In 1928 Jean Rhys published her novel Postures (Quartet in later editions), which centred on a troubled year in her marriage to Jean Lenglet, Dutch writer and journalist, who wrote under the pen-name of Edouard (Edward) Nèvè. The events of that year in Paris, thinly disguised in Quartet, have become public knowledge. While Lenglet was arrested in 1923, convicted for embezzlement, and extradited from France in the following year, Rhys was given shelter in the home of her literary patron, the English writer Ford Madox Ford (F.M. Hueffer). Her subsequent entanglement with Ford and his common-law wife, the Australian painter Stella Bowen, was to prove fatal to Ford's union with Bowen as well as to Rhys' marriage with Lenglet. The publication of Postures caused a great scandal in literary circles, especially in England, where many people thought Jean Rhys had behaved disgracefully to Ford and Stella Bowen by putting them recognisably in her novel. Jonathan Cape refused to touch the book for fear of an action for libel, but Chatto & Windus agreed to bring it out on the condition that Rhys change her title.

Beside Quartet, whose characters, Marya and Stephan Zelli and Lois and Hugh Heidler, are partly based on the real-life enactors of this domestic drama, there are a number of other texts that have some bearing on the affair. Among them are de Nèvè's counterpart to Quartet, the novel Barred (1932), described as a "true story" in its authorial preface, Ford's novel When the Wicked Man (1931) and Bowen's autobiography Drawn from Life (1940). These accounts, with their varying blends of fact and fiction, are now commonly agreed to represent a kind of fictional "debate," such as might take place between four witnesses of the same event, each of whom claims to be in possession of the "truth." Critical discussions of this debate, however, have tended to concentrate on the point of view of three members of the quartet only. The voice of Edward de Nèvè is rarely heard, no doubt due to the difficulty in obtaining one of the few extant copies of Barred, or its Dutch and French versions, In de Strik and Sous les verrous.

The first-person account of the hero of Barred, Jan van Leeuwen, contains very severe criticism of Stania, his wife. He is much harder on his spouse than Marya Zelli is on hers: in Quartet, narrated in the third person, she is presented to us as judging Stephan rather more mildly than herself. Jan pictures his wife as weak and selfish, and without proper regard for him, and he
minimizes his own share in the muddle she gets herself into. He blames her for more than indolence. Where Marya Zelli only reluctantly accepts the Heidlers' offer to stay with them, partly to keep Stephan from worrying about her, Jan van Leeuwen presents Stania as disregarding his warnings not to get mixed up with Hübner, her Fordian protector. Furthermore, he hints that if it wasn't Hübner it would have been someone else; "so many dogs after an easy prey" (p. 102). And he even suggests after his discharge from prison Stania betrays him to the Foreign Police, who have expelled him from France without a passport.

As Edward de Nèze informs us in his preface to Barred, it was Jean Rhys who encouraged him to publish the French manuscript he showed her on a visit to Amsterdam, and who translated it for him and found an English publisher for it. However, a comparison of the original text with Rhys’ adaptation reveals that she not only translated but also considerably rewrote her husband’s novel, and the picture of Stania in Barred, harsh though it may be, is a watered-down version of an even more merciless portrait in Sous les verrous. Both Lenglet and Rhys went to some lengths to gloss over the exact nature of her share in the English edition. In his dedication of Barred “to Jean,” de Nèze did thank her for taking "much trouble" over "this gloomy child of mine," but apart from stating that "like a good guardian and a devoted godmother you took care of its baptism," he did not go into further particulars. In de Strik, the Dutch edition, did not mention Rhys at all, and it was only in the preface to Sous les verrous that de Nèze hinted at a difference between the three novels: "pour certaines raisons . . . il m’a fallu changer un peu l'intrigue dans la version anglaise, changement que j'ai repris dans la version hollandaise. La différence est minime." He did not mention the reasons for this change. Jean Rhys, too, kept silent about the matter, except in a famous statement, repeated by Diana Athill, that in translating "her husband’s fictionalised version of events . . . she had given way to the temptation to cut a few - a very few - sentences about herself which struck her as 'too unfair'."

