The topic of theater as metaphor implies reflections not on theater as such, but, rather, on theater turning out to be not only theater, comprising, in fact, larger discursive practices. Theatrical and dramatic images used as a definition of theater are not an end in themselves, but a means to convey other, more important content of various kinds related to faith and religion, rituals and etiquettes of power, etc. Theatrical imagery reveals itself as a flexible means of presentation, that is, not the final point of the aesthetic process, but one of its means, a language to describe reality, which is more important than the imagery; in that sense, any discursive practice offering elements from the theatrical lexicon or theatrical method becomes productive. Our analysis shall use as its textual material the tradition of French anecdotes from the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries, a time when the genre of the anecdote actually received this name and when its poetics were conceptualized.

Our point of reference shall be the text of Comediana, ou Recueil choisi d’anecdotes dramatiques; bons mots des comédiens, et réparties spirituelles; de bonhomie et de naïveté du parterre, created by a well-known man of letters, Charles-Yves d’Avallon, who signed his works as Cousin d’Avallon. Cousin d’Avallon wrote over two dozen texts with the suffix ana in their titles, on writers (including Molière, Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, Chateaubriand, Mme de Staël), on general human features (for example, on avariciousness, which became the main subject of his Harpagoniana, with a title based on the main character’s name from Molière’s comedy), as well as on politicians, including Napoleon Bonaparte. Let us note that the “magic formula” ana ou anecdotes is used in this collection’s title (as well as those of other collections). Let us also recall that this French literary genre dates back to the late Renaissance. The collections that recorded unpublished remarks and comments by great scholars, scientists, or mighty men appear from the end of the seventeenth until the middle of the nineteenth century. Gabriel Peignot, a contemporary of Cousin d’Avallon, as well as a philologist, bibliographer, and member of the Besançon Academy, faced the necessity to construct a false etymology: as suggested by this bibliographer, the compilers of ana giving this title to their works had initially meant
an anecdote, but did not use this latter word due to its dissonance when combined with the principal character’s name. Seen from this perspective, *ana* becomes an abbreviation of anecdote:

Let us get back to *ana* and talk about the etymology of this word, which remains a mystery [...]. It is known that the Books whose name ends in ANA usually contain reflections and little-known anecdotes about those who are their object. Could the word ANA be considered as a diminutive of ANECDOTA [...]? Because the word Anecdota, added to a proper name, made it very unpleasant to the ear (for example, *Menagianecdota*), a part of the added word fell off, and a plural neuter ending was added to the remaining part; thus, *Menagiana* was formed from *Menagianecdota*, or *Verba non edita*.

Actually, Peignot is asserting the priority of the word “anecdote” and presenting *ana* as a derivative; it is not sufficient for him to merely suggest that the two “matrices” are based on the intent to demonstrate the “interior” of the persons concerned.

One of the anecdotes in the *Comediana*, dealing with Mademoiselle de Champmêlé, a French actress of the seventeenth century, is particularly worthy of our attention:

Mademoiselle Champmêlé, célèbre actrice, sacrifia Racine au comte de Clermont-Tonnerre. On fit le quatrains suivant sur cette aventure, quatrains dont tout le sel et toute la finesse roulent sur un jeu de mots:

Au tendre amour elle fut destinée,
Qui prit long-temps Racine dans son cœur;
Mais par un insigne malheur,
Le tonnerre est venu qui l’a déracinée.

This anecdote was told 35 years before the publication of the *Comediana* in the *Anecdotes dramatiques*, a three-volume collection by Jean Marie Bernard Clément and Joseph de la Porte, published in Paris in 1775. In addition to the above-mentioned anecdote, we can read another one, also dealing with love affairs:

Racine aima la Champmêlé, qui lui fut infidèle; et il s’en vengea par un beau-mot, qu’il adressa à son mari, et que Boileau a rimé dans cette épigramme:

De six amans contens et non jaloux,
Qui tour-à-tour servaient Madame Claude,
Le moins volage était Jean son époux.

---

Un jour pourtant d’humeur un peu trop chaude,
Serrait de près sa servante aux yeux doux,
Lorsqu’un des six lui dit, que faites-vous?
Le jeu n’est sûr avec cette Ribaude;
Ah ! voulez-vous, Jean, Jean, nous gâter tous?
Despréaux ne lisait cette épigramme qu’à ses meilleurs amis.³

Our attention is attracted by the unity of tone and the predetermined character of this anecdote’s heroine; within this anecdotic discourse, the French actress is interesting in one respect only; all diversity and features not fitting into the specific one which is underlined are cut off and not mentioned.

