

A Study of Allusion: Barbey's Stendhal in "Le Rideau cramoisi"

EVEN AS EARLY as the 1850's, when Barbey d'Aurevilly may have composed the first draft of "Le Rideau cramoisi,"¹ there were a number of fervent *stendhaliens*, and by 1874, when the story was published as a part of *Les Diaboliques*, Barbey had long been an ardent admirer of the great novelist. In Barbey's and others' articles, one may gain insights into the fascination and horror that *Le Rouge et le noir* held for its nineteenth-century readers. An even deeper understanding of Stendhal's novel becomes apparent on studying how "Le Rideau cramoisi" alludes to *Le Rouge* with title, epigraph, image, detail, character, and plot parallels. The allusion in Barbey's story functions much like a metaphor—*Le Rouge* serving as one term and the tale told by the Viscount de Brassard, the other. The conjunction of the two terms emphasizes the common elements: egotistical protagonists who, seemingly without volition, violate the codes of honor and hospitality. In addition, the metaphorical functioning of the allusion serves as the principal device for eliciting the essential theme of satanism.

The allusion apparent in this story could perhaps be classified as "extended, parallel allusion." Of the different varieties, it is the simplest. It thus provides a convenient vehicle for suggesting a way of approaching the device and for positing a theory to explain its mechanism. Although I believe that a better understanding of allusion may aid in evaluating those works that make use of it, I do not wish to give the impression that the device has been ignored. Pierre Fontanier, for example, proposed the following, perfectly acceptable definition: "L'Allusion . . . consiste à faire sentir le rapport d'une chose qu'on dit avec une autre qu'on ne dit pas, et dont ce rapport même réveille l'idée."² It does seem, however, that the implications of such definitions have been, if not unknown, at least passed over. Fontanier's precision has the advantage of stressing the essential

attributes of allusion. As he points out, the device is more than one term; indeed, it is more than two terms. It consists of the perception of a relationship between a minimum of two terms, at least one of which is explicit, perception stimulated internally by a text (if we limit ourselves to literature). In the most knowing examples of the device, one term does not equal the other; one term cannot, then, communicate the allusive meaning, be it semantic or affective; the meaning is communicated only metaphorically by the reader's synthesis of the two terms. Of course, the term "qu'on ne dit pas" has to be known to the reader; otherwise, the text would never succeed through its own means in establishing the relationship and communicating the meaning. It follows that one must question the efficacy of allusion that, like that in Eliot's *The Waste Land*, requires authorial explanation even for cultivated contemporaries.

I

Perhaps, since the critical understanding of *Le Rouge et le noir* has changed considerably since Barbey's time, it would be helpful to review briefly the testimony of nineteenth-century witnesses in order to reach an approximation of how the literati understood Stendhal's novel, the unstated term of Barbey's allusion. These former readers watched Julien while his obsessive ambition and vanity drove him to grasp and hold Mme de Rênal's hand, to seduce and in the process dishonor her, to defy the wishes of his friend and benefactor, the Abbé Chélan, by troubling the uncertain peace the poor woman found after Julien's departure; they followed Julien as he capriciously misused his power,³ as his undoubted courage was proved, and as he betrayed the confidence of his friend, the Abbé Pirard, and of his patron, M. de la Mole, by accepting the spoiled, willful Mathilde's invitation to possess her; and they were filled with anguished fascination, well aware of the

attractions of this charming, genial, valorous protagonist and of his infernal misdeeds. Despite Julien's genius, his occasionally sincere love for both Mme de Rênal and Mathilde, and the courage revealed in his attack on the oppressive forces of society, he committed heinous crimes: not only did he attempt to murder Mme de Rênal, but he betrayed his friends and benefactors and dishonored his women. Though the nineteenth-century reader might, like Taine, try to understand the motivations of this protagonist, such an attempt never implied an effort to excuse him. "Je ne veux point l'excuser; je veux seulement montrer qu'il peut être au fond très généreux, très reconnaissant, bon, disposé à la tendresse et à toutes les délicatesses du désintéressement, et cependant agir en égoïste, exploiter les hommes, et chercher son plaisir et sa grandeur à travers les misères des autres."⁴ As Hippolyte Babou put it in 1846, Julien was a "fourbe sublime" filled with a "repoussante grandeur."⁵ Even Julien knew, and repeatedly said, that he deserved death (*Rouge*, pp. 452, 454, 456, 482).

In 1854, Sainte-Beuve, a decidedly unenthusiastic critic of Stendhal, announced "une génération nouvelle qui se met à s'éprendre de ses œuvres, à le rechercher, à l'étudier en tous sens presque comme un ancien, presque comme un classique" ("M. de Stendhal," p. 301). Judging from Léon Chapron, the admiration of some readers later approached religious veneration:

C'était pendant un entr'acte d'une première représentation du théâtre Cluny. La critique, singulièrement attirée par deux actes dignes des Petites-Maisons, s'était réfugiée au plus proche cabaret. . . . Barbey entra, flanqué d'un jeune homme à figure tout aimable. . . . "Ouf!" fit le jeune homme en se laissant choir sur une chaise, "je suis dans un état d'imagination renversée!" D'instinct, je relevai la tête, et laissai échapper une manière de hennissement comme un cheval de bataille—à la sonnerie connue.

Négligemment, en faisant "celui qui n'a pas l'air," je murmurai entre haut et bas, parlant de l'auteur de la pièce: "Ah! si les lettres de cachet existaient encore, il n'eût pas osé!" Le jeune homme à son tour, eut un tressaillement. Ces deux citations de Stendhal plaçaient cet inconnu et moi sur un terrain ami. C'est une sorte de francmaçonnerie que l'admiration, j'oserai dire la folie du *Rouge et Noir*.

Jean Richepin qui passait par hasard . . . nous présenta l'un à l'autre. C'est un Stendhaliste aussi, ou mieux un Rougiste, que Richepin. Un peu inférieur

entre nous. A partir de la deux centième page, certaines parties du texte lui échappent.

