



The

RABELAIS
ENCYCLOPEDIA

EDITED BY ELIZABETH CHESNEY ZEGURA

bloodiest civil conflict—the Wars of **Religion** that effectively put an end to the brilliant French **Renaissance**.

Readings: Frederic J. Baumgartner, *Henry II. King of France 1547–1559* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1988); Robert J. Knecht, *French Renaissance Monarchy. Francis I and Henry II*, 2nd ed. (London: Longman, 1996); Ian D. McFarlane, ed., *The Entry of Henry II into Paris 16 June 1549* (Binghamton, NY: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1982).

Elizabeth Chesney Zegura

HER TRIPPA An astrologer and occultist, one of the authorities that **Panurge** consults in the *Third Book* (25), most often identified as a combination of Trithemius (*Steganographia*) and **Cornelius Agrippa** (*De occulta philosophia* and *De incertitudine et vanitate scientiarum et artium*). It is **Epistémon** who suggests this consultation, which seems significant as Her Trippa's questionable methods of divination are of the type that **Pantagruel**, the usual instigator of the text's consultations, would appear to condemn. The astrologer presents in fact an encyclopedia of magic erudition that completes and concludes the series of consultations relying on divination.

We are confronted with the type of elaborate intellectual **farce** that has come to represent the text's ironic design while evacuating (or at least discrediting) the physical farce of the first two books. Her Trippa is the only authority who has already experienced what **Panurge** is so frightened of, namely to be cuckolded, as we learn from the **trickster** himself at the beginning of the chapter. The astrologer's ignorance of this personal mishap casts an instant doubt on his abilities as a soothsayer. His verdict, however, corresponds to all the other verdicts, confirming that Panurge will indeed be cuckolded, beaten, and robbed by his future wife. What is more, it is the most unequivocal verdict, leaving Panurge without the option of reinterpreting it in his favor as he is wont to do. In his rage the trickster unmasks Her Trippa, first insulting him rather violently and then drawing on a number of proverbs from **Erasmus's** *Adages*, reproaching him for his lack of self-knowledge. The criticism culminates in what Panurge calls the "first characteristic of philosophy," the phrase "KNOW THYSELF," forming, in capital letters, the center

of the chapter and repeating, essentially, the advice that could be considered the leitmotif of all fourteen consultations beginning with **Pantagruel's** "Ricochet song" (3BK 9). The trickster—combining biblical and classical sources (the parable from the Sermon on the Mount, which is part of the aforementioned sequence of *Adagia* as well as Plutarch's *polypragmon*)—essentially reproaches the occultist for his ability to see the mote in others' eyes but not the beam in his own.

Although Panurge seems correct in his qualifications of the prognosticator, who, blissfully ignorant of his own wife's adulterous actions, is nonetheless convinced to be able to predict another man's marital future, the irony consists in the fact that the trickster implicitly unmasks himself in his ranting, as he and Her Trippa turn out to be mirror images as models of **philautia**, unable to detect in themselves what they so easily recognize in others. Furthermore, both of them adhere to the illusion that univocal solutions can be provided to inherently ambivalent problems. In this way the trickster's severe criticism of the occultist proves to be a dismantling of blind adherence to univocal models of thought expressed through Panurge's subtle unconscious self-satirization, a technique that illustrates the *Third Book's* new brand of elaborate satire.

Readings: Jean Céard, *La nature et les prodiges* (Geneva: Droz, 1977); Edwin M. Duval, *The Design of Rabelais's Tiers Livre de Pantagruel* (Geneva: Droz, 1997); Michael A. Screech, "Girolamo Cardano's *De Sapiencia* and the *Tiers Livre de Pantagruel*," *BHR* 25 (1963): 97–110.

