CROSS-REFERENCES

Modern French theory and the practice of criticism

edited by
David Kelley and Isabelle Llasera

CROSS-REFERENCES

**Modern French theory
and the practice of criticism**

**edited by
David Kelley and Isabelle Llasera**

Society for French Studies · 1986

Supplementary Publication No. 8

Intertextuality: to inter textuality or to resurrect it?

MICHAEL WORTON

To SPEAK of intertextuality is, must be possible. However, it is also to enter a minefield of warring definitions, for, since Kristeva introduced the term in her work on Bakhtine, critics and theorists have elaborated radically different interpretations of the term and, more importantly, of the concept. I do not intend to offer a historical analysis of the career of the notion,[1] but to draw both on French theories and on American misreadings of them in an attempt to explore further the usefulness for the reader of an awareness of the operability of intertextuality.

When Kristeva introduced the term, it was in the context of a general theory of textual productivity, and her idea of the text as a signifying practice and as a 'dispositif intertextuel' serves essentially to challenge the principle of the writing subject as unified and/or founding; hence her affirmation that intertextuality supplants intersubjectivity.[2] However, Kristeva herself recognizes later that the term may all too easily be used to designate (may be appropriated by) source criticism, and so she states a preference for the term 'transposition'.[3] The nature of Kristeva's theoretical project and perspectives makes inevitable her eschewal of the term, but it is precisely this refusal after 1974 to use the term that has opened up the critical field and permitted reinterpretations of the relationships between texts.

While very different, the theoretical and interpretative practices of Bloom and Riffaterre seem to me *creative* alternatives to Kristeva's theoretical position. Both insist — in highly idiosyncratic ways — upon the hermeneutic importance of locating and describing an act of origination. Bloom's theory is essentially genetic but, while he seeks to locate the individual precursor-text of which the later text is a strong and agonistic rewriting, his theory is radically opposed to French theories in that it is a theory of personal influence — he sees 'intra-poetic relationships as parallels of family romance'.[4] Riffaterre has most explicitly defined his project as the exploration of intertextuality, and when he elaborates his own theory, it is in order to develop a semiotics of poetry that focuses on reading and on the readability of texts and that attempts to describe how readers interpret poems. Riffaterre's intertextual readings of individual poems are brilliant analyses, but they often depend upon erudition, on a vast knowledge of the literary canon. Consequently, his reading practice may be seen as somewhat elitist — and he himself frequently seems to be engaged in a Bloomian agonistic struggle with previous readers.

Located in the (antithetical) space between these different theories, each of which has greatly influenced my thinking and to which I owe important debts, the project of this paper is to examine the textual function of intertextual presupposition or, more precisely, to question how such presupposition exists functionally within texts.

It is axiomatic that all writers rewrite the work(s) of their predecessors. This rewriting is in many ways a generous expression of gratitude, but it is also a

function of (conscious and, more often, unconscious) aggression as the writer battles to demarcate and affirm his/her own creative space. Given the constraints of space, I cannot here elaborate a complete theory of intertextual referentiality (which would need to take into account such intertextual phenomena as quotation, plagiarism, etc.), and so I propose to focus on veiled, encoded rewritings of (reminiscences of) segments of anterior texts, taking my examples from the work of Michel Tournier whose novelistic and critical project is self-consciously grounded in an (ambiguous) fascination with intertextuality. Tournier is interesting, since he both writes intertextually, quoting from and referring to other texts, and offers (partial) readings of his texts — indeed, his critical essays are particularly appropriate for my purposes, for they have a value as a form of autobiography and also as paradigms of certain processes of reading.

