MATHIJS SANDERS

“Vive la France et la Hollande amies!”¹

The Netherlands-France Society between 1916 and 1919 The Construction of a Repertoire

During the First World War and the interwar period, bilateral societies played an important role in the processes of literary and cultural transfer between the Netherlands and the surrounding countries. This article sets out to explore part of the reception of French literature and culture in the Netherlands by studying the cultural repertoire developed within the “Genootschap Nederland-Frankrijk” (The Netherlands-France Society) between 1916 and 1919. Analysis of the institutional settings and discursive practices concerning this international transfer brings to light how some prominent spokesmen in and around the Society constructed a strategic repertoire in order to (re)define Dutch cultural identity.

1. Introduction

In recent years, historians have devoted considerable attention to the international cultural relations between the Netherlands and neighbouring countries during the First World War and the interwar period. This focus on the international dynamics of Dutch culture is closely connected to a changing vision of the period between the two world wars. In the first part of his standard work *Het Koninkrijk der Nederlanden in de Tweede Wereldoorlog* (The Kingdom of the Netherlands in the Second World War) – significantly entitled *Voorspel* (Prelude) and published in 1969 – Lou de Jong sketched the image of a conservative and almost motionless society, culturally very inward-looking and politically dominated by confessional “pillars” (the social segments identified with the three main religious and ideological denominations in the Netherlands: Protestant, Catholic and Socialist). Whereas Europe was in a state of turmoil, the Dutch still lived in a practically untouched world.² Research into the political discourse, the public debate, and the cultural exchanges between the Netherlands and, in particular, Germany, has, after

¹ Gustave Cohen in: *Enquête sur l'attitude de la Hollande et des Hollandais pendant la guerre*, Leyde: s.a., [1919], p. 22–24.

² L. de Jong, *Het Koninkrijk der Nederlanden in de Tweede Wereldoorlog*. Part 1: *Voorspel*, Leiden: Staatsuitgeverij, 1969.

De Jong, provided new insights. As a consequence of cautious neutrality politics, but primarily due to the contending parties' interest in a neutral buffer, the Netherlands remained outside the hostilities of the Great War. Nonetheless, the war had a profound impact on Dutch politics, economy and culture; and it also deeply affected writers and intellectuals who feared that their country would not be able to maintain neutrality. During and after the war, many leading intellectuals stressed the importance of international orientation and cooperation.³ With their efforts and actions they initiated and stimulated processes of cultural transfer between the Netherlands and neighbouring countries. In doing so, they shifted the discussions to Dutch national identity and the international position of the Netherlands.⁴

The new insight that the Netherlands was not an island but fully part of European culture has not yet led to a more international view of Dutch literary historiography. Although daily newspapers, weekly journals, and literary periodicals in the Netherlands paid substantial attention to literary affairs in Europe during and after the First World War, international literary relationships still constitute a blind spot in literary historiography. No study has systematically examined as yet how foreign literature functioned in the Dutch literary system during the twentieth century.

This article sets out to explore the transfer of French literature to the Netherlands between 1916 and 1919. "Transfer" refers here to processes by which cultural *artefacts* and *ideas* are circulated between cultural spaces.⁵ Combined insights from network theories and system theories can function as a useful heuristic tool, a

³ M. Frey, *Der Erste Weltkrieg und die Niederlande. Ein neutrales Land im politischen Kalkül der Kriegsgegner*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1998; P. Moeyes, *Buiten schot. Nederland tijdens de Eerste Wereldoorlog 1914–1918*, Amsterdam, Antwerpen: Arbeiderspers, 2001; M. Abbenhuis, *The Art of Staying Neutral. The Netherlands in the First World War*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006; E. Tames, *Oorlog voor onze gedachten. Oorlog, neutraliteit en identiteit in het Nederlandse publieke debat 1914–1918*, Hilversum: Verloren, 2006. Recently Nijgh & Van Ditmar published two anthologies of Dutch songs, poems and prose texts on World War I: Rob Kammelaar e.o. (eds.), *Het monster van de oorlog. Nederlandse liedjes en gedichten over de Eerste Wereldoorlog*, Amsterdam: Nijgh & Van Ditmar, 2004; Idem, *De Eerste Wereldoorlog door Nederlandse ogen. Getuigenissen, verhalen, betogen*, Amsterdam: Nijgh & Van Ditmar, 2007. On the impact of the Great War on Dutch literature, see also Geert Buelens, "Reciting Shells. Dada and, Dada in & Dadaists on the First World War", in: *arcadia* 41, 2006, 2, p. 275–295.

⁴ See W. Mühlhausen a.o. (eds.), *Grenzgänger. Persönlichkeiten des deutsch-niederländische Verhältnisses*, New York, Berlin: Waxmann, 1998; F. Boterman, Marianne Vogel, *Nederland en Duitsland in het Interbellum*, Hilversum: Verloren, 2003; and primarily Madelon de Keizer, Sophie Tates (eds.), *Moderniteit. Modernisme en massacultuur in Nederland 1914–1940*, Zutphen: Walburg Pers, 2004; and Martin Kraaijestein, Paul Schulten (eds.), *Wankel evenwicht. Neutraal Nederland en de Eerste Wereldoorlog*, Soesterberg: Aspekt, 2007.

⁵ Ewald Mengel, "Cultural Transfer, Translation and Reception of Anglophone Drama: The Theoretical Foundations of the 'Weltbühne Wien' Project", in: http://www.ned.univie.ac.at/Data/5/2363/WeltbühneWien_englisch_mengel.pdf (12/05/2008), p. 2. See also the article by Armin Paul Frank in this issue.

searchlight that may help to explain the dynamics of international cultural transfer. I suggest that these transfer processes were guided by shared cultural *repertoires*. The underlying assumption is that *actors* and *institutions* play a vital role in these processes. The second assumption is that actors (writers, critics, mediators, publishers) generally act on the basis of a shared repertoire, a “mental equipment” of knowledge, values, conventions, prescriptions and ideas (including normative conceptions of art and literature).⁶ Repertoires usually have a strong strategic dimension. They serve as a means to attain, demarcate, strengthen, or defend a position in the literary and cultural field and to propagate ideas and conceptions of culture and literature on people.

