

ROLAND BARTHES'S SECRET GARDEN

FRANCES BARTKOWSKI

University of Iowa

«In an author's lexicon, will there not always be a word-as-mana?...This word has gradually appeared in his work; at first it was *masked* by the instance of Truth (that of systems and structures); now it blossoms, it flourishes; this word-as-mana is the word 'body'.»(RB, p. 129)

Here is an entrance to Barthes's texts: the fictional personage who speaks as RB reveals that there has been a progressive disclosure of the body at work through each of the books. Here then is an attempt to locate and follow this thread of the body as a structuring metaphor of the texts from *Writing Degree Zero* to *Barthes by Barthes*. However, this admission is no surprise by the time the reader of Barthes has duplicated the writer's itinerary. With such an admission, even though made by the fictive RB, an attempt will also be made to examine what new possibilities for critical discourse are projected by *A Lover's Discourse*, once this organizing structure has been revealed.

Once the body is acknowledged as a pretext for *The Pleasure of the Text*, the critical perspective begins to focus less on any written text and more on the internal processes of the reading subject. From *Writing Degree Zero*, with its socio-historical questions and their effects on literature, to *A Lover's Discourse* and the discourse of the imaginary, Barthes has traveled very far. But a closer look at the texts in between these two poles may expose a route that contains markers which point the way from the social to the personal. The *Lover's Discourse* in fact is not purely a personal discourse;

rather it is one of the lover speaking to the silent other. Though an internal discourse, it is always interfaced with the social situations in which it occurs: waiting, dependence, contingencies, declarations. The coupled words and phrases of all Barthes's earlier texts may now be seen as a figure of this more problematic coupling: the lover and the loved; the self and the other.

Since *Writing Degree Zero*, Barthes has been pointing at masks: those of literature that point only to themselves, those of social myths, and in *Barthes by Barthes* he points to his own. He is writing *Sur Barthes* as he had once written on Racine, looking for an organizing structure that may be common to many of the texts. But the contemporary readers of *Writing Degree Zero* (1947-53) could not have predicted the Roland Barthes of *The Pleasure of the Text*. Only a retrospective view of Barthes allows one to look behind the mask and ask where is the body behind the concern with History in *Writing Degree Zero*? If such a disclosure is to be found, then it is in the discussion on style that one may sense the *mot-mana* in its as yet latent stage. It would be useful to look closely at this passage from *Writing Degree Zero*. Barthes clearly articulates his definitions of language and writing. It is when faced with the third element—style—that certain metaphors begin to obscure rather than define that which Barthes wishes to call style: to quote selectively from pages 10-12 of the English text:

...a self-sufficient language which has its roots only in the depths of the author's *personal* and *secret* mythology...a vertical and lonely dimension of thought...the *private portion* of the ritual...the decorative voice of *hidden, secret flesh*...a sub-language elaborated where flesh and external reality come together...the transmutation of a Humour...style is never anything but metaphor... always a secret...² (emph. added) [*WDZ*, p. 10-12]

Suddenly the very concrete socio-economic concerns of the text, which very effectively delineate the relationship of literature and the writer to society, break down into a vocabulary that is private and verges on the mystical. An invocation of the medieval notion of 'humours' does little to explain style. What is remarkable is the reference to the body as a collection of humours (from Michelet), and the repeated notion of style as private, secret, of the flesh. While this may not be an adequate definition of style for

