In the preceding pages, I have attempted to show that the category of the libertine novel possesses a fundamental unity. I would not claim, however, that none of its characteristic marks can be noted elsewhere. A certain number of seventeenth-century novels share some degree of similarity with the works I call libertine. Nevertheless, in every case the distinguishing traits outweigh the resemblances.

For example, three early seventeenth-century novels have much in common with the libertine novels: John Barclay’s *Euphormionis Lusinini Satyricon*, Agrippa d’Aubigné’s *Baron de Faeneste*, and Jean de Lannel’s *Romant satyrique*. Of the three, Barclay’s *Euphormio* is certainly closest to the libertine texts, since it is a first-person account of the disgraces à la page of an “oppressed” hero, once a freeman, now a slave, who feigns madness in order to gain a certain degree of freedom. Besides its presentation of madness, the work’s treatment of the occult, complete with a witchcraft scene reminiscent of the opening of *Francion*, provides an additional thematic similarity. Finally, its occasional verse interludes, obviously influenced by the classical tradition of Menippean satire, link it compositionally with certain representatives of the libertine tradition. Such resemblances are, however, more than counterbalanced by the absence of a breakdown into shorter units, by the lack of a sense of tradition, and above all by the novel’s complex relationship to antiquity. It is written in Latin rather than the French chosen by the libertine authors, their decision being in a sense parallel to Descartes’s composition of the *Discours de la méthode* in French instead of in Latin. *Euphormio* is also packed with allusions to antiquity, clas-
sical literature, and mythology, closer to a sort of libertine roman héroïque than to a comic novel. As a result of its classical flavor, the work's alleged autobiographical content is difficult to discern, if indeed it does exist. The final barrier between Barclay and the future libertine tradition is his work's rejection of the dialogic. Euphormio's end is doubly happy, with a stable system provided, first, by a continued faith in the values of Antiquity and, second, by the ultimate financial and political security assured for Euphormio at the home of Tessa Ranactus, whose eulogy provides the closing passage of the novel. Euphormionis Lusinini Satyricon is clearly a daring book and one that has no place in the world of the sentimental romances that dominated the novelistic horizon at the time of its appearance, but it remains a far cry from a work of libertine contestation.

Despite such obvious links to the libertine mode in Agrippa d'Aubigné's Baron de Faeneste as its use of dialogue form, it is impossible to qualify as libertine a text composed precisely in order to defend a particular stand on a religious issue. The work is marked from one end to the other by its author's convictions, and these, rooted in the belief in one true system, are eminently monologic. Le Romant satyrique keeps its distance from libertine fiction. If the Ayme-Dieu passage is interpreted as a reference to Théophile, it could be described as a novel with a sense of tradition. But this tradition cannot be termed libertine, for Théophile is defended only if he is not guilty of the crime of atheism. Lan nel's novel remains at the stage of the roman à clef, rejecting autobiographical impulses. With its third-person narration and its lack of fragmentation, it stays within contemporary norms.

The second category of works to merit comparison in this context is vaster, composed of novels of other writers who were intimately connected in some capacity with the movement of libertinage érudit. These texts are so varied that they are best examined in chronological order. The Confessions of J.-J. Bouchard are libertine only in the eighteenth-century sense of the word, a unique case in the milieu from which they originated. Editors of this third-person account of the sexual exploits of the young hero Oreste generally assume it is autobiographical, although in addition to the veil of the third person, the roman à clef technique is also employed. Since extremely little is known about
Bouchard's youth, the importance of the autobiographical component cannot be measured with any degree of precision. The only real similarity between the Confessions and the libertine novels is evident when Bouchard occasionally deviates from the use of Greek pseudonyms to refer directly to his closest contacts in the world of libertinage érudit, Luillier and Gassendi.

The next two examples, works by members of the Tétrade, provide even more convincing evidence that this milieu was simultaneously producing very different types of prose fiction. Naudé's Jugement de tout ce qui a esté imprimé contre le cardinal Mazarin depuis le sixième janvier, jusques à la Declaration du premier avril mil six cens quarante neuf, more familiarly known as the Mascurat, takes the form of a dialogue between the libraire Saint-Ange and the printer Mascurat. It shares evident formal similarities with the libertine novels, but despite this and the occasional presence of references to such figures as Peiresc and Gassendi, the Mascurat remains too much the story of Mazarin—his "true" genealogy, and so on—and is insufficiently preoccupied with the "novelistic" to get beyond the stage of polemical literature. It is clearly not the story that matters here, but the defense. Le Parasite Mormon (1650), a coproduction of La Mothe Le Vayer and Sorel, has absolutely nothing of the libertine about it, other than the subtitle histoire comique it shares with several of these novels. It is a more than predictable third-person adaptation of a story by Zayas, of a type better known through the work of the only novelist in Gassendi's little clan not to have produced a libertine novel, Scarron.

Scarron's Roman comique is close to the works of the libertine tradition because of its reflections on language and the self-consciousness that results from Scarron's long association with the burlesque style. Other similarities are its formal division into short chapters, its juxtaposition of disparate fragments, its rejection of closure, and its ultimate defense of relativism and the dialogic. But Scarron's choice of the third person and his refusal to throw off the mask of the burlesque to let in either a sense of a libertine past or autobiographical elements firmly ground his novel in the tradition of comic fiction. This is also the category to which the novel of Scarron's first imitator, the known libertine Claude Le Petit, must be assigned. L'Heure du berger (1662)
makes its reference to the Roman comique clear with its subtitle, "demy-roman comique ou roman demy-comique," but true affinities with either Scarron or especially with libertine fiction are nonexistent in this rather colorless, third-person pseudo nouvelle espagnole. It is evidently not sufficient to be a libertine to produce libertine fiction.

