Narrating multiple selves:  
The ‘double’ first person in the work of Giorgio Pressburger

There are two related aspects to Giorgio Pressburger’s work which make him an especially interesting case to look at within the field of first person narrative. The first is that he wrote his earliest publications together with his twin brother, Nicola, thus making explicit the fact that the writing of the self – especially when shared between two voices – is always subject to complex processes of negotiation. The implications of this uncertain “I” seem also to have permeated Pressburger’s later works, however, which were written after his brother’s death, and where the narrating first person now enacts and seeks to resolve the fragmentation of this partial loss of self. Secondly, all of Pressburger’s works are written in Italian, which is not his mother tongue language, allowing him to make use of the multiple aspects of that ‘double perspective’ experienced by so many migrant writers (cf. Rushdie 1991). Indeed, as Miletic says, ‘It is not surprising that the theme of the doubles appears frequently in immigrants’ writing; it can be considered a fitting means of visualizing the troubled and sometimes split identity of those who treat two different languages as their mother tongues.’ (2000: 235) The Pressburger twins were born in Budapest in 1937, but left their country of origin as part of the mass migration of over 200,000 Hungarians in the aftermath of the Russian suppression of the 1956 uprising to settle in Italy. Thus I will also explore the ramifications for the representation and expression of the speaking “I” when the self is written in a language not originally one’s own.

The first narrative work that the Pressburger twins wrote was Storie dell’Ottavo Distretto, a collection of short stories about the Jewish community in Budapest, published in 1986. In an interview that Pressburger gave to Laura Lepschy, which has recently been published in its English version (Lepschy 2012), he discusses at length how the twins devised and divided the writing of the work. Giorgio explains how he had already worked out a general plan and written two of the twelve stories when Nicola became seriously ill. At that stage, Giorgio proposed that they write the volume together, to distract his brother from his suffering and also to ensure that he left a written legacy in the world. They then divided up the stories to be written between them, Nicola also adding new ones, but both choosing a specific and different literary model: Nicola, the prose of Austrian author Peter Handke, Giorgio, the poetic voice of Triestine Umberto Saba.

Their conversations about the volume, in keeping with their general model of communication, Pressburger reports, were held in Italian, not Hungarian. They would meet every two weeks and swap manuscripts, later commenting on and annotating each other’s work. Despite the difference in literary models, and the diversity of their own formations, it is remarkable how unified the style of the stories is. Indeed, Pressburger himself states that he gave the manuscript to fellow author Claudio Magris to read, and he was not able to tell which twin had written which.¹ Indeed,

¹ This is similar to an incident described in a later novel written by Pressburger, I due gemelli: ‘La grafia di tutte (le lettere) era quasi uguale, per cui sulle prime non fui in grado di distinguere quali dei
Joachim Jung cites this ability to create a sort of seamless ‘mono-dialogue’ between narrating voices as one of the most crucial to literary partnerships: ‘The prime features of twin authors are perfect harmony in style and thinking, and mutual calculability. One partner must know the other to the extent that he can guess what the other would think in a given situation.’ (1998: 244) But in the case of real twins, this ability to slide into each other’s identities also seems to open the possibility of playing with notions of authorship and narrative reliability, as we will go on to see.

* 

Storie dell’Ottavo Distretto contains quite a few instances of German, Yiddish, and Hebrew words and phrases (with Italian translations in notes at the bottom of the pages), something that is significant because this element of multilingualism becomes less explicit in Pressburger’s later, solo works, only to reappear in his most recent publication Nel regno oscuro. However, despite the presence of other languages, and the narrative setting of Budapest, there is no inclusion of Hungarian words within Storie dell’Ottavo Distretto, and indeed, the exclusion of the mother tongue is notable in all Pressburger’s work. The author often declares himself to be fascinated by the phenomenon of non mother tongue writers, stating that he found writing in Italian to be an advantage when tackling sometimes painful memories pertaining to his own childhood, which he has described as being ‘indicibile nella lingua materna’ [unspeakable in the mother tongue], because the foreign idiom afforded a greater distance and objectivity to the treatment of the subject matter. This is an opinion that in his interview with Lepschy mentioned above, he claims to have shared with his brother Nicola, and can be explained in psychoanalytic as well as cultural terms. For Daniel Gunn has shown how because of its proximity to childhood memories, the mother tongue ‘represents the site of maximum desire and therefore of maximum danger and suffering’ (1988: 99) and Ralph Greenson adds that it is ‘the bearer of important unresolved conflicts’, with subsequently learned languages offering the opportunity to ‘build up a new defensive system against past infantile lives’.