other writers, it is valid for what will much later be acknowledged as the primarily personal relationship of Barthes-as-writer-and-reader to any literary text. This is perhaps the one location in *Writing Degree Zero* where Barthes speaks of himself and the body, already claiming both as central to the definition of 'écriture.' Certainly an idiosyncratic explanation of style, one can see looking back from *Barthes by Barthes* how the body, the *mot-mana* has indeed been present from the beginning. Here is an attempt by Barthes to define what appears to be the 'inexpressible'; Barthes much later points to the body as the 'thing' that has always inhabited his discourse. These two pages in *Writing Degree Zero* are the gaps in the seam of what is otherwise a very concrete study of writing and literature, as Susan Sontag points out in her preface to the English translation. Perhaps the mask of history, here so clearly in view, is what makes for an elliptical style throughout: ellipsis but not yet fragmentation. Barthes does not disclose his private vocabulary until much later. In the fragment «Que ça se sache» of *Barthes by Barthes* there is again an affirmation of the 'unexpressed word' that wants to be known through the text. In *The Pleasure of the Text* Barthes-the-reader describes the way in which a text of pleasure may communicate to him: «That's it! And further still: that's it for me!»³ Once the *scriptible* has been defined in *S/Z*, the unexplored language of pleasure and bliss may enter into the critical discourse. But the writerly text cannot be recuperated in the way that the readerly text lends itself to various types of exegesis. Barthes, the grey eminence of structuralism, is now willing and even eager to make room for just those texts that cannot be dissected by academic criticism, but can only be met with visceral responses and recognition of what he once called style. In *Writing Degree Zero* he sought and yet avoided definition. By the time of *The Pleasure of the Text* the only definition possible is located somewhere in the body. Is Barthes renouncing his earlier attempts at concretizing the structures of literary forms? Is he suddenly speechless in the face of some quality of literariness that will not be grasped? Whether he has come to an end in his work with specific texts is still an open question. *Lover's Discourse* hints at a new perspective which may become useful in dealing with the writerly text. The poles of *Writing Degree Zero* and *A Lover's Discourse* need to be brought closer together.

In the passage on style from *Writing Degree Zero* Barthes speaks of style as being of a vertical dimension—a depth that can-

not be measured or traveled. Only that which is horizontal may be subjected to the critical discourse; the syntagmatic chain may be reconstructed.

...speech has a horizontal structure...everything is held forth, meant for immediate consumption,...' (WDZ, p. 11) «...the lover speaks...a horizontal discourse: ...no novel (though a great deal of the fictive)...the great narrative Other,...' (LD, p. 7)

No longer dealing with literary narrative in the same way, Barthes has now turned his attention to the narrative structure of the imaginary discourse of the one in love. Certainly literary antecedents are present everywhere and are cited throughout. A study of the *roman* has given way to a study of that which constitutes the *romanesque*. Barthes's concerns here are less with the narrative structures than with the emotional or imaginary discourse that motivates the texts he cites, both written and unwritten (his own private lover's discourse). What was only suggested in the fragment in *Barthes by Barthes* «Transgression de la transgression» has come to pass in the *Lover's Discourse*. But as he noted: sentimentality has reintroduced the question of love «but in another place.» The amorous discourse may now be examined with the same tools that were used in «The Structuralist Activity,» for example. The imaginary has a structure as solid as any written narrative and may be articulated through a very self-revealing examination of a 'je' speaking to an 'il' that does not respond—that would be an *other* discourse. But is the *Lover's Discourse* the «last of the transgressions?»

...let us now imagine reintroducing into the politicosexual field thus discovered, recognized, traversed, and liberated...a touch of sentimentality: would that not be the *ultimate* transgression? the transgression of transgression itself? For, after all, that would be *love*: which would return: *but in another place*. (RB, pp. 65-66)

...by a reversal of values, then, it is this sentimentality which today constitutes love's obscenity,...It is then the *impossible* moment when the obscene can really coincide with affirmation, with the *amen*, the limit of language (any utterable obscenity as such can no longer be the last degree of the

obscene: uttering it, even through the wink of a figure, I myself am already recuperated, socialized).’ *ILD*, pp. 175, 179]

