

## The Aesthetic of Painting within the Plays of William Shakespeare

François-Xavier Gleyzon

University of Lancaster, United Kingdom

---

Roman Jakobson defines the poetic as “the emphasis put on the message for its own sake, . . . the function which stresses the palpable side of signs, thus deepening the fundamental dichotomy between signs and objects.”<sup>1</sup> Stressing the poetic function in a literary language defined in terms of communicational functions seems to be quite paradoxical and may appear as totally unfeasible. It is then during this short *moment* allocated to us that we will try to attempt the so-called impossible and, in doing so, to respond to the challenge. This project therefore seems to be a gamble, but so much the better as this gamble is ambitious. To read without clear-cut prejudgements a *living* text, the project will be contemplated in all modesty, as modesty shows due concern for knowledge. In this paper my aim is to examine and investigate the point of contact/interface between the poetic and dramatic text, and identify by which specific figure of speech the poetic is crystallized and finds its place in dramatic writing, thus allowing in “la voie/la voix”<sup>2</sup> of (interior) images through the reading of the “Aesthetic of Painting within the Plays of William Shakespeare.”

Questioning the relationship between the poetic and the dramatic (communicative) text is, first and foremost, understanding the text in its entirety as an object for study and analysis, without losing sight of the fact that “the essence of the poetic in the theatre is the essence of a particular *moment* within the entirety of discourse.”<sup>3</sup> Is it possible to perceive or to take in at the “blink of an eye,” at the “blink of an ear,” the detail of poetic writing during the time of a performance?

What can one grasp of the poetic in a dramatic text whose writing is intended to be addressed in the most immediate sense? The somewhat radical answer seems to be “yes” and “no.” “No,” for the idea of being able to grasp everything in the course of a theatrical performance is pure fantasy. And “yes” because we will always discover particular moments, privileged places in which the

poetic (we will see a little later in what way) takes up residence in the folds of a dramatic text dedicated to *saying*. We then understand (without needing to formally express it) when we talk about this “way of saying,” we hear, we listen to dramatic writing in the “selfsame rustle of language,” a style of writing that only makes sense on stage, in action, “in being represented,” in short, a style of writing which could be described as economical in which every utterance has its own power/force. G. Deleuze states it for us: “In art ... it is not a question of reproducing or inventing forms, but of harnessing vital forces.”<sup>4</sup>

#### HYPOTYPOSIS IN THE THEATRE

I can see a *place*, a *space*. “It is no longer about the real space that the stage shows us but another space entirely.”<sup>5</sup> There are indeed privileged moments in the theatre during which the spectator, without the help of a *physical* visibility, is constrained to build “images” or “a(n) accurate and tangible (picture) depiction of the thing one is referring to”<sup>6</sup> Fontanier in *Les Figures du Discours*, and Quintilian well before him, defines hypotyposis as being “a figure of speech which paints a picture of the things one is talking about in such vivid colours that one thinks one is seeing them with one’s own eyes and not simply hearing a recital of them.”<sup>7</sup> And Father Lamy would add, “A figure of speech which paints things so vividly that it seems that not only does one hear them or one read them, but one sees them and enacts them.”<sup>8</sup> Hypotyposis, I would say, is everything the words of a speaker bring out, just like a window open on the beyond in the story, a space created by the character-narrator(s) with the essential aid of the spectator. It is a space, shall we say, intimate, almost in camera (for it is open to whomever is willing to take the trouble to walk into it; we participate; our active *collaboration* is asked for), which would phenomenologically bring into play, on three different levels, sensitivity, imagination, and intellect. The act of achieving the (painted) picture in the theatre initiated by the character-narrator only exists thanks to its *correlative*, the craftsman. Every utterance containing a hypotyposis calls for and demands an interactive sensory receptacle,<sup>9</sup> artistically “productive”: the recipient.<sup>10</sup> This esthetic-organic link between the character-narrator(s), allows the “total” achievement of scene painting in the theatre. Hypotyposis only has creative power “where intention and attention meet up with each other.”<sup>11</sup>

Several examples of hypotyposis are discernible in Shakespeare’s work. Take, for example, *King Lear* (but this is just

one example among so many others [4.6.24-37]), where Edgar, talking to Gloucester, describes an imaginary place situated on the edge of a cliff. Hypotyposis disorientates, transcends contradictions, is at the same time both presence and absence, the real and the imaginary, and this place becomes an imagined reality. This is the strength behind hypotyposis which, given its deceitful discourse, convinces and persuades. Gloucester is on the point of falling off the cliff and so are we:

