Przekładaniec, special issue, "Translation and Memory" 2019, pp. 26–51
doi:10.4467/16891864ePC.19.010.11385
www.ejournals.eu/Przekladaniec

KAROLINA KWAŚNA
https://orcid.org//0000-0002-8543-6609
Jagiellonian University
karolina.kwasna@doctoral.uj.edu.pl

MAGDA HEYDEL
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3778-692X
Jagiellonian University
m.heydel@uj.edu.pl

"WHY DON'T YOU TELL THEM..." UNHEARD VOICES IN CLAUDE LANZMANN'S FILM *SHOAH**

Abstract

Claude Lanzmann's nine-hour documentary *Shoah* (1985) is a rich source of knowledge on the Nazi extermination of Jews in Central Europe. Its main material consists of interviews with people who witnessed the Holocaust, conducted in the very locations of the wartime events. The present paper analyses an iconic scene from Chełmno on Ner, where between 1940–43 and 1944–45 the first Nazi death camp was located. A group of locals – gathered in front of the parish church, around one of the survivors of the camp – recall the events, sometimes in stunning technical detail. Their Polish utterances are translated into French; English subtitles are based on the French of the interpreter. The Polish linguistic material is not neutral: it is marked with dialectal and sociolectal features; the speakers engage in conversation on the side, comment on the situation of the interview in various ways, verbal and non-verbal. In the translation, both into French and English, sentences are skipped, the plurality of voices is flattened, and differences in memory are smoothed out. The resulting text is rather a summary than a translation. The paper offers close-up analyses of chosen sequences from the interview to show the complexity of the communication situation and the extent of distortion caused by the

* Originally published in Polish in *Przekładaniec* vol. 38/2019, this article appears in English thanks to the financial support of the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education (grant no. 643/P-DUN/2018).

way translation works in the film. It also offers an alternative translation, which aims at giving voice to the actual people of Chełmno and acknowledging as fully as possible the complication and difficulty of memory construction through language, especially in a highly traumatic context. It hopes to offer insights into the bystander position in Holocaust discourse.

Keywords: Holocaust, Chełmno on Ner, Claude Lanzmann, *Shoah*, translation, bystander, trauma

In his huge documentary *Shoah*, Claude Lanzmann used no archival photographs, and this was an intentional decision. The director often emphasized the geographical and topographical character of the film, which was supposed to combine the knowledge of the past events with an experience of space. The aim of such a dynamics of narration is to create an impression of an entanglement of two orders in one place – "here and now" and "there and then" (Sendyka 2013: 324). Margret Olin remarks that Lanzmann did not attempt to visualize the Holocaust, since he believed that there were limits to the representation of the Shoah. The film was supposed to become a "new form" that would tell a different story about the Holocaust. As the director admitted, his work is "a fiction of the real" (Lanzmann, as cited in LaCapra 1997: 232), allowing the viewer to live through the Holocaust, because the film is an event in itself. He believed that film, image or art are forms in which and through which testimony is realized, and he referred to his own work in that way (Bojarska 2010). Thus, one will not see in it the liberation of the camp, bulldozers filling in the ditches full of corpses, boarded up wagons or the silhouettes of sick and starved prisoners (Olin 1997: 1), the images that dominated Alain Resnais' *Nuit et brouillard* (1955) and *Le Chagrin et la Pitié* by Marcel Ophüls (1969) – the first and most famous documentaries on the Holocaust. The most important role in Lanzmann's film is played by the conversations on and descriptions of the Holocaust as remembered by the witnesses, perpetrators and bystanders (cf. Hilberg 1993). The great power of *Shoah* stems from the sequences allowing the viewer to realize that, although the director and his interlocutors are standing in the same place where prisoners were murdered and their corpses burned about thirty years earlier, they cannot see what the people telling their story now had witnessed. Visualizing the events of the war requires the awakening of imagination, which engages all the senses, not only sight. As Simone de Beauvoir wrote, thanks to this technique, "for the first time, we live it in our

minds, heart and flesh. It becomes our experience" (Beauvoir, as cited in Franklin 2011: 27). The material collected and selected for presentation by the director[1] can therefore be considered a document of oral history which

> does not consist of searching for and discovering new facts, but bringing them in the field of imagination, symbols, desires, images and interpretations. Such an attitude results in the fact that the "mistakes of memory" and "untrue statements" that result from them have scientific value (Stolarz 2012: 104, trans. A.M.).

Unclear, incomplete or wrong statements on the part of the witnesses and bystanders contain a great deal of valuable information that forces viewers to see the Holocaust not only as a historical fact, but, above all, as an individual and collective experience. The words of the protagonists in Lanzmann's film can be compared to the famous four photographs taken in Auschwitz by the Sonderkommando prisoners – "images in spite of all", as Georges Didi-Huberman called them, which, for a long time considered too blurred to serve as a representation of the Holocaust, were cropped and retouched. Meanwhile, the analysis conducted by Didi-Huberman allowed us to see them as an insight into the experience of the Holocaust, the fear that dominated the lives of camp prisoners. These photographs must be asked the right questions (Didi-Huberman 2008: 32–33).

In Lanzmann's film, the Holocaust, invisible in everyday life, hides in the places visited by the director. Spaces and buildings – whose owners, as well as looks and character, have changed since the dramatic events – bear witness to the Holocaust in a meaningful way. They provide the background for the conversations with people who witnessed the scenes of the Holocaust and now, by verbalizing their experiences from the past in front of the camera, activate images stored in their memory, which are generally unavailable to the director or the viewer. What happens here is a chain relation of translation: mental images are translated into words in the statements of the witnesses, while these words are translated from Polish into French to produce mental images available to both the director and viewers, then the French version is translated into English and other languages in the form

[1] The Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington DC stores ca. 185 hours of outtakes of the interviews that were not included in the final, 9-hour version of Lanzmann's film. This material gives a new perspective on the already interpreted interviews, but also raises many new questions regarding the film's message.

of film subtitles. The linguistic material created as a result of this multiple re-coding is then treated simply as an equivalent of the initial statement, an equivalent whose identity with the original is rarely discussed or reflected upon in research that uses Lanzmann's documentary as a source of knowledge and material.

The concept of equivalence in translation has been thoroughly criticised by theoreticians (Baker 2005: 77–80). Anthony Pym (2010: 37–38) defines it explicitly as a belief structure and a socially useful fiction. Lanzmann's film – which features the figure of the interpreter and reveals the scenes of translation, allowing viewers to listen to the original utterances parallel to the text of the live translation – actually exposes this fiction. It is a paradox, because the translation in the film crops and retouches the voices of speaking people and only the edited version is presented as a material for further research and interpretation. The starting point of the research and translation project we have undertaken is the moment of revealing how translation works in the film. We cannot agree to the reduced versions of the Holocaust witnesses' statements. We suggest a new English literal translation of Lanzmann interlocutors' statements, undermining the stability of the commonly accepted translation. The experiment we have undertaken reveals successive layers of both linguistic and extra-linguistic complexity of the communication situation unfolding in front of the viewers of the film.

