L. Clark Keating. *Joachim du Bellay*. Twayne's World Authors Series, 162. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1971. Pp. [6+] 149. \$6.15.

Keating's "panoramic view" of Du Bellay's life and works is only the second such study to appear since Chamard's monumental *Joachim du Bellay* (1900), and is the first to be published in English. More than twenty years have passed since Saulnier's *Du Bellay* (1951)—though Keating persists in calling it "new" and "recent"—and it was undoubtedly time for a reassessment and a rethinking of the poet's work and of recent scholarship devoted to him.

Knowing that there is not the remotest chance that Du Bellay's biography will ever have to be significantly altered, Keating eschews original research and follows the accounts of Chamard and Saulnier. The life is accompanied by illustrations taken from the works—"passages choisis" which are also translated into literal and accurate English—and by summaries of the prose and of the longer poems. Keating's description of Du Bellay's career is reliable and, in spite of some awkward sentences, readable. He has put the poet's plagiarism of Speroni in *La Deffence* into proper perspective (p. 16) and has deflated his self-justifying claims of having been ill-educated through his youth and adolescence (p. 4).

Inevitably there are some points to quibble at. Why does Keating constantly misspell *Poëmata* as "*Poematià*"? Why does he so often neglect to footnote his factual assertions? Is he unaware of Spenser's translation of *Les Antiquitez*? Does he believe that the Seymour sisters are really just "three English girls" (p. 36)? Does he not know that "*Contre les pétrarquistes*" (1559) is only a reprint of "*A une dame*" (1553)?

The "Selected Bibliography" is totally inadequate. It draws over half its ninety-seven items from before 1932, i.e., from before the completion of Chamard's authoritative edition of Du Bellay's French poetry. Much worse, it overlooks twenty articles and eight books which appeared in 1961-70 and which Keating could have found had he looked in the *PMLA* bibliographies.

The foregoing implies that Keating's book is susceptible of improvement. This is not the case. At almost every step he reveals so unsure a grasp of the intellectual and literary tradition of the Pléiade as to be unsuited for treating his subject at more than the superficial level (see e.g., pp. 30-32, 66, 104). He has little sense of how poets create (see his remarks on *Les Antiquitez*, p. 93, and on the "Discours au roy," p. 114) and deprecates the use of the rose as a symbol of short-lived beauty because "rose lovers know that ... the bloom of the cultivated rose is fairly long lasting" (p. 109)! He seems to believe that *La Deffence* is holy writ, from whose precepts Du Bellay should never have departed. His critical judgments are trivial (see e.g., pp. 23, 49, 94) and he much prefers inventing anecdotes, presumably to liven things up (see e.g., pp. 10-11, 30, 61, 65).

In short we have a story book of no use to the scholar or the student.

JOHN McCLELLAND, *University of Toronto*

A.E. Creore. *A Word-Index to the Poetic Works of Ronsard*. Vol. 5 (in 2 parts) of *Compendia: Computer-Generated Aids to Literary and Linguistic Research*. Ed. R.A. Wisbey. Leeds: W.S. Maney, 1972. Pp. xii + 1652.

There is scarcely a need to justify Ronsard's poetic works as the almost perfect corpus for a study of French vocabulary in the latter half of the XVIth century. Laumonier's incomparable eighteen volume edition—begun in 1914 and completed only in 1967—had revealed to us in its extensive *apparatus* the constant revisions Ronsard had made in all his poetry throughout the six successive *oeuvres complètes* (1560-1587). As well as being structural and syntactic these revisions can also indicate changing tastes in matters of vocabulary, perhaps also semantic shifts, but until the publication of Creore's computerized index there was no means of systematically linking up isolated phenomena.

Using the Laumonier edition as his text, Creore has listed, with a few exceptions, every instance of every word in Ronsard's poetry, giving the volume, page, and line number, as well as the date; e.g., ABANDONNER [vol.] 12 [p.] 30 [v.] 47 [15] 63. In all, this produced, according to Creore (p. viii), some 375,000 entries. In a list of this magnitude some error was inevitable, and this is acknowledged, and corrections made, in the brief "errata" which precede each volume. In my own checking of 300 entries (150 from Creore to Ronsard, 150 from Ronsard to Creore), I noted the following: some minor errors in dating (notably in the references to vol. 12), one mistaken line number, and some inconsistencies in numbering interpolations, in spite of the principle established on page xi, note 4.

Although Creore wanted the *Word-Index* to be as complete as possible, he was obliged to make various concessions, notably involving the omission of a number of shorter, very common words. His mistake is not to tell us exactly which ones (see p. viii, where a tantalizing "etc." leaves us wondering). Anomalies result: VOTRE figures in the index but it actually represents *le vôtre* (*le* and *votre* were both proscribed); *moi-même* does not appear either—not even under MEME—in spite of its importance; was it really necessary to list all 8,657 principal uses of *être* and all 5,200 uses of *tout*? On the other hand he has wisely distinguished between *ainsi* and *ainsi que*, *la mort* and *le mort*, etc.

