes that awaits camp prisoners, ought we not to ask ourselves whether there might also be a particular way of writing, of perceiving, of approaching things? Is there any such thing as a concentrationary style or literature, – apart from that of victims, who have nothing left to express – a literature in which all events, even the most familiar, seem incomprehensible, reprehensible, revolting, irritating and so extremely opaque, especially to the uninitiated. (51)

We are dealing here, then, with a literature that evokes the camps only indirectly, obliquely and allusively through the mark that they have left on the everyday world of today. Cayrol is arguing for an analogical, allegorical or, as one early critic suggested, a ‘parabolic’ literature in response to the disaster.²³ In ‘Pour un romanesque lazareen’, Cayrol refers to a number of artists who could be said to practise such an art, only a few of whom are deportees, and some of whom precede the historical event of the camps itself: Prévost, Stendhal, Picasso and, above all, ‘the troubled Albert Camus’, whom he calls ‘the first historian and researcher’ (52) of concentrationary art.²⁴ What allows Cayrol to characterize the work of these diverse artists as ‘concentrationary’ (and elsewhere he makes the analogy with Kafka’s *The Trial* and *In the Penal Colony*) is not the subject matter of their art but, rather, their ability to find an appropriate form (or style) to convey the transformation of the human in the modern era. Like Lazarus who comes from one time and place to haunt another (and hence disturbs the relation between past and present, life and death), this literature exists in a timeless zone to refashion our sense of self and the real.

In his 1964 postface to Cayrol’s 1959 novel *Les corps étrangers*, Barthes lucidly identifies the way in which the novel evokes the historical event stylistically without ever naming it explicitly, so that it inhabits everyday life in the present as a sort of existential ‘malaise’:

What must be suggested, if not explicated, is how such a work – whose germ is in a specific, dated history – is nonetheless entirely a literature of today. The first reason is perhaps that the concentrationary system is not dead: there appear in the world odd concentrationary impulses – insidious, deformed, familiar – cut off from their historical model but dispersed like a kind of style; Cayrol’s novels are the very passage from the concentrationary event to the concentrationary everyday; in them we rediscover today, twenty years after the camps, a certain form of human malaise, a certain quality of atrocity, of the grotesque, of the absurd, whose shock we receive in the presence of certain events, or worse still, in the presence of certain images of our time.²⁵

Barthes’s engagement with Cayrol dates from 1950 and, notably, he refers to Cayrol three times in *Le degré zéro de l’écriture* (1953).²⁶ Here, the works of Cayrol, Camus, Blanchot, Queneau and others are examples of writing stripped of the historical and

institutional baggage known as ‘literature’, which he will call either ‘the zero degree of writing’ (‘le degré zéro de l’écriture’), ‘neutral writing’ (‘une écriture blanche’, ‘une écriture neutre’) or ‘transparent writing’ (‘une écriture transparente’). Yet, in this postface entitled ‘La Rature’ written eleven years later, Barthes returns to the link between a style of writing and its historical imprint, thus highlighting the constant tension in Barthes’s own theories between a neutral writing and its social meanings. In ‘La Rature’, Barthes identifies the central feature of Cayrol’s concentrationary art: a particular form of writing that registers – indirectly, even insidiously – the historical moment as a series of echoes and reverberations in the present and that can hold up to the surface of our familiar world a mirror whose reflection reveals a haunted landscape.²⁷

In his coauthored book on cinema with Claude Durand, Cayrol describes this process as the construction of a parallel universe through which the viewer/reader can perceive the familiar world differently:

The imagination could thus be defined as the perception, or apprehension, of the real through this parallel universe produced by means of the cinema, whose time of reading (the rhythm of editing) is not the instantaneous time of seeing an image but the visual time required for the doubling of this image.²⁸

This way of reading the ‘real’ through its ‘stretched out’ and ‘doubled’ image confirms Basuyaux’s description of Cayrol’s method as a ‘secret’ way of bearing witness to the real through fiction (‘témoigner clandestinement’). Just as, according to Cayrol, the concentrationary reality ‘has grown up clandestinely’ in everyday life, so the art required to expose it must also be a secret testimony to a transformed landscape. Cayrol affirmed this indirect method in an interview in 1957: ‘I write to testify. . . . No, that’s a ridiculous thing to say. What I mean is, to testify secretly (*clandestinement*)’.²⁹ What cannot be described directly has to be evoked allusively in other terms and, hence, draws together the experiential and aesthetic in a distinctive way.

However, as Salgas observes, Cayrol’s Lazarean literature not only refashions the opposition between testimony and fiction but ‘all the conventional alternatives of the discourse on the camps: representation—the unrepresentable . . . before—after, etc.’.³⁰ It is an imaginative approach that allows one thing to be spoken or seen through another while simultaneously abolishing the frontiers that would keep them apart. This can be seen clearly in *Nuit et brouillard* and *Muriel*, in which, in different ways, the overlaying of the everyday with horror is paralleled by the overlaps between the Nazi concentration camps and the (unspoken but present) Algerian War of Independence (1954–62) (see also Resnais’s *Hiroshima mon amour* for the same process in relation to occupied France and Hiroshima). The understanding of concentrationary memory that Pollock and I have proposed in this series on the concentrationary is premised on Cayrol’s notion of a doubled or haunted present in which different times and spaces collide, a process that, elsewhere, I have defined as palimpsestic memory.³¹

The collapse of the distinction between fiction and the real (writing and history) is paralleled, then, by the similar collapse in the distinction between past and present and between different spaces involved in the ‘doubling’ process of concentrationary art. Barthes’s comments on the connection between writing and history as a haunting of the former by the latter highlights the analogical/allegorical mode of this art. It is a renewal of literature (of art in general) in the wake of the camps that, aware of its own inability to narrate the experience directly and conscious of the limitations of the conventional novelistic devices of character, plot, time and place, proposes a new space between opposites whose political aesthetic is an urgent project for the post-war world.³²

This understanding of the allusive presence of history within the ‘style’ of Cayrol’s writing should allow us to reappraise the so-called apolitical nature of the New Novelists in France in the 1950s and 1960s (Alain Robbe-Grillet, Claude Simon, Michel Butor, Marguerite Duras and others) with whom Cayrol was often associated. For, in the light of this sort of reading of the link between history and literature, far from simply constituting the new, nonpolitical avant-garde whose formal experiments in the novel were in direct opposition to a Sartreian understanding of politically committed literature,³³ the New Novelists could, instead, be seen as the standard-bearers of the concentrationary style that Cayrol describes in *Lazare parmi nous*. This does not mean that the textuality and process of writing of these texts can simply be recuperated by a direct political reading; it might mean, however, that the features that characterize Lazarean literature as described in *Lazare parmi nous* – doubling, confusion of ‘separate’ worlds, time, space and self out of joint, the affective investment in objects, and so on – which are largely shared by ‘the new novel’, can be read (indirectly, obliquely, allusively, even allegorically) as the mark (‘l’empreinte’) of the concentrationary, as they can be in Cayrol’s own novels.

