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ABSTRACT

In this thesis we propose to do an in-depth study of the prologues to the works of Rabelais, leaving aside the prologue to *Le Cinquième Livre*. We will study the prologues for their own merit without embarking on an analysis of how they relate to the books they precede.

Each of the four chapters has a two-fold purpose. The first is to examine the content, tone, and literary style of each prologue. The second is to examine the author/reader relationship that exists in the prologues.

The first chapter illustrates how the oral aspect of the marketplace is the trademark of the prologue to *Pantagruel*. The second chapter examines the prologue to *Gargantua* where the author deals with the problem of interpretation. The third chapter studies the prologue to *Le Tiers Livre*. We see how this prologue is even more serious than the second, focussing on the problems of activity versus idleness and the acceptance of new ideas. The fourth chapter deals with *Le Quart Livre*, the longest of the four prologues. It shows how this prologue differs from the preceding three. Here the author is at ease with himself and his public which is reflected in the content and tone.

Just as the content becomes more serious with each succeeding prologue the structure also becomes more complex. This becomes clear in the second half of each chapter where we analyse the narrating instance by Gérard Genette's method.
In looking at the author/reader relationship we examine the functions of the narrator and then look at the role of the narratee. Throughout the four prologues the function of communication is always present and this is vital since the primary purpose of the prologues is to establish a rapport between author and reader. The role of the narratee is followed from prologue to prologue and we see it take on a more active and responsible capacity with each succeeding prologue.
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INTRODUCTION

The work of François Rabelais, after more than four hundred years of study and analysis by critics, both favourable and unfavourable, still provides for today's reader, a rich source of material to be examined with more modern techniques and methods. Leaving aside the main body of Rabelais' work, we will in this present study focus our attention on the prologues to his books beginning with the Prologue to *Pantagruel*, the first of Rabelais' major works to be published, and then studying in order the prologue to each succeeding work.\(^1\)

One of the most interesting aspects of the prologues to analyse is the manner in which Rabelais deals with the author/reader relationship. As Giraud points out in his book *Littérature française: La Renaissance, I, 1480-1548*:

> cette œuvre n'est pas un tout accompli et fermé, derrière lequel s'effacerait l'auteur et devant lequel se trouverait le lecteur, seul. L'œuvre rabelaisienne a ceci de particulier qu'elle est écrite à la première et à la troisième personne et que le lecteur ne cesse d'être sollicité. Le point de vue du conteur est un point de vue ambigu; qui sont, en effet, ces il, je, nous? Est-ce je qui s'adresse au lecteur, est-ce le je-personnage ou le je-auteur? Entre l'auteur, ses personnages et le lecteur s'établissent ainsi des rapports très particuliers qui d'une part rappellent constamment au lecteur qu'il se trouve devant une fiction, avec l'auteur à l'intérieur de cette fiction. Puisque chaque lecteur réagit différemment à cette double invitation, l'œuvre de Rabelais demeure une œuvre in fieri.\(^2\)

It is in the prologues that the "author/reader" contact is most prevalent.

The tradition of the prologue is one that emerges out of the Middle Ages where it is a part of the "chansons de
gestes", being used by the authors to tell their public of the utility and truthfulness of their writings. Although Rabelais also uses the prologue for this purpose, especially the prologue to *Pantagruel*, it is also a means by which he establishes a pact between author and reader. The prologues belong to the storytelling ritual, a protocol that establishes the proper circumstances for the teller and listener.

Among the vast critical writings on Rabelais' works, relatively little has been done in the way of a systematic commentary on the prologues. A few critics have written articles or dedicated chapters of books to a study of the contents and the form of the prologues in general or of certain ones in particular. One critic who views the prologues as an important part of Rabelais' work is Dorothy Coleman. In her book *Rabelais: A Critical Study in Prose Fiction* she devotes a chapter to the Prologues, exploring the author/reader relationship. She concerns herself mainly with the presence of Rabelais in his "self-conscious role of literary creator" and traces the "complicity between author and readers and the "persona" of the author throughout the prologues". Her chapter "The Olympian Author" also deals with the author/reader relationship. What her study lacks and this thesis concentrates on is a systematic examination of content and tone in each of the prologues as well as a discussion of the role of the narratee.

The prologues are also often viewed as keys to the thematic and structural elements of the books they precede. In the article "The Function of the Prologues in the Works of Rabelais", 
Margaret Spanos divides the prologues to Gargantua, Le Tiers Livre, and Le Quart Livre into "devis - direct discourse between author and reader, who is treated as physically present audience", and "narré" the short dramatic action that, according to her, "contains in miniature the structure of the book", a concept she adopts from Plattard.

In the article "Ambiguity and Point of View in the Prologue to Gargantua" Floyd Gray states that Rabelais uses ambiguity as a means of expression and "a desire to confuse and appear intoxicated". He also discusses the use of the "I" and how it serves to confuse author and narrator. A second article by the same author, "Structure and Meaning in the Prologue to the Tiers Livre" opposes the two traditional interpretations of Le Tiers Livre as real military or religious struggles with artistic creation. For Gray the theme of the prologue is the importance of literary effort plus natural endowment of an author versus technical skill. He points out that the circular structure of the prologue reflects the circular structure of the book it precedes.

In addition to the above mentioned articles, Gray has also written a book entitled Rabelais et l'Ecriture in which the first chapter entitled "Alcofribas Nasier" is devoted to the prologues. In it Gray shows how Rabelais' writing matures with each successive prologue. He sees the prologues as part of the language of the theatre. He maintains that Rabelais' intention, in the prologues, was to transform the reader's outlook from a closed vision to a certain freedom of vision and thought.
Mikhail Bakhtin, in his book *Rabelais and his World*, the chapter on "Language of the Marketplace", also deals mainly with the prologues once he has established Rabelais' physical connection with the marketplace. He shows how each prologue embodies the language of the marketplace and how the "author" tries to persuade the listener with praise and abuse, exaggerated stories, and with the accumulation of words for the sheer pleasure of creating them. The prologues are a reflection of "Renaissance journalism", a parody of everything that was part of the institutions of the times.

Alfred Glauser discusses the prologues in the first chapter of his book *Rabelais Créateur*. The chapter which is entitled "Présence de Rabelais" points out that the prologues are detachable from the books they introduce. They are a manifestation of the "moi social" and "la critique avant la critique et après la critique". By this Glauser means that Rabelais anticipated his critics and so gave a rebuttal to their comments before they even had a chance to formulate them.

In his book *Rabelais au Futur*, Jean Paris devotes the first section to the prologues. He deals with the ambiguities of "parole" et "écriture", concluding that neither is complete by itself nor can stand on its own.

A global view of the four prologues is presented by François Rigolot in *Les Langages de Rabelais*, "langage du Présentateur": "les signes linguistiques seront expressément choisis pour brouiller le sens des choses signifiées". According to him the first three prologues all propose a serious/non-serious
reading of the books. The fourth prologue tells us to accept the contradictions.

Each of the above mentioned critical writings focuses on one specific aspect of one or of all four prologues. The basic aim of the present study is to do an in-depth analysis of the content and tone of the prologues and to examine the author/reader relationship. This relationship will be studied by applying Gérard Genette's method of analysing the narrating instance, "the generative instance of narrative discourse" as presented in Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method. While Genette applies his theories to Proust we shall adopt them and apply them to Rabelais' prologues.

In order to study the narrating instance, "that uttering that produces the discourse", Genette examines how the narrating itself is implicated in the narrative. He distinguishes between the act of writing and the act of narrating, which should not be confused because the "rolé of narrator is itself fictive even if assumed directly by the author". It is not Rabelais who tells us the story of Pantagruel but the narrator Alcofribas Nasier. The "I" of the first two prologues only designates the the narrator, Alcofribas Nasier, just as the "I" of the third and fourth prologues designates Rabelais narrator and not Rabelais author.

In Rabelais' Prologues it is important to examine the narrating instance and the traces it has left in the narrative discourse, to see if the narrating instance changes or stays the same from prologue to prologue. Because of the complexity of
the narrative instance, it is necessary to analyse systematically
the different elements of the narrating instance, looking at
the categories Genette labels as "time of narrating, narrative
level and person".20

The time of narrating is an important element of the
narrating instance since a story must be told in either the
present, past, or future tenses. Time of narrating is deter-
mined with relation to the story. It is legitimate to assume
that all narrating must be "subsequent" to what it tells. How-
ever, this is not always so. There are "prior", "simultaneous",
and "interpolated" narratives where the narrating does not
follow the story but comes before it, occurs at the same time
as the story or fits in between the action of the story.

In the first four books of his novel, Rabelais makes use
of all four types of narratives at some point or other. The
narrator addresses the narratee in the present or future tense
but tells the story in the past tense. At times, however, the
time of narrating and the time of the story are one and the
same. The prologues themselves stand apart from the books
they precede because they are directed at the narratee and have
seemingly little to do with the tales that follow. The distinct
impression is given that the prologues were written after each
of their respective books, and that they thus present a finished
product to the public. In spite of this, the prologue can be
labeled as a "prior" narrative because the time of narrating in
the prologues is before the time of the action in the book.
We will examine the time of narrating within each of the prologues
in the chapters that follow in order to see how Rabelais deals with this aspect of the narrative instance.

The second element of the narrating instance is the narrative level, i.e., the distance between the narrating instance and the story. Genette defines this difference in level by saying that "any event a narrative recounts is at a diegetic level immediately higher than the level at which the narrating act producing this narrative is placed". The narrating act which produces the narrative is called extradiegetic, in the first degree, and the events it recounts are "diegetic" or "intradiegetic", in the second degree. The narration of the story of Pantagruel is extradiegetic while the events themselves, the giants' adventures, are "diegetic". When a story within a story occurs it is called a "metanarrative" and the events that occur within are called "metadiegetic". These different levels and their functions will be studied later in chapters three and four with reference to the stories about Diogenes and Couillatris. This concept of narrative level is very useful because it lets us explore the relationship between author and text, which leads directly to an examination of the author/reader relationship.

"Person" is the third element of the narrating instance. Genette points out that the labels "first person" and "third person" narratives are inadequate because:

the presence of first person verbs in a narrative text can refer to two very different situations which grammar renders identical but which narrative analysis must distinguish.

A narrative can be either "heterodiegetic", indicating that
the narrator is absent from the story he tells or "homodiegetic", indicating that the narrator is present as a character in the story he tells. It is noteworthy that absence is absolute but that presence has its degrees. The homodiegetic narrative can have a narrator who can be either the hero of the story or simply be present as a character, usually an observer. When the narrator is present as the hero of the story he tells, the narrative is called "autodiegetic".

In every narrative the narrator can have one of four types of status depending firstly, on the narrative level - extra or intradiegetic and secondly, on his relationship to the story - hetero- or homodiegetic. These four types of status are:

1) extradiegetic-heterodiegetic - a narrator in the first degree who tells a story he is absent from.

2) extradiegetic-homodiegetic - a narrative in the first degree who tells his own story.

3) intradiegetic-heterodiegetic - a narrator in the second degree who tells stories he is on the whole absent from.

4) intradiegetic-homodiegetic - a narrator in the second degree who tells his own story.  

One finds a mixture of all four types of narrating in Rabelais' novel but in the prologues only the first type of narrating is present.

Aside from the obvious function of narrating the story, the narrator, according to Genette, fulfills other functions or roles. The function concerning the story is called the narrating function. The function concerning the text is called the directing function. This occurs whenever the narrator refers to the text in his discourse. There are three functions
that concern the narrating situation: "the function of communication", "the testimonial function", and "the ideological function". Only the narrative function is essential and the other four functions are present in varying degrees depending on the author, as we shall see in the following chapters.

The final dimension of the narrating instance that Genette discusses is the role of the narratee. He maintains that the receiver of the message does not have a purely passive role. Genette puts the narratee on the same level as the narrator with respect to the narrating instance. An intradiegetic narrator automatically elicits an intradiegetic narratee, for example, the sender and receiver of letters in a "roman épistolaire". The second person marks "tu" and "vous" can never designate us, the real readers.

On the other hand a narrator that is extradiegetic, as is the case with Rabelais' prologues, can only envisage a narratee that is extradiegetic. The extradiegetic narratee merges with the implied reader with whom each of us, the real reader, can identify. The absence of an intradiegetic narratee gives the impression that no distance exists between the real reader and narrator. It is precisely this relationship that is of interest in the prologues. The narratee is important because as Genette puts it: "the real author of the narrative is not only he who tells it, but also, and at times even more, he who hears it". 25

Each of the four chapters in this thesis will examine one of Rabelais' prologues. We will examine the content, tone,
style of each prologue, and follow that with an in-depth study of the author/reader relationship by using the Genette type analysis as outlined in this "Introduction". Any progression or change in content, tone, style, or the author/reader relationship will be summarized in the "Conclusion".
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CHAPTER ONE

PROLOGUE TO PANTAGRUEL

When Pantagruel Roy des Dipsodes, Restitué à son naturel, Avec ses faicts et prouesses espoventables, Composez par feu M. Alcofribas, Abstracteur de Quinte Essence, was published in 1532 in Lyon, Rabelais had just embarked on a career in medicine. This was his first literary publication. He chose not to publish under his own name but rather under the pseudonym Maistre Alcofribas Nasier, an anagram for François Rabelais. It was a type of self-protection; Rabelais, the humanist, would have perhaps hesitated in associating himself with the "chap" books that Pantagruel is following up. On the other hand adopting a pseudonym like Alcofribas Nasier could be a desire to create the anonymity of a Barker and would contribute to creating the marketplace atmosphere of the prologue. The choice of pseudonym and later its abandonment, as we will see, affects the role of author in the prologue.

Rabelais based Pantagruel on the Grandes et inestimables Chronicques de l'enorme geant Gargantua, a short anonymous publication that was a great success at his time. The Chronicques were strictly aimed at the general public. In Pantagruel, however, Rabelais seems to have had in mind a more educated class, an elitist public as well. Humanists would appreciate his work fully with its many allusions to the state of the intellectual, political and religious life in France at that time and its many references to antiquity. The under-
-lying comic vein of the work might be reason enough to suppose
that his book is a simple burlesque work written strictly for
amusement. Certainly, at the level of language, most people
could appreciate his book. Some chapters, however, were ob-
viously above the level of the common reader. The episode
with the Limousin scholar, Pantagruel's meeting with Panurge,
and Gargantua's letter to Pantagruel, for example, are episodes
which could be appreciated on a general level, but certainly
not in detail, by the common reader. The simple person prob-
ably could not understand the satire of the empty-headed snob
in the episode with the Limousin scholar even though he could
certainly laugh at the mechanics of the situation.

The prologue which is the subject of our analysis follows
the dedicatory "dizain" by Hugues Salel and precedes the text.
It is written by the author as an introduction to his work,
somewhat like an advertisement. This prologue is the short-
est of all of Rabelais' prologues and is not often a subject
for critical examinations. Most critics feel that Rabelais' literary technique improved considerably in his later books
and they therefore often concentrate on them, unfortunately
neglecting to study the prologue to Pantagruel.

Rabelais wrote during a period of transition between the
oral and written traditions and the prologue to Pantagruel,
more than any of the others, reflects this fact. Although
his work is a printed book, it is oral in many respects, as
we shall see later. Indeed, in order for the reader to appre-
ciate all its aspects, it should be read aloud.
Rabelais presents himself as a vendor of a market product. This explains the flattery of the reader that is found in the first paragraph of the prologue. Flattery of the buyer has been a part of the advertising business of any age and has always been a main feature of the marketplace and the fairground. There the vendor calls out to his potential customers attracts their attention by making them feel important and then goes on to profess the attributes of his merchandise, in this case a book.

The prologue opens with the words "Très illustres et très chevalereux champions, gentilz hommes et aultres". This over flattering salutation can be read either as an address to the upper echelon of society because it is they who read books, or as flattery of more ordinary people to whom the invention of the printing press has made books more accessible. The addition of "aultres" makes us wonder who the prospective readers are, introducing an idea of uncertainty and doubt, opening up an abyss thus hinting at the ambiguity in the author/reader relationship which Rabelais will exploit to a greater degree later.

Rabelais continues to build up his readers referring to them as good knights who have dedicated themselves "à toutes gentillesses et honnestetéz" (P. p. 215) to a book called the Grandes et inestimables Chronicques de l'enorme geant Gargantua. He refers to it as the book which they had recently seen, read, and known, "veu, leu, et sceu" (P. p. 215), implying experience, learning, and knowledge.
One of Rabelais' main concerns is that the book achieve credibility. The first indication of this is the quote: "comme vrays fideles les avez creues guantement" (P. p. 215). Later on it will be compared to religious books. The reader's first impression is that his truly fine book "dignes de grande louange et memoire sempiternelle" (P. p. 215) was written for the gentlemen of society. However, the fact that they discussed it only when they ran out of other topics to talk about introduces a measure of doubt concerning the great value of this book:

\[y avez maintesfoys passe vostre temps avecques les honorables dames et damoyselles, leur en faisans beaulx et longs narrez alors que estiez hors de propos. (P. p. 215)\]

We see here an example of a Rabelais who does not like to leave his readers with impressions that are unalterable, with respect to the value of his book, a feature we shall see at every turn of the text.

Rabelais next attempts to give a convincing argument for the validity and worthiness of the book. He tells the listener that if it were up to him he would propose that everyone forget what he or she was doing and, instead, commit this marvelous book to memory. A reading of this book can thus be compared to the Christian vocation, where the individual abandons everything in order to follow the Saviour. One reason for memorizing the book would be the possibility of the printing presses disappearing or being destroyed, something which in Rabelais' time was perhaps a lurking fear due to the novelty
of the invention. Once the book was committed to memory it would be up to every individual to transmit the contents of this precious book orally to his descendants. It should be passed on like a "religieuse Caballe". In addition to being a form of amusement the book is thus associated with secret religious works which might have mysterious virtue about them:

"car il y a plus de fruit que par aventur ne pensent un tas de gros talvassiers tous croustelevez, qui entendent beaucoup moins en ces petites joyeusetés que ne faict Raclet en l'Institute. (P. p. 216)"

The effect the book produces becomes something of great importance because it cannot be entrusted merely to paper.

It is also important to note how the tone has changed from the loftiness of the beginning, where Rabelais seeks to seduce his reader, to a coarseness in the second paragraph: "un tas de gros talvassiers tous croustelevez". "Cróustelevéz" was a usual insult in a century when there was no known cure for venereal disease. He is lashing out against one of his favourite targets: ignorant professors of law. The prologues offer many examples of sudden shifts of level from a lofty to a vulgar tone, something which is typical of Rabelais' work in general. It is a means of incorporating opposing ideas, addressing everyone and keeping his readers alert by the shock of the change of the different levels.

To prove the veracity of his statement the narrator uses the "eye-witness technique", "J'en ay congneu" (P. p. 216),
a device widely used in the oral tradition, as well as in the marketplace. Another example of these asides used to persuade and convince his audience can be found in the following paragraph. Here again, the author reinforces the truthful value of his statements. Unsuccessful hunters found comfort in reading the *Chronicques*, according to Rabelais,

> J'en ay congneu de haultz et puissans seigneurs en bon nombre, qui allant à chasse de grosses bestes (...), voyant la proye gaigner à tire d'esle, ilz estoient bien marrys, comme entendez assez; mais leur refuge de reconfort, et affin de ne soy morfondre, estoit à recoler les inestimables faictz dudict Gargantua. (P. p. 216)

Which hunter of "grosses bestes" could possibly find comfort in reading the *Chronicques* as a consolation for having lost his prey? These unbelievably exaggerated claims contribute to the humorous character of the whole paragraph.

Having made the claim that the *Chronicques* have the power of consoling the disappointed, Rabelais moves on to further claims. Like a quack selling his medicine at the country fair, he purports that his product cures all that ails.

The book has a healing effect even in cases when doctors are helpless:

> Aultres sont par le Monde (ce ne sont fariboles) qui, estans grandement affligez du mal des dentz, après avoir tous leurs biens despenduz en medicins sans en rien profiter, ne ont trouvé remedé-plus expedient. (P. p. 216)

Here we have a good example of one of Rabelais' favourite themes: attacks on doctors. Many had been accused of readily accepting payment even when they were of no help. In the rest of the above sentence Rabelais combines two opposing
styles using a mixture of quasi-medical and vulgar vocabulary to produce a very comic effect. Rabelais states they found no better than to put:

lesdictes Chronicques entre deux beaulx linges bien chaulx et les appliquer au lieu de la dou-leur, les sinapizand avecques un peu de pouldre d'oribus. (P. p. 216)

The author describes this charlatan's cure, (applying powder from excrement to wounds), in such a way that the action takes on a very serious and important tone. It sounds exactly like the recipe for a proper medical prescription. The pseudo-mystery that medicine hides behind is evoked here by the medical jargon which often complicates the very simple. The adjective "beaulx" and the adverb "bien" underline the pseudo-serious tone.

