

AMBIVALENCE AND PARADOX
IN CHARLES SOREL'S *LE BERGER EXTRAVAGANT*

By
Rachel Hatch

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
(French)

at the
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON
2014

Date of final oral examination: 5/13/2014

The dissertation is approved by the following members of the Final Oral Committee:

Martine Debaisieux, Professor, French
Richard Goodkin, Professor, French
Ullrich Langer, Professor, French
Marion Vuagnoux-Uhlig, Assistant Professor, French
Stefania Buccini, Professor, Italian

© by Rachel Hatch 2014

All Rights Reserved

In Memory of
Dr. Sheldon Kerry Grant,
(1939-2005)
Grandpa

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank Martine Debaisieux, my advisor. Not only is she one of the field's leading critics on Charles Sorel, but she is also a gifted teacher. I had the privilege of taking one of her classes my first semester of graduate school and was so impressed that I hoped I would one day be fortunate enough to work more closely with her. And she has proved to be an extraordinary advisor. Besides the regular demands posed by drafting a dissertation, she has helped me work through three moves (two of them international), not to mention the births of my two children. In all of this, she has remained understanding of these challenges yet always encouraged me to keep on going.

I would also like to thank Richard Goodkin, whose valuable comments always helped me see my texts with fresh eyes, as well as Ulrich Langer, who assisted me in better framing this project. I am additionally appreciative of Marion Vuagnoux-Uhlig, and Stefania Buccini, whose engagement in my thesis committee gave this project further definition, as well as of other professors who perhaps unknowingly shaped my academic interests, including William Berg, Jan Miernowski, and Keith Busby. I am grateful for the support of my fellow graduate students, especially Kaitlin King, Martha Goodge, and Anna Bachman Barter, whose cheerful support has helped me pull through to the end.

My journey to this point started years in the past, maybe as long ago as the high school class where an extraordinary German teacher we called "Herr Corry" helped me discover my talents and passion for language. My love of German led me explore other languages, first Spanish, and then, in college, French, taught by the inimitable Elise Leahy, Jr. She was first my mentor and has since become a great friend and my loudest cheerleader.

And none of this could have been possible without the love and support of my family. I'm grateful to my mother, who taught me to think, and to my father, who taught me to see. I will always be indebted to my children, Christian and Alexander, who granted me the time to finish this project. Lastly, and most importantly, I owe so much to my husband Richard, whose many sacrifices – the cooking, the time, the cycling, the sleep – made this dream a reality and whom I will always thank with my whole heart.

Abstract

This dissertation examines ambivalence and paradox in Charles Sorel's *Le Berger extravagant, ou parmy des fantaisies amoureuses on void les impertinences des Romans & de [la] Poësie* (1627-28) and its republication as *L'Anti-Roman, ou l'histoire du berger Lysis, accompagnée de ses Remarques* (1633-34). Sorel's lengthy *histoire comique* (2910 pages in octavo) follows the comedic escapades of "Lysis," a young Parisian intoxicated by fiction much like Don Quixote. Sorel claims that each plot element is a transformation from another work of fiction and that he intends to do away with fiction by showing the absurdity of these texts. The most striking feature of *Le Berger extravagant* is the extensive *Remarques* (818 pages) where Sorel systematically comments on his models and the distance he takes from them.

While previous interpretations focus primarily on the narrative of *Le Berger extravagant*, my study treats the *Remarques* as essential to the interpretation of the text. A main objective of my dissertation is to analyze Sorel's ambivalent position towards his readers in statements of intention expressed in the *Remarques* and liminary texts. Ultimately, rather than being polemic and critical, *Le Berger extravagant* proves to be a "self-conscious" exploration of fiction that successfully displays its power of seduction.

In the first two chapters, I discuss characteristics of the text, particularly the complex authorial figure and the ambiguity of Lysis's madness. I also examine the strategies and rhetorical devices Sorel uses to present the work as unique and superior to other fictional narratives. In chapter three, I explore contamination between the diegesis and the *Remarques* in two essential episodes to exemplify the paradoxical nature of the text. Chapters four and five analyze some important aspects of the transformation of Cervantes's *Don Quixote* within *Le*

Berger extravagant and the significance of physical and textual disguises compared to Honoré d'Urfé's *L'Astrée*. By analyzing the original treatment of literary models and often ambiguous comments on them in Sorel's second and lesser-known *histoire comique*, my dissertation not only contributes to the interpretation of this complex work of fiction but also to an understanding of the elusive and contradictory figure of its author.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	ii
Abstract.....	iv
Introduction.....	1
I: <i>Le Berger extravagant</i>: Charles Sorel’s “<i>miracle estrange</i>”.....	31
Defiance of Textual Convention.....	32
Complexity and Confusion of Authorial Identity	39
Fiction and Critique	44
<i>Extravagance</i> in <i>Le Berger extravagant</i>	54
Conclusions.....	62
II: Convincing Illusions: The Paratextual Rhetoric of <i>Le Berger extravagant</i>.....	65
Rhetoric of Blame and Censure	68
Rhetoric of Praise.....	80
Rhetoric of Defense	92
Conclusions.....	100
III: Ambivalence and Contamination in the Text and Metatext of <i>Le Berger extravagant</i>	104
Notions of the <i>Roman</i> in the Seventeenth Century	105
Sorel’s Estimation of the <i>Roman</i> During his Later Career	111
<i>Livre I</i> : Discussions of Echo	114
Explanation and Evaluation in the Diegesis	115
Evaluation and Elaboration in the <i>Remarques</i>	123
Evaluation of <i>Le Berger extravagant</i> in the <i>Remarques</i>	133
The <i>Remarques</i> of <i>Livre VIII</i>	138
Conclusions.....	152

IV: Transformation of <i>Don Quixote</i> in <i>Le Berger extravagant</i>	158
<i>Don Quixote</i> in <i>Le Berger extravagant</i>	160
The Resolution of <i>Don Quixote</i>	167
The Resolution of <i>Le Berger extravagant</i>	177
Conclusions	191
 V: Disguise and Transformation in <i>Le Berger extravagant</i>	 197
Lysis's Disguise	205
Fontenay's Disguise	221
Conclusions	238
 Conclusion	 245
 Works Cited	 259

Introduction

Mais voilà que trois ans avant *Le Cid* paraît un livre au titre bizarre: *Anti-Roman*. Trois cent quatorze ans avant la Préface de Sartre au *Portrait d'un inconnu* de Nathalie Sarraute, qualifié fortement...d'anti-roman. Ce n'est pas (encore) lieu, ici, de s'attarder sur ce bouquin contemporain de Richelieu, qui est comme un Don Quichotte plus embarrassé, et aussi plus conscient. Cet Anti-Roman de Charles Sorel avait pour premier titre : "Le Berger Extravagant" : c'était un roman anti-pastoral, anti-chevaleresque, anti-courtois. Or cette imitation parodique du roman médiéval – qualifié par Sorel de "*bon pour les Hobereaux*" – tendait vers de tout nouveaux pouvoirs. "Je considère tout ce qui est au monde et je l'escry comme je le voy" : son projet c'est de pouvoir accomplir cette totale considération. [...] *L'Anti-Roman* de 1633, c'est donc la fondation même...du roman. Celui dont le modèle est censé nous être pour toujours infligé, jusqu'à la fin des temps.¹

In *Le Récit hunique*, Jean Pierre Faye, French philosopher, novelist and poet, expresses astonishment at Charles Sorel's *Le Berger extravagant*,² finding it "bizarre," strange, and difficult to define. Faye observes certain ties between it and the *nouveau roman* of the twentieth century, since both demonstrate a similar deconstructive consciousness about the principles of fiction. Faye also notes the way the text is strongly reminiscent of Cervantes's *Don Quixote*, yet more discursive, as it is paired with a large amount of metatext³ that does not appear in the Spanish work.

One of the most significant comments Faye makes about the text is that it is a work that has a "project." And indeed, the 1627-28 *Le Berger extravagant, ou parmy des fantaisies*

¹ Jean Pierre Faye, "Que faire, quand il y a la peste?" *Le Récit hunique* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1967) 31. See also "Surprise pour Anti-Roman" (36-55) in the same volume. In this essay, Faye enters into greater detail about what makes Sorel's work surprising, discussing the remarkable *Préface*, parallels between the text and *Don Quixote* and the *Histoire comique de Francion*, and the particular nature of imitation in the work.

² Throughout my thesis, I refer to Sorel's text as *Le Berger extravagant*, using the years of each edition to distinguish the one from the other. In general, my dissertation focuses on the 1626-27 publication. However, in certain chapters, I take purposeful looks at the 1633-34 text, either to compare it with the earlier edition, or to consult the *Conclusion*, appended only to the later publication.

³ I refer to Gérard Genette's conception of transtextuality as a guide for my use of the term "metatext" in this dissertation. Genette casually explains that metatext is "commentary" and that it is the ultimate avenue whereby the author may be critical of his own text (Gérard Genette, *Palimpsestes: la littérature au second degré* [Paris: Seuil, 1982] 11).

amoureuses on void les impertinences des Romans & de [la] Poësie and its 1633-34 republication as *L'Anti-Roman, ou l'histoire du berger Lysis, accompagnée de ses Remarques* are texts with a strong sense of purpose. Sorel begins each edition by enumerating the “goals” he expects to accomplish.⁴ Then, in the conclusion, he evaluates whether or not he has done so. That the author explicitly states “intentions” in a work with so much reflective commentary makes *Le Berger extravagant* unusual as a work of fiction. The author’s discussion of his work and purpose adds a second perspective from which to consider this text. This commentary, however, proves unreliable: at times, these “explanations” complement the narrative, but at others, they conflict with it, or simply seem distanced from it.

Because *Le Berger extravagant* is a metatextual work, it naturally entails paradox. Linda Hutcheon considers the paradoxes at the heart of metanarrative, writing that

[i]n all fiction, language is representational, but of a fictional “other” world, a complete and coherent “heterocosm” created by the fictive referents of the signs. In metafiction, however, this fact is made explicit and, while he reads, the reader lives in a world which he is forced to acknowledge as fictional. However, paradoxically the text also demands that he participate, that he engage himself intellectually, imaginatively, and affectively in its co-creation. This two-way pull is the paradox of the reader. The text’s own paradox is that it is both narcissistically self-reflexive and yet focused outward, oriented toward the reader.⁵

In her study, Hutcheon also calls metatextual works “texts with self-consciousness,” “auto-referential texts,” and “narcissistic narratives” because they are simultaneously focused on themselves and yet in dialog with the reader. These descriptions are equally applicable to Sorel’s text, a work in which many paradoxes, not just those associated with metatext, are a pivotal element. Sorel himself, for example, identifies another central paradox of *Le Berger extravagant*

⁴ A detailed study of the author’s “intentions” will be undertaken in chapter two of this dissertation.

⁵ Linda Hutcheon, *Narcissistic Narrative: The Metafictional Paradox* (Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1980) 7.

when he claims that “de plusieurs fables ramassees, j’ay fait une histoire veritable.” This accomplishment leads Sorel to label his work a “*miracle estrange*” (*BE, I, Préface*).

In my thesis, I investigate the complex and sometimes paradoxical relationship between text and metatext through the lens of Sorel’s explanation of his text and purpose in liminary passages. Throughout my study, I focus closely on the *Remarques* to observe how the work fulfills or strays from the author’s descriptions. Because I consider the possibility that the author acts as a *charlatan*, even in the explanatory *Remarques*, I acknowledge that Sorel may wear a mask of counterfeit sincerity as he describes and carries out his “intentions.” Nevertheless, I am interested in the particular elements of this “project” as well as the role that the *Remarques* are to play in the possible accomplishment of it.

In *Le Berger extravagant*, Sorel⁶ may be considered a *charlatan*⁷ or a *mystificateur*, since much of his narration, which occurs in the guise of explanation, is delivered tongue-in-cheek, making it impossible to take at face value. Martine Debaisieux makes connections between Sorel in his role as author of *Le Berger extravagant* and the eponymous character of his better known *Histoire comique de Francion*.⁸ In that text, Francion is a *charlatan* and, in one part, is even

⁶ The authorial figure in both editions of *Le Berger extravagant* is extremely complex and will be discussed at greater length in chapter one as one of the work’s distinguishing features. However, while I recognize that “Sorel” the narrator and assembler of Lysis’s adventures needs to be distinguished from the author per se, for the sake of ease and clarity, I nevertheless use the writer’s name to refer to the authorial figure in the text.

⁷ The *Dictionnaire universel* defines “*charlatan*” literally as “faux medecin qui monte sur le theatre en place publique pour vendre de la theriaque & autres drogues, & qui amasse le peuple par des tours de passe-passe & des bouffonneries, pour en avoir plus facilement le debit.” Of course, the word also has a more figurative meaning that also applies to Sorel: “Engeoleur, celui qui veut persuader quelqu’un par des flatteries & des hableries, pour en tirer avantage.”

⁸ Martine Debaisieux, *Le Procès du roman: écriture et contrefaçon chez Charles Sorel*. 2nd Ed. (Saratoga: Stanford French and Italian Studies, 1989) 121-22, 145-8.

accused of being a *faux-monnayeur*. He is a trickster whose capacity to charm other characters comes from his adroitness with words. This alone allows parallels to be drawn between Sorel the writer and Francion the *charlatan*, but the link between the two is solidified most strongly when, in *Livre Neuvième*, Francion reveals his intentions to author *Le Berger extravagant*.⁹

Sorel not only presents the title character as a *charlatan*, but implies that he, the author, is one as well. In *Livre Huitième* of *La Vraye histoire comique de Francion* (1633), Sorel laments that episodes of licentiousness in the work may be wrongly interpreted as authorial indulgence in vice. To justify what he has written, he explains that he has disguised both himself and his text in order to combat evil. The language he uses, however, has double meaning. “Il est besoin que j’imite les apothicaires, qui sucent par le dessus les breuvages amers, afin de les mieux faire avaler.”¹⁰ In explaining his work, Sorel effectively illustrates that he is literally a *charlatan*. Gifted with the same skills as his character, the author proves that he too knows how to mask his words to create illusions.¹¹

Sorel’s acknowledgment of his deception in the *Histoire comique de Francion* is not restricted to the narrative of Francion’s adventures. Rather, the author admits that illusion and fiction are characteristic of even the work’s paratextual¹² passages. In the *Advertissement*

⁹ Francion decides to draft *Le Berger extravagant* during an episode in the countryside as he tends to his flocks: “Or pour vous parler de ce dernier livre que je n’ay pas escrit, mais que j’ay seulement en l’imagination pour ce que je portois la houlette lors que j’y ay songé, son titre sera Le Berger extravagant. Je descry un homme qui est fou pour avoir leu des Romans et des Poesies, et qui, croyant qu’il faut vivre comme les Heros dont il est parlé dans les livres, fait des choses si ridicules qu’il n’y aura plus personne qui ne se moque des Romanistes et des Poetes si je monstre cette Histoire” (Charles Sorel, *Histoire Comique de Francion*. Ed. E. Roy. [Paris: Hachette, 1924-31] XI, 28-34).

¹⁰ Charles Sorel, *La Vraye histoire comique de Francion*. Ed. Emile Colombey. (Paris: A. Delahays, 1858) 302.

¹¹ See Holly Tucker, “Pleasure, Seduction, and Authorial Identity in Charles Sorel’s *Le Berger extravagant*,” *Neophilologus*. Vol. 84 No. 3 (July 2000), 354.

¹² “Paratext” is another term used by Gérard Genette in his description of transtextuality and refers to the texts that frame a work. It includes the title, prefaces, epigraphs, conclusions and epilogues. Genette explains that they are “lieu[x] privilégié[s] de la relation pragmatique entre l’œuvre et son lecteur” and that they may be places where the

d'importance au lecteur, for example, Sorel equates the content of the *advertissement* with that of the narrative.

Que si l'on ne se contente point de cette raison, et qu'on trouve encore mauvais ce que j'ay dit, je suis quitte pour respondre que je suis bien d'avis que l'on n'en croye que ce que l'on voudra, et que mon livre estant facetieux, l'on prenne pour des railleries ce que je mets dans cet Advertissement aussi bien comme le reste.¹³

He writes that the same deceptions that are an integral and expected part of the narrative also exist in the work's para- and metatext. This compromises the sincerity of the authorial voice and reveals the trickery that may be present at every turn.

Comparable illusions exist in *Le Berger extravagant*, in which the author plays an equally deceptive role. While the work is accompanied by large amounts of exegetical para- and metatext (including prefaces, forwards, conclusions, and the *Remarques*, which are nearly as extensive as the diegesis itself), Sorel admits that these passages, like those in the *Histoire comique de Francion*, may be fraught with illusions that undermine their explanatory and even critical functions. In the *Remarques* that follow *Livre I*, Sorel admits the apparent contradiction of his metatext: "Tout cecy est un exercice d'esprit, où par des propos ambigus il semble que je blasme ce que je loüe, & il semble aussi que je loüe ce que je blasme quelquefois. Toutes ces diverses pieces rapportees feront connoistre mon intention aux bons esprits" (*BE, IV, Rem. I*, 61). In the *Conclusion* of the 1633-34 *Anti-Roman*, Sorel is even more explicit about deception in the *Remarques*.

Il faut que je vous confesse icy enfin que pource que nos Remarques ont suivy l'histoire qui est toute libre & toute Comique, vous y avez veu des opinions que l'on ne doit pas

author explains and eventually evaluates his goals (Gérard Genette, *Palimpsestes: la littérature au second degré*, 9). See also Gérard Genette, *Seuils* (Paris: Seuil, 1987) 191.

¹³ Charles Sorel, *Histoire comique de Francion*. Ed. E. Roy, XIX.

recevoir si l'on les prend à la rigueur; mais vous reconnoistrez avec facilité celles qui ne sont pas dites à bon escient & qui ont une double signification (*A-R, II, Conclusion*, 1033).

This admission is striking, since Sorel previously claimed that the *Remarques* are the part of the text where he explains and expounds on the diegesis.

Even more disconcerting, however, is the fact that this statement is made at all. Sorel seems to flaunt the work's artificiality: on the one hand, he is clear about his desire to dismantle illusion, but on the other, he admits his own duplicity. Maurice Lever concludes that the work's seemingly contradictory criticism of and indulgence in illusion ultimately leads to a destruction of the text. "[D]iscours narratif et discours critique sont ici confondus: le roman se prend lui-même pour objet et se détruit à mesure qu'il se raconte."¹⁴ As will be further explored in chapter two of this dissertation, such apparent inconsistencies in attitude render the author's "intentions" problematic since, as Lever suggests, they may undermine the coherency of the text. Alternately, however, they may prove to be part of a "project" not delineated in the work's paratexts.

The plot of *Le Berger extravagant* revolves around the same questions of illusion and sincerity that characterize the metatext. Sorel's second *histoire comique* tells the story of Louys, a young Parisian whose mind has been addled from reading too many *romans*. In *Livre I*, his cousin and caretaker Adrian explains that rather than pursuing a respectable profession as he was encouraged to do by his *bourgeois* family, Louys chose to spend his time reading "certain fatras de livres que l'on appelle des romans" (*BE, I, I*, 32), finally deciding to become a *comédien*. Adrian recounts how the young man "s'estudi[ait] tous les jours à contrefaire le berger," and how he caught him reciting verses to himself at night "comme s'il eust parlé à quelque belle dame." He also describes how Louys would sit in front of the mirror, practicing the graceful poses of a

¹⁴ Maurice Lever, *Le Roman français au XVIIe siècle* (Paris: PUF, 1981) 95.

pastoral shepherd (*BE, I, I, 35-6*). Eventually, the young man dubs himself Lysis, a more elegant name better suited to his new vocation, and speaks, dresses, and acts as though he truly believes he is a pastoral *berger*. However, the revelation that Lysis's *folie* began as a *comédie* raises doubts about the nature of the young man's "madness" and anticipates his admission in the final *livre* that he was, at times, only feigning his "*extravagance*."

The gentleman Anselme then agrees with Adrian to take Lysis to the Brie region to cure him of his "madness." Anselme encourages Lysis's cooperation by telling him that they are actually going to Forez, the setting of *L'Astrée*. Once there, the country gentlemen Clarimond, Hircan, and Oronte exploit Lysis's antics in humorous ways. According to the *Préface*, Lysis's reenactments of famous moments from other works highlight the logical inconsistencies of mythology and contemporary fiction, especially *romans*. The nature of the adventures and their critical bent are strongly reminiscent of Miguel de Cervantes's *Don Quixote*.¹⁵

The diegesis is episodic in nature and diverse in its content. The first volume contains adventures engineered by the gentlemen who take Lysis under their wing. *Livres VII* and *VIII*, on the other hand, recall to some extent Sorel's *La Maison des jeux* (1642, 1657), in which characters assemble together to pass the time by telling stories to each other. In *Le Berger extravagant*, these books contain the narratives of characters that hearken back to specific genres (Sorel explains that "il y a quatre ou cinq histoires dans ce volume, lesquelles sont pour se mocquer de quatre différentes sortes de romans" [*BE, II, Advertissement au lecteur*]) such as the *roman d'aventures* and the tropes of Classical mythology. In *Livre IX*, Lysis and the gentlemen stage a play – after some deliberation *Le Ravissement de Proserpine* is chosen (*BE, II, IX, 357*) –

¹⁵ The strong parallels with *Don Quixote* are explored in detail in chapter four of this dissertation.

in which each character uses a specific kind of language. This allows the author to comment on each: “Fontenay prit les allusions & æquivoques, Polidor les hyperboles, Meliante les metaphores, & Clarimond le galimathias” (*BE*, II, IX, 355). The penultimate *livre* contains a lengthy debate on the merits and failings of fiction,¹⁶ while the last is dedicated to disabusing Lysis, which is prompted by the return of Adrian to collect his young charge.

Le Berger extravagant has a strong dramatic feel, especially in the opening scene, which not only reinforces the notion of Lysis as an actor, but also highlights the text’s hypertextual¹⁷ nature. In the *Préface*, Sorel suggests that his text is “disguised”¹⁸ much as an actor is, and only resembles those that he has singled out for critique. The theatrical “staging” of the work is emphasized from the beginning of the narrative, where characters are described as actors playing out certain roles. As the work opens, Lysis is sitting on the banks of the Seine watching his flock and speaking poetic dialog to his sheep. In the 1633 *Anti-Roman*, the narrator anticipates the theatrical moment, announcing: “Voila la Scene qui s’ouvre” (*BE*, I, I, 3). Lysis’s clothes are described as the costume of an actor, painstakingly patterned after the garments of the pastoral shepherds he imitates. The narrator concludes his description of Lysis’s costume by noting the character’s resemblance to a famous actor.

¹⁶ This debate is reminiscent of the structure of Fancan’s *Le Tombeau des Romans* (1626).

¹⁷ Hypertextuality is another aspect of Genette’s notion of transtextuality. Genette explains that hypertextuality is “toute relation unissant un texte B (hypertexte) à un texte antérieur A (hypotexte) sur lequel il se greffe d’une manière qui n’est pas celle du commentaire” (*Palimpsestes: la littérature au second degré*, 13).

¹⁸ Sorel writes: “Quant à l’ordre de ce recueil extraordinaire, il est à la mode des plus celebres romans, afin que ceux qui se plaisent à les lire ne dedaignent point de le lire aussi, et s’y treuvent ingenieusement surpris” (*BE*, I, *Préface*). Sorel acknowledges resemblances between the *roman* and *Le Berger extravagant*, yet steadfastly maintains that his text is different. See also Holly Tucker, “Pleasure, Seduction, and Authorial Identity in Charles Sorel’s *Le Berger extravagant*,” 349. Tucker’s comments on *Le Berger extravagant* as a “disguised” work are discussed in chapter five of this dissertation.

Il portoit en escharpe une pannetière de peau de fouyne, et tenoit une houlette aussi bien peinte que le baston d'un maistre de cérémonies, de sorte qu'avec tout cet équipage il estoit fait à peu près comme Bellerose, lors qu'il va représenter Myrtil à la pastorale du Berger fidelle (*BE, I, I, 3*).

The narrator sets the work up to unfold like a play, with the principal figure Lysis acting out other works of fiction.¹⁹ The dramatic elements of the text further establish the main character's consciousness of himself as an actor, which becomes particularly relevant when Lysis confesses that he was, at times, only pretending to be mad.

Anselme, the gentleman who invites Lysis to the country, is also introduced in a theatrical role. At one point, he counterfeits the mythological Echo, whom Lysis is questioning, thus becoming an actor in his own right. He is the first of many characters who respond to Lysis's adventures and *extravagance* with reason and logic. After Lysis and Anselme arrive in the country, it is principally Clarimond, his devotion to clarity hinted at in his name, who attempts to cure Lysis. While residing with the gentlemen Hircan and Oronte, Lysis has a number of adventures orchestrated by these gentlemen and inspired in part by Classical mythology and chivalric romances. Many revolve around Lysis's attempts to woo the maid whom he has dubbed "Charite." He sends her letters delivered in convoluted ways, is "transformed" into a girl (in reality, badly disguised) to be able to work alongside her, and fakes his own death in order to encourage her affections.

Lysis's adventures often conclude in comedy: the courier that Lysis sends to deliver his letter is accidentally set on fire, and as a "girl," he is put on trial for his supposed lasciviousness in seducing the manservant. The humorous nature of the work is perhaps what most recommends

¹⁹ For extensive discussion of theatricality in *Livre I* of *Le Berger extravagant*, see: Anne Theobald, "Stages in the Novel: Theatrical Characteristics in Sorel's *Histoire comiques*," Diss. (2011) 79-125.

it to the modern reader, and what makes it relevant today despite its otherwise deterring length.²⁰ However, alongside the narrative of Lysis's comic adventures runs the critical aspect of the work, embodied most clearly in the form of the metatextual *Remarques*.²¹

In the 1627-28 edition, the *Remarques* follow the text in one large section and purport to comment upon and explain the diegesis. In the 1633-34 republication, the *Remarques* are appended directly to the *livres* upon which they comment, which emphasizes their importance to the overall work. Certainly, *Le Berger extravagant* can and has been successfully studied independently of its metatext. The focus of my dissertation, however, is the relationship between text and metatext as the author presents and comments on his work. For this reason, I spend little time analyzing Lysis's adventures separate from the commentary that the author provides on them.

To some extent, the *Remarques* can be situated in the context of commentary in works starting in the Middle Ages. In elaborating on works from the Middle Ages, Paul Zumthor identifies an inclination toward explanation and expansion innate in all texts that justifies the existence of commentary at that time:²² “Ainsi borné, contraint, le texte possède une fécondité propre, une aptitude à engendrer d’autres textes: effet d’une ‘mouvance’ affectant l’imagination et l’intellect du lecteur, sur lesquels se projettent les vibrations d’un discours à la fois immobile

²⁰ The 1627-28 *Berger extravagant*, for example, contains four volumes in octavo, three of which are composed of nearly a thousand pages each. The 1633-34 *Anti-Roman* is slightly longer.

²¹ In *La Vie et les œuvres de Charles Sorel*, Emile Roy comments on the unusual double structure of *Le Berger extravagant* and emphasizes the large amount of critical metatext. “Il y a de tout dans le *Berger extravagant*; il y a même un joli roman, qu’il faut se donner la peine d’en extraire” (Emile Roy, *La Vie et les œuvres de Charles Sorel, sieur de Souvigny 1602-1674* [Paris: Hachette, 1891] 120).

²² Zumthor writes specifically about the significance of glosses and annotations in medieval literature.

et intense.”²³ Karlheinz Stierle opposes the terms *commentaire* and *texte* based on a definition of the latter provided by Furetière (“Texte: terme relatif opposé à commentaire”) and proposes for his own part that “le commentaire naît de la transformation du texte écrit en texte parlé, représenté.”²⁴

Stierle additionally points out that the tradition of commentary in the Middle Ages, delivered exclusively in Latin and produced only in scholarly institutions,²⁵ corresponds to a particular method of digesting a text known in Latin as *studium*. “La réception dans le mode du *studium* est une réception réfléchie, discontinue. Par ses approches réitérées, elle cherche à pénétrer dans le détail et à approfondir la conception du tout. Cet effort ne peut être un effort isolé et sans le support des savoirs accumulés et des pratiques acquises.”²⁶ This way of approaching a text not only attempts to understand its particularities, but also seeks to situate them in the larger contexts of theology, philosophy, law, and medicine that make up the institutions in which they are produced.

Michel Jeanneret observes that by the sixteenth century, the commentary of the Middle Ages has given way to something new.

La glose qui, au Moyen Age, sert à dégager le sens moral, prend une allure plus technique, plus philologique. Au lieu d’imposer un déchiffrement allégorique, le commentaire favorise l’intelligence du sens littéral: il explique le texte dans sa différence,

²³ Paul Zumthor, “La Glose créatrice,” *Les Commentaires et la naissance de la critique littéraire* (Paris : Aux Amateurs de livres, 1988) 12.

²⁴ Karlheinz Stierle, “Les lieux du commentaire,” *Les Commentaires et la naissance de la critique littéraire*, 20.

²⁵ Ibid., 24.

²⁶ Ibid., 23.

il en signale les ressources encyclopédiques et rhétoriques. Du coup, il change de nature.²⁷

Jeanneret's study is of particular interest because he investigates the relationship of commentary to passages such as prefaces. While he is careful to establish the differences between commentary and liminary texts, he nevertheless recognizes a commonality of purpose between the two. "Reste pourtant que l'un et l'autre sont écrits *a posteriori*, que ce sont des métadiscours, qu'ils remplissent la même fonction d'intermédiaire entre le texte et son destinataire et que, comme tels, ils peuvent infléchir le lecture."²⁸ Both kinds of commentary thus alter the reader's approach to the text.

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, poetic commentary becomes an important genre that Gisèle Mathieu-Castellani explains is a "mode de programmation structurant le sens – à partir de la double tradition de l'exégèse érudite, et du modèle italien, plus attentif aux aspects littéraires et philosophiques."²⁹ Mathieu-Castellani writes that such commentary³⁰ is delivered by an authority whose discourse "peut être la satire ou le panégyrique, *blâmer* ou *louer*." The commentator thus takes a stand on the material at hand: "attester, contester, relèvent d'une même activité: ici et là un discours d'autorité distribue bons ou mauvais points, énonce ses jugements, dicte ses normes."³¹ Mathieu-Castellani also notes the interest of the commentator as to the truth

²⁷ Michel Jeanneret. "Préfaces, commentaires, et programmation de la lecture. L'exemple des *Métamorphoses*," *Les Commentaires et la naissance de la critique littéraire*, 31.

²⁸ Ibid., 31.

²⁹ Gisèle Mathieu-Castellani. "Le commentaire de la poésie (1550-1630) : l'écriture du genre," *Les Commentaires et la naissance de la critique littéraire*, 41.

³⁰ Some examples of such commentaries are those of Muret on *Les Amours de Ronsard*, those of Tristan L'Hermite on his *Plaintes d'Acante* as well as La Ceppède's comments on his own *Théorèmes*.

³¹ Ibid., 42

of the ideas being presented in the poetry. “Le discours du Commentaire est toujours un discours de la vérité, et qui tient le poème comme discours de la vérité.”³²

The *Remarques* of *Le Berger extravagant* certainly recall these genres of commentary. The *studium* of the Middle Ages seems to be echoed in the digestive manner in which Sorel approaches his *anti-roman*, not only revealing the particular “sources” that inspired a given episode in the work, but also bringing in other texts to further situate the ideas suggested by these works. Additionally, Sorel’s commentary on his *anti-roman*, as described in the opening portion of the *Remarques*, is meant to alter the way that the reader approaches and understands the text through explanation. This effect is amplified by the large quantity of *Remarques* Sorel provides in addition to the many liminary passages that introduce it. And, reminiscent of poetic commentaries of the sixteenth and seventeenth century, Sorel situates his comments on the texts that Lysis transforms in terms of approval or distaste, blame or praise, with a special interest for the portrayal or approximation of truth in fiction.

Nevertheless, a certain ambivalence characterizes both the text of *Le Berger extravagant* and the author’s attitude toward the works upon which he comments. In this dissertation, my understanding and use of the term “ambivalence” is founded on the theoretical work of Mikhaïl Bakhtin and Julia Kristeva. Bakhtin writes about “*ambivalence carnavalesque*,” which comprises the “double world” (“*dualité du monde*”) entailed in the rituals of *Carnaval*: the meeting of rich

³² Ibid., 43.

and poor, high and low, sacred and profane, birth and death.³³ He proposes that this duality can be applied to texts that necessarily contain traces of the socio-historical environment in which they are produced.³⁴ Julia Kristeva clarifies and expands Bakhtin's application of this ambivalence in her writings on *intertextualité*, especially in "Le mot, le dialogue et le roman" where she explains that

tout texte se construit comme mosaïque de citations, tout texte est absorption et transformation d'un autre texte. A la place de la notion d'intersubjectivité [proposée par Bakhtine] s'installe celle d'*intertextualité*, et le langage poétique se lit, au moins, comme *double*.³⁵

In *Le Berger extravagant*, Lysis's adventures are ambivalent in this intertextual sense, but in a deliberate way, since his extravagant behavior is, according to the *Préface*, always purposefully based on specific episodes from other texts: "il ne luy [à Lysis] arrive point d'avantures qui ne soient véritablement dans les autres auteurs."

Alternately, ambivalence, in the sense of indecision or hesitation, can be observed in the author's attitude toward the texts he proposes to critique. Critics have noted that while Sorel is insistent about the work's project of judgment, he constantly oscillates between celebration and censure of the *roman* in his text.³⁶ Jean Serroy explains the author's dilemma as it is first manifested in the *Histoire comique de Francion*. "Les romans, dans la mesure où ils flattent l'imagination et endorment l'esprit critique, sont les agents de fausseté, des ennemis de cette

³³ Mikhaïl Bakhtin, *Rabelais and his World*. Trans. Hélène Iswolsky. (Indiana University Press, 1984) 104.

³⁴ Mikhaïl Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*. Ed. Michael Holquist. (University of Texas Press, 1981) 9-10.

³⁵ Julia Kristeva, "Le Mot, le dialog et le roman," *Recherches pour une sémanalyse* (Paris : Seuil, 1969) 85.

³⁶ See Anne-Elisabeth Spica, "Charles Sorel, entre fascination et répulsion pour le roman." *Charles Sorel, polygraphe*. Ed. Emmanuel Bury and Eric Van der Schueren. (Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 2006) 167-187.

‘franchise’ que le héros [Francion] veut apporter aux hommes.”³⁷ And indeed, Sorel claims that his work, with the help of the *Remarques*, exists to confront the many “recueils de folies que l’on [...] donne pour des livres” (*BE, I, Préface*). However, as will be explored further in chapter three, alongside his critique, the author also demonstrates an appreciation for the possibilities of representation offered by the *roman*.

Another contradiction in the work has to do with the way Sorel chooses to describe his text. In the *Préface*, Sorel claims that a purpose of the text is to point out and judge “bad” (“*mauvais*”) works of fiction and to expose their authors as “*conteurs de mensonges*” by closely approximating their content and style (“je me suis servy de leurs pointes et de leurs pensees” [*BE, I, Préface*]). Then, he identifies a central paradox of his work when he insists that “de plusieurs fables ramassees, j’ay fait une histoire veritable” (*BE, I, Préface*). Sorel sets up an important dichotomy by grouping the works he purports to critique under the heading “*fables ramassees*” and individualizing his text as an “*histoire veritable*.” By labeling his work in this manner, Sorel indicates that *Le Berger extravagant* is somehow “true” while the texts he judges, *romans* in particular, are “*fables*.” Yet such a statement is problematic because his text is composed of these “*fables*.”

Sorel therefore offers seemingly opposing descriptions of his text. On the one hand, he denies having written another *roman* (“Je me mocquerois de ceux qui diront qu’en blasmant les Romans, j’ay fait un autre Roman” [*BE, I, Préface*]) yet simultaneously insists on the exact nature of his “representation”³⁸ by claiming that every one of Lysis’s adventures can be traced

³⁷ Jean Serroy, *Roman et réalité: les histoires comiques au XVIIe siècle* (Paris: Minard, 1981) 296.

³⁸ Sorel uses the verb “resembler” to describe the translation of episodes from other texts into *Le Berger extravagant*: “mon berger *resemble* en beaucoup d’endroits de certains personnages qui ont fait des extravagances semblables aux siennes” (*BE, I, Préface*, my emphasis).

back to another text. Francis Assaf proposes a way to resolve this apparent contradiction by understanding the appellation “*histoire véritable*” in light of the way the word “*véritablement*” is used in a previous passage³⁹.

Sorel entend-il représenter la réalité? Pas celle du quotidien, mais plutôt celle de l’écriture telle que la pratiquent ces scribouillards fainéants qui l’indignent. Dans ce sens, Sorel comme son exégète Hinds ont raison sur ce point: il a composé une ‘histoire véritable,’ c’est-à-dire un texte qui représente authentiquement la réalité textuelle telle que la pratiquent ses confrères.⁴⁰

The work is therefore not a “true” depiction of life events, but rather a “true” or “genuine” representation of other texts.

Sorel’s denial that his work is a *roman* (even going so far in the 1633-34 republication to dub it an “*anti-roman*”⁴¹) seems to be part of an effort to distinguish the work from the “*ouvrages inutiles*” the author insists are inadequate. Nevertheless, critics such as Leonard Hinds argue that Sorel has a tendency to critique these texts using the same techniques of writing that characterize them.⁴²

It is even more interesting to note that Sorel’s authorial voice, in its efforts to emerge by means of emphatic tones and wide-sweeping claims, critiques these very means and draws attention to its own conventional, imaginary, and representational nature. This technique of criticizing by means of doing the very thing being criticized continues

³⁹ “[I]l ne luy [à Lysis] arrive point d’avantures qui ne soient *véritablement* dans les autres auteurs” (*BE, I, Préface*, my emphasis).

⁴⁰ Francis Assaf, “Sorel et l’écriture, ou l’évolution d’une mentalité,” *Charles Sorel, polygraphe*, 213

⁴¹ Sorel defines the term in *Livre I* of this edition, (writing of his text as though it were authored by someone else). “Et de vray, ce nom de Roman que l’on donne à ces Histoires pleines de charmes & de délices meriteroit bien d’estre donné à la sienne [*Le Berger extravagant*] qui est tout délicate et toute charmante, mais neantmoins l’on l’appelle l’Anti-Roman, pour ce que d’ordinaire les romans ne contiennent que des choses feintes, au lieu que l’on nous donne cette histoire pour véritable” (*A-R, I, I, 2*).

⁴² Holly Tucker writes of this same contradiction when she describes the author’s attempts to differentiate *Le Berger extravagant* from other *romans* in terms of its unusual purpose. “While Sorel clearly acknowledges that he imitates traditional fiction to attract readers, he also underscores that his imitation is essentially an articulation of *difference* (“une intention différente de l’ordinaire”); he thus hints at a type of double-layered (text/subtext) configuration to his *histoire*” (Holly Tucker, “Pleasure, Seduction, and Authorial Identity in Charles Sorel’s *Le Berger extravagant*,” 349).

through the rest of *Le berger*'s restaging of authorship.⁴³

This may be because, despite his insistence that *Le Berger extravagant* is not a *roman*, Sorel understands that the inherently truthful *roman* can be used to communicate "realities" or truths. Jean Serroy, for instance, recognizes Sorel's estimation of the *roman* as a uniquely valuable tool for doing so.

Comme il [Sorel] ne cesse de le répéter dans ses préfaces, avertissements, adresses au lecteur, le roman est pour lui une chose sérieuse. Il est, sous le voile de la fiction, l'expression la plus juste de la réalité, celle qui, ne s'embarrassant pas des règles contraignantes qui touchent les genres canoniques, laisse toute liberté à l'écrivain pour traduire la vérité des êtres et des choses.⁴⁴

Sorel expresses a similar sentiment in *La Bibliothèque françoise* (1664, 1667), in which he describes the enlightening function of the *roman*. "Rien n'empesche que sous d'agreables feintes, on ne represente les plus beaux secrets de la Morale & des autres connoissances."⁴⁵ In *Le Berger extravagant*, Sorel's oft-repeated desire to critique the *roman* is countered by his simultaneous respect for it, an apparent contradiction that complicates efforts to adequately define this "extraordinary"⁴⁶ work.

Le Berger extravagant shares its tenuous and uncertain relationship to the *roman* with other *histoires comiques*, which are notably self-examining and "self-conscious" texts. In the *histoires comiques* of Sorel and other seventeenth-century authors, the themes of truth and falsehood, and fiction and *vraisemblance* are also dominant. In *De la connoissance des bons*

⁴³ Leonard Hinds, "The Comedy of Authorship in Charles Sorel's *Le Berger extravagant*," *Cahiers du Dix-Septième: An Interdisciplinary Journal*. Vol. 6 No. 2. (Fall 1992), 193.

⁴⁴ Jean Serroy, "Situation de Charles Sorel." Introduction. *Charles Sorel, polygraphe*, 8.

⁴⁵ Charles Sorel, *La Bibliothèque françoise* (Paris: Compagnie des libraries du Palais, 1664) 406.

⁴⁶ Sorel refers to his own text as a "*recueil extraordinaire*" (*BE, I, Préface*).

livres, Sorel explains that *vraisemblance* is a cardinal characteristic of the “*romans comiques*”: “ils ont grand besoin d’être défendus [...L]es bons Livres Comiques sont des Tableaux naturels de la Vie humaine.”⁴⁷ Sorel additionally writes that “le meilleur roman ressemblera au monde réel,”⁴⁸ reiterating his belief that both fiction and a form of “reality” can be complementary facets of the *roman*.

But the “*monde réel*” about which Sorel writes is a specific kind of “realism.” Martine Debaisieux explains that although *histoires comiques* are not “*réaliste*” in the nineteenth-century sense of the word, Sorel and other authors created works of fiction that are credible or *vraisemblable*.⁴⁹ In his *histoires comiques*, Sorel creates more verisimilar plots than those which may be found in the *romans d’aventures* or the *romans tragiques* of his time. The action of his *histoires comiques* takes place in contemporary France rather than in a distant setting. Even the language of his *histoires comiques* differs greatly from the affected poetic metaphors found in the traditional fiction of his day.⁵⁰

Sorel’s use of *vraisemblance* in his *histoires comiques* exemplifies his interest in “*vérité*” and “*naïveté*”⁵¹ and their textual representations, a concern that is manifest in works from

⁴⁷ Charles Sorel, *De la Connaissance des bons livres, ou examen de plusieurs Auteurs* (Paris: André Pralard, 1671) 157.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 172.

⁴⁹ The use of *vraisemblance* in the *histoire comique* is evidence of these authors’ consciousness of the artifice of fiction. Furetière defines “*vérité*” in terms of absolutes: “Certitude d’une chose qui est toujours la même, qui ne change point.” “*Vraysemblance*,” on the other hand, is the “caractere ou apparence de vérité.” Theorists of the era debated this opposition at length. See René Bray, *La Formation de la doctrine classique en France* (Paris: Hachette, 1927).

⁵⁰ For a more detailed and complete discussion of these ideas, see: Martine Debaisieux, “L’Histoire comique, genre travesti,” *Poétique*. No. 74 (April 1988), 169-181.

⁵¹ The *Dictionnaire universel* defines “*naïveté*” as: “[v]érité dite simplement et sans artifice.” It is the expression of truth in language. The distinction between *vérité* and *vraisemblance* is captured in Boileau’s observation that “[l]e vrai peut quelquefois ne pas être vraisemblable” (*Art Poétique*, [1674] III, 48). The debate between the two is at the

various stages of his career. The author's attention to accuracy is demonstrated in his works as an *historiographe*. Within a short time of publishing *Le Berger extravagant*, Sorel bought the charge of *historiographe du roi* from his uncle and published his *Avertissement sur l'Histoire de la monarchie française* (1628). This text exposes the authors of existing histories of France as writers of fiction who "s'imagin[aient] sans doute écrire quelque roman des chevaliers de la Table-Ronde."⁵² His own historical project, *Histoire de la monarchie française* (1629), accordingly breaks with tradition, eschewing exaggerations of rulers' heroics in order to more accurately describe France's historical origins, however humble they may have been. *Le Berger extravagant*'s claim to be an "*histoire véritable*," is therefore highly reminiscent of Sorel's work as a historiographer.

But of all Sorel's writings, *Le Berger extravagant* is most strongly linked to the *Histoire comique de Francion*. Jean Serroy observes that both texts interrogate the role of illusion in the *roman*, noting: "*Le Berger extravagant* ne fait qu'illustrer et développer, en effet, les idées soutenues par le héros libertin tout au long de *L'Histoire comique*. Se méfiant de toute fausseté, Francion fait tout naturellement porter sa défiance sur l'illusion romanesque."⁵³ *Le Berger extravagant* perpetuates the way Francion "s'emploie d'abord à démasquer les fausses

heart of the *Querelle du Cid*, in which it was often argued that *vraisemblance* was superior to *vérité* for aesthetic reasons.

⁵² As quoted in: Émile Roy, *La Vie et les œuvres de Charles Sorel*, 330-51.

⁵³ Jean Serroy, *Roman et réalité: les histoires comiques au XVIIe siècle*, 295.

apparences.”⁵⁴ In particular, it examines the falseness of the *roman*, putting it on trial as a counterfeit discourse.⁵⁵

Le Berger extravagant also bears strong ties to Sorel’s later theoretical works. Fausta Garavini places *Le Berger extravagant* at the center of a triptych composed of the *Histoire comique de Francion*, *Le Berger extravagant*, and *La Science universelle*. Garavini considers all three works as steps along a trajectory toward truth. She notes how the *Conclusion* of the 1633 *Anti-Roman* labels this truth “LA SOUVERAINE VERITE” (*A-R, II, Conclusion*, 1133) and proposes that *La Science universelle*

constitue le couronnement des aspirations soréliennes, le point d’arrivée d’un *iter* précocement tracé et obstinément suivi [...] La clef de l’interprétation de son chemin réside dans le dilemme entre le rôle de ‘conteur de fables’ obstinément refusé et l’ambition d’un message idéologique à transmettre.⁵⁶

Le Berger extravagant may therefore be considered a central example of the author’s evolving efforts to expand his knowledge of truth and represent it for his readers.⁵⁷

⁵⁴ Fausta Garavini, *La Maison des jeux: science du roman et roman de la science au XVIIe siècle* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1998) 47.

⁵⁵ In *Livre XII* of the *Histoire comique de Francion*, Francion is tried as a *faux-monnayeur*. Martine Debaisieux observes that “le procès fait à Francion pour avoir émis de la fausse monnaie, sujet principal du livre douze, se trouverait justifié: s’il semble immotivé dans le contexte diégétique de la conclusion, l’épisode peut être considéré comme une mise en abyme du ‘procès’ du roman exposé dans les derniers livres. ‘Procès’ dans les deux sens du mot: la dénonciation de la contrefaçon de l’œuvre (et de la fiction en général) est indissociable du dévoilement de son ‘processus’ de création, de la mise en scène des principes de son développement” (Martine Debaisieux, “Le tombeau des romans’: de *Francion* au *Berger extravagant*,” *Papers on French Seventeenth-Century Literature*. Vol. 16 No. 30 [1989], 170).

⁵⁶ Fausta Garavini, *La Maison des jeux: science du roman et roman de la science au XVIIe siècle*, 86-7.

⁵⁷ The term “SOUVERAINE VERITE” used by Sorel in the 1633 *Anti-Roman* reappears in the introduction of *La Science universelle* in which it becomes a subject of central importance. There, Sorel writes: “[q]uiconque possedera la Science Universelle, aura donc la Souveraine Verité, autant qu’elle peut estre connuë des Esprits humains” (*La Science Universelle*, I, 39). Richard Hodgson further explains the purpose served by “la SOUVERAINE VERITE:” “Une fois qu’on aura trouvé cette ‘souveraine Verité’ et cette ‘droicte Raison’, explique Sorel dans *La Science universelle*, on pourra à la fois ‘remédier aux erreurs de l’esprit de l’homme’ et fonder la ‘Vraye Science des Mœurs.” Hodgson calls “La Vraye Science des Mœurs” the “clé de voûte” founded on truth and reason (Richard Hodgson, “De la ‘comédie humaine’ à la ‘perfection de l’homme,’ *Charles Sorel, polygraphe*, 26-7).

Because of Sorel's interest in truth and the problems entailed in attempting to represent it, illusion and artifice are constant themes of contemplation in *Le Berger extravagant*. In the *Préface*, Sorel reveals a central illusion of the work when he explains that the text resembles the traditional *roman* only to entice unsuspecting readers. "Quant à l'ordre de ce recueil extraordinaire, il est à la mode des plus celebres romans, afin que ceux qui se plaisent à les lire ne dedaignent point de le lire aussi, et s'y treuvent ingenieusement surpris" (*BE, I, Préface*). Holly Tucker comments on this passage and the significance of this illusion.

For this reason, he [Sorel] must use divertissement as a type of travestissement. Employing pleasure in much the same way as the "dangerous" fiction the author criticizes, the author thus fashions a type of disguise that is based on the fabrication of an image of the *roman* that is used to mask the underlying, and edifying, *anti-roman*.⁵⁸

Sorel claims that the pleasing *roman* is a "disguise" that veils a critical text. The reader, lured by the promise of an enjoyable experience, is to be drawn into a work that demonstrates the failings of the *roman* it only appears to be.

The reader's pleasure is a central feature of this illusion, and a matter of great interest to the author, both in the *Préface* of the 1627-28 edition and in *Livre I* of the 1633-34 *Anti-Roman*. In the *Préface*, the reader is warned that the work's resemblance to the *roman* is illusory, yet Sorel uses this deception to lure in unsuspecting readers. Sorel's *roman/anti-roman* therefore becomes a spectacle to the reader who expects deception. Sorel becomes an illusionist, amusing his audience with his "tricks" of textual transformation. While the reader may initially be unaware of the work's "hidden" criticisms, the experience is nevertheless enjoyable even after they are revealed.

⁵⁸ Holly Tucker, "Pleasure, Seduction and Authorial Identity in Charles Sorel's *Le Berger extravagant*," 349. Tucker's article, as well as her thesis on *Le Berger extravagant*, are solidly based on this view of Sorel's work as a "double-layered text." She goes on to explain that "[t]he double-layered nature of the narration poses particular challenges for interpretation because meaning becomes suspended in the murky space between 'same' and 'other,' between *roman* and *anti-roman*."

However, Sorel simultaneously demonstrates unease with the notion of pleasure because textual enjoyment is a principal feature of the *romans* that he attacks. Sorel claims that such texts are not only empty pleasures, but actually evil (“*mauvaises choses*”). The power of the *roman* to corrupt is a common seventeenth-century argument against the appropriateness of the *roman*⁵⁹ and is echoed by Sorel in *De la connoissance des bons livres*.

A quoy donc sont propres nos Romans? Leurs Autheurs nous estiment si credules, ou le sont tellement eux-mesmes, que de nous dire serieusement que leurs Livres sont faits pour exciter à la Vertu. Mais ne doivent-ils plustost exciter à toute sorte de vice, comme à l’amour impudique, à l’oisiveté, et à un abandonnement general aux Voluptez?⁶⁰

Holly Tucker observes that in this passage Sorel draws a parallel between two different kinds of pleasure.

Contributing to a common argument against the novel, Sorel suggests here an equivalence between textual pleasure and sexual pleasure – or at the very least an effect of contagion from the text to the imagination – which influences the reader to act in a manner that is contrary to norms of moral conduct.⁶¹

Sorel strongly denies the presence of this kind of pleasure in his text precisely because of its ability to corrupt.

Additionally, Sorel may dismiss the amusing aspect of his work because it undermines his critical aims. Throughout the plot of *Le Berger extravagant*, pleasure is often associated with trickery. The country gentlemen who take advantage of Lysis, for example, explain that fooling the *berger* is profoundly entertaining. In *Livre XIV*, when Clarimond urges them to stop trying to dupe Lysis, they protest: “Pourquoy ne jouyrans nous pas encore de l’agreable humeur de

⁵⁹ See, for example, François Dorval-Langlois de Fancan. *Le Tombeau des romans*. Ed. Frank Greiner. *Pour les Romans*, 70 and Jean-Pierre Camus, *Petronille: Accident pitoyable de nos jours, cause d’une vocation Religieuse*. (Lyon: Jacques Gaudion, 1626. *Google Books*. Web.) 460. The attitude of seventeenth century writers on the function and value of the *roman* is discussed in greater detail in chapter three of this dissertation.

⁶⁰ Charles Sorel, *De la connoissance des bons livres*, 125-6.

⁶¹ Holly Tucker, “Pleasure, Seduction, and Authorial Identity in Charles Sorel’s *Le Berger extravagant*,” 348.

Lysis?” Clarimond responds: “Représentez vous que quand vous auriez intention de vous *donner encore du plaisir* de ce pauvre berger, vous ne le pourriez plus faire guere long temps” (*BE, III, XIV*, 163-4, my emphasis).⁶²

Illusion in *Le Berger extravagant* may occur in the guise of explanation. Like the patter of a magician who uses language to deceive, Sorel’s specially chosen words give him the ability to replicate and experiment with deception even as he purports to clarify his work. Graham Jones and Lauren Shweder write about the role speech plays in the illusion-making of a professional magician. They emphasize the power of the magician’s language to influence the way an audience interprets a trick.

As we will demonstrate, through the course of performing the trick, the magician’s verbal routine allows an audience to see a potentially uninteresting sequence of gestures as paranormal – to perceive something otherwise unbelievable. In part, the magician accomplishes this effect through the use of performative speech. In the magician’s spoken routine, the seemingly descriptive narration of an imaginative world of illusion functions through implicit performativity to influence the audience’s perception of events [...] The meaning of the magician’s talk lies not in its descriptive accuracy, but in the power it has to affect how an audience construes what it sees.⁶³

The illusionist uses explanatory language to misdirect and misrepresent. In fact, these “explanations” are what ultimately become the illusion.⁶⁴

Jones and Shweder explain that the magician’s dialog works by establishing complicity with the audience. The magician cultivates the audience’s trust by claiming to reveal the secret of

⁶² Jessica Moss, in discussing the relationship between pleasure and illusion in the writings of Plato, suggests that it is the illusion inherent in pleasure that causes Plato to discourage its cultivation. “Pleasure is dangerous because it is a *deceiver*. It leads us astray with false appearances, bewitching and beguiling us, cheating and tricking us. In particular, it deceives us by appearing to be good when it is not” (Jessica Moss, “Pleasure and Illusion in Plato,” *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*. Vol. 72 No. 3 [May 2006], 504).

⁶³ Graham Jones and Lauren Shweder, “The Performance of Illusion and Illusionary Performatives: Learning the Language of Theatrical Magic,” *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*. Vol. 13 No. 1 (2003), 52.

⁶⁴ The magician’s efforts to misdirect his audience are a kind of performative utterance, since they are part of his attempt to fool. Like the statements discussed by J. L. Austin, the magician’s language masquerades as fact, but instead serves to accomplish the magician’s design (J. L. Austin, *How to Do Things With Words* [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975] 4).

the trick. This very dialog, however, is what deceives the audience and completes the illusion.

The magician's careful management of the threshold between the visible and the invisible leaves an audience with an incomplete perspective. In the trick we are considering, this epistemological gap is ultimately supplemented by language. The linguistic work of the magician creates a frame in which the audience can come to interpret its visual experience, which has been intentionally limited. In effect, the magician linguistically fills in the blanks with information that directs the viewer's attention away from the invisible and provides an interpretive framework for the visible. Allowing the audience to see only movements that closely correspond to his narrative accompaniment of the trick, the magician uses gesture and discourse to dynamically reinforce each other. Thus, he does not merely "do" a trick, for the spoken aspects of his performance bear an enormous phenomenological burden in accomplishing illusion.⁶⁵

The illusion occurs in language, not through any visual means, making it particularly unexpected. It is facilitated by the explanations the audience assumes are removed from the artificiality of the trick and, therefore, trustworthy. Much like a professional magician, Sorel may use his explanatory, metatextual language to create illusions and mislead the reader.

Because these deceptions may permeate the *Remarques*, they risk twisting the author's project into something very different from what is described in the *Préface*.

One particular manifestation of illusion of interest in *Le Berger extravagant* is artifice. Furetière makes the link between illusion and artifice explicit when he explains that "*artifice*" can signify "[f]raude, deguisement, mauvaise finesse." Sorel writes in the *Préface* that he is interested in interrogating the fraud of fiction in other *romans*, myths and poetry. His integration of hypotexts into the storyline of *Le Berger extravagant* seems to be an attempt to answer the question posed by Daniel Chouinard: "A quel moment de l'opération interviendra donc le mensonge, la fiction? Comment concilier la négation de la fable et sa transmutation paroxystique

⁶⁵ Graham Jones and Lauren Shweder, "The Performance of Illusion and Illusionary Performatives: Learning the Language of Theatrical Magic," 54.

en réalité?”⁶⁶ The artifice of Sorel’s own text becomes a central focus of the “explanatory” *Remarques*.

In fact, artifice is at the heart of the craft of fiction-making in which Sorel appears to be so profoundly interested. The *Dictionnaire universel* gives this second, equally relevant definition of “*artifice* :” “industrie de faire des choses avec beaucoup de subtilité.” The French and English word *artifice* comes from the Latin *artificium*, meaning an “art, craft, or trade.” In *Le Berger extravagant*, the notion of artifice is strongly tied to the illusion and deception of fiction-making. In the *Remarques*, Sorel uses the word *artifice* to describe the way a character has interpreted an adventure from another source. In the *Remarques* that accompany *Livre VII*, for example, Sorel praises the character Fontenay for his interpretation of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* and employs the word *artifice* to refer to his interpretation. The term is used in conjunction with others that connote a manual “crafting” or “making” of fiction: “Voilà pour monstrier que Fontenay ne dit rien que de vray-semblable, & qu’il *ourdit*⁶⁷ sa fable avec beaucoup de *dexterité*” (*A-R, I, Rem. VII*, 1116, my emphasis).

In the *Préface*, Sorel indicates that part of the project of the *Remarques* is to expose the artifice of his text and others. Daniel Chouinard explains that the *Remarques* exist as a kind of reader’s guide to the art of composing a work of fiction.⁶⁸ But the exposure of artifice does not

⁶⁶ Daniel Chouinard, “Charles Sorel (anti)romancier et le brouillage du discours,” *Etudes Françaises (Québec, Canada)* Vol. 14 (1978), 76.

⁶⁷ The verb “*ourdir*” has to do with two separate industries: textiles and brick-laying. “OURDIR. Disposer & arranger en long, les fils ou chaisne de la toile ou d’une estoffe sur le mestier, pour ensuite y passer la trême. En termes de Maçonnerie, se dit d’un grossier enduit qu’on fait de chaux ou de plâtre sur un mur de moison, par dessus lequel on en met un autre de plâtre fin qu’on unit proprement avec la truelle” (Furetière, *Dictionnaire universel*). In both cases, the image of Fontenay physically “making” or “crafting” his tale is suggested.

⁶⁸ “Puisqu’encore, pour paraphraser Sorel, nous aussi, ‘gros asnes’ pour la plupart, nous aurons besoin d’un Anselme qui veuille bien, par ses remarques, nous dévoiler les artifices du peintre et corriger nos erreurs de perspective” (Daniel Chouinard, “*L’Anti-Roman de Charles Sorel: poétique d’une lecture, lecture d’une poétique.*” Diss. Université de Montréal. [1983] 158).

occur in the *Remarques* alone. In fact, Fausta Garavini goes so far as to assert that “[l]’intrigue n’est qu’une convention pour agencer un mécanisme littéraire qui vise à mettre à nu son propre artifice à travers un amoncellement d’artifices exhumés de toute la littérature accumulée au cours des siècles”⁶⁹ Sorel’s examination of the artifice of other texts in fact becomes a macrocosm for the phenomena of ambivalence and paradox of any work of fiction. The *anti-roman* thus could be viewed as a *roman* undone, exposed, and deconstructed for the reader’s edification and enjoyment.

A number of studies, mainly articles, examine the ambiguity of *Le Berger extravagant*, but aside from A. L. Franchetti’s *Il Berger extravagant di Charles Sorel*, no books exist that exclusively treat Sorel’s text.⁷⁰ Part of the reason for this is that *Le Berger extravagant* is studied less frequently than Sorel’s more popular *Histoire comique de Francion*. The originality of my dissertation is to identify the descriptions Sorel gives of his work, especially the *Remarques*, and then to observe how he carries out his project. In so doing, I work toward a redefinition of the function of the *Remarques* and their effect on the text as a whole. Daniel Chouinard’s dissertation “*Anti-Roman* de Charles Sorel: Poétique d’une lecture, lecture d’une poétique” (1983) provides a close reading of *Le Berger extravagant*’s confused discourse. Ideas Chouinard proposes on the text’s self-dismantling language are expanded in his article “Charles Sorel:

⁶⁹ Fausta Garavini, *La Maison des jeux: science du roman et roman de la science au XVIIe siècle*, 89.

⁷⁰ A few doctoral dissertations consider *Le Berger extravagant* from other perspectives, including Caren Greenberg’s “Meditation and Madness: Charles Sorel’s *Le Berger extravagant*” (1977); Leonard Hinds’s “Literary Tombs: Novelistic Experimentation in Honoré d’Urfé’s *L’Astrée* and Charles Sorel’s *Le Berger extravagant*,” (1989); Holly Tucker’s “Strategies of Imitation in Charles Sorel’s *Le Berger extravagant*,” (1996); Geneviève Jacques’ “Lysis, mélancholique abusé ou abuseur dissimulé? La représentation théâtrale dans *Le Berger extravagant*” (2002); and Anne Theobald’s “Stages in the Novel: Theatrical Characteristics in Sorel’s *Histoires Comiques*” (2011).

(anti)-romancier et le brouillage du discours,” in which he focuses on the ambiguity of the work’s juridical language. Eli Cohen’s doctoral thesis “A Poetics of Paradox: Images of Discourse in Early Modern Novelistic Fiction” (2011) examines the expression of ambiguity in Sorel’s *Histoire comique de Francion*. He proposes that the *Histoire comique de Francion* uses language that both seeks to communicate meaning, and yet is paradoxically duplicitous and untrustworthy. While Cohen acknowledges that such language is also characteristic of *Le Berger extravagant*, he makes only passing mention of the text.

In the second part of my dissertation, I examine the treatment of two important seventeenth-century texts in *Le Berger extravagant: Don Quixote* and *L’Astrée*. Leonard Hinds’s *Narrative Transformations from L’Astrée to Le Berger Extravagant* traces the evolution of poetic forms from one text to the other and notes the ways Sorel interprets d’Urfé’s language. Hinds does not, however, analyze these transformations in light of Sorel’s descriptions of *Le Berger extravagant*, as I propose to do. In *Roman et réalité: les histoires comiques au XVIIe siècle*, Jean Serroy acknowledges the “self-conscious” nature of *Le Berger extravagant*, explaining the critical role played by the *Remarques*. However, Serroy seems willing to take Sorel’s descriptions of his own work at face value, not questioning them as I do in this dissertation. Finally, Martine Debaisieux’s study *Le Procès du roman: écriture et contrefaçon chez Charles Sorel* examines the protean writing of Sorel’s *Histoire comique de Francion*, *Le Berger extravagant*, and *Polyandre, histoire comique*. This work, as well as her article “Le Tombeau des romans’: de *Francion* au *Berger extravagant*” lay the framework for my dissertation in

which I seek to understand Sorel's first *histoire comique* in its role as a "tentative de démystifier les techniques romanesques,"⁷¹ especially as it discusses and experiments with those techniques.

Particular mention should be made of the availability of *Le Berger extravagant* and the influence this has had on the number of studies that have been made of the work. The text was first reprinted by Slatkine Reprints in 1972. The difficulty of textual analysis posed by this lengthy work was greatly eased with the advent of digital versions first made available in 1982. While initially limited to the University of Chicago's ARTFL Project, Sorel's text can now be accessed elsewhere online. The most comprehensive reproduction of the text was made available in 2009, when Google Books digitized original publications of the 1627-28 *Berger extravagant* and the 1633 *Anti-Roman*, including the *Remarques*. These digital editions are not only searchable but contain images of original seventeenth-century publications, allowing the work to be studied with unprecedented ease and accuracy. The increased availability of the text has facilitated the completion of my dissertation by allowing me to conduct studies with greater specificity.

In my dissertation, I examine the way Sorel describes the work and his "intentions" in both editions of *Le Berger extravagant* and explore how problems of representation shape and mask the expression of that project. I look at the tenuous relationship between text and metatext to understand how Sorel's commentary on other works facilitates a discussion of his own text. As I study specific examples of hypotexts in *Le Berger extravagant*, I investigate the notions of

⁷¹ Martine Debaisieux, "'Le tombeau des romans': de *Francion* au *Berger extravagant*," 170.

imitation and invention both as subjects of para- and metatextual discussion and as the driving force behind Lysis's adventures.

In chapter one, I present an overview of the distinguishing features of *Le Berger extravagant* and seek to answer the question: "In what ways is *Le Berger extravagant* 'un miracle étrange?'" To do this, I explore how the work defies textual conventions and elaborate on the ties it shares with other *histoires comiques*. I also examine the confusion surrounding the authorial figure and take a look at the complex relationship between fiction and critique that is a hallmark not only of *Le Berger extravagant*, but of Sorel's entire career. Additionally, I discuss the significance of "madness" in the work, including that of Lysis as well as that of *Le Berger extravagant* itself.

In chapter two, I analyze the paratext of *Le Berger extravagant*, studying the way Sorel describes his text and his purpose for writing it. In portions of the work such as the *Préface*, the *Remarques sur le tiltre* of the 1627-28 edition, and the *Conclusion* of the 1633-34 republication, Sorel lays out a project of judgment and deconstruction. In this chapter, I examine the way he uses the language of the paratext as a tool of illusion, at times only feigning sincerity as he describes his intentions and his text. The goals he enumerates form a framework for the rest of the dissertation, in which I seek to understand the relationships between fiction and truth, text and metatext, and hypo- and hypertext that are fundamental aspects of the rest of the work.

Chapter three examines the relationship between text and metatext in greater detail by looking at the interaction between the diegesis and the *Remarques* in two different *livres*. In this chapter, I focus on the way Sorel uses the *Remarques* to comment on the works of fiction Lysis "represents" as well as on the character's interpretations. I also investigate the way Sorel introduces texts that are not mentioned in the diegesis, in order to understand the purposes of the

metatext that Sorel may not admit. Identifying its various functions allows me to center in on the work's contradictory nature and to better understand Sorel's somewhat surprising reluctance to pass judgments on fiction.

In chapters four and five, I continue my exploration of the ambiguous relationship between text and metatext by examining two seventeenth-century fictions that are imitated, transformed, and discussed in the work. Chapter four looks at resemblances between Cervantes's *Don Quixote* (1605, 1615) and *Le Berger extravagant*. I first acknowledge the many structural and narrative parallels between the works to determine the nature of imitation in each text and then examine the significance of Lysis's resemblance to Don Quixote by comparing the episodes of death and reform in the two works. In this chapter, I pay special attention to the evolution of *Le Berger extravagant* from the first to second edition in order to further understand the problems of representation of which the work is conscious.