Bernd Renner

HERESY Rabelais could easily have been burned at the stake for his writings. All four books were considered *heretical*—that is, damaging to the central teachings of the Catholic Church—and condemned by the religious authorities in France immediately after they appeared in print. The *Pantagruel* was reportedly censured or at least denounced, in 1533, less than a year after its publication in Lyon; a re-edition of *Pantagruel* and *Gargantua*, in 1543; the *Third Book*, in 1546; and the *Fourth Book*, in 1552, this time by both religious and civil authorities—the **Sorbonne** and the **Parlement**. In Catholic theology, no crime was more serious

than heresy, deemed tantamount to murder but infinitely worse. A murderer ends a mortal life before its time; a heretic, it was argued, snuffs out the immortal life of souls by depriving them of salvation. Spreading errors of faith and false beliefs, the heretic kills for all eternity. Heretics were burned at the stake not only to punish evil, but also to purify and protect the community by eliminating all traces of an infectious and deadly pollution.

The modern reader of Rabelais is unlikely to have such thoughts in mind. Rabelais, however, was keenly aware of what was at stake in attacking the Church. Not just a few but hundreds of reform-minded Catholics in France were burned at the stake between 1523 and 1560 (El Kenz 1997). This practice is alluded to early in *Pantagruel*, implicitly in the famous "jusques au feu exclusive" in the prologue ("This I maintain fully and firmly to any point, short of the stake"), and explicitly in chapter 5 when **Pantagruel** on his tour of French universities stopped at Toulouse "but did not stay there long when he saw that they had their professors burnt alive like red-herrings, [and went away] saying 'God forbid I should die such a death.'" The professor in question, Jean de Cahors, had just been sentenced (January 1532) to death for having made heretical statements at a dinner. He was burned alive on the place Saint-Etienne in Toulouse in June, four months before Rabelais published *Pantagruel*. From 1533 to his death in 1553, Rabelais, always on the lookout for safe havens and protective patrons, was constantly prepared to flee and did so (Poitou, Chambéry, Metz, Rome) each time one of his books was condemned. When the Sorbonne condemned the *Third Book* immediately after publication in 1546, he left France for the imperial city of Metz; in the same year, his sometime colleague and editor in **Lyon, Etienne Dolet**, convicted of heresy for having published portions of the Bible in French, was hanged and burned in Paris on the Place Maubert. Over the next three years, from 1547 to 1550, the Paris *Parlement* issued more than five hundred convictions of heresy, sixty of which carried the death penalty.

In the sixteenth century, what exactly was meant by the term *heresy*? Everyone knew it meant religious views not sanctioned by the

Church; heresy was the opposite of orthodoxy. But what was orthodoxy, at a time when so much had changed and the Church itself spoke of reform? In 1543 **Francis I** issued a royal ordinance enjoining "inquisitors of the faith to pursue Lutherans and heretics as seditious, disruptors of the public peace, and conspirators against the security of the State" (Isambert 818–21). But how would an inquisitor know who was a "Lutheran," and what exactly was a "heretic"?

The Sorbonne provided a precise response to these questions, included with the Ordinance of 1543. Registered in the Parlement on July 3 and published in the streets of Paris the following day, it contains a list of twenty-five Articles of faith set forth by the dean and doctors of theology of the University of Paris assembled at the demand of the king, "in order briefly to set forth, in written form, what faithful preachers and doctors of theology must preach and read, and what other faithful Christians must believe with the Catholic church" (Isambert in Beck 1986: 821). The list defines orthodoxy concisely (*ce qui est à croire*) as understood by the Sorbonne in 1543, and thus defines heresy as well, by contrast and implication in some cases, though in others, heretical doctrines are specified explicitly. Many of the articles are stated in the form of opposing imperatives (*it is necessary to believe X and not Y*). The Ordinance of 1543 with its Sorbonne addendum ("What is to be believed, and preached, concerning the points which have lately fallen into controversy concerning our Holy Faith and Religion" [52]) carries, as a royal decree, the highest judicial authority, and the pronouncements of the Sorbonne doctors carry the highest doctrinal authority in France. All in all, it would be hard for the nonspecialist reader of Rabelais to find a better introduction (or the specialist a better summary) regarding the question of "heresy in the time of Rabelais."