The exaggerated claims do not end with this example; they become increasingly preposterous. The fifth paragraph takes on the tone of the flesh, daily life, and music. It begins with images of those suffering from venereal disease and gout: "Mais que diray je des pauvres verolez et goutteux? O, quantes foys nous les avons veu, ...". (P. p. 216)

The tone reveals a sort of false pity, with the adjective "pauvres", and the interrogative "Mais que diray je", and also the exclamation "O". As far as Rabelais is concerned, illnesses caused by bodily excess are not as morally serious; corruption of the soul is a worse sickness. The images do not make a lasting impression of ugliness or suffering, nor inspire excessive pity, since those afflicted with the diseases
are comically compared to parts of musical instruments and to animals:

nous les avons veu, à l'heure que ilz estoient bien oingtz et engressez à poinct, et le visage leur reluysoit comme la claveure d'un charnier, et les dentz leur tressailloyent comme font les marchettes d'un clavier d'orgues ou d'espinette quand on joue dessus, et que le gosier leur es-cumoit comme à un verrat que les vaultres ont aculé entre les toilles. (P. pp. 216, 217)

The readers become detached from the suffering as a result of this type of vivid and unusual imagery. Because the afflicted are compared to inanimate objects or to a hunted beast, the reader's sympathy is not aroused to the same extent as if the comparison was made on a more human level, evoking their suffering or discomfort. We are able to laugh because the narrator is telling us that syphilitics and those suffering from gout found all their consolation in reading the Chron-icques, a claim as dubious as the previous one made about the hunters. This claim of alleviation of pain is linked to a religious superstition of the time, to which Rabelais makes a reference in a rather satiric manner. Some believed, at the time, that being read an account of the life of Saint Mar-guerite would lessen the pain of women, in childbirth. A comparison of the two books in this way is Rabelais' way of attacking, in general, religious superstition which was very prevalent at the time. At the same time he playfully indi-cates the value of what he is extolling.

After having expounded all the virtues of his book, the street vendor asks his audience and prospective buyers: "Est-ce rien cela?" (P. p. 217) as if to say "Isn't that enough?"
He then dares them to show him something better; a tactic still used in modern advertising: "Trouvez moy livre, en quelque langue, en quelque faculté et science que ce soit, qui ayt telles vertus, propriétés et prerogatives". (P. p. 217) Rabelais uses three words, (vertus, propriétés, prerogatives), essentially meaning the same thing to reinforce his thoughts and to give rhythm to the sentence. This is a technique used by poets and "rhétoriqueurs". So far, the tone of this paragraph has been situated on a high plane but the second half of the sentence nullifies this with the phrase "et je poieray chopine de trippes". (P. p. 217) Tripe, being the stomach and intestines of animals, were eaten mainly on slaughtering days because they could not be preserved. This very unrefined source of food was considered to be unclean by many, for the tripe still contained some excrement. Then, once again, the tone is raised in the habitual series of three adjectives, each meaning the same thing: "Il est sans pair, incomparable et sans parragon". (P. p. 217) Once again the barker's technique gives strength to Rabelais' argument not only through words but through rhythm. Street vendors, charlatans, and hucksters are all known for their eloquent speech but not necessarily for telling the truth. The following sentence "Je le maintiens jusques au feu exclusive" (P. p. 217) tells us that Rabelais is willing to stand behind his word but not to the extreme of being willing to die for it. However, the obvious allusion to heretics gives a more serious tone to the passage. The sentence was added in later editions and
we may assume this was because Rabelais himself had been accused of heresy and heretics were burned at the stake. Therefore at the outset of his literary attempt he had to make sure his book was considered a comedy and not an open attack on the institutions. Rabelais was successful in this respect because he maintained the tone of a street vendor who was permitted to say anything, as long as it was said in clownlike fashion. No tone remains intact very long with Rabelais and the reader is almost immediately brought down to a more insulting language on the author's part, when he calls those who remain disbelievers of his claims "abuseurs, prestinateurs, emposteurs et seducteurs". These epithets recall the bitterness of religious controversy. They were accusations used by the Sorbonne against heretics and are therefore dangerous as they often resulted in death. It is also interesting to note that three of them are synonymous with liar and, by association, this meaning is transferred to "prestinateurs".

Throughout the prologue the author has been showing us the great value of the Chronicques. Here the reader is given supposedly concrete proof of the popularity, and therefore, the utility of the book by comparison with other books. Once again a reference is made to some mysterious content of the Chronicques and it is compared to the occult properties found in certain books. Whereas at the beginning, the book was compared with religious books, here the worldly quality is emphasized:
Bien vray est il que l'on trouve en aulcuns livres dignes de haulte fustaye certaines proprietés occultes, au nombre desquelz l'on tient Fessepinte, Orlando furioso, Robert le Diable, Fierabras, Guillaume sans paour, Huon de Bourdeaux, Montevieille et Matabrune; mais ilz ne sont comparables à celluy duquel parlons. (P. pp. 217, 218)

Some titles Rabelais gives are real (Orlando furioso, Robert le Diable, Fierabras, Guillaume sans paour, Huon de Bourdeaulx), others are imaginary (Fessepinte, Montevieille, Matabrune). The authenticity of the references is not of great importance to Rabelais. He is showing his erudition as well as inventiveness and at the same time giving a sense of authority to his claims. His purpose is to hoodwink his listener and this he does by any means, dishonest or otherwise. To top all claims of popularity and utility, the narrator tells us that: "...il en a esté plus vendu par les imprimeurs en deux moys qu'il ne sera acheté de Bibles en neuf ans". (P. p. 218) This is the ultimate comparison because the Bible is not only a spiritual book, but the only book. The statement Rabelais makes might appear sacrilegious but because it is only another of a long list of exaggerations and because it is part of the marketplace-type claims, it is only considered comic and not an attack on the Bible or the religious institutions. The statement is also a reflection of the Franciscan monks who were known for their religious jokes which readily mocked sacred things.

In the second to last paragraph, we come finally to Pantagruel itself as well as to the storyteller. The reader is introduced to the narrator who calls himself "je, vostre humble esclave". (P. p. 218) The book he gives us is "de
mesme billon" (P. p. 218) as its predecessor but "un peu plus equitable et digne de foy" (P. p. 218). The "un peu plus" ties in well with "humble esclave". Our narrator is being very modest at this point when he is no longer praising the Chronicques but actually introducing his own book. It is a false sort of humility because he was so extreme in praising the Chronicques that saying his book will be even a little better, is really not a humble act. He, unlike others, only speaks of the truth and things he has witnessed. "Je ne suis nay en telle planette et ne m'advint oncques de mentir, ou asseurer chose que ne feust veritable". (P. p. 218)

In the middle of the paragraph he breaks this quasi-humble and serious tone with the following sentence:

J'en parle comme un gaillard Onocrotale, voyre dy je, crotenotaire des martyrs amans, et crocquenotaire de amours. (P. p. 218)

This is a play on words around "protonotaire". "Onocrotale", "crotenotaire", and "crocquenotaire" are all substitutes for "protonotaire". "Onocrotale" means pelican and "crotte" means animal droppings. These substitutions convey how Rabelais really felt about the "protonotaires" who were prelates of the church, known for their love of the good life. The paragraph concludes with the narrator announcing his subject matter, "des horribles faictz et prouesses de Panta-gruel" (P. pp. 218, 219) and how he came to be an authority on that:

lequel j'ay servy à gaiges dès ce que je fuz hors de page jusques à présent, que par son congîé je
m'en suis venu visiter mon pais de vache, et scávoir si en vie estoyt parent mien aulcun. (P. p. 219)

By these details about the narrator's life Rabelais still adds verisimilitude to the work but in a different way this time. Alcofribas here makes the reader feel as if he had known him since he was a small boy. A strong empathy between reader and teller is thus created. The latter is obviously a caring person who has not forgotten his homeland nor his relatives. Here Rabelais shows another demand put on the author by the reader for whom anonymity is always unsettling. Even though the author may be called Alcofribas Nasier, he does exist, does live somewhere, does have a family. Therefore if the author is real then the text itself must also be real and true.

The ending of the prologue is in direct contrast with the beginning. The first paragraph deals with the theme of "champions" and "chevalerie". The last paragraph on the other hand is full of oaths and curses: oaths evoking the devil upon himself, the storyteller, should he be lying and curses on those who do not believe all that he tells. The tone of this paragraph once more gives the feeling that we are present at a fair and a huckster is selling his wares. We see a progression where the vendor is carried by his own discourse as in a trance of persuasion. The huckster wants us to believe that all his claims are true and that is why he says:

je me donne à cent mille panérées de beaulx diables,
corps et ame, trippes et boyaux, en cas que j'en
mente en toute l'hystoire d'un seul mot. (P. p. 219)

Here again we have a comically impossible method of measuring devils, by the basketfull, and an exaggerated number, one hundred thousand. So our storyteller gives himself up "body and soul", even the intestines and bowels, to this throng of devils if one word of what he utters is a lie. The last sentence contains as many as seven curses, five of which evoke diseases on those who do not believe his claims:

Pareillement le feu saint Antoine vous arde, mau de terre vous vire, le lancy, le maulubec vous troussse, la caquesangue vous viengne, le mau fin feu de ricquracque, aussi menu que poil de vache, tout renforcé de vif argent, vous puisse entrer au fondement; et comme Sodome et Gomorrah puissiez tomber en souphre, en feu et en abysme, en cas que vous ne croyez fermement tout ce que je vous racompteray en ceste presente Chronicque! (P. p. 219)

The ordinary public is not excluded and would probably understand and appreciate his play on words as well as the lusty remarks and jokes. The use of popular curses and oaths at the end of the prologue was a device used to surprise his readers. He really wants to prevent them from slipping into any easy, secure approach by his threats of dreadful consequences should the reader not believe him.

In his article "Le prologue de Pantagruel, le prologue de Gargantua, examen comparatif", André Gendre comes to some very interesting conclusions regarding the syntax and use of comparison in the two texts. He maintains that the first prologue does not reflect popular speech even though it reflects popular images because the complex weaving of subordinate
clauses evokes the syntax of a cultured individual. However, this does not mean that the prologue to *Pantagruel* does not have a tone of improvisation. Evidence of spontaneity can be found in the first paragraph with the many "et" conjunctions: three that connect the three principal clauses and seven within the clauses themselves. The lack of grammatical sequence in the third and fifth paragraphs also gives an air of improvisation as does the impression left with the reader when only 2/9ths of the text is devoted to principal clauses and the rest to dependent clauses. Inserted clauses reflect the asides of the thought process. The span of subordinate clauses is quite vast but it is rather interesting to note the absence of causal and consecutive clauses, which belong to the realm of logically elaborated thought constructions.

Comparison is one element that is common to both prologues. Gendre illustrates, via examples from the prologue, how they serve different purposes. In the prologue to *Pantagruel*, the comparative is used twenty times. For the most part Rabelais is concerned with establishing the truthfulness of his work (or the *Chronicques*). To prove this, he uses a comparative evaluation on the basis of credibility, cure, diversion, and commercial value. Rabelais' entire argument in the prologue hinges on a comparison. In paragraph eight when he finally introduces his own book as the subject, he states that it is "un aultre livre de mesme billon" (P. p. 218) comparing it to the *Chronicques* he has already described in detail.
Gendre's study illustrates, with concrete examples, that this prologue was written in a very spontaneous manner and as a result, perhaps, at times, lacks proof of logically elaborated thought. It reflects popular images even though Rabelais does not limit himself to popular speech.

In the second part of the chapter we will deal with what may be the most interesting aspect of the prologues: the author/reader relationship. The nature of the prologue, in which the author is speaking to his public, makes this its focal point. To examine this relationship demands a certain approach with specific goals and limitations and that is why Genette's method, as outlined in the introduction, will be applied as the second part of this analysis.

If we are to examine the narrating instance, "the generative instance of narrative discourse" it has to be done by way of an analysis of the "time of narrating", "narrative level", and "person".

A crucial element of the generative instance of narrative discourse is the time of narrating. How are the events told in relation to time? The prologue is written in the present tense because it is presented as an actual encounter between storyteller and listener with references to the past and the future. The verb "adonnez" which is in the present and implies an audience present at the time of narrating in the first paragraph, is an example of direct coincidence between narrative time and reading time.

A direct reference is made to time in the eighth para-
graph of the prologue. It starts off in the present, "je...
vous offre de present un aultre livre de mesme billon", (P. p. 218) and then a more precise reference later in the same paragraph:

C'est des horribles faictz et prouesses de Panta-gruel, lequel j'ay servy à gaiges dès ce que je fuz hors de page jusques à present. (P. pp. 218, 219)

The imperfect subjunctive in the following example, "laissat", "souciast", and "mist", imply the future. Narrative time is "prior", preceding the actual events to be narrated in the book itself:

Et à la mienne volonté que chascun laissat sa propre besoigne ne se souciast de son mestier et mist ses affaires propres en oubly, pour y vacquer entièrement. (P. p. 215)

The past tense is used throughout to draw on the readers' past experiences, at the beginning, to establish a link between the author's own book and the one he is basing it on:

vous avez n'a queres veu, leu et sceu, les Grandes et inestimables Chronicques de l'enorme geant Gar-gantua. (P. p. 215)

Later, the past tense is used when the author gives proof of his claims. They begin with "J'en ay cognieu...". (P. p. 216)

The prologue closes with a paragraph written in the present, present subjunctive, and future tenses, cursing those who do not believe the story:

et comme Sodome et Gomorre puissiez tomber en souphre, en feu et en abysme, en cas que vous ne croyez fermement tout ce que je vous racompteray en ceste presente Chronicque! (P. p. 219)

From what we have seen it is clear that Rabelais manipulates narrative time as is quite common in this type of harangue. There is a certain playfulness in the way the
readers are taken from present, to past, to future. Once again Rabelais wants his readers to be alert and receptive to change because his book is constantly changing.

In addition to the time of narrating, the narrative levels of the prologue are also essential to an understanding of the generative instance of narrating. The prologue is essentially on a completely different narrative level from the book. It is presenting a book, a story that we will encounter in the coming pages. Using Genette's terminology, we can say that the prologue is on an extradiegetic level, defined as the distance between the narrating instance, producing the narrative, and telling the story. Therefore, the narrating act is extradiegetic and the events it recounts are diegetic. The act of producing the story of Pantagruel is an event recounted in the prologue:

Voulant doncques, je, vostre humble esclave, accroistre vos passetemps davantage, vous offre de present un autre livre de mesme billon,(...) C'est des horribles faictz et prouesses de Pantagruel. (P. pp. 218, 219)

The fact that we have a prologue in which the narrator removes himself from the story to tell us in advance about it is an extradiegetic act. It creates a certain distance between the narrating instance and the story. The long discussion about the Chronicques does not reveal anything about the story of Pantagruel but it gives us the frame of reference in which to judge the value of Pantagruel. This prologue is simple with regards to narrative levels since only one exists. There is no story within a story in this first
prologue.

The third phase of our analysis centers on "person". Genette maintains that the terms "first person" or "third person" narrative are inadequate. However, it is important to distinguish between the use of the "je" by a narrator who is just telling the story and a narrator who is a character in the story. The uninvolved third person narrator is called heterodiegetic and the involved first person narrator is called homodiegetic. The prologue illustrates this distinction. It is a good example of a homodiegetic narrative. This is evidenced by Rabelais' references to himself (he uses "je" and the possessive pronouns and adjectives twenty-one times) plus other more explicit references such as "je vostre humble esclave". There are also twenty-two references to "vous" and each evokes the first person. We are made aware of the fact that the narrator will not be the hero of his tale but that he will be present as a character with perhaps a role that is active or just as an observer for he has been with the hero for many years: "lequel j'ay servy à gaiges dès ce que je fuz hors de page jusques à present". (P. p. 219) The status of the narrator does change in the book but in this prologue it is one of extradiegetic homodiegetic.

We ask ourselves also, "What purpose does a narrator serve?" Aside from telling the story, there are several other functions he fulfills. Other than the narrating function, there is a "directing function" which is like stage directions. This function is operative when the narrator makes a reference
to the text in his discourse. In this prologue the first seven paragraphs are devoted to the *Chronicques* and comparison makes them references to *Pantagruel* as well. Finally, some reference explicitly to *Pantagruel* is made in the last two paragraphs. The author refers to it as: "un aultre livre de mesme billon, sinon qu'il est un peu plus equitable et digne de foy que n'estoit l'aultre." (P. p. 218) All the qualities possessed by the *Chronicques* are present in *Pantagruel* but to an even greater extent. The author gives us the subject matter of his book: "C'est des horribles faictz et prouesses de Pantagruel". (P. pp. 218, 219) He wants to make a strong point before finishing the presentation and beginning the story itself. The author purports to be not only the master of his telling but of the reading that will be given to it: "affin que je face fin à ce prologue (...) en cas que vous ne croyez fermement tout ce que je vous racompteray en ceste presente Chronicque!" (P. p. 219) The directing function tells us the value of the book and how we should accept it.

Three functions affect the narrating situation. The first is the "function of communication" when the narrator focuses on keeping the contact between himself and the narratee open without having to transmit any real message. In this prologue the narrator addresses the public many times. There are six imperatives and the vocative is used sixteen times. Contact is established with the first sentence: "Très illustres et très chevalereux champions, gentilz hommes et aultres, qui voluntiers vous adonnez...". (P. p. 215) The narrator is
addressing the present public in very flattering terms ensuring himself that they will listen to what he has to tell them. The question, "Est ce rien cela?" (P. p. 217) establishes a sort of dialogue between narrator and narratee. The imperative "Trouvez moy livre..." (P. p. 217) also reinforces the impression that the narrator is speaking to someone, exactly the effect Rabelais is striving for. The insults he hurls upon his reader in the last paragraph show a downward movement in his pattern of communication. He moves from respect to abuse in a very short space even though he was concerned about establishing and maintaining communication between narrator and reader.

The second function that affects the narrating situation is called the "testimonial function" or the "function of attestation". It reveals the nature of the speaker's attitude towards his subject matter. The narrator goes to great lengths to tell us that he is telling us the truth:

Car ne croyez (si ne voulez errer à vostre escient), que j'en parle comme les Juifz de la Loy. Je ne suis nay en telle planette et ne m'advint oncques de mentir, ou asseurer chose que ne feust veritable. J'en parle comme un gaillard Onocrotale, voyre dy je, crotenotaire des martyrs amans, et crocquenotaire de amours: Quod vidimus testamur. (P. p. 218)

Here the narrator swears that he is telling the truth but the second to last sentence of the quotation lets the reader know that it is all a joke. The play on words around "protonotaire" exposes his claims for what they really are: preposterous. The Biblical phrase in Latin at the end of the above quotation has a disquieting effect on the reader because of the abrupt
change in style. It does however fit with the author's claims of veracity since he is drawing a parallel between himself and Saint John of the Apocalypse. This juxtaposition of the religious and the secular was a common feature of Franciscan humor with which Rabelais was most familiar since his days as a monk. The second vow of truthfulness comes in the last paragraph:

   je me donne à cent mille panérees de beaulx diables, corps et ame, trippes et boyaux, en cas que j'en mente en toute l'hystoire d'un seul mot. (P. p. 219)

This oath is so exaggerated that the reader takes it altogether lightly. The effect of these claims to veracity is full of parody for the author knows we cannot take him seriously.

The third function concerning the narrative situation is the "ideological function", very much like the preceding function where the narrator comments on the story. This function is the most difficult to pinpoint because any ideological commentary is inserted very discreetly. The whole prologue is for the large part a commentary in itself on the oral and literary traditions. We know that superstition is attacked through superstition. For example, the curative powers of the *Chronicques* are compared to the curative powers of *The Life of Saint Marguerite*. No institution is safe from Rabelais' attacks; the church, lawyers, and doctors are all assaulted.

From the functions mentioned above, we can conclude that the predominant ones are the "directing function" and the
"function of communication". The "directing function" focuses on the text and the "function of communication" ensures that an atmosphere of dialogue predominates.

Finally, we must consider the role of the narratee in the prologue. We have already established that the narrator is extradiegetic and therefore, according to Genette, the narratee must also be extradiegetic. This type of narratee merges with the implied reader with whom each real reader can identify. The absence of an intradiegetic narratee lessens the gap between narrator and narratee because we do not sense the presence of an intermediary between us and the narrator. He is not writing for a specific individual. Rabelais strengthens the pact between narrator and narratee by his extensive use of the vocative, for example: "qui voluntiers vous adonnez à (...) et, comme vrais fideles, les avez creues gualantement, et y avez maintesfoys passé vostre temps", (P. p. 215) "Trouvez moy livre", (P. p. 217) "Voulant doncques, je, vostre humble esclave, accroistre vos passetemps dadvantaige, vous offre de present un aultre livre de mesme billon". (P. p. 218)

In the first paragraph the narratee is designated in certain elevated terms, "illustres, che valeureux' champions, gentilz hommes" and one ambiguous term, "aultres".

Then again in paragraph six of the prologue the narratee is addressed, this time in the imperative "Trouvez moy livre...". The tone is still elevated but changed slightly in that the narrator is giving an order to the narratee.

In the eighth paragraph the narrator becomes the narratee's
"humble esclave". The narratee is elevated once again but this does not last. With the closing paragraph the tone towards the narratee changes drastically. The narratee is threatened with violent curses should he not firmly believe what the narrator is about to recount. 9

The role of the narratee is an ambiguous one because the message itself is open to more than one interpretation. The essence of any literary work lies in the interpretation each reader has of it. In the case of the prologue, the narratee is at the mercy of the narrator, accepting his flattery at the beginning but disturbed by his curses at the end.

This concludes the analysis of the "narrative instance" in the prologue to *Pantagruel*. After examining the "time of narration" we have seen that the prologue was written in the present tense, for a participating audience, with references to the past and future experiences of the readers. This prologue is simple as far as narrative levels are concerned since there is only one, the extradiegetic level. After discussing the different functions of the narrator in the text it became evident that the "directing function" and the "function of communication" were the two predominant ones in this prologue. With regards to the role of the narratee there remains a sense of manipulation on the part of the narrator.

