Questions of Influence in Modern French Literature

Palgrave Studies in Modern European Literature

Published in association with the Centre for Modern European Literature,
University of Kent, UK

Series Editors: **Thomas Baldwin, Ben Hutchinson, Anna Katharina Schaffner
and Shane Weller**

Editorial Advisory Board: Brian Boyd, Michael Caesar, Claus Clüver, Patrick
ffrench, Alison Finch, Robert Gordon, Karen Leeder, Marjorie Perloff, Jean-Michel
Rabaté, Andrew Michael Roberts, Ritchie Robertson, Hubert van den Berg

Many of the most significant modern European writers and literary movements
have traversed national, linguistic and disciplinary borders. *Palgrave Studies in
Modern European Literature* is dedicated to publishing works that take account of
these various kinds of border crossing. Areas covered by the series include European
Romanticism, the avant-garde, modernism and postmodernism, literary theory,
the international reception of modern European writers, and the impact of other
discourses (philosophical, political, psychoanalytic and scientific) upon modern
European literature.

Titles include:

Thomas Baldwin, James Fowler and Ana de Medeiros (*editors*)
QUESTIONS OF INFLUENCE IN MODERN FRENCH LITERATURE

Anna Katharina Schaffner and Shane Weller (*editors*)
MODERNIST EROTICISMS
European Literature After Sexology

David Williams
WRITING POSTCOMMUNISM
Towards a Literature of the East European Ruins

Forthcoming titles:

Larry Duffy
FLAUBERT, ZOLA AND THE INCORPORATION OF DISCIPLINARY KNOWLEDGE
Righting the Epistemological Body

Ros Murray
ANTONIN ARTAUD
The Scum of the Soul

Palgrave Studies in Modern European Literature
Series Standing Order ISBN 978-1-137-02455-8 (hardback)
(outside North America only)

You can receive future titles in this series as they are published by placing a standing order.
Please contact your bookseller or, in case of difficulty, write to us at the address below with
your name and address, the title of the series and the ISBN quoted above.

Customer Services Department, Macmillan Distribution Ltd, Houndmills, Basingstoke,
Hampshire RG21 6XS, England

Questions of Influence in Modern French Literature

Edited by

Thomas Baldwin

James Fowler

and

Ana de Medeiros

palgrave
macmillan

Preface, selection and editorial matter © Thomas Baldwin,

James Fowler and Ana de Medeiros 2013

Remaining chapters © Contributors 2013

Softcover reprint of the hardcover 1st edition 2013 978-1-137-30913-6

All rights reserved. No reproduction, copy or transmission of this publication may be made without written permission.

No portion of this publication may be reproduced, copied or transmitted save with written permission or in accordance with the provisions of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, or under the terms of any licence permitting limited copying issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency, Saffron House, 6–10 Kirby Street, London EC1N 8TS.

Any person who does any unauthorized act in relation to this publication may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.

The authors have asserted their rights to be identified as the authors of this work in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

First published 2013 by
PALGRAVE MACMILLAN

Palgrave Macmillan in the UK is an imprint of Macmillan Publishers Limited, registered in England, company number 785998, of Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 6XS.

Palgrave Macmillan in the US is a division of St Martin's Press LLC, 175 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10010.

Palgrave Macmillan is the global academic imprint of the above companies and has companies and representatives throughout the world.

Palgrave® and Macmillan® are registered trademarks in the United States, the United Kingdom, Europe and other countries.

ISBN 978-1-349-45632-1 ISBN 978-1-137-30914-3 (eBook)
DOI 10.1057/9781137309143

This book is printed on paper suitable for recycling and made from fully managed and sustained forest sources. Logging, pulping and manufacturing processes are expected to conform to the environmental regulations of the country of origin.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

A catalog record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

For Alison Finch, an important influence

This page intentionally left blank

Contents

<i>Series Editors' Preface</i>	ix
<i>Preface</i>	xiii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xxiii
<i>Notes on Contributors</i>	xxiv
Introduction:	
Influence: Form, Subjects, Time	1
<i>Daniel Brewer</i>	
1 Voltaire, Dante and the Dynamics of Influence	18
<i>Russell Goulbourne</i>	
2 Post-Revolutionary Uses of Pascal	32
<i>Philip Knee</i>	
3 The Survival of Sade in French Literature of the 1950s	46
<i>Perrine Coudurier</i>	
4 Jules Laforgue, Hartmann and Schopenhauer: From Influence to Rewriting	58
<i>Madeleine Guy</i>	
5 Text, Image and Music: Paul Valéry's Melodrama <i>Sémiramis</i> and the Influence of the Ballets Russes	71
<i>Natasha Grigorian</i>	
6 Influence as Appropriation of the Creative Gesture: Henri Matisse's <i>Poèmes de Charles d'Orléans</i>	84
<i>Kathryn Brown</i>	
7 Samuel Beckett's Funerary Sculpture	99
<i>Claire Lozier</i>	
8 'Périmer d'avance': Blanchot, Derrida and Influence	111
<i>John McKeane</i>	
9 Figuring Influence: Some Influential Metaphors in Derrida, Valéry and Freud	126
<i>Paul Earlie</i>	