In chapter five, I study the treatment of Honoré d'Urfé's *L'Astrée* (1607-27) to explore how it is another expression of Sorel's ambivalent text. Notions of representation are critical to this chapter: I examine examples of disguise in *L'Astrée* and *Le Berger extravagant* in order to uncover the textual "disguises" in the latter text. I look at two episodes, one in which Lysis is "transformed" (in reality, disguised) into a girl, and one in which Fontenay falls in love with his own disguised reflection. Ultimately, my study of textual "disguise" allows me to approach the author's paratextual descriptions of his own text with greater understanding and context.

Chapter One

Le Berger extravagant: Charles Sorel's "miracle estrange"

In the *Préface* of the 1627-28 edition of *Le Berger extravagant*, Charles Sorel refers to his text as a “*miracle estrange*” and a “*recueil extraordinaire*” (*BE, I, Préface*). The latter description captures two of the work’s cardinal features. Firstly, it is a “*recueil*,” or a collection – a plural text both because it transforms¹ a number of others and because it contains a second part composed of a large amount of metatext. Secondly, and perhaps more consequentially, Sorel insists that the work is unusual. The author identifies some of its unique characteristics in the *Préface*, pointing out, for example, that it is a text in which he critiques others by “representing” their weaknesses. Others of the work’s remarkable characteristics are not specifically mentioned, yet are nevertheless important aspects of the extraordinary text. Authorial identity, for example, is confused, and “*extravagance*” – even if simulated – is a significant characteristic of the main character Lysis who transforms other texts.

The work’s unusual features influence the reader’s understanding of the author’s purported “intentions.” In this chapter, I discuss what distinguishes *Le Berger extravagant* from other texts, especially those that Sorel proposes to critique, and simultaneously note its ties with other *histoires comiques*, texts that share a similar purposefulness and self-consciousness.

¹ In her dissertation on imitation in *Le Berger extravagant*, Holly Tucker presents three definitions for the word *copie* taken from the *Dictionnaire universel*. The third equates copying with counterfeiting, which Furetière in turn defines as a kind of disguise. Tucker concludes that: “it is precisely this notion of counterfeit that allows us to understand Sorel’s paradoxical stance toward imitation. Sorel imitates the very models he criticizes in order to transform them.” In accordance with this understanding of Sorel’s process, I will use the word “transformation” to describe the process by which Sorel incorporates other works into his texts. As was mentioned in the introduction of this dissertation, Sorel himself uses the verb *representer* (Holly Tucker, *Strategies of Imitation in Charles Sorel’s Le Berger extravagant*. Diss. [University of Wisconsin--Madison, 1996] 71-86).

I therefore first explore these commonalities between the *histoire comique* and *Le Berger extravagant* in order to better contextualize Sorel's project of critique that he claims is of utmost importance. Then, I discuss the complexity of authorial identity in the text and seek to understand why Sorel attributes the origin of his work to several different "authors." Afterwards, I analyze the relationship between fiction and critique that is a hallmark of Sorel's career and examine its manifestation in *Le Berger extravagant* in which the one inevitably contaminates the other. I conclude by looking at the portrayal of Lysis's "*extravagance*," considering how it may, in fact, be play-acting and discuss how the "*extravagant*" texts that Sorel chooses to attack impact the composition of *Le Berger extravagant*.

Defiance of Textual Convention

While Sorel bills *Le Berger extravagant* as an exceptional text, it nevertheless shares features with other *histoires comiques*. In the first line of the *Préface*, Sorel explains that the work is a reaction to other texts, including the fiction in vogue in his era, whose authors believe that they have created masterpieces.² Sorel's principal aim, described as a response to the large number of "bad" yet successful authors, is critical in nature. The author sets his text apart by calling others "*ouvrages inutiles*" and arguing that his work, in contrast, is purposeful and necessary.

Le Berger extravagant shares its focused, critical flavor with other *histoires comiques* that examine textual and social conventions through parody and satire. Martine Debaisieux explains that the nascent genre opposes the traditional *roman* by depicting setting, subject matter,

² "Je ne puis plus souffrir qu'il y ait des hommes si sots que de croire que par leurs romans, leurs poésies, et leurs autres ouvrages inutiles, ils méritent d'être au rang des beaux esprits" (*BE, I, Préface*).

and language in unconventional ways.³ The setting of the *Histoire comique de Francion*, for example, is a mundane environment in contemporary France. Its characters take distance from the pretentious language found in texts such as the *romans de chevalerie* and pastoral works by speaking in a “natural” style. Sorel’s description of such texts in *La Bibliothèque française* focuses on their “naïveté.” “[I]l y a rien là aussi que des descriptions naïves des vices de quelques hommes et de tous leurs défauts, pour s’en moquer et les fayr hayr, ou de quelques tromperies des autres, pour nous apprendre à nous en garder.”⁴

In *Le Berger extravagant*, Sorel’s critique occurs most obviously in the transformation of episodes from other texts.⁵ As part of his discussion on hypertextuality, Gérard Genette distinguishes between “imitation” and “transformation,” which describe two different ways one text may interpret another. “J’appelle donc hypertexte tout texte dérivé d’un texte antérieur par transformation simple (nous dirons désormais *transformation* tout court) ou par transformation indirecte: nous dirons *imitation*.”⁶ “Parody”⁷ and “travesty” are forms that “transform” other works, while “caricature,” “forgery” and “pastiche” instead “imitate” them. Genette’s discussion of hypertextuality continues with a categorization of the functions of these different transformations and imitations, illustrated in a rose window-like wheel, where the *ironique*,

³ Martine Debaisieux, “L’histoire comique: genre travesti,” 170-2.

⁴ Charles Sorel, *La Bibliothèque française*, 174.

⁵ In *La Bibliothèque française*, Sorel observes of *Le Berger extravagant* that “il parle de toutes choses, il y mesle aussi quelque critique des fautes qu’on trouve en des livres estimez fort serieux et fort excellens” (176).

⁶ Gérard Genette, *Palimpsestes: la littérature au second degré*, 14.

⁷ “Parody,” according to Genette’s terminology, refers to a very specific kind of transformation in which a text playfully alters another work. A satirical transformation is, in contrast, a “travesty” and a serious one is a “transposition.” A “parody” therefore refers only to a narrow subgroup of texts. Linda Hutcheon defines parody somewhat differently, broadening the classification to connote “imitation with critical distance” (Linda Hutcheon, *A Theory of Parody: the Teachings of Twentieth-Century Art Forms* [New York: Methuen, 1985] 36).

ludique, comique, sérieux, polémique, and satirique are arranged in relationship to each other.

Genette's schema demonstrates the various effects that a hypertextual work may have on the reader, providing, for example, Giraudoux's *Elpénor* as an example of the *comique*, and Miguel de Unamuno's *La Vida de Don Quijote* as an example of a work that reads as *polémique*.⁸

Genette does not neglect to stress that his categorizations are by no means absolute and that there may be further degrees of nuance between them.

As a hypertextual work, *Le Berger extravagant* functions according to Genette's system of categorization, but in a particular way because it refuses to conform to one sole register. Genette takes into account texts that straddle the line between the registers, yet *Le Berger extravagant* contains different forms of hypertextuality at various points in the work. It is, for example, *satirique* in Clarimond's *travestissement burlesque Le Banquet des dieux* in *Livre III*, while *ludique* in *Livre V*, in which Lysis believes he has been transformed into a willow tree. In this episode, the narrator plays with the situation by referring to the *berger* as a "*saule*" as he reports his dialog (*BE, I, V*, 681). While it is difficult to be sure the message or mood Sorel intends to convey at any given time, it is possible to recognize the effect that the text has on the reader and the way that the hypotexts are portrayed.

The textual transformations in *Le Berger extravagant* are, Sorel insists, part of his project to critique other works. Other texts are introduced into *Le Berger extravagant* by the main character, Lysis, whose attempts to replicate *romanesque* actions and speech clash humorously with the work's mundane setting. As has been previously noted, Sorel claims that the work is composed exclusively of episodes taken from other texts. This assertion reflects the author's effort to create one text out of many, almost as though to purposefully realize the theories on

⁸ Gérard Genette. *Palimpsestes: la littérature au second degré*, 40-45.

textual relationships proposed by Mikhaïl Bakhtin and Julia Kristeva. Sorel insists on what Genette would term the text's intertextuality⁹ in order to present his work as an *anti-roman* and a *tombeau des romans*.¹⁰ Furthermore, by describing his work in this way, Sorel implies that he treats the texts he selects for critique in an objective manner. In reality, however, these other works are transformed, or altered in some way, making *Le Berger extravagant* less of a intertextual work and more of a purposefully hypertextual one.

Martine Debaisieux explains that hypertextuality is a cardinal feature of the *histoire comique* in general.

Définir l'histoire comique en fonction de sa visée mimétique serait en réduire la portée et la complexité. Le caractère composite du genre vient du fait qu'à la nouveauté du sujet se mêlent des éléments de l'esthétique traditionnelle, généralement repris dans un but parodique.¹¹

Like other *histoires comiques*, *Le Berger extravagant* twists, refracts, and parodies¹² other works in order to judge them, resulting in a text that is ambivalent:¹³ both itself and other.¹⁴

⁹ Genette borrows the word from Julia Kristeva. He describes intertextuality as "relation de coprésence entre deux ou plusieurs textes, c'est-à-dire éidétiquement et le plus souvent, par la présence effective d'un texte dans un autre. Sous sa forme la plus explicite et la plus littérale, c'est la pratique traditionnelle de la citation (avec guillemets, avec ou sans référence précise); sous une forme moins explicite et moins canonique celle du plagiat [...]; sous une forme encore moins explicite et moins littérale, celle de l'allusion" (*Palimpsestes: la littérature au second degré*, 8).

¹⁰ This expression, used by Sorel in the *Préface*, has been discussed at length by critics. Daniel Chouinard proposes that the term represents Sorel's critical project: "Le *Berger extravagant* ne prétend pas moins qu'être le « tombeau » du roman [...] de son langage, de son idéologie et de toutes ses actualisations depuis *l'Iliade* jusqu'à *l'Astrée*" (Daniel Chouinard, "Charles Sorel: (anti)romancier et le brouillage du discours," *Etudes Françaises*, 66). *Le Tombeau des romans* is also the title of a treatise on the value and dangers of the *roman* published in 1626, the same year as the first volume of *Le Berger extravagant*. Some critics ascribe this work to Sorel.

¹¹ Martine Debaisieux, "L'histoire comique: genre travesti," 175.

¹² Genette pieces together a possible etymology for the word *parodia*, interpreting it as a "singing off key" or a "transposition." (From *ode*, meaning "to chant," and *para*, meaning "along with") (*Palimpsestes: la littérature au second degré*, 10).

¹³ Kristeva employs the word "*ambivalent*," also used by Bakhtin, to explain how borrowed words or texts that appear in a new context create a text with multiple "*significations*" (Julia Kristeva, "Le Mot, le dialogue et le roman," *Recherches pour une sémanalyse*, 93). Ambivalence and subjectivity are at the heart of the textual distortion that Kristeva and Linda Hutcheon identify as "parody." Kristeva explains that parody occurs when the meaning of the borrowed text is subverted to that of the new work (Ibid., 94). In *A Theory of Parody: The Teaching*

While many *histoires comiques* use hypertextuality as a vehicle for critique, *Le Berger extravagant* is nevertheless unique in the particular way that it transforms texts. Rather than using one sole form, Sorel uses many of the various types of hypertextuality¹⁵ that Genette describes in *Le Berger extravagant*. In some cases, for example, Sorel uses “parody,” modifying the subject of the hypotext without altering the style. At other moments, he employs the “burlesque” as he changes the style but not the subject of his hypotexts.

The many different kinds of hypertextuality in the work make it difficult to categorize. In fact, Genette uses *Le Berger extravagant* as the principal example of what he calls an “*antiroman*,” a work that resists classification because of the many forms of textual transformations that may be found in it.¹⁶ Genette’s description of the work as an *antiroman* centers on Lysis’s “*délire*” and names his madness the driving force behind the text’s hypertextuality.¹⁷ Genette argues that Lysis’s interpretations of other texts are improvisations generated by his madness, distortions that allow Sorel to exaggerate and emphasize the undesirable features of other works.

of *Twentieth Century Art Forms*, Linda Hutcheon explains that a parody changes a text from its original source in at least one noticeable, intentional way (37).

¹⁴ Genette further distinguishes intertextuality from hypertextuality by explaining that the reader’s comprehension of the source is necessary to fully understand a hypertextual work. This is because “un hypertexte peut à la fois se lire pour lui-même, et dans sa relation à son hypotexte” and that the hypertext “gagne [...] toujours à la perception de son être hypertextuel” (*Palimpsestes: la littérature au second degré*, 450-1).

¹⁵ Genette categorizes the various forms of hypertextuality based on the register of the texts’ subjects and style. Texts that are noble in style and subject, for example, may be epics or tragedies. Texts noble in style but with a vulgar subject are parodies; specifically, mock heroic texts and pastiches. In contrast, texts that are vulgar in style but noble in subject are burlesque or travesties, and texts vulgar in both style and subject are comedies (*Palimpsestes: la littérature au second degré*, 22).

¹⁶ Initially, Genette suggests that “*parodie mixte*,” which is a text with a “*structure complexe et indécise*” containing many different types of hypertextuality, may adequately describe *Le Berger extravagant*. Genette writes that the “*parodie mixte*” “hésite entre les diverses possibilités de la parodie, du burlesque, et de l’héroï-comique” (*Palimpsestes: la littérature au second degré*, 194-8).

¹⁷ Genette calls *délire* “le principal opérateur du type d’hypertextualité propre à l’*antiroman*” (Ibid., 168).

Furthermore, *Le Berger extravagant* is unusual, even as an *histoire comique*, because of the way it purposefully advertises its connections to other works. Its hypotexts are announced and dissected in extensive commentary contained principally in the *Remarques*. There, Sorel discusses the reasoning behind the way characters transform other texts in the diegesis. Additionally, he uses the *Remarques* to highlight differences between these works in their original forms and the way they appear in *Le Berger extravagant*. This allows him to propose that the changes he has made to other texts are actually improvements: alternate examples of how these works might have been construed to better effect.

While much of Sorel's commentary concerning the hypertextual transformations in the work is directed toward other texts, some of it is channeled inward, as the work considers its own functions and even questions its own genre. This too is characteristic of the *histoire comique*. Jean Serroy emphasizes the "self-conscious" qualities of such texts, writing: "Le roman comique [...] pousse toujours plus loin sa réflexion sur lui-même et en vient, à travers la multiplicité de ses tentatives, à découvrir à un genre qui se cherche encore l'immensité de son champ littéraire."¹⁸ Like Serroy, Debaisieux points out that many *histoires comiques*, including *Le Berger extravagant*, are reflections on the problems of representation that plague the *romanesque*. "[Sorel] vise à faire ressortir la distance entre l'image fausse – 'chimérique' – que le roman traditionnel donne de la réalité, image qui n'a plus rien à voir avec son modèle."¹⁹

Self-examination in *Le Berger extravagant* is perhaps most evident in the work's many paratexts in which Sorel first proposes and later evaluates his "goals." Gérard Genette recognizes the significance of paratexts when he points out their capacity to serve as a mediator between

¹⁸ Jean Serroy, *Roman et réalité: les histoires comiques au XVIIe siècle*, 17.

¹⁹ Martine Debaisieux, "L'histoire comique, genre travesti," 179.

author and reader.²⁰ In *Le Berger extravagant*, Sorel uses these passages to reassure the reader of his good will: “le desir que j’ay de travailler pour l’utilité publique, m’a fait prendre le dessein de composer un livre qui se moquast des autres,” insisting that “j’ay si peu de vanité que je ne desire point que l’on sache mon nom” (*BE, I, Préface*). Such assurances of authorial benevolence, however, are precisely what render the “sincerity” of the work’s paratexts suspect. And indeed, as Sorel himself reveals in the *Remarques*, his first deceptions do appear in the *Préface*.²¹

Some of Sorel’s commentary is focused on the question of what kind of work he has written. Unlike the majority of texts, which Genette explains do not explicitly confront the question of their own genre,²² *Le Berger extravagant* constantly attempts to define not only its project, but also what kind of text it is. The abundance of prefaces, *avertissements*, and conclusions are evidence of Sorel’s extensive ruminations on the question. Further reflective passages can be found in the *Remarques*, which comment not only on the diegesis, but on the text as a whole.²³ Sorel uses this portion of the work to return again and again to the subject of the text’s very unusual nature, reminding the reader that what he or she is reading is different from other works.

²⁰ Gérard Genette, *Palimpsestes: la littérature au second degré*, 9.

²¹ See chapter two for an in depth discussion of Sorel’s use of his *Préface* and other paratexts.

²² Genette explains that a work’s architextuality, or its designation as part of a genre, may go unmentioned, either because it is obvious, or because the work resists classification (*Palimpsestes: la littérature au second degré*, 4).

²³ In *Le Berger extravagant*, one can tentatively separate the “text” from the “metatext” by dividing the work into the narrative and the *Remarques*. However, it is important to note that metatext is not restricted to the *Remarques* and may also appear in the diegesis. The opening of the 1633-34 *Anti-Roman* contains a good example of metatextual contamination of the diegesis. The first lines of *Livre I* are: “Que ceux qui se plaisent aux Histoires d’Amour, viennent escouter celle-cy; Elle ne leur doit pas estre moins agreable que celles qu’ils estiment, puis qu’elle contient ce qu’il y a de plus merueilleux dedans les autres” (*A-R, I, I, 1*). Similar commentary can be found throughout both editions of *Le Berger extravagant*.

The abundance of metatext, coupled with the author's insistence on the work's critical nature is part of the way Sorel distinguishes *Le Berger extravagant* from other *romans*. However, like other *histoires comiques*, *Le Berger extravagant* critiques other texts and interrogates accepted (but inadequate, in Sorel's view) methods of fiction-making by purposefully distorting and deconstructing them. However, the text is unique even compared to other *histoires comiques* in the way that it repeatedly reminds the reader of its project. Perhaps most significantly, Sorel is very explicit about the transparency of his text and the work's unique nature. When the *Remarques* are read in conjunction with the rest of the work, the sheer volume of descriptive and explanatory passages becomes especially obvious, at times eclipsing the work's project of critique. Ironically, the stress Sorel incessantly puts on his text and its goals is precisely what causes the reader to question the purpose of the work.

Complexity and Confusion of Authorial Identity

Examining *Le Berger extravagant* in light of Sorel's commentary is problematic because of the author's complex and often artificial identity. Sorel's name is not attached to either publication of the text: in the 1627-28 edition, no author is listed on the title page. In the 1633-34 version, the author's name is given as Jean de la Lande, Poitevin, which, Emile Roy explains, is a pseudonym that Sorel has borrowed from a Breton author and translator.²⁴ Sorel's refusal to admit authorship of *Le Berger extravagant* reemerges in various places, including writings from his later career. In *La Bibliothèque françoise* and *De la connoissance des bons livres*, for example, Sorel mentions his early *histoires comiques* but discusses them as though he were not

²⁴ Emile Roy, *La Vie et les oeuvres de Charles Sorel*, 408.

the author. In *La Bibliothèque françoise*, Sorel writes that he wishes to be remembered for his later works, not his early *romans comiques*.

Il vaudroit mieux ne l'estimer Auteur d'aucun Livre, que de luy en attribuer quelques uns qu'il n'approuve pas, & de luy donner une autre reputation que celle qu'il doit avoir. Le soin qu'il prenoit autrefois de cacher la pluspart de ses ouvrages, témoigne assez le peu de desir qu'il a eu de paroistre par leur moyen.²⁵

Leonard Hinds comments on Sorel's persistent anonymity, finding it "a deliberate effort to promote confusion concerning [...] the texts themselves. [...] The authorial figure is mutable, multiple, and capable of reproaching and subverting successive representations of itself."²⁶ The author's mutability is evident in both editions. In the 1627-28 *Berger extravagant*, the author remains unnamed, yet a single authorial voice can nevertheless be identified. In the *Préface*, the author, using the pronoun "je" to refer to himself, comments on the text. This same "je" is understood to be the narrator in the diegesis and persists into the *Remarques*, keeping the authorial voice of the entire work relatively consistent.

However, authorial identity in the 1633-34 edition is much more difficult to define. In the liminary *Au Lecteur*, the work's author is described in the third person. The writer describes how "L'histoire du Berger Lysis" and "Ses Aventures" have been communicated to him by another figure vaguely identified as "un personnage que j'honore" (*A-R, I, Au Lecteur*, 7).²⁷ This narrator is therefore not the author, but rather an editor, an organizer or a compiler of the work.²⁸ The

²⁵ Charles Sorel, *La Bibliothèque françoise*, 427.

²⁶ Leonard Hinds, "The Comedy of Authorship in Charles Sorel's *Le Berger extravagant*," 191.

²⁷ In fact, much of the narrator's language changes from first person to third person, or from the active to passive voice between editions (E.g. "Je dy que ceux qui ont le cerveau leger..." [*BE, III, XIV*, 749] changes to "Le texte de l'histoire dit, que ceux qui ont le cerveau leger..." [*A-R, II, XIV*, 1071]). The author thus becomes increasingly detached from his text.

²⁸ While the author in the 1627-28 edition also explains that he has received his text from the hands of others, this is not mentioned until the final *livre*.

question of authorial identity becomes even more complex when the narrator explains that the content of the work has been influenced by “une quantité d’autres manuscrits sur differens sujets.” The voice of the *Remarques* appears to coincide with that found in the liminary passages. However, this voice is inconsistent in its identity, seeming, at times, to “forget” that it is not the author.

Authorial identity is confused still more by the ties the *Le Berger extravagant* has to the *Histoire comique de Francion*. In that work, Francion describes his intentions to write *Le Berger extravagant*; however, nowhere in the later text is there any acknowledgement of this connection. As Maurice Lever observes: “Ni le récit, ni les personnages, ni la conception d’ensemble n’établissent de continuité entre les deux ouvrages.”²⁹ Nevertheless, the idea that a character has authored the story is taken up again in *Le Berger extravagant* in order to perpetuate a sense of “reality” about Lysis’s adventures.

The question of authorship among the characters in *Le Berger extravagant* is raised as Lysis tirelessly searches for a candidate to transcribe his adventures. At first, Lysis decides that Clarimond will write his story, but after discovering the gentleman’s distaste for poetry and the *roman*, Lysis threatens to discard him in favor of another gentleman who plays the *berger* Philiris.

Lysis ne pouvant plus souffrir les contradictions continuelles de Clarimond, se fascha contre luy outre mesure. Asseure toy, luy dit-il, que si tu continuës a vivre comme tu as commencé, je te puniray comme il faut. Tu n’auras pas l’honneur d’escrire mon histoire. Tu ne seras plus le depositaire de mes pensees, j’ay desja jetté les yeux sur Philiris dont l’humeur est douce et complaisante. (*BE, II, VIII, 212*)

²⁹ Maurice Lever, “Le statut de la critique dans *Le Berger extravagant*,” *Revue d’histoire littéraire de la France*. Vol. LXXVII No. 3-4 (1977), 418.

Since the work is the very record the character seeks to create, the reader is encouraged to invest in Lysis's search for the proper "*depositaire de [ses] pensees*" and to think about which character will eventually be chosen as the "author."

Despite Lysis's threat to abandon Clarimond, there is a strong correlation between Clarimond's actions, dialog, and opinions and those Sorel expresses in the *Préface*. In the narrative, Clarimond is also an author, producing a *travestissement burlesque* that he shares with the other characters. Furthermore, he acts in a manner consistent with Sorel's views when he discourages Lysis's extravagant behavior and takes the offensive against fiction in the debate in *Livre XIII*. The connection between Sorel and Clarimond is solidified further at the end of *Livre XIV* in which the narrator explains the source of his information about Lysis. "Je vous ai raconté maintenant tout ce que j'avais dessein de vous dire des diverses fortunes du berger Lysis, suivant les mémoires que j'en ai eus de Philiris et de Clarimond qui n'ont pas eu le loisir de les mettre par ordre" (*AR, I, XIV*, 1051). At this point, authorship is attributed in an indirect way to both Clarimond and Philiris, in spite of Lysis's discontent with the former earlier in the work.

However, the real significance of this statement from *Livre XIV* is the way it demonstrates the complexity of authorship in the text. Understanding the origin of the work is not as simple as determining who first wrote down Lysis's adventures, because there is also the matter of who collected and abridged them, who narrates them, and who comments on the narration in the metatext. All of these roles are authorial roles, and all of them are important facets of the text that are confused by Sorel's reluctance to admit authorship. Leonard Hinds comments on these multiple senses of "author" that Sorel juggles and distorts in the text. First, the author is "one who creates independently from others, namely in an original manner, or as the origin of creation." This notion coincides with one of Sorel's definitions of an author

presented in *De la connoissance des bons livres*. In that text, he insists that an author cannot be truly considered such without producing something original or new.³⁰ Additionally, an author is “one who augments or supplements a previous text.” In this sense, even Lysis may be considered an author, since he transforms – improves, if one is to believe the *Remarques* – other texts as he imitates them. Thirdly, authors are “authorities or models of creation that have had some weight and influence in rhetorical and literary traditions.”³¹

Hinds points out that these varied manifestations not only confuse the conception of “author” in *Le Berger extravagant*, but also become a subject of the work’s own study and interest. Sorel first interrogates the idea of “author” in the *Préface*, as he explains the reason he has created the work: his discontent with the unwarranted renown other authors have won with their substandard books. Hinds explains the subsequent examination of “authorship” that Sorel conducts throughout the work.

Authorship appears as a fictive characterization or role, approved according to hierarchical codes of prestige. Furthermore, authorship constitutes a place or position which Sorel’s authorial figure occupies all the while he attacks its conventional status in literature and society as authoritative.³²

One result of Sorel’s refusal to admit authorship, then, is the exploitation of the idea of an “author.” By distorting the authorial figure and allowing it to take multiple forms, he demonstrates how these varied notions of author can both compliment and contradict one another.

³⁰ Charles Sorel, *De la connoissance des bons livres*, 18.

³¹ Leonard Hinds, “The Comedy of Authorship in Charles Sorel’s *Le Berger extravagant*,” 192.

³² *Ibid.*, 193.

While it is possible to separate the conflicting “authorial voices” in *Le Berger extravagant* by treating them individually, in this dissertation, I consider them as a single entity, albeit a plural, fragmented one. I therefore refer to the authorial voice(s) in both editions by simply using the author’s name, although I understand and acknowledge the complexity of this figure as well as the fact that it is represented differently in each edition. In considering how Sorel explains his text and then effectuates the critique that he claims is an important goal, I am interested in the problems posed by the multiple “authors” of the text. These oft-times contradictory “authors” facilitate and deconstruct the textual illusions that are a part of traditional fiction.

Fiction and Critique

The plural and complex authorial figure in *Le Berger extravagant* considerably influences the way Sorel’s critical aims may be interpreted. By separating the author of the *Remarques* from that of the rest of the work, for example, Sorel creates a sense of objectivity, putting himself in a position to more effectively comment on his own text. Thus, he employs a kind of fiction to facilitate his critique. Accordingly, the division between fiction and critique in *Le Berger extravagant* is tenuous at best, with the one constantly contaminating the other. Martine Debaisieux recognizes the unique relationship between the two modes in Sorel’s *oeuvre*, and remarks that “l’œuvre de Sorel [...] accorde une place privilégiée aux questions de critique et d’histoire littéraire – au risque d’être parfois taxée de contradiction, et de déconcerter le lecteur appelé à faire la part entre la fantaisie et le sérieux.”³³ Many of Sorel’s works examine

³³ Martine Debaisieux, Introduction, *Description de l’île de portraiture*. By Charles Sorel. (Genève: Droz, 2006) 55-6.

and judge others. In later texts, such as *La Bibliothèque françoise* and *De la connoissance des bons livres*, critical examination is an explicit and central focus. Since judgments in *Le Berger extravagant* may be made in both the narrative and critical portions (not necessarily delineated by the divide between diegesis and *Remarques*), it too is “*entre la fantaisie et le sérieux*,” sharing characteristics with Sorel’s earlier and later works that have much the same function.

Sorel’s first and most successful *histoire comique* is the *Histoire comique de Francion*, published in several editions,³⁴ some of which overlap with the appearance of *Le Berger extravagant*. As I explained in my introduction, the *Histoire comique de Francion*’s strong connection to the *anti-roman* is made explicit with the revelation of Francion’s intention to author *Le Berger extravagant*. While the *Histoire comique de Francion* does not obviously contain a portion of text dedicated to literary commentary like the *Remarques* of *Le Berger extravagant*, it is nevertheless, like many other *histoires comiques*, a critical work.

Maurice Lever notes three distinct registers of critique in the *Histoire comique de Francion*. He first identifies the parenthetical authorial voice that manifests itself at several points throughout the work. Second, critique is given as characters become mouthpieces for the author’s opinions and messages. Lastly, Lever proposes that the work is also, to some degree, an *anti-roman*. “Le roman se prend lui-même pour objet et se détruit à mesure qu’il se raconte: il devient la négation de ce qu’il est, l’*Anti-Roman*.”³⁵ Martine Debaisieux expands on this notion

³⁴ The first edition appeared in 1623. In 1626, Sorel republished the work, which was then composed of eleven books. In 1633, *La Vraye histoire comique de Francion* was put into print, which had twelve books in total. In 1858, Emile Colombey published a critical edition that became the first of many others that would continue to appear into the twentieth century.

³⁵ Maurice Lever, “Le statut de la critique dans *Le Berger extravagant*,” 417.

as she recognizes patterns of critique common to these first two *histoires comiques*. Specifically, she notes similarities of purpose between the *Remarques* of *Le Berger extravagant* and the final four books of the last edition of the *Histoire comique de Francion*. The *Remarques* reveal the sources of Lysis's adventures, and the last four books of the *Histoire comique de Francion* "viseraient en quelque sorte à déconstruire l'illusion produite par les sept livres de la première édition et à dénoncer le caractère parodique de l'œuvre." Both of these portions denude the processes of literary creation by presenting them openly to the reader for consideration.³⁶

As both Lever and Debaisieux observe, while the *Histoire comique de Francion* and *Le Berger extravagant* question conventions of literary production, the way this exploration is carried out in each text is quite distinct. Lever notes the transparency with which critique occurs in the *Histoire comique de Francion*, writing in particular that the episode in which Francion dresses as a shepherd certainly evokes the pastoral *L'Astrée* yet does not satirize it. Instead, the bucolic episode presents an alternate rendering of d'Urfé's text, which encourages comparison between the two works.

Il [Sorel] précise encore son intention en projetant la fiction pastorale sur sa propre narration, surimposant ainsi l'image fixe et mensongère de *L'Astrée* sur le fond animé de la réalité vécue. Cette surimpression a pour effet de consolider la vraisemblance de l'un et de faire basculer l'autre dans l'irréalité.³⁷

Le Berger extravagant, on the other hand, is much more aggressive in its critique, since it goes on the offensive against other texts with oftentimes merciless parody reinforced by authorial scorn in the *Remarques*. In the *Preface*, Sorel identifies his style as "*satyrique*," with the explicit aim to "*faire haïr*" works undeserving of the renown they have garnered.

³⁶ Martine Debaisieux, "'Le tombeau des romans': De *Francion* au *Berger extravagant*," 170.

³⁷ Maurice Lever, "Le Statut de la critique dans *Le Berger extravagant*," 419.

Nevertheless, the nature of critique in the *Histoire comique de Francion* prefigures principal elements of *Le Berger extravagant*. In the *Livre Quatrième* of the *Histoire comique de Francion*, Francion recounts an experience from his youth in which Hortensius, the pedant, has him act in a play he has written. Hortensius has, in reality, concocted his drama from “des Comédies imprimées” and other sources. Francion’s role as an actor anticipates Lysis’s function in *Le Berger extravagant*. For instance, the narrator describes Lysis as a “comédien” or actor who has dressed like an Astrean shepherd in order to reenact episodes from other works.³⁸ Moreover, in the *Histoire comique de Francion*, Francion not only acts out the lines he is given but recalls a strong desire to improvise on them. “Je tâchois d’en imiter les vers, lorsque j’en voulois composer d’autres.”³⁹ In *Le Berger extravagant*, Sorel delivers critique through Lysis’s transformations of other texts that essentially create new ones.

The nature of critique in *Le Berger extravagant* is also prefigured in an episode from the *Livre Onzième* in the *Histoire comique de Francion*. In this scene, Francion and his friends convince Hortensius that he is heir to the Polish throne. Hortensius easily falls for the ruse because the *romans* he has read have given him false expectations about “reality.”

Lui, qui avoit lu les romans, ne trouvoit point étrange que d’un misérable écrivain il fût devenu roi, vu qu’il avoit souvent écrit des aventures pareilles, où il ne trouvoit pas tant de vraisemblance qu’en la sienne, et qu’il étoit si accoutumé à ces choses-là qu’il n’y voyoit rien d’extraordinaire.⁴⁰

Hortensius is a model for Lysis whose credence in the veracity of *romans* fuels his performances as an actor. Maurice Lever comments on this episode and notes that “[l]a plaisanterie, qui va se

³⁸ See Martine Debaisieux, “‘Le tombeau des romans’: De *Francion* au *Berger extravagant*,” 173.

³⁹ Charles Sorel, *La Vraye histoire comique de Francion*, IV, 140.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, XI, 459.

prolonger sur une quinzaine de pages, illustre par elle-même, et sans le secours de contrepoint critique, la folie qui s'empare des lecteurs de romans."⁴¹ Both Hortensius and Lysis behave "extravagantly" after having read too many *romans*. Their behavior calls the *vraisemblance* of these *romans* into question.

While Lysis's behavior may resemble Hortensius's, it is true that critique in the *Histoire comique de Francion* often occurs implicitly. As Serroy explains: "La parodie s'installe à l'intérieur du récit." In *Le Berger extravagant*, the narrative of Lysis's adventures is, in many instances, also capable of providing similar kinds of critique without the help of the extensive *Remarques*. The debate in *Livre XIII*, for example, certainly speaks for itself, while the staging of various fables by Clarimond, Hircan, Lysis and others in *Livre IX* are interpretations of particular kinds of texts that are understandable without knowing the reasoning behind their inclusion. However, the *Remarques* allow Sorel to be a perpetually present guide that not only offers direct commentary on the text, but, as will be explored in chapter three of this thesis, expands it in other ways as well.

Ultimately, Lever emphasizes the differences between the *Histoire comique de Francion* and *Le Berger extravagant* when he raises the question of authenticity in each work. "Le *Francion* est un vrai roman comique; le *Berger* est un faux roman sérieux."⁴² The issue of how Sorel intends that *Le Berger extravagant* should affect the reader is difficult to resolve. Either the text feigns being comical and entertaining, or it overplays the imperative nature of its critical side. In the *Préface*, Sorel clearly identifies his text as a "serious" work, an "*histoire véritable*." However, the text's ability to function on its own – both as an entertaining and critical work –

⁴¹ Maurice Lever, "Le Statut de la critique dans *Le Berger extravagant*," 420.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 418.

without a reading of the *Remarques* challenges this assumption. The nature of critique is therefore uncertain with high risks of inauthenticity and contradiction.

Nevertheless, the nature of textual evaluation in *Le Berger extravagant* prefigures some of Sorel's later works with overtly critical aims. In *La Bibliothèque françoise*, for example, published for the first time in 1664, Sorel takes a survey of French literature, cataloguing works from a broad range of disciplines. Subjects of discussion include letters, discourses, *romans*, fables, novella, philosophical treatises, and poetry. The wide spectrum of texts Sorel considers is evidence of his desire for “*perfection*,” or completion in his discussion. In the *Avant discours*, Sorel enumerates the various texts on which he has modeled the *Bibliothèque françoise* and admires their abundance and variety. He describes these texts as “*catalogues*” containing the “*richesses*” of “*tous les Auteurs*.”⁴³ Sorel intends that, like these works, the *Bibliothèque françoise* will be an index that is as exhaustive as possible. In particular, he hopes that his “*catalog*” will join with those of Classical works already in existence in order to complete the register of useful books. “*Mais qu'ils exaltent [les bibliothèques Latines & Grecques] tant qu'il leur plaira, ils ne les sçauroient rendre parfaites, sans y joindre nos Livres François.*”⁴⁴ The notion of “*perfection*”⁴⁵ or completion is one of the main justifications Sorel offers of the work.

As in *La Bibliothèque Françoise*, Sorel also strives for completeness in *Le Berger extravagant*. He insists that his work is composed entirely of others, and emphasizes the large

⁴³ Charles Sorel, *La Bibliothèque françoise, Avant discours*, 2-3.

⁴⁴ Ibid., *Avant discours*, 2.

⁴⁵ The *Dictionnaire universel* makes it clear that the notion of completeness is a common denotation of the word “*perfection*” in the seventeenth century. “*PERFECTION. s. f. Consommation, achèvement de quelque ouvrage que ce soit.*” This is the first definition Furetière presents.

number of texts that he has transformed. In *Roman et réalité: les histoires comiques au XVIIe siècle*, Jean Serroy describes *Le Berger extravagant* as a collection and also uses the word “*catalogue*” to show that it contains other works.

Le « tombeau » qu’imagine Sorel est, en fait, une immense fosse commune, où il précipite pêle-mêle *tous* les romans qu’il connaît – et il les connaît presque tous -, depuis l’Antiquité jusqu’aux œuvres de son temps. *Le Berger extravagant* est, ainsi, d’abord, un énorme catalogue [...] La narration, dans le roman de Sorel, est sans cesse citation.⁴⁶

Serroy emphasizes the breadth of the text as well as the author’s desire to represent “*tous* les romans qu’il connaît.” Like *La Bibliothèque françoise*, *Le Berger extravagant* is, in many ways, a register of Sorel’s vast knowledge of the *roman* of his time as well as of Classical mythology, philosophy, and other kinds of texts. Lysis’s adventures facilitate lengthy discussions in the *Remarques* in which works beyond those that the character imitates may be introduced.⁴⁷

Further parallels between the two texts can be noted. The survey of French literature conducted in *La Bibliothèque françoise*, for example, is heavily colored by Sorel’s value judgments. In the *Avant propos*, Sorel writes that he hopes the “bad” books he has expressly chosen not to include in his register will be condemned to oblivion.

Qu’est-il besoin mesme de sçavoir le compte de plusieurs mauvais Livres, comme s’il s’en trouve de nommez dans de tels Catalogues, où l’on s’est proposé de les nommer tous? Il y en a qu’il faudroit plutost supprimer, que d’en éterniser le souvenir, sans nous apprendre quels ils sont.”⁴⁸

Texts found unworthy of mention are therefore omitted entirely from the *Bibliothèque françoise*, indicating that its content is a subjective authorial choice. Besides shunning “bad” texts, the work is equally interested in praising those that are “good:” “Comme son intention est aussi de faire

⁴⁶ Jean Serroy, *Roman et réalité: les histoires comiques au XVIIe siècle*, 297, my emphasis.

⁴⁷ See chapter three for further discussion of this point.

⁴⁸ Charles Sorel, *La Bibliothèque françoise, Avant discours*, 4.

naistre le desir à chacun de voir nos Livres François, il cherchera icy des occasions de loüanges plutost que de blâme.”⁴⁹ The author makes himself the judge that first determines the eligibility of works for inclusion in his catalog, and secondly, praises deserving texts.

Sorel’s value judgments are of similar importance in *Le Berger extravagant*. According to the *Préface*, the author’s distaste for certain kinds of literature is the driving force behind his writing. As he and the characters discuss the works Lysis transforms, they pass judgments as to their efficacy and value. Comparisons between various texts are also made, where Lysis’s representations in *Le Berger extravagant* are contrasted with their original forms. In nearly all cases, the versions found in Sorel’s own text are praised as more appropriate, improved adaptations.

In many ways, Sorel’s *De la connoissance des bons livres* follows the same trajectory of critique that may be observed in *Le Berger extravagant* and *La Bibliothèque française*. Much like *La Bibliothèque française*, *De la connoissance des bons livres* is a treatise that contains the author’s value judgments of different forms of literature. In the *avertissement* preceding the text, Sorel writes that the verdicts he pronounces will be uncolored by the opinions of others. Sorel’s critical project in this text is somewhat more ambitious than that in *La Bibliothèque française*. Rather than simply omitting unworthy texts, Sorel actively writes against them in the hope of destroying their renown.

Il est juste d’exterminer, si l’on peut, ce nombre de Fables & de Romans, qui font tant perdre du temps à la jeunesse, & qui la portent aux folles passions & au libertinage; il a fallu condamner les Poètes trop licencieuses, & sur tout les Comedies, qui donnent [sic] l’exemple des choses dont les Romans ont fourny les preceptes.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ Ibid., *Avant discours*, 6.

⁵⁰ Charles Sorel, *De la connoissance des bons livres, Avertissement sur ce livre*, ii.

The strong vocabulary Sorel employs (“*exterminer*” and “*condamner*”) indicates his determination to discredit texts he deems inappropriate.

In the *Préface* of *Le Berger extravagant*, much the same kind language can be found, indicating a commonality of purpose between the two texts. Sorel writes of his intention to “faire haïr les mauvaises choses” and to make the work “le tombeau des romans, et des absurditez de la poësie.” This desire is echoed in the *Advertissement* of *De la connoissance des bons livres*, where Sorel writes using almost the same phraseology: “On n’a point crû qu’il y eust un plus grand Secret pour *fair haïr* ces amorces des Voluptez, que de montrer leurs *absurditez* & leurs impertinences.”⁵¹ The offensive against “bad” literature that is an important element of *De la connoissance des bons livres* is, as indicated by the *Préface*, already of great significance in *Le Berger extravagant*.

De la connoissance des bons livres consists of several treatises, the first of which deals with different categories of literature (“*Histoire*,” the “*roman*,” and “*poësie*”) and the last dedicated to questions of style and language. *Traité II*, in which Sorel discusses the *roman*, is split into two separate parts. One argues for it and the other against, in a style reminiscent of Fancan’s *Le Tombeau des Romans*. The two texts are a kind of debate in which the author considers both sides of the issue without, at least initially, coming to a definite conclusion. In *Le Berger extravagant*, this same kind of dual argumentation is employed, incarnated perhaps most obviously in the debate in *Livre XIII* in which characters divide into two camps and literally put the *roman* and poetry on trial. But the work as a whole can also be understood as a *tombeau*, since it demonstrates absurdities through Lysis’s adventures and then provides discussion of these texts’ weaknesses.

⁵¹ Ibid., *Avertissement sur ce livre*, ii-iii, my emphasis.

However, Leonard Hinds proposes that by using the word “*tombeau*” to describe his text, Sorel may have had something other than a destructive aim in mind. He quotes Furetière’s definitions of the word that suggest that there are multiple ways of understanding the term.

However, if one understands the metaphor to mean a “text-crypt” or textual monument, one can say that *Le berger* enshrines, transforms, and innovates literary conventions so as to anticipate the development of the modern novel as a genre in France. *Le berger* would therefore function according to the paradoxical definition of *tombeau* according to Ariès and Furetière: a monument that preserves by recounting some features of the romance and committing others to oblivion.⁵²

Again the notion of the catalog reappears. The “*tombeau*” that is *Le Berger extravagant* may be interpreted as the extensive index of texts recorded in Lysis’s adventures as well as authorial commentary in the *Remarques*. These interpretations and discussions become a monument or inventory of the many works of Sorel’s erudition.

In the *Advertissement* of *De la connoissance des bons livres*, Sorel describes the kind of critique his readers will discover in the work as well as what he hopes to accomplish by it. “De tout cecy les enseignemens sont succints pour estre moins embarassans; Sur tout, la Critique en est douce & agreable, afin qu’il plaise mesme à ceux qu’on croiroit en devoir estre touchez.”⁵³ Sorel calls the content of his text “*enseignemens*,” or teachings, indicating that he intends for his work to educate his readers. Furthermore, the critique is intended to be “*douce & agreable*.” Ultimately, Sorel explains that the principal goal of *De la connoissance des bons livres* is, indeed, precisely what the title of the work indicates: to educate his readers about the best books: “Nostre dessein est de connoistre les bons Livres.”⁵⁴

⁵² Leonard Hinds, *Narrative Transformations from L’Astrée to Le Berger extravagant* (West Lafayette: Perdu University Press, 2002) 138.

⁵³ Charles Sorel, *De la connoissance des bons livres, Avertissement sur ce livre*, v.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, *Avertissement sur ce livre*, i.

A very similar desire to teach and to make what is taught easily digestible by the student may be found in *Le Berger extravagant*. In the *Préface*, Sorel elaborates on his intention to “rendre mesme la censure agreable à ceux qui y sont interessez.” As in others of Sorel’s works, critique in *Le Berger extravagant* is characterized by an intent to educate and to make that education pleasant. Significantly, Sorel uses the word “*agreable*” to describe his critical project, indicating that although the work is not a *livre de plaisir* like those he critiques, the judgments he passes should not be distasteful to read. The pleasurable experience offered by fiction is therefore an important part of Sorel’s project, despite protests in the *Préface* to the contrary. The tension between the notions of critique and fiction is a key element not only in the way Sorel frames his intentions, but also in the execution of the text as a whole.

Extravagance in Le Berger extravagant

In *Le Berger extravagant*, fiction and critique come together in the figure of the main character, the principal avenue by which texts are transformed. Lysis is the “*berger*” mentioned in the title, and his “*extravagance*” his identifying characteristic. The words “*extravagant*,” “*extravagance*” and the verb “*extravaguer*” appear repeatedly throughout the text, often in connection with Lysis’s dramatizations of other fictions. In *Livre II*, for example, Lysis’s dialog is overheard by passersby, and the narrator observes: “Ce discours si *extravagant* fit connoistre à ces bourgeois que cet homme cy avoit la teste fort mal faite” (*BE, I, II*, 80, my emphasis). Lysis’s apparent credence in the veracity of fiction is labeled “*extravagance*,” as are the texts that the character imitates. In *Livre XIII*, Clarimond’s argument against the utility of fiction is punctuated by references to the “*extravagance*” of poets and other authors (*BE, III, XIII*, 17, 27,

28, 59). Elsewhere in the text, Clarimond refers to poetry and fiction as “*follies*,” and poets and authors as “*fous*” (e.g. *BE*, VI, 851).

The theme of madness is not unique to *Le Berger extravagant*, as it recurs in many works in France throughout the seventeenth-century.⁵⁵ In “Du Francion de Sorel au Pharsamon de Marivaux: histoire de la folie à l’âge de l’anti-roman,” Richard Hodgson explains that “*extravagance*” is actually the most common word for “madness” used during Sorel’s time.⁵⁶ Cotgrave’s English/French Dictionary from the seventeenth century translates the French word “*extravagant*” as “idle, out of the way, astray, fantastical,”⁵⁷ indicating a deviation from the norm. Similarly, in “Le Roman comique ou la mise en scène du dé(voile)ment,” Martine Debaisieux points out that the verb “*délirer*” means “*sortir du sillon*.”⁵⁸ “*Extravagance*” and “*délire*” both describe the departure from “*le droit chemin*” that characterizes Lysis’s actions.

Lysis’s *extravagance* is principally dramatic in nature, and translates as stylized gesture and dialog. As I mentioned in the introduction, Lysis is presented as an actor in the first portion

⁵⁵ The *fou* is present in *histoires comiques* such as Sorel’s *Histoire comique de Francion* and *Le Berger extravagant*, but can also be found in works like *Le Chevalier hypocondriaque* by Du Verdier, and in theatrical examples such as *L’Illusion comique* by Corneille and *Andromaque* by Racine.

⁵⁶ Richard G. Hodgson, “Du Francion de Sorel au Pharsamon de Marivaux: histoire de la folie à l’âge de l’anti-roman,” *La naissance du roman en France. Topique romanesque de l’Astrée à Justine, Paris – Seattle – Tübingen, Papers on French Seventeenth Century Literature*. Ed. Nicole Boursier and David Trott. (Biblio 17, 1990), 31.

⁵⁷ According to the *Dictionnaire universel*, “*extravagance*” is “chose dite ou faite mal à propos, follement.”

⁵⁸ “Tout en évoquant l’idée d’écart’ essentielle à la composition du texte, ces précisions qui préparent l’émergence de la figure du fou évoquent l’étymologie du terme ‘délirer’: sortir du sillon, et d’un terme particulièrement usité à l’époque, ‘extravaguer’; ‘s’écarter de la voie’. Ces expressions s’associent à l’image du ‘droit chemin’ privilégiée par le discours classique et récurrent dans les écrits de Descartes; elle apparaît là même où le philosophe, pour éviter de ‘s’égarer’, s’efforce de chasser les illusions des ‘fous’ et du ‘mauvais génie, non moins rusé et trompeur que puissant’” (Martine Debaisieux, “Le Roman comique ou la mise en scène du dé(voile)ment,” *Le Labyrinthe de Versailles: parcours critiques de Molière à La Fontaine*. Ed. Martine Debaisieux. [Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1998], 177).

of *Livre I*. His costume and acting are observed with surprise by the gentleman Anselme (*BE, I, I, 8*). Similarly, in *Livre III*, when Lysis passes a theater troupe performing a pastoral play, he jumps onstage and begins participating as though he were a part of the production. Anselme attempts to hold him back because he is afraid the other spectators will be unsettled by his madness: “Anselme le vouloit aller retenir de peur qu’il ne monstrast sa folie à tout le monde, mais ceux qui estoient avec luy le retindrent luy mesme, desirans voir ce que feroit Lysis, dont ils avoient remarqué les extravagances” (*BE, I, III, 318*). Lysis’s dramatic reenactments both trouble and amuse other characters because they reveal the character’s apparent investment in the texts he has internalized and advertize his disconnect with “reality.”

In her dissertation “Stages in the Novel: Theatrical Characteristics in Sorel’s *Histoires Comiques*,” Anne Theobald considers the theatricality of Lysis’s madness at length. Her discussion centers on the troubling ambivalence of the character’s *extravagance* in terms of the following question: is Lysis really mad, or is he just a very good actor? Theobald provides evidence for both sides of the issue. She gives examples that support the notion that Lysis may be truly, physically mad⁵⁹ and simultaneously entertains the possibility that Lysis’s madness may be nothing more than an act. She does not conclude one way or another because both positions are equally justified by the text.⁶⁰ Lysis’s acting and his madness are inextricably linked and alternately blamed for the character’s *extravagance*.

⁵⁹ At several points in the text, for instance, there are suggestions that Lysis may suffer from a clinical madness. Anselme, upon observing Lysis’s antics for the first time, reacts with surprise, and the narration indicates that Anselme at first believes Lysis’s *extravagance* to be a physical ailment. “Anselme oyant toutes ces choses si peu communes, eut un estonnement nonpareil, & connut qu’il avoit trouvé un homme malade de la plus estrange folie du monde” (*BE, I, I, 8*).

⁶⁰ Anne Theobald. Diss. “Stages in the Novel: Theatrical Characteristics in Sorel’s *Histoires Comiques*,” 100.

Nevertheless, the author demonstrates a contradictory attitude toward the character's "extravagant" behavior and dialog throughout the work. Sorel constantly reminds the reader of Lysis's *extravagance*, referring to him as a "fou" and even "le plus fou de tous les hommes." The adjective "extravagant" appears numerous times to describe the character, which calls attention to Lysis's condition and emphasizes the otherness or unnaturalness of Lysis's actions in a way that reads as criticism. Yet at the same time, the author lauds the character's behavior, particularly in the *Remarques*.⁶¹ Confused authorial attitude toward Lysis is problematic because it generates uncertainty in the author's position vis-à-vis the texts the character transforms. This has the result of calling the work's supposed "goals" into question.

However, the impact of Lysis's *extravagance* is made all the greater by the character's revelation in the final *livre* that he was, at times, playacting rather than suffering from legitimate madness.

Aussi avoua-t'il à Clarimond qu'il se repentoit de bon cœur de tout ce qu'il avoit fait: mais qu'il luy avoit esté impossible de s'en abstenir, pource qu'encore qu'il connust bien la verité, quelquefois il se vouloit abuser pour abuser aussi les autres, afin de rendre ses aventures plus remarquables: comme par exemple, il n'avoit jamais crû qu'à moitié qu'il eust esté changé en arbre, ny tant d'autres choses extraordinaires, mais il avoit feint de les croire afin que les autres les creussent aussi, & que l'on les mist dans un Roman qui rendist sa renommée éternelle. (*A-R, II, XIV*, 1040-1)

Lysis's confession is extremely consequential because in admitting that he was not always mad, he contradicts the narrator who gives no indication that Lysis is conscious of his behavior or the effects that it has on the other gentlemen. The narrator thus proves unreliable, having reported nothing in the character's actions or dialog that would support the idea that the character in fact understood "*la verité*."

⁶¹ This idea will be explored in detail in chapter three of this dissertation.

Even more significantly, however, Lysis's confession calls the entire work into question. The text becomes ambivalent, able to be read in two very different ways. Either Lysis's extravagant behavior is evidence of a madness, which causes him to be duped by the country gentlemen and serve as the source of their amusement, or he is the *metteur-en-scène* of a great deception where he fools the gentlemen and the reader into believing that he is mad in order to manipulate them. In this case, Lysis would prove not to be *le berger extravagant* at all, but rather an imposter, having acted out the *extravagance* for which he is credited, and through which Sorel demonstrates the errors of other texts.

The question of Lysis's lucidity or madness is a central focus of Geneviève Jacques's doctoral thesis. She admits the ambiguity of Lysis's behavior and the confession and proposes that it may be resolved by understanding the character's "*humeur mélancolique*." Jacques proposes that the driving force behind Lysis's behavior is not necessarily a delusion caused by the over-reading of *romans*, but rather desires to escape his social class as well as to pursue the young "Charite:"

Lysis possède un caractère très ambivalent: des moments de grande lucidité alternent avec des moments de folie parce qu'il est sous l'influence de son humeur mélancolique [...] Lysis est aussi habité par un désir d'être comédien pour fuir sa condition sociale, et, quand il ne se laisse pas emporter par des moments de folie, il réussit même à manipuler ses compagnons pour les faire entrer dans son jeu.⁶²

She additionally proposes that it matters little whether or not Lysis is truly mad or not; Sorel is able to create an *anti-roman* simply by virtue of the fact that the character acts as though he is: "Ainsi, même si Lysis n'était pas complètement fou, le seul fait de tenir un discours qui appartient parfois à la folie permet la construction d'un anti-roman dans lequel l'auteur pourra

⁶² Geneviève Jacques. "Lysis, Mélancolique abusé ou abuseur dissimulé? La représentation théâtrale dans *Le Berger extravagant* de Charles Sorel." Diss. (Université Laval. 2002). *ProQuest*. Web, 6.

passer son message critique tout en conservant une certaine impunité et en évitant de se voir catégorisé comme romancier.”⁶³

Whether Lysis is or is not mad, his actions are, as Jacques acknowledges, theatrical in nature. “A de nombreux moments, il se veut un excellent comédien qui joue un rôle principal, un berger extravagant, et qui en jouera quelques autres au gré de ses fantaisies.”⁶⁴ And, as in any spectacle, Lysis’s dramatic madness is performed before an audience. In some cases, his actions are comical but nevertheless serve an important role. When Anselme and Lysis first meet, for instance, Anselme reacts with astonishment at Lysis’s unusual behavior.

Anselme, l’ayant aperçu de tout loin, s’estonna de sa façon si extraordinaire. [Il l’] entendit dire des paroles autant animées que s’il eust esté sur un théâtre; aussi ne crut-il point autre chose, sinon qu’il répétoit le personnage de quelque comédie dont il devoit estre, comme l’on en avoit depuis peu joué une à Saint Cloud. (*BE, I, I, 4-5*)

Anselme’s amusement at Lysis’s costume and dialog is ultimately what makes him agree to take Lysis under his wing.

In other cases, however, Lysis’s displays of acting or madness are haunting spectacles that disturb his audience, the other characters. When Lysis and Charite meet, for example, the maid is unnerved by Lysis’s unusual attire. “Mais elle qui n’estoit pas accoustumee à voir des hommes habillez comme luy, ne le prenoit que pour un sauteur de foire Saint Germain” (*BE, I, II, 271*). This initial encounter colors Charite’s attitude toward the would-be shepherd, putting her in constant fear of her admirer’s *extravagance*.

Lysis’s dramatizations or madness have other even more troubling outcomes. Soon after deciding to live as a pastoral shepherd, for instance, Lysis takes to the fields, hoping for

⁶³ Ibid., 3.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 12.

company in his enterprise. However, those who see him are upset by his appearance, dialog, and actions and conclude that he must be some sort of supernatural being. “Plusieurs paysans passèrent asses près de luy, mais il n’y en eut pas un qui eust la hardiesse de l’acoster: ils le prenoient tous pour un fantosme” (*BE, I, I*, 39-40). Lysis’s encounter with the true shepherd Richard also ends with the latter believing he is a ghost. “[Richard] demeura si estonné d’avoir veu un homme fait comme luy, & entendu des discours tels que les siens, qu’il crut qu’infailliblement c’estoit un esprit qui luy estoit apparu” (*BE, I, I*, 46-7). Later, Lysis’s reputation for madness causes him to be followed by a crowd of children and attacked. “Les petits enfans s’amassoient par troupes [...] criant comme ceux de Paris, quand ils voyent des Mascarades [...] Ceste canaille malicieuse, jettoit des pierres à Lysis” (*BE, I, I*, 131).

In another episode in *Livre II*, Lysis makes a plan to visit Charite at night. He enlists the help of the servant Gringalet to tilt a ladder up against what he believes is Charite’s window. When Lysis climbs the ladder, Gringalet hears a noise and flees, leaving the *berger* clinging to the swaying object. As Lysis hurries to kiss the stones against which he is sure Charite has often leaned, he inadvertently splashes his head into a basin of blood that has been left on the sill. As Clarimond recalls later, “vous [Lysis] cheustes du haut en bas d’une eschelle, ayant le nez tout barbouillé de sang, tellement que l’on vous prit au collet comme un larron et un meurtrier” (*BE, III, XIV*, 229). Lysis is physically soiled by his madness, which terrifies those around him. Such unsettling conclusions to Lysis’s adventures lend greater somberness to the character’s *extravagance*. They become troubling spectacles intended to demonstrate the weaknesses of other texts.

Lysis's *extravagance* is also a marker of the work's hypertextuality, since it is intended to encourage the reader to question the formulae of texts the character imitates. Lysis's "*délire*," to use the terminology employed by Gérard Genette, alters other works of fiction and disfigures them in order to judge them. He is, Genette explains, "un héros à l'esprit fragile et incapable de percevoir la différence entre fiction et réalité[. Il] prend pour réel (et actuel) l'univers de la fiction, se prend pour l'un de ses personnages, et 'interprète' en ce sens le monde qui l'entoure."⁶⁵

From another perspective, Lysis suffers from what Michel Foucault, in *Histoire de la Folie à l'âge classique*, calls "folie par identification romanesque," an attribute of characters who confuse fiction and reality. Foucault writes that "[d]e l'auteur au lecteur, les chimères se transmettent, mais ce qui était fantaisie d'un côté, de l'autre devient fantasme ; la ruse de l'écrivain est reçue en toute naïveté comme figure du réel."⁶⁶ Cervantes's Don Quixote is proposed as the archetype of such figures who demonstrate "une inquiétude sur les rapports, dans l'œuvre de l'art, du réel et de l'imaginaire."⁶⁷ In *Le Berger extravagant*, Lysis's extravagant behavior allows the author to question the problematic distinction between the "*réel*" and "*l'imaginaire*."

Certainly, a great deal of the *extravagance* of interest in *Le Berger extravagant* is found in the texts that Lysis interprets. In contrast, Sorel denies that his own text is "mad" in the same way. A large part of the *Preface* is dedicated to convincing the reader that the work is not another "*folie*" and that he, although an author, is not a "*sot*." Sorel claims that he has instead

⁶⁵ Gérard Genette, *Palimpsestes: la littérature au second degré*, 168.

⁶⁶ Michel Foucault, *Histoire de la folie à l'âge classique* (Paris: Gallimard, 1964), 48.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 48.

made an “*histoire veritable*,” a term, like “*anti-roman*,” that he uses to contrast his work with the “*extravagances*” of the typical *roman*.

Conclusions

By describing *Le Berger extravagant* as a “*recueil extraordinaire*” and a “*miracle estrange*,” Sorel emphasizes the unusual nature of his endeavor. Indeed, when he explains the need for his work, he implies that he has taken the task upon himself because no one else has stepped forward. He illustrates the purpose, lists his inadequacies, but then expresses determination because of his desire to work for what he calls “*l'utilité publique*.”

Chacun demeurera d'accord que si l'on vouloit n'estre plus trompé, il seroit besoin d'establir un censeur de livres, qui ne donnast congé qu'aux bons d'aller par le monde, et condannast les autres à la poussiere d'un cabinet. J'avouë que mon esprit est fort esloigné de la capacité que devoit avoir la personne à qui l'on donneroit ceste charge, et neantmoins le desir que j'ay de travailler pour l'utilité publique, m'a fait prendre le dessein de composer un livre qui se moquast des autres. (*BE, I, Préface*)

But the reasons why Sorel is adamant about the work's singularity are not so apparent. Why is so much of the *Préface* - and the rest of the work as well - preoccupied with the text's unique character? Why is it so important that the work is different, even extraordinary?

On one level, Sorel's insistence on the text's originality may be the author's way of resolving the apparent contradiction of labeling *Le Berger extravagant* an “*histoire veritable*.” In so doing, Sorel insists that the work is – exclusively, he claims – essentially a collection of “copies” of a large number of other works. He “duplicates” these other texts in order to point out their failings. In *L'Ecole du réel*, Clément Rosset considers the notion of the double and points out that there are two kinds, one of which is the “*double de remplacement*,” where the copy eliminates the original.

Tout autres sont les doubles de remplacement, qui ont pour fonction d'éliminer l'original en se faisant passer pour lui, par un effet d'alternative qui affirme leur existence par la suppression de leur modèle, telle une cellule organique qui reproduit une cellule en phagocytant cette dernière.⁶⁸

By “copying” other works, Sorel attempts to condemn the original to oblivion and preserve the revelations about the text in question delivered by *Le Berger extravagant*.

At the same time, Sorel's preoccupation with the question of originality may be an attempt to break free of the constantly recycled yet less-effective fictional constructs he attacks in his work. At the center of *Le Berger extravagant*, then, is the question of whether or not it is possible to write without borrowing from texts that have come before. Martine Debaisieux, in her study of the parallels between the *Histoire comique de Francion* and *Le Berger extravagant* identifies one of the central problems of the developing *roman* that these texts confront:

“l'impossibilité d'échapper aux modèles.”

S'étant donné pour but de présenter des “Tableaux naturels de la Vie humaine,” l'auteur de *Francion* est amené à dénoncer les limites du “réalisme,” qui seront formulés deux siècles plus tard par Stendhal: “rien n'est plus difficile en fait de romans que de *peindre d'après nature*, de ne pas *copier des livres*.” Or, ces limites de l'originalité, Sorel les exploitera de façon systématique dans *Le Berger extravagant*, pour créer une œuvre qu'il qualifie d' “extraordinaire” et pour assurer paradoxalement sa différence. En désignant le principe d'assimilation comme fondement même du processus créatif de Sorel dans son œuvre romanesque, les “Remarques” permettent de transformer cette “Histoire véritable” faite de “plusieurs fables ramassees” en “tombeau des Romans.”⁶⁹

Recognizing that originality has its limits, Sorel insists that his text is innovative precisely because it “copies” – or rather contains and transforms – others. In serving as a kind of catalog of other texts, albeit distorted by the author's “*style satyrique*,” the work, an assemblage of “fables ramassees,” becomes a “*miracle étrange*.”

⁶⁸ Clément Rosset, *L'Ecole du réel* (Paris: Gallimard, 1984) 467.

⁶⁹ Martine Debaisieux, “‘Le Tombeau des Romans:’ de *Francion* au *Berger extravagant*,” 175.

Moreover, as he “represents” other texts in his own, Sorel provides a second viewpoint from which they may be considered.⁷⁰ In *Livre VI*, for example, when Lysis tells Carmelin that his lover “Parthenice” has turned into a rock, his companion’s astonished reaction encourages the reader to consider the improbability of such metamorphoses in poetry and mythology (*BE, I, VI*, 957). Thus, the transformative “copy” in *Le Berger extravagant* is an alternate version of another text in which its failings, and less often, strengths, may be more fully understood.

In the next chapter, I further investigate the language Sorel uses to describe *Le Berger extravagant*, including the dimensions of originality that I have considered in this chapter. Rather than focusing exclusively on the claims the author makes about his work, however, I also study the way Sorel writes about other texts and, subsequently, the way he lays out his project to judge and critique them. In much of the author’s writing, there is a tendency to constantly remind the reader of the originality and novelty of the work. In the next chapter, by placing this language in a wider context, I explore the reasons that this may be so.

⁷⁰ See Holly Tucker, “Pleasure, Seduction, and Authorial Identity in Charles Sorel’s *Le Berger extravagant*,” 352.

Chapter Two

Convincing Illusions: The Paratextual Rhetoric of *Le Berger extravagant*

If we are to believe the way Sorel describes his text in the *Préface*, *Le Berger extravagant* is a work that relies heavily on its persuasive powers. And indeed, the work contains several episodes that seem calculated to convince the reader of important principles, as well as debates in which opposing viewpoints on fiction are put forth and examined. In *Livre I*, for example, Lysis and Anselme argue over the plausibility of texts that tell the story of the mythological figure Echo.¹ Later, near the end of the work, characters hold a lengthy debate over the utility and dangers of fiction in general. In both instances, these characters attempt to convince others of their point of view. Persuasion also characterizes the metatextual *Remarques*, in which Sorel dissects and expounds episodes from the diegesis, and is also at the heart of Sorel's descriptions of the work found in the liminary passages. The author uses these portions of text – these paratexts – to both lay out his intentions and to convince the reader of their significance.

Due to its persuasiveness, the language of these paratexts evokes, to some degree, principles of Classical rhetoric. It would be difficult to ascertain to what degree Sorel was conscious of and wrote with the prescriptions of Classical rhetoric in mind, since scholars disagree on the extent to which writers in early seventeenth-century France were trained in the art.² But whether or not Sorel meant to apply these specific principles in *Le Berger extravagant*,³

¹ This episode will be examined in detail in chapter three.

² Hugh M. Davidson pinpoints 1635 as the beginning of a “significant period of development for rhetoric.” This date marks the founding of the *Académie Française* and follows the appearance of *Le Berger extravagant* by eight years (*Audiences, Words, and Art: Studies in Seventeenth-Century French Rhetoric*, [Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1965] 3-24). However, Laura Rescia writes that Sorel was conscious of these principles (“Entre théorie et

there is no doubt that persuasion is at the core of his writing strategy.