Ignored by many critics, the prologue to *Pantagruel*, even though it was the author's first literary attempt, proves to have been worthy of examination. The study reveals a
refreshing spontaneity that in later prologues will disappear in favour of a more sophisticated technique.
CHAPTER ONE

1 François Rabelais, Pantagruel, Oeuvres Complètes, Tome I. (Paris: Editions Garnier Frères, 1962). p. 215. All future references to this text will be designated as P, followed by the page number.

2 Cabbala refers to the oral tradition handed down from Moses to the Rabbis of the Mishnah and the Talmud. This later referred to the supposed tradition of the mystical interpretation of the Old Testament.

3 Raimbert Raclet was a professor of law at Dôle. Rabelais is implying that Raclet does not understand the Justinian Institutes which he is teaching and commenting. Cf. Pantagruel, Ch. 10, where Rabelais indicates his high opinion of Justinian Institutes. pp. 273, 274.


5 "Prestinateurs" and "seducytours" were added in 1542.

6 "Prestinateur" refers to a Calvinist, one who believes in predestination.


9 Cf. page 26 of the above text.
La Vie très horrificque du grand Gargantua père de Pantagruel was published in 1534, two years after Pantagruel. Like the first book, this one also appeared under the pseudonym of Alcofribas Nasier. Although published after, Gargantua is generally placed ahead of Pantagruel. Both stories deal with the childhood, education, and exploits of their respective heroes and Gargantua being Pantagruel's father, it thus seemed logical to rearrange the order, if not to conform to the chronology of composition, at least to respect that of the genealogy of the protagonists. However, we have followed here the chronology of publication since our purpose is to examine the evolution of the author's thought and style.

The prologue to Gargantua is of the same length as the prologue to Pantagruel. It is however, as we shall see, more complex and less spontaneous than the first. Like the first, the second prologue contains long digressions dealing with topics seemingly irrelevant to the book itself. They do serve as points of comparison to the book the author is presenting to the public, comparing the interior and exterior of apothecary boxes to the apparent and hidden meanings of the book he is writing.

In the first prologue the author presented his book as a magical medicine. Here, Rabelais is more interested in the question of interpreting the content. In the first five paragraphs the author encourages a serious reading of his book,
an attitude which he then proceeds to destroy in the last part of the prologue, in a dialectical movement which is now familiar to us.

Rabelais launches into his argument for a serious reading with the precept that appearances are deceiving. To illustrate his reasoning he draws on an example from ancient literature showing how Socrates was like Silenes:

Alcibiades, ou dialoge de Platon intitulé Le Bancquet, louant son precepteur Socrates, sans controverse prince des philosophes, entre autres paroles le dict estre semblable es Silenes.

As Rabelais explains, Silenes were apothecary boxes with decorative amusing pictures painted on the outside, and which contained priceless life-giving drugs inside. These boxes derived their name from Silene, a teacher of the god of wine, Bacchus, in Greek mythology. He was usually portrayed as being ugly and drunk but in reality he was a wise man with a beautiful soul. A parallel is drawn between the Silenes and Socrates who appeared repulsive but was truly a sage and knowledgeable in all things. Like the boxes, Socrates' exterior concealed marvellous virtues.

Rabelais then takes the liberty of exposing his ideas on the opposition between the exterior and the interior in order that anyone reading this apparently humorous book should not judge it too quickly. He reminds the reader of the well-known saying:

l'habit ne fait point le moine, et tel est vestu d'habit monachal, qui au dedans n'est rien moins que moine, et tel est vestu de cappe Hespanole, qui en son couraige nullement affiert à Hespaine.

(G. pp. 6, 7)
Rabelais is trying to prove that in the same way as a man should not be judged a monk from his cowl or a soldier because he wears a Spanish military attire, his book is to be read seriously, even though the subject matter may appear frivolous on the surface. To do so he compares the book to the apothecary boxes as if there should be some natural resemblance between the two:

C'est pourquoy fault ouvrir le livre et soigneusement peser ce que y est deduict. Lors congoistrez que la drogue dedans contenue est bien d'aultre valeur que ne promettoit la boite, c'est-à-dire que les matieres icy traictees ne sont tant folastres comme le titre au-dessus pretendoit. (G. p. 7)

In drawing such a comparison, the author is presuming that his book will get the same consideration as the Silenes.

Having established the possibility that his book has certain hidden meanings which one would be unable to perceive by just looking at the cover, Rabelais contends also that it is necessary: "à plus hault sens interpreter ce que par adventure cuidiez dict en gayeté de cueur". (G. p. 7) The author is telling us that what may appear pleasurable may often also be useful and profound. He gives the example of the "chant de Sirenes" which lured sailors to their deaths. The beautiful melodies concealed an unexpected danger. This is another example of the incongruity between exterior and interior.

Rabelais next reverts to the image of the container and the contained: "Crochetastes vous oncques bouteilles?". (G. p. 7) The bottles he refers to are presumably full of wine, which for Rabelais is almost always a positive force. The paragraph
continues with the author telling us to remember the look of expectation on our faces when we open a bottle: "Caisgne!
Reduisez à memoire la contenence qu'aviez". (G. p. 7) We then come to one of the most famous images in all of Rabelais' work and certainly a crucial concept of this prologue:

Mais veistez vous oncques chien rencontraunt quelque os medulare? C'est, comme dict Platon, *lib. iij de Rep.*, la beste du monde plus philosophe. Si veu l'avez, vous avez peu noter de quelle devotion il le guette, de quel soing il le guarde, de quel ferveur il le tient, de quelle prudence il l'entomme, de quelle affection il le brise, et de quelle diligence il le sugce. Qui le induict à ce faire? Quel est l'espoir de son estude? Quel bien pretend il? Rien plus qu'un peu de mouelle. (G. p. 7)

The author describes in detail how the dog fervently and carefully extracts the precious and scarce marrow from the bone. The dog's actions are ultimately justified because of the benefit he gets from such a painstaking operation:

Vray est que ce peu plus est delicieux que le beau-coup de toutes aultres, pour ce que la mouelle est aliment elaboure à perfection de nature. (G. p. 7)

The marrow is a force-giving nourishment for the dog. The reader, like the dog, should work relentlessly until he has absorbed the essence of the work he is reading. Rabelais is implying that it often takes hard work and devotion to extract what is truly of importance in a work of art, in this case his book. One is unable to capture the essence of the author's labours at a mere glance of the container, one must study the contents in detail.

The last paragraph of Rabelais' argument for a serious reading continues in the same vein. Referring to the dog
as a wise animal the author writes:

A l'exemple d'icelluy vous convient estre saiges, (...) rompre l'os et sugcer la sustantificque mouelle. (G. p. 7)

Reading a book should involve the same process as sucking the marrow from a bone. The reader must be patient; his reward may seem small but in fact the quantity does not reflect the quality. The author thus implies that his work hides a deep philosophical meaning. The end of the fifth paragraph directly states that a careful reading of the book will reveal a mysterious and sacred content. One should read it

avecques espoir certain d'être faitz escors et preux à ladicte lecture; car en icelle bien aultre goust trouverez et doctrine plus absconce, laquelle vous revelera de très haultz sacremens et mysteres horribiques, tant en ce que concerne nostre religion que aussi l'estat politicq et vie oeconomique. (G. p. 8)

The reader, it is to be hoped, will become a wiser and more courageous person able to taste the hidden values the book has to offer. At the close of this argument Rabelais states explicitly that his book will reveal a great deal "tant en ce que concerne nostre religion que aussi l'estat politicq et vie oeconomique" (G. p. 8). After having made an excellent case for a serious reading of his book, Rabelais now takes pleasure in doing just the opposite by stating that the book should be accepted at face value and that no deeper meaning should be attached to it.

Rabelais begins to refute what he stated in the first half of the prologue by denying that an author gives his work special hidden meaning on purpose. He uses Homer as an example
to illustrate his point:

Croiez vous en vostre foy qu'oncques Homere, escrivent l'Iliade et Odyssee, pensast es allegories lesquelles de'luy ont calfreté Plutarche, Heraclides Ponticq, Eustatie, Phornute, et ce que d'iceulx Politian a desrobé? Si je croiez, vous n'approchez ne de pieds ne de mains à mon opinion. (G. p. 8)

The author's use of the word "calfreté" reveals his disdain for critics who make it their job to find more than meets the eye in a text. In his opinion those who, like religious professors, find Christian imagery in everything they read, are very foolish.

Rabelais then focuses on the composition of his own book stating that he, like Homer, was not thinking of any allegories when he wrote it:

Car à la composition de ce livre seigneurial, je ne perdiz ne employai oncques plus, ny autre temps que celluy qui estoit estably à prendre ma refection corporelle, scâvour est beuvant et mangeant. (G. p. 9)

He wants to dispel any impression that his book is the result of long hours of thought and labour, wanting us to believe that he wrote it spontaneously with little reflection, giving an example of the Roman poet Ennius whose work is said to smell more of wine than of oil. This, for Rabelais, is more a compliment than an insult because wine is often associated with a positive source of inspiration.

Rabelais' books have come under the same malicious attacks as those of Ennius but he manages to shrug these off:

Autant en dit un tirelupin de mes livres; mais bren pour luy! L'odeur du vin, ô combien plus est friant, riant, priant, plus celeste et delicioeus que d'huille! (G. p. 9)

The author takes pride that his book, like some digestible
substance is agreeable to the taste buds as well as sweet smelling. Writing, while under the influence of the heavenly aroma of wine, conveys a sense of lighthearted conviviality, suggesting that the product will be lighthearted also. Eating and drinking being two very important themes throughout Rabelais' work, both in their concrete and spiritual sense, then it is not surprising that he should state:

A moy n'est que honneur et gloire d'estre dict et repute bon gaultier et bon compaignon, et en ce nom suis bien venu en toutes bonnes compagnies de Pantagruelistes. (G. p. 9)

The Pantagruelistic spirit, which consists of a "certaine gayeté d'esprit en mespris des choses fortuites"², is a budding tradition that Rabelais is continuing from the previous book.

Rabelais can also be very severe when reproaching others for their actions. For example, his remarks about Demosthenes are quite scathing. He attacks Demosthenes' work for lacking spontaneity, implying that if one spends that much effort in producing a work of art it cannot possibly be natural, "ses Oraisons sentoient comme la serpilliere d'un ord et sale huillier" (G. p. 9).

The same to and fro motion that we found in the prologue to Pantagruel exists in the present one. The reader is manipulated by the author between serious and non-serious poles. Rabelais loves to play the devil's advocate, one minute presenting an argument for the serious side of writing and the next making fun of that same argument.

In order to appreciate fully what Rabelais states in the prologue it is necessary to examine the author's style more
closely. How one says something becomes almost as important as what one says.

The first sentence describing Socrates is extremely long but in spite of its length it remains very pleasurable to read because of the rhythm created by Rabelais' accumulation technique:

\[
tant\ \text{laid il estoit de corps et redicule en son maintienn, le nez pointu, le reguard d'un taureau, le visage d'un fol, simple en meurs, rustiq en vestimens, pauvre de fortune, infortuné en femmes, inpe\text{t}e à tous offices de la republique. (G. pp. 5, 6)\]

As a painter uses the strokes of his paint brush to paint an unflattering portrait, the author uses this accumulation of words. In the same sentence Rabelais also describes Socrates as:

\[
tousjours riant, toujours beuvant d'autant à un chascun, tousjours se gaubelant, tousjours dissimulant son divin sçavoir. (G. p. 6)\]

This description has an unsettling effect on the reader and Rabelais uses it as a transitional gesture before accumulating all the positive characteristics to describe the soul of the sage:

\[
entendement plus que humain, vertus merveilleuse, couraige invincible, sobresse non pareille, contentement certain, assurance parfaicte, deprisement incroyable de tout ce pourquoy les humains tant veiglent, courent, travaillent, navigent et bataillent. (G. p. 6)\]

This collection of negative and positive characteristics serves to overwhelm the reader, showing the influence of the language of the marketplace on Rabelais' writing. Eloquent speakers abounded in the marketplace environment and were never at a loss for words either when praising or chastising someone or
something. The style here directly reflects the content of the prologue which deals with the idea that appearances are deceiving. Presenting two opposing sides of an argument is characteristic of Rabelais and in order to impose this idea he has chosen a traditional metaphor of exterior versus interior.

When Rabelais advises the reader that he should work diligently to absorb the essence of his book he uses the accumulation technique to strengthen his message, telling him to follow the example of the dog who devotedly extracts the marrow from the bone:

A l'exemple d'icelluy vous convient estre saiges, pour fleurer, sentir et estimer ces ceaulx livres de haute gresse, legiers au prochaz et hardiz à la rencontre; puis, par curieuse leçon et méditation frequente, rompre l'os et sugcer la sustantificque mouelle. (G. p. 7)

He is told to "fleurer, sentir et estimer ces beaulx livres de haute gresse". The first two verbs signify to smell or to sniff out. They imply an actual savouring of the books but "estimer" on the other hand implies an abstract appreciation of them. The books themselves are described in both abstract and concrete terms: "ces beaulx livres de haute gresse". Rabelais deliberately mixes the image of the "beaulx livres" with the "de haute gresse" which makes them real and digestible like the strength-giving marrow from the bone. The qualifying phrase "de haute gresse" justifies the use of the verbs "fleurer" and "sentir".

In the prologue to Pantagruel Rabelais often used three words, having essentially the same meaning, to strengthen his argument but also to convey the marketplace eloquence of the
barker since the words were similar in sound as well as meaning. He uses the same technique in this prologue when exalting the qualities of wine in contrast with those of oil:

"L'odeur du vin, ô combien plus est friant, riant, priant, plus celeste et delicieux que d'huille!" (G. p. 9). "Friant, riant, priant" not only end with the same sound, but also transmit the same meaning. They imply that the wine is appetizing, alluring, and enticing, qualities that can be either concrete, referring to the wine as a beverage, or abstract, referring to its inspirational effects.

A study of the syntax in the second prologue shows, according to Gendre, that Rabelais has a better mastery of his material than when he wrote _Pantagruel_. He is more aware of what he wants to say and how he wants to say it. The coordinating conjunction "et" is no longer used indiscriminately showing less improvisation on the author's part. Conversely, in the prologue to _Gargantua_, strong conjunctions like "mais" are used in important places where Rabelais defends his reasoning. A marked difference between the two prologues is found in the use of the main clause which is found frequently in the prologue to _Gargantua_ as in the first prologue, indicating more control. Rabelais is not constantly slipping into an inordinate use of the subordinate clause, another indication that he has abandoned improvisation and spontaneity in favour of a more rigorous style. However, even though he uses less subordination, there is more variety in the type of subordination used. It is notable that the prologue to _Gargantua_ has a number of causal,
consecutive, indirect interrogative clauses and Latin infinitive constructions, none of which existed in the prologue to *Panta-gruel.* Also to be noted is the frequent use of the clause in parenthesis. On the syntactic level the second prologue has thus a much more rigid and elaborate construction than the first.

The comparisons used are different from those in the first prologue. They have a much more important role. Even the logic of the prologue's structure is comparative. With comparisons: "silène extérieur/silène intérieur; Socrate extérieur/Socrate intérieur; Gargantua intérieur/Gargantua extérieur" Gendre sees Rabelais abandoning improvisation in favour of a more structured approach to his new work.

The second half of the prologue seems to be a refutation of the first half and has been interpreted as such by most critics. Rabelais appears to be denying the existence of any hidden seriousness in his book, something which he so strongly implied in the first half. He does this by saying it was written spontaneously, in a short time and under the influence of wine. According to Gendre, however, it should not be viewed as a negation of the first half but as a corrective. He wants the reader to be aware that there is not one absolute way of reading a book. Rabelais places his book in the same realm as those of Homer and Ennius, and states that these authors intended no allegorical meanings to theirs. Nevertheless, these works do have great value. The second comparison he makes has to do with wine and oil. The reader's first impression leads him to believe that wine has a negative value but comparison soon
negates this notion:

quoy qu'un malautru ait dict que ses carmes sentoyent
plus le vin que l'huille.

Autant en dict un tirelupin de mes livres; mais
bren pour luy! L'odeur du vin, ô combien plus est
friant, riant, priant, plus celeste et deliciex que
d'huille! Et prendray autant à gloire qu'on die de
moy que plus en vin aye despendu que en huyle, que
fist Demosthenes, quand de luy on disoit que plus en
huyle que en vin despendoit. (G. p. 9)

Wine for Rabelais is definitely a positive force.

One of Rabelais' most widely used and highly favored
writing techniques is the continual change in his spheres of
reference, an up, and down motion from lofty to common language
that surprises and intrigues the reader at every turn of the
text. The prologue begins with a reference to Plato's Banquet
and in the following paragraph continues with references to
Pantagruel, Gargantua, the author's own books, and humorous
imaginary books like Fessepinte, La Dignité des Braguettes,
Des Poys au lard cum commento. This is clearly a move from a
lofty sphere of reference to Plato in a common direction border­
ing on the vulgar with reference to the last three imaginary
books. In the following paragraphs the language is elevated
once again when references are made to Plato, Galen, and
Pythagorus.

The sixth paragraph is especially interesting because it
opens with a discussion about Homer on a note that indicates
some hint of what is to follow by the use of the word "calfreté"
which has more to do with the caulking cracks in walls than
with analysing a text. The paragraph ends on a common tone
through the use of a proverb:
...un Frere Lubin, vray croque lardon s'est efforcé
demonstrer, si d'adventure il rencontroit gens aussi
golz que luy, et (comme dict le proverbe) couvercle
digne du chaudron. (G. p. 8)

Rabelais then states that he wrote while drinking, indi-
cating a lack of seriousness about his work, but in the
next breath tells the reader that is the time to write "ces
hautes matieres et sciences profundes, comme bien faire
sçavoiit Homere". (G. p. 9) Such apparent contradictions in-
vite the reader to examine the text from different angles,
keeping in mind various possible interpretations.

In discussing the author/reader relationship in the pro-
logue it is necessary to look closely at the first sentence
of the prologue: "Beuveurs tres illustres et vous, verolez
tres precieux, - car à vous non a aultres, sont dediez mes
escriptz". (G. p. 5) From the start this prologue is dealing
with contradiction which will become its central theme. It
is unusual that drunkards be addressed as illustrious and
syphilitics as esteemed members of society. This is quite
unlike the envisaged public of the first prologue who were
"Très illustres et très chevalereux champions, gentilz hommes
et aultres". (P. p. 215) "Illustres" and "precieux" are unlike-
ly adjectives for beuveurs and verolez, two nouns normally
used in the pejorative sense. However, we have already seen
that Rabelais does not abhor the disciples of the gods Bacchus
and Eros. This form of address is once again an example of
the language of the marketplace that dominated the first pro-
logue. It was totally acceptable for a Barker to use quasi-
-insults when speaking to his public and when worded cleverly
the remarks were not perceived as derogatory.

The author/reader relationship develops on a note of self assurance on the author's part. After he speaks of Socrates, Rabelais addresses a rhetorical question to his readers:

A quel propos, en voustre advis, tend ce prelude et coup d'essay? (G. p. 6)

which he answers with:

Par autant que vous, mes bons disciples, et quelques foulz de sejour,... (G. p. 6)

The readers have become his "bons disciples"; they have read *Pantagruel* and are now a part of the "bonnes compagnies de Pantagruelistes", (G. p. 9) But not forgetting the double message of this prologue the readers are also addressed as "quelques foulz de sejour".

Near the end of the prologue a sentence strengthens this idea of a strong tie between author and reader:

Pour tant, interpretez tous mes faictz et mes dictz en la perfectissime partie; ayez en reverence le cerveau caseiforme qui vous paist de ces belles billes vezées, et, à vostre povoir, tenez moy toujours joyeux. (G. p. 9)

The sentence indicates a conspiracy between author and reader, one that will ensure that the reader interprets what the author says as the latter intended it. Rabelais seems to be giving the reader a more defined and important role in this prologue than in the preceding one. Here, the reader is being entrusted with the role of interpreter but is reminded always to keep in mind that which is joyous. Rabelais undercuts his own statements in his mock-serious style, "ayez en reverence le cerveau caseiforme". "Caseiforme"-in the form of a cheese-signifies a not-too-intelligent, not-too-serious person as author. By
undercutting his own statements, he encourages a lighthearted approach to the reading of his book.

The last short paragraph of the prologue both flatters and insults the readers. The author calls them "mes amours" (G. p. 9) and tells them to enjoy themselves reading the rest of the book, "à l'aise du corps et au profit des reins". (G. p. 9) Rabelais then becomes insulting: "Escoutez, vietz d'azes" (G. p. 9) and repeats a curse already used in the first prologue: "que le maulubec vous trouque!". (G. p. 9) Such abuses and insults are fewer and less harsh than those in the prologue to Pantagruel and one tends not to be offended because all seems to be said in good-natured fun under the influence of the wine.

In his article, Gendre concludes that the role of the comparison in the two prologues serves a dual purpose. In presenting Pantagruel the author was concerned about the acceptance of his book as a work of art. The role of the reader is fulfilled if he accepts the book as truths. Points of comparison for Pantagruel were other novels from the realm of popular literature. As for the presentation of Gargantua, comparison takes on another set of values as Homer and other great ancient writers are used as points of reference. The author gives the reader a much more important role in this prologue because he is entrusting him with the interpretation of the message of the book. The authoritarian attitude of the author at the end of the first prologue is abandoned in favor of an attitude that gives the reader a certain sense of autonomy and freedom.
The prologue to Gargantua is much more homogeneous than Pantagruel. To be sure some of the same elements are there, a mixture of flattery and insults, Rabelais has modified his approach in this respect. He proposes a serious and non-serious approach to his book and then lets the reader choose. Because he is not that explicit how he wishes his book to be read, his reader must choose either to read between the lines, accept the book at face value, or do a little of both.

