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Abstract

This thesis aims to present a history of Tel Quel - periodical, group and series. It is argued that this can only be done at a significant level if it is realised that the overriding concern of Tel Quel, and what gave it both intellectual and actual existence, was the production of a theory of literature through editorial activities. The present work therefore concerns itself with identifying and analysing the theory of literature produced by the group's writers and theorists, principally Philippe Sollers and Julia Kristeva, through a broadly historical framework which alone can show that this theory remains constant despite the shifts of Tel Quel with regard to the context.

The theory is a logic of literature. It proposes that the latter is a transformative experience. Reading and writing, particularly of certain 'limit texts' operate a transgression of the limits of so-called 'normal' experience, and a transformation of language, of phenomena, of the body, of history. This transgression and transformation are possible because language is seen as a potentially infinite, open system, within which restricted, closed systems such as discourse, communication, 'society' and the subject exist. Literature effects the opening of closures within language. It is thus an analytic, dissolutory force, the radicality of which social and political institutions attempt to reduce.

The articulation of Tel Quel with the Nouveau Roman, structuralism, Marxism and psychoanalysis is assessed in this light, and so is the association of the review with notable thinkers of the period, such as Barthes and Derrida. A special importance is given to the writing practice it generates, which is described through analysis of some of the numerous creative texts produced by Tel Quel writers, selected to illustrate various aspects of this practice.

Even the final dissolution of the review, and its continuation, with a changed practice in L'Infini, should
be read from the same internal, theoretical perspective, as a development anchored in the act of literary creation seen as transformative, negative and analytic, as is demonstrated by the tapes of recent interviews which are supplied in a separate volume (with transcripts).
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Tapes (with transcripts) in separate volume
'Les avant-gardes n'ont qu'un temps; et ce qui peut arriver de plus heureux, c'est, au plein sens du terme, d'avoir fait leur temps. Après elles, s'engagent des opérations sur un plus vaste théâtre. On n'en a que trop vu, de ces troupes d'élite qui, après avoir accompli quelque vaillant exploit, sont encore là pour défiler avec leurs décorations, et puis se retournent contre la cause qu'elles avaient défendue. Il n'y a rien à craindre de semblable de celles dont l'attaque a été menée jusqu'au terme de la dissolution.'

Guy Debord — *In girum imus nocte et consumimur igni*
CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

I. Introduction

The first and most obvious question to answer is 'Why study *Tel Quel*'? *TQ* has had a massive but unidentified influence upon literary theory. It is implicated in the 'structuralist' and 'post-structuralist' currents that have emerged from France since the 1960s, and it is normally associated with the names Barthes, Foucault, Derrida, Lacan, Althusser, Kristeva. *TQ* must however be distinguished from a loose 'Lacano-Althusserianism'. Although it played a major part in the rise to prominence of Barthes, Foucault and Derrida and *a fortiori* Kristeva, a fact which is often forgotten in discussion of these writers, it is distinct from the thought of these individuals. *TQ* should not be confused with any rough, undefined, structuralism or poststructuralism. It has a precise and specific character distinct from these currents that has yet to be defined.

This thesis therefore attempts to rectify two misconceptions. Firstly, that of the non-specificity of the review. Secondly, that of its difficulty. *TQ* is often complex and dense, but it is not 'obscure and impenetrable' as the stereotyped view has it.

The first misconception, of the non-specificity of the review, also implies that *TQ* is also at the mercy of shifts in the context, from *Nouveau roman* to
Structuralism, to semiology to Marxism, Maoism, 'Atlanticism' and so on. The thesis thus also attempts to trace the hidden continuity, the permanent thread behind these shifts in strategy. It analyses the specific theory of literature that defines this continuity. The history of TQ we are tracing is an internal history read from the perspective of this theory, rather than from that of the context. It is a history reinterpreted by literature and theory, not one assessed from a sociological point of view.

The sociological perspective seems to have determined so far the state of other studies of TQ. The recent study of TQ by Louis Pinto in Bourdieu's review *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* is a sociological reduction that has given rise to a critical reaction in *L'Infini*, the continuation of TQ. The sociological reduction and its reaction show what is at stake. However, the sociological reduction is the fullest response to TQ so far. Other considerations are fragmentary and do not approach the main issue, of the theory of literature. Indeed, other studies of other reviews have so far been predominantly historical or sociological, judging the review, be it *Les Temps modernes*, *Esprit* or *Scrutiny*, from the point of view of the context, social or historical. No paradigm exists for our approach, which is internal, assessing the review from the point of view of the theory it develops itself, and working outwards to the context.

This seeks to evade the danger of the chronicle, which is a danger for TQ itself in so far as the chronicle would
relate only the review's reactions to the context and would miss the underlying continuity. On the other hand, there is a danger that in attempting an 'internal' history our perspective will become indistinguishable from that of TQ itself, that the necessary critical distance would be lost. However, instead of adopting an external distance, judging the review from a point outside it, in the context, we desire to maintain an internal critical distance by moving further in to the heart of the theory of literature in question and assessing the historical development of TQ from that point. There is thus a dual movement operative here: inward, to define the continual logic or theory of literature of TQ and outward, to trace the history of the review from that perspective.

There are further problems with a study of TQ. Firstly, although part of the particularity of TQ is its anchoring in the literary creativity of those involved in it, the review is one of literary criticism. It is defined not just by direct theoretical statement and creation but also by the choices it makes of the objects of critical study. What is in question here is the distinction between literature and criticism, which TQ itself, among other influences, has done much to erode. Traditionally, criticism analyses literature and a critical study of a critical enterprise would be a criticism at a second remove. At every remove, so to speak, the critical distance is further and the focus less precise. This functions also in the question of the choice of critical object. TQ's choice of critical object must be followed by
a further critical choice. Through its choice, TQ identifies a limited area of literature; our choice identifies an area which is limited still further. The loss is not only one of the precision of the focus, but through reasons of space, of breadth, ending with a focus too wide yet not wide enough. The second remove at the same time limits and dissipates the focus.

On the other hand, part of the theory of literature TQ defines identifies the importance of writing that transgresses the limits between genres. To an extent, theory is a writing that is on the same footing as fiction. Theory as writing, if we are careful not to lose sight of this in a confused thesis that 'everything is fiction', can operate a kind of transference between text and text, literature and criticism, so the second remove and the loss of focus is annulled in the transference. Theory as writing operates from the moment of creation outward, implicating literature, criticism and the writing of this thesis on that literature and criticism in the same movement of transference. Our analysis thus becomes inwardly tied to the logic of TQ through a basis in literary creation. The necessity will be to keep a balance between the force of transference and the critical distance, so the thesis will not become indistinguishable from its object, and so it does not lose sight of its object. The tension and at times the oscillation between the two defines this thesis.

A further problem is that of reduction. TQ is still a living force, not only in L'Infini but also in its textual
influence. This thesis strives not to become a closure that would reduce TQ to a set of principles, but a productive reading that re-opens the debate. L'Infini, and an encounter with the individuals responsible for TQ, still active in different contexts, tend to undermine the possibility of a historical, closed account. The recorded interviews included in the separate volume of this thesis constitute this encounter and the living force that keeps TQ open to its infinite re-interpretation. The possibility of a thesis on TQ is an aspect of the interviews themselves. At the end, it appears, in view of the continuation of TQ not only temporally, in L'Infini but also in the effect of reading it produces, that the thesis as history cannot be anything other than a 'déchet', a fallen fragment or fetish from a work in progress, a closed element in a transfinite transgression. The force of tranference we have mentioned can perhaps force a way out of the closure of history.

Part of the theory of literature developed in TQ is an emphasis on the radicality and irreducibility of writing. The specificity of the review was partly that most of those involved were writers of fictional texts. A thesis on TQ must take account of this, but also of the irreducibility of the texts. Due to the importance of the experience of reading it is not thought suitable to simply offer reductive accounts of these texts; instead the historical development of the writing of TQ as a whole will be commented on, while we will offer examples of 'readings' of certain texts. These more textually
'inscribed' readings are situated at the centre of the thesis, in Chapter Four. The force of creativity involved is intended to radiate through the thesis, anchoring it in the moment of creation.

The structure of the thesis is as follows: Chapter One looks firstly at the context of reviews, showing that a vacuum existed for a literary review at the time of TQ's formation and pointing to paradigms in Surrealist reviews and those associated with Georges Bataille. Secondly, it reviews the philosophical and literary context of the review's creation, analysing also the conditions of possibility of the climate of the time in which TQ is published. It identifies a double context for TQ, the immediate context and the hidden context which is reinterpreted and evaluated by TQ.

Chapter Two, 'Intervention' analyses how TQ intervenes in the context and develops its specific theory of literature. The formation of the review is reviewed as an accidental circumstance that enabled the logic of literature to be set in motion. We show how the Nouveau Roman is really a red herring that is superseded in favour of an emphasis on a theory of poetic language. Section II, 'From avant-garde to science' shows how TQ functions as a critical platform for avant-garde practices while at the same time developing a theory of literature. The fourth section 'The logic of literature' analyses this core theory as presented in Sollers's Logiques and in TQ.

Chapter Three, entitled 'Theory' looks at the theoretical articulation of this theory with Marxism and
psychoanalysis and analyses its expansion in the work of Kristeva. It also analyses how the theory develops into a theory of the subject of literature seen as an exception.

Chapter Four, as we mentioned above, is a condensed history of TQ's literary work and a reading of certain texts.

Chapter Five analyses the 'dissolution', that is, the dispersion and expansion of the theory of literature of TQ. It looks at the implications of the theory of literature beyond the demise of the political systems in which TQ placed its faith, and analyses the factors involved in the dissolution, the disappearance and survival, of TQ.

The Chronology at the end of the thesis plots the historical evolution of the review against events in the context.
II. The context of reviews

Reviews in 1960

The emergence of TQ in 1960 is into a context where the status of other reviews and of the disposition of publishers is a determining factor in the distribution of intellectual forces. The dominant reviews of the period before 1960 were the *Nouvelle revue française*, *Les Lettres nouvelles*, *Les Temps modernes*, *Critique* and *Esprit*.

The *NRF*, published by the dominant publisher of the time, Gallimard, had been interrupted during the war but had recommenced in 1953 under the direction of Jean Paulhan and Marcel Arland. The review published established writers from before the war and those that had emerged during the war, such as Malraux, Claudel, S.-J. Perse, P.J. Jouve, René Char, but it equally gave space to new writers such as Ionesco, Mandiargues, Butor, Blanchot, Jean Duvignaud, Robbe-Grillet. After the war, however, the review had lost the prestige and dominance it had gained before the war; there was no explicit ideology other than 'literary quality', the approach not defined by any project or a specific view of literature. The *NRF* remained, nevertheless, the dominant review for mainstream literature.

*Les Lettres nouvelles* was created in 1953 by Maurice Nadeau and was published by Julliard, also home of *Les Temps modernes*. Nadeau's aim was to create a review
between the NRF and *Les Temps modernes*, not 'engaged' but not as eclectic in its aesthetic tastes as the NRF. The review thus published more 'experimental' writers such as Sarraute, Beckett, as well as numerous foreign writers.

*Les Temps modernes* was the review founded by Sartre, De Beauvoir and others in 1945 which would become the 'engaged' review of existentialism. At the end of the 'fifties much of the review was devoted to analyses of the Algerian situation, although Sartre's play *Les Séquestrés d'Altona* appeared in this time. *Les Temps modernes* thus gives a very reserved and limited place to literature and is not in any sense a 'literary review'. It stands at the opposite end to the NRF in terms of political engagement but is a fundamental pole in the disposition of intellectual forces not only in 1960 but throughout the 'sixties.

*Critique*, created by Bataille in 1946, had become in the 'fifties a space open to philosophical analyses and work from the human sciences. This factor proves important for the role of *Critique* in the emergence of structuralism. The review was also receptive to the more radical work in literary criticism, Bataille and Blanchot, writers of the 'nouvelle critique' such as Jean-Pierre Richard and Jean Starobinski as well as Roland Barthes and Michel Foucault. Through its publication by Minuit the review was also associated with the *Nouveau roman*, thus with a more experimental literature than the NRF. *Critique* was entirely devoted to critical reviews, it published no works of fiction; thus it is a review that defines a
critical space that informs the context from a slightly displaced site.

Esprit had been created in 1932 by Emmanuel Mounier to become a review of 'personalism', a 'new humanism' that proposed a 'person' not in conflict with the social; the 'person' was thus 'engagé' (Mounier was apparently responsible for the term 'engagé'). Esprit was thus a review sympathetic to Marxism but with a humanist approach. It was published by Seuil and was open to such writers as Barthes, approximating to the type of Les Temps modernes, a review that combined political comment with social and cultural analysis.

Other, less important reviews of the period included in the literary field the Mercure de France, mourned by Sollers in 1965, which published his essay on Ponge and Starobinski's edited version of Saussure's 'Anagrammes'. Cahiers du Sud and Action poétique were literary reviews based in Marseille. The latter's militant approach to poetry, including much from overseas, will play an important role later in the decade in the opposition to TQ. L'Arc, founded in 1957 and open to literature and art of an experimental character soon shifted its format to become a review of special issues devoted to writers, painters or thinkers, without a defined policy. The review Preuves, literary and committed on the left, was also associated with L'Herne, begun in 1963 and run by Dominique de Roux.

In the non-literary reviews Arguments (published by Minuit) was important as a forum for leftist, non
affiliated Marxism. Barthes notably published important articles in *Arguments* (on the Nouveau roman)^2. *Socialisme ou barbarie* was equally a forum for a Marxism critical of Stalinist bureaucracy, out of which writers such as Henri Lefebvre^1 and Cornelius Castoriadis,^4 as well as Jean-François Lyotard,^5 would emerge as influential on the 1968 events. Also closely linked to *Socialisme ou barbarie* was the review *Internationale situationiste*,^6 that had been created in 1958 from the remnants of the Surrealist and Lettrist movements. *Internationale situationiste* plays a crucial but to an extent 'unidentifiable' role in the context during the 'sixties, and forms a 'hidden' parallel to the adventure of TQ in its traversal of the avant-garde.

Reviews which were organs of the PCF were *Les Lettres françaises*, run by Aragon and Pierre Daix,^7 which would become a foyer receptive to TQ in its Marxist period. *La Nouvelle critique* and *La Pensée* were the critical and philosophical organs of the party respectively. The former is the specific vehicle of TQ's alliance with the PCF. Both play an important role in the dissemination of the work of Althusser.

These reviews define the 'network' of reviews in 1960. The distribution of publishers here is set around Gallimard, Julliard and Minuit. *Critique*, *Arguments* and the Nouveau roman were not in any sense dominant although they could be said to form the 'avant-garde' of the context. Gallimard objectively dominated the publishing scene through the NRF, the publication of Sartre's works,
those of Aragon, Céline, Blanchot, and its earlier association with Gide and with Surrealism. Seuil had emerged from the resistance and been set up by Catholic 'progressists'. Esprit, run by Jean-Marie Domenach after Mounier, was its principal review, which suggested the perspective of the publisher; humanist, sympathetic to the left. The success of Seuil was established by the book 'The little world of Don Camillo' which sold over a million. At the same time it published work by Franz Fanon and Léopold Senghor, the film maker Chris Marker, Jean Cayrol, Francis Jeanson (the latter was also associated with Les Temps modernes). Seuil was thus closer to political life than Gallimard, and associated with the opposition to the Algerian war. The OAS bombed the Seuil offices several times, as well as those of Minuit. However, Seuil was not in competition with Gallimard.

The decision to create a review centred around a group of young writers introduced by Jean Cayrol was determined, therefore, by the wish to create a literary review of the same kind as the NRF or Les Lettres nouvelles that could act as a platform for the writers of Seuil. Removed from the political engagement of Seuil (Esprit), the review would establish the publisher in the field of literature. Seuil had also published work by Barthes, Le degré zéro de l'écriture, Mythologies and Michelet, parts of which had been originally published in Esprit, Les Lettres nouvelles and Arguments. Barthes was associated with Minuit, Nadeau (who had published Histoire du surréalisme at Seuil) and Seuil (Cayrol and
François Wahl), providing a link in the 'réseau'. Barthes is one element that will transform Seuil eventually into the publisher of the structuralist 'revolution' with the publication of *Communications* and the work of that group (Todorov, Greimas, Ducrot, Bremond, Metz, Edgar Morin [ex. of *Arguments]*) by Seuil and the eventual publication of Lacan under the aegis of François Wahl who ran the human sciences section of Seuil. TQ is part of this transformation, but before its emergence Seuil was still an 'engaged', humanist publisher in the shadow of Gallimard looking for an investment in the literary field.

In September 1960 the 'Manifeste des 121', a petition against the Algerian war created, in a sense, a schism between the 'engaged' group of Sartre, Nadeau, Jerôme Lindon (head of Minuit), some of the 'Nouveaux romanciers' and the emerging structuralist 'réseau' of Barthes, Morin and the *Critique* group. When TQ enters the context, therefore, there is a polemical atmosphere over the question of commitment. TQ immediately comes down on the side of non-commitment, but significantly associates itself with Minuit, occupying an ambiguous place, aestheticist but 'formally' committed.

Satellites or Obstacles; reviews after 1960

During the existence of TQ, from 1960 to 1982, a number of other reviews appear which transform the context. The Chronology shows the dates of reviews, but we can note here the emergence of reviews in the human sciences that
will play an important role: Communications, Cahiers pour l'analyse and a plethora of psychoanalytical reviews form a network of periodicals in which important scientific work to which TQ refer will be produced. In terms of literary reviews which appear as obstacles or part of the opposition to TQ, L'Herne, run by Dominique de Roux, publishes irregular special issues on specific writers from a perspective not defined by the left. La Quinzaine littéraire is a monthly review run by Nadeau, antipathetic to Sollers and TQ but sympathetic to Barthes and the structuralist 'réseau'.

Reviews which emerge in the wake of TQ, thus as repetitions or deviations from TQ include Change (see later), Littérature, Poésie, Digraphe (run by Jean Ristat), Textuel, Txt and others which feature the same combination of progressive literary experimentation with new critical approaches, either Derridean, Lacanian or other. The extent to which TQ functions as a paradigm is evident, but TQ also escapes this field by being non-defineable according to any specific approach. Poétique seeks to be a review of literary theory and analysis uniquely and, created in 1970, assembles the formalist residues left behind by TQ. Its leading group includes Todorov, Genette and Cixous, and it published work by Derrida, J.P. Richard, while remaining open to work in poetics from the U.S. (eg. Paul de Man) and elsewhere (Jauss and reception theory). Poétique and Change may, as Sollers suggests, have been created by Seuil to create an internal opposition to TQ, but Change soon
shifts elsewhere and Poétique is a vital foyer for the reception and development of new approaches in literary theory which divert from the field of TQ, fulfilling a function distinct from those of TQ.

TQ's position within Seuil is subject to various shifts, however. If at the beginning the review is intended as a 'masthead', this function is soon adumbrated by the interest in Minuit, Ponge and Artaud (both published by Gallimard). The formalist and structuralist period establish TQ as the leading factor in Seuil's spearheading publication of structuralist work. The militant period diverts this back into politics, but Maoist politics were not out of place within Seuil. The final period, however, sees TQ establishing links with Grasset and Gallimard and moving away from the 'field' of Seuil, and here it may be true to say that TQ is a kind of 'enclave' within its publisher. After the deaths of Barthes and Lacan, the two figures that assured TQ's position at Seuil through Sollers's amicable links with both, the break is precipitated by Sollers's writing of Femmes in which Barthes and Lacan are thinly disguised and parodically inserted in a humorous narrative that does not spare their privacy. TQ does not, therefore, act as a mouthpiece of Seuil although at times it publishes excerpts from forthcoming works, but operates independently of the publisher, also with a minimum amount of financial pressure. This independence undoubtedly determines TQ's effect of displacement in the context and its 'traversée' of the intellectual history of the 1960's
The paradigmatic context

The above describes the syntagmatic, immediate context of TQ, there is also a paradigmatic context in which there are explicit and implicit links between TQ and past periodicals. Surrealism is the most obvious movement of the avant-garde which the adventure of TQ recalls, and TQ invites comparison with La révolution surréaliste and Le surréalisme au service de la révolution. Surrealism is essentially a movement based in reviews, in that mobile space, and the same can be said of TQ's 'textual' revolution although a different problematic is involved. The Surrealists are essentially discovering a new continent in 'le rêve' and much of La Révolution surréaliste is devoted to that discovery and the exploration of that continent. TQ's analyses of the text do not have such a sense of discovery, despite the many parallels. TQ's 'field' appears in more continuity with the scientific and philosophical discourse of the time than that of the Surrealists. Thus the review itself (TQ) appears more sober, notably without an emphasis (initially) on the figurai dimension, on art, that made Surrealism an avant-garde movement across the arts, rather than, as in the case of TQ, an insistence on literature. It is also true to say that TQ is removed from comparison with Surrealism as it comes after it; Surrealism was essentially that last real movement of the avant-garde,
and to the extent that TQ is seen as an avant-garde art movement it is recapitulative and reinterpretative of past insights. However, our proposition is that the 'avant-garde' moment of TQ's passage is limited and it is more pertinent to see the review as a radicality linked to science and logic and not posed against it.

If there are points of comparison they are to be found in the strategy of the review. Surrealism, like TQ, as a review, lived and developed through crises, crises in relation to the context and crises internal to the respective groups:

"La revue évolue de crise en crise, et trouve précisément dans ses crises une force constante de renouvellement." ¹⁰

The strategy of the forcing through of crises is what Sollers and TQ learn from Breton and the Surrealist movement, while the functioning of TQ as a forcing of crises can be linked to the transgressive functioning of writing, the logic of which the review sets in place. The place of Sollers, compared to Breton, is also interesting in that while Breton 'entretenait avec tous des relations de type violemment affectif' ¹¹, that is, he was an affective centre of the Surrealist movement, Sollers practised a kind of displacement of his place in regard to the TQ group, leading to the confrontation of the latter, in some instances its rupture and in others its shift to a new disposition.

TQ can also be compared to certain of the periodicals and groups around Bataille: Documents, Acéphale, the Collège de Sociologie ¹². Bataille's interest in founding a community on the basically singular experience of excess
or transgression his work concerns is a paradigm for TQ. The community is moreover a community of science (to the foreground in Documents, Critique) that is caught in a dialectic of transgression with violence, eroticism, 'base materialism' (to the fore in Acéphale and Documents). TQ also puts into action this dialectic of transgression between the discourse and community of science and the singularity of excess. Bataille's projects also present a doubling of this dialectic between review and group. Bataille's projects for 'secret societies' or 'Colleges', the Collège de sociologie or the Collège d'études socratiques, are important for their attempt to form a community of individuals, a society, based on the singular. TQ's groups, the committee, the Groupe d'études théoriques, the wider grouping of collaborators, function in the same way. That this is a conscious parallel for TQ is suggested by the publication in TQ of Bataille's text 'C'est une banalité..', opening the Collège d'études socratiques in 1942, and an accompanying text by Michel Fardoulis-Lagrange, involved in the project, that insists on this aspect of 'la mise en commun de l'expérience profonde'. After the 'preliminary' approach to the logic and ideas behind TQ, a further inquiry would look at the subjective tensions and affective responses such a community involved, but this is a whole new project.

The TQ 'group' is therefore in a state of perpetual displacement or crisis, which our history will traverse to show how the movement of the review is scanned by the exclusions and departures - Hallier in 1963, Faye in 1967,
Thibaudeau and Ricardou in 1971, to end with a stable core in which, however, the group is already dispersed. Crisis and a community of the singularity make TQ something other than a movement of the avant-garde, and something specifically related to writing and literature.

This is what makes TQ differ from the Situationist movement which in many other respects is a similar adventure. Crisis, permanent dissolution, the undermining of the '-ism', of identification are common to Sollers / TQ and Debord and the I.S. However, the former is carried by the transgressive force of writing, which is an infinite dépense or dissolution, while the effect of the I.S. is as an invisible undermining of the logic of the spectacle that was too linked to a Hegelian thesis of alienation and thus resulted in a profound skepticism and pessimism,'* compared to the skeptical optimism of L'Infini. Nevertheless, the epigraph at the beginning of the thesis suggests that the mechanism of dissolution, of the avant-garde and even of the notion of the avant-garde is common to the two parallel movements resounding around 1968 and in its wake.
III. The philosophical context

Post-war

The general effects of the Second World War upon the general intellectual context in France was a widespread wariness of the right, a corresponding shift to the left, and a general will for reconstruction - of moral values, political values, and of the philosophical basis on which they rested, but also which derived from them. After 1944, there was a longing for basic social, political and intellectual renewal. The moment of conflict between a generation affected by this will and a younger generation unaffected by the will for reconstruction and desirous of other aims and objects occurs in the 1960s.

As well as the effects of the war and the conflict of generations, a Kuhnian shifting of paradigms, other factors must be taken into account in the background to the philosophical climate of the 1960s. Between 1945 and 1956 the field of philosophical discourse is effectively divided between two 'camps' - the existentialist and the Marxist. Marxism in France in the period following the war to 1956 was effectively limited to the line adopted by the French Communist Party (henceforth PCF), which itself adopted wholesale the Soviet line. At the 1947 reunion of the Komintern the world situation was divided by Jdanov between Soviet Communism and American Imperialism. In this atmosphere of 'Cold War' one was either for or against the
USSR, and thus either for or against Marxism as such. The only Marxist philosophy was the economism elaborated by Stalin, the official inheritor of the Marx-Engels-Lenin tradition. Marxism had to be identified with Stalinist Communism without qualification.

This reduction of the area of critical debate around Marxism and the Manicheism of the field ensured the relative sterility and absence of 'leftist' alternatives at the time. The texts of the 'Western Marxists' - were either marginal or yet to be translated, groups such as Socialisme et Barbarie and the Trotskyists were far from the limelight. The limitation of Marxist discourse to Stalinism had a crucial effect upon the field of philosophical discourse itself, as any intellectual activity in France had to define its relationship to Marx, as a kind of pre-condition for its being taken seriously by the philosophical 'establishment' and the reading public.

The history of this period is undoubtedly dominated by the 'engagement' of Sartre after his experience in the war. In order, perhaps, to politicize and to actualize the existentialist philosophy put forward in L'Etre et le Néant Sartre and his friends De Beauvoir, Merleau-Ponty, Raymond Aron among others, formed the periodical Les Temps modernes in 1946. Much of the anti-Stalinist, socialist thought of the time was cristallised around this review, and the relationship of the 'TM' team to the PCF reflected most of the debates of the period. However, the existentialists never dissociated themselves, at this
time, from a general affirmation of the USSR as the locus of proletarian revolution. Although aware of the existence of the labour camps, Sartre and Merleau-Ponty could still claim, in a 1950 editorial that:

"Quelle que soit la nature de la présente société soviétique, l'URSS se trouve grosso modo située dans l'équilibre des forces du côté de celles qui luttent contre les formes d'exploitation de nous connues."  

From 1945 to 1956 the Temps modernes - PCF relation was to suffer numerous upsets, leading in one instance to the departure of Merleau-Ponty in 1953 from the committee of the review. Sartre, however, although he never joined the party, was to remain a 'compagnon de route' of the PCF until 1956.

At the same time, but in an arena removed from the front line of political debate, and within the Universities, a Hegelian renaissance had taken place, due, originally to the lectures of Alexander Kojève at the Ecole pratique des Hautes Etudes between 1933 and 1939 and the teaching of Jean Hyppolite at the Ecole Normale Supérieure. This was a renaissance largely because French philosophical teaching in Universities had been limited to the Kantian rationalism of Brunschwig and Alain, and resisted any intrusion from 'Germany'. Kojève's lectures, attended by such names as Bataille, Lacan, Breton, Aron, Merleau-Ponty, and Queneau, were collected in the 1947 publication, edited by Queneau, of L'Introduction à la lecture de Hegel, while Hyppolite, who taught Althusser, Deleuze, Foucault and Derrida among others, translated Hegel's Phénoménologie des Geistes in 1941, and wrote various commentaries on Hegel in the following years.
Kojève is particularly crucial as a 'filter' of Hegelianism. His importance for the thought of the 1960s is inestimable.⁴

So the post-war philosophical context is characterised by a Manichean deadlock which to an extent paralysed progressive thought. It is a time of reaction to the catastrophe of the war, which plays an important part in defining the climate of the 'sixties as one of radicalism with regard to this time.

The break-up after 1956

A number of events determine 1956 as a decisive turning point. In February, at the 20th Congress of the CPSU in Moscow Krushchev denounced Stalinism and began the programme of de-Stalinisation and 'peaceful co-existence' that characterised the next few years. In November Soviet tanks entered Hungary and the Hungarian uprising was crushed.

The invasion of Hungary led directly to Sartre's break with the Soviet Communist Party and indirectly to the support of the Algerian FLN by Les Temps modernes. The Krushchevite doctrine of de-Stalinisation, meanwhile, was met with dismay by many previously Stalinist PC members, and with the new theoretical geography, this led eventually to their resignations or exclusions, thus creating the possibility for a new 'gauchisme', neither existentialist nor affiliated to the PCF. Outside France, the 20th Congress led indirectly to the Sino-Soviet split
of 1960 and the eventual emergence of Maoism as an alternative for left-wing intellectuals.

The modification of the intellectual climate after 1956 meant that Marxism and existentialism were no longer in direct confrontation. This modification may in some ways explain the shift in the dominant mode of thought from existentialism to structuralism in the early 1960s. Sartre having dissociated himself from Soviet Marxism and embarked upon his philosophical quest for a 'synthetic anthropology',* the field was laid open for the convergence of varying discourses of a more scientific, anti-humanist nature, these discourses being up until the early and mid-sixties to a large extent 'specialist' and not in the front line.

The explanation for the rise to prominence of structuralism is a convergence of a number of currents in linguistics and anthropology with movements in literary criticism, psychoanalysis, philosophy itself, and also with developments inside the PCF and outside it in 'leftism'. One opening for this convergence was provided, to an extent, by the possibilities for a new leftism after 1956, an area in which philosophical questions not directly concerned with Soviet Communism could be discussed. The new leftism is effectively created by the breaking up of the previous Manichean mould, by the formation of new groups of ex-PCF members and the emergence of previously marginalised left-wing groups such as Arguments and Socialisme et barbarie.

A crucial part of the convergence mentioned above is
the emergence of a philosophical discourse within the PCF. Up until the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU (Communist Party of the Soviet Union) in 1956, the International Communist Movement had been marked by a strict theoretical adherence to the deterministic materialism put forward by Stalin, the PCF following this line to the letter. However, at the 20th Congress, Krushchev detailed a programme of de-Stalinisation which effectively meant a dedication to the doctrine of 'peaceful co-existence' and also to that of the 'peaceful transition' to socialism. After the initial shock, this doctrine was in turn followed by the PCF and most other European Communist parties. Later in the same year came the Soviet invasion of Hungary, which led, in particular to the expulsion of leading PCF intellectuals Henri Lefebvre and Jean-Toussaint Desanti,* and the alienation of former fellow travellers. In 1960 came the decisive split with the CPC (Chinese Communist Party.) which saw the Krushchevite de-Stalinisation as revisionist, betraying the principles of Marxist-Leninist political theory. Within the PCF the Krushchevite de-Stalinisation resulted in a theoretical formulation which advocated a return to the young Marx as an antidote to the dogmatism of Stalinism. The return to the young Marx stresses the Hegelian aspects of Marxism, and it was also exercised in the name of a rigorous humanism. Kruschev declared at the 22nd Congress that everything was 'in the name of Man, for the benefit of Man'.

The return to the Hegelian Marx was also accompanied,
outside the PCF, by the continuation, or the legacy renewed, of the tradition of Western Marxism. Texts by 'Western Marxists' of the 'first wave' (Lukács, Karl Korsch) were re-published or translated in France at this time, as were translations of the work of later 'Western Marxists' such as Marcuse. The most striking aspects of this renaissance of Marxist theory were its humanism, its Hegelianism and its historicism.

It is within this context that Louis Althusser, having joined the PCF in 1948, started to develop his original contribution to Marxist theory. Seeing the Kruschevite line as a right-wing critique of Stalinism, and prompted to write by the 20th Congress and the Sino-Soviet split, he hinted, in articles of the late 'fifties, that this return to the young, Hegelian Marx, was at the expense of Marx's fundamental discovery - of historical materialism as the Science of History. His critique of Kruschev's de-Stalinisation programme implied an allegiance to the Maoist, anti-CPSU position, for which Althusser was arraigned in 1963 and 'was obliged to affirm the correctness of the PCF's own line'. Althusser's critique of the return to the younger Marx was a result of two beliefs; the view that it implied a regression to German idealist philosophy which remained within bourgeois ideology and the view that this return necessitated a deliberate blindness to the 'epistemological break' effected by Marx and Engels in The German Ideology which left behind all 'speculative philosophies of history' to formulate the science of history that was historical.
materialism. The accompanying humanism of Sartre, Garaudy et al was likewise suspect as concomitant with right-wing bourgeois ideology, a barrier to any true formulation of historical materialism on a scientific basis. Althusser's project was thus to restructure the science of historical materialism as it was proposed by the later, mature Marx (Capital); a project of 'critique, reconstruction and defence' which ran against the official line of the PCF.

Althusser's theoretical anti-Hegelian, anti-humanist, anti-historicist position co-incided roughly with the rise of structuralism in separate disciplines. A further condition of possibility for the climate of the 1960's is the emergence at the forefront of intellectual discourse of disciplines previously limited to the Universities: anthropology and psychoanalysis, and to an extent, history. The publication of Lévi-Strauss's Anthropologie Structurale (1958) and La Pensée Sauvage in 1962 was crucial to the transition from phenomenology to structuralism. Writing in a chapter entitled 'Histoire et Dialectique', directed specifically against Sartre's 'synthetic anthropology' of the Critique de la Raison dialectique (1960), that:

"le but dernier des sciences humaines n'est pas de constituer l'homme, mais de le dissoudre,"

Lévi-Strauss was laying down the precepts of a scientific, anti-humanist perspective in the human sciences, a perspective already adopted or to be adopted in other areas by Barthes. (Mythologies, 1957, Elements de Sémiologie, 1964) This, and the anti-humanist perspectives adopted by Foucault and Lacan, both more or less
influenced by the structural linguistics of Saussure and the Prague school, offered Althusser in turn a theoretical position different from, and opposed to the Hegelian, humanist position of the PCF and that of Sartre, whose consternation at the rise of structuralism was a decisive factor in the transition of the two 'ideologies'.

Lacan, having trained as a psychiatrist under Clérambault, became a member of the Société Psychanalytique de Paris, (officially recognised by the International Psychoanalytical Association) in 1934. In 1932 he had published his Doctoral thesis 'De la Psychose paranoïaque dans ses rapports avec la personnalité', on the 'cas Aimée', having started work at the Clinique St. Anne in 1927. In the inter war years he had contributed to the surrealist review Minotaure " his work on paranoia finding sympathy with the ideas of Dali; he was also involved with a phenomenological review. In the years that followed he published many of the texts that will appear in 1966 in Ecrits.

The development by Lacan of a re-reading of Freud in a philosophy of language derived from Saussure and implicitly resting on an emphasis on the mediation of experience through a Symbolic order will also form part of the panoply of forces that will converge in the mid-sixties. Lacan's break with 'ego-psychology' and an analysis tied to instinct, in favour of an emphasis on the irredeemably symbolic nature of human interaction is similar to Althusser's rupture with humanist Marxism. The
institutional history of Lacan is well documented in Roudinesco's book *La Bataille de cent ans*, the theoretical history by Malcolm Bowie in *Lacan* but it is important to note here that the constitution of the EFP in 1964, the publication of *Ecrits* by Seuil in 1966 and the deliverance of the Seminar from 1953 onwards form an essential part of the context of TQ.

It is via the use of structural linguistic models borrowed from Saussure, Jakobson and Troubetzkoy, by Lévi-Strauss that structural linguistics was integrated into psychoanalysis, literary theory and philosophy. Lévi-Strauss initially used the models of linguistics in his analysis of kinship systems. His early articles were collected in *Anthropologie Structurale* while an earlier work 'Les Structures élémentaires de la parenté' (1947) was dedicated more precisely to the structural analysis of kinship systems. However it is with *La Pensée sauvage* that the philosophical implications of the structural approach are made clear. By this time Lévi-Strauss had been recognised as a major force; his inauguration into the Collège de France took place in 1960.

Within the specific discipline of philosophy, but in its margins, the work of Michel Foucault, departing from the same epistemological foundations as Althusser (Bachelard and Canguilhem) is an important current. Foucault's insistence on 'la déraison' as an excluded silence within Western rationality becomes specifically relevant to TQ at a certain moment. In a wider context, Foucault's antihumanism defines the context of TQ's appearance.
The intellectual movements which start to become apparent in the late 'fifties and early 'sixties will be at their apogee in the mid-sixties when TQ starts to intervene in the field of philosophical discourse, and it is as the convergence of various strands of philosophical discourse with various strands of literary discourse that the 'moment of Tel Quel' can be understood. However, other patterns of historical influence will appear during the development of the review. TQ in a sense operates a constant re-interpretation of historical, linear temporality, such that the above is only a starting point for a possible history that will return on this context to reinterpret it.
IV. The literary context

Existentialism, 'désinvolture', abstract & 'Nouveau'

While the history of philosophy is subverted by the temporality of writing, in the same way in literature any generational history is undermined to an extent by the ruptures of the individual writer. Writing proposes a different temporality. However, in order to pose the immediate context of TQ's appearance, a certain structure can be proposed.

To focus specifically on the novel, as this is the area in which TQ will first intervene, in the period from 1955 to 1960 there were four broad kinds. Each group is defined according to its position in relation to its time. Thus, firstly, there are texts by writers who were already established, writers who had made their name before or during the war: Malraux, Jean-Paul Sartre, Albert Camus, Simone de Beauvoir. This writing is concerned with the effects of the war and with reconstruction after it, either explicitly or implicitly. Some of these writers can be described as existentialist (Sartre, Camus, De Beauvoir, Anouilh) in as much as their works concern the responsibility of an individual consciousness placed 'in situation' in a particular social context.

The second group includes texts by writers who were perhaps reacting exclusively against the moral issues, the engagement, of the post-war writers. Flowering around the
mid-'fifties, the main characteristics of these writers was a certain 'désinvolture'. With this lack of social concern or engagement there is an emphasis on style and language (not lacking in the first group, however.) Françoise Sagan, Marguerite Duras, Christiane Rochefort, Roger Vailland, Romain Gary could be included in this rough grouping.

A third group, which is a group constituted principally by the singularity of its members rather than by a common theme or style, can, however, be described as the 'abstract' novel. The work of Blanchot, Klossowski and Bataille is an important current of work; marginal in the period in question and reinterpreted as a fundamental influence by the TQ writers.

A fourth group of novelists can be ranged under the collective term of 'nouveaux romanciers'. This is a younger generation of writers which becomes prominent around the turn of the decade. This grouping includes Alain Robbe-Grillet, Nathalie Sarraute, Michel Butor, Claude Simon, Robert Pinget, Claude Ollier. Robbe-Grillet is the unwilling theoretical spokesman of the group, and they are for the most part published by the Editions de Minuit. The Nouveau roman can be schematically divided into two periods. The first is represented by the pre-1960 work of Robbe-Grillet, Sarraute and Butor, and its concerns are represented theoretically, for Robbe-Grillet at least, in the same author's articles of the period, collected in Pour un Nouveau Roman. While it may be possible to propose the rejection of the conventional
apparatus of plot, character, and even more so of 'commitment' through content, as common characteristics of the Nouveau Roman the 'littérature objective' of Robbe-Grillet was not the same kind of writing as Sarraute's 'tropismes', or the work of Ollier, Simon or Pinget. In the context, however, the salient feature of the Nouveau Roman, as proposed by Robbe-Grillet in *Pour un Nouveau Roman*, was its critique of anthropomorphism. Both Sartre and Ponge's *Le Parti pris des choses* are criticised in this light, and Robbe-Grillet apparently, and this is an index of the theoretical confusion of his writing, proposes either a world from which consciousness is absent or one which is dominated by the perceptual apparatus.

In the 'second wave' of the Nouveau Roman, in which it is possible to say that TQ intervene through the person of Jean Ricardou, the emphasis is more on the textual apparatus. There is a fundamental ambiguity of reference between the world of objects and the world of language, a perceptual reality and a linguistic reality, or the signifier and the referent. The self-consciousness of the text becomes the focus of the novel.

The period immediately before TQ's 'entrée en matière' also sees the publication of novels by Klossowski, Queneau, Bataille and late works by Céline. These 'singular' publications provide examples of an experimental writing that does not fall into any particular 'school' but does form an important pre-text for TQ. Bataille, Klossowski and Blanchot write novels in which, unlike the Nouveau Roman, subjectivity is
fundamentally at stake as opposed to being completely absent (or totally present, as Morrissette proposes of Robbe-Grillet). The stress on experiences of excess in which the subject loses his footing on the ground of rationality in the novels of these three writers forms an important backdrop to TQ's innovations in the novel.

Poetry: sparsity and experimentation

In the genre of poetry, the period after the second world war is fairly sparse. This is reflected in the poetry itself. René Char's work, exemplified in *Recherche de la base au sommet* is a 'poésie blanche', in which the focus is narrowed, for example from the epic scope of the work of Saint-John Perse, to the space of the word and its etymological resonance. The philosophy of Heidegger is a reference point for this poetry. The work of Jouve and Bonnefoy could also be situated in this lineage, where the emphasis is on restriction. At the same time the writing of Michaux and Ponge constitutes a pair of singularities that is an important pre-text for TQ's innovations. Michaux's poetry and experimentation with hallucinogenic drugs can be linked with the exceeding of the subject mentioned earlier. Ponge's work is important for its 'semantic materialism' rather than its supposed 'parti pris des choses' which Robbe-Grillet had mistaken for a pretention to objectivism.
Reassessment of the context - the double context

These currents are part of the immediate context into which TQ enters in 1960. We have stressed how this context in only provisional; TQ operates a re-assessment of the post-war context and essentially rejects most of these currents as derivations or deviations from earlier, pre-war currents. Thus the Nouveau Roman is a deviation from the more innovative work of Roussel, and before him Joyce, Kafka, Proust. The work of Michaux and Ponge, although a valuable part of TQ's immediate context, and never rejected as such, derives from Surrealism. Surrealism is a crucial part of the context of TQ in terms both of its periodicals, which are models, and its emphases. Surrealism was muted in the post-war period but it returns in 1968 as a 'neo-surrealism' which TQ specifically opposes.

Other currents in the margins of Surrealism are of paramount importance for TQ. It is almost a commonplace of the discourse of Sollers or Pleynet about the post-war period that the works of Artaud and Bataille are 'illisible' in the material sense. It is indeed true that TQ has an immeasurable effect on the reintroduction of these writers into the forefront of literary debate. Before 1960 their presence is hardly felt. Pound, Céline and Joyce are also writers who, to a certain extent, remain absent from the preoccupations of the period.11

Thus in assessing the context of TQ's appearance in
terms of literature we are involved with an ambiguous 'double'. On the one hand the Nouveau Roman is the dominant avant-garde in the novel, and TQ provisionally jumps on the bandwagon of this current, rather than identify itself with more formally traditional currents. However, there is also a hidden context of the period with writers like Bataille, Ponge and to a lesser extent Blanchot, Michaux, Klossowskki, and of the pre-war period, with Surrealism, Artaud, Bataille again. This ambiguity will define TQ's intervention in the context and its transformation of the context, through the different emphases it brings, and the reinterpretation of literary history this implies.

The context of literary criticism: objective and 'nouvelle'

In the nineteen-fifties two broad kinds of criticism can be identified. One is more traditional, has an idea of itself as 'objective' criticism, is mostly defined by its status as 'university' criticism and is influenced by the important work of Lanson. The other is interpretative and is known as 'la nouvelle critique', which puts it in the same immediate context as the Nouveau Roman and 'la nouvelle vague'. Its exponents are also in the University but in more marginal institutions. Roland Barthes, writing in 1963, distinguishes between 'les deux critiques', considering the explicitly or implicitly ideological nature of their perspectives. The 'nouvelle critique' is
explicitly ideological in that it takes as its basic reference a structure or ideology such as existentialism, Marxism, psychoanalysis, phenomenology, structuralism. 'La critique lansonienne' or 'paleo-criticism' declares itself to be objective and non-ideological; 'elle refuse toute idéologie et ne se réclame que d'une méthode objective', writes Barthes. 'La critique lansonienne' claims to establish objective truths and is aimed at the elucidation of the true meaning of the work. Barthes shows, justifiably, how this kind of criticism is just as imbued as 'la nouvelle critique' with ideological presuppositions of a 'natural attitude'. In the same sense that the Nouveau roman is the ascendant current in the novel, the 'nouvelle critique' is thus ascendant for TQ in this context.

The distinction between the two kinds of criticism can be traced back to the quarrel that separated Proust from Sainte-Beuve in Proust's Contre Sainte-Beuve. The work of Valéry in the first half of the twentieth century constituted a criticism that was non-academic, intuitive and aesthetic rather than academic, objective and biographical. 'La nouvelle critique' derives from this current and other philosophical currents that traverse it. The 'nouvelle critique' has been referred to as 'ideological' because most of the various kinds of criticism covered by this term can be attached to a certain ideology or school of thought. The philosophy of existentialism, for example, is operative in the existential biographies of Sartre, as well as in his
essays on writers such as Ponge, Proust, Mauriac, Blanchot, Bataille. Despite the criticisms of Sartre's approach by structuralist critics, it forms an important body of work in the context. Derrida, for example, admits that he discovered writers like Blanchot and Bataille through Sartre's critical essays. The work of critics such as Starobinski and Marthe Robert seems to be a search for an existential problematic behind the work. The work of Lucien Goldmann looks for the sociological structures behind the work. The main current of 'la nouvelle critique' and the criticism that is most accurately designated by that name, is more difficult to assign to a particular philosophy. It is often known as 'thematic criticism' or 'phenomenological criticism'. Its common denominator is that it is generally influenced by the work of Bachelard. The work of Jean-Pierre Richard, Georges Poulet and Jean-Paul Weber falls into this category. Bachelard's phenomenological criticism began with an attempt to find the generative images or archetypes that lie behind the images used in the work. This developed into an attempt to construct a 'phenomenology of the poetic image'. Poulet and Richard thus look at the images used in the work in order to construct a phenomenology of the imagination. Weber is more concerned with a universal theory of literary creation. Their perspective is in a sense anthropological rather than structuralist.
Outside the main currents of criticism as for literature, the work of Blanchot and Bataille is of fundamental importance for TQ. Again it is evident that the main pretext for TQ's intervention is in the margins of the immediate context. The work of Blanchot stems from a view of the universe and of man's situation within it that is similar to that of Sartre. Blanchot questions 'man's condition' through the existence of the literary work and its preoccupations. He departs from literature to learn about the world rather than departing from the world, from biography and so on, to learn about the work. The conclusions Blanchot draws are crucial: literature is an impossible activity, destined to destroy itself through its lack of utility and its self-consciousness. There is an emphasis on the subjectivity of the writer, who is involved with an activity of fundamental risk. Blanchot's emphasis on the self-consciousness of the text, on the experience of the writer and on the negativity that the experience implicates, a philosophy with an extremely Hegelian tone, is an important part of the background to TQ's critique of the text.

No less important is the work of Bataille in criticism. The influence of La Littérature et le Mal and Bataille's essays in Critique is a hidden influence that will become apparent in the course of the 'traversée' of the thesis. Bataille's emphasis on experiences of excess - eroticism, violence and the sacred, form an important
antidote to the excesses of structuralism in TQ. Sollers's essays in Logiques are a continuation of Bataille's approach to the limit as a transgression.

Roland Barthes is partly implicated in 'la nouvelle critique' but is best considered apart from it. He is of particular importance for TQ as part of the context and as an ally. His work before 1960, although marginal, forms part of the context of criticism into which TQ enters. Barthes's first major publication is Le Degré zéro de l'écriture. This work is a history of the way in which literature signals itself as literature, of the concept of literature as such, and is thus intimately linked to the preoccupations of Blanchot. Barthes main reference point, however, is Sartre's Qu'est-ce que la littérature. At the same time Barthes is producing articles on the theatre that show a marked preference for Brecht. Barthes's work previous to 1960, with its relations to Sartre and Brecht, is of a slightly different character to his 'structuralist' work. While Le Degré zéro de l'écriture established the Blanchotesque thesis of the disappearance of literature, and Barthes's essays on the Nouveau Roman in the late 'fifties contributed much to Robbe-Grillet's conception of his own work, after Mythologies Barthes's concerns tend more towards structuralism and semiology, only to emerge later as a theory of the text and of writing. Barthes's position straddling the University (he worked at the C.N.R.S. for intermittent periods) and the literary press is crucial. It partly enables the later intersections operated by TQ and is a precondition for the
development of a structuralist or semiological literary criticism. Thus Barthes's essays on theatre, the Nouveau Roman and criticism, collected in 1964 in *Essais critiques* constitute an important block of innovative thought on literature that is instrumental in the development of TQ. The semiological perspective is developed at the same time in the final, theoretical essay of *Mythologies* ('Le Mythe aujourd'hui') which can be situated as the inauguration of semiology as far as literary criticism is concerned. Barthes later notes that *Mythologies* combined two initiatives - the demystification of bourgeois ideology from a Marxist / Brechtian perspective, implicitly relevant to the later development of the critique of ideology in TQ, and the Saussurean 'science of signs', a science that would study the life of signs in society. This distinction signals the two different aspects of Barthes's work, that in a sense combine in the mid to late 'sixties to focus specifically on the Text.

Saussure had predicted that linguistics would be a part of a general science of semiology. Barthes turns the equation around, so that semiology is but one of the sciences that take structural linguistics as their base and propose language as the sign system through which all others are articulable. Linguistics as such therefore becomes a vital source for any criticism that departs from the semiological perspective.

Barthes's activities as semiologist and as literary critic are thus in a dislocated manner effective in the
immediate context of TQ. The fact that Barthes's work is important in these two areas at different moments attests to the importance for TQ of Barthes's heterodox character and interests. The continuity between Barthes's interests is also crucial, reflecting the cross-fertilisation of separate areas and institutions through and in TQ with the common denominator of a certain view of writing which we can again suggest to be, immediately, influenced by Blanchot, Bataille and Barthes.

Linguistics

The backdrop to Barthes's development of semiology is an intense development of linguistics. Barthes's interaction with the Ecole pratique des Hautes Etudes, where fields such as linguistics, anthropology and philosophy could intercommunicate, came to a scientific focus with the Communications group and periodical which included Todorov, Bremond, Ruwet, Christian Metz. This group was a fruitful link for TQ. It is a corridor through which developments in linguistics could filter through to other areas.

In the area of linguistics it is important to signal the continuing work of Jakobson, particularly in widening out the field of poetics. The work of Benveniste is perhaps even more important in criticising certain aspects of Saussurean theory and developing the concept of 'énonciation'. The rise of Chomskyan linguistics in the late 'fifties and early 'sixties is also an essential
pretext for the work of Kristeva, who uses it against structuralist linguistics and then opposes it herself."

It is certain that the development of structuralism and of semiology have a decisive effect on the kind of criticism TQ develops. The reference to linguistic terms and theories is a constant of the critical writing in TQ. TQ does not for all this become identified with structuralism or semiology. As with literature the 'investment' in the more marginal work of Bataille and Blanchot, in which subjectivity is a principal focus, prevents such an exclusive stance. The work of Barthes is a crucial part of the context as a current that traverses both of these areas, then to become specifically implicated in TQ's history and transformed by it.

TQ's relation to the context is thus double. It enters into a role in which it fulfills the functions expected of it by the context, as a 'champion of literature', of the Nouveau Roman, the 'nouvelle critique', but at the same time refers to another context, less obvious and less linear, which is its true context. Through this trans-historical reference TQ effects a constant reinterpretation of its own context and of the notion of historical context itself.
NOTES FOR CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

The following abbreviations will be used in the notes: Sollers, Logiques (L), Sur le matérialisme (SLM), Théorie des exceptions (THEX), Improvisations (IMP); Théorie d'ensemble (THE); Kristeva, Séméiotikê (S) (We will use this title instead of the original Greek Σημειωτική), La Révolution du langage poétique (RLP), Polylogue (P), Pouvoirs de l'horreur (PH). Page references in text are to text under discussion, unless otherwise specified.

I. Introduction

1. 'Tel Quel' will henceforth be written 'TQ'. 'TQ' is used to refer to either the review itself, as an organism, or the group constituted around the review. Our perspective is that the review has a logic of its own beyond the sum of the experiences of each of its contributors. References to the review will give the number out of 94 of the issue concerned.

2. See Bibliography. Susan Rubin Suleiman, Stephen Bann, Jean-Paul Aron, Francois Dosse offer brief accounts that miss the essential basis of the review. Leslie Hill and Celia Britton, Jean-Louis Fourny, Danielle Marx-Scouras, Geert Lerout, Marian Hobson give useful accounts of specific aspects. The testimony of Elisabeth Roudinesco is also useful, while the recent article by Louis Pinto and the accounts by P. Thody and Keith Reader are dominated by their partisan stance. The considerations by Aldo Rossi, Anne Nicolas, Leon S. Roudiez, Per Aage Brandt and Stephen Heath are incomplete due to the date of their appearance. Philippe Forest's recent biographical overview of Sollers's work appeared too late to have been fully commented on. Its perspective is non-theoretical and non-analytic. Much 'information' can be gleaned from Sollers's and Kristeva's recent semi-autobiographical novels and Pleynet's journals.


4. Of the TQ committee members, only Marc Devade and Julia Kristeva are not 'creative writers'. Devade is, however, a painter, and present on the committee for that fact and for his relations with the periodical Peinture, cahiers théoriques and the group 'Supports-Surfaces' with which TQ was associated. Kristeva's status is, as Barthes underlined in 'L'étrangère' (Le Bruissement de la langue, Paris 1984, Seuil, p. 197), always 'l'intruse', due to her origins (Bulgarian), her sex and the nature of her work.

II. The context of reviews

Reviews in 1960

1. There is an early polemic with Dominique de Roux, giving rise to Baudry's article 'Céline véhicule à De Roux', TQ28 Winter 1967.


3. Later to publish influential works on 'everyday life' (Critique de la vie quotidienne, Paris 1947, Grasset) and urban space, Lefebvre
was also the early mentor of Guy Debord, chief editor of L'Internationale sitzuationiste.

4. Castoriadis had published an important assessment of the bureaucracy of the Soviet Union that went unnoticed in Socialisme et barbarie 2 1949, republished as Le Socialisme bureaucratique, Paris 1973, 10/18. He has recently become a psychoanalyst.

5. Lyotard would go on to become a 'post-structuralist' philosopher in the 'seventies. Dérive à partir de Marx et Freud, Paris 1973, 10/18, p.226-9, has some unilluminating comments on TQ.

6. Situationniste International, Paris, 1958-69, republished by Editions Gérard Le bovici, Paris 1985. The recent works of Debord, (see Bibliography) are also invaluable for a 'strategic' consideration of the role of the avant-garde. The role of the Situationists is 'unidentifiable' as they were not taken seriously by the intellectual establishment until the late 'seventies, eg. by Sollers/Clavel in Délivrance, Paris 1977, p. 51.

7. Daix would later publish Nouvelle critique et art moderne, Paris 1968, in the Collection TQ and later, after leaving the PCF, militate in TQ for Czech dissidents, TQ 58.


Satellites or obstacles - reviews after 1960


The paradigmatic context


11. ibid.p.V.


14. ibid.

15. This has already been rewritten in a fictional mode by Sollers in Femmes, Paris 1983, Gallimard, and Portrait du Joueur, Paris 1984, Gallimard, and by Kristeva in Les Samouraïs, Paris 1990, Fayard. Pleynet's journals : Le Voyage en Chine, Paris 1980 Hachette, Spirito peregrino, 1981, Hachette, L'amour, 1982, Hachette and Le Jour et l'heure, Paris 1989 Plon also offer 'affective' analyses of some of the later years. In interviews, all three stress the aspect of subjective experience of the adventure of TQ. Elements to be taken into account in such an analysis of the 'réseau' of subjective, affective responses would be the singularity of the experience of writing and of psychoanalysis in Kristeva's case, the way the temporality of this experience conflicted with the temporality of the context and with the 'monumental' temporality of literature and art, and how my own subjectivity is engaged in this adventure.

III. The philosophical context

Post-war

5. The late 'seventies saw a 'retour à Kant', suggesting the possibility of a cyclical Hegel/Kant pattern.
6. cf. comments of Sollers in a personal interview where he insists on the importance of the Bataille-Kojève relationship.

The break-up after 1956

7. Individuals like Henri Lefebvre and Edgar Morin left the PCF at this point.
8. Sartre's time in the early 'sixties was dominated by his work on L'Idiot de la famille, Paris 1971-2, on Flaubert. His comments in 'Sartre répond', L'Arc 30, 1966, where he joins TQ to Foucault and Robbe-Grillet in an anti-historicist amalgam indicate his position removed from the forefront of debate, but he re-emerges as a political force in the aftermath of 1968. Situations X, Paris 1976, Gallimard.
9. Desanti will later be interviewed in TQ by Kristeva as part of an investigation of the rationalism of science. TQ 58 Summer 1974.
10. cf. the comments of Perry Anderson in In the tracks of historical materialism, London 1983, where he compares TQ unfavourably with Western Marxists.
12. See Chapter 3, I.
14. The Annales school of historians were never specifically aligned to structuralism and pre-dated it.

IV. The literary context

Existentialism , 'désinvoluturc', abstract and Nouveau Roman

3. Roland Barthes, 'Littérature objective' Critique ,1954,
6. Cf. Chronology. TQ is not the 'Nouveau-nouveau roman' but a new departure on a different basis, as we will show.
   Céline, *D'un chateau l'autre*, Paris 1957.

Poetry ; sparsity and experimentation

Reassessment of the context - the double context

Literary criticism ; objective and 'nouvelle'

In the margins

Linguistics
25. See Chronology, works of Jakobson, Benveniste, Martinet.
CHAPTER TWO - INTERVENTION

I. The formation of Tel Quel

The accident of formation

The immediate precondition for the formation of TQ, apart from the distribution of publishers and reviews, is the biography of Philippe Sollers. He was born Philippe Joyaux in Talence, near Bordeaux, in 1936. His family were minor industrialists. Considerations of the physical biography of Sollers, the history of illness and of sexual 'education' attain a specific importance in the light of later works. Vision à New York re-interprets these aspects in the light of Paradis. It is irrelevant to write here a biography of Sollers, because, as with Joyce, the life of Sollers is wholly intertwined with his writing, to the extent that to reproduce it here would be to present something that is enounced as a parallel with an experience of writing as a factual history. Writing re-interprets the biography, rewrites the biography. As such the 'real' biography of Sollers, or Philippe Joyaux, is irrelevant for our purposes. What is relevant is that Sollers was 'discovered' by Mauriac and Aragon and won a contract at Le Seuil through Francis Ponge and Jean Cayrol. His first novel Une curieuse solitude was a huge success and this was the reason why Le Seuil agreed to the
formation of a literary review around Sollers, as a good investment. The formation of the review, with two friends Hallier and Huguenin, also up and coming talents, was thus to an extent entirely determined by financial considerations. Le Seuil wanted to create the next NRF. It was also to an extent a mistake, since Sollers diverted from the path that Une curieuse solitude had promised and deceived those who had placed great hopes in him. The formation of the review is thus an accident; it is only an accident of this sort that could have set the textual mechanism of the review in motion, since the context would never have permitted the foundation of a machine that would re-interpret and transform it.

The first issue - aestheticism

The first issue of TQ appears in Spring 1960, with a committee of six, mostly from the stable of writers of Cayrol's review Ecrire at Le Seuil. It contains a new poem by Francis Ponge, 'La Figue (sèche)' as well as an older 'Proème' which dated from 1924. The six members of the editorial committee were all represented in the contents of the first issue, five of them by short prose pieces, Matignon by a short critical piece on 'Flaubert et la sensibilité moderne'. Of the other articles or extracts of the first issue 'La Poursuite' by Claude Simon and 'L'attentat' by Jean Thibaudeau indicate an orientation towards the Nouveau Roman, while a short descriptive prose piece by Cayrol suggests the homage of TQ to their mentor
The issue opens with a 'Déclaration', while at the centre of the review is an 'Enquête sur le don de l'écrivain' in which the question 'Pensez-vous avoir un don de l'écrivain?' was put to many contemporary writers. At the end of the issue there are some 'Notes de lecture' in which books recently published are given marks out of 20 by each of the committee members. The last two devices are a nod to the Surrealist reviews, which also used these methods. Finally, there is an editorial section in which the committee signals current publications and events in the media.

As far as concerns the approach suggested by the title, the epigram and the 'Déclaration', the opening epigraph from which the name 'Tel Quel' is taken derives from Nietzsche:

'Je veux le monde et le veux tel quel et le veux encore, le veux éternellement, et je crie insatiablement: bis! et non seulement pour moi seul, mais pour toute la pièce et pour tout le spectacle ; et non pour tout le spectacle seul, mais au fond pour moi, parce que le spectacle m'est nécessaire, parce qu'il me rend nécessaire, parce que je lui suis nécessaire et parce que je le rends nécessaire'.

The affirmation of the state of things implicit here differs from the Valéry title,' where it puts the emphasis on a raw, unchanged state rather than on the affirmation. The potential conservatism of this position is to be set against its optimism, its affirmation, but rather than see this original epigraph as a definition it is more appropriate to see 'Tel Quel' as a shifter, constantly redefined by the epigraphs at the beginning of the review, until the early 'seventies when they are dropped.'
The title 'Tel Quel' is, however, justified and qualified by the 'Déclaration' as an apology for literature, without an ideological justification:

'Les idéologues ont suffisamment régné sur l'expression pour que celle-ci se permette enfin de leur fausser compagnie, de ne plus s'occuper que d'elle-même, de sa fatalité et de ses règles particulières.'

The call for 'la qualité littéraire' and an end to the rule of literature by ideology, the Manicheism of committed or non-committed literature, in this declaration exhibits most of the characteristics of an 'aestheticism'. This aestheticism affirms writing and poetry above all, as a privileged contact with the world, rather than an 'art for art's sake' which denies reality. It is an aestheticism that is susceptible to develop into a formalism.

The first issue of TQ indicates the co-existence of a number of currents; a purely aesthetic current concerned with the reduction to a 'pure' vision which tends towards a second current, which is the more formally experimental tendency of the Nouveau Roman and Ponge, and a third current, which departs from a certain subjective experience that is produced within writing. At the same time there is a recognition of the Surrealists through the format of the review. These currents will enter into conflict, perhaps not as a result, yet, of their intrinsically contradictory nature but as a result of the internal conflicts of the committee and the working out of the specific character of TQ, before the 'logic' of writing is set in place.

Much of the material published in the first two years of
the review's existence is eventually superseded. At the same time the view of language presented in most of the texts published at this early stage, especially those written by members of the editorial committee, has a part to play in the development of the review. Alongside the interest in the Nouveau Roman, these texts (eg. those by Hallier, Huguenin, Coudol, Boisrouvray) are very conscious of their use of language. This speculation on language has however not formed into an innovative literary practice, the self-consciousness of the writing is not thought through critically. As such the aestheticism of the first period appears 'ambiguous'.\(^8\) The emergence of a critical discourse on writing is due initially, as we will show, to the Nouveau Roman and the review's dissociation from it.

