

pages, the harvest of truly thought-provoking articles remains modest; the work's ambition of re-envisioning and renewing Molière for our time remains more than occasionally beyond its grasp.

Despite the wide range of quality, from excellent and thought-provoking to (in a very few instances) forgettable, and the deeply regrettable lack of sustained editorial attention (e.g., the absence of an index; the occasional typographic or even textual flub in both French and English, such as “Panuphle” for “Panulphe” or “Oronte” used twice for “Orgon”; and most glaringly, “Quoique” misquoted in an article's title citation of the *Dom Juan* incipit “Quoi que puisse dire Aristote...,” and repeated throughout in the article's headers—(an autocorrector's imposition?), this work deserves a place on university library shelves for those contributions that best achieve the volume's lofty aim.

Robert Garnier. *Hippolyte (1573). La Troade (1579)*. Ed. Jean-Dominique Beaudin. Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2019. 618 pp. 24 €. Review by MARC BIZER, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN.

For the past fifteen years or so, sixteenth-century French tragedy has been experiencing a Renaissance of sorts: reborn during the French Wars of Religion, it affords insights into the ongoing relationship between tragedy and history but also into how seventeenth-century tragedy evolved from it. These texts of *La Troade* and *Hippolyte*, first published as part of Garnier's *Théâtre complet* in 1999 and 2009, respectively, are now being rereleased in this two-volume edition, accompanied by lengthy introductions, an *apparatus criticus*, notes, bibliography, and *indices verborum et nominum*. Garnier's *œuvre* is clearly a labor of love for Beaudin, who, in addition to publishing the playwright's complete works, has also written a number of articles on Garnier over the years. The timing of the appearance of this volume with the French *agrégation* exam doubtless explains some of the useful, albeit unusual (at least for a contemporary North American audience) emphasis on *Quellenforschung* where each introduction is followed by a comparative table showing correspondences between Garnier and his model (Seneca). Indeed, the introductions consist largely of act-by-act

summaries with detailed comments on principal differences between the tragedy and its source(s).

This approach obviously serves the general philological and thematic nature of the *agrégation* well. However, some of the remarks can be rather vague, such as when Beaudin notes that the dialogue between Phèdre and Oenone in the second act of *Hippolyte* “contient toutes sortes de développements moraux et métaphysiques” (20). But, perhaps more importantly, Beaudin fails to define what he means by “the tragic,” observing a little later, “Cet acte original établit donc des liens avec la suite du drame et augmente le tragique” (23). Questions of genre arise as well, such as when Beaudin speaks of “le lyrisme élégiaque” (353) and then, on the following page, of “les méditations lyriques” (354). Finally, Beaudin does have a tendency to make impressionistic remarks, such as when he comments “L’organisation de la tirade révèle en Garnier un authentique homme de théâtre” (34), or to yield to the temptations of the intentional fallacy, when he remarks “Garnier a trouvé plus naturel et plus efficace sur le plan dramatique de placer cet éloge dans la bouche de Phèdre” (20). Lastly, the deficiency of the mainly philological and thematic orientation of the commentary is that it does not always do justice to the specificity of these texts, written as they were during the Wars of Religion.

Even if had Garnier simply transposed Seneca and Euripides into French, these tragedies would necessarily acquire new meaning by virtue of their publication during the historical and cultural context of the Wars of Religion. To Beaudin’s credit (Garnier’s preface to the *Troade* leaves no doubt on this subject), he does at one point acknowledge that the “destruction de Troie par l’ennemi et le supplice d’Astyanax rappellent les atrocités commises dans les guerres de Religion” (338–39). But opportunities are missed, in the scholarly overview that he proposes, to delve more deeply into the historical connections with certain scenes. For instance, when Odysseus attempts to track down Astyanax in the *Troade* in order to insure that Hector leaves no descendants to avenge him, Beaudin finds the scene “une des mieux réussies” because of its “mouvement dramatique . . . remarquable,” but one might also wonder whether the scene hints at a kind of anticipation of *raison d’état*. These reservations aside, we owe Beaudin a debt of gratitude for his tireless contributions to keeping sixteenth-century French tragedies accessible to modern scholarly audiences.