Actors who share a repertoire can constitute a *network*, by which I mean a system of interrelated actors, objects and institutions, built and maintained in order to achieve particular (common) goals.⁷ Repertoires are thus produced within networks of actors and institutions. These institutions, for example cultural societies and periodicals, serve as both social and discursive spaces. In order to study the presupposed interdependency of institutional settings and the production of repertoires, an approach is needed which combines institutional analysis with an examination of discursive practices, that is, the ways in which actors in a specific institutional setting and role formulate their opinions and, where literature comes into play, their conceptions of literature.⁸

In my analysis of these discursive practices, which actors collectively drew upon to organize their conduct and construct their programme, I will focus on three aspects: (1) narrative patterns, that is the ways in which actors narrativised and historicised the relationship between the Netherlands and France; (2) the rhetorical schemes and strategies, that is the ways in which actors positioned themselves in their texts and arranged schemes and tropes so as to convince the audience; and (3) the verbal registers they made use of in order to express their opinions and demarcate their position. By registers I mean semantically coherent sets of frequently occurring words with a shared semantic connotation in relation to a

⁶ Els Andringa, “Penetrating the Dutch Polysystem: The Reception of Virginia Woolf, 1920–2000,” in: *Poetics Today* 27, 2006, 3, p. 501–568; Els Andringa, Sophie Levie, Mathijs Sanders (eds.), *Het buitenland bekeken. Vijf internationale auteurs door Nederlandse ogen (1900–2000) = Nederlandse letterkunde* 11, 2006, 3.

⁷ This definition of networks proceeds from Latour’s “Actor-Network Theory”: Bruno Latour, *Reassembling the Social. An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. According to Latour, an actor-network contains people, objects and organisations. These are collectively referred to as “actors”. I would prefer to distinguish between actors (humans), organisations (institutions) and objects (artifacts).

⁸ Van Rees and Dorleijn define a “conception of literature” as “a set of mostly *normative* ideas and arguments on the nature and function of literature, on literary techniques and their alleged effects on readers”. Kees van Rees, Gillis J. Dorleijn, “The eighteenth-century literary field in Western Europe: The interdependence of material and symbolic production and consumption”, in: *Poetics* 28, 2001, p. 331–348 (340).

delimited area of application (literature, art, culture, politics, etc.). Research into these aspects of discursive behaviour can bring to light the axioms and underlying *doxa* that dominated at least part of the debate on Dutch national identity and on the relationships between the Netherlands and neighbouring countries. It is my intention to study this debate by focussing on a specific case: the repertoire which was constructed and disseminated within the institutional context of the “Genootschap Nederland-Frankrijk” (The Netherlands-France Society) in the years between 1916 and 1919. My assumption is that this repertoire constituted the ideological framework for at least part of the reception of foreign literature in the Netherlands.

Up to now, bilateral societies have received little scholarly attention, although they have played an important role in transfer processes between the Netherlands and neighbouring countries during and after the First World War.⁹ The Netherlands-France Society set out to intensify the relations between the Netherlands and France and to counteract the dominant image in the French press of Holland as a pro-German nation. Since the documentary material is voluminous, I shall limit myself to the initial years of the Society (1916–1919) and to the initiatives and publications of two key figures within the Society’s organizational network who were vital to its image and who, as cultural mediators and ambassadors, made a case for the integration of the French culture in the Netherlands: the Romance scholars Jean-Jacques Salverda de Grave (1863–1947) and Pieter Valkhoff (1875–1942).¹⁰

2. The Emergence of a Network

On Sunday 12 March 1916, six friends met to consider the possibility of creating a committee to promote knowledge about the French sciences, culture and literature in the Netherlands.¹¹ The initiative came from the Romance scholar Pieter Valkhoff, who immediately gained the support of Jean-Jacques Salverda de Grave. *Nederland-Frankrijk. Genootschap voor wetenschap, letteren en kunst* (The Netherlands-France Society for the sciences, literature and the arts) was a sister organisation of the *Comité France-Hollande* in Paris, which was subordinate to the as-

⁹ Ismee Tames wrote a brief account about the Netherlands-German Society: I. Tames, “De Nederlandsch-Duitsche Vereeniging en het verlangen naar ware cultuur”, in: Boterman/Vogel, *Nederland en Duitsland in het interbellum* (see note 4), p. 53–76.

¹⁰ About Salverda de Grave see Tine H. Wind, “Jean Jacques Salverda de Grave”, in: *Jaarboek van de Maatschappij der Nederlandse letterkunde 1947–1949*, Leiden: MNL, 1949, p. 130–140; about Valkhoff see C. Serrurier, “Pieter Valkhoff”, in: *Jaarboek van de Maatschappij der Nederlandse letterkunde 1942*, Leiden: MNL, 1942, p. 147–155.

¹¹ At the first meeting the following people were present: the Romance scholars Prof. J.J. Salverda de Grave, Dr. P. Valkhoff and Dr. C. Serrurier, the mathematician Prof. J.A. Barrau, the writer Johan de Meester and the painter and essayist Philippe Zilcken.

sociation *L’Idée Française à l’Étranger*, *Association Nationale pour la Défense des Idées Françaises à l’Étranger*. These organisations aimed to counter German propaganda and strengthen the bond between France and the Netherlands.¹² The close connections between them indicate that French organisations and networks probably played an important part in the Dutch initiative. The foundation of the Netherlands-France Society must, of course, be considered against the background of the war. In March 1916, Dutch neutrality was severely threatened when the German minister of foreign affairs declared that Germany would invade the Netherlands unless the Dutch government would take effective steps to prevent a British invasion.

The six founders and key participants of the Netherlands-France Society were all members of Dutch social and academic elites and had gained prestige as connoisseurs of French history, art and culture. Born in the decades between 1860 and 1880, they were children of the nineteenth century, the age of institutionalised sociability. Their working programme demonstrated an all but boundless number of initiatives: the Society would publish and distribute catalogues of French scholarly works, equip a standard library with books about French art and sciences, organize lectures, concerts and exhibitions, and negotiate with French publishers and book sellers about a faster import of French books. At the same time, work was to be done to expand the Society’s own organizational network. Alongside a national executive committee, regional departments with their own sub-committees were set up. Within a year, the Society had seven departments and more than 800 members (in 1931: twelve departments and approximately 1500 members).¹³ The executive committee took upon itself to stabilise the Society’s network by strengthening the consensus about its main purposes, aligning other actors, and claiming authority to speak on behalf of the Society, thus ensuring its homogeneity.