10	Roland Barthes's Ghosts: Photobiographical Influence and Legacies <i>Fabien Arribert-Narce</i>	140
11	'Le Cycle de Nestor': Patrick Pécherot's Rewriting of Léo Malet <i>Angela Kimyongür</i>	154
12	Jacques Roubaud's Rejection of <i>Japoniste</i> Influence: <i>Tokyo infra-ordinaire</i> <i>Lucy O'Meara</i>	166
13	Ghosts of Influence? Spectrality in the Novels of Marie Darrieussecq <i>Carine Fréville</i>	180
14	'Now I See Me, Now You Don't': Working with/against Paternal Influence in Marie Nimier's <i>Photo-Photo</i> <i>Ana de Medeiros</i>	194
	<i>Bibliography</i>	208
	<i>Index</i>	219

Series Editors' Preface

Many of the most significant European writers and literary movements in the modern period have traversed national, linguistic and disciplinary borders. The principal aim of the Palgrave Studies in Modern European Literature series is to create a forum for work that takes account of these border crossings, and that engages with individual writers, genres, topoi and literary movements in a manner that does justice to their location within European artistic, political and philosophical contexts. Of course, the title of this series immediately raises a number of questions, at once historical, geo-political and literary-philosophical: What are the parameters of the modern? What is to be understood as European, both politically and culturally? And what distinguishes literature within these historical and geo-political limits from other forms of discourse?

These three questions are interrelated. Not only does the very idea of the modern vary depending on the European national tradition within which its definition is attempted, but the concept of literature in the modern sense is also intimately connected to the emergence and consolidation of the European nation-states, to increasing secularization, urbanization, industrialization and bureaucratization, to the Enlightenment project and its promise of emancipation from nature through reason and science, to capitalism and imperialism, to the liberal-democratic model of government, to the separation of the private and public spheres, to the new form taken by the university, and to changing conceptions of both space and time as a result of technological innovations in the fields of travel and communication.

Taking first the question of when the modern may be said to commence within a European context, if one looks to a certain Germanic tradition shaped by Friedrich Nietzsche in *The Birth of Tragedy* (1872), then it might be said to commence with the first 'theoretical man', namely Socrates. According to this view, the modern would include everything that comes after the pre-Socratics and the first two great Attic tragedians, Aeschylus and Sophocles, with Euripides being the first modern writer. A rather more limited sense of the modern, also derived from the Germanic world, sees the *Neuzeit* as originating in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. Jakob Burckhardt, Nietzsche's colleague at the University of Basel, identified the states of Renaissance Italy as prototypes for both modern European politics and modern European

cultural production. However, Italian literary modernity might also be seen as having commenced 200 years earlier, with the programmatic adoption of the vernacular by its foremost representatives, Dante and Petrarch.

In France, the modern might either be seen as beginning at the turn of the seventeenth to the eighteenth century, with the so-called '*Querelle des anciens et des modernes*' in the 1690s, or later still, with the French Revolution of 1789, while the Romantic generation of the 1830s might equally be identified as an origin, given that Chateaubriand is often credited with having coined the term *modernité* in 1833. Across the Channel, meanwhile, the origins of literary modernity might seem different again. With the Renaissance being seen as 'Early Modern', everything thereafter might seem to fall within the category of the modern, although in fact the term 'modern' within a literary context is generally reserved for the literature that comes after mid-nineteenth-century European realism. This latter sense of the modern is also present in the early work of Roland Barthes, who in *Writing Degree Zero* (1953) asserts that modern literature commences in the 1850s, when the literary becomes explicitly self-reflexive, not only addressing its own status as literature but also concerning itself with the nature of language and the possibilities of representation.

In adopting a view of the modern as it pertains to literature that is more or less in line with Barthes's periodization, while also acknowledging that this periodization is liable to exceptions and limitations, the present series does not wish to conflate the modern with, nor to limit it to, modernism and postmodernism. Rather, the aim is to encourage work that highlights differences in the conception of the modern – differences that emerge out of distinct linguistic, national and cultural spheres within Europe – and to prompt further reflection on why it should be that the concept of the modern has become such a critical issue in 'modern' European culture, be it aligned with Enlightenment progress, with the critique of Enlightenment thinking, with decadence, with radical renewal, or with a sense of belatedness.

Turning to the question of the European, the very idea of modern literature arises in conjunction with the establishment of the European nation-states. When European literatures are studied at university, they are generally taught within national and linguistic parameters: English, French, German, Italian, Scandinavian, Slavic and Eastern European, and Spanish literature. Even if such disciplinary distinctions have their pedagogical justifications, they render more

difficult an appreciation of the ways in which modern European literature is shaped in no small part by intellectual and artistic traffic across national and linguistic borders: to grasp the nature of the European avant-gardes or of high modernism, for instance, one has to consider the relationship between distinct national or linguistic traditions. While not limiting itself to one methodological approach, the present series is designed precisely to encourage the study of individual writers and literary movements within their European context. Furthermore, it seeks to promote research that engages with the very definition of the European in its relation to literature, including changing conceptions of centre and periphery, of Eastern and Western Europe, and how these might bear on questions of literary translation, dissemination and reception.