In the second part of this chapter we will deal more specifically with the author/reader relationship, perhaps the most interesting aspect of the prologues. The nature of the prologue, in which the author speaks to his public, makes this rapport its focal point. To fully appreciate the complexities of this relationship demands an approach with specific goals and limitations and that is why Genette's method of analysis will be applied to the prologue of Gargantua as it was to the prologue of Pantagruel.

The first element of "the generative instance of narrative discourse" to be examined is "the time of narrating". The focus here is on the way in which the events are told in relation to time. Since the prologue is presented as an actual encounter between author and reader, it begins in the present tense, "car à vous, non à aultres, sont dediez mes escriptz". (G: p. 5) Here the marketplace vendor is trying to seduce the audience into buying his book. There is a direct interaction between author and reader when Rabelais addresses the reader in the present tense.
The author uses the past tense when he explains certain events to the reader. For example, the comparison between Silenes and Socrates: "Silenes estoient jadis..." (G. p. 5) is presented in the past tense as are his remarks about Demosthenes: "quand de luy on disoit que plus en huyle que en vin despendoit". (G. p. 9)

Rabelais also has recourse to the future tense which he does not hesitate to use and at times the future is implied through the imperative and infinitive. The author uses the future when implying a deeper meaning to his book: "Lors congoistrez que la drogue dedans contenue est bien d'autre valeur que ne promettoit la boite" (G. p. 7), "car en icelle bien aultre goust trouverez et doctrine plus absconce, laquelle vous revelera...". (G. p. 8) He uses the infinitive when encouraging the reader to read between the lines: "A l'exemple d'icelluy vous convient estre saiges pour fleurer, sentir et estimer ces beaulx livres de haulte gresse".

The imperative is used in the second half of the prologue when Rabelais tells the reader not to take his book seriously:

Pour tant, interpretez tous mes faictz et mes dictz en la perfectissime partie; ayez en reverence le cerveau caseiforme qui vous paist de ces belles billes vezees, et, à vostre povoir, tenez moy tousjours joyeux. Or esbaudissey vous, mes amours, et quayement lisez le reste, tout à l'aise du corps et au profit des reins! (G. p. 9)

The prologue ends with the future tense "et je vous plegeray tout ares metys". (G. p. 9) Ending the prologue in this manner is appropriate because the future serves as an invitation and introduction to the book.
Rabelais manipulates narrative time very skillfully. Transitions from present to past to future are performed very subtly and therefore the reader must be alert and attentive to the effect Rabelais always strives to achieve.

The prologue, not being a part of the narrative in the book but rather a separate story about the story and its interpretation, is on a different level from that of the life and exploits of Gargantua. It is on what Genette defines as the extradiegetic level, that is to say, the distance between the narrating instance, which produces the narrative and tells the story, and the prologue is then by definition an extradiegetic act. The events recounted in it are called diegetic: they are within its own framework. The prologue deals with the manner of the production of the book and the book tells the story. The prologue does not mention, even once, Gargantua and his adventurous life but rather vaguely talks about "mes escriptz" (G. p. 5) in the first sentence. Then in the second paragraph the book is referred to as "ce prélude et coup d'essay...lisans les joyeulx títres d'aulcuns livres de nostre in­vention...C'est pourquoi fault ouvrir le livre et soigneuse­ment peser ce que y est deduict". (G. pp. 6, 7) The next reference is to be found in paragraph five: "Ces beaulx livres de haulte gresse...". (G. pp. 7, 8) Further on the author mentions: "ces joyeuses et nouvelles chronicques... ce livre seigneurial". (G. pp. 8, 9) Paragraph eight contains two references: "mes faictz et mes dictz...ces belles billes vezées". (G. p. 9) In paragraph nine he says simply: "lisez
le reste". (G. p. 9) These allusions to the story, from which the narrator is removed, are an extradiegetic act. A certain distance has been created between the narrating instance and the story. This prologue, like the first, is simple with regards to narrative levels. Only one exists since there is no story within a story.

The third phase of our analysis centers on "person". Genette maintains that the terms "first person" or "third person narrative" are inadequate. He prefers to use "homo-diegetic" narrative in order to designate the first person narrative and "heterodiegetic" narrative to designate the third person narrative. It is also important to distinguish between the use of the "je" by a narrator who is just telling the story as a witness and a narrator who is a character in the story.

In the prologue to *Pantagruel*, the reader is being convinced that the book is one of truth recounted by an eye-witness:

> C'est des horribles faictz et prouesses de Pantagruel lequel j'ay servy a gaiges dês ce que je fuz hors de page jusques à present, que par son congîé je m'en suis venu visiter mon pais de vache, et scâvoir si en vie estoyt parent mien aulcun". (P. pp. 218, 219)

No such pretense is made in the prologue to *Gargantua*. The reader is left to assume that this book is allegorical or purely imaginative. We do not know this time if the narrator will be a character in the book. His presence or absence in the story is not made clear. The narrator is, however, present in the prologue and this is a good example of a homodiegetic narrative. This technique fosters a feeling of closeness between author and reader since the former identifies himself
with the text. Evidence of this can be found in the many references the narrator makes to himself through the use of "je" as well as possessive pronouns and adjectives. In all there are fourteen references to the narrator. It also must be recalled that all references to the second person plural evoke the first person. Just as in the first prologue the role of narrator is extradiegetic-homodiegetic, that is, he is outside the events, but relates them in the first person.

Following closely Genette's line of analysis of "the person", we must study the role of the narrator and his functions. Other than the "narrating function", where he tells the story, he fulfills other functions. Firstly, there is the "directing function", which is operative when the narrator makes references to the text in his discourse. In all there are at least a dozen references to the text. These are divided into two opposing sides: one that tells us to read the book seriously:

car en icelle bien aultre goust trouverez et doctrine plus absconce, laquelle vous revelera de tres haultz sacremens et mysteres horribiques, tant en ce que concerne nostre religion que aussi l'estat politicq et vie oeconomicque. (G. p. 8)

the other encourages us to enjoy the book at face value:

Or esbaudissez vous, mes amours, et guayement lisez le reste, tout à l'aize du corps et au profit des reins! Mais escoutez, vietz d'azes, - que le maulubec vous trouisque! - vous souvienne de boyre à my pour la pareille, et je vous plegeray tout ares metys. (G. p. 9)

The reader is left to anticipate what will be said in the book that is to follow. In spite of the strong "directing function" the reader cannot be sure of Rabelais' intentions.

The first of the three functions that affect the narrating
situation is the "function of communication" the purpose of which is to keep the contact between narrator and narratee open without necessarily having to transmit any real message. Rabelais establishes a line of communication between narrator and narratee from the very first sentence by using the vocative twice: "Beuveurs tres illustres, et vous, Veroléz tres precieux, - car à vous, non à aultres, sont dediez mes escriptz". (G. p. 5) The narrator makes it clear that he is speaking to his audience and he immediately makes that contact and then goes on to strengthen it through the use of the interrogative:

A quel propos, en voustre advis, tend ce prelude et coup d'essay? (G. p. 6) Mais veistes vous oncques chien rencontrant quelque os medulare? (G. p. 7) Croiez vous en vostre foy qu'oncques Homere, escrivent l'Iliade et Odyssey, pensast es allegories...? (G. p. 8)

Because of the use of interrogative sentences, the text reads like a dialogue, the best form to depict communication. A kind of unspoken contract is established between narrator and narratee with regards to how the book should be read:

Pour tant, interpretez tous mes faictz et mes dictz en la perfectissime partie; ayez en reverence le cerveau caseiforme qui vous paist de ces belles billes vezées, et, à vostre povoir, tenez moy tousjours joyeux. (G. p. 9)

The author is asking that his text be read in what is a contradictory manner: seriously and lightheartedly. The question remains whether or not to choose between the two or accept them at the same time. "Ayez en reverence" would seem to indicate seriousness, but when it is juxtaposed to the comic image "cerveau caseiforme", the request can hardly be taken in earnest. It is difficult to respect a cheeselike brain.
The exterior versus interior image is also evident here because the appearance of a cheese can often be very deceiving as to its real taste.

The many vocatives, interrogatives, and imperatives in this prologue show that Rabelais was genuinely concerned about establishing a channel of communication between narrator and narratee. The nature of the prologue, whose purpose is to establish a direct link between author and reader, is proof enough that communication is a major goal. It is not Rabelais' aim, however, to make communication simple and straightforward. As always, Rabelais wants his readers to participate actively in the work and come to their own conclusions once he has presented them with both sides of the coin in any argument.

The "testimonial function", which is the second of the three functions affecting the narrating situation reveals to us the nature of the speaker's attitude towards his subject matter. In the first prologue the nature of the speaker's attitude towards his subject matter was quite clear, but such is not the case in the second prologue. In the prologue to Pantagruel the speaker's role was to convince the listener/reader that the story being told was the truth given to them by an eye-witness. Here, paragraphs one to five are a convincing argument for interpreting the text in such a way as to find seriousness where there is only apparent comedy:

Par autant que vous, mes bons disciples, (...) jugez trop facilement ne estre au dedans traicté que mocqueries, folateries et menteries joyeuses, veu
Rabelais is even more explicit in paragraph five:

Car en icelle bien aultre goust trouverez et doctrine
plus absconce, laquelle vous revelera de tres haultz
sacremens et mysteres horrificques, tant en ce que
concerne nostre religion que aussi l'estat politicq
et vie oeconomicque. (G. p. 8)

These seem clear and irrefutable arguments for not being
satisfied with merely a literal reading of the text.

However, no sooner has he said this than Rabelais takes
the opposite stance. He tells us that we are wrong to assume
that a writer like Homer had anything allegorical in mind when
he wrote his works. He goes on to say that when he himself
wrote his book:

je ne perdiz ne emploiy oncques plus, ny aultre
temps que celluy qui estoit estably a prendre ma
refection corporelle, sçavoir est beuvant et mangeant.
(G. p. 9)

He concludes his argument for accepting what is written at
face value by saying:

Or esbaudissez vous, mes amours, et guayement lisez
le reste, tout à l'aise du corps et au profit des
reins! (G. p. 9)

This is not the same line of defence as in paragraphs one
to five, but it is not an easy choice. We are left disquieted,
uncertain, and in doubt as to how the book should be read.

The third function concerning the narrative situation is
the "ideological function". It is similar to the testimonial
function where the narrator comments on the story, letting us
thus perceive how he feels about certain issues. It is very
difficult to separate this function from the preceding testimonial function. Any commentary Rabelais makes that would reveal his ideological point of view is inserted discreetly. His comments like:

l'habit ne faict point le moyne. (G. p. 6)
à plus hault sens interpreter ce que par adventure cuidiez dict en gayeté de cueur. (G. p. 7)
c'est à dire ce que j'entends par ces symboles Pythagoricques. (G. pp. 7, 8)

reveal a certain principle, one that points to looking for a deeper meaning in literature. However, in the second half of the prologue the opposing view is presented and it too can be a reflection of the "ideological function". Rabelais' comment about "un Frere Lubin" referring to a certain monk who claimed to have discovered images of the Christian religion in Ovid, plus the debate concerning wine and oil, show a different type of ideology. The whole prologue could be considered as a commentary on approaches to reading a literary work.

Of the five functions mentioned above, the predominant ones are the "directing function" and the "function of communication". These two functions were also predominant in the first prologue as we showed in our analysis. The "directing function" focuses on the text while the "function of communication" ensures that an atmosphere of dialogue prevails throughout the prologue.

The last phase of our analysis, following Genette's principles, concentrates on the role of the narratee. Here again, as in the previous prologue, we have seen that the narrator is extradiegetic and therefore the narratee must also be extradiegetic. It is very easy to confuse this type
of narratee with the implied reader with whom each real reader can in turn identify. Because of the absence of an intradiegetic narratee, the presence of an intermediary between us and the narrator seems diminished and therefore the gap between narrator and narratee is lessened. The story is not being told to any particular individual as in a "roman épistolaire" for example, but in general to "Beuveurs tres illustres, et vous, Verolez tres precieux" (G. p. 5), and "mes bons disciples, et quelques aultres foulz de sejour". (G. p. 6) In other words it is for those who read what he writes that Rabelais strengthens the pact between narrator and narratee by his extensive use of the vocative. In each paragraph the vocative is used at least twice (usually at the beginning) except for paragraph eight where it occurs four times in the last sentence. The last and shortest paragraph contains six vocatives and so the narrator/narratee relationship gets stronger and stronger toward the end of the prologue. Rabelais wishes to assure the support of his readers before he begins his tale.

The tone Rabelais adopts toward the narratee is much clearer in the prologue to *Pantagruel* than it is in the prologue to *Gargantua*. In the former there is a clear downward movement from elevated to pejorative terms. In the prologue to the latter, however, this sharp shift in tone is not manifest. From the beginning there is a certain ambiguity surrounding the narratee, due to the juxtaposition of "beuveurs" to "illustres", and "verolez" to "precieux". The ambiguity continues in the second paragraph where "mes bons disciples,
et quelques aultres foulz de sejour" are placed side by side. These are the only two descriptions we have of the narratee.

The narratee has a much more responsible role in the prologue to *Gargantua*. He is not being asked simply to accept something but to interpret it:

*Pour tant, interpretez tous mes faictz et mes dictz en la perfectissime parte; ayez en reverence le cerveau caseiforme qui vous paist de ces belles billesvezées, et, à vostre povoir, tenez moy tousjours joyeux.* (G. p. 9)

The prologue to *Gargantua* ends on a vaguely similar note to that of the prologue to *Pantagruel*, that is, with a curse. However, Rabelais restricts himself to uttering one curse in this compared to seven in the previous prologue. The curse coupled with "mes amours" and "vietz d'azes" does not have such a powerful effect of intimidation. The narrator cajoles the narratee. We have the distinct impression that Rabelais has mellowed because his insults, as well as his praise and flattering of the reader, are greatly subdued showing more sophistication on his part. One must also keep in mind that the subject matter of this prologue is more serious because of the nature of the argument presented by Rabelais. The role of the narratee remains an important but ambiguous one. The narratee in the prologue has choices; firstly, to accept the argument of always looking for a hidden meaning; secondly, to believe the argument that tells us to take things at face value; or, thirdly, to adopt the position of doubt and questioning. Rabelais wants to make certain that his work is perceived in an open-minded manner.
This concludes the analysis of the "narrative instance" in the prologue to Gargantua. As the prologue to Pantagruel, the present one was written in the present tense for an audience whose participation Rabelais solicits. References are also made to the past and future in both prologues. In the prologue to Pantagruel, however, Rabelais refers to the immediate past, whereas in the prologue to Gargantua he turns to references of antiquity in order to justify his arguments, giving his argument in the air of seriousness. Both prologues are written on only the extradiegetic level of narration and both have an extradiegetic-homodiegetic narrator. We can thus conclude that the "directing function" and the "function of communication" are the two predominant functions of the narrator in both prologues. There is a noted change in the role of the narratee from the first to the second prologue. In the prologue to Pantagruel the narratee was subject to excessive flattery or excessive abuse. In the prologue to Gargantua the narratee is treated more objectively and given a more responsible and active role, he is asked to interpret what he reads, revealing an evolution in the author's attitude towards his readers and his authorial responsibility.
NOTES

CHAPTER TWO

1. François Rabelais, *Gargantua, Oeuvres Complètes*, Tome I (Paris: Editions Garnier Frères, 1962), p. 5. All future references to this text will be designated as G. followed by the page number.


4. Lines 14, 26, 44, and 58 give the reader the impression of a well thought out argument and of more self-assurance on the author's part.

5. Gendre, p. 11.


7. Cf. pp. 34, 35 above.
CHAPTER THREE

PROLOGUE TO LE TIERS LIVRE

Le Tiers Livre des faicts et dicta heroiques du bon Pantagruel was published in 1546, twelve years after Rabelais' second book, Gargantua. Unlike the first two books, this one appeared under his own name. For a time his previous two books were banned by the Sorbonne but he received a "Privilège" from the king to publish Le Tiers Livre and republish the previous two, indicating that he was favoured and protected by royalty. Le Tiers Livre differs markedly from Pantagruel and Gargantua. The theme of the giants, their childhood, education, and exploits is abandoned in favour of a theme on a more human scale. It deals with the problem of decision-making, in Panurge's case, that of marriage.

The present prologue is much longer than the first two and it is much more complex. Where the first two prologues contained long digressions seemingly irrelevant to the book itself, the prologue to Le Tiers Livre is comprised of two complete stories, the first concerning the philosopher Diogenes and the second Ptolomy. The two stories, as we shall see, serve to illustrate two of Rabelais' main ideas in the prologue.

In the prologue to Pantagruel the author presents his book as a magical medicine, and in the prologue to Gargantua he shows his concern for the interpretation of his book, presenting a serious and non-serious reading of the text. The prologue to Le Tiers Livre shows the author's concerns
about the questions of activity versus idleness and the acceptance of new ideas. The prologue also exemplifies the author's doubts about himself as a writer and about his literary creation.

At the beginning of the prologue, Rabelais addresses his public just as he did in the previous two, introducing the subject, in this case "Diogenes, le philosophe cynic". According to the Rabelaisian scholar Screech, Rabelais probably borrowed the story of Diogenes either from Lucien or Budé, familiar as he was with the works of both authors. The story of Diogenes itself is defined as a "narré", a "short dramatic action" in Margaret Spanos' article "Functions of the Prologues in the Works of Rabelais". This short dramatic action reveals Rabelais' concern regarding idleness. It begins with the announcement of Philip of Macedonia's plans of attack against Corinth and a description of how the citizens of this city prepared to defend themselves against the invading forces:

\[
\text{tous feurent non à tort espoventez, et ne feurent negligens soy soigneusement mettre chacun en office et debvoir pour à son hostile venue resister et leur ville defendre.}
\]

The description of the defence and the enumeration of the armaments of Corinth is, according to Bakhtin, the largest listing of its kind in world literature. Rabelais, for instance, uses thirteen terms for swords and eight for lances. This accumulation of weaponry lends an epic quality to the prologue and at the same time ties it in with the marketplace.
form of the two previous prologues where the vendor tries to pass off his product by way of extreme exaggerations. As Bakhtin points out, the accumulation of weaponry is all part of the "loud street ordinance" so common in Rabelais' time.

The preparations for war are a serious matter and the long listing of weaponry, by its piling up effect, serves to convey a tone of urgency to the actions of the Corinthians. In ending the long description, Rabelais cannot resist the temptation to insert a traditional joke regarding the women of Corinth. He states:

Femme n'estoit, tant preude ou vieille feust, qui ne feist fourbir son harnoys: comme vous sçavez que les antiques Corinthiennes estoient au combat couraigeuses. (T.L. p. 396)

The Corinthian women were known for their courage in amatory combat and so Rabelais transfers this to mean their courage in field combat as well.

When the reader finally encounters Diogenes, he is presented in direct contrast with the other citizens of Corinth. He is not employed in any of the preparations for war. After observing his compatriots for a few days, he decides to abandon his idleness and undertakes some personal effort. This switch is made rather suddenly and then feverishly he begins to push his barrel. The reader of course anticipates that Diogenes is undertaking an activity related to the preparation for war, for Rabelais describes him: "comme excité d'esprit Martial". (T.L. p. 396) However, the "esprit Martial" does not instill a feeling for war in Diogenes. Once on top of the hill Diogenes "y roulla le tonneau fictil". (T.L. p. 396) Rabelais
compares these actions to those of Sisyphus that suggest the long, seemingly never-ending, toil of Diogenes. This comparison also gives the story somewhat of a mythical dimension.