What is to be believed, and preached, concerning the points which have lately fallen into controversy concerning our Holy Faith and Religion (52).

1. It is necessary to believe, with certain and firm Faith, that Baptism is necessary for everyone for their Salvation, even for small children, and that by Baptism is conferred the Grace of the Holy Spirit.

2. By like constancy and firmness of Faith, it is to be believed that man has his unfettered and Free Will, by which he may do Good or Evil; and by which, even if he be in Mortal Sin, he may, with the help of God, be restored to Grace.
3. And it is no less certain that to those who are of age and capable of Reason, after having committed Mortal Sin, Penitence is necessary, which consists in Contrition, Confession that must be made as a Sacrament verbally to a Priest, and in the same way Satisfaction.
4. Further, it is to be believed the sinner is in no way justified by Faith alone, but also by his Good Works, which are of such necessity that without them, a man who is capable of Reason can not obtain Eternal Life.
5. Each and every Christian is required to believe firmly that in the act of Consecration at the Altar, the bread and the wine are converted to the true body and blood of Jesus Christ, and that after the aforementioned Consecration there remains only the form of the said bread and wine under which is truly contained the real Body of Jesus Christ, born of the Virgin Mary and who suffered on the rood of the Cross.
6. The Sacrifice of the Mass is of the institution of Jesus Christ and is useful and profitable for the living and the dead.
7. The Communion of the Eucharist under the two signs of bread and wine is not necessary for the Laity, whence properly and for certain and just reasons it has long been ordained by the Church that the aforementioned Lay public receive Communion only under the form of bread.
8. And further, the power to consecrate the true Body of Jesus Christ was given by Him only to Priests ordained and consecrated according to the custom and observance of the Church, and likewise the power to absolve sins in the sacrament of Penitence.
9. And as well, these Priests truly do consecrate, even bad Priests or Priests in mortal sin, the true Body of Jesus Christ, provided it is their intention to do so.
10. Confirmation and Extreme Unction are two Sacraments instituted by Jesus Christ, by which is conferred the Grace of the Holy Spirit.
11. And it must not be doubted that the Saints, as much in this mortal life as those in Paradise, do miracles.
12. It is a holy thing and most pleasing to God, to pray to the blessed mother of God the Virgin Mary, and to the Saints in heaven, that they be advocates and intercessors for us toward God.
13. And for this reason we must not only imitate and follow these Saints who reign with Jesus Christ, but honor and pray to them.
14. And for this reason, those who out of devotion visit churches and other places dedicated to these Saints, perform holy and religious actions.
15. If perchance someone, inside or outside of Church, begins praying directly to the glorious Virgin Mary, or to some Saint before praying to God, this is in no way a sin.
16. Nor must there be any doubt that it is indeed a Good Work to kneel before an image, either of the crucifix or the Virgin Mary or the other Saints, to pray to our Lord Jesus Christ and to the Saints.
17. Further, it is necessary to believe firmly and in no way to doubt, that there is a Purgatory, in which the souls there detained are aided by prayers, fasting, alms, and other Good Works, so that they be the more speedily delivered from their pains.
18. Each and every Christian is required to believe firmly that there is on Earth one universal visible Church, which cannot err in matters of Faith and Morals, and which all Christians must obey in matters of Faith and Morals.
19. And that if anything in the Holy Scriptures came into controversy or doubt, that it belongs to this Church to define and determine these matters.
20. It is equally certain that one must believe many things that are not expressly and specifically contained in the Holy Scriptures, things which must nonetheless be accepted by the tradition of the Church.
21. By the same certainty of Truth it is necessary to believe that the power of Excommunication is by divine right granted without mediation by Jesus Christ to the Church, and that for this reason ecclesiastic censures are greatly to be feared.
22. It is equally certain that a General Council convoked in due and legitimate fashion and representing the universal Church, cannot err in

determining matters pertaining to Faith and Morals.