The aim of this article is to describe a fragment of the director's conversation with the inhabitants of Chełmno on Ner, in a group scene in front of a parish church (01:20:00–01:37:20, Lanzmann 1986). In the translation of this sequence into French and, consequently, also into the English subtitles, important statements of the director's interlocutors were omitted. The paper looks at the sentences that were skipped altogether, fragments of conversations between the participants of the scene which did not get into the official transcript, and comments made on the side. It also looks into translation problems appearing in the first of the abovementioned links of the communication chain, i.e. the linguistic activation of the memories from the times of the German occupation in Chełmno. The descriptions of the war time reality, especially the down-to-earth technical aspects of the extermination of the Jews, contain numerous lacunae and undefined places. It is often impossible to know what people describing specific situations mean exactly, as they tend to use expressive language which is imprecise, sometimes naive, referring to individual and collective concretisations stored in their memory. By suggesting an alternative version of the translation of the Chełmno

inhabitants speech, the paper also supplements contextual knowledge on the basis of various sources, especially when it comes to images invoked by the words used. The analysis is based on a strong conviction that the omission of a significant part of the linguistic material in translation results in serious changes in the semantic structure of the testimonies given by Lanzmann's interlocutors and, in consequence, impinges on their interpretations.

Chełmno on Ner. The camp. The parish fair.

Chełmno, as well as the nearby villages of Koło and Dąbie, were under German occupation as early as September 1939. The administrative changes were introduced very quickly – the name of the village was changed to Kulmhof, Dąbie was renamed Eichstäd, and Koło – Warthbrücken. First, the local intelligentsia—teachers, pharmacists and doctors—were arrested, as well as people from different social classes who were perceived by the Germans as a threat to the new authorities. They were subsequently taken to prison in Koło and, in November of the same year, executed in a forest near Rzuchów. The Jewish families of this region were transferred to Dąbie, where an open ghetto was established on July 15th, 1940. In that period the area around the village was visited twice by Herbert Lange, who was to become the first commandant of the Kulmhof camp (Montague 2012: 49–51). The decision to establish the camp there was based on the geographical aspects: close proximity of forests, the seclusion of the village, good road and rail transport, and, above all, closeness of the Jewish population of Reichsgau Wartheland. The Germans had begun to build the camp already in 1940. The building of the local fire department was seized by the SS, and Lange, with his deputy, moved in to the municipal office. The local palace, church and parsonage were also requisitioned.

The neo-Gothic palace, erected in the 1880s by Nikolai Karl von Bistram, a descendant of a tsarist general, was taken over by the Polish state after the end of the First World War. It was divided into flats for the villagers. However, when the Germans took control over the village, the lodgers were displaced from the palace, and its space and role were adjusted to Lange's plans: the establishment of a death camp. The camp consisted of two parts. One included the aforementioned palace, around which a high wooden fence was erected; the other was located outside the village center, in the Rzuchów forest, where the murdered prisoners were burned and buried (Węgrzyn

2015: 284). Additionally, a Police Watch Unit (*Polizeiwachtkommando*) was established to maintain communication between the camp authorities and the residents of the surrounding villages, as well as for keeping the camp secret. The commandant himself presented the tasks to the officers:

> Lange gave a speech, explaining that Kulmhof was the place where Jews from the Warthegau were gassed and that our task was to guard and blockade the forest camp, the mansion and the village, so that no unauthorized people could see what was going on. (Alois Häfele, as cited in Montague 2012: 56).

Apart from the palace, the extermination of the Jewish population was carried out also in the parish church of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary in Chełmno, which during the second period of the camp's activity (1944–1945) had the same function as the palace in the first period. In both of them, Jews were imprisoned and then murdered, and their bodies were buried in the Rzuchów forest. Lanzmann interviewed the inhabitants of Chełmno in front of this very church.

The scene, set in front of the church in Chełmno on Ner on the day of the parish fair, one of the most iconic sequences of the film, conveys a complex message and has a strong symbolic value. The central figure of the group gathered in front of the church is Szymon Srebrnik, one of the four survivors of the death camp. The scene (01:20:00–01:00–01:37:20, Lanzmann 1986) begins very calmly, almost idyllically with a song sung by Szymon Srebrnik (Lanzmann 1986: 01:21:53), who was sent to the camp in 1944[2] at the age of thirteen and stayed there until the liberation in 1945. The villagers remembered him well, as they had seen him many times while performing the duties assigned to him by the Nazis. What is interesting, Chełmno residents also remembered his beautiful voice and the fact that he sang songs while floating along the river with a guard, collecting greens for rabbits.[3] He was even nicknamed "Śpiewak" [the singer] at that time (Montague 2012: 155). The inhabitants of Chełmno, gathered around Srebrnik, appear on the screen against the background of the church (01:22:24). The people are facing the camera and standing stiffly. From behind the camera, comes the voice of the director and his interpreter, Barbara Janicka. The director asks his questions

[2] The first period of the camp's activity lasted until 1943. The second period took place between 1944–1945.

[3] The history of Szymon Srebrnik is described in Sobesto, Heydel in the present volume, p. 58.

in French and the answers come in Polish. As Dorota Głowacka notes, the French language "imposes the course of the conversation and sets the tone for the narrative" (Głowacka 2016b: 115). It can be noticed in the utterances adapted to the needs of the French language. Janicka translates the questions and then passes the answers to Lanzmann. At this point the communication is suspended and the people should wait for the interpreter, but they do not. As a result, Janicka is not always able to hear all the utterances of the group members who speak at the same time, outshout one another and exchange comments. In addition, their Polish has some characteristic social and dialectal features, the speakers use mental shortcuts, which complicate the message even more.[4] Faced with such a complex communication situation, the interpreter is not able to convey all the statements in translation – it is even harder in the case of the English subtitles, created on the basis of her translation. Part of the verbal material – and when it comes to the analysed scene it is a significant part – is therefore omitted in the English version so as the translation can be nearly considered to be a summary. A viewer who speaks Polish notices the differences already in the first seconds of the scene:

CL: Il y a beaucoup de monde, énormément, non?
BJ: Bardzo dużo ludzi przyszło, prawda?
ES: It's a huge crowd, isn't it?
ChI: Tak. Nie. Dużo. Tak, ale mało, bardzo mało. Jeszcze mało. Dzisiaj pada deszcz, dlatego. Bo pogody nie ma. Pogody nie ma, tak.
BJ: Parce qu'il y a de temps pas beaucoup. Il pleut.
ES: But the weather's bad. It's raining.[5]

The differences appear already in the translation of the director's question in Polish and English versions – in both languages there are phrases that are natural in such a situation. This is more of an opening remark than a question, a kind of commentary on the situation, which to a large extent has phatic function here and actually achieves the intended effect: Lanzmann's interlocutors confirm their readiness to enter into the dialogue with full commitment. The simultaneous agreement with the guest's observation (yes, there are many people), as well as a negation (no, there are too few, there could have been more) and explanation of the cause (because of the

[4] See Czesak in the present volume, p. 75–107.

