by Charles Perrault, the reciprocation of the lover’s gift by the beloved seems to signify a consensual relation, whereas in Catherine Bernard’s version, the offer of the gift signals coercion, but Reddan shows that even in the happy version Perrault’s heroine is without real power. Chapter five examines the relatively rare but still significant unhappy endings of some seventeenth-century fairy tales (by d’Aulnoy, Murat, and Bernard) in order to argue that, despite their endorsement of the companionate model of marriage, these authors also admit that neither love nor marriage guarantees happiness.

Reddan begins and ends her book by addressing readers’ expectations about the presentation of love in fairy tales, arguing persuasively that the seventeenth-century works of her conteuses did much to establish our twenty-first century ideas about this genre. At the same time, her own book slightly confounded some of my expectations, as I had anticipated more discussion of the authors’ marital history, the characters’ sexuality, and the difference between the treatment of love in novels and tales. Nevertheless, Reddan makes a strong argument that the authors whom she studies created the codes of a literary genre to critique the codes of their society.

**Hubert Bost. *Bayle calviniste libertin*.

This collection of 23 articles from across Hubert Bost’s career positions Bayle as operating between two poles: one Calvinist—supported by Bayle’s apparent fideism and lifelong profession of the Reformed faith; one libertine—the critical, skeptical, and, of course, mocking Bayle, especially with respect to religious matters. This mapping of Bayle’s positions is further charted by reference to four overlapping registers between Calvinist and libertine: the reasons for faith and belief; unlimited critical thought including the support of freedom of conscience; intellectual logic and scholarly knowledge; and finally political reflection. Additionally, Bost takes care to remind us of the “personal journey” that must inform our reading of a figure who often places himself as the impartial collator of historical facts. The strange
and varied, but carefully selected, articles and cross-references of the *Dictionnaire* tells that Bayle addresses which topics he wishes to address, and we do well to remember the person shaping this critical history.

Bost points out that part of the continued charm of reading Bayle is his lack of systematic thought. A collection of various studies may thus be the best way to grasp the variety of questions Bayle engaged throughout his writing. Regardless, Bost manages to effectively show that Bayle does circle some common themes.

This collection broadens the reach of some of Bost’s lesser-known work in addition to well-cited articles. A good balance is struck between in-depth historical work pulling insights from understudied contemporaries and correspondence as well as more far-reaching articles engaging the uptake and impact of Bayle’s philosophical ideas such as patriotism, secularism, and tyranny. The standout feature to this reviewer is the devotion to the theological Bayle, that is, the articles on Bayle’s reception of Calvin, use of the Bible, Protestantism (or perhaps ‘Huguenot-ness’), and most uniquely Bayle’s understanding of the sermon. Far from erasing Bayle’s professed religion and theological training, Bost challenges not only the “secretive atheist” Bayle but also those interpreters who accept Bayle’s religiosity but do not offer it any explanatory power over his ideologies.

Given the vast spread of material I will comment on some selected chapters that stood out this reading. The article on “Adam” and “Eve” in the *Dictionnaire* illustrates just how integrated and cross-referenced these articles were while simultaneously teasing out Bayle’s biblical hermeneutics apart from the infamous “David” article.

“Un ‘Protestant Compliqué’” is a masterclass in upholding what a thinker writes about themselves. Sparring with those who take Bayle’s Protestantism and “admit the reality to better empty it,” Bost denies this quick escape. Here we are forced to engage the complications that internal critiques of religion bring for the professing adherent.

“Bayle and Censorship” offers a concise refutation of Straussian readings of Bayle. Here Bost argues that Bayle does not cave to censorship be it political or ecclesiastical and espouses ideas threatening to these various groups. We do not need to find a secret meaning behind Bayle’s words when they already face censorship.
“La Rétorsion du Libertinage” engages Bayle’s own understanding of “libertine” placing the term contextually and as both useful critique of religion and hostile byword. Bost walks us through Bayle’s defenses and counter-attacks of “libertine” accusations from his opponents. While it’s not clear that Bayle ever makes contact with this pole in the same way as his Calvinist side, Bost convincingly shows the usage of libertine critiques in Bayle’s writings.

The use of definitions is careful throughout, citing contemporary usage to avoid anachronisms. The use of charts (ch. 1, 6), along with appendices and lists of articles, helps the reader follow both Bost’s research and track the presence of names and ideas throughout the massive volumes of the Dictionnaire. The collection would have benefited from summaries or subsets of the many chapters. The introduction does a good job explaining the scope of Bost’s inquiry but does not engage particular chapters and how they fit into the picture; this is left to the reader. Perhaps, like Bayle, the collection defies easy categories and collating. This reader would like to see more unpacking of the many boxes of Baylean scholarship.

If we are constantly offering correctives to maintain the “complicated Protestant” between the poles of Calvinist and libertine, it is the religious side that warrants greater strength in the current tug of war. These investigations form a valuable collection for a new wave of scholars who, informed by the post-secular turn, are reappraising the religious Bayle. Yet a caution is given them to take seriously the messy and complex mix of Bayle’s positions. Alongside Bost’s earlier Bayle monograph (2006), this collection gathers a career’s work of indispensable Bayle scholarship. More broadly, here is a refreshing model of letting your object of study breathe in the midst of complications and contradictions.