Tournier's fascination with intertextuality is actualized in his first published novel *Vendredi ou les Limbes du Pacifique* which is a strategic and radical rewriting of Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*. As the novelist himself recognizes, his years of study at the *Musée de l'Homme* determined the nature of his reading of Defoe,[5] and he even refers to Lévi-Strauss as 'mon ancien *maître*' and, metaphorically, as a father.[6] The essay on *Vendredi* in *Le Vent paraclet* reveals that he misread Defoe's text in order to write a *prospective* novel which would correct the retrospective philosophy and politics which inform *Robinson Crusoe*. However, the desire to rewrite Defoe's novel should not be interpreted ('analysed') as wholly aggressive, in that there is no drive to destroy, to abolish, the object of rewriting. Rather, *Vendredi* functions within an economy of dependence (and of contestation) on (and with) *Robinson Crusoe* which must exist — and exist as read — if *Vendredi* is to generate in the reader creative speculation. *Vendredi* certainly subverts the historicity of *Robinson Crusoe*, but, while it is parasitic on the precursor-text, it entertains with it a *dialogic* relationship — it responds to, and distorts, *Robinson Crusoe* in order to suscitate a reinterpretation of cultural history and to present etiology as intertextual play.

When reading *Vendredi*, one is presented with an *obligatory* intertext (although there are many references to other — segmental — intertexts, notably the Bible). My intention here is, though, to explore the signifying and programmatic force of discrete (and sometimes obscured) references, and so I have elected to consider a particular episode from *Le Roi des Aulnes*. Convinced that no critical practice to date can measure the full operative role of influence, Tournier nonetheless reveals in *Le Vent Paraclet* (some of) the intertextual references which structure his novels and their reading. Tournier's own analyses of his novels are, however, not only descriptive, but also directive and even prescriptive; his comments may help the reader to decode his novels — but only in the way he desires. We therefore find the presentation (by a writer) of a conscious awareness of the workings of intertextuality — but the *revealing* of certain (chosen) intertextual references serves (vainly . . .) to deny to the reader other possible references or evocations. A valuable document and an important, even an essential, Tournier text, *Le Vent paraclet* is to a certain extent a work of critical terrorism which seeks to protect, to defend the writer from the (free) incursions of the reader into the interpretative space proposed by the novel.

In *Le Vent paraclet*, Tournier reveals and articulates a Bloomian anxiety of influence: while recognizing that scriptural reminiscence is a form of furtive hommage, the protectively self-reading novelist affirms that a writer's admiration for a previous work of art is often accompanied by a sense of frustration, by a desperate illusion that the late-come writer himself/herself should have written it (see *LVP*, pp. 51–52). Such is the force of this illusion that the late-come writer chooses to rewrite *violently* the precursor-text, attempting to arrogate priority to his/her own text:[7] this priority cannot, of course, operate within a historical chronology, but may operate within an interpretative chronology, preceding and (over-) determining an adequate hermeneutic reading of the precursor-text. Tournier offers the example of a school-boy jousting game which, described near the beginning of *Le Roi des Aulnes*, is according to him a rewriting of a similar scene in *Le Grand Meaulnes* (see *LVP*, p. 52).[8] In the Alain-Fournier text, the scene is (apparently) episodic and anecdotal, whereas in the Tournier text it fulfils a thematic, *prophetic* role, prefiguring the dominant structuring theme of 'la phorie' (carrying). Tournier's interpretative exploration of the emotional and cultural importance of the act of carrying is itself grounded in a vast intertextual field ranging from Greek and Biblical texts through Montaigne's *Essais* to twentieth-century European novels, and his postulation of an intertextual relationship consequently effects a reinterpretation of *Le Grand Meaulnes*, investing it with a serious analytical function. Such a re-reading however inevitably de-centres Alain-Fournier's text and privileges episode over story. Furthermore, one cannot but wonder whether Tournier's rewriting is an innocent hermeneutic revelation of significance or an agonistic attempt to substitute one authority for another. The signifying practice of Tournier's text transposes and transgresses that of Alain-Fournier's and thereby demands a re-evaluation of the enunciative position in both novels — and ultimately in *Le Vent paraclet*. Tournier's form of intertextual unwrapping poses more problems than it resolves. When a writer indicates his/her creative manipulation of what Barthes calls the 'souvenir circulaire' of reading(s),[9] be it in a novel, an autobiographical or (meta) critical text or a journal, the reader is confronted by a blocking mechanism that restricts the free (and freely intertextual) reading of the text. The reader is in fact defined and determined by the self-reading writer, that is to say, the reader becomes or is presented strongly, influentially, as a projection of the writing subject. Tournier dares even to go so far, in *Le Vent paraclet*, as to define the readerly process as a form of *self-hagiography*, projecting onto the reader his own narcissistic impulses (*LVP*, p. 220). While it is undeniable that all reading is, to a greater or lesser extent, narcissistic,[10] Tournier's definition bears witness to a desire to *invent* the reader, to create an idealized image of himself, and it suggests that the writer-text-reader relationship is a closed circuit. Aggressed by the writer, the reader is trapped in a kind of double bind and, rendered sterile and impotent by the explicit intertextual directive, remains blocked (metaphorically) between life and death.

