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Literary Translingualism in Switzerland:

Pierre Lepori and Beat Christen

„Was ich für ein vieltöniger Mensch bin, ein wahres Orchester.“
(What a polyphonic character I am, truly an orchestra.)

Robert Walser, Mikrogramme

“The basic error of the translator is that he preserves the state in which his own language happens to be instead of allowing his language to be powerfully affected.”

Walter Benjamin, The Task of the Translator

Plurilingualism in Switzerland

In 2013, 64.5% of the population indicated German – generally meaning Swiss German dialect – as their main language, 22.6% French, 8.3% Italian and only 0.5% Romansh. German is the chief language in seventeen Cantons out of 26. French is predominantly spoken in four Cantons; three Cantons are bilingual (German and French), and Italian is mainly spoken in Ticino. In the Canton of Graubünden, three different languages are used: German, Italian and Romansh whose status differs radically from that of the other three languages.

In fact, Romansh became a national language only in 1938 and within a very specific international context. It was a strong reaffirmation of cultural plurality in the face of German Nazism. There are five different sub-forms of Romansh, which vary quite a lot with regard to each other. In 1982, the Swiss linguist Heinrich Schmid created Rumantsch grischuna an artificial language based on compromise. This specific variant became an official language in 1996 and was taught in school as a written language from 2005 on. Despite these efforts, Romansh is slowly disappearing. In 1950, 1% of the Swiss population still spoke Romansh, this amount was halved by 2000.

Only 1/8th of the Swiss population grows up multilingually, learning a second language before going to school. The typical Swiss generally speaks one national language and another foreign language, mostly English. In the French part of the country, the
amount of bilingual speakers reaches 10.4% and in the Italian part 9.5%. In the German-speaking part, however, it amounts only to 4.9%. This asymmetrical setting is a consequence of the cultural, economic and linguistic predominance of the German-speaking area. The weaker regions have to rely on bilingualism in order to compensate in part for the existing demographic and economic disparity.

The Swiss journalist José Ribeaud, who in 2010 published a critical study on multilingualism in Switzerland (Ribeaud 2010), argues in an interview published in December 2013 (Ribeaud 2013) that French and German are less and less used in everyday life. Swiss German dialect is generally considered up to date and cool. Along with English, it is the most used language in Switzerland. Neither of them is a national language. Ribeaud interprets this trend in terms of an anti-global and anti-European feeling. More and more often people from the German-speaking part of Switzerland communicate with their French counterparts in English. English has been substituted for French in some primary schools in the German-speaking part of the country. The use of Swiss German dialect, furthermore, has become a general rule in political discussions as well as in the media, slowly and surreptitiously abolishing the former diglossic situation, which was constitutive for the bilingual Swiss identity of the German-speaking part of the population. Swiss German dialect was learnt at home and mostly used as a spoken language in private situations. Standard German, on the other hand, was learnt in school and used in public situations and in writing.

In this changing socio-linguistic context, the new forms of literary translingualism, combining different national languages, I will discuss in the second part of my speech, have become particularly interesting both from a cultural and political point of view. They reaffirm the vision of an originally multilingual Switzerland, actively and provocatively counteracting the strong monolingual trend originating in the German-speaking part of the country and the triumphal march of a globalized and globalizing English.

**Literary translingualism in Switzerland**

In his seminal work, *The Poet's Tongues. Multilingualism in Literature*, Leonard Forster, in order to illustrate the deep impact 19th century nationalism and monolingualism had on
writers and their choice of a specific language, discusses the case of the Swiss writer Conrad Ferdinand Meyer. Meyer had two languages at his disposal, German and French. He hesitated, but in the end he opted to write in German “as a result of the war of 1870 and the unification of Germany – not a very good reason, we may now think, especially for a Swiss; until then he had seriously considered writing in French.” (Forster 1970: 55) As I want to show in this paper, contemporary Swiss writers do no longer have to grapple with such heartbreaking decisions.