Our second example will be the _Arliquiniana_, a book published in 1694. It was written by a lawyer, Charles Cotolendi, a Provençal by origin, living in Paris, who was the author of several hagiographies and biographies of famous people, including the Duke of Montmorency and St. Francis of Sales. In the wake of _Arliquiniana_’s success, Cotolendi published a sequel titled _A Book without Name_ (1695), and five years later another one titled _Saint-Evremoniana_ (1700). _Arliquiniana_ is centered on imaginary conversations between Cotolendi and Harlequin—whose legal name was Domenico Biancolelli (1640–1688)—an Italian actor famous in the 1670s, who had been invited to France by Cardinal Mazarin. Domenico was so talented that he was often fully identified with this well-known _commedia dell’arte_ character to the extent that even nowadays the personage of Harlequin is sometimes called “Dominique” in French contexts. It was not the first time that an actor had been identified with the type he represented on the stage within seventeenth-century French cultural practices. A well-known memoir writer, Gédéon Tallemant des Réaux, recounts the story in his _Historiettes_ collection of another, chronologically earlier Harlequin—Tristano Martinelli, a _zanni_ actor who was very much favored by Marie de Médicis, the second wife of King Henry IV of France. He was one of the first to adopt for his role or mask the name of Alichino (_Hellequin_), one of the demons featuring in Dante’s _Divine Comedy_.⁴

In his collection of anecdotes about Henry IV, Tallemant des Réaux describes a meeting between the King and Harlequin:

In these days Harlequin came to Paris with his company and, while greeting the King, he found a suitable moment when His Majesty got up from the throne, and in his sprightliness he took the King’s seat all at once, and then said, addressing him as if the King was Harlequin: ‘Well, Harlequin, you came here with your company to entertain me. I am

---

⁴ Inferno, Canto XXI.
much pleased with it. I promise to protect you and shall give you such and such wages’, etc. The King did not dare to contradict him, but said in the end: ‘Whoa, hold on! You have played my part long enough, now let me play it myself’.\textsuperscript{5}

The scene of Henry IV’s meeting with a theatrical character, who had actually adopted the name of a demon, has several meanings. The first one alluded to is the concept of the relativity of the “roles” humans play in real life and the types represented on the stage; it is about the world as a theater and about royal power as a configuration of actions that are similar to stage performances. Harlequin emphasizes that the status of Henry IV is nothing but that of a role; he is questioning the king’s claim to be an agent of political will; Harlequin is thus cast as a personification of backstage power able to uncover a face behind the mask and to shuffle destiny’s cards.

Let us get back to the \textit{Arliquiniana}. In the foreword and in the part titled \textit{The Appearance of Harlequin}, Cotolendi refers to himself as a collector of “real” conversations with Harlequin; in fact, the conversations represent an imaginary dialogue between Cotolendi and Harlequin, who had died in 1688. Harlequin is elevated above mere mortals, standing between the worlds of life and death; we are witnessing the talks with the dead Dominique or with someone so successfully impersonated by him. Harlequin is providing information from the otherworld, telling, often in sarcastic tones, about the lives led by great men, including scientists and writers, in the Elysian Fields:

Pray, would you please tell me,—I said to him—what is your pastime in the Elysian Fields?—My lot here is a little easier than before, because where I am, everyone appears as he is, having no possibility to hide his true feelings. During my lifetime, I have often turned against those who would only put on the mask of an honest man (honnête homme). Now I witness only unmasked hearts, and a generous man appears to be generous, I need but a sole look to tell a decent woman from a frivolous one, and I am pleased with this sincerity. Having finished his words, he almost wished to go away...—How so! To leave me so quickly! This is unfair... I have always wanted to learn something about some of my acquaintances, and you could help me with it. Please tell me what Molière is doing twenty years after his death.—He answered me—Terence and Plautus are still chasing him, in order to lessen his fame.—What about Corneille?—This one is conversing with the characters from his tragedies, and his companions are praising his wisdom.\textsuperscript{6}