In the first quote Barthes suggests only a hypothesis: imagine such an improbable occurrence—the notion of sentimentality as a social sin. As each layer of language is laid bare, the latest acceptance—that of the language of sexuality via the psychoanalytical vocabulary, the possibility of sin becomes more and more limited. The very use of a religious term seems a necessary defense, an ironic stance before sentimentality, the newly obscene word, is even utterable. Love has taken the place of politics, sex and religion as a topic inappropriate to social intercourse, the order of discourse. To free the language of sentimentality and thereby love would, however, bring love *to* an appropriate level of discourse, as was possible for the language of sexual politics. Barthes, always in search of ‘morality,’ seems to welcome the possibility of such a transgression. And what is the *Lover’s Discourse* if not a step toward this liberation of language? In between the two passages cited above from the *Lover’s Discourse* there are sections related to Bataille and Sade, both of whom made very significant attempts to stretch the limits of language and therefore put into question the entire definition of the obscene. But the saying or writing of those texts in and of themselves was not obscene. Only that which remains unspeakable—*indicible* can be obscene. Today then, for Barthes, sentimentality is this uncharted linguistic territory. Hiding between parentheses and the unexpected *passé simple*—that demiurgic tense—Barthes knows his amorous discourse has acknowledged and exposed a great deal of sentimentality; this is after all the language of love as it exists in the imaginary dialogue. He is now recuperable and recuperated by giving voice to that inner/other narrative created by the lover. (Perhaps something of the *scriptible* has been liberated through the *dicible*.) But to maintain the idea of ‘obscenity’ is to hold on to some sacred notion/text, some thing which is unknowable, unsayable. First it was style that eluded Roland Barthes, then the writerly text, now the body laid bare; there is still a censor—it is emotion, raw and irrational and obscene. Though the play of the emotions is being dramatically represented in the *Lover’s Discourse* it is sifted through consciousness. There is always another mask for Roland Barthes.

In his two latest texts Barthes seems to be moving away from

the rigid binarism of his earlier structuralist activity—in particular that couple which dominates *S/Z*: the readerly and the writerly. Possible third terms now begin to modulate the apparent opposition in a move toward resolution or mutual interdependence. Just as the obscene is rendered neutral by its entry into the order of discourse, Barthes is searching for a way to say that which has been unspeakable, to pass beyond a strict duality of the linguistic modeling system he had adopted from Saussure and others.

In the fragment entitled «Readerly, writerly and beyond...» Barthes introduces a new notion:

...alongside the readerly and the writerly, there would be something like the *receivable*...[that] would be the unreaderly text which catches hold, the red-hot text...whose function...would be to contest the mercantile constraint of what is written;...armed by a notion of the *unpublishable* would require the following response: I can neither read nor write what you produce, but I *receive* it, like a fire, a drug, an enigmatic disorganization.⁸ [RB, p. 118]

The writerly text which required that the reader participate in the production of meaning is being replaced in Barthes's imagination by a text which meets with no verbal or linguistic response. This new text he foresees is like the asocial text of bliss which can only create sensations in the reader—it is received like a drug and will have its enigmatic effect. Barthes welcomes texts which do not lend themselves easily to a critical discourse—they cannot be recuperated. Yet each of his own texts seems to prepare the way for new sorts of productions which Barthes-the-reader eagerly awaits while he creates new tools for dealing with such unexpected literary arrivals. The text is bound to pass beyond the pleasure principle, but Barthes is always ready to try to bring it back into the realm of speech and its horizontal structure; even the text which is only *receivable* finds its reader/respondent.

A new couple is established in the *A Lover's Discourse*:

The unreal is uttered, abundantly (a thousand novels, a thousand poems). But the disreal cannot be uttered; for if I utter it...I emerge from it...Instead of this hold, a vivid reality has just appeared: the reality of the Sentence....⁹ [LD, p. 91]

This feeling of the *déréal* once named has become part of the *réel*. Language, the sentence, may be inadequate, but it is still a field that accommodates all attempts to pass beyond it. Barthes may appear to have moved far from the Saussurean model, but even in the *A Lover's Discourse* what is examined is still the connected horizontal chain of signifiers—the *parole* of the lover. The linguistic categories are still operative:

...In the lover's realm...nothing but signs, a frenzied activity of language: to institute on each furtive occasion, the system (the paradigm) of demand and response.¹⁰ [LD, p. 68]