2 Indeed, it is also interesting to see how the foreign insertions were dealt with in the English translation of Storie dell’Ottavo Distretto – often these are simply translated into English (so “Nicht vor dem Kind!” (1986: 11) becomes “Not in front of the children!” on p. 8 of Gerald Moore’s translation (1990). At other times the foreign language phrase was left in italics in the original, and directly followed by the English translation within the main body of the text (“Ho lile welas! God forbid”, 1990: 58). The one example left as it is in the original is the amusing phonetic renditions of a foreign accent in English (“Vo duju vant to iit”; “Hau mach mani?”, 1986: 55), maintained, in italics, in the translation (1990: 66).

3 ‘La lingua come confine ovvero ‘apprendistato per una metamorfosi’. Unpublished lecture given by Giorgio Pressburger at Christ Church, Oxford, 8th March 2005.

4 Greenson 1978: 38. Greenson also describes suggesting to a patient that she speak in German, her mother tongue, to which she replied, “I am afraid. I don’t want to talk German, I have the feeling that talking in German I shall have to remember something I wanted to forget […] In German I am a scared, dirty child; in English, I am a nervous, refined woman.” (1978: 34).
After Storie dell’Ottavo Distretto failed initially to find a publisher, the twins set about writing a novel, which would eventually become L’elefante verde (The Green Elephant, 1988), the story of the life of their father. Again, they divided the work into two parts, with Giorgio electing to write the first six chapters, and Nicola the second six. However, this plan was soon inverted, and the work underwent numerous revisions, not only because Nicola passed away after the first draft had been written, but also because they found that their ‘versions’ of their childhood were different, and that they placed very different emphasis on various events. This in turn obviously had long-reaching, creative implications for the construction of the narrative itself with each twin developing and revising the other’s memories and inserting his own into the fabric of the story.

There is another element of this first-person writing that I would like to pick up on regarding L’elefante verde, which relates to the prologue and epilogue that Giorgio says he added to the manuscript after Nicola’s death. This is the seemingly self-conscious consideration of the trope of first-person narrative itself, also in relation to the presence of two different ‘first-person’ narrators. The story opens with the following statement:

Il famoso pensatore Blaise Pascal proponeva di sconfiggere la cupidigia – il male peggiore dell’uomo – abolendo l’io. [...] Lui e i suoi amici, durante i loro incontri nel rigoroso ritiro di Port Royal, si sforzavano di non porsi mai come soggetto d’una frase. (Pressburger, G & N 1988: 7)

The famous thinker Blaise Pascal proposed that cupidity – man’s greatest sin – could be defeated by abolishing the ego. In the course of their ascetic retreats at Port Royal, he and his friends would go to great lengths to construct sentences which avoided the use of the word “I”. (Pressburger, G & N 1994: i)

The narrator then goes on to frame the story as: ‘(un)a storia che due amici mi hanno pregato di scrivere per loro basando il racconto parte su miei ricordi personali, parte sulle loro “confessioni” fatte in tempi e luoghi diversi.’ (Pressburger G & N 1988: 7) ‘[(A) story.’ which two friends of mine asked me to write for them, based in part on my own personal memories, and in part on their “confessions”, made to me at various times and places.’ (Pressburger G & N 1994: i)

Yet one of the twins takes over the writing of the story towards the end of the narrative, and though his identity is revealed in the final pages of the novel, it is upturned once again in the epilogue. The ambiguous nature of this shared identity was also prefigured in an earlier incident where the father of the twins is unable to tell which drawer in a locked piece of furniture belongs to which son, and when he finds various pieces of writing there he cannot make sense of whom has written which.