Such scanty information does not prepare the reader of Barred and Sous les verrous for the real extent of Jean Rhys' editing. The difference between the two novels is far from minimal. The change in "intrigue" de Nèze referred to has important consequences for the development of character and plot, while the passages omitted by Jean Rhys amount to rather more than "a few sentences." All in all, Rhys scrapped between six-and-a-half to seven-thousand words from her husband's narrative; about twenty-five pages of text, or one tenth of the entire manuscript. The nature of Rhys' modifications soon becomes evident from a comparison of practically any page taken at random from the English and the French editions. Hardly a paragraph has remained unchanged. Where she did not cut or rephrase, Rhys changed the order of words within sentences, of sentences within paragraphs, and of paragraphs within chapters. She altered the arrangement of tenses and of de Nèze's shifts between quoted direct speech, indirect speech, monologue and "pure" narration. The result is a text that strikes us as more economical and consistent than its rather ponderous and over-explicit predecessor. Lenglet must have recognized in Rhys' miglior fabbro, for with few exceptions he translated the Dutch version of his novel straight from the English, rather than from his own French manuscript. It is indeed obvious that, as far as her stylistic emendations of Sous les verrous are concerned, Jean Rhys must have been primarily motivated by artistic rather than "personal" considerations. In many of the changes she introduced we sense her infallible writer's instinct, her perfectionism and perhaps also her desire (inseparable from these) to make her husband's style a little more like her own.
It is not difficult to perceive Rhys' method. She consistently eliminates passages that she thought superfluous or simply irrelevant. Although Lenglet occasionally restored a phrase or two for emotional emphasis (pp. 22, 21, 18), he generally took over such alterations in the Dutch edition. Rhys especially condensed de Nève's longish passages of indictment against the French penitentiary system; presumably for dramatic purposes, since they detracted from the story's main interest. She speeded up or slowed down Jan van Leeuwen's account, as the case might be, by changing from pure narration or (free) indirect speech to direct quoted speech, dialogue or (interior) monologue—and vice versa. This way Rhys avoided both narrative monotony, and the disturbing frequent disruptions of the narrative voice characteristic of Lenglet's text. Her use of tenses, too, especially in the transition from narrated past to historical present, and from historical present to interior monologue, is smoother than in Sous les verrous. Rhys turned many of the protagonist's frequent rhetorical questions into affirmative statements (pp. 48, 50, 43). A meticulous editor, she inverted the order of many words, lines and paragraphs for the sake of narrative logic, sometimes even moving phrases from one chapter to another. Lenglet's long-winded sentences and paragraphs were broken up, and his chapters sub-divided. Of some pages, rewritten in their entirety, few traces of the original remain (pp. 247-48, 247-48, 211).

A time-consuming task, even without the numerous additions Jean Rhys made to her husband's work, often for the sake of clarity or emphasis (pp. 246, 246, 210). She patiently inserted transitional sentences to clear up inconsistencies (pp. 120, 122, 105), some of which were created by her own pruning and cutting. Other additions, like a bit of Rhys-pathos at the end of Chapter IV, are more difficult to defend and these were not always taken over by Lenglet. Puzzling, however, is that he agreed to change the names of various Paris locations, with "l'Hôtel Trianon" becoming "Hôtel du Nord," "La Rotonde" "Le Panthéon": mistake, correction of faulty topography, or Rhys' deliberate attempt to prevent identification of place and event? Inevitably, the English version also contains a few genuine mistakes. Of errors like "twice a week" for "deux fois par mois," a slip surprisingly retained in the Dutch version, the most intriguing is Rhys' repeated translation of "bureau of anthropology" for "à l'anthropométrie." The mistake does not recur in the Dutch edition (pp. 45, 46, 40). We can only surmise Jean Rhys had never heard of the humiliating "measuring" (of the parts of the body and their proportion) that the hero, as a suspected criminal, is subjected to after his arrest.

