

edition were published, dated 1637 and 1641. The *Segunda parte* was reedited by Juan de Vera Tassis in 1686. Both editors rightly base their editions of *Amor, honor* and *El mayor monstruo del mundo* on the QC version of its texts, the initials indicating its publisher, María de Quiñones, and bookseller, Pedro Coello. But they correct its errors judiciously from other early editions. For *Amor, honor*, the two earliest editions were *sueltas* (pamphlets) included in anthologies purported to be the *Parte 23* (P23) and *Parte 28* of Lope de Vega, which give the play the title *La industria contra el poder y el honor contra la fuerza* (Ingenuity against power and honor against force). The *suelta* in *Parte 28*, however, correctly attributed the play to Calderón, as do two other undated *suelta* editions (SU and SU1) that contain significant variants, including certain verses omitted in QC, as does P23. Vila thus faced the challenge of deciding which of those thirty verses to incorporate and which Calderón might have eliminated had he revised the text for publication, something she thinks more likely than I do.

For *El mayor monstruo*, Caamaño deals with the contamination of the textual tradition in two Vera Tassis editions, and in two manuscript copies: partially autograph M1, and M2, an early eighteenth-century copy. After publishing his *Segunda parte* based on the false edition known as Q, Vera Tassis, having found M1, published another edition with a new version of *Mayor monstruo*, also dated 1686, of which only one copy is presently known. Unfortunately, in doing so, he conflated the two versions of the play. Caamaño observes that Vera followed the first version closely for act 1, but in act 2, in which Calderón made increasing changes, Vera's text coincides closely with the second version. M2, which derives from M1, is similarly contaminated by passages from the play's first version. Caamaño's double edition sorts them out with care and commendable critical intelligence.

Margaret R. Greer, *Duke University*

*Poétiques médiévales de l'entre-deux, ou le désir d'ambiguïté.*

Dominique Boutet.

Essais sur le Moyen Âge 64. Paris: Honoré Champion, 2017. 486 pp. €75.

---

This far-reaching work persuasively describes a medieval poetics of ambiguity: it demonstrates how, in a wide-ranging selection of medieval texts, meaning is indistinct and indeterminate. Falling between generic and stylistic distinctions, whether of chronicle, hagiography/historiography, theater, *roman*, or lyric, these texts blur significance, multiplying possible readings. This volume proposes to explore not what may be ambiguous for modern-day readers, but rather instances of "authentic ambiguity" (12) intended by the author and received as such by readers. As such, it insists upon the plurality of this poetics. Rather than a study of such mixed genres as the fantastic, comic, or fabliaux, it examines works that 1) are intentionally at the border of distinct genres, 2) mix styles

in order to destabilize the reader, and 3) introduce a play of obscured meaning. The work treats a wide-ranging number of primary texts, most of which are drawn from Northern France in the High and late Middle Ages, from the Guillaume d'Orange cycle to François Villon (although Guillaume IX's Occitan "Vers de dreit nien" opens the volume).

The critical terms of the study are three: ambiguity; the in-between (*l'entre-deux*); and blurring, both in terms of genre (*brouillage intergénérique*) and of meaning (*brouiller le sens*). These terms give the volume its structure. Divided into four parts—"Laughter and the epic: between [static] ambivalence and [dynamic] ambiguity"; "Religious parodies or writing of the in-between"; "Intergeneric blurring and ambiguity of meaning"; "Blurring meaning, or making meaning"—this work is progressive in nature. That is, if it begins at an elemental position in which ambiguity is differentiated from ambivalence, it concludes with the assertion that a poetics of ambiguity not only blurs meaning, but indeed creates meaning (deriving from Meschonnic's *forme sens*). In this, such a poetics is new and experimental, and yet not necessarily in opposition to tradition (18, 464). The goal of a poetics of ambiguity is the destabilization of the reading public, a goal which is also, strikingly, Boutet's own for this work (459).

