concerning the solution of some problems of orthography could perhaps be raised, but they are not worth making here. What really counts is that students of Italian literature will from now on be able to read in his entirety an author who, though not of the first magnitude, surely deserves a prominent place within the important genre of *novellistica*.

GIANRENZO P. CLIVIO, *University of Toronto*

François Rabelais. *Pantagrueline Prognostication Pour l'An 1533, avec Les Almanachs Pour les Ans 1533, 1535 et 1541. La Grande et Vraye Pronostication Nouvelle de 1544*. Textes établis, avec introduction, commentaires, appendices et glossaires par M. A. Screech assisté par Gwyneth Tootill, Anne Reeve, Martine Morin, Sally North et Stephen Bamforth. Paris, Genève: Librairie Droz, 1974.

This is, as far as I know, the only critical edition of all the known astrological works and fragments by Rabelais. The *Pantagrueline Prognostication* and the *Almanachs* are available in various forms in most editions of the *Oeuvres Complètes*, but nowhere in so complete a form or with such thorough critical treatment. For the *Pantagrueline Prognostication*, Professor Screech and his assistants have chosen to reprint the text of the first (1533) edition. Changes in subsequent editions (1535, 1537, 1538, 1542, when it became the *Pronostication . . . Pour l'An Perpetuel . . .*; and 1553) are included as variants.

Three very serious prognostications by Henry de Fine (1518 and 1533) and Jean Laet (1533), both of Louvain, are also reproduced, as well as a satirical humanist prognostication, the "Ridicula sed jucunda quaedam vaticinia" of J. F. Ringelbergius—"Il s'agit d'un jeu de l'esprit d'un auteur qui croit fermement à l'astrologie" (p. xiii)—and the satirical prognostications of Henrichmann and Starrenwald from the *Facetiae* of Bebei, to which Rabelais appears to be indebted.

The impressive but somewhat unco-ordinated critical apparatus consists of an introduction, notes on the texts, variants at the bottom of each page of text, notes following the works, an *Index nominum* and an *Index verborum* at the end of the book, two appendices and a *Post scriptum*. The editor recognizes the difficulties this may cause his reader (p.177), but makes few concessions to her. He apologizes that the notes are "copieuses," and yet decides (p. xxiii), inexplicably, to leave his discussion of the evangelical aspects of the *Prognostication . . .* for the Notes, rather than deal with them in the Introduction. The variants are scrupulously numerous (e.g., 1.2. *Jesus le Christ* for *Jesuchrist*; 1.4. *Louin*, *Louvain*, *Louan*, *Louain*, variants for *Lovain*). It would have been extremely useful to have had the explanatory notes on the same page as the text (as in the TLF *Gargantua*) or, at the very least, to have some indication in the text that a passage is footnoted (e.g., letters for variants, numbers for notes as in the Garnier *Oeuvres Complètes*). It is also to be regretted that the *Almanach Pour l'An xli* is reproduced in facsimile only (it is not easy to read), without a typographical transcription as is provided in the *Seuil Oeuvres Complètes*, following Marty-Laveaux.

In his introduction and notes and in his choice of supplementary texts, Professor Screech provides very useful source material for a study of Renaissance attitudes to astrology. However, he does not seem to this reader adequately to account for the comic ambiguity of Rabelais' stance on the subject.

Professor Screech emphasizes the historical context of the first edition of the *Pantagrueline Prognostication* and maintains, as he has done in his edition of *Gargantua* (TLF, 1970), that Rabelais' position is pedagogical, spreading "la leçon de son maître Erasme" (G., p. xxii), that Rabelais' political and religious views in the 1530's correspond directly to those of his patrons the Du Bellays and François I, and that "pour l'essentiel" there is nothing ambiguous about Rabelais' works (G., p. lxvii). There is clear evidence that Rabelais wrote the *Pantagrueline Prognostication* at least in part to reassure the French population, seriously disturbed by almanacs violently favourable to Charles V's imperialist designs: "La noblesse royale de France prosperera et triumpchera ceste année en tous plaisirs et délices, tellement que les nations estranges voulentiers se y retireront" (ch. vi). Rabelais also satirizes current credulity regarding specific predictions of "l'astrologie divinatrice" and argues in favour of an acceptance of and participation in the edicts of Divine Providence.

On the other hand, Professor Screech's careful confluences indicate that Rabelais' planetary predictions correspond very closely to "scientific" accuracy, a fact which is borne out by Rabelais' enduring reputation as a serious astrologer in an age when astrology was "an essential aspect of the intellectual framework in which men were educated" (Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic* [London, 1971], p. 285). Two of the extant almanacs by Rabelais (1541 and 1544) are not satirical; as Professor Screech points out, Rabelais was well versed in the very acceptable astrological medicine. The editor might also have noted the high compliment paid by Pantagruel to Guillaume du Bellay, whose death, as befits the passing of a great man, was announced by comets (*Quart livre*, ch. xxvi-xxvii).

The title change of the *Prognostication* is not irrelevant; Rabelais warns that "Ceste année les aveugles ne verront que bien peu, les sourds oyront assez mal . . ." and that "Mort cure menasse quelque peu le persil . . ." (ch. iii). It seems to me that there is as much playful exploration of contradictions in accepted beliefs here as there is specific propaganda, and that Rabelais is exploring the possibilities of the "sign language" of astrology in much the same way as he explores other uses of language. The subject is worth further study, for this volume is an essential primary source.

JANE COUCHMAN, *Glendon College, York University*

Etudes rabelaisiennes, t. XI (*Travaux d'humanisme et renaissance*, CXXXIX). Geneva: Droz, 1974. Pp. xv, 147.

The question which occupies most space in this volume is that of the dating of *Gargantua* with M. A. Screech putting forward further points in support of his choice (pp. 9-56) and G. Defaux briefly summarizing his view (137-142). Marcel Françon supports Screech (81-82), and R. Maréchal devotes most of his preface to the debate. Unfortunately space does not allow a review of all the arguments here. Screech's main point in favour of 1535 rather than 1534 is that Rabelais linked Tunis and Barbarossa, a connection unthinkable before the Turk captured the city, an event not generally known until the beginning of 1535. The city subsequently fell to Charles V in July of that year. Seeing Rabelais as an instrument of royal propaganda who assisted the Du Bellay brothers in their work, Screech finds that the author belittled the Emperor's triumph by turning his victory into a comic episode of the Picroc