\textsuperscript{6} Charles Cotolendi, \textit{Arliquiniana, ou les bons mots, les histoires plaisantes et agréables recueillies des conversations d’Arlequin}, Paris 1694, p. IX.
Cotolendi is asserting that all his dialogues are true, that he has tried to discover the interior of Harlequin’s life, hidden from other people’s eyes:

My purpose is to collect not only the wondrous words said by Harlequin in the guise of his character on the Italian stage, but also to present many pleasant stories told by those with whom he was on friendly footing. I will also speak of serious things, and relate moral maxims so often present in his speech.⁷

The character of Harlequin in Cotolendi’s text is stable; he figures as a “demon”, often ready to make a “saucy joke”. Dominique was a highly appreciated theater actor and a well-respected man; he was valued for his exceptional mind and for his aphorisms full of wisdom. Cotolendi is trying to collect the best of Harlequin’s jokes; this results in a transformation of the Arliquiniana from a coherent discourse with jokes integrated into its “frame” into a collection of short stories and witticisms:

In another comedy he was playing a sick man, healed by a doctor. The doctor asked a payment from him, but Harlequin was not even thinking of settling accounts. The doctor sued him, and thus Harlequin appears before the judge, insisting that he has never asked the doctor to give him health, and that he is ready to give it back.⁸

In this way, the character of the dead actor Harlequin becomes an incarnation of reason, a transcendent power possessing information and sharing it with an initiate.

Let us note that the events described are not called “anecdote” in the texts, though one could have intuitively used this word to apostrophize the depicted situations. Let us also recall that the term anecdote as a name for a specific variant of historical narrative began to establish itself in France in the first half of the seventeenth century, after the discovery of a pamphlet titled Anekdota, attributed to Procopius of Caesarea, a Byzantine historian of the sixth century CE. The manuscript was found in the Vatican Library by the scholar Niccolo Alemanni, who translated the text from Greek into Latin and published this version with his own comments under the title Procopii Caesarensis Anekdota seu Arcana Historia (1623). Alemanni, when he published this text by Procopius that the author had left without a title, referred to a Greek encyclopedic lexicon from the tenth century whose title spelled Suda, in which this literary work had been actually mentioned for the first time as Anekdota, that is, literally translated, “unpublished notes”. Actually, Alemanni transformed the word anecdote,

⁷ Ibid., pp. 1–2.
⁸ Ibid., p. 4.
which previously had served to specify the status of a literary work as handwrit-

ten and not readily available for a broader public, into a name for this text and

its genre; he thereby created a type of historical work breaking with the traditions

of ceremonial official historiography.

The official works by Procopius, who lived in the sixth century, celebrating

the Emperor Justinian were well known. In medieval Christian Europe

and in the early modern period, Justinian was considered as one of the most

important historical figures. Let me recall that Justinian tried to restore the

Roman Empire and also conducted administrative and judicial reforms, thus

earning himself posthumous fame and authority in Europe as a lawgiver. The

discovery of the secret notes turned upside down all previous visions of

him: Procopius, who praised Justinian in his official works as a lawmaker

and conqueror of barbarian peoples, is very severe about the Emperor in the

text not intended for publication. In the seventeenth century, the most fa-

mous episodes were those related to the debauchery and follies of Justi-
nian’s spouse, the Empress Theodora (whose portrait with a nimbus we can

see even now in the mosaics in Ravenna). Most of the facts, or rumors, about

the Basilissa were presented by Procopius in the ninth book. Procopius de-

scribes in detail how Theodora, after growing up in depravity, became a co-

median famous for the most disgusting vices, ascribed to the actress by the

crowd. The text published by Alemanni on the basis of Procopius (which

passed over the most obscene anecdotes, but made allusions to them) be-

came one of the most popular books in the seventeenth-century French intel-

lectual sphere. Procopius’ naturalism is striking; he does not resort to

restrictions and describes the emperor’s and the empress’s vices in great de-

tail. It seems here that the anecdote is intended to become a rendering of

“true” history, but when studying it more closely, one notices that Procopius

cannot help but use rhetoric and poetical schemes. The most well-known ex-

ample in this respect is the following characterization of Theodora by

Procopius:

And though she made use of three orifices, she used to take Nature to task, complaining

that it had not pierced her breasts with larger holes so that it might be possible for her to

contrive another method of copulation there. And though she was pregnant many times,

practically always she was able to contrive to bring about an abortion immediately.9

