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*Introduction*

Serge Doubrovsky’s classic 1963 study, *Corneille et la dialectique du héros*, starts with a question that has remained all too familiar for Corneille scholars of different generations: ‘Bien des livres et des articles ont été consacrés à Corneille: que dire de lui de neuf et de vrai?’.[[1]](#footnote-1) And yet it is a question that Corneille’s critics and commentators have managed to answer, negotiate, or elude in a range of different and often creative ways. This *état présent* aims to provide a selective overview of Corneille criticism roughly from 1984 (the tercentenary of his death) to the present day.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Fortunately for those seeking, like Doubrovsky, to find something both ‘new’ and ‘true’ to say, Corneille’s corpus is dogged by so many stereotypes — stereotypes often extrapolated from a small handful of plays and reinforced by the vagaries of academic publishing and the often reductive nature of university teaching — that there is a lot to react against. Indeed, far from being just a tragedian with a taste for the heroic, Corneille was an extraordinarily inventive and innovative playwright who tried his hand at a range of genres, from tragicomedies to machine-plays, from tragedy-ballets to *comédies héroïques*. In addition to being a playwright, Corneille was also a dramatic theorist, a poet, and a gifted translator, although these elements of his work are even now only gradually being recognized in their own right. Indeed, perhaps one of the reasons why so many of Corneille’s plays have traditionally been overlooked has been Corneille’s resistance to generic expectations. Whereas his contemporaries Racine and Molière can be ‘cherry-picked’, albeit sometimes quite brutally, and made to fit into schemas of ‘classical’ tragedy or comedy that have been developed in large part from their own practice, Corneille’s works remain stubbornly resistant to easy categorization.

Corneille scholarship has traditionally been dominated by the so-called ‘tetralogy’ of *Le Cid*, *Horace*, *Cinna*,and *Polyeucte*, a quartet sometimes accompanied by *Rodogune* and *Nicomède*,thus making up Harold Bloom’s sextet of Corneille’s canonical works,[[3]](#footnote-3) or by one or both of his most famous comedies, *L’Illusion comique* and *Le Menteur*. Unsurprisingly, the ‘big four’ plays, and this small handful of others, are routinely republished, and student guides to them are common.[[4]](#footnote-4) Yet even book-length critical studies of Corneille — and indeed some of the very best ones — also gravitate heavily around these particular plays, sometimes to the total or near-total exclusion of others. Whereas few commentators are as bold as Han Verhoeff in explicitly focusing on a corpus of supposedly ‘great’ plays from the vast mass of Corneille’s writings,[[5]](#footnote-5) several explicitly limit their corpus to a particular time period that, more often than not, overlaps largely with the famous works, from the mid-1630s until the death of Louis XIII.[[6]](#footnote-6)

Yet this focus on the early tragic plays (and in the case of *Le Cid* originally tragicomic, although this point is often overlooked) can not only distract attention from Corneille’s other works but also give a skewed impression of what we expect to find across his corpus as a whole. Some critics have insisted on perceiving an underlying unity beneath Corneille’s apparently very different works; in 1977, for instance, Marie-Odile Sweetser insisted that ‘l’unité de l’œuvre [cornélienne] est organique, diffuse à travers tout le théâtre, par-delà les différences de genres’.[[7]](#footnote-7) The primary risk of such approaches, as Mary Jo Muratore has suggested, is that they perpetuate clichés rather than challenging them: ‘yearning for esthetic coherence,’ she claims, ‘readers anxious to locate […] familiar Cornelian qualities are willing to mold the text around the periphery of received opinion’.[[8]](#footnote-8)