The Nouveau Roman - tactical support and contestation

It is by way of a tactical support of the Nouveau Roman, a tactical alliance \(^9\) with Editions de Minuit, that TQ will mark out a place for itself at the forefront of literary innovation. The strategy put into practice by the review is to establish the alliance by way of publishing extracts from the work of the 'nouveaux romanciers', affirmative critical reviews of their work, and to introduce into the editorial committee individuals who have a particular connection with Editions de Minuit and the Nouveau Roman. At the same time the tactical nature of this support is indicated by an emphasis on other, parallel interests, specific to the review, in
areas which could prove to be contestatory of the ideas and practice of the Nouveau Roman, in tactical support also of elements from which a possible systematic critique could emerge, and in the increasing qualification of affirmative criticism with a number of adversely critical points.

The first two years thus see a proliferation of extracts from the work of 'nouveaux romanciers', accompanied by critical reviews of their work, including an affirmative review of Dans le labyrinthe by Sollers. Thibeaudeau and Ricardou's entry into the committee cements the alliance, while a critical discourse begins to emerge through the 'La littérature aujourd'hui' series of interviews and articles by the critics Barthes and Genette. The second period will see the development of this criticism and an explicit statement of the review's position in Sollers's review of Pour un Nouveau Roman. The intervention of 'le langage poétique' represented by the entry into the committee of Pleynet, Denis Roche, J.-P. Faye and the subsequent change of direction is also instrumental in this distancing. A further instrumental factor is the implicit opposition of the tactical interest in the Nouveau Roman and the explorative interest in the marginal texts of Ponge, Bataille, Artaud.

The importance of the 'nouvelle critique' for TQ in the first two years is in developing a critical perspective on the Nouveau Roman, specifically in the articles of Genette, and in elaborating a critical perspective on its own position within the literary
context, a factor made evident in the interview published with Roland Barthes. Despite publications which indicate the review's sympathy with the 'nouvelle critique' of Richard, for example, it soon becomes evident that TQ separates itself from the 'nouvelle critique' as such, and is more sympathetic to the 'structuralist' criticism of Barthes and Genette. This sympathy will prove efficient in identifying the review with an innovative and fast emerging current of criticism which will become more powerful as the decade progresses.

The second context - exploratory activities

Alongside the strategic or tactical activity of the review, during the first period, is the 'informative' or 'explorative' activity. Although the 'tactical' elements of the first period - alliance with the Nouveau Roman, support of the 'Nouvelle critique', can also be described as exploratory and tending towards the definition or marking out of a field, it is in the publication of various key authors that this period is exploratory in the sense of creating a field of inquiry and interest specific to the review. These explorations are also instrumental in creating a current of interest that, in the case of Artaud and Bataille, emphasises an experience of excess that provides the basis for a poetic language that enters into conflict, implicitly, with the rationalism of the Nouveau Roman. For the first period the 'explorative' aspect is thus represented by the publication of texts by Ponge,
Artaud and Bataille, with a lesser emphasis on other authors such as Pound, Hölderlin and Borges. The exploration of Ponge, Artaud and Bataille and Pound continues in subsequent issues, while there is a lesser interest in the other writers, linked to the demise of the aestheticism of the first period. The focus on Bataille, specifically, inscribes a mechanism or a logic of transgression in the movement of the review that subsequent periods will develop. This activity defines what we have delineated as the 'second context' which undermines the superficial tactical interest in the Nouveau Roman and begins to establish what we define as the permanent characteristics of the review.

The establishment of the committee

The early period of the history of TQ is characterised by an extreme volatility in its editorial committee as the specificity of the review is elaborated and its 'logic' is set into motion. The departures and exclusions (in the case of Hallier) are a result of these shifts in policy and can be interpreted as birth pangs in this sense. After the earlier purging of the heroic tendency of Huguenin and the Heideggerian tendency of Deguy the main shift occurs in 1963 when the first major split in the editorial committee takes place leaving Sollers and Boisrouvray as the only two remaining members of the original committee. Jacques Coudol leaves at the same time as Hallier. Hallier's departure is due ostensibly to the
latter's attempt to take over the exclusive direction of the review. However, aesthetic differences between the formalistic tendencies of the group around Sollers and the less serious and less analytical approach of Hallier can be cited as further reasons.

With Hallier, Coudol, Huguenin and Matignon now gone, the committee is entirely restructured, under Sollers's initiative, when Marcelin Pleynet, Jean-Louis Baudry and Denis Roche enter the committee at Issue 13 (Summer 1963). Marcelin Pleynet immediately becomes the 'Secrétaire de rédaction', and the committee is restructured as a group as opposed to a committee with a 'Directeur'. Pleynet's moderating role as secretary is nevertheless pertinent for the future development of the review. With the entry into the committee of Jean-Pierre Faye in Autumn 1963 the committee is as it will stay for quite some time, until the departure of Boisrouvray and the arrival of other new members.

The constitution of the committee is another 'accidental' factor that enables the review, in our view, to function as it does. It may not be so accidental, however, if we consider the eventual committee to be made up of individuals favoured by Sollers, and Sollers as the motive force of the review. Sollers does objectively force the exclusions of Hallier, Faye, Thibaudeau etc. but he does not create the situation in which the exclusions are made possible. There is a part of the functioning of the review which is that of the mechanism, and a part which is the precipitation of crises by a will, aware of this
mechanism. Our analysis attempts to take account of this in its passage.

The second period of the history of TQ, from 1963 to 1967, follows the development of the review from the inception of the new committee and the exclusion of Hallier, a break with an aestheticist, eclectic and non-theoretical approach to its intersection with the scientific currents that emerge in the mid to late nineteen-sixties, to transform the space of the avant-garde in the review into a space of science. This period sees the elaboration of both a textuality proper to the review in the practice of both novelists and poets, and a coherent theory of textuality not yet defined as a science. This implies a disengagement from the Nouveau Roman, the emergence of poetic language as an important force and the introduction into the review of currents from linguistics and 'formalism' which develop into a powerful critical tool. The review also functions in this period as a melting pot or site of intersection of the avant-garde in literature and other areas, which can be seen as paralleled by the critical exploration of 'limit texts' (Ponge, Artaud, Dante, Bataille, Sade, Mallarmé, Lautréamont) from which a theory of literature is built up that forms the basis of TQ's radical vision of the text, and which is affirmed throughout the existence of the review in various forms. This is the setting in motion of a logic that functions throughout the history of TQ and traverses its various mutations.
II. The dépassement of the Nouveau Roman / Poetic language.

The noise of Robbe-Grillet / transgressive strategies

We underlined above how the strategic alliance with the Nouveau Roman was only a temporary measure to enter into the context, and that a 'dépassement' of this phenomenon was necessary. In the period now in question this 'dépassement' occurs in three different ways. Firstly, through a close examination of the practice of a number of writers associated with the Nouveau Roman. This is represented by the 'La littérature aujourd'hui' series of interviews which feature Barthes, Sarratue, Butor and Robbe-Grillet among others. Secondly, TQ engages with the Nouveau Roman in critical reviews and articles which directly and indirectly concern the phenomenon. Most of these reviews and articles are concerned with Robbe-Grillet, author of Pour un Nouveau Roman, as the 'nouveaux romancier' who is the most theoretically prominent and who had the closest relationship to the review during the first period. Sollers's review of this book is a critical point in the 'dépassement'. The review continues, however, to publish texts by Simon, Ollier and by Ricardou, an indication of how it is the ideological phenomenon of the Nouveau Roman that is the obstacle, rather than the practice of those writers concerned.

The 'dépassement' of the Nouveau Roman thus entails not only a critical attack on the theoretical foundations of
that ideology, but also an emphasis on the writers of the Nouveau Roman as individual writers, in an attempt to disengage their practice from 'the theoretical noise of a Robbe-Grillet'. Michel Butor, for example, in the fourth of the interviews published emphasises the fact that he does not belong to any school and cannot be considered solely as a novelist. The interview with Robbe-Grillet separates the fiction from the theoretical work.

It seems that the main target for TQ in the ideology of the Nouveau Roman is the notion of the realism that it implies. TQ begins to develop a textuality in which the old problematic of real/unreal is redundant, as well as that of objective/subjective. We can identify this strategy as the enclosing of oppositions within a larger space; it becomes characteristic of TQ. We can call it dialectical or transgressive and trace it to the influence of Bataille and beyond him Hegel. This is a major focus of our theoretical analysis in Chapter Three.

Foucault - Roussel : textual space

A more important point in the development of an indirect critical understanding of the problems raised by the Nouveau Roman is Sollers's review of Michel Foucault's book Raymond Roussel, shifting the perspective from a debate around the question of realism to more radical questions of textual space, auto-referentiality and infinity, a space closer to Blanchot that to Robbe-Grillet. Sollers stresses in Foucault's account how
textual space envelops questions of objectivity or subjectivity. So while Robbe-Grillet emphasises the objective qualities of Roussel's work, Foucault and Sollers focus on the linguistic reality of the text:

'Il faut...accepter sa réalité, c'est à dire une pratique vertigineuse du langage (incessament confronté à son origine et au hasard qu'il implique aussitôt).'(p.46)

This suggests a fundamental disparity between the two approaches. Robbe-Grillet sees in Roussel a reduction of language to a pure descriptive function; Sollers (and Foucault) see in Roussel a vertiginous, that is to say, risky, transgressive language which confronts its own origin. For Sollers the equation has to be rethought from the point of view of language as the space within which the text operates. In this sense Robbe-Grillet remains on the other side of the limit that enables a text such as Roussel's to be read as a text. Robbe-Grillet remains a prisoner of the distinction between subjective and objective, real and imaginary, interior and exterior, that is dissolved once the text is seen as a space interior to language, resulting primarily from the productivity of language.

In the same way Roussel can only be said to be a writer of the 'imaginary' or the 'fantastic', as for the Surrealists, if a real is posited as a basis for the view of the world implied in the text. Sollers repeats and affirms Foucault's analysis that Roussel's texts do not represent a pre-given reality but construct a new, linguistic reality and are 'cette fabrication en acte'(p.47). Concluding the article, Sollers proposes the
replacement of Roussel in his proper place:

'Ne vivons-nous pas cette "inquiétude" du langage, cette "angoisse du signifiant" dont Roussel a défini la géométrie ? Il faut pour le comprendre, replacer Roussel, dans cet espace linguistique.' (p.50)

As an inventor of a 'linguistic space' Roussel is disengaged from the problems of realism that Robbe-Grillet in his emphasis on 'objective' description and the 'imaginary' as an adjunct of this, had claimed him for. This new linguistic space displaces 'realism' and is a crucial step in the dépassement of the Nouveau Roman. Sollers's insistence on what we call a new textual space defines a new area of debate and can be seen to open TQ to a new context, a context of texts in a temporality of writing.

An imaginary book

To continue our analysis of Sollers's delineation of a new space of the text, we can see how he continues his elaboration of the logic of this linguistic space in the theoretical article 'Logique de la fiction'. This describes a hypothetical book; the article is thus programmatic, it defines a project. Whether or not this project is carried out or not depends on a reading of the texts and the writing of texts since. It is the distance between theory and reading that defines the impact of TQ. Do the texts fulfill the expectations of the theory? Our textual analyses in Chapter Four, we suggest, affirm that they do. Moreover, it must be borne in mind that the distinction between 'theory' and 'fiction' wears very thin
at moments, so that the reading of the theory itself confirms the theory.

Sollers criticises in the article the novel as it is read at the present in the same way that he will later in 'Le Roman et l'expérience des limites'. The novel as a 'reflection' of reality or as a 'decoration', in short, the representational novel is distanced by Sollers. As opposed to the representational text, which Sollers relates to Platonic idealism of 'forms' and 'ideas', the text of 'fiction' implicates its reader. The representational text left its reader 'outside' the text. As the representational text is 'exterior' to the reality it purports to represent, the reader is 'exterior' to the text. The text of fiction situates all three elements within the same interior, immanent space.

In order to delineate this space, Sollers has recourse to a Husserlian époché in a similar way to Robbe-Grillet, but while the latter goes too far in this reduction, and thus remains a prisoner of the Cartesian cogito that is implicit in any objectivism, by missing it, Sollers recognises a subjectivity as a kind of basis: 'Quoi que je fasse, il y a toujours la présence obscure du reste que j'étais.' This phenomenological gesture does not go as far as existentialism, however, in seeing this subjectivity as a basis for action. As opposed to the existentialist credo 'I am because I do', 'I am constituted by what I do', Sollers situates the 'Je' inside a current, a process of thought, 'I am thought' ('Je suis pensé'). The subject is thus situated within a
current which he is unable to control, but nevertheless he attempts to understand his position. This understanding, 'la compréhension' derives from a source of contestation of the current and an attempt to follow it:

'C'est pourquoi je définirai la "compréhension" que j'attends comme une opération assez souple... pour suivre ses propres phénomènes, se placer à leur côté lorsqu'ils se font 'langage'... le mouvement que j'évoque tient de la danse, de la nage, de tout ce j'appelle une chance en marche. La mobilité délivre le chant, le chant se fait immobilité sans frein (courant dans un courant)'.(p.7)

Distinct from both the Nouveau Roman and existentialism, Sollers thus outlines the 'logic of fiction' on the basis of a subjectivity that is situated as a position within a current of thought, which 'doubles' this current and exists as a contestation of it, within it. The space in which this current exists 'contains' language; language is less the exclusive space in which the current takes place than a transgressive movement that enables a doubling of the current. The 'current' defined here can be recognised as a Bataillean continuity:

"Nous sommes ainsi conduits à reconnaître un milieu porteur de continuité, un champ où s'exerce périodiquement la faculté d'identification, un espace ni intérieur ni extérieur, susceptible d'être englobé par une combinatoire neuve et mathématiquement fondée".(p.7)

The realm of discontinuity contains the distinction between exterior and interior, subjectivity and objectivity, reader and writer, language and reality, conscious and unconscious, the language of rationality and of dream or madness. It is from a perspective of continuity that Sollers's view of fiction is derived.

On this basis a number of formulations that remain constant throughout the passage of TQ are set in place:
fiction as a 'redoublement' (p.4) or doubling of a subjectivity that is within a current that is infinitely in movement, and an aleatory quality that is emphasised as 'une chance en marche'. The 'combinatoire neuve et mathématiquement fondée' looks forward to the 'transfini' elaborated by Kristeva, to Sollers's title Nombres, but also to Paradis.

While Sollers's essay is important beyond its implicit critique of the Nouveau Roman, the criticism is present in the elaboration of a continuous space and the critique of representative fiction. While the Nouveau Roman's auto-referentiality (as in Robbe-Grillet's Dans le labyrinthe, recognised by Sollers) is close to the notion of 'redoublement' the theory of the subject that is outlined by Sollers is absent from Robbe-Grillet's theoretical formulations, as is the basis in Bataille's notions of continuity and transgression.

Robbe-Grillet vs. Bataille. The exclusion of 'le non-savoir'

In his review of Robbe-Grillet's Pour un Nouveau Roman Sollers develops the Bataillean critique of the Nouveau Roman as a critique of rationality. The modern novel, for Sollers, places itself at the level of an interrogation, or a contestation, as was proposed in 'Logique de la fiction' of meaning or thought. Sollers stresses how 'la déraison' or 'le non-savoir', to extend Sollers's vocabulary towards Bataille, is also part of this thought,
part of the continuity of which Robbe-Grillet's rationality is a restricted area. The contestation of thought must of necessity go by way of a recognition of 'le non-savoir'. Foucault's work on the limit between reason and 'unreason' is crucial here. So Sollers is therefore recognising what we have already emphasised, how the rationality of the Nouveau Roman is undermined by the 'non-savoir' recognised in or by Artaud, Bataille, Foucault.

Sollers also attacks the opposition of subjective and objective, the author, and the notion of the text as spectacle, all from a perspective that we define as one of transgressive continuity. This is the application of a logic of transgression that we see as being applied at other moments as the logic of the precipitation of crises mentioned earlier. We could even call it the 'logic of TQ' to show how crucial it is to the theoretical and strategic functioning of the review.

Cérisy 1963

After these insights the 1963 Cérisy conference appears as a failure to apply this logic. The discussion comes up against the obstacle of the necessity of referring every discussion to Robbe-Grillet and realism. However, where the conference is useful for our purposes and for the evolution of the review is in the presence of Michel Foucault, who defines for the review its own status and direction. His comments are pertinent for a discussion.
of the difference between TQ and other cultural movements.

Foucault significantly suggests the differences between the approach of TQ and the Surrealists (p.12) voicing a distinction that was latent in such articles as 'Logique de la fiction'. The distinction as Foucault presents it, an assessment we would endorse, is twofold: while the Surrealists treat various 'spiritual' experiences such as dreams, madness, transgression, as aspects in a psychological space, positing a 'beyond' ('au-delà' or 'en deçà') to the operation of thought, Sollers and by extension TQ treat these experiences as mechanisms operating in the space of thought. Foucault cites the importance of Blanchot and Bataille, especially of the latter whose importance for TQ results partly from his having brought such experiences as eroticism and 'la folie' out of the psychological space of the Surrealists and onto the level of thought. While for the Surrealists, Foucault clarifies, language was only 'un instrument d'accès' or a 'surface de réflexion' (p.13) of the psychological processes pushed forward by the 'au-delà', into the space of language, language for Sollers and TQ is the element in which these operations take place. As we saw in 'Logique de la fiction', language is a space in a continuity in the interior of which the operations of thought take place, and into which the 'exterior' is merged. It therefore makes no sense to talk of a 'beyond', a non-linguistic space in which psychological operations could take place. The main difference between a psychological approach and one which situates itself on
the level of thought is the difference of relation to language. Psychology postulates the existence of operations of the mind that are exterior to language, in that they are independent and generative of motives that are revealed or expressed in language (as the Surrealists would postulate). Sollers's emphasis on language as interior space places itself in direct opposition to what Foucault calls 'psychologism':

'Tout l'anti-psychologisme de la philosophie contemporaine, c'est bien dans cette ligne là que Sollers se place.'(p.13)

Foucault proposes that Sollers's inquiries address themselves to the area of correlation of thought and language, to the intermediary space which links 'penser et parler'.(p.13)

The emergence of a poetic language

With Sollers's review of *Pour un Nouveau Roman* the Nouveau Roman is theoretically superseded, and it no longer acts as an obstacle to the theoretical development of the review. Strategically, the review becomes less identifiable as a *foyer* of support for the Nouveau Roman as other currents begin to achieve more prominence in the review. Textually, the Nouveau Roman is transgressed in the work of Sollers, Baudry, and the other novelists of the review, with the possible exceptions of Faye and Ricardou, who we have indicated as remaining within a representational or expressionist perspective. However an important parallel to this transgression is the emergence in the review of poetic language and a critical discourse...
on it, which as we have stressed goes beyond the emphasis on the rational of the Nouveau Roman.

The poetic function of language according to Jakobson entails an emphasis placed on the medium in which the message is transmitted, the code, language as such. This self-referentiality and stress on the materiality of language does play a large part in the poetic language of TQ but it is of limited use as a theoretical approach due to Jakobson's departure from a model of language as communication. Poetic language also involves, in a sense closer to the approach of Kristeva, a transgression of ordinary discourse and of the limits of the latter. This transgression can however be linked to Jakobson's poetic function in that the stress on the materiality of language and on the code can propose a logic radically different from that of rational, communicative discourse.

Poetic language in this sense is present from the beginning of the review in extracts from Artaud, Hölderlin, and in Bataille's investigations into 'le non-savoir'. However, on the contemporary level, poetic language appears in the review in the work of Marcelin Pleynet and Denis Roche, published in extracts in the review, in the 'Collection Tel Quel', and in the critical articles they also publish in the review.

Denis Roche - subversive intent

To the eye the writing of Denis Roche looks like poetry. It displays all the visual signs of poetry; lines
of unequal length, each line beginning with a capital letter, surrounded and eroded by the empty spaces of the page, set in its centre. The reader is however struck by the apparent distance between the subject matter and the conventional themes of poetry - courtly love, metaphysics, or by the fracturing and frustration of these themes by the form of the poem. At times the subject matter of the writing is deliberately and perversely non-poetic, at other times the 'conventional' poetic theme is subverted by the 'lozenge' shape of the poem, the ending of the line, the intervention of typographic error, or false 'enjambements' between lines.

Roche's work is thus, within poetry, an attack on the rules and conventions of the genre, an enterprise entirely dedicated towards the destruction of poetry through the mutual opposition of poetic form and non-poetic content, non-poetic form and poetic content. This enterprise makes Roche a highly singular figure in TQ, since the 'ironic' position he adopts, defined by the subversive intent, colours his critical stance as well, leading eventually to the subversion of even the pretensions of a critical discourse by the fracturing of language the poetry entails.

Although Roche has an obvious antecedent in Rimbaud his poetry also implicitly refers to the non-French tradition of Pound, Cummings and Olson, thus offering a different approach from that of Pleynet and a fortiori from that of Deguy. Roche's critical work in TQ is an important importation of this tradition into the French context.
establishing TQ at the beginning as a space receptive to innovative non-French traditions, especially those from the U.S. The importance of Roche's interest in Pound is crucial for the elaboration of a critical discourse on poetic language in TQ, due to Pound's insistence on a technical discourse on poetry, and also for the reinterpretation in TQ of a 'maudit' writer. The interest of Pound in Chinese writing will also prove a crucial reference for TQ. However, Roche's interest in Pound and his practice in poetry are highly individual, they do not essentially define the collective project of TQ except in the negative sense of the destruction of the ideology of poetry. Roche's reference to Pound and also to Kandinsky form a different historical background from that of Sollers, Pleynet. Roche's position within the group is an extreme, in which the subversive, destructive possibilities of writing are pushed to a limit which disallows any critical analysis. The importance of Roche's approach as a limit and a reminder of the subversive intent of writing is however fundamental.

Marcelin Pleynet - poetic experience

Marcelin Pleynet's experience of poetic language, experience being a key word, is of a radical subjection. It is experienced as a 'battement de sens' that subverts identity, authorship, the name. In the first text, Provisoires amants des nègres, there is a 'mise en scène' of the conflict, induced by this experience,
between a Heideggerian nostalgia for a lost origin and the radical alienation writing entails. In the later works this nostalgia is no longer present, so that there is a definite movement towards a more fundamental subjection to the writing, a more radical experience of alienation. This experience of loss of identity is what defines poetic language, at first, for Pleynet. The presence of such writing in TQ is an excess with regard to the rationality of the Nouveau Roman, which can be said to attempt to foreclose this question of subjectivity through a fetishistic attention to detail. This experience of writing also determines a number of critical concerns.

The critical work of Pleynet is determined by his experience as a writer. Again Pleynet's emphasis is on non-French writers such as Olson, but uniquely in his case there is a close concern with non-verbal arts such as painting, dance and music. Pleynet's articles on U.S. Abstract Expressionist painting form an important body of work on this subject in France, but for TQ this can more pertinently be seen as a writing on something that escapes discourse but nevertheless implicates it and appeals to it. The non-verbal is also an excess with regard to the discursive, an experience of a loss of control.

Pleynet's real subject in his art criticism is his own experience of poetic language. The critical articles are thus instrumental in defining the character of TQ as an investigation into excess, and in associating the review with areas of the avant-garde in painting and other arts. To an extent Pleynet remains within the experience of
writing and not yet able to critically analyse it. The Heideggerian nostalgia determines this limitation, which seems to be superseded by the next work, *Paysages en deux* and the critical articles that follow it.

Pleynet's next poetic works, in *Paysages en deux* and *Comme*, represented in the review in extracts throughout this period, tend increasingly towards a problematisation of the relation between language and reality, which is present as a 'dédoublment' in the text, between landscape and language in *Paysages en deux*. This doubling emerges from a focus on language 'à l'état naissant'. The text emerges from its creative source, not the author but a contestation of language, as a fragmentation of language, which can nevertheless be divided into 'chant', the material music of language, and 'critique' a thought that reflects on this music. As such the 'critique' of Pleynet itself, as we have already underlined, is implicated in the experience of writing. The critical discourse that emerges from this approach is represented by Pleynet's articles 'La Pensée contraire' and 'L'Image du sens' that appear simultaneously to Sollers's 'Logique de la fiction' and the Cérisy debates. 'La Pensée contraire' questions the status of poetry as a genre and in doing so proposes an original poetic language before the language of communication, following Vico and Rousseau. The 'fundamental experience' that leads to this first language, an experience of terror, becomes part of the sacred when opposed by rationality and identity. It is a question, therefore, with poetic language, of
rediscovering the contestation of the language of rationality and identity through a fundamental experience. It is easy to recognise here Bataille's 'expérience intérieure' and 'non-savoir', and Kristeva's later theoretical formulation of this contestation of rational language and identity by poetic language. Pleynet refers to Roger Caillois, whose links with Bataille are well known, and to Michel's Foucault's early text *Maladie mentale et psychologie*, linking 'l'expérience fondamentale' to mental illness. Pleynet thus lays down the basis of TQ's later theory of poetic language in the same way Sollers had in 'Logique de la fiction', but in different terms.

In 'L'Image du sens', for Pleynet, the reader is up against a new code. The rhetoric Pleynet describes is one in which the reader is confronted with the image of meaning within language, that is to say, with the production of the code as such:

'...tout se passe comme si l'homme affrontait aujourd'hui pour la première fois, non plus le vocabulaire de l'identité des apparences..., la grammaire dogmatique de l'unité d'un sens, mais...la multiplicité où se joue l'image du sens...' (p.73)

Only that writing which contests through refusing to 'decorate' the world and to slip into an established order, is valid - a writing that contests is a writing which confronts the reader with an unreadability - just such a moment is present, and the new 'code' is one which confronts the reader with the mechanics of meaning as such. What is to be avoided is univocity of meaning and the constraint of language to referentiality.

The kind of work that is criticised is one where the
world is presented as a spectacle - as a reality which
goes beyond (or exists outside) the work,
representation." Pleynet's remarks here can be situated
in the context of a general critique in TQ of the image.
The image is in fact subverted by meaning, since the image
of meaning is no image, no fixed representation, but a
process. Pleynet continues, the notion of the 'work'
(l'oeuvre) thus needs to be totally re-considered. Rather
than inscribing itself at the head of a tradition and
presenting itself as the summit of the thought of our
civilisation, the new work inscribes the work in a system
of interdependencies, as part of a 'réseau', writes
Pleynet (p.75), citing Foucault. Pleynet thus posits,
implicitly, the need for TQ to offer a different version
of the history of literature. The work is thus part of a
reading which is not, this time, exhausted by the writing
itself. This writing which is also a reading is not,
moreover, a complete representation of something that
might have come before (or anything outside it) - it is
meaning in the process of production. The fact that the
work is no longer presented as a given and closed
perception of the world (a representation) but as a
participation in the infinite production of sense of the
world means that there is no longer any complete
difference between the writer and the reader ; both
participate in the same reading / writing.

Pleynet's interests in painting and other arts are a
function of his vision of writing. Pleynet's critical
review articles of Merce Cunningham and John Cage,
Rauschenberg, Burroughs, are important for the continuation of Pleynet's critique of representation. The title of the Rauschenberg review is 'Le monde est une peinture pas une décoration'. There is also a continued insistence on process and contestation, the process of composition of dance, for Merce Cunningham, the novel for Burroughs, which are exhibited by the works themselves, all of which are contestations in their relation to tradition. The interest in the U.S. avant-garde can also be seen as relevant if it is viewed as a result of the 'grafting' of Surrealism into U.S. culture in and after the IIInd World War. Pleynet's articles are thus instrumental in the 'return' of this graft in France. Pleynet transforms the immediate context of TQ by a return to a pre-war concern, via a 'grafting' into a different context.

Both Roche's and Pleynet's work are formative of the character of TQ as a review during this period, both in their poetic work and in their critical interests, which are simultaneously determined by their experience as writers and by the theoretical development of the review. We have shown how they begin to define a 'poetic language' outside the novel, and in the case of Pleynet, to introduce critical concerns that derive from poetic language.
III: From Avant-garde to Science

Despite the crucial concepts of a future theory of literature having been laid out in TQ in the articles analysed in the above section TQ does not immediately express its conception of literature in scientific terms. The development of semiology and structuralist linguistics in literary criticism has not yet reached its fruition, and during the period up to 1967 TQ has a specific part to play in the exposition of this current, which can be labelled 'formalist'. As well as acting as a foyer for the reception of new ideas from linguistics, and their 'translation' into literary theory TQ also acts as a site of intersection of a number of currents of the avant-garde in literature and elsewhere. There is a general trend towards the elaboration of this composite of avant-gardes into a coherent scientific theory, which we will attempt to trace in this section.

Intersection with Critique

During this period TQ develops a network of relations in the context that define its place as a site of intersection of innovative practices and criticism in literature. TQ therefore has a strategic effect on the context as a corridor for the avant-garde, but the choices made, the relations that are privileged also help to define the specific project of TQ, either through a
community of ideas, or through distinction from other currents in the same areas. An important aspect of TQ's activity in this way is its involvement with a number of writers who can be grouped around the periodical Critique. This grouping is formed around three major figures from an older generation: Caillois, Blanchot and Klossowski, and completed by two younger writers: Foucault and Deleuze. These writers are represented (except Deleuze) in the special issue marking Bataille's death in 1962. Besides this intersection, where each author contributes an article on Bataille, Deleuze writes on Klossowski, Blanchot and Foucault; Foucault writes on Blanchot, Klossowski and Deleuze; Klossowski writes on Blanchot. While Critique is associated with these writers on numerous occasions, there is moreover an implicit alliance between Critique and TQ through the publication of essays by Sollers, Thibaudeau and Faye in Critique and the reciprocal publication of articles by Foucault and Barthes (both members of the 'Conseil de Rédaction' of Critique with Michel Deguy, an ex-member of TQ's editorial committee) in Critique on the work of TQ authors during this period. This implicit alliance (which also implicates Jacques Derrida at a later date) shows how TQ, as well as supporting the structuralist vogue, is also involved in the work of a slightly older generation of thinkers which has its roots in the activity of Bataille.

The current of thought represented by Bataille, Klossowski and Caillois is derived originally from the pre-war ferment contemporary with Surrealism. All three
thinkers are fundamentally Nietzschean in their outlook, a Nietzscheanism filtered through a Kojèvian reading of Hegel, since Bataille and Klossowski at least had attended Kojève's lectures on Hegel and Kojève himself played a not minor part in the Collège de Sociologie.® Blanchot, of the same generation as Bataille, Caillois and Klossowski was not associated with the Collège but did emerge from the experience with Hegel offered by Kojève. Foucault and Deleuze are influenced by this current of thought, but tend more to oppose the implicit Hegelianism of Blanchot and to detect a critique of it in Bataille.® TQ's continual and permanent sympathy with Bataille, in our opinion a major factor of the review's theory, ensures a sympathy with Caillois and Klossowski, while the relation with Foucault is fraught with tension. We analyse this implicit tension in the section below.

"Foucault mis en abîme"

In the article 'Le Langage à l'Infini'® Foucault presents a view of literature remarkably similar to that which will be proposed by TQ. The isomorphism between the two approaches is present in the emphasis on literature as determined by auto-representation, by an interior doubling which makes of literature: 'l'oeuvre de langage' (p.45). Foucault, however, gives a characteristically Nietzschean/Hegelian turn to his argument by insisting on the absence of God. The question for Foucault remains: what function can literature have in the absence of
Foucault's insistence on auto-representation in literature as a response to this absence recalls Blanchot's premonition of literature's self-destruction. This conclusion, different from that of TQ, could be seen to result from the insistence on the Nietzschean notion of the death of God, since the concept of auto-représentation depends on an idea of literature as essence, reliant on metaphysics. Blanchot and Foucault's 'absence of God' perpetuates the presence of an essence as opposed to a process, the basic notion operative in TQ's view of literature.

Although the two presentations present similar projects, despite being in different 'languages', perhaps there is a fundamental disparity between them. Sollers's and TQ's general, implicit project opens out from an experience of the radicality of writing which emphasises its non-representative functions, the materiality of language and language as a continuous, interior space. This is transformed into a science of the text accompanied by a history in which language as interior space and the non-representative aspect of language are emphasised. The 'mise en abîme' whereby the text turns round upon itself to take its own being as an object of consideration is part, but not the exclusive defining factor, of this emphasis. Foucault's emphasis on literature as a mirror in which a possible infinity of representations is figured is fundamentally different from that of TQ on 'la non-expressivité radicale' of language. In other words, auto-representation is a figure within the context of a
text still thought as representative. Foucault's examples are different: Borges, the Arabian nights, Diderot.

Some of Foucault's concepts introduced here and in 'Distance, Aspect, Origine', such as the vertical structure of the novel, superimposed on itself[^13] , and the network ('réseau') of texts that are no longer single works added to an existing stock but infinite progressions in an interior space of language, are important for TQ, but superseded by later more scientific formulations. However, the different points of departure for Foucault's and TQ's approach attest to the limited relevance of the former for the latter. Foucault's article appears here, therefore, as part of the general composite of ideas out of which TQ's science develops. Implicitly, this approach is already superseded by that outlined by Sollers and Pleynet. Sollers's affirmative review of Deleuze's *Proust et les signes*[^14] hints at a possible convergence between a Nietzschean and a semiological demystification in TQ, but the investment in metaphysics this is later seen to represent is soon withdrawn.

Another intersection that could be the basis of further inquiry[^15] is TQ's support of innovative practices from outside France. The support of the Italian neoavanguardia[^16] , the work of Sarduy[^17] and in another sense Pleynet's interest in the critical work of Olson[^18] defines the character of this period. While the support of Sarduy provides a further link with Barthes[^19] , the latter factor can be seen in the context of the elaboration of a critical language on poetry in the review. An 'x-ray' of
a number of intersections operated by the review in the period leading up to 1967 would show the development of a concern with form and with the elaboration of a critical language to account for innovations accomplished in different areas. This concern and language achieves its fruition with the explicitly Formalist and structuralist interests of TQ. However, the dangers of too great an investment in Formalism, at the expense of the interest of TQ in writers such as Artaud and Bataille, seems to have been assessed and prevented by a no less important investment in psychoanalysis, that is, an enquiry into subjectivity.

Pre-analytical psychology

The first couple of years of TQ show a marked interest in the non-rational, 'le non-savoir' in Bataille's terminology, and it is in this sense that it is of interest for TQ. The texts by Bataille, Caillois, Borges and Michaux bear out this interest and approach. The interest is not yet informed by a reading of Freud; the main reference is to Foucault's introduction to Binswanger's *Rêve et Existence*, an existential psychology, thus a psychology filtered through a philosophical perspective. This emphasis on the non-rational which in the texts of Caillois and in some of the novels of the group tends to concentrate exclusively on dreams, is elaborated as a specific interest in this theme in the following years.
Baudry's review of 'Investigations psycho-somatiques' by Michel de M'Uzan, Pierre Marty and Christian David focuses, as is clear from the title, on dreams. The theoretical or scientific value of this investigation is not, however, underlined, a factor that leads to the conclusion that the interest here is less in psychoanalysis than in dreams as a text, a similar preoccupation to that of the Surrealists, criticised later in TQ as an overemphasis on the preconscious at the expense of the unconscious. The lack of emphasis on analysis here leads to a certain amount of equivalence between the Surrealists and the project of TQ. However, the emphasis on dreams can also be taken as an example of an excess, an aspect of the non-rational rather than as 'le merveilleux', or a point of the resolution of contradictions in a sur-reality. Dreams are taken as an extension of thought rather than an undercurrent or a transcendent point.

The language of dreams is also the subject of Sollers's review of Hervey de St. Denys's Les rêves et les moyens de les diriger. Parallels with the Surrealists are again suggested due to this emphasis on a non-Freudian, non-scientific and non-analytic approach to dreams. However, dreams are presented by Sollers as thought, a thought that exceeds rationality, and therefore as a language, and he criticises the writer for his lack of insight into dreams as a language. Here Sollers at the same time points to future developments and indicates the limitations of the non-analytic approach by proposing that
dreams be seen as *signs*. Sollers's formulation awaits a fertilisation, as it were, by a scientific reading of Freud's *The interpretation of dreams*, or by a Lacanian theory of the unconscious as 'structured like a language', an encounter that will take place in 1965 when Sollers and Baudry attend the seminar. Meanwhile TQ's encounters with psychoanalysis remain within the limits of a non-analytic approach.

Sollers approaches psychoanalysis from the same direction as the Surrealists, but with a different theoretical basis, which is the difference between Bataille's transgression of rationality by 'le non-savoir' and Breton's too Hegelian idea of synthesis or resolution. The question of transgression and excess as opposed to the preoccupation with reality and transcendence remains the fundamental difference between the two approaches. The difference as we see it is that, while Surrealism looks to psychoanalysis for help, TQ's approach is rather an attempt to export the insights of literature into psychoanalysis, an attempt which succeeds.

The interest in pre-Freudian or non-Freudian psychology (since TQ's approach is non-analytic) is continued with a review of Groddeck's *Le Livre du ça*, while in his review of Marthe Robert's biography of Freud Thibaudeau also affirmatively recognises Surrealism's involvement with Freud. A more specifically psychoanalytical interest is indicated with Baudry's review 'Le rêve de la littérature', a critical review of a *Choix de rêves* by Jean Paul, the 18th century German writer. The subject is
dreams as they are treated in literature. The article is informed by the same readings as Sollers's 'Logique de la fiction', as Baudry notes, similarly to Sollers:

'les ordres du subjectif et de l'objectif semblent se dissoudre dans le milieu onirique, s'il est vrai que le rêveur habite et anime les objets qui lui sont proposés'. (p.86)

The dream world is thus a milieu of continuity parallel to the text. It is this parallel that characterises TQ's approach to psychoanalysis. Baudry extends the parallel we have identified to describe the dream as an intermediary space, which is the same space referred to above as the 'interior' or continuous space of the text. It is a space in which contradiction is not annulled but thought through not as anathema to the logic of rationality but as a figure of thought. This space as dream is explicitly parallel to the text as TQ propose it in Baudry's formulation that can be read as a critical nexus:

'Le rêve, la situation du rêveur à l'intérieur de son rêve, fait songer à un livre qui racontait au lecteur, dans l'instant même où il le lit, sa propre lecture et cette lecture serait la vie. En fait, nous vivons nos rêves mais nos rêves nous lisent'. (p.87)

The emphasis on 'life' as a text, to be read, indicates the semiological orientation of the review, but the corresponding emphasis on the 'mise en abîme' and on the productivity of reading, as a writing at the same time prefigures the specific theory of the text of TQ as 'écriture-lecture' and process.

Despite Sollers's and Baudry's attendance of Lacan's seminar in 1965 the psychoanalysis TQ investigates is not Lacanian, but is a Derridean rereading of Freud. The importance of Sollers's encounter with Lacan lies more in
an implicit friendliness despite theoretical disagreement. Meanwhile, we will look more closely at the psychoanalytical engagement of TQ in Chapter Three.

Russian Formalism - method or theory?

The conjunction with the Russian Formalists is exhibited both in the publication of articles by the Russian Formalists in TQ and by references to them by the writers of TQ. The major event in this conjunction, however, is the publication, in the 'Collection Tel Quel', of texts by the Russian Formalists, entitled Théorie de la littérature, collected and translated by Tzvetan Todorov.

Firstly, it must be underlined that Todorov's publication and the consequent publicisation of the work of the Russian Formalists is an event of extreme importance not only for TQ but also for French literary theory as such. While Roman Jakobson, a leading member of the Formalists and of the Prague school of linguistics, was publishing material in France and had been specifically important in providing the generative seeds of structuralism in his interaction with Lévi-Strauss and in introducing important concepts such as the distinction between the two axes of linguistic signification and the poetic function of language, the Russian Formalist school as an entity is unknown until Todorov's publication.

The importance of the conjunction with Russian Formalism for TQ specifically is evident in a number of ways.
Firstly, the emphasis placed by the Formalists upon a scientific approach to literature is a factor of major importance in distancing approaches to the text which rely on extra-literary phenomena. Philosophical, psychological and sociological approaches to the text are rejected in the name of an approach which concentrates on the immanent structure of the text or on the 'system' of literature.\(^3\) In the context of the specific history of Russian Formalism this approach largely resulted negatively from opposition to the traditional approach of Potebnia and Vesilovsky and of the Symbolists. The approach which relies upon extra-literary phenomena, according to the Formalists, results in a mass of conflicting opinions and confusion, notions of 'decoration' and 'realism', all resulting from a primary lack of distinction between the language of literature and the language of ordinary discourse.\(^6\) The re-occurrence of Russian Formalism in the mid-sixties is thus a crucial aspect of the distancing of the confusion resulting from a non-immanent approach.

The most important aspect of the Russian Formalist approach for TQ is the advocation of an approach to literature as a system with its own laws. This emphasis catalyses a tendency already present in TQ. Resulting from this primary distinction, between literary discourse and ordinary discourse, Russian Formalism and its French counterpart presents itself as a research into 'littérarité'.\(^7\) This research is carried out on a synchronic level, by the comparison of literary discourse
with ordinary discourse, and as such linguistics is an important asset. Saussurean linguistics, with its distinction between synchrony and diachrony and between **langue** and **parole** offered, moreover, important models in this research. In addition to the exploration of 'littérarité', on the synchronic level the Formalists sought to understand the distinction between prose and poetry.

On a diachronic level, the Formalists sought to understand the evolution of literature (in the work of Tynianov in particular) and the inner laws of genre. They introduced the important concept of the series which will prove instrumental in the future theorisations of TQ, of **correlation**, each work being held in a correlative relation to other works in the same genre, synchronically, to other works diachronically, either in the same genre or by the same author. The concept of correlation is also instrumental in the theorisations of TQ, particularly in reconstituting the link between literature and other structures.

Formalism offers the benefits of a rigorous, systematic approach to literature and is of definite advantage to TQ. However, its positivism, the lack of any theory and its reliance on method determines its limits for TQ's theory of literature. It is the forerunner to a science of literature, but it is not this science itself.

The passage from method to science in TQ is effected through a number of paths. Jakobson's criticism evolves towards what Kristeva will later term a 'paragrammatic'
approach, but the emergence of Kristeva as a theoretical force in 1967 is the major transformative moment. She introduces the important emphasis on process into the theoretical map of language and in doing so opens up areas blocked by Formalism. Formalism as such is taken up by such periodicals as Change and Poétique, evidence of how the residues of TQ's work continue to have an effect in the context, while the review displaces itself.

**Structuralism displaced**

If Formalism is important but limited for TQ the same can be said of structuralism, which is distinct from Semiology. Genette and Todorov are the main protagonists of 'structuralist' literary criticism in TQ, a current that develops from the earlier interest in 'la nouvelle critique'. 'Structuralist' criticism, distinguished from 'thematic criticism' by Genette, is the object of a critical alliance with TQ. Besides the major case of Barthes, Genette and Todorov both publish articles in TQ and have their first books published by Sollers in the 'Collection Tel Quel'. Barthes, Genette and Todorov were all engaged in work at the Ecole pratique des Hautes Études, a university institution which is the main source of structuralist poetics and semiology at this time. The Ecole's CECMas (Centre des études de communications de masse) section publishes the journal Communications in which Barthes, Todorov and Genette are involved, as well as Greimas, Bremond, Ruwet, J.C. Milner and Christian
Metz. This review is a major forum for structuralist and
semiological work during this period, but it does not
focus specifically on literature. Apart from specific
issues (4, 8), and to a limited extent periodicals such as
Critique, the main forum for such work specifically
concerning literature is TQ. Through publishing work by
Genette and Todorov, including the introduction in France
by Todorov of the theories of Austin [the
performative/constative distinction] in his article on
Laclos,45 TQ is associated with the forefront of this
critical wave, which, by way also of Russian Formalism,
allows 'un travail de systématisation et de
radicalisation'46 to take place.

A number of factors make this alliance with
'structuralism' limited. Firstly, the arrival of Kristeva
alters the context. TQ invests its scientific capital in
this internal element rather than a series of external
allies. A second factor is the emergence of Derrida as
a critic of structuralism as reliant on the notions it set
out to replace.47 Derrida will also effect a considerable
displacement of the theoretical focus of TQ away from the
formalism of this period. Structuralist criticism is also
displaced by the eventual emergence of Marxism as a
theoretical reference, which is linked to the view of the
text as a production or process, introduced by Kristeva.
It is the emphasis on structure rather than on the sign
that is limited for TQ. The semiology of Barthes is far
more important in this respect, both in its own right and
as the area where Kristeva develops her first analyses.
The interaction of TQ with Roland Barthes is a continuous one and is a crucial part of the history of both parties. The interview with Roland Barthes published in TQ7 proposes Barthes in an avuncular, if not paternal role. The position of TQ is characterised by the aestheticism and disengagement that were aspects of the first period. An aspect of Barthes' position is a tendency towards 'engagement' in the Sartrean and Brechtian sense. Barthes, mistrustful of 'aestheticism', implicitly adopts a position at a slight distance from TQ. The 'Littérature et signification' interview offers a different relationship. The questions posed by TQ tend to start from apparent contradictions in Barthes' work, and perhaps have a mutual effect of indicating a position in relation to the context. Barthes' answers reflect his semiological activity of the time and past preoccupations already indicated. The main focus of the interview is, as the title suggests, literature as signification, as a system of signs, something Barthes articulates by way of Brecht. It is underlined that literature is a second-order sign system, made with language, but different from language in that it does not purport to signify a 'real', but rather the fact that it is literature (p.263). Such an enunciation in TQ is crucial in intersecting a statement of the fundamentally linguistic basis of literature and of its non-representative function, already emphasised in TQ, with the semiological activity carried out by Barthes.
Barthes can however be seen to have invested in a multiplicity of areas, TQ, *Communications* and the EPHE, *Critique*, according to his subject. This multiplicity, synchronically, can be taken as a symptom of a diachronic tactic or psychological 'taste', or rather 'distaste' at being fixed, 'le vertige du déplacement' in Stephen Heath's words. TQ offers to Barthes a suitably mobile site for a continuous mutual friendship, but if Barthes' nausea for hysteria seems contradicted by his interaction with TQ it must also be remembered that there is in Barthes' work a continual tendency towards militancy, a tendency that TQ allows him to continue without committing himself. However, rather than as is usual, stressing the idiosyncrasies of TQ's influence on Barthes it is more illuminating to underline that Barthes sets an example of singularity important for TQ. Barthes' interaction with TQ soon emerges as a strong support and a parallel articulation of the experience of writing emphasised in TQ. This articulation takes place in articles in *Critique* and in the seminar at the EPHE. The seminar constitutes not only a vital site of exploration but also a meeting place between the project of TQ and of semiology. Sollers's essay on Mallarmé, 'Littérature et totalité' was originally given as an exposé in this seminar in November 1965. It is also through the space of this seminar that Julia Kristeva first encounters Sollers and TQ. In 1966 she will introduce Bakhtine into France through this space.

However, it is undoubtedly the Barthes-Picard debate
that cements Barthes' relations with TQ on the side of a 'pratique immanente du texte'. Picard's attack on Barthes' *Sur Racine* in *Nouvelle critique, nouvelle imposture*, from the point of view of an aestheticist, positivistic and anti-theoretical approach is strongly attacked by Sollers in an article in TQ and Barthes' reply, *Critique et vérité* is published by Sollers. In TQ Sollers articulates this attack as a symptom of the general recuperative faculty of the literary establishment. Since Picard's pamphlet was published in the same collection (directed by the anarchist and positivist J.-F. Revel) as a number of avant-garde texts, the question of the resistance of a certain avant-garde is suggested. Pleynet delineates, in 'Le problème des avant-gardes', a way out of this impasse in emphasising a close attention to the concrete and material problems of writing raised by Barthes, Lacan and Derrida. Meanwhile, Barthes parallels the same ideas in *Critique et vérité*, in reply to Picard's attack, and in doing so suggests the basis of a theory of writing as will be developed in TQ.

The 'parallel articulation', an incessant sliding of one discourse over the other, is also marked by Barthes' increasing references to and support of TQ associated writers such as Sarduy, Sanguinetti and Sollers. Sollers effectively replaces Robbe-Grillet as the epitome of the 'text' to which Barthes refers throughout his work, and Barthes conception of the 'Text' is elaborated as his association with Sollers and TQ develops. In addition, while Barthes' articles on Robbe-Grillet spurred the
writer on to theoretical developments in his writing, in the case of Sollers it is the writing that produces developments in the criticism, as is evident from the two 'versions' of Barthes' article on Drame. Barthes' initial narratological and morphological approach to Drame can be seen to be undermined deliberately by the text of the article itself; the second version focuses more on process and transformation, showing the influence of Kristeva. However, the structure of Drame and its critique by Barthes can already be seen to be exceeded by the subjective experience the text vehiculates.

Barthes' review of Drame is exemplary of a certain tension of the 'formalist' epoch of TQ towards a critique of the limitations of criticism from the point of view of writing. Writing itself is transgressive of the limits of formalism. The development of semiology is in a way at the same time a resolution and an exacerbation of this tension, since it at the same time emphasises the process of writing and evades the fault of stasis attributed to formalism, but also leads to a remarkable expansion of theory. Kristeva's extension of semiology is the immediate catalyst of this expansion, but the theory of both Barthes and Kristeva interacts with a more important current of thought than the composite influences of Formalism and Structuralism, which is the elaboration of a logic of literature, notably developed by Philippe Sollers in his text Logiques.
IV. The logic of literature

The following section attempts a fairly thorough analysis of the logic of literature, or of writing, set out in Sollers's book *Logiques* and in the texts in TQ that appear around it. The development of such a logic in practice, in the novels and poetry of TQ or associated with it will be looked at in the context of a discussion of TQ's textual practice as a whole, in Chapter Four. Meanwhile, this analysis is justified for at least two reasons; firstly, the analysis will show that the book constitutes a central 'theory of literature' that remains constant throughout the history of the review, and of which other moments are either extensions, or articulations with different theoretical areas. The 'limit texts' analysed by Sollers, which our analysis traverses, present a 'logic of literature' in relation to which literature as a whole is transformed. The analysis is thus justified theoretically, as it presents the central element of the theory of literature TQ stands for. The second justification is historical; the series of analyses presented here represent the critical activity of the review in its most enlightened moments from 1965 to 1967, and show the development of a logic of literature just prior to the catalysing action by Kristeva which transforms this theoretical activity into a 'science of literature'. The following analysis will thus stress the logical aspects of the theory of literature presented; for
reasons of space and pertinence repetition of a central theory is avoided, and some critical essays of *Logiques*, for example, those on Roussel (already dealt with), Ponge, James are regrettably elided from analysis. The central core of 'limit texts' is thus, in the order of their appearance and of their analysis: Artaud, Dante, Mallarmé, Sade, Bataille, Lautréamont.

**Artaud - Derrida : theft from self**

Artaud presents the interest of a life lived in close proximity to madness or psychosis, and an extensive writing that approaches and transgresses limits of violence and sense. He is the object of interest in *TQ* from the very beginning, and this underlines the permanence of the peculiar logic at work in his work for *TQ*. It is also significant that it is over Artaud that Derrida first collaborates with *TQ*, since Artaud's thought poses major problems for the metaphysics Derrida's work itself attempts to deconstruct.

Derrida's essay on Artaud stresses a critique of metaphysics, the area where Derrida is of most interest for *TQ*, and develops the notion of 'general writing' which we can superimpose on Bataille's continuity. The extension of the concept of writing that Derrida introduces effectively enlarges *TQ*'s approach to literature into a philosophical argument in which notions of presence, Being, meaning are undermined. From this perspective, the logic of literature transforms the underpinnings of
Western ideology in philosophy. However, TQ's interest in this transformation are literary, not philosophical, and this poses problems for the relation between TQ and Derrida. Derrida essentially uses Artaud as an example of his philosophy of writing, despite decrying exemplification. Artaud experiences at a physical level a loss of self through subjection to a writing that comes before him, for Derrida the condition of all Western metaphysics. Where Derrida's essay becomes more exciting is in the suggestions of a psychoanalytical approach to this theft from self through the notion of anality and Artaud's writing on it. However, this is overwhelmed by the intention to show that Artaud is an exemplar of the undermining of metaphysics by writing.

Artaud's thought

Sollers is indifferent to the fate of metaphysics, and consequently uses concepts that may belong with it, but in doing so paradoxically elaborates a thought on writing that is determined more by writing than by thought. Artaud's thought, for Sollers, is however not the thought of which Artaud was author, but of which he was the victim. 'La pensée émet des signes' is the title of the essay, which Sollers adapts from Mallarmé's 'Tout pensée émet un coup de dés' (a stress on the aleatory aspect of the productive space Sollers outlines that will be looked at later); 'la pensée' is language as 'milieu absolu' or 'milieu de transformation'. In this space, suggested by
Derrida as 'l'écriture' the duality of writer and reader, or actor and performer in Artaud's consideration of the theatre, is dissolved. It is then possible to enter into the general writing or production of signs and to 's'écrire':

'Ce renversement décisif qu'il s'agit... de s'écrire et de se produire, d'entrer dans la seule réalité des signes, où l'on est soi-même un signe'.

The logic of writing is thus initiated by an experience of alienation or of a double, in which it is recognised that a general writing produces all meaning. The second stage is the passage to a wider space where the different layers of experience communicate. The third step is to enter into this infinite productivity and to live this meaning ('s'écrire').

Artaud is at the same time essential and unimportant for this logic, as through his transgression he passes into this space of fundamental communication where it is the logic of writing that is productive, rather than the individual. Nevertheless, what is important is the way the individual experiences this transgression. In Artaud's case, as Sollers emphasises, the question of the body is particularly important, but we will look closer at the importance of the body in the section on Bataille. In another sense the specificity of the individual writer depends on the extent to which the experience of writing is lived joyfully or as a sentence. Sollers interprets Artaud's position in relation to this experience as that of a victim. Other writers live and write the experience differently, and in relation to different areas, but the
central fact remains that writing changes the writer's life. Artaud's life and thought are rethought from the perspective of the logic of literature, which is transformative, changing life to the point of madness and death.

Dante and writing's traversal

Dante is a surprising limit text, not damned, but saturated with erudition. Nevertheless, Sollers claims Dante for the text, and this shows that the experience in question is not historically anchored in modernism but vertical and potential in any literary endeavour. It is a transhistorical logic, the only major difference being the historical conditions or the conditions of language. So while Artaud or Mallarmé's writing are received as fragments of a language, a language experienced from the point of this logic, Dante's writing is an attempt at a total language. The language of literature as Sollers proposes it is conditioned therefore by bright illuminations of certain fragments, in our modernity, but complete traversals in other ages, in the work of Dante and Sade, for example. The major exception of such a total experience of literature in modernity is Joyce, thus his massive relevance for TQ at a later point.

As with Artaud, the logic of literature necessitates a new interpretation of the entirety of Dante's oeuvre; the whole of his literary creation is transformed from this standpoint. Sollers thus interprets Dante's oeuvre, not
only the Commedia but also De Vulgare Eloquentia and the Vita Nuova, in terms of the relation of the subject to the writing. It is the subjective and the totalising aspects of the experience of writing that are stressed here, hence in the first case the contemporary relevance of Dante's experience which can 'traverse' ('parcourir' p.46) any subject. The experience is in a vertical continuity with our experience as readers and can equally return 'nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita' (p.46) as the experience of any subject with relation to his own language.

The specificity of Dante's experience with relation to the other texts of rupture is that it is, like that of Joyce and Sollers as the writer of Paradis, an attempt at a total language, a text that would resume all other texts, 'la surface unique de toutes les langues enfin dégagés et traduites' (p.46), and it relates the experience of the subject in relation to this totalisation. De Vulgare Eloquentia and the Vita Nuova are thus read as preliminary stages to the Commedia in the application to the subject (Dante) and the language (Italian) of the logic of literature. In the first what is in question is the birth of a language; a further specificity of Dante is the inaugural relation his text bears to the Italian language (p.54). In the Vita Nuova love or desire leads to the birth of the subject within the writer, or the birth of the writer as subject, 'la naissance linguistique du sujet' (p.57). The logic thus articulated is thus; 'quelqu'un fait parler, il parle, il parle pour quelqu'un' (p.57), a trinity of positions we can reiterate
as alienation / speech / communication. The key to this birth, for Dante, is the death of his lady Beatrice, and Sollers articulates this as a sign of 'cette traversée de la mère'(p.60). Woman, the Mother, as the site of the law (or reproduction) must be traversed or transgressed in order for the subject to pass beyond the individuality he is, 'la mise en carte de l'identité sociale'(p.60), to become a writer capable of entering into the general writing of transgressive writing that is beyond the law. Thus a fundamental aspect of the logic of literature is the transgression of the incest taboo; the Mother must be 'traversed' by writing in order for the subject to exit from his social, phenomenal identity and enter into the non-identity of the writer. Woman is the site of the law as she has control over reproduction. Writing traverses woman, goes beyond the Mother, realises a possibility of incest as the limit of reproductive, familial relations, and trangresses it. The experience of Hölderlin, Sade, Baudelaire, Artaud, Bataille reproduces this pattern. The writer thus passes, in his subjectivity, beyond social identity, and it is this transgressive domain of subjectivity that Sollers sees as that of Dante and the writer in general:

'l'essentiel est de voir qu'il s'agit dans tous les cas d'une expérience qui isole et détruit le sujet hors de toute issue, toute société possible'. (p.61)

The fact that this experience of writing as a 'traversée' of the Mother, of woman as such, applies exclusively to a male pantheon of writers is not without relevance for a feminist critique of TQ. The writer is proposed as
ubiquitously male, and woman as such is positioned as the silent barrier he must traverse in order to become a writer. Can the logic be applied when the writer is a woman? It is then the relation of the woman to her mother that is in question. In effect, since if language is posed as the instance of a paternal order the woman is speaking inside the limits of a paternal order, to break through these limits through a traversal of the barrier of incest is to rediscover her true identity as woman. Writing 'through the Mother' would then be a kind of reversal of the process of birth, which for a woman would be of particular importance. Kristeva focuses on this later in 'Stabat mater', where the experience of maternity is a similar transgression to that of the writer. The dynamics of this supermimposition need to be clarified, but it is our analysis that TQ's logic of literature is consistent with a feminist writing. It is not necessarily a question of gender but of the cultural positions assigned to men and women in respect to the law.

To briefly trace the logic of literature as it is experienced by Dante and retold by Sollers: 'Dante' is born as a writer through the death of Beatrice. The Commedia is an objective writing that is freed from the necessity of subjective expression, as Dante has reached 'le point où le langage parle'(p.57) through this sacrifice. Discovering the writing he is, Dante doubles himself, such that 'Dante se situe comme écriture de Dante'(p.63), which explains the same experience as the 's'écrire' of Artaud, an experience in which the subject
(re)writes his existence in terms of writing. The *Commedia* is thus an allegorical narrative of the traversal of this subject through language. The *Inferno* is a passage through a multiplicity of signifiers or languages, which, having been dedicated to a 'usurious' end on earth, now possess their users. This passage allegorises the alienation of the subject from what he believed to be his identity, as 'author' of his actions and speech. This 'traversée archéologique du langage'(p.68) turns onto a present of writing in the *Purgatorio*, in which participation in the world is gradually relearnt, the signified extended. The *Paradiso*, at the summit of this hierarchy, is a plenitude of the signifier, a site of writing which writes itself, consumes itself, which ends in the entrance of Dante into the wheel of Love, such that he becomes what had moved him to start with. If the *Purgatorio* is the present of writing where the subject, having traversed his alienation, discovers the writing of the world, or discovers that the world is writing, the *Paradiso* is the identification of the subject with the force which moves this writing. Sollers thus interprets the *Commedia* as a symbolic account of a subject who traverses the totality of languages to place himself at the point of origin of the force of enunciation. This force is named 'passion'(p.76), and is comparable to Kristeva's 'sémiotique', as the pulsional base of enunciation.

We can articulate the logic in question here with Lacanian psychoanalytical theory. Sollers ends the
article with a quotation from Eckhart:

'Là je suis ce que j'étais, je ne crois ni ne décrois, car je suis là, une cause immobile qui fait mouvoir toutes choses.' (p.77)

If we read this in a certain way, through Benveniste as it were, it corresponds to Freud's 'Wo es war soll ich werden' or Lacan's 'La où c'était il me faut advenir', affirming the displacement of the subject across various positions that are nevertheless continuous in terms of their punctuality, always there as positions of the subject of enunciation, 'je'. In other words, we can define the experience of writing as the passage of the subject from the radical alienation where social identity is lost, through a productive multiplicity of sense, to a present of enunciation and communication in which the subject of the énoncé is the subject of the énonciation.

'Le transfert' is also relevant here, since it is a question of the love of the subject moving him to the traversal of writing. In the psychoanalytical experience, transference, which Lacan links to the experience of love, engages the subject in an analytic traversal of the limits of his own subjectivity, or it can do if the subject is not blocked by his own fantasy or symptom. The experience of the logic of literature is thus of relevance to psychoanalysis as a 'successful' analytic transgression of limits, engaged through a 'transfert'.

Sollers detects in Mallarmé the same experience of alienation, subjective death and impersonality that were present in Artaud and Dante, which we will not reiterate here. Where Mallarmé introduces new aspects of the logic of literature are, firstly, in his historical situation (by Sollers) as the literary agent of an ideological mutation contemporaneous with Marx and Freud. The notion of the epistemological break implicit here will be discussed later as problematic. Secondly, Mallarmé's importance lies in his explicit theoretical reflection on literature from the perspective of his experience of its transformation. This begins to produce, in Sollers's writing, a projective theory, that is a theory which produces a project for writing that will become that of TQ.

Firstly, writing is not a question of representation, of a spectacle. Language is not a representative instrument. Mallarmé's writing privileges suggestion, a writing evoking the writing that pre-evokes it. (p.105) It is not a question of a thing represented by a word or a sign but of a volume of meaning brought forth by writing, in which silence becomes an element among others, to be read (p.106). In terms of the relationship of language to 'the world', Sollers proposes later in the essay on Bataille, that it is not a question of 'words and things' but of space and relations; writing occupies the same space as the object (p.172).
As in the experience of Dante there is a third stage after the death of the author, the 'speaking' of the writing, communication. (p.108) The disappearance of the author occurs in view of a reading. This communication is not 'between' reader and writer; reading is no longer a question of a decoding of an author's intention. Reading is rather a practice that puts the reader in touch with the language of which he, as subject, is a consequence; 'il faut qu'il comprenne que ce qu'il lit, c'est lui'. (p.108) In terms of the above description of the relation between language and the world, communication is also the placing of the reader and writer in the same space, a space of continuity. The writing of Mallarmé confronts us definitively with the notion that 'penser est écrire, que lire c'est lire ce que nous sommes'. (p.110) In the first instance the realisation that 'ça s'écrit', that existence, including social existence, is governed by a general writing, leads to the realisation of the imperfection of languages due to their multiplicity. (p.103) We can note that, as Dante's Inferno traverses this multiplicity towards a plenitude of the signifier, Mallarmé proposes literature as a supreme language. This supreme, 'total' language is in close relation with science, after the realisation of the ubiquity and productivity of language and the dependence of the economy upon it, thus the relevance of grammar and rhetoric. (p.103) Literature or writing is to be distinguished from speech; the latter is used in everyday communication and is compared to the circulation of money and
information (as language in Dante's *Inferno* was presented by Sollers). (p.104) Literature is a less 'interested', more essential form of language which is a dépense. Thus Mallarmé's reflections turn on political economy; literature must reintroduce dépense through the myth, that will liberate language from the domination of the circuit of exchange that is dominated by money. (p.112-3) This emphasis on dépense prefigures a later strand of TQ's Marxist period, particularly the work of J.-J. Goux, that implicates again the thought of Bataille. The basis of TQ's Marxism, a Marxism in which it is the superstructural level that is most important, lies therefore in a consideration of the economy that originates in Bataille, but which Sollers also detects in Mallarmé. In a sense TQ's Marxism is already a 'post-Marxism'.