Kristeva has defined reading as aggressive participation, as an active appropriation of the Other, and writing as the productive form of reading, as a work-process which tends towards complete participation and aggression.[11]

Kristeva's position here is comparable to that of Bloom, in that both recognize the aggressive nature of writing — and it is pertinent to recall Lacan's affirmation that aggression is the correlative of narcissistic identification.[12] The violence which generates writing is a symptom of the urgent desire and need to establish priority, but the written text rewrites — as it is read — the problematics of textual signification and reference.

When Tournier offers a genetic source for his jousting scene, he may seem to be validating Riffaterre's assertion that 'la textualité a pour fondement l'intertextualité'.[13] However, it seems to me that this apparent aid to decoding is precisely a denial of the operative function of intertextuality and even of the text's power to signify. The reader, as presented in *Le Vent paraclet*, is a desiring projection of the novelist himself (who may unconsciously fear to read his own texts freely), and one might suggest that Tournier manipulates and exploits an intertextual phenomenon in order to annul or forestall the interpretative and (re)generative processes of reading. Once again we are faced with the writer's concern with priority: he wishes to engender, to have engendered, not only the text but also the reader — who is thereby denied an operative role.

The ex-posure of *Le Grand Meaulnes* as source is a (deluded) attempt to impose the fixity of his own text, to refuse connotational signification both to *Le Roi des Aulnes* and to *Le Grand Meaulnes*, and to prevent the reader from yielding to the disquieting and disruptive signifying operations of intertextuality which Jenny has aptly described as 'une machine perturbante'.[14] When one (re)reads the jousting scene in *Le Roi des Aulnes* after having read Tournier's critical remarks, one inevitably remembers (or learns!) Alain-Fournier's text, but other intertextual references enter functionally into the ludic play which is the work of reading — and the remembering of other utterances in other texts serves to neutralize partially the imposed reminiscence. Tournier's project in *Le Vent paraclet*, paradigmatic perhaps of the self-protective and authorizing mechanisms of all writers aware of the liberating function for the reader of intertextuality, is to negate the play of semiotic forces that, operative in/for the act of reading, permit an interpretative movement from denotation to connotation, that is to say a movement from reductive meaning(s) to semiotic expansion.

Tournier's explicit revelation of a source may help the reader to understand his intentional and pre-textual agonistic drives, but it also blocks a free intertextual reading of the text, in that the enunciative position of the writer is privileged over the signifying potential of the text, that is to say, the (pleasurable) excess of textual signification is denied — and denied to both the late-come text and the precursor-text.