Cayrol’s assimilation into the new avant-garde of the New Novelists at the end of the 1950s was indicative of the new critical distinction that was being forged at the time between formal poetics and politics; the shared adventure of the process of writing was at the expense of any historical referent for the new experimental work. Robbe-Grillet’s own collection of theoretical essays, *Pour un nouveau roman* (1963), played a large part in reinforcing this dichotomy, a binary opposition that has generally been maintained ever since.³⁴ Even Basuyaux – whose description of Cayrol’s Lazarean literature as a ‘secret testimony’ suggests the possibility of an indirect political reading of a language that seems apolitical on the surface – reconfirms the dichotomy between poetics and politics when she observes that ‘Cayrol creates a very direct link between his work and the concentrationary universe, unlike the New Novelists’. Coquio similarly maintains that ‘the link between the Lazarean and the “New Novel” in 1958 was accompanied by the effacement of the camp experience’.³⁵ However, in an interview in *Libération* in 1989 following the publication of his novel *L’Acacia*, Claude Simon observes that ‘if Surrealism came out of the war of 1914, what happened after the last war is linked to Auschwitz. I believe we often forget this

when we talk of the “nouveau roman”. It is no coincidence that Nathalie Sarraute wrote *L'ère du soupçon* and Barthes *Le degré zéro de l'écriture*.³⁶ Although Simon uses ‘Auschwitz’ in a general way here to cover all the camps, the connection he makes between the camps and the ‘nouveau roman’ (New Novel) is clear, as it is in Barthes’s observation in ‘La Rature’:

All the literary techniques with which we credit today’s avant-garde, and singularly the New Novel, are to be found not only in Cayrol’s entire œuvre, but even, as a conscious programme, in *Pour un romanesque lazarien* (a text which dates from 1950).³⁷

Citing Cayrol’s influence on Barthes, Yannick Malgouzeu highlights the inevitable link between literature and history, even, paradoxically, at those moments when the former is stripped back to its ‘zero degree’: ‘In short, all works are a product of Literature, such as it is expressed at a particular historical moment. . . . In this sense, Literature is profoundly linked to History even when it challenges History through its questioning of those very forms inherited from History’.³⁸

Simon’s reading of the relationship between fiction and the camps (indeed, between literature and history in general) is in the spirit of Cayrol’s ideas on a particular style that can register indirectly the effect of the historical event on the modern world. Concentrationary art paves the way for the sort of oblique approach developed by novelists like Romain Gary, Georges Perec or Simon himself, which implicitly references history through an allusive style. The connections established by Perec, for example, between the ‘autobiographical’ and ‘fictional’ narratives in his work *W, ou le souvenir d'enfance*, which he describes as a ‘fragile intersection’ between the two, owes much to the reworking of notions of testimony and fiction and politics and poetics first proposed in Cayrol’s Lazarean model of literature.³⁹ The ‘real’ and the imagined are reshaped so that the affective, the experiential and the historical are embedded in literary forms in oblique ways, as Barthes’s essays on Cayrol clearly demonstrate. In the words of Marcelin Pleynet, the ‘concentrationary experience’ is lived by Cayrol both on an existential and poetic plane.⁴⁰

By the same token, Cayrol’s concentrationary or Lazarean art provides an early blueprint for what we now call ‘spectral’ literature, in which ghosts of the past haunt the landscape of the present. This model can clearly be seen in the works of Patrick Modiano, W. G. Sebald and even Jorge Semprun, in which ‘normal’ objects, featureless landscapes and banal everyday life are transformed and rendered uncanny as they contain the traces of, and are haunted by, other layers of meaning from elsewhere, invisible but powerfully present. Cayrol’s Lazarus is the prototype of the ‘revenant’ who disturbs normality. Jutta Fortin and Jean-Bernard Vray are surely right to introduce their edited collection of essays on the ‘spectral imaginary’ in contemporary French literature through a discussion of the influence of Cayrol’s Lazarean model.⁴¹ Concentrationary style is a new form of the art of the invisible.

The Concentrationary and the Disfigurement of the Human

Concentrationary art as a style that alludes to the disfigurement of the human in the modern world requires a refreshed understanding of the term ‘concentrationary’ itself. Over the last few decades (from at least the 1980s), there has been, first, a conflation of ‘the concentrationary’ with the event itself of the concentration camps of the World War II, and, second, the conflation of the concentration camps with the Holocaust. In our previous discussions of the concentrationary in this series of books, Pollock and I have attempted to rescue the notion of the concentrationary from both these conflations: not only does the concentrationary haunt modern times in a way that refuses temporal specificity but it also refers to an experiment on humanity carried out (in its most egregious form) in the concentration camps, not the extermination camps, which were the major (though by no means the only) sites of the attempted genocide of the Jews. For Cayrol, the figure of Lazarus captures the disfigured humanity of the modern era, and is therefore not the Jewish victim of the Holocaust, nor even the concentration camp deportee, but what the returning deportee carries with him as a message to us all in ‘normal’ life. As Malgouzeu observes, ‘(It is) not a question of bearing witness to the event but rather the world in the wake of the event’.⁴² Lazarus is the ancient mariner of our times, the ghost of the past who interrogates the present.

In his book on writing and the camps, Alain Parrau is one of the few to make the distinction between a concentrationary literature and Holocaust writing, based on the differences between the concentration and extermination camps. However, for Parrau, concentrationary literature includes ‘all testimonies in written and *narrative* form by survivors of the Nazi and Soviet camps’.⁴³ This does not correspond to Cayrol’s notion of concentrationary art, which, as we have seen, is not simply writing by camp survivors, nor about camps themselves. Clearly, even Parrau’s sensitive distinction between concentrationary literature and Holocaust writing fails to identify what is central to Cayrol’s notion of concentrationary art. The ‘concentrationary’ is not only a style that alludes to a historical event but a present form that contains the traces of the rupture announced by the camps, the signs in which that history must be read. Do we, then, need a new category of ‘concentrationary’ writers (of artists in general), which would include the novelists mentioned above and others, to distinguish their approach from that of Holocaust writers?

The subtle disfigurement of the everyday that is central to this approach (as I argue in my chapter in this volume) suggests that the concentrationary has a resonance far beyond the space of the camps themselves and the shattered lives of returning deportees; it defines a profound transformation in modern life. In our introductions to *Concentrationary Memories* and *Concentrationary Imaginaries*, Pollock and I quoted Jacques Lacan’s use of the term ‘concentrationnaire’ (in his famous 1949 article on ‘The Mirror Phase’) to refer not to the camps as such but to the way in which social relations have been subsumed within, and consequently disfigured by, a utilitarian

ethos. Lacan's use of the term was not unique but exemplary of the broad way in which the word was used in this period to link the experience of the camps to the more general objectification of human relations under the hegemonic forms of capitalism (as we have already seen in Rousset's writings).

In the same year as Lacan's article, the philosophers Cornelius Castoriadis and Claude Lefort defined extreme forms of bureaucratization in concentrationary terms in the first issue of the journal *Socialisme ou barbarie*. According to Christophe Premat, 'this bureaucratization of society is a truly concentrationary phenomenon in the sense that the system of exploitation instituted produces a pseudo-rational logic of development and controls the different spheres of individuals' social existence. This bureaucratization prohibits any possibility of a renewal of social norms.'⁴⁴ This sort of approach – and that of the Frankfurt School in which the camps are related to modernity rather than a throwback to pre-Enlightenment society – becomes an important model for Hannah Arendt's analysis of systematic dehumanization and the totalitarian state in her book *Origins of Totalitarianism*. In *Tristes topiques* (1955), the anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss makes numerous references to the concentrationary universe and likens the task of the ethnologist to that of a Lazarus-like figure who is permanently displaced after his travels to other lands. In the 1960s, urban sociology, social anthropology and cultural theory of the city – for example, Jean Baudrillard, Guy Debord, films by Jean-Luc Godard (*Deux ou trois choses que je sais d'elle*) and so on – critiqued the dehumanized forms of modern living in a rationalized, consumer society in terms of a concentrationary model of space. In 1975 the philosopher Claude Boudet wrote a book called (tellingly) *La société concentrationnaire: analyse de la société de consommation*.⁴⁵ In reference to Cayrol's book on the transformed post-war city, *De l'espace humain* (1968) (which I discuss further in my chapter in this book), Basuyaux highlights how Cayrol's use of a concentrationary logic to define new city life is symptomatic of this general critical understanding of the new social reality of everyday life in the 1960s:

Cayrol employs the concentrationary universe as a way of perceiving the 'concentrationary' nature of society. This approach allows a broader reading of the phenomena which shape the concentrationary. The camp is raised to the level of an interpretive paradigm, an analytical tool for social anthropology. . . . The camp is therefore no longer confined within the field of the analysis of totalitarian societies but functions as a prism of analysis of phenomena which are, more broadly speaking, political, sociological, economic and also linguistic.⁴⁶

Coquio also refers to the political meaning of the neologism 'concentrationnat' and shows how Cayrol 'extended the phenomenon to techniques of roundup and containment used during the Algerian War of Independence, and even to the depersonalization and corraling together of citizens in the big housing estates in the suburbs

which destroy the necessary “space” required for the independence and self-respect of the individual.⁴⁷

This broad use of the terms ‘concentrationnaire’ and ‘concentrationnat’ to refer to the rationalization, bureaucratization and objectification of human relations in modern capitalism will be explored further in Mathew John’s essay and my own in this collection. Suffice it to say here that many French cultural critics, sociologists, anthropologists, writers and filmmakers in the first few decades after the war were working with this more general understanding of ‘le concentrationnat’ in modern capitalist society – and one to which the Italian philosopher Giorgio Agamben returns in his theorization of the camp ‘not as a historical fact and anomaly belonging to the past . . . but in some way as the hidden matrix and nomos of the political space in which we are still living’.⁴⁸ Hence, Cayrol’s notion of concentrationary art expressed in *Lazare parmi nous* emerges from, and is, in turn, an influence on, this broader meaning of the term.