The Netherlands-France Society emphatically presented itself as a private initiative, independent of any political or ideological direction. The Society can be characterized as a small-scale intellectual network of committed publicists who were not attached to any of the religious and ideological pillars that dominated the Dutch political scene in these years but was embedded in a liberal environment that flourished in institutes such as the Royal Netherlands Academy of Sciences, the Society of Dutch Literature in Leiden and the literary periodical *De Gids* (The Guide). The initiatives and cultural opinions of the Society’s key members revealed a clear awareness of tradition, and, it seems, little sympathy for the hesitantly emerging literary and artistic avant-gardes in the Netherlands. Hence, it is no

¹² On the German propaganda in the Netherlands during World War I, see Nicole Eversdijk, “‘Stärkung jener völkischen Eigenschaften, welche die Holländer mit uns gemein haben.’ Een aspect van de Duitse visie op Nederland in 1914–1918”, in: Martin Kraaijestein, Paul Schulten (eds.), *Wankel evenwicht. Neutraal Nederland en de Eerste Wereldoorlog*, Soesterberg: Aspekt, 2007, p. 207–231.

¹³ *Gedenkschrift 15 jarig bestaan Genootschap Nederland-Frankrijk 1916–1931*, Wageningen: Vada, 1931, p. 10–11.

surprise that one of the first achievements of the Society was a touring exhibition (November 1916 – April 1917) of French impressionist paintings, an initiative by Philippe Zilcken.

The opening of this exhibition in The Hague already revealed much about the efforts and objectives of the Society. Salverda de Grave, the Society's *président* right from the start, proposed in his opening speech that was delivered first in French and then in Dutch that, although the Netherlands had always been susceptible to foreign influences, “we” would always remain “Nederlanders” (Dutchmen). National independence was of primary importance:

We are Dutchmen and Dutchmen we will remain; Dutchmen in the way that history has made us. What we want is to prevent that our national character gets damaged by an all too one-sided influence from abroad. We consider Romance culture to be indispensable and we wish to call upon the beneficial role which it has continually played in our scholarly and artistic life. Because it is the expression of sincerity in the arts, of clarity in the sciences, it is the school of self-control and mastery of the matter.¹⁴

Evidently, cosmopolitan idealism and national self-consciousness were in Salverda de Grave's exposition both members of the same family. This ideological position could be referred to as critical nationalism of a liberal cut: an appeal for contemplation of national identity in an international (French/Latin) context. In short, the intention of the Netherlands-France Society can be characterized as an instance of cultural mobilization whilst maintaining neutrality and indeed serving national interests by means of a receptive attitude regarding French culture.¹⁵

3. The construction of a repertoire

The speech in The Hague was not the first and only time that Salverda de Grave emphasized the affinity between the Dutch and Romance cultures. *Neutrality*, *independence*, and *objectivity* were key words in the discourse of opinion makers when it came to legitimizing the position of the Netherlands during the war.¹⁶ That neutrality and independence did not mean the same as *aloofness* and *impartiality*

¹⁴ “Nederlanders zijn wij; Nederlanders blijven wij; Nederlanders zoo als de geschiedenis ons heeft gemaakt. Wat wij willen is: te beletten dat onze volksaard schade zou kunnen ondervinden van te eenzijdige inwerking van buiten. Wij achten de Romaanse cultuur onmisbaar en wij beroepen ons op de heilzame rol die zij steeds heeft gespeeld in ons wetenschappelijk en ons artistiek leven. Want zij is de uiting van oprechtheid in de kunst, van helderheid in de wetenschap, zij is de leerschool van zelfbeheersching en van heerschappij over de stof” (Report “Tentoonstelling van Fransche kunst” [Exhibition of French art], in *Nieuwe Rotterdamse Courant*, 21 November 1916; Salverda de Grave as cited in this report; my translation, M.S.).

¹⁵ The concept of “cultural mobilization” is also used by Tames, *Oorlog voor onze gedachten* (see note 3), p. 23–24, following J.N. Horne, *State, Society and Mobilization in Europe during the First World War*, London: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

¹⁶ Moeyes, *Buiten schot* (see note 3), and Tames, *Oorlog voor onze gedachten* (see note 3).

was apparent from Salverda de Grave's essay “Hollandais et Français” in the journal *La Revue de Hollande*. This monthly periodical was edited by the Frenchman G.S. de Solpray (who was of Hungarian origin) with the assistance of Georges Gaillard and the Walloon writer and journalist Louis Piérard, author of several publications on the Dutch-French relationship.¹⁷ *La Revue de Hollande* was distributed by Georges Crès (Paris) and A.W. Sijthoff (Den Haag) in several European countries “où la langue française est en honneur”.¹⁸ De Solpray presented his journal as a space open to intellectual and artistic debate and as an intellectual *trait-d'union* between France and the Netherlands.¹⁹ The periodical aimed at strengthening mutual interests between Dutch and French readers, by publishing essays on the French-Dutch relationship (for example on “L'esprit français sur l'architecture et l'art décoratif hollandais”), an “Enquête sur l'influence de l'esprit Français en Hollande”, and translations of Dutch literature. The latter included poems by Hélène Swarth, Herman Gorter, and P.C. Boutens, short stories by Ary Prins, Henri Borel, Cyriel Buysse, Henri van Booven and Augusta de Wit, and novels by Frederik van Eeden (*Le petit Johannès*) and Arthur van Schendel (*Le vagabond amoureux*), all mentioned as “principaux collaborateurs”. De Solpray self-confidently referred to Pierre Bayle (1647–1706) – the Huguenot philosopher who fled from France to the Netherlands in 1681 because of the religious politics of Louis XIV²⁰ – and the late seventeenth-century *Revue de Hollande*, thus historically embedding both the French-Dutch relationship and his own periodical and objectives. By identifying Bayle's putative character – especially his religious tolerance and cosmopolitanism – with the “spirit of France”, he transformed Pierre Bayle and the *Revue de Hollande* into historical icons of Dutch-French relationships. Pierre Bayle therefore functioned in the strategic repertoire deployed by De Solpray and other key figures in and around the Society for creating a transnational common identity.²¹

¹⁷ See primarily Louis Piérard, *La Hollande et la Guerre*, Paris, Nancy: Librairie Militaire Berger-Levrault, 1917; idem, *Gross-Deutschland, la Belgique et la Hollande*, Bruxelles/Paris: Van Oest et Cie., 1918.

