

# From the Narration of Crime to the Crime of Narration: Claude Simon's *Le Palace*

DORIS Y. KADISH, *Kent State University*

I wish to examine here the subject of crime in the New Novel, using Claude Simon's *Le Palace* as an example.<sup>1</sup> I shall approach this subject by comparing two different critical positions on the status of criminal referents in the New Novel. The first position, prevalent in writings concerning the early New Novel, can be called the "narration of crime" position. The second position, prevalent in writings concerning the later New Novel, can be called the "crime of narration" position. In order to compare these two positions I shall first expound upon the "narration of crime" position, apply it briefly to *Le Palace*, and criticize it. Next I shall expound upon the "crime of narration" position and then similarly apply and criticize it.

That a comparison of critical positions on the New Novel is to be made explains, in part, the choice of *Le Palace*. Published in 1962, *Le Palace* is in many ways characteristic of both the early and the later New Novels. It is therefore more open than a distinctly early or distinctly later New Novel to both of the critical positions, positions which can be identified *grosso modo* with the period and with the writers and critics of both the early and the later New Novel. Another reason for the choice of *Le Palace* is that Claude Simon has received less attention in respect to the subject of crime than such other new novelists as Michel Butor, Alain Robbe-Grillet, and Claude Ollier, even though crime plays a major thematic role in many of his most important novels. Its importance in *Le Palace* can be noted in the author's description of this novel, a description which can serve subsequently as a resumé of its major events. "Autre exemple de composition symétrique, *le Palace* qui s'ouvre par un chapitre intitulé *Inventaire*, se ferme sur un autre intitulé *le Bureau des objets trouvés*, le chapitre central, sur les cinq que comporte l'ouvrage, intitulé *les Funerailles de Patrocle* (décrivant l'enterrement d'un chef révolutionnaire assassiné) lui-même encadré par les chapitres 2 et 4 qui relatent chacun un meurtre, le premier raconté par son auteur, le deuxième soupçonné par le narrateur qui en est le témoin incertain."<sup>2</sup>

It was common for critics and readers of the early New Novel to apply the first critical position in order to seek clues to understanding a new and unfamiliar narrative practice. For since crime was observed to be thematically recurrent in the New Novel, critics and readers turned their attention to this theme with the belief that to view the New Novel as a narration of crime, analogous to the detective story, would help to elucidate its meaning. This was thought to be true for two reasons. One reason was that themes like investigation and search which provide unity of plot in narrations of crime are also themes in the New Novel. These themes could thus serve as clues to discovering a unified plot in the New Novel. A second reason was that themes like interrogation and revolt which have been said to have underlying philosophical and psychological implications in narrations of crime are also themes in the New Novel. These themes could thus serve as clues to discovering a coherent world view in the New Novel.

A few examples of this first critical position, that of the "narration of crime," can be offered. Jean-Paul Sartre depicts Nathalie Sarraute's *Portrait d'un inconnu* as "un anti-roman qui se lit comme un roman policier," basing the analogy primarily on the element of search common to the two types of fiction.<sup>3</sup> Ludovic Janvier concludes the chapter of *Une Parole exigeante* entitled "Le Point de vue du policier" with the statement that "le Nouveau Roman, c'est le roman policier pris au sérieux," after having developed the analogy in detail. Janvier's analogy depends on the New Novel having a certain vision of the world: the world perceived as enigmatic, problematic, mysterious. Janvier states, "ces oeuvres dessinent une conduite: questionner fortement, elles vivent d'une intention: révéler. Une esthétique commune, celle du secret. Une démarche commune, le dévoilement."<sup>4</sup>

The analogy between detectives and New Novel characters and narrators is suggested in Michel Butor's *L'Emploi du temps*.<sup>5</sup> An "explosion de la vérité" is seen as their common end, and an extended interrogation, as their common means. This interrogation involves disruption and change; and in the disruptive nature of his interrogation the detective, states Butor, differs fundamentally from such defenders of law and order as policemen, "car ils sont les gardiens de l'ordre ancien mis en danger, tandis que lui veut agiter, troubler, fouiller, mettre à nu, et changer." Butor's detective, then, is a rebel seeker-of-truth, an enemy of darkness and deceit, an agent of revelation and change as are, presumably, such prototypical characters of the New Novel as Butor's Jacques Revel, the narrators of Nathalie Sarraute's *Martereau* and *Portrait d'un inconnu*, or the husband in Robbe-Grillet's *La Jalousie*.

