metaphors of pleasure and his depiction of Elicia and Areúsa's envy of Melibea's pleasure affect the dominant reading of the Tragicomedia, enabling readers to focus more on the attractions of romantic love and less on the mechanics of punishment for transgressions. Dorothy S. Severin in her "Audience and Interpretation: Gradisa the Cruel and Fiometa the Rejected in Juan de Flores's prosimetrum, Grimalte y Gradisa" focuses on how Alonso de Córdoba's poetry, added to the prose text of Flores's Grimalte y Gradisa and voiced by the female characters Gradisa and Fiometa, constitutes a revision for a wider audience. Arguing that Flores originally wrote for an all-male academic audience and thus focused on the anti-social effects of romantic love, Severin proposes that the expanded version not only is appropriate for public reading and musical accompaniment but also would please a courtly audience with its play on conventions and the tragic ending. She compares this process of adaptation to that of the Celestina, arguing that both revisions would be read quite differently by a female audience. Not only are these two essays the best of the collection, the overlap in their topics and arguments make for a strong conclusion to a mixed volume.

—Denise Filios, University of Iowa


The fifty articles from the third international Christine de Pizan Congress collected in this volume make a hefty contribution to the thriving publishing industry devoted to Christine de Pizan. The editors wisely have divided the papers under ten headings: I. Autoportraits (7 articles); II. Intertextualités anciennes (5); III. Mouvances contemporaines (6); IV. "Politique" (4); V. "Politiquement vivre." L'Ethique (5); VI. L'Université des femmes (6); VII. Figures et rhétorique (7); VIII. Texte et image (4); IX. Manuscrits, Bibliométrie, Ecdotique (4); X. Langue et style (2). Many articles deal with one particular work of Christine de Pizan (thereafter CdP), and this reviewer found it very rewarding to read together articles dealing with Le Livre de la cité des dames (Lori Walters, Margarete Zimmermann, Monique Niederoest, Roman Reisinger, Earl Jeffrey Richards), Le Livre des trois vertus (Christine McWebb, Meg Lota Brown, Julia M. Walker), and Le Livre du chemin de long estude (Julia Simms Holderness, Didier Lechat, Christian Heck).

There are interesting and original articles on CdP’s life such as Nikolai Wandruszka’s. He attempts a thorough examination of CdP’s Italian family and makes the surprising statement that she may have used her maiden name when she decided to write because she was a widow. This hypothesis would be more convincing if he had provided other examples from the late Middle Ages of wives who adopted their husband’s name and then resumed using their maiden name after they were widowed. Jennifer Monahan shows how extensively CdP drew on Valerius Maximus. Didier Lechat believes that CdP
did not use the original Latin but a French translation and drew upon florilegia and books of exempla for secondary quotations of this author. Sylvie Lefèvre asks whether CdP had read Nicole Oresme’s translations of Aristotle or Simon de Hesdin’s and Nicolas de Gonesse’s translations of Valerius Maximus. She is inclined to think that CdP used Oresme. Christian Heck provides a concise and precise history of the motif of the heavenly ladder found in CdP’s *Chemin de long estude*. He points out that CdP did not use Boethius’ ladder of philosophy, but the Biblical image of the heavenly ladder, which she transformed into an allegory of intellectual life.

In the longest article of this collection, Nadia Margolis attempts to demonstrate that a scholastic type of vernacular humanism already existed in the fifteenth century and that CdP should be considered one of these first humanists. Margolis views Nicolas de Clamanges as CdP’s model: like him, CdP used Hellenisms and Latin neologisms, and like Petrarch, both writers admired men and women whose virtues would become characteristic of the French Renaissance. This is an ambitious article in an area which needs further exploration. Rosalind Brown-Grant proposes that, following the rules of the *accessus ad auctores*, the “literary theory” of the Middle Ages, CdP was a moralist who believed that both the author and his/her work should be moral. James Laydlaw persuasively demonstrates the originality of CdP’s construction of her ballades in a witty, fun to read article. Earl Jeffrey Richards’s article on editing CdP’s texts is illuminating, particularly since it explores the potential of electronic technologies to render this task easier. Michel Quereuil presents his research on CdP’s vocabulary explaining how he and Joël Blanchard organized their book *Lexique des œuvres de Christine de Pizan* (1999) on this important subject.