Quale fosse il cassetto di Beniamino quale quello di Samuele, non era mai riuscito a indovinare [...] (L’)alleanza dei due figli impediva di vedere fino in fondo alle loro anime, capire quali fossero i veri sentimenti di ciascuno e quali fossero soltanto i riflessi di ciò che l’altro pensava o suggeriva.’ (Pressburger G & N 1988: 73)

He never did find out which was Benjamin’s drawer and which was Samuel’s [...] (H)is sons’ complicity prevented him seeing into the depth of their souls and understanding which were their real feelings and which were simply reflections of what the other thought or suggested.’ (Pressburger G & N 1994: 90).
Beniamino is initially presented as the actor (thus resembling the real-life Giorgio), and Samuele, the banker (Nicola), until over a symbolic game of chess, the twins reveal that contrary to their father’s wishes it is Beniamino who is the banker, and Samuele the actor. After this revelation, the previously third person narrative suddenly shifts to first person. The twin who writes this part (and confirms having asked the elderly local acquaintance to write the main body of the text) is seemingly Samuele the actor, who tells of his anguished search for his own existence, the existence of the speaking “I”. He writes of losing himself in a crisis of interpretation, hiding behind the various masks and costumes of his profession (exclaiming at one point: “Non chiamatemi così! Io non sono Samuele!” (Pressburger G & N 1988: 86) [“Don’t call me that! I am not Samuele!”] (Pressburger G & N 1994: 108), and ultimately goes as far as to seek plastic surgery to definitively ‘lose’ his own identity.

However, in the epilogue, there is a final twist: ‘Un’ultima cosa. Non voglio mentire. L’autoritratto di mio fratello Samuele, l’ho scritto io, Beniamino.’ (Pressburger G & N 1988: 89) [‘One last thing. I must be truthful. The last chapter, the self-portrait of my brother Samuel, was written by me, Benjamin.’] (Pressburger G & N 1994: 113). The uncertainty that this constant shift in narrative person brings about is very similar to that contained in a trilogy written by a fellow Hungarian and contemporary born writer who also fled the country in 1956, Agota Kristof. Kristof writes through the device of identical twin narrators (using “we” in the first novel, Le grand cahier (1986), “he” in the second, La preuve (1988), and “I” in Le Troisième Mensonge (1991)) though even the “I” employed in the third novel shifts between the two protagonist-narrators, exposing the falsities of the narrative in a destabilizing dialectic. We are never sure which twin is writing, and which stories are true. ‘Des mensonges […] Des choses inventées. Des histoires qui ne sont pas vraies, mais qui pourraient l’être’ (Kristof 1991: 84) [Lies […] Made-up things. Stories that aren’t true but might be] (Kristof 1997: 410) is how one twin defines the manuscript, while the other confesses:

Ce que j’écris n’a aucune importance […] J’essaie de raconter mon histoire, mais je ne peux pas, je n’en ai pas le courage, elle me fait trop mal. Alors, j’embellis tout et je décrits les choses non comme elles se sont passées, mais comme j’aurais voulu qu’elles se soient passées. (Kristof 1991: 14)

What I write is absolutely meaningless […] I try to tell my story but all of a sudden I can’t – I don’t have the courage, it hurts too much. And so I embellish everything and describe things not as they happened but the way I wish they had happened. (Kristof 1997: 345)

In Kristof’s case it has been suggested that this trope of double, self-reflexive writing serves to illustrate the parable of European history, which is destabilized and rewritten following each conflict it endures (cf. Kuhlman 2003). However it is also true that the continual ‘self-consuming’ pattern of rewriting enacted in the trilogy by the twins’ conflicting accounts in some ways mimics the trauma of the migration experience and the difficulty of expressing that experience in a foreign tongue: ‘As an immigrant writer, Kristof can only remain true to her subject-matter and communicate it to her audience by representing that experience as opaque, incomprehensible and undergoing a constant reappraisal and metamorphosis.’ (Miletic 2000: 260) Yet in Pressburger’s case, the use of the ‘double’ first person in L’elefante verde seems also to be preoccupied with a more personal quest for identity. On closer inspection, the
prologue is signed with an amalgamation of both the twins’ initials: G.N. (Giorgio / Nicola). For perhaps the truth here is that each twin does not write himself, but the other, and the (double) narrative ‘a quattro mani’ is the only solution capable of expressing an identity which is shared between two people.