When asked what motivates him to roll his barrel so, Diogenes replies that:

à aultrre office n'estant pour la republicque employé il en ceste façon son tonneau tempestoit pour, entre ce peuple tant fervent et occupé, n'estre veu seul cessateur et ocieux. (T.L. p. 397)

Diogenes' aimless activity is as feverish as the activity of the other citizens preparing for war. It is in fact a parody of the preparations for war. But even though Diogenes does not participate in the military activities he feels strongly that he should not be idle. This is perhaps an indication that Rabelais does not intend to negate completely what the Corinthians are doing. Bakhtin states:

But here again there is no bare negation of his patriotic work; the accent is placed on the fact that Diogenes' flippant parody is also useful, that he also serves in his way the defense of Corinth. No one should be idle, but laughter is not an idle occupation. The right to laughter and gay parody is here opposed not to the heroic citizens of Corinth but to the calumniators, to the enemies of free humour.⁶

Once the episode of Diogenes is completed, the reader's attention is focussed on the world of the author and the pre-occupation of his era, which happen to be exactly the same as that of Corinth where everyone is seen:

soy instantement exercer et travailler, part à la fortification de sa patrie, et la defendre, part au repoulsement des ennemis, et les offendre. (T.L. p. 397)

Since he was not chosen to participate in the offensive seg-
-ment of his country's army the author finds himself in a state of inactivity similar to that of Diogenes. However, this idleness does not suit Rabelais any more than it suited Diogenes, he states that:

"ay impute à honte plus que mediocre être veu spectateur ocieux de tant vaillans, disers et chevalereux personnages, qui en veue et spectacle de toute Europe jouent ceste insigne fable et tragique comédie, ne me esvertuer de moy mesmes et non y consommer ce rien, mon tout, qui me restoit. Car peu de gloire me semble accroitre à ceux qui seulement y emploient leurs œilz, au demeurant y espargnent leurs forces, celent leurs escuz, cachent leur argent...(T.L. p. 398)

Inactivity during war time is totally inappropriate and one should do what one can. Rabelais conveys this idea by the example of Diogenes who decides to roll a barrel back and forth. Like Diogenes, he does not take an active part in the military efforts but instead decides to roll his own barrel:

"Prins ce choys et election, ay pensé ne faire exercice inutile et importun, si je remuois mon tonneau Diogenic qui seul m'est resté du naufrage fait par le passé on far de Mal'encontre. (T.L. p. 398)

The above quotation is the beginning of an association between the Diogenic barrel and the author's work that will become all the more explicit throughout the prologue. In the following quotation we see the importance the barrel holds for Rabelais:

"Attendez un peu que je hume quelque trait de ceste bouteille: c'est mon vray et seul Helicon, c'est ma fontaine caballine, c'est mon unicque enthousiasme. Icy beuvant je delibere, je discours, je resoulz et conclus. Après l'épilogue je rix, j'escripz, je compose, je boy. (T.L. pp. 398, 399)

The wine contained in the barrel gives him the necessary inspiration and strength he needs to write his book. As in
the prologue to *Gargantua*, Rabelais gives examples of ancient writers (Ennius, Aeschylus, Homer, and Caton) all of whom drank while they wrote and wrote while they drank. Rabelais himself is merely following their example. The reader should not feel excluded from this. He is invited to take a drink provided he praises God for it:

> Si de mesmes vous autres beuvez un grand ou deux petitz coups en robbe, je n'y trouve inconvenient aulcun, pourveu que du tout louez Dieu un tantinet. (T.L. p. 399)

In speaking about himself it also becomes evident that the author believes in predestination, but not in the Calvin-istic sense:

> Puys doncques que telle est ou ma sort ou ma destinee (car a chascun n'est oultroye entrer et habiter Corinthe) ma deliberation est servir et es uns et es autres; tant s'en fault que je reste cessateur et inutile. (T.L. p. 399)

Rabelais believes that each person will fulfill his unique and inevitable destiny, no matter how unpleasant the road. Rabelais' destiny was obviously not to make war but to write books:

> Envers les guerroyans je voys de nouveau percer mon tonneau. Et de la traicte, (laquelle par deux praecedens volumes (si par l'imposture des imprimeurs n'euissent esté pervertiz et brouillez) vous feust assez congneue) leur tirer du creu de nos passetemps epicenaires un gaullant tiercin et consecutivement un joyeulk quart de sentences Pantagrueliques; par moy licite vous sera les appeler Diogenicques. (T.L. pp. 399, 400)

Diogenes' barrel and Rabelais' literary creation have been equated implicitly throughout the prologue but in the above quote the idea becomes explicit when the author refers to his two previous books, *Pantagruel* and *Gargantua*, published under a pseudonym. Now writing and publishing under his own
name, Rabelais accepts responsibility for the previous books as well, and promises an imminent fourth book. Even though, like Diogenes, Rabelais does not take part in the war as a soldier, he is conscious of its importance and expresses his concern by plunging into his work rather than idly standing by.

The second major concern Rabelais deals with in the prologue is the question of the acceptance of novel ideas. He deals with this question by means of another "narré". It consists of a short dramatic action almost unrelated to the dialogue between author and reader. The author recounts a story, he supposedly once read, about Ptolemy who tried to ingratiate himself with the Egyptians by offering them two rare gifts. The first gift was a Bactrian camel, all black, and the second was a slave whose body was half black and half white. Ptolemy hoped that these gifts would augment the people's love for him but they produced the reverse effect: he was put to death. Instead of being rewarded for his ingenuity, he is punished. Rabelais recounts this tale to show the danger one faces in presenting new ideas. It was not always beneficial to be innovative and it was certainly always safer to remain within the status quo.

The story of the camel and the slave is certainly allegorical as was the story of Diogenes for Rabelais scarcely ever writes only on one level. The author's books can be equated with Ptolemy's gifts. Their unique character endangered their giver. Just as the Egyptians put Ptolemy to death for being a non-conformist, so the Sorbonne establishment could have
tried Rabelais for heresy. However, Rabelais is more concerned about the reading public which might not accept the novelty of his book.

This fear of not being accepted by the public is crystallized when Rabelais clearly states:

Cestuy exemple me faict entre espoir et craincte varier, doubtant que pour contentement propensé je rencontre ce que je abhorre, mon thesaur soit charbons, pour Venus advieigne Barbet le chien, en lieu de les servir je les fasche, en lieu de les esbaudir, je les offense, en lieu de leurs complaire, je desplaise et soit mon adventure telle que du coq de Euclion.  
(T.L. p. 401)

He fears that he will meet the same fate as Euclion's rooster: "lequel, pour en grattant avoir descouvert le thesaur, eut la couppe guorgée". (T.L. p. 401) He asks "Would it not be distressing if that were to happen to me?". According to him it is not an impossibility: "Autresfoys est il advenu: advenir encore pourroit". (T.L. p. 401) Suddenly, Rabelais' fears disappear and a new confidence in the public emerges. He believes that they will accept the new literary form he has to offer because they are also filled with the Pantagruelian spirit and would not condemn his work for they are aware of the author's good intentions.

Having expressed his ideas on inactivity during a time of war and the uncertainty of presenting the public with new ideas, Rabelais once again turns our attention to his barrel, inviting us to drink: "Enfans, beuvez à pleins guodetz". (T.L. p. 401) He clarifies the invitation saying that he is not one to twist a person's arm: he leaves the decision
The author assures his readers that his barrel will be inexhaustible. They need not fear that there will not be enough wine as at the wedding feast at Cana. As Christ turned water into wine, he will make sure that his casks remain a living spring with a perpetual flow as well. Rabelais is equating his work with a mystical power saying that it is life giving. He gives other inexhaustible sources of joy in order to validate his claim and at the same time to show his knowledge of ancient literature:

Attendez un peu que je hume quelque trait de ceste bouteille: c'est mon vray et seul Helicon, c'est ma fontaine caballine, c'est mon unique enthusiasm. (T.L. p. 398)

He equates the barrel with Pandora's box: "Bon espoir y gist au fond, comme en la bouteille de Pandora". (T.L. p. 402)

When Pandora's box was opened, all the good and evil escaped from it, leaving only hope, and by comparison we can deduce that Rabelais' book holds a lot of hope. The allusions the author makes here fortify his argument by showing the authority of time and of writers of all eras.

The penultimate paragraph continues on the same note of authority. Rabelais states: "Notez bien ce que j'ay dict, et quelle maniere de gens je invite", (T.L. p. 402) and in
rather unflattering terms he refers to those he excludes from his gathering. This aspect will be discussed in greater detail when we deal with the author/reader relationship.

How a writer expresses his ideas is important in any literary work but with Rabelais, style is an element that needs to be examined in detail. The most impressive stylistic feature of this prologue is the accumulation of expressions that have essentially the same meaning. This becomes evident when Rabelais describes the activities of the Corinthians preparing to defend themselves against the invading army of Philip of Macedonia. His description is organized according to a well-defined pattern. The paragraphs begin with "Les uns...", "Les aultres...", and "chascun...". This pattern is repeated twice. The type of verb phrases and nouns Rabelais likes to compile can be illustrated by the following quotations:

Les autres remparoient murailles, dressoient bastions, esquarroient revelins, cavoient fossez, escuroient contremines, gabionnoient defenses, ordon-noient plates formes, vuidoient chasmates, rembar-roient faulses brayes, erigeoient cavalliers, ressapoient contrescarpes, enduisoient courtines, produisoient moyneaux, taluoient parapetes, enclavoient barba-canes, asseroient machicoulis, renouoient herses Sarrazinesques et Cataractes, assoyoient sentinelles, forissoient patrouilles. (T.L. p. 395)

All these activities are associated with reinforcing their city against the onslaught of the invading army. The list of weaponry is also very impressive. The author prides himself on the rich vocabulary he has at his command designating essentially the same objects by many different words either from the Middle Ages or the sixteenth century:
Apart from the sheer joy of expending the verbal energy of discourse, Rabelais uses this accumulation of weaponry not only to overwhelm the reader with his own literary abilities but also to convey the vast dimensions of war.

When describing Diogenes, pushing the barrel up and down the hill, the author uses sixty-four verbs, all ending in "oit" and most of them containing the "R" sound: "tournoit, viroit, brouilloit, barbouilloit; hersoit, versoit, renversoit, ...". (T.L. p. 396) The repetitious monotonous rhythm of the above quotation almost conveys the movement of the barrel and the sounds of the contents of the barrel swooshing from side to side with the rolling motion.

Rabelais is also very skillful at manipulating words in order to surprise his readers. He enjoys the playfulness this skill affords him. An example of this manipulation occurs at the beginning of the prologue with the sentence: "C'est belle chose voir la clairte du (vin et escuz) Soleil". (T.L. p. 393) While the reader expects to see the word "soleil" in print, there is a short delay. The words in parentheses just happen to be two of Rabelais favourite topics: wine and money...

In the second paragraph of the prologue we have an example of how the author deals with one of these favourite topics:

Vous item n'estez jeunes, qui est qualité competente pour en vin, non en vain, ainsi plus que physicalement
philosopher et désormais estre du conseil Bacchique, pour en lopinant opiner des substances, couleur, odeur, excellence, eminence, propriété, faculté, vertus, effect et dignité du benoist et désiré piot. (T.L. p. 393)

First, Rabelais plays on the words with "en vin non en vain", the two nouns have the same sound but a different meaning. Then he ends the sentence with a long list of the positive qualities of wine.

Rabelais' poetic talent is evident in his handling of language as in the following sentence:

je serviray les massons, je mettray bouillir pour les massons, et, le past terminé, au son de ma musette mesureray la musarderie des musars. (T.L. p. 399)

Here again, the author carefully and tunefully chooses alliterative words, this time beginning with "m", to produce a rhythmical effect. He avails himself of poetic license changing the natural word order. When referring to Euclion's rooster, he writes: "lequel, pour en grattant avoir descouvert le thesaur, eut la couppe guorgee". (T.L. p. 401) The reader is caught by surprise when he sees the last two words. Everyone is aware that the phrase should read "guorge couppee" but Rabelais relishes in dealing with the unexpected and so permits himself not only to reverse word order but also to change an adjective into a noun and a noun into an adjective. He does not hesitate to integrate purely oral language into written form. At the end of the prologue he makes threatening noises like "Gzz,gzzz,gzzzz" (T.L. p. 403), sounds rarely seen in print.

As in the previous two prologues one of the aspects of Rabelais' style is a tendency to shift from a lofty to a common level of language or sphere of reference. The beginning
of the prologue is itself a good example of this. The author, in addressing the good people, as well as the boozers and the gouty, talks to them about the ambiguous figure of the cynic philosopher Diogenes. This mention is followed by a Biblical reference to one of Jesus' miracles, namely granting the gift of sight to a blind man.

Rabelais' description of the preparations for war end on an unexpected note, a pun about the amatory and military prowesses of Corinthian women:

\[
\text{Femme n'estoit, tant preude ou vieille feust, qui ne feist fourbir son harnoys: comme vous sçavez que les antiques Corinthiennes estoient au combat couraigeuses. (T.L. p. 396)}
\]

Later, in a paragraph devoted to discussing the importance of the barrel and mentioning ancient authors, Rabelais inserts a little comedy: "Par la vierge qui se rebrasse, je ne sçay encore". (T.L. p. 398) The humour prevents the reader from becoming serious enough to forget the oral and marketplace character of this prologue. Making fun of the Virgin would certainly be sacrilegious in any other context, but on the stand of the marketplace the comic imagination can have free rein.

Rabelais asserts that although he will not fight the war as a soldier, he will nevertheless sing the praises of the victories. But this paragraph, like many others, ends on an unexpected note of familiarity in sharp contrast to the elevated tone that prevails up to that point: "Je n'y fauldray par Laphathium acutum de Dieu, si Mars ne failloit à Quaresme; mais il s'en donnera bien garde, le paillard". (T.L. p. 400)
"Lapathium" was pronounced as "la passion". This subtly allows Rabelais to swear by the passion of Christ. That is also a way of saying that something is inevitable because the month of March is always during Lent. The last part of the sentence refers to "Mars" the god of war. "Mars" was known for his amorous exploits with Venus, hence the epithet "paillard" and, by association, Rabelais is revealing his affection for those who give in to the flesh. This one sentence shows a mixture of religious, common, and ancient spheres of references, skillfully brought together to keep the reader alert and interested and to touch on every aspect of life.

The change in levels of language leads us to an examination of the author/reader relationship because there is a definite shift in the author's attitude towards his reader throughout this prologue. The rapport between author and reader can best be studied in that part of the prologue that Margaret Spanos calls "devis" in her article "Functions of the Prologues in the Works of Rabelais".

This prologue, like the others, starts with the author's address to the public. Here he treats them as "Bonnes gens, Beuveurs tresillustres, et vous Goutteux tresprecieux". (T.I. p. 393) Rabelais is flattering them in a jocular manner as he did in the prologue to Gargantua. Throughout the "devis", the author manipulates his audience by asking them questions about Diogenes, who will be the subject of the "narré". This manipulation takes place in the form of questions that the reader of course never has a chance to answer: "veistez vous
oncques Diogenes, le philosophe cynic? Si l'avez veu, vous n'aviez perdu la veue". (T.L. p. 393) Later he inquires: "Si veu ne l'avez (comme facilement je suis induict à croire), pour le moins avez vous ouy de luy parler". (T.L. p. 393) The public of course could not possibly have seen Diogenes, and the storyteller is well aware of it but he is leading them on so that he can talk about what he wants to:

Si n'en avez ouy parler, de luy vous veulx presentement une histoire narrer, pour entrer en vin (beuvez doncques) et propous (escoutez doncques), vous advertissant (affin que ne soiez en simplesse pippez comme gens mescreans) qu'en son temps il feut philosophe rare et joyeux entre mille. S'il avoit quelques imperfections, aussi avez vous, aussi avons nouš. (T.L. p. 394)

Whether the listeners had heard of Diogenes or not, Rabelais will tell his tale anyhow.

All of the rhetorical questions to the reader, as well as the remarks in parentheses "(beuvez doncques)", "(escoutez doncques)" help to create an atmosphere of conviviality. These are the types of comments one would expect to hear from a storyteller rather than read in a book. Although this prologue was written years after Pantagruel, the oral tradition is still maintained. We have the impression that Rabelais is gathering the people around him in the storyteller's manner.

One of the author's main concerns is that his book be accepted by the public but he does not, as a result, put the readers on a pedestal. This is evident from the way he addresses them at the beginning of the prologue and again in the following quotation: "(afin que ne soiez en simplesse pippez comme gens mescreans)". Rabelais is essentially saying that they are
simple and that they can be deceived like so many infidels.

After recounting the story of Diogenes the author is careful to maintain the storytelling atmosphere he strived to establish in the first half of the "devis". The story of Ptolomy is interspersed with comments directed at the listener: "Me souvient toutesfoys avoir leu(...), Qu'en advient-il? (...), "Somme". (T.L. p. 400) After the story of the camel and the slave the oral character of the prologue is maintained with sentences like: "Cestuy exemple me faict entre espoir et craincte varier," (...), "De ce poinct expedie, a mon tonneau je retourne" (T.L. p. 401) and "Notez bien ce que j'ay dict". (T.L. p. 402) These comments are strictly for the benefit of an audience. Rabelais wants to keep their attention by involving them in the storytelling process.

Even though the opinion of the public is ultimately important for any author, we saw that Rabelais does not try to win it over by tact or by being overly complimentary. He does, however, at one point show some confidence in its judgement concerning his book. After expressing his fears of condemnation the author shows some self assurance:

Non fera, Hercules! Je reconnois en eulx tous une forme specifique et proprieté individuale, laquelle nos majeurs nomenclent Pantagruelisme, moientant laquelle jamais en maulvaise partie ne prendront choses quelconques ilz congoistront sourdre de bon, franc, et loyal couraige. Je les ay ordinairement veuz bon vouloir en payement prendre et en icelluy acquiescer, quand debilité de puissance y a esté assossiée. (T.L. p. 401)

He is confident that his public will not misinterpret him, and with this in mind he invites his friendly audience to drink from his barrel: "Sus à ce vin, compaings! Enfans,
beuvez à pleins guodetz" (T.L. p. 401) (...) Tout Beuveur de bien, tout Goutteux de bien, alterez, venens à ce mien tonneau"...(T.L. p. 402) This invitation has a ring of friendly familiarity but the tone does not last.

The last two paragraphs sound familiar only in so far as they remind the reader of the prologue to Pantagruel. In them Rabelais adopts an authoritative tone starting with:

Notez bien ce que j'ay dit, et quelle maniere de gens je invite (...) je ne l'ay persé que pour vous, Gens de bien, Beuveurs de la prime cuvée, et Goutteux de franc alleu. (T.L. p. 402)

The rest of the prologue is then devoted to telling the public who is not invited to be a part of Rabelais' audience. He uses a very pejorative language to indicate that lawyers and doctors are not welcome, n'éither are the avaricious and ugly:

Des caphars encore moins, quoy que tous soient beuveurs oultrez tous verollez croustelevez, guarniz de alteration inextinguible et manducation insatiable. Pourquo? Pource qu'ilz ne sont de bien, ains de mal... (T.L. p. 403)

Rabelais becomes very abusive in the second half of the last paragraph. He does not use exactly the same curses as he did in the preceding two prologues but he is very adamant about chasing the uninitiated from his presence:

Pourant arrière, cagotz! Aux ouailles, mastins! Hors d'icy, caphars, de par le Diable hay! Estez vous encorez là? Je renonce ma part de Papimanie, si je vous happe. Gzz. gzzz. gzzzz. Davant davant! Iront ilz? Jamais ne puissiez vous fianter que à sanglades d'estrivieres, jamais pisser que à l'estrapade, jamais eschauffer que à coups de baston! (T.L. p. 403)

Crudely, Rabelais alludes not only to usually unmentioned bodily functions but also to sadistic sexual pleasure. He uses such body language because everyone is most vulnerable
at the physical level.

The prologue to _Le Tiers Livre_, like the first two pro-
logues, has many of the same oral characteristics, with the
initial address to the public, the rhetorical questions through-
out and the curses at the end. But this prologue differs
from the previous two in length and structure. We find the
usual dialogue between author/reader or storyteller/listener
but in addition it contains two complete short tales. The
prologue to _Pantagruel_ focuses on the problem of establishing a
literary work of art but the prologue to _Gargantua_ deals with the
problem of interpretation. This prologue focuses on the author
and his concerns about reader acceptance.

In the second part of the chapter we examine more thor-
oughly a topic we have already touched upon and which may be
the most interesting aspect of the prologues, the author/reader
relationship. The nature of the prologue in which the author
is speaking to his public makes this special rapport its focal
point. As in the previous two chapters we will follow the
principles outlined by Genette in order to examine the narrating
instance by analysing the "time of narrating", "narrative level",
and "persón".

One of the elements of "the generative instance of
narrative discourse" to be examined is the time of narrating.
We will focus on the way in which the events are told in
relation to time. Since the prologue is presented as an actual
encounter between storyteller and listener it is written for
the most part in the present with references to the past and
The use of the present tense establishes a close author/reader relationship and shows the presence of an immediate audience that must be dealt with. In the first half of the "devis" the storyteller addresses the listener in the present tense: "je suis vrayement forissu (...) Vous item n'estez jeunes (...) je suis induict à croire (...) vous estes tous du sang de Phrygie extraictz (ou je me abuse)". (T.L. pp. 393, 394)

Just before launching into his story of Diogenes, Rabelais addresses his readers once again in the present:

"de luy vous veulx presentement une histoire narrer, pour entrer en vin (beuzez doncques) et propous (escoutez doncques), vous advertissant (...). S'il avoit quelques imperfections, aussi avez vous, aussi avons nous. (T.L. p. 394)"

Half way through the "narré" Rabelais interjects a comment to the reader which illustrates how the present tense brings together storyteller and listener: "comme vous scavez que les antiques Corinthiennes estoient au combat couraigeuses". (T.L. p. 396) After he finishes the story of Diogenes the author wants the reader to consider his own case and he presents this in the present tense as well:

"Je pareillement, quoy que soys hors d'effroy, ne suis toutesfoys hors d'esmoi, de moy voyant n'estre fait aucun pris digne d'oeuvre, et consyderant par tout ce tresnoble royaulme de France, deça, dela les mens, un chacun aujourd'huy soy instantement exercer et travailler... (T.L. p. 397)"

With the second "narré" about the camel and the slave, the author involves the reader directly by the use of the present tense at the beginning of the anecdote: "Me souvient toutesfoys"
and then once again in the middle of the story he interjects a rhetorical question "Qu'en advient-il?". (T.L. p. 400)

The past tense is used when Rabelais draws on the reader's past experiences or on his own as storyteller. For example, before telling the story of Diogenes he asks his audience: "Si l'avez veu (...) Si veu ne l'avez (...) pour le moins avez vous ouy de luy parler". (T.L. p. 393) The stories he tells about Diogenes and Ptolemy are both told in the past tense as is the short digression about Euclion's rooster and how he meets his end.