To return to writing, if speech is verbal, writing becomes hieroglyphic. As Derrida had suggested, writing is no longer subservient to speech, but achieves a different status that is linked to different sign-systems. Writing, no longer representation, evokes a volume of sense, and is thus not a linearity but a theatre, in which it operates as a dance (p.114). The closeness here to Artaud's writings on the theatre indicates the proximity of the two experiences, the extent to which it is a question of the same logic. The Book (Mallarmé's projective vision of literature) is thus a rigorous structure, with a guarantee in syntax (since the order of language must replace the author) that is 'transposed' rather than expressed.
However, the Book eventually admits its own impossibility, so that only fragments of it can appear, such as the *Coup de dés*, which operates the spatial dissemination of one sentence, the definitive unit of meaning. Mallarmé's projection for the 'Theatre', meanwhile, is that its fiction will give way to 'un texte enfin réel qui serait l'explication permanente du monde'. Writing eventually passes from its 'supreme' place in literature into reality. Sollers writes in capitals this utopian projection that seems thus to attain the character of a project that goes beyond the intention of analysis:

> 'IL NOUS FAUT DONC RÉALISER LA POSSIBILITÉ DU TEXTE COMME THÉÂTRE EN MÊME TEMPS QUE CELLE DU THÉÂTRE DE LA VIE COMME TEXTE si nous voulons occuper notre situation dans l'écriture qui nous définit...' (p.115)

TQ's critique of 'literature' derives from this expansion of writing into the area of 'life', while the emphasis on theatre underlines the non-linear character of TQ novels, the projection of time into space.

It can be objected that Mallarmé's project for literature, only a small part of his output most of which is left unconsidered by Sollers, is utopian, and so, consequently, is the TQ project. In other words, TQ's theory of literature is purely ideological and not based on practice. It certainly is utopian, or rather atopian, in that it belongs to no place, it is unterritorial, but our reading of texts in Chapter Four will suggest that the reading of these texts is an experience that engages with the same logic and transforms literature and experience as the theory proposes; the novels and the
poetry, in other words, transform the process of reading and propose a new approach to literature. The essays on Sade and Bataille continue this tendency towards the project. The former also sees TQ's entry into a wider area of debate.

Sade - the ideology of reading

While Sollers's essay on Sade in Logiques can be read in the context of our analysis of the logic of the text, it is originally situated in the context of a conference and special issue on Sade in which articles by Klossowski, Barthes, Hubert Damisch and Michel Tort also appear. We will examine Sollers's writing on Sade in that context, while continuing to stress the evolution of Sollers's thought on the logic of literature.

A particular aspect that the issue on Sade, which is titled 'La pensée de Sade', addresses is the ideology of literature, through the censoring of Sade, or the refusal to read Sade 'in the text'. The critical approach to Sade therefore enables an attack, which TQ becomes identified with, on the ideology of literature seen as representation, on certain ways of reading. A large part of the issue is therefore concerned with the possibility of reading Sade, the problems such a reading poses and the reasons for its censure.

While Klossowski, belonging to an earlier and more philosophically oriented generation, looks at Sade's 'experience' in as much as it is 'translated' in the
writing, and with the 'philosophical position' taken in the novels, Barthes adopts a more textually oriented approach. Barthes' concern is explicitly to read Sade, and describe the semiological organisation of the text. Thus despite the fact that Barthes' analysis appears free from the emphasis on ideology of Sollers's text, for example, it effects a strategic gesture in concentrating on the material aspects of the text, on the signifier. Sade's 'thought', for Barthes, therefore, is not the signified of his texts, but the organisation of signifiers in the text. For Barthes, therefore, it is the organisation of daily life that is the measure of Sade's utopia, and his article attempts an 'ethnography of the Sadean village', in the same way as his analysis of the fashion system, at this point 'in progress'. Through this reading, Barthes indicates, moreover, to what extent the Sadean text is in rupture with the mythical or ideological reading of it. It is not erotic, for example, according to modern standards, due to the totally different function of the language, or of the signifier, which is evident for example in the use of clothing as part of a strip tease, totally absent in Sade but a central element of modern eroticism. Erotic is, for Barthes, an allusive language which functions through metaphor, suggestion. Sade's text, on the other hand, functions as a 'combinatoire'(p.30), the sexual must be logically articulated. Thus Barthes' conclusion is basically the same, but subtly different from that of Klossowski; the specificity of Sade lies in the subjection
of sexuality to the combinatory logic of language.

Barthes goes further, however, in his analysis of this 'contamination'. Eroticism relies on a language of images. A fundamental aspect of the investigation of Sade is the emphasis on language, on the text as opposed to the image or representation, and as such certain comments of Damisch and Tort deviate from the textual approach. Both Barthes and Sollers present a militant argument for the primacy of the text and in this we can see a specific aspect of the approach of TQ.

As well as two structural rules of exhaustivity and reciprocity (p.32), which Barthes sees as determining the horizontal, syntagmatic organisation of the text rather than the vertical, paradigmatic organisation, Barthes identifies the specificity of the Sadean text in the primacy of language. We can also note how Sade's text privileges the horizontal axis at the expense of the vertical. Barthes thus sees in Sade's text the intersection of two codes - the erotic and the linguistic, which conflict due to the fact that the first is metaphoric, essentially constituted along the vertical axis, while the second is essentially metonymic. (p.34) Both Klossowski and Tort insist on this aspect, seeing in the apathetic reiteration or repetition of the aberrant act a subversion of the structure of the novel as such. Barthes' analysis thus sees Sade's text as a formal subversion of the code. This subversion of the code, of metaphor by metonymy, can be seen as a basis of Barthes' notion of the Text, as enounced in Le Plaisir du Texte, or
Barthes recognizes Sade's transgression as a transgression of language. It is a mistake to read Sade as representation, not to distinguish the sign from the referent. Sade is on the side of *semiosis*, not *mimesis*. Sade's transgression is linguistic rather than moral, suggesting that the moral itself is linguistic.

If Barthes' militancy here is primarily turned against realism, towards the elaboration of a logic of the Text, against a certain type of reading of Sade, Sollers's reading articulates this 'type of reading' with an ideological and political order, widening the context of the rupture effected by the radical text. Following the suggestions of the text on Mallarmé that pointed towards Marxism, Sollers's text is partly directed as an attack against the type of culture that either censures Sade or reads Sade as representation.

The rupture that a reading of the text of Sade would constitute in our culture points, for Sollers, to fundamental elements both of the text and of our culture. Earlier, in 'Le Roman et l'expérience des limites', Sollers had suggested how the repression of the Sadean novel was an index of how the novel was a repository for the ideological representation of our society. In that essay also Sollers indicates the almost existential choice with which he is concerned here; either we live according to some external representation or we live as signs of ourselves, we live our lives as the fiction they are, as
signs produced by thought. Here the experience of Artaud links with that of Sade, or with Sade as read by Sollers. The logic of literature as we have described it comes into play to transform Sade's writing from representation to a text the reading of which undermines the ideology on which representation is based, and which it justifies. Sade's text destroys the ideology of neurotic culture, in which the individual represses the writing he is; thus Sade's text gives the reader the possibility of living according to this writing. Sollers insists here not on an existentialist ethic of becoming but on the primacy of the experience of writing.

We can identify the focus of Sollers's article on Sade as the ideology or reading entailed by the logic of writing; this is enounced initially in terms of an analysis of causality. It is not a question of thought as cause of language, therefore of representation or expression, but of a language without cause, a writing of the signifier as effect. This anomaly is explained by seeing writing as cause and effect of itself. We could articulate this logic thus: the signifier is not caused by the signified; neither is the signified caused by the signifier, since the signified itself is a signifier. The signifier is therefore the effect of itself. This 'signifier of the signifier', as Derrida suggested in De la Grammatologie, can be seen as a general writing, in that language is always already based on the logic of writing. Sollers, moreover, equates this writing with desire.
For Sollers, the culture that cannot read Sade and that a reading of Sade denounces is a neurotic culture based on a hypostasis that transforms a fiction (the cultural representation of nature or God) into a reality (nature). (p.80) The relevance of the question of sexuality is thus that it implicates, as does language, the whole question of the relation of nature to culture, which is the division on which the ideology of neurotic culture is based. The most radical aspect of Sade's text is thus the postulation that nature is a phantasm of culture (p.80), produced by the neurosis of culture to mask off or foreclose what threatens it within itself.

The Marxist dimensions of this critique of culture are easily recognisable. The Marxist orientation is further indicated by Sollers's insistence on a dialectical interpretation that is, Sollers explains, an interpretation not determined a priori by a definition of nature but left 'à son entière responsabilité formelle'. (p.80) The latter phrase echoes Barthes' insistence on 'la responsabilité des formes', indicating how TQ's Marxism is to a large extent a critique of ideology of a demystificatory quality, like Barthes' Mythologies.

Sollers articulates the logic of Sade's text as an insistence on perversion in order to oppose neurosis. This attests to a reading of Freud, as the latter postulates that 'neuroses are the negative of perversions'. If society is neurotic it is constituted through a repression of what in fact makes it function, namely, sexuality, and its character depends on the substitution of sexual drives
by societal symptoms. In the sense that sexuality as such is not purely defined by the normal, neurosis is also a repression of the sexual aberrations - perversion.

Sade will therefore emphasise 'le Mal' in so far as it is the unconscious of the Good or the normal. The Sadean 'renversement' (p.82) can only, moreover, repeat itself in order not to fall into being just the inverse of the normal. However, perversion is not only the inverse of neurosis but also the ground from which it develops as a repression. If ideology is neurotic any thought that brings to light its repression is perverse. 'La pensée théorique' (p.82), Sollers asserts, is perverse. Sollers articulates here an annexing and a widening of Freudian thought to a critique of culture and ideology. The opposition of perversion and neurosis is not limited to the question of sexuality but used as a structure or model. Similarly to the articulation with Marxism, the Freudian thesis of the primacy of the sexual is not directly acknowledged. In effect, the gesture here owes more to Bataille, consisting in the relation of a restricted economy to a general economy; the restricted economy is the neurosis that survives through the exclusion of what it excludes, the general economy is the level of continuity which we could equate with Freud's 'polymorphous perversity'. This fusion of Bataille and Freud, as well as that of Bataille with Marx installs certain problems at the beginning of TQ's Marxism and Freudism that have an effect later in TQ's history.

Sollers's essay on Sade, like those of Damisch and Tort,
shows the effect of a reading of Derrida's *De la Grammatologie* in the widening of the concept of writing. In fact, this emphasis was already present in TQ and Sollers's theory of writing, finding a common basis in Bataille's notion of the general economy. However, in 'Sade dans le texte' the Derridean notion of the repression of writing at the expense of speech or the voice is particularly visible. Thus Sade's text is:

'une modification violente, intégrale, de l'écriture sans cesse refoulée par la parole divinisée' (our underlining). (p.79)

Moreover, through the dominant position of writing in Sade's text, as the determination of the action:

'La Voix de la conscience fait place à l'ECRITURE du désir' (Sollers's emphases). (p. 92)

Sollers's text thus extends Derrida's critique of the supplementarity of writing with respect to speech and the reversal of this, via Sade.

In articulating the logic of Sade's text Sollers poses the basis of TQ's later investigation of religion. Sollers shows how Sade is led to affirm Evil as the unconscious of Good, in as much as the latter is the basis of neurotic culture based on a view of language as representation. Sade's text is thus 'une affirmation du Mal divin....' (p.94) a sacralisation that is directed against a 'profane' culture of humanism that denies its sacralisation. Atheism as such is not enough to account for the restricted sacralisation of humanism. It is necessary to go to the extremes of the atheological gesture, as Sollers later affirms a propos of Bataille, through a sacralisation of Evil or 'le Mal radical' as the
later investigation asserts. Thus the conditions of the sacred are affirmed in order that they might be tranngressed, to create 'un sacré impossible à sacraliser'. (p. 95) The sacred has to be reaffirmed, recognised, in order to be transgressed. In other words, Sade affirms 'un Mal radical' to go to the extremes of experience and transgress every limit potentially open to a sacralisation.

We can identify the logic Sollers's describes here as a logic of the negation of the negation. In Sollers's reading of Sade, the Good or normality or neurotic culture assigned a representative role to discourse. This is a negation, we can add, in that it is a repression of writing and desire. Sade thus emphasises Evil, the negation of Good, thus a negation of the negation. However, the negation of the negation is only a reaffirmation or compensation of neurotic culture as long as it does not then become an affirmation, which in Sade is writing as an affirmation without limits, dedicated to say everything ('tout dire'). The negation of the negation thus hinges into a transgression of the opposition that opposes, in this case, Good and Evil. The logic of transgression is a logic of the negation of the negation that becomes an affirmation. The logic of writing itself follows this pattern, tranngressing the limits of representative discourse and becoming an affirmation without limits. The 'writing' of Derrida, opposed to the 'voice', then has to be extended into language. In other
words, the opposition of writing and speech is 
transgressed by the affirmation of writing within 
language.

The logic of the negation of the negation that lies 
behind Sollers's thought in Logiques shows an implicit 
reliance on a post-Hegelian negative strategy. 
Philosophically, this negativity may remain within the 
limits of a dialectical world view. Postmodernism would 
perhaps criticise this dependence, but the argument that 
positive and negative are not opposed but contained in a 
hyper-negativity is the same as the logic described 
here.

Sade - writing and desire

The analysis of Sade also introduces an area of debate 
that is crucial to the whole interpretation of writing as 
theorised by TQ, the articulation of writing with desire 
and sexuality. It therefore seems pertinent to examine the 
different versions of the articulation here, as part of 
the discussion of the logic of writing.

Firstly, sexuality is super imposed on writing. Sollers 
equates the sexuality that neurotic culture represses in 
order to exist with writing. Desire is equated with 'ce 
qui se trouve écrit en moi'. (p.81) There is a 
danger of equating the general writing with a libidinal 
substance that exists 'before language', falling into an 
expressive fallacy whereby writing is the expression of an 
underlying subjective state. In our view, this is neither
accurate nor the true picture of Sollers's thought. The question the articulation of writing with desire effectively turns on is: is desire previous to language? Sollers seems to suggest as much in the description of desire as:

'l'absence même des limites, l'interminable et irresponsable énergie sans contraires dont chaque société doit détourner et canaliser la force'. (p.81)

However, desire is precisely 'taught to me' by 'ce que je trouve écrit en moi', a writing. Writing is thus previous to desire. 'Le refoulement sexuel est d'abord un refoulement du langage'. (p.81) Elsewhere, however, it is affirmed that desire is 'l'effet sans cause' (p.79). Sexuality is not a cause since it is 'au fondement même, inconscient, du processus causal'. (p.84) In the passage from Neurosis to the text, 'La Voix de la conscience a fait place à l'ECRITURE du désir'. (p.92) If desire is posed as outside writing or language, then it becomes part of 'le non-langage' or 'le non-dit', a thesis of the subversion of language by what is outside it is accurate. However, as we have suggested, this would affirm an extra-linguistic libidinal substance. If on the other hand, desire is either simultaneous or posterior to writing, writing is capable of saying everything, 'tout dire', transgressing the limits that exclude sexuality 'outside' language. Sollers seems to suggest the latter thesis, that writing is desire, and that desire is a writing, in the Derridean sense, but he does not articulate the mechanism of the inscription of desire in writing.

Damisch and Tort attempt this much. The former
emphasises that with Sade it is not a question of imagination or of phantasm, as Tort suggests. If this was the case, desire would be channelled into metaphor. Sade's text articulates, rather, a metonymic logic of desire in language. Desire functions metonymically according to a regulated progression or series of combinations. Damisch explicitly states that desire functions according to the laws of language. (p.59) Although it is not explicitly stated as such, this is a Lacanian thesis, that desire is instituted by the Symbolic and functions according to rules of condensation and displacement. More specifically, Damisch states that the excess of the signifier over the signified is the matrix of desire. We can see that this notion, also Lacanian, is however coloured by a Derridean reading which insists on metonymy as the figure of desire, and on an originary difference or 'écart' that functions in language as a displacement from one element to the next. The text of Sade functions according to the combinatory logic of the 'écart'. The excess of the signifier over the signified is perhaps precisely equivalent to the Derridean notion of writing. However, Damisch also indicates in Sade's text places where the order threatens to break down under the pressure of desire; here desire appears as an extra-linguistic force. Desire only 'borrows' the ways of order, it is directed towards an entropic disorder. (p.63) Here, although it is not introduced as such, Damisch introduces the Freudian death drive, the tendency to return to a state of rest, as a force 'before' desire in as much as
the latter is inscribed in writing through a fundamental 'écart' or difference. The confusion as to the situation of desire is perhaps traceable to a lack of distinction between desire and the death drive.

M.Tort's analysis is more explicitly Lacanian, following also from that of Damisch in emphasising Derridean difference as a law of the logic of Sade's text, but linking this to Foucault's notion of the taxinomic 'tableau' which intersects with Barthes' rule of exhaustivity to form the motor of the text that enters into conflict with a counter-tendency towards the pictural tableau. This structures 'l'effet Sade' or 'le fantasme de Sade' which dictates that at least one of the perversions or 'écarts' as signifiers will implicate the subject. However, M.Tort's analysis differs from the others in that he stresses 'le fantasme' and the text as a 'mise en scène' or a representation of this phantasm. The psychoanalytical reading is shown to be implicated in a return of the thesis of representation and imagination, while the other analyses stressed the logic of the text as opposed to that of the image.

We have looked at the TQ reading of Sade in terms of the logic of literature proposed in Sollers's Logiques and in terms of its analysis of the articulation of writing with desire. The TQ reading extends the logic of literature to a critique of culture, marking the anti-social tendencies of this logic. Sexuality is enveloped within literature. The proposition of literature as negativity which we also detected in the other essays and previously, and
implicitly as anti-social, conflicts with the review's political allegiances, but Marxism for TQ is, as we have stressed, only expedient. Moreover, it is the function of the review to engage literature in this conflict with the social; in this sense the contradictions of TQ's strategy are a function of its literary theory. The review is a social phenomenon, and the paradox of a literary review provides the tension that defines TQ. At the same time the reading of Sade, like that of Artaud, changes the reading of this writer irredeemably.

Bataille - transgression

The context in which Sollers's Logiques essay on Bataille, 'Le Toit,' appears is important for the light it throws on the interpretation of the essay and its importance in the history of the review. It appears first in TQ29, which is the first issue to bear the subtitle 'Science / Littérature' that will remain throughout the history of the review (it will be added to later on), and which signals the deliberate adoption of and emphasis on a theory of literature. The word 'science' has a number of determinations; the Mallarmean reference to the proximity of literature and science, but also Althusser's emphasis on the science of Marxism, which becomes relevant at a later point. The issue also contains Kristeva's first essay in TQ, 'Pour une sémiologie des paragrammes,' as well as an essay by Jakobson 9, affirming linguistics as a science. The essay on Bataille thus appears in a context
that affirms science while Sollers's essay shows how Bataille at the same time affirms the necessity of science and insists on something that would go beyond science. The essay on Bataille thus appears as a transgressive logic implanted within science and within the review. Similarly, while Sollers states that the article was refused by the periodical L'Arc (where Derrida's article on Bataille was published) for its Marxist 'dimensions', and it is simultaneous with the review's dialogues with La Nouvelle Critique[^1], it is our analysis that the article implants a transgressive logic within dialectical materialism. The article is also projective, programming a project for literary theory and practice for TQ.

To briefly review the main points of an earlier article on Bataille, 'De grandes irrégularités de langage'^[^2] Sollers outlines a number of the aspects that make Bataille a crucial reference for TQ and installs at this early stage (1963) a recognition of the radical importance of Bataille for the logic of writing. Sollers sees in Bataille an affirmation of 'le jeu' or 'la volonté de chance'^[^3], which we can identify with the experience of writing in that 'le jeu' and 'la chance' carry the subject into an experience of which he is not the author. Writing becomes an opening into 'l'inconnu', or 'une théâtre sans fin'^[^4], prefiguring Kristeva's development of the logic of trangression as moving from a restricted domain to a potential infinity.^[^5] Bataille's experience is moreover 'une logique menée à son comble'(p.157), indicating how it is not a question of a refusal of rationality but its
completion. Sollers also interprets Bataille's experience of writing as 'une dialectique de langage avec l'inexprimable' (p.155), thus affirming early on the dialectical character of the experience. The dialectic engages what Sollers recognises here as 'une négativité sans emploi' (p.156) which he links significantly to Lautréamont's Poésies.

Negativity appears a key term in the articulation of TQ's theory of literature with Bataille. It is potentially vulnerable to a Nietzschean critique that would disrupt its dialectical basis (eg. Derrida, Foucault), but on the other hand this negativity can be interpreted as a 'gay science' or an active nihilism of Nietzschean character.

Our analysis of Sollers's 'Le Toit' will show it to render explicit the dependence of the logic in question on Bataille's thought, but also to extend the logic into different areas. For example, the passage from discontinuity to continuity, Sollers writes, can pass through the 'infinite use of literature' (p.165). While the use of the term 'infinite' introduces a crucial problematic of TQ's theory, it is worth asking how and why this is a transgression. Writing is proposed by Sollers as a part of the series of repressed objects or acts the exclusion of which discontinuous culture exists on. The Derridean notion of the repression of writing in favour of speech is implicitly behind this formulation. At the same time Sollers indicates how the discontinuity / continuity dialectic in Bataille is operative at the level, 'on the surface' of the opposition discourse / silence (p.166).
Discourse assigns to language a representative function, language is seen as an instrument towards the signification of truth. 'Literature' meanwhile is assigned a reserved, 'minor' place within discourse, whence the illusion of seeing Bataille as a 'poet' and Bataille's subversion of the classification of discourse.

The precise logic in question here can be set out systematically: the transgression of discourse operates through the negation of discourse within discourse, by silence. 'Silence' here is what discourse excludes, not an absence of writing but an excess of writing; it is also the unspoken difference that writing effects, a difference not in the space of speech but in the space of the trace. (Part of TQ's theory of literature involves a re-evaluation of what 'silence' is, a re-evaluation traceable to Mallarmé, but which is paralleled in music by Webern and Cage.)

To extend and analyse the logic in question, if we look more closely at how the negation of discourse operates we can see that if discourse rests on an expressive fallacy, it rests also on the division between the signified and the signifier. Writing displaces the direction of signification from the direction: signifier-signified to the direction: signifier-signifier, thus 'liberating' writing from the signified and enabling an infinite signification (later 'significance'). This displacement is a negation of a negation (therefore an affirmation) that does not assign any 'final sense' to writing but turns it towards a dépense or a consumation.
In the infinite articulation of signifier with signifier it is a question of space and relation rather than a linear relation to a pre-given truth.

Writing transgresses, therefore, when it becomes an infinite relation of signifier to signifier, rupturing the closure of discourse effected by the 'vertical' signifier-signified vector. What was silent thus works on discourse from within it to open discourse to its infinity. What was silent, we can add, angling our analysis towards Derrida, is the trace of the signifier.

How is this opening effected? In other words, what forces the writing through the vertical screen of representation? The answer Sollers gives is: eroticism (p.182). We can refer here to Barthes' distinction between eroticism as allusion, based on metaphor, and eroticism in writing as metonymic violence, displacement. While the former leaves sexuality outside language, the latter inscribes it in writing. The eroticism defined by Bataille is not a metaphoric allusion to sexuality but an affirmation of life to the point of death. In other words it is through linking pleasure to horror, sexuality to death, that it becomes an infinite displacement of signifiers, or as Sollers writes, citing Bataille, a 'développement de signes' (p.183). Discourse is violated through the deliberate association of pleasure with death, so that the limit between discourse and violence is ruptured. We can reinterpret this as a subversion of the signified by the signifier, of the relation of metaphor by the structure of metonymy. Writing
is also the 'mise en jeu au fond 'répugnante' du sujet du discours' with respect to science. While the latter forecloses the subject, the former implicates the subject in the writing through sacrifice, in which eroticism is fundamentally involved. The elaboration of the transgression of writing replaces literature as the inheritor of the sacrificial function of religion and identifies an 'age of language' in which eroticism is also a key element, the transgressive body the 'major referent' of a 'violation of discourse' (p.180). Thus Bataille's thinking on eroticism, discussed by Sollers, is evidently a fundamental background to the texts proposed not only by Sade, in a retrospective way, but also by Bataille himself and by Sollers, Baudry, Guyotat, the TQ novelists in general.

**Bataille - the body**

The specific import of Sollers's essay on Bataille apart from its amplification of the logic of literature is its reflection on the place of the body, the vision of writing derived from a reading of Bataille and the experience of the subject of writing of Bataille's 'inner experience'.

In the essay on Mallarmé Sollers had stressed the disappearance of the writer through the writing as a kind of sacrifice. Bataille's investigation of the sacrifice also implicates this movement. Sollers writes this as 'la mise en jeu au fond "répugnante" du sujet du discours' (p.180). This 'mise en jeu' or sacrifice in
writing profoundly implicates the body of the writer. The body here is not the abstraction of science but a material excess or continuity; 'le corps est en nous ce qui est toujours "plus" que nous'. (p.179-80) Sollers thus outlines a definition of 'l'écriture corporelle' (p.180) as a sacrifice of the identity of the author and the consequent writing of 'la violence intérieure de l'être' (p.180). This sacrifice invokes a passage from 'le corps', the body in as much as inhabited by the restricted identity of the subject, to 'la chair'. 'La chair', Sollers asserts, is to be interpreted not as a substance exterior to writing which would achieve expression within it, as we indicated would be the case if we posed desire outside language. 'La chair' is rather the materiality in which the writing of desire or the unconscious, 'le rêve', is inscribed. Inscription here opposes de-scription. Sollers thus proposes 'l'écriture corporelle' as a corporeal inscription of writing, in the sense of 'Le Verbe s'est fait chair'. The body is not outside language, or if it is it is as 'poids mort', therefore, but is itself a writing through an originary inscription, which Sollers refers to Derrida's 'scène de l'écriture' as investigated in TQ. This inscription evades the ambiguities of desire as substance or the body as exterior to language. However, if 'la chair' is the inscription of desire, and literature is the site of the subversion of discourse by this inscribed movement, eroticism the access to this inscription, Sollers also poses the existence of 'une profonde vie organique' and 'la masse matérielle'. (p.179) The body
'before' the inscription is suggested implicitly as the body subject to the Freudian death drive, 'poursuivant sa travail de mort'. The death drive thus 'irrigates' 'la physique du geste écrit'. (p.183) As far as the death drive is the tendency to return to an original entropic state, writing is thus a detour, 'le détour écrit vers la mort'. Writing is the form of the detour taken by violence through the social, Sollers proposes. As a principal undercutting the inscription of desire Sollers thus poses, not without a degree of ambiguity, a radical negativity which will find a more complex and psychoanalytically based enunciation in Kristeva's semiotic.

'L'écriture corporelle' is thus discourse subverted both by the inscription of sexuality in the writing body, the body of language as it were, and the death drive which directs the writing towards its destruction. Writing is a 'mise à mort du langage'(p.186), a dissolution. Here we again recover the logic of the negation of the negation, since writing as a destruction of language negates language or discourse as the negation of the inner violence of the body. Writing is therefore an affirmation: 'une affirmation redoublée du langage...jusque dans le silence.' Sollers's work here is an important enquiry into the area of intersection between literature and psychoanalysis that is largely original and not developed elsewhere other than in TQ. At the same time, Sollers maps out an area of writing, 'l'écriture corporelle' in which the subject is 'mise en jeu' corporeally, that is immediately relevant to the texts of TQ, retrospectively
to Sade, Artaud, Bataille but also to such writers as Guyotat, whose writing can be said to function because of the opening of this space.\textsuperscript{16} That this derives from a study of Bataille indicates the extent to which a writing of excess already transgresses the limits of psychoanalysis within TQ.

\textbf{Bataille beyond Marx}

In 'Le Toit' Sollers develops the critique of bourgeois culture that he began in 'Sade dans le texte'. While the latter was based on a recognition of society as neurotic, in reference to Bataille Sollers recasts this as discontinuity. The perspective is the same, since as neurosis is determined by a repression, discontinuity is determined by a restriction that excludes continuity. The discontinuity, limiting the continuity of the body, of 'inner violence', is the basis of the identity of individuals and of the sacralisation of the individual on which society is based. Within this restricted economy there is a circuit of exchange, of money and information. Sollers's critique is thus a Marxism filtered through a Bataillean emphasis on continuity, since the circuit of exchange also cuts out 'le travail'. (p.167) The Marxist perspective is also indicated by the dialectical relation between discontinuity and continuity, or the human and the non-human; as was indicated in the essay on Sade, culture is established through the exclusion of what it then proposes as nature, through the intervention of the law or
interdiction. The relation between the law and what it excludes is not fixed a priori, however; it is a human intervention, and is ruptured by a continuous movement of transgression through such areas as violence, eroticism, writing. Within culture the interdiction was marked by religion, sacrifice and the sacred generally, but in our present culture the interdiction is masked through a hypostasis. (Later we will relate this to TQ's focus on religion and on the work of Girard.)

The relation between transgression and the law is thus stressed by Sollers as a dialectical relation. (p.170) This dialectic is at the basis of TQ's Marxism, and the extent to which it is a Marxist dialectic is essentially what TQ's Marxism rests on. Sollers states that Bataille interrogates dialectical materialism on the ground on which it is constructed, also that he poses the problem 'on the other side' of dialectical materialism, inner experience. Bataille's dialectic of transgression recognises a principle of excess, however, which dialectical materialism does not. The contradiction of Bataille's dialectic, if it is a contradiction, is stressed by Sollers as irreconcilable, and to the extent that dialectical materialism proposes a resolution of contradictions it conflicts with TQ's Marxism. Moreover, it is possible to suggest that Bataille's transgression is not based on a contradiction, the essence of the dialectic, but on excess and difference, and that therefore TQ's Marxism is misaligned with Bataille's transgression. As the latter is a more fundamental
movement, TQ's Marxism has only a limited applicability, as limited as the emphasis on contradiction as opposed to difference. At the same time, in as much as dialectical materialism is a philosophy, Bataille's thought, the writing of TQ, exceeds it. Sollers sees Bataille's thought as 'un oui sans réserve donné au dialectique matérialiste' (p.179); in other words, TQ exceeds dialectical materialism, carries it to its logical limit, to the point at which it breaks down or opens into the unknown.

In the three areas we have identified; literature, the body and Marxism, Bataille is of specific importance for TQ, not only as an influence on the theory of literature developed, but as the instigator of a subversive logic implanted within TQ's more restricted moments. TQ is not, as we have suggested above, the perpetrator of this transgressive logic, but the site of its application. However, it is certain that Sollers, for example, recognises the functioning of this logic and precipitates the crises and theoretical steps demanded, rather than acting as a resistant barrier to them. In the context of the theory of literature, meanwhile, Bataille appears as a return to the basic philosophy behind the logic we are looking at. Lautréamont, on the other hand, appears as the most explicit and complete example of the functioning of this logic, as a logic, in the history of literature.
Lautréamont's thanatography

The reading and analysis of Lautréamont is transformative of TQ's theory of literature. Of all the texts analysed in TQ it is the one which most explicitly transforms the theory of literature, and reorganises the reading of literature as a whole. The intervention of the text of Lautréamont in 1967 corresponds with the moment of theorisation. The first stage of the reading of Lautréamont is Pleynet's 1967 book on Lautréamont, of which Sollers's essay (published in Critique) is a review. While Pleynet identifies the main areas of relevance of a reading of Lautréamont, for our purposes, which we can reiterate as establishing a basic logic of literature, Sollers's essay is more important, thus our greater emphasis on that work. However, between Pleynet's book and Sollers's essay Kristeva's article 'Pour une sémiologie des paragrammes' appears in TQ 29. Sollers refers to this crucial text in his essay, so that we can see Kristeva's article as the main instance of the transformation that Lautréamont's text effects. We will refer to the use Sollers makes of Kristeva's article but analyse it further in the context of a discussion of her work.

Thus identifying the major points only of Pleynet's book, the only reading Lautréamont's text allows is that of its scription, the materiality of its writing. Lautréamont effects a shift from ideological to literal reading; literalality is a first step in the transformation
of literature. The text is moreover transgressive of the limits of genre, biography and vraisemblance. Maldoror therefore denies the possibility of a reading that relates to these areas, and insists on a reading of its literality, its writing, thus proposing what we identified earlier as 'écriture-lecture'. Existing at the level of rhetoric, Maldoror functions as a negation of rhetoric and its limits.

Sollers's characteristic first gesture is to distance any other reading of Lautréamont (except Pleynet's), particularly that of Surrealism ('prétexte à inflation verbale') (p.250) and Blanchot ('lecture essentialiste') (p.251). Both derive from the redundancy of interpretation and of a reading with reference to truth which, Sollers remarks, prevent the possibility of a science which he relates to Derrida's science of writing. This shows how the concern to distance certain readings has narrowed from the target of a general bourgeois humanism to the closer adversaries of Breton and Blanchot. The specificity of TQ's approach depends therefore on a distinction from these readings and at this moment (1967) and in this space (Critique) this distinction has become more important.

The reading of Lautréamont is specifically crucial as it is a writing that, according to Sollers's reading, offers a theory of writing as transgression and in doing so affects at its base the logic on which language as discourse is founded. The essay on Lautréamont is the one which produces most coherently a new logic of writing through the transformation of linguistic and logical
concepts. Sollers's essay follows and refers to Kristeva's analysis 'Pour une sémiologie des paragrammes' which elaborates a new logic according to a number of crucial notions which Sollers marks. The first is the notion of potential infinity (p.255), which we can see as basically equivalent to the transfinite, which Sollers also refers to. The transfinite, to state very briefly a concept that will be analysed further on in the context of the work of Kristeva, is defined by the next element of an infinite set, or by an infinity not posed as beyond but dependent on a progression of numbers to infinity, the next number being transfinite. The second aspect is a new way of thinking negation and contradiction. Negation is determinative, contradiction defines; in other words the law of non-contradiction no longer holds, and negation is not a lack of signification or a denegation but a productive signification. Affirmation is not opposed to negation. Thirdly, the text is seen as a negation, destructive and autodestructive, a 'voie zéro' (p.255) in Kristeva's terms.

The definition of a new science depends, according to such epistemologists as Kuhn, on the production of new concepts and a new object. The new object of Sollers's enquiry is the text, in so far as it differs from 'literature', often used pejoratively. A major new concept of the theory Sollers introduces is 'thanatography'. This is linked to the question of the name. From the Chants to the Poésies there is a passage from the pseudonym to the Proper Name. Pleynet had underlined how in the passage
from the first to the second version of Chant 1 how the writer effaces any biographical trace to speak of. Sollers cites Pleynet's comment:

'Le pseudonyme a permis au nom propre d'avoir un autre référent que l'héritage paternel. Ducasse est désormais le fils de ses œuvres.' 

The passage of the writing of Maldoror necessitates, like the experience of Mallarmé, Dante, Artaud, the death of the biographical subject; this writing 'for' death is 'thanatographie'. (p.254) The thanatographic text is a writing which forces the death of the subject of biography. Every writing is thus tragic, as Sollers had suggested in the essay on Bataille. The death of the subject is not simply, moreover, that of the subject of the énoncé, the subject posed as author, but also of the subject of énonciation, the subject posed by the instance of discourse. Both belong, Sollers proposes, to a metaphysical space, in which Freudian psychoanalysis is also implicated. Writing decentres this subject, giving rise to 'l'énoncé de l'énonciation de l'énoncé' (p.254). In other words there is never an act of writing in which the subject is present to himself and at the origin of his writing. Everything is already written. This is also termed 'une infinitisation des énoncés' or 'une désénonciation généralisée' (p.254) to emphasise the negative direction of this production. Pleynet's analysis had relied to an extent on Benveniste's opposition, and Sollers advances here in breaking with the linguistic structure, relevant to speech, and creating a new concept more relevant to the space of writing.
In establishing 'l'absence de tout sujet' Sollers refers to Derrida's comments on 'l'absence originale de tout sujet'. However, this is not without posing problems; Derrida's 'writing' threatens to foreclose the possibility of any subject, and in as much as the subject is an important aspect of TQ's Bataillean emphasis, the problem is how to reintegrate the subject into the writing. Sollers's concept of 'désénonciation' suggests that, rather than the original absence of any subject, writing is a continual negation of the subject, its exceeding and 'mise à mort'. The subject of writing emerges through the affirmation that this negation hinges on. Writing, as well as a 'thanatographie' is also an 'enfantement', the birth of the subject of writing. Sollers's reading of Lautréamont / Ducasse goes beyond the limits of Derrida's absence of the subject to affirm the subject of writing. At the same time the concepts of thanatography and 'désénonciation' distance a previous linguistic structure that would limit this to a space of speech.

Lautréamont and the translinguistic

A crucial transformative concept that the reading of Lautréamont introduces more explicitly is the notion of the 'trans-' movement, transfinite, transphenomenal, translinguistic. This derives from the idea of the 'traversée' from the essay on Dante, but is filtered through Kristeva's introduction of mathematical thought in her article. The movement 'across' is 'un procès qui
traverse'. It is distinct, Sollers asserts, from the 'infra' or 'supra' spaces that Benveniste refers to. (p.257-8) That is, it does not remain inside or outside language but undoes this distinction by a passage through or across. Bataille's transgression, which completes and goes through the limit is a pretext for this. The translinguistic movement does not pass into a beyond language but passes across the language, doubling it, and opening it into its infinite permutation.

Rather than posing a transcendence, excusing a 'beyond language', writing poses the next element in an infinite permutational chain. Sollers produces a number of concepts related to this; 'l'englobement' is the movement whereby the text includes the space of discourse, 'l'englobement d'un espace par un autre espace' (p.255), 'l'englobement de la dualité bien / mal.' (p.285) The 'relance' (p.258) is the setting in place of the the next element of the permutational chain. The 'vide' (p.256) is the space immediately before this 'relance'. Writing thus envelopes, it re-organises, and creates a certain emptiness or void. Writing is a movement to create the empty space after discourse from which the writing is then rethrown into its permutation. Our use of the term 'permutation' indicates that a strong element in this logic is the parallel importance of mathematics. 'L'écriture mathématique' (p.266) is of course without reference to a space of speech; it is not a language but only a writing, as Derrida indicated in De la Grammatologie. Thus Sollers writes:

'L'écriture mathématique, ou plutôt celle qui accomplit, à
Language, or discourse is thus subverted by writing. The latter, through 'mathematical thought' is thus also linked to Chinese thought, for which mathematics is a crucial space. The essay on Lautréamont also definitively introduces Chinese thought as a reference in TQ, but reasons of space and unity of subject matter do not permit a more thorough investigation of this articulation."

The translinguistic movement is also transphenomenal (p.266) in that it transgresses reality or the appearance of things while at the same time not excluding it. Rather than becoming an idealism, posing reality on one hand and a transcendent ideality on the other, the transphenomenal movement opens out the materiality of the phenomenal to its infinite productivity. (This is our extension of Sollers's argument). In the logic of transgression it will therefore be a question for TQ of affirming simultaneously the material and the ideal, rather than remaining limited by either materialism or idealism. It is evident therefore that the concept of the transversal, developed in Sollers's commentary on Lautréamont, is a crucial element that defines the logic of literature.

Lautréamont and negation

Lautréamont's text is notorious for abounding with impossible metaphors and comparisons, and for the negation that the Poésies operate on the first text, Maldoror.
Sollers emphasises the different way of looking at affirmation and negation that Lautréamont introduces. The space of writing is a space of negation, 'un réseau ondoyant et négatif'(p.255) writes Sollers, citing Kristeva. This negation is however a productive negation, a movement which is written into the notion of effacement, dépense or consumption. The paradox of this productive negation is produced by the fact that writing knows no negation in so far as the latter is opposed to affirmation. The unconscious also knows no contradiction in this sense; Sollers cites Freud's statement to this effect which will often be reiterated in TQ. Writing is thus:

'la mise en fonctionnement d'un espace qui ne connaît pas de contraire, étant la contradiction en acte... la contrascription.' (p.291)

Sollers's implicit identification here of negation and contradiction is problematic, since contradiction can be seen as within the limits of an essentialist thought. Despite an implicit dependence on concepts derived from Derrida and related to the theory of the trace, Sollers tends to efface difference under contradiction, and this creates specific problems which we will deal with later in the context of TQ's Marxism. At this stage, the text is seen as an active negation. Sollers refers here to a Chinese philosophical proposition of:

'le fait d'employer des séries de négations de négations jusqu'à ce qu'il ne reste rien qui puisse être affirmé ou nié'. (p.293)

In Sollers's reading, therefore, Maldoror is a traversal of all the possibilities of negation - we can see the
relevance of the previous reading of Sade and the later reading of 'le Mal radical' - while the Poésies produces a series of paradoxical énoncés no longer affected by the opposition of affirmation and negation. Both are included in the general affirmation - negation, the 'oui-non' (p.286) of writing.

We have reviewed Lautréamont as specifically important for TQ due to the transformation his text effects on the accepted interpretation of literature. Maldoror and the Poésies are read as the application of a logic across language, transgressing its limits, and a logic moreover of negation. The transformation this induces in the view of the writing subject introduces the term 'thanatography', writing as 'writing through death'. The recognition that Lautréamont transforms any rhetoric or discourse through this negative transgression informs TQ's political alliances. Politics and the social are transformed from the perspective of literature. This recognition also informs the explicit formulation of a project with Sollers's 'Programme', which opens Logiques and thus transforms a composite of essays on 'limit-texts' into a programmatic theory of literature.

The moment of theorisation

The 'Programme' is the definition of a collective project and a theory of writing, a 'pro-gramme'. Like Kristeva's 'Pour une sémiologie des paragrammes' it is set out in logical steps - 1. 1.1 , 1.2, 2 etc, with the
principal statements in capitals, underlining the scientific character of its propositions and its character as a manifesto or project programming the future development of TQ. Thus:

'UNE THÉORIE D'ENSEMBLE PENSÉE À PARTIR DE LA PRATIQUE DE L'ÉCRITURE DEMANDE À ÊTRE ÉLABORÉE'.(p.9)

The demand for this 'théorie d'ensemble' that we can translate both as a coherent theory and a collective theory is partly answered by the publication of the book of that title in 1968, indicating the extent to which the programme actually functions. However, the most significant aspect of this programme is its angling of the theory of writing towards its insertion into a historical structure and its articulation with Marxism. The rupture of the text is historically situated, contemporary ('before the same unknown'[p.10]) with Marx. Thus the rupture of Lautréamont / Mallarmé is 'announced' and 'pursued' by those of Dante / Sade and Artaud / Bataille. The historical field of this rupture is characterised by its denegation or the repression of these ruptures and by the consequent 'borders' of madness, eroticism and so on. This historical field is however monumental. The theory of the text subverts the concept of history as posed by idealism, Sollers states, which depends on its discontinuity, the exclusion of these spaces of continuity. Sollers proposes a monumental history based on 'une durée conçue comme temps des langues'(p.11). Thus the history envisaged by Sollers here is one between texts, in the sense that Lautréamont transgresses and thus comes after the texts he transgresses, the age of rhetoric as it were. Lautréamont
is thus proposed as contemporary with Marx in the sense that Lautréamont's transgression is equivalent to the transgression of history proposed by Marx. Textual practice is 'on the same side' or in the same space as Marxism.

The crucial step here, if we look at the foundations of Sollers argument, is to equate the dialectic of the text with the dialectic of history proposed by Marx. This equation is problematic, firstly because the transgression of the text is not necessarily dialectical, and secondly because dialectical materialism as proposed by Marx is not necessarily at the same level as the dialectic of excess proposed by TQ and Bataille before them. Another foundation is the proposition of contradiction as a motor of the text (p.12), which we have already indicated as problematic. This links the text to the movement of history and thus to the same dialectical movement.

'Programme' effectively announces TQ's Marxism but also writes these contradictions into its projection, effacing difference under contradiction, programming a break with Derrida and the 'diversion' of TQ into Marxism and Maoism.

The 'programme' also constitutes a definitive statement, which is referred to in TQ in successive articles as such, of the theory of writing developed in Logiques. Sollers thus emphasises the disengagement from representation and expression, the affirmation of literality and spatialisation, the relevance of the thought of different cultures, writing as negation, the necessity of a science of writing. The language Sollers
uses, removed from the space of critique or commentary of a specific text, directed to the elaboration of a theory, will characterise the next period of TQ's history, which also includes an investigation of the epistemological foundations of science as such. The time of theory in TQ thus follows the time of the development of the experience and the logic of writing, and the reading and writing of this experience. The moment of theory also corresponds with the moment of politics, simultaneous, moreover, with an explosive moment of politics in the events of 1968.
NOTES FOR CHAPTER TWO - INTERVENTION

I. The formation of the review and first period.

The accident of formation

1. The 'mythobiography' of Sollers can be followed in Vision à New
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9. TQ1 p.3.
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    réduction', THE p.391.
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Artaud: 'Chiotte à l'esprit' TQ3 Autumn 1960; 'Notes sur la
    peinture' TQ15 Autumn 1963; 'Onze lettres à Anais Nin' TQ20 Winter
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Bataille: 'Les larmes d'Eros' TQ5 Spring 1961; 'Conférences sur le
    non-savoir' TQ10.
21. Ezra Pound: 'Canto IV' TQ6 Summer 1961; 'L'art de la poésie'
TQ11.
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The establishment of the committee
26. Pleyenet reports in a personal interview that the relation between his role as secretary and as poet was 'complètement schizé'.

II. The 'dépassement of the 'Nouveau roman' / Poetic language.

The noise of Robbe-Grillet / transgressive strategies
1. Roland Barthes, 'La littérature aujourd'hui' TQ7 ; Nathalie Sarraute, 'La littérature aujourd'hui II' TQ9.
2. Sollers, 'Pour un Nouveau roman' TQ18.
3. Claude Simon, 'La poursuite' TQ1 ; 'Correspondance' TQ16. Claude Ollier, 'Le dispositif' TQ3 ; 'La porte d'or' TQ7 ; 'L'été indien' TQ12. Jean Ricardou, 'Sur la pierre' TQ2 ; 'Description d'un striptease' TQ5 ; 'Réflexion totale' TQ12 ; 'Gravitation' TQ16.
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10. Sollers, 'Logique de la fiction' TQ15 p.5.
12. See our reading of Nombres, Chapter 4.
13. See Chapter 3.IV.

Robbe-Grillet vs. Bataille : the exclusion of 'le non-savoir'

Cérisy 1963
15. From the conference, a debate on the novel and one on poetry, as well as papers given by Sollers, Faye and Pleyenet are reprinted in TQ 17 Spring 1964.

The emergence of a poetic language
16. An article ready for publication looks at this transgression. See also Chapter 4, 'Pretexts'.
17. Both Faye and Ricardou publish novels outside TQ: Faye - L'écluse, Seuil,1964. Ricardou - La prise de constantinople, Minuit,
1965.

19. See Chapter 3.111.

Denis Roche - subversive intent

22. Denis Roche, 'Kandinsky à venir' TQ14 Summer 1963.

Marcelin Pleynet - poetic experience

23. 'c'est moins la place que j'occupe, c'est moins le texte que j'écris, qui m'intéressent, que l'expérience que le texte me permet de vivre...' (with reference to critical texts') Pleynet, Transculture, Paris, 1979, 10/18, p. 129. Pleynet's approach could be described as a subjection to the experience of writing and its analysis. Cf. Chapter Four and 'L'amour, inceste, fragmentation dans Rime de Marcelin Pleynet', unpublished article.
34. Cf. Sollers, 'Programme' L. p.11.
35. Pleynet, 'La compagnie de Merce Cunningham' TQ18 ; 'Naked Lunch' TQ18 ; 'Le monde est une peinture pas une décoration' TQ18.

III. From avant-garde to science

1. The 'avant-garde' can be defined, for our purposes, as a movement that attempts to situate itself in rupture with tradition or history, a reactive position relative to history which is opposed to the analytic and transgressive approach of TQ.
Intersection with Critique

4. 'La Prose d'Acteon' NRF 135, 1964 (on Klossowski); 'La Pensée du dehors' Critique 229, 1966 (on Blanchot); 'Theatrumpoliticum' Critique 282, Nov. 1970 (on Deleuze).

13. Foucault, 'Distance, aspect, origine' THE p.15.
15. Cf. 'Tel Quel and the Italian neoavanguardia' Unpublished article.

Pre-analytical psychology and dreams

22. Dragne (see Appendix I), Les Images, Capriccio italiano.
25. That is nonetheless extenuated elsewhere, for example in 'Logique de la fiction' and Foucault's introduction to the debate on the novel
at Cérisy. The difference is between transcendence and transgression. See Chapter 2.14. on Bataille and Chapter 5.2. on the 'Nouveaux philosophes' on the same question.


**Russian Formalism - method or theory?**

33. THE p.393.
35. 'New criticism', a similar approach, was not widely known in France at this time, although TQ had published an essay by T.S. Eliot on Goethe in Issue 2, Summer 1960.
40. Eikenbaum, art. cit. p.64.
42. Tynianov, art. cit, p.130.

**Structuralism displaced**

46. Todorov, 'Choderlos de Lacos et la théorie du récit' TQ27 p.17. Austin's 'How to do things with words' was translated in 1970 as 'Quand dire c'est faire' (Seuil). Austin's work is later used in an interesting way on Molière and seduction by Shoshana Felman in 'Don Juan et la promesse d'amour' TQ87 Spring 1981.

**TQ-Barthes : mutual benefit**

48. Roland Barthes, 'La littérature aujourd'hui' TQ7 and *Essais critiques* p. 160.
55. Soillers, 'Picard, cheval de bataille' TQ24 p.92.

**IV. The logic of literature**

**Artaud-Derrida ; theft from self**

1. There is a special issue on Artaud (TQ20 Winter 1965) which includes: Antonin Artaud, 'Onze lettres à Anaïs Nin'; Paule Thévenin, 'Antonin Artaud dans la vie'; Jacques Derrida, 'La parole soufflée'; Philippe Sollers, 'La pensée émet des signes'.

**Artaud's thought**


**Dante and writing's traversal**

6. Cf. Sollers's discussion in 'Je sais pourquoi je jouis' TQ90 Winter 1981, where it is related to the 'trinity' of the subject. See Chapter 3.IV.
8. 'Le transfert' or transference is in psychoanalysis the operation of 'actualisation' whereby the unconscious is 'carried over' to the analyst. Both Lacan (Seminar on 'Le transfert', *Le Séminaire Livre VIII*, Paris, 1990, Seuil.) and Barthes (in *Fragments d'un discours amoureux*, Paris, 1977, Seuil, Coll. TQ.) compare transference to love. I would like to deal with the relation of the reader to the text in this perspective in a future research project.

**Mallarmé - the science and economy of literature**

10. Kristeva later elaborates on this identification of the sentence
as opposed to the word or the phoneme as 'le résumé final de toute complexité' (Sollers) in her reformed linguistics.

Sade - the ideology of reading

23. See Chapter 5.II & V.
24. As, for example, in Baudrillard.

Sade - writing and desire

27. Tort, 'L'effet Sade', TQ28. The title is of course a pun, suggesting, 'Les fessades'.

Bataille - transgression

32. Sollers, 'De grandes irrégularités de langage' Critique Aug-Sept. 1963 also in L.
34. L. p.154.
35. See Chapter 3.III.

Bataille - the body


Lautréamont's thanatography

38. Sollers, 'La science de Lautréamont' Critique 245, Oct.1967 and
40. See Chapter 3.III.
41. So that the 'transfinite' number is an 'outer limit' of the set of infinite numbers, a shifting limit.
42. Thomas Kuhn, The structure of scientific revolutions.
44. Derrida, De la grammatologie p.100.

Lautréamont and the translinguistic

45. Derrida, De la grammatologie p.12.
46. In the essay on Lautréamont, Sollers refers to quotations taken from the work of Joseph Needham, Science and civilisation in China, and the work of Marcel Granet, La pensée chinoise. These two will be the principal sources of Chinese thought for TQ and the focus of the Chinese philosophical interest later on, although Sollers does refer to works, such as that of Chi-Tsang, that do not feature in either Granet or Needham. Maspero's work on Taoism is also cited as an influence by Sollers and Pleynet.

The moment of theorisation

47. Sollers, 'Programme' TQ31 Summer 1967.
CHAPTER THREE- THEORY

The following chapter attempts a number of things. Firstly, it examines the articulation of the theory of literature developed by TQ with Marxism and psychoanalysis, showing how both are extensions of the theory of literature into these areas, rather than overdetermining invasions of literature by Marxism or psychoanalysis. Certain problems with TQ's Marxism are pointed out, and its evolution towards a 'post-Marxism' is traced. TQ's role in the 1968 events is reviewed in this context. TQ's engagement with psychoanalysis is shown to be more consequent, but all the same a subversion of psychoanalysis by literature, rather than the opposite. Secondly, a thorough analysis of the theoretical interventions of Kristeva functions as an investigation of the basis of TQ's theory of literature in a theory of language. Kristeva's work is analysed as the scientific basis of TQ's theory of literature, influenced by the work of Sollers previously analysed but to a large extent reorganising this theory in more scientific terms. Finally, we look at the evolution of the theory of literature of TQ in the work of Kristeva and Sollers, arguing that there is a constant application of the same logic, while it is extended into different areas. The specific historical evolution of the review, its engagement in numerous polemics and the details of its strategic moves are not analysed fully here, for reasons of space and theoretical unity. Our thesis attempts to be
primarily theoretical, with a basic but minimal historical structure, rather than a historical chronicle of events. However, where events in the context, for example May 1968, become relevant to the development of the theory they will be discussed. The reader is referred to the Chronology at the end of the thesis where the polemical interventions and the strategic steps of TQ can be read, plotted against events in the context.

I. The extension of theory - Marxism

The Marxism of Logiques depended, as we suggested, on the equivalence of the dialectic of transgression and dialectical materialism, on the elaboration of contradiction as a generator of writing, and a parallel between the 'monumental' history of literature and history as interpreted by Marx. It also elaborated a critique of culture oriented towards a Marxist critique of ideology. Théorie d'ensemble, as the presentation of the explicitly Marxist extensions of the theory of the text elaborates different points. Firstly, there is an analogy between the Classical economy as analysed by Marx and the economy of language as analysed by TQ, with a corresponding analogy between the critique of the Classical economy and the Derridean critique of logocentrism and the sign, and between Marxist epistemology and Kristeva's semiology. Secondly, there is a recognition that literature is a
privileged part of ideology, and that a subversion of literature is a subversion of ideology. A third aspect is the emphasis on materialism as opposed to idealism and a critique of the latter from the standpoint of the former. Fourthly, these aspects are articulated through an espousal of Althusserian concepts and ideas such as the theoretical revolution of Marx, the break between ideology and science (which is termed a 'coupure épistémologique') and a notion of theoretical practice similar to Althusser's. This bases TQ's initial Marxism on the four notions of production, ideology, epistemology and materialism.

The effacement of production

The central node of the early Marxism of TQ, the analogy between the monetary economy and the linguistic economy, is enounced by Jean-Joseph Goux (not a committee member) and Jean-Louis Baudry in articles which appeared in late 1967 and early 1968. The basis of the initial Marxism is proposed as an analogy. The first and basic aspect of the analogy is that the production of the text, its writing, the productivity of language in general, is equated with production as such, the work that produces products in the economy; both are 'occulted' by ideology, 'literature' in the first place, the Classical economy in the second. This effacement of productivity is underlined by Sollers, Kristeva, Baudry and Goux and is fundamental, since the analogy between 'Classical literature' and the Classical
economy as analysed by Marx, and thus between the critiques or sciences of both derives from it.

For Baudry, society censors any product that displays its own production and thus reveals and contests the system of exchange on which it rests. Textual practice is such a production. 'Literature' is the ideology constituted to resist this contestation. To analyse literary production is therefore to expose the ideology and show its relativity, the illusion of universality on which it rests; its susceptibility of being replaced. Literature, moreover, is a privileged area of ideology in that it is made with language, the system in which every subject represents himself to himself. Thus the literary notions of 'character', 'human nature' fulfill ideological purposes. The theory (Marx, Freud) and practice (Mallarmé, Lautréamont) that exposes this ideology and focuses on the textual level is thus also censored and repressed. According to Baudry, who follows Althusser's opening statements in *Lire le Capital* in this formulation, Marx, Freud and Nietzsche recognised a way of reading that was also a writing, not an entry into the economy of meaning and representability. This theory and practice shows how the signifier (in both literature and the Classical economy) is 'lacunaire', has the status of a blank, an absence; how the inscription of the signifier (writing and work) is unreadable due to the effacing efforts of the ideology.

Goux's articles are interesting mainly through the use of the opposition exchange value / use value. The exchange
value of language seen as communication, expression, in terms of its translatability is opposed to the use value of language, which is defined as its productivity. Productivity is said to be occulted and exploited by exchange, which makes all linguistic production transparent and equivalent in meaning. Goux links use value to Derrida's movement of \textit{différence} and to the signifier, while exchange value is ranged with the signified and the metaphysics of presence or logocentrism. The main thrust of this articulation with Marxism is a critique of exchange. Meaning is proposed as production and materiality as opposed to transparence.

There are definite problems when it comes to the precise details of both Baudry's and Goux's arguments. The relations between Marxism and the TQ approach are put forward as an analogy. Literature 'is like', 'does not differ from' '', the economy as described by Marx. Textual production 'is like' work. Neither Goux nor Baudry analyse the status or the import of the analogy they draw, so that we are left with the impression that they are simply going through the permutations of a fairly arbitrary comparison.' Baudry and Goux's formulations fulfill an expected place in the TQ critique of representation and the championing of writing and its materiality, without really probing further into the precise relations between, especially, textual production and production as such. At times it seems that the oppositional play between exchange and production is what really determines what is proposed, such that one may question the theory's reliance on an
abstract model, a 'common measure', while abstraction is the very notion it attacks. The proposed analogy is certainly perspicacious, but without an examination of its foundations and deeper implications it remains fairly arbitrary, and thus vulnerable.

While the literary marketplace is undoubtedly linked to the economy in a fairly organic way, through the crucial notion of ideology, the links between work as production and writing as production, thus the comparison between the effacement of writing and the oppression of the working class, are not fully analysed and this is a serious lacuna. One side of the analogy, what one may call the 'positive' side, thus remains 'in the air'. Goux does in fact hint at a comparison between Marx's conception of work as an action of the change of nature by man, and the violent 'inscription' or tracing of writing.' However, as Kristeva points out, Marx did not give a full analysis of this aspect of the economy:

'Cette productivité antérieure à la valeur, ce "travail présens", Marx n'a ni l'intention ni les moyens de l'aborder'.

The analysis of production that would be comparable with the productivity of the text does not exist in Marx, and in this sense the basis of the analogy remains exterior to Marxism, or an extension of Marxism.

**Critique of the general equivalent**

A more fruitful analysis, suggested later by Goux, again inspired by Derrida, would be to subject the exchange value / use value opposition as it appears in
language to a Bataillesque critique of the economy of commensurability. Goux's later article 'Numismatiques', offers a critique of the notion of value as such. Again starting from Marx, Goux shows how certain values become capital, how they become the general equivalents in a heterogenous multiplicity of signifiers, forcing everything to obey the logic of the Same. Money is the archetypal form of the general equivalent, it is linked syntactically, formally and genetically (and thus in a far less arbitrary way than in Goux's previous article) to the promotion of other capital values - the Father, the phallus, the monarch and language - to the status of the general equivalent. The capital value, or 'étalon', must also efface the stages by which it has become capital, in order to achieve this status. Marx's Capital analyses the genesis of the value - money. Goux shows, in 'Numismatiques', how the Father, the Phallus and Language, follow the same genesis according to the same syntactical laws. Here, the analogy is founded at a far more basic level, that of syntax, and Goux goes so far as to suggest that the promotion of a capital value to a totemic, fetichistic status is a feature of capital-ism, thus all these movements obey a structural necessity. The alternative to such a centralised, totem based economy would be, according to Goux, the textual, in which the heterogeneity and multiplicity of signifiers enters into play. Returning to the notion of value, Goux suggests that it is simply a variant of the Platonic form or idea. This proposes the essential target of TQ's critique as
fetishism, as the constitution of a fixed value, and TQ's approach as what could be called an acephalic materialism. A key reference here is of course the thought of Bataille, in as much as a critique of the economy of commensurability intersects with an emphasis on the pre-sense productivity of language and production in general as dépense (expenditure), and a materialism that resolutely decapitates any pretension to capital-ism. Goux in fact cites Bataille in 'Numismatiques' in a decisive proposition:

'...c'est une pensée non phallocentrique, non centralisée, une pensée encore impensée du réseau... une pensée du texte...texte que rien ne saurait intituler . D'une manière générale "les possibilités de l'existence humaine peuvent dès maintenant être situées au-delà de la formation des sociétés monocéphales".' "

Textual thought is thus non-centralised and plural. However in our reading, this critique of value and exchange tends to leave out the question of meaning in language, having associated it with value and exchange. The problem with an acephalic materialism is that it leaves the head out of its consideration. In order not to become an insistence on form at the expense of content, meaning has to be reintroduced as an element of textual thought. Kristeva's signification is the concept that effectively rescues this from the excesses of the abstraction of meaning.

Kristeva's semiology and Marxism

Kristeva in fact suggests an analysis of the productivity of language and a corresponding analysis of
productivity as dépense in her article 'La Sémiologie comme science critique': 'Là-bas, sur cette scène il s'agirait des rapports d'un corps et d'une dépense.' Kristeva situates Freud, particularly The Interpretation of Dreams as a crucial step in this direction. Kristeva's project for semiology is to explore this area of productivity. Semiology would thus begin from a radical, epistemological break with the study of language, literature and so on, studied in terms of exchange, communication, representation. This annexes the radical writing practiced in TQ in that it looks not at the ideological object 'literature' but at specific signifying practices. Kristeva's proposed semiology is posed as equivalent to the project of Marx for the science of history, and this is her main point in this essay. This is the second main point of TQ's Marxism, which at once extends and completes the steps taken by Goux and Baudry. Marx is thus already extended by Freud and Bataille.

There is a structural equivalence between Marxism and TQ's 'science of textuality'. It is already evident that TQ's critique of bourgeois literature hinges on Marx's critique of the economy through the critique of the fetishistic, property based structure of both systems. However, in a more fundamental way, semiology is equal to Marxism in that it breaks with the ideology of 'literature' and 'literary criticism' to found a science that supplies its own theory. Marxism and TQ are thus linked through the same movement, from ideology to
The basically Althusserian conception of Marxism at work here is of a science that does not rely on previous 'ideological' philosophies but founds its own theory and constantly subjects it to criticism through its scientific progress. It is not, however, a circle, since the scientific knowledge produced by semiology or Marxism does not simply reaffirm the ideological basis of the science but constantly reassesses and denies the philosophy which underpins it. Semiology is thus a science that is also a critique of science (p.84). The science of Marxism or of semiology produces the epistemological break through the introduction of a new apparatus or vocabulary, the subversion of an old one (p.85). It defines a new method of reading, and produces a new theoretical object.