**

However, even in his later works, written after Nicola’s death, Pressburger returns to the device of a destabilizing narrating “I”. In his 1989 collection of short stories, *La legge degli spazi bianchi*, Pressburger posits himself as the transcriber of the five tales to follow – two of which are written in the first person, three in the third (and he signs the preface ‘G.P’). But he also adds footnotes and bibliographic references to the stories themselves (in anticipation of the much more extreme case of note-making which we will look at in more detail in regard to *Nel regno oscuro*), and even enters the stories told in the third person as an omniscient narrator able to cast doubt on the protagonist’s affirmations and consequently to discredit them. For example, in the central story of the volume, ‘Vera’, it is claimed that the personal notes and diaries of the protagonist Dr. Friedmann were donated to a professor by Friedmann’s wife after his death, and were eventually passed on to the narrator of the current volume. Friedmann’s note-taking is explicitly referred to throughout the story, and is also commented on and contested by the narrator, putting the reliability of the notes taken, and the value of the material they contain, into question: ‘Il dottor Friedmann, usando queste parole da lui stesso scrupolosamente annotate – o fu la memoria a trasformarle? – cedette all’impulso di allargare sempre di più il significato e l’interpretazione dei fatti.’ (Pressburger 1989: 59) [‘Speaking these words – which he later scrupulously noted down (or had they been altered by his memory?) – Doctor Friedmann gave way to the temptation to attribute ever widening significance to his interpretation of the facts.’] (Pressburger 1990: 89)

In a collection mainly preoccupied with positing death and disease as a measure of the human against the divine and the eternal, Pressburger is thus also concerned once again with an exploration of the limitations and unreliability of language and hence also of narration itself. In ‘Vera’, for example, the aphasic illness suffered by the child-patient, as well as the loss of speech-memory which affects the doctor-protagonist Fleischmann in the eponymous story ‘La legge degli spazi bianchi’ work to cause a rupture in language’s perceived ability to denote identity, and a subsequent displacement of meaning into the blank realm of silence. ‘Tutto è scritto negli spazi bianchi tra una lettera e l’altra. Il resto non conta.’ (Pressburger 1989: 24) [‘Everything is written in the spaces between one letter and the next. The rest doesn’t count.’ Pressburger 1990: 38] This insistence on the ambiguity of language itself, coupled with the shifting of the narrative voice from first to third person, and the presence of a double-edged voice which simultaneously reports and casts doubts on the facts narrated, seems to continue the trope of a ‘double’ narration in Pressburger’s work even when the author is no longer part of a pair writing.

Another interesting aspect, which was touched upon earlier, is how in this collection any previous presence of ‘foreign’ words or phrases has been scrupulously removed – Pressburger going even as far as to translate road names in Budapest into Italian: ‘via dei Grandi Trasporti’, ‘via dell’Albero d’Acacia’, to name but two.\(^5\) But it

\(^5\) Indeed, Pressburger comments on this example himself as part of a deliberate narrative strategy: ‘in un volumetto di racconti che si chiama *La legge degli spazi bianchi* si parla di una via di Budapest che si chiama ‘Via dei Grandi Trasporti’ e, tradotto in italiano alla lettera, il nome di quella via, ‘Via dei
is striking how he creates a markedly foreign topology with these place names, and
populates them with characters with explicitly Jewish names— as if to reveal the traces
of his central European heritage hidden under the polished surface of his Italian.
Discussing Derrida’s ‘Monolingualism of the Other’, Gentzler says: ‘(m)onolingual
cultures always carry with them their silent, deferred twin, the multilingualism of the
other, as well as that ongoing process of translation that occurs beneath the surface.’
(2006: 106) Indeed, this multilingual aspect to Pressburger’s work becomes much
more explicit in *Nel regno oscuro* (2008), which becomes akin to a choral resistance
to assimilation, using multiple languages to ‘evade, expand, enrich and diversify
existing codes of signification.’ (Gentzler 2006: 121)

