

tween Gods and mortals during Antiquity. While Alonge shows, for example, how Euripides has to change his tragedy (*Iphigénie*) because of public rejection, a comprehensive explanation of Greek religion as it is portrayed in Euripides would reinforce his claims. This being said, the pointed summaries of the plays as well as the clear and detailed analysis help the reader engage with the texts presented. The structure of the book, while at times conducive to repetition, is clear and easy to navigate. Rather than hiding under theoretical jargon, Alonge offers a breath of fresh air with this logical and well-crafted study on Racine. *Racine et Euripide* is truly a pleasure to read.

Anne Cayuela and Marc Vuillermoz, eds. *Les Mots et les choses du théâtre. France, Italie, Espagne, XVI^e–XVII^e siècles*. Geneva: Droz, 2017. 303 pp. 48.00 CHF. Review by PERRY GETHNER, OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY.

This volume, consisting of seventeen articles, comprises the proceedings of a conference held in 2015 by the research organization *IDT—Les Idées du théâtre*, devoted to the study of liminary texts of plays, especially prefaces, dedications, prologues, and critiques. The goal is to examine how playwrights viewed themselves and various aspects of theatrical activity and to compare those ideas across three neighboring countries: France, Italy, and Spain. The articles, focusing on specific points of terminology, are highly technical, and some of them require extensive knowledge of theatrical conventions in one or more of the three countries. However, most are accessible for the general literary scholar.

Sandrine Blondet examines the language used by French playwrights from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to refer to the composition process. Obvious terms such as *labeur*, *effort*, *peine*, and their synonyms may serve multiple purposes, such as letting authors pride themselves on their hard work and professionalism, or instead

such features as solitude and help from the Muses, and their attitudes range from modesty (usually false) to vaunting of their creative genius.

Philippe Meunier examines how Spanish playwright Tirso de Molina designates plagiarists, never mentioning people by name but calling them drones and contrasting them with honeybees, traditionally viewed as models of productivity and good behavior. The contrast enables Tirso to glorify the creative artist in a manner compatible with humanistic and Catholic thought.

Emmanuelle Hénin shows how Georges de Scudéry developed the standard comparison between poetry and painting more often and in greater depth than his colleagues. Being a lover of painting and a collector himself, he devoted many poems to painters or to paintings, both real and imagined. Inserting himself into the early stages of French art criticism, he expressed a preference for color over line, for daring over regularity, and for sketches over finished work. This correlated with a fondness for experimentation, variety, and exciting subjects; hence, his preference for tragicomedy. Scudéry was apparently unique in extending the contrast in painting between design and color to the contrast in the drama between the printed text and the special attractions linked to performance, lauding the value of both.

Marine Souchier, in her analysis of the terms that French dramatists of the seventeenth century used to describe people of their profession, notes the gradual decline of terms emphasizing the reduction of art to mere craft (*faiseur, artisan, versificateur*, etc.) or the need to earn money at the expense of higher goals (*poète crotté*). Instead, there is more focus on writers' behavior, with criticism of bad models guilty of such sins as vanity, envy, pedantry, and engaging in cabals.

Juan Carlos Garrot Zambrana finds that Spanish Golden Age playwrights who contrast the experience of watching plays and reading them are more likely than their counterparts in other countries to prefer reading, often complaining about the poor quality of the performances. Calderón, who seems to have been ambivalent on the subject for much of his career, privileges performance in regard to the religious dramas of his late period, which, he acknowledges, give less pleasure when printed.

Enrica Zanin shows how dictionaries published in the three countries during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries treated vocabulary relating to drama. The differences are caused by the aims of the compilers: they may aim to be descriptive or prescriptive in regard to

usage, focus on differences between the drama of antiquity and that of the present day, include terms from various professions or focus on literary language alone, distinguish (or not) between poetic and theatrical concerns. At times the entries reflect views on the morality of drama or its value as a philosophical metaphor.

Fausta Antonucci (an article in Spanish with a summary in French) discusses how Spanish Golden Age playwrights came to adopt non-standard terminology for act and scene divisions, inspired by differences in dramaturgy.

Marc Douguet shows how the principles, adopted by the French, of linking of scenes and of not leaving the stage empty within an act, though related, are not identical. The latter, derived from the drama of the Ancients, is descriptive and helps determine when acts end and interludes begin. The former, prescriptive, is a technique to provide greater dramatic continuity (introduced at a time when dramaturgy favored fragmentation) and enhance the unity of action.