However, the literary biographer's main interest is not in the manifold formal alterations Jean Rhys made in her husband's novel. It is, rather, in the implications of what Diana Athill wrote about Rhys in her preface to Smile Please. When Jean Rhys confessed to her editor that she had scrapped from Lenglet's portrait of Stania what she felt to be "too unfair," she was really saying that she had cut out those "sentences about herself" that clashed with her own view of the role she had played in the events, fictionalized in his novel. And if Rhys erased or altered bits of what she felt to be an ungenerous picture of herself, the changes she made in the portrayal of the other characters must have been motivated by the same desire: to reshape de Nève's view of them; to bring it closer to her own view. "Pour la version française j'ai préféré conserver le manuscrit intact pour lui garder son originalité incontestable," Lenglet wrote in his foreword to Sous les verrous. It is, indeed, only in that edition that we can hear his authentic voice, see what he saw, feel what he felt. In the English translation the focus has been re-adjusted: "slightly pulled from the straight," as Virginia Woolf put it, in a different context. The translator corrected not only the author's language
Rhys' first move in a series of changes necessary to complete this process of adjustment was to eliminate one of the characters, Mme. Hübner, from Lenglet's story. The omission cannot be defended on artistic grounds, for Hübner's wife has a specific role to play in the events of *Sous les verrous*, and her disappearance creates various awkward narrative hitches, which neither Rhys, nor de Nève in his Dutch translation, managed completely to overcome. With the quartet turned into a somewhat less unusual "eternal triangle," the relationship between Hübner, Stania and Jan van Leeuwen is placed in a different light. Stania, though still the unfaithful wife, is no longer in Jan's eyes quite so spineless, so deficient in self-respect as when, in the French edition, she lets herself be manipulated into an affair with a married couple. Since the focus of narration resides with Jan van Leeuwen, his change of opinion also affects the reader's view of Stania's and Hübner's culpability.

Rhys' removal of Mme. Hübner from the scene involved numerous alterations, ranging from nominal and pronominal references to statements about the Hübners having a daughter (pp. 202-03, 199, 172). Vanished are Jan's jeers at Mrs. Hübner's complicity, his attacks on her "complaisance horrible" (pp. 113, 116, 99) regarding her husband's escapades (pp. 94, 95-96, 82), his insinuations about her plotting and scheming (pp. 175, 174, 150). Rhys painstakingly cut out any allusion to Stania as a "troisième de ce ménage" (pp. 192, 189, 163), to the point of eliminating even incidental references to the frequency of *ménages à trois* among foreigners in Paris (pp. 161, 161, 139).

But it is in Jan's conversations with Stania that we find the most significant omissions. In *Sous les verrous*, the Hübners' bad moral reputation is the cause of Jan's immediate suspicions when Stania moves in with them. Among the passages Rhys did not translate are his efforts to make her see that she is being manipulated: "sa femme a laissé faire, t'a encouragée pour que le caprice de son grand homme soit plus vite passé" (pp. 213, 210, 180). Stella Bowen's autobiography confirms that in such scenes, where Jan van Leeuwen tries to confront his wife with an unwelcome truth, Lenglet's fictional version of the role Bowen played as Ford's permissive partner is factually correct. By removing Hübner's wife, Rhys certainly spared her fictional self such a confrontation. At the same time she took away much ground for Jan's feeling that Stania is being victimized, by rewriting various episodes in which his wife unwittingly encumbers him with incriminating evidence (pp. 113, 116, 99). Other changes concern the nature of the Hübners' financial assistance of Stania. In *Sous les verrous* she tells Jan not to worry about her because the Hübners have asked her to stay with them and have collected a little money from friends. In *Barred*, Stania claims her friend Mathilde Dubar is helping her and has introduced her to Hübner, who will give her "a sort of job" and find her a better room (pp. 123-24, 126, 108).