In Classical rhetoric, persuasion is built on the relationship of the orator to his or her audience. In *Le Berger extravagant*, a similar rapport between author and reader is of great importance, especially given the large number of ambassadorial paratexts the author uses to describe his work. In these passages, Sorel presents a certain kind of authorial persona. He figures as a central, ever-present author that mediates the reader's reaction to the work by emphasizing and reemphasizing its unusual nature. He also mitigates any unwanted responses that may occur due to misunderstanding. In so doing, he uses a calculated rhetoric to establish himself as a guide and a teacher. This validates his discourse and, due to an increased sense of authority, makes it more persuasive.

Throughout *Le Berger extravagant*, Sorel demonstrates a sensitivity to the way his rhetoric may be received by the reader. In Classical rhetoric, the fifth canon or element, *actio*, describes the delivery of a discourse. In *De Rhetorica*, Aristotle explains the importance of establishing *ethos* or the credibility of the speaker so that the rhetoric will be effective.⁴ In *Le*

pratique romanesque: le rôle de la rhétorique dans *Le berger extravagant* de Charles Sorel," [Charles Sorel, *polygraphe*, 2006], 265). Similarly, Elizabeth Tilton writes that young boys of Sorel's age and social class would have been instructed in the art of Classical rhetoric. She claims that "as part of the classical 'trivium,' this discipline was an important part of their basic schooling ("Charles Sorel, lawyer, and the case of the *Berger extravagant*," [Papers on Seventeenth Century Literature. Vol. 3 (1975)], 69).

³Even if Sorel was not aware of the constructs of Classical rhetoric, he did write in a period of change increasingly influenced by juridical discourse. Marc Fumaroli identifies Sorel as one of many writers "à la frontière entre [...] deux mondes." Fumaroli explains that these writers were "*robins*," shaped by the Humanist discourses of the university as well as the traditions of the juridical domain. "Si la Cour s'est imposée comme le public avec lequel il faut compter, la nouvelle littérature n'est pas son œuvre, mais le plus souvent celle de robins ayant reçu de l'Université et des Jésuites une formation humaniste et du Parlement une empreinte morale et juridique" (*L'Age de l'éloquence* [Geneva: Droz, 1980] 611).

⁴ "Necesse est non solum ad orationem respicere, quomodo apra sit ad demonstrandum, & ad fidem faciendam, sed etiam ipsum eviasdam in odi, & judicem comparare" (Aristotle, *Aristotelis stagirtae rhetoricorum libri tres: eiusdem De poetica liber unus*, Ed. J. Libert (Paris: J Libert, 1629) *Gallica*, BNF, Web, II, 1, 129). ("The orator must not only try to make the argument of his speech demonstrative and worthy of belief; he must also make his own character look right and put his hearers, who are to decide, into the right frame of mind" [Aristotle, *Rhetoric*. Trans. W. Rhys Roberts. Ed. Jim Manis. *The Electronic Classic Series*. Pennsylvania State University-Hazleton. Web. II, 1].)

Berger extravagant, Sorel takes great care not only to set himself up as a knowledgeable judge, but also to show that the work is able to demonstrate appropriate fiction-making. That this work of persuasion begins in the liminary passages is unsurprising: in order for Sorel's project to be effective, the reader must be persuaded from the beginning of the author's competence.

In *De Rhetorica*, Aristotle describes factors that an orator must take into account when attempting to persuade his or her audience as to the qualities or defaults of a certain person or idea. "Continget verò simul dum de his dicemus, ut etiam illa aperiamus, ex quibus eviusdammodi existimabimur secundum mores, quæ erat secunda fides."⁵ Similarly, in the *Institutio Oratoria*, Quintilian provides thoughts on elements that a discourse should take into account that is calculated to censure or praise. Some of these correspond to the way that Sorel presents his text, attempting to glorify it while he critiques others. Even if the author of *Le Berger extravagant* was not aware of these texts, the persuasive techniques he uses may be shown to be effective because they are also recognized by Aristotle and Quintilian. As I examine Sorel's language in presenting his work, especially in regards to his use of praise and blame, I will consider concepts from these two Classical texts in order to frame the rhetorical language the author employs.

In my study, I first analyze Sorel's rhetoric of blame and praise, which he uses to contrast other texts with his own, *Le Berger extravagant*. Such language appears repeatedly in the work's liminary passages as well as in the *Conclusion* of *L'Anti-Roman*. Next, I consider the way Sorel defends and explains his work, in an attempt to validate its existence. As I look at these two functions, I seek to understand not only how Sorel attempts to convince the reader of the

⁵ Aristotle, *Aristotelis stagirtae rhetoricorum libri tres*, I, 9, 68. (In doing so, we shall at the same time be finding out how to make our hearers take the required view of our own characters -- our second method of persuasion [Aristotle. *Rhetoric*. Trans. W. Rhys Roberts. I, 9. Web].)

pertinence of *Le Berger extravagant*, but also the reason why doing so is so important.

Rhetoric of Blame and Censure

In the *Préface* of *Le Berger extravagant*, Sorel explains his objective to critique and censure other texts. This is put forth as the principal purpose of *Le Berger extravagant*, which the author describes in terms of a duty he cannot ignore.

Quant à moy je croy qu'ayant acheté une telle marchandise pour excellente, on seroit bien fondé à la reporter à l'auteur, pour s'en faire rendre son argent; et chacun demeurera d'accord que si l'on vouloit n'estre plus trompé, il seroit besoin d'establir un censeur de livres, qui ne donnast congé qu'aux bons d'aller par le monde, et condannast les autres à la poussiere d'un cabinet. (*BE, I, Préface*)

Sorel's claim that he is working for the greater good of his readers is one of the virtues (*virtutes*) identified by Aristotle that qualify a man for praise: "Et quæcuoc opera aliorum sunt caussa: minus enim sui. Et quæcunq; bone actiones sunt erga alios, sed non erga se."⁶ Sorel reemphasizes his benevolence many times throughout *Le Berger extravagant*, both in the *Remarques* as well as in the diegesis. He also contrasts his text with others by explaining that the works he censures are lacking in utility. In *De Rhetorica*, Aristotle explains that usefulness is the highest kind of virtue that qualifies a man for praise ("Necesse vero est maximas esse virtutes, quæ aliis utilissimæ sunt: si quidem est virtus, faculeas quæ beneficia facit."⁷) and that, while he describes only the virtues for which men may earn renown, the opposite may be considered true of the vices (*vitio*) that instead merit censure. Sorel thus frames his project in such a way that it reflects the prescriptions offered by Aristotle: he justifies himself as the author by pointing out

⁶ Aristotle, *Aristotelis stagirtae rhetoricorum*, I, 9, 72. ("Also, all actions done for the sake of others, since less than other actions are done for one's own sake; and all successes which benefit others and not oneself" [Aristotle. *Rhetoric*. Trans. W. Rhys Roberts. I, 9. Web].)

⁷ Ibid., I, 9, 69. ("If virtue is a faculty of beneficence, the highest kinds of it must be those which are most useful to others" [Aristotle. *Rhetoric*. Trans. W. Rhys Roberts. I, 9. Web].)

the admirable purposes of his text and argues that the texts that he critiques are in need of correction because they are not useful.

Sorel writes that he has chosen the a specific register, the “*satyrique*,”⁸ to address such works, which coincides with definitions of “*satyre*” from Furetière’s *Dictionnaire universel*.⁹ The *satyrique* “SATYRE, est aussi une espece de Poëme inventé pour corriger & reprendre les moeurs corrompuës des hommes, ou critiquer les meschants ouvrages tantost en termes piquant, tantost avec des railleries”¹⁰ It is associated with judgment, particularly with negative judgments. Sorel explains that his chosen style is both optimal and necessary to critique the works he has targeted: “je me suis mocqué d’une infinité de livres impertinens, avecque le stile qui estoit *necessaire*” (*BE, I, Préface*, my emphasis).

The “*satyrique*,” as described in the *Préface*, functions primarily through the use of humor. Lysis’s adventures are comedic interpretations that Sorel calls “*farces*.” (“J’ay fait des farces des anciennes fables des Dieux, & les ay traitees comme elles meritent” [*BE, I, Préface*]). These “*farces*” display the errors of other works, and Sorel uses them to educate his readers. He claims to illustrate the failings of other texts by placing them in comical situations and interpreting them in absurd ways.

When Sorel first announces his project of censure, he explains that he points out errors in order to encourage the reader to reconsider his or her opinion of other texts.

⁸ [M]ais où est-ce qu’ils me pourront trouver un meilleur stile que le Satyrique, pour faire hayr les mauvaises choses, & en rendre mesme la censure agreable à ceux qui y sont interessez, & ne seroit-ce pas faire trop d’honneur à des sottises, que d’en parler autrement qu’avec des railleries? (*BE, I, Préface*).

⁹ This definition corresponds closely with a modern meaning for the French word “*satire*.” “Écrit dans lequel l’auteur fait ouvertement la critique d’une époque, d’une politique, d’une morale ou attaque certains personnages en s’en moquant” (*Trésor de la langue française*. Web.). Perhaps a more common use of the modern word “*satire*” is embodied in another definition: “Ecrit, propos ou œuvre par lesquels on raille ou on critique vivement quelqu’un ou quelque chose.”

¹⁰ Furetière, “Satyre.” *Dictionnaire universel*, non-paginated.

Il est vray que nostre censure ne doit pas estre si generale qu'il n'y ait une exception si petite qu'elle soit, et je sçay bien qu'il se trouve encore quelques hommes de vertu eminente, qui composant par passe-temps et non pas par profession, ne doivent pas estre rangez indifferemment avec ceux que je blasme: mais je ne veux nommer ny les uns ny les autres, afin que chacun se flatte, et croye estre de ceux que je mets à part, bien que tel lira cecy qui y sera des premiers touchez. (*BE, I, Préface*)

Sorel writes that he condemns authors who do not merit the renown their writings have earned them. His censure provides new perspectives on “undeserving” texts as he denudes them of their auras of grandeur and confronts their failings: “Cependant je m’assure que je feray remarquer des erreurs dont tous les siecles anciens ont esté abusez” (*BE, I, Préface*). In the opening *Remarques*,¹¹ Sorel specifies the kinds of errors he targets. “Je me suis mocqué d’une infinité de livres impertinens” (*BE, IV, Rem.*, 6). The adjective used to describe the texts Sorel censures is “*impertinens*,”¹² indicating works that are illogical or unreasonable. The author explains that texts are repeatedly singled out for judgment when they prove to be “*invraisemblables*.”

Importantly, however, Sorel emphasizes that he does not critique works merely because they are fictional. In fact, as will be explored in chapter three of this dissertation, Sorel uses the *Remarques* to praise certain works of fiction for their ingenuity. Texts are negatively judged only when they misuse techniques of fiction-making. This is most often manifest in the form of logical inconsistencies recognized by Sorel in the *Remarques* and by characters in the diegesis. In *De la connoissance des bon livres*, in which Sorel describes the proper use of the *roman* as “la vraye image des pensées,”¹³ indicating that it has value in his mind. There, as in *Le Berger*

¹¹ In *Le Berger extravagant*, the *Remarques* are grouped together and follow the conclusion of the narrative. They open with an authorial statement about their general importance. For ease, I refer to this portion of the *Remarques* as the “opening *Remarques*,” since they are not designated by any other title.

¹² Furetière’s *Dictionnaire universel* gives the following definition of the adjective “*impertinent*.” “Qui n’agit ou ne parle pas selon la raison.” A second definition of the word is: “en termes de Palais, se dit de ce qui n’appartient pas à la question, qui ne sert de rien à sa decision.” The English word “*irrelevant*” approximates the sense of this second definition.

¹³ Charles Sorel, *De la connoissance des bons livres*, 227.

extravagant, Sorel censures fiction when it communicates absurdities rather than truths.

In the *Préface* and the opening *Remarques* of *Le Berger extravagant*, Sorel explains where he intends to critique other works. He writes that texts lacking in logic and reason are dealt with in two places: first in the narrative,¹⁴ and then in the *Remarques*.¹⁵ One example of censure in the diegesis can be found in *Livre III* in which the character Clarimond presents his composition “Le Banquet des dieux.” Through this text, the character mocks the aspects of Roman mythology that he finds absurd. To do this, Clarimond uses the style Sorel refers to in the *Préface* as the “*satyrique*.” Roman gods gather in an assembly strongly reminiscent of Plato’s *Symposium*. However, Clarimond uses a strikingly different tone to attack the costumes and behaviors of the gods. His text presents them in a series of episodes designed to question their appropriateness.

Clarimond interrogates Classical mythology by using pointed imagery and humor to erode the awe surrounding it. In this way, “Le Banquet des dieux” may be considered a microcosm of the project Sorel describes in the *Préface*. In Clarimond’s text, the gods tote their personal symbols to the banquet despite the inelegance of bringing weaponry or other unwieldy objects to the table. The resulting image mocks the practice of Classical writers who perpetually describe these figures toting their personal accessories (*BE, I, III, 376*). In one part of the tale, the plausibility of Janus’ two heads is questioned when the heads begin speaking different languages. The heads contradict and insult each other, but finally become friends because, in so doing, they can share a drink (*BE, I, III, 392*).

¹⁴ “S’il leur semble que les imaginations de Lysis sont fort fantasques, c’est là que je les veux tenir: car ce sont les mesmes qui ont fait acquerir tant de gloire à nos conteurs de mensonges” (*BE, I, Préface*).

¹⁵ “Je veux faire des remarques sur mon livre, où le leur feray voir à quoy tendent les diverses railleries qui s’y rencontrent” (*BE, III, Rem., 4*).

Clarimond transposes the circumstances of the offending mythology to a new register in which its faults of logic are accentuated. He does this by creating a *travestissement burlesque*, treating his noble subject in a vulgar style. For instance, he observes the tendency of the gods to carry certain accessories and so reframes the characters in a new setting with a different tone. The resulting humorous situation demonstrates that the only reason the gods are portrayed with the objects that represent them is simply so that they can be easily identified. In the case of the two-headed Janus, Clarimond tests what would occur if the god's two independently acting and speaking heads"¹⁶ truly were autonomous.

Sorel explains in the opening *Remarques* that censure delivered by characters such as Clarimond is revisited and broadened in the metatext. In the *Remarques*, Sorel takes note of the role the characters play in the process of judgment, pointing out how they have modified the work of fiction or mythology being scrutinized. Often, Sorel intensifies censure in the *Remarques* using comparison. He juxtaposes the "failings" of the critiqued work with the interpretation of it that appears in *Le Berger extravagant*. In the *Remarques* of *Livre III*, for example, which comment on "Le Banquet des dieux," the mythology that is the target of Clarimond's text is attacked with a question: "Veulent-ils [les poètes] faire les Divinitez si sottes que d'estre touchees de leurs passions?" Sorel then expresses approval for Clarimond's text because it avoids the pitfalls of the original: "L'imagination de Clarimond est donc de beaucoup plus excellente" (*BE, IV, Rem. III, 123*).

In the *Préface*, as Sorel illustrates his project to censure other works of fiction, he selects

¹⁶ One of Janus's heads was able to see the future, while the other could see the past.

specific words that, by their connotations, accentuate the importance of his goals.¹⁷ He pokes fun at the targets of his critique by labeling them “*coupables*,” and using the words “*censure*” and “*blasme*” alongside “*condemnation*” and “*coupables*.” These are terms that belong to specific fields concerned with judgment: specifically, the juridical and religious domains.

In the juridical sphere, this vocabulary is associated with the accusation and prosecution of those brought before a secular legal tribunal. In this context, Sorel’s choice of words would imply that texts in *Le Berger extravagant* are put on trial so that the author may determine their “guilt” or “innocence.” Elizabeth Tilton explains that one of the criteria by which Sorel judges other works is utility, a quality that, as has been shown, Aristotle identifies as a principle form of virtue.¹⁸

In the ‘Espitre aux lecteurs,’ Sorel proposes to prove to the public that the novels it enjoys are useless. The readers, then, are to be a jury which must be convinced unconsciously that the fiction is real and consciously that, upon a careful weighing of the evidence, other novels in vogue are to be condemned.¹⁹

Daniel Chouinard identifies another standard of judgment when he observes Sorel’s emphasis on clarity. “S’il fallait entériner les déclarations d’auteur, nul plus que Sorel ne serait étranger à toute forme de brouillage. La ‘brouillerie’, jointe à l’obscurité, constitue l’un des crimes majeurs

¹⁷ Il est vray que nostre censure ne doit pas estre si generale qu’il n’y ait une exception si petite qu’elle soit, & je sçay bien qu’il se treuve encore quelques hommes de vertu eminente, qui composant par passe-temps et non pas par profession, ne doivent pas estre rangez indifferemment avec ceux que je blasme: mais je ne veux nommer ny les uns ny les autres, afin que chacun se flatte, et croye estre de ceux que je mets à part, bien que tel lira cecy qui y sera des premiers touchez. Puis que la voix generale est plus forte que la particuliere, je me raporte au peuple de la condamnation des coupables (*BE, I, Préface*).

¹⁸ In the *Advertissement aux lecteurs* at the beginning of *Polyandre, histoire comique*, Sorel writes of the importance of choosing to read books that are useful. “De sorte que si l’on on fait des Livres ou de semblables choses soient escrites, ils trouveront aussi leurs Lecteurs, & par ce moyen chacun fait sa fantaisie dans son choix, mais il faut prendre garde à s’attacher à ce qui a le plus d’utilité” (*Polyandre, histoire comique, Advertissement au lecteurs*, non-paginated).

¹⁹ Elizabeth M. Tilton, “Charles Sorel, Lawyer, and the Case of the *Berger extravagant*,” 69.

de la ‘fable’ ou fiction.”²⁰ In *Le Berger extravagant*, Sorel repeatedly stresses his desire for clarity. He writes that texts found lacking in this attribute are brought under attack.

Sorel’s use of the words “*condamner*” and “*coupable*” to elaborate on his intentions hints at the incorporation of juridical constructs in various places in *Le Berger extravagant*.²¹

Throughout the work, conversations and debates between characters often evolve into trials of the works they discuss.²² This occurs most notably in *Livre XIII* in which the usefulness of various works of fiction is discussed and fiction itself is explicitly put on trial. The characters Clarimond, Philiris, and Musardan become “lawyers,” advocating for and against fiction, while Anselme, the author, and, ultimately, the reader, serve as judges.²³

The words “*censure*,” “*condemnation*,” “*coupable*,” and “*blasmer*” that Sorel uses to describe his text have not only juridical connotations, but moral ones as well. These words reinforce the significance of Sorel’s intentions by framing his project in terms of good and evil. In the *Préface*, Sorel describes his aim to “faire hayr les mauvaises choses.” He intends to point out the “bad” to help his readers avoid it. The author again describes his project in terms of

²⁰ Daniel Chouinard, “Charles Sorel: (anti)romancier et le brouillage du discours,” 70.

²¹ The situation of trial that Sorel alludes to in the *Préface* is reminiscent of the structure of *De la connoissance des bons livres*. Not only is a part of the text set up to pit one point of view against another, mimicking the defense and prosecution of a legal trial, but similar vocabulary is used in this later text which also proposes to judge works according to their merit. Like other writers of his time, Sorel argues in one part of the text that the *roman* in particular is a “*mensonge*” and that the reading of them is “*pernicieuse*.” This indicates that the evaluation of such texts must take moral values into consideration.

²² One example is the debate between Lysis and Anselme in *Livre I*. This passage will be studied in detail in chapter three of this dissertation.

²³ Elizabeth Tilton argues that the trial of fiction in *Livre XIII* may be proof of Sorel’s knowledge of Classical rhetoric. She notes the “contrast of fabrications with known facts” presented during the debate, as well as the suggestions for the improvement of fiction offered by Clarimond. Tilton finds both of these strongly reminiscent of Classical rhetorical procedure. In her conclusion, she states that the “rhetorical structures and devices are not limited to such obvious situations as debates [in *Le Berger extravagant*]. They can be traced through Sorel’s entire narrative and perhaps through other examples of the long tradition of fiction attacking fiction.” While elaboration on this idea proves to be beyond the scope of Tilton’s article, it is nevertheless true that debate and persuasion are central to the processes of censure described in the *Préface* of *Le Berger extravagant* (Elizabeth M. Tilton, “Charles Sorel, Lawyer, and the Case of the *Berger extravagant*,” 77, 79-80).

virtue and vice when he warns:

D'ailleurs puis que toutes les belles choses ne sont pas bonnes, quand ils auroient l'esprit aussi beau comme ils pensent, ce n'est pas à dire qu'il eust cette marque de bonté qui consiste en prudence, et en force, et en la pratique des plus solides vertus qui sont seules dignes d'estre louées. (*BE, I, Préface*)

By speaking of his intentions in these terms, Sorel implies that his project may have moral value as well as literary significance.

The use of judicial and moralist vocabulary to discuss literary matters is not exclusive to *Le Berger extravagant*. Rather, sixteenth- and seventeenth-century writers and philosophers repeatedly evaluate poetry and the developing *roman* in terms of their moral value. The trial of fiction conducted in *Le Berger extravagant* is paralleled perhaps most closely by that in Fancan's *Le Tombeau des romans*.²⁴ In Sorel's *De la connoissance des bons livres* and Daniel Huet's *Traité de l'origine des romans*, the subject of good and evil in fiction is considered. In many cases, the verdicts delivered by these authors are not in favor of fiction. Such works are deemed frivolous, with little instructional value. Maurice Lever summarizes the attitude of some of Sorel's contemporaries toward the *roman* when he writes "mieux vaut une action basse mais véritable qu'un récit édifiant mais inventé."²⁵

The axes of "virtue" and "vice," and "good" and "evil" used by Sorel and Huet to comment on the fiction of their era would later become important elements in the Classical aesthetic of the latter half of the century. Jean Mesnard observes that in the Classical era, beauty could be defined according to its true or good qualities. Mesnard cites the plays of Pierre Corneille ("Vous avez un tel dégoût des mauvaises choses, et les savez si nettement démêler

²⁴ Considered by some to be written by Sorel himself, (see Jean Serroy, *Roman et Réalité: Les Romans comiques du XVIIe siècle*, 296-7) the author of *Le Tombeau des Romans* proclaims that "[les romans] sont semblables à ces vases felez, qui n'ont pas un son entier & agreable, puisqu'ils n'ont que celui du mensonge, monstre si hideux & si ennemy des vertus" and that "[l]a menterie est le plus lache de tous les vices" (45, 58).

²⁵ Maurice Lever, *Le Roman française au XVIIe siècle*, 25.

d’avec les bonnes”²⁶) and the writings of René Descartes (who writes of “la puissance de bien juger et distinguer le vrai d’avec le faux”) as evidence of a tendency to equate goodness and beauty. Mesnard argues that celebration and equation of the “good” and “true” is integral to the overarching late seventeenth-century aesthetic.²⁷

By presenting his intention to critique in terms of virtue and vice, Sorel’s language not only prefigures this aspect of the Classical aesthetic identified by Mesnard but also recalls Aristotle’s comments on the various manifestations of what is noble (“*honestum*”) and thus deserving of praise. Aristotle writes that above all, the good and pleasant are those things which most recommend something for admiration. “Ac honestum quidem est, quod eum per se eligendum fit, laudabile est: vel quod, cum bonum fit, iucundum est, quia bonum. Quod si hoc est honestum, necesse est ut virtus honesta fit, laudabilis est.”²⁸ In the opening *Remarques*, Sorel describes how the metatext helps the reader recognize truth. “Afin qu’il n’y ait rien qui leur empesche de connoistre la verité, je veux faire des remarques sur mon livre” (*BE, IV, Rem., 4*). By identifying his search for truth as “good,” Sorel further justifies his own praise of his work.

However, the same text that reverences truth and clarity also contains an overwhelmingly involved authorial voice manifest most often in the explanatory *Remarques*. Daniel Chouinard describes this authorial voice as the source of a “*contre-brouillage préventif*” that in fact contradicts the author’s struggle for clarity. The exhaustive explanations of the metatext serve to

²⁶ Pierre Corneille, *Clitandre, A Monseigneur le Duc de Longueville*, non-paginated.

²⁷ Jean Mesnard, “Vraie et fausse beauté dans l’esthétique au dix-septième siècle,” *Convergences – Rhetoric and Poetic in Seventeenth-Century France: Essays for Hugh M. Davidson*. Ed. David Lee Rubin and Mary B. McKinley. (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1989), 4.

²⁸ Aristotle, *Aristotelis stagirtae rhetoricorum*, I, 9, 68. (“The Noble is that which is both desirable for its own sake and also worthy of praise; or that which is both good and also pleasant because good. If this is a true definition of the Noble, it follows that virtue must be noble, since it is both a good thing and also praiseworthy” [Aristotle. *Rhetorica*. Trans. W. Rhys Roberts. I, 9. Web].)

tangle Sorel's rhetoric even further as they incessantly deconstruct even the most obvious puns and *doubles-entendres*. Chouinard points out that this discourse not only threatens to take the life out of the humorous portions of *Le Berger extravagant*, but also results in a complete deconstruction of the fictional experience. "La sur-motivation narrative, qui fait ici office de surcroît d'information au destinataire, recoupe une particularité formelle propre à la méthode sorélienne: le mépris de tout effet de fascination."²⁹

Sorel's language in the *Préface* denies the significance of what Chouinard calls the "fascination" of the fictional experience in *Le Berger extravagant*. Beyond admitting that the work is entertaining in order to draw in readers, Sorel appears to focus exclusively on the serious ("serieuses") tasks of judgment and instruction brought about through the *satyrique*. "Je pense bien qu'il y en aura qui me voudront reprendre d'avoir mis icy des bouffonneries, & qui me diront que la verité est si venerable, que son party doit estre soustenu avec des raisons serieuses" (*BE, I, Préface*).

Interestingly, Sorel's description of his goals in the *Préface* ultimately makes the liminary portions of the text crucial reading for the effectuation of the project he describes. Without these paratexts, the reader risks remaining unaware of the instructive purpose of the work and would focus only on its "bouffonneries." If the language in the *Préface* is taken as a sincere representation of the author's intentions, the *Remarques* must also be an essential part of the experience Sorel plans for his readers. They too become critical to the realization of the author's goals of instruction that require an ever-present authorial voice.

In order to totally eschew the experience of "fascination" the work may inadvertently offer, Sorel therefore must not place emphasis on humor or the pleasure offered by the narrative.

²⁹ Daniel Chouinard, "Charles Sorel: (anti)romancier et le brouillage du discours," 71.

Instead, he must focus on how the work comments on other texts, often in explanatory or judgmental ways. And Sorel's insistence on the importance of discussion does appear to be reflected in the text. The *Remarques* in particular offer discussion on almost every subject, including meta- metatextual discussions of the para- and metatext themselves. The *Remarques sur le tiltre*, for instance, comment not only upon the *Préface*, but also on the title. In explaining the title, Sorel elaborates on his word choice, especially his use of the adjective "*extravagant*." Afterwards, the project laid out in the *Préface* is revisited. This time, however, it is accompanied by additional explanations. Sorel explains that he has not attacked all poetry, only what he considers bad (*BE, IV, Rem. sur le tiltre*, 8-9). Afterwards, there is a lengthy description of what may be considered "*Poësie*." Subsequently, the author feels the need to describe the relationship of "*Poësie*" to the "*Roman*" as well as the etymology of the word. These explanations elaborate only on a very small part of the text: the title, demonstrating how copious commentary is in the work.³⁰

Sorel's struggle for clarity suggested by the enormous quantity of commentary is, however, undermined by these very same excessive explanations. Sorel's eagerness to enlighten confuses more often than it elucidates. As Chouinard suggests, Sorel's commentary creates a particular "*brouillage*" of its own, rather than succeeding in combating chaos and error. The many pages Sorel dedicates to the elaboration of his project, the discussions arguing the need for such a text as *Le Berger extravagant*, and even the justifications for his word choice in the title

³⁰ Certainly the language found in the *Remarques sur le tiltre* differs from that in the later *Remarques*. First of all, this portion of text comments not on other works of fiction, but on *Le Berger extravagant* itself. Secondly, since it describes itself, the tone is always positive. Sorel has no need to use the "*satyrique*" that he writes he will use elsewhere. The commentary on commentary found in the *Remarques sur le tiltre* at first appears to be a struggle for clarity. As Laura Rescia explains, the exhaustive nature of Sorel's language projects a certain kind of sincerity. "Sorel indique ainsi clairement la nécessité de ne jamais oublier le dialogue avec son public, ainsi que de se rendre parfaitement compréhensible, conformément à la règle de la *claritas*" ("Entre théorie et pratique romanesque: le rôle de la rhétorique dans *Le Berger extravagant* de Charles Sorel," *Charles Sorel, polygraphe*, 268).

seem to support the idea that Sorel wishes to fully disclose his intents and purposes. However, as the explanations accumulate, and metatext becomes meta-metatext, the main points lose rather than gain clarity, and the text becomes harder, not easier to understand.

Despite the apparent contradictions inherent in it, Sorel's explanatory rhetoric is reader-oriented, with constant reminders that he is instructing and enlightening his readers. In the *Préface*, Sorel explains how he softens his critique and even makes it enjoyable for the reader.³¹ The language of the *Préface* is also enticing. Sorel promises an experience of pleasure in order to urge the reader to endorse his project of censure. The way that Sorel takes his audience into account (those that are used to reading *romans*, as he explains in the *Préface*), is strongly reminiscent of Quintilian's suggestions to the orator who wishes to best recommend him- or herself to an audience. Quintilian, referring to Aristotle, invites the speaker to consider the opinions of his or her audience before delivering a speech, since if one knows how ones listeners may respond to a certain idea, one can better adapt the discourse for successful reception.

Interesse tamen Aristoteles putat ubi quidque laudetur aut vituperetur. Nam plurimum refert qui sint audientium mores, quae publice recepta persuasio, ut illa maxime quae probant esse in eo qui laudabitur credant, aut in eo contra quem dicemus ea quae oderunt: ita non dubium erit iudicium quod orationem praecesserit.³²

Sorel also invites the reader to place him- or herself on the author's side and to comfortably experience the work as a spectator, not a recipient of its critique. The pleasure that

³¹ "Le Satyrique [... fait] hayr les mauvaises choses, & en [rend] mesme la censure agreable à ceux qui y sont interessez" (*BE, I, Préface*).

³² M. Fabii Quintilia, *Ni Oratoris eloquentissimi institutionum Oratorium Libri XII* (Basil: Joannis Bebelii, 1529) *Gallica*, BNF, Web. III, 7, 47v. ("But Aristotle thinks it of importance to the orator to consider the place in which anything is to be commended or censured, for it makes a great difference what the manners of the audience are and what opinions are publicly entertained among them, as they will be most willing to believe that the virtues which they approve are in him who is eulogized, or that the vices which they hate are in him whom we censure" [Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*. Trans. Rev. John Selby Watson. 1856, III, 7, 23].)

comes of experiencing and participating in this project, however, is very different from that offered by the works he condemns. This is enjoyment free of delusion, very different from the “*fascination*” works of fiction can provide.

Sorel’s rhetoric of censure as it appears in the paratext is, in fact, part of a larger project to redistribute blame and praise. Another critical aspect is his intention to praise other texts that demonstrate proper techniques of fiction-making and use them to reasonable ends. In the next portion of this chapter, I investigate this particular rhetoric and explore how Sorel uses it to enlarge his ambitious project.

Rhetoric of Praise

In exploring the rhetoric of blame Sorel uses to describe his intentions, I concentrated mostly on the author’s attitude toward other texts. In this portion of the chapter, however, in which I focus on Sorel’s rhetoric of praise, I take into greater account the way the author talks about his own work since, as may be expected, Sorel writes admiringly about his own text and of himself as its author. His discussion of *Le Berger extravagant* occurs primarily in a spirit of competition in which he compares his work to those he critiques. As he judges other works, he often puts forth his own writing as a more appropriate example of a successful text.

In the paratext, Sorel juxtaposes the empty claims of other texts with the accomplishments in his own in order to establish the superiority of *Le Berger extravagant*. In so doing, he celebrates his own deeds and emphasizes what he has accomplished, a criteria that Quintilian recognizes as one that renders a person worthy of praise: “Vtra sit autem harum via utilior cum materia deliberabimus, dum sciamus gratiora esse audientibus quae solus quis aut primus aut certe cum paucis fecisse dicetur, si quid praeterea supra spem aut expectationem,

praecipue quod aliena potius causa quam sua”³³ In the last lines of the *Préface*, Sorel claims: “Tout ce que je pourrois dire sans repeter leurs mesmes vanteries [des autres auteurs], est que je donneray des effets dont l’on n’a donné que des paroles & des esperances, & que je *feray* tout ce que les autres promettent” (*BE, I, Préface*, my emphasis). Sorel voices his distaste for the unfulfilled “*paroles*” of authors who have failed to produce appropriate texts. He uses the action verb “*faire*” to describe how his own text is different from these others. He is actively successful where other authors have been neglectful and failed.

Sorel argues in the opening *Remarques* that it is the distinct purpose of his work that makes it superior to others without a similar focus.

Il est vray que sans leurs persuasions, il y a eu des gens de toute sorte de qualitez qui ont preferé quelque chetif Roman à mon histoire, s’imaginant qu’elle n’estoit pleine que de faidaises & de choses qui n’estoient pas dignes d’estre leues, bien que je soustienne que mon livre est plus serieux qu’aucun Roman, puisqu’il apprend à les mespriser tous. (*BE, IV, Rem., 2*)

Sorel strikes a humorous note as he proposes that his text is “*plus serieux qu’aucun Roman*” in spite of the “*faidaises*” within it, simply because it is poking fun of other works with similar plot elements. In this same light-hearted tone, Sorel uses a comparative to set his work above others.

Furthermore, Sorel describes criticism the work has unjustly received and explains that the disapproval of others will be dealt with in the text. As he illustrates this process, his vocabulary becomes increasingly competitive.

[I]l est vray que si j’ay la hardiesse de publier moy-mesme ces diverses censures, c’est pour le mespris que j’en fay, & pour l’assurance que j’ay que la pluspart des doctes ont pris du plaisir à mon ouvrage, & que je n’ay plus à vaincre que des ignorans qui n’auront pas si tost ouy ce que j’ay entrepris de dire qu’ils se repentiroit de m’avoir attaqué, &

³³ M. Fabii Quintilia, *Ni Oratoris eloquentissimi institutionum Oratorium Libri XII*, III, 7, 47v. (“Which of these two methods will be the more eligible for us, we shall have to consider according to our subject, keeping in mind, however, that the celebration of those deeds is most pleasing to the audience which the object of our praise is said to have been the first to do, or to have done alone, or with the aid of but few supporters, whatever else he may have effected beyond hope or expectation, and especially what he has done for the good of others rather than for his own” [Quintilian. *Institutio Oratoria*. Trans. Rev. John Selby Watson. III, 7, 16].)

qu'ils seroient honteux de signer ce qu'ils ont dit contre moy. (*BE, IV, Rem.*, 4)

As Sorel describes his intent to win over his opponents and refute their critical attitude toward him, he uses verbs such as “*vaincre*” and “*attaquer*.” This strong language signals his intention to offensively tackle criticisms that have been made of him.

Sorel is persistent in arguing that his text is superior to others. Interestingly, the author goes so far as to evoke the *Histoire comique de Francion*, another of his own writings, in order to further establish the supremacy of *Le Berger extravagant*. In the *Conclusion* of the 1633 *Anti-Roman*, the author compares the two texts and determines that *L'Anti-Roman* is the better work.

Je ne nie pas qu'il n'y ait quelque chose d'agreable dedans l'histoire Comique du sieur Moulinet Duparc,³⁴ mais il y a parmy quantité de choses qui ne servent pas beaucoup à reprendre les erreurs du monde, & l'on y treuve tant d'inegalité en plusieurs lieux, que cela nous donne à connoistre que ce n'est qu'un ramas de plusieurs contes qui ont esté arrangez par diverses personnes [...] Quoy qu'il en soit si l'on confronte l'histoire de Francion à celle de Lysis avec le jugement qui y est necessaire, l'on trouvera que le moindre traict de celle du berger est cent fois plus ingenieux. (*A-R, II, Conclusion*, 1104-5)

Admittedly, knowing that Sorel is the author of both texts intensifies the strength of this comparison for the modern reader. However, Sorel does praise the *Histoire comique de Francion* as a text that is “*agreable*,” suggesting that *Le Berger extravagant* must be even more so. Additionally, as Sorel compares his present work with his earlier one, he determines that *Le Berger extravagant* is even cleverer (“*ingenieux*”) and returns to the idea of purpose, declaring that the aims of *Le Berger extravagant* are superior to those of the *Histoire comique de Francion*.

In the *Préface*, Sorel's tone of competition persists as he further describes how *Le Berger extravagant* may be compared to the texts he critiques.

³⁴ Moulinet Duparc is one of the pseudonyms used by Sorel.

[M]on stile qui ne suit que la Nature & mon Genie, doit avoir plus de grace que des choses contraintes & estudees, & en tout cas si mon langage ne satisfait les plus difficiles, je fay voeu de n'espargner desormais ny temps ny travail, pour rendre mes ouvrages dignes d'un Ecrivain, qui s'estant moqué de tous les autres, est obligé de faire mieux. (*BE, I, Préface*)

Once more, Sorel responds to his critics with what reads as a tongue-in-cheek vow as he promises to outshine every one of the authors whose works he judges in *Le Berger extravagant*. In so doing, he reiterates the distinctive status of his text with additional comparatives. The adverb “*plus*” occurs twice, and “*mieux*” once. He claims that his text is superior because he not only *does*, but because he *will do better* (“*faire mieux*”) than other authors.

Elsewhere in the *Préface*, Sorel emphasizes the superiority of *Le Berger extravagant* in terms of its clarity and purpose, describing the work in language that separates it from the common *roman*. As we have seen, he uses the appellation “*histoire veritable*” to set it apart.

Au reste je me moqueray de ceux qui diront qu'en blasmant les romans, j'ay fait un autre roman. Je respondray qu'il n'y a rien icy de fabuleux, et qu'outre que mon berger represente en beaucoup d'endroits de certains personnages qui ont fait des extravagances semblables aux siennes, il ne luy arrive point d'avantures qui ne soient veritablement dans les autres authours: tellement que par un miracle estrange, de plusieurs fables ramassees, j'ay fait une histoire veritable. (*BE, I, Préface*)

Sorel insists on the work's veracity as its defining and distinguishing feature. This word “*veritable*” reappears in the *Conclusion* of the 1633-34 republication. In the following passage, the author evaluates the success of his work in terms of its truthful elements: “En tout ce que je dy icy, je parle avec tant de verité que les maistres du mestier sont du mesme avis quand ils entrent en leur bon sens, tellement qu'il n'y a rien à me repartir” (*A-R, II, Conclusion*, 1120). Sorel reemphasizes that *Le Berger extravagant* is associated with “*verité*,” while the *roman*, on the other hand, is inferior and “*fabuleux*.”³⁵

³⁵ The presence of “frivolous” (“*frivole*”) material in *Le Berger extravagant* therefore becomes important to defend, since it could tarnish the author's case for his work's superiority. To that end, the author's devotion to truth is repeatedly reaffirmed. Sorel explains that the presence of questionable material is a result of his dedication to

In this selection from the *Préface*, Sorel writes that *Le Berger extravagant* is paradoxically composed of “*fables ramassees*” but at the same time different from them because it is “*veritable*.” In the first sentences of the opening *Remarques*, Sorel separates his text from other works of fiction starting with the title. “Premierement je parleray du tiltre de mon livre, qui est je croy assez convenable. Il ne peut pas estre honteux pour moy, puisque s’il y à de l’extravagance, c’est celle des autres & non pas la mienne” (*BE, IV, Rem., 1*). Sorel relentlessly reaffirms the work’s unprecedented nature throughout the *Remarques*. He uses its innovative character as further proof of its superiority.

Sorel’s insistence on the work’s unique nature is one of the ways that he justifies his praise of it. Another of the possible manifestations of *virtus* identified by Aristotle is the quality of being different from all others. Aristotle explains that this particular characteristic is one that may be exploited to praise someone to the fullest extent. “Utendum est autem ariam eorum, quæ valent ad amplificandum multis: ut si solus, vel primus, vel eum paucis, vel hic maxime fecit. Omnia enim hæc honesta sunt.”³⁶ Sorel may play up his unusual text, especially in comparison to others, in order to further recommend it for praise.

In the opening *Remarques*, Sorel invokes *Le Berger extravagant*’s novelty and invention as further proof that the work is one-of-a kind. “Cependant je fay icy ce que fort peu d’Autheurs se proposeroient de faire” (*BE, IV, Rem., 3*). This statement specifically references the author’s

faithful representation. He can then deal with subjects that would otherwise be inappropriate. Daniel Huet’s *Traité de l’origine des romans* discusses the similar permissibility of “*dangereuse passion*” in Honoré d’Urfé’s *L’Astrée* when he states: “Si l’on dit que l’amour y [dans *L’Astrée*] est traité d’une manière si délicate et si insinuante, que l’amorce d’une si dangereuse passion, entre aisément dans de jeunes cœurs; je répondrai que non-seulement il n’est pas périlleux, mais qu’il est même en quelque sorte nécessaire que les jeunes personnes du monde connaissent cette passion, pour fermer les oreilles à celle qui est criminelle, et pourvoir se démêler de ses artifices; et pour savoir se conduire dans celle qui a une fin honnête et sainte” (Pierre Daniel Huet, *Traité de l’origine des romans* [Paris: N. L. M Desessarts, 1799] 126). The presence of undesirable content matter is justified in terms of its educational value.

³⁶ Aristotle, *Aristotelis stagirtae rhetoricum*, I, 9, 77. (“We must, for instance, point out that a man is the only one, or the first, or almost the only one who has done something, or that he has done it better than any one else; all these distinctions are honourable.” [Aristotle. *Rhetoric*. Trans. W. Rhys Roberts. I, 9].)

intention to address criticism other authors have made of the work. But Sorel describes the overall project of the metatextual *Remarques* as equally inventive. “Ce sera là [dans les *Remarques*] que je declareray mes intentions, & que je donneray des raisons contre l’impertinence de plusieurs escrivains, lesquelles jamais personne ne s’est imaginees” (*BE, IV, Rem.*, 6). In the *Remarques*, Sorel claims to point out “*impertinences*” or errors that have gone unnoticed by previous readers.

The praise Sorel directs at his text is vital because it supports the goals he promotes in the paratext. However, although Sorel incessantly praises his own text, he nevertheless attempts to convince his audience of his own modesty. To do this, Sorel insists on his disinterest in praise in the *Préface*, in which he describes self-praise as an undesirable characteristic of other works. Again differentiating himself from other authors, he claims, ironically, that he is not so presumptuous.

Mais j’en ai assez dit si je ne veux que ceux qui ne me connoissent pas m’accusent de presumption. Il ne faut pas imiter ces Auteurs qui dans leurs livres n’ont rien mis autre chose que leurs loüanges, & neantmoins veulent estre estimez pour les avoir faits, comme s’ils devoient estre loüez eux mesme. A quoy me serviroit-il de me loüer, veu que ceux qui escrivent aujourd’huy se loüent Presque tous, & que l’on n’est pas obligé de me croire plustost qu’eux? (*BE, I, Préface*)

Sorel explains that congratulating himself on his own writing would be ineffective as a persuasive tool because of the logical impasse that would occur if he attacked self-admiring works in a work in which he did the same. The author claims that imitating other texts in this way would reduce *Le Berger extravagant* to the level of those it judges, making it common, and therefore, less effective.

Yet Sorel’s refusal to acknowledge that he praises himself is, in fact, the very means by which he accomplishes this. In claiming that he has no interest in extolling his own text, he sets

his work above others that do. Paradoxically, therefore, the very act of denying that the work congratulates itself allows Sorel to ironically point out how unique, and therefore, how superior his own work is.

Elsewhere in the *Préface*, Sorel again emphasizes his disinterest in self-praise. In the following passage, he argues that his unwillingness to reveal his identity is proof of his disinterest in renown.

Ayant decouvert la fin que je me propose, il ne faut point que personne s’imagine que j’aye entrepris cecy pour me faire estimer par-dessus les Poëtes [...] J’ay si peu de vanité que je ne desire point que l’on sçache mon nom, ny que des affiches me facent connoistre, & puis quand j’aurois surmonté tous les Escrivains de ce temps, la victoire seroit si petite. (*BE, I, Préface*)

Sorel claims that he has omitted his name from his work in order to avoid praise. However, the author’s insincerity is accentuated when the final clauses of his argumentation serve to diminish other works. With a playful wink to the reader, he argues that even if his work were better than those he censures, it would speak little of its quality. By devaluing other works, Sorel invites another comparison with *Le Berger extravagant*, however unfounded.

And certainly, there is strong evidence that Sorel is, in fact, very interested in being recognized for his work. In the opening *Remarques* of *Le Berger extravagant*, there are additional attempts to subtly reaffirm the work’s superiority, including one in which Sorel describes his intention to include criticism he has received of his work in the text itself. He then explains the significance of this choice:

Les petits escrivains du siècle, croyant qu’ils ne pourroient plus acquerir de reputation par leurs fables ridicules, & par leurs pointes extravagantes, si mon berger estoit une fois estimé, n’en ont pas si tost veu les premieres feuilles, qu’ils ont tasché de le descrire par tout. Je ne trouve rien en cela que je ne deusse attendre, non pas que je vueille songer au proverbe qui dit que l’on est toujours mesprisé de ceux de son mestier, mais pource que je considere qu’ils me doivent hayr infailliblement puisque j’ay entrepris de rebaisser leur mestier propre. (*BE, IV, Rem.*, 1-2)

Sorel includes other authors' criticisms of *Le Berger extravagant* for persuasive reasons, using the fact that the work has been criticized as proof of its effectiveness in bringing circulation to his ideas. He describes how the work has succeeded in revealing the "*mestier propre*" of fiction writers and in demystifying the "*science*" of fiction writing. The retaliatory criticism reported in the *Remarques* becomes only further proof of the work's success.

In the *Préface*, Sorel explains that the element of surprise is essential to the reader's realization that his work is extraordinary. "Quant à l'ordre de ce recueil extraordinaire, il est à la mode des plus celebres Romans, afin que ceux qui se plaisent à les lire ne dedaignent point de le lire aussi, & s'y treuvent ingenieusement surpris." Sorel indicates that his work first pleases, and then surprises because it is a "*recueil extraordinaire*." In particular, the reader may be astonished as he or she is unexpectedly instructed and edified by the work. In describing this experience, Sorel makes assumptions about his reader's expectations. He anticipates that the reader will erroneously believe *Le Berger extravagant* to be just like "[l]es plus celebres Romans" that he critiques. Sorel actively contradicts the notion that his work resembles others, or is ordinary, because common, widely-read texts are precisely the ones he singles out for censure. He stresses that *Le Berger extravagant*, because it is unique, creates lasting impressions that help accomplish his didactic goals.³⁷

³⁷ The *Conclusion* of the 1633-34 *Anti-Roman* indicates what some of these key points are. "Je veux faire voir icy à quoy peuvent servir les aventures de Lysis, car encore que j'en aye parlé d'un costé & d'autre, ce que je diray en bref semblera avoir plus de force, & remettra les Lecteurs en memoire de ce qu'ils ont veu pour leur monstrier que ce ne sont pas des fantaisies inutiles" (*A-R, II, Conclusion*, 1075). The *Préface* also gives some indication of what Sorel would have the reader bear in mind. "S'il leur [aux lecteurs] semble que les imaginations de Lysis sont fort fantasques, c'est là que je les veux tenir: car ce sont les mesmes qui ont fait acquerir tant de gloire à nos conteurs de mensonges. Que s'ils l'estiment fou de parler avec extravagance comme il fait, & de s'estre deguisé en fille, ou d'avoir crû estre metamorphosé en arbre, il faudra donc qu'ils avouent aussi que ceux qu'il imite en tout cela, ont esté encore moins sages, car ce sont eux qui en ont parlé les premiers, & ils ne devoient pas escrire des choses qui ne sçauoient estre, ny celles que l'on ne doit pas faire" (*BE, I, Préface*).

It is interesting that Sorel anticipates the reader's amazement in the *Préface*, a part of the work that precedes the main text. The surprise is therefore announced from the beginning, reducing the chance that the reader may experience any real astonishment upon reading the work. However, by announcing it, Sorel may imply that the reader's astonishment is not limited to an initial realization of the nature of the work. Rather, it may be caused by the way the work continually reaffirms its own uniqueness and superiority as described in the *Remarques* and demonstrated in the diegesis. It may occur as the reader progressively comes to an understanding of the failings of other works. These failings are then, in turn, juxtaposed with the more successful, unique text: *Le Berger extravagant*.

Surprise becomes particularly effective as a persuasive tool when it appears in conjunction with the resolution of illusions in the text. In the opening *Remarques*, for example, Sorel explains that the reader's first surprise occurs as his or her own expectations are revealed to be erroneous deceptions (*BE, IV, Rem., 13*). In the *Dictionnaire universel*, Furetière echoes the connection between surprise and illusion in definitions of the noun "*surprise*" and the verb "*surprendre*:" "Surprise: se dit aussi d'une tromperie, d'une chose qu'on fait contre l'ordre, ou sur la confiance d'autrui." "Surprendre: signifie aussi, Tromper quelqu'un, luy faire faire une chose trop à la haste, ou en luy exposant faux." Furetière points out that the linked mechanisms of surprise and illusion occur when one encounters that which is "*contre l'ordre*," or against expectation.

The reader is surprised a second time when he or she encounters deceptions in the meta- and paratext. The *Remarques* explain that illusions are an important part of the text. In the *Remarques sur le tiltre*, another illusion is uncovered that deals specifically with the author's repeated claims of modesty. Here, he candidly explains the deceptions of his rhetoric. Although

the passage is lengthy, it is worth reproducing in its entirety.

Qui est l'homme de quelque mestier que ce soit, qui ne s'efforce de surpasser ses compagnons, s'il luy est possible, & quelle justice si rude a jamais cherché des peines contre cette action? Mais ne prenons garde qu'à ma conclusion; c'est la que l'on void l'intention de celuy qui escrit. Je dy que je ne veux pas imiter ceux qui se loüent, pource qu'aussi bien ne me croiroit on pas, & quand je mets que je feray tout ce que les autres promettent, c'est apres avoir mis, que si je me voulois loüer ce seroit tout ce que je pourrois dire sans les vanteries des autres. Si les lecteurs ont de l'esprit ils connoistront que c'est icy se loüer sans se loüer, & l'artifice dont toutes ces paroles sont accompagnées, leur doit faire digerer le reste. En fin ce ne sont pas de grandes nouvelles de dire que je m'estime quelque chose. Quand je serois humble en toutes les autres occasions, il ne seroit pas à propos que je voulusse passer icy pour le moindre des Escrivains, puisque j'ay entrepris de leur monstrier leurs deffaux. La Satyre à une licence que les autres ouvrages n'ont pas, & son stile imperieur ne permet pas que l'on y accorde la timidité avec la hardiesse. (*BE, IV, Rem. sur le tiltre, 13-4*)

Sorel explains how he exploits language in order to present a false sense of modesty. He points out the clues in the *Préface* that both hint at and veil the true message of his rhetoric. Sorel specifically indicates the illusion in his language when he describes “l'artifice dont toutes ces paroles sont accompagnées.” By creating an illusion and revealing its presence, Sorel demonstrates as early as the *Préface* his capacity to use language to deceive.

The illusions revealed in moments of surprise are part of the persuasive discourse of the paratext. In the *Remarques sur le tiltre*, Sorel illustrates how this particular deception in the *Préface* has not weakened his arguments, but rather strengthened them. He proposes that this example of deception is, in fact, evidence of his ability to effectively use illusion. “Il ne seroit pas à propos que je voulusse passer icy pour le moindre des Escrivains, puisque j'ay entrepris de leur monstrier leurs deffaux” (*BE, IV, Rem. sur le tiltre, 3*). The author attempts to convince the reader that he is a competent writer in order to strengthen his credibility as a judge of the illusions in other works. By deceiving in unexpected places, Sorel demonstrates a solid knowledge of the writers' craft of artifice that he proposes to expose.

The rhetoric of praise Sorel uses in the paratext is invitational. The author encourages the reader to make judgments alongside him, including him or her in the effectuation of his goals. In the *Préface*, Sorel describes the reader as his co-adjudicator. “Puis que la voix generale est plus forte que la particuliere, je me raporte au peuple de la condamnation des coupables” (*BE, I, Préface*). This too is a persuasive technique: by granting the reader a position alongside him, Sorel flatters him or her about the significance of his or her opinions and gives him or her a stake in the accomplishment of the project. This calls to mind Quintilian’s recommendations when he suggests that an orator should praise his audience in order to strengthen his cause. (“Ipsorum etiam permiscenda laus semper [nam id benivolos facit], quotiens autem fieri poterit, cum materiae utilitate iungenda.”³⁸) While Sorel does not explicitly praise his audience, he does attempt to get the reader on his side by suggesting that the reader accompany him in his project of critique.

At the same time, however, Sorel’s invitation for the reader to make judgments of his or her own does not allow for differing points of view. The author clearly intends for the reader to align his or her opinion with his, and so purposefully guides the reader toward certain conclusions. He does this through suggestions and explanations that assume the reader’s agreement with him. In the *Préface*, for example, Sorel suggests the proper way one should consider the work. “S’il leur [aux lecteurs] semble que les imaginations de Lysis sont fort fantasques c’est là que je les veux tenir: car ce sont les mesmes qui ont fait acquerir tant de gloire à nos conteurs de mensonges.” By labeling Lysis’s imaginations “*fantasques*,” Sorel not only hints at events in the diegesis, but also qualifies them. Sorel thus subtly influences future

³⁸ M. Fabii Quintilia, *Ni Oratoris eloquentissimi institutionum Oratorium Libri XII*, III, 7, 47v. (“Some praise of his audience, too, should always be mingled with his remarks (for it makes them favorably disposed towards him) and, whenever possible, should be so introduced as to strengthen his cause” [Quintilian. *Institutio Oratoria*. Trans. Rev. John Selby Watson. III, 7, 24].)

judgments the reader makes. The author implants in his readers a presupposition about the nature of the character's adventures, slanting their judgment before they can evaluate the text objectively.

While this rhetorical technique may seem underhanded, Sorel admits that the language he uses is persuasive, meant to influence the opinions of his readers, both "*les doctes*" and "*les ignorants*."

Il ne faut pas croire neantmoins que ce soit pour les ignorants seulement que je me propose cecy, car quand je n'eusse pas esté averty du mespris qu'ils ont fait de ce qu'ils n'ont pas entendu, je n'eusse pas laissé de faire mes Remarques qui sont comme la consommation de mon ouvrage, pource que je sçay bien que l'on y trouvera des choses qui sont aussi pour les doctes. (*BE, IV, Rem., 5-6*)

The *Remarques* facilitate an understanding of the text that eliminates conclusions Sorel deems erroneous. The same opinion-shaping methods described here as characteristic of the *Remarques* exist throughout the work. While some may be more obvious than others, these techniques are a fundamental part of the project of a work whose success, when judged by statements in the paratext, is based fully upon its ability to change opinion.

The rhetoric of praise in the work's paratext is essential in order for it to be convincing. Sorel first establishes *Le Berger extravagant* as a superior example of fiction to show that his work is effective. He then presents himself as a competent manipulator of illusion so that his judgments of other fictions will be considered valid. The reader must be guided toward specific conclusions so that he or she may appropriately participate in the trial of fiction that takes place in the work. The project of *Le Berger extravagant*, as laid out in the *Préface*, rides on the reader's recognition of it as a superior, inventive, and successful text. For this reason, descriptions of the work's invention which, in many instances, recall principles of Classical rhetoric suggested by Aristotle and Quintilian, are not mere self-congratulations. Rather, they are

essential elements of the goals the author claims he has written the text to accomplish.

Rhetoric of Defense

In the first line of the opening *Remarques*, Sorel states that he must defend his work. “Si jamais livre eut besoin d’estre defendu, c’est cettuy cy” (*BE, IV, Rem., 1*). He frames his need in terms of the differences between his text and others, writing that he has included “sans crainte tout ce qui estoit necessaire à mon sujet,” in contrast to other authors who have written nothing more than “*fables ridicules*” (*BE, IV, Rem., 1*). Because of the fundamental differences he sees between his work and others, Sorel concludes that a defense of his unusual text must form a part of his commentary on the work. And, indeed, language defending *Le Berger extravagant* can be found in the *Préface*, throughout the *Remarques*, and in the *Conclusion* of the 1633-34 republication.

Sorel’s rhetoric defending *Le Berger extravagant* is three-fold. Firstly, a justification is made of the author personally in his role as creator of the work. This discourse appears most noticeably as the text responds to criticisms the author claims have been leveled at him. Secondly, Sorel defends the actions and dialog of the character Lysis. Lastly, he argues in support of his own project, including the purpose of the *Remarques*. In the opening *Remarques*, Sorel writes that explanation is one of his primary methods of defense. “Enfin je promets de deffendre tout mon livre, tant pour le langage que pour les aventures, & de le rendre presque aussi avantageux pour ceux qui ont passé toute leur vie à lire” (*BE, IV, Rem., 5*). Discussions of events in the diegesis, whether they occur in the *Remarques* or through observations by the characters, are part of the defense the author makes of the text. These explanations provide indispensable support to Sorel’s project, without which, the author insists, *Le Berger extravagant*

would be incomplete.

Sorel often defends himself as the author of *Le Berger extravagant* by leveling attacks at his opponents. In the opening *Remarques* of *Le Berger extravagant*, Sorel lists examples of criticism he has received as the work's author. "[S]i j'ay la hardiesse de publier moy-mesme ces diverses censures, c'est pour le mespris que j'en fay" (*BE, IV, Rem., 4*). Sorel responds to disparagement by framing it in terms of his opponents' ignorance and stupidity. Using blatantly defamatory rhetoric, he contrasts the foolishness of his enemies against the strength of his own rationality.³⁹ "Je n'ay plus à vaincre que des ignorans qui n'auront pas si tost ouy ce que j'ay entrepris de dire qu'ils se repentiront de m'avoir attaqué, & qu'ils seroient honteux de signer ce qu'ils ont dit contre moy" (*BE, IV, Rem., 4*).

Sorel deflects this criticism by emphasizing the ignorance of his judges. This strategy nullifies censure by calling into question the qualifications of those who condemn him. "Ce qui est bien estrange, c'est qu'il y en a eu qui tout au contraire des autres, ont trouvé beaucoup de choses n'estoient pas assez plaisantes, n'ayant pas l'esprit de les goûter" (*BE, IV, Rem., 3*). Elsewhere, he argues that critics of the work are unable to "*cognoistre une bonne partie de ce livre*" (*BE, IV, Rem., 3*), in order to invalidate their opinion.

Sorel's argumentation is reminiscent of the circumstantial *ad hominem*⁴⁰ of modern logic⁴¹ that disqualifies attacks by framing them in the context of the speaker's situation. This

³⁹ By placing the words of his critics in the metatext, the author repeats, to some degree, the exercise of the diegesis. In the diegesis, other texts are reframed in order to expose their *invraisemblance*. Similarly, the *Remarques* disqualify criticism of the *Le Berger extravagant* by placing it in the greater context of the metatext. This highlights the inconsistency and poor judgment of the work's opponents.

⁴⁰ There are different forms of the argument *ad hominem*. In this chapter, I reference only the circumstantial.

⁴¹ Doug Walton attempts to determine the origin of the argument. "Many of the traditional informal fallacies of the logic textbooks can be traced back to their origins in Aristotle's list of fallacies. The *ad hominem* is not in that list"

rhetorical technique is used once again in the *Conclusion* of the 1633-34 text in which Sorel describes what he has accomplished. As in the opening *Remarques*, the author immunizes his work against critique by claiming that his enemies' negative opinions are the very thing that reveals their incompetence as judges.

Cela me persuade que j'ay fait mes affaires si seurement que je suis à couvert de tous costez, & qu'il faut que l'orgueil & la vanité ployent dessous moy. Je pense n'avoir rien dit que les plus sages n'approuvent, & un homme seroit despourveu de sens s'il s'attaquoit à moy desormais, puisque tous mes discours ne tendent qu'à faire voir des veritez qui n'ont esté cachées que pour nostre dommage. Il faudroit qu'il s'opposast aussi à nostre Religion qui condamne les fables des Romans & de la Poësie dont j'ay monstré les absurditez. (*A-R, II, Conclusion*, 1128-9)

The author first suggests that those who find fault with the work are out of their minds and then claims that his opponents must also be enemies of “*notre Religion*.” Sorel thus disqualifies their opinions firstly by pointing to their supposed intellectual incapacities, and secondly by implying that their opposition to his project must indicate a more serious antagonism toward the Church.

The persistence of circumstantial *ad hominem* in the paratext suggests Sorel's need to defend *Le Berger extravagant* on a subjective level, rather than relying solely on objective reasoning. While *ad hominem* argumentation is sometimes considered fallacious, the philosopher Charles Taylor argues that *ad hominem* rhetoric can in fact be effective in certain cases. Taylor asserts that this occurs when there is a discrepancy between opposing parties' frame of reference. Rational argumentation is based on criteria both parties accept as valid. When there is no common ground, objective discourse is limited in its effectiveness.⁴² Such situations call for

(“Searching For the Roots of the Circumstantial *Ad Hominem*” [*Argumentation*. Vol. 15 (2001)], 207). However, in his article, he investigates two possible origins for the argument: firstly that it came from Aristotle through Locke, and secondly that it came from writings of Classical philosophers. Walton concludes that it is impossible to know its origins for certain.

⁴² Charles Taylor, *Philosophical Arguments* (Harvard University Press, 1995) 34-60.

subjective argumentation, of which the circumstantial *ad hominem* is an example.⁴³

In *Le Berger extravagant*, Sorel's use of *ad hominem* argumentation⁴⁴ again demonstrates the author's desire to characterize his work and goals as unique. Sorel's abandonment of rational defense emphasizes the discord between previous forms of literature and the experience offered by *Le Berger extravagant*. Additionally, it points to the author's expectation that his readers have no frame of reference from which to properly understand the project of his work. Sorel thus defends himself as the author by reemphasizing the distinctive nature of his text.

Sorel is interested in defending not only himself as the author, but also the eponymous character Lysis. He constantly addresses Lysis's actions and dialog as part of his justification of *Le Berger extravagant*. In particular, he describes Lysis as an "imitator" rather than the originator of the works the character interprets. "Je leur monstreray que Lysis ne faict rien d'extravagant qu'à l'imitation des histoires fabuleuses qu'il a leuës, & je leur allegueray tant d'autorités qu'ils verront les rapports qui se trouvent entre ses aventures & celles des personnages des Romans" (*BE, IV, Rem., 4*). In fact, Sorel's defense of Lysis is the explicit overarching project of the *Remarques*. In them, he comments on the action of the narrative and identifies the sources of works Lysis improvises in order to contextualize the character's madness.

⁴³ Doug Walton also argues for the validity of circumstantial *ad hominem*, especially as it was used in the writings of Classical philosophers. He explains that although modern logic relies almost entirely on objective evidence, exclusive of details of the philosopher or scientists' life, ancient rhetoric could be soundly based on a person's identity since "the philosopher was expected to live up to the standards he or she set for others. By these lights, the circumstantial type of *ad hominem* argument is not a fallacy, but a respectable meta-philosophical argument" ("Searching For the Roots of the Circumstantial *Ad Hominem*," 219).

⁴⁴ Taylor explains that, in the seventeenth century, scientific reasoning could be in direct conflict with religious thought. For this reason, the discoveries of figures like Galileo made no sense to the pre-modernists because the frame of reference from which each side operated was completely different (*Philosophical Arguments*, 45).

As Sorel defends Lysis, he often writes of the character as though he were a real person. In other words, Lysis is not justified merely as a product of the author or his work but as an independent entity, as though he were someone the author knew. In *Livre XI*, for example, during preparations for Angélique's wedding to Anselme, Lysis asks why certain wedding traditions described in ancient Greek mythologies have not been performed. In the *Remarques*, Sorel observes that "Lysis respond fort bien" and indicates that he may be aware of these traditions from his reading of "les Essays de Montagne, bien qu'il ne les estimast pas tant qu'un Roman" (*BE, IV, Rem., XI, 560-2*). This explanation is representative of the way Sorel repeatedly describes Lysis's actions as though he had simply observed them, rather than composed them.

Treating Lysis as a person rather than a character allows the author to augment the sense of "reality" in the work. At the end of *Livre XIV*, Sorel claims that Lysis's adventures could be taken from real-life observation, with only the names altered.

Que sçavent-ils si je ne leur ay point conté une fable pour une histoire, ou bien si pour deguiser les choses, et ne point faire connoistre les personnages dont j'ay parlé, comme je ne leur ay pas donné les noms qu'ils portent d'ordinaire, je n'ay point pris la Brie pour quelque autre province? (*BE, IV, XIV, 250-1*)

By suggesting that Lysis and the other characters may be real people, Sorel is able to present his work as an "*histoire*." This defends the substance of the work, since any objectionable content can be excused as facts the author has simply reported.

Furthermore, by claiming to report rather than invent, Sorel causes a dramatic shift in the roles of the author, characters, and reader. The author, for instance, becomes a character himself when he describes having observed the characters and reported their actions. This inserts him into the characters' fictional world. Simultaneously, he becomes a joint-spectator with the reader

as he engages him or her in discussions about the events he has observed.⁴⁵ These alterations in narrative roles increase the immediacy of the work and exploit the traditional limitations of each of these figures.

A third facet of Sorel's defense concerns *Le Berger extravagant* itself, including its unusual content. In the opening *Remarques*, Sorel writes: "Je ne laisseray pas non plus en arriere les occasions où je pourray monstrier qu'il y a de la doctrine aux endroicts, où l'on croyoit qu'il n'y eust que de la bouffonnerie" (*BE, IV, Rem.*, 5). Once more, Sorel defends himself by giving explanations and elaborating on points not immediately discernible in the diegesis. In the opening *Remarques*, Sorel describes the *Remarques* as a place where he reveals hidden information that he refers to as "*doctrine*." Sorel explains that this information will be disclosed where the reader least expects to find it.

By using the word "*doctrine*," Sorel suggests that this information is vital.⁴⁶ Thus, the *Remarques*, in defending *Le Berger extravagant*, will also convey important information difficult to uncover in the diegesis. The emphasis on the hidden nature of this "*doctrine*" serves as a defense of the *Remarques*. By stating that they uncover hidden truths in the work, undetectable without commentary, Sorel affirms their indispensability.