This famous description is modeled on a well-known description of

Neera, an Athenian actress and hetaera; it thus turns out that Procopius

---

as well as Alemanni are following the traditional logic of historical discourse by choosing the events that need to be mentioned in accordance with an initially chosen frame. Hermogenes, one of the famous authors of *progymnasmata*, mentions a speech by Demosthenes, who exclaimed that Neera works “with three orifices”\(^\text{10}\). Procopius thus displays his ability to exaggerate; his text is not only a fine sophistical game, but may be considered an inverted praise. Procopius borrows rhetorical and poetical patterns and adapts real characters to them; he uses theatrical topoi and metaphors to provide matrices serving to create characters such as he wishes to present them.

One excellent example of the strategy of implementing “general” features in a historical narrative is a text by the French historian Antoine de Varillas; its title is *Anecdotes of Florence, or a Secret History of the House of Medici*. The idea of writing a historical work about the Medici was conceived by Colbert, who in 1662 instructed Varillas to begin to collect, for political ends, materials related to the famous Italian family. In 1662–1663, when Varillas began to study in the libraries the documents in connection with the Medici’s history, the Royal Printing House had published a two-volume edition of the book by Procopius. Having familiarized himself with it in detail, as well as with its French translation (1669), Varillas decided to realize the work commissioned by Colbert by emulating Procopius’ text:

> Si Procope, qui est le seul auteur dont il nous reste des Anecdotes, avait laissé par écrit les règles de ce genre d’écriture, je ne serais pas obligé de faire une préface, parce que l’autorité de cet excellent historien, que l’Imprimerie Royale vient de nous donner si correct, suffirait pour me mettre à couvert de toutes sortes de reproches, supposé que je les eusse observées avec exactitude.\(^\text{11}\)

There are several answers to the question of why it is the Florentine story of the fifteenth century that became the focus of Varillas’s attention. Ph. Hourcade hypothesizes that the surge of interest was connected to the marriage, celebrated in 1661, of the King’s cousin Marguerite Louise d’Orléans, whose chosen one was Cosimo III, future Grand Duke of Tuscany.\(^\text{12}\) But it may be that the cause for the interest in the House of Medici is of a quite basic nature. In his


monograph on Lorenzo the Magnificent, I. Cloulas,\textsuperscript{13} discussing the interest in the Florentine ruler in the time of Louis XIV, says that Lorenzo was regarded not simply as an ancestor, but also as a kind of spiritual precursor of the French monarch. In this connection, it is interesting to read in Varillas’s text the comparison of young Lorenzo the Magnificent, who had just gained power, with the Sun, which in the 1680s was the symbol of the French monarch. This may reveal the intention of the initiator of the project, Colbert. The characterization of Lorenzo by Varillas reads as follows: “Il s’y fit connaître aux amis de son nom pour ce qui’il y devait être. Il y dit son avis avec une maturité d’esprit qui fut admiré, et commença par cette heureuse adresse à se faire regarder comme un soleil levant”.\textsuperscript{14} The final version of the text was published in 1685–22 years after the first drafts—in The Hague. In this edition, Varillas’s book consists of seven volumes of different size. The first volume covers the period of rule of Cosimo the Elder; the second and the third volumes, which are the main and most voluminous parts, deal with Lorenzo the Magnificent; in the said volumes, much attention is given to the story of the Pazzi conspiracy. At the beginning of the fourth volume, Varillas reports Lorenzo’s death and, contradicting actual chronology, offers after that a gallery of portraits of the most outstanding figures of the Renaissance, including Leonardo Bruni, Pico della Mirandola, Angelo Poliziano, etc. The fifth and the sixth volumes cover the period of the Medici’s return to Florence after Savonarola’s execution and Piero Soderini’s and Machiavelli’s rule: after 1512, Florence found itself under the rule of the Vatican, where the power soon passed to Pope Leo X, whose secular name was Giovanni Medici; he was the second son of Lorenzo the Magnificent. The seventh (last) volume is the smallest (it is one third of the size of the foreword); the most impressive figures from the milieu of Pope Leo X are described in it; in addition, there are portraits of Savonarola and Marsilio Ficino. It seems that Varillas abruptly ceased to work on the text; in the foreword, many more portraits are announced than there are in the actual volumes; the reasons for this configuration are unknown.