...the amorous subject has no system of sure signs at his disposal...I look for signs, but of what? What is the object of my reading?¹¹ [LD, p. 214]

The amorous and the literary discourse are both a collection of signs that need to be read. The ultimate faith and the object of Barthes's inquiry is still in language. And the play is still between the signifier and the signified in a search for signification. Barthes is now reading love as he had read literature. The sign system of the other must be deciphered. But all readings remain provisional. Everything must be put into words though their meanings are to be found outside the linguistic activity in the language of the body, where meaning is manifest and unmediated. The lover's discourse is always as self-conscious as the literary discourse. But the languages of the lover and the loved one are unmatched, unshared like the languages between author/other and reader (the desire to grasp some meaning is as strong, and as frustrated). Only translation is possible—into an other discourse. The haiku is often cited in the *Lover's Discourse* as a genre that speaks the amorous discourse. The laconic nature of the haiku as a form of pure expenditure is closer to the language of the body which needs only a gesture to produce meaning (p. 257 in the French original). The teachings of the East, most notably Zen Buddhism for Barthes, are a move beyond the subject and object—a split that informs all of Western philosophy and language. But this form of discourse is a vain hope for Barthes who needs the words and signs of the other to read, even if he will not interpret, and even if their truth is momentary and provisional, as is his reading of the moments and incidents of the amorous discourse. The frustration of any text in the produc-

tion of meaning by an other is felt by Barthes most strongly in the fragment cited above, «L'incertitude de signes.»

A moment which occurs often in Barthes's writings is one he calls a feeling of exclusion—his otherness in relationship to the text he is reading at any given time. This can be seen even in Barthes' *Mythologies*:

The mythologist is condemned to live in a theoretical sociality...one last exclusion threatens the mythologist...condemned to metalanguage...condemned for some time yet always to speak *excessively* about reality.¹² [*Mythologies*, pp. 157-159]

From the early concerns with the materiality of signs in myth, Barthes moved to the disclosure of that ultimate material reality—the body. Perhaps there he could go beyond the meta-language and back to a language universally apprehended.

In *Barthes by Barthes* (in the fragment called «L'exclusion»), Barthes describes the feeling of exclusion from a social reality—the marriage he comes upon at the church; from this moment to his feeling of exclusion from the text.

...he felt more than excluded: detached: forever assigned the place of the witness, whose discourse can only be, of course, subject to codes of detachment: either narrative, or explicative, or challenging, or ironic: never *lyrical*, never homogenous with the pathos outside of which he must seek his place.¹³ [*RB*, p. 86]

The painful exclusion of the child («Un souvenir d'enfance») has become the detached, resigned exclusion of the critic. The lover, too, is excluded not only from the language and body of the other, but from that of 'others.' This is seen most clearly in the fragment «Le potin» (gossip).

Pain suffered by the amorous subject when he finds that the loved being is the subject of 'gossip' and hears that being discussed promiscuously...the 'subject' comes to light by gossip,...Gossip reduces the other to he/she...For me the other is neither *he* nor *she*; the other has only a name of his own, and her own name. The third person pronoun is a wicked pronoun: it is the pronoun of the non-person, it absents, it

annuls."¹⁴ [LD, pp. 183-185]

Here the loved one is excluded by the neutralizing gossip of others; but it is as easily the lover who may become *he* or *she*—thereby also losing his/her person(a). The loved one may only be truly perceived by the lover, all other perceptions exclude the proper name. Barthes himself does not want to become the *il* of the *potin*. The horror of exclusion is that the language of the self may not respond—one is silence by the *bavardage* of others.