Let us now consider *Le Palace* in the light of the critical position which has just been set forth and illustrated. Let us consider specifically whether the novel assumes unity of plot and coherence of world view when it is considered as a narration of crime.

In *Le Palace*, as in the other novels written by Claude Simon in the 1960's, mystery is without a doubt an important thematic component. In *La Route des Flandres* (1960), for example, mystery surrounds the de Reixach suicides; in *Histoire* (1967) it surrounds the departure-death of a woman. In *Le Palace* mystery surrounds a series of violent deaths: the assassination of the revolutionary leader Santiago; the assassination committed by the Italian gunman; the disappearance or assassination of the American; the suicide or murder suggested at the end of the novel.<sup>6</sup>

The search to dispel the mystery of these violent deaths likewise plays a prominent role in *Le Palace*; and if the detective story analogy comes to mind more readily with *Le Palace* than with other novels written by Claude Simon in the 1960's, it is undoubtedly because there is more violent crime in *Le Palace* and also because the theme of search and the figure of the narrator-as-detective are more thematically significant in this novel. The narrator of *Le Palace*, let us recall, has returned to Spain some fifteen years after the Spanish Civil War in which he, then a student, participated. In the past he searched for the truth about the mysterious events mentioned above, and in the present, fifteen years later, his search continues, involving an investigation into all facets of his past and present experience.

The theme of investigation does apply and give unity to the seemingly disparate events in *Le Palace* if we define an investigation, for our purposes, as a series of places—literally as a trajectory in space—through which one passes in order to understand the reality of an enigmatic act. An investigation,

so defined, occurs in each major sequence of events recounted in *Le Palace*. In Part II of *Le Palace* the Italian gunman describes, by telling his story to the narrator and by drawing a diagram, how he entered a restaurant, passed through and around a series of places in order to kill a man, and then retraced his movements to leave the restaurant after having committed the murder. A trajectory is thus formed by the series of places through which the Italian gunman passes to commit the murder. This trajectory is an investigation in the sense that, in order to succeed in committing the murder, the Italian gunman must understand the strategic importance of each place in the series. It is also an investigation in the sense that, in order to recollect and reconstitute the crime later when speaking to the narrator, he must understand the order and the specific nature of each place in the trajectory. In Part III, members of a revolutionary party move in a circular path through the city during the funeral procession for the assassinated leader Santiago. This circular trajectory is an investigation in the sense that those in the procession are moving through a series of places, carrying signs and banners which express their bewilderment about Santiago's assassination, in the vain and unfounded belief that their movements will enable them to understand why he was killed. This same trajectory, seen from a distance by the narrator and his companions, is an investigation of revolution in general in the sense that the narrator questions, at each place in the series, the meaning of revolution. The narrator similarly investigates both a specific act and the meaning of revolution in Part IV. By wending his way through the city from his hotel to the revolutionary headquarters and back again, he seeks to understand, at each place, the facts of the American's disappearance and the larger meaning of revolution. Each such trajectory-investigation in space is, let us remember, repeated at least twice in the sense that the narrator lives and relives in memory the violent reality of all of the mysterious events, thus creating in *Le Palace* a great multiplicity of similar patterns.

A coherent world view can be seen in *Le Palace* by regarding this novel in the light of such other "narration of crime" themes as interrogation and revolt. Butor's theme of the detective as rebel seeker-of-truth can shed light on the political world view of the narrator of *Le Palace*: a revolutionary engaged with others in a quest for justice and change in conjunction with his personal quest for truth. The theme of interrogation can be related to the narrator's philosophical tendencies to question and doubt.<sup>7</sup> Indeed, nothing seems sure in his world: neither the validity of remembering the past nor even the possibility of clearly perceiving the present.<sup>8</sup> Thus consciousness of an event in the present is presented in *Le Palace* as "cette énorme suite, ou plutôt masse, ou plutôt magma, ou plutôt maelstrom de sensations, de visions, de bruits, de sentiments et d'impulsions contraires se pressant, se bousculant, se mélangeant, se superposant, impossible à contrôler et à définir."<sup>9</sup> In short, it is easy to see how one can conclude, from various more or less direct psychological and philosophical statements such as the above, and from statements made by such spokesmen of cynicism as the American in *Le Palace* or Blum in *La Route des Flandres*, that a generalized world view of doubt, confusion, and disorder characterizes *Le Palace* and other novels by Simon, written in the 1960's, in which interrogation is a theme.

The "narration of crime" position has just been expounded upon and briefly applied. The limitations of this position can now be considered. By criticizing a position that I have applied, I shall express my partial—but not total—dissatisfaction with this position.