Kristeva's formulation is more interesting than those of Baudry or Goux in that the analogy she suggests is less arbitrary and more structurally meaningful, since it is determining at the level of the structure of knowledge. Also, Baudry and Goux, without thinking through the epistemological problems of their research, do not emphasise the break between the ideological study of exchange and the semiological study of signifying practices as production. At the same time it seems as if it is not so much Kristeva proclaiming her semiology to be Marxist but indicating that Marxism may in fact have been a semiology before the fact. Thus Marxism as such is not specifically relevant in itself but only in its extension.

Moreover, the Marxism to which Kristeva structurally
allies her semiology is a profoundly Althusserian one. The notions of the epistemological break, the distinction between science and ideology and the idea of theoretical practice that TQ's Marxism is based upon are all taken from Althusser's *Pour Marx* and *Lire le Capital*. Commentators on Althusser have revealed his Marxism also to be based on a philosophy, inherited from Spinoza and Bachelard, that is also foreign to Marxism itself, such that TQ's Marxism is doubly an extension. The extending of Marxism in this sense is in our analysis what makes TQ's Marxism at the same time a diversion and an autodestructive traversal. We will attempt to elucidate this further on.

**Ideology**

The third point of contact with Marxism we have identified, after the arbitrary analogy with the monetary economy and the structural analogy with Marxist epistemology exhibits a far more organic, but also far less original link between TQ's approach and Marxism. In numerous places literature is posited as a privileged site for the implantation of ideology, due to the sacrosanct notions of author, character, human nature, representation and exchange that are affirmed there. However, it is possible that the ideology of literature or of language not only justifies but also founds exchange in the economy. The exchange of meaning determines the exchange of goods, not vice versa. So the direction of the analogy
with Marxism is reversed, revealing TQ's Marxism to be an extension of Marxism outside its own limits, a transformation of it rather than a Marxism as such. TQ's Marxism is always a post-Marxism in stressing the action of the superstructure on the base, and contradictory in that at the same time it wants to affirm the materiality and the determining role of the signifier, the infrastructure of language.

The conception of ideology at work in TQ's Marxism is an Althusserian and Gramscian 'historic bloc', or 'efficace des superstructures' that transforms Marxism, and perhaps also undermines its foundations. It also presents a conception of ideology as a false conception of the world, a distortion, but not one that can be dissipated through a disalienation, as some 'Western Marxists' would affirm. Althusser's conception is more Spinozist in that it sees ideology as the imaginary relation of men to their world, which they experience in their spontaneous, everyday experience. As such, ideology is always present, it can only be evaded through a theoretical, scientific process, which produces scientific objects. Althusser's distinction is between imaginary objects, those of empirical knowledge, and 'true' objects, knowledge of which which can only be attained through the detour of science. Sollers cites Althusser on this in a 1969 essay:

"on ne peut parvenir à la connaissance des objets réels concrets qu'à la condition de travailler aussi et en même temps sur des objets formels abstraits".15

The idea that ideology is permanent and empirical, that it exists as a series of imaginary relations or
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representations lies behind TQ's approach at this stage although it will be criticised later for its foreclosure of the constitutive role of language and of the subject, i.e. from a Lacanian point of view. TQ's early Marxism, with its basis in Althusserian theory, is thus misaligned with the theory of literature, since for the latter it is language, which in the Marxist schema is seen as infrastructural, that is determinative. The Althusserian notion of 'determination in the last instance' by the infrastructure is too tenuous to redress the balance with what we could call an overemphasis on ideology. What is demanded by TQ's theory of literature is a theory of ideology which takes account of the constitutive role of language and the role of the subject. Kristeva's stress on signifying practices comes to fill that role.

Epistemology

A further factor in TQ's Marxism is the situation of Marx in a historical context. Marx and Freud are situated as the sign of an 'epistemological' break more or less contemporaneous with Lautréamont and Mallarmé. 'Epistemological break' here signifies the moment from which an ideology begins to be thought critically, in a radically different mode, by a science which has produced its own theory and object. Mallarmé and Lautréamont found the science of literature; Marx the science of history. Freud's scientific breakthrough is the discovery of the unconscious. Thus Marxism is situated, in a
profoundly Althusserian way, in a historical ('monumental') context that inscribes TQ at its end, or rather outside the 'closure' of which Marxism is the other outside, the other end.

Althusser was able to develop an anti-humanist, anti-Hegelian theory of Marxism thanks to his conception of theory as a specific practice independent of the political. The theory of theoretical practice is a 'theory of the production of knowledge' which explains the difference between an ideology and a science. The theory of theoretical practice affirmed the break with ideology as a precondition, and affirmed itself as a specific practice among others. TQ take up this definition of theoretical practice as a practice among others (ideological, economic, social, political) and equate their practice as situated between the text as a scriptural practice and theory as theoretical practice. Theoretical practice is specific in that it produces theoretical objects that are radically different from the empirical objects they correspond to; they do not 'reflect' them according to a vulgar Marxist conception. Marxist science depends on these theoretical objects for its scientific status. We can argue however, that it is only because of the distinction between empirical objects and theoretical objects that theoretical practice is possible, and that it is theoretical practice that produces this distinction; that the theory is thus tautological. TQ's theory of literature is a diversion from its true path in that it gets caught up in the
problems of Althusserian Marxism which itself is a doomed project.

In this sense, affirming the theory of theoretical practice means also affirming Althusser's conception of the nature of science and its difference from ideology. Althusser is a Spinozist in this conception, as we have seen, since he sees experience, empirical evidence, as imaginary and false. Science can only be arrived at through rational enquiry. We can underline here, as does J.M. Benoist in his critique of Marxist philosophy, the reliance of this Spinozist distinction on an a priori conception of truth. Through his Spinozism Althusser therefore reintroduces, or reaffirms, a linear, monovalent logic of truth which is exceeded by psychoanalysis as well as Derridean deconstruction.

If we look more closely at the ideological underpinnings of TQ's version of history, we can see that the Bachelardian concept of the 'problematic' (the new theoretical object produced by science) and the 'epistemological break' ('coupure' and thus 'coup', 'après coup' etc in TQ's formulation) intervene to separate empirical knowledge based on ideological suppositions and beset by epistemological obstacles from scientific knowledge. Althusser's Marxism thus relies on a non-Marxist philosophy of the status of truth (Spinoza) and a rationalist theory of the history of science as discontinuous, based also on a mistrust of 'common knowledge'. It is thus pertinent to dispute TQ's reliance on Althusser and thus on Spinoza and rationalist
epistemology. Neither Spinoza or Bachelard are acknowledged in the review. The foundations of TQ's theoretical Althusserianism are not analysed and may in fact be at odds with other aspects of TQ Marxism, such as their Batailleque materialism, which would undoubtedly dispute the limitative faith placed in rationality and the scientific community on the part of Bachelard and his disciples (eg. Canguilhem, Cavaillès, Kuhn).

**Contextual pressure**

The analogical and Althusserian Marxism is developed by TQ in the period of the strategic alliance with the P.C.F. and the dialogues with La nouvelle critique, between 1967 and 1970 (See Chronology). Through its espousal of Althusserian concepts and terminology TQ to an extent exacerbates tensions within the PCF between the Althusserian factions and those opposed to Althusser. The notion of theoretical practice, that is, a practice independent of politics, created tensions within and without the PCF around Althusser's theory. These tensions were also those between those sympathetic to Maoism and those not sympathetic to Maoism. It is therefore true to an extent that TQ's alliance with the PCF pushed the latter towards a crisis, but this crisis is determined more by Althusser's decision not to leave the Party. However, the events of 1968 reveal the alliance with the PCF to have been far more retentive for TQ than it was productive of crises.
The explosion of May 1968 has an immediate and a delayed effect on TQ. The immediate analyses of the events in TQ and by Sollers in *La Nouvelle Critique* repeat the analyses of the events by the PCF, that is to say, that they were a spontaneous, petit-bourgeois revolt that essentially undermined the class struggle. 'Contestation' replaced 'Révolution'.22 The ideology of 'imagination', 'spontaneity' is criticised as a voluntarist idealism or 'rousseauisme'23 which masks the true role of the Party, the Leninist dictum of the necessity of the Party and Marxist science, i.e. the Althusserian postulate of the autonomy of theory and its guiding role.24

TQ's immediate reaction, therefore, is to affirm the primacy of the Party and the importance of theory. Although, from a Marxist-Leninist point of view, TQ's criticisms of the student events are just, objectively the PCF's role in the events was to act as a barrier between the demands of the students and the workers on one hand and between the workers and the government on the other, to pose reformist demands before the government and give in at the first opportunity, thereby effectively betraying the long term interests of the workers and students by settling for short term wage increases. TQ's reasons for mistrusting the student revolt and those of the PCF are not the same but the alliance is still retentive of TQ's proper engagement with the events. This creates a certain amount of implicit tension in their relations since, on the one hand, TQ is further left (verging towards Maoism) than the reformist PCF (while at the same
time affirming the primacy of the Party as the only vehicle of class struggle) and on the other hand, 1968 reaffirmed the value of the 'cultural' revolution, the importance of ideology and the superstructure, which is essentially a Maoist line. 1968 thus revealed the reformism of the PCF and fixed a rendez-vous at the end of the decade between Maoism and theoretical Marxism-Leninism. 25

The effect of the events of 1968 cannot, however, be limited to the field of political alliances and of Marxism, since 1968 was an insurrection that had a profoundly organic effect on the whole country. 1968 was also an eruption, an irruption, of a vital language, inside a dead language. 26 The dead language was the language of authority, of the Apparatus (State, University as well as Party). 1968 was the irruption of the political signifier into 'everyday life' 27, of an admittedly somewhat confused theoretical discourse into the 'situation'. As well as being, perhaps, an 'inflation' of the sign 28, this was a condensation - of a political signifier with desire 29, articulated by the play of signifiers across the surfaces, written or auditory, of 1968. As an insurrection in language, of the signifier, 1968 cannot not organically affect an organism whose determining activity is the production of texts. At a level below the strategic the TQ writers are affected organically. This is marked in Sollers's Lois 30 for example, by a switch to a more rhythmical, vital, Célinesque language in which the political signifier is
brought to the forefront, also in Pleynet's *Stanze* where, in a remarkable development from *Comme*, the political is enmeshed in the text in fragments. The level that retains or delays this irruption, however, is the strategic; the retentive alliance with the PCF. The tension in this alliance, from 1968 to 1971, is determined by the contradictory relationship between this retention and the vitality of the letter in the practice of the writers in question. When this breaks, the vitality becomes evident at the strategic level in the 'sloganist' tracts of the 'Mouvement de Juin 1971', following the Chinese model. The retention of this vitality has a counter-effect, in a sense, in the somewhat hysterical character of TQ's Maoist pronouncements.

An event in the context thus creates external and internal pressure on the politics of the review and precipitates its theoretical development. The theoretical development towards a strategically Maoist position is effected by an expansion of the area of debate of the review into philosophy. This philosophical expansion is moreover signalled by the adoption of a new subtitle. TQ43 is the first issue to carry the subtitle 'Littérature / Philosophie / Science / Politique', which adds the couple 'Philosophie / Politique' to the already present 'Science / Littérature'. The sequence of terms indicates 'une exposition analytique vers sa cause'. In other words, literature is the 'other scene' of philosophy, its 'repressed', the area in which its conflicts are played out; science is the epistemological foundation of
philosophy, while both science and philosophy are determined by events in the political arena.

In our analysis this is a diversion from the proper interpretation of TQ's theory of literature. For the latter, literature is transformative of the world, of consciousness and thus of reality. In a sense the flow of determination has to be formed into a circle, so that while politics is in a sense determining in literature, literature becomes determining in politics. The forming of this circle of influence is in effect what occurs with TQ's Marxism, as it becomes more and more undermined by negativity. This undermining is paradoxically begun with the investigation of the philosophy of Marxism that this subtitle signals. The investigation of the foundations of Marxism at the same time renders redundant the alliance with the PCF and shows the theoretical justice of the movement towards Maoism. Our analysis will attempt to show, however, that while this movement is towards the truth of Marxism it is also, and therefore, a potentially catastrophic, auto-destructive precipitation of the inherent contradictions of Marxism.

This philosophical expansion is for the most part effected in the séances of the Groupe d'études théoriques which, since the end of 1968 had added to the role of TQ as review and collection the role of a group intervening in the context. The group is directly modelled on the Collège de Sociologie founded by Bataille, and its purpose is to form a corridor of influence whereby the theory of TQ can have an effect on
the context. Many of the key texts of the period 1968-1971 derive from this space. Through this space TQ's interventions in the social and political sphere are widened. The part of the action of TQ in the context that this group represented is not recuperable in a thesis, but its theoretical effect is to sharpen the cutting edge of TQ's influence.

The philosophical expansion - dialectical materialism

The philosophical investigation after 1970 is effective in shifting the basis of TQ's Marxism and thus undermining the articulation of the rupture of the text with historical materialism, so that if the first phase of TQ's Marxism revolves around production, ideology and epistemology, the second phase, announced by the addition of the 'philosophy' subtitle and the declaration of a philosophical investigation, focuses on dialectical materialism.

TQ's semantic materialism has been signalled earlier. In 'Sade lisible' Pleynet shows how part of the sub-text of Sade is the philosophical materialism of the time. Bataille's 'La vieille taupe' proposed a base materialism which we linked through Goux's 'Numismatiques' articles to an 'acephalic' materialism. Sollers's articles from 1968 develop the basis of materialism towards the philosophical investigation of 1970 onwards. In 'Survol / Rapport (Blocs) / Conflit' Sollers affirms the necessity of '(une) position matérialiste de base', but he immediately
refers to Lacan's statement that his theory of language as the structure of the unconscious was implied by Marxism in that language was not part of the superstructure. Language as part of the infrastructure, that is, part of the determinative production of the real, implies a materialist theory of language, based on the minimal principles of the signifier and the letter (p.6). TQ's materialism is articulated with Marxism as a semantic materialism, and it is this sense that TQ can later affirm that 'la matière pense' since language is materiality. TQ's materialism is thus only permitted through a reversal of structuralism that poses the materiality of the signifier, but also by Derrida's work in that it proposes that the signified is always already a signifier. Derrida's work removes language from an idealist space of speech into one of writing, enabling TQ's materialism.

Sellers proposes as much in his Autumn 1969 article on Derrida, 'Un pas sur la lune', where he writes: 'LA PENSEE DE LA TRACE SERAIT FONDEMENTALEMENT MATERIALISTE'(p.8). However, in this move towards the investigation of dialectical materialism Sellers effects a shift from difference to contradiction which creates problems with the Derridean aspect of the theory. Before looking more closely at this we will examine the basis of Sellers's interpretation of dialectical materialism.

The explicit investigation of dialectical materialism is begun with Sellers's 'Lénine et le matérialisme philosophique'. Sellers's argument here derives from the basic movement of the negation of the negation that we
identified as the foundation of his *Logiques*. It is now 'applied' to and identified in the philosophy of Marxism. First of all, materialism is not the opposite of idealism, it is an element that transgresses this opposition as the negation-affirmation transgresses the positive/negative opposition (p.97). Materialism is thus an 'unité duelle' that opposes it to materialism/idealism. Sollers's materialism, as well as being a materialism of writing, is also a transgressive materialism, two reasons why it presses at the outer limits of the Marxist system. A further crucial element for dialectical materialism, Sollers continues, is Hegel, whose idealism is an idealism 'at its summit' (p.98), such that it can only be turned over into dialectical materialism. Implicitly, dialectical materialism is the affirmation-négation beyond the opposition of mechanist, metaphysical materialism and idealism; 'la logique du matérialisme sort de l'idéalisme poussé au bout' (p.100).

We should pause here at the name of Hegel, as if Hegel is 'included' in dialectical materialism then it is a negation of the negation beyond Hegel that we are concerned with in Sollers's thinking; it is not a Hegelian *Aufhebung* or 'néglivité abstraite' but a 'negativité absolue' that is not susceptible to exposition in discourse. We are led here to refer across to the distinction of Derrida in his essay on Bataille between a negativity that can be recuperated in discourse and one that cannot which does not fall within the movement of the dialectic but goes beyond it. The affirmation-négation of
Sollers, which he sees in dialectical materialism is a Bataillean negativity 'sans réserve' that transgresses the limits of the dialectic. As such there is an ambiguity in TQ's discourse, between the Hegelian dialectic, directed always to the exposition of a final presence, and a Bataillean transgressive dialectic. It is a question of shifting the definition of 'dialectic', but perhaps the very notion of dialectic cannot hold up to this shift. Bataille's negativity is a continual dépense, a non-mediatisable negativity. If this shift functions it drags Marxism into a different arena from that of the Hegelian dialectic, where it perhaps cannot survive.

Here is where the shift from difference or trace to contradiction operates. Contradiction is proposed by Sollers as 'la "détermination essentielle"' (p.99) (he quotes from Lenin) of negativity. Elsewhere this is rephrased as 'le négatif "inclus" dans le positif, la contradiction dans "l'essence même des choses"'. (p.103) The recourse to the word 'essence' and 'essentielle' in the quotations reveals the blindspot of the shift from difference to contradiction. Difference is not an essential movement but an 'écart', a distance, in Bataille's terms an excess. However, Sollers goes on to explicitly question the relation between difference and contradiction, which is the knot of the relation of Derridean writing to Marxism. To set this out systematically: there is a determining contradiction between affirmation and negation which is negated in language. For Sollers language is only the transitory
channel of the effects of infinite contradiction of 'matter in movement'. Language as a differential movement is an effect of contradiction. Contradiction thus determines difference within language:

'[la différence est toujours déjà l'effet de la contradiction - "Toute différence est une contradiction", Le langage est toujours déjà pratique, marquage, écriture différenciée-différenciante (historique et sociale) de la contradiction'.(p.107)

The first principle of Sollers' logic, which he proposes to be that also of dialectical materialism, is contradiction as the duality of affirmation and negation not taken in opposition to each other, rather than the Derridean movement of difference. Through the exigencies of the articulation with Marxist philosophy Sollers is led to transform the Derridean insistence on difference to one on contradiction, thus divorcing from this point Derridean theory and the theory of literature of TQ. Derrida's *différance* derives from a different philosophical basis, as it can be proposed that contradiction remains within a metaphysics of presence and of the sign (positive or negative) as opposed to a dynamics of difference or of the trace. The different basis to this (Platonic) metaphysics would be the Democritean *rythmos*. Derrida's 'Hors livre' in *La Dissémination* enounces a critique of contradiction from this angle. The theory of literature of TQ can thus be seen as a kind of persistence of a Hegelian 'negative strategy' but the loss of Derridean difference might not in fact be such a loss after all, as it prepares for a comprehensive theory of the subject of literature in the
work of Kristeva, and evades the cul-de-sacs that the Derridean approach often leads to.

The heterogenisation of contradiction

This does not alter the fact, however, that the investigation of Marxism leads to its self-destruction. Sollers identifies in Lenin's philosophy, 'une pluralisation, une hétérogénéisation de la contradiction' (p.105-6). As soon as it is proposed, therefore, contradiction becomes complexified, and this complexification is implicated in the general logical dépassement of Marxism towards which TQ are moving, reflected also in the work of Kristeva.

We will attempt to follow the basic steps of the logic Kristeva proposes. For Kristeva, negativity is posed as the movement of infinite heterogenous matter; determination poses a finite 'something' determined by this infinite negativity.  Determination is thus contradiction (infinite / finite)(p.272-3). It is the affirmation of a negativity which would otherwise be hypostatised into 'pure negativity'(p.281-2). If we look at the development of TQ's Marxism it is evident that the identification of negativity with a Bataillean heterogeneity turns out to be determining in the explosion of dialectical materialism into an insistence on a heterogenous plurality. So Kristeva's insistence on the first term of a term of dialectic logic - the infinite heterogeneity of matter as negativity, forms the basis of
a future insistence on the heterogenous and the plural at the expense of the Marxist dialectic. The relation of Bataille to the materialist dialectic is further studied in Kristeva's 'Le sujet en procès' and in the Cérisy colloquium on Bataille "", evidence that Bataille is as we have suggested a 'trou' in TQ.

Where we can see Kristeva marking the insufficiency of Hegelian dialectic logic is in its repression of matter. She posits, accordingly, a 'logique dialectique matérieliste'(p.263). Thought, signifying practices, are thus generated from the negative heterogeneity of matter. The closure of a 'system' or a structure, of an identity or a representation, entails the foreclosure (Kristeva extends the psychoanalytical concept to apply to her semio logic) of matter, and this is nowhere more visible than in the context of the subject of discourse:

'Dans cette systématicité représentant le sujet signifiant, la matière est foreclose : la structure du sujet est une homogénéité qui n'a pas de dehors hétérogène...' (p.284)

We can identify here a critique of Lacanian psychoanalysis as centred on the subject and the object, within the sphere of the homogenous, its structure being a repression or foreclosure of heterogenous matter. The focus of Kristeva's work, prefigured in 'L'engendrement de la formule' and carried on here and in 'Le sujet en procès' is on the production of signifiance from heterogenous matter and the position of the subject in this process. The insistence on heterogeneity thus implicates at the same time a 'dépassement' of the Lacanian structure of intersubjective relations and an emphasis of the place of
the subject. Sémanalyse, the analysis of this signifying production, is thus part of a passage from semiology to psychoanalysis.

The shift towards psychoanalysis, the place of the subject and its relation to a heterogenous 'dehors', can be seen as already moving away from the systematic, structural emphases of Marxism which Sollers is attempting to displace onto the terrain of transgression. The poetic text is instrumental in providing the basis for this shift. Texts such as Joyce, Céline, Lautréamont and Sollers, are systems open to the heterogenous, giving access to an outside foreclosed in homogenous structures. That Marxism is a homogenous, closed system and not an insistence on heterogeneity, plurality and infinity or that the attempt at displacement has failed to have a political effect is what the shift away from Marxism in the mid-seventies implies.

Pluralisation of the dialectic

Parallel to Kristeva's insistence on heterogeneity Sollers is extending the pluralisation of contradiction, notably in an important essay on Mao, 'Sur la contradiction'. The essay is situated immediately before the strategic shift to Maoism and carries this shift through philosophically. However, it also represents a further complexification of contradiction towards the transgression even of the very notion of contradiction and is thus pertinent for an analysis of TQ's undermining of
dialectical materialism.

For Sollers, Leninism proposed a fundamentally important step in the distinction between principal and secondary contradictions. This makes it possible for TQ to pose a principal, antagonistic contradiction behind couples that are secondary and in effect non-antagonistic even while being presented as antagonistic. Kristeva, for example, posits the heterogenous matter/signifying practice relation as a principal contradiction while the Lacanian subject/objet petit a contradiction is determined by the principal contradiction and interior to signifying logic. It is thus also possible to see the contradictions between, for example, economism and humanism as non-antagonistic and secondary, i.e not really contradictions. In other words, the principal contradiction (which is non-symetrical) is between idealism and materialism, while the contradiction between economism and humanism is interior to idealism. Humanism represses external causality, economism represses internal causality. The distinction repeats that between the general and the restricted economy and is entirely coherent but also pre-empted by the previous 'logiques'. It is in the same light that we can understand the dogmatism/revisionism couple enounced in TQ, later under the name 'dogmatico-revisionism'. This 'étagement de la dialectique' has strategic as well as theoretical effects. It enables TQ to occupy a 'removed' position, as 'tiers exclu' (p.74) in the strategic field of the time, a position infinitely displaceable in relation to the oppositions of the context in which it
moves. That the enouncement of this conception is roughly simultaneous with the break with the PCF implies the efficacy of this strategy, removing TQ from being involved in any kind of affiliation. Sollers, TQ and L'Infini can be seen to have occupied this (non) position of displacement and excluded middle throughout, so that criticisms are often misreadings of this essential logic.

The importance of Mao's philosophical intervention is affirmed by Sollers as being a 'leap forward' in the theory of dialectical materialism. The precise point, the 'kernel' ('noyau') which Mao extracts from Lenin is contradiction. (p.122) The emphasis on the dialectic, and its pluralisation was seen by Sollers, but also by Althusser at an earlier, more difficult, moment, as a way out of the Scylla and Charybdis situation of the humanism/economism contradiction. Sollers insists, distinct from Althusser in this, on the specific 'cultural sedimentation' of Mao's elaboration of the dialectic (p.130). The Chinese language is already predisposed to the dialectic, as a non-logocentric method of inscription, a fact already underlined by the emphasis on Freud's conception of the ideogrammatic as a language analogous to that of the dreamwork. One may agree with this formulation to the extent that it presents the Chinese language as a non-logocentric inscription, but, as J.-M. Benoist points out, this does not prevent Mao's text from presenting teleological, systematic and logocentric conceptions."

Through the introduction of contradiction as the
internal motor of development Sollers poses a similar 'model' to Kristeva's geno-text/pheno-text duality in 'L'engendrement de la formule' - an engendering principle 'falls' into a structure; the movement of contradiction 'falls' or poses the overdetermined structural causality of the dialectic. In the same way that Kristeva outlined the denegation or denial of structuralism in literature through the introduction of a radical outside, emphasised as heterogenous, Sollers outlines the denegation of structural Marxism by the introduction of a radical, heterogenous process:

'Il n'y a inégalité, surdétermination, etc., que parce qu'il y a lutte, et lutte différenciée à tous les niveaux. La réalité n'est pas un champ substantiel et clos où "règne l'identité des contraires" mais l'ouverture produite par la lutte des contraires.'(p.140)

The question remains unanswered whether or not the introduction of the heterogenous outside in fact sabotages the structural causality of the structure, rendering the 'kernel' of the Marxist dialectic, 'determination in the last instance' unworkable. If overdetermination complicates the linear conception of contradiction, the 'determination in the last instance', then contradiction as internal causality sabotages overdetermination. The question must be asked whether the Maoist pluralisation of the dialectic is not in fact a de-Marxisation of the dialectic, and the Maoisation of TQ a de-Marxisation of TQ.

This heterogenisation of the dialectic is also an opening towards the Freudian concept of the death drive, 'pulsion de mort' as a (negative) principle of
development, suggesting the possibility of a displacement of the Marxist frame of reference by a shift towards Freud. This can be seen as a nodal point, or 'explosive' point where the tensions between the Marxist systematicity and the Bataille/Freud conjunction which emphasises heterogeneity and non-mediatisable negativity, a 'beyond the pleasure principle' are visible. Perhaps part of the tension that produces developments in TQ is the maintenance of these opposing tendencies within a theoretical corpus.

We can see the Maoist phase in TQ's strategy and theory as a shift away from Marxism in that, while Marxism is a fundamentalism which insists that all antagonisms are mediated through the fundamental antagonism of the class struggle, the economic determining in the last instance, Maoism moves towards (it does not get there) the abandonment of this last instance by an insistence on the specificity of each contradiction, an irreducible plurality not solvable by the resolution of a fundamental antagonism. TQ's Maoist phase reflects an uneasy tension between fundamentalism and pluralism. Pluralism insists on the irreducibility of antagonisms, also on the irreducibility of antagonism itself. The Lacanian surplus of the Real over its possible reintegration in the Symbolic50, or the Kristevan insistence on the surplus of the heterogenous over structure (2 over 1), or Bataille's non-mediatisable negativity, or Freud's death drive beyond the pleasure principle, posit this irreducibility. In as much as Marxism presents the possibility of a
resolution of this plural irreducibility through that of an essential antagonism by abolishing it, it can be seen as a totalitarian illusion. In as much as Maoism presents a becoming non-antagonistic of an antagonistic, essential contradiction, and the maintenance of this contradiction as non-antagonistic, it is also potentially totalitarian. The value of TQ is in presenting, subtly, the uneasy alliance of fundamentalism with pluralism and the gradual merging of the first into the second.

**Ideology and signifiying practice**

A further important current of TQ's Marxism during this period is an investigation of the question of ideology. While Sollers underlines the way that the ideology of idealism functions to mask the truth of materialism in 'Sur le matérialisme', Baudry, in 'Pour une matériologie', develops an argument against Althusser. Following Kristeva, he insists on the fact that ideology is not 'imposed', that it does not 'interpellate' subjects, but that it is inscribed in signifying practices and thus implicated in the very notion of subjectivity. Against Althusser Kristeva and Baudry implicitly refer to Lacan's theory of the construction of the subject and the irredeemably symbolic nature of human interaction, while Kristeva's thesis of the inscription of ideology in signifying practices is capital. The argument between a view of ideology as imposed by 'apparatuses' and an accompanying postulation of a 'desire' emanating from the
oppressed classes against this imposition, against a view of ideology as a necessary, imaginary relation concomitant with subjectivity and with the Symbolic is also reflected in a debate between Marie-Claire Boons and Bernard Sichère later in 1972.\(^{101}\)

Meanwhile counter ideological strategies are elaborated and undertaken in the review. An insistence on the materiality of the signifying practices in which ideology is inscribed is a fundamental step, and analyses of 'the code', such as those undertaken by Jean-Louis Schefer, Roland Barthes, Pleynet and Marc Devade\(^ {52}\) are important in this respect. Through its insistence on the materiality of signification and its diverted reflection of philosophy literature is also instrumental in this counter ideological strategy, as Sollers affirms in his 'Thèses générales'.\(^ {53}\) Through this investigation of ideology, however, the limitations of the Marxist approach become more and more apparent, and the promise of the psychoanalytical field more evident.

We have looked at the articulation of TQ's theory of literature with Marxism and showed it to be an extension of Marxism into new areas. We also analysed it as a 'post-Marxism' that always stresses the action of the superstructure on the base. We have identified a second stage in TQ's Marxism as a philosophical investigation of dialectical materialism. By focusing on the notions of heterogeneity and plurality, we showed how this investigation hollows out the basis of Marxism and tends towards the dissolution of the latter. At the same time we
showed how certain contradictions were functioning within TQ's Marxist theory, how it was essentially based on an Althusserian epistemology which entered into conflict with other areas of the review's theoretical activity. We also focused on how Derridean *différance* was effaced under the concept of contradiction. This presents TQ's Marxism as an auto-destructive traversal; the legacy or destiny of this traversal will be analysed in Chapter Five. However, it is necessary to point out that the dissolution of Marxism also occurs through a parallel articulation with psychoanalysis, some aspects of which we will now look at in more detail.
II. The extension of theory - psychoanalysis

Between Derrida and Lacan

We saw from our previous analysis how TQ's interest in psychoanalysis was up to a certain point pre-Freudian; it was an interest in dreams rather than in the science or practice of psychoanalysis. However, with the first extensive analysis of Freud in TQ, Derrida's 'Freud et la scène de l'écriture', the previous interests take on a different tenor, since they focus on the dream as a writing as opposed to a representation. Derrida's essay initially defines the space of TQ's extension of its theory into psychoanalysis. This inscribes in TQ a certain ambiguity, for such articles as Sollers's 'Le roman et l'expérience des limites' and Pleynet's 'Les Problèmes de l'avant-garde' had referred to the enterprise of Lacan as productive, while Derrida's essay defines an ambiguously non-Lacanian space, both at the level of its situation in the context and of its theory. This ambiguity functions in TQ's interest in psychoanalysis from its point of inscription and determines this interest in the subsequent years; it establishes an important distance from the mainstream of Lacanian analysis.

Derrida's intention in the article is to show how, although psychoanalysis remains within the closure of metaphysics criticised as logocentric, Freud opens out within it a subversive space, a 'scene of writing' that transgresses this closure. Derrida's essay thus traces the
career of the metaphor of writing in Freud's texts from the *Sketch for a scientific psychology* through the *Interpretation of dreams* to the short 'Note on the mystic writing pad'. Our reading of Derrida's article interprets it as crucial for TQ's articulation with psychoanalysis as such, and particularly relevant for a critique of Lacan.

Derrida's article is a discreet critique of Lacan's structuralist psychoanalysis, for it proposes, through a reading of the concept of difference in Freud, that writing as espacement and difference is at work in the unconscious before verbal representations. The latter are linked to the pre-conscious and thus to the ego. Dreams indicate an archi-écriture, 'lithographie d'avant les mots, métaphonétique, non-linguistique, a-logique' (p.307) (thus identifying a continuity with a different logic than that of non-contradiction, like Sollers's logic of affirmation-negation). This writing undoes the distinction between signifier and signified and is not readable according to any code (p.311). It is not therefore a question of 'la consécution linéaire irréversible, passant de point de présence en point de présence'(p.321):

'L'écriture générale du rêve déborde l'écriture phonétique et remet la parole à sa place' ; 'L'intérêt de la psychanalyse pour la linguistique suppose qu'on "transgresse" le "sens habituel du mot langage" '(Derrida quotes Freud here)( p.323)

In so far as Lacan's articulation of the unconscious as structured like a language is restricted to language based on 'la parole' and on the Saussurean sign Lacan is within the closure of metaphysics that represses writing. Lacan's emphasis on the signifier emphasise a presence, rather than a difference, and Derrida proposes generally that language
is restricted to the level of the pre-conscious. This critique, which is reiterated in TQ as we shall see, is however discordant to an extent with other, more Lacanian, emphases in TQ. We can read Michel Tort's references to Lacan in his essay on Sade as being taken up in Derrida's identification of a closure, as are, perhaps, Barthes's emphases on the code in the same issue. Lacan, on the other hand, does not propose any metalanguage of difference before language or the Symbolic. Difference is an effect of language rather than language being an effect of difference, writing. An oscillation between these two positions is readable in the history of TQ's theory, which gradually gives way to an effacement of difference under contradiction as we have suggested in the previous section.

The subject is also taken up in Derrida's critique of the space of logocentrism:

'A l'intérieur de cette scène (de l'écriture) la simplicité ponctuelle du sujet classique est introuvable'. (p.335)

Derrida also suggests, in a note, 'archi-écriture' as an effacement of the subject and the Proper Name, recalling Sollers's emphasis on writing as thanatography and on the question of the Name. So even in so far as Lacan's interventions are a 'subversion of the subject', remaining centred on the question of the subject, Derrida's article is a critique of Lacanian theory. (This is our reading of it, Lacan is not mentioned in the article.) Baudry develops this in a space closer to TQ's theory, and Kristeva introduces the important notion of the 'non-sujet' which continues this perspective. This critique of
the subject does not however operate without posing problems in the space 'between' Derrida and Lacan.

Derrida also sketches out in this essay the foundations of the area in which TQ's theory and its articulation with psychoanalysis is specifically implicated. The question of difference or difféance (the a is added to underline its deferring movement and to affirm the specificity of writing) is linked to Freud's death-drive. Difference, Derrida proposes, is a movement that defers a 'dangerous investment' (p.300) through the constitution of a reserve ('réserve'). Dépense is deferred through repetition. Thus 'life' defends itself against death through an economy of difference, repetition, 'réserve', in which repetition and difféance appear as the working of death in life, the death drive. We have already stressed how Sollers's Logiques and Bataille had already prefigured the economy as a deferral of dépense. Derrida's identification of difféance with dépense and the death drive identifies the principal space of TQ's articulation with psychoanalysis as the dynamic between the pre-Symbolic and the Symbolic. Kristeva's work in particular will focus on this dynamic. However, Derrida warns against proposing an original 'life' that then comes to protect itself (p.362); the concept of primacy is to be rethought, since it is the trace or the difference (between life and death) that is primary, a fact that undermines the notion of origin. Derrida links this to Freud's concept of the 'nachträglich' ('à - retardement') (p.303) which is fundamentally operative in TQ in ways which we will
encounter further on. The 'après-coup', identified by Derrida, is another of the notions that operates in TQ from its moment of inscription, and Derrida's article is a crucial moment in this sense.

While indicating the ambiguity of the space of TQ, 'between Derrida and Lacan' Derrida's text also identifies areas of inquiry (the emphasis on the 'Scène' as opposed to representation). It also suggests the elaboration of a psychoanalysis of literature as a focus on 'le devenir littéraire du littéral' (p.340), that is, an analysis of the literary signifier and its specificity. That Derrida indicates the specificity of literature as the space of the letter, 'le littéral', paradoxically identifies the relevance of Lacan, as Sollers will indicate in 'Survol / Rapport (Blocs) / Conflit'. Lacan's insistence on the instance of the letter is part of a materialist theory of language. Kristeva's reading of Saussure's 'Anagrammes' is also productive in this area. TQ's extension of its theory into psychoanalysis 'takes place' in this space of writing and of the letter, and Derrida's essay is programmatic in this context.

Baudry's essay 'Freud et la "création littéraire"', extends the critique of Lacan that we have brought out of Derrida's article. It is telling within the history of TQ due to its distinction between two Freuds. The first is the Freud of writing, identified by Derrida, and this will be the Freud celebrated in TQ in this period, but the second, with whom Baudry is specifically concerned in this essay, is the Freud of the analysis of literary texts.
Baudry shows how Freud's view of literature is entirely taken up in a view of 'literary creation' determined by the ideology of representation, expression, the subjectivity of the author, and a distinction between reality and imagination that is constantly undermined by the more radical insights of the writing of the unconscious. Implicitly, Baudry initiates in TQ the argument that psychoanalysis has nothing to say about literature, which will be developed, notably by Sollers, in the 'seventies. Psychoanalysis cannot understand the literary text and its attempts to do so miss the essential radicality of literature. Lacan's reading of Poe8, which is later suggested as an exception to this rule, is not referred to and consequently we can suggest that it is as yet unread in or by TQ. On the other hand, writing, literature (Baudry refers to Lautréamont) can reveal to psychoanalysis its transgression in literature, through a parallel and an extension of the concept of writing into the concept of the unconscious.

Baudry identifies the limitations of psychoanalysis as its obsession with the subject as centre. The Freudian distinction between reality and imagination, or between real dreams and literary dreams which emerges in Freud's analysis of Jensen's Gradiva, derives from the persistence of the reference to the subject', the position of the author. We can see that Lacan's psychoanalysis is at the same time within this problematic and a transgression of it, since it seems also centred on the question of the subject while it is also a 'subversion du sujet' and its
positioning within language. Again, the philosophical background here is the situation of difference in or outside language that we have proposed as the area of an oscillation in TQ.

In a final section of the article Baudry also suggests that desire as such is an effect of representation:

'Ne pourrait -on pas dire que le désir lui-même est un effet de la représentation, d'une mise en présence, et que dans la mesure où il est toujours désir de quelque chose....il est engagé dans la pensée téléologique du sens'. (p.173)

From this analysis we can infer that the problematic of desire is thus relevant to the restricted economy of 'la parole', the focus of Lacan's enterprise, while writing, implicitly, is more relevantly linked to the problematic of the death-drive and dépense. Desire and the phantasm are thus 'impropre ou inutile' in Baudry's terms (p.173) for the question of writing as textual production. Baudry's implicit critique of Lacan (again, not named) prefigures Kristeva's later emphasis, which we have already suggested in the previous chapter, and further specifies the focus of TQ's psychoanalytical interest as non-Lacanian. Baudry links this restriction again to the central question of the subject, while for writing as for sex it is not a question of the subject but of inscription and dépense, and this in turn is identified as Freud's 'beyond the pleasure principle'. The question of the subject is effectively effaced under that of writing, at this stage, but in TQ's later emphases it will be reintroduced in specifically psychoanalytical terms in the work of Kristeva, who can be seen as playing a decisive role in the mediation of TQ 'between Derrida and Lacan'.
Perversion, play, 'après -coup' and infinite analysis

Two specific areas where TQ's theory and practice of the text 'hinges' on psychoanalysis and may derive some theoretical justification in Freud are around the questions of the neurosis / perversion opposition and of play. It is a question here of a Freud upon whom TQ have retroactively projected the characteristics of radicality. Firstly, in as much as the text inscribes the writing of the unconscious, it is opposed to neurosis, which represses this unconscious text. The text and neurosis are thus mutually exclusive, as Baudry suggests (p.159-60). This follows Sollers's comments in his essay on Sade which identify writing and perversion, and Goux's linking of the text and Freud's polymorphous perversity. Linked to this, Freud's tentative comparison of play, 'le jeu' and literature could have given rise to (and does, in TQ's analysis itself) an emphasis on the text as an operation of distribution and permutation. Perversion is a form of play and of permutation. Baudry refers to Nietzsche's thought as such a thinking of the radicality of 'le jeu' (through this we can see the relevance of Bataille's 'volonté de chance'). In this thought, 'le jeu' and reality are not opposed, as they are in Freud's approach, but reality is produced by 'le jeu' (p.162). We can identify here a significant aspect of TQ's counter-ideology or ideology of a second degree as a privilege given to the ludic and the permutational. This emerges both in the theory (eg. the reading of Sade) and in practice (eg. the
reference to the I Ching of Drame). 'Le jeu' is not opposed to the serious, however, and its translation as 'play' does not carry its full resonance into English. It seems more pertinent to link it with the Nietzschean 'volonté de chance' of Bataille, and the aleatory emphasis of Sollers's earlier aphorism: 'La pensée émet des signes', thus to Mallarmé's '(toute pensée émet) un coup de dés'.

A further point of juncture with Freud is over the notion of the 'après-coup'. In the same article Baudry identifies Freud's insight that the phantasm always carries a trace of its origin. This is a justification of the idea that any writing is already a retroactive reading of another text, which it transgresses. The temporality of the 'après coup', which we can ally with the Derridean trace, is behind the general notion of intertextuality that functions in TQ's theory. In this sense there is no original moment of creation, an insight that Baudry also finds in Freud, in his analysis of the psychoanalyst's reliance on the 'ideologeme' of representation. Following an analysis of Michel Tort in Cahiers pour l'analyse, Baudry suggests that variants of 'representation' are operative at all levels of Freud's topology; at the level of the pulsions, their unconscious representations (Vorstellung) and symptomatic formations (Darstellung). The topology thus appears as 'une représentation de représentation de représentation' (p.172-3), suggesting an infinite chain of representations that thus become signifiers, since no longer related to an origin. This
suggests Freud's more radical insight, 'l'autre versant de la pensée freudienne' (p.173), of interpretation as the eternal 'renvoi' of signifer to signifer. While this recalls Lacan's signifying chain, in this context it is Derrida's writing that is the 'ideologeme'.

In the areas of perversion, play, the 'après coup' and eternal interpretation or analysis we have seen how through a reading of an important article by Baudry a number of aspects of TQ's theory are grounded in Freudian thought. However, the articulation of this theory with psychoanalysis continues to oscillate, as we suggested, in the space between Derrida and Lacan, not without some ambiguity in TQ's relations with both individuals.

**Freud and the dreamwork**

Freud is also enlisted in the rupture or epistemological break that we looked at in the context of Marxism, but Freud is in our analysis far more important than Marx for TQ's theory. This is born out by looking at Kristeva's project for semiology, which at a certain point is obliged to refer to Freud to extend Marxist theory to the area of 'pre-sense productivity', or the production of meaning before exchange. The Freudian unconscious and the notion of the dreamwork effectively open up this area.

Kristeva identifies Freud's unconscious as the 'travail antérieur au dire circulaire, à la communication' a pre-sense productivity of language. As such Freud opens up the area of a study of language considered apart from
meaning. Freud's work is thus analogous to Marx's emphasis on use value and opens out the area of a dépense anterior to meaning. The Freudian emphasis can thus be seen to have been already prefigured, for example, by Sollers's introduction of the terms 'signifiance' and 'écriture naissante' in his articles on the work of Pleynet. The productivity of language is termed, by Kristeva and others 'l'autre scène' i.e. the scene different from that of meaning, the sign, representation and communication; it could also be seen as the 'other scene' or quite simply the 'other' of structuralism with its emphasis on language as structure at the expense of productivity. 'Scène' also has a quite specific meaning, opposed to 'spectacle' and 'representation' and referring to the Artaudian / Mallarmean space of the text as volume or 'scène'.

Interpretation or reading

An important qualification must be added, however, to the comparison between the dream and writing, which identifies another area of Freud's importance and forestalls the objection that while TQ's theory denies interpretation, Freud privileges it. The latent content of the dream and language as text are not hidden 'behind' or 'before' the manifest content or language when it is seen as communication. For it to be so would be to affirm the ideologeme of representation and representability. The dissimulated object is inscribed in the text as
'lacunaire'; it is already there, in the text, and is what enables the text to function, but is not evident. For Baudry it is an:

'Inscription non lisible tant qu'une écriture, par un redoublement de l'inscription, ne le donne pas à lire'.\textsuperscript{13}

The absent letter is only readable once a reading re-writes it; thus affirming the complementarity of reading and writing as emphasised by TQ in most of their work. This entails a new conception of the relation between a text and what it dissimulates as non-representative. The productivity, the 'writing' that determines the text is always already inside it (although the 'dedans/dehors' opposition is also affected by this transformation), but in the 'mode' of absence. Freud thus appears as a pioneer of a new conception of reading which defines it as a 'redoublement', a doubling of the writing it reads. The reading writes or re-writes the already written text in such a way as to make apparent the inscription of the general, dissimulated writing that determines the text. Baudry writes:

'Lire apparaîtra donc comme un acte d'écriture et pareillement écrire se révèlera être un acte de lecture - écrire et lire n'étant que les moments simultanés d'une même production.'\textsuperscript{14}

The reading/writing will also read the inscription of ideology in the text, a crucial factor that distinguishes the text that remains within the ideological closure from one that transgresses it. Freud thus joins with Marx as theorised by Althusser in \textit{Lire le Capital} and with Lautréamont in so far as their texts re-write the inscription of the text in the ideology of literature. Freud appears, 'après coup', as an instigator of the
reading/writing complementarity proposed by TQ. The temporality of this inscription is to be rethought by Freud's concept of the 'nachträglich', as we indicated previously, which explodes the linearity of representation.

Such are the basic elements of TQ's articulation of its theory with psychoanalysis at this stage. Further aspects may be identified which also play a part in this extension. The structure of inscription that escapes representation is moreover linked to the rebus or the hieroglyph, and this is a further element of the radicality TQ identify in Freud. We have indicated above the relevance of the Freudian concept of neurosis to TQ's critique of culture, and the relevance of perversion to the text. The work of Guyotat, a permutational 'polymorphous perversity', published in TQ in 1969\textsuperscript{15}, can be seen as resonant with this perspective.

\textbf{Primary and secondary dépense}

The principal objection to be raised to TQ's articulation of the theory of the text and Freudian thought, which is a powerful and coherent annexation of Freud, is not in this annexation itself, although the historical situation of Freud as an epistemological break is prey to the same problems we indicated a propos of the same operation with regard to Marx, but in its link with Marxism. As Kristeva suggests, Freud's analysis of pre-sense productivity makes up for an absence in Marx.
does not tackle the dépense anterior to the exchange-system he criticises and in this lack Marxism remains within this space. The problematic link, as we would interpret it, lies in the relation between the unconscious, dépense, 'le travail' and use-value. We would propose that use value and work remain within the restricted economy that is analagous to the conscious, while dépense transgresses this restriction. The unconscious, as writing, is moreover not a dépense as a primary process but a secondary dépense that is instituted as a reaction to the violence of a primary dépense. The unconscious as writing is a deferred dépense, an infinite repetition and effacement. Production, meanwhile, can be associated with this secondary dépense but only if the conscious elements of the subject of production and the aim of production are abstracted. There is thus a certain idealisation of work in TQ's Marxism, as there is in Bataille's materialism. From these distinctions, moreover, Marxism remains within the restricted economy and the Freud-Marx-text analogy breaks down due to this three tier system of economies. From the second distinction, there is a difference between primary and secondary dépense, analagous to Freud's primary and secondary processes. Theoretically, TQ's Marxism is the part that is lost, while this also identifies an area of ambiguity in the relations between TQ's interpretation or use of Bataille and their interpretation and use of Freud.
Fragments of Lacanian theory

While Freud, and moreover a very Derridean Freud as we have demonstrated, is enlisted in justification of TQ's theory, Lacan is only really present at this stage in fragments; there is no real theoretical engagement with the Lacanian theory of the primacy of the Symbolic, or the Mirror stage, or the Symbolic/Real/Imaginary structure.

Goux's 'Numismatiques' had implicated in its structural model Lacan's theory of the phallus, comparing it to the capitalisation of money as value in capitalism but Goux's work is dissociable from the essential currents of TQ's theory. Sollers refers to Lacan's 'materialist theory of language' in his stress on the signifier and the letter. This is significant in that it is specifically over this question that a Derridean critique of Lacan will be elaborated.16 The reference to the 'instance of the letter' is relevant for TQ in so far as the signifier, the materiality of language, is thought as determinative of the production of meaning. Furthermore, Lacan's thesis that the subject is represented by a signifier for another signifier, referred to by Michel Tort in his essay on Sade, is interesting for TQ in its proposition of a subjectivity 'subject to' the permutations of writing. However, the reference to Lacan's theory here does not express an agreement between TQ's theory of the text and the entirety of Lacan's psychoanalytical theory or his theory of language as the irreducibly symbolic other of human intersubjectivity. As we have suggested, Derrida's
critique of the closure of structuralist linguistics within an insistence of presence is a determinative movement in TQ. The interest in the signifier and the letter is moreover followed through in a more extensive and transgressive way by Kristeva in her 'paragrammatism' and in the publication of Saussure's 'Anagrammes', edited by Starobinski, in TQ in 1969. Kristeva's analysis does not treat the letter or signifier as a presence but effects a shift to a process of signifiance, which combines the differential process of Derrida with a reformulation of semiology and the concept of the sign; the subject is implicated in this process, establishing Kristeva's intervention eventually as an approach to the transsubjective rather than the simply subjective in Lacan or the abstraction of the subject in Derrida. In effect, therefore, Lacan is present strategically, as a reference in Sollers's essay, but Lacan's psychoanalysis is essentially bypassed. In some senses, however, Lacanian theory is integrated into the textual practice of TQ, in such texts as Henric's Archées and Risset's Jeu; this integration is effectively a transgression, since the text as process writes across the limits of the structure that may be analogous with Lacan's propositions."

TQ's engagement with psychoanalysis appears as based essentially on the identification of the unconscious with the radical textual productivity proposed by TQ. The relations of this to Lacan's work are ambiguous and do not develop fully until the next decade. As Elisabeth Roudinesco suggests", TQ's relations with psychoanalysis
are not as intense as those of Surrealism, but this is due to the fact that the writing TQ focus on and put into practice transgresses the limits of psychoanalysis. TQ finds some justifications for its theory of literature in psychoanalytical theory, but this has nothing specific to teach TQ's approach. Neither Freudian nor Lacanian theory shed light on the process of literary creation as such; they do not provide models for the reading of texts or a way of understanding the subjectivity of the writer. Instead, TQ's literary theory sheds much light on psychoanalysis, given that it looks at an area 'beyond' the subject. It is an analysis (in the sense of a dissolution) that is parallel to the practice of psychoanalysis, and as we have suggested a more fruitful area of articulation of psychoanalysis with literary theory, might be around the notion of transference (see later). Meanwhile, Kristeva's later work tends towards a pre-subjective or pre-symbolic psychoanalysis that is liable to shed light on the process of literary creation.

TQ's psychoanalysis is thus not part of a 'Lacano-Althusserianism'. Nevertheless the use of concepts and the elaboration of parallels between the text and the unconscious constitute the most elaborate articulation of this kind in the context. At the same time, the essential stakes of this articulation pass through Kristeva's work as it develops after about 1970 to become the main filter of psychoanalysis in the review.
III. The intervention of Julia Kristeva

In this section we will look at how the intervention of Kristeva both develops from and feeds into the logic of literature so far developed in TQ, and how it evolves from a specific consideration of the logic of poetic language towards a notion of the subject that is particularly crucial to the theory of TQ, implicating psychoanalysis.

The initial intervention of Kristeva in France is indirectly treated in the article 'Mémoire' and her novel Les Samouraïs. For our purposes it is important to note that she first encounters TQ and Sollers through the intermediary of Genette and Barthes' seminar. It is through Sollers's text 'Littérature et totalité' that she is first acquainted with the theoretical work of Sollers. Kristeva's personal liaison with Sollers is an arbitrary factor that assures her engagement with TQ and produces an effect in the productive interchange of ideas with the work of Sollers and TQ. The effect of this liaison is not, however, so arbitrary, as it brings together a radical experience of the text with a scientific approach that has a transformative effect on both. According to Kristeva's reminiscence, Sollers introduces her to the text of Bataille, and this, for example, is a crucial factor in the transgression of science effected in her work.
Since Kristeva's initial intervention is in the context of her reappraisal of the science of signs, it is pertinent to examine her project for its reformation. It is evident first of all that the theoretical force of Kristeva's intervention, linked not only to her breadth of references but also to her 'eccentric' origins and perhaps to her sex, are immediately enlisted for TQ. There is no period 'before TQ' to speak of. Much of Kristeva's early work, in TQ and in the linguistics periodicals to which she contributes (Communications, Langages, Information sur les sciences sociales, Semiotica) is done under the banner of semiology but Kristeva's project for semiology appears slightly different than that, for example, of Barthes in Elements de sémiologie. Kristeva follows Barthes's reversal of Saussure in Mythologies, upholding the idea that, rather than linguistics being eventually subsumed into a larger 'science of signs', semiology is part of linguistics. Semiology, in other words, uses the methodology of linguistics, and must also approach its object through language. It is also, paradoxically, transgressive of linguistics. This paradox is explained by the fact that, while semiology uses the methods of linguistics and enounces itself in language, it addresses itself to what the Soviet semioticians of Tartu term 'systèmes modelants secondaires'; these are what Kristeva also calls 'pratiques sémiotiques' or 'pratiques translinguistiques', which, while they may have a
linguistic base, add to this a complementary system which dislocates and subverts the norms of communication, exchange of meaning and expression that linguistics assumes as its object of study. Semiology is thus in a position to return its critical gaze onto linguistics.

In 'Le Sens et la mode', a review of Barthes' *Système de la mode*, Kristeva asserts that structuralism, which borrows from linguistics its method and models, is efficient in its demystifying effect, but reaches a point of saturation, a tautological limit, when it starts to demystify itself, to return its critical gaze onto its ideological foundations. Semiology is thus the science of signs that, through the study of signifying practices different to or complementary to language, can demystify the structuralist ideology.

The condition of semiology's capacity to effect this return on its linguistic origins, however, is that it escapes from the closed circuit of exchange that the sign assures. In the closed world of sign-exchange meaning circulates, as money in the economy. Kristeva sees the semiology of Pierce and Saussure as coextensive with this exchange mechanism. In this sense we can see the relevance of terms such as 'clôture', and 'rupture' in the vocabulary of TQ. The condition of semiology's critique of the sign based ideology of meaning is the study of the semiotic practices in question as a production of meaning. It is to this end that they are referred to as practices or as texts. The critical aspect of Barthes' *Système de la mode*, for Kristeva is assured by his study of fashion
as a text, a practice not enounced in language but across it. We can recognise the emphasis on the diagonal, pointed out earlier a propos of Sollers. Barthes' study makes evident the tautological equation of meaning and fashion ('sens' and 'mode') and therefore of the sign and of exchange in the economy. Structuralist semiology, a reified expression of society's system of exchange, meets its own image in what it studies on the condition that it shifts its gaze onto the production of meaning.

The study of a semiotic practice as translinguistic effected not in the units of language but in its relations and in its spaces, and not reducible to language, not the sum of its effects thus makes possible semiology in its critical mode. 'Systèmes modelants secondaires', the translinguistic, semiotic practices are thus the exteriority of linguistics that semiology traverses in order to turn its gaze onto linguistics. For Kristeva, poetic language is the privileged area of this research.

Before looking at the epistemological status of semiology as Kristeva sees it, it is worth pointing out that these developments are already to an extent foreshadowed in TQ. Already in 'Littérature et signification' Barthes had told his interviewers 'j'entends toujours signification comme procès qui produit le sens, et non ce sens lui-même'. The textual practice of TQ is already focused explicitly on the generation and process of meaning rather than on the fixed meanings offered to it by culture. Textuality pre-empts the
scientific, theoretical gesture of semiology. Kristeva integrates it into a scientific system which has the advantage of specifying both its relation to language, and the epistemological factors to be taken into consideration. TQ is also the foyer for semiological or semi-semiological researches preceding those of Kristeva or contemporary with her work, and her activity makes TQ into an important foyer for such work. TQ can be seen as an incisive point where semiology joins a radical practice of writing - it is the 'other' of the more sober foyers of semiology such as Communications, Langages and later Poétique. Kristeva provides the link between the two areas and her work should be seen, rather than an extension of scientific research into the textual arena of TQ, as a militant invasion of the areas of semiology and linguistics by a representative of TQ's radical textuality in theory, in which signifiance is already promoted.

We have already outlined how Kristeva's project for semiology depended on an Althusserian distinction between ideology and science. If we look more closely at this articulation, it is evident that while semiology is envisaged as a production of models (which it may borrow from other formal sciences such as logic or mathematics or indeed linguistics), it is also a study of models, of 'systèmes modelants', it can therefore be called 'la production de la théorie du modelage qu'elle est'. At each step of its research semiology produces at the same time new objects of study and new formal models. Its theoretical status, therefore, is to think both its method
and its object." Semiology is therefore a constant critique of its scientific basis in its critical return on the linguistics it starts from. It is a rupture of the circle of dependence between science and philosophy, 'un cercle qui ne se referme pas' (p.84), a death and a relaunching (relance) of science - a site of aggression and subversion.

Such a view of semiology presents it as an approach analogous to that of Marx, but a Marx re-read in the light of Bachelard by Althusser. The Althusserian influence can be seen directly in Kristeva's description of the borrowing of terms and models effected by semiology. Semiology borrows terms from linguistics, mathematics and logic, but applies them to the translinguistic process of the semiotic practice in question, where they attain a 'displaced sense', ('un sens décalé' (p.85)). The premises of the science from which the terms are borrowed are thus subverted. This description corresponds directly to Althusser's approach in *Lire le Capital*, where he describes how Marx dislocates a term such as surplus value from its use by Classical economists by transposing it from the study of exchange to that of production. Through this dislocation, the complicity of the science from which the terms are borrowed with the object of its study (Classical economics and capitalism) is revealed, a process Kristeva indicated, as we saw, in Barthes' *Système de la mode*. This step in Althusser is the same as the one by which the second reading (of production) is present as a necessary absence in the first (of exchange).
By extension, semiology, the study of the process of signification studies a production occulted by the structuralist and early semiological studies of meaning as sign-exchange based. Kristeva's semiology is thus complicitous with Althusser's epistemology of Marxism, which relies on Bachelardian rationalism, and is guilty of the same disregard for its origins as indicated above a propos of TQ's Marxism.

The epistemological status Kristeva gives semiology, as the Marxist science nevertheless is an impetus for the breaking out of the circuit of sign-exchange and the movement towards the study of the process of signification, already implied by Barthes and by textuality without the Althusserian background. Although she provides, through this article, a justification of semiology as a Marxist science that will fall with Althusserian Marxism, the positivistic limitations of semiology, already indicated by Derrida, soon give way in Kristeva's work to a sémanalyse that perhaps undermines the Marxist epistemological analogy. We can see this pattern reflected in the general trends in thought at the time. The scientific impetus of thought running through the late 'sixties, and through TQ, eventually gives way to a psychoanalytically dominated approach, mediated through the analysis of the place of the subject, and through this to an ethics. Semiology essentially elides the subject in its insistence on models and so, in a different mode, does Derrida's différence. When the subject is reintroduced as
an object of study scientific semiology gives way to a sémanalyse.

The logics of poetic language

The reintroduction of the subject is effected via Kristeva's elaboration of a logic of poetic language, which Kristeva elaborates in her first book Sémčiotiké. It is a crucial and characteristic aspect of Kristeva and TQ's articulation with science and with psychoanalysis that it is effected via a theory and practice of poetic language; science is transformed through literature. This must always be borne in mind in considering Kristeva's theoretical work.

Refusing the Chomskyan avenue 18, and opting at one moment for the alternative transformational linguistics of Saumjan - Soboleva of the Tartu school 19, and at other moments for the numerical models 20 or set theory offered by mathematics, Kristeva offers a variety, in fact a proliferation, of alternatives to the structuralist approach. The complexity and scope of her references to linguistic, mathematical and logical models tends to blur the sharpness of focus of the lens through which she approaches her object at times. Sémčiotiké is distinguished by an exuberance in the proliferation of theories and models which later becomes more focused; this may be a function of the epistemological status of her approach as critique of science or of the dispersed origins of the articles that make up the book. Kristeva does not in fact
propose any fixed scientific model but rather a plurality of models that are effaced in the production of theory. This underlines how her relation to science is always one of transgression. The basic gesture, the shift to a transversal process, remains constant.

This shift, as argued earlier, is possible through the study of a system complementary to language. Kristeva studies poetic language, her contribution to semiology or to the theory of linguistics derives from this determining instance. A decisive part of this theory is the relation of poetic language to the language of communication and denotation.

The Russian Formalists, as we have seen, set out to define the specificity of literature in relation to linguistics, and emphasised the fact that literature could not be reduced to language; in Kristeva's terms, it was translinguistic. However, in setting out the idea that literature was a deviation from the norm, however subversive of that norm, the Formalists essentially provided a variant of the idea that literature was a supplementary decoration in relation to the language of communication, an aspect Kristeva identifies and criticises. Jakobson's analysis of poetic language as an emphasis on the message as such was also in this vein. This view holds sway in TQ during a certain time, but its limitations begin to appear when Formalism is superseded by the Derridean critique of structuralism. Implicitly, if literature is considered as a supplement to normal language, for Derrida the characteristics of literature
must be already in normal language. Moreover, the view that literature is a deviation leads to a certain stasis in the political and ideological practice of literature. Kristeva provides, in her first article in TQ, 'Pour une sémiologie des paragrammes', a complex alternative view of the relation of poetic language (which replaces the concept of 'literature') to language that is based on the notion of the infinite. Its aim is to find a logic of poetic language.

Kristeva's main point of departure in this text is Saussure's 'Anagrammes', which were originally published, edited and commmented by Jean Starobinski in the Mercure de France in 1964. Unedited extracts are published in TQ in 1969, indicating a strategic desire in TQ to integrate the more radical moments of linguistics, the margins of linguistics, into its project. Saussure had attempted in these texts to analyse certain Latin poems as double, that is, as having hidden within them the name of a chief or a god, an anagram which was dispersed in the text; this was nevertheless determined by the intention of the author. Saussure's intention was not subversive. It is Starobinski who initially poses the basis of further inquiry:

'Pourquoi ne verrait-on pas dans l'anagramme un aspect du processus de la parole - processus ni purement fortuit ni pleinement conscient?' (p.31-2)

In the passage from Saussure's writing to Kristeva's, Saussure's theory has been considerably altered from its basic premises, this shift is not acknowledged explicitly, but Kristeva seems to suggest that Saussure's original
intention is not complicit with hers by shifting the terminology from 'anagram' to 'paragram'. The shift from 'ana-', which signifies an anteriority or a substructure that is under or behind the text at a removed level, to 'para-' which captures the idea of dispersal or dissemination across or alongside the text corresponds to Kristeva's intention. This is to see the paragrammatic not as the intentional effect of an author but as an indication of the inescapably double nature of poetic language.

The paragrammatic level of the text insists in the relations and spaces of the text, having the radical effect of opening up the linearity of communicative, denotative discourse, which Kristeva calls the pheno-text, the text as phenomenon, to a volume of signifiance. Signifiance is infinite, because not fixed by denotation or the sign; it is a volume or space of generation or engenderment, which Kristeva calls the geno-text. The radicality of Kristeva's theory here is to break the linearity of denotative language by outlining this space, complementary to communicative language as a generative volume. In more poetic terms, she introduces silence and volume into discourse.