Come on, sir, here's the place. Stand still. How fearful  
 And dizzy 'tis to cast one's eyes so low!  
 The crows and choughs that wing the midway air  
 Show scarce so gross as beetles. Halfway down  
 Hangs one that gathers samphire - dreadful trade!  
 Methinks he seems no bigger than his head.  
 The fishermen that walk upon the beach  
 Appear like mice, and yond tall anchoring bark  
 Diminish'd to her cock, her cock a buoy  
 Almost too small for sight. The murmuring surge  
 That on th'unnumber'd idle pebble chafes,  
 Cannot be heard so high. I'll look no more,  
 Lest my brain turn, and the deficient sight  
 Topple down headlong. (4.6.24-37)<sup>12</sup>

Depicting<sup>13</sup> minute detail,<sup>14</sup> hypotyposis appears as the end result of painstaking work, carried out with a magnifying glass. *Painting-from-a-certain-perspective*, going as far as *trompe-l'oeil*, hypotyposis does not deform the overall effect of the final painting, despite the feeling of dizziness that the latter can awaken in us. Let us take note of a second hypotyposis different from the one we have just alluded to.

Bushy, in *Richard II*, offers us a rather fascinating description of what one could doubtless call an *anamorphic painting*.<sup>15</sup> Just like pictures employing the use of perspective, the eye of sorrow offers us a vision both divided and biased of something complete in several objects. Looked at straight on, they are merely indicative of confusion, whereas looked at side on, the object-subject or the subject-object appears both clearly and distinctly.

Each substance of a grief hath twenty shadows,  
 Which shows like grief itself, but is not so.  
 For sorrow's eye, glazed with blinding tears,  
 Divides one thing entire to many objects,  
 Like perspectives, which, rightly gaz'd upon,  
 Show nothing but confusion - ey'd awry  
 Distinguish form, So your sweet Majesty,  
 Looking awry upon your lord's departure,

Find shapes of grief more than himself to wail,  
 Which, look'd on as it is, is naught but shadows  
 Of what it is not. Then, thrice-gracious queen,  
 More than your lord's departure weep not. More's not seen,  
 Or if it be, 'tis with false sorrow's eye,  
 Which for things true weeps things imaginary. (2.2.4-27)

I have selected for discussion another instance of hypotyposis that still offers us a representation of painting, but this time with a mobile frame. In this respect, *Cymbeline* offers the most fascinating example of the kind. In Act 1 Scene 3, Pisanio reports to Imogen Posthumus Leonatus' departure from the shore of the haven.

*Imogen.* Then waved his handkerchief?

*Pisanio.* And kiss'd it, madam.

*Imogen.* Senseless linen! Happier therein than I!  
 And that was all?

*Pisanio.* No, Madam; for so long  
 As he could make me with his eye or ear  
 Distinguish him from others, he did keep  
 The deck, with glove, or hat, or handkerchief,  
 Still waving, as he fits and stirs of 's mind  
 Could best express how slow his soul sail'd on,  
 How swift his ship.

*Imogen.* Thou shouldst have made him  
 As little as a crow, or less, ere left.  
 To after-eye him.

*Pisanio.* Madam, so I did.

*Imogen.* I would have broke mine eye-strings, crack'd them  
 but  
 To look upon him, till the diminution  
 Of space had pointed sharp as my needle;  
 Nay, follow'd him, till he had melted from  
 The smallness of a gnat to air; and then  
 Have turn'd mine eye, and wept. (1.3.1.7-22)

We can see how the eye/our gaze slides from one space to another, focusing our attention on one particular part of a picture or rather on an imagined representation of painting marked off by a frame. It is interesting to notice how the frame responds to our visual request/desire to *virtually* look/focus upon the figure of Posthumus. Thus, as we gaze at Posthumus edging away from the haven, the frame simultaneously diminishes its sides. Doubtless, this very sequence in *Cymbeline* calls attention to the concept of detail in painting. As we all know, gazing at a detail in painting involves a frame, and yet not a frame like other frames, but a mobile frame called *passé-partout*, a term used by picture-framers to indicate a frame, the base of which is moveable, cut out of a square of

cardboard and open in the middle so that the picture it is framing can be seen. It is not in the strict sense a frame, but rather a frame within a frame. It allows us to see, or makes visible, empty space, an image, a painting... but it can also hide things. Its sides are moveable and almost removable. And also, to be honest, the inner edges of a mobile frame are often bevelled. In this respect, a *pass-partout* is not a pass-key (a *pass-partout* in French) which would enable us to decipher and/or disentangle any enigmas or complexities subsumed in the folds of a dramatic text or in a representation of painting. Once more we need to know if the frame will mark off our discourse or if it will be the "objective" object of it. What do we see then? What is hidden from us? What are we made to see? What is there under the frame? "I would be hard put to say where the picture is that I am looking at, for I do not look at it as I look at a thing ... I see according to or with it rather than the thing itself."<sup>16</sup> But the will to see is always to see more than is visible.