The change in *Barred* of Stania's residence, at a hotel instead of at the Hübners' flat, is the cause of a slightly jarring effect in some of the conversations she has with her husband. In the French version, Stania says at one point that she has put up at a hotel because the Hübners' infant daughter needs her room (p. 203). Since on moving into their apartment she had told Jan "Je dormirai avec Mme. Hübner" (p. 124), he suspects the whole manoeuvre to be a cover-up for an estrangement between the lovers, engineered by Mrs. Hübner. When Jan asks Stania why it is that she has also stopped working for Hübner at his flat, she answers, quite plausibly: "Parce que nous y sommes dérangés tout le temps" (p. 211). In *Barred* Stania moves to a different hotel "because the
other place gave me the blues," which makes Jan's subsequent question illogical ("Have you stopped working for him?") and her answer cryptic ("Yes. Because we're interrupted all the time.") (p. 208). Lenglet must have noticed the inconsistency because he rewrote the sequence in Dutch, with slightly better results: "werk je niet meer voor hem? Zeker . . . maar we worden voortdurend gestoord" (p. 179).

However, Stania finally admits that Mme. Hübner is being difficult and always has been: "Lorsque cela a commencé, j'ai voulu les quitter . . . elle refusait l'argent pour partir." This explodes the myth of "friends" helping her, as her husband is quick to point out: "L'argent? Mais c'était à toi. . . . Pourquoi n'es tu pas allée voir Mlle. Dubar et tous les autres?" (p. 212-213). The English and Dutch versions of this conversation are again illogical: instead of blaming Hübner's wife, Stania, at this late point in the story, suddenly blames his relatives, whose existence had not been previously mentioned (pp. 210, 180).

In the English translation, the plausibility of other scenes suffers from the occasional replacement of Mme. Hübner by Stania's friend, Mathilde Dubar. Since she is a minor character, and not particularly intimate with either Stania or Hübner, the question arises of what she is doing at his side all the time, for instance in the painful confrontation scene between the hero and his wife's lover (pp. 192, 188-89, 163). It is difficult to see, too, why Stania should be as upset as she is by Mathilde's unexpected return to Paris (pp. 186, 184, 158), or why she takes such pains to hide from her friend a few kissing marks her lover has left on her upper arms (pp. 185, 185, 158-9). But exchange Mme. Hübner for Mathilde in the English and the Dutch edition, and all becomes clear.

Beside effacing Lenglet's attacks on Stella Bowen, Rhys also toned down his hero's bitter criticism of Hübner, the Ford character. With Miss Dubar replacing Hübner's wife as a chaperone, Jan has less reason to object to Hübner's contacts with Stania (pp. 98, 100, 85). While the more notorious side of Hübner's sexual reputation simply vanished alongside with his condoning partner, a page-full of stories about women protégées ruined by the painter-critic was cut out altogether (pp. 94, 95, 82). In Sous les verrous, the hero is especially incensed at Mme. Hübner's excuses that her husband needs his affairs for his artistic development ("elle prétend que sans cela son art n'existerait pas"?), but such insinuations about Hübner abusing his artistic reputation are absent from Barred. Rhys also carefully removed the most merciless of Jan's comments on Hübner's obesity, his false teeth, his "genives anémiques," and toned down or scrapped the invective directed at him: "goujat hypocrite," "pantin," "canaille."

Barred notably weakens Hübner's hold over Stania, who in Sous les verrous rarely makes a decision without consulting him first. To her husband's question whether she will come abroad with him after his release from prison, she answers: "Je ne sais pas; ça dépendra de ce que Hübner dira." In the English translation, Stania's answer has become a question, put by Jan: "I suppose you'll ask Hübner to advise you?" the sarcasm of which is emphasized in Dutch: "Ik zou het aan Hübner vragen als ik jou was" (pp. 141, 140, 120). On the whole the protagonist of Barred (and In de Strik), though no less mistrustful of his rival than his counterpart in Sous les verrous, has less ground for suspicion: "quelque chose se prépare contre moi" is watered down to "these plans!" (pp. 124, 126, 108).

This also applies to the grudges he holds against his wife. Omitted in the
English translation are various bitter remarks by van Leeuwen about Stania's habit of getting about with men "rencontrés au hasard," regardless of the risks. Rhys cut out some of Jan's sexual complaints as well: "... Stania n'a jamais compris mes élans. Etait ce pudeur, raisons de santé, crainte? Je ne sais. Toujours est-il que là nous ne nous sommes pas compris comme il le fallait" (pp. 85, 86, 74). Remarks about his wife's irritability and her bad moods were likewise scrapped or rewritten, although In de Strik retains a few instances. Stania's sneering comment "tu es un mesquin" was omitted in both translations (pp. 242, 241, 206).