An equally serious fault to seeing poetic language as simply a deviation from normal language would be to see the geno-text as an independent level that could exist on its own, without the mediation of communicative language, as perhaps in 'automatic writing'. The pheno-text is the necessary 'support' and 'relaunching' (relance) of the
The text is necessarily double, it is characterised by the continual oscillation between pheno-text and geno-text. Kristeva's point here is that, if denotative, communicative language is formalisable according to a logic that goes from 0-1, that is, according to a logic of identity, of the sign where identity is a limit and negativity is its privative opposite, poetic language operates according to a logic that goes from 0-2, where 0 denotes and 1 is transgressed. Transgression of identity, of '1', can be seen as a motor for TQ's theory and practice of the text and it is crucial for Kristeva's formulation here.

According to the logic (0-2) of transgression, denotative, communicative language is contained within poetic language, doubled by the paragrammatic level. The text can therefore be communicative at the same time as being paragrammatic, even while the latter is the destruction of the former. However, the denotative and communicative level is the law, therefore a repression or a 'foreclosure' in Lacanian terms of the movement beyond it - the paragrammatic. This view of communication, the sign and therefore the subject of speech, correlates with the view discussed earlier of the subject as hypostasis and of the culture of the sign as a neurotic fixation. The poetic text, Lautréamont for example, is a destructive, negative traversal of the culture of identity, but it is also its reordering, its transformation. This transformation is further specified by Kristeva with the notions of the transfinite and of intertextuality.
Transfinity ; intertextuality

In order to specify the relation of poetic language to communicative discourse in 'Pour une sémiologie des paragrammes' Kristeva introduces the mathematical notion of the infinite. Cantor (1845-1918) sets out to show how the infinite is actual and real; in terms of the text this is to show how the geno-text or the infinite, previously 'transcendent' is formalisable in real terms. We will outline this concept with reference to J.-L Houdebine's discussion of it in a 1983 article.37

Cantor poses the set of infinite numbers [1,2,3,4...]. The largest number in this set cannot be even or odd. This led mathematicians to posit the infinite as an indeterminate potentiality. For Cantor this evades the real problematic, 'la problématique infinitiste'(p.89). For Cantor, the 'principles of engenderment' mean that an infinite set is characterised by a continual addition of elements to the largest of that set; as long as another number can be added we have not reached the infinite number. Cantor poses or names the number w as a limit to this set which can have no limit. The contradiction is transgressed if we renounce considering the number w as the same kind of number as a 'normal' number. What is required is a radical break between normal numbers and what Cantor calls transfinite numbers. The transfinite number is an element 'immediately superior' to the sequence of normal numbers, or it is, in J.-L. Houdebine's
terms, a limit exterior to and not interior to the set concerned (p.100). In different terms, it is a limit that is always already transgressed. We can recognise the logic of Bataille's transgression here, the transfinite being attained through a jump or a break of the interior limit that transgresses this limit. While the transfinite is actual, not transcendent, it cannot be judged real however, by the logic of identity (Logos), it is real according to an epistemologically different logic of the transsubjective or the translinguistic.

In Kristeva's formulation, poetic language, the genotext or the paragrammatic can be seen as transfinite. The paragrammatic text, already indicated to be a volume, is an infinite generation, but not indeterminate or transcendent since each actual appearance of the paragrammatic in the text, each letter, phoneme, word, sentence (according to a principle of expansion or 'exhaustion' as Barthes noted of Sade) is a transfinite mark, the act of nomination of a volume of signifiance. The same notion is introduced by Kristeva in 'L'Engendrement de la formule' with the notion of the 'infini-point' as a signifying differential that 'supports' the volume of infinite signifiance and is dispersed across the text in a paragrammatic fashion. The text is an actualisation of the infinite - an infinite volume of signifiance actualised in the finite phenomenon of the pheno-text. The task of semiology or poetic research is thus to analyse the finite in relation to the infinite (p.57).
Poetic language is also an infinite set in that it opens out the linearity of discourse into the infinite volume of signification. Poetic language is therefore the only language that demonstrates the infinity of the linguistic code or set. All other languages are limited domains of the set [language], while poetic language is 'equipotential' with it. Other languages are more limited zones which repress or foreclose the infinite. Poetic language thus contains the code of usual language in a sense, and its relation to it is redistributive, in other words it destroys denotative language while reconstructing it. This combination of negation and affirmation is developed by Kristeva in 'Poésie et négativité'; we can also recall its importance for Sollers's reading of Lautréamont. Kristeva shows how Lautréamont's text redistributes énoncés it takes from the anterior textual corpus according to operations of negation which are also affirmations.

The transfinite perspective informs much of TQ's approach to the text. A text is often analysed according to its relation to the infinite. Is it open or closed, transgressive or transcendent? The definition of literature, as far as TQ is concerned, may well be based on its capacity to transform closed systems by opening them to an infinite transgression.

This basic logic is behind the renowned notion of intertextuality. Intertextuality refers to the fact that the writer reads the anterior textual corpus as a re-writing, a redistribution, of that corpus. The notion is
complicated by the fact that the 'anterior textual corpus' comprises the subject's insertion into the 'social text'. 'Je' therefore rewrites himself, as we can read in Baudry's analysis of Rimbaud. Through the re-reading / writing of the anterior textual corpus the writer inserts the text into history:

'Le texte littéraire s'insère dans l'ensemble des textes: il est une écriture-réplique (fonction ou négation) d'un autre (des autres) texte(s). Par sa manière d'écrire en lisant le corpus littéraire antérieur ou synchronique l'auteur vit dans l'histoire, et la société s'écrit dans le texte'.

Writing is thus a participation, an aggression towards the anterior textual corpus, prefigured in Mallarmé by réminiscence -sommation, emphasised in TQ before Kristeva in so far as the participatory nature of reading is always stressed. What the notion of intertextuality means is not only that a text is related to the totality of other texts as to a network or series, but that the writing reorganises literature as a whole in traversing and transgressing it, reorganises also the text of identity (the subject) and of society (history). Intertextuality proposes a vision of literature as transformative of itself and of the world.

Scenic space

The text is a negative space, articulated with other texts, and transformative. It is also a volume, it ruptures the linearity of representation, and as such it becomes what we could call a scenic space. Whereas before it was seen as a spectacle or, in terms of representation, a represented expression, now the text becomes a scène,
not a static, removed spectacle, but a space of practice, transcènique. Signifiance is not a single linear event but a practice in space. The volume of sense spatialises signification; it becomes theatrical or gestural. Its writing is a scénographie, a writing of the gestural. The transcenic, as proposed by Kristeva, Baudry, Sollers, is the passage, ('traversée') of signifiance in volume across the space of the text, only observable from the point of view of a scène, ('une autre scène') as a representation, such as the phenomenal, present-tense level of Sollers's Nombres. This explains the importance, beyond the theatre as spectacle, of Artaud's writing, and Mallarmé's conception of writing as gesture in space - Le Livre as a theatrical presentation of writing. One may see, in addition to the emphasis on Artaud, an emphasis on the scenic space in TQ as another instance of the 'other scene'. Barthes' article on the Japanese puppet theatre Bunraku, J-L. Schefer's book Scénographie d'un tableau, applying the argument to pictorial space, Guy Scarpetta's novel Scène, are just a few explicit instances of this. It is an 'other scene' in that it substitutes for the theatrical space of representation and spectacle, a space the Situationists had pointed out was the the nodal point of Western capitalism to a frightening degree, a scenic space as volume and as generation that is linked with the other 'other scene' of Eastern thought in the Japanese No plays, the Mexican Tarahumaras, and Chinese and Indian theatrical practices, as Kristeva suggests.

In the novels of TQ, linear plot development is
replaced by a scenic space, which often relies on a structure such as the square, or the cube, or a repetitive and revolving structure such as the permutation of pronouns, or the seasons of the year. Scenic space also implicates in the theory and practice of literature 'transcenic' practices such as dance (Merce Cunningham) and in some senses, music. It has the powerful effect of linking the previously contemplative practice of literature to a more sensuous practice where reading and writing are seen as activities implicating the body in a passage across a space. Reading becomes a dance, in which the voice in the body traverses the space of the page.

Towards the subject of process - the non-subject

It is in effect possible to see in Kristeva's book Séméiotikè a progression from the earlier texts towards the last, 'L'engendrement de la formule'. Formalisation and semiology, repeated in various modes across the book, give way in the last text to a more extensive approach, signalled by the shift from sémiologie to sémanalyse, and occasioned by the radicality of its object, Nombres. Sollers's text can therefore be seen to effect a shift in Kristeva's theory - it widens and becomes more sensuous and corporeal. Sollers's Nombres provides the pivot on which Kristeva's work swings into a new period. We can detect in this text an increase in references to an 'outside' of our culture. There is also a major new departure in the introduction of the problematic of the
subject, the body and sexuality, not absent in other texts, but not emphasised.

We noted earlier the relevance of Lacan's subversion of the subject for TQ and the potential opposition between Lacan's emphasis on the Symbolic and Derridean différance. The Derridean perspective, elaborated by Sollers in *Logiques*, informs Kristeva's theory of the place of the subject as a 'mise à mort' and in the postulation of a pre-symbolic process only readable in the Symbolic. Kristeva evades the inability of Derridean theory to provide a coherent theory of the subject by the insistence on the transsubjective dimension. This at the same time 'includes' Lacanian psychoanalysis. Implicitly, Lacanian theory ceases to be relevant (as a description of the subject) in the space of the text, as it applies to the subject of discourse and communication, and the text, in Kristeva's view of it, transgresses the realm of discourse. The text, as double, also, therefore, transgresses the subject of discourse. Although split, the subject of discourse remains in the zone of identity (0-1); in Kristeva's theory the subject is thought as co-extensive with the sign, and is therefore transgressed by the paragrammatic level of the text (0-2). As such the Lacanian unconscious, which is equated with the Symbolic as Other, is co-extensive with the realm of discourse:

'..cette zone se présente plutôt comme une assise solide de la parole que comme une sortie à travers la parole, puisque c'est d'un point de vue privilégié de la parole logique (ici non-poétique) et de son sujet, que le concept d'inconscient est forgé en tant que modèle opératoire qui assume le rôle de résidu où se jouent des opérations qui ne sont pas dans la parole'.(p.212)
The subject of discourse is thus a subject complicit with the logic of identity, and the unconscious is added as the zone of the other, anything that logic cannot cover, in order to situate it within the domain of the subject. Kristeva therefore demands a concept of the subject that escapes from the domain of logic and speech, and a corresponding concept of the unconscious. The first is sketched in this first phase, the second is not analysed until later, with the notion of the 'sujet en procès' and the 'semiotic'.

The notion Kristeva uses to refer to the transgressive subject is 'le sujet zérologique', a term borrowed from Linnart Mäll to refer to the Buddhist notion of sunyavada, which signifies zero or 'le vide'. It is interesting to note how a notion significant to Kristeva's theory derives from an Eastern culture through the refractive lens of a Soviet writer. The fact that Mäll's text appears in TQ again indicates to what extent the review integrates an 'other scene' in its publishing practice. The 'sujet zérologique' or 'le non-sujet' appears when the denotative level of language is reduced to zero. The 'sujet zérologique' is a subject beyond the sign, characterised by a negation of the denotative aspect of language. The subject is limited to the domain of the sign:

'Ce "sujet" zérologique est extérieur à l'espace gouverné par le signe... Le sujet zérologique (on voit à quel point le concept de "sujet" est déplacé ici) ne dépend d'aucun signe même si nous, à partir de notre espace rationnel, ne pouvons le penser qu'à travers le signe.'(p.213)

The subject is thus characterised by a negativity, and a
negativity which is not identifiable within Western culture. However, since the subject-sign is transgressed by the text, the text contains the subject, the 'sujet zérologique' is only approachable through the subject of discourse, as the paragrammatic is impossible without the denotative and communicative, which it nevertheless annuls. The text is therefore a space which is a continual oscillation or a transgression, between the subject and the vide:

'Si cet espace "vide" où se meut le sujet zérologique est le pôle opposé de notre espace logique, dominé par le sujet parlant, alors la pratique sémiotique poétique, avec ses particularités, devient le lieu où se joignent ces deux pôles dans un incessant mouvement de l'un vers l'autre.'(p.213)

The text therefore effects the annulation of the subject. This enables a conception in which the subject is at the same time included in the text, constructed by the text and annulled by it. It is not a question, therefore, of a text without a subject; the subject is a necessary condition of the text, and Lacanian theory is relevant up to a point, the point of transgression.

The fallen subject

This theory of the subject is further developed in Kristeva's analysis of Sollers's Nombres, a point where Sollers's textual experience feeds into her work and transforms it in a movement towards psychoanalysis. According to Kristeva's reading of Nombres, the structure of the text, the 'pheno-text', is a 'fall-out' of the process of generation. The geno-text is an infinite
engendering process that denies fixity - the pheno-text is an accidental incidence. *Signifiace*, in other words, is: 'comme (une ) opération dont la structure n'est qu'une retombée décalée'. The pheno-text is thus an 'objet chu' or a 'déchet'. The geno-text does not know the subject:

"il (the geno-text) est son autre oeuvrant en deça et au-delà de lui. Lieu hors-subjectif et hors-temporel (le sujet et le temps n'apparaissent que comme des accidents de ce vaste fonctionnement qui les traverse..

The subject of the text, the 'je' of the text is therefore also an 'objet chu', a 'déchet'. In *Nombres* 'je' is a site, an 'infini-point' of an otherwise unlimited process of *signifiace*. The subject can therefore be seen as the place of a sacrifice (p.59). The geno-text sacrifices its engendrement for the fixity of the pheno-text, its volume for the facial surface of the 'je'. Sacrifice and 'déchet', the subject is also a lure ('leurre'). In determining the pheno-text and the 'je' as 'déchet' and sacrifice Kristeva effects a passage from the geno-text to the pheno-text, the movement is from the process to its incidence. In the movement in the opposite direction, which is the movement of reading, from phenomenon to generation, incidence to process, the subject is a lure, not at all in the sense it has for Lacan which is as an Imaginary mirror - identification with an ego or imago, but, and the difference relates to the reversal of the direction of the luring, as a ruse to entrap the subject, or the reader, in the infinite process of germination, the signifying process. For, if the text is an 'objet chu', a 'déchet' it is also a 'relance', a point of relaunching of the process. The *relance* is
attributable to the surplus of engenderment over the subject. The text as surplus of signifiance over the level of denotation is a dépense in which the subject is consumed, burned or annulated. In other words, the surface level of the text, with its subject 'je' lures the reader into the process of signifiance through a surplus of signifiance over the denotative level, through its transgression, 'la signifiance résorbant le corps du sujet' (p.57). The Bataillean resonance here, working through Sollers's text, is obvious in Kristeva's formulations. Signifiance is a process of dépense as an annulating, unfixed volume of sense expiating itself. This surplus or dépense is articulated by Kristeva with jouissance. The surplus of the geno-text in the pheno-text makes the text an 'objet de jouissance'. The reading of the text is thus a passage, a saut from déchet to jouissance. Jouissance is a loss of the body, a sacrifice of the body 'ce dont le manque permet de dire corps: la jouissance', and the subject through the infinitisation (which the Vedic hymns, an intertextual seam of Nombres term poudroiement) of the text. Jouissance is thus intimately linked to the annulation of the subject and the infinite, to a subjective death and to signifiance.

In this textual topology the subject of literature appears as something that has 'fallen' into phenomenality from an infinite process. Conversely, writing (and reading) is a sacrifice to this process. Kristeva (and Sollers, in Nombres sketch out a sacrificial view of literature that finds a reverse echo in Pascal's 'pari',
but also in a whole tradition of literature seen as a risky, violent practice that puts the subjectivity of the writer in the balance. The terms of Kristeva's enunciation of this vision, 'déchet', 'jouissance' suggest also a specifically psychoanalytical approach to this sacrifice, and implicate the body. Just as we previously emphasised the role of the body in the 'dance' of writing considered as transcenic, the body is implicated in this sacrifice, through dépense and jouissance.

Kristeva is thus beginning to sketch a conception of textuality, not limited to Nombres but as if instigated by it, which sees it as an affair with death, with jouissance as annulation of the subject as déchet or objet chu. One may correlate the notion of jouissance with the Cantorian idea of the transfinite, as a saut into a zone radically different from that of the finite and quantative, the latter zone corresponding to pleasure as opposed to jouissance. Kristeva therefore extends the models of previous analyses into more corporeal areas, marking a shift from an emphasis on epistemology to an ethics of the body. This has repercussions in the area of sexuality.

The silent woman

There is a view of sexual relations in her analysis of Nombres that may foreshadow later developments in Kristeva's theory. In Nombres 'je' is doubled by 'elle', 'elle' not as a person, ('personne' in the sense that Benveniste uses it), but as a function of 'je', as a
dépassement of the phallocentric One. "Elle" est une fonction de "je", une case de son jeu....'(p.69). 'Elle' is the representation of the female death through which the jouissance and death of the 'je' is possible:

"Elle" renverse sa jouissance qu'il reçoit comme miroir de sa propre mort. Jouissant de sa mort, "elle" assure la représentation de sa jouissance à lui, et lui donne cette représentation de jouir qui déracine de la subjectivité' (p.69)

Sollers had already sketched this sacrifice in his essay on Dante. In addition, 'elle' is 'la fonction même de la germination sans fin', 'une mère folle' (p.69-70) - the feminine (non) person is the extension or doubling of 'je' through which 'je' must pass (through a sexual act) in order to attain the infinitisation of the germinative process. The text thus effects the possession of the Mother:

'La possession de la Mère - d'"elle" - est par conséquent la première transgression de l'unicité de "je", le premier acte indispensable à son excentrement...' (p.70)

One may see this also in Dante, ('la femme est cette traversée de la mère..' "") and in Bataille (Ma Mère) as Kristeva suggests (p.70).

Although this may foreshadow further developments in Kristeva's work it is worthwhile at this point posing the question: to what extent this notion of femininity is specific to Sollers's text and to a masculine representation of femininity, working through Kristeva's text through the internal corruption that texts effect on one another. The Dantesque, Bataillesque and Sollersian view of femininity presented here as an ideal locus for the process of germination and jouissance, as an escape
path from the phallocentricity of male jouissance and sexuality, in other words of femininity as an extension of masculinity through which the latter can represent its death and jouissance, is very similar to Lacan's view of femininity as the (non) locus of non localisable, unobservable jouissance, of non-Being in the sense that woman does not exist.\textsuperscript{2} This view of femininity, and the frequency with which it appears in male 'textual' representations of the feminine, is certainly questionable in so far as the female is always the non person, the non existent, the silent. It is also interesting to note, in view of Kristeva's later valorisation of motherhood, her emphasis here that the text is 'la recherche de la femme non-mère, la seule radicalement autre, la soeur' (p.59). A not negligible aspect of TQ's conceptual activity exists around the question of sexuality, treating the notion of the repressed homosexual nature of society, woman as object of exchange or sublimated version of the male ego, and the repression of an originary matriarchy as aspects of this conceptualisation of femininity.

The transgressive and sacrificial view of literature, historically speaking, also implicates a reassessment or at least a problematisation of the place and role of femininity. This is present in Hölderlin, Nerval, Baudelaire, Proust, Joyce, Kafka. It is often the figure of the Mother who is specifically in question. While we may question the extent to which it is actually a question of gender and if the notions of masculinity and femininity at play actually fulfill a more symbolic role, TQ's
inquiry into this area, which has fueled a proliferation of other enquiries of this kind, occupies a quite typical place in the history of this kind of literature.

Kristeva's 'L'Engendrement de la formule' therefore introduces some notions of subjectivity and non-subjectivity that seem to go beyond or elsewhere from the Lacanian subject of discourse to posit a (non) subject of death and jouissance. Kristeva's notion of the subject remains, however, to an extent within a Freudian / Lacanian space in that it distinguishes between a subject and non-subject; the subject is the subject of discourse or is not at all - in Lacanian terms, it is in the Symbolic or is not at all, it is split by desire and lack or is not a subject. A later step, after the publication of Deleuze and Guattari's Anti-Oedipe and TQ's reaction to it is the consideration of a pre-verbal, pre-Oedipal subject, subject to pulsions of what Kristeva terms the 'semiotic', where it is a pre-symbolic area, more relevant to the work of Klein and Freud than Lacan, that is investigated. Kristeva thus at the same time implies Lacanian thinking in the history of TQ and implies a movement beyond it.

We have analysed Kristeva's intervention as contributing an essential scientific impetus to the theory of literature developed in TQ. As we stressed above, the limitations of this approach are soon bypassed through Kristeva's movement towards a psychoanalytically oriented approach, which eventually becomes an ethics. We must emphasise, however, that psychoanalysis and ethics are
both approached via literature or poetic language, not for their own sake. Kristeva effectively creates a new psychoanalysis and a new ethics through her analysis of the literary text and the subjectivity of the writer. Literature transforms science and the ethics that it evolves into.
IV. The subject of literature - Kristeva

Fragmented theory

The theory of literature elaborated in TQ during the 'seventies becomes less and less identifiable with the theory of a group, a movement reflected in the gradual dispersion of TQ into a collectivity of 'exceptions'. The theory of literature thus loses the definition of Théorie d'ensemble and 'Programme'; it is fragmented as it traverses the Maoist period and its philosophical extension. The theoretical texts of TQ during the 'seventies are not produced in the name of 'Theory' but as contributions of their authors to the areas they are specifically interested in. The end of 'Theory' as such can thus be situated in the philosophical extension that hollows out the Althusserian 'theoretical practice' and 'epistemological break' on which the theory was based and marking a massive turn towards psychoanalysis as the ground of any theory of the literary subject. The Artaud/Bataille colloquium also tended to invest theoretical hope in the Maoist cultural revolution, so that when the latter falls through a unified theory of literature is impossible, fragmented into the excess and the exceptions which were the basis of this investment in the first place. The theory of Sollers and Kristeva during the 'seventies is thus a theory of the subject of literature, seen as an exception, a theory that engages an implicit dialogue with Lacanian psychoanalysis, massively
present in TQ's interests of the decade.

A chapter on the theory of TQ during the 'seventies is therefore an impossibility except in so far as it affirms the exception. In this sense, the work of Kristeva, Pleynet and Sollers constitutes the theory of TQ during this decade. The other theorists of TQ, Houdebine, Scarpetta, Sichère...derive their positions from those of Sollers and Kristeva and Pleynet, while the latter's work is largely directed towards painting. There remains in the work of TQ a tension between the individual and the collective work of 'TQ' as such, so that while their 'theory' is 'in TQ' and identifiable with it, it tends away from it and against it. The theory of TQ in the 'seventies is thus its own dissolution. Kristeva's work at once concentrates on the 'canon', Artaud, Bataille, (the colloquium in 1972 being the last collective moment which marks these destructive tensions) Mallarmé, Lautréamont, but also moves away from 'TQ' after a certain point into the area of non-Lacanian psychoanalysis and notably focuses on Céline, as a writer whose individuality ruptures any kind of project. Sollers's non fictional texts are aphoristic and tend more and more away from the project, away from TQ in so far as this is a project and a 'position'. Consequently, we can argue that the theory of TQ is thus not identifiable with the work of Kristeva in La révolution du langage poétique, Polylogue or Pouvoirs de l'horreur or Sollers in Théorie des exceptions but in the tensions that these works constitute, between themselves and the general strategic movement of the
review. In Kristeva's essays there is an increasing undermining of the subject of theory, of metalanguage by the violence of excess and this finds symptoms in the irruption of subjectivity in texts like 'Hétérhie de l'amour' and the consideration of areas of subjectivity, abjection, love, femininity, in which the subject of theory is implicated.

Artaud / Bataille

The texts on Artaud and Bataille by Kristeva from the 1972 colloquium are marked by a tension between the project of the cultural revolution, Maoism, that TQ as a project and group projects and the textual dynamics Kristeva sketches out. It is our interpretation that Kristeva's theory is detachable from the political emphasis, from the affirmation of Maoism, due to the very basis that makes such an emphasis possible, the aspect of practice that Kristeva underlines. Practice is in fact later mutated into an ethics of literature that seems to contradict any political, totalising effect, by introducing into the social the jouissance which is exploited in oppression. In other words, literature is on the way to a denial of politics and a constitution of an ethics of which Maoism was theoretically the project but of which, practically, it was a failure. That such a political approach would always fail seems marked from the start. Kristeva's essays mark how TQ's cultural revolution is in complete contradiction with itself, being based on
the infinite productivity of contradiction.

This contradiction is itself mirrored in the opposing textual dynamics of Artaud and Bataille. We will briefly examine Kristeva's delineation of this dynamic. The Symbolic, which is co-extensive with Lacan's field of the same name, is identified by Kristeva as language as such. This entails a positing of a thesis, a thetic moment anterior to any discourse, a factor Kristeva imports from Husserl's phenomenology. The thetic is an affirmative moment, it can only be affirmative, as Frege pointed out (with Freud), negation or denegation is a movement inside, interior to this thesis. The Symbolic field in / of the subject is however 'preceded' by the anterior field of the semiotic, which is labelled differently according to Kristeva's object of criticism. The semiotic, the heterogenous (Bataille), 'le rejet' (Artaud) negativity (Hegel) is at the same time foreclosed by the Symbolic and is its condition as it is the pulsional energy that the Symbolic diverts. If syntax is part of the Symbolic, it is already derived from the semiotic which is already syntactically organised, in a sense, by the rhythm of pulsions across the body in a motility Kristeva locates in the 'chora' (p.57), Plato's word for a nature preceding God.

Following Kristeva, we can articulate this logic psychoanalytically. It specifically implicates Lacanian psychoanalytical theory as a closure. The semiotic is present in the anal and oral stages, in a sadism or aggression linked to these that is seen as the violence
of 'le rejet'. The Symbolic, with the 'cut-off point' of the thetic moment, is a castration that inaugurates the phallus as 'object manqué', the metonymic law of desire, the Oedipal familial triangle, and the censure of the signifier in the S/s relation. In the text, Kristeva explains, there is a dynamic between the Symbolic and the semiotic that takes various forms but which involves a 'traversée' of the first by the second, a 'procès du sujet' (p.56). The text is determined by the interplay of the dynamic between the two 'orders' Kristeva proposes. The subject of literature is a subject that traverses or exceeds the Symbolic by introducing the violence of the semiotic, subverting the former and creating a new symbolic organisation and a 'nouveau dispositif réel' (p.68) that Kristeva identifies as innovation. The mechanisms of this subversion and innovation differ for each author.

Having set out the two sides of this dynamic, Kristeva's writing oscillates between the two sides, entailing different consequences with regard to the context. In 'Le sujet en procès' (Artaud) it is evident that Kristeva is confronting two theories of the subject, that of Lacan and that of Deleuze and Guattari in L'Anti-Oedipe (p.56). The extent to which the theory of the subject of literature hinges on to the psychoanalytical theory of the psychoses is affirmed by Kristeva's assertion that while Lacan's subject is paranoid, a 'sujet unaire' (p.55) determined by rejection of the Other, desire of the Other, triangulated into the familial Oedipus complex, there is a schizoid
subject, that of Deleuze and Guattari, although not identified as such, which is afamilial, prior to the realm of desire, moved not by desire for a lack but by 'le rejet', a pulsional movement identified primarily with anality. In the essay on Artaud, Kristeva sets out a transgression of Lacan's symbolic order by the fluidity of Deleuze and Guattari, and the subject of literature is the site of this contradiction, this practice.

However, if a propos of Artaud Kristeva tends towards Deleuze and Guattari's position that desire is within the paranoiac realm of capitalist culture and affirms for example Artaud's focus on non-verbal gesturality as a limit of the avant-garde subversion of the Symbolic, in the essay on Bataille Kristeva emphasises the fact that the avant-garde that privileges negativity and misses the thetic moment is 'l'envers solidaire de l'instance monothéiste' (p.107), a negative theology that fetichises 'le corps morcelé' (p.108). *Anti-Oedipe* can be seen as a potential fetichisation in this sense. In the essay on Bataille Kristeva can be seen to propose the opposing side of the dynamic, emphasising Bataille's focus on desire in eroticism (p.116). This remains, however, a position that is 'traversée', exceeded or transgressed. Bataille is 'transoedipe' (p.123) rather than 'anti-oedipe'. The logic of 'la méditation' (p.117) accompanies this transgression of the discursive. Bataille's experience is thus of a constant recovering of the thetic moment in its continuous transgression by the semiotic.

Artaud / Bataille are thus the two approaches to a
contradiction between the two orders outlined by Kristeva. If the first approaches the limit of the avant-garde in dance, gesturality and a non-verbal, hieroglyphic writing and in psychosis, the second privileges the logic of transgression in works of theory that meditate on dépense, while also limiting the transgression in literature to themes in a récit which is logically structured (p.121).

The subject of literature, therefore, is a subject that constantly approaches its own excess or dépense. Literature thus approaches the experience of psychosis, it is intimately linked to the subject of psychoanalysis but it is on the 'side' of psychosis, the psychoanalysis that literature implies is itself a psychoanalysis that questions its own foundations. Kristeva approaches psychoanalysis 'through' the subject of literature and thus introduces a contestation of the psychoanalysis of the subject of discourse. The subject of literature is psychoanalysed, but also puts the theoretical writer, the analyst him/herself in analysis, threatening the discourse of the latter with its excess. This is the 'transfert' operated by the text. We will try to show how this 'transfert' confronts Lacan.

Lacan

Kristeva proposes an extension and a parallel of Lacanian theory.* Kristeva's analysis recognises Lacan's Symbolic order installed by castration and identification, installing desire, but poses a traversal of this order by
the dynamic that precedes it. Kristeva thus returns to the infant before the Oedipal, specifically before the Father or the Name of the Father, thus to the Mother. In this 'return' she refers to the psychoanalytical work of Melanie Klein in infant psychosis, which Lacan had specifically attempted to distance himself from in the intervention of the Father. There is thus a particular dynamic in play here between the Mother-child relation as the archaic scene 'before' the Father's intervention, and the domination of the Father or his metaphor, or between an analysis dominated by meaning and one dominated by objects and their relations. Kristeva, coming after Lacan, after the Father, returns through the Father (Lacan) to the Mother (Klein), but the relation of daughter to both Father and Mother is highly ambivalent, as the daughter can only know the Mother through the relation with the Father. The nodal point of Kristeva's relation to Lacan is therefore around the question of the irreducibility of meaning and the impossibility of a non-mediated pre-symbolic experience. The question will be: how does Kristeva's postulation of the semiotic arrive at its theoretical description, just as the relation with Derrida posed the opposing question of how différence was positioned in relation to language.

The implications of this for the subject of literature, which Kristeva looks at across the writers Artaud, Bataille, Mallarmé, Lautréamont, Céline, Sollers are important. If we acknowledge the fact that Kristeva's theory is enounced with reference to that of Lacan,
implicitly if not explicitly, then the relation this implies between the subject of psychoanalysis and the subject of literature is crucial.

Bearing in mind that for Lacan, 'l'Inconscient, c'est la parole de l'Autre' and that 'Le sujet, c'est le signifiant pour un autre signifiant', the subject of psychoanalysis for Lacan is the subject of speech, of language. The subject is a subject in as much as he is implied by speech. The subject of literature, analysed by Kristeva, is a subject traversed by the excess that the relation of literature to language induces. In other words, the difference between literature and language is proportional to the subversion of the Lacanian subject implied by Kristeva.

The excess of literature appears in various forms, but always involves the same subjective traversal of the Symbolic, the same dynamic between human and biological factors. However, Kristeva does not fall 'outside' Lacan by proposing that the difference between literature and language is simply the subversion of the Symbolic by the pulsional. Literature proposes a successful traversal of the limit between Symbolic and semiotic and a re-organisation of the Symbolic, its extension or transgression. Literature is not equivalent to psychosis; as Sollers suggests, the writer is a 'Schreber heureux', a subject who has passed beyond psychosis by reintegrating the experience of the transgression of the Symbolic in the Symbolic. The question that inevitably arises from this is how to account for the specificity of avant-garde
literature. Kristeva's answer to this is the degree of success of the subject in traversing the Symbolic and not falling into a 'poetic' celebration of the semiotic, the extent to which the subject attains, through a subversion of language or symbolic logic, a new organisation of the relation of the semiotic to the Symbolic, innovation. Other literature may fall into one or other sides of the Symbolic/semiotic divide and entertain either a strict respect for the Law of the Father and a neurotic repression of the semiotic, or a 'poetic femininity' as Bataille would term it. The cost of either of these choices seems to be fetichism, the choice of specific objects to hold back the semiotic. A successful traversal eschews this option.

A more fundamental question we may ask is to what extent the semiotic is already in the Symbolic, to what extent the elements that subvert the logic of the Symbolic are already contained within it, whether they are eroticism, violence, gesturality. Is there a general economy, a negativity anterior to the thetic moment ? Since we can only know the semiotic within the Symbolic, how do we know it comes from outside it ? In other words is Kristeva's theory an extension of Lacan, or does it remain within the limits of the thought of Lacan ? This problem is subtly differentiated through Kristeva's work after the Artaud/Bataille essays.
If Artaud and Bataille reflect each other by approaching the Symbolic/semiotic divide from different directions, in the different organisations of the Symbolic they propose, the same can be said of Lautréamont and Mallarmé although in a more complex way. Kristeva proposes that, if Mallarmé undertakes a subversion of the syntactic and morphophonemic organisation of the Symbolic i.e. if the semiotic 'dispositif' is detectable at this level, with Lautréamont it is more a question of the semiotic in the subjective instances of discourse and in the relation to the anterior textual corpus. Mallarmé's subversion is essentially at the level of the enunciation, that of Lautréamont focuses on the logic implied by the enunciation. If Mallarmé's subversion is more formal in that his text approaches limits of coherence, Lautréamont's subversion is never incoherent but approaches the logic implied by language. It is evident that the historical pattern programmed in TQ from 'Programme' is a reference here; the positioning of Mallarmé and Lautréamont as a 'révolution' situated in history is still enounced as a 'history of the avant-garde', and furthermore, the dialectic of the text, between Symbolic and semiotic, is still 'inserted' into dialectical materialism as thought by Lenin and Mao. However, behind this reference there is a more pernicious influence, perhaps, of the logic of the
text as 'negation of the negation', as transgression, that was proposed in Sollers's Logiques before the 'Programme'. The tension between these two instances, operative in this work, will be resolved in the subsequent work by the dropping of the historical reference and the necessity of articulating the textual revolution with the political, Maoist revolution. We can see a caesura between this work and the later work that also corresponds to the rough division we have drawn between TQ as group and TQ as a collection and an insistence on the exception. That is to say that Kristeva's theory for Artaud/Bataille and Mallarmé/Lautréamont is enounced partly with a view to the collective project of TQ which is its own dissolution, a theory of dialectical materialism, while it also undermines the foundations of Marxism as system. The problem arises when the excess that the text introduces is pushed as far as to make production and the political a field alien to that of the excess itself. After this point the excess, the exception is affirmed for its own sake, or perhaps for the sake of the 'transfert' it operates within psychoanalysis. Kristeva's theory thus appears as a machine of auto-dissolution. It is also pertinent to point out that after the dissolution of the project, the Symbolic/semiotic dynamic becomes more nuanced with Kristeva's engagement as a psychoanalyst.
Céline

Departing from Artaud/Bataille, Lautréamont and Mallarmé, Kristeva's work after 1974/5 involves a new set of concerns and a development in the theory of the subject of literature. For Kristeva, it is 'sans doute hypersymptomatique' that this turn should introduce Céline as an object of inquiry, a text that, associated with anti-semitism, is less easily insertable into a 'left' avant-garde project. It is precisely as exception that Céline is introduced. However, it is not only Céline who exhibits the turn of Kristeva's concerns, but articles on film, painting (Bellini), dissidence, love, that accelerate, gradually, a liberation of subject matter that achieves fuller fruition with the later books that present a proliferation of subjects. However, we could also point out that all of these subjects are approached with reference to a common ground in psychoanalysis. It is Kristeva's profession of psychoanalyst after 1975/6 that most affects the exceptional quality of her work, given that from politics to psychoanalysis necessitates a movement from the group to the individual, who is in need of a cure, by way of 'le transfert' that implicates the body, the individuality of the analyst.

In the Artaud/Bataille, Lautréamont/Mallarmé analyses, following from the TQ project of an exploration of dialectical materialism, Kristeva departs from an analysis of Hegel. Negativity, hypostatised by Hegel's idealism,
is rethought by Kristeva as a heterogeneity or a materiality. This was consistent with Sollers's basic stress on the negation of the negation and affirmation/negation as the movement of the text. A basic reference for the TQ theory of the text was contained in Hegel's dialectic, and this permitted the articulation with Maoism. After 1975 the reference to Hegelian negativity wanes in Kristeva's work, and the semiotic, pulsional instance is set more in terms of a psychoanalytical context. We can situate this as a moment at which Kristeva's work diverges from that of Sollers, without being opposed to it, but by entering into a different area.

In the essay on Céline, Kristeva presents a synopsis of her theory of the Symbolic/semiotic dynamic, where the semiotic forces are proposed to reside in infantile echolalia, rhythm, intonation, music. The subject of literature traverses the paternal law, the Symbolic, to attain the body of the Mother, the subversion of literature is thus a transgression of the incest taboo. Kristeva reiterates that psychosis, the foreclosure of the Name of the Father, and fetichism, the refusal of the jouissance of the attainment of the Mother's body by the positioning of a phallic Mother, are the two limits bordering literature. The first results in a psychotic non-communicative babble, the second in an objectivisation of the pure signifier.

Where there is a development is in the question of style. It is Céline's style, that is, the individuality of
his writing and its intersection with the body that produces the subversive effects of the semiotic. Kristeva identifies these in phrastic rhythms and obscene words (p.166), and she adds that, in the case of Céline, it is not a question of a subversion of the rules of 'classical poeticity' but a confrontation of the body, the identification and rupture of the body, with the community. To this extent the style of Céline recalls a crisis common to every ego. The problematic in question here is no longer of the political/theoretical project, variously Marxist or anarchistic, that finds in a monumental history of literature a channel for its cultural revolution but of the crisis that is involved in the conflict between individual and community (already present in Kristeva's analysis of Sollers's H). This ethical concern is increasingly present in Kristeva's writings, and it also permits a rereading of the previous work that detects this problematic from the essay on Barthes in 1971, which stressed the ethical concern of a 'cohesion' of the semiotic with the Symbolic.23 The question of the subject of literature is now more indicative of the crisis of the transition of any subject into sociality.

The non-verbal - the abject

A corollary of this emphasis on the crisis of subjectivity is evident in Kristeva's work since then; Céline is the principle literary figure in this crisis,
but it achieves a different aspect in 'Ellipse sur la frayeur' and 'La maternité selon Giovanni Bellini', both on non-literary subjects, film and painting, and as a result published outside TQ, in *Communications* and *Peinture* respectively. The first restates the semiotic/Symbolic dynamic in terms of 'specular seduction and 'la frayeur', while the second celebrates Bellini's traversal of the *jouissance* of the Mother through colour, opposed to Leonardo da Vinci's fetichisation and cult of the phallic Mother. Perhaps a symptom of the limits of the affirmation of the semiotic in literature or of the *traversée* is the fact that Kristeva is led to focus on the non-verbal, where colour, tone, 'frayeur', 'terror' (p.375) are ranged with the semiotic. The semiotic is no longer the affirmed moment of an avant-garde project, but a painful experience for the subject in crisis. The utopian support of the avant-garde becomes an ethics of the cure. This is implicated in the political movements of TQ. In the 'Pourquoi les Etats-Unis' discussions Kristeva explicitly marks this turn when she emphasises as an aspect of the U.S. avant-garde, the non-verbal; dance, painting, film (p.4). The turn away from the project of the avant-garde is a turn from the 'revolution of poetic language' that as a symptomatic limit turns to the non-verbal.

The subject of literature, revolutionary in the case of Artaud, Bataille, Lautréamont, Mallarmé, in the case of Céline is an exception, a singularity. This shift, as we suggested, implies further shifts in the semiotic/
Symbolic dynamic.

If in the earlier texts of the 'project' Kristeva affirms the poetic subversion of the Symbolic as a kind of anarchistic/political revolution, the experience of psychoanalysis, also perhaps of childbirth and maternity lead to a more nuanced conception of the 'traversée'. In 'Polylogue' Kristeva writes of:

'la violence qui me ronge...dissout l'identité et les cellules' (p.175), 'silence violent, pulsion, vide heurtée et à ce rebours parcours de la jouissance'(p.193), 'gaiété déchirée de la douleur'(p.198).

The terms are more of pain, violence. In 'Ellipse sur la frayeur' Kristeva refers to Sollers's phrase in Paradis, 'Ecrire relève de la terreur'(p.375). Terror is also aggression...; Kristeva refers to Freud's description of the autoerotic sadistic pulsion that takes the ego of the subject as its object. The Hegelian, Bataillean terms of negativity and transgression become more stratified in terms of Freud's description of the transition into adulthood. Thus when Kristeva writes of abjection a propos of Céline this is prefaced by an analysis of infantile phobia, little Hans, and borderline cases of psychosis. Abjection relates to a 'narcissisme primaire' (p.54) where there is a fundamental ambiguity between the subject and the object, an ambiguity that results in violent affects of repulsion. Abjection is thus a return to a difficult, painful state between identity and non-identity, between subject and object that is related to a 'narcissisme primaire'. On its return in the present, abjection is a threat to social and individual cohesion. Literature can be a symbolisation of the abject, and
Kristeva's canon is recast to include Dostoyevsky, Borges, Artaud, Proust, Joyce, Kafka, Bataille, Sartre and Céline. The reference to Freud's 'narcissisme primaire' at the same time distances the postulation of a Hegelian negativity, a pre-symbolic force, and recasts this force in terms of a moment at the borderline of subjectivity. This moment is not one of transgression, but one of ambiguity. Kristeva thus maps out a non-Lacanian model that is also distinct from the Hegelian notion of a pre-Symbolic Real or negativity:

'C'est dire qu'il y a des existences qui ne se soutiennent pas d'un désir, le désir étant toujours d'objects. Ces existences là se fondent sur l'exclusion. Elles se distinguent nettement de celles entendues comme névrosés ou psychoses, qu'articulent la négation et ses modalités, la transgression, la dénégation, et la forclusion. Leur dynamique met en question la théorie de l'inconscient, dès lors que celle-ci est tributaire d'une dialectique de la négativité.' (p.14)

The abject is thus not a pre-symbolic abstract force that is effective in an anamnesis in the Symbolic, but an oscillatory ambiguity in the subject, a crisis of subjectivity, that returns from a space before the constitution of the Symbolic and the unconscious. Kristeva essentially opens up an area before the Symbolic in which there is already a kind of subjectivity, but which is threatened by the pulsional within it. Her theory is thus discordant with that of Lacan which exists 'within' the thetic moment of the Symbolic, as she identifies a subjectivity before the Symbolic. In the book on abjection, therefore, Kristeva separates her analysis of 'le rejet' that had emerged in the article on Artaud from the Hegelian notion of negativity, and this separation also confronts Lacan in as much as his Symbolic was
implicitly within this system. The 'narcissisme primaire' and 'le refoulement primaire' (p. 18) that Kristeva identifies radically transforms the relation of her work to Lacan and evade the problem of the existence or not of the general economy by bypassing the question of transgression.

We can see that the movement of Kristeva's thought in the 'seventies implies a passage from an insertion of the 'procès du sujet' in a project of cultural revolution linked through the Hegelian notion of dialectical negativity, through a 'painful' recognition of the crisis of this subjective experience, to a focus on an area prefatory to the Symbolic but not associated with Hegelian negativity. This movement is entirely consistent with Kristeva's engagement with psychoanalysis, and it defines TQ as a space of divergence not defined by a common theory or project except in so far as it is exceptional, i.e. in so far as it denies the project.

The subject of literature - Sollers

'Le dire pensant'

While the theoretical writing of Kristeva starts from a scientific formalisation and increasingly implicates the subject of theory in its writing, the theoretical writing of Sollers starts from writing to produce a theory. Theory is the thought that the practice of writing has created. Thus while the writing of Drame and Nombres produces the
theory of Logiques, the writing of Lois produces Sur le matérielisme, the writing of H and Paradis produces the various articles that appear in TQ, some of which are collected in Théorie des exceptions. Sollers's articles do not tend towards the elaboration of a coherent theory; they are aphoristic and encyclopedic; they apply a certain logic to what they consider. This logic is that of 'le dire pensant'[^30], a theory in the course of being produced in language through the effects of the signifier, of the voice upon the letter. Thus Sollers's non-fictional writing is always 'inscribed', with a sometimes impenetrable amount of complexity, in the form of his writing, in his style. Sollers's article on Artaud, 'L'état Artaud'[^31] is one of the first examples of this 'mode' of writing. The production of theory through the language of a subject immersed in the space of language, of the voice, is thus the fundamental basis of Sollers's theory, and of his writing in Paradis. This theory, despite being fragmentary, is nevertheless based on a logic, or a 'system', which we will now attempt to describe. This system is not restricted to TQ but we would see it as part of a long term strategy on the part of Sollers, so the logic of dissolution that it sets in place is partly the cause of the dissolution and dispersion of TQ and its eventual passage to L'Infini.
Psychoanalysis blocked

Sollers's articles confront psychoanalysis with literature. They examine, for example, a propos of the writers Joyce and Dostoyevsky, the extent to which psychoanalysis was blocked in its attempt to analyse the subject of literature. Literature can in turn turn a critical gaze onto psychoanalysis and analyse it, as it does in Kristeva's theory. For Sollers, a nodal point of the articulation of literature and psychoanalysis is the question: 'D'où viennent les enfants ?', the title of one of Sollers's articles. The answer, 'le corps de la mère' (p.18) is the body Sollers's theory postulates as this blockage. Already present in the earlier essay on Dante is the notion of the traversal of the Mother, which Sollers metaphorises here as 'sortir d'Egypte', in other words the realisation is that the Mother, thus incest, thus Oedipus is a screen that allows discourse to function. (cf. the article "Folie"-mère-écran). The circulation of signs, of language, is closed at its possible hole, ('trou') by the screen of the Mother. This is what allows Freud to say that it is a refusal of femininity that is the condition of social discourse, and what Sade and Joyce suggest in their work, which Sollers had pointed out. We could indicate that all this depends of the view of the Mother, and the resonance Sollers's transgressive approach to his postulation of the Mother has with the reader. However, like Lacan's Name of the Father, the Mother is
perhaps a shifter, a 'maternal metaphor' that has a universal resonance.

Religion is the 'system' that, for Sollers, most consequentially thinks through the position of the Mother. In 'Vers la notion de Paradis' Sollers considerably widens the frame of reference of his 'system' by marking the engagement of a reading of the Bible that Paradis has forced through. The reference to the Bible, to religion and to the question of the sacred is the key to the development of Sollers's theory, 'applied to' and 'engaged by' the logic of the text. This articulation permits an elaboration of the theory that is not closed within the necessity of reference to Marxism or psychoanalysis. Religion is essentially a corridor for the articulation of this theory.

'Le Semblant'

To attempt to sketch out Sollers's theory, we can begin from the proposition, in 'Le Pape' that 'le monde est une illusion, un mensonge'(p.218). The circulation of signs, of meaning in language creates a system of representations that are nonetheless illusory; this circulation is thus 'le semblant', that may also be compared to Guy Debord's 'Spectacle'. Sollers proposes this realm of 'le semblant' as the world that is defined by the common measure, the social: 'Le semblant est la texture de l'étant'. 'Le semblant' is a Lacanian term referring to the imaginary consistency that the symptom
gives to the subject's existence." Sollers reforms it to refer to the world of representations, while Kristeva affirms Sollers's use of the term in 'Le vréel' where she writes:

'Le langage est alors toujours du semblant, vraisemblable mais jamais vrai' (p.20).

'Le semblant' in Sollers's use of the term does however resonate in Lacan's usage in that for Sollers 'le semblant' affirms the idea of a common measure, of a collective unconscious or a cofraternity, a rationality while for Lacan the same sense of consistency is connoted, a consistency which paradoxically makes the subject 'different'. We will return to the intersection of Sollers with Lacan. For the moment we can conclude that an essential element of Sollers's 'system' is a vision of the social, of discourse, what Kristeva calls the 'polis' as an illusory system of representations, a 'spectacle'. Sollers can thus be seen to occupy a specific place in a long tradition of moralists who argue for the illusory nature of the social, from Parmenides to Guy Debord.

The next important point to make is that reproduction is part of the realm of 'le semblant'. As Kristeva and Lacan affirm, sexual identity is an aspect of the Symbolic, it is not pre-given. It is part of Sollers's theory that reproduction is an effect of language. This joins with Lacan's proposition that 'there is no sexual relation', sex does not stand as a biological fact outside language. Sollers thus follows a tradition of thinkers who deny the existence of 'nature'. Sollers's thought is entirely consistent with that of Lacan in proposing no non-
Symbolic, 'natural' sexuality. Meanwhile, we can recognise that what we proposed earlier as a criteria for literature; its relation to the infinite, is repeated here in the situation of the limits of language.

The limits of language

Wittgenstein proposed that the limits of language are the limits of thought. Consequently, we can see that whatever is posed as outside these limits becomes 'sacred' or unthinkable. The important gesture, it would seem, for Sollers, is to propose that language has no limits, that it is infinite. The limits of language being posed, what is outside appears as transcendent, and the question therefore implicates religion. Sollers's fundamental step is to propose to go through this question by emphasising religion to the limit. What is posed as outside language, sex for example, is the condition of religion. If the Mother for example is posed as the limit of language, the Symbolic being coincident with the limit of the incest taboo, there is a religion of the Mother, which for Sollers is the condition of society, specifically French society. Sollers's gesture, transgressing this religious law, is to emphasise that the Mother is a daughter, of a father...." The error is to pose a limit to the transgressive movement of language that in fact remains within its limits.

In this investigation of religion which is undertaken to evacuate the possibility of any religiosity whatsoever,
Sollers focuses on Catholicism, which is for him the religion that itself evacuates the possibility of the religious. In the 1978 essay 'Le Marxisme sodomisé...' both Marxism and psychoanalysis are signalled as limited in their attempt to impose a rule, a common measure; the exception affirming this rule. Sollers announces his attempt to move towards a different conception of the exception, or in other words, of the subject. In the Trinity, and the Immaculate Conception, Sollers shows how Catholicism proposes a hole, 'trou' in 'le semblant'. The Virgin Mary is a hole in the realm of reproduction, the only real hole that is not blocked up by a phallus or fetish that 'crowns' the Trinity and enables the paradoxical equivalence of three in one. Mary is at the same time mother and daughter of her son. Catholic 'dogma' is the 'negation of the negation' that negates firstly death, in the Assumption or the Resurrection of Christ, and reproduction or sex in the 'effet BVM'(Bienheureuse Vierge Marie).

While it may be argued that Sollers's writing amounts to not much more than provocative wordplay, we can counteract this by affirming that it is precisely wordplay that becomes important in a literary reassessment of language. The effects of the signifier, 'paragrammaticism' in Kristeva's sense, become crucial, and produce meaning. This at the same time transforms the relevance of religion here; it is not relevant for what it says about religion but for what it says about the limits of language. Beyond
this, if we read Sollers's 'system' against him for a moment, religiosity is mere posture.

The negation of the negation

The negation of the negation implies that existence, the phenomenal is a fall from the infinite, that the subject is a 'déchet'. Sollers points out the equivalence between 'n'être' and 'naître', this homophony indicating how Sollers's theory is produced at the level of the signifier, of its combinatory logic, a fact that in a sense anchors the theory of the transgressive movement of language in what it seeks to prove. Catholicism, in the Trinity, enables this negation of the negation that transgresses the closure of the 'semblant' towards the infinite.

Sollers's radical proposition is that infinity is not 'outside' language but that language is an infinity, a nameable infinite that we have already called the 'transfinite'. His writing attempts an infinitisation of language by the 'débordement' of the closure of 'le semblant'. What Sollers thus proposes is an abandonment of the illusion that language represents something or that it is limited, and an entrance of the subject into 'le dire pensant', the possibilités of the infinite of language, 'l'infini virtualité des langues'.

It should be evident that the logic of literature in question here is a reformulation of that produced earlier in Logiques, but applied to different areas. It is a
consistent theory that maintains a transformative view of literature, seen as an opening of a closed system. If we now look more closely at the subject of literature, it becomes clear that, after the divergences of the systems of Marxism, the subject of literature is an exception. The exceptional status of the subject is attained through the traversal of the experience of writing.

The logic of the exception

In 'Le Marxisme sodomisé...', the 'je ne sais quoi' referring to Catholicism Sollers proposes a new vision of the exception other than as that which confirms the rule. This is centred on the the question of the name, a previous emphasis of 'La science de Lautréamont'. Sollers writes that:'le semblant est la texture de l'étant..qui permet à penser que les noms sont équivalents.'\(^{57}\) The reproduction of the name, Father to son, is a 'reproduction dans la parole' (p.36) that must be interrupted in language in order to constitute an exception, a singularity. This 'coup dans le langage'(p.36) is effected by Lautréamont, Joyce, Sade, who 'pass through the name' or Name of the Father by a 'redoublement'\(^{58}\) of their name. The name is thus included in the tissue of language but exceeded by the overflow of signifiance. Writing turns the name from a Name of the Father into a name of the exception. Thus 'le nom, vocalement, sort du semblant'.\(^{59}\) In 'Lettre de Sade' Sollers condemns the mutation of the name of Sade into an
adjective, and the repression of the fact that Sade lived and died, that he was a singularity that was outside the rule. In terms of the subject of literature, the ’passage through the name‘ involves a realisation that, as Nietzsche wrote : 'I am all the names of history'. In other words, the literary exception can only be constructed through intertextuality, through a traversal of all the possibilities of other texts in the text, and a transfinite movement beyond this.

The subject of literature therefore becomes an exception through a passage through language, to the point where he can 'occupy' his name. This occupation (our term) refers not only to the fact that when we use the word 'Shakespeare' we think as much of a text, a body of language, as a historical individual, but also to the physical occupation of the body by language. Writing is not a Derridean impersonal process but a profoundly sensuous invasion of the body by language, an inhabitation of the body by the voice, to the point where the body becomes a name, an exception at the transfinite point of language. The logic of the exception is not only theoretical, it is also physical.

A Jesuitical position

Following this argument and tracing its historical echoes, we can articulate Sollers's position as Jesuitical. Sollers's education by Jesuits is perhaps not without consequence. A number of points of
intersection can be detected. Firstly in an essay entitled "Eloge de la casuistique" from 1978, Sollers praises Graçian for having recognised that:

'le langage, en ce monde, est en trop, est la figure même d'un excès qui indique, comme à l'envers, le trop-plein divin qui vide et gonfle en même temps les phénomèmes.' (p.34)

Language is thus identified as an excess that appears as the divine:

'le verbe peut donc nous accompagner au-delà des fins de tout ce qui a été fait et se fera jamais.' (p.37)

As in the experience of Loyola, 'codified' by Barthes, language traverses the positioning of the subject:

'Une autre idée de l'écriture est cependant possible: ni décorative ni instrumentale, c'est à dire en somme seconde, mais première, antécédente à l'homme, qu'elle traverse, fondatrice de ses actes comme autant d'inscriptions.'

Sollers thus proposes an ethics of the traversal of the subjective and the phenomenological by the combinatory logic of language.

The subject of Paradis - alienation, multiplicity and prophecy

What does this mean for literary practice? What would a text that put into practice this logic look like? Since the theory is itself produced by the writing of Paradis, it is probable that it would look like Paradis. First of all, the subject is alienated. The experience of reading Paradis is a subjection to an incessant stream of writing, which effaces any original subjectivity in writer or reader and immerses them in the mechanism of writing.

Secondly, we saw how in Kristeva's analysis of
Sollers's *Nombres* 'je' was a site of sacrifice, a point in an infinite curve. If literature is seen as a realisation of the infinite possibilities of language, the subject of literature is a subject who is able to traverse all the negations or fixations that the phenomenological imposes on the infinity of language. The subject of literature is thus an infinity of subjects or subject positions, a *multiplicity* of subjects. *Paradis* does not offer a single narrator but a proliferation of different subjects for each position of 'je'. At the same time, if literature is seen as the traversal of the limits of language and the occupation of a transfinite point, the subject of literature occupies a transfinite position. This position, one step beyond all possible subjective positions, is actually the place of God, the limit of language. The subject of writing assumes the voice of God, as the aim of literature is to desacralise everything so as better to indicate the radical materiality and infinity of language. The writing of *Paradis* is thus *prophetic*. The subject of literature establishes itself at the point of enunciation of prophecy.

This passage from alienation through multiplicity to prophecy is thought by Sollers in the notion of the 'tri'. The 'passage du sujet à son trinité' involves: 'la mise en place roulante, sélective des positions d'énonciations possibles.' (p.201) It describes the permutative positions of the subject in a process of traversal of the negation of the negation. Sollers describes the 'passage to the trinity' across these combinations:

1. 'J'écris donc je ne suis pas'
2. 'J'écris donc je suis l'Autre'
3. 'J'écris donc je dis que je ne suis pas et que je suis l'Autre.' (p.102)

1. is the thanatography, the death of identity, of the author in the traversal of writing. 2. is the alienation of writing where the subject is annulled in his identification with the Other, language; Rimbaud's 'Je est un Autre'. 3. is the position of the subject of literature who enounces these two positions in an énoncé. As Sollers had affirmed in 'La science de Lautréamont', writing is the '(des)énononciation de l'énoncé de l'énonciation.' Paradis thus produces the énoncé of the thanatography, disenunciation and dissolution of the subject of writing. A detailed reading of Paradis would look at its repetition, its different levels of enunciation, its oscillation between descriptive passages on a fetishistic society and epiphanic 'punctums' and the texture, the rhythm of the language used.

We analysed how in Logiques the experience of literature was interpreted differently by the writers concerned, Artaud or Mallarmé, Dante or Sade. Sollers's particular interpretation of the experience is to convert it into a prophetic, global vision that re-intervenes in the social arena. Since the experience of literature itself is antithetical to social discourse, to the discourse of the 'polis', it is not surprising that the prophetic subject of literature appears paranoiac. The voice of prophecy and of paranoia coincide. Paranoia is here nothing more than the vision of society from the point of view of literature. The 'para-dis' (through
speech) results quite logically in a para-noia, as it attempts a transformative reinterpretation of the world of discourse from a position at its limit.

It is also quite logical that 'para-dis' and paranoia should turn into parody. Parody is also a writing on a discourse that transforms it, this time through laughter. Parody is paranoiac to the extent that it sees and reinterprets everything from the perspective of an extreme position. Thus the novels of Sollers from Femmes, and Sollers's parody of the place and function of the intellectual, from the perspective of the writer, are quite consistent with the logic of literature we have sketched out. TQ is a limit that is crossed in this traversal; Chapter Five sets out the mechanism of this as a dissolution.
I. Marxism: the extension of theory

1. Théorie d'ensemble was a collection of articles published in December 1968 which provided a recapitulative summation of the work of the review up to that date, and a programmatic statement of the way the theory of the text was linked to both Marxism and psychoanalysis. It republished most of the articles from the Nouvelle Critique dialogues and the Cluny conference, and also included important liminary texts by Foucault, Derrida and Barthes. The book as a whole is representative of TQ's project at a certain moment, but TQ as such should not be identified exclusively, as it often is, with the project put forward in Théorie d'ensemble.

The effacement of production

2. Baudry: 'Écriture, fiction, idéologie'; 'Linguistique et production textuelle'. Goux: 'Marx et l'inscription du travail', in THE.
3. Ibid. p.130.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid. p.131.

Critique of the general equivalent

10. 'Numismatiques I' (TQ35) follows the genesis of the general equivalent referring to Lacan for the Father and the Phallus. II (TQ36) follows the consequences and develops a counter-ideology.
12. Ibid. p.59.

Kristeva's semiology and Marxism

14. Cf Gregory Elliott, Althusser, the detour of theory. Perry Anderson, Considerations on Western Marxism.

Ideology


Epistemology

17. Kristeva, art. cit. p.84.
19. Ibid., Chapter Two, 'Les nouvelles aventures de la dialectique'.
20. The scientific reference for TQ during this period seems to have been the work of the periodical Cahiers pour l'analyse. This group,
including Jacques-Alain Miller, Alain Badiou, Yves Duroux, Michel Tort were all ex-pupils of Althusser at the Ecole Normale Supérieure. TQ's reference to this group again shows its 'hidden' reliance on a Bachelardian epistemology.

21. Cf. Benoist, op. cit p.70 'la notion de dépense introduit en effet la lézarde d'une négativité non médiatisable'.

Contextual pressure

22. 'La Révolution ici maintenant' and 'Mai 1968', TQ 34 Summer 1968; Sollers,'Contestation ou Révolution', La Nouvelle critique, June 1968.

23. 'Rousseauisme', 'Mai '68', TQ34 p.94. Barthes, in his 'second version' of 'Drame, poème, roman' for THE adds a critique of spontaneity as 'le comble de la convention', (p.33). The real intellectual mentors of the students were people like Marcuse, and the Situationists, influenced by the Hegelian Marxist currents of the late fifties. (Lefebvre, Castoriadis, Lefort, Edgar Morin) The key word was alienation, which indicates the Hegelian perspective.

24. TQ 34 p.94-5. TQ 34 announces the Groupe d'études théoriques with a text entitled 'La Révolution ici maintenant', which contrasts with the Surrealist/Trotskyist 'La révolution d'abord et toujours' and is a critique of the 1968 revolt, contrary to the interpretation of Keith Reader in Intellectuals and the left in France since 1968, Basingstoke, 1987, p. 10. It is declared that the 'révolution ici maintenant' is 'textuelle' and that theory is affirmed against 'éclectic and sentimental individual activities', TQ 34 p.4. The Bataille text published for the first time, 'La "vieille taupe" et le préfixe sur dans les mots surhomme et surréaliste', is re-inserted in a context of a critique of Surrealism and 'icarian revolt', in which the 1968 revolutionaries are undoubtedly the target. The articles by Hollier and Sollers of TQ 34, 'Le savoir formel' and 'La grande méthode' elaborate TQ's position as anti-surrealist, anti-spontaneist, Marxist Leninist and theoretical, an indication of how strategic positions are effected through the transformation of context of the Bataille article, or how strategy is a function of the interpretation of Bataille.

25. There is also a longer term effect of 1968 that rebounds on Marxism through the contestation of those who would become the 'Nouveaux philosophes'.


29. This at least is the thesis of Deleuze and Guattari in Anti-Oedipe, Paris 1972, Minuit, and Jean-François Lyotard in Des dispositifs pulsionnels, Paris, 1973, 10/18.


32. The 'Mouvement de Juin 1971' had its own organ which brought together reports from Maoist and anarchist movements in various
universities. Its approach was highly polemical and typical of a revolutionary 'tract'. It lasted for about four issues. The Movement also published material in Peinture, cahiers théoriques.

33. TQ43 p.3.
34. The Groupe d'études théoriques met in the Rue de Rennes, charging a nominal admission fee. Such luminaries as Lacan, Deleuze, Klossowski attended the sessions. It was suspended in 1971 when TQ is split over the PCF alliance.
35. Cf. Denis Hollier, Le Collège de Sociologie, 10/18.

The philosophical expansion - dialectical materialism

36. Pleynet, 'Sade lisible' TQ34 and THE.
40. Sollers, 'Lénine et le matérialisme philosophique' SLM.
42. Derrida, 'Hors livre' in La dissémination, p.12.