#### THEATRICAL HYPOTYPOSIS IN A PLACE, THE SUBJECTILE

The speech (*parole*) of hypotyposis<sup>17</sup> seems to have been prompted or rather spirited away,<sup>18</sup> then purloined by the recipient (spectator or reader). This is the power of hypotyposis the only power of which is *unpower*.

*Unpower*, Derrida would say, is not, as we know, impotence, the sterility of "nothing to say" or a lack of inspiration. Quite the contrary, it is inspiration personified, "the strength of a vacuum, a whirlwind of breath from a prompter who aspires to it and misappropriates the very thing that he allows to come to me and which I thought I could state in my name."<sup>19</sup> It is in this new *place*, this *void* (*loss* as some people would term it) of artistic inspiration, that hypotyposis acts. This space "projected," "spirited away/prompted" by speech at the heart of, present inside the text, and "subjective," serves as a "birthing table for text and canvas, as the mater/matrix/pater, whose double-sensed *couches* signals at once the labor of birthing, and the layers and layers underpinning what we hear and see and call by the name of art."<sup>20</sup>

This new *space, place*, may be termed a *subjectile*.<sup>21</sup> Let us define the term more precisely, the notion being part of the code of painting and indicative of *what lies beneath* (*subjectum*) as a substance, a subject. "Between the beneath and the above, it [the *subjectile*] is at once a support and a surface, everything distinct from form, as well as from meaning and representation, not representable."<sup>22</sup> Such is this *place*, this other space, this *subjectile* in a word, where, in

effect, hypotyposis takes refuge mobilising the present<sup>23</sup> and space to give birth to art.

One might also add that the way in which Hypotyposis manifests itself is peculiar and problematic. Anne Ubersfeld informs us that it appears as the "I" of the character-narrator defining itself, "representing a certain world view," a picture.<sup>24</sup> She says—perhaps too quickly—that both are simultaneously those of the writer "I." Let us note, however, as we have said above, that this narratorial "I" is an "I"/"eye" which functions at the heart of the recipient to the point of believing that this "I"/"eye" is actually in *me*, acting inside *me* (cf. Lamy and the definition of *unpower*).

Hypotyposis is the result of an encounter, of an exchange, or, to put it in a nutshell, of a *dialectic*, between, first and foremost, the "I"/"eye" represented by a character-narrator and secondly, the inclusion in the message of ideas on the one hand, and the convocation and action of sensitivity, imagination, and intellect, subsumed in the *subjectile* on the other hand. This is a *dialectic* in which the authorial voice could finally be heard and read. The voice, the transcendent qualities of the voice, the theatrical voice will be examined later on.

#### ICONIC HYPOTYPOSIS: FROM SIGHT TO VOICE.

I must note in passing that hypotyposis in the theatre can only be initiated by the vector-power of *speech*. At the heart of the *subjectile*, theatrical hypotyposis shows us a picture, a painting. If we reverse this figure of speech—one figure of speech calls for another—we obtain what Louis Marin has designated "iconic hypotyposis."<sup>25</sup> It is no longer a question of language, discourse or speech which would depict things to the point of making a picture of them, but about the image, the picture, the representation in painting which would lead one to understand, by "specific figures," sounds and noises to the point of making of them a voice. Would this be an impossible and fanciful undertaking or a scientific and reasonable one? How could one represent pictorially and hear in painting the unrepresentable prompting of signs (*a spirited away speech*)? How and, more precisely, by what means, could pictorial representation offer to vision the *sound of words*.<sup>26</sup> By *sound of words* let us understand a substance halfway between a noise, a shout, a sound and rational articulation or discourse. Let us be even more precise to avoid all misunderstanding: we understand by *sound of words* merely vocal and phonic phenomena, and not a transcendent and internal *Voice*. But to hear the Voice,

we must first of all hear the sound of words. So this change from *seeing* to *saying*, according to Louis Marin, can only be thinkable and intelligible on condition that “the fantasia of the *Voice* in the picture be performed in a way of speaking which allows it to be heard”<sup>27</sup>—“a spirited away speech” in which the *Voice* (the latter cohabiting with the *sound of words*) can be heard and reverberates.