The predominant concern of the "narration of crime" position is the referential dimension of fiction. I have, for example, just put together the pieces of a New Novel text so that its subject and significance can be found. Investigation provides the clue to its thematic unity, interrogation, to its philosophical unity. But in so putting together the pieces, the literal dimension has been ignored, little interest having been given to the complex narrative practices of the New Novel. Had more interest been paid to the literal dimension of the New Novel its basic unlikeness to other "narrations of crime" like the detective story would have been noticed. Indeed, Stephen Heath, a recent critic of the New Novel, points out that reading a detective story consists in the movement from crime to its solution, and that "it would be wrong to see in this movement which might suggest a certain activity—the reader 'spots the clues'—anything more, finally, than a fundamental passivity." He adds: "This is the *comfort* of the detective story: it offers a deep confirmation of the nonproblematic nature of reality in absenting writing before an ultimate, untroubled truth. In this, the detective novel can be seen as the very type of the 'Balzacian' novel with its premise of a realist writing that declares itself transparent before the fixed source of 'Reality.'"<sup>10</sup> Todorov notes that the detective story "restera toujours assujetti à une vraisemblance quelconque,"<sup>11</sup> and Genette that, like other popular genres, it conforms to "le principe formel de respect de la norme."<sup>12</sup>

Search, rebellion, and mystery may be the subjects of the detective story. But, as these statements suggest, they are not the principles of its creation as a text. It may be possible to propose that the detective story is an instance of social nonconformism; and it is understandable that this nonconformism would have appealed to the early New Novel, whose goal it was to contest bourgeois values in life and in literature. But it does not seem possible to deny that the detective story is an instance of literary conformism and that its writer does not exercise the freedom and creativity of the new novelist. Todorov points out that to succeed in varying or improving upon the prescribed formula is to fail as a detective story writer. "Le roman policier a ses normes; faire 'mieux' qu'elles ne le demandent, c'est en même temps faire moins bien."<sup>13</sup> Another critic of the detective story concurs, stating that in this genre "toute psychologie des personnages, toute liberté (comme on dit) créatrice chez l'auteur sont absentes: il n'y a qu'un livre qui obéit nécessairement à sa formule."<sup>14</sup>

It is evident that a problem was prevalent among writers during the early years of the New Novel. The problem was how to generate referents, criminal or other, in such a way as to encourage the reader to focus on the generative process itself, not on the referents generated. The "serious detective story" did not encourage a reading which would so focus on the generative process. On the contrary, it encouraged the reader of the early New Novel to discover the secret of the text, to solve its mystery, to go beyond its apparent disregard for plot: in short, to focus all the more intensely as its subject. It is not surprising then that the principal works of the New Novel which lend themselves to being considered as "serious detective stories" (i.e., *Les Gommés* (1953), *Le Voyeur* (1955), *Passage de Milan* (1954), *L'Emploi du temps* (1957), *La Mise en scène* (1958), etc.) are confined to the early period of the New Novel, as are those critical considerations of New Novel texts containing criminal referents as "narrations of crime."

Certain modern critics and writers have focused primarily on the literal dimension of fiction. Their theory of *écriture textuelle* emphasizes the productive and material rather than the representational nature of writing, and in this theory the notion of textual violence is central. Their position, which I shall call the "crime of narration" position, is that crime and violence are terms

which more aptly apply, metaphorically, to the literary practice of the New Novel than to its subject. This position is maintained because of two factors: one in the nature of narration in general,<sup>15</sup> the other in the nature of narration in the New Novel.

These critics contend that there is a sense in which narration—indeed, all literary uses of language—transgresses ordinary uses of language. Narration involves repetition, pause, symmetry, ellipsis: in short, it involves incessantly “breaking” that linear progression which characterizes nonliterary uses of language. And if the instances of “breaking” are more apparent in the New Novel than in the realistic novel, it is only because new novelists do not pretend to subordinate literary functions to expressive and representational functions. It is in this vein that Roland Barthes spoke of description in *Le Voyeur* as “criminal.” “Chez Robbe-Grillet les constellations d’objets ne sont pas expressives, mais créatrices; elles ont à charge, non de révéler, mais d’accomplir; elles *font* le crime, elles ne le livrent pas: en un mot, elles sont littérales.”<sup>16</sup>

Narration in the later New Novel is considered to be particularly criminal.<sup>17</sup> The highly aggressive and revolutionary vocabulary of recent critics and writers reveals their intentions in this regard. The goal of the New Novel, we are told, is to destroy *l’idéologie dominante*, to decompose the bourgeois mentality, by committing such acts of textual violence as dynamiting syntax, subverting metonymy, and amputating words. In short the New Novel now seeks actively to assert the “literarity” of narration by systematically practicing that violence or crime which is presumed to be the basis of narration and of literary uses of language.

