

in the desire not to 'drain to its dregs the urn of bitter prophecy'. Both writers emphasized and justified the primacy of form even in their discursive works. 'Le jour donné à la pensée', says Renan (p. 850), 'est ici [in 'les sciences morales'] la seule démonstration possible. La forme, le style, sont les trois quarts de la pensée, et cela n'est pas un abus, comme le prétendent quelques puritains. Ceux qui déclament contre le style et la beauté de la forme dans les sciences philosophiques et morales méconnaissent la vraie nature des résultats de ces sciences et la délicatesse de leurs principes.' Wilde likewise insisted that language is 'the parent, and not the child, of thought' (p. 962). It is perhaps because Renan and Wilde embodied these principles in their work that we can still read their essays with pleasure and excitement, though intervening events have made them seem an untropical comment on human nature.

BRIAN NICHOLAS

BIRMINGHAM

TWO NOTES ON 'GARGANTUA AND PANTAGRUEL'

I

In *Pantagruel*, one reads the following sentences:

'Jentens et veulx que tu aprenes les langues parfaitement. Premieroment la Grecque comme le veult Quintilian. Secondement la Latine. Et puis Lhebraïcque pour les saintes letres, et la Chaldaïcque et Arabicque paroillement... (Justo (Lyon, 1542), fo. E^{ro}).

The term *Chaldaïcque* needs to be explained. As a matter of fact, it corresponds to Aramaic and/or Syriac. The *Psalterium Hebreum, Grecum, Arabicum, Chaldeum* (Genuae, 1516) which I can consult contains the following texts: the Hebrew, two Latin texts, a Greek translation, one in Arabic, one in Aramaic, and a Latin translation of the Aramaic text.¹ One sees, thus, that Rabelais must have been aware of the works of scholars who tried to establish a correct text of the Bible. One can add that Rabelais seemed to make a distinction between the languages which are useful for the study of the Holy Scripture: Greek and Latin, for the New Testament; Hebrew, for the Old Testament;² while Aramaic and Arabic could also be helpful.³ One recalls the works of Lefèvre d'Étaples and of Erasmus (see M. Françon, *Autour de la Lettre de Gargantua à Pantagruel* (Rochecorbon, 1957), pp. 7-8). In the *Cahiers du collège de Pataphysique*, 13-15, pp. 24-34, there is a scholarly, although only half-serious, article on 'l'hébreu de Rabelais'. The author of that article says of Rabelais: 'Nous sommes persuadé qu'il a eu entre les mains une bible hébraïque, et même qu'il a dû retenir quelques passages en sa mémoire: on le voit par la façon dont il opère le choix des noms pour son roman.' I should be inclined to think that Rabelais heard of, or saw, a polyglot Bible and, perhaps, the so-called 'Columbus' Psalter. It is also interesting to note that, as early as 1516, use was made of Arabic versions by Bible scholars.

¹ *Historical Catalogue of the printed editions of Holy Scripture in the Library of the British and Foreign Bible Society* compiled by T. H. Darlow and H. F. Moule (1911), II¹, no. 1411. 'This Genoa Psalter was apparently the first polyglot work published. It gives in eight columns the Hebrew, a literal Latin version of the Hebrew, the Latin Vulgate, the Greek Septuagint, the Arabic, the Chaldee (in Hebrew characters), a literal Latin version of the Chaldee, and *Scholius*.' One also reads: 'Title in five languages... on verso a letter... with the same repeated in Greek, Hebrew, Arabic, and Syriac....'

² *Historical Catalogue*, pp. 1-2: 'in a letter... dated July 1501, Aldus writes *Vetus et novum Instrumentum graece, latine et hebraice nondum impressi, sed paraturo*. The work never came to birth. One specimen leaf survived... giving the first few verses of Gen. i in Hebrew (pointed), Greek (accented), and Latin in three parallel columns.'

³ *Ibid.* pp. 2-6, no. 1412: '(Biblia Polyglotta), 1514-17. 'The earliest of the great Polyglots, known as the Complutensiam, the Spanish, or Ximenes' Polyglot.' This is part of the description: 'Throughout the O.T. the general arrangement is as follows: the Hebrew is printed in the outside column, with the Hebrew roots in the margin; the Latin Vulgate in the middle; the Greek Septuagint, with an interlinear Latin translation, in the inside column. In the Pentateuch the Chaldee Paraphrase (in Hebrew characters) is added at the foot of the page, side by side with a Latin translation of it; the Chaldee roots being also added in the margin. (For the rest of the O.T. the Chaldee Paraphrase was transcribed, and done into Latin; owing, however, to its corrupt text, it was not printed....)' Let us point out the no. 1413: '1518. *Psalterium in quatuor linguis, Hebraea, Graeca, Chaldea, Latina... Coloniae. 1518.*' and its description: 'The Psalter in Hebrew, Greek, Ethiopic (not Chaldee), and Latin.'