However, a free (and itself potentially agonistic) reading of Tournier's novel discovers a network of intertextual resonances that Tournier does not mention, that he may unconsciously have suppressed. For instance, Nestor, who fulfils a carrying role analogous to that of Meaulnes, meditates before entering the fray, affirming: 'Une cour de récréation [. . .] c'est un espace clos qui laisse assez de jeu pour autoriser les jeux. Ce jeu est la page blanche où les jeux viennent s'inscrire comme autant de signes qui restent à déchiffrer'. This speculation upon the meaningfulness (or meaninglessness) of game and games inscribes into

the text a subversion of the notion of locatable meaning and thereby serves to challenge the binary intertextual relationship proposed in *Le Vent paraclet*. What seems to me significant is not only that this segment questions the locatatibility and fixity of meaning but also that it 'authorizes' ludic play as constituent of signification and posits the closed space of the game (of the text) as a blank page where signs may be inscribed. Every individual intertextual reading of this passage is necessarily aleatory, is a function of past (chance) readings, in that the text does not depend upon any 'obligatory intertextuality'.[15] However, the self-reflexivity which subverts both the linear narrative and Tournier's commentary none the less calls for an intertextual speculation because of the *incompleteness* of Nestor's meditation and because of the equation formulated between games and (blank) pages — or texts. As Butor has suggested, critical activity consists of considering all works as incomplete, as unfinished,[16] and the act of completion that is reading necessarily involves a productive manipulation of the intertext — which itself has an operative value. This intertext cannot be fully described or located, but it undoubtedly has a signifying function: as Riffaterre has recently affirmed, intertextuality is the conflict between the text and the intertext.[17] However, when the intertext is localized as one single text, the conflict is reduced to a binary opposition which may certainly reveal an anxiety of influence and a drive to establish priority, but which inters or annuls the full semiotic productivity of the text, substituting for the textuality of the text a genetic conflict in which each utterance is read only as a transformation of an anterior and locatable utterance. Intertextuality is more than this, though; it is an *intertextual semiotics*.[18] In his definition of the functioning of intertextuality, Riffaterre has recourse to Peirce's concept of the interpretant or criterion of relevance. Riffaterre convincingly asserts that in order for intertextuality to function and for the text to assume its textuality, the reading from the text to the intertext (and back) must pass by the interpretant which 'translates the text's surface signs and explains what the text suggests'.[19]

In the textual segment of *Le Roi des Aulnes* under consideration, the equivalence explicitly established between game and blank page would seem to be the interpretant that generates the significance of the segment — and of the novel itself. The game is posited as having a meaning or meanings which cannot immediately (or perhaps ever) be grasped. The notion of the game as sign certainly challenges the anecdotal status of the game in *Le Grand Meaulnes*, but more importantly it contributes to the pattern of overdetermining utterances and events in *Le Roi des Aulnes* which privilege prophetic relationships over cause-effect relationships. Throughout Tournier's novel, there is a meditation on the problem of interpretability — indeed, on one level, the novel may be defined as a semiotic response to Claudel's religious and metaphysical project of seeking an answer to the question 'Qu'est-ce que cela veut dire?'. It is, however, this obsessive questioning of the meaning of signs that denies the validity of Tournier's revelation of a (manipulated, manipulable) source in *Le Grand Meaulnes*, since the jousting passage and the entire novel *Le Roi des Aulnes* interrogate how — and whether — signs signify. I would go so far as to suggest that the intertextual reference postulated by Tournier does not re-determine Alain-Fournier's text, but serves rather to underline the blindness to the

significance of signs that is an essential and semantically constitutive element of *Le Grand Meaulnes*. Tournier's admission of an (apparent/possible . . .) intertextual relationship may thus be seen to deny conflict and consequently intertextuality, and paradoxically to re-affirm the textuality of *Le Grand Meaulnes*. The act of specifying the/a precursor-text is in itself an act of blindness in that the novelist has not recognized (or perhaps refuses to recognize) the signifying nature of his own text: when acting as his own reader, Tournier presents himself as the addressee of his text, arrogating to himself not only the right but also the ability to decode his text. Tournier's commentary on his novel, his self-reading, is a function of protective splitting whereby the novelist becomes his own interpreter in order to guard against the inopportune irruption of the reading Other into the (willed) closure of the text.[20] It would seem, though, that he reads reductively, privileging theme over text and thereby offering a genetic reading which cannot, which *will* not, account for intertextual signifying processes.