[5] In all the quotations BJ stands for Barbara Janicka, the interpreter; CL for Claude Lanzmann, ChI for the Chełmno Inhabitants and ES for English Subtitles.

bad weather) are undoubtedly the signals of openness to the developing communication situation and readiness to give exhaustive answers to the questions asked. Although the topic of this part of the conversation is not important, what is reflected is the dynamics of the group as well as different roles (some people are willing to give additional explanations, while others only nod) and the polyphony of the answer which will turn out to be an important element of the interview. The group's utterances contain different versions, either contradictory or complementary.

In the translation, all those elements are missing. The dialogues between the inhabitants, differences of opinion and a process of reaching a common version of the events are, in this fragment, reduced to one summarising sentence which suppresses the voices of the people of Chełmno. An alternative translation of this microscene, supplemented with the hushed or uncaptured utterances, looks as follows:

CL: Il y a beaucoup de mond, énormément, non?
BJ: Bardzo dużo ludzi przyszło, prawda?
NT: There are many people, aren't there?
ChI: Tak. Nie. Dużo. Tak, ale bardzo mało. Jeszcze mało. Dzisiaj pada deszcz, dlatego. Bo pogody nie ma. Pogody nie ma, tak. Ładnie odpowiadaj, bo…[6]
NT: Yes. No. Many. Yes, but few, very few. Not that many yet. It's raining today that's why. Because the weather's bad. The weather's bad, that's right. Answer nicely, or else…[7]

"Answer nicely, or else..."

On top of the complexity resulting from the fact that many people speak at the same time, in the initial scene one could also notice signals of the psychological dimension of the interview conducted in front of the camera: a situation unusual for the inhabitants of Chełmno. One of the women refuses to allow others to use the common word for the parish fair (which in Polish actually means "indulgence") and introduces the official name of the holiday functioning in the church language (The Nativity of the Blessed Virgin

[6] Without professional sound processing it is impossible to decide unequivocally whether the woman says "answer" (Pl. "odpowiadaj") or "tell them" (Pl. "opowiadaj"). It seems that the latter part of this sentence sounds like "or he won't film you" (Pl. "bo cię nie nagra"), but this also needs confirmation.

[7] NT in quotations stands for "new translation" suggested by our research group.

Mary): she recites it distinctly, with clear, unnatural intonation, to the approval of other participants of the scene. The need to adapt to the difficult situation forces the inhabitants to move from their everyday, rural language to its more official, all-Polish version.

In his analysis of the linguistic and cultural changes in contemporary Polish countryside culture, Józef Kąś emphasizes the of the functioning so-called cultural filter, which influences the form of expression. He defines this phenomenon as follows:

> the behavior (not only a linguistic one) of the dialect user aiming at convincing the interlocutor that the cultural system enjoying in a given rural community a higher level of prestige is not unknown to the speaker; hence we can observe various attempts on the part of the speaker […] to protect himself/herself from being assigned to a worse, "backward" cultural circle (Kąś 2003: 73, trans. A.M.).

Both the speech and the body language of the Chełmno residents are undoubtedly connected with the effort to create a proper image of individuals and community, to protect themselves from accusations of backwardness. The people in front of the camera are aware that they are exposed to foreign eyes; so, they have to control the situation in which they find themselves. They are nervous and want to do their best. What is more, the director's questions require them to return to events that have been painfully impressed on their minds, a traumatizing memory. One can get the impression that the locals recall well-known events that have been discussed many times and become established as local stories. Piotr Kuhiwczak notes that after the end of the war, the interviews with Holocaust witnesses were conducted as a form of therapy; only later were the recordings seen as material for historical research (Kuhiwczak 2007: 69). In the case of Lanzmann's film, we do not know whether anyone had talked to the inhabitants of Chełmno beforehand or if they had been prepared for this interview in any way. Their utterances, especially those on the side, not addressed to the director, are cryptic and linguistically marked. This makes them an interesting material from which a linguistic portrait of the community and its members emerges. In her analysis of the linguistic slips and grammatical errors that appear in the utterances of the group, Dorota Głowacka comes to the conclusion that they may also be a proof of the trauma resulting from the knowledge that every day, right behind the walls of their houses, there

happened a tragedy, involving thousands of prisoners of the camp: a trauma which may not have been worked through (Głowacka 2018: 248–249).

In the passage analyzed above in the background one can hear a half-humorous remark passed by one of the women to her neighbour: "Answer nicely, or else…", accompanied by a gesture of adjusting the scarf to her head. This snippet of a warning is not translated. It seems irrelevant for the interview and does not answer any of the director's questions; we can assume the interpreter did not notice it. However, it is significant in terms of understanding the situation in which the people of Chełmno found themselves. This remark, seemingly unrelated to the conversation, made with a smile, indicating the intimacy of the speakers (they are on first name terms), is an ironic warning or a threat, which incidentally reveals the tension felt by the participants of the interview. Such a phrase could be used by a mother or a teacher to a child who has to pass an exam and is being tested or evaluated.

"Answer nicely, or else…" is an introduction to the announcement of punishment, sanctions, responsibility for not using the correct, schooled Polish.[8] The adverb "nice" is grotesquely inadequate in the conversation of two adults. The combination of the general, mild category of "nice" and the suspended threat may indicate both the thinking patterns within which Lanzmann's interlocutors operate (a public statement as subject to punishment and reward; a person asking a question as an instance requiring the "niceness" of the statement and imposing penalties and rewards) and the fact that the trauma has not been worked through (anything you say may be turned against you, is subject to sanction). Omitting this statement in the translation of the film – although it does not influence the core of the general message – results in the loss of the layer of communication concerning the subjectivity of the people who speak up. The viewer misses the information that the group of excited, though slightly amused inhabitants of Chełmno, filmed in a way that, despite their efforts, emphasizes their social class, is so tense that there is a need to verbalize their emotional state in this marginal remark. The internal dynamics of the group can be misinterpreted, especially without the knowledge of the content of the side remarks – for example, as an expression of disregard for the director's question or their own memories. In the context of what Kąś writes, this marginal comment reflects a failed attempt on the part of the speakers to pass as a more prestigious group, not to be assigned to the "worse" cultural circle.

[8] See Czesak in the present volume, p. 75–107.