As Peter Utz (2009) points out, literary translingualism is not a completely new phenomenon within Swiss literature. Literary polyphony, one of the forces that fueled aesthetic innovation in Modernism in the early 20th century, had also an impact on Swiss literature. The Swiss literary system has been characterized by a double allegiance, to the national literatures of Germany, France and Italy on the one hand, and to the inner regional linguistic differences on the other. This resulted in two different forms of translingual writing that were sometimes combined in the work of a single author. Charles Ferdinand Ramuz (Zeender Berset 2010: 28) introduced oral and regional forms of French into his novels. Robert Walser (Utz 2009: 143) used both Swiss German dialect and French. Max Frisch and Friedrich Dürrenmatt, who wrote most of their work from 1950 to 1990, made frequent use of oral dialectal forms. Forms of literary polyphony can also be found in the work of the Swiss German writer Hermann Burger (Schmitz-Emans 2004). Utz stresses the fact that this tradition goes back as far as the late 19th century. Jeremias Gotthelf, for instance, who lived from 1797 to 1854, had to translate his novels about peasant-life in the Canton of Bern, into Standard German to make it fit for publication, creating thus a double-voiced text (Utz 2009: 146).

The new forms of translingual writing I want to discuss here are the result of a series of profound cultural changes beginning in the late 1980ies. Among them are the weakening of the ideological notion of a monolithic national culture with its own unique national language (Yildiz 2011), the growing migratory movements of people traveling for work and leisure, the masses of exiles leaving their countries of origin in search of work and peace, the waning taboos on the mixing of languages, and, last but not least, the growing number of bilingual writers all around the world.

Contrary to the polycentric German cultural sphere (Utz 2009), the French literary tradition has been generally based on a centralized, classicist, even purist notion of cul-
ture. Despite this fact, the notions of cultural mixing – métissage, créolisation, hybridité –, that began to have an impact on the cultural scene of the French part of Switzerland from the 1990ies on, originated in the Francophone world, in Canada and the Caribbean (see also Jaquier 2004). It is no wonder then that the two authors I want to discuss here have moved from their respective language areas to the French-speaking region of Switzerland. As Pierre Lepori self-ironically puts it: “Être exilé dans son propre pays, se situer à la marge de soi-même […]”, to be exiled in one’s own country, to situate oneself at the margins of oneself (Lepori 2013a: 43). This geographical distance – “recul géographique” (Bezzola 2001: 15) – allows for a different perspective and opens up new potentialities (Maggetti 2001: 9).

Daniel Maggetti, another bilingual author born in Ticino and living in Lausanne, points to the fact that very often personal reasons (Maggetti 2001: 10) – like a change in the place of residence – ultimately lead to a bilingual choice. This is also the case with the two authors I want to discuss here. The uniqueness of the Swiss situation consist perhaps in its relatively narrow territorial set-up of four different languages. As migrants in their own country, Swiss bilingual authors can take advantage of the close proximity of the different cultural spheres without actually leaving their country of origin, avoiding thus some of the existential tragedies that profoundly affect the lives of other translingual writers. I will now to turn to the first author I want to discuss here: Pierre Lepori.
Pierre Lepori

Lepori, whose first language is Italian, was born in Lugano in 1968 and moved to Lausanne in 1997, at the age of 29. He studied literature in Siena and Berne and did his PhD on the theatrical tradition in Ticino. He works for the Swiss Radio as journalist and literary critic. His departure for another linguistic area impacted directly on his writing career. As he puts it in an e-mail interview (Lepori 2016), he was neither a translator nor an author before leaving Ticino. He started out his writing career as a translator from French into Italian and Italian into French, began writing poetry in Italian and subsequently three novels (Grísì, Sessualità and Come cani), which he all self-translated into French (Sans peau, Sexualité, Comme un chien). Mathilde Vischer (2014) also mentions the still unpublished novel Silk that Lepori has written directly in French. Before this novel Lepori had already written smaller French texts.

The use of French allows Lepori a certain distance, which is fundamental in the case of Silk, as the novel is dedicated to the author’s youth. Contrary to the French he uses in his self-translations, which is mainly aiming for correctness, the language used in Silk is full of surprising poetic twists, unhabitual interferences, and sudden changes in register, in a word freer (Vischer 2014). If Italian is his first language, French is his language of adoption and independence.