By becoming a reader/critic Barthes has condemned himself to a metalanguage. The progress from *Writing Degree Zero* to *The Pleasure of the Text* is one which lays bare each of the assumed meta-languages up to what seems the last disclosure—the body, the bliss of the text and of the reader. In the *Lover's Discourse* Barthes assumes the meta-language of the lover—the imaginary as it speaks to and in the subject. Perhaps this is as close as Barthes can come to the source of his language. By dissecting that most personal discourse of the self as it faces the unreal material of loving, Barthes is giving speech to the unconscious. He is examining its narrative structure as closely as he had Balzac's *Sarrasine*. Suddenly the 'white writing' of Blanchot cited in *Writing Degree Zero* and the writerly/blissful texts of Sollers can be approached, made readable through the frame of reference of a lover who speaks. The fatigue and languor of the amorous discourse find their literary analogs in these two authors' works. Though Barthes still cannot speak of them in the same manner in which he can approach and appropriate the readerly text, he can now locate the source(s) of their use of language. His imaginary discourse has found a connection in the amorous discourses of other literary creations. This structuring of that other narrative—the imaginary—is seen by Barthes as a means of speaking that which has remained closed off to academic discourse. But the critical discourse necessary to the modern text is not one of detachment. Barthes must plunge into and sound out his own language of the unconscious before he can honestly hope to enter into the amorous literary discourses that populate his text. Then the literary works and the lover's narrative may interpenetrate and disclose each other. The writerly may be made readerly, but only provisionally. Bliss may be spoken, even if in the speaking it is transformed. The writing of the amorous/narrative is a step away from the original as it existed before it became language.

Like the preterite of the classical text in *Writing Degree Zero*, the imperfect is the time of the lover's discourse—memory speaking in order to remember, not to understand. Barthes has sur-rendered the need but not necessarily the desire to interpret, to understand, the *vouloir-saisir* (the will-to-possess) that the critic seeks to formulate this final affirmation: the *non-vouloir-saisir* (the non-will-to-possess) is a renunciation of any attempt to fix the other/text. Barthes can continue to «produce without appropriating» (*Fragments*, p. 277). But a final detachment must be made even here: he must not maintain an attachment to the desire to no longer appropriate meaning. This is not a renunciation of language or critical discourse, but an ease that Barthes can accept with the inadequacy he has always felt between language and experience/literature. The body may apprehend—words will always be an incomplete translation of what is *saisi* by the body. The imaginary discourse is an inner one that for Barthes elucidates to some degree the sensations of the body; it can become literature, it is always fiction. The body, once spoken, is a narrative, a text which like any other cannot be finally fixed, but may be provisionally disclosed.

The idea of non-will-to-possess (further echoes of Zen) is Barthes's most current moral position or choice. Barthes has always sought a morality, a way of reading texts that would not be deterministic. In *Writing Degree Zero* he makes clear the fact that order always implies repression. The writerly/blissful text is one of less order than the classical/readerly text. For this reason Barthes applauds its subversive use of language. But he does not remain silent. He still tries to find an appropriate language for the modern text—but with a difference. He will make no claims on the text; he alone is morally responsible for what he chooses to read in the text-/other. The Barthes of *Writing Degree Zero* saw writing as the «morale du langage» (p. 10), the «morality of form» (p. 5). RB of *Barthes by Barthes* still maintains that the object of his work is the «morality of the sign» (p. 101). Where else is morality most connotatively located if not in the body?

The three gardens of Barthes' youth in Bayonne provide the best metaphor for his search for a morality of the sign and a morality in literature.

...three symbolically different spaces (and to cross the boundary of each space was a significant action)...The wordly, the

domestic, the wild: is this not the very tripartition of social desire?...¹⁵ [RB, p. 8]