Creore neglects to inform us that he indexes the words in their simplest form: all nouns are given in the singular, all adjectives in the masculine singular, all verb forms in the infinitive. Well, not quite all. Some past participles used adjectivally have separate listings (*agité*, *mort*, *ravi*); others, equally adjectival, do not (*armé*, *emprisonné*, *marqué*). Much the same thing is true for the present participle. It would also have been wise to differentiate between reflexive and non-reflexive uses of the verb.

To facilitate consultation Creore has worked out a system of cross-reference "in many cases" (p. x). But again he has neglected certain possibilities, e.g., we are grateful that *je ne sais quoi* is indexed separately, but wish there was a reference to it under SAVOIR. Two further aids to consultation, both welcome and indispensable, follow the main index. The first is an alphabetical list of the words in the main list, with the number of their uses; the second a list of the same words according to frequency. Finally Creore lists the words in reverse alphabetical order, but to no apparent purpose, since the words appear not as they do in the text, but in the standardized spellings and forms of the original list. We can thus deduce nothing about morphology or rhyme, and the purpose of reverse alphabetical order is defeated.

Two further criticisms. Creore has failed to correct his basic text using the *errata* provided by the editors. He has thus missed some variants (e.g., in vol. 12) and has wrongly indexed some words (e.g. in vol. 15). He has also omitted Ronsard's prose works from his index, hoping they will be the subject of a "supplementary volume" (p. viii). Since in rela-

tive dimensions the prose works are trifling—166 pages in all—and since they are complete in Laumonier's edition, it seems needless economy to have left them out.

Criticisms, however, pale into insignificance in the face of the sheer weight of effort and years Professor Creore has devoted to his task. Whatever the shortcomings—and, taken all in all, they are minor—we now have an *instrument de travail* which is eminently usable and which will make our own work both easier and more accurate.

JOHN McCLELLAND, *University of Toronto*

Florence M. Weinberg. *The Wine and the Will: Rabelais's [sic] Bacchic Christianity*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1972. Pp. 188. \$10.95.

Henri Weber in a recent article (*Europe*, Jan. - Feb. 1972, p. 3) suggests that, among the ultra-up-to-date French intellectuals, the word is: don't read Montaigne, read Rabelais. So nowadays Montaigne stands modestly aside, probably feeling grateful that there is at least Butor to keep his name alive in avant-garde circles; and the younger French *seiziémistes* almost all concentrate on Rabelais, using an approach based on structural linguistics, and work either from or towards Michel Beaujour's admirably challenging slogan: "*Rabelais ne veut rien dire*" (*Le Jeu de Rabelais*, 1969, p. 26; italics his.)

Still, some people continue to be convinced that Rabelais really did mean to say something. Weinberg certainly is convinced; and the main objection I have to her valuable study is the same one that I have for other literary historians like Saulnier and Screech: it is that they all give the impression that Rabelais mainly meant to say *one* thing. They don't agree about exactly what the message is, but they are out to convince us that there is a single, coherent, though concealed, message. Doesn't Rabelais tell us so, in the Prologue to *Gargantua*? The retort from Beaujour, Jean Paris, François Rigolot, and other contemporary critics is, of course, that Rabelais doesn't tell us anything anywhere; his narrator and his various personages say all sorts of ambiguous and contradictory things—notably in that same Prologue. But Weinberg believes we should take the first part of the Prologue literally, and so she searches for the substantific marrow.

What she discovers is summed up in the two nouns of her title. For the second noun, I find her argument more ingenious than convincing, and it would be unfair therefore if I tried to summarize it. It has to do with an unexpected reading of the celebrated rule of the Abbey of Thélème—a reading which nevertheless makes sense in terms of the message Weinberg reads in the Five Books.

My preference is for her longer and more fully developed first section, devoted to the wine-theme. She shows how Renaissance syncretism assimilated into the Christian mythology many elements of the Bacchic myth in hermetic tradition, and how Rabelais exploits this fusion of traditions and develops out of the wine-theme an intricate system of images. These can easily be read in either of the contradictory ways suggested in the *Gargantua* Prologue, but to Weinberg the system seems justified only if one accepts the hypothesis that the marrow is a single message, saying essentially that evangelical Christianity is best.

What intrigues me is not so much this reading of the message, a reading which is now widely accepted; it is rather the way Weinberg connects elements of the Bacchic myth with the *topoi* of voyage and search that dominate the last three books of Rabelais. Not