

attributes the dearth of representations of the wet nurse's loss of her own child to the fact that most writers were upper- and middle-class men "whose own survival may well have depended on the willingness of a lower-class wet nurse to sell the milk intended for her own child" (98). Given that 20,000 Parisian babies were in the care of wet nurses in 1875 (66), it is remarkable that the wet-nursing industry disappeared almost entirely by the end of the Great War—not due to an increase in maternal breast-feeding, importantly, but to the increasing availability and affordability of pasteurized milk. As Marcus puts it, the rise of safe bottle-feeding "finally accomplished what centuries of medical, moralist, and literary persuasion could not: the emancipation of the maternal breast" (116).

Mother's Milk and Male Fantasy may seem dry (an effect offset by the occasional overwrought sentence such as "Like Geneviève's milk, female sexuality explodes in the face of the reader, leaving behind a dangerous, yet oddly enticing, odor of sexual vice . . ." [84]) and a bit repetitive at times. But this is serious, meticulous scholarship in a compact—just over 116 pages for the study proper—form, on a topic whose relevance continues to be demonstrated in our ongoing debates about breast vs. bottle feeding.

Hope Christiansen

University of Arkansas

Closson, Marianne, Nathalie Grande, Claudine Nédelec et Ghislain Tranié, éd. *Femme et Folie sous l'Ancien Régime*. Paris : Classiques Garnier, 2022. 361 p.

This collection of eighteen studies is the product of a 2021 colloquium which adopted a multidisciplinary perspective to examine the connection between *femme* and *folie* in Ancien Régime culture. As Closson and Tranié explain in their useful avant-propos, Michel Foucault's *Histoire de la folie à l'âge classique*, however influential, has a major flaw in that it does not differentiate the sexes. The essays here ensure that *la folie féminine*, long associated with the body and sexuality (rather than with the intellect, as for men), gets its critical due, especially since "la femme est folle dans son corps mais aussi de son corps" (8). As the collection as a whole demonstrates, on the question of *fous* vs. *folles*, the latter are shown again and again to have simply dared to "outrepass[er] la position qui leur est assignée" (25).

With review space at a premium, it is impossible to elaborate on every contribution. Thankfully, a few representative examples provide a good snapshot of the volume's diversity and overall high quality. (Studies by Éléna Guillemard, Astrée Ruciak, Ghislain Tranié, Aurélie Bonnefoy-Lucheri, Claudine Nédelec, Judith Le Blanc, Laurence Sieuzac, Stéphanie Genand, Bernd Renner, and Sacha Grangean round out the volume's offerings.) Part 1, "Folles de Dieu, Folles de Diable," introduces readers to a cast of colorful characters including "mystiques, sorcières, possédées, convulsionnaires, religieuses au comportement jugé scandaleux ou traumatisées par une conversion forcée, ou encore victimes de la 'folie du couvent,'" groups that, however disparate, together embody "une condamnation qui vise spécifiquement toute expression féminine 'excessive' de la croyance" (45). Bénédicte de Maumigny-Garban looks at the cases of two seventeenth-century provincial noblewomen who lived the experience of *enfermement*, Jeanne Guyon and Louise du Néant, both keen on maintaining autonomy in their spiritual quest and to exploring the limits of *la folie* as defined by the monarchy and the Church, and more specifically in its relationship with mysticism (79). Éva Yampolsky's study of the *convulsionnaires de Saint-Médard* then analyzes how women's bodies were instrumentalized by defenders and detractors of Jansenism alike, the latter of whom attempted to discredit the women by reducing the phenomenon to "une affaire de femmes, à la fois délirantes et immorales" (107). Part 2, titled "Folles de Littérature, Folles en Littérature"—which the avant-propos posits as "la plus importante de l'ouvrage" (45)—looks at the literary *folle* in works representing a

variety of genres but particularly theatre and opera. Élisabeth Lacombe provides a fascinating analysis of Gabriel Bounin's 1561 tragedy, *La Soltane*, in which the female protagonist, Rose, is victim and actress of her own *folie*. What makes Rose remarkable as a *figure de folle féminine* is her ability not only to get what she wants via sorcery and her *parole de folle* but to spread her affliction to the main male characters. Nathalie Grande looks at the ways Molière's *Les Précieuses ridicules*, Boileau's *Dialogue des héros de roman*, and Subligny's *La Fausse Clélie* directly target Madeleine de Scudéry, to "[la] réduire au silence et vouer ses œuvres à l'absurde et à l'oubli" (181); Boileau's approach, notably, was to treat Scudéry herself as *folle* so that there was no need to debate her work at all (175). Theresa Varney Kennedy focuses on three women playwrights, Antoinette Deshoulières (*Genséric*, 1680), Anne-Marie du Bocage (*Les Amazones*, 1749) and Françoise Thérèse Aumerle de Saint-Phalier (*La Rivale confidente*, 1752) whose female characters are avatars of the authors themselves. "En projetant leurs impulsions rebelles non pas dans leurs héroïnes mais dans des femmes folles," she explains, "les autrices dramatisent leur propre division—leur tentative à la fois d'accepter les restrictions de la société patriarcale et de les rejeter" (183). Women who dared to write tragedy—long gendered masculine—risked being accused of attempting to usurp masculine literary power.

Three studies merit special mention in part 3, titled "Folles en leur corps, Répression du féminin." Closson delves into *La Nymphomanie ou traité de la fureur utérine* (1784) by Dr. Bienville, who considers the birth of desire in a young woman as a moment of high risk, "celui de basculer dans la 'fureur utérine'" with frightening physiological, psychological, and sociological effects (273), the cure for which comes in the form of a doctor with "un programme destiné à faire de la femme un être entièrement soumis à des règles d'hygiène physique et mental, sous le regard de l'expert" (285). In this paradigm, the doctor gets to play the savior, "proposant donc des remèdes au mal qu'il vient d'exposer, jusqu'à envisager la solution du mari-médecin" (286), marriage being the definitive cure. Sarah Dumortier, for her part, scrutinizes sexual violence through the prism of *la folie*. Even though rape was theoretically punished by death—especially if the victim was a virgin—sexual aggressors suffered few consequences, their crimes perceived as a moral transgression equivalent to fornication. Besides, all they had to do was accuse the victim of *folie*. The burden on women was to prove that they derived no pleasure from the act and that they resisted in vain. Finally, Marjorie Charbonneau offers a fascinating discussion of pornographic engravings, long hidden away in l'Enfer at the BNF, of Marie-Antoinette, "la dernière folle de l'Ancien Régime" (301). Charbonneau shows that the body of the queen, objectified and sexualized, became a political tool for the defenders of the Republic in the final years of the eighteenth century. As humoral medicine had it, men's health is weakened by the expulsion of too much sperm; the Marie-Antoinette represented in the engravings (several of which adorn the pages of the article) was thus a danger to men's *esprit vital*. Moreover, there was no need to directly mock Louis XVI for his sexual difficulties (or to discredit royal power) when the pornographers could "pass[er] par le corps en fureur de Marie-Antoinette, seul vecteur capable de railler le roi sans trop de risque" (311). It is hard to imagine a more dramatic example of a woman "overstepping" (to return to the study's original premise) her assigned position than the depiction of the queen in these graphic images.

Hope Christiansen

University of Arkansas