The migration of the term across the fields of identity, social relations, the new urbanism and reconfigured humanity in the post-war world can, then, be related to the understanding of concentrationary art as a style rather than a specific content. In both cases, the surface of the everyday (to which Cayrol refers in *Nuit et brouillard* as its ‘décor’)⁴⁹ hides an invisible reality that must be read through its phenomenal form, in the same way that Lazarus’s human appearance dissembles where he has come from and the split (and dehumanized) being that he has become.⁵⁰ The concentrationary is essentially composed of the two faces of horror and the everyday, one always contained in the other, ‘the inhuman *in* the human’ (‘l’inhumain *dans* l’humain’).⁵¹ Viewed in this way, the reading of the signs of popular culture (as, for example, in Barthes’s *Mythologies* or Debord’s analysis of the spectacle) and the neo-Marxist readings of new consumer society (Castoriadis, Baudrillard, Althusser) could be said to share a concentrationary mode of apprehension. Kristin Ross’s reading of the hidden history of decolonization beneath the trappings of post-war modernization in France could be extended to reveal the presence of the concentrationary too.⁵² In *Concentrationary Imaginaries*, Pollock and I attempted to map out the hidden presence of a concentrationary imaginary in contemporary popular culture. Cayrol’s concept of concentrationary art provides us with the tools for a symptomatic reading of this kind so that the attack on the human *qua* human can be identified in the most unlikely of places.

Our discussion of concentrationary art in this book is, thus, premised on clarifying the specificity of ‘the concentrationary’/‘Lazarean’, distinguishing it from a generalized understanding of the Holocaust and tracing its genealogy, forms and uses in the post-war period. There are at least two good reasons for this focus: first, it highlights the particular contribution made by Cayrol’s Lazarean model to theories of art in the wake of the camps; second, it specifies the ‘anthropological’ shift that the model seeks to address, that is, a disfigurement of the human that is not simply con-

fined to the camps themselves (or to any one time and place) but haunts the modern world as an invisible presence in everyday life.

Essays on Concentrationary Art

As the fourth and final work in our series on *Concentrationary Memories and the Politics of Representation*, this book comprises the first English translation of Jean Cayrol's writing on concentrationary art, *Lazarus Among Us* (*Lazare parmi nous*), a detailed analysis of the theory of concentrationary art, and an application of it to aspects of contemporary culture. We have divided the contents into three parts to cover these aims: Part I consists of Cayrol's two essays that make up *Lazarus Among Us*, Part II consists of two chapters on the Lazarean, and Part III consists of four chapters that use a Lazarean approach to analyse aspects of contemporary culture (film, music and the visual arts).

In Chapter 1, Patrick French traces the path of Lazarean literature in France from the late 1940s to the 1960s (although, as he points out, the 'paradoxical temporality' of Cayrol's model actually extends back before the camps, too). Although Cayrol uses the words 'concentrationary' and 'Lazarean' more or less interchangeably, French outlines the different genealogies of these terms in the immediate post-war period and concentrates on the path of the Lazarean. He shows how Cayrol's use of the Lazarus story, following Maurice Blanchot and others, itself changes from a Christian tale of resurrection to the far more general and ambivalent idea of the presence of death in life and the need for an art that can register this condition. Following a detailed analysis of Cayrol's description of the Lazarean in *Lazare parmi nous*, and with Roland Barthes's articles on Cayrol as his guide, French highlights the tension between the Lazarean as a zero degree of writing, whose form (unencumbered by the trappings of the institution of literature) relates to an existential or phenomenological state, and its indirect connection to an historical event (the camps). He highlights Barthes's focus on Cayrol's treatment of objects, which, though sharing many of the characteristics of other contemporary writers like Samuel Beckett, Alain Robbe-Grillet and Francis Ponge, is nevertheless always propelled by an attempt to rediscover the human from which we have become alienated, a 'transcendent humanism' that is, however, never attained but always in process. This is not a return to the human before the camps but a refigured human born in the shadow of the exile, displacement and alienation unleashed on the modern world by the camps, which requires a new form of expression to convey it, 'existence expressed at the level of form' (hence, Barthes's frequent comparisons of Cayrol's Lazarean model and Camus's 'écriture blanche' in *L'étranger*).

In Chapter 2, Griselda Pollock approaches the figure of Lazarus and the concept of a Lazarean aesthetic from the perspectives of literature and the visual arts. She explores how a Christian Biblical figure, shown to be itself ambiguous, can be taken theoretically and aesthetically beyond its theological source to 'figure' a politi-

cal condition of post-concentrationary and also post-genocidal subjectivity. Drawing on Rembrandt and Van Gogh, linking the latter to Alain Resnais and Jean Cayrol, Pollock sets up a dialogue between Cayrol's Lazarean returnee and a text, *Night* (1954/58) by Jewish Holocaust survivor Elie Wiesel, in which the key elements of Lazarus – an entombed, shrouded corpse returning from 'death to life' – also emerges as its concluding figuration of his condition. The anxiety that might result from confusing a return from political deportation to the concentrationary condition of *Nacht und Nebel* (Night and Fog), effective disappearance and destruction through overwork and malnutrition, and the Jewish survivor (lone surviving member of his family and most of his community), is negotiated by triangulation with textual analysis of the Gospel of John and exploration of the Hebrew origins of the Greek name Lazarus, *El'azar*, which gives rise to the Jewish name Eliezer, as in Eliezer Wiesel.

In Chapter 3, I explore the wider understanding of the concentrationary in French critical thought on everyday life in the post-war period and apply it to an analysis of Chantal Akerman's 1975 film *Jeanne Dielman, 23, quai du Commerce, 1080 Bruxelles* (1975) as an example of concentrationary cinema. For the major post-war theorist of the everyday, Henri Lefebvre, the concentrationary was the hidden matrix of modern life and, hence, the site on which the new disfigurement of humanity was taking place. The task was therefore to demystify everyday life in order to combat alienation. This method was taken up by a number of sociologists, anthropologists, cultural critics and others to re-evaluate the notion of habitable (or inhabitable) spaces in the modern consumer city, especially domestic space. I then go on to apply the reading of everyday life through a concentrationary lens to Akerman's film, focusing in particular on her treatment of domestic space, objects and the body. I suggest that Akerman's filmic style, like Cayrol's concentrationary style, allows us to perceive these as both signs of disfigurement of the human and also, paradoxically, the conduits through which a re-humanization may emerge in terms of memory, desire and the affective life.

In Chapter 4, Matthew John applies Cayrol's notion of concentrationary art to the re-emerging theme of work and the workplace within contemporary French cinema, focusing particularly on Laurent Cantet's film *Ressources humaines* (1999). John highlights the connections between Cayrol's theoretical writing on the concentrationary and critical commentaries on abstract labour and the workplace, most notably the work of Herbert Marcuse, to read a logic of mechanized, systemic violence beyond the historical specificity of the concentration camp and within the very fabric of our everyday lives. Looking beyond the more overtly social themes in the film, John argues that it is at the level of the film text itself that the concentrationary can be read, namely at the somewhat unlikely interface between documentary and melodrama and the critical distance this creates between the spectator and the film. He suggests that the tradition of French *cinéma-vérité*, with its equally dynamic mix of fiction, documentary and the social, provides this way of reading the concentrationary as a

generalized presence in the post-war world, thus presenting a far deeper and more consistent threat to the human as it mutates and migrates across the landscape of modernity.

