The idea of ‘vraisemblance’ is one which is elusive, and of which many definitions have been offered. J. N. J. Palmer adds to these, ‘The function of “le vraisemblable” in French Classical aesthetic theory’, FS, 29:15–26. His illustr are taken largely from Corneille, La Mesnardière and D’Aubignac. J.-P. Dens, ‘“Beauté” et “Grâce” au 17e siècle’, RHLF, 75: 795–9, explores the resonances which these two terms arouse: he goes on to examine the relationship between them, drawing as he sees it the line of demarcation which separates them. Another art. which seeks to draw distinctions is Y. Coirault, ‘Autobiographie et Mémoires (17e et 18e siècles), ou existence et naissance de l’autobiographie’, RHLF, 75:937–57; for the part dealing with the 17th c., it is largely De Retz who provides the material which furnishes the argument. A work of peripheral interest is G. S. Santangelo, La ‘Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes’ nella critica del ’900, Bari, Adriatica Editrice, 210 pp. T. B. Jones and B. de B. Nicol, Neo-classical Dramatic Criticism 1560–1770, CUP, 189 pp., contains a lengthy chap. on French crit. writing, most of which is of the 17th c. In particular, Chapelain, D’Aubignac, Corneille and Rapin are discussed, with considerable quotation from their works. A series of arts built round a theme, ‘Les Éléments de longue durée dans la France du 17e siècle’, appears in XVIIIS, fascs 106–7. P. Chaunu introduces the series with a paper on the implications of the title chosen. J. Meyer, ‘Le 17e siècle et sa place dans l’évolution à long terme’, 23–57, points to the shifts in morality which came with the scientific and technological advances made in the 17th c. R. Mousnier, ‘Les Survivances médiévales dans la France du 17e siècle’, 59–79, considers five such features: ‘le lignage’, ‘les fidélités’, ‘les Ordres’, ‘les corps’, ‘la seigneurie’. M. Bée, ‘La Société traditionnelle et la mort’, 81–111, discusses attitudes towards death and burial rites. Finally, J.-R. Armogathe, ‘Emendatio intellectus’, 113–29,
The Seventeenth Century

2. Poetry


La Fontaine. The idea discussed in M. Defrenne, ‘Le Phénomène créateur chez La F.: le poète et le monde’, *AIFS*, 12:119–67, is the insistence by a number of critics upon ‘la primauté de la lecture dans le processus créateur chez La F.’. And yet La F.’s memory is said to have been extremely poor. But his powers of observation vis à vis nature were apparently equally defective: his descriptions are not reliable. So this was not the source of his creative activity. D. concludes that, as previously suggested, La F.’s inspiration was indeed literary. K. Kupisz, ‘Les Amours de Psyché et de Cupidon de La F. — essai d’une étude générique’, *Romania Wratislavienska*, 10:5–35. Here is a work which contains sections belonging to many different genres. How are we to classify the whole? For K., the best term seems to be ‘poème en prose’, since the work is ‘situé à mi-chemin entre les 3 genres lit. distincts: le conte, le poème et le roman’. J. D. Lyons, ‘Author and reader in the *Fables*’, *FR*, 49:59–67. Certain relationships have already been explored, the ‘esthétique de la transparence’ (Odette de Mourgues), the ‘aesthetics of negligence’ (Lapp). What L. has in mind is La F.’s attempts ‘to keep the reader in a state of constant awareness of the text as a text, to make the act and moment of creation of the work the true focus of the reader’s attention’: a lit. inspiration, rather than from life. G. Molinié, ‘Sur l’Adonis de La F.’, *RHLF*, 75:707–29. A question of sources, a rich mine indeed in considering *Adonis*: the art. concentrates upon one work never previously mentioned as a possible source, *Combat de l’Amour et de la Chasteté* by le Sieur de Mandelot. M. argues his thesis well.

Maynard. A publ. by the Association des Amis de M., their cahier 5, contains 5 arts: J.-P. Lassalle, ‘Les Maynard et le