patriarchal ideology by erasing or objectifying women, female-authored texts which represent women in negative terms “bear witness to the destructive potential of such an ideology” (p. 103). If male writers are vilified for their “egocentrism” (p. 40) in exalting “their subjective authority as writers,” Wroth is praised for the “authority of her authorship” (p. 157). If male poets misogynistically silence the female voice, Wroth cleverly ignores the male love object so that “no male beloved can finally fracture her authorship” (p. 160). Criticism so rooted in identity politics limits itself to throwing roses or stones. Nor can it account for the playful indeterminacy of early modern texts such as the crossdressing pamphlets or female-authored defenses of women which, Diane Purkiss argues, ventriloquize the female voice in order to recuperate its subversive potential (London, 1992, pp. 69–101). Furthermore, the argument finally results in a radical reduction in the multiple positions Miller herself argues that women occupied. Miller’s commitment to “the potentially liberating force of homosocial bonds” (p. 140) among women, for example, leads her to downplay not only the overt commercial competitiveness among polemicists such as Rachel Speght and Esther Sowernam, but also the vexed relationship between Pamphilia and Antissia in the *Urania* — a relationship which includes *both* bitter rivalry (*Urania* 94–5) and homoeroticism (p. 148). While Miller’s book is a welcome attempt to place Mary Wroth in the larger context of early modern culture, its potentially nuanced insights into this fascinating and prolific author are continually compromised by its rigid political agenda.

CHRISTINA LUCKYJ, *Dalhousie University*

Hélisenne de Crenne. *Les Angoysses douloureuses qui procedent d'amours*, édition critique présentée et annotée par Christine de Buzon. Paris, Honoré Champion, 1997. Pp. 728.

Christine de Buzon’s critical edition of the *Angoysses* by Hélisenne de Crenne (the very successful alias of Marguerite Briet) is complete, accurate and a pleasure to read. There are the usual aids: introduction (pp. 7–41), bibliography (pp. 43–85), critical apparatus, notes (pp. 509–632), glossary (pp. 683–690, but without page references back to the text), and two indexes (pp. 705–728), one for names appearing in the romance itself and the other for names mentioned in the introduction and notes. The notes are replete with citations and discussions of passages, above all from Boccaccio’s *Flammette* and Caviceo’s *Peregrin*, which Hélisenne incorporated into her text. Especially welcome is the presence of a “Dictionnaire mythologique” (pp. 667–681) containing extracts from Dame Hélisenne’s own 1541 translation of the first four books of Virgil’s *Aeneid*. Christine de Buzon has also

made use of this translation in her notes. Finally, there is a detailed “Résumé du roman” (pp. 639–662) for each of the three parts with appropriate leaf references.

To anyone familiar with the previously available modern editions, the presentation of the text of this edition of the *Angoysses douloureuses* is particularly striking: it contains only the text and 110 small woodcuts without any chapter headings. The 1541 Paris edition (the fourth) follows Denis de Harsy’s Lyonese edition (c. 1539) in combining the roughly 50 small vignettes and 56 chapter headings to break up and organize the text. In the editions of the *Oeuvres*, *Les Angoysses* contains only the chapter headings, a procedure which was to recur in the editions of Secor and Demats. By contrast, in the two earliest Parisian editions printed with *privilège* by Denis Janot, the images alone were used to structure the text. Here, for the first time, the editor has been faithful to the practice of those early editions. This is all the more important as the added chapter headings and the vignettes do not always come at the same places, thus leading to a text which has been segmented in a very different manner. Along with the usual progressive reading, I think we can say that the editions with chapter headings would have facilitated a superficial table-of-contents reading for each part, accompanied by various plunges into the text itself when the reader’s attention was caught by the subject of the heading. Instead of putting them in square brackets within the text, as Secor did, Christine de Buzon has relegated them to the critical apparatus. She has also grouped them together in a separate “Annex” at the end.

In the text itself, only the 110 images appear to mark the divisions within the three parts. As Stephen Rawles noted in his 1976 doctoral dissertation on Denis Janot, 41 of these cuts seem to have been made for this work. In addition to repeats, other earlier Janot vignettes were pressed into service. Although occasionally, there are two per page, or on facing pages, and at other times it may take ten pages for the next cut to appear, the average being about one for every four pages. I think this would encourage fairly continuous reading within each of the three parts, with what can be seen as pleasant, contemplative halts set up along the way.