Rhys definitely made Stania appear less dishonourable. In Sous les verrous, her words and actions convince her husband (and the reader) that she must have been an easy conquest for Hübner. In the English version, the reader no longer shares Jan's feelings to quite the same extent, for Stania gives him less food for distrust; the effect is that the hero is made to look over-suspicious, his wife somewhat less culpable. Precisely how Stania is involved with Hübner remains largely a matter of speculation until the end of the story, and their affair is pictured as developing gradually rather than "en si peu de jours" (pp. 98, 100, 86). Jean Rhys cut out those passages in which Stania mentions to her husband various facts he considers compromising, like Mme. Hübner leaving her alone with Hübner on a holiday. Some of the things she tells him in Sous les verrous strike her husband (and the reader) as premeditated cruelty; for instance her explanation of some bruise-marks on her shoulders: "Hübner m'a pincée" (translated as "Somebody must have pinched me" [pp. 173, 172, 149]). Because of such alterations, Jan's strongest grievance against Stania, the indifference she shows to his feelings, could be eliminated.

A significant modification takes place in connection with Stania's remissness about some papers that her husband needs to prove his innocence. In Sous les verrous she tells him that she has not written to his office for them because both Hübner and Miss Dubar advised against it. In the English version, Stania's near-criminal negligence is softened: there has been no reply to her letters; she is reluctant to go since she is afraid she will be humiliated; Miss Dubar has convinced her that there is no point in going (pp. 115, 118, 101). Such excuses, which make Stania's actions more understandable, and perhaps also more acceptable, recur several times. Can we hear in them Jean Rhys pleading her case, defending herself against her husband's charges, five or six years after the unhappy entanglement with her literary patron had come to an end? Whatever the answer, van Leeuwen's accusations about Stania's duplicity and lack of support are considerably toned down, to the extent that he is even made to function as his wife's mouthpiece: "I began to make excuses for her. Once she had told me that because life had always been hard for her something in her was frozen and afraid" (pp. 116, 118, 101-02). Of such reflections there is no trace in the original. Rhys painted Stania as more loving, more concerned about her husband, adding sentences like "I worry about you all the time" (pp. 140, 140, 120), and transforming what was in Sous les verrous a wishful thought into reality: "[Stania] kissed me more affectionately than she had done earlier in the day" (pp. 184, 183, 158). She also omitted all categorical statements made by Stania about her infidelity, except in the climactic final scene, and she "censured" Jan's report of the lovers together. "Je vois Stania sourir à ce gros homme gras, de son sourire plein de soumission et d'admiration" is translated as "I saw how Stania looked at him" (the Dutch stays closer to the original: "Ik zag hoe verliefd Stania tot hem opkeek . . ."). An identical phrase is scrapped altogether (pp. 192-96, 189-93, 161-66).

Such, then, are the "very few sentences about herself" Jean Rhys omitted,
changed or added to Lenglet's portrait of Stania, with the purpose of making it less "unfair" to (her view of) herself. That Edward de Nève took over the great majority of these modifications in the Dutch version of his novel is intriguing. But not quite so intriguing as his move, surely unprecedented in literary history, to allow the intrusion of his wife's point of view in his fictional self-portrait as Jan van Leeuwen, both in the English and in the Dutch edition. What Rhys seems to have aimed at in rewriting Lenglet's version of himself, was to prevent the expression of certain thoughts and feelings he had once had about her. She altered or eliminated passages concerning the hero's suffering, especially his bitterness against his wife: "Que j'ai grimmé de fois derrière ce masque joyaux du rire depuis que je connais Stania!" (pp. 86, 87, 75). She cut out many of his sentiments of loving sorrow, pity and concern, his sense of loss (pp. 51, 53, 46) and of his strong physical desire for her (pp. 197-98, 194, 167). Of the line "Je cache ma tête dans le coussin que je mords à pleines dents en l'étouffant, pour que ne retentisse pas le cri de désir que je pousse vers Stania," the last seven words were not translated.