¹⁸ R. de H., “La Revue de Hollande”, in: *La Revue de Hollande* 2, 1916, 1, p. 1–2. *La Revue de Hollande* appeared between July 1915 and September 1918. The pro-German Dutch weekly *De Toekomst* [*The Future*] tried to unmask *La Revue de Hollande* by stressing that this journal was an unwelcome foreigner and a threat to Dutch neutrality. See Sleeswijk, “De ‘Revue de Hollande’ – en nog iets”, in: *De Toekomst* 1, 1915, 18, p. 360–361.

¹⁹ G.S. de S., “Enquête sur l'influence de l'esprit Français en Hollande”, in: *La Revue de Hollande* 2, 1916, 6, p. 507.

²⁰ On the *Revue de Hollande* in the early modern era see: Hans Bots, Françoise Waquet, *La République des Lettres*, Berlin: De Boeck, 1997.

²¹ La rédaction, “La Revue de Hollande”, in: *La Revue de Hollande* 1, 1915, 1, p. 3–4; C. Serrurier, “Pierre Bayle”, in: *La Revue de Hollande* 2, 1916, 11, p. 1316–1342; also: Cornelia Serrurier, *Pierre Bayle en Hollande: étude historique et critique*, Apeldoorn: Dixon et cie, 1912.

Salverda's essay in *La Revue de Hollande* was an ode to *l'esprit Français*. The essayist postulated a deep mental and intellectual affinity between the Netherlands and France²², in which essentialist and quasi-mythic notions about national mentalities and character traits once again dominated. His essay manifested a preoccupation with national characteristics that were considered to be genuine.²³ Salverda de Grave argued, for example, that the most distinguished quality of the French spirit was its "*haute noblesse*", which resulted in "*l'absence de ces manifestations délirantes qui nous ont si souvent choqués chez ses ennemis*". Political current affairs did not constitute the subject of the article, but "*un problème plus général*": Salverda de Grave wished to demonstrate "*qu'il existe entre le caractère des Hollandais et le caractère des Français des ressemblances qui rapprochent ces nations des Anglais et les différencient du peuple allemand*." In his description of the mental affinity between French and Dutch culture, Salverda de Grave alternately used the terms "*esprit*" (spirit), "*caractère*" (character), "*nature*" (nature) and "*âme*" (soul). Just like De Solpray, he claimed that this mental affinity had common roots in French and Dutch history, by referring to the French Protestant refugees who had settled in the Netherlands in the seventeenth century, after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes (which had granted the Huguenots the right to worship without state persecution) by Louis XIV in 1685. In referring to these events of the past, Salverda de Grave presented France and the Netherlands as the two protagonists of the same story. The French influence, he argued, would not diminish the Dutch character, but would lead to a mutual reinforcement, to a realization that "we" and the French were distinctly different from the Germans. It will be clear that dichotomous thinking and a firm belief in national identities dominated his argument. Francophiles such as Salverda de Grave attributed characteristics to the French and German nation that respectively reflected the auto- and hereto-image of their own ideal national identity, qualities which as *topoi* continually emerged in their texts. Salverda de Grave listed a number of common French and the Dutch character traits, such as respect for the individual, a drive for freedom and democratic thinking, the impartial production of knowledge, and last but not least, "reasonableness" and "sobriety" ("*contrôle de la raison et de la réalité*").

Salverda de Grave's argumentative scheme revealed his double bond to both positivism and *Geistesgeschichte*. Traces of positivism can be detected in the deterministic explanations which he conveyed: "race", "milieu" and "moment" – Taine's trinity – determined the chief characteristics of a people's national character. These deterministic insights were, however, eclipsed by a *geistesgeschichtliche* dominant.

²² J.J. Salverda de Grave, "Hollandais et Français", in: *La Revue de Hollande* 1, 1916, 7, p. 829–853.

²³ On the discursive construction of national identities through narrative patterns and images within institutional contexts, see Ruth Wodak a.o. (eds.), *The Discursive Construction of National Identity*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999; and Manfred Beller, Joep Leerssen (eds.), *Imagology. The Cultural Construction and Literary Representation of National Stereotypes. A Critical Survey*, Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi, 2007.

Ultimately, not “blood” and “destiny” but “talent” and “spirit” determined a national character. Salverda de Grave’s frequent mention of the concept of *spirit*, and the abstract essentials by which he described the “French spirit” pointed in this direction. He considered the “French spirit” to be the manifestation of a French national identity that manifested itself pre-eminently in art and literature. In this approach to nationality, he found himself in the company of authoritative historians of his time, such as Jacob Burckhardt and, more recently, Johan Huizinga and Jan Romein, who employed terms such as “national character” and “spiritual imprint”. They interpreted the “spirit” of a people as the sum of characteristics whereby a certain group could distinguish itself from other groups. They also attributed a strong reality value to “spirit”. That this mode of thinking was prevalent amongst literary critics is apparent from the essay “Introduction à l’étude de la littérature néerlandaise” by Dirk Coster, following the editorial foreword to the first number of *La Revue de Hollande*. The essay opened with the proposition: “*Tout littérature nationale est la voix vivante d’un peuple, l’émanation de sa vie collective*”.²⁴

To obtain an understanding of the French spirit through reading the work of French thinkers and writers was of prime importance to Salverda de Grave (and, as we shall see, to many other critics associated with the Society). Salverda de Grave and his associates constructed an image of France that was the exact opposite of the stereotypical representation of France at the turn of the nineteenth century (France as decadent and immoral and Paris as the sewer of Europe).²⁵ They attempted to promote, in other words, a new standard discourse and a revised repertoire of stereotypes about French and Romance culture.

The domination of German-oriented science at Dutch universities and the necessity of restoring the balance by strengthening the French influence formed the essence of Salverda de Grave’s argument in *De Gids* at the beginning of 1917. This liberal monthly had a strong academic character. The editors H.T. Colenbrander and Johan de Meester (co-founder of the Society) participated in some of the same cultural and intellectual network as Salverda de Grave, whose article “Waarom het Genootschap ‘Nederland-Frankrijk’ is opgericht” [Why the ‘The Netherlands-France’ Society has been founded] included the Society’s statement of principles and working programme.

The foundation of “The Netherlands-France” Society is an act neither of hate against Germany, nor, in the first place, one of sympathy with France, but from national self-defence. It is a consequence of the war, insofar that the founders learned to see the necessity for self-defence through facts and situations, the threatened horror of which the war has already revealed to

²⁴ Dirk Coster, “Introduction à l’étude de la littérature néerlandaise”, in: *La Revue de Hollande* 1, 1915, 1, p. 5–28.

