International Journal of Language and Literature
December 2014, Vol. 2, No. 4, pp. 109-122
ISSN: 2334-234X (Print), 2334-2358 (Online)
Copyright © The Author(s). 2014. All Rights Reserved.
Published by American Research Institute for Policy Development
DOI: 10.15640/ijll.v2n4a6
URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.15640/ijll.v2n4a6

William Faulkner and the French-Speaking World

Nabil Boudraa[1]

Abstract

This article deals with the influence of William Faulkner on some French andFrancophone writers.I argue that French authors, such as Jean-Paul Sartre, Albert Camus, and André Malraux, find in Faulkner's fictional work resonance to their own philosophical ideas, namely the sense of the tragic and the metaphysics of time. Francophone writers, on the other hand, like KatebYacine, Edouard Glissant, RachidBoudjedra, among many others, are more attracted to Faulkner's work for such issues as the vernacular language, the poetics of landscape, and the class and race issues.

Key words : Influence-Faulkner- French literature- Francophone literature

The Martinican writer Édouard Glissant, when asked, in a graduate seminar I attended two decades ago, about his choice for the best writer of the twentieth century, said without any hesitation: "Faulkner, despite Joyce and Proust." Later in the same day I watched a documentary on the Algerian writer, Kateb Yacine, and again I was surprised to hear that he, too, invoked Faulkner as "the greatest writer of our time." This fascination with Faulkner stirred my curiosity, and I immediately wanted to understand why both Glissant and Kateb, as Francophone writers, admired this American writer instead of such writers as Jean-Paul Sartre, André Malraux, or even Albert Camus. After all, Faulkner would seem to be more distant from Glissant and Kateb geographically, linguistically, politically, and even culturally. Ironically, though, it was precisely these three French writers who made William Faulkner so popular, not only in France, but in most French-speaking countries and beyond.

[1]Oregon State University

Faulkner's influence on world literature cannot be overestimated. Several books and essays have already been published on this topic, but insufficient attention has been given to Faulkner's great influence on French and Francophone writers.I will attempt in this article to shed a little more light on his work's impact on the French-speaking world. Most importantly, I would like to illustrate how fascinations for this world-renowned author from Mississippi are different among some of these French and Francophone writers, depending on the cultural, socio-historical and political contexts.

First, it must be emphasized that these French and Francophone writers did not read Faulkner in the original text. It was mostly through the French translations of Maurice Edgar Coindreau, René-Noël Raimbault and Henri Delgove, among others, that they had access to Faulkner's fictional world.

In fact, the first French critical appreciation of Faulkner's work was written by Coindreau on 1 June 1931 in *La Nouvelle Revue Francaise*. The following year, Raimbault and Delgove undertook the translation of *Sanctuary*with a preface by Malraux, which promoted Faulkner's literary fame in France. Interestingly enough, during that same period Faulkner remained less read in his own country. The French translations of Faulkner's novels in the thirties and forties made a long lasting impact on other authors from the Third World—including Kateb Yacine, Rachid Boudjedra, Mario Vargas Llosa, Carlos Fuentes, Gabriel Garcia Marquez, and Jorge Luis Borges—who found in his work not only a reflection of their own culture, but also a new form of expression for their own writing.

Rather than diagnosing Faulkner's influence on all of these writers, I will limit my analysisto the three French "heralds" mentioned above, namely Sartre, Malraux, and Camus, and to two major Francophone writers: Kateb Yacine and Édouard Glissant. At the time of Kateb's and Glissant's encounter with Faulkner's work in Paris in the late forties and early fifties, their respective countries were under French colonial rule. Both were in Paris around the same time. Édouard Glissant was a student of philosophy at the Sorbonne, while Kateb Yacine worked as a laborer and "public writer" for the illiterate North African immigrant workers. It was the time when the American novel was *en vogue (why underlined as it might be understood as a title?)* in France, and also the period of which Sartre declared that "for the youth in France, Faulkner was a god" (qtd. in Faulkner xii).

Faulkner's impact in France coincided with the development of Kateb's literary consciousness and the writing preparations for his magnum opus, Nedjma (1956). Glissant, in turn, acknowledged Faulkner's influence on his work when he received the Renaudot award for his first novel, La lézarde (1958). These writers, both French and Francophone, clearly had different reasons for their lasting admiration for Faulkner. Rather than focusing on each writer in sequence, I will examine thematically Faulkner's various impacts on this entire group.