As for the third key term in the series title – literature – the formation of this concept is intimately related both to the European and to the modern. While Sir Philip Sidney in the late sixteenth century, Martin Opitz in the seventeenth, and Shelley in the early nineteenth produce their apologies for, or defences of, 'poetry', it is within the general category of 'literature' that the genres of poetry, drama and prose fiction have come to be contained in the modern period. Since the Humboldtian reconfiguration of the university in the nineteenth century, the fate of literature has been closely bound up with that particular institution, as well as with emerging ideas of the canon and tradition. However one defines it, modernity has both propagated and problematized the historical legacy of the Western literary tradition. While, as Jacques Derrida argues, it may be that in all European languages the history and theorization of the literary necessarily emerge out of a common Latinate legacy – the very word 'literature' deriving from the Latin *littera* (letter) – it is nonetheless the case that within a modern European context the literary has taken on an extraordinarily diverse range of forms. Traditional modes of representation have been subverted through parody and pastiche, or abandoned altogether; genres have been mixed; the limits of language have been tested; indeed, the concept of literature itself has been placed in question.

With all of the above in mind, the present series wishes to promote work that engages with any aspect of modern European literature (be it a literary movement, an individual writer, a genre, a particular topos) within its European context; that addresses questions of translation, dissemination and reception (both within Europe and beyond); that considers the relations between modern European literature and the other arts; that analyses the impact of other discourses (philosophical,

political, scientific) on that literature; and, above all, that takes each of those three terms – modern, European and literature – not as givens, but as invitations, even provocations, to further reflection.

Thomas Baldwin

Ben Hutchinson

Anna Katharina Schaffner

Shane Weller

Preface

If we are to explore the concept of influence as it has been understood and experienced by French writers and artists from the eighteenth century onwards, we will need to find moments of clarity and to uncover discursive spaces within a conceptual landscape whose terrain is notoriously difficult to map. French-language writers from the eighteenth century to the twenty-first, including Constant, Derrida, Diderot, Flaubert, Foucault, Gide, Helvétius, Roubaud, Rousseau, Sartre, Tocqueville, Valéry and Voltaire, have been concerned not only with the question of influence in apparently concrete, literary or artistic senses, but often also in rendering the concept problematic in itself. While some of these writers have conceived of influence in terms that reflect a more or less ordinary usage, others have been less sure of their ground and are thus, perhaps, more radical. Be they more or less radical in that sense, the essays in this volume examine the relations of influence among the arts of France. In the process, they describe points of contact between literature and the other arts, and question the assumptions underlying key theories of influence (not all of them French).

Undoubtedly, the most celebrated theory of influence in the last 40 years is Harold Bloom's. In his preface to the 1997 edition of *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*, Bloom accounts for the absence of a reflection on Shakespeare from the 1973 edition of his work. He suggests that he 'excluded' Shakespeare, 'one of the most influential of all authors during the last four centuries', because he 'was not ready to meditate on Shakespeare and originality'.¹ Subsequently, he grumbles that 'the entire movement of our current School of Resentment is towards eradicating Shakespeare's uniqueness' and that 'Neo-Marxists, New Historicists, French-influenced theorists all demonstrate their cultural materialism by giving us a reduced Shakespeare, a pure product of the "social energies" of the English Renaissance'.² According to Bloom, 'the French have never valued originality'.³ What, though, is originality? It is, as Bloom himself acknowledges, a concept at least as vague and in need of explication as influence. As the essays in this volume demonstrate, for a number of French writers and artists over the last three centuries, assigning value to such things as originality requires close scrutiny of the complex and often fugitive notion of influence.

Bloom also argues that 'strong poets make [poetic] history by misreading one another, so as to clear imaginative space for themselves'.⁴ His corpus consists largely of English and American poets, especially Milton and the Romantics. The hypothesis that writers practise creative misreadings of those who precede them, and that these are a symptom of the 'anxiety of influence', is a powerful one that is not restricted to poetry.⁵ However, it seems curiously timeless, being unbound by history, context and genre. It would be facile to remark that Bloom's work has generated its own anxiety of influence among other (strong) theorists, but it has certainly been subject to radical questioning and reappraisal. One example is Paul H. Fry's essay 'How to Live with the Infinite Regress of Strong Misreading'.⁶ Fry relativizes and historicizes Bloom by placing him in a twentieth-century tradition of thinking 'about' influence, with reference to T. S. Eliot, Bakhtin, Jauss and Gadamer. He summarizes his findings as follows:

Bloom distinguishes too sharply, for the good of his own position, between his own psychological wars among poets and the philological tracing of verbal influence he dislikes and [...] actually reintroduces historical change in a salutary way just insofar as he himself participates in verbal source hunting.⁷

Put in more immediately accessible terms, we might suggest that Bloom's work on influence creates a superficial distortion designed to mask a highly significant tension between the idea of a general, transposable meaning for 'influence' as somehow self-evident (X is chronologically prior to Y, which it helps to explain), and the view that 'influence', like any term used to discuss literary and visual artefacts, must be understood in its historical context. While a number of the contributors to this volume engage with Bloom's views, they do not accept them uncritically. Indeed, a number of them can be said to take on the very task – questioning the self-evidence of influence – that Fry describes.