Varillas, who is afraid of being attacked by other historians, reasons that Procopius had not left behind any guidelines of how to write anecdotes because he was not able to finish his work or that the description of such guidelines is not available to us due to a partial loss of the text; these lost passages may have been, according to Varillas, exactly the part in which Procopius had outlined what many consider to be missing in his work. The

\textsuperscript{14} Varillas, \textit{Les anecdotes}, p. 100.
reconstruction of these guidelines is necessary for Varillas in order to provide protection from possible critics:

Je me crois réduit, comme ceux qui s’engagent dans de nouvelles routes, je veux dire, à prendre toutes les précautions nécessaires pour n’être pas condamné dès l’entrée de mon ouvrage, à m’imposer des lois moi-même sur lesquelles je prétends être jugé par un équitable lecteur, à condition que je ne les emprunterais ni de ma raison, ni de mon caprice, mais seulement des exemples du même Procope, que je l’aurais toujours devant mes yeux, puisque je ne saurais trouver d’autre guide.\(^\text{15}\)

Although Procopius’ anecdotic narrative was at variance with historical models prevalent in antiquity, Varillas associates it, as well as his own work, with the latter ones also, which implies that there is an entire set of rules and a highly developed structural complexity, that is, an “artistic” nature of the genre in which he tries to excel:

C’est donc avec son approbation, que je suppose pour le fondement de ce discours, qu’il n’est pas si facile d’écrire des anecdotes qu’on le pourrait figurer, parce que d’un côté l’on ne saurait se dispenser d’aucune des règles qu’Aristote, Cicéron, Plutarque et les autres maîtres de l’art ont si judicieusement prescrites pour l’histoire publique; et de l’autre côté il y en a beaucoup d’autres, que je rapporterai dans la suite de cette préface.\(^\text{16}\)

The dichotomy of two kinds of rhetoric, one of them historical and the other anecdotic, is illustrated by Varillas by referring to Procopius, who, as a historian on the one hand and as an anecdotist on the other, has chosen different ways to describe the same event—the recall of the victorious Belisarius from Africa by Justinian. In the second book of his *Vandalic War*, Procopius presents as the cause of the event the Emperor’s jealousy of the general’s fame, as Varillas highlights:

Il est certain que Procope s’est acquitté du devoir d’un fidèle historien, lorsque recherchant la cause qui avait porté l’empereur Justinien à rappeler Bélisaire de l’Afrique, d’où il avait chassé les Vandales en trois mois, quoique la présence de ce grand capitaine fût absolument nécessaire pour affermir sa nouvelle conquête; il écrit que ce service était de telle considération, que Justinien, ne se sentant pas capable de la récompense, craignit que Bélisaire ayant les armes à la main ne se fît lui-même justice. Procope en demeure là, parce qu’il croit avoir satisfait aux lois de l’histoire; et certainement il y aurait eu de l’injustice à lui demander alors quelque chose de plus.\(^\text{17}\)

\(^{15}\) Ibid., p. 43.  
\(^{16}\) Ibid.  
\(^{17}\) Ibid., p. 44.
As an anecdotist, however, Procopius has developed a different interpretation of the same events, because he could tell about something impossible to include in historical works, where the truth has to be hidden when it is not in line with the “general” laws of historical necessity:

Mais quand il s’avisa longtemps après de travailler à ces Anecdotes, il crut qu’il n’y avait rien à déguiser sur un fait si bizarre, qu’il en fallait expliquer les particularités les plus cachées, et que la curiosité de son lecteur ne serait pas pleinement satisfaite, à moins que de lui révéler ce mystère de cour; que ce qu’il avait fait passer dans le second livre de la guerre des Vandales pour un effet de l’ingratitude et de la jalousie d’un souverain à l’égard d’un de ses sujets que la fortune élevait trop haut, n’était, à proprement parler, qu’une intrigue d’amour d’Antonienne, femme de Bélisaire, qui se hâtait de retourner à Constantinople pour y revoir l’infâme objet de sa passion.18

When Procopius creates the official version of history he cannot mention the true cause of the event (Antonina had made Justinian call Belisarius back to Constantinople because she wanted to meet again with her lover). The anecdote becomes an appropriate way to reveal the actual reason behind this recall.