²⁵ See Raf de Bont, Tom Verschaffel, *Het verderf van Parijs*, Leuven: Universitaire Pers, 2004.

them. The war was thus the reason, but that is no longer the case, for we want our work to be durable and we expect that it will bear fruit primarily in times of peace.²⁶

According to Salverda de Grave, the Society was a-political; its field of work was the domain of the spirit. The author presented himself both in the first person singular and the first person plural – as representative in an exposition which was clearly intended to be collective. The personal pronoun “we” in this essay had at least three referents: “we” the members of the Society, “we” philologists, and “we” Dutchmen. Salverda de Grave then substantiated the affinity between the French and “us/we” [the Dutch] by once again indicating a corresponding mentality, in which the same stereotypical resemblances and oppositions were employed as in the French article. Maintaining national independence had to be the highest objective, and in order to realise it, openness to “foreign influences” was essential. Salverda de Grave’s liberally tinted critical nationalism – in line with *De Gids* – nevertheless revealed a growing uneasiness with the neutrality discourse. “[S]piritual independence”, Salverda de Grave concluded, will benefit from French influences and be damaged by (an excess of) German ones. Whereas Salverda de Grave was still preaching to the converted (an international network of like-minded intellectuals) in *La Revue de Hollande*, in *De Gids* he addressed a wider audience and provoked debate. The editors offered Barend Sijmons (Professor of Germanic languages in Groningen and thus associate colleague of Salverda de Grave) the opportunity for a response.²⁷ According to Sijmons, Salverda de Grave’s essay suffered from a lack of nuance and testified to a limited perception. Sijmons turned his colleague’s arguments around by focusing on the affinity between the Netherlands and Germany. His arguments were of a somewhat different nature: where Salverda de Grave emphasized the mental affinity, Sijmons alluded to kinship. Referring to insights from ethnography, he stated: “[t]he main point is that in German scientific works we find flesh from our flesh, and blood from our blood.”

By presenting Dutch culture as a member of an extended Latin-Romance family, Salverda de Grave adopted a public position in the debate amongst Dutch opinion makers about the identity of Dutch culture and about the position of the Netherlands on the European stage. The thoughts expressed in his essays can be linked with the public debate in the Netherlands during the First World War, as

²⁶ “De stichting van het Genootschap ‘Nederland-Frankrijk’ is een daad, niet van haat tegen Duitsland, en evenmin in de eerste plaats van sympathie voor Frankrijk, maar van nationale zelfverdediging. Zij is een gevolg van de oorlog, in zover als de oprichters de noodzakelijkheid dier zelfverdediging hebben leeren inzien door feiten en toestanden, waarvan de oorlog hun al de dreigende verschrikking heeft geopenbaard. De oorlog is dus de aanleiding geweest, maar ook niet meer. Want wij willen dat ons werk duurzaam zal zijn en wij verwachten dat het vooral in vreedstijd vruchten zal dragen.” (J.J. Salverda de Grave, “Waarom het genootschap ‘Nederland-Frankrijk’ is opgericht”, in: *De Gids* 81, 1917, 2, p. 354–364 (354); my translation, M.S.).

²⁷ B. Sijmons, “‘Fransche’ en ‘Duitsche’ wetenschap”, in: *De Gids* 81, 1917, 3, p. 545–551.

analysed by Ismee Tames in her dissertation *Oorlog voor onze gedachten* (War for our Thoughts), which primarily concerns the formation of opinions about Germany and England.²⁸ She concludes that all the opinion makers in the public debate were convinced that the Netherlands had to remain outside the hostilities. The debate concerned the true nature of neutrality and by extension also involved a discussion on Dutch identity. Since the Netherlands had neither an official propaganda service nor censorship, the debate could freely develop as long as neutrality was not actually endangered. This relative freedom meant that although the government was, indeed, in favour of consistent neutrality politics, the repertoire of the Dutch journalists was neither enforced nor sanctioned from above. In the exchange of ideas, all possible positions could be adopted. In and around The Netherlands-France Society a repertoire was constructed which served as an ideological framework for the reception of French literature and culture. Research into conceptions of literature within the Society will render the contours of this repertoire more precise.

4. Literature and Criticism: *French Art*

The Netherlands-France Society was multidisciplinary. Its area of work included science and humanities, literature and the arts. While Salverda de Grave primarily focused his attention on the humanities, his pupil Pieter Valkhoff – who also contributed to *La Revue de Hollande* – represented the Society’s ideal in terms of literature. Almost immediately after the establishment of the Society, Valkhoff took the initiative to publish a series of essays on French art and literature for a Dutch public. From Valkhoff’s correspondence with various (potential) contributors it is evident what he had in mind: a series of monographs and anthologies about modern French art for a wide audience.²⁹ The complete title of the series was: *Fransche kunst. Bibliotheek van Fransche letterkunde, schilderkunst, muziek, enz.* (French Art. Library of French literature, Painting, Music, etc.). Valkhoff was able to get the series published by A.W. Sijthoff. This publisher also brought out De Solpray’s *La Revue de Hollande* and created a distinct profile as an internationally orientated publishing company.³⁰

²⁸ Tames, *Oorlog voor onze gedachten* (see note 3).

²⁹ For the research into this series I studied the letters by P. Valkhoff to Jan Greshoff, Johannes Tielrooy, Arij Prins and Constant van Wessem which are to be found in the collection of the Letterkundig Museum in The Hague.

³⁰ See: A.W. Sijthoff’s *Uitgevers-Maatschappij N.V. Leiden 1851–1951*, Leiden: Sijthoff, 1950. In 1917–1918 the magazine *Nouvelles de Hollande, Revue du Nederlandsche Anti-Oorlogsraad* was also published by Sijthoff; it appeared in German and English as well (*Holländische Nachrichten; Holland News*). Between 1916 and 1932 Sijthoff published the *Catalogue de la Bibliothèque du Palais de la Paix*.