Any intertextual reading must focus on textual utterances, not on themes which, given the nature of the cultural and social continuum, are necessarily shared by various writers and readers. For this reason, it seems to me that Tournier's self-proclaimed pre-occupation with the readability of his texts is misplaced, in that he believes (in *Le Vent paraclet*, at least) that thematic familiarity and accessibility are sufficient guarantees of the communicative value and function of his texts. Comparing himself to Gide who stated that he wrote to be read a second time, he affirms: 'J'écris moi aussi pour être relu, mais, moins exigeant que Gide, je ne demande qu'une seule lecture. Mes livres doivent être reconnus — relus — dès la première lecture' (*LVP*, p. 184). The experience of reading *Le Roi des Aulnes* may indeed, on one level, be that of re-encountering certain mythic and psychic structures, but one also confronts a text which 'says other'. The textually explicit definition of games as signs posits not only games but also all narrative events (of which the game is paradigmatic) as signs, that is to say, the text articulates and enacts a subversion of the mimetic illusion, postulating fictional happenings as markers of textuality. The inscription into the textual web of the fictionality of novelistic discourse, itself intertextually determined by, for example, Stendhal's use of parenthetic questioning of the 'reality' of his characters in *Le Rouge et le Noir*, draws the hermeneutic reader's attention away from event to text by the fact that it implicitly accepts the existence of autonomous semiotic systems or discourses *within which* any individual textual practice operates its processes of transformation.

Functioning as the interpretant of the textual segment, the game/page equivalence demands a speculation on the locatability of meaning, and the reader, surprised and halted in a heuristic reading by such an equivalence, focuses on the textual utterance, on individual textual signs, seeking justification (or meaning) in intertextual reminiscences rather than in intratextual logic. It is not possible to locate — or to impose — the intertext itself which is vast, but I would offer as an alternative (and possibly arbitrary) intertextual reference Mallarmé's meditations on the signifying power of white space, which have been rethought and rewritten by a succession of later writers.[21] In passing, I

would suggest that Tournier suppresses any memory of Mallarmé's texts within *Le Roi des Aulnes* and *Le Vent paraclet* because, unlike Alain-Fournier, Mallarmé is, in Bloomian terms, both a strong poet and a strong father: whereas the late-come Tournier can establish an interpretative priority over Alain-Fournier, this is not possible with Mallarmé. However, my main point is that the text's interrogation of meaningfulness is illocutionary, inscribing the reader/addressee within an economy of dialogue. In other words, the text, as it is articulated, presupposes a response from the reader who, by interrogating the text and the intertext, accords textuality to the sequence of textual signs.

Nestor's speculation, which is explicitly described as addressed to no-one (and which is therefore addressed to the reader) continues: 'Il faudrait voir ce qui se passerait si les murs se rapprochaient. Alors l'écriture se resserrerait. En serait-elle plus lisible?' (*LRA*, p. 76). The development and the maintenance of the metaphoric equivalence programme readerly speculation on the structural function of enigma within the text, since the metaphor is presented — and perceived/received — as itself enigmatic, and also functions as the model, as the primary actualization of the matrix-structure of the novel, i.e. the labyrinthine questioning of semiotic signification. However, what interests me most here is the explicit articulation of a question — which presupposes the ability to answer or not to answer — and this presupposition itself presupposes that the (unknown) reader, who alone can legitimize the textuality of the text, has *already read*, has already encountered analogous interrogative and illocutionary textual occurrences. Tournier's text as a signifying practice assumes or presupposes the existence of other discourses which it appropriates, be it in a confirmatory or a refutatory mode, and itself responds to the juridical force of anterior texts, to a force which calls up/for later, discrete textual interventions into the arena of textual politics.