The Metaphysics of Time

The context of Faulkner's success in France in the thirties and forties might also be explained by the popularity of some philosophical and literary movements at that time, such as Existentialism and the Philosophy of the Absurd. The prevailing ideas on such existential issues as death, despair, fate, and deity certainly found resonance in Faulkner's epic novels.

In July 1939, Sartre wrote a short but very lucid analysis on the conception and treatment of time in Faulkner's The Sound and the Fury. Sartre contends that there is no future in Faulkner's fiction. There is only a past, which seems to completely overshadow the present. In the following passage, he compares Faulkner's vision of the world to that of a man sitting in a convertible looking back. At every momentshadows emerge on his right, and on his left flickering and quaveringpoints of light, which become trees, men, and cars only when they are seen in perspective. The past here gains a surrealistic quality; its outline is hard, clear and immutable. The indefinable and elusive present is helpless before it; it is full of holes through which past things, fixed, motionless and silent, invade it (Sartre, Literary 228).

Sartre, who was impressed by the negation of temporality in Faulkner's novel, argues that humans' misfortune lies indeed in being time-bound. Faulkner strips time of its future and therefore of its dimension of freedom. His characters, for example, never look ahead. For him, the past is never lost; it is always there. It even becomes an obsession. In comparing the treatment of time in Faulkner and Proust, Sartre rightfully argues that Faulkner "takes risks and pursues his thought to its uttermost consequences."

Proust, on the other hand, being a Frenchman and a classicist, cannot lose himself so deeply as Faulkner does. The French characteristics of eloquence, intellectuality and propensity for clear ideas explain Proust's "retaining at least the semblance of chronology" (Sartre, *Literary* 228).

For Faulkner, Man is the sum of his past. The past is with us always and at every moment. "The past is never dead," says his character, Gavin Stevens, in *Requiem for a Nun*. Faulkner's obsession with the past comes alive at different levels in his fiction. For Malcolm Cowley, even Faulkner's long sentences carry this burden of containing both the present and the past. Faulkner himself admits that "his ambition is to put everything into one sentence—not only the present but the whole past on which it depends and which keeps overtaking the present, second by second" (Cowley 663).

Sartre goes on to contend that Faulkner's metaphysics lies in his temporality. Man's misfortune is his temporal aspect. In simple terms, time is obviously the subject in *The Sound and the Fury*. Man is clearly the sum of his past. "Nothing happens, everything *has* happened" Sartre adds. The present is the only thing that exists, and is, in its turn, constantly chased by another present.
Faulkner himself admits this notion:

In fact, I agree pretty much with Bergson's theory of the fluidity of time. There is only the present moment in which I include both the past and the future, and that is eternity. In my opinion, time can be shaped quite a bit by the artist. (Bouvard 362)

However, Faulkner's universe, which is always oriented towards the past, contradicts Sartre's openness to the possibilities of the future. Basing his arguments on Heidegger's metaphysical theories of time, Sartre argues that even the loss of all hope is itself a possibility. For him, Faulkner's characters lack free will, which obviously contradicts his own belief in free will and humanity as a capacity to become. Nevertheless, Sartre was still fond of Faulkner's fiction: "I like his art, but I don't believe in his metaphysics. A barred future is still a future" (Sartre, "Time" 228).

The Modern Tragedy

In his preface to the French translation of *Sanctuary*, Malraux's often quoted sentence "*Sanctuary* is the intrusion of Greek tragedy into the detective story" (94) clearly encapsulates the salient and appealing aspect of the tragic Faulkner. Malraux, who had already published best-selling novels, most of which focused on Man's fate, suffering, and solitude, was immediately attracted to Faulkner's notion of destiny:

In Faulkner, there is no particular presentation of man, there are no values, nor, in spite of the stream-of-consciousness monologues in his early books, is there even any psychology. But there is the figure of Destiny, standing alone behind all these similar and diverse beings like Death in a hospital ward of incurables. An intense obsession crushes each of his characters, and in no case do the characters succeed in exorcising it. (92)Malraux, who dealt with the existential issue of death in most of his novels, sees in Faulkner's work the epic force that springs each time we see one of his characters in a face-to-face with what he calls the "irremediable." In reading Faulkner (and some of Malraux's texts), one feels that indeed Man exists only to be crushed. Malraux goes on to say thatthe tragic poet expresses what obsesses him, not to exorcize the obsession (the obsessive object will reappear in his next work), but to change its nature: for, by expressing it with other elements, he makes the obsession enter the relative universe of things he has conceived and dominated.