One of this work's primary assets is its reminder that play is not only a characteristic of the postmodern. Boutet defines this medieval play as being not (simply) ludic but also technical, akin to the play that may be experienced in such machinery as cogs (11). Here, it is the play between genres and styles, between multiple possible meanings and interpretations that creates gaps in readers' expectations. This machinery terminology is not chosen by chance; such machinery represents the kind of unbending and stiff culture, social institutions, and general rigidity in which such a poetics is situated, and which is enacted in Boutet's oft-repeated term *scélrose* (as both noun and adjective, meaning sclerotic, fossilized, hardened) (46, 58, 70, 71, 307, etc.). Indeed, Boutet's concluding sentence suggests a broader horizon, as he asserts that a medieval poetics of ambiguity—and thus of originality—may save (all?) literature from such sclerosis (464).

Despite its title, which suggests an analogy between ambiguity and *l'entre-deux*, this study carefully distinguishes them: *l'entre-deux* derives from the writing of the text itself, whereas ambiguity is a "phenomenon of reception" (459–60). This distinction is important, and the analysis here oscillates between production and reception: it provides close textual readings and evaluates reception; this latter is based most often on the readings of modern critics. At times, the ambiguity that Boutet analyzes is in fact located in this modern critical reception. Such is the case for his discussion of the *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne*, identified here as the earliest exemplar of a poetics of the *entre-deux* [95]: Boutet persuasively argues that modern critics (e.g., Favati, 1965; Owen, 1967) want to see a single interpretation that the text itself denies. His readings of primary texts are also at times conditioned by, or in response to, modern scholarship. Such is the case of his reading of Guillaume de Lorris's *Rose*, which places itself in opposition

to interpretations of its presentation of *fine amor* as spiritual (Ribard, 1973) or mystical (Kamenetz, 1986). Boutet argues that the equivocal nature of love here is located in the garden of Déduit, with its polysemous fountain (and ambiguous figure) of Narcissus (following Hult, 1981). A greater attention to recent works of scholarship on medieval literature in English—Chamberlin’s *Medieval Arts Doctrines on Ambiguity* (2001); my *Medieval Poetics of Contraries* (2006); Armstrong and Kay’s *Knowing Poetry* (2011) come to mind—would have been useful. In the end, Boutet’s assertion of a medieval poetics of ambiguity is as illuminating as it is newsworthy.

Michelle Bolduc, *University of Exeter*

“*Perceval le Gallois*” en prose (Paris, 1530): *Chapitres 26–58*.

Maria Colombo Timelli, ed.

Textes littéraires du Moyen Âge 45. Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2017. 316 pp. €43.

The prose redaction of Chrétien’s *Conte du Graal* alongside its two prequels and three of its Continuations in the 1530 edition, produced in black letter, by the publishing syndicate of Jean Longis, Jean Saint-Denis, and Galliot du Pré has long been an object of fascination. Extant in eighteen copies held in libraries across Europe and the US, it represents the first postmedieval material manifestation (either in prose or verse) of Chrétien’s text and its pre/sequels, as well as the last published version to appear before the late eighteenth century. To date, the main reference edition of the prose *Perceval* had been that offered by Alfons Hilka as an appendix to his 1932 edition of the *Conte du Graal*, but this contained only Chrétien’s text and its execution is far from living up to the standards we would expect of critical editions today.

Maria Colombo Timelli, the editor of the present volume, has made an eminent career out of the study of the 1530 *Perceval* both with respect to the object and the text it contains. She presents to us here a much needed full critical edition of the first three branches of the First Continuation which, she promises, will be followed by a volume dedicated to the same text’s fourth and fifth branches, as well as ones for the Second Continuation, the Manessier Continuation, and finally the *Élucidation* and the *Conte du Graal* together (19). What the book fails to mention is whether the other prequel present in the 1530 edition, the *Bliocadran*, will be included as part of this project (one would assume in the last volume), and why the constituent parts should be published out of order with respect to their compilation in the 1530 edition. There may be a pragmatic reason for this editorial decision, but it is not one that the preliminary matter allows the reader to understand.

Otherwise, the introduction contains all the usual and expected tools including detailed plot summaries, a methodical overview of the extant artifacts and their associated editorial history, a discussion of the practice of prosification in the Middle Ages