Lepori makes no conscious and systematic use of plurilingualism in his texts. His writing strategy consists in allowing accidental infractions, a slipping off into unexpected obliqueness, which results in hidden linguistic stratifications. He is not looking for a unifying bilingual rendering of his experience and he strictly avoids using dialect. As he puts it himself: “There is a sort of dialectal taboo in my linguistic existence.” (Lepori 2016) Lepori describes his activity as a self-translator in terms of adaptation, change and betrayal. To translate oneself is to transgress oneself linguistically. In “Créoliser la Suisse”, he writes programmatically: “La Suisse n’est pas créole … mais elle nous offre la possibilité d’une infraction, d’une trahison de la langue maternelle et du terroir paternelle”, Switzerland is not creole but … it offers us a possibility of infraction and betrayal of our mother tongue and paternal soil (Lepori 2013a: 43).

In 2013, Lepori published Sans peau a French translation of his first Italian novel Grísì originally edited in 2007. There are several macro-structural changes to be made out: in-
version of the sequence of the first chapters, new paragraphs added, some passages deleted, resulting in greater clarity for the reader. There are also rhythmical differences. The sentences in the French version tend to be shorter. The linguistic register has been lowered leading to an attenuation of the dramatical dimension. All in all the self-translation has resulted in a greater distance of the author towards his characters (Vischer 2014: 121-123). Lepori writes under the title: “adapté de l’italien par l’auteur”. As Vischer rightly points out (Vischer 2014: 123) the differences are both a result of language change and of a series of other reasons. The border between these two is, however, very difficult to draw. As Lepori writes in a “Queer in Translation”, a short comment at the end of the French adaptation, self-translation opens up unexpected new paths. “Franchir la frontière intime entre deux idiomes”, he adds, ”n’est pas un acte innocent; le corps de la langue s’hybride, il devient trans- et inter-genre. Et tant pis pour les bonnes moeurs”, to cross the frontier between two idioms is not an innocent act; the body of language becomes hybrid, trans- and inter-gender. And never mind common decency (Lepori 2013: 103).

Lepori points here to a very interesting connection: that between literary genre and gender as opposing and separate categories to be contaminated and actively connected to each other. Peter Utz also suggests that the innovative momentum of literary polyphony generally leads to a transgression of the traditional borders between literary genres: “Die innovative Dynamik literarischer Polyphonie treibt auch die literarische Gattungstradition über sich hinaus.” (Utz 2009: 145) The process of creolization and hybridization affects the identity of the writer, the body of the text as well as its position within the traditional territories of literary genres. Literary polyphony questions and abolishes clear cut borders across a whole series of metaphorically interlinked areas.

Probably Lepori’s most interesting translingual project so far, are the four different editions of his short novel Sexuality, first written in Italian (Sessualità) and nearly simultaneously self-translated into French (Sexualité). The German version (Sexualität), based on a combination of the Italian and French version, was done in collaboration with the professional translator Jacqueline Aerne. The result is a translation with two originals, if one considers self-translation as the creation of a new original. Finally, Lepori edited a fourth trilingual version under a German title: Sexualität. All four books were published in 2011.
The novel tells the story of Olivier, his sister Laura and her friend Erika who meet in Geneva, on middle, neutral ground for five consecutive days – from Sunday to Thursday – so that Olivier can finally meet his son Michele, he has not seen for fourteen years. Olivier is Italian but lives on his own in Paris. He decided to drop the final ‘o’ of his original Italian name, the same way, perhaps, that the author changed his first name from Piero to the French Pierre. He chose to speak French in order to get away from his childhood experiences (Lepori 2011: 25). Laura and Erika lived in Berlin, but have recently moved to Zürich. Together they have raised Michele in Olivier’s absence (Lepori 2011: 83). The first three days consist of three parts, each of which is in a different language. Olivier’s reflections and remembrances are in French – his language of adoption –, followed by an Italian dialogue with his sister Laura. In the last section, Erika, who originally comes from Germany comments, ponders and reminisces in German. She is the less involved of the different characters and German is not one of the languages of the author. After Laura’s departure, signaling a failure of the Italian dialogue between brother and sister, only German and French remain. There is, however, a short glimpse of a still possible reconciliation at the very end. Michele, who has just met his father, speaks on the phone with Laura who is already back in Zürich and asks her in German to teach him Italian. This is described in the novel as an attempt at a completely new beginning beyond fixed gender-roles and the compulsions of a traditional family: “Tabula rasa” (Lepori
In a way, this is a reinvention of Oliver’s mother tongue, through the prism of another language, performed by his sister who is Michele’s adoptive mother.