23. And it is no less certain that by divine right there is a Pope, who is chief Sovereign in the militant church of Jesus Christ, and that all Christians must obey him, who has the power as well to confer Indulgences.
24. The Constitutions of the Church, such as fasting, avoidance of meat, abstinence of the flesh, among several other things, do truly oblige the Conscience, in particular to eschew all scandal.
25. Vows and especially monastic and religious ones, like perpetual abstinence, poverty, and obedience, are obligations of Conscience.

From two basic principles that were generally accepted, divine **grace** and salvation, flowed a series of bitterly contested issues: **free will** and predestination, justification (by faith alone or by faith and good works), the sacraments (their role, how they were to be observed, but first of all their *number* and *definition*—one of the thorniest questions being that of the *real presence* of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist). These are followed at more remote levels of eschatological and ecclesiological controversy by “constitutions,” observances, doctrines, and dogmas—the mass, Purgatory, cult of the Virgin and Saints, status of images, fasting, religious orders, ultimate and infallible authority of (and in) the Church, authority of the Pope vis-à-vis the councils (including the power of the Pope to dispense indulgences, added seemingly almost as an afterthought in no. 23). All these issues were interrelated, complex, fiercely disputed, and in varying degrees mocked or occasionally defended by Rabelais.

The list covers most of the litigious points contested by Reformers of the various confessional leanings hinted at behind the scenes of Rabelais’s comedy and satire—*évangélisme*, Lutheranism, Calvinism, and others—confronting the corrupt traditionalism and militant ignorance that dominated the Church and resisted all attempts at eliminating abuses. It was against the Church that Rabelais directed his most powerful and riskiest attacks.

Readings: David El Kenz, *Les buchers du roi. La culture protestante des martyrs 1523–1572* (Seysssel: Champ Vallon, 1997); François Isambert, *Recueil gé-*

néral des anciennes lois françaises, vol. 12 (Paris: Plon, 1822–33) in Jonathan Beck, *Théâtre et propagande aux débuts de la Réforme. Six pièces polémiques du recueil La Vallière* (Paris/Geneva: Slatkine, 1986).

Jonathan Beck

HERO Rabelais’s first two books are clearly structured as parodies of the epic poems and legends of antiquity and of the medieval *chansons de geste* and chivalric romances. Allusions to legendary figures of the past appear throughout the narrative, and nearly all pagan, biblical, and medieval heroes (and villains) are either lumped together in an incongruous genealogy (P 1), condemned to a degrading common fate *aux Enfers* (P 30), or relegated to the Island of the **Macraeons** (4BK 25–28). Very few contemporary readers would question the use of the term *mock-heroic epic* as an accurate description of *Pantagruel* and *Gargantua*, since nearly all of the major characteristics of the original models are present: the hero inherits a prestigious genealogy; precocious displays of courage, strength, or intelligence are observed during childhood; his **education** or apprenticeship is exceptionally rapid and foretells future greatness; faithful companions are attracted by his obvious valor and worth; various initiatory trials test his fitness for the supreme challenges of warfare and single combat; and if he is victorious, legitimate political order is restored, or a new order is founded, preparing the way for the future growth of a great dynasty, city, or empire. Even death in battle leads to apotheosis and legendary status.

Although the last two books are not structured according to this model, they do contain epic-heroic elements. The first chapter of the **Third Book** describes how a truly heroic victor should govern a newly conquered territory, while the next four chapters expose the demented reasoning of the increasingly tyrannical antihero, **Panurge**. Both the consultations of the **Third Book** and the “odyssey” of the **Fourth Book** recall the extraordinary voyages and encounters of classical and medieval adventurers.

Rabelais’s depiction of the hero, however, systematically calls into question the definition and value of the concept, as many references are irreverent and disrespectful. Panurge tells **Panta-**