***

*Nel regno oscuro*, Pressburger’s most recently published novel, is a highly
personal re-writing of Dante’s *Inferno*, in which Freud replaces Virgil as the
protagonist’s guide on a journey into the darkest moments of twentieth century
history, which is specifically positioned as a memorial to Shoah victims. Since
Pressburger takes Dante as his foremost literary model, it is also important to see how
the combined narration of the personal and the collective relates back to the trope of
subjectivity in *La Divina Commedia*. As Manuele Gragnolati writes, the *Divina
Commedia* stands at the crossroads of a typically ‘medieval’ concept of the self as
exemplary and archetypal, and a more modern sense of individuality and subjectivity:

(As) is already made clear in the first two lines of the poem – ‘Nel mezzo
del cammin di nostra vita, mi ritrovai in una selva oscura’ (‘Midway along
the journey of our life, I woke to find myself in a dark wood’, Inf. I, 1-2) –
the dialectic between the collective ‘nostra’ (‘our’) and the individual ‘mi’
(‘I’) expresses well the sense that Dante-pilgrim’s journey from the misery
of hell to the glory of heaven holds both an allegorical value that is valid
for all humankind and a specific value that refers to the historical and
personal case of Dante Alighieri. (Gragnolati 2010: 236)

And indeed in *Nel regno oscuro* Pressburger constantly fuses the telling of his own
individual trauma with that of the macro history of the twentieth century,
as is stated in one of the notes to the narrative: ‘Con molta probabilità (l’autore) tenta invece di
elevare quelle vicende a rango di mito, come lo sono spess
o vita e morte dei propri familiari.’ (Pressburger 2008: 250) [It is very likely that the author is trying to elevate
such matters to the status of myth, as often happens with the lives and deaths of one’s
own relatives.] 6 (My translation)

There are several other specific aspects of the narrating voice that I would like
to focus on within *Nel regno oscuro*: the difficulties in narrating one’s own trauma,
both on an individual and a collective level; the use within the narrative of

---

6 As Dominick LaCapra has commented: ‘One’s bond with the dead, especially with dead intimates,
may invest trauma with value and make its reliving a painful but necessary commemoration or
memorial to which one remains dedicated or at least bound. This situation may create a more or less
unconscious desire to remain within trauma.’ LaCapra 2001: 22.
psychoanalysis and of Freud as a guide (particularly as the analyst-guide is also given the use of the first person in his narration of the actions and reactions of the patient in moments of extreme emotion); how the first-person narrative achieves a multilingual chorality; and how the narrative itself is split once again along double lines – this time into text and meta-text in the extensive use of endnotes within the volume.

Trying to communicate and transfer a sense of one’s own trauma has inevitable consequences for the narrative one is telling, as writing itself involves processes of remembering, repeating and working through which can colour and shape the story being told. As LaCapra reminds us: ‘It may involve distortion, disguise, and other permutations relating to processes of imaginative transformation and narrative shaping, as well as perhaps repression, denial, dissociation, and foreclosure.’ (LaCapra 2001: 88) Pressburger very much posits himself as a ‘patient’ in need of the support (and often the medication) provided by Freud the guide, as well as the narrator, subtly playing with the reader’s perceptions of the authority of his position as author. Furthermore, the encounters that take place within Nel regno oscuro are indeed striking in their subjectivity. The characters, their speeches, and versions of events combine to form a ‘rewriting’ of the twentieth century which reflects Pressburger’s own interpretations and perspective on history. However, Pressburger has also remarked on how the very writing of the book helped him to overcome longstanding personal trauma – and particularly to come to peace with his horror of suicide (which in the volume leads the narrator to voice a very emotional invective against Primo Levi) which stems from tragic events in his own childhood (Cf. Bond, Gragnolati & Lepschy 2010: 262). Thus the personal re-writing of trauma leads to a therapeutic model for the first person narrative, which is facilitated by its psychoanalytical framework.