This task has been underway for some time, of course, and was prominent in a variety of fields before the publication of Bloom's text. Indeed, nowhere, perhaps, has life been made more difficult for the concept of influence – and the notion of authentic 'origin' by which it is often accompanied – than in the work of Jacques Derrida, and of 'deconstruction' more generally. While, as Alison Finch has observed, Derrida himself is capable of taking the term 'influence' for granted,⁸ his approach to influence in *L'Écriture et la différence* (*Writing and*

Difference) is decidedly more hostile: 'Nous parlons ici de convergences et non d'influence; d'abord parce que c'est là une notion dont le sens philosophique ne nous est pas clair' ('Here, I am talking about convergences, not influence: first of all, because that is a notion whose philosophical meaning is not clear to me').⁹ 'La Structure, le signe et le jeu dans le discours des sciences humaines' ('Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences') was published in 1967, some six years before the appearance of Bloom's work (Derrida's text was first delivered, in fact, as a conference paper at Johns Hopkins University in 1966). In this text, Derrida focuses on what he perceives as the weaknesses of Lévi-Strauss's structural anthropology.¹⁰ In so doing, he highlights the pitfalls of a belief in a certain kind of influence. 'Structure', on this view, has been understood as a system organized around a centre, a fixed origin, and it is precisely such organization and 'fixing' of 'structure' that serve to limit its 'play'.¹¹ Derrida provides a long list of names that have been given to the conception of a founding centre: origin, end, *arkhe*, *telos*, *eidōs*, *ousia*, consciousness, God, man, among others, all of which are essential to the history of Western metaphysics and its understanding of 'self-present' being. For Derrida, in its nostalgia for a single, definitive origin existing before or behind all substitutes, the modern period (the limits of which remain difficult to determine)¹² evinces a growing awareness of 'centre' or 'origin' as an unattainable object of desire. It is because of the very nature of language that perpetual substitution – or *différance* – must take place: language masks absence with presence, and its differential mobility depends on its lack of centre. In light of Derrida's observations, and as a number of the contributors to this volume demonstrate, to understand influence as a straightforward active/passive relation between a writer X (an irreducible 'origin') and another writer Y (a recipient) is to show symptoms of a deep-rooted attachment to a 'metaphysics of presence'.¹³

In a similar vein, the work of Roland Barthes illuminates the movement or 'play' of language between works of art (and critical writing on them). Barthes's views on 'intertextuality', as expressed in 'Texte (théorie du)' ('Text [Theory of]') and elsewhere, are essential for an understanding of the relations that obtain between artworks. These views are explored in more detail in Daniel Brewer's Introduction and inform the analysis in a number of the subsequent contributions. They also reflect Barthes's take on the concept of influence itself. In a somewhat tetchy interview with Renaud Matignon published in *France-Observateur* in 1964, Barthes insists that 'je ne crois pas aux influences' ('I do not believe in influences').¹⁴ For Barthes, it is 'langages' (understood as 'des formes que l'on peut

remplir différemment' ['forms that we can fill up differently']) rather than 'ideas' that are transmitted between texts: 'c'est pourquoi la notion de *circulation* me paraît plus juste que celle d'*influence*; les livres sont plutôt des "monnaies" que des "forces"' ('this is why the notion of *circulation* seems to me to be more suitable than *influence*; books are "currencies" rather than "forces").¹⁵ For Barthes, the task of the critic is not to discover hidden truths about authors or their works, still less to pinpoint their influences; nor is it to produce a replica of the literary text. It is, rather, to bring about a 'contact of languages'¹⁶ through 'integration'¹⁷ and 'rewriting'.¹⁸ Indeed, 'la "preuve" critique, si elle existe' ('critical "proof", if it exists') seeks not to discover 'l'œuvre interrogée, mais au contraire à la *couvrir* le plus complètement possible par son propre langage' ('the work in question, but rather to *cover* it as fully as possible with its own language').¹⁹ We are thus invited to view the relation of 'influence', if we dare to call it that, not as 'X acting upon Y', but as a 'contact' between X and Y in which the circulation and rewriting of linguistic 'forms' are played out.

This view allows, of course, for the possibility that 'Y acted upon X'. In *Patterns of Intention: On the Historical Explanation of Pictures* (in a section entitled 'Excursus against Influence'), Michael Baxandall expounds on this very possibility. He questions the usefulness of what he describes as a 'Humean' image of causality (one billiard ball, X, hitting another, Y) as an account of the workings of artistic influence, arguing that the following is a more suitable metaphor for the ways in which works of art make contact with one another:

An image that might work better for the case would be not two billiard balls but the field covered by the billiard table. On this table would be very many balls [...] and the table is an Italian one without pockets. Above all, the cue-ball, that which hits another, is *not* X, but Y. What happens in the field, each time Y refers to an X, is a rearrangement. [...] Arts are positional games and each time an artist is influenced he rewrites his art's history a little.²⁰