He does not defend himself against anguish by expressing it, but by expressing something else with it, by bringing it back into the universe. (94)

Camus was likewise convinced that the only writer who could produce a modern tragedy in the twentieth century was Faulkner. To prove his point, he adapted Faulkner's novel *Requiem for a Nun*for the theatre in 1956. In a letter to the editors of the *Harvard Advocate* on 30 May 1951, Camus expressed his admiration for Faulkner in the following words:

I am a great admirer of William Faulkner whose work I have known and practiced for a long time. He is, in my opinion, your best writer; the only one who is inscribed in your literary tradition of the nineteenth century and one of the rare creators in the West.

I mean he created his world, irreplaceable and recognizable among a thousand worlds, the way others before him did like Melville, Dostoevsky or Proust. *Sanctuary* and *Pylone* are masterpieces. (Couch 122)

John Philip Couch believes that "a more plausible explanation for [Camus's] choosing *Requiem for a Nun* may have been a growing awareness that his own plays failed to communicate the qualities of tragic seriousness that he found in Faulkner's novels" (122). Camus confessed indeed that "Faulkner is the only truly tragic dramatist of our time [...] only Faulkner has known how to find an intensity of tone, of situation, intolerable to the point of making the heroes deliver themselves by means of a violent, superhuman act" (318). Faulkner's genius, Camus also believed, resides in his use of everyday language in the writing of tragedies. In his preface to Maurice Coindreau's translation of *Requiem for a Nun*, he goes on to explain that:

Faulkner has resolved in his manner, and without even being aware of it, a very difficult problem—the problem of a language for modern tragedy. How can characters in business suits be made to speak a language ordinary enough to be spoken in an apartment and unusual enough to sustain the high level of tragic destinies? Faulkner's style, with its staccato breathing, its interrupted sentences, its repeats and prolongations in repetitions, its incidences, its parentheses and its cascades of subordinate clauses, gives us a modern, and in no way artificial, equivalent of the tragic soliloquy... (Camus 313)

There are several aspects to Camus's strong attraction to Faulkner's sense of the tragic. First, Faulkner chooses his heroes and criminals from real life, most likely through daily newspaper stories. Second, he puts forth, with a heightened dramatic intensity, the conflicting face-to-face between his characters and their destiny. According to Camus, their acceptance of this Destiny is simply another key to the world of ancient tragedies. This dimension is sustained through a narrative process that induces readers to expect a tragic outcome. More importantly, Camus sees in Faulkner's style of language—the one spoken by most ordinary people in everyday life—a perfect fit for a modern tragedy. Indeed, Faulkner made of his "Yoknapatawpha county" a place for a universal modern tragedy. That mythical world alone was enough for Camus to draw inspiration for his own fiction, which focused on the elements that elevate Man to his greatness, such as the spirit of endurance, a positive attitude and the refusal to give up in the face of "the Absurd."

Furthermore, Faulkner's Mississippi reminds Camus of his own home country, Algeria. These two regions carry the weight of a tragic situation with obviously different contexts but certainly with the same universal moral. The tragic in Faulkner's South represents the curse of slavery and the subsequent misfortune of the Civil War, which completely wiped out an entire world of traditions and values. Similarly, Algeria could have been the ideal Mediterranean place, long desired by Camus, if it were not for the curse of the war and the clash between the various communities. In sum, these two distant and yet similar regions became metaphors for a lost Eden.