Barthes's itinerary can be seen as a passage from the public to the private garden. The public garden has its socially known and accepted codes—it is history, the real, Barthes's first mask of *Writing Degree Zero*. The second garden is still public in its appearance but private in its function (for the home). That is the Barthes of the structuralist period whose tools are used to unearth the functioning devices of the literary worker. There is a utilitarian purpose in this search for the morality of the sign as a public phenomenon. Literature is the combination of structures that constitute it as such—it can be dismantled to lay bare its moving parts, and reconstituted. The *jardin casanier* (the domestic garden) may be replanted annually—it serves and nourishes. But the third garden—the wild, overgrown, untended space behind the house is completely private. The young Barthes went there infrequently, yet its effects seem to have been the most enduring. For surely it is Barthes's private garden which comes to function in the texts from *S/Z* through *A Lover's Discourse*. A personal morality must be established here—there are no known codes which function in the wild garden. Barthes no longer walks through only the center path of this garden. He is making an attempt to domesticate or name the savagery he finds here, the self he finds here. Once we have been exposed to the Barthes of the *Lover's Discourse* we feel we know what demons and illusions abound in his private garden. This laying bare makes his earlier works more idiosyncratic and at the same time more subject to recuperation because we have learned the language of his imaginary discourse. We have greater insight into the Barthes who attempts to seize by not-wanting-to seize the real of an amorous/literary discourse. The non will-to-possess is the private morality which will function in the wild garden of the *Lover's Discourse*.

Postscript:

It has become apparent that yet another garden haunted Barthes's private repertoire of images. In the first posthumous work published, *La Chambre claire*, an essay on photography, Barthes's

longest meditation focuses on a photograph of his mother. It was his mother's death which prompted a search through old family photographs to find that *one* which would evoke for the author the mother as sensed by memory, as seen by personal history. The photograph chosen is not reproduced for the reader for, as Barthes points out, it would remain unreadable. It is, however, described: a girl of five, mother of the writer, is standing in the *jardin d'hiver*, or winter garden. Like all photographs it says merely, «this once was.» Hypostatizing the photograph as the partial object (the mother's breast of Kleinian psychoanalysis) Barthes's photo is one of the mother herself *in* that garden whose function is to protect the plants from the cold, as the mother once sheltered the child from the world. The green and white world of covered gardens in winter restores to Barthes's memory a moment, a «punctum» frozen by the photo, but codeless.

This photograph particularly jars his personal history since it represents a moment before his own birth. Yet it distills her face, her body and her reality as no other photo does for him. Like the house in Bayonne with its three gardens, this final garden has disappeared. Yet the symbolic space it represents takes its place among those other latent forms which Barthes fills with signification and thereby makes readable. The *jardin d'hiver* is also private—it is enclosed and harbors those flora which could not otherwise survive the winter. Face to face with the image of his mother as a child, Barthes mirrors the moment reproduced in the autobiography: he becomes the infant held by the mother whose gaze constructs the self. Now, after her death he speaks of how her illness made her into his child—once again the child pictured in this photograph. Barthes has «abandoned» himself not only to the image but to the Imaginary and the «figure» of the mother constructed by that discourse.

NOTES

1. «Dans la lexique d'un auteur, ne faut-il pas qu'il y ait toujours un mot-mana?...Ce mot est apparu dans son oeuvre peu à peu; il a d'abord été *masqué* par l'instance de la Vérité (celle de l'histoire), ensuite par celle de la Validité (celle

des systèmes et des structures); maintenant il s'épanouit: ce mot-mana, c'est le mot 'corps.' *Roland Barthes par Roland Barthes* (Paris: Seuil, 1975), p. 133, (hereafter referred to as *RB*). Pagination in the text refers to the English translation by Richard Howard. (New York: Hill & Wang, 1977)

2. «...un langage autarcique qui ne plonge que dans la mythologie *personnelle* et *secrète* de l'auteur...une dimension *verticale* et *solitaire* de la pensée...il est la 'chose' de l'écrivain...la *part privée* du rituel...la voix décorative d'une *chair inconnue* et *secrète*...un infra-langage qui s'élabore à la limite de la chair et du monde...la transmutation d'une *Humeur*...le style n'est jamais que *métaphore*...toujours un *secret*...» *Le Degré zéro de l'écriture* (Paris: Seuil, 1953), pp. 12-13. Pagination in the text refers to the English translation by Annette Lavers and Colin Smith. (New York: Hill & Wang, 1968)

3. «c'est ça! Et plus encore: c'est cela pour moi!... *Le Plaisir du texte* (Paris: Seuil, 1973), p. 24. Pagination in the text refers to the English translation by Richard Miller (New York: Hill & Wang, 1975) p. 13.