The use of the future tense is limited. Rabelais uses it when talking about his destiny:

je feray ce que feirent Neptune et Appolo en Troie soubs Laomedon, ce que feit Renaud de Montaulban sus ses derniers jours: je serviray les massons, je mettray bouillir pour les massons, et, le past terminé au son de ma musette mesureray la musarderie des musars. Ainsi fonda, bastit et edifia Amphion, sonnant de sa lyre, la grande et celebre cite de Thebes. Envers les guerroyans je voys de nouveau percer mon tonneau. (T.L. p. 399)

The imperative and future tenses are used when he speaks of the destiny of his book which he equates with a barrel of wine:

Et paour ne ayez que le vin faille, comme feist es nopces de Cana en Galilée. Autant que vous en tireray par la dille autant en entonneray par le bondon. Ainsi demeurera le tonneau inexpuisible. (T.L. p. 402)

The prologue also closes with the imperative and future tenses. Rabelais is chasing the uninitiated reader from his presence, throwing in a curse at the end just for good measure. It is significant that the ending is written in the future tense because it shows the author's preoccupation with reader acceptance.
It also serves as an invitation and introduction to the book, opening it to an outside time-space.

From the previous two chapters, we have already established that the prologues are separate from the books they precede and that the narrating of the prologue is an extradiegetic act. The prologue is not part of the narrative that makes up the book, in this case, Panurge's quest for an answer to whether or not he should marry. This prologue deals with artistic creation and there are critics who see it as a key to interpreting the book. But the prologue itself never explores any of the details that are found in the book. This prologue is vaguer since it makes fewer references than the other two to the following book. There is only one explicit reference to the book itself, made in the middle of the prologue:

je voys de nouveau percer mon tonneau. Et de la traicte, (laquelle par deux praecedens volumes (si par l'imposture des imprimeurs n'eussent esté pervertiz et brouillez) vous feust assez congneue) leur tirer du creu de nos passetemps epicenaires un guallant tiercin et consecutivement un joyeuillez quart de sentences Pantagruelicques. (T.L. PP. 399, 400)

The remaining references are implicit when Rabelais talks of "tonneau". This word is used as a symbol of writing and inspiration. The above quotation also alludes to the previous two books and to a planned fourth book. A certain distance has been created between the narrating instance and the story by this extradiegetic act.

In the third prologue however, not all the recounted events are diegetic. There are two instances of a story within a story, which Genette calls "second-degree narrative" or
"metadiegetic narrative". This technique is as old as storytelling itself but Genette explores a new dimension directly related to it. He examines the different relationships connecting the metadiegetic narrative to the first narrative into which the former is inserted.

Genette defines the first type of relationship as one of "direct causality", where the metadiegetic narrative has an "explanatory function". Therefore the explicit or implicit "raison d'être" for the second-degree narrative is to answer the question: "What events have led to the present situation?" This first type of relationship which is direct and not achieved by way of the narrative is not found in the third prologue.

In fact the only type of relationship connecting the metadiegetic to the diegetic narrative in the third prologue is "thematic". This implies a contrast and analogy with no special chronological continuity, the aim being essentially one of "persuasion".

In the third type of relationship the metadiegetic content is of little importance to the unfolding of the main diegesis. What does matter is the relationship between the narrating act and the present situation. The act of narrating itself fulfills the "function of distraction or obstruction" in the diegesis. A classic example of this type of relationship is found in Thousand and One Nights where narrative follows narrative with no real relationship except to prolong the life of Scheherazade. This device does not seem to be used by Rabelais in the third prologue although it is sometimes
difficult to see the thematic link between the main body of the narrative and some of the digressions.

In the prologue to *Le Tiers Livre* the two instances of metadiegetic narrative, the story of Diogenes' barrel and the story of Ptolemy's camel and slave, both have the function of persuading. They illustrate the author's own ideas and the teaching function to determine the reading of the present prologue. There is no spatio-temporal continuity between the diegesis and the metadiegesis. These stories are like fables; they try to exert an influence on the diegetic situation. It is the author's way of persuading the listeners to agree with him.

The transition from one narrative level to another is usually achieved by the narrating. For example, this occurs when the narrator says: "de luy vous veux presentement une histoire narrer..." (*T.L.* p. 394) or "Me souvient toutesfoys avoir leu que Ptolemé..." (*T.L.* p. 400) to introduce the second-degree narrative. Another example of transition between two narrative levels is when the narrator wants to return to the first level of narration. The narrator says: "Je pareillement ..." (*T.L.* p. 397) or "Cestuy exemple me faict entre espoir et craincte varier..." (*T.L.* p. 401), when he has left the realm of the metadiegesis and is once again on the area of the diegesis.

Genette classifies as "transgressive" "any intrusion by the extradiegetic narrator or narratee into the diegetic universe (or by the diegetic characters into a metadiegetic
universe etc.). These digressions are called "metalepses". Although mainly a feature of the modern novel, they do occur in Rabelais' work. In this prologue a metalepse occurs when, in the middle of the Diogenes' story, Rabelais addresses his readers: "comme vous sçavez que les antiques Corinthiennes estoient au combat couraigeuses" (T.L. p. 396) and in the middle of the camel and slave story the author interjects "Qu'en advient-il?" (T.L. p. 400)

From our discussion of narrative level in Le Tiers Livre we can see that this aspect is developed and refined to a greater degree here than in the preceding two prologues. The prologues to Pantagruel and Gargantua were written on one level of narration without any metadiegetic narratives.

The third phase of our analysis centres on "person". Genette maintains that the terms "first person" and "third person" narrative are inadequate. It is important however, to distinguish between the use of the "je" by a narrator who is just telling the story and a narrator who is a character in the story. The uninvolved narrator is called heterodiegetic and the involved narrator is called homodiegetic.

Whether or not the narrator is present or absent from the storyline of Le Tiers Livre is not crucial to this analysis. We do know from the many references to "je" and "moi" that the narrator is present in the prologue and we can therefore label it as a homodiegetic narrative. In all, "je" and its possessive pronoun and adjective are used sixty times, considerably more often than in either of the first two prologues. In the
third prologue, as in the preceding two, the role of narrator is extradiegetic-homodiegetic.

Apart from the "narrating function", the narrator has certain other roles to fulfill. We will concentrate first of all on the "directing function". This function is operative when the narrator refers to the text in his discourse. In this prologue the narrator rarely and then only vaguely refers to his book. The first reference comes half-way through the prologue: "si je remuois mon tonneau Diogenic" (T.L. p. 398) and the "tonneau" as we showed in the first half of the present chapter is a symbol for his book. Almost all further references made to Rabelais' book are to "tonneau". The directing function was very important in the first two prologues but here it seems quite secondary. The author is less concerned about how his book should be read than how it should be received.

Three functions affect the narrating situation. The purpose of the first, "function of communication", is to keep open the contact between narrator and narratee. Rabelais is very conscious of establishing a base for this type of communication. The prologues partially serve this purpose. As in Prologues One and Two, the first sentence here sets the scene for communication between narrator and narratee: "Bonnes gens, Beuveurs tresillustres, et vous Goutteux tresprecieux, veistez vous oncques Diogenes, le philosophe cynic?". (T.L. p. 393) The vocative is used twice and, in addition, the sentence is interrogative. Asking the reader questions lends an air of dialogue to the text and in turn depicts communication very
well. Questions and comments like "Que feray-je en vostre avis?" (T.L. p. 398) "Comme vous scavez..." (T.L. p. 396) "Comme vous diriez sus le commencement du second degré. (...) (laquelle par deux praecedens volumes (...) vous feust assez congneue)" (T.L. p. 399) "Si bon ne vous semble, laissez-le" (T.L. p. 401) all reinforce the channel of communication between narrator and narratee. The imperative and the many vocatives (twenty-five in all) also serve the same purpose.

The only ambiguity in this function of communication remains in the "vous". The "vous" at the beginning and end of the prologue do designate different people. The "vous" in the first sentence refers to an audience that Rabelais likes. This audience is addressed throughout the prologue. Near the end however, "vous" is used to designate a totally different group of listeners. In the last paragraph "vous" specifies those Rabelais is not inviting to drink from his barrel:

Arriere, mastins! (...) Venez vous icy culletans articuler mon vin et compisser mon tonneau? (...) Estez vous encore là? (...) si je vous happe. (T.L. p. 403)

Here he is mainly concerned about chasing the uninvited from his presence.

The second function, the "testimonial function", reveals the speaker's attitude towards his subject matter. Rabelais' attitude to his books becomes less and less obvious with each prologue. Prologue One tries to convince the public of the truthfulness of Pantagruel. Prologue Two tells the readers that there are many ways to read a book. Prologue Three shows the author's concern with presenting the public with the
novelty his book affords. The author hints at this through the story of Diogenes and then becomes more explicit: "Prins ce choys et election, ay pensé ne faire exercice inutile et importun, si je remuois mon tonneau Diogenic...". (T.L. p. 398)

Like Diogenes, the author chooses not to follow the herd, but instead to carve his own path:

je voys de nouveau percer mon tonneau. Et de la traictc, (laquelle par deux praecedens volumes (si par l'imposture des imprimeurs n'eussent esté pervertiz et brouillez) vous feust assez congneue) leur tirer du creu de nos passetemps epicenaires un guallant tiercin et consecutivement un joyeulx quart de sentences Pantagruelicques; par moy licite vous sera les appeler Diogenicques. (T.L. pp. 399, 400)

The author once again digresses with the story of Ptolemy who is put to death when his only intention was to please. His fault was in being too innovative. Rabelais, too, is original and his work might be considered too daring:

The revolutionary thing about his way of thinking is not his opposition to Christianity, but the freedom of vision, feeling, and thought which his perpetual playing with things produces, and which invites the reader to deal directly with the world and its wealth of pheno-nomena.

Dorothy Coleman in her book, *Rabelais: A Critical Study in Prose Fiction*, describes Rabelais' book as a Menippian Satire. Rabelais also fears losing his right to publish and maybe even his life:

Cestuy exemple me fait entre espoir et craincte varier, (...) en lieu de les servir je les fasche, en lieu de les esbaudir, je les offense, en lieu de leur complaire, je desplaise et soit mon adventure telle que du coq de Euclion (...) lequel, pour en grattant avoir descouvert le thesaur, eut la couppe guorgée. (T.L. p. 401)

But then he reassures himself that, since his readers are filled with a spirit of Pantagruelism, he and his books will survive.
Rabelais returns once more to the subject of his "tonneau", i.e., his book, and invites the public to drink heartily from it, for the wine will never run out:

Autant que vous en tireray par la dille, autant en entonneray par le bondon. Ainsi demeurera le tonneau inexpuisible. Il a source vive et vene perpetuelle. (T.L. p. 402)

On the whole, Rabelais seems very optimistic about his writing. Through the "testimonial function" the author's work can be perceived like the work of Sisyphus; as Rigolot states in his book, Les Languages de Rabelais:

Rabelais Sisyphus de prologue, nous prepare, via Diogenes, à accepter Panurge, Sisyphus du livre, et derrière ce dernier un aultre Rabelais, Sisyphus du texte total.12

Presenting new ideas is worth any risk. But the progression is one of optimism that the work will be accepted and become a never-ending source of pleasure and wisdom for its readers. His work becomes the "tonneau" for the reader.

The "ideological function", the last of the three functions concerning the narrative situation, is very difficult to distinguish from the preceding one. Rabelais' ideological point of view is always ambiguous. He is often careful to camouflage his opinions in order to protect himself. Indirect expression, allegories, and allusions are some of the devices characteristic of this function. The parallels Rabelais makes here between himself, Diogenes, Ptolemy, and "le coq de Euclion", are all the different ways he expresses his thoughts on war, literary creation, and originality, not to mention religion and the judicial system.
Of the five functions discussed above, the predominant ones are the "function of communication" and the "testimonial function". There is a partial change here from the previous two prologues where the "directing function" replaces the "testimonial function". It is interesting that in this prologue both predominant functions pertain to the narrating situation. In this prologue it becomes more important to know how the reader feels about his subject than simply knowing how to read his books.

Having discussed the functions of the narrator, we shall now turn to the role of the narratee. As in the previous two prologues, we find here an extradiegetic narrator and therefore the narratee must also be extradiegetic. This type of narratee is easily confused with the implied reader with whom each real reader in turn identifies. Whereas the vocative was extensively used in the first two prologues, it is limited in the third. This is explained by the presence of two short stories told in the "third person" within the prologue itself. The use of the vocative is most prevalent at the beginning of the prologue because Rabelais wants to establish a rapport between author and reader.

The tone Rabelais adopts to deal with the narratee is much more like that which he used in the prologue to Gargantua than in the prologue to Pantagruel. The reader is addressed in mock-elevated terms at the beginning of the third prologue: "Bonnes gens, Beuveurs tresillustres et vous Goutteux tres precieux". (T.L. p. 393) The "good" reader is never abused in the rest
of the prologue. The narrator asks for the narratee's opinion and invites him to drink from his barrel. In the last paragraph however, there is a downward shift in language just as in the prologue to *Pantagruel*. The uninvited readers are called all manner of derogatory names, cursed, and chased from Rabelais' presence:

> Pourtant arrière, cagotz! Aux ouailles, mastins! Hors d'icy, caphars, de par le Diable hay! Estez vous encores là? Je renonce ma part de Papimanie, si je vous happe. Gzz. gzzz. gzzzz. Davant davant! Iront ilz? Jamais ne puissiez vous fianter que à sanglades d'estrivieres, jamais pisser que à l'estrapade, jamais eschauffer que à coups de baston! (T.L. p. 403)

Even though the curses in this last sentence are unlike those in the first prologue and less extensive, they remain of the scatological nature, concrete body attacks being much more threatening than psychological mental attacks. Rabelais uses body language in each of the prologues and through his books. Constant references to the flesh are not unusual for the literature of the author's period. Rabelais is especially fond of them because they add a very human dimension to his work.

The role of the narratee remains important in this prologue as in the previous two. It is not however a well-defined role in this case. The narratee is not told what to accept as truth, nor how to interpret what he hears. However, it is important that the author confides in him his doubts and hesitations about his new work and appeals to his good nature to understand the work properly.

This concludes the analysis of the "narrative instance" in the prologue to *Le Tiers Livre*. We have discussed Rabelais' use of time of narrating and have concluded that it does not
differ from Prologues One and Two. The prologue is written in the present tense with references to the past and the future. We have seen that the levels of narration are more complex and complete in this prologue, where more than one level of narration exists, than in the preceding two. We discussed the different functions of the narrator and concluded that the "function of communication" and the "testimonial function" were the two predominant ones. Finally, the role of the narratee was examined and we saw that, although important, his role is more subtle in the third prologue, and that he is not called upon as openly as before. The narratee's role shows that the author's perception of his reader has changed and that the author's sense of security has diminished. Rabelais has taken on the responsibility of authorship for Le Tiers Livre as well as Pantagruel and Gargantua. No longer hiding behind a pseudonym, he shows more respect for his reader by being less "cocky" about his own literary prowess. The twelve years of silence between Gargantua and Le Tiers Livre have resulted in a more complex prologue showing a distinct evolution of the author's style and ideas. This prologue shows Rabelais' concern for reader acceptance in presenting this new form of novel which has been called a Menippean Satire. Novelty has an unsettling effect on all and may not always be embraced with enthusiasm.
CHAPTER THREE
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10 "Je" and its possessive pronouns and adjectives are used 21 times in the prologue to *Pantagruel* and 14 times in the prologue to *Gargantua*.


13 The vocative is used 25 times in *Le Tiers Livre*, 22 times in *Pantagruel*, and 40 times in *Gargantua*.

CHAPTER FOUR
PROLOGUE TO LE QUART LIVRE

Rabelais first promised a book on voyages in the last chapter of Pantagruel but the public had to wait 20 years for its publication. Following the appearance of Le Tiers Livre in 1544, Rabelais was forced to leave France for a short time. He left for fear of persecution because of his books even though he had received a "privilège" from the king for their publication. In 1548, when the first version of Le Quart Livre was published, the Sorbonne remained a dangerous and real threat to him in spite of his special status. The work was comprised of an Epistle to Rabelais' new patron, Cardinal Odet de Châtillon, followed by what is now called the "Ancien Prologue", and by ten chapters. The book was subsequently revised and rewritten so that the final edition, as we know it today, of Le Quart Livre de faicts et dicts héroiques du bon Pantagruel, published in 1552, consists of a new prologue and 67 chapters. Let us simply say, at this point, that in comparison to the "Ancien prologue", the prologue to the 1552 edition of Le Quart Livre is relatively free of bitterness.

This prologue is the longest and most complex in structure of the four in our study. As in the third prologue, Rabelais uses his own name and title "Docteur en Medicine" instead of a pseudonym. The prologue has three divisions. The first is "devis", defined in Margaret Spanos article, "Functions of the Prologues in the Works of Rabelais"¹, as "the direct discourse between author and reader (who is treated as a physically
present audience". The second division is "narré", defined in the same article as a "short dramatic action". The third division takes us back to "devis".

The purpose of the "devis", the author/reader dialogue which is part of all Rabelais' prologues, is to inform the reader of the author's attitude towards his book. The basic theme of this dialogue between the author and the reader is that of health and what Rabelais calls "mediocrité". Rabelais is no longer concerned with the manner in which his book should be read. His goal is to transmit a message to his readers.

"Mediocrité" for Rabelais was a positive quality or virtue. One tends to translate "mediocrité" by the words "moderation" or "golden mean" which can only refer to the Greek ideal of a sound body and mind. This theme is embodied in the "narré". The transition from "devis" with its principal theme of health, to "narré" with its principal theme of "mediocrité" is achieved smoothly since the second theme evolves directly from the first:

J'ay cestuy espoir en Dieu qu'il oyra nos prieres, veue la ferme foy en laquelly nous les faisons; et accomplira cestuy nostre soubhayt, attendu qu'il est mediocre. (Q.L. p. 14)

Rabelais is trying to impress upon his readers that good health cannot be ensured through human efforts but rather through sincere and humble prayers that God chooses to answer. He defines the term and gives a Biblical example of "mediocrité":

Mediocrité a esté par les saiges anciens dicte aurée c'est à dire precieuse, de tous louée, en tous endroictz agréable. Discourez par les sacres Bibles, vous trouverez que de ceulx les prieres n'ont jamais esté esconduites qui ont mediocrité requis. (Q.L. p. 14)
This definition introduces the word "aurée", golden, thus referring specifically to the Greek ideal. Still, as part of the transition, Rabelais gives two examples of how God grants those wishes that are made in moderation. The first is Zacchaeus' wish to see Jesus in Jerusalem (Luke 19) and the second is of the guild prophet who lost an axehead in the river Jordan and prayed to retrieve it (2 Kings 6). The young prophet's wish was fulfilled because, as Rabelais states, his prayer was reasonable, moderate. It is questionable whether God would have granted a different type of wish:

S'il eust souhaité monter es cielx dedans un charriot flamboiant comme Helie, multiplier en lignée comme Abraham, estre autant riche que Job, autant fort que Sanson, aussi beau que Absalon, l'eust il impetré? C'est une question. (Q.L. p. 15)

Such hyperbolic wishes which are anything but "mediocre" are Rabelais' way of showing the absurdity of wishing the impossible.

The use of this Biblical example as the transition between "devis" and "narré" is very appropriate since the subject of the "narré" is the woodcutter, Couillatris, who lost his axe.

Based on Aesop's fable about the woodcutter and the axe, the main story of the "narré" also serves as a framework for a second complete story about the council of the gods. In fact the digression is twice as long as the story itself. Rabelais states Couillatris' problem in one page then goes on to tell us about the council of the gods for eight more pages and concludes Couillatris' story in another three. The story of Couillatris and his lost axe moves at a relatively speedier pace than the digression on the council of the gods. The reader
is introduced to the woodcutter and sees him in action almost immediately as he tries to solve his problem: "En cestuy estrif commença crier, prier, implorer, invocquer Juppiter, par oraisons moult disertes". (Q.L. p. 16) Rabelais' choice and accumulation of verbs helps to give a sense of urgency to the action. A very detailed description of Couillatris' stance is given by the author:

levant la face vers les cieulx, les genoizlz en terre, la teste nue, les bras haulx en l'air, les doigts des mains esquarquillez, disant à chascun refrain de ses suffrages, à haulte voix infatiguablement: "Ma coignée, Juppiter, ma coignée, ma coignée; rien plus, ô Juppiter, que ma coignée ou deniers pour en achatuer une aultre! Helas! ma paouvre coignée! (Q.L. p. 16)

The description evokes an image of an desperate man who does not ask for great wealth or what he does not deserve. He wants only to be able to provide an honest existence for himself.

The story of Couillatris' lost axe is interrupted at this point as Rabelais launches into a description of how the council of the gods reacts to Couillatris' cries. The story about the gods is in truth of secondary importance but is twice as long as the principal story of the lost axe. This is in part based on Homeric tradition, detailing carefully what goes on in the heavens among the gods. Rabelais also wants his readers to be aware of the forces of destiny and how man is merely a jest of gods.

Jupiter starts off the dialogue among the gods. He is quite disturbed by the noise Couillatris is making: "Quel diable, demanda Juppiter, est là bas qui hurle si horrifiquement?".
It is interesting that Rabelais chooses the word "bellow" to describe prayer to the gods. It is unusual because of the Biblical starting point where prayer is humble, but traditional in ancient literature where prayer is often loud. Jupiter then, in true judicial manner, goes on to enumerate cases of importance the gods have been handling and have been asked to handle. These are all political events which occurred in Europe and Asia during the latter part of Rabelais' life. The last of these events deals with a squabble between two professors of "le Collège royal", Galland and Ramus whom Rabelais must have known. Jupiter finally asks one of the gods, Priapus, how he would settle the argument between the two adversaries. Jupiter states: "J'ay maintes fois trouvé ton conseil et avis equitable et pertinent: et habet tua mentula mentem". In mock-heroic style, the Latin quotation is a means by which Rabelais can elevate the vulgar, making the irony more scathing. Rabelais does not see the human body as shameful and so never hesitates to discuss any part of the human anatomy. His work is full of comments about both male and female sex organs and he uses this as a source of comedy, as was usual at the time.