Over the last few decades, however, there have been some very fruitful attempts to move beyond the Corneille of cliché; several scholars have explicitly taken up the challenge of Corneille’s overlooked and less critically successful plays. Even here, however, the gravitational pull of the tetralogy is so strong that writers are often tempted implicitly to dismiss these other plays as either (for the comedies) mere anticipations of the ‘great’ works, or (for the later dramas) weak reflections of their creator’s past glory.[[9]](#footnote-9) Perhaps inevitably, many of the most interesting engagements with these works have taken the form of individual articles, many of which have addressed Corneille’s sporadic forays into other genres (tragicomedy, *comédie héroïque*, *tragédie-ballet*, machine play) from various perspectives.[[10]](#footnote-10) Nevertheless, several conferences and collections have specifically focused on lesser-known works, whether explicitly in combination with more canonical works (often with the *agrégation* syllabus in mind[[11]](#footnote-11)) or in occasional works devoted to specific stages in Corneille’s career.[[12]](#footnote-12) Although exploring the intertextual interrelations between different texts has the potential to be very productive and enlightening, in practice such volumes — much like the wealth of conference proceedings that emerged after the 1984 tercentenary — tend to be quite fragmented and piecemeal in approach.[[13]](#footnote-13) Only very rarely indeed have Corneille’s lesser-known works had full-length studies devoted specifically to them, either individually or as a group. One notable exception is Susan Read Baker’s *Dissonant Harmonies*,[[14]](#footnote-14) which explicitly addresses five of Corneille’s least successful plays, from *Clitandre* to *Othon*. Baker’s study does not merely fill critical gaps in Corneille studies, and neither does it attempt to rehabilitate these works as neglected masterpieces; rather, it actively reflects on the nature of dramatic failure, considering what aesthetic and ideological compromises made these plays so unsuccessful and problematic.

Unlike the generic experimentations of his late period, Corneille’s comedies are at least largely concentrated within one particular stage of his career (1629–45), at least if one overlooks (as most commentators do) the later *comédies héroïques*, namely *Don Sanche d’Aragon*, *Tite et Bérénice*,and *Pulchérie*. In the 1980s (the heyday for studies of Corneille’s comedy), commentators helpfully re-evaluated the subtleties of Corneille’s comic approach rather than merely dismissing his works as clumsy steps on the way to Molière.[[15]](#footnote-15) A similar appreciation has also been shown by works that read Corneille’s comic production alongside that of other playwrights.[[16]](#footnote-16) Perhaps surprisingly, critical interest in his comedies qua comedies appears to have waned of late; it is to be hoped that the new Garnier edition of Corneille’s complete theatre currently appearing under the direction of Lilian Picciola will help to rehabilitate Corneille’s comedies further over the coming years.[[17]](#footnote-17)

# *Form and development*

Recently, the idea that Corneille’s plays reveal some ‘underlying unity’ seems to have given way to a related, but subtly different, sense of Corneille’s theatre as undergoing a continuous development. Michel Prigent, for example, argues that Corneille’s works ‘se déduisent les unes des autres, se complètent, se balancent’ in such a revealing way that it is best to explore them in chronological order.[[18]](#footnote-18) The vast majority of Corneille’s commentators would seem, in practice, to agree. With a few notable exceptions, almost all monographs on Corneille treat his works chronologically, following the twists, turns, and occasional leaps or hiatuses of a career that is characterized by experimentation and change. Almost inevitably, this chronological approach is the standard one for Corneille’s biographers, who for the most part manage to offer contextually informed readings of Corneille’s writings without resorting to naïvely reductive biographical explanations; indeed, as Marc Fumaroli points out, even Corneille’s first biographer, his nephew Fontenelle, insisted on the vast gulf that separated ‘“l’homme”, fort terne et banal’ from ‘l’œuvre, riche de tant de chefs-d’œuvre’.[[19]](#footnote-19) André Le Gall’s weighty but readable biography in particular manages to interweave a general account of Corneille’s life with moments of very precise and illuminating textual analysis.[[20]](#footnote-20)

Interestingly, however, the same chronological approach is the default even in less explicitly biographical works. While this approach certainly has its merits, however, it risks rehearsing the same stock narratives about Corneille’s career and its periodization. Indeed, some of the most compelling and original works on Corneille have abandoned a chronological approach. Nina Ekstein’s *Corneille’s Irony*,[[21]](#footnote-21) for example, approaches Corneille’s whole corpus (both dramatic and theoretical) through a succession of lenses, but without implicitly reifying it as a fixed and unchanging monolith. Georges Forestier’s rich and meticulously well-informed *Essai de génétique théâtrale: Corneille à l’œuvre* (like his later *Corneille: le sens d’une dramaturgie*) recognizes in Corneille’s work ‘une quête constante de renouvellement’,[[22]](#footnote-22) but largely shuns chronology in an attempt to reconstruct the creative act itself. Despite focusing primarily (and explicitly) on Corneille’s tragedies, Forestier deftly interweaves reflection on Corneille’s comedies and dramatic theory, as well as writings by his contemporaries. Drawing attention to the heavy stylization of seventeenth-century tragedy and the intractable demands it places on its subject matter, Forestier positions himself forcefully against what he regards as the dominant approach of treating Corneille’s themes — particularly politics — as primary to the detriment of the dramatic form. Rejecting those who emphasize the political aspects of Corneille, Forestier reminds us that Corneille himself dismissed ‘la rhétorique’, ‘la morale’ and ‘la politique’ as mere ‘broderie’[[23]](#footnote-23) compared to the true (that is, formal and structural) questions of theatre.