For Baxandall, to say that Cézanne influenced Picasso, for example, as a matter settled only in terms of direct and 'one-way' causation, is not only to risk blurring the 'differences in type of reference' that Picasso makes to Cézanne, and to be blind to 'the actively purposeful element [...] of Picasso's behaviour to Cézanne', but it is also to ignore the fact that Picasso 'changed forever the way we can see Cézanne [...], whom we must see partly diffracted through Picasso's idiosyncratic

reading: we will never see Cézanne undistorted by what, in Cézanne, painting after Cézanne has made productive in our tradition'.²¹

While a number of the essays collected here examine influence in relation to the visual arts, and consider a range of prismatic effects of the kind that Baxandall describes, they also consider the 'diffractions' of images by texts as they occur in ekphrastic descriptions (verbal representations of visual representations). The situation is complicated by the fact that such descriptions may turn out to be 'notionally' ekphrastic, if for instance they purport to 'represent', in words, a non-existent painting. If, as Murray Krieger suggests, 'ekphrasis is, in effect, an epigram without the accompanying object, indeed without any object except the one it would verbally create',²² then in what sense can the visual image be said to influence its own description in words?

This collection was planned as French focused without being limited to French literature. While it demonstrates the short-sightedness of Bloom's complaint about 'the French', its purview also opens onto interdisciplinary and comparative approaches. Of course, we do not claim an absolute specificity for French approaches to influence; nor that they constitute an 'origin' or 'centre' for which others are mere substitutions; nor that the views of French artists, authors and theorists regarding influence are somehow more valuable than those of their European or American counterparts, for example. We believe, nevertheless, that some of the most fruitful and distinctive engagements with the concept of influence in the course of the last 300 years have been produced by French writers and artists, and that the essays contained in this volume are a vivid reflection of that.²³

The essays have been arranged in an order that attends to chronology and theme alike, which forms a number of overlapping time spans. The first two essays engage with texts spanning the late medieval to the early nineteenth century, a period during which the earlier meaning of influence²⁴ was increasingly displaced by alternative meanings. In 'Voltaire, Dante and the Dynamics of Influence', Russell Goulbourne revisits the relationship between one of the great *philosophes* of the Enlightenment and an Italian late medieval writer with whom he has rarely been connected. This allows us to see the relationship between Voltaire and Dante in a new light (indeed, to see it rather than not). In 'Post-Revolutionary Uses of Pascal', Philip Knee examines echoes of Pascal in conservative thinkers of the early nineteenth century, in particular Chateaubriand, Maistre and Lamennais. From this discussion there emerges a nuanced account of Pascalian influence. It is as though Chateaubriand and the other writers studied here 'invent' their precursor

Pascal, or make him (over) in their own image. The third piece, by Perrine Coudurier, takes the reader back as far as Sade, and forward to the mid-twentieth century. Her subject is an intriguing post-war surge of interest in the 'divine Marquis' in French intellectual circles. The 1950s saw writers such as Georges Bataille, Simone de Beauvoir, Maurice Blanchot, Pierre Klossowski, Jean Paulhan, Raymond Queneau and Pauline Réage stage various 'returns' to Sade. A complex pattern of fascination and repulsion emerges, as these mid-century writers sift through Sade for explanations of social, cultural and/or historical phenomena (including the Holocaust).

The following two essays span works from 1885 to the early 1930s. Madeleine Guy examines the ways in which Jules Laforgue was influenced by Schopenhauer and the latter's disciple Eduard von Hartmann. This influence went deeper than a selective borrowing or citation: in particular, Hartmann's *Philosophie des Unbewussten* (*Philosophy of the Unconscious*) inflected the vision/version of Schopenhauer that Laforgue 'inherited'. Subsequently, Laforgue re-reads literature under the influence of these thinkers, and vice versa. This 'circulation' of influence can be traced in Laforgue's early work, *Le Sanglot de la terre* (*The Sob of the Earth*), written in verse; and, in prose, the *Moralités légendaires* (*Moral Tales*), especially 'Hamlet ou les suites de la piété filiale' ('Hamlet or the Consequences of Filial Piety'), 'Salomé' and 'Lohengrin, fils de Parsifal' ('Lohengrin, Son of Parzival'). Natasha Grigorian reflects on the verbal, visual and aural affinities between Paul Valéry's musical drama *Sémiramis* and Sergei Diaghilev's ballet *Schéhérazade*. Focusing on the verbal and visual aspects of the musical drama, this essay examines parallels between *Sémiramis* as a 'spectacle total' and the libretto and costume design of the ballet *Schéhérazade*, as produced by the Ballets Russes in 1910. Kathryn Brown extends the span of the two preceding pieces 'forward' to Matisse, and 'backward' to the work of a fifteenth-century poet, Charles d'Orléans, rewritten by Matisse in the form of a *livre d'artiste*. Produced between 1941 and 1944, this artist's book differs from Matisse's other ventures in this area by virtue of the fact that Matisse not only illustrates, but furthermore copies, in his own hand, the selected verses of the poet. Brown also examines Rilke's 'quotation' of Charles Baudelaire in *Die Aufzeichnungen des Malte Laurids Brigge* (*The Notebooks of Malte Laurids Brigge*) and Jorge Luis Borges's fictional 'review' of Pierre Menard's (re) composition of Cervantes's *Don Quixote*. Each case posits influence as a performative act in which one artist identifies with another through the re-enactment of creative gesture; this gives rise to a tension between 'mere' copying and 'pure', original creation.