The volume follows the very structure of analytic sessions, by leading the reader through a circular pattern of free association which constantly revolves around the same images and thus attempts to convey the way in which the unconscious works: for example, in Chapter Four, the narrator sees a rose, ‘which for him, carries associations ranging from a line in an operetta by Emmerich Kalman (Die Bajadere) to his wet nurse Rosa, to Umberto Eco’s Il nome della rosa, the poem ‘Rosa fresca auletissima’, Pasolini’s collection Poesia in forma di rosa, right up to the encounter with Rosa Luxemburg, who tells of her youth, ideals, and violent death’ (Gragnolati 2010: 241). But psychoanalysis also lends another important function to the telling of the narrative, by allowing the narrator to stage such encounters with dead people, and allowing these people to speak. Because these meetings are framed within the unconscious of the protagonist / narrator himself, and therefore take place within his own subjective fantasy, there is no conflict within the reader’s suspension of disbelief, and Pressburger himself is absolved from the need to place his journey through ‘hell’ in theological terms. Hell, for Pressburger, is a historical reality, and one which is absorbed into the self – thus, Nel regno oscuro is the portrait not just of a lacerated twentieth century, but also of a divided and damaged subjectivity which finds solace in the therapy of self-narration.

This division of the (narrating) “I” itself is manifested in two different ways within the volume. The first is evident – in staging the self-portrait of one’s own unconscious through a series of encounters, Pressburger allows a multitude of characters to take the speaking voice of “I”, which thus becomes choral, rather than individual. This also causes a huge shift in style for the author – from the clean and precise Italian of previous works, he moves towards employing a veritable babel of
different languages and dialects, even inventing words himself and playing with mis- or trans-pronunciations, and finally allowing the insertion of some veiled Hungarian into the multilingual narrative. As Pressburger himself states:

Ho anzi tentato un trucco, cioè da alcuni personaggi ho fatto pronunciare delle parole ungheresi come se fossero parole italiane, per esempio una signora anziana dice in questo libro ‘non mi piace questa herce-hurca’, che vuol dire questa confusione. (Bond, Gragnolati & Lepschy 2010: 258)

[Actually, I tried out a trick, by making some characters in the book pronounce Hungarian words as if they were Italian: for example, an elderly lady says, ‘I don’t like this herce-hurca’, which means this mess.] My translation.

In this way Pressburger seems to have found a way to express the multinational, multicultural and multilingual nature not only of his individual trajectory, but also of the historical situations experienced, thus successfully characterizing his own subjectivity as well as how he views a possible repository of the modern unconscious.

The second division inherent in the narration is found in the addition of seventy-four pages of accompanying notes to the volume, which function as a kind of meta-narrative – commenting on, anticipating, glossing, questioning, and sometimes even casting doubt on the narrating voice of the main text, and referring to it in the third person. For example, when the narrator tells Freud he does not know what the song he can hear is, a note is provided which states:

L’autore non rivela quale canzone sente cantare: non lo vuole rivelare perché è una questione troppo intima […]; oppure non sa davvero definire la melodia, il titolo, le parole, come qualche volta capita nei sogni? Capita spesso che l’autore parli di una cosa di cui non sa nulla, nemmeno il nome. (Pressburger 2008: 272)

[The author does not reveal the song he can hear: does he not want to reveal it because it’s too personal […] or does he really not know how to define the melody, the title, the words, as sometimes happens in dreams? The author often speaks of things he knows nothing about, not even their names.] My translation.

This technique seems to serve to both stabilize the narrative (by providing reference and background to the encounters), and to destabilize it, and in so doing, provides a further example of the ‘double’ voice that I have attempted to show is a constant feature of Pressburger’s writing. From his earliest works such as L’elefante verde, written together with his twin Nicola, where the true identity of the narrator is often uncertain, to the self-conscious, omniscient writing of La legge degli spazi bianchi which casts the reliability of language (and thus also the narrative in question) into doubt, to finally the damaged, split subjectivity in search of solace presented in Nel

---

7 “Rohadt szarok, pendejos, marijones, furiferes trifuriferes inferni, baka-yaro, merdosi assassini, arschloche, mother fuckers, saloppes, cons, jop tvoje matj, jebem ti, la puta che ti pariò, stercorari, had-hajá, szájbabasztott dögök.” (Pressburger 2008: 188)

8 Indeed, when I asked Pressburger in an interview if the function of the notes was more to stabilize or destabilize the narrative, he replied that they were intended to perform both. Cf. Bond, Gragnolati & Lepschy 2010: 260.
*regno oscuro*, first person writing in the works of Giorgio Pressburger constantly calls into question what it truly means to narrate the self.
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