Vernacular Language

Faulkner's language compelled Kateb Yacine's admiration as well. No other writer, Kateb thought, used colloquial language the way Faulkner did. The French critic Jacqueline Arnaud tells us that Kateb Yacine discovered Faulkner when he moved to Paris in 1947. In the following years, he read most of the French translations of Faulkner. It was during this period that he was writing his first novel, *Nedjma*. Faulkner's *The Sound and the Fury*, *Absalom, Absalom!*, *The Wild Palms*, and *Light in August* in particular provided him with the "tools of liberation"[1] that he needed to formulate his own writing.

By that time he had certainly been exposed to other world-renowned poets and novelists, such as Joyce, Balzac, Hölderlin, Yates and Hemingway, among many others, but it was Faulkner who provided him with the techniques he needed to "convince the French in French that Algeria was not French." The French tradition of writing, Kateb argues, simply did not allow him to express the depth of what he had to say.

Algeria's linguistic issue has always been a complicated one. It must be emphasized that Kateb Yacine was probably among the very few North African writers who understood the problem of languages and nationalism at that time. The domination of the French language in colonial Algeria was soon to be replaced by another diglossic situation, in which classical Arabic dominates all the other popular languages, including colloquial Arabic and the various Berber dialects across Northern Africa. Given this complex linguistic environment, Faulkner's writing was very beneficial to Kateb Yacine's conception of his own literary expression.

If I was obliged to melt in the French language the first time, and I am aware it is an alienation, why would I renew this alienation in Arabic [classical], because Arabic is not my language either [...] I prefer the languages of everyday life, because literature for me is life. Faulkner's strength, for example, is not the beautiful sentences; he does not write in literary English. Faulkner's English is slang, the slang of American Blacks. The true writers would look for things the way they are in real life. We do not love a language. One has to write the language of the people, of life. I believe it is possible for the Algerian writers who write in French to go beyond this step, towards Arabic [colloquial] or Berber; in any case, towards a vernacular language. (qtd. in Arésu, *The Fiction*; my translation)

By speaking their true language, the black characters in Faulkner's fiction play a very important role. Lucas Beauchamp and Joe Christmas are interesting characters in Modern literature precisely because they sound true. Through their language, they come out as three dimensional characters. Kateb Yacine remained faithful to this idea and devoted most of his later writing to popular theatre in the two vernacular languages: *derja* (colloquial Arabic) and *tamazight*(Berber).

The Issues of Race and Class

Faulkner's influence on Kateb's style of narration is not, however, limited to form. Kateb, who later gained his reputation as the "Algerian Faulkner," had long been impressed with Faulkner's courage and genius in dealing with issues of class and race. The living conditions in the South described so well in Faulkner's fiction resembled those of pre-independence Algeria. The complex relationships between whites and blacks in the American South were similar to those between the "French of Algeria" (*Pieds-noirs*) and the natives (*Indigènes*). The power struggles in the American South, with whites dominating and exploiting blacks, were not strange to North Africans in the colonial context. These *Pieds-noirs*, Kateb argues, are racists only because their initial misery prevents their humanity from coming out. Their only purpose is to perpetuate the privileges they reaped from colonization. So, it was Faulkner's direct confrontation with these issues and the way he depicted those conflicts in his novels that impressed Kateb Yacine. For him, Faulkner becomes an accomplice of his black characters, so much so that he becomes himself black.

Faulkner, he says,was a convict of literature [...] In his work one sees him wrestling with the reality of his characters [...] When he shows a black murderer [sic], he overloads him [...] The black murderer towers above every single page in the book.

You have a feeling that Faulkner has not turned his back upon his own world, that he has taken full responsibility for it. True, Faulkner was helped by the fact that he was a countryman, and therefore in close relationship with the elements. This gave him such a power as to make him the greatest writer of our time (Arésu, "Elaborative" 12).

It is precisely these qualities, Kateb adds, that are lacking in Albert Camus's work. Camus simply could not or did not want to come to grips with the political and racial issues that dominated Algeria at the time. Algeria for Camus, Kateb argues, is reduced to a mere landscape, a symbolic backdrop. Instead of portraying the ambiguous and complex relationships between the *Pieds-noirs* and the natives, Camus chose to depict only the world of the European settlers.[2]

Furthermore, Kateb Yacine also felt affinity with Faulkner in his portrayal of the dichotomy between the world of the city and that of the country. In the last part of his life, Kateb Yacine spent most of his time in rural Algeria where he carried on his work in theatre. This attachment to the land (and to the peasantry) gives both Faulkner and Kateb a perspective on life which shows in their respective works and which cannot be overlooked.