There follow chapters on Beckett, Derrida and Barthes that throw up a complex web of connections among writers, thinkers and artists of various epochs and cultures. Claire Lozier's essay 'Samuel Beckett's Funerary Sculpture' considers the importance of late-medieval funerary sculpture for an understanding of the lives, or rather half-deaths, of a number of Samuel Beckett's supine characters. The first of two pieces on Derrida, by John McKeane, is entitled "'Périmen d'avance": Blanchot, Derrida and Influence'. Derrida expressed the view in an early article that Blanchot's reading of madness is essentialist. Blanchot went on to rewrite certain texts of the 1950s from 1969–73; these revisit the topic of madness, and present it as non-essential. From Blanchot's writing, Derrida's commentary and Blanchot's rewriting, it emerges that Blanchot undergoes/exercises the influence 'of' deconstruction. The other piece on Derrida, by Paul Earlie, is entitled 'Figuring Influence: Some Influential Metaphors in Derrida, Valéry and Freud'. Earlie situates Derrida's *Mal d'archive: une impression freudienne* (*Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*) within the context of his writings on psychoanalysis and deconstruction in general. At issue, above all, is Derrida's relation to that mighty precursor Freud. Earlie shows how in *Mal d'archive* Derrida distinguishes between concept and notion in order to suggest that influence should be rethought in terms of 'impression', an idea that is not bound by the presence/absence dichotomy that Derrida rejects. Fabien Arribert-Narce explores key texts by one of the major thinkers of influence: Roland Barthes. More specifically, he re-examines Barthes's writings on the photographic image and their importance for a wide range of novelists, artists and theorists, with particular emphasis on the 'photobiographical' elements of their work.

The closing four pieces focus on primary texts written since the beginning of the twenty-first century. Angela Kimyongür's piece shows a modern-day writer engaging or re-engaging, aesthetically and ideologically, with a popular crime writer of the 1940s. Patrick Pécherot's revival of the character of private detective Nestor Burma, originally conceived by Léo Malet in 1943 in *120 rue de la Gare* (*120 Station Street*) and featuring in his *Les Nouveaux Mystères de Paris* (*New Mysteries of Paris*) series, is not quite pastiche and certainly not parody. The extent of Malet's influence on Pécherot's trilogy is evident not merely in the regeneration of Burma, but also in a range of narrative features as well as in the predominant role played in the three novels by Paris and the language of the city. Lucy O'Meara considers aspects of the most recent in a series of waves of 'japonisme' beginning in the

mid-nineteenth century. The postmodern Japanese city has become a rich locus in French literature, and contemporary responses to Japan tend, perforce, to constitute either an extension or a repudiation of the aestheticcentric tradition of 'japonisme' in previous French writing. Particularly interesting in this regard is the work of Jacques Roubaud, a long-time scholar of Japanese literature.

In the penultimate chapter, Carine Fréville explores the role of absence, loss and mourning in the writing of Marie Darrieussecq. The latter presents the phantom ('le spectre') as supplementing the impossibility of finding an adequate verbal expression of trauma (usually the death of a child). This connects her writing to that of Nicolas Abraham, Maria Török and Didier Dumas; Derrida's *Spectres de Marx* (*Spectres of Marx*) provides a further important reference for comparison. In Darrieussecq, the fantastic thus allows an otherwise impossible response to the trauma of losing an object of love. Darrieussecq's vision is further enriched by an 'intermedial intertext' that includes Patrick Modiano, Hervé Guibert, James Joyce, Louise Bourgeois, Bernard Faucon and Francesca Woodman. The closing piece, by Ana de Medeiros, is on Marie Nimier. A thread that runs through a large number of Nimier's texts (and not only the autobiographical ones) is the 'puzzling-out' of Roger Nimier's image and its influence on his daughter. In *Photo-Photo* there is a passage in which Karl Lagerfeld, whom the narrator seems to have adopted as a father substitute, offers the narrator a mirror. He proceeds to show her her own 'image' in the person of a double named Frederika, whom he encourages her to meet. This interaction can be read as a survival of the Imaginary within the Symbolic; it suggests a return to an Imaginary dream of self-in-other, yet is inaugurated by the symbolic Father to whom one owes the vital 'mirror'. *Photo-Photo* can thus be seen to continue Nimier's quest to establish the influence of what *is not* over what *is*; the haunting of an absent 'presence' by a 'present' absence, usually paternal.

As soon as we consider the range of its uses, we see that the term 'influence' cannot be exhaustively defined – that it does not go to a single conceptual essence. This does not mean, however, that it must defeat all scholarly investigation. Wittgenstein (influentially) rethought concepts and their relation to words in terms of family resemblances. The present collection has discovered such resemblances among concepts activated by the word 'influence', and provides some of the materials and methods that are necessary for both greater precision and flexibility in our use of the word.