Rhys also removed introspective passages full of self-pity, smugness, and self-righteousness (pp. 134-39, 133-38, 115-19). The pathos of "Ah! si j'avais un ami, un seul, un vrai," scrapped in Barred, returns in the Dutch translation, as does a detailed account of the help Jan van Leeuwen receives from his one true copain, an "Apache" (pp. 154, 154, 132). Presumably, Rhys curtailed this story because she wanted to speed up the narrative, though she surprisingly retained the hero's moralistic discourse on the contrast between the solidarity found among criminal males and the fickleness of women in general (and his wife in particular, pp. 251, 253, 215). She also carefully rewrote many passages centring on his feelings of humiliation and self-contempt; the tone of mortification is not as strong in Barred as it is in Sous les verrous. Self-indictment and rationalizations about the hero's "apathie déshonorante," "résignation coupable et honteuse," and "lâche complaisance," have disappeared (pp. 180, 179, 154). De-emphasized, too, is Jan van Leeuwen's growing conviction that in trying to spare Stania, he has killed in her all feelings for him: "... ma résignation devant le fait accompli, et ma soumission à ses exigences et à celles des Hübner l'ont éloignée pour toujours de moi" (pp. 198, 195, 167).

The hero that emerges from Barred and In de Strik is a man who feels less for his wife and suffers less because of her than the protagonist of Sous les verrous. Also a man who is a somewhat less reliable narrator. Perhaps the most remarkable omission in Jean Rhys' translation is a two-page entry in which Jan van Leeuwen is given a "good character." After his release from prison, his lawyer tells him that he has put his hands on the letters Jan had sorely needed during his trial, and that he is willing to reopen the case if Jan can pay for them (pp. 187-88, 186, 160). The episode strengthens Jan van Leeuwen's stature as a dependable informant about the facts of his arrest; it also speaks loudly against his wife. By removing it from Barred altogether, Rhys eliminated a conspicuous reminder of Stania's marital negligence, symbolized in the lost letters.

When Jean Lenglet took over Jean Rhys' adaptation of Sous les verrous, he put his seal of approval on her view of the events that had generated his novel. Rhys did not try to put "the real facts" in the place of his fiction; she proposed another fiction, which he accepted as "faire" than his own "true story." The intrusion of the focus of the unfaithful wife into the narrative perspective of the betrayed husband substantially alters our picture of the betrayal. Though Barred is very different from Quartet in outlook and
perception, the distance between the latter novel and Sous les verrous is greater still, indeed almost unbridgeable. Barred may be seen as an effort to bridge the gap, an effort which was successful because of the cooperation that took place on both sides. De Nève thanked Rhys for having been a "good guardian" to the "gloomy child" he had created out of the ruins of their marriage. Rhys took "much trouble" over his text, which she turned into a more effective, and also a less bitter narrative. Reading the three versions of Edward de Nève's counterpart to Quartet, one hears Jean Rhys and Jean Lenglet engaged in a long conversation about events still painful to them both, with Barred answering the charges made by Sous les verrous, and In de Strik offering the final gesture of reconciliation.

NOTES

1Postures, London, Chatto & Windus, 1928; Quartet in American and subsequent English editions. For the relationship between Rhys' life and her novels see Diana Athill's foreword to Jean Rhys' unfinished autobiography, Smile Please, London, Andre Deutsch, 1979, pp. 9-10. "All her writing, she used to say, started out from something that had happened. . . . truth to its essence was vital to the therapeutic function of the work as well as to its value to other people . . . ." Mrs. Maryvonne Moerman-Lenglet kindly permitted the following apt quotation from an unpublished letter Jean Rhys wrote to her in 1976: "As to the truth and the whole truth - it is very rare. And never one sided. A novel is not the truth . . . but there is a good deal of truth in writing - more than in the mean and prejudiced lies that so many believe."

2Rhys and Lenglet separated in 1924 and were divorced in 1932. Ford and Bowen parted company in 1927.