Heterogenisation of contradiction

46. Kristeva, 'L'engendrement de la formule' TQ37, 38 and S.

Pluralisation of the dialectic

47. Sollers, 'Sur la contradiction' TQ45 and SLM.
48. Also 'morcelement' and 'diffraction' cf. Benoist, art. cit.

Ideology and signifying practice

53. Sollers, 'Thèses générales' TQ44.
II. The extension of theory - Psychoanalysis

Between Derrida and Lacan

2. Ibid. p.307.
3. Michel Tort, 'L'effet Sade', TQ28 p.75. Michel Tort, moreover, was a member of the Cahiers pour l'analyse group, sympathetic to Lacan, but from the different standpoint of Althusserian epistemology (later criticised by Sichère in 'Sur la lutte idéologique' TQ52,3).
7. Baudry, 'Freud et la "création littéraire"' TQ32 and THE.

Perversion, play, 'après - coup' and infinite analysis

14. Ibid.  
15. Guyotat, 'Bordels boucherie' TQ36. Sollers's article 'La matière et sa phrase', Critique 290 July 1971, is a highly developed psychoanalytical reading of Guyotat's Eden, Eden, Eden, referring to Freud on fetishism, Melanie Klein's infant analysis, Ferenczi and work done by Guy Rosaloto, among others, in the Nouvelle revue de psychanalyse.

Fragments of Lacanian theory

17. The texts seem to propose a topology analogous to Lacan's Real/Imaginary/Symbolic, effecting a demystification of the Imaginary, often referred to as a screen, and an opening of the Symbolic, figured as a circle or sphere, to the Real. Henric's Archées can be read as variants of Lacan's vector of signification in the 'graph' (Ecrits II. p. 165.). An article prepared for publication, possibly part of a larger work on the TQ novel in general, looks at these texts in this light.

III. The intervention of Julia Kristeva

3. 'Mémoire' L'Infini I p.43-44.

The project of semiotics

4. Kristeva's book Le texte du roman is partly inserted in S and in 'Du symbole au signe' in TQ34, so there is no justification in seeing it as a pre-TQ text (as does John Lechte in Julia Kristeva, London,
1990, Routledge, p.102), except perhaps in what it owes to the work of Lucien Goldmann, nevertheless already surpassed by Kristeva in her analysis.


10. Cf also Kristeva's essay on Barthes 'Comment parler à la littérature' *TQ*47 which is however concerned more with the ethical aspect of Barthes' enquiry. See later.

11. 'Le sens et la mode' p. 1006.

12. Sollers compares the constitution of the TQ committee to such a transfinite organisation.


14. Kristeva's work contrasts with the formalism of Todorov, Genette, Greimas et al and radically transforms the context of poetics in France. The 'sober *foyers*' of *Communications* and *Poétique*, however , continue to function as before, evidence of their resistance to the force of someone Barthes called 'L'étrangère'.

15. 'La Sémiologie comme science critique', *THE* p. 82.

16. 'La sémiologie est ainsi un type de pensée où la science se vit (est consciente) du fait qu'elle est une théorie. A chaque moment où elle se produit , la sémiologie pense son objet, son outil et leur rapport, donc se pense, et devient dans ce retour sur elle-même la théorie de la science qu'elle est.' Ibid. p. 82-3.


**The logics of poetic language**

18. Kristeva uses Chomsky's transformational linguistics to shift the stasis of structuralism but criticises it for its reliance on a Cartesian subject and on a subject-predicate sentence structure. She proposes a 'nominal' sentence structure based on a modifier - modified structure.


22. 'Pour une sémiologie des paragrammes' *TQ*29. p.55.


26. Kristeva is also partly inspired by the 'dialogic' of Bakhtine, whose work she introduces into France.
Towards the subject of process, the non-subject

38. 'Une approche possible du sunyavada' TQ 32.

The fallen subject

39. 'L'Engendrement de la formule' TQ37 p.35.
40. TQ 38 p.67.

The silent woman

41. Sollers, L. p.60. quoted by Kristeva, TQ 38 p.70.

The subject of literature - Kristeva

2. Most of Pleynet's work is collected in Art et littérature, Paris, 1976, Seuil, Coll. TQ. Pleynet's art criticism, and his theoretical articles, no less a part of the theory of 'TQ', demand a separate study due to considerations of space, but, to point out the basic problematic involved, in 'La Folie thétique' Pleynet is concerned with the experience of the literary subject in the same way as are Sollers and Kristeva, and this involves a similar experience of subjective 'vacuity' as that elaborated in different terms by the latter two. Pleynet ends this important essay with the phrase' J'y...
suis de ne pas y être et d’y être je n'y suis pas' which programmes his writings on literature, art and psychoanalysis in TQ. A further aspect of Pleynet's input is a focus on the historicity of modern culture, which he is also concerned with in the recent Les Modernes et la tradition, Paris, 1990, Gallimard.


**Fragmented theory**


**Artaud / Bataille**


**Lacan**

10. RLP p. 43.
11. Cf. 'Le sujet en procès' P. p.57. In 'Noms de lieu' (TQ68 Winter 1976) her reference is rather to Winnicott.
13. 'D'une identité l'autre' P. p.165.

**Lautréamont / Mallarmé**

14. RLP p. 207.

**Céline**

15. PH, Back cover rubric.
16. 'Ellipse sur la frayeur et la séduction speculaire' in Communications 23 1975, special number on film (and in P.).
17. 'La maternité selon Giovanni Bellini' Peinture 10-11 Dec. 1975 (also in P).
18. 'Un nouveau type d'intellectuel, le dissident' TQ 74 Autumn 1977 ; 'La dissidence comme réfutation du discours de gauche' TQ76 Spring 1978.
19 'Héréthique de l'amour' TQ4 Autumn 1977.
20. Eg. in 'Matière, sens, dialectique' TQ44 and 'Expérience et pratique' in P.
21. 'D'une identité l'autre' P. p.159.
22. 'Polylogue' TQ57 and P. p.175-6.
23. 'Comment parler à la littérature' P. p.25.

**The non-verbal - the abject**

24. 'Ellipse sur la frayeur' P. p.379, section on 'Frayer et séduction'.
25. 'La maternité selon Bellini' P. p.416.
27. In PH.
28. As J. Rose notes, (op. cit. p.152) Kristeva refers to the work of André Green on the 'affect'. This stress on the affect that traverses the Symbolic is part of a non-Lacanian analysis. The question remains, however, of the interpretation of the affect 'as' affect, engaging in an unsolvable oscillation between language and non-language.


The subject of literature - Sollers

'Le dire pensant'

30. 'le dire pensant'is a phrase from a personal interview with Sollers. See separate volume.


Psychoanalysis blocked

32. 'D'où viennent les enfants' TQ65 Winter 1976.

33. '..tout le problème étant de savoir ce qui est arrivé ou pas à sortir d'Egypte.' 'Histoire de femme' TQ88 Spring 1981 p.36.

34. 'Folle' - mère - écran' TQ69 Winter 1977 and 'D'où viennent les enfants' : 'La mère occidentale est alors cet écran refermé, momifié, repucelé, ravagé, revirginisé à l'envers....' p. 19.

35. Sollers, 'D'où viennent les enfants' ; 'Freud insiste : c'est de toute façon la féminité qui est refusée par les deux sexes.' p.19. 'et le fait qu'une femme se soit acharnée contre lui prouve qu'il excède bien, en ce point, ce qui de l'homme, en la femme, refuse la femme', 'Lettre de Sade' THEX p. 56. 'ce qu'il (Joyce) 'déplace' c'est très exactement la place de la paranoïa féminine.' 'Joyce et cie' THEX. p. 93.

36. 'Vers la notion de Paradis II' TQ75 Winter 1978.

37. 'Le Pape', TQ84 Spring 1980 and THEX.

'Le Semblant'
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The writing effect

The logic of literature for which TQ produce the theory is also put into practice in the texts written by the writers involved with TQ. Our approach is broadly historical, beginning with the first texts and tracing the development of the approach specific to TQ. There is not so much a 'TQ group' as a constant and consistent experience running through a series of texts. The following section attempts to delineate the characteristics of this series of texts, to define which particular texts are in question, therefore to distance other textual approaches, and finally to offer a reading of some of these texts. For reasons of conciseness and focus, a choice has been made to limit these readings to only five texts (Sollers's Drame, Nombres, and Lois, Denis Roche's Le Mécrit, Pleynet's Stanze). Further analyses of novels by Jean-Louis Baudry, Jacqueline Risset, Jacques Henric, Pierre Rottenberg could not be included here for the reasons stated above. They present similar textual strategies although each work introduces a new problematic and merits a separate consideration.

These texts are not 'representative' of the TQ text as such, although it could be said that Sollers's novels present the characteristics of the text that his theory postulates. There is always an element that falls outside the theory, however; our approach has been to read it not
against the theory, but as an extension of it into other areas, the distinction between theory and fiction being blurred by the realisation that both are writing. Reading here cannot be separated from the activity of writing which it strives to follow and which it is. The reading of a text is its transposition into a different space. Consequently, the readings offered here are not in the terms of literary criticism or text analysis, although sometimes they may fall into that mode; they strive to be themselves a writing, produced by the encounter with the texts that inspire them. This 'writing effect', as we might term it, can be seen to radiate outwards throughout the thesis, to produce an open and transgressive effect in the tone of closure and finality of the enterprise of writing a thesis.

Pre-texts

The texts by Sollers (Le Parc), Thibaudeau (Une Cérémonie royale), Ricardou (L'Observatoire de Cannes), Baudry (Le pressentiment) and Faye (Battement) from 1960 to 1962 are 'pre-TQ' texts, although extracts from some of them are published in the review.

Thibaudeau's Une Cérémonie royale owes much to Robbe-Grillet, but also hints at the future development of Thibaudeau's work in the 'contamination' of the objective description by 'emotive' connotations which imply a subjective point of view nevertheless not reducible to the identity of a narrator.
Ricardou's approach remains more within the limits of the Nouveau-roman, though developing the ambiguity between the text and the real.

Baudry's *Le Pressentiment* approaches the TQ text from the direction of Proust, rather than from Robbe-Grillet. It features a first person narration which privileges moments of emotive tension and makes them intervene in the text, which is sometimes ruptured by 'blanks' within the page. The writing is exceeded by the subjective dimension and the 'silence' of this excess affects the text.

Faye's *Battement*, recognised by Sollers¹, is also removed from the TQ approach due to its psychological orientation. It features some aspects of the TQ text such as the displacement of the narrator from 'je' to 'il', but relates this not to the writing, the text, but to the psychology of the subject. The writing appears as the representation of an exterior reality. Faye's approach is clearly distinct from that of TQ. *Analogues* remains within this perspective but presents itself more as a reflection on the trilogy of previous texts, of which *Battement* is the last.²

Sollers's *Le parc*³ is important due to the relation to the Nouveau roman it articulates, but also remains prefatory to what we identify as the TQ text. The Robbe-Grilletian objectivism of the descriptions of what the narrator sees from his balcony can be seen to be undermined by or articulated with the subjective dimensions of memory and imagination, and by the scene of the writing itself. What is interesting in *Le parc* is not
so much the extent to which the novel can be described in a critical framework applicable to Robbe-Grillet, but the extent to which the more characteristically Sollersian elements of the novel exceed that framework. The objectivism of the novel is thus exceeded by the elements of subjective excess, dream, memory and imagination, and by the 'scene of writing', which doubles the scene of vision.

For the novel it is after 1963 that the specificity of TQ's approach begins to emerge. Foucault's article 'Distance, Aspect, Origine' and the 1963 Cérisy conference play a part in this emergence, defining this specificity. Baudry's Les Images, Sollers's Drame, Rottenberg's Le Livre partagé and Thibaudeau's Ouverture present the first grouping of TQ novels, while the novels by Sanguineti and Maurice Roche are important presentations of writers outside the review with approaches parallel to those of TQ. We have argued elsewhere that Sanguineti's work remains to an extent within a realist problematic. The novels of M. Roche, however, are an important and highly individual strand of TQ's textual activity, extending the radicalism of the text into the subversion of typography and a polyphony of textual voices.

Continuity and consumption

It is evident that the first, prefatory, period privileges the Nouveau roman, while after 1963 and the dépassement of the latter, with the input of a critical
reflection in the review and outside it, the TQ novel is roughly contemporaneous with the creation of the 'Collection TQ'. In poetry, Pleynet's Provisoires amants des nègres represents his poetic work from 1958 to 1962 and owes much to the Heideggerian nostalgia that we have already outlined. Paysages en deux suivi des Lignes de la prose, as its title indicates, plays on the duality of the referential and the auto-referential dimensions of the text and begins to approach a more radical perspective. Comme is the fruition of this development and represents a transgression of the genre 'poetry' to become more relevant to the text as defined by TQ. Roche's work is highly individual from Récits complets, and accelerates its subversion of poetry up to Le Mécrit in 1972. Roche's work is in a sense a single and singular adventure, which, although an important part of TQ's textuality, remains distinct from it and does not develop in the same way.

Drame, Les Images, Le livre partagé and Comme develop a fiction in which the notions of identity and of narrative are replaced by a continuity between writing and reading and by a 'consumation' of the text, the continual effacement of its own writing. Baudry's metaphor of the superimposition of images becomes in Drame an internal effect of reading and is related, as it is also in Le Livre partagé, to a burning, a sacrifice, or a loss of vital body fluids. The subject of literature thus finds (him)self consumed, a subject of loss, and permuted across a series of pronoun positions as he is 'written' by the tracing and effacement of the novel. The novels outline a
fiction of permutation, continuity and consumption, implicating also the aspects of arbitrary structure and a subversion of typographic space.® These texts, published in 1964, 1965 and 1966, develop a fiction relative to the 'logic of fiction' outlined by Sollers. Reading as consumption renders irrelevant the notions of character, plot and realism, and re-situates the reading on the level of the economy of meaning, an economy of constant loss in which the reader is also caught.

Textual practice

The textual practice of the review as we define it can be seen from 1967 to at same time drop some of its less essential aspects, such as the work of Faye® and Ricardou®, and broaden to include other writers such as Severo Sarduy®, Jacques Henric® and Pierre Guyotat.® The works of Henric, Guyotat and Sarduy form a series of new departures that are informed by and inform the theory of TQ. From the committee, the work of Rottenberg® occupies a space between theory and practice that is restricted to the review, forming an irreducible block of writing continuously 'in process' in the review. Rottenberg's writing make TQ into something always more than a theoretical organ. TQ's theoretical activity is always doubled, in the review itself, by textual activity which presents a level of non-interpretatable, irreducible writing that anchors TQ into the practice of writing.

Tracing the development of the textual mechanisms at
work in these texts we can see a movement from a tautological encounter of the writing by itself (Comme, Le Parc) to a problematics of transgression. To the effects of the trace, effacement and dépense (Drame, Les Images, Le Livre partagé) are added the effects of permutation (Personnes, Nombres). From the 'mise en cause' of the subject is added a transsubjective process (Nombres, Jeu, Archées) which is articulated with a sexual 'traversée' beyond the effects of castration, the text effecting a dissection of its capitalisation by meaning or subjectivity (Nombres, Personnes, Archées). The text becomes a generalised perversion and a permutative writing of sex (Eden Eden Eden). The intertextual, transformative effect of the text is developed (Nombres, La 'Création'). The productive, generative process of the text and its relation to the surface or spectacle of the text is 'mise en scène' (Nombres, Archées). The text becomes a non-linear volume or 'scène' disposed by a structure or 'réseau' that does not restrict the text in a dialogue or a triangular closure but opens it out to an infinite 'signification' (Nombres, Scène).

In a second movement, with Sollers's Lois marking the new departure, the effects of the political context (1968) transform the text which becomes a parodic subversion of the ideological (Lois, Cobra). The text becomes a carnivalesque polyphony in its parodic rewriting of the ideological pre-text. Humour becomes a decisive element of the writing (Lois, Cobra). The formal transgression of the text focuses more closely on the material level of the
language, subverting the investment of ideology in the
signifier (Lois). In poetry, the subversive effects of the
signifier and the effects of a transgressive eroticism move
towards a destruction of the edifice of poetry (Eros
énergumène, Le Mécrit) while the aspects of poetry as
'chant' or 'incantation' are extended to a mythic level
where they are directed to subvert the historical
structures of ideology (Stanze).

Le Mécrit, Stanze and Lois diverge from the broad
'avant-garde' of the TQ text through the re-emergence of a
subject of experience in the text, or the specificity of
the enterprise. Other writers of the TQ group can be seen
to have reached a point of saturation in the exploration
of the formal effects of the text, its trace/effacement,
permutation, intertextuality, materiality, sexual economy.
Baudry publishes no more novels for TQ after La
" Création". Rottenberg no further texts. Henric's novels
(Chasses, Carrousels) extend the same process of Archées
to other cultures, other areas, but the essential textual
mechanism, the experience of reading, is the same. M.
Roche's technique progressivly disrupts writing by the
iconographic, verging towards a hieroglyphic text.¹²
J.Risset's poetry, after Jeu, proposes a less formally
experimental text in which the interest is more at the
level of the subjective experience inscribed, particularly
of femininity.¹³ Denis Roche diverts, tangentially, to the
novel and towards a photographic autobiographical
inscription.¹⁴ Sarduy's texts extend their exploration of
the 'other scenes' of non-Western religions.¹⁵
Sollers's Lois and Pleynet's Stanze are thus symptomatic of a divergence in TQ's textual practice, prefiguring a later effect of dispersion in the review. The 'individualised' practices of H, Paradis and Rime show how the texts of this moment fracture the collective practice of TQ. This suggests that to a certain extent the 'TQ text' is a dead end, but we would rather propose that it is a necessary process of traversal of a sacrifice of the subject to writing, which could become the production of a theoretically informed group. The continuation of the practice of Sollers, Pleynet, D. Roche, J.Risset is potentially more interesting as a writing 'beyond' the TQ text, in that it shows what the writer makes of the experience of this traversal.

Readings of texts

Sollers - Drame

In Drame the drama of the text is its writing. The novel enacts its own self-discovery, which is also a self-consumation, a burning that also begins Nombres, linking the texts as rings or chain links. The discovery does not move through an unveiling or a striptease, a succession of events. It wants to be instantaneous, total immanence. Nevertheless the text must amass a series of blocks of writing that are superimposed rather than horizontally linked in a temporal progression. Temporality is projected into spatiality. As a result of the denial of
fictional time, time as plot (récit), the structure of the novel is referred to a spatial structure rather than a temporal convention. In Drame the structure is twofold, first the 64 alternate sequences of the I Ching; secondly, the 64 squares of the chess board. Reading, we inhabit the chess board; the demarcation line between black and white is a physical reality. The squares make us as much their prisoners as the I/he who is at the same time their excuse and prisoner. The permutation of the I Ching between broken line and unbroken line is paralleled in the alternation of sequences 'in' 'Je' and in 'Il'. Permutation is also of identity. But permutation, while it makes the novel a repetition, not an unfolding, does not make it linear. Further implications of the projection of temporality into spatiality is that the text now appears not so much as a linear construction, but more as a constellation or galaxy. Drame often refers to itself as galaxy or sky and brings forth echoes from another text governed by the aleatory, Mallarmé's Un Coup de dés.

The spatial dimension of the text turns it into a materiality, and as such the drama of its material appearance is a visual spectacle, the visual/material spectacle of film. However, Drame seeks to evade the fixity of the spectacle, the realm of the spectacular which is entirely the realm of representability, the reduction of the materiality of anything which can be exchanged, made part of the economy of utility. The text is useless according to an economy of use, but affirmative in the realm of dépense. Thus, in Drame the word
spectacle is an ambiguous nexus of contradiction. Reading it across the text we can detect the traces of a critique of the 'society of the spectacle' alternating with the spectacle as simply the manifestation of the visible, the surface of the text. There is a constant dialectic of transgression between the text as spectacle and the text as production.

The text concentrates on the single moment of its tracing. The reading, which must also effect this (re-)writing is also focused (as a zoom lens) on a short textual space. The reading does not project forward or back, to a transcendent end, nor backwards to a cause. Reading, I am always brought to this point, a single note. Because reading is brought close to the point, almost static, there is at the same time no reason and every reason to continue. No reason because there is nowhere to get to, every reason because the point is never exactly a point, it is always (already) a desire for another point. Reading is now less a finding out, a possible justification or not of the spectacle, a self-denial, a referral outside itself or even to somewhere else inside the book, but an experience with the language and texture, an immersion in the fluid of sense and with the dynamics of its emergence. But the point is never completely self-contained, because the functioning of language wants the movement of signification. The point is always a trace. There can be no signifier without signification, no pure or present signifier. Drame is a novel to the extent that it is not a tableau, a stillness. It lives in sense
and sense is the fluid, the blood that circulates in its veins, the economy of its body. The emphasis on a fluidity of meaning moreover links with the writing's focus on an economy of loss, through corporeal excretions—blood, sperm, excrement. This dépense is at the same time corporeal and linguistic.

*

Sollers - Nombres

Nombres pre-empts and deconstructs its criticism and its reading is not an encounter with a plot or with themes. It is not a polythematism. The problem is that any descriptive approach to Nombres appears simply as an extension of its writing.

Nombres is an extension of Logiques into a different space, removed from the necessity of discussing Artaud, Bataille, Dante, but reintegrating, redistributing these logics in the space of fiction. What falls out in this extension is the Proper Name, the factual information, the code of discursivity that marks the 'essay' as a series of thoughts on a subject, logically articulated.

The affect of Nombres is such that, reading it, I am sometimes ejected from myself, I lose myself, its affective charge being greatest at the moments of eroticism and violence in the text, castration, fellatio, intercourse, urophilia, but also in the very movement of the body of language in which Nombres communicates. Here I
am affected, destroyed by my reading. We (discourse, code) do not read Nombres to the extent that we foreclose this affective response, a response that the difficulty of the text, its boredom, fragmentation and interruption, is the measure of.

Nombres is structured around the figure of the square. The square of Nombres, both surface and matrix, provides a frame for the novel that disallows any recourse to the idea of expression or emanation, and as a frame it brings representation into play. The square frames the writing and blocks any transcendence through the mechanism of its sequential rotation. Again, this is a textuality of repetition rather than teleology. What this enables is an infinite repetition that does not appeal to an infinite posited as beyond but recognises a tranfinite actuality in the next side of the square. The square also differs from the triangle in not proposing a summit, or the Hegelian dialectical pyramid which is the matrix of idealism.

Signified and signifier, irrespective of 'le sens', enumerate or disseminate themselves differentially. That is, there can be no equivalence, since any equivalence is already an infinitesimal difference. Nombres engages this mechanism of infinite and infinitesimal subversion, evacuating the possibility of an end or a beginning, a birth. Nombres presents the text as a shifting interplay between the impersonality of the numeration and the signifiance that the words bring forward. The mechanism is not all and is not abstracted,
there is no 'pure signifier', the mechanism is a numeration of language which undermines the status of authorship, expression and truth, while meaning is a movement which establishes cross-currents across the numeration. The subject is implicated in this machine not as operator but as victim, the subject is in effect disarticulated, decomposed in the textual machine (a more formally integrated version of Kafka's tattooing machine in 'In the penal colony'^), whence the constant use of the term 'décomposition' and its variants to refer to the dismemberment or 'morcellement' of the text and of 'je'.

**Nombres** is a machine that redistributes language. Its redistribution is made explicit in its 'samples' from other texts – mythical, scientific and political. The fragments are unattributed. They are not assignable to any Name (any Name of the Father), but they are signalled by 'guillemets', the sign for which in French has more in common with the parenthesis than the 'quotation mark'. Why not dispense even with these? Because what is important is that the reader experiences them as coming from somewhere else, as coming from somewhere. The reader experiences therefore the signalling of a discourse, a **topos**, place or territory (for Deleuze and Guattari^"^) that is outside the text. The vacillation between **topos** (discourse) and writing in the text, which is atopic, is indicative of the subversive effect the text has on ideology, whether idealist or materialist."^ Nombres does not present a materialist ideology but integrates and
redistributes fragments of texts in its text. The jouissance of writing is only experiencable in antithesis to the moment of discourse, of 'le récit', and the fragments of other texts, other territories. So the unattributed but signalled fragments function, as much as a genealogy of a repressed materialism, as a topos which the writing interweaves and decomposes. The fragments are already 'detrimentalised', taken away from their contexts, Nombres decomposes them still further by inserting them into the atopic dérive of writing, in which, however, they remain as blocks or pivots that cut up our reading and interject the topos of which jouissance is the pleasure of extenuation.

The movement of the writing in Nombres, continuing that of Drame, is a consumation. The effacing dépense of the text is this burning that was already happening, an ignition that is repeated continuously. This ignition is reiterated throughout the text. Burning as decomposition, of the text as presence and of the 'moi' also as such, of the body as image is also shifted, metonymically, to explosion and decapitation. The detonation of Nombres is, spatially, the movement from the plane of the present (4) to the generative signifiance of its dissemination (1,2,3), which is a saut, but also a rupture of the membrane of (4), of the screen, ('paroi', 'membrane', 'nappe', 'écran'). The jump between the present of writing to its generation is metaphorised as an explosion and a rupture. This explosion semantically communicates, between the semantic levels of the text, with the violence of
revolution, a violent rupture of the closure of the metaphysics of presence to the process of history. \textit{Nombres} is not a reflection of a historical process, but a performance of this process on a textual stage or in a textual topology.

The 'saut', rupture of the membrane, explosion of 'le paroi' is a spatial dispositive of the removal of the head, a decapitation. We can read here an echo of Mallarmé's 'Hérodiade'. The removal of the head, or perhaps, of a head within the head, of the head of capitation rather than the corporeal head that contains the brain, is as we have underlined a link between the spatial disposition of the text and its political semantic level (execution, removal of the head of idealism). It is also, moreover, linked semantically with the eroticism of the text, in which the body of the narrator is 'mise en jeu'. Like \textit{Personnes}, \textit{Nombres} dismembers, analyses the body as image, as it is represented in Western representative space, the specular image of the body undergoes, in \textit{Nombres} a violent dismemberment. The body is a 'corps morcelé', so that the text is played out across and around the organs. The corporeal in \textit{Nombres} is an organic corporeality in which the pulsation of organs rhythmically disposes a kind of disseminating flow from them. The membrane of the body is constantly threatened by the irruption of a dépense, the integrity of the body is lost in an explosion, its capitation also destroyed by a removal of the head and of the sex (the phallus and penis). Castration is the
sectioning of presence, the phallic centre, 'le moi', the integrating identity that stitches over the hole of femininity. *Nombres* is opened up by this castration, as its writing is a 'battement d'organes illimités' (p.14); castration permits this 'morcellement' as if the body's integrity were held together at these points of the head and the sex. *Nombres* is thus a writing in which 'je' becomes 'elle'.

What castration opens up is the possibility of *jouissance* by an opening of femininity, 'le trou' or 'la fente'. This is the sexual economy behind Sollers's writing, which is sexist if we consider that woman is thereby excluded from discourse, but feminist, paradoxically, if the text enounces the female *jouissance* of writing that phallocentricity blocks up. It may not, however, be a question of gender, in that the metaphoric castration (and castration of metaphor) here could be seen as a liberation of the femininity of masculinity. *Nombres* is nevertheless a text of *jouissance*, if *jouissance* is defined as a dissemination or dépense (or dispersion) of sense without reference to a fixed, phallic code. Barthes: *ce qu'il veut, c'est le lieu d'une perte, c'est la faille, la coupure, la déflation, le fading qui saisit le sujet au coeur de la jouissance.*

Lacan's theorisation of *jouissance* is perhaps too objectal, too much linked to an object (a), another object, but in so far as the *objet a* is a kernel of the Real, and a surplus that resists entry into the Symbolic, a heterogenous kernel or kernel of heterogeneity,* Nombres opens into the real and constantly chases the non-objectal *objet a* across its surface, around its volume. *Nombres*, in
other words, refuses the One, and opens the Symbolic up to the Real. This heterogeneity of the Real is in Nombres played across a dismembered body; the text is thus far from the Nouveau Roman in its refusal of objects as integral units; it decomposes objects, integrity, in its jouissance as fading\textsuperscript{2}, deflation, decomposition.

Signifiers in Nombres are plural, and act as knots between the material, phonic level of the text and its 'significance'. To read Air across the book, for example, is to bring into play this multiplicity of semantic levels, to make them function, but also to bring into play, to voice the sound R. Nombres plays on both the semantic and phonic levels, signifier and signified, crossing so that signifier becomes signified, R (sound)$\rightarrow$Air (fluide gazeux etc.) and signified signifier, Air $\rightarrow$ R (Section 1). The semantic emphasis on air, therefore, as atmosphere of vibrating germs is perhaps at the heart of Nombres : le souffle, which articulates air is the pulsating base of the writing, perhaps the objet petit a, the real kernal of jouissance. Le souffle is the textual and corporeal machine (that will be more precisely calibrated in Paradis). Le souffle is moreover the basis of 'la voix'. The vowels, 'fond brûlant de couleurs' (p.14) are modulated by the flow of 'le souffle' through the mouth, the voice emerges as a flow of air through the vocal chords, rythmically articulated by consonants, 'le nombrant', marks, notches on a body of sound, the maternal body of which the traversal is jouissance.

Le souffle is an object petit a, behind the fantasy
(the Imaginary) of a récit or a theme, le souffle is the irreducible reste, surplus, 'plus de jouir', of the Real that the text opens language (the Symbolic) into. The subject, in this topography is, as subject of the enunciation, subjected to the decomposing flux of language in its opening up to the heterogenous. The subject is analysed, castrated, 'morcéle' by the rhythmic numbering of the text as machine, as a breathing machine, a lung. 'Le moi' of the subject is decomposed, murdered in the text. The writing, as the passage through the maternal body of language, the possession (in the sense of violation) of the maternal body, violence inflicted against the maternal body, is also the death of the subject. Death here can be read as a death of egocentricity, after which the subject carries on living, surviving, as a non-subject. There is a difference between the 'continual' death of psychosis, and death as event, as cessation. This is a death within death, like that of M. Valdemar in Poe's story, which continues to breathe in the body. Death of the subject, of its integrity. 'ma mort' (p.65) is an echo of Bataille's Ma mère. The price for this possession and passage through the Mother, to her jouissance, her opening is the éclatement of je, his own jouissance through the exit from the phallus and into the dismembered organic jouissance of the material substratum. There is no sex as gender here, but perhaps an archi-femininity that is before the opposition of male and female. If Je is a male subject, the writing of Nombres disposes of Je.
Nombres is a novel of a 'prise de conscience' in which the 'prise' passes through a 'perte de conscience'; 'l'histoire de sa décomposition dans sa propre décomposition'. There is a jouissance inside jouissance, 'jouissant parfois à l'intérieur de sa propre jouissance' that prevents the writing from being ranged under the term psychosis. The Name of the Father is absent from the text, foreclosed; it returns in the Real to castrate and dismember the subject, but the latter enjoys this dismemberment, passes through and masters psychosis by enouncing this dismemberment, dismembering it. The text is thus a liberation of the subject from the tyranny of Logos, Law and Language, and the emergence of a jouissance of the organic body, the material substratum that is aphallic, acephalic, and also rooted in an experience of how the subject relates to the subjection it is, how the body relates to the stream.

Denis Roche – Le Mécrit

The use of typography to indicate the arbitrariness of the convention of poetry, a device which instead of resorting to 'vers libre' or an unpunctuated flow emphasises the convention in order to destroy and subvert it, is visible at a physical level in Denis Roche's Le Mécrit. The technique is referred to as 'surcodification' in the preface to the earlier Eros énergumène. This
subversion is a 'defiguration':

'Défigurer la convention écrite c'est, en écrivant, témoigner de façon continue que la poésie est une convention (de genre) à l'intérieur d'une convention (de communication).'(p.11)

In Roche's work it takes on a violent form, symptomatic however of the violent repression the idealist conception of poetry exerts on its violent heterogenous outside. The intensification of typography is a symptom of a neurosis; it is a neurotic extremism to the measure of the idealism (as neurosis) that poetry is. For Roche poetry is almost exclusively associated with the idealist, the neurotic, characterised by repression and sublimation. Poetic language, however, in Roche's texts can be understood in the light of Kristeva's theory, as a subversion by a heterogeneity that is repressed by the neurosis or sublimation of poetry.

The emphasis on typography in order to disfigure is thus intensified; this is most noticeable, at the limit of non-sense, in the series entitled 'Quatre textes', which present four pages proposing different poetic / typographic codes, including Chinese. The content of each page's typographic layout is frankly undecipherable, but the problematic is not of interpretation or of decoration. We are presented with an unreadable text in an immediately signifying code (signifying: this is poetry). The convention is thus subverted by the non-sense it contains. This at once points up the conventionality of the typographic code, it is an over-codification, and the heterogenous materiality language, writing can become when pushed to excess. This also points to the localisation of
the code, the Chinese text presents a totally different conception of space and writing than the other three Western texts. That the code is localised further deconstructs any pretention to universality or naturality on the part of the idealist poetic. In the final text of Le Mécrit the disfigurement of convention reaches further limits with the presentation of 'inscriptions' of indecipherable (Etruscan), absolutely heterogenous (for a non-Etruscan) blocks of text, doubled by a commentary in French itself disfigured to the point of non-sense. What in fact occurs in these texts is the 'pouring' of a poetic material into a mould ('empreinte') which imposes its typographic structure on the content and violently distorts its meaning. Historical, metalinguistic, erotic and parodic texts are poured in to the mould and the result is a 'zero degree of poeticity' marked by the structure only of the inscription.

The particular force of Roche's work can be seen, in this final limit of Le Mécrit, in its violence, a violence mimicked in the violent excision of quotation: 'je n'ai à dire que ma violente action d'écrire'(p.134) , 'que chaque / fois que j'écris la violence de l'endroit m&ocC/cope'.(p.135) The violence of Roche's work is not only typographic but semiotic, the undecipherable and 'foreign' texts have already been indicated as part of this, but the eroticism of the text is also part of its violence. The title 'Eros Energumène' signifies, as Roche writes:

'Il y a matière à convulsion pour celui qui écrit, dont on dit qu'il est énergumène, c'est à dire qu'il est agité par un enthousiasme déréglé ou une vive passion.'
Le Mécrit intensifies the subversion of convention by the heterogeneity of eroticism. An erotic poetry characterised by sublimation i.e. repression of its sexual character is precisely disfigured by the introduction of the obscene (the ob-scene), which opens the text to the effect of the violence of the return of the repressed. The 'récit' of intercourse is present in the text, as are words that have either an obscene or a biological register: coït, con, vulve etc. But this is not any kind of pornography. The words are inserted in a context that resists mimesis, and thus the words have to be read on their level of language. This highlights the written nature of sexuality, its basis in language. The transportation of the obscene into language is a gesture that is far from pornography and favourable to feminist ideology in basing sexuality not in nature but in language.

It is a female sexuality that Roche's writing envisages as a trou, a trou noir, which neurosis attempts to close (suture or foreclose itself to). However, there is a certain ambiguity as to whether 'le trou', as it appears in the text is vaginal or anal; there is a strong context of anality in Le Mécrit: 'A croire qu'aligner des merdes sans suite il va en sortir un début d'intestin / Prêt à toutes les roulures rhétoriciennes. Flooop.' (p.123) The text can be seen at times to revert to an orality and an anality previous to genitality, and it is in this oscillation that the ambiguity of the text's eroticism resides. Both 'stages' however are characterised by the pulsional. By
opening the text to the obscene the text becomes open to
the erotic as pulsional rather than the erotic as
neurotic, as retentive. Le Mècrit acknowledges this
pulsional aspect in its notation: 'faire aller et venir la
véhémence' (p.115); 'la pluie des phrases'. (p.37) The pulsation of
the text is also an element acknowledged by the text, the
line can in fact be seen as a pulsional 'unit', a rhythmic
articulation of drive (pulsion), its articulation being
pulsation, given that, as Lacan writes, drive itself is
not rhythmic.32 The line therefore articulates the drive,
the scopic drive, if we bear in mind also that Lacan
sharply separated the scopic from the invocatory drive33,
we could say that while the musical, incantatory effect of
the language may give pleasure, the division of lines
induces an experience of frustration. In *Eros énergumène*,
Roche writes of his texts as 'une série d'arcs réflexes passant
la rétine'. (p.9) and as 'la discipline rétinienne'. These arcs
are often single 'pulsions' which the end of the line
interrupts in mid-flow without continuation. The pulsional
rhythm of the text is crossed by another rhythm, syntactic
and semantic;, and the two subvert each other's
functioning. The pulsional rhythm of lines cuts off
syntactic units in mid-flow and fragments them, while the
syntactic flow can establish a continuity between lines
that ruptures this pulsation.

The text becomes a site of contradiction between the
material, pulsional base of the scopic, 'la discipline
rétinienne', and the invocatory drive, the phonetic rhythm
on one side, even while these two are also in conflict,
and the investment of sexual charge in the semantic material of the text on the other. At the same time as the pulsional text fragmenting and frustrating the text as a 'récit', and the syntax establishing a cross-current to the pulsional, the pulsional undermines the syntactic and semantic flow through the paragrammatism of the text. The text thus becomes at moments a motor of phonetic displacement that produces meaning only accidentally through this process:

' "6 / Je me balance entre l'énoncé d'un chiffre et le début d'une phrase qui pourrait être: "Un peu plus tard, un nouveau naufrage se produisit au large des phares. Le pilote était'.(p.49)

The f of chiffre produces phrase, the ase of which produces the age of naufrage which produces the arge of large which produces the ares of phares, of which the ph

This describes the formal mechanism of Roche's poetry. The content is also relevant, although a first reading may see it as subservient to the formal distortions of poetic conventions. It seems that Roche's poetic strategy for each 'series' of texts, since his first text 'Forestière amazônie', is to assemble a number of different texts, some of them his own, some those of other poets, some factual. The content of the texts is thus a juxtaposed series of fragments of different origins, with different 'modes'. The modes of the fragments - erotic, metalinguistic, metapoetic, theoretical, factual are interwoven and establish ambiguities in their juxtaposition. The metapoetic becomes the erotic, for example. So, through the use of a 'cut-up' technique
reminiscent of Burroughs, Roche subjects the *topoi* of the fragments he chooses to a *vident* dismemberment and confrontation not only with other conflicting *topoi* but also with the disfiguring effect of the poetic form he engineers. Reading, here, becomes partly an impossible hermeneutic experience, attempting to trace a meaning or a continuity between fragments, partly a hilarious production of an infinite possibility of meanings, because of the impossibility of *one* sense, mostly an experience of frustration due to the constant interruption of a content or a form that moves off in a different direction.

Roche uses a typewriter to write. "*Le ruban impersonnel de l'insatisfaction*"(p.61), operates not simply as a transcribing apparatus of a stream of consciousness (this is not *automatism* in the Surrealist sense) but as a mechanism intervening in the process of writing. This is evident in the intervention in the text of typographic characters that are not letters, (numbers, the signs & + = ) as well as the indiscriminate use of capitals. However, the 'secret' of Roche's writing is the use of the typewriter with a very high speed of inscription. This forces an inscription in which numerous errors appear, errors due to the 'précipitation' of the writing but also due to the 'return of the repressed'. What this way of writing forces through is a text in which the return of the repressed is deliberately intensified via the use of the machine, and the subject of the énonciation is himself undermined by the errors the machine and the speed of inscription effect. The text is
thus a 'tissue of errors', a tissue of hesitations, agglutinations, blockages, slippages of cogs in the mechanism of writing. The text is: 'un langage dont la sollic-solennité congédie' (p.21) 'Pas de limite - pas de limite au plaisir du mélange'. (p.22) The precipitation of the mechanism forces errors and then is interrupted and shifts to different words or sentences, leaving the initial error or errors intact. This not only undermines the idea of expression through the intervention of the mechanism, but exhibits the process of writing typographically. It often leads to an agglutination in the text: 'hélène non grosse aboutie alla langgueO' (p.141) where the phonemic patterning of the text disturbs its syntax.

Le Mécrit is Roche's final text of poetry, which presents 'le degré zéro de la poéticité'. It is 'miswritten' to destroy the edifice of poetry and to open the writing to the 'hasard' of this tissue of hesitations, the materiality of language and writing as process. It stands in a perverse relation to other TQ texts of this time, Sollers's Lois and H, Pleynet's Stanze. In the latter text the 'convention' of poetry is replaced by a poetic language borrowing from different cultures and different psychic conditions (psychotic rather than neurotic). This perverse relation is doubled by Roche's effective denial of the theoretical function. It is possible however to trace a similar development to that of Sollers, and Sollers's preface 'L'aréopagite' is an interesting pointer to the development of Sollers's style in Lois. The passage from Eros énergumène to Le Mécrit
introduces a more obscene rather than courtly erotic material, and a less austere and more familiar language and vocabulary, thereby introducing the humorous and heterogenous in the same way that Lois differs from Nombres. Louve basse, Roche's 1974 text, takes off again but without the skeleton of the poetic edifice to deconstruct, producing a different form of biographical, violent, humorous writing which also reworks Roche's work up to that point and its reception. 36

*  

Sollers - Lois

Basic structure : the permutation of a sentence: 'nifié face à face, niant la membrane, l'entrée' (p.5) connoting the negation of the negation, in 6 cantos, figured as a cube, the cube also figured as a tambourine, a percussive membrane. The 'geometrical' structure of the text is however a vestige, a 'déchet' its other developments exceed.

The major departure of Lois is in its treatment of the rhythm of the writing. The ascetic writing of Nombres is ruptured by the auditive force of rhythm. The transformation works at the level of the sentence structure of the French language and the unit of the word, which is transgressed. Lois attacks the percussive auditive base of the French language. The rhythm which Lois most consciously employs is the decasyllable, and
less often the octosyllable. The scansion of the text into decasyllabic or octosyllabic phraseological units already indicates the importance of rhythm for the text, the fact that within the prose structure of the writing the language is being worked on at the level of its rhythm. The repetitive, often rhyming but more often assonating metrical units constitute the writing as a music and also lead to effects of humour and transgression of the boundaries of word units. However Lois differs from the work of Denis Roche in transgressing inside the line rather than the boundary of the line itself.

Lois abounds in nominal constructions that elide or evade the subject-predicate structure while conforming to the rhythmic principle of the decasyllable. The past participle, with ending é is often employed as a motor for the writing and as an elision of the subject-predicate structure. The list, which this aggregate of nominal forms approaches, a technique recalling Rabelais, is used to parodically catalogue 'le bourjus' and 'la francité' (p.55). There the horizontal prosaic structure, already worked from the interior by the rhythm, collapses into the verticality of the catalogue. In addition, the text of Lois includes also, as a disturbance of its regular percussion, Chinese characters, typographically spaced lines of 'poetry', a musical score, individual words set out on their own and dialogue. More than Nombres, but less systematically than the latter, Lois is a plurivocal text that approaches the typographic multiplicity of Maurice Roche's work. However, all the variations are
based in the transformation of the language at the level of rhythm, which is the generative principle of the text.

Lois abounds in single words, followed by exclamation marks. The exclamation mark itself interrupts the continuity of the sentence, punctuates it and exemplifies the percussive force of the text. This punctuation is also a 'ponction' and a punctum, recalling Barthes' use of the term in La Chambre claire, to denote the 'little hole', the subjective wound that the photograph inflicts. It punctures the surface of the text, intervenes as a caesura and as a rupture of the texture of writing. It marks the incidence of a radical alterity that comes to punctuate the subject. It is also a signal of the fact that, with Lois, Sollers has moved from a practice of writing by hand to one of writing with a typewriter. With the first there was undoubtedly a certain fetishisation of the written, of inscription, articulated with a fascination of Chinese writing. Lois moves beyond this fetishisation. Writing by hand was also more suitable to the 'exercices spirituels' of Drame and Nombres. The necessity of these exercises is transgressed, biographically, by the scene at his father's graveside where Sollers intones Eckhart to fill the space left by death. The practice of typing emphasises the auditive quality of the writing, its percussive quality, while handwriting is conducted in silence. The exclamation mark, in the auditive, musical tapestry of the writing therefore intervenes as a repetitive blow or strike that punctuates (literally) the surface of writing, and is used explicitly for this
purpose, as in some contemporary music (Webern, Boulez) a sudden and short downstroke of strings interrupts the score.

A significant development from the earlier texts in Lois is the parodic intertextual transformation the text performs on other texts. This will become a specific aspect of Sollers's writing in Paradis and the texts since then. So Lois is more than just a tissue of jokes; it is also a text of parodic jouissance. Sollers refers to a larger level of humour as 'l'humour dans lequel baigne le langage'. The larger humour that Lois develops is more extensive than the short-circuiting of the economy that the 'monnaie' of jokes affords. This larger humour is precisely 'beyond the pleasure principle'. Humour, in this context, is perhaps structurally the same as the Lacanian Real, if it is seen as a larger area of heterogeneity in which both the Symbolic (language and culture in general) and the Imaginary (fantasy) are deployed, as closures. The Real and Humour are a larger area in which language bathes, a negativity in which language as thetic moment exists. The Real marks its incidence in the exclamation marks, as punctures/punctums that are repeated in the text.

So Lois does not use jokes to attain homeostasis, but as part of a general discharge, dépense, that is fundamentally to be linked to Freud's death drive. As jouissance, Real, Humour beyond the pleasure principle, Lois is further to be linked to 'le rire' in Bataille's sense, a laughter that is at the same time horrible and
comic. A 'rire majeur' as opposed to a 'rire mineur'. If we identify this humour as parody, parody becomes a textual strategy whereby other texts are included and transgressed in the text. Parody results from intertextuality. In Lois and to an extent in Paradis, parody results from the humorous enveloping of other texts in the tissue of the writing. To the extent that parody is an aspect of postmodernity, these texts are postmodern.

In as far as we posit a subject of Lois the writerly subject is affected by the decentring occasioned by the plurality of voices. It is a subject which is split, written, spoken, lived on one hand and writing, speaking, living on the other. Thus in Lois the proliferation of the impersonal construction: 'je parle, mais ça vient d'ailleurs'(p.58). The subject is thus split but rather than fading, disappearing, as in what we might call the first term of this operation of the emergence of the writing subject, the subject is caught in a continual, instantaneous oscillation between two borders, two possibilities; that of being written, thought by ça, and the act of writing, the composition that this entails. This can be enounced as the 'jouissance à l'intérieur de la jouissance' noted à propos of Nombres; the fading or jouissance becomes sense, becomes 'savoir', reconstituting the subject, subject for another signifier. The subject of writing returns, reading jouissance as sense, the énonciation as énoncé in the writing, and fading again. The subject does not therefore so much fade as oscillate.
(Sollers calls it 'springing'), and Lois is a text that articulates this logic of signifying the subject for another signifier, jouissant the subject for another jouissance.

We can articulate this oscillation with the punctuation - puncturing of the text, the oscillation of the subject takes place between two punctums, punctures of the text. The exclamation mark is a mark of the vacillation of the subject, its annulation, which then returns. The oscillation is also articulated across the two borders of the text and the intertext. Sollers / Hölderlin, Sollers / Joyce. The subject is split across texts, oscillates across texts. This oscillation is in fact the opening of Lois, its matrix, where the subject is either on one side or the other, if he is on one side he is already on the other: 'nié face à face, niant la membrane, l'entrée, ce qui s'y trouve existe ailleurs.' The oscillation is also a logic of the negation of the negation.

Reading texts such as Lois is thus an oscillatory experience, as Barthes suggests in Le Plaisir du texte. The writing is a constant dissolution of the topos, an incessant deterritorialisation, a fading jouissance, and the reader is caught in this, but this can only be thought, and can only set itself off from a topos, a territory. Reading never gets beyond the limit to the paradisiac world of total, radical jouissance, but always has to return to the fixed values of culture and identity, to leap off again. In this sense the writing of Barthes,
critical, but experiencing this oscillation, is an intertextual example for the reader of these texts.

*  

Pleynet - Stanze

Stanze signifies, like Le Mécrit, poetry. It is within the same context as the work of Denis Roche. So we can see it: as in a tangential relation to the work of Baudry, Sollers, Henric and Risset and in continuity with Le Mécrit. However, having already looked at Le Mécrit as the destruction of poetry, it should be evident that Stanze, published as poetry in 1973, is within the field that D.Roche exits from with Le Mécrit. The difference between the two approaches is that while Roche limits the 'edifice' of poetry in order to destroy it, Pleynet's conception of poetry is wider and subject to a significant investment in terms of the violence writing engages. We can see the relevance here of some remarks of Pleynet in 1972 (date of publication of Le Mécrit) where he distinguishes between two types of attitude in response to the current desolation of poetry and specifically of 'des manifestations actuelles du travail sur la langue chez les poètes'. The first attitude decrees the 'death of poetry' (objectively the approach of D. Roche) of which Pleynet writes:

"Je dirais ..que c'est une attitude de démission fuyant l'urgence de la question d'excès (en son fond sexuel) et se prêtant plus ou moins consciemment à l'exploitation de la virtualité de procès du cadavre poétique qu'elle entretient'.
In effect, the 'death of poetry' may destroy poetry but also fixes it within certain limits (a coffin or urn, the rectangle of Roche's texts) which can lead to its repetition (as a corpse). Pleynet's attitude is to re-invest in the field of poetry what has been repressed — that is, its historical dimension of excess which is in conflict with the norm as its repressed violence. Denis Roche's divergence is an equally valid option, but one can see how his divergence from the review is logical at the level of textual practice.

Stanze is an epic work. It relies on the complex matrix and structure of a traversal of the modes of production of history across its different 'Chants' (of 9 programmed Cantos only 5 have been published). This process is interrupted by TQ's shift away from Marxism; Stanze's structure is perhaps disposable, although as 'mise en scène' of a conflict between economy and incantation it is interesting in the context of this period, symptomatic of the complex interplay of political and subjective forces that Pleynet's position as secretary of TQ perhaps implied.

What Stanze reinvests in poetry is excess and this is operative in the text, as in the work of Roche, in a transformation and displacement of the letter through the effects of a violence associated with sexuality and incest. Rime, which also works on this level, is a more violent text, perhaps due to the absence of the economic structure; it is also in a sense more successful than Stanze due to this absence and the clarity and force of
the experience it engages.

Reading Stanze is an experience with a writing which brings into play the forces of displacement and condensation, the logic of the unconscious. The text is fragmented so as to resemble the fragmented language of the schizophrenic. Pleynet writes:

'la mesure qui m'intéresse est celle des textes de Hölderlin dits "de la folie".' (p.159)

This logic and this fragmentation operate in the poetry in the 'instance of the letter', for example the 'r' in 'crommencement' and 'la bonne mère varginale'(p.13-14).

The text also projects the phantasy of the subject. This is most evident in Canto I which is the fictional primal scene of the text. Canto I is 'le plus investi subjectivement'(p.156) in that it deploys the phantasmatic material that the figure of the monkey (from the Chinese legend) engages. This introduces the homosexual phantasy at the base of the social organisation, and the figure of the phallic mother, 'la mère armée' (p.11), as the desired object of this phantasy. Canto I is deployed around this object, and its paragrammatism, its condensations and displacements are forced through as symptoms of this desire. However, as well as projecting the phantasy which is the condition (according to Freud) of social organisation, the text is its analysis ('joyeuse pratique d'analyse'(p.155)) through a writing that traverses the phantasm in its paragrammatism. Thus fragments conduct their own analysis through the instance of the letter:

'OUI crommencement marqué avec le savoir (?)
dans le corps ouvert de la chienne mère
Vénérée'.(p.11)
Crommencement: the beginning (of knowledge) is also a crust (croûte) or scab (crasse) or screen (écran) in that it represses the knowledge of the opening of the mother's body: le corps ouvert. It is also the marking of the knowledge or belief of religion (croyance, croix) in the sublimation of this holed mother into a holy mother. The word 'crommencement' is a vocalised signifier: cri, that in its codified condensation (cryptogramme) is an analysis (critique), and an intersection (croisement). The production of signifiance from the intervention of a letter, of a signifier, indicates how a reading of Stanze can only be effected by entering into the productivity of the text, by transforming the critical analysis into a practice of the text, and incidentally indicating 'how it works'. Continuing this mode of reading, the word 'Vénérée' produces Venus, Venereal, Venerated; proposing that the sexual, veneral mother is venerated, sublimated into a 'goddess' when 'le savoir' blocks her open body....

The text of Canto I is thus the projection of the phantasms invested in the figure of the monkey and the 'armed' phallic mother, across a series of postures that the text 'mounts', including incest ('mère ténébreuse touché au ventre' (p.14)) as the fundamental taboo, but also the analysis of these phantasms, their 'traversée' by the writing which analyses them through the instance of the letter, the signifier, their decomposition in the writing which is in a state of continual atomisation.

There is a paragrammatic text that often becomes
explicit in fixing on one letter, in the first Canto the letter R becomes a kind of fetish letter that is chased across the fragmented surface of the text investing énoncés with a paragrammatic surplus meaning. A paragrammatic reading of r in the first pages of Stanze runs across:

'nourrière', 'terre', 'père', 'crommencement', 'mère', 'varginale', 'floraison', 'crommancante', 'castré'...

Later, this is made more explicit as a fetishisation of the letter:

'femmes qui se ssentent coupés
et toute l'humidité fertile où il se branle et toutes les filles de la branlée
assises sur leur étron
et la meR le moRt et la moRdRe partagés en deux
la|quette qui circule
qui quette de dent
lettre à lettre fétique merdeux'(p.59)

The R, which, taken away as a capital leaves: me, mot and mode, is the surplus, excess, that undermines the discourse of the ego (me), the word as unit (mot) and the mode(s) of production that form the structure of Stanze. It is also the 'étron', 'fétique merdeux' that is designated as a 'bouchon' to stop up the traumatic hole of the mother, the phallus/fetish (|) that circulates, that is the infant's penis imagined as that of the Mother ('quiquette') and the infant imagined as this phallus, that is chased and which chases (displaces) the traumatic hole, inside the text (de dent) (dedans), a phallus threatened by castration, 'quiquette de dent', the w/hole indicating a displacement of the letter / fetish in the text: 'lettre à lettre.....

The paragrammatic excess of the letter is made explicit
here, and for Pleynet this seems almost to be a definition of poetry; the violence of a conflict between the paragrammatic, diagonal displacement of the letter with the verticality of meaning and subjectivity, a conflict between the letter and the voice.

The subject is more intensely invested in the text than in Lois, for example. If Sollers is fully in control of the 'traversée' by writing of his identity, indifferent to it, 'jouissant', Pleynet's experience is perhaps more painful, more of a risk. This may derive from the different position of the Mother that each text assigns. For Pleynet incest is a horizon that is displaced, that constantly returns, while for Sollers the 'traversée de la mère' seems to be a joyful transgression that is not affected by a return. Pleynet's experience is one of love, to the extent that he writes that 'aimer est nier'; Sollers's textual experience is closer to the Father and to a filiation beyond the Mother, beyond that transferential experience. Consequently, a reading of Stanze or Rime is an experience of violence and risk. In Pleynet's poetry the effects of the real, in the instance of the letter and the transgression of 'la face maternelle' are exposed as they are to the reader. In Sollers this transgression is reintegrated into the 'énoncé' of the text; violence is thrown back into the jouissens of writing. So if Sollers controls the effect of transgression through the continuity of a musical prose, (H, Paradis ) Pleynet's experience is one of violent
fragmentation; poetry is spatially displaced, the violence exposed.

*
NOTES FOR CHAPTER FOUR - TEXTS

Pre-texts

3. An article prepared for publication looks at the intertextuality of Le Parc with Robbe Grillet.
4. An article ready for publication looks at 'Tel Quel and the Italian neoavanguardia'.

Continuity and consumption

5. Cf. also the work of Marc Robic, Pierre Boudon in TQ31.

Textual practice

6. Faye's last published extract is 'Prose, prosodie' in TQ22, Analogues is his only published extract in TQ.
7. Ricardou's last extract is 'Diptyque' TQ27 Autumn 1966. La Prise de Constantinople is published by Minuit.
13. J. Risset, Jeu.'La petite marque sur l'estomac' TQ70 Spring 1977 ; '7 passages de la vie d'une femme' TQ74 Autumn 1977 ; '9 poèmes de Mnémmosyne' TQ84 Spring 1980 ; 'En voyage' TQ90 Autumn 1981.
Readings of texts

Sollers - Nombres

19. The 'dissemination' of the text provides a 'seam' for Derrida's reading of Nombres, 'La dissémination', which is less an analysis of Nombres than a parodic simulation of the text, cf. Marian Hobson's essay, 'On the subject of the subject'.
20. Cf. Alain Badiou, 'La subversion infinimentimale' in Cahiers pour l'analyse 9, an issue in which a translation of Cantor also appeared, referred to by Sollers in 'Survol / Rapport (Bloks) / Conflit'.
22. Cf. Deleuze & Guattari, Anti-Oedipe.
23. Cf. Roland Barthes, Le plaisir du texte p.49. 'Le texte, lui, est atotique, sinon dans sa consommation, du moins dans sa production...De cette atorie il prend et communique à son lecteur un état bizarre: à la fois exclu et paisible.'
24. J.-L. Baudry, Personnes. A reading of the web of intertextualities between Les Images, Drame, Personnes and Nombres, having been executed, is not present due to considerations of space.
27. This fading can also be linked to 'aphanisis', as Lacan discusses it in Seminar XI p.243.

Denis Roche - Le Mécrit

31. In Lacan's use of the term 'foreclosure', the foreclosure of the Name of the Father returns on the subject 'in the Real' as a violent affect.
33. Ibid. p.134.
34. Like Pierre Guyotat, although his process of composition is more complex. With Lois and H, Sollers also shifted to the direct use of a typewriter.
35. Cf interview with J. Ristat, in Qui sont les contemporains, taken from Gazette de Lausanne.
36. Roche's work as a whole demands a more detailed discussion. Cf. C. Prigent's Denis Roche, Seghers, 'Poètes d'aujourd'hui' ; J.M. Gleize, Poésie et figuration, last chapter, & an article prepared for publication, 'The miswriting of Denis Roche'.
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37. Cf. 'Webern' in THEX and TQ's publication of work by Boulez. In 'Logique de la fiction' Sollers links the subversion of fiction to
that of tonality.
38. 'Littérature et revolution' Peinture 1972, in Pleynet, Art et littérature .

Pleynet - Stanze

41. Cf. 'Norme et excès','La Folie théétique' and 'La Compromission poétique' where Pleynet outlines a complex theory referring to the anthropological work of Dumézil to present a conflict between a norm and its excess, a law and the violence it represses (See Chapter Five), a theory in many respects identical to that of Girard and that later proposed in TQ .
42. 'Il me faut défaire ce chant du récit qui le tient...' Le Jour et l'heure, Paris, 1989, Plon, p.129. For further analyses of the economy of Stanze see F. Bruzzo, 'Clé pour l'anatomie du singe' TQ 77 and Robert W. Greene, 'Poetry, metapoetry and revolution, Stages on Marcelin Pleynet's Way' Romanic review 68 & my unpublished article 'Poésie, amour et fragmentation; une lecture de Rime de Marcelin Pleynet'.
43. Rime pp.18, 52.
I. The dissolution of the Marxist system

We suggested in Chapter Three how the philosophical investigation undertaken in TQ hollowed out the basis of Marxism, making it highly ambiguous and subject to subversion by its own premises. The Maoist phase of the history of TQ exacerbates these tensions by pushing the system of Marxism to the point at which it breaks up. In that sense our interpretation of TQ's Maoism is as an excessive Marxism, engineered to transgress the system of Marxism.

This deliberately engineered excess accounts for the hysterical tone of the review's political pronouncements, which occur particularly in the satellite periodicals that began to proliferate around TQ, Peinture, Promesse, the tracts of the Mouvement de Juin 1971. The special issue on Barthes of Autumn 1971 inscribes an ironical critique of this revolutionary political hysteria at the outset of the Maoist period, suggesting that this excessive political fervour is doubled by an investigation of elements that subvert it and will eventually supplant it. These elements have in common a Lacanian perspective that recognises the importance of the economical relation between the Law, or Symbolic order, and its excess or jouissance. Marxism is thus doubled and overtaken by a psychoanalytically based approach. This is examined in detail in the next section.
The interest in China presents a complex interplay of political and cultural factors. On the one hand TQ wishes to ground its political allegiance to Maoism in aesthetic and philosophical concerns. Thus the Chinese conception of 'espace-temps' is related to TQ's radical approach to temporality, 'projected into space'. Chinese 'graphic language' is related to the textual practice of TQ which denies representation and privileges inscription, and often structures the text around spatial motifs. François Cheng and Julia Kristeva sketch out a view of the Chinese language and Chinese poetry that relates it to the revolution of poetic language Kristeva sees in Mallarmé and Lautréamont. Cheng defines an annulment of the distance between subject and object that does not aim at objectivity but at an interiorisation of the external world. Kristeva argues that in this poetic practice the subject is traversed and exceeded by the 'matière' of significance that is brought into play, a dialectical operation which is similarly linked to the textual practice of TQ.

While the similarities between the more radical moments of literature and Chinese signifying practices are striking, because both present an 'outside' of Western culture, the links between the aesthetic and the political are tenuous. There is a marked overinvestment in the ideological at the expense of political analysis, so that there is a certain amount of wishful thinking in TQ's
Maoism; it projects an ideological justification onto a political reality that is divergent from this justification. The Chinese culture investigated by TQ is, for example, almost without exception based on ancient modes of thought and takes no account of the modern political reality of China. On the other hand, if we accept that TQ's Maoism is, consciously or not, a transgression of Marxism, then the misappropriation of political reality is not as relevant as the massive introduction, effected by TQ, of a wealth of erudite knowledge about China into the arena of intellectual debate in France.

Concerning the interplay of the political and cultural in TQ's Maoism, it is also true that the Maoist period sees a greater emphasis in the review on political questions. A large number of articles appear in the review from sinologists who offer favourable reports of the political reforms since the Cultural Revolution. While the projective wishful thinking of TQ has much to do with its disastrous misreading of the political reality in China, it also has a lot to do with the disinformation supplied by these erudite sinologists. Their insights were at the expense of a considerable blindness. Thus for a long time, from 1971 to 1976, TQ's political pronouncements are determined by a disastrous interpretation of a reality onto which is projected a version of events conditioned by an ideological overinvestment.
Critique of Marxism

At the same time, theoretical developments within TQ are enveloping the system of Marxism. The cornerstones of Marxist theory are chipped away while the spirit of dialectical materialism, but one already exceeded by heterogeneity, remains. This suggests that TQ's Marxism is to a large extent only a nominal Marxism, it borrows the robes of Marxism in order to subvert it from within.

Donald Lowe, for example, concludes in his examination of Marxist thinking on the East, that Marxism is Europocentric. Marx and Engels inherited the Hegelian conception of China as historically stagnated because it did not fit in to the plan of the dialectical development of historical materialism. Lowe's argument is that this resulted from the misplaced Hegelian idea that Marx and Engels inherited, that, universally, the rational was the real, that historical development followed an immanent, rational development. We can note here that for TQ, theoretically, the real is rational, but there is a larger real, a 'Real' that envelops the real as rational, not an irrational, but a larger rationality. So that TQ can be seen to be in advance, theoretically, of the limitations of Marxism.