A French writer, Pierre Guyotat, corroborates this view by saying that, "Faulkner was a writer who could not be on the (impatient) side of the urbanite; he did, and would always, side with the peasant, with the latter's perception of 'slow time'" (Gresset 376). Faulkner was indeed more comfortable in his small Mississippi town of Oxford than in the cities where he spent some time like New Orleans, Paris and later Hollywood.

The Deferred and the Opaque

Among all these French and Francophone authors—under Faulkner's spell—Glissant is without any doubt the one who wrote most extensively and profoundly about the Southern writer. His study, *Faulkner, Mississippi*, is an excellent reading of not only Faulkner's work but also of his own work.In this brilliant homage,Glissant underlines Faulkner's uniqueness and originality in both form and content.

The techniques of circularity, repetition, deferment, and opacity, among many others, are all characteristics of a literary work that, by Glissant's account, surpasses all other writings in the twentieth century. Faulkner's work is very much rooted in the little "postage stamp" of Mississippi, but it is also of a universal dimension.

The human condition it depicts finds echoes almost anywhere in the world. In addition, Glissant finds in Faulkner's fiction a world in which his own ideas of opacity, relation, trace, lineage, legitimacy, digenesis, and miscegenation find resonance. Throughout most of his intellectual career as a philosopher, Glissant thought out the ontological relationship between community and territory in what he calls *atavistic* cultures, whose *raison d'être* depends on territorial legitimacy and on its aggrandizement through conquest and colonialism. This, Glissant argues, rests on the power of predictability; in other words, on the possibility of foreseeing "what is to come, what is going to be conquered, and what is going to be discovered" (115). *Composite* cultures, on the other hand, such as that of the United States, cannot legitimize their newly acquired territory. The lineage myth, the creation stories, the genesis that "legitimize" territory in *atavistic* cultures do not apply to these newly *composite*cultures. Glissant sees clearly how that ethos is at play in Faulkner's fictional world. Yoknapatawpha, he says, is a "composite culture that suffers from wanting to become an atavistic one and suffers in not being able to achieve that goal" (115).

This impossibility of establishing a territorial foundation in Faulkner's South is aggravated by the impossibility of foreseeing and predicting, hence the absence of any future, as explained in the above section on Sartre. The past, however, is fully charged not only with the bitterness (from that failure), but also with malediction, violence, and family declension. All of this is, of course, echoed in the Caribbean context (another composite region), where the subtleties of race, slavery, legitimacy, expropriation, and violence were commonplace. Hence, the affinity with some Caribbean and Latin American writers, such as Alejo Carpentier, Gabriel Garcia Marquez, Derek Walcott and Saint-John Perse, who also admired Faulkner's writing. Furthermore, the world of the plantation in Faulkner's fictional world resonates perfectly with Glissant's attempt to rethink the identity of this newly formed creole culture and to suggest new ways for "Relation" and co-existence that go beyond the injustice and the sufferings created by the exploitative system of the plantation.

Faulkner's genius, Glissant explains, also lies in the manner in which he sets out to elucidate this damnation of the South. Unlike conventional Western novels, Faulkner's fiction proceeds with accumulation, concealment, fluctuation, and, most of all, deferment. The tragedy and malediction of Faulkner's South are never expressed or described. Faulkner rather defers them, revealing bits and pieces, but the full disclosure of the secret is always put off indefinitely. This type of opaque writing (or what Camus calls breathless writing) creates in readers a sense of vertigo, which is universally compelling. Faulkner's style is certainly not didactic. For example, he never links causes with effects (as in the damnation caused by slavery). Faulkner, again according to Glissant, disperses, delays revelation and diffracts perception. In sum, he only suggests and defers, he never tells. Quoting Raimbault, Glissant adds: "[Faulkner] makes no effort to draw out the causes; he records the effects. Once his characters have been invented (that is, re-created after a real-life model), severed from him and let loose into the scene, they become free and independent" (143). It is precisely this technique that fascinated Malraux and other writers, as I mentioned above.