### Speech [Sound of Words +Voice]

Nevertheless, on reflection, all that appears to remain of sound, of the sound of words, of the sound of the voice in painting is the unavoidable trace of its absence, a strange absence present in the painted representation, the “*present absence*” of the ineffable, as Derrida would term it. This is the *present absence* of music, choirs, and language whose signs can be visually represented in painting. The voice is able to find achievement by becoming singular: signs of representation in painting await the looks that will be focused on them for the voice that they manifest to be awakened virtually. But the voice, as we have already pointed out, is not speech, even though we can have no speech without voices.<sup>28</sup> Just like theatrical hypotyposis, the voice, which cohabits with the sound of words, is to be found at the heart of speech, both of them being interdependent and intrinsically linked. It “is not only sound nor too quickly meaning.”<sup>29</sup> We are in effect talking about a transcendence of the voice in relation to speech that a picture would allow us to understand. Iconic hypotyposis puts things in such a way in front of the spectator’s *eyes* that a voice appears to audibly emanate from the picture, the *Voice* of the picture perhaps. To sum up, iconic hypotyposis *is* the *Voice* that shows in a gaze as to the painter that gives the voice to the eye.

In the Renaissance, more than in any other movement perhaps, the mission of art seems to impose this paradox or even the certainty that the picture can and must speak. Donatello, according to the famous story about him by Vasari, addresses his work-in-progress, the *Zuccone*, by saying: “*E mentre che lo lavorava, guardandolo tuttavia gli diceva: Favella, favella...*” (and, while he was working, he said to the picture as he gazed at it: “Speak, speak...”)<sup>30</sup> Many other examples are to be found in the plays of Shakespeare, notably in *A Winter’s Tale* (with the well-known allusion to Giulio Romano) and the statue of Hermione. The sound in the painted representation is a controversial theme that has mobilised many critics. An important article may be mentioned at this point—even though the latter seems to contradict our argument—entitled *Signum harpocraticum* by André Chastel.<sup>31</sup>

This article decries the possibility of speech<sup>32</sup> in the representation of painting. We are therefore dealing with the *Signum harpocraticum*, in which the subject represented declares in a gesture “which is familiar to us” that we need to be silent. He closes his mouth to be quiet (or else he imposes on the spectator the obligation of doing so). Many examples are set before us, all illustrative of so-called silence in painting. But let us lend a more attentive gaze, or, if I might be allowed to say so, a more attentive ear to one painting in particular, that of Dosso Dossi, “Jupiter and Mercury” (cf. Annexe).

On the left-hand side of the painting we can see Jupiter busy with painting butterflies. Virtue, positioned on the far right of the picture, craves an audience with Mercury (in the middle of the painting), which the latter refuses. To put it succinctly, “Mercury imposes silence on the Art of Rhetoric.”<sup>33</sup> Silence in painting is therefore possible with the aid of the *signum harpocraticum*, which has a primary and primordial referent which is that of sound. It is exactly on his point and in this work of denying sound in painting that André Chastel finds a formidable problem about which, it seems to me, he does not appear to have thought. Defining painting as the art of silence carried to perfection, as something non-sonorous, is still a way of referring to sound negatively, for silence only exists on condition that its opposite, sound, is known and experienced. So “Jupiter and Mercury,” and many other examples of Renaissance painting, in their will to depict or to impose silence, deliberately offer us at the same time, and paradoxically, sound. Not the negation of sound but *negative sound*. To reiterate how could we imagine silence if sound was not cut off? For there to be silence, there is a presupposition of a point of reference: sound. This gesture (*Signum Harpocraticum*) imposes silence and points, at the same time, towards an ulterior/anterior sound in the picture. In this way *silence* can be *seen* and it can be *heard/listened to* at the heart of the *subjectile*.

Hypotyposis (in the theatre) corresponds to “iconic” hypotyposis with three common denominators.

There is, first of all, that *speech* in the theatre, a speech that stems from the text and which only exists to the *text to writing*. We can follow the following layout:

**Theatrical Hypotyposis:**

Text—Speech (including the *sound of words* + *Voice*)—Image (painted representation)

**Iconic Hypotyposis:**

Image (painted representation)—*Sounds of Words* (including *Voice*).