The concepts of the State and of class consciousness are similarly criticised by Kristeva. She notes how the State is a set or totality that blocks the force of revolutionary negativity. Part of Marx's radical discovery, she asserts, is that the State as a totality
that would envelop negativity is an illusion: 'L'Etat comme ensemble de tous les ensembles est une fiction'(p.39). She further criticises the similar Leninist idea that the State can systematise a totality of individual wills. Moreover, Marx did not see that the illusion of the State as 'ensemble de tous les ensembles' prevented the posing of the existence of the infinite. She thus attacks Marxism for its closure of the infinity of which poetic language is an exploration. Moreover, the concept of 'class consciousness' is shown to be limited in its applicability only to totality and to production. Marxism itself never goes beyond the sphere of production and the revolution of the proletariat thus only leads to the perfectioning of this system. Thus, even at this early stage, (1972) for Kristeva Marxism as system is illusory and repressive.

A crucial aspect where the system of Marxism is subverted by other elements of TQ's focus is centred on the question of the subject. Kristeva's 'subject in process' takes account of a heterogeneity and negativity that the subject posed by Marxism denies. She implies that Marxism is a humanism in that it is still too linked to Feuerbach; 'le marxisme écarte la négativité hegelienne'. Marx proposes a 'unification subjectale '(p.59) of this negativity that transforms the subject into an atom rather than a process.

In his article on Bataille at the 1972 conference, Sollers similarly proposes the subject as 'la question rongeante non résolue' that goes beyond dialectical
materialism. The emphasis on the subject is at the expense of the system of Marxism, and it tends towards the elaboration of an ethics based on this subject as singularity or exception. Of course this passes through psychoanalysis which is the most consequential consideration of the place of the subject. It must be underlined, however, that the subject considered here is a 'subject in process', neither the split subject posed by Lacan or the absent subject that Derrida's trace effaced. However, in the context it is Lacanian psychoanalysis, rethought from the perspective of poetic language by Kristeva, that appears as the most promising area. TQ, Sollers particularly, forge a narrow path between the two poles of Althusserian Marxism and Derridean deconstruction. While the former is criticised for its deflection of the place of the subject in a 'procès sans sujet' the latter is criticised as idealist in its celebration of a 'substance' of difference previous to the materiality of language. The Derridean moment and the Althusserian moment for TQ give way to a Lacanian moment, but always within the framework of the transformative effect of literature.
It would be misleading to propose that the obvious contradictions in TQ's theories and strategies are subject to an overall control by a determining will. However, it is part of the specific character of TQ that it deliberately engineers contradictions in its own strategy, between different elements of its strategy. The elaboration of the 'subject of process' enters into a violent contradiction with the system of Marxism, or political strategies as such. These contradictions are not washed over but are maintained by the elaboration of a political philosophy based on this subject. This political philosophy is then superimposed, erroneously in our estimation, on Maoist China.

The politics Kristeva elaborates from her subject, for example, is a utopian anarchism that seems to admit from the start the impossibility of its resolution. According to this philosophy the negativity at work in the subject in process is also at work in society, and becomes a revolutionary force when liberated from stasis in such atomic institutions as the family or the state. The radicality of this theory, as we suggested in our discussion of Kristeva's work, becomes attenuated as she fits it into a more psychoanalytical frame. Later she will rework the same dynamic, but in terms of an ethics of the reintegration of this negative excess into the Symbolic, into discourse. This ethical approach is present in the 1971 essay on Barthes where she writes:

'L'objectivation du désir pour l'écriture exige du sujet (de la
This suggests that Kristeva plays on different levels; one which will be dropped which is the Maoist / anarchist level and which is closer to TQ and Sollers; the other, closer to Barthes and psychoanalysis, which recognises the necessity of an ethics of the transformation of the Law to account for its excess. The question of women also enters into this debate, hence TQ and Kristeva's flirtation with the feminist movement Psych et po (see later) and a series of articles on the question. The questions of women and of sexuality are introduced, by Kristeva among others, to have a subversive and undermining effect on the system of Marxism.

'Le Voyage en Chine' - phantasy and fragmentation

Given the theoretical redundancy of the system of Marxism, undermined by the negativity of the subject of process, it appears that TQ's continued allegiance to Maoism in China is based on the premise that Maoism itself is a critique of Marxism, while remaining at the same time the 'truth' of Marx's thought. Such is the view proposed by the numerous articles on China and on Maoism that appear in the review. As we suggested above, this is a phantasmatic projection conditioned by disinformation and an overinvestment in the ideological level. The irruption of the reality of the Chinese situation, partly in the TQ
trip to China in 1974 and completely with the death of Mao and the arrest of the Gang of Four in 1976 ruptures the membrane of this phantasy, but without catastrophic effect, since it is doubled by the psychoanalytical and ethical instance we have identified.

The trip to China in 1974 is not completely an encounter with the reality or 'real' of China, since this is an opaque reality, as Barthes points out, it is not subject to a hermeneutics. The encounter with the physical reality may have had an effect in fragmenting the cohesion of the group in relation to the phantasy of revolutionary Maoist China. It breaks up the group fantasy, and each individual reacts to the experience differently. This can be read in Pleynet's journal of the trip Le Voyage en Chine, published in 1980. We can identify this as a moment, there are others, at which TQ ceases to function as a group and becomes a community of individuals.

François Wahl's critical articles in 'Le Monde', entitled 'La Chine sans utopie' have an effect in forcing TQ to realise the phantasmatic, projective effect China has; they criticise Wahl for just this, not seeing the beam in their own eye. Sollers, however, invests further hope in the 'Criticise Confucius/Lin Piao' campaign, seeing it as an antimetaphysical widening of the scope of Maoism and a move towards the extinction of the State. This was far from the case, the campaign enabled in fact a reinforcement of the power of the State to counter Lin Piao radicalism. This was disastrous due to the events that follow; the death of the moderate Zhou en lai, Mao's
increasing retirement from politics and the rise of the extreme Gang of Four on the left. However, despite the continued ideological projection Sollers also insists on questions of aesthetics and sexuality that tend to transgress, in our view, the limits of the system of Marxism, which remains in Maoism. Aesthetics and sexuality are emphases that slide underneath the shift in strategy of TQ. Sollers emphasises in his encounter with China:

'un dynamisme du geste, de la transformation', 'une autre façon d'être dans l'espace, dans le geste, la langue, le sens'.(p.18)

In Lacanian terms, once the veil of the political Imaginary is lifted, the Real of Chinese thought - its gestural aesthetics returns.

Sollers also programmes the demise of the Maoist current in TQ by tying its fate in with the question of women and of sexuality. He asks the question: do women exist other than as objects of exchange in China? (p.10) Kristeva's book Des Chinoises gives a partial answer, but the gesture of shifting the whole question into the arena of sexuality is effective in withdrawing the political and philosophical investment of TQ in Maoist China.

We have identified in the TQ trip to China a rupture of the phantasy of a utopian China and the emergence of the Real, of its alterity, tied into the question of its 'other' theatre of gesture. This Real also implicates the status of Women. Perhaps not coincidentally, Kristeva's response to the trip to China is articulated in the terms of her engagement with the feminist movement Psych et po, a radical splinter group of the MLF (Mouvement de
libération des femmes). This engagement is a failure in communication for both parties; Kristeva's approach which recognises the ubiquity of power in signifying practice conflicts with that of the militant Psych et po group. The encounter is recounted in fictional terms in Kristeva's Les Samouraïs. To this extent, Kristeva's book Des Chinoises, published by Des femmes, the publishing house run by Antoinette Fouque and Psych et po is highly contradictory and not necessarily representative. It is partly determined by the utopian anarchism we identified earlier, partly by the gradual emergence of her psychoanalytical and ethical concerns. Since we proposed these to be already present in Kristeva's work, Des Chinoises seems like a retentive return to an old problematic.

Kristeva's essential thesis in the book is that feminism and Maoism alike are a critique of phallocentric patriarchy. She bases this on the thesis that non-Confucian (i.e. Taoist and Buddhist) sexuality was based on genitality, and thus on a 'traversée d'Oedipe', since a true genitality would go beyond phallocentricity. The book itself runs historically through the early matriarchy, the repression of women in Confucianism, the laws of the Jiangxi Soviet, favourable to women's rights, and their emergence in the Cultural Revolution and especially in the Criticise Confucius campaign. The 'historical' part of the book is preceded by a theoretical critique of 'monotheism', the religious conception of women, and an analysis of the psychoanalytical discourse
on female sexuality. However, Kristeva separates the psychoanalytical part of the book from the historical part, stating that this is in order to guard against a utopian projection of one onto the other. This dissociation invites a deconstructive reading that would see the psychoanalytical part of the book as a critique of the historical part. Indeed, while Kristeva pays lip-service to Maoism in the historical section, the psychoanalytical section criticises patriarchy. The extent to which Mao is or isn't a Father is the nexus of TQ's Maoism from this point. This deflects the question of Maoism onto the question of sexuality and the Freudian and Lacanian psychoanalytical terms of the Name of the Father, and sets a term to TQ's Maoism in the death of the Father. Furthermore, it sets up Maoism for a critique of its approach to sexuality. While Taoism may imply a non-neurotic sexuality, the same is not necessarily true of Maoism.

Pleynet's articles on the trip to China look, typically, at the form of a discourse on China as such and his subjective response. Pleynet's emphasis on the subjective response can be attributed to the degree of moderation and self-denial necessary for the role of the secretary of the review. The 'traversée d'abord subjective' (p.31) of his account shifts the emphasis onto the singularity of the writer, away from ideology. For Pleynet, China is an 'outopos', a utopia to the extent of its absolute otherness that cannot be recuperated in any place or 'topos'. As we suggested earlier, the
otherness of China as an experience enables the invasion of this lack of meaning, an impossibility of hermeneutics, by the ideology of Maoism. Thus TQ's trip to China appears as an oscillation between a recognition of its otherness and of the impossibility of interpretation, and the blanketing of this otherness by ideology. The ability to analyse the experience of this otherness only emerges painfully and slowly, and only after the phantasy has waned. This goes some way to explain why Pleynet's journal Le Voyage en Chine was only published six years later, in 1980, and only after much of Pleynet's important work on painting that recognises the importance of the analysis of experience. Due to reasons of space and focus, Pleynet's art criticism, which merits a special study, is not analysed here.

To conclude, the trip to China was an encounter with an alterity that broke through the membrane of the Imaginary of TQ's ideological investment in Maoism. In certain instances the phantasy survives, but undermined by the Real of aesthetics and sexuality. It also has the important effect of fragmenting the cohesion of the group, united in its ideological projection. The subjectivity of the writer emerges, framed in a more psychoanalytical terms. The ability to analyse this experience only emerges through this combination of the subjectivity of the writer and the context of psychoanalysis.
The death of the Father; the exception

As we proposed above, the whole question of TQ's Maoism from the trip to China revolves around the questions of whether the Chinese subject is neurotic or beyond neurosis, and whether or not Mao appears as a Father. The first question is posed but is not analysed in TQ. Although certain articles do approach the question of psychoanalysis in China, recognising its complete absence⁹, the tools of a psychoanalytical treatment of the Chinese subject as such are not available. This blockage seems to have been displaced onto and sublimated in the experience of the Western subject of China; the accounts of Pleynet and Barthes recognise this anti-hysteria but can only analyse their own experience, which, in as much as they are subjects who are up to a certain point subject to the 'Western neurosis', becomes a paradise projected onto an opaque reality.

Sollers addresses the question of Mao as Father at the moment of Mao's death in 1976. An earlier article, by Eliane Escoubas⁹, had recognised the importance for Maoism of Mao's status as Father or revolutionary subject. Sollers's thesis follows this in affirming that in constructing a mausoleum for Mao, as occurred also with Lenin, the body becomes a corpse which elicits an exploitation, 'une jouissance du cadavre'.¹⁰ By mummifying Mao his thought is turned into 'une lettre morte'(p.139), exhibiting how Marxism remains determined by Western religion, the dominance of the Father. With the death of
Mao, therefore, Maoism is turned into an oppressive, bureaucratic system which is supported by the jouissance of the corpse of the dead Father, as Leninism turned into Stalinism by the same process.

At the same time, Sollers develops a critique of Marxism from the perspective of the subjectivity of the exception, that of the writer. This is foreshadowed by the continual insistence on the subjectivity of the writer as transformative of the system, for example in the 1972 article on Bataille. The individual thought of Marx and Freud is affirmed by Sollers against its erection into a system, a gesture repeated a propos of Sade in 'Lettre de Sade'. The terms are still those, however, of the dialectic; for Sollers the catastrophe of Marxism is that it denies the negativity of the dialectic. 1968, for example, is the return of this negativity that 'survived' in the artistic marginalities. Sollers's reliance on a dialectical mode of thought, the fundamental importance of the negation of the negation in his thought, links his thought and writing back to more traditional intellectual patterns, to Kojève and Hegel. This may, as we have suggested, set him at odds with Kristeva, and with the more subjectively oriented terms of Pleynet, which we have not looked at explicitly. Nevertheless, in the terms of our examination of Sollers's 'theory' in Chapter Three, the emphasis on the exception and on the negation of the negation are consistent.

The emphasis for the moment, however, is on the subject as exception. Having passed through the Freudian/Lacanian
dissolution of the subject as authority, the subject is now viewed by Sollers as the locus of a practice, of language, sex, which supports an individuality or an exception. The valorisation of the exception against the systematic, the Situationist 'spectacle' is a more radical turn than the turn against Marxism or even against Marx which is fairly inevitable given the situation, as it emphasises singular, individual practice as against Theory, the Group, the political project. TQ therefore becomes in this view no longer a group with a project, a 'group-in-fusion', but, in Sollers's view, a collection of singularities each of which forms an 'exception'.

We have looked at the dissolution of TQ's Marxism in terms of the internal logic of the thought and practice of the review. Contextual factors, such as the widespread disillusionment with Marxism of the mid-seventies, the publication of Solzenitzyn's *The Gulag Archipeligo*, the rise of the 'Nouveaux philosophes', the delayed after-effects of 1968 certainly play a major part in this process, but TQ's shifting allegiances are not at the mercy of the context, but follow, as we show, an internal logic. The emergence of the emphasis on the exception and of the thesis of the 'jouissance du père mort' effectively closes the bracket on Marxism and Maoism, so a theory based on the practice of literature and an analysis based on a Freudian / Lacanian notion of the Name of the Father as Symbolic Law and jouissance intervene to close the parenthesis on Marxism. The problematics of literary creation and of psychoanalysis undermine the
problematics of dialectical materialism. TQ bypasses political engagement or disengagement via an engagement with the ethics of the exception and those of Freud and Lacan. When the Maoist ideological phantasy is dropped the whole underlying problematics of the subjectivity of the writer as exception, the importance of sexuality and of an ethics that takes account of both emerges in full force. Before looking in more detail at the subjectivity of the writer as exception and the political articulation of this as dissidence, we will examine the terms of the psychoanalytical problematics involved.
II. Ethics: the Law and its excess

The view of the subject as exception and the politics of dissidence associated with it emerges in TQ through the underlying psychoanalytical perspective that focuses on excess, or jouissance and its relation to the Law or the Symbolic order. The following section attempts to analyse the terms of this problematic.

Psychoanalysis via Italy

Lacanian psychoanalysis was originally overshadowed in TQ by a Derridean critique, by Derrida himself, Baudry and later Luce Irigaray. As we proposed, the necessity of disengaging from both Althusser and Derrida isolated Lacanian psychoanalysis as the most promising area in the context for TQ. Furthermore, Kristeva's emerging concentration on the subject, a subject beyond that of Lacan, implicated Lacanian psychoanalysis. It was accepted as relevant, but trangressed by the excess of poetic language. The early to mid-'seventies thus sees an increasing engagement with Lacanian analysis in TQ, but the period also sees an increasing interest in Freud's later work, for example on religion; the articles by Hubert Damisch and those by Daniel Sibony focus on this area.

However, the 'Lacanian connection' is pursued obliquely, as so many of TQ's strategic movements are. Having underlined the 'Italian connection' in TQ in numerous
instances, not only the links with the 'neoavanguardia' and the Feltrinelli publishing house around writers Sanguineti and Balestrini, but also through M.A. Macciòcchi, it is not altogether surprising that part of TQ's investigation of psychoanalysis in the 70s passes by way of the new Italian Lacanian school set up by, among others, Armando Verdiglione. An aspect of TQ's shift away from Marxism implicated Italy through Macciòcchi and her hero Gramsci. So, if TQ's Marxism at one point passes from France (the PCF, Althusser) to Italy, the same mechanism of displacement is detectable as regards the 'institution' of psychoanalysis. Although the links and friendship between TQ and the Ecole Freudienne de Paris and other groups (such as the Société Psychanalytique de Paris) are active and strong, this never becomes fixed as an alliance between the groups, due to the tendency to flee institutional ties that TQ maintains and the theoretical limitations of Lacanian theory as suggested by Kristeva. Thus the adventure of TQ with the Italian psychoanalytical empire of Armando Verdiglione is determined partly by permitting a displacement of the centre - Paris - of analytical discourse. The importance of Italy as a foyer of debate is also significant for the fact of fascism but also as religion, particularly Roman Catholicism, is a dominant ideological force and TQ's ideological concerns; femininity, sexuality thus find themselves of particular pertinence in this country.
Jouissance and fascism; the ethical function of literature

A 1973 conference, organised by Verdiglione, on 'Psychanalyse et politique' sets out the terms of a confrontation of TQ's Marxism with psychoanalysis. For Sollers, for example, Marxist materialism ignores the importance of the subjective. The excess or 'motivations affectives' (p.29) that are thereby repressed are exploited, transformed into religion by idealism. This exploited excess is defined as fascism, which turns jouissance into massacre. Sollers identifies a possible cause of this situation in the lack of a law that can account for jouissance. While the emphasis on fascism may be a face-saving exercise to smooth over the crisis of Marxism, there is a basic structure here that we can recognise. An economical structure is posited where a subjective excess or jouissance returns on an economy that represses it. The oppositional or repressive relation between the Law and excess is criticised in favour of a transformative or cohesive relation between the two; literature, as excess, thus has an ethical function in reintegrating excess into the Symbolic order.

Kristeva enounces a similar problematic, but she also recognises the difficult situation of this ethics. This ethics is not a politics, for the political is the communal, and the community is held together by a 'common measure' which is language. Excess is radically alien to
the common measure. The semiotic, the heterogenous remains threatening to the linguistic community which therefore forecloses it. This foreclosure of excess results in the return of the excess as a mythical or political force, as religion or as fascism.

Kristeva also frames this in more psychoanalytical terms. If the semiotic / Symbolic relation is seen as an economy of castration, Kristeva proposes, then the play around the limit between the two is an 'eroticisation' of castration (p.64). On the other hand if this relation is foreclosed, castration, the separation of the subject from the object, is foreclosed, and the belief in the substance of the libido, in sex, that results can be transferred directly to social mechanisms - an investment of the libido in the political that is Kristeva's definition of fascism. If fascism fetishises sex as power, the practice of language as a semiotic / Symbolic play recognises fetishism but constantly subverts it. What monologism represses reappears in the guise of a violent substance - fascism, 'le retour du refoulé dans le monologisme religieux et politique'(p.66). Monologism is thus complicitous with fascism, leading us again to the position that literature, its 'ethical function' as Kristeva states, is to 'faire passer dans le langage ce que le monologisme refoule' (p.66), to transform discourse through the introduction of its excess.
Kristeva's approach is not yet complicit with her psychoanalytical practice. She begins to practice in 1976, but already her approach to literature appears as a kind of cure, which is the focus and aim of psychoanalysis. Kristeva's approach to the 'cure' is one which, in our analysis, envelops TQ's approach to literature in an ethical function. The cure aims for the integration of excess into discourse, into language through the transformation of discourse, or of the Symbolic order, rather than its repression or foreclosure. The relation has changed from one of dialectical opposition, repression or denegation, to one of integration and cohesion, but there is a constant in the emphasis on the transformation of reality, or society by literature.

Kristeva's article on Sollers's novel H reflects this problematic. After the formalistic emphases of her article on Nombres, 'Polylogue' is far more concerned with the question of the subject, an index of Kristeva's increasing movement towards a psychoanalytical perspective of the cure, but the experience of writing on Sollers produces a political consideration in Kristeva's article. She insists on the fact that the violence that is repressed by 'Yalta', by the constitution of the 'free world', returns as fascism (p.175). As we stressed earlier the introduction of the term violence to signify what was before termed the heterogenous is a recognition of the subjective crisis and pain that the subject of analysis,
and of literature endures. To the extent that world of Yalta represses this violence, 'L'euphorie communatoire ment' (p.175). In as much as the communal represses the violence of excess, of negativity, it is illusory, based on a lie.

Kristeva thus proposes a similar perspective to Sollers'. The social is viewed from the point of view of an exception and thereby seen as an illusory spectacle; politics is the discourse of the illusion, of 'la réalité', given that all reality is illusory and spectacular, while literature, or the madness of subjects 'on the borderline' becomes 'le réel', or in Kristeva's later terms 'le vréel'. Literature is the truth of a society based on a communal lie. The value of art thus lies implicitly, for TQ, on its ability to tell the truth, and this notion is a constant from the opening 'Déclaration' of 1960 to L'Infini at the present.

Literature is thus assigned an ethical function to transform discourse, the Law, through the integration of excess or negativity. Such is what can be identified as the 'theory' of TQ at this point. However, since it becomes increasingly difficult in the 'seventies to speak of TQ as an anonymous theoretical group, it is perhaps pertinent to distinguish between Kristeva's psychoanalytical approach which tends towards the cure of an individual in analysis and therefore recognises the difficulty and pain of the transformation involved on a subjective level, and Sollers's approach which is a more radical, paranoid vision of the social as spectacle and
illusion, and of literature as Messianic truth. Since it is Sollers who dominates the review, it is the latter perspective that dominates TQ in its last years, implicating an interest in religion. However, Kristeva's analytic practice remains a constant pole of interest in the review, and the tension between her and Sollers at times rebalances the review.

Analysis

Analysis is in fact a crucial notion and activity for TQ, for jouissance or excess is itself mute and opaque. In Bataille's terms it is silent. We can look for a moment at Marcelin Pleynet's writing on painting to elucidate this point. Pleynet's approach sees the painting as a silent object of fascination. It is a kind of jouissance, and excess beyond discourse. As such the subject's relation to it remains one of fascination or obsession. Relating this to the dynamics of the Law and excess in TQ, fascination and obsession have the character of religion and fascism, as an inflicted jouissance. In order to break the Medusa-like stare of this fascination the subject must analyse his own response to the painting, and integrate this within the discourse of his subjectivity, his experience. For TQ, analysis is necessary to deflect the dangers of jouissance as terror and enable it to transform discourse, society, subjectivity. TQ's approach to experience in general, whether artistic, social, psychoanalytic is thus analytic and transformative. The irreducibly mediated
nature of any experience is stressed, thus the necessity of analysis which turns jouissance into a transformative analytic force. TQ do not therefore propose a subversion of discourse by a silent jouissance but the transformation of discourse by an excess become analysis. Analysis is in fact etymologically linked to jouissance as a dissolution. (we will look at this in our final section). At the same time, TQ do not argue for the recuperation of excess within the system, as it is a question of a transformation of discourse from the perspective of the exception.

Elements of excess; transgressive or transcendental

During the early 'seventies, within TQ and outside it in the context, the trends we have observed and commented above are realised in articles and publications. In the review itself, alongside TQ's Maoism, there is a continual stress on elements of excess that threaten to return on discourse. The focus on Artaud and Bataille is important in this respect, and it is possible also to see a series of articles on the question of sexuality and of women as important. This does not form itself into any 'feminism', even though TQ at one moment publishes some short statements from the Psych et po group, with which Kristeva was briefly involved. Dominique Desanti's analysis of the role of women in the utopian socialism repressed by Marxism is effective in undermining the basis of the Marxist system through an emphasis on desire.

In the mid-seventies publications from outside TQ begin
to outline the same dynamic of the return of excess on discourse. The 'Nouveaux philosophes' movement is implicated in this, but it comes essentially from within Lacanian circles. G. Miller's book *Les pousses-au-jouir du Maréchal Pétain* is an analysis of fascism as an inflicted jouissance that is welcomed in *TQ*¹², and in a sense plays the role of a pivot between *TQ*'s Maoism and its next phase of dissidence and the exception. The early works of the 'Nouveaux philosophes' do not on the other hand meet with such approval; Clavel, Glucksmann, Lardreau and Jambet are criticised for turning the return of the excess on the system into a return of the transcendental.¹³ A recurrent gesture resurfaces here: *TQ* criticise the transcendental while affirming the transgressive, although in some of the later religious interests of the review the distinction between the two becomes slightly blurred. We could say that the fundamental movement is transgressive, while the effect and the rhetoric is transcendental. However, there is a continuity up to a point between the transgressive and analytic *TQ* and the transcendental emphases of the 'Nouveaux philosophes' which can explain the later friendliness between the two groups.

Crisis in rationalism

Towards 1976, when the final disengagement from Maoism occurs, *TQ* articulate the crisis in their own strategy, brought on by the internal contradictions we have described, as a 'crise du rationalisme'.¹⁴ Rationalism is
in crisis to the extent that it cannot account for excess that returns on it as violence or transcendentalism. Having thus posed the basis of the 'crisis of rationalism' TQ enounces its strategies. Firstly, the thinking of 'another limit' than that of rationalism, one that can take account of its transformation, regulating an ethic but also 'perméable à une jouissance' (p.83). This position recognises the necessity of a limit, a Symbolic Law without which fascism returns in the Real (Kristeva's analysis) but calls for its enlargement to take in the irrational, jouissance. A 'new psychoanalytical rationality' and aesthetic practice are means to this end. Secondly, the analysis of totalitarianism(s) must be continued. Thirdly, the history of religion(s), undertaken with the aid of psychoanalysis, is a necessity, as religion appears as the repressed of rationalism.

The review thus undertakes in general to analyse the forms of Unity or Law that the social rests on. This indicates to what extent the principles of Lacanian analysis have permeated TQ. The concepts of Unity, the 'one', Symbolic Law are derived from Lacan's later work but also owe a lot to Freud's later work on religion. An increasing emphasis in TQ is the irreducibility of the Symbolic and the impossibility of an 'unmediated' relation to desire, sexuality, subjectivity. Lacan is affirmed, in other words, against Deleuze and Guattari, the idea of a libidinal substance underlying the social which oppresses it. The insistence on the Lacanian Symbolic is also at the basis of the later emphasis on 'le mal radical' and
the impossibility of reducing the antagonism inherent in 'le lien social', an insistence of the 'Nouveaux philosophes' movement. These emphases programme the interests of TQ from the mid-seventies, but on a deeper level the 'crisis of rationalism' editorial is simply the emergence onto an explicit strategic level of emphases that had been present since the beginning of the decade and implicitly all through TQ's history. When Maoism is dropped as a strategic emphasis the ethics considered above becomes explicit and merges into a politics. As we will suggest, a politics on this basis is a politics of dissidence. The shift, for example to the U.S.A is not so much a turnaround in political allegiances as the emergence of an already present theory into its application in a wider arena.
III. The politics of Dissidence

The dissolution of Marxism for TQ is susceptible to produce a political vacuum, but what we have identified as an insistence on the ethics of the relation of the Law to excess provides a link between TQ's excessive Marxism, pushed to its limit, and a politics based on the exception, elaborated from the point of view of the singular subject of literature. This politics is in itself an impossibility, since politics is the discourse of the communal, not of the exception, but a politics or ethics of the exception is articulated in TQ, under the name of dissidence. Dissidence can thus be seen as an ethics that derives from the insistence on the radical but transformative relation of excess to the Law, and on the exception, particularly in literature. While our next section proposes to examine TQ's notion of the exception in literature in more detail, this section looks at the details of TQ's discourse on dissidence, and on its dissident discourses. This focus in itself covers a specific period in TQ's history, from the special issue on the U.S. of 1977, and is itself the subject of a special issue in 1978. Our analysis will thus focus on these issues.
'Dissidence' in French, given that this signifier itself proves to be an intersection in the texts of TQ, comes from the Latin 'dissidentia', signifying the action of separating from the community. This separation from the community is evident in TQ on a number of levels, politically, psychoanalytically, philosophically and in terms of the internal organisation of the committee. Dissidence, with a capital D also refers to the particular phenomenon of the dissident writers of the Soviet bloc who are the subject of a consideration in TQ and a special issue.

The issue on the U.S. marks a point of departure of the dissident movement of TQ. Before 1977 there are nevertheless intimations of this movement, inversely comparable to the gradual withdrawal of support from Maoism. However, the 'new rationality' emphasis, the articles on Glucksmann, Miller, Desanti, the reviews of Solzhenitzyn do not explicitly enounce a politics of dissidence, perhaps since the determining instance at that point is the dissolution of the Marxist system. This also determines a series of critical articles on Marxism, particularly those by Houdebine on Marxist views of language. These are a cathartic and face-saving exercise that look backwards rather than forwards. Dissidence, although specifically produced under Stalin and Krushchev, has a wider range; in its wider meaning it is relevant beyond the demise of Marxism.
The issue on the US deliberately instigates a politics of dissidence in TQ. Firstly, it is an enlargement of perspective, figured by an aerial picture of the world in the first pages. This enlargement implicates not only a shift away from the traditional French concentration of the gaze eastwards, but also an enlargement of subject matter to include, notably, religion.

This shift also implies a fairly radical change in the function of the intellectual engaged in an impossible relation with the USSR or China. In French intellectual life in general the function of the French intellectual can be seen to have undergone a change after 1968 to become, for example in the case of Foucault, more punctual. For TQ this is reflected in the shift from a politics of opposition to an ethics of the transformation of discourse as we have suggested. Kristeva focuses specifically on the status of the intellectual in a later article which we will consider in detail, but the issue on the U.S. implies the problematic through its focus on the difference between the U.S. and France (the articles of Corso, Birnbaum and Hoffman deal with this).

Moreover, for the issue on the U.S. TQ no longer appears as a group. The 'Pourquoi les Etats-Unis' discussion presents three individuals, Sollers, Kristeva and Pleynet, who speak from three different places and to each other, implying that their respective positions differ. This shows to what extent TQ now considers itself, through its textual organisation, as a collection of singularities, not as a community. However, despite the
singular difference and importance of Pleynet and Kristeva, it is Sollers who effectively dominates the review from this point, a situation reflected in the share of articles that each writer contributes.4

Kristeva had already written in 'D'Ithaca à New York' (1974) about the experience of her trip to the U.S. in terms which indicate that for her at least, dissidence was already a potentiality. For example, she explains how the experience of 'la voyageuse' is not to have a 'chez-soi' as the place of the Other, a fixed opposition (p.495). Given Barthes's description of Kristeva as 'l'Etrangère' we could detect this dissidence as implicit throughout Kristeva's 'traversée' of the intellectual history of France from 1965, only here she articulates this in terms of the subjective dynamics of the relation to the Law. The subject, threatened by this lack of place ('atopie') must make a pact with the Law, must desire the Law in order to ensure the continuity of identity that allows her to say 'Je', to assume the place of the subject of theory. Contrary to the antithetical status of the Law and the intellectual in France, Kristeva notes of the U.S. that the Law is on one side, separated from 'la substance', without the realisation of the place of the limit in language (p.501). Thus transgression in the U.S. is split into a multiplicity of areas that are predominantly non-verbal, and thus have no effect on discourse. This lack of transgression in language of the Law, of discourse, is paralleled by a lack of role for intellectuals comparable to the situation in Europe. Thus 'tout est libre mais rien
n'est possible' (p.508). The contestatory role of the intellectual is non-existent and it is possible only to fill in the void left by the multiplicity of non-verbal art. However, rather than returning to France, affirming the transgressive or contestatory role of the intellectual Kristeva proposes, implicitly, that the anti-thetical system in Europe can only lead to totalitarianism, to the establishment of a Law that imposes itself on the subject and exploits his jouissance. To live in the U.S. as the site of polyvalence, multiplicity, ghettoisation, is the only way to avoid totalitarianism. There is no possibility of rupture, feminism even has no effect on the Law. Kristeva thus renounces the place of the intellectual as part of a community of contestation to occupy (but is it really an 'occupation'?) a singular place 'à l'écoute des discours de l'autre.'(p.513) In TQ, a French periodical, this contestation of the place of the intellectual is an important step since it also does what it enounces. For Kristeva, therefore, the shift to the U.S. in 1977 is predicted earlier, in 1974, and is a move away from the community of intellectuals, a dissidence.

That this dissidence is accompanied by a self-consciousness of the place of the intellectual is further justified in Kristeva's important article of TQ 74 (an issue entirely dedicated to 'Recherches féminines') entitled 'Un nouveau type d'intellectuel, le dissident'. Dissidence implying a movement away from, a separation, this separation implicates the self-consciousness that displaces the place and function of the intellectual, and,
implicitly, the review.

For Kristeva the Gramscian and Sartrean concepts of the intellectual derived from an opposition between individual and mass that itself derived from the Master/Slave dialectic. This implicated also a belief in 'le mythe d'une société réussie' (p. 3). What is necessary, Kristeva suggests, is a move away from this dialectical way of thinking.

We can see how the whole question of dissidence can be taken as a movement away from the dialectical, antithetical pattern of thinking. Antithesis is what leads to Kristeva's confession 'Je désire la Loi'. The shift to the U.S. can be seen in these terms as a shift to a status of the intellectual as more punctual and heterogenous, since in France the destruction of the Symbolic, the Law by its excess ends with the subject desiring the stability of the Law, in the U.S. In TQ, after the U.S. issue the multiplication of practices, a dispersion of the semiotic into 'zones of negativity' is a fundamental step towards a non-dialectical way of thinking, a move away from the Hegelian basis. The logical basis of Sollers's thought in the negation of the negation may conflict with this, but we can also point out the more parodic status of the intellectual that Sollers adopts. Parody is a way of doubling the Law without falling into an atopic void; it also has a logical basis in the negation of the negation, as we have suggested. However, there is an element of conflict between Sollers's apparently Hegelian position and Kristeva's
psychoanalytical position, but Sollers's system is 'more than' antithetical, it appears more as if the Law leaves him indifferent rather than in a position of antithesis.

If Sollers moves into parody, Kristeva also elaborates, in this article, a new vision of the status or 'fonction dissidente' (p.4) of the intellectual, as 'communautaire mais singulière', addressing all but heard by the individual, his or her singular jouissance. But the multiplicity of singularities means that society is inherently impossible, a vision of '(les) ensembles sociaux comme imposibles'. Again, society is seen as an illusion and an impossibility, conditioned by a violence that will in TQ become increasingly rendered in religious terms as 'radical evil'. We will look more closely at this in the next section.

The dissident function of the intellectual for Kristeva is therefore an openness to both sides of the Law and to the multiplicity of singularities. She proposes that the Rebel and the psychoanalyst do not fullfil this function; standing on opposite sides of the Law. Only the writer can experience both aspects. We can recognise the return to the common denominator of the affirmation of literary creation and the transgressive pattern: the writer experiences the limits of identity and the subversion of the Law in language that leads to:

'l'embrasement de l'être de la loi dans un vide-détente, paix, néant.' (p.5)

This connotes the indifference of Sollers we suggested earlier. The writer is always a dissident.
Maternity and dissidence

Where Kristeva adds her own singular voice to the constant logic of TQ is in her proposition that women are also always dissident, demonic, as they are 'outside' discourse. The Mother is the guarantee of discourse, and thus outside it. Here Kristeva reproduces the Lacanian exclusion of women from language in as much as language assumes all desire as phallic, and Sollers's vision of the repressed matriarchy as guardian of the Law. This ideology is dominant and not challenged in TQ. However, Kristeva develops this in a radical shift towards motherhood. Maternity itself is an experience with psychosis, 'identité qui se scinde, se replie' (p.6), which passes to love. It is thus a passage, a 'traversée' from nature to culture, semiotic to Symbolic. In as far as women are excluded from the Symbolic, maternity allows:

'une chance d'accéder à ce rapport, si difficile pour une femme, à l'Autre, au symbolique et à l'éthique' (p.6),

the 'diffusion' of this passage onto 'le corps social'. Maternity thus effects a passage from the excluded singularity of the woman to the ethics of the community:

'La maternité est un pont entre singularité et éthique.' (p.6)

Feminine creativity can be thought from this point of view.

This 'theory' does a number of things at the same time. Firstly, it inscribes the possibility of a discourse on femininity that would not be as 'masquerade' or identification with the phallic, a position that defines the position of TQ with regard to feminism. Secondly, it
constitutes a fairly radical and controversial break with feminism that proposes maternity, usually taken as a sign of women's subjection, as a starting point. TQ thus becomes distanced from 'feminism' as such and identified with a dissident feminism, a feminism dissident from feminism and a dissident feminism in as much as separate from male dominated discourse. Thirdly, this shift locates Kristeva's 'theory' firmly in her own experience of maternity, and the article 'Héréthique le l'amour', a text on representations of maternity doubled by a 'poetic' account of childbirth, ruptures the scientificity of theory by the diffusion of maternity Kristeva announces.

It is necessary to emphasise, however, that this emphasis on maternity does not essentially conflict with Sollers's critique of matriarchy, as it is the Mother in so far as excluded silent guarantee of the Law that is his target, while Kristeva's 'writing through' of the experience of motherhood is its transgression. It is significant, therefore, that Kristeva refers to de Kooning's 'Women' as the most truthful representation of creativity, via maternity, and reproduces a de Kooning alongside a Piero de Francesca in the middle of 'Héréthique de l'amour', since the next issue contains Sollers's essay on de Kooning in which he writes:'Elles sont bêtes et irréfutables comme l'idée même de société.'

Motherhood, therefore, is dissidence, but it is also a possibility of ethics which is carried over by Kristeva into L'Infini and her later books on love, depression, 'étrangeté'. Kristeva's 'exile' from TQ during this last
period is symptomatic of her 'generalised' exile: 'Je parle une langue d'exil', 'L'exil est déjà, en soi-même, une dissidence.' Dissidence seen as an exile can in fact be seen as the condition of many French intellectuals since the 'seventies whose site of enunciation is often outside the hexagon in the U.S.

The literature of Dissidence

The special issue on dissidence of 1978 acts as an explicitation of the currents of dissidence operative in the review. It also 'applies' the notion of dissidence to specific areas such as literature and psychoanalysis. In fact, the fact that the first three articles derive from a conference on 'Dissidence, inconscient et pouvoirs' organised by Verdiglione surely justifies the use of the term 'dissidence of psychoanalysis', given Verdiglione's status, and since Sollers's article poses the limitations of Freudian theory with regard to literature, taking as an example Freud's short article on Dostoyevsky. For Sollers, literature (Dostoyevsky) undermines psychoanalysis, it is a negation that goes further than Freud, 'une dépense au delà de la dépense'(p70). The Oedipal limitations of psychoanalysis, 'au nom du père-pour-la-mère'(p.64) are also pointed out, while psychoanalysis is blind to 'le fils incluant son père'(p.64). Sollers's departure in writing on Dostoyevsky is thus entirely determined by an exceeding of psychoanalysis by literature. Literature becomes a symptom
of psychoanalysis itself that points to its limits. Dostoyevsky is a dissident in this sense, but also in the sense that literature can exhibit 'le fond du Mal' (p. 63), affirm 'une dépense au delà de la dépense'; the same philosophy of the impossibility of the social link is present here, played against the 'sociability' of Freud. Dissidence is linked to this impossibility and to the disappearance of the writer, 'acceptant la disparition' (p. 57), the epigraph from Bataille's L'Impossible affirms. Sollers refers to 'la roulette' à propos of Dostoyevsky, prefiguring a later focus on 'le pari pascalien' as the sacrifice of the writer, his disappearance in the infinity of language. This disappearance can also be read as that of TQ itself.

Pleynet's text is explicit in its statement of the stakes of dissidence. If literature is a symptom: 'Il ne saurait y avoir de communauté de symptôme.' (p. 19) Literature is the most singular experience. The stress on the experience of the writer is an element of Pleynet's writing on writing that continues throughout his work, so that the focus here on dissidence as 'dissidere', separation, singularity is perhaps a 'return of the repressed' of the earlier formalist and ideologically conditioned period and as we have already proposed, of Pleynet's role as secretary. Pleynet stresses here the illusion of community, specifically as concerns literature. The effect of these remarks both to the Verdiglione conference and to TQ can be taken as effects of fracture and dispersion of any illusion of community or
hegemony as regards either psychoanalysis, literature or TQ itself.

In the same way Macciocchi® stresses Pasolini as a writer, as a dissident from the PCI, 'le dissident des dissidents'(p.28) also in his homosexuality, due to the 'nature intrinsèquement homosexuelle' of the community, pointing to the truth of 'le lien social'. TQ's critique of community is also articulated with the sexual economy that was affirmed in the review since Sollers's essay on Dante; society is intrinsically homosexual, women are present as objects of exchange. As such, Macciocchi asserts, Pasolini was intolerable to society. Symptomatic of the way in which dissidence acts as a kind of knot which paradoxically binds together various currents in TQ is Macciocchi's statement:

'Le testament de Pasolini dans Salo en arrive à la conclusion que la violence du pouvoir est générale, et que la société en elle-même, fondée sur ce pouvoir, n'accepte sa loi que d'un mal radical.'(p.35)

The thesis of radical Evil at the same time implicates an exploration of the status of the law in religion, Judaism, Christianity and Islam, but also the literature of Sade, with that of Solzenitzy. Significantly, Kristeva had already, in 'Noms de lieu' linked the names of Sade and Solzenitzyn through their writing that links jouissance to horror." The thesis of radical evil can be seen to derive logically from the earlier insistences on a law based on jouissance or a wider rationality. TQ is not, however, the 'forum' for this idea, but rather the 'victim' of its dispersive effect.

In the articles by Sollers, Pleynet and Macciocchi, the
notion of dissidence thus acts as a knot that binds together a number of emphases that are effective in defining the character of the review from that point. In a sense this binding together is a temporary measure to bring about this effect; dissidence is a self-contradicting notion that enables a subsequent dispersion. However, there is also a specific meaning of the term 'Dissidence' that refers to the literature associated with Solzenitzyn et al.

In this issue the two dissidences are brought together around a discussion of literature. Kristeva looks explicitly at dissident literature as a refutation of 'le discours de gauche'. The latter, for Kristeva, is based on a view of the people as 'polis', and of society as a contract, that excludes the individual and the irrational. The thesis of 'le Mal radical' is reiterated, here in terms of ethics; any ethic becomes totalitarian if not based on the categories of the Impossible, Evil, the cause of any social relations. Religion fulfilled this function, but in the present climate of the lack of religiosity aesthetics 'contaminates' the political; this is the phenomenon of dissidence. In other words, if for Sollers, Pleynet and others it is necessary to emphasise literature as an exception to 'l'illusion communautaire' or 'le semblant', for Kristeva, not (yet) a writer of literature as such, there is a continuing concern with the possibilities of an ethics, the link between the individual and the social, undoubtedly due to her psychoanalytical practice.
Solzenitzyn, the explicit focus of Kristeva's article, writes a polyphonic, carnevalesque language with a multiplicity of subjects that faces the 'realised paranoia' (p.43) of the totalitarian state. For Kristeva, therefore, the essence of society is paranoiac, based on the 'ubiquité du mal' (p.42) and a universal aggression. Thus not only is the Gulag the truth of Marxism, but Marxism as totalitarianism is the truth of 'le lien social paranoïaque' (p.43). The political pessimism of this position is countered by Kristeva's insistence on ethics despite the impossibility of any social link. Dissidence, meanwhile, is not a positivity, an alternative, but an asocial movement, 'un lieu hors la contrainte sociale' (p.43).

Politically, this seems to affirm the 'carnevalesque' revolt of the Italian Movement 'refusant la loi jusqu'au crime' (p.43) which is the subject of a book by Maccio cchi. Kristeva however poses the necessity of reconstructing the social ('que tout est à refaire autrement' (p.44)) without proposing any institutional answer. The dissident movement in a sense creates a political vacuum, since the possibility of the political is rejected. Implicitly, this suggests a movement towards religion in TQ, as an ethics based on original sin, and literature, as exceptional, as the exceeding of 'le lien social'.

Dissidence therefore implies for TQ the rejection of the very idea of a project and of the idea of a collective group called TQ. TQ as a group ceases to exist
definitively with the emphasis on dissidence, if it was not already fractured by the shock of the trip to China and the U.S. focus. Dissidence also implies dispersion, and this dispersion is that of the review itself. However, after dissidence, but articulated with it, is the emphasis on the singularity or exception that we have continually stressed TQ to adopt in this last period. The exception comes after dissidence in the sense that dissidence is a separation from, and the exception is a point radically different from the body which is thus fragmented.
IV. The exception in literature

The view of the writer as exception is enounced explicitly in Sollers's book *Théorie des exceptions* (1986) which collects essays that appeared from the mid-seventies. However, it will become evident that we are dealing with the same logic of literature as that proposed in *Logiques* and in Kristeva's theory. The difference between the analyses of the exception and the earlier work lies in the widening of focus we have identified as operative since the U.S. issue. While the canon of writers of *Logiques* included Dante, Sade, Lautréamont, Mallarmé, Artaud and Bataille this period looks also at Joyce, Céline, Proust, Dostoyevsky, Faulkner, Balzac, Hugo and Malraux. The widening of focus also takes in the relevance of religion and of biography. This change is not a radical shift but a widening of perspective; what is dropped is the idea of a historical progression, already suggested by the shift to 'monumental history' from linear history. So all writers are potentially exceptions, while the historical conditions change. Biography thus becomes of interest as the way the writer experiences the 'traversée' of writing, while history becomes part of 'le semblant' or social illusion that is re-interpreted by the writer. The vision of the writer's subjectivity as an exception that transforms history also implies an extensive consideration of Joyce in the review, which we will look at in the course of our analysis.
The literary exception is, firstly, anchored in the singularity of a name. This would seem to propose a departure from the 'anonymity' of the textual machine of TQ's earlier emphases, but it is in fact its extension beyond the limits of an avant-garde formalism which postulated only a textual machine. The emphasis on the name is precisely due to the dissolution of the identity of the author. Sollers explains this mechanism in 'L'Auguste Comte': the writer passes through the alterity of the pseudonym (Lautréamont) and 'all the names of history' to finally be able to sign his own name Isidore Ducasse. The same tripartite passage from alienation or death of identity through a reintegration of the multiplicity of discourses, their re-reading and re-writing, to the subjectivity of the writer is described in Logiques or Séméiotikè.

Sollers continues in the same interview to make the same point about Joyce. The writer is an exception, but:

"Parce que toutes ces expériences sont très différentes les unes des autres et c'est parce qu'elles sont très différentes les unes des autres que c'est la même."(p.121)

There is a kind of community of the exception in this sense, that TQ / L'Infini defines, but:

"c'est un espace qui ne fait pas communauté d'une façon égalisante.'

The exception, therefore, is the writer, the text 'after' the effect of intertextuality or rereading / rewriting that the experience of literature operates on subjectivity. The question of the name is thus crucial,
the possibilities of the name as a singularity exist only after the passage of the subject through alterity and multiplication in writing. It is the name as a transfinite singularity that is affirmed, that is, the name as the last one after a set of infinite names. What is therefore being proposed is the occupation of the name, or the occupation of a singular linguistic event by the singularity of the body.

This singularity, what we could call the 'use value' of the name, to revive an earlier analogy, is opposed to the capacity of exchange of language in general, or social discourse. The name of the social subject is a sign of an identity, as Sollers proposed, 'la mise en carte de l'identité sociale', while the literary name is an exception. Thus, in 'L'Assomption' Sollers criticises the mutation of the name into a part of a social set, deconstructing the logic that passes from 'Tous les hommes sont mortels' to 'Socrate est un homme' and 'Socrate est mortel', and he criticises as we have seen the adjectivisation of the name of Sade into a psychoanalytical term. Psychoanalysis is also implicated here, since it makes of the exception a 'case'. Implicitly, TQ affirms singularity and the physical occupation of language, in the name, in opposition to the exchange of meaning, exemplification. This is 'against interpretation', in Susan Sontag's sense to the extent that the occupation we are speaking of enables not a silence but an infinite writing.
The body of the exception

It is evident that the view of the writer as exception which we have analysed as an occupation of the name implies a consideration of the body. The body of the exception is an exceptional body, and it is analysed in TQ as such, for example by Philippe Muray in the aptly titled 'Le corps glorieux de l'écriture'. Other analyses of this question are undertaken by Scarpetta (on Artaud) and Muray again (on Céline). Literature, Muray proposes, opens up the possibility of a 'resurrection dans le multiple' (p.61). We can recognise here the transfinite singularity that emerges through the death of individuality and passage to multiplicity and infinity. The question of resurrection is engaged and with it the question of the body, the signature and Christ. The signature is the written sign of the occupation of the body of the exception. The figure of Christ is engaged precisely because in that case it is a question of a resurrection and the disappearance of the body. Focusing on the Turin shroud as a knot of this problematic, Muray proposes that the body of the writer is engaged in a dissolution:

'Le verbe se faisant chair dissout jusqu'à la chair, le corps ne tient plus le coup dans l'incarnation.'(p.68)

The body becomes thus 'un corps glorieux', an 'unsupportable reality'. In other words, the passage of the experience of writing reveals to the subject that he is entirely permuted by language, language permutes his body, and that outside language his body is a 'déchet', an
unsupportable reality. This recalls what we have already signalled a propos of Sollers as the sacrifice of the body in the writing in a kind of 'pari pascalien'; 'infini-rien'. In 'Socrate en passant' Sollers also emphasises how for the writer the body is a limitation to be transgressed through 'le pari'. Hypothesising for a moment about the effects on reading of the sacrifice Sollers proposes, we can see that the world of phenomena is a limitation for a passage of the transcendental, transgressive subject. Transcendence here is effected through a transgression, thus the relevance of what we suggested earlier as a transgressive movement with a transcendental effect. Transcendence is permitted by a writing that transgresses the limits of the body. For this writing must coincide with the voice, the corporeal instance of language, and pass through it in a move beyond the corpse. In other words, the body occupied by language, possessed by language, is a body that has the possibility of transcending itself as body, as 'déchet' and becoming the body as voice. A writing that coincides with the voice, that reaches a certain still silence at the end of the phrase-unit that coincides with the stillness in the interstices of breathing enables the possibility for the body of coinciding with itself and revealing the possibilities of transcendence in language. Sollers himself terms the passage beyond the circulation of 'le déchet', 'le trou noir' or 'le transphère' (p.275), suggesting how there is also a rewriting of psychoanalysis implicated here. The body of the exception escapes from the
circulation of 'le transfert', or extends it, to become transcendent, beyond the sphere, in writing. The metaphor of the black hole suggests how it is a question of exiting from the circulation of the phenomenal universe through and into a hypernegativity.

The signature of the exception; intertextuality

The signature of the exception can only take place after the traversal of the infinity of texts, after intertextuality. In Houdebine's article 'La Signature de Joyce' the question of the passage to the transfinite singularity of the name is articulated as from the particular through the universal to the singular. The signature is a 'transname'(p.62). (We can add this to a list of words suffixed by 'trans' throughout TQ - transfinite, transgression, transsujet, transscène, transoedipe). Sollers had stated in 'Socrate en passant':

'Je suis ce sujet singulier qui s'intéresse à la logique de l'universel.'(p.280)

Joyce's 'wake', Houdebine explains, expresses the idea of the post-universal singularity that exists in a temporality of the 'pressant'(p.53). We can link this to Sollers's 'plus que présent', which is a temporality of the dépense of all previous discourses. The singularity of the exception, in other words, is a post-intertextual singularity. Implicitly, texts which are conscious of their intertextual relations with other texts and open to them, like Joyce, Lautréamont, Borges are more likely to be exceptional texts.
Houdebine discusses the signature of Joyce, of the exception, as an 'infinite point' coming after the multiplicity of discourses. We can recognise this point as a transfinite point, the next point after the last possible point. The transfinite is not a term used explicitly here; its logic is what we detect behind these critical points, but as if to prove the relevance of Cantor's 'transfini', or restate its relevance, Houdebine gives an effective 'compte-rendu' of Cantor's thought in L'Infini. The logic of the transfinite is implicit here; the exception is thus the point after the 'traversée' of intertextuality which opens into infinity.

Houdebine lays out a structure for this 'traversée' based on Joyce's word in Finnegans Wake 'me/ander/tale':

a) 'le récit de moi comme autre. b) le récit de l'autre comme moi. c) l'Autre en moi, moi en l'Autre comme dit.' (p.61)

It is evident that this coincides with Sollers's 'passage du sujet à son trinité' and the same logic of Logiques. To reiterate it, it is a passage through alienation to the integration of language in a writing that traverses language, a 'para-dit'. It is worth pointing out that this is neither metaphoric nor real. It is not a question of a discourse that is consciously aware of copying all other languages - the 'traversée' moreover exists within one language, although there are exceptions of which Joyce is the obvious one, but of a writing that has no consciousness of itself as original and no fear of plagiarism ('le plagiat est nécessaire') and acknowledges itself as within the same general corpus (language) as the infinite discourse of all human interaction.
Intertextuality is not limited to relations between texts but implies a vision of the interrelatedness of all the textures of human experience mediated in language. With this consciousness, the text 'comes after' language, not as an end but as a continuing process to infinity ('(une) publication permanente'). Borges implicitly realised this when he noted that every writer creates his own precursors.

The exception and the family; towards the Father

The subjectivity of the writer as exception also implicates a consideration of the relation to the family. Consistent with emphases since Logiques, this relation is a transgression of the incest taboo. It is a question of a passage through the Mother or the blockage of this passage by the screen of the Mother. If the Mother is a screen then the writer is blocked in the particularity of his own particular history. Vivianne Forrester's essay 'Proust - le texte de la mère' offers an account of the tensions involved in this dynamic.

There is an implicit psychoanalytical problematic behind the familial transgression of the writer, which we will try to elucidate. Behind the Mother it is the Father who is desired, the Father being not as for Lacan a Name of the Father, a single Father who has to be continually killed to reiterate an initial sacrifice or murder, but a Father of filiation. Filiation opens the subject to the infinity of past discourses rather than the closed
structure of the family and reproduction. Sollers suggests in 'Pourquoi je suis si peu religieux' how the figure of Christ is so important for the writer as Christ joins the Father and Son together in one person. The Mother intercedes between Father and Son to prevent the passage of the subject into the multiplicity of past discourses. Perhaps it is relevant that Sollers's own Father, according to his 'mythobiography', was an atheistic liberal, his mother a Catholic.

The Mother, or woman in general, for Sollers is the guardian of the circulation of signs and fetishes within the restricted economy of reproduction. The writer transgresses the figure of the Mother. This is the generative matrix of the critique of the position of women in TQ, feminist in a certain sense if one agrees that women are to some extent complicit in their insertion in phallocentric discourse and if we maintain that the Mother/Father positions are not gender specific. Kristeva's work is not in conflict with this, her affirmation in 'Hérétique de l'amour' that maternity is or can be the experience of a 'traversée' of the Law is itself a passage through the Mother. Maternity here is an open experience, rather than a closure of 'le trou' with the phallus of the infant; 'maternité est un pont entre singularité et éthique.'

In her later work, which is published in the last issues of TQ, Kristeva elaborates a complex psychoanalytical theory which can be seen to be consistent with the thought of the transgression of the Mother
towards the Father of filiation.

From Kristeva's articles 'Noms de lieu' and a fortiori in 'Abjet d'amour' there is an inscription of the psychoanalytical case in the review. Analysis as a practice thus in a sense intersects with writing as a practice. It is this aspect of practice, necessarily deriving from the experience of a singular subject, that distinguishes Kristeva's analysis from the theoretical psychoanalysis previously in question in TQ. The emphasis on singularity of psychoanalysis is stressed in an editorial note to a special issue 'Actualité de la psychanalyse':

'Le discours analytique n'est il pas, par son ancrage dans la sexualité, par l'irréductibilité de la pratique qui le porte, par sa marginalité nocturne inaudible aux fantasmes communautaires, un des rares lieux où s'énonce la sauvage singularité, insensée, de l'être parlant.'

Kristeva's articles in this issue approach the exception through a discussion of love, the subject of her next book Histoires d'amour. Love is at the same time approached through psychoanalysis and used to outline a psychoanalytical theory, an indication of the thematic approach, or an approach based on the affect of Kristeva's work since Pouvoirs de l'horreur. As a theme love is effective in linking together the psychoanalytical transference and the singular experience of the writer.

Kristeva's theory looks at the passage of the subject from the fusional dyad of infant and mother to the insertion into the Symbolic in terms of a primary narcissism. A primary identification with an Imaginary Father or 'Father of imaginary prehistory' is the
condition of the disengagement from the abject, the difficult oscillatory relation with the Mother. The Semiotic / Symbolic dynamic is also rephrased here in terms of a passage from the pulsional or libidinal to representations or mnesic traces. Narcissism is the structure of the circulation between discharge, affect or the pulsional, and the representations which are investments around 'le vide', a concept borrowed from André Green, of the subject.

The relations Kristeva sets out between the subject of love, the Mother and the Father can be superimposed over the familial relations proposed in the TQ theory of the exception in literature. The appeal to the figure of the Father is common to both and both implicate a relation of love or transference in the transgressive movement of the exception. Kristeva shows how the Mother can be a figure of terror, as in the experience of abjection, a figure of closure and painful ambiguity. On the other hand, she also shows in her article on maternity, 'Héréthique de l'amour', that it can be an open experience, a 'good' jouissance. From this perspective it appears that whether the Mother appears as closure or as opening depends on the experience of the subject, and the experience of Sollers imposes a view of the Mother as 'bad'. However, it is true to say that many male writers, those analysed by TQ, propose the same view of the Mother; to this extent we can agree with the association of the transgression of literature with that of the Mother, while bemoaning the lack of analysis of women writers in TQ.
The theory we have commented above is derived and applied to a number of different texts, but perhaps the most complete and extensive text in question is Joyce. Joyce appears as the writer who epitomises TQ's view of literature during the 'seventies. The different emphases of the TQ theory of literature can be gauged in reference to the analyses of Joyce. In particular, Joyce is the paradigm of the experience of the writer as exception, but we will also consider the earlier considerations of Joyce which recoup some earlier theoretical emphases. Such a retrospective assessment seems justified by the overwhelming importance of Joyce for TQ and for reasons of unity of subject matter. The same gesture is effected by Houdebine in the very last issue of TQ in an article entitled 'Joyce tel quel', and this is an acknowledgement of the importance of Joyce for the review.

In the early 'seventies the texts on Joyce play an important part in the affirmation of the exception of the writer against historically totalising movements such as Fascism and Stalinism. Joyce appears as a 'symptom' to the extent that the political analyses and strategies TQ effects occur partly through a concentration on his texts, and he points to what has been historically repressed:

'Joyce déplace en acte, en histoire, ce qui s'effectue de l'inconscient dans la langue'.

The textual effects that are marked here have a real political importance in that Joyce is a historical unconscious, a return of the repressed of Stalinism,
Fascism that later analyses (by Sollers and Houdebine) will take up. TQ thus champions the subversive values of Joyce's texts, mostly Finnegans Wake against nationalism, through the concept of 'l'élangues'. 'L'élangues' is distinct from Lacan's totalising 'lalangue', promoting the multiplicity of languages that Joyce's Finnegans Wake celebrates. Joyce becomes almost synonymous with the capacity of literature to undermine politically totalising systems, and to this extent the emphasis on Joyce is a political choice. In discussing Deleuze and Guattari's book on Kafka in TQ 63 Scarpetta plays Joyce against the authors' philosophical intentions. Likewise, discussing Lukács Joyce is used as a stick to beat not only the representative of social(ist) realism but also Brecht, who failed to recognise the value of the Joycean text. The emergence of a critical discourse on Joyce appears as a continuation of the emphasis on the singular subjectivity of the writer that transgresses the political structures in which TQ's Maoism is implicated. Joyce appears implicitly as the exception that returns of the rule to subvert and transform its system.

Joyce the symptom

Joyce thus appears as a 'symptom' of psychoanalysis and history, which points to its repressed areas. This immediately poses the question of to what extent the symptom is equivalent to the exception. Joyce is precisely the nexus of this question, and it can enable a comparison
between the approach to literature of TQ and of Lacan. For
Lacan, Joyce was 'the symptom' or 'le sinthome' (the
saint, outside normal human relations). The relation
between language and literature is knotted around the
question of the symptom by Lacan. If the subject of
language, the subject as such, experiences a 'manque à
être' through his subjection to the other, that something
is missing in his relations with the world or with the
other, the symptom is what the subject wants to use to
stop up this lack. If the subject in language is always
subject to metonymic substitution, the subject always
fading in the fort/da play of the signifier-subject-
signifier vector or shuttle, the symptom is a bit, a thing
that for the subject resists this movement and blocks up
the hole where the subject disappears. Moreover, if the
substitution of meaning is a law, if every subject is
subject to the unconscious, the symptom is what
constitutes singularity, the symptom is what makes the
exception. For Lacan, the relation of literature to
language is that the former equivocates between meaning
and symptom, between the instance of the letter as
metonymy and as 'dead letter', the letter as symptom, or
'letter' and 'litter'. Joyce is the symptom in this sense;
he is also the 'sinthome', the saint outside normal human
relations, as the symptom is the blockage of language.

However, the symptom for TQ, the exception, is not a
blockage of language but its infinity. This is consistent
with the relation to Lacan we have sketched out earlier.
Lacan's approach identifies a blockage because it does not
entertain the possibility of an infinite enunciation. Excess or jouissance for Lacan is silent, whereas for TQ it is reintegrated into language to become an infinite enunciation. Superimposing Lacan's Borromean knot of Symbolic, Imaginary and Real on Sollers's Trinity, it is evident that while for Lacan the Real is a silent, terrible shock, for Sollers there is the possibility of resurrection after the passage through alienation and multiplicity. The symptom thus becomes reformed as an infinity within language, a 'débordement' or a 'trop-plein', a music. Sollers's view of language as infinity can be seen less as jouissance, which Lacan sees as a silent blockage of the Symbolic, and more as jouissens an infinite productivity of signifiance. In this sense, the symptom is an exception that cannot yet speak.

Joyce and transphenomenality

Joyce also symptomatically points to TQ's widening of focus to take in religion in the latter half of the 'seventies, particularly in the special issue 'Obscenité et théologie'. This introduces a vision of reality or phenomenality as illusion, enounced from the point of the exception, in this case Joyce, that is a fundamental level of TQ's theory. It is thus worth looking at the implicit thought behind Sollers's extensive discussion with Houdebine in this issue, 'La Trinité de Joyce'.

The stress is on Joyce's critique of Catholicism. The beginning of Ulysses is analysed as a conflict between
Greek paganism and Jesuit Catholicism (p.39). In the former (for Mulligan) the Mother is a substance, a 'mother nature' that should be venerated. Stephen's refusal to kneel in front of his mother's death bed is indicative, for Sollers, of his will to attain a distance with regard to the matriarchy (p.41). Joyce's Catholicism is a refusal of a pagan maternal substantialism. The linking of Mother to nature suggests moreover the 'transphenomenal' aspect of TQ's theory in the sense that the maternal is thus linked to the phenomenal. Language and writing, as a passage to infinity, pass beyond or transgress the order of the phenomenal; they are transphenomenal. What writing thus enables is access to the invisible, to something outside the order of the phenomenal. (The resonance of this with Pascalian theology is evident). This something outside can be allied with Bataille's 'non-savoir' or excess; in the case of Joyce the experience of Catholicism, specifically of the Trinity, allows this passage in language through the screen of the phenomenal. Moreover, this is consistent with the constant critique in TQ of the visual and the representational, the spectacle, in favour of language and thought.