Numerous illustrations of this “crime of narration” position can be found, particularly in the theoretical writings of Jean Ricardou. The following one is particularly interesting in regard to our subject because it offers an explanation of the continued presence in later New Novel texts of criminal referents. Ricardou’s argument, roughly, is that since referents are frequently metaphors of narrative practice and since the narrative practice in the New Novel is violent, violent referents will thus frequently be found in the New Novel. “Si la fiction est, à un certain niveau, une métaphore de sa narration, il est alors permis de croire qu’une thématique privilégiée doit accompagner globalement certains processus narratifs. Ainsi n’est-ce guère l’effet du hasard si des ouvrages récents utilisant la rupture et le circulaire, accueillent en leur fiction, chacun à sa manière, les mêmes idées d’incendie, d’ensanglantement, de révolution.”<sup>18</sup>

Once again we shall examine *Le Palace*, this time in the light of this new position on the status of crime in the New Novel. Specifically we shall examine two kinds of textual violence: first on the level of the material continuity of the text, second on the level of its narrative linearity.

Discontinuity or “rupture” of various sorts characterizes all of Claude Simon’s fiction, even his earliest works. For example, third-person narration is disrupted as early as *Le Tricheur*, and chronology is disrupted radically in *Le Sacre du printemps*. Normal syntax is disrupted in *Le Vent* by parentheses, linear plot in *L’Herbe* by inventories, semantic monovalence in *La Route des Flandres* by metaphors and puns. And these are just a few examples in each of these works of Simon’s discontinuous narrative practices. Violence and death—either or both—are, not surprisingly, major themes in each of these works. Indeed, they are major themes in virtually all of Simon’s novels. *Le Palace* then differs

only in degree from earlier texts by Simon. Thematically, in *Le Palace* violence plays a greater role; literally, discontinuity is of a newer and more radical sort, as we shall now see.

The practice of systematically breaking the material continuity of the novel first appears in *Le Palace*. This practice can be said to form a collage-type of novel, a type of novel which will in fact be developed by Simon in subsequent works. There are many instances of various types of breaks in the material continuity of *Le Palace*, the most conspicuous of which are the newspaper headlines.

On ten different pages in *Le Palace* appear a total of fifteen announcements of four different sorts, all of which refer to the revolutionary leader Santiago and almost all of which serve to announce his violent death. Because the newspaper headlines are all in boldface capital letters and are almost all set off and indented in the text, they constitute a sharp break in the typographical continuity of the text. The referent (Santiago's death) can be said then to be a metaphor of the type of narration (typographical discontinuity). Indeed, one does find elsewhere in Simon's writings newspaper headlines that similarly concern violent deaths.<sup>19</sup>

But there is more. Since the newspaper headlines are in Spanish they constitute a break in the uni-lingualism of the French text<sup>20</sup>; and since in most instances they begin with inverted question marks and exclamation marks, they constitute a break in that punctuation considered normal by the French reader. Again the referential violence is a metaphor of narrative violence: in this case the referent (the Spanish revolution) is a metaphor of the type of narration (the discontinuity produced in the text by Spanish words and punctuation.)

Still other functions of the newspaper headlines can be noted. The first is syntactic. Newspaper headlines normally constitute a break because of their elliptical syntactic forms, such as the following from *Le Palace*: "La quinta columna a la obra: Santagio asesinado" (p. 30). But Simon goes ever farther. In several instances his headlines are orthographically incorrect: "Quien (instead of Quien) ha muerto" (p. 184); "Santagio (instead of Santiago) asesinado" (p. 30). Moreover, in several instances the headlines are grammatically incorrect: "Quien ha muerto a (instead of al) comman" (p. 29); "Quien a (instead of ha) muerto el (instead of al) commandante" (p. 39). And in several instances the headlines are illegitimate fragments: either syntactic ("Quien a muerto?", p. 113) or lexical ("comman," p. 29; "muer," p. 144).<sup>21</sup>