The final two chapters extend the use of Cayrol's theory of the Lazarean to the question of sound. In Chapter 5, Benjamin Hannavy Cousen develops the analysis of the concentrationary image that he first proposed in earlier work, an image that can take one or all of these three modes: the citational, the indexical and the amnesiac.⁵³ He suggests that Cayrol's Lazarean 'postulate' makes it possible to identify a fourth type of image that 'embodies' a different, more agitating and disturbing sense of 'return' than is contained in any of the earlier modes of concentrationary image. It can be both a quality of the other images and an undoing of them (and their audience). Hannavy Cousen then explores the characteristics of a 'Lazarean image' in relation to the work of the singer/songwriter Nick Cave, whilst suspecting that the chief identifier of the Lazarean is that its characteristics are impossible to grasp. The Lazarean return does not offer the comfort of the past like a ghost or a haunting, nor is it the banality of the zombie threat. It is something else – but something that is difficult to grasp.

In Chapter 6, Griselda Pollock draws on her exploration of the Lazarean in Chapter 2 to extend its potential into contemporary art. She studies the relay between the musical score composed by East German composer Hanns Eisler for Alain Resnais's *Nuit et brouillard* (1955) and its deconstructive reworking by Scottish artist Susan Philipsz in an installation in the Austrian town of Bregenz titled *Night and Fog* (2015) in order to pose the question of Lazarean sound. The aesthetic politics of Eisler's continuous musical track accompanying Cayrol's fractured poetic spoken text is analysed to identify what Thomas Trummer has defined, in post-Adornian terms, as 'the autonomy of the auditory'. The auditory is theorized drawing on John Mowitt's proposal of the concept of the audit as the equivalent, in sound theory, of the gaze in visual theory. Thus, the locus of the aesthetic political effect moves to the auditor whose body becomes the resonance chamber of the individuated and isolated notes Susan Philipsz choreographs across the space in her installation. Philipsz's work also addresses the history of political persecution both in Germany and the United States of Hanns Eisler, who during his brief exile in the States wrote the classic text on film music with fellow refugee, Theodor Adorno. This chapter offers a reading of the relatively overlooked sonic, and specifically musical, dimension in what we have argued is to be understood as the classic instance of concentrationary cinema, *Nuit et brouillard*, by looking back at it through the prism of Philipsz's sonic reworking. The artist's installation, however, made good an evasion in *Nuit et brouillard* by linking her isolation of single instruments and their notes from Eisler's score to a Jewish cemetery near Bregenz where the flute, used compassionately by Eisler when confronting images of the dead, punctuates the silence of a preserved cemetery for a missing community. The solitary violin, taken up in Philipsz's installation because

it is rare in Eisler's composition, forms a bridge to a moving passage in Elie Wiesel's *Night* (1954/58) describing Eliezer, the boy, hearing a fellow prisoner on the point of death expending his failing life force on playing Beethoven's concerto on his violin to a community of the dead and dying. The close readings of musical score, literary text and contemporary art installation conclude that we can identify as Lazarean the way that Philipsz's work interrupts Eisler's musical flow, which, despite its critical and political aesthetics, retains the composition – the concerted-ness – of the Beethoven concerto cited by Wiesel, despite the use of a Schoenbergian musical modernism. Philipsz's singularity lies in both placing the sound in the body of the visitor/auditor while transmitting to that auditor the trace of a body, that of the musician coaxing single sounds out of their instruments to produce what Pollock names agitating 'sonic revenants'.

The concentrationary, as defined by David Rousset and Jean Cayrol in the immediate aftermath of World War II, has not disappeared and takes on new guises in new historical conjunctures. It is for this reason that we feel it is important to bring back into focus the two essays by Cayrol that make up *Lazare parmi nous* – largely overlooked, especially in the English-speaking world – as a way of detecting and challenging 'the concentrationary universe'. For, although the concept of concentrationary or Lazarean art that Cayrol presents in *Lazare parmi nous* emerges from the experience of the concentration camps of World War II, it nevertheless has a resonance far beyond that event that we would do well to acknowledge if we are to renew our ideas of the polity, sociality and the human today. In this book we argue that art forms motivated (even unconsciously) from a Lazarean perspective can constitute modes of resistance to the new shapes of the concentrationary in contemporary life. Concentrationary art is not a political or ideological manifesto for our times; rather, it is a subtle and ambivalent political aesthetic that makes visible the ways we can be unknowingly stripped of our humanity and urges us to pursue the continual struggle to define what it is to be human.

Max Silverman is Professor of Modern French Studies at the University of Leeds. He works on post-Holocaust culture, postcolonial theory and cultures, and questions of memory, race and violence. His most recent monograph, entitled *Palimpsestic Memory: The Holocaust and Colonialism in French and Francophone Fiction and Film* (Berghahn, 2013), considered the connections between the Holocaust and colonialism in the French and Francophone cultural imaginary. He has recently published three coedited books with Griselda Pollock on the theme of 'the concentrationary': *Concentrationary Cinema: Aesthetics as Political Resistance in Alain Resnais's 'Night and Fog'* (Berghahn, 2011), *Concentrationary Memories: Totalitarian Terror and Cultural Resistance* (I.B. Tauris, 2014) and *Concentrationary Imaginaries: Tracing Totalitarian Violence in Popular Culture* (I.B. Tauris, 2015).

Notes

1. D. Rousset, *L'Univers concentrationnaire* (Paris: Éditions de Pavois, 1946); G. Pollock and M. Silverman (eds), *Concentrationary Cinema: Aesthetics as Resistance in Alain Resnais's Night and Fog* (London and New York: Berghahn Books, 2012); *Concentrationary Memories: Totalitarian Terror and Cultural Resistance* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2013); *Concentrationary Imaginaries: Tracing Totalitarian Violence in Popular Culture* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2015).
2. In his biography of Cayrol, Michel Pateau admits that 'for me, at the time, the name of Jean Cayrol evoked . . . a writer somewhat forgotten in the list of authors of the 1950s' ('le nom de Jean Cayrol m'évoquait alors . . . quelque écrivain un peu oublié dans une bibliothèque des années 1950'); M. Pateau, *Jean Cayrol: Une vie en poésie* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 2012), 23.
3. See, respectively, J. Cayrol, *Oeuvre lazareenne* (Paris: Seuil, 2007); P. Kuon (ed.), *Les Mots sont aussi des demeures: Poétiques de Jean Cayrol* (Eidôlon, 87, Presses Universitaires de Bordeaux, 2009); M.-L. Basuyaux, *Témoigner clandestinement: les récits lazareens de Jean Cayrol* (Paris: Editions Classiques Garnier, 2009); M. Pateau, *Jean Cayrol: Une vie en poésie* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 2012); D. Oster, *Jean Cayrol et son oeuvre* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1967).
4. 'Cayrol raconte qu'il composa son premier poème à onze ans', C. Durand, 'Préface' in M. Pateau, *Jean Cayrol*, 10.
5. For a history of *Écrire* and *Tel Quel*, see P. Forest, *Histoire de Tel Quel 1960–1982* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1995).
6. See, however, D. Carroll, 'Jean Cayrol or the fiction of the writer', *MLN* 88(4) (1973) and M. Silverman, 'Horror and the everyday in post-Holocaust France: *Nuit et brouillard* and concentrationary art', *French Cultural Studies* 17(1) (2006) 5–18. For Cayrol's work in film, see D. Ostrowska, 'Dreaming a cinematic dream: Jean Cayrol's writings on film', *Studies in French Cinema* 6(1) (2006) 17–28.
7. "D'un Romanesque concentrationnaire", from *Esprit* 159 (1949), 340–57, re-appeared under the title 'De la mort à la vie' when it was published to accompany Cayrol's script for the film *Nuit et brouillard* (*Nuit et brouillard: Commentaire*, Paris: Fayard, 1997, 47–113). 'Les Rêves concentrationnaires' first appeared in *Les Temps Modernes* 36 (1948), 520–35.
8. However, for a brief discussion of Cayrol's contribution to theories of the novel, see J. Lévi-Valensi, "Pour un romanesque lazareen" de Jean Cayrol une théorie ontologique du roman", in A. Pfersmann (ed.), *Fondements, évolutions et persistance des théories du roman* (Fleury-sur-Orne: Minard, 1998).
9. Cayrol often uses 'art' and 'literature' interchangeably, just as he does with 'concentrationary' and 'Lazarean'. In this introduction, I will follow Cayrol's practice, although, as Patrick French observes in his essay in this volume, the terms 'concentrationary' and 'Lazarean' draw on a different semantic range.
10. 'L'Allemagne a interprété avec l'originalité propre à son histoire la crise qui l'a conduite à l'univers concentrationnaire. Mais l'existence et le mécanisme de cette crise tiennent aux fondements économiques et sociaux du capitalisme et de l'impérialisme. Sous une figuration nouvelle, des effets analogues peuvent demain encore apparaître. Il s'agit, en conséquence, d'une bataille très précise à mener. Le bilan concentrationnaire est à cet égard un merveilleux arsenal de guerre.' D. Rousset, *L'Univers concentrationnaire*, 186–187; *The Other Kingdom*, trans. Ramon Guthrie (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1947) 173.
11. In the introduction and in Chapter 3, page numbers of quotes from the present translation of *Lazare parmi nous* will appear in the text in parentheses. In all other chapters, quotes will be referenced in the notes.
12. 'Les objets cayroliens ne sont nullement personnalisés, mais il émane pourtant d'eux une sorte d'affectivité particulière; ils portent une chaleur, ils constituent un refuge tout comme une grande ville reconforte l'homme apeuré.' R. Barthes, 'Jean Cayrol et ses romans', in *Œuvres complètes* vol. 1 1942–1961. (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1993), 141–62, 150.
13. R. Barthes, "The Object-World", in *Critical Essays* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1972), 4–12; 'Le Monde objet', in *Essais Critiques* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1964), 19–28.
14. Quoted in Oster, *Jean Cayrol et son oeuvre*, 12. (Matthew John describes Cayrol's aesthetic as 'the horrific extension of the surrealist project', *Concentrationary Cinema: Aesthetics and the Camps*, un-