In giving his opinion on the Galland/Ramus conflict, Priapus tells a complete story of his own about the feuding dog and fox, a legend Rabelais borrows from J. Pollux. He reminds Jupiter how he did not want to intervene in the dog and fox conflict. The fox's destiny was never to be caught and the dog's destiny was to catch the fox. The two fates were
contradictory. Priapus reminds Jupiter:

Vous protestates non contrevenir aux destins. Les destins estoient contradictoires. La verité, la fin, l'effect de deux contradictions ensemble feut déclaré impossible en nature. (Q.L. pp. 18, 19)

Jupiter's hesitation to intervene in the destiny of the two animals created a great thirst in Olympia: "Tout ce noble consistoire, par default de resolution categorique, encourut alteration mirifique". (Q.L. p. 19) The word "alteration" throughout the fourth book indicates a state of imbalance, a state which is often depicted as causing a drought in the land or a thirst among the population. One solution is to bring on the wine: "et feut en icelluy conseil beu plus de soixante et dixhuict bussars de nectar". (Q.L. p. 19) For Rabelais wine has the power to cure and the power to correct an imbalance.

Priapus ends his story by reminding Jupiter that the thirst did not subside until he turned the fox and dog into stone, something he proposes for Galland and Ramus: "soubdain feurent tresves de soif criées par tout ce grand Olympe". (Q.L. p. 19) The paragraph ends on a note of vulgarity mixed with erudition, a technique dear to Rabelais: "Ce feut l'année des couilles molles, près Teumesse, entre Thebes et Chalcide". (Q.L. p. 19)

Priapus' final advice concerns the use of the petrified dog and fox. He suggests that they be placed in Notre Dame alongside a statue of Pierre du Coingnet that was used for extinguishing candles:

Et seront, en figure trigone equilaterale, on grand temple de Paris, ou on mylieu du pervis, posées ces trois pierres mortes, en office de extaindre avecques le nez,
These comments serve as a subtle criticism of the Sorbonne, Rabelais being on the side of the royalty in the long standing rivalry between the church and the monarchy. The Sorbonnites gave the name Pierre du Coingnet "(du coin)" to a grotesque statue placed in a corner of the Notre Dame cathedral used for extinguishing candles. This is a direct reference to Pierre de Cugnières, a royalist who was an adversary of those who based their arguments on the infamous Décrétales.

With the play on words for "couille" Rabelais avoids being openly critical of the church but shows his ingenuity at finding some means of ridiculing practices he considers unethical.

Jupiter shifts his attention from Priapus to other more pressing matters, a battle stirred up by Pastophores around the Tyrrhenian Sea near the Apennines, and he looks forward to the amusement the gods will get from this. Couillatris' cries are too much for Jupiter and so he orders Mercury to see what he wants. At one point Jupiter orders the return of Couillatris' axe:

Si fault il luy rendre. Cela est escript es destins, entendez vous? Aussi bien comme si elle valust la duché de Milan. A la verité, sa coingnée luy est en tel pris et estimation que seroit à un Roy son Royaulme. (Q.L. p. 21)

However, before this can be accomplished Priapus interrupts with yet another story.

This anecdote concerns the meaning of the word "coingnée".
The first meaning, states Priapus, is attributed to a tool for chopping wood, but the second is completely different. "Coingnée" in the second sense refers to a loose woman. The word is thus fraught with sexual connotations. The digressions and anecdotes serve to prolong the anticipation to the conclusion of the main story. This is typical of the oral storytelling tradition. They are also a means by which Rabelais can incorporate word games which he loves dearly. Rabelais enjoys the process of narration as much as reaching the goal of his narration.

The remainder of the story which includes two short poems is quite vulgar but also comical, in the sense that this is a supposed conversation among the gods and not a group of "macho-lumberjacks", bragging about their masculinity. Rabelais uses the vulgar to bring the gods down to a human level, sexuality being a normal and healthy function.

Before taking the reader back to the story of Couillatris, Rabelais concludes the story of the assembly of the gods. Jupiter renders a judgement regarding the lost axe based on "mediocrité". By having Mercury offer Couillatris a choice of axes--his own, a silver one and a gold one--Jupiter is testing the woodcutter to see if he is truly a man of "mediocre" wishes. Jupiter orders Mercury to give Couillatris the silver and gold axes if the man chooses his own axe, but orders Mercury to behead him if he should lay claim to an axe that is not his own. The woodcutter refuses the silver and gold axes and takes his own, promising a sacrifice to Jupiter if he lets
him keep the axe. Mercury's answer is as follows:

Et, pour ce que as opté et soubhaité mediocrité en matiere de coingnée, par le vueil de Jupiter je te donne ces deuxaultres. (Q.L. p. 24)

The phraseology "en matiere de..." makes the whole incident sound like a very important question of law or theology.

The author next shows us how Couillatris uses his new-found wealth. Couillatris' story is situated at Chinon, Rabelais' birthplace, where the woodcutter invests the money from the sale of the silver and gold axes. We are given a detailed account of Couillatris' purchases:

Il en achapte force mestairies, force granges, force censes, force bordes et bordieus, force cassines, prez, vignes, boys, terres labourables, pastis, estangs, moulins, jardins, saulsayes; beufz, vaches brebis, moutons, chevres, truyes, pourceaulx, asnes, chevaux, poules, cocqs, chappons, pouletz, oyes, jars, canes, canars, et du menu. (Q.L. p. 25)

All of the purchases are land, real estate or animals. Couillatris does not spend his new-found wealth foolishly on luxury goods, but stays close to a natural life, remaining basically the same person he always was: a moderate man. He represents values that Rabelais believes in: a free will to choose between good and evil, each carrying its just reward.

Rabelais embraces the Couillatris incident as the perfect opportunity to discuss human nature. He shows how Couillatris' countrymen quickly become jealous of his prosperity:

et feut, en leurs espritz, la pitié et commiseration, que au paravant avoient du pauvre Couillatris, en envie changée de ses richesses tant grandes et inopinées. (Q.L. p. 25)

Their main concern becomes finding out how they too can find
greater wealth. In this case they think that the answer lies in losing their hatchets. Even the lower nobility follow suit with the peasants, selling their swords in order to purchase axes simply to lose them. They are like pilgrims who travelled to Rome to buy a blessing from a new Pope:

Vous eussiez proprement dict que fussent petitz Romipetes, vendens le leur, empruntans l'aultruy, pour achatper mandatz a tas d'un pape nouvellement créë. (Q.L. p. 26)

Rabelais disapproved greatly of the philosophy that condoned the practices that enabled the buying of God's blessing. As far as he was concerned God's love and grace could not be purchased with money and therefore anyone who profitted from such commerce was not acting according to the spirit of the Lord. For his time period, Rabelais was treading on very dangerous ground in his discussion on free-will and grace.

The "narrê" concludes with Mercury offering a choice of three hatchets to every man who lost one. Each greedily chooses the gold one and in so doing is beheaded. Rabelais wants to impress upon his readers that greed is punished while moderation is rewarded. The concluding sentence of the "narrê" is like the moral of Aesop's fable "Voylà qu'advient à ceulx qui en simplicité soubhaitent et optent choses mediocres". (Q.L. p. 27)

A return to the "devis" occurs with the last four paragraphs of the prologue and the dialogue between author and reader resumes. We shall examine this relationship in detail later. Let us now turn to the stylistic features of the prologue which also need to be examined in detail in order to appreciate fully the rich Rabelaisian language.
A typical feature of Rabelais' work is word-accumulation, sometimes to show his vast knowledge of a certain subject, but mostly for the sonority and the sheer joy of expending verbal energy. An example of this can be found near the beginning of the prologue, when Rabelais deals with the theme of health. As the most important element of life it should be cherished and if lost searched for: "dessoubz, davant, darriere, à dextre, à senestre, dedans, dehors, loing ou près". (Q.L. p. 13) This accumulation of adverbs shows Rabelais' enthusiasm which he transfers to the reader in part due to the repetition of "d". Almost all the words are made from two syllables indicating place and almost all places are imaginable.

Accumulation is also used to describe what Couillatris buys with the money he receives for the gold and silver axes. It has an overwhelming effect like his new-found wealth.

Like a poet Rabelais often uses alliteration to give his writing a rhythmic quality as is evident in the following quotation:

Sans santé n'est la vie que langueur; la vie n'est que simulachre de mort. Ainsi doncques vous, estans de santé privez, c'est à dire mors, saisissez vous du vif, saisissez vous de vie, c'est santé. (Q.L. p. 14)

The repetition of the "v" and "s" sounds also draws the reader's attention to the content as well as form. Rabelais does not hesitate to incorporate a little rhyme in his prose near the end of the prologue:

Au soir un chascun d'eulx eut les mules au talon, le petit cancre au menton, la male toux au poulmon,
la catarrhe au gavion,  
le gros froncle au cropion;  
et au diable le boussin de pain pour s'escurer les dents.  
(Q.L. p. 28)

The author makes light of a grave situation by writing about it in such a fashion.

Rabelais also enjoys a play on words and uses it to produce a comic effect whenever possible, both in Latin and in French. An example of this is when Jupiter says to Priapus in Latin: "et habet tua mentula mentem". (Q.L. p. 18) Later Priapus substitutes "mentule" for "memoire" on two different occasions: "Et me soubvient (car j'ay mentule, voyre diz je memoire bien belle)" (Q.L. p. 22) and then later "(Ô belle mentule, voire, diz je, memoire! je soloecise souvent en la symbolisation et colliguance de ces deux motz)". (Q.L. p. 22)

A variation on the word "saviour" is present at the beginning of the prologue when Rabelais substitutes the word "Servateur" for "Salvateur", which would make God our preserver instead of our saviour. In the same quote there is also a manipulation of the word "emancipée". At the beginning of the quotation he uses it to signify that health has been lost or freed from the "seigneurie" like a slave and then at the end of the quotation he simply drops the first letter and uses "mancipée" to indicate that health has been found or seized, the opposite of freed.

At times a word may have a double meaning as in the case of "coingnée" which according to Priapès signifies a tool and a loose woman.

Rabelais also invents words. He does this when he is unable to find just the correct word in his vast vocabulary.
or for the sheer pleasure of inventing and creating a certain sound. An example of this is the adjective "gimbretile-tolletée" which he invents to describe the loose woman. This word is perhaps derived from "gimbreteux" meaning lascivious and "toller" meaning to take away.

The tone of conviviality of this prologue is partially transmitted by way of an oral style of writing. Rabelais uses language not normally seen in print, at the beginning of the prologue:

Ha, ha! Bien et beau s'en va Quaresme! (Q.L. p. 11)

and again near the end:

Hay, hay, hay. Et de qui estez vous apprins ainsi discourir et parler de la puissance et prædestination de Dieu pauvres gens? Paix, st, st, st, humiliez vous davant sa sacrée face et recongnoissez vos imperfections. (Q.L. p. 28)

Words like "Ha", "hay", and "st" are more often heard than seen in writing.

In telling the story of Couillatris, Rabelais successfully incorporates an unlikely mixture of fable, mythology, the imaginary, and the real. He skilfully weaves together vulgarity with erudition, for example, using Latin to say that a penis has a mind of its own. He juxtaposes elevated and vulgar styles with no qualms. Priapus is described in a stately stance:"Priapus restoit debout au coing de la cheminée" (Q.L. p. 21), a sufficiently dignified position for a god, but then later in the same paragraph he is described as "exhibant son coingnouoir dodrental" (Q.L. p. 21), a position lacking somewhat in decorum.
Rabelais also mixes the abstract with the concrete. He speaks of health at the beginning of the prologue and tells his listeners that they should look for it high and low. He contrasts an abstract idea, health, with concrete places where it might be found. He uses the concrete words "seigneuries" and "vos territoires" to signify the body. Bringing together those two incongruous aspects is all part of Rabelaisian comedy and Rabelaisian style.

The rapport between author and reader remains to be studied and this can best be done by taking a closer look at the "devis". The beginning of the author/reader dialogue shows a change in the author's perception of his audience. Here he addresses them simply as "Gens de bien, Dieu vous saulte et garde!" (Q.L. p. 11); his feelings are unambiguous. This time there is no intermediary between the readers and God. This is a significant change from the form of address used in the previous three prologues.

In the first paragraph Rabelais calls out "Où estez vous? Je ne vous peuez veoir". (Q.L. p. 11) This lighthearted tone continues in the second paragraph where the author is quite jovial, and, having put on his glasses exclaims: "Ha, Ha! Bien et beau s'en va Quaresme! Je vous voy" (Q.L. p. 11)—all part of the here and now of a private friendly conversation.

The prior quote "Où estez vous? Je ne vous peuez veoir. Attendez que je chausse mes lunettes!" (Q.L. p. 11), was a common joke but also hints that Rabelais' physical condition
might be deteriorating. Poor eye-sight is one of the signs of old age. Rabelais would now be between 58 and 70 years of age (depending on which date of birth one accepts, 1494 or 1482). His preoccupation with health is thus understandable. It is perhaps this fact that inspired him to write on health and moderation, two aspects of life he was familiar with and the true value of which he knew well, being both a doctor and a priest.

The tone of the friendly little chat between author and reader continues with Rabelais showing an interest in the grape harvest, common in his part of France: "et doncques? Vous avez eu bonne vinée, à ce que l'on m'a dict". (Q.L. p. 11) He is concerned about their well-being. A good harvest means prosperity and plenty for his listeners. The health theme which predominates in the fourth prologue becomes more explicit in the second paragraph. As if he were an old friend, the author continues to express his concern for his listeners, enquiring after the health of their families. "Vous, vos femmes, enfans, parens et familles, estez en santé désirée? Cela va bien, cela est bon, cela me plaist". (Q.L. p. 11) The tone here is one of warmth and kindness.

Rabelais now turns more specifically to his own health:

Quant est de moy, par sa saincte benignité, j'en suys là, et me recommande. Je suys, moïennant un peu de Pantagruelisme (vous entendez que c'est certaine gayeté d'esprit conficte en mespris des choses fortuites), sain et degourt; prest à boire, si voulez. (Q.L. pp. 11, 12)

Being in good health, as is his public, the author presents his greetings, recommending himself and his book at the same time.
Rabelais is being quite modest here and does not display any of the forcefulness which was at times prevalent in the previous prologues. The second sentence: "Je suys, moiennant un peu de Pantagruelisme (...) sain et degourt;" indicates an acceptance for what cannot be avoided. Rabelais seems to have made peace with what life has handed him. The last part of that sentence "prest à boire, si voulez" shows a willingness to get on with life and enjoy what he can along with others.

Still developing the health theme, Rabelais quotes from the Bible: "Medecin, o, gueriz toymesmes". (Luc, IV, 23) (Q.L. p. 12) This is an invitation to moderation, not to be overly arrogant but to be more humble and to practice what one preaches. In this way Rabelais is able to introduce his sub-theme: doctors, a favorite subject of ridicule and criticism. This theme is further developed with a reference to Cl. Galen, a famous doctor who died in 201 A.D. at the age of 70. Rabelais shows that Galen feared a fate that Euripides wrote about:

Medecin est des aultres en effect; Toutesfois est d'ulceres tout infect. (Q.L. p. 12)

To impart an air of authority to his statement Rabelais gives a list of references, albeit false, when referring to Galen, for example, "lib. 2, De usu partium, lib. 2, De differentiis pulsuum, cap. 3, et ibidem, lib. 3, cap. 2, et lib. De rerum affectibus". (Q.L. p. 12) A doctor cannot, Rabelais believes, be entrusted with someone else's health unless his own is good. Quoting from Galen, he states:

Car (dict il lib. 5. De sanit. tuenda) difficilement sera creu le medicin avoir soing de la santé d'aultruy,
Rabelais also refers to Asclepiades who finally died in his old age, not as a result of any particular illness but because he fell off a poorly maintained staircase.

According to Rabelais, health is the most important element of life. If his readers should be so unfortunate as to lose their good health, Rabelais prays that they come across it and hold on to it:

Si, par quelque desastre, s'est sante de vos seigneuries emancipee, quelque part, dessus, dessoubz, davant darriere, a dextre, a senestre, dedans, dehors, loing ou pres vos territoires qu'elle soit, la puissiez vous incontinent avecques l'ayde du benoist Servateur rencontrer! En bonne heure de vous rencontree, sus l'instant soit par vous asserée, soit par vous vendi-quée, soit par vous saisie et mancipée. Les loigs vous le permettent, le Roy l'entend, je le vous conseille. (Q.L. p. 13)

This quotation still fits into the realm of kindly concern expressed by Rabelais for his listeners.

Rabelais' statements about the value of good health are very strong indeed. He is preoccupied with the idea:

Sans sante n'est la vie, n'est la vie vivable: (...) Sans sante n'est la vie que langueur; la vie n'est que simulachre de mort. Ainsi doncques vous, estans de sante privez, c'est a dire mors, saisissez vous du vif, saisissez vous de vie, c'est sante. (Q.L. p. 14)

It is as if he were speaking from experience and wanting to share it with others. Age is often equated with wisdom and Rabelais wants his listeners to profit in some way from what he has experienced. In the first half of the "devis", the part which precedes the "narré", Rabelais is not at all aggressive towards his public. This changes somewhat as we
shall see later in the second half of the "devis" which follows the "narré".

In the transition from "devis" to "narré" the style of writing depicts a dialogue between storyteller and listener. The paragraph in the following quotation is very oral in character:

A propos de soubhaictz mediocres en matiere de coingnée (advisez quand sera temps de boire), je vous raconteray ce qu'est escript parmy les apologues du sage Aesope le Français. (Q.L. p. 15)

The tone Rabelais adopts here is very familiar, especially with the aside in parenthesis to the listeners giving them permission to interrupt him, saying that if he goes on too long, they can take a drink.

The second half of that sentence is in sharp contrast with the first. It deals with the genealogy of Aesop:

...j'entends· Phrygien et Troian, comme afferme Max. Planudes; duquel peuple, selon les plus veridiques chroniqueurs, sont les nobles François descenduz. Aelian escript qu'il feut Thracian; Agathias, après Herodote, qu'il estoit Samien: ce m'est tout un. (Q.L. p. 15)

Rabelais' memory perhaps fails him in giving these details but for him the impression of erudition is as important at times as its accuracy. The paragraph ends on a familiar note however, with the author saying: "ce m'est tout un" (Q.L. p. 15), implying that the origins of the French or of Aesop are of little importance to him, creating an effect of double irony.

Rabelais also interrupts the "narré" with a little aside in parenthesis made to his readers "(comme vous sçavez que Necessité feut inventrice d'Eloquence)". (Q.L. p. 16) An interjection of this type sustains the contact between author
and reader established in the "devis" and underlines the storyteller's presence in the "narré".

With the last four paragraphs of the prologue, Rabelais returns to the realm of the "devis": the dialogue between author and reader. He begins it with an imperative sentence "Prenez y tous exemple...". (Q.L. p. 27) Listeners should learn something from the tale of Couillatris he has recounted, namely to be moderate in their prayers to God. Prayers made to God in humility are answered but arrogant ones are not. Rabelais gives an example of what happens to those who do not wish with "mediocrité":

Au soir un chascun d'eulx eut les mules au talon,
    le petit cancre au menton,
    la male toux au poulmon,
    le catarrhe au gavion,
    le gros froncle au cropion;
    et au diable le boussin de pain pour s'escurer les dents. (Q.L. p. 28)

These unsightly and painful afflictions could await those listeners who do not take Rabelais advice and learn from his example. The friendly tone of the first half of the author/reader dialogue is tempered here with what could easily be interpreted as a threat.

The second to last paragraph deals with the major theme of the "narré", namely moderation or "mediocrité". Rabelais tells his listeners: "Soubhaiitez doncques mediocrité: elle vous adviendra; et encorez mieulx, deument ce pendent labourans et travaillans". (Q.L. p. 28) It is not enough to pray simply for what one wants in life. God wants to see us put in an honest day's work for our gains. In the same paragraph Rabelais
scolds those who question the will and power of God:

Hay, hay, hay. Et de qui estez vous apprins ainsi discouir et parler de la puissance et prædestination de Dieu, paouvres gens? Paix: st, st, st; humiliiez vous davant sa sacrée face et recongoissez vos imperfections. (Q.L. p. 28)

Once again the friendly tone that dominated the first half of the "devis" is replaced by warnings not aimed directly at his listeners but at those who are not humble before God.

The closing paragraph of the prologue takes the reader back to the beginning and one of the principal themes, health:

je fonde mon esperance, et croy fermement que, s'il plaist au bon Dieu, vous obtiendrez santé, veu que rien plus que santé pour le present ne demande. (Q.L. p. 28)

This statement shows Rabelais' firm belief that our health is in God's hands. Praying for health, not being an extravagant wish but one made in moderation, is sure to be answered. Rabelais digresses at this point by telling a little story to illustrate his point according to Biblical tradition. He tells of two thieves from Genoa who greeted potential victims with the salutation: "Health and wealth, sir". Because the thieves were not satisfied with health, but sought after wealth, justice would have it that they were often left with neither.

