

Paul Scarron. *“Un vent de fronde s’est levé ce matin”*: *Poésies diverses attribuées à Paul Scarron (1610–1660)*.

Ed. Hubert Carrier. Sources classiques 106. Paris: Champion, 2012. 146 pp. + 15 b/w pls. €45. ISBN: 978-2-7453-2190-9.

In this posthumous volume, Hubert Carrier resurrects the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century debates over Paul Scarron’s literary contributions to the French civil wars known as the Fronde (1648–53). Carrier succinctly presents the existing arguments, evaluates them, and adds his own analysis with, in three

instances, new information gleaned from a collection of mazarinades (poetic critiques of Cardinal Mazarin) owned and annotated by Tallement des Réaux (1619–92). This privately owned collection, unknown to earlier scholars such as Paul Morillot, Émile Magne, and Maurice Cauchie, fell into Carrier's hands in 1976. While professing to entrust any final conclusions to the reader, Carrier leaves no doubt as to his own convictions which credit Scarron with more poetic creation than scholars have previously conceded. More often than not Carrier's supplementary facts and extended analyses reinforce the reigning critical opinion; occasionally they tip the balance in disputed cases; on one occasion (with regard to *Les Triolets de la Cour*) they significantly increase the proportion of a poem credited to Scarron; never do they dramatically upset what has heretofore been known or supposed.

In clear, direct prose the introduction justifies Carrier's project, gives an overview of the arguments to be developed in the rest of the volume, and weaves the texts that can with any certainty be considered Scarron's into the biographical details of the poet's life. In all, Carrier examines fifteen mazarinades ascribed to Scarron by one or more of his seventeenth-century contemporaries. Carrier arranges the texts in four chapters according to whether their attribution to Scarron is certain, probable, possible, or denied. Each text under consideration receives first an evaluation of the external evidence upon which one might claim Scarron's handiwork, such as his name in the title, or handwritten notes by the poet's contemporaries. Carrier then proceeds to an evaluation of internal evidence: themes, vocabulary, and style that are common to both the text in question and other works undoubtedly written by Scarron. After giving publication details for all known seventeenth-century editions, Carrier prints and provides a critical apparatus for the six texts in the probable and possible categories, deferring to Cauchie's two-volume *Poésies diverses* (1947–61) for Scarron's other known poems. As the contested pieces do not exist in many competing editions, the textual variants are few. Carrier's analytical notes are helpful without being extensive. The volume is enriched by an index, bibliography for further studies, and black and white facsimiles of the fifteen title pages from editions held at the Bibliothèque Mazarine.

The strength of Carrier's approach lies in his thorough knowledge of Scarron and in his insistence on considering all available pieces of evidence and weighing them as a whole. In general, Carrier's conclusions seem sound, particularly since he often manages to restrain his enthusiasm for the Frondeur by responsibly placing texts that he considers definite attributions in the probable category, and some he finds probable he lists as possible. Nonetheless, Carrier's marshaling of evidence is not entirely consistent. As one example among several, a rare word (the Italian *forfante*) that Carrier considers a Scarron signature in one poem (*Le Passeport*) he attributes to a clever plagiarist in another (*Les Œufs rouges*). Other contextual clues justify attributing to Scarron the former and not the latter, but Carrier's altering the value of the same example is a bit alarming. Fortunately, Carrier's profound familiarity with Scarron protects him from egregious error even when he overstates

the import of a particular proof. This familiarity becomes the evidence that Carrier considers his most decisive, yet that is also somewhat tenuous: the apparently recognizable yet indefinable Scarron spirit. In form and content *Les Œufs rouges* resembles other Scarron works enough to be filed among them but for the single fact that it lacks the poet's verve. Carrier therefore denies that Scarron had any hand in it other than to have penned the pieces that inspired the counterfeit. Indeed, Carrier's high opinion of Scarron's talent leads him to reject all poems of poor quality.

Carrier's careful analysis of Scarron's works will be helpful to specialists of the mazarinades and to students of the Fronde. His methods may be of interest to scholars facing questions of attribution concerning other authors and texts.

REBECCA C. HARMON
Grove City College