Kristeva has convincingly asserted that every text is under the jurisdiction of other discourses which impose upon it a (semantic, signifying, intertextual . . .) universe, and that every text seeks to transform this universe.[22] This seems to me demonstrated by Tournier's text which is determined *as significant* more by the existence and the nature of Mallarméan interrogations of textuality than by any thematic comparison: his text seeks to rewrite, does rewrite, Mallarmé's evaluation of silence as signification. Each utterance in my chosen segment (and in the whole of the novel) functions within an economy of dialogue, but this economy is double: the reader responds, must respond to the text, and the text is actively engaged in a conflictual relationship with presupposed and presupposable texts. The already-read to which a text may refer and on which it depends for its textuality to function may be precise or vague for the reader (Tournier himself speaks of 'le déjà-lu-quelque-part'),[23] but it is never single.[24]

In *Le Vol du vampire*, Tournier revises radically his attitude towards the reader, moving from a conception to a perception and recognizing the alterity of the reader.[25] This change of position has altered his awareness of the functioning of literary texts and consequently has altered his mode of writing. The heightened self-consciousness which informs his most recent works has led to a change in the fabric of his texts: his own already-read is no longer veiled and

encoded, but is *encrypted*. This movement in Tournier's writing practice has implications for the reading of the later novels, in that the reader is confronted within these texts by textual expressions of melancholy and by the writing down/in/out of the fantasmatic phenomenon of incorporation.[26]

It seems to me that an understanding of the specific functioning of any of Tournier's texts is dependent on a recognition of the fact that the textual utterances are acts of presupposition and that the text has semantic value only when a generalized presupposition is perceived to be a dominant structuring force. The reader is 'given' Tournier's text which denies (explicitly and implicitly) its autonomy and so he/she seeks to reconstruct (some of) the discourses which operate functionally within the economy of presupposition, and by this exploratory and interpretative process he/she both accords textuality to the text and prepares its future signification as 'already-read'. The process of reading is necessarily an intertextual activity, the guarantee of signification, of textuality. By reading intertextually, one denies the fixity of the text and thereby resurrects it from the willed closure, from the tomb, of intention and denotation. One also discovers that the flotation of meaning is not a purely intratextual phenomenon; it is an economic and juridical process operated by the reader who, in his/her reading practice, may recognize genetic determination, but who also perceives — and assumes — the fact that the loss or, more precisely, the unlocatability, of reference is what revives the text.

I would therefore suggest that the concept of intertextuality is vital for any theory (and for any practice) of reading in that it denies the authoritative validity of genetic readings which seek to fix the text, like a spiked butterfly which the entomologist will dissect scientifically. Intertextual analysis is possible only if the reader accepts that such an analysis must be founded on the speculative creativity of ambiguity. There is no *knowing*, but there are different modes of understanding, of responding, of reading . . .

It is undeniably useful and valuable to know which texts a writer remembers and which texts he/she forgets — and indeed some of my current work on Tournier involves and is dependent upon reading his as yet unpublished notebooks and manuscripts which enable the critic not only to understand the nature of his writing practice and to locate what Mauron calls his 'mythe personnel',[27] but also to encounter — and in a juridical mode — his concept of what his/the novel is.

As a reader, it is though, perhaps more important to discover, or, rather, to speculate upon, what the text remembers and forgets. This readerly practice, a practice in that it is a continuous, active questing after knowledge, is the essence of the act of intertextual reading and operates in/with/against economies of dialogue and of specularity. This practice cannot but recognize that relationships between texts are presupposed — if indescribable, unlocatable — and that the perception of the signifying force of these relationships is constitutive of meaningfulness and ultimately of textuality. Textuality certainly seems to be definable as the textness of the text, but, like intertextuality, it seems also to be dependent upon conflictual or reinforcing relationships; and the text cannot assume its textuality without the intervention of the reader, of a reader.