These two elements (*sound of words* + *Voice*) are categories indissociable from Speech.

Finally, the last common denominator between *Theatrical Hypotyposis* and *Iconic Hypotyposis* is the *Voice* referred to as the *Transcendent Voice*.

If such a conclusion, having as its aim to illuminate common denominators between a theatrical hypotyposis and an iconic hypotyposis, still incurs the doubt of my readers, might I be permitted to lay down the following mathematical formula, somewhat fastidious, of course, but which does have the merit of demonstrating effectively the existence of a “real” and “perfect” interface between theatrical and iconic hypotyposis, between those two arts of theatre and painting.

$\text{HYPOTYPOSIS IN THE THEATRE} = \text{Speech. (Sounds of Words + Voice)}$ .

$\text{HYPOTYPOSIS IN THE THEATRE} = \text{Speech. Sound of Words} + \text{Speech. Voice}$ .

$\text{Speech. Voice} = \text{HYPOTYPOSIS IN THE THEATRE} - \text{Speech. Sound of Words}$ .

$\text{Voice} = \frac{\text{HYPOTYPOSIS IN THE THEATRE} - \text{Speech. Sound of Words}}{\text{Speech}}$

$\text{Voice} = \text{Hypotyposis} - \text{Sound of Words}$

It can be seen here how the *Voice* seems to drive away Speech and subtract from Theatrical Hypotyposis the Sound of words. In this way, the *Voice* is released, which has still to be found by complicated detours during which our attention must be concentrated on the internal, creative *Voice*, and not on the artificiality of the sound of the words, empty of meaning, altering the power of artistic creation. When we talk about the *Voice*, it is not necessarily the authorial voice, but the creative voice, which by the insertion of a hypotyposis accomplished its pictorial destiny with the help of the spectator-reader. This space, in which this formula functions, we know it already, we have already named it: the *subjectile*.

Let us here take note of an important point which makes our task harder, but we have already said beforehand that every voice in the theatre is made material by sound. Such is the condition of the human voice. The Transcendent Voice cohabits with the sound of words. There is a work of deconstruction being asked of us here, not to destroy, but to understand, to break down into small

parts in order to understand better and thus adhere to and participate in art. Hypotyposis in the theatre is therefore the creation of a painting, of an image, keeping it in mind that the creative Voice will be buried under the sound of words. We must hear it, for us to risk the search and to hear/listen to the Voice, which speaks to us and to which we answer in order to put the finishing touches to the picture.

So:

*Voice* = Hypotyposis - Sound of Words

Hypotyposis = *Voice* + Sound of Words

In other words:

*Voice* = Image - Sound of Words

Image = *Voice* + Sound of Words

Here then is an outline of one line of research that seems to me interesting to explore and to go deeper into: *hypotyposis* in its place, the *subjectile*; *hypotyposis* offering to the theatre, to the text, as to painting, an interface allowing the two arts to change one into the other, to communicate between each other. So theatrical hypotyposis is nothing other than the image of sound in which the *Transcendent Voice* is there to be found, to be discovered, and to be listened to. Theatrical hypotyposis is a “talking” picture placed under the eyes of the spectator. As far as iconic hypotyposis goes, the opposite is true, for it gives to the eye an opportunity for hearing and for listening to the Internal Voice of the painting, the *Transcendent Voice*. It may here be seen how, in the course of a stasis in a dramatic movement, Theatrical hypotyposis—as a result, seemingly, of transubstantiation—turns sound into images, or, more precisely, into an “organized picture,” into a pictorial art. As we have seen already, an *Internal Voice* or a *Transcendent Voice* will be born from this. In the same way Iconic Hypotyposis—also as the result of transubstantiation—changes a picture to release a Voice.

It is during these moments in the folds of a text dedicated to saying, revelatory of speech, and in the margins of a pictorial representation that the poetic takes up residence and offers an analysis reconciling opposites, for what is out of sight is not necessarily absent from our mind’s eye and, finally, what is beyond human hearing is not necessarily inaudible.

## Notes

1. Roman Jakobson, *Essai de Linguistique Générale* (Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1993), 218.

2. I deliberately use the terms “la voie/la voix” in French (*voie* meaning the way, and *voix*, the voice) for it conveys a double meaning, a *double entendre* which would be lost if translated into English

3. Anne Ubersfeld, “**Poétique et Pragmatique: le Dialogue au Théâtre**,” in *Applied Semiotics/Sémiotique Appliquée* (Toronto University Press, 1997), 120.

