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I. General

As in 1966, there are few major books to report, although the volume of production as a whole remains high. Certain bibliographical items are now completed. The third and final vol. of A. Cioranescu, *Bibl. de la litt. française du 17e siècle*, CNRS (pp. 1511–2231), 724 pp., continues the list of authors from N to Z and contains the index. The B.N. *Catalogue général des livres imprimés* for items published between 1960 and 1964 is now complete (it runs to 10 vols, excluding books publ. in non-Roman scripts); the *Catalogue général des livres imprimés* (authors) for items publ. before 1960, which we did not mention last year, has now reached ULEY. Another B.N. publ., the *Catalogue collectif des périodiques du début du 17e siècle à 1939, conservés dans les bibliothèques de Paris et dans les bibls universitaires des dépts* has now reached its fourth and final vol., R–Z, xix + 1063 pp. The other usual Bibls continue to appear: R. Rancœur, *Bibl. de la litt. française moderne, année 1966*, Colin; 272 pp.; the *Bibl. of French 17th-c. Studies*, 14, publ. for the Mod. Lang. Assn of America, French Group iii, for 1966; O. Klapp, *Bibl. der franz. Literaturwissenschaft*, v, Frankfurt, Klostermann, for 1965–6, lii + 679 pp.; the *PMLA* bibl. for 1966, and the regular issues of *RHLF* and *SFr*. The importance as a bibliographical tool of a knowledge of typography and book-production is emphasized in two informative arts in *AJFS*, iii, 3: W. Kirksop, ‘Vers une collaboration de la bibl. matérielle et de la crit. textuelle’, and R. Lauffer, ‘Pour une description scientifique du livre en tant qu’objet matériel’.

There are no fewer than four histories of French lit. to be considered, one from Britain and three from France. All aim to give the general reader a view of the century in the light of modern research, and authors previously considered as minor get more house-room. The British one, P. J. Yarrow, *The
17th Century (Lit. Hist. of France, ed. P. Charvet, vol. ii), London, E. Benn; New York, Barnes and Noble, 448 pp., is scholarly, readable and excellent. The largest and most luxurious of the French ones is A. Adam, G. Lerminier, E. Morot-Sir, Litt. française (Coll. ‘In-4°’), vol. i: Des Origines à la fin du 18e siècle, Larousse, [iv] + 399 pp., with fine and ample illus., many of them from little-known sources, and a large number of well-known contributors. It is intended to be the successor of the Bédier-Hazard manual. The second is the work of a former teacher turned novelist, P. Guth, Hist. de la litt. française, vol. i: Des origines épiques au siècle des lumières, Fayard, 615 pp. Unlike the others it lacks a bibliography, but it is often entertaining — e.g. ‘Malherbe, le père Ubu de la grammaire’, ‘Mme de Sévigné, la “Veuve joyeuse”’ — and sometimes stimulating. The third, by a team headed by P. Abraham and R. Desné, Manuel d’hist. littéraire de la France, vol. ii: De 1600 à 1715, Editions sociales, 492 pp., tables, is much more traditional in approach, despite its Marxist affiliations, and the bibliography is good and well up to date. On the language side, there is a *photo-reprint of the 1934 Huguet, L’Évolution du sens des mots depuis le 16e siècle, Geneva, Droz, x + 347 pp. J. Roger, Panorama du 17e siècle français, Seghers, 256 pp., joins companion vols for other periods.

Among articles of general interest, one of the most thought-provoking is S. Doubrovsky, ‘New Critics and Old Myths’, YFS, 38, 18–26. The author poses the question: why do classical writers, who used to be largely ignored by liberal thinkers, attract so much attention from left-wing ‘nouveaux critiques’? Part of the answer is that both in the 17th c. and in our own day, writers realize that they cannot influence society to any great extent. The link between the 17th c. and modern times is also explored by R. Garapon, ‘Classical and contemporary French Literature’, UTQ, xxxvi, 101–12; the author pleads for a ‘rehabilitation’ of classical literature on the grounds that it can help us to understand modern works. R. Zuber, ‘Calvinisme et classicisme’, XVII S, 76–7, 5–22, takes the view that Calvinism and classicism might have made a fruitful marriage, had it not been for the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. J. Hytier, ‘The Classicism of the classics’, YFS, 38, 5–17, traces the origins of the confusion over the terms