We knew – we didn't know

Against this background, the director begins to ask questions directly referred to Szymon Srebrnik who is standing in the centre of the group, and then also to the events of the occupation period. His questions become brutally direct, but the answers of the group are nevertheless polyphonic and ambiguous in this context. Particularly noteworthy is the passage in which Lanzmann asks whether his interlocutors knew what was happening behind the closed doors of the trucks that were arriving at the church and then going away:

> CL: Et tous savaient que c'étaient des camions de mort, que c'étaient des camions où on gazait les Juifs?
> BJ: Czy państwo wtedy, wtedy państwo wiedzieli, że to były ciężarówki, w których gazem truto, czy nie? Wtedy.
> ES: And they all knew these were death vans?
> ChI: No chyba, że… Nie. Wiedzieliśmy. Myśmy nie wiedzieli. Ja nie wiedziałam. A tam, to na nago…
> BJ: Oui, ils ne pouvaient pas ne pas savoir.
> ES: Yes, they couldn't help knowing.

Interpreting the director's question, Barbara Janicka seems to recognize and respect the psycho-social situation of the interlocutors, and she introduces a polite form of address "państwo" [a collective noun for ladies and gentlemen], although it does not appear in the director's question.[9] The director's questions often sound like statements, the forms chosen by the interpreter soften his utterances. Also a kind of barrier and distance emerges – Janicka speaks more "about" the inhabitants, but not "to them". This slightly increases the sense of security, and the group in front of the Church reacts uninhibitedly, once again giving contradictory answers. The loudest messages dominate in the transaltion, as they can be heard. As a result, the voices competing with the ones the interpreter has heard – and which met the expectations of the director – are omitted, also in the English subtitles. In this simplified translation, the contradiction between the answers disappears, and they are summarized in a sentence suggesting that everybody knew what was happening in the mobile gas chambers, because it was impossible not to know it. As a result the speakers are deprived of the right to ignorance.

[9] See Czesak in the present volume, p. 80.

Perhaps at that time they were too young to find out about the atrocities; perhaps, they were well protected; perhaps, they are now performing an act of repression, because they did not want to know and still do not want to know; perhaps, there is still a strong taboo, connected with the occupation ban on coming near the camp. However, regardless of the reasons and how we assess them, the possibility of ignorance is obliterated in this scene.

Here is the new translation amended with the omitted statements:

> CL: Et tous savaient que c'étaitent des camions de mort, que c'étaient des camions où on gazait les Juifs?
> BJ: Czy Państwo wtedy, wtedy Państwo wiedzieli, że to były ciężarówki, w których gazem truto, czy nie? Wtedy.
> NT: Did you know then, then, did you know that those were trucks in which the Jews were poisoned with gas, or not? Then.
> ChI: No chyba, że… Nie. Wiedzieliśmy. Myśmy nie wiedzieli. Ja nie wiedziałam. A tam, to na nago… Spalano.
> BJ: Oui, ils ne pouvaient pas ne pas savoir.
> NT: Unless… No. We knew. We didn't know. I didn't know. And that there?… Naked… Were being burnt.

Different answers to Lanzmann's question can be perceived as traces of a crack, a symbolic sign of the community's break-up that took place in connection with the establishment of the camp in the village. When the occupants took control over Chełmno and its surroundings, a new order began to prevail there. The territory of individual villages ceased to play a key role, and the previous division was replaced by the borders set by the camp, the Rzuchów forest, the parish church and the fences that were being built – either wooden or of barbed wire. The everyday life of the inhabitants of these territories had also been changing diametrically. Some of them were "employed" as "workers" at the construction of crematoria, as it turned out later. The workers often did not realize what the purpose of the construction would be, although they certainly also rejected this knowledge under the influence of various factors: their own sense of security being a significant one. The villagers were also employed to bury the bodies of the prisoners in the Rzuchów forest, clean the area of bodies, and reload them onto trucks. They also segregated the personal belongings of the victims (Montague 2012). The local farmers continued to cultivate the land, often in the direct vicinity of the camp. They learned about the events through their own observations, hearing the voices coming from behind the fences, and

listening to the stories that were circulating. Over a period of thirty years the narratives, both on a micro and macro scale, were mixed, and the most frequently recalled memories were strengthened and popularized; the period between the first and second stage of the camp's existence got blurred, which is visible in the memories of the Chełmno residents. While talking to them, Claude Lanzmann deals with a complex and expanded narrative which hides numerous layers of knowledge and ignorance, and symbolically reveals the breakdown of the community traumatized by the events of the occupation.

In the passage quoted above, there are also some side remarks exchanged by the speakers. They too are omitted from the translation, e.g. the words: "And that there?… Naked" uttered by one of the women. This seemingly insignificant phrase refers to the knowledge of some of the Chełmno inhabitants about what happened to the bodies or still living prisoners in the Rzuchów forest, where the trucks transported them.

"He walked with chains on his ankles..."

The problems outlined above become more and more apparent as the director's questions force the people to get back to the past events. The inhabitants of Chełmno are transferred into the occupation reality by a simple question about Szymon Srebrnik:

> CL: Pourqoui tout le village se souvient-il de lui?
> BJ: Dlaczego wszyscy pamiętają o panu Szymku?
> ES: Why does the whole village remember him?
> ChI: Pamiętamy, bo chodził w łańcuszkach, spętane nogi, do pasa przywiązany łańcuch i pompował wodę, schodził z tej góry i pompował wodę z rzeki do pałacu. Jeździł tak… Z tym z gestapo… To go pamiętamy dobrze.
> BJ: Alors, ils s'appelent bien, parce qu'il allait avec des chaînes aux chevilles… …et parce qu'il a chanté sur la rivière.
> ES: They remember him well because he walked with chains on his ankles… …and he sang on the river.

One of the women answers more eloquently than the others. She talks about a thirteen-year-old Srebrnik as a prisoner in the camp. However, when Barbara Janicka begins to translate the answer, one can hear that the people complement the answer with further details they remember. This relatively long passage is a good example of the kind of speech used by the local

community. The woman's narration consists of images and memories known to the inhabitants of Chełmno, but available neither to the viewers of the film nor the translator. Janicka manages to translate the fragment about "chainlets on his [Srebrnik's] ankles", to which she adds information that Srebrnik sang in a boat on the river. She probably heard it in a different moment and it refers to her knowledge about the situation in Chełmno. The eloquent woman standing in front of the church never mentions the singing at all, it is an addition from the interpreter. Meanwhile, the information that the boy "went with the one from the Gestapo" is omitted, as well as the astonishingly detailed description of the chains with which the thirteen-year-old prisoner was bound and the description of his work – pumping water to the palace. Only a section of the infromation the woman provides gets actually translated. Her utterance is a kind of "archival photograph" accessible only to the people who are able to recall their memories of the boy's punitive work.