With respect to the filiation of editions, however, this critical text does not contain one drawback. We have, on the one hand, as noted, an excellent text, based — like Secor’s edition — on the copy housed at the Bibliothèque municipale in Besançon. On the other hand, we are offered a very thorough bibliography of all editions of Hélienne de Crenne’s writings up to 1560, including references to as many copies as possible, and the list of the more than 200 libraries consulted. But somehow, the almost organic link that should lead from the bibliography to the critical edition and text has been skewered, with some unfortunate consequences.

As Rawles first established in his thesis, there exist two Janot editions of the *Angoysses douloureuses*, both containing the text of the two-year *privilège* on the back of the title page, dated 18 September 1538 — the only date in either of these editions. For a start, the two completely reset editions can be distinguished by the

spelling “contenant” vs. “contenantz” in the main title, and by the quire signatures in Parts II and III: single letters in the earlier edition as opposed to double and triple in the other (for instance, in II: A2 vs. AA2; III: A2 vs. AAA2). The bibliography fails to record this latter important distinction. Of the first edition, which, following Rawles, Christine de Buzon designates “1538.A,” one complete copy is known which is in private hands; two copies are nearly complete; and one contains only Part III. At least eight copies of the second edition (“1538.B”) exist; some copies contain quire or parts from both editions.

After such detailed preparation, this reviewer was astounded to read the first sentence of the section “Établissement du texte”: “Le texte reproduit est celui de la première édition (Paris, Janot, 1538) d’après l’exemplaire de la Bibliothèque municipale de Besançon” (p. 87). This is the copy edited by Secor and by all accounts — both in Rawles and in de Buzon’s own bibliography — is a copy of what has come to be recognized as the second Janot edition, that is “1538.B.” Nor has the Lyonese edition, which accounts both for the chapter headings as well as the *dizain* “Helisenne aux lisantes,” replacing the *privilege* on the verso of the title page, been taken into account. It has simply been “exclue” without further ado (p. 89).

Two examples will suffice to show the possible consequences of this exclusion. In the first line of Part II, the author invokes “o lecteurs benevoles.” Below, we learn that this is replaced by “mes dames benevoles” in editions B (Sergent, 1541), C (Langelier, 1543) and F (Grouleau, 1560). Such a statement is correct for the Paris editions (the first Janot edition shows the same reading), but is not accurate overall, since this change first appears in the c. 1539 Lyonese edition. Next, consider the small substitution on sign. AA3^{vo} (p. 231). The text reads: “faulx delateurs qui luy ont telle faulte imposée,” whereas below we are informed that “imposée” is replaced by “composée” in edition C (Langelier, 1543) and F (Grouleau, 1560). In fact, the later reading appears in the De Harsy edition (as well as in the 1541 Sergent edition, which should have been listed), but “composée” is in reality the form employed in the first Janot edition. So, in this case, what is given as an innovation from the fifth edition (or rather fourth) is quite simply the original text. This change first occurs in the second Janot edition, which is before us, and it involves a switch from “imposée” to “composée” and not vice versa.

The most serious consequence of the promotion of the Besançon copy to the status of an “A” edition — which is the position it occupies in this critical edition — is that more than 20 years after the publication of Rawles’s thesis, we still have no idea about what changes might have been made in preparing the second edition. Whether we imagine Marguerite Briet herself stopping in at the printer’s shop, or the intervention of a corrector or proof-reader, in the case of a living writer, these are certainly important questions to look at. From the similarities in page set-up and the few soundings I have taken, it seems likely that there were no major additions.

It may well be the case that the text of the second Janot edition is slightly better than that of the first edition. But that still remains to be seen. Even if it turns out to be so in many cases, the text that we have is neither the first edition nor the text from which later editions were derived.

To conclude: although it cannot be used to follow the evolution of the text of the *Angoysses* during its earliest stages, this is a well-edited and researched edition of the second of the two initial Janot printings of the *Angoysses douloureuses*. Christine de Buzon has given us a very readable and faithful modern edition of Hélienne de Crenne's text, and we can follow with ease the corrections to this text by Claude Colet in the three Grouleau editions appearing between 1551 and 1560. In particular, for the first time since 1539, this edition respects the textual presentation of the earliest Janot editions. The bibliography is also excellent, and the edition contains many helpful and innovative features such as the indexes and the mythological dictionary. It is a pleasure to be able to read and to study all three parts of this text in a modern format.

WILLIAM KEMP, *Collège du Vieux-Montréal*