- published PhD thesis, University of Leeds (2012), 20.) Oster highlights the paradox at play in the Lazarean relationship with objects (*Jean Cayrol et son oeuvre*, 45), which Basuyaux then defines as 'a means of both describing the impact of the camp and effacing its effects' ('à la fois un moyen de dire l'impact du camp et un moyen d'en annuler les effets' (Basuyaux, *Témoigner clandestinement*, 148). For a further discussion of Cayrol and objects, see M. Nadeau, *Le Roman français depuis la guerre* (Paris: Gallimard, 1970) 39.
15. 'Lazare n'est plus chez lui l'homme ressuscité par Jésus, mais l'individu définitivement seul qui, voué à vivre et mourir deux fois, se sent dépossédé de sa vie et de sa mort.' C. Coquio, *La Littérature en suspens. Écritures de la Shoah: le témoignage et les œuvres* (Paris: L'Arachnéen, 2015), 278 and 279 respectively; Basuyaux, *Témoigner clandestinement*, 139.
 16. Cayrol's use of the figure of Lazarus is discussed in more detail in the essays by French, Pollock and Cousen.
 17. J.-P. Salgas, 'Shoah ou la disparition' in D. Hollier (ed.), *De la Littérature française* (Paris: Bordas, 1993), 1005–13, 1007. Cf. Georges Bataille's observation that, after Auschwitz, 'the image of Man is, from that moment, inseparable from a gas chamber' ('l'image de l'homme est inséparable, désormais, d'une chambre à gaz') (*Critique*, 12 May 1947).
 18. '(A) la différence de ces auteurs, J. Cayrol n'a jamais écrit « son » témoignage des camps; ni ses fictions, ni ses essais ne sont une relation littérale de cette expérience. Ce point essentiel empêche de conférer à ses textes le même statut qu'aux autres témoignages.' Basuyaux, *Témoigner clandestinement*, 18.
 19. 'A la conscience hypersensible du "revenant", le monde du Retour est vite apparu comme défiguré par les tics majeurs de l'univers concentrationnaire. (L)a figure symbolique de Lazare n'est pas chez Jean Cayrol une abstraction elle a surgi de l'expérience vécue des camps de concentration. Cependant, il ne s'agira pas de témoignage explicite sur l'horreur des camps . . . L'intérêt et l'importance de l'oeuvre de Cayrol viennent de ce qu'elle a été, d'emblée, la transposition la plus juste, et la seule durable, d'une occurrence historique datée, de ce que Cayrol a appelé L 'OUTRAGE infligé à la condition humaine contemporaine. L'art lazareen "est né directement d'une telle convulsion humaine, d'une catastrophe qui a ébranlé les fondements mêmes de notre conscience" (R L. p. 203). De plus, ce qui assure une portée supplémentaire au romanesque lazareen n'est pas uniquement la référence concentrationnaire, ni les problèmes de réinsertion de Lazare dans une vie miraculeusement retrouvée. A la conscience hypersensible du "revenant", le monde du Retour est vite apparu comme défiguré par les tics majeurs de l'univers concentrationnaire. "Ça sent plus fort que jamais le concentrationnaire. écrivait Jean Cayrol; l'influence, la solitudine concentrationnaire ne cessent de s'accroître, non seulement dans leurs réalisations ininterrompues mais encore dans le psychisme européen et même mondial" (R.L. p. 201).' M. Bertrand, 'Les Avatars de Lazare le romanesque de Jean Cayrol', *The French Review* 51(5) (1978), 674–75. Salgas also observes that 'the Lazarean dimension of a narrative is independent of the narration of this experience' ('la dimension lazareenne d'un récit est indépendante de la narration de cette expérience') ('Shoah ou la disparition', 1006).
 20. 'une empreinte concentrationnaire de l'humanité indélébile'. P. Kuon, 'Préface' in P. Kuon, (ed.), *Les Mots sont aussi des demeures*, 10.
 21. 'C'est l'Époque post-totalitaire qui est elle-même survivante . . . [Cayrol] veut dire que nous sommes tous entrés dans un nouveau monde lazareen'. J.-L. Déotte, 'Le Régime nominal de l'art. Jean Cayrol: une esthétique lazareenne' in A. Brossat and J.-L. Déotte (eds), *L'Époque de la disparition: Politique et esthétique* (Paris: L'Harmattan, 2000), 31. For a similar argument in relation to Chris Marker's film *La Jetée* (1962) (the present as the site of the aftershock of a traumatic event), see G. Pollock, 'Dreaming the face, screening the death: Reflections for Jean-Louis Schefer on *La Jetée*', *Journal of Visual Culture*, 4(3) (2005).
 22. 'l'existence d'un camp de l'après-guerre, camp du présent, recouvrant la vie la plus quotidienne'. Basuyaux, *Témoigner clandestinement*, 158. Elsewhere, Basuyaux describes Cayrol's practice in these terms: 'It is a question of inscribing the concentrationary experience in a text that is neither a narrative of the camps (in the sense of a literature of testimony or specifically autobiographical in character) nor a fiction explicitly related to the camps. Instead, it is a fiction that, without actually talking about the camps, bears its imprint in its form' ('Il s'agirait d'inscrire l'expérience concentrationnaire dans

