

DISCUSSION AND COMMENT

In Vol. 1 of the *IFR*, pp. 164-166, Professor Daniel P. Deneau commented on Renée Riese Hubert's article "Microtexts: An Aspect of the Work of Beckett, Robbe-Grillet and Nathalie Sarraute" (*IFR*, 1 [1974], 9-16). Professor Hubert replies:

Professor Deneau's blow-up of *Snapshots* shows a strange distortion of what I have actually written. By rearranging some of my statements, he seems to take the counterview of what I have said. He ends up, here and there, by putting himself into paradoxical situations. For instance, he suggests that I erroneously claim Robbe-Grillet's *Snapshots* lack unity and later sets out to prove diversity. His interpretations developed at greater length and taken from a different angle are, in spite of his vehement show of disagreement, hardly at variance with my own. I cannot quite grasp Professor Deneau's objective nor his thesis (except some only too obvious advice that Robbe-Grillet's *For a New Novel* might throw light on the subject). Feeling that *Snapshots* deserves greater exposure than I have given it, he eagerly seized the opportunity for polemics. As his belligerence results in a more detailed picture of *Instantanés*, it was thus in the service of an eminently good cause.

The first sentence of the second paragraph of Professor Deneau's comment was set incorrectly. It should read:

Professor Hubert contends that "The Dressmaker's Dummy" is a "series of snapshots" or a "verbal inventory," which does not add up to "any meaning" or arrive at any "coherent, overall view" (p. 12); she implies that the observer is equivalent to "the objective eye of the camera" (p. 12) and indicates that Robbe-Grillet "conveys only the image of a moment thus pointing to our divorce from reality" (p. 13—"divorce from reality"? how so?).

We would like to take this opportunity to apologize to Professor Deneau for this unfortunate error.

The Editor