Sorel's defense of himself, Lysis, and *Le Berger extravagant* is delivered in two distinct tones. In some passages, the author's role as a guide or teacher is presented in language that

⁴⁵ See Joan E. DeJean, *Libertine Strategies: Freedom and the Novel in Seventeenth-Century France* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1981) 60.

⁴⁶ The *Dictionnaire universel* reveals that "*doctrine*" is: "Sçavoir, erudition, ce qu'on a appris en lisant, ou voyant le monde." The passage points out that the word often describes what is contained in books, as well as the positions of authors or social groups, including those that are religious, e.g.: "La *doctrine* de l'Eglise est orthodoxe."

demonstrates his desire to help the reader. In the opening *Remarques*, Sorel describes his benevolent intentions. “[J]’ay dessein d’apporter plus de profit que de delectation” (*BE, IV, Rem.*, 3). The author claims he is less interested in entertaining his readers than in assisting them to some degree. Subsequently, Sorel points to the existence of the *Remarques* as additional evidence of his good-will. “Je ne voudrois pas que personne allast employer neuf où dix ans à lire tous les Autheurs que je citeray, si bien que j’obligeray beaucoup les lecteurs leur donnant des sommaires de tant de divers ouvrages, & leur aprenant quelle estime l’on en doit faire” (*BE, IV, Rem.*, 4-5).

At the same time, however, there is a tone of aloofness and authority that characterizes Sorel’s rhetoric. In the quotation examined earlier, Sorel uses the word “*doctrine*” in an attempt to define the relationship between author and reader. Significantly, this relationship is hierarchical, with the author placed in the position of instructor to the reader. In that same passage, the use of the verb “*monstrer*” indicates the need for a guide. The author assumes this role as he unveils hidden truths to the reader. “Ayant mis au jour une doctrine cachee, il est temps que je la descouvre” (*BE, IV, Rem.*, 6). The author reveals the “*doctrine*,” and the reader receives it. By assuming a more enlightened role than the reader, the author justifies his writing and removes it out of the reach of those who might critique it.

Similarly, as Sorel describes his benevolence in identifying the source of works interpreted in *Le Berger extravagant*, he simultaneously reinforces his position as intellectually superior to the reader. The assertion that it would take his readers “*neuf où dix ans*” to read all the works quoted in the text implies that the author himself must be extremely well-read, much more so than his readers. Similarly, the use of the verb “*apprendre*” establishes the author’s superior knowledge, and thus his ability to impart that knowledge to others. Daniel Chouinard

recognizes the reiteration of hierarchical imposition in the *Remarques* which he interprets as rhetorical grasps at power. “Il y a effectivement, dans les remarques, une nette volonté d’imposer au récepteur une autorité supérieure, d’assurer chez lui une subordination aussi prononcée que possible par rapport aux commentaires.”⁴⁷ The image is clear: the author is the master; the reader, the student. The establishment of this hierarchy makes criticism of the “master’s” work difficult.

In the *Conclusion* of the 1633 republication, Sorel proposes that his text itself is evidence of his qualifications as a guide. He catalogs the works of other authors that he believes inferior to *Le Berger extravagant* and laments the defamation he has suffered despite the quality of his work. “O ignorance brutale! me voudroit on mettre au dessous de ceux qui n’ont fait que des petits discours remplis de poinctes inutiles, bien que j’aye donné au peuple tant d’observations diverses? faut il preferer de vaines paroles à de vives raisons?” (*A-R, II, Conclusion*, 1111). Sorel defends his position as instructor based on the merit of the “*observations*” and the “*vives raisons*” in the work.

Sorel’s defense of the author, of Lysis, and of *Le Berger extravagant* is, in the end, a strong offense. In the opening *Remarques*, Sorel attacks critics in terms of their ignorance, invalidating their critique based on the circumstances in which it was given. He discusses the actions of the character Lysis by presenting him as a real person, releasing himself from responsibility for the content of the work. He presents the defense of the work itself in terms of the important information it conveys, both in the diegesis and in the *Remarques*. Finally, in the *Conclusion*, Sorel congratulates himself for the successful accomplishment of his goals. This argumentation ties the defense of the work into the passages that praise and explain the work’s

⁴⁷ Daniel Chouinard, "Charles Sorel: (anti)romancier et le brouillage du discours," 84.

project. The offensive assertiveness of Sorel's rhetoric is part of the author's campaign to convince the reader of the urgency and necessity of the text.

Conclusions

In the paratext of *Le Berger extravagant*, Sorel makes a concentrated effort to persuade the reader of the work's critical and therefore instructive qualities. The way he emphasizes his didactic goals, often in harmony with principles of Classical rhetoric found in *De Rhetorica* and the *Institutio Oratoria*, places them in opposition to the enjoyable or pleasing facets of the text. While Sorel admits that the entertaining aspects of *Le Berger extravagant* are essential for attracting readers, his repeated emphasis on the more "serieuses" educational purposes of the work opposes the "bouffonneries" of the text embodied in Lysis's exploits. Much of the paratext, including the *Préface*, parts of the *Remarques*, and the *Conclusion* constantly reference the conflict between these two aspects of the work.

The disharmonious dichotomy between instruction and entertainment becomes of central importance when trying to understand the function of *Le Berger extravagant's* extremely abundant para- and metatext. The paratext, which contains Sorel's goals and descriptions of the work, casts the text in a differing light from that suggested by the diegesis alone. Without the *Remarques* or the paratext, *Le Berger extravagant* may be considered a highly-entertaining, profoundly comical text with a less overt didactic or critical overtone. In the paratext however, Sorel makes a concentrated effort to convince the reader that the experience that the work should provide is very different from what he or she would encounter without his guidance.

The paratext, in defending and explaining the text, must also therefore be a defense and explanation of itself. In attempting to convince the reader of the work's instructive properties,

Sorel must also persuade the reader of the paratext's relevance and of the necessity for its explanations and defenses, as well as the over-abundant metatext found principally in the *Remarques*. By pointing out in the *Préface* that the reader may miss the point of the work entirely without the paratextual explanations, Sorel implies that there are two distinct experiences offered by *Le Berger extravagant*. There is first that which the author does not endorse: that is, the entertaining spectacle of a mad character's antics ("*bouffonneries*") that differs little from other *romans*. Then, there is the experience that Sorel instead recommends: a reading of Lysis's adventures in the context of the discussions that they facilitate. However, this is not fully possible without a careful reading of the work's "other" texts, first the paratexts and then – or simultaneously, in *L'Anti-Roman* – the *Remarques*.

The paratext is therefore a campaign for a unique author-guided experience that is only possible when the reader is convinced of the pertinence of the para- and metatexts. In particular, Sorel uses paratexts to emphasize the hypertextual nature of the work, suggesting that the full extent of Lysis's interpretations can only be appreciated by understanding their origin as revealed in the metatext. The description of the *Remarques*, which appears on its title page, argues for the indispensability of the *Remarques*.

Remarques sur les XIII livres du berger extravagant. Où les plus extraordinaires choses qui s'y voient, sont appuyées de diverses autorités, & où l'on treuve des recueils de tout ce qu'il y a de remarquable dans les Romans, & dans les ouvrages poétiques, avec quelques autres observations, tant sur le langage, que sur les aventures.

Sorel's description of the *Remarques* advertises its three most essential qualities: first, its breadth, suggested in words like "*tout*" and "*recueils*;" second, its "*autoritez*," the enlightened authorial perspective it provides; and third, the expansion of the "*extraordinaire*" and the "*remarquable*" only available in the metatextual portions of the work.

The *Remarques* also offer the reward of hidden truths that, Sorel argues, can only be

revealed in authorial commentary, truths that accompany the “*doctrine*” he describes in the *Préface*. In the *Conclusion* of *L’Anti-Roman*, Sorel reviews the work and indicates that one of his accomplishments was indeed to show his readers the truths in other works that were hidden by their original authors. By reframing these texts in *Le Berger extravagant*, Sorel gives his reader another perspective on them, a viewpoint that is then enriched by metatext in which the author points out truths that other authors had clumsily obscured “*pour nostre dommage*.” The *Remarques* provide a discussion on these modified works and bring to light important lessons hidden in their original forms. It is not only the improvisations of other works that are instructive; indeed, these alterations may be observed by an astute reader. Rather, it is the authorial elaboration on points the reader is unable to observe for his or herself that is of the most value, since the work ultimately asks the reader to pass judgment on absent texts.

However, since illusion is as much a part of the para- and metatext as it is of the diegesis, one wonders whether these portions of the work may, in the end, also contain many of the same “*fantaisies*,” or illusory experiences that may be found in the narrative. The first lines of the *Remarques sur le premier livre du Berger Extravagant* focus on the dramatic “*bouffonneries*” of Lysis’s behavior that, significantly, like the work’s liminary passages, come at the beginning of the text. “Puisque ce livre est remply de fantaisies extraordinaires, je croy qu’il à esté bon de le commencer, par le discours que tenoit Lysis comme avec une faillie d’esprit.” Sorel then describes the work’s beginning as a theatrical presentation in which an actor recites his lines. “Ce commencement d’histoire est aussi comme une ouverture de Theatre, où la toile estant levee, un homme paraist soudain & recite les vers de son personnage” (*BE, IV, Rem., I, 13*). One cannot help but wonder if an exploration of the work’s metatext may also reveal it to be “*remply de fantaisies extraordinaires*,” directed by an authorial figure who is as much an actor as Lysis,

conscious of his language and the “delivery” of his “lines.” Might the *Remarques* that he explains are part of his serious (“*serieux*”) project in fact be as entertaining as the “*fantaisies*” of Lysis’s adventures?⁴⁸

⁴⁸ Sorel gives a hint of the nature of his para- and metatexts when he writes in the *Histoire Comique de Francion* : “Que si l’on ne se contente point de cette raison, et qu’on trouve encore mauvais ce que j’ay dit, je suis quitte pour respondre que je suis bien d’avis que l’on n’en croye que ce que l’on voudra, et que mon livre estant facieux, l’on prenne pour des railleries ce que je mets dans cet Advertissement aussi bien comme le reste” (Charles Sorel, *Histoire comique de Francion*, ed. E. Roy, XIX).

Chapter Three

Ambivalence in the Text and Metatext of *Le Berger extravagant*

In *Livre I*, as Lysis wanders through the countryside, he recalls that fictional shepherds often question the mythological figure Echo for guidance and direction. Because he believes such characters to be as real as he is, he reasons that he too must be entitled to speak with the nymph. He queries Echo aloud, asking about the course he should take as an afflicted lover. Surprisingly, Echo responds, and in a manner reminiscent of the Classical texts and pastoral tradition with which Lysis is familiar. However, Echo's final response does not replicate the *berger's* last syllables as he expects. The narrator then explains the ruse: Anselme, Lysis's gentleman friend, has been hiding behind a bush, imitating Echo's voice. When Anselme emerges, Lysis suspects him of having counterfeited the nymph, but the gentleman refuses to admit his role in the conversation.

In works such as Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Echo's responses, in repeating the final syllables of the question, often comment on the inquirer's situation. The question-response model by which Echo functions can in many ways be considered a provisional representation of the relationship between text and metatext in *Le Berger extravagant*. In the *Metamorphoses*, Echo's answers often prove to be insightful observations. Similarly, in *Le Berger extravagant*, the way Sorel describes the *Remarques* suggests that they follow or "echo" the narrative, offering clarifications on the work.

Charles Sorel's *Le Berger extravagant* is a work that, according to the paratext, can only be truly understood by reading the *Remarques* in tandem with the diegesis.¹ In this chapter, I

¹ This point was previously discussed in chapter two.

investigate the relationship between text and metatext and seek to understand the specific role of the *Remarques* in expanding and enriching the work. As I focus on the *Remarques*, I examine how they fulfill or stray from the way Sorel describes them in the paratext. In particular, I am interested in how the author uses them to comment on the works that inspire Lysis's adventures, since this is the function he repeatedly attributes to them. In addition, I examine how and why Sorel references other texts that do not play a role in the diegesis. In conducting this study, I hope to better understand the reason Sorel constantly opposes *Le Berger extravagant* with other texts, insisting on its uniqueness and differences. As I look at the way the author uses the *Remarques*, I seek to comprehend the method behind his criticisms, as well as the ambivalence that results from them. By looking at the way Sorel discusses his own text, I show how the author's claim that it is superior and unique may be deceptive.

Notions of the *Roman* in the Seventeenth Century

In *De la connoissance des bons livres*, Sorel presents the *roman* as a genre in opposition to the "*histoire*." In that text, Sorel defines an "*histoire*," as a record of truth: "Quand on nomme l'*histoire* absolument, l'on entend la veritable, et celle qui a la vraye forme d'*histoire*."² Frédéric Charbonneau examines Sorel's categorization of "*histoires*" in *La Bibliothèque françoise* and notes the particular status held by the kind of text the author writes about. "On peut même dire qu'avec Sorel, le siècle dans son ensemble considérait l'*histoire* comme le plus grand des genres en prose – un genre que grandissaient paradoxalement les échecs des Modernes aussi bien que

² Charles Sorel, *De la connoissance des bons livres*, 66.

les réussites des Anciens.”³ Conversely, Sorel associates the “*roman*” with lies and deception. He argues in *De la connoissance des bons livres* that he cannot therefore esteem it to the same degree as the “*histoire*”.

L’on a voulu persuader que les Romans valaient mieux que l’Histoire; Mais il ne faut point pretendre qu’on laisse longtemps en crédit un si estrange Paradoxe. Hé quoy! ces Conteurs de Fables voyans une Histoire ne sont-ils pas satisfaits d’une simple Narration des evenemens selon qu’ils se trouvent vray? Ne sont-ils pas contents d’une chose que l’on a tant de peine à chercher, qui est la supreme Verité, dont l’excellence consiste à n’y avoir parmy elle aucun meslange de mensonge?⁴

Raymond Picard similarly points out that “dans la hiérarchie des genres, si contraignante au XVIIe siècle, le roman occupe le degré le plus bas,”⁵ an observation Jean Serroy cites in order to demonstrate the inferior position occupied by the early seventeenth-century *roman* as it begins to be recognized as a distinct kind of literature.⁶

When *Le Berger extravagant* is published, the *roman* is still very much in development. Characteristics of the genre have yet to be established and individual authors differ as to how it should be defined. Serroy attributes the vast amount of writings on the genre to the fact that it is still in evolution, fluid in its prescriptions, and uncertain even in its appellation.

A côté [des romans] s’élabore, tout au long du siècle, sous forme de préfaces, d’essais, voire de catalogues, un ensemble de textes théoriques qui, de Fancan à Du Plaisir, en passage par les Scudéry, Sorel, Huet, Segrais, Guéret, Huet, Boileau, accompagnent les balbutiements du genre de débats sur la nature du romanesque, sur la moralité de l’affabulation, sur les rapports entre fiction et réalité, et s’attachent même déjà à dégager

³ Frédéric Charbonneau, “L’histoire aux rayons de *La Bibliothèque françoise*,” *Charles Sorel, polygraphe*, 162.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 82-3.

⁵ Raymond Picard, “Remises en question,” *Revue d’Histoire littéraire de la France*. Vol. 77 No. 3/4 (May-Aug 1977), 356.

⁶ Jean Serroy, *Roman et réalité: les histoires comiques au XVIIe siècle*, 14.

une histoire de la littérature narrative.⁷

Serroy points out that the large amount of commentary on the *roman* appears in *romans* themselves, often in liminary passages such as prefaces. Authors demonstrate a need to define the genre in which they write and to create a new kind of literature that is different from that which has come before, yet which also has unusual power for fascination and moral influence.

In *Le Tombeau des Romans* (1626), Fancan considers the pros and cons of fiction in a manner strongly reminiscent of methods used in *Le Berger extravagant*. The text is divided into two separate portions, one arguing the merits of fiction, while the other contemplates its faults. Frank Greiner, in an introduction to his critical edition of the work, argues that the text provides many points of view on a single subject, possibly with a playful intent.⁸ In the portion of the work that describes the dangers of fiction, Fancan explains that the *roman* is perilous because it encourages the reader to entertain dangerous passions. “Je dis que le recit de ces estranges accidens dont ils cajolent ceux qui les lisent, fait perdre le soin d’examiner ce qu’il y a de manque & de contraire à la solidité du bien dire.”⁹ Similarly, Jean-Pierre Camus’ *Dilude de Pétronille* (1626), which appeared the same year, recounts the story of a young girl who erroneously believes that “toutes les sciences divines & humaines estoient comprises en celle-ci [dans les fables], et enveloppées sous ces enigmes.”¹⁰ The narrator explains how a wise *religieux* convinces her to read other, more “proper” texts, such as histories and religious works, implying that these are more appropriate vehicles for the delivery of moral truth.

⁷ Ibid., 14.

⁸ Frank Greiner. “Introduction.” *Le Tombeau des Romans où il est discours I. Contre les Romans. II. Pour les Romans*. 1626. (Reims: Presses Universitaires de Reims, 2003) 30.

⁹ François Dorval-Langlois de Fancan. *Le Tombeau des romans*. Ed. Frank Greiner. *Pour les Romans*, 70.

¹⁰ Jean-Pierre Camus, *Pétronille: Accident pitoyable de nos jours, cause d’une vocation Religieuse*. (Lyon: Jacques Gaudion, 1626. *Google Books*. Web.) 460.

Conversely, Coulet observes that seventeenth-century authors also recognize the capacity of the *roman* to influence its readers for good. Elsewhere in *Le Tombeau des romans*, for example, the author explains how the *roman* can teach and promote moral ideas. He makes an analogy with the parables told by Jesus Christ in the New Testament to argue that fiction may indeed be used in for edification. Additionally, Daniel Huet's late-seventeenth-century *Lettre à M. de Segrais sur l'origine des romans* (1670) justifies fiction by emphasizing the virtues that it can portray. "On a eu peu d'égard à l'honnesteté des mœurs dans la plupart des Romans Grecs et des vieux François, par le vice des temps où ils ont esté composez."¹¹ In the *Advertissement d'importance aux lecteurs* in the *Histoire comique de Francion*, Sorel also emphasizes the power of fiction to edify ("J'avois meslé l'utile avec l'agréable," he writes) and correct ("Il m'estoit facile de reprendre les vices serieusement, afin d'esmouvoir plutost les meschans à la repentance qu'à la risée").¹²

Furthermore, seventeenth-century discussion of the *roman* centers around the question of whether or not an author is obliged to follow a set of predetermined rules in drafting a work. In the preface to Madeleine de Scudéry's *Ibrahim* (1641), Georges de Scudéry argues strongly for the necessity of following certain rules when writing in a specific genre. He compares the construction of a text to that of a building. Both must be properly built according to a set of plans in order to function efficiently.

Châque Art a ses regles certaines, qui par des moyens infailibles menent à la fin que l'on se propose: et pourveu qu'un Architecte prenne bien ses alignemens, il est assuré de la beauté de son bâtiment [...] Souffrez donc que je vous descouvre tous les ressorts de

¹¹ Daniel Huet, *Lettre de Monsieur Huet à Monsieur de Segrais de l'origine des romans*. 2nd ed. (Paris: Sebastien Mabre-Cramoisy, 1678) 165.

¹² Charles Sorel, *Histoire Comique de Francion. Advertissement d'importance aux lecteurs*. Ed. E. Roy, XII-XIII.

cette machine, et que je vous face voir, sinon tout ce que j'ay fait, au moins tout ce que j'ay tâché de faire.¹³

However, Scudéry's devotion to rules is counterbalanced by Scarron's opposition to them. Scarron objects most vocally to those imposed by "*les Anciens*". In *Le Roman comique* (1651), a *conseiller du parlement* expresses displeasure at the constant reliance on Greek and Roman formulas in the *roman* and theater.

De la Comédie on vint à parler des romans. Le Conseiller dit qu'il n'y avait rien de plus divertissant que quelques romans modernes; que les Français seuls en savaient faire de bons; mais que les Espagnols avaient le secret de faire de petites histoires, qu'ils appellent Nouvelles, qui sont bien à notre usage et plus selon la portée de l'humanité que ces héros imaginaires de l'antiquité.¹⁴

Scarron suggests that adhering too closely to the traditional and antiquated stunts the development of new genres such as the Spanish "*nouvelles*."

Lastly, Serroy points out that Sorel's contemporaries attempt to understand the relationship of fiction and truth in the *roman*, often evoking the notion of *vraisemblance* as a way to reconcile the two. In a preface to *Ibrahim*, Georges de Scudéry explains how he attempts to make his works as true to "reality" as possible without reporting history. "Pour moy, je tiens que plus les aventures sont naturelles, plus elles donnent de satisfaction." He couches his reasoning in a plea for moderation: "Mais comme tout excès est vicieux, je ne m'en suis servy [des naufrages dans ses Romans] que modérément pour conserver le vray-semblable."¹⁵

The question of *vraisemblance* in the *roman* is taken up by Sorel in the *Advertissement*

¹³ Georges de Scudéry, "Préface." *Ibrahim ou l'illustre Bassa. Première partie*. (Paris: Antoine de Sommaville, 1644) non-paginated.

¹⁴ Scarron, *Le Roman comique. Tome Premier*. (Paris: Libraire de la Bibliothèque Nationale, 1880) 153.

¹⁵ Georges de Scudéry, "Préface." *Ibrahim ou l'illustre Bassa*, non-paginated.

aux lecteurs of his last *histoire comique*: *Polyandre, histoire comique*, the first volume of which was published in 1648. In this passage, Sorel describes the content of his book and the kind of adventures that may be found in it.

Après tout sans faire tant le subtil, il faut considerer que ces livres-cy estant d'invention d'esprit, il ne faut pas penser y trouver toutes les veritez que l'on s' imagine, veu que l'on n'est pas obligé d'y en mettre, & que l'on se peut contenter de choses vraysemblables. Que si mesme il y en à de vrais en leur particulier, il ne faut pas s'attendre neantmoins qu'elle le soient en general, & que ce que l'on peut expliquer en partie le doive estre de mesme dans la suite.¹⁶

In Sorel's view, *vraisemblance* is adequate for a work of fiction in which events have the appearance of "reality" without having necessarily taken place. If the semblance to "*veritez*" is close enough, the reader can still be edified.

Madeleine de Scudéry also distinguishes between the *vrai* and the *vraisemblable* in *Clélie* (1661). Her characters discuss the practice of mixing fiction with history to render it more believable. "[Il n'y a] rien qui établisse mieux une Fable bien inventée, que ces fondemens historiques qu'on entrevoit par tout; & qui font recevoir le mensonge meslé avec le verité."¹⁷ Fiction is described as a "*mensonge*," yet the characters point out that by mixing it with truth, one arrives at an intermediate yet acceptable *vraisemblance*. "Le véritable art du mensonge, est de bien ressembler à la verité."¹⁸ Like Sorel, Scudéry's characters conclude that a work that is *vraisemblable* is an appropriate form of art.

¹⁶ Charles Sorel, *Polyandre, histoire comique* (Paris: Veuve N. Cercy et Augustin Courbé, 1648) *Advertissement aux lecteurs*, non-paginated.

¹⁷ Madeleine de Scudéry, "De la manière d'inventer une fable." *Conversations sur divers sujets. Tome Second*. (Paris: Claude Barbin, 1680) 460.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 463.

Sorel's Estimation of the *Roman* During his Later Career

Like other authors of his time, Charles Sorel contributes to the discussion on the *roman* in several works from his lengthy career. While the evolution and variability of Sorel's opinions must be taken into account, his writings nevertheless contain a relatively consistent arc in defense of *vraisemblance* and *vérité*.¹⁹ As Sorel's career evolves, however, he expresses increased discomfort both with his previous works and with the tenants championed in them. In part, this occurs because of the changing literary aesthetic and advent of Classicism in the mid seventeenth century that certainly molds his perspective on fiction. In one case, Sorel writes that he wishes to be remembered for his later, more serious works and laments that he will not be forgotten as the author of his earlier *romans* which he describes as "*frivoles*."²⁰ Similarly, in *De la connoissance des bons livres*, Sorel comments on his *histoires comiques* from the perspective of an objective third party and offers a conflicted opinion of *Le Berger extravagant*. On the one hand, he recognizes the work's qualities: "on doit avoir quelque obligation au Livre de l'Anti-Roman qui contient l'Histoire d'un Berger extravagant, lequel n'a de l'extravagance que pour se moquer de celle de ces autres Bergers & de tous les personnages de nos Romans."²¹ On the other, however, he questions the effect of such works on the reader.

Ils [les auteurs des Romans comiques] se persuadent que leurs Fictions sont dans une grande vray-semblance, pour ce qu'ils s'exemptent des plus notables erreurs des Romans de Bergerie, & de ceux de Chevalerie, & qu'ils ne font point parler les personnes d'une maniere si éloignée de leur condition; mais quoy qu'ils ne racontent ny Fables, ny enchantemens, il ne laissent pas de nous rapporter beaucoup de choses absurdes,

¹⁹ Sorel's first two *histoires comiques*, the *Histoire comique de Francion* and *Le Berger extravagant* both contain prefaces or "*advertissements*" in which the "frivolous" adventures they contain are qualified in terms of the truths they nevertheless communicate.

²⁰ Charles Sorel, *La Bibliothèque française*, 427.

²¹ Charles Sorel, *De la connoissance des bons livres*, 102.

tellement que leurs Ouvrages peuvent passer pour des Romans qui sont pour le moins aussi Romans que tous les autres.²²

Sorel acknowledges the *vraisemblance* of the *roman comique*, yet is unable to whole-heartedly endorse it because its resemblance to the common *roman* is still too strong.

Anne-Elisabeth Spica considers the contradictions in Sorel's writings on the *roman* and qualifies Sorel's attitude as ambivalent, halfway between approval and repulsion for his own works and fiction in general. "Il est frappant d'y observer à quel point l'attitude de l'écrivain [Sorel] est ambiguë à l'égard des romans qu'il connaît et qu'il commente."²³ Spica sees Sorel's ambiguity as evidence of his attempts to reconcile concepts of representation, such as imitation and invention.

Prenons au sérieux cet art de tenir dans le même temps deux positions contradictoires: il signale la pratique d'une mimésis romanesque non pas duelle, qu'elle oppose la pastorale au roman comique, qu'elle rejette la fable allégorique pour un propre vraisemblable ou qu'elle dénonce les mensonges romanesques au profit de possibles narratifs, mais bien paradoxale, en fondant la fiction sur la merveille de son engendrement.²⁴

Spica observes in Sorel's work a profound paradox that stems from the author's desire to create a kind of fiction built on the exposure of its elements. These paradoxes are expressed in *Le Berger extravagant* as Sorel simultaneously celebrates the frivolities of the *roman* at the very moment he claims to critique them. As Spica notes, "Il valorise le merveilleux,²⁵ voire l'absurde,

²² Ibid., 103.

²³ Anne-Elisabeth Spica, "Charles Sorel, entre fascination et répulsion pour le roman." *Charles Sorel, polygraphe*, 167.

²⁴ Ibid., 176.

²⁵ Spica's use of the word *merveilleux* is related to some degree to what Daniel Chouinard identifies as the "fascination" provided by the fictional experience (See Daniel Chouinard, "Charles Sorel (anti)romancier et le brouillage du discours," 71). "*Merveilleux*" is the power of fiction to deceive and, in so doing, delight its readers.

au moment où il semble le condamner.”²⁶ Sorel’s trial of the *roman* is simultaneously a theatrical production, a dramatization of the practices of writing and production of a work of fiction.²⁷ This renders *Le Berger extravagant* a contradictory spectacle, in which appreciation for the “*merveilleux*” appears alongside passages of censure of it.

These contradictions, however, consist of more than Sorel’s simultaneous celebration and censure of the *roman*’s frivolity. The unique relationship between text and metatext in the work, for example, is also problematic. This is particularly consequential since the *Remarques* are billed as a locus of clarification where the author’s opinion on various works of fiction – and fiction in general – may be unequivocally understood. However, as Eli Cohen explains, Sorel’s desire to discuss and clarify threatens the work’s critical project.

Literature can be so preoccupied with questions of form that it can ultimately, and paradoxically, undermine the presuppositions involved in the claim to social efficacy of any discourse, including its own, and do so precisely through a thematizing of formal inconsistencies and ruptures in discourse that perpetually shadows and disrupts the apparently unifying narrative of the text as a whole.²⁸

While Spica sees the paradoxes of *Le Berger extravagant* as part of a constructive exploration of fiction-making, Cohen suggests that they may be fundamentally destructive. He understands the performance of metatext – the *Remarques* in *Le Berger extravagant* – as a critical part of the work. Either it clarifies text, or it contradicts its own function and confuses the text further.

²⁶ Ibid., 176.

²⁷ “Cette volonté de théâtraliser la parole pour mettre en scène la fiction a pour preuve la manière dont Sorel redistribue les trois préfaces et l’incipit des *Remarques* du *Berger extravagant* de 1627-28 dans la préface de L’anti-roman de 1633, ainsi que la manière dont il nourrit d’additions la fin des *Remarques* sur le livre XIV. Dans les deux cas, il insiste surtout sur la mise en scène de la manière dont le récit lui est parvenu, qu’il donne à voir autant qu’à lire, dans sa matérialité. Le roman devenu sa propre scène suggère de nouveaux effets d’enchâssement, non seulement narratifs mais aussi spectaculaires” (Ibid., 179).

²⁸ Eli Cohen, “A Poetics of Paradox: Images of Discourse in Early Modern Novelistic Fiction.” Diss. (Princeton University, 2011), 4-5.

However, by allowing for the possibility that the *Remarques* are not strictly metatextual, we may bring their purposes and functions into greater focus. As I examine the relationship between text and metatext in this chapter, specifically considering the content of the *Remarques*, I hypothesize that their function is relatively fluid, not strictly defined, as Sorel might lead the reader to believe. In particular, I explore the ways that the line between text and metatext (and by extension, fiction and critique) may not be clearly delineated and study the paradoxes that result when text becomes metatext and vice versa. Through my analysis of the *Remarques* accompanying two different *livres* of *Le Berger extravagant*, I hope to shed light on the way the *Remarques* are simultaneously discursive and explanatory, constructive and destructive, fiction and critique.

In the first portion of my study, I analyze a selection from *Livre I* of *Le Berger extravagant* and the accompanying *Remarques*. This *livre* contains a conversation between the characters Lysis and Anselme on the function of Echo. In the course of their discussion, they bring up various other texts to find the best mythological explanation of a natural phenomenon. In the *Remarques*, Sorel also comments on the conundrum of the Echo and then adds his own perspective to the ideas proposed in the diegesis. The interlacing of text and metatext in the two discussions of this episode brings to light the processes of judgment Sorel describes as being so important to the *Remarques*. It also, however, demonstrates how authorial elaboration broadens the scope of the text and blurs the line between text and metatext.

Livre I: Discussions of Echo

In *Livre I*, after it is revealed that Anselme has impersonated Echo, Lysis and Anselme

debate at length over the legitimacy and utility of texts that deal with the mythological figure. They discuss Narcissus' and Echo's story as it appears in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and then proceed to evaluate the way the myth is represented in various other works. While the *Metamorphoses* may be the most obvious hypotext evoked by this episode, Lysis and Anselme comment on a number of other works in the course of their conversation. Some of these directly treat the story of Echo, while others are instead thematically related.

As Anselme and Lysis discuss these works, they express their opinions on them and argue about their strong and weak points. Although their debate takes place in the diegesis, their commentary may be considered metatextual in a manner similar to the *Remarques*, since they are talking about an event (Lysis's encounter with Echo/Anselme) that occurred in the narrative. Later, in the *Remarques*, Sorel considers the characters' discussion and adds his own viewpoint on the conclusions at which they have arrived.

Explanation and Evaluation in the Diegesis

In their discussion, Lysis and Anselme scrutinize four texts. They talk about the myth of Narcissus and Echo from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, the story of the nymph and Pan from Jacques Amyot's translation of *Les Amours pastorales de Daphnis et Chloé*, as well as the tale of the fairy and conduits from François Béroalde's *Voyage des princes fortunés*. Additionally, they review the mythology of the *Moirai*, or the Fates, especially as represented in Homer's writings. In the *Remarques*, Sorel discusses further texts relating to Lysis's and Anselme's conversation. These works will be examined in a second portion of this analysis.

As the characters consider various textual representations of Echo, they concentrate first

on the logistical problems in the works they reference. They discuss, for example, how Echo could possibly be able to repeat the words of people all over the world. As the conversation advances and the characters express their points of view, Lysis and Anselme each take on an increasingly specific role. Lysis frequently asks questions and demands clarification while Anselme serves as an elucidator and a judge.²⁹

Lysis's first question is triggered by the experience he believes he has had speaking to Echo. He points out inconsistencies in her story and essentially questions the validity of the mythology. He seeks to understand why "Echo" (in reality, Anselme) responded to his final question without echoing his last syllables.

N'a-t'elle plus d'ennuy qui la travaille? n'est-elle plus amoureuse de Narcisse, ayant trouvé que Charite a un plus beau visage que luy? Mais tout au contraire n'a-t'elle pas du sujet de s'attrister, puisque Charite est de son sexe, & qu'elle n'en sçauroit recevoir de contentement? N'est-ce point qu'elle en est devenuë folle, & que maintenant elle s'extravague? Je le croy pour moy, ou bien il faut qu'elle se soit enyvree. (*BE, I, I*, 51-2)

Lysis's question reflects the discrepancy he observes between his own encounter with "Echo" and the experiences of characters in texts he has read. He expresses a desire to understand Echo's (Anselme's) behavior and initially satisfies his need for clarification by providing an explanation of his own. He suggests that Echo is *extravagante* either because she is jealous of Charite's beauty, or because she is drunk. Lysis's conclusion is an attempt to reconcile the fictional setting of the myth with his own "real world" experience. Because he believes he inhabits the same "world" as Echo, he interprets deviations from the myth in terms of circumstance: Echo failed to repeat his words not because of any error of logic in the myth, but rather because she may have been drunk.

²⁹ Anselme's role as judge in *Livre I* prefigures the similar role he takes on in *Livre XIII* in which he serves as arbiter in the debate on fiction.

Anselme responds by challenging and then refining Lysis's explanations. He first identifies the assumption upon which Lysis has based them: that there is only one Echo, only one figure that echoes the words of people all around the world. Anselme points out that various works describe the phenomenon of an echo in alternate terms. He suggests that Lysis consider these other texts, since they may provide more logical explanations than those that Lysis currently has in mind.

Anselme's role as elucidator is reinforced by the kind of language that punctuates his dialog: "Mais, en quelle erreur estes vous," "je m'en vais vous esclaircir cecy," "Mais voicy encore une autre chose digne de remarque," and "Apprenez une autre doctrine" (*BE, I, I, 52, 53, 55*). Anselme's explanations appear to be directed not only toward Lysis, but also at the reader, seemingly for the benefit of both. As Anselme debates the merits of various texts with Lysis, his language mirrors that used by Sorel, who indeed often directly addresses the reader in order to explain certain points in the *Remarques*.

Importantly, Anselme does not dismiss texts in his explanations simply because they are works of fiction. He does not, for example, argue that the myth of Echo is a poor substitute for scientific knowledge. Instead, he responds to Lysis on the same level that the character first attempted to explain Echo's *extravagance*: he argues the merit of fiction and myth in terms of their systems of logic. When one text proves inadequate, Anselme proposes others that are more consistent with his experience.

To this end, Anselme suggests three additional texts for Lysis to consider. He first introduces ideas from Jacques Amyot's translation of Longus's *Les Amours pastorales de*

Daphnis et Chloé.³⁰ He explains that concepts in this work are superior to those in the *Metamorphoses* because they better illustrate how an echo can occur in several places at once. Anselme recounts how the deity Pan finds himself unloved by the nymph he adores and so orders shepherds to kill her. The shepherds cut up her body into a million small pieces which they then scatter all over the world. The Muses then assign the fragments the task of repeating people's words.

The next ideas Anselme proposes come from François Béroalde's *Voyage des princes fortunés*. Referencing this work, Anselme describes how a great fairy builds a large system of conduits that help her assist her people. These pipes allow her to advise princes and knights without leaving her castle. After the fairy leaves the world, the tubes fall into disrepair. As a result, people's words are repeated back to them as they leak through holes. This explanation of an echo is superior to Ovid's because it more convincingly explains its behavior.

Thirdly, Anselme suggests that Lysis consider the mythology of the *Moirai* as described in the poetry of Homer. At this point, the characters have finished their discussion of Echo and begin to entertain explanations of lifespan in various texts. Anselme points out how in Homer's myth the three *Moirai* spin, measure, and cut each life. He is dissatisfied with the mythology's rationalization because it fails to take into account the vast numbers of people living at one time. He therefore modifies ideas from Ludovico Ariosto's *Orlando furioso*, the influential sixteenth century Italian epic,³¹ in order to explain the concept. Anselme proposes that the threads of lives

³⁰ Although I identify the source of these ideas here, these texts are not mentioned by name in the diegesis. They are instead revealed in the *Remarques* accompanying this episode.

³¹ The *Orlando Furioso* was published in French in 1543 (Lyon: S. Sabon) as *Roland furieux, composé premièrement en ryme thuscane par messire Loys Arioste, et maintenant traduit en prose françoise*. The translation is attributed to Jehan des Gouttes or Jehan Martin. Another translation by Gabriel Chappuys appeared in 1576 (Lyon: B. Honorat).

are not spun by three beings but rather by an infinite number of silkworms. While this explanation is no more scientific than that which is featured in Homer's text, it is nevertheless deemed superior because it is better thought out.

Anselme and Lysis each contribute to the discussion using a distinct kind of argumentation. Anselme, in his role as elucidator to Lysis and the reader, considers texts in terms of their plausibility. He evaluates the way they explain "real-life" occurrences and their success in remaining consistent. Furthermore, Anselme applauds their *vraisemblance* and utility and disapproves of authorial shortsightedness and the inability to adequately present ideas.

As the discussion progresses, it becomes increasingly clear that Anselme's judgments are consistent with the opinions expressed by Sorel in the *Préface* and opening *Remarques* of *Le Berger extravagant*. Much like Clarimond, as he presents his text "Le Banquet des dieux," Anselme becomes a vehicle for authorial commentary. In the *Préface*, for instance, Sorel expresses discontent with the lack of logic in certain works of fiction and explains that one of his intentions is to point this out. "Neantmoins je m'assure bien qu'en me moquant des poètes, je les ay obligez malgré qu'ils en ayent, et leur ay fait la leçon. [...] je leur ay monstré le moyen qu'ils devoient suivre pour esclaircir toutes leurs fictions." Anselme accomplishes this goal to some degree as he discusses various texts with Lysis.

Elsewhere, Sorel describes his desire to improve on other works. "Je fay vœu de n'espargner desormais ny temps ny travail, pour rendre mes ouvrages dignes d'un escrivain, qui s'estant moqué de tous les autres, est obligé de faire mieux" (*BE, I, Préface*). Anselme also acts

in behalf of the author in this capacity as he proposes fables that are more logical than others.

The works he suggests are not his own creations. Rather, Anselme uses them as a starting point, and then modifies them to form a “text” that is superior to others.

Anselme’s argumentation is characterized by rational thought and a desire to explain and improve. Lysis’s dialog, on the other hand, is punctuated by outbursts of emotion that indicate an inability to discuss fiction reasonably. As Anselme proposes and modifies other texts to better explain the phenomena the characters discuss, Lysis reacts with rage. Lysis’s tirade contains religious vocabulary that demonstrates his devotion to the texts that Anselme critiques.

Que je croye cela, dit Lysis, je croiray plutot que je vole come Dedale. Jamais Ovide n’a parlé de cecy. Vous l’avez pris [Anselme’s version of Ariosto’s silkworm myth] dans quelque livre apocrife. Tant que les Parques s’occuperont à retordre le fil de mes journees, j’adjousteray foy au dire des bons anciens. (*BE, I, I, 57-8*)

Words such as “*croire*,” “*apocrife*,” and “*foy*” all belong to the religious and juridical domains. Lysis uses them to defend the authors he refers to as “*bons anciens*.” Lysis sides with those who would revere Classical philosophers and writers in the late seventeenth-century *Querelle des anciens et des modernes*.

Anselme references the *Moirai* in order to point out shortcomings in Homer’s poetry. He then modifies ideas from Ariosto’s text, expanding on his description of the silkworms, to create a better explanation of lifespan. But Anselme’s improvisation on these themes triggers further fury on Lysis’s part.

Je n’ay jamais ouy parler de tout ce que vous dites, s’escria alors Lysis. Vous estes Heretique en Poësie, vous falsifiez le texte d’Homere & de Virgile, pour nous abreuver d’une mauvaise science. Allez ailleurs chercher des esprits que vous puissiez seduire. Je suis trop ferme en ce que je croy pour estre esbranlé par vos opinions, qui sont possible

puisees de quelque nouvel auteur, qui n'est suivy de pas un autre. (*BE, I, I, 62-2*)³²

Again, Lysis uses religious vocabulary,³³ including the word “*heretique*,”³⁴ to protest against the ideas Anselme proposes. Lysis states that they must have come from some “*nouvel auteur*,” whose thoughts are invalid because they do not appear in the works of the “*bons anciens*” he reveres. He accepts neither Anselme’s modifications nor any texts that do not make up the literary canon with which he is familiar. At last, he rejects Anselme’s arguments and refuses to discuss the matter further.

Lysis’s rebuff of Anselme’s rationale leads Anselme to abandon fiction as part of his argument. Rather, he resorts to scientific explanations that trump the works of fiction they have previously discussed.

Vous vous faschez, dit Anselme, il y a bien plus: Aprenez qu’en ce que vous avez dit, n’y en ce que j’ay dit moy-mesme, il n’y a rien de veritable. Il n’y a point de Nymphes Echo qui nous responde: C’est nostre voix mesme qui retentit en quelque concavité, & qui rejaillit vers nous, comme la lumiere du Soleil est repoussee par reflexion du lieu où elle jette ses rayons. Il n’y a ny Parque ny Destin non plus, & ce n’est que la volonté de

³² Page 62 is incorrectly numbered as 26.

³³ Lysis’s use of religious vocabulary to defend his actions and opinions occurs in episodes throughout the work. In *Livre XIV*, as part of the attempt to “cure” Lysis of his *extravagance*, a hermit tries to convince him of his erroneous behavior, and Lysis responds by using a religious vocabulary to describe his devotion to Charite. The episode is explained in the *Remarques*. “Quand l’on parle à Lysis de se recommander aux Saints, il dit que c’est une belle Sainte qu’il sert: car il y a des Poètes qui appellent ainsi leur maistresse, & j’en ay veu un qui disoit qu’il n’estoit pas malade de Saint, mais qu’il estoit plustost malade de Sainte” (*BE, III, Rem. XIV., 730-1*). The *Remarques* go on to explain that Lysis’s use of this vocabulary is in emulation of certain authors who write of love using religious terminology.

³⁴ Lysis’s use of the word *heretique* reveals the strength of his adherence to fictions and myths without regard to their *vraisemblance*. The word *heretique* describes one who blasphemes against the accepted doctrines of the Church: “Heresie. s. f. Erreur en la Foy Chrestienne, Toutes les doctrines qu’on avance contre les decisions de l’Eglise Catholique & des Conciles sont de vraies *heretiques*. Ce mot vient du verbe Grec *haircomai*, *elige*, *je choisis*. Suivant cette étymologie ce mot est du nombre de ceux qui tiennent le milieu, & qui peuvent se prendre en bonne & en mauvaise part. Cependant l’usage a tellement prevalu, que par le mot d’*heresie* on n’entend plus autre chose qu’une attaché opiniastre à une proposition erronée & condamnée” (Furetière, *Dictionnaire universelle*, non-paginated).

Dieu qui rend nos vies longues ou courtes. (*BE, I*, 62-63)³⁵

Anselme once again begins with “*Aprenex que*” in order to solidify his position as elucidator. In fact, Anselme’s explanation resembles the scientific descriptions of natural phenomena contained in the first volume of Sorel’s *La Science universelle: La Science des choses corporelles* (1634).³⁶ Both Anselme in *Le Berger extravagant* and Sorel in *La Science universelle* first discredit false notions and then communicate correct information. In *La Science des choses corporelles*, this process occurs as Sorel discusses the physicality of rays of sunlight. First, the popular, false notion is cited: “Ils ne pensent pas qu’ils [the rays] puissent estre des corps.” Then, correct information is stated and fortified by explanation. “L’on adjoûte encore icy une preuve, c’est que l’on entend bien mieux la nuit que le jour. Cela témoigne que les rayons sont corporels.”³⁷

Anselme’s resort to scientific explanation halts the discussion of fiction. Importantly, however, the character does not use this argumentation in order to triumph over Lysis in their debate. Instead, he seems convinced from the beginning that Lysis will reject even this most “truthful” of explanations. After his revelation, he simply suggests that they end the conversation: “Mais laissons cela pour maintenant & parlons d’une chose qui ne fasse pas naistre en nous tant de disputes. Lysis qui ne vouloit pas chercher l’occasion de quereller un homme dont il avoit beaucoup [sic] affaire, fut bien aise de changer de discours” (*BE, I, I*, 63). The narrative then changes direction, refusing to celebrate Anselme’s scientific explanation or to allow Lysis the opportunity to discredit it.

³⁵ Page 62 is incorrectly numbered as 26.

³⁶ See, for example, *La Science des choses corporelles. I, De l’immobilité de la terre* (Paris: P. Billaine, 1634) 146-193, in which the passage of sound in relationship to that of light is discussed.

³⁷ Charles Sorel, *La Science universelle, I, De la lumière*, 476.

The two characters' argumentation does not, therefore, progress from "fiction" or "falsehood" toward a triumphing "science" or "truth." Indeed, the absence of further commentary following Anselme's revelation indicates that fiction, not fact, was the focal point of these conversations. This idea is reinforced in the *Remarques*, since there Sorel makes very little of Anselme's scientific explanation. A single sentence acknowledges Anselme's revelation, validating its truthfulness: "Je ne puis que ajouter à ce qu'Anselme dit de l'Echo" (*BE, IV, Rem. I, 35*). However, the lack of further development on this point seems to indicate that the heart of the discussion was the connections between texts treating similar subjects. In their evaluative conversation, Anselme and Lysis test fiction not against truth, but rather against effectiveness, or *vraisemblance*, to rationally explain and expound upon a given theme.

Evaluation and Elaboration in the Remarques

The debate between Lysis and Anselme may be considered metatextual, since the characters consider the merits and failings of various texts and compare them with others that may be more logical. The *Remarques* that correspond to this episode are also metatextual, but in a different way. As Sorel comments upon Lysis's and Anselme's debate, he elaborates on themes introduced in the diegesis and proposes new texts for consideration. Like Anselme, he too evaluates various works of fiction, but he also comments upon the debate itself, setting himself up as the ultimate authority with the power to act as the final judge of the conversation.

In the *Remarques*, Sorel enriches Lysis's and Anselme's discussion by consulting further sources. Anselme's and Lysis's conversation touches on five different texts. Sorel mentions

these again in the *Remarques* in much the same order.³⁸ An additional four, however, are exclusive to the *Remarques*. These texts are interspersed with those mentioned by the characters in the diegesis. Because a greater number of texts is examined in the *Remarques*, Sorel's discussion is broader.

Like Lysis and Anselme, Sorel considers texts in the *Remarques* in order to judge and evaluate them. This is consistent with the way he describes the purpose of the *Remarques* in the work's paratext (*BE, IV, Rem., 4*). In total, Sorel discusses eight texts in conjunction with this episode. Of those eight, five are determined to be lacking in some way. The other three, however, appear to be introduced as part of a second project of the *Remarques*: to perpetuate the discussion and provide additional commentary. The large amount of explanation and discussion that appears in the *Remarques* may, as Cohen suggests, risk undermining its logic and reason by increasing confusion in the work. Alternately, however, it may take the text in different directions, expanding the breadth of its textual discussions and creating thematic networks that tie various works together in surprising or unforeseen ways.

In the *Remarques*, Sorel first considers the treatment of Echo in *Les Bergeries de Juliette* by Nicolas de Montreulx. He justifies his discussion of this text by claiming that it is "le livre ou il y a le plus d'Echos." He then explains that in this work, shepherds consult Echo for answers to their pastoral problems. Sorel criticizes the text for the poor manner in which Echo responds to her inquisitors. "[M]ais il y a fort peu de responses qui se rencontrent bonnes: l'on n'y trouve pas grande finesse" (*BE, IV, Rem. I, 31-2*). Echo's reply is bad because her language is awkward,

³⁸ The exception is the mention of Ovid's version of the myth of Echo. This follows a discussion of the other texts.

with contorted phraseology and isolated words that have no meaning.

L'on void qu'au premier il manqué un article, & que pour bien respondre il est besoin de dire, il *faut*, & pour le dernier ce mot de *verité* est bien nû, il ne va pas ainsi tout seul en nostre langue. Il faudroit dire, *c'est la verité*, ou bien, *vous dites la verité*, mais cela ne se pourroit pas rencontrer dans la response de l'Echo. (*BE, IV, Rem. I, 33*)

The syntactical errors in Echo's replies are the result of Montreux's poorly-orchestrated efforts to make Echo repeat the last syllables of questions directed to her. Sorel points out that the Echo in this text does not respond as a normal person would. Sorel's criticism of *Les Bergeries de Juliette* illustrates criteria the author uses to evaluate texts: dialog must be natural and *vraisemblable*, even when uttered by mythological characters.

Sorel then discusses Erasmus' *Colloquia Familiaria*, which also contains a representation of Echo. He expresses displeasure with this text because the dialog between Echo and her inquisitors is unnatural. He explains how Erasmus has awkwardly mixed two languages; Echo is questioned in Latin but responds in Greek. Sorel's disdain is evident as he poses the question: "Quand l'on parle latin où François à un Echo, comment est ce que l'on s'ira imaginer qu'il vous respondra en une autre langue?" (*BE, IV, Rem. I, 34*). Sorel disproves of the *Colloquia familiaria* for the same reason he censured *Les Bergeries de Juliette*: portraying dialog in an unbelievable manner is unacceptable, even in a work of fiction.

Sorel briefly addresses the *Metamorphoses* only to pass to Longus's *Les Amours pastorales de Daphné et Chloé* translated by Jacques Amyot. In the diegesis, Anselme takes ideas from this text, modifies them, and shares them with Lysis. Importantly, Sorel abstains from discussing or evaluating this fiction in the *Remarques*. His lack of judgment or commentary seems to endorse the modified version of it proposed by Anselme.

Sorel then segues into a tangential discussion on pantomimes and other “*basteleurs*” like Echo. The author explores these themes by evoking writings of Jean Antoine de Baïf on pantomimes and mentioning the Roman actor Quintus Roscius Gallus.

Ce conte [de Roscius] n'est point si bas, qu'il ne serve d'un grand exemple, pour monstrar les sottises opinions des esprits preoccupez, mais il ne vient à mon sujet, que pour faire voir quels basteleurs sont les Pantomimes, du nombre desquels c'est à juste sujet qu'Anselme a mis la Nymphé Echo, puisqu'elle contrefaict toute sorte de voix. (*BE, IV, Rem. I, 37*)

Sorel's discussion on these two points does not appear to be judgmental. Instead, the author uses them to elaborate upon a theme. Their inclusion expands the discussion, enriching it by providing additional examples of “*basteleurs*,” one of the subjects of interest to the author at this point in the *Remarques*. This discussion does not correspond directly to the debate between Lysis and Anselme found in the narrative. Instead, these texts alter the course of the metatext, turning it away from the plot and toward what seem, initially, to be tangential ideas. These ideas, however, play an important role in the way Sorel transforms the *Remarques* into a kind of catalog. The *Remarques* become a text in their own right, a place where the links between correlated subjects may be more fully explored.

After the deviation offered by these two sources, Sorel returns to the debate in the diegesis. He identifies the origin of Anselme's story of the great fairy and describes how the character has modified *Le Voyage des princes fortunés*: “Pour l'Echo qui s'est faict par des tuyaux d'air congele, l'invention en vient d'un ouvrage Steganographique faict par Beroalde: mais qui prendra la peine de le voir, trouvera qu'Anselme n'y a pris que le premier dessin, y adjoustant beaucoup de choses qui esclaireissent tout” (*BE, IV, Rem. I, 37-8*). Anselme changes the text so that it better illustrates how an echo works.

As Sorel praises Anselme for his modifications, he refers to them as “*inventions*.” The author approves of the way Anselme alters Béroalde’s text to clarify it. Commentary on Béroalde’s unmodified *Le Voyage des princes fortunés* is virtually absent, implying that Anselme has greatly changed the content of the text. In reality, however, Anselme has done little to alter Béroalde’s work. If one compares Anselme’s version of the tale with Béroalde’s, it becomes clear that Anselme’s rendition in *Le Berger extravagant* bears striking resemblance to the actual text of *Le Voyage des princes fortunés*. Béroalde’s text reads as follows:

Le moyen qu’elle [the fairy] en inventa fut qu’elle congela une grande quantité d’air dont elle fit un tuyau fort grand qu’elle poussa tant par-dessus les monts, par les ras des eaux, par les antres et cavernes, que l’extrémité en vint jusqu’auprès de sa sœur, qui par ce moyen l’oyait parler à elle et lui répondait; si bien que trop séparés, et par de si grandes distances, elle ne laissaient journellement de se visiter par paroles et discouraient de leurs secrets par la voix qui coulait du long de ce canal. Après la mort de ces dames il est advenu par l’indisposition du temps que ce tuyau tant exquis a été usé et brisé par endroits, qui est cause qu’après la voix proférée on en oit d’autres qui sont redites par l’air vaguant ça et là.³⁹

In fact, Anselme repeats much of the language of Béroalde’s work word for word. In the passage below, taken from *Le Berger extravagant*, these repetitions are marked in italics.

Elle [the fairy] congela par l’aide des Demons une grande quantité d’air, dont elle fit plusieurs tuyaux qu’elle posa par-dessus les villes, les montagnes, & les rivières, les rendant invisibles à tout chacun, & lors qu’elle avoit quelque chose à apprendre à ceux qu’elle affectionnoit, elle le disoit par là, tellement qu’en peu d’heure elle leur annonçoit ce qui devoit avenir, & leur donnoit de tres salutaires conseils, & mesme ils luy pouvoient respondre de la mesme façon. Or ayant quitté ce monde, il ne s’y trouva pseronne capable de se servir de *son secret*, quoy que beaucoup de Magiciens y essayassent. Il est donc arrivé petit à petit par l’injure du temps *que les longs tuyaux ont esté usez & brisez en beaucoup d’endroits, & lors que l’on parle aujourd’huy, la voix y est portee, mais elle en ressort aussi tost par les ouvertures.* (BE, I, I, 36-7, my emphasis)

³⁹ François Béroalde de Verville, *L’Histoire véritable ou le voyage des princes fortunés* (Albi: Passage du Nord-Ouest, 2005. Google Books. Web.) 311-2.

While Anselme has altered some aspects of the text, much of the substance remains identical to Béroalde's. Sorel's emphasis on Anselme's "*invention*" in the *Remarques* is therefore puzzling. Anselme's version seems less an "*invention*" than a direct fulfillment of Sorel's assurance in the *Préface* that the content of *Le Berger extravagant* comes completely from other texts.⁴⁰

The conflicting evidence in this example demonstrates that Sorel is quite ambivalent toward the concept of invention in *Le Berger extravagant*. On the one hand, the author lauds Anselme for the improvements he has made to a text. On the other, the fact that the work has hardly been altered at all seems instead to endorse Béroalde's text as it stands. Significantly, the paradox of this situation is only detectable to the reader who is familiar with or who consults the original source. However, as Sorel states in the opening *Remarques*, he does not expect his readers to either know or read the texts he references (*BE, IV, Rem., 4*). The reader is rather invited to rely on authorial explanation. He or she may therefore be unable to detect signs of Sorel's ambiguous attitude toward imitation and invention.

After addressing Anselme's treatment of *Le Voyage des princes fortunés*, Sorel continues to follow the discussion in the diegesis rather closely. He identifies the *Orlando furioso* as the source of Anselme's ideas about the silkworms. He again praises the way that Anselme has modified this text and agrees that it is an improvement on the myth of the *Moirai* in the poetry of Homer. Commentary on Homer's writing is minimal. Sorel focuses on Anselme's modifications and the way that the character has transformed principles found in the *Orlando furioso*.

As he discusses Anselme's interpretation, Sorel considers what it means to imitate. "C'est

⁴⁰ "Il ne luy [à Lysis] arrive point d'avantures qui ne soient veritablement dans les autres auteurs" (*BE, I, Préface*).

plustost reprendre un auteur que de l'imiter, quand l'on augmente ainsi les choses. Apres tout cela il faut sçavoir que les Poëtes n'ont eu guere de raison de feindre qu'il y avoit trois Parques pour conduire nos vies" (*BE, IV, Rem. I, 38*). He concludes that Anselme's treatment of a passage from the *Orlando furioso* is not imitation because the character has deviated so significantly from the original text. And, in this case, the author accurately describes the extent of Anselme's modifications. There are indeed several differences between Ariosto's text and the version cited by Anselme.

In the *Orlando furioso*, the knight Astolfo goes to the moon where he finds a capsule filled with the wisdom of another knight, Orlando. It is here that Astolfo encounters a palace filled with different threads.⁴¹ The character views three women at work, one winding the thread as it is spun by the worms, a second moving it once it is spun, and a third separating the good threads from the bad. Astolfo's companion then explains the scene: "Le vecchie son le parche, che son tali / Stami, filano vite a voi mortali."⁴² ("Know that the Parcae are those ancient wives, / That in this fashion spin your feeble lives."⁴³)

The situation described by Anselme is somewhat different. He tells Lysis that the women have "un grand panier où il y a Presque autant de vers à soye qu'il y a d'hommes qui vivent sur terre" (*BE, I, I, 60*). He then illustrates the roles of each of the Fates: the first takes the threads for spinning, the second cuts them, and the third prepares new ones for spinning. Anselme explains that threads that come from a single worm are all of the same ancestral line. Further, he

⁴¹ Ludovico Ariosto, *Orlando furioso*. (Ferrara: Francesco Rosso da Valenza, 1532) *Les Bibliothèques virtuelles humanistes. Canto 34, LXXXVIII*.

⁴² Ibid., *Canto 34, LXXXIX*.

⁴³ All translations of this work are from: Ludovico Ariosto, *Orlando furioso* (1532. Tr. William Stewart Rose [London, 1910]. Electronic ed. By D. B. Killings [1995]).

describes how threads are not always cut; rather, they sometimes break, which occurs when a life ends preemptively. Anselme therefore significantly alters the central theme of Ariosto's text.

While the *Orlando furioso* focuses on the separation of good threads from bad "Sceglie le belle fila ha l'altra cura / Perche si tesson poi per ornamento / Del paradiso, e de i piu brutti stami / Si fan per li dannati aspri legami" ("The choicest threads are culled for Paradise, / And after, for its ornaments are wrought; / And fashioned from the strands of foulest show / Are galling fetters for the damned below."⁴⁴), Anselme is interested in the cutting or breaking of the thread that occurs when a person dies.⁴⁵

Because Sorel's evaluation of Anselme's modifications is, in this case, valid, the author proves to be unreliable in the way he describes the kind of textual transformations that occur in the work. At times he offers truthful assessments of the interpretation of texts in *Le Berger extravagant*. At others, however, the use of a text may be veiled in deceptive metatextual discussion. The undependable nature of the authorial voice makes it difficult to determine how much Sorel has transformed any given text. His position on principles of imitation and invention thus becomes problematic and contradictory.

Sorel's discussion in the *Remarques* serves specific purposes. First, the author uses this portion of the work to judge texts, both those mentioned in the diegesis and others he believes to

⁴⁴ Ibid., *Canto 34*, XC.

⁴⁵ Anselme alters the original myth of the *Moirai* in such a way that he minimizes its moralistic implications. Rather than focusing on the second Fate as a guide of people's choices during their lives, Sorel chooses to concentrate Anselme's interpretation of the processes of death and the connections between generations. While this may be interpreted as part of the way the author works to destabilize established values, it is also, in this instance, a rhetorical choice. As will be demonstrated shortly, Sorel's discussion tends toward the theme of death, and by altering the myth of the *Moirai* in this way, the author is better able to link texts together so as to arrive more convincingly at his selected final example, one that deals explicitly with the theme of death.

be thematically related. As he evaluates various works, he does not attempt to determine whether the text in question is scientifically “true” or “false,” but rather whether it is effective and logical in the context of the myth. The texts examined in conjunction with the episode of the Echo all attempt to describe a natural phenomenon. Sorel uses the *Remarques* to examine representations of Echo in these works and to determine if they are appropriate. He criticizes Montreulx’s *Les Bergeries de Juliette* and Erasmus’ *Colloquia familiaria* because both fail to present Echo’s dialog in a believable way.

In most cases, Sorel compares various texts to the modifications of them that appear in the plot of *Le Berger extravagant*. He praises these alterations as improvements upon the sources from which they come. Anselme is twice praised for his “*invention*,” making *Le Berger extravagant* itself the standard against which other works are judged. Homer’s writings on the *Moirai*, for example, are negatively evaluated for their inability to adequately explain lifespan. Anselme’s version of Ariosto’s *Orlando furioso*, on the other hand, is praised as a better explanation: “Cela est encore mieux” (*BE. IV, Rem. I, 38*).

Consequentially, many of the positive judgments Sorel passes in conjunction with this episode are directed at Anselme’s modifications and inventions. Anselme is thus held up as a kind of model creator of fiction. He becomes a second incarnation of the author as a figure that also creates successful texts. In *Livre I* of the 1633-34 *Anti-Roman*, Sorel describes his objective to create an exemplary text as part of an effort to combat the “evil” of bad literature.

Ayant cela [le livre de *L’Anti-Roman*] en ma possession, il m’a esté permis d’en tirer ce qui me pouvoit servir pour bastir mes Remarques, suivant toujours l’advis de celuy qui m’avoit fait present de tant de rares choses. Il me disoit que c’estoit un acte bien loüable de tascher de remedier promptement à un mal qui s’empiroit tous les jours de plus en plus, & que je le devois faire puisque j’en trouvois le moyen. (*A-R, I, I, 9*)

The changes Anselme makes to other works are part of the author's crusade against ineffective and illogical texts. They make *Le Berger extravagant* less of a purely retroactive, judgmental work, and more of an active, demonstrative one.

A second aspect of Sorel's discussion in the *Remarques* concerns his extensive commentary on tangential subjects suggested by various texts. These wandering discussions are ultimately unwarranted by Lysis's and Anselme's argument in the narrative. At first, Sorel's commentary follows the diegesis rather closely. He points out the inspiration for the episode (the *Metamorphoses*), evaluates other texts that portray Echo, and then remarks on the works mentioned by the characters. Elsewhere, however, his discussion deviates somewhat widely from the themes that are at the heart of Lysis's and Anselme's conversation.

A third and somewhat striking aspect of Sorel's commentary becomes evident as his discussions of all the texts are considered in tandem. The works he evaluates all deal with a theme introduced only briefly in the diegesis. *Les Amours pastorales de Daphnis et Chloé*, *Le Voyage des princes fortunés*, Homer's description of the *Moirai*, and the *Orlando furioso* all treat the subject of death. In Montreux's work, Pan has a nymph killed who refuses to return his affections. In *Le Voyage des princes fortunés*, the conduits fall into disrepair because of the death of the great fairy. Finally, both the myth of the *Moirai* and the *Orlando furioso* concern the duration of life and causes of death.

This theme is only expressed in explicit terms at the close of the discussion when Sorel mentions a text from a "*dialogue italien*" with which he is familiar. This text contains a conversation between the allegorical characters *Vie* and *Mort*, who "sont les deux Parques qui gouvernent les ans des hommes, & qu'après que l'une en a fait la trame, l'autre la vient couper"

(*BE, IV, Rem. I, 38*). Sorel crowns this text as the best description of the beginning and ending of life because of its clarity. “Cela est encore mieux que ce que disent les Anciens, car c’est assez de ces deux Deesses pour l’office qu’on leur donne” (*BE, IV, Rem. I, 38-9*). Sorel’s evaluation of various works eventually leads to this final consideration of the theme of death. This not only allows him to tie many of the works he has reviewed together, but also leads him to the Italian text that gives him the optimal close to his discussion. This last text fully demonstrates the criteria he believes are essential in an appropriate work of fiction. He identifies these principles as simplicity and sense, core values he champions throughout *Le Berger extravagant*.

Evaluation of Le Berger extravagant in the Remarques

As was discussed in chapter one, the authorial figure in *Le Berger extravagant* is inconsistent and contradictory, especially in the 1633-34 *Anti-Roman*. In this second edition of the work, Sorel makes the distinction between the author of the text and the author of the *Remarques* a central point of the work’s liminary passages. By insisting that the author of the *Remarques* is different from that of the narrative, Sorel is able to put distance between his commentary and the work itself. This strengthens the potency of his explanations and judgments in the *Remarques*. Separating these two “authors” liberates him to more fully express his opinions about the texts in question in the diegesis, and about the way they are interpreted by Lysis and the other characters. In addition, identifying two separate “authors” allows Sorel to feign objectivity.

Nevertheless, Sorel’s evaluations of *Le Berger extravagant* are never negative. Sorel consistently praises his own work for the different ways it demonstrates good fiction. For

instance, as he critiques less-successful works, he simultaneously validates changes – almost always “improvements” – that have been made on those texts in the diegesis. Echo’s speech in works such as *Les Bergeries de Juliette* and the *Colloquia familiaria* is critiqued because of the lack of “*finesse*” in her dialog. Sorel lauds the representation of “Echo” in *Le Berger extravagant*, however, for her natural speech.

Je pense que Lysis à eu de meilleures rencontres que ce donneur de Grec & de Latin, & pour ce qui est des François, si l’on me remonstre qu’il luy estoit aisé de les surpasser, puisqu’il ne parloit pas en vers comme eux, je leur respondray qu’il n’y estoit obligé, & qu’il n’est pas besoin de se servir de la Poësie pour interroger un Echo. (*A-R, I, Rem. I, 40*)

In particular, Sorel approves of the way *Le Berger extravagant* refuses to adhere to a set of arbitrary rules that would constrain the representation of Echo’s responses. He is pleased with his text’s deviations from traditions he considers unnecessary.

In addition, Sorel approves of the manner in which Echo is represented in *Le Berger extravagant* because of the originality of her portrayal.

L’on void par tout que les Echos respondent, mais l’on n’en void point dans aucun livre qui interroge; au lieu que quand Lysis a dit, *Tu m’as assuré de mon bien par un propos assez frequent*, l’Echo luy demande, *quand?* Je n’estime pas peu cette rencontre, & puis celle-cy, de voir qu’à la fin l’Echo dit autre chose que les dernieres syllabes de Lysis, afin de le surprendre. C’est cela que je veux dire ne se void nulle part. Nous n’avons point veu aussi de Romans où il y eust un homme qui contrefist l’Echo, voila ce qui n’est pas commun. (*A-R, I, Rem. I, 141*)

Sorel is pleased with how he has unexpectedly reversed the roles of Echo and her interrogator.