The last sentence of the prologue however, seems to have little connection with the rest of the paragraph. It is an invitation to drink and listen to the story of Pantagruel:

Or, en bonne santé toussez un bon coup, beuvez en trois, secouez dehait vos aureilles, et vous oyrez dire merveilles du noble et bon Pantagruel. (Q.L. p. 29)
But the words "en bonne santé" maintain a link with Rabelais' preoccupation with health in this prologue. This ending is very different from the preceding prologues where the reader is confronted with all sorts of abuses, harsh and mild, and told to listen to what was about to follow. This ending, however, resembles the last sentence of the prologue to *Gargantua* because of the invitation to drink and listen: "vous souvienne de boivre à my pour la pareille et je vous plegeray tout ares metys" (G. p. 9), the perfect situation for listening to a story.

The prologue to *Le Quart Livre* is most like the third prologue. Each is comprised of three parts: "devis", "narré", "devis". It is however even longer and more complex in structure than the third as we shall see later. The fourth prologue differs from the first two because of its complexity and because it does not exhibit the same tone of the marketplace. The tone here is one of friendly conviviality one might find in a room where an old man is telling stories to his drinking companions. In this prologue, Rabelais does not have to establish his credibility as a writer. He has proved himself through the three books that precede this one. The fourth prologue is a means by which the author can impart some of the wisdom that comes with age to his readers.

Having discussed the narrative techniques of "devis" and "narré" we will now turn our attention to a study of the time of narration, of the narrative levels, and of person.

Focusing on the time of narration we can see that the "devis" is written in the present tense. "Gens de bien, Dieu
vous saulve et guard! Où estez vous? Je ne vous peuvez voir.
Attendez que je chausse mes lunettes!". (Q.L. p. 11) Rabelais is speaking to an audience whose presence he can feel but which he pretends to be unable to see due to his failing eyesight. This is concrete symbolization of a real situation, since the writer of a book cannot have direct contact with his readers. Rabelais tried to counteract this fact in the previous three prologues but as Screech points out: "the new spacious prologue to the Quart Livre all sense of distance between Rabelais the man and Rabelais the masked author is dropped". The second half of the "devis" is also written in the present tense. After telling the story of Couillatris, Rabelais states: "Prenez y tous exemple..." (Q.L. p. 27) and "Aussi, voyez vous par experience que...". (Q.L. p. 27) The "narré" itself is written in the past tense as is, of course, usual: "De son temps estoit un pauvre...". (Q.L. p. 15)

This prologue, like the other three is thus written essentially in the present tense. The present creates the fiction of a listener who is present in front of the author, listening to him. It makes the text more immediate and strengthens the author/reader relationship. The secondary stories are told in the past tense but even they use the present tense to a great extent because the characters often use direct discourse.

In the previous three chapters we established that the prologues are separate from the books they precede and that the narrating of the prologues is an extradiegetic act. The
prologues are not part of the storyline that makes up the book, in the case of *Quart Livre*, the voyages to the different islands. Yet some critics see the prologue as a key to interpreting the meaning and structure of the book that follows. The prologue, however, never touches upon any of the details of the book. This prologue makes only two references to the book that follows it. The first reference occurs at the beginning of the prologue and it is quite vague: "Quant est de moy, par sa saincte benignité, j'en suys là, et me recommande. Je suys, moiennant un peu de Pantagruelisme". (Q.L. p. 11) The author recommends himself as a vessel of pantagruelic spirit probably referring to his previous books. The second reference is at the very end of the prologue: "secouez dehait vos aureilles, et vous oyrez dire merveilles du noble et bon Pantagruel". (Q.L. p. 29) The prologue serves the same overall purpose as in the previous three books: it creates a certain distance between narrating instance and the story by its extradiegetic act. The events recounted in the prologue are diegetic, that is, part of the universe of the story, recounted by the narrative.

In the fourth prologue as in the third, not all recounted events are diegetic. There are instances in the prologue where there is a story within a story. Genette calls this phenomenon, second degree narrative or metadiegetic narrative. Although this technique is traditionally part of storytelling, Genette explores a new dimension directly related to it. This new dimension examines the different relationships connecting the
metadiegetic narrative to the first narrative into which the former is inserted.

The first type of relationship is one of direct causality where the metadiegetic narrative has an explanatory function. Therefore the explicit or implicit raison d'être for the second degree narrative is to answer the question: "What events have lead to the present situation?".

The second type of relationship is thematic. It implies a relationship of contrast or analogy where there is no special or temporal continuity between metadiegesis and diegesis. This type of narrative has the "function of persuading".

The third type of relationship between the two story levels has no explicit causes. Here the act of narrating itself fulfills the "function of distraction or obstruction in the diegesis". It postpones the unfolding of events in the diegesis.

Through the three types of relationships mentioned above that connect the two narratives, the importance of the narrating instance grows with each one. In the first type of relationship the linking of the two levels is direct and not achieved by way of the narrative. In the second type of relationship the connection is indirect. It is achieved through the narrative which becomes indispensible to the linking of the two levels. In the third type of relationship the metadiegetic content is of little importance; what matters is the relationship between the narrating act and the present situation.
In the prologue to *Le Quart Livre* there are several degrees of narrative. There is of course the first degree narrative: the dialogue between the storyteller and his listeners. The second degree narrative, the story of Couillatris, has the "function of persuading", of exerting an influence on the diegesis or first degree narrative. Rabelais tells this story in order to convince his readers that what he is saying about "mediocrité" is true. It is also interrupted by a third degree narrative: a description of the assembly of the gods. This interruption is quite lengthy and fulfills the "function of distraction or obstruction". It postpones the conclusion to the story about Couillatris. Rabelais goes even further and inserts a fourth degree narrative: Priapus' two stories. This narrative also fulfills the "function of distraction or obstruction" because it postpones Jupiter's judgement and the conclusion of the narrative about the assembly of the gods.

The transition from one narrative level to another is usually achieved by the act of narrating. The second degree narrative is introduced by a comment like:

A propos de soubhaictz mediocres en matiere de coingnée (advisez quand sera temps de boire), je vous raconteray ce qu'est escript parmy les apologues du sage AEsope lé François. (*Q.L.* p. 16)

The third degree narrative evolves from the story of Couillatris:

Mais tant grande feut l'exclamation de Couillatris qu'elle feut en grand effroy ouye on plein conseil et consistoire des Dieux. (*Q.L.* p. 16)

This type of comment serves as a perfect introduction for another story.

The fourth degree narrative comes just in time to postpone
Jupiter's judgement on Couillatris' axe and in so doing end the third degree narrative. The transition is not smooth but comes as a rather blunt interruption, quite out of place:

Priapus restoit debout au coing de la cheminée. Il, entendent le rapport de Mercure, dist en toute cour-toysie et joviale honestété: "Roy Juppiter, on temps que, par vostre ordonnance et particulier benefice, j'estois guardian des jardins en terre, je notay que ceste diction, coingnée, est equivocque à plusieurs choses. (Q.L. p. 21)

With this introduction Priapus starts to tell his story which is nothing more than a comic interlude.

A return to the diegesis is achieved by the following comment: "Voylà que c'est. Voylà qu'advient à celux qui en simplicité soubhaitent et optent choses mediocres". (Q.L. p. 27)

Other types of transitions Genette defines as "transgressive":

any intrusion by the extradiegetic narrator or narratee into the diegetic universe (or by the diegetic characters into a metadiegetic universe etc.).

These transitions are called "metalepses". Although mainly a feature of the modern novel, they also occur in Rabelais' work. An example of a metalepse in this prologue is when Rabelais addresses his readers while in the midst of telling the story of Couillatris: "(comme vous scavez que Necessité feut inventrice d'Eloquence)" (Q.L. p. 16) or near the end of the story when he interrupts with a reference to Aesop: "Encore, dict l'apologue AEsopicque...". (Q.L. p. 26) Comments like "Que vous en semble?" (Q.L. p. 28) addressed to the reader from the first degree narrative are also metalepses. Yet they are not very disruptive. Interruptions of this type can be also found
From our discussion of narrative level in *Le Quart Livre* we can see that this aspect is developed and refined to a far greater degree than in the previous three prologues. In the prologues to *Pantagruel* and *Gargantua* there was simply the first degree narrative and in the prologue to *Le Tiers Livre* there are two narrative levels. As Rabelais becomes a more experienced writer, his books have a more complex narrative style.

The third phase of our analysis centers on "person". Genette maintains that the terms "first person" or "third person" narrative are inadequate. It is more important to distinguish between the use of the "je" by a narrator who is absent from the story he is telling or by a narrator who is present as a character in the story. The absent narrator is called heterodiegetic and the present narrator is called homodiegetic.

Whether or not the narrator is present or absent from the storyline of the *Quart Livre* is not crucial to our analysis. We do know that the many references to "je" and "moi", as well as the references to "vous" which in turn imply the presence of "je", prove that the narrator is present in the prologue and we can therefore label it as a homodiegetic narrative. In all, "je" and its pronoun and adjective are used twenty-five times, considerably less often, considering the length of this prologue, than in the previous prologues. This is due, in part, to a greater expansion of the "narré" and to a lesser preoccupation, on the part of the author, with his own role in the
prologue. The role of the narrator remains extradiegetic-homodiegetic as in the preceding three prologues.

As outlined in the previous chapters, the narrator also has certain functions to fulfill, apart from the "narrating function" which consists of the narrator telling the story and which is present in all narratives.

We will concentrate first of all on the "directing function". This function is operative when the narrator refers to the text in his discourse. In this prologue the narrator refers to his book only once. This reference is at the end of the prologue: "secouez dehaut vos aureilles, et vous oyrez dire merveilles du noble et bon Pantagruel". (Q.L. p. 29)

The directing function which was very important in the first two prologues plays a secondary role in the last two. The author seems no longer concerned that his book be accepted or read in a specific fashion. The fact that it is there seems to be enough for the mature author.

Three functions affect the narrating situation in the Prologue. The purpose of the first, "the function of communication", is to keep the contact between narrator and narratee open. Rabelais is very conscious of the importance of establishing a base for this type of relationship. The prologue itself partially serves this purpose. As in the preceding prologues, the beginning sets the scene for communication between narrator and narratee:

Gens de bien, Dieu vous saulve et guard! Où estez vous? Je ne vous peux veoir. Attendez que je chausse mes lunettes!
Ha, ha! Bien et beau s'en va Quaresme! Je vous voy. Et doncques? Vous avez eu bonne vinée, à ce que l'on m'a dict. (Q.L. p. 11)

The use of the vocative and interrogative, as well as interjections like "ha, ha" all lend an air of dialogue to the text. Rhetorical questions like: "Me demandez vous pourquoi, gens de bien?" (Q.L. p. 12) also reinforce the impression that a channel of communication between narrator and narratee really exists. Other comments the narrator makes in parentheses as asides to the narratee also strengthen the function of communication. A few examples of these types of comments are:

(advisez quand sera temps de boire). (Q.L. p. 15)
(comme vous sçavez que Necessité feut inventrice d'Eloquence). (Q.L. p. 16)
Cestuy en vostre advis estoit il desgousté? (Q.L. p. 27)
Que vous en semble. (Q.L. p. 28)
attendez encore un peu avecques demie once de patience (Q.L. p. 28)

The imperative and the many vocatives (fifty in all) serve the same purpose. We notice that the vocative is used twice as often in this prologue as in the prologue to Le Tiers Livre. This prologue would seem therefore to focus on the narratee, whereas the third prologue focused on the narrator.

In the previous three prologues there is always some degree of ambiguity regarding how Rabelais feels about his audience. He could be flattering at one moment and abusive and insulting the next. These excesses seem to have disappeared altogether by the time the author writes Le Quart Livre.

The second function "testimonial function", reveals the speaker's attitude toward his subject matter. Rabelais' attitude towards his books becomes less and less obvious with
each prologue. In the first prologue he tries to convince the public of the truthfulness of Pantagruel. In the second prologue he tries to tell his readers that there is more than one way to read a book, suggesting a profound meaning. In the third prologue he describes the process of writing a work of art and tries to justify its existence. The fourth prologue deals with the themes of health and moderation. The author, now established but aging, is preoccupied with different worries.

Rabelais makes one vague reference to his fourth book that shows how he feels about it. This reference comes in the form of a recommendation of himself:

Quant est de moy, par sa saincte benignité, j'en suys là, et me recommande. Je suys, moiennant un peu de Pantagruelisme (vous entendez que c'est certaine gayeté d'esprit conficte en mespris des choses for-tuites)... (Q.L. pp. 11, 12)

The testimonial function is not that prevalent in this prologue. It was of much greater importance in the preceding three.

The "ideological function", the last of the three functions concerning the narrative situation is usually difficult to distinguish from the "testimonial function" but it seems more clearly defined in this prologue. Rabelais' ideological point of view regarding health and moderation is not so revolutionary that he has to camouflage his opinions. He makes references to the medical profession but since he is a doctor himself comments like "Medecin, o, gueriz toymesmes" (Q.L. p. 12) are neither too critical nor threatening. Criticism regarding the church does not escape Rabelais' skillful pen altogether.
He makes a point of defending Pierre de Coingnet and attacking the practice of buying blessings (from a newly established Pope).

Of the five functions discussed above, the predominant function in all four prologues remains the function of communication. In the fourth prologue the ideological function predominates. We have seen a subtle change in this respect with each prologue. In the first two prologues it is the function of communication and the directing function that are most important. In the third prologue the testimonial function replaces the directing function and in the fourth prologue the ideological function replaces the testimonial function.

Having discussed the functions of the narrator, let us now study the role of the narratee. As with all three previous prologues, this prologue has an extradiegetic narrator and therefore the narratee must also be extradiegetic. This type of narratee is easily confused with the implied reader with whom each real reader in turn identifies. In the fourth prologue the vocative is, once again, used extensively, approximately twenty-five times at the beginning of the prologue and twenty-five times at the end. Rabelais uses the vocative at the beginning in order to establish a rapport between narrator and narratee and to capture his attention for the duration of the second, third, and fourth degree narratives. The use of the vocative at the end of the prologue is a form of insurance that the narratee stays under his storyteller's spell for the duration of the book.
The tone Rabelais adopts to deal with the narratee is unlike any used in the previous three prologues. He neither elevates nor debases the narratee. His form of address is "Gens de bien" in the opening sentence and again in the middle of the third paragraph. The narratee of paragraphs twenty-seven and twenty-eight does not seem to be the same type of person as at the beginning of the prologue. Here, Rabelais seems to be addressing a group that is not exercising moderation:

Prenez y tous exemple, vous aultres gualliers de plat pays, qui dictez que, pour dix mille francs d'in-trade, ne quitteriez vos soubhaitz; et désormais ne parlez ainsi impudement, comme quelque foys je vous ay ouy soubhaitans. (Q.L. p. 27)

This is the closest Rabelais gets to being abusive with his readers. This is certainly a departure from his previous prologues. The ending however, improves, once again, the status of the narratee:

Or, en bonne santé toussez un bon coup, beuze en trois, secouez dehait vos aureilles, et vous oyrez dire merveilles du noble et bon Pantagruel. (Q.L. p. 29)

The role of the narratee remains an important one in this prologue as it was in the previous three. It is not a well defined role in this case. There are no descriptions of the narratee except for "gens de bien" (Q.L. p. 11) and "vous aultres gualliers de plat pays" (Q.L. p. 27). The narratee is simply invited to listen and learn from the stories in the prologue and to enjoy those in the book to follow.

This concludes the analysis of the prologue to Le Quart
Livre based on Genette's method of studying "narrative instance". We have discussed Rabelais' use of the time of narration and have concluded that the predominant use of the present tense differs little from the previous prologues. We have seen that the levels of narration are more complex in this prologue than in the preceding three. We have discussed the different functions of the narrator and concluded that the "function of communication" and the "ideological function" were the two predominant ones. Finally the role of the narratee was examined and we saw that it remains an important aspect of this and the previous three prologues. The tone with which the author deals with the narratee shows that his perception of the reader has changed substantially. This prologue, even more than the third, would seem to indicate that the author's experiences have helped produce the most complex of all the prologues and a special respect for his public.
NOTES

CHAPTER FOUR


3 "Légende ancienne rapportée par Ovide (Métamorphoses, VII, v. 763 et suiv.) et Pausanias (IX, 19), que Rabelais emprunte à l'Onomastication de J. Pollux (V,5)". (Q.L. p. 19, note 2).

4 M.A. Screech, Rabelais (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1979), p. 343. The term that Rabelais uses for Savior God - "Dieu Servateur" - is based on the classical Latin term "Servator" rather than on the Christian Latin "Salvator". Renaissance scholars often preferred the word "Servator", since it kept the idea of salvation but also added the idea of protection, dominant in the classical world.

5 Rabelais was, no doubt, familiar with Galen's writings. It is therefore interesting that he would give false references to them.

6 This is a verse written by Euripides and quoted by Erasmus in Adages IV, 4, 32.

7 Screech, p. 322.


9 Genette, pp. 234, 235.

10 "Je" is used 21 times in the prologue to Pantagruel, 14 times in the prologue to Gargantua, and 60 times in the prologue to Le Tiers Livre.
Having examined each of the four prologues on an individual basis, we must now draw some conclusions regarding their development and progression.

With respect to content, the prologues become progressively more and more serious. In the prologue to *Pantagruel* the oral aspect of the marketplace that Rabelais was so familiar with, predominates. The author uses exaggeration and hyperbole to take the reader in, just as a marketplace vendor does with his prospective buyers. Here the novice author is actually trying to sell his book using every means of persuasion available to him.

The prologue to *Gargantua* is twice as long and already shows a more serious content. The author deals with the problem of interpretation: exterior versus interior, appearances versus reality. The atmosphere of the marketplace is partially abandoned for a discussion that focuses on Socrates. Rabelais uses the example of the philosopher to show how appearances can be deceiving.

In the prologue to *Le Tiers Livre* the format of the prologue changes. Instead of a simple discourse between author and reader, or teller and listener, Rabelais also includes a short story about Diogenes to illustrate his point. The author deals with the problem of activity versus idleness and the acceptance of new ideas. This prologue still shows that Rabelais is not completely at ease with his readers in spite of the vast
popularity of his first two books.

The theme of health and moderation takes over the prologue to *Le Quart Livre*. This is the longest of the four prologues we have studied. It is also the one that shows us an author who is at ease with himself and his audience. Unlike the preceding three, this prologue conveys an atmosphere of conviviality not yet achieved by the others.

Each of the prologues is written in the present tense, since the prologues are seen as actual encounters between a storyteller and his listeners. The past tense, however, is used in recounting events that have occurred previously.

As the content becomes more serious, the structure of the prologues also becomes increasingly more elaborate. The first two prologues are simple in structure. They are both written strictly on the extradiegetic level. The second and third prologues are more complex, with second degree narratives. The second degree narrative in both *Le Tiers Livre* and *Le Quart Livre* prologues serves the function of persuasion, making use of a convincing anecdote to illustrate the author's point of view. In the fourth prologue there is even a third degree narrative, the story about the council of the gods, that serves to postpone the conclusion of the story about Couillatris, the second degree narrative.

The role of the narrator is the same in all four prologues: extradiegetic-homodiegetic. The presence of the narrator is strongly felt throughout the prologues because "je, vous" and their possessive pronouns and adjectives are used frequently,
as is shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pantagruel</th>
<th>Gargantua</th>
<th>Le Tiers Livre</th>
<th>Le Quart Livre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>je</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vous</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A study of the narrator's functions showed that communication was one of the two functions always present. This corroborates our belief that the primary purpose of the prologues is to establish a rapport between author and reader. The other functions were the directing function in the first two prologues which supports the conclusion we arrived at concerning the content of the prologues: that their main concern was with having the book accepted and how it should be read. In the third prologue the second function of the narrator is the testimonial function, once again supporting the claims of the content. It shows the author's seriousness about what he is saying regarding the acceptance of new ideas and his role as author. The ideological function is the second most predominant function of the narrator in the prologue to Le Quart Livre and once again this is congruous with the content of the prologue: the theme of health and moderation. Rabelais uses this opportunity to write about his own beliefs on the subject.

It is important also to note the question of authorship of the prologues. In the first two books Rabelais uses the pseudonym Alcofrías Nasier. Subsequently he uses his own name. In the prologue to Le Tiers Livre he also assumes the responsibility for having written Pantagruel and Gargantua. It is interesting to note how, once the author has put his real name
to his books, the directing function of the narrator is replaced by the more personal testimonial and ideological functions that let the reader perceive the author's ideas about his subjects.

The role of the narratee changes drastically from the prologue to *Pantagruel* to the prologue to *Le Quart Livre*. In the first prologue the narratee is subject to excessive flattery at the opening and to equally excessive abuse at the close of the prologue. The prologue to *Gargantua* presents a narratee with a more responsible role. He is given a certain choice as to how to read and interpret the book the author is introducing. From the table shown on the preceding page we can see that the pronouns designating the narratee outnumber the pronouns designating the narrator, almost three to one. The narratee in *Le Tiers Livre* takes on a more subtle role. The initiated narratee is invited to drink from the barrel but the uninvited one is cursed. In this prologue the emphasis is more on the narrator since he is concerned with his writing and feelings of self-doubt even more than he is concerned with reader acceptance. The last prologue we looked at shows us a narratee that is not abused but invited to listen and learn from a wise and aging narrator. Once again the table on the preceding page points out how the emphasis is more on the narratee than the narrator in this prologue.

Thus, this study illustrates that the narratee progressively acquires a more active and responsible role in the narrative, making him an equal partner with the narrator in the pact of communication established in the prologues. As the author gains
confidence in himself he allows the listener a larger role in his prologues. He no longer feels the need to keep the narratee at a distance by use of abuse but can establish with him a friendly and somewhat intimate relationship.
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