Tournier's willed act of authorizing is paradigmatic of the work of much critical activity which, by locating and specifying sources, inters texts or textual segments. How, then, to resurrect text and textuality? First of all, by recognizing while reading that unconscious forgetting by the reader is often a function of suppression — even perhaps of repression — and that the suppressed memories will return *in the text* to haunt not the writer but the reader — as he/she is determined by the text and its various centripetal and centrifugal strategies. Secondly, by admitting that the acts of remembering generated by the reading of any text are, to a great extent, arbitrary and aleatory — but not therefore necessarily inappropriate.

It is precisely the capacity of a text to call up acts of remembering in the reader that makes possible a legitimization of its signifying capacity, of its intertextual semiotics, and that guarantees the life of its textuality — which is a function, a direct function, of the responses of the reader.

I choose to conclude in terms which may seem over-dramatically metaphoric, but which may have a certain appropriateness when speaking of Tournier. The text left by a writer, and especially a text left, given, by a self-reading and self-interpreting and prescriptive writer, is a dead letter, a corpse. But this corpse, this textual corpus, calls for resurrection — just as any letter is an appeal, an appeal to be sent back rewritten, transformed.

In the Gospel of St John, we find the story of Lazarus who, when resurrected by Jesus, comes forth from the tomb, bound with grave-clothes and his face bound about with a napkin (*John*: 11.44). Jesus says: 'Loose him, and let him go.' This potent image of resurrection, articulated only in John who is particularly important for Tournier's theological musings and manipulations,[28] seems to me a useful, if provocative, image for the role and the work of the reader engaged in an intertextual, hermeneutic activity. The reader is the Saviour of the text; he/she can resurrect the corpse, but cannot effect the work of complete unbinding/unwrapping of the corpse. Like Christ, he/she can only say: 'Loose it, and let it go.'

NOTES

[1] For such historical analyses, see, for example, Leyla Perrone-Moisés, 'L'intertextualité critique', *Poétique*, 27 (1976), 372–84; Marc Angenot, 'L'«intertextualité»: enquête sur l'émergence et la diffusion d'un champ notionnel', *Revue des Sciences Humaines*, 189 (1983), 121–35; Hans-George Ruprecht, 'Intertextualité', *Texte*, 2 (1983), 13–22. The exact meaning of the term 'intertextuality' is now unclear (or at least multiple), since various critics use it in differing ways. Gérard Genette has offered as more specific alternatives the terms 'transtextualité', 'paratextualité' and 'architextualité' (*Introduction à l'architexte* (Seuil, 1979), pp. 87–88). While Genette's terms permit a valuable narrowing of critical focus, I prefer to use 'intertextuality', whose very ambiguity serves to alert us to the ambiguous functioning of this textual phenomenon.

[2] Julia Kristeva, *Sèméiôtikè. Recherches pour une sémanalyse* (Seuil, 1969), p. 85.

[3] J. Kristeva, *La révolution du langage poétique* (Seuil, 1974), pp. 59–60.

[4] Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence* (New York, 1975), p. 8.

[5] Michel Tournier, *Le Vent paraclet* (Gallimard, 1977), p. 221. All references will be to this edition, abbreviated as *LVP*, followed by page number(s), and will be included in the text. References to *Le Roi des Aulnes* will be to the Folio 1975 edition, abbreviated as *LRA*, and will also be included in the text.

[6] M. Tournier, *Le Vol du vampire* (Mercure, 1981), p. 400.

[7] M. Tournier himself uses a vocabulary of violence (see *LVP*, p. 53), but, like all writers, he also has genuine feelings of affection for, and gratitude towards, his predecessors. Indeed, in a somewhat different context, he has asserted that 'toute création implique amour' (Michel Tournier and Arthur Tress, *Rêves* (Brussels, 1981), p. 38). However, as in the family romance, feelings of love can co-exist with (fantasmatic) desires to abolish the parent.

[8] The relevant scenes occur in *LRA*, pp. 75–78, and Alain-Fournier, *Le Grand Meaulnes* (Livre de Poche, 1967), pp. 101–03.