The Poetics of Landscape

Glissant's appreciation of Faulkner also lies in the latter's depiction of the relationship between humans and the natural environment.

In one of his essays, he explains:

> My friends are always astonished to hear me say that I am very Faulknerian, knowing that there were a lot of problems of racism with Faulkner in the United States. I am very Faulknerian because it seems to me that the only white writer from the United States who brought stylistics to the meeting point with landscape, is again Faulkner. (Baudot 108)

More importantly, Faulkner does not describe landscapes nor does he create "generic tableaux." Landscape, Glissant says,is diffused in the text, connected to the people who speak. The rich foliage in the Big Woods is manifest more in the density and profusion of prose in "The Bear" than as a painterly technique. You remember that the Woods, leaning toward Sam Fathers and the young Ike McCaslin, took on the aura of a primordial Mother.

The whole book is a wilderness. This way of treating the subject ensures that the landscape truly becomes one—a landscape—a subject and a person, rather than just an acquiescent décor (Baudot 157).

Landscape in Faulkner's fiction becomes indeed a character, and sometimes the main character as in the short story "The Bear." It is not just a place, or simply a backdrop to the story. The Southern land for Faulkner is also the embodiment of suffering, appropriation, illegitimacy, anguish and most of all damnation. To understand and elucidate this damnation without saying it, and without any *ressentiment*—to use Nietzsche's word—Faulkner pushes into "the obscurity of the country, into the place where no one goes" (Baudot 157). In Faulkner's work, the land of his "Yoknapatawpha county" is presented as the stage where some major injustices in the South took place, such as the dispossession of Indians, the spoliation of the lands, slavery, and above all the tragedy of the Civil War.

Similarly, in Kateb Yacine's work, nature is often vociferous and uncompromising. Most of his characters, however, remain rooted and well-adjusted to the land. They never fight against it. Instead, they harmonize with it. One of the most striking affinities between Kateb's and Glissant's fiction is the significance of the wild animal in the characters' relationship with Nature. The bear in Faulkner's*Go Down, Moses*, and the recurrent image of the eagle in Kateb's fiction, represent not only the wilderness but also the spirit of the ancestors.

In the case of Faulkner, it is through Old Ben—the bear—that Sam Fathers connects with his Native American roots. In Kateb's case, the eagle, or sometimes the vulture, is the one that brings the ancestors' disappointment and wrath to the lost and dispossessed descendants. In his second novel, *Le polygone étoilé*, we read:

They would not lack spaces to conquer, and it would become necessary to exhume everything, to reconstitute everything, to ignore the mortgage of this dubious land which attracted soldiers and locusts, whose owner had been killed, dispossessed, jailed and had undoubtedly emigrated, leaving to his inheritors an old illegible act mentioning no more than a polygonal space bristling with thistle, ostensibly barren and almost uninhabited, immense, inaccessible and with no boundaries except stars, barbed wire, naked earth, and the sky at its heels (qtd. in Arésu, *The Fiction* 144).

Kateb time and again joins Faulkner in glorifying the ancestor who cannot be vanquished despite the failures and defeats. "In memory of the rebellious few, irreducible in their hideouts, down to their very roots: robust Promethean mankind, still virgin after each rape, which did not owe anybody anything" (144). The parallels with Faulkner are in fact numerous. In Kateb's *Nedjma*, the female protagonist, Nedjma, who lends her name to the novel, is an allegorical representation of Algeria, which was violated by its successive conquerors. The South, in Faulkner's novels, was also violated by conquests as illustrated above. On the formal level, *Nedjma* also resembles novels like *The Sound and the Fury* and *As I Lay Dying* in terms of its broken linearity, quick succession of narrators, interior monologues, stream of consciousness, flashbacks, and circularity. In sum, by borrowing some techniques from Faulkner, Kateb Yacine laid the foundations for a revolutionary anti-colonial discourse and opened a new perspective for a typical North African writing, which has already served two generations of writers.

These perspectives from the French-speaking world offer us fresh insights into Faulkner's literary legacy and testify to his metaphysical and technical richness.