In his *Chełmno and the Holocaust: The History of Hitler's First Death Camp*, Patrick Montague says that during the war Srebrnik worked mainly with one Walter Burmeister. The man noticed the boy in the first days after he was sent to the camp and was exceptionally kind to him – he often intervened during the "selection", stood up for Srebrnik when another SS officer got annoyed by the boy, and was even heard to declare that he would take the boy to Germany after the end of the war (Montague 2012: 154). It was probably thanks to this that Srebrnik managed to survive. The narrative of the woman is extremely important as it sheds light on the everyday life of both the prisoners and the people living in the territory surrounding the camp, and proves that some seemingly impossible human relationships still existed. This is further confirmed when she quotes her conversation with a driver of one of the death trucks (01:24:08–01:24:25). We learn that the woman knew his name and, what is more, she had the guts to address him, which illustrates the kind of relationship that was created between the victims and their torturers. In the translation, however, one can read only that the boy had his legs chained ("…he walked with chains on his ankles"). Apart from omitting the circumstances described above, the translation also eliminates the information about the visual aspect of the instrument of torture. Szymon Srebrnik himself describes his arrival to Chełmno in 1944 as follows:

> Everyone was shackled in leg-irons. The chains restricted the legs in such a way that it was not possible to take normal steps, only small ones (Srebrnik, as cited in Montague 2012: 154).

In 1945, Srebrnik testified in the Łódź Court that "The shackles on our ankles were also chained to our waists" (Srebrnik, as cited in Heberer 2011: 184).

In translations, there are two variants of the word "łańcuszki" on Srebrnik's legs: shackles (*kajdany*) and chains (*łańcuchy*). On the Yad Vashem museum website, among numerous exhibits, one can actually find a photograph of these "chains" with a caption: *leg irons*. They were made of ring chains connected with each other. Probably another strand of the same shape was attached to the waist of the then thirteen-year-old boy.

The woman who mentions Srebrnik's chains, gives a precise description of the instrument of torture and the work the boy was doing. The fact that she uses the diminutive form "łańcuszki" ("chainlets", "little chains") instead of the seemingly neutral and truthful word "łańcuch" ("chain") requires interpretation. The form "chain" is only seemingly neutral, because it connotes not only the weight and brutality of the object, but also its usage in a village household. A chain is a tether for animals, dogs or cows forced to stay in place but never for people. A man in chains or on a chain is a scandalous sight: a captive deprived of human features. The image of a chained man introduces a whole network of associations, connected with oppression and humiliation, present in cultural memory. In medieval Europe, the executioner tied up the convicts' hands and, only then, were they led to the place of execution or, to humiliate them even more, transported by an animal that was considered unclean (e.g. a pig). This custom lasted until the late 18th century (Wojtucki 2014: 199). Such actions, as well as stigmatization, subordination, starvation and public punishments, are interpreted and defined by Grégoire Chamayou as humiliation techniques (Chamayou 2012: 13). Gabriel Marcel described similar practices in the context of the Second World War (Marcel, as cited in Chamayou 2012: 13). Both authors emphasize that the aim was "to humiliate the degraded person in his/her eyes so that he/she could be used more easily" (Chamayou 2012: 14). The opposition of humiliating dehumanization is appreciation, or any kind of humanizing techniques thanks to which a person is perceived as a "human being" (Chamayou 2012: 14).

Dehumanization is a phenomenon described also by postcolonial criticism. As Patric Brantlinger (2011) writes, in the context of the Victorian vision of Africa as the "dark continent", dehumanization became a tool for legitimizing exploitation and creating subordinate subjectivity. Descriptions of torture to be found in archival documents, works of historians and journalists (Lindkvist 1997; Hochshield 1999), as well as literary works based on

the authors' own experiences (e.g. in Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*) may serve as parallels to the memories of the woman from Chełmno. In Maryse Condé's novel, *I, Tituba, the Black Witch of Salem* (1992), based on archival materials, the first-person narrative brings to mind associations with confession or testimony. The process of dehumanization described by the narrator began with public humiliation and gradual exclusion from the community, which included a public march of chained convicts:

> Constables then placed such heavy chains on our ankles and wrists that we could hardly move (…). It was February, the coldest month of a year (…). A crowd had gathered along the main street in Salem to watch us leave. The constables rode ahead while we slid around in the snow and mud on the road (Condé 1992: 93).

In the Polish imagination and historical memory there is an image of chained independence fighters deported to Siberia by Russian occupation authorities. In the 19th century Russia practiced a form of administrative deportation which did not require a trial, and the majority of deportees at that time were political enemies, i.e. Poles who were not ready to accept the loss of independence (Applebaum 2007: 48–49). An iconic presentation of such a situation is Scene I of Act III of Adam Mickiewicz's *Forefathers' Eve*, *Part III*, which describes the repressions implemented by tsarist Russia in the 1830s. In the opening scene of the drama, one of the prisoners tells the others about the transport of convicts he accidentally witnessed. The description is extremely visual and emotional; one of the scenes features a child in chains:

> I saw them —The prisoners were led from the council hall.
> Little boys! Broken, heads shaved every one,
> Just like recruits. And at each back, a gun.
> Poor lads! The youngest was no more than ten:
> He whimpered that the heavy fetters rankled
> His feet, and pointed at his bloody ankle:
> The iron had eaten halfway to the bone.
> The toff on horseback canters up, looks down,
> "What's this?" he frowns, in righteous consternation.
> "It weighs ten pounds. Ten pounds is regulation!" (Mickiewicz 2016)

Mickiewicz's drama, a work of great political potential, invariably associated with the struggle for national liberation and reaction to external

oppression, is an important, though not always conscious element of the Polish representations of systemic violence (the functioning of the Russian apparatus of oppression) and individual violence (scenes describing the suffering of particular people). The chained child, sentenced to death, is an image of a double taboo transgression: against both humanity and the innocence of a child.

The woman in the Chełmno scene paints a picture of the dehumanization of the boy by the Germans. Instead of being gassed and burnt, like his relatives, he was turned into an animal fit for physical work. The shackles constitute the literal and symbolic centre of the image here, and their interpretation designates the meaning vectors of the quoted statement. This is not to suggest that the people of Chełmno in their memory of the occupation scene are consciously accompanied by images from Mickiewicz's works. Still, the way the Nazis tortured Szymon Srebrnik fits into a strong cultural paradigm of presenting the ruthlessness of the enemy-occupant. The detailed description of the shackles, omitted in the translation, suggests that the witnesses looked closely at the convict, and the memory of this scene is still alive. The characteristic word "łańcuszki" (chainlets), a diminutive that is completely eliminated from the translation, constitutes an additional important proof of the fact that the observers go beyond neutrality or indifference.

It is not easy to interpret the diminutive noun form unequivocally. Perhaps it is a subconscious gesture of defence against the speaker's own painful memories, an attempt to mitigate a nightmarish image: chainlets seem to be not as heavy as chains or shackles. In this way, on the level of language the image of a child subjected to torture becomes less drastic. At the same time, a gesture of disagreement with the dehumanization of Srebrnik comes to the fore, a refusal to move linguistically to the side of the torturers, who inflict chains on people. This is even more striking since the protagonist of this image from the past stands right next to her and is received in the Chełmno community as a friend who returns after a long time, welcomed as a neighbour. The situation undoubtedly forces Lanzmann's interlocutors to play certain roles. However, regardless of the motivations, the traces of the Chełmno residents' attitudes are not reported in the translation.