One can infer that Simon seeks to accentuate his break with fixed graphic and linguistic systems and that he does this by introducing textual violence in *Le Palace* on many levels: typographical, uni-lingual, punctuational, syntactical, and lexical. The important crime in *Le Palace* is material, and this fact is dramatized by such details, noted above, as the destruction of Santiago's name, his title, and his language. Revolution in *Le Palace*, then, does not function only as a referent. As Gérard Roubichou remarks, "*Le Palace* inscrit, en son texte, une double révolution (politique et narrative), comme le suggère l'épigraphie."<sup>22</sup>

Let us consider briefly now the second source of textual violence in *Le Palace*, that on the level of narrative linearity. Consider the short, autonomous narration in Part II of the novel entitled "Le Récit de l'homme-fusil." Temporally, this story constitutes a break since the events related in it occurred

at some unspecified time prior to, and unrelated to, the time period of the major sequence of past events. This story also constitutes a break in narrative voice since it introduces a second narrator into the novel. In this respect *Le Palace* is unlike *Le Vent*, *L'Herbe* and *La Route des Flandres* which precede it, for *Le Palace* ceases to record throughout the content of a single consciousness. This practice, like the practice of breaks in the material continuity of the novel, is highly significant in that it will be developed and extended in Simon's subsequent novels. In *Histoire* there will be a duality of narrative voice; from *La Bataille de Pharsale* on there will be more and more complete fragmentation and dislocation of the source of narration.

We can note, finally, that "Le Récit de l'homme-fusil" breaks with the metonymy of the narration which contains it and to which it bears a metaphorical relationship. The events "Le Récit de l'homme-fusil" relates constitute a repetition or duplication, in some sense, of the events of the larger narration. As such it acts to abyme/abime, to recall Ricardou's pun,<sup>23</sup> the larger narration, that is, both to duplicate and to undermine the linearity of the larger narration. Indeed, the linearity of *Le Palace* is incessantly undermined by various kinds of repetition and duplication of events. Simon's description of its symmetrical composition emphasizes this, as does the novel's epigraph: "Révolution: Mouvement d'un mobile qui, parcourant une courbe fermée, repasse successivement par les mêmes points (Dictionnaire Larousse)." Ricardou noted, let us recall, that "la rupture et le circulaire" are the narrative practices which generate violent and revolutionary referents.

"Le Récit de l'homme-fusil" specifically serves to emphasize the discontinuous and circular nature of narration in *Le Palace*. "L'homme-fusil" is portrayed, pencil in hand, marking a paper with fragmented, circular patterns, an act which resumes the act of narration in Simon's novel of and about revolution. "Le Récit de l'homme-fusil" is in many senses, as we have seen, a crime of narration, and it is not surprising, then, that its narrator is a criminal. He is not, however, the only criminal force in the novel. The narrator-student also introduces interruptions and disruptions of various sorts; and he does the same as the listener in "Le Récit de l'homme-fusil." It is not surprising that he too is a criminal, a revolutionary, and, as the enigmatic final act of the novel suggests, an assassin.

What are the limitations of the "crime of narration" position? The predominant concern of this position is the literal dimension of fiction. This concern derives from a concerted effort to combat certain pervasive ideological principles about literature, principles which are ingrained in readers, writers, and critics. That the novel functions in order that a writer may express a world view or may recount a preconceived story are examples of such principles that are now under attack. It is not surprising then that the "narration of crime" position has ceased to be popular since those principles are, as we have seen, integral parts of it. I have no quarrel with the claim that the purpose of the New Novel is not served by trying to write a serious detective story. That point is indeed my criticism of the "narration of crime" position. But I do criticize the "crime of narration" position for falsely claiming that the early New Novel did not strive to be, *inter alia*, a serious detective story.

By detecting in *Le Palace* themes and plots typical of the "narration of crime" position, I hope to have shown that, even in the 1960's, this position played a significant role in the New Novel. It seems important to show this because in so doing we acknowledge the earlier conceptual concerns of such writers as Claude Simon. Not to acknowledge these concerns promotes a dis-

torted and biased view of the New Novel. But at the same time, by examining such principles as textual violence, I hope we have emphasized those textual concerns of the "crime of narration" position which have always played a significant role in Simon's works, as in the works of other new novelists, and which are now their dominant concerns.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>The term "New Novel" is used loosely, for the purposes of generalization, to refer to that body of contemporary French fiction commonly designated as such by critics and novelists, on the basis of a certain unity of narrative practice, theory, and theme. For a recent evaluation of the generalization, as well as for the distinction which I make between the early and the later New Novel, see Jean Ricardou, *Le Nouveau Roman* (Paris: Seuil, 1973).