3Edward de Nève, Barred, London, Desmond Harmsworth, 1932; Ford Madox Ford, When the Wicked Man, New York, Horace Liveright, 1931 and Stella Bowen, Drawn from Life, London, Collins, 1940 (revised ed. Maidstone, George Mann, 1974). Of these texts, only Bowen's claims to be strictly factual. In his preface to Barred, de Nève characterized his novel as "here and there . . . a photograph, not a work of the imagination." In Ford's fictional account, Rhys is vulgarized as a drunken Creole journalist whose husband has committed suicide. Marya, in Quartet, is much less creative and talented than Rhys herself was - the same applies to de Nève's Stania. None of Rhys' heroines are writers - a conspicuous omission often overlooked by those who like to read her work as pure autobiography.


8Foreword to Smile Please, op. cit., p. 15. This is corroborated by what Rhys
wrote to Wyndham: "I'm afraid I did leave out some of his (Lenglet's) bitter remarks about me but left some in. (The same went for the nice ones.)" (Ibid., p. 283). A comparison of Barred and Sous les verrous yields no examples of the latter part of this statement.

This is a rough estimate, which does not take into account the words and phrases Rhys eliminated in the process of rewriting numerous passages from Sous les verrous, a process which also necessitated the addition of other words and phrases.

In de Nève's English preface he expressed his admiration for Rhys' "beautiful work."

In her letter to Francis Wyndham, op. cit., Rhys wrote: "... it's oddly comforting that you saw something of my writing in it [Barred]. . ."

See, for instance, Sous les verrous, pp. 136-37 and 149, Barred, pp. 135-36 and 148-49; In de Strik, pp. 116-17 and 128. Unless otherwise indicated, of all subsequent page-references, the first will refer to the French, the second to the English, and the third to the Dutch edition of de Nève's novel. It may be tacitly assumed that the Dutch version follows Rhys' translation: exceptions will be explicitly stated. The examples given are to be considered as representative and in no way exhaustive.

Cf. Sous les verrous, p. 51, Barred, p. 53 and In de Strik, p. 46. As we learn from Lenglet's preface to the French edition, it was passages like these that caused the long delay of his novel's publication in France. In a response to this article, his daughter stressed social indictment as the book's main theme: "... a protest against a system moulded into the form of a novel in which some events corresponded with Ed. de Nève's own experiences. That protest was the reason why Stock would not risk publication, capitulating only after the book appeared in Holland and England." (Letter, 11th August, 1984, translation M. Kappers).

Cf. Sous les verrous, pp. 22-26, 37 and 41, Barred, pp. 21-25, 37 and 42, and In de Strik, pp. 18-22, 33 and 37.

Compare, for instance, the endings of Chapter I and the beginnings of Chapter II in the three editions.

Pp. 59, 62, 53. The context shows the original version to be correct. The same applies to pp. 107, 108, 93, where "soupe froide," rendered as "soup," is corrected again in Dutch. In Barred, p. 51, Rhys appears to have missed de Nève's irony when she omitted his quotation-marks in "salle de danse" (for place of third degree police-interrogation, p. 49). The quotation-marks reappear in Dutch (p. 44). Or are all these printer's errors?

Woolf's phrase applies to the interference of a male point of view in the works of nineteenth-century women novelists. See A Room of One's Own, London, The Hogarth Press, 1929, p. 111.

By her removal of Mme. Hübner, Rhys changed the plot but did not improve the narrative; in this one instance, she may be said to have acted not as a "good" but as a "bad" godmother to the manuscript she had "adopted."
It is, of course, intriguing that Rhys, some ten years after the events fictionalized by de Nèze, removed all traces of Stella Bowen’s role in them. Her portrait of Lois Heidler in the earlier Quartet is as merciless as de Nèze’s picture of Mme. Hübner in Sous les verrous. It is tempting to speculate, as does Delany, op. cit., p. 21, that Rhys may have had second thoughts about Bowen’s guilt for what had happened, especially after Ford had discarded her. Francis Wyndham, in a reaction to the first draft of the present article, disagreed: “I think that Jean was anxious to help Jean Lenglet (whom she also felt she had wronged) without compounding the offence against the others. I do not think she altered in her attitude towards Stella ...” (Letter, June 28th, 1984). Another comment came from Harold Beaver of the University of Amsterdam, who suggested a possible parallel with Scott Fitzgerald’s handling of his wife Zelda’s Save Me the Waltz, pointing out that in reshaping Lenglet’s plot, Rhys made quite sure that Sous les verrous did not sail too close for comfort to her own fictionalized version, “and then (maybe rather guiltily) did her best to improve the MS by every other means” (Letter, April 9th, 1984). If this is the case, it is odd that the changes Rhys introduced in the characters of both Stania and Hübner make them resemble Marya and Heidler of Quartet more, not less, than they did in the original French version.