"He pumped water from the river..."

The translation omits the description of the work Srebrnik was supposed to do. According to one of the women, he was supposed to "go down that mountain and pump water from the river to the palace". While speaking, the woman moves her head energetically to the left behind her, as if pointing to the very place and uses the demonstrative pronoun "that". Others unanimously confirm these words by nodding their heads. The eye of the camera is focused on the people but in the image evoked from their memories a hill appears next to the church with a palace on its top. In fact, the area around the church in Chełmno is flat, there is no mountain nearby. The villagers probably think about the hill, where the church is located and where the no longer existing palace used to be placed:

> In 1941, Chełmno was dominated by an old estate with a dilapidated neo-Gothic mansion situated on about three hectares (7.5 acres) of land on the western edge of the village. The other dominant feature was the village church, located some 100 meters down the highway, but separated by a small gully. (…) Behind the mansion and church the ground sloped steeply, then levelled out along the Ner River (Montague 2012: 50).

The group actually stand on this very "mountain", which is in fact a small hill. Chełmno is located on a hilly plateau, surrounded by *urstromtäler* (Kondracki 2002: 125–126); the church and palace were located on the slope of the plateau. The church has survived but the palace was almost completely destroyed during the first liquidation of the camp in 1943. This makes the woman's statement that "Mr. Szymek" was supposed to "pump the water into the palace" even more unclear.

Srebrnik was sent to Chełmno in 1944, in the period of the second camp (1944–1945). At that time, the Jews were no longer kept in the palace, but in the parish church. The only building in the vicinity suitable for use was the granary. It was there that Srebrnik was located after his arrival to Chełmno (Montague 2012: 153). The boy was assigned to work in the so-called *Hauskommando*. His tasks included washing floors, collecting food for the rabbits kept in the camp area, as well as supplying water to workers in the Rzuchów forest. He also had to amass the teeth, extracted from the victims, from which he later, in Burmeister's office, removed the golden caps. There was no running water in the camp at that time, so one of Srebrnik's tasks

was to "haul drinking water from the river up to the camp" (Montague 2012: 155). In another passage of Lanzmann's documentary, Martha Michelsohn, the wife of the Nazi teacher in Chełmno, describes the sanitary conditions in the camp and is positive that there was no pumping system. However, she mentions the well from which the water was brought. Her words are also unclear, as she uses the phrase "one had to turn it" (org. "man so drehen musste"). One can assume that the water was not "pumped", but rather "carried in buckets" or "hauled" (Montague 2012: 155). In the references found by Montague, there is also no record of the water-supplying system in the granary. There is, however, a fragment concerning the supply and bringing of the water by Srebrnik. Taking into account the fact that the camp was completely destroyed in 1943 and then re-opened in 1944, the information about the lack of running water, as well as the fact that the woman from Chełmno uses mental shortcuts (she does not mean the palace, but the area around the palace where the granary was located), it should be assumed that the water was rather transported or carried, although one cannot be completely certain of it.

This is the proposed new translation of the passage discussed, including also the omitted bits of the utterances:

> CL: Pourqoui tout le village se souvient-il de lui?
> BJ: Dlaczego wszyscy pamiętają o panu Szymku?
> NT: Why does everybody remember about Mr. Szymek?
> ChI: Pamiętamy, bo chodził w łańcuszkach, spętane nogi, do pasa przywiązany łańcuch i pompował wodę, schodził z tej góry i pompował wodę z rzeki do pałacu. Jeździł tak… Z tym z Gestapo… To go pamiętamy dobrze.
> BJ: Alors, ils s'appelent bien, parce qu'il allait avec des chaînes aux chevilles… … et parce qu'il a chanté sur la rivière.
> NT: We remember because he walked in chainlets, his ankles tied up, the chain attached to his belt, and he pumped water, he walked down that hill and pumped water from the river to the palace. So he went… With the guy from the Gestapo… So we remember him well.

"Some kind of iron cars, armored.."

The last element, that in a sense sums up the analysis so far and confirms the complexity and difficulty in the scene discussed, is the moment when the inhabitants are asked to describe in detail the transport of the Jews from the church to the forest.

CL: Comment est ce qu'on les transportait à la forêt?
BJ: A jak ich transportowano do lasu? Czym?
ChI: Ciężarówkami, ale nie, samochodami… Auta. Auta żelazne były takie, zakute, buda wielka. Żywych. Mogła ważyć ze trzy kilo taka buda… Jakich trupów? Przecież oni gazowali. …a dołem odchodziła ta… Tak, tak. …odchodziło wszystko dołem. Niech pani im to opowie… Drabinka też tam taka…
BJ: Aux camions. Les camions blindé… …très grands. Par le bas venait le gaz.
ES: In very big armored vans. The gas came through the bottom.
ChI: Oni wywozili, ale… Żywych…
CL: Alors… on les transportait dans les camions à gaz. C'est bien ça?
ES: Then they were carried in gas vans, right?
BJ: To znaczy wywozili ich tymi ciężarówkami gazowymi?
ChI: Tak.
BJ: Oui, dans les camions à gaz.
ES: Yes, in gas vans.

A lively response to the question "How were they transported to the forest? By what?", again polyphonic and chaotic, is full of mental shortcuts, broken phrases, specific, irregular language forms. The translator is able to render only bits of what is being said. It is then briefly summarized by Lanzmann asking whether the inhabitants meant the gas vans – he actually uses the term, which was coined after the Second World War and could not have been used earlier by the people of Chełmno. The director's suggestion together with the form of the transaltion lead to a reduction of aspects of the answer other that the technical ones. The description of vehicles and the installation used to kill people is of course crucial here but without an access to what the Chełmno citizens say, their agitation can be attributed only to the willingness to show off their knowledge. While in fact, the scene uncovers their deep ignorance. They cannot reach an agreement on how to define the trucks – they have no words for them; a woman, emphasizing the fact that they were big, makes an absurd remark that "such a wagon" might have weighed "about three kilos". However, the most moving are the snippets in the background: "Alive", "What corpses? They were gassing", "Yes, yes" and "Why don't you tell them".

An image of incoherent collective memory emerges from those shreds. Some members of the community knew that the people transported in those "wagons" were being murdered, while others thought that the truck carried the dead bodies of the victims. This time the differences are no longer declared, as they were a little earlier, when three answers to the director's question were given at once: "We knew", "We didn't know", and "I didn't

know". Now the ignorance or unawareness appears as if by chance, in passing, drawn out by a categorical rhetorical question: "What corpses?" and an unequivocal statement: "They were gassing". All this dramatic verbalization of the plexus of knowledge and ignorance, as well as the act of mercilessly revealing the truth in front of those members of the group who may have defended themselves against it or had been protected from it, disappeared from both French and English texts – they were literally lost in translation.