Forestier was by no means the first person to emphasize form over content in Corneille’s play-writing. Even after the pioneering work of H. T. Barnwell into Corneille’s dramaturgy,[[24]](#footnote-24) Muratore could lament in 1990 that Corneille’s tragedy was still widely regarded as ‘a complex of moral themes rather than a dramatic entity’;[[25]](#footnote-25) Judd Hubert, too, claims that some critics’ stress on the political background reduces ‘plots and characters to manifestations of ideology as though the dramatist had intended to provide material for future historians and political scientists rather than entertain an audience’.[[26]](#footnote-26) Arguing that ‘Corneille’s theater is primarily form, not statement; and that form is more stage-conscious than mimetic’,[[27]](#footnote-27) Hubert advocates what he calls a ‘poietic’ [*sic*] approach, one which treats ‘the genesis or, better still, the auto-genesis of the work of art’.[[28]](#footnote-28)

Anticipating both Forestier and Hubert, in 1990 François Lasserre also sought to reconstruct the genesis of Corneille’s texts, taking as his focus Corneille’s developing strategies to the ‘traumatisme’ of the *querelle du* *Cid* in a period dominated by the imposing figure of Richelieu.[[29]](#footnote-29) To some extent, all of these ‘genetic’ approaches involve guesswork, but Lasserre and Forestier in particular make meticulous use of other textual sources to construct plausible narratives. At their best, they can bring Corneille to life, not as a biographical individual or thinker whose political ideas can be ‘lifted’ wholesale out of his tragedies, but as a creative constructor of plots and characters, who is responding to a network of internal and external pressures.

The relationship between print and performance has also been of interest – not least in the special issue of the *Revue d’histoire littéraire de la France* on ‘Un Corneille hors texte’,[[30]](#footnote-30) which explores Corneille’s extra-textual relationship to his works — his relationship with his actors, printed texts, and publishers. Whereas most formalist studies of Corneille focus on general issues of plot or character construction, there have been works devoted to more intricate formal matters of style, verse, and rhetoric,[[31]](#footnote-31) and of specific dramatic devices and concerns such as monologues, props, movement on- and off-stage, and the dramatic illusion.[[32]](#footnote-32) In different ways, these works all shed light on the technical aspects of Corneille’s poetry and stagecraft, often with an eye to their practical consequences for the spectator or listener.

Although Corneille’s own dramatic theory has also been the topic of growing exploration, Corneille’s theoretical writings are still too often dismissed — whether explicitly or implicitly — as justifications for his own practice. Relatively little has changed since Forestier, in 1996, dismissed the critical ‘leitmotiv’ that ‘Corneille, l’auteur français qui s’est le plus longuement exprimé sur son art […] ne doit surtout pas être pris au sérieux en tant que critique et que théoricien’.[[33]](#footnote-33) Although those who have explored Corneille’s dramatic theories have tended to do so in tandem with — and as an explanatory adjunct to — Corneille’s dramatic practice,[[34]](#footnote-34) some commentators have gradually been addressing his dramatic theory as an independent entity.[[35]](#footnote-35) Interest has also slowly been growing in Corneille’s theoretical penumbra; over the last couple of decades, various editors have published editions of seventeenth-century critical texts that engage with Corneille.[[36]](#footnote-36)