4. G. Deleuze, *Logique de la Sensation: Francis Bacon* (Paris: Editions de la Différence, 1984), 60.

5. M. Blanchot, *L'Entretien Infini* (Paris: Gallimard, 1969), 432.

6. P. Lamy, *De l'Art de Parler* (Paris: A. Pralard, 1678), 159.

7. P. Fontanier, *Les Figures du Discours* (Paris: Champs Flammarion, 1968), 390.

8. J. Jouveny, *L'Elève de Rhétorique* (Lyon: Hachette, 1892), 31.

9. The painting of a scene in the theatre can only happen if the recipient listens.

10. With one important rider. Even though he is an agent participating in the act of artistic creation, the recipient-spectator is not a matrix, but (perhaps putting it crudely) an exchange-disappropriation-appropriation between the character-narrator and the recipient-spectator we have mentioned. The matrix, that type of creative fund, will be named differently a bit further on in this paper.

11. G. Genette, *Esthétique et Poétique* (Paris: Editions Seuil, Collection Point, 1992), 8.

12. All references to the plays of Shakespeare in this paper are to the edition of Stephen Greenblatt's *The Norton Shakespeare* (1997).

13. One notices at the same time that this hypotyposis leaves behind a smudge of *sfumato*, which according to John Greenwood, “is an Italian painterly device, which is in fact the rendering of a fine haze across the breadth of the picture that lends to the painting a kind of atmospheric effect.” J. Greenwood, *Shifting Perspective and the Stylish Style: Mannerism in Shakespeare and his Jacobean Contemporaries* (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1998), 8.

14. Is this not one of the characteristics of Mannerism as defined by Claude Gilbert-Dubois: “another characteristic (of mannerism) is the art of detail. A Mannerist treatment often appears as the result of an intensive reading.” Dubois, C-G., *Le Maniérisme* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1979), 36.

15. For a closer study of the concept of anamorphosis, please refer to the work of Jurgis Baltrusaitis, *Anamorphic Art* (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey Ltd, 1977).

16. Merleau-Ponty, *L'Oeil et l'Esprit* (Paris: Editions Gallimard, 1964), 23.

17. Ubersfeld, 1997, 81.

18. Hypotyposis is, in short, a “Spirited away Speech” / *une Parole Soufflée*, the action of *prompting*, *souffler* in French and the action of robbing, *souffler* as well in French, of misappropriating/purloining. It is also perhaps, in another register the image of the prompter in a theatre. We will opt for the term “spirited away” for it has, via its latin root “spirare” semantic links with theft and breath.

19. J. Derrida, *L'écriture et La Différence* (Paris: Editions Seuil, Collection Tel Quel, 1967), 263.

20. J. Derrida and P. Thévenin, *The Secret Art of Antonin Artaud* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1999), 12.

21. The term was first used by Antonin Artaud. J. Derrida gives an erudite analysis of it in “Forcener le Subjectile,” *Etude pour les Dessins et Portraits d'Antonin Artaud* (Paris: Gallimard, 1986).

22. Derrida and Thévenin, 12.

23. We will leave to one side the problem of the temporal for the time being. We could quote Mallarmé who, facing up to art, found himself cut off from the present: "there is no present, no - a present does not exist" (*Quant au Livre*), cité par Derrida, 341, "Le Théâtre de la Cruauté et la Clôture de la Représentation" in *L'Écriture et la Différence*.

24. Ubersfeld, 119.

25. L. Marin, *De la Représentation* (Paris: Editions Seuil-Gallimard, Collection Hautes Etudes, 1994), 239.

26. The expression "sound of words" is used by N. Poussin, the painter, in a letter addressed to his client and friend Chantelou. (N. Poussin, *Lettres et Propos sur l'Art*, ed. A. Blunt ([Paris, Hermann, 1964], 123-5).

27. Marin, 336.

28. Speech seems to be an obligatory way to gain access to the voice.

29. Marin, 338.

30. André Chastel, A. *Le Geste dans l'Art* (Paris: Edition Liana Levi, Collection Opinion, 2001), 65.

31. Chastel, 65.

32. He speaks of the impossibility of speech in painted representation and not of sound, the voice, nor of the sound of (the) voice. He does not differentiate between propositions, he does not speak of the eventuality of a voice as transcendence in relation to speech.

33. Chastel, 85.