Christophe Couderc, analyzing the taxonomic vocabulary found in the paratexts of Spanish Golden Age plays, confirms the standard view that categories for dramatic genres were porous. He focuses on the usage of the terms *fábula* and *historia*, which could serve as a synonym of *comedia* in designating any type of play, or indicate the type of subject matter, or refer to the category of source material.

Coline Piot examines the terminology applied to the new type of short comedy that came into prominence during the third quarter of the seventeenth century. It would take time for the term *petite comédie* to become standard, thus aiding to distinguish this more refined sub-genre from the medieval genre of farce. However, the term *farce* was sometimes used to designate these plays, either to denigrate comedy in general or to discredit specific authors of short comedies (Molière by his opponents, or Molière's rivals by his admirers).

Emmanuele De Luca traces efforts to define the Italian term *lazzi*, as well as noting various etymologies given for it. He shows that, although the term does not appear in Italian sources until the middle of the seventeenth century and in French sources until the end of that century, the basic idea (comical improvisation constituting either independent scenes or interruptions within scenes) corresponded to well-known practice of Italian performers. The difficulty with trans-

lating it into French is that it designated improvisatory techniques, which were not the norm for French actors.

Véronique Lochert and Bénédicte Louvat make a comparative study of terminology from Italy, France and Spain used to describe actors and their activities. They note a gradual evolution away from terms inherited from Antiquity and relating to rhetoric, and toward an appreciation for what performers can bring to the theatrical experience. While the Italians show the most concern for theorizing performance practice (style of declamation, gesture, ability to inhabit a role) and the Spaniards the least concern, the trend toward recognition of actors' contributions is undeniable.

Teresa Jaroszevska studies the development in France of a caricatural character type, the *capitan* (braggart soldier). This figure, derived from both Latin comedy and the Italian *commedia dell'arte*, became especially popular during the first half of the seventeenth century due to the desire to satirize the armies of Spain while the countries were at war, and it largely died out during the second half of the century, due to the increased insistence on psychological realism. She enumerates over thirty names or titles of such characters, giving the etymology and history of each.

Céline Fournial studies the reception in France of Lope de Vega's theoretical treatise *Arte nuevo*. His defense of a new dramaturgy, not in conformity with the practice of the Ancients, was not invoked by French theorists until the Quarrel over *Le Cid*. Corneille's opponents took Lope's opening section out of context to suggest that the Spanish playwright was really making a public apology for violating the classical rules in order to pander to the bad taste of his audiences, thus justifying their own rejection of Spanish models.

Patrizia De Capitani, in a comparative study of prologues from Italian and French comedies in the sixteenth century, notes the frequent use of wordplay, often obscene, plus metaphor and personification, to convey matters of theoretical import in a light-hearted and non-technical way. Topics included fidelity to Latin models versus search for novelty (both in the type of plot and in dramaturgy), preference for hilarity or for seriousness of tone (including satire), and calls for the public's approval. Some comparisons, such as that between the comedy and the female body, were limited to Italy.

Hélène Tropé studies the development, in both Spain and France, of terminology relating to comic characters, to types of gestural and verbal humor, and to theories on the nature and purpose of laughter. Despite common influence from the Italian *arte* tradition, the countries evolved distinctive comic character types while sharing many theoretical notions.

Stéphane Miglierina, after tracing the uses of the Latin term *suavitas* in both the Vulgate and rhetorical treatises, shows that the word could retain either type of meaning in the modern languages. In a handful of texts written by or for Jesuits it could even be linked to laughter, but only the form of humor compatible with honest recreation.

Since this colloquium was linked to the establishment of a database, these articles are intended primarily as directions for future research that could be incorporated into a broader comparative history of drama. But they are inherently worthwhile in that they bring together great amounts of useful information.

Katherine Ibbett. *Compassion's Edge: Fellow-Feeling and Its Limits in Early Modern France*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018. 296 pp. \$79.95. Review by KATHLEEN HARDESTY DOIG, EMERITA, GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY.

The image used on the jacket of this book seems at first glance remarkably inapposite. It features a profile sketch of a male head, labeled “compassion” in a series of illustrations of the passions by Charles Le Brun, but more suggestive to modern eyes of anger or consternation than tenderness. As Katherine Ibbett explains, our definition of compassion as an emotion with connotations of sympathy and heartfelt concern harks back to the meaning the term began to acquire in the eighteenth century. In the preceding early modern period, roughly from the end of the Wars of Religion through the era of Louis XIV, the conception and practice of compassion were subject to definite limits, limits that are clearly visible in Le Brun’s uneasy figure and which are explored in detail in this illuminating study.