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


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
seeing these elements so clearly in the first two books, I had not been able to give myself a satisfying explanation about why all five books hold together so admirably. Weinberg’s analysis of the system of images associated with the Bacchic myth makes clear the unifying factor which had not been successfully identified before. She demonstrates that the great drinking scenes in the first two books represent the same thing as the dialogues of the Third Book and the voyage of the last two—that is, the search for truth, to be achieved by divine inspiration as manifested in the reeling dionysian furor, in accordance with the traditions of both pagan and Christian symbolism. Score yet another point for the literary historians’ study of sources.

JOHN A. WALKER, University of Toronto


A young woman and her lover exiled on a bleak island off the eastern coast of Canada, their struggle to survive against physical and psychological obstacles, and the woman’s ultimate rescue after her lover’s death—this is the stuff of which adventure movies are made. It is also the stuff of which many a good tale has been composed since Marguerite de Navarre’s first account of the adventure in 1558. Arthur Stabler’s task of uncovering the first Renaissance versions of the story, establishing what relationships exist among them and tracing their various descendants throughout four centuries has been well done and clearly reported in this intriguing account of the “story of the story.” This amply documented, well-organized study is unpretentious, readable, and clearly “a labor of love,” as Professor Stabler informs us in his preface.

A chronological treatment automatically assists the reader. In Chapter One (“Sixteenth-Century Versions and the ‘Authentic’ Story”), Professor Stabler analyzes in detail the three sixteenth-century versions and with the help of textual comparisons establishes interrelationships among all three. The chapter concludes with the author’s convincing reconstruction of what the authentic story might have been. Chapter Two (“Marguerite de Roberval in Literature after 1600”) contains plot summaries of all later versions of the story. What is particularly interesting about this chapter is the insight it offers into what influences the evolution of a story. Successive recounts of the tale engender numerous embellishments and perpetuate misreadings which in turn become part of the story. And the literary temperament of the time in which a particular version is published will often mark the plot as well. Thus, the stark struggle to survive becomes in the nineteenth century a Rousseau-like idyll complete with a detailed explanation of the moral formation of the daughter born to the marooned couple. Predictably, the latest version of the story written in our century adds to the tale a few contemporary touches such as “the first full-Hollywood happy ending” and “liberal (for 1953) dashes of explicit sex.” Chapter Three (“Marguerite de Roberval in History”), the last and the shortest, rapidly traces the historical accounts of Marguerite’s adventures.

Although Professor Stabler discusses the development of Marguerite’s story chronologically, the derivation of particular accounts is at times difficult to keep in mind. Despite repeated references in the text to the original source from which the story under consider-