ascribed to women: most obviously virtue, chastity, and submission to patriarchal figures. In Montpensier’s case, this process of self-construction is literalized in the commissioning of buildings, gardens, and portraits and tracked in her correspondence and memoirs. Thus Montpensier continues in forceful terms a conversation about structural misogyny found previously, for example, in Christine de Pizan’s *Livre de la cité des dames*. Marı́ñez also fully situates Montpensier’s work in the tradition of female architectural patronage, moving from Anne de Bretagne’s chateau in Nantes to Diane de Poitiers’s Anet and the Medici queens’ Tuileries and Luxembourg. A brief final chapter deals with her fictional works and their imagined spaces: a moon, an island, faraway realms. Throughout, scrupulous biographical detail is extracted from Montpensier’s life-writing and analysed for the strategic positioning it reveals, in a (very real) world where everybody around her is after her money. Marı́ñez considers two major, overlapping patterns in Montpensier’s work: a search for maternal substitutes (her mother, Marie de Bourbon, had died in childbirth at the age of twenty-one), and an obsessive reiteration of rank. This latter emphasis emerges particularly after the Fronde: Montpensier had famously ordered a cannonade shot directly at the king’s troops, resulting in her forced exile to Saint-Fargeau in 1652. From 1660, following conversations with Mme de Motteville, she began seriously to envisage a way of life free from the constraints of marriage; she was exiled again, now to Eu, following a refusal to marry the King of Portugal, who had been described to her as debauched, unmannerly, and fond of murder. The portraits she commissioned of herself are brilliantly suggestive repositories of familial detail: painted by Pierre Bourgignon, she poses as Minerva, virgin goddess, and protectrix of the arts, holding but looking triumphantly away from a small inset portrait of her father, who seems insignificant and immobilized in comparison. Throughout, this sort of interdisciplinary analysis is the book’s strength. It is let down, however, by the quality of production. The photographs look like (and presumably are) holiday snaps, with all the attendant problems of foreshortening and truncation. Some are terribly blurred. Quotations move bizarrely and inconsistently between English and French. Why is Mme de Sévigné only read in translation, for example, and her renowned announcement of Montpensier’s late and shocking attempt to marry, for love, the lowly Comte de Lauzun (‘la chose la plus étonnante, la plus surprenante, la plus merveilleuse, la plus miraculeuse’, and so on and so forth) given only in English? These are issues for the editors at Brill Rodopi as much as for the author.

EMMA GILBY
SIDNEY SUSSEX COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE
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Although Jean Racine is widely considered an exceptional reader of ancient Greek, there are few studies devoted to the topic, and those that do exist are not recent (for instance, Roy C. Knight, *Racine et la Grèce* (Paris: Boivin et Cie, 1951)). Tristan Alonge’s welcome contribution (a revised version of his 2015 Paris IV-Sorbonne doctoral dissertation), traces the development of Racine’s commitment to Euripides from childhood through his dramatic career. Alonge contends that the ‘révolution racinienne’ (a term adopted from Georges Forestier) was largely due to Racine’s successful imitation of Euripidean characterization as understood through the lens of Aristotle’s *Poetics*. The title hardly does justice to the scope of the book, which includes analyses of Racine’s engagement with early modern authors as well as many additional ancient texts. The book is organized into five lengthy chapters plus an Introduction and Conclusion: the first chapter lays the
groundwork for the others by exploring Racine's early training in Greek translation; the following four offer case studies of the 'Euripidean' plays. Chapter 1, ‘Un élève pas comme les autres: l'origine de la révolution’, provides an overview of Racine's Jansenist education, a targeted study of his annotations of Greek texts, and some preliminary thoughts about how the reading practices he developed as a student at Port-Royal would colour his early theatrical forays. Chapter 2, ‘La Thébaïde ou le “crime involontaire”: la révolution à l'épreuve de la scène’, suggests that Racine's initial attempt to stage pure Aristotelean heroes — characters that are neither too good nor too bad — was unsuccessful in large part because of his failure to engage seriously with French predecessors and contemporaries. Chapter 3, ‘Andromaque, entre trauma et espoir: la révolution contestée’, demonstrates that contemporary literary quarrels compelled Racine to renegotiate his allegiance to Euripides (and Aristotle), a mediation evidenced by the changes he made to the end of the play in subsequent years. Chapter 4, ‘Iphigénie, obéir et mourir: la révolution oubliée’, argues that, although Racine nominally returns to Euripides after a six-year hiatus, he fundamentally distances himself from the Greek playwright by portraying his Iphigénie as unambiguously ‘good’ (in other words not Aristotelian) and by employing a traditional (Cornelian) plot. Chapter 5, ‘Phèdre ou Euripide abandonné: la révolution affichée’, claims that at the height of his career Racine was so immersed in the French theatrical milieu that his programmatic overtures to Euripides belie what amounts to a ‘betrayal’ of antiquity. The titular emphasis on ‘revolution’ feels forced, and the insistence that Racine discovered ‘the secret’ of Euripidean tragedy (or of Aristotelian characterization) seems overstated. The author’s tendency to oversimplify the Greek texts can compromise his case, and the drive to rank the relative importance of Racine’s sources threatens to obscure the rich tapestry of textual interplay that emerges from his study. A greater awareness of certain theoretical models, such as intertextuality and reception studies, would help. Nevertheless, this book offers many insights into Racine’s deep engagement with antiquity and will be a crucial reference for anyone working on early modern tragedy and classical reception.

MARY HAMIL GILBERT
BIRMINGHAM–SOUTHERN COLLEGE
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The editors of this collection of essays present the idea of an œuvre en rupture as an early modern paradox, simultaneously connoting divine creation and its destruction. They aim firstly to show how the early modern desire to innovate, explored here in the fields of philosophy, politics, cosmology, and aesthetics, redefines the status of an œuvre within the traditions to which, however disruptively, it belongs. Secondly, they seek to demonstrate the high degree of public interest in Italian-influenced œuvres en rupture in France, even if these fall foul of official censors. The first section focuses on science and philosophy, with essays on politics, philosophy, and the natural world. Jérôme Lamy presents Pierre Belon’s Italian-influenced demonstration of the political usefulness of botany as balanced between the two scientific traditions of Renaissance analogy and classical ordering. Didier Foucault traces both the Italian traditions behind Giulio Cesare Vanini’s irreligious naturalist philosophy, and its reception in France as subversive libertinage. Jean-Pierre Cavaille demonstrates how Louis Machon, using biblical authority to defend Machiavelli (in a political context that hypocritically denounces Machiavellianism), develops a naturalist philosophy in which religion serves