Mon nouveau camarade, Paul Bourget, le critique délicat et le charmant poète, passa le reste de la soirée avec moi. Nous nous récitâmes le *Rouge et le Noir* jusqu'à une heure avancée.⁶

Perhaps Zola had good reason to "dire leurs vérités," as Sainte-Beuve would say, to these *stendhaliens* (formed, I might add, well before the oft-cited 1880 date Stendhal picked as the point at which he would come into his own) who glorified the romantic elements, that is "les parties fantasmagoriques, les exagérations de système, les enflures du tempérament." Indeed, Zola felt that Barbey's understanding of Stendhal and Balzac was "le coup de folie romantique qui a fêlé [son] talent."⁷

Barbey's admiration for Stendhal was to prove long-lived. As early as 1853, in "Stendhal et Balzac," he had equated Stendhal with Balzac: both were masters, he insisted, but of different sorts. Other reports make it clear that his veneration for "Stendhal, qui publiait . . . des choses aussi neuves que profondes, Stendhal, l'original auteur de *Rouge et noir*" ("X. Doudan," p. 300) was not restricted to his published criticism.⁸ He must have known esthetes like the later Chapron and Bourget who shivered on hearing phrases from *Le Rouge et le noir* worked into conversations. He could doubtless watch the phenomenon described by Bourget: "l'effet d'une intoxication inguérissable. Quand ce roman ne révolte pas, il ensorcelle" ("Stendhal (Henri Beyle)," p. 309). And he surely knew, as did Bourget, that *Le Rouge et le noir* continued "à avoir mieux que des admirateurs, des fanatiques, justifiant ainsi le mot d'un de ses contemporains: 'ceux que Beyle a mordus restent mordus'" ("L'Art du roman chez Stendhal," p. 43). Barbey must have known all this, for in 1853 he said, "Pour notre compte, nous ne savons pas si un esprit *superfin* comme Stendhal-Beyle, de cette saveur et de ce haut goût, sera jamais populaire, mais ce que nous savons, c'est qu'il a résolu le problème le plus difficile dans les lettres, comme dans les arts, comme dans la politique, et qui consiste à exercer une grande puissance sans avoir une grande popularité" ("Stendhal et Balzac," p. 13). As Harry Levin has suggested, Bourget attempted to retell *Le Rouge et le noir* in *Le Disciple*.⁹ Barbey seems to have understood more fully the potential of that enchantment

which remains long after reading Stendhal's masterpiece. Subtly, he alluded to it. The most ardent *stendhalien* might not be consciously aware of the allusions, but the *ensorcellement* Barbey sought does not result from an appeal to the conscious mind alone.¹⁰ With the title, numerous details, and plot parallels, Barbey attempted, and, I suggest, succeeded in reactivating the pattern of fascination and horror etched deep in the minds of *Le Rouge et le noir*'s admirers by Stendhal, "cet étrange esprit qui ressemble au serpent, qui en a le repli, le détour, la tortuosité, le coup de langue, le venin, la prudence, la passion dans la froideur, et dont, malgré soi, toute imagination sera l'Eve" (Barbey, "De Stendhal," p. 37). Even as early as the 1850's, Barbey could be sure of a public that, at the very least, would sense the resonance of his allusion to *Le Rouge et le noir*. This fact should not be overlooked, for, as suggested before, allusion must be perceived by *someone*—perhaps just the author, though Valéry would have us believe that "nul n'écrit pour soi seul."¹¹

Of course, the existence of an audience is by no means enough. Only the text can prove the presence of allusion, and for the device to be recognized, "Le Rideau cramoisi" must be appreciated for itself alone. Like so many of Barbey's tales, it is a story within a story. The first speaker, whom I shall call the narrator, remembers a trip he once made in a coach shared with the Viscount de Brassard. Because of an accident, the coach stopped for repairs beneath a window from which shone "lumière . . . tamisée par un double rideau cramoisi" (*B.d'A.*, II, 21). After Brassard mentioned the curtain, the narrator saw the viscount's deathly pallor and sensed his trembling—both reactions were highly uncharacteristic of this brave dandy. At the narrator's prompting, Brassard began his revelation. Some thirty-five years before, as a young officer, he had lived in that very room behind such a curtain and had taken his meals with his undistinguished bourgeois hosts. One day, without having received any prior warning, he was confronted by their astonishingly beautiful daughter, Mlle Albertine (or Alberte, as she was also called). The impassive Albertine paid him no attention, and he soon became indifferent to her. Then, one evening, while maintaining her "air de Princesse en cérémonie" (*B.d'A.*, II, 35), she reached beneath the table and squeezed his hand. Brassard immediately fell in love, and the girl's

parents did not suspect the "drame mystérieux et terrible qui se jouait alors sous la table" (*B.d'A.*, II, 34). References to her hands and to her queenly manner begin to reappear insistently. The next night he slipped her a letter, but a month passed without further communication. The young man's love for "la grande Mademoiselle Impassible" (*B.d'A.*, II, 41) slowly turned to hate. Nonetheless, he could do nothing to combat his obsession for the girl. One night, his door opened, and she fell into his arms half nude. They consummated their passion while listening fearfully for the sound of her parents. In her eyes he sees madness, and neither of them was able to forget, "dans les plus vifs de nos transports, l'épouvantable situation qu'elle nous faisait à tous les deux" (*B.d'A.*, II, 45). But their virtually wordless affair continued for more than six months. Alberte came every other night, unless she happened to awaken her parents while passing through their room. In those instances, she found a satisfactory excuse and returned to her bed.

At this point the narrator interrupts Brassard once again "pour ne pas paraître trop pris par son histoire, qui me prenait, car, avec les dandys, on n'a guère que la plaisanterie pour se faire un peu respecter" (*B.d'A.*, II, 48). He knows of a similar story: Mlle de Guise "recevait toutes les nuits, dans la chambre de sa grand'mère, endormie derrière les rideaux, un amant [i.e., M. de Noirmoutier] entré par la fenêtre" (*B.d'A.*, II, 49). Mlle de Guise's enjoyment was a bit too noisy, and she awakened her grandmother, whom she reassured with an excuse.

Brassard brushes off the comparison. Despite all dangers, Albertine continued to frequent his room. Finally, however, the girl died during a voluptuous spasm. With a touch typical of Barbey, the viscount, thinking she had only fainted, continued his lovemaking. Suddenly, he became aware of her lifelessness, and he frantically attempted to resuscitate her. All efforts failed, even blood-letting, which only resulted in mutilating her arm. The young man was terrified for himself and ashamed of his "deshonorante sensation." "L'idée de cette mère, à laquelle j'avais peut-être tué sa fille en la déshonorant, me pesait plus sur le cœur que le cadavre même d'Alberte" (*B.d'A.*, II, 52-53), but he was far too frightened to return the girl's body through her parents' bedroom to her bed. Instead, he fled the room, the house, and the town,

leaving the corpse on his couch and his problem in the hands of his colonel. No one ever told him what happened, and, prevented by "quelque chose qui ressemblait à cette peur que je ne voulais pas sentir une seconde fois" (*B.d'A.*, II, 56), he never asked. Throughout the rest of his life the Viscount de Brassard bore a "tache noire" which "a marqué . . . tous mes plaisirs de mauvais sujet" (*B.d'A.*, II, 24, 57). Because of cowardice, his crime against hospitality and justice (*B.d'A.*, II, 46) almost certainly resulted in dishonor for the girl and her family.

Then, at the completion of the tale, the interlocutors fall into a moody silence. Suddenly the viscount grasps the narrator.

"Tenez!" me dit-il, "voyez au rideau!"

