

for himself, but it may be assumed that many Anglo-Saxons, when they find that "*Béatrix*" is in parts an enlarged and somewhat varied edition of "*La Femme Abandonnée*," will respond in the negative. On the other hand, readers who enjoy analysis will perhaps think that Balzac has analyzed the characters of *Félicité* and *Béatrix* and described their complex relations with marvelous skill. The characterization of *Claude Vignon* and *Conti* may also please them, as well as the remarkable if concise portrayal of the *Vicomtesse de Kergaronët*. If they demand well-wrought scenes, that in which *Calyste* nearly murders *Béatrix* on the cliffs will perhaps please them, and, as always in Balzac, they can find shrewd comments on life. Whether they will think the character of *Calyste* exaggerated, or whether they will agree with *M. Barrière* in considering sublime the maternal love of the *Baroness*, who wishes to see her son make *Béatrix* his mistress, must be left undetermined.

Critics have regretted that Balzac added a third part to his story, which might well have concluded with *Félicité* taking to her convent and *Calyste* signing his marriage contract with *Sabine de Grandlien*. They have also observed that while the first and second parts are scenes both of provincial and of private life, the third is as much a Parisian scene as one of domestic misfortune. They have felt that, whatever may be the merits of the third part, it does not harmonize well with the novel as it stood in 1839, and this feeling many readers have doubtless shared without knowing exactly why.

The fact seems to be that Balzac made a mistake in not treating "*Un Adultère Rétrospectif*" as a sequel to "*Béatrix*." It was written several years later, it preserved practically but two of the old characters, it added a number of new ones, it changed the scene to Paris, in the main, and it became much more a story of intrigue. By a few typograph-