Eighteen volumes of the series *Fransche kunst* appeared between the end of 1917 and 1922.³¹ The series was to a great extent financed by the Society. The hardcover books, between 100 and 150 pages, were distributed free of charge to public and school libraries.³² The cover designs by Jacob Jongert (volumes 1–6) and Johan Briedé (volumes 7–18) resembled nineteenth-century *art nouveau* style. Acquiring texts for the series, Valkhoff made use of his own network (the Netherlands-France Society) and of the literary network of the Dutch poet and critic Jan Greshoff – a key figure in Dutch literary circles and a literary critic writing for the pro-Entente daily newspaper *De Telegraaf*. Greshoff saw to it that Valkhoff got in touch with his close friend the Flemish poet and critic Jan van Nijlen, who had fled to the Netherlands in 1914 and tried to gain a living by writing essays on French literature for Dutch periodicals. In 1915 Valkhoff published his prose translation of Van Nijlen's poem "In ballingschap" ("En exile") in *La Revue de Hollande*.³³ In 1918–1919 Van Nijlen's essays on Francis Jammes and Charles Péguy were published in the series. Together with André de Ridder, Van Nijlen represented the French-minded Flemish fraction in *French Art*. Greshoff also acted as a mediator between Valkhoff and the composer and critic Matthijs Vermeulen, who published in the series a two-volume essay, in which he argued that the French musical tradition had been underestimated.³⁴

The series was not subject to a detailed editorial programme. Nevertheless, the first part of the series, a collection of essays by the editor Valkhoff entitled *De Fransche Geest in Frankrijks letterkunde* (The French Spirit in France's Literature), made it evident that *Fransche kunst* was part of the cultural mobilization programme of the Netherlands-France Society. Literature was assumed to play an important role in this mobilization, probably because of its supposed emotional effects and its ability to narrativise history and thus to construct and represent the emotional and ideological foundation for a shared identity. An essentialist vision of "the French spirit" dominated in Valkhoff's book, which offered a sketch "of the French spirit in its unity and diversity [...] considered in connection with France's literature", just as in Salverda de Grave's essays. Valkhoff provided a series of explanations for the distinguishing qualities of the French spirit: the historical composition of the French people from the "three major European races", "the

³¹ For a chronological summary of the series, see appendix.

³² See *Gedenkschrift 15 jarig bestaan Genootschap Nederland-Frankrijk* (see note 13), p. 10–11.

³³ Letter from P. Valkhoff to J. Greshoff, 21 august 1915 (Letterkundig Museum, Den Haag). Jan van Nijlen, "En exile", in: *La Revue de Hollande* 1, 1915, 3, p. 364–365 (translation by Valkhoff of Van Nijlen's poem "In ballingschap", in: *Groot Nederland* 13, 1915, II, p. 208–211).

³⁴ Greshoff did not succeed however in acquiring essays from J.C. Bloem (on Marceline Desbordes Valmore) and Constant van Wessem (on French music) for the series (Letter from Valkhoff to Greshoff, 11 september 1917; letter from Valkhoff to Van Wessem, 9 april 1920; Letterkundig Museum, Den Haag). Bloem never wrote his essay; Van Wessem published his essays on French music in *De muzikale reis*, Amsterdam: Van Munster's Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1920, p. 20–51.

Mediterranean, the Celtic and the Teutonic”, each with their own complexion, stature and skull length, furthermore a unity of language, and, finally, geographical and climatological factors determined the mentality of the French. Valkhoff’s argument was largely based on nineteenth-century positivism that was then prevalent in ethnography as well. Traces of the temperament theory can also be found in Valkhoff’s discussion: clarity, enthusiasm, liveliness, courtliness, and intellectualism were distinctive characteristics of the French spirit, considered as a composite of various regionally determined temperaments. These explanations projected an image of France as an “ideal of Justice and Beauty, demanding the highest sacrifices, which are brought about with great pleasure.” Valkhoff made no direct references to the war, but he could not refrain from pointing out that the French were humane and forgiving, that “Charity” and “Freedom” were their innate qualities. The French were, moreover, excellent in sociability: “Telling others about their ideas and sharing them with them, carrying others along in their rise to the ideal, has always been a delight for the Frenchman.” Valkhoff emphatically proposed sociability as a social virtue that found its expression in eloquence and tolerance. Johannes Tielrooy, in his assenting discussion of Valkhoff’s book in the weekly periodical *De Amsterdammer*, referred to “harmonious constancy” as the main characteristic of the French spirit. According to Tielrooy, it explained why present-day France was waging war “against the war itself”. The “noble” French spirit had been “destined to realize the new world order, to work together with the community of people, the birth of which this war probably signifies.”³⁵

Of primary importance for Valkhoff were the “ennobling influence” of the French tradition and the purity of French folk lyricism. The endorsement of Maurice Barrès was therefore more than just some casual name dropping: French artists who were conscious of race and tradition did not settle in the capital, for they “do not want to become “*déracinés*” in dangerous Paris, which kills the ‘individual self’.” However, this positive evaluation of Barrès did not lead Valkhoff to propose an exclusive nationalistic programme. Instead, his argument constituted a plea for an open culture: “Foreign influences one can find in all of French literature throughout the centuries, and they are the salvation of the French spirit.” The attention paid to Barrès is significant as an indication of Valkhoff’s and the Society’s cultural orientation. In 1918, the above-mentioned Romance scholar Johannes Tielrooy dedicated a brief study in the series to Barrès.³⁶ Without uncritically reproducing Barrès’ nationalistic and autocratic opinions, Tielrooy referred to him as “a great man” who developed from being “a demoralized sceptic, an awful mocker, a fierce individualist” into “an apostle of nationalism, tradition, and religious understanding”. Barrès found a purpose to which he could direct his

³⁵ Johannes Tielrooy, “De Fransche geest”, in: *De Amsterdammer*, 16 February 1918.

³⁶ J. Tielrooy, *Maurice Barrès*, Leiden: Sijthoff, 1918.

activities. According to Tielrooy, Barrès's development was like that of France: the dilettante became a man of action, just like the defeated France of 1870 became the combative and strong France of the present. In his appraisal of Barrès's artistic calling, Tielrooy alternately used literary and ethical arguments. Accordingly, he rejected Barrès' anti-Semitism, but "for good art one should be able to forgive nearly everything; because in a poet's art lies his best self". In fact, Tielrooy tried to "save" Barrès in the interests of French culture:

The young generation, Barrès and his contemporaries, are saving France. If they had been any different, then their country would not have possessed the strength it demonstrated on the Marne and at Verdun. The young generation would never have accomplished France's salvation by renouncing their spiritual wealth: the action did not betray the spirit.³⁷

A basic ideological and poetical pattern is apparent in Valkhoff's series, which indicates an orientation towards classicism and the *école romane*. The "French spirit" may be a composition of regional individualities, its common source was in Latin culture. This vision was also conveyed by Jan Greshoff's contribution to the series, a collection of articles from *De Telegraaf* entitled *Latijnsche lente* (Latin Spring).³⁸ According to Greshoff, paying attention to new French literature was essential because "with our spiritless, small, and provincial art we can learn from new French literature."³⁹ In Greshoff's book, this idea led to critical remarks on neutrality: the country avoids through neutrality politics "the heartbreaking misery of the war", but, flipside to this neutrality, the Netherlands will suffer moral and intellectual damage because "after the war we shall remain alien to rejuvenated life, which will spring up all around us."