L'ombre svelte d'une taille de femme venait d'y passer en s'y dessinant!

"L'ombre d'Alberte!" fit le capitaine. "Le hasard est par trop moqueur ce soir," ajouta-t-il avec amertume. (*B.d'A.*, II, 57)

Soon the coach leaves the "mystérieuse fenêtre" which the narrator still sees in his dreams.

Although the melodramatic elements of the story have little to recommend them, the tale is surprisingly powerful. Le Corbeillier even considers it a "chef-d'œuvre de composition et de style" (p. 84). I would suggest that the success of "Le Rideau cramoisi" results to a great degree from Barbey's skillful use of the sentiments that Stendhal had aroused with another story. Because Stendhal had taken the whole of a long book to build such emotions, Barbey was able to play upon this affective preparation with parallel plot, themes, and images. Barbey's creation was not a copy of Stendhal; nonetheless, it is very close. Regardless of the fact that Mathilde initiated their affair by squeezing Julien's arm rather than his hand, Julien violated the codes of honor, hospitality, and justice in seducing her. He was led to commit a crime that dishonored both of the women he loved and their families. And the book terminates with a mutilated body. It makes little difference that Albertine went to Brassard's room and Julien to Mme de Rênal's and Mathilde's or that Barbey's female and Stendhal's male are disfigured in death. As V. Propp has pointed out, similar reversals are common in the transferral of such tales.¹² Julien and Brassard make love despite the danger of parental discovery; their egotism leads them to commit crimes that result in intense

feelings of guilt and in dishonor; and the two stories end with the damaged body of one of the principals. Brassard, because of what he calls "l'état lâche de mon âme démoralisée (un mot de l'Empereur que plus tard j'ai compris!)" (*B.d'A.*, II, 54), considers suicide, as does Julien. Brassard rejects the idea because of his dedication to the career of arms; Julien, because, as he puts it, "Napoléon a vécu" (*Rouge*, p. 457). Stendhal makes it clear that society represents the most important culprit in Julien's adventure. Do not Barbey's descriptions of the little provincial town that is devoid of interest and activity serve to suggest a similar, though not identical, cause? In addition, the "grand canapé de maroquin bleu," on which Brassard takes Albertine, appears repeatedly (*B.d'A.*, II, 28, 42, 45, 46, 49, 51), as does the "grand canapé bleu" on which Mathilde habitually sits (*Rouge*, pp. 253, 363, 365). The English word "Really" which served Barbey as an epigraph parallels that of *Le Rouge et le noir*: "La vérité, l'âpre vérité," a quotation Barbey used as the epigraph to another novel with the Stendhalian title, *L'Amour impossible*. The title of "Le Rideau cramoisi" also comes from a passage in *Le Rouge* which Barbey, obsessed with themes of blasphemy,¹³ could scarcely have missed, for Julien attempts to murder Mme de Rênal inside a church whose windows are hung with crimson curtains:

Julien entra dans l'église neuve de Verrières. Toutes les fenêtres hautes de l'édifice étaient voilées avec des rideaux cramoisis. Julien se trouva à quelques pas derrière le banc de Mme de Rênal. . . . En ce moment, le jeune clerc qui servait la messe, sonna pour l'élévation. Mme de Rênal baissa la tête. . . . Julien . . . tira sur elle un coup de pistolet. (*Rouge*, pp. 449-50)¹⁴

But the clearest reminder of *Le Rouge et le noir* occurs in the seemingly digressive story about M. de Noirmoutier and Mlle de Guise with which the narrator interrupts Brassard. We remember that on Julien's second visit up the ladder and through Mathilde's window, the latter's laughter awakened her mother (*Rouge*, p. 360).

Within Barbey's text, the allusion works in much the same way as a metaphor . . . take Gide's garden path, "riante de fleurs," for example. This metaphor has two terms: *riante* and *fleurs*. Since flowers have never been known to laugh, we are encouraged to seek a figurative meaning that makes sense. Some will doubtless read the phrase as "une allée où il y a des fleurs" and thus lose

much of the resonance. Both terms have meaning that is important to the text. Figuratively, laughing might suggest not only joy, life, merrymaking, etc., but mockery, exultation, and guffaws as well. Similarly, flowers may elicit the connotations of death, love, temptation, spring, etc. When placed together, we ignore the nonpertinent associations of the isolated terms and understand the metaphorical combination to depict a flowery garden exuding joy. Succeeding images will reveal that this garden is protected from the world by hedges and walls. The metaphor further elicits and emphasizes a connotation that is present only peripherally in terms by themselves: an aura of transitory youth and love. Thus Gide described and at the same time prepared the Garden of Eden imagery that becomes progressively more important through the rest of *La Porte étroite*.

Similarly, the allusion Barbey used to help unify "Le Rideau cramoisi" has two terms. One is *Le Rouge et le noir*, and the other consists of the story told by Brassard. As we pass from the title, the epigraph, the descriptive detail, to the events recounted, to the characters involved within "Le Rideau cramoisi," the Stendhalian term gradually becomes more consistent and more powerful. Were we to consider *Le Rouge et le noir* isolated from Barbey, as would normally be proper, it clearly has polyvalent significance—much of which has little if anything to do with "Le Rideau cramoisi." Brassard's story certainly does not represent an attack on the values of a corrupt society, for example. Neither is the viscount a hypocrite, nor unable to establish viable relationships with other men. As in the case of Gide's metaphor, irrelevant Stendhalian associations are ignored; other devices highlight the significant elements in Brassard's tale that are not pertinent to the allusion.

More important is the fact that Julien represents a tragic figure possessing a tragic flaw (that is, his class, his genius, and his egotism which thrust him into a Hobbesian world of warfare where, at least until his imprisonment, he was able neither to communicate effectively with his equals nor to form viable human relationships or conventions based on honor, respect, and reason). As Borgerhoff and, to a lesser degree, Sacy and Hemmings have seen, Julien was fated to fall and die.¹⁵ Nevertheless, Stendhal insists that Julien is not really responsible for his actions—e.g., the epigraph for Chapter xxi of Book I: "Alas, our frailty is the cause, not we:

/ For such as we are made of, such we be." Consequently, although I think some efforts to white-wash Julien go too far, I agree with the basic conclusions of those modern critics, starting as nearly as I have been able to determine with Léon Blum, who would absolve him and shift the blame to his youth, his insensitive father, the perverse Mme de Rênal who seduced him (such, at least, is Blum's opinion), his hypocritical fellow seminarians, the intractable Mathilde who forced herself on him, the repressive unfeeling society of the day, his courage and honor which would not allow him to bypass a challenge.¹⁶ Indeed, Julien appears incapable of controlling his destiny in any but a superficial way. Still, he trespassed against his fellows, and his predestined fate is clearly foreshadowed by the blood and decapitation imagery. He thereby resembles the classical conception of a tragic hero. In another epoch he might well have succeeded, but, like many other Romantic heroes, he was born in exile at a time and place where understanding and success were impossible.

Brassard, likewise an exceptional man, "dif-férait déjà tant des hommes de nos jours" (*B.d'A.*, II, 17). True, he did not suffer from a tragic destiny, but he confronted an equally inexplicable series of events against which he seems powerless. At no time was he in command. On the sole occasion that he attempted to assume the masculine role by writing a "billet suppliant, impérieux et enivré, d'un homme qui a déjà bu une première gorgée de bonheur et qui en demande une seconde" (*B.d'A.*, II, 36), he found himself denied even a repetition of what he had already experienced. Alberte resembled an "Infante" (*B.d'A.*, II, 31, 33, 37, 48) or a "Princesse" (*B.d'A.*, II, 35, 45); she took his hand and with "la même souveraineté" (*B.d'A.*, II, 34) pressed his foot; and "ce fut bien plus elle qui me prit dans ses bras que je ne la pris dans les miens" (*B.d'A.*, II, 45). In short, she initiated their affair; she caused him to make love to her; she chose the parental home for their meetings; and when she died at such an inauspicious moment, who could blame an ordinary young man for his indecisiveness and cowardly flight? But is that enough to absolve Brassard? We know that his courage was later thoroughly tested and proven. (Even his youth would seem insufficient to explain the radical deviation from the pattern apparent in the rest of his life.) The additional fact of his self-sufficiency and vanity (he loved to don his dress

uniform for his solitary pleasure) makes it even more surprising that he would so forget himself as to act the poltroon. This uncharacteristic action is understandable only if we accept another movement worked into the fabric of the story: diabolism.

No one can doubt that Alberte is a *diabolique*. Prepared by the collected title, *Les Diaboliques*, the identification of Alberte and the devil finds support in a number of passages. Her black, cold eyes and general coldness are frequently noted. When she takes Brassard's hand and later presses her foot against his, he feels as though he has been immersed in "un de ces bains insupportablement brûlants d'abord, mais auxquels on s'accoutume et dans lesquels on finit par se trouver si bien, qu'on croirait volontiers qu'un jour les damnés pourraient se trouver fraîchement et suavement dans les brasiers de leur enfer" (*B.d'A.*, II, 34). She has "une si effrayante précocité dans le mal" (*B.d'A.*, II, 35), and is both "diaboliquement provocante" (*B.d'A.*, II, 36) and "infernalement calme" (*B.d'A.*, II, 41). In addition, Brassard talks of "le visage de cette diablesse de femme dont j'étais possédé, comme les dévots disent qu'on l'est du diable" (*B.d'A.*, II, 43). Finally, when she actually appears in his room, she is compared to a "vision . . . surnaturelle" (*B.d'A.*, II, 44). Barbey seems to have been so sure of his ability to make Alberte appear diabolical that he weakened the significance of vocabulary related to "devil." For Brassard, "diable" and its cognates are mere expletives. He speaks, for example, of his own "diable de figure" (*B.d'A.*, II, 23).

By attenuating the force of such words, Barbey avoided "une insistance presque trop grande" on the theme of diabolism.¹⁷ The faint suggestion of the infernal provided by this vocabulary offers sufficient indication of the only possible explanation for Brassard's helplessness and cowardice. For those not deaf to the reverberations of Stendhal's masterpiece, where the theme of fate is so strong, the many allusions to *Le Rouge et le noir* compel a conscious or unconscious search for an analogous movement in "Le Rideau cramoisi." The devil works through Alberte.¹⁸ Because of her diabolical power, Brassard was no more responsible than Julien, but he nonetheless committed crimes for which he suffered throughout the rest of his life.

Doubtless, constant awareness of the themes of

the accompanying tales and of the group title, *Les Diaboliques*, would reveal the satanism so important to this story. By itself, it would probably do so only when read by someone familiar with *Le Rouge et le noir*. Here we come to what seems to me to be the essential function of this allusion. As suggested before, it highlights the egotism, the crime, the punishment, and the dishonor. It appears more important, however, that the repeated, even insistent, allusions to Stendhal's work cause the two terms of this enlarged metaphor to be seen in conjunction and, thus, to elicit the latent, principal theme. One term of the allusion, *Le Rouge et le noir*, has tragic destiny among its associations. When metaphorically related to the other term, the story told by Brassard, the latter's inability to control his adventure is emphasized. Immediately, the descriptions Brassard gives of his condition after the death of the girl become even more striking: "cette peur nideuse," "la situation horrible," "le cerveau comme une toupie cruelle," "Hallucination effroyable! par moments le cadavre d'Alberte me semblait emplir toute ma chambre," "l'écroulement qui se faisait en moi," "l'horrible gouffre dans lequel je me débattais," in short, phrases destined to depict a fear so great that even the much older and far more cynical dandy would still feel the effects. The allusion prepares and elicits the belief that an evil force was at work.

Though the potential of allusion was not unknown to Barbey in earlier efforts,¹⁹ perhaps nowhere else did he show such a mastery of this artistic device. He apparently recognized that by alluding to another well-known work of literature, he could highlight and support his own work through imagery, theme, and plot parallels. Too obvious an allusion might have removed the reader's attention from the work in hand, but Barbey's tale stimulates affective patterns of a previous response by extremely subtle means. Only after "Le Rideau cramoisi" receives a careful critical reading does the allusion become clear, although it was doubtless at work before. When one becomes aware of the allusion, it seems possible to assume that it constitutes a major reason for the success of Barbey's story, that Barbey used *Le Rouge et le noir* as a powerful tool to further his own artistic ends.

II

The extended, parallel allusion found in "Le

Rideau cramoisi" is only one of several different varieties of the device. Elsewhere, one may find it simply in a recurring name. Zola, for example, gave the heroine of *La Curée* the name of Renée and, thus, by alluding to René, the nominal allusion highlights the theme of incest.²⁰ Or it may appear in a more complex way with numerous, different allusions working in conjunction toward a common end.²¹ Zola's use of *Phèdre* in *La Curée* to emphasize his theme of the degradation of man provides an example of limited allusion operating in only one portion of a book. On the other hand, it frequently appears as the primary device for unifying the whole of a work.²² But whether extended to the whole or limited to a word, a phrase, or a part, the allusive relationship may be produced in different ways. It may come from a direct opposition. The import of Faulkner's allusion to Eliot in *Pylon*, for example, appears to be that modern man need not be a J. Alfred Prufrock, that the modern world is not necessarily a waste land. Various degrees of opposition also occur,²³ as does the fairly straightforward, extended parallel with which I have been concerned here. In all cases, however, the result of allusion is the same: it creates a relationship or image that means something different from any one of its constituent terms.

As will be noticed, the classification and the approach I suggest are internal. Whether one accepts the categories proposed above—extended, limited, parallel, oppositional, or complex—or substitutes others,²⁴ it seems to me that the critic best considers allusion from the standpoint of its functioning within a literary work. Of course, other classifications are possible. When the allusion serves comic ends, as in such parody as Petronius' *Satyricon*, or involves "de la critique littéraire 'en action,'" as Proust termed his pastiches, or functions to warn against any concessions to the "beast," as is the case of Vercors's allusion to the tragic death of Saint-Pol-Roux in the *récit*, *Le Silence de la mer*, one might categorize the device in the light of its thrust, be it comic, critical, or didactic. Inevitably, however, such labels oversimplify, for the *Satyricon* is perhaps more didactic than comic, and Proust's pastiches are certainly as comic as critical. Or one might follow a more traditional schema, and, depending on whether an author alludes to current events, as Huysmans does in the last chapter of *Là-bas*, or to recorded history, as Mme de La Fayette in *La*

Princesse de Clèves, or to myth, classify the allusion according to the external referent.²⁵ Unfortunately, classifications imply and all too frequently impose a methodology. By choosing to orient ourselves according to but one of the constituent elements, and one, moreover, that exists outside the text, the danger arises that the mechanism of the allusion will be misunderstood, that its presence will pass unnoticed, and that valid judgment of allusive works will therefore be impossible. Allusion is an internal process. Each example exists only as it occurs within a particular work, and it consists of two or more terms working to establish a relationship.

My insistence on the inadvisability of external classifications may seem punctilious, but I think the referential orientation of much Barbey scholarship is directly relevant to the fact that, while the allusion of "Le Rideau cramoisi" to *Le Rouge et le noir* has been ignored, scholars have in vain devoted much effort to discovering the source of the story. With no proof other than the titillating love stories he and other biographers have constructed from scanty facts, Jean Canu claims, for example: "C'est à lui [i.e., Barbey] et non au vicomte de Brassard . . . qu'était arrivée dans sa jeunesse l'aventure du *Rideau cramoisi*."²⁶ According to A. Le Corbeillier, Pierre Louÿs suggested as a source a story in the *Mémoires du P. de la Joye* where the narrator carried two drugged sisters back to their bed, located next to their mother's, after having ravished them.²⁷ Had the roles simply been reversed from the "Rideau" or *Léa* (as is the case when Mirbeau's concupiscent Célestine causes the death of Monsieur Georges in the *Journal d'une femme de chambre*), without the addition of the narcotic, one might be more convinced. As Jacques Petit, Barbey's excellent editor, clearly understood, stories with such superficial similarities are legion. To prove his point, Petit cites a story from Balzac's *La Muse du département* in which a doctor delivers an illegitimate child after having crossed the room of the woman's unknowing and sleeping husband (Petit, II, 1280). One could also recall Valmont's adventure with Cécile Volanges in *Les Liaisons dangereuses*, or Brantôme's "fort honneste et belle dame" who leaves her sleeping husband to guard "le nid du cocu" while she communes with a visiting lover, or Julien Sorel's trips to Mme de Rênal's and Mathilde's rooms.²⁸ These examples relate to

only one aspect of Barbey's story: illicit love coupled with a dangerous passage and the peril of discovery. I know of no story prior to "Le Rideau" that has as well the themes both of necrophily²⁹ and of the devil incarnate as woman. But should we not insist on a prior combination of themes and events similar to Barbey's and settle for sources of isolated elements, as is the custom of scholars interested in such matters,³⁰ the possible influences increase enormously. Théophile Gautier's "La Morte amoureuse" includes necrophily and a "fatal woman," but so do many others, as Mario Praz has established.³¹ Such themes were commonplace throughout the nineteenth century. In one case, Hoffmann's "Le Choix d'une fiancée," we find a young lady with the same name as Barbey's heroine, two of whose three suitors are terribly afflicted through the intervention of a sorcerer.³² Barbey knew the work of Brantôme, of Gautier, of Hoffmann, of Balzac, of Stendhal. He may have known the *Mémoires du P. de la Joye* or any number of other similar stories. Confronted with such a multitude of potential sources, one is not surprised that this search has thus far ended, and will doubtless continue to end, with a question mark. It may have been in a story Barbey heard or read or in one of his own adventures. He may have had no source other than his imagination. We do not know. It is interesting to note, however, that the quest for sources has not provided the slightest comprehension of why "Le Rideau cramoisi" is, although not a masterpiece, "one of Barbey's most successful tales."³³ Further, only one of the suggested "sources" has much importance, if we consider Barbey's story as a completed work, subject to a reader. That one, *Le Rouge et le noir*, is essential to its understanding. Stendhal's novel does not provide *the* source, however. Before having discovered him around 1838 (Petit, I, 1246), Barbey had already written *Léa* (1832), a tale with many relevant elements that are repeated in "Le Rideau cramoisi"—*Léa's* death, for example, is caused by the emotion aroused when Réginald takes a surreptitious and forbidden kiss. We still cannot be certain of Barbey's source. We do know the work to which he alluded.

I do not wish to question the validity of source studies. The more or less tenuous conclusions about influences on an author or his sources frequently give insights into the creative processes. Robert J. Niess's finely nuanced, solid study, *Zola, Cézanne, and Manet: A Study of L'Œuvre*

(Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press, 1969) is a case in point. Niess dispels the beliefs that Zola either plagiarized or wrote a biography of the young Cézanne, and he goes on to make us more conscious of the author's invention and art. Likewise, though for different reasons, Mario Praz's monumental *The Romantic Agony* is valuable, for it helps understand one aspect of the nineteenth century. Perhaps it is worth remembering, however, that contrary to the impression with which one is left after having read Fernand Letessier's edition of Chateaubriand's *Atala, René, Les Aventures du dernier Abencérage* (Paris: Garnier, 1958), the artistry of an author does not appear on subtracting all the sources. And, in a somewhat different vein, although it may well be important, as Plattard has suggested, "pour analyser [l'] invention artistique [de Rabelais], de savoir quelle image il gardait dans sa mémoire de la société contemporaine,"³⁴ it is more important to study the way the "sources" finally function in the completed text. Still, despite the fact that not all influences, reminiscences, or sources are equally interesting,³⁵ it would be absurd to agree with Henri Béraud that "la recherche des influences et des sources d'inspiration est un plaisir de cuistre."³⁶ Nonetheless, perhaps it would be worthwhile to reexamine the enormous body of such scholarship in order to ascertain whether or not sources suggested might work allusively as well; perhaps, when we sense the echo of a prior work, it is worth wondering whether the established resonance functions internally to further esthetic ends.

Aside from the dangers inherent in an external orientation, scholars interested in sources may pass over allusions because they are primarily concerned with either identity (plagiarism or debt) or distinction (originality). The thought that virtual identity can be original, that subtle distortions *and* outright differences can prove an intimate relationship seems antithetical to the underlying orientation of such analyses.³⁷ Furthermore, because a convincing demonstration of either depends on unequivocal resemblances, the subtler examples of allusion may be overlooked. Perhaps the most skillful instances of allusion remain undiscovered because their importance does not reside externally in some other work and because their integration into the story is so complete that they become apparent only when we subject the story itself to a thorough analysis. Indeed, should the writer label his allusion with a clear reference,

he might well destroy the effect of allusion, which frequently depends upon a light touch. (I except, of course, burlesque.)

If Barbey, for example, had mentioned *Le Rouge et le noir*, the reader would have had difficulty giving his story undivided attention. As Barbey well knew, "Malheureusement je ne suis ni Montesquieu ni Beyle, ni aigle ni lynx" (*B.d'A.*, II, 1429). Had a comparison of *Le Rouge et le noir* and "Le Rideau cramoisi" been encouraged, Barbey's little work would have come off a poor second. The author was, however, able to exploit Stendhal's work by stimulating the sympathetic vibrations of those affective chords so powerfully played upon by Stendhal. Barbey's allusion becomes an artistic device that turns an otherwise flawed tale into a powerful short story. *Le Rouge et le noir* provides but one of the raw materials which went into Barbey's creative furnace. Apparently, he took Stendhal's masterpiece in the same way he would take a rhetorical device, or a traditional symbol, or a word from the common language and then used it in his own way for his own artistic purposes. Consequently, although Barbey's

allusion may indicate a source, as far as "Le Rideau cramoisi" is concerned, its importance lies in its allusion. Doubtless some will not agree. Alain Robbe-Grillet, for example, makes a curious distinction, which I do not accept. In an interview conducted by J. J. Brochier, he said, "De plus, quand je photographie un objet qui existe, je prends aussi quelque chose à quelqu'un. Quand j'écris un roman, je suis vraiment le créateur de tout ce qu'on y trouve. Mais quand, dans un film, je photographie un monument, ce monument appartient déjà à un auteur: le sculpteur qui l'a conçu."³⁸ I should think that the debt would be the same whether he alludes to the Oedipus myth in *Les Gommès*³⁹ or employs the statue as a leitmotif in *L'Année dernière à Marienbad*. In both cases, although he has taken something from someone else, his use is entirely his own. Similarly, although Stendhal's *Le Rouge et le noir* belongs to Stendhal, Barbey's allusive use of the novel belongs to Barbey, for it was his own invention.

University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Notes

¹ Although "Le Rideau cramoisi" was probably composed before 1867, as Jacques Petit suggests, a more precise date has not been established—Jacques Petit, ed., *Barbey d'Aureville: Œuvres romanesques complètes*, 2 vols. (Paris: Gallimard, 1964, 1966), II, 1280, 1288, 1300. (All further references to this edition will be found in the text, cited by volume and page. References to Petit will be preceded by his name, those to Barbey by *B.d'A.*) I would suggest that the first version probably predated *Un Prêtre marié* (1864) and *Le Chevalier des Touches* (1864) by a good deal, perhaps by as much as ten years. Both *Un Prêtre marié* and *Le Chevalier des Touches* show a command of his characters' idiom which also appears at the end of "Le Rideau cramoisi" and is notably absent in Brassard's description of his feelings while holding Alberte's hand (*B.d'A.*, II, 33–34). As I shall attempt to demonstrate below, the older Brassard, a dandy par excellence, was the master of any situation and certainly articulate. Therefore, the unevocative clichés Brassard uses in the hand-holding passage are out of character. Perhaps, then, it is not too unreasonable to suggest that Barbey first composed "Le Rideau cramoisi" in the 1850's when he was led to write two articles concerned with Stendhal.

² *Les Figures du discours* (1821–30; rpt. Paris: Flammarion, 1968), p. 125. He also makes an important distinction between allusion and allegory, the former being metaphorical and the latter not (pp. 114–18). Perhaps it would also be useful to distinguish between allusion and plagiarism. The latter consists of equal, nonmetaphorical terms and, when successful, the text in hand does not sug-

gest a source. To the contrary, successful allusion *must* suggest something else. For more recent discussions of allusion, see, e.g., Bernard Weinberg, "Foreword," *French Poetry of the Renaissance* (Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 1954), p. xxi; Gérard Genette, *Figures II: Essais* (Paris: Seuil, 1969), pp. 272–81; Leo Hickey, "El Valor de la alusión en literatura," *Revista de Occidente*, No. 88 (July 1970), pp. 49–60.

I should also like to acknowledge my debt for the stimulation provided by Enrico de'Negri's fine article: "The Legendary Style of the *Decameron*," *RR*, 43 (1952), 166–89. After having established the two terms of Boccaccio's allusion to the Book of Job in the tale of Griselda (10th tale of the 10th day), he concludes by drawing attention to a further problem: "The analogy is evident. It remains to be seen which extension Boccaccio may have attributed to it, which symbol he may have assigned to his last legend." The present article is an attempt to provide a framework which will facilitate the resolution of such problems.

³ Stendhal, *Le Rouge et le noir*, ed. Henri Martineau (Paris: Garnier, 1960), pp. 278–79. Further references will be found in the text, preceded by the notation, *Rouge*.

⁴ Hippolyte Taine, "Stendhal (Henri Beyle)," *Nouveaux essais de critique et d'histoire* (1864; rpt. Paris: Hachette, 1905), p. 233.

⁵ "Stendhal," *Les Sensations d'un juré* (Paris: A. Lemerre, 1875), p. 121. For the summary in this paragraph, the following sources have been particularly helpful: the article by Babou, pp. 87–136; Adolphe Paupe, *Histoire des œuvres de Stendhal* (Paris: Dujarric, 1903), esp. pp. 75–103;

C.-A. Sainte-Beuve, "M. de Stendhal: Ses Œuvres complètes," *Causeries du lundi*, 9^e série, 3^e éd. (Paris: Garnier, 1869), pp. 301–41; Jacques Petit's edition of *Barbey d'Aureville: Le XIX^e siècle: Des œuvres et des hommes*, 2 vols. (Paris: Mercure de France, 1964, 1966), I, 110–23, which includes portions of the following: Barbey's "Stendhal et Balzac," *Romanciers d'hier et d'avant-hier* (1853; rpt. Paris: A. Lemerre, 1904), pp. 1–16; his "De Stendhal," *Littérature épistolaire* (1856; rpt. Paris: A. Lemerre, 1893), pp. 31–49; his "Prosper Mérimée" (1874) and his "X. Doudan" (1876), *Littérature épistolaire*, pp. 211–25 and pp. 291–304, respectively; Prosper Mérimée, "Notes et souvenirs" (1855), *Stendhal: Correspondance inédite* (Paris: Calmann Lévy, 1907), I, v–xxiv; Paul Bourget, "Stendhal (Henri Beyle)," *Essais de psychologie contemporaine*, 8^e éd. (1883; rpt. Paris: A. Lemerre, 1892), pp. 251–323, and his later (1923) "L'Art du roman chez Stendhal," *Quelques témoignages* (Paris: Plon, 1928), pp. 41–55; Taine's "Stendhal (Henri Beyle)," *Nouveaux essais*, pp. 223–57; E.-M. de Vogüé, "De la littérature réaliste: A propos du roman russe," *RDM*, 3^e période, 75 (15 mai 1886), 298; Emile Zola, "Stendhal" (1880), *Les Romanciers naturalistes* (Paris: Fasquelle, 1906), pp. 75–124.

⁶ *L'Événement* (1^{er} mai 1882), quoted from Paupe, pp. 88–89.

⁷ "Stendhal," p. 123. Zola attacks, not Stendhal, but his followers: "Avec ces dangereux disciples, tout passant devient un homme immense, le sublime court les rues. Ils ne peuvent causer dix minutes avec n'importe qui, sans faire du Balzac et surtout du Stendhal, cherchant sous les mots, manipulant les cervelles, découvrant des abîmes. Ce n'est point ici de la fantaisie; je connais des garçons fort intelligents qui comprennent de la sorte les maîtres du naturalisme moderne. Eh bien! je déclare tout net qu'ils sont dans le cauchemar" (pp. 123–24).

⁸ Pierre Brun, *Henry Beyle—Stendhal* (Grenoble: A. Gratiot, 1900), p. 59.

⁹ *The Gates of Horn: A Study of Five French Realists* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1963), p. 128.

¹⁰ See, e.g., the dedication to Marthe Brandès:

Si vous les ensorcelez tous,
Sorcière, soyez-leur cruelle . . .
Mais vous, Mademoiselle, vous!
Qu'aucun d'eux ne vous ensorcelle!
(*B.d'A.*, II, 1599–1600)

¹¹ *Œuvres*, II, Bibliothèque de la Pléiade (Paris: Gallimard, 1960), p. 676.

¹² "Les Transformations des contes fantastiques," in *Théorie de la littérature*, trans. Tzvetan Todorov (Paris: Seuil, 1966), esp. p. 248.

¹³ See, e.g., *L'Ensorcélée* and another of the stories in *Les Diaboliques*, "A un dîner d'athées."

¹⁴ Jacques Petit asks, "Serait-ce pousser trop loin que de voir un rappel de cette image [du sang] dans 'la fascinante lumière' du 'rideau cramoisi' dans 'ce carré vide, rouge et lumineux'?"—"L'Imagination de la mort," *RLM*, Nos. 189–92 (1968), p. 82. A *stendhalien* would immediately make this association, for, as is widely recognized—e.g., H. Martineau, *Rouge*, n. 1—E. B. O. Borgerhoff, "The Anagram in *Le Rouge et le noir*," *MLN*, 68 (1953), 383; André Le Breton, *Le Rouge et le noir de Stendhal: Etude et analyse* (Paris: Mellottée, 1934), pp. 236–37—Stendhal

clearly associated blood with the curtains: "En sortant, Julien crut voir du sang près du bénitier, c'était de l'eau bénite qu'on avait répandue: le reflet des rideaux rouges qui couvraient les fenêtres la faisait paraître du sang" (*Rouge*, p. 25).

¹⁵ Borgerhoff, "Anagram," pp. 383–86; S. de Sacy, "Le Miroir sur la grande route," *Mercure de France*, 306 (1949), 74–76; F. W. J. Hemmings, *Stendhal: A Study of His Novels* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), pp. 124–25.

¹⁶ *Stendhal et le beylisme* (Paris: P. Ollendorff, 1914), pp. 129–41. For others of similar persuasion, see, e.g., Albert Thibaudet, *Stendhal* (Paris: Hachette, 1931), pp. 120–22; or, more recently, Hemmings, *Stendhal*, pp. 117–19; his "Stendhal relu par Zola au temps de 'l'Affaire' (documents inédits)," *Stendhal Club*, 4^e année (1962), pp. 305–06; and Grahame C. Jones, *L'Ironie dans les romans de Stendhal* (Lausanne: Grand Chêne, 1966), pp. 52–58.

¹⁷ The conclusion is Jacques Petit's (II, 1302) and is simply unacceptable.

¹⁸ The well-established theme of the devil incarnate as woman (see n. 31) may also encourage the reader to see Alberte as a *diabolique*. In this case, Barbey's allusion would resemble the technique I have elsewhere called "allusive complex" (see n. 21). It is also possible, as Mark Suino has suggested to me, that the crimson of the curtains acts in the manner of what a Russian Formalist would term a "minus device." If so, the color, which normally represents life, blood, passion, etc. automatically suggests its symbolic opposite—black. Death and the dark forces would then be conjured up, and *Le Rouge et le noir* as well. Some consideration should be given to this suggestion, for the story turns around "une réalité cachée," as Marcel Proust has pointed out in *A la recherche du temps perdu*, Bibliothèque de la Pléiade (Paris: Gallimard, 1954), III, 375, whether it be the banal silhouette which makes Brassard shiver, the acceptable front Alberte and Brassard display above the table while beneath there is hand-play, or, finally, Alberte herself, the reality whose opposite is suggested but not explained.

¹⁹ Rogers makes the very interesting suggestion that *Léa* alludes to the Sleeping Beauty legend (*Novels*, pp. 36–37).

²⁰ See also, A. H. Pasco and Wilfrid J. Rollman, "The Artistry of Gide's Onomastics," *MLN*, 86 (1971), 523–31. In a similar vein, the fact that Barbey's "Albertine" represents a fatal woman must have been a positive factor in Proust's choice of the name for his heroine. Proust, as noted below (n. 18), knew the story. Paolo Cherchi's considerations on Voltaire's use of names within the larger perspective of a parody of Genesis in *Candide* provides another example: "Alcune note per un commento al *Candide*," *ZFSL*, 78 (Feb. 1968), 44–53.

²¹ I have studied this kind of allusion in "Marcel, Albertine and Balbec in Proust's Allusive Complex," *RR*, 62 (1971), 113–26.

²² E.g., Gide's *Thésée*, Giraudoux's *Electre*, Anouilh's *Antigone*. For other examples, see E. Ludovicy, "Le Mythe grec dans le théâtre français contemporain," *RLV*, 22 (1956), 387–418.

²³ Zola's use of *Phèdre*, already mentioned, could be cited as one example of allusion highlighting difference, though not opposition. It emphasizes the pathetic sordidness of Renée and Maxime, by pointing out that mythic charac-

ters were great even in their crimes. Another example is to be found below in n. 36.

²⁴ Henri Morier, *Dictionnaire de poétique et de rhétorique* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1961), pp. 4–15, suggests, for instance, “l’allusion de circonstance,” “l’allusion de transfert,” “l’allusion formelle,” “l’allusion symbolique.”

²⁵ E.g., Boris Vian’s allusion to the Isis myth in *L’Ecume des jours*. For an example of historical, current, and mythic allusions working in conjunction in the same work, see the excellent study on Malherbe’s odes by David Lee Rubin: *Higher, Hidden Order: Design and Meaning in the Odes of Malherbe*, UNCSRL, No. 117 (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1972).

Fontanier, *Figures*, pp. 125–26, would add to historical and mythical allusions, “allusion morale,” by which he means reference to social customs or opinions.

²⁶ *Barbey d’Aurevilly* (Paris: R. Laffont, 1945), p. 413.

²⁷ *Les Diaboliques de Barbey d’Aurevilly* (Paris: Edgar Malfère, 1939), p. 83.

²⁸ Brantôme, *Les Dames galantes* (Paris: Garnier, 1960), p. 71. For similar adventures, see the story of the mortal risks run by Captain Beaulieu while enjoying the two daughters of the man holding him prisoner (pp. 101–02). For other such stories, though without excessive danger, see pp. 145–50.

²⁹ Although Brassard is not attracted to dead bodies, I think the fact that he has intercourse with one, however accidentally, justifies the use of this term in reference to “Le Rideau.”

³⁰ E.g., A. C. Lee, *The Decameron: Its Sources and Analogues* (London: David Nutt, 1909), pp. 231, 257, 294.

³¹ *The Romantic Agony* (New York: Meridian, 1956), esp. pp. 189–286.

³² In *Contes fantastiques de E. T. A. Hoffmann*, trans. Loève-Weimars, IV (Paris: E. Renduel, 1830), 1–146.

³³ B. G. Rogers, *The Novels and Stories of Barbey d’Aurevilly* (Geneva: Droz, 1967), p. 109.

³⁴ Jean Plattard, *L’Œuvre de Rabelais (Sources, invention et composition)* (Paris: H. Champion, 1910), p. 37.

³⁵ It may be, e.g., that Barbey’s “Le Rideau cramoisi” was the source for the already mentioned episode in *Le Journal d’une femme de chambre* (Paris: Fasquelle, 1900), pp. 166–204, and of a similar adventure in a popular espionage novel by Jean Bruce, *Les Espions du Pirée (OSS 117)* (Paris: Presses de la Cité, 1962), pp. 35–37. In the latter novel, Enrique tells that he once rendered nightly visits to the daughter of a deaf mother by passing through a bedroom window. One night, after “je me suis mis à lui faire des trucs et des machins,” he discovers that she is dead, and “je me suis sauvé comme si j’avais eu le diable à mes trousses.” Neither Mirbeau nor Bruce makes significant use of Barbey’s creation; only the elements of plot are borrowed; the resonance of Barbey’s tale is not exploited. Perhaps the story has value for itself alone in that it may excite a reader’s interest; it may also help build an understanding of Enrique and, in Mirbeau, of Célestine. In these two cases, the recognition, however tentative, of the source, in no way helps to understand the novels; it does not lead to a deeper appreciation; nor, for that matter, does it help evaluate the two novels, if indeed there is any qualitative difference between them. Consequently, it seems

of little critical interest. It may, of course, be useful to those concerned with the creative processes of writers.

³⁶ “Les Sources d’inspiration du ‘Bateau ivre,’” *Mercur de France*, 153 (1922), 104. Béraud is interesting because he actually says what many believe and because he goes on to advocate the investigation of affinities over sources. Such studies have proliferated as doubts have arisen about the validity of source hunting. Here again, however, serious problems arise, for all too often the statement of affinities fails to take into consideration whether and how authors have employed preceding or contemporary literature. W. D. Redfern’s conclusion, after a careful comparison of Stendhal’s *Le Rouge et le noir* and Camus’s *L’Etranger*, provides a good example: “Both writers are linked by their Romantic premise that the good die young; that, if they lived longer, they might deteriorate. Both stories tell of a young man’s error. But Julien’s passions drive him to choose his own mistake. Meursault’s mistake is almost made for him. Perhaps this is the main difference, in nature and in quality, between the unashamed and the embarrassed Romanticism of these two prisoner-heroes”—“The Prisoners of Stendhal and Camus,” *FR*, 41 (1968), 659. Certainly, one would not censure comparison for the sake of evaluation. On the other hand, one cannot but wonder at the validity of this judgment by a critic who has not recognized that *L’Etranger* alludes to *Le Rouge et le noir*, that Camus has used Stendhal’s novel.

This is not the only time Camus was to allude to Stendhal. In *La Chute*, for another example, Jean-Baptiste Clamence’s decisive experience on the bridge alludes to a similar episode that occurred in the life of Stendhal’s Justin Louaut—“Philosophie transcendante,” *Mélanges de littérature: Essais de psychologie, les mœurs, et la société sur ses propres livres*, ed. Henri Martineau, II (Paris: Le Divan, 1933), 271–77. Part of the significance resides in the fact that Louaut jumped in and saved the person, where Clamence, of course, did not.

³⁷ E.g., “Mais des auteurs comme ceux qui viennent d’être cités [i.e., Giraudoux, Cocteau, Pierre Mille, et Jules Lemaître] (et même comme le Gide d’*Edipe* et de *Perséphone*) trahissent peut-être, dans leur reprise de sujets cent fois traités, la faiblesse secrète de tant d’auteurs modernes: le manque de fougue imaginative, la crainte de puiser à même la vie, souvent vulgaire, et brutale, et la préférence pour la matière déjà épurée, sublimée et filtrée par maint prédécesseur”—Henri Peyre, *L’Influence des littératures antiques sur la littérature française moderne: Etat des travaux* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1941), pp. 80–81. For an example of vitally related divergences that have not been understood, there is C. Th. Dimaras’ “Gide et la Grèce,” *Revue d’Athènes*, No. 2 (April 1951), p. 42: “Dans [l]a première période [de Gide], celle du symbolisme, la Grèce ancienne passe et repasse; on dirait presque des souvenirs de collège, enregistrés par le génie. Plus tard il y est revenu, en puisant librement dans la littérature hellénique des sujets qu’il renouvelait sans trop se soucier de leur origine ou de leur sens profond. Je ne crois pas qu’il puisse être question de la tradition de la Grèce ancienne dans l’œuvre d’André Gide.”

³⁸ “Mes Romans, mes films et mes ciné-romans,” *Magazine Littéraire*, No. 6 (April 1967), p. 17.

³⁹ As Bruce Morrisette has suggested in *Les Romans de Robbe-Grillet* (Paris: Ed. de Minuit, 1963), pp. 52–75.