Whereas many critics, on occasion, draw on Corneille’s theoretical pronouncements as explanatory tools for his actual plays, others have cleverly reversed the polarity by reading Corneille’s plays as themselves displaced or dramatized engagements with theoretical issues.[[37]](#footnote-37) As Alice Rathé puts it, ‘Corneille incorpore dans la trame même de plusieurs de ses pièces des considérations de principe concernant leur composition’.[[38]](#footnote-38) This metatheatrical dimension is, of course, most explicit in *L’Illusion comique*, and indeed has (understandably) dominated discussions of this play in particular. Yet it also appears in *Le Menteur* and (even more so) *La Suite du Menteur*, and indeed in configurations throughout Corneille’s tragic corpus too. Another interesting vein has been to explore Corneille’s engagement with emotion as something both represented within and produced by his plays.[[39]](#footnote-39) Echoing, building on, and yet in many ways transcending this approach is John D. Lyons’s groundbreaking and subtle *The Tragedy of Origins*,[[40]](#footnote-40) which explores a handful of Corneille’s plays as dramatizing a particular confrontation with history and time. Lyons’s study follows a doubly chronological progression, tracing the history of Rome through close readings of five plays which also, very neatly, follow each other chronologically in Corneille’s career, from Rome’s triumph over Alba in *Horace* (1640) to Rome’s collapse and the anticipated rise of France in *Attila* (1667). Corneille had a great understanding of history, not just in the straightforward sense of his copious knowledge of historical sources; as Lyons demonstrates, Corneille shows an acute understanding of the complexity of historical movements and the intractable problems that hindsight — his own, but also that of his characters — can bring.

# *Thematic studies*

Although, as Forestier reminds us, Corneille described politics as mere ‘embroidery’ adorning the dramatic plot, Corneille’s engagement with the political has been an abiding and very fruitful concern for many of his commentators.[[41]](#footnote-41) Furthermore, very few of any of these studies treat politics as something entirely separate from dramaturgy. Indeed, commentators have been increasingly attentive to the potential tensions between political and aesthetic concerns. While Baker’s study specifically explores ‘works where the major elements of Cornelian dramaturgy do not coalesce smoothly’,[[42]](#footnote-42) others trace the complex imbrication of the political and the dramatic in even the more successful works.[[43]](#footnote-43) In fact, even those studies which bring examples from Corneille into more general explorations of political themes keep a helpfully sharp eye on the conventions and constraints of seventeenth-century dramaturgy.[[44]](#footnote-44) Indirectly, and in different ways, such works demonstrate the subtlety and skill with which Corneille works his political ‘embroidery’.

After politics (although deeply intertwined with it), the next richest vein for thematic studies of Corneille has surely been gender.[[45]](#footnote-45) Perhaps unsurprisingly, feminist approaches to Corneille have focused largely on the portrayal of his female characters, often divided into sub-categories (heroines, queens, villains, captives…).[[46]](#footnote-46)Although masculinity, in contrast, has been explored far less often, at least as an explicit and distinct theme, Mitchell Greenberg and Richard E. Goodkin have addressed the struggles and tensions between Corneille’s male characters and others, both women and rivals.[[47]](#footnote-47)  Once quite a staple for Corneille scholars, the theme of love also promises to shed light on gender dynamics, although, disappointingly, this has not been the subject of sustained study for some time.[[48]](#footnote-48)

In another sense, of course, Corneille’s preoccupation with masculinity is so profound that it will underlie almost any study of Corneille, particularly any that address heroes and heroism. Even in the 1960s, surely the heyday of reifying ‘Cornelian heroism’, Doubrovsky and others conceived of the hero not as a monolithic being but as someone in some form of dynamic or dialectical relationship to his (or occasionally her) environment.[[49]](#footnote-49) Yet clichés about ‘the Cornelian hero’ remain tenacious. As Myriam Dufour-Maître puts it in her recent collection interrogating the myth, there has long been a tendency to regard Corneille’s plays as depicting ‘une même qualité héroïque’ being ‘progressivement éprouvée, mûrie, soumise à des variations quasi musicales de pièce en pièce’.[[50]](#footnote-50) Other studies have focused more on heroic qualities and virtues rather than heroic characters, thus sometimes helping to revalorize the roles of secondary characters.[[51]](#footnote-51) Such virtues have also been explored from religious angles: although, predictably, Corneille’s own complex relationship to religion has been explored most fully in relation to his two martyr tragedies *Polyeucte* and *Théodore*, some scholars have traced religious impulses in his secular works as well.[[52]](#footnote-52) Corneille’s own religious poetry and translations have also been the subject of interesting study; Richard Parish in particular has revisited the old Corneille–Racine opposition from the perspective of their translations of religious material.[[53]](#footnote-53)