<sup>2</sup>Claude Simon, "La Fiction mot à mot," in *Nouveau Roman, hier, aujourd'hui: 2, Pratiques* (Paris: U.G.E., 1972), p. 93.

<sup>3</sup>Jean-Paul Sartre, Préface de *Portrait d'un inconnu* (Paris: Gallimard, 1956), p. 8.

<sup>4</sup>Ludovic Janvier, *Une Parole exigeante* (Paris: Minuit, 1964), p. 49.

<sup>5</sup>Michel Butor, *L'Emploi du temps* (Paris: Minuit, 1957), pp. 147, 148, 161, 171.

<sup>6</sup>This event is indeed mysterious. John Sturrock contends that the act is the narrator's suicide: *The French New Novel* (London: Oxford University Press, 1969), pp. 53 and 62. Vivian Mercier contends that it is the Italian gunman's death: *The New Novel from Queneau to Pinget* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1970), p. 304.

<sup>7</sup>P. M. Levitt, in speaking of the narrator of *La Route des Flandres*, says: "Georges cannot know; therefore, he questions. In this he is unlike the heroes of Robbe-Grillet—who cannot know but who believe that they do—or those of Butor—who likewise seek answers but who are destroyed by their search." "Disillusionment and Epiphany: the novels of Claude Simon," *Critique, Studies in Modern Fiction*, 1 (1970), 59.

<sup>8</sup>"La donnée première, on pourrait dire la catastrophe initiale, pour Simon, c'est la fragmentation généralisée de l'Être. Le monde est perçu comme éclaté; la perception est une brève hallucination rétinienne. La forme du vécu, c'est un informe conglomérat d'instantanés purs; et l'univers de l'instantané, c'est le cauchemar de l'illogique." Serge Doubrovsky, "Notes sur la genèse d'une écriture," in *Entretiens* (Montpellier: Editions Subervie, 1972), p. 52.

<sup>9</sup>Claude Simon, *Le Palace* (Paris: Minuit, 1962), p. 98. Subsequent references to *Le Palace* are to this edition and will be placed in parentheses in the text.

<sup>10</sup>Stephen Heath, *The Nouveau Roman: A Study in the Practice of Writing* (London: Elek Books, Ltd., 1972), p. 34.

<sup>11</sup>Tzvetan Todorov, *Poétique de la prose* (Paris: Seuil, 1971), p. 98.

<sup>12</sup>Gérard Genette, *Figures II* (Paris: Seuil, 1969), p. 74.

<sup>13</sup>Todorov, p. 56.

<sup>14</sup>Charles Grivel, "Observations du roman policier," in *Entretiens sur la paralittérature*, Cérisy-la-Salle (Paris: Plon, 1970), p. 233.

<sup>15</sup>"Ce qui est curieux, à la réflexion, c'est le lien étroit qu'il y a, dès le début, entre la violence et le récit." Jean-Pierre Faye, *Le Récit hunique* (Paris: Seuil, 1967), p. 26.



<sup>16</sup>Ronald Barthes, *Essais critiques* (Paris: Seuil, 1964), p. 66.

<sup>17</sup>Stephen Heath points out that from the outset the New Novel was considered as criminal, its detractors speaking, for example, of its assassination of the traditional novel. Heath, p. 33.

<sup>18</sup>Jean Ricardou, *Pour Une Théorie du nouveau roman* (Paris: Seuil, 1971), p. 221.

<sup>19</sup>For example, "Elle se jeta du 4e étage," in *Histoire* or "L'Assassin de la rue Danremont a été arrêté hier soir" in *Le Tricheur*.

<sup>20</sup>In "Cryptique," Sylvère Lotringer speaks of linguistic transgressions in general as a "travail d'insecte ou mieux d'inceste puisqu'il s'agit de violer la langue maternelle." *Claude Simon, Colloque de Cérisy*. (Paris: U.G.E., 1975), p. 328.

<sup>21</sup>One can call into question in this regard the validity of the following statement about Simon and language made by Serge Doubrovsky: "Pourtant, s'il s'agit de faire éclater le langage, il n'est pas question de l'atomiser. Contrairement à ce que dit Ricardou sur ce point, le *mot*, chez Simon, est respecté; il échappe à la débâcle" (Doubrovsky, p. 56).

<sup>22</sup>Gérard Roubichou, "Aspects de la phrase simonienne," *Claude Simon, Colloque de Cérisy* (Paris: U.G.E., 1975), p. 208.

<sup>23</sup>Ricardou, *Le Nouveau Roman*, p. 50.