At one point, “Echo” asks Lysis a question, rather than answering one, as she traditionally does, and repeats the last syllables of his last statement in order to do so. Sorel is also satisfied with Anselme’s artifice in posing as Echo, claiming that the character’s deception is unprecedented.

As Sorel praises *Le Berger extravagant* for its originality in representing other texts, he compares the work to others that do not measure up in the same way. When he describes the innovative nature of the Echo in *Le Berger extravagant*, for example, he contrasts it with the banality of the Echo in *Les Bergeries de Juliette*. “Or non seulement l’Echo de Lysis est meilleur que ceux que l’on a vus par le passé, mais il a aussi quelque chose de nouveau, qui ne se trouva jamais ailleurs” (*A-R, I, Rem. I, 138*). Sorel also explains the significance of his text’s originality by explaining why novelty is necessary in a work of fiction. “Ce n’est pas le tout que d’écrire tout ce qui nous vient en l’esprit, il faut que ce que l’on écrit soit nouveau, pour plaire entièrement, & pour nous acquérir une gloire parfait” (*A-R, I, Rem. I, 137*).

Sorel asserts the importance of novelty with two principal arguments. First, he explains that new material is necessary “*pour plaire entièrement*.” He describes how recycling the same themes and procedures creates ineffectual and dull fiction. Furthermore, he insists that the unexpected is what renders a work worthy of recognition.

L’on a beau mettre des Echos dans des livres, comme il y en a dans tous les Romans; l’invention en est vieille; outre cela ils ne valent rien tous. Si l’on en fait un meilleur que les autres, c’est beaucoup de vérité, mais si de surplus il y a dessous quelque invention cachée, laquelle ne soit pas commune, c’est ce qui la rend incomparable (*A-R, I, Rem. I, 138*)

Sorel does not claim that subject matter cannot be revisited, but he does insist that this material must be presented in a new way. This should include unexpected twists that Sorel describes as “*quelque invention cachée*.” He argues that challenging the reader’s expectations allows an author to create a text that is “*incomparable*” and ultimately proposes his own work as an example of just such a work.

Despite the constant praise leveled at *Le Berger extravagant* for its ingenuity, there remains a profound unease with the questions of imitation and invention that define fiction-making. In the *Remarques* of the 1633-34 *Anti-Roman*, after explaining that texts must contain “quelque invention cachée” Sorel immediately backtracks. “Je ne dy pas cecy afin que l’on en donne toute la louange à celuy qui a pris la peine de mettre son Histoire par escrit, car je pense qu’il n’y a rien inventé & qu’il n’a fait qu’escire les choses comme l’on les a rapportées” (*A-R, I, Rem. I, 138*).⁴⁶ Sorel appears to recognize the contradiction inherent in the way he judges other texts. He affirms that he has chosen the *roman* as the vehicle by which to critique other *romans*, and so evokes the *Remarques* to clearly distinguish his work from those he criticizes. The extensive metatextual *Remarques* not only make the text original and therefore superior to others, but also allow the author to consider difficult questions of imitation central to the developing genre. What’s more, they permit him to do so from a removed and privileged position, despite ambiguous commentary on the invention and imitation in his work.

Moreover, Sorel’s project to judge works of fiction, as described in the paratext, entails a judgment on the idea of fiction in general. Sorel confronts this question with a reluctance that has been observed by Fausta Garavini. She notes Sorel’s hesitance to judge fiction, especially in relationship to notions of truth or “reality,” and comments on the paradoxes and contradictions in *Le Berger extravagant* on the question of value of fiction.

Mais la principale qualité de l’œuvre est ailleurs. Avant tout dans le fait qu’entre maladie (littéraire) et thérapie la frontière est incertaine et continuellement franchie, sans pourtant que l’écrivain se prenne au piège de sa propre fiction et que son talent mimétique l’induisse à s’identifier et à se perdre avec son public dans la fantasmagorie

⁴⁶The corresponding passage in the 1627-28 text reads differently, since Sorel does not insist on the distinction between the two “authors” to the same degree in his first edition. “Je ne dy pas cecy afin que l’on m’en donne de la louange, je n’y ay rien inventé, & n’y fait qu’escire les choses comme l’on me les a raporteés” (*BE, III, Rem. I, 31*).

tourbillonnante des séquences qu'il construit; il fait plutôt la parodie de lui-même, pour s'y mirer ensuite avec satisfaction et observer malicieusement le lecteur, désorienté au contraire par les continuels changements de points de vue, par les brusques ajustements optiques, par la tension hypnotique qui l'attire dans un spectaculaire diorama d'images.⁴⁷

Although Sorel attempts to draw clear lines between his own text and others that he brands as common and inferior, *Le Berger extravagant* proves unable to present itself as the cure to “bad” fiction. This is because, as Garavini observes, Sorel’s text parodies even itself, reducing the divide between it and the texts it professes to correct. In the paratext, Sorel insists that *Le Berger extravagant* is not a pedestrian example of fiction, but rather a remedy for it. In practice, however, “*maladie*” and “*thérapie*” mix and combine, resulting in a disorienting work in which judgments are unclear and questions are left unanswered.

Like Garavini, Daniel Chouinard recognizes a dissolution of purpose in *Le Berger extravagant* that can be noted in relation to the *Remarques*. He notes the failure of the *Remarques* to function as Sorel indicates they should in the *Préface* and opening *Remarques*. He explains how this may be observed especially in the changes that occur from the 1627-28 edition of the work to that of 1633-34.

Et c'est dans cette tension corollaire entre l'élucidation et le développement paranarratif que se jouera la transformation du *B.e.* en *A.-R.* Même assujettie aux cadres qu'elle s'est imposée, l'expansion du métatexte devient telle que les « remarques » « non seulement servent quelquefois de commentaire & qu'elles expliquent les choses, mais aussi en quelques lieux elles disent ce qui n'eust pas mauvaise grace dans le texte, & qui a esté obmis tout expres, afin de poursuivre de fil des narrations sans y user d'une longueur trop ennuyeuse » (*BE, IV, Rem., VIII, 356*). La nature des *Remarques* évolue donc radicalement: elle se métamorphose en une espèce de supplément à la fiction, si bien qu'en 1633, les gloses « ne servent pas pour l'intelligence des choses obscures que pour dire des choses que l'on ne pouvoit pas mettre dans le fil de l'histoire » et « ne sont point

⁴⁷ Fausta Garavini, *La Maison des Jeux: Science du roman et roman de la science au XVIIe siècle*, 90.

icy des Annotations serviles » mais « plutôt des Additions à l'histoire, & des discours meslez ». (*A-R, I, Rem., I*, 101-2)⁴⁸

Chouinard suggests that Sorel's difficulty in explaining the function of the *Remarques* stems from the fact that part of his project is to attempt to define the text. From the 1627-28 to the 1633-34 edition, the lines between text and metatext grow increasingly faint. The narration itself becomes more self-conscious, more self-describing, more self-judging. The *Remarques* cease to function as commentary on a primary text, but rather become, as Chouinard writes, quoting Sorel, "*discours meslez*." In the place of final verdicts, there is a reluctance to pass judgment on fiction. This hints that the author understands that his text shares more qualities with the "common" works he targets for criticism than he readily admits.

In the second portion of this chapter, I examine the *Remarques* that accompany *Livre VIII*, in which the metatext becomes increasingly reminiscent of narrative. In doing so, I seek to further understand the tenuous relationship between text and metatext that marks *Le Berger extravagant* as unique work that nevertheless resembles and shares strong ties with others.

The *Remarques* of *Livre VIII*

The *Remarques* of *Livre VIII* are distinct from the *Remarques* accompanying other *livres* because they are particularly extensive. What's more, in contrast to the *Remarques* that follow *Livre I*, Sorel's commentary often deviates widely from the plot line of the diegesis and forays into discussions on related subjects that prove to be quite lengthy. The diegetic portion of *Livre VIII* contains a number of tales recounted by various characters, which may contribute to the rich narrative feel of the *Remarques* that accompany it. To some extent, these *Remarques* mirror the

⁴⁸ Daniel Chouinard, "L'Anti-Roman: Poétique d'une lecture, lecture d'une poétique," 142.

diegesis in that both portions of text contain long stories inserted into a larger setting, many of which are quoted in full. Sorel uses these tales to enrich the metatext in ways beyond those mentioned in the work's paratext. Like portions of the *Remarques* following *Livre I*, these *Remarques* also become self-sustaining text that is no longer simple commentary.

Of all books in *Le Berger extravagant*, *Livre VIII* is perhaps most similar to *Livre VII*, since both concern the lengthy stories that various characters recount to each other. In *Livre VII*, the gentlemen disguised as the *bergers* "Fontenay" and "Philiris" relate their "adventures." Subsequently, in *Livre VIII*, the characters Meliante and Polidor describe their so-called experiences. This is followed by a brief segment in which the pedantic Carmelin, who serves as Lysis's companion for most of the work, is persuaded to share a story of his own. Many of the *Remarques* accompanying the *livre* focus on the tales recounted by these characters.

In the *Remarques* of *Livre VIII* in the 1633-34 *Anti-Roman*, Sorel does not begin to discuss the narrative's source material until he comments on an observation Lysis makes in the diegesis. After listening to the tales of Fontenay and Philiris, Lysis yearns to be transformed ("*metamorphosé*") into Charite, the girl that he loves, herself. His friends respond that this already took place when Lysis disguised himself as a woman. In the *Remarques*, Sorel mentions this interchange only so that he can discuss the *Histoires des amans volages de ce temps*.⁴⁹ "Cette belle pensée que Lysis avoit de vouloir estre metamorphosé en Charite, & les assurances que l'on luy donne qu'il l'est déjà, n'ont rien de si estrange que l'on ne treuve quelque chose de semblable dans l'histoire des Amans Volages de ce temps" (*A-R, II, Rem. VIII*, 105).

⁴⁹ The text, authored by François de Rosset, first appeared in 1616 and was then augmented and republished in 1619 as *Les Histoires memorables et tragiques de nostre temps*. Interestingly, Rosset's collection of tales contains characters who share names with those in Sorel's *Anti-Roman*. There is, for instance, a Polydor and a Lysis. The latter experiences a "*mort pitoyable*" in *Histoire XXI*.

Sorel relates one tale from Rosset's text in detail. He recounts how a character named Valérie pretends not to be home to avoid visitors while the knight Cloridan, her lover, is away:

L'on void que Valerie pendant l'absence de son Cloridan, faisoit dire qu'elle n'estoit pas à la maison, à toutes les Dames qui la demandoient, pource qu'elle estoit où estoit son Amant (à ce que veut faire entendre l'Auteur) & que les personnes qui eussent pensé la venir visiter eusse visité Cloridan plutost qu'elle? N'est-ce pas là cette transformation dont parle nostre livre. Cette belle Dame estoit devenuë homme, & il faut croire aussi que son Chevalier avoit esté changé en fille. (*A-R, II, Rem. VIII, 105-6*)

As Sorel shares the tale, he addresses his audience as though he were an oral storyteller. For instance, he addresses his readers directly and asks them to consider various aspects of the story ("*n'est-ce pas là...*"). Sorel uses this kind of language to draw his audience in and to allow it to participate in the unfolding of the tale. The oral flavor of this passage is characteristic of the rest of the *Remarques* of *Livre VIII*. In the case of this text, Sorel seems less concerned with judging Rosset's text than exploring a second example of the sentiment Lysis expresses in the diegesis.

The conversational tone with which Sorel presents this tale reappears as he discusses a second text. In the diegesis, Carmelin is persuaded to recount a story concerning a man who asks for salt at a Witches' Sabbath. Sorel explains how Carmelin has altered the tale from its commonly accepted form. He recounts the original version that Carmelin has distorted. The tone Sorel employs strongly resembles the one he used when recounting the selection from Rosset's *Histoire des amans volages de ce temps*.

L'on dit que c'estoit un homme qui s'estant apperceu que sa femme n'estoit pas toujours aupres de luy la nuit, voulu sçavoir où elle alloit. Il l'espia une fois, & vid qu'apres s'estre greffée par tout, elle monta sur un balet, & s'envola par la cheminée. Il voulut esprouver la mesme chose, & s'estant frotté de la mesme greffe, il fut porté par l'air en semblable posture. (*A-R, II, Rem. VIII, 123*)

Sorel continues to relate the tale in this manner, telling how the man arrives at a dance where

there is no salt. Upon receiving some, the man thanks the Lord for it, which causes all the demons to disappear. Once he makes his way home, he has his wife burned on charges of witchcraft. The juxtaposition of plot elements in this telling is purposely disjointed, in order to intensify each event and pique the audience's curiosity about how the tale will finish.

Sorel uses specific formulas to relate the story. He opens his rendition with "L'on dit..." to indicate that the tale is known to a certain demographic. He then invites the audience to discover the story with him by relating the important points so as to elicit the strongest physical reaction possible. This is done by employing short, succinct sentence structures, for instance: "Sa femme n'estoit pas toujours aupres de luy la nuit..." and "Il [...] vid qu' [...] elle monta sur un balet, & s'envola par la cheminée." The abrupt end to the tale comes with the revelation that the man's wife is burned for witchcraft. This increases the directness of the story, and ends the tale on a dramatic note.

In the diegesis, the version recounted by Carmelin is very different. Carmelin is persuaded to tell the story by the country gentleman Hircan (who is pretending to be a magician) in order to play along with Lysis's fantasies. Carmelin, however, is not in on the joke and truly believes Hircan to be the character he portrays. Believing that Hircan is about to perform a magic spell, Carmelin sputters out: "permettez qu'auparavant je m'en aille en quelque lieu querir du sel" (*BE, II, VIII*, 316). The character then explains the reasoning behind his plea. He wished for salt because he recalls a story in which a man is able to banish demons by asking for some.

The differences between the version of the story recounted in the *Remarques* and that told by Carmelin in the diegesis are not restricted to mere details. Instead, comparing the two versions reveals alterations of main plot points that change the significance of the story.

Il me souvient que ma grand'tante m'entretenant un soir auprès du feu quand j'étois petit, me conta qu'un certain homme s'estant trouvé au sabat où l'on faisoit bonne chere, demanda du sel à ceux qui servoient, voyant qu'il n'y en avoit point, et que le festin sembloit imparfait; aussi sçavez vous bien que lors qu'a quelque maison la salliere manque entre autres choses necessaires au repas, l'on dit aux valets ou aux servantes qu'ils montent sur une eschelle pour voir ce qu'il faut sur la table. L'on aporta donc à cet homme une saliere pleine de mie de pain, à cause dequoy il se mit à crier, he! Mon dieu n'auray-je point de sel? Ce qu'estant fait toute l'assistance disparut. L'on connoist par là que les diables hayssent le sel, et qu'ils ne se tiennent point aux lieux où il y en a, ny là où l'on en parle. (*BE, II, VIII, 316*)

In Carmelin's version, the devils disappear because they can't stand salt, not because of the man's invocation of the Lord's name. Carmelin then concludes that it is impossible to know the devil, since, as another proverb goes, you have to eat salt with someone before you can get to know them. Carmelin arrives at his conclusion by associating related ideas taken from the various texts and proverbs he mixes as he shares the tale. While key points vary from this version of this tale to the one recounted by Sorel in the *Remarques*, the oral tone in which the story is related is somewhat similar. Carmelin's version, however, is rougher in style, punctuated with exclamations such as "*he!*" and longer sentences that link together ideas that Carmelin has collected from various sources.

The tale of the Witches' Sabbath therefore appears in two separate forms in the text and must be intended to be read twice, once in the diegesis and once in the metatext. The two versions of the story are very different thematically. The *Remarques*, however, synthesize the conclusions of both versions and lend a dose of humor as they explain how Carmelin has altered the tale. At the same time, as Sorel describes the various associations Carmelin has made, he invites the reader to examine and admire the character's reasoning. He describes Carmelin's version as a product of a certain way of thinking, and thus a suitable retelling of the story.

Cela n'est pas mal à propos de dire que l'on n'apporta à cet homme que du sel

contrefaict, & que l'assemblée diabolique oyant parler de Dieu & du sel en mesme temps, fut mise en suite comme recite Carmelin. Les Autheurs racontent cela d'une façon, & le peuple d'un autre. Or bien qu'il y ait beaucoup de verité à ce que Carmelin y adjouste, il le dit si naïvement que l'on ne peut l'ouyr sans rire. Il faloit bien qu'il eut ouy parler de la puissance que le sel exorcise contre les Diabes, & qu'il eust entendu lire la Demonomanie: car il rapporte des choses qui approchent fort de ce que l'on void dans ce livre. (*A-R, II, Rem. VIII, 123-4*)

Sorel ultimately credits both versions as valid. He distinguishes between “*les Autheurs*” and “*le peuple*,” and identifies them as two groups that should be expected to generate different versions of the story. He refuses to elevate one above the other since both are products of different yet valid forms of reasoning. As Sorel associates Carmelin with “*le peuple*,” he explains how the character has come to his conclusions. In order to further support Carmelin’s reasoning, the author points out that the character may have had in mind Jean Bodin’s *De la démonomanie des sorciers* (1593). The connections Carmelin makes between Bodin’s text and various proverbs is evident in the composite nature of his story.

After describing the sources of Carmelin’s tale, Sorel relates another story in which salt plays an important role. He recounts an episode from the Bible in which Lot’s wife is turned into a pillar of salt. Her transformation occurs because she looked back at the city of Sodom after God commanded her to leave it. This story from the Bible is mentioned as one of several others in which salt is an important element. Much as Carmelin has done in his tale, Sorel links various texts together through the association of related elements. This carries the discussion from one point to another and connects the texts as part of a larger picture, much as Carmelin does in his tale of the Witches’ Sabbath. The similarity between Carmelin’s and Sorel’s methodology is strengthened by the *Remarques* themselves. “Voila comme sur les discours d’un homme tel que Carmelin que l’on estime idiot, l’on peut avoir quelquefois de hautes considerations” (*A-R, II, Rem. VIII, 124*). In fact, Sorel essentially repeats the exercise of association made by Carmelin in

the text, demonstrating that Carmelin's reasoning may be considered a model of his own.

The third text Sorel discusses in the *Remarques* appears after his commentary on Carmelin's tale of the Witches' Sabbath. This third work is Nicholas de Montreulx's *Les Bergeries de Juliette*, a text Sorel also mentions in the *Remarques* of *Livre I*. As is the case of other fictions discussed in the *Remarques*, the pretense Sorel offers to explore this text is rather loose. The author justifies his discussion by evoking a comment made by Lysis. "Lysis veut obliger Amarylle à raconter son histoire, à cause qu'elle ressemble à la Nymphé Lucide, & qu'il croit que cela luy a fait courir diverses aventures, comme par exemple, il en est beaucoup arrivé à Lygdamon qui est un personnage de l'Astrée" (*A-R, II, Rem. VIII, 125*). Sorel then summarizes the story of Lygdamon from *L'Astrée*, but only in order to make the thematic link (the question of uncanny resemblance) he needs to segue into a retelling of part of *Les Bergeries de Juliette*.

Sorel then recounts the story of a woman named Catulle, whose lover, the chevalier Delio, leaves for a time. During this period, a man appears in the city whom its citizens mistakenly believe to be Delio. They send him to Catulle, and the two cultivate their relationship as though the stand-in were really Delio. It is later revealed that the man posing as her lover committed multiple crimes on his way to the town, and must, therefore, be hanged. Catulle's servant Catin explains to her that the false Delio can be saved if Catulle agrees to marry him. Catulle sends her servant to have the intruder released, upon which the condemned man promptly flees, freeing Catulle of any obligation to finalize the marriage.

Sorel then comments on this story, but the conclusions that he draws do not address the question of resemblances that justified the work's inclusion in the *Remarques* in the first place. Instead, the author discusses the questions of marriage raised by the text. In addition, he debates

whether or not it is possible for good children to come from a marriage between morally compromised parents. These deviations from the main subject are not unconsciously embarked upon; afterwards, Sorel acknowledges the direction the *Remarques* have taken: “Ce sujet meriteroit de plus longs discours; mais il est un peu separé du nostre, qui ne concerne que les ressemblances de visage pour lesquelles il est tout assuré qu’il y a d’estranges aventures dans les Romans, tellement que nous en avons assez parlé” (*A-R, II, Rem. VIII, 129*).

Sorel defends the retelling of this episode from *Les Bergeries de Juliette* by explaining how it is representative of the “*estranges aventures*” of *romans*. He insists that such “*aventures*” merit appearance in *Le Berger extravagant*. Importantly, Sorel chooses to focus on the “*estrange*” nature of this episode from *Les Bergeries de Juliette* and does not critique or judge it.⁵⁰ Instead, he shares his own perspective on the work, detailing a second way that Catulle might have freed the false Delio.⁵¹ By including the tale as a second example of a “*estrange aventure*” and also offering an alternate resolution for the story, Sorel is far from judging these works. Rather, he becomes a kind of co-writer with Montreulx, interested in the same themes found in the other text.

The absence of extensive judgment during Sorel’s discussion of *Les Bergeries de Juliette* further emphasizes the way the *Remarques* contribute to larger dialogs and expand subjects of

⁵⁰While Sorel generally abstains from judgment and critique during the discussion of this episode from *Les Bergeries de Juliette*, he does express disappointment that the work did not include a reference to the source that must have inspired it. “Elle [Catulle] fit sa requeste [de faire délivrer celui qui prétend être Delio] aux Juges, qui bien que fâchez luy delivrent le criminel, lequel à ce dit le livre ne fit pas comme le Picard qui estant prest à estre pendu, & voyant qu’une boiteuse le demandoit pour mary, dit au bourreau, *attaque, attaque, elle cloque*. Il a falu que l’Auteur ait mis là ce beau conte, sur lequel il est à croire qu’il avoit formé le sien, & je pense qu’il ne s’en pouvoit desdire” (*A-R, II, Rem., VIII, 127*).

⁵¹ Sorel points out that Catulle did not offer to go and have the pretended Delio released herself, because then she would have to admit that she was a prostitute. Generally, Sorel explains, prostitutes were allowed to have condemned criminals pardoned so that they could marry and thus be removed from their “*vice*.”

interest to the author. Here, Sorel uses *Les Bergeries de Juliette* to carry the discussion from one point to another. The trajectory of the discussion is intentional, as Sorel makes particular mention of it. As he finishes his discussion of *Les Bergeries de Juliette*, Sorel admits that the topics of discussion inspired by this text are different from those that spurred its inclusion. He acknowledges that the deviations the text has allowed him to take have led him to a subject “*un peu separé du notre*” (*A-R, II, Rem. VIII*, 129). His commentary was initially inspired by questions of recognition and deception, but Montreux’s text allows him to turn the discussion toward questions of parenthood and progeny. This, in turn, deviates to an anecdote on Roman practices of colonization. Through his purposeful tangents, Sorel thus becomes another of the storytellers like those featured in *Livre VII* and *VIII*, broadening the discussion through intellectual detours that forge connections between texts.

Furthermore, these deviations allow Sorel to include the kinds of “*estranges aventures*” the author finds to be strong points of *Les Bergeries de Juliette* within his own text. Retelling fiction that does not need correction multiplies the experiences of “good” fiction showcased by *Le Berger extravagant*. By transforming a source once and sometimes twice in the work, Sorel facilitates the reader’s exposure to a wide array of texts and the ideas contained in them. Embarking on unforeseen deviations allows him to share and further expound on these ideas, enriching the experience offered by his work.

One of the most striking aspects of the *Remarques* of *Livre VIII* is the two full-length tales Sorel inserts into his discussion. Instead of summarizing them, the author reproduces them and places them in their entirety in the text of the *Remarques*. Like other works that he

comments on in this portion of the chapter, these tales' link to events in the diegesis is not initially obvious. Rather, their inclusion stems from a small portion of the character Philiris' dialog. He speaks poetically to Lysis, who has been enjoying the telling of stories so much that he does not wish to return to the house to sleep.

Berger, dit Philiris, voyez qu'il n'y a plus moyen de partir; il est trop tard. La nuit voulant tenir son empire à son tour a fait venir une armée de nuages espais qui font fuir la lumiere. Les grands vents qui soufflent maintenant semblent les chasser comme s'ils estoient des Sergens de bande. Le Dieu du Sommeil avec sa compagnie de Songes, tient l'arriere garde, & n'estant armé que de pavots, il espere neantmoins de vaincre tout le monde. (*A-R, II, VIII, 97*)

Rather than comment on the event that is taking place (Philiris's attempt to convince Lysis to come inside), Sorel chooses to focus on the poetic significance of Philiris's words by describing similar allegories that appear in lesser-known texts.

La description que Philiris fait de la nuit est à la mode de certains Romans qui ne sont pas communs. Il veut faire des personnages des nuës, & des vents, & leur donner les qualitez, des gens de guerre. S'il avoit le loisir il descriroit le combat qu'ils ont contre la lumiere, & il imiteroit en cela, un petit Roman que j'ay veu du combat des saisons. (*A-R, II, Rem. VIII, 140*)

Sorel then incorporates a portion of this "*Roman*" into the *Remarques*.

The allegory concerns war that the personified seasons *Printemps*, *Esté*, and *Automne* wage against their common enemy *Hyver*. *Esté* in particular, believes that *Hyver* robs the other seasons of their respective beauties and must, therefore, be defeated. The tale features Roman divinities such as Vulcan and Phoebus who come to the aide of the seasons in the ensuing battle. The story is lengthy and employs the same oral storytelling style that characterizes other fictions discussed in this chapter. At its conclusion, Sorel discusses it, noting its strong points as well as ways in which he has modified the original text for inclusion in the *Remarques*.

Sorel's commentary on this tale is more critical in nature than that which accompanies *Les Bergeries de Juliette*. His criticism focuses most heavily on his struggle to sort it out from its source and to make sense of it. Sorel cites the superfluous versification and clutter that he encountered in the original version, as well as the lack of logic he finds in several places. For instance, he expresses dissatisfaction that each season battles *Hyver* out of the order in which they arrive in the course of a year. What's more, the author does not understand why the various gods that assist the seasons only remain active for limited periods of time

Sorel reveals that in recounting the allegory, he has taken certain liberties with the original text and attempted to remedy some of its failings. "Cette invention de combat me plaist assez: mais elle n'est pas ainsi dans son lieu, où il y a beaucoup de choses sur lesquelles il ne faut pas jeter les jeux; car il y a force vers, & force Anagrammes qui ne sont point du sujet" (*A-R, II, Rem. VIII*, 145). The author explains how he has removed superfluous poetry to make the story more enjoyable and easier to read. Nevertheless, Sorel reiterates the value of the original source, praising it for its overall strengths and effectiveness.

Sorel's commentary on the tale is brief, and is quickly followed by another text. This second work is offered as additional discussion of the concept of war introduced with the tale of the seasons. Sorel explains that the origin of this new text is a manuscript.

Mais si l'on ne se contente pas de cet exemple, je m'en vay en donner encore un qui est pris d'un manuscript que l'on m'a mis entre les mains avec plusieurs autres pour bastir cet Anti-Roman. L'on y void la guerre des jours gras contre les jours maigres. Pource que je ne scaurois rien retrancher ny adjouster à ce que l'on y a mis, je ne rapporteroy pas ce discours à ma fantaisie comme la guerre des Saisons. Le voicy tout entier. (*A-R, II, Rem. VIII*, 145)

Sorel makes a distinction between the sources of the allegory of the seasons and that of the second tale. The first was told "à [la] fantaisie" of the author, with certain modifications made

in order to increase its clarity and impact. The second story, on the other hand, appears in the *Remarques* of both the 1627-28 and 1633-34 texts transcribed verbatim. Sorel employs quotation marks to demonstrate the lack of alteration from its original source.

Because Sorel insists that nothing has been changed in the tale that is to follow, he appears, from a critical perspective, to favor this second tale over the first. And indeed, the introduction to the tale indicates the author's profound approval for the text. In fact, Sorel admits that he would be unable to improve upon the tale if he wanted to. (*"Je ne scaurois rien retrancher ny adjouster"* [*A-R, II, Rem. VIII, 153*]). This statement predicts the nature of the commentary that will follow the recounting of this story; the text will likely be used not to demonstrate poor technique, but rather to amplify the discussion of the subject at hand.

The tale Sorel quotes describes the exploits of *les jours gras* that combat *les jours maigres*. The story is a fable that explains the origin of *Carnaval* and *Carême* observed during the seventeenth century. Following the quoted material, Sorel provides a commentary on it that is, as predicted, very positive. Only one small matter is raised, concerning the opinion of certain days of the week for or against the campaigns of *les jours gras*: "Il est vray que l'Auteur pouvoit dire aussi qu'auparavant ils avoient esté neutres" (*A-R, II, Rem. VIII, 153*). However, the bulk of the discussion focuses on the ingenuity of the tale: "Voila une fable ingenieuse où l'on remarque une suite telle qu'elle doit estre" (*A-R, II, Rem. VIII, 153*).

Sorel's treatment of this text is unique, even among works that are reviewed positively elsewhere in the *Remarques*. This is because the author's commentary accompanying this tale closely resembles the way he discusses his own writing. When he comments on *Le Berger extravagant*, Sorel is unequivocally positive, with ample praise for the actions and words of the

characters as they invent or modify the works of others to improve them. Anselme, for example, is praised in the *Remarques* of *Livre I* for the ingenious way in which he handles the unfolding of the Echo episode. The commentary accompanying the tale of *les jours gras* in the *Remarques* of *Livre VIII* is delivered in much the same tone.

Comparing Sorel's commentary on the tale of *Les Jours gras* with his discussions of *Le Berger extravagant* reveals other similarities. One of the most noticeable, for example, is the author's use of the word "*si*" to illustrate a situation. Below is a sample of the commentary that follows the tale of the war of *Les Jours gras*:

Si les jours gras commencerent d'estre aimez à la Sainct Martin, c'est à cause des desbauches qui se font en ce temps là, & si les jours maigres envoyèrent des garrisons un peu après dedans les Cloistres, c'est que le Caresme commence dès les Advents de Noël aux Monasteres. Que si les jours gras s'emparent du Samedy, c'est que depuis Noël jusqu'à la Chandeleur l'on mange de la chair ce jour là. (*A-R, II, Rem. VIII, 153*)

In this short example, the word "*si*" is used three times as Sorel identifies correlations and then explains in a demonstrative manner.

Sorel uses the word in a similar fashion in the *Remarques* when he explains the actions or thoughts of one of his characters in the diegesis. For example, in *Livre VIII*, Carmelin shares his experience working for the *menuisier* Taupin, and relates an experience in which Taupin has his portrait painted as a gentlemen. When the first layer of the painting is removed, it is revealed that the artist painted the man as a cuckold. Sorel's commentary on this episode makes similar use of the word "*si*" in order to explain and justify the actions and thoughts of Taupin. "Si Taupin fit faire des habits plus grands qu'il ne luy en falloît, l'on ne peut pas bien dire s'il se comparoit en cela à Alexandre Roy de Macedoine, qui se fit faire des armes d'enorme grandeur, ou bien si c'estoit une raillerie des Lyonnois, ou si Carmelin mesme l'invente" (*A-R, II, Rem. VIII, 132*).

Similarly, after the tale concludes in the diegesis, Clarimond refers to another text in a way that might not be expected. This is explained in the *Remarques* using this same “*si*”: “S’il [Clarimond] appelle icy le livre d’Heliodore l’histoire Æthiopienne, encore que les Traducteurs l’appellent Æthiopique, c’est pource que l’on dit un Æthiopien & une Æthiopienne, & qu’Æthiopique n’est qu’un mot corrompu du Latin” (*A-R, II, Rem. VIII, 137*). Additional examples can be found throughout the *Remarques*.

Another parallel exists in the way Sorel describes the origin of the tale of *Les Jours gras* as “*un manuscript que l’on m’a mis entre les mains*.” This is significant since this is precisely the way in which the source of *L’Anti-Roman* is described in the 1633-34 edition. In the *Au Lecteur* portion of the work, Sorel explains:

Il y a plus de huict ans que cette Histoire me fut communiquée par un personnage que j’honore de toute mon affection lequel m’incita à la remettre par ordre. Il y avoit deslors en son cabinet quantité d’autres manuscripts sur differens sujets, dont il avoit dicté quelques uns, & il avoit laissé faire les autres à quelques personnes à qui il en avoit donné l’invention ou les memoires; Cettui-cy estoit de ceux où plusieurs mains avoient touché, mais par l’instruction que je reçus, il me fut aisé de mettre de l’égalité par tout. (*A-R, II, Au Lecteur, 7-8*)

Sorel thus claims that both texts originate from manuscripts that have made their way into his possession. This link between the two works further equalizes them: both are worthy of positive commentary, and both are significant as representations of successful fiction.

The way Sorel deals with the story of *Les Jours gras* is further evidence of contamination between text and metatext that occurs in the *Remarques*. Examining the texts discussed and integrated into the *Remarques* of *Livre VIII* reveals that the *Remarques* do indeed judge other works of fiction, as described in the paratext. Nevertheless, they also introduce other works that have little to do with Lysis’s adventures in order to divert the course of the discussion. These

works alter the trajectory of the commentary and give the *Remarques* the potential to act as text in their own right. Additionally, they increase the breadth of the text by increasing the amount of successful fiction and providing extensive intellectual discussions on varied interrelated subjects. Sorel is then able to repeat the exercise of the diegesis in the *Remarques*; he introduces other texts, possibly masquerading as an external source, in order to create a work with an expansive as well as qualitative metatext.

Conclusions

In both of these *livres* of *Le Berger extravagant*, the relationship between text and metatext has proved to be complex and ambiguous, with text often taking on characteristics of metatext as characters elaborate on a theme through textual exploration. Conversely, Sorel's *Remarques* often demonstrate a capacity for treating other works in much the same way as the diegesis does. Furthermore, the patterns of association demonstrated by characters are revealed to be characteristic of Sorel as the writer of the *Remarques*. As similar processes are used in text and metatext to expand discussion, the line between the diegesis and the *Remarques* is repeatedly blurred.

It is therefore difficult to divide *Le Berger extravagant* into two clear and separate parts that may be labeled text and metatext due to a breakdown in the distinction between other, "common" works of fiction and Sorel's text. By including other works in the *Remarques* for expansion, *Le Berger extravagant* increasingly resembles these texts that the author singles out as inferior to his own. Additionally, contradictions as to the origin of certain parts of *Le Berger extravagant* (for example, whether they are taken directly from other works, or whether they

have been altered before appearing in *Le Berger extravagant*) reflect the difficulty Sorel has effectively classifying the work as a purely imitated text, as he claims in the *Préface*. These struggles reflect the paradoxes inherent in an *histoire comique* like *Le Berger extravagant* that relies on *vraisemblance* to resolve certain problems of fiction.

In his eighteenth-century treatise *Réflexions critiques sur la poésie et sur la peinture* (1719), Abbé Jean-Baptiste Dubos identifies the paradoxes inherent in *vraisemblable* fiction. “D’un côté, les hommes ne sont point touchés par les événements, qui cessent d’être vraisemblables, parce qu’ils sont trop merveilleux. D’un autre côté, des événements, si vraisemblables, qu’ils cessent d’être merveilleux, ne les rendent guère attentifs.”⁵² In *Le Berger extravagant*, even in the metatextual portions of his work, Sorel proves unwilling to surrender the “*merveilleux*” of fiction for a work that is purely critical. Instead, he borrows, or imitates “*merveilleux*” from the other works that he places in the text and metatext. By identifying other texts as sources, Sorel is able to preserve the *vraisemblance* he champions and still create an entertaining, often humorous text. Thus, in *Livre I*, the mythological figure Echo is able to appear through the imitation of Ovid and other authors. Yet the *vraisemblance* is preserved when the work deviates from the cited source and Sorel reveals that it is Anselme who, in fact, provides the voice.

The author’s ambiguous attitude toward imitation and invention revealed in the *Remarques* is indicative of the way *Le Berger extravagant* confronts the paradoxes posed by the burgeoning novelistic tradition. In *The Dialogic Imagination*, Mikhail Bakhtin describes texts

⁵² Jean-Baptiste Dubos, *Réflexions critiques sur la poésie et sur la peinture* (Paris: Jean Mariette, 1719) 81.

like *Le Berger extravagant* in terms of their progressiveness and the way they examine the novel as a genre.

They [texts like *Le Berger extravagant*] become more free and flexible, their language renews itself by incorporating extraliterary heteroglossia and the “novelistic” layers of literary language, they become dialogized, permeated with laughter, irony, humor, elements of self-parody, and finally – this is the most important thing – the novel inserts into these other genres an indeterminacy, a certain semantic openendedness, a living contact with unfinished, still-evolving contemporary reality [...] all these phenomena are explained by the transposition of other genres into this new and peculiar zone for structuring artistic models [...] a zone that was first appropriated by the novel.⁵³

In other words, Bakhtin proposes that the same tendency toward critique found in *Le Berger extravagant* is characteristic of the novel as a whole, a particular kind of text he explains has the power to examine itself as a continuously evolving object. “The novel is the only developing genre and therefore it reflects more deeply, more essentially, more sensitively and rapidly, reality itself in the process of its unfolding. Only that which is itself developing can comprehend development as a process.”⁵⁴

Although Bakhtin describes the novel in general, these features in fact correspond very well to various aspects of Sorel’s *anti-roman* discussed in this dissertation. Certainly *Le Berger extravagant* is parodic in that it incorporates hypotexts into its pages in order to “expose the conventionality” of various examples of the literature the author claims to despise. Furthermore, Sorel reformulates these texts, distorting them rather than imitating them closely, bringing out specific facets for the reader’s closer examination. The work is also critical much as Bakhtin explains that the novel is. The work’s *Préface*, for example, is a place where Sorel communicates his goals to the reader, goals which center around his intention to critique other texts.

⁵³ Mikhail Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*. Ed. Michael Holquist. (University of Texas Press, 1981) 7.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 7.

Furthermore, the *Remarques* that follow each *livre* purport to offer contemplative introspection not only about the work's hypotexts, but about the nature of *Le Berger extravagant* itself.

Many scholars have recognized Charles Sorel's work as a positive contribution to the evolution of a genre. Maurice Lever is among the first to reinterpret *Le Berger extravagant* as a combination of imaginative fiction and critical commentary not necessarily delineated by the separation between diegesis and *Remarques*. Similarly, Martine Debaisieux observes the juxtapositions of narrative and metanarrative as manifestations of the experimentalist fiction-making that permeates the work.⁵⁵ Likewise, Leonard Hinds suggests the paradigm of ambivalence, represented by the figure of the *tombeau des romans* used by Sorel, as a way to understand the progressive nature of *Le Berger extravagant*. "Instead, could he [Sorel] be using the tomb as a metaphor for a productive enterprise that questions and transforms convention by monumentalizing and celebrating a selection of previous literary sources while rejecting others?"⁵⁶

The inherently deceptive character of the work may render it impossible to determine the purpose for which Sorel penned it, yet the mixing of text and metatext, fiction and critique reveal the author's struggle with the core principles of fiction-making. In the first chapter of this dissertation, I examined the work's paratext and observed the way Sorel tends to describe his text as a superior, judgmental work. His goals may be qualified as principally reactive in nature, since Sorel proposes himself as an arbiter of works and indeed of whole genres already in existence.

⁵⁵ See Martine Debaisieux, "Le tombeau des romans": de *Francion* au *Berger extravagant*," 169-70.

⁵⁶ Leonard Hinds, *Narrative Transformations from L'Astrée to Le Berger extravagant*, 138.

He makes negligible mention of the practices of experimentation and the development of a new kind of fiction noted by scholars of Sorel.

In his later works, Sorel quantifies *Le Berger extravagant* according to its critical aspects, not its evolutionary ones. In *La Bibliothèque française*, Sorel writes: “Pour le berger extravagant, c’est un roman complet qui est une satire contre les romans et contre quelques ouvrages poétiques.”⁵⁷ Likewise, in *De la connoissance des bons livres*, he explains: “On doit avoir quelque obligation au Livre de l’Anti-Roman qui contient l’Histoire d’un Berger extravagant, lequel n’a de l’extravagance que pour se moquer de celle de ces autres Bergers et de tous les personnages de nos romans.”⁵⁸

At the same time, however, the *Remarques* of the two *livres* examined in this chapter reveal a strong delectation for discussion, deviation, and the resulting amplification of text. From one perspective, the large amount of metatextual commentary on both Sorel’s own text and others may be viewed as evidence of the author’s experimentation with the mechanics of fiction-making, mechanics that he claims *Le Berger extravagant* exists to critique. Consequentially, it becomes nearly impossible to situate the work on an axis of pro-activity and reactivity. Sorel’s text is neither totally reactive nor is it completely radical in the sense that it professes the intention to revolutionize the way fiction is written. Rather, it is ambivalent, vacillating between imitation and improvisation, mixing fiction and commentary in both the text and metatext, and pairing passages of critique and judgment with experimentations on how fiction may help find meaning and truth and forge connections between interrelated ideas.

⁵⁷ Charles Sorel, *La Bibliothèque française*, 177.

⁵⁸ Charles Sorel, *De la connoissance des bons livres*, 101.

In the next two chapters of this dissertation, I examine the representation of two essential works in the text and metatext of *Le Berger extravagant*. In chapter four, I study the role of *Don Quixote* while chapter five centers principally on Sorel's interpretation of disguise heavily influenced by *L'Astrée*. In both chapters I consider the way in which these two texts become further manifestations of Sorel's ambivalence as I look at the impact that these two monumental works have on the narrative and commentary of *Le Berger extravagant*. In these studies, I intend to shed further light on the complicated relationship between text and metatext that both distinguishes the work and yet simultaneously connects it to others.

Chapter Four

Transformation of *Don Quixote* in *Le Berger extravagant*

Charles Sorel's *Le Berger extravagant* shares many characteristics with Miguel de Cervantes' *Don Quixote*. On a superficial level, both works feature a main character deranged by the over-reading of fiction and plagued by what Michel Foucault calls "*la folie par identification romanesque*." This character departs on a series of comical adventures, accompanied by a simple, yet sometimes insightful companion. Additionally, he is surrounded by other characters who alternately attempt to cure him of his madness and take advantage of it. In the end, he is disabused of the errors of his ways and renounces the folly of his prior actions. On a more profound level, the character becomes a vehicle by which the author comments on other texts, including *romans* and poetry.

Other similarities are evident in the finer details of the works. In both texts, Don Quixote and Lysis are very conscious of their appearances and take care that they are wearing the right attire and bear the proper names. Lysis, for instance, insists upon wearing the *berger's* costume, while the knight-errant takes care to dress his horse and person appropriately for his imagined station. In addition, Lysis and Don Quixote both change their names to more pastoral or knightly epithets.¹ Both characters also anticipate that their adventures will be written down. Don Quixote expects an account of his exploits to join those of Amadís de Gaula, and Lysis constantly searches for the one worthy of putting down his adventures in writing (*BE, II, XII, 451*).

The two works are tied even more closely together by the occupation that the two characters share at various points – shepherdry. In *Don Quixote*, the main character gains a new

¹ Lysis changes his name from Louys, and Don Quixote alters his from Alonso Quixano.

interest in the second part of the work. Having been condemned to abandon knight-errantry for a year, Don Quixote tells his friends that he wishes to become a shepherd. For Lysis, pretending to be a *berger* is the central focus of his adventures. Lysis and Don Quixote express similar motivations for retreating to the pastures. Both have a desire for the privacy of the countryside² where they will have the freedom to pursue their chosen vocations.³ Furthermore, both characters make extensive plans for their friends to join them in the fields, neither intending to become shepherds alone.⁴

In this chapter, I investigate the treatment of *Don Quixote*, one of the most influential works of European literature of the seventeenth century, in *Le Berger extravagant*. Since the two texts share many characteristics both superficial and more profoundly structural, I attempt to answer the question: “In what way does the scope of *Le Berger extravagant* differ from that of *Don Quixote*?” I do not focus on the extent to which the Spanish text influenced the French one, but rather seek to understand the differences between the works and what they may reveal about *Le Berger extravagant*’s ambiguous relationship between text and metatext. Specifically, I examine the resolution of Don Quixote’s madness and the nature of his “conversion,” and then compare it with Lysis’s *délire* and the way he is “cured.” By studying the conclusions of both

² Don Quixote explains to his companions that becoming a shepherd will allow him to “entretenese en la soledad de los campos, donde arrienda suelta podia dar vado a sus amoroso pensamientos” (Miguel de Cervantes, *Don Quixote de la Mancha, segunda parte*. [Madrid: Juan de la Cuesta, 1615], LXXIII, 565. Biblioteca Digital Hispánica. Biblioteca Nacional de España. Web). (“enjoy the solitude of the fields, where he would give full scope to his amorous sentiments” [Miguel de Servantes Saavedra, *The History of and Adventures of the Renowned Don Quixote*. Trans. T. Smollett. London: W. Longman, 1786) IV, 351].)

³ In *Livre I*, Lysis explains to Anselme the reasons why he has decided to become a shepherd. These include the opportunity to act “sans qu’un oeil envieux les regarde” (*BE, I, I*, 10-13).

⁴ In addition to Sancho Pança, who has already agreed to accompany him, Don Quixote invites additional “shepherds” and promises to provide them the flocks they will need. Similarly, Lysis attempts to gather around him others interested in pursuing a pastoral lifestyle. Besides the invitations he extends to his gentlemen friends (Anselme, Clarimond, etc.), Lysis also sends a letter to Paris, encouraging its poets to come to the fields and become shepherds to better practice their art (*BE, I, VI*, 874-5).

works, I intend to shed further light on the attitudes Sorel exhibits toward other *romans* and poetry in general. I am also interested in the evolution of the end of *Le Berger extravagant* from the 1627-28 edition to that of 1633-34, and investigate how increased references to Lysis's *extravagance* – that is, his apparent belief that he is a character from a work of fiction – further distinguish Sorel's text from the Spanish work it resembles in many other ways.

In this chapter, I focus on the moment of reform in both works because the way the madness or pretended madness of each character is resolved reveals much about the particular techniques each author uses to imitate and transform other texts. As I study the final passages of each work, I focus on the conditions by which the characters are brought to see the errors of their ways, their eventual fate, as well as the impact of their *extravagant* adventures in each text. Finally, I consider in greater depth the question of madness versus playacting, and investigate the hints as to Don Quixote's and Lysis's consciousness of their own extravagant behavior.

Don Quixote in Le Berger extravagant

In *Le Berger extravagant*, Charles Sorel introduces, discusses, and passes judgment on an extensive number of texts. Besides the works imitated by Lysis and the other characters in the diegesis, the *Remarques* are full of examples in which Sorel references other texts in order to elaborate on various points that interest him. The many parallels between *Le Berger extravagant* and *Don Quixote* make the Spanish work one of the most important of those to find their way into Sorel's *anti-roman*. But beyond the obvious ties it bears to *Le Berger extravagant*, *Don Quixote* is a significant hypotext because of its impressive cultural and literary history.

Don Quixote was first published in 1605, in an era when Spanish novels were very popular in France. In particular, late sixteenth-century affinities for picaresque novels such as *La vida de Lazarillo de Tormes y de sus fortunas y adversidades* (1554), pastoral novels, especially Montemayor's *Diana* (1559), and chivalric novels such as *Amadís de Gaula* (1508) prepared the cultural atmosphere in France for the advent of *Don Quixote* in the early seventeenth century.⁵ As early as 1611, translations of the Spanish text began to appear across Europe. The work was first introduced in France when César Oudin, a French hispanist, published his translation of the Spanish work as *L'Ingenieux Don Quixote de la Manche* in 1614.⁶ The second part of *Don Quixote* appeared in Spain in 1615 and was soon after translated into French by François de Rosset in 1618. Additional translations of both parts would continue to be published in France throughout the century and beyond.

Esther Crooks notes that of all of the countries to translate Cervantes' *Don Quixote*, France led Europe in the number of editions published.⁷ She writes that the sheer quantity of translations is evidence of the particular interest the work garnered there.⁸ She recognizes the significance the text has on seventeenth-century French theater⁹ and *roman*, making special

⁵ See Esther J. Crooks, *The Influence of Cervantes in France in the Seventeenth Century* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1931) 12-3.

⁶ Miguel de Cervantes, *L'Ingenieux don Quixote de la Manche*. Trans. César Oudin. (Paris: Jean Foüet, 1614. *Google Books*. Web.).

⁷ Esther J. Crooks, *The Influence of Cervantes in France in the Seventeenth Century*, 20.

⁸ "It is evident, therefore, that the French by their editions of Cervantes' works in Spanish and French made their countrymen familiar with the master novelist, influenced them to imitate him, and furnished models for the translation of his works into other languages" (Ibid., 23).

⁹ Crooks discusses *Don Quixote's* influence on works such as C.A. Seigneur de C... 's *L'Heureux désespéré* (1613) and Nicholas Chrestien's *Les Amantes ou la grande pastorelle* (1613), for example (Ibid., 80).

mention of its influence on the *histoire comique* and Sorel's writing.¹⁰ Rachel Schmidt proposes that it is *Don Quixote*'s themes that may have made it so interesting to translators and writers of the early seventeenth century: "*Don Quixote de la Mancha* is a great novel about art, about the way it creates – and deforms – societies and persons."¹¹ In particular, she notes the Spanish text's focus on problems of representation, a concern expressed in many works of the early seventeenth century, including Sorel's *Le Berger extravagant*. Indeed, both *Don Quixote* and *Le Berger extravagant* deal with the limits of verisimilitude, exploring how it may work as a "function of authenticity" with "the power to place the reader in the physical and temporal setting of the literary protagonist."¹² Esther Crooks notes passages from *La Bibliothèque française* in which Sorel describes *Don Quixote* as "naïve" and "entertaining"¹³ to illustrate the author's interest in and awareness of the Spanish work.

The scholarly tradition of determining whether or not *Le Berger extravagant* is merely a reproduction of *Don Quixote* can be traced as far back as the late nineteenth century. In *La Vie et les oeuvres de Charles Sorel*, for example, Émile Roy writes that *Le Berger extravagant* is an inferior imitation of Cervantes' masterpiece: "Au lieu du noble Hidalgo de la Manche [...] on verra un petit bourgeois parisien essayer [...] de mener la vie pastorale [...] Ce n'est plus un livre à hautes visées [...] mais un récit rustique et familier."¹⁴ Roy's opinion of *Le Berger extravagant* is far from flattering, since it refuses to consider the complexities of Sorel's work,

¹⁰ Crooks makes particular mention of its influence on *Le Berger extravagant* (Ibid., 67).

¹¹ Rachel Schmidt, *Forms of Modernity: Don Quixote and Modern Theories of the Novel* (University of Toronto Press, 2011) 3.

¹² Ibid., 4.

¹³ Esther J. Crooks, *The Influence of Cervantes in France in the Seventeenth Century*, 64.

¹⁴ Emile Roy, *La Vie et les œuvres de Charles Sorel*, 120.

yet it is nevertheless more generous than that expressed by Maurice Bardon in *Don Quichotte en France au XVIIe et au XVIIIe siècle* (1931). Bardon declares *Don Quixote* the superior text based on the mood and outcome of each work.

Ce qui frappe tout de suite à la lecture du *Berger*, c'est la similitude de dessein entre Sorel et Cervantes. [...] Cervantes, et la chose est évidente, a voulu d'abord tourner en ridicule les aventures chevaleresques; et son héros n'est à l'origine qu'un personnage parodique. Pourtant Cervantes, s'intéressant peu à peu à sa victime, a fini par l'aimer. [...] L'auteur français, au contraire, n'a toujours voulu que rendre une manie, railler une mode. [...] Il n'y a donc pas lieu de s'étonner qu'à une intention purement négative corresponde un résultat purement négatif. [...] Inférieur à Cervantes, dont il se souvient sans l'égaler, pour la conception générale de l'œuvre et l'étude psychologique des personnages, Sorel demeure encore bien au-dessous de lui pour l'art du style et la qualité de la plaisanterie.¹⁵

Bardon's judgment is founded upon the premise that one of Sorel's primary goals is to replicate Cervantes' work. He therefore understands the differences between the two works as Sorel's failure to properly do so. Bardon also takes issue with the manner in which Lysis is treated in *Le Berger extravagant*, interpreting Sorel's text as being little more than the entertaining adventures of a mad character. Roy and Bardon see the works as two attempts to accomplish the same goal and therefore surmise that one must be better than the other.

More recent studies shy away from labeling one text superior to the other, yet still investigate the question of how much Cervantes's text influenced Sorel's. A general tendency in these studies is to conclude that *Le Berger extravagant* is a reaction to the earlier work. Leonard Hinds, for example, describes Lysis's role as a direct response to *Don Quixote*'s. "In all truth, Lysis *feigns* the role of the pastoral *Don Quixote*, because based on his care to master his own

¹⁵ Maurice Bardon, *Don Quichotte en France au XVIIe et au XVIIIe siècle* (1931. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1974) 108, 134-135.

text, we know that he is conscious of the artificial nature of literary convention.”¹⁶ In Leonard Hinds’s estimation, Lysis’s role corresponds to Don Quixote’s and is a kind of commentary on it. In my dissertation I do not investigate the degree to which *Don Quixote* influenced *Le Berger extravagant*, but nevertheless recognize that the multiple parallels between the works indicate that similar purposes may be behind Cervantes’s and Sorel’s texts.

Despite the analogous characteristics that may be observed in the two works, references to *Don Quixote* are relatively rare in *Le Berger extravagant*. In the *Remarques* of *Livre XIV* and the *Conclusion* of *L’Anti-Roman*, Sorel addresses the question of the Spanish work’s influence and explicitly states that *Don Quixote* has minimally impacted the content and direction of *Le Berger extravagant*.¹⁷

Il ne faut pas oublier que quelques uns disent que ce livre n’est qu’une imitation de Dom Quixote de la Manche, & que Fontenay reproche aussi à Lysis qu’il a quelque chose de l’humeur de ce Chevalier errant: mais excepté que ces deux hommes sont tous deux fous, l’on n’y trouve point d’autre conformité. (*BE, Rem. XIV*, 780; *A-R, II, Conclusion*, 1097)

The author recognizes that his work resembles *Don Quixote* but denies that it had any role in the formulation of his own text. He goes on to admit that he has read *Don Quixote*, but stresses that it was only once, long ago, and claims to scarcely even remember its contents. “Il est vray que je ne nie pas que je n’aye eu connoissance du Dom Quixote, mail il y avoit douze ans entier que je ne l’avois leu quand j’ay fait cecy, & quand je fy cette premiere lecture je n’estois pas en un aage capable d’y remarquer beaucoup de choses” (*BE, Rem. XIV*, 780-1). Sorel’s discussion has a

¹⁶ Leonard Hinds, *Narrative Transformation from L’Astrée to Le Berger extravagant*, 33.

¹⁷ Esther J. Crooks conducts a study in which she considers passages from *Le Berger extravagant* in tandem with scenes from Cervantes’s *Gitanilla*. She finds remarkable parallels between the two texts and concludes that Sorel has attempted to imitate this other text by Cervantes. “Sorel, in truth, shows good judgment in varying the motif and in introducing local color, but his taste and skill are far inferior to those of Cervantes” (*The Influence of Cervantes in France in the Seventeenth Century*, 65-7).

strong comparative element and centers on the limitations and failings of the Spanish text. By focusing on the errors in *Don Quixote*, which the author finds very extensive, he accentuates the differences between the two works in an attempt to prove that his text is not an “*imitation*.”

When *Don Quixote* is mentioned elsewhere in *Le Berger extravagant*, it is with a sense of reluctance. The author seems eager to suppress any connection the reader will certainly make between the two works. When references to the Spanish text are unavoidable, Sorel is careful to assert the superiority of *Le Berger extravagant* over Cervantes’s text. In one episode from *Livre IV*, for example, “Fontenay,” a gentleman friend of Oronte and Hircan, comes to the country and pretends to be a shepherd to indulge Lysis. He observes the pretend *berger* and comments on the similarity of his behavior to that of Don Quixote. Fontenay makes the heretofore unspoken link between Lysis and Don Quixote explicit.

Ma foy nostre maistre (dit Fontenay, qui ne pouvoit rien celer de ce qu’il pensoit) je pense que vous estes le successeur de Dom Quixote De La Manche, & que vous avez herité de sa folie. Apres avoir esté Chevalier errant, il voulut estre Berger, mais il mourut sur ce dessein, & je croy que vous voulez estre Berger au lieu de luy, & que vous l’imitez en vos extravagances. (*BE, I, IV, 609*)

Fontenay’s statement is another indication of Sorel’s awareness that his text resembles *Don Quixote*. As Fontenay compares Lysis to the knight-errant and his decision to take up shepherding, he suggests that the young man is playing the pastoral role Don Quixote is unable to assume because of his death. Lysis’s indignant response seems to be another opportunity for the author to respond to the obvious connections between *Le Berger extravagant* and *Don Quixote*.

Vous avez menty, s’escria Lysis, je ne fay rien que de mon invention propre, je n’imitay jamais celuy que vous dites, & si j’ay leu son histoire, ce n’a esté qu’en passant. C’estoit un fou, qui s’imaginoit qu’il estoit l’Amant de Dulcinee, sans jamais l’avoir veuë, au lieu

que j'ay cét avantage d'entretenir tous les jours Charite. Il n'entendoit rien à chercher la souveraine felicité. Ce n'est point dans les armes qu'elle se rencontre: on n'y reçoit que de la peine, et l'esprit y devient brutal; c'est à garder les troupeaux qu'il y a du profit & du contentement. (*BE, I, IV, 609-10*)

In another episode in *Livre XIV*, the question of *Don Quixote's* influence on Lysis's behavior is once again raised as part of Clarimond's efforts to dissuade the *berger* from playing shepherd. In this passage, Clarimond makes reference to Fontenay's previous observation and comments on the comparative value of each character's adventures. Again, Clarimond's dialog, as it is one of so few passages to directly address the question of influence, may potentially be interpreted as authorial commentary.

Souvenez vous des reproches que vous fit un jour Fontenay, quand il vous compara à Dom Quixote, il y en aura beaucoup qui croiront que vous l'imitiez, & quand vos aventures seroient plus belles que les siennes, ils trouveroient tousjours que ce seroit de plus grandes preuves de vostre folie. (*BE, III, XIV, 211-2*)

Clarimond uses the word "*reproches*" to describe Fontenay's remarks, indicating that he was, in fact, making an unflattering comparison.¹⁸ Clarimond acknowledges the ties between the two texts but makes it clear that Lysis's adventures are superior both in scope and technique to those that may be found in *Don Quixote*, describing them as: "*plus belles que les siennes*" [i.e. than Don Quixote's]. Although Clarimond disapproves of Lysis's behavior, he insists that Lysis's exploits are better than those of Don Quixote.

These few direct mentions of *Don Quixote* are the only ones that are made in *Le Berger extravagant*.¹⁹ Sorel's reticence to acknowledge the value of Cervantes's text or its influence on

¹⁸ "Espece d'injure qu'on fait à quelqu'un, en luy representant en face ses défauts" (Furetière, *Dictionnaire universel*, Non-paginated).

¹⁹ Beyond these references, there are a few additional passages that mention knight-errantry in general. These are perhaps vague nods to the Spanish text:

his work reemerges, however, during his discussion of it in *La Bibliothèque françoise*. There, the author compares the difficulty of writing *Don Quixote* to that of drafting *Le Berger extravagant*. “Il était plus difficile de faire trouver des aventures agréables pour un berger [...] que pour un chevalier errant, comme Don Quichotte.”²⁰ By claiming that the Spanish text would have been far easier to construct, Sorel elevates the status of his work over Cervantes’s.

Despite the strong attitude of denial Sorel exhibits toward *Don Quixote* and the emphasis he puts on the differences between the two works, the influence of the Spanish text on *Le Berger extravagant* was recognized at the time of its writing and has additionally been well-documented by modern scholars. Partially for this reason, the question of influence is not the central focus of my study. Rather, I focus on the implications of Sorel’s hesitation to acknowledge this influence and try to understand his negative descriptions of the Spanish text. I intend to identify the differences that Sorel insists separate the two works, especially those related to the way the main characters imitate other texts. Ultimately, I hope to understand how the parallels between the two works in their final scenes may reveal general tendencies in the way Sorel transforms other texts in his *anti-roman*.

The Resolution of *Don Quixote*

-
- a. *IV*, 179 Feeling shepherds should have the same privileges, Lysis takes the liberty of naming animals and objects just as the knight-errants do in their stories (all the time thinking that the stories of knight-errantry are a bit mad.)
 - b. *VI*, 240 A mention of knight-errants who decide to take up the shepherd’s crook after abandoning their arms.
 - c. *X*, 376-7 A mention of rustics dressed as knight-errants that go off to have adventures.

²⁰ Charles Sorel, *La Bibliothèque françoise*, 59.

The last scenes of *Don Quixote* begin when the title character falls suddenly ill and loses consciousness. After he wakes from a deep sleep, Don Quixote reports the intervention of Providence, expresses his remorse at his behavior, and renounces his adventures as a knight-errant. Shortly afterwards, the character succumbs to death, frustrating his prior plans to turn to shepherdry. All of this happens in the space of two chapters that are characterized by a sense of haste and abruptness.

The timeline that culminates in Don Quixote's death is short, yet includes four significant events: his sickness, his deep sleep, his reform, and his death. In the penultimate chapter, the housekeeper delivers a lengthy tirade when she learns that Don Quixote has decided to become a shepherd. Don Quixote then "find[s him]self somewhat out of order" and asks to be put to bed. At this point, there is no indication that the character's illness will result in his death. As Chapter LXXIV opens, however, Don Quixote's demise is foreshadowed by the narrator's musings about death: "Como las cosas humanas no sean eternas, yendo siempre en declinación de sus principios, hasta llegar a su ultimo fin, especialmente las vidas de los hombres, y como la de don Quixote no tuviese privilegio del cielo para detener el curso de su fuya."²¹ ("As nothing human is eternal, but every sublunary object, especially the life of man, is always declining from its origin to its decay; and Don Quixote had no particular privilege from heaven exempting him from the common fate."²²)

In the remaining portion of the chapter, Don Quixote is seized with fever, falls into a sleep that lasts six hours, and wakes to deliver a speech in which he recounts how Providence has

²¹ Miguel de Cervantes, *Don Quixote de la Mancha, segunda parte* (Madrid: Juan de la Cuesta, 1615) LXXIII, 567. Biblioteca Digital Hispánica. *Biblioteca Nacional de España*. Web.

²² Miguel de Servantes Saavedra, *The History of and Adventures of the Renowned Don Quixote*. Trans. T. Smollett. IV, 354.

intervened and banished his delusions. “Bendito sea el poderoso Dios, quien tanto bien me ha hecho.” (“Blessed be the Almighty [...] for this great benefit He has vouchsafed to do me!”) Don Quixote explains that he has experienced a kind of conversion, stating: “yo tengo juyzio ya libre, y claro, sin la sombras caliginosas de la ignorancia, que sobre el me pusieron mi amagra y continua a leyenda de los detestables libros de la Cavallerias ya conozco sus disparates, y sus embelecos[.]”²³ (“I now enjoy my judgment undisturbed, and cleared from those dark shadows of ignorance, in which my understanding hath been involved, by the pernicious and incessant reading of those detestable books of chivalry. I am now sensible of the falsity and folly they contain[.]”²⁴) Immediately afterwards, Don Quixote passes away.

To add to the striking nature of this conclusion, Don Quixote’s dramatic changes of opinion are not brought about by any kind of argumentation or by events that convince him of his error. Instead, his conversion is abrupt, caused by the unseen but reported intervention of Providence.²⁵ Don Quixote’s role in his reformation is therefore passive, as he expresses no desire to change prior to the events of the conclusion. Indeed, there is only evidence to the contrary: until the moment of his illness, Don Quixote rejects other characters who fail to “see” the stories that he plays out. During the last scene of the work, however, Don Quixote expresses gratitude for the revelation Providence has given him of his madness.²⁶ *Don Quixote* thus concludes *deus ex machina*, making the character’s confession unexpected and unsettling.

²³ Miguel de Cervantes, *Don Quixote de la Mancha, segunda parte*, LXXIII, 568.

²⁴ Miguel de Servantes Saavedra, *The History and Adventures of the Renowned Don Quixote*. Trans. T. Smollett. IV, 356.

²⁵ The pivotal function of Providence makes Don Quixote’s renunciation of his belief in his adventures analogous to a religious conversion. The character is completely changed and rejects his prior behavior like a repentant sinner.

²⁶ Certain scholars, including Howard Mancing, recognize hints of an impending “conversion” in the narrative. (See Howard Mancing, *Don Quixote: A Reference Guide* [Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2006]). Nevertheless, there is

Don Quixote's conversion is followed quickly by his death, which further complicates its implications. This sequence of events has attracted the attention of various scholars of *Don Quixote*, some of which identify the character's death as puzzlingly superfluous. A. G. Lo Ré, for example, remarks that "Don Quixote's miraculous recovery of mind should be accompanied by a recovery of body, one might think."²⁷ Lo Ré argues that Don Quixote's death seems odd given the enthusiasm with which he denounces the works of fiction that inspired his foolish behavior. Lo Ré proposes that in order to validate and solidify the conversion, it would be more logical to allow the character time to live and demonstrate reformed behavior.

Lo Ré therefore attempts to resolve the ending of *Don Quixote* by considering the character's initial transformation and the process by which Alonso Quixano "becomes" Don Quixote. He ultimately proposes that Don Quixote may be understood as a character with two distinct identities.

As Don Quixote becomes Alonso Quixano el Bueno, he can be made to reject the detestable books of chivalry; he can be made to accept as error his having believed in the existence of knights errant; he can be made to repent of this supposed error; however, *he obviously cannot physically separate himself from his other self who is dying of fever caused by melancholy*. The contrite Alonso Quixano, having been allowed to take upon himself the sins of his other self, Don Quixote, therefore dies—I repeat, not by divine ordination, for the author is behind his death—but *because of Don Quixote's "tristezas" and "melancolías"*. Each self takes a part in the death of our character: Don Quixote provides the physical reason for the actual, dignified death while Alonso Quixano allows for deserved spiritual salvation.²⁸

no overt evidence that the adventures recounted in the previous chapters would not resume if Don Quixote were to recover. None of the characters expect Don Quixote to alter his behavior: the housekeeper's tirade suggests that she fully expects a continuation of the knight-errant's extravagant behavior.

²⁷ A. G. Lo Ré, "The Three Deaths of Don Quixote: Comments in Favor of the Romantic Critical Approach," *Cervantes: Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America*. Vol. 9 No. 2 (1989), 23.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 23.

Lo Ré's constant use of the verb "become" to explain Don Quixote's change of mind and confession suggests that the character changes significantly enough that he may be conceptualized as two separate entities. And if Alonso Quixano "becomes" Don Quixote at the beginning of the work, so at the end would he once more be restored to his previous identity.

