May 14 1931

To the Committee on Graduate Study:

I submit herewith a thesis by Miss Reba Archalita Millsaps, "A Comparison of Rabelais's Ideas on Intellectual, Religious, and Social Freedom with those of Montaigne, Calvin, and Marguerite de Navarre." I recommend that this thesis be accepted for 9 hours credit in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

32

Charles K Kaun
Major Professor

At the request of the Committee on Graduate Study, I have read this thesis and recommended its acceptance.

Walter E. Stiefel

Paul Brett

Accepted by the Committee

F. M. Stamps
Chairman

A COMPARISON OF RABELAIS'S IDEAS ON INTELLECTUAL, RELIGIOUS, AND SOCIAL FREEDOM WITH THOSE OF MONTAIGNE, CALVIN, AND MARGUERITE DE NAVARRE

A THESIS

Submitted to the Graduate Committee
of the
University of Tennessee
in
Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the degree of
Master of Arts



ARCHALITA REBA MILLSAPS

June, 1931

CONTENTS

		Page
Introduction.....		i-ix
Chapter I	The Opinions of Rabelais on Intellectual, Religious, and Social Freedom.....	1-53
Chapter II	Montaigne and Rabelais.....	54-83
Chapter III	Marguerite de Navarre and Rabelais.....	84-97
Chapter IV	Calvin and Rabelais.....	98-107
Conclusion.....		108-111

Bibliography

102098

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

For aid in the planning and the writing of this paper, I am greatly indebted to Dr. E. K. Kane, Chairman of the Department of Romance Languages, and Mr. W. E. Stiefel, Professor in the Department of Romance Languages, University of Tennessee.

Archalita Reba Millsaps

June, 1931.

INTRODUCTION

The characteristic intellectual manifestation of the Renaissance in France was the spirit of free inquiry, of revolt against traditional authority.[1] In other words, it was the assertion of the freedom of man and of the rights of the individual.[2] For this reason the sixteenth century marks a great change in all the provinces of the intellectual life. Here can be seen the full advent of the Italian Renaissance with its spirit of intense liberty and originality.

There have been many treatises written on the general theme of freedom as found in the Renaissance in France.[3] Various authors have been considered as representing various phases of liberty in this period.[4] Comparative studies have also been made of the idea of liberty as it is expressed by individual authors in different periods.[5] It will be

---

1. Tilley, The Literature of the French Renaissance, p. 33.
2. Ibid., p. 13.
3. Ibid., pp. 5-43.
4. Van Laun, History of French Literature, pp. 281-341. Rabelais, Montaigne, and Calvin are each considered as free thinkers. However, no comparison is made between them.
5. L. E. Rector, Comparison of Educational Ideas of Montaigne and Rousseau,

noted, however, that these studies are either general treatments of the idea of freedom as conceived by certain authors in the Renaissance, or they are comparisons of the ideas of an author of the sixteenth century with similar ideas of a writer of an entirely different period. As yet no serious study has been made comparing the ideas of freedom of authors of the sixteenth century.

It is the purpose of this thesis to compare specifically the literary expression of the ideas on freedom found in four representative authors, namely, Rabelais, Montaigne, Calvin, and Marguerite de Navarre.[1] In this study Rabelais will be taken as the point of departure, a procedure justified by the fact that he is the most representative figure of the Renaissance in France and the chronicler of all its most important ideas. The other three typify the three chief realms to which the idea of freedom was applied: Calvin liberated the soul, Montaigne the mind, while Marguerite de Navarre is the representative of Platonism, the apostle of a new social morality.

---

1. The books selected as containing the most representative expressions of the idea of freedom in the Renaissance are as follows:
   Pantagruel and Gargantua (5 books), of François Rabelais
   The Essais, of Michel de Montaigne
   The Institution de la Religion Chrétienne, of Jean Calvin
   The Heptaméron, of Marguerite de Navarre.

As indicated above, there were three fields in which the principle of freedom was asserted in the Renaissance, the intellectual, the religious, and the social.

The Renaissance upheld the validity of human reason as opposed to that of authority, the Renaissance conception being that man can find truth only through experience and experiment or through free examination and interpretation of authority. To the thoughtful people of the sixteenth century truth was no longer an abstract absolute to be accepted blindly simply because it had always been accepted. In this thesis, therefore, both the assertion of the right of independent thought and examples of the exercise of that right have been used to show the attitude of each author.

In religious history the Renaissance coincides chronologically with the great period of upheaval in religion known as the Reformation, the latter being an assertion of the principles of freedom as opposed to authority in religion. One can distinguish here two main currents: first, the insistence on the right of individuals to interpret or prove religious truth in the light of fact and reason; second, the emphasis on the right of the individual to believe and worship according to the dictates

of his own conscience.[1]

The Renaissance was a period marked by a profound change in the structure of society. The old, accepted ideas of the relations between men and women were either rejected or modified. The "Bataille des Femmes" with the clear affirmation of the rights of woman which it produced, is one of the striking phenomenon of the age and shows the turmoil which the new ideas were creating.