See Stella Bowen, op. cit., pp. 165 and 167: “In order to keep his [Ford’s] machinery running, he requires to exercise his sentimental talents from time to time upon a new object ... female devotion is always a drug on the market!” She adds: “I simply hated my role!”

Pp. 94, 95, 82. The passage includes remarks, also cut, about Hübner abusing “[le] prestige que sa situation d’artiste-peintre et critique d’art connu lui confrère. Il en profite pour cultiver les caprices spéciaux.” Rhys eliminated similar innuendo about the Hübners’ social circle: “c’est pour l’art que tous ces gens prétendent vivre, c’est en son nom qu’ils se permettent les pires débauches” (pp. 162, 162, 139). In his letter, op. cit., Francis Wyndham commented on her protection of Ford’s image that Rhys did eventually alter in her attitude towards him, “but probably not until some time later.”

See pp. 190-96, 187-93, 161-66; and 124, 127, 119. “Canaille” (pp. 141, 140, 121) was watered down to “beautiful fellow.”

Pp. 141, 140, 120. The adjective “ennuyée,” when applied to Stania, is consistently translated as “worried,” or scrapped altogether. In de Strik retains the note of annoyance, with Dutch “verveeld” or “bits” (pp. 245, 245, 209).

Pp. 151, 150-51, 130. The Dutch version sticks to the original French.

At a conference on Commonwealth literature in January 1985, held at the Free University in Amsterdam, the suggestion was made that Lenglet may have preferred to work from the English rather than the original French edition for purely commercial reasons: Based was doing fairly well in England, and a Dutch translation based on Rhys’ version might hope for the same success. If this is so, the commercial aspect does not seem to have had sufficient weight with Lenglet to induce him to rewrite the already finished manuscript, Sous les verrous, for the French market.
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JEAN RHYS AND MODERNISM: A DIFFERENT VOICE

Veronica Marie Gregg

Surviving fragments about the life of Jean Rhys reveal surprisingly little about that life. But despite the limited number of hard facts available, or perhaps because of it, critical perspectives on the Jean Rhys oeuvre are based extensively on biographical commentary which uses her fictional creations as self-portraits, designating as intuitive, original or peculiarly her own the form and style of her craft. One consistent feature of much of the criticism is the obliteration of the dividing line between the author and the critics' interpretation of her characters and themes. Her work is seen as minor, narrow, personal, sordid even, with little connection to anything outside of itself and the author's reality. A characteristic viewpoint is expressed by Elgin Mellown in his *Jean Rhys: A Descriptive and Annotated Bibliography of Works and Criticism*:

There is no need to make extravagant claims for the novelist: her limited output and the circumstances of her publication kept her from being an influence upon other writers in her lifetime, and her technique, so carefully crafted to express the sensibilities of women of her time, may not be of great value to writers of a later generation. But the unconquerable human spirit which informs all of her work cannot date, and one knows that readers and writers of the future, whether male or female, will continue to appreciate her expression of the feelings and longings of the isolated individual. Jean Rhys may be a minor figure in relation to the literary giants of the twentieth century, but within her own area she is an artist without peer.¹

The view of an artist's work as a product to be measured in terms of itself is one which is challenged by one of the undisputed "literary giants of the twentieth century," T.S. Eliot:

No poet, no artist of any art has [sic] complete meaning alone. His significance, his appreciation is the appreciation of his relations to the dead poets and artists. You cannot value him alone, you must set him for contrast and comparison among the dead. I mean this as a principle of aesthetic not merely historical criticism. [W]hat happens when a new work of art is created is something that happens simultaneously to all works of art which preceded it.²