Srebrnik himself, in his testimony, claimed that the gas vans were specially adapted to this function (Srebrnik 1945). We know that camp Kulmhof was equipped with two gas vans and one truck for clothes disinfection (Montague 2012: 162). The testimonies of witnesses are often misrepresented, since nobody actually saw the murdering of the prisoners. The uncertain knowledge about the subject came from stories and observations. This is why those trucks were shrouded in a terrifying mystery – it was known that the journey ended with death; and this made people even more scared. The words of the woman and the intonation she uses, make the described gas chambers "come alive": one almost feels their weight ("iron", "big wagon", "about three kilos, such a wagon") and fear at the sight of them: it is impossible to get out of them because they are "armored".

The difficulty in translation is caused by both the emotional level of the descriptions and their fragmentariness. Michael Tager, analyzing the language of people describing their experiences in Auschwitz (Primo Levi in their number), emphasizes the fact that words used in common speech were unable to convey the reality – they did not carry sufficient a "load", or "intensity" (Tager 1993: 266). Tager emphasizes the fact that Levi's fear resulted also from disorientation, after being transported to an unknown location (Tager 1993: 266). Henryk Mania, in 1940 present at the gassing of the patients of the mental hospital in Owińska, when the gas vans were used for the first time, describes those vehicles as follows: "It was a kind of a furniture truck, hermetically sealed, with a separate cab. It seems to me that the inside was covered with sheeting. I don't remember if there was any inscription on it. The exterior was painted a dark color." (Mania, as cited in Montague 2012: 203). Bronisław Falborski remembered the trucks in a similar way: "The van was black and box-shaped. The roof was almost flat and met the sidewalls at nearly right angles. It seems to me that it was covered with sheet metal." (Falborski, as cited in Montague 2012: 207).

In order to translate the description that emerges from the utterances of the inhabitants of Chełmno, it is necessary to use the descriptive material

coming from other sources. The translation in the film, shortened, summarizing, somehow assumes common knowledge about the mobile gas chambers and does not allow the questioning of the way they looked. And yet it is precisely the doubt and uncertainty that constitute the essence in this scene. Uncertainty also emerges from the polyphonic and interrupted description of the pipe system that brought the exhaust gases to the chamber of a truck. We can hear only snippets of the utterances, interrupted fragments of the conversation; we learn that something "ran at the bottom" and that there was "a little ladder". The description consists of snapshots, it is at most a collage or an assemblage of nearly unrelated fragments. The vision of the past is not coherent, it disintegrates into small pieces, shreds.

This is one of the few moments when the audience can hear Srebrnik, who stands in the middle of the group. He confirms the woman's words and encourages her: "Why don't you tell them." At this point, the memories of the bystanders and of a Holocaust survivor converge. This is not the only scene of this kind. In her analysis of the *Shoah* outtakes, Głowacka noticed a similar thread of understanding between Srebrnik and the workers from the Rzuchów forest. Their narrations, although conducted from a completely different perspective, have many points in common and complement each other. They try to recall the macabre moment when suddenly the bodies of suffocated victims fell out of a gas van on the way to the forest (Głowacka 2016a: 307). From the testimony of Srebrnik one can also know that he himself knew perfectly well how the gas vans looked and worked: "The doors were closed, locked and bolted. The motor was started. The exhaust gas was directed into the van by a special exhaust pipe and it poisoned the people inside (…) (Srebrnik, as cited in Montague 2012: 162). In another fragment of his testimony, he describes the "ladder" mentioned by the Chełmno inhabitant:

> The exhaust pipe went from the engine along the chassis and into the van, through a hole in the car's floor, which was covered with a perforated sheet of metal. The hole was located more or less in the middle of the chassis. The van's floor was also covered with a wooden grate, just like the one in the bathhouse (Srebrnik 1945).

Other descriptions also contain information about holes in the chassis, which were sometimes covered with nets. The Germans also used bottled gas to kill their prisoners. At that time, the bottle was connected to "a hose (or two hoses), the outlet of which was located inside the vehicle, under the bench" (Mania in Montague 2012: 203).

In the quoted fragment, the bits of broken memories of the inhabitants of Chełmno are confirmed by other testimonies. Each person – the perpetrator (Henryk Mania), the survivor (Szymon Srebrnik) and the bystanders (the Chełmno inhabitants) – describe the same mechanism and understand one another almost without words. However, in order to notice this thread of understanding, it is necessary to hear and translate every voice:

> CL: Comment est ce-qu'on les transportait à la forêt?
> BJ: A jak ich transportowano do lasu? Czym?
> NT: And how were they transported to the woods? By what?
> ChI: Ciężarówkami, ale nie, samochodami… Auta. Auta żelazne były takie, zakute, buda wielka. Żywych. Mogła ważyć ze trzy kilo taka buda… Jakich trupów? Przecież oni gazowali. …a dołem odchodziła ta… Tak, tak. …odchodziło wszystko dołem. Niech pani im to opowie… Drabinka też tam taka…
> BJ: Aux camions. Les camions blindés… …très grands. Par le bas venait le gaz.
> NT: By trucks, but no, by cars. Cars. Some kind of iron cars, armored, a huge wagon. Alive. It might have weighed about three kilos, such a wagon… What corpses? Why, they were gassing. …and at the bottom ran that… Yes, yes. … everything ran at the bottom. Why don't you tell them. A little ladder there…

The translation in the film does not reproduce this level of understanding. By reducing voices and eliminating complications it simplifies and schematizes the landscape of memory as well as separating its subjects. Without generally falsifying the informational level of the message (though this happens also), this reductive translation introduces unanimity where there were discorded voices, one version where there were many, a coherent image where there were only broken pieces. Thus, it deprives the recipients of the French version, and even more so the readers of the English subtitles, of the access to what is the essence of the document: the voice of the witnesses. The analysis of a few very short passages from the ten-minute scene of Claude Lanzmann's *Shoah* implies that the voice of the people of Chełmno was ignored in the translation and became no more than a basis for a summarized message, concentrated on facts and disregarding attitudes and emotions, including the trauma of the village's inhabitants, who looked at the annihilation to which the prisoners of the camp were subjected. In some aspects, these attitudes and emotions are conveyed through the film image; but in many cases it is impossible to read the images precisely without knowing the words that accompany them.