- un texte qui ne soit ni récit des camps (au sens de littérature de témoignage, de texte à caractère explicitement autobiographique), ni fiction explicite sur les camps. Une fiction qui, sans raconter les camps, en porterait l’empreinte dans sa forme’ (Basuyaux, *Témoigner clandestinement*, 29). See also a similar statement by Jacqueline Lévi-Valensi on the nature of Lazarean literature: ‘The Lazarean narrative attempts to realise not the “objective” reality of the lived experience but the state of he who has survived this experience of horror and terror, of the “unliveable”, of death; of he who has “returned” to the land of the living but can only establish with this world, with time and space, with others and, finally, with himself, relations which are irregular and of the utmost singularity’ (‘Le romanesque lazareen tente de rendre compte non de la réalité « objective » de l’expérience vécue, mais de l’état de celui qui a survécu à cette expérience de l’horreur et de la terreur, à l’« invivable à la mort de celui qui est « revenu » parmi les hommes, mais ne peut plus entretenir avec le monde, avec le temps et l’espace, avec les autres et, finalement, avec lui-même, que des relations dérégulées, d’une absolue singularité.’) (“Pour un romanesque lazareen” de Jean Cayrol’, 197).
23. For a ‘parabolic’ literature, see Claude-Edmonde Magny, ‘Le Temps de la réflexion. La parabole de Lazare ou le langage retrouvé’, *Esprit*, 142 (1948) 311–23. Catherine Coquio describes Cayrol’s analogical mode as follows: ‘These narratives were not testimonies. The camp could only be deciphered through signs and allusions in an atonal prose in which characters, situations, things and words only vaguely recalled a history. The memory of the camp . . . was expressed through a form of avoidance or allusive displacement’ (‘Ces récits n’étaient pas des témoignages. Le camp n’affleuraient que par signes et allusions dans une prose narrative atone qui laissait les personnages, les situations, les choses et les mots rappeler vaguement une histoire. Le souvenir du camp . . . s’exprimait par une forme d’évitement ou de déplacement allusif’), Catherine Coquio, *La Littérature en suspens*, 272. (See also Yannick Malgouzo, *Les Camps Nazis: Réflexion sur la réception littéraire française* (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2012), 308, and Basuyaux, *Témoigner clandestinement*, 29.)
 24. In an early article on *Lazare parmi nous*, Roland Barthes makes a direct comparison between Cayrol’s Lazarean art and Camus’s literature of the absurd. See ‘Un prolongement à la littérature de l’absurde’ in *Ceuvres complètes* vol. 1, 1942–1961 (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1993), 105–106.
 25. ‘Ce qu’il faut suggérer, sinon expliquer, c’est comment une telle œuvre, dont le germe est dans une histoire datée, est cependant pleinement littérature d’aujourd’hui. La première raison en est peut-être que le Concentrationnat n’est pas mort il se fait dans le monde d’étranges poussées concentrationnaires, insidieuses, déformées, familières, coupées de leur modèle historique, mais diffusées à la façon d’un style les romans de Cayrol sont ce passage même de l’événement concentrationnaire au quotidien concentrationnaire en eux nous retrouvons aujourd’hui, vingt ans après les Camps, une certaine forme du malaise humain, une certaine qualité de l’atroce, du grotesque ou de l’absurde, dont nous recevons le choc devant certains événements ou pis encore devant certaines images de notre temps.’ R. Barthes, ‘La Rature’ (postface au livre de Jean Cayrol, *Les corps étrangers*) in *Roland Barthes, Ceuvres Complètes*, vol. 2, 1962–1967 (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1993), 592–600, 599; ‘Cayrol and Erasure’ in *The Rustle of Language* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1989), 189–90 (translation modified).
 26. R. Barthes, *Le Degré zéro de l’écriture* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1953), 10, 30 and 32.
 27. For a fuller discussion of Barthes’s engagement with Cayrol’s work in the years 1950–64, see Malgouzo, *Les Camps Nazis*, 313–23.
 28. ‘L’imagination pourrait être ainsi définie comme la perception ou appréhension du réel à travers cet univers parallèle qu’on lui soumettrait au cinéma, et dont le temps de lecture (le rythme du montage) serait non plus le temps de voir une image, si rapide, mais le temps de vision nécessaire au dédoublement de cette image.’ J. Cayrol and C. Durand, *Le Droit de regard* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1963), 24.
 29. ‘J’écris pour témoigner . . . C’est idiot de dire cela. Enfin, mettons, pour témoigner clandestinement’. Interview on 25 July 1957 in *Les Nouvelles littéraires*, quoted in Basuyaux, *Témoigner clandestinement*, 166. Cayrol is clearly influenced by the testimony of Robert Antelme’s *L’Espèce humaine* in which the signs of humanity in the face of extreme violence have to be sought secretly (I discuss this further in my chapter in this volume.) However, the idea of a ‘clandestine’ literature also played a significant

- role more generally in the French resistance when truths had to be dressed up in another language (often through poetry) to avoid the censor. Reading the surface for secret (hidden) meanings is, of course, also an essential mechanism for discovering the truth beneath the Nazis' euphemistic language ('stücke', 'figuren' and so on).
30. 'toutes les alternatives habituelles du discours sur les camps représentation-irreprésentable . . . avant-après, etc.' Salgas, 1007.
 31. *Palimpsestic Memory: The Holocaust and Colonialism in French and Francophone Fiction and Film* (New York and Oxford: Berghahn, 2013).
 32. If Cayrol was opposed to direct testimony, he was always highly conscious of the risks of fictionalizing the camps. In an article on the relationship between literature and testimony in 1953, he criticizes the stories of the camps that domesticate and popularize the experience and turn the camp into a museum: 'the concentration camp has become an image, a fiction, a story. . . . It has become domesticated. We are in the world of folklore' ('le camp de concentration est devenu une image, une fiction, une fable. . . . Il est décent. On est au folklore'). His criticism is aimed specifically at works by Erich Maria Remarque (*L'Étrange de vie*) and Robert Merle (*La mort est mon métier*), both published in 1952, which he contrasts with those of David Rousset, Robert Antelme and Louis Martin-Chauffier, all of whom (in their different ways) avoid the 'romanesque' and find a mode of expression that preserves the strangeness, unreality and incommunicability of the experience of the camps. (See 'Témoignage et littérature', *Esprit* (April 1953), 575–577.) Jacques Derrida discusses the impossibility of disentangling fiction and testimony in *Demeure: Maurice Blanchot* (Paris: Galilée, 1998).
 33. See J.-P. Sartre, *Qu'est-ce que la littérature?* (Paris: Gallimard, 1948).
 34. See however L. Higgins, *New Novel, New Wave, New Politics: Fiction and the Representation of History in Post-War France* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1996).
 35. 'Cayrol met son œuvre en relation étroite avec l'univers concentrationnaire, ce que ne font pas les Nouveaux romanciers'; 'l'intégration de l'œuvre lazaréenne au Nouveau Roman acquise en 1958, s'est faite au prix de l'effacement de l'expérience du camp'. Basuyaux, *Témoigner clandestinement*, 112; Coquio, *La Littérature en suspens*. 277. See also a similar distinction made by Silke Segler-Messner between 'une écriture blanche' and a notion of history: 'Even if the novels of Jean Cayrol seem to exhibit numerous characteristics of this neutral writing – the dissolution of the opposition between form and content, the anonymous characters, the wandering voice of the narrator, the absence of plot – the difference between the vision of a "transparent" language (Barthes) and the project of Lazarean writing (Cayrol) can be seen in terms of the response to history' ('Même si les romans de Cayrol semblent présenter de nombreuses caractéristiques de cette écriture blanche – la dissolution de l'opposition entre forme et contenu, l'anonymat des figures, la voix vagabonde du narrateur, le manque d'intrigue – la différence entre la vision d'une parole transparente (Barthes) et le projet d'un romanesque lazaréen (Cayrol) se manifeste dans l'évaluation de l'histoire'), S. Segler-Messner, 'Pour une esthétique de l'imaginaire dans l'œuvre de Jean Cayrol' in P. Kuon (ed.), *Les Mots sont aussi des demeures* 103.
 36. 'Si le surréalisme est né de la guerre de 1914, ce qui s'est passé après la dernière est lié à Auschwitz. Il me semble qu'on l'oublie souvent quand on parle du "nouveau roman". Ce n'est pas pour rien que Nathalie Sarraute a écrit *L'ère du soupçon*; Barthes, *Le degré zéro de l'écriture*'. Cited in Malgouzo, *Les Camps Nazis*, 368. Dominique Viart recognizes that Simon's own writing, like Cayrol's, is haunted by history indirectly, through allusion 'Simon . . . never represented the concentration camp but, on more than one occasion, his work alludes to it' ('Simon . . . n'a jamais représenté de camp de concentration, mais son œuvre plus d'une fois, y fait allusion'), D. Viart, 'Vers une poétique "spectrale" de l'Histoire in J. Fortin and J.-B. Vray (eds), *L'Imaginaire spectral de la littérature narrative française contemporaine* (Saint-Etienne: Publications de l'Université de Saint-Etienne, 2012), 42.
 37. 'Toutes les techniques littéraires dont nous créditons aujourd'hui l'avant-garde, et singulièrement le Nouveau Roman, se trouvent non seulement dans l'œuvre entière de Cayrol, mais encore, à titre de programme conscient, dans *Le Romanesque lazaréen* (texte qui date de 1950).' Barthes, 'La Rature', 599 'Cayrol and Erasure', 190.