In separating Don Quixote into two distinct parts Lo Ré is able to suggest that the character, in fact, neither converts nor reforms. Instead, Don Quixote's confession represents the "return" of the sane Alonso Quixano. One manifestation of the character replaces the other; instead of change, there is exchange. Seen from this angle, the mad Don Quixote does not reform at all but instead perishes because he is deprived of his adventures and the illusions he clung to throughout the work. The restoration of Alonso Quixano destroys the deceptions and therefore, the character that created them.

At the same time, however, Lo Ré's proposition has implications for the way the author deals with Don Quixote's adventures at the end of the work. If Alonso Quixano replaces Don Quixote in the novel's final scenes, then it is not Don Quixote who renounces the deceptive power of fiction, but rather the enduringly sane Alonso Quixano. In this case, "Don Quixote" has already been exchanged for "Alonso Quixano" before renunciation or repentance. The integrity of "Don Quixote's" extravagance is therefore left intact when the uninteresting and thus irrelevant "Alonso Quixano" is eliminated with his death.

Edward H. Friedman uses much the same constructs as Lo Ré to understand the perplexing death of Don Quixote. He also writes of the title character using two separate epithets to distinguish between their differing attitudes and values. Friedman strongly argues that the text

endorses Don Quixote and not Alonso Quixano because of the character's death that follows his reform.

Without a doubt, Don Quixote is superior to Alonso Quixano, yet, it may be argued, not so much by force of character but because the book is about him. That the madman is more entertaining than his sane counterpart is hardly surprising. [...] the treatment of disillusionment suggests a wish to humanize the overtly literary character [Don Quixote], in a sense to bring him back into the domain of Alonso Quixano.²⁹

Friedman's statements that "the book is about [Don Quixote]" and that "the madman is more entertaining than his sane counterpart" hint at the value of the main character's adventures that is solely due to their entertaining nature. The book seems to be about the mad Don Quixote and his adventures rather than the sane Alonso Quixano and his contrition.

The conclusion of *Don Quixote* provides a kind of anamorphostic experience, since it presents two different levels of fictional representation. On one level are Don Quixote's adventures that are "mad" imitations of episodes the character has read about. These fantastical backdrops, which exist only so long as Don Quixote acts out his fantasies upon them, collapse in the conclusion to give way to what ultimately functions as a second, much more "realistic" frame-story. This verisimilar frame-story is inhabited by the other characters that are conscious of Don Quixote's madness. Don Quixote's confession represents the juxtaposition and confrontation of both of these.

Ultimately, the use of the frame-story challenges the idea that Don Quixote's adventures are merely entertaining pieces of comedy. This frame-story operates according to a differing set

²⁹ Edward H. Friedman, "Executing the Will: The End of the Road in *Don Quixote*," *Indiana Journal of Hispanic Literature*. Vol. 5 (Fall 1994), 107.

of rules than those that govern of the rest of the novel; while Don Quixote plays out his adventures in an imagined world of fantasy and madness apparent only to him, the frame-story focuses on the moralistic and religious connotations of the character's actions, externalized from the knight-errant's frame of reference. The conclusion then challenges the humor of Don Quixote's adventures, shifting the tone of the work from comical to serious and edifying. As the "real" world returns, the character's entertaining adventures are subjected to the qualification of their potential to instruct. The comedy they generate is swallowed in Don Quixote's "conversion" which is replete with religious overtones.

Martine Debaisieux describes the episode in *Le Berger extravagant*, mentioned in the previous chapter, in which Carmelin relates the tale of the double-layered portrait. She describes the metamorphosis of the portrait that occurs when the *menuisier* presents it to his friends. After he scrubs it with a cloth, as he was directed, the image of the man as a gentleman disappears, revealing the painting of the man as a cuckolded peasant. Debaisieux points out the effect of these opposite representations that are superimposed on each other.³⁰ In Carmelin's tale, both the image of the cuckold revealed by the *menuisier's* scrubbing and the initial image of the gentleman are equally deceptive. Similarly, in *Don Quixote*, both levels are equally fictional. However, the implosion of Don Quixote's fictional delusions in the conclusion disguises the fact that the frame-story is equally fictional. This serves to emphasize the moral implications of the finale and to accentuate the principles that are meant to transfer to the reader's own life.

Another of the critical questions raised by the conclusion is the extent to which Don Quixote's madness is feigned or whether his eccentric behavior is intentional. Some clues may

³⁰ Martine Debaisieux, "Représentation et anamorphose : *Histoire comique de Francion*," *Papers on French Seventeenth Century Literature*. Vol. 14 No. 27 (1987), 590-1. See also Martine Debaisieux, *Le Procès du roman: écriture et contrefaçon chez Charles Sorel*, 12-13.

be found in the way he initially takes on his fictional identity. As Don Quixote becomes a knight-errant, he does his best to become one as fully as possible. He renames, for example, not only himself, but the other characters around him.³¹ Gérard Genette's description of the *délire* of characters in an *antiroman* focuses on the way these characters imitate others.

L'imitation consciente et (presque) lucide, procédé dominant de *Pharsamon*, déjà présent chez Cervantes, où don Quichotte, par exemple, ne *se croit* pas dès l'abord chevalier, mais cherche à *le devenir*, et ne se tient pour tel qu'une fois adoubé par un aubergiste qu'il prend pour un châtelain: et *simule* volontairement la folie dans la Sierra Morena, non parce qu'il se prend pour Amadis, mais simplement pour faire comme lui; et l'on sait combien ambiguë est sa relation à Dulcinée, qu'il se garde bien de « reconnaître », malgré les incitations de Sancho, dans la première pécore venue.³²

According to Genette, Don Quixote's transformation is lucid and conscious. Whether or not the character truly believes he is a knight-errant is irrelevant. What matters are his constant efforts to simulate as closely as possible the desired identity.

As demonstrated in several episodes throughout the text, Don Quixote is often unable to recognize his own madness. As he imitates the behavior of characters from chivalric romances, he does so unaware of how his actions differ from those of the other characters around him. Because he cannot identify that his behavior is "madness," Don Quixote engages in activities that threaten his health and life, as well as those of the other characters. In Chapter LII of Part I, for example, Don Quixote encounters a goatherd who calls him mad. Despite the offhand manner in which this comment is made, Don Quixote swiftly flies into a rage and attacks him in an attempt to defend his honor. His actions nearly get him killed.

³¹ For example, he christens Aldonza Lorenzo, a peasant woman who lives nearby, Dulcinea del Toboso, and names himself her champion.

³² Gérard Genette, *Palimpsestes: la littérature au second degré*, 170.

Soys un grandissimo vellaco, dixo a esta fazon don Quixote: y vos soys el vazio, y el menguado, que yo estoy mas lleno que jamás lo estuvo la muy hideputa, puta que so pario, y diciendo, y hablando arrebatò de un pan que junto a si tenia, y dio con el al cabrero en todo el rostro, con tanta furia que le remacho las narizes: mas el cabrero que no sabia de burlas, viendo con quantas veras le maltrataban, sin tener respeto a la alhombra, ni a los manteles, ni a totos aquellos que comiendo estañan, saltò sobre don Quixote, y asiéndole del cuello con entrambas manos, no dudara de ahogalle, si Sancho Pança no llegara en aquel punto.³³

(“You are a most impudent rascal! (cried the knight, overhearing what he said.) it is your skull that is unfurnished and unsound; but mine is more pregnant than the abominable whore that brought you forth.” So saying, he snatched up a loaf, and flung it at the goatherd with such fury that he leveled his nose with his face. Eugenio, who did not understand raillery, finding himself maltreated in earnest, without any respect for the carpet, table-cloth or company, leaped upon the knight, laying hold of his collar, with both hands, would certainly have strangled him, if Sancho Panza had not at that instance sprung to his master’s assistance.³⁴)

Many of his exploits demonstrate an inability to see how his adventures are incongruous with the conditions of the “real” world where he plays them out. His imitations of book characters obstruct his capacity to interact appropriately with the non-fantastical world of which he is also a part.

The question of Don Quixote’s madness is considered throughout the text in passages that anticipate the conclusion. In the final chapters, it is implied, the reasons behind Don Quixote’s behavior will be revealed. The portions of text that foreshadow Don Quixote’s reform and death, however, often turn out to be misleading. Near the end of the first part,³⁵ for example,

³³ Miguel de Cervantes, *Il ingenioso hidalgo don Quixote de la Mancha* (Madrid: Juan de la Cuesta, 1605) LII, 641. *Bibliotheca Digital Hispánica*. Biblioteca Nacional de España. Web.

³⁴ ³⁴ Miguel de Servantes Saavedra, *The History and Adventures of the Renowned Don Quixote*. Trans. T. Smollett. II, 327.

³⁵ Many scholars believe that the second part of *Don Quixote* was Cervantes’s reaction to a rival’s publication of a sequel to his work. Furious at this infringement upon his material, Cervantes, who had been working on a second part, rather abruptly finished and published it. See Howard Mancing, *Cervantes’ Don Quixote: A Reference Guide*, 16.

the injured Don Quixote is brought home to the care of his family. The narrator suggests that the character will eventually die a scorned madman and emphasizes the character's unrepentant nature,³⁶ even going so far as to include a preview of the mocking burlesque epitaphs that will appear on Don Quixote's tomb. Later, in Chapter XXIV of Part II, there is another mention of the character's later death, but this time with the anticipation of an eventual reform.³⁷ The narrator implies that the character will confess to pretending to believe in his own exploits so that they will better mirror those in the books he has read.³⁸

The notion that Don Quixote will admit to playacting coincides with Genette's description of characters in an *antiroman*. Genette describes characters whose *délire* consists of consciously acting so as to imitate others as closely as possible. In the second part of *Don Quixote*, the narrator describes the character's renunciation of his madness in these same terms. However, as the work comes abruptly to a close, Don Quixote does not admit to being conscious of his madness. Instead, he talks about the ensorcelling power of the texts that have produced his

³⁶ See A. G. Lo Ré, "The Three Deaths of Don Quixote: Comments in Favor of the Romantic Critical Approach," 25.

³⁷ The narrator explains that the "author" of Don Quixote's adventures, Cide Hamete, wrote in the margins of this chapter that "No me puedo dar a entender, ni me puedo persuadir, que al valeroso don Quixote le passasse punralmente todo lo que en el antecedente capitulo queda escrito [...] y si esta aventura parece apócrifa, yo no tengo la culpa, y asi sin afimarla por falsa, o verdadera la escribo. Tu letor, puseseres prudente juzga lo que te pareciere, que yo no devo, ni puedo mas, puesto que se tiene por cierto, que al tiempo de su fin y muerte dizen que se retrato della, y dixo, que el la avia inventado por parecerle que convenia, y quadrava bien con las aventuras que avia leydo en sus historias, y luego profigue diziendo" (Miguel de Cervantes, *Don Quixote de la Mancha, segunda parte*, XXVIII, 196). ("I cannot conceive or persuade myself that the valiant Don Quixote literally saw and heard all that is recounted in the foregoing chapter [...] but, after all, should the adventures seem apocryphal, the blame cannot be laid to my door, and therefore I give it to the public without affirming it either to be true or false. Reader, if thou hast discernment, thou mayest judge for thyself; for it is neither my duty, nor is it in my power to do more: though it is held for certain, that the knight, on his death-bed, retracted the whole, saying he had invented the story because it seemed to agree and quadrate with these adventures he had read in his books" [Miguel de Servantes Saavedra, *The History and Adventures of the Renowned Don Quixote*. Trans. T. Smollett. II, 208].)

³⁸ "Cervantes evidently had in mind here an ending in which Don Quixote would admit to *play-acting* in this and perhaps in other instances. There are places in the novel where one can infer this is happening. Don Quixote's death, however it may have been next planned to come about, would then take place" (A. G. Lo Ré, "The Three Deaths of Don Quixote: Comments in Favor of the Romantic Critical Approach," 26).

“folly.”³⁹ He describes how the grace of God has allowed him to escape his madness and perceive the truth. Don Quixote’s wonder at his new-found awareness seems to indicate that his prior madness was, in fact, unconscious.

The conclusion is therefore contradictory because it presents the relatively straightforward conversion of the title character yet simultaneously complicates the reform by its abruptness. The complete change that occurs in Don Quixote is off-putting because of the lack of continuity between it and the rest of the novel, requiring somewhat complex constructs, such as Lo Ré and Friedman’s two-part character, to make sense of it. In the next part of this chapter, as I study the nature of the conclusion in *Le Berger extravagant*, I hope to understand how the process by which Lysis reforms, and the differences between his change of heart and Don Quixote’s, reveal more about the particular way Sorel’s text comments on others.

The Resolution of *Le Berger extravagant*

The conclusion of *Le Berger extravagant* mirrors the last chapters of *Don Quixote* in many ways. The final scenes in both works are concerned with the title character’s change in behavior and attitude towards the works of fiction he imitated. Much like Don Quixote’s, Lysis’s reform is accompanied by a dialog of regret for his previous actions. However, in *Le Berger extravagant*, the progression toward resolution is much lengthier a process. Lysis’s reform is

³⁹ “Ya so enemigo de Amadis de Gaula, y de toda la infinita caterva de su linaje, ya me son odiosas todas las historias profanas del andante Cavalleria: Ya conozco mi necedad, y el peligro en que me pusieron, averlas leydo: ya por misericordia de Dios escarmentando en cabeça propia las abomino” (Miguel de Cervantes, *Don Quixote de la Mancha, segunda parte*, LXXIII, 569). (“I am now an enemy to Amadis de Gaul, and the whole infinite tribe of his descendants: now, are all the profane stories of knight errantry odious to my reflection: now I am sensible of my own madness, and the danger into which I have been precipitated by reading such absurdities, which I, from dear-bought experience, abominate and abhor” [Miguel de Servantes Saavedra, *The History and Adventures of the Renowned Don Quixote*. Trans. T. Smollett *Don Quixote*. VI, 356].)

brought about principally through extensive argumentation intended to convince him not only of the folly of his actions, but also, it would seem, the reader as well.

As the final book in the work opens, a hermit attempts to convince Lysis that his belief in the reality of fiction is heretical. When his argumentation is unsuccessful, Clarimond takes his turn at convincing Lysis of the error of his ways. Like the hermit, he first accuses Lysis of heresy which causes the *berger* to admit that he understands that the gods that appear in poetry do not actually exist. Then, Clarimond endeavors to convince Lysis that transformations of people into objects are impossible and exposes the ruses that Hircan, Anselme, and Oronte employed to encourage Lysis in his belief in his adventures. Lysis is sorry for his actions and runs to his room in tears. Clarimond follows, insists that Lysis wanted to be fooled, and then explains the finer details of the tricks the gentlemen used to cultivate and take advantage of Lysis's madness.

At length, Lysis begins to be convinced. He appears at dinner, abashed, but no longer in his *berger* costume. At the meal, he is offered a marriage to Charite if he will abandon his fantasies. It is at this point that Lysis delivers his puzzling confession: he claims to have known all along that the metamorphoses and adventures he pretended were happening were not real. Lysis then spends several days under the tutelage of Clarimond who instructs him daily with the aim of completing his reform. When Lysis is reintroduced to friends, his manner has changed. He seems melancholy, but he and Charite are married and live together in Brie. Lysis's love of reading keeps Clarimond in constant fear of a relapse, so the gentleman assigns himself the task of constantly monitoring Lysis's behavior. The work then ends on an ambiguous note: Lysis's reform does not seem to be permanent when the narrator hints at the possibility of further adventures.

Lysis's change of attitude is a slow process that contrasts starkly with the suddenness of Don Quixote's reform. Don Quixote's conversion takes place unexpectedly while the character sleeps. Lysis, on the other hand, changes slowly, due principally to Clarimond's urging that he change his behavior. In fact, the path to Lysis's reformation begins as early as *Livre XIII*, in which a debate is held over the utility and dangers of fiction. The arguments Clarimond contributes as a key voice in that argument lay the groundwork for the more direct discourses he levels at Lysis in the final *livre*.

Significantly, Clarimond's dialog in attempting to convince Lysis is not one-sided. Rather, Lysis interacts with Clarimond throughout the chapter, responding to each point Clarimond makes. He poses questions and even argues with Clarimond, refusing to easily abandon his point of view. Lysis is therefore not passive like Don Quixote in his acceptance of Clarimond's ideas. His back-and-forth arguments with Clarimond echo the debate of *Livre XIII*, in which each side has an opportunity to state his point of view. Clarimond's claims against fiction in the penultimate *livre* certainly set up Lysis's consequential reform and are accompanied by Philiris's defense of it. In *Livre XIV*, Lysis comes to gradually accept Clarimond's views that he rejected in *Livre XIII*. The *Remarques* explain that Clarimond is successful in convincing Lysis to change because of his skill in using fictional examples to demonstrate the hazards of fiction (*BE, IV, Rem., XIV, 747*).

Lysis's conversion is therefore much more transparent than that of Don Quixote which is essentially implicit with no progression and no explanation. Don Quixote is mad at one moment and sane the next. In *Le Berger extravagant*, however, there is an extensive dialog that leads to Lysis's realization of the error of his ways. The character's thought processes are written into the

text, allowing the reader to constantly monitor the state of his evolving attitudes and to understand the reasoning behind his change of heart.

Other characters make further revelations to Lysis throughout the course of the final *livre*, including his grounded cousin Adrian, the country gentlemen Hircan, Anselme, and Oronte. These revelations become the basis for additional authorial discussion in the *Remarques*. In the diegesis, Hircan explains that he was never a magician and Philiris reveals his duplicity in pretending to be a shepherd like Lysis (*A-R, II, XIV*, 1015-6). Then, Clarimond explains the textual influences of the adventures acted out in various episodes, denuding their sources and inspirations (*A-R, II, XVI*, 1020). Then, in the *Remarques*, Sorel considers these conversations at length (*A-R, II, Rem., XIV*, 1069-70).

Sorel's discussion of Lysis's reform in the *Remarques* is particular because it repeats commentary already made in the diegesis. At one point in *Livre XIV*, Clarimond tries to convince Lysis to give up playacting by using examples from various works of fiction. In the *Remarques*, Sorel lauds Clarimond's argumentation. "C'est une grande subtilité de luy [Lysis] amener des autoritez prises de ses auteurs. C'est le moyen de le rendre sage par les maximes de la folle; car s'il est si fou de croire tout ce que disent les Romans, il faut qu'il adjouste foy à ce que Clarimond luy en cite" (*A-R, II, Rem., XIV*, 1070). However, this observation has already been made almost word for word in the diegesis: "Cette subtilité de Clarimond fut fort grande. Il vouloit ramener Lysis à la raison par l'autorité de ces anciens auteurs, & le rendre sage par les maximes de sa folie" (*A-R, II, XIV*, 1033-4). Clarimond's "*subtilité*" is thus discussed twice using nearly the same expressions. This repetition amplifies the commentary on Lysis's reform, first making it clear that authorial discussion on these events closely revisits important events of the final *livre*, and second, that this commentary is important enough to appear more than once.

Lysis's eventual fate is handled very differently from that of Don Quixote. In contrast to the knight-errant, whose reform is followed by death, the future trajectory of Lysis's life is a part of the work's resolution, and it begins with his marriage to Charite. A second aspect of his life after his conversion is Clarimond's involvement in Lysis's continued rehabilitation. The character carefully monitors Lysis's reading material and behavior in general⁴⁰ because he is concerned that Lysis could revert to his former, undesired behavior. In fact, it is this capacity for relapse that provides one of the strongest contrasts between *Le Berger extravagant* and *Don Quixote*.

The unstable nature of Lysis's reform is intensified by the narrator's hint that the character may have additional adventures after the conclusion of the work. "Je ne veux pas dire qu'il ne luy soit arrivé des aventures assez plaisantes depuis son mariage, mais ses amis particuliers en ont esté les seuls tesmoins" (*A-R, II, XIV*, 1050). While the word "*aventures*" used in this passage could be interpreted in many ways, the modifier "*plaisantes*" seems to indicate that the narrator is referring to the kind of extravagant exploits entertained by Lysis throughout *Le Berger extravagant*. Lysis's personality and affinity for *aventures* remain even after his reform. Unlike in *Don Quixote*, descriptions of Lysis's behavior in the final *livre* of *Le Berger extravagant* are consistent with his actions prior to his conversion. The conclusion thus has little shock value and seems reasonable, especially given Clarimond's extensive efforts to relieve Lysis of his delusions.

⁴⁰ In *Livre XIV*, the narrator describes the dedication Clarimond must exercise to keep Lysis from reverting to his former attitudes. "Clarimond ne voulant pas qu'il fust jamais superstitieux ny extravagant, luy osta toutes ces fantaisies dès qu'il eut appris qu'il n'en estoit possédé" (*A-R, II, XIV*, 1049).

In *Don Quixote*, there is a strong difference of tone between the portions of text that contain the title character's exploits and the passages that describe his reform and follow it. In *Le Berger extravagant*, however, the gradual nature of Lysis's reform eliminates the need to understand the text using a frame-story construct. The consistency of Lysis's mindset before and after he changes his behavior avoids the jarring transition that occurs in *Don Quixote*. In particular, the lengthy dialogs between Lysis and Clarimond facilitate the reader's reentry into the text that follows the *livres* concerned with Lysis's delusions.

In *Don Quixote*, the frame-story structure is in place to provide perspective on the main characters' adventures and to qualify them in terms of their didactic value. The conclusion of Sorel's work, on the other hand, is uninformed by the interpretive slant of a frame-story. While the *Préface* describes the author's aims to instruct his readers as to the value of various texts, the overtly didactic tone of *Don Quixote* is largely absent from the final *livre*. Clarimond and the hermit work to convince Lysis of the error of his ways, but the suggestion that Lysis's adventures continue even after his reform undermines any absolute moralistic message that may be propagated by the narrator.

The didactic ideas that might be communicated in the final *livre* are further frustrated by the contradictory treatment of Lysis's behavior throughout the text. In the *Remarques*, Sorel lauds Lysis for the ingenuity and frankness of his language and behavior. In *Livre XIV*, for example, when Lysis describes Charite using vocabulary usually reserved for expressing religious devotion, Clarimond and the hermit rebuke him for blaspheming. However, in the *Remarques*, Sorel explains that similar words appear in the poetry of Ronsard and Desportes.

While the author expresses displeasure at its use by these poets, he never censures Lysis for the way he uses it. Rather, he approves of the character's cleverness: "il s'avise d'une chose que tous nos Poètes ne se fussent jamais imaginé." "Il trouve cette subtilité de dire que..." and "Lysis est un homme merveilleux" (*A-R, II, Rem., XIV*, 1065). In the *Remarques*, Sorel constantly praises Lysis for his inventiveness in spite of Clarimond's frustration with it.

The work is additionally ambiguous about any lesson it may deliver at its end when Lysis is effectively rewarded for his mad behavior rather than punished. Burt Kay makes a similar observation about the mixed signals in the conclusion when he notes that "Far from being dangerous and absurd, Lysis's extravagances have proved more than profitable for him: he ends up with the girl he loves, a lovely little home in the country, and security for the rest of his life."⁴¹ The lack of moral message seems to undermine the purposes of the work; the dangers of fiction seem relatively non-threatening in light of Lysis's happy, if open-ended, conclusion.

As in *Don Quixote*, the question as to whether or not the main character is conscious of the eccentricity of his behavior is also a pivotal part of the final *livre* of *Le Berger extravagant*. As Clarimond finishes convincing Lysis of his extravagance, the *berger* makes a kind of confession that, due to the potential contradictions it raises with the narration of the work, is perhaps the most striking element of his reform. Lysis expresses feelings of remorse for his behavior, but concludes his apology by admitting that he sometimes pretended to be more deceived than he was.

⁴¹ Burt Kay, "A Writer Turns against Literature: Charles Sorel's *Le Berger extravagant*," *Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa/University of Ottawa Quarterly*. Vol. 43 (1973), 284.

Il faut croire qu'il [Lysis] avoit un esprit fort facile à persuader, et qu'il estoit aussi aisé de luy faire haïr ses extravagances, comme il avoit esté aisé de les luy faire aymer. Aussi avoüa-t'il à Clarimond qu'il se repentoit de bon cœur de tout ce qu'il avoit faict: mais qu'il luy avoit esté impossible de s'en abstenir, pource qu'encore qu'il connust bien la verité, quelquefois il se vouloit abuser pour abuser aussi les autres, afin de rendre ses aventures plus remarquables; comme par exemple, il n'avoit jamais crû qu'à moitié qu'il eust esté changé en arbre, ny tant d'autres choses extraordinaires. (*BE, III, XIV, 545*)

Lysis's comment indicates that he understood his own madness to some degree and altered his behavior to make his adventures as interesting as possible. Comprehending the consequences and potential of his own behavior, he perfected the various adventures he recreated.

Lysis's confession is problematic, however, because it calls into question his role in the work as well as that of other characters. Throughout *Le Berger extravagant*, Lysis is presented as a victim of his *délire* and his gentlemen friends as characters who are entertained by it. Lysis's confession, however, contradicts this notion. He describes himself instead as an active player in the creation of the adventures, and even as a manipulator of those who believe they are taking advantage of a fool. Lysis's confession therefore eases the transition between the madness of the adventures and the lucidity of the conclusion. Because Lysis admits complicity, at least to some extent, in the creation of the adventures, the reader is forced to reconsider the implications of each episode. Lysis's confession ultimately introduces the possibility of illusion in the text that follows his reform. His conversion itself becomes suspect, since there is a chance that he could be feigning even this.

The question of whether Lysis is truly mad or whether he merely pretends to be is further developed in the evolution of the text from the 1627-28 edition to that of 1633-34. Daniel Chouinard's doctoral thesis contains an extensive study of the changes in the text from the first

edition to the second. His observations are helpful in examining how textual changes in the final *livre* shed further light on the nature of Lysis's imitation and potential madness.

The latter portion of *Livre XIV* contains the dialog between Clarimond and Lysis that eventually leads to Lysis's reform. Between the 1627-28 and 1633-34 editions of the text, a small number of changes can be noted in their conversation. While these alterations are sometimes little more than simple word substitutions, they nevertheless clarify the nature of Lysis's madness and imitation.

1627		1633	
Page	<i>Clarimond to Lysis :</i>	Page	
539	[S]i ces gens là prenoient cet habit, c'estoit pour se conformer aux personnes qu'ils frequentoient, ce qui ne peut arriver en vous, veu que vous estiez possible le seul de berger illustre en France...	1022	[S]i ces gens là prenoient cet habit, c'estoit pour se conformer aux personnes qu'ils frequentoient, ce qui ne peut arriver en vous, veu que vous estiez possible le seul de berger <i>Romanesque</i> en France...
543	<i>Clarimond to Lysis :</i> Qu'aviez vous esperé de faire en vous habillant comme un comedien?	1035	Qu'aviez vous esperé de faire en vous habillant comme un comedien, & <i>en vivant comme un personnage Romanesque?</i>
545	<i>Narrator :</i> [C]omme par exemple, il n'avoit jamais crû qu'à moitié qu'il eust esté changé en arbre, ny tant d'autres choses extraordinaires.	1040-1	[C]omme par exemple, il n'avoit jamais crû qu'à moitié qu'il eust esté changé en arbre, ny tant d'autres choses extraordinaires, <i>mais il avoit feint de les croire afin que les autres les creussent aussi, & que l'on les mist dans un Roman qui rendist sa renommee eternelle.</i>

549	<i>Narrator :</i> Je vous ay raconté maintenant tout ce que j'avois dessein de vous dire des diverses fortunes de mon berger extravagant...	1051	Je vous ay raconté maintenant tout ce que j'avois dessein de vous dire des diverses fortunes <i>du Berger Lysis</i> ...
-----	--	------	---

In the first three examples, the text of the 1633-34 edition is changed to include references to *Romans* or the *romanesque*. In the first example, Lysis is no longer called a “*berger illustre*” but instead a “*berger Romanesque*.” In the second, text has been added to the description of Lysis’s costume. Instead of simply being dressed “*comme un comedien*,” he is clothed “*comme un comedien, & en vivant comme un personnage Romanesque*.” The third example comes from Lysis’s confession discussed previously and alters the text to indicate that Lysis wished that: “*l’on les [ses aventures] mist dans un Roman qui rendist sa renommee eternelle*.” Lysis is once again described as a character in a *roman*.

The 1633-34 edition repeatedly refers to Lysis as a *romanesque* character, or a character whose behavior is similar those that appear in *romans*. When Clarimond calls Lysis a *berger Romanesque*, he makes reference to the shepherds of pastoral fictions that Lysis emulates. Similarly, when he comments upon Lysis’s clothing, describing him as “*un personnage Romanesque*,” he references Lysis’s imitation of book characters through the garments that he wears. In the third example, it becomes clear that Lysis wants his adventures to be written down as though he were a character from a work of fiction. In every way, he wishes to be like the heroes of his favorite books.

In the 1633-34 edition, Lysis’s role as a character therefore becomes much more explicit. Lysis’s confession in the 1627-28 version of the work reveals his consciousness of this role. In

the 1633-34 text, however, Lysis is more overtly described not simply as a character in a work of fiction, but one that attempts to imitate those from the *romans* that he has read. Throughout the text, Lysis seeks to emulate these *romanesque* fictional characters through conscious playacting. He becomes a tool whereby the author is able to integrate the *romanesque* into the very *vraisemblable* text.

Lysis's consciousness of his behavior is very different from the kind of imitation practiced by Don Quixote. Throughout *Don Quixote*, the knight-errant consistently acts without regard for consequences to his health, the health of those around him, or the continuation of his own adventures. His disregard for the consequences of his actions is evidence of his undeviating mission to imitate a knight-errant. Lysis, on the other hand, is much more cautious with his own person, demonstrating a judicious amount of good sense when the circumstances of the adventure risk injury to his person. In one passage from *Livre IV*, for example, Lysis becomes melancholic because Charite refuses to return his affections. He speaks about the problem to Anselme who, knowing Lysis's tendency to imitate storybook characters, suggests:

Mais vous voyez qu'Astree a mesprisé Celadon, apres l'avoir bien aymé, repartit Anselme, pensez vous estre mieux traité? Que me voulez vous donc conseiller de faire? reprit Lysis. Il n'y a point de doute, continua Anselme, qu'il faut que vous vous jettiez aussi bien que luy dans la riviere de Lignon à la moindre parole rigoureuse que vous dira Charite. (*A-R, I, IV, 524*)

Lysis hesitates to follow such advice, even when the behavior has precedence with the characters he generally seeks to emulate. "Faites moy donc tenir trois Nymphes sur le rivage, toutes prestes à me tirer de l'eau, repliqua Lysis, car que sçay je si elles y viendroient, si l'on ne les en advertissoit: je me pourrois noyer en attendant, car je ne sçay pas nager" (*A-R, I, IV, 524-5*). Anselme suggests that he throw himself in anyway, but Lysis's better judgment nevertheless interferes with his desire to imitate. "*Je ne me fie point là dessus*, dit Lysis, trouvez moy deux

vessies de pourceau, et puis je me precipiteray hardiment dans Lignon, les ayant sous mes aisselles.” Lysis’s refusal earns Clarimond’s approval: “Voilà qui est fort sagement dit” (*A-R, I, IV*, 524-6). In the end, Lysis invents a way to imitate Céladon without risking injury. His proposal of an alternate solution further attests to the cognizance with which he playacts a *romanesque* character.

In an episode in *Livre XII*, Lysis determines that, in order to perfectly imitate scorned lovers from *romans* he has read, he must die. Again, Lysis demonstrates an unwillingness to submit to an actual death, understanding the consequences of such an action. Instead, he contrives a way to appear to do so without suffering any physical harm. Lysis thus explains to his companion Carmelin, with whom he plans the exploit, that: “[i]l faut *contrefaire* le mort quelque temps” (*A-R, II, XII*, 647, my emphasis). In this instance Lysis’s playacting again reflects an awareness of the consequences of his behavior. His simulation is calculated and careful, very unlike the reckless madness displayed by Don Quixote.

As Lysis lays plans for his pretended demise, it becomes clear that he is conscious that the appearance or illusion of death is enough to create an adventure worthy of being put down in writing. As he sketches out plans for his “death” with Carmelin, he explains one reason for his act. “Le secret de cecy est d’accomplir en mesme temps une chose qui me rende recommandable envers Charite, & envers la posterité” (*A-R, II, XII*, 647). The word “*posterité*” marks Lysis’s awareness of future readers who will learn of his adventures as told in a forthcoming *roman*. That his exploits are indeed recorded in *Le Berger extravagant* and again in the second edition of the work does not so much indicate that he is of unsound mind, but rather that he has an uncanny clairvoyance in understanding his function as a *romanesque* character.

Lysis's adventures often improve on the texts that he imitates. As he lays plans for his "death" in *Livre XII*, he takes into account the *romans* he has read, isolates the common points, and then devises how he can replicate their experiences and results without suffering negative consequences. He therefore distances himself from these characters, abandoning efforts to copy the behavior of stricken lovers and resorting to careful simulation. Lysis also makes commentary on the decisions of these other characters to end their own lives, pointing out that his own course of action is preferable to theirs because it produces the same results (which are to cause their lovers to lament their absence). "Car si je me tuois tout à fait comme plusieurs que je nommerois bien, ne seroit-ce pas une folie estrange, veu qu'il n'est pas hors d'esperence que quelque jour je ne devienne heureux?" (*A-R, II, XII*, 650). Lysis understands that he would be thwarting his own happiness to follow exactly the examples in the *romans* he has read. He therefore alters the stories in order to produce a better result.⁴²

Not insignificantly, Sorel applauds the changes Lysis makes to these stories in the *Remarques*.

Quelle extravagance trouve-t'on en l'esprit de Lysis qui veut contrefaire le mort? N'est-il pas encore plus sage que tant d'amans qui se tuent pour la rigueur de leur maistresse? Si Iphis ne se fust pendu que par feinte, il eust aussi bien adoucy le cœur d'Anaxarete, & son entreprise eust esté de beaucoup plus utile: car que luy servoit il d'estre aymé d'elle apres son trespas? Il n'en pouvoit plus recevoir de contentement, & possible que les nouvelles n'en venoient pas jusqu'aux champs Elysées. Lysis qui estoit plus fin, avoit la curiosité de voir quelle mine feroient tous ceux qui penseroient qu'il fust mort. (*A-R, II, Rem., XII*, 748-9)

⁴² It is difficult to read this passage and not wonder whether Lysis's commentary might be directed toward Cervantes' work. The episode of Don Quixote's death is preceded by a moment in which the knight-errant laments his inability to magically restore the peasant he imagines to be Dulcinea del Toro to her imagined state as a great lady. While Don Quixote's melancholy may not directly cause his demise, it nevertheless helps bring closure to the numerous adventures in the work, many of which occur to champion his lady's honor.

Sorel praises Lysis for his cleverness in modifying the storylines of characters from other texts. His commentary suggests that Lysis's improvements are a means by which judgments may be passed on the illogical nature of other characters' actions. But Sorel's admiration is not limited to the changes Lysis makes to other works of fiction in representing the death of a lover. Instead, it extends to the methods the character uses to simulate death.

Shortly thereafter, Sorel makes a comparison with an episode from *Don Quixote* in order to demonstrate the superiority of Lysis's inventiveness.

Il [Lysis] ne veut pas feindre de se donner d'une espée au travers du corps, pource qu'il auroit peur que la fraude ne fust reconnuë. Vous voyez dans le Dom Quixote que Basile feignit de se tuër devant Quiterie, & la supplia de luy faire cet honneur de le prendre pour mary avant qu'il mourust: mais si par hasard le Curé ne fust trouvé là, qui dit qu'il ne luy falloit point tirer l'espée du corps qu'après qu'il l'auroit confessé, pource qu'il mourroit au mesme temps que l'on auroit desbouché sa playe; il faut croire que l'on eust connu qu'il n'estoit pas blessé veritablement, & qu'ayant visité son corps l'on eust trouvé que son espee avoit passé par un tuyau de fer remply de sang & non pas par son costé. Lysis estoit donc fort avisé de vouloir seulement feindre de prendre du poison pour joüer son jeu plus finement. (*A-R, II, Rem., XII, 749-50*)

The results Lysis achieves in simulating the death of a scorned lover surpass even those of characters who have also circumvented death by faking it. As Lysis carries out his own "demise," he demonstrates his consciousness of the visual aspect of illusion.

The awareness with which Lysis acts as a character in a work of fiction is further reflected in the final alteration that may be noted from the 1627-28 to the 1633-34 edition of *Le Berger extravagant*. In this last example from the table provided earlier, the epithet "extravagant" is removed from the 1633-34 text. The *Anti-Roman* thus presents Lysis as a character whose *extravagance* or madness is a feature only of the *romanesque* characters he imitates. In the *Remarques* of *Livre I*, Sorel explains that the adjective *extravagant*, when used in

connection with Lysis, has been removed. The adventures in the work are *extravagant* because they come from *romans* worthy of censure. Because Lysis reproduces and alters these adventures, he is not *extravagant* in the same way (*A-R, I, Rem., I*, 106-7). Instead, he is a character whose conscious manipulation of other texts actually improves them.

Conclusions

In *Don Quixote*, the title character's death makes his reform decidedly permanent and reads as a punishment for the knight-errant's behavior. In *Le Berger extravagant*, however, Lysis's eventual fate remains unclear. After the narrative concludes on an unresolved note, the question of Lysis's future is taken up in the *Remarques* in which Sorel presents at some length the possibilities for Lysis's future. He describes the efforts Lysis must continually make in order to escape his previous habits and "s'acoustumer petit à petit à vivre comme les autres" (*A-R, II, Rem., XIV*, 1071). He further reveals that Lysis expresses an interest in philosophical texts, but that his attraction to such works may eventually lead him not to become a philosopher, but rather to do "des choses aussi extravagantes que quand il estoit Berger. C'est pour monstrier qu'un esprit tel que le sien, ne peut jamais le rendre si sain qu'il ne tesmoigne de quelque legereté" (*A-R, II, Rem., XIV*, 1072).

With each supposition, however, there is a constant sense of doubt, as though the author himself is not sure what at last became of the character. Sorel's hypotheses do not, therefore, completely settle the question he knows his readers have about what happened to Lysis. Rather, they appear to give the author the opportunity to speculate alongside the reader and to discuss the possibilities and different life paths on which Lysis could potentially be led. As I observed in the

previous chapter, the *Remarques* often function in this way. Sorel habitually uses the briefest mentions of other texts in order to segue into lengthy discussions on themes that are of particular interest to him. Such passages often have a narrative feel of their own that allows them to surpass the simple role of commentary. In this case, Sorel's commentary is a metatextual consideration of the response his readers will have to the conclusion. The author thus addresses the questions posed by the final *livre* not by answering them, but by taking a step back and recognizing the reader's interest in these questions. Then, as Sorel leaves the last sequence of events unsettled, *Le Berger extravagant* concludes on a note of incompleteness that comes with a work still in progress.

The *Remarques* are also important in addressing the ambiguous moral message at the end of the work. Rather than discussing it in the narrative, Sorel relegates to the *Remarques* the question of the way Lysis's adventures should be interpreted. The *Conclusion* of *L'Anti-Roman* opens with Sorel's explanation of the purpose of this part of the text.

Je veux faire voir icy [dans la Conclusion] à quoy peuvent servir les aventures de Lysis, car encore que j'en aye parlé d'un costé & d'autre, ce que je diray en bref semblera avoir plus de force, & remettra les Lecteurs en memoire de ce qu'ils ont veu pour leur monstrier que ce ne sont pas des fantaisies inutiles. (*A-R, II, Conclusion*, 1075)

In *Le Berger extravagant*, the didactic tone of the Spanish text is much less obvious until an appeal is made to the *Remarques*, which purport, as a whole, to show the significance of Lysis's adventures.

Lastly, the ambiguity surrounding Lysis's madness in *Le Berger extravagant* is perhaps the most striking element to set Sorel's text apart from *Don Quixote*. Lysis's confession that he occasionally played along with the gentlemen who thought they were fooling him, in order to make his adventures more exciting, indicates the consciousness with which Lysis's adventures

were orchestrated. Because of this revelation, doubt is cast even on the sincerity or fullness of Lysis's reform. Consequentially, the narrator's reliability is also called into question, since the narrative never gives any hint of the character's deceptions. This is yet additional evidence that illusion is prevalent throughout the text, both in the actions of the main character and in what the author chooses to reveal in the narrative and the *Remarques*.

The attitude of denial towards *Don Quixote* can perhaps then be explained by noting that the differences between the Spanish text and *Le Berger extravagant*, as manifest in the conclusion, are indeed of some consequence. The scope of the two novels, while similar in that they purport to comment on other works of fiction, is unique to each work because of the kinds of texts each singles out. In many ways, the focus of *Le Berger extravagant* is broader than that of the Spanish work. Don Quixote's exploits are largely imitations of books of chivalry, of which *Amadis de Gaula* is perhaps the most often referred to, and, to a lesser extent, the picaresque novels of the sixteenth century. In *Le Berger extravagant*, however, the range of texts imitated by Lysis and evaluated in the *Remarques* is much broader, including works from ancient mythology, foreign and domestic texts, poetry, novellas, and *romans*. Furthermore, these texts are not limited to works of fiction. Philosophical texts, as well as historical treatises, are given mention in the *Remarques* when their content lends itself to the discussion at hand.

On another level, the increased purposefulness of Lysis's madness, which turns out to be, in many instances, playacting, allows Sorel to bend accepted constructs of fiction to a greater extent than that which may be seen in *Don Quixote*. In *Le Berger extravagant*, Lysis's consciousness of himself as a character allows him to break the fourth wall and to comment on his own role as a character in the text. As Leonard Hinds points out, in general, "[c]haracters cannot acquire any knowledge of themselves or their world outside the terms of representation,

for they must remain within the modes of artifice themselves.”⁴³ Sorel, however, uses Lysis’s “madness” to thwart this accepted construct as part of his deconstruction of the limits of fiction.

The fact that Lysis’s madness is revealed to be deliberate at times allows Sorel to made new texts out of old, transforming them through Lysis’s adventures. While Don Quixote’s adventures generally culminate in his injury or embarrassment, the main character’s adventures in *Le Berger extravagant* are, in many cases, purposeful and contemplative, leading to extensive discussions about the various aspects of the texts being imitated. Sorel makes constant reference to the way Lysis and the other characters improve on other works of fiction. The logic behind these enhancements is often explained in the *Remarques*, so that the reasoning behind them may be fully understood and the reader may appreciate the alterations that have been made.

In fact, the commentary accompanying Lysis’s exploits is so extensive and so discursive that it is possible to argue that the narrative is actually an excuse for the more introspective *Remarques*. In the conclusion of *Don Quixote*, commentary on the knight-errant’s adventures comes in the form of the narrator’s and the other characters’ limited reactions to his reform. In *Le Berger extravagant*, the discussion is repeated after the conclusion of the narrative. In the *Remarques*, the events of the conclusion are recounted in full detail, accompanied by the extrapolative ruminations of the author. The *Remarques* then seem to provide not only a response to the diegesis and additional commentary on Lysis’s reform, but also an extended edition of the text itself, revisited and amplified.

Lysis’s alterations of other texts provide the basis for the metatextual commentary that occurs both in the diegesis and in the *Remarques*. They make Lysis a kind of “magician” who

⁴³ Leonard Hinds, *Narrative Transformations from L’Astrée to Le Berger extravagant*, 101.

stages illusions of texts that differ greatly from the attempts at imitation that may be noted in *Don Quixote*. Lysis approximates works of fiction, creating reproductions of other texts that are illusory because they are essentially inaccurate. Lysis alters other texts by taking them from their original context and modifying them so that they work in the *vraisemblable* story world of *Le Berger extravagant*. In doing so, he tests the viability of the logic of these works in their new setting.

Anne-Elisabeth Spica identifies the pivotal point of *Le Berger extravagant*'s exploration of fiction that takes place through the transformative nature of Lysis's adventures:

En effet, le mal romanesque est très précisément désigné: il ne consiste pas dans l'existence même de la fiction, mais dans la possibilité de tromperie qui s'associe à la mise en place de l'illusion inhérente à la fiction, c'est-à-dire dans les gauchissements éventuels de ses représentations dès lors que l'on se place du côté de la réception romanesque.⁴⁴

In the *Préface* of *Le Berger extravagant*, Sorel describes an inherently destructive and reactive project when he defines the work's critical aims. "Le desir que j'ay de travailler pour l'utilité publique, m'a fait prendre le dessein de composer un livre qui se moquast des autres, et qui fust comme le tombeau des romans, et des absurditez de la poésie" (*BE, I, Préface*). The alterations texts undergo in *Le Berger extravagant* are some of the central paradoxes of the work. Sorel transforms the "*absurditez*" of poetry and *roman* by making them verisimilar and theoretically denuding them of their capacity to deceive. However, the versions of these texts that appear in *Le Berger extravagant* must remain deceptions because they no longer closely resemble their original sources. They are mere images of the texts they once were.

⁴⁴ Anne-Elisabeth Spica, "Charles Sorel, entre fascination et repulsion pour le roman." *Charles Sorel, polygraphe*, 176.

In this chapter, I have focused on the final passages of *Don Quixote* and *Le Berger extravagant* to discover the unique way Sorel handles questions of imitation and madness. In the next chapter, I continue my examination of a second major hypotext in Sorel's work by examining the representation of another seventeenth-century text in *Le Berger extravagant*: Honoré d'Urfé's masterpiece *L'Astrée*. By investigating the role of *L'Astrée* in Sorel's work, I hope to further understand how the author's transformations of other texts work not only as a tool of judgment, but also as a discursive device.

Chapter Five

Disguise and Transformation in *Le Berger extravagant*

Disguise as a form of deception is an important element not only in *Le Berger extravagant*, but also in Sorel's other *histoires comiques*. In both the *Histoire comique de Francion* (1623) and *Polyandre, histoire comique* (1648), for example, Francion and Polyandre have adventures in which they take upon themselves various roles or identities.¹ Disguise and trickery are also topics of interest in Sorel's later, more critical works. The theme is raised, for example, as part of a discussion about problems of representation in *La Science universelle* (1634-44), *Description de l'Ile de portraiture* (1659), and *De la connoissance des bons livres* (1671). In these texts, Sorel's discussions of disguise tend to center on the disconnect between a representation and what it is intended to stand for. Martine Debaisieux proposes that Anselme's portrait of Charite in *Le Berger extravagant* may be considered an emblem of this discussion. In *Livre II*, Anselme transforms Lysis's metaphorical description of Charite into a literal representation, giving the subject, for example, real roses for cheeks.² The end product, a "monstrueux tableau," illustrates in a very visual way the gap between a representation and what it signifies.³

¹ In the opening scene of the *Histoire comique de Francion*, the eponymous character disguises himself in order to distract Valentin. Additionally, one of the four thieves who plan to rob Valentin disguises himself as the serving girl Catherine. He is later unmasked by Laurette, Valentin's wife. Similarly, in *Polyandre, histoire comique*, the title character, while at the house of the widow Aurélie, disguises himself as a religious figure in order to subdue her outspoken grandmother. Throughout both works, Francion and Polyandre cloak their faces or body as well and use an accompanying "disguised" or fraudulent dialog. See Andrew Suozzo, "Disguise and the Rites of Death and Resurrection in Sorel's Francion." *The French Review*. Vol. 53 No. 1 (October 1979), 23, 26.

² Debaisieux goes on to explain that in *Description de l'Ile de Portraiture*, the pairing of fiction and critique facilitates the investigation of visual and literary representation. In *Le Berger extravagant*, which sports a heavy meta- and hypertextual content, Sorel employs a similar technique. He uses text and metatext together to explore problems of representation, especially in episodes that revolve around the theme of disguise (Martine Debaisieux. Introduction. *Description de l'Ile de Portraiture*, 29-30).

³ "La déception de l'amoureux Lysis face au 'monstrueux tableau', qui ne correspond que trop bien aux consignes dictées au peintre, illustre de manière plus générale l'écart irréconciliable entre modèle et représentation. Sorel

Disguise is one manifestation of the problems of representation that are central to *Le Berger extravagant*.⁴ Instances in which characters disguise themselves or put on costumes can be found throughout the text. In some cases, these episodes are described as part of elaborate theatrical productions.⁵ In *Livre V*, for example, several of the characters come together to stage an involved series of disguises. As the *livre* opens, Lysis claims that he has been transformed into a willow and climbs into a tree, refusing to budge. His gentlemen friends attempt to get him to come down, but he declines, insisting that trees do not move. Likewise, when they try to get him to take refreshment, he turns them down, pointing out that trees cannot eat or drink. Lysis even weathers a storm through the night, determined to remain as motionless as a tree. His friends, while amused at first, soon become concerned for his health. They therefore concoct an elaborate ruse in which they disguise themselves as dryads and river gods in order to convince Lysis to come down. At the end of the meal, however, the illusion is dissolved as the narrator reveals that the picnic adventure was merely a spectacle put on by the other characters.

Quand il fut ainsi armé toute la compagnie luy ayant promis de le venir retreuver la nuit suivante, prit congé de luy, et s'en alla se mettre dans un carrosse qui estoit à cent pas de là, pour s'en retourner chez Hircan, qui estoit celui qui avoit joué le personnage du Dieu de la riviere de Morin. Lucide estoit une galante veufve de ses voisines, le Violon estoit son valet de chambre, et les Hamadryades estoient des servantes. Il s'estoit deguisé avec tous ces gens cy pour tromper Lysis, s'imaginant qu'il y auroit autant de plaisir avec luy

reprendra cette question systématiquement – et sous de multiples perspectives – dans *La Description de l'isle de Portraiture, et de la ville des Portraits*. Tout en répondant à un phénomène de mode qu'il célèbre et dénonce à la fois, ce texte renchérit sur un problème esthétique qui retient l'attention de l'auteur depuis le début de sa carrière: les limites de la vraisemblance et le bien-fondé des procédés mimétiques. Car il faut préciser que par le terme 'portrait', Sorel désigne le concept de représentation en général" (Martine Debaisieux, "Utopie à la derive," *Charles Sorel, polygraphe*, 382). See also *ibid.*, 393-4.

⁴ For further discussion of disguise and theatricality in *Le Berger extravagant*, see Anne Theobald's dissertation "Stages in the Novel: Theatrical Characteristics in Sorel's *Histoires Comiques*."

⁵ Additional examples of disguised characters may be found in *Livre VI* when "Philiris" and "Fontenay" arrive in costume to profit from Lysis's madness along with the other country gentlemen. The two characters are presented with special focus on their disguises. "On vid deux hommes vestus de taffetas blanc ayans de belles pannetieres en escharpe, des chapeaux de paille sur la teste, et des houlettes peintures en la main" (*BE*, I, VI, 929-30).

qu'au plus superbe balet du monde, & si l'on avoit fait acroire qu'il estoit muet, c'estoit de peur qu'il ne fust reconnu à sa parole. (*BE, I, V, 754-5*)

In this episode and elsewhere in *Le Berger extravagant*, disguise is a visual form of deception, used to fool and to create illusion. Disguise and the trickery that it represents are critical aspects of *Le Berger extravagant* not only because they function as important plot elements, but also because they may be understood as a model of the deceptions at the heart of the text. Holly Tucker recognizes the central importance of disguise and masquerade in *Le Berger extravagant*, and suggests that the work is, in fact, a “disguised” text.

Indeed, the entire plot of *Le Berger extravagant* is based on this game of disguise, pleasure, revelation, and moral instruction. Deceived and seduced by the pleasurable stories of pastoral tradition, the Cervantine protagonist, Lysis, functions as a type of virtual reader for Sorel. Anselme and his companions disguise themselves as shepherds in order to reproduce the fictional world that Lysis is expecting to find in the real world with the hopes of dissuading him from his folly. As Anselme explains, the purpose behind the masquerade is to allow Lysis to “se divertir” and, as a result, “il se tirera de beaucoup d'erreurs.” (*BE, I, I, 37-8*)⁶

Le Berger extravagant may be considered “disguised” because of the unique kind of hypertextuality⁷ that may be found in the work. Not all hypotexts are hidden: in fact, interpretations of texts such as the *Metamorphoses* and *L'Astrée* are often quite evident. Characters routinely point out similarities between Lysis's adventures and events from these and other works. However, the work's hypertextuality is complicated by the author's simultaneous eagerness and reluctance to reveal his source material. Sorel explains that he does not intend for the reader to identify every text that has been interpreted in the work and invites the reader to

⁶ Holly Tucker, “Pleasure, Seduction, and Authorial Identity in Charles Sorel's *Le Berger extravagant*,” 349.

⁷ Hypertextuality is a key component of Gérard Genette's conception of textuality as presented in *Palimpsestes: la littérature au second degré*. There, Genette explains that hypertextuality is “toute relation unissant un texte B (hypertexte) à un texte antérieur A (hypotexte) sur lequel il se greffe d'une manière qui n'est pas celle du commentaire” (13). Aspects of Genette's transtextuality are discussed in the introduction of this dissertation.

consult the *Remarques* for direction. Following the authorial voice's prescription, however, creates a delay between the encounter with the hypotext and the moment of its identification. During this time, the hypotext is "disguised," or indistinguishable from the hypertext. The risk of intentional "textual disguise" must also be considered: that is, moments when Sorel purposefully obscures the true processes at work by withholding or confusing the process of textual transformation.⁸

As they assume their disguises, Lysis and Fontenay stand in for fictional characters from other works. As they do so, they use their new identities to dramatize the texts that they bring into *Le Berger extravagant*. The two episodes I study in this chapter are alternately inspired by tales of transformation from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Honoré d'Urfé's *L'Astrée*. In addition, *Le Berger extravagant* borrows from the pastoral genre in vogue in France in the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth century.

Ian Johnston writes that "[n]o work from classical antiquity, either Greek or Roman, has exerted such a continuing and decisive influence on European literature as Ovid's *Metamorphoses*."⁹ Ann Moss echoes this statement in her book *Poetry and Fable*, which seeks to explore the influence of the *Metamorphoses* on sixteenth-century French poetry. She notes: "For the Renaissance, as for the later Middle Ages, the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid was the most important encyclopaedia of fable, a major progenitor of commentary on myths, and the most

⁸ See chapter three for specific examples.

⁹ Ian Johnston, "The Influence of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." University of Texas. Web.

familiar model for narration.”¹⁰ Moss explores how, in the sixteenth century, poets such as Clément Marot, Maurice Scève, Louise Labé, Joachim du Bellay, and Pierre de Ronsard use images and figures of speech directly inspired by the *Metamorphoses*. Henri Barton examines its manifestation in the seventeenth century, citing the pervasiveness of Ovid’s poem that stretches even beyond literature to domains such as architecture.¹¹ In the theater, tales from the *Metamorphoses* inspire Théophile de Viau’s *Pyrame et Thisbé* (1621) and Isaac de Benserade’s *Iphis et Iante* (1637). The seventeenth century also produced interpretations of Ovid in the form of *travestissements burlesques*¹² such as Charles d’Assoucy’s *Ovide en belle humeur* (1649) and Louis Richer’s *Ovide bouffon, ou Les Métamorphoses burlesques* (1649). Part of the work’s popularity during the Baroque era stems from the period’s strong interest in the same themes of transformation present in Ovid’s poem.¹³

Similarly, Ann Moss explains that important themes present in Ovid’s text resonated with certain sixteenth-century poets. “In the far-fetched fables of the mythological narratives dear to sixteenth-century poets, [...] questions about the status of fiction are raised in their purest form.”¹⁴ In the seventeenth century, Charles Sorel is one of the authors whose writings are also influenced by the *Metamorphoses*. However, Henri Bardon notes the many references Sorel

¹⁰ Ann Moss, *Poetry and Fable: Studies in Mythological Narrative in Sixteenth-Century France* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984) 2.

¹¹ Henri Bardon, “Sur l’influence d’Ovide en France au 17ème siècle,” *Atti del Convegno Internazionale Ovidiano*. Vol. II. Rome: Instituto di Studi Romani Editore, 1958) 69-70.

¹² “Le travestissement burlesque modifie donc le style sans modifier le sujet; inversement, la ‘parodie’ modifie le sujet sans modifier le style” (Gérard Genette, *Palimpsestes: la littérature au second degré*, 29).

¹³ Jean Rousset conceptualizes the Baroque era’s thematic interest in transformation by proposing the character Circé from Classical literature as its emblem (Jean Rousset, *La Littérature de l’âge baroque en France: Circé et le Paon* [Paris: Corti, 1953] 16).

¹⁴ Ann Moss, *Poetry and Fable: Studies in Mythological Narrative in Sixteenth-Century France*, 2.

makes to the work in *Le Berger extravagant* and concludes that the author must disdain it.¹⁵

While Sorel does express displeasure at the “*invraisemblance*” of certain tales from the *Metamorphoses*, the work’s role in *Le Berger extravagant* is more complex than Bardon’s assessment of it. Nevertheless, Sorel is interested in these same questions about the purpose of fiction, making the various interpretations of the *Metamorphoses* in *Le Berger extravagant* particularly significant.

The problems of representation treated in the *Metamorphoses* are also integral to the pastoral genre popular in late sixteenth-century and early seventeenth-century France. While French examples exist,¹⁶ it was in Italy and Spain (with works such as Montemayor’s *Diana* [1559] and Sannazzaro’s *Arcadia* [1504]) that the genre blossomed and developed. Jean-Pierre van Elslande explains that the French fascination for the pastoral occurs at an important moment in history, when religious and philosophical questions are coming to a head. In pastoral works, these questions are considered as, for example, devotion is pitted against erudite *libertinage* in the many moments of debate.¹⁷

In addition, the pastoral genre is characterized by an abundance of forms of artifice. Laurence Gregorio notes how disguise is an example of this artifice and works as a transformer of identity: “disguise is easy and most effective, and it must be said that [in the pastoral] faces

¹⁵ Henri Bardon, “Sur l’influence d’Ovide en France au 17ème siècle,” 75-78.

¹⁶ Examples of French pastoral literature include *Les Bergeries de Juliette* (1588) by Nicolas de Montreux who also wrote a series of pastoral dramas (*Athlette* [1585], *La Diane* [1592], and *L’Arimène* [1597]). Another author and translator of note is Roland Brisset of Tours who wrote *La Dieromène* (1596) after translating the Italian Giovanni Battista Guarini’s *Il Pastor Fido* (1593).

¹⁷ See Jean-Pierre van Elslande, *L’Imaginaire pastoral du XVIIe siècle* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1999) 2-4.

count for less than clothes in attempts at identification and recognition.”¹⁸ Thomas DiPiero explains that another form of disguise can be seen in linguistic artifice.¹⁹ The episodes from *Le Berger extravagant* that I consider in this chapter play on both this kind of artifice as well as physical disguise.

Of the examples of pastoral fiction that are important hypotexts in *Le Berger extravagant*, *L'Astrée* is by far the most prevalent and significant. Honoré d'Urfé's monumental work recounts the love story of Céladon and Astrée who are faced with obstacles presented by the artifice and disguise of various other characters. Part I was published in 1607, while the posthumous Part IV appeared in 1627, not insignificantly the year after the publication of Sorel's *Le Berger extravagant*. Much of Part IV is believed to have been completed by another hand, possibly that of Balthazar Baro, d'Urfé's secretary, who also wrote the fifth part, which appeared a year later. This work, of enormous cultural and literary importance, is labeled by Gérard Genette “le premier grand roman français depuis le Moyen Âge”²⁰ and many later authors would identify *L'Astrée* as the source of inspiration for their own writings.²¹

¹⁸ Laurence A. Gregorio, *Pastoral Masquerade: Disguise and Identity in L'Astrée* (Saratoga, CA: ANMA Libri & Co., 1992) 11.

¹⁹ DiPiero makes a study of the problematic language used by characters of the pastoral, filled with *double entendre* (*Dangerous Truths and Criminal Passions* [Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992], 23-61). In a later article, he goes on to describe the pastoral as an inherently duplicitous medium through which authors make commentary upon corresponding, if veiled, social situations. “These novels relied on deliberately contrived artifice to allow the initiated – largely aristocratic readers – do discern moral truth behind a densely encoded wall of poetic language depicting a world whose veiled referent existed in real life: the aristocracy of the day” (“Unreadable Novels: Toward a Theory of Seventeenth-Century Aristocratic Fiction,” *Novel*. Vol 38 No. 2/3 [Spring/Summer 2005], 135).

²⁰ Gérard Genette, “Le serpent dans la bergerie.” *Figures I*. (Paris : Seuil, 1966) 110.

²¹ Marie de Gournay writes that *L'Astrée* “sert de bréviaire aux dames et aux galants de la cour” and. Maurice Lever suggests that the contemporary readers of *L'Astrée* might have found enjoyment in the pastoralization of their own

While *L'Astrée* may provisionally be recognized as an example of pastoral fiction, d'Urfé's work is nevertheless a unique example of the genre for many reasons. Jean-Pierre van Elslande observes that most examples of pastoral literature in France between 1600 and 1630 are not prose narratives, but works of theater. This immediately sets *L'Astrée* apart.²² Similarly, Maurice Laugaa concludes that *L'Astrée* is neither a true pastoral nor an example of the emerging *roman*, but rather “entre la loi initiale de la convention pastorale et le sourd travail d'un genre en gestation.”²³ Eglal Henein also focuses on the uniqueness of d'Urfé's masterpiece, noting: “D'Urfé, lui, avait fait œuvre originale” and respects the distance the work puts between itself and other examples of pastoral fiction. She points out, for example, that *L'Astrée* parodies well-known episodes from other pastoral works.²⁴

In *La Bibliothèque française*, Sorel describes the pioneering nature of *L'Astrée* in terms of its style. “En ce temps-là Messire Honoré D'Urfé, ayant mis au jour son *Astrée*, voulut entierement s'éloigner du style ampoullé de quelques romans, et user d'un style plus raisonnable.”²⁵ In fact, Sorel's comment about *L'Astrée* is reminiscent of the way he talks about his own writing:²⁶ “De la sorte que cela est descript, je croy qu'il n'y a rien qui ne soit vray

society: “elle [la condition de berger] symbolise une autre façon de vivre, d'aimer, de sentir; elle suggère une autre idée du bonheur” (*Le Roman français au XVIIe siècle*, 53).

²² Jean-Pierre van Elslande, *L'Imaginaire pastoral du XVIIe siècle*, 37.

²³ Maurice Laugaa, “Structures et personnages dans *L'Astrée*,” *Etudes Françaises*. Vol. 2 No. 1 (1966), 5.

²⁴ Henein specifically mentions the story of Clidaman, Lindamor and Ligadmon from *L'Astrée*, which deforms an episode from *Amadis de Gaula* (*Protée romancier: les déguisements dans L'Astrée d'Honoré d'Urfé* [Paris: Schena-Nizet, 1996] 155).

²⁵ Charles Sorel, *La Bibliothèque française*, 233-4.

²⁶ In fact, Sorel makes other connections between *L'Astrée* and his own work in *De la connoissance des bons livres*: “[D]’autant plus doit-on estimer la lecture de celui d’Astrée, qu’on y voit de bonnes instructions sur diverses occurrences, avec quantité de Discours où la Doctrine est jointe à la beauté & à l’agrément, pour en former des conversations les plus utiles du monde” (155). In the *Remarques* of *Le Berger extravagant*, Sorel describes his *anti-roman* as a useful work: “Je ne laisseray pas non plus en arriere les occasions où je pourray montrer qu’il y a de la doctrine aux endroits où l’on croyoit qu’il n’y eust que de la bouffonnerie” (*BE, I, I*, 108). Perhaps most poignantly,

semblable” (*A-R*, I, I, 152). Because of the admiration Sorel seems to demonstrate for *L’Astrée*, the interpretation of d’Urfé’s text in *Le Berger extravagant* becomes particularly significant.

In this chapter, I examine the theme of disguise in two episodes from *Le Berger extravagant*. The first comes from *Livre IV*, in which Lysis is “transformed” into a girl by the “wizard” Hircan. The second is taken from *Livre VII*, in which various characters recount their supposed “adventures” to entertain and poke fun at Lysis. In his story, the character “Fontenay” explains how he met his wife, spinning a complex tale of disguise that succeeds in spell-binding Lysis. These two episodes contain elements that are strongly reminiscent of *L’Astrée* and the *Metamorphoses*. As I analyze these two moments of disguise in *Le Berger extravagant*, I investigate what Lysis’s and Fontenay’s disguises may reveal about the textual “disguises” and transformations at the heart of Sorel’s work.

Lysis’s Disguise

The episode in *Le Berger extravagant* in which Lysis disguises himself as a girl begins when he sees the gentleman Hircan strolling through the country and mistakes the gentleman’s walking stick for a magician’s staff. Lysis therefore concludes that he has just encountered a wizard and therefore asks Hircan to transform him into a girl so that he can seek employment as a maid alongside Charite. Hircan, playing along, agrees to change Lysis by performing a kind of “magic” ritual. After the “spell,” Lysis steps outside and is surprised when passersby do not recognize his transformation. He then returns to Hircan, concerned that the “metamorphosis” has

he notes that *L’Astrée* is a “*Roman qui contient plusieurs autres Romans*,” (*BE*, I, I, 153) a text with varied plots and stories tangled together. This construction mirrors that of *Le Berger extravagant* of which Sorel writes: “de plusieurs fables ramassees, j’ay fait une histoire veritable” (*BE*, I, *Préface*).

been ineffectual. Hircan remedies the problem by providing Lysis with a girl's dress. The disguise is then complete.

Thereafter, Lysis begins work in Leonor's house, where Charite lives. His gentlemen friends, including Clarimond and Anselme, come to dinner and immediately see through the pretend *berger's* disguise. They agree to play along, however, to see what entertainment they can draw from the episode. The servants are similarly forbidden from letting on that they know that Lysis is a girl. Lysis then renames himself "Amarylle," remembering that Céladon in *L'Astrée* took the identity of a woman (*BE, I, IV, 538*). The gentlemen poke fun at Lysis by doing things that provoke him: at one point Clarimond tries to corner "Amarylle" and kiss "her" pretending to have fallen madly in love with "her."

After a few days, the gentlemen devise another scheme ("une comedie" [*BE, I, IV, 550*]) to enrich the adventure that Lysis has dreamed up ("tirer plus de plaisir de luy" [*BE, I, IV, 549*]). They have Marcel, Leonor's manservant, claim that "Amarylle" tried to seduce him. The gentlemen then stage an elaborate trial in which "Amarylle" must prove her innocence by walking across a bed of coals. If "she" succeeds in traversing the embers without being burned, then she is innocent. But if she is injured, they will know that she has been unchaste. "Amarylle" submits to the trial not knowing that the embers are, in fact, cool and emerges unharmed. This, however, causes Oronte to accuse her of being a witch (*BE, I, IV, 562*) and the others conclude that she must therefore die. Clarimond then volunteers to die in her place, still pretending to be in love." Leonor acts outraged at what she calls *follie* (*BE, I, IV, 563*) and orders that both "Amarylle" and Clarimond be killed. Hircan, playing the wizard, enters in a show of flame and smoke and rescues the two "condemned." He then transforms "Amarylle" back into Lysis, ending the adventure.