Not only did the Renaissance demand greater freedom and more equality in the relations between the sexes, but also insisted on the individual's right to choose his own social state. Finally, it should be remarked that at the basis of Renaissance morality is the idea that the individual's goal in life is the most perfect possible self-development, which necessarily implies that he must be free from conventional social restraint.

The Renaissance attitude toward intellectual, religious, and social freedom becomes more striking when contrasted with the viewpoint of the Middle Ages.

---

1. Calvin belongs to the first group, believing that the individual should interpret religious dogma in the light of known historical fact and reason. Montaigne and Rabelais especially upheld both the idea of free thought and free worship in religion. Marguerite de Navarre is particularly interested in the latter.

The Medieval habit of thought is one of subjection to authority, to absolutism in church and state, which were inevitably one.

During the Middle Ages political power was regarded as the sacred monopoly of privileged classes. Liberty of discussion, freedom of speech and press were sternly limited by despotism. Liberty of belief and of religious inquiry was prohibited by the church.

It is not to be inferred, however, that elements of vigor were lacking in the Middle Ages. What was wanting was freedom - the feeling of human independence, liberty in approaching questions of philosophy, religion, scholarship, and literature. The courage born of knowledge was lacking. Untaught persons had more just enthusiasm for free-thought and inquiry, perhaps, than scholars, but the former were constrained by ignorance and fear of the doom pronounced upon heretics and rebels. The vengeance of the church hung over them, causing the pursuit of truth to become a thing practically impossible. The other world with its heaven and hell was an ever-present source of terror in the conscience of the individual. However sweet the world seemed, however fair the flesh, both the world and the flesh were given over to the devil.

It was not worth while to master and economize the resources of the earth, to utilize the good and ameliorate the evils of this life, while everyone agreed that the present was but a brief imperfect prelude to an infinitely worse or infinitely better future. To escape from these preoccupations and prejudices except upon the path of conscious and deliberate sin was impossible for all but minds of rarest quality and courage. Even these were too often reduced to the recantation of their suppressed errors either by a sense of guilt or by compulsion of the church.

In addition to regard for tradition as a shackle of will, there is another obvious characteristic of the Middle Ages, the toleration and even enjoyment of various forms of ugliness. "The frequent choice of the Last Judgment as a subject for painting, and the copiousness of hideous detail with which it was invariably executed, the almost exclusive representation of the Redeemer in agony rather than in loving majesty,[1] the stunted and emaciated forms of Byzantine art, witchcraft, demonology, dances of

---

1. Lecky, Rationalism in Europe, Vol. I, p. 257. Compare the tradition on the deformity of Our Lord.

death, are all signs of the same slavish superstition, of that dark and gloomy feeling which substitutes the worship of ugliness for the worship of beauty, and a religion of fear for a religion of love."[1] This is in direct contrast with the Renaissance love for beauty.[2]

There was, however, a certain feeling for beauty in the Middle Ages. The cathedrals in France - Rheims, Chartres, and Bourges - are living manifestations of this fact. In this matter, as in that of free inquiry, it is only in a few isolated individuals that the feeling for beauty has altogether full play - that it separates itself entirely from the bondage of ugliness and asceticism. There is little art in the Middle Ages that is wholly free from some form of ugliness. Even in architecture there are to be found shapes of hideous character.

The Middle Ages had yet a third characteristic which is interesting to note - the limitation of knowledge. Before the invention of printing[3] the possession of books was confined to the rich and the

---

1. This love for beauty is after all merely another side of the same impulse as the spirit of free inquiry. While the latter spirit is the assertion of man's intellect, the delight in beauty is an expression of the freedom of his senses.
2. Tilley, Literature of the French Renaissance, pp. 8-9.
3. About 1453.

great or to a few ardent scholars,[1] but the invention of printing made it possible to produce cheaper and more accurate books which the Revival of Learning demanded.

The root of the whole system of education in the Middle Ages was the blind adherence to tradition and the slavish dependence of the students on the teacher.[2] The two textbooks used in the entire higher educational system were the Sentences of Peter Lombard and the Summulae of Petrus Hippanus.[3] These books supplied the texts used by both teachers and pupils of the Middle Ages. The teacher usually dictated the lesson while the pupil took notes. He had no desire to criticize the things his teacher told him. It is no wonder that there was little development of man's intellectual powers. The same method of learning prevailed in all branches of

---

1. Scholars whose courage and intellect were high enough to surmount the obstacle of their poverty - such men as Grossette, Roger Bacon, or Edmund Rich.
2. The professor dictated the commentaries on the books read. These commentaries the student accumulated in his notebooks. Thus when the student in turn became a teacher, he used the notes given him by his professor.
3. The Sentences represented theology, and was a collection of theological propositions compiled from the Fathers. The Summulae represented Aristotle's logic and was an abridgement of the Organon of Petrus Hispanus. The propositions in the Sentences were arranged and analyzed in uniformity with the ideas of scholastic philosophy, while the Summulae contