Bangor University

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Back and forth between written and spoken : studies of transposed voices in Celine's 'Voyage au bout de la nuit', Queneau's 'Zazic dans le metro' and their adaptations

Blin-Rolland, Armelle

Award date:
2011

Awarding institution:
Bangor University

[Link to publication](#)

Back and Forth between Written and Spoken: Studies of Transposed Voices in Céline's *Voyage au bout de la nuit*, Queneau's *Zazie dans le métro* and their Adaptations

Armelle Blin-Rolland

Bangor University

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

Abstract of thesis

Full name: Armelle Blin-Rolland

Title of thesis: Back and Forth between Written and Spoken: Studies of Transposed Voices in Céline's *Voyage au bout de la nuit*, Queneau's *Zazie dans le métro* and their Adaptations

What happens to literary voices when they are transposed into another medium? This is the central question of this study, which takes as its primary focus Céline's 1932 *Voyage au bout de la nuit*, Queneau's 1959 *Zazie dans le métro* and their adaptations into a variety of media, namely illustration, comic book, film, recorded reading and stage performance. Through the lens of the model of ventriloquism and with a theoretical framework that includes post-structuralist theories of voice and Bakhtinian dialogism, the analysis first reveals differing modes of relationships between voices (narrator's and characters') in *Voyage* and *Zazie*, in terms of vocal control and vocal power. The analysis then moves onto the further layers of complexity added to the voices of *Voyage* and *Zazie* in the adaptations. The literary voices, and the different ventriloquial relationships between narrators and characters, are re-configured through the relationship between text and image (in illustration and comic book), between the soundtrack and the imagetrack (in film), and through the use of the dynamics of voice (in acting). My analysis of 'voice', firstly within the texts and secondly in their adaptations, aims to reveal how 'voice' remains in a permanent process of construction. The study, then, explores how textual vocality is created through ventriloquism and relationships of control and power between voices, and how it is actualised and transposed in adaptation. I suggest that the ways in which the textual voices of *Voyage* and *Zazie* are, in turn, challenged, empowered, trapped, uniformised or dislocated in the adaptations show the cyclicality of loss and gain with regard to voice. I seek to demonstrate that voice is constructed in a dynamic of appropriation and expropriation, through the dialogue between one's voice and the other's voice, between the unfinished textual voices and the readers' and adapters' own voices.

Table of Contents

List of tables

Acknowledgements

Declaration

Parts of Part I, Chapter 2 have been published as 'Narrative Techniques in Jacques Tardi's Adaptations *Le Der des Ders* and *Voyage au bout de la nuit*', *European Comic Art*, 3.1 (2010), 23-36, and 'Voice in Adaptation: Tardi's Illustration of Céline's *Voyage au bout de la nuit*', in *Adaptation: Studies in French and Francophone Culture*, ed. by Neil Archer and Andreea Weisl-Schaw (Peter Lang, forthcoming 2011). This work has not previously been accepted in substance for any degree and is not being concurrently submitted in candidature for any degree.

Signed .... (candidate)

Date   ....

STATEMENT 1

This thesis is the result of my own investigations, except where otherwise stated.

Where correction services have been used, the extent and nature of the correction are clearly marked in a footnote(s).

Other sources are acknowledged by footnotes giving explicit references. A bibliography is appended.

Signed .... (candidate)

Date   ....

STATEMENT 2

I hereby give my consent for my thesis, if accepted, to be available for photocopying and for inter-library loan, and for the title and summary to be made available to outside organisations.

Signed ………………………. (candidate)

Date ……………………………

Introduction

What happens to literary voices when they are transposed into another medium? This is the central question of this study, which takes as its primary focus two influential French novels of the twentieth century, Louis-Ferdinand Céline's 1932 *Voyage au bout de la nuit* and Raymond Queneau's 1959 *Zazie dans le métro*, and their adaptations into a variety of media.[1] As texts and adaptations which throw the relationship between written and spoken language into sharp relief, the media that constitute my corpus range from illustrated novels to theatrical productions, from recorded readings to film. These adaptations are, for *Voyage*, Jacques Tardi's 1988 illustration, and five readings and performances by four actors, in chronological order: Michel Simon's 1955 reading of an abridged excerpt of the beginning of the novel entitled 'La Guerre'; Pierre Brasseur's 1955 reading of an excerpt entitled 'La Mère Henrouille'; Fabrice Luchini's performance in Benoît Jacquot's 1988 medium-length TV film entitled *Voyage au bout de la nuit*, and the 1994 CD recording of Luchini's play *Voyage au bout de la nuit* at the Comédie des Champs Elysées; and excerpts of Denis Podalydès's 2003 reading of the entirety of *Voyage au bout de la nuit*.[2] For *Zazie*, the adaptations I will analyse are, in chronological order, Louis Malle's 1960 film, Jacques Carelman's 1966 illustration, and Clément Oubrerie's 2008 comic book.[3] Through the lens of the model of ventriloquism, I seek to analyse the construction and organisation of voices within literary texts, focusing on issues of vocal control and power, the dialogic aspect of reading and adaptation, and the transposition of textual voices into the visual and/or sound. In this respect, the model of ventriloquism will also be explored against the backdrop of theories of orality, vocality, voice and adaptation. This introduction will deal first of all with concepts of

---

[1] Louis-Ferdinand Céline, *Voyage au bout de la nuit* (Paris: Gallimard, 1952). Raymond Queneau, *Zazie dans le métro* (Paris: Gallimard, 1959). Hereafter referred to by abbreviated titles *Voyage* and *Zazie*, and references are given in brackets within the body of the text (*CV* and *QZ*).

[2] Louis-Ferdinand Céline, *Voyage au bout de la nuit*, illus. by Jacques Tardi (Paris: Futuropolis Gallisol Editions, 2006). References are given within the body of the text, as *TV*. Louis-Ferdinand Céline, '*Voyage au bout de la nuit* – La Guerre', read by Michel Simon, and '*Voyage au bout de la nuit* – La Mère Henrouille', read by Pierre Brasseur, *Anthologie Céline 1894-1961*, 2 CDs, CD 1, ed. by Paul Chambrillon (Frémeaux & Associés, 2000). Benoît Jacquot, dir., *Voyage au bout de la nuit* (Institut National de l'Audiovisuel, 1991). Louis-Ferdinand Céline and Fabrice Luchini, *Voyage au bout de la nuit*, 2 CDs (Virgin France, 1994). Louis-Ferdinand Céline, '*Voyage au bout de la nuit*' de Louis-Ferdinand Céline: texte intégral lu par Denis Podalydès*, read by Denis Podalydès, 16 CDs (Frémeaux & Associés, 2003).

[3] Louis Malle, dir., *Zazie dans le métro* (Paris: Arté Vidéo, 2005) [on DVD]. Jacques Carelman and Raymond Queneau, *Zazie dans le métro de Raymond Queneau raconté en images par Jacques Carelman* (Paris: Gallimard, 1966). References are given within the body of the text, as *CZ*. Clément Oubrerie, *Zazie dans le métro: d'après l'œuvre de Raymond Queneau* (Paris: Gallimard Jeunesse, 2008). References are given within the body of the text, as *OZ*.

orality and vocality in order to justify the choice of corpus. Through a literary review of Célinian and Quenellian studies, the argument will then come to the theoretically burdened notion of 'voice', and the model of ventriloquism. Finally, the notion of 'voice' will be explored in relation to adaptation and the media examined in the present study.

Voyage and *Zazie* are two seminal texts in their innovative use of orality and oral language, marking a turning point in the development of the twentieth-century French novel. It is for this reason that these novels open themselves up to particular modes of adaptation. The term 'orality' was originally coined to refer to the predominance of oral traditions and verbal expression in primarily oral societies. The difference between orality and literacy has been theorised, most notably, by Walter J. Ong in *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the World* (1982), and Paul Zumthor, who focuses in particular on medieval literature and oral poetry.[4] Zumthor defines 'l'oralité' as 'un terme historique qui désigne un fait touchant des modalités de transmission [qui] signifie simplement qu'un message est transmis par l'intermédiaire de la voix et l'oreille'.[5] According to Zumthor's diachronic classification, orality can be primary, as in pre-literate cultures; mixed, in societies where the influence of writing and print is still external and partial; or secondary, in societies where literacy is dominant.[6] Used by Ong and Zumthor, 'orality' only refers to oral communication, which includes, of course, vocal, but also gestural communication. The term orality has however also been used in relation to the transposition of features of spoken language into literary language, in 'oralised texts' that are concerned with 'la figuration de la voix'.[7]

---

[4] See Walter J. Ong, *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the World* (London: Routledge, 2002), and Paul Zumthor, *Introduction à la poésie orale* (Paris: Seuil, 1983), hereafter cited as Zumthor, *Introduction*; *La Poésie et la voix dans la civilisation médiévale*, pref. by Yves Bonnefoy (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1984); *La Lettre et la voix: de la "littérature" médiévale* (Paris: Seuil, 1987), hereafter cited as Zumthor, *La Lettre et la voix*; *Ecriture et nomadisme: entretiens et essais* (Montreal: L'Hexagone, 1990), hereafter cited as Zumthor, *Ecriture et nomadisme*; and 'Oralité', *Intermédialités: histoire et théorie des arts, des lettres et des techniques*, 12 (2008), 169-202, hereafter cited as Zumthor, 'Oralité', 169-202.

[5] Zumthor, *Ecriture et nomadisme*, p. 192.

[6] Zumthor, 'Oralité', 169-202 (pp. 189-190).

[7] Jérôme Meizoz, *L'Âge du roman parlant (1919-1939): écrivains, critiques, linguistes et pédagogues en débat*, pref. by Pierre Bourdieu (Geneva: Droz, 2001), p. 475. Hereftare cited as Meizoz, *L'Âge du roman parlant*. For examples of analysis of orality in literature, see *La Littérature se fait dans la bouche: la représentation de la langue parlée dans les littératures romanes du XXème siècle*, ed. by Sylvie Durrer and Jérôme Meizoz (Geneva: Slatkine, 1996); Catherine Rouayrenc, 'Le "transport du parlé en écrit" chez C.F. Ramuz', *Europe*, 853 (2000), 106-134; and *Oralité et littérature: échos, écarts, résurgences*, ed. by Geneviève Calame-Griaule (Paris: Publications Langues o', 2005).

Jérôme Meizoz characterises the stylistic technique of literary orality as one which creates a 'mirage des voix'.[8] He defines 'récits oralisés' as 'marqués par des traits typiques de l'oral', and as '[pouvant] mettre en scène […] des traits du français ordinaire et/ou non-conventionnel'.[9] Meizoz focuses his analysis on a historically specific trend of literary orality in what he characterises as 'romans parlants'. These 'romans parlants' are oralised French-language novels of the interwar years in which orality is interwoven with the notion of 'popular language'. The transposition of features of spoken language in these texts is, then, in order to 'faire populaire', as is the case for instance with Céline's first two novels, *Voyage* and *Mort à crédit* (1936).[10] In Meizoz's analysis however, Queneau, with his first novel *Le Chiendent* (1933) in particular, is revealed as a 'désenchanteur' who ironises on the ideological and political use of orality by Céline and writers of the proletarian movement. *Voyage*, published in 1932, is historically part of the literary trend of 'romans parlants'. Queneau himself characterised *Voyage* as the first novel 'où pour la première fois le style oral marche à fond de train'.[11] *Zazie*, published in 1959, is not part of the literary trend of 'romans parlants' as defined by Meizoz. It is still, however, an oralised text, due to Queneau's attempt at creating a 'néo-français', the new language he theorises as early as in 'Ecrit en 1937', and which implies a reform of spelling, grammar and syntax of written French based upon spoken French.[12]

To date, orality in Céline and Queneau has been analysed from a linguistic and stylistic, socio-political, and aesthetic point of view. For instance, Andreas Blank (1990) compares the transposition of spoken French in *Voyage* and *Le Chiendent*, and in the works of Céline and Queneau as a whole (1991).[13] Pascale Gaitet (1992) examines what she characterises as 'political stylistics' in a chronological analysis of Zola's *L'Assommoir*, *Voyage* and *Zazie*, focusing on the sociological and political relevance of the stylistic

---

[8] Meizoz, *L'Âge du roman parlant*, p. 359. Meizoz is here referring to the example of Jean Giono's *Un de Baumugnes* (1929).
[9] Meizoz, *L'Âge du roman parlant*, p. 35.
[10] Catherine Rouayrenc, *'C'est mon secret': la technique de l'écriture 'populaire' dans 'Voyage au bout de la nuit' et 'Mort à crédit'* (Tusson: Du Lérot, 1994). Hereafter cited as Rouayrenc, *'C'est mon secret'. Mort à crédit* is hereafter referred to by abbreviated title *Mort*.
[11] Raymond Queneau, 'Ecrit en 1937', in *Bâtons, chiffres et lettres* (Paris: Gallimard, 1965), pp. 11-26 (p. 18). Hereafter cited as Queneau, 'Ecrit en 1937', pp. 11-26.
[12] Queneau, 'Ecrit en 1937', pp. 11-26. In fact, while Meizoz's focus is on 'romans parlerie' of the interwar years, he still gives *Zazie* as an example of 'récit oralisé' and 'récit-parlerie' that is concerned with the figuration of voice, in this way similar to texts by Sarraute and Beckett for example. Meizoz, *L'Âge du roman parlant*, pp. 34-35.
[13] Andreas Blank, 'Discours émotif et discours contrastif: la transposition du français parlé dans *Voyage au bout de la nuit* de L.-F. Céline et dans *Le Chiendent* de Raymond Queneau', in *Actes du colloque international de Toulouse: L.-F. Céline*, ed. by Catherine Vigneau-Rouayrenc (Paris: Société d'Etudes céliniennes, 1991), pp. 33-46; *Literarisierung von Mündlichkeit: Louis-Ferdinand Céline und Raymond Queneau*, pref. by Hans-Martin Gauger (Tübingen: Narr, 1991).

device of 'popular language as literary artifact'.[14] Jean-Pierre Martin (1998) adopts an aesthetic approach to discuss, in particular, the differences between Céline's and Queneau's points of view on written and spoken language, and their antithetical uses of orality.[15] My analysis will differ from these approaches due to my focus on vocality (a point to which I will turn shortly) and on adaptation. The transposition of features of spoken language is a stylistic device that creates a 'mirage d'oral' for the reader.[16] Orality, in oralised texts, is an illusion that relies on textuality to represent the discrepancy between spoken and written language. The present study will examine how the voices of *Voyage* and *Zazie*, which are defined by their textual simulation of orality, can be transposed into a medium that combines text and image (such as illustration or comic book), sound and image (cinema) or consists of sound alone (recording).

It is this focus on adaptation that determined the choice of *Voyage* and *Zazie*, rather than other texts by Céline and Queneau. Arguably the most successful and well-known texts by their authors, *Voyage* and *Zazie* are the novels by Céline and Queneau of which there is the greatest quantity of adaptations. Céline's *Mort* and *Casse-pipe* (1949) have both been illustrated by Tardi (respectively in 1988 and 1989, with new editions published in 2006 and 2007), and there are recordings of two excerpts from *Mort* by the actress Arletty (1955), but there is a greater breadth of adaptation material derived from *Voyage*. Focusing on *Voyage* enables me to analyse one illustration and five recordings. The situation is even more marked with *Zazie*, since it is the only novel by Queneau that has been adapted into other media.[17]

If it is indeed the orality of each of these novels that has sparked such a breadth of adaptations, the term 'orality', which refers to the moment of composition, will need to be placed in contradistinction to another term of analysis: 'vocality', which relates to the moment of reception. Zumthor defines 'vocalité' in terms of contrast to 'oralité': 'vocalité, en revanche, me paraît une notion anthropologique, non historique, relative aux valeurs qui sont attachées à la voix comme voix et donc se trouvent intégrées au

---

[14] Pascale Gaitet, *Political Stylistics: Popular Language as Literary Artifact* (London: Routledge, 1992). Hereafter cited as Gaitet.

[15] Jean-Pierre Martin, *La Bande sonore : Beckett, Céline, Duras, Genet, Perec, Pinget, Queneau, Sarraute, Sartre* (Paris: José Corti, 1998). Hereafter cited as Martin, *La Bande sonore*.

[16] Meizoz, *L'Âge du roman parlant*, p. 36. Similarly, Martin talks about the 'mirage de l'oralité' (Martin, *La Bande sonore*, p. 36).

[17] *Exercices de style* (1947) has been adapted, notably into an illustrated version by Carelman (1963). *Exercices de style* consists of 99 versions of the same story, each in a different style which serves as a typical example of literary constraints.

texte [oral ou écrit] que la voix transmet'.[18] Clive Scott further explores the term

'vocality' in relation to poetry and translation. In *Translating Rimbaud's 'Illuminations'*,

Scott writes:

> I imagine a translation which is not only a text, but a textualised vocality through which a voice could embody itself. I prefer 'vocality' to 'voice' here, because what I envisage in a text is something rather more generalised, not a voice but the quality of voice, available to be actualised by a voice.[19]

Vocality, for Zumthor and Scott, is an intention that is incorporated into the text to be

transmitted vocally. Zumthor talks about a situation of performance, and Scott gives the

example of a man reading Shakespeare out loud.

Though Scott uses the term vocality specifically in relation to translation, it is

fruitful also for the study of adaptation. Indeed, as Linda Hutcheon points out, there are

obvious correspondences between the processes of translation and adaptation:

> In many cases, because adaptations are to a different medium, they are re-mediations, that is, specifically translations in the form of intersemiotic transpositions from one sign system (for example, words) to another (for example, images). This is translation but in a very specific sense: as transmutation or transcoding, that is, as necessarily a recoding into a new set of conventions as well as signs.[20]

In the present study I expand on Zumthor's and Scott's definitions of vocality, and

suggest that the reader actualises the vocality of the text with his or her own voice

whether s/he is reading internally, or transmitting it in a situation of performance. I,

then, understand the vocality of a text as its quality of voice, available to be actualised

and appropriated by the (internalised or externalised) voice of a reader, and that of the

adapter.[21] I consider adaptations as the concretisation of what Barthes, in 'Pour une

théorie de la lecture', characterises as 'des lectures *vivantes*', 'produisant un texte intérieur,

homogène à une écriture virtuelle du lecteur'.[22] In a 'lecture vivante', the reader's role is

not passive but creative in the construction of the meaning of the text, in the same way

---

[18] Zumthor, *Ecriture et nomadisme*, p. 192.

[19] Clive Scott, *Translating Rimbaud's 'Illuminations'* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2006), p. 65. Hereafter cited as Scott.

[20] Linda Hutcheon, *A Theory of Adaptation* (New York: Routledge, 2006), p. 16. Hereafter cited as Hutcheon.

[21] For a discussion of the distinction between an internal and an external reading, see Helen Abbott, *Between Baudelaire and Mallarmé: Voice, Conversation and Music* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009).

[22] Roland Barthes, 'Pour une théorie de la lecture', in *Œuvres complètes*, 3 vols, ed. by Eric Marty (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1993), II, pp. 1455-1456 (p. 1456). In later references to texts from this edition of the complete works of Barthes, the volume is cited as *Œuvres complètes*, followed by the volume number.

as the listener, in Bakhtinian dialogism, is part of the construction of the meaning of the utterance.[23]

In line with this reader-oriented focus, in my analysis of *Voyage* and *Zazie* I will adopt the Barthesian theory of 'La Mort de l'auteur':

> Un texte est fait d'écritures multiples, issues de plusieurs cultures et qui entrent les unes avec les autres en dialogue, en parodie, en contestation; mais il y a un lieu où cette multiplicité se rassemble, et ce lieu, ce n'est pas l'auteur, […] c'est le lecteur […]. La naissance du lecteur doit se payer de la mort de l'Auteur.[24]

The meaning of a text, in the theory of the death of the author, is seen as being ultimately and permanently constructed by its readers. It might seem paradoxical to apply the theory of the death of the author to adaptation. Indeed, Linda Hutcheon argues that

> adapters' deeply personal as well as culturally and historically conditioned reasons for selecting a certain work to adapt and the particular way to do so should be considered seriously by adaptation theory, even if this means rethinking the role of intentionality in our critical thinking about art in general.[25]

This is echoed by Julie Sanders, who argues that 'in any study of adaptation and appropriation the creative import of the author cannot be as easily dismissed as Roland Barthes's or Michel Foucault's influential's theories of the "death of the author" might suggest'.[26] However, I suggest that adapters should be understood as being first readers and then authors, transposing the source text into their chosen medium through their historically situated interpretation of it. There is not one author, and the text is un-final, permanently being constructed by the layering of readers' concrete interpretations of it, their actualisations of the vocality of the text with their own voice. Before I examine the theoretically burdened notion of 'voice', which is central to my analysis, I shall first situate the contribution of the present study to the fields of Célinian and Quenellian studies, in which 'voice' has not received the critical attention it merits.

Célinian studies only really started as an academic field in the late 1960s, three decades after the publication of *Voyage*, as Céline's œuvre had been mostly ignored in the post-

---

[23] See Mikhail Mikhaïlovich Bakhtin, 'The Problems of Speech Genre', *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, trans. by Vern W. McGee, ed. by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986), pp. 60-102. Hereafter cited as Bakhtin, 'The Problems of Speech Genre', pp. 60-102.
[24] Barthes, 'La Mort de l'auteur', in *Œuvres Complètes*, II, pp. 491-495 (p. 495).
[25] Hutcheon, p. 95.
[26] Julie Sanders, *Adaptation and Appropriation* (London: Routledge, 2006), pp. 2-3. Hereafter cited as Sanders.

Liberation era.[27] *Voyage*, as Céline's first and most successful novel, has since then received extensive critical attention, and has been examined from a variety of standpoints, most notably stylistic, semiotic, psychoanalytic, Bakhtinian and historicist.

Stylistic studies of *Voyage* include Albert Chesneau's *La Langue sauvage de Louis-Ferdinand Céline* (1974), which analyses the evolution of Céline's style from *Voyage* to *Rigodon* (1969).[28] In the volume *L.-F. Céline 2: écriture et esthétique* (1976), two articles focus specifically on *Voyage*. Jean-Luc de Boissieu identifies some of 'les effets littéraires et les archaïsmes' in *Voyage* and argues that their function is not only to be a 'contrepoids aux vulgarismes', but also to surprise the reader.[29] Danièle Racelle-Latin focuses her analysis on 'l'effet argotique' in *Voyage* and the illusion of orality.[30] More recently, Catherine Rouayrenc, a specialist of orality in Célinian and proletarian writing, examines how the Célinian style challenges the distinction between *récit* and *discours*. In *'C'est mon secret'* (1994), Rouayrenc analyses Céline's strategies and techniques for inserting orality into the text. She shows that in *Voyage*, compared with *Mort*, 'la subversion [de la langue littéraire] peut paraître plus théorique que réelle'.[31] In two articles also published in 1994 and focusing on *Voyage* alone, Rouayrenc offers a stylistic and grammatical analysis of the use of 'et' in the text, and examines how Céline uses the insertion of direct speech syntactically and semantically as part of his intention to 'subvertir le récit par le discours'.[32]

There have also been psychoanalytic approaches to Céline's texts. In *Pouvoirs de l'horreur*, Julia Kristeva offers a semiotic and psychoanalytical examination of the importance of the notion of 'abjection' in Céline's texts, including *Voyage*: 'tout est déjà dans le *Voyage*: la douleur, l'horreur, la mort, le sarcasme complice, l'abjection, la peur… Et ce gouffre où parle une étrange déchirure entre un moi et un autre – entre *rien* et

---

[27] A notable early study of Céline's work is Léo Spitzer's 1935 article 'Une habitude de style, le rappel chez Céline', first published in *Le Français Moderne*. Léo Spitzer, 'Une habitude de style, le rappel chez Céline', in *Les Cahiers de l'Herne: L.-F. Céline*, ed. by Dominique de Roux and others (Paris: L'Herne, 2007), pp. 384-391. Hereafter cited as Spitzer, pp. 384-391.

[28] Albert Chesneau, *La Langue sauvage de Louis-Ferdinand Céline: essai de stylistique thématique* (Lille: Service de reproduction des thèses, 1974). Hereafter cited as Chesneau.

[29] Jean-Luc de Boissieu, 'Quelques faits "littéraires" ou archaïsants dans *Voyage au bout de la nuit*', in *L.-F. Céline 2: écriture et esthétique*, ed. by Jean-Pierre Dauphin, *La Revue des lettres modernes*, 462-467 (1976), 33-51 (p. 47). Hereafter cited as Boissieu, 33-51.

[30] Danièle Racelle-Latin, '*Voyage au bout de la nuit* ou l'inauguration d'une poétique "argotique"', in *L.-F. Céline 2: écriture et esthétique*, 53-77 (p. 58). Hereafter cited as Racelle-Latin, 53-77.

[31] Rouayrenc, *'C'est mon secret'*, p. 82.

[32] Rouayrenc, 'De certains "et" dans *Voyage au bout de la nuit*', *Roman 20-50*, 17 (1994), 161-169; 'L'insertion du discours direct dans *Voyage au bout de la nuit*', *Champs du signe: sémantique, rhétorique, poétique*, 4 (1994), 95-115 (p. 114). By Rouayrenc, see also 'Vers une étude du rythme célinien', in *Actualité de Céline*, ed. by Alain Cresciucci (Tusson: Du Lérot, 2001), pp. 183-217.

tout.[33] Kristeva argues that it is the importance of abjection in Céline's writing that fascinates the reader: '[si Céline] nous montre […] un des points ultimes jusqu'où peut s'avancer ce qui, pour le moraliste, sera du nihilisme, il témoigne également du pouvoir de fascination qu'exerce sur tous, ouvertement ou en cachette, cette région de l'horreur'.[34] In *Une écriture psychotique: Louis-Ferdinand Céline*, Isabelle Blondiaux argues that Céline's language 'renvoie à la langue "naturelle" d'un sujet-psychotique-narrateur'.[35] Referring to *Voyage*, she analyses the psychotic divide of the narrator into two autonomous entities, Ferdinand Bardamu and Robinson, the former representing the consciousness, and the latter the subconscious of the narrator.

In *Poétique de Céline* (1985), the model of Henri Godard's analysis of *Voyage* and the rest of Céline's novels is Bakhtin's dialogic principle. Godard examines the Célinian style from *Voyage* to *Rigodon*, focusing his analysis on 'le plurivocalisme célinien' (the constant shifting of registers and voices in Céline's narratives), the Célinian narrative voice and 'la position que le narrateur assigne à son récit par rapport au monde réel et à la vérité'.[36] Godard separates Céline's novels from the anti-Semitic pamphlets and argues that the Célinian style is a counter-discourse that goes against fascist ideology. This approach is significant because it focuses on literary analysis and does not take into consideration the political status of the author.

By contrast, in *Céline ou l'art de la contradiction: lecture de 'Voyage au bout de la nuit'*, the crux of Marie-Christine Bellosta's argument is that in Céline's writing the style cannot be separated from his ideology. In order to understand Céline's approach as an intellectual, Bellosta analyses *Voyage* as a hypertext, examining it as a philosophical novel inscribed in its contemporary intellectual background, such as Freudian concepts and the proletarian movement. Bellosta examines how, in Céline's writing, 'l'idéologie se cheville sur l'esthétique', and she demonstrates that 'l'œuvre de Céline forme un ensemble cohérent du point de vue de la pensée et de la posture du locuteur'.[37] From *Voyage* onwards Céline's style, Bellosta argues, 'accompagne […] le choix du "moi" prolétarien-fasciste'.[38] Echoing Bellosta's work, Philippe Alméras shows that Céline's ideology existed prior to the pamphlets, and he argues that *Voyage* is 'susceptible de

---

[33] Julia Kristeva, *Pouvoirs de l'horreur* (Paris: Seuil, 1980), p. 166. Hereafter cited as Kristeva.
[34] Kristeva, pp. 245-246.
[35] Isabelle Blondiaux, *Une écriture psychotique: Louis-Ferdinand Céline* (Paris: A.G. Nizet, 1985), p. 109.
[36] Henri Godard, *Poétique de Céline* (Paris: Gallimard, 1985), p. 12. Hereafter cited as Godard.
[37] Marie-Christine Bellosta, *Céline ou l'art de la contradiction: lecture de 'Voyage au bout de la nuit'* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1990), p. 16; p. 285. Hereafter cited as Bellosta.
[38] Bellosta, p. 300.

plusieurs lectures: une lecture anarcho-gauchiste certes, une lecture préexistentialiste certainement, mais aussi une lecture pré-raciste'.[39]

While Godard, in his analysis, separates style from ideology, Bellosta and Alméras see style as intertwined with ideology. The discordance between these approaches shows that Célinian studies have been shaped by what Rosemarie Scullion characterises as 'the standard dichotomous view of Céline', or 'the "great stylist"/"abhorrent racist" polarity that has so long constricted thinking and research on Céline'.[40] Indeed, Alméras states that 'le problème essentiel [lorsque les études céliniennes de type universitaire ont démarré] semblait alors de concilier *Voyage* et *Bagatelles*', that is to say, how to reconcile *Voyage*, which upon publication in 1932 had been received as a pacifist and even Communist text, and Céline's violently anti-Semitic pamphlets such as *Bagatelles pour un massacre* (1937).[41] In 'Postmodern Céline', Philip Watts argues that this problematic resulted in the tendency in the postmodern critical reception of Céline to separate Céline's literary output from his political production. Watts critises seminal studies of Céline's œuvre, such as Kristeva's *Pouvoirs de l'horreur* and Godard's *Poétique de Céline*, for their exclusive focus on the aesthetic dimension of Céline's novels.[42]

Watts's essay examines 'a variety of social distinctions configured in Céline's texts: chiefly the racial and ethnic differences foregrounded in the pamphlets, but also those involving discourses on rationality, gender, and class'.[43] In the same volume, in the essay 'The (Con)Quest of the Other in *Voyage au bout de la nuit*', Jennifer Forest discusses the fabrication of feminity in *Voyage* as inextricably linked with the modernist opposition between Europe and the United States. Forest focuses her analysis on the masculine gaze, and female inadequacy and degeneracy in Bardamu's relationship with American, French and European women throughout the text.[44] By contextualising *Voyage* as a modernist text and engaging with ideology rather than adopting a single-minded focus

---

[39] Philippe Alméras, *Les Idées de Céline: mythe de la race, politique et pamphlets* (Paris: Berg International, 1992), pp. 41-42. Hereafter cited as Alméras.
[40] Rosemarie Scullion, 'Introduction', in *Céline and the Politics of Difference*, ed. by Rosemarie Scullion and others (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1995), pp. 1-12 (p. 2). Hereafter cited as Scullion, pp. 1-12. In later references to chapters in this volume, the volume is cited as *Céline and the Politics of Difference*, ed. by Scullion and others.
[41] Alméras, p. 41. Céline's other two anti-Semitic pamphlets are *L'École des cadavres* (1938) and *Les Beaux draps* (1941).
[42] Philip Watts, 'Postmodern Céline', in *Céline and the Politics of Difference*, ed. by Scullion and others, pp. 203-215.
[43] Scullion, pp. 1-12 (p. 12).
[44] Jennifer Forest, 'The (Con)Quest of the Other in *Voyage au bout de la nuit*', in *Céline and the Politics of Difference*, ed. by Scullion and others, pp. 120-139. Hereafter cited as Forest, pp. 120-139.

on its aesthetic aspect, Forest's essay is representative of the direction in Célinian studies that accounts for, rather than evacuates, the politics of Céline's novels.

Against this critical backdrop, my contribution to the field of Célinian studies takes a fresh standpoint by focusing on *Voyage* as a source text for adaptations. My analysis will not focus on how *Voyage*, as Céline's first novel, relates to his œuvre stylistically and/or ideologically. Rather, I will analyse *Voyage* as an un-final text, a vocality available for adapters to appropriate and transpose into their chosen medium. Rather than basing my analysis on the figure of Céline, I will adopt the Barthesian model of the death of the author, and consider the text as autonomous from its author, and as the monologue of its first-person narrator, Ferdinand Bardamu. I am of course aware of the complexity of the autobiographical bond between Bardamu and Céline, as well as of the complexity of Bardamu's voice itself in relation to Céline's œuvre.[45] Bardamu was already the name of the protagonist of the play *L'Eglise*, published in 1933 but written prior to *Voyage*.[46] An analysis of the manuscript of *Voyage* highlighted the indeterminacy of Bardamu's voice throughout the writing process, as medical student Arthur Ganate's statement about 'la race française' in the opening scene of *Voyage* was first attributed to Bardamu.[47] Moreover, Philip H. Solomon argues that all of Céline's texts have only one narrator, 'successive versions of the same figure, designated as Bardamu in his first novel, Ferdinand in those that follow'.[48] However, my analysis will not take into account the figure of the author, the indeterminacy of Bardamu's voice prior to the completion of the text, or the evolution of Bardamu's voice before and after *Voyage*, because it treats the voices of the text (its vocality) as separate from a subjective identity, and open to subjective readings.

My analysis will, then, focus solely on *Voyage* as Bardamu's monologue whilst taking into account the complexity of this approach. As Alméras has argued, 'la lecture

---

[45] About this complex biographical bond, the tendency to equate Céline and Bardamu, and the construction of the 'myth' of Céline by the writer after the publication of *Voyage*, see for example Alméras, pp. 41-75. For a critique of the tendency in early Célinian studies to see Bardamu as a projection of Céline, in particular in Erika Ostrovsky's 1967 *Céline and his Vision* and Bettina Knapp's 1974 *Céline: Man of Hate*, see J.H. Matthews, *The Inner Dream: Céline as Novelist* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1978), pp. 29-31.

[46] See Charles Krance's 'L.-F. Céline: "Just an Individual"?' for a discussion of the correspondences between *L'Eglise*'s Bardamu and Roquentin in Sartre's *La Nausée* (1938), and an analysis of the discursive opposition between self and other (in particular, 'the Jew') and oppressive otherness with regard to Bardamu's sense of self and identity both in *L'Eglise* and *Voyage*. Charles Krance, 'L.-F. Céline: "Just an Individual"?', in *Céline and the Politics of Difference*, ed. by Scullion and others, pp. 84-97. Hereafter cited as Krance, 'L.-F. Céline: "Just an Individual"?', pp. 84-97.

[47] Alméras, p. 42.

[48] Philip H. Solomon, *Understanding Céline* (Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 1992), p. 7. Hereafter cited as Solomon.

de Céline ne peut être […] totalement innocente, [et] il existe un lien direct entre son idéologie et son activité littéraire'.[49] My reading of *Voyage*, though it adopts the Barthesian model of the death of the author, will not be 'innocent', in the sense that I will examine the construction of Bardamu's narrative voice in the relationship between the self and the other, focusing my analysis on the potential powers and violence of the voice. Like Godard in *Poétique de Céline*, I base my analysis on Bakhtinian dialogism, but my approach lies in the addition of the model of ventriloquism to the Bakhtinian dialogic principle. The model of ventriloquism has recently been suggested in Célinian studies by Greg Hainge and Kane X Faucher in their article 'Une voix déplacée: la ventriloquie chez Céline ou Pour en finir avec le jugement historique'.[50] Hainge and Faucher examine the abnegation of reality, with particular focus on Céline's post-Second World War novels, through Céline's ventriloquising of the protagonists in the narrative, his imagined readers and the various figurations of his literary persona. This narrative ventriloquism, they suggest, circumvents an insufficient reading of Céline according to a representational model with regard to history. My use of the model of ventriloquism will differ from that of Hainge and Kane, firstly because they focus their analysis on Céline's post-Second World War novels and the problematic representation of history, but mostly because they consider Céline as the ultimate ventriloquist at the source of the texts. I, on other hand, will use the model of ventriloquism on a purely textual level in order to examine the potential powers of the voice in the relationship between the narrative voice and the others, and I will identify Bardamu as the narrator-ventriloquist.

Quenellian studies have, of course, not been shaped by the kind of dichotomy and polarity inherent to Célinian studies. Much of the literature on *Zazie* focuses on Queneau's use of language and its connections with Queneau's attempt at creating a 'néo-français'. Indeed, as Walter Redfern argues, it is clear from the incipit of *Zazie,* the phonetic contraction 'Doukipudonktan' (*QZ*, p. 9), that Queneau's text is 'primarily concerned with language: its plasticity, its oddities, its mechanisms and conventions'.[51] In one of the first academic analyses of the text, Barthes (1964) focuses on the

[49] Alméras, p. 328.
[50] Greg Hainge and Kane X Faucher, 'Une voix déplacée: la ventriloquie chez Céline ou Pour en finir avec le jugement historique', *Etudes céliniennes*, 5 (2009-2010), 71-93.
[51] W.D. Redfern, *Queneau: 'Zazie dans le métro'* (London: Grant & Cutler, 1980), p. 27. Hereafter cited as Redfern.

opposition between the 'langage-objet' of main character Zazie and the 'méta-langage' of the adults around her.[52] Christopher Shorley (1981) focuses his analysis on the use of oral language (rather than spoken language), gesture and non-verbal communication in Queneau's novels, including *Zazie*.[53] Marie-Sophie Armstrong (1992) brings out the correlations between Queneau's thoughts on 'néo-français', as he expresses them in 'Ecrit en 1937', and his treatment of language in *Zazie*. Armstrong aims to demonstrate 'how, far from being influenced by Neo-French uniquely in a superficial fashion – in an occasional use of phonetic spelling for instance – *Zazie* is connected to Queneau's linguistic theories in a less visible and more organic fashion'. She focuses her analysis on how in the novel some names are transcribed in other 'sèmes'.[54]

In a volume that brings together articles focusing on Vian, Queneau and Prévert as 'trois fous du langage', Diane Sears (1993) continues on from where Barthes's analysis left off. She shows intertextual connections between Vian and Queneau in her comparison of Zazie and Zénobie (the young girl from Vian's 1959 play *Les Bâtisseurs d'Empire ou le Schmürz*), and of the struggle through language between the two young girls and the adults around them.[55] In the same volume, Sada Niang (1993) analyses the perception that *Zazie*'s 'marginalised' characters have of written language as authoritative and even menacing. Niang argues that in his subversion of the arbitrary norms of written language, Queneau 'révèle une langue française aux potentiels sémiotiques considérables'. Niang also points out an intertextual aspect of the text as he suggests that Queneau integrates 'des formes expressives caractéristiques des littératures antillaises', in particular 'talking sweet', as part of his attempt to break the discursive constraints of the French novel.[56] Dominique Jullien (2000) further explores the intertextuality of Queneau's experimental treatment of French in *Zazie* by examining its convergences with orality in Amos Tutuola's *The Palm-Wine Drinkard*, which Queneau translated into French under the title *L'Ivrogne dans la brousse*.[57] Given its stylistic

---

[52] Barthes, '"Zazie" et la littérature', in *Œuvres complètes*, I, pp. 1260-1264. '"Zazie" et la littérature' is part of Barthes's *Essais critiques*, published in 1964.

[53] Christopher Shorley, '"Joindre le geste à la parole": Raymond Queneau and the Use of Non-Verbal Communication', *French Studies*, 35:4 (1981), 408-420.

[54] Marie-Sophie Armstrong, '*Zazie dans le métro* and Neo-French', *Modern Language Studies*, 22:3 (1992), 4-16 (p. 4).

[55] Dianne Sears, 'Zazie et Zénobie sèment la zizanie: les troubles du langage dans *Zazie dans le métro* et *Les Bâtisseurs d'Empire*', in *Trois fous du langage: Vian, Queneau, Prévert*, ed. by Marc Lapprand (Nancy: Presses Universitaires de Nancy, 1993), pp. 91-99. Hereafter cited as Sears, pp. 91-99. The short title for this volume in references for chapters in the volume is *Trois fous du langage*, ed. by Lapprand.

[56] Sada Niang, 'Dimensions orales de l'écrit dans *Zazie dans le métro*', in *Trois fous du langage*, ed. by Lapprand, pp. 109-123 (p. 112). Hereafter cited as Niang, pp. 109-123.

[57] Dominique Jullien, 'Zazie dans la brousse', *Romanic Review*, 91:3 (2000), 263-278.

inventiveness and use of 'néo-français', *Zazie* has also been studied from the perspective of translation studies for the challenge it represents, for instance by Henri Plard (1985), who discusses the differences between Barbara Wright's English and Eugen Helmlé's German translations of *Zazie*.[58]

As Susan Bernofsky explains, 'much of the literature on Queneau is devoted to his experimentalism', which manifests itself not only in the language of the novels but also 'in [their] structure [...] and their characters'.[59] Stanley Fertig (1984) attemps to lay the grounds for a 'narratologie quenienne' as constructed around the problematic of time and the refusal of traditional temporality in the novel. Fertig argues that Quenellian texts, including *Zazie*, are shaped by cyclicality, parallelism and repetition.[60] David L. Gobert (1986) focuses his analysis of *Zazie* on the nature and the role of the ambiguous character of Trouscaillon.[61] Bernofsky (1994) discusses the ways in which *Zazie* is an anti-realist novel, and examines the connections between Zazie and Lewis Carroll's Alice.[62]

Studies of *Zazie* have thus far focused on the different ways in which the text challenges and re-invents the French novel, and on deciphering a text that has multiple interpretations and is deeply intertextual. In the present study I will shift the focus from the challenge and re-invention of language and the novel to that of voice. I will explore the ventriloquial dynamics between the characters and the third-person narrator, who gives up on the role of structuring instance, in such a way as to risk cacophony. Moreover, the notion of 'voice' in adaptations of *Zazie* has not been extensively analysed.

---

[58] Henri Plard, 'Sur les limites du traduisible: *Zazie dans le métro* en anglais et en allemand', in *Communiquer et traduire: hommages à Jean Dierickx*, ed. by G. Debusscher and J. P. Van Noppen (Brussels: Université libre de Bruxelles, 1985), pp. 65-74. On translating *Zazie*, see also Klaus Lichem, 'Innersprachliche Mehrsprachigkeit und deren Übersetzungsproblem in *Zazie dans le métro* von Queneau', in *Europäische Mehrsprachigkeit*, ed. by Wolfgand Pöckl (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1981), pp. 73-85; and Mona Wodsak, '"Un délire tapé à la machine par un romancier idiot"?: Zum Problem der Übersetzung von Raymond Queneaus *Zazie dans le métro*', in *Offene Gefüge: Literatursystem und Lebenswirklichkeit*, ed. by Henning Krauß and others (Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1994), pp. 295-316. Hereafter cited as Wodsak, pp. 295-316.
[59] Susan Bernofsky, 'Zazie in Wonderland: Queneau's Reply to the Realist Novel', *Romanic Review*, 85:1 (1994), 113-124 (p. 115). Hereafter cited as Bernofsky, 113-124.
[60] Stanley Fertig, 'Pour une narratologie quenienne', in *The French Novel: Theory and Practice, Followed by Michel Butor: 'Bilame ou Diode'*, ed. by Maynor Hardee (Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina, 1984), pp. 77-88.
[61] David L. Gobert, 'The Essential Character in Queneau's *Zazie dans le métro*', *Symposium*, 40:2 (1986), 91-106. Hereafter cited as Gobert, 91-106.
[62] Bernofsky, 113-124.

It is, then, my twofold analysis of the construction of the voices of *Voyage* and *Zazie*, and their appropriation by adapters, that constitutes a fresh contribution both to Célinian and Quenellian studies. The notion of 'voice', which is central to the present study, is complicated to define. Twentieth-century theories have challenged the conception, inherited from classical antiquity, of 'voice' as the origin of language, and therefore the idea that it should be favoured over writing. This idealised conception of 'voice' is most notably expressed in France by Jean-Jacques Rousseau in *Essai sur l'origine des langues* (1781). Voice is understood by Rousseau as originating in thought rather than speech, because it is dictated by emotion. Natural voices are unarticulated and communicate emotion in the same way as singing, through rhythm and intonation. Voice is natural, whilst articulation, the principle of language, is conventional, and only appears once reasoning takes over passion and emotion. Rousseau vilifies writing, which according to him alters language by fixing it, and erases the emotional aspect of voice, already altered by language. Passion and emotion disappear in favour of monotony and coldness, as the original emotional voice has been perverted and shaped to fit convention.[63]

Ferdinand de Saussure's conception of 'voice' and its relationship with language can to some extent be linked to this tradition, going from Aristotle to Rousseau. This is seen in *Cours de linguistique génerale* (1916), where writing is considered as secondary to speech: 'l'objet linguistique n'est pas défini par la combinaison du mot écrit et du mot parlé: ce dernier à lui-seul constitue cet objet'.[64] Zumthor points out the importance of Saussure in the evolution of the concept of orality, as Saussure 'mit, plus fortement que ses prédécesseurs "néo-grammairiens", l'accent sur le caractère oral du langage, cette oralité en définissant le mode d'existence profond et la spécificité'.[65] This focus on spoken rather than written language implies a focus on voice rather than print.[66] While Saussure sees writing and spelling in particular as derivative of speech, his understanding of voice is more complex than the Rousseauian ideal. Michel Arrivé explains how:

> Saussure confère à la voix deux statuts opposés. C'est qu'il envisage ses relations avec le langage de deux façons différentes. Tantôt il la considère comme un

---

[63] Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Essai sur l'origine des langues* (Paris: Larousse, 1990).
[64] Ferdinand de Saussure, *Cours de linguistique générale* (Paris: Payot, 1949), p. 45. Hereafter cited as Saussure.
[65] Zumthor, 'Oralité', 169-202 (p. 177).
[66] Zumthor explains that voice and speech are interlinked, and he defines 'la parole' as 'le langage vocalisé, phoniquement réalisé dans l'émission de la voix'. Zumthor however points out that voice is more complex than the channel for spoken words, as 'la voix déborde la parole'. Zumthor, *Introduction*, p. 12.

instrument qui, au même titre que d'autres, par exemple l'écriture, est propre à manifester la langue: dans ce cas, elle reste extérieure au système que constitue la langue. Tantôt il la donne comme l'une des sources du changement diachronique qui constitue la langue en tant qu'objet sémiologique: il est alors amené à voir dans l'objet produit par la voix le seul authentique objet linguistique.[67]

The complexity, and apparent contradiction, of Saussure's conception of 'voice' is informed by the relationship between 'langue' and 'parole', which are inter-dependent: 'la langue est nécessaire pour que la parole soit intelligible et produise tous ses effets; mais celle-ci est nécessaire pour que la langue s'établisse; historiquement, le fait de parole précède toujours'.[68] Voice and print are both instruments to manifest 'la langue' as 'parole' (speech and writing). As a producer of sound however, it is voice that originates the diachronic evolution that constitutes 'la langue'.[69] Voice, then, depends on 'la langue', as 'parole' (speech and writing) needs 'la langue', but 'la langue' also depends on voice.

In *De la grammatologie* (1967)*,* Derrida deconstructs the Rousseuian conviction of writing as derivative and Saussure's semiology.[70] Derrida questions the Rousseauian view of voice, where, in Christopher Norris's words, '*voice* becomes a metaphor of truth and authenticity, a source of self-present "living" speech as opposed to the secondary lifeless emanations of writing'.[71] Derrida challenges this vision by suggesting the concept of 'archi-écriture'. 'Archi-écriture' is not writing in the narrow sense of being graphic or inscriptional. It is created in the movement of

> la violence originaire du langage qui consiste à inscrire dans une différence, à classer, à suspendre le vocatif absolu. Penser l'unique *dans* le système, tel est le geste de l'archi-écriture.[72]

'Archi-écriture' is the movement 'de la différence, de la classification et du système des appellations'.[73] Writing in this sense is not subsidiary and derivative of speech, but it is, in fact, the precondition of speech. Meaning is permanently deferred and constructed in *différance*, a term coined by Derrida combining the two meanings of 'différer', to differ and to defer. *Différance* 'permet l'articulation des signes entre eux à l'intérieur d'un même

---

[67] Michel Arrivé, 'Saussure: un langage sans voix?', *Rifl: Rivista Italiana di Filosofia del Linguaggio*, 3 (2010), 27-38 (p. 36). Hereafter cited as Arrivé, 27-38.

[68] Saussure, p. 37.

[69] As Arrivé points out, 'c'est le son, produit de la voix, qui est à l'origine [de] changements' such as letter substitutions or elisions. Arrivé, 27-38 (p. 35).

[70] For an analysis of Derrida's deconstruction of Saussure's semiology, see James I. Porter, 'Saussure and Derrida on the Figure of Voice', *MLN*, 101.4 (1986), 871-894.

[71] Christopher Norris, *Deconstruction: Theory and Practice*, revised ed. (New York: Routledge, 1993), p. 28.

[72] Jacques Derrida, *De la grammatologie* (Paris: Minuit, 1967), p. 164. Hereafter cited as Derrida, *De la grammatologie*.

[73] Derrida, *De la grammatologie*, p. 162.

ordre abstrait'.[74] Words can only be explained through other words, and words only make sense in their difference from other words. Therefore, what Saussure calls 'signifié' is, according to Derrida, always in a position of 'signifiant', because any perception is already representation.

Whilst Rousseau hails 'voice' as primary and originary, Derrida argues that there is no possible way to determine a point of origin:

> Il n'y a jamais eu que de l'écriture; il n'y a jamais eu que des suppléments, des significations substitutives qui n'ont pu surgir que dans une chaîne de renvois différentiels, le 'réel' ne survenant, ne s'ajoutant qu'en prenant sens à partir d'une trace et d'un appel de supplément, etc.[75]

Voice was never 'originary', because it has always been pervaded by *différance*. 'Archi-écriture' is the precondition of the expression of meaning, and the first emanation of voice was already a supplement. In Derrida's view, voice produces both presence and absence: as one speaks, one is split between a speaking subject and a hearing subject ('s'entendre parler').[76] The movement of *différance* does not happen to a subject; rather, it produces the subject. One has a perception of, and understands oneself through the difference with oneself.

While in Derrida's view the truth behind voice is found in writing, Roland Barthes identifies the unique quality of voice in its 'grain'.[77] By contrast with the uniqueness of the grain of the voice, 'la langue' is unitary and collective. 'Parole', as the individual manifestation of language, deriving from 'archi-écriture' as the precondition of a linguistic system, is in fact in a sense not free. Indeed, in his inaugural lecture at the Collège de France, Barthes argues that 'la langue n'est ni réactionnaire ni progressiste; elle est tout simplement fasciste; car le fascisme, ce n'est pas d'empêcher de dire, c'est d'obliger à dire'. 'La langue', because it comprises of a system of rules, forces one rather than allows one to speak, and it is through repetition that a language becomes unitary and collective. For the voice to communicate to the other, to speak, it must, then, submit to language: 'je ne puis jamais parler qu'en ramassant ce qui *traîne* dans la langue'.[78]

---

[74] Derrida, *De la grammatologie*, p. 92.
[75] Derrida, *De la grammatologie*, p. 228.
[76] See Derrida, *La Voix et le phénomène: introduction au problème du signe dans la phénoménologie de Husserl*, 3d ed. (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2003), pp. 87-88. Hereafter cited as Derrida, *La Voix et le phénomène*.
[77] See Barthes, 'Le Grain de la voix', in *Œuvres complètes*, II, pp. 1436-1442.
[78] Barthes, 'Leçon', in *Œuvres Complètes*, III, pp. 801-814 (pp. 803-804).

In my discussion of voice, what Barthes describes as the act of 'ramasser ce qui *traîne* dans la langue' will be seen as a process of appropriation of diversity through repetition. While Barthes sees the grain of a voice as its unique quality, I will, then, explore the significance of the appropriation of diversity. I will understand voice as un-final and permanently being constructed, in listening as much as in speaking, in this respect following the Derridean view. A further critical conception of voice is useful here. Bakhtin insists on the critical role of the listener in the construction of meaning:

> When the listener perceives and understands the meaning […] of speech, he simultaneously takes an active, responsive attitude towards it. He agrees or disagrees (completely or partially), augments it, applies it, prepares for its execution, and so on […]. Any understanding is imbued with response and necessarily elicits it in one form or another: the listener becomes the speaker.[79]

In Bakhtinian dialogism, an utterance, as soon as it is spoken, does not belong to the speaker: it is taken in by the addressee, who, by understanding, interpreting and acting upon it, becomes in turn a speaker. The utterance is internalised by the addressee, who, through listening and understanding, takes part in constructing its meaning. Any utterance is dialogic, in relation not only to what comes after but also before: 'any utterance is a link in a very complexly organized chain of other utterances'.[80] According to Bakhtin, any speaker is firstly a respondent to previous utterances, and words exist in three aspects:

> as a neutral word of language, belonging to nobody; as an *other*'s word, which belongs to another person and is filled with echoes of the other's utterance; and, finally, as *my* word, for, since I am dealing with it in a particular situation, with a particular speech plan, it is already imbued with my expression.[81]

Any linguistic act is a momentary appropriation of words that belong to no-one, thus hypothetically to everyone (to an other, and to me). It is a reaction in the form of repetition through a re-organisation of others' words that already carry the meaning of previous utterances, and that can be appropriated as my words. Bakhtin makes a distinction between one's speech, which is the sum of one's utterances, and the unique speech experience of each individual, which

> is shaped and developed in continuous and constant interaction with others' individual utterances. This experience can be characterized to some degree as the process of *assimilation* – more or less creative – of others' words (and not the words of language). Our speech […] is filled with others' words, varying degrees of otherness or varying degrees of 'our-own-ness', varying degrees of awareness

---

[79] Bakhtin, 'The Problems of Speech Genre', pp. 60-102 (p. 68).
[80] Bakhtin, 'The Problems of Speech Genre', pp. 60-102 (p. 69).
[81] Bakhtin, 'The Problems of Speech Genre', pp. 60-102 (p. 88).

and detachment. These words of others carry with them their own expression, their own evaluative tone, which we assimilate, rework, and re-accentuate.[82]

As our speech is 'filled with others' words', one's speech experience is, then, not constructed directly in the assimilation of language, but of others' use of language, through a permanent interaction with the other in the form of dialogue. In Bakhtinian dialogism, every speaker appropriates and alters others' words (neutral words, belonging to no-one, but that they have heard from others) to create an utterance. One adjusts one's voice in relation to previous voices, to the addressee's voice, whether known or anticipated, and to one's own perception of one's voice ('s'entendre parler').

Following the Bakhtinian model of dialogism, voice is seen as the construction of individuality through the appropriation of diversity, that is to say the appropriation of other voices, as Jacques Bres and Aleksandra Nowakowska explain:

> Les discours dans lesquels il se reconnaît, les voix auxquelles il s'identifie, le locuteur tend à les effacer en tant que tels dans l'appropriation qu'il en fait, avec l'illusion constitutive qu'il en est l'origine énonciative, comme si sa *voix* saisissait la réalité des faits sans le filtre discursif des autres *voix*.[83]

When speaking, one uses others' words as if they were one's own, appropriates them, and gives the illusion of being the origin of the utterance. However no voice is originary, because all voices are constructed upon other voices, in a constant movement of deferral and differentiation. In Richard Aczel's words,

> far from being a guarantor of self-presence, voice is always an effect of perpetual differentiation and deferral; a composite, polyphonic, and "always already" quotational quality which allows of no final return to any recuperable originary source.[84]

In the present study it is this concept of 'voice' as permanently in the process of construction through the appropriation of diversity (others' voices, in speaking and in listening) that I will explore.

In Part I, I will analyse this notion of voice as a process of construction in relation to texts, in the construction of the vocality of *Voyage* and *Zazie*, that is to say the organisation of the voices within the text: the primary voices that are the narrators' and the secondary voices of the characters'. Narratology has provided useful tools to classify

---

82 Bakhtin, 'The Problems of Speech Genre', pp. 60-102 (p. 89).
83 Jacques Bres and Aleksandra Nowakowska, 'Dialogisme: du principe à la matérialité discursive', in *Le Sens et ses voix: dialogisme et polyphonie en langue et en discours*, ed. by Laurent Perrin and others (Metz: Université de Metz, 2006), pp. 21-48 (pp. 24-25). Hereafter cited as Bres and Nowakowska, pp. 21-48.
84 Richard Aczel, 'Understanding as Over-Hearing', *New Literary History*, 32:3 (2001), 597-617 (p. 599). Herefafter cited as Aczel, 'Understanding as Over-Hearing', 597-617.

and understand narrative voices. In *Figures III*, Gérard Genette, when defining narrative voices, is concerned with three questions: 'who speaks?', 'when?' and 'from where?'. He provides a model for analysing narrative voices in the text. The application of this model to *Voyage* and *Zazie* establishes Ferdinand Bardamu, the first-person narrator of *Voyage*, as extra-homodiegetic, and *Zazie*'s third-person narrator as extra-heterodiegetic, Bardamu being involved as a character in the story he is telling whilst *Zazie*'s narrator is not.[85] While Genette's classification is useful in terms of establishing the relationship between *histoire*, *récit* and *narration*, narratology's concerns with 'who speaks, when and from where?' limit the analysis of voice, as Aczel argues:

> The first step towards reopening (opening up) the concept of voice is to restore the realm of 'how' – tone, idiom, diction, speech-style – to a central position among the configuration of essential first questions of narrative voice (Genette's who, when and from where).[86]

Following Aczel's call for a 'qualitative discussion of voice' in fiction, my analysis of voice in *Voyage* and *Zazie* will place the question of 'how' in a prominent position alongside the classic narratological questions of 'who', 'when' and 'from where', in order to understand how textual voices are constructed to create the vocality of the text.

The identity of the narrative voice is not that of a simple, unified speaker, because the narrative voice, as Aczel argues, 'is a fundamentally *composite* entity: a specific *configuration* of voices. But it is, nonetheless, *actively* configured, and it is precisely in the traces of its (artistic) organization that its identity resides'.[87] Aczel's definition of the narrative voice confirms the idea of voice as a process of construction. The identity of the narrative voice resides in the traces of its construction of the vocality of the text, that is to say the organisation of the voices of the text. Unlike physical voices, whose linguistic choices can be unconscious, the configuration of different voices by the narrative voice is organised (or 'orchestrated', to use Bakhtin's term) into an artistic whole, which means that all linguistic choices are conscious.[88] This confirms why I do not take into account the writers of the texts, and instead analyse the figure of the narrator as the vocal instance responsible for the organisation of voices within the text.

---

[85] Gérard Genette, *Figures III* (Paris: Seuil, 1972), pp. 252-259.

[86] Richard Aczel, 'Hearing Voices in Narrative Texts', *New Literary History*, 29:3 (1998), 467-500 (p. 469). Hereafter cited as Aczel, 'Hearing Voices', 467-500.

[87] Aczel, 'Hearing Voices', 467-500 (p. 483).

[88] See Mikhail Mikhaïlovich Bakhtin, 'Discourse in the Novel', in *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, ed. by Michael Holquist, trans. by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), pp. 259-422 (pp. 291-292). Hereafter cited as Bakhtin, 'Discourse in the Novel', pp. 259-422.

The narrative voice, I suggest, has vocal control within the text. Vocal control is, I propose, the capacity of the voice to become aware of difference, and to exploit this difference with its linguistic choices. Vocal control is linked to mastery of language in relation to context. Bakhtin writes that

> the better our command of genres, the more freely we employ them, the more fully and clearly we reveal our own individuality in them (where this is possible and necessary), the more flexibly and precisely we reflect the unrepeatable situation of communication.[89]

Bakhtin defines speech genre as the result of the fact that 'each sphere in which language is used develops its own *relatively stable types* of these utterances'. Speech genres are types of utterances or situations governed by recognisable conventions or codes.[90] Bakhtin argues that the better one masters various speech genres, the better one communicates one's individuality. Individuality is best expressed in diversity because, rather than being unique (as Barthes's grain), it is made up of what Nietzsche, notably, has called 'the subject as multiplicity'.[91] Controlling one's voice means controlling the effect it has on the other. In this respect, we are dealing with classical rhetorical techniques in terms of the art of persuasion. Indeed, the voice that is in control is that which is capable of expressing exactly what it means in order to have the effect it wishes to have on the other. To be understood by the other, the voice must be capable of appropriating various speech genres, and of adapting itself to others' conventions.

The voice that is most in control is, thus, the voice with no stable vocal identity, that which is able to hide its individuality and to take on another's, because, aware that voice and language are constructed in difference, it shows a richer use of language and can 'put on' other voices to be best understood. The voice that is most control is, thus, the voice that is transferable, in the sense that it can best appropriate others and create the illusion of being original, natural. This idea of the potential transferability of voice is evoked by Scott. In relation to Barthes's comparison between the singers Panzéra (as a voice with grain) and Fischer-Dieskau (as a voice without grain) in 'Le Grain de la voix', Scott writes that

---

[89] Bakhtin, 'The Problems of Speech Genre', pp. 60-102 (p. 80).

[90] Bakhtin, 'The Problems of Speech Genre', pp. 60-102 (p. 60).

[91] 'The assumption of one single self is perhaps unnecessary; perhaps it is just as permissible to assume a multiplicity of subjects, whose interaction and struggle is the basis of our thought and our consciousness in general? A kind of aristocracy of "cells" in which dominion resides? To be sure, an aristocracy of equals, used to ruling jointly and understanding how to command? *My hypothesis*: the subject as multiplicity'. Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Will to Power*, trans. by Walter Kaufmann and R. J. Hollingdale, ed. by Walter Kaufmann (New York: Random, Vintage, 1968), p. 270.

the voice is caught between the twin appeals of Panzéra and Fischer-Dieskau, between a voice which simply comes from the body and the voice which is ventriloquial, transferable, able to express any self or any otherness, between a voice which inhabits words and a voice which delivers them.[92]

Panzéra's voice is characterised by Barthes as having a 'grain' that makes it instantly individual and unique. Fischer-Dieskau on the other hand is considered to be without individuality, because his voice does not show a constant and instantly recognisable grain. Fischer-Dieskau however has a 'transferable' voice, that is to say that he is capable of changing, and adapting his voice. Panzéra, due to his unique 'grain', is trapped in his own voice, and condemned to be himself, whilst Fiescher-Dieskau is able to 'express any self or any otherness', like a ventriloquist. The voice that is most in control is the voice that the other will have the impression of understanding best, of relating to, and of engaging the illusion of hearing themselves in the other's voice. The voice that is most in control has no stable vocal identity; it is a ventriloquist's voice.[93]

This model of ventriloquism, central to my analysis of the construction of voices and the dynamic of vocal control in *Voyage* and *Zazie*, inherently problematises issues of 'individual' voice, control, power, origin, presence and absence. Ventriloquism serves as a useful metaphor for the relationship between the narrator's and the characters' voices in a text, not only in free indirect speech but also in the representation of dialogues:

> The most obvious example of the ventriloquism effect in narrative is the representation in a narrative text, by its narrator, of what is said (or thought) by its characters – where the primary voice of the narrator, that is to say, presents another, secondary voice, that of a character, speaking 'through' it.[94]

The narrator is the ventriloquist, the primary voice that encompasses, intones and orchestrates the secondary voices, those of the characters. Responsible for the vocality of the text, the narrator/ventriloquist orchestrates the voices of the characters to achieve a certain vocal effect. Narrators need characters to construct their own voice as

---

[92] Scott, p. 93.
[93] Aczel goes further than this and uses the Bakhtinian model of dialogism to argue that, 'if, as Bakhtin suggests, every utterance is permeated with *heteroglossia* – the tongues of others, with which every utterance is "overpopulated" – every act of speech is an act of ventriloquism'. Aczel, 'Understanding as Over-Hearing', 597-617 (p. 599). I understand a ventriloquial voice not merely as a voice that performs an act of ventriloquism (since, following Aczel's use of the Bakhtinian model of dialogism, all voices would then be ventriloquial), but rather as a voice that is aware of, develops and uses its ventriloquial capacity.
[94] Patrick O'Neill, *Fictions of Discourse: Reading Narrative Theory* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996), p. 59.

narrative, in the same way as ventriloquist and dummy are interdependent. The ventriloquist is defined by the dummy, which would not exist without him or her.[95]

Derrida's notion of 's'entendre parler' and his idea of voice as producer of both presence and absence are taken to an extreme in ventriloquism. Indeed, as the ventriloquist hears his/her voice(s) through the dummy, s/he is literally, physically split into speaker and listener. When one hears oneself speak, one becomes aware of oneself as a divided subject, and has a new understanding of oneself through the difference from oneself as a unique subject. The construction of voice results from the awareness of the multiplicity of others' voices, and the capacity to take on another voice. The construction of voice in diversity mirrors the multiplicity and the division of the self. The ventriloquist's voice, because it is made of plurivocality, is a vocal actualisation of identity as plural. The dummy stands as another self, or another possible self of the ventriloquist. Goldblatt suggests that

> being outside the self, in a Nietzschean manner, is a way of extending, even empowering the status quo self, of recognizing other voices in ourselves and of problematizing the idea that the self is located in the behaviour of a single mind or body.[96]

Ventriloquism is a literal case of 'being outside the self', and a vocal extension of the self. Rather than being fixed and a whole, the self vacillates between two or more possible vocal actualisations of it.

Following this interpretation of ventriloquism implies taking the ventriloquial exchange as a conversation between two or more parts of a split self. However, ventriloquism is also closely linked with the idea of control not only of one's self but also of others. The ventriloquist can usurp voices due to their gift for vocal reproduction. The model of ventriloquism, in this sense, illustrates that as voice is constructed in the appropriation of others' voices, it also implies the possibility of expropriating their voice from the other, as Bakhtin has shown:

> Language is not a neutral medium that passes freely and easily into the private property of the speaker's intentions; it is populated – overpopulated – with the intentions of others. Expropriating it, forcing it to submit to one's own intentions and accents, is a difficult and complicated process.[97]

---

[95] Ventriloquism originally existed without puppet or dummy; however this study uses modern ventriloquism as its metaphor, the relationship between ventriloquist and dummy. For a history of ventriloquism, see Steven Connor, *Dumbstruck: A Cultural History of Ventriloquism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000). Hereafter cited as Connor.

[96] David Goldblatt, *Art and Ventriloquism*, critical commentary by Garry L. Hagberg (London: Routledge, 2006), p. 49. Hereafter cited as Goldblatt.

[97] Bakhtin, 'Discourse in the Novel', pp. 259-422 (p. 294).

The ventriloquist can expropriate another's voice by, for instance, talking instead of them. Due to the potential effect it can have on another's voice, the ventriloquial voice problematises issues not only of vocal control, but also of vocal power. Indeed, Steven Connor argues that 'sound, and as the body's means of producing itself as sound, the voice, will be associated with the dream and the exercise of power'.[98] Connor notes that

> [the ventriloquial hero] combines emptiness as a character with an absolute power. Indeed, his emptiness, his polyphonic perversity, *is* his power.

> The ventriloquial voice is powerful both because it is able to retain its individuality and because it is able to lose it. It is in fact most inimitably itself in its capacity to dissolve into in simulations [*sic*].[99]

The ventriloquial voice is self-transformative. It has abnegated any stable vocal identity because it is constructed in the permanent oscillation between voices, including others' voices. Following Connor, I suggest that the ventriloquist's power comes from their capacity to dissolve their voice into others, to erase the characteristic features – such as accent, intonation or expression, the 'how?' or the vocality – and the grain of their individual voice. Their voice is, as any other, constructed in dialogism, but they are, if they wish, able to take the violence of expropriation to an extreme, by usurping the other's voice and using it to talk instead of them, or 'through' them, and eventually silence them. They are also able, if they wish, to create chaos and cacophony.

The ability to take on other voices that ventriloquism entails can, then, potentially be used in two different ways: in relation to oneself, to mirror the multiplicity of the self, or in relation to the other, to dissolve that self through usurpation of other, and others', voices. The different outcomes of the ventriloquial model will enable me to explore the problems and challenges that underscore notions of voice, construction, control and power in *Voyage* and *Zazie* and, significantly, how these can be transposed (or fail to be transposed) upon adaptation into another medium.

The way in which *Voyage* and *Zazie* deploy (narrative) voices as a means of controlling both the text and its orality reveals differing standpoints that fuel the analysis of the present study. *Voyage* is Bardamu's retrospective monologue about his experiences during the First World War, in colonial Africa, in America and as a doctor in France, all environments that he has failed to understand. Bardamu narrates the text, ventriloquises all the other characters, and his voice is the only truly adaptable one within the novel. My analysis aims to demonstrate how both tendencies of

---

[98] Connor, p. 23.
[99] Connor, p. 320; p. 330.

ventriloquism are present in the text: as metaphor for power, as well as the vocalisation of another possible self, through the figure of Robinson. I seek to explore how Bardamu uses vocal control in the relationship between his voice and the voices of others, and whether or not he achieves vocal power.

By contrast, I will explore how *Zazie*'s narrator strives for polyphony. Following Bakhtin, Jacques Bres and Aleksandra Nowakowska define polyphony as follows:

> La polyphonie – et ceci en accord avec la conception musicale du terme – les présente [les voix] à égalité, sans que l'une ne prenne le pas sur l'autre […] [La polyphonie] problématise la production du sens, voire, au dire de certains, la brouille, de sorte que la polyphonie est au risque de la cacophonie.[100]

Similarly, it is possible to read *Zazie* as a text in which there is no hierarchy of voices, which results in potential cacophony and chaos. *Zazie*'s narrator sporadically abdicates the control that is inherent to the function of narrator, which is to organise the voices in the text. *Zazie*'s world is a chaotic world where everything is unstable: language, gender, place, names and voices. What happens to textual voices when polyphony turns into cacophony, and when the ventriloquist's voice risks dissolving and erasing any stable vocal identity? The apparent loss of power or control of voice forms a central element of my analysis of the novel.

After analysing each of the novels in turn, comparative questions then emerge: What can the model of ventriloquism bring to the analysis of the vocality of *Voyage* and *Zazie*? Do Bardamu's and *Zazie*'s narrator's uses of ventriloquism differ, and if so why? How do they construct the vocality of the text, in the relationship between their narrative voice and the voices of the characters, and to what purpose? Do they fail, or succeed? Can the characters gain vocal control, or even vocal power? Are the powers of voice only related to violence on the other? The answers to these questions, which I address in the closing section of Part I, then constitute the basis of Part II which turns its focus towards the further layers of complexity of voices in adaptation. After having established how the ventriloquial model works in each of the novels, I move on to explore how the ventriloquial transposes into other media, taking as its starting point the issue of whether or not the reader is a further ventriloquist.

An adaptation is the concretisation of a reading, that is to say of a reader's interpretation and appropriation of the text. The role of the reader in the construction of the text is highlighted by Aczel:

---

[100] Bres and Nowakowska, pp. 21-48 (p. 24).

> The classical Genettean question of 'who speaks?' in a narrative needs to be if not supplanted then at least supplemented by the question of how narrators, characters, and other vocal instances in texts are constructed by the reader to speak.[101]

The vocality of the text, constructed by the organisation of its voices, is available for the reader to actualise with their own voice, which is historically and culturally situated. Aczel points out that the reader, in a sense, becomes a ventriloquist by intoning the voices in the text through his/her own.[102] The vocal construction does not end with the completion of the text, but it is permanent, and renewed with every reading. By understanding the text through his/her own voice, the reader adds a vocal supplement to it, thus further deferring the point of origin of the voice, which is already a trace, because it is absent from the text. Clive Scott argues that

> all written texts are no longer spoken; they are texts without an originating voice, to which readers can, temporarily, only *lend* their voices; but what is produced is the voice of language/text rather than the language/text that has issued from a voice.[103]

Every reader adds a vocal supplement by temporarily substituting their own historically situated voice for the (absent) originating voice of the text. No reading is definitive, as it takes part in the always renewed actualisation and construction of the voice of the text.

Adaptation further problematises issues of deferral and differentiation. An adaptation is constructed in relation to a reading of the primary work and also, in some cases, of previous adaptations. *Voyage* had been read by Michel Simon and Pierre Brasseur before Luchini did his reading, and by all three of them before Podalydès conducted his. *Zazie* had already been transposed into the visual field by director Louis Malle and Jacques Carelman before cartoonist Clément Oubrerie. Moreover, adapters do more than temporarily lend their voices to the text, as their reading produces a concrete result. To the act of reading, that is to say the actualisation of the vocality of the text by one's voice, a further process is added through adaptation, that of transposing the vocality of the text from one signifying system to another.

The secondary work is a supplement to the primary one, in the sense that it would not exist without it, but it also casts a new light upon it by renewing it, and re-opening

---

[101] Richard Aczel, 'Commentary: Throwing Voices', *New Literary History*, 32:3 (2001), 703-706 (p. 703).
[102] Aczel, 'Understanding as Over-Hearing', 597-617 (p. 607). Goldblatt uses the metaphor of ventriloquism to reflect on the way artworks 'speak' to people. In Saul Ostrow's words, 'Goldblatt's proposition is that the work of art comes to embody not the intent of the artist nor does it speak for itself, but actually comes to be the device through which the viewer speaks'. Saul Ostrow, 'Preface', in Golblatt, pp. xiii-xvi (p. xv).
[103] Scott, p. 86.

the perception of the text. Adaptation reshapes the reader's experience by provoking comparison and new interpretation, thus differentiation and deferral. Moreover, the adaptation of a text into another medium potentially reconfigures the relationship between the textual voices, thus the dynamic of vocal control, whether through erasure of voice if the chosen field of transposition is 'silent' (such as in visual adaptation) or through physical actualisation of voice if a 'spoken' form of adaptation (such as cinema or theatre).

The complexities and the breadth of the concept of adaptation, which is central to the present study, have only very recently received enough academic scrutiny for adaptation studies to become a discipline in itself.[104] Indeed, in the introduction to the first issue of the journal *Adaptation*, launched in 2008, the editors point out that 'up until a decade ago, adaptation was normally regarded as an area unworthy of sustained academic study'. The former disdain of adaptations as 'crude usurpations of literary masterpieces that threatened both literacy and the book itself' resulted in the prominence in studies of adaptations of the fidelity discourse.[105] This fidelity discourse has been dismissed by adaptation scholars, for instance by Linda Hutcheon, who argues that

> the rhetoric of "fidelity" is less than adequate to discuss the process of adaptation. Whatever the motive, from the adapter's perspective, adaptation is an act of appropriating or salvaging, and this is always a double process of interpreting and then creating something new.[106]

Fidelity discourse is problematic, not least because the source text is itself always inscribed in intertextuality, and as such it cannot be designated as the sole originary source of the adaptation. However, Kate Griffiths suggests that in spite of the 'revisionist voices' in adaptation studies, fidelity 'as an issue, will not quite go away', because 'fidelity is, and should be, an issue for those who adapt'.[107] Indeed, the adaptation always engages in a complex intertextual (and intermedial) relationship with its source text. The problem of the notion of fidelity in adaptation is particularly relevant to the present study, first of all because fidelity discourse influences the

---

[104] For a review of adaptation studies, see Thomas Leitch, 'Adaptation Studies at a Crossroads', *Adaptation*, 1:1 (2008), 63-77.

[105] Deborah Cartmell and others, 'Introduction to *Adaptation*', *Adaptation*, 1:1 (2008), 1-4 (p. 1).

[106] Hutcheon, p. 20.

[107] Kate Griffiths, *Emile Zola and the Artistry of Adaptation* (London: Legenda, 2009), p. 6. Apart from Hutcheon and Sanders, the revisionist voices that criticise the fidelity discourse are also those of Brian McFarlane and Kamilla Elliott. See Brian McFarlane, *From Novel to Film: An Introduction to the Theory of Adaptation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), and Kamilla Elliott, *Rethinking the Novel/Film Debate* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

reception of an adaptation, as we will see with the chosen adaptations of *Voyage* and *Zazie*. Secondly, in relation to voice, the notion of fidelity in adaptation further problematises the question of the origin of voice, which I define as constructed as in the appropriation of diversity rather than as individual and original.

In order to understand what happens to literary voices when they are transposed into another medium, I shall analyse the adaptations *as adaptations*, following the theoretical model outlined by Hutcheon:

> To deal with adaptations *as adaptations* is to think of them as [...] inherently 'palimpsestuous' works, haunted at all times by their adapted texts. [...] Although adaptations are also aesthetic objects in their own right, it is only as inherently double- or multilaminated works that they can be theorized *as adaptations*.[108]

Considering the adaptations of *Voyage* and *Zazie as adaptations* rather than as autonomous works means examining how they engage in intertextual dialogue with Céline's and Queneau's original texts. It is fruitful to use Genette's concept of 'palimpsest' with regard to adaptation. 'Palimpsest' is linked to 'hypertextuality'. Genette defines a hypertext as 'tout texte dérivé d'un texte antérieur par transformation simple ([…] *transformation* tout court) ou par transformation indirecte: […] *imitation*'.[109] Genette argues that a hypertext 'nous invite à une lecture relationnelle', which can be characterised as a 'lecture *palimpsestueuse*'.[110]

The 'palimpsestuous' specificity of an adaptation lies in its extensive and acknowledged engagement with the 'original' work or works. Hutcheon uses the notion of palimpsest with regard to the pleasure it procures for the viewer, as the 'ongoing dialogue with the past, for that is what an adaptation means for audiences, creates the doubled pleasure of the palimpsest: more than one text is experienced – and knowingly so'.[111] The viewer finds pleasure in the layering of the text as palimpsest, provoking, in Sanders's words, 'juxtaposed readings'.[112] Experiencing an adaptation *as an adaptation* implies 'a conceptual flipping back and forth between the work we know and the work

---

[108] Hutcheon, p. 6.

[109] Gérard Genette, *Palimpsestes: la littérature au second degré*, Collection Poétique (Paris: Seuil, 1982), p. 14. Hereafter cited as Genette, *Palimpsestes*. As Genette points out, every text is a hypertext to some extent: '[l']hypertextualité] est évidemment un aspect universel (au degré près) de la littérarité: il n'est pas d'œuvre littéraire qui, à quelque degré et selon les lectures, n'en évoque quelque autre et, en ce sens, toutes les œuvres sont hypertextuelles'. However works such as parody or pastiche 'le sont plus (ou plus manifestement, massivement et explicitement) que d'autres'. Genette, *Palimpsestes*, p. 16.

[110] Genette, *Palimpsestes*, p. 452. Genette borrows the term 'lecture *palimpsestueuse*' from Philippe Lejeune, scholar specialist of autobiography.

[111] Hutcheon, p. 116.

[112] Sanders, p. 25.

we are experiencing'.[113] Pleasure, then, comes for the viewer from his or her involvement through his or her memory of the original work or works.[114]

The notion of the palimpsest signals the existence of traces of another, earlier form that has been at least partially erased to make room for the new one. In adaptation, it is in fact 'the very endurance and survival of the source text' that enable the ongoing process of adaptation as experience.[115] The source text, though it survives, does not of course survive 'intact', as it is supplemented with the new text, and becomes an origin in the Derridean sense of trace. This idea of (partial) erasure, and the remaining traces that ensue, echoes the notion of voice researched in the present study as ongoing construction, in a permanent movement of deferral and differentiation (*différance*). Adaptation is here, then, understood in the sense of an evolution of the source text, as repetition with variation.

In adaptation studies, there is a strong focus on the relationship between literature and film. This somewhat limited focus is challenged by Linda Hutcheon, who considers as adaptations works as varied as video games or theme parks, and Julie Sanders, who supplements the term adaptation with the broader concept of appropriation. The fresh contribution that the present study makes to the field of adaptation studies lies in the fact that I do not focus on one particular medium, such as cinema, but consider adaptations in a range of fields, including illustration, comic book, film, and recording (audio-book, stand-alone recordings, and theatre). The chosen medium greatly influences the adaptive process, and for my analysis it is important to understand the specificity of the notion of 'voice' in relation to each medium, especially for the implications of control or power that this entails.

Comics studies, like adaptation studies, is a recent academic discipline in its own right.[116] As such, a great proportion of works have primarily focused on justifying the

---

[113] Hutcheon, p. 139.

[114] Of course, the experience is different if the viewer is not familiar with the source text, or is not aware that he or she is watching an adaptation. Hutcheon then differentiates between 'knowing' and 'unknowing' audiences. She prefers the term 'knowing' to 'the more common descriptors of learned and competent' (Hutcheon, p. 120). This has resonances with Eco's differentiation of the 'naive addressee' from the 'critical addressee' with regard to intertextuality and 'quotation' in post-modern aesthetics. See Umberto Eco, 'Innovation & Repetition: Between Modern and Postmodern Aesthetics', *Daedalus*, 134:4 (2005), 191-207. Hereafter cited as Eco, 191-207.

[115] Sanders, p. 25.

[116] Laurence Grove sees as an 'anomaly' the fact that *bande dessinée* studies (by contrast to comics studies) is not a better established academic discipline. Despite the status of *bande dessinée* as a 'neuvième art' and the institutionalisation of the form in France and Belgium, 'it is virtually a taboo subject in French

importance of comic books as a field of study.[117] Scholars have also strived to establish both a definition and the semiotics of the medium.[118] While the notion of 'voice' has been an important concept in literary studies, its specificity in relation to comic books has not been theorised. 'Voice' in comic book is linked to the relationship between image and text, which is also prominent in illustration. Harry Morgan (2003) establishes the difference between comic books and illustration in the fact that in illustration the image supplements specific aspects of the text, while in comic books the narrative is expressed through the sequential relationship between panels (with image and, though not always, text).[119] Due to the supplementary nature of the image in illustration, it has been subjected to the same kind of fidelity discourse as the one seen in adaptation studies, for example by Edward Hodnett in his *Image and Text: Studies in the Illustration of English Literature*.[120] Christophe Martin (2005), on the other hand, explores the potential semiotic complexity in the relationship between the text and its supplemented image in illustration.[121] The difference between the image-text relationship in comic book and illustration has implications with regard to voice. Thierry Smolderen's recent work on the evolution of the role of the speech balloon in relation to the label (2006, 2009) explores the potential for comic books to create the pretence of speech in representing a situated speech-act that works autonomously in the image, making it a sound image.[122] The implication of Smolderen's work for the present study is, then, that characters in a comic book can have an autonomous voice, while in illustration the characters in the

---

universities'. Laurence Grove, *Comics in French: The European Bande Dessinée in Context* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2010), p. 7. Hereafter cited as Grove.

[117] For example, the point of Rocco Versaci's analysis is to show that 'through their emphasis on individual, stylized art and expressive layouts, [the comic books on which he focuses his analysis] celebrate the capacities of the comic book and help establish the literary and artistic value of that medium'. Rocco Versaci, *This Book Contains Graphic Language: Comics as Literature* (New York: Continuum, 2007), p. 199. Hereafter cited as Versaci.

[118] See for instance Thierry Groensteen, *Système de la bande dessinée* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1999), hereafter cited as Groensteen; Henry Morgan, *Principes des littératures dessinées* (Angoulême: Editions de l'An 2, 2003), hereafter cited as Morgan; Douglas Wolk, *Reading Comics: How Graphic Novels Work and What They Mean* (Cambridge, MA: Da Capo Press, 2007). For an overview and assessment of contemporary scholarship, as well as possible routes for the development of the discipline, see Greg M. Smith, 'Surveying the World of Contemporary Comics Scholarship: A Conversation', *Cinema Studies*, 50:3 (2011), 135-147.

[119] Morgan, pp. 87-125.

[120] Edward Hodnett, *Image and Text: Studies in the Illustration of English Literature* (London: Scolar Press, 1982). Hereafter cited as Hodnett.

[121] Christophe Martin, *'Dangereux suppléments': l'illustration du roman en France au dix-huitième siècle* (Louvain: Peeters, 2005). Hereafter cited as Martin, *'Dangereux suppléments'*.

[122] Thierry Smolderen, 'Of Labels, Loops and Bubbles: Solving the Historical Puzzle of the Speech Balloon', *Comic Art*, 8 (2006), 90-112, hereafter cited as Smolderen, 'Of Labels, Loops and Bubbles', 90-112; *Naissances de la bande dessinée: de William Hogarth à Winsor McCay* (Brussels: Les Impressions Nouvelles, 2009), hereafter cited as Smolderen, *Naissances de la bande dessinée*.

image are mostly silent, and even if they do speak, their voice can only be understood in relation to the text that surrounds and deciphers the image.

Unlike in comic book and illustration studies, voice is a well-researched concept in film studies, partly as a result of a 'growing interest in the subject of film sound and an increasing sounds consciousness among film writers and scholars'.[123] Two seminal studies of voice in film are Michel Chion's 1982 *La Voix au cinéma* and Kaja Silverman's 1988 *The Acoustic Mirror: The Female Voice in Psychoanalysis in Cinema*. Chion's *La Voix au cinéma* deploys a psychoanalytic approach and focuses in particular on cases of voice-over and voice-off, that is to say when the source of the voice is not visible by the viewer. In his analysis, Chion introduced the terms of 'la voix acousmatique' (a voice whose source is not seen and derives power therefrom) and 'le vococentrisme' (the dominance of the voice over all other sounds in the viewer's perception).[124] Chion's analysis of the voice in film was critised as phallo-centric by Kaja Silverman, who in *The Acoustic Mirror* adopted a psychoanalytic and feminist approach and argued that women are relegated as objects in classic cinema and that as a result they cannot express their subjectivity.[125] Recently, Britta H. Sjogren has challenged Silverman's pessimistic view of female subjectivity in cinema and has argued that women can in fact speak in classic cinema.[126] The complexity of the relationship between voices and bodies in film is partly due to the heterogeneity of the channels of sound and image, which has been analysed notably by Gilles Deleuze in *Cinéma 2: l'image-temps*.[127] This heterogeneity has led Rick Altman to propose the model of ventriloquism for the theorisation of the image-to-sound relations in film.[128] Notions of heterogeneity between sound and image, the power of voice in film, and cinema as ventriloquism will be crucial for my analysis of the transposition of textual voices in Malle's *Zazie*.

---

[123] Martin Shingler, 'Fasten Your Seatbelts and Prick Up Your Ears: The Dramatic Human Voice in Film', *Scope: An Online Journal of Film & TV Studies*, 5 (2006) <http://www.scope.nottingham.ac.uk/ article.php?issue=5&id=128> [accessed 07/02/2011].

[124] Michel Chion, *La Voix au cinéma* (Paris: Seuil, 2005). Hereafter cited as Chion.

[125] Kaja Silverman, *The Acoustic Mirror: The Female Voice in Psychoanalysis and Cinema* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1988). Hereafter cited as Silverman.

[126] Britta H. Sjogren, *Into the Vortex: Female Voice and Paradox in Film* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2006). Hereafter cited as Sjogren.

[127] Gilles Deleuze, *Cinéma 2: l'image-temps* (Paris: Minuit, 1985). Hereafter cited as Deleuze.

[128] Rick Altman, 'Moving Lips: Cinema as Ventriloquism', *Yale French Studies*, 60 (1980), 67-79. Hereafter cited as Altman, 'Moving Lips', 67-79. Altman's article is part of a special issue of *Yale French Studies* on sound in film, showing a shift in film studies from a focus on the image to recognition of the importance of sound in film. Also in this volume, see Mary Anne Doane, 'The Voice in the Cinema: The Articulation of Body and Space', *Yale French Studies*, 60 (1980), 33-50. Hereafter cited as Doane, 33-50. Altman is an leading theorist of sound in film; see for instance his book *Sound Theory, Sound Practice* (New York: Routledge, 1992).

Finally, my analysis of actors' recordings of *Voyage*, which I gather under the name of 'vocal adaptations', does not relate to a defined academic field, due to the variety of media (stand-alone recording, audio-book, TV film and recorded theatre), but rather to voice studies in general. Of particular relevance to the analysis of the actors' uses of their voice will be the Barthesian distinction between the voice with grain, which has individuality because it bears the traces of the body, and the voice without grain, to which Scott attributes a ventriloquial capacity.

For each adaptation of my corpus, I will analyse the transposition of the vocality of either *Voyage* and *Zazie* examined in Part I of the present study. The order of the chapters of Part II is structured by genre, rather than chronologically or by novel, following an evolution from 'silent' media that combine text and image (illustration and comic book), to sound media that combine soundtrack and imagetrack (film), or that consist of the soundtrack alone (recordings, audio-book, CD recording of stage performance).

In Tardi's illustration of *Voyage*, Bardamu's monologue is juxtaposed with his devocalisation in the silent images. I will examine Tardi's illustration as a cross-media artwork which allows a dialogue between visual and textual, and analyse whether the juxtaposition of text and image reconfigures the vocality of Bardamu's monologue, and whether it challenges Bardamu's narrative voice. In his illustration, Tardi appropriates *Voyage* as a historically situated reader and an author using the specificity of his chosen medium. I will explore how Tardi's illustration, in turn, affects the reading process, and to what extent it participates in the permanent and un-final dialogic construction of the source text.

I shall then compare Carelman's illustration and Oubrerie's comic book adaptation of *Zazie*, focusing my analysis on the transposition of the cacophony of the original text. Carelman's illustration is strongly inscribed in the fidelity discourse, while Oubrerie advocates a process of complete appropriation of the source text by the adapter. As Carelman's illustration attempts to faithfully transpose the cacophony and experimentality of Queneau's text, what is the relationship between image and text (the textual surroundings, as well as text in the speech balloons) in his illustration? Can the characters gain vocal control? By contrast with Carelman's illustration, Oubrerie's comic book shows a certain uniformisation of the cacophony of the original text, and offers an adaptation that is primarily aimed at a young audience. How does the substitution of

cacophony and chaos with uniformisation affect the narrator's and the characters' voices? Through the comparison between Carelman's and Oubrerie's works, I will explore to what extent the adapters' choices, their historical situation and use of their chosen medium can shape their transposition of the source text, and to what extent these factors can potentially empower or weaken the textual voices.

In order to understand what happens to *Zazie*'s textual voices when they become cinematic voices, I shall focus my analysis on the most striking feature of voices in Malle's film, which is their post-synchronisation. Can the voices gain a body in the transposition from text to a medium that combines the heterogeneous elements of the visual with sound? I will examine how Malle's film relates to the notion of voice as construction and to the model of ventriloquism, and the relationship between voice and gesture, and between voice, control and power.

Finally, in my analysis of Simon's, Brasseur's, Luchini's and Podalydès's readings and performances of *Voyage*, I will explore to what extent the differences between the actors' vocal abilities and qualities shape their vocal adaptations of the text. How do the actors render the ventriloquism of Bardamu's narrative voice? Is Bardamu empowered by being read out loud? And does the presence of a live audience in Luchini's play influence the vocalisation of Bardamu? Taking into account the historical situation of the actors, their relationship to the figure of Céline, and the differences between media (stand-alone recording, audio-book, TV film, theatre), I will examine how the actors' performative choices differ, how this influences their vocalisation of Bardamu, and the un-final construction of his narrative voice.

My analysis of the concept of 'voice', firstly within the texts and secondly in their adaptations, aims to reveal, in detail, how 'voice' as both a concept and a reality, remains in a permanent process of construction. By selecting a corpus that presents modes of transposition of ventriloquial power, I aim to show how voice is always unfinished, always unfulfilled, because it is constructed in dialogism. Voice uses other voices, perhaps violently, to understand how to organise linguistic signs and best achieve an effect on the others and the world. Voice best mirrors the self as multiplicity in the vacillation between different voices, like a ventriloquist, at the risk of dissolution. The construction of physical voices is echoed in the construction of textual voices and their adaptation: reading, and adaptation even more so, exemplifies that voice is a permanent construction, always being re-shaped, with every new interpretation adding a supplement to the vocality of the text, in the permanent movement of differentiation

and deferral. Textual voices in adaptation are changed, transposed, interpreted, and potentially challenged. They are re-invented, and re-vocalised. My analysis of voice in *Voyage* and *Zazie*, texts and adaptations, seeks, then, to explore how textual vocality is created, and how it is actualised and transposed through and into other voices in adaptation.

Part I: Textual Voices

Chapter 1: Textual Voices in *Voyage au bout de la nuit*

The orchestration of the textual voices in *Voyage* and the construction of the voice of the first-person narrator, Ferdinand Bardamu (who is also the protagonist), reveal issues of vocal control and vocal power which will become the central focus of this chapter. The construction of the Célinian narrative voice has been examined by Godard in *Poétique de Céline*, using the Bakhtinian model of dialogism, and in order to situate my analysis I shall first give an overview of Godard's work, before explaining how my analysis will differ from his.

The two main Bakhtinian concepts used by Godard are 'plurilingualism', 'le *plurilinguisme* des langues nationales ou des usages ou parlers qui coexistent entre elles', and 'plurivocality', 'le *plurivocalisme* ou *dialogisme* dont peuvent se charger beaucoup de ces usages lorsqu'ils se font discours ou "voix"'.[1] According to Bakhtin, within a national language there is a tension arising from the dynamics of unitary language and heteroglossia. Unitary language embodies the centripetal forces which homogenise and centralise language, and organise language uses into a hierarchy, while heteroglossia is characterised by the centrifugal forces which decentralise, and create internal differentiation and stratification within a national language.[2] As I outlined in the introduction, *Voyage* is a text that throws the relationship between spoken and written language into sharp relief, and the tension between spoken and written French is a central aspect of the plurilingualism of all of Céline's novels. For instance, Godard analyses how Céline uses juxtaposition, while subordination is more traditionally used in written language. This technique leads to a

> réconciliation […] entre les deux formes de notre langue [spoken and written] que nous n'employons qu'alternativement, non pas seulement pour des raisons culturelles, sociales, historiques ou idéologiques, mais aussi parce que chacune est un système. En jouant sur les éléments communs, en subvertissant certains qui font partie de l'un pour les faire servir à l'évocation de l'autre, Céline met fin à ce divorce.[3]

While the literary orality of *Voyage* is arguably the most prominent aspect of its plurilingualism, Godard identifies the variety of French ('les français') used by Céline,

---

[1] Godard, p. 126.
[2] Bakhtin, 'Discourse in the Novel', pp. 259-422 (pp. 270-272).
[3] Godard, p. 51.

sporadically in *Voyage*, and more extensively in his other texts. These 'languages' are differentiated from each other from a diachronic or synchronic point of a view, and include popular language, army language, medical language, and literary and philosophical language.[4] Following Bakhtin, Godard characterises them as 'languages', for instance 'langues de métier ou d'activité et de vie spécialisées', under which category army language and medical language fall. These 'languages' have their own proper lexicon and, sometimes, syntax, such as popular language. Godard argues that each of the 'languages' used in *Voyage*, and Céline's texts in general, is 'un timbre de l'orchestration' of the Célinian narrative voice: 'toute une série d'effets sentis comme les plus "céliniens" naissent du choc de ces vocabulaires ou du partage du discours entre eux'.[5]

Godard's study links the plurilingualism of Céline's texts to what he terms 'le plurivocalisme célinien', the plurivocality of the narrative voice. The narrative voice uses 'languages' *as* voices in the Bakhtinian sense, that it to say as the incarnation of an interpretative position within heteroglossia. Plurivocality refers to the way the narrative voice is constructed out of the voices of others, and to the way it positions itself in relation to these voices. In what Godard characterises as plurivocality of opposition, 'chaque mot est employé contre le mot de l'autre, comme une agression'. This can be seen for example in the use of oral and 'popular' language in opposition to written 'bourgeois' language. Plurivocality of intimacy, by contrast, implies a certain adhesion to the other's voice and, possibly, internal conflict arising from this adhesion.[6] According to Godard, the 'intense' plurivocality of the Célinian narrative voice, which uses 'différents français concurremment, et parmi eux surtout ceux qui sont des voix', contributes to the construction of the narrative voice as 'insaisissable ou irrepérable', but paradoxically 'unique et une plus encore que multiple, [ce] qui fait la force de l'œuvre'.[7]

Godard, then, uses the Bakhtinian model of dialogism to analyse the dynamics and tensions at play in the construction of the Célinian narrative voice out of other voices, and I will explore how this relates to the relationship between the narrator's and

---

[4] Concerning 'popular language', Kristeva for instance writes of 'la segmentation particulière, "populaire" de la phrase célinienne', of which 'les exemples sont innombrables dans les premiers romans de Céline, en particulier dans le *Voyage*'. Kristeva, p. 228. For uses of other 'languages', see also for instance Racelle-Latin's analysis of 'l'introduction d'une poétique "argotique"' (Racelle-Latin, 53-77) in *Voyage*, and Boissieu's analysis of 'faits "littéraires" ou archaïsants' in *Voyage* (Boissieu, 33-51).
[5] Godard, pp. 83-84.
[6] Godard, p. 131.
[7] Godard, p. 181.

the characters' voices. That the uniqueness of the Célinian narrative voice is the result of its multiplicity echoes the notion of a ventriloquial voice. It is primarily in the addition of the ventriloquial model to Bakhtinian dialogism, and in the analysis of the causes and consequences of this ventriloquial ability that my analysis will depart from Godard's. Moreover, I will understand voice in a more 'literal' way than Godard (and Bakhtin), by including aspects such as the volume of voices in the text. In order to analyse the construction of the narrative voice of *Voyage*, I will first examine the voices at the intradiegetic level, focusing on their physical qualities (their tone, their volume) in order to establish the 'vocal atmosphere' of the text. In order to identify what leads Bardamu to construct his narrative voice, I will examine his relationship, as a character, with the others' voices, firstly in terms of volume, quantity, and use of language (focusing on issues of vocal control), and secondly in terms of his speech experience, in the dialogue between voices. I will then focus on the ventriloquial narrative voice, by analysing how and to what purpose Bardamu uses and orchestrates the voices of the characters. Finally, I will examine the special case of the character of Robinson and to what extent his relationship with Bardamu can be likened to the relationship between ventriloquist and dummy as outlined by Goldblatt. By analysing how the two tendencies of ventriloquism (in relation to oneself, and in relation to the other) are present in the text, I will explore how and to what purpose Bardamu constructs his narrative voice, whether he achieves vocal power, and if he does, how he uses this vocal power and whether it fulfils him as a narrative voice.

Voices at the intradiegetic level

What defines the voices of the characters of *Voyage*, and what is the relationship between them? Given the importance of 'popular language' in the narrative voice and the fact that Bardamu regularly refers to a binary opposition between 'les riches' and 'les pauvres', it could be expected that the voices of the characters mirror plurilingualism and that the working-class characters predominantly use 'popular language' and the doctors 'bourgeois language'.[8] However, as Chesneau has shown, a stylistic analysis of

---

[8] The following quotation is an example of Bardamu's comments opposing 'les riches' and 'les pauvres': 'les riches n'ont pas besoin de tuer eux-mêmes pour bouffer. Ils les font travailler les gens comme ils disent. Ils font pas le mal eux-mêmes, les riches. Ils paient. On fait tout pour leur plaire et tout le monde est bien content. Pendant que leurs femmes sont belles, celles des pauvres sont vilaines. C'est un résultat qui vient des siècles, toilettes mises à part. Belles mignonnes, bien nourries, bien lavées. Depuis qu'elle dure la vie n'est arrivée qu'à ça' (*CV*, p. 421).

the text using the criterion of 'situation' reveals the failure of a socio-linguistic reading of the characters' voices, as 'les tensions sociologiques entre les personnages céliniens […] ne se traduisent pas du tout par des dissonances linguistiques'.[9]

The failure of a socio-linguistic reading of the text can be explained by the fact that with the only true 'riches' in the text, it is the physical qualities of their voices as much as their language that typifies and signifies them as members of the dominant class. In *Misère et parole*, Frédéric Vitoux acknowledges the relativity of the 'notion de riche' in *Voyage*. Indeed, while Bardamu often refers to a binary opposition between 'les riches' and 'les pauvres', the dominant class is for the most part not represented by characters in the text and as such, within the text, the dominant class is overall a silent group.[10] In *Voyage*, the only characters that can really be considered as 'riches', as in 'non pas comme "plus riches que d'autres" […], mais comme détachés sensiblement de l'ordre commun de l'humanité célinienne', are the owner of the luxurious houseboat and his family.[11] They are present in one scene towards the end of the novel, when they invite Bardamu, Robinson and his fiancée Madelon to join them for coffee. The man is a wealthy painter, and he and his family appear as idealised 'riches', living almost outside of society (which echoes Vitoux's definition of the rich as 'comme détachés'). It is in the voices of these people that Bardamu identifies their status as 'riches', members of the dominant class:

> Depuis longtemps je n'avais pas entendu des voix aussi distinguées moi. Ils ont une certaine manière de parler les gens distingués qui vous intimide et moi qui m'effraie tout simplement, surtout leurs femmes, c'est cependant rien que des phrases mal foutues et prétentieuses, mais astiquées alors comme des vieux meubles. Elles font peur leurs phrases bien qu'anodines. […] Et même quand ils prennent des tons canaille pour chanter des chansons de pauvres en manière de distraction, ils le gardent cet accent distingué qui vous met en méfiance et en dégoût, un accent qui a comme un petit fouet dedans, toujours, comme il en faut un, toujours, pour parler aux domestiques. (*CV*, pp. 506-507)

In this description, there is a relationship of potential violence and domination between the voices of the wealthy and the voices of the poor, here represented by Bardamu, Robinson and Madelon. This potential violence can be seen in the words 'intimide', 'effraie', 'peur', and 'fouet'. As the sentences of the wealthy characters are clumsy and

---

[9] Chesneau, p. 254.
[10] In fact, Vitoux sees a direct link between the silence of the 'riches' in *Voyage* and *Mort* and their power: 'les riches sont essentiellement silencieux; du moins le fondement de leur richesse participe-t-il d'un silence qui leur permet une véritable action sur le monde. Leur silence, en d'autres termes, n'est que la marque du refus de se contenter d'une parole de distraction, de fuite, simulacre d'action'. Frédéric Vitoux, *Louis-Ferdinand Céline: misère et parole* (Paris: Gallimard, 1973), p. 78. Hereafter cited as Vitoux.
[11] Vitoux, p. 74.

pretentious, it is not in their use of language that these people are violent towards 'the poor'. Rather, violence is contained within their voices, their 'manière de parler', and 'accent'. In Bardamu's description of the scene, there is the idea that the poor are 'the other' for the inhabitants of the houseboat, who sing 'des chansons de pauvres' as if they were exotic and exciting, putting on 'des tons canaille', which can imply that by singing these songs they are seeking to 's'encanailler'. However, when singing these songs they retain their accent and do not alter their voice. They perform the words of the other but do not put on the voice of the other, and in this way they assert their difference and their superiority. This quotation shows the potential violence of voice against – and of domination over – the other, here in terms of social status.

Throughout the text, it is from the physical qualities of voices, rather than from their use of language, that Bardamu gets information on speakers. At war, in Robinson's first appearance in the text, it is his voice that reveals that he is French and not German: 'une voix lourde et enrouée, qui avait l'air bien française' (*CV*, p. 59). Perhaps surprisingly, it is the quality of this voice as 'lourde et enrouée' rather than the accent that seems to signify it as French. It is then the different ('autre'), sad tone in Robinson's voice that reveals he has more experience of war than Bardamu and the other soldiers, as his voice is 'comme plus triste, donc plus valable que les nôtres' (*CV*, p. 59). In colonised Africa, it is the aggressiveness and the 'truquage' in the voices of the white colonisers that make them easily identifiable for Bardamu: 'leurs voix de blancs bien reconnaissables, agressives, truquées' (*CV*, p. 172).

Bardamu regularly attributes the features of voices to the speaker's background, life experience, or social status. Voice can also be shaped by the speaker's profession, as in the case of Protiste, a priest whose voice 'ne s'élevait guère au-dessus d'une certaine monotonie confidente, qui lui venait, je l'imaginais du moins, de sa profession' (*CV*, p. 425). The physical quality of voices (their tone, volume, accent) signify, and typify the speakers, whether they have altered it themselves, such as the white colonisers and their 'voix truquées', and the priest and his confessional tone, or their voice has been altered by exterior factors, such as Robinson.[12] As can be seen from these descriptions, voices in the text have the potential to give away information on the speaker, and Bardamu shows the ability to 'read' voices. Only in two instances do

---

[12] The extent to which the war can alter a voice is shown by the case of Bardamu's fellow soldier Jean Voireuse, whose voice is 'foutue', and who as a result cannot fulfil his ambition of 'rentrer dans les chœurs au théâtre' (*CV*, p. 145).

characters alter their vocal style enough to surprise Bardamu. In colonial Africa, when sergeant Alcide tells Bardamu about his orphaned niece, his tone contrasts with his usual loud volume: 'je l'entendais derrière mon dos qui essayait de me raconter quelque chose au sujet de cette photo, avec une drôle de voix que je ne lui connaissais pas encore. Il bafouillait' (*CV*, p. 206). Similarly, once, Madelon speaks in a 'voix que je ne lui connaissais pas, une voix monotone aussi comme une personne tout à fait déterminée' (*CV*, p. 613).

Apart from their tone or accent, voices in the text are characterised by their volume. In every episode of the text apart from the USA (to which I will turn later), volume is generally loud, as the following examples from each episode demonstrate:

- at war: 'perdu parmi deux millions de fous héroïques […] avec casques, sans casques, sans chevaux, sur motos, hurlants' (*CV*, p. 24); '"vont-ils s'en aller ces charognes!' qu'il [Pinçon] hurlait même' (*CV*, p. 39)

- in colonial Africa: 'on les reconnaissait les commis nègres à ce qu'ils engueulaient passionnément les autres noirs' (*CV*, p. 179); 'mais ces conditions implacables n'empêchaient pas Alcide de gueuler, au contraire. Ses hurlements déferaient au-dessus de son fantastique exercice et parvenaient bien loin […]. Plus loin rebondissaient-ils même encore, en tonnerre ses "Gardes à vous!"' (*CV*, p. 197); 'ahuri par ces gueulards de nègres' (*CV*, p. 209)

- in Paris and the Parisian suburbs of la Garenne-Rancy, where Bardamu is a doctor and in which almost every character is loud: 'et on s'engueule dans le tramway déjà, un bon coup pour se faire la bouche […], aux fortifications on se menace, on gueule un dernier coup' (*CV*, p. 305); 'là viennent chuter, craquer, rebondir les cris, les appels des vingt maisons en pourtour' (*CV*, p. 336); 'une famille en vadrouille occupait toute la rue en gueulant au coin de la rue Jean Jaurès' (*CV*, p. 401)

- in the psychiatric hospital, where Bardamu subsequently works and which is more sporadically loud than the other situations: 'quelques hurlements, de temps à autre, nous parvenaient jusqu'à notre salle à manger […], aux quelques fenêtres des réfectoires qui donnaient sur la rue les fous venaient parfois hurler et ameuter le voisinage' (*CV*, p. 525); 'et alors c'était des cris, des douches, des éclaircissements à n'en plus finir' (*CV*, p. 541); 'on ne sut à temps l'empêcher de hurler par sa fenêtre qu'il ne voulait plus jamais mourir' (*CV*, pp. 576-577)

In order to examine the volume in the text, it is fruitful to compare the number of occurrences of a selection of words denoting loud volume with that of words denoting

low volume. For loud volume, I have chosen 'crier', which implies a range of volume, from 'des petits cris avortés' (*CV*, p. 27) to 'que je leur criais moi, du plus fort que je pouvais' (*CV*, p. 80); 'hurler', which implies louder volume than 'crier'; and 'gueuler' and derivatives (only when these derivatives refer to speaking, and not to 'gueule' as face) such as 'engueuler' and 's'engueuler', which imply both loud volume and aggressiveness. For low volume, I have chosen 'murmurer', 'chuchoter', and 'soupirer'.

- 'crier' and derivatives: forty occurrences

    o However in two instances these screams are avoided, when Bardamu has 'failli crier' (*CV*, p. 132), and when he keeps quiet because the mother of his dying patient 'aurait crié encore plus fort' (*CV*, p. 333)

    o In two instances in Africa the shouts are produced by animals (*CV*, p. 229; p. 230)

- 'hurler' and derivatives: twenty-one occurrences

    o However, in one instance the little girl who is beaten up by her parents in la Garenne-Rancy can no longer scream: 'quand ils l'avaient tellement battue qu'elle ne pouvait plus hurler, elle criait encore un peu quand même' (*CV*, p. 339)

- 'gueuler' and derivatives: seventy-one occurrences, including forty-five of 'engueuler' and 's'engueuler' and derivatives

    o However in the hospital for wounded soldiers 'on ne nous engueulait pas' (*CV*, p. 115), and in six instances Bardamu avoids an 'engueulade', at least temporarily (*CV*, p. 132; p. 278; p. 376; p. 425; p. 461; p. 505; p. 597)

By contrast:

- 'murmurer' and derivatives: five occurrences
- 'chuchoter' and derivatives: ten occurrences
- 'soupirer' and derivatives: nine occurrences

These numbers seem to show that the overall atmosphere of *Voyage* tends to be more often loud (or potentially loud, as Bardamu sometimes avoids 'engueulades') than quiet. Loud volume is used by the characters to express a variety of emotions, including happiness and joy (the audience in the theatre is 'hurlante de joie', *CV*, p. 132; Bébert is

'éternuant et hurlant, réjoui', *CV*, p. 310); anger (Colonel Pinçon, the couple beating up and shouting at their daughter); pain (the little girl who is beaten up); excitement (the couple who get sexually aroused by abusing their daughter); shame (the mother whose daughter is dying from the after-effects of an abortion). Loud volume is also simply the usual vocal style of some characters, particularly the anonymous characters in Paris and la Garenne-Rancy. The relative abundance of 'engueuler' and 's'engueuler' also shows a tendency not only towards loud volume, but also aggressiveness between the voices in the text.

While loud volume in the text often denotes aggressiveness, low volume does not, of course, mean lack of aggressiveness on the part of the characters, as for example they can 'se chuchoter mille injures' (*CV*, p. 482). Low volume does not have more positive connotations than loud volume. For instance, in colonial Africa, the softness of the Director's vocal style is linked with conspiracy and betrayal. Dr Bestombes, chief of medicine at the hospital for wounded soldiers, only adopts a comforting tone and does not 'engueule' the soldiers in order to manipulate them and send them back to the front.

In some instances there can also be a certain incoherence or at least unexpectedness in the juxtaposition of words denoting or implying a certain volume, for instance when the aforementioned mother of the dying woman 'chuchotait […], mais si fortement, si intensément, que c'était pire que les imprécations' (*CV*, p. 330). Bardamu seems to acknowledge a paradox between Father Protiste's whispering and the 'size' of what he is telling him: 'il avait beau chuchoter, tout ce qu'il me racontait me paraissait malgré tout immense, insupportable, à cause du calme sans doute autour de nous et comme remplis d'échos' (*CV*, p. 430). The juxtapositions with 'vociférer' and derivatives also render a sense of incoherence, as 'vociférer' implies loud volume and anger, but is used to qualify joy and gaiety: 'vociféra-t-il jovialement' (*CV*, p. 277), 'elle reprenait vociférait guillerette' (*CV*, p. 324), or 'des vociférants sourires' (*CV*, p. 395). This type of irrational or incoherent dynamics of voice contributes to the general atmosphere of loud volume in the text. While I am not implying that all characters are permanently loud and aggressive, there is nonetheless a general vocal atmosphere of loudness and aggressiveness in *Voyage*, and this has ramifications for the interpretation of the text's voices.

Bardamu's voice as a character

In order to understand the position of Bardamu's voice as a character among this general vocal atmosphere of volume, aggressiveness, and potential violence, it is fruitful to examine the instances where 'crier' [to shout], 'hurler' [to yell] and 'gueuler' and derivatives are associated with him. Bardamu only yells once in the text, towards the end, at the 'fête foraine', when he is trying to lighten the atmosphere of aggressiveness between Robinson and Madelon: '"C'est à la fête qu'on est!" que je hurle moi, pour une fois que j'étais à bout d'invention' (*CV*, p. 602). This shows that Bardamu does not tend to use loud volume. Bardamu produces, or almost produces, shouts ten times in the text. These ten occurrences are all in the first half of the text, which ends with the episode of the USA, before Bardamu returns to France and becomes a doctor. They show an evolution in Bardamu's use of loud volume towards silence. At the very beginning of the text, Bardamu shouts twice in the context of a lively but friendly conversation with fellow medical student Arthur Ganate (*CV*, p. 18). At war, Bardamu shouts once, when he announces the death of the Colonel: '"Le colonel est mort!" que je leur criai', but the answer he receives ridicules his effort to announce the news with a loud volume: '"C'est pas les colonels qui manquent!" que me répondit le brigadier Pistil' (*CV*, p. 31). After the war, it is loud volume that will result in Bardamu's committal, as he hallucinates and cannot help but shout on the street and at dinner: 'sur moi aussi qu'on tire Lola! que je ne pus m'empêcher de lui crier', and 'On va tirer! que je leur criais moi, du plus fort que je pouvais […]. On va tirer! Foutez donc le camp tous!... Et puis par la fenêtre que j'ai crié ça aussi. Ça me tenait. Un vrai scandale' (*CV*, p. 80). In this scene, Bardamu's use of loud volume comes from lack of control ('je ne pus m'empêcher'), and as a result he is committed to a hospital for wounded and traumatised soldiers, under the direction of Dr Bestombes. At this hospital, Bardamu invents fake heroic war stories that are then performed to great success. However Branledore, Bardamu's roommate, takes the credit for himself. Bardamu almost shouts: 'Mais c'est de moi qu'il s'agit! ai-je failli crier à ce moment. De moi seul! Je connaissais mon Branledore, on se serait engueulés devant tout le monde et peut-être même battus. Finalement ce fut lui qui gagna la soucoupe. Il s'imposa' (*CV*, p. 132). This scene shows an evolution in the volume of Bardamu's voice, as Bardamu opts for silence in order to avoid more volume and violence ('on se serait engueulés'), and in this way lets the other

triumph. This evolution is momentarily reversed by the scene on the *Amiral Bragueton*, an exception in Bardamu's use of loud volume to which I will turn shortly.

Gradually, Bardamu distrusts and avoids loud volume, partly because he does not succeed in having a positive effect for himself through loud volume. In the last two instances where 'crier' is used in relation to Bardamu, the verb is used in correlation with 'essayer'. First, Bardamu chooses not to use loud volume: 'j'aurais peut-être pu essayer […] de me mettre à crier: "Vive Dollar! Vive Dollar!" […] Moi, j'avais une autre combinaison en tête' (*CV*, p. 238). Then, Bardamu fails to have an effect through loud volume, when he tries to shout 'Au secours!' to people from his room, which is high up in the New York hotel *Laugh Calvin*, but 'rien que ça leur faisait […]. Dans le bruit d'eux-mêmes ils n'entendent rien. Ils s'en foutent. Et plus la ville est grande et plus elle est haute et plus ils s'en foutent' (*CV*, p. 268).

Bardamu, who mostly fails to have the desired effect through volume and then chooses not to be loud, perceives loud volume as an aggression, such as when the cries of a baby '[lui] firent une impression abominable. Quels cris, mon Dieu! Quels cris! Je n'en pouvais plus' (*CV*, p. 347). Threatened by the loud volume of the voice of the aforementioned mother of the woman dying from the after-effects of an abortion, he chooses to be silent in order to prevent more volume: 'je n'avertis point la mère […], la mère aurait crié encore plus fort et ne m'aurait pas écouté davantage. Elle finirait jamais de se plaindre et de s'indigner […]. Autant se taire et regarder dehors' (*CV*, p. 333). Volume is more often directed against him than produced by him, as can be seen from the analysis of the use of 'engueuler' and 's'engueuler' in relation to him. He is 'engueulé', or fears being 'engueulé' fourteen times, as part of a group, in particular at war, or later on his own. By contrast, he 's'engueule' with another character only twice, and he 'engueule' only twice as well, once Robinson, and once a dog.

Bardamu's voice is not only generally less loud than the overall volume of the voices in the text, it is also regularly not well-assured, as is shown by the fact that he 'bafouille' eight times. Moreover, when Bardamu says something it is often a 'gaffe': 'ici je commis une lourde gaffe' (*CV*, p. 270); 'j'ai senti que je venais de gaffer une fois de plus' (*CV*, p. 287); 'vous faites visiter souvent? demandai-je tout soufflant et gaffeux' (*CV*, p. 486); 'c'était la gaffe!... Une de plus' (*CV*, p. 607); 'j'avais assez gaffé comme ça pour ma part. Je pouvais attendre un petit peu avant de m'y remettre' (*CV*, p. 610). However, while Bardamu's voice seems to be largely inconsequential within the text, due to its lack of or failure at volume, or problematic, due to his propensity to 'gaffe',

Bardamu shows a skilful use of plurilingualism and certain adaptability of voice. He successfully uses the extremes of 'popular language' and 'bourgeois language' according to his interlocutor. When having a conversation with Robinson, his voice is strongly oralised:

> Mets-toi à leur place à Madelon et à sa mère… Est-ce que t'aurais été content toi à leur place? Comment? En arrivant là-bas t'avais à peine de chaussures, pas de situation, rien, t'arrêtais pas de râler la longueur des journées, que la vieille gardait tout ton pognon et patati et patata… […] Et comment moi alors que je t'aurais envoyé te faire mettre! (*CV*, p. 566)

Here Bardamu uses emphatic structures ('à leur place à Madelon et à sa mère', 'est-ce que t'aurais été content toi'), non-use of negative 'ne' ('t'arrêtais pas'), grammatically incorrect expression ('la longueur des journées' rather than 'à longueur de journée'), slang ('pognon', 'se faire mettre'), and swallows sounds ('t'aurais', 't'arrêtais pas', 't'avais'). Bardamu adjusts his language to Robinson's: 'voilà comment que je lui parlais moi à Robinson' (*CV*, p. 566). By contrast, when speaking to Dr Baryton, the director of the psychiatric hospital, Bardamu shows a use of the other extreme, 'bourgeois language':

> Peut-être, cher monsieur Baryton, osai-je toutefois encore l'interrompre, peut-être que ces sortes de vacances impromptues que vous vous disposez à prendre ne formeront-elles en définitive qu'un épisode un peu romanesque, une bienvenue diversion, un entracte heureux, dans le cours un peu austère certes de votre carrière? (*CV*, pp. 550-551)

The expression is refined ('impromptu', 'ne formeront-elles en définitive que', 'une bienvenue diversion') and the voice noticeably less oralised than in the previous quotation. Bardamu's social identity is protean, as like Bestombes, Baryton and Parapine he is a doctor, but is as poor as his working-class patients. His use of language oscillates between the two extremes of the binary opposition between 'popular' and 'bourgeois' language. Bardamu is able to 'put on' the voice that is appropriate at a given moment to his interlocutor, or rather the voice that his interlocutor will identify as appropriate. As I mentioned, Chesneau fails to provide a socio-linguistic reading of the text, as the bourgeois characters regularly use features of 'popular' language. This does not show adaptability to the interlocutor, as bourgeois and working-class characters never talk to each other, but lack of control: 'tantôt ils parlent "bien", comme se doit de parler un médecin ou un professeur d'Histoire, et tantôt ils s'expriment comme les pauvres diables qu'au fond d'eux-mêmes ils sont réellement'.[13] Bardamu's plurilingualism, by

---

[13] Chesneau, p. 278.

contrast, is linked to his vocal adaptability, and as such it becomes plurivocality, and a sign of vocal control.

The adaptability of Bardamu's voice is seen during the episode of L'Amiral Bragueton, the ship on which he travels to Africa. In this scene, Bardamu shows a successful combined use of the other's words, volume and gesture, and in this way escapes a severe beating:

> Enfin, je me risquai pour terminer à faire tournoyer un de mes bras au-dessus de ma tête et lâchant une main du capitaine, une seule, je me lançai dans la péroraison: 'Entre braves, messieurs les Officiers, doit-on pas toujours finir par s'entendre? Vive la France alors, nom de Dieu! Vive la France!' C'était le truc du sergent Branledore. Il réussit encore dans ce cas-là. […] J'observai parmi les auditeurs un petit moment d'hésitation, mais tout de même il est bien difficile à un officier aussi mal disposé qu'il puisse être, de gifler un civil, publiquement, au moment où celui-ci crie si fortement que je venais de le faire: 'Vive la France!' Cette hésitation me sauva. (*CV*, p. 159)

Here, Bardamu shows the capacity to imitate and successfully use the voice of Branledore (his words, volume, and gesture), which hints at Bardamu's potential ventriloquial ability, in the sense of his ability to assimilate and 'put on' the voice of the other. In another scene, when Bardamu visits his former American lover Lola in New York, he shows the potential power of his voice against the other. Lola tells him that her mother has been diagnosed with cancer, and Bardamu threatens to harm her with his medical knowledge by talking to her all night long if she does not give him money: 'Lola, prêtez-moi je vous prie l'argent que vous m'avez promis ou bien je coucherai ici et vous m'entendrez vous répéter tout ce que je sais sur le cancer, ses complications, ses hérédités, car il est héréditaire, Lola, le cancer. Ne l'oublions pas!' (*CV*, p. 283). In her article on the fabrication of femininity in *Voyage*, Forest argues that 'Bardamu's use of medicoscientific language is another means by which the male narrator guarantees his own superiority and means of transcendence'. She gives this scene between Bardamu and Lola as an example of how Bardamu uses, or, rather, threatens to use, medical language semantically.[14] Bardamu is threatening here due to what he knows, the medical words and expressions he has assimilated, and how he plans to use his voice against Lola, by talking to her all night long and forcing her to listen. The superiority Bardamu gains over Lola, which Forest analyses in terms of his masculinity, also hints at his capacity to construct his voice and to use it against the other, and his acute awareness that he can harm the other and get what he wants with his voice alone.

---

[14] Forest, pp. 120-139 (p. 134; p. 139).

Bardamu, then, shows the capacity to appropriate words and expressions, to use them (against Lola, to save himself on the Amiral Bragueton), and to put on an appropriate voice. However, I have shown that overall at the intradiegetic level his voice proves mostly inconsequential. This inconsequence is, I suggest, partly due to the loud volume and the speech quantity that surround and oppress him. For example Bébert's aunt, Bardamu's concierge, 'parlait énormément' (*CV*, p. 310); the mother of the dying woman 'ne finirait jamais de se plaindre et de s'indigner' (*CV*, p. 333); and the doctors regularly speak in tirades that can take up over three pages. As his voice is drowned out or ignored, Bardamu gradually opts for silence, thereby letting the others speak. I propose that this silence is one reason for the subsequent construction of his narrative voice, in an attempt to reverse the dynamics of control and violence between his voice and those of the others. That this silence was originally imposed on him partly explains what can be seen as a paradox between his mostly inconsequential and silent voice as a character and his narrative voice. Indeed, I will argue that his narrative voice is constructed as part of his revenge over the voices that silenced and oppressed him. This revenge is what leads him to breach the silence a second time ('ça a débuté comme ça. Moi, j'avais jamais rien dit', *CV*, p. 15), but this time on his own initiative. An examination of two crucial stages in Bardamu's speech experience, and the functions of speech and dialogue in the text, will help understand further the dynamics between voices in the text and Bardamu's construction of his narrative voice.

Bardamu's speech experience

Speech experience, according to Bakhtin, is different from speech, which he defines as the sum of one's utterances. Speech experience on the other hand is the process of assimilation of others' words.[15] While Bakhtin's definition of speech experience focuses on the way one assimilates the words of others, in my analysis of Bardamu's speech experience I will examine what Bardamu learns about the potential and construction of voice from others. The two stages of Bardamu's speech experience which I shall analyse are the war and the USA, because it is at war that Bardamu is first submitted to the violence and aggressiveness of voices, and because it is in the USA and New York in particular that he understands to what extent he needs the voices of the others. Both

---

[15] Bakhtin, 'The Problems of Speech Genre', pp. 60-102 (p. 89). See Introduction, p. 24.

experiences, I suggest, are important with regard to the construction of his narrative voice.

Bardamu's speech experience at war is characterised by loud volume and aggressiveness being directed against him for the first time, 'se faire engueuler jusqu'à en être étourdi' (*CV*, p. 37), for a 'délire' which he does not understand (*CV*, p. 26). The character that epitomises vocal aggression towards Bardamu is Major Pinçon: 'Il nous réunissait chaque soir les hommes de la liaison et puis alors il nous engueulait un bon coup […]. Il nous envoyait à tous les diables'. Pinçon submits Bardamu and the other soldiers to repeated verbal abuse:

> Foutez-moi tous le camp, nom de Dieu, nous sommait une fois de plus le Pinçon, en nous balançant sa lanterne à hauteur du nez. On va se mettre à table! Je ne vous le répéterai plus! Vont-ils s'en aller ces charognes! qu'il hurlait même. Il en reprenait, de rage, à nous envoyer crever ainsi, ce diaphane, quelques couleurs aux joues. (*CV*, p. 39)

Pinçon uses a loud volume, an insult and a threatening gesture against the soldiers. It is only because of his rank that no-one can respond to Pinçon's loud and aggressive voice, and this is what silences the other. Bardamu, by using the expression 'reprendre quelques couleurs aux joues', implies that Pinçon benefits from or is even regenerated by the use of the power of his voice against the other.

While at war Bardamu experiences the power one voice can have against another by silencing it, and how one voice can even benefit from this power, he also understands the capacity of voices to construct fiction. When Bardamu comes back to Paris from the front, he witnesses to what extent words can be assimilated, repeated, performed, and supplemented, in the people's appropriation of war propaganda:

> On mentait avec rage au-delà de l'imaginaire, bien au-delà du ridicule et de l'absurde, dans les journaux, sur les affiches, à pied, à cheval, en voiture. Tout le monde s'y était mis. C'est à qui mentirait plus énormément que l'autre. Bientôt, il n'y eut plus de vérité dans la ville. (*CV*, p. 74)

Here, there is the sense of a competition between voices' potential for fiction ('c'était à qui mentirait plus énormément que l'autre'), a competition which is then literal between the wounded soldiers at the hospital where Bardamu is sent. Whereas Bardamu was silenced and threatened or attacked by Pinçon, in this hospital Dr Bestombes's voice is comforting and paternal, as its aim is to gain the soldiers' trust and to manipulate them in order to send them back to the front. The lack of aggressiveness and low volume in Bestombes's voice enables Bardamu to assimilate and even supplement his words and to construct his voice in anticipation of what Bestombes wants from him, which is to

show patriotism and heroism. In the hospital, Bardamu understands the performative

potential of his voice, as he and other wounded soldiers practice:

> Au début, nos petites allures patriotiques n'étaient pas encore tout à fait au point,
> pas très convaincantes. Il fallut une bonne semaine et même deux de répétitions
> intensives pour nous placer absolument dans le ton, le bon. (*CV*, p. 120)

Bardamu and the other soldiers find the 'right tone' for their voice to perform

successfully. Bardamu not only performs patriotism, but also fictionalises it as he

invents fake heroic war stories, thereby entering into a competition with Branledore:

'[Branledore] se mit dès lors à me disputer sauvagement la page de l'héroïsme. Il

inventait de nouvelles histoires, il se surpassait, on ne pouvait plus l'arrêter, ses exploits

tenaient du délire' (*CV*, p. 130). At war, and subsequently in the hospital, Bardamu

learns the potential violence of voice against the other, and the fictional and

performative potential of his voice to save him, at least temporarily. Bardamu's

experience of the war (at the front, then back in Paris) is significant in his speech

experience, because he understands the power one voice can have against another and

how to construct his voice by practising, and 'putting on' a voice in anticipation of the

other.

By contrast, in the USA, and New York in particular, Bardamu's speech

experience is characterised by silence and lack of interaction with the others' voices. As

can be seen from Bardamu's account of the war and the hospital, Bardamu has a

tendency to use 'nous' to position himself as part of a group. The other members of this

'nous' however are never named and do not speak, and in this way Bardamu's 'nous'

constitutes an anonymous and silent group. Bardamu also employs 'nous' upon his

arrival in the USA, but rapidly switches to 'je', as he experiences intense isolation. On

the streets of New York, Bardamu is ignored: 'je demandais à plusieurs voisins de la

foule ce que c'était que ce bâtiment-là qu'on voyait, mais la plupart feignirent de ne pas

m'entendre' (*CV*, p. 248). Bardamu is ignored to the point where he feels he has almost

ceased to exist: 'je me sentais bien près de ne plus exister, tout simplement'

(*CV*, p. 262). The USA are ungraspable to him and his American dreams turn into

endless searching for meaning: 'toute cette Amérique venait me tracasser, me poser

d'énormes questions' (*CV*, p. 254). In New York, Bardamu is not silenced and

threatened by the volume and quantity of speech of the other's voice. However, his

voice is ignored, and he is even denied the possibility of listening.

Bardamu's 'failure' in New York is interesting with regard to his speech experience, because he realises that he needs the other's voice, and that he needs stories. When he visits Lola in New York, he wishes there were a concierge in her building, and complains about the general lack thereof in the city:

> La ville entière manquait de concierge. Une ville sans concierge ça n'a pas d'histoire, pas de goût, c'est insipide telle une soupe sans poivre ni sel, une ratatouille informe. Oh! savoureuses raclures! Détritus, bavures à suinter de l'alcôve, de la cuisine, des mansardes, à dégouliner en cascades par chez la concierge, en plein dans la vie, quel savoureux enfer! (*CV*, p. 271)

In this quotation the figure of the 'concierge' serves as receptacle for and transmitter of the stories and the dirty secrets of a place, which echoes Bardamu's narrative function as 'dépositaire de tous les discours', 'personnage récipiendaire'.[16] France and the French colonies are the opposite of New York: there is no anonymity, and hearsay is constitutive of life. All the 'vains bavardages', 'ragots et calomnies' and even 'impressions seulement' (*CV*, p. 188) are crucial for Bardamu's speech experience, because they feed the narrative potential of his voice. In New York, Bardamu understands to what extent he needs the voices and the stories of the others. Indeed, in order for his voice to potentially become a narrative voice, it needs to feed from the others, as it turns them into characters.

While Bardamu needs the voices and the stories of others (assimilated during his speech experience, they will be crucial for the construction of his narrative voice), in his interaction with the others his desire to 'understand' is not satisfied by dialogue. In his analysis of the functions of speech in *Voyage* and *Mort*, Vitoux analyses the function of speech for 'the poor' as one which aims to escape misery, rather than to understand it or act against it:

> leur fuite n'est qu'une fuite individuelle devant le malheur. Si leur condition de pauvres les coupe des riches, leur méthode pour échapper à la misère les coupe nécessairement les uns des autres. Leur parole est une parole solitaire, non pas une incitation à la révolte mais un monologue. Chacun parle et en parlant ne prend pas la peine d'écouter les autres.[17]

Vitoux's analysis of the function of speech focuses on a social reading of the text, which is not the approach of the present study. Nonetheless, Vitoux's analysis of speech as individual and the refusal to listen to the other partly explains the failure of dialogue for Bardamu, who, by contrast, seeks to understand the successive environments he is in:

---

[16] A.C. and J.P. Damour, *L.-F. Céline: 'Voyage au bout de la nuit'* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1985), pp. 110-111. Hereafter cited as Damour.
[17] Vitoux, p. 26.

'inutile de leur expliquer des choses peu ordinaires aux préposés. Ils ne peuvent pas m'aider à comprendre' (*CV*, pp. 442-443).

At war, there is no point in talking to the other soldiers, because Bardamu seems to be the only one who understands the horror of the situation: 'je voyais bien que c'était pas la peine de leur rien raconter à ces gens-là, qu'un drame comme j'en avais vu un, c'était perdu tout simplement pour des dégueulasses pareils!' (*CV*, p. 32). Bardamu's dialogue with soldier Kersuzon only serves to entertain Bardamu: 'Kersuzon me répondait toujours pareil quand je le questionnais la nuit, ça finissait par me distraire comme un tic. Il m'a répété ça [c'est tout noir comme un cul] encore deux ou trois fois et puis il est mort, tué qu'il a été' (*CV*, p. 43). Dialogue has no purpose because Kersuzon endlessly replies the same utterance. As Bardamu ceaselessly tries to understand the point of war (this 'délire'), his only human interactions consist of not being able to communicate with other soldiers and being yelled at by Pinçon, until he meets Robinson, a special character in the text whom I will analyse in detail in the last part of this chapter.

After the war, dialogue follows the same pattern, as interactions do not enable communication, partly due to the characters' need to impose their voice through the quantity of their speech, as can be seen from the doctors' tirades and many of the 'poor' characters' propensity to speak 'énormément', like Bébert's aunt, and to perform and not listen, like the mother of the dying woman. Dialogue is also used by characters to discharge their pain and sorrow on each other in a sort of verbal contamination: 'les gens n'ont rien à se dire, ils ne se parlent que de leurs peines à eux chacun, c'est entendu. Chacun pour soi, la terre pour tous. Ils essaient de s'en débarrasser de leur peine, sur l'autre' (*CV*, p. 371). As pointed out by Vitoux, characters also seek reassurance and entertainment in conversation in order to escape reality, like Baryton, the director of the psychiatric clinique: '[Baryton] l'aimait la conversation, et d'une façon presque inquiète, il l'aimait amusante et surtout rassurante et bien pensée. Sur le compte des tapés il désirait ne point s'appesantir.' (*CV*, p. 524). Dialogue also appears as the collision of individual voices in an attempt to impose their own, potentially violently, and through loud volume: 'Et puis chacun d'entre eux a encore parlé un bon coup rien que pour son compte, presque violemment […] Beaucoup trop haut ils parlaient tous, comme chez les fous' (*CV*, p. 373).

Throughout his speech experience, Bardamu learns the potential of voice for violence against the other, and for narrative and performance. He understands that he

enjoys and needs the stories of others, but that dialogue with the other cannot help him understand the environments he is in. As he is threatened or even attacked by the voices of others, he also listens to them, learning of the potential ventriloquial ability of his own voice. The only viable option for his voice to survive, to not be definitively silenced, is to listen to the other speak, to assimilate and anticipate the other's voice, in the construction of his narrative voice.

Bardamu's ventriloquial narrative voice

There is a stark contrast between Bardamu's voice as a character, silenced/silent and threatened, and his voice as narrator, in control of the narrative act and of the voices of the characters. This difference has been commented on, for instance by Godard who considers it as another aspect of plurivocality in the text:

> dans le récit apparemment un de Bardamu, deux individus se manifestent tour à tour […]. Sous ce Bardamu qui "a compris", ni son dessein de faire comprendre ni la langue dans laquelle il s'y emploie ne peuvent faire que ne reparaisse le Bardamu d'avant: naïf, ignorant […], respectueux ou même soumis, protestant de son innocence et soucieux de se justifier […]. Le plurivocalisme trouve déjà dans *Voyage au bout de la nuit* à jouer à la fois de la superposition des valeurs d'un même discours et de celle des voix dans le discours du même individu.[18]

Racelle-Latin sees the narrator as being 'loin de se confondre avec le héros de l'aventure, il n'est pas non plus simplement l'être fictif qui "raconte" une histoire, mais se confond avec l'instance de l'écriture elle-même'.[19] Solomon analyses the consequences of the discrepancy, as 'the older narrator has long since been disabused of the illusions his younger and more naïve incarnation will entertain', and he argues that 'given their differences in knowledge and experience, there will be a continuing, ironic interplay between the protagonist and the narrator (the protagonist-turned-narrator)'.[20] Forest examines this discrepancy by characterising Bardamu the character as 'the vagrant-turned-social-critic' and Bardamu the narrator as 'the doctor', who 'repositions [Bardamu as character] in the social world'. Forest analyses the narrative act as a 'retroactive reading'. Focusing on the episode of the USA, before Bardamu returns to France and becomes a doctor, she argues that this retroactive reading is 'no doubt a product of the narrator's acquisition of a medical degree, which allows him to establish a fundamental difference between his own social marginality and that arising from

---

[18] Godard, pp. 176-177.
[19] Racelle-Latin, 53-77 (p. 68).
[20] Solomon, p. 17.

"true" female corruption'.[21] While I follow a different approach to that of Forest, of interest for the present study is the idea in her analysis that Bardamu as narrator has gained something (a medical degree, or vocal power) and uses it in order to manipulate the events he is narrating.

I interpret the discrepancy between Bardamu as character and Bardamu as narrator as an evolution of his voice towards vocal power. As demonstrated above, Bardamu's voice, as a character, is characterised by a certain 'voiceless impotence', as it is not loud enough, or is inconsequential, or Bardamu refuses to speak because he knows he will not be listened to.[22] However Bardamu also learns how to use the voices of the others, by repeating and supplementing their words, and by letting them speak, thereby becoming a recipient of the words of the others. I argue that the construction of Bardamu's voice as a narrative voice is based upon this ventriloquial ability, as he assimilates and internalises the oppressive otherness of the others' voices into his own. He retells the events in which his voice was silenced or challenged in an attempt to turn around this voiceless impotence, as no-one can answer him and he now cannot be challenged (or at least, only potentially by the reader). While Bardamu as a character cannot help but be immersed and stifled by the voices of the others, as a narrator he can appropriate these voices. Indeed, Alméras asks

> qu'est-ce que le *Voyage* de ce point de vue sinon un immense monologue et parfois une tirade, la partie du docteur Bardamu de *L'Eglise* supprimant toutes les autres, libéré de la contrainte du dialogue avec les autres, du cadre d'une partition où il devait nécessairement placer sa voix. C'est à travers elle que devront nécessairement se faire entendre toutes les autres (celle d'Arthur Ganate, celle de Princhard, celle de Robinson ou celle de Madelon). Elle seule rendra compte de ce voyage aussi imaginaire que symbolique.[23]

That it is through Bardamu's voice that the voices of others now have to be heard implies that Bardamu's narrative voice is ventriloquial. Bardamu is 'libéré de la contrainte du dialogue avec les autres', a dialogue which never fulfilled his need to understand, and in which the characters only tried to impose their voice.

As Bardamu's narrative voice becomes ventriloquial, the theme of puppetry and the relationship between puppeteer and puppets is hinted at in the text, in the scene where Bardamu visits Lola in New York. As Lola is having tea and cakes with her friends, Bardamu thinks:

---

[21] Forest, pp. 120-139 (p. 133).
[22] Krance analyses Bardamu as 'the solitary mouthpiece of voiceless impotence in the face of the onslaught of the collective'. Krance, 'L.-F. Céline: "Just an Individual"?', pp. 84-97 (p. 93).
[23] Alméras, p. 339.

> Tout dans ces moments vient s'ajouter à votre immonde détresse pour vous forcer, débile, à discerner les choses, les gens et l'avenir tels qu'ils sont, c'est-à-dire des squelettes, rien que des riens, qu'il faudra cependant aimer, chérir, défendre, animer comme s'ils existaient. (*CV*, p. 274)

Bardamu talks as if he could see through people, the void beyond their physical presence. Bardamu here describes a shadowy, ghostly world inhabited with what only has the appearance of reality and humanity. The use of the verb 'animer' positions Bardamu as in control of these characters. In this quotation there is also a sense of the theatrical and farcical aspect of the narrator's task, and its potential pointlessness, a notion which I will explore at the end of this chapter. By using 'squelettes' and the verb 'animer', Bardamu seems to refer to the bodies rather than the voices of the characters, and as such he hints at puppetry rather than ventriloquism. However, if we refer to the difference between the two acts as analysed by Goldblatt, Bardamu is a ventriloquist rather than a puppeteer: 'unlike puppeteering, in ventriloquism the voice-source appears with, is present to the figure and is itself a character in the performance as the ventriloquist impresses the appearance of the singularity of their role'.[24]

As Bardamu's narrative is a retroactive reading of the events, part of his power is that he can position himself as the only witness of what he has experienced, as if his monologue were the only possible version of reality. The war for instance can only be told by him because other soldiers could not, or refused to, engage in dialogue in order to 'understand'. Concerning his time in the Congo, Bardamu suggests the possibility that everything and everybody disappeared after he had left:

> Peut-être que rien de tout cela n'est plus, que le petit Congo a léché Topo d'un grand coup de sa langue boueuse un soir de tornade en passant et que c'est fini, bien fini, que le nom lui-même a disparu des cartes, qu'il n'y a plus que moi, en somme, pour me souvenir encore d'Alcide… […] Qu'il n'existe plus rien. (*CV*, p. 210)

The place might ('peut-être') have vanished, and Bardamu might be the only one who still remembers Alcide, thus the only one who can give accounts of him. By reconstructing his experiences into a textual reality, Bardamu's voice and memory indeed become the only valid ones, because they are the narrator's. 'Qu'il n'existe plus rien': Bardamu turns the situation around and takes total control of a place where, in reality, he was silenced and dominated. Simply by not talking about this place, about these people could he erase their existence from the textual reality he is recreating. In the ventriloquist's monologue, the world and people are created and erased solely by his

---

[24] Goldblatt, p. 39.

voice. What Bardamu chooses to tell of the places he has been and the people he has encountered is the only thing that will exist of them.

The narrative act is, I suggest, partly motivated by a revenge on the voices of the others, interiorised in the narrative voice, which now has power over them, in contrast with Bardamu's voiceless impotence as a character. In the following quotation, Bardamu as character announces by way of warning his future re-creation of people and events:

> Je dirai tout un jour, si je peux vivre assez longtemps pour tout raconter. 'Attention, dégueulasses! Laissez-moi faire des amabilités encore pendant quelques années. Ne me tuez pas encore. Avoir l'air servile et désarmé, je dirai tout. Je vous l'assure et vous vous replierez d'un coup alors comme les chenilles baveuses qui venaient en Afrique foirer dans ma case et je vous rendrai plus subtilement lâches et plus immondes encore, si et tant que vous en crèverez peut-être, enfin.' (*CV*, pp. 311-312)

This quotation is in inverted commas in the text; it is what Bardamu thought as character, before he became narrator. It reveals the idea of revenge over an overwhelming and disgusting reality, which, once narrator, he will recreate and darken until the possible death of the people turned into his puppets. Ventriloquism here appears as the fulfilment of desire for power as a means to accomplish revenge, as the inconsequential physical voice becomes a narrative voice ('je dirai tout'). This quotation epitomises the evolution of Bardamu's voice from passive to active in its relation to the voice of the other:

> sa révolte toute verbale s'allie curieusement à la passivité et l'amène tout au plus à privilégier sur le plan de l'action les conduites du refus ou de la démission […]. Ce n'est 'qu'après coup', et dans la parole, que le héros célinien trouve à se venger de sa honte sociale et de sa misère par un acte de réduction symbolique; le narrateur Bardamu dont l'acte autobiographique tout entier apparaît comme une rupture de silence audacieuse […] se faisant après l'événement, dans la réalité imaginaire du verbe (de l'autre côté de la vie): révolte verbale et phantasmatique.[25]

With the beginning of the text 'ça a débuté comme ça. Moi j'avais jamais rien dit' (*CV*, p. 15), Bardamu breaches the silence twice. Firstly, as a character, he is made to speak by Arthur Ganate, an act from which he will suffer, starting with his enrolment in the army. Secondly, Bardamu chooses to speak as a narrator, to take revenge and to turn around his voiceless impotence as a character.

In order to analyse Bardamu's narrative according to the ventriloquial model, it is productive to compare it with Godard's use of the Bakhtinian concept of plurivocality for internal focalisation, which Godard calls 'superposition des voix':

---

[25] Racelle-Latin, 53-77 (p. 73).

> Le plurivocalisme que Bakhtine met en évidence est avant tout celui des discours sociaux. Mais le roman est d'autre part en lui-même une source de plurivocalisme. Parce qu'il est dans sa nature de se faire entendre, en même temps que celle du narrateur, la parole des personnages et même leur pensée, il favorise, indépendamment de la valeur sociale des discours, la superposition de plusieurs voix dans le même énoncé.[26]

Godard adds that in passages in free indirect speech in which the narrator renders the thoughts of the character, 'c'est bien toujours le narrateur qui parle – c'est-à-dire qui écrit –, mais il parle en "empruntant la voix" du personnage, en le "faisant parler", ou, ce qui revient au même, en lui "prêtant sa voix"'.[27] While Godard argues that lending his voice, making the other speak and borrowing the other's voice pertain to the same process in this 'superposition des voix', I suggest on the other hand that 'borrowing' the character's voice and 'making him/her speak' can imply, in fact, stealing this voice, putting it on, or forcing the other to speak. In Godard's analysis the potential violence of voice is mostly found in plurivocality of opposition, in which the narrative voice goes against a voice in the sense of an interpretative position but not in the literal sense of someone else's voice. Godard does not mention a sense of violence in the texts between the narrative voice and the characters, and his analysis of 'superposition des voix' does not imply a hierarchy of voices. By contrast, analysing the relationship between Bardamu's narrative voice and the voices of the characters through the lens of the model of ventriloquism implies taking into account the possibility that one voice is using the other, perhaps violently, and the possibility that the narrative voice that is making the characters speak has power over these voices he is ventriloquising.

The way Bardamu takes revenge over the characters is, I suggest, by putting on their voice, speaking 'like them', with their vocal style, and commenting on their voices. For example, in the scene with the mother whose daughter is dying (which runs from 'sa mère m'entrouvrit la porte du palier' to 'elle referma la porte derrière moi, peu à peu', *CV*, pp. 330-334), there is a clear opposition between Bardamu's voice as a character and his narrative voice. Indeed, as a character he is mostly silent and not listened to: 'je n'essayai point de la dissuader', 'je n'avais plus rien à dire', 'je demandai tout de même à voix timide', 'autant se taire et regarder dehors'. By contrast, his narrative voice is prominent in the scene, which is 1,374 words long. Bardamu's narrative comments make up 1,276 words; reported speech from the mother only makes up 98 words. There is one case of 'ironised' direct speech as Bardamu integrates

---

[26] Godard, pp. 165-166.
[27] Godard, pp. 166-167.

her voice into his narrative comment, thereby openly putting it on: 'et puis quelle force ne m'aurait-il pas fallu pour interrompre cette farouche au moment juste où elle "ne savait plus comment sauver l'honneur de la famille"' (*CV*, p. 332). His narrative voice is prominent, and he only puts on the voice of the mother for selected short, exclamatory sentences, such as 'Quelle honte! L'hôpital! Quelle honte, Docteur! A nous! Il ne nous manquait plus que cela! C'est un comble!' or 'J'en mourrai, Docteur! J'en mourrai de honte!'. Bardamu insinuates that the mother is performing, as he talks about her 'rôle' and her 'plus belle réplique'. Bardamu orchestrates the voice of the mother: he selects some of her 'répliques' out of her quantity of speech (he implies that she is talking ceaselessly, but her utterances only make up 98 words) and emphasises their extremeness and their quality of performance ('je lui ai fourni sa plus belle réplique, celle qu'elle attendait'). While as a character he cannot speak, as a narrator he ventriloquises her to emphasise the rehearsed and extreme quality of her voice:

> Et puis quelle force ne m'aurait-il pas fallu pour interrompre cette farouche au moment juste où elle "ne savait plus comment sauver l'honneur de la famille". Quel rôle! Et qu'elle le hurlait encore! Après chaque avortement, j'en avais l'expérience, elle se déployait de la même façon, entraînée bien entendu à faire de mieux en mieux à chaque fois! Cela durerait ce qu'elle voudrait! Aujourd'hui, elle me semblait prête à décupler ses effets.

Bardamu's account of this scene shows how he uses the voices of the characters, by putting them on for extreme utterances, often with comic or tragi-comic potential. This shows the narrative act, in the discrepancy between the quantity of the mother's utterance when it happened, and the selected, short, exclamatory sentences selected by the narrative voice. The scene is centred on the mother's voice; however the quantity of her voice in the scene 'as it happened' is substituted with selected utterances, as the narrative voice only puts on her voice sporadically. The same process can be seen with most characters, for example Bébert's aunt: while she speaks a lot, her utterances are selected and orchestrated as the narrative voice uses its comic potential.

Indeed, while at the intradiegetic level Bardamu is threatened by the loud volume and the quantity of speech of the characters, in the text there is in fact a small quantity of reported speech. The characters' voices are condensed, altered, and it is mostly their extreme utterances that are reproduced in the narrative. In the case of the doctors, who mostly speak in tirades and diatribes, the quantity of reported speech is important, however their voices are ultimately shown as pointless and inconsequential. Baryton gives up on his responsibilities and leaves for England, leaving behind him a memory

'qui nous faisait à tous comme un peu honte' (*CV*, p. 558). Parapine's voice is a good example for the tension between quantity and quality: when consulted by Bardamu about Bébert's typhoid, he proves to be incapable of articulating an appropriate answer because he knows too much about the topic:

> Parapine mis au courant de mes difficultés ne demanda pas mieux que de m'aider et d'orienter ma thérapeutique périlleuse, seulement il avait appris lui, en vingt années, tellement de choses et de si diverses et de si souvent contradictoires sur le compte de la typhoïde qu'il lui était devenu bien pénible à présent, et comme qui dirait impossible, de formuler au sujet de cette affection si banale et des choses de son traitement le moindre avis net ou catégorique. (*CV*, p. 359)

Parapine later becomes a silent character, and appears as a shadow vaguely following what is happening around him. As a narrator, then, Bardamu uses the voices of the characters, putting on their voice for a few extreme utterances, showing the pointlessness of their voices (the doctors), their ridicule (Bébert's aunt), their lack of genuineness (the mother), or their sadism (the couple who beat up their daughter). The characters' utterances punctuate the narrative, as the narrator sporadically puts on the extreme and overwhelmingly negative voices of the characters.[28] As he opted for silence as a character, Bardamu listened, assimilated their voices, and he is now possibly making them worse ('je vous rendrai plus subtilement lâches et plus immondes encore') by selecting and orchestrating their voices, as now his narrative voice provides the only valid version.

Godard analyses the relationship between the Célinian narrator's and the characters' voices as follows:

> [Céline] ne perd jamais de vue […] que la parole des personnages, si singularisée, si pittoresque, d'une verve si personnelle soit-elle, est toujours son invention, au même titre que le récit qu'il raconte en tant que narrateur. Du coup, elle n'a jamais l'autonomie, concrétisée par guillemets, qu'elle a chez d'autres.[29]

Here, Godard seems to confuse Céline and the Célinian narrator. If we see Bardamu as the protagonist-turned-narrator of *Voyage*, then the story he is narrating and the voices of his characters are not his 'invention', but his 'creation'. The ventriloquial narrative voice has absorbed, assimilated, and now repeats, alters, supplements, 'puts on' the voices of the others. Unlike Godard, then, I would not say that Bardamu lends his voice to characters. Rather, he has assimilated and appropriated their voices, and he now speaks through them, and in fact instead of them. By expropriating and intoning the voices of those who silenced him, Bardamu constructs his narrative voice out of the

---

[28] The only truly positive character in the text is Molly, the American prostitute.
[29] Godard, p. 169.

voices of the others, and by turning his inconsequential physical voice into a narrative voice, Bardamu achieves vocal power. The question however is whether this vocal power fulfils him, and whether he retains it. This question is best articulated in the context of the character of Robinson.

Robinson

While thus far I have examined how the ventriloquial model can be used to analyse Bardamu's act as the construction of his voice out of the others in order to achieve power over them, the other tendency of ventriloquism, in relation not to the other but to oneself, is also present in the text through the figure of Robinson. In the first half of the novel, the war and Bardamu's travels, Robinson appears at the end of each episode, and Bardamu follows him. In the second half of the novel, when Bardamu comes back to France and becomes a doctor, it is Robinson who follows Bardamu. Most analyses of *Voyage* mention the 'special case' of Robinson in the text. Robinson is described by Vitoux as 'le double, l'identique dont les aventures et les souffrances prolongent celles du héros'.[30] Krance describes him as 'a kind of alter-ego to Bardamu', and he argues that *Voyage* 'can, in some ways, be described as a "pas de deux" where the roles of leader and follower in the first half of the novel are played by Robinson and Bardamu respectively, while the second half of the novel casts Bardamu in the lead'.[31] This is echoed by Vitoux, who sees Robinson as the 'modèle' and Bardamu as the 'disciple' in the first part, and a reversal of roles in the second part.[32] Pierre Verdaguer characterises Robinson as Bardamu's double, and as 'comme un fantôme, venant hanter la conscience de Bardamu'.[33]

Following the idea of Robinson as a 'double' of Bardamu, I propose to use the model of ventriloquism to analyse the relationship between them, when the ventriloquial ability is used in relation to oneself, to mirror the multiplicity of the self. In *Art and Ventriloquism*, Goldblatt describes ventriloquism as '[containing] conversations essentially within a single entity while it is, at the same time, a duality'.[34] The primary difference between Bardamu and Robinson is, in Verdaguer's words, that 'Bardamu

---

[30] Vitoux, p. 150.
[31] Charles Krance, *L.-F. Céline: The I of the Storm* (Lexington, Kentucky: French Forums, 1992), p. 95. Hereafter cited as Krance, *The I of the Storm*.
[32] Vitoux, p. 152.
[33] Pierre Verdaguer, *L'Univers de la cruauté: une lecture de Céline* (Geneva: Droz, 1988), p. 140. Hereafter cited as Verdaguer.
[34] Goldblatt, p. 154.

possède une sagesse qui lui permet de survivre [….] alors que Robinson représente une tendance extrême d'inadaptation'.[35] This difference is mirrored in their voices: while Bardamu's voice is characterised by adaptability to the interlocutor and propensity to silence, Robinson almost exclusively uses 'popular language', grammatically and syntactically incorrect French, and slang. His propensity to not use the proper word is in fact ridiculed by Bardamu : 'Il y avait pourtant de tout dans cette tourmente, excepté des vaches, mais [Robinson] tenait à ce terme impropre et générique' (*CV*, p. 219). Moreover, Robinson tends to talk a lot, and it is this tendency that will eventually lead him to his death: '[si Robinson] a eu un courage suffisant pour renoncer aux modalités les plus compromises de la parole, il n'en a pas pour autant *appris à se taire*'.[36]

The relation between Bardamu and Robinson has similarities with the American ventriloquist act Bergen/McCarthy as analysed by Goldblatt.[37] Charlie McCarthy, the wooden dummy, is coarse and straightforward, whilst Edgar Bergen, the ventriloquist, is reserved and controlled. Goldblatt characterises ventriloquism as 'a strategy for the constructing of virtual possible selves', and while Bardamu describes other characters as skeletons he has to animate, he cannot help but be attracted to his vocal opposite, Robinson.[38] Concerning Bardamu's attraction to Robinson, Matthews argues that 'it is as though Robinson embodies an energy and a positive attitude to life that Ferdinand knows to be lacking in himself'.[39] Robinson is the opposite of Bardamu not only in his voice but also in his relationship with the voices of others. Robinson seems to benefit from confrontation with other voices: 'par l'engueulade on ne le vexait pas. On aurait dit plutôt même que ça lui redonnait du courage' (*CV*, p. 495). Moreover, unlike Bardamu who chooses to be silent rather than to not be listened to, Robinson only strives to speak, whether or not he is listened to, as he tells Bardamu:

> T'as l'air de dire que je sais pas trop de quoi je me plains hein? qu'il me répondait alors. Mais le sens tout de même qu'il faut que je me plaigne… C'est comme ça… Il me reste plus que ça… Je vais te dire… C'est la seule chose qu'on me permette… On n'est pas forcé de m'écouter. (*CV*, pp. 492-493)

The importance of Robinson's voice in the construction of Bardamu's can be seen in the fact that it is Robinson who first shows Bardamu the fictional potential of voice in order to take advantage of, or fool, the other by telling them what they want to hear, in

---

[35] Verdaguer, p. 141.
[36] Vitoux, p. 159.
[37] Goldblatt, pp. 33-49.
[38] Goldblatt, x.
[39] Matthews, p. 50.

his use of 'la parole mensongère et consciente pour améliorer son état', a speech function which Bardamu will abundantly use, most notably on the Amiral Bragueton.[40] It is also Robinson's voice which makes Bardamu remember, and this will be crucial for Bardamu's narrative: 'je [Bardamu] remontais dans mon passé avec le ton de sa [Robinson] voix comme un appel devant les portes des années et puis des mois' (*CV*, p. 218). Here, again, Bardamu focuses on the tone of voice rather than what is said, and it is the tone that has an effect on him.

That Robinson makes Bardamu remember also implies that Robinson has potential narrative power himself. When Robinson comes back to see Bardamu and tell him what has happened since the death of la mère Henrouille, the punctuation shows that Robinson is the intradiegetic narrator for almost seven pages: his utterances are no longer preceded with a hyphen, but the dialogues he resituates are (*CV*, pp. 567-573). Because Robinson has experienced the same environments as Bardamu and due to the stark contrast between their two voices, Robinson is the potential narrator of another *Voyage*, his version of his and Bardamu's story, in his own striking vocal style. However when Robinson loses his sight and becomes another potential narrator of his and Bardamu's common story, the reader does not get to hear his version:

> Il n'en finissait pas de raconter tout ce qu'il pouvait réunir, de souvenirs sur les choses et les voyages qu'on avait faits ensemble, même de ce qu'on n'avait encore jamais essayé de se souvenir. Il se rappelait des choses qu'on avait jamais eu le temps encore d'évoquer. Dans sa retraite le monde qu'on avait parcouru semblait affluer avec toutes les plaintes, les gentillesses, les vieux habits, les amis qu'on avait quittés, un vrai bazar d'émotions démodées, qu'il inaugurait dans sa tête sans yeux. (*CV*, p. 416)

In his analysis of the text, Krance ignores Robinson's narrative potential and argues that the role of Bardamu as narrator is in fact to narrate their common journey, up to the point where Robinson completes this journey by dying:

> of the two, it is only Robinson who truly reaches the end of the night. As a fictional character, he is dependent on Bardamu's first-person narrative for his very being; he thus delegates to Bardamu, who remains just this side of the night that Robinson reveals to him, the role of narrating their journey in common. It is during the periodical absences of Robinson that Bardamu achieves full status as visionary voyager, or, to put it another way, that he comes close to achieving full identity in the confusion of narrator and actor.[41]

Krance analyses the evolution from Bardamu's narrative voice to the narrative voice in Céline's later texts. He argues that halfway through the novel, when Bardamu stops

---

[40] Vitoux, p. 154.
[41] Krance, *The I of the Storm*, p. 95.

following Robinson, his narrative begins 'to take *into account* the phenomenon of its own narratability', which will culminate in later texts with the fusion between narrator as chronicler and narrator as performer.[42] Krance outlines an evolution in the relationship between Bardamu's and Robinson's voices: as Bardamu becomes more and more silent (preparing his narrative voice), Robinson starts to speak without caring whether or not he is listened to, without attempting to lie or to anticipate what the other wants to hear. As a result of this evolution, Robinson provokes his own death by refusing to be silent or refusing to tell Madelon what she wants to hear when she asks him if he loves her. As, according to Krance, Bardamu's role is to tell their common story,

> when Robinson provokes his own death [...] he in effect kills the story, with nothing left for the narrative but the remnants of his own discourse trailing off [...]. With Robinson as narrative foil out of the way, and with Bardamu having reclaimed his speech as his at the very moment of his ultimate expectoration, Céline was now ready to embark on the next stage of his journey.[43]

While Krance's analysis is focused on the evolution from Bardamu's narrative voice to later Célinian narrative voices, within the context of *Voyage* Robinson's death, because it ends the novel, is the conclusion of Bardamu's narrative. That Bardamu as narrator becomes silent once Robinson is dead echoes the inter-dependence in the relationship between ventriloquist and dummy:

> that Charlie is dependent upon Bergen for what is said is clear enough. But also, that without Charlie, Bergen *as* ventriloquist would not have happened. Not only is it true that if not for Charlie at least one voice of Bergen's would not have been heard but also Bergen's identity as person would be seriously altered. The dummy defines (identifies) the ventriloquist.[44]

Robinson is dependent on Bardamu (in Krance's words, 'as a fictional character, he is dependent on Bardamu's first-person narrative for his very being'), however Bardamu is also dependent on Robinson. It is Robinson who helps him construct the fictional potential of his voice, and Robinson who makes him remember. Robinson also provides Bardamu with events and a story to tell, as Robinson attempts to kill la mère Henrouille, has a complicated relationship with Madelon, and gets shot. With the disappearance of Robinson, Bardamu, as he did before he became the narrator, chooses to be silent: 'qu'on n'en parle plus' (*CV*, p. 631) is the last sentence of the novel. Once Robinson is dead, there is nothing left for Bardamu to tell, as Bardamu has lost his *other* voice.

---

[42] Krance, *The I of the Storm*, p. 101.
[43] Krance, *The I of the Storm*, p. 101.
[44] Goldblatt, p. 42.

The question of whether Bardamu is fulfilled by his vocal power as a ventriloquial narrative voice is linked in part to the opposition which belies an inter-dependent relationship between him and Robinson. Robinson, unlike Bardamu, sets up a contrast between his voice and that of the other. Bardamu, after being silenced, chooses to be silent, until fifteen or twenty years later, when he becomes a narrative voice. In his narrative act he does not confront the voices that silenced and attacked his own, but gains power over them by having assimilated and interiorised them. In his revenge over the characters, his superiority over their voices means that he can shape them, alter them, without risking being challenged by them. The vocal power he achieves does not however satisfy him, as it does not help him to understand the other, but merely to ventriloquise them. Bardamu in fact grows wary of his own voice:

> Les choses auxquelles on tenait le plus, vous vous décidez un beau jour à en parler de moins en moins, avec effort quand il faut s'y mettre. On en a bien marre de s'écouter toujours causer… On abrège… On renonce… Ça dure depuis trente ans qu'on cause… On ne tient plus à avoir raison. (*CV*, p. 574)

It is not clear here whether Bardamu is referring to his voice as a character or as a narrator. I suggest that he refers primarily to his narrative voice. Indeed, he says he is tired of hearing himself speak; as a character, however, he is already silent by this stage of the novel. He adds that he does not need to be right anymore, however as a character he is not confronting the others in order to impose his voice and his opinion as right. I suggest that Bardamu is not satisfied with the vocal power he has gained through ventriloquism, and grows tired of it. Since ventriloquising the characters does not help him make sense of what he went through, at the end of his monologue the idea of the pointlessness of his narrative act appears, prefigured in his statement in New York that 'les gens et l'avenir [sont] des squelettes, rien que des riens, qu'il faudra cependant aimer, chérir, défendre, animer comme s'ils existaient' (*CV*, p. 274). That Bardamu's narrative ends with Robinson's death is significant, because Robinson has accomplished what Bardamu never did, which is to 'confront' his voice with that of the other, rather than to show adaptability or ventriloquise the other. As he refuses to be silent, he provokes his own death, while Bardamu is safe, but unsatisfied.

As Bardamu tires of the power of his voice, there is also at the same time a sense of menace for his vocal power. While his vocal power cannot be challenged by the characters, his narrative voice has throughout the text been permanently threatened by the other (another 'other'), through the figure of the imagined, fantasised, potentially

hostile reader. Commenting on Robinson's death, Bardamu evokes the possibility that one's voice can be misunderstood by the other because of words:

> Avec les mots on ne se méfie jamais assez suffisamment, ils ont l'air de rien les mots, pas l'air de dangers bien sûr, plutôt de petits vents, de petits sons de bouche, ni chauds, ni froids, et facilement repris dès qu'ils arrivent par l'oreille par l'énorme ennui gris mou du cerveau. On ne se méfie pas d'eux des mots et le malheur arrive. Des mots, il y en a des cachés parmi les autres, comme des cailloux. On les reconnaît pas spécialement et puis les voilà qui vous font trembler pourtant toute la vie qu'on possède et tout entière, et dans son faible et dans son fort… C'est la panique alors… Une avalanche… On en reste là comme un pendu, au-dessus des émotions. […] Donc, on ne se méfie jamais assez des mots, c'est ma conclusion. (*CV*, pp. 610-611)

This quotation echoes the idea of a violence of appropriation and expropriation between voices, as one word exists in three aspects for every speaker, as a word of language, as the word of the other, and as my word. The words 'cachés parmi les autres, comme des cailloux' refer, I suggest, to the way a word can be appropriated ('facilement repris') and become the other's word as s/he interprets what one has said. While as a character Bardamu is careful to be silent, as narrator his voice is omnipresent, and addressed to a silent interlocutor, the reader. Godard has analysed the importance of the figure of the potentially hostile reader/interlocutor in Céline's fiction, which leads the Célinian narrative voice to permanently repeat, specify and justify.[45] This stylistic technique of 'rappel', constitutive of *Voyage* (and Céline's later texts), was analysed as early as 1935 by Léo Spitzer in his article 'Une habitude de style, le rappel chez Céline'.[46] Martin characterises this technique as one which is made of 'des éléments musicaux ou mélodiques, mais aussi comme des façons de rappeler à soi le lecteur: surtout, que le lecteur ne manque pas au rappel'.[47]

The vocal power Bardamu has achieved over the characters is to tell someone ('je dirai tout'), however Bardamu's voice is also potentially threatened by this someone, this fantasised, anonymous other. With the 'rappel', Bardamu explains, justifies, repeats for the other, while in his narrative he has power over the other. As I have sought to demonstrate, Bardamu's voice needs to be fed by the voices and the stories of the

---

[45] Godard, pp. 228-229.
[46] Spitzer, pp. 384-391 (p. 388). Kristeva summarises Spitzer's interpretation as follows: 'le sujet parlant occuperait, en somme, dans ce type de phrases, deux lieux: celui de son identité propre (là, il va droit à l'information, au rhème), celui de l'expression objective, pour l'autre (lorsqu'il reprend, rappelle, éclaircit)'. She then analyses this stylistic technique of 'segmentation' in terms of 'stratégies "régressives"', a syntactical cacpacity that is already present in 'des locuteurs populaires', and that is 'actualisée, présente et effective chez […] Céline, pour qui le "faire populaire" est un artifice, une clause d'écriture, le résultat d'un travail acharné avec et à travers la syntaxe'. Kristeva, pp. 231-232.
[47] Martin, *La Bande sonore*, p. 108.

others, but it also needs to be listened to, to tell someone. The beginning of *Voyage* is ambiguous in this regard: Bardamu as character is forced to speak, Bardamu the narrator breaches the silence of his own accord (against the characters), but also, at the same time, seems to answer an 'interrogatoire'.[48] The fantasised hostile reader is necessary to Bardamu's voice, because the ventriloquist's voice needs to be listened to, but also potentially threatening for it. While Bardamu has achieved vocal power over the others (a power which does not in fact satisfy him), just by the act of using his narrative voice he senses that there is a cyclicality of loss and gain with regard to voice, since the one to whom his voice is addressed will appropriate it, intone it – adapt it. The vocal power he gains is, then, shown as both ultimately pointless and dangerous; his orchestration of the characters turns out to be futile, and the relationship with the reader further jeopardises his status as orchestrator.

---

[48] Godard, p. 132.

Chapter 2: Textual voices in *Zazie dans le métro*

The orchestration of the textual voices of *Zazie* reveals a differing relationship between characters' and narrative voices in comparison with *Voyage* which will become the central focus of this chapter, particularly in terms of vocal control and power. In my analysis of the vocal system of *Zazie*, I will focus in particular on the polyphonic aspects of the text, and their implications for *Zazie*'s textual voices. Queneau's texts have been characterised as polyphonic, for instance by Inez Hedges who analyses the 'polyphony' of Queneau's texts in the relation to the reader:

> To adapt [one] of Barthes's paradigms, *Zazie* is a writable text (*texte scriptible*) that can only be enjoyed by a reader who participates in the play of its significations. Its mix of slang, spoken and literary French, neologisms, and phonetic puzzles challenges the reader's sensitivity to the nuances of the language [...]. The polyphony of Queneau's texts pluralizes the linear progression of the readable text (*texte lisible*) and disperses its elements. Language explodes in the disruptive celebration of itself *qua* language, foregrounding its powers of expression and rejecting its traditional subordinate role in relation to plot and character.[1]

Hedges uses the term 'polyphony' to refer to a creative 'mix' of heteroglot variety, but she does not refer to voices.[2] By contrast, Martin uses the term in relation to voices in his analysis of polyphony as textual strategy in Queneau's texts:

> les petites voix contraputiques du roman quenien à la troisième personne, fantaisistes et impertinentes, dénient les pouvoirs qui seraient octroyés à la grande voix abjecte des profondeurs. La polyphonie y joue ainsi le rôle d'une cacophonie: elle parasite l'émission d'une subjectivité souterraine et médiumnique, ses simulations ventriloques, ses halètements et ses borborygmes, où s'incarnerait une éthique de l'aveu et de l'authenticité [...]. Cette stratégie vise en particulier à dresser la machine monstrueuse du roman contre l'écriture du *je*. Elle casse le rythme, et suscite, dans le silence d'une voix refoulée, les babils mêlés et contradictoires de multiples locuteurs. Recherchant l'effacement, l'instance énonciatrice [...] est insituable. Elle se garde de l'illocutoire qui chez Céline, au cœur du délire, constamment rappelle le lecteur à l'ordre d'une présence [...]. Elle ne feint pas la confidence. Elle travaille au contraire, par son activité de sape et sa force de distanciation, à s'absenter.[3]

---

[1] Inez Hedges, *Breaking the Frame: Film Language and the Experience of Limits* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1991), p. 8. Hereafter cited as Hedges.

[2] Sue Vice explains the relation between heteroglossia and polyphony as follows: 'polyphony is a way of realizing heteroglossia in the novel, without being identical to heteroglossia. "Polyphony" means "multi-voicedness", while "heteroglossia" means "multi-languagedness" [...]. Polyphony refers to the arrangement of heteroglot variety into an aesthetic pattern. One of the principal ways of ensuring the presence of the different voices of heteroglossia in the novel is the creation of fictional characters'. Sue Vice, *Introducing Bakhtin* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997), p. 113. Hereafter cited as Vice.

[3] Martin, *La Bande sonore*, pp. 238-239.

The link between polyphony and cacophony, outlined here by Martin, will be an important aspect of my analysis of *Zazie*. Martin makes an opposition between Queneau's polyphonic use of third-person narrative and Céline's ventriloquial and subjective first-person narrative, which echoes the contrast I am analysing in the present study between the ways in which Bardamu and the narrator of *Zazie* deploy textual voices. Bardamu's ventriloquial narrative voice uses the voices of the others to impose his own, while, as I will show, it is possible to read *Zazie* as a text in which there is no hierarchy of voices due to the third-person narrator's striving for polyphony and vocal dissolution.

The term 'polyphony' is also used by Stanley E. Gray in his discussion of the 'openness' of Queneau's texts. According to Gray, the criteria for the definition of 'openness' and 'cloture' in relation to literary texts 'must be not only the degree of alienation from the "I" which is the source of the work but also the degree of resistance of the work to any focus or point of view'. Gray argues that Queneau's works are open 'because they are polyphonic and because their voices resist assimilation, succeed in remaining independent of each other and of their source'.[4] Gray's use of the term 'polyphony' is closer to Martin's analysis than Hedges's, in the sense that multi-voicedness is seen as a textual strategy that goes against or at least distances itself from the 'I', and leads to a multitude of points of view, so much so that none is prevalent. This echoes Martin's characterisation of 'un sujet éclaté, disséminé, distancié dans la troisième personne' in Queneau's texts.[5]

While Hedges, Martin and Gray talk about the polyphony of Queneau's texts, they do not provide an in-depth analysis of polyphony as a textual strategy, in part because this is not the aim of their respective studies. Indeed, Hedges only briefly describes *Zazie* as the original text of Malle's film adaptation, Gray's study focuses on a comparison between formalism in Beckett and Queneau, and Martin's analysis, which is the most extensive of the three, is part of a larger study on what Martin characterises as 'la bande sonore', situating Queneau and Céline in relation to other writers such as Beckett and Sarraute. None of these analyses refers to the polyphony of *Zazie* in particular; even Hedges, who focuses on *Zazie*, refers to the polyphony of Queneau's texts in general. Thus, while the polyphonic tendencies in Queneau's texts have been

---

[4] Stanley E. Gray, 'Beckett and Queneau as Formalists', *James Joyce Quarterly*, 8 (1971), 392-404 (pp. 402-403).

[5] Martin, *La Bande sonore*, p. 254.

commented on, the use of polyphonic features as a textual (and vocal) strategy by the narrative voice of *Zazie* has not been analysed in depth, as I will do in this chapter.[6]

I use 'polyphony' as it was first defined by Bakhtin, primarily in *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, where the concept of polyphony is closely linked with dialogism. Indeed, in Bres and Nowakowska's words, both polyphony and dialogism

> reposent fortement sur l'idée d'un dialogue, d'une interaction, entre deux ou plusieurs *discours*, *voix* ou *énoncés*; […] le dialogisme est un principe qui gouverne toute pratique langagière, et au-delà toute pratique humaine, alors que la polyphonie consiste en l'utilisation littéraire artistique du dialogisme de l'énoncé quotidien.[7]

'*The polyphonic novel is dialogic through and through*', because it is the use of dialogism in the novel, not only in the dialogues between characters but also in the structure of the text: 'dialogic relationships exist among all elements of novelistic structure; that is, they are juxtaposed contrapuntally'.[8]

Polyphony, in this sense, means multi-voicedness in the novel. By voice, Bakhtin refers to 'the speaking personality, the speaking consciousness'.[9] 'Polyphony' should be placed in contradistinction with the term 'plurivocality', which I used in my analysis of textual voices in *Voyage*. 'Plurivocality' is 'dialogized plurilingualism'.[10] Plurivocality can refer to one word, one voice (such as the Célinian narrative voice), or to 'les différentes strates vocales que sont entre autres la narration littéraire et les styles des personnages'.[11]

---

[6] The polyphony of Queneau's texts has also been analysed by Dorothy Gabe Coleman, who situates Queneau in the tradition of encyclopedism and in relation to Rabelais in particular. Dorothy Gabe Coleman, 'Polyphonic Poets: Rabelais and Queneau', in *Words of Power: Essays in Honour of Alison Fairlie*, ed. by Dorothy Gabe Coleman and others (Glasgow: University of Glasgow, 1987), pp. 46-68.

[7] Bres and Nowakowska, pp. 21-48 (p. 23). While in the present study I am using 'polyphony' in the Bakhtinian sense, the concept of polyphony is widely used in linguistics, and covers diverse senses. Marion Carel characterises the two main tendencies as 'polyphonie intertextuelle' (polyphony in the Bakhtinian sense, the use of dialogism in the novel) and 'polyphonie sémantique', developed by Oswald Ducrot and focusing on the polyphony of utterances in everyday use, thus in fact closer to the Bakhtinian concept of dialogism. Marion Carel, 'La Polyphonie linguistique', *Transposition: musique et sciences sociales*, 1 (2011) <http://transposition-revue.org/les-numeros/polyphonie-et-societe/article/la-polyphonie-linguistique> [accessed 17 May 2011]. For an overview of the different approaches to and uses of polyphony and dialogism in contemporary linguistics, see the volumes: Perrin and others, eds, *Le Sens et ses voix*, and Jacques Bres and others, eds, *Dialogisme et polyphonie: approches linguistiques* (Brussels: De Boeck-Duculot, 2005).

[8] Mikhail Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, ed. by and trans. by Caryl Emerson, intro. by Wayne C. Booth (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984), p. 40. Bakhtin's italics. Hereafter cited as Bakhtin, *PDP*.

[9] Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, 'Glossary', in Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination,* pp. 423-434 (p. 434).

[10] Susan Petrilli, 'Communication, Dialogue and Otherness in Mikhail Bakhtin's Metalinguistics', *Russian Journal of Communication*, 3:1 (2008), 268-280 (p. 272).

[11] El hadji Camara, 'L'Hybridation générique comme mécanisme de représentation dans le *Pleurer-Rire* d'Henri Lopes et *La Vie et demie* de Sony Labou Tansi', *Les Cahiers du GRELCEF*, 1 (2010), 215-226 (p. 216).

Literary polyphony is 'a particular mode of plurivocality'.[12] Polyphony, in the Bakhtinian sense, does not necessarily imply language differentiation between voices or differentiated vocal styles in the novel, but '*a plurality of independent and unmerged voices and consciousnesses, a genuine polyphony of fully valid voices*', as these voices are '*with equal rights and each with its own world*'. The heroes of polyphonic novels are '*not only objects of authorial discourse but also subjects of their own directly signifying discourse*', and what is important is the hero's gaze on the world and him/herself, rather than the way s/he appears in the world.[13]

By contrast with the characters' voices in monologic texts (such as Tolstoy's, or Turgenev's, according to Bakhtin), the voices of the heroes of polyphonic novels are unfinalised, and they are not predetermined. This is because there is no causality, no genesis outside the character's consciousness that explains his/her behaviour as part of his/her objectification as a character of the authorial discourse. The polyphonic novel implies a new relationship between the author's and the characters' voices, in comparison with monologic texts in which the characters are limited to being finalised objects of the authorial discourse, as the author always has the last word and holds the 'truth'. By contrast, the heroes of polyphonic novels are 'not voiceless slaves […], but *free* people, capable of standing *alongside* their creator'.[14]

This new relationship between authorial and characters' voices does not mean that the author is absent from the polyphonic novel. Indeed, 'the freedom of a character is an aspect of the author's design', and the author's new position has an active and positive quality, lying in the orchestration of the dialogue between the fully valid and free voices of the characters. The function of the author of a polyphonic novel is, then, not to transform others' consciousnesses into objects of his/her authorial discourse (as in monologic texts), but to reflect and re-create these other consciousnesses as fully

---

[12] Maria Shevtsova, 'Dialogism in the Novel and Bakhtin's Theory of Culture', *New Literary History*, 23:3 (1992), 747-763 (p. 753).

[13] Bakhtin, *PDP*, pp. 6-7. Bakhtin first considered that only Dostoevsky's novels were polyphonic; later (when a victim of Stalinism), he came to believe that polyphony was, in David Lodge's words, 'not a unique discovery of Dostoevky's, but an inherent characteristic of the novel as a literary form'. David Lodge, ed., *Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader*, 2nd ed., revised and expanded by Nigel Wood (Harlow: Longman, 2000), p. 104. However, just as Genette argues that all texts are hypertextual but some are more hypertextual than others, some novels are more polyphonic than others (see Genette, *Palimpsestes*, p. 16, and Introduction, p. 34). A possible criticism of Bakhtin's concept of polyphony is his binary opposition between polyphonic and monologic novels, which can be read in terms of democratic novels vs. totalitarian novels. This opposition has, as Brian McKenna points out, 'been seized upon by some in quest of an evaluation principle for prose fiction'. Brian McKenna, 'The British Communist Novel of the 1930s and 1940s: A Party of Equals? (And Does That Matter?)', *The Review of English Studies*, new series, 47:187 (1996), 369-385 (p. 370).

[14] Bakhtin, *PDP*, p. 29.

valid and unfinalised voices engaged in dialogue.[15] Thus, in David Lodge's words, a polyphonic novel can be defined as a 'novel in which a variety of conflicting ideological positions are given a voice and set in play both between and within individual speaking subjects, without being placed and judged by an authoritative authorial voice'.[16]

This Bakhtinian model of polyphony is useful for the analysis of the textual voices in *Zazie*, in particular the relationship between the narrator's and the characters' voices. *Zazie*'s narrator, like the polyphonic author as described by Bakhtin, does not retain 'any *essential* authorial "surplus"'.[17] Due to the rarity of descriptions, the predominance of dialogues and the importance of free indirect discourse in the narrative voice, the reader perceives not how the characters appear in the world, but rather how they see it, and each other. This is similar to what Bakhtin describes in the polyphonic Dostoevskian novel, whose hero 'is not an objectified image but an autonomous discourse, *pure voice*; we do not see him, we hear him; everything that we see and know apart from his discourse is nonessential'.[18]

However, Bakhtin's approach to polyphony does raise a number of issues that affect the analysis of *Zazie*'s textual voices. Firstly, Bakhtin's use of the term 'author' is potentially problematic. In Vice's words, 'a general problem that Bakhtin's own chronotopic moment raises is his preference for the term "author" over "narrator"'. In fact, Vice regularly substitutes 'author' with 'narrator'.[19] Following Vice, rather than using the ambiguous term of 'author' (in the sense of implied author) and analysing the relationship between author's and characters' voices, I will focus on the way the narrative voice deploys and organises textual voices in *Zazie*, as I did in my analysis of *Voyage*. Secondly, Bakhtin understands 'voice' as the 'speaking consciousness', and in his analysis of polyphony in Dostoevsky's novels he never takes into account the physical qualities or attributes of voices, such as volume and accompanying gestures. Like in *Voyage*, these aspects of oral communication are important aspects of the vocal system of *Zazie*, as the dialogues between characters often incorporate dynamic notations such as '(silence)', '(geste)', and other indications of volume and intonation. Thirdly, Bakhtin does not relate polyphony to ventriloquism; in fact, the opposition between polyphony

---

[15] Bakhtin, *PDP*, pp. 65-68.
[16] David Lodge, *After Bakhtin: Essays on Fiction and Criticism* (London: Routledge, 1990), p. 86.
[17] Bakhtin, *PDP*, p. 72.
[18] Bakhtin, *PDP*, p. 53.
[19] Vice, p. 4. For example: 'where Bakhtin […] says "author", it is often clearer to replace this with "narrator"'. Vice, p. 126. For a discussion of Bakhtin's omission of a helpful distinction between author and narrator and how this relates to contemporary literary theories, see Vice, pp. 126-127.

and ventriloquism is what characterises the opposition of Queneau and Céline in Martin's analysis. Insofar as the heroes of polyphonic novels are, to a certain extent, free and independent voices standing alongside the narrator's voice, the characters are, then, not ventriloquised. Instead, their free and fully valid voices are organised in dialogue. However, by analysing the relationship between polyphony and ventriloquism in *Zazie*, I aim to show how the articulation of these two apparent opposites reveals how the notion of freedom of the characters is problematic, and the narrator's role is potentially ambiguous.

My analysis will begin with how the model of polyphony works in *Zazie*, focusing on concepts of non-predetermination, unfinalisability, the characters as objects and/or subjects of their own signifying discourse, and the relationship between the narrator's and the characters' voices as defined by the relationship between polyphony and ventriloquism. Having explored how polyphony works in *Zazie*, and in particular how it relates to Bakhtinian polyphony, I shall analyse the consequences of polyphony as a textual strategy, and its possible evolution (or dissolution) into cacophony, focusing on the dynamics of vocal control in the text and the ambiguity of the narrative voice. Finally, I shall focus on two characters, Zazie and Trouscaillon, who are distinguishable from the others, as I will argue, because of their potential vocal power, and I will examine whether or not they can succeed in gaining vocal power in the polyphonic and potentially cacophonic world of *Zazie*.

The characters of *Zazie* and the 'flaw' of the polyphonic system

An important aspect of the freedom of the characters in the Bakhtinian model of polyphony is that they are not predetermined. While in a monologic text the characters are objectified and finalised, the heroes of a polyphonic novel

> become relatively free and independent, because everything in the author's design that had defined him and, as it were, sentenced him, everything that had qualified him to be once and for all a completed image of reality [in monologic texts], now no longer functions as a form for finalizing him, but as the material of his self-consciousness.[20]

In a monologic text, then, the characters' 'story' (factors such as their upbringing, their environment) is expropriated from them and used to turn them into finalised, explainable objects, because they are predetermined. I propose that the non-

---

[20] Bakhtin, *PDP*, pp. 51-52.

predetermination of the characters of *Zazie* is shown by their appropriation of their past into a story of which they are the narrator, in this way becoming intradiegetic narrators. They retain their past, and tell it through their own voice. For example, it is Zazie who tells Trouscaillon the story of the murder of her father by her mother. The reader only hears this story through Zazie's voice; the narrator does not mention or comment on it, while this event could have been used by the narrative voice as cause or genesis to explain the character of Zazie and construct her into a finalised object. Indeed, Zazie acknowledges it could have traumatised her: 'c'était pas beau à voir. Dégueulasse même. De quoi mdonner des complexes' (*QZ*, p. 55). Zazie, then, becomes the narrator of this element of her past, and reveals a drive to tell her story to the seemingly uninterested Trouscaillon: she asks him 'ça vous intéresse, hein?' to which he replies 'pas spécialement', but she behaves as if he had expressed a desire to hear the story. She then tells him to calm down and to stop talking, saying 'vous seriez plus en état de l'apprécier, mon histoire' (*QZ*, pp. 52-53). Her delivery carefully manipulates rhetorical effects: 'c'est lui qui avait refilé la hache (silence) pour couper son bois (léger rire)' (*QZ*, p. 52). She prepares her narrative as she first tries to arouse Trouscaillon's interest, asking him whether he read about it in the paper, and telling him about the trial before saying 'je vais vous la raconter, mon histoire' (*QZ*, p. 53). When she recounts the events she is indeed telling a story; for example, she does not spoil the twist that her mother was hidden in the laundry room: 'il était tout seul, ou plutôt il se croyait tout seul, attendez, vous allez comprendre', and she uses simile and metaphor: 'il met la clé dans sa poche et il roule des yeux en faisant ah ah ah tout comme au cinéma', 'ircommence à me courser, enfin bref, une vraie corrida' (*QZ*, p. 54). By using these strategies, Zazie appropriates this element of her past through her own voice, as she becomes the narrator of it. The narrative voice does not expropriate it from her by commenting on it or using it to objectify her into a finalised character of whom only the extra-diegetic, omniscient narrator knows the 'truth'. Other examples of characters becoming narrators of their own past story include Trouscaillon's conversation with Fédor in Chapter 16, and Gabriel and Turandot remembering the war. Gabriel, narrating the bombings, presents himself as a fearless hero:

> N'empêche que j'ai jamais eu peur [pendant les bombardements] et j'ai même jamais rien reçu sur le coin de la gueule tu vois, même pendant les pires. Les Frisous, eux, ils avaient une pétoche monstre, ils fonçaient dans les abris, les coudocors, moi je me marais, je restais dehors à regarder le feu d'artifice, bam en

plein dans le mille, un dépôt de munitions qui saute, la gare pulvérisée, l'usine en miettes, la ville qui flambe, un spectacle du tonnerre. (*QZ*, p. 38)

The characters are given the freedom to tell their own story through their own voice. The extra-diegetic narrator does not interfere and does not seem to be omniscient, and as the characters appropriate their past, they even appear as potential narrative voices.

In the Bakhtinian model, the fact that the heroes of polyphonic novels are not predetermined is linked to their unfinalisability. As they act in the present, they can never be fully known, unlike objectified characters in monologic texts. Dmitri Nikulin explains the link between unfinalisability of voice and inexhaustibility:

> The inexhaustibility of a person is exemplified in and by the unfinalizability of the person's voice […]. The 'true state of affairs' about a person can never be presented in a finite number of statements or propositions, neither by oneself through a reflective self-description nor by the other, because, in being the same yet each time new, one cannot be presented in a fully exhausted image or finalized description.[21]

The characters of *Zazie* are made up of contradictions and variations, and as such they can be characterised as unfinalised and inexhaustible, albeit in a much more extreme and literal way than the Dostoevskian heroes as analysed by Bakhtin. The unfinalisability and inexhaustibility of the characters of *Zazie* constitutes one of the difficulties posed by the text for interpretation.[22] Indeed, Gobert points out that the difficulty of interpretation of Queneau's works and the multiple meanings of the novels are 'caused in part by the ambiguity of the "marionettes" which defy categorical definitions'.[23] The characters are ambiguous because they are not realistic, and by characterising them as 'marionettes' Gobert implies that their incoherence is due to their lack of substance, as they are irrationally controlled by a puppeteer (Gobert however does not imply the presence of a ventriloquist). What I see as the characters' unfinalisability would then, following this analysis, be the result not of the characters' freedom but of their lack of it. By contrast, I argue that the extreme unfinalisability of the characters is part of the strategy of the narrative voice to not control the characters at all, as it strives for dissolution and absence and relinquishes its role of orchestrator and, ultimately, controller, or ventriloquist.

---

[21] Dmitri Vladimirovich Nikulin, *On Dialogue* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2006), p. 87.

[22] Wodsak points out: 'jede Figur des Romans zeigt widersprüchliche Züge oder zerfließt völlig im Unbestimmten' [Each character of the novel shows contradictory characteristics or dissolves completely in uncertainty] [my translation]. She argues that the 'incoherence' of *Zazie* draws attention to language, and that this focus on language (form rather than content) influences the translation process (in her case from French into German). Wodsak, pp. 295-316 (p. 295).

[23] Gobert, 91-106 (p. 91).

In his analysis of the ambiguity and the impossible categorisation of characters, Gobert focuses on the 'reverse complementarity' of Gabriel and Trouscaillon; 'adversaries whose characters are both built on contradictory natures, [they] are characterised by identity, masked, however, by diversity'.[24] Gobert therefore implies the existence of a true stable and unique identity. However I propose that identities in the novel are not so much masked than characterised by diversity, because they are unfinalised. As such, they are unresolved. Zazie's relentless questioning of her uncle's sexuality (though she does not know the meaning of 'hormosessuel') shows a desire on her part, and eventually her failure, to understand and categorise Gabriel. The question of Gabriel's sexuality is never resolved in the novel, I suggest, because it does not have a stable, finalised answer. Gabriel is married to Marceline, and jealously protective of her, however at the end of the text she appears as a male character named Marcel. Rather than seeing Marceline/Marcel as a man masked as a woman or vice versa however, I propose that the gender of the character is unfinalised (and as a result so is her/his partner's sexuality).

The character that epitomises unfinalisability in the text is Trouscaillon, who cyclically reappears with a new, imperfect identity, and to whom I will turn in detail later in this chapter. The unfinalisability of the characters is taken literally at the end of the novel as it turns into the potential ability to exchange roles and voices. After being rescued by Marceline/Marcel, the characters now have to keep themselves hidden. In order to do so, Turandot gets into the cage of his parrot Laverdure, who now carries him. The two also exchange their voices, as Turandot utters Laverdure's permanent phrase, 'Tu causes, tu causes, c'est tout ce que tu sais faire', while Laverdure utters 'Alors au revoir, les gars!' (*QZ*, p. 187).

This interchangeability exemplifies how the unfinalisability and the inexhaustibility of the characters is of a different nature to that of the Bakhtinian model of polyphony, where the Dostoevskian heroes are unresolved and unfinalised with regard to their ideological position and Weltanschauung. In *Zazie*, the essence of the characters is their unfinalisability, but this unfinalisability applies to 'factual' aspects such as their gender, name, identity or profession. They are unresolved not as consciousnesses, in relation to themselves (as for example Raskolnikov is unresolved in *Crime and Punishment*), but rather in relation to the other (the other characters, and the reader), who is unable to categorise them, and to resolve their identity due to their

---

[24] Gobert, 91-106 (pp. 95-96).

unfinalisability. The characters have, rather than the ability to dress up and mask their identity, the potential to change.

It seems, then, that the polyphony of *Zazie* is based on contradiction, paradox, and irrationality, and this is further confirmed by the characters' relationship with their supposedly factual surroundings. In *Zazie*, places and surroundings are described not 'objectively' but through the gaze of the characters, for example when Zazie leaves Marceline and Gabriel's flat and sees the quiet neighbourhood: 'Zazie n'est pas tout à fait déçue, elle sait qu'elle est bien à Paris, que Paris est un grand village et que tout Paris ne ressemble pas à cette rue' (*QZ*, p. 33), or in the battle scene in Chapter 17, where the description is from the point of view of the characters: 'c'était maintenant des troupeaux de loufiats qui surgissaient de toutes parts. Jamais on upu croire qu'il y en u autant' (*QZ*, p. 179). In an earlier scene, the inability of two characters to identify what they see reveals, I suggest, that the system that would normally give the characters 'the position enabling [them] to interpret and evaluate [their] own self and [their] surrounding reality' is potentially flawed and problematic in *Zazie*.[25] As such, this relationship between the characters and their view of their surroundings reveals, also, the flaws in the novel's so-called 'polyphony'. In Chapter 1, as Charles is giving Gabriel and Zazie a ride home in his taxi, Charles and Gabriel intend to show Zazie a number of iconic Parisian buildings, as this is the first time she is visiting the city. They are however unable to agree on what the buildings they are showing are, and they end up almost arguing:

> – Et ça! mugit [Gabriel], regarde!! le Panthéon!!!
> – Qu'est-ce qu'il faut pas entendre, dit Charles sans se retourner.
> […]
> – C'est peut-être pas le Panthéon? demande Gabriel.
> Il y a quelque chose de narquois dans sa question.
> – Non, dit Charles avec force. Non, non et non, c'est pas le Panthéon.
> (*QZ*, pp. 14-15)

Wodsak sees the characters' (and in particular the taxi driver Charles') inability to name their surroundings as an early indication that 'der Roman keine ernstahfte Evokation einer wie auch immer gearteten "außerliterarischen Realität" sein will, daß er kein politisches, sozialkritisches, philosophisches etc. Anliegen vertritt und keine Botschaften dieser Art vermitteln will'.[26] While this passage indeed shows the reader that the world

[25] Bakhtin, *PDP*, p. 47.
[26] [An early indication that] 'the novel does not mean to be a serious evocation of an "extra-literary reality" of any kind whatsoever, that it does not represent political, sociocritical, philosophical (etc)

of *Zazie* does not mean to present an 'objective' image of reality, this is problematic for Gabriel and Charles, as can be seen from their attempts to identify the buildings, and the resulting quasi-argument between them. The inability to name the surroundings goes further, as Gabriel confuses his local tobacconist's with another one:

> − On est bientôt arrivé, dit Gabriel conciliant. Voilà le tabac du coin.
> − De quel coin ? demande Charles ironiquement.
> − Du coin de la rue de chez moi où j'habite, répond Gabriel avec candeur.
> − Alors, dit Charles, c'est pas çui-là.
> − Comment, dit Gabriel, tu prétendrais que ça ne serait pas celui-là?
> − Ah non, s'écrie Zazie, vous allez pas recommencer.
> − Non, c'est pas celui-là, répond Charles à Gabriel. (*QZ*, p. 16)

Seeing the world through the characters' gaze, normally such a key feature of polyphonic novels, leads to uncertainty and irrationality in *Zazie*, as the characters do not know what they are looking at.[27] The battle between contradicting ideologies in Bakhtinian polyphony, in which the narrator does not offer a 'truth', is here trivialised and turned into a battle about the names of Parisian buildings, in which the narrator does not even participate in the activity of establishing the truth. The inexistence of an objectified, monologic truth is transposed into a world in which even facts are not stable. The inability to name one's surroundings, though perhaps seemingly insignificant, points to the ambiguity of the polyphonic model in *Zazie*, in which characters are given freedom, but in a world which they cannot understand because it is not real: 'la vérité! s'écrie Gabriel (geste), comme si tu savais cexé. Comme si quelqu'un au monde savait cexé. Tout ça (geste), c'est du bidon: le Panthéon, les Invalides, la caserne de Reuilly, le tabac du coin. Oui, du bidon' (*QZ*, p. 17). Gabriel's utterance is echoed by Mado's feeling about the characters' impossibility of understanding 'life':

> − D'ailleurs nous, est-ce qu'on entrave vraiment kouak ce soit à kouak ce soit?
> − Koua à koua ? demanda Turandot.
> − A la vie. Parfois on dirait un rêve. (*QZ*, p. 144)

These arguments, whether about naming surroundings or about how to understand 'life' ultimately reveal a pointlessness to the characters' role in the novel's polyphony. The freedom they have been given does not bring them anything, as seeing the world through their gaze means confusion. Subjects of their own signifying discourse, they struggle however to exploit their power to signify or grant meaning. I propose that the

---

matters, and does not mean to convey messages of this type' [my translation]. Wodsak, pp. 295-316 (p. 296).

[27] The irrationality of Zazie's world is shown by Louis Malle in his film adaptation (which will be the focus of Part II, Chapter 3): in this scene in the taxi, the characters drive past the same building every time, but give it different names, and argue about them.

instance responsible for this 'flaw' in the polyphonic model of *Zazie* is, in fact, the narrative voice – which, as outlined above, the characters themselves, finding themselves at a loss within the polyphonic system, sometimes attempt to take on.

The relationship between the narrator's and characters' voices: polyphony and ventriloquism

In order to analyse the narrative voice, and its relationship with the characters' voices in *Zazie*, I propose to bring together the concepts of polyphony (as it is 'flawed' in *Zazie*) and ventriloquism. That polyphony and ventriloquism are linked is shown by the fact that ventriloquists were first called polyphonists (from 'polyphonism' however rather than 'polyphony').[28] Taking polyphony and ventriloquism as models for the deployment and organisation of textual voices in a literary text however reveals a significant difference between the two. In polyphony there is no apparent hierarchy of voices (characters', narrator's), as they all have equal rights and are fully valid and independent; ventriloquism, by contrast, implies that one voice is putting on the many voices of the text, and the ventriloquial metaphor implies the possibility of not only appropriating but also expropriating the other's voice. As I outlined in the introduction, ventriloquism has two tendencies: in relation to oneself (to mirror the multiplicity of the self through many voices), and in relation to the other (by putting on the other's voice, speaking through the other). I suggest that, like in *Voyage*, both tendencies are present in *Zazie*, however used in a different way, and this time in combination with polyphony.

Martin talks about 'le roman quenien à la troisième personne' as going against the '*je*', a movement which is also present in Gray's analysis. The narrative voice of *Zazie* is, indeed, characterised by its vocal alterity. It is stratified into a layering of voices, including what can be characterised as a 'literary voice' ('refined' expression), an 'oralised voice' ('oral' syntax, grammar and vocabulary), and the characters' voices (when the narrative voice reports their thoughts or utterances in free indirect discourse, which is an emblematic form of polyphony in the novel). Already in Chapter 1 of the novel, examples of layers of voice can be discerned. In the passage that opens the novel, the narrative voice 'puts on' Gabriel's voice, which is typified by the elision of negative 'ne' and oral syntax, as it renders his thoughts:

---

[28] About polyphonism and ventriloquism, see Connor, p. 291; p. 296; pp. 298-299; p. 327; pp. 329-330; p. 398.

> Doukipudonktan, se demanda Gabriel excédé. Pas possible, ils se nettoient jamais. Dans le journal, on dit qu'il y a pas onze pour cent des appartements à Paris qui ont des salles de bains, ça m'étonne pas, mais on peut se laver sans. Tous ceux-là qui m'entourent, ils doivent pas faire de grands efforts. (*QZ*, p. 9)

In the following quotation, still from the beginning of Chapter 1, all three layers of voice can be discerned:

> Heureusement vlà ltrain qu'entre en gare, ce qui change le paysage. La foule parfumée dirige ses multiples regards vers les arrivants qui commencent à défiler, les hommes d'affaire en tête au pas accéléré avec leurs porte-documents au bout du bras pour tout bagage et leur air de savoir voyager mieux que les autres. Gabriel regarde dans le lointain; elles, elles doivent être à la traîne, les femmes, c'est toujours à la traîne; mais non, une mouflette surgit qui l'interpelle.
> (*QZ*, p. 11)

The narrative voice is, in turn, 'oralised' (in the first and last sentences), 'literary' (the second sentence), and puts on a character's voice (Gabriel's, as the narrative voice follows his gaze and renders his thoughts). These examples show how the narrative voice of *Zazie* moves swiftly from one type of voice to another. In her article 'Voices: Bakhtin's Heteroglossia and Polyphony, and the Performance of Narrative Literature', Linda M. Park-Fuller uses the Bakhtinian concepts to analyse the stratification of voices in Tillie Olsen's novel *Yonnondio: From the Thirties* (1974). Focusing on the layering of 'literary' and 'oral' voices in the narrative voice, Park-Fuller argues that the movement between literary and oral narration represents the narrator's capacity as a dynamic unifying and diversifying force, as this force renders the common experience of the Depression through many voices.[29] I propose that in *Zazie* the polyphonic quality of the narrative voice is not used as a dynamic unifying and diversifying force, but as a strategy of dissemination, and potential dissolution of any stable vocal identity. In *Zazie*, a character's voice, when it is freed up through the use of free indirect discourse, also becomes one of the voices of the narrator, as the narrator shows a ventriloquial ability to put on others' voices. Polyphonic tendencies in *Zazie* can, then, be seen as a principle of construction not only for the characters' voices to be free but also for the narrative voice to dissolve. As the narrative voice, through free indirect discourse, creates the voice of a character as an 'I', it also distances itself further from the possibility of its own voice being an 'I'. The ventriloquial ability to mirror the multiplicity of the self is here taken to an extreme, as the narrative voice constructs itself in vocal heterogeneity

---

[29] Linda M. Park-Fuller, 'Voices: Bakhtin's Heteroglossia and Polyphony, and the Performance of Narrative Literature', *Literature in Performance*, 7 (1986), 1-12.

and risks dissolution because it engages, instead, with a polyphonic strategy of 'freedom' and 'equality' of voice.

The narrative voice in *Zazie* is, then, constructed out of, and participates in, the construction of others' subjectivities. As I have shown however, the characters, perhaps paradoxically, do not necessarily benefit from the freedom they have gained (as I will show, Trouscaillon is an extreme example of the harm polyphony can do to a character). As a result, I suggest that *Zazie* reveals and exploits a certain paradox in the Bakhtinian model of polyphony, in which characters are both objects of the authorial discourse and subjects of their own signifying discourse. Analyses of *Zazie* differ on the question of whether the characters are objects or subjects. Gobert, by characterising them as 'marionettes', implies that they are only objects. By contrast, Niang argues that 'néo-français' participates in the construction of the characters' subjectivity, thus implying that they are subjects of their own discourse. Niang describes Queneau as transcriber of the characters' voices.[30] In her analysis of self-reflexivity in *Zazie*, Bernofsky suggests a more complex relationship between characters and author. She argues that the characters' voices are logically not free (they could not possibly say anything other than what they say), because they are characters in a novel, and as such their words come from somewhere else (the author). Some characters, however, are aware of their status of written beings, as can be seen in the conversation between Fédor and Trouscaillon, in which mistakes that could not have been perceived orally are corrected (*QZ*, pp. 164-165). This self-awareness, in Bernofsky's argument, leads to 'a curious sense of complicity' between some characters and the author.[31] While Bernofsky's approach is clearly author-oriented, she outlines a further layer of complexity between characters and controlling instance that is fruitful for my analysis.

As I have shown, the relationship between the narrator's and the characters' voices combines flawed polyphonic tendencies with a ventriloquism turned toward the self rather than the other. The characters are, then, both imperfect objects and imperfect subjects. However, Marceline and Gabriel stand out as exceptions in this relationship. When Marceline is complimented by Mado on how well she speaks ('ce que vous causez bien'), she replies 'je n'y suis pour rien' while lowering her eyes (*QZ*, p. 141). While this reply can be seen as simple modesty, Bernofsky analyses it as 'a

---

[30] Niang's analysis, then, echoes the role of the polyphonic 'author', who seems to listen to or transcribe the characters' voices. Vice, p. 113.
[31] Bernofsky, 113-124 (p. 117)

curious hesitancy to take credit for [her] utterance'.[32] As Marceline implies that she is not responsible for what she says, she is shown as fully the object of another's voice. While Bernofsky sees this other's voice as the author's, I have analysed the narrator as the (un)controlling instance. Here, it would seem that the narrator fully uses the control inherent to the function of narrative voice, and, perhaps, speaks through Marceline. In this way, Marceline gains vocal power, not in violence towards the other, but by seducing Mado.

The same dynamic between narrator and character is found in Gabriel's speech at the Eiffel tower (*QZ*, pp. 90-91). This speech serves to point to the self-reflexivity of the text, as it includes intertextual references to Sartre, Shakespeare, and Calderon, a reference to a novelist, and the 'highly literary device' of speaking in the third person.[33] About this speech, Andrew Horton argues that Queneau

> exposes Gabriel as a character composed of allusions, parodies, half-borrowed lines, and partially understood ideas. He is the language that speaks, and that language has the paradoxical reality of his career: male ballerina. But Queneau's critique is also a celebration. Gabriel is more than the sum of his borrowed phrases and concepts; he is an individual capable of expressing his dream-reality state in an imaginative flow of language that ends with a final wink as the reader acknowledges the presence of the 'idiotic novelist (oh! sorry)' as the master puppeteer.[34]

Horton analyses this speech in conjunction with Queneau's aim to critique language and expose its limitations, but also to suggest 'its vast possibilities for expressing the imagination'.[35] Horton points out that Gabriel appears as both a fabricated character and an individual with the power to signify or grant meaning. Written by a novelist, Gabriel can however speak. With regard to the relationship between narrator and character, it is when Gabriel becomes fully an object that, like Marceline, he gains vocal power, again not in violence towards the other, but in seduction or attraction: after this speech, a group of tourists become obsessed with him, follow him around and even kidnap him. The narrator, who gives him vocal power, deflects the responsibility of the utterance further (like a ventriloquist), by referring to the figure of a novelist dreaming up and typing the story. After this first speech, Gabriel seems to have gained not only vocal power but, in fact, a voice to match his 'air majestueux trouvé sans peine dans son

---

[32] Bernofsky, 113-124 (p. 117).

[33] Gaitet, p. 184.

[34] Andrew Horton, 'Growing Up Absurd: Malle's Zazie dans le Métro (1960) from the Novel by Raymond Queneau', in *Modern European Filmmakers and the Art of Adaptation*, ed. by Andrew Horton and Joan Magretta (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1981), pp. 63-77 (p. 66). Hereafter cited as Horton, pp. 63-77.

[35] Horton, pp. 63-77 (p. 63).

répertoire' (*QZ*, p. 15): he gives two more speeches in the novel, both of which are a success with the tourists, and in which he does not refer to himself in the third person (*QZ*, pp. 117-118; *QZ*, pp. 150-152). The cases of Marceline and Gabriel, I suggest, show to what extent the polyphonic model is flawed in *Zazie*, as the characters in fact need a controlling instance, and perhaps even a ventriloquist (or 'puppeteer', in Horton's terms). The characters have the control of their own voice but do not seem to benefit from it, and they are mostly uncontrolled by a narrative voice that appropriates their voice as part of its own plural narrative voice. As a result of this relationship, polyphony in the novel risks turning into cacophony.

Consequences of a 'flawed' polyphony

The consequences of a 'flawed' polyphonic system in *Zazie* point towards the way the text verges on cacophony. If polyphony in the Bakhtinian sense cannot be analysed in terms of speech differentiation, does the novel reveal, instead, textual markers of cacophony? When does polyphony, multi-voicedness and voices with equal rights, turn into cacophony, and what is the role of the ventriloquial act in this process? It is, in fact, difficult to determine at what point polyphony turns into cacophony, as the conversation between Gabriel and Mouaque towards the end of the novel illustrates:

> − Qu'est-ce que (oh qu'il est mignon) t'insinues (il m'a appelée) sur mon compte (une mousmé), dirent, synchrones, Gabriel (et la veuve Mouaque), l'un avec fureur, (l'autre avec ferveur). (*QZ*, p. 170)

As Gabriel and Mouaque talk at the same time ('synchrones'), they are not listening to each other, and, logically, the characters around them should not be able to understand either of them clearly. This therefore seems to imply cacophony. However, their utterances are in fact synchronised by the narrative voice, which uses a textual construction (the use of brackets), and for the reader there is no confusion with regard to the speaker of the utterance, and this instead implies polyphony. This passage can, then, be characterised as being both polyphonic, at the structural level, and cacophonic, at the level of the characters.

David Bordwell seems to imply that polyphony in the Bakhtinian sense is already on the verge of cacophony: 'the novel, according to Bakhtin, is not a spectacle organized around Jamesian sight lines; it is a polyphony, even a cacophony, of different

registers of speech and written languages: a montage of voices'.[36] Following the musical meaning of the term, cacophony is often understood in pejorative terms, as a negative version of polyphony, 'polyphony gone wrong':

> mais sans les accords comme piliers de base, la polyphonie dégénèrerait en cacophonie au sens le plus strict du terme; elle sortirait des gonds directeurs de l'ensemble harmonique de l'œuvre singulière pour s'épendre de manière anarchique […]. Tant dans la composition musicale que littéraire, différentes voix ne peuvent se réaliser *polyphoniquement* qu'en s'appuyant sur le tout, sur la totalité du texte en question. Le contraire dégénérait […] en cacophonie ou en anarchie textuelle.[37]

Cacophony, in this analysis, is defined by a non-adherence to the governing rules that shape an overall structure. There is, however, a fine line between what is 'acceptable', and what is not. Laurence Rosier defines polyphony as 'l'harmonie de la discordance', as many different, discordant voices are orchestrated into a harmonious whole.[38] Yet the potential for that discordance to tip over into cacophony when it is no longer governed by the rules of harmony remains a significant risk. The tipping point between polyphony and cacophony seems to revolve around how voices are governed, organised or orchestrated.

In her analysis of Albert Cohen's *Belle du Seigneur* (1968), Claire Stolz argues that the novel is characterised by 'beaucoup de polyphonie, beaucoup de voix souvent divergentes, mais pas de cacophonie', which she attributes to the presence of what she terms an 'archinarrateur', the 'instance narrative qui chapeaute les autres', or the 'chef d'orchestre'.[39] The 'archinarrateur' is the instance that 'domine totalement' the narration and its many voices, as it organises them into a harmonious whole, a unity:

> le roman apparaît tel un diamant comme un objet aux reflets multiples et variés, mais ayant une unité très forte; les facettes, bien que dirigées dans des directions opposées, s'organisent dans une construction géométrique harmonieuse, mais toujours ouverte, toujours en devenir.[40]

Stolz argues that the presence of the 'archinarrateur' in *Belle du Seigneur* is revealed through 'la récurrence de traits stylistiques dans toutes les parties du livre, quelles que

---

[36] David Bordwell, *Narration in the Fiction Film* (London: Routledge, 1986), p. 17. Hereafter cited as Bordwell.

[37] M.-Pierrette Malcuzynski, *Entre-dialogues avec Bakhtine, ou: sociocritique de la [dé]raison polyphonique* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1992), p. 180; p. 181.

[38] Laurence Rosier, 'Polyphonie: les "dessous" d'une métaphore', in *Le Sens et ses voix*, ed. by Perrin and others, pp. 189-211 (p. 199).

[39] Claire Stolz, *La Polyphonie dans 'Belle du Seigneur' d'Albert Cohen: pour une approche sémiostylistique* (Paris: Champion, 1998), p. 323; p. 321; p. 316. Hereafer cited as Stolz.

[40] Stolz, p. 314.

soient les instances narratives'.[41] *Belle du Seigneur*, then, is a polyphonic novel that does not turn into a cacophonic text because its many voices are orchestrated and united by a dominant, stable and, in a sense, unique (with recurrent stylistic features) narrative voice.

The narrative voice of *Zazie*, by contrast to the 'archinarrateur' of *Belle du Seigneur* as analysed by Stolz, can be described as a plural voice that risks turning into cacophony, or at least a semblance of it. Characterised by its ventriloquial capacity, it combines its many voices by exploiting the inharmonious dissonances between them. Rather than the recurrent stylistic features of one 'arch-voice' that unites the text, there is a narrative voice that tends to dissolution and whose recurrent stylistic feature is its dissonance. As outlined above, rather than both unifying and diversifying the voices of the text, it dissolves into them, disseminates, and does not unify. The ventriloquial, plural narrative voice is, more often than not, a cacophony of disjointed voices in itself.

I suggest that this plural and potentially cacophonic narrative voice directly affects the polyphony of the text because it does not organise the dialogue between the characters. Bakhtin argues that a polyphonic novel is 'constructed [by the author] as a great dialogue, but one where the author acts as organizer and participant in the dialogue without retaining for himself the final word'.[42] The voices of a polyphonic novel are organised into a dialogue, which often means a confrontation, by the narrator ('the author' in Bakhtin's quotation). In the light of this, cacophony can be described as the failure of dialogue in the Bakhtinian sense between characters. This is Patrick Tourchon's argument in his analysis of polyphony in Joseph Conrad's *Lord Jim* (1899-1900), as in one scene 'the voices' discordance is then maximal […], and makes the three characters deaf to each other's speech that nobody masters anything any longer. Polyphony here verges on cacophony'.[43] In *Zazie*, I suggest that the narrative voice relinquishes its active and positive role of orchestrating the dialogue between the characters, which leads to the failure of dialogue in the novel, and, as a result, to cacophonic tendencies.

Dialogue does not fail in the sense of a lack of 'exterior dialogues' between the characters. Indeed, as pointed out by Niang, 'le silence des personnages seuls est systématiquement brisé par l'irruption d'un personnage qui entamera d'emblée un

---

[41] Stolz, p. 325.
[42] Bakhtin, *PDP*, p. 75.
[43] Patrick Tourchon, 'Polyphony in *Lord Jim*: On *Übermensch*', *Conradiana*, 40:1 (2008), 71-88 (p. 84).

dialogue'.[44] For example in Chapter 12, Trouscaillon has just parted from Mouaque, who 'revenue à la solitude', says 'je fais des folies'. While these words are uttered 'à mi-voix pour elle-même', they are still heard and replied to: 'destinés à l'usage interne, ces quatre mots provoquèrent néanmoins la réponse que voici: qu'est-ce qui n'en fait pas'. (*QZ*, p. 125). In Chapter 16, Trouscaillon is alone, and sees a man who pretends to be sleeping, 'ce qui ne rassura pas Trouscaillon mais ne l'empêcha point cependant de lui adresser la parole' (*QZ*, pp. 162-163). As can be seen from these two examples, dialogue seems both impossible to avoid and a compulsion for the characters. The importance of talking for the characters is emphasised by the parrot Laverdure's recurrent comment 'tu causes, tu causes, c'est tout ce que tu sais faire'. However, while dialogue is predominant in the text, it does not turn into dialogicality. For example, Charles and Gabriel engage in a dialogue in order to repeat something that was already confirmed:

> – Et après tu restes dîner avec nous.
> – C'était pas entendu ?
> – Si.
> – Alors?
> – Alors, je confirme.
> – Y a pas à confirmer, puisque c'était entendu. (*QZ*, p. 18)

Gabriel accuses Turandot of using words whose meaning he does not know (*QZ*, p. 40), dialogues trail off (when Zazie has run away, the dialogue moves onto washing machines, *QZ*, p. 40), Gabriel cannot remember what he was saying ('Oui, dit Gabriel pensivement, de quoi qu'on causait? De rien, répondit le type. De rien', *QZ*, p. 71), and Laverdure's refrain is contagious, as the characters 'commencent à répéter la phrase perpétuelle de Laverdure', accusing each other of only being able to talk.[45] Dialogue fails because 'each character tends to pursue his or her own train of thought (and they often miss their connections) with sublime disregard for what anyone else is trying to say at the same moment'.[46] Horton argues that 'talk is a large part of what any of the characters can do (including Laverdure) to express themselves and establish their identities'.[47] The characters, however, do not seem to understand that to 'establish their identities' they have to enter into a dialogue, and to bring their voice into contact with that of the other.

Although the characters do not listen to each other and often tell each other to be quiet, they do not, however, engage in the kind of battle between voices that is essential

---

[44] Niang, pp. 109-123 (p. 114).
[45] Sears, pp. 91-99 (p. 94).
[46] Redfern, p. 24.
[47] Horton, pp. 63-67 (pp. 66-67).

to the construction of voice in the polyphonic model, in which 'dialogue has penetrated inside every word, provoking in it a battle and the interruption of one voice by another'.[48] Sears points out that in *Zazie* the adults have a 'discours automatique, figé, mené par le cliché et par des associations d'idées mécaniques'.[49] They see words as neutral words of language, not populated by other voices, and language as abstruse and fixed, as can be seen when they dismantle idioms and focus on standard grammar, which is an aspect of unitary language. As a result of this conception of language as not shaped by voices, the characters are deaf to each other's voices, menaced by and obsessed with a language they see as unitary rather than heteroglot. They are animated by a compulsion to talk, to have 'le dernier mot' (*QZ*, p. 68), to tell their story to the other, whether or not s/he listens:

> − Alors allez-y, dit Fédor Balanovitch, sinon c'est moi qui raconte.
> − Non, non, dit Trouscaillon, parlons encore un peu de moi.
> […]
> − Eh bin, continuez, dit Fédor Balanovitch. Sans ça je commence. (*QZ*, p. 165)

With the freedom to express themselves and to interact with the other fully valid voices, the characters ultimately fail to construct their voice, because they fail to listen and to enter a dialogue. As heroes of a polyphonic text they have been given 'the direct power to create meaning or signify'; as objects of a potentially cacophonic narrative voice that tends to dissolution, however, they are imperfect subjects of their own discourse, which is not organised into a dialogue out of which a unity or meaning can be constructed.[50] Without the vocal power they gain when ventriloquised, the characters do not construct their voice but only talk.

While the narrative voice leaves the characters as free voices, there are two instances in the text that act as 'rappels à l'ordre': Zazie and Laverdure.[51] Laverdure's 'tu causes, tu causes', and Zazie's comments such as 'vous allez pas recommencer' (*QZ*, p. 16), 'mon cul' or 'quand tu déconnes comme ça, tu le fais esprès ou c'est sans le vouloir ?' (*QZ*, p. 17) fulfil part of the role that the narrator has relinquished. Zazie and Laverdure, however, no longer fulfil this role towards the end of the text, as after the night at the club they are tired and quiet. At this point in the text, the volume of other characters then gradually becomes louder in contrast to Zazie's and Laverdure's

---

[48] Bakhtin, *PDP*, p. 75.
[49] Sears, pp. 91-99 (p. 93).
[50] Caryl Emerson and Gary Saul Morson, *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of A Prosaics* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1990), p. 239.
[51] Barthes, '"Zazie" et la littérature', in *Œuvres complètes*, I, pp. 1260-1264.

increasing silence: Gabriel shouts ('Ho ho! crie Gabriel'), Mado shouts ('qu'elle crie par

la portière'), Trouscaillon asks something shyly and then begs ('dit Trouscaillon

timidement', 'dit Trouscaillon d'une voix suppliante'), Gabriel talks 'd'une voix paisible

et redoutable à la fois', Trouscaillon 's'écrie', Laverdure speaks feebly ('dit faiblement

Laverdure'), Zazie is quiet ('Zazie la bouclait'), Mouaque screams ('hurla la veuve

Mouaque'), Turandot and Gridoux scream ('hurlèrent Turandot et Gridoux'), Mouaque

'braille', and the group is then interpellated for 'tapage nocturne, qu'ils hurlèrent les

deux hanvélos, chahut lunaire, boucan somnivore, médianoche gueulante' (*QZ*, pp. 168-

171).

Here, polyphony, again, verges on cacophony, as the characters are no longer told

off by Zazie or exposed as being only able to talk by Laverdure, and volume is out of

control. In Bakhtinian polyphony, the freedom of the characters is ultimately 'further

testimony to the author's complete control over the text and its occupants', as the

author has created and orchestrates the characters as free, both objects and subjects.[52] I

suggest that the cacophonic tendencies in *Zazie* are, similarly, further testimony of the

narrator's power. Left free, the characters cannot gain vocal power, cannot construct

their voices, while the narrator is constructing its own narrative voice out of theirs.

Unable to exploit their power to signify or create meaning, the characters appear as

dummies in need of the ventriloquist who has, nonetheless, mostly relinquished

ventriloquial power. However, two characters stand out among the 'marionettes' of the

text, for different reasons: Zazie and Trouscaillon.

Zazie: the potential powers of voice

The figure of Zazie has mostly been interpreted in her relationship to (or, rather,

against) the adults in the text. Barthes points out the difference between them in terms

of language, as he argues that Zazie speaks a 'langage-objet' that goes against the adults'

'méta-langage'.[53] In her comparison of Zazie and Vian's Zénobie, Sears argues that

'Zazie et Zénobie, louées toutes les deux pour leur pouvoir de raisonner, luttent contre

les mauvais raisonnements des adultes'.[54] Gobert describes Zazie as

> one of the diabolical forces [together with Trouscaillon] invading Gabriel's garden
> of Eden. She is, of course, the negator, the imperious definer of reality, as Barthes

---

[52] Vice, p. 115.
[53] Barthes, '"Zazie" et la littérature', in *Œuvres complètes*, I, pp. 1260-1264.
[54] Sears, pp. 91-99 (p. 94).

has seen her, the inquisitor who unmasks the hypocrisy and shakes the lethargy of the adult world.[55]

Bernofsky, by contrast, provides an original explanation for the difference between Zazie and the other characters of the novel: 'in the midst of these complacently self-conscious fictional creatures who inhabit a blatantly artificial universe, Queneau places one figure who clearly believes that she's a real little girl on a visit to Paris'.[56] What sets Zazie apart from the other characters would then be her paradoxical nature, because 'at the same time she is very much of a fictional, linguistic construct and invokes the emotional content of a figure in the realistic mode'.[57] Zazie's unawareness of being a character in a novel as revealed by Bernofsky could, then, explain her 'langage-objet' in comparison with the 'méta-langage' of the adults, who are self-aware characters that engage in meta-narrative complicity with the author.

However, in my analysis I have sought to demonstrate that the relationship between characters and narrator is more complex than one of complicity. (Un)controlled and (un)orchestrated by a cacophonic narrative voice, the characters are neither fully objects nor fully subjects, and move (confusingly) between the two positions at different stages in the text. While Bernofsky argues that by being unaware of her status as the character of an author Zazie shows naïveté, I suggest that by refusing the possibility that she is the object of another's voice, Zazie in fact gains potential vocal power as fully the subject of her own signifying discourse.

The specificity of the relationship between the narrative voice and Zazie in comparison with the other characters stands out during her conversation with Charles at the top of the Eiffel tower:

> – Tu as de drôles d'idées, tu sais, pour ton âge.
> – Ça c'est vrai, je me demande même où je vais les chercher.
> – C'est pas moi qui pourrais te le dire.
> – Pourquoi qu'on dit des choses et pas d'autres ?
> – Si on disait pas ce qu'on a à dire, on se ferait pas comprendre.
> – Et vous, vous dites toujours ce que vous avez à dire pour vous faire comprendre ?
> – (geste).
> – On est tout de même pas forcé de dire tout ce qu'on dit, on pourrait dire autre chose. (*QZ*, pp. 87-88)

Bernofsky argues about this scene that

---

[55] Gobert, 91-106 (p. 91).
[56] Bernofsky, 113-124 (p. 118).
[57] Bernosfky, 113-124 (p. 121).

> Zazie says certain things and not others because she has no alternative; this is of course a perfectly natural state of affairs (characters' lines are always written by authors), but in the context of a novel populated by eminently self-aware fictional constructs, her lack of self-knowledge seems a sort of naïveté.[58]

I propose to reverse Bernofsky's analysis of this conversation and to see Zazie as showing awareness that she is an object, while Charles shows unawareness of his status as (imperfect) object, as he thinks that he says what he says only in order to be understood by the other (though dialogue fails in the text). Zazie first wonders where she 'finds' what she says, thereby seeing her active role in the construction of her voice; and when she denies that she is forced to say what she says ('on est tout de même pas'), this shows that she has conceived the possibility that her role is in fact passive in the construction of her voice, before rejecting it. In this sense, Zazie *refuses* the possibility of being forced to say what she says, of being ventriloquised, of being an object in the carefully constructed textual system as a whole. She affirms herself as the sole subject of her own signifying discourse. Rather than naïveté, this conversation, then, shows her belief that her own voice is fully valid, independent, and non-predetermined. I argue that this is what gives her a potential vocal power of her own, unlike for example Charles or Mado, who are not aware of being objects, or Gabriel and Marceline, who gain vocal power by being ventriloquised. According to Bernofksy, that Zazie is a realist character trying to understand an absurd world shows her naïveté; I suggest that as she believes, or forces herself to believe, that she is real in a real world, she also believes in the potential power of her voice over the others.

Zazie has a 'langage-objet' because she wants to have a direct effect. In the early stages of the novel, she shows a powerful use of volume, intonation and language. For example when she leaves her uncle and aunt's house, Turandot goes after her, and she orchestrates or directs a crowd in order to get rid of him:

> [Turandot] la rattrape, la prend par le bras et, sans mot dire, d'une poigne solide, lui fait faire demi-tour. Zazie n'hésite pas. Elle se met à hurler:
> – Au secours! Au secours!
> Ce cri ne manque pas d'attirer l'attention des ménagères et des citoyens présents [….]. Après ce premier résultat assez satisfaisant, Zazie en remet:
> – Je veux pas aller avec le meussieu, je le connais pas le meussieu, je veux pas aller avec le meussieu.
> Exétéra. (*QZ*, p. 33)

While Turandot is silent ('sans mot dire'), Zazie shows a skilful use of loud volume to call attention. 'Devant ce public de choix', Zazie then switches to low volume to obtain

---

58 Bernofsky, 113-124 (p. 120).

the effect she wants: 'c'est trop sale, murmure Zazie'; 'Zazie glisse à voix basse quelques détails dans l'oreille de la bonne femme' (*QZ*, p. 34). Writing about this scene Bernofsky argues that though Zazie 'mimics well', 'she only knows the words for things, not what they signify'; however it is clear that Zazie knows the effect that words have on people, as my analysis has demonstrated.[59] This scene also shows Zazie's potential for performance, of which she is constantly aware ('merde alors, chsuis aussi bonne que Michèle Morgan dans *La Dame aux camélias*', *QZ*, p. 66). Zazie understands that vocal power can be based on performance, and that it can be directed against the other, in her use of language as well as volume. Carol O'Sullivan points out that 'Zazie's irreverence and aggressiveness are painted linguistically, using argotic deformations and vocabulary as well as phonetic spelling'.[60] She is physically violent towards her uncle Gabriel (in Chapter 9), and vocally aggressive towards the great majority of characters she encounters ('demande Zazie en gonflant ses mots de férocité', *QZ*, p. 16; 'dit Zazie avec férocité', *QZ*, p. 98).

Zazie however falls asleep at a crucial point in the text, and when she wakes at the very end of the text her last sentence to her mother is 'j'ai vieilli' (*QZ*, p. 189). This enigmatic last sentence has been interpreted in various ways by critics. For example Niang argues that 'ce surplus d'expériences est fonction non seulement des multiples aventures du texte mais surtout d'un apprentissage linguistique à l'issue duquel la norme française a été appropriée par la foule marginalisée des personnages du roman'.[61] Bernofsky sees it as the sign of Zazie's essential sadness 'because she is not, and can never be real'.[62] Gobert points out that 'her final words […] leave unanswered the question as to whether or not she has benefited from the action. What is certain is that, at the end of the novel, she is unable to sustain her comic role'.[63] Horton suggests that 'in terms of Zazie's development, the ending suggests growth, change, maturity. [...] The line suggests a certain amount of self-reflection with a trace of melancholy. Yet Queneau clearly leaves her vitality and innocence intact'.[64] I propose, instead, to read the ending in terms of the loss of her vocal power. As the other characters become louder and more violent (leading to cacophonic tendencies), Zazie has become quieter. I

---

[59] Bernofsky, 113-124 (p. 119).
[60] Carol O'Sullivan, 'Picturing Characters: Zazies à gogo', in *Seeing Things: Vision, Perception and Interpretation in French Studies*, ed. by Simon Kemp and Libby Saxton (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2002), pp. 263-279 (p. 265). Hereafter cited as O'Sullivan, pp. 263-279.
[61] Niang, pp. 109-123 (p. 121).
[62] Bernofsky, 113-124 (p. 124).
[63] Gobert, 91-106 (p. 93).
[64] Horton, pp. 63-77 (p. 65).

suggest that she has tired of her potential vocal power, which would show that exerting vocal power against the other is exhausting, and that it is easier to be controlled as an object to seduce the other (like Gabriel and Marceline). As Zazie resolves to be the imperfect object of another's voice, she abandons her suspicions toward a narrative voice that would try to control her and that could potentially control and ventriloquise her, against her will. Zazie, who constituted herself as polyphonic hero, a free and independent voice, gives in to a monologic ending.

Trouscaillon, polyphony, cacophony, and ventriloquism

The scene where Zazie turns a crowd against Turandot is mirrored by the scene where she tries to do the same thing this time with Trouscaillon, but he pre-empts her:

> C'est du tout cuit, se dit Zazie avec sa petite voix intérieure. Elle prit sa respiration et ouvrit la bouche pour pousser son cri de guerre: au satyre! Mais le type était pas tombé de la dernière pluie. Lui arrachant le paquet méchamment, il se mit à la secouer en proférant avec énergie les paroles suivantes:
> − Tu n'as pas honte, petite voleuse, pendant que j'avais le dos tourné.
> Il fit ensuite appel à la foule s'amassant:
> − Ah! Les jitrouas, rgardez-moi cqu'elle avait voulu mfaucher.
> Et il agitait le pacson au-dessus de sa tête.
> − Une paire de bloudjinnzes, qu'il gueulait. Une paire de bloudjinnzes qu'elle a voulumfaucher, la mouflette. (*QZ*, p. 57).

Zazie, Trouscaillon and Gabriel are the only three characters that show the potential to get the attention of a crowd, and of performing. I have argued however that Gabriel's vocal power on the other comes from his status as object of the narrative voice. While Zazie tires of her vocal power, I propose that Trouscaillon loses it before he can fully use it. Trouscaillon, in fact, represents the extent to which the polyphonic model is flawed in *Zazie*. As outlined above, the characters are not predetermined because

> there is no causality […], no genesis, no explanation based on the past, on the influences of the environment or of upbringing, and so forth. Every act a character commits is in the present, and in this sense is not predetermined; it is conceived of and represented by the author as free.[65]

With Trouscaillon, this is taken to an extreme: he seems to be only a character of the present, with hardly any knowledge of his past. In Chapter 7 he has forgotten his name, his age, and where he lives, because he has not learnt this information by heart (*QZ*, pp. 80-83); in Chapter 15 when he visits Marceline at night, he remembers that he

---

[65] Bakhtin, *PDP*, p. 29.

has been there before and was offered a drink, but does not remember the name he gave:

> Meussieu Pédro? Pourquoi ça 'meussieu Pédro? demanda le type très intrigué, en agrémentant meussieu Pédro de quelques guillemets.
> – Parce que c'est comme ça que vous vous appeliez ce matin, répondit doucement Marceline.
> – Ah oui? fit le type d'un air désinvolte. J'avais oublié. (*QZ*, p. 155)

In his discussion with Fédor Balanovitch, he does not give any details about his past:

> Je ne vous dirai rien de mon enfance ni de ma jeunesse. De mon éducation, n'en parlons point, je n'en ai pas, et de mon instruction, je n'en parlerai guère car j'en ai peu. Sur ce dernier point, voilà qui est fait. J'en arrive donc maintenant à mon service militaire sur lequel je n'insisterai pas. Célibataire depuis mon plus jeune âge, la vie m'a fait ce que je suis. (*QZ*, p. 165)

The phrase 'la vie m'a fait ce que je suis' suggests a form of predetermination, however, through the excess of negation, Trouscaillon does not give any details about his life that would explain 'what' life has made him. He has no past to appropriate and turn into the material of his consciousness and voice.

With no cause, no genesis, Trouscaillon has no stable identity: he appears as Pédro-surplus, Trouscaillon, Bertin Poirée, and finally Aroun Arachide. Every one of his appearances ends in defeat, as pointed out by Gobert:

> by interrogation he will learn nothing; information will be provided to him by others only voluntarily, when not solicited; unsuccessful in his amorous pursuits, he can conquer the one he does not want (Mouaque); the rescues he accomplishes were not needed. His momentary triumphs eventually will prove to be defeats, and those whom he would subjugate ultimately will reverse the situation or escape his grasp.[66]

In his last appearance, as Aroun Arachide, Trouscaillon seems to have achieved vocal power:

> Je suis je, celui que vous avez connu et parfois mal reconnu. Prince de ce monde et de plusieurs territoires connexes, il me plaît de parcourir mon domaine sous des aspects variés en prenant les apparences de l'incertitude et de l'erreur qui, d'ailleurs, me sont propres. […] A peine porté disparu par vos consciences légères, je réapparais en triomphateur, et même sans aucune modestie. Voyez! (Nouveau geste non moins noble, mais englobant cette fois-ci l'ensemble de la situation). (*QZ*, p. 185)

He claims that Aroun Arachide has been his real identity all along, and I suggest that Trouscaillon is trying to appropriate the past he has now accumulated throughout the text, as he does not have a past prior to the text like the other characters. However, his moment of triumph is short-lived, as Laverdure follows his speech with his denigratory

---

[66] Gobert, 91-106 (p. 95).

'tu causes, tu causes'. Gabriel and his friends are then saved by Marceline, now Marcel, as s/he gets the characters to disappear into the ground by activating the goods lift, on which the characters happened to be standing without being aware of it. Trouscaillon attempted to absorb all his identities into a single voice that would allow him to exert power *against* the others, to triumph over them. However, as Laverdure points out that all he can do is talk, his vocal power is shown as inconsequential, only talk. Moreover, the narrator does not let him gain vocal power, and sends a deus ex machina in the shape of Marceline/Marcel, a character that has gained vocal power on the other by becoming fully the object of another's voice. No matter how hard he tries, Trouscaillon cannot gain lasting vocal power in a text that combines polyphony and ventriloquism, precisely because of this combination. It seems, then, that a narrative voice in *Zazie* still retains a certain level of power and control, when it gives Marceline and Gabriel the powers of voice to seduce or attract the other, and refuses the demonic Trouscaillon the powers of voice against the other.

Conclusion of Part I

In Part I, I have sought to demonstrate how examining *Voyage* and *Zazie* through the lens of the model of ventriloquism reveals the opposite ways in which the narrative voice constructs itself in the relationship to the characters' voices. Bardamu uses his ventriloquial ability to seek revenge and impose his voice as the only valid one. The narrator of *Zazie* strives for polyphony, at the risk of dissolution and cacophony. Bardamu fully controls his characters, and uses them in his retroactive reading, although it results in failure of control. By contrast, the narrator of *Zazie* has (mostly) refused the control inherent to its function, which is to orchestrate the voices of the characters. Bardamu's characters provide him with comic or tragic potential for his narrative, and he uses and manipulates their voices. The characters of *Zazie*, by contrast, are both imperfect objects and imperfect subjects, (un)controlled and (un)orchestrated by the narrative voice, unable to exploit their power to signify. The polyphonic system is potentially flawed, and risks turning into cacophony, or a semblance of it. This turning point however is unstable and precarious, and polyphony is never irretrievable.

The powers of voice are mostly related to violence towards the other, in the expropriation of the other's voice (Bardamu), vocal aggressiveness and manipulation (Zazie), or triumph over the other (Trouscaillon as Aroun Arachide). Vocal power against the other is seen as unsatisfying (Bardamu), inconsequential (Trouscaillon as Aroun Arachide), endangered (Bardamu in relationship to the reader), and ultimately exhausting (Zazie). The vocal system of *Zazie* however also shows the powers of voice in the seduction of the other, when Gabriel and Marceline are given a voice by the ventriloquist that they do not use against the other.

How, then, can the complex textual voices of *Voyage* and *Zazie* be intoned by a reader turned adapter? If the reader threatens Bardamu's vocal power, is Bardamu's voice expropriated from him in the adaptations? If so, do his characters instead gain a voice? How can the combination of polyphony, cacophony and ventriloquism in *Zazie* be transposed into another medium? Can the characters of *Zazie* become fully subjects in the adaptations? In order to answer these questions, I turn, in Part II, to a broad range of different adaptations of each of the texts.

Part II: Adapted Voices

Chapter 1: Challenging Bardamu's narrative voice in Tardi's illustration of *Voyage au bout de la nuit*

Voyage au bout de la nuit was re-edited in 1988 by Futuropolis with illustrations by cartoonist Jacques Tardi.[1] The new edition was a commercial success, unlike Tardi's subsequent illustrations of Céline's *Casse-pipe* (1989) and *Mort à crédit* (1991). It is a large format album with 600 black and white illustrations and the complete original text by Céline. Tardi's images are totally silent, with no speech balloons, and uncaptioned. They have a different temporality and point of view from those of the text, insofar as the narrative is represented but not the narrative act. In this chapter, I shall examine Tardi's illustration in relation to my analysis of voice in *Voyage*. The inclusion of Tardi's images creates a juxtaposition of the ventriloquial narrative voice with its erasure in the pictorial representation. The purpose of this chapter is to analyse the adaptation of *Voyage* as vocal construct, into a new work that juxtaposes the visual and non-vocal with Bardamu's monologue. I shall first examine issues of fidelity and hierarchy with regard to the conception and reception of Tardi's *Voyage*, and explain why I shall analyse it as an adaptation. I shall then study the transposition of the textual voices from textual to pictorial and the reconfiguration of the vocal system of the text in the relationship of control and power between the narrator's and the characters' voices. Finally, I shall analyse the illustration as the concretisation of Tardi's appropriation of the text as a reader, and how it, in turn, affects the reading process, thus participating in the permanent and un-final dialogic construction of the vocality of the text.

Illustration and adaptation

Jacques Tardi is a major figure in the French-language comic book. Besides the works for which he has done scenario and artwork (such as the successful series *Les aventures extraordinaires d'Adèle Blanc-Sec*, since 1976), he has adapted numerous novels into comic books, most famously volumes of Léo Malet's *Nestor Burma* series (12 volumes since 1982), Didier Daeninckx's *Le Der des Ders* (1997) and Jean Vautrin's *Le cri du peuple*

---

[1] *Voyage* was previously illustrated by painter Clément Serveau as part of the collection *Le Livre moderne illustré* in 1935, and in 1942 by painter Gen Paul, which his friend Céline asked him to do.

(2001-2004). In addition to illustrating three texts by Céline, he has drawn the covers for all Folio paperback editions of Céline's novels. The First World War is a theme that runs through Tardi's work, and that constitutes the main theme of the album *C'était la guerre des tranchées* (1993) and the series *Putain de guerre!* with Jean-Pierre Verney (since 2008). Tardi acknowledges the evocation of the Great War in *Voyage* as one of the reasons why he chose to illustrate the novel. As he explains in an interview in *Le Monde*, 'avec Céline, je restais dans l'univers qui m'intéresse, 1914-1918, tout ça...'.[2] Tardi originally planned to adapt *Voyage* into a comic book but eventually opted for the medium of illustration. This decision is justified by the status of *Voyage* as a 'monument' of French literature and the anticipation of the negative reception that would meet its adaptation into a comic book, as Tardi outlines in *Entretiens avec Numa Sadoul*:

> C'est moi qui ai voulu mettre en images *Le Voyage* [*sic*]. Personne n'est venu me chercher. C'est moi qui ai sollicité l'autorisation d'illustrer ce texte, qu'à une époque j'avais envisagé d'adapter en bande dessinée. C'était une idée folle, il aurait fallu couper dans le texte et rajouter des dialogues. Epineux, quand même, dans le cas d'une œuvre reconnue comme aussi hautement littéraire, innovatrice, importante, et tout et tout… J'entends d'ici la critique: 'De quoi il se mêle, celui-là? Il tague un monument!'[3]

This is confirmed in the interview with *Le Monde*:

> Et [Céline] est un très grand écrivain. Mais ses livres sont très peu dialogués, il aurait donc fallu que je coupe. C'est tout à fait possible d'adapter Céline en BD mais cela impliquait des coupes. Or j'avais moins de scrupules à les faire dans Malet que dans Céline; c'est quand même une autre pointure! Je l'ai donc illustré, pas adapté.[4]

The negative reception that Tardi anticipates results from a hierarchy between arts, in which literature is deemed as superior to the lower form of comic book.[5] As Hutcheon points out, 'if an adaptation is perceived as "lowering" a story (according to some imagined hierarchy of medium of genre), response is likely to be negative'.[6] The remark anticipated by Tardi, 'de quoi il se mêle, celui-là?', rejects the idea of a profitable dialogue between the two media, and 'il tague un monument!' positions literature as

---

[2] Yves-Marie Labé, 'Jacques Tardi: "J'ai mis au jour une tombe criblée de balles"', *Le Monde* [online], 17/08/2005 <http://www.lemonde.fr/culture/article/2005/08/17/ jacques-tardi-j-ai-mis-au-jour-une-tombe-criblee-de-balles_680761_3246_1.html> [accessed 12/02/2010]. Hereafter cited as Labé, 'Jacques Tardi: "J'ai mis au jour une tombe criblée de balles"'.
[3] Numa Sadoul, *Tardi: entretiens avec Numa Sadoul* (Paris: Niffle-Cohen, 2000), p. 88. Hereafter cited as Sadoul.
[4] Labé, 'Jacques Tardi: "J'ai mis au jour une tombe criblée de balles"'.
[5] As Ann Miller states, 'the history of *bande dessinée* necessarily includes consideration of its struggle for recognition as an art form', in Ann Miller, *Reading Bande Dessinée: Critical Approaches to French-language Comic Strip* (Bristol: Intellect Books, 2007), p. 13. Hereafter cited as Miller.
[6] Hutcheon, p. 3.

superior to comic book. Graffiti is another 'low' art form that is here used pejoratively in the sense of an act that degrades monuments. Tardi also refers to a hierarchical system that sets Malet's *Nestor Burma*, as detective novels, lower than Céline ('c'est quand même une autre pointure!').

I suggest that by evoking the scruples he would have had to 'couper dans le texte et rajouter des dialogues', Tardi refers to *Voyage* as an untouchable text, which shows the importance of dialogism in the reading process. As a historically situated reader, Tardi's perception of the text is influenced by the construction of Céline's *Voyage* as a 'monument' of French literature. Tardi did not feel that he would be allowed, as a comic book artist, to adapt *Voyage* into his medium because he anticipated the critical reception as negative, and he could already 'hear' the voices that would meet his adaptation of *Voyage* ('j'entends d'ici la critique'). Unlike with *Nestor Burma* or *Le Der des Ders*, Tardi felt the adaptive possibility was restricted with regard to *Voyage*, not because of a lack of adaptive potential in the text itself, but due to the dialogue in which it is situated. Tardi's understanding of *Voyage* is thus partly 'overdetermined' by what Aczel calls 'the echoes it believes it hears of the dialogue from whence it has come'.[7] Tardi could not totally appropriate the vocality of the text because it had also been constructed by the other voices of previous readers, and of literary criticism over the course of fifty years.

On a textual level, because *Voyage* is Bardamu's monologue, its inadaptability and its untouchability is in fact that of Bardamu's voice. In my examination of *Voyage* in Part I, Chapter 1, I have analysed Bardamu's voice as a construct out of the voices of the others. Cutting and adding ('couper' and 'rajouter') would throw the orchestration of voices by the ventriloquial narrative voice off balance. Tardi's 'scruples' position Bardamu's voice as a voice that cannot come down to an essence, or as what Barthes calls a grain, but, on the contrary, as a construction in which no parts can be transformed, added, or removed without fundamentally altering, and in a sense betraying the whole.[8] Tardi eventually settled for an illustration juxtaposed with the complete original text, and Bardamu's voice is thus seemingly left intact. However, as I aim to demonstrate, Bardamu's voice is in fact reconfigured by the illustration.

Though Tardi did not adapt Céline's text into a comic book but as an illustration, a medium which requires a less invasive transformation because the original text is still

---

[7] Aczel, 'Understanding as Over-Hearing', 597-617 (p. 615).
[8] Barthes, 'Le Grain de la voix', in *Œuvres complètes*, II, pp. 1436-1442.

present in its entirety, the critical reception of Tardi's *Voyage* nonetheless accused him of 'bastardising' Céline's *Voyage*, as the artist explains:

> Je me suis donc contenté de mettre en images. Ça m'a quand même valu d'être montré du doigt pour avoir salopé le chef-d'œuvre avec mes vilains graffitis, d'avoir 'abâtardi' l'immense livre: 'Céline abâtardi', a-t-on pu lire sur une double page, dans *Libération*, à la sortie du bouquin. C'était déchirant de voir comment ils prenaient ça… Un blasphème! […] Si j'avais été peintre, passe encore, mais dessinateur de bande dessinée, tu vois l'outrage![9]

The use of the terms 'outrage' and 'abâtardi' designates *Libération*'s reaction to illustrated *Voyage* as based on a hierarchical classification of arts, which had been anticipated by Tardi. Bardamu's voice is seen as not only self-sufficient (thus Tardi's illustration as unnecessary and degrading, 'vilains graffitis') but also as almost sacred, something that should not be altered, even if only by its juxtaposition alongside images. This fidelity discourse can also be seen in the first scholarly article on Tardi's illustration, written by Albert Mingelgrun, who argues that the images should be evaluated in terms of fidelity to the pre-existent text, and that Tardi's caricatural images betray the original novel.[10] Interestingly, Tardi's illustration was criticised on both sides: by literary criticism for 'bastardising' a monument of literature, and by the *bande dessinée* community for being an illustrated text rather than a comic book. Benoît Peeters, a renowned comic book writer and a scholar specialising in Hergé, argues that in some 'romans graphiques', the image fulfils a mere decorative function. He gives Tardi's *Voyage* as an example of these 'romans graphiques' that

> penchent clairement du coté du livre illustré, ceux notamment dont le texte préexiste et est donné dans son intégralité. […] Etant par nature autosuffisant, un texte comme *Voyage au bout de la nuit* de Céline ne peut que reconduire l'image, fût-elle de Tardi dans son ancien statut d'illustrateur. Si brillant soit-il, le dessin constitue alors une sorte de prime décorative, ouvrant dans le meilleur des cas sur un réseau second, ayant sa propre cohérence.[11]

In Peeters's view, due to the self-sufficiency of Céline's pre-conceived and unaltered text Tardi's illustrations can only fulfil a decorative function. Peeters analyses illustrated *Voyage* from the viewpoint of comic book rather than illustration. Indeed, *Voyage* is referred to at the beginning of a section entitled 'Le roman graphique: une longue quête', though graphic novel is a different medium from illustrated novel, the former being in the format of comic book. Peeters's analysis cannot do justice to the medium

[9] Sadoul, p. 87.
[10] Albert Mingelgrun, 'Céline-Tardi: de la fiction narrative à la fiction dessinée', in *Actes du Colloque international de Toulouse, L.-F. Céline: 5-7 juillet 1990* (Tusson: Du Lérot, 1991), pp. 179-182.
[11] Benoît Peeters, *Lire la bande dessinée* (Paris: Flammarion, 2002), pp. 140-141. Hereafter cited as Peeters.

of illustration, given the fact that a *bande dessinée* is defined by the very element that distinguishes it from an illustration, namely sequential linearity. A comic book with text is characterised by the intertwining of the verbal and the iconic chains into a unity. This intertwining is made possible by the 'complémentarité du lisible et du visible: ce que le texte vient offrir est précisément ce que l'image ne pourrait donner, et vice versa', as Peeters states about Rodolphe Töpffer's conception of *récit en estampes.*[12] In a comic book with text, text and image are interdependent because the narrative is expressed through their combination. In an illustrated text on the other hand, the image is dispensable to the narrative, because it is a supplement to it. This explains Peeters's comment about the text of *Voyage* as being 'par nature autosuffisant' because the image, in theory, is not needed to complete the text. In a comic book, text and image are used in integration and complementarity, and I propose to analyse the medium of illustration in terms of fragmentation and supplementarity.

In *Principes des littératures dessinées*, Harry Morgan states that in a comic book the reader can at any moment refer to an image. On the other hand, 'si le lecteur a l'impression que certains passages seulement du récit sont illustrés, il interprète sa lecture comme celle d'un texte illustré, non comme celle d'une bande dessinée'. Morgan establishes that it is not the relationship between text and image that defines comic books, but 'des choix d'ordre narratifs et formels qui sont préalables à la répartition du contenu narratif en textes et en images'.[13] Whilst in a comic book the narrative is expressed through the sequential relationship between panels (with image and, often but not always, text), in an illustrated text the image affects the textual narrative and the reading experience by supplementing specific aspects and scenes of the text. Tardi's decision to illustrate *Voyage* rather than to adapt it into a comic book means that the narrative use of text and image in *Voyage* differs greatly from his *bande dessinée* adaptations of Malet or Daeninckx. Unlike Peeters, I shall argue that the inclusion of illustrations in *Voyage* is not 'decorative', but brings a new coherence to the original narrative by reshaping it into a binary one: the text, and juxtaposed with it, perhaps even confronting it, its visual version. I propose to analyse Tardi's *Voyage* as an adaptation (a new unity, text *with* images) that uses the specificity of its chosen medium and reconfigures the orchestration of the voices of the original and unaltered text.

---

[12] Peeters, p. 107. Rodolphe Töpffer is widely recognised as the first modern creator of comic art.
[13] Morgan, p. 131; p. 152.

Analysing Tardi's work as an adaptation, the concretisation of a reading through the transposition of the original work into a new unity, implies understanding the relationship between text and image in a different way than has traditionally been done in studies of illustration, for instance by Edward Hodnett in *Image and Text: Studies in the Illustration of English Literature*. Hodnett states that 'some doubt that even the most talented illustrator fully understands the intent of an author must always be present'. Focusing the case of William Blake, who illustrated himself, Hodnett argues that

> here for once we can be certain that the image stands in correct relation to the text […]. Here there can be no question about the artist's understanding of the poet's meaning or of his competence to express that meaning visually or to project a parallel statement, if that is what he prefers to do.[14]

The characterisation of Blake's illustration as standing in 'correct relation to the text' implies that in some other cases this relation is, on the contrary, an 'incorrect' one. Moreover, when Hodnett assesses Burne-Jones's illustration of Chaucer as 'images that bring out [the texts'] essential meanings and elicit appropriate responses in modern readers', he implies that a successful illustration is a visual duplication of the essence of the text that directs the reading experience. The use of words such as 'correct' and 'appropriate' implicate that there is right and wrong in illustration. Hodnett's analysis is based upon the argument that the illustration should have a relation of fidelity to the text. Hodnett's doubts about illustrators' capacity to 'fully understand' the texts are based on the supremacy of the author's intention, rather than the reader's construction of the meaning of the text. Instead of following this type of analysis, I propose to study the medium of illustration in the case of *Voyage* as a form of adaptation rather than as a duplication of the text that can be deemed correct or incorrect. As Julie Sanders states, in adaptation

> the 'rewrite', be it in the form of a novel, play, poem or film, invariably transcends mere imitation, serving instead in the capacity of incremental literature, adding, supplementing, improvising, innovating. The aim is not replication as such, but rather complication, expansion rather than contraction.[15]

Dealing with Tardi's *Voyage* as an adaptation, then, means refuting the idea that the illustration should be faithful to and serve the text.

The fact that I shall analyse *Voyage*, an illustrated text, as an adaptation can seem paradoxical. The term 'illustration' is deemed reductive for instance by artistic director Etienne Robial, co-founder of Futuropolis editions:

---

[14] Hodnett, p. 85.
[15] Sanders, p. 12.

Pour *Voyage au bout de la nuit*, ce que je trouvais fascinant, c'était de montrer aux lecteurs, la vision qu'en avait Tardi. De faire la même démarche qu'un réalisateur qui s'accapare un texte pour le livrer sous forme de film… On est loin de la notion d'illustration…[16]

This is echoed by film critic Michel Boujut, who asserts that 'ce n'est pas en illustrateur qu'il [Tardi] s'est approprié le livre de Céline, mais en cinéaste'.[17] The comparison between Tardi's work on *Voyage* with that of a film director emphasises its adaptive aspect and deems the qualification of illustration as simplistic or undermining, because it is not as creative a process as adaptation. Martin acknowledges the parallel between illustration and film adaptation:

de prime abord, les problèmes posés par l'illustration du roman pourraient sembler assez proches de ceux de l'adaptation cinématographique d'une œuvre littéraire. Mais, quelle que soit la fréquence des gravures au fil des pages, il s'agit d'une adaptation partielle, ou plus exactement fragmentaire, fonctionnant sur le mode de l'accompagnement et non de la substitution, et formant ponctuellement une sorte de 'doublure' visuelle dans la trame du texte imprimé.[18]

Martin differentiates illustration from film adaptation due to the fragmentary and sporadic quality of the former. Whilst Martin limits his comment to a comparison of illustration with film adaptation, I propose to analyse Tardi's illustration of *Voyage* as a form of adaptation using the fragmentary specificity of the chosen medium. Tardi's *Voyage* is an adaptation because it constitutes a new unity (with text and images) that is a 'rewrite' of the original work. The adaptation of *Voyage* by Tardi does not lie solely in the pictorial representation, the illustration itself, but in its juxtaposition with the pre-existent text. In *Entretiens avec Numa Sadoul,* Tardi explains that illustrating did not only imply drawing but also being in charge of the organisation of text and image on the page:

La maquette, la répartition des images, tout a été fait par moi. J'ai essayé de respecter le rythme du texte, de distribuer les images – petites, verticales, horizontales, doubles pages – en fonction de la cadence, des moments forts. J'ai même rajouté des culs-de-lampe, comme des espèces de ponctuations, pour souligner une phrase ou une fin de paragraphe qui me semblait significative.[19]

This is where the adaptive process lies: in the shaping of a new text, designed to be read as a unity, and consisting of Céline's text *and* the images. The narrative is adapted, because the text and the reading process are reconfigured by the inclusion of the

---

[16] Alain Foulet and Olivier Maltret, *Presque tout Tardi* (Dieppe: Sapristi, 1996), p. 108. Hereafter cited as Foulet and Maltret.
[17] Foulet and Maltret, p. 114.
[18] Martin, *'Dangereux suppléments'*, p. 30.
[19] Sadoul, p. 103.

images. Some scenes are now both read and seen, and some passages are indicated as especially significant by the presence of a 'cul-de-lampe'. Moreover, the main vocal instance of the text, Bardamu, is no longer narrator in the images, which therefore offer another perspective from that provided by the text. This aspect, which is not commented on by Tardi, will be crucial for my analysis.

Tardi's work on *Voyage* is creative and interpretive, which corresponds with Linda Hutcheon's definition of adaptation:

> an acknowledged transposition of a recognizable other work or works; a creative *and* an interpretive act of appropriation/salvaging; an extended intertextual engagement with the adapted work. Therefore, an adaptation is a derivation that is not derivative – a work that is second without being secondary.[20]

Hutcheon's characterisation as 'a work that is second without being secondary' goes against the hierarchical classification of arts that influenced Tardi's anticipation of and the actual reception of *Voyage*, and which is linked with the issue of fidelity in adaptation studies. Since the criterion of fidelity is ultimately an invalid one, I propose that the adaptation should be analysed according to the criteria of the 'personality' of the adapter and the use of the new medium in its specificity. This is echoed by Tardi:

> on va changer de moyen d'expression et l'œuvre originale subira des transformations obligatoires, importantes ou non, dues au changement de genre – le nouveau support ayant ses propres règles –, dues aussi à la personnalité de l'adaptateur.[21]

The importance of the personality of the adapter is exemplified by Tardi's obsession with the First World War, which often dictates his choice of original works. The prominence of the 'personality' of the adapter originates in their 'personal' reading of the text, which precedes its adaptation. Indeed, adaptation is a concretisation of reading, of a reader's interpretation and appropriation of the work. The reader, who is culturally and historically situated, is constructive of the meaning of the text when s/he performs what Barthes calls a 'lecture *vivante*', in which the reader 'virtually' produces an internal text.[22] In adaptation, this 'lecture *vivante*' produces a concrete, physical result. From a first glance, it is clear that the images in Tardi's *Voyage* provide a strikingly personal interpretation of the text. Bardamu has common characteristics with Tardi's other characters:

---

[20] Hutcheon, pp. 8-9.
[21] Sadoul, p. 85.
[22] See Barthes, 'Pour une théorie de la lecture', in *Œuvres complètes*, II, pp. 1455-1456, and Introduction, p. 12.

> Mes personnages ont un certain air de famille, ce sont tous des clones de Brindavoine: une espèce de grand dadais prognate, avec le nez pointu, l'air un peu paumé. C'est le type de héros que je dessine naturellement.[23]

Bardamu's 'family likeness' to Brindavoine (from the first albums, *Adieu Brindavoine* and *La fleur au fusil*, published in 1974) and all other Tardi characters posits the adaptation as a creation by Tardi, and part of his work as a whole. Moreover, images in *Voyage* appear as a personal interpretation of the text due to their expressionist quality. Black fades to grey and backgrounds are mostly blurred and fading; faces are not detailed but almost sketch-like, and expressions and gestures are exaggerated and grandiloquent. The Great War is regularly represented through nightmarish hallucinations, such as an army of skeletons (*TV*, pp. 62-63), or a soldier with a gas mark watering a military cemetery resembling Verdun (*TV*, p. 279).

Besides the personality of the adapter, the other criterion that posits Tardi's *Voyage* as adaptation is, I argue, the use of the chosen medium in its specificity. Adaptation arises from the adapter's (then still reader) desire to transpose the original text into another form. In the case of Tardi, he explains that the 'point de départ' that motivates the adaptation process can be

> une situation qu'on visualise, une phrase, un détail […]. Parce qu'on sent le parti qu'on pourrait en tirer ou simplement parce que le contenu vous motive, à condition que l'image ait un rôle à jouer.[24]

The decision to adapt comes from the desire to transpose the text into, and tell a story through, his chosen medium, and the feeling that the pictorial has a role to play in this transposition. The necessary transformations inherent to adaptation will result in gains as much as losses. The use of the medium of illustration in its specificity is particularly interesting with regard to voice in *Voyage*. The fragmentation between text and image leads, I suggest, to the confrontation between Bardamu's monologue, his space of vocal control, and the erasure of his voice in the illustration, a situation which would have been greatly different if Tardi had pursued his original wish to transpose *Voyage* into a comic book. Indeed, the voicelessness of Tardi's images is even more striking when compared with the integration of text and image in Tardi's usual chosen medium, comic book, particularly with regard to the use of the speech balloon.

Whilst in an illustrated text there is a clear division between text and image, in a comic book with text their relationship is one of integration, which is exemplified by

---

[23] Sadoul, p. 99.
[24] Sadoul, p. 85.

Thierry Smolderen's comparison of the speech balloon with the traditional use of the label (which can be compared to the caption in illustration) in R.F. Outcault's weekly series *Hogan's Alley* in the *New York World*. Smolderen focuses on the use of text with regard to three characters: the Yellow Kid, the boy who falls out of a window every week, and the parrot. Both the text written on the Yellow Kid's nightshirt and the boy's comment on his own fall carry out the standard function of the label. Indeed, they are texts of 'auto-présentation' that contribute to the timelessness of the image, which works in the same way as an emblem. On the other hand, Outcault uses the label in a different way, as a speech balloon, for the parrot:

> alors que celui-ci [le *label*] ne peut se comprendre qu'en tenant compte du titre et de la légende, c'est-à-dire en se référant au cadre textuel défini par l'auteur, la bulle du perroquet, au contraire semble en mesure de se libérer de ce cadre. Elle flotte en toute liberté, en toute autonomie dans l'image.[25]

A label and a speech balloon are not read in the same manner. To be understood, the label has to be read in relation to the textual accompanying and deciphering the image. The speech balloon on the other hand works autonomously *in* the image. Its presence creates the pretence of speech: it is a 'bout de texte qui échappe à la complexe structure d'autorité, sous-jacente à toute espèce de discours […], et qui, de ce fait, bascule du côté de l'image: une *image sonore*'.[26] The speech balloon denotes a 'situated speech-act'.[27] It is 'la représentation figurée de la voix'.[28] With the speech balloon, text and image are integrated into an autonomous unity. In the medium of illustration on the other hand the images, to be understood, have to be read in relation to the text which they supplement, and which deciphers them. Illustrations are not autonomous and narrative, but a supplement to the narrative and autonomous text. Whilst the speech balloon is the irruption of voice in the image, in Tardi's *Voyage* illustration is the erasure of textual voice.

Voices in illustrated *Voyage*

In Tardi's *Voyage*, the visual not only clearly provides an interpretation of the story, but also offers a shift in focalisation through the transposition of Ferdinand Bardamu from extra-homodiegetic narrator to main character, as Tardi chooses to illustrate the

[25] Smolderen, *Naissances de la bande dessinée*, p. 123; p. 124.
[26] Smolderen, *Naissances de la bande dessinée*, p. 124.
[27] Smolderen, 'Of Labels, Loops and Bubbles', 90-112 (p. 112).
[28] Michel Melot, *L'illustration: histoire d'un art* (Geneva: Skira, 1984), p. 223.

narrative but never the narrative act. Through a comparative analysis of the novel and its illustration, focusing partly on quotations I have examined in my textual analysis of *Voyage* (Part I, Chapter 1), I will argue that Tardi offers a new perspective on Bardamu's narrative by means of a confrontation of the textual with the visual.

As narrator, Bardamu recreates the people he has encountered as his characters. When in New York, in a scene where he is trying to borrow money from his American ex-lover Lola when her friends come over for tea, he describes 'les choses, les gens et l'avenir' as 'des squelettes, rien que des riens, qu'il faudra cependant aimer, chérir, défendre, animer comme s'ils existaient' (*CV*, p. 274; *TV*, p. 168). The use of the verb 'animer' clearly positions Bardamu as in control of his characters.[29] However, this statement of power (albeit tainted with hopelessness, as Bardamu talks about his 'immonde détresse') is undermined by the image illustrating the scene. The rectangular page-width image is placed in the middle of the page, cutting through the two columns of text. Due to its size and also its position above the quoted excerpt, the image is seen before the excerpt is read. In the illustration Bardamu looks puzzled and almost scared; he is fed because he cannot afford to buy food, and stared at by a group of elegant and rich women. He is in a position of inferiority. The juxtaposition of the image alongside the text reveals that total control can only be achieved by Bardamu over utter passivity, once people have been turned into his characters.

Through the juxtaposition of image with text, Bardamu's monologue is designated as what it is, a reconstruction of reality. Talking about his time in Congo, Bardamu suggests that everything and everybody disappeared after he had left:

> Peut-être que rien de tout cela n'existe plus, que le petit Congo a léché Topo d'un grand coup de sa langue boueuse un soir de tornade en passant et que c'est fini, bien fini, que le nom lui-même a disparu des cartes, qu'il n'y a plus que moi, en somme, pour me souvenir encore d'Alcide… […] Qu'il n'existe plus rien.
> (*CV*, p. 210; *TV*, p. 128)

I have shown that Bardamu's voice and memory become the only valid ones, because they are the narrator's.[30] This quotation, which holds a statement of (textual) power, is however juxtaposed in the illustration with the image of submission and fear, as Bardamu, looking confused and frightened, is taken to the forest on a boat. In 'The Link between Text and Image in Tardi's *Voyage au bout de la nuit*', Marie-Manuelle Silva argues that 'the text is revealed through images, which are put together according to the

---

[29] See Part I, Chapter 1, p. 59.
[30] See Part I, Chapter 1, pp. 59-60.

options of the *mise en scène*.[31] As I have analysed, voice is a constructive process which is never finalised, and narrative voices are permanently being constructed by the reader. Tardi's adaptation of *Voyage* continues the construction of Bardamu's voice by, paradoxically, deconstructing it through the juxtaposition of, and the confrontation between, text and images. Bardamu's voice is 'revealed' as a construction by being embedded in another construction, which results from Tardi's '*mise en scène*' decisions. Here, Tardi chooses to illustrate Bardamu's journey to the forest in an image that takes up half of the page, but ignores Bardamu's statement of textual power. The juxtaposition of text and image thus exposes, and actualises the diametrical opposition between the role of Bardamu as almighty narrator and his role as powerless character – the opposition between his part in the scene and his part in the staging of the scene – and the construction of the monologue is laid bare.

As shown in my analysis of voice in the novel, Bardamu's monologue, the text of *Voyage*, is his attempt to make sense of what he has lived by recreating it. What Bardamu seeks is to provide his interpretation of reality, and he ends up taking control of reality by becoming a narrative voice. By way of warning Bardamu as a character already announces his future recreation of reality:

> Je dirai tout un jour, si je peux vivre assez longtemps pour tout raconter. 'Attention, dégueulasses ! Laissez-moi faire des amabilités encore pendant quelques années. Ne me tuez pas encore. Avoir l'air servile et désarmé, je dirai tout. Je vous l'assure et vous vous replierez d'un coup alors comme les chenilles baveuses qui venaient en Afrique foirer dans ma case et je vous rendrai plus subtilement lâches et plus immondes encore, si et tant que vous en crèverez peut-être, enfin.' (*CV*, pp. 311-312; *TV*, p. 192)

I pointed out in my textual analysis that this quotation, which is in inverted commas, renders what Bardamu thought as a character, before he became narrator.[32] The situation that leads to Bardamu's desire for revenge is what he considers his exploitation by the inhabitants of la Garenne-Rancy, who do not pay for medical consultations. In this quotation there is a patent sense of revenge over an overwhelming and disgusting reality which, once narrator, Bardamu will be able to reconstruct and manipulate. He implies that he appears 'servile et désarmé' on purpose, as part of a master plan, to enable his future monologue. He thus positions himself as in power, even as a character, because he is duping everyone. However, the combination of text and image exposes

---

[31] Marie-Manuelle Silva, 'The Link between Text and Image in *Voyage au bout de la nuit de Céline* by Tardi', in *Writing and Seeing: Essays on Word and Image*, ed. by Rui Carvalho Homem and Maria de Fátima Lambert (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2006), pp. 331-342 (p. 337).
[32] See Part I, Chapter 1, p. 60.

the disparity between Bardamu's total control as narrator and his powerlessness as character. The image juxtaposed with the above excerpt shows Bardamu looking confused and downhearted. He is silent towards Bébert's aunt behind him, who is represented with her mouth wide open, as if she were shouting at him. Bébert's aunt, like the other inhabitants, takes advantage of Bardamu: 'la tante à Bébert en a profité comme les autres de mon désintéressement orgueilleux. Elle en a même salement abusé' (*CV*, p. 311; *TV*, p. 192). The illustration, of a conversation between Bardamu and Bébert's aunt taking place on the same page, undermines the 'vocal revenge' ('je dirai tout') announced by Bardamu by juxtaposing with it an image of him as silent and shouted at from behind by a woman who 'débine [him] […] en chaque occasion' (*CV*, p. 311; *TV*, p. 192). Here, Bardamu's statement of potential power is limited to the text and erased from the pictorial representation.

As a character, Bardamu sporadically achieves partial control over people thanks to his ability to adapt his voice to his interlocutor. In the following quotation, he manages to please his American lover Lola – with whom his relationship will nonetheless end bitterly – during a walk through the Bois de Boulogne:

> A vrai dire, je n'y étais jamais allé, moi, aux courses avant la guerre, mais j'inventai instantanément pour la distraire cent détails colorés sur ce sujet [the Longchamp racecourse], à l'aide de récits qu'on m'en avait faits, à droite et à gauche. […] Elle lui plut si fort ma description idéale que ce récit nous rapprocha. (*CV*, p. 76-77; *TV*, p. 51)

In this scene, Bardamu starts to become in control of his voice. Back from the war to Paris, where 'bientôt, il n'y eut plus de vérité' (*CV*, p. 74; *TV*, p. 50) because all have joined in the refrain of patriotism, he has understood that for his survival he has to lie. He no longer says the truth but instead has started to construct his voice by appropriating others' and reusing them in anticipation of what his interlocutors want to hear. In this quotation, he succeeds in pleasing Lola with details heard from others' stories about the Longchamp Racecourse. He makes his own story from other stories about something he has himself never experienced, and his capacity to construct and adapt his voice brings him and Lola closer together.

The scene, in which they converse and walk through the Bois de Boulogne, is illustrated by four images, three of them placed on a double page (*TV*, pp. 50-51) and the fourth one taking up two pages with no text (*TV*, pp. 52-53). Interestingly, the images emphasise the action of walking rather than talking. In the first image both Bardamu and Lola have their mouths shut and look straight ahead of them; in the

112

second image, though it is unclear whether Lola's mouth is open, she however seems to be talking, as Bardamu's face is turned towards her in what looks like a listening pose. In the last two images they are seen from the back, so that there is no possibility to see whether they are conversing. Though this scene is the beginning of Bardamu's ability to construct and adapt his voice, the conversation does not figure prominently in the visual representation, and only Lola is represented as talking. Bardamu's vocal power in the textual environment is not mirrored in the illustration. However, later, in the scene where Bardamu, in a restaurant, shouts what will be considered as anarchist statements by the gendarmes (*CV*, p. 80; *TV*, pp. 56-57), his complete loss of vocal control is prominently represented in the illustration. The image that illustrates Bardamu's outburst shows him gesticulating and being stared at by an angry crowd, and when arrested he is represented handcuffed by gendarmes, with bulging eyes and his mouth wide open into a disproportionately big black hole.

Bardamu's vocal power in the text is reconfigured in the images, in which he appears burdened with an inadequate body, lost, and confused. The almost perpetual expression on his face is one of stupefaction and fear, and his body is mostly useless and regularly mishandled. In the text, Bardamu narrates his various sufferings with distance and irony, but the brutality of what he endures is exposed in the pictorial representation. For instance, when in the military hospital, the soldiers have to undergo electroshock treatment. The textual account of the scene is extremely ironic: 'notre médecin-chef aux beaux yeux, le professeur Bestombes, avait fait installer pour nous redonner de l'âme, tout un appareillage très compliqué d'engins électriques étincelants dont nous subissions les décharges périodiques' (*CV*, p. 118; *TV*, p. 75). In the image illustrating this passage, Bardamu is shown as receiving the shocks. His features are grotesquely distorted: his mouth is a black hole with irregular outline and his hands are out of proportion. Juxtaposed with his retrospectively sarcastic comments about Bestombes's 'coûteux bazar électrocuteur' is his helplessness against his ordeal. When Bardamu loses his narrative voice and is trapped in the present of the narrative in Tardi's illustrations, the dislocation between the narrator's voice and his body, hence the instability of his power is revealed through the images.

This devocalisation of Bardamu in the illustration implies a new relationship between him and the other characters. While in the monologue Bardamu, through his ventriloquial and omnipresent narrative voice, is in control of the characters, in the illustration he is often shown in a corner of an image, his mouth a small dot, his arms

limp against his body, while the characters around him talk, smile, shout or move. This can be seen for example in the three illustrations on pages 82-83, when Bardamu is in the hospital for wounded soldiers and an actress performs his war stories (*CV*, pp. 131-132). In the first illustration, Branledore shouts (his mouth is wide open) and stretches his arm to wave a small French flag, and three other characters smile. Bardamu is in the foreground in the right corner, his mouth a small dot. In the second illustration, the actress performing Bardamu's heroic war poems (for which Branledore takes all the credit) is shown with her mouth wide open, one hand on her heart, her other arm stretched in the air in a theatrical gesture. In the last illustration, three soldiers smile widely, wave small French flags, and have their arms up in the air, while Bardamu appears, significantly smaller than them, in the bottom right corner, his mouth, again, a small dot. On this double page, Bardamu is, then, silent and motionless, while the other characters seem to transpose successfully from text to image. The illustration of the scene with the mother of the woman who is dying from the after-effects of an abortion is also interesting in this regard (*CV*, pp. 330-334; *TV*, pp. 200-201). The image is big, taking up three quarters of the double page in width, and half of it in height. Bardamu is sat on a chair in the foreground, in the left corner, his mouth shut and his hands on his lap. The mother is in the middle of the image, and her entire body is visible. Her mouth is wide open, she has one hand to her face, and she lifts the other and makes a fist. As I showed in my textual analysis, in this passage Bardamu's narrative voice is prominent, and he only puts on the voice of the mother for selected short and exclamatory utterances.[33] In the visual environment by contrast, the mother's voice is prominent: she is in the middle of the illustration, and she is shouting and making a theatrical gesture. Bardamu, in the image, is limited to his role of victim of the mother's voice, silent and motionless in a corner. The loud and aggressive voices of some characters, used by Bardamu in his monologue, turn into grotesque and grandiloquent silent voices, while Bardamu, devocalised, is mostly with his mouth shut, his arms limp against his body. There are exceptions, but as I showed in my textual analysis, Bardamu's use of loud volume in the text is mostly inconsequent or harmful to him. This is mirrored in the aforementioned illustration of electroshock treatment, or when Bardamu loses control in the restaurant, before he is arrested and sent to the hospital for wounded soldiers (*TV*, pp. 56-57). There is one significant exception in which Bardamu shows a powerful

---

[33] See Part I, Chapter, pp. 61-62.

use of volume and gesture both in the text and the illustration, the episode of l'Amiral Bragueton, to which I will turn later in this chapter.

I suggest that, for some characters, the transposition from the monologue to the visual potentially allows them to regain the voices that had been expropriated from them in the ventriloquial narration, but in a different form, as what I shall term 'silent voices', in Tardi's silent illustration. I use the term 'silent voice' following Steven Connor's analysis of characters in a silent film whose voices are mutated into 'bodily forms' that let them animate and shape space with grandiloquent gestures and expressions.[34] In her article on Tardi's illustration, Johanne Bénard argues that it is in the caricatural and grotesque aspect of his illustrations that Tardi best reveals the 'abject' (first analysed by Kristeva in *Pouvoirs de l'horreur*) in Céline's novel. Bénard focuses her analysis in particular on the mouths of the characters in the illustration:

> On a reproché aux illustrations de Tardi d'être fixes. On aurait pu tout autant faire grief au bédéiste du mutisme de ses sujets. Car, sans les bulles qui les accompagnent habituellement, les héros de Tardi ont perdu la parole. Ou bien ils n'ont pas de bouche. Ou bien ils ont de toutes petites bouches, fermées. Toutefois, il leur arrive aussi d'ouvrir la bouche: pour vociférer, hurler, vomir, grimacer ou ricaner. Leur silence est donc lourd de cris, exprimant, sans que l'on puisse souvent en decider, l'effroi, la colère ou la répulsion. C'est là, dans l'abject, que la vision rejoint (en-deçà de la difference phonologique) la parole: c'est là que Tardi rencontre Céline.[35]

While Bénard argues that the characters have 'perdu la parole', I suggest that they did not in fact have the power of speech in *Voyage*, because their voices had been expropriated from them by the ventriloquial narrator, Bardamu, who selected and used their utterances. While Bardamu is devocalised in the illustration, some of his characters gain the potential power to use their voice, mutated into a silent, grotesque voice that allows them control of the visual environment. Two sequences of images are particularly interesting in this aspect. In four illustrations of la mère Henrouille on pages 240 and 241, placed on a double page with text, the white and light grey background is bare, so that the whole focus is on la mère Henrouille's exaggerated physical features, such as the expression of fury on her face, and the gesture of throwing her arms in the air in anger. The size of the panels varies according to her movements. Another example of a sequence of images is the scene when Madelon shoots Robinson (*TV*, pp. 366-369), which seems to come from a silent film: her mouth is wide open,

---

[34] Connor, p. 11.
[35] Johanne Bénard, 'Céline revisité par Tardi', in *Le Livre: De Gutenberg à la carte à puce = The Book: From Gutenberg to the Microchip*, ed. by Johanne Bénard and Jean-Jacques Hamm (New York: Legas, 1996), pp. 134-146 (pp. 144-145). Hereafter cited as Bénard, 'Céline revisité par Tardi', pp. 134-146.

and her gestures and expressions are exaggerated in order to convey her voice without words.

Interestingly, the capacity to mutate their regained voices seems limited to working-class and female characters, such as la mère Henrouille, Mado, Bébert's aunt, or Robinson. The male bourgeois characters, the doctors who speak in tirades and have intermittent control of their voices in the textual environment, are always represented with their mouths shut, and never have grandiloquent gestures, even in scenes where it could have been expected, such as when Parapine gets angry at his laboratory assistant (*CV*, p. 359; *TV*, p. 215) or Baryton gives a lengthy emotional monologue (*TV*, pp. 322-323). In this regard, Tardi's illustration can, then, perhaps be read in terms of a politics of voice, as the uncontrolled, female and/or working-class voices that were mocked and undermined by Bardamu in the monologue now take over in the illustration, in a reversal of the dynamics of control and power.

Whilst some characters regain voices, I suggest that the silence in the illustration prevents Bardamu from constructing his voice. In a perpetual present that he does not control and cannot turn into a narrative, he cannot feed on others' voices and thus not construct his. The absence of others' words means that Bardamu cannot appropriate them and use them in an arrangement of previous utterances. Bardamu's power is limited to the textual environment because it is strictly based upon voice, and to construct itself his voice needs others that it can appropriate, ventriloquise and manipulate. As Aczel argues, the narrative voice is an active configuration of voices, whose identity resides in the traces of its organisation.[36] It is this 'active configuration' that, I suggest, is denied to Bardamu in the illustration.

The images offer another version of the same narrative through the transposition of textual into pictorial, from a regnant and stifling narrative voice to its erasure. They challenge the pre-existent text by confronting it with another reality constituting of its morphing from textual into pictorial. Some of Bardamu's reflections as narrator turn into graphic hallucinations when illustrations materialise and amplify some of Bardamu's fears, turning them into nightmarish visions.

> En tue-t-on assez des pauvres? C'est pas sûr… C'est une question? Peut-être faudrait-il égorger tous ceux qui ne comprennent pas? Et qu'il en naisse d'autres, des nouveaux pauvres et toujours ainsi jusqu'à ce que qu'il en vienne qui saisissent bien la plaisanterie, toute la plaisanterie… Comme on fauche les pelouses jusqu'au moment où l'herbe est vraiment la bonne, la tendre. (*CV*, p. 481; *TV*, p. 279)

---

[36] Aczel, 'Hearing Voices', 467-500 (p. 483).

This quotation is illustrated by the aforementioned drawing representing a giant solider with a gas mask watering a military cemetery resembling Verdun. Arguably, this image prolongs rather than confronts Bardamu's voice by echoing 'et qu'il en naisse d'autres, des nouveaux pauvres' and the comparison between soldiers dying at war and 'fauche[r] les pelouses'. There is a clear interpretation of the text, but the image, from which Bardamu is absent, cannot be considered as going 'against' his voice. However, next to this image there is another illustration in which Bardamu's voice is, I suggest, expropriated from him and turned against him. The image refers to the following quotation:

> Faut se dépêcher, faut pas la rater sa mort. La maladie, la misère qui vous disperse les heures, les années, l'insomnie qui vous barbouille en gris, des journées, des semaines entières et le cancer qui nous monte déjà peut-être, méticuleux et saignotant du rectum. (*CV*, p. 481; *TV*, p. 279)

Whilst in the text Bardamu uses firstly 'vous', which works as 'on' and does not imply he is included in his statement, and then switches to the general 'nous', in which he might be included but not alone, this quotation does not describe something that actually happens to him. However, Tardi's illustration shows him in a bad physical state, victim of what he is, as narrator, describing as a general statement about mankind. Bardamu is represented as a victim of his own narrative voice.

That Bardamu's narrative voice is expropriated from him echoes the construction of voice in dialogism through a movement of appropriation and expropriation. Bardamu constructs his voice by appropriating others' voices, thus expropriating them from others. As narrator he ventriloquises them, and as character the adaptability of his voice results from his lack of individuality: he can 'put on' voices according to his interlocutor, and obtains his stories (such as his aforementioned description of the Longchamp Racecourse, but also his fake war stories when in the military hospital) by appropriating others' and claiming to be the source of the utterance, something in which only Robinson, narrator of another virtual *Voyage*, can match his ability. However, in this image Bardamu is expropriated from his voice, which is fragmented and reversed against him.

I have analysed ventriloquism as the construction of one's voice in diversity, through the imitation and the appropriation of other voices, and the control of one's voice through the control of others'. In the text Bardamu's voice is characterised by control: it narrates, is the only truly adaptable one and ventriloquises the other characters. The juxtaposition of the illustration, where his vocal power is erased,

reshapes his orchestration of the vocal instances and challenges the dynamic of vocal control. The ventriloquist is denied 'his polyphonic perversity, [which] *is* his power'.[37] The adaptive process lies in the reconfiguration of the original work's narrative construction through the use of the specificity of the medium of illustration into a new unity made of text *and* image. The adaptation furthers the construction of Bardamu's voice by confronting the ventriloquist with his devocalisation. In my textual analysis, I argued that Bardamu both needed and feared the imagined reader, who potentially threatened his narrative power.[38] That Bardamu's narrative voice is now appropriated as part of a new narrative, combining text and image, created by a reader turned adapter, hints at the inevitability of loss and gain and the cyclicality of appropriation and expropriation with regard to voice.

Adaptation and the reader(s)

Adaptation is a concretisation of reading, and as such, it is based on an interpretation and an appropriation of the original work. Martin argues that

> l'illustration se situe […] à la frontière entre production et réception du texte: […] les estampes sont toujours déjà une *lecture* (c'est-à-dire un choix), qui sélectionne des passages clefs, laissant dans les limbes de l'irreprésenté (ou dans la forme très spécifique de la forme de l'imaginaire de la lecture) des pans entiers du texte en question.[39]

Tardi himself points out that 'dans le moindre paragraphe du *Voyage* […] il y a quinze possibilités de dessins'.[40] His adaptive choices can be seen in his decison to leave Bardamu's narrative act unrepresented, and in the importance of the First World War in the images, even after the war is over. The episode of the Great War has a 'caractère inaugural', for *Voyage* of course, of which it is the first episode, but also for Céline's works as a whole: 'c'est là, chez Céline, où s'origine un imaginaire de la mort alliant la peur d'une mort immediate, le désir de tuer et la *vision* des corps en putréfaction'.[41] Ann Miller states that 'Tardi's attack on nationalist mythology is mainly, although not exclusively, focused on its deployment at the time of the First World War. Most of his work […] is haunted by the war and its aftermath.'[42]

---

[37] Connor, p. 330.
[38] See Part I, Chapter 1, pp. 68-70.
[39] Martin, *'Dangereux suppléments'*, p. 28.
[40] Sadoul, p. 88.
[41] Bénard, 'Céline revisité par Tardi', pp. 134-146 (p. 136).
[42] Miller, p. 160.

The illustration of the scene of l'Amiral Bragueton is interesting in this regard. In this scene, Bardamu manages to survive in the face of the other passengers thanks to a theatrical speech in which he praises France by shouting 'Vive la France!' (*CV*, pp. 159-160; *TV*, pp. 98-99).[43] The first illustration (*TV*, p. 98) shows Bardamu under a French flag, tilting his head back, his mouth wide open, one hand on his chest and the other up in the air in a theatrical manner. Here, Bardamu displays what I have qualified as a 'silent voice', as his textual voice is mutated into a bodily form that allows him control in the illustration. On this occasion, the image clearly duplicates, and in a sense emphasises, Bardamu's vocal achievement. In the textual environment he appropriates and repeats, by putting on Branledore's voice, the propagandistic discourse, the 'refrain' in which he has heard multiple voices join since the beginning of the war, and this vocal adaptability, this successful use of dialogism is transposed into the visual. That on this occasion the illustration mirrors Bardamu's potential vocal power, while elsewhere it erases it, can be seen as a critique of blind patriotism during the Great War in order to manipulate the soldiers and the people. Indeed, in this image Bardamu is successful in putting on the other's silent voice, as he appears as a parody of the soldiers in the hospital, and Branledore in particular, with their grandiloquent gestures and small French flags.

It can in fact be argued that Bardamu's weakness, the erasure of his vocal power, is linked to the importance of the Great War in Tardi's work. In this aspect, Bardamu is part of the lineage of Tardi's First World War 'heroes':

> Davantage que la guerre elle-même, l'idée directrice est la manipulation des individus: comment des gens ont perdu complètement le contrôle de leur existence, comment ils se sont trouvés embarqués dans des trucs qu'ils n'avaient pas choisis et qui vont, à partir de ce moment-là, décider à leur place pour le restant de leur vie… […] Chez moi […], les personnages contrôlent quand même difficilement la situation. […] Ils n'ont pas de mission à accomplir. Ils ne sont pas sur des rails avec des idées fixes, ils sont ballottés. C'est un peu comme ça que je vois les choses. D'abord, des héros, je n'en connais pas.[44]

Tardi's statement that, in his work, 'les personnages contrôlent quand même difficilement la situation' finds echo in his interpretation of *Voyage*: indeed, it is Bardamu's vocal power that is erased from the illustration, reshaping the dynamic of control and the orchestration of voices present in the textual environment. *Voyage* as a new unity with text and images becomes part of Tardi's work, and Bardamu through the

[43] See Part I, Chapter 1, p. 51.
[44] Sadoul, p. 23.

adaptation becomes part of the 'family' of Tardi's characters. Paradoxically, the 'silent voice' that Bardamu acquires in the scene of l'Amiral Bragueton is thus not a sign of vocal control from him, as his voice is used in the construction of a reader's appropriation of his monologue. His voice becomes secondary (whilst in the monologue it is primary), orchestrated rather than orchestrating.

Tardi's illustration of *Voyage* is his reading of the text, which he concretises not only with the actual illustrations but also through their size, their position, and the presence of corbels. When he describes the corbels he has added as a kind of punctuation to emphasise a passage of the text that '[lui] semblait significative', the use of the verb 'sembler' means that Tardi positions his reading of *Voyage* as personal rather than respecting an assumed truth or essence of the text.[45] Interestingly, to describe the corbels Tardi uses a term related to the textual rather than the visual ('des espèces de ponctuation'). The text is left intact, clearly separated from framed images, but the textual environment is invaded by hybrid signs, halfway between textual and pictorial.

Tardi's illustration of *Voyage*, the concretisation of his reading of the text according to his historically situated personality and using the fragmented specificity of the medium of illustration, in turn, influences the reader, by reshaping their relationship to the text through the inclusion of the images. Philippe Sollers's comment on Tardi's illustration is noteworthy in this aspect:

> Peu de livres ont une aussi grande puissance de **vision** que **Voyage au bout de la nuit**. […] Le héros métaphysique de Céline est ce petit homme toujours en route, entre Chaplin et Kafka mais plus coriace qu'eux, vous le redécouvrez ici, perplexe, rusé, perdu, ahuri, agressé de partout, bien réveillé quand même. […] Céline lui-même a comparé son texte aux bandes dessinées, aux 'comics'. […] Ce Tardi-Céline l'aurait ravi. L'œil traverse le récit comme une plume hallucinée, on voit le déplacement sans espoir mais plus fort, dans son rythme de mots et d'images, que tout désespoir. Il faut relire Céline en le **voyant**. Tardi lui rouvre l'espace. Le grouillement et la simplicité des épisodes et du jugement qu'il porte se redéploient. (*TV*, back cover) [Sollers's emphasis]

Sollers's laudatory comment fulfils an advertising function by positioning Tardi's illustration of *Voyage* as legitimate, thus offering an argument against the negative reception of the book, such as in *Libération*, based on a hierarchy of arts. Indeed, the comment, situated on the back cover of the new edition of Tardi's *Voyage*, asserts the relevance, and almost the necessity, of Tardi's illustration. 'Vision' and 'voyant' are highlighted in bold; Sollers argues that Céline would have been delighted with the

---

[45] Sadoul, p. 103.

illustration, and positions Tardi as legitimate by asserting that Céline himself compared his style to comic books. Sollers blurs the frontier between words and images: 'l'œil traverse le récit comme une plume hallucinée', 'son rythme de mots et d'images'. His statement that 'Il *faut* relire Céline en le voyant' [my emphasis] and the use of the prefix 're-' ('rouvre', 'se redéploient') positions Tardi's illustration as an inclusion from which the original text benefits. In a sense, Sollers presents Tardi's illustration not as a supplement but as a complement to the text.

In this commentary, Sollers also emphasises the potential influence of the inclusion of the illustrations on the reader. Tardi's *Voyage* is a new unity, distinct from the self-sufficient original text but on which, by engaging in intertexual dialogue with it, it has an effect. It invariably influences the reader's perception of the original text by reshaping it, without changing a word of it. Matthieu Letourneux argues that 'l'illustration impose sa lecture'.[46] Martin echoes and nuances this statement:

> le mode d'intégration est celui, minimal, de l'insertion, et […] le rapport entre les deux n'est pas essentiel au fonctionnement de l'œuvre. Il n'en reste pas moins que l'illustration induit des effets de lecture tout à fait déterminants. Le rapport qui unit l'image au texte est, semble-t-il, avant tout de soumission: les vignettes restent toujours plus ou moins opaques sans le recours au texte, qui demeure essentiel ne serait-ce que pour désigner les figures. […] Mais l'image est aussi ce qui offre en retour une 'lecture' du texte.[47]

Martin points out the paradoxical relationship between text and image in illustration. The image is, logically, 'submitted' to the pre-existent and self-sufficient text, without which it would not exist and not be deciphered. However, in return, it offers, and arguably imposes a reading, an interpretation of the text. In the case of *Voyage*, the images envelop the text, due to their size, position and their quantity (600 images for 380 pages). Due to their frequency and the presence of corbels (Tardi's 'ponctuation'), the images impose a rhythm to the reading process. Martin further argues that

> l'illusion propre au roman illustré consiste à donner les gravures pour des images ayant le même référent que le texte: la 'réalité' dont l'image serait la représentation dans un autre code. Or, le référent de l'image n'est autre que le texte lui-même.[48]

The case of Tardi's *Voyage* is however more complex. Indeed, as I have shown in my analysis, the illustration refers to the fictional reality created by the text, but with a different point of view, because of the erasure of the ventriloquial narrative act, which

---

[46] Matthieu Letourneux, 'Illustration et sérialité dans les livraisons romanesques (1870-1910)', <http://www.enc.sorbonne.fr/histoiredulivre/letourneux.htm> [accessed 12/02/2010]. Herafter cited as Letourneux, 'Illustration et sérialité'.
[47] Martin, *'Dangereux suppléments'*, p. 25.
[48] Martin, *'Dangereux suppléments'*, p. 33.

creates a confrontation between text and image and problematises vocal control and power. The juxtaposition of the image with the text induces a supplement of signification through the fragmentation between text and image. The illustration reconfigures the orchestration of the vocal instances by the narrator and, consequently, the reader's actualisation of the vocality of the text.

The illustration, the concretisation of Tardi's reading, then, in turn affects and reconfigures the reading process. That a person reads Tardi's illustrated version rather than a cheaper paperback edition of the text means that this reader wants the reading process to be affected and reconfigured. Due to the absence of captions and speech balloons, the images are not directly linked to specific lines of the text but to the page or text column as a whole. The reader, then, actively links the image to the text, integrates the fragmented text and image together throughout the reading process. The images are seen before the text is read, thus in a sense they potentially pre-empt the text, and they sometimes interrupt the reading, when they take up a double page. The reading process is reconfigured by, in a sense, a concretisation of the structural iterability of reading as analysed by Derrida. In his answer to John Searle, who says that the death or absence of an author does not influence the understanding of writing, Derrida argues that there is an irreducible and structural gap ('un abîme') between what the author meant and what the reader understands. The writing (the 'marque') is repeated, but not repeated identically, as the reader's understanding is always contaminated by another context.[49] In the case of Tardi's illustration, Bardamu's monologue is invaded by the visual, which reconfigures the reading process. The structural iterability, alteration in repetition as analysed by Derrida is echoed by Tardi's wish for a series of illustrations of *Voyage* by different artists, 'le même roman illustré par plusieurs dessinateurs':

> Je dis aux gens: 'Voyez, c'est ainsi que MOI je vois les choses, ça peut vous plaire ou non'… J'aimerais qu'il y ait déjà dix éditions illustrées de *Voyage au bout de la nuit* par autant de dessinateurs différents! J'adorerais que Vuillemin le fasse.[50]

By expressing his wish for a series, Tardi insists on the un-final quality of his work on *Voyage*. He clearly positions it as *his* version of a well-known and self-sufficient text.

By juxtaposing images with Bardamu's voice, by incorporating it into a new unity, Tardi's *Voyage* concretises the voice's quality as un-final, in process. Aczel describes understanding a text as 'the over-hearing in written texts of composite, overdetermined

---

[49] Jacques Derrida, *Limited Inc.* (Paris: Galilée, 1990), p. 120.
[50] Sadoul, p. 103.

voices which do not point to a single, originary speaker function'.[51] In Tardi's *Voyage*, the illustration is the concretisation of a historically situated understanding, a construction based upon the voice of the text, which in turn furthers the voice of the text by participating in its permanent construction. Bardamu's voice, itself already composite and diverse, is, in a movement of *différance*, further deferred and differentiated. The illustration supplements his ventriloquial narrative voice with its erasure (its transposition from textual into visual) and thus reshapes the orchestration of voices and the vocality of the text (its quality for voice). *Voyage* is read again, heard again and now seen by readers, possibly already attuned to Bardamu's voice, through the text's concrete supplementation with a reading (Tardi's reading), expressed through the specificity of the medium of illustration. Tardi's illustration of *Voyage* engages in intertextual dialogue with the original text and offers to the reader the possibility of understanding Bardamu's voice in a supplemented way, thus to hear it, and actualise it anew, in the permanent process of the construction of voice. Through the devocalisation of the ventriloquist, the illustration participates in the cyclical movement of appropriation and expropriation with regard to voice, and, possibly, the inevitability of loss and gain with regard to vocal power. Two adaptations of *Zazie*, to which I shall now turn, show different modes of combination of text and image and different modes of transposition of textual voices.

---

[51] Aczel, 'Understanding as Over-Hearing', 597-617 (p. 615).

Chapter 2: The voices of *Zazie* in text and image: Carelman's illustration and Oubrerie's comic book adaptation of *Zazie dans le métro*

The processes of transposition of the textual voices of *Zazie* in Jacques Carelman's (1966) and Clément Oubrerie's adaptations (2008) will be the central focus of this chapter. Oubrerie's *Zazie* is a typical example of contemporary *bande dessinée*, as it is an A4 format hardback album with less than eighty pages. The format of Carelman's *Zazie*, by contrast, is somewhat unusual, and potentially problematic to classify. The book looks like a hybrid of illustrated novel and comic book. The vast majority of the pages are divided into panels, there is a certain amount of speech balloons, and the original text is divided into varyingly short sections, placed most often under the corresponding image(s), and on some occasions in the centre of or around it. Carelman's *Zazie*, at first glance, seems to be a comic book with text under the image. These comics, such as *Bécassine* or early *Les Pieds Nickelés*, are not considered as illustrated texts, because the image is not superfluous.[1]

Véronique Le Poittevin characterises Carelman's *Zazie* as a *bande dessinée*, and the title, *Zazie raconté en images par Jacques Carelman*, would indeed seem to indicate that it is a comic book, in the sense of an image-based narrative.[2] However, in this chapter I will refer to Carelman's *Zazie* as an illustrated novel. Laurence Grove points out that 'the closeness between bande dessinée and illustrated novel is still an issue today', which is due, in part, to the differences in definitions of *bande dessinée*.[3] Following his definition of *bande dessinée* partly in terms of 'the interaction of text and image – the forming together of a completed whole', Grove outlines the difference 'between a textual narrative that includes images' (an illustrated novel), and 'an image-based narrative that draws upon

---

[1] About *Bécassine* see for instance, Grove, pp. 41-42. About *Les Pieds Nickelés* see for instance Morgan, pp. 112-113. Peeters, however, nuances the importance of the image in *Bécassine* and *Les Pieds Nickelés* when he gives them as examples of 'une forme de bande dessinée au caractère essentiellement verbal'. Peeters, p. 15.

[2] Véronique Le Poittevin, 'Représentations de la ville: du texte à l'image', *Cahiers Raymond Queneau*, 17-19 (1990), 85-93 (p. 88).

[3] Grove, p. 42. For instance, Grove sees the textual element as intrinsic to *bande dessinée* (even 'silent' *bandes dessinées*), in this way taking issue with Groensteen's definition, who sees *bande dessinée* as a specifically visual form. Grove provides a summary of the different definitions of *bande dessinée*, that place the emphasis on the relationship between the different parts (Peeters), speech balloons (Filippini), the narrative in the gap between images (Frémion), or the literary qualities (Morgan). Grove argues that the differences and debates in *bande dessinée* scholarship have contributed to making *bande dessinée* an accepted art form (unlike, perhaps, comics, in the non-French-language context). Grove, pp. 18-20.

written text as an intrinsic element' (a *bande dessinée*).[4] In Carelman's *Zazie*, the images are, in spite of their omnipresence, intrinsically not necessary to the narrative, because the original text, reproduced in its entirety, is self-sufficient. Following Grove, I will, then, consider Carelman's *Zazie* as an illustrated novel, in which the text is the anchor, rather than the image.[5] I will argue that, in fact, the 'dispositif' of *bande dessinée* and the speech balloons are used to reinforce the dependence of the image to the text. It is for this anchoring of the text that I have chosen to compare Carelman's *Zazie* with Oubrerie's, as the comic book presents different modes of transposition of voices in the relationship between text and image.[6] I suggest that both versions of *Zazie* are adaptations, because both are transpositions influenced by the historically situated personality of the adapter, and using the specificity of the chosen medium. However Carelman's illustration is strongly inscribed in a discourse of fidelity, in this way perhaps refusing its status of adaptation, while Oubrerie's comic book is openly an adaptation and an appropriation of the original text. In this chapter, I shall first focus on voices in Carelman's illustration of *Zazie*, and analyse in particular the use of speech balloons, the relationship between text and image, the processes of entrapment and containment of the characters' voices and the possible reinforcement of the control and supervisory role of the narrative instance. I shall then analyse the transposition of the textual voices of *Zazie* in Oubrerie's comic book, in particular in the relationship between the characters and the narrative instance, and argue that Oubrerie offers a uniformisation of voices, and a possible idealised view of voice.

Carelman's illustration: trapped and contained voices

Jacques Carelman is a French theatre set designer, painter, sculptor and an author, best known for his 1969 *Dictionnaire des objects introuvables*. He has illustrated texts by Marcel

---

[4] Grove gives Tardi's *Voyage* as an example of the former, in which 'the removal of the images would not diminish our understanding of the storyline', while in Tardi's comic book adaptation of Daeninckx's *Le Der des Ders*, 'the story is presented through the images'. Grove, pp. 19-20.

[5] While the book is described as a comic book by Le Poittevin, it is however characterised as an illustration in the Gallimard catalogue, and it would seem that Carelman did not take issue with the term 'illustration'. Indeed, in a 1970 televised interview, Carelman does not correct the interviewer's use of the term 'illustrer' with regard to his work on *Zazie*. Francis Giraud, dir., 'Queneau illustré par Jacques Carelman', *En toutes lettres* <http://www.ina.fr/art-et-culture/litterature/video/I00011584/queneau-illustre-par-jacques-carelman.fr.html> [accessed 25/02/2010]. Hereafter cited as Giraud, 'Queneau illustré par Jacques Carelman'.

[6] The omnipresence of the images in Carelman's *Zazie* is why I selected this illustration for the present study, rather than Rocher Blachon's (1979, re-edited as paperback in 1999) or Catherine Meurisse's (paperback, 2009).

Aymé, Dostoevsky, Gogol, La Fontaine, Gaston Leroux, and Pierre Mac Orlan among others. Prior to *Zazie*, he illustrated Queneau's *Exercices de style* in a 1963 edition. In a 1970 televised interview, Carelman explains that it is because of the correspondences between Queneau's texts and his own visual work that he subsequently decided to work on *Zazie*: 'un an après j'ai tenté une autre expérience avec un autre texte de Queneau, parce que je trouve que nous avons des points communs justement'. Carelman states that he considers himself part of the same 'famille intellectuelle' as Queneau, and adds that 'plusieurs personnes [lui] ont déjà dit que finalement [il] faisai[t] la même chose sur le plan plastique et graphique ce que Queneau a fait sur le plan de la littérature [*sic*]'.[7] Their belonging to the same intellectual family seems indeed obvious: Carelman is a member of the Collège de 'Pataphysique and co-founder in 1980 of the OuPeinPo (Ouvroir de Peinture Potentiel). The OuPeinPo is one of the Ou-X-Po groups deriving from the OuLiPo, Ouvroir de Littérature Potentiel, co-founded by Raymond Queneau and François Le Lionnais in 1960.

The correspondences Carelman sees between his work and Queneau's, perhaps surprisingly, did not prompt him however to try and appropriate *Zazie* and offer *his* personal vision of it. On the contrary, he aimed to be as faithful as possible to the original text, or rather, the author's intentions. This approach can be seen in Carelman's description of the illustrative process:

> comme j'ai eu la chance d'avoir l'auteur vivant, sous la main si j'ose dire, et comme j'ai pas voulu commettre de bêtises, de bévues, pas trahir la pensée de l'auteur, qui est assez complexe – parce que sous des dehors comme ça assez légers, avec des mots qui ont fait la joie de toute la France pendant des années n'est-ce pas, il y a des choses beaucoup plus importantes qui sont cachées dans Queneau. Alors je voulais pas me tromper, je suis allé le voir et je me suis renseigné sur chacun des personnages, et [pour] tous les personnages je lui ai soumis les dessins successifs que j'en ai faits. Pour ne pas le trahir.[8]

The relationship between artist and writer as described by Carelman does not evoke a collaborative process, but rather a justification of Carelman's illustration as legitimate, and not betraying the author ('pour ne pas le trahir'). Perhaps paradoxically, given his belonging to an intellectual family characterised by experimentality, Carelman, here, refers to a traditional, pre-Barthesian and Foucauldian notion of the author. Indeed, the artist's statement that there are 'des choses beaucoup plus importantes [...] cachées dans Queneau' refers to a hidden truth or message in the text that would not be readily

---

[7] Giraud, 'Queneau illustré par Jacques Carelman' [my transcription].
[8] Giraud, 'Queneau illustré par Jacques Carelman' [my transcription].

available to the reader but held only by the author. Carelman seems to refuse freedom of interpretation because of a fear of betraying 'la pensée de l'auteur', as shown by his choice of words: 'se tromper', 'bêtises', 'bévues', 'trahir'. Carelman's conception of the illustrative process, as shown by his need for the author's approval, and his refusal of freedom of interpretation, echoes the discourse of fidelity as found both in adaptation studies and in illustration studies. The most significant example of Carelman's submission to the author's 'truth' about the text is in his representation of Marceline. The justification of his illustrative decision is inscribed in his seeking for the author's approval:

> un doute plane sur ce personnage. On ne sait jamais ce que c'est exactement. Queneau me l'a dit, c'est un travesti, et il m'a même ajouté que c'était un officier allemand – enfin c'est pas du tout dans l'histoire, le texte, ça il faut vraiment que je lui aie arraché son secret. Dans son esprit c'était donc un officier allemand qui était resté caché clandestinement après la Libération de Paris. Et qui a vécu avec l'oncle Gabriel. Alors dans la dernière image du livre, pour rappeler cette petite chose, enfin cette espèce de clin d'œil que j'ai fait, quand la soi-disante [*sic*] tante raccompagne Zazie à la gare, elle est coiffée d'un chapeau tyrolien, enfin c'est une petite notation en passant.[9]

Carelman's final image of Marceline / Marcel refers to a clue for a mystery that, he argues, cannot be solved with the text alone ('c'est pas du tout dans l'histoire, le texte'). The text Carelman intends to illustrate is, in a sense, a virtual text, the author's unwritten text ('dans son esprit') rather than the concrete text available to readers for interpretation and appropriation. This approach explains why Carelman submitted drafts of his drawings of the characters to Queneau ('[pour] tous les personnages je lui ai soumis les dessins successifs que j'en ai faits'), while *Zazie* is a text in which characters' physical appearance is hardly ever described, thus remains open to the reader's interpretation. Carelman's illustration seems to be submitted not to the autonomous and self-sufficient text but to the supremacy of the author's intent, which he had to 'arracher' from Queneau. In the case of Marceline, the unwritten 'secret' Carelman got from Queneau stems in fact from a concrete early draft of the text. Though the televised interview dates back to 1970, Carelman does not seem to be aware of the similarity between the 'secret' he obtained from Queneau and the character of Marceline in a fragment of an early draft of *Zazie* published in 1960 in the journal *Biblio*.

---

[9] Giraud, 'Queneau illustré par Jacques Carelman' [my transcription]. 'German Tyrol' has been part of Austria since 1918, but Tyrolean clothes are commonly used as a German stereotype.

In this early draft, Marceline is a German soldier who deserted and has been hiding at Gabriel's since 1942.[10]

It seems, then, that it is not his own vision with which Carelman aims to supplement the text, but Queneau's 'originary' vision. I suggest that the illustration tends to take the text inwards (returning to the author's intent, the conception of the book – and in the case of Marceline, to a concrete early draft, unbeknownst to Carelman) rather than outwards (the supplementation of the text with another's appropriation of it, such as in the case of Tardi's *Voyage*). The addition of the illustration, then, follows a backward movement: the text goes back to its origin as draft or unfinished text in the author's mind. There are a number of implications stemming from Carelman's approach to illustration for the voices of *Zazie*, in the relationship between text and image.

If we compare Carelman's illustration of *Zazie* with Tardi's version of *Voyage*, it seems that the image is in a sense more present in the former than in the latter, as every image is visually linked to a bit of text, even though it mostly only refers to a specific aspect of the textual section it illustrates. This means that though more present, the image is never visually autonomous from the reproduced original text, as there is not a single page without text. The original text is present in two different ways: in its entirety, but divided or fragmented into varyingly short sections rather than the paragraphs and chapters of the original version; it is also contracted into and duplicated in speech balloons. As I explained in my examination of Tardi's *Voyage*, Smolderen analyses the speech balloon as the irruption of sound in the image. The speech balloon creates the pretence of speech and works autonomously in the image, which becomes a sound image (an 'image *sonore*').[11] In Carelman's *Zazie* however, the speech balloons do not integrate text and image into an autonomous unity. Though 'sonore', the image is not independent from the textual material, of which the speech balloons are repetitions and contractions. I propose that the implication of this is that the characters' voices, in the illustration, are not independent from the textual surroundings, and that in Carelman's illustration the characters do not *speak*, in spite of the presence of speech balloons pointing at their mouths. Their voices are trapped and contained within the text that

---

[10] Michel and Stéphane Bigot points out Jeanne Lalochère's 'énigmatique réplique' to Gabriel, 'Natürlich […]. À propos, ta femme, ça va?' (*QZ*, p. 12), and see it as a possible 'souvenir de cette conception de Marceline sous les espèces d'un officier allemand', a memory of an early draft, rather than a 'clue' as to the true identity of Marceline. Michel and Stéphane Bigot, *'Zazie dans le métro' de Raymond Queneau* (Paris: Gallimard, 1994), p. 187. Hereafter cited as Bigot.

[11] Smolderen, *Naissances de la bande dessinée*, p. 124. See Part II, Chapter 1, p. 108.

surrounds them. In this regard, the transposition from text to text and image can be characterised in terms of loss with regard to characters' voices in the original text as I analysed them in Part I, Chapter 2. The independent (however flawed) and uncontrolled voices of the characters turn into repetitions and contractions, trapped and contained.

The emblematic function of some speech balloons, I suggest, participates further in the entrapment and containment of the characters' voices within the textual surroundings. Indeed, some speech balloons can be seen as in between speech balloon and label, as described by Smolderen.[12] For instance, in the first illustration, the text's incipit 'Doukipudonktan' (*QZ*, p. 9) is repeated in the image, in Gabriel's think balloon (*CZ*, p. 3). The opening word of the text and its first linguistic agglomeration, 'Doukipudonktan' is emblematic of *Zazie*, as Johanne Bénard outlines: '"Doukipudonktan". D'emblée le roman de Raymond Queneau, *Zazie dans le métro*, exhibe son projet: transcription de l'oral et subversion de l'écrit et du genre romanesque'.[13] Chris Andrews even sees 'Doukipudonktan' as so famous a quotation that it is a reduction of Queneau:

> By 'the writer that we know', I mean, rather simplistically, the author of novels whose main distinctive features are the quasi-phonetic rendering of spoken French, ironic humour, and mathematically determined structures. I mean the novelist who begins *Zazie dans le métro* with the segment 'Doukipudonktan'.[14]

Because 'Doukipudonktan' is emblematic of the text's most striking characteristic, its linguistic inventiveness, and is one of its most famous lines, its reproduction in Gabriel's think balloon fulfils an emblematic function.

The use of the speech balloon to illustrate Zazie's 'Napoléon mon cul [...] Il m'intéresse pas du tout, cet enflé, avec son chapeau à la con' (*QZ*, p. 16) is also in a sense emblematic. 'Mon cul' is representative of Zazie's character, as Turandot points out.[15] This 'clausule vigoureuse', 'un procédé nouveau de dérision qu'on a beaucoup remarqué', as Barthes characterises it, contracts her lack of respect and her propensity to swear.[16] O'Sullivan even sees it as a reason for the success of the novel: 'Zazie's

---

[12] Smolderen, *Naissances de la bande dessinée*, pp. 123-124. See Part II, Chapter 1, p. 108.

[13] Johanne Bénard, 'Un cinéma zazique?', *Cinémas*, 4:3 (1994), 135-154 (p. 135). Herafter cited as Bénard, 'Un cinéma zazique?', 135-154.

[14] Chris Andrews, 'Surrealism and Pseudo-Initiation: Raymond Queneau's *Odile*', *The Modern Language Review*, 94:2 (1999), 377-394 (p. 377).

[15] '– J'ai dit, dit Turandot, j'ai dit: je cause mon cul. [Gabriel] – Et qu'est-ce que tu insinues par là? Si j'ose dire. – J'insinue que la gosse, qu'elle soit ici, ça me plaît pas' (*QZ*, p. 27; *CZ*, p. 13). Saying 'mon cul' immediately refers to Zazie.

[16] Barthes, '"Zazie" et la littérature', in *Œuvres complètes*, I, pp. 1260-1264 (p. 1262).

iconoclasm and her greeting of every surprising piece of information with the sceptical "mon cul" made her an immediate *succès de scandale* among French readers'.[17] The emblematic aspect of 'Napoléon mon cul […]. Il m'intéresse pas du tout, cet enflé avec son chapeau à la con' in particular is made obvious by the fact that it is on the back cover of the paperback edition of the text (*QZ*, back cover). In Carelman's illustration, the utterance is contracted to 'Napoléon mon cul' in the image, and Zazie's speech balloon is topped with a hat that is immediately recognisable as Napoléon's (*CZ*, p. 7). The emblematic function is here in the graphic use of the hat, emblematic of Napoléon, and the contraction and repetition of Zazie's utterance. Zazie's enigmatic last utterance, 'j'ai vieilli' (*QZ*, p. 189), which, as I pointed out in my textual analysis, has attracted various interpretations, can also be considered as emblematic, and as fulfilling an emblematic function when displayed in a speech balloon in Carelman's illustration (*CZ*, p. 98).[18]

Smolderen outlines the two types of 'arrêts' defined by William Hogarth in his 'bataille des images': 'l'arrêt emblématique (qui pétrifie les figures dans les postures intemporelles, hors de toute contrainte physique) et l'arrêt instantané (qui saisit au vol des personnages en pleine action)'.[19] I suggest that when emblematic lines of the text, that as such have become *quotations* from the text, are reproduced in the image, the characters are petrified, not in an a-temporal posture (they are not, for instance, falling down a building, like the boy in Outcault's images), but with an a-temporal voice. Their voices (whose utterances we can see, thanks to the speech balloons) are petrified, or frozen at a moment that is emblematic of the text. I suggest that in Carelman's *Zazie* there are two types of quotation marks.[20] Firstly, in all speech balloons pointing at the characters' mouths (there are other ways to inscribe text in the image, to which I will turn shortly), the characters' utterances are in quotation marks because their utterances are shown as having an origin, the textual section below or around them. This origin, however, is a trace in the Derridean sense, as the trace of the utterance in the original text.[21] Secondly, when the speech balloons fulfil an emblematic function, the characters' utterances are in quotation marks not only in relation to the textual surroundings, but

---

[17] O'Sullivan, pp. 263-279 (p. 263).
[18] See Part I, Chapter 2, p. 94.
[19] Smolderen, *Naissances de la bande dessinée*, p. 123.
[20] I am borrowing the term 'quotation marks' from Umberto Eco, who outlines their importance in postmodern works in the relationship between the work and the viewer or reader. See Eco, 191-207. I will analyse this concept in more detail in relation to Malle's *Zazie* in Part II, Chapter 3.
[21] See Derrida, *De la grammatologie*, p. 228, and Introduction, p. 23.

also in relation to the outside of the text, the dialogue in which the text is inscribed. In neither case can the characters *speak*.

I propose that the entrapment and containment of the characters' voices in Carelman's illustration also comes from the fact that most of the characters' voices are strongly characterised due to the constant typography they have in the speech balloons. For example, the typography of Zazie's voice in the speech balloons is a child's handwriting, and regularly has ink stains. Charles's utterances are in a speech balloon in the shape of a puff of smoke, and the typography for la Veuve Mouaque, whom Trouscaillon describes as 'une rombière de la haute' (*QZ*, p. 159; *CZ*, p. 80), is florid and her speech balloons are in the shape of an embroidered handkerchief. Mado, who is in love with Charles, has heart-shaped speech balloons. Though Trouscaillon is characterised by a succession of identities, the gothic typography of his voice is constant. Able to dress up and take on different identities, it seems however that he cannot alter his voice.

When Zazie, the other character whom I analysed as having potential vocal power in the original text, tells the story of her father's murder by her mother (*QZ*, pp. 52-56), the story is contained in her speech balloon in the illustration, and drawn and written clumsily, as a child would (*CZ*, pp. 26-28). When in her speech balloon she tells the trial scene, there is another speech balloon contained in hers, which holds what the lawyer said at the trial. However, the text in the lawyer's speech balloon is so stained and clumsily written than it is unreadable. The strong characterisation of Zazie's voice as a child's voice, in a sense, prevents her from being an effective storyteller, while in the original text she is a gifted storyteller, as I showed in my textual analysis.[22] Here, Carelman's illustration undermines her storytelling skills, her vocal control, and the potential fictional power of her voice.

I suggest that the strong characterisation of the characters' voices in the illustration, in fact, undermines the independence and autonomy of their (however flawed) voices in the polyphonic original text. In *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, Bakhtin argues that language differentiation between characters' voices does not guarantee polyphony in a text, but, on the contrary, that

> language differentiation and the clear-cut 'speech characterizations' of characters
> have the greatest artistic significance precisely in the creation of objectified and

---

[22] See Part I, Chapter 2, p. 77.

finalized images of people. The more objectified a character, the more sharply his speech physiognomy stands out.[23]

The visual metaphor of 'speech physiognomy' finds echo in Carelman's illustration, as the characters' nature or personality is *shown* by the typography of their voices in the speech balloons. The strongly characterised voices of the characters in Carelman's illustration, then, participate in their objectification. Moreover, I propose to draw from Silverman's argument that in film, 'like synchronization, postdubbing performs a supervisory role with respect to sexual difference, enforcing the general dictum that female voices should proceed from female bodies, and male voices from male bodies'.[24] In Carelman's illustration, there is arguably an enforcement of sexual difference between female voices and male voices. Indeed, the typography of the major female characters' voices is joined-up handwriting, even Zazie's, which, as it regularly has ink stains, appears as the 'draft' of a female voice, as if she were learning not only how to write, but how to write a female voice. The typography of the male voices, by contrast, is in print.

The characters' voices are objectified, as that of a young girl learning to write (Zazie), a woman in love (Mado), a male smoker (Charles), an obscure or tenebrous man (Trouscaillon), or an upper-class woman (la Veuve Mouaque). The characters are turned into marionettes, or rather dummies out of which a strongly characterised voice comes, shown as theirs by a speech balloon pointing at their mouths. In this regard, I propose that Carelman's illustration, perhaps in line with his author-oriented approach, reinforces the supervisory role, to borrow Silverman's term, of the narrative instance.

However, two characters stand out as exceptions for different reasons, Gabriel and Marceline, whom I analysed as having a special relationship with the narrative voice in the original text. Gabriel seems to be able to put on the other's voice: indeed, once, he imitates Zazie, by saying 'devoir mon cul' ('mon cul' being, as I discussed, emblematic of Zazie's voice), and this utterance is written with the typography of Zazie's voice in Gabriel's speech balloon (*CZ*, p. 20). This would suggest that Gabriel has a potential ventriloquial ability. Marceline's voice, like those of the others, is constant and strongly characterised, as the voice of a feminine, soft woman. As in the text she is always referred to as speaking 'doucement', in the illustration the typography of her voice is a neat, feminine joined-up handwriting, and her speech balloons are in

---

[23] Bakhtin, *PDP*, pp. 181-182.
[24] Silverman, p. 47.

the shape of her mouth. However, if one accepts that Marceline is a male German soldier, she is then, in fact, not trapped with a strongly characterised voice. Indeed, if she is German she has to conceal her accent, and if she is a man she has to alter her male voice into a feminine one. In this regard, it is fruitful to refer to queer theory, in particular the idea of gender as performance. In *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, Butler argues that 'there is no gender identity behind the expressions of gender; […] identity is performatively constituted by the very "expressions" that are said to be its results'.[25] Chris Beasley points out that Butler's analysis focuses on

> bodies that 'do not matter' in the gender and heteronormative. [Butler] focuses upon those bodies that are in some senses 'both/neither' (rather than either/or), that *cannot* or *will not* fit as the one or 'the other' in the gender and sexuality binaries.[26]

Marceline's identity can be seen as fluid, corresponding with the idea of 'both/neither', as she is both a man and a woman, and neither a man nor a woman. Moreover, her feminine voice can be seen as consciously performative, if one assumes that she has altered her voice into a 'feminine' one. However, Beasley adds, while

> transgender and transsexual individuals appear to qualify as gender outlaws who might provide concrete instances of Butler's alternative political strategy regarding identity crossings, such individuals can also be viewed as restating gender identities rather than displacing gender.[27]

Marceline can be seen as not causing 'gender trouble', in the sense that she performs a feminine voice in order to hide (as a male German soldier who deserted). Her 'transgendered voice' is recognised as female because it uses the signs of an instated female voice, as seen in the joined-up handwriting.

I propose that Gabriel and Marceline *speak* despite the processes of entrapment and containment of voices, by using them. Gabriel can put on Zazie's strongly characterised voice, with which she on the other hand is trapped and which undermines the potential of her textual voice. The speech balloon points at Gabriel's mouth, but the voice is not his. Marceline *speaks* as a woman, because she is not a woman. The speech balloons point at her mouth, and contain a constructed, performative female voice. This hints that Gabriel and Marceline are perhaps helped rather than hindered by the supervisory instance that the narrative instance has become in Carelman's illustration, as

---

[25] Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (London: Routledge, 1990), p. 25.
[26] Chris Beasley, *Gender & Sexuality: Critical Theories, Critical Thinkers* (London: Sage, 2005), p. 110. Hereafter cited as Beasley.
[27] Beasley, p. 110.

they, in the original text, were given vocal power as they let themselves be ventriloquised.[28]

While speech balloons pointing at the characters' mouths mostly contribute to the entrapment and containment of their voices, I propose that they can however find solutions to gain, or at least not lose, with regard to their voice, in the transposition from text, to text with image. This happens when the illustrated novel turns, in a sense, into a comic book, as text and image are integrated together, combined into a whole, rather than the image submitted to the text. In some cases, an utterance in the text is transposed graphically in the image. In the first chapter, as Charles gives Gabriel and Zazie a ride home from the station, Zazie starts to tell the two men 'la nouvelle génération, […] elle t'…', but she is interrupted by Gabriel's 'ça va, ça va, […] on a compris' (*QZ*, p. 17; *CZ*, p. 8). In the image illustrating this conversation, Zazie's speech balloon, containing 'la nouvelle génération elle t'.', is being cut with scissors by Gabriel, as his 'ça va, ça va' becomes graphic. When Trouscaillon says 'j'aime les enfants' in the text (*QZ*, p. 46), in the image he draws the figure of a little girl on the pavement with his umbrella (*CZ*, p. 23). Rather than repetitions and contractions, these are transpositions that work with text *and* image.

The image is regularly metamorphosed by a literal transposition of the text into the graphic field. The altercation between Gabriel and the 'ptit type' is a clear example (*QZ*, p. 10; *CZ*, p. 4). The illustration is characterised by metamorphosis to echo the text in the visual field: Gabriel's arms morph into a gorilla's when the 'ptit type' tells him 'tu pues, eh gorille' (the utterance is in the text, but not repeated in a speech balloon in the image). The 'ptit type' then turns into a midge, to echo '[Gabriel] allait tout de même pas laisser sa chance au moucheron' in the text, which renders Gabriel's thought through free indirect discourse. Gabriel then has a mirrored wardrobe as torso, as in the text, through free indirect discourse again, the 'ptit type' calls him an 'armoire à glace'. The last image of this altercation illustrates the following textual section:

> Le ptit type se mit à craindre. C'était le temps pour lui, c'était le moment de se forger quelque bouclier verbal. Le premier qu'il trouva fut un alexandrin: 'D'abord, je vous permets pas de me tutoyer.' 'Foireux', répliqua Gabriel avec simplicité. Et il leva le bras comme s'il voulait donner la beigne à son interlocuteur.

In the image, the 'ptit type' is protecting himself with a shield, on which 'd'abord je vous permets pas de me tutoyer' is written, as Gabriel's 'foireux', shaped as an arrow, is

---

[28] See Part I, Chapter 2, pp. 84-86.

directed against his shield. In this case, the utterances are not repeated in a speech balloon pointing at the characters' mouths, but *used* by the characters, by the 'ptit type' to protect himself, and by Gabriel to attack him. I propose that when the characters find an alternative solution (other than speech balloons pointing at their mouths) to the transposition from text to text and image, their voices 'escape' the processes of entrapment and containment. In these cases, there is an integration of text and image into a new unity, rather than repetition of the textual in the visual. Here, the characters' voices, independent and uncontrolled in the original text, gain rather than lose in the transposition.

It seems, then, that the characters' voices in the text have the potential to metamorphose the image, in a combination of text and image. The characters are able to metamorphose, and to metamorphose the other. Charles's taxi turns into a First World War taxi of the Marne in the image when Zazie asks him, in the text, if he has found it on the banks of the Marne river (*QZ*, p. 16; *CZ*, p. 7). When Gabriel, in the text, answers Zazie's 'quand tu déconnes comme ça, tu le fais esprès ou c'est sans le vouloir?' with 'c'est pour te faire rire mon enfant', in the image he morphs into *Le Petit chaperon rouge*'s wolf dressed up as the grandmother (*QZ*, p. 17; *CZ*, p. 8). Turandot turns into a dog with a keg barrel after downing a glass of wine and being told by Mado, in the text, that 'ça vous apprendra à faire le terre-neuve' (*QZ*, p. 36; *CZ*, p. 18). By contrast, when Zazie asks to go to Saint-Germain des Prés in the text, in the image she has the same haircut as Juliette Gréco, but 'à Saint-Germain des Prés' is repeated in a speech balloon pointing at her mouth (*QZ*, p. 17; *CZ*, p. 8). Here, Zazie's metamorphosis into Juliette Gréco (emblem of Saint-Germain des Prés, and for whom Queneau wrote a song) fulfils an emblematic function, and her voice is trapped and contained. When the characters do not have speech balloons pointing at their mouths in the image, which would prevent them from *speaking* in the image, their voice can potentially gain from the transposition from text to text and image, as what they say in the text shapes the illustration.

In this regard, Carelman's illustration echoes the polyphony of the original text. The image can be shaped by voice, and by all voices alike, as no voice has more potential to shape than another. In my textual analysis, I argued that the characters were given flawed freedom, as they could not make anything out of it due to their obsession with mastering French language. In the illustration, it is in fact when the characters do not appear to be speaking (when they do not have a speech balloon pointing at their

mouths) that they are most in control of their voice. However, the illustration duplicates the text as the space of voices that echo, ignore, trick or fail to understand each other, and are obsessed with a 'correct' use of French. The illustration duplicates the abstrusity of language for the characters, by repeating some utterances in speech balloons. For instance, Zazie's confusion about her uncle's sexuality is contracted into a speech balloon ('une pédale? une lope? un pédé? un hormosessuel?', *QZ*, p. 129; *CZ*, p. 66); the restaurant manager moans about his clients' linguistic abilities ('et ça prétend causer le français', *QZ*, p. 132; *CZ*, p. 68); Trouscaillon, while trying to seduce Marceline, has to check a dictionary to find out how to tell her to take her clothes off: 'c'est français ça: je me vêts' (*QZ*, p. 160; *CZ*, p. 80); Trouscaillon later confesses to Fédor that 'la grammaire, c'est pas mon fort', as well his need to talk: 'j'ai la confession qui m'étrangle la pipe' (*QZ*, pp. 163-164; *CZ*, pp. 82-83).

The characters' obsession with speaking as much as possible (while in the illustration they cannot in fact *speak*) and speaking correctly, which as I analysed leads to a risk of cacophony in the original text, is in the illustration supplemented into a graphic risk of cacophony due to the strong characterisation of the characters' voices in the speech balloons. Over the course of the book, polyphony risks turning into cacophony as there are more and more speech balloons with strongly differentiated graphic voices concentrated in one image. The first image on page 68 is an example of graphic cacophony. The image corresponds to a fairly long textual section (roughly twice as long as usual). Gabriel has taken Zazie and the tourists out to dinner, and they have been followed by Trouscaillon and la Veuve Mouaque (*QZ*, pp. 130-132). While in the text the characters' utterances are consecutive, the image confers a sense of simultaneity, of a 'tableau'. The characters seem to be talking at the same time, none of them looking at the person addressing them, and every speech balloon displays the character's unique vocal typography. Gabriel asks 't'as fini de déconner?' (in his usual 'script' writing), seemingly looking to the restaurant manager, who says 'et ça pretend causer le français' (Chinese typography), seemingly looking down at Zazie, who asks 'qu'est-ce que tu attends pour lui casser la gueule' (child's handwriting), looking up at Gabriel. La Veuve Mouaque tells Gabriel 'Tordez-y donc les parties viriles' (florid typography, embroidered napkin speech balloon), and Trouscaillon walks away, saying 'je veux pas voir ça' (gothic typography). Voices ignore each other, and the individual 'grains' of their voices, rendered by very different typographies, are in dissonance.

In my textual analysis, I argued that polyphony, though it does not become irretrievable, risks turning into cacophony in the original text, because of the complex relationship between the characters' and the narrator's voices. (Un)controlled by the narrator, given a freedom they do not, or cannot exploit, the characters of the potentially flawed polyphonic system of *Zazie* risk turning into cacophonic voices. While in the original text the risk of cacophony is due to a lack of control on the part of the narrative voice, in the illustration the risk or semblance of cacophony is due to the reinforcement of the supervisory role of the narrative instance, now in charge of the combination of text and image. Indeed, graphic cacophony occurs when the strongly characterised voices of the characters are in dissonance, and when their confusion towards language is contracted and repeated in speech balloons that point at their mouths. Carelman's illustration reinforces the control of the narrative instance, while in the original text the narrative voice mostly refuses this control. The illustration increases but also reveals the power of the ventriloquist, because the voices are given an origin, or a trace that seems like an origin, with speech balloons that point at the mouths of characters but do not in fact enable them to speak. Trapped and contained the characters can find ways of controlling their voice in the image despite the processes of entrapment and containment. They are, however, shown as belonging to the new narrative instance, the 'author', which is, I suggest, particularly obvious in Carelman's illustration of Gabriel's speech at the Eiffel tower.

In my textual analysis, I argued that in this scene Gabriel lets himself be ventriloquised by the narrative voice, and gains vocal power as he relinquishes the control of his own voice.[29] In Carelman's illustration, the image juxtaposed with Gabriel's speech (*QZ*, pp. 90-91) takes up roughly three quarters of the page (*CZ*, p. 46). It shows Gabriel with an exaggeratedly big head, hanging from the top of the Eiffel Tower and holding a skull (to echo the reference made to *Hamlet* in the text). The bottom half of the Eiffel Tower merges into a train, a horse carriage and a monument. Zazie and Marceline's faces are also present in the image, because they are mentioned in the speech. To transpose the reference to the 'romancier idiot' in Gabriels' speech, Carelman has signed the image in the bottom right corner. I argued that the mention of the idiotic novelist was a deferral of responsibility from the narrative voice to an external author. Carelman's illustration, because it is signed, institutes the presence of an author at the source of the work, while ignoring the characterisation of this author as

---

[29] See Part I, Chapter 2, pp. 85-86.

idiotic in the original text. While in this image Gabriel seems to show an integration of text and image, as his textual voice shapes the image in which there is no speech balloon pointing at his mouth, the independence of his voice is contradicted by the signature, which shows him as belonging to an authorial instance. While Gabriel and Marceline in fact benefit from the processes of entrapment and containment of voices in the illustration, the other characters can only sporadically escape them.

Oubrerie's comic book: uniformised and idealised voices

By contrast, the relationship between text and image, and between the characters and the narrative instance, is very different in Clément Oubrerie's comic book. Oubrerie is an illustrator of children's books and has been a cartoonist since 2005. He is best known for the series *Aya de Yopougon* (since 2005), written by Marguerite Abouet, which tells the story of a young Ivorian woman in the 1970s. Oubrerie adapted *Zazie* as part of the 'BD Jeunesse' Gallimard collection *Fétiche*, for which artists choose a text from Gallimard's catalogue to adapt, with titles that include adaptations of Marcel Aymé's *Les Contes du chat perché* (adapted by Agnès Maupré), Charles Perrault's *Peau d'âne* (Baudoin) and Antoine de St-Exupéry's *Le Petit Prince* (Joann Sfar, author of the successful comic book series *Le Chat du rabbin*, and film director). It is noteworthy that Oubrerie's comic book *Zazie* is marketed as aimed at young readers, which, I will argue, shapes the adaptation of the voices of *Zazie*.[30] Queneau's *Zazie*, first published in 1959 in the NRF collection, is nowadays published in the 'Folio Junior' collection, and marketed as suitable for readers over nine years old, in spite of the possible reading challenge it represents, its potentially difficult themes (such as incest, murder or rape), and the abundance of slang. This complete re-evaluation of the book's audience shows that no reading of a text is definite, but that its actualisation is permanently being renewed according to a historically situated reading.

In order to situate my analysis of the transposition of voices in Oubrerie's *Zazie* comic book, I shall examine his approach of the adaptive process, as he exposes it in his reply to Elisabeth Chamontin's negative review, published in the journal of the

---

[30] The link between comic book and childhood is, perhaps surprisingly, 'a critical blind spot in comics scholarship', as Charles Hartfield writes: 'the lack of a theoretically informed perspective on childhood detracts from comics studies. The default position for many recent comics researchers has been to reject entirely the link between comics and childhood, as if to jack the form up to some higher standard of seriousness.' Charles Hatfield, 'Comic Art, Children's Literature, and the New Comics Studies', *The Lion and the Unicorn*, 30:3 (2006), 360-382 (pp. 377-378).

Quenellian *Association des Amis de Valentin Brû*. Oubrerie has posted both the review and his reply on his blog, *Oubreblog*. Interestingly for the present study, Oubrerie justifies his take on the original text by making a distinction between his work and Carelman's (which Oubrerie only read after finishing his comic book), between adaptation and illustration, transformation and accompaniment:

> J'utilise le terme 'adapter' à dessein […] car c'est une démarche qui n'est pas assimilable à celle 'd'illustration' comme celle qu'a pu avoir Carelman avec le même roman. Illustrer c'est accompagner le texte, intégral ou pas, d'images qui respectent autant que possible son sens, alors qu'en adaptant on a la liberté (et la responsabilité) de choisir, de modifier, de transposer, de réécrire, bref de transformer l'œuvre originale en une autre œuvre, non moins originale mais surtout pas pareille.[31]

Oubrerie emphasises the appropriative and transformative aspect of the adaptive process. The terminologies he uses throughout his reply, such as 'insolente liberté', 'transformer', or 'contre-pied', stand in stark contrast with Carelman's approach. As Oubrerie wishes for his adaptation to be 'surtout pas pareille' to the original text, his visualition of *Zazie* is also strikingly different from previous ones. For example, with regard to the characters, Oubrerie's Zazie is ginger and long-haired, while Malle's, Blachon's, and Carelman's are all short- and dark-haired, and Oubrerie's Marceline is a Black woman, while in all other versions she is white.[32]

Before writing his comic book Oubrerie was familiar with Malle's and Blachon's versions of *Zazie*, which influenced the adaptive process, as Oubrerie strived to differentiate his visualisation from previous ones. For instance, Oubrerie admits that Philippe Noiret, who plays Gabriel in Malle's film adaptation, is 'envahissant', and that he struggled to '[se] débarrasser de [lui]'. In contrast with Malle's version (and Carelman's, with which Oubrerie was not familiar at the time), Oubrerie '[a] opté, devant l'exubérance verbale et la surenchère naturelle du récit, pour la sobriété'. By opting for sobriety and realism, Oubrerie, in a sense, emphasises the lack of common

---

[31] Clément Oubrerie, 'Polézazimique' <http://clementoubrerie.blogspot.com/2009/04/polezazimique.html> [accessed 23/06/2011]. Hereafter cited as Oubrerie, 'Polézazimique'.
[32] Chamontin criticises Oubrerie's representation of the characters, which she analyses in terms of 'modernisation' and 'political correctness'. About Zazie's hair, she argues: 'il faut aussi "moderniser", c'est-à-dire mettre des cheveux longs à Zazie parce que toutes les pré-ados se coiffent ainsi aujourd'hui'. Chamontin sees political correctness in the representation of Gabriel as, she says, 'un jeune homme d'aujourd'hui, sympathique et sportif, en aucun cas ambigu, à des années lumière de l'image de la tantouse aux sourcils épilés'. Oubrerie replies, invoking his historical situation, that 'aujourd'hui un costaud habillé en sévillane ne représente plus le summum de la transgression éditoriale. Mes travestis ne passent donc pas sous les fourches caudines de la cage aux folles'. Oubrerie is referring to the 1973 Jean Poiret's stage play and 1978 Edouard Molinaro's film *La Cage aux folles*. Elisabeth Chamontin, 'Une Zazie politiquement correcte?', in Oubrerie, 'Polézazimique'.

points between himself and Queneau. The artist ends his reply to Chamontin by stating that 'plutôt que de représenter les personnages à gros traits et de souligner les effets à coups de cymbales, j'ai préféré les esquisser afin que le lecteur se les approprie sans à priori'.[33] Whilst Carelman's illustration is in a sense aimed at the author (in his need for approval, and details such as his secret about Marceline's true identity), Oubrerie positions his adaptation as aimed at the reader, albeit a specific type of reader, as the comic book is targeted at young readers.

Oubrerie's justification of his adaptation of *Zazie* is inscribed in the notion, already examined with regard to the reception of Tardi's *Voyage* ('Céline abâtardi'), of the comic book as a 'lower' art form than literature.[34] Indeed, Oubrerie feels the need to assert the artistic value of the medium of comic book: 'la bande dessinée n'est ni un outil de vulgarisation ni un produit dérivé mais un art à part entière'. Oubrerie insists on the importance of the specificity of his chosen medium in a section of his article entitled 'Les contraintes de la bande dessinée'. For instance, he mentions the commercial aspect of comic book to explain the limited length of the album (72 pages), as 'le prix du livre fait qu'un ouvrage de format A4 en couleurs dépassera rarement 80 pages'. Another specificity of his chosen medium, 'talking' comic book, is the integration of text and image into a completed whole. Tardi explained that had he adapted *Voyage* into a comic book he would have had to add dialogues; Oubrerie on the other hand had to cut through the dialogues in *Zazie*:

> La structure de la bande dessinée n'autorise pas une infinité de phrases et il faut en prendre son parti. Bien que confronté à un roman aussi 'bavard' que *Zazie*, il était bien évidemment hors de question pour moi de réécrire les dialogues (bien que j'y sois autorisé) et l'élagage fut donc la règle: le petit jardinier-dessinateur a sorti son sécateur et a coupé ce qui dépassait.[35]

To describe the process of cutting through the dialogues, Oubrerie uses the analogy of pruning. It is necessary for a gardener to prune: the brutality of the process is in fact needed, as it allows flowers to bloom, or trees to develop with a strong structure. Adaptation can be seen as a process that is in a sense brutal (as it deconstructs and reshapes), but ultimately for the sake of the original text, as it tells its story again, differently, and to a new audience. The analogy of pruning can be linked to Oubrerie's statement, quoted above, that the adapter has 'la liberté (et la *responsabilité*)' [my emphasis] to transform the original work into a new one. The use of 'responsabilité'

---

[33] Oubrerie, 'Polézazimique'.
[34] See Part II, Chapter I, pp. 100-102.
[35] Oubrerie, 'Polézazimique'.

evokes a sense of duty on the part of the adapter, as well as the idea that the adapter in fact 'cares for' the original work, which becomes his / her responsibility. Again, adaptation appears as a necessary cultural practice. This is echoed by Hutcheon, who uses the metaphor of Darwinian evolution in her theory of adaptation, and argues that 'adaptation is how stories evolve and mutate to fit new times and different places'.[36] With regard to the voices of *Zazie*, this view of adaptation would imply that they have to be intoned by an adapter in order to be heard, and in turn intoned, by new readers, in this case young readers. I will argue that Oubrerie's adaptive process, which he describes in terms of transformation, appropriation, sobriety, and even perhaps necessity, empowers the voices of *Zazie*, now speaking for young adult readers.

The characters' voices in Oubrerie's adaptation are characterised by a uniform typography and the constant use of capital letters – as is common in comic books –, which creates a certain homogeneity. Volume is represented through the change of font size in the speech balloons, which remain the same size, thus making the writing look even smaller: Zazie's mother's 'arvoir ma chérie, arvoir Gaby!' is in a small font size because she is in the distance (*QZ*, p. 12; *OZ*, p. 3); when Gabriel tells Pédro-surplus he is a 'danseuse de charme', his whispering low voice is rendered by a small font size in a regular sized speech balloon (*QZ*, p. 62; *OZ*, p. 24); when Zazie walks in, proudly wearing her new pair of jeans, the phrase 'alors tonton, comment trouves-tu mes bloudjinzes?' (*QZ*, p. 65; *OZ*, p. 25) is in bold, representing the accentuated volume of her utterance. On page 37 the writing in Gabriel's speech balloon shows that his voice is decreasing in volume, as the font size gradually gets smaller. In Bertin Poirée's injunction to Marceline, 'eh bien, ma toute belle, dévêtez-vous! et en vitesse! à poil! à poil!' (*QZ*, p. 161; *OZ*, p. 58) the words are in bold from 'dévêtez-vous'. Though these examples show that there are indications of volume, these are logically limited to the scenes where it is obvious that the characters are whispering or shouting, such as 'Aïe!' (*OZ*, p. 37), 'au secours' (*OZ*, p. 39) or 'attention!' (*OZ*, pp. 42-43). The overall aspect of voices in the book is that of uniformity: the great majority of words seem uttered on the same tone, and the characters' voices are not represented as having individual 'grains'.

The uniformity in Oubrerie's comic book is, in a sense, taken to an extreme in his representation of the groups of tourists that follow Gabriel after his speech at the Eiffel tower (*QZ*, p. 91; *OZ*, p. 32). Oubrerie draws the group as pairs of identical men and women. All men wear sunglasses, a beige hat and an orange and yellow shirt, and all

---

[36] Hutcheon, p. 176.

women wear dark sunglasses, a pink headscarf and a yellow top with black dots. The perspective in the panel in which they first appear also reinforces the uniformity of the group: the scene is seen from Gabriel's angle, and he is above the crowd, standing on a guardrail. Moreover, the tourists, already a group of clones, then acquire a common uniform voice. On page 35 for instance, the unison speech balloon containing 'Sainte-Chapelle!' is shown as emanating from six tourists, and the three visible ones in the image are exactly in the same position, with arms outstretched up in the air. On page 36, the tourists call for 'Sainte-Chapelle!' again in a common speech balloon. They are sat in the tourist bus in two symmetrical rows, men on the left and women on the right. The perspective in the panel reinforces uniformity, as they are seen from the front of the bus.

The overall uniformity of voices, while arguably common in comic books, stands in stark contrast to the strongly differentiated (female / male) voices of Carelman's *Zazie*, dissonant and heterogeneous when placed alongside each other, and that risk turning into cacophonic voices. In this regard, it is interesting to compare the reading process in relation to Carelman's illustrated novel and Oubrerie's comic book. In Carelman's cacophonic 'tableau' (*CZ*, p. 68), the reader reads the image as all characters talking at the same time. In Oubrerie's comic book by contrast, when there are several speech balloons in one panel, the reader reads it as a conversation, and sees temporality and duration in the combination of text and image. As Groensteen points out, in comic books there is 'un temps propre au binôme bulle-personnage, puisque, si plusieurs locuteurs cohabitant à l'intérieur d'une même vignette et se répondent, leurs prises de parole ne pouvant être synchrones, chacun vit "à l'heure de sa bulle"'.[37] This comic book convention, I suggest, contributes to the process of preventing cacophony from occurring in the *Zazie* comic book. Oubrerie's adaptive choice of cutting through the original text, in a sense, also prevents cacophony from occurring, as Oubrerie chose to cut most of the characters' 'nonsense' out, such as Gabriel's and Charles's conversation about whether 'c'était entendu' that Charles would come for dinner (*QZ*, p. 18). As a result of the need to cut through the text due to the specificity of the medium of comic book, characters in Oubrerie's adaptation do not talk for the sake of talking, and the absence of the 'background' noise of their nonsense contributes towards not creating cacophony. As Oubrerie shows characters that can speak to each other, with uniform

---

[37] Groensteen, pp. 90-91.

voices that are not in dissonance, the comic book seems to offer a polyphonic system that is not flawed.

This harmonious uniformisation is, I suggest, due in part to the disappearance of the textual narrative voice. I insist on using the term 'textual narrative voice', because there is still a narrating instance in the comic book, a 'meganarrator', insofar as narration, in film and comic book, 'arises […] out of sequentiality and articulation'.[38] The presence of a meganarrator is obvious for instance in the parallel narration of the scenes with Marceline and Bertin Poirée, and Gabriel in the club (*QZ*, Chapters 14 and 15; *OZ*, pp. 53-58). As Miller points out, it is fruitful to compare narration in film and comic book, as film narrative theory establishes the 'theoretical well-foundedness of the claim that a process of enunciation can be at work in a visual medium. Like cinema, *bande dessinée* does not simply show, but also tells, through the way in which images are articulated'. Miller adds that

> our concern is […] to combat the assumption that the term 'narration' necessarily refers in *bande dessinée* only to the text of the *récitatif*. Just as filmic narration may be delegated to a voice-over, so *bande dessinée* narration can be delegated to a *récitatif*, but this is nonetheless subordinated to an overall narrative process which works through both images and text (and for which we can adapt Gaudreault's term 'meganarrator').[39]

In Oubrerie's *Zazie* there are no *récitatifs*, however there is a narrative process, thus a narrating instance. The textual narrative voice of Queneau's novel, in the adaptation, turns into a 'silent' meganarrator. Indeed, this meganarrator, though it is ultimately responsible for the verbal and visual narrating instances, is itself non-vocal, which is crucial with regard to my analysis.

In the *Zazie* comic book, the original text's narrative act is not represented, though Oubrerie could have chosen to contract the narrative voice and insert it in *récitatifs*. The characters' words in speech balloons are supplements in the Derridean sense: they are supplements to something which is now absent (and was designated as present in Carelman's illustration), the textual narrative voice, now replaced with a silent narrating instance. It can be argued that this adaptive choice mirrors the inevitable cyclicality of loss and gain with regard to voice, as the textual narrative voice has dissolved to the point of disappearance. The characters on the other hand have gained a voice which is no longer embedded in the textual narrative voice.

---

[38] Miller, p. 107.

[39] Miller, p. 108. André Gaudreault uses the term 'meganarrator' in *Du littéraire au filmique: système du récit* (Paris: Méridiens Klincksiek, 1988), p. 113.

The characters gain voices due to the specificity of the medium of comic book: their speech balloons, unlike in Carelman's illustration, create the pretence of speech independently from the textual (or even 'authorial' in Carelman's illustration) surroundings. The images thus become autonomous sequential 'images sonores', in which the characters *speak* rather than repeat contractions in a graphic juxtaposition with the textual narrative. The adaptation, already historically and intellectually distant from the original text, distances itself from it even more (while Carelman could never get close enough to it), as the original text is cut through and transformed. Though the characters' words are logically still in quotation marks (as they are not 'original' words), there is the *pretence* of spontaneous speech. *Zazie* 'happens' again, *after* the text; its vocality is re-actualised, whereas Carelman's illustration is seen and read simultaneously with the original text, in parallel to it.

I suggest that the disappearance of the textual narrative voice in the comic book means that the characters are free to take on the enunciative role which is not held by the silent meganarrator, that of verbal narrator. The comparison of Carelman's and Oubrerie's take on Gabriel's first speech is in this regard revelatory. Gabriel's first speech is the only instance in the text where there is a direct authorial mention (to an instance that is not the narrative voice), as Gabriel qualifies 'toute cette histoire' as 'à peine plus que le délire tape à la machine par un romancier idiot (oh pardon!)'. As I explained, Carelman takes this clue literally, and by signing the image he shows the characters as belonging to an (a non-idiotic) author. Oubrerie's take on Gabriel's speech is extremely different. Gabriel's speech is spread over nine panels (*QZ*, pp. 90-91; *OZ*, pp. 32-33). In the first panel Gabriel only says 'l'être ou le néant' and 'voilà le problème', and this slow pacing is in stark contrast to Carelman's 'crowded' image. In the second panel, tourists start gathering around Gabriel while he talks, and in the third panel Gabriel gets to climb on a guardrail. He has an audience from the start, while in the original text the audience is only mentioned at the end of his speech, and he is in an oratory position, as he gets higher than the tourists, which does not happen in the text. Gabriel is already in a situation of vocal control, and in the next four panels his voice temporarily becomes a narrative voice. The panels have a different frame and colour, and his words are in *récitatifs*. His words are also transposed into images: the Panthéon, a taxi ('car du taximane enfui dans son bahut locataire'), the top of the Eiffel tower ('ma niece à trois cents mètres dans l'atmosphère'), Marceline. In the eighth panel, Gabriel stands on the guardrail, surrounded by the group of tourists; in the ninth, the

perspective is from below him, showing him pointing in the distance in a theatrical manner. As the speech had to be cut through due to the specificity of the medium of comic book, the direct authorial comment is erased. As we have seen, Miller describes *récitatifs* as occurring 'when *bande dessinée* narration is delegated to a narrative voice-over'.[40] Thus, I propose that, here, the meganarrator delegates narration to a temporary narrative voice. Gabriel as narrator is different from the meganarrator because he is not implicit, not silent. His voice becomes a narrative voice, as he brings a vocal supplement to the narration which the meganarrator lets him take on temporarily. By contrast, in the original text, Gabriel let himself be ventriloquised in order to gain vocal power.

Zazie similarly takes on a narrative role when she tells Trouscaillon of the murder of her father by her mother. Zazie's narrative in Oubrerie's comic book takes up eighteen panels (*QZ*, pp. 51-56; *OZ*, pp. 19-21). Like in Gabriel's speech, Zazie's words are in *récitatifs*, and the frame and colour of the panels are different from the regular ones. In Carelman's illustration Zazie is represented as a character telling a story, due to her presence at the bottom left-hand corner of the image and the speech balloon emanating from her (*CZ*, p. 28). In Oubrerie's comic book on the other hand, there is a complete switch to her narrative in the panels signalled as her story. Like Gabriel in the aforementioned example, she temporarily takes up a narrative role. Chamontin criticises Oubrerie's representation of Zazie's story for not being realistic:

> les scènes dans lesquelles Zazie racontait froidement, très 'matter of fact', la tentative de viol incestueux qu'elle avait subie, puis tout aussi pragmatiquement l'assassinat de son père par sa mère avec la complicité de l'amant, sont transposées dans la B. D. en une sorte de cauchemar, par l'effet d'un changement dans le dessin et la couleur. Elles deviennent alors fantasmatiques et perdent toute leur réalité et leur perversité.[41]

I propose that the fact that this scene 'perd [toute] [sa] réalité' and is 'fantasmatique' is precisely because it is Zazie's narrative. It is in contrast with the rest of the comic book – in which there is a narrating instance, but no narrative voice – because Zazie's is a narration using both voice and image and in which the narrator is identified or personified. The contrast between 'reality' (the fictional reality of the comic book, its 'norm') and Zazie's narrative is obvious the four times when Zazie interrupts her story, and the panels get back to their usual shape and colour.

The other instances when characters take on a narrative role in the comic book are: Zazie explaining she wants to be a sadistic schoolteacher (*QZ*, p. 24; *OZ*, two

---

[40] Miller, p. 120.
[41] Chamontin, 'Une Zazie politiquement correcte?', in Oubrerie, 'Polézazémique'.

panels, p. 8); Turandot telling what happened when he chased Zazie who was trying to run away (*QZ*, pp. 37-38; *OZ*, three panels, p. 12); Gabriel remembering bombings during the war (*QZ*, p. 38; *OZ*, two panels, p. 13), and Turandot reminiscing the black market (*QZ*, p. 38; *OZ*, one panel, p. 13); Mado explaining how Charles irritates her (*QZ*, p. 75; *OZ*, one panel, p. 27); Bertin Poirée telling Marceline about encountering Zazie and la Veuve Mouaque (*QZ*, p. 159; *OZ*, two panels, p. 56) and Aroun Arachide telling about the various identities he has taken on (*QZ*, p. 185; *OZ*, one panel, p. 69). The short length of these examples (sometimes only one panel) shows that the characters do not become narrators; they temporarily put on a narrative voice, and their words are juxtaposed with images, as is usual with *récitatifs* in a comic book. There are two instances where the characters' narrative voice is different. Firstly, when Zazie tells why she wants to be an astronaut (*QZ*, p. 24; *OZ*, p. 9), her (verbal and graphic) narration is in her speech balloon, and included in a regular panel. This is the only case where a character's narration does not take over an entire panel. Secondly, on page 57, Gabriel gives a speech before performing his act (*QZ*, pp. 151-152; *OZ*, p. 57). In the first two panels his words are included in a speech balloon emanating from him; the third panel however is a close-up of Zazie listening to her uncle, who is not in the image and whose words are in a *récitatif* rather than a speech balloon. The panel does not have a different shape and colour, as happens with other temporary narrative voices. In this case, and for one panel only, Gabriel seems to take on a full narrator's role rather than putting on an intradiegetic narrative voice.

The narrative voice that the characters temporarily put on, as personified narrators in any narration, is still 'invariably swallowed up in the overall narrational process […], which they do *not* produce'.[42] Oubrerie's *Zazie*, however, seems to show that polyphony can work, that characters can listen to each other, and narrate in turn. The violence of the original text is also arguably toned down in the comic book, in particular in the relationship between Zazie and Gabriel. The affection they feel towards each other is emphasised throughout Oubrerie's comic book, and the cover shows their complicity, as it figures Zazie and Gabriel, back to back, looking over their shoulder to each other with a smile on their face.[43] The treatment of voices in the comic book, I

---

[42] Bordwell, p. 61.
[43] This stands in contrast to other covers and posters. Zazie's face features prominently on the original poster of Malle's film (1960), with the other main characters, smaller, in a car (the cover of the DVD edition shows Zazie alone); Siné's cover of the novel (1963) shows a stylised Zazie with an underground ticket as torso; Carelman's, Zazie alone at the entrance of the underground (1966); Meurisse's, Zazie and

suggest, is part of, not simplification or 'political correctness' as Chamontin argues, but of a certain idealisation of the original novel. With Oubrerie's comic book, *Zazie* perhaps really becomes a story, not merely marketed at children, but for a young audience.

In this regard, it is fruitful to compare the American series *Classics Illustrated* (1941-1971) with the Fétiche collection. *Classics Illustrated*, a series of comic book adaptations of works from the literary canon, were characterised by a rejection of the medium of comic book, and the aim was to entice the readers to eventually turn to the original, and 'real' literature. The series was, then, characterised by a 'paradoxical attitude – to simultaneously use and efface the comic book medium'.[44] The case is very different with regard to Oubrerie's *Zazie*, and the Fétiche collection as a whole, as can be seen from the description of the collection on the Gallimard website:

> Avec 'Fétiche', nous ouvrons aux auteurs de bandes dessinées l'accès à notre fonds littéraire. Chacun jette son dévolu sur un texte. Un souvenir d'enfance ou bien une découverte récente… Un grand classique, un chef-d'œuvre oublié ou une œuvre contemporaine… En tout cas, un texte qu'il aime, qu'il veut célébrer à sa façon, et dont il sait qu'il pourra faire un bon livre en bandes dessinées. Il se l'approprie avec ses outils préférés: le dessin, les cases, les bulles et les séquences. Il travaille, il interprète, il réécrit… en toute subjectivité. L'auteur, c'est lui maintenant. Et il entend bien donner à ses lecteurs autant qu'il a reçu.[45]

'A sa façon', 'l'auteur, c'est lui', 'il se l'approprie avec ses outils préférés', 'en toute subjectivité': the original text is supplemented with an author's personal reading of it, concretised using the specificity of their chosen medium ('le dessin, les cases, les bulles et les séquences'). In the adaptive process the text is cut and transformed, in order to be taken forward to a new audience ('et il entend bien donner à ses lecteurs autant qu'il a reçu'). There is no rejection of the medium of comic book, no obligatory canon, and no stated aim to get young readers to turn to the originals.

Both Carelman's illustration and Oubrerie's comic book are the concrete result of a personal and historically situated reading of the text. I suggest that paradoxically, Oubrerie's comic book adaptation is an expansion through contraction, while

---

Laverdure at the entrance of the underground (2009). Blachon's original cover for the hardback edition of his illustration (1979) figures both Zazie and Gabriel at the entrance of the underground, however there is no sense of complicity between them. Zazie stands with her hands on her hips, her mouth open, probably complaining about the underground being on strike, while Gabriel makes a gesture that seems to mean that nothing that can be done. The cover of the 1999 paperback edition of Blachon's illustration figures Zazie alone.

[44] Versaci, p. 187.

[45] Gallimard Jeunesse, 'Fétiche' <http://www.gallimard-jeunesse.fr/Catalogue/ GALLIMARD-JEUNESSE/Fetiche> [accessed 14/08/2011].

Carelman's illustration is a contraction through repetition: the comic book concretises the un-final quality of voice, as it cuts and re-constructs voices while Carelman, through repetition, complements the vocality of the text in order to finalise it, risking making it hermetic to the reader. Oubrerie re-actualises the text's vocality, furthers it by supplementing it with his concrete reading of it. Carelman understands the author as the unique origin of the heterogeneous voices of the text and the reader as the instance seeking the authorial meaning. With his obsession for delivering the correct, authorial meaning, the addition of the illustration takes the text back, towards its pre-vocality, its (lost) origin as the author's text, before its quality for voice becomes available to the reader, in this way weakening the textual voices, and reinforcing the control of the supervisory and ventriloquial narrating instance. Oubrerie's comic book openly participates in the permanent construction of the voices of the text by re-orchestrating them, opening them up to be appropriated by him, and, in turn, his new readers. The voices of *Zazie*, trapped, contained and potentially cacophonic in the illustration, become idealised, un-flawed polyphonic voices in the comic book, empowered by the disappearance of the ventriloquist, now a non-vocal meganarrator. In these two adaptations, the voices of *Zazie* are transposed into media that combine text and image, and I shall now turn to Malle's adaptation of the novel, in order to analyse what happens to the voices of *Zazie* when they become cinematic voices.

Chapter 3: Post-synchronisation, heterogeneity and the powers of voices in Malle's film adaptation of *Zazie dans le métro*

Louis Malle's film adaptation of *Zazie* was released in 1960, only one year after the publication of Queneau's novel. Malle wrote the screenplay in collaboration with Jean-Paul Rappeneau. Queneau was not involved in the process, which was neither because of his lack of experience in the cinematic medium, nor, it can be assumed, because he refused to participate.[1] The fact that Malle did not wish to collaborate with Queneau seems to show that the director wanted to appropriate *Zazie* and be the author of the new filmic text. This process of appropriation of the text by the director can be linked with auteurism. Auteurism followed novelist and filmmaker Alexandre Astruc's formula the 'caméra-stylo' (1948), which 'valorized the *act* of filmmaking; the director was no longer merely the servant a pre-existing text (novel, screenplay) but a creative artist in his/her own right'.[2] In 1954 Truffaut inaugurated the 'politique des auteurs', one of whose points was that 'there is only one auteur of a film and that is the director'.[3] *Zazie* is taken as autonomous from its author (and his intentions, which, by contrast, will so concern Carelman in 1966), available to be appropriated and transposed into a new medium by a new author (as will be the case with Oubrerie's adaptation in 2008), and becomes part of a new *oeuvre*.

Zazie is Malle's third feature film, following *Ascenseur pour l'échafaud* (1957) and *Les Amants* (1958). *Zazie* was a critical success but a commercial failure, and has since then achieved the status of 'cult film', as the director explains: 'it was a tremendous flop [...]. People don't remember that, because it became a sort of cult film [...] For some people now it's become a key film'.[4] It is difficult to define what makes a film a 'cult film', as 'the cult film' is

> not defined according to some single, unifying feature shared by all cult movies, but rather through a "subcultural ideology" in filmmakers, films or audiences are

---

[1] Indeed, it can be assumed that Queneau would not have refused to be consulted, given his later involvement in the adaptive process for Carelman's 1966 illustration (see Part II, Chapter 2). Moreover, Queneau had experience in adapting for the cinema, as he had participated in the writing of the screenplay for René Clément's 1954 film adaptation of Louis Hémon's novel *Monsieur Ripois et la Némésis*.
[2] Robert Stam, *Film Theory: An Introduction* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2000), p. 83. Hereafter cited as Stam.
[3] Michel Marie, *The French New Wave: An Artistic School*, trans. by Richard Neupert (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), p. 42. Hereafter cited as Marie.
[4] Philip French and Louis Malle, *Malle on Malle*, ed. by Philip French (London: Faber and Faber, 1993), p. 29. Hereafter cited as French and Malle.

seen as existing in opposition to the "mainstream" [*sic*] […] In other words, "cult" is largely a matter of the ways in which films are classified in consumption.[5]

The status of 'cult film' derives from a sustained interest in the film from the audience. In 1993 Malle explains that 'of all [his] films of that period' (early 1960s), *Zazie* is 'the one that's constantly playing in Paris somewhere'.[6] As a sign of this sustained interest, the film was released in 2005 as a special DVD edition.[7] The fact that *Zazie* was a commercial failure might then in fact partly explain why it has become a cult film, as 'cult film' is constructed by oppositional taste, in reaction to what is perceived as 'mainstream'.[8] As Malle himself suggests, *Zazie* is a film that explores film language, and its appeal can then be explained by the very reason of its initial commercial failure.[9] Audiences were puzzled by the strangeness of the film, as is evidenced by its reception. Rappeneau explains that 'ce film qui devait faire rire a fait parfois presque peur' and he compares *Zazie* to a 'tonneau de dynamite en pleine figure des gens'. Kénout Peltier and André Hervée describe the reception in more nuanced terms: 'les spectateurs étaient un peu paumés, un peu agressés'.[10] *Zazie* was then perceived as an attack on the viewers (Rappeneau), or at least as a film that sidelined and, to some extent, alienated its viewers (Peltier and Hervée). For an audience that constructs its taste in distinction with that of 'mainstream' audiences, the strangeness of *Zazie* is what sustained interest and contributed to making the film cult.

The 'strangeness' of *Zazie* in fact problematised Malle's belonging to the New Wave. For historians of the director's career, the film

> is either a puzzlement, a disappointment, or proof of [Malle's] uneven and unusual career. This film [...] was brightly colored, silly, with some scenes shot in fast motion, and did not seem to fit what one expected of Malle, much less of the New Wave. [...] The real break in the critical reception of [Malle's] career does seem to owe much to this popular, gaudy, colorful *Zazie*, a film that did not fit the strict demands of auteur criticism.[11]

---

[5] Mark Jancovich and others, 'Introduction', in *Defining Cult Movies: The Cultural Politics of Oppositional Taste*, ed. by Mark Jancovich and others (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003), pp. 1-13 (p. 1). Hereafter cited as Jancovich and others, pp. 1-13.

[6] French and Malle, p. 29.

[7] *Zazie dans le métro*, dir. by Louis Malle (Paris: Arté Vidéo, 2005) [on DVD].

[8] Jancovich and others, pp. 1-13 (p. 1).

[9] French and Malle, pp. 26-28. Malle employs the term 'cinematic language' rather than 'film language'. The terms are synonyms, and in this study I choose to use film language.

[10] Interview with André Hervée, Kénout Peltier and Jean-Paul Rappeneau, 'Images et sons: Louis Malle le précuseur' [my transcription]. Extra features to *Zazie dans le métro*, dir. by Louis Malle (Paris: Arté Vidéo, 2005) [on DVD]. Hereafter cited as Hervée and others.

[11] Richard Neupert, *A History of the French New Wave* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2002), pp. 122-123. Hereafter cited as Neupert.

The puzzlement *Zazie* induced was due to the fact that it did not correspond with the expectations resulting from Malle's New Wave affiliation by that point in time. Malle saw the adaptation of Queneau's text into a film as a chance to explore new cinematic techniques:

> I was in a very experimental mood. I thought the challenge of adapting *Zazie* to the screen would give me a chance to explore cinematic language. What was brilliant in the book was an inventory of all the different literary techniques and also, of course, a lot of pastiche. It was playing with literature and I thought it would be just as interesting to try to do the same with cinematic language. [...] One of Queneau's early works was called *Exercices de style* – that was what it was for me, an exercise in style, to deepen my knowledge of the medium [of film].[12]

Malle decided to adapt *Zazie* because of the 'challenge' it represented. Indeed, being a text primarily concerned with language, *Zazie* was considered impossible to transpose. René Clément was supposed to adapt the book before Malle, but abandoned the project. The inadaptability of Queneau's *Zazie* is in fact the subject of Johanne Bénard's article on Malle's film, 'Un Cinéma zazique?'. Bénard argues that 'en présupposant que le projet de *Zazie dans le métro* est la transposition de l'oral […] l'adaptation de *Zazie* au cinéma est à strictement parler impossible' and, consequently, 'le film et ses replis sont impuissants à traduire ces petites secousses du langage zazique'.[13]

In the above quotation from *Malle on Malle*, the director talks about 'cinematic language', a notion that has been widely used in analyses of the film, for instance by Inez Hedges, who defines 'film language' as such:

> the term 'film language' has come to designate the conventions according to which cinematic works are made in such a way that their audiences can comprehend them. Like the spoken or written language described by linguists, the visual language of film exercises limitations as well as offering possibilities for expression.[14]

In this study I have focused on how adaptations transpose an 'original' text by using the grammar and the specificity of the chosen medium. The chosen medium 'limits as much as it opens up new possibilities', to borrow Linda Hutcheon's assessment of the medium of comic book in adaptation, which in turn echoes Hedges's statement that 'the visual language of film exercises limitations as well as well as offering possibilities for expression'.[15] Each medium has its own specific signifying procedures, and cinematic language is a pluri-codic medium, as it is 'the set of messages whose matter of

---

[12] French and Malle, pp. 26-28.
[13] Bénard, 'Un cinéma zazique?', 135-152 (p. 136; p. 152).
[14] Hedges, p. xv.
[15] Hutcheon, p. 35.

expression consists of five tracks or channels: moving photographic image, recorded phonetic sound, recorded noises, recorded musical sound, and writing (credits, intertitles, written materials in the shot)'.[16] In this chapter I will analyse how this pluri-codic medium is used in the transposition of literary voices, focusing on the combination of sound and image.

In the case of Malle's adaptation of *Zazie*, Malle's belief in 'cinematic language' implies that the challenge he had taken on was possible to overcome, and indeed fruitful, as it would allow him to 'deepen [his] knowledge of the [cinematic] medium'.[17] As film is a language, the adaptation is a transposition from one language to another – an inter-semiotic translation. The 'exercise in style' is thus not in vain, as both text and film can be analysed as systems that are, in a sense, comparable, and it is then possible to find equivalences between them. Indeed, the way Malle adapts *Zazie* is to try and find cinematic equivalences to typically linguistic aspects of the text ('we were always trying to find some equivalent to what Queneau was doing with literature').[18] By trying to do what is considered impossible, Malle finds answers to problems that are thought to be unsolvable, as he transposes Queneau's critique of literary language into a critique of film language:

> The young director was fascinated with the challenge of playing with and thus critiquing the conventions of film in a similar way. [...] Queneau's *Zazie* thus became a framework to which he remained faithful in spirit, while simultaneously it was a point of departure for his own imaginative and satirical interests.[19]

In his critique of film language, Malle pushes the cinematic medium to its limits, as is evidenced by the reception of the film. In a trans-media dialogue, it is through the adaptation of a text that Malle explores film language further. By 'breaking up cinematic language', Malle challenges the specific signifying procedures of the medium, thus exploring further its expressive and communicative potential.[20] Malle plays with film language and creates a seemingly chaotic film that forces the viewer to re-assess his or her understanding of film grammar (or, alternatively, to give up on the film, as shown by the negative reception). By so doing, Malle explores not only film language but also, in a sense, language as a whole, if one understands cinema as a form of visual language that is part and parcel of language as signifying practice. Visual language draws from

---

[16] Stam, p. 112. The term 'pluri-codic' is borrowed from Christian Metz's 1971 *Language et Cinéma*.
[17] French and Malle, p. 28.
[18] French and Malle, p. 26.
[19] Horton, pp. 63-77 (p. 63).
[20] Horton, pp. 63-77 (p. 63).

visual literacy (collective and individual 'understanding' of visual signs) and is always mediated (photographs for instance are mediated as communicative acts).[21] Cinema is a language, 'not only in a broadly metaphorical sense but also as a set of messages grounded in a given matter of expression, and as an artistic language, a discourse or signifying practice characterized by specific codifications and ordering procedures'.[22] By challenging and exploring film language, *Zazie* in fact explores the notion of language, as the puzzled viewer is confronted with a film that does not signify in ways that he or she would expect, thus permanently calling upon him or her to re-assess his or her understanding of language – at the risk of becoming hermetic and excluding the viewer. By exploring cinema as a signifying system, *Zazie* then also explores language, as we receive and understand it.

Whether Malle's film is 'successful' in his critique of cinematic conventions through his adaptation of *Zazie* is not my concern here. Malle's *Zazie* has not received extensive academic coverage, possibly due to the fact that it is not a typical New Wave film, and analyses have mainly focused on the 'challenge' taken on by Malle. For instance, Horton (1981) examines how Malle transposes Queneau's internal critique of literature into a critique of cinematic conventions. Hedges's analysis of the film (1991) is part of a broader study about cinematic conventions and films that break them. Bénard (1994) argues that because Queneau's *Zazie* represented the transposition of spoken language, it was impossible to adapt, and Malle's *Zazie* is, in her opinion, a failure as an adaptation. More recently, O'Sullivan (2002) discusses a series of visualisations of Queneau's text, including Malle's film, and examines to what extent they can be seen as translations. Thus, analyses of the film to date have focused almost exclusively on language (film language) as a whole. In this chapter however, I will refine this to a focus on voice, thus shifting the emphasis from language as signifying system, *langue*, to language as *parole*.[23] This aspect has so far been neglected by critics, despite the importance of voice in the text the film transposes. For instance, O'Sullivan points out about Zazie that 'in the [...] novel, the vocal aspect of the heroine is very pronounced', but she does not explore this point any further.[24]

---

[21] Benedikt Feldges, *American Icons: The Genesis of a National Visual Language* (Hoboken: Taylor & Francis, 2007), p. 191.
[22] Stam, p. 112.
[23] Saussure, p. 37. See Introduction, pp. 21-22.
[24] O'Sullivan, pp. 263-279 (p. 265).

Rather than Malle's breaking up of film language, what is of interest for the present study is how the voices of a text meant as the transposition of oral language, are adapted into cinematic voices in a medium that combines sound and the visual. In the adaptations analysed thus far in this study, textual voices have been transposed into two different media which still incorporate text (whether in a text/image relationship of confrontation, such as in Tardi's *Voyage*, submission, in Carelman's *Zazie*, or integration, in Oubrerie's), and are still 'silent'. In Malle's *Zazie*, voices are now heard, and no longer read, thus no longer textually oralised. The orality of the original text is described by Carol O'Sullivan as one of the reasons why the novel is a challenge to adapt into film:

> [the novel's] narrative as well as its dialogue are crammed with verbal jokes, puns and phonetic spelling. While a certain amount of dialogue can be reproduced with minimal alteration in the film, the humour of Queneau's phonetic spelling is a specifically readerly humour. The language is funny because it looks unfamiliar, but when the reader tastes it on the tongue it sounds just like spoken French. Hence its resistance to adaptation into the cinematic medium.[25]

The orality of the original text is achieved by a transposition of spoken and oral language into textual language. This spoken/written dichotomy is not transposed into the film, in which voices are never textual.[26]

In order to understand what happens to *Zazie*'s textual voices when they become cinematic voices, I shall examine the most striking feature of voices in the film, which is their post-synchronisation, and the link between voices and words in comparison with the original text. Post-synchronisation problematises the origin of voice as the voice is not clearly produced by the body seen on screen, and I shall analyse the relationship between the voices and bodies of *Zazie* under these new conditions of incompatibility. How can bodies and voices be coherent when they are not elements of a whole? How does Malle's film relate to the notion of voice as construction? How can *Zazie*'s characters gain a bodily voice in a medium that combines the visual with sound? What is the relationship between voice and gesture, and between voice, control and power?

Post-synchronised voices

From a contemporary point of view, the most striking feature of the voices in Malle's *Zazie* is how unnatural they sound. It is extremely apparent that they are post-synchronised voices, as they are often desynchronised from lip movements, and they do

---

[25] O'Sullivan, pp. 263-279 (p. 275).
[26] It would be interesting to analyse how watching the film with subtitles influences the perception of the dichotomy between written and spoken languages. However this is not within the scope of this research.

not sound anchored within the spatial environments. In many instances they even sound like voice-overs. The dislocation of voice from the body was common in films at the time, as seen for instance in films by New Wave directors such as Alain Resnais's *Hiroshima mon amour* (1959, screenplay by Marguerite Duras), Jean-Luc Godard's *À bout de souffle* (1960) or François Truffaut's *Jules et Jim* (1962). Asynchronisation in *Zazie* is thus consistent with its historical situation, in part for aesthetic and in part for technical reasons.[27] By contrast, in Malle's *Le Souffle au coeur*, released in 1971, eleven years after *Zazie*, voices are perfectly synchronised with lip movements and anchored within the spatial environments. The post-synchronisation of voices in *Zazie* can perhaps best be described in terms of contrast to the technique that was not employed, direct sound:[28]

> l'enregistrement en son direct permet de garder le son d'origine, celui du tournage […]; il permet de restituer la voix dans son contexte sonore réel; la résonance d'une voix est toujours déterminée par les éléments du décor, son emplacement spatial, son écho, son rapport aux bruits d'ambiance, etc. […] Le son direct […] restitue la voix de l'acteur au moment même de son interprétation, plus précisément au moment de l'interprétation représentée sur la bande image. Cette simultanéité d'enregistrement et de restitution permet de représenter la voix dans le parfait synchronisme des mouvements corporels qui ont marqué son émission originale.[29]

Voices in *Zazie* can be characterised as the exact opposite of what is described in this quotation. They do not resonate in space, and as a result are not anchored in the image. The voices are the actors', but not at the moment of the interpretation seen in the film. They are dislocated from bodies and desynchronised from the lip movements.

In order to understand what Malle is exploring and developing in *Zazie*, it is fruitful to situate the film in relation to the use of sound in Malle's most famous film, *Ascenseur pour l'échafaud* (1957), considered to be a precursor to the New Wave.[30] Neupert points out that the director had already experimented with sound in his first feature film:

> [the] slippage between diegetic sounds (sometimes [Jeanne Moreau] speaks in sync with appropriate wild, diegetic sounds; at other times there is no diegetic sound or all the sounds seem postsynchronized) and the occasional voice-over and Miles Davis's score further challenge norms of image-to-sound relations that will later typify many of Malle's films and much of the French New Wave. If this

---

[27] Susan Hayward defines asynchronisation as '[occurring] when the sound is either intentionally or unintentionally out of sync with the image'. Susan Hayward, *Cinema Studies: The Key Concepts*, 3d ed. (London: Routledge, 2006), p. 30. Hereafter cited as Hayward.
[28] Or rather the technique that was originally used but did not give satisfactory results. I will return to this point later.
[29] Michel Marié and Francis Vanoye, 'Comment parler la bouche pleine?', *Communications*, 38 (1983), 51-77 (p. 55).
[30] Neupert, p. 86.

were a Godard film, critics would argue he is foregrounding the materiality of the recording process, moving sound from one scene to another; Malle seems to be carrying out the same sort of experimentation here, though historians have been much less inclined to search for such strategies in his œuvre.[31]

Similar to the relationship between voice and image in *Zazie* is what Neupert characterises as the 'slippage between diegetic sounds' in *Ascenseur pour l'échafaud*. Neupert points out that while Godard's experimentation with sound is well documented, this aspect has been neglected in examinations of Malle's œuvre. It is for this reason that the present study aims to explore experimentation with sound in *Zazie*, focusing on post-synchronisation.

Post-synchronisation was used for two different reasons in *Zazie*. Firstly, Kénout Peltier (editor) and André Hervée (sound engineer) explain that the technique was used for scenes that had been shot in slow or fast motion. Indeed, according to Malle, 'a lot of scenes are shot with the camera speed of eight frames or sometimes twelve frames per second, but it does not show because the actors play in slow motion'.[32] In this case, then, post-synchronisation was clearly used as part of the director's aesthetic intention to challenge norms of image-to-sound relations. Secondly however, post-synchronising the dialogue turned out to be necessary for the entirety of the film, due to technical difficulties unforeseen by the director. Peltier and Andrée explain that the camera used (Caméflex) drowned out the actors' voices during shooting, and as a result the dialogues were unintelligible. The crew then had to resort to post-synchronisation, spending over twenty days 'à refaire *tout* le dialogue'.[33] Unlike with the scenes shot in slow or fast motion, post-synchronising the entirety of the dialogue was then not originally part of the director's aesthetic intention to break up film language. However, I would like to suggest that Malle in fact ultimately used the technical approximation of post-synchronisation to develop the experimentation with image-to-sound relations he had initiated with *Ascenseur pour l'échafaud* and already intended to continue in *Zazie* by means of the use of slow and fast motion.

Indeed, though Malle did not plan to use post-synchronisation to such an extent in *Zazie*, it is a technique that '[allows] filmmakers to manipulate sound and to experiment with the relation of sound to image'.[34] For example, in relation more specifically to the New Wave, Michel Marie's discussion of the experimental treatment

---

[31] Neupert, p. 109.
[32] French and Malle, p. 26.
[33] Hervée and others [my transcription].
[34] Maria Pramaggiore and Tom Wallis, *Film: A Critical Introduction* (London: Laurence King, 2005), p. 205.

of voices in Jean Rouch's and Godard's films prominently features the idea that post-synchronisation engenders the freedom for the director to explore and challenge image-to-sound relations. Marie explains that 'Godard was enthralled by the freedom of the interior monologues' in Rouch's *Moi, un Noir* (1958), in which Rouch had asked the actors 'to dupe quite freely over their own performances'. Influenced by Rouch's use of post-synchronisation, Godard then used the technique for his short film *Charlotte et son Jules* (1958), in which 'he had the audacity to dupe in Jean-Paul Belmondo's dialogue himself'. Godard then further experimented with post-synchronisation in *À bout de souffle*, 'where the same liberty and offhandedness [as in *Charlotte et son Jules*] are obvious' in relation to sound.[35] Of course, the case of Godard's films is different from *Zazie*, because Godard always intended to use post-synchronisation. However, what is significant with regard to the present study is the idea that post-synchronisation, whether originally a choice or a necessity, engenders freedom for the director and allows him or her to explore and challenge the relation between sound and image, and between voices and bodies. Following Neupert's call to search for strategies which challenge norms of image-to-sound relations in Malle's œuvre, I shall consider the asynchronisation of voices (their desynchronisation from the bodies) as an aesthetic intention arising from a technical issue.

Sound effects and music in *Zazie* are also, of course, post-synchronised. However unlike voices, they are not desynchronised with the image, a contrast which, I suggest, situates the extent to which the unnaturalness of voices is an aesthetic intention. There is coherence between music and image, as shown for instance by the cartoonesque soundtrack music, which Horton has characterised as 'suitably bouncy music', accompanying the surreal scene of Pédro and Zazie's *course-poursuite*.[36] The case with sound effects is more complex, as there is an occasional mismatch between image and sound, which, according to Hedges, is a way of 'disturbing narrative coherence'. Hedges goes on to say that 'Malle makes the most of the opportunity [to disturb narrative coherence] by showing a man in the flea market who runs the bow of a violin against the arm of his suit while violin music is heard on the soundtrack'.[37] Bénard also comments on this flea market scene, when she writes that 'au niveau de la bande sonore […] la synchronisation délibérément mauvaise [donne] lieu à des associations

---

[35] Marie, pp. 95-96.
[36] Horton, pp. 63-77 (p. 70).
[37] Hedges, p. 11.

incongrues, quand les sons ne correspondent pas à l'image (comme pour les objets au marché)'.[38] However, this experimentation with the relation between sound and image, in which sounds do not correspond with what the viewer expects to hear, is different from what happens with voices. An important distinction comes through the way that the sounds are mismatched, but not desynchronised with the image, and they remain anchored in the spatial environment. This is done for particular effect. For instance, when Zazie picks up a shoe that makes the sound of a musical box at the flea market, there is incoherence between sound and image for the viewer, precisely because there is temporal correspondence between sound and image. In spite of their obvious mismatch, the music starts when Zazie picks up the shoe and ends when she puts it back, thus the music sounds like it is integrated with the image.

By contrast, the synchronisation between voices and the actors' lip movements is often loose and voices are not anchored in space. As a result of this, voices in *Zazie* seem to float, unattached to or unproduced by mouths, which are where viewers expect them to come from. As Michel Chion has argued, a 'coïncidence temporelle des mouvements [de la bouche] avec les sons entendus' is the 'critère ultime de l'attribution et de localisation de la voix sur un personnage'.[39] By not doing this, *Zazie* points to the artifice of synchronisation in sound films, and to the pretence of a unity between voice and body, of their coherence as a whole, though sound has been supplemented to the image through the process of post-synchronisation. Indeed, in *Into the Vortex: Female Voice and Paradox in Film*, Britta H. Sjogren stresses the 'parallel' status of sound in sound film, rather than its 'unity' with the image, as sound has been worked and manipulated to create a sound track that would eventually be 'married' to the image.[40] The parallel status of sound in sound film, then, implies a division rather than unity between the voices (as elements of the sound track) and the bodies (as elements of the image). Chion argues that 'par son principe même, [le cinéma parlant] redivise; il coupe entre le corps et la voix, pour recoller ensuite, ou non, à l'endroit du *pointillé*'.[41] In *Zazie* voices are only loosely re-connected ('recollées'), which, I suggest, exposes the lack of coherence between *Zazie*'s cinematic voices and bodies.

---

[38] Bénard, 'Un cinéma zazique?', 135-154 (p. 148). Bénard talks about deliberately bad synchronisation; however she does not extend it to the desynchronisation of voices from lip movements, which she does not comment upon in general (only about Zazie's cries, to which I shall return later).
[39] Chion, p. 119.
[40] Sjogren, pp. 5-6.
[41] Chion, p. 117.

This disjunction between voices and bodies in *Zazie* pertains to the relationship between sound and image – the sound image and the visual image – in modern cinema as analysed by Deleuze in *Cinéma 2: l'image-temps*.[42] In modern cinema, the sound image and the visual image become autonomous elements, and it is the relationship stemming from this disjunction which constitutes the audio-visual image:

> ce qui constitue l'image audio-visuelle, c'est une disjonction, une dissociation du visuel et du sonore, chacun héautonome, mais en même temps un rapport incommensurable ou un 'irrationel' qui les lie l'un à l'autre, sans former un tout, sans se proposer le moindre tout. C'est une résistance issue de l'écroulement du schème sensori-moteur, et qui sépare l'image visuelle et l'image sonore, mais les met d'autant plus dans un rapport non totalisable.[43]

According to Deleuze, the audio-visual image is constituted by the heautonomous relation between the sound image and the visual image. Using Deleuze's concept of heautonomy (which Deleuze borrowed from Kant), Warwick Mules explains that 'a heautonomous relation is characterised by disjunctive synthesis, or the paradoxical conjoining of actively differentiating elements into a transformational synthetic whole'.[44] The audio-visual image is then constituted by the heautonomous, asymmetrical and irrational relationship of the sound image and the visual image, as it is this very separation which reinforces the image as audio-visual. The complex link between the two disparate images induces a new intertwining or a specific re-linkage. In his study *Deleuze on Cinema*, Ronald Bogue explains that the disjunction between the sound image and the visual image is exploited in modern film to create a new, complex reading, involving a re-linking of the two. Bogue focuses his analysis on Duras's 1974 *La Femme du Gange*:

> If, as Duras claims, *La Femme du Gange* is a film of images and a film of voices, one may say that every modern film is also two films, a visual film of screen images and an audio film of sounds shaped from the sonic continuum of speech, music, and noises. […] The modern image is audio-visual, and modern lectosigns exploit the power of a disjunction of sound and sight. Such lectosigns must be read, in that visual images must be re-enchained in series; sonic images, shaped from the continuum of words, music, and sounds, must be re-enchained with one another; and the two strands must be re-enchained in a complementary, non-totalizable, asymmetrical come-and-go that issues from a generative disjunction between the two.[45]

---

[42] By 'modern cinema' Deleuze refers to post-World War II films, while pre-World War II films form 'classic cinema'.

[43] Deleuze, p. 334.

[44] Warwick Mules, 'The Figural as Interface in Film and the New Media: D.N. Rodowick's *Reading the Figural*', *Film-Philosophy*, 7:7 (2003) <http://www.film-philosophy.com/vol7-2003/n56mules> [accessed 10/12/2010] (footnote 3).

[45] Ronald Bogue, *Deleuze on Cinema* (London: Routledge, 2003), pp. 193-194.

The disjunction between the sound image and the visual image is generative because it produces the audio-visual image. By exploiting 'the power of a disjunction of sound and sight', modern films reshape the 'reading' of film, in the sense that they require a re-linkage between the sound image (whose sonic images must be re-enchained) and the visual image (whose lectosigns must be read).[46] In a sense, the spectator must work to reconcile the diachronic relationship between the sound image and the visual image so as to form a synchronic relationship. If every modern film is two films, a visual film and an audio film, that have to be re-enchained, this implies that the viewer must be active in his or her reading of the film. He or she becomes part of the construction of the film through his or her reading of the generative disjunction between the sound image and the visual image. In relation to *Zazie*, this active part of the viewer, turned 'reader', goes some way to explain the sustained interest in the film and its construction as 'cult' by audiences. The film, through the disjunction between sound and image, calls for the attention of the viewer, who must reflect on the interstice ('faille') between sight and sound, to become part of the construction of the meaning of the film.[47] This is a dynamic already analysed in Bakhtinian dialogue, in which the listener takes on an active role in the construction of the utterance. Through his or her understanding of and reaction to the utterance, the listener becomes the speaker.[48] The viewer of *Zazie* must take on a similarly active and responsive attitude towards the film, as he or she re-enchains the sound image with the visual image.

In his article 'Le stratège et le stratégique', Tom Conley, following Deleuze, argues that 'la parole' in modern film becomes 'un écho d'elle-même', because 'l'acte de parole n'a plus de repères; sa géographie — les lieux d'origine et de destination de la parole — est on ne peut plus incertaine et improbable'.[49] This is seen in *Zazie*, in the way that the 'geography' of voices becomes uncertain. By means of poor lip-synchronisation, the film reveals the dislocation between the cinematic voices and the cinematic bodies, as the voices heard do not come from the bodies seen on screen. These cinematic voices are not the bodies' original voices, which have been drowned out. Instead, they are post-synchronised and supplemented voices. Any origin of voice is displaced, as voices

---

[46] In the glossary to the English translation of *Cinéma 2*, a lectosign is defined as 'a visual image which must be "read" as much as seen'. Gilles Deleuze, *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*, trans. by Hugh Tomlinson and Robert Galeta (London: The Athlone Press, 1989), p. 335.
[47] Deleuze, p. 327.
[48] Bakhtin, 'The Problems of Speech Genre', pp. 60-102 (p. 68). See Introduction, pp. 23-24.
[49] Tom Conley, 'Le stratège et le stratigraphe', *CiNéMAS: revue d'études cinématographiques*, 16.2-3 (2006), 74-94 (pp. 83-84).

in Malle's *Zazie* are shown as having been controlled, manipulated, and added to bodies with which they do not exactly fit. Bodies can be perceived as voiceless puppets to which voices have been supplemented. The bodies do talk, or rather perform the act of speaking, as shown by their lip movements, but the voices we hear, which are (mostly loosely) attributed to them, seem to come from elsewhere. I propose that the way in which this corresponds with the ventriloquial model reveals something very fruitful for understanding the particular use of voice deployed by Malle in *Zazie*, and the complex and asymmetrical relationship between the cinematic voices and the cinematic bodies.

Before I explain how the ventriloquial model can be used in relation to *Zazie*, the model must first be explained in relation to sound film in general. In his article 'Moving Lips: Cinema as Ventriloquism', Rick Altman proposes the ventriloquial model for the conceptualisation of image-to-sound relations in sound film. Characterising what has been called by Sjogren as 'the "parallel" status of sound' as 'the fundamental scandal of sound film', Altman argues that 'cinema's ventriloquism is the product of an effort to overcome the sound-image gap, to mask the sound's technological origin'.[50] The aim of cinema's ventriloquism is, then, to create the illusion of an organic unity between the cinematic voices and the cinematic bodies, while they are in fact heterogeneous.

Using the ventriloquial model implies, of course, a ventriloquist, that is to say an instance in control of the voices ungoverned and unproduced by the bodies seen on screen. Altman argues that

> the sound track is a ventriloquist who, by moving his dummy (the image) in time with the words he secretly speaks, creates the illusion that the words are produced by the dummy/image whereas in fact the dummy/image is actually created in order to disguise the source of the sound. Far from being subservient to the image, the sound track uses the illusion of subservience to serve its own ends.[51]

Here Altman personifies the sound track as a ventriloquist in charge of the orchestration of sound and image. Altman used the ventriloquial model in this 1980 article in order to challenge the then conventional analysis of sound, according to which 'the sound track in classical narrative films is by and large redundant'.[52] As Annette Davidson explains, 'in a deconstructive maneuver, Altman reverses the prioritization of

---

[50] Sjogren, p. 6. Altman, 'Moving Lips', 67-79 (p. 79).
[51] Altman, 'Moving Lips', 67-79 (p. 67).
[52] Altman, 'Moving Lips', 67-79 (p. 67). This article was written in 1980, and since then 'work such as Altman's has sought to redress the theoretical balance in favor of the soundtrack', as Annette Davidson explains. Annette Davidson, 'Playing in the Garden: Sound, Performance, and Images of Persecution', *Indiana Theory Review*, 19 (1998), 35-54 (p. 36). Hereafter cited as Davidson, 35-54. As a result, sound theory in film is now a well-researched area. With particular focus on voice, see for instance the works already cited in this study of Michel Chion, Kaja Silverman or Britta H. Sjogren.

image over sound completely'. The purpose of Altman's reversal is 'to demonstrate that neither the soundtrack nor the imagetrack is in practice prioritized over the other', as 'both are necessary in order to confirm the truth of the other'.[53]

Rather than using Altman's image of the ventriloquist/sound track secretly speaking while moving the dummy/image however, I think it is perhaps more productive to perceive the figure of the ventriloquist in sound film as the arranger, rather than the sound track. I borrow the term 'arranger' in relation to film from Inez Hedges, who defines it as such:

> unlike literature, film conveys information to the spectator on multiple channels: image, dialogue, music, sound effects. I use the term 'arranger' for the controlling consciousness that must ultimately be held responsible for the selection and combination of the sounds and images of the film.[54]

The arranger, 'the controlling consciousness', orchestrates image-to-sound relations, thus the relation between the cinematic voices (as part of the sound image) and the cinematic bodies (as part of the visual image). I suggest a revision of Altman's model in order to identify the arranger as the ventriloquist, as the arranger fulfils a ventriloquial role in the sense that it combines heterogeneous voices and bodies and creates the illusion of an organic unity between them.

It may seem paradoxical to identify as the ventriloquist a controlling consciousness that does not speak. For example, in Altman's model, the ventriloquist/soundtrack is described as secretly speaking. In the model that I propose in relation to sound film however, the arranger's ventriloquism does not consist of throwing one's voice (of secretly speaking through another), but of combining voices and bodies that are heterogeneous.[55] The ventriloquist/arranger displaces, modulates, and places recorded voices in combination with filmed bodies in order to produce cinematic voices for cinematic bodies. In this model, ventriloquism then lies in using voice as material and making it into a cinematic voice, combined with a cinematic body. To use Steven Connor's terminologies of voice as event (something that happens) and voice as object (something that can be manipulated, displaced, distorted), the ventriloquist/arranger uses voices as objects and makes them into events, that is to say

---

[53] Davidson, 35-54 (pp. 35-36).
[54] Hedges, p. 3.
[55] I borrow the expression 'speaking through' from Steven Connor, who explains that 'ventriloquism has an active and a passive form, depending upon whether it is thought of as the power to speak through others or as the experience of being spoken through by others'. Connor, p. 14.

cinematic voices combined with cinematic bodies, and perceived by the viewer as coming from the bodies seen on screen, thus as events.[56]

This ventriloquial model, when considered in close conjunction with the director's challenge towards film language, reveals a number of important features of the use of voice deployed by Malle in *Zazie*. In *Zazie*, the voices are shown as having been added to bodies with which they do not exactly fit. As we have seen, Altman argues that 'cinema's ventriloquism is the product of an effort to overcome the sound-image gap, to mask the sound's technological origin'.[57] In Malle's *Zazie* however, the arranger does not make the effort to mask the disjunction between voices and bodies, but in fact reveals it, showing that there is no organic unity between the cinematic voices and the cinematic bodies. By means of poor lip-synchronisation, the arranger exploits the fact that sound in film 'carries with it the potential risk of exposing the material heterogeneity of the medium'.[58] The arranger reveals that the cinematic voices are at the intersection of human and machine.[59] The arranger, then, reveals the illusionistic and ventriloquial technology that is used to combine voices and bodies.[60] This strategy, I suggest, is part of the film revealing itself as film, the challenge of film language, which is corroborated by Hedges when she argues that 'Malle's major innovation in adapting Queneau's novel is the creation of a parodic film arranger who reveals himself at every moment as unreliable and subversive in relation to the basic rules of cinematic coherence'.[61]

Hedges personifies the arranger as male, like Altman personifies the sound track/ventriloquist as male. While Hedges probably identifies the arranger in *Zazie* as male because of the sex of the director, Altman proposes his ventriloquial model for the conceptualisation of sound-image relationship in sound film in general. The identification of the instance that is ultimately in control of the film (whether the

---

[56] Connor, p. 32.

[57] Altman, 'Moving Lips', 67-79 (p. 79).

[58] Doane, 33-50 (p. 35).

[59] Alain Boillat highlights the intersection between human and machine that represents 'la voix des films parlants': 'la voix des films parlants, bien qu'appartenant en propre à un individu, est en outre déterminée par la matérialité technique de son enregistrement et de sa restitution. Elle représente par conséquent l'agent d'une rencontre entre l'humain et la machine'. He adds that the cinema voices of sound films offer 'une représentation ambiguë – et par là même fascinante – de l'humain, puisqu'elles évincent paradoxalement l'individu comme présence tout en s'en faisant de façon très personnalisée la manifestation phonique'. Alain Boillat, *Du bonimenteur à la voix-over: voix-attraction et voix-narration au cinéma* (Lausanne: Antipodes, 2007), p. 18; p. 25.

[60] As Altman argues, 'the fundamental scandal of sound film […] is that sound and image are different phenomena, recorded by different methods, printed many frames apart on the film, and reproduced by an illusionistic technology'. Altman, 'Moving Lips', 67-79 (p. 79).

[61] Hedges, p. 10.

arranger or the ventriloquist) as male is, of course, significant and problematic with relation to female and male subjectivity and issues of control. The equation of male and control in Hedges's analysis of *Zazie*, and even more so in Altman's ventriloquial model, implies the containment of female subjectivity within the diegesis as analysed by Kaja Silverman in what she characterises as 'classic cinema'. For the purposes of her analysis Silverman understands 'classic cinema' as a textual model rather than a formal system, in which women are relegated as objects, trapped and contained within the diegesis, and in which they cannot speak or see. In *Into the Vortex* Sjogren criticises Silverman's 'pessismistic' analysis and proposes an alternative model for female subjectivity in cinema, in which voices are not prisoners of the image and neither the image nor the sound track dominates in creating meaning. The heterogeneity of the image and the sound track, she argues, does not obliterate difference, but accounts for the existence of contradiction. She suggests that the feminine can in fact *speak* despite processes of containment, or alongside them.[62]

In *Zazie*, the illusionary ventriloquial model is revealed, this way revealing the relationship between voices and bodies as arbitrary. 'Unreliable and subversive in relation to the basic rules of cinematic coherence', as Hedges characterises 'him', the arranger shows that male voices are artificially, 'mechanically' attributed to male bodies, and female voices to female bodies, and that all voices are the intersection of human and machine. It can be argued that characters, whether male or female, cannot in fact speak at all. The question, then, lies rather in if and how characters can 'speak' *despite* the contradiction that their voices do not belong to them.

Voice and body are divided rather than re-united in a coherent whole, which problematises the source, or the origin of voice. Due to the poor synchronisation, the characters' bodies do not seem to be the channels of the voices that are attributed to them. It is important to stress that the fact that voices are desynchronised from lip movements does not mean that they are completely disembodied. Thanks to the actor's timbre and the difference between male and female voices, there can be no doubt for the viewer as to which character the voice should be attributed to.[63] As Malle refuses the

---

[62] Sjogren, p. 43.
[63] For example, in the first scene, it is clear that 'Doukipudonktan' should be attributed to Gabriel, as the voice is male, and he has an expression of slight disgust (at the smell) and wonder; or that 'le train de six heures soixante' should be attributed to Jeanne Lalochère, as the voice is female, and she is seen in her lover's arms with her lips moving.

classic cinema model of male control, cinema's ventriloquism is here voluntarily imperfect, strange, designating itself as artifice, an illusion that is not deceptive.

Before exploring specific examples of the ventriloquial metaphor by examining the relationship between voice and body and issues of control and power of voice, I shall focus on words and voice in the film, and in particular 'verbatim' dialogue from the novel. As voices are shown as manipulated and controlled, how does this reconfigure the relationship between the voices and the words they say? How does this, in turn, reconfigure the relationship between the audience and sound, voice and vision?

Voices and words

Since voices are not produced by bodies in *Zazie*, the film also problematises the origin of the words the voices say. In order to understand the problematic origin and the displacement of words in the film, I shall analyse Malle's film *as an adaptation*, following Linda Hutcheon's theoretical focus.[64] Considering Malle's film as an adaptation rather than an autonomous work means examining how it engages in intertextual dialogue with Queneau's original text. I shall analyse how Malle's *Zazie* is a repetition with variation of the text, not focusing on the transposition of the critique of literary language into a critique of film language as has been done in other analyses, but on literal repetition with variation: how voices repeat words from the text. For instance, in the opening scene at the train station, the fact that it is Gabriel who says 'natürlich' and not Jeanne Lalochère as in the book, though seemingly insignificant, problematises the vocal origin or source of the word, as it has been displaced from Jeanne Lalochère's voice to Gabriel's.[65] Gabriel's 'natürlich' is in quotation marks, and I borrow the term 'quotation marks' from Eco in his analysis of innovation and repetition. Eco characterises as quotation marks the way in which works quote others, however these quotation marks are not physical in the sense that the quotation is not referenced. Because of this, 'one can say that these marks can be perceived on the basis of an extratextual knowledge', and as a result they can go unnoticed.[66] In the case of Gabriel's

---

[64] Hutcheon, p. 6. See Introduction, p. 34.

[65] 'Natürlich, dit Jeanne Lalochère qui avait été occupée' (*QZ*, p. 12).

[66] Eco, 191-207 (p. 202). Eco gives examples of quotation marks from Steven Spielberg's *Raiders of the Lost Ark* (1981) and *E.T.* (1982), as well as Woody Allen's *Bananas* (1971). This particular quotation refers to an intertextual gag, where E.T. encounters a person dressed up as a character from Irvin Kershner's *The Empire Strikes Back* (1980) and hugs it as an old friend. This scene is in quotation marks because of the various connections between the two films and their directors. Eco explains that in order to understand this gag, the viewer must be aware that it is in quotation marks.

'natürlich' in Malle's *Zazie*, the quotation marks are not evident, in the sense that they would only appear *as* quotation marks to an attentive reader of Queneau's original text. Moreover, the function of the displacement of 'natürlich' seems unclear. In order to understand the relationship between voice and words in the film, I shall analyse how three textual excerpts pass from one voice to another and whether or how this disturbs coherence and compatibility between voice and words.

Excerpts of Trouscaillon's words during his conversation with Fédor Balanovitch (starting with 'j'ai la confession qui m'étrangle la pipe', *QZ*, pp. 164-166) are used on three different occasions. Firstly, as Gabriel and Zazie walk out of the station at the beginning of the film, Charles is outside his taxi, and says 'j'ai la confession qui m'étrangle la pipe... la confession enfin la racontouse, quoi… je ne vous dirai rien de mon enfance' (*QZ*, p. 165). He is talking to no-one, while people are shouting and arguing to get in his taxi. The third time words of the 'racontouse' excerpt are uttered (I will return to the second time later, as it is different), it is by Trouscaillon, in the scene where he, Zazie and Mouaque go after Gabriel, who has been 'guidenappé' by the group of tourists. Trouscaillon giggles with Mouaque while he says 'de mon instruction je n'en parlerai guère car j'en ai peu. Sur ce dernier point, voilà qui est fait. J'en arrive donc maintenant à mon service militaire' (*QZ*, p. 166). He keeps talking but his voice is shortly drowned out by Zazie shouting to hitch-hikers, telling them to get in the car.

Excerpts of Trouscaillon's 'racontouse' in the original text are then uttered by both Charles and Trouscaillon, while the scene in which they occur in the novel (Trouscaillon's conversation with Fédor) does not happen in the film. This particular excerpt, which is partially repeated as it is shared by Charles and Trouscaillon, is made up of words that say virtually nothing. The conclusion 'la vie m'a fait ce que je suis', which neither Charles nor Trouscaillon have time to say, does not result in information concerning 'what' the utterer is. Trouscaillon's 'racontouse' is exposed as interchangeable between these two characters, and the fact that it is uttered by both does not disturb coherence between voice and words. In this case, repetition then appears as an emptying process rather than as reinforcing meaning.

However, in the second instance when the 'racontouse' excerpt is uttered, this time by Gabriel at the beginning of his Eiffel tower speech, there is a certain incompatibility between voice and words.[67] Gabriel's 'racontouse' is more extensive

---

[67] Horton analyses this scene as a metaphor for the instability of language and sexuality; he argues that 'Malle heightens Queneau's interest in the relationship of language-identity-sexuality in the Eiffel Tower

than Charles's or Trouscaillon's in the film. Gabriel repeats what Charles already said (though he could not have heard it), and continues:

> ni de ma jeunesse. De mon éducation, n'en parlons point, je n'en ai pas, et de mon instruction je n'en parlerai guère car j'en ai peu. Sur ce dernier point, voilà qui est fait. J'en arrive donc maintenant à mon service militaire sur lequel je n'insisterai pas. Célibataire depuis mon plus jeune âge, la vie m'a fait ce que je suis (*QZ*, p. 166).

Gabriel is the only one who says the line stating that the utterer is 'célibataire depuis [son] plus jeune âge'. He is, however, not single, while Trouscaillon and Charles (until he later proposes to Mado) are. In spite of the 'racontouse' excerpt being repeated three times by three different characters, these words, which would have been interchangeable between Charles and Trouscaillon, are uttered by the only character for which they are incoherent. The addition of the 'racontouse' to Gabriel's speech designates the relationship between voice and words as irrational, as Gabriel repeats words regardless of issues of incoherence or incompatibility. Bakhtin argues that an individual's unique speech experience is shaped through the assimilation of others' words.[68] Here, though Gabriel's speech is indeed filled with others' words, he does not assimilate them. Rather, he repeats them verbatim. I employ the term 'repetition' according to my focus on the film as an adaptation rather than an autonomous work, yet the process of repetition is obviously peculiar, as Gabriel repeats words he has not heard being said by another, and there is no interaction with the other's utterance that is to be repeated.

Umberto Eco has shown that repetition and seriality do not exclude innovation and that quotation has become typical of postmodern art.[69] Talking specifically about film, Degli-Espositi explains that 'citational aesthetics are typical features of any postmodern text', as they 'base their very existence on repetition with a difference'. As a result, 'the act of communication tends to supersede the content of the communication'.[70] The 'racontouse' excerpt, already a repetition from the original text, becomes a repetition within the film. Every time, it is repeated with a difference: by a new voice, in a different setting, and in a new form (shorter or longer). It is then, paradoxically, always repeated as new. Meaning does not come from the content of the

---

scene while also increasing the cinematic significance of the scene'. Horton does not point out that the beginning of Gabriel's speech is a supplement to his speech in the text, and is in fact part of Trouscaillon's 'racontouse' excerpt. Horton, pp. 63-77 (p. 72).

[68] Bakhtin, 'The Problems of Speech Genre', pp. 60-102 (p. 89). See Introduction, p. 24.

[69] Eco, 191-207.

[70] Cristina Degli-Esposito, 'Postmodernism(s)', in *Postmodernism in the Cinema*, ed. by Cristina Degli-Esposti (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 1998), pp. 3-18 (p. 5; p. 7).

utterance (it is in fact nonsense with regard to Gabriel), but from the repetition process, in the intersection between scheme and variation. This repetition within the film can also be seen as a rhetorical technique: in a sense, it arouses the engagement of the viewer, as he or she becomes part of the construction of the meaning of repetition through his or her recognition of the process.

Two other instances expose the unnaturalness of the link between voice and words in the context of a dialogue that is a repetition from the original text. In these two scenes one character takes over another's part in the conversation, and the words they say produce incoherence because they are others' words, which should logically change the interlocutor's attitude. However, the textual dialogue is reproduced without the major alterations the change should provoke. The first scene is the seduction scene between Mado and Albertine. The exchange between the two women is very similar to the textual one. Mado starts playing with a hat and a scarf (unlike in the text) and (like in the text) asks Albertine 'Pourquoi qu'on vous voit pas plus souvent? Moi, j'aimerais vous voir plus souvent'.[71] She is then taken away by Trouscaillon, who has been hiding behind a folding screen. He comes out from behind the screen with the hat and scarf which Mado was wearing, and takes up Mado's lines (in the text): 'Mais oui, pourquoi qu'on vous voit pas plus souvent, vous qu'êtes en si rayonnante santé que je me permets de vous le signaler et si belle par-dessus le marché, oui pourquoi ?'. Albertine answers: 'je ne suis pas d'humeur tapageuse', to which Trouscaillon says 'enfin sans aller jusque là vous pourriez…', and Albertine ends the conversation with 'n'insistez pas, ma chère'.[72] Though Trouscaillon is covering his face with the scarf (which is anyway quite see-through), his disguise cannot fool Albertine: he is dressed as a policeman, and his voice is obviously very different from Mado's. However, Albertine does not acknowledge the change in interlocutor, and there is no alteration of the dialogue, to the extent that Albertine calls Trouscaillon 'ma chère'.

This substitution of one character with another without alteration of dialogue is repeated in the scene where Trouscaillon/Bertin Poirée attempts to seduce then rape Albertine. Again, the dialogue is slightly contracted and mostly retained (bar a few minor alterations), while the setting is different, as the scene does not take place in Gabriel and Albertine/Marceline's flat but in Gabriel's dressing room in the club. When

---

[71] In the text: 'Pourquoi qu'on vous voit pas plus souvent? (silence). On aimerait vous voir plus souvent. Moi (sourire) j'aimerais vous voir plus souvent' (QZ, p. 142).
[72] This is almost identical to the dialogue between Mado and Marceline in the text (QZ, p. 143).

Albertine mentions her niece in the conversation, Zazie turns up at the door. Albertine tells her to stay there while she goes to fetch her luggage, and once she has left the room, Zazie takes over her aunt's part in the conversation with Trouscaillon. He does not acknowledge the change of interlocutor, though an adult woman, on whom he has a crush, has been replaced with a little girl. Trouscaillon calls Zazie 'Albertine' and 'ma toute belle', and the exchange goes on with Zazie saying Marceline's words in the text.

In order to further analyse these two instances, I think it is fruitful to use the notion of recitation as a type of repetition. Repetition and recitation are not mutually exclusive, as recitation is an act of repetition from memory. Recitation then implies both memory and performance, as the words that are to be recited have been learned before the utterer delivers them. The notion of recitation, then, implies two potentially contradicting aspects: automatism and performance. Recitation can, indeed, entail a sense of automatism, as the utterer delivers a text that pre-exists him or her. However, the idea of performance can contradict the sense of automatism.[73] The distinction between repetition and recitation is apparent in the two scenes described above. In the first scene, between Mado and Albertine, Trouscaillon repeats Mado's utterance (her utterance from the text), while Albertine recites her lines from the original text. In the second scene, Zazie repeats her aunt's utterance (from the text), while Trouscaillon recites his lines from the original text. Though Mado's lines have been 'stolen' by Trouscaillon (in the first scene) and Albertine's lines by Zazie (in the second scene), their interlocutors still recite their scripted, or fixed part in the dialogue. Albertine's and Trouscaillon's lines are recited, unaltered by changes in the conversational settings, while Mado's and Albertine's lines are repeated with a difference, the change in utterer exposing the quotation marks to bring a sense of parody to the scenes.

This notion of recitation is emphasised by the two instances when Trouscaillon seems to be rehearsing his line before saying it to Albertine: he first whispers 'mais mon charme personnel ne vous laissera pas' in a close-up shot before telling her 'je pense sincèrement que mon charme personnel ne vous laissera pas indifférente'; and similarly he first whispers, again in a close-up shot, 'et mon pouvoir séducteur' before telling her

---

[73] The idea of recitation as performance is particularly prominent in relation to poetry and music. Talking specifically about country music, Aaron A. Fox explains that recitation (when a verse, verses or a whole song is spoken rather than sung) is usually reserved for emotionally heightened passages, which contradicts the idea of automatism that recitation can also imply. Aaron A. Fox, *Real Country: Music and Language in Working-Class Culture* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004), p. 275.

'vous verrez. Un bout de conversation et mon pouvoir séducteur opérera'.[74] As he rehearses his lines, it is the dramatic aspect of the recitation that is emphasised; in the case of Albertine, her bland, monotonous performance posits her as delivering an utterance that pre-exists her, as if she were talking in free indirect discourse.

In these two scenes, the process of repetition is again peculiar: Trouscaillon in the first scene and Zazie in the second scene repeat respectively Mado's and Albertine/Marceline's lines without having heard them in the first place. What they repeat are the words of the original text, and the film exposes itself as an adaptation engaging in intertextual dialogue with its source. In the case of the interlocutors, Albertine and Trouscaillon, they recite their lines despite the change in the conversational settings. Bakhtin insists on the listener's active role as part of the construction of the meaning of an utterance.[75] In *Zazie*, the listener reacts to the meaning of speech (the meaning of the utterance), however, the meaning of the utterance should, according to the logic of Bakhtinian dialogue, be altered by the change of utterer, yet this does not happen here. The interlocutor (Albertine, Trouscaillon) does not take an active, responsive attitude towards what is said to them: they repeat what was an active, responsive attitude in the text. They simply recite their part of the dialogue.

These examples show a reconfiguration of the relation between voice and words under new conditions of incompatibility. The construction of meaning through dialogism is impossible as dialogues are exposed as repetitions without assimilation. The meaning the words convey as well as the reaction they cause are fixed and cannot be altered. Incoherence between words and the vocal emission does not prevent the repetition of the dialogue, as words pass from one voice to another without changing the course of words: for instance Gabriel moves from the 'racontouse' to his speech without alteration. Words cannot be appropriated, they can only be recited, and that any voice repeats them will not change the course of the dialogue. Voices are channels for fixed, scripted words, and they are replaceable, as it does not matter in which tone, with which accent, with which 'grain' they are said. It is not through words that voices can have an effect, gain control or power. In the original text, words and language are distorted by the characters' oralised voices: there is a new tense ('surjonctif'), linguistic oddities, grammatically incorrect structures, agglomerated sentences (the famous

---

[74] These are the same lines as in the text (*QZ*, p. 128).
[75] Bakhtin, 'The Problems of Speech Genre', pp. 60-102 (p. 68). See Introduction, pp. 23-24.

'Dukipudonktan'). It is written French that is used as malleable material. In the film on the other hand, words cannot be distorted in the way they are in the text: while the reader sees the distortion of textual language, the viewer simply hears people talking, that is to say, using spoken language. In the transposition from text to film, the malleability of language thus has to be partly lost, and it seems that rather than (French) language it is now voice that is distorted. Indeed, now that words are fixed sometimes to the point of being separated from the conversational setting, and the quotation marks are pointed out through processes of repetition and recitation, it is voice that becomes the material available to be distorted and manipulated.

I argued earlier that the citationality of *Zazie* links the film with postmodern aesthetics.[76] There is an obvious link between postmodernism and adaptation in general, because of its profound and open intertextuality and its inherent citationality, as has been noted for instance by Julie Sanders, and more recently Rachel Carroll.[77] Concerning quotation marks in postmodern literature, Eco argues that

> it is typical of what is called postmodern literature and art [...] to quote by using (sometimes under various stylistic disguises) *quotation marks* so that the reader pays no attention to the content of the citation but instead to the way in which the excerpt from a first text is introduced into the fabric of a second one.[78]

In Malle's *Zazie*, the quotation marks that rule the relationship between voices and words are pointed out by processes of repetition and recitation. The idea of words being fixed and recited is also emphasised, even when words are uttered by the appropriate voice, by some of the actors' typically New Wave diction. Bénard points out that 'les comédiens récitent sur un ton tout à fait antinaturel: c'est un jeu le plus souvent outré, avec des changements brusques d'intonation ou d'attitude'.[79] This is particularly obvious with Gabriel (Philippe Noiret) and Albertine (Carla Marlier). Gabriel is the most 'theatrical' of all characters, and his delivery links recitation with heightened emotionality, as in music. Albertine's delivery on the other hand is very flat, which

---

[76] Pascale Gaitet explores postmodern aspects of Queneau's *Zazie* (referring mostly to Fredric Jameson) in the profound mixture of high and low and the sense of loss of meaning and the way the materiality of words becomes obsessive over meaning. Gaitet, see in particular pp. 168-181.

[77] In *Adaptation and Appropriation* Julie Sanders links adaptation to postmodernism through intertextuality, as she states that 'the processes of adaptation and appropriation [...] are in many respects a sub-section of the over-arching practice of intertextuality'. She adds that 'the impulse towards intertextuality, and the narrative and architectural *bricolage* that can result from that impulse, is regarded by many as a central tenet of postmodernism'. Sanders, p. 17. Rachel Carroll points out that adaptation 'as cultural practice [...] exemplifies key trends in postmodern culture'. Rachel Carroll, 'Introduction: Textual Infidelities', in *Adaptation in Contemporary Culture: Textual Infidelities*, ed. by Rachel Carroll (London: Continuum, 2009), pp. 1-10 (p. 1).

[78] Eco, 191-207 (p. 201).

[79] Bénard, 'Un cinéma zazique?', 135-154 (p. 42).

echoes the text's indication of speaking 'doucement', and links recitation with the idea of automatism and free indirect discourse.

I propose that these types of anti-realistic diction, in which voices seem to recite a text, point to a notion of voice researched in the present study as a fabrication or a construction. The textual voices of *Zazie* have first been made into new textual/made-to-be-spoken voices, through the intermediary adaptation from novel to screenplay. Before being 'spoken' (recited) by the actors, they have had to be learnt, and rehearsed. They are then said, during the shooting, but drowned out, then reworked, and (de)synchronised with the moving images. The 'reciting' tone of the actors participates in making the film self-reflexive. By designating the voices as 'cinematic voices', it points towards an aspect of the fabrication process, through which the textual voices are made into 'sound' voices. Voices in *Zazie* are not natural or bodily; rather, they are made (and made to fit – or not – bodies), they are produced. Bénard talks about the 'changements brusques d'intonation ou d'attitude', which according to her contribute to defy 'toute vraisemblance psychologique'.[80] This refers to a seemingly irrational dynamics of voice, in which the voice does not follow the body: voices become loud or soft, but do not fit with the body or its gestures.

Precisely how the voices relate to the body needs further analysis, however. The mnemonic toing and froing between the source text and the film participates in the palimpsestuous pleasure of experiencing the adaptation *as adaptation*, and the actors' reciting tone and irrational dynamics of voice participate in the film's self-reflexivity. What effect do citational aesthetics have within the diegesis, however? Are the characters, with their quoting or reciting voices dislocated from their bodies, and thus presented merely as automatons?

Relationship between voice and body: silent, distorted and recorded voices

In order to address the question of the relationship between voice and body, I shall focus on the relationship between voice and body under the new conditions of incoherence and incompatibility. How can there be coherence between a body and a voice it does not produce? An instance of coherence between voice and body is what I call a silent voice, a term I already used in my analysis of Tardi's *Voyage*.[81] There is

---

[80] Bénard, 'Un cinéma zazique?', 135-154 (p. 42).
[81] See Part II, Chapter 1, p. 114.

coherence between voice and body precisely because the voice is not heard. Silent voices occur in a quasi-voiceless scene, the sequence starting when Albertine escapes Bertin Poirée to bring Gabriel his dress, and ending when Zazie wakes up. In the first half of this sequence (until Zazie falls asleep), there are no vocal sounds. All the main characters are present: Bertin Poirée/Trouscaillon chases Albertine through the traffic; Mouaque looks for Trouscaillon, inspecting every policeman she sees; Zazie walks around; Charles, Mado, Turandot, Laverdure and Gridoux get into the taxi; and Gabriel sits in a rocking chair, looking worried that his dress is not yet there. Trouscaillon, Albertine and Mouaque talk during this sequence, but their voices are not heard, only their lip movements are seen. I would like to suggest that in this 'silent' sequence (there is music, but no words are heard), the characters' unheard voices function in the same way as the voices of characters in a silent film as described by Chion:

> le personnage de film muet, avec son corps animé remuant les lèvres, se donne pour partie d'un tout qui est le corps parlant, et laisse chacun imaginer pour soi la voix qui en sort. En nous privant donc ostensiblement de quelque chose, d'un élément, […] le cinéma muet nous [fait] rêver à l'harmonie d'un tout.[82]

Characters in silent films do talk, but their voices are not heard – which is why Chion suggests *le cinéma muet* should rather be called 'cinéma sourd'.[83] In this scene, paradoxically and temporarily, the characters gain a voice that fits their body: as it is unheard, it is imagined and provided by the viewer. Voice is here coherent with the body because it is attributed by another, the viewer (rather than re-connected by this viewer).

When voices are heard, I propose that there can still be coherence between voice and body when voice is not merely shown but used as an object and overtly manipulated. When Zazie and Charles walk down the Eiffel Tower stairs, sound and image are speeded up to the extent that it becomes impossible to understand what they are saying. Andrew Horton argues that in this scene Malle '[creates] a flow of images and sound directly through film to reflect Zazie's speeded-up world, as in the descent of the tower, giving the audience an even more immediate experience of Zazie's spirit than is possible in the novel'.[84] Whilst it is difficult to uphold Horton's interpretation that the speeded-up voices reflect Zazie's 'speeded-up world', what nonetheless remains of interest for the present study is the 'flow of images and sound'. In this scene the

---

[82] Chion, p. 118.
[83] Chion, p. 20.
[84] Horton, pp. 63-77 (p. 73).

manipulation of both voice and body, their simultaneous speeding-up, brings a certain coherence between them in contrast to the incompatibility that characterises voice/body relationships elsewhere in the film. Voices and bodies are here coherent because they are both used as objects, overtly manipulated.

The scene where Pédro-surplus is at Gabriel and Albertine's flat is, I suggest, an instance where the extreme manipulation of a voice as object leads to coherence between vocal sound and image. In this scene, Zazie tells Gabriel he should throw Pédro-surplus out, and her uncle answers 't'en as de bonnes, si c'est un flic'. In the novel, Zazie then says:

> c'est pas parce que c'est un flic qu'il faut en avoir peur […]. C'est hun dégueulasse qui m'a fait des propositions sales, alors on ira devant les juges tout flic qu'il est, et les juges, je les connais moi, ils aiment les petites filles, alors le flic dégueulasse il sera condamné à mort et guillotiné et moi j'irai chercher sa tête dans le panier de son et je lui cracherai sur sa sale gueule, na. (*QZ*, pp. 65-66)

In the film, Zazie's mouth is closed when one hears her voice say 'c'est pas parce que c'est un flic qu'il faut en avoir peur'. The voice literally floats, unattached to Zazie's still lips. The scene then cuts from Zazie and Gabriel to Pédro-surplus and Albertine, and the same sentence is repeated in a voice which sounds like a distortion of Zazie's usual one (more high-pitched, faster pace). Then, the rest of the above excerpt is not understandable (only the word 'dégueulasse' stands out), as Zazie's voice, still distorted, is multiplied, and these voices talk over each other. The scene is now shot from above, looking down at the characters. Zazie is running around the other characters, like a child playing, and with the noise of children's voices, the scene evokes a playground. I suggest that this scene shows the possibility of coherence between voice and body under conditions of incompatibility, as the body does not produce voice. While Zazie's voice is completely dislocated from her body, the manipulated and displaced voice produces a soundtrack in coherence with the image, as the scene imitates a playground through sound and image.

It would, then, seem that coherence between voice and body can be achieved by exploiting their incompatibility, that is to say, by exploiting the fact that bodies do not produce voices: the characters' silent voices are given to them by another; Zazie and Charles's speeded-up voices fit with their bodies through external manipulation; and Zazie's dislocated voice is used as soundtrack for the image. In the *course-poursuite* scene between Zazie and Pédro, I propose that coherence is achieved between a body and another's recorded voice. This moment happens towards the end of the *course-poursuite*.

174

Zazie runs away from Pédro, and they get to two symmetrical rounded flights of stairs that meet at the top.[85] Pédro, after Zazie has pushed him, stays at the bottom of the stairs, while she runs to the top of the stairs and stops there. This is when the recorded voice is heard. It is a male adult voice; the words are not intelligible, as it sounds like the voice is played backwards. While the voice is heard, Zazie seems to mime the words, as her lips can be seen moving (though it is not very clear). She moves her arms in a strange, unnatural manner while the voice is being heard. Pédro-surplus looks up at Zazie and starts clapping. Immediately after the recorded voice stops, and about one second after Pédro has started the clapping movement, recorded applause follows. While the recorded applause is still going on, Zazie drinks from a glass of water and throws the rest onto Pédro. The *course-poursuite* then continues.

Coherence between voice and body here is, again, achieved under conditions of incompatibility. When the characters talk, their voice and body should be elements of a whole, but it is revealed that the body does not produce voice, and that it is not the body's original voice that is heard. When characters talk they sound like they are dubbed, and their bodies are incoherent with the voices that are given to them because their original voices are missing. In this scene however, there is coherence between Zazie's awkward, disarticulated movements and another's voice played backwards. Zazie reacts to the recorded voice, which does not replace her own lost original voice.

In this respect, Zazie appears to be an articulated puppet: her movements are disarticulated and she mimes the distorted, unintelligible words of a voice that cannot be hers. However, the scene can also be interpreted as an instance of vocal control from Zazie. The *course-poursuite* is punctuated with close-ups of Zazie jumping and laughing, and she regularly fools Pédro, including by multiplying herself and appearing in two places in the same image. She appears to be in control of the situation; could she also be in control of the recorded voice? Is her body controlled by the recorded voice, or does she control it to an extent (does she 'press play')? As I have analysed, there can be coherence between voice and body, not in spite of, but because of, their incompatibility. Is it possible for the characters to take advantage of this incompatibility to gain control of voice(s), and use it or them to exert power?

---

[85] Horton argues about the *course-poursuite* that 'this section, totally invented by Malle and his co-writer, most clearly establishes Zazie's buoyant enthusiasm while simultaneously celebrating Malle's ability to play with cinematic conventions'. Horton, pp. 63-77 (p. 70). O'Sullivan analyses the scene as an echo of the original novel's 'highly intertextual nature' due to its references to various cartoons and silent films. O'Sullivan, pp. 263-279 (p. 276). Horton and O'Sullivan's analyses focus on cinematic language, and neither of them mentions the recorded voice on which my analysis will focus.

The powers of voice

To examine issues of vocal control and power in the film, the first scene on which I shall focus takes place at the night club and does not happen in the text. At the beginning of this scene, Zazie proves once again to be a 'small, destructive catalyst' enjoying the consequences her actions have on others.[86] Gabriel is bent in a phone box that is too small for him, and when Zazie surprises him by scratching the top of the phone box he straightens himself up and breaks it. He is then told off by the pianist of the club, while Zazie watches on and laughs at what she has provoked. In this scene however her capacity to 'provoke a series of reactions' goes further than elsewhere in the film (and the book), as she goes on to actively command, rather than to cause and then passively watch, the effect she has on others.[87] While Gabriel and the pianist are still arguing, Zazie's face suddenly becomes serious and she interrupts them to ask 'Alors, c'est comme ça qu'on m'abandonne?' As she comes closer to the adults she is shot from the back, her hands on her hips; she asks in a distorted, high-pitched voice, 'c'est comme ça qu'on me laisse avec une vieille folle?' The adults look scared and walk backwards away from her. Zazie then asks something which starts with 'c'est comme ça que', but the end of the question is not understandable, as the voice is very high-pitched and fast-forwarded. With every step she makes, Gabriel and the pianist move one step further away from her, looking increasingly scared. Here Zazie's direct effect on others is achieved through a combinative use of voice and body to convey anger and menace. Zazie's distorted voice is completely disconnected from her body; her mouth is not seen (by the viewer) as it becomes increasingly un-realistic. The fact that the voice is un-anchored in the spatial environment is used to invade and structure it, and Zazie's body relays the anger and menace contained within the voice as she walks towards the increasingly scared adults one step at a time, her hands on her hips.

Zazie then reaches the piano, and tells the group of adults (Gabriel and the female dancers into whose line he has fallen when walking backwards away from his niece) 'Attention, un, deux, trois' with her usual un-distorted voice, and moving one finger. While she says this, the camera angle changes, and she is now filmed from the front. She starts playing the piano, and Gabriel and the dancers start dancing, following the rhythm and melody she is playing. As a technician activates a lever, curtains go down

---

[86] O'Sullivan, pp. 263-279 (p. 277).
[87] O'Sullivan, pp. 263-279 (p. 277).

and the turntable on which Gabriel and the dancers dance starts turning and rising. Because of the curtain, Zazie cannot see the movements she is commanding. When she abruptly stops playing the piano, a crushing sound is heard, and as she pops her head out of the curtain she laughs at the havoc she sees. Gabriel bumps into a man in a bear costume juggling with fire, and a fire starts. The scene then cuts to a statue of an angel, next to which Zazie appears (literally), her hands on her hips, looking serious.

Horton describes this scene as 'Gabriel rehearsing on stage with dancers in a deep focus-shot that reminds us of the newspaper dinner scene in *Citizen Kane* (1941) as Zazie plays the piano'.[88] Horton's description points out the intertextual nature of the scene but evokes a normal rehearsing situation, with Zazie playing the piano and Gabriel and the dancers following with no sense of them being forced to do so. While the dancers are smiling when they are following the music (like rehearsing for the coming show – they were rehearsing before Zazie's arrival), Gabriel on other hand looks confused, obeying Zazie, and almost as if his body was moving against his will. A ventriloquist can impose a voice onto a body; Zazie imposes a rhythm onto bodies, dictates them as a puppeteer, but while a puppeteer moves the strings to control their puppets, Zazie does so through sound. Her gesture (hitting the piano keys) commands sound, which in turn commands the movements of the adults. As soon as she stops playing they collapse, like a game of musical chairs, but also like a puppeteer suddenly letting go of the strings. At the beginning of the scene the manipulation of voice as sound material is used in correlation with Zazie's body and intention, so that she gains vocal power. She then directly uses music as rhythmic sound material, to which she is capable of subjecting bodies. Voice and music, as types of sound material, can be used in order to have an effect on others, to gain power over them.

However it seems that all this power can lead to is chaos. After looking serious, Zazie smiles absently, then shrugs and says 'à leur âge' about the adults trying to stop the fire she has made them cause. Zazie now seems bored with the power she has acquired.[89] In his analysis of the ventriloquist Valentine Vox (in Henry Cockton's 1840 *The Life and Adventures of Valentine Vox, Ventriloquist*), Connor argues that 'Valentine's ventriloquial powers prove to be wholly useless for any purpose other than causing mayhem or taking revenge upon minor pomposity and wickedness [...] [His power]

---

[88] Horton, pp. 63-77 (p. 73).
[89] That Zazie now seems bored with the power she has acquired echoes Bardamu's dissatisfaction with his vocal power. See Part I, Chapter 1, pp. 68-70.

seems only to be able to work in the direction of disorder and complexity'.[90] This is what Zazie seems to realise at the end of the scene: she intended to take revenge on Gabriel for leaving her behind, but she cannot achieve anything other than chaos with the power she has acquired, and while she enjoys it at first, it cannot completely satisfy her.

The other character who displays vocal power in the film is Trouscaillon, which is logical, as Zazie and Trouscaillon are the novel's only aggressive and even to an extent diabolical characters.[91] While Zazie tires of the power she can have on others before she can risk losing it (possibly by growing up), Trouscaillon's relationship with vocal power mirrors the inevitable cyclicality of loss and gain with regard to voice which I have analysed in this study. Trouscaillon, characterised by constant metamorphosis, best represents the 'negation' of character in *Zazie*, the fact that characters have no stable identity (in Malle's words, 'the world [Zazie] discovers is so chaotic, there's no sense of order or meaning, every character is going through changes').[92] Trouscaillon's various identities seem to be unjustified : 'les métamorphoses de [Trouscaillon], de ses patronymes comme de ses conduites, paraissent tellement gratuites qu'il nous glisse entre les doigts'.[93] In the original text, Trouscaillon first appears as Pédro-surplus, then Trouscaillon, Bertin Poirée (to Marceline alone), and Aroun Arachide, which is his final identity, after the battle between Gabriel's group and the staff of the café where they go after Gabriel's show. Aroun Arachide, who is described as carrying a 'pébroque', appears with '[des] messieurs, fortement armés'. He gives a speech in which he goes through the identities he has had so far:

> Oui [...], c'est moi, Aroun Aracide. Je suis je, celui que vous avez connu et parfois mal reconnu. Prince de ce monde et de plusieurs territoires connexes, il me plaît de parcourir mon domaine sous des aspects variés en prenant les apparences de l'incertitude et de l'erreur qui, d'ailleurs, me sont propres. Policier primaire et défalqué, voyou noctinaute, indécis pourchasseur de veuves et d'orphelines, ces fuyantes images me permettent d'endosser sans crainte les risques mineurs du ridicule, de la calembredaine et de l'effusion sentimentale […]. A peine porté disparu par vos consciences légères, je réapparais en triomphateur, et même sans aucune modestie. Voyez! (Nouveau geste non moins noble, mais englobant cette fois-ci l'ensemble de la situation.) (*QZ*, pp. 184-185)

Gabriel's group is then saved by Marcel/Marceline, and because this is the last appearance of Trouscaillon in the text, Aroun Arachide seems to be the real identity he

---

[90] Connor, p. 321.
[91] See Gobert, 91-106 (p. 92), and Part I, Chapter 2, pp. 91-92.
[92] French and Malle, p. 28.
[93] Bigot, p. 120.

has been concealing throughout the text. This scene, as I have analysed, is an illusionary statement of power from Trouscaillon/Aroun Arachide, as he claims that all his previous identities were only disguises or masks, part of a masterplan, intentional rather than failures; they only had 'l'apparence de l'incertitude et de l'erreur'. By simply stating that 'je suis je', Arachide also puts an end to the speculation on his identity, and he puts himself in a situation of superiority by stating that he has been fooling the other characters with his disguises, and that he is, unbeknownst to them, 'prince de ce monde'. Arachide's speech exposes the appearance/disappearance cycle that has characterised him, until he reappears one last time 'en triomphateur'.

In the film, as in the text, Arachide's army appears before he does, but it is a recording (a film within the film). When Arachide appears, at the sound of drum rolls, he does not wear a 'pébroque' as in the text, but is dressed in black military clothes, thus immediately reminiscent of Mussolini (a connotation which is also emphasised by the actor's Italian accent); 'dictator' etymologically means 'the one who speaks', which implies that a dictator's power is partly based upon their use of voice. Arachide's speech is a contraction and 'shuffling' of the textual one, and he does not say 'je suis je'. In this scene, I propose that Arachide appears, to use Chion's terminology, as 'maître des voix'.[94] Arachide controls the recorded voices through gesture and movement in order to punctuate his speech:

– 'Oui c'est moi, Aroun Arachide, Prince de ce monde': Arachide opens his mouth wide, and crowd noises resonate; with the gesture of making a fist, he stops the crowd's noise, as if he was catching them.

– 'Celui que vous avez connu et parfois mal reconnu': again, he opens his mouth wide, and the noise of a crowd resonates; he moves his hand as if he were the conductor.

– Mouaque then says 'Trouscaillon, mon roi', and with one gesture he orders the army to shoot her. Here, it is the recorded image which he controls through gesture. He pushes Mouaque's corpse, and continues:

– 'Policier primaire et défalqué voyou noctinaute, indécis pourchasseur de veuves et d'orphelines', here he conducts the crowd again, before starting talking again: 'il me plaît de prendre les apparences de l'incertitude et de l'erreur'.

A piano then falls over his head, and a battle starts. He will not be seen as Aroun Arachide again. For a short while, Arachide is the master of voices, and it is when he

---

[94] Chion, pp. 81-90. Chion's examples are of men controlling female voices; with Aroun Arachide this gender aspect is not relevant.

controls others' voices through gesture that he can control his own voice and body, as shown by his powerful, efficient vocal dynamics during his speech: he raises and lowers his voice, and his gestures accompany his intonation.[95]

Hedges argues that Aroun Arachide/Mussolini is in fact Trouscaillon's real identity, which he has managed to conceal from other characters throughout the film:

> On the visual plane, Malle's portrayal of Pedro/Trouscaillon/Mussolini is a form of displacement. On reflection, the spectator realizes that Pedro's previous association with a mugging (in his first scene with Zazie), interrogation (his abuse of the shoemaker Gridoux and Gabriel), authoritarianism (his behavior in the traffic jam), and despotism (his attempted seduction of Albertine in Gabriel's dressing room with its picture of Napoleon on the wall) have been clues to his concealed identity of a fascist murderer throughout the film. The refusal of people to recognize the many faces of fascism for what they are is a theme Malle would take up again in *Lacombe, Lucien*.[96]

According to Hedges's analysis, Trouscaillon's successful concealment of his real identity as a fascist murderer is due to the spectators' refusal to interpret the clues given throughout the film. Unlike Hedges, I would argue that Trouscaillon has constructed rather than concealed his identity throughout the film, to eventually achieve the power he has as Aroun Arachide, dictator and 'maître des voix'. The roles he has taken on have been increasingly connected with authority. As Pédro-surplus there is only a glimpse of authority to him; he first seems to be a paedophile, and only behaves like a policeman when he interrogates Gabriel, before being thrown out and confessing to Gridoux that he has forgotten his name. As Trouscaillon he pretends to be a policeman and behaves as such, but is mostly useless and does not manage to get rid of Mouaque. As Bertin Poirée he pretends to be an inspector (hierarchically higher than Trouscaillon the traffic policeman), but is immediately unmasked by Albertine. The portrait of Napoleon, which is the most 'authoritarian' of the clues outlined by Hedges, can be seen as a sign of this crescendo towards power, as it occurs towards the end of the film, before Trouscaillon returns as Aroun Arachide.

While in the text Arachide is Trouscaillon's final identity, in the film he appears one last time, in his least powerful role yet. Trouscaillon re-appears when Albert/Albertine is on the underground with Zazie, who is asleep, on their way to the station. This time, Trouscaillon is a ticket collector. When he sees Albert/Albertine he

---

[95] Bénard's analysis of this scene focuses on the film's self-reflexivity: 'le film n'a pas fini de connoter le faux, puisque la finale de cette dernière séquence burlesque, avec un Aroun Arachide en "chemise noire", est l'occasion de la projection, derrière la vitrine de la brasserie, d'un autre film (pour représenter sa troupe) avec bruits d'applaudissements *off* de foule'. Bénard, 'Un cinéma zazique?', 135-154 (p. 146).
[96] Hedges, p. 14.

makes as if to say something, but as she does not look at him he shrugs and walks away. This is different from the voices I have characterised as 'silent voices', where characters talk but their voices are unheard. Trouscaillon's voice is not unheard, it is unused. He does not use gesture as voice, as his shrug shows that he decides against using his voice. Trouscaillon has been increasingly associated with authority, and with his Aroun Arachide persona, he achieves vocal power, before taking on a voiceless (his shortest) unnamed role, in which he has no effect whatsoever on Albert/Albertine, who does not see him, or Zazie, who is sleeping. Horton agrees about Trouscaillon's re-appearance that it represents a threat:

> The ending is a relief, not a solution. [...] Although Pédro-Trouscaillon-Mussolini is carted off at the end of the café sequence, Malle has him return as a conductor on the métro, which finally reopens, as Zazie is being taken to her mother at the train station for the trip home. Unrecognized because of his new 'identity', the 'type' endures to become a threat on yet future occasions.[97]

Now that Trouscaillon has lost the power he had as Aroun Arachide, he can indeed regain it and, at some point, become a threat again. I then propose that the fact that Trouscaillon appears one last time, as a ticket collector who does not say a word after having been a dictator and 'maître des voix', shows the cyclicality of loss and gain of vocal power.

Trouscaillon's appearance as Aroun Arachide also shows that ventriloquial power is based on illusion. The crowd Arachide masters might have been scarce, and the recording might have been distorted and amplified. Moreover, as it is a recording, the crowd's cheers were not originally destined for him. However, he is the 'master of voices' precisely because his power is based on illusion and deception. As such, his vocal power can only be shortly lost. Significantly, he does not say 'je suis je' during his speech, as he does in the book. Because he reappears, he represents the negation of a stable character: his Aroun Arachide persona was no more definite than any other. As a voiceless, unnamed ticket collector (who does not even appear in the text), he has to start all over again, to try and construct for himself the identity he does not have, and eventually gain power over others' voices and control over his own voice.

As the analysis has aimed to demonstrate, Malle's film adaptation of *Zazie* shows a reconfiguration of the textual voices through their relationship with bodies. In the novel, textual voices are disembodied: the characters' physical appearance is not

---

[97] Horton, pp. 63-77 (p. 75).

described (we only know that Gabriel is tall), and most gestures, represented as (geste), remain open to the reader's interpretation. As bodies are absent, the dynamic of control and power revolves solely around voice. While the narrator risks letting cacophony settle, the characters attempt to gain vocal power by talking as much as possible. They try to impose their voice through quantity, talking over others and repeating others' words without appropriating them. In order to gain power they first have to achieve vocal control, which they believe comes from mastering language, and it is French grammar and the gap between written and spoken language which prove most problematic. Vocal power is thought to be achieved by taking on a narrating role, that is to say by talking the most, the most grammatically correctly, and saying 'original' words rather than repeating others'. Voice can become powerful when used as linguistic material on others, but in order to silence them.

In the film, power is however not achieved by taking on a narrating role: when Zazie tells Pédro-surplus the story of her father's murder by her mother, her voice does become a voice-over which structures the flash-back, but this only lasts a short while.[98] For the rest of the scene, the focus is not on her story, but on the burlesque image of Pédro-surplus being splashed with sauce from the mussels she is eating. Her voice becomes a noise covered by other noises, and her words cannot be heard. In the film, where bodies are exposed (unlike in the text), control and power involve a coherent use of voice and body, or voice and gesture.

However it appears that there is no compatibility between cinematic voices and bodies. The characters show an irrational dynamics of voice, in which gestures do not correspond with intonations, and the arranger/ventriloquist reveals that the post-synchronised cinematic voices do not come from the cinematic bodies seen on screen. Steven Connor argues that 'always standing apart from or non-identical with the body from which it issues, the voice is by definition irreducible to or incompatible with that body. And yet the voice is always in and of the body.'[99] This incompatibility between voice and body is taken further in *Zazie*. Voices are not in and out of bodies. Rather, they are out of them, floating around them. How can characters achieve coherence between their bodies and the voices they do not produce, the voices that are supplemented to them by the arranger/ventriloquist?

---

[98] Hedges points out that Zazie's narration of her father's murder by her mother represents 'intertextuality between frames', as it is a parody of Resnais's *Hiroshima mon amour*. Hedges, p. 13.
[99] Connor, p. 208.

I have suggested that coherence between body and voice can be achieved when the voice is completely disconnected from the body, when the voice is another's, or openly used as another's. Power can then be acquired by exploiting the incompatibility between voice and body: Zazie's un-anchored voice is used to invade the image, and Trouscaillon achieves a powerful and coherent combination of voice and body when he manipulates others', bodiless voices. The film then shows different ways to gain power by using voice and body: the projection of voice (Zazie's) in correlation with menacing body language; puppetry, where the ventriloquial voice is substituted with music and movement; and the commanding through gesture of recorded, absent voices. However when the body acquires power through voice, it realises that all it can lead to is destruction and it tires of it (Zazie), or it almost immediately loses it, and is reduced to a voiceless body (Trouscaillon). Ventriloquism, in the sense of the ventriloquial ability to force heterogeneous voices and bodies to match, is shown as ultimately pointless or ephemeral, and it is even rejected and mocked by the satirical arranger/ventriloquist. The question I shall now address, through my examination of readings and performances of Céline's *Voyage*, is how the voice can ever gain lasting power, if the governing of voice in order to acquire power through aggression and violence on others is only a temporary illusion of real power.

Chapter 4: From a textual voice to an actor's voice in readings and performances of *Voyage au bout de la nuit*

Central to my analysis in this chapter is the extent to which the differences between four actors' vocal abilities and qualities influence or shape their vocal adaptations of *Voyage*. I examine five readings and performances of Céline's *Voyage au bout de la nuit*: Michel Simon's 1955 reading of a condensed excerpt of the beginning of the novel entitled 'La Guerre'; Pierre Brasseur's 1955 reading of an excerpt entitled 'La Mère Henrouille'; Fabrice Luchini's performance in Benoît Jacquot's 1988 medium-length TV film entitled *Voyage au bout de la nuit*, and the 1994 CD recording of Luchini's play *Voyage au bout de la nuit* at the Comédie des Champs Elysées; and excerpts of Denis Podalydès's 2003 reading of the entirety of *Voyage au bout de la nuit*.

In order to situate my analysis, I will also refer to readings of *Mort à crédit*. The chronology of the different readings and performances of Céline's *Voyage au bout de la nuit* and/or *Mort à crédit* examined or mentioned in the present study can be outlined as follows:

Table A: readings and performances of Céline's *Voyage au bout de la nuit* and/or *Mort à crédit* analysed or mentioned in the present study

Date	Actor	Type	Title	Length (mins)
1955	Michel Simon	Recorded reading	'La Guerre' [*Voyage*]	21.29
1955	Pierre Brasseur	Recorded reading	'La Mère Henrouille' [*Voyage*]	13.13
1955	Arletty	Recorded reading	'Les Vacances en famille' [*Mort*]	6.15
1955	Arletty	Recorded reading	'Le Certificat d'études' [*Mort*]	8.00
1955	Arletty	Recorded reading	'Le Départ pour l'Angleterre' [*Mort*]	16.11
1988	Fabrice Luchini	Medium-length TV film [directed by Benoît Jacquot]	*Voyage au bout de la nuit*	45 (approx.)
1994	Fabrice Luchini	Recording of entirety of one stage performance at the Comédie des Champs Elysées	*Voyage au bout de la nuit*	84.50 (2 CDs)
2005	Denis Podalydès	Audio-book	*Voyage au bout de la nuit*	Over 1000 (16 CDs)

Arletty's readings of excerpts from *Mort* will be referred to but not analysed in depth in the present study for, whilst it would be fruitful to analyse Arletty's readings in relation to vocal adaptations of Céline's texts as this would introduce the criterion of the gender of the performer into a corpus that is overwhelmingly male, her recordings are nonetheless not related to *Voyage* at all.

The criterion for selection was that the performance should be a monologue by one actor. This would enable me to examine questions of the narrative ventriloquial powers of voice in a different way from that deployed in my analysis of Tardi's illustration, in which Bardamu's narrative voice is challenged by means of the juxtaposition with his powerlessness as character in the image. If Bardamu's voice is disempowered in the illustration, is it empowered in vocal adaptations of his monologue? By singling out the criterion of a monologue, this has allowed for the inclusion of works in different media, namely a stage adaptation (Luchini), a TV film (Luchini), recorded readings of excerpts (Simon and Brasseur) and an audio-book (Podalydès).[1]

There are two potential pitfalls with regard to my selected corpus. The first pitfall has to do with the nature of Luchini's stage adaptation. I analyse a CD recording of it and am therefore lacking primordial aspects of theatre.[2] However, I am not analysing Luchini's performance *as* a play, but the recording of *a* representation of the play (the recording was planned, and carried out in just one take). The second pitfall has to do with the length of Podalydès's recording (over 1000 minutes, 16 CDs). As it is not possible to analyse the recording in its entirety, or at least not within the scope of the present study, I will focus on the same excerpts that are read by Simon ('La Guerre') and Brasseur ('La Mère Henrouille'). It is important to point out that I do not claim that my analysis of Podalydès's reading is representative of the whole audio-book, but only of the selected passages.

---

[1] Luchini's engagement with *Voyage* is more extensive than the recording and the TV film analysed in this chapter. Luchini performed the play *Voyage au bout de la nuit* (of which I analyse the 1994 recording) between 1986 and 1999. He then adapted the American episode of *Voyage* into a play entitled *L'Arrivée à New York*, which he performed between 2001 and 2004. In addition to these two plays, Luchini also performs excerpts from *Voyage* in his play *Par cœur* (which also incorporates texts by La Fontaine, Hugo, Flaubert and Baudelaire). *Par cœur* was filmed by Benoît Jacquot in 1998. Luchini still performs excerpts from *Voyage* (and other texts) today in 2011, as part of his play *La Fontaine*.

[2] Ubersfeld points out the 'caractère immédiat et éphémère' of theatre, and she argues that 'il n'y a pas de traces de la représentation, ni de retour possible […]. Photos et vidéos ne sont que des outils imparfaits qui laissent tomber les conditions mêmes de la communication théâtrale et la réponse du récepteur'. Anne Ubersfeld, *Lire le théâtre II: l'école du spectateur* (Paris: Belin, 1996), p. 19. Hereafter cited as Ubersfeld.

While Simon, Brasseur, Luchini and Podalydès have distinctly dissimilar voices, Podalydès's can however be characterised as of another kind to those of the other actors, in the sense that it sounds less unique. In order to understand this difference, it is productive to use the concepts of grain and timbre. Barthes talks about the grain of a voice as being 'le corps dans la voix qui chante, dans la main qui écrit, dans le membre qui exécute'.[3] In *Lire le théâtre II*, Ubersfeld defines the timbre of a voice as the

> élément individuel par excellence, [qui] rend le travail d'un acteur inoubliable et personnel. Le timbre est un élément auquel on peut rattacher la *musicalité* […] et le *grain*, ces infimes imperfections vocales auxquelles Roland Barthes attachait un si grand prix, car elles rendent une voix individuelle et charnelle.[4]

With Simon, Brasseur and Luchini's voices, the obviousness of a particular timbre and the presence of a grain in their voices would imply that they are more easily recognised by the listener, because they are less likely to be confused with the voices of other actors. Luchini has a tendency to use an extensive range of vocal dynamics and a wide tessitura; the tessitura of Brasseur's voice is characteristically low, and his pace generally slow; Michel Simon has a very particular timbre, and retains traces of his Genevan accent. To paraphrase Ubersfeld, their voices and their vocal styles contribute to make their performances unforgettable and individual. Compared with Luchini's, Brasseur's and Simon's voices, Podalydès's can be characterised as being more neutral, or whiter.[5] While of course all voices are unique and individual, Podalydès's *sounds* less unique and individual than those of the other actors. This distinction echoes that made by Barthes between Panzéra as a voice 'with grain' and Fischer-Dieskau as a voice with great vocal technique but 'without grain'.

In his analysis of Barthes's comparison between the two singers, Scott points out that the lack of grain in Fischer-Dieskau's voice makes the singer's voice ventriloquial and transferable.[6] The voice without grain is defined by its absence of individuality, which results in its ventriloquial ability to express or take on another's. This is of course particularly relevant for singers, such as Fischer-Dieskau, or actors, such as Podalydès. Rather than being one's individual or unique voice, the voice without grain has the potential to adapt to fit any part, because as it is defined by lack (the lack of traces of a body), it can be supplemented with another's (for an actor, with a character's). A voice

---

[3] Barthes, 'Le Grain de la voix', in *Œuvres complètes*, II, pp. 1436-1442 (p. 1441).
[4] Ubersfeld, p. 176.
[5] 'White' is here understood as 'neutral', in the sense of Barthes's 'écriture blanche'. Barthes, 'Le Degré zéro de l'écriture', in *'Le Degré zéro de l'écriture' suivi de 'Nouveaux essais critiques'* (Paris: Seuil, 1972), pp. 7-67, see pp. 59-61.
[6] Scott, p. 93. See Introduction, pp. 27-28.

with grain, on the other hand, imposes a body on the character. Through my analyses of the actors' readings and performances of *Voyage*, I shall examine if and how this preliminary distinction between Podalydès's voice as without grain and transferable, and the voices of the other actors as with grain and distinctive timbres affects the performance and interpretation. I am aware that the categories of vocal uniqueness and vocal transferability are potentially problematic because they are extremes, and that the concepts of grain and timbre cannot be applied to Bardamu's voice, because it is textual. However, Bardamu's voice is nonetheless, as I have demonstrated in my textual analysis, ventriloquial. If however Podalydès's voice can, using Scott's terminology, be characterised as ventriloquial, how does it, in turn, relate to Bardamu's ventriloquial narrative voice? How do Simon's, Brasseur's and Luchini's 'vocal uniqueness' on the other hand shape their performance of Bardamu's voice, one of whose features is to be adaptable and carefully constructed (rather than 'natural')?

The actors' bringing to voice of *Voyage* is the result not only of their vocal qualities such as the grain of their voice or lack thereof, but also of their interpretative choices. Ubersfeld uses the concepts of the intentional and the involuntary to explain the dynamic that shapes the process of acting for every actor:

> le comédien construit telle mimique, tel geste, telle intonation pour dire : *je suis*, ou *je fais* telle chose. Mais, en même temps, il est producteur de signes qu'il n'a pas choisi de produire: le timbre ou le 'grain' de sa voix, sa stature, la forme de ses traits, l'aura qui l'environne, les rôles qu'il a déjà joués, autant d'éléments signifiants sur lesquels il n'a pas de prise, même s'il les connaît parfaitement. Le travail du comédien est de dialectiser les signes involontaires, de les adapter après en avoir pris conscience, autrement dit de les transformer d'involontaires en volontaires (et s'il se peut, d'inconscients en conscients) ; de 'faire avec' – ou de les neutraliser si nécessaire.[7]

Though Ubersfeld refers in particular to acting in theatre (which in my corpus only applies to Luchini's performance at the Comédie des Champs Elysées), the relationship she describes between 'signes intentionnels' and 'signes involontaires' is useful for the analysis of the actors' readings of *Voyage*. With regard to voice, all four actors have to deal with the signs they have not chosen to produce: for Luchini, Brasseur and Simon, the grains and distinctive timbres of their voices (their 'vocal uniqueness'), for Podalydès the lack of grain and relatively indistinctive timbre of his voice (his potential vocal transferability). In my analyses of adaptations of *Voyage* and *Zazie*, the new medium is of central importance in the adaptive process. In these vocal adaptations, it

---

[7] Ubersfeld, p. 140.

can be argued that this new medium is the actor's own voice, as it both limits and opens up possibilities in the dynamic between the intentional and the involuntary. While all of the vocal adaptations in my corpus are performances, only Luchini's stage adaptation is a performance as defined by Zumthor in *La Lettre et la voix*: 'lorsque *communication* et *réception* [...] *coincident dans le temps*, on a une situation de *performance*'.[8] The implication of this difference is that Luchini's performance in the stage adaptation is directly influenced by the presence of the live audience, which is part of the performance as process, given that 'il n'y a pas de distance entre l'émission [...] et la réception (avec son retour à l'émetteur)'.[9] While the listeners of Simon's and Brasseur's recordings, Podalydès's audio-book and the spectators of Jacquot's film do participate in the construction of the narrative voice by interpreting and appropriating it, their reception does not directly influence, and cannot potentially alter the production of the narrative voice, as it is already recorded when they receive it.

This distinction, alongside the fact that recorded readings are not usually perceived as adaptations, may partly explain why out of the vocal adaptations in my corpus only Luchini's play has received academic attention. In her article on stage adaptations of Céline's novels, Bénard argues that Luchini's performance is not so much 'une lecture d'œuvre' as 'un théâtre minimaliste', which she calls 'théâtre d'écoute' in opposition to Castorff's and Castelluci's adaptations which she qualifies as 'théâtre d'émotion'. Bénard's article is part of a broader reflection on 'la théâtralité dans l'œuvre de Céline', and its aim is to 'explorer les possibilités de la transposition du texte de Céline au théâtre'.[10] While Bénard focuses on the theatricality of Céline's novels, I focus on the vocality of *Voyage* in the sense of its quality of voice, and capacity for voice (to borrow Clive Scott's terminology).[11]

My approach in this chapter has connections with Sébastien Ruffo's work on 'the phonostylistics of the dramatic character', or 'phonostylistique de la prolation dramatique'.[12] However my approach is from an aesthetic point of view, while Ruffo's is

---

[8] Zumthor, *La Lettre et la voix*, p. 19.

[9] Ubersfeld, p. 19.

[10] Johanne Bénard, 'Céline transposé: l'adaptation des romans de Céline au théâtre', *Etudes céliniennes*, 4 (2003), 5-24 (p. 5). Hereafter cited as Bénard, 'Céline transposé', 5-24.

[11] Scott, p. 65. See Introduction, pp. 11-12.

[12] By Sébastien Ruffo see: 'The Phonostylistics of the Dramatic Character', *Consciousness, Literature and the Arts*, 4:2 (2003) <http://blackboard.lincoln.ac.uk/bbcswebdav/users/ dmeyerdinkgrafe/archive/ruffo.html> [accessed 27 December 2010]. (Note: this is the URL of the journal.) Hereafter cited as Ruffo, 'The Phonostylistics of the Dramatic Character'. *L'Herbier du souffleur: Critique phonostylistique de la prolation dramatique* (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Montréal, 2003). 'Vers une critique comparatiste de la voix au théâtre', *Etudes françaises*, 39.1 (2003), 99-110. Hereafter cited

empirical and cognitive.[13] Ruffo's research, whose aim is to reach 'une analyse plus objective du phénomène de la performance', takes as its source text (the text to be performed) Rostand's 1897 play *Cyrano de Bergerac*, and examines four actors' performances of the role of Cyrano. Ruffo argues that the fact of having 'côte à côte, des prolations concurrentes à comparer' has advantages because as the text is the same, it is easier to differentiate what is 'vocal' from what is 'verbal' in the actors' performances.[14]

Adapters of a text are readers who produce their own concrete interpretation and appropriation of the original text. At the root of Ruffo's 'new breed of performance analysis' as he characterises it, there is the idea that Rostand's text already contains each of the interpretative and performative possibilities favoured by each actor. Ruffo argues that by focusing on 'the way the actors deliver their lines, it becomes clear that their vocal craftsmanship highlights and moves and informs the text so as to reveal meanings listeners would not have noticed had they read the play in silence'.[15] This idea echoes Barthes's notion of the text as infinite, eternally written here and now.[16]

The 'infinity' and 'openness' of the text seems at first to stand in contrast to my analysis of Bardamu's monologue as ventriloquial and articulated around the powers of voice. Bardamu reconstructs reality through his narrative voice, and his aim is to impose his interpretation of reality. As such, it would seem that *Voyage* is a text that imposes an interpretation rather than lets the reader construct their own (I will return to the reading process in relation to Céline's texts). In *Performance, réception, lecture*, Zumthor argues that 'l'interprète [...] est l'auteur empirique d'un texte dont l'auteur implicite à l'instant présent importe peu, car la lettre de ce texte n'est plus lettre seule, elle est le jeu d'un

---

as Ruffo, 'Vers une critique comparatiste de la voix au théâtre', 99-110. 'Faustian Ethos and Vocal Ambitus: The Vocal Style of Actors Playing Faustian Situations', *Acts of 'Risk, Trust and Civility': A Pluridisciplinary Symposium*, Victoria College, May 6-8, 2005 (University of Toronto) <http://www.semioticon.com/virtuals/risk/ruffo/RuffoWeb.htm> [accessed 27 December 2010]. Hereafter cited as Ruffo, 'Faustian Ethos and Vocal Ambitus'.

[13] Ruffo defines phonostylistics as 'inclusive of prosody (accents and melody, or *intonation*, with intensity, duration, pitch, rhythm) and voice quality, as well as, generally, any component of stylistic intentionality found in the vocal aspect of the discourse'. Ruffo explains that his 'expertise is in the analysis of intonation – vocal style, or "phonostylistics". With it, [he tries] to situate [his] work within a broader cognitive semiotic approach to theatre and cinema reception based on empirical analysis'. Ruffo, 'Faustian Ethos and Vocal Ambitus'.

[14] Ruffo, 'Vers une critique comparatiste de la voix au théâtre', 99-110 (p. 110).

[15] Ruffo, 'The Phonostylistics of the Dramatic Character'. Ruffo seems to imply that had listeners read the play out loud they would have noticed those other meanings, however he does not take into account the (lack of) distinction between internal and external reading, and between reading and listening.

[16] See in particular by Barthes in *Œuvres Complètes*, II: 'La Mort de l'auteur', pp. 491-495; *S/Z*, pp. 555-728; and 'Analyse textuelle d'un conte d'Edgar Poe', pp. 1653-1676. See Introduction, pp. 12-13.

individu particulier incomparable'.[17] In order to establish to what extent, in each reading, Bardamu's voice is reduced in importance and replaced by a reader's, or is on the contrary empowered by being read out loud, my analysis will focus on the relation between voice, narration, power and reception.

In order to describe the actors' vocal styles, in the analysis of the recordings I will examine the following vocal attributes in each of the readings/performances:

- dynamics of voice (including vocal emphasis and volume)

- tessitura

- vocal errors and hesitations

- non-verbal sounds (or non-verbal utterances)

- whether the actor 'follows' or 'breaks' Bardamu's textual voice (rendering of punctuation, whether the text is altered)

- how the actor renders the other characters' voices

I will not analyse each element in turn, as it would not be possible within the scope of the present study, but in conjunction with the recordings as and when each attribute arises. At this stage, it is sufficient to acknowledge that the categories of dynamics of voice and the rendering of other characters' voices relate particularly well to notions of voice and power. What I shall go on to explore is the relation, if any, between volume, control and power, and the voice's ventriloquial narrative capacity.

In order to analyse the readings and performances, I will use the following system:

Table B: transcription conventions for the analysis of the recordings of actors' performances of *Voyage*

CAPS	Syllables marked by strong prosodic stress
[pause]	Pause in the performance: [short pause] or [long pause]
[comment]	My comments and descriptions, such as: [audience laughs] or [voice breaks]
[loud] / [soft]	Volume in this segment in relation to previous one (slightly, very or extremely)
Word—	Sound lengthened by actor

In relation to the original text:

[**bold**]	What is altered or added by the actor
[~~strikethrough~~]	What is not said by the actor

Before I analyse the recordings, in order to best situate them, I shall return first of all to the relationship between Céline, Bardamu, and voice. Then, I turn to Podalydès's self-

---

[17] Paul Zumthor, *Performance, réception, lecture* (Longueuil: Préambule, 1990), p. 79.

theorisation in his book *Voix off* in order to understand how an actor's relationship with his own and others' voices can influence my analysis of the performance of a textual narrative, and notions of vocal power, control and ventriloquism. The first readings I analyse are Simon's and Podalydès's vocal interpretations of the same excerpt of *Voyage*, 'La Guerre', and I focus on the actors' vocalisations of the discrepancy between Bardamu as narrator and Bardamu as character. In the second excerpt, 'La Mère Henrouille', I compare Brasseur's and Podalydès's performative choices to vocalise la Mère Henrouille's argument with her daughter-in-law, and the role of Bardamu as ventriloquial narrator. Finally, I focus on Luchini's film and stage performances to examine how and why the actor's performance differs between the two, and how the live audience is part of the process of construction of the narrative voice.

Céline, Bardamu and voice

In my textual analysis of *Voyage* in Part I, Chapter 1, I followed Barthes's theory of the death of the author, and did not take Céline into consideration. With the recordings however, exploring the relationship between Céline, Bardamu and voice is challenging, because it opens up new perspectives on Bardamu's voice. A preliminary observation is that the boundaries between the voices of Céline and Bardamu seem to have been blurred by the recordings. Luchini mixes excerpts of *Voyage* and *Mort* (in which the narrator is called Ferdinand, as in Louis-Ferdinand Céline, but also Ferdinand Bardamu) with interviews of Céline, thus blurring the figures of narrator and author. Bardamu's name is not mentioned anywhere on the boxed set of Podalydès's audio-book, while Céline's figures prominently, and in the accompanying booklet there are three texts on Céline, a biographical chronology of the writer's life, a bibliography of Céline's works and a list of works on Céline.[18] Simon's and Brasseur's readings have been re-edited as part of the *Anthologie Céline*, in which readings are mixed with interviews of the author, 'Céline vous parle', and songs sung by Céline. In a sense, this anthology can be seen as presenting an account of Céline's voice: his own, and his literary voice as read by others. In these recordings, then, Bardamu is seen through the prism of the figure of Céline, reinforced by the (assumed or mythologised) biographical aspect of Céline's writing (a

---

[18] The texts on Céline are 'Maréchal des Logis', by Thomas Compère-Morel, director of the Historial de la Grande Guerre, 'Céline' by the journalist and writer Pol Vendromme, and 'Céline, *Voyage au bout de la nuit* et la Grande Guerre' by the historian Jean-Jacques Becker.

biographical aspect which becomes even more obvious with *Mort à crédit*).[19] Due to the blurring between Céline's literary enunciation, his biography and the narrator of his texts, the name of Bardamu is shown as standing as a pseudonym for Céline – a name which is itself a pseudonym for Louis Destouches.

In his article 'Posture et biographie', Jérôme Meizoz analyses the construction of the figure of Céline. Meizoz states that 'le pseudonyme fait de l'auteur un énonciateur singulier, presque fictif, un personnage à part entière de la scène d'énonciation littéraire'.[20] Bardamu, as fictional narrator, is 'equated' with Céline, who is almost a fictional character, in the sense that it is a construction of the public persona of the author, his self-fashioning into a 'posture':

> Une posture constitue l' 'identité littéraire' construite par l'auteur lui-même, et souvent relayée par les médias qui la donnent à lire au public. […] Il serait également possible de convoquer la notion latine de *persona* désignant le masque, au théâtre, qui institue tout à la fois une voix et son contexte d'intelligibilité. Sur la scène de l'énonciation de la littérature, l'auteur ne se présente et ne s'exprime que muni de sa *persona* ou posture.[21]

The posture of the author, though exterior to the text, can influence the reader's perception and interpretation of it. If the reader of *Voyage* is acquainted with Céline as posture, he or she 'reads Céline' through his or her reading of Bardamu's monologue. The fictional construction of Céline, in turn, is seen as reflected in the character of Bardamu, who acts as a kind of spokesperson for Céline. The first name 'Ferdinand', both in Ferdinand Bardamu and Louis-Ferdinand Céline (Louis Destouches's middle name), reinforces the connection or the relay between the author as fictional figure and the fictional narrator. The posture institutes a voice, and directs how this voice can be understood ('institue une voix et son contexte d'intelligibilité').[22] In commenting Destouches's doctoral thesis, *Semmelweis*, Meizoz points out that when it is

> publié cette fois [in 1936] sous le nom de Louis-Ferdinand Céline, annexé et désormais intégré à l'œuvre littéraire déjà reconnue, cet essai biographique renforce la posture que Céline a imposé dès 1932 au public, celle du médecin-qui-écrit.[23]

---

[19] By contrast, Bardamu's name figures prominently in Philippe Sollers's comment on the backcover of Tardi's illustration. *TV*, backcover. See Part II, Chapter 1, pp. 119-120.

[20] Jérôme Meizoz, 'Posture et biographie: *Semmelweiss* de L.-F. Céline', *COnTEXTES*, 3 (2008), <http://contextes.revues.org/index2633.html> [accessed 18/10/2010] (para. 1 of 37). Hereafter cited as Meizoz, 'Posture et biographie'.

[21] Meizoz, 'Posture et biographie: *Semmelweiss* de L.-F. Céline' (para. 2 of 37). The concept of 'posture', first used by Alain Viala, has been a prominent aspect of Meizoz's sociology of literature. See also Meizoz, *Postures littéraires: mises en scène modernes de l'auteur* (Geneva: Slatkine Erudition, 2007).

[22] Meizoz, 'Posture et biographie' (para. 2 of 37).

[23] Meizoz, 'Posture et biographie' (para. 17 of 37).

Louis Destouches defended his doctoral thesis *Semmelweis* in 1924. The text was published in December 1936 under the name Louis-Ferdinand Céline for the first time (in *'Mea culpa' suivi de 'La Vie et l'œuvre de Semmelweis'*), four years after *Voyage*, and a few months after *Mort*, published in May 1936.[24] Meizoz's use of hyphens ('médecin-qui-écrit') implies that these words are inseparably and automatically associated. Céline remains a composite figure of a doctor-who-writes, rather than purely a writer or purely a doctor.

When *Voyage* was published, Céline was only at the start of the construction of his persona. In the readings under analysis in this chapter, Simon, Brasseur, Podalydès and Luchini intone the voice(s) of the text according to their own historical and cultural situation. When they read the text (in the 1950s for Simon and Brasseur, the 1990s for Luchini, the 2000s for Podalydès), *Voyage* is seen through the prism of the now well-established persona of the author. *Voyage* is retrospectively seen as the appearance of the persona, rather than as the text upon which the persona was constructed.

The persona of Céline was especially important with regard to the motivation behind Simon's, Arletty's and Brasseur's 1955 recordings, because it had by this point become problematic. Paul Chambrillon initiated and produced the recordings that in 2000 would be re-edited as part of the *Anthologie Céline*. In the booklet of the *Anthologie Céline*, Chambrillon explains that the idea of famous actors recording excerpts of Céline's texts was partly motivated by the idea that 'Céline *écouté* gagnerait de nouveaux lecteurs et qu'un disque contribuerait à miner le silence occultant une œuvre importante'.[25] These first recordings date from 1955, and by this point in time Céline had become an extremely controversial figure. The posture 'Céline' was no longer simply that of the doctor-who-writes, but also that of the anti-Semite who had overtly expressed his hatred for Jews in pamphlets and had momentarily been deprived of his citizenship rights because of his collaboration during the Second World War.[26] The

---

[24] Meizoz outlines the chronology of the different editions of *Semmelweis*, highlighting the 'statut éditorial étrange de cet ouvrage', which has been published in six different editions. Meizoz, 'Posture et biographie' (para. 9-16 of 37).

[25] Paul Chambrillon, 'Histoire des enregistrements', *Anthologie Céline 1894-1961*, 2 CDs, ed. by Paul Chambrillon (Frémeaux & Associés, 2000), CD booklet, pp. 7-19 (p. 10). Hereafter cited as Chambrillon, pp. 7-19. Chambrillon only talks about Arletty and Simon, but does not mention Pierre Brasseur.

[26] Céline's first pamphlet is in fact Mea Culpa, published in 1936. This pamphlet is however different from the following ones, because it is shorter and anti-Communist, but not openly anti-Semitic. Céline was deprived of his citizenship rights in 1950 and condemned to one year in prison (which he had by then already served in Denmark, where he had been exiled), a fine of 50,000 francs and the seizure of half of his possessions. Céline was granted amnesty in 1951, and returned to France. For a biography of Céline, see for instance Philippe Alméras, *Céline: entre haines et passions* (Paris: Robert Laffont, 1994), or in English, Nicholas Hewitt, *The Life of Céline: A Critical Biography* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999).

'œuvre importante' to which Chambrillon refers is, of course, the novels and not the pamphlets, and with these 1955 recordings there is an attempt to make a clear distinction between Céline the writer of fiction (the doctor-who-writes) and Céline the author of pamphlets. What has happened with Céline's notoriety is that the fictional voice (the narrative voice) has been silenced, in the sense that it is no longer read, because of the other ideological and now predominant aspect of Céline's voice. The recordings are motivated by a desire to rehabilitate the narrative voice (hence 'une œuvre importante' rather than, for instance, an important author). In order to break the silence occulting the œuvre, it is an other's voice (Simon's, Arletty's, Brasseur's) that has to take over the narrative voice. If Céline's voice is heard through an intermediary voice, it can perhaps be recovered from the silence imposed by the effects of the author's biography, and gain new readers. In a sense, the author has to die for the reader to be born.

While Simon, Arletty and Brasseur recording excerpts from Céline's texts was then partly motivated by a desire to rehabilitate Céline in 1955, the situation is different with regard to Luchini's and Podalydès's engagements with *Voyage*. When Luchini started performing excerpts from *Voyage* in 1986, and Podalydès's audio-book was published in 2005, Céline had arguably already been rehabilitated as a major twentieth-century French writer.[27] However, Céline still is, and probably always will be, a controversial author, the reception of whose fictional œuvre is closely tied with his biography and his pamphlets.[28] While Podalydès has not commented on the subject, Luchini has regularly expressed the idea that Céline's œuvre can, and arguably must be distinguished from the biography of the author. In this regard, Luchini's position can be likened to the tendency in Célinian studies to separate aesthetics from ideology.[29]

---

[27] That Céline was rehabilitated is perhaps most obviously shown by the publication of his complete works (apart from the pamphlets) in the Pléiade edition (1974 onwards), and also by the extensive academic attention Céline's works has received. In fact, in a 1975 interview about challenging language in literature, Barthes says that 'il y a eu la tentative de Céline [de rejoindre la langue parlée], c'est pour cela qu'en dépit de ses opinions politiques il garde une très grande importance; je le vois au niveau des étudiants, qui souvent veulent faire des thèses sur son œuvre'. Barthes, 'Roland Barthes met le langage en question', in *Œuvres complètes*, III, pp. 366-369 (p. 368).

[28] This has been made particularly obvious recently by the decision not to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of Céline's death. Jean-Pierre Martin, in his book *Contre Céline*, argues (against Kristeva for instance) that the pamphlets should not be sidelined as 'madness' in Céline's works, but that Céline's anti-Semitism is constant and intentional. Martin however considers *Voyage* the sole exception. See Jean-Pierre Martin, *Contre Céline, ou: D'une gêne persistante à l'égard de la fascination exercée par Louis Destouches sur papier bible; avec quelques propositions de baccalauréat d'une fin de millénaire; roman* (Paris: José Corti, 1997).

[29] For a review of Célinian studies, see Introduction, pp. 13-18.

In a 2001 TV interview with Thierry Ardisson to promote the play *L'Arrivée à New York*, Luchini insists he does not want to be Céline's advocate, as what matters to him is Céline's literary output, while 'l'individu [lui] importe peu'.[30] In fact, Luchini is only interested in *Voyage* and *Mort*, which were both published before the first pamphlet *Mea Culpa*, and more importantly before the first anti-Semitic pamphlet, *Bagatelles pour un massacre* (1937), as the actor explains in a 2009 interview with *L'Express*: 'on le sait tous, après *Mort à crédit*, il y a des problèmes. C'est des pamphlets, c'est la folie, c'est la démence. Et après il y a *Nord*, qui est quand même moins fort... Et alors? Il reste le *Voyage*'.[31] In this 2009 interview, Luchini describes his own experience as reader of Céline and reiterates his argument that Céline's early literary output can be considered independently from the author's 'terrifying' biography: 'alors, voilà, je découvre [sa] vie et je suis terrorisé. Et puis, on lit. Tout simplement'.[32]

With regard to *Voyage*, the idea that one should 'simply read' reassesses the importance of Bardamu's voice over that of Céline, which has become muddled with the author's biography. As I have pointed out, Luchini's engagement with *Voyage* (and, to a lesser extent, *Mort*) was extensive. While performing Céline the actor was also regularly a guest on French TV shows, on which occasions he talked about Céline at length and had a tendency to recite passages from the text. Given his popularity and his presence in the media, Luchini can then be seen as having in fact contributed to what Chambrillon aimed to do with the 1955 recordings. An actor who is an obsessive reader of Céline, he has been an intermediary voice between Céline and contemporary readers. Like the 1955 recordings, Luchini's obsessive engagement with Céline's first two novels has ultimately contributed to a revisionist viewpoint, in which the voices of Céline's narrators Bardamu and Ferdinand are now (once again) separate from the voice of their author. What I identified at the beginning of this section as the blurring of the boundaries between Céline and Bardamu in the recordings is then, in fact, due to the effort to distinguish between Céline's post-1937 persona (the anti-Semite, the

---

[30] Ardisson & Lumières, 'Fabrice Luchini et son spectacle sur Louis-Ferdinand Céline', *Tout le monde en parle* <http://www.ina.fr/ardisson/tout-le-monde-en-parle/video/I08197141/ fabrice-luchini-et-son-spectacle-sur-louis-ferdinand-celine.fr.html> [accessed 19/10/2010] [my transcription]. Hereafter cited as Ardisson & Lumières, 'Fabrice Luchini et son spectacle sur Louis-Ferdinand Céline'.
[31] François Busnel, 'Fabrice Luchini: "Un acteur, c'est celui qui déchiffre les cicatrices"', *L'Express* [online], 22/12/2009 <http://www.lexpress.fr/culture/scene/ fabrice-luchini-un-acteur-c-est-celui-qui-dechiffre-les-cicatrices_837805.html?p=3> [accessed 14/10/2010]. Hereafter cited as Busnel, 'Fabrice Luchini: "Un acteur, c'est celui qui déchiffre les cicatrices"'.
[32] Busnel, 'Fabrice Luchini: "Un acteur, c'est celui qui déchiffre les cicatrices"'.

collaborationist) and Céline's pre-1937 literary ouput, and consequently, the effort to equate, with regard to *Voyage*, Céline and Bardamu.

Besides rehabilitating Céline as a fictional voice, the idea of actors recording texts by Céline also originates in the perception that these novels are '[faits] pour la haute voix', as argued by Paul Chambrillon.[33] Céline claims to be the first one to have transposed the emotion of spoken language into literary/written language. This is a constant claim for instance in *Entretiens avec le Professeur Y* (1955). In this text, Céline describes the process of reading his texts by referring to his 'style' as a 'petite musique' produced by a voice which forces its way into the reader's head against his or her will, who cannot stop hearing it. The first person speaking in the following dialogue is Céline (as character in *Entretiens avec le Professeur Y*) and the second one is the (fictional) interviewer:

> – Le lecteur d'un livre émotif... une de mes œuvres!... en style émotif!...
> – Alors?
> – Il est d'abord incommodé un peu…
> – Ah?... qui?...
> – Le lecteur qui me lit! il lui semble, il en jurerait, que quelqu'un lui lit dans la tête!... dans sa propre tête!...
> – Bigre! bougre!
> – Parfaitement!... dans sa propre tête! pas de bigre! pas de bougre!... sans lui demander la permission! […] Pas simplement à son oreille!... non!... dans l'intimité de ses nerfs! en plein dans son système nerveux! dans sa propre tête! […] que quelqu'un lui joue comme il veut sur la harpe de ses propres nerfs![34]

According to Céline, reading 'him' ('le lecteur qui me lit') is at first uncomfortable (the reader is 'incommodé un peu'). The reader, as far as he or she knows, is reading a book, but feels like the text is being read to him or her by a voice, which Céline does not describe as his but as an anonymous voice ('quelqu'un lui lit dans la tête'). This voice is not speaking but reading in the reader's head, which cancels the pretence of spontaneous orality. This voice invades the reader's head, possibly against his or her will ('sans lui demander la permission'), and as such it invades the reader's privacy. The act of reading is supposed to be intimate, as the reader is 'alone', immersed in the text, and willing, as the reader chooses to continue reading. Here however, the act of reading is sinisterly described as an invasion by a strange voice, which cannot be stopped.

---

[33] Chambrillon, pp. 7-19 (p. 8). The orality of Céline's work has been extensively analysed. See Introduction, pp. 13-14.
[34] Céline, *Entretiens avec le Professeur Y* (Paris: Gallimard, 1955), pp. 99-100. Hereafter cited as Céline, *Entretiens avec le Professeur Y*.

This notion of reading is a type of ventriloquial relationship. The reader is not being spoken through, but an other's voice is still being imposed on him or her. While the reader expects to actualise the vocality of the text with his or her own voice and to hear it internally, the ventriloquial voice 'springing' from the text substitutes the reader's voice, which makes him or her feel uncomfortable, invaded and possibly violated. The reader's internal reading voice is silenced by an external (but technically silent, as the reader hears it in his or her head) voice, which is felt by the reader as being produced by the text. The vocality of the text, which should be its capacity for voice, is here in a sense ventriloquial, as it is the imposing of a voice the reader does not control.

This idea of the ventriloquial voice of the text echoes my analysis of Bardamu's narrative voice as a ventriloquial voice, constantly needing the attention of the reader (the voice of the text needs to be 'activated', and it needs a head to invade), carefully constructed rather than spontaneous (the voice reads, it does not speak), and not giving the reader room for interpretation in its careful reconstruction of 'reality', 'facts', and people into characters. If 'reading Céline' implies being ventriloquised into one's own head, how does this relation of power between text and reader transpose into the recordings? If the ventriloquial reading voice does not allow the 'birth of the reader', do recordings of the texts allow it? Do the actors bring a new relationship between the text and the reader/listener, between Bardamu's voice and the reader/listener?

Bénard points out that Céline's statements about his texts being read out loud are at first sight contradictory.[35] In the sixth manuscript of *Entretiens avec le Professeur Y*, the writer claims that if his novels are read out loud (whether by or to someone), 'ils y perdent toute leur magie! ils sont écrits pour être lus très tranquillement par des personnes dans leurs fauteuils… la magie opère!'[36] This would seem logical, given that it is also in *Entretiens avec le Professeur Y* that Céline talks about the ventriloquial reading voice. If the text is read out loud, the reader imposes his or her own voice onto the text. The magic to which Céline refers might well be the invasion of the reader's head by the ventriloquial voice of the text. Céline's stance against his texts being read out loud is

---

[35] Bénard, 'Céline transposé', 5-24 (p. 18).

[36] Céline, 'Notes et variantes', in *Romans*, 4 vols, ed. by Henri Godard (Paris: Gallimard Pléiade, 1993), IV, pp. 1354-1386 (p. 1381). This quotation is from the sixth manuscript of *Entretiens avec le Professeur Y* (there are nine in total), and is an addition to the passage on the reader hearing a voice 'dans sa propre tête' in the definitive 1955 edition. This passage can be found in Céline, *Entretiens avec le Professeur Y*, pp. 99-100; and Céline, 'Entretiens avec le Professeur Y', in *Romans*, IV, pp. 489-561 (p. 545).

however contradicted by his praise of Arletty's and Simon's recordings,[37] and his involvement in the process.[38] Bénard argues that there might, in fact, not be a contradiction: 'le texte célinien ne se prête qu'à l'acteur chevronné qui, sensible à son "souffle", sera prêt à transposer sur scène la lecture intime'.[39] According to this analysis, performing Céline is not an easy task, and not available to every reader, but something that can only successfully be carried out by experienced actors.[40] Indeed, the apparent orality of Céline's texts is in fact highly codified. The text is not written as one speaks, and to read it out loud one must first work on it and understand its 'souffle'.

Céline praises Arletty's and Simon's recordings, and he insists that he is not capable of satisfactorily reading his own texts out loud. He says he is no actor, and that his attempts would be a disaster: 'à leur place je me ferais lyncher... tout à fait d'autres aptitudes'. He is the 'ouvrier' that makes the texts, and they are the actors capable of bringing them to voice.[41] Listening to 'Céline vous parle', it can indeed be assumed that, had Céline read his own texts, the result would be difficult to listen to.[42] The writer stutters a lot, and his voice is very high-pitched and quavering. Thus, there is a clear distinction between Céline's voice and 'his' textual voice. Perhaps paradoxically, Céline's 'emotive' textual voice is better vocalised by an other's voice. Moreover, if one follows Céline's description of the reading process in *Entretiens avec le Professeur Y*, the writer reading his own texts would constitute a problematic layering, because he would not be duped by the ventriloquial voice inserted within the text.

---

[37] In 'Voyage au bout de la parole' Jean Guénot reproduces a letter Céline sent him, in which the author writes about how he found Simon's and Arletty's recordings 'admirables'. Jean Guénot, 'Voyage au bout de la parole', in *Les Cahiers de l'Herne: L.-F. Céline*, ed. by Dominique de Roux and others (Paris: L'Herne, 2007), pp. 300-309 (p. 302). Hereafter cited as Guénot, pp. 300-309.

[38] In the booklet of the *Anthologie Céline* Chambrillon tells how Céline was involved in the project of the 1955 recordings throughout the process. He was present when Simon and Arletty recorded the excerpts, and answered the actors' questions. In the booklet there are pictures of Céline during one of the recordings (unspecified) and pictures of the writers with Simon and/or Arletty. In fact, a picture of the three is the cover for the CD. This involvement of the author in the adaptative process in order to get the 'correct' reading of the 'original' text echoes Carelman's approach to the illustration of *Zazie*. See Part II, Chapter 2, pp. 125-127.

[39] Bénard, 'Céline transposé', 5-24 (pp. 18-19).

[40] Céline is, of course, not the first writer to require trained and in-tune readers, as this was already the case for instance with Mallarmé, and Baudelaire post-trial. Both poets 'were concerned with finding a suitable reader for their poetic texts' and were not concerned with naïve readers 'with no tools at their disposal to grasp the subtleties of the text'. Helen Abbott, *Between Baudelaire and Mallarmé: Voice, Conversation and Music* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), p. 55. The case of Céline is however different: while only a trained and in-tune reader can read Céline's texts out loud (perform them), the idea of the ventriloquial voice invading the reader's head when reading internally seems to, in fact, favour a naïve reader, who can be duped by the voice of the text.

[41] Guénot, pp. 300-309 (p. 302).

[42] Louis-Ferdinand Céline, 'Céline vous parle', *Anthologie Céline 1894-1961*, 2 CDs, CD 1, ed. by Paul Chambrillon (Frémeaux & Associés, 2000).

The choice of two actors with extremely distinctive voices, Simon and Arletty, implies that what I have characterised as vocal uniqueness is a determining factor for an actor to be able to perform Céline, while gender is not. Indeed, Céline praised Arletty's vocalisation of *Mort*'s narrator Ferdinand. It is not the gender of the voice that matters but its uniqueness, and in the case of Arletty this means her 'gouaille' and her strong Parisian accent, some 'working-class' qualities which fit with the text. This would imply that the qualities of a voice needed to read Céline should include its emotional capacity, as well as its popularity (which would bring success and new readers).

After this examination of how and by whom Céline's voice can be performed, the focus of my analysis can now return to Bardamu's voice rather than that of the author. If vocal uniqueness is a determining factor to be able to perform Céline, what does this imply for Podalydès's lack of vocal individuality and potential vocal transferability? What happens not to Céline's, but to Bardamu's voice when an actor performs it? What does Bardamu gain and/or lose in the transposition from a textual to a performance voice? Before I start answering these questions, I shall first focus on Podalydès's relationship with voice (his and others') as he describes it in his book *Voix off*. The case of Podalydès has mostly been left out in this analysis of the relationship between Céline, Bardamu and voice, because the actor has not commented on Céline as posture. However Podalydès's reflection on voice and acting as a whole in *Voix off* offers new perspectives for my analysis of voice in the recordings.

An actor's relationship with his and others' voices

Denis Podalydès, who is also a director and a script-writer, has been a member of the Comédie-Française since 2000. Podalydès started recording audio-books in 2002. His first was of Plato's *Apologie de Socrate*, and he has since recorded readings (sometimes with other actors) of texts by Rousseau, Diderot, Baudelaire, Proust and Agatha Christie among others. When asked to write a self-portrait, the actor first struggled to find an approach, and finally opted for an 'autoportrait en voix', entitled *Voix off* (2008).[43] *Voix off* is a fictionalised account of Podalydès's relationship not only with his own voice but also with the voices of others, such as family members, friends and fellow actors. The text is divided into sections that are introduced by headings on the model of 'voix

---

[43] Denis Podalydès, *Voix off* (Paris: Mercure de France, 2008). Hereafter cited as *VO* with page number in brackets within the body of the text.

de…', for instance 'Voix de mes frères', or 'Voix de Charles Denner' (*VO*, p. 75). There are no obvious links or transitions between the sections. The text is an attempt at self-theorisation, as Podalydès endeavours to recount and analyse the process of the construction of his voice as actor.[44] Podalydès's reflection on voice and self-theorisation offers a new perspective on questions I have raised in this research, such as the construction of one's voice in dialogue with others', issues of voice and control and voice and power.

The relationship with his voice as described by Podalydès in *Voix off* is complex. The actor explains that he used to be unhappy with his voice and his vocal style, which he deemed incompatible with the theatre career he wished to pursue. This started as a child. He tells of a scene when, aged eleven, he was playing the part of the witch in *Blanche-Neige*.[45] With regard to his use of voice in this part, he describes his acting style as one in which 'je force', which conveys both the idea of straining his voice, and of overacting. To play the part of the witch, he alters his voice ('extrême nasalisation') and uses a dramatically exaggerated vocal style, rolling the 'r' and lengthening syllables and words (*VO*, p. 42).

This scene could be seen merely as anecdotal, however Podalydès uses this story to reflect on his tendency 'des années durant' to strain his voice and to overact because, as he explains, 'il ne me vient pas à l'esprit que je puisse faire du théâtre avec ma pauvre voix flûtée d'enfant sage, timide, et quelquefois polisson'. For years (he does not specify until when exactly), he feels that 'pour obtenir l'effet, je n'ai d'autres possibilités que de placer ma voix dans le masque'. The aim of this 'vocal mask' is to turn his voice into what he considers an actor's voice should be: 'il me semble, si je m'en réfère aux voix d'acteur qui me sont familières, qu'il doit en être ainsi, si je veux être moi-même acteur' (*VO*, p. 42). Podalydès does not specify who these actors are, however his description of an exaggerated vocal style in the *Blanche-Neige* anecdote shows that he, then and for years after that, tries to achieve what can be characterised as a distinctive or characteristic timbre and vocal style. Recalling Ubersfeld's definition, timbre contributes to making the actor's performance individual and unforgettable.[46] In this case however, Podalydès refers to 'voix d'acteur' in the plural, which seems to indicates that this type of acting was a convention of actor training that did not in fact denote individuality.

---

[44] This attempt at self-theorisation can be likened to Barthes's *Roland Barthes par Barthes* (1975).
[45] Podalydès does not specify whether this was for a school play, or with his brothers, or on his own.
[46] Ubersfeld, p. 176.

The 'theatre voice' to which Podalydès aspired in his childhood and adolescence was, then, a vocal mask not only for him but also for the actors whose voices he tried to reproduce. It is a vocal style that is forced and not individual, and because of it Podalydès would later be told he lacked sincerity in his acting (*VO*, p. 42).

The account of Podalydès's attempt to acquire a 'theatre voice' shows that his relationship with his voice was formed in comparison with other voices, representing an ideal to which he aspired. In *Voix off*, Podalydès often refers to his voice in negative terms. For instance, he imagines the family of Pierre Bourdieu (Podalydès is friends with the son, Emmanuel) as 'une version double de la [sienne]', and in his description his own 'voix de clown bavard fait une trouée nasillarde' in the 'douce et acceuillante' vocal atmosphere of the Bourdieu family (*VO*, p. 89). Podalydès's undermining of his voice as disrupting ('trouée') the soft and pleasant voices of the Bourdieu family is possibly a self-deprecating conceit for the purpose of the book. Moreover, that Podalydès used to perceive his voice as a weakness rather than a strength partly explains why he has always been so interested in voice, and so aware of its importance with regard to acting.

As can be seen from the *Blanche-Neige* anecdote, Podalydès had a tendency to try to alter his voice to imitate those of others, as part of his envy or desire to conform. As a young adult, when he was preparing for the competitive examination of the *classe libre* at the Cours Florent, Podalydès became obsessed with the actor Jean-Luc Boutté, who at the time was playing the part of Pyrrhus in *Andromaque*.[47] The first time Podalydès saw Boutté act, Boutté immediately became his favourite actor due to 'la simple mélancolie de son beau timbre' (*VO*, p. 100), as Podalydès explains in the section 'Voix de Jean-Luc Boutté'. Podalydès then tried to copy Boutté's voice: 'son visage me reste vague. Sa voix, je l'ai souveraine au cœur, je la veux, je la garde, je tâche de l'extraire de la mienne, je n'y arrive pas, je recommence' (*VO*, p. 100). An obsession with voice is obvious here: while Podalydès only has a vague memory of Boutté's face, he remembers his voice perfectly, and has with it a relation of desire ('je la veux') and appropriation ('je la garde'). Podalydès tries to reproduce Boutté's voice through his own, and though he fails he does not give up ('je recommence'). Podalydès's use of the expression 'l'extraire de la mienne' implies a hope that his voice has the capacity to modulate, a faith in a ventriloquial capacity of the voice. Podalydès does not clearly state why he so wants to

---

[47] Podalydès does not specify a date, but this can be dated as 1982, which is when Boutté played in Patrice Kerbrat's staging of *Andromaque*. This would put Podalydès at aged nineteen.

reproduce Boutté's voice, but from his account of his intense admiration for Boutté, it seems that he wishes Boutté's voice were his, or rather that Boutté's voice could shape his own. The imitation of Boutté's voice is, then, perhaps a learning process for Podalydès, as internalising Boutté's voice could help him improve his acting by learning from what he considers to be the best.

In the section 'Voix de Jean-Luc Boutté', Podalydès goes from his discovery of Jean-Luc Boutté in 1982 to Boutté's performance in Lermontov's *Le Bal masqué* in 1992.[48] The process of appropriation of Boutté's voice described above focuses in particular on Boutté's final line in *Le Bal masqué*, 'je te l'avais bien dit tu es cruel' (a line which is itself repeated a number of times by Boutté on stage):[49]

> Je garde la petite phrase, je la répète, la ressasse, la redis à qui veut l'entendre – mots, intonation, rythme – comme on ramasse un minuscule caillou du lieu enchanteur que l'on vient de visiter, un morceau du décor qu'on dérobe à la sauvette. (*VO*, p. 101)

Podalydès's attempt at appropriating Boutté's voice goes through the process of imitation of the actor's voice as a whole (its 'mots, intonation, rythme') and obsessive repetition (as signalled by the use of the verbs 'répéter', 'redire', even 'ressasser').[50] Podalydès characterises his relationship with Boutté's voice as similar to a souvenir from a 'lieu enchanteur', but he also gives the impression that he has hastily stolen part of this voice ('un morceau du décor qu'on dérobe à la sauvette'). This idea of stealing part of a voice echoes the deception aspect of ventriloquism and the dynamic of appropriation and expropriation in the construction of voice which I have been analysing in the present study. However in this case there is no sense of violence or expropriation of Boutté's voice. The appropriation of Boutté's voice is motivated by intense admiration and even 'vénération' for the actor (*VO*, p. 101) with no desire to use it for deception (for instance, Podalydès does not put on Boutté's voice to deceive others). The appropriation of another's voice in this case is for intimate reasons, and with no desire to harm the other in the process.

Podalydès takes the idea of stealing a voice one stage further with his appropriation of Antoine Vitez's voice when he is a student at the Conservatoire national supérieur d'art dramatique:

---

[48] Again, Podalydès does not specify a date in the text.
[49] Podalydès does not say whether between 1982 and 1992 he kept trying to reproduce Boutté's voice, or whether he stopped in 1982 and started again in 1992.
[50] Following my analysis of repetition and recitation, Podalydès's obsessive repetition is a form of recitation. Indeed, it implies memory, automatism and performance, as he attempts to appropriate and memorise the sentence, and repeats it 'à qui veut l'entendre'. See Part II, Chapter 2, pp. 168-169.

> Je vole tout: idées, images, mots, blagues, attitudes, style, rhétorique, accents, intonations, timbre. […] J'imite Vitez, afin d'être Vitez. Je ne cache pas mes sources, mais les élèves me prêtent naturellement personnalité et méthode. Ils n'imaginent pas que l'emprunt soit total. Dans mon élan, je perds la conscience de ma ruse, improvise dans le personnage, me sens tout à fait à ma place dans la voix de Vitez. (*VO*, p. 105)

While it is possible that Podalydès in fact failed in his ventriloquising of Vitez and did not fool the other students, in his account of the episode he implies that he was successful. The borrowing, not being acknowledged, thus becomes an act of deception, as 'je ne cache pas mes sources' turns into a 'ruse'. Here, Podalydès is the only one aware of the ventriloquial act. Podalydès's desire to be Vitez goes to such an extreme that he eventually feels more at ease in Vitez's voice than his own, forgetting his masquerade, and taking liberties with the 'character' of Vitez. Podalydès, then, appears as a ventriloquist caught at his own game. His power is in his vocal duplicity (which, given his skill at reproducing others' voices, can turn into multiplicity), or his ventriloquial capacity.

While Podalydès feels at ease in Vitez's voice and cherishes Boutté's, he is disappointed with his own voice, the voice he produces when he is not appropriating another. In the following quotation, Podalydès recalls that the first time he listened to his first audio-book *L'Apologie de Socrate* (2002), he felt betrayed by his own voice:

> Ma voix n'est pas telle que je l'entends, telle que je la veux, telle que je la profère, de l'intérieur de la tête, de la gorge, de la bouche. Trahison. Elle ne parle pas comme les autres, n'édifie ni ne figure aucun monde, aucun paysage. Me faudra-t-il attendre, vieillir un peu, connaître quelques épreuves? Que la voix s'aggrave, que le rythme se précise, que la langue se délie? Attendre que les années passent, que ma propre voix me devienne étrangère, celle d'un autre? (*VO*, p. 13)

Podalydès, in a manifestation of Derrida's 's'entendre parler', experiences the difference between his voice as he hears it in his head, as he wants it, and as others hear it (on the recording).[51] That his voice 'is not as he hears it' might seem a commonplace observation and it is perhaps surprising that Podalydès expected otherwise. This disappointment leads him to describe his voice as a traitor to himself. He does not blame his voice because it is too weak or without grain for instance. The use of the word 'trahison' implies that the voice refuses to give him the narrative power that he craves and that he hears in the voices of other actors. By accusing his own voice of betraying him rather than blaming himself for his disappointment, the actor implies that his voice is independent of his own self. Podalydès is capable of modulating his voice

---

[51] See Derrida, *La Voix et le phénomène*, pp. 87-88.

into that of another, however it seems that there is nothing he can do to alter his 'natural' voice. While others' voices have become his thanks to his ventriloquial capacity, his own voice eludes him.

This same notion of voice-as-traitor is found in another context in *Voix off*, in Podalydès's description of Jacques Weber's 'vocal breakdown' at some point in the run of Weber's hugely successful stage performance as Cyrano de Bergerac (1983).[52] Jacques Weber is an actor who possesses what I have qualified as vocal uniqueness. Podalydès typically describes Weber's voice as 'la voix de l'Excellence', 'la voix de stentor', or even as being 'comme des morceaux de pierre roulant et gisant au milieu d'un paysage de Bretagne, vaste, accidenté, coutumier des vents et tempêtes' (*VO*, p. 162; p. 166; p. 167). When he was playing the part of Cyrano however, Weber's voice turned from weapon to enemy:

> Tout le temps de la représentation, tu [Weber] t'interroges. Pour la première fois de ta vie d'acteur, ta voix, cet organe puissant dont résonne et tremble chaque soir l'immense théâtre Mogador, de l'orchestre aux galeries, ta voix te semble séparée de toi, faite d'autre chose que de toi; l'arme fidèle ne serait-elle qu'un instrument délicat et faible ou, pire, une force sournoise et rétive, capable de – décidée à – te trahir au pire moment? Tu ne sais pas. (*VO*, p. 163)

> Comment pouvais-tu savoir que la détestation, pire, la malédiction viendrait, non pas des critiques, pas du public, non, de l'intérieur de toi, du dedans de la bouche et de la gorge, de la voix elle-même, serait la voix elle-même, et préférerait, au milieu du triomphe et de la lumière, rebrousser chemin, te laisser en rade, gueule ouverte, et fouiner dans son gouffre, sa noirceur taciturne? (*VO*, p. 166)

While Podalydès to a certain extent expects to be disappointed with his voice, Weber relies on his, which he can project to fill space ('cet organe puissant dont résonne et tremble chaque soir l'immense théâtre') and which is a consistent weapon for the actor ('l'arme fidèle', 'chaque soir'). Weber's vocal power as an actor does not lie in its multiplicity (its ventriloquial capacity), but in its uniqueness (its strength, and its grain). The grain of a voice is the traces of the body in the voice, and Weber's vocal breakdown is significantly described as a kind of out-of-body experience ('ta voix te semble séparée de toi').

In the above quotations, there is a certain personification of the voice: it is 'décidée à', it 'préférerait', it 'laisse [Weber] en rade'. Podalydès writes that 'la détestation

---

[52] Weber told Podalydès of the breakdown over twenty years after it happened, when the two were shooting Emmanuel Bourdieu's film *Intrusions* (2008) together: '[Weber] me [Podalydès] raconte [...] – je l'enregistre – la dépression qui, au milieu des représentations triomphales de *Cyrano de Bergerac*, retourne sa voix comme un gant' (*VO*, p. 162). Podalydès's account in the text however does not seem to be a transcription of Weber's description (Weber is referred to in the third person, the style is definitely not spoken, and Podalydès adds reflections and his interpretation).

[vient] [...] de la voix elle-même', while it would have seemed more logical to write 'de ta propre voix'. Voice is attributed agency as it is described as independent from the person to whom one would assume it belongs. Because of this autonomy of the voice from his body, the actor loses his vocal control, and his vocal power. The actor wonders whether the voice is weak and feable, or even a potential enemy, perhaps capable of turning against and betraying him. If the voice is a traitor, its power, then, lies in choosing whether to come out of the body or not. In this section 'Voix de Jacques Weber', Podalydès shows, then, that relying on the voice as a weapon also implies accepting the risk of it turning against the body that produces it, and perhaps destroying identity.

Podalydès account of this vocal breakdown by Weber is overall rather dramatic. He focuses on the breakdown for five pages, while he could have opted for a more balanced account of Weber's voice throughout his career. This obsessive attention on the risks of the voice shows that Podalydès is fascinated by, but also wary of, voice. However when Podalydès describes his own recording of Proust's *Albertine disparue* (audio-book published in 2006, four years after the 'betrayal' of *L'Apologie de Socrate* and three years after the recording of *Voyage*)[53] the actor seems to be finally satisfied with his voice, and confident that it now has narrative power:

> Je fais vivre des personnages, des pensées, des sentiments de papier, j'avance dans un récit, une forêt dans laquelle je taille ma route à coups d'accent, d'inflexions, de vitesses […], de ralentissements […] de changements de registres, de variations sonores. Mais de ma voix […] lisant les mots d'un autre, ceux d'un mort lointain, dont la chair est anéantie, mais dont le style, la beauté de ce style, fait surgir un monde d'échos, de correspondances et de voix vivantes par lesquelles je passe, parlant à mon tour, entrant dans ces voix […], je sais que je parle, je sais que c'est de moi qu'il s'agit, non pas dans le texte, bien sûr, mais dans la diction de ces pages. […] Alors d'autres voix encore se font entendre, dans la mienne. (*VO*, pp. 14-15)

After feeling betrayed by his voice on the recording of *L'Apologie de Socrate* (2002), Podalydès wondered whether age would change his voice for the better. *Albertine disparue* is recorded only four years after *L'Apologie de Socrate*, and Podalydès's voice is unlikely to have drastically changed in such a short amount of time.[54] *Albertine disparue* is Podalydès's sixth audio-book, and it can be assumed that it is with practice that his

---

[53] Podalydès's recording of *Albertine disparue*, which is the sixth volume of *À la recherche du temps perdu*, was published by Thélème (2006) and is part of the recording of the entirety of *À la recherche du temps perdu* (Thélème, 2006) read by André Dussollier, Lambert Wilson, Robin Renucci, Michael Lonsdale and Guillaume Galienne.

[54] Indeed, listening to the recordings, one cannot hear a significant difference in the voice.

reading improved, or simply that with habit, Podalydès got used to hearing how his own voice sounded in recordings. As the description of the 'successful' reading of *Albertine disparue* (*VO*, pp. 13-15) is straight after the 'betrayal' of *L'Apologie de Socrate* (*VO*, p. 13), without mention of the audio-books in between, this dramatic change may be part of the fictionalisation of Podalydès's account of his relationship with his voice.

Of particular significance for the present study however is the way the actor describes his allegedly newly-acquired narrative power. Podalydès 'fait vivre' Proust's characters by intoning their textual voices, and in this way he actualises the vocality of the text (its quality for voice) with his own voice. The actor's voice enters and goes through the textual voices he is reading ('je passe, parlant à mon tour, entrant dans ces voix') and his voice, in turn, echoes others ('alors d'autres voix encore se font entendre, dans la mienne'). These voices are not within the text Podalydès is reading, but 'dans la diction de ces pages', within Podalydès's use of his voice. This quotation ends the section that opens *Voix off*, and as such it serves as prologue for the book and its collection of the 'voix de...' that have made and become part of the actor's voice, and that now 'se font entendre' in Podalydès's voice. Being made up of voices of others', his voice can become another's because it can 'faire vivre' others.

Podalydès's recording of *Voyage* was published by Frémeaux three years before *Albertine disparue* was published by Thélème. In *Voix off* the actor does not comment on the recording of *Voyage*. In the interviews he gave when the audio-book was published however he seemed satisfied with his work and confident of his approach towards the text, as the following quotations suggest:

> Ce que fait Fabrice Luchini est prodigieux, mais mon travail est d'une autre nature […]. Il me faut trouver le sens de la vague et nuancer les couleurs vocales pour caractériser les personnages. Ce qui implique de reconnaître la phrase célinienne, comme on repère un parcours: elle est truffée de surprises, si on ne les anticipe pas, la sortie de route est assurée.[55]

> Il ne faut pas trop interpréter le texte, mais plutôt l'investir sans passer par l'incarnation, en laissant une certaine distance.[56]

Podalydès clearly differentiates his work from Luchini's in the first quotation. Of course, given that Podalydès recorded an audio-book and Luchini performed excerpts

---

[55] Alexandre Demidoff, 'Une lecture intégrale du *Voyage au bout de la nuit*', *Le Bulletin Célinien*, 252 (2004), 17. (Note: this article is only one page long.) Hereafter cited as Demidoff, 17.

[56] This quotation comes from *Epok*, a now defunct magazine of La Fnac, which is not available online and is difficult to source in paper format. Frémeaux reproduced the quotation on its website, see <http://www.fremeaux.com/index.php?page=shop.product_details&category_id=69&flypage=shop.flypage&product_id=607&option=com_virtuemart> [accessed 14/01/2011].

from the text over eighteen years, their work is inevitably different in scope. In these quotations Podalydès shows that he is confident of his approach (as seen in his use of 'il ne faut pas') and that recording *Voyage* required thorough preparation in order to become intimate with the text.

Reviews of Podalydès's audio-book were positive, and reviewers and commentators have repeated Podalydès's idea of nuance, which implies subtlety, and of a certain distance from the text. Writer Daniel Pennac comments that Podalydès displays 'une science de la lecture, une lecture non intervenante', and adds: 'c'est magnifique. Sur une profondeur de 16 heures, c'est la lecture la plus extraordinaire'.[57] The notion of a 'science de la lecture' echoes the idea that the reading was preceded by thorough preparation, and was informed by a reflection on the use of voice in recorded reading. 'Une lecture non intervenante' would imply that Podalydès does not add an interpretation to the text and that he is a nonintrusive intermediary voice between the text and the listener. The alleged subtlety of Podalydès's reading is praised again for the way in which there is 'pas d'excès, pas d'ostentation dans cette lecture presque familière'.[58] The reviews do not praise the actor's unique voice or vocal style, but his subtle performance. From these comments, Podalydès's reading of *Voyage* seems to correspond with Scott's idea of a voice with great vocal technique and no grain as a transferable voice which delivers words rather than inhabits them.[59]

The 'science de la lecture' is revealed also in the aforementioned article published in *Le Bulletin Célinien*, in which Podalydès's work on *Voyage* is situated in relation to that of other actors who, before him, have read and performed Céline's texts. Simon is described as a 'révolté bougonnant', Arletty as 'gouailleuse', George Wilson (who recorded the entirety of *Rigodon*) as a 'stentor', and Luchini as '[aimant] enchanter en public les morceaux de bravoure [de *Voyage* et *Mort*]'.[60] These descriptions stand in direct contrast to Podalydès's subtle and nonintrusive reading. In order to understand the full implications of this comparison, I shall focus in detail on Simon's and Podalydès's readings of the beginning of *Voyage* in the next section. The nature of

---

[57] Interview with Vincent Josse, 'Esprit critique', *France Inter*, 27 June 2009 [my transcription].
[58] This quotation is from *Le Magazine littéraire* and is quoted in Frémeaux press dossier, see: <http://www.fremeaux.com/ index.php?page=shop.product_details&category_id=69&flypage=shop.flypage&product_id=607&option =com_virtuemart> [accessed 14/01/2011].
[59] Scott, p. 93. See Introduction, pp. 27-28.
[60] Demidoff, 17.

Podalydès's voice as supposedly transferable and nonintrusive will be subjected to much closer scrutiny.

'La Guerre': a comparison of readings by Michel Simon and Denis Podalydès

'La Guerre', an excerpt read by both Michel Simon and Denis Podalydès, starts at the very beginning of the novel, when Bardamu enrols in the army following a conversation with Arthur Ganate, and ends with Bardamu concluding that 'La guerre ne passait pas' after he has witnessed the deaths of the Colonel and the messenger.[61] The excerpt read by Simon is abridged, while Podalydès does not cut any sections of the text. As it is the very beginning of the novel, in this excerpt there is the greatest discrepancy between Bardamu as character and Bardamu as narrator because the contiguity has not yet been established. This discrepancy is seen in Bardamu's naivety, which stands in contrast to his cynicism as narrator. After the deaths of the Colonel and the messenger, Bardamu candidly imagines the end of the war and the glory this will entail for him and other soldiers, only to be harshly brought back to reality and to have his fantasy crushed (*CV*, pp. 29-30). He then announces the death of the Colonel to soldiers who do not care ('Et moi qui possédais la grande nouvelle [...] "C'est pas les colonels qui manquent!"') (*CV*, p. 31), and he swears: "'Je leur raconterai plus rien à l'avenir!" que je me disais, vexé. Je voyais bien que c'était pas la peine de leur rien raconter à ces gens-là, qu'un drame comme j'en avais vu un, c'était perdu tout simplement pour des dégueulasses pareils!' (*CV*, p. 32) Bardamu is here confronted with the powerlessness of his voice, in reaction to which his ventriloquial narrative voice is later constructed. It can be argued that this discrepancy between Bardamu as character and Bardamu as narrator provides Simon and Podalydès with a first interpretative choice, whether it is a completely conscious choice or not. Should they vocalise the text with the voice of Bardamu the narrator or Bardamu the character? Should Bardamu sound confident, or should he sound scared and angry; in control, or overwhelmed? Should Bardamu's lines of dialogue be said in a different way from his narration? Who, ultimately, is 'the' Bardamu that the actors should bring to voice?

---

[61] Though 'La Guerre' is the title of Simon's recording, I also use it for Podalydès's reading for the sake of clarity. The excerpt goes from page 15 to page 33 in the novel. In Podalydès's audio-book, it is on CD 1, tracks 2-7 (chapters 1 and 2). Chapters are not numbered in the novel, but they are in Podalydès's audio-book. The passages that are analysed in this chapter are on the CD provided with this study (Simon's recording is track 1, and Podalydès's tracks 2-3).

Responding to these questions, it is useful to recall Ubersfeld's concept of the involuntary in every actor's performance, because the difference between two actors' voices will inevitably shape two different Bardamus. Due to what can be characterised as Simon's vocal uniqueness, his Bardamu bears clearer character traits than Podalydès's. On the other hand, due to the relative whiteness of Podalydès's voice, Podalydès's Bardamu does not sound as if he comes from a particular social class, or a particular region, and he is neither particularly old nor particularly young.[62] A comparison of Simon's and Podalydès's vocalisations of 'La Guerre' must, of course, take into account the difference in type between the two recordings, a stand-alone track and an audio-book. Simon has to 'bring Bardamu to voice' in under twenty-two minutes, while Podalydès's Bardamu will be developed over sixteen hours.

The excerpt under analysis follows the deaths of the Colonel and the messenger, as Bardamu starts thinking:

> 'Ils sont peut-être tous morts à l'heure actuelle? que je me demandais. Puisqu'ils ne veulent rien comprendre à rien, c'est ça qui serait avantageux et pratique qu'ils soient tous tués très vite… Comme ça on en finirait tout de suite… On rentrerait chez soi… On repasserait peut-être place Clichy en triomphe…. Un ou deux seulement qui survivraient. Dans mon désir… Des gars gentils et bien balancés, derrière le général, tous les autres seraient morts comme le colon… Comme Barousse… comme Vanaille (une autre vache)... etc. On nous couvrirait de décorations, de fleurs, on passerait sous l'Arc de Triomphe. On entrerait au restaurant, on vous servirait sans payer, on payerait plus rien, jamais plus de la vie! On est les héros! qu'on dirait au moment de la note… Des défenseurs de la Patrie! Et ça suffirait !... On payerait avec des petits drapeaux français!... La caissière refuserait même l'argent des héros, et même elle vous en donnerait, avec des baisers quand on passerait devant sa caisse. Ça vaudrait la peine de vivre!' Je m'aperçus en fuyant que je saignais du bras, mais un peu seulement, pas une blessure suffisante du tout, une écorchure. C'était à recommencer. (*CV*, pp. 29-30)

In this excerpt Bardamu reports what he thought as a character. The fact that these thoughts are in inverted commas clearly establishes the difference between the narrative voice and the character's voice, even when it is most likely that these thoughts were formulated in an internal voice.[63] Bardamu's thoughts here are a fantasy, as shown by their positive nature, and the use of the conditional tense throughout. Bardamu fantasises about the narrative power of voice: 'dans [son] désir', he has the capacity to 'kill off characters' he dislikes (and a lot of them: 'etc'), and to replace them with 'un ou

---

[62] Of course, the difference between the two also results from the difference in acting styles.
[63] This is also the case with the 'revenge' quotation I examined in my textual analysis, in which Bardamu as character announces his future narrative reconstruction of 'reality'. *CV*, pp. 311-312. See Part I, Chapter 1, p. 60.

deux seulement' anonymous soldiers, whom he creates as 'heroes' alongside himself. The fantasy narrative however is abruptly erased ('c'était à recommencer') as Bardamu realises he only has 'une écorchure'. Though here his voice already displays narrative qualities, it is still impotent, and he has not yet acquired the narrative power of voice.

The way in which Simon brings this excerpt to voice is revealing. I have divided the excerpt into four sections according to the rhythm of Simon's reading (the sections will then be different for Podalydès): in each section there is a 'vocal unity' (same speed, tone, or volume).

1) Ils sont peut-être tous morts à l'heure actuelle [?] que je me demandais. Bardamu is speaking as narrator; there is no inflection on the question and it is said in the same tone as the previous sentence (not included in this segment of analysis) 'ça et là des morceaux de fumée âcre s'accrochaient aux mottes', which is descriptive thus typically narrative.

2) [louder] Puisqu'ils ne veulent rien comprendre à rien, c'est ça qui [**srait**] avantageux et pratique qu'ils [**soyent**] tous tués très vite… Comme ça on en finirait tout de suite… On rentrerait chez soi [~~…~~] On repasserait peut-être place Clichy en triomphe…. Un ou deux seulement qui survivraient. Dans mon désir… Des gars gentils et bien balancés, derrière le général, tous les autres seraient morts [short pause] comme le colon… Comme Barousse… comme Vanaille (une autre vache)… [~~etc~~].

The tone is clearly different from (1): the volume of the voice rises, and there is a sense of anger in the voice. Bardamu has 'switched' from narrator to character's voice. The pace is quite fast, and it is more colloquial than the text ('srait', 'soyent'). The ellipses are not maintained after 'chez soi'; Bardamu is excited rather than introspective.

'Etc' is erased, possibly because it is too textual (though, as we will see, it is vocalised by Podalydès), or playing down the extent of Bardamu's cruelty.

3) [**On aurait— on on**] nous couvrirait de décorations, de fleurs, on passerait sous l'Arc de Triomphe. [**On**] On entrerait au restaurant, on vous servirait sans payer, [guttural non-verbal sound] on payerait plus rien, [laughs] jamais plus de la vie ! On est les héros ! qu'on dirait au moment de la note… [~~Des défenseurs de la Patrie!~~] Et ça suffirait !... [~~On payerait avec des petits drapeaux français!... La caissière refuserait même l'argent des héros, et même elle vous en donnerait, avec~~]

~~des baisers quand on passerait devant sa caisse.~~] [**Bah hé !**] Ça vaudrait la peine de vivre!'

The tone of the voice is now sarcastic rather than angry. Simon's Bardamu stutters and repeats; we do not know whether this is intentional in Simon's vocalisation, or to be explained simply by the actor's lack of focus on the text (the second option is likelier in the first instance, where there is an actual mistake, 'on aurait' instead of 'on nous couvrirait'). Whether this is intentional or not, it is part of the 'bringing to voice' of Simon's Bardamu. The repetition 'on on' gives the impression that Bardamu is excited and starts speaking without having finalised his thought. This gives a sense of a spontaneous and excitable narrator, whose discourse is in process rather than prepared. The guttural sound, the laughter and 'bah hé!' are 'vocal' rather than 'verbal', to use Ruffo's classification.[64] The voice uses non-verbal sounds to express emotion. The emotion or spontaneity of the voice is also heard in the tendency to become more high-pitched at the end of a sentence ('vie', 'héros').

While Simon adds non-verbal sounds, he also cuts the text. The erasure of sentences that can be seen as 'disrespectful' or politically incorrect might be a result of Simon's reluctance as recounted by Chambrillon, who reports that Simon said: 'si j'enregistre ces pages sur la guerre [...], les militaires viendront me fusiller (sic)'.[65] Due to the erasure of the two sentences, there is no longer a mockery of French national symbols (as in 'on payerait avec des petits drapeaux français!'), and no longer a repetition with sarcasm of the discourse of war (as in 'des défenseurs de la Patrie!'). The dialogic aspect of Bardamu's voice (his capacity to repeat through re-organisation) is played down, while the addition of non-verbal sounds, in turn, makes the voice more 'spontaneous', less articulate, and less constructed; communicating emotion through non-verbal sounds.

4) Je m'aperçus en fuyant que je saignais du bras, mais— un peu seulement, pas une blessure suffisante du tout, une écorchure. [**C'é**] [laughs] C'était à recommencer.

There is a short pause between (3) and (4), that is to say between Bardamu's fantasy as character and the return of the narrative. When the voice is heard again it is slightly softer. Simon lengthens a syllable (mais—), doubles a syllable (cé), and adds a non-

[64] Ruffo, 'Vers une critique comparatiste de la voix au théâtre', 99-110 (p. 110).
[65] Chambrillon, pp. 7-19 (p. 12).

verbal sound (laughter), which shows sarcasm. Even on the 'return' to the narrative voice, Simon's reading retains a sense of being spontaneous and un-constructed.

By contrast, Podalydès's vocalisation of the same excerpt reveals a different approach:

1) [soft] 'Ils sont peut-être tous morts à l'heure actuelle? que je me demandais. The question is vocalised through interrogative intonation. Moreover, the volume is quiet, close to whispering, so that it sounds like a hopeful question, as if Bardamu really believed 'they' could all be dead.

2) Puisqu'ils ne veulent rien comprendre à rien, c'est ça qui serait avantageux et pratique qu'ils soient tous tués [short pause] très vite [---]

Bardamu is made to sound slightly angry at these people who 'ne veulent rien comprendre à rien'. The pace is quite fast.

3) [louder] Comme ça on en finirait tout de suite [no pause] On rentrerait chez soi [no pause] On repasserait peut-être place Clichy en triomphe

The volume is now louder and there is no breathing pause between the sentences, which make Bardamu sound excited and hopeful again, although this time it is almost childlike.

4) [softer] Un ou deux seulement qui survivraient. Dans mon désir… Des gars gentils et bien balancés, derrière le général

Together with a shift to a quieter dynamic, Bardamu speaks slowly, in a dreamy voice, which echoes the idea of 'dans mon désir'.

5) [louder and faster] tous les autres seraient morts comme le colon… Comme Barousse… comme Vanaille (une autre vache)...

Volume and tempo increase on 'tous les autres seraient morts'; Bardamu sounds even more like an excited child than in (3). He is excited thinking about the death of those he dislikes, and thus possibly excited by the potential narrative power of his voice, as he sounds as if he believed they were really dead.

6) [slower and softer] etc. On nous couvrirait de décorations, de fleurs, on passerait sous l'Arc de Triomphe.

Here, the voice is neutral, as if it were simply stating facts, reporting what would logically happen after the end of the war. Bardamu is taken up in the reality of what he is saying.

7) [louder and faster] On entrerait au restaurant [no pause] on vous servirait sans payer [no pause] on payerait plus rien, jamais plus de la vie! On est les héros! qu'on dirait au moment de la note! Des défenseurs de la Patrie! Et ça suffirait!

Volume and tempo gradually increase, and Podalydès removes one ellipsis. As in (3) and (5), Bardamu sounds like an excited child. 'Jamais plus de la vie' is said while laughing, and this laughter is of happiness but not sarcasm, as was the case in Simon's vocalisation.

8) On payerait, avec des petits drapeaux français

Bardamu is now back to a factual, descriptive tone, as he thinks up the concrete details of his fantasy.

9) [louder and faster] La caissière refuserait même l'argent des héros, et même elle vous en DONNERAIT, avec des BAISERS quand on passerait devant sa caisse. Ça vaudrait la peine de vivre!

Volume and tempo increase; there is emphasis on 'donnerait' and 'baisers', probably to highlight how 'incredible but true' the fantasy is ('et même').

10) [soft] Je m'aperçus en fuyant que je saignais du bras, mais un peu seulement, pas une blessure suffisante du tout, une écorchure. C'était à [**rcommencer**].

There is a pause between (9) and (10), as well as a change of track, which would imply that this new sentence is seen as the beginning of a new section, in which Bardamu is, again, miserable. 'Je m'aperçus en fuyant que je saignais du bras' is uttered in a soft, sad voice. Bardamu sounds possibly angry and sad when saying 'c'était à recommencer' – there is a slight elision of 'e' and the 'r' is stronger ('rcommencer'), which arguably makes the word sound stronger. This is one of the rare instances of Podalydès modifying the text slightly upon vocalisation.

The most obvious difference between Simon's and Podalydès' vocalisations is that apart from in (2), Simon's Bardamu has a constant vocal style characterised by repetitions, non-verbal sounds and sarcasm, while Podalydès's vocal style is more varied but does

not incorporate textual modifications. As can be seen from the analysis of Podalydès's vocalisation, there is alternation, between factual and descriptive, and excited and childlike, and it is through difference that a distinctive voice emerges. The grain, in any given segment, is not particularly remarkable. It is not the sound of the voice (as constant) that defines the voice, but its mobility. Simon's Bardamu on the other hand is defined by his very voice, as the uniqueness of the voice posits the uniqueness of the character. This difference between a unique, constant voice and a white and mobile voice corresponds with the difference between what I have qualified as Simon's vocal uniqueness and Podalydès's potential vocal transferability. This difference has implications on 'the' Bardamu constructed by each actor.

Simon and Podalydès, I suggest, bring two different types of narrator to voice. Simon's Bardamu is a safe and confident narrator: the horrors the character has just witnessed do not influence the vocal style of the narrator. The narrator remembers the character's fantasy in a slightly sarcastic way. Podalydès's Bardamu on the other hand, really sounds like he believes the fantasy exposed here. He is in turn excited and childlike, showing his naivety, in turn factual and descriptive, showing that he is caught up in the narrative power of his voice, which makes the erasure of the fantasy ('c'était à recommencer') more tragic in Podalydès's vocalisation.

Simon's Bardamu on the other hand is distanced from the events he is recounting.[66] This distance is obvious elsewhere, for example in the scene in which a shell interrupts the conversation between the Colonel and the messenger by killing them both, and Simon openly laughs when he says 'ce fut la fin de ce dialogue' (*CV*, p. 28). Bardamu obviously did not laugh when as character he witnessed this. As narrator who remembers the messenger's last sentence well however, the horror of the situation makes him laugh. Another example of this sarcastic distance is the laughter added by Simon in the café scene, when Bardamu has the discussion with Arthur Ganate that will lead to Bardamu's enrolment. Simon's Bardamu laughs when he says 'et puis j'étais ému aussi parce que le garçon m'avait un peu traité de sordide à cause du pourboire' (*CV*, p. 17). Bardamu as character was emotional, and as narrator this makes him laugh. He is not only laughing at the situation (such as with the shell), but also at himself,

---

[66] The age difference at the time of recording between the two actors also influences the listener's perception of Bardamu. Simon was sixty when he recorded the excerpt and Podalydès forty when the audio-book was released, and this age difference is heard in the actors' voices. Though Bardamu does not say exactly how old he was when he joined the army, it can be assumed that he is in his early or mid-twenties. That Simon's Bardamu is noticeably older than Podalydès's means that the former has more distance from the events he is remembering and recounting.

exposing the distance between himself as character and himself as narrator.[67] The uniqueness and sarcasm of Simon's Bardamu voice, then, are what establish him as a narrator figure. The subjectivity of his account is emphasised, and it is this subjectivity which makes the story worth listening to. In a sense, the narrative act takes over the actual narration.

By contrast, Podalydès's Bardamu sounds more fragile and confused, as if he were re-experiencing the events he is recounting. While Simon's Bardamu sounds acutely aware of the ridicule and naivety of Bardamu's fantasy of the end of the war, with Podalydès's recording the mixture of childlike excitement and factual description implies that the voice has started to believe what it is itself creating, in the narrative power which is crushed a couple of lines below. The impotence of the voice also echoes the idea of voice as traitor as found in *Voix off*: the voice is evocative, but in fact it fools Bardamu into believing in its power.

As is already apparent in the analysis of this 'fantasy' excerpt, Simon has a strong tendency to add non-verbal sounds and interjections: for instance, '[**hé**] c'est tout à fait comme ça, que m'approuva Arthur' (*CV*, p. 18); '[**hé hé**] [~~mais~~] voilà-t-y pas que' (*CV*, p. 18); '[**ha!**] [~~il~~] y en avait des patriotes!' (*CV*, p. 19); 'à présent j'en étais assuré [**bah**] pire qu'un [**rcrue**] [~~chien~~]' (*CV*, p. 23); 'foirant d'émotion [**béh !**] ça le courrouçait fort' (*CV*, p. 27); '[**bah**] des abrutis' (*CV*, p. 32). The words (or half-words) Simon adds, as can be seen from these examples, are words whose meaning is expressed through intonation, and the main intonation the actor gives to most of these interjections is of sarcasm. It is interesting that Simon supplements Bardamu's textual voice with such a significant amount of interjections, while on the other hand he deducts so much from Bardamu's textual voice. Indeed, Simon's reading of 'La Guerre' is a very abridged excerpt from the text, sometimes cutting whole pages at a time. In his reading, there is a dynamic of supplementation and deduction with regard to Bardamu's voice, which has strong parallels with the dynamic of appropriation and expropriation I have analysed in preceding chapters. Simon appropriates Bardamu's textual voice, as he supplements it

---

[67] This performative choice is, of course, one of the interpretative choices among those offered by the text, as I explained at the beginning of this chapter. The distance between character and narrator is obvious for instance in 'justement la guerre approchait de nous deux sans qu'on s'en soye rendu compte' (*CV*, p. 17).

with his interjections and sarcasm, but also in a sense expropriates it, as he cuts and reorganises it.[68]

Bardamu does, however, gain something in Simon's recording: it is what I shall characterise as a 'vocal body'. In my analyses of *Voyage* and Tardi's illustration, I argued that the discrepancy between Bardamu as narrator and as character is mirrored in the gap between his powerful narrative voice and his powerless body. I talked about how some characters gain a 'silent voice' in the illustration, as their voices are mutated into bodily forms.[69] In the case of Simon's vocalisation of Bardamu, I propose that Bardamu gains a vocal body, as the abstract and absent body (for the listener) is heard through the voice, in its grain. Simon's Bardamu renders emotion through voice, in laughter, non-verbal sounds, interjections, and the actor's audible breathing. The actor's audible breathing even regularly alters the punctuation of the text, for instance: 'et puis ceux qui ne voudront pas crever sur mer, ils pourront toujours aller crever sur terre où c'est bien fait plus vite [**breathing**] encore qu'ici' (*CV*, p. 18). Simon speaks the sentence up to 'plus vite' very fast, so fast that he needs to pause and breathe before finishing 'encore qu'ici'. A similar thing happens with the sentence 'On y passerait tous, le colonel comme les autres, tout mariole qu'il semblait être, et sa carne ne ferait pas plus de rôti que la mienne quand le courant d'en face lui passerait entre les deux épaules' (*CV*, p. 25). Simon does not pause, and finishes the sentence completely out of breath. Even when the actor is not out of breath, his breathing is always audible, and this is unlikely to be due to issues of quality with the recording, because in Arletty's readings, which were recorded with the same equipment, the actress' breathing is not audible.[70] Simon was, then, either speaking very close to the microphone (whether intentionally or not), or his breathing was simply extremely heavy.

The vocal body that Bardamu gains is, in a sense, slightly deficient, as the breathing is loud and 'badly' managed, as the actor is frequently out of breath. Moreover, it sometimes sounds as if Simon were not completely in control of his voice, such as when the tessitura of the voice extends (see in the passage analysed above the tendency to go high-pitched). The vocal style is made up of imperfections, but it is

---

[68] Céline was aware of the changes made by Simon, given that the writer was present at the recording. Simon refused to say 'chien' in the quotation from page 23 because he did not want to 'dire du mal des chiens' and 'diffamer les animaux', and it is Céline who suggested the actor said 'r'crue' instead of 'chien'. Chambrillon, pp. 7-19 (pp. 13-14).

[69] See Part II, Chapter 1, p. 114.

[70] Chambrillon, pp. 7-19. Chambrillon does not specify whether Brasseur's reading was also recorded with the same equipment, however it probably was, given that Arletty's, Simon's and Brasseur's readings were all recorded the same year (1955). Brasseur's breathing is not audible in the recording.

through the deficiency of this vocal body that Bardamu gains vocal uniqueness. While Bardamu's textual voice has been restricted, it is supplemented with a new type of emotion, not so much through words, but through the presence of the body in the voice, in particular with the omnipresence of Simon's 'souffle' throughout the recording, so that voice is heard even when no words are uttered, and the words are inhabited by the voice that produces them, because of the traces of the body in the voice. Podalydès's Bardamu, on the other hand, has a more 'perfect' voice than Simon's. The actor manages his breathing well, pausing when the punctuation indicates to do so. As a result of the lack of vocal body, the vocal variations (dynamics, tessitura) sound intentional rather than involuntary.

Podalydès's recording can be characterised as more faithful to Bardamu's textual voice than Simon's, which is partly due to the difference in type of the recordings.[71] Indeed, Podalydès is reading the novel in its entirety, which is why he does not abridge or alter it. Moreover, Podalydès's faithfulness to Bardamu's voice is explained by the actor's thorough preparation for the recording of *Voyage*. Preparation helped the actor avoid what he calls 'les sorties de route', of which Simon's mistakes can be seen as examples.[72]

The differences between Simon's and Podalydès's voices and vocal styles ultimately shape their vocal adaptations of the text. With Simon's vocal uniqueness, Bardamu's voice is characterised by its imperfections, its grain, and the vocal body inhabiting the words. Bardamu's voice is in a sense both empowered and weakened by Simon's reading, as it is constructed in a dynamic of appropriation and expropriation, or supplementation and deduction: its construction is simplified, but it gains a body. Podalydès's vocal transferability on the other hand gives Bardamu a voice that is characterised by its mobility and its adaptability. Bardamu's voice is not empowered by Podalydès's reading because of the actor's fidelity to the textual voice, which is transposed in its careful construction, but not supplemented.

While 'La Guerre' problematises the potential narrative power of voice and the discrepancy between Bardamu as character and Bardamu as narrator, it is clear that the concept of ventriloquism is not directly relevant to the passage. In the next section,

---

[71] That Simon can be considered as less faithful to the original text than Podalydès is noteworthy, because Céline was involved in Simon's recording. Along with Céline's suggestion that Simon say 'r'crue' instead of 'chien', this seems to show that on this occasion Céline's approach to performance (and adaptation) was not influenced by the fidelity discourse found in adaptation theory.
[72] Demidoff, 17.

therefore, I shall analyse Brasseur's and Podalydès's vocal adaptations of the excerpt 'La Mère Henrouille', which problematises Bardamu's ventriloquial narrative voice. One of the questions I shall ask is how Podalydès's transferable and ventriloquial voice and Brasseur's vocal uniqueness (which is nonetheless deeply different from Simon's) relate to Bardamu's ventriloquial narrative voice.

'La Mère Henrouille' read by Pierre Brasseur and Denis Podalydès

The passage I analyse as read by Brasseur and Podalydès is entitled 'La Mère Henrouille'.[73] It is situated around halfway through the novel, when Bardamu is a doctor in the Parisian suburbs of la Garenny-Rancy. It is Bardamu's first encounter with la mère Henrouille. Mrs Henrouille, the wife of la mère Henrouille's son, wants to have her mother-in-law committed, which is why Bardamu is involved in his capacity as doctor. This excerpt evokes and problematises Bardamu's power as narrator. As character he does not say a word, while as narrator he is almost omniscient, knowing intimate details about the Henrouilles. He has been told part of these details by Bébert's aunt, who is his concierge, and the Henrouilles have confided in him because he is their GP (*CV*, pp. 316-317).

This context is present in Podalydès's reading, because he reads the text in its entirety. On the other hand, the passage read by Brasseur is a stand-alone recording, and as such it is autonomous from the rest of the text, in the same way as Simon's 'La Guerre'. In Brasseur's reading, Bardamu's omniscience is more typical of a narrator than of a doctor-who-writes, simply reporting his patients' confidences and secrets. Bardamu does not mention his involvement (or say 'je') for three pages: 'tout de même ils voulaient à toute force me la montrer la vieille, j'étais venu pour ça' (*CV*, p. 323). Up until this sentence is read by Brasseur at 6'44 (roughly halfway through the track), Bardamu has appeared exclusively as third-person narrator. Even after Bardamu mentions his part in the story, he still acts as silent observer, with minimal involvement. While he knows the most intimate details about this family, when the daughter-in-law talks to him he pretends not to understand, and while as doctor he should be leading the consultation he does not ask la mère Henrouille a single question. This scene, then,

---

[73] Though 'La Mère Henrouille' is the title of Brasseur's recording, I also use it for Podalydès's reading for the sake of clarity. The excerpt goes from page 320 (starting with 'dans le fond du jardin qu'elle était') to page 326 (ending with 'elle s'était bien défendue') in the novel. In Podalydès's audio-book, it is on CD 9, tracks 6-9 (chapter 21). The passages analysed in this chapter are on the CD provided with the present study (Brasseur's recording is track 4, Podalydès's tracks 5-7).

presents us with a clear discrepancy between the narrative voice and the character's voice, and this is more significant with regard to Brasseur's reading because there is no context or clear explanation as to how Bardamu has come to know so much about this family.

The omniscience of Bardamu as narrator is indirectly evoked by la mère Henrouille, when she questions to what extent he, as a doctor, can really know what goes on in her head, after the daughter-in-law tries to get Bardamu on her side:

> – Ecoutez-la, Docteur, maintenant qui délire et qui m'insulte! Comment voulez-vous que nous la gardions ici ?
> La vieille fit face alors de mon côté, à moi, son nouveau danger.
> – Qu'est-ce qu'il en sait celui-là si je suis folle? Il est-y dans ma tête? Il y est-y dans la vôtre? Faudrait qu'il y soye pour savoir?... (*CV*, p. 326)

Through her rhetorical questions, la mère Henrouille signals that Bardamu is neither in her head, nor in her daughter-in-law's. The fact that Bardamu is not in their heads implies that his extensive 'knowledge' of their psychology in his narrative is in fact mostly the result of his construction of them as his characters. This remark by la mère Henrouille can also be seen as foreseeing Bardamu's revenge: he is not in her head now, but he will invade and fill it, when he constructs his narrative voice.

The passage presents us with two strong female voices engaged in an argument.[74] La mère Henrouille uses her voice to express her anger, and her daughter-in-law uses her voice to try to convince both her mother-in-law and (primarily) Bardamu that la mère Henrouille should be committed. Bardamu describes la mère Henrouille's vocal style as one in which 'elle parlait dru' (*CV*, p. 323) and her voice as 'sa voix cassée' (*CV*, p. 324). She tends to get angry: 'elle se remit en colère' (*CV*, p. 325), and she shouts: 'elle criait' (*CV*, p. 323). While the daughter-in-law's voice is not described, the use of 'parlementer' ('tentait de parlementer la bru', *CV*, p. 322) potentially offers a performative option. This confrontation, then, provides the actors with the opportunity

---

[74] The men (Bardamu and Henrouille), on the other hand, do not want to be involved. Women are often talkative in *Voyage*. This is seen not only in the Henrouille family, but also in the relationship between Robinson and Madelon. Also, Bébert's aunt is the most talkative character in the novel, because she covers two stereotypes: that of the talkative woman and that of the 'concierge'. The stereotype of 'la femme bavarde' or the 'talkative woman' has been analysed in particular by Dale Spender in *Man Made Language*. Spender argues that women are considered talkative, not because they are compared to men who speak less, but because they are judged according to the model of the silent woman. The norm, then, is not the masculine, but the silence of women in a patriarchal society. The stereotype of the talkative woman is judged in comparison with the silent (or, rather, muted) woman (Molly, the American prostitute, can be seen as an example of a 'good' silent woman). See Dale Spender, *Man Made Language* (London: Routledge, 1980), in particular the chapters on 'Constructing Women's Silence', pp. 52-75, and 'The Dominant and the Muted', pp. 76-105. See also Corinne Monnet, 'La Répartition des tâches entre les hommes et les femmes dans le travail de la conversation', *Nouvelles questions féministes* 19:1 (1998), 9-34.

to explore vocal nuances and to perform a confrontation between two women solely with their own voice.[75]

The two aspects I shall focus on in my analysis of Brasseur and Podalydès's recordings are the vocal confrontation between la mère Henrouille and her daughter-in-law, and the ambivalent figure of Bardamu, the almighty and omniscient narrative voice, as well as the silent doctor who pretends he does not understand what is being said to him so as not to use his voice. My analysis will explore how the two actors render the vocal confrontation between the daughter-in-law and la mère Henrouille, and how their vocalisation of these two characters throughout the excerpt shapes their bringing to voice of Bardamu.

In order to analyse how the confrontation is vocalised by Podalydès and Brasseur, I have selected four utterances (two by Mrs Henrouille, two by la mère Henrouille) out of the seven that constitute the argument (I will later analyse the eighth and last utterance in detail). These four dialogue lines are representative of the vocal styles of the actors, and of the differences between them. Analysing all seven utterances would have implied some repetition, which is avoided here. Each utterance will be analysed in terms of first Podalydès's reading, then Brasseur's, treating each utterance as a separate excerpt.

1. [Mrs Henrouille] Croyez-vous pas, Docteur, qu'elle est folle?... Y a plus moyen de la faire sortir!... Ça lui ferait du bien pourtant de temps en temps!... Mais si grand-mère que ça vous ferait du bien!... Ne dites pas non… Ça vous ferait du bien!... Je vous assure. [*Bardamu's narrative comment*] Elle veut pas qu'on s'occupe d'elle… Elle aime mieux faire dans les coins… Il fait froid chez elle et y a pas de feu… C'est pas possible voyons qu'elle reste comme ça… N'est-ce pas, Docteur, que c'est pas possible? (*CV*, p. 325)

1a) The daughter-in-law's first two utterances as vocalised by Podalydès:
    [soft] Croyez-vous pas, Docteur, qu'elle est folle?... Y a plus moyen de la faire sortir!... Ça lui ferait du bien pourtant de temps en temps!...
    [angry, louder and higher tessitura] Mais SI grand-mère que ça vous ferait du bien![---] Ne dites pas non[---] ça vous ferait du bien![---] [**Jvous**] assure[---]
    [*Bardamu's narrative comment*]

---

[75] To the best of my knowledge there is no information on Brasseur's recording, therefore it is not known whether the actor chose the passage himself.

[upset] Elle veut pas qu'on s'occupe d'elle…

[upset and louder] Elle aime mieux FAIRE dans les coins…

[upset] Il fait froid chez elle et y a pas de feu…

[soft and fast] C'est pas possible voyons qu'elle reste comme ça […] n'est-ce pas
Docteur, que c'est pas possible?...

When talking directly to Bardamu, at the beginning and at the end of this passage, Mrs
Henrouille speaks in a soft tone, which can be interpreted as her attempt to coax him so
as to convince him that she is right while she still asks him for his opinion (albeit
showing the answer she wants through the use of negation, 'croyez-vous pas' and of
'n'est-ce pas'). When talking directly to her mother-in-law, Mrs Henrouille speaks louder
and her voice is more high-pitched, which implies that she is being emotional and
cannot prevent this from showing in her voice. When she explains how la mère
Henrouille wants to live (not directly talking to Bardamu or her mother-in-law), her
tone is harsh. She is worried about her mother-in-law and upset that she will not let her
do anything. Podalydès does not vocalise the ellipsis, and the faster pace that results
gives a sense of excitement and of emotional involvement from Mrs Henrouille.

1b) As vocalised by Brasseur:

[confident] Croyez-vous pas, Docteur, qu'elle est folle?

[slightly louder] Y a plus moyen de la faire sortir!... Ça lui ferait du pourtant de
temps en temps!...

[exasperated, louder] Mais SI grand-mère que ça vous ferait du bien— [**Ndites**]
pas non—

[softer] Ça vous ferait du bien— Je vous assu—re.

[*Bardamu's narrative comment*]

[soft and sightly mocking] Elle veut pas qu'on s'occupe d'e—lle… Elle aime
mieux faire dans les coins…

[soft] Il fait froi—d chez elle et y a pas de feu… C'est pas possi—ble voyons
qu'elle reste comme ça… N'est-ce pas Docteur, que c'est pas possi—ble?...

Brasseur's Mrs Henrouille is different from Podalydès's in terms of tempo and vocal
style. Tempo is slow throughout, and the vocal style is less varied than in Podalydès's
reading. Brasseur renders the ellipses through pauses, and even, in a sense, emphasises
them by lengthening some words. There is no sense of emotional involvement as in
Podalydès's reading. Mrs Henrouille is exasperated rather than angry or worried when

she talks directly to la mère Henrouille, and she is even slightly mocking (rather than upset, as in Podalydès's vocalisation) when she says 'elle aime mieux faire dans les coins'. In Brasseur's voice, Mrs Henrouille is relaxed and confident when she talks to Bardamu, as Brasseur's performative choice is to emphasise the technique of rhetorical persuasion employed by Mrs Henrouille in this passage.

2. [la mère Henrouille] Rendez-moi donc tout ce que je possède et puis je m'en irai d'ici!... J'ai de quoi vivre moi!... Et que vous n'en entendrez plus parler de moi!... Une bonne fois pour toutes!... (*CV*, p. 325)

2a) La mère Henrouille's utterance as vocalised by Podalydès:

> [loud and fast] Rendez-moi donc tout ce que je possède et puis je m'en irai d'ici [↓]
> j'ai de quoi vivre moi! Et que vous n'en entendrez plus parler de moi!... Une
> BOnne fois pour toutes!

La mère Henrouille is angry (the line is preceded by the narrative comment: 'la vieille se remit en colère'), and Podalydès vocalises anger through loud volume and a fast tempo. He even makes one sentence out of two because he is speaking so fast. His emphasis on the beginning of the word 'bonne' also shows anger, as he exploits the plosive consonant. Vocalising anger through loud volume and a fast tempo is arguably the most obvious interpretative choice, which corresponds with the idea of Podalydès's non-intervening reading.

2b) Brasseur:

> [loud but slow] Rendez-moi donc TOUT ce que je possède
> [slightly faster] et puis je m'en irai d'ici!...
> [short pause]
> J'AI de quoi vi—vre moi
> [pause]
> Et que vous n'en— n'[**entendiez**] plus parler de moi!... UNE bonne fois pour
> toutes!...

La mère Henrouille speaks loudly but at an overall slow pace. There is vocal emphasis in three places, and two words are lengthened. Brasseur makes a mistake with 'n'en entendrez', as he says 'n'entendiez' instead. He uses the subjunctive instead of the future tense, as in the construction: 'et qu'on n'entende plus parler de vous', while in the text it

is constructed on the model of 'et [je vous assure] que vous n'en entendrez plus parler de moi!', but 'je vous assure' (or equivalent) is omitted. This unusual syntax is typically what could result in a 'sortie de route', to borrow Podalydès's term, and this is what happens with Brasseur. Though it is most likely that this mistake was not intentional, it still shapes Brasseur's vocalisation of Bardamu, because it has been kept, while the passage could have been recorded once more. With regard to Bardamu, it can be argued that the narrator is so focused on rendering la mère Henrouille's particular vocal style that he makes a mistake. The words are not accurately delivered, but they are inhabited by la mère Henrouille's vocal uniqueness.

This next utterance requires context. La mère Henrouille has just said that if she does not have enough money to live on she will find a job.

3. [Mrs Henrouille] Travailler? Grand-mère! Mais où ça? Ah! Docteur. Ecoutez cette idée: Travailler! A son âge! A quatre-vingts ans bientôt! c'est de la folie ça, Docteur! Qui est-ce qui voudrait d'elle? Mais grand-mère, vous êtes folle!... (*CV*, p. 326)

3a) Podalydès:

> [fast and worried] Travailler? Grand-mère! Mais où ça?
> [soft] Ah! Docteur. Écoutez cette idée:
> [louder, fast and worried] Travailler à son âge! À quatre-vingts ans bientôt! c'est de la FOlie ça, Docteur! Qui est-ce qui voudrait d'elle? Mais grand-mère, vous êtes folle!...

Mrs Henrouille repeats the last word of la mère Henrouille's utterance, 'travailler', with shock. The tempo is fast and the volume loud, rendering distress. The whole utterance is said with disbelief in the voice, as Mrs Henrouille takes Bardamu as her witness ('Ah! Docteur. Écoutez cette idée'). La mère Henrouille has just provided her with the opportunity to demonstrate that her mother-in-law is mad and should be committed, but Mrs Henrouille does not show any signs of satisfaction or contentment. Instead, she sounds worried and in shock. I use 'sound' here because it is obvious from the text that she is acting. While she highlights how 'mad' the idea is to Bardamu, she still manages to sound worried. The point here is to convince Bardamu.

3b) Brasseur:

> [soft and mocking] Travailler? Grand-mè—re! Mais où ça—? Ah! Docteur.
> Ecoutez cette idée:
> [laughing] Travailler!
> [soft and mocking] À son âge! À quatre-vingts ans bientôt! c'est de la foli—e ça,
> Docteu—r!
> [slighlty faster and angry] Qui est-ce qui voudrait d'elle? Mais grand-mère, vous
> êtes folle!...

In Brasseur's reading, 'travailler' is repeated with sarcasm rather than shock and disbelief as with Podalydès. The lengthening of words contributes to the mocking and patronising tone. Mrs Henrouille even laughs as she repeats 'travailler!', this way openly showing how ridiculous she finds her mother-in-law's idea, but not that it makes her worried. The last line however is said in a slightly faster tempo and in a slightly angry tone, revealing a certain exasperation on the part of Mrs Henrouille that it is taking so long to get her mother-in-law committed. While in Podalydès's reading Mrs Henrouille pretends that she is worried and that she wants to commit her mother-in-law for la mère Henrouille's own sake, in Brasseur's reading there is no such attempt to show care, worry or affection toward la mère Henrouille.

4. [la mère Henrouille] Folle! Personne! Nulle part!... Mais vous y êtes bien, vous quelque part!... Sale caca!... (*CV*, p. 326)

4a) Podalydès:

> [loud and fast] Folle! Personne! Nulle part!... Mais vous y êtes bien, vous quelque
> part!... Sale CACA!...

The transition between (3a) and (4a) is slightly confusing, due to the fast pace and the fact that neither the daughter-in-law nor la mère Henrouille have a distinctive vocal style. Here, Podalydès, as in (2a), favours the interpretative choice of vocalising anger through loud volume and fast tempo. He emphasises the word 'caca' because it is an insult, showing la mère Henrouille's anger toward her daughter-in-law.

4b) Brasseur:

> [very loud and higher tessitura] Folle!

> [loud] Personne! Nulle part!... Mais vous y êtes bien, vous quelque part!... Sale
> caca!

The volume on 'folle!' contrasts sharply with the daughter-in-law's soft and mocking tone in (3b). Brasseur does not speak as fast as Podalydès and pauses between sentences, placing a stronger emphasis on the ellipses. La mère Henrouille shouts, as in Podalydès's reading, but in a more intense way, both in volume and vocal style. On 'folle' the tessitura is heightened, and on 'caca' the anger is so intense that the voice almost chokes.

In this vocal confrontation, the actors' performative choices vary significantly. With regard to Mrs Henrouille, the fact that the daughter-in-law does not sound manipulative in Podalydès's reading does not mean that she is not so, but that she is simply a better actress in front of Bardamu. In Brasseur's voice the soft and mocking modulation of the daughter-in-law's voice is so exaggerated that it displays her persuasive intentions, while in Podalydès she dissimulates her intentions towards her mother-in-law well by modulating her voice in relation to what she says. As a result of these different interpretative choices, the final utterance then made by Mrs Henrouille following on from the excerpts cited above is perceived differently by the listener when it is performed by Brasseur than by Podalydès. La mère Henrouille has just insulted her daughter-in-law, who addresses Bardamu directly: 'Écoutez-la, Docteur, maintenant qui délire et qui m'insulte! Comment voulez-vous que nous la gardions ici?' (*CV*, p. 326). In Podalydès's reading, this is said with a fast tempo and in an emotional tone, while Brasseur keeps the same mocking, patronising tone and slow tempo. Podalydès's Mrs Henrouille sounds worried and upset, hurt by the insult, and her question to Bardamu genuine. In Brasseur's voice on the other hand, Mrs Henrouille is not hurt but content that la mère Henrouille has provided her with the opportunity to prove her point.

Overall, Brasseur vocalises Mrs Henrouille in an extreme, even caricatural way as the perfidious daughter-in-law, while Podalydès's reading is more subtle. Mrs Henrouille's voice is secondary to Bardamu's primary voice (meaning that he ventriloquises her), and I would suggest that as a result of the lack of caricature in Podalydès's reading, his Bardamu appears as a more reliable narrator than Brasseur's. In this aspect, the actors show two different types of ventriloquism. Brasseur uses ventriloquism in a comical way, emphasising the caricatural aspect of his performance. Podalydès, as a more reliable narrator, gives the impression of accurately reporting Mrs

Henrouille's words and vocal style (such as her display of emotion through voice), but not of performing a caricatural impersonation of the character. I suggest that Podalydès's vocalisation of Mrs Henrouille, when compared with Brasseur's, shows the vocal transferability of the actor's, and consequently Bardamu's, voice. The narrative voice is mobile, adaptable, and believable as that of another self – which, in fact, participates in the deception of ventriloquism, as the reliable narrator gives the impression of reporting Mrs Henrouille's words exactly as she said them.

Brasseur and Podalydès, then, make different interpretative choices for this confrontation between la mère Henrouille and her daughter-in-law. While Podalydès's vocalisation of Mrs Henrouille is more varied than Brasseur's, it is the opposite case with la mère Henrouille. La mère Henrouille's vocal style is to shout, and in Podalydès's reading her voice is still well-controlled and its volume not significantly louder than for Mrs Henrouille. In Brasseur's reading on the other hand there is one error, instances where the voice is more intense, and alongside with the overall slow tempo and slightly broken phrasing (with longer pauses), this contributes to render the uniqueness of la mère Henrouille's voice, as it is described by Bardamu in the text, rather than to make her a caricature, as Brasseur does with Mrs Henrouille.

The difference in the actors' interpretative choices for the two women is part of their differing vocal adaptations of the narrator.[76] Bardamu, in this passage, has an obvious fondness for la mère Henrouille: 'son regard [...] vous faisait oublier le reste, à cause du plaisir léger qu'il vous donnait malgré soi et qu'on cherchait à retenir après en soi d'instinct, la jeunesse' (*CV*, p. 324). While this fondness or pleasure ('plaisir') is not supplemented or emphasised in Podalydès's reading, I suggest that in Brasseur's it is rendered through voice, by turning Bardamu's vocalisation of la mère Henrouille into a performance that the narrator openly enjoys.

At the beginning of the passage, where Bardamu's narrative voice prevails, Brasseur's Bardamu speaks in an extremely deep and slow voice, with added breaks to the text: for instance, 'pour voir / si on ne pouvait faire, par exemple / entrer / sa vieille chez les soeurs de Saint-Vincent' (*CV*, p. 320); 'c'est autre chose qui l'occupait /

[76] The fact that male actors bring female characters to voice (and do not attempt to alter their voices into a 'female' voice) makes it particularly obvious that this is Bardamu's narrative. An option would have been to get female actors to 'act' women. This has been done, for instance, with recordings of *Zazie dans le métro*, such as the 2004 audio-book, with seven actors (male and female) (Jeu Eco Lire, 2004), and the 2010 audio-book read by Claude Piéplu and Evelyne Levasseur (Le Livre qui Parle, 2010). This would have been possible in particular for Brasseur's recording, where dialogue holds an important place (while this episode is part of the text as a whole in Podalydès's reading).

dans le moment, ses bruits / dans l'oreille / qui n'arrêtaient pas' (*CV*, p. 321); 'il s'était dit qu'ils l'empêcheraient de dormir / ces bruits / abominables' (*CV*, p. 321); 'la femme de ménage / passait chez eux / trois heures par semaine / pour laver' (*CV*, p. 321). Bardamu's voice first livens up when he talks about la mère Henrouille: 'À travers sa porte, elle engueulait [**says the word laughing**] tous ceux qui s'approchaient de sa turne' (*CV*, p. 322). The fact that Bardamu laughs shows that he enjoys the character of la mère Henrouille and finds her comic. Bardamu's fondness for la mère Henrouille is shown in the text in particular in his description of her vocal style:

> Ce regard allègre animait tout alentour, dans l'ombre, d'une joie jeunette [...], sa voix cassée quand elle vociférait reprenait guillerette les mots quand elle voulait bien parler comme tout le monde et vous les faisait alors sautiller, phrases et sentences, caracoler et tout, et rebondir vivantes tout drôlement comme les gens pouvaient le faire avec leur voix et les choses autour d'eux au temps encore où ne pas savoir se débrouiller à raconter et chanter tour à tour, bien habilement, passait pour niais, honteux, et maladif. […] Elle était gaie la vieille Henrouille, mécontente, crasseuse, mais gaie. (*CV*, p. 324)

Brasseur's vocalisation of this passage supplements the sense of enjoyment of the character of la mère Henrouille by Bardamu:

> [soft] Ce regard aLLègre animait TOUT alentour [short pause] dans l'ombre d'une joie— JEUNETTE
>
> [slightly louder] Sa voix CAssée quand elle vociférait reprenait GUILLerette les mots [**almost laughs**]
>
> [short pause]
>
> [softer] quand elle voulait bien parler comme tout le monde
>
> [short pause]
>
> [slightly louder and faster] et vous les [**fsait**] alors SAUtiller, ph—rases et sentences, CARAcoler et tout, et [**rbondir**] VIVANTES, tout drôlement, comme les gens [**laughing while saying 'comme les gens'**]
>
> [musical voice] pouvaient le faire avec leur VOIX et les choses autour d'eux au temps encore
>
> [short pause]
>
> [soft] où ne pas savoir se débrouiller à
>
> [musical voice] RAconter et CHANter tour à tour bien habilement
>
> [soft] PAssait pour niais, honteux, et maladif.
>
> […]

> [louder] Elle était GAIE la vieille Henrouille, MECONTENTE, crasseuse, mais
> GAIE

In this passage as vocalised by Brasseur there is a process of appropriation of la mère Henrouille's voice by Bardamu. When he describes how she speaks, he modulates his voice so as to speak as she does (but still not as a 'female' voice). La mère Henrouille's voice is described in terms of liveliness ('guillerette', 'sautiller', 'caracoler', 'vivantes'), which is rendered by the use of dynamics of voice by the narrative voice as performed by Brasseur. Moreover, Brasseur speaks twice in a musical tone, when Bardamu describes how highly regarded being a skilled storyteller and singer used to be. 'Raconter et chanter tour à tour bien habilement' conveys the idea of the use of voice as part of a performance, which is enjoyed both by the *conteur* and the audience.[77] Bardamu's vocal style in this passage stands in stark contrast with his usual one, and it can be argued that the performance is constructed so that the vocalisation of this passage will stand out against the overall gloominess, depth and seriousness of the narrative voice up until then. In Podalydès's vocalisation of this excerpt on the other hand, there are no particularities, which is why I do not transcribe it here.

The difference between Podalydès's and Brasseur's performative choices with regard to Bardamu's relationship to la mère Henrouille's vocal style is particularly evident at the very end of the passage, where the differing performative choices result in strikingly differing interpretations of the text. La mère Henrouille kicks Bardamu and the daughter-in-law out, and Bardamu's narrative voice takes over again. In Brasseur's recording, Bardamu's voice contrasts starkly with that of la mère Henrouille, as it is at the lowest extreme of tessitura, and slow when he says: 'elle nous épiait encore par-derrière sa lampe, à nous éloigner par la cour [long pause] quand nous l'eûmes traversée, que nous fûmes assez loin' (the use of passé simple also contrasts with the colloquialism of la mère Henrouille's utterances). There is a pause, and when the voice is heard again it is transformed:

> [hysterical laughter] elle s'est remise à rigoler— [high tessitura on 'rigoler']
> [breathes in]
> [still laughing slightly] Elle s'était bien défendue

---

[77] Though Brasseur's reading is not a performance in the Zumthorian sense of simultaneous emission and reception of the narrative voice, this sense is still present in Brasseur's reading. Zumthor, *La Lettre et la voix*, p. 19.

The laughter and the alteration of the narrative voice show Bardamu's appropriation of la mère Henrouille's voice. The sense of performance is here obvious in the contrast between Bardamu's vocal style (deep, gloomy, slow) and his style when it is interwoven with that of la mère Henrouille (high tessitura, loud, laughing). When saying 'elle s'était bien défendue', Bardamu is content. Given his fondness for la mère Henrouille, it can be assumed that he is content that she has won. By contrast, in Podalydès's reading there is no clear victory of la mère Henrouille. The actor vocalises the text without adding any extra non-verbal sounds (such as laughter), and the narrative goes on after 'elle s'était bien défendue'.

Brasseur and Podalydès show two different interpretations of the vocal confrontation and Bardamu's ventriloquial narrative voice in 'La Mère Henrouille'. In Podalydès's reading the stark contrasts are not between the vocal styles of the characters (as their vocal style is determined by what they say rather than their individuality), but are incorporated in terms of the changing emotional engagements of each character. Bardamu and his characters deliver their words, while the characters of Brasseur's Bardamu inhabit their words with their individuality (even when they are not directly saying them, as is the case with the description of la mère Henrouille's vocal style). Using the concept of 'word-painting', which refers to a composer's technique in word-setting music, is useful here to describe the difference between Brasseur's and Podalydès's readings: Brasseur 'paints' the vocal style of the characters, whereas Podalydès 'paints' the vocal emotion, that is to say the content of the utterances.

Podalydès's voice is transferable, not because he alters it to make it sound like those of the characters (there are no caricatures, no impersonations), but because it lacks individuality, and as such it is potentially able to express any self or any otherness. In this passage, Podalydès's ventriloquial, transferable voice relates to Bardamu's textual ventriloquial narrative voice because the act of ventriloquism is constructed upon deception. Bardamu's ventriloquism is an act of deception revealed by clues throughout the text (such as la mère Henrouille's 'il est-y dans ma tête?') but not openly acknowledged by the narrator, who presents himself as an innocent victim. Podalydès, as Bardamu in the text, manages to mask the act of ventriloquism. He does so by not *openly* performing Bardamu's ventriloquism. Brasseur, by contrast, makes Bardamu's ventriloquism of la mère Henrouille and Mrs Henrouille clear, as he emphasises the narrative act as an act of performance, and as a ventriloquist's performance. While Simon in 'La Guerre' supplements Bardamu's narrative voice with a vocal body,

Brasseur does not add anything that is not already present in the text, such as the fondness for la mère Henrouille, which the actor turns into the enjoyment of the performance of her character by the narrator. He emphasises it as part of his performative choice. Podalydès makes the performative choice of not intervening and of not emphasising, for instance that the narrative act is a performance addressed to an audience. This comparison between Brasseur's and Podalydès's vocalisations of 'La Mère Henrouille' introduces the idea that Bardamu's narrative act is a performance. In the next section, I shall explore the notion of voice as performance further by analysing two vocalisations of Bardamu by Fabrice Luchini.

Fabrice Luchini's Bardamu

I examine two vocalisations of *Voyage* by Fabrice Luchini, in Jacquot's 1988 medium-length TV film, and the 1994 recording of Luchini's play, in order to understand how Luchini vocalises Bardamu, and if the inclusion of a live audience in the play influences the actor's vocal adaptation of *Voyage* in comparison with the TV film. The actor explains that an extensive, passionate, engagement with *Voyage* is, in his opinion, the only way to be able to bring its textuality to voice:

> C'est quoi, l'écrit? Ça n'a l'air rien de rien, cette question, mais on doit se la poser de façon quasiment névrotique. […] Mon obsession, avec Céline, était la suivante: comment restituer la perfection de l'écrit dans une oralité qui ne trahisse pas les intentions premières de l'œuvre? Voilà. Cette obsession est devenue une passion. Je travaillais tout le temps: pendant les dîners, la nuit, pendant que je jouais d'autres pièces ou des rôles de cinéma... Aujourd'hui, j'en suis sorti mais cette passion m'a occupé au moins trente-cinq ans de ma vie.[78]

Luchini's obsessive relation with *Voyage* ('névrotique', 'je travaillais tout le temps') is imbued with complete admiration for the source text, which is apparent in his concern to 'restituer la perfection de l'écrit' and not to betray the 'intentions premières' of the text. That Luchini refers to the original intentions of the œuvre rather than that of the author is most likely to be due to his effort to make a distinction between Céline and his texts, as I analysed above in the section on 'Céline, Bardamu and voice'. Luchini's idea of the original intentions of the text is highly problematic, because it implies that there would be a correct way to perform and reproduce *Voyage*, and incorrect ways that betray the text. The same problematic discourse of fidelity to the source text is found in adaptation studies. In this chapter, through my analyses thus far of Simon's, Brasseur's,

---

[78] Busnel, 'Fabrice Luchini: "Un acteur, c'est celui qui déchiffre les cicatrices"'.

and Podalydès's readings of *Voyage*, I have shown that the vocal adaptations of the same text vary significantly with each actor, due to the actor's own voice and vocal style, as well as his performative choices, and the nature of the recording (audio-book versus stand-alone recording). The original intentions that Luchini identifies (though he does not specify what they are) and that have shaped his performance are, then, in fact, to be found in some of the performative and interpretative options contained within the text (but they remain precisely as options).

Luchini's concern with the original intentions of the text is therefore highly problematic, but it is also informative as to how the actor approaches the performance of the text. The 'original intentions' seem to be linked to the orality of the text, that is to say directly to the actor's use of voice in his performance, rather than to a definitive meaning that would be 'hidden' in the text. The idea of 'restituer' the orality of the text is also found in Luchini's 2001 interview with Thierry Ardisson about *L'Arrivée à New York*, as the actor explains that what he intends to do is to 'essayer de restituer le texte à l'oral'.[79] His insistence on 'essayer de restituer' the text, rather than simply 'restituer', can be seen as a sign of modesty (false or not) from his part, however it also suggests that Luchini considers his performance of *Voyage* as a constant, recurring attempt, a process that can never be finalised. The 2009 interview with *L'Express* was published five years after Luchini had stopped performing his second play adapted from *Voyage*, *L'Arrivée à New York* (in 2004), and the actor does not in fact say that he succeeded in 'restituer' (reproducing) the perfection of the text orally. Rather, he says that he 'arrive à dire Céline pas trop mal'. This can, again, be seen as (false) modesty. However, the actor also likens his obsession with the text to a neurosis, and 'aujourd'hui, j'en suis sorti' implies that Luchini stopped performing plays adapted from *Voyage* because he managed to get over his neurotic obsession, not that he had succeeded in reproducing and not betraying *Voyage*. His obsession can, then, be seen as impossible to fully satisfy. As such, his performance of *Voyage* remains a permanent process, always un-final, which explains why the actor performed his two plays adapted from *Voyage* (*Voyage au bout de la nuit* and *L'Arrivée à New York*) over so many years (between 1986 and 2004), and why he eventually had to stop (or at least pause) and move on, shifting the focus from Céline to La Fontaine in recent years, while still incorporating *Voyage* in his subsequent plays. If Luchini's performance of *Voyage* is indeed a process, does this mean that his

---

[79] Ardisson & Lumières, 'Fabrice Luchini et son spectacle sur Louis-Ferdinand Céline'.

performance of *Voyage* has changed over the years? Is there an evolution in his interpretation between Jacquot's 1988 film and the 1994 recording?

A significant difference between Jacquot's 1988 film and the 1994 recording lies in the presence of a live audience in the play. Luchini explains that he does not in fact enjoy reading silently for himself, but prefers to perform the text. In fact, he seems to favour performing it on stage:

> Je n'ai aucun plaisir à lire […] Pour moi, lire, c'est être actant et non pas être absorbé. Il y a des gens qui aiment l'histoire et qui sont pris dans l'histoire que raconte un roman. Moi, je suis incapable d'être pris dans une histoire. J'ai un immense plaisir de comédien lorsque je lis sur scène, lorsque la lecture devient orale, mais l'attitude de prendre un livre et lire dans ma tête ne m'apporte aucun plaisir.[80]

That Luchini prefers to perform the text on stage ('sur scène') implies that he favours the presence of a live audience (although he does not mention the audience). Luchini makes a distinction between internal reading, in which the reader is absorbed ('être pris') by the text, and performing the text, in which the reader becomes the narrative voice, 'actant', and externalises the text. This distinction echoes the Barthesian concepts of passive and active reading, the latter being a reading in which the reader actively contributes to the text and, in a sense, writes the text.[81] Luchini claims, therefore, not to be a mere consumer but a producer of the text, and his production of it is a concrete vocalisation of it for an audience, that is to say the taking over of the textual narrative voice, transposed into a stage narrative voice. The idea of being a producer of the text in the Barthesian sense stands in contrast with the actor's obsession for reproducing the text orally and not betraying its original intentions. This discrepancy shows Luchini's obsession as impossible to reconcile with his role as 'actant' and producer of the text. I suggest that his performance of *Voyage* is a process that cannot be finalised (because he cannot 'succeed'), but that participates, in turn, in the permanent construction of the text by its readers.

What Luchini enjoys most of all, then, is to share, to tell, on stage ('lorsque je suis sur scène'), in the presence of an audience. The simultaneous presence of the actor, the producer of the narrative voice, and the audience, the receiver of the narrative voice, constitutes a significant difference in Luchini's vocalisation of Bardamu in the play compared with his performance in the film (a difference to which I will turn shortly), but also compared with Simon's, Brasseur's and Podalydès's readings. The readings

---

[80] Busnel, 'Fabrice Luchini: "Un acteur, c'est celui qui déchiffre les cicatrices"'.
[81] Barthes, 'Pour une théorie de la lecture', in *Œuvres complètes*, II, pp. 1455-1456. See Introduction, p. 12.

examined so far in this chapter imply a relationship of presence/absence between the (new) narrative voice and the listener (through the intermediary of CD).[82] In Luchini's stage performance, the audience and the actor are both present at the same time, and the listener cannot control the process temporally (they can leave the theatre, but not pause, repeat, fast-forward, etc.). Moreover, in the context of the play the audience is part of the performance as process as they audibly react to the vocalisation of Bardamu (for instance by laughter or applause) in the presence of the actor.

Jacquot's 1988 *Voyage au bout de la nuit*, which lasts around forty-five minutes and is in black and white, was made for the channel La Sept (which became Arte France in 2000). By this point in time Luchini had already been performing *Voyage* on stage for two years. The overall atmosphere of the film is of melancholy, and Luchini as Bardamu seems acutely aware of the pathos and tragedy of his narrative. The setting of the film can be characterised as austere: Luchini is the only actor, and the sole props are three chairs. Luchini regularly accompanies the dynamics of voice with what I have characterised as a conductor's gestures with regard to Aroun Arachide in Malle's *Zazie*.[83] However overall he is quite static. Nothing happens, apart from the narrative act, so that there is hardly any distraction from the narrative voice.

The film resembles filmed theatre, as there is only one set and Luchini is on what looks like a stage. Due to this theatre aspect the lack of an audience is striking. Moreover, Luchini as Bardamu regularly talks directly to the camera, which highlights the inevitably dialogic aspect of the monologue, and shows the need for an absent/present addressee to watch and listen to Bardamu's narrative. The reception of a film is characterised by interplay between absence and presence. When a film is being watched, the actor on the screen is absence made presence. Moreover, 'the screen also functions to make presence absence, as the spectator is absent from the screen upon which she or he gazes. [...] Although the spectator is absent from the screen, she or he becomes presence as the hearing, seeing subject'.[84] In Jacquot's *Voyage*, this

---

[82] As I explained at the beginning of this chapter, one issue with my corpus is the fact that I analyse Luchini's performance through a recording of it, which is why I shall focus solely on voice (the actor's, the audience's sounds) rather than gesture.

[83] See Part II, Chapter 3, p. 178.

[84] Hayward, p. 4. This interplay as described by Hayward is arguably stronger with regard to the experience of watching a film in the cinema, as the spectator is immersed in the film, while when watching a film on TV he or she can more easily be distracted and not pay full attention. About the 'essential disparities' between cinema and television 'that make them different in the way that they are made and watched', see Ben Calvert and others, *Television Studies: The Key Concepts*, 2nd ed (London: Routledge, 2008), pp. 111-113. However, Jacquot's *Voyage au bout de la nuit*, though made for TV, is a film

absence/presence interplay is inscribed in the film. The spectator is absence (there is no-one around the stage to listen to Bardamu's narrative) made presence, as he or she is imagined and called upon, as Luchini/Bardamu talks directly into the camera. The striking absence of an audience, then, highlights the need for its presence. The interplay between absence/presence, along with the fact that as a TV film Jacquot's *Voyage* implies an intimate reception, most probably at home, stands in contrast with Luchini's stage performance, which implies simultaneity of communication and reception, going to the theatre and experiencing the play among a crowd.

Luchini's stage performance contains the passages already present in the film, extended and supplemented with others. The overall atmosphere of the stage performance is very different from that of the film. The lingering sadness and ultimate quietness of the film is substituted with extreme dynamics of voice from the actor and audible reactions from the audience, mostly laughter. In order to compare Luchini's vocal adaptations of *Voyage* in Jacquot's film and in the play, I analyse the differences between the actor's vocalisation of passages from the text which I have grouped into three different types: Bardamu's narratorial comments, the voices of the characters within Bardamu's narration, and finally the special case of the character of Robinson.

In the first example of Bardamu's narratorial comments, Bardamu has come back from America and is studying to become a doctor:

> Toujours plus ou moins seul pendant mes heures libres je mijotais avec des bouquins et des journaux et puis aussi avec toutes les choses que j'avais vues. Mes études, une fois reprises, les examens je les ai franchis, à hue à dia, tout en gagnant ma croûte. Elle est bien défendue la Science, je vous le dis, la Faculté c'est une armoire bien fermée. Des pots en masse, peu de confiture. (*CV*, p. 303)

Luchini's vocalisation of this excerpt in the play is characterised by the actor's use of the dynamics of voice:

> Toujours plus ou moins seul pendant mes heures libres je mijotais avec des
>
> bouquins et des journaux et puis aussi avec toutes les choses que j'avais vues
>
> [loud] Mes études, une fois reprises, les examens je les ai franchis, à hue à dia, tout
>
> en gagnant ma croûte
>
> [soft] Elle est bien défendue la Science, je vous le dis [audience laughs softly]
>
> [loud] la Faculté c'est une armoire bien fermée. Des pots en masse

and as such it requires more constant attention from the viewer than for instance an entertainment programme.

[soft] peu de confiture [audience laughs][85]

Luchini uses the dynamics of voice to emphasise the potentially comical comments, not by saying them louder, but on the contrary by lowering the volume of his voice. This soft volume establishes a confiding tone, which is emphasised by the comment 'je vous le dis', as Luchini's Bardamu engages in a privileged relationship with the audience. By contrast, in the film, Luchini's vocalisation of this excerpt is on a significantly more constant volume, and obviously there is no audible reaction from the audience. In the play, Luchini uses volume to direct the audience's reaction, and is successful in this, as he elicits laughter at the two comments he emphasises. When comparing the 1988 film and the 1994 play, it appears that Luchini has altered his performance precisely because there is a live audience, thus exploiting the rhetorical technique of knowing one's audience.

That the presence of a live audience influences the actor's vocalisation of Bardamu is also apparent with regard to the second example of Bardamu's narratorial comments, in which Bardamu talks about the cleaning habits of the inhabitants of la Garenne-Rancy:

> Qui ne ferait pas sa poussière dans ces endroits-là, sur les coups de sept heures, passerait pour un fameux cochon dans sa propre rue. Carpettes secouées, signe de propreté, ménage bien tenu. Ça suffit. On peut puer de la gueule, on est tranquille après ça. (*CV*, p. 309)

Luchini's vocalisation in the play elicits laughter from the audience:

> [soft] Qui ne ferait pas sa poussIÈRE dans ces endroits-LÀ, sur les [coups de]
>
> sept HEURES, passerait pour un fameux cochon dans sa propre rue.
>
> [loud] Carpettes secouées, signe de propreté, ménage bien [**tnu**].
>
> [softer] Ça suffit.
>
> [louder] On peut puer de la gueule, on est tranquille après ça [audience laughs
>
> softly][86]

The film and the stage performance present two different interpretative choices of the same excerpt, rendered through intonation. In the film, there is no emphasis on 'on peut puer de la gueule, on est tranquille après ça', while in the play Luchini emphasises the comical aspect of Bardamu's community's habits. The first part of the comment (up until 'fameux cochon') is uttered in a soft volume, rendering the idea of people secretly talking behind people's backs ('on passerait pour' refers to the reputation one has in

---

[85] This passage is track 08 on the CD provided with this study.
[86] This passage is track 09 on the CD provided with this study.

one's neighbourhood). By contrast, Luchini then increases the volume of his voice on 'carpettes secouées, signe de propreté, ménage bien tenu', in this way vocalising it as a saying or proverb proudly known in the community. The softer volume of 'Ça suffit' reveals its status as a narratorial comment distinct from the other utterances, and Luchini's Bardamu then raises the volume of his voice again on 'on peut puer de la gueule, on est tranquille après ça'. It is a sarcastic narratorial comment, but it is vocalised in the same way as 'carpettes secouées, signe de propreté, ménage bien tenu', and in this way it is shown as another proverb in the neighbourhood. Luchini's Bardamu uses the dynamics of voice to reveal the ridicule of the values of the community, and elicits laughter from the audience. I suggest that this vocal strategy of making the audience laugh by ridiculing the inhabitants of la Garenne-Rancy extends Bardamu's textual revenge. In the text, Bardamu inwardly warns the community: 'Attention dégueulasses! [...] je dirai tout […] [J]e vous rendrai plus subtilement lâches et plus immondes encore, si et tant que vous en crèverez peut-être, enfin' (*CV*, pp. 311-312). This quotation is not included in Luchini's *Voyage* (neither the film nor the play), but in the play Luchini's Bardamu makes the audience laugh at the community that despised and belittled him, this way taking revenge on them through the use of his voice.

By contrast, in the film, the lack of emphasis on 'on peut puer de la gueule, on est tranquille après ça' does not show the comment as meant to induce laughter. Rather, it is vocalised as a assessment from the appalled and saddened narrator on the fact that in la Garenne-Rancy cleanliness only has to be maintained on the outside, while indoors there is the state of decay that Bardamu, as doctor and outsider, powerlessly witnesses. In the novel, there is no punctuation indicating whether the passage is intended as funny or not, which means that both of Luchini's interpretations are potentially contained in the text.

Interpreting the passage differently is arguably more an option for the film audience than for the theatre audience, due to the difference in reception. The spectator of Luchini's play is, to a certain extent, influenced by the reaction of the audience crowd around him or her. The collective experience can, for instance, emphasise the comic aspect of Luchini's performance, because in drama

> the collective aspect actually increases the intensity of the reception. [...] Collective reception sparks off various socio-psychological group-dynamic processes in

which the numerous individual reactions reinforce and harmonise with each other to produce a relatively homogeneous group reaction.[87]

Luchini's Bardamu in the play directs the reception of the audience by establishing a relationship of connivance with the audience and using the dynamics of voice to get the audience to laugh when he wants them to. The laughter he elicits is intensified and homogenised by the collective experience. Luchini's stage performance can, then, be seen as more 'closed' that his vocalisation of Bardamu in Jacquot's film because it refuses breadth of interpretation by the audience.[88]

In the next example, it is a different kind of laughter that Luchini's Bardamu elicits from the audience as he exposes the darker side of the inhabitants of la Garenne-Rancy:

> Dès le troisième verre de vin, le noir, le plus mauvais, c'est le chien qui commence à souffrir, on lui écrase la patte d'un grand coup de talon. Ça lui apprendra à avoir faim en même temps que les hommes. On rigole bien à le voir disparaître en piaulant sous le lit comme un éventré. C'est le signal. Rien ne stimule les femmes éméchées comme la douleur des bêtes, on n'a pas toujours des taureaux sous la main. (*CV*, p. 337)

This passage is vocalised as follows in the stage performance:

> Dès le troisième verre de vin le noir le plus mauvais, c'est le chien qui commence à souffri—r
>
> [louder] on lui écrase la patte d'un grand coup de talon
>
> [softer] Ça lui apprendra à avoir faim en même temps que les hommes [audience's shocked laughter]
>
> [louder] On rigole bien à le voir disparaître [**sous la table en piaulant**] C'est le signal. Rien ne stimule [**mieux**] les femmes éméchées comme la douleur des bêtes [softer] on n'a pas toujours des taureaux sous la main [long shocked laughter from the audience][89]

---

[87] Manfred Pfister, *The Theory and Analysis of Drama*, trans. by John Halliday (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 37-38.

[88] Mathias Broth offers a linguistic analysis of the interaction between actors and theatre audience, focusing on sounds produced by the audience such as coughing, throat-clearing, and laughter. Broth examines collective laughter as the result of a constant process of negotiating and coordinating between spectators. See Mathias Broth, 'Agents secrets: Le public dans la construction interactive de la représentation théâtrale' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Uppsala University, Disciplinary Domain of Humanities and Social Sciences, Faculty of Languages, Department of Romance Languages, 2002), in particular, about collective laughter, pp. 79-134, available at <http://uu.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2:160916> [accessed 01/07/2011]; 'The Theatre Performance as Interaction between Actors and their Audiences', *Nottingham French Studies*, 50:2 (2011), 113-133 (pp. 120-129) on laughter in particular).

[89] This passage is track 10 on the CD provided with this study.

Unlike in the first and second examples, Luchini's delivery does not differ greatly between the film and the stage performance. What is significant however is the addition of the audience's vocal reaction in the stage performance. The narrative voice provokes their offended or shocked laughter with the comment about the dog and, even more so, the sexist comment about inebriated women, emphasised by the sudden softness of the voice. The narrative voice interrupts the narrative in order to leave time for the audience to react, which emphasises that the audience's reaction is part of the construction of the narrative voice, thus showing the latter's profoundly dialogic aspect.

In the TV film, the comment 'on n'a pas toujours des taureaux sous la main' is also uttered in a soft volume, and Luchini's Bardamu also remains silent for a few seconds before he carries on with the narrative. There is, however, no live audience to react and fill in the silence. It is unclear whether Luchini's Bardamu is waiting for a reaction that cannot happen because there is no live audience; or imagining the reaction of the absent/present spectator; or simply getting his thoughts back together before he carries on. The reaction is in any case left open, as there is a silence leaving room for the spectator to fill in, whether or not with laughter, or even no reaction at all. Here, Bardamu's narrative voice is, as in the play, also constructed in dialogue with the listener, but it is constructed upon a lack.

In this example, the presence of a live audience in the stage performance does not influence Luchini's vocalisation, as he does the same thing in the film. The presence of the audience, however, means that their vocal reaction is part of the performance as process, because production and reception are simultaneous. As such, the reaction of the audience is part of the construction of Bardamu's voice in dialogue. The presence of a live audience in the stage performance in fact potentially threatens Bardamu's narrative voice, as their reaction could be negative, or at least not the one he intended to provoke. It is also however potentially empowering, as it gives him the opportunity to direct the audience's reaction and to incorporate it into the construction of the narrative voice.

If the inclusion of a live audience empowers Bardamu, how does it affect his ventriloquising of the characters of his narrative? In order to answer this question I focus on Luchini's vocalisation of Bébert's aunt. As with the second example of narratorial comments, Bardamu ridicules the inhabitants of la Garenne-Rancy as part of his revenge over them. Bébert's aunt provides Bardamu's Luchini with great comic potential, which is corroborated by the actor when he explains that 'la partie américaine

[of *Voyage*] est beaucoup plus difficile à jouer [than la Garenne-Rancy] parce qu'elle est plus descriptive et qu'il y a moins de personnages pittoresques, comme la tante à Bébert'.[90] Bébert's aunt is one of the stereotypes of the talkative women in the text, and her comic potential is exploited by Luchini in particular in his vocalisation of the conversation in which Bébert's aunt asks him for syrup to prevent Bébert from masturbating:

> – Bébert, Docteur, faut que je vous dise, parce que vous êtes médecin, c'est un petit saligaud!... Il se 'touche'! Je m'en suis aperçue depuis deux mois et je me demande qui est-ce qui a pu lui apprendre ces saletés-là?... Je l'ai pourtant bien élevé moi! Je lui défends… Mais il recommence…
> – Dites-lui qu'il en deviendra fou, conseillai-je, classique.
> Bébert, qui nous entendait, n'était pas content.
> – J'me touche pas, c'est pas vrai, c'est le môme Gagat qui m'a proposé…
> – Voyez-vous, j'm'en doutais, fit la tante, dans la famille Gagat, vous savez, ceux du cinquième?... C'est tous des vicieux. Le grand-père, il paraît qu'il courait après les dompteuses… Hein, j'vous le demande, des dompteuses?... Dites-moi, Docteur, pendant qu'on est là, vous pourriez pas lui faire un sirop pour l'empêcher de se toucher?
> Je la suivis jusque dans sa loge pour prescrire un sirop anti-vice pour le môme Bébert. (*CV*, pp. 310-311)

This passage is vocalised as follows by Luchini's Bardamu in the stage adaptation:

> [very loud] Bébert, Docteur, faut que je vous dise [voice breaks on 'dise']
>
> [extremely loud] parce que vous êtes médecin, c'est un petit saligau—d!
>
> [pause]
>
> [extremely loud] Il se 'touche'! [audience laughs softly]
>
> **[Je sais pas qui lui a appris]** ces saletés-là— Je l'ai pourtant bien élevé— [~~moi~~]
>
> [slightly softer] Je lui défends Mais il recommence
>
> [softer] Dites-lui qu'il en deviendra fou, conseillai-je
>
> [pause]
>
> [softer] classique [audience laughs]
>
> [loud] J'me touche pas, [**fit Bébert**] c'est pas vrai—
>
> [extremely loud] c'est pas vrai c'est le môme Gagat qui m'a propos/
>
> [extremely loud] [**Oh—**] Voyez-vous, j'm'en doutai—s, fit la tante, [~~dans~~] la famille Gaga—, vous savez, ceux du cinquième C'est tous des vicieux Le grand-père, il paraît qu'il courait après les dompteuses [audience laughs softly]
>
> [loud] Hei—n
>
> [softer] j'vous [~~le~~] demande

[90] Busnel, 'Fabrice Luchini: "Un acteur, c'est celui qui déchiffre les cicatrices"'.

[pause]

[loud] des dompteuses

[pause]

[louder] Dites-moi, Docteur, pendant qu'on est là, vous pourriez pas lui faire un sirop pour l'empêcher de se toucher? [audience laughs]

[extremely articulated] Je la suivis jusque dans sa loge pour prescrire un sirop anti-vice pour le môme Bébert [audience laughs longly][91]

As can be seen from the transcription, the narrative voice uses extreme dynamics of voice in this passage. By contrast, in the film Luchini uses the other extreme of dynamics of voice and whispers. Both performative options are contained within the text, as it does not indicate one rather than the other. Bébert's aunt might be whispering as this is an intimate topic, or she might be speaking as loudly as she usually does. In the stage performance the narrative voice opts for one extreme in order to exploit its comic potential, while in the film the narrative voice opts for the other extreme for its connotation of shame.

In the stage performance, Luchini's Bardamu exploits the comic potential of Bébert's aunt for instance with the pause he leaves before 'Il se "touche"!' This pause works as a means of building up the audience's anticipation. The abundance of laughter in this passage is induced as much by the material as by the use the actor makes of it. Luchini's Bardamu emphasises the almost burlesque tone of the conversation (the 'dompteuses', the syrup), as well as his own two narratorial comments, 'classique', which is preceded by a short pause and is uttered in a soft volume which contrasts with Bébert's aunt screaming, and 'je la suivis jusque dans sa loge pour prescrire un sirop anti-vice pour le môme Bébert'. This second and last comment is emphasised by extreme articulation from the actor, both in the film and the stage adaptation, in order to show sarcasm. However in the film there is no-one to laugh, while in the stage performance this last comment induces prolonged hilarity from the audience.

It is fruitful to compare the use of ventriloquism in this passage with Brasseur's vocalisation of la mère Henrouille, another strong female voice in the text. In Brasseur's reading, the focus is on the character rather than the narrator, and the episode of 'La Mère Henrouille' concludes with the victory of la mère Henrouille, as her voice is interwoven with Bardamu's. In Luchini's stage performance however, Bardamu uses the comic potential of Bébert's aunt, but eventually it is his narratorial comment that

---

[91] This passage is track 11 on the CD provided with this study.

concludes the episode, as well as getting the strongest reaction from the audience. Luchini's Bardamu uses ventriloquism as performance of an extreme, comic voice, but unlike Brasseur's Bardamu he ultimately uses this voice as a means of emphasising his own narrative voice to the audience. This strategy can, of course, be explained by the fact that Bardamu dislikes Bébert's aunt, while Brasseur's performative choice was to supplement Bardamu's fondness for la mère Henrouille. It is however significant that Luchini's Bardamu uses ventriloquism as a means to empower the ventriloquist's voice (his own), while Brasseur's Bardamu uses it to emphasise the voice of the ventriloquised (la mère Henrouille). Indeed, this strategy shows Luchini's Bardamu in the stage performance as possibly aiming to empower his voice by using the character of Bébert's aunt, which corresponds with Bardamu's textual revenge as announced in the text. In the film, the apparent intention of using the character of Bébert's aunt is not as present or successful as in the stage performance: Bébert's aunt whispers rather than screams, which shows a certain sense of self-restraint on her part, making her less of a comic character. Moreover, Bardamu's final comment concludes the episode, but in the stage performance the audible laughter from the audience is part of the construction of the narrative voice.

In order to conclude my analysis of Luchini's vocalisations, I shall turn to another character, Robinson. As I explained in the textual analysis, Robinson is a special character in the text because he is the narrator of another, alternative *Voyage*.[92] In order to examine how Robinson's role is rendered in Luchini's vocal adaptations, the scene I shall first focus on is when Robinson and Bardamu go for a drink on a Sunday and Robinson explains that he wants a new job. Hearing 'des airs d'Amérique', Robinson starts thinking about his time with Bardamu and Molly (who was involved with both) in the USA. In a narratorial comment Bardamu undermines Robinson's status as alternative narrator of their time in America: 'pendant deux ans qu'il avait passés là-bas, il n'était pas entré bien en avant dans la vie des Américains' (*CV*, p. 376). Bardamu implies that Robinson would not be a good narrator, because in the USA he did not integrate and understand how Americans live. Bardamu, on the other hand, has made the effort to understand the USA, a fact which he shows in his description of American music, straight after undermining Robinson's role as alternative narrator: 'leur espèce de musique, où ils essaient de quitter eux aussi leur lourde accoutumance et la peine écrasante de faire tous les jours la même chose et avec laquelle ils se dandinent avec la

---

[92] See Part I, Chapter 1, pp. 66-67.

vie qui n'a pas de sens, un peu, pendant que ça joue. Des ours, ici, là-bas' (*CV*, pp. 376-377). Bardamu then says 'il [Robinson] n'en finissait pas son cassis à réfléchir à tout ça'. Robinson is also thinking about the USA, constructing the alternative *Voyage* narrative. In the stage performance, the comment 'il n'en finissait pas son cassis de réfléchir à tout ça' induces laughter from the audience. The audience laughs because it is unlikely that Robinson is thinking about Americans in such a complex way as Bardamu, given that he has never 'entré bien en avant dans la vie des Américains' and this way he failed to understand the USA. Robinson as alternative narrator is, then, ridiculed.

After a pause, the conversation between Robinson and Bardamu starts again, as Robinson asks Bardamu:

> – Tu vois pas un truc, toi, que je pourrais faire pour sortir de mon métier qui me crève?
> Il émergeait de sa réflexion.
> – J'voudrais en sortir de mon business, comprends-tu? J'en ai assez moi de me crever comme un mulet… J'veux aller me promener moi aussi… Tu connais pas des gens qu'auraient besoin d'un chauffeur, par hasard?... T'en connais pourtant du monde, toi?
> C'étaient des idées du dimanche, des idées de gentleman qui le prenaient. Je n'osais pas le dissuader, lui insinuer qu'avec une tête d'assassin besogneux comme la sienne, personne ne lui confierait jamais son automobile, qu'il conserverait toujours un trop drôle d'air, avec ou sans livrée. (*CV*, p. 377)

Luchini's Bardamu vocalises this conversation as follows in the stage performance:

> ['strangled' voice] Tu vois pas un truc, [~~toi, que je pourrais faire~~] pour sortir de mon métier qui me crève
>
> [normal voice] Il émergeait de sa réflexion.
>
> ['strangled' voice] J'voudrais m'en sortir de mon busine—ss comprends-tu
>
> [**Ferdinand**] ['strangled' voice; louder] J'en ai [**marre**] moi de me CREver comme un mulet
>
> ['strangled' voice] [**J'voudrais**] aller me promener [**Ferdinand**] Tu connais pas [**quelqu'un**] qu'aurait besoin d'un
>
> ['strangled' voice; louder] d'un chauffeur par hasard?
>
> [normal voice; very loud] T'en connais pourtant du monde toi— [voice almost breaks in laughter]
>
> [normal voice] C'étaient des idées du dimanche [audience laughs] des idées de GENTLEMAN qui le prenaient. Je n'osais pas le dissuader, lui insinuer qu'avec une tête d'assassin besogneux comme la sienne [audience starts laughing] personne ne lui confierait jamais son automobile [audience still laughing]

[pause]

[normal voice] qu'il conserverait toujours un trop drôle d'air, avec ou sans livrée. The narrative voice emphasises the fact that this is a conversation: Robinson has a distinctive, strangled voice compared with Bardamu's regular voice, and Robinson calls Bardamu by his first name twice, most probably for the sake of clarity. While the line 't'en connais pourtant du monde, toi' is said by Robinson in the text, in the stage performance it is clearly part of the narrative voice rather than Robinson's as reported by the narrator. Indeed, the voice is not strangled, and it almost breaks into laughter at the end of the line, openly laughing at Robinson. It also announces the comic aspect of the narrative comment to come. In the film, Luchini's vocalisation is overall similar, however the narrative does not break into laughter, and more significantly there is no pause between 'automobile' and 'qu'il conserverait toujours'. In the third example of narratorial comments above (the comment about women and bulls), there is a pause in the narrative both in the film and the stage performance, and in the stage performance this pause was filled with laughter from the audience, while in the film there was a silence. In the conversation between Robinson and Bardamu however, it seems that the pause in the narrative was not planned by the actor, but that prolonged laughter from the audience interrupts the performance. In the film on the other hand, there is no room for laughter. This shows to what extent the audience is part of the performance as process, and consequently of the construction of the narrative voice as inscribed in this process, in the interaction with the audience.

As the conversation between Robinson and Bardamu goes on, Robinson is disappointed with Bardamu's reaction, and complains that Bardamu always criticises him ('En Amérique j'allais pas assez vite, que tu disais… En Afrique, c'est la chaleur qui me crevait… Ici, je suis pas assez intelligent…', *CV*, p. 377). Robinson then realises that what he needs for people to find him 'bien gentil' is money, and suggests that he and Bardamu get 'une petite maison de rapport avec six locataires qui payent bien'. Bardamu acquiesces ('c'est effectivement vrai'):

> Il [Robinson] n'en revenait pas d'être arrivé tout seul à cette conclusion majeure. Alors il me regarda drôlement, comme s'il me découvrait soudain un aspect inouï de dégueulasse.
> – Toi, quand j'y pense, t'as le bon bout. Tu vends tes bobards aux crevards et pour le reste, tu t'en fous… T'es pas contrôlé, rien… T'arrives et tu pars quand tu veux, t'as la liberté en somme. T'as l'air gentil mais t'es une belle vache tout dans le fond!...
> – Tu es injuste Robinson! (*CV*, pp. 377-378)

In the stage performance this conversation is vocalised as follows:

> Il n'en revenait pas d'être arrivé tout seul
>
> [louder] à cette conclusion majeure [audience laughs]
>
> Alors il me regarda drôlement, comme s'il me [**trouvait tout à coup**] un [**air**] inouï de dégueulasse.
>
> [Robinson's voice] Mais dis donc toi, t'as le bon bout
>
> [louder] Tu vends tes bobards aux crevards [audience starts laughing] et pour le reste, tu t'en fous [still laughing] T'es pas contrôlé, rien T'arrives et tu pars quand tu veux, t'as la liberté en somme T'as l'air gentil mais t'es une belle vache tout dans le fond Ferdinand [audience laughs]
>
> [softer] T'es une belle vache
>
> [pause]
>
> [still soft] T'es injuste[93]

In this excerpt Robinson vocalises the possibility that Bardamu is not as 'gentil' as he seems, that he in fact is 'une belle vache'. Robinson openly goes against Bardamu, however he is ridiculed by the narrative voice, for instance by the vocal emphasis on 'conclusion majeure'. Robinson's suspicions about Bardamu are delivered in such a way as to emphasise their comic aspect, and they induce laughter from the audience. The comical delivery however stops with 'T'es une belle vache / T'es injuste', which are uttered in a softer volume, both in the film and the stage performance. This abrupt change in the delivery shows Bardamu as hurt by Robinson's comment. In the film, 't'es injuste' concludes an episode in which there has been no-one to laugh at Robinson (Bardamu did not leave room for a reaction from the absent/present audience), and Bardamu has not laughed either while reporting the conversation (by contrast, in the stage performance he openly laughs). The overall tone of the conversation is much bleaker than in the stage performance. In the stage performance on the other hand, the delivery on 't'es injuste / t'es une belle vache' comes after Bardamu has got the audience to laugh with him at Robinson. With this last comment, it retrospectively seems that ridiculing Robinson was an act of revenge over this last hurtful comment. Bardamu used the audience to laugh with him at Robinson partly because Robinson challenged him.

In the stage performance, Bardamu uses the audience to ridicule the potential narrative of Robinson (if he were the narrator, it would be ridiculous), while at the same

---

[93] This whole passage with Robinson is track 12 on the CD provided with this study.

time exploiting it in his own narrative to make the audience laugh. For example, in another scene which is in the stage performance but not in the film, Bardamu provokes the hilarity of the audience by using Robinson's considerations on women: 'moi, tu sais, je m'en passe des femmes avec […] leur ventre dans lequel il y a toujours quelque chose qui pousse, tantôt des mômes, tantôt des maladies' (*CV*, p. 398). In this same scene, two textual comments are erased from the stage performance. The first comment that is erased is: 'c'était l'indépendance qu'était son faible à Robinson [~~il le disait lui-même~~]'. By erasing 'il le disait lui-même', the narrative voice does not acknowledge Robinson's capacity for self-reflection, and as a result 'c'était l'indépendance qu'était son faible à Robinson' seems to come from the narrative voice alone, part of the mockery of the character of Robinson. The narrative voice also undermines Robinson's role in Luchini's Bardamu's vocalisation of '"Robinson, les verres! Nom de Dieu! qu'il commanda. C'est-y moi qui vais vous les laver?" Robinson bondit d'un coup. [~~"Tu vois, qu'il m'apprit, je fais ici un extra !"~~]'.

As the comparative analysis of the film and the stage performance has aimed to demonstrate, in the film Bardamu's narrative voice is constructed upon the lack of an audience. As Bardamu makes absence presence, for instance by talking directly to the camera, the silence that surrounds his monologue is even more striking. In the stage performance Bardamu's textual voice is supplemented by the inclusion of the live audience, whose audible reaction as directed by his narrative voice is part of the construction of his voice, because it is part of the performance as process. Bardamu's voice is also empowered by his undermining and mockery of Robinson, who through Luchini's performative choices is no longer shown as the narrator of an alternative *Voyage*, which is possibly part of Bardamu's revenge over him.

In the stage performance, the narrative voice is supplemented by the inclusion not only of the live audience, but also with excerpts from *Mort*. Though the play is entitled *Voyage au bout de la nuit*, it incorporates passages from *Voyage* and *Mort*, as well as quotations from Céline and seemingly improvised (but probably rehearsed) comments by Luchini. The purpose of Luchini's comments is mostly to situate the narrative for the sake of clarity. For example before quoting from an interview of Céline, Luchini explains that 'c'est un interview qu'il a donné quelques années avant sa mort', or to introduce a passage with Robinson, Luchini explains that the narrator 'marche avec Robinson, le personnage dont je vous ai parlé tout à l'heure'. The most extended

comment by Luchini is at the beginning of the encore. He thanks the audience for their 'écoute intense', and acknowledges that the audience influences his performance, implying that the performance is (even if only minimally) different every time. Luchini's comments are not part of the construction of the narrative voice, as they are clearly differentiated from the actual monologue. Quotations from Céline are not part of the monologue either, as they are not only introduced but also commented by the actor. By contrast, excerpts from *Voyage* and *Mort* are not commented. Only one scene with Robinson is introduced by the aforementioned comment, because this is necessary for the sake of clarity, as Luchini has just been quoting Céline and no transition would have left the audience confused. Though the actors' comments are, of course, part of the performance, they are not part of Bardamu's narrative voice, which is clearly distinguished from Luchini's.

There are no transitions between excerpts from *Mort* and *Voyage* and the actor never specifies that the monologue is made of passages from two different texts. The chosen excerpts from *Mort* fit perfectly with *Voyage*, for instance at the beginning of the play, after Bardamu has set up as a doctor in La Garenne-Rancy, Luchini vocalises an excerpt from *Mort* in which Ferdinand describes and condemns the practices of a fellow doctor. The narrative then smoothly returns to *Voyage*, taking up where it had left off. The name Bardamu is never mentioned in the play, but Ferdinand is. This however does not mean that the narrative voice is designated as *Mort*'s Ferdinand's alone, because Bardamu's first name is also Ferdinand. I suggest that the narrative voice that is constructed by the actor is still Bardamu's, but supplemented with that of *Mort*'s narrator. Excerpts from *Voyage* make up the majority of the play (there are more of them, and they are longer), and excerpts from *Mort* are chosen according to how they fit with *Voyage*. The voice of *Mort*'s narrator is thus included in Bardamu's, rather than placed alongside it.

One particular passage from each text is repeated a number of times throughout the play. An excerpt from the incipit of *Voyage* (which was added by Céline in 1949) is uttered three times, and an excerpt from the passage of the death of Mrs Bérenge, from the beginning of *Mort*, is uttered twice. The sentence that is repeated from the incipit of *Voyage* is: 'si j'étais pas tellement contraint, obligé pour gagner ma vie, je vous le dis tout de suite je supprimerais tout' (*CV*, p. 13). The incipit was added by Céline seventeen years after the first publication of *Voyage*. Céline claims that he is misunderstood ('tout est mal pris') and refers in particular to *Bagatelles pour un massacre*, one of his violently

anti-Semitic pamphlets. This incipit is part of the construction of the author as posture, however this context is not present in Luchini's performance. The line that is repeated is not announced as external to the narrative (as is the case with quotations from Céline), but as part of it. As such, it becomes part of the construction of Bardamu's narrative voice. Throughout the play, Bardamu says three times that if he were not constrained he would erase everything, threatening to end the narrative, but every time the narrative goes on. Bardamu's narrative voice is, then, constructed as a paradox: he is unwilling to talk, but the enjoyment he takes in the narrative contradicts this statement. This line is used as *captatio benevolentiae* by Bardamu, which is part of the establishing of his relationship with the audience, and thus the construction of his narrative voice.

In the passage from *Mort* that is repeated on the other hand, the voice reveals its narrative power and its enjoyment of the narrative act:

> Je pourrais moi dire toute ma haine. Je sais. Je le ferai plus tard s'ils ne reviennent pas. J'aime mieux raconter des histoires. J'en raconterai de telles qu'ils reviendront, exprès, pour me tuer, des quatre coins du monde. Alors ce sera fini et je serai bien content.[94]

This passage is uttered for the first time at the end of the first part of the play (before the encore), and then repeated at the end of the encore. This passage from *Mort* is used as a conclusion, but I suggest that it can be seen as retrospectively establishing how Bardamu has been using the narrative. With the incorporation and the repetition of this excerpt from *Mort*, Bardamu (as re-constructed by Luchini) reveals his narrative power, and his enjoyment of the narrative act ('j'aime mieux raconter des histoires'). The aim of the narrative is, firstly, to take revenge ('je pourrais moi dire toute ma haine'), and secondly to induce revenge ('ils reviendront, exprès, pour me tuer'). Paradoxically, the narrative voice wants to tell stories ('de telles' implies that they are not completely true, thus that he is ventriloquising the characters) in order to be silenced ('alors ce sera fini et je serai bien content').

The line from the incipit of *Voyage* is not in Jacquot's film, while the passage from *Mort* is, although this time it is only used the once. The construction of Bardamu's voice, then, is continued in the stage performance compared with the film. Through the repetition of both these excerpts, Luchini constructs a narrative voice that was induced by hatred (he started telling stories in order to take revenge) and that wishes to induce hatred and to be silenced. The narrative voice also claims to be forced to speak ('si j'étais pas tellement contraint') while it is also clearly enjoying the narrative act. While

---

[94] Louis-Ferdinand Céline, *Mort à crédit* (Paris: Gallimard, 1952), p. 14.

Luchini is concerned with not betraying what he calls the original intentions of the text, out of the actors of my corpus he is the one who is technically the least faithful to the text, as he re-constructs Bardamu's voice. He is however the actor who empowers Bardamu's voice, by directing the audience as well as by emphasising the complexity and darkness of Bardamu's ventriloquial narrative voice.

Thus far in this analysis I have focused on the way the narrative voice is constructed and empowered by making the audience react audibly. In one scene however, the narrative voice's effect on the audience is not to make them laugh, but to reduce them to complete silence. This happens with arguably the darkest and most disturbing scene of the text (which is not in the film), in which a couple need to tie up and beat their little girl in order to have intercourse:

> D'après sa voix, elle [the little girl] devait bien avoir dans les dix ans. J'ai fini par comprendre après bien des fois ce qu'ils lui faisaient tous les deux. Ils l'attachaient d'abord, c'était long à l'attacher, comme pour une opération. Ça les excitait. 'Petite charogne' qu'il jurait lui. 'Ah! la petite salope!' qu'elle faisait la mère. 'On va te dresser salope!' qu'ils criaient ensemble et des choses et des choses qu'ils lui reprochaient en même temps, des choses qu'ils devaient imaginer. Ils devaient l'attacher après les montants du lit. Pendant ce temps-là, l'enfant se plaignotait comme une souris prise au piège. 'T'auras beau faire petite vache, t'y couperas pas. Va! T'y couperas pas!' qu'elle reprenait, la mère, puis avec toute une bordée d'insultes comme pour un cheval. Toute excitée. 'Tais-toi maman, que répondait la petite doucement. Tais-toi maman! Bats-moi maman! Mais tais-toi maman!' […] Je ne pouvais pas fermer la fenêtre non plus. Je n'étais bon à rien. Cependant, je crois qu'il me venait des forces à écouter ces choses-là, des forces d'aller plus loin, des drôles de forces et la prochaine fois alors, je pourrais descendre encore plus bas la prochaine fois, écouter d'autres plaintes que je n'avais pas encore entendues, ou que j'avais du mal à comprendre avant, parce qu'on dirait qu'il y en a encore toujours des autres au bout des plaintes encore qu'on n'a pas encore entendues ni comprises. […] 'Viens toi grande! Vite! Viens par là!' Tout heureux. (*CV*, pp. 338-339).

In the stage performance, the narrative voice renders the horrors of the power of voice through dynamics:

> D'après sa voix elle devait avoir dans les dix ans.
>
> [short pause]
>
> J'ai fini par comprendre après bien des fois ce qu'ils lui [**fsaient**] tous les deux.
>
> [very loud] Ils l'attachaient d'abord, c'était long à l'attacher, comme pour une opération. Ça les excitait.
>
> [screams] Petite charo——gne
>
> [very soft, almost whispers] qu'il jurait lui
>
> [screams] [~~Ah! la~~] petite salo——pe!

[very soft, broken voice] qu'elle faisait la mère

[screams] On va te dresser salope!

[short pause]

[soft] qu'ils criaient ensemble et [**puis**] des choses [et] [**puis**] des choses qu'ils lui reprochaient en même temps

[slightly louder] des choses qu'ils devaient imaginer.

[louder] Ils devaient l'attacher après les montants du lit.

[short pause] Pendant ce temps-là, l'enfant se plaignotait comme une souris prise au piège

[very loud] T'auras beau faire petite vache

[furious, vicious] t'y couperas pas

[screams] t'y couperas pas [Va!]

[not screaming] qu'elle reprenait, la mère, puis avec toute une bordée d'insultes

[softer] comme pour un cheval. Toute excitée

[soft] Tais-toi Maman, que répondait la petite tout doucement. Tais-toi maman! Bats-moi maman! Mais tais-toi maman—

[…]

[loud] Je [ne] pouvais pas fermer [**la p…**]

[softer] la fenêtre non plus. [**J-j**]'étais bon à rien

[…]

Cependant je crois qu'il me venait des forces à écouter ces choses-là, des forces d'aller plus loin

[pause] des drôles de forces

[loud] et la prochaine fois alors, [**ben**] je pourrais descendre encore plus bas la prochaine fois, écouter d'autres plaintes que je n'avais pas encore entendues, ou que j'avais du mal à comprendre avant parce qu'on dirai—t

[short pause]

[louder] qu'il y en a encore toujours des autres au bout des plaintes encore qu'on n'a pas encore entendues ni comprises

[…]

[loud] Viens toi grande! [**Viens vite par ici!**]

[screams] Viens par là— [**viens par là—**]

[soft] tout heureux[95]

There are three different voices' in this passage. The mother and the father's voices are interchangeable. They are pure volume, violence, and abuse. The little girl's voice is soft ('se plaignotait comme une souris') and abused. She asks for her mother to stop talking, and it seems to be her parents' vocal abuse that does the more harm to her, rather than physical abuse. Bardamu's voice in this passage is at one point confused, as he makes a mistake ('la p... fenêtre') and stutters. His voice is thus uncontrolled, while at the same time extremely controlled, as can be seen from the impressive dynamics of voice, from a screaming to a soft voice. The reaction of the audience to this scene is significantly silent, whether out of shock, or disgust.

The silence of the audience echoes an anecdote told by Luchini at the beginning of the encore. He explains that the owner of the nearby bar (where the audience goes for a drink after the performance) once came to see him and asked him 'mais qu'est-ce que vous leur faites?' Luchini, taken aback, asked the man to explain what he meant. The man struggled to explain, first saying that 'ils ne sont pas', until he realised what state the members of audience are in after Luchini's performance: 'ils pensent'. This anecdote offers an interesting insight regarding the audience's reaction to the performance once it is over. Given that they have just left the theatre, the spectators are most likely to be thinking about the performance they have just seen. The collective experience of watching a play (for instance laughing together) gradually turns into an individual experience: according to the bartender they are all thinking, however they are no longer influenced by the crowd around them and they can react differently, whether they verbalise their reaction to the play (for instance by discussing it), or they remain silent. By thinking about the narrative voice (the new narrative voice as constructed by Luchini), the members of the audience participate in its construction. After listening to the narrative voice for almost two hours, they, in turn, are in the process of becoming producers of the narrative. The narrative voice has created a gap for the members of the audience to 'fill with ever changing possible worlds in a dynamic process of reading'.[96] While their reaction to the narrative voice was homogeneous, once they have left the theatre they have the opportunity to have their own individual memory of the

---

[95] This passage is track 13 on the CD provided with this study.
[96] Pieter Verstraete, 'Vocal Distress on Stage: Voice and Diegetic Space in Contemporary Music Theatre', <http://web.mit.edu/comm-forum/mit4/papers/verstraete.pdf> [accessed 04/07/2011] (p. 10). This paper was given at the fourth Media in Transition Conference (Mit4), 6th-8th May 2005, Cambridge, MA. Verstraete focuses on the singing voice, however his analysis is relevant for the present study and the analysis of voice as performance.

experience. Luchini's *conteur* performance to the audience participates in the permanent dynamic construction of Bardamu's narrative voice, which through him has gained new readers, that is to say entered new heads that will, in turn, intone Bardamu's voice with their own, according to their memory of the voice of Luchini's Bardamu. As the analysis has aimed to demonstrate, it is with Luchini's stage performance that Bardamu's voice really is empowered. Over eighteen years, the actor explored how Bardamu's textual voice can be brought to voice, re-constructing it and re-organising it through his own, and communicating it to an audience, making Bardamu's voice both an ephemeral event and a permanent process.[97]

Four voices, four Bardamus

Simon's, Brasseur's, Podalydès's and Luchini's vocalisations of Bardamu are shaped by a combination of the intentional and the involuntary, of their vocal qualities and vocal styles as well as their performative choices. The classification of vocal uniqueness (as a voice with grain) and potential vocal transferability (voice without grain but with great vocal technique) has been fruitful in analysing the differences between the actors' vocalisations. The concept of the grain of a voice has proven most relevant to Simon, with whom Bardamu, in a dynamic of deduction and supplementation, loses the careful narrative construction of his voice while gaining a vocal body. By contrast, the relative lack of individuality of Podalydès's voice means that in his vocalisation he does not impose a grain on Bardamu. More transferable, the actor's voice shows greater vocal technique and mobility, and in his vocalisation of 'La Guerre' the narrative voice is successful in 'putting on' the voice of Bardamu as character.

Brasseur's vocalisation, like Simon's, is constructed around vocal uniqueness, but centers on the relationship between the characters and the narrative voice. This can of course be partly explained by the difference between 'La Guerre' (as an excerpt dominated by the contrast between Bardamu's voice as character and his voice as narrator) and 'La Mère Henrouille' (with its two strong female voices). Bardamu's regular narrative voice as vocalised by Brasseur has a distinctively low tessitura and slow tempo, but with the two strong female voices, the narrative voice becomes that of a

---

[97] In recent years, Luchini has, in a sense, further deconstructed and re-constructed Bardamu's textual narrative voice by incorporating it in his other plays, intertwining it with texts by La Fontaine, Baudelaire or Hugo. Of course, Luchini might, in the future, perform his plays adapted from *Voyage* again, or a new adaptation.

conteur performing and enjoying the narrative act, with the patronising vocal style of Mrs Henrouille and, even more so, the vocal uniqueness of la mère Henrouille. Brasseur's vocalisation shows a narrator that needs the uniqueness of his characters for the narrative act to become performance, while Simon's Bardamu appears self-sufficient, as the narrative act is centred on the uniqueness of the narrative voice (the combination of the actor's and the narrator's voices). Podalydès's Bardamu, like Brasseur's, needs characters, but in order to appear reliable as a narrator capable of transferring his lack of vocal individuality and transferring his great vocal technique to the characters in his narrative. The classification between vocal uniqueness and potential vocal transferability is however less relevant to Luchini's Bardamu, given that the actor, in a sense, stands in between these two extremes: his voice is individual and unforgettable (to paraphrase Ubersfeld) not only because of its timbre but also because of his mobile vocal style in his use of extreme dynamics of voice.

Other than the actors' vocal qualities and vocal styles, the medium also shapes and influences the vocalisation of Bardamu. Podalydès's recording of *Voyage* lasts over sixteen hours, and his nuanced interpretation is best suited to the medium of an audio-book, while Simon's and Brasseur's vocalisations are stand-alone recordings. The importance of the new medium in adaptation is perhaps best shown by the comparison between Luchini's vocalisation of Bardamu in Jacquot's TV film and the actor's stage performance. The medium of theatre implies the inclusion of a live audience, whose presence and reactions become part of the construction of the narrative voice in dialogue, while in the film Bardamu has to construct his narrative voice upon the lack of an audience.

Brasseur's, Podalydès's and Luchini's vocalisations show three uses of ventriloquism. Brasseur's Bardamu uses ventriloquism as performance, and Podalydès's uses his lack of vocal individuality as vocal transferability, as his rendering of the characters' voices appears plausible and reliable, and ventriloquism is used as deception. Luchini's Bardamu uses ventriloquism as empowerment of his narrative voice. In ventriloquism as performance, the ventriloquist's voice only serves as a contrast to the extreme voices of the ventriloquised, which ultimately are what makes the performance a success.[98] Luchini's Bardamu on the other hand uses ventriloquism to empower his own voice (emphasising his narrative comments or his narrative role). Luchini's stage performance of *Voyage* shows that the voice can gain lasting power, but not solely

---

[98] See Goldblatt's analysis of the logic of the act Bergen and McCarthy. Goldblatt, pp. 33-49.

through aggression and violence, as was the case in *Zazie* which only led to a temporary illusion of real power. In Luchini's stage adaptation, Bardamu ventriloquises his characters (in my analysis I focused on Bébert's aunt and Robinson), not to show their uniqueness (like Brasseur), not to deceive the audience and appear reliable (like Podalydès), but to ridicule them and to undermine their existence outside of his narrative voice. Bardamu takes revenge as he establishes a relationship of connivance with the audience and makes them laugh or be shocked, with him, at those he has turned into his characters. It is in the relationship with the audience that Bardamu's voice is really empowered: the violence of his narrative voice is combined with its power of seduction, as he successfully directs the reaction of the audience, integrating it in the construction of his narrative voice. The narrative voice is empowered by being deconstructed (passages are selected and mixed), supplemented (with *Mort*'s Ferdinand), performed and received. It is an ephemeral event and a process, as it will, in turn, be constructed further by the spectators. Bardamu's narrative is, then, only properly empowered when it truly becomes that of a reader, and in fact those of its readers.

Conclusion

The present study set out to examine how literary voices are constructed, and what processes of transposition they go through when they are adapted into another medium, by focusing on two influential oralised twentieth-century French novels, *Voyage* and *Zazie*, and their adaptations into illustrated novel, comic book, film, recorded reading and stage performance. The Bakhtinian concepts of dialogism and polyphony, and the model of ventriloquism have been central to my analysis of 'voice'. By supplementing Bakhtin's theories with the model of ventriloquism, it has been possible to further explore notions of violence and of a dynamic of appropriation and expropriation between voices that are inherent to Bakhtinian dialogism. In Bakhtinian polyphony, equal and fully valid voices are at work alongside each other, whereas the model of ventriloquism exploits the potential paradox that these voices are both the subjects of their own signifying discourse and the objects of another's voice. Bakhtinian dialogism shows that voices are constructed in appropriation of the words of other, and I have used the model of ventriloquism in order to reveal further layers of complexity inherent to the notions of origin of voice, vocal control and vocal power. The ventriloquist speaks as the other, through the other, and as such, s/he can appropriate and even expropriate the voice of the other as one of his/her own voices. S/he can also give a voice to a voiceless body, such as the ventriloquist's dummy. Consequently, I have employed the model of ventriloquism as a hypothesis for the theorisation of textual and adapted voices, focusing on the dynamic of control and power between one's voice and the other's voice, as well as the relationship between voice and body in texts and other media, between text and image, image and/or sound.

The model of ventriloquism sheds a new light on the textual voices of *Voyage* and *Zazie*. Whilst the orality of these two seminal novels (their spoken or vocal aspect) has been analysed from a variety of approaches (stylistic, psychoanalytic, Bakhtinian, historicist, narratological, and from the standpoint of translation studies), I have shown that using the ventriloquial model to analyse the textual voices of *Voyage* and *Zazie* reveals differing standpoints and in fact differing conceptions of voice, and of the relationship between one's voice and the other's voice. Bardamu uses his ventriloquial ability against the other, and expropriates his/her voice from the other. The narrator of *Zazie*, by contrast, uses the ventriloquial ability in relation to the self, as the narrative voice is constructed as a layering of dissonant voices, at the risk of dissolution. While

Bardamu controls and gains power over the others, the narrator of *Zazie* mostly relinquishes the control inherent to the function of narrative voice. However this control is then reused in order to prevent the voice of Aroun Arachide from silencing all others. *Zazie* shows that polyphony is always at risk of turning into cacophony, but that this turning point is unstable and that polyphony does not, however, become irretrievable. My analysis of *Zazie* has also shown that an individual voice needs that of the other; Gabriel and Marceline each gain a voice that seduces the other by letting themselves be spoken through by the narrative voice, and the characters fail to construct their (own) voice because they do not listen to each other. *Voyage*, by contrast, shows one voice striving to be in control of all others. Bardamu succeeds in doing so, but eventually finds his voice unfulfilled, lacking his other voice, that of Robinson, and both fearing and needing the voice of another, the reader.

Bardamu's complex relationship with his fantasised reader relates to the process of adaptation, and leads to the question of whether the process of adaptation can in a sense be a betrayal of, or at least a risk for, the original text whose voices are (mis)appropriated by a reader turned adapter. The notion of an 'original' text is in itself of course problematic, as every text is, to a certain extent, already a palimpsest. Historicist readings of *Voyage* such as Bellosta's have shown how the text is itself an adaptation of contemporary concepts and debates, and of previous texts, and the intertextuality of *Zazie* has been the subject of similar analyses, for instance by Niang and Jullien.[99] As oralised texts, *Voyage* and *Zazie* present themselves as particularly problematic to adapt. As I have shown, Fabrice Luchini's and Denis Podalydès's work on *Voyage* required a significant amount of preparation and reflection on the questions concerning if and how an oralised text can be spoken. Malle's film adaptation of *Zazie* has been analysed as unsuccessful by Bénard, because the orality of *Zazie* is completely lost when it is heard rather than read.[100] The adaptive process and the reception of Tardi's, Carelman's and Oubrerie's works have also been shaped by the discourse of fidelity in particular and the idea that the adaptation can betray the original text, and the original author.

In the present study I have sought to demonstrate that the study of adaptation reveals new perspectives on the concept of the death of the author. In adaptation, the 'original' author is absent from the text to be adapted, however if still alive s/he can still

---

[99] For a review of Célinian and Quenellian studies, see Introduction, pp. 13-20 XX.
[100] Bénard, 'Un cinéma zazique?', 135-152.

be 'brought back' for the adaptive process. Carelman felt he needed Queneau's advice and opinion on his visualisation of *Zazie*. Céline was involved in Simon's recording, and in fact the project of popular actors recording excerpts of Céline's novels was meant to bring new readers to the Célinian narrative voices through another's voice. By contrast, Malle positioned himself as the *auteur* of his adaptation of *Zazie*, and Queneau was not involved in the process. With Tardi's, Oubrerie's, Podalydès's and Luchini's adaptations, the authors were deceased, but the figure of the author was still present in the sense that the novels had been elevated as seminal texts of twentieth-century French literature. This influenced the negative reception of Tardi's and Oubrerie's works, and in fact had a direct effect on Tardi's adaptation, as the artist eventually opted for the medium of illustration rather than comic book. While the author of a text is dead, or absent, the text will still be understood by some as *belonging* to the author, as was the case for Carelman. With the *Anthologie Céline*, while the omnipresence of the author over the texts was undermined, Céline was still involved in the readings of his texts by actors. By contrast, the original text can be seen as a source to be used by the adapter to enable him to become the author of the new text, as Malle and Oubrerie both did with *Zazie*. The case of actors' readings and performances of *Voyage* offers a different type of adapter-to-author relationship: the actors do not become authors of a new text, but by performing the original text they, literally, supplement it with their own personal reading of it. As the author is conceptually dead, s/he becomes a trace, which some adapters idealise (Carelman), or s/he can become an embarrassing trace that needs to be justified (Céline for Luchini, and, to an extent, the *Anthologie Céline*). Moreover, the 'original' text, in adaptation, gains multiple authors. Tardi, in fact, sees himself as one of the possible authors of versions, or variations, of *Voyage*. Adapters are both readers and temporary authors of the 'original' texts, supplementing it with their own historically situated reading of it, which is also informed by their relationship to the dead, original author (whether or not he is deceased in reality).

In the present study I have sought to 'prove' that adaptations add a further layer of complexity to the vocality of the original text. New readers/authors/adapters give their versions of it, using the specificity of their chosen medium, and intoning the vocality of the original text with their own voice. I have analysed adaptation as the concretisation of a reading in the Barthesian sense of a 'lecture vivante', and combined reader-oriented post-structuralist theories with theories of adaptation by 'revisionist' voices such as those of Linda Hutcheon and Julie Sanders, who have contributed to the

development of a conceptual framework for adaptation studies. Adaptations are valid materials for analysis, whether these adaptations have been received as 'good' or 'bad' according to criteria of fidelity and classification of arts, and whether they attempt to be faithful or free transpositions, to appropriate, follow, supplement, retain, modernise, or reveal aspects of the original text. I have also sought to show that adaptation studies benefit from going beyond a narrow novel-to-film focus, with adaptations ranging from illustration to stage performance.

Against this backdrop of adaptations into different forms, what has emerged from my analysis is that voice is in itself a process of construction, and of adaptation of, and to the other's voice. Through my analysis of the adaptations of the textual voices of *Voyage* and *Zazie*, I have aimed to show how the study of 'voice' can benefit from the study of adaptation across media, and from an interdisciplinary understanding of voice, drawing from theories of voice in comic book, film and theatre, which reveal that voice, itself, is *adaptable*. The adaptations examined in this study all participate in the permanent construction of the literary voices of *Voyage* and *Zazie* as un-final voices. In this respect, the reader is already, in a sense, a ventriloquist intoning the voices of the text with his/her own voice, and the adapter concretises his/her reading and intoning of the voices of the text according to his/her historically situated personality and using the specificity of his/her chosen medium. An adaptation adds a new layer to the original text as palimpsest, and induces a palimpsestuous reading for those reading or viewing them *as adaptations*. Adaptations can bring new readers, or sometimes alienate old ones: by intoning the voices of the text, they contribute to making them heard, whether anew, or for the first time, as in the case of Oubrerie's comic book, aimed at a young audience unfamiliar with the original novel. Adaptation appears as a necessary cultural practice for the text to evolve, survive and be read by new readers, but also for voices to adapt to new voices, and to be heard and intoned, and renewed.

The study of adaptations of *Voyage* and *Zazie* has also led me to explore in greater depth the relationship between voice and body, because I have exploited the model of ventriloquism which, in line with post-structuralist theories in particular, problematises the belonging of a voice to a body, and, moreover, suggests that voices can be stolen from or attributed to bodies. The characters of *Voyage* and *Zazie* are remarkably 'vocal' due to the orality of the novels, and they are also remarkably ventriloquial. This means that they are, in a sense, almost purely vocal, as they are hardly described in terms of their physical or corporeal appearance. In *Voyage*, Bardamu has a complex relationship

257

with bodies: his own, which burdens him, and those of others, which obsess and disgust him. Whereas in Tardi's illustration, Bardamu loses his voice and cannot escape his body, while his characters gain silent voices, in Simon's reading Bardamu gains a vocal body. The characters of *Zazie* gain cinematic bodies in Malle's film, but that are dislocated from their cinematic voices. As a result of the heterogeneity of the imagetrack and the soundtrack, they have to try to find a way to combine and to make their cinematic voices and bodies coherent. Zazie finds coherence in the manipulation of the others' bodies, and Trouscaillon in the manipulation of others' voices. These transpositions suggest an inherent violence of voice, when vocal power is gained out of the other, by expropriating his/her voice, and used against the other's voice and/or body. Violence and revenge are certainly part of Bardamu's vocal power, and why this power can be so violently turned against him. However, Queneau's *Zazie*, and Oubrerie's adaptation even more so, show the power that one's voice can have for, rather than against, the other. This power of voice for the other is seen in terms of seduction in the novel, and in terms of equality between voices in the comic book. Oubrerie's adaptation shows a certain idealisation of voice, as all voices listen to one another and can temporarily become narrative voices.

I have suggested that the different ways in which the textual voices of *Voyage* and *Zazie* are adapted show the cyclicality of loss and gain with regard to voice, constructed in a dynamic of appropriation and expropriation, through the dialogue between the unfinished textual voices and the readers' and adapters' own voices. Using the fragmentation and supplementation of illustration, Tardi challenges Bardamu's powerful ventriloquial voice, and frees the voices of female and working-class characters that gain a silent voice in the silent illustrations. With Simon, Bardamu gains a vocal body. Podalydès renders his deceptive voice. In Brasseur's reading, Bardamu's voice becomes performative and turned to the other. In Luchini's stage performance, Bardamu's voice is empowered by going against the other, the ventriloquised, but also by seducing the other, the theatre audience. The narrative voice of *Zazie* is reinforced and the characters trapped and contained by Carelman, using the image as submitted to the text. In Oubrerie's comic book, the narrative voice is dissolved and the characters uniformised and idealised. In Malle's adaptation, with the parallel status of sound in film the narrative voice is turned into an ironical ventriloquist and the characters' voices dislocated from their bodies. I have sought to show that if voice is constructed in the appropriation of the other's voice, gaining power against the other also implies risking

losing it. Indeed, one's voice can and possibly will be expropriated by another, as with Bardamu; and taking on too many voices can risk dissolving the 'subject' altogether, as with *Zazie*'s narrator. With the model of ventriloquism and the study of adaptations, voice is revealed as an un-final, and un-finalisable creation, out of the other's voice, against it sometimes, but also potentially for it. It is when one voice is attacked but another seduced that lasting vocal power can perhaps be gained, and when one gives into dialogue rather than shying away from it, like Luchini's Bardamu. Vocal power against the other is shown, variously, as tempting, tiring, unfulfilling, or dangerous, and the other's voice is revealed as feared but also desired, threatening but necessary to the construction of one's voice, out of, against or for the other's voice.

Bibliography

Primary works

Carelman, Jacques and Raymond Queneau, *Zazie dans le métro de Raymond Queneau raconté en images par Jacques Carelman* (Paris: Gallimard, 1966)

Céline, Louis-Ferdinand, *Voyage au bout de la nuit* (Paris: Gallimard, 1952)

—, '*Voyage au bout de la nuit* – La Guerre', read by Michel Simon, *Anthologie Céline 1894-1961*, CD 1

—, '*Voyage au bout de la nuit* – La Mère Henrouille', read by Pierre Brasseur, *Anthologie Céline 1894-1961*, CD 1

—, '*Voyage au bout de la nuit' de Louis-Ferdinand Céline: texte intégral lu par Denis Podalydès*, read by Denis Podalydès, 16 CDs (Frémeaux & Associés, 2003)

—, *Voyage au bout de la nuit*, illus. by Jacques Tardi (Paris: Futuropolis Gallisol Editions, 2006)

Céline, Louis-Ferdinand and Fabrice Luchini, *Voyage au bout de la nuit*, 2 CDs (Virgin France, 1994)

Chambrillon, Paul, ed., *Anthologie Céline*, 2 CDs (Frémeaux & Associés, 2000)

Jacquot, Benoît, dir., *Voyage au bout de la nuit* (Institut National de l'Audiovisuel, 1991)

Malle, Louis, dir., *Zazie dans le métro* (Paris: Arté Vidéo, 2005) [on DVD]

Oubrerie, Clément, *Zazie dans le métro: d'après l'œuvre de Raymond Queneau* (Paris: Gallimard Jeunesse, 2008)

Queneau, Raymond, *Zazie dans le métro* (Paris: Gallimard, 1959)

Secondary works

Abbott, Helen, *Between Baudelaire and Mallarmé: Voice, Conversation and Music* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009)

Aczel, Richard, 'Hearing Voices in Narrative Texts', *New Literary History*, 29:3 (1998), 467-500

—, 'Understanding as Over-Hearing', *New Literary History*, 32:3 (2001), 597-617

—, 'Commentary: Throwing Voices', *New Literary History*, 32:3 (2001), 703-706

Alméras, Philippe, *Les Idées de Céline: mythe de la race, politique et pamphlets* (Paris: Berg International, 1992)

—, *Céline: entre haines et passions* (Paris: Robert Laffont, 1994)

Altman, Rick, 'Moving Lips: Cinema as Ventriloquism', *Yale French Studies*, 60 (1980), 67-79

—, *Sound Theory, Sound Practice* (New York: Routledge, 1992)

Andrews, Chris, 'Surrealism and Pseudo-Initiation: Raymond Queneau's *Odile*', *The Modern Language Review*, 94:2 (1999), 377-394

Ardisson & Lumières, 'Fabrice Luchini et son spectacle sur Louis-Ferdinand Céline', *Tout le monde en parle* <http://www.ina.fr/ardisson/tout-le-monde-en-parle/ video/I08197141/ fabrice-luchini-et-son-spectacle-sur-louis-ferdinand-celine.fr.html> [accessed 19/10/2010]

Arrivé, Michel, 'Saussure: un langage sans voix?', *Rifl: Rivista Italiana di Filosofia del Linguaggio*, 3 (2010), 27-38

Armstrong, Marie-Sophie, '*Zazie dans le métro* and Neo-French', *Modern Language Studies*, 22:3 (1992), 4-16

Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhaĭlovich, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, ed. by Michael Holquist, trans. by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981)

—, 'Discourse in the Novel', in *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, pp. 259-422

—, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, ed. by and trans. by Caryl Emerson, intro. by Wayne C. Booth (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984)

—, 'The Problems of Speech Genre', *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, trans. by Vern W. McGee, ed. by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986), pp. 60-102

Barthes, Roland, 'Le Degré zéro de l'écriture', in *'Le Degré zéro de l'écriture' suivi de 'Nouveaux essais critiques'* (Paris: Seuil, 1972), pp. 7-67

Barthes, Roland, *Œuvres Complètes*, 3 vols, ed. by Eric Marty (Paris: Seuil, 1994)

Beasley, Chris, *Gender & Sexuality: Critical Theories, Critical Thinkers* (London: Sage, 2005)

Bellosta, Marie-Christine, *Céline ou l'art de la contradiction : lecture de 'Voyage au bout de la nuit'* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1990)

Bénard, Johanne, 'Un cinéma zazique?', *Cinémas*, 4:3 (1994), 135-154

—, 'Céline revisité par Tardi', in *Le Livre: de Gutenberg à la carte à puce = The Book: From Gutenberg to the Microchip*, ed. by Johanne Bénard and Jean-Jacques Hamm (New York: Legas, 1996), pp. 134-146

—, 'Céline transposé: l'adaptation des romans de Céline au théâtre', *Etudes céliniennes*, 4 (2003), 5-24

Bernofsky, Susan, 'Zazie in Wonderland: Queneau's Reply to the Realist Novel', *Romanic Review*, 85:1 (1994), 113-124

Bigot, Michel and Stéphane Bigot, *'Zazie dans le métro' de Raymond Queneau* (Paris: Gallimard, 1994)

Blank, Andreas, 'Discours émotif et discours contrastif: la transposition du français parlé dans *Voyage au bout de la nuit* de L.-F. Céline et dans *Le Chiendent* de Raymond Queneau', in *Actes du colloque international de Toulouse: L.-F. Céline*, ed. by Catherine Vigneau-Rouayrenc (Paris: Société d'Etudes céliniennes, 1991), pp. 33-46

—, *Literarisierung von Mündlichkeit: Louis-Ferdinand Céline und Raymond Queneau*, pref. by Hans-Martin Gauger (Tübingen: Narr, 1991)

Blondiaux, Isabelle, *Une écriture psychotique: Louis-Ferdinand Céline* (Paris: A.G. Nizet, 1985)

Bogue, Ronald, *Deleuze on Cinema* (London: Routledge, 2003)

Boillat, Alain, *Du bonimenteur à la voix-over: voix-attraction et voix-narration au cinéma* (Lausanne: Antipodes, 2007)

Boissieu, Jean-Luc de, 'Quelques faits "littéraires" ou archaïsants dans *Voyage au bout de la nuit*', in *L.-F. Céline 2: écriture et esthétique*, ed. by Dauphin, 33-51

Bordwell, David, *Narration in the Fiction Film* (London: Routledge, 1988)

Bres, Jacques and Aleksandra Nowakowska, 'Dialogisme: du principe à la matérialité discursive', in *Le Sens et ses voix*, ed. by Laurent Perrin and others, pp. 21-48

Bres, Jacques and others, eds, *Dialogisme et polyphonie: approches linguistiques* (Brussels: De Boeck-Duculot, 2005)

Broth, Mathias, 'Agents secrets: le public dans la construction interactive de la représentation théâtrale' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Uppsala University, Disciplinary Domain of Humanities and Social Sciences, Faculty of Languages, Department of Romance Languages, 2002)

—, 'The Theatre Performance as Interaction between Actors and their Audiences', *Nottingham French Studies*, 50:2 (2011), 113-133

Busnel, François, 'Fabrice Luchini: "Un acteur, c'est celui qui déchiffre les cicatrices"', *L'Express* [online], 22/12/2009 <http://www.lexpress.fr/culture/scene/fabrice-luchini-un-acteur-c-est-celui-qui-dechiffre-les-cicatrices_837805.html?p=3> [accessed 14/10/2010]

Butler, Judith, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (London: Routledge, 1990)

Calame-Griaule, Geneviève, ed., *Oralité et littérature: échos, écarts, résurgences* (Paris: Publications Langues o', 2005)

Calvert, Ben and others, *Television Studies: The Key Concepts*, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2008)

Camara, El hadji, 'L'Hybridation générique comme mécanisme de représentation dans le *Pleurer-Rire* d'Henri Lopes et *La Vie et demie* de Sony Labou Tansi', *Les Cahiers du GRELCEF*, 1 (2010), 215-226

Carel, Marion, 'La Polyphonie linguistique', *Transposition: musique et sciences sociales*, 1 (2011) <http://transposition-revue.org/les-numeros/polyphonie-et-societe/article/la-polyphonie-linguistique> [accessed 17 May 2011]

Carroll, Rachel, 'Introduction: Textual Infidelities', in *Adaptation in Contemporary Culture: Textual Infidelities*, ed. by Rachel Carroll (London: Continuum, 2009), pp. 1-10

Cartmell, Deborah and others, 'Introduction to *Adaptation*', *Adaptation*, 1:1 (2008), 1-4

Céline, Louis-Ferdinand, *Mort à crédit* (Paris: Gallimard, 1952)

—, *Entretiens avec le Professeur Y* (Paris: Gallimard, 1955)

—, 'Notes et variantes', in *Romans*, 4 vols, ed. by Henri Godard (Paris: Gallimard Pléiade, 1993), IV, pp. 1354-1386

Chambrillon, Paul, 'Histoire des enregistrements', *Anthologie Céline 1894-1961*, CD booklet, pp. 7-19

Chamontin, Elisabeth, 'Une Zazie politiquement correcte?', in Oubrerie, 'Polézazimique'

Chesneau, Albert, *La Langue sauvage de Louis-Ferdinand Céline: essai de stylistique thématique* (Lille: Service de reproduction des thèses, 1974)

Chion, Michel, *La Voix au cinéma* (Paris: Seuil, 2005)

Coleman, Dorothy Gabe, 'Polyphonic Poets: Rabelais and Queneau', in *Words of Power: Essays in Honour of Alison Fairlie*, ed. by Dorothy Gabe Coleman and others (Glasgow: University of Glasgow, 1987), pp. 46-68

Conley, Tom, 'Le stratège et le stratigraphe', *CiNéMAS: revue d'études cinématographiques*, 16:2-3 (2006), 74-94

Connor, Steven, *Dumbstruck: A Cultural History of Ventriloquism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000)

Damour, A.C. and J.P. Damour, *L.-F. Céline: 'Voyage au bout de la nuit'* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1985)

Dauphin, Jean-Pierre, ed., *L.-F. Céline 2: écriture et esthétique*, *La Revue des lettres modernes*, 462-467 (1976)

Davidson, Annette, 'Playing in the Garden: Sound, Performance, and Images of Persecution', *Indiana Theory Review*, 19 (1998), 35-54

Degli-Esposito, Cristina, 'Postmodernism(s)', in *Postmodernism in the Cinema*, ed. by Cristina Degli-Esposti (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 1998), pp. 3-18

Deleuze, Gilles, *Cinéma 2: l'image-temps* (Paris: Minuit, 1985)

—, *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*, trans. by Hugh Tomlinson and Robert Galeta (London: The Athlone Press, 1989)

Demidoff, Alexandre, 'Une lecture intégrale du *Voyage au bout de la nuit*', *Le Bulletin Célinien*, 252 (2004), 17

Derrida, Jacques, *De la grammatologie* (Paris: Minuit, 1967)

—, *Limited Inc.* (Paris: Galilée, 1990)

—, *La Voix et le phénomène: introduction au problème du signe dans la phénoménologie de Husserl*, 3d ed. (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2003)

Doane, Mary Anne, 'The Voice in the Cinema: The Articulation of Body and Space', *Yale French Studies*, 60 (1980), 33-50

Durrer, Sylvie and Jérôme Meizoz, eds, *La Littérature se fait dans la bouche: la représentation de la langue parlée dans les littératures romanes du XXème siècle* (Geneva: Slatkine, 1996)

Eco, Umberto, 'Innovation & Repetition: Between Modern and Postmodern Aesthetics', *Daedalus*, 134:4 (2005), 191-207

Elliott, Kamilla, *Rethinking the Novel/Film Debate* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003)

Emerson, Caryl and Michael Holquist, 'Glossary', in Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, pp. 423-434

Emerson, Caryl and Gary Saul Morson, *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1990)

Feldges, Benedikt, *American Icons: The Genesis of a National Visual Language* (Hoboken: Taylor & Francis, 2007)

Fertig, Stanley, 'Pour une narratologie quenienne', in *The French Novel: Theory and Practice, Followed by Michel Butor: 'Bilame ou Diode'*, ed. by Maynor Hardee (Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1984), pp. 77-88

Forest, Jennifer, 'The (Con)Quest of the Other in *Voyage au bout de la nuit*', in *Céline and the Politics of Difference*, ed. by Scullion and others, pp. 120-139

Foulet, Alain and Olivier Maltret, *Presque tout Tardi* (Dieppe: Sapristi, 1996)

Fox, Aaron A., *Real Country: Music and Language in Working-Class Culture* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004)

French, Philip and Louis Malle, *Malle on Malle*, ed. by Philip French (London: Faber and Faber, 1993)

Gaitet, Pascale, *Political Stylistics: Popular Language as Literary Artifact* (London: Routledge, 1992)

Gallimard Jeunesse, 'Fétiche', <http://www.gallimard-jeunesse.fr/Catalogue/ GALLIMARD-JEUNESSE/Fetiche> [accessed 14/08/2011].

Gaudreault, André, *Du littéraire au filmique: système du récit* (Paris: Méridiens Klincksiek, 1988)

Genette, Gérard, *Figures III* (Paris: Seuil, 1972)

——, *Palimpsestes: la littérature au second degré*, Collection Poétique (Paris: Seuil, 1982)

Giraud, Francis, dir., 'Queneau illustré par Jacques Carelman', *En toutes lettres* <http://www.ina.fr/art-et-culture/litterature/video/I00011584/ queneau-illustre-par-jacques-carelman.fr.html> [accessed 25/02/2010]

Gobert, David L., 'The Essential Character in Queneau's *Zazie dans le métro*', *Symposium*, 40:2 (1986), 91-106

Godard, Henri, *Poétique de Céline* (Paris: Gallimard, 1985)

Goldblatt, *Art and Ventriloquism*, critical commentary by Garry L. Hagberg (London: Routledge, 2006)

Gray, Stanley E., 'Beckett and Queneau as Formalists', *James Joyce Quarterly*, 8 (1971), 392-404

Griffiths, Kate, *Emile Zola and the Artistry of Adaptation* (London: Legenda, 2009)

Groensteen, Thierry, *Système de la bande dessinée* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1999)

Grove, Laurence, *Comics in French: The European Bande Dessinée in Context* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2010)

Guénot, Jean, 'Voyage au bout de la parole', in *Les Cahiers de l'Herne: L.-F. Céline*, ed. by Roux and others, pp. 300-309

Hainge, Greg and Kane X Faucher, 'Une voix déplacée: la ventriloquie chez Céline ou Pour en finir avec le jugement historique', *Etudes céliniennes*, 5 (2009-2010), 71-93

Hatfield, Charles, 'Comic Art, Children's Literature, and the New Comics Studies', *The Lion and the Unicorn*, 30:3 (2006), 360-382

Hayward, Susan, *Cinema Studies: The Key Concepts*, 3d ed. (London: Routledge, 2006)

Hedges, Inez, *Breaking the Frame: Film Language and the Experience of Limits* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1991)

Hervée, Andrée and others, 'Images et sons: Louis Malle le précuseur', extra feature to *Zazie dans le métro*, dir. by Louis Malle [on DVD]

Hewitt, Nicholas, *The Life of Céline: A Critical Biography* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999)

Hodnett, Edward, *Image and Text: Studies in the Illustration of English Literature* (London: Scolar Press, 1982)

Horton, Andrew, 'Growing Up Absurd: Malle's *Zazie dans le Métro* (1960) from the Novel by Raymond Queneau', in *Modern European Filmmakers and the Art of Adaptation*, ed. by Andrew Horton and Joan Magretta (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1981), pp. 63-77

Hutcheon, Linda, *A Theory of Adaptation* (New York: Routledge, 2006)

Jancovich, Mark and others, 'Introduction', in *Defining Cult Movies: The Cultural Politics of Oppositional Taste*, ed. by Mark Jancovich and others (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003), pp. 1-13

Josse, Vincent, 'Esprit critique', *France Inter*, 27 June 2009

Jullien, Dominique, 'Zazie dans la brousse', *Romanic Review*, 91:3 (2000), 263-278

Krance, Charles, *L.-F. Céline: The I of the Storm* (Lexington, Kentucky: French Forums, 1992)

—, 'L.-F. Céline: "Just an Individual"?', in *Céline and the Politics of Difference*, ed. by Scullion and others, pp. 84-97

Kristeva, Julia, *Pouvoirs de l'horreur* (Paris: Seuil, 1980)

Labé, Yves-Marie, 'Jacques Tardi: "J'ai mis au jour une tombe criblée de balles"', *Le Monde* [online], 17/08/2005 <http://www.lemonde.fr/culture/article/2005/08/17/ jacques-tardi-j-ai-mis-au-jour-une-tombe-criblee-de-balles_680761_3246_1.html> [accessed 12/02/2010]

Lapprand, Marc, ed., *Trois fous du langage: Vian, Queneau, Prévert* (Nancy: Presses Universitaires de Nancy, 1993)

Leitch, Thomas, 'Adaptation Studies at a Crossroads', *Adaptation*, 1:1 (2008)

Le Poittevin, Véronique, 'Représentations de la ville: du texte à l'image', *Cahiers Raymond Queneau*, 17-19 (1990), 85-93

Letourneux, Matthieu, 'Illustration et sérialité dans les livraisons romanesques (1870-1910)', <http://www.enc.sorbonne.fr/histoiredulivre/letourneux.htm> [accessed 12/02/2010]

Lichem, Klaus, 'Innersprachliche Mehrsprachigkeit und deren Übersetzungsproblem in *Zazie dans le métro* von Queneau', in *Europäische Mehrsprachigkeit*, ed. by Wolfgand Pöckl (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1981), pp. 73-85

Lodge, David, *After Bakhtin: Essays on Fiction and Criticism* (London: Routledge, 1990)

—, ed., *Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader*, 2nd ed., revised and expanded by Nigel Wood (Harlow: Longman, 2000)

Malcuzynski, M.-Pierrette, *Entre-dialogues avec Bakhtine, ou: sociocritique de la [dé]raison polyphonique* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1992)

Marie, Michel, *The French New Wave: An Artistic School*, trans. by Richard Neupert (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003)

Marié, Michel and Francis Vanoye, 'Comment parler la bouche pleine?', *Communications*, 38 (1983), 51-77

Martin, Christophe, *'Dangereux suppléments': l'illustration du roman en France au dix-huitième siècle* (Louvain: Peeters, 2005)

Martin, Jean-Pierre, *La Bande sonore: Beckett, Céline, Duras, Genet, Perec, Pinget, Queneau, Sarraute, Sartre* (Paris: José Corti, 1998)

Matthews, J.H., *The Inner Dream: Céline as Novelist* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1978)

McFarlane, Brian, *From Novel to Film: An Introduction to the Theory of Adaptation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996)

McKenna, Brian, 'The British Communist Novel of the 1930s and 1940s: A Party of Equals? (And Does That Matter?)', *The Review of English Studies*, new series, 47:187 (1996), 369-385

Meizoz, Jérôme, *L'Âge du roman parlant (1919-1939): écrivains, critiques, linguistes et pédagogues en débat*, pref. by Pierre Bourdieu (Geneva: Droz, 2001)

—, *Postures littéraires: mises en scène modernes de l'auteur* (Geneva: Slatkine Erudition, 2007)

—, 'Posture et biographie: *Semmelweiss* de L.-F. Céline', *COnTEXTES*, 3 (2008), <http://contextes.revues.org/index2633.html> [accessed 18/10/2010]

Melot, Michel, *L'illustration: histoire d'un art* (Geneva: Skira, 1984)

Miller, Ann, *Reading Bande Dessinée: Critical Approaches to French-language Comic Strip* (Bristol: Intellect Books, 2007)

Mingelgrun, Albert, 'Céline-Tardi: de la fiction narrative à la fiction dessinée', in *Actes du Colloque international de Toulouse, L.-F. Céline: 5-7 juillet 1990* (Tusson: Du Lérot, 1991), pp. 179-182

Monnet, Corinne, 'La Répartition des tâches entre les hommes et les femmes dans le travail de la conversation', *Nouvelles questions féministes*, 19:1 (1998), 9-34

Morgan, Henry, *Principes des littératures dessinées* (Angoulême: Editions de l'An 2, 2003)

Mules, Warwick, 'The Figural as Interface in Film and the New Media: D.N. Rodowick's *Reading the Figural*', *Film-Philosophy*, 7:7 (2003) <http://www.film-philosophy.com/vol7-2003/n56mules> [accessed 10/12/2010]

Neupert, Richard, *A History of the French New Wave* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2002)

Niang, Sada, 'Dimensions orales de l'écrit dans *Zazie dans le métro*', in *Trois fous du langage*, ed. by Lapprand, pp. 109-123

Nietzsche, Friedrich, *The Will to Power*, trans. by Walter Kaufmann and R. J. Hollingdale, ed. by Walter Kaufmann (New York: Random, Vintage, 1968)

Nikulin, Dmitri Vladimirovich, *On Dialogue* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2006)

Norris, Christopher, *Deconstruction: Theory and Practice*, revised ed. (New York: Routledge, 1993)

Oubrerie, Clément, 'Polézazimique' <http://clementoubrerie.blogspot.com/2009/04/polezazimique.html> [accessed 23/06/2011]

O'Neill, Patrick, *Fictions of Discourse: Reading Narrative Theory* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996)

Ong, Walter J., *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the World* (London: Routledge, 2002)

O'Sullivan, Carol, 'Picturing Characters: Zazies à gogo', in *Seeing Things: Vision, Perception and Interpretation in French Studies*, ed. by Simon Kemp and Libby Saxton (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2002), pp. 263-279

Linda M. Park-Fuller, 'Voices: Bakhtin's Heteroglossia and Polyphony, and the Performance of Narrative Literature', *Literature in Performance*, 7 (1986), 1-12

Peeters, Benoît, *Lire la bande dessinée* (Paris: Flammarion, 2002)

Perrin, Laurent and others, eds, *Le Sens et ses voix: dialogisme et polyphonie en langue et en discours* (Metz: Université de Metz, 2006)

Petrilli, Susan, 'Communication, Dialogue and Otherness in Mikhail Bakhtin's Metalinguistics', *Russian Journal of Communication*, 3:1 (2008), 268-280

Pfister, Manfred, *The Theory and Analysis of Drama*, trans. by John Halliday (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988)

Plard, Henri, 'Sur les limites du traduisible: *Zazie dans le métro* en anglais et en allemand', in *Communiquer et traduire: hommages à Jean Dierickx*, ed. by G. Debusscher and J. P. Van Noppen (Brussels: Université libre de Bruxelles, 1985), pp. 65-74

Podalydès, Denis, *Voix off* (Paris: Mercure de France, 2008)

Porter, James I., 'Saussure and Derrida on the Figure of Voice', *MLN*, 101:4 (1986), 871-894

Pramaggiore, Maria and Tom Wallis, *Film: A Critical Introduction* (London: Laurence King, 2005)

Queneau, Raymond, 'Ecrit en 1937', in *Bâtons, chiffres et lettres* (Paris: Gallimard, 1965), pp. 11-26

Racelle-Latin, Danièle, '*Voyage au bout de la nuit* ou l'inauguration d'une poétique "argotique"', in *L.-F. Céline 2: Ecriture et esthétique*, ed. by Dauphin, 53-77

Redfern, W.D., *Queneau: 'Zazie dans le métro'* (London: Grant & Cutler, 1980)

Rosier, Laurence, 'Polyphonie: les "dessous" d'une métaphore', in *Le Sens et ses voix*, ed. by Perrin and others, pp. 189-211

Rouayrenc, Catherine, *'C'est mon secret': la technique de l'écriture 'populaire' dans 'Voyage au bout de la nuit' and 'Mort à crédit'* (Tusson: Du Lérot, 1994)

—, 'De certains "et" dans *Voyage au bout de la nuit*', *Roman 20-50*, 17 (1994), 161-169

—, 'L'insertion du discours direct dans *Voyage au bout de la nuit*', *Champs du signe: sémantique, rhétorique, poétique*, 4 (1994), 95-115

—, 'Le "transport du parlé en écrit" chez C.F. Ramuz', *Europe*, 853 (2000), 106-134

—, 'Vers une étude du rythme célinien', in *Actualité de Céline*, ed. by Alain Cresciucci (Tusson: Du Lérot, 2001), pp. 183-217

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, *Essai sur l'origine des langues* (Paris: Larousse, 1990)

Roux, Dominique de and others, eds, *Les Cahiers de l'Herne: L.-F. Céline* (Paris: L'Herne, 2007)

Ruffo, Sébastien, *L'Herbier du souffleur: critique phonostylistique de la prolation dramatique* (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Montréal, 2003)

——, 'The Phonostylistics of the Dramatic Character', *Consciousness, Literature and the Arts*, 4:2 (2003) <http://blackboard.lincoln.ac.uk/bbcswebdav/users/ dmeyerdinkgrafe/archive/ruffo.html> [accessed 27 December 2010]

——, 'Vers une critique comparatiste de la voix au théâtre', *Etudes françaises*, 39:1 (2003), 99-110

——, 'Faustian Ethos and Vocal Ambitus: The Vocal Style of Actors Playing Faustian Situations', *Acts of 'Risk, Trust and Civility': A Pluridisciplinary Symposium, Victoria College, May 6-8, 2005* (University of Toronto) <http://www.semioticon.com/virtuals/ risk/ruffo/RuffoWeb.htm> [accessed 27 December 2010]

Sadoul, Numa, *Tardi: entretiens avec Numa Sadoul* (Paris: Niffle-Cohen, 2000)

Sanders, Julie, *Adaptation and Appropriation* (London: Routledge, 2006)

Saussure, Ferdinand de, *Cours de linguistique générale* (Paris: Payot, 1949)

Scott, Clive, *Translating Rimbaud's 'Illuminations'* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2006)

Scullion, Rosemarie, 'Introduction', in *Céline and the Politics of Difference*, ed. by Scullion and others, pp. 1-12

Scullion, Rosemarie and others, eds, *Céline and the Politics of Difference* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1995)

Sears, Dianne, 'Zazie et Zénobie sèment la zizanie: les troubles du langage dans *Zazie dans le métro* et *Les Bâtisseurs d'Empire*', in *Trois fous du langage*, ed. by Lapprand, pp. 91-99

Shorley, Christopher, '"Joindre le geste à la parole": Raymond Queneau and the Use of Non-Verbal Communication', *French Studies*, 35:4 (1981), 408-420

Silva, Marie-Manuelle, 'The Link between Text and Image in *Voyage au bout de la nuit de Céline* by Tardi', in *Writing and Seeing: Essays on Word and Image*, ed. by Rui Carvalho Homem and Maria de Fátima Lambert (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2006), pp. 331-342

Silverman, Kaja, *The Acoustic Mirror: The Female Voice in Psychoanalysis and Cinema* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1988)

Shevtsova, Maria, 'Dialogism in the Novel and Bakhtin's Theory of Culture', *New Literary History*, 23:3 (1992), 747-763

Shingler, Martin, 'Fasten Your Seatbelts and Prick Up Your Ears: The Dramatic Human Voice in Film', *Scope: An Online Journal of Film & TV Studies*, 5 (2006) <http://www.scope.nottingham.ac.uk/article.php?issue=5&id=128> [accessed 07/02/2011]

Sjogren, Britta H., *Into the Vortex: Female Voice and Paradox in Film* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2006)

Smith, Greg M., 'Surveying the World of Contemporary Comics Scholarship: A Conversation', *Cinema Studies*, 50:3 (2011), 135-147

Smolderen, Thierry, 'Of Labels, Loops and Bubbles: Solving the Historical Puzzle of the Speech Balloon', *Comic Art*, 8 (2006), 90-112

—, *Naissances de la bande dessinée: de William Hogarth à Winsor McCay* (Brussels: Les Impressions Nouvelles, 2009)

Solomon, Philip H., *Understanding Céline* (Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 1992)

Spender, Dale, *Man Made Language* (London: Routledge, 1980)

Spitzer, Léo, 'Une habitude de style, le rappel chez Céline', in *Les Cahiers de l'Herne: L.-F. Céline*, ed. by Roux and others, pp. 384-391

Stam, Robert, *Film Theory: An Introduction* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2000)

Stolz, Claire, *La Polyphonie dans 'Belle du Seigneur' d'Albert Cohen: pour une approche sémiostylistique* (Paris: Champion, 1998)

Tourchon, Patrick, 'Polyphony in *Lord Jim*: On *Übermensch*', *Conradiana*, 40:1 (2008), 71-88

Ubersfeld, Anne, *Lire le théâtre II: l'école du spectateur* (Paris: Belin, 1996)

Verdaguer, Pierre, *L'Univers de la cruauté: une lecture de Céline* (Geneva: Droz, 1988)

Versaci, Rocco, *This Book Contains Graphic Language: Comics as Literature* (New York: Continuum, 2007)

Verstraete, Pieter, 'Vocal Distress on Stage: Voice and Diegetic Space in Contemporary Music Theatre' <http://web.mit.edu/comm-forum/mit4/papers/verstraete.pdf> [accessed 04/07/2011]

Vice, Sue, *Introducing Bakhtin* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997)

Vitoux, Frédéric, *Louis-Ferdinand Céline: misère et parole* (Paris: Gallimard, 1973)

Watts, Philip, 'Postmodern Céline', in *Céline and the Politics of Difference*, ed. by Scullion and others, pp. 203-215

Wodsak, Mona, '"Un délire tapé à la machine par un romancier idiot"?: Zum Problem der Übersetzung von Raymond Queneaus *Zazie dans le métro*', in *Offene Gefüge: Literatursystem und Lebenswirklichkeit*, ed. by Henning Krauß and others (Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1994), pp. 295-316

Wolk, Douglas, *Reading Comics: How Graphic Novels Work and What They Mean* (Cambridge, MA: Da Capo Press, 2007)

Zumthor, Paul, *Introduction à la poésie orale* (Paris: Seuil, 1983)

—, *La Poésie et la voix dans la civilisation médiévale*, pref. by Yves Bonnefoy (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1984)

—, *La Lettre et la voix: de la "littérature" médiévale* (Paris: Seuil, 1987)

—, *Ecriture et nomadisme: entretiens et essais* (Montreal: L'Hexagone, 1990)

—, *Performance, réception, lecture* (Longueuil: Préambule, 1990)

—, 'Oralité', *Intermédialités: histoire et théorie des arts, des lettres et des techniques*, 12 (2008), 169-202