This episode is reminiscent of a series of scenes in *L'Astrée* in which Céladon disguises himself as Alexis. One of the parallels between the two characters' disguises is the reason that they take on their alter-egos. Lysis wants to get nearer to Charite and to learn her feelings without upsetting her, as he has previously, inadvertently, done. "Je souhaite seulement de sçavoir, si je suis aymé de ma maistresse, & si quelque jour elle rendra mes desirs contens" (*BE, I, IV*, 528). In *L'Astrée*, Céladon describes a similar motivation. After Astrée, the *bergère* he loves, commands Céladon to leave her presence, the druid Adamas convinces Céladon to disguise himself as his daughter Alexis. Adamas conjectures that the disguise will allow the rejected *berger* to approach Astrée without disobeying her order not to appear before her again.

- Ah ! mon père, répondit le Berger, après y avoir songé quelque temps, et comment entendez-vous qu'Astrée, par ce moyen, ne me voie point? - Pensez-vous, ajouta le Druide, qu'elle vous voie, si elle ne vous connaît? Et comment vous connaîtra-t-elle ainsi revêtu? - Mais, répliqua Céladon, en quelque sorte que je sois revêtu, si serai-je en effet Céladon, de sorte que véritablement je lui désobéirai. - Que vous ne soyez Céladon, il n'y a point de doute, répondit Adamas, mais ce n'est pas en cela que vous contreviendrez à son ordonnance, car elle ne vous a pas défendu d'être Céladon, mais seulement de lui faire voir ce Céladon. Or elle ne le verra pas en vous voyant, mais Alexis.²⁷

Interestingly, in *Le Berger extravagant*, Charite issues a similar command to Lysis, although hers is contradictory and impossible for Lysis to honor: "Je vous commande que vous ne m'obeissez plus" (*BE, I, VI*, 886). Her request, however, is delivered some time after Lysis disguises himself. Nevertheless, Lysis consistently demonstrates the same respect for Charite's feelings that are Céladon's trademark. Lysis therefore takes on the qualities of a "perfect lover" after the courtly tradition, much as Céladon does in *L'Astrée*.

²⁷ Eglal Henein, "Deux Visages De L'Astrée - Portail." Tufts University, n.d. Web. *L'Astrée* (1621). *II, X*, 624, 625. Adamas insists that a disguised Céladon would not be in violation of Astrée's order, since she would not recognize him for who he truly is. Adamas' suggestion, however, is given in the unspoken hope that the disguised Céladon will be recognized by Astrée, (whom she believes to be dead) and will immediately forgive him for disobeying her. Moreover, Adamas is personally interested in Céladon's success in reuniting with Astrée. He believes Céladon and Astrée's union will assure his own happiness, as predicted by an oracle (*Ibid., II, VIII*, 314).

In another analogous moment, the characters Lysis and Céladon are disguised by other characters. In *Le Berger extravagant*, Lysis believes that Hircan is a magician with the power to alter the appearances of others. “Cecy n’est point sans remede, dit Lysis, j’essayeray de me desguiser pour l’aller [Charite] voir. Ne pouvez vous pas par vostre art, me donner une autre forme que la mienne, & me rendre méconnoissable? J’avisera cette nuit au visage que vous devez prendre, repartit Hircan” (*BE, I, IV, 530*). Importantly, Lysis requests more than a simple disguise. What he asks for, in fact, is a complete metamorphosis and the anonymity that such a transformation will provide. Much like Céladon, who agrees to disguise himself because it will allow him to pass unrecognized, Lysis wants to be “*méconnoissable*.”

Lysis’s request for “*une autre forme*” reflects the fact that his disguise will be a transformation across gender lines. Accordingly, Hircan uses a “spell” to create the disguise.

Lysis s’alla coucher librement ayant de tresbonnes esperances, et le lendemain au matin l’enchanteur l’ayant esté trouver luy fit plonger la teste dans un seau d’eau, cependant qu’il marmotoit quelques paroles inconnuës, & il luy dit apres, asseurez vous que vous estes maintenant tout semblable à une fille de village des plus gentilles. Vous n’avez qu’à aller à cette heure-cy treuver Leonor; je sçay bien qu’elle a affaire de servante; elle vous loüera indubitablement, et par ce moyen vous pourrez voir continuellement Charite, et jouyr de tous les contentemens du monde. (*BE, I, IV, 530-1*)

Hircan’s “magic” comes with the guarantee that Lysis will accomplish his goals. Hircan then completes the ritual by having Lysis submerge his head in a bucket of water, supposedly turning him into a girl.

In *L’Astrée*, Céladon also creates his disguise with the help of another character. After Astrée issues her commandment to Céladon, he dives into the river Lignon in despair, intending to kill himself. After having been rescued from the river by nymphs, Céladon is approached by the druid Adamas who suggests that disguise may be the solution to the *berger’s* problems. He helps Céladon consider the particulars of the disguise, including the female alter-ego that he will

take on to preserve his anonymity. Lysis's idea to disguise himself as a woman is inspired in part by the way Céladon assumes Alexis' identity (*BE, I, IV, 538*). Lysis recognizes and admires the way dressing and acting like a woman allows Céladon to pass into areas that would otherwise be forbidden. Céladon is able to gain access to Astrée in a manner that would be impossible if he were to merely pretend to be another man.

Another link between *Le Berger extravagant* and *L'Astrée* can be observed in the way Lysis's and Céladon's disguises are created. Despite Lysis's faith in Hircan as a magician, he finds out that his appearance has not changed sufficiently when his masculine clothing betrays his identity to passersby.

Le Berger voyant cecy connut que le charme d'Hircan n'estoit pas si fort qu'il avoit pensé, mais tout aussi tost il songea que la faute venoit de ce qu'il avoit gardé son habit d'homme, qui n'avoit pas esté changé comme son corps: de sorte qu'il s'en voulut retourner chez le Magicien pour y mettre remede. Il luy dit ce qu'il en pensoit, et Hircan luy avoüa que lors qu'il auroit un habit de fille, il pourroit bien mieux tromper le monde qu'en ayant un de garçon. (*BE, I, IV, 534*)

When Lysis discovers that Hircan's "magic" has been ineffective, Hircan quickly remedies the situation by equipping Lysis with the proper female costume. Lysis then admires himself in the mirror and is pleased by the image he sees. "Il se regarda dedans, & s'escria avec un excez d'allegresse. Ha! Dieu, l'on ne peut mieux ressembler à une Bergere que je fay" (*BE, I, IV, 535*).

Similarly, in *L'Astrée*, Adamas describes the involved process of disguising Céladon.

Et quelques jours apres vous vous habillerez comme elle [Alexis], & je vous recevray chez moy, sous le nom de ma fille Alexis, & il sera fort à propos de dire qu'elle est malade: car la vie que vous avez faite depuis plus de deux Lunes vous a changé de sorte le visage, & tant osté de la vive couleur que vous souliez avoir, qu'il n'y a celuy qui n'y soit trompé en vous regardant.²⁸

²⁸ Ibid., II, X, 624.

While Céladon's costume is essential to the creation of his disguise, more is required for it to be sufficiently convincing. Céladon must also take on the identity of Adamas' daughter Alexis – and feign illness to explain his current lack of color. In both works, the donning of the disguise is a somewhat complex process that must take into account the particular situations of the characters as well as their desires to approach their loved ones.

Furthermore, in both *Le Berger extravagant* and *L'Astrée*, the integrity of the disguises is constantly threatened. Adamas goes to great lengths to disguise Céladon as his daughter Alexis, yet the resemblance between Céladon and "Alexis" is nevertheless observed. During the scene in which Hylas falls in love with the disguised Céladon, Céladon's brother Lycidas remarks:

Et afin, disoit-il, que sans offencer je vous dise quelle elle est, representez-vous le visage de feu mon frère [Céladon] quand il estoit en sa plus grande beauté: car elle [Alexis] luy ressemble, de sorte que je ne vis jamais pourtrait qui ressemblast mieux à un visage, ou pour mieux dire, jamais miroir ne representa rien plus naïvement.²⁹

The resemblance is striking – clearer than even the reflection of a mirror – yet, remarkably, the disguised Céladon is never found out.³⁰ The reader is never satisfied with an explanation as to how this can be.³¹

In *Le Berger extravagant*, Lysis enjoys a similar immunity to discovery. This is due, not to the comprehensiveness of his disguise, but rather to the agreement Hircan and his friends Anselme, Clarimond, and Oronte have made to play along with the idea of the masquerade. The

²⁹ Ibid., II, XII, 903.

³⁰ In the posthumous portions of *L'Astrée* (Part of Part IV and all of Part V), Céladon's disguise begins to fail as he is increasingly careless about keeping his identity secret. Indeed, at one moment, he decides to behave and speak as a man despite the risk of being found out. Adamas also urges Céladon to give up the disguise and reveal to Astrée who he really is. Despite these movements toward revelation, the integrity of the disguise somehow holds.

³¹ This problem is discussed at length by Laurence A. Gregorio who states that "[p]astoral characters remain unimpressed by their habitual inability to attribute identity properly with all but the most familiar of their acquaintances." He attributes this dilemma to a tendency of pastoral writing to focus not on the physical description of a character, but rather on behavior patterns or philosophical leanings (*The Pastoral Masquerade: Disguise and Identity in L'Astrée*, 12, 19).

dubiousness of Lysis's disguise is revealed by the reactions of those who are not in on the joke. Before Anselme is informed of the situation, he sees "Amarylle" enter the room and recognizes Lysis at once: "Ha! Madame, si ce n'est là Lysis, voyla une fille qui luy ressemble parfaitement bien" (*BE, I, IV*, 543). Anselme is soon after let in on the joke and agrees to play along.

In both Céladon's and Lysis's situations, difficulty maintaining the disguise is just as important as the way the other characters react to it. This process is somewhat different for Lysis than it is for Céladon. Leonard Hinds proposes one reason for this; in *L'Astrée*, the disguise may be conceptualized as a "coextension of body and mind." He explains that Céladon is able to subjugate his own desires to those of Alexis, and as he assumes her identity, he buries his own character.³² In *Le Berger extravagant*, however, Hinds sees both Lysis and "Amarylle" preserved within the same embodiment, creating a figure with "layered" motivations.³³ Alternately, Eglal Henein conceptualizes the complexity of the disguise by separating the desires of "Alexis" from those of Céladon: "Alexis appréhende de s'égarer à cause de Céladon. Que désirerait Alexis, elle qui a réalisé ses espoirs? Que craindrait Céladon, lui 'qui est parvenu au comble de tous les malheurs'? Alexis craint de perdre sa place. Céladon désire reconquérir la sienne."³⁴ In Henein's view, Céladon does not submit to a kind of mental extinction while in disguise, but rather faces a conflict of interest with the position occupied by his alter-ego.

Hind's attempt to distinguish the treatment of Lysis's and Céladon's disguise is problematic, since Céladon does not truly become Alexis nor does his personality disappear

³² "Unlike d'Urfé, who presents material and spiritual metamorphoses, Sorel does not exploit a notion of the coextension of body and mind. In fact, he stages transvestitism as an activity of layering seemingly contradictory identities, such as the desiring subject and the object of desire" (Leonard Hinds, *Narrative Transformations from L'Astrée to Le Berger extravagant*, 115).

³³ See *ibid.*, 148, 156.

³⁴ Eglal Henein, *Protée romancier: les déguisements dans l'Astrée d'Honoré d'Urfé*, 335.

when he assumes the disguise.³⁵ It is, however, true that in *Le Berger extravagant* Lysis is constantly confronted with the mundane and, for lack of a better word, “realistic” difficulties of creating and maintaining his disguise. In Sorel’s text, the particulars of the disguise are discussed to a degree unparalleled by d’Urfé’s. Besides the logistics required to maintain a smooth chin (accomplished by rubbing a pumice stone over his stubble for days before his disguise) and a womanly hairstyle (which quickly worsens as the days go by, as Lysis doesn’t know how to fix it), Lysis must struggle to conceal his male figure (*BE, I, IV, 535, 544, 548*). Additionally, Lysis often forgets that he has been “transformed,” and betrays his identity in his dialog. “Quelquefois elle [”Amarylle”] ne se pouvoit empescher de parler de soy au genre masculin, au lieu de parler au feminin, neantmoins on faisoit semblant de n’y pas prendre garde” (*BE, I, IV, 544-5*). Paradoxically, the lengthy descriptions of Lysis’s efforts to remain in disguise come alongside episodes that demonstrate just how transparent it actually is.

The narrator gives additional insight into Lysis’s thought process as the character grapples with the problems posed by his disguise. During the mock-trial, “Amarylle’s” internal dialog reveals “her” consciousness that she is still, to some degree, Lysis, despite the “metamorphosis” she has undergone.

Pour Amarylle, disoit elle en soy mesme, je sçay bien qu’elle est chaste, mais pour Lysis je ne le sçay pas asseurement. Toutefois mes pieds ne seront pas bruslez, car c’est au corps & en l’exterieur que je suis Amarylle, et je ne suis Lysis qu’en l’ame, puis qu’un Magicien m’a fait changer de figure. (*BE, I, IV, 560*)

While little explanation is offered about the details of Céladon’s disguise in *L’Astrée*, the character nevertheless faces challenges remaining undercover.³⁶ Some time after Céladon

³⁵ This is evidenced by the way Céladon remains in disguise during these scenes.

³⁶ In his book on cross-dressing in seventeenth-century France, Joseph Harris comments upon Céladon’s disguise in *L’Astrée*. He agrees with Hinds that Céladon’s disguise changes his identity. He writes that “Alexis” becomes “more than a simple mask to be adopted or discarded. As becomes gradually clear, cross-dressing produces in Céladon a

disguises himself as Alexis, Adamas arranges for him to stay with Astrée and some of her companions. In this episode, the disguised Céladon and the women are together, getting ready to go to sleep. Astrée, infatuated with her new friend, begins to undress Céladon/Alexis, which poses a threat to the integrity of the disguise.

Cependant Astrée estoit si empeschée autour de sa chère Alexis, qu'elle ne luy pouvoit laisser oster une espingle sans y porter soigneusement la main, & la Druyde, tant qu'il luy fut possible, luy laissa faire cet amoureux office; mais quant il fallut oster sa robe, craignant qu'elle ne reconneust le deffaut de ses tétins, elle fit signe à Leonide qui, sçachant bien ce qu'elle vouloit dire, & s'approchant d'elle: Belle bergère, luy dit elle commençons de nous deshabiller, car je voy bien que vous vous amusez après ma sœur, et elle a une coustume qu'aussi-tost qu'elle est au lict, elle s'endort [... c]'est pourquoy despeschons de nous mettre au lict, afin que nous ne l'incommodions point.³⁷

As the disguised Céladon/Alexis spends time in Astrée's company, the issue of his male body repeatedly jeopardizes his disguise. When dressing and undressing, Céladon is constantly encumbered by what cannot be changed under the clothing:

[p]our le sein il estoit impossible d'y remedier, aussi n'y avoit-il rien qu'elle [Alexis] craignist que ce seul deffaut, qu'elle cachoit avec tant de peine, qu'il estoit bien analysé qu'on s'en peust prendre garde. Ayant donc bien rejoint sa chemise sur son estomac, et les manches de la chemise, de peur qu'on ne s'aperceust de ce qu'elle portait en bas, elle ouvrit les rideaux du costé où se deshabilloit Astrée.³⁸

But it is not Céladon's body alone that is problematic. As the disguise succeeds in bringing the estranged lovers together, allowing Céladon the intimacy of participating in moments of dress and repose with Astrée, it simultaneously prevents the full realization of

crisis of subjectivity and identity as his alter ego 'Alexis' begins to develop an existence, a personality, a history, and even desires of 'her' own." Yet Harris interprets the looming presence of Alexis not as a replacement of Céladon but rather as an addition to it. He writes of a "duality," noting that Céladon "even refers to himself in the plural at the very point he envisages re-establishing his original, unified identity in the eyes of his beloved" (*Hidden Agendas: Cross-Dressing in 17th Century France* [Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 2005] 121).

³⁷ Honoré d'Urfé, *L'Astrée: où par plusieurs histoires, et sous personnes de Bergers, & d'autres, sont deduits les divers effets de l'honneste Amitié. Troisième Partie.* (Paris: Courbé, 1646) III, X, 418.

³⁸ Ibid. III, X, 418, 419.

Céladon's goal. Henein notes that in certain passages from Part IV, the narrator begins once more to name Céladon with feminine pronouns, as if to emphasize how the disguise is curtailing the realization of the *berger's* desires to court and wed Astrée as a man.³⁹ "Qui suis-je? se demande Alexis. Une troublante correspondance s'établit entre des aspirations opposées et un personnage dédoublé. La crainte d'Alexis et le désir de Céladon se heurtent [...] La cohabitation du berger et de la feinte druide, d'abord plaisante, devient périlleuse parce qu'elle aboutit à un schisme."⁴⁰ The success of Céladon's disguise therefore becomes difficult to determine. His reluctance to abandon his disguise is what ultimately prevents him from being fully united with Astrée as her lover. Only when he removes the disguise can he trigger the sequence of events that leads to true reconciliation.⁴¹

The question of whether "Amarylle's" disguise is effective is similarly complex. Certainly, unlike d'Urfé's hero, who, in the tradition of disguised pastoral characters, enjoys a certain immunity to discovery,⁴² Lysis is unsuccessful in fooling almost anyone. In spite of this, however, he still enjoys a kind of success, since his initial goal, as stated to Hircan, was to see "s'[il est] aimé de [s]a maistresse, & si quelque jour elle rendra [s]es desirs contents." Furthermore, Hircan initially assured Lysis that he would enjoy "tous les contentemens du monde" (*BE, I, IV*, 532). Accordingly, the narrator reports of the days in disguise that "Amarylle

³⁹ Emma Donoghue also comments upon this problem: "His [Céladon's] female persona, 'Alexis,' starts to take over from him; the narrator increasingly uses 'her' name and feminine pronouns to refer to Céladon, and the frontispieces to the third and fourth volumes feature 'her.' Our hero [...] is frozen, unable to act" (*Inseparable: Desire Between Women in Literature* [New York: Random House, 2010] 47).

⁴⁰ Eglal Henein, *Protée Romancier, les déguisements dans l'Astrée d'Honoré d'Urfé*, 339.

⁴¹ As narrated in Balthazar Baro's Part V.

⁴² See Laurence A. Gregorio, *Pastoral Masquerade: Disguise and Identity in L'Astrée*, 11.

passa quatre jours avec tous les contentemens du monde,” (*BE, I, IV, 546*) fulfilling Hircan’s promise to the letter.⁴³

However, Lysis’s own evaluation of his disguise does not take into account the desires he initially states about his own love or happiness. Rather, after Hircan “transforms” Amarylle back into Lysis, the pretended *berger* focuses on the inventive nature of his adventure.

Il [Lysis] disoit qu’il luy estoit arrivé une chose *qui n’estoit dans aucune histoire du monde*, & que l’on voyoit bien dans le Pasteur fidelle⁴⁴ une Bergere qui portoit un mesme nom que luy, laquelle estoit accusee faulxement d’avoir perdu son honneur, & que dans une Pastorale plus nouvelle qu’il avoit leuë, il y avoit aussi une autre Bergere accusee de mesme: mais que *jamais on n’avoit ouy parler*, qu’un Berger ayant pris les habits de fille, fust repris de justice pour semblable sujet. (*BE, I, IV, 569-70*, my emphasis)

Lysis is pleased because his disguise allowed him to have an adventure of which “*jamais on n’avoit ouy parler*.”

Lysis’s adventure as Amarylle is made possible by his apparent *délire*: the character appears to believe that the “spell” Hircan works on him really changes him into a girl. As I discussed in my introduction, Genette describes how the madness of characters in an *antiroman* allows an author to question features of the works of fiction they interpret. Foucault explains that *folie par identification romanesque* demonstrates an unease between the “réel et imaginaire.”⁴⁵

⁴³ Hircan’s promise and its literal fulfillment are one example of the difference in tone between *L’Astrée* and the *Le Berger extravagant*. In Sorel’s text, Hircan’s promise is humorous, but the situation in *L’Astrée* is not.

⁴⁴ The text to which Lysis refers is Giovanni Battista Guarini’s pastoral tragic-comedy *Il Pastor fido*. The text was published in 1589, and enjoyed significant popularity throughout Europe. As Lysis indicates, there is a character with the same name as his alter-ego. Amarilli, betrothed to Silvio because they are both of godly parentage, is discovered in the company of Mirtillo, the man she loves yet hides her feelings for. It is assumed that they have been indiscrete, so Amarilli is condemned to die for her supposed sin. She is saved when Mirtillo offers to take her punishment. Before he can be executed, however, it is revealed that Mirtillo is, in fact, Silvio’s brother. Amarilli and Mirtillo are therefore able to marry.

⁴⁵ “Folie, où sont mises en question les valeurs d’un autre âge, d’un autre art, d’une autre morale, mais où se reflètent aussi, brouillées et troublées, étrangement compromises les unes par les autres dans une chimère commune, toutes les formes, même les plus distantes, de l’imagination humaine” (Michel Foucault, *Histoire de la folie à l’âge classique*, 48).

In this episode, the country gentlemen play along with Lysis's "metamorphosis," pretending not to know who Amarylle really is and concocting further adventures for the new "maid." However, Lysis's *extravagance* is just as important to the continuation of the adventures. In each instance, even when the stakes appear to be high (as when Amarylle is put on trial or sentenced to death), Lysis stubbornly remains in character, allowing the adventure to develop further.

Lysis's dialog reveals that is familiar with *L'Astrée* and the way Céladon disguises himself to be near the woman he loves. Lysis's behavior while disguised is often a conscious interpretation of the other character's actions. In some ways, therefore, he may be said to "play" Céladon like an actor interprets a dramatic role in a work of theater. His "metamorphosis" into Amarylle thus also entails a "transformation" into Céladon. In the text, emphasis is put on the way Lysis's adventures are acted out.

Tout cecy avoit esté une partie faite par Clarimond & Anselme [...] ils eurent bien du plaisir à parler de toutes les sottises que le Berger amoureux avoit faites. Chacun avoüa qu'il n'y avoit rien de pareil à sa conversation, & que *l'on venoit de voir* par effect une aventure remarquable, *que l'on n'avoit point veu* jusqu'alors autrement que par escrit. (BE, I, IV, 568-9, my emphasis)

His actions become a spectacle that is facilitated by his eager audience, the country gentlemen, who pretend to "see" the disguise.

The madness or acting of Lysis's disguise provides several opportunities for Sorel to comment on *L'Astrée* and the other texts represented in Lysis's adventure. Sometimes this occurs through the discussions of characters like Clarimond and Anselme, who, among others, are spectators to Lysis's playacting. These characters often make judgments on the production, reminiscing on the way the texts are staged and pronouncing a verdict on their execution. This commentary is an essential part of the way hypotexts are presented in *Le Berger extravagant*.

In the *Remarques*, Sorel provides additional commentary on various aspects of the disguise. Much of it is critical in nature and centers on the failings of the original texts Lysis transforms. The episode, for example, in which Lysis is put on trial for his supposed lasciviousness is an imitation of two ancient Greek romances, the *Aethiopica* (Theagenes and Chariclea) and *The Adventures of Leucippe and Clitophon*. Sorel is insistant on the absurdities he sees in these texts that are questioned and reframed in *Le Berger extravagant*. After recounting the tales in brief, he expresses his disapproval of specific unbelievable plot elements.

Ce que l'on y trouve de difficile à croire, est que cette fille [Chariclee] estant jettée dans un feu, comme si elle eust esté coupable de la mort de Cybelle, se sauva par le moyen d'un Pantharbe qu'elle portoit. Ce sont des reveries de dire qu'une petite pierre enchauffée dans un anneau ayt la vertu de garantir une personne des flammes. Il valoit mieux dire tout d'un train, que les Dieux avoient conservé Chariclee pour son innocence. (*BE, IV, Rem., IV, 190*)

Sorel then explains how Amarylle has corrected this error, yet, importantly, emphasizes that the *Aethiopica* still functions as the source of reference.

Toutefois, il faut songer qu'il y avoit quelques lettres gravees sur cette pierre, & que c'estoient possible des caracteres de magie qui rendoient cet anneau si puissant. Cela estant on les trouve plus satisfait, & c'est tousjours une autorité que l'on peut apporter pour dire qu'Amarylle porte sur soy de semblables preservatifs. (*BE, IV, Rem., IV, 190*)

Sorel makes it clear that it is important that the reader remember the original source that inspired the episode, despite its failings. Recognition of the hypotext is necessary for understanding how Lysis has improved the text in *Le Berger extravagant*.

Sorel's commentary in the *Remarques* is also expansive in that it provides, in many instances, a very thorough catalog of the many texts to have inspired the scene. In his discussion of Amarylle's trial, Sorel enumerates six different works that inspired the character's walk across

the embers.⁴⁶ The author not only explains the various sources of inspiration for the episode, but also takes the opportunity to recount specifics from each plot, carefully illustrating which details informed which aspects of Lysis's behavior (*BE, IV, Rem., IV, 187-9*).

In the opening *Remarques* of *Le Berger extravagant*, Sorel indicates that one of the *Remarques*' main purposes is to identify the sources of material referenced in the diegesis. However, while *L'Astrée* is certainly one of the most obvious sources of this episode, in the *Remarques* of *Le Berger extravagant*, Sorel makes little comment on it.

Pourquoy n'est-il [Lysis] pas crû estre aussi bien deguisé qu'un million d'Amants que se trouvent dans nos histoires feintes? La chose estoit encore plus vray-semblable, puis qu'il avoient tousjours esté soigneux de se faire raser le menton, & de se servir de quelques secrets qui empeschassent que la barbe ne luy vinst, ce qui est une particularité à quoy les autres ne songeoient pas. Pour ce qui est du reste, il y a une infinité d'exemples de ceux qui se sont mis en service pour avoir le moyen de voir leurs maistresses: mais passons ces choses dont personne ne peut estre en doute. (*BE, IV, Rem., IV, 184-5*)

Given the number of parallels between Lysis's and Céladon's disguises, the lack of direct references to *L'Astrée* is striking. Sorel writes instead of "un million d'Amants que se trouvent dans nos histoires feintes" and "une infinité d'exemples" that may be identified as the source for this scene. These texts include the countless examples from pastoral literature in which the topos of disguise is exploited by couples who face obstacles to their reunion. Yet, no particular work is named in the *Remarques*. Genette's observation of the *antiroman* becomes very apt: "Son hypotexte est en fait un hypogénre."⁴⁷

The commentary in the *Remarques* of the 1633-34 *Anti-Roman*, however, is more extensive. There, Sorel praises Hircan for his ingenuity as a magician, pointing out the way his

⁴⁶ These include the *Aethiopica* and *The Adventures of Leucippe and Clitophon*, as well as texts by the Latin author Valerius Maximus, the historian Claude Fauchet, the German classical scholar Joachim Camerarius, and the French humanist Pierre Boaistuau (*BE, III, Rem., IV, 187-9*).

⁴⁷ Gérard Genette, *Palimpsestes: La Littérature au second degré*, 171.

actions mock ancient wizards from mythology (*A-R, I, Rem., IV*, 650). He praises Lysis for his inventiveness in playing a believable “Amarylle,” explaining that pastoral characters neglect the kinds of care Lysis takes in preparing for his disguise (*A-R, I, Rem., IV*, 651). Most frequently, he indicates that the events in *Le Berger extravagant* are much more believable than those from other pastorals that inspire Lysis’s behavior: “La chose estoit encore plus vray-semblable” (*A-R, I, Rem., IV*, 652). In all of this, however, *L’Astrée* is never mentioned by name. As in the *Remarques*, the text is perhaps alluded to when the narrator states: “Il y a beaucoup de choses en suite sur lesquelles je ne dy rien, non pas que je les estime moins que les autres: mais c’est qu’elles portent leur explication” (*A-R, I, Rem., IV*, 657), but there is nothing definitive.⁴⁸ Certainly it is true that the seventeenth-century reader of *Le Berger extravagant* would have known and understood the elements of pastoral fiction in Sorel’s text. Moreover, given the monumental nature of d’Urfé’s masterpiece, it seems unlikely that the contemporary reader would ever have been, as the *Remarques* say, “*en doute*.”

Instead, the lack of explanation in the *Remarques* seems to indicate that the spectacle of transformation and “textual disguise” in *Le Berger extravagant* is in and of itself valuable commentary on the source material. In the diegesis, Sorel uses Lysis’s madness to juxtapose hypotext and hypertext dramatizing the textual metamorphoses at the heart of the work. Characters comment upon Lysis’s transformation of the texts that they and the reader recognize and pronounce judgments on the character’s actions. This commentary highlights the differences

⁴⁸ There is, however, one mention of Céladon in the diegesis. It comes during a moment of internal dialog as Lysis justifies his disguise to himself. “Non, non, il n’y a point de honte de prendre ce vestement quand l’Amour le commande. Le grand Alcide changea bien sa massuë en une quenouille, & vestit la robe d’Iole au lieu de la peau de lyon. Poliarque ne s’est-il pas vestu en fille, se faisant appeler Theocrine, & Celadon n’a-t’il pas fait le mesme, se faisant appeler Alexis? (*A-R, I, IV*, 562). Nevertheless, Sorel does not pronounce judgment or offer interpretive commentary, except to note that Lysis thinks Céladon a worthy model for emulation.

between d'Urfé's and Sorel's works as well as the transformative processes that occur in *Le Berger extravagant*.

In the episode of Lysis's disguise, Sorel questions accepted tropes in *L'Astrée* by simulating them in a manner that questions their reasonability. When Hircan "transforms" Lysis into a girl, he performs a spell in which Lysis is asked to dunk his head into a bucket of water. In *L'Astrée*, water also appears as a consequential plot element. The impetuous waters of the Lignon into which Céladon casts himself foreshadow the character's eventual change of identity. These rushing, raging floods add credibility to the figurative power of its waters to alter.⁴⁹ In *Le Berger extravagant*, however, Hircan uses water in a diminutive ritual of transformation. He strips away the power of the floods in *L'Astrée* as he "transforms" Lysis. The imminent failure of Hircan's gesture is all the more pointed since the ritual to which he submits Lysis bears striking resemblances to the Catholic sacrament of baptism.⁵⁰ When Lysis steps from the "magician's" presence and is noticed by a woman, the counterfeit nature of the procedure is immediately revealed by her comment: "Vrayment; luy respondit la villageoise en grommelant, je ne voudrois pas qu'une telle fille [Lysis déguisé] eust couché avec la mienne. J'aurois peur qu'elle n'en fist d'autres" (*BE, I, IV, 532-3*).

In this episode, Lysis's disguise creates opportunities for the author to expand *Le Berger extravagant* through the character's transformation of various elements of *L'Astrée*. His madness

⁴⁹ Twyla Meding discusses the manipulative and erosive nature of the Lignon: 'Rien n'est constant que l'inconstance, durable mesme en son changement.' So the narrator of *L'Astree* ponders the shepherd Celadon's plunge into the river Lignon's waters of oblivion and its illustration of the inherent changeability of all things, particularly the once-constant and mutual love shared by the capricious shepherdess Astree and her faithful suitor" (Twyla Meding. "Pastoral Palimpsest: Writing the Laws of Love in *L'Astrée*." *Renaissance Quarterly*. The Free Library by Farlex. [22 Dec 1999] Web).

⁵⁰ When undoing the "magic," Hircan also uses water. This time, he pours it over Lysis's head, and speaks "magic" words: "Ce doute [de son genre] luy dura jusqu'à tant que le Magicien, comme pour user d'un contre-charme, luy eust jetté un peu d'eau sur la teste, en proferant quelques mots barbares" (*A-R, I, IV, 583*).

creates the adventure and generates the need for critique that is provided by both the other characters and the author in the *Remarques*. The episode's theatricality broadens the scope of the work by inviting the reader to be a part of Lysis's audience and to appreciate the way that he stages the transformations of the works that inspire him. In the diegesis, this spectacle is unique because of the way it allows the characters the opportunity to interact with the "actor" Lysis and to amplify the adventure further by contributing to the counterfeit world of fiction that is being created. In the *Remarques*, what commentary there is points back to this theatrical presentation by simultaneously revealing and veiling the sources that inspired Lysis's behavior. The "disguise" of Sorel's text thus becomes increasingly complex as Sorel preserves other texts in the *Remarques* and attempts to conceal others in the diegesis.

The episode I will examine next comes from *Livre VII* in which Fontenay recounts his "adventure" to amuse the other characters, but more especially to play along with Lysis's belief in the world of fiction he believes he lives in. The nature of Fontenay's disguise is somewhat different from that of Lysis because it is a secondary narrative that the character concocts from a pool of various fables and myths, including *L'Astrée* and the *Metamorphoses*. Instead of madness, Fontenay demonstrates artifice, or the ability to consciously construct an adventure. The awareness the character demonstrates in composing his narrative is of particular interest because of the way Sorel constantly ponders the transforming elements in *Le Berger extravagant*. For this reason, Fontenay's disguise gives additional insights into the nature of textual "disguise" in *Le Berger extravagant*.

Fontenay's Disguise

Significantly, Fontenay's narrative in *Livre VII* bears many similarities to the episode of Lysis's disguise. The connection between the accounts is reinforced by Lysis's reaction to the other character's narrative: "Il m'est tombé des larmes des yeux au recit de son aventure [de Fontenay] qui m'a touché de si pres" (*BE, II, VII*, 107). Fontenay's tale uses the theme of disguise to both exploit and repair other texts by creating direct comparisons between them and *Le Berger extravagant*. In particular, the narrative examines problems of duplication and the unreliability of appearance in texts such as the *Metamorphoses*, as well as the paradoxes they present.

Although Fontenay is disguised as a woman for reasons of love as Lysis is, his experience is more complex. As the narrative progresses, Fontenay transfers his affections multiple times from one subject to another. Initially, he describes his infatuation with a "nymph" he sees at a pool. Then, he is fooled by his own disguised reflection in the water. Later, he entertains a relationship with this same reflection in the mirror. Lastly, he falls in love with a disguised woman who later becomes his wife. Each of these encounters offers a different perspective from which to consider the effects of disguise, and each is based on a different form of illusion. Each stage of the disguise bears ties to the *Metamorphoses* or *L'Astrée* and demonstrates Fontenay's use of artifice to control the direction his story takes.

Fontenay's narrative is made up of three distinct stages. In the first, the character sees a beautiful woman washing herself and asks the magician Zenocrite to use his magic to make her reappear. Zenocrite responds unexpectedly, disguising Fontenay as a woman and bringing him back to the water. Fontenay sees his own reflection in the pool and, at first, believes that he is seeing the "nymph" he glimpsed earlier. Only after attempting conversation and physical contact

does he realize the ruse. This recognition, however, does nothing to curtail his admiration for the image he has seen.

Parallels can be observed between Fontenay and Narcissus from the *Metamorphoses*. In both cases, the character takes his reflection in water for that of another person and subsequently falls in love with it. The difference between the two texts, however, rests in the character's understanding of the situation. Narcissus' infatuation is a punishment inflicted upon him for spurning the previously cursed Echo. His ignorance of the source of the image eventually causes his demise. While both characters recognize the image as their own, this discovery delights Fontenay, while it greatly saddens Narcissus.

Chacun m'avoüra que ce visage est aymable, et pour moy je me sentirois tres-heureux si je trouvois une fille qui en eust un aussi beau. Pleust à Dieu que cela fust ! Mais pourquoy le désiré-je y a t'il rien de meilleur que d'estre Maistresse et serviteur tout ensemble? à toute heure je pourray voir la beauté dont je suis espris. Si je souspire, elle souspirera; si je ris, elle rira aussi; si je cherche des faveurs, elles seront aussi tost obtenues que desirées; si je donne quelque chose à ma Nymphé, il n'y aura rien de perdu, car je donneray tout à moy mesme. (*BE, II, VII, 77-78*)

While Narcissus' state is a punishment for his treatment of Echo, Fontenay speaks as if the situation is an advantage. He claims that the idea of a relationship in which he can play both partners appeals to him because of the perfect, controlled reciprocity it offers.

Additionally, both Fontenay and Narcissus are taken with an image that, while having no real substance, is treated as though it were a real-life entity. This phenomenon is all the more interesting because the images the characters view are reflections, or doubles, of themselves. Clément Rosset, in his work on "reality" summarized in *L'Ecole du réel*, explains the double as an essential element of illusion. In order for an illusion to work, the double must be indistinguishable from the original. But the double does not produce any illusion unless it does, in fact, differ from the original in some significant way. Rosset then explains the problem with

using the word “*double*” to describe the illusory substitute. “Paradoxale, car la notion de *double*, on le verra, implique en elle-même un paradoxe: d’être à la fois elle-même et l’autre.” A true double would be an exact copy, which cannot be the case if an illusion – a scenario of deception – is to be created:

Cependant toute duplication suppose un original et une copie, et on se demandera qui, de l’“autre événement” ou de l’événement réel, est le modèle, et qui le double. On découvre alors que l’ “autre événement” n’est pas véritablement le double de l’événement réel. C’est bien plutôt l’inverse: l’événement réel qui apparaît lui-même comme le double de l’ “autre événement.” En sorte que c’est l’événement réel qui est, finalement, l’ “autre” : l’autre c’est ce réel-ci, soit le double d’un autre réel qui serait lui le réel même mais qui échappe toujours et dont on ne pourra jamais rien dire ni rien savoir.⁵¹

Rosset concludes that because the disguised “*autre événement*” is mistaken for the original, it, for all intents and purposes, becomes the “*événement réel*.” If the illusion is successful, the true *original* ceases to exist. At this point, it is not clear whom Narcissus believes his reflection to be, since his dialog is ambiguous at this point⁵² but he nevertheless converses with the image as though it represents someone separate from himself. Like Fontenay, Narcissus believes that the reflection he sees represents a tangible figure capable of being loved.

Fontenay’s request to the magician is for an image; he wants Zenocrite to produce a picture of the “nymph” he viewed at the pool’s edge. “Donnez moy ce contentement *que je la voye encore une fois avant que de mourir*” (*BE, II, VII, 71*, my emphasis). His description of the

⁵¹ Clément Rosset, *L'Ecole du réel*, 18, 32.

⁵² “Sed quod videt, uritur illo: Atque oculos idem, qui decipit, incitat error. Credule, quid frustra simulacra fugacia captas? Quod petis, est nusquam: quod amas, avertere, perdes. Ista percussæ, quam cernis, imaginis umbra est. Nil habet ista sui: Tecum venitque, manetque: Tecum discedet: sit u discedere possis” (Ovid, *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoseon. Libri XV*. [Philadelphia: Impensis Wm. Pontell et Soc., 1805] *III*, 430-6). (“Il ne sçait que c’est qu’il a devant les yeux, mais quoy que ce soit, c’est ce qui le charme, c’est ce qui l’afflige, c’est ce qui le martyre. Ce qui l’attire, c’est ce qui le decoit, ce qui l’esmeut, c’est ce qui le trompe. Abusé que tu es, pourquoy tasches-tu de prendre une image qui te fuit ? Ce que tu caresses n’est rien, destourne-toy de là, & ce que tu aymes se perdra, car il n’a autre estre que celuy que ta presence luy donne. Ceste beauté que tu vois n’est que l’ombre de la tienne, ombre qui te fuit & demeure tousjours avec toy, ombre qui s’en ira si tu peux t’en aller” [*Les Metamorphoses d’Ovide, traduites en prose Française & de nouveau soigneusement receües et corrigées*. Trans. Nicolas Renouard. (Lyon: Nicolas Gay, 1650) *Le troisième livre*, 122-3.])

initial encounter with the woman stresses that the only contact with her to this point has been through sight. “Comme je jettay les yeux dessus les eaux qui estoient fort claires en cét endroit là, je vy dedans une Nymphé la plus belle que l’on se puisse imaginer” (*BE, II, VII, 73*, my emphasis). Zenocrite thus disguises Fontenay in order to create an image with which Fontenay may fall in love. This image is purely visual, however, present only when cast on another, reflective material like the water of the pool. Despite its limitations, what Fontenay sees in the water effectively fulfils the qualifications he gave to Zenocrite.

Zenocrite grants Fontenay’s request, but the reflection’s durability remains dependent on the integrity of the material upon which it is cast. The water of the pool risks destroying the image and thwarting the purpose of the disguise because of its constant movement.⁵³ Indeed, when Fontenay attempts to touch the image, it immediately disappears.⁵⁴ The character is thus unable, at this stage, to take his relationship with the image past visual admiration.⁵⁵ Fontenay tries to make contact with the “nymph” in another way: he asks to hear her speak: “Sa veuë m’a

⁵³ Water is also inherently unreliable in *L’Astrée*. Genette writes of its function particularly as it works in the *Fontaine de la Vérité d’Amour*. He describes its role as the surface upon which a fugitive image is projected. “Dans les pastorales, le sorcier à qui l’on s’adresse pour connaître la vérité sur son amour, c’est dans un miroir qu’il la montre, instrument d’élection du savoir magique. Dans *L’Astrée*, le miroir est devenu fontaine, la Fontaine de la Vérité d’Amour, où se reflète le visage de la bien-aimée absente: le miroir aquatique révèle les présences invisibles, les sentiments cachés, le secret des âmes [...] L’homme qui se connaît, c’est l’homme qui se cherche et ne se trouve pas, et qui s’épuise et s’accomplit dans cette incessante poursuite. Telle est la leçon que le Lignon murmure à Diane, et à bien d’autres. Et Céladon, lui-même ne remplira son destin d’Amant Parfait qu’au terme d’une épreuve aquatique dont la signification mystique est transparente: plongeon expiatoire, mort symbolique, baptême et résurrection. Le lieu de l’Etre est toujours l’Autre Rive, un au-delà. Ici et maintenant, le miroir liquide n’offre à qui s’y recueille que l’image fuyante d’une existence transitoire” (*Figures I*, 26-7).

⁵⁴ Genette writes of the Narcissistic trope in Fontenay’s tale, *L’Astrée*, and in many examples of Baroque literature. “Dans la poétique baroque, le thème de Narcisse n’est pas simple: il constitue au contraire ce que de nos jours Gaston Bachelard nommera un *complexe de culture*, où se marient deux motifs déjà ambigus: celui de la Fuite et celui du Reflet. Cette image sur laquelle il se penche [...] est une image fuyante, une image *en fuite*, car l’élément qui la porte et la constitue est voué par essence à l’évanouissement. L’eau est le lieu de toutes les traîtrises et de toutes les inconstances: dans le reflet qu’elle lui propose, Narcisse ne peut se reconnaître sans inquiétude, ni s’aimer sans danger” (*Ibid.*, I, 21).

⁵⁵ Significantly, the word “admiration” contains the Latin root “*mira*” which also is at the base of the word “mirror.” Its stem is also evident in the Spanish verb “*mirar*” meaning “to look” or “to see.”

satisfait entièrement, luy [à Zenocrite] repartis-je, mais je voudrois bien aussi l'entendre parler. Je n'ay pû encore luy faire rompre son silence" (*BE, II, VII, 79*). Zenocrite is able to satisfy this wish since he is a ventriloquist, but when the magician leaves, the image is again mute.

In the *Metamorphoses*, Narcissus is similarly limited in the contact he can make with the image in the pool. He falls in love with his own reflection but his inability to touch it causes him to cry, which distorts the image in the water.

Dixit, et ad faciem rediit male sanus eandem;
Et lachrymis turbavit aquas; obscuraque moto
Reddita forma lacu est: Quam cùm vidisset abire,
Quò fugis? Oro, mane; nec me, crudelis, amantem
Desere, clamavit; liceat, quod tangere non est,
Adspicere, et misero præbere alimenta furori.⁵⁶

Il n'eut pas achevé ces plaintes, que trop follement espris de soy mesme, il retourna encore à son ombre, & fondit tant de larmes dessus, que l'eau troublée de ses pleurs, troublant les vives eaux de la fontaine, ternit l'argent qui brilloit dedans, & fit comme disparoitre l'image. Ne la voyant pas si à clair qu'auparavant, il se persuadoit à tout propos qu'elle devoit s'esvanouïr, & pour la tenir s'escrivoit: Où fuyez-vous si tost ? Demeurez encore, beau portraict de moy-mesme, ne soyez pas si cruel que de m'abandonner. S'il ne m'est permis de vous toucher, qu'il me soit au moins permis de vous voir, & d'une si miserable veuë entretenir ma douce fureur.⁵⁷

Narcissus' frustration at being unable to connect with his "lover" ultimately destroys the image.

Despite the pleasure Narcissus and Fontenay find in viewing their own reflections, their relationships are limited because they are simply seeing visual representations of their lovers.

Neither character is aware of this at first. When they do discover the true nature of the objects of their affections, they are upset at the limitations imposed on their relationships.

⁵⁶ Ovid, *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoseon. Libri XV, III*, 474-9.

⁵⁷ *Les Metamorphoses d'Ovide, traduites en prose Française & de nouveau soigneusement receües et corrigées*. Trans. Nicolas Renouard. *Le troisième livre*, 125.

Yet following this scene, Fontenay's narrative departs significantly from the myth of Narcissus. The character Philiris, who also recounts a tale in this *livre*, identifies parallels between Fontenay's story and the Narcissus myth and points out some of the important differences.

Pour ce qui est de vous, je croy que vous avez voulu renouveler la fable de Narcisse, mais encore n'avez vous rien fait de si sot que luy [...] Narcisse qui n'avoit point d'autres habits que les siens ordinaires, prenoit sa representation pour quelque belle Deesse. Si cela estoit vray je dirois que ce jeune homme estoit devenu fou, mais cela estant faux, je diray que le poëte qui l'a inventé, n'a point eu de jugement: car posé le cas que les miroirs ne fussent point en usage au païs de Narcisse, et qu'il n'y eust pas mesme de bassins ny de poisles chez sa mere au fonds desquels il se pûst mirer, luy qui estoit chasseur et vivoit parmy les champs ne s'estoit-il jamais regardé dedans une fontaine? Avoit il vescu jusqu'à l'âge de seize ans sans en rencontrer? Et s'il en avoit rencontré, comme il le faut croire necessairement, pourquoy admiroit il son visage comme une chose nouvelle, et s'imaginoit-il qu'il y eust une Nymphé dessous l'eau ? Que n'avoit il fait plutost cette niayserie des l'âge de huict ans? elle luy eust esté permise. L'on void par là que pour rendre son aventure vray semblable, il la faudroit racommoder à l'imitation de celle du berger Fontenay. (*BE, II, VII*, 84-5)

Philiris judges Fontenay's narrative superior to Ovid's poem because it is infinitely more "*vray semblable*." He finds it unlikely that Narcissus would ever have fallen in love with his own reflection, since, certainly, he would have recognized himself in the pool. In the *Remarques*, Sorel praises Fontenay for his ingenuity in constructing his tale and Philiris for his insight.

Voila pour monstrier que Fontenay ne dit rien que de vray-semblable, & qu'il ourdit sa fable avec beaucoup de dextérité. Il reforme outre cela celle de Narcisse, monstrant que personne n'a pû croire qu'il y eust une Nymphé sous les eaux, s'il n'avoit esté deceu, comme luy qui avoit esté vestu en fille sans y penser, & qui entendoit la voix contrefaite de Zenocrite [...] J'approuve tout ce que Philiris dit contre luy (Narcisse). (*A-R, I, VII*, 1116-7)

In the second segment of Fontenay's narrative, the character replaces the water with a mirror. This allows him to circumvent the unreliability of the pool and to further develop his relationship with the image he fell in love with at the pool's edge.

Je me fis faire des habits de fille que je mettois ordinairement, & m'estant enfermé dedans ma chambre, où il y avoit un miroir de quatre pieds de haut & trois de large, je me considerois depuis les pieds jusqu'à la teste. J'estois ravy en cette contemplation, encore que tout mon bien ne fust qu'en la superficie d'un verre, & j'eusse bien voulu avoir les yeux attachez autrepars qu'en mon visage afin de le pouvoir regarder en son naturel. Toutefois ma fidelle glace me le representant au naïf, je faisois passer l'image de ses beautez jusques dans mon cœur où elle estoit conservee. (*BE, II, VII, 82-3*)

Fontenay is inventive in constructing a more ideal situation for viewing his “lover.”

Additionally, he recognizes the importance of remaining in disguise when before the mirror, because it is a “female” image he desires to see. He therefore solves one of the problems posed to Narcissus, whose lack of ingenuity condemns him to remain at the mercy of the water’s fugacity.

However, the image in the mirror is therefore entirely dependent on the effectiveness of Fontenay’s disguise. The character not only uses his clothing in order to see the object of his affection, but depends on it to erase his true identity. Similarly, in *L’Astrée*, Céladon dons his disguise in order to be once more near the *bergère* he loves. In both texts, the characters’ clothing creates false appearances that not only hide their true identities, but also present a false façade. In *L’Astrée*, Céladon’s disguise delivers the invisibility promised by Adamas. He is able to remain close to Astrée without offending her with the image of the exiled Céladon.

Eventually, he is allowed into the constant presence of Astrée and is able to remain by her, even while she sleeps because Astrée believes that he is Alexis.

Et lorsqu’il y avait apparence qu’elle [Astrée] s’endormirait, elle [Alexis] jeta de fortune les yeux sur le lit où estoit Astree, et parce qu’il faisoit chaud comme estant au commencement de Juillet, ces belles filles avoient laissé leurs rideaux ouverts, et le Soleil donnant dans les fenestres, dont les vitres estoient seulement fermées, rendoit une si grande clarté par toute la chambre, que l’œil curieux de cette feinte Druide peut aisément voir Astrée, qui par hasard estoit couchée au devant du lit, Léonide s’estant mise au milieu des deux [...] Jugez donc quelle veuë fut celle qu’Alexis eut alors d’Astree ?

[.....] L'autre [bras] estoit relevé sur la teste qui, à moitié panchée le long du chevet, laissoit à nud le costé droit de son sein.⁵⁸

In *Le Berger extravagant*, Fontenay's mirror cannot produce the necessary illusion without the character's costume and the way it erases his own identity. It therefore both provides him the same anonymity needed by Céladon as well as the image he loves. However, at a certain point, it becomes clear that neither disguise is capable of moving either Céladon's or Fontenay's relationships forward. Rather, they begin to threaten the characters' initial goals because, in offering a certain invisibility, the disguises simultaneously start to transform their identities and desires.

As the narrative of *L'Astrée* progresses, for example, Céladon's disguise begins to generate conflict within the character.⁵⁹ In the end, the internal battle becomes so fierce that Céladon exclaims:

Mais quand je veux rentrer en moy-mesme, qui suis-je, qui redoute et qui desire? Suis-je Alexis? Non, car que peut davantage desirer Alexis? Suis-je Céladon? Non, car que peut craindre celuy qui est parvenu au comble de tous les malheurs [...] Je suis sans doute un meslange, et d'Alexis et de Céladon.⁶⁰

Céladon's alter-ego begins to conflict with his original identity, confusing his wishes with those he has developed by pretending to be "Alexis."⁶¹ Because his desires to approach Astrée and do as she wishes are what led him to don the disguise in the first place, its disintegration is troubling

⁵⁸ Honoré D'Urfé, *L'Astrée* (1619). III, X, 419-420 [incorrectly numbered as 402].

⁵⁹ See Eglal Henein, *Protée romancier: les déguisements dans l'Astrée d'Honoré d'Urfé*, 335-9.

⁶⁰ Honoré d'Urfé, *L'Astrée: où par plusieurs histoires, et sous personnes de Bergers, & d'autres, sont deduits les divers effets de l'honneste Amitié*. Quatrième Partie. (Paris: Augustin Courbé, 1633) IV, V, 252.

⁶¹ Mitchell Greenberg notes that the disguise "throws out of kilter the possibility for any subjectivity, even of the most fluid kind [...] Céladon comes up against his own androgyny, his own dual desire, in which there is no 'he,' no 'she,' just a play of signifiers, refusing any signified" (*Subjectivity and Subjugation in Seventeenth-Century Drama and Prose* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006] 43).

and disorienting. The disguise effectively undermines his original goals and thus the purpose of the disguise.

Fontenay experiences a similar confusion of identity in *Le Berger extravagant*. The character is conscious that he plays both sides of the relationship in admiring his own image in the mirror. When kidnapped by Alcidimas, it is Fontenay's separation from his mirror that troubles him most.

Il sembloit que je fusse passé tout entier dedans vous [le miroir], & il m'estoit avis pareillement que je vous comprenois tout en moy, tant ma pensee estoit remplie de vostre object [...] J'ay perdu ma maistresse & mon serviteur tous ensemble [...] J'avois eu si peu de consideration qu'estant esloigné de mon miroir; j'avois creu estre esloigné de moy-mesme. (*BE, II, VII, 89, 90*)

Fontenay's identity is so tied to the projection in the mirror, that when parted from it, he loses his understanding of who he, the originator of the reflection, is. Unlike Céladon, however, whose disguise prevents him from developing his relationship with Astrée further, Fontenay's disguise draws him so deeply into his relationship that he is consumed by it, leading the character to dismiss the importance of all else.

Since neither Céladon's nor Fontenay's disguises prove able to sufficiently enrich the relationships the characters pursue, it becomes clear that a moment of unveiling must follow the disguise in order for the masquerade to have been worth undertaking. For Céladon, this is not a welcome prospect. The confusion of his desires renders him unhappy, but he is reluctant to reveal his true identity to Astrée because it will place him in violation of the commandment that he has already risked his life to obey. In the fifth part of *L'Astrée*, authored by d'Urfé's secretary Balthazar Baro, Adamas repeatedly pushes Céladon to remove his disguise. However, Céladon resists; he cannot remove the disguise and remain the "perfect lover." As Céladon realizes the

limitations of his disguise, the eventuality of the dissolution of his relationship becomes more likely.

Conversely, Fontenay's obsession with the mirror is resolved by his separation from it. Trapped by self-love, he can only realize a relationship that goes beyond sight by ceasing to admire his own image. In the *Remarques* that follow *Livre VII* in *L'Anti-Roman*, Sorel mentions an explanation wise men ("*les doctes*") give for cases of self-love:

Ses regards estoient donc retournés vers luy avec la mesme force qu'ils eussent eue sur un autre, & les propres yeux attirerent le poison qu'ils avoient jetté [...] Voila comment les doctes parlent des charmes des yeux qu'ils sont si grands, qu'ils peuvent faire mourir toute sorte d'animaux. (*A-R, I, VII, Rem.* 1117)

By describing love as a "*poison*" and the power of the gaze to "*faire mourir toute sorte d'animaux*,"⁶² Sorel foreshadows the breakdown of Fontenay's disguise as a kind of liberation. The sense of foreboding attached to Céladon's unveiling in *L'Astrée* is thus transformed into a positive event in *Le Berger extravagant*.

In the third stage of Fontenay's story, the character is abducted by Alcidimas, who, believing him to be a woman, has fallen in love with him. At his captor's residence, Fontenay encounters Alcidimas' "brother" Iphis. The two sleep in the same bed one night, and Fontenay discovers that Iphis is no more a man than he himself is a woman. Later, after escaping back to his own abode, Fontenay is confronted by Théodore, the undisguised Iphis, who has come to

⁶² Sorel's description of the *poison* of love is reminiscent of the image of the basilisk, whose glance is fatal, that is represented in lyric poetry, including Maurice Scève's *Délie*. Emblem XXI, for example, represents a basilisk looking in the mirror, with the words "MON REGARD PAR TOY ME TUE" encircling it. The poem beneath it reads: "Je m'esjouys quand ta face se monstre, / Dont la beaulté peult les Cieulx ruyner : / Mais quand ton œil droit au mien rencontre, / Je suis contrainct de ma teste cliner : / Et contre terre il me fault incliner, / Comme qui veulx d'elle ayde requérir, / Et au danger son remede acquerir, / Ayant commune en toy compassion, / Car tu ferois nous deux bien tost perir. / Moy du regard, toy per reflection" (Maurice Scève, *Délie, object de plus haulte vertu* [Lyon: Sulpice Sabon, 1544] *Gallica*. BNF. Web. 87, CXCVI).

prove that she is more beautiful than the disguised Fontenay. Fontenay falls in love with her and subsequently smashes his mirror, bringing the disguise to a close.

This third portion of the tale bears strong similarities to the story of Filidas, a character whose story is narrated in *L'Astrée* by Astrée's friend Diane. Filidas is betrothed before birth to her cousin Diane in order to reconcile their estranged parents. When Filidas is born a girl, her parents hide this fact and raise her as a man. None of the other characters are aware of her gender until, when grown, she expresses her love for the *berger* Filandre. Problems arise when still-disguised Filidas pursues Filandre, since the *berger* and his sister Callirée, unbeknownst to anyone else, have each disguised themselves as the other. Filidas therefore unknowingly courts Callirée. Filidas' unhappy assay of love eventually ends with her death under the hooves of a Moor's steed.

In both episodes, Fontenay and Filidas struggle with the problem of satisfying their heterosexual desires as disguised characters, an undertaking rendered even more complex by the presence of other disguised characters around them. As they grapple with these disguises with varying degrees of success, both Fontenay and Filidas encounter the possibility of physical intimacy with members of the same sex. In *Le Berger extravagant*, Iphis obliges Fontenay to lie next to her, initially believing Fontenay to be a woman. Interestingly, Fontenay, who should believe that he is getting into bed with another man, interprets the situation as though he were, indeed, a woman.

Alors sans m'esmouvoir je recues ses [d'Iphis] baisers comme venans de la part de l'amie de ma Maistresse. Je ne pensois pas qu'il y eust du mal à cela, comme si j'eusse recue les mesmes carresses de son frère, pource que je me croyois fille aussi bien qu'elle, & neantmoins je luy monstray bien tost que j'estois homme où [sic] tout au moins hermaphrodite. (*BE, II, VII, 92-3*)

Paradoxically, Fontenay believes he has just engaged in a heterosexual interaction, not because he has discovered that Iphis is a woman, but because he considers himself to be female. He therefore equates Iphis' caresses with those of her brother. In other words, the disguise overrides the "reality" he should understand, causing the character to interpret the situation in an erroneous fashion.

In the tale from *L'Astrée*, confusion of desire manifests itself as Filidas interacts with the disguised Filandre and his sister Callirée. When Filidas kisses Filandre to demonstrate her love, the other characters, not yet knowing Filidas is a woman, believe that they are viewing a man kissing a man.⁶³ Then, while pursuing Filandre, Filidas unintentionally shows affection for Callirée, believing her to be Filandre. Diane recounts:

Mais j'y pouvois estre bien aysement trompée, puis que Filidas le fut, quoy qu'il ne veist que par les yeux de l'Amour qu'on dit estre plus prenants que ceux d'un lynx; car soudain qu'ils furent arrivez, elle nous laissa la fainte Callirée, je veux dire Filandre, et emmena la vraie dans une autre chambre pour se reposer. [...] Dequoy et l'un et l'autre estoit fort scandalizé, et quoy que Callirée fust fort resoluë de supporter toutes ses importunités pour le contentement de son frere, si est ce qu'elle qui croyoit Filidas estre homme, en avoit tant d'horreur que ce n'estoit pas une foible contrainte que celle qu'elle se faisoit de parler à elle.⁶⁴

Filidas is betrayed by her own disguise. Consequentially, she mistakenly takes the wrong person into the bedroom,⁶⁵ discovering, as Fontenay does, the perils of pursuing a relationship in a setting where disguise is commonplace.

⁶³ Eglal Henein, "Deux Visages De L'Astrée - Portail." Tufts University, n.d. Web. *L'Astrée* (1621). I, VI, 167.

⁶⁴ Ibid. I, VI, 171.

⁶⁵ The story of Filidas is highly informed by a tale from the *Metamorphoses*. In this story, a woman who shares a name with Iphis, is disguised at birth. She is disguised to save her from the wrath of her father, who swore to kill her if she was a boy. When she comes of age, she is betrothed to Ianthe, with whom she falls in love. In order to facilitate the match, the goddess Juno intervenes and transforms Iphis into a man. In France, the myth became better known with the appearance of Isaac de Benserade's drama *Iphis et Ianthe* in 1637.

The complex games of disguise that flourish around Filidas put her at a distinct disadvantage because she fails to act in accordance with the identity she feigns. Filidas chooses to remain in disguise to escape the loss of power she experiences as a woman,⁶⁶ but openly courts the male *berger* that she falls for. Her encounter with the disguised siblings Filandre and Callirée produces confusion on every front: Callirée follows Filidas to the bedroom believing Filidas is a man, who in turn believes Callirée (disguised as Filandre) is one as well. In reality neither one is, which creates scandal among characters in the know. In the end, Filidas' mistake is a result of her insistence on maintaining her disguise while neglecting to act as her companions believe that she should. If she had been undisguised, her kiss to Filandre would not have surprised the other characters, and her accidental advances to Callirée would have been averted.

Conversely, Fontenay's actions align with those of the heterosexual female he is pretending to be. Because of the consistency of Fontenay's appearance and actions, his heterosexual desires can only be satisfied by an encounter with another figure in disguise. That Fontenay stumbles upon just such a person is humorous because the chances of it happening are so slim. After hearing the story, Lysis appreciates the coincidence and expresses his desire to extend the effect of reciprocity even further:

Ainsi qu'il a couché avec Iphis qui estoit desquisée en garçon, je souhaiterois de bon cœur que pour rendre son histoire parfaite, sa Theodore eust esté deguisée ainsi, & que leurs parens les voyans semblables en beauté & en richesses, eussent voulu les marier ensemble. Fontenay prenant Theodore pour un homme eust fuy de telle nopces, & Theodore prenant Fontenay pour une fille eust aussi tasché d'éviter de luy estre jointe, craignant de n'en recevoir jamais de contentement. Leurs plaintes eussent esté reciproques, & neantmoins estant mis dans le lict nuptial, ils eussent trouvé qu'ils avoient dequoy se donner du plaisir l'un à l'autre, & ils n'eussent eu autre chose à faire le matin qu'à changer de vestement pour mettre tout en bon ordre. (*BE, II, VII, 107-8*)

⁶⁶ "[E]lle resolut de se conserver ceste autorité, considerant que la liberté que le nom d'homme rapporte, est beaucoup plus agreable que n'est pas la servitude à laquelle nostre sexe est sousmis" (Eglal Henein, "Deux Visages De L'Astrée - Portail." Tufts University, n.d. Web. *L'Astrée* (1621). I, VI, 160).

Lysis notes that even if the two were to have been married without discovering the other's identity, all obstacles presented by the disguises would have been negated. In the *Remarques* of *L'Anti-Roman*, Sorel agrees with Lysis, even going so far as to state: "Il est vray que si Fontenay estant habillé en fille, eust espousé Theodore qui eust esté habillée en garçon, il n'y eust rien eu de mal-faict" (*A-R, I, Rem., VII*, 1119). He then goes on to mention Ovid's tale of the disguised Iphis, whose betrothal to her female friend Ianthe could only be resolved through some sort of metamorphosis.⁶⁷ Fontenay, on the other hand, is able to liberate himself by simply removing the disguise.

In both cases, confusion of desire is dealt with in differing but similarly final ways. In Filidas's case, her refusal to abandon her disguise puts the appearance of her actions and her intent at odds with one another. This leads to erroneous interpretations on the part of other characters. Her failure to act in accordance with her companions' expectations ultimately leads to her death, which occurs when she joins Filandre as a soldier in an attack on the Moors.⁶⁸ The problem posed by Filidas's refusal to align appearance, desire, and action is eliminated by Filidas's removal from the work.

For Fontenay, a similar moment of destruction occurs, but, since he is in love with an image, it occurs not with the obliteration of a person, but instead by way of the elimination of the object upon which the reflection was cast. Fontenay recounts:

⁶⁷ "Cela eust bien valu la metamorphose d'Iphis mary d'Ianthe, qui ayant esté fille en sa jeunesse fut marié à cette Ianthe à cause qu'il avoit tousjours esté pris pour un garçon, & la veille de ses nopces fut changé en ce que l'on avoit tousjours pensé qu'il fust" (*A-R, I, Rem., VII*, 1119).

⁶⁸ Eglal Henein comments: "Tant qu'elle [Filidas] garde son habit d'homme, elle prête le flanc à la critique, à l'interprétation injurieuse. Puisque l'amour ne l'a pas poussée à renoncer à son travestissement, comment d'Urfé sortira-t-il de cette situation? Il va tuer Filidas" (*Protée Romancier: les déguisements dans l'Astrée d'Honoré d'Urfé*, 281).

Maudissant alors ce miroir qui m’avoit si long-temps enchanté, je pris un baston & le cassay en plus de pieces que je ne m’y estois regardé de fois. Je bruslay aussi tous mes habits de fille, me representant que pour estre aymé de Theodore il falloit paroistre homme, et veritablement ce changement d’humeur me venoit bien à point, car je ne pouvois plus guere long temps deguiser mon sexe, veu que je commençois d’avoir du poil aux jouës, et qu’on estoit bien empesché tous les matins à le raser. (*BE, II, VII, 101-2*)

The instruments of the illusion, that is, the clothing and the mirror, symbols of a now defunct reciprocal relationship, are ceremoniously destroyed.

Like the episode of Lysis’s disguise recounted in *Livre IV*, Fontenay’s narrative reveals the expansion of text facilitated by the character’s disguise. Fontenay’s relates his tale in such a way as to appear as mad as Lysis. He hopes to convince the pretended *berger* that he too believes in the reality of events that generally occur only in works of fiction, mythology and poetry. In his story, the character exhibits signs of *extravagance*,⁶⁹ but, as Clarimond reveals in the last *livre* of the work, it is feigned *extravagance*. Fontenay’s tale is a clever transformation of the stories of Narcissus, Céladon, Filidas, and many others - all victims – into scenarios in which he maintains control.

Fontenay’s narrative demonstrates artifice in two different ways. First, it is evident in the changes that have been made to the texts that inspire his actions in the tale. In the *Remarques*, Sorel explains that the character uses “*industrie*” and “*subtilité*” to craft a story for the pleasure of an audience that includes Lysis, the other characters, Sorel, and the reader (*A-R, I, Rem., VII, 1116-7*). Significantly, Lysis is the only spectator who acts as though he believes the story to be a true history. Everyone else is aware that the tale is a fiction. This is important since his

⁶⁹ Clarimond responds to Fontenay’s tale by exclaiming: “Voila donc vostre conte finy? A la bonne heure. Je n’a jamais rien ouy de plus impertinent, & vous nous avez fait connoistre que vous avez esté autrefois le plus grand hypocondriaque & le plus melancolique foû qui ai jamais esté sur terre” (*BE, II, VII, 106*). In the *Remarques* of *L’Anti-Roman*, however, Fontenay is praised for his thinking: “Voila pour monstrier que Fontenay ne dit rien que de vray-semblable, & qu’il ourdit sa fable avec beaucoup de dexterité” (*A-R, I, Rem., VII, 1117*).

narrative garners praise as an appropriate example of fiction by the character Philiris as well as Sorel in the *Remarques*.