There are articles which do not shed light on anything particularly new, but are nonetheless a pleasure to read for the quality of their writing. For example, Kevin Brownley approaches CdP’s intellectual persona by examining her readings of what he calls her “canon”: Meun, Dante, Ovid, and Boccaccio, and how she gradually transformed their gendered texts to fit her own feminist beliefs. Jacqueline Cerquiglini-Toulet finds in CdP a sensual reader and writer who often used culinary metaphors for her love of reading. Particularly interesting is the image of milk as the ultimate food of mystical knowledge among virgins: St. Christine’s blood becomes milk as she is martyred, and Joan of Arc gives to France “her breast full of peace and sweet nourishment.”

Some of the articles are intriguing and/or a bit controversial. Lori Walters tries to demonstrate that CdP used St. Augustine’s *City of God* as a model for her *Cité des dames*. Walters points out how much they are alike by showing their differences: CdP wrote an apology of women; Augustine an apology of Christianity. It is unclear that this method works. Kate Langdon Forhan boldly asserts that CdP is a political theorist often inspired by the works of Aristotle and Aristotelianism. Tania Hemelryck and Sylvie Jeanneret are correct, in the opinion of this reviewer, that CdP was clearly a moralist, more interested in ethics than in political theory.
What makes a writer write? Monique Niederost’s article makes the intriguing suggestion that chastity is necessary to intellectual creativity. CdP would not have written anything if she had not become a widow, and to remain intellectually fertile, she stayed chaste for the rest of her life. Roman Reisinger uses discourse analysis to identify the rhetoric of urban women’s conversations in an article that is hard to follow at times.

In such a large collection it is perhaps inevitable that some of the articles are not very original or deal with tiny textual motifs or even twist CdP’s words to fit the theses of their authors. In fact, this would have been a better volume if the editors had selected the twenty or so best papers. This would also have eased the daunting task of editing so many selections in four languages. Many Anglophone writers made the commendable effort to write in French, but the results are not always very good. Julia Simms Holderness’s tenuous thesis presented in tortuous French is made all the more difficult to read by numerous semantic and grammatical errors. Margolis’s article cannot be immediately understood if one does not notice that the numerical divisions of her essay are faulty. Zimmermann’s article contains German and Spanish passages that are, for no discernable reason, sometimes translated into French, sometimes not. Forhan’s translations of CdP are frequently erroneous. For all its faults, there is much to learn and enjoy in this book. It is a valuable addition to the ever-growing output of CdP studies.

—Josette A. Wisman, American University


The purpose of this volume is to account for the “paradox” of the “tremendous appeal of the Arthurian legends in America” (xi) where egalitarian ideals would seemingly conflict with the medieval social structure of Arthur’s court. Lupack and Lupack elegantly support their argument that American Arthuriania accomplishes a “democatization” (xiii) of the European legends, drawing on those threads of the stories that address American concerns of the last three centuries. In the process, the authors examine minor works of canonical writers from Twain to Steinbeck from a perspective that invigorates analysis of texts that have often been disparaged or dismissed by critics. Perhaps more significantly, they provide the serious critical commentary on mostly forgotten writers, many of them women, for which their earlier anthologies, Modern Arthurian Literature\(^1\) and Arthurian Literature by Women\(^2\), illustrated the need.

In the first chapter, “Arthurian Literature before Twain,” the authors show how nineteenth-century American writers draw on the works of Malory and Tennyson, but create a distinctly American voice in their reinterpretation of chivalric ideals. Lupack and Lupack argue that Hawthorne’s “The Antique Ring,” for example, “presents a tale that is deliberately flawed in order to comment on the nature of the tale itself” (2) as too dependant on an English