38. 'Toute oeuvre s'intègre *in fine* à la Littérature telle qu'elle est exprimée à un moment historique. . . . En ce sens, la Littérature demeure indexée à l'Histoire quand bien même elle la conteste par la remise en question de la forme héritée de cette même Histoire'. Malgouzu, *Les Camps Nazis*, 317. Malgouzu is right to point out the connection between concentrationary art and the 'nouveau roman': 'From a purely genealogical point of view, and based on Roland Barthes's own analysis, it seems entirely possible to see Lazarean theory as a direct influence on the Nouveau Roman' ('D'un point de vie purement généalogique et en se fondant sur l'analyse même de Roland Barthes, il semble possible de considérer la théorie lazaréenne comme l'ascendant direct du Nouveau Roman') (322).
39. G. Perec, *W ou le souvenir d'enfance* (Paris: Denoel, 1975). Jean-François Louette has more recently applied Cayrol's model to the theatre of Samuel Beckett; see J.-F. Louette, 'Beckett, un théâtre lazaréen', *Les Temps Modernes* 604 (1999).
40. Quoted in Basuyaux, *Témoigner clandestinement*, 168.
41. J. Fortin and J.-B. Vray, 'Avant-propos' in J. Fortin and J.-B. Vray (eds), *L'Imaginaire spectral de la littérature narrative française contemporaine* (Saint-Etienne: Publications de l'Université de Saint-Etienne, 2012), 7–22.
42. 'Non plus témoigner de l'événement, mais plutôt du monde à la lumière de l'événement'. Malgouzu, *Les Camps Nazis*, 308. See also P. Kuon: 'The originality of Jean Cayrol's *Lazarean* narratives . . . is to be found in the attention to the traumatised *psyche*, not only of the survivors but of post-concentrationary humans and society' ('L'originalité des récits *lazaréens* de Jean Cayrol . . . réside dans l'attention portée à la *psyché* traumatisée, non seulement des survivants, mais de l'homme et de la société post-concentrationnaires' in P. Kuon, *L'Écriture des revenants: Lectures de témoignages de la déportation politique* (Bruxelles: Éditions Kimé, 2013), 316.
43. 'L'ensemble des témoignages écrits, dans la forme du *récit*, par les survivants des camps nazis et soviétiques'. A. Parrau, *Écrire les camps* (Paris: Editions Belin, 1995), 16. See also L. Jurgenson, *L'Expérience concentrationnaire est-elle indécidable?* (Monaco: Editions du Rocher, 2003) in which the definition of concentrationary literature is, similarly, works that attempt to express the experience of the concentrationary universe. For the distinction between the concentration and extermination camps, see also S. Lindeperg and A. Wiewiorka, *Univers concentrationnaire et génocide: Voir, savoir, comprendre* (Paris: Arthème Fayard (Mille et une nuits), 2008).
44. 'Cette bureaucratization de la société est un phénomène proprement concentrationnaire, dans le sens où le système d'exploitation institué produit une logique pseudo-rationnelle de développement et contrôle les différentes sphères de l'existence sociale des individus. Cette bureaucratization assèche toute possibilité de renouvellement des normes sociales.' Christophe Premat, 'L'Analyse du phénomène bureaucratique chez Castoriadis', *Tracés. Revue de Sciences humaines* (en ligne), 1 (2002); accessed online at <http://traces.revues.org/4131>; DOI:10.4000/traces.4131 on 2 August 2017.
45. See M. Horkheimer and T. Adorno, *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (New York: Continuum, 2001 [1944]); H. Arendt, *Origins of Totalitarianism* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1967 [1951]); Z. Bauman, *Modernity and the Holocaust* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1989); C. Boudet, *La Société concentrationnaire: analyse de la société de consommation* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1975).
46. 'L'univers concentrationnaire y est perçu comme un "concentré" de société, une modélisation qui permet une plus grande lisibilité des phénomènes qui l'habitent. Le camp se hausse alors au rang de paradigme interprétatif, de véritable outil pour l'anthropologie sociale. . . . Le camp sort ainsi du champ de l'analyse des totalitarismes, pour servir de prisme à l'analyse de phénomènes plus largement politiques, sociologiques, économiques, mais aussi linguistiques.' Basuyaux, *Témoigner clandestinement*, 113.
47. 'À étendu ce phénomène aux techniques de parage utilisées pendant la guerre d'Algérie, et même à la dépersonnalisation et la promiscuité des grands ensembles citadins, où la promiscuité détruit "l'intervalle" nécessaire à l'intégrité des individus.' Coquio, *La Littérature en suspens*, 279. See also Basuyaux, *Témoigner clandestinement*, 113–22. Basuyaux also draws attention to George Matoré's *L'Espace humain: L'Expression de l'espace dans la vie, la pensée et l'art contemporains* (Paris: Éditions de la Colombe, 1962) and Léo Scheer's *La société sans maître: Essai sur la société de masse* (Paris: Editions

- Galilée, 1978), both of which, in their different ways, use a concentrationary model to analyse the ‘anthropological mutation’ of post-war society. Peter Kuon rightly describes the neologism ‘le concentrationnariat’ as ‘what remains of Auschwitz, that is, the virus which inhabits and haunts our societies and ourselves’ (‘Ce qui reste d’Auschwitz, à savoir le bacille qui depuis lors habite et hante nos sociétés et nous-mêmes’) in ‘La “peste” le “concentrationnaire”: poétiques de l’oblique (Cayrol, Camus, Rousset, Percec)’ in Kuon (ed.), *Les Mots sont aussi des demeures*, 157.
48. G. Agamben, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), 166.
 49. *Nuit et brouillard: Commentaire* (Paris: Fayard, 1997), 24. See also Cayrol’s comment on contemporary cinema that ‘instead of enlightening us directly only illuminates a décor’ (‘au lieu de nous éclairer directement, n’éclaire plus qu’un décor’) in J. Cayrol et C. Durand, *Le Droit de Regard*, 16.
 50. In his study of the ‘concentrationary experience’, the sociologist Michael Pollak uses the ‘limit’ experience of the camps to reveal basic truths about social identity, in the way that Georg Simmel, at the end of the nineteenth century and beginning of the twentieth century, used the experience of the outsider/stranger as a way of highlighting everyday experience in the modern metropole, or, in the 1920s and 1930s, the use of ‘the immigrant’ by the Chicago School of sociologists. See M. Pollak, *L’Expérience concentrationnaire: Essai sur le maintien de l’identité sociale* (Paris: Editions Métailié, 2000).
 51. Coquio, *La Littérature en suspens*, 281.
 52. See K. Ross, *Fast Cars, Clean Bodies: Decolonization and the Reordering of French Culture* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995).
 53. See B. Hannavy Cousen, ‘ISNT’T THIS WHERE . . . Projections on Pink Floyd’s Wall: Tracing the Concentrationary Image’ in Pollock and Silverman (eds), *Concentrationary Memories*, 203–22; ‘Seep and Creep; The Concentrationary Imaginary in Martin Scorsese’s *Shutter Island*’, in Pollock and Silverman (eds), *Concentrationary Imaginaries*, 163–86; *The Seeping and Creeping of Haunted Memory: The Concentrationary in Post-War Cinema* (PhD, University of Leeds, 2011).