Greshoff expressed in his essays a vision of culture – a testimony of "our love and admiration for the struggling France" – that was based on core notions from a classicist cultural and literary discourse: order, hierarchy, tradition, reason, simplicity, and clarity. He derived these core notions from the works of three authors who were at the very centre of his repertoire: Maurras, Barrès and Daudet. *Balance*, a notion from the discourse on political neutrality, acquired a literary counterpart in the poetics of Greshoff's argument in the concepts of *order* and *hierarchy*. Inequality and dissimilarity – the supremacy of the intellectual elite and of Latin culture, the French genius – were thus effectively placed in a prominent position. Along with the leading man of the *école romane*, Jean Morréas, Greshoff shared an aversion to the legacy of romanticism and symbolism. Literature and reality should

³⁷ "Het jonge geslacht, Barrès en zijn tijdgenooten, redden Frankrijk. Waren zij anders geweest, dan zou hun land niet de kracht bezeten hebben die het aan de Marne en bij Verdun heeft getoond. En geenszins bewerkte het jonge geslacht Frankrijk's redding door afstand van zijn geestelijke weelde te doen: de daad versmaadde niet den geest." (Tielrooy, *Maurice Barrès*, see note 36, p. 53–54; my translation, M.S.).

³⁸ J. Greshoff, *Latijnsche lente*, Leiden: Sijthoff, 1918. In 1924 a second revised edition appeared also published by Sijthoff.

³⁹ Greshoff, *Latijnsche lente* (see note 38), p. V.

once again become closely connected through the personality of the writer. These opinions brought Greshoff in the vicinity of Charles Maurras' *Action Française* movement, with which he had sympathized for some time.⁴⁰

In the essay “De twee beschavingen” (The two civilisations), Greshoff interpreted the war as a spiritual conflict between two civilisations:

These civilisations have to purify each other in an extreme battle in order to continue to exist next to each other and with full independence. This war is not only about politics and economic ascendancy: it is about the highest interests of mankind. It is about Style.⁴¹

The narrative pattern is clear. Greshoff described the war as a “purification”, a necessary *rite de passage*, a phase of suffering from which European culture would once again rise like a Phoenix. The passage also shows how Greshoff took a core concept from a critical literary register, namely “Style”, and transferred it to the domain of cultural criticism. The multiple connotations of “style”, and of such related concepts as “form”, “harmony”, “simplicity”, and “purity”, made a rhetorical transposition from one domain (literary criticism) to another (cultural criticism or cultural politics) possible.⁴²

A similar pendulum movement between culture and art criticism, and a comparable dichotomy between the Romance and the Germanic culture, is apparent in other volumes of the series. C.P. van Rossum in his monograph *Het moderne Franse tooneel* (Modern French Theatre) connected French theatre with the spirit of “the Latin”. In his view, “the Latin spirit” was much *clearer* than that of “the Germanic”: “The well-balanced construction of French comedy completely accords with the psyche of the French people who glorify and worship the beauty of the form with great love, as a revelation of nature in its pure style and well-balanced proportions”. Once again we come across the notions of “clarity”, “balance” and “purity” as characteristics of the “French spirit”.

According to Greshoff, “German Culture” – prey to materialism and mercantilism – fell into decline, whereas French Civilization was able to raise itself after 1870 to acquire a “national objective” through the inner strength of its people. French victory will herald a new development of European culture, “for Germany the Defeat is the only possibility for a moral self-recovery.” “Innate respect for tradition” and a “tranquil aristocratic spirit” characterize the French mentality. These traits were expressed in poetry in what Greshoff calls “moving restraint”

⁴⁰ On Greshoff's early opinions see Michelle Wiegel, “Enkele ideologische en politieke aspecten van het literair-kritische werk van Jan Greshoff”, in: F.A.H. Berndsen et alii (eds.), *Poëtica-onderzoek in de praktijk*, Groningen: Passage, 1993, p. 63–77.

⁴¹ “Deze beschavingen moeten zich aan elkander in een uitersten krijg zuiveren om naast elkaar en volmaakt zelfstandig te kunnen voortbestaan. Het gaat in dezen oorlog niet alleen om politiek en economisch overwicht: het gaat om de hoogste belangen der mensheid. Het gaat om den Stijl.” (Greshoff, *Latijnsche lente*, see note 38, p. 22; my translation, M.S.).

⁴² See also Michelle Wiegel, “Enkele ideologische en politieke aspecten van het literair-kritische werk van Jan Greshoff” (see note 40), p. 65–71.

("bewogen gebondenheid"): the poetry of Jammes, Moréas, Claudel, Barrès and others was, after all, characterized by "good sense", "simplicity", "discipline" and "classical purity". At the end of his essay Greshoff endorsed the argument that Salverda de Grave had put forward in 1917: Dutch culture should be enriched with that of France, without losing its national autonomy.

5. Conclusion

What insights and topics for discussion does my explorative research into the Netherlands-France Society provide for studying the transfer and integration of a foreign literature into a national context? I introduced The Netherlands-France Society as a kind of "micro cosmos", a small-scale network in the broader context of bilateral relationships between the Netherlands and the surrounding countries during and after the First World War. In the texts of Salverda de Grave, Valkhoff, Greshoff, and other actors within this network, the construction of a shared repertoire became visible. Via fixed references and value definitions, they constructed an image of French culture (and of the French "spirit") that was to function as a positive identification model for Dutch intellectuals and artists and, via dissemination through Dutch daily newspapers and magazines, for the Dutch public. The dispute between Salverda de Grave and Sijmons shows that competing networks and repertoires were at work in the debate on national and transnational identity. These repertoires functioned as frameworks for the reception of foreign texts and oeuvres.