Secondly, Fontenay uses *artifice* within his narrative as a plot element. It is present as the characters in the narrative circumvent or repair the glaring errors of the hypotexts that inspire their behavior. Zenocrite the magician, for example, in staging Fontenay's vision at the pool, brings the *berger* to the water in disguise and acts as a ventriloquist to present a more plausible version of the fate of Ovid's Narcissus. Later, Fontenay avoids the problems posed by the fugitive nature of water by transferring his image from a pool to a mirror, all the while maintaining his disguise. Finally, removed from his mirror, he remains in disguise. Yet, by keeping his actions and thoughts consistent with his disguised persona, he is able to successfully navigate his encounter with "Iphis."

The improvements Fontenay makes on texts such as the *Metamorphoses* and *L'Astrée* are well-received, both by other characters and by Sorel in the *Remarques*. Much of the commentary Sorel makes on Fontenay's narrative is positive in nature. Much as Lysis is recognized as being "right" in his interpretation of *L'Astrée* ("Lysis avoit raison de croire que l'on le prendroit pour une fille" [*A-R, I, Rem., IV*, 651]), Fontenay "observe fort les reigles de ceux qui font des histoires avecque jugement" (*A-R, I, Rem., VII*, 1118), marking him as a competent fiction-maker. The *Conclusion* to the 1633-34 *Anti-Roman* even goes so far as to suggest that Fontenay's ingenuity is unsurpassable:

Où est-ce que l'on a mieux parlé des operations de la magie, & des artifices de ceux qui se disent magiciens, que fait le Berger Fontenay? N'a-t'il pas toutes les pensées que l'on peut avoir sur l'amour de soy-mesme, & l'avanture qu'il a chez Alcidas n'est elle pas merveilleuse? N'est-ce pas aussi une belle conclusion que l'amour qu'il porte apres à Theodore? Les Romans à l'antique ont-ils quelque chose de plus ingenieux? (*A-R, II, Conclusion*, 1079-80)

Sorel's praise for Fontenay's and Lysis's transformations of other texts demonstrates the way the author expands *Le Berger extravagant*. The author writes that as he critiques other texts, he provides them with a kind of defense of their own. This defense becomes a part of the text that broadens its approach and perspective.

[N]e trouve-t'on pas en plusieurs lieux de mon livre, que j'ay employé autant de raisons pour deffendre les choses que j'ay mises en question, comme pour les attaquer, si bien que quand l'on voudroit s'opposer aux jugemens que j'en ay donnez, l'on ne sçauroit rien escrire que je n'aye déjà escrit? (*A-R, II, Conclusion*, 1128)

Sorel explains that he has made his argumentation very thorough and describes how the inclusion of opposing arguments completes the text.

While Sorel's statement reveals the importance of producing a "perfect" or complete text, it also gives evidence of the author's conflicted attitude toward Lysis's and Fontenay's invention and experimentation. Whether in the diegesis, the commentary of characters, or in the *Remarques*, the reader can never be sure whether the kind of argument he or she is reading is meant to support or contradict the author's position. Instead, the text is ambivalent, containing opposing voices of praise and critique. This encourages the reader to believe that these debates are perhaps not meant to be resolved and that the trial of fiction undertaken in the work is not meant to arrive at or to be understood in terms of one final conclusion. Instead, the textual "disguises" of the work may be evidence of the multiple points of view that make up the author's discursive explorations in *Le Berger extravagant*.

Conclusions

Although Lysis's and Fontenay's transformations of other texts are lauded by the country gentlemen and the author as improvements on the original sources, the characters face many of

the same obstacles presented by disguise that plagued the characters they imitate. One of the issues raised in their adventures is the way their disguises obstruct their original goals, ultimately transforming them into something different. In Fontenay's narrative in *Livre VII*, the character's disguise first facilitates his desire but soon becomes a restriction, since it only allows him to cultivate his love for a woman through sight. His disguise does afford him the opportunity to meet Iphis/Theodore, who eventually becomes his wife, yet when she presents herself to him dressed as a woman, he instantly realizes the limitations of the reflection of the mirror. He not only discovers just how much of a counterfeit the image he has worshipped in the mirror has been, but also that he wants more than to simply love a woman through sight. "[J]e luy [à Theodore] ouvris ma porte: mais ô Dieux! quels miracles vy-je en elle! Elle avoit tant de charmes que j'en fus esbloüy, & commencay à trembler d'estonnement, reconnoissant que je n'avois rien qui luy fust pareil" (*BE, II, VII, 99*). Because of her physical traits and presence that make her more desirable than the image he has been pining after, Fontenay destroys his mirror and removes his disguise. The restoration of his beard and masculine clothing allow him to court and eventually marry Theodore "au contentement de tous ceux de nostre congnoissance qui se resjouyssoient de voir le beau marié avec la belle" (*BE, II, VII, 105*). Fontenay's desires are thus changed from his original wish, expressed to Zenocrite, to merely see ("voir") the object of his affections, to yearning to "avoir la passion pour quelque chose qui se pust mieux toucher qu'une ombre" (*BE, II, VII, 101*).

A similar phenomenon can be noted in the composition of *Le Berger extravagant*, a text that may also be considered "disguised." As the previous chapters in this dissertation have shown, Sorel writes that the work exists for particular reasons ("je feray remarquer des erreurs dont tous les siecles anciens ont esté abusez" [*BE, I, Préface*]), and that it only feigns being "à la

mode des plus celebres romans” in order to attract readers of such texts (*BE, I, Préface*).

However, the “disguise” threatens the integrity of the project because in pointing out errors of the past, Sorel imitates the texts he critiques to an extreme degree. Lysis’s entertaining and often comical adventures undermine the serious goals Sorel insists upon in the *Préface* and *Remarques*, giving the various forms of debate that appear in the work a lighthearted and even playful slant. Sorel’s goals are challenged and even compromised by the presence of what Anne-Elisabeth Spica calls the “*merveilleux*”⁷⁰ and Daniel Chouinard refers to as the “*fascination*”⁷¹ of the fictional experience. Paradoxically, these are introduced into the work by Lysis’s adventures, the very tool Sorel proposes to use to critique other texts.

And yet Sorel is insistent on the paradoxical success *Le Berger extravagant* has in accomplishing its original goals: in the *Conclusion* of *L’Anti-Roman*, Sorel exclaims: “Ce qui est de remarquable en toutes les histoires qui se racontent icy, est que leur beauté ne les empesche pas d’avoir quelque extravagance pour se moquer de Lysis” (*A-R, II, Conclusion*, 1087).

Nevertheless, the true scope of the “disguised” work often surpasses, and thus changes the goals that Sorel enumerates in the *Préface*. The *Conclusion* of *L’Anti-Roman* begins, for example, by recounting in great detail many of the most striking episodes from the work. In many instances, the author points out the improvements that various characters have made on other texts or reiterates the kind of critique provided by a particular episode. However, this lengthy register often repeats commentary that was given in the *Remarques* of each *livre*, hinting that the repetition and multiplication of these adventures is also beneficial because of their inventiveness, which is ultimately amusing and entertaining. This becomes particularly evident in Sorel’s

⁷⁰ Anne-Elisabeth Spica, “Charles Sorel, entre fascination et répulsion pour le roman.” *Charles Sorel, polygraphe*, 176.

⁷¹ Daniel Chouinard, “Charles Sorel (anti)romancier et le brouillage du discours,” 71.

comments, which are punctuated by exclamations of pleasure. (“Où est-ce que l’on a mieux parlé des operations de la magie [...] que fait le Berger Fontenay?”; “Quant à l’histoire de Philiris n’a-t’elle pas plus de naïvetez & de belles pensées que les histoires amoureuses que l’on fait pour estre vray-semblables?”; “Quant à Meliante il raconte une histoire guerriere qui est fort agreable” [*A-R, II, Conclusion*, 1079-80]).

The use of disguise as a plot element in the two *livres* I have examined in this chapter also reveals a significant paradox fundamental to the kind of disguise “worn” by Sorel’s text. In the diegesis, the narrator makes it clear that Lysis’s disguise, despite his many attempts to cultivate an impenetrable façade, is almost completely transparent. Even after Hircan provides him with the dress that completes his costume, the other characters are quick to recognize him underneath it. At the same time, however, Lysis enjoys a certain immunity from discovery. Despite the gentlemen’s realization of “Amarylle’s” true identity, they never call him out. Instead, they play along with him, going so far as to request the silence of the other characters to ensure that Lysis’s disguise runs no risk of failure.

Le Berger extravagant, as a “disguised” text, also labors under this same paradox of simultaneous revelation and concealment. In part, the work may be considered “disguised” because it is an *histoire comique*, a text that combines narrative and critique in a complex combination of elements, the former at times obscuring the latter. In the *Advertissement aux lecteurs* of *Polyandre, histoire comique*, Sorel accordingly observes that

la vraye Histoire Comique selon les preceptes des meilleurs Autheurs, ne doit estre qu’une peinture naive de toutes les diverses humeurs des hommes, avec des censures vives de la pluspart de leurs deffaux, sous la simple apparence de choses joyeuses, afin qu’ils en soient repris lors qu’ils y pensent le moins.⁷²

⁷² Charles Sorel, *Polyandre, histoire comique* (1648. Genève, Slatkin Reprints, 1972) *Advertissement aux lecteurs*, 6.

As has already been discussed, in the *Préface* of *Le Berger extravagant*, Sorel goes to great lengths to establish that the narrative is merely a means whereby he can critique “leurs [authors undeserving of literary success] romans, leurs poésies, et leurs autres ouvrages inutiles” (*BE*, I, *Préface*). Sorel realizes that his intentions may go misunderstood and that the text risks being mistaken for “*un autre roman*.” The *Préface* then seems to be a gesture in which the “disguise” is revealed, yet it is a disguise that requires a certain endorsement on the reader’s part in order for the text to be readable and digestible. Much like the scene in which Anselme recognizes the disguised Lysis, yet agrees to pretend not to recognize him, the reader must enter into a similar kind of agreement with the author. The reader must understand that each episode is “disguised” and then “play along” with the author, indulging him in the enjoyment of the adventures he simultaneously disavows.

However, the textual disguise in *Le Berger extravagant* is neither totally transparent nor a bad imitation, like Lysis’s disguise is in the narrative. Rather, through the title character’s various adventures, Sorel often simulates other works of fiction – including mythology and poetry – to such a close degree that the reader is unable to fully tell the difference without the aid of the subsequent *Remarques*. The text becomes a kind of *trompe-l’oeil* of poetry, mythology and *roman* that the reader must rely on the author’s guidance to fully decipher. Severo Sarduy explains that *trompe-l’oeil* “se [fait] passer pour le référent, court-circuitant le signifié [...] et ainsi [nie] ‘l’art.’” It is a specific kind of illusion that “la vue renonce; le toucher doit venir faire la preuve et démentir ce que le regard, victime de son ingénuité, ou de la ponctuelle construction d’un artifice donne pour sûr.”⁷³ *Le Berger extravagant*, as it transforms other texts, in fact models them so closely that it deconstructs the art of their creation. The author’s project of

⁷³ Severo Sarduy, *La Doublure* (Paris: Flammarion, 1981) 49, 50.

critique, veiled behind an illusion of fiction – fiction that Sorel insists is not really fiction at all – can only therefore hope to be effective with the aid of the work’s many para- and metatexts.

As a popular element in the kinds of texts Lysis repeatedly imitates, disguise allows both Lysis and Fontenay to transpose episodes from such works as *L’Astrée* and the *Metamorphoses* in order to expand the significance of their adventures. As Lysis and Fontenay disguise themselves as girls, they recall the behavior of characters such as Céladon, Narcissus, and Filidas and copy their behavior, thereby expanding the breadth and scope of their actions (or recounted actions, in the case of Fontenay). In *Le Berger extravagant*, the “disguise” of fiction that the text “wears” provides for a similarly expansive experience, since the author takes it upon himself to point out the errors of “*tous les escrivains de ce temps*” (*BE, I, Préface*, my emphasis). This allows for the promulgation of the text, the continued indulgence for the “disguise,” and ultimately, the creation of a work that resists reaching its end. Martine Debaisieux notes the way Sorel’s *Histoire comique de Francion*, which was augmented and republished at two different times, “semble donc constamment vouloir retarder sa fin. Texte protéiforme, *Francion* illustrerait une ‘hostilité à l’œuvre achevée’ que Rousset reconnaît dans la littérature baroque, ‘ennemie de toute forme stable.’”⁷⁴ Debaisieux explains that *Le Berger extravagant*, as the “*seconde partie*” of the *Histoire comique de Francion*,⁷⁵ represents a continued effort to proliferate the text and extend it even beyond the limits of the additions of the later editions. The very lengthy *Berger extravagant* demonstrates a similar reluctance to conclude; even after fourteen books of adventures that imitate various forms of literature, the narrator indicates that the end of the text

⁷⁴ Martine Debaisieux, *Procès du roman: écriture et contrefaçon chez Charles Sorel*, 52. Debaisieux cites Jean Rousset’s *La Littérature à l’âge baroque*, 231.

⁷⁵ In the 1626 edition of the *Histoire comique de Francion*, Sorel presents *Le Berger extravagant* as a continuation of Francion’s adventures, authored by the character himself. “Je travaillerai à mettre par ordre les aventures du Berger extravagant que Francion a composées, et les donnerai au public comme une seconde partie de cette Histoire comique” (Ed. Antoine Adam. 462).

does not represent the termination of the adventures. “Je ne veux pas dire qu’il ne luy soit arrivé des aventures assez plaisantes depuis son mariage, mais ses amys particuliers en ont esté les seuls tesmoins” (*BE*, III, XIV, 248). Then, the reader encounters the *Remarques*, a body of text that is almost as extensive as the narrative itself.

Disguise itself is a paradox: the simultaneous coupling of presence and absence, of the visible and the invisible.⁷⁶ That the theme of disguise is so closely woven into both Lysis’s adventures and the fabric of the text itself emphasizes the paradoxes and ambiguity that are so characteristic of Sorel’s text and that challenge the way he describes it. It is a work that demonstrates both error and perfection, insufficiency and abundance – without confining the negative traits to other works alone. Rather, in transforming the texts he critiques, Sorel’s text offers a pass into the *coulisses* of fiction-making, exposing both its strengths and its many limitations, limitations that *Le Berger extravagant*, even as it strives to be superior, finds that it cannot totally escape.

⁷⁶ See Severo Sarduy, *La Doublure*, 15-21.

Conclusion

In this dissertation I have demonstrated how *Le Berger extravagant* is an ambivalent and paradoxical text. Its ambiguous nature is partially a result of Sorel's hesitancy to fully endorse the project of attack against fiction that he suggests in the *Préface* is his focus. Daniel Chouinard highlights Sorel's paradoxical indulgence and criticism of Lysis's madness as evidence of the author's ambivalence, and observes his oscillation between praise and blame for myth and fable.¹ Significantly, this struggle to reconcile the "*mensonge*" of fiction with what Sorel refers to as "*la souveraine verité*" (*A-R, II, Conclusion*, 1134) is not unique to *Le Berger extravagant*. Rather, it is an issue that proves to be of concern to the author throughout his lengthy career.

Frédéric Charbonneau, in an article on Sorel's *Bibliothèque Française*, describes how the author's reluctance to pronounce a firm verdict on fiction in *Le Berger extravagant* is also evident in his earlier works, including the *Histoire amoureuse de Cleagenor et de Doristée* (1621) and *Le Palais d'Angelie* (1622).² Similarly, in his later works, including *La Bibliothèque française* and *De la connoissance des bons livres*, Sorel returns again to discussions on the essence, purpose, and value of fiction, indicating that he has yet to come to terms with the notions of fiction and truth:

Sorel lui-même se fera quelques années plus tard l'écho de telles polémiques au second traité *De la connoissance des bons livres*, où il répond aux objections des contempteurs et des sceptiques. Contre ceux qui prétendent qu'elle [la fiction] est incertaine et quasi toujours mensongère, ou qu'elle est un monument somptueux mais inutile, il affirmait avec confiance qu'il « se peut trouver des Ecrivains qui ont le pouvoir & l'intention de réussir en leur ouvrage, » et « qu'il n'y sçauroit avoir tant de fausseté dans les ouvrages

¹ Daniel Chouinard, "Charles Sorel: (anti)romancier et le brouillage du discours," 75.

² For descriptions of these works, see Emile Roy, *La Vie et les oeuvres de Charles Sorel*, 34-6 and Gabrielle Verdier, *Charles Sorel* (Boston: Twayne, 1984) 16-21.

des uns ou des autres, que quelque verité n'y paroisse, comme une vive lumiere parmy les ombres. » (Charles Sorel, *De la connoissance des bons livres*, 78- 9)³

Despite the tendency that may be noted in Sorel's evolving career to increasingly distance himself from fiction and from his earliest works, the author refuses to completely dismiss fiction as an avenue to truth. The simultaneous acceptance of fiction and truth is a pivotal element in *Le Berger extravagant*, in which Sorel proposes to judge the *extravagance* of fiction and poetry and yet, as has been shown at length in this dissertation, displays an inclination for Lysis's madness, and by extension, fiction in general. In his *anti-roman*, Sorel's attitude is exemplified in a passage from *Livre III* in which Clarimond, whose role in the text makes him a kind of spokesman for the author,⁴ comments that "pour estre heureux au monde, il faut estre roy ou fou; pource que si l'un a des plaisirs en effect, l'autre en a par imagination. Qui ne peut donc estre roi, tasche de devenir fou" (*BE, I, III*, 477). Although Clarimond later becomes the driving force behind efforts to reform Lysis, he initially greatly enjoys the *berger's* behavior, indulging his extravagance because it amuses him. Like Clarimond, Sorel too regards Lysis's exploits with an appreciation for their entertaining value, which is particularly evident when he applauds the character's inventiveness in the *Remarques*.

Much of this dissertation has focused on the crucial role of the paratext in understanding the work through the lens of Sorel's explicit goals. In fact, the author's ambivalence toward fiction in *Le Berger extravagant* is first embodied in these paratexts, and more specifically the *Préface*, in which the author's "intentions" are perhaps most emphatically stated. The way these goals are presented anticipates Sorel's paradoxical approach to his project in the rest of the work.

³ Frédéric Charbonneau, "L'Histoire aux rayons de la *Bibliothèque Française*." *Charles Sorel, polygraphe*, 163.

⁴ Clarimond often plays the role of *metteur-en-scène* in Lysis's adventures. Like the author, he concocts situations that bring out the extremes of Lysis's behavior.

While Sorel explains in the *Préface* that he has created a “*miracle estrange*,” – an unusual work – the manner in which he enumerates his goals is, in fact, very traditional. He includes them in a preface alongside the customary assertions that the frivolities in his work are, in reality, teaching tools.

Le Berger extravagant therefore exists somewhere between the traditional and the revolutionary, refusing to back up even the paratextual assertions about what kind of text it is. Anne-Elisabeth Spica proposes that the work’s ambiguous character may be a result of the vehicle Sorel has chosen to accomplish his goals. Far from being incompatible with Sorel’s stated intentions to critique, fiction should lend itself very well to the author’s judgmental project.

Pour le polygraphe Sorel, la littérature doit conférer à son lecteur à la fois « science » et « sagesse », et la fiction n’est pas exclue d’un tel point de vue. Le roman constitue une forme d’éducation positive à la fiction et à ses dangers: la méthode intègre son objet [...] Il convient d’y entendre un récit qui se déroule conformément à la logique narrative telle que l’approuve Sorel, une histoire qui, jouant de ses présupposés par le moyen de la feinte, de la fiction, ne donne pas sa narration pour vérité, mais pour une fiction dans la vérité, cohérente avec elle-même, et capable d’enseigner cette cohérence en même temps au lecteur-spectateur.⁵

However, Spica explains that in *Le Berger extravagant*, Sorel’s use of this medium, rather than serving as a tool whereby the author intensifies his critique, ultimately demonstrates his affinity for the structures and motifs of narrative.

De tels propos signalent combien Sorel est fasciné par l’écriture romanesque et plus encore par son merveilleux. Non seulement il prône la parfaite liberté d’invention d’un roman à la fois sujet et objet de l’écriture, dans *Le berger extravagant* comme dans

⁵ Anne-Elisabeth Spica, “Charles Sorel, entre fascination et répulsion pour le roman,” *Charles Sorel, polygraphe*, 182, 184.

L'Orphize de Chrysante,⁶ mais il intègre sérieusement les formules thématiques et narratives qu'il condamne pourtant sans relâche au profit de l'histoire vraisemblable ou comique.⁷

The apparent contradictions in *Le Berger extravagant* may be recognized in a study of Sorel's text, but they also are evident in other *histoires comiques*. In his discussion of the genre, Maurice Lever writes that "il s'agit en somme d'un roman qui refuse les ingrédients habituels de la fiction, qui se défie de l'imaginaire, qui tend vers une vision lucide et une peinture sincère de la vie quotidienne; en un mot, d'un roman qui nie le roman."⁸ Lever notes that the *histoire comique* attempts to break the conventions of its own form, effectively denying the traditional *roman*. Martine Debaisieux also emphasizes the difficulty of attempting to definitively categorize the *histoire comique*, pointing to its composite nature as one of the primary causes.

L'histoire comique, genre dont l'avènement dans le courant du XVII^e siècle correspond à une crise de l'esthétique romanesque en France, échappe à toute tentative de définition stricte [...] Si l'on se base sur les catégories « satire/histoire/*romance* » établies par Robert Scholes pour définir les 'modes de la fiction,' on ne peut que constater la résistance de l'histoire comique à la classification.⁹

She ultimately suggests the genre may be best understood as "un déguisement 'extravagant' du roman."¹⁰

⁶ In *L'Orphize de Chrysante, histoire cyprienne*, published the same year as the first edition of *Le Berger extravagant*, the character Chrysante hesitates to identify himself as a writer. As Fausta Garavini observes: "Sorel/Chrysante ne veut pas s'abaisser au métier d'écrivain dans lequel il perçoit quelque chose d'avalissant: ici encore, comme dans le *Francion* et dans le *Berger*, il essaye de partager la responsabilité de l'œuvre en en attribuant la rédaction à un quelconque compilateur et en revendiquant uniquement la conception" (Fausta Garavini, "L'itinéraire de Sorel: du 'Francion' à la 'Science universelle,'" *Revue d'Histoire littéraire de la France*. Vol. 77 No. 3/4 [May-Aug 1977], 436).

⁷ Anne-Elisabeth Spica, "Charles Sorel, entre fascination et répulsion pour le roman," *Charles Sorel, polygraphe*, 176.

⁸ Maurice Lever, *Le Roman français au XVII^e siècle*, 83.

⁹ Martine Debaisieux, "L'histoire comique, genre travesti," 169.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 169.

Le Berger extravagant also shares the *histoire comique*'s characteristic "self-consciousness." Debaisieux writes that "la plupart de ces textes introduisent une réflexion sur l'activité romanesque" and more specifically that "Sorel compose *Le Berger extravagant* – qu'il qualifie de 'tombeau des romans' – comme commentaire critique et comme tentative de démystifier les techniques romanesques."¹¹ The *histoire comique* in general is profoundly interested in questions of the appropriateness of fiction and the way it should be written. It is a genre uniquely capable of contending with such questions, since the hefty amount of metatext characteristic of these works allows the reader insights into the author's normally-veiled thought process in composing the text.

In *Le Berger extravagant*, the textual "self-consciousness" of the *histoire comique* is captured in the work's many debates and trials. Such trials are reminiscent of the episode from the *Histoire comique de Francion* in which the titular character is accused of being a counterfeiter ("faux-monnaieur"). Debaisieux describes how this scene illustrates the processes of trial in the *Histoire comique de Francion* and *Le Berger extravagant*.

S'il [le procès de Francion dans le *Livre Douzième de L'Histoire comique de Francion*] semble immotivé dans le contexte diégétique de la conclusion, l'épisode peut être considéré comme une mise en abyme du « procès » du roman exposé dans les derniers livres. « Procès » dans les deux sens du mot: la dénonciation de la contrefaçon de l'œuvre (et de la fiction en général) et indissociable du dévoilement de son « processus » de création, de la mise en scène des principes de son développement.¹²

Much as the counterfeiter is put on trial in the *Histoire comique de Francion*, so does Sorel claim to put another kind of counterfeit – fiction – on trial in *Le Berger extravagant*. Daniel Chouinard describes the judiciary formulas of the work as a labyrinthine language that exposes the

¹¹ Martine Debaisieux, "Le tombeau des romans": de *Francion* au *Berger extravagant*," 169, 170.

¹² Ibid., 170.

conventions of fiction and poetry: “[Ce discours] met en scène le procès de la littérature.” Chouinard explains that these formulas paradoxically create “un récit se réfléchissant et se composant.”¹³ The “*brouillage du discours*” of which Chouinard writes is therefore not an inadvertent result of Sorel’s project, but rather a manifestation of its self-conscious and even discursive nature.¹⁴

Paradoxically, constructs of trial in *Le Berger extravagant* are of interest not because they deliver decisive verdicts but rather because they reveal the full extent of the author’s ambivalence toward fiction. They therefore serve a very different purpose than that for which they are advertised, becoming discursive rather than conclusive. Sorel’s ambivalent attitude is especially evident in the penultimate *Livre XIII*, in which fiction is debated and put on trial. In this episode, Philiris represents the defense of fiction, and Clarimond takes the role of the prosecution. Both sides present their opinions in lengthy discourses fortified with textual examples that often come from *L’Astrée*. Sorel’s inconclusiveness persists through the verdict: the trial ends as a draw when Anselme, the appointed judge, ultimately declares neither side the winner.

No decision is delivered, leaving the question at hand unsettled. Instead, judgment is deferred to the *Remarques*, in which Sorel, acting as the final judge, presents the decision missing in the narrative.

¹³ Daniel Chouinard, “Charles Sorel: (anti)romancier et le brouillage du discours,” 77. See also Daniel Chouinard, “Les figures du procès dans *Le Berger extravagant*: le commentaire sorélien et l’archéologie de la topique romanesque,” *La Naissance du roman en France: Topique romanesque de “L’Astrée” à “Justine.”* Ed. Nicole Boursier and David Trott. Biblio 17. (Paris: *Papers on French Seventeenth Century Literature*, 1990) 13-27.

¹⁴ This trial is reminiscent of those in pastoral novels and in *L’Astrée*, in which debates are held for debate’s sake. A similar kind of trial can also be observed in Marguerite de Navarre’s *Heptaméron*, in which the characters hear a tale from one of the company members and then discuss it. The opinions of the various characters do not lead to solid conclusions. Instead, they link one story to the next, generally by way of a common theme.

Quant à Anselme, il donne un jugement fort circonspect, & fait voir qu'il ne desire offencer personne, ny courir le danger d'estre estimé si presumptueux que de vouloir condamner tout à fait, des choses que plusieurs treuvent excellentes. Toutesfois cela n'empesche pas, que ceux qui sont plus resolués que luy, ne donnent librement leur avis de tout, puisqu'il leur en a mesme accordé la permission. (*A-R, II, Rem., XIII*, 981)

Sorel concludes the trial by turning the arguments of the defense against themselves,¹⁵ finally declaring: “[j]e concluds pour Clarimond contre Philiris” (*A-R, II, Rem., XIII*, 978).

The final events of *Le Berger extravagant* then progress in apparent fulfillment of the decision pronounced in the *Remarques*. Clarimond proceeds with his agenda to disabuse Lysis of his folly and correct the character's understanding of fiction. He exposes Philiris's duplicitous role in the trial (*BE, III, XIV*, 526-7) and reveals that Lysis's supposed cohorts simply participated in his exploits to poke fun at him (*BE, III, XIV*, 527). He then expresses his disapproval of Lysis's behavior (*BE, III, XIV*, 530) and finally reveals the elaborate fabrication of Lysis's adventures. In a further attempt to eradicate illusion, Lysis makes his own confession, revealing his own role in the realization of his adventures (*A-R, II, XIV*, 1040).¹⁶ However, as I demonstrated earlier, the work's ending is, in fact, quite unclear, concluding on an ambiguous note as to the final state of Lysis's reform and fate. The author's “verdict” is ultimately undermined by the determined open-ended nature of the last scenes.

Nevertheless, the *Remarques* play a key role in this debate because it is there that Sorel is once again given an opportunity to comment on the matters at stake. This is an indication of the essential role played by this part of the text. The *Remarques*, which embody one aspect of the work's very extensive para- and metatextual sections, are indispensable, as Sorel himself takes

¹⁵ Daniel Chouinard, “Charles Sorel: (anti)romancier et le brouillage du discours,” 82.

¹⁶ At one point, Lysis goes so far as to ask that Clarimond write down his adventures.

great care to assert.¹⁷ They represent the opportunity to cultivate conversation that surpasses the role of commentary or judgment. They also bring a certain coherency to the work as a whole, preserving the integrity of the diegesis by removing seemingly tangential discussions so as not to disrupt the flow of the narrative.¹⁸

The broad scope of the para- and metatext of *Le Berger extravagant* give Sorel the opportunity to enter the work not only as the narrator of Lysis's adventures, but explicitly as the author or compiler of the text. His relentless presence informs the work's deconstructed fictional experience. Like the novel, *Le Berger extravagant* is indeed dialogic,¹⁹ yet dialogic in a very specific way. The text is part of the social textual network into which the work cannot help but be inscribed, but it is also unique because of the author's deliberate efforts to increase those connections and to make them explicit. He does so by intervening in every episode, every conversation, and every debate to propose new texts for contemplation which, in turn, lead to new subjects for consideration. Rather than leaving the reader to discover hidden connections, he announces every reference to every text – even those already mentioned in the diegesis – solidifying these ties and multiplying them to extreme degrees.

¹⁷ “Ceux qui ne savent ce que c’est de doctrine et d’erudition, prennent l’histoire du Berger Lysis pour une simple raillerie; mais ceux qui penstrent plus avant et considerent les Remarquent [sic] qui sont à la fin de chaque livre, voyent bien que cela est fait pour contenir quantité de secrets Philosophiques sous des fictions agreables” (*BE, II, X*, 463-4).

¹⁸ See Fausta Garavini, *La Maison des jeux: Science du roman et roman de la science*, 91.

¹⁹ As mentioned in chapter three, Mikhail Bakhtin conjectures that certain works are dialogic, meaning that they respond to texts, authors, and the social atmospheres that have preceded them, are influenced by them and at the same time inform them. In “Le Mot, le dialogue et le roman,” Julia Kristeva explains Bakhtin’s use of the word “*ambivalence*” to describe a work that is dialogic: “Le terme d’‘ambivalence’ implique l’insertion de l’histoire (de la société) dans le texte, et du texte dans l’histoire; pour l’écrivain ils sont une seule et même chose. Parlant de ‘deux voies qui se joignent dans le récit,’ Bakhtine a en vue l’écriture comme lecture du corpus littéraire antérieur, le texte comme absorption de et réplique à un autre texte” (*Recherches pour une sémanalyse*, 88). The dialogic text then is double and conveys two meanings at any given time: the first communicated by the text itself, independent of outside influences, and the second that is charged with the meanings transmitted through an intertextual web. This may occur on a scale as small as a single word or on the broader level of meanings generated by larger portions of text.

The *Remarques* in particular allow Sorel to increase the breadth of his discussions. While they do offer him the opportunity to pronounce verdicts he shies away from in the narrative, the author typically eschews them. Instead, he suggests further possibilities for the reader's consideration, proposing new texts that provide additional perspective on a given topic. Leonard Hinds suggests that this is because Sorel wishes to "[delegate] critical responsibility to individual readers." Here, he comments specifically on the debate in *Livre XIII* as an example.

Though the narrator ostensibly takes a noncommittal position, he does inject his own opinion in trivializing the whole purpose of putting literature on trial. Since literature is only meant for pleasure, it is not so necessary to human experience that it be universally judged. The narrator thus deflates the importance of the scene as the decisive debate in determining the final word on literature. Again, debate becomes an antidebate, because the decision for indecision was predetermined on the level of narration, and all the more because the final adjudication of the case is deferred to a virtual readership outside the text.²⁰

While Hind's point of view represents a valid interpretation of Sorel's non-committal language, the author's ambivalence may alternately indicate his reluctance to limit the direction the text may take. By forgoing opportunities to pass judgments and pronounce firm verdicts, the author leaves the text open and undefined.

Sorel's reluctance to pronounce clear verdicts therefore causes his proclaimed goals of judgment to fade in preference to devices of discursive amplification and, as we will see, epistemological exploration. The text turns from the obligations of trial which demand conclusion and finality as Sorel instead invites the reader to consider – and accept – the text as a landscape of multiple opinions and voices²¹ – many of them contradictory – on a vast number of

²⁰ Leonard Hinds, *Narrative Transformations from L'Astrée to Le Berger extravagant*, 73.

²¹ "The novel contains a number of traditional images and overtones. Their meaning goes far beyond the author's initial intentions. [...] These deeper elements of the traditional carnival themes and images seem almost to contradict the author's own intentions" (Mihail M. Bakhtin, *Rabelais and his World*, 104).

subjects, including philosophy, science, and history as well as literature and fiction. In the *Conclusion* to the 1633-34 *Anti-Roman*, Sorel insists on the importance of the large amount of subjects discussed in the work, asserting that “aussi c’est que l’on a treuvé cet expedient de se jetter sur les fables anciennes autant que sur les nouvelles, ce qui rend notre livre plus abondant en choses curieuses & dignes d’estre sceuës” (*A-R, II, Conclusion*, 1102). He also claims that one will “encore treuver icy force contes sur divers sujets pour en faire leur profit” (*A-R, II, Conclusion*, 1105) because he considers “*tout ce qui est au monde*” (*A-R, II, Conclusion*, 1124, my emphasis). Rather than passing conclusive judgment, he remains ambivalent about the texts he proposes to critique. This ambivalence is all the more noticeable as the text evolves from the 1627-28 *Berger extravagant* to the 1633-34 *Anti-Roman*, in which the author’s commentary becomes less pointed through increased use of the third person. This allows him to expand the text, and to invite the reader to reconsider the ways in which the work may be considered successful.²²

The *Conclusion* of *L’Anti-Roman* presents an opportunity for Sorel to evaluate his text, and as he does so, he avoids focusing exclusively on the project of critique he presents in the *Préface* – although he does indeed remind the reader of it. Rather, he emphasizes the abundance he has achieved in *Le Berger extravagant* and concludes that he has succeeded in attaining what he terms “*perfection*.”

[C]ar mes remarques sont composées de telle sorte qu’elles contiennent *tout ce qu’il y a dans les Romans & dans la Poësie*, tellement que les Poëtes ne pourront plus rien faire qu’ils ne le prennent de moy [...] je deffie mesme les Escrivains d’aujourd’huy d’atteindre à la perfection de *tant de diverses intrigues que j’ay citées*, desquelles j’eusse pû composer un Roman plus admirable que tous les autres, si je n’eusse trouvé plus à

²² See Martine Debaisieux. *Le Procès du roman: écriture et contrefaçon chez Charles Sorel*, 91-94 for further discussion on the “*ouverture*” of the *histoire comique*.

propos de les mespriser afin de ne tromper personne. (*A-R, II, Conclusion*, 1122, my emphasis)

Here, Sorel emphasizes the “*perfection*” or “completeness” of *Le Berger extravagant* and claims that it exceeds that which may be found in other works. Even the debates on the various texts referenced throughout the work are effective not because they conclude with a coherent verdict, but rather because they make connections between various texts, fill *Le Berger extravagant* with the contemplative dialog of both character and author, and transcend the simple processes of debate by which works may be judged.

In the last passages of the *Anti-Roman*, Sorel indicates that “*perfection*” may be most fully attained by consulting “d’autres ouvrages,” other works that are not fiction and that contain more fully what he refers to as “LA SOUVERAINE VERITÉ.” He specifies that “LA SOUVERAINE VERITÉ” constitutes a “Doctrine universelle” because it disqualifies “toutes les Erreurs du monde.” His project in *Le Berger extravagant*, to point out “celles des fables Poétiques,” only one representation of the author’s desire to communicate different aspects of truth.

La SOUVERAINE VERITE est reservée pour d’autres ouvrages où l’on la verra serieusement escrite & sans aucune fiction. [...] C’est là qu’il y a des choses extraordinaires; c’est là que l’on void une Doctrine universelle qui n’a point encore esté traitée de cette sorte. Toutes les Erreurs du monde y sont refutées, & celles des fables Poétiques n’en font que la plus petite partie tant il s’y rencontre de differens sujets; & neantmoins toutes ces refutations y sont aussi fort peu considerables au prix de la certitude des Sciences qui s’y treuve avec un ferme établissement de tout ce que les hommes doivent sçavoir pour atteindre à la perfection (*A-R, II, Conclusion*, 1133-4).

In the final passages of the *anti-roman*, we witness a change of direction in the language Sorel uses to discuss his own work. Sorel indicates that from the perspective of “LA SOUVERAINE VERITÉ,” the errors to be found in the works he discusses are, in fact, of relatively minimal importance compared to those related to knowledge. Rather than emphasizing

the critical aspect of his text, as he has done so many times elsewhere, Sorel now points to *Le Berger extravagant*'s role as part of a larger project, one that, due to the text's nature as a work of fiction, cannot be completely fulfilled in *Le Berger extravagant*. Fausta Garavini recognizes Sorel's change in tone and explains that it is part of the work of expansion he undertakes in the text, a function in which the *Remarques* play a critical role.

Le propos du *Berger* ne serait donc pas seulement de « railler les fables des Poètes » ; l'histoire de Lysis est peut-être un écran destiné à masquer les critiques des « vieilles erreurs » et « opinions vulgaires » contre lesquelles Francion tempêtait déjà. Parti de la satire des fables, Sorel a sans doute vu, chemin faisant, son projet primitif s'amplifier; et il a déversé dans les *Remarques* des extensions, ramifications et corrélations avec les différents domaines de la connaissance (qui seront par la suite ordonnées dans la *Science universelle*). *Le Berger* s'offre alors dans toute l'ambiguïté d'une révélation voilée, d'un message à la fois clair (en tant que « tombeau des Romans ») et codé (en tant que recueil touffu de méditations paraphilosophiques).²³

As has been discussed previously, Garavini identifies Sorel's *La Science universelle* as the ultimate representation of "LA SOUVERAINE VERITÉ" that the author indicates is also a defining facet of *Le Berger extravagant*.²⁴ Garavini points out that Sorel uses passages, taken word for word from *Le Berger extravagant*, in *La Science universelle*,²⁵ indicating that the work is a place where important ideas that surpass the literary domain may be conceived and entertained. As Garavini suggests, when considered through the retrospective prism of the later *Science universelle*, *Le Berger extravagant* readily surpasses its function as a bitter criticism of other texts and authors and becomes an important centerpiece in the author's career-long interest in discussing and pursuing knowledge and truth.

²³ Fausta Garavini, *La Maison des jeux: science de la roman et roman de la science*, 96.

²⁴ See the introduction of this dissertation for further discussion of Garavini's comment.

²⁵ Fausta Garavini, *La Maison des jeux: science de la roman et roman de la science*, 101.

And so, Sorel's unusual work, this "*miracle étrange*," with its extensive para- and metatexts, its over-involved authorial voice, and blend of critique and narrative, can be considered a work which is not, in fact, essentially about literature. Rather, Sorel considers ideas, associated with different domains, including science, religion, and philosophy. Sorel's delectation for the exploration of *all* sorts of topics and his craving for the discussion of *all* fields of knowledge are emphasized by Garavini as part of the author's striving toward "*perfection*:"

"[L]e rêve sorélien est au contraire la connaissance totale, la possession de tous les domaines du savoir."²⁶ Garavini further explains that within *Le Berger extravagant* there is evidence of a project that surpasses debates on fiction. "Son extraordinaire compétence en matière de romans, qui fait du *Berger* comme une immense anthologie de la littérature de fiction, n'est qu'une minime partie d'un patrimoine beaucoup plus vaste."²⁷ To support this idea, she quotes Sorel's *Remarques*:

Ces beaux Auteurs me voulant prendre de tous costez, me reprocheront encore que ma jeunesse a esté bien mal employee, puisque j'ay appris tant de fables qu'eux mesmes ne sçavent pas, mais croient-ils que cela m'ait occupé tout entier? et mes remarques ne sont elles pas universelles? Aprenez, petits esprits qui faites les grands, que je ne laisse pas de m'adonner à des estudes plus serieuses, et que de quelques livres que vous vouliez parler j'en sçay plus par cœur que vous n'en avez leu de vostre vie." (*BE, IV, Rem., XIV*, 811)

Le Berger extravagant is an ambivalent *tombeau des romans*, a text that resists closure. The project Sorel presents to his readers in the *Préface* could therefore be seen as a pretense for the exploration of a multiplicity of ideas proposed by characters, dissected by the narrator, and revised in their associations with others in the *Remarques*. Purposefully inconclusive, then, *Le Berger extravagant* makes the reader question its critical nature and seems to invite him or her to

²⁶ Ibid., 99.

²⁷ Ibid., 99.

“contemplate”²⁸ the immense panorama of knowledge, both inside and outside of literature.

Thus, the ideal reader of this “*extravagant*” text is called to become a “curious”²⁹ reader, who, like Francion, the protagonist of Sorel’s first *histoire comique*, “*s’étudi[e] à sçavoir la raison naturelle de toutes choses.*”³⁰

²⁸ In Sorel’s *La solitude et l’amour philosophique de Cléomède* (1640), the character Cléomède, speaks to Dorilas about the relationship between love and virtue. The protagonist describes man’s need for “*contemplation*” in understanding the universe and achieving an understanding of what they refer to as “la Beauté Souveraine.” Cléomède’s discourse focuses on the need for “*contemplation*” to understand the totality of God’s creations: “[L]eur Ame (aux hommes) estant enfermée dans la prison du Corps, ne void point les choses sans quelque voile, & ne penettre point a ce qui est de spirituel qu’elle ne voye auparavant ce qui est corporel. Il est besoin d’ailleurs que l’homme que Dieu a crée pour estre le contemplateur de ses œuvres, connoisse autant les plus basses que les plus hautes, puisque la sagesse infinie n’y est pas moins manifeste (Charles Sorel, *La solitude et l’amour philosophique de Cléomède, premier sujet des Exercices moraux* [Paris: Antoine de Sommaville, 1640] 216-7).

²⁹ The first two definitions offered by Furetière of the word “*curieux*” are applicable to Sorel and his text, which demonstrate first a desire to accumulate knowledge, and second, to assemble it, in all its “beauty” and “rarity” in one place: “CURIEUX, se dit en bonne part de celuy qui a desir d’apprendre, de voir les bonnes choses, les merveilles de l’art & de la nature [...] CURIEUX, se dit aussi de celuy qui a ramassé les choses les plus rares, les plus belles & les plus extraordinaires qu’il a pû trouver, tant dans les arts que dans la nature” (*Dictionnaire universelle*, non-paginated). For more on the notion of “*curiosité*” in Sorel’s time, see *Curiosité et Libido sciendi de la Renaissance aux Lumières*. Ed. N. Jacques-Chaquin et S. Houdard. ENS éditions. (Paris: Ophrys, 1998). The application of this search for knowledge in Sorel’s works is conceptualized by Martine Debaisieux in the Introduction to her critical edition of *Description de l’Ile de Portraiture* (60-62).

³⁰ “Comme ces vieilles erreurs furent chassées de mon entendement, je le remplis d’une meilleure doctrine, et m’estudiai a sçavoir la raison naturelle de toutes choses, et avoir de bons sentimens en toutes occasions, sans m’arrester aux opinions vulgaires” (Charles Sorel, *Histoire comique de Francion*. Ed. A. Adam, 214).

Works Cited

Works by Charles Sorel

L'Anti-Roman, ou l'histoire du berger Lysis, accompagnée de ses Remarques. Paris: Toussaint du Bray, 1633-34. BNF. *Gallica*. Web.

Le Berger extravagant, ou parmi des fantaisies amoureuses on void les impertinences des Romans & de [la] Poësie. 1627-8. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1972.

---. University of Chicago, *ARTFL*. BNF, *Gallica*. Web.

La Bibliothèque françoise. Paris: Compagnie des libraires du Palais, 1664. University of Chicago. *ARTFL*. Web.

La Bibliothèque françoise. 2nd ed., 1667. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1970.

De la Connaissance des bons livres, ou examen de plusieurs Auteurs. Paris: André Pralard, 1671. BNF. *Gallica*. Web.

De la Connaissance des bons livres, ou examen de plusieurs Auteurs. 1671. Ed. Lucia Moretti Cenerini. Rome: Bulzoni, 1974.

Description de l'île de portraiture: et de la ville des Portraits. 1659. Ed. Martine Debaisieux. Genève: Droz, 2006.

Histoire amoureuse de Cléagenor et de Doristée. Paris: Toussaint du Bray, 1621.

Histoire comique de Francion. 1623, 1626, 1633. Ed. Emile Roy. Paris: Hachette, 1924-31.

Histoire comique de Francion. In *Romanciers du XVIIe siècle*. Ed. Antoine Adam. Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, Paris: Gallimard, 1958. 61-527.

La Maison des jeux (Vol. 1). 1657. Ed. Daniel A. Gajda. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1977.

L'Orphize de Chrysante. Paris: Toussaint du Bray, 1625.

Le Palais d'Angélie. Paris: Toussaint du Bray, 1622.

Polyandre, histoire comique. 1648. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1972, 1974.

Polyandre, histoire comique. 1648. Ed. Patrick Dandrey and Cécile Toublet. Paris: Klincksieck, 2010.

La Science des choses corporelles. Paris: P. Billaine, 1634. BNF. *Gallica*. Web.

La Science des choses spirituelles. Paris: P. Billaine, 1637. BNF. *Gallica*. Web.

La Science universelle, dernière édition revue et augmentée. Paris: N. Le Gras, 1668. BNF. *Gallica*. Web.

La Solitude et l'amour philosophique de Cléomède, premier sujet des Exercices moraux. Paris: Antoine de Sommaville, 1640. *Google Books*. Web.

La Vraye histoire comique de Francion. 1633. Ed. Emile Colombey. Paris: A. Delahays, 1858. BNF. *Gallica*. Web.

Other Literary Works

Ariosto, Ludovico. *Orlando furioso*. Ferrara: Francesco Rosso da Valenza, 1532. *Bibliothèques virtuelles humanistes*. Web.

---. *Orlando furioso*. 1532. Trans. William Stewart Rose. London, 1910. Ed. D. B. Killings, 1995. Web. 15 June 2013.

Aristotle. *Aristotlis stagirtae rhetoricorum libri tres: eiusdem De poetica liber unus*. Ed. J. Libert. Paris: J Libert, 1629. *Gallica*. BNF. Web.

---. *Rhetoric*. Trans. W. Rhys Roberts. Ed. Jim Manis. *The Electronic Classic Series*. Pennsylvania State University-Hazleton. Web.

Béroalde, François de Verville. *L'histoire véritable ou le voyage des princes fortunés*. 1610. Ed. Georges Bourgueil. Albi: Passage du Nord-Ouest, 2005.

Boileau, Nicolas. *Art Poétique*. Paris: Denys Theirry, 1674.

Camus, Jean-Pierre. *Petronille: Accident pitoyable de nos jours, cause d'une vocation Religieuse*. Lyon: Jacques Gaudion. 1626. *Google Books*. Web.

Cervantes, Miguel de. *Don Quixote de la Mancha, segunda parte*. Madrid: Juan de la Cuesta, 1615. Biblioteca Digital Hispánica. *Biblioteca Nacional de España*. Web.

---. *The History and Adventures of the Renowned Don Quixote*. Trans. T. Smollett. Vol. I-IV. London: W. Longman, 1782-86. *Google Books*. Web.

---. *El ingenioso hidalgo don Quixote de la Mancha*. Madrid: Juan de la Cuesta, 1605. Biblioteca Digital Hispánica. *Biblioteca Nacional de España*. Web.

---. *L'Ingenieux don Quixote de la Manche*. Trans. César Oudin. Paris: Jean Foüet, 1614. *Google Books*. Web.

- . *Seconde partie de l'histoire de l'ingénieux et redoutable chevalier, Dom Quichot de la Manche*. Trans. François de Rosset. Paris: La veuve Jacques du Ciou, & Denis Moreau, 1618. *Google Books*. Web.
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *De Oratore*. Ed. E. H Warmington. Trans. E. W. Sutton and H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library. Harvard University Press, 1948.
- Descartes, René. *Discours de la Méthode. Méditations métaphysiques. Les Passions de l'âme*. In *Œuvres et Lettres*. Ed. A. Bridoux. Paris: Gallimard (Pléiade), 1952.
- Dubos, Jean-Baptiste. *Réflexions critiques sur la poésie et sur la peinture*. 1719. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1967.
- Fancan, François Dorval-Langlois. *Le Tombeau des romans*. Texte établi d'après l'édition de Claude Merlot, 1626. Ed. Frank Greiner. Reims: Presses Universitaires de Reims, 2003.
- Furetière, Antoine. *Dictionnaire Universel, contenant generalement tous les mots françois tant vieux que modernes, & les Termes de toutes les Sciences et des arts*. 1690. BNF. *Gallica*. Web.
- Huet, Daniel. *Lettre de Monsieur Huet à Monsieur de Segrais de l'origine des romans*. Seconde édition. Paris: Sebastien Mabre-Cramoisy, 1678. *Google Books*. Web.
- Huet, Pierre Daniel. *Traitté de l'origine des romans*. 1670. Paris: A.-G. Nizet, 1971.
- Ovid, *Les Metamorphoses d'Ovide, traduites en prose Française & de nouveau soigneusement receües et corrigées*. Trans. Nicolas Renouard. Lyon: Nicolas Gay, 1650. *Gallica*. BNF. Web.
- . *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoseon. Libri XV*. Philadelphia: Impensis Wm. Pontell et Soc., 1805. *Google Books*. Web.
- Quintilia, M. Fabii. *Ni Oratoris eloquentissimi institutionum Oratorium Libri XII*. Basili: Joannis Bebelii, 1529. *Gallica*. BNF. Web.
- Quintilian. *Institutio Oratoria*. Trans. Rev. John Selby Watson. 1856. Ed. Lee Honeycutt. *Quintilian's Institutes of Oratory*. Web.
- Scarron. *Le Roman comique*. In *Romanciers du XVIIe siècle*. 1651, 1657. Ed. Antoine Adam. Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, Paris: Gallimard, 1958.
- Scève, Maurice. *Délie, object de plus haulte vertu* [Lyon: Sulpice Sabon, 1544] *Gallica*. BNF. Web.
- Scudéry, Georges de. Preface. *Ibrahim ou l'illustre Bassa*. 1644. Paris: Société des textes français modernes, 1998.

Scudéry, Madeleine de. *Conversations sur divers sujets. Tome Second*. Paris: Claude Barbin, 1680. *Google Books*. Web.

Urfé, Honoré de. *L'Astrée: où par plusieurs histoires, et sous personnes de Bergers, & d'autres, sont deduits les divers effets de l'honneste Amitié*. (1607-27). Vol I – IV. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1966.

---. "Deux visages de *L'Astrée* - Portail." Vol I-II. Ed. Eglal Henein. Tufts University. Web.

Critical Works

Austin, J. L. *How to Do Things With Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Bakhtine, Mikhaïl M. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.

---. *Rabelais and his World*. Trans. Hélène Iswolsky. Indiana University Press, 1984.

Bardon, Maurice. *Don Quichotte en France au XVIIe et au XVIIIe siècle*. 1931. Genève : Slatkine Reprints, 1974.

Bardon, Henri. "Sur l'influence d'Ovide en France au 17e siècle." *Atti del Convegno Internazionale Ovidiano*. Vol. II. Rome: Istituto di Studi Romani Editore, 1958.

Barthes, Roland. *Arcimboldo*. Milan: F. M. Ricci, 1978.

Béchade, Hervé de. *Les Romans comiques de Charles Sorel. Fiction narrative, langue et langages*. Genève: Droz, 1981.

Bray, René. *La Formation de la doctrine classique en France*. Paris: Hachette. 1927.

Burwick, Frederick and Walter Pape. *Aesthetic Illusion: Theoretical and Historical Approaches*. New York: W. de Gruyter, 1990.

Charbonneau, Frédéric. "L'histoire aux rayons de *La bibliothèque française*." *Charles Sorel, polygraphe*. Ed. Emmanuel Bury and Eric Van der Schueren. Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 2006. 155-166.

Chouinard, Daniel. "L'anti-roman de Charles Sorel: Poétique d'une lecture, lecture d'une poétique." Diss. Université de Montréal, 1983.

---. "Charles Sorel: (anti)romancier et le brouillage du discours." *Etudes Françaises*. 14. (1978): 65-91.

- . "Les figures du procès dans *Le Berger extravagant*: Le commentaire sorélien et l'archéologie de la topique romanesque." *La naissance du roman en France : Topique romanesque de "L'Astrée" à "Justine."* Ed. Nicole Boursier and David Trott. Biblio 17. Paris: *Papers on French Seventeenth Century Literature*, 1990. 13-27.
- Clerc, Arto. "Engagements pastoraux et utopiques au XVIIe siècle." *MLN. La Littérature Engagée aux XVIe et XVIIe siècles*. 120:1 (January, 2005): 170-180. *ProQuest*. Web.
- Cohen, Eli. "A Poetics of Paradox : Images of Discourse in Early Modern Novelistic Fiction." Diss. Princeton University, 2011. *ProQuest*. Web.
- Coulet, Henri. *Le Roman jusqu'à la Révolution*. Paris: Armand Colin, 1967.
- Crooks, Esther J. *The Influence of Cervantes in France in the Seventeenth Century*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1931.
- Davidson, Hugh M. *Audience, Words and Art. Studies in Seventeenth-Century French Rhetoric*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1965.
- De Vos, Wim. *Le Singe au miroir: emprunt textuel et écriture savante dans les romans comiques de Charles Sorel*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1994.
- Debaisieux, Martine. "Francion et les détour(nement)s de l'histoire comique." *Lectures du Francion de Charles Sorel*. Ed. Daniel Riou. (Les Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2000): 25-38.
- . "L'Histoire comique, genre travesti." *Poétique*. 74 (April 1988): 169-181. Reappears in P. Dandrey (éd.) *Charles Sorel/ Histoire comique de Francion*, Paris: Klincksieck, 2000, 69-79.
- . Introduction. *Description de l'île de portraiture*. By Charles Sorel. 1659. Ed. Martine Debaisieux. Genève: Droz, 2006, 29-62.
- . "Parodie et carnaval: l'exemple de Charles Sorel." *Cahiers du Dix-septième: An Interdisciplinary Journal*. 3:1 (Spring, 1989): 307-318.
- . *Le Procès du roman: Écriture et contrefaçon chez Charles Sorel*. Saratoga: Stanford French and Italian Studies, 1989. 2nd Ed. Orléans: Paradigme, 2000.
- . "Le Roman comique, ou la mise en scène du dé(voile)ment." *Le labyrinthe de Versailles: parcours critiques de Molière à La Fontaine*. Ed. Martine Debaisieux. Amsterdam: Rodopi. (1998): 171-185.
- . "Représentation et anamorphose: *Histoire comique de Francion*." *Papers on French Seventeenth Century Literature*. 14: 27 (1987): 589-602.

- . "Sous le signe de Mercure: de la thématique du vol à la fraude littéraire dans le *Francion*". *Littératures Classiques*. 41 (2001): 49-62.
- . "Le tombeau des romans': de *Francion* au *Berger extravagant*." *Papers on French Seventeenth Century Literature*. 16: 30 (1989): 169-178.
- . "Utopie à la dérive : *La description de l'isle de Portraiture*." *Charles Sorel, polygraphe*. Ed. Emmanuel Bury and Eric Van der Schueren. Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 2006. 381-398.
- DeJean, Joan E. *Libertine Strategies: Freedom and the Novel in Seventeenth-Century France*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1981.
- Dipiero, Thomas. *Dangerous Truths and Criminal Passions*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992.
- . "Unreadable Novels: Toward a Theory of Seventeenth-Century Aristocratic Fiction." *Novel*. 38:2/3 (Spring/Summer, 2005): 129-146.
- Donoghue, Emma. *Inseparable: Desire Between Women in Literature*. New York: Random House, 2010.
- Faye, Jean Pierre. *Le Récit hunique*. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1967.
- Foucault, Michel. *Histoire de la folie à l'âge classique*. Paris: Gallimard, 1964.
- Franchetti, A.L. *Il berger extravagant di Charles Sorel*. Florence: Olschki, 1977.
- Friedman, Edward H. "Executing the Will: The End of the Road in *Don Quixote*." *Indiana Journal of Hispanic Literature*. 5 (Fall 1994): 105-125.
- Fumaroli, Marc. *L'Age de l'éloquence*. Geneva: Droz, 1980.
- Garavini, Fausta. *La Maison des jeux : science du roman et roman de la science au XVIIe siècle*. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1998.
- . "L'itinéraire de Sorel: du 'Francion' à la 'Science universelle'." *Revue d'Histoire littéraire de la France*. 77: 3/4 (May-Aug 1977): 432-9.
- Genette, Gérard. *Figures I*. Paris: Seuil, 1966.
- . "La rhétorique restreinte." *Communications*. 16:16 (1970): 158-171.
- . *Palimpsestes: la littérature au second degré*. Paris: Seuil, 1982.
- . *Seuils*. Paris: Seuil, 1987.

- Gombrich, Ernst H. *Art and Illusion: A Study in the Psychology of Pictorial Representation*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Phaidon, 1968.
- Greenberg, Caren. "Mediation and Madness: Charles Sorel's *Le Berger extravagant*." Diss. Cornell University, 1977. *ProQuest*. Web.
- Greenberg, Mitchell. *Subjectivity and Subjugation in Seventeenth-Century Drama and Prose*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Gregorio, Laurence A. *Pastoral Masquerade: Disguise and Identity in L'Astrée*. Saratoga, CA: ANMA Libri, 1992.
- Greiner, Frank. Préface. *Le Tombeau des romans*. By François Dorval-Langlois. 1626. Reims: Presses Universitaires de Reims, 2003.
- Guellouz, Suzanne. "Le Roman parle du roman: critique et poétique du genre dans *Le berger extravagant*." *Charles Sorel, polygraphe*. Ed. Emmanuel Bury and Eric Van der Schueren. Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 2006. 251-262.
- Harris, Joseph. *Hidden Agendas: Cross dressing in 17th century France*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 2005.
- Henein, Eglal. "Deux Visages De L'Astrée - Portail." Tufts University. Web.
- . *Protée Romancier: les déguisements dans l'Astrée d'Honoré d'Urfé*. Paris: Schena-Nizet, 1996.
- Hinds, Leonard. "The Comedy of Authorship in Charles Sorel's *Le Berger extravagant*." *Cahiers du Dix-Septième: An Interdisciplinary Journal*. 6:2 (Fall, 1992): 191-202.
- . "Literary Tombs: Novelistic Experimentation in Honoré d'Urfé's *L'Astrée* and Charles Sorel's *Le Berger extravagant*." Diss. University of Michigan, 1989. *ProQuest*. Web.
- . *Narrative Transformations from L'Astrée to Le Berger Extravagant*. West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 2002.
- Hodgson, Richard G. "De la « comédie humaine » à la « perfection de l'homme » : Charles Sorel moraliste." *Charles Sorel, polygraphe*. Ed. Emmanuel Bury and Eric Van der Schueren. Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 2006. 19-30.
- . "Du Francion de Sorel au *Pharsamon* de Marivaux: histoire de la folie à l'âge de l'anti-roman." *La naissance du roman en France. Topique romanesque de l'Astrée à Justine, Paris – Seattle – Tübingen, Papers on French Seventeenth Century Literature*. Ed. Nicole Boursier and David Trott. Biblio 17. (1990): 29-38.

- Hutcheon, Linda. *A Theory of Parody: The Teachings of Twentieth-Century Art Forms*. New York: Methuen, 1985.
- . *Narcissistic Narrative: The Metafictional Paradox*. Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1980.
- Idt, Geneviève. "La Parodie: rhétorique ou lecture?" *Le Discours et le sujet*. Actes des colloques animés par R. Molho. Paris-X-Nanterre, Institut de Français, Centre d'Etudes des Sciences de la Littérature. (1973): 128-173.
- Jacques, Geneviève. "Lysis, mélancolique abusé ou abuseur dissimulé? La représentation théâtrale dans *Le Berger extravagant* de Charles Sorel." Diss. Université Laval. 2002. *ProQuest*. Web.
- Jeanneret, Michel. "Préfaces, commentaires, et programmation de la lecture. L'exemple des *Métamorphoses*." *Les Commentaires et la naissance de la critique littéraire*. Ed. Gisèle Mathieu-Castellani and Michel Plaisance. Paris: Aux Amateurs de livres, 1988, 30-39.
- Johnston, Ian. "The Influence of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." University of Texas. Web.
- . "Lecture on Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." University of Texas. Web.
- Jones, Graham and Lauren Shweder. "The Performance of Illusion and Illusionary Performatives: Learning the Language of Theatrical Magic." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*. 13: 1 (2003): 51-70.
- Judovitz, Dalia. "Mort de l'allégorie dans *Le Berger extravagant*." *Lendemain*. 50 (1988): 46-55.
- Kay, Burt. "A Writer Turns Against Literature: Charles Sorel's *Le berger extravagant*." *Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa/University of Ottawa Quarterly*. 43 (1973): 277-91.
- Kristeva, Julia. "Le Mot, le dialogue et le roman." *Recherches pour une sémanalyse*. Paris: Seuil, 1969.
- Laugaa, Maurice. "Structures ou personnages dans *L'Astrée*." *Etudes Françaises*. 2:1 (1966): 3-27.
- Lever, Maurice. *Le Roman français au XVIIe siècle*. Paris: PUF, 1981.
- . "Le statut de la critique dans *Le Berger extravagant*." *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France*. LXXVII, 3-4 (1977): 417-431.
- Lo Ré, A. G. "The Three Deaths of Don Quixote: Comments in Favor of the Romantic Critical Approach." *Cervantes: Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America*. 9:2 (1989): 21-41.

- Mathieu-Castellani, Gisèle. "Le commentaire de la poésie (1550-1630): l'écriture du genre." *Les Commentaires et la naissance de la critique littéraire*. Ed. Gisèle Mathieu-Castellani and Michel Plaisance. Paris: Aux Amateurs de livres, 1988, 40-50.
- Meding, Twyla. "Pastoral Palimpsest: Writing the Laws of Love in *L'Astrée*." *Renaissance Quarterly*. The Free Library by Farlex. Web.
- Mesnard, Jean. "Vraie et fausse beauté dans l'esthétique au dix-septième siècle." *Convergences – Rhetoric and Poetic in Seventeenth-Century France: Essays for Hugh M. Davidson*. Ed. David Lee Rubin and Mary B. McKinley. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1989. 3-33.
- Moss, Ann. *Poetry and Fable: Studies in Mythological Narrative in Sixteenth-Century France*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Moss, Jessica. "Pleasure and Illusion in Plato." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*. 72:3 (2006): 503-535.
- Picard, Raymond. "Remises en question." *Revue d'Histoire littéraire de la France*. 77: 3/4 (1977): 355-358.
- Rescia, Laura. "Entre théorie et pratique romanesque: le rôle de la rhétorique dans *Le berger extravagant* de Charles Sorel." *Charles Sorel, polygraphe*. Ed. Emmanuel Bury and Eric Van der Schueren. Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 2006. 263-276.
- Rosset, Clément. *Le Réel et son double: essai sur l'illusion*. Paris: Gallimard, 1976.
- . *L'Ecole du réel*. Paris: Gallimard, 1984.
- Rousset, Jean. *La Littérature de l'âge baroque en France: Circé et le Paon*. Paris: Corti, 1953.
- Roy, Émile. *La Vie et les œuvres de Charles Sorel, sieur de Souvigny, 1602-1674*. Paris: Hachette, 1891.
- Sarduy, Severo. *La Doublure*. Paris: Flammarion, 1981.
- Schmidt, Rachel Lynn. *Forms of Modernity: Don Quixote and Modern Theories of the Novel*. University of Toronto Press, 2011.
- Serroy, Jean. *Roman et réalité: les histoires comiques au XVIIe siècle*. Paris: Minard, 1981.
- . "Situation de Charles Sorel." *Charles Sorel, polygraphe*. Ed. Emmanuel Bury and Eric Van der Schueren. Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 2006. 1-18.
- Skornia, H. J. "Charles Sorel as a Precursor of Realism." *PMLA*, 56:2 (1941): 379-394.

- Spica, Anne-Elisabeth. "Charles Sorel, entre fascination et répulsion pour le roman." *Charles Sorel, polygraphe*. Ed. Emmanuel Bury and Eric Van der Schueren. Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 2006. 167-187.
- Stierle, Karlheinz. "Les lieux du commentaire." *Les Commentaires et la naissance de la critique littéraire*. Ed. Gisèle Mathieu-Castellani and Michel Plaisance. Paris: Aux Amateurs de livres, 1988, 19-29.
- Suozzo, Andrew G., Jr. *The Comic Novels of Charles Sorel: A Study of Structure, Characterization, and Disguise*. Lexington, Kentucky: French Forum, 1982.
- . "Disguise and the Rites of Death and Resurrection in Sorel's Francion." *The French Review*. 53:1 (1979): 23-28.
- Taylor, Charles. *Philosophical Arguments*. Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Theobald, Anne. "Stages in the Novel: Theatrical Characteristics in Sorel's Histoires Comiques." Diss. University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2011. *ProQuest*. Web.
- Tilton, Elizabeth Meier. "Charles Sorel. Lawyer, and the Case of the *Berger extravagant*." *Papers on French Seventeenth Century Literature*. 3 (1975): 69-81.
- Tucker, Holly A. "Pleasure, Seduction, and Authorial Identity in Charles Sorel's *Le Berger extravagant*." *Neophilologus*. 84:3 (July, 2000): 347-358.
- . *Strategies of Imitation in Charles Sorel's Le Berger extravagant*. Diss. University of Wisconsin--Madison, 1996. *ProQuest*. Web.
- Van Elslande, Jean-Pierre. "La mise en scène du discours." *Méthodes et problèmes*. Dpt. de Français moderne, Université de Neuchâtel. Web. (2003):
- . *L'imaginaire pastorale du XVIIe siècle*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1999.
- Verdier, Gabrielle. *Charles Sorel*. Boston: Twayne, 1984.
- . "Fiction as a Game: Sorel's *La Maison des jeux* and the Dilemma of the Novel in the Seventeenth Century." *French Literature Series*. 16 (1984): 11-22.
- Walton, Doug. "Searching For the Roots of the Circumstantial *Ad Hominem*." *Argumentation*. 15. (2001): 207-221.
- Zumthor, Paul. "La Glose créatrice." *Les Commentaires et la naissance de la critique littéraire*. Ed. Gisèle Mathieu-Castellani and Michel Plaisance. Paris: Aux Amateurs de livres, 1988, 11-18.