4. «...la parole a une structure horizontale...tout est offert, destinée à une usure immédiate...» *Degré zéro*, pp. 12-13.

5. «...l'amoureux parle...c'est un discours horizontal: ...aucun roman (mais beaucoup de romanesque)...Autre narratif,...» *Fragments d'un discours amoureux* (Paris: Seuil, 1977), p. 11. Pagination in the text refers to the English translation by Richard Howard. (New York: Hill & Wang, 1978)

6. «...imaginons maintenant de réintroduire dans le champ politicosexuel ainsi découvert, reconnu, parcouru et libéré...un *brin de sentimentalité*: ne serait-ce pas la *dernière* des transgressions? la transgression de la transgression? Car enfin de compte ce serait *l'amour*: qui reviendrait: *mais à une autre place*.» *IRB*, p. 70]

7. «...par un renversement de valeurs, c'est donc cette sentimentalité qui fait aujourd'hui l'obscène de l'amour...C'est donc le moment *impossible* où l'obscène peut vraiment coïncider avec l'affirmation, *l'amen*, la limite de la langue (tout obscène dicible comme tel ne peut plus être le dernier degré de l'obscène: moi-même en le disant, fut-ce à travers le clignotement d'une figure, je suis *déjà* récupéré).» *[Fragments, pp. 207-211]*.

8. «...à côté du lisible et du scriptible il y aurait quelque chose comme le *recevable*...[ce] serait l'illisible qui accroche, le texte brûlant...dont la fonction...serait de contester la contrainte mercantile de l'écrit; armé par une pensée de l'*impubliable* appellerait la réponse suivante: je ne puis lire ni écrire ce que vous produisez, mais je le *reçois* comme un feu, une drogue, une désorganisation énigmatique.» *IRB*, p. 122].

9. «L'irréel se dit abondamment (mille romans, mille poèmes). Mais le déréel ne peut se dire; car si je le dis...c'est que j'en sors...A la place de ce trou, un réel très vif vient de surgir: celui de la Phrase...» *[Fragments, p. 107]*

10. «...Dans le champ amoureux...rien que des signes, une activité éperdue de

parole: mettre en place à chaque occasion furtive, le système (le paradigme) de la demande et de la réponse.» [*Fragments*, p. 82].

11. «...le sujet amoureux n'a à sa disposition aucun système de signes sûrs...Je cherche des signes, mais de quoi? Quel est l'objet de ma lecture?» [*Fragments*, p. 253].

12. «Le mythologue est condamné à vivre une socialité théorique...une dernière exclusion menace le mythologue...condamné au méta-langage...condamné pour un certain temps à parler toujours excessivement du réel.» (Paris: Seuil, 1947), pp. 245-246. Pagination in the text refers to the English translation by Annette Lavers. (New York: Hill & Wang, 1972)

13. «...il se sentait plus qu'exclu: détaché: toujours renvoyé à la place du témoin, dont le discours ne peut être, on le sait, que soumis à des codes de détachement: ou narratif, ou explicatif, ou contestataire, ou ironique; jamais *lyrique*, jamais homogène au pathos en dehors duquel il doit chercher sa place.» [*RB*, p. 89].

14. «Blessure éprouvée par le sujet amoureux lorsqu'il constate que l'être aimé est pris dans un 'potin,' et entend parler de lui d'une façon commune...le 'sujet' vient au jour par le potin...Le potin réduit l'autre à il/elle...L'autre n'est pour moi ni *il* ni *elle*; il n'a que son propre nom, son nom propre. La troisième personne est un pronom méchant: c'est le pronom de la non-personne, il absente, il annule....» [*Fragments*, p. 217]

15. «...trois espaces symboliquement différents (et passer la limite de chaque espace était un acte notable)...Le mondain, le casanier, le sauvage: n'est-ce pas la tripartition même du désir social?...» [*RB*, p. 10].