For the Francophone writers—those originating from the colonized world—Faulkner provided not only new techniques to break away from the colonizer's traditional way of writing, but also themes that reflected their own situations. For their French counterparts, Faulkner was clearly the perfect literary illustration of their philosophical concepts. For some, his fiction provided both guidance and validation for their literary undertaking. For others, his world view simply offered a challenge to their own understandings of the human condition and the world at large.

Several affinities between Faulkner and the Francophone writers in particular remain to be addressed. Among these is the role of oral tradition in their writing: "Faulkner found freedom in the fluidity of his sources. Unlike the poetry he had read, which seemed fixed because written, the stories he knew existed only in oral tradition, many of them in more than one version. They not only permitted play, they invited it" (Minter 82). Faulkner lived in a milieu in which old peasants, planters and black servants told stories. Similarly, Kateb avoided academic and urbane circles, preferring the company of ordinary people. His status as *l'écrivain public* (the public writer) for the illiterate workers in Paris allowed him access to an entire world of personal stories that nourished his creative imagination. So, this oral aspect of their respective sources helped shape their literary genius. This aspect alone—worth an entire writing project—promises to push open a new door into Faulkner's world.

Notes

[1]Expression borrowed from Pascale Casanova, qtd. in Gunther Kodat 188.
[2]This criticism of Camus, which was also made by several critics on both sides of the Mediterranean, is in my opinion unjustified and is of course still open to debate. I have argued elsewhere that while it might be true that Camus's fiction did not include the indigenous population, most of non-fiction writing dealt with the iniquities and injustices of colonialism.

Works Cited

Arnaud, Jacqueline. *La littérature maghrébine de langue française*. Paris: Publisud, 1986.
Baudot, Alain. Bibliographie annotée d'Édouard Glissant. Toronto: GRAF, 1993.
Bernard Arésu. Counterhegemonic Discourse from the Maghreb: The Poetics of Kateb's Fiction. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1993.
---. "Elaborative Fiction: Kateb and Faulkner." CELFAN Review 5.3 (May 1986): 10–16.
---. The Fiction of Kateb Yacine: A Study in Afro-Occidentalism. Diss. U. of Washington, 1975.
Blotner, Joseph. Faulkner in the University. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1959.
Bonn, Charles. Kateb Yacine, Nedjma. Paris: PUF, 1990.
Bouvard, Loic. "Conversation with William Faulkner." Modern Fiction Studies 5 (Winter 1959–60): 361–64.
Camus, Albert. Lyrical and Critical Essays. New York: Knopf, 1968.
Couch, John Philip. "Camus and Faulkner: The Search for the Language of Modern Tragedy." Yale French Studies 25 (1960).
Cowley, Malcolm. The Portable Faulkner. New York: Viking, 1970.
Dash, Michael. Édouard Glissant. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995.
Faulkner, William. Œuvres romanesques, vol. 4. Paris: Gallimard, 1977.
Glissant, Édouard. Faulkner, Mississippi. Paris: Stock, 1996. Trans. Barbara Lewis and Thomas Spear. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1996.
Gresset, Michel. "Faulkner and the Third World." Faulkner, His Contemporaries, and His Posterity. Ed. Waldemar Zacharasiewicz. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 1993.
Gunther Kodat, Catherine. "William Faulkner: An Impossibly Comprehensive Expressivity." The Cambridge Companion to the Modernist Novel. Ed. Morag Shiach. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007.
Kateb, Yacine. Nedjma. Paris: Seuil, 1956.
Killingsworth, Kay. "Au-delà du déchirement: l'héritage méridional dans l'œuvre de William Faulkner et d'Albert Camus". Esprit (septembre 1963): 209–34.
Malraux, André. "A Preface for Faulkner's Sanctuary." Yale French Studies 10 (1952): 92–94.
Minter, David. William Faulkner: His Life and Work. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1980.
Raimbault, René-Noël. Faulkner. Paris: Universitaires, 1963.
Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Literary and Philosophical Essays*. Trans. Annette Michelson. New York: Criterion, 1955.
---. "Time in Faulkner: The Sound and the Fury." Trans. Martine Darmon. *Three Decades of Criticism.*Ed. Frederic J. Hoffman and Olga W. Vickery. Ann Arbor: Michigan UP, 1960. 225–32.
Woodworth, Stanley. *William Faulkner en France*. Paris: Lettres Modernes, 1959.