The choice of the three different languages is fundamentally dictated by a mimetic, representational concern (see Sternberg 1981 and Taylor-Batty 2013). In the single monolingual sections of the novel, each narrator speaks only one language. This creates a strong distance between the single characters and their different identities. Despite this, the novel implicitly and explicitly thematizes plurilingualism and a quest for reunion and reconciliation both of the languages and the people involved in the story. The different characters are in fact plurilingual. Olivier speaks Italian and French, Laura both Italian and German. Furthermore, the author/narrator translates Erika’s meditations that are originally in German into Italian and French. Only in the trilingual edition these passages are actually in German. This implicit polyphony “suscite une réflexion sur la multiplicité des langues, entre elles et dans la même langue”, provokes a reflection on the multiplicity of languages, between them and in the same language (Vischer 2014: 124). In this sense, as Vischer suggests, there is an implicit dialogue between the different monolingual variants.

The possible relationship between the dissimilar languages is captured in the metaphor of the couple which is conjugated in different ways throughout the novel: brother/sister, father/son, twin-sisters (Inga and Shawanna), male/female, and female/female. The round primeval double character from Plato’s *Symposium* is explicitly summoned at a certain point: Olivier and Laura are described as the two halves of the same body (Lepori 2011: 22). Lepori translates male homosexuality into the relationship of brother and sister and into the parallel couples of Laura and Erika (a lesbian relationship) and that of the two twin sisters Inga and Shawanna. These couples do not confirm to strict complementarity but overcome the borders between gender and generation, in this sense they are fundamentally trans-gender and trans-generational. Vischer (2014: 11) quotes Michaël Oustinoff who compares Genette’s notion of a palimpsestuous text to the incestuous dimension (see also Guldin 2007) of self-translated texts “une logique palimpsestueuse” (Oustinoff 2001: 26). This transgressive incestuous dimension pervades Lepori’s text gesturing towards male homosexuality, which strangely enough is absent from the book.

In Lepori’s plurilingual novel, the different languages are strictly separated from each other and there is little use of calques, loanwords, Italianisms or Gallicisms in the different monolingual versions. In a way, Lepori’s writing practice seems to be less radical and
transgressive than his theoretical statements would have it. In his e-mail interview, furthermore, he points to the fact that the four editions have actually hidden the main issues discussed in the book and unduly taken center stage (Lepori 2016). Literary bilingualism, he continues, should not be practiced as a mean in itself. A point to be considered.

As Vischer puts it: “Lepori ne fait pas trembler aussi radicalement le français ou l’italien que d’autres auteurs”, Lepori does not make French or Italian tremble as radically as some other authors do (Vischer 2014:126). This echoes a comment from Walter Benjamin’s “The Task of the Translator”. “Without explicitly naming or substantiating it, Rudolf Pannwitz has characterized the true significance of’ the “freedom” of translation. ‘Our translations, even the best ones, proceed from a wrong premise. […] The basic error of the translator is that he preserves the state in which his own language happens to be instead of allowing his language to be powerfully affected [italics mine] [durch die Sprache gewaltig bewegt] by the foreign tongue.” (Benjamin 2000: 22) This, as I will show in the next section, is the path pursued by the other author discussed in this essay: Beat Christen.

**Beat Christen**

Christen was born in Lucerne in 1965 and moved to Oron-le Châtel nearby Lausanne in 1991, at the age of 26. He studied philosophy, German and French in Anger, Zurich and Lausanne and is currently working as a teacher. As he writes in an e-mail interview (Christen 2016) his career as a writer was triggered by a language-learning experience in France. After a couple of weeks, he started dreaming in French. His first poem, however, was written in German, during his stay in France. Subsequently he began writing bilingual poetry, tentatively at first, because of a lack of confidence in the new language. In the meantime the gap between the two languages has become smaller and the doubts with regard to German bigger. As he points out in a colloquium at the French Department of the University of Geneva on June 15 2001, his poetry was originally not addressed at a bilingual reading audience (Christen 2002: 110). “Plus j’avance dans ma demarche, plus cela me permet d’avoir deux chants, deux voix”, the more I proceed on my way the more I develop two songs, two voices (Christen 2002: 110). Self-translation leads onto another, devious path (see also Zingg 2003). Besides writing bilingual poetry Christen also trans-
lates from German into French, for instance the first poem of Durs Grünbein’s *Vom Schnee oder Descartes in Deutschland* which he published on his website (see [http://beat-christen.ch/?page_id=446](http://beat-christen.ch/?page_id=446)).