According to Dorota Głowacka, the policy of translation at work in Lanzmann's document makes it impossible to return to the past in the way in which "those remembering lean towards each other, although they remember the past differently" (Głowacka 2016a: 309). The untranslated passages are an example of collected memory which assumes the experiences of individuals but at the same time does not rule out the creation of common structures of remembrance (Kobielska 2010: 181). As Karolina Koprowska notes, the memory of the Holocaust in the countryside is the memory of individuals, stored in private memories, known and accessible only to those belonging to the community (Koprowska 2018: 177–183). The inhabitants of Chełmno, in the analysed scene, share their memory with the director in a generous manner; but their voices are reduced simplified and smoothed out. Each of the individual voices omitted from the translation is a part of the Holocaust memory in Chełmno. Grammatically non-standardised statements, repetitions, signals of confirmation sought from neighbours, are part of the testimony. The task of making a translation of the film that would record the factual, but also the affective, emotional and cultural content of the statements is overwhelming but absolutely necessary at the same time. Without undertaking it, one of the most important documents concerning the Holocaust will remain partly silent and partly misleading. If the translation were polyphonic, with a comprehensive cultural explanation of the multiple contexts to be taken into account in an attempt at hearing and understanding the voices of actual people, the film would be much richer. It would also certainly complicate and refine our thinking about the Holocaust and the people who bear witness to it. Dorota Głowacka is right when she claims: "No, we have not finished with this film yet" (Głowacka 2016a: 310).

Translated by Anna Mrzygłodzka

Bibliography

Applebaum A. 2007. *Gulag: a History*, New York: Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group.

Baker M. (ed.). 2005. *The Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies*, London–New York: Routledge.

Bojarska K. 2010. "Człowiek imieniem Lanzmann", *Tygodnik Powszechny*, https://www.tygodnikpowszechny.pl/czlowiek-imieniem-lanzmann-144007 (access: 1.06.2019).

Brantlinger P. 2011. *Taming Cannibals: Race and the Victorians*, Ithaca–London: Cornell University Press.
Chamayou G. 2012. *Podłe ciała. Eksperymenty na ludziach w XVIII i XIX wieku*, trans. J. Bodzińska, K. Thiel-Jańczuk, Gdańsk: słowo/obraz terytoria.
Condé M. 1992. *I, Tituba, Black Witch of Salem,* trans. R. Philcox, Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.
Didi-Huberman G. 2008. *Images in Spite of All. Four Photographs from Auschwitz*, trans. S.B. Lillis, Chicago–London: The University of Chicago Press..
Franklin R. 2011. "On Film: Shoah, by Claude Lanzmann", *Salmagundi* 180/171, pp. 26–34.
Głowacka D. 2018. "The Tower of Babel. Holocaust Testimonials and the Ethics of Translation", in: M. Waligórska, T. Kohn (eds.), *Jewish Translation – Translating Jewishness*, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Press, pp. 237–258.
Głowacka D. 2016a. "Współ-pamięć, pamięć 'negatywna' i dylematy przekładu w *wycinkach* z *Shoah* Claude'a Lanzmanna", *Teksty Drugie* 6, pp. 297–311.
Głowacka D. 2016b. *Po tamtej stronie: świadectwo, afekty, wyobraźnia*, Warszawa: Instytut Badań Literackich PAN.
Heberer P. 2011. *Children During the Holocaust*, Maryland: Compass Point Books.
Hilberg R. 1993. *Perpetrators Victims Bystanders: The Jewish Catastrophe, 1933–1945*, New York: Harper Perenial.
Hochschield A. 1999. *King Leopold's Ghost*, Houghton Mifflin: New York.
Kąś J. 2003. "Słownictwo gwarowe i ogólnopolskie w mowie ludności wiejskiej (na materiale gwar orawskich)", in: H. Kurek, F. Tereszkiewicz (eds.), *Podkarpackie spotkania. Literatura – język – kultura, t. 3, Kultura wsi podkarpackiej*, Kraków: Universitas, pp. 67–77.
Kobielska M. 2010. "Pamięć zbiorowa w centrum nowoczesności. Ujęcie Jeffreya K. Olicka", *Teksty Drugie*, 6, pp. 179–194.
Kondracki J. 2002. *Geografia regionalna Polski*, Warszawa: PWN.
Koprowska K. 2018. *Postronni? Zagłada w relacjach chłopskich świadków*, Kraków: Universitas.
Kuhiwczak P. 2007. "The Grammar of Survival. How Do we Read Holocaust Testimonies?", in: M. Salama-Carr (ed.), *Translating and Interpreting Conflict*, Amsterdam–New York: John Benjamins, pp. 61–73.
LaCapra D. 1997. "Lanzmann's *Shoah*: *Here There Is No Why*", *Critical Inquiry* 23 (2), pp. 231–269.
Le Chagrin et la Pitié. 1969, M. Ophüls (director).
Levi P. 1988, *The Drowned and the Saved*. London: Michael Joseph.
Lindkvist S. 1997. *"Exterminate All the Brutes": One Man's Odyssey into the Heart of Darkness and the Origins of European Genocide*, New York: The New Press.
Mickiewicz A. 2016. *Forefathers' Eve*, trans. C.S. Kraszewski, Glagoslav Publications.
Michelson M. 1979. United State Holocaust Memorial Museum, https://collections.ushmm.org/search/catalog/irn1004243 (access: 27.04.2019).
Montague P. 2012. *Chełmno and the Holocaust. The History of Hitler's First Death Camp*, The University of Chapel Hill: California Press.

Mroczkowska-Brand K. 2017. *Deportowani z życia. Nowe głosy w narracjach literackich i ich kolonialne konteksty*, Kraków: WUJ.

Nuit et brouillard. 1955, A. Resnais (director).

Olin M. 1997. "Lanzmann's Shoah and the Topography of the Holocaust Film", *Representations* 57, pp. 1–23.

Pym A. 2010. Exploring Translation Theories, London–New York: Routledge.

Sendyka R. 2013. "Pryzma – zrozumieć nie-miejsca pamięci (*non-lieux de memoire*)", *Teksty Drugie* 1-2, pp. 323–344.*Shoah*. 1985, C. Lanzmann (director).

Srebrnik S. 1945. *Protocol of the Interrogation of the Witness*, http://www.holocaustresearchproject.org/survivor/srebrnik.html (access: 17.08.2018).

Stolarz A. 2012. "Historia mówiona w warsztacie historyka mentalności", *Pamięć i Sprawiedliwość* 2 (20), pp. 103–114.

Tager M. 1993. "Primo Levi and the Language of Witness", *Criticism. Fin de Siècle Perspectives on Twentieth-Century Literature and Culture* 35 (2), pp. 265–288.

Tryuk M. 2016, "Interpreting and Translating in Nazi concentration camps during World War II", *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series: Themes in Translation Studies* 15, pp. 121–141.

Węgrzyn Ł. 2015. "Granice nazistowskich obozów koncentracyjnych i zagłady na terenie okupowanej Polski", *Studia z Geografii Politycznej i Historycznej* 4, pp. 277–290.

Wojtucki D. 2014. *Kat i jego warsztat pracy na Śląsku, Górnych Łużycach i w hrabstwie kłodzkim od początku XVI do połowy XIX wieku*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo DiG.