# *Corneille’s contexts*

Although we have been looking so far at studies devoted primarily to Corneille himself, we should not neglect Corneille’s key role in a range of general, comparative, or historical studies. Of course, Corneille’s name and key works will feature, inevitably, in any introduction to early modern or seventeenth-century French literature; here I shall focus only on those works where he plays an explicit or key role. For a writer who famously boasted ‘Je ne dois qu’à moi seul toute ma Renommée’,[[54]](#footnote-54) Corneille actually engaged with a striking range of ancient and modern sources, and recent scholars have traced Spanish and Italian influences, some (like Tasso) even unacknowledged by Corneille himself.[[55]](#footnote-55) Corneille’s importance is recognized in a range of general or comparative studies. Although many of these, unsurprisingly, focus on theatre — whether specifically French[[56]](#footnote-56) or more broadly European[[57]](#footnote-57) — Corneille also surfaces in a number of comparative or transnational studies whose focus far exceeds the stage. The prototype of these studies is perhaps Jean Starobinski’s *L’Œil vivant*[[58]](#footnote-58) — and indeed many have similarly been French in focus — but recent scholars have read him alongside such varied international literary figures as Ovid, Georg Büchner, and Salman Rushdie.[[59]](#footnote-59)

Of course, in literary history Corneille’s name is most insistently accompanied by those of the younger two members of the classical triumvirate: Racine and Molière. That said, the great age of sententious ‘Corneille versus Racine’ comparisons (a staple of French publishing since La Bruyère’s *Les Caractères*) seems finally to be over, at least since H. T. Barnwell’s pointedly subtitled *The Tragic Drama of Corneille and Racine: An Old Parallel Revisited*.[[60]](#footnote-60) A few brave souls still dare to pit the two against each other, albeit often on a very specific point of comparison.[[61]](#footnote-61) Increasingly, though, Racine and Corneille tend to appear together nowadays not as twin figureheads but as just two authors among others, often alongside Philippe Quinault or Corneille’s rather overshadowed younger brother Thomas.[[62]](#footnote-62) Readings of Corneille alongside Molière, in contrast, seem to be dominated by the curious and controversial theory first put forward by Pierre Louÿs in 1919 that Corneille was actually the author of Molière’s plays. Various books have appeared arguing the case, adopting a range of approaches, biographical, statistical, and lexicographical.[[63]](#footnote-63) Dominique Labbé’s mathematical calculations have allowed him to attribute almost twenty plays signed by Molière to Corneille. Perhaps because of the poor marketability of a hypothetical book supporting the status quo — or perhaps, some would claim, because of the statistical evidence in favour of the Labbé hypothesis — refutations of this theory have largely been consigned to websites rather than monographs.[[64]](#footnote-64)

Although Corneille’s direct influence on later writers has typically been more taken for granted than explicitly addressed,[[65]](#footnote-65) his critical afterlife, and the fluctuating fortunes of his own works over time and geographical space, have also interested scholars. A few collected volumes have been specifically devoted to charting Corneille’s evolving reputation across history.[[66]](#footnote-66) Ralph Albanese, Jr, has picked up the narrative from 1800 onwards,[[67]](#footnote-67) while other scholars have explored the more recent history of Corneille in performance.[[68]](#footnote-68)

# *Conclusion*

It would be foolish to insist on a ‘grand narrative’ charting the movements of Corneille criticism over the last three decades. As Corneille was well aware from adapting his own historical sources, the more compelling and *vraisemblable* such a narrative would be, the more it would implicitly involve omitting some examples, overvaluing others, and establishing origins and turning-points that are ultimately artificial or indefensible. That said, if anything emerges from an overview of recent Corneille scholarship, it is the impression of a corpus in constant evolution. This is, of course, only appropriate for a writer whose career spanned almost a half-century of great political, personal, and aesthetic change. But it is striking how often this flux is reflected in the very form and structure of so many Corneille monographs, and indeed many of the very best ones. After all, recognizing the constant innovations, the trials and errors, that underlie Corneille’s dramatic career should not in itself compel Corneille scholars to adopt a chronological approach, as the vast majority still do. In very different ways, some recent studies have demonstrated that addressing Corneille’s corpus — or a substantial part of it — as a whole does not necessarily mean treating Corneille as some sort of monolith, as though there were no essential difference between *Mélite* (1629) and *Suréna* (1674). Whatever the case, and whatever one’s methodological preferences, the image of a corpus in constant evolution can be applied to Corneille criticism just as well as to his own works; in different ways, Corneille scholarship has adapted to changes in the publishing intellectual environment and found new and often compelling ways of responding to Doubrovsky’s seemingly resigned and fatalistic opening question.
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