Notes

1. Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*, 2nd edn (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. xiii.
2. *Ibid.*, p. xv.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.*, p. 5. Bloom further explicates his theory of influence in *A Map of Misreading*, 2nd edn (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).
5. In any case, Bloom uses 'poem' loosely, as when he talks of Freud's work as a 'poem' (*The Anxiety of Influence*, p. 9).
6. *Modern Language Quarterly*, 69.4 (December 2008), 437–59.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 438.
8. See Alison Finch, 'The French Concept of Influence', in *'When familiar meanings dissolve...': Essays in French Studies in Memory of Malcolm Bowie*, ed. by Naomi Segal and Gill Rye (Oxford and Bern: Peter Lang, 2011), pp. 235–48 (p. 247). Finch's example is Jacques Derrida's reference to 'l'influence reconnue de Condillac' ('the well-known influence of Condillac') in *De la grammatologie* (Paris: Minuit, 1967), p. 393. All translations are our own.
9. Jacques Derrida, 'Violence et métaphysique', in *L'Écriture et la différence* (Paris: Seuil, 1967), p. 164 (cited by Finch in 'The French Concept of Influence', p. 247).
10. See Derrida, *L'Écriture et la différence*, pp. 409–28.
11. See *ibid.*, pp. 409–10.
12. Derrida names Freud, Heidegger and Nietzsche as among the most radical 'decentralizing' thinkers (see *ibid.*, p. 412).
13. *Ibid.*
14. The interview was, in fact, published under this very title. See Roland Barthes, *Œuvres complètes*, ed. by Éric Marty, 5 vols (Paris: Seuil, 2002), II, pp. 615–19.
15. *Ibid.*, II, p. 616. Emphasis in original.
16. *Ibid.*, II, p. 617.
17. *Ibid.*, II, p. 505 ('Qu'est-ce que la critique?').
18. See 'Table ronde sur Proust', in Gilles Deleuze, *Deux régimes de fous: textes et entretiens 1975–1995*, ed. by David Lapoujade (Paris: Minuit, 2003), pp. 29–55 (p. 30).
19. Barthes, 'Qu'est-ce que la critique?', II, p. 505. Emphasis in original.
20. Michael Baxandall, *Patterns of Intention: On the Historical Explanation of Pictures* (New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 1985), p. 60. Emphasis in original. It may of course be argued that Hume's investigation into causality is more sceptical, and also more sophisticated, than Baxandall asserts.
21. *Ibid.*, pp. 61–2.

22. Murray Krieger, *Ekphrasis: The Illusion of the Natural Sign* (Baltimore, MD and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992), p. 16.
23. See here Alison Finch's arguments in 'The French Concept of Influence', which are a powerful presence in many of the discussions in this volume.
24. For instance 'Qualité, puissance, vertu qu'on prétend qui découle des astres sur les corps sublunaires' ('Quality, force, virtue that is said to be exercised by the stars on the sublunary bodies'; see *Dictionnaire de l'Académie française*, 4th edn [1762]).

Acknowledgements

The editors would like to thank the team at Palgrave, especially Sacha Lake, Paula Kennedy, Sally Osborn and Linda Auld, for their patient and generous support.

Notes on Contributors

Fabien Arribert-Narce is a JSPS (Japan Society for the Promotion of Science) Postdoctoral Fellow at the Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, Japan. He completed his PhD (*co-tutelle*) in French (2011) at the University of Kent, UK and the Université Paris III–Sorbonne Nouvelle, France. He is the author of a forthcoming monograph, *Photobiographies: pour une écriture de notation de la vie* (Roland Barthes, Denis Roche, Annie Ernaux) (2013), and has published several journal articles and book chapters on European photobiography.

Thomas Baldwin is Reader in French and Co-Director of the Centre for Modern European Literature at the University of Kent, UK. His publications include *The Material Object in the Work of Marcel Proust* (2005), *The Flesh in the Text* (co-edited with James Fowler and Shane Weller, 2007), *The Picture as Spectre in Diderot, Proust and Deleuze* (2011) and *Text and Image in Modern European Culture* (co-edited with Natasha Grigorian and Margaret Rigaud-Drayton, 2012).

Daniel Brewer is Professor of French at the University of Minnesota, USA. He is the author of *The Discourse of Enlightenment in Eighteenth-Century France: Diderot and the Art of Philosophizing* (1993) and *The Enlightenment Past: Reconstructing Eighteenth-Century French Thought* (2008). He has co-edited, with Julie Candler Hayes, *Using the Encyclopédie: Ways of Knowing, Ways of Reading* (2002) and, with Patricia Lorcin, *Spaces of War in France: Experience, Memory, Image* (2009); and edited *The Cambridge Companion to the French Enlightenment* (2013). He is presently working on a book on the experience of time and regimes of historicity in eighteenth-century French culture.

Kathryn Brown is Assistant Professor of Art History at Tilburg University, Netherlands. She is author of *Women Readers in French Painting 1870–1890* (2012) and has published widely on nineteenth- and twentieth-century French painting and literature, aesthetics and contemporary art. Recent articles have appeared in *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, *American Art* and the *Forum for Modern Language Studies*. She is editor of, and contributor to, *The Art Book Tradition in Twentieth-Century Europe* (2013) and *Interactive Contemporary Art: Participation in Practice* (forthcoming with I. B. Tauris).