II

Twenty years ago, Richard Salomon published a most interesting note 'A Trace of Dürer in Rabelais' (*M.L.N.* LVIII (1943), 498-501). R. Salomon claimed that Kleberger showed to Rabelais the famous woodcut of a rhinoceros, by Dürer. We need, first, to recall that the authenticity of the *Cinquiesme Livre* is dubious, so that one must still make reservations about the identification of Rabelais with the author of that book. What I should like to point out, here, is the similarity of the text of the passage of the *Cinquiesme Livre* with an inscription on a drawing attributed to Dürer. This inscription is also to be found at the top of Dürer's woodcut. Here is part of the English translation given by Campbell Dodgson ('The Story of Dürer's Ganda', in *The Romance of Fine Prints*, ed. A. Fowler (Kansas City, 1938), pp. 45-56):

It has in front on its nose a strong sharp horn and when the beast comes at the elephant to fight him, it . . . rips him up where his skin is thinnest, and so kills him.

Now, here is an English translation of the passage of the *Cinquiesme Livre* which concerns us:

it had a horn on its snout . . . long and pointed, with which it dared to do battle with an elephant. With this horn it struck the great beast in the belly—which is the weakest and tenderest spot in an elephant—and laid it dead on the ground. (Rabelais, *Gargantua and Pantagruel*, a new translation by J. M. Cohen (Penguin Books), p. 675.)

I saw a rhinoceros there . . . methought it was not much unlike a certain boar which I had formerly seen at Limoges, except the sharp horn on its snout . . . ; by the means of which that animal dares encounter with an elephant, that is sometimes killed with its point thrust into its belly, which is the most tender and defenceless part. (*The Works of Francis Rabelais*. Translated from the French by Sir Thomas Urquhart and Motteux (1859 edition), II, 500.)

There exists a letter by Valentim Fernandes,¹ which is known only in an Italian translation. We can freely translate it in this way: Pliny says that the rhinoceros [which] has a horn on its nose, is another enemy of the elephant. Having to fight it, the rhinoceros tries to strike it in the belly, which is the spot very much the weakest and the most tender.

il quale animale al tempo de Romani Pompeo Magno ne suoi guochi come dice Plinio fu mostrato nel circo con altri diversi animali; Questo Rhinoceros el quale dice haver uno corno nel naso et esser un altro inimico allo helephante che havendo a combattere con loro aguzia el corno a una prieta et nella battaglia se ingegna feriro nella panza per essor loco molto più debole et tenero . . . (*Storia dei viaggiatori italiani nelle Indie orientali compilata da Angelo de Gubernatis* (Livorno, 1875), p. 389.)

In his *Natural History*, VIII, xxix (20), Pliny indeed says that in the games of Pompeius there was also seen the rhinoceros, [which has] a horn on its nose, and is the second natural enemy of the elephant. When the rhinoceros fights the elephant, it seeks, above all, to strike the belly which it knows to be the most tender ('in dimicatione alium maxime petens, quam scit esse molliorem').

The similarity of these texts is indeed very close; but Salomon remarks: 'The fact that Dürer's caption gives the tale from Pliny as Rabelais does, should not be

¹ F. M. Rogers mentions several times the name of Valentim Fernandes (*The Quest for Eastern Christians* (Minneapolis, 1962), pp. 48, 49, 113, 116, 121, 188) and discusses a 'letter sent by Valentim Fernandes on 26 June 1510, from Lisbon to an acquaintance in Nuremberg' (p. 125): it 'summarizes events beginning with the adventures of Tristão da Cunha's fleet of 1506'.

overestimated in the philological search for affiliation. Rabelais knew his Pliny well enough to find the data for himself, without benefit of Dürer's quotation.' Salomon also says: 'The inscription, in Dürer's own hand, repeating the story from Pliny, is probably copied from a letter of Valentim Fernandes . . .'. This is the letter which we quoted above.

Valentim Fernandes goes on to say that the description of the rhinoceros given by Strabo is in agreement with what he saw. Fernandes gives, besides, an account of an encounter between an elephant and a rhinoceros, at the court of the king of Portugal. When the elephant saw the rhinoceros, it fled and ran toward a window which was barred with iron bars. The elephant broke it with its teeth and trunk.

