explicitly state. Butler herself uses the term “abuse” more frequently than “violence,” and it is clear that in the Middle Ages, as today, “abuse” might encompass more than physical force, including verbal attacks and economic deprivation. Medieval records could be frustratingly vague in describing abuse; while witnesses seeking to prove abuse were often graphic in description—in one instance, stating that a husband beat his wife until “blood poured out both by her nostrils and ears” (151)—the courts themselves often seem to have used terms like “maltreat” or “diverse squabbles and discord” (100). Further discussion of the vocabulary used to describe marital abuse would be welcome to clarify this elision of “abuse” and “violence.”

This criticism, however, in no way diminishes the value of having these cases of marital disharmony, whether violent or not, discussed in such systematic fashion. While structurally Butler’s study bears the marks of its origins as a dissertation, it also stands as a valuable contribution to the history of gender in late medieval England.

Anna Dronzek
University of Denver
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in the series include editions of
the writings of Louise Labé,
Katharina Schütz Zell, Vittoria
Colonna, Moderata Fonte, and
many others.

In the Series Introduction, the
general editors, Margaret L. King
and Albert Rabil, Jr., trace the
various influences on misogyny
in the Western tradition, from
Hebrew to Greek to Roman to
Christian. The editors posit the
origin of today’s advances in gender
equality in the dissenting voices
of women who wrote six hundred
years ago. The Introduction
touches on many important issues
surrounding “the other voice,”
including problems of chastity,
power, speech, and knowledge.

Medieval feminists may
be troubled by the Series
Introduction’s placement of
Christine de Pizan. She is
acknowledged as an important,
eary, professional, female writer.
However, a reader may come away
with the idea that Christine is
an early modern voice in Europe
rather than late medieval. Positing
the voices of early modern women
as the first “other voices” ignores
the voices of women in the Middle
Ages. This oversight may be
off-putting to those who study
women in the Middle Ages and
may provide other readers with a
misapprehension about the role
of Christine de Pizan and other
medieval authors in the history
of women’s writing. However,
this criticism of the Series
Introduction in no way diminishes
the importance of Klosowska’s
edition, and her presentation of
l’Aubespine demonstrates how vital
it was to include her in this series.

Klosowska’s Volume Editor’s
Introduction provides a nice
overview of l’Aubespine’s life,
work, and significance to French
literary studies. L’Aubespine’s
importance as an early modern
voice, Klosowska argues, is three-
fold. First, her work had been
lost until Klosowska’s and others’
recent efforts. Second, her erotic
poetry offers a counternarrative
for the traditional view of early
modern, female authors as
fearful to maintain their chastity,
modesty, and femininity.
L’Aubespine’s poems “describe
homoeroticism, masturbation,
multiple orgasms, and sexual
agency” (17). In fact, she authors
the first known lesbian poem
in French, Sonnet 9. Third,
l’Aubespine’s relationship with
Ronsard and their mutual
construction of authorial voices
makes her part of the foundation
of the national literature of
France. Their poetic dialogues
construct “a myth of the woman
author that establishes her as a
heroic, national, masculine figure,
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makes her part of the foundation
of the national literature of
France. Their poetic dialogues
construct “a myth of the woman
author that establishes her as a
heroic, national, masculine figure,
better than any other man, and not a representative of the female sex” (16).

Klosowska only briefly touches on her detective work in Italy and France during which she attributed a number of poems to l'Aubespine that had formerly been considered anonymous. She also uncovered a fragment of a previously unknown poem by Ronsard. More discussion of her detective work and the work of other l'Aubespine scholars would have been welcome. However, given the broad audience of this series, perhaps her brevity can be excused. Scholars who want to know more should look to the article she published in *French Forum* (32:1-2) in 2007 entitled “Madeleine de l'Aubespine: Life, Works, and Auto-mythography: An exchange with Ronsard, ca. 1570-80.” This article mentions the critical edition of l'Aubespine's work she is preparing for Honoré Champion (under review) and the forthcoming biography of l'Aubespine by Isabelle de Conihout and Pascal Ract-Madoux. It is obvious that Klosowska is part of “the current confluence of scholars, access, and accidents of preservation” working “to bring out l'Aubespine's legacy” (*French Forum*, 19). As Klosowska notes, l'Aubespine’s life is actually quite well-documented, if little studied. It is her literary works that have been lost, ignored, or misattributed.

Klosowska’s presentation of l'Aubespine’s work opens with the extant fragment of the dedicatory poem from the posthumous edition of her work (unfortunately, lost in a 1904 fire in the Turin library). This anonymous poem was supposedly written by one of her lovers. It is followed by seventeen sonnets by l'Aubespine interspersed with epigrams and songs by l'Aubespine and poems addressed to her by Ronsard (including the newly-discovered, three-line fragment), Philippe Desportes, and Agrippa d'Aubigné.

The poems are fascinating, and Klosowska’s translations are eminently readable. L’Aubespine’s poems stand on their own as literary creations, but do call to mind the themes and work of more well-known poets in their sensuality (Labé) and mythic references and erudition (Ronsard). At times, a bit of the erotic ambiguity and word play of l'Aubespine’s work is lost in the English translation. For example, the highly erotic Sonnet 11 plays with the masculine gender of the word “lute” in French to sexualize the musical experience. Differences in linguistic constructions oblige Klosowska to use “he” and “him” better than any other man, and not a representative of the female sex” (16).
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The poems are fascinating, and Klosowska’s translations are eminently readable. L’Aubespine’s poems stand on their own as literary creations, but do call to mind the themes and work of more well-known poets in their sensuality (Labé) and mythic references and erudition (Ronsard). At times, a bit of the erotic ambiguity and word play of l'Aubespine’s work is lost in the English translation. For example, the highly erotic Sonnet 11 plays with the masculine gender of the word “lute” in French to sexualize the musical experience. Differences in linguistic constructions oblige Klosowska to use “he” and “him”
to translate the French “il” and “le” which could arguably also be “it” in English.

The Appendices feature parts of l’Aubespine’s translations of Ovid’s *Heroides* and Ludovico Ariosto’s *Orlando furioso*. Klosowska includes the first forty verses of l’Aubespine’s translation of the first canto of *Orlando*. This translation was long thought to be by an anonymous, male translator who was praised for “his” clarity and mastery. The epistles l’Aubespine translated from the *Heroides* (2, 5, 16, and 17), Klosowska argues, point to her interest in rewriting gender stereotypes as these epistles deal with characters such as Phyllis, Oenone, and Helen. Epistle 2, Phyllis to Demophoon, is in the Appendices. The presentation of the translations is less accessible than that of l’Aubespine’s poems. Included is the original Latin and Italian followed by l’Aubespine’s sixteenth-century French translation with no English or modernized French translation. However, l’Aubespine’s early modern French is not a huge barrier to any reader of modern French. We will have to wait for Klosowska’s critical edition for the complete texts of l’Aubespine’s translations.

Klosowska’s work is a most welcome addition to the canon of early modern authors, female and male. This bilingual edition would be a great complement to any Anglophone or Francophone classroom focusing on early modern authors, women writers, queer studies, sexuality, or a range of related topics.

Elizabeth A. Hubble
University of Montana

END NOTES

1. For recent controversies surrounding Labé, see Mireille Huchon’s *Louise Labé: une créature de papier* (Geneva: Droz, 2006), which argues that Labé’s work is an invention of a group of male poets. Scholars continue to dispute Huchon’s argument.
2. The only other major source for l’Aubespine’s work is BnF MS fr. 1718. The Turin manuscript can be partially reconstructed from a detailed description.
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