This implies a fundamental difference in the relation of language to the body, which we have already partly considered a propos of Muray's 'corps glorieux'. If we read a series of intersections of concepts in the later articles of TQ, 'le corps' is within the order of the phenomenal; it is 'le déchet' in the sense that it is condemned to death and putrefaction. The body of writing
as opposed to the organic body is 'le Chair', the body in so far as it is inhabited by 'le Verbe' or 'le souffle' and thus inscribed with the possibility of a perpendicular transgression of the phenomenal. This emphasis on a kind of transcendence is not, however, an apology of idealism. Joyce's approach to the question, as interpreted by Sollers, through Catholicism, necessitates this emphasis.

The question of 'le Verbe fait Chair' is at the same time completely consistent with Kristeva's psychoanalytical theory, where the subject disengages from the maternal 'fusional dyad' through an experience of abjection (in Ulysses Stephen's disgust with the substance of his mother's body) and an identification with an Imaginary Father. Significantly, this identification is mobilised, for Kristeva, by the voice:

> 'Cette identification idéale au Symbolique soutenu par l'Autre, mobilise donc davantage la parole que l'image.'

The voice or 'le souffle' intervenes in 'le corps' to transform it into 'la Chair', the body of writing. The stress on the voice at the expense of the image reveals that the critique of the visual in TQ is the negative side of an affirmation of language. The materialism of TQ is not a fetishisation of writing but an affirmation of the irrepressible role of language in human relations.

The question of transcendence and the theology that permits it are the essential subjects of the 'Trinité de Joyce' discussions which focus on Joyce's inscription of the trinity and the 'heresies' that deny the various dogmas of Catholicism. Joyce acts here as a symptom in the sense that his writing is the platform for a discussion of
wider issues that we have extracted as a 'theory' of writing. However, Joyce does not act as a symptom in the Lacanian sense of a blockage that could serve to put an end to 'le transfert'. Sollers and Houdebine's discussion of Joyce is a productive reading of the text that produces an extension of theory or a reiteration of a theory. Theory here is not a set of dogmatic principles but a mobile production, a 'transfert' in a sense, that operates from one text to another.

From Joyce to Jazz

This theoretical transference operates also towards music. The transphenomenal emphasis shifts from the discussion of Joyce to that of Jazz in 1979. Sollers proposes that writing is in advance of jazz since the latter is still tied to the order of the phenomenal, even though it strains to escape from it (p.32). Writing thus moves towards 'le non être'. To be tied to an instrument is to be tied to the phenomenal: 'c'est trop fixé' (p.32), but writing carries within it:

'cette espèce de trou par quoi ça ne fait jamais bruit de fond quand même; c'est à dire le trou qui est en train de s'expliquer à lui même pourquoi il est un trou, et là il y a quelque chose qui encore une fois n'est plus de l'ordre des phénomènes.' (p.32)

Writing, again, escapes the order of the phenomenal through 'le trou' which we could explain, in Bataillean terms, as a vertical transgression, an 'assomption' as opposed to the horizontal discontinuity and temporality of the 'visible'. We can also ally this to Kristeva's
insistence on a primary identification that is of the order of the metaphor rather than of metonymy. Metonymy is a (Lacanian) quest for the object of desire, thus it is in the area of the objectal or phenomenal; metaphor, the identification with an Imaginary Father, is not (yet) of the order of the objectal. In Kristeva's analysis this functions towards the Symbolic, towards the order of the visible; while in writing this would function in the inverse direction, towards 'le vide' (p.34) she identifies as the subject's position in this dynamic, not as regression but as transgression. Significantly, Kristeva stresses the importance of 'l'écoute' here.

The discussion on jazz is important in focusing on music. 'Le trou' can in fact be seen as an exit from the visible to the invisible through the medium of the voice and its music, through the ear. Sollers had stressed the importance of the ear as opposed to the eye for Paradis, and of the ear as the opening through which 'le verbe' enters the body of the Virgin. In his 'mythobiography', Sollers also emphasises the importance of having a ruptured tympanum for his writing career. While the relevance of the latter two points may be limited, we can argue that Paradis also presents as radical a challenge to the eye, in reading, as it does to the ear. The visual impression of absolute unpunctuated continuity contrasts with the necessity of pauses in the aural appreciation of the text. Furthermore, much of the radicality of TQ's textuality pertains to typographic innovation; the texts of Denis Roche and a fortiori Maurice Roche are an
important strand of the TQ text. To this extent, we can say that while the affirmation of language as such privileges the ear, the materiality of language being affirmed through music and the voice, this also involves a reinterpretation of the visual aspect of the text. The text is now less a representation, but appears more as a musical score.

Returning to the question of the transphenomenal, Houdebine reiterates the dynamic of the phenomenal and the transcendent in terms of visibilia/invisibilia (p. 43), while asserting that the Symbolic is able to codify the invisible, transform 'le vide' into the space of meaning; the sense of the Trinity is thus that it inscribes a logic of the transgression of the phenomenal in the Symbolic. This is why the passage to 'le vide' or 'le non-être', that might as well also be called 'l'être' given the affirmation-negation in question here, is not a regression to a pre-Symbolic but a transgression/transcendence within language.

Writing and sex

The theory of the exception in TQ is worked across a series of texts, Lautréamont, Joyce, Céline, Sade, which, continued in L'Infini, begin to constitute an encyclopedic approach to literature as a whole rather than a close focus on a specific canon of writers. The dispersion of TQ is also that of its subject matter, but there is a constant theory at work. Moreover, the analyses are
supported in TQ by the publication of numerous documents relevant to the text considered. This suggests to what extent the work of encyclopedic cataloguing of the transgressions of the exception is accompanied in the review by an extensive work of documentation. The same is also true of the review's interest in religion. An important documentary subject of TQ in its last years is the work of Gilbert Lely on Sade, which suggests the relevance of a discussion of the approach to sexuality implied by TQ's approach to language.

Sade's 'Récapitulations', for example, is a catalogue of masturbations which implicates sexuality and obscenity in the singularity of the writer. It suggests that sex is open to the same infinite permutations as writing and a 'comptabilité de la jouissance' as Pleynet terms it in an accompanying article, is what discourse cannot accept, what appears as 'obscene'. In other words, the stress on obscenity is there to show how the sexual is an effect of the Symbolic. Similarly, Joyce's letters to Nora, published in TQ, stress the written form, they are a demand for writing rather than for sex. The obscene is what cannot be recuperated by a 'natural' form of sexuality, as within the limits of reproduction, therefore putting in doubt the 'semblance' of sexuality as natural and leading to the postulation that 'ce qu'on appelle sexe n'est qu'un effet de langage'. This is consistent with Lacan's infamous postulation that there is no sexual relation, if it is padded out slightly. There is no natural sexual relation that is not mediated through the
order of language. This also suggests that sexual difference is an effect of language, and denigrates the notion of a natural sexuality in favour of a polymorphous perversity.

However, while Lacan would affirm that sexuality is determined by language, he might not go so far as to say that jouissance is also under its spell. For TQ, jouissance is also, as we have underlined above, integrated in language. Sollers proposes in 'Je sais pourquoi je jouis' that jouissance is not ineffable but is permutable, subject to an infinite enunciation. The accountability or geometry of jouissance may be a more radical proposition than that of its silence. We can read this in a poem by Marcelin Pleynet entitled 'Litanies', published in TQ and in Rime, which is a list of numbers written out in French from one to one thousand and two and ending with the phrase 'mille et tre', which is the number of women Don Juan has apparently slept with in Mozart's opera. That jouissance is susceptible to the infinite permutation of language is what the poem teaches us.

Textual singularities - Barthes

The later years of TQ thus sees a proliferation of analyses of literary exceptions, the continuation of which in L'Infini will be assessed further on. It is also important to note the re-emergence as an important current of interest in TQ of the publication of original and innovative texts by young writers, which also continues in
L'Infini. Already established associates of TQ such as Maurice Roche continue to publish in the review alongside the percussive force of Paradis. It seems relevant to include in this bracket the writings of Roland Barthes after Fragments d'un discours amoureux. L'obvie et l'obtus, a series of texts on painting and music is published posthumously in 1980 in the 'Collection'.

Barthes' critical sensibilities and his style run throughout the review as a pole against which the theory and writing of TQ in general measure themselves. This is a constant tension within the dynamics of TQ as a whole; a separate thesis would examine the relation of Barthes to TQ perhaps in terms of a love story. Barthes' writing is in a sense removed from TQ; his writing does not reproduce the theory of TQ, but explores and opens out other areas.

Barthes' last two published texts in the review can however be seen in continuity with the currents of thought in TQ in this period. 'On échoue toujours...' concerns Stendhal's relation to Italy; it is an extension, in a sense, of Fragments d'un discours amoureux, forming an important current of the analysis of love, which implicates transference psychoanalytically, with the previous book and Kristeva's Histoires d'amour and even Pleyt's Rime", suffused in the question of love for the Mother. Barthes' focus here, 'la sorte d'aphasie qui naît de l'excès d'amour'(p.340) joins with Kristeva's "Ne dis rien" in its theme, if not in its approach. Barthes' writing has become more personal, singular; Stendhal is not present as part of canon of writers but as a personal
concern of Barthes. It is this personal, singular aspect that can be seen to form the basis of Barthes' contributions to the review perhaps even since 1971. Thus it is not pertinent to speak of Barthes being a 'member' of the TQ group, or 'under its influence'; the relation is more of the way a singularity is related to his own body and to the group.\textsuperscript{45}

In 'Délibération'\textsuperscript{44} the focus is explicitly personal, but this is itself the subject, framed in the question of a consideration of the writing of the diary. Barthes' final non-posthumous contribution to the review thus raises the question of the inscription of singularity in writing. Barthes does not assert the status of the individual but poses the same singularity of the exception. The Journal thus raises the question 'Suis je?' (p.412), and the writing of this singularity is linked to a subjectivity of dépense, as it is in the 'Text', in Barthes's final words:

'je puis sauver le Journal à la seule condition de le travailler à mort, jusqu'au bout de l'extrême fatigue, comme un Texte à peu près impossible..'(p.413)

Literature in TQ in this final period thus appears as a dispersed literature that nevertheless affirms the basic theory of the singularity of the writer and the dépense of the text, of writing. This dispersion and continuation coincide in the dissolution of the review in its passage to \textit{L'Infini}. 
V. Dissolution

There are several interpretations of 'dissolution' as concerns TQ. One is the termination of the publication of TQ, the shift and transformation of its editorial team to Denoël and Gallimard and the change in title to L'Infini. Another is a dissolution as a negativity at work in literature, the negative force of the truth as it emerges from the experience of the exception in literature.

Dissolution as analysis

Dissolution also means analysis, and analysis, including psychoanalysis, is also implied in the first dissolution, the shift of TQ to L'Infini. Psychoanalysis itself is not completely annulled in TQ due to the affirmation that its discourse on literature is limited. It is still affirmed as a privileged site of the singularity of the subject, for example by Sollers in 'Le cours de Freud'. As well as Kristeva's work, which we have looked at, Lacanian analysis is praised for its continuation of Freud's essential discoveries, against projects of political community and against philosophy. Sollers ends the article, nevertheless, by playing religion and art against psychoanalysis. Psychoanalysis is posed as necessary but limited.

It is moreover a dissident psychoanalysis that TQ affirms through its publications. Verdiglione continues to
be important as the organiser of a number of conferences separate from the institutional space of Lacanian analysis. A further point of this psychoanalytical dissidence is stressed by Sollers in various articles as the resistance of and criticism of the psychoanalytical conference at Tblissi in the USSR which various Lacanian and other analysts attended. In 'Le Cours de Freud' Sollers interprets this as a sign of complicity between the Soviet-Marxist hegemony and the psychoanalytical institution (p.242). TQ is thus further established as a space critical of psychoanalysis, which nevertheless affirms the writing and theory of Lacan against psychoanalysis as such in a sense. Lacan's gesture of the dissolution of the EFP is welcomed by Sollers. So TQ's position towards Lacan is ambiguous, it is dissident and affirmative at the same time. Lacan's theory is at some points criticised as limited; the 'Nom du père', for example, is reversed as a 'Père du nom' (p.222), a Father of filiation rather than an abstract universal paternal metaphor. Lacan's theory of the subject is implicitly supported while his approach to literature, over Joyce and Sade, for example, is confronted by Sollers in his articles on the same writers.

An important discourse on this subject in addition to Sollers's articles are Sollers's discussions with Shoshana Felman on the subject of 'la chose littéraire'. Felman and Sollers emphasise how psychoanalysis is dependent on literature, for example it takes the Oedipus complex from Sophocles; 'la chose littéraire' thus informs and
undermines psychoanalytical theory through this 'transfert'. Literature can analyse psychoanalysis, and this is an operation Lacan effects in the Seminar on The purloined letter. Similarly, if Joyce is a symptom, it is because 'la chose littéraire' (the expression suggesting the unbearable repressed status of literature for the discourse of analysis) is a symptom of psychoanalysis. Stuart Schneidermann, in 'Lacan et la littérature' also notes that 'la lecture lacanienne de Freud est un détournement de textes'. Lacan's reading of literary texts is in a sense affirmed within his theory as a subversion of theory, a 'hole' in theory, presenting the possibility of a reading of Lacan's reading of literature against his theory, an operation conducted in Felman's book La Folie et la chose littéraire. Thus there is at the same time an affirmation of Lacan, a Lacan within Lacanianism, and a critique of psychoanalytical theory in as much as it is a rationality that excludes the 'folie' of 'la chose littéraire'. Literature analyses or dissolves psychoanalysis, itself a dissolution and the institutional dissolution of the latter by Lacan reflects that of TQ in literature.

Dispersion - religion and art

The dissolution of TQ also occurs in a dispersion of subject matter. While this dispersion remains filtered through the focus on literature, religion and art emerge as important currents of interest in TQ in its last few
years.

The necessity of the posing of the question of religion in TQ has already been described; it is historically and subjectively relevant. Historically, as philosophy had not succeeded in dissolving the question and the lack of religiosity led to a return of the irrational in politics. This analysis is presented by Sollers, B:H. Lévy and J:M. Benoist in a number of articles. Subjectively, the experience of religion, of Joyce specifically, is necessary as a symptomatic logic of the renaissance of the subject and the transgression of the phenomenal. The religious in TQ is thus determined by literature. Where religion is the exclusive focus of a number of articles it is the more radical moments that are emphasised, such as the book of Job, Gnosticism, Islamic mysticism, Zen Buddhism. As Bataille had already stressed, it is in its more mystical, radical moments that religion comes closest to the transgressions of literature.

TQ's interest in religion is also determined by the latter's awareness of 'le Mal radical' and certain texts are emphasised in this respect. Philippe Nemo's analysis of the book of Job, 'Job et le Mal radical' is a prefatory statement of this interest linked to the emergence of the 'Nouveaux philosophes' or a philosophy of dissidence. Later, TQ supports and questions the work of René Girard, which essentially presents the notion that religion is a discourse of the exclusion of the violence inherent in any social link; the sacrifice affirmed by religion is the outlet of this violence on a "bouc
émisnaire'. Christianity is interpreted as a religion which is most aware of its own status as sacrifice. It is evident how this system is continuous with the work of Bataille published in TQ on a prehistorical economy of exclusion of violence. Girard's thesis operates in TQ as a return to this prehistorical question, as well as a stress on 'le Mal radical.'

The political aspects of the religious emphasis of TQ, Sollers's praise of the Pope', for example, can be read as gestures against the hegemony of philosophy in the context. Religion, Sollers had suggested, appears as obscene in the contemporary intellectual scene. This also associates TQ with the 'Nouveaux philosophes' who opt for a return to religion rather than the analytic philosophy of such writers as Jacques Bouversesse with which Deleuze and Guattari, Lyotard and even Derrida are associated.® This division in the context, which is also to an extent between the publishers Minuit (and its review Critique) and Grasset and Gallimard, remains relevant at the present. The politics of religion are primarily a strategic gesture that is overdetermined by the politics of the exception in literature.

The addition of the subtitle 'Art' to the other subtitles 'Littérature/Philosophie/Politique/Science' in 1979 suggests a conscious recognition of the addition of this function to the review. The work of Pleynet had already formed an important current, and his analyses of Cy Twombly, Motherwell, Giorgione, Pollock, Matisse, Picasso and Giacometti are important contributions to the
discourse on art in France as such, demanding a separate analysis. The widening of the focus of the review to become less specifically focused on literature and more generally supportive of 'art' in general, while literature remains the predominant focus, is suggested in the publication of interviews with Stockhausen and John Cage. One of the final issues of the review is a special issue on Picasso, which shows how far the review has now a less defined space of inquiry. The dispersion is also, therefore, within the arts, a movement that is continued in L'Infini and also 'diverted' in Art press, in which the work of TQ and its associates continues to be affirmed up to the present.

**Intellectual self-consciousness and dissolution**

The dispersive effect we have identified in the review since 1977 and the widening of the focus of the review to the disparate areas of religion and art, nevertheless resonant with an implicit theory of literature that continues in this period, is however not enough to explain the eventual dissolution of the review. The objective reason for this dissolution is Sollers's writing of Femmes, which would not have been published by Seuil. Its publication by Gallimard justifies the shift of the review to Gallimard's subsidiary Denoël and later to Gallimard. Seuil being co-proprietors of the name 'Tel Quel' the name of the review is changed to the fitting L'Infini. It is obvious that it is less a question of the end of TQ than
its continuation under a different name.

The dissolution, which is in fact a continuation, is however accompanied by a discourse in TQ which its place in the context is specifically considered. The discourse on the place and function of the intellectual and the review is implicitly present throughout the history of the review, but it is only in this last period that it emerges explicitly and has an effect on the institutional place of the review. In a sense it is an exceeding of TQ by itself, signalled by this self-conscious discourse that leads to the shift to L'Infini. Sollers's articles 'On n'a encore rien vu' and 'Le G.S.I' constitute the explicit self-consciousness indicated here.

'On n'a encore rien vu' makes explicit a division between an 'avant-garde' TQ and TQ as it is now, which we can see as more or less synonymous with the beginning of L'Infini. On one side there is the 'avant-garde' periodical that, for Sollers, was caught in the illusion of a belief in a social revolution, that was the illusion of all the avant-gardes of the twentieth century, Surrealism, Futurism, that the crisis of the West could be turned into a state of non-crisis. TQ had traversed the adventure of the avant-garde in this sense. This does not imply a conservatism with regard to literature but a radical position with regard to both art and social reality. Literature based on the notion of the exception is, for Sollers, already beyond the notion of the 'avant-garde' that is also linked to the idea of the 'movement'. The link between social revolution and artistic revolution is
illusory because it postulates a continuity between the logic of the exception and that of society, of the 'polis', which we have suggested above is the reverse of the true situation. We insist on the word 'exception':

'Mais il s'agit de revenir sans cesse sur des exceptions. Nous voulons éclairer l'histoire du côté de l'exception et pas du côté de la règle ou de la communauté.'

Following through Sollers's argument, the shift is from community to singularity. In terms of social reality it seems that the more radical position, that may be erroneously supposed to be 'on the right', is that the resolution of the critical state is a violence that represses the impossible contradictions of society. This is a move away from 'revolutionary' ideas towards a position that implicates religion, but also Freud's death drive.

There is thus a self-conscious critique of a TQ as avant-garde and revolutionary that projects the 'new' TQ into a different space. At the same time, however, Sollers emphasises here a continuity, an insistence, in TQ, on the experience of literature, an assertion that can be backed up as we have shown. We can develop this: TQ at the same time revolves and repeats, insists. The paradox of change and insistence is 'explained' by a different way of looking at temporality. TQ cannot be interpreted through the temporality of the book, of the text, as it is a periodical that exists in a historical dimension; it is always non-closed, open to its next 'fall'. It disturbs a hermeneutic approach. Neither, however, can it be read exclusively as a historical temporality in terms of
events, with revolutionary and strategic turns, as the repetition and insistence of writing, either of Paradis or the experience of Artaud, Bataille, Sade, Dante etc, remains constant and undermines the linearity of this eventual history. The temporality of the book is thus undermined by the temporality of history which is undermined by the temporality of the text. A thesis on TQ is thus a traversal that eventually evacuates the possibility of a historical thesis on TQ, it dissolves itself in this paradox.

Nevertheless, it continues. The self-consciousness in relation to its past history is continued in TQ in Sollers's articles; the review is now tied organically to the history of his writing. It is continued in Sollers's 'Pourquoi j'ai été chinois' where the question of Maoism is specifically undermined by Sollers's gestural interest, a constant. In 'Le G.S.I' however Sollers approaches a more developed 'theory' of TQ's place in the context, in discourse. Sollers's proposition in 'Le G.S.I' is that TQ, Paradis, Sollers constitute a space outside the predictable circulation of discourses, that programmed by the organism, invented by Sollers, called the G.S.I., the 'Gestion des surfaces imprimées' or 'Giration du semblant illimité' (p.10). The programmation of discourses or 'le semblant', or 'the spectacle', to use Debord's term, is thus total, with a few exceptions. TQ falls outside the circuit of the G.S.I., Sollers proposes, while it is obvious from the critical discourses on the review since then that its interpretation does not. Why? Because the
discourse of TQ cannot be predicted:

'ce qui entraîne que l'expérience est telle qu'elle désoriente toute assignation de place'. (p.10)

Also because TQ is in a situation of 'permanent dissolution'(p.11). More fundamentally, it is because TQ reproduces the memory of discourses, of the GSI, that is, it desacralises all the positions of its own discourse in a traversal of all discourses including that which is fundamental, religion. 'TQ suit une évolution parallèle à celle de la constitution de la mémoire GSI.' (p.11) This involves an experience of fiction in which the place of the subject is exceeded, but which does not opt for psychosis, madness, a position predicted by the GSI. Permanent dissolution is a more radical proposition. Evidently the publication of Paradis is an important aspect of this displacement, but Sollers also recognises Lacan, Pascal, Lautréamont, Joyce as exceptions who might escape the programming by discourse, the circuit of 'le semblant'. In this excess, therefore, Sollers situates TQ in a different context of a dynamic between 'le semblant' and what escapes it; implicating the dialectic between the review as historical temporality and as textual temporality that Paradis specifically pointed to (this is our interpretation). Permanent dissolution is also that of the subject of dépense, and of the writing of the infinite text, of writing as infinite permutation.

This permanent dissolution raises many questions. We have tried to show how the review at the same time shifts and continues. That Paradis at the same time shifts and continues with Femmes will be evident from a reading of
both texts. *Femmes* is still the experience of a subject who thinks of himself as beyond the circuit of exchange of 'le semblant', here made concrete, metaphorised in Sollers's vision of society and of women. Punctuation only shifts the enunciation of the writing into a narrative space that nevertheless comes after the experience of traversal of the unpunctuated writing, which continues. Subjectivity is still put into 'process' in the text through the splitting of the narration between the narrator, S. and the writer of books without punctuation. There is still a technique that suspends the meaning in non-closure in the Célinean technique of the three dots at the end of phrases that are often nominal clauses, notational marks rather than subject-predicate structures. The process of Sollers's writing itself is in effect what forces the shift into *L'Infini*, the structure of the context of publishing houses, the context of 'le semblant' does the rest.

The dissolution of TQ in its shift of place and name is thus the sign of a permanent dissolution. The words of Guy Debord, who Sollers acknowledges in a position similar to his own, at the beginning of the thesis thus exemplify the adventure of the review. Permanent dissolution is also a kind of death, and it is not surprising that the demise of TQ coincides roughly with the death of one of its principal allies, Roland Barthes, and the death of Lacan, with whom it had always entertained a mutually helpful but suspicious relationship. That this dissolution is permanent, not the burial of a corpse but its survival,
the infinite consummation of an excess, is assured by the
texts left behind that are not closed but infinitely open
to their re-writing.

Epilogue : L'Infini

TQ dissolves into L'Infini in a movement away from the
institution, the group, the totalisations of 'theory' and
towards the exception. The 'theory' of the exception that
looks at the text in terms of its relation to other texts,
its position vis-a-vis infinity, sexuality, the family,
religion, language is extended in L'Infini which sees a
proliferation of 'entries' to the encyclopedic cataloguing
of the exception in literature, of which we can name:
Shakespeare / Pascal / Loyola / Kafka / Nabokov / Rimbaud.
Obviously, the ten year history of L'Infini would require
a more detailed analysis of the configurations of this
'traversée', with a specific analysis in each case, and in
some sense TQ requires the same, but L'Infini appears in
this light as the extension or continuation of TQ, rather
than a different departure. What changes is the relation
of the review to the context, which becomes more
'traditional' ; Sollers's position as 'enlightened
dictator' of L'Infini is less original than the
permanently dissolving community of exceptions of TQ, and
the publication of L'Infini by Gallimard may give the
appearance of a more traditional approach, but this is
only an appearance. L'Infini still occupies the same
radical position in the context as TQ did, affirming the
radical transformative effect of literature on social and political reality. The N.R.F. still celebrates 'pure' literature, but as a restricted, decorative area. The hegemony of philosophy in Critique, for example, is opposed by L'Infini's rigorously exceptional and anti-systemic stance. In addition, a number of 'sous-TQ' perpetuate various moments of TQ's past that it transgressed or dissolved.

However, L'Infini is almost totally dominated by Sollers. To this extent the tension that characterised TQ, between the perspectives of Sollers, Kristeva, Pleynet and the others, a tension between individuals and ideas, is lacking in L'Infini. L'Infini also has not developed or evolved as TQ did. It does not have the ideologies of structuralism, Formalism, Marxism, Maoism to traverse; it does not have to set up and set in motion the logic of the text. L'Infini is based on a fairly constant emphasis on literature as exception that begins with TQ. L'Infini also exists in a period that has not seen the ideological swings and eruptions, centred on 1968, that the period of TQ did. The context of L'Infini is that of the spectacle, the dominance of the media, particularly visual, and of information; its ideological dominance is coincidental with the creation of L'Infini.

L'Infini is published in a context of postmodernity, a context in which as Lyotard puts it the great narratives have ceased to function. In postmodernity reference and meaning become submerged in a proliferation of seductive, superficial visual systems which Baudrillard calls the
'hyperreal'. In this context, L'Infini's assertion of the exceptional truth of literature is a constant and singular voice of dissent, sometimes accompanied by a parodic discourse within and on the discourse of the spectacle, as in Sollers's novels. So L'Infini is valuable, but perhaps not of such interest, academically, as TQ. However, it is also misleading and illusory to separate TQ from L'Infini: L'Infini extends the theory produced in TQ, expanding it, dissolving it in a context not determined by a group or associated with institutions. L'Infini is the dissolution of TQ into open, infinite form.
NOTES FOR CHAPTER FIVE
DISSOLUTION

I. Dissolution of the Marxist system

1. TQ47 Autumn 1971.

China - overinvestment in the ideological

5. For example, J. Daubier, cf. 'La Chine aujourd'hui' TQ50 Spring 1972; 'Idéologie, pouvoir et gauchisme en Chine populaire' TQ54. Daubier is the author of an account of the Cultural Revolution and editor of the important periodical La nouvelle Chine. See also Jean Chesneaux, 'Yanan' TQ61, & Charles Bettelheim in TQ48/9.

Critique of Marxism


Contradictions - politics and the subject

11. Kristeva, 'Comment parler à la littérature' TQ47 p. 28
12. Eg. Dominique Desanti, 'Les socialistes et les femmes' TQ61; Catherine Franchbin, 'Le féminisme utopique de Charles Fourier', TQ62; Michèle Mattelart, 'Le coup d'etat feminin'; Susan Sontag, 'Feminisme et fascisme' TQ 63; M.A. Macciocchi, 'Sexualité feminine dans l'ideologie fasciste' TQ66; 'Recherches feminines' TQ 74; Dominique Desanti, 'L'autre sexe des bolcheviks' TQ77.

'Le Voyage en Chine'; phantasy and fragmentation

16. Cf Kristeva, 'La Femme, ce n'est jamais ça' TQ59 and P.

The Death of the Father—the exception

II. Ethics; the Law and its excess

Psychoanalysis via Italy

1. Luce Irigaray, 'Le v(i)ol de la lettre' TQ45

Jouissance and fascism; the ethical function of literature

5. Sollers, 'A propos de la dialectique' in Psychanalyse et politique.

Violence and cure; social illusion and truth

7. 'Polylogue', P. p.175.
8. Cf. 'Le vréel' in Folle vérité, Paris, 1979, Seuil, Coll.TQ.

Analysis


Elements of excess; transgressive or transcendental

10. TQ58 Summer 1974 p.93.
11. Dominique Desanti, 'A propos de Flora Tristan' TQ53 Spring 1973. Cf. also Susan Sontag's 'Projet d'un voyage en Chine' TQ54, which, coming immediately after a report by Jean Daubier on China, subverts this 'factual' response by a subjective and phantasmatic one, grounded in desire, suggesting that TQ's sinophilia is itself phantasmatic and projective.

Crisis in rationalism

III. The politics of dissidence

The dissident intellectual

1. TQ71-3 Autumn 1977 'Etats Unis'.
4. From the U.S. issue, compared to Sollers's articles, not including Paradis, which number around 30, Pleynet contributes 12 pieces and Kristeva 4.
6. 'Hérétique de l'amour' TQ74 p. 41.
7. Scarpetta, 'Le corps américain' TQ71-3 p. 250.

Maternity and dissidence

8. TQ74 p.38. cf. also P. p.477.
10. She only publishes another 3 articles in the review after this issue.

The literature of dissidence

15. Sollers, 'Dostoyevski, Freud, la roulette' TQ76 THEX p. 70.
17. Pleynet, 'De l'inégalité sexuelle I' TQ76.
18. M.A. Macciocchi, 'Pasolini : assassinat d'un dissident' TQ76.
20. Kristeva, 'La littérature dissidente comme réfutation du discours de gauche' TQ76.

IV. The exception in literature

The name of the exception

1. Sollers, 'L'Auguste Comte' TQ79 Spring 1979 and THEX.
2. L. p. 60.
3. Sollers, 'L'Assomption' TQ91 Spring 1979 and THEX.

The body of the exception

5. Philippe Muray, 'Céline et la religion révélée' TQ85 & Céline, Coll. TQ & G. Scarpetta, 'Artaud écrit ou la canne de St. Patrick'
TQ81 Autumn 1979.
7. Cf. Sollers's novel La Fête à Venise which treats this question 'thematically' through the astrophysician with whom the narrator lives. The transfinite point of writing appears as a black hole ('trou noir').

The signature of the exception; intertextuality

The exception and the family - towards the Father
11. Muray, 'Le corps glorieux de l'écriture' TQ80 p.60.
18. Although there is creative work by women writers, the only important study of work by women writers is Vivianne Forrester's article in TQ74 on Emily Bronté, Emily Dickinson, Virginia Woolf, 'Féminin pluriel'.

Joyce tel quel
20. TQ54 Autumn 1973 p.3.
22. 'L'écriture comme multiplication des langues' p. 86 ; 'Il n'écris pas dans "lalangue" (au sens de Lacan) mais dans l'élangues : ça saute, ça coupe et c'est singulier pluriel' p. 90.

Joyce the symptom
26. Cf. 'Joyce & co' translated by S. Heath, who changes 'jouissance' to 'jouissens' to bring out this difference: 'Caught between the circulation of money and that of meaning but exceeding them by sense and pleasure, joycity, joyance, joysense - jouissens.' TQ64 Winter 1976 p.5.

Joyce and transphemomenality
28. Cf. Colette Soler, 'Literature as symptom' in Lacan and the
subject of language New York 1991, p. 218. 'it is the problem of putting an end to the transferential relationship with the analyst.'

From Joyce to Jazz

30. Sollers's offers a reading of Parmenides, in which 'le non être' is reversed to become 'le semblant', in the interviews in separate volume.
31. Sollers, 'L'Assomption' 'Donc cette façon de prendre, d'emprunter, de dire de plus en plus et de donner au discours sa fonction métaphorique ultime, passe par le mécanisme logique de l'assomption.' THEX p. 227.
32. Cf. Kristeva, 'Freud et l'amour' in Histoires d'amour, 'Objet métonymique du désir . Objet métaphorique de l'amour' p.44. 'Métaphore, entendez mouvement vers le discernable, voyage vers le visible' p. 43. Sollers's writing functions in the reverse direction, from Symbolic to Semiotic, visible ('le semblant') to invisible ('l'infini').
33. 'cette identification archaïque n'est pas à vrai dire objectale' Kristeva, art. cit. p.36.
34. Sollers, 'je crois que la vraie liberté devrait passer plutôt par le tympan' 'Jazz' TQ80 p.26. Cf. the picture of Sollers's ear in TQ83. 'Ici l'oeil s'efface dans ce dont se souvient l'oreille', 'Vers la notion de Paradis THEX p. 196. Cf. 'Comment aller au paradis' Art press.

Writing and sex

35. eg. 'Une carte postale de Freud' TQ65 ; Hölderlin, 'Fragment inédits' TQ68 ; M. De Sade, 'Récapitulations' TQ78 ; Gilbert Lely, 'L'almanach illusoire de M. de Sade' TQ78 ; Georges Bataille, 'C'est une banalité' TQ81 ; D.A.F de Sade, 'D'Alembert, Troubadours, Vaudois.' TQ81 ; Joyce, 'L'influence universelle de la Renaissance' ; 'Lettres à Nora'; 'Lettres à Mme Fleischmann' TQ 83.
38. Sollers, 'La trinité de Joyce' p. 65.
40. Sollers, 'Je sais pourquoi je jouis' TQ90 Winter 1982 and THEX.
41. M. Pleynet, 'Litanies', TQ64 & Rime.

Textual singularities - Barthes

42. R. Barthes, 'On échoue toujours à parler de ce qu'on aime' TQ85 Autumn 1980 and Le bruissement de la langue.
44. Kristeva, "Ne dis rien" TQ91 Spring 1982.
45. Cf. the 'Tel Quel' section of Roland Barthes par Roland Barthes p. 177-8.
46. TQ82 Winter 1980, also in Le bruissement de la langue.

V. Dissolution

Dissolution as analysis

1. Sollers, 'Le cours du Freud' TQ79 Spring 1979 and THEX.
3. Shoshana Felman, 'La chose littéraire, sa folie, son pouvoir'

Dispersion - religion and art


Intellectual self-consciousness and dissolution

12. 'On n'an encore rien vu' TQ85 Autumn 1980 and IMP.


15. 'Pourquoi j'ai été chinois' TQ81 Summer 1981.
**CHRONOLOGY**

Events relevant to TQ: Important articles, books published in the 'Collection' and by TQ writers. Committee changes and other events.

- 1957 Sollers's 'Le défi' is published in *Ecrire* 3, praised by Mauriac.
  - Sollers, *Le Parc*.
  - Michel Maxence joins committee.
  - Affirmative letter from Sollers to Marcelin Pleynet on Pleynet's poetry.

  - Deguy, Richardou join committee. Coudol, Maxence leave committee.
  - Sollers's attempts to evade military service end in a military hospital, from which he is 'rescued' by the intervention of Malraux, the Minister of Culture.

Publications and events in the context

- Barthes - Mythologies
- Lévi-Strauss - Anthropologie structurale
- Blanchot - L'espace littéraire
- Robbe-Grillet - Dans le labyrinthe
- Sarras' - Le Planétarium
- Sartre - Critique de la raison dialectique
- Levinas - Totalité et infini
- Merleau-Ponty - Signes
- Martinet - Éléments de linguistique générale
- Simon - La Route des Flandres
- Bator - Degrés, Répertoire
- Thibaudeau - Une cérémonie royale
- Godard - A bout de souffle
- Death of Camus
- During the Algerian war, the 'Manifeste des 121' calls for intellectuals to signal their disagreement.
- Wittgenstein - Tractatus logico-philosophicus (trad. Klossowski)
- Foucault - Folie et déraison
- Starobinski - L'Oeil vivant
- Pinget - Clope ou dossier
- Simon - Le maintien de l'ordre
- Richardou - L'Observatoire de Cannes
- Genet - Les paravents
- Ponge - Le grand receuil
- Michaux - Connaissance par les gouffres
- Robbe-Grillet/Ressais - L'année dernière à Marienbad
- Rauschenberg expo, in Paris
- The review *Communications* is created at the Ecole pratique des Hautes Etudes.
- Death of Merleau-Ponty
- OAS active in Paris

Koyré - Du monde clos à l'univers infini (trad.)
Lévi-Strauss - La pensée sauvage
Sartre - L'Imagination
Rousset - Forme et signification
Derrida - L'Origine de la géométrie
Deleuze - Nietzsche et la philosophie
Bataille - Les larmes d'Eros
Bator - Mobile
Sarras' - Les fruits d'or
Pinget - L'Inquisitoire
Faye - Battement
Baudry - Le pressentiment
Crisis in committee when Hallier attempts to become Director. Hallier leaves committee.

Collection Tel Quel begun with Denis Roche's Récits complets and Flaubert, La première éducation sentimentale.

Contacts between Sollers & J. Derrida.

1963 Pleynet, 'Exposition Mark Rothko'; Charles Olson, poète et critique(12); Faye, Analogues(13); Pleynet, 'La peinture de Rauschenberg'(13); Baudry, 'Les Images'(14)

D. Roche, 'Les idées centésimales de Miss Elanize'(14)

Pierre Boulez, 'Le Goût et la fonction'(14,15)

Robbe-Grillet, 'La littérature aujourd'hui'(14); Sollers, 'Logicus Solus'(14); Sollers, 'Logique de la fiction'(15); Foucault, 'le langage à l'infini'(15).

Sollers, L'Intermédiaire; Pleynet, Paysages en deux suivi des Lignes de la prose; Baudry, Les Images.

Pleyne, D. Roche, J. P. Faye join committee. Michel Deguy leaves committee.

September - Colloquium at Cérisy, 'Une littérature nouvelle' chaired by Michel Foucault.

Foucault, 'Distance, aspect, origine' in Critique on TQ texts. Sollers contributes to special issue of Critique on Bataille.

1964 Barthes, 'Littérature et signification'(16); Faye, 'Nouvelle analogie'(17); Pleynet, 'La pensée contraire'(17); 'L'Image du sens'(18); Baudry, 'Investigations psychosomatiques'(18)

Pleyne, 'Rauschenberg'; 'Naked lunch'(18); Sollers, 'Les rêves et les moyens de les diriger'(18); Sollers, 'Pour un Nouveau Roman'

Baudry, 'Le rêve de la littérature'(19); Sollers, 'Proust et les signes'(19).

Faye, Analogues; D. Roche, Les idées... Barthes, Essais critiques; Boulez, Relevés d'apprenti; Sanguineti, Capriccio italiano.

1965 Special issue on Artaud : Sollers, 'La pensée émet des signes'; Thévenin, 'Antonin Artaud dans la vie'; Derrida, 'La parole soufflée'(20); Chkhlovski, L'art comme procédé'(21); Ricardou, 'La prise de Constantinople'(22); D. Roche,'Eros énergumène'; J. Risser, 'Poésie et prose'(22); P. Rottenberg, 'Le Livre partagé'.

Special issue on Dante(23): Sollers, 'Dante et la traversée de l'écriture'.

Sollers, Drame; Pleynet, Conne; Todorov(ed.), Théorie de la littérature; Rottenberg, Le livre partagé; Ungaretti, A partir du désert.

Barthes's article on Drame, 'Drame, poème, roman'.

Simon - Le Palace
Char - La parole en archipel
Michaux - Vents et poussières
Pleyne - Provisoirs avant des nègres
Death of Georges Bataille
OAS 'plastiquages' of anti-war intellectuals
Demonstrations in France over war
Referendum in Algeria

1965 Special issue on Dante(23): Sollers, 'La pensée émet des signes'; Thévenin, 'Antonin Artaud dans la vie'; Derrida, 'La parole soufflée'(20); Chkhlovski, L'art comme procédé'(21); Ricardou, 'La prise de Constantinople'(22); D. Roche,'Eros énergumène'; J. Risser, 'Poésie et prose'(22); P. Rottenberg, 'Le Livre partagé'.

Special issue on Dante(23): Sollers, 'Dante et la traversée de l'écriture'.

Sollers, Drame; Pleynet, Conne; Todorov(ed.), Théorie de la littérature; Rottenberg, Le livre partagé; Ungaretti, A partir du désert.

Barthes's article on Drame, 'Drame, poème, roman'.

1965 Special issue on Artaud : Sollers, 'La pensée émet des signes'; Thévenin, 'Antonin Artaud dans la vie'; Derrida, 'La parole soufflée'(20); Chkhlovski, L'art comme procédé'(21); Ricardou, 'La prise de Constantinople'(22); D. Roche,'Eros énergumène'; J. Risser, 'Poésie et prose'(22); P. Rottenberg, 'Le Livre partagé'.

Special issue on Dante(23): Sollers, 'Dante et la traversée de l'écriture'.

Sollers, Drame; Pleynet, Conne; Todorov(ed.), Théorie de la littérature; Rottenberg, Le livre partagé; Ungaretti, A partir du désert.

Barthes's article on Drame, 'Drame, poème, roman'.

Foucault - Naissance de la clinique
Foucault - Raymond Roussel
Deleuze - La philosophie critique de Kant
J. T. Desanti - Phénoménologie et praxis
Robbe-Grillet - Pour un Nouveau Roman
Le-Clézio - Le procès-verbal
Deguy - Biefs
Beckett - À les beaux jours
First issue of review L'Herne on Céline
U.S. blockade of Cuba
Assassination of Kennedy

1965 Special issue on Artaud : Sollers, 'La pensée émet des signes'; Thévenin, 'Antonin Artaud dans la vie'; Derrida, 'La parole soufflée'(20); Chkhlovski, L'art comme procédé'(21); Ricardou, 'La prise de Constantinople'(22); D. Roche,'Eros énergumène'; J. Risser, 'Poésie et prose'(22); P. Rottenberg, 'Le Livre partagé'.

Special issue on Dante(23): Sollers, 'Dante et la traversée de l'écriture'.

Sollers, Drame; Pleynet, Conne; Todorov(ed.), Théorie de la littérature; Rottenberg, Le livre partagé; Ungaretti, A partir du désert.

Barthes's article on Drame, 'Drame, poème, roman'.

Lévi-Strauss - Le cru et le cuit
Barthes - Éléments de sémiologie
Goldmann - Sociologie du roman
Mauron - Psychocritique du genre comique
Deleuze - Proust et les signes
Merleau-Ponty - L'oeil et l'esprit
Sartre - Les mots
Badiou - Almages
J. P. Faye - L'écluse
Bourdieu, Passeron - Les héritiers
Althusser publishes article 'Freud et Lacan'. Lacan founds the Ecole freudienne de Paris and begins Seminar at Ecole pratique des hautes études on 'Les quatre concepts fondamentaux de la psychanalyse'.

The reviews Socialisme et barbarie. Arguments fold.

Evacuation of French troops from Algeria. Brezhnev replaces Krushchev in USSR.
published in Critique.

Julia Kristeva arrives in Paris in December.


1966 Jakobson, 'Du réalisme artistique'(24); Sollers, 'Le roman et l'expérience des limites'(25); Pleynet, 'Les problèmes de l'avant-garde'(25); Jakobson, 'Glossolalie'(26);
Derrida, 'Freud et la scène de l'écriture'(26);
Pleynet, 'Les Chants de Maldoror et de Lautréamont'(26);
Sollers, 'Littérature et totalité'(26).

Thibaudeau, Ouverture; M. Roche, Compact; Genette, Figues I; Barthes, Critique et vérité; Pleynet, Lautréamont.

Tel Quel conference on 'Signe et perversion chez Sade'.

Boisrouvray leaves committee.
Pleynet in Chicago lecturing on Lautréamont.

Sollers meets Julia Kristeva.

Sollers interested in Cultural revolution in China, committee opts for opening a dialogue with the PCF.

1967 Special issue on Sade(28): Texts by Sollers, Barthes, Klossowski, Damisch, Tort. Genet, 'Ce qui est resté d'un Rembrandt...'(29); Sollers, 'Le Toit'; Kristeva, 'Pour une sémiole des paragrammes'(29); Sollers, 'Programme'(31); D.Roche; 'La poésie est inadmissible'(31);
Baudry, 'Écriture, fiction, idéologie'.

Faye, Le récit hunique; Ricardou, Problèmes du Nouveau Roman; Derrida, Écriture et différence; Baudry, Personnes; Sanguineti, Le noble jeu de l'oeuvre.

Sollers publishes 'La science de Lautréamont' in Critique.

Dialogues with PCF journal La nouvelle critique.

Contacts with PCF intellectuals such as Pierre Daix and Jacques Henric and with Jean-Louis Bodebise and Guy Scarcetta of the poetry review Promesse, which will become a TQ satellite.

Emergence at the end of the year of split in committee.

Jean-Pierre Faye leaves, Jacqueline Risset and Pierre Rottenberg join committee.

Adoption of 'Science/littérature' subtitle.

Marriage of Sollers & Kristeva.

1968 Derrida, 'La pharmacie de Platon'(32,33); Kristeva, 'Distance et anti-representation'(32); Baudry, 'Freud et la création littéraire'(32); J-R. Goux, 'Marr et l'inscription du travail'(33);
Bataille, La vieille taupe et le préfixe "sur"...'(34);
Special issue; 'La sémiole aujourd'hui en URSS'(35);

Sollers, Logiques; Nombres; Thibaudeau, Imaginer la nuit; D. Roche, Eros énergumène; Pierre Daix, Nouvelle critique

Derrida publishes 'De la Grammatologie'
Review Mercure de France ceases publication

Lacan's seminar is 'L'Objet de la psychanalyse'
Presidential elections, De Gaulle elected.
Mao: Little red book.

1969 Lacan - Ecrits
Foucault - Les mots et les choses
Benveniste - Problèmes de linguistique générale
Greimas - Sémantique structurale
Chomsky - Le langage et la pensée
Macherey - Pour une théorie de la production littéraire
Adorno - Dialectique négative
Burroughs - The soft machine

Students of Althusser at the Ecole normale supérieure create the review Cahiers pour l'analyse which will publish Althusser, Foucault, Derrida and Lacan's 'La Science et la Vérité.'

Maurice Nadeau creates the review La Quinzaine littéraire

Lacan's seminar is 'Pour un logique du fantasme'.

The 'Picard affair' erupts after the publication of Picard's 'Nouvelle critique ou nouvelle imposture' and Barthes' reply.

Chinese cultural revolution.

Derrida - De la grammatologie
Derrida - La voix et le phénomène
Todorov - Littérature et signification
Deleuze - Présentation de Sacher Masoch
Barthes - Système de la mode
Debord - La société du spectacle
Vaneigem - Traité de savoir vivre à l'usage des jeunes générations

Simon - L'histoire
Tournaire - Vendredi
Gayotat - Tombeau pour 5 million soldats
Rosaloto et al. - Le désir et la perversion
Heidegger - Introduction à la métaphysique (trad)
Glucksmann - Le discours de la guerre
Goddard - La Chinoise

Student unrest in Strasbourg; circulation of Situationist tract 'De la misère en milieu étudiant'.

Lacan's seminar: 'L'Acte psychanalytique'
Death of Che Guvara

Althusser - Lénin et la philosophie
Lefort, Morin, Caudry - Mai '68 la brèche
Poulantzas - Pouvoir politique et classes sociales
Serres - Héraclès I
Deleuze - Différence et répétition
Yves Battistini - Trois présocratiques
Leclaire - Psychanalyser
Sève - Marxisme et théorie de la personnalité
Baudrillard - Le système des objets
et art moderne ; Théorie d'ensemble.

Faye, Roubaud & others create periodical Change published by Seuil.

Statement on events of May, 'La Révolution ici maintenant' supports PCF policy on events.

No statement is forthcoming on Prague Spring.

The Groupe d'études théoriques is created. Sessions begin in September.

(Texts which were lectures at the GET are marked with an asterisk)

Polemical over TQ's refusal to join the Union général d'écrivains created by Faye and Butor among others.

Colloquium at Cluny with La nouvelle critique on 'Littérature et linguistique'.

1969 Sollers, 'Survol/Rapport (Blocs)/Conflit'*{36} ;
Guyotat, 'Bordels boucherie'{36} ; Starobinski,
'Le texte dans le texte'{37} ; Kristeva, 'L'engendrement de la formule'*{37,38} ; Sollers, 'De quelques contradictions'{38}
Sollers, 'Un pas sur la lune'{39}.

Kristeva, Séméiotiké ; J.-L. Schefer, Scénographie d'un tableau ;
Genette, Figures II ; Henric, Archées.


Articles by Pleyenet in the film review Cinéthigue criticise the 'brouillage historiciste' of Change and Cahiers du cinéma in their appropriation of Eisenstein for a theory of 'montage'.

Sollers and Kristeva occupy the office of Robert Flacelière, director of the EPHE, after the latter suspends Lacan's seminar.

Continuing sessions of Groupe d'études théoriques.

1970 Pleyenet, 'Incantation dite au bandeau d'or'{40} ;
Mao-tse-toung, 'Dix poèmes'(trad. Sollers.){40} ;
Derrida, 'La double séance'*{41,41} ; Sollers,
'Lézine et le matérialisme philosophique'*{43}.

Pleyenet, L'enseignement de la peinture ; Thibaud, Mai '68 en France ; Baudry, La 'Création' ;
Sollers/Ponge, Entretiens avec Francis Ponge ; Barthes, S/Z.
Julia Kristeva and Marc Devade join committee.

The periodical Peinture, cabres théoriques, a satellite periodical of TQ, is formed by the 'Support / Surfaces' group of artists, including Marc Devade, Louis Cane, Daniel Dezeuze.

Further polemical interchanges with Change over interviews of Faye & Sollers by Jean Ristat in the Gazette de Lausanne.

Faye accuses Sollers and TQ of opportunism, dogmatism and fascistic tendencies in its earlier period. An issue of TQ enlists Barthes, François Wahl, Jean Thibaudoe, Maurice Roche

Ruwet - Introduction à la grammaire générative
Cix/ous - L'exil de James Joyce
Modiano - Place de l'étoile
Rédë - Aven

Yourcenar - L'Oeuvre au noir

In May student demonstrations erupt in Paris, followed by the occupation of the Sorbonne and the creation of occupying Councils. After the University is cleared the unrest spreads, leading to a General Strike. The strike is called off after negotiations between the govt. and the CGT.

In August the Prague Spring uprising is suppressed by Communist forces.

The University of Vincennes is created to appease student demands for more freedom, with Foucault as Director of the Dept. of Philosophy. Serres and Deleuze will lecture there.

Lacan's seminar is 'D'un autre à l'autre'. The review Scilicet is created as an organ of the Ecole freudienne de Paris.

Deleuze - Logique du sens
Foucault - L'Archéologie du savoir
Blanchot - L'entretien infini
Rosaloto - Essais sur le symbolique
Cix/ous - Dedans
Dupin - L'embrasure
Durau - Détruire, dit-elle
Simon - La bataille de Pharsale
Denis Roche - Carnac

The reviews Txt and Cinéthique are created. Lacan's seminar at the EPHE is suspended. It moves to an amphitheatre near the Panthéon. Lacan lectures at Vincennes, where he harangues the revolting students.

Demonstrations and occupations at Vincennes. Cahiers pour l'analyse ceases publication and its members enter the militant Gauche prolétarienne.

Pompidou elected in Presidential elections. Lin Piao designated as Mao's successor.
in refuting this and attacking Change.

The new University at Vincennes, created after 1968, is criticised in TQ, particularly the Department of Psychoanalysis run by Serge Leclaire, seen as an ally of Faye and Change.

Addition of 'Philosophie/politique' to subtitle.

Article in Critique by Sollers on Guyotat's Eden, eden, eden, for which Sollers, with Leiris and Barthes, contributes a preface. Sollers and TQ intervene in a polemic over the interdiction of publicity for Guyotat's novel; a petition is circulated and gains the signatures of most French intellectuals.

Second Cluny colloquium, with La nouvelle critique, Change and Action poétique. TQ, Kristeva and Derrida are the object of violent criticism, which puts strain on the relations between TQ and the PCF on the one hand, and TQ and Derrida on the other.

The Nouvelle revue de psychanalyse, published by Gallimard, is created by J.B Pontalis, once of Les Temps modernes. Lacan's new seminar is 'D'un discours qui ne serait pas du semblant'. Judith Miller, Lacan's daughter is sacked from Vincennes for subversion. Further occupations etc.

In December, Foucault gives his inaugural lecture at the Collège de France.

U.S offensives against Vietnam.

1971 Kristeva, Matière, sens, dialectique* (44);
Sollers, 'Sur la contradiction's (45); Pleynet, 'Lautrémont politique' (45); Sollers, 'Lois' (46); Special issue on Surrealism and neo-Surrealism (46); D.Roche, 'Le Mécrit' (46);
Special issue on Roland Barthes (47).

Barthes, Sade ; Fourier ; Loyola ; Risset, Jeu ; Sollers, Lois ;
Ricardou, Pour une théorie du Nouveau Roman ; M. Roche, Circus.

Polemical interchange with Alain Jouffroy, of the Opus International art review, who criticises TQ's appropriation of Bataille for Marxism-Leninism from a Surrealist perspective. TQ criticise Jouffroy's 'neo-Surrealist' 'posthumous reconciliation' of Bataille and Breton, and Breton and Aragon.

TQ join the film reviews Cinéthique and Cahiers du cinéma for a manifesto directed against the reviews Positif and Change. TQ, in an editorial note, criticises Cinéthique for their criticism of the PCF.

Foundation of the Maoist 'Mouvement de Juin 1971'.
The offices of TQ are covered in Maoist 'dazibao'.
Pleynet criticises in 'Lautrémont politique' the 'posthumous reconciliation' of Aragon and Breton.

La nouvelle critique publishes a critical note on TQ's addition of the subtitle 'Philosophie/politique' and the criticism of Aragon. A note in TQ signals TQ's readiness to break with the PCF.

Sollers intervenes over the PCF interdiction of Maria Macciocchi's book De la Chine at the Humanité festival.
The November issue of TQ(47) announces the formal break with the PCF and La nouvelle critique. Promesse follows. Cinéthique is declared to have been right in its earlier criticism, but still in error on other points. The Groupe d'études théoriques is suspended and TQ is declared in crisis.

At the end of the year, Thibaudeau and Ricardou leave the committee. TQ becomes overtly Maoist.

1972 Special issue: 'La pensée chinoise' (48/49);
Sollers, 'Das Augenlicht' (51); Pleynet, 'Travestilait' (51);
D. Roche, Le Mécrit ; Derrida, La Dissémination ;
Scarpella, Scène ; Balestrini, Tristan.

Polemical interchange of views in the review between Bernard Sichère and Marie-Claire Boons suggests a critique of Althusser.

The review Digraphe, of Derridean orientation is created by Jean Ristat. Lacan's seminar is 'Encore'
The 'Gauche prolétaire' movement is dissolved.
Publication, in *Positions*, of Derrida's discussions with Kristeva and with Houdebine and Scarpetta. Derrida is pinned down on the question of Marxism; his response, in parts of *La Dissémination* suggest a subtle critique of TQ's approach.

July - Colloquium at Cérisy on 'Artaud/Bataille: Vers une révolution culturelle'.

The art review *Art press*, with which Scarpetta and Henric will collaborate, begins publication. It will develop into a forum receptive to TQ and *L'Infini*.

1973 Special issue on Artaud/Bataille(52) ; Special issues on Joyce *Joyce in progress*(54,55 ) ; Sollers, H ; Barthes, *Le plaisir du texte* ; Pleynet, Stanze.

Denis Roche leaves the committee over disagreements with the committee over the publication of the Artaud/Bataille conference proceedings. D.Roche's tape-recorded intervention on Artaud is not published in the 10/18 volumes edited by Sollers. D. Roche publishes his intervention, 'Artaud refait' later in his novel *Louvre basse* in 1976.

Kristeva in the U.S. TQ criticises Hallier's *La cause du peuple*, which ironically recalls the early split with TQ.

TQ condemns the Fascist coup d'état in Chile and the PCF - PS alliance at home in France. Sollers's H fictionalises the narrator's response to the funeral of Pierre Overney, killed at a demonstration.

Sollers and Kristeva at Milan conference *Psychanalyse et politique* organised by Verdiglione.

1974 Sollers, *Sur le matérialisme* (55,56) ; Kristeva, *La révolution du langage poétique* (56) ; Special issue on Sollers(57) ; First instalment of *Paradis* (57) ; Special issue on China(59) .


Editorials critical of Althusser and of Derrida.

April - May; trip to China of TQ delegation.

Participants were Sollers, Kristeva, Pleynet, Barthes, François Wahl.

On return, letters in *Le Monde* by Wahl and Barthes.

Sollers affirms 'Criticise Confucius' campaign in China. Sollers, Kristeva, Pleynet attend Verdiglione colloquium on 'Psychanalyse et sémiotique'.

1975 Barthes, *'Untel par lui-même'* (61) ; Sollers, *Lettre de Sade* (61) ; Pleynet, *À la mère* (62) ; Kristeva, *D'une identité l'autre* (62).

Kristeva(ed.), *La traversée des signes* ; Henric, *Chasses* ; Boules, *Par volonté et par hasard*.

Baudry leaves committee, having published nothing since 1972.

Pierre Overney is killed at an anti-govt. demonstration.

Alliance between PCF and PS. Nixon visits China.

Althusser - *Réponse à John Lewis*

Lacan - *Séminaire II, I.*

Foucault (ed.) - *Moi , Pierre Rivière...*

Lytotard - *Dérive à partir de Marx et Freud*

Lytotard - *Des dispositifs pulsionnels*

Pasqualini - *Prisonnier de Mao*

Hallier - *La cause des peuples*

Lan's seminar: 'Les non dupes errant'

Coup d'état in Chile, Allende assassinated.

End of Vietnam war, Watergate scandal.

In France, strikes at the Lip factories lead to demonstrations; gains for the Right in legislative elections.

1975 Barthes, *Roland Barthes par Roland Barthes*

Deleuze & Guattari - *Kafka*

Foucault - *Surveiller et punir*

Glucksman - *Le cuisinier et le mangeur d'hommes*

Miller - *Les pousses-au-iouir du Maréchal Pétain*

Clavel - *Ce que je crois*

Lacan - *Séminaire XI, Encore*
1976 Sollers, 'Joyce et cie' (64); Sollers, 'La main de Freud' (64); Gérard Miller, 'A propos du fascisme francais' (64); André Glucksmann, 'Réponses'; Sollers, 'D'où viennent les enfants?' (65); Pleynet, 'La "folie" théétique'; 'Crise du rationalisme' editorial (65).  
Kristeva, Polylogue; Sollers & Clavel, Délivrance.  
Affirmative critical response in TQ to Gérard Miller's Les pousses au jouir du Maréchal Pétain, but not for André Glucksmann's Le cuisinier et le mangeur d'hommes or L'ange.  
In Délivrance Sollers shows his disillusionment with 'l'illusion marxiste' and his vision of the 'tragédie' of the events in China.  
Letters on China by Sollers in Le Monde.  
Verdiglione colloquium on 'La Folie'.  
Sollers's first trip to the U.S. Meeting with De Kooning.  
Kristeva practicing psychoanalysis.

1977 Barthes, 'L'obsèque de l'amour' (68);  
Kristeva, 'Noms de lieu' (68); 'A propos du maosisme' (68); Sollers, 'Folie' - mère - écran (69); Sollers, 'La notion de mausolée dans le Marxisme'; Special issue on the U.S. (71-73).  
Barthes, Fragments d'un discours amoureux; Macci^phi, Après Marx, avril; Pleynet, Art et littérature; M. Roche, Opéra bonifie.  
Verdiglione colloquium on 'La violence'  
Affirmative article by Sollers in Le Monde on Bernard-Henri Lévy's La barbarie à visage humain.

1978 Special issue on 'Recherches féminins' (74);  
Kristeva, 'Un nouveau type d'intellectuel, le dissident' (74); Sollers, 'Le marxisme sodomisé par la psychanalyse elle-même violée par on ne sait quoi..' (75); Sollers, 'Dostoyevsky, Freud, la roulette' (76); Special issue on Dissidence (76); Part special issue on Pleynet (77).  
Vivianne Forrester, Vestiges.  
Sollers, Pleynet at Verdiglione's 'Dissidence' colloquium.

1979 Girard, 'Quand les choses commenceront' (78, 79);  
Saïd, 'Récapitulations' (78); Sollers, 'L'Auguste Comte' (79); Sollers, 'Jazz' (80); Muray, 'Le corps glorieux de l'écriture' (80); Felman, 'La chose littéraire..' (80, 81); Sollers, 'Pourquoi je suis si peu religieux' (81); Houdebine, 'La signature de Joyce' (81); Scarpetta, 'Artaud écrit'.  
Kristeva (ed.), Folle vérité; M. Roche, Macabré;
Plénynet, Transculture; Situation de l'art moderne. Barthes publishes Sollers écrivain in which he stresses Sollers as a writer. Pierre Rottenberg leaves the committee, having published nothing in the review since 1971. The subtitle 'Art' is added to 'Littérature/Philosophie/Politique/Science'.

1980 Barthes, 'Délibération'(82); Sollers, 'Socrate en passant'(83); Special issue on Joyce(83); Sollers, 'Le Pape'(84); Sollers, 'On n'a encore rien vu'(85); Barthes, 'On échose toujours'(85); Muray, 'Céline et la religion révélée'(85).

Kristeva, Pousse de l'horreur; M. Roche, Maladie mélodie; Plénynet, Le Voyage en Chine.

TQ publishes an eulogistic note after the death of Roland Barthes. Sollers welcomes the dissolution of the EFP by Lacan. Articles in TQ by Bernard-Henri Lévy and Jean-Marie Benoist criticise the 'hegemony of philosophy' of the moment, aiming at Critique.

1981 Sollers, 'Le G.S.I'(86); Sollers, 'Pourquoi j'ai été chinois'(88); 'Histoire de femme'; Houdebine, 'Joyce, littérature et religion'; Muray, 'Balzac, le XIXème siècle, l'occulte'(89).

Sollers, Paradis; Vision à New York; Plénynet, Rime; Spirito peregrino; Muray, Céline; Heeric, Carroussels; Sarduy, Maîtreva; Ginsberg, Om (entretiens).

1982 Sollers, 'Je sais pourquoi je jouis'(90); Special issue on Picasso(90); Sollers, 'L'Assomption'(91); Special issue on 'Actualité de la psychanalyse'(91); 'Entretiens avec Malraux'(92).

Barthes, La chambre claire
Deleuze and Guattari - Mille plateaux
Debray - L'écriture
D. Roche - Dépôts de savoir et de technique
Special issue of Critique on Anglo Saxon philosophy
Roland Barthes dies in hospital.
Louis Althusser stranges his wife Hélène and is committed.

Papal visit.

1983 Muray, 'Hugo nécromantique'(94); Houdebine, 'Joyce tel quel'(94)

Sollers's Femmes is published by Gallimard. TQ shifts to Denœl/Gallimard and changes its name to L'Infini. In an editorial, a discussion between Sollers and an alter ego affirms the disappearance and survival of TQ.

Barthes - Le grain de la voix
Lacan - Séminaire III
B.-E. Lévy - L'idéologie française
Baudrillard - Simulations
Clément - Vies et légendes de Jacques Lacan
Debray - Critique de la raison politique
Scarpetta - Eloge du cosmopolitisme
Glucksman - Cynisme et passion

Death of Lacan in September.
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