Perrine Coudurier is *Attaché temporaire d'enseignement et de recherche* at the Université de Lorraine, France. She is currently completing a doctoral dissertation on the French novel and the concept of terror in the 1950s, at the Université Paris IV–Sorbonne, France, where she also teaches courses on twentieth-century French literature, information science and communication. Her research assesses questions of memory, the art of writing post-World War II and literary French history from 1945 to the present.

Paul Earlie is a Laming Junior Fellow at the Queen's College, Oxford, UK. His DPhil thesis examined the influence of psychoanalysis on the development of deconstruction in Derrida's writings, from his early phenomenological work to his later reflections on 9/11. His current research project focuses on the legacy of the Greek sophists in post-war French thought.

James Fowler is Senior Lecturer in French at the University of Kent, UK. He has written extensively on the eighteenth-century French novel and French philosophy, and has recently developed research interests in a number of British writers, including Samuel Richardson. His publications include *Voicing Desire: Family and Sexuality in Diderot's Narrative* (2000) and *The Libertine's Nemesis: The Prude in 'Clarissa' and the 'roman libertin'* (2011). He edited *New Essays on Diderot* (2011) and co-edited *The Flesh in the Text* (2007) with Thomas Baldwin and Shane Weller.

Carine Fréville completed her PhD on the representations of trauma in the works of Marie Darrieussecq, Malika Mokeddem and Lorette Nobécourt at the Centre d'Études Féminines et d'Études de Genre at the Université Paris VIII, France. She has published articles on spectrality and mourning in the works of Darrieussecq; on the rewriting of traumatic events and on identity and gender issues in the works of Mokeddem; and on abortions and maternal violence in the works of Nobécourt.

Russell Goulbourne is Professor of Early Modern French Literature at the University of Leeds, UK. His publications include *Voltaire Comic Dramatist* (2006) and a translation of Rousseau's *Reveries of the Solitary Walker* (2011). He is currently writing a book on the culture of posterity in eighteenth-century France.

Natasha Grigorian is a Research Associate in Comparative Literature at the University of Konstanz, Germany, and University of Vienna, Austria. In her research, she focuses on late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century European literature and visual art. She is the author of a recent

monograph, *European Symbolism: In Search of Myth (1860–1910)* (2009). Together with Thomas Baldwin and Margaret Rigaud-Drayton, she is co-editor of a collective volume, *Text and Image in Modern European Culture* (2012). Her current research project focuses on the legacy of symbolism and counterfactual thought experiments in literature.

Madeleine Guy is a former student of the École Normale Supérieure in Paris. She is currently a PhD student in French literature at the Université de Poitiers, France. Her thesis, titled ‘La Bibliothèque imaginaire de Jules Laforgue’, is a study of the rewritings of several authors in Jules Laforgue’s collection of novellas, *Moralités légendaires*.

Angela Kimyongür is Senior Lecturer in French in the School of Languages, Linguistics and Cultures at the University of Hull, UK. Until recently, her research focused on the fiction of Louis Aragon; she has authored two monographs and numerous articles on his work. She is currently working on French crime fiction. Recent publications include ‘Patrick Pécherot, Eugenics and the Occupation of France’ in *Violence and War in Culture and the Medias* (2012); ‘“The Beast never dies”: Maurice Gouiran and the Uses of War Memory’, *Journal of War and Culture Studies* (2011); and ‘Dominique Manotti and the *roman noir*’, *Contemporary Women’s Writing* (2012).

Philip Knee is Professor of Philosophy at Université Laval, Quebec, Canada. His publications include *Qui perd gagne. Essai sur Sartre* (1993); *Penser l'appartenance. Enjeux des Lumières en France* (1995); *La Parole incertaine. Montaigne en dialogue* (2003); and two edited collections of essays: *Rousseau juge de Jean-Jacques. Études sur les Dialogues*, with G. Allard (2003) and *Rousseau et le romantisme* (2011).

Claire Lozier is Lecturer in French at the University of Leeds, UK. She is the author of *De l'abject et du sublime: Georges Bataille, Jean Genet, Samuel Beckett* (2012) and of several articles and book chapters on the work of these authors. Her current research project examines the presence of the Baroque in the work of Georges Bataille.

John McKeane is Lecturer in French at the Universities of Cardiff and Oxford, UK. He works on modern French writing and thought. His doctoral thesis addressed Maurice Blanchot’s fragments and dialogues, and he has recently been working on a younger generation of thinkers including Philippe Lacoue-Labarthe and Jean-Luc Nancy. In addition to various articles, his publications include a co-edited collective volume entitled *Blanchot Romantique* (2010) and a translation of Nancy’s *Adoration (the Deconstruction of Christianity, II)* (2012).

Ana de Medeiros is Reader in French and Life Writing at the University of Kent, UK, and the Academic Director of the University of Kent at Paris. She works mainly on postcolonialism, feminism and life writing, and has published on a number of authors including Assia Djebar, Marie Nimier, Marguerite Yourcenar and the Lusophone writer Lídia Jorge. With Carine Fréville she recently co-edited a special issue on women and wounded bodies for the *International Journal of Francophone Studies* (2012). Her current research project focuses on the absent father in contemporary French autobiographical writing.