[9] Roland Barthes, *Le Plaisir du texte* (Seuil, 1974), p. 59.

[10] I do not use the term in any pejorative way, but following Guy Rosolato's usage; see especially G. Rosolato, 'Le narcissisme', *Nouvelle Revue de Psychanalyse*, 13 ('Narcisses'), 7–36.

[11] J. Kristeva, *Sèméiôtikè*, p. 120.

[12] Jacques Lacan, 'L'agressivité en psychanalyse', *Revue française de psychanalyse*, année 12 (1948), 375.

[13] Michael Riffaterre, 'Sémiotique intertextuelle: l'interprétant', *Revue d'esthétique*, 1–2 (1979), 128.

[14] Laurent Jenny, 'La stratégie de la forme', *Poétique*, 27 (1976), 279.

[15] This notion of intertextual functioning has been convincingly posited by M. Riffaterre in 'Production du roman: l'intertexte du *Lys dans la vallée*', *Texte*, 2, 23–33.

[16] Michel Butor, *Répertoire III* (Minuit, 1968), p. 18.

[17] M. Riffaterre, 'Production du roman', p. 23.

[18] See M. Riffaterre, 'Sémiotique intertextuelle', p. 128.

[19] M. Riffaterre, *Semiotics of poetry* (London, 1978), p. 81.

[20] This process of splitting would seem to reveal an (ambiguous) pre-occupation with the Double who can both frighten in his/her difference and reassure in his/her similarity. The fear of the Double is most powerfully expressed in novelistic terms in M. Tournier's *Les Météores* (Gallimard, 1975), where one of the twins flees the other in order to escape potential engulfment.

[21] See, for example, Stéphane Mallarmé, 'Réponses à des enquêtes: Sur Poe', *Œuvres complètes* (Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, 1945), p. 872. Following Mallarmé, the Surrealists especially were fascinated by the function of white space; see, for example, Paul Eluard, 'Physique de la poésie', *Minotaure*, 6, 6. I realize, of course, that my discourse can be turned against myself and that, determined both by my own pre-occupations and by the chance of my own reading, I may appear merely to be substituting one intertext for another. However, I do not wish to *impose* — as privileged — any intertext, but to indicate how there can be no single intertext. Indeed, on hearing A. S. Byatt's paper 'Nature morte', I realized that M. Butor's notion of 'l'écriture blanche' in 'Les œuvres d'art imaginaires chez Proust' is another possible intertextual reference (which I had forgotten — or suppressed). But . . . I would agree with A. S. Byatt's assertion that memory does not work in a random way; as readers or writers, we remember or forget for *functional* reasons.

[22] See J. Kristeva, *La Révolution du langage poétique*, p. 339.

[23] M. Tournier, *Le Vent paraclet*, p. 52.

[24] It will be clear that I conceive of textuality as a quality of the text which *presupposes* the presence and work of a reader. For this reason, I cannot accept such negative definitions as that offered recently by Roger Shattuck who sees textuality as 'a kind of refried solipsism' (*The Innocent Eye: On Modern Literature and the Arts* (New York, 1984), p. 350. To recognize textuality is to accept that, in Tournierian terms, texts function *both* centripetally and centrifugally.

[25] M. Tournier, *Le Vol du vampire*, pp. 11–27.

[26] My work currently in progress involves a study of Tournier's recent novels in the perspective of encrypting and incorporation (following the work of Nicolas Abraham and Maria Torok, notably in *Cryptonomie: Le Verbier de l'homme aux loups* (Aubier-Montaigne, 1976) and *L'Écorce et le noyau* (Aubier-Montaigne, 1978).

[27] See Charles Mauron, *Des Métaphores obsédantes au mythe personnel* (Corti, 1962).

[28] For a justification of the importance for Tournier of the Gospel of St John, see my article 'Ecrire et ré-écrire: le projet de Tournier', *Sud*, 61 (special number on Tournier), 52–69.