German, he writes ironically in “La récréation”, The recreation (Christen 2001b), is not really his mother tongue. His grandmother was German and came to Switzerland when she was seventeen years old, here she married, had children and learnt Swiss German. In this sense, his father’s mother tongue was Swiss German. However, considering his grandmother’s German origin, it was a very special kind, a sort of second-hand Swiss German. In Christen’s view, languages are never clearly separated from each other, but always overlap and co-penetrate each other. There is no uncontaminated origin. But there are still other languages. In the French original there is a homophonic word play: maternelle/fraternelle/charnelle, sons/sens and vis/dit. Besides the mother tongue, writes Christen, „la langue maternelle“, there is also a fraternal language, „une langue fraternelle“, the language St. Francis used to converse with the world of animals and objects and the bodily language, „langue charnelle: celle dont les sons, les sens et le rythme incarnent le mieux ce que je ne vis pas, ce que j’aimerais vivre, ce que j’ai entendu vivre, ce que je vis, ce que d’autres ont vécu, ce qu’ils ont dit, ce qu’ils n’ont pas dit“, the bodily language best incorporates the sounds, the senses and the rhythm of what I live, others have lived, have said and have not said (Christen 2001b: 26-27). I will come back to these notions when discussing his last book *Qu’homme Wie ein Wie* (Christen 2014).
The text I would like to discuss here is Christen’s second collection of bilingual poetry *Leer réel* published in 2003. “Leer” means empty in German and “réel” is the French word for real. Together the two words form a bilingual palindrome, suggesting a double reading: Emptiness is real. Reality is empty. Languages are similar and dissimilar at the same time. Besides the homophonic symmetry there is, thus, an asymmetry of sense: German emptiness turns into French reality and French reality re-disappears into German silence. A double message of absence, lack and dispersal of meaning. The two words seem to mirror each other. Because of the accent on the French word, however, this mirror, even if only slightly, is fundamentally cracked. The bilingual title is also a meta-communicative comment on the content of the collection as a whole and the possibility of translating the meaning of one language fully into the other. Contrary to the title, the German poems have been placed on the right page and the French on the left. This is, furthermore, an inversion of the disposition of the first collection of poems *Poser un lapin Versetzt* published two years earlier. The titles and poems of two books take the form of a chiasm. Furthermore, the two chiasms are inversions of each other

In the e-mail interview, Christen explains this specific choice as an illustration of the fact that neither language precedes the other or is more important than the other (Christen 2016). A language is not poorer because it does not possess the same expression as the other. This also implies that the starting point for a new poem can be either one language or the other or both. The two texts comment each other and need to be read together, moving back and forth from one language to the other, from left to right and from right to left. This double movement confirms and contradicts at the same the linearity of writing and reading, introducing the notion of an endless circularity of an unstoppable loop. Christen’s writing strategy also abolishes the difference between original and translation, creating a third, double, bilingual poem. One version echoes the other, enlarges and circumscribes it at the same time.
Christen, very much along the lines of Lepori, defines translation as recreation, allowing himself a lot of freedom in the process of rewriting. What looks as a drawback in the beginning turns out to be an advantage. The fact that a certain expression is missing in the other language activates the creativity of the writer. Misunderstandings are productive: “Le malentendu est intéressant et productif” (Christen 2002: 110). The second language leads onto another path. Sometimes the translation can even be better than the original forcing the author to get back to the first text: “souvent l’auteur est jaloux de sa propre traduction”, often the author is jealous of his/her own translation (Christen 2002: 110).

In the passage from one language to the other and back a series of changes pertaining to content and form, rhythm and choice of words are introduced (compare Zeeender Berset 2010: 149-152 and 223-231). Some poems have a different formal setup: six verses become nine; stanzas of six verses are transformed into stanzas of four verses each; a poem consisting of a couple of longish lines is transmuted into a slim poem of many short lines. The two poems placed next to each other are related in ways that are not always apparent right away and vary from case to case. Only a careful analysis, attentive to layout, poetic form, to semantic, phonetic and syntactic aspects can reveal the intricacies of their connection. In one French poem, “nuit” and “jour”, night and day, are substituted for “dunkel” and “hell”, dark and light, and their position is playfully inverted and reinverted in the course of the poem, creating a weird distorted echo-effect. To translate and recreate is a form of double writing (“double écriture”) a serious game (“une sorte de jeu sérieux” (Christen 2002: 111). The two languages do not only mirror each other, they also contaminate each other. German word order is imported directly into the French version and idiomatic expressions or metaphors are translated literally into the other language. This leads to surprising estrangement effects, which force the reader to step back and take a closer look at the functioning of language itself and the way languages relate to each other.