This narration corresponds to that given by Damião de Góis in his *Crónica do Felicissimo Rei D. Manuel. Nova edição conforme a primeira de 1566* (Coimbra, 1955), IV, 53-4; but, in this work, Góis mentions the encounter between the rhinoceros and the elephant as having taken place in 1517: 'Anno de mil, & quinhentos, & dezasette' (p. 53), whereas, in his *Hispania* (1542), he says: 'Quem ludum Rex Ulyssipone praebeuit Anno (si bene memini) M.D. XV. Vel XVI.' (last page). There, Góis wrote 'elephas succubuit', whereas, in the *Crónica*, he narrates that the elephant fled. He also says, in the *Crónica*, that in October of the same year, the king sent the same rhinoceros to the Pope: 'Esto mesmo Rhinocerota mandou elRey dom Emanuel, no mes Doctubro deste Anno, aho Papa Leam deçimo, & ho embarcaram em Lisboa em hũa ná de que iha por Capitão Ioam de pinna . . .' (p. 54). The boat which carried the rhinoceros stopped at Marseilles where Francis I was at that time. The King of France wanted to see the rhinoceros which was then brought to land. But the year 1517 is surely false, as I find that Francis I was at Marseilles from 23 to 26 January 1516, when he came back from Milan. We have his itinerary through Pavia, Sisteron, La Sainte Baume, Saint Maximin (*Catalogue des Actes de François Ier* (Paris, 1905), VIII, 417). The text of the *Crónica*, however, was used and partly reproduced in translation, by Gustave Loisel, *Histoire des ménageries de l'antiquité à nos jours* (Paris, 1912, I, 217), a work which was pointed out by Professor V.-L. Saulnier (*B.H.R.* XI (1949), 126, n. 2). On the other hand, Professor Marcel Bataillon (*Études sur le Portugal au temps de l'humanisme* (Coimbra, 1952), p. 181) drew the attention of readers to the *Hispania* of Góis.

Let us end by saying briefly that, later, the rhinoceros perished in a shipwreck, after it left Marseilles. A drawing had been made of the rhinoceros, beforehand, and this was the model reproduced by Dürer in another drawing (which is attributed to him) and in his famous print.

We can also remark that Góis specifies that he himself saw the elephant and the rhinoceros in Lisbon: *vidi* (*Hispania*); we read, in the 'Lettera scripta da Valentino Moravia germano a li mercatanti di Nurimberg' (Angelo de Gubernatis, *Storia dei viaggiatori italiani nelle Indie orientali* (Livorno, 1875), p. 389): *io vidi*. In the *Cinquiesme Livre*, chapter xxx, there is a series of paragraphs beginning thus: 'Là nous vismes . . .'; 'Plusieurs aussi y veismes . . .'; 'Je y veiz un rénocéros . . .'; 'Je veiz trente-deux unicornes . . .'; 'Je y veidz ung chamelón . . .'; 'Je y veidz trois hidres . . .' and twelve more sections starting with 'Je y veiz . . .'. One realizes, thus, the way in which this chapter is composed. Moreover, commentators have pointed out the sources of the references made in that chapter to different animals, real, imaginary, or burlesque. Many of the allusions come from Pliny.

Jean Plattard (*État présent des études rabelaisiennes* (Paris, 1927), p. 71) remarked that Sainéan gave, as an argument in favour of the authenticity of the *Cinquième Livre*, the fact that 'le naturaliste le plus souvent allégué est Pline l'Ancien, source ordinaire des connaissances de Rabelais en histoire naturelle.' Once more we find that the so-called realism of the rabelaisian novels is the result of the crudition of their author or authors: in general, these novels contain numerous references to authorities, rather than to things which have actually been observed.

It seems to me that, in the *Cinquième Livre*, the reference to Kleberger, which suggests an allusion to Dürer's print, would also indicate that the description of the rhinoceros is taken from the inscription on that print rather than from the text of Pliny himself.

A detail interests us, and this is it: we read, in the *Cinquième Livre*, 'un rénoécéros... peu différent d'un verrat' (Boulenger ed., p. 861), and we wonder whether there is a reference to Strabo (*Geography*, 16. 4. 15): 'its shape is most nearly like that of the wild boar... except its nose, which has a snub horn...'

Finally, we shall say that, when one reads the paragraph of the *Cinquième Livre* which is devoted to the rhinoceros,¹ one is inclined, at first, to believe that there was an actual fight between a rhinoceros and an elephant, and that the elephant was killed. However, as we know, there was no real fight, since the elephant fled,² and it was not put to death. But, in the *Cinquième Livre*, there is a succession of verbs in the imperfect tense: 'avoit, osoit' which are descriptive and then 'rendoit' would seem to correspond to a perfect tense and would appear to be narrative. Actually, the imperfect tense used, 'rendoit', corresponds not to a real happening, but to a description which comes from Pliny, directly or not.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

MARCEL FRANÇON

¹ 'Je y veiz un rénoécéros du tout semblable à celluy que Hans Cleberg m'avoit autresfois monstré, peu différent d'un verrat que austresfois j'avois veu à Legugé, excepté qu'il avoit une corne au muffle, longue d'une coudée et poinctue, de laquelle il osoit entreprendre ung éléphant en combat et, d'icelle le pongnant soubz le ventre (qui est la plus tendre et débille partie de l'éléphant), le rendoit mort par terre' (Boulenger ed., p. 861). Let us remark that the Cohen translation would convey, more than the Urquhart and Mottoux translation does, the idea of an actual fight.