Cyrano's fantastic voyages left a heritage in the form of what Lachèvre terms the libertine utopias of the late seventeenth century: La Terre australe connue (1676), by the defrocked cordelier Gabriel de Foigny, and Denis Veiras's (or Vairasse) L'Histoire des Sévarambes (1677–79). Both these texts are no more than pale heirs of Cyrano's explosive prototype, and they must be situated completely outside French libertine tradition, with which, furthermore, they make no attempt to identify themselves, either through libertine naming or defending. Foigny's utopia is the more interesting of the two, but even he makes relatively little use of the potential of the philosophical dialogue. The first person and the dialogic disappear progressively from La Terre australe connue, to be replaced by description of the Australiens and their customs. The only passage that could be identified as autobiographical is the closing one describing the hero Sadeur's trial. This may serve as a reference to Foigny's own trial in Geneva by the Vénérable Compagnie. But even this allusion cannot be compared to the libertine evocations of intellectual repression. Sadeur's trial and condemnation do not occur as a result of his daring pronouncements, but because, during a war between the Australiens and the Fondins, he had refused to fight. Such an account could more accurately be described as a parody of the dangers of the libertine condition. La Terre australe connue is a text that conforms to Lachèvre's most negative interpretation of the libertine tradition in its desire to treat "forbidden" religious and sexual matters simply to scandalize, not to arrive at a coherent philosophy. Veiras's utopia has no link with libertine tradition other than its rejection of organized religion as embodied in the Christ-like figure, the imposter and false prophet Omigas. L'Histoire des Sévarambes is narrated in the third person and makes no attempt to integrate autobiographical elements.

After Cyrano, a second libertine writer is generally given credit for inaugurating a genre with an important future. Chapelle's
Voyage à Encausse is situated near the beginning of a trail of little-known works by major authors: Racine's *Voyage en Languedoc* (1661–2), La Fontaine's *Voyage de Paris en Limousin* (1663), and Regnard's *Voyage de Normandie* (1689), to mention the major representatives in the seventeenth century alone. The fact that Racine’s *Voyage* precedes his would seem to indicate that paternity of the genre should not be attributed to Chapelle. In fact, Chapelle’s manipulation of the form first used by Racine demonstrates his choice of an outsider’s role within the confines of this particular type of voyage literature. Both Sainte-Beuve and Neubert grant an identical status to all these works, undoubtedly because of their formal similarities: all mix verse and prose, and all are presented as one or a series of letters. Such a comparison does a great injustice to Chapelle, who realizes far more fully than other practitioners the potential of the supple form he employs. He often goes beyond the frivolity of the *récit de voyage* of the well-bred traveler who never ventures very far from home and certainly never knows dangerous or exotic encounters to acknowledge his role in the libertine experience. In Racine’s view of Languedoc, precious reigns. The threatening unknown and even travelogue concreteness are replaced by graceful mythological references. La Fontaine’s text is largely of guidebook quality, with its descriptions of churches, châteaux and their gardens, paintings, and statues. The only names that occur in this voyage are those of artists. At times, in the fifth letter for example, the *Voyage de Paris en Limousin* reads like a museum catalogue. In the *Voyage de Normandie*, Regnard is more attentive to details and above all to details of a “realistic” nature (food, lodging) than either Racine or La Fontaine; but he remains, like them, completely removed from the type of voyage composed by Chapelle. In fact, his text in the form of a letter to a woman with a fictional name (Artémise), with its obsessional vision of women babbling in the coach, completes the reduction to a polite society game of a form that once served as a contribution to the libertine dialogue. The *Voyages* of Racine, La Fontaine, and Regnard may be described as charming bagatelles of famous men, meant, according to Neubert’s play on one of the seventeenth-century’s most quoted slogans, to entertain but not to instruct. They are clearly of a different tissue from the text they allegedly imitate.
There are certain other seventeenth-century French novels possessing some of the characteristics of the novels I have identified as libertine, but the cross-section of texts just examined here, from Barclay to Regnard, provides a fair estimate of the limits of the incursion of other narrative trends into the territory measured out for this study. It is my hope that even this short review can provide some sense of the libertine novel's unique position in the history of seventeenth-century French prose narrative.

1. They prefer to remain anonymous, undoubtedly because of the rather scandalous content of the *Confessions* for a work of seventeenth-century prose. The *Confessions* probably dates from 1630, the date of the *Voyage de Paris à Rome* with which it composes a single manuscript, but it was not published until 1881.

2. Published anonymously, without date or place of publication. Philippe Wolfe in his article “*Le Mascurat* de Gabriel Naudé” demonstrates that the first edition was published in Paris by Cramoisy in late 1649.

3. On this point, I disagree with Wolfe, p. 115, and with Sainte-Beuve's statement that the *Mascurat* was the seventeenth-century’s *Neveu de Rameau* (quoted by Wolfe, p. 103).

4. On this interpretation of the *Roman comique*, see my Scarron’s “*Roman comique:* A Novel of Comedy, A Comedy of the Novel.