Varillas rejects the hierarchical principle when he is comparing history and anecdote; at the same time, the author of The Anecdotes of Florence highlights the central opposition between official history and private anecdote:

L’historien considère presque toujours les hommes en public; au lieu que l’écrivain d’anecdotes ne les examine qu’en particulier. L’un croit s’acquitter de son devoir, lorsqu’il les dépeint tels qu’ils étaient à l’armée, ou dans le tumulte des villes; et l’autre essaie en toute manière de se faire ouvrir la porte de leur cabinet. L’un les voit en cérémonie, et l’autre en conversation; l’un s’attache principalement à leurs actions, et l’autre veut être témoin de leur vie intérieure, et assister aux plus particulières heures de leur loisir. En un mot, l’un n’a que le commandement et l’autorité pour objet, et l’autre fait son capital de ce qui se passe en secret et dans la solitude.19

The obsession with “secrecy” and small details, with the hidden springs of history, though not recorded in its “official” rendering, is extended to the study of the character’s behavior, which reflects his temperament. In this respect also, the logic of affect replaces the logic of necessity. If the historian is allowed to distort the truth, the author of an anecdote has to tell the truth in full, in order to reveal the genuine (the “corporeal”, not the “public”) causes of great events:

Ce n’est pas que l’écrivain d’anecdotes ne fasse une peinture des personnes aussi exacte et aussi fidèle pour le moins que saurait faire l’historien; mais il la fait à sa mode. Il ne

18 Ibid.
19 Ibid., p. 45.
The anecdote interprets private facts, tailoring them on the basis of similarity to a specific affective model: the anecdote’s author may, of his own volition, reduce the variety of historical events to one particular case that is not a generalization of all the others, and not even the brightest among them, but one chosen solely to show the described event as an ordinary one, oft-recurring and, therefore, not exceptional, just an illustration of a predominant vice or virtue, an outward manifestation of internal aspirations. In this way a private episode, without losing its private nature, is perceived as a potential pattern of similar events and a demonstration of the character’s habit, allowing the reader to judge the everyday life and character:

During the age at issue, passion was considered a weakness opposed to reason; passion transforms the human mind into a slave passively enduring the influence of an external force, most often originating from the body. The description of a dominant passion, that is, of a deviation from the human norm, namely an action silenced by the historians, becomes the anecdotist’s principle, making him reduce the whole behavior of his character to a small set of obsessive ideas (the “flaws” of mind):

20 Ibid.
21 Ibid., p. 47.
According to Varillas, an anecdotist has to learn the secret of Plutarchian moral philosophy: a human being is the least secretive about that what is going on in the depths of his heart at the moment when a passion dominating him or her reaches its extreme. This mention of Plutarch’s method gives Varillas a free hand; after referring to the analysis of psychological motivations, he presents the characters at the moments of external realization of passions at their peak, in fact fully destroying their inner individuality and transforming them into patterns pre-established according to literary concepts. Varillas ties the description of the characters’ external behavior to their morals, addressing the issue of history’s causality in his own way. Every action of a character is interpreted according to his temper; Varillas considers affect as a source of historical dynamics, subtly asserting that, if people were perfect, there would be no history. In anecdotes, the history of an individual is reduced to a story of passion; thus Varillas is utilizing, consciously or unconsciously, conceptual elements of classicist theater. As soon as the dominating passion has emerged, historical characters begin to act like Molière’s Harpagon and Argan, who are reduced to one passion only. It may seem paradoxical to a modern reader that the psychological perspective claimed by the author leads to a reduction of a historical person to just one passion. This feature is highly reminiscent of the logic of creating characters for comedy, and it dates back to the character studies by a disciple of Aristotle, the philosopher Theophrastus, whose work became immensely popular in seventeenth-century France. Let me recall what is commonplace: Theophrastus, a Greek philosopher who lived in the fourth century BC and was the teacher of Menander, identified 30 types (the liar, the slanderer, the grumbler, the arrogant one, etc.); and thus the New (Attic) Comedy became in many aspects a result of the assimilation of peripatetic psychology. The reductionist strategy of the anecdote goes back to the same conceptual and formal methods.

22 Ibid., p. 46.
23 “[...] ce beau secret, que Plutarque a le premier decouvert dans sa philosophie morale, savoir, qu’il n’y a point d’état dans la vie où l’on soit plus négligent à cacher ce qui se passe dans le fond du cœur, que quand la passion qui le domine est arrivée jusque dans l’excès” (ibid., p. 45).