We can understand and describe the intentions and activities of the Society and its spokesmen in terms of networks and repertoires. Institutional analysis reveals the ways in which the aforementioned critics and mediators attempted to achieve their goals. Thus, the Society was an intellectual network which served itself through various infrastructural channels: a closely organized society with regional departments whose representatives had access to several periodicals (*La Revue de Hollande*, *De Gids*, *De Amsterdammer*, *Den Gulden Winckel*) and whose publications were brought out by an internationally renowned publishing company (Sijthoff). Studying the repertoires of these critics brings to light which French authors and oeuvres functioned as benchmarks, what strategies and conventions guided their public behaviour, and how French literature was selected, classified and judged. It was certainly not a coincidence that in the series *Fransche kunst* precisely those artists were discussed who moved after the turn of the century from symbolism to an art that was more concerned with reality. They tried to achieve a balance between reason and emotion, tradition and renewal, individualism and community, freedom and restraint (Barrès, Morréas, Péguy, Jammes). Critics like Valkhoff, Greshoff, and Van Nijlen could easily interpret their work against the background of a stereotypical image of the French "spirit". These works could then

function as references in the repertoire of these and other Dutch critics. Further research is needed to determine the extent to which these people and their networks and organisations dominated the market for French literature in the Netherlands during the interwar period

The discursive practice of the spokesmen in and around the Society revealed a recurring narrative pattern. The essays by Salverda de Grave, Valkhoff and others offered a macro-narrative representation of France and the Netherlands as "spiritual twins". The authors repeatedly stressed the profound relatedness between the two countries by referring to the historically rooted affinity between the French Huguenots and the Dutch Protestants. De Solpray deployed the same legitimizing strategy when he referred to Pierre Bayle and the late seventeenth-century *Revue de Hollande* in the first issue of his own *La Revue de Hollande*. The analysis of rhetorical strategies shows which tropes and schemes these critics employed to express their opinions. Ontological metaphors and personifications ("the strength of France", "the French spirit"), as well as parallelisms and antitheses (French "*esprit*" versus German "*Geist*") served to convince the audience and gain its sympathy. Furthermore, an inventory and analysis of the verbal registers, in particular of the normative connotations of frequently occurring key words, show what semantic markers these critics used to express their opinions. Concepts such as "tradition", "balance", "harmony", "clarity", and "purity", which were advanced as characteristics of the "French spirit" and which were rooted in a long discursive tradition of thinking about French/Latin culture, acquired a strong normative dimension of meaning, whereas concepts such as "independence", "impartiality", and "neutrality" functioned in a neutrality discourse whose precise area of application (military, political, cultural, literary) had to be determined time and again.

The public position of critics and spokesmen emanated from their *doxa*: a shared belief in fixed national identities, in the superiority of Romance culture, and in the profound congeniality between the French and the Dutch spirit. Interpreted as a system of connected repertoires, rhetorical strategies and verbal patterns, this public position becomes almost predictable. The critics within and around The Netherlands-France Society can therefore be understood to be members of a cultural interpretative community, which was clearly also a community of mutual interests consisting of people who authorized each other. Critics such as Tielrooy (in *De Amsterdammer*) and Greshoff (in *De Telegraaf*) actively and consciously contributed as "propagandists" to the perpetuation of views on French culture as presented in their reviews of the volumes in the series *French art*. Far from expressing an impartial scholarly and artistic practice, this series (and other texts produced within the Society's network) was firmly embedded in the cultural mobilization by an intellectual elite.

Finally, research into The Netherlands-France Society also provides insights into Dutch literature in the twentieth century. In the main, the story literary

historians tell about this period still concentrates on the succession of literary movements and generations within a national context and on the literary production of a selected number of canonized authors. 1916 is quite often considered a significant year in the history of Dutch literature, with the debut of poetry books by Paul van Ostaïjen and Martinus Nijhoff and the foundation of the journal *Het Getij* (The Tide).⁴³ Dutch literary historians rarely if ever refer to the impact of World War I on the cultural and literary debates during and after the war, even though Dutch writers and intellectuals considered the war an important break. This paper brought another facet of 1916 to the surface, namely that Dutch literary and cultural opinion makers did indeed fully participate in international literary and cultural dynamics. Changes in Europe necessitated a reconsideration of the Dutch national identity within a broader context, as well as of its relationships with other nations. Dutch literature should therefore not be studied in isolation.

Appendix: French Art. Library for French literature, painting and sculpture, music etcetera. Edited by P. Valkhoff. A.W. Sijthoff's Publishing Company, Leiden.

1. P. Valkhoff, *De Franse geest in Frankrijks letterkunde*. 1917.
 2. J.J. Salverda de Grave, *De Troubadours*. 1917.
 3. Cornelis Veth, *Fransche Caricaturisten*. 1918.
 4. Jan van Nijlen, *Francis Jammes*. 1918.
 5. J. Greshoff, *Latijnsche lente. Opstellen en aanteekeningen*. 1918.
 6. Johannes Tielrooy, *Maurice Barrès*. 1918.
 7. C.P. van Rossem, *Het moderne Fransche tooneel*. 1918.
 8. Matthijs Vermeulen, *De twee muzieken. Deel I*. 1918.
 9. Matthijs Vermeulen, *De twee muzieken. Deel II*. 1918.
 10. Ca. Serrurier, *De Pensées van Pascal*. 1919.
 11. Jan van Nijlen, *Charles Péguy*. 1919.
 12. André de Ridder, *Remy de Gourmont*. 1920.
 13. Emile Boulan, *Figures du dix-huitième siècle. Les sages: Fontenelle et Mme de Lambert*. 1920.
 14. Just Havelaar, *Auguste Rodin*. 1920.
 15. Marguerite de Rouville, *De Levenskunst van Vauvenargues*. 1920.
 16. J.J. Salverda de Grave, *De historie van Jan van Parijs*. 1921.
 17. Georges Jean-Aubry, *Fransche muziek. Deel 1. 1922**.
 18. Georges Jean-Aubry, *Fransche muziek. Deel II. 1922**.
 19. M. de la Prise, *De eenzame van Port-Royal*. 1922.
- * Translation by M.J. Premsele of Georges Jean-Aubry, *La musique française d'aujourd'hui*. Paris 1916.

⁴³ Primarily see Ton Anbeek, *Geschiedenis van de literatuur in Nederland 1885–1985*, Amsterdam, Antwerpen: Arbeiderspers, 1999, p. 110–131.