² Professor Rogers kindly pointed out to me the following item: 'Forma e natura e costumi del rinoceronte' by Luis de Matos in *Boletim Internacional de bibliografia lusobrasileira*, 1 (Lisbon, 1960), 387-94. There is a woodcut of a rhinoceros, whose forelegs are bound by a rope or a chain. This picture resembles the woodcut by Hans Burgkmair. Dodgson remarks: 'It can hardly be denied that Burgkmair's rhinoceros resembles the real thing more closely than the celebrated woodcut by his contemporary at Nuremberg... Did he obtain at Augsburg a better representation of the Lisbon rhinoceros than had reached Dürer at Nuremberg?' What impresses me is that Valentim Fernandes was a well-known printer (see Rogers, p. 48) and Rabelais's novels seem to have been very much influenced by the printers of the time, who were anxious to make known the latest and foremost publications of their friends, acquaintances and colleagues.

IMAGES IN SCÈVE'S 'DÉLIE'

The apparent obscurity of Scève's love poetry has led critics either to read into *Délie* hermetic allusions, alchemical, cabalistic, and numerological symbolism or to suggest that the main difficulty is akin to that of the English Metaphysical poets.¹ Yet the poems of *Délie* have an immediate, even emotive appeal for the reader. Words and images imprint themselves on the reader's mind and capture his imagination before the argument of the poem is fully understood. Even at a first reading many dizains are illuminated by shots of light—startling analogies, suggestive comparisons, insistently repeated words and vowel and consonant harmony. As twentieth-century readers we tend to admire these shots of light for their own sake in so far as they set in motion a free play of associations, transcribe sense impressions or describe aspects of nature and mythology in a way which seems 'delightful' and 'fresh' to us. Isolated lines of *Délie* like 'A l'embrunir des heures tenebreuses' (dizain 126) or 'De toute Mer tout long et large espace' (259) or single images like 'Comme le Lievre accroppy en son giste' (129) or 'Tu me seras la Myrrhe incorruptible | Contre les vers de ma mortalité' (378) are valued more highly than the poems in which they are embedded. Even a critic as perceptive as Henri Weber finds an arid zone in the dizains in the intervals between the striking imagery:

comme souvent chez Scève entre un beau départ et une belle chute on rencontre une zone prosaïque où dominant l'effort de l'enchaînement logique et la subtilité du cliché pétrarquiste.²

On the other hand, Odette de Mourgues, in analysing a number of dizains with a 'metaphysical' quality, remarked that Scève's imagery was functional, 'an imperious necessity of thought which cannot express itself otherwise'.³ This approach is suggestive provided that we bear in mind that this term 'functional' does not of itself ascribe to Scève a peculiar and personal use of images which differs totally from, for example, the practice of the Pléiade poets. Pléiade images too are more than merely decorative: they have a function to fulfil in the poems although that function may be a different one.

If we re-set Scève's images both in the context of the particular dizains in which they operate and in the light of sixteenth-century knowledge, there are, I believe, two important consequences for our reading of Scève: first, he appears less difficult or hermetic and more traditional; secondly, the images cease to be the main criterion of difference between Scève and the Pléiade.

The body of knowledge that the sixteenth-century poet expects us to share affects both our understanding and our evaluation of his images. The question 'What do the images mean in the poem?' needs to be answered via an exploration of the associations, semantic, symbolic and mythological, attached to words and

¹ See, for example, F. Brunetière in *Études Critiques sur l'histoire de la littérature française*, 6^e série (Paris, 1899), pp. 79-95; A. M. Schmidt, 'Haute Science et poésie française au XVI^e siècle: La gnose de Maurice Scève', *Les Cahiers d'Hermès*, no. 1 (Paris, 1947). V. L. Saulnier, *Maurice Scève* (Paris, 1948), I, 249 ff., has an excellent 'mise au point' of the hermetic interpretations of *Délie*.

² *La création poétique au XVI^e siècle en France* (Paris, 1956), p. 226.

³ *Metaphysical, Baroque and Precieux Poetry* (Oxford, 1953), p. 19.