I would like to discuss briefly a telling example from Leer riel (Christen 2003: 36-7). Very often, Christen makes use of inversions. In this specific case, the word order of the title and the first line are turned around forming a chiasm. The French O is translated into a German E: mot/Aussitôt → Wortweh/Verweht. Furthermore, by turning the French alliteration mal/mot into the German Wortweh, the German W looks a bit like the French
M standing on its head. Another inversion of word order can be found in line four: *chose petite/enfant* and *Dem Kind/das Kleinste.*

Zeender Berset comments pointedly on the loss and dispersal of meaning suggested by the relationship of the two poems. Translation reveals a rift between languages but also fundamentally questions the relationship of words and things: “[…] le lecteur découvre le décalage entre les mots et les choses du fait d’un sense qui ‘se décale’ ou se disperse (‘verweht’). […] Comme le poème français le dit à deux reprises, tout ‘fait défaut’. Entre les deux poèmes, le sens se dérobe: toute chose, petite ou grande finit toujours par manquer. Pour rendre plus sensible, les derniers vers allemand et français diffèrent et rendent compte d’un contenu déviant – faire s’opposant à abhanden kommen (disparaître).” (Zeender Berset 2010: 254)

As Lepori, Christen uses a series of metaphors to describe the relationship of the two languages. He speaks of an associative net linking the different elements with each other across the page and the language divide (Christen 2002: 110). Translingual writing operates like water flowing down a hill taking different often unpredictable paths: “comme de l’eau qui descend une pente, elle peut aller ici ou là, selon la topographie.“ (Christen 2002: 110). The asperities in the terrain will make it go either this way or that. The poet is like a child looking for differently shaped stones to throw at the surface of a pond so that they may jump from spot to spot creating surprising concentrical patterns leading both poet and reader on a flight of fancy (Christen 2001b: 25-6). Translingual writing, finally, works like a kaleidoscope, rearranging the many-colored fragments of a glass that has never been
As Daniel Maggetti put it (Maggetti 2003a: 94), Christen’s translingual writing does not strive to exhaust the meaning of a particular text but attempts to multiply the ways to access it in order to understand it better.

In his last book *Qu’homme Wie ein Wie* Christen (2014) has drastically expanded the scope of his bilingual adventure adding Swiss German text passages to French and German, moving from poetic diction to prose and inserting parodistically distorted texts from the worlds of advertisement – eg. “Humanitella E la vita è bella!” (Christen 2014: 53), which is a macabre parody of the slogan “Ticinella E la vita è bella” from the Swiss cold-cut manufacturer Rapelli – and politics (e.g. the form used to communicate the refusal, annulation or abrogation of visa (Christen 2014: 128). Christen is also taking up his notions of “langue fraternelle”, the language of St. Francis used to converse with the world of animals and objects and “langue charnelle”, bodily language. If Lepori’s characters move between genders and generations the multiple narrator of *Qu’homme Wie ein Wie* explores different forms of bodily experience. He turns into an earthworm, a common swift, a baby being born, a chicken on its way to the slaughter house, a snow flake and a female refugee crossing the strait of Gibraltar. The plurality of languages, different text-formats, typographic layouts and poetic voices has been complemented by the colorful drawings and aquarelles of the artist MUMA, born in Barcelona in 1957 but living in Lausanne since 1986.

I would like to conclude with a quote Beat Christen used as an epigraph to his *Poser un lapin Versetzt* (Christen 2001a: 7) and the essay “La recreation” (Christen 2003: 79). It highlights ironically and surreptitiously the complexity and intricacy of the two-way relationship within a bilingual speaker. “Ce que je mens / en allemand, / je le pensais en français. (Chanson populaire alsacienne)”, the lies I say / in German / I thought them up in French (Alsatian popular song).
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