Bibliography

- Agamben, G. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.
- Arendt, H. *Origins of Totalitarianism*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1967 [1951].
- Barthes, R. ‘Jean Cayrol et ses romans’ in *Œuvres complètes* vol. 1, 1942–1961. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1993; 141–62.
- . ‘The Object-World’ in *Critical Essays*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1972, 4–12; ‘Le Monde-objet’, *Essais Critiques*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1964, 19–28.
- . ‘La Rature’ (postface au livre de Jean Cayrol, *Les corps étrangers*) in *Œuvres Complètes*, vol. 2, 1962–1967. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1993, 592–600; ‘Cayrol and Erasure’ in *The Rustle of Language* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1989).
- . ‘Un prolongement à la littérature de l’absurde’ in *Œuvres complètes* vol. 1, 1942–1961, Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1993, 105–6.
- Basuyaux, M.-L. *Témoigner clandestinement: les récits lazareens de Jean Cayrol*. Paris: Editions Classiques Garnier, 2009.
- Bataille, G. *Critique*, 12 May 1947.
- Bauman, Z. *Modernity and the Holocaust*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1989.
- Bertrand, M. ‘Les Avatars de Lazare: le romanesque de Jean Cayrol’. *The French Review* 51(5) (1978), 674–82.
- Boudet, C. *La Société concentrationnaire: analyse de la société de consommation*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1975.
- Carroll, D. ‘Jean Cayrol or the fiction of the writer’, *MLN* 88(4) (1973), 789–810.
- Cayrol, J. *Lazare parmi nous*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1950.
- . ‘Témoignage et littérature’. *Esprit* (April 1953), 575–77.
- . *Nuit et brouillard: Commentaire*. Paris: Fayard, 1997.

- . *Oeuvre lazaréenne*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 2007.
- Cayrol, J. and Durand, C. *Le Droit de regard*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1963.
- Coquio, C. *La Littérature en suspens. Écritures de la Shoah: le témoignage et les œuvres*. Paris: L'Arachnéen, 2015.
- Déotte, J.-L. 'Le Régime nominal de l'art. Jean Cayrol: une esthétique lazaréenne', in A. Brossat and J.-L. Déotte (eds), *L'Époque de la disparition: Politique et esthétique* (Paris: L'Harmattan, 2000), 13–37.
- Derrida, J. *Demeure: Maurice Blanchot*. Paris: Galilée, 1998.
- Durand, C. 'Préface' in M. Pateau, *Jean Cayrol: Une vie en poésie* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 2012), 9–21.
- Forest, P. *Histoire de Tel Quel 1960–1982*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1995.
- Fortin J. and Vray, J.-B. 'Avant-propos' in J. Fortin and J.-B. Vray (eds), *L'Imaginaire spectral de la littérature narrative française contemporaine* (Saint-Etienne: Publications de l'Université de Saint-Etienne, 2012), 7–22.
- Hannavy Cousen, B. *The Seeping and Creeping of Haunted Memory: The Concentrationary in Post-War Cinema* (PhD University of Leeds, 2011)
- . 'ISN'T THIS WHERE . . . Projections on Pink Floyd's Wall: Tracing the Concentrationary Image', in G. Pollock and M. Silverman (eds) *Concentrationary Memories: Totalitarian Terror and Cultural Resistance* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2013), 203–22.
- . 'Seep and Creep: The Concentrationary Imaginary in Martin Scorsese's *Shutter Island*', in G. Pollock and M. Silverman, *Concentrationary Imaginaries: Tracing Totalitarian Violence in Popular Culture* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2015), 163–86.
- Higgins, L. *New Novel, New Wave, New Politics: Fiction and the Representation of History in Post-War France*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1996.
- Horkheimer M. and Adorno, T. *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. New York: Continuum, 2001 [1944].
- John, M. *Concentrationary Cinema: Aesthetics and the Camps*, unpublished PhD thesis, University of Leeds (2012).
- Jurgenson, L. *L'Expérience concentrationnaire est-elle indicible?* Monaco: Editions du Rocher, 2003.
- Kuon, P. *L'Écriture des revenants: Lectures de témoignages de la déportation politique*. Bruxelles: Éditions Kimé, 2013.
- . 'Préface' in P. Kuon (ed.), *Les Mots sont aussi des demeures*, 7–13.
- . 'La "peste" le "concentrationnaire": poétiques de l'oblique (Cayrol, Camus, Rousset, Perec)' in P. Kuon (ed.), *Les Mots sont aussi des demeures*, 145–59.
- Kuon, P. (ed.), *Les Mots sont aussi des demeures: Poétiques de Jean Cayrol*. (Eidôlon, 87) Bordeaux: Presses Universitaires de Bordeaux, 2009.
- Lévi-Valensi, J. "'Pour un romanesque lazaréen" de Jean Cayrol: une théorie ontologique du roman' in A. Pfersmann (ed.), *Fondements, évolutions et persistance des théories du roman* (Fleury-sur-Orne: Minard, 1998), 195–203.
- Lindeperg, S. and Wieviorka, A. *Univers concentrationnaire et génocide: Voir, savoir, comprendre*. Paris: Arthème Fayard (Mille et une nuits), 2008.
- Louette, J.-F. 'Beckett, un théâtre lazaréen', *Les Temps Modernes*, 604 (1999), 93–118.
- Magny, C.-E. 'Le Temps de la réflexion. La parabole de Lazare ou le langage retrouvé'. *Esprit*, 142 (1948), 311–323.
- Malgouzou, Y. *Les Camps Nazis: Réflexions sur la réception littéraire française*. Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2012.
- Nadeau, M. *Le Roman français depuis la guerre*. Paris: Gallimard, 1970.
- Oster, D. *Jean Cayrol et son oeuvre*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1967.
- Ostrowska, D. 'Dreaming a cinematic dream: Jean Cayrol's writings on film'. *Studies in French Cinema* 6(1) (2006), 17–28.
- Parrau, A. *Écrire les camps*. Paris: Editions Belin, 1995.
- Pateau, M. *Jean Cayrol: Une vie en poésie*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 2012.
- Perec, G. *W ou le souvenir d'enfance*. Paris: Denoel, 1975.
- Pollak, M. *L'Expérience concentrationnaire: Essai sur le maintien de l'identité sociale*. Paris: Editions Métailié, 2000.

- Pollock, G. 'Dreaming the face, screening the death: Reflections for Jean-Louis Schefer on *La Jetée*'. *Journal of Visual Culture*, 4(3) (2005), 287–305.
- Pollock, G. and Silverman, M. (eds) *Concentrationary Cinema: Aesthetics as Resistance in Alain Resnais's Night and Fog*. London and New York; Berghahn Books, 2012.
- . *Concentrationary Memories: Totalitarian Terror and Cultural Resistance*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2013.
- . *Concentrationary Imaginaries: Tracing Totalitarian Violence in Popular Culture*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2015.
- Premat, C. 'L'Analyse du phénomène bureaucratique chez Castoriadis'. *Tracés. Revue de Sciences humaines* (en ligne), 1 (2002). Accessed online at <http://traces.revues.org/4131>; DOI:10.4000/traces.4131 on 2 August 2017.
- Ross, K. *Fast Cars, Clean Bodies: Decolonization and the Reordering of French Culture*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995.
- Rousset, D. *L'Univers concentrationnaire*. Paris: Éditions de Pavois, 1946.
- . *The Other Kingdom*, trans. Ramon Guthrie. New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1947.
- Salgas, J.-P. 'Shoah ou la disparition' in D. Hollier (ed.), *De la Littérature française* (Paris: Bordas, 1993), 1005–13.
- Sartre, J.-P. *Qu'est-ce que la littérature?* Paris: Gallimard, 1948.
- Segler-Messner, S. 'Pour une esthétique de l'imaginaire dans l'oeuvre de Jean Cayrol' in P. Kuon (ed.), *Les Mots sont aussi des demeures*, 99–113.
- Silverman, M. 'Horror and the everyday in post-Holocaust France: *Nuit et brouillard* and concentrationary art'. *French Cultural Studies* 17(1) (2006), 5–18.
- Silverman, M. *Palimpsestic Memory: The Holocaust and Colonialism in French and Francophone Fiction and Film*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn, 2013.
- Viart, D. 'Vers une poétique "spectrale" de l'Histoire' in J. Fortin and J.-B. Vray (eds), *L'Imaginaire spectral de la littérature narrative française contemporaine* (Saint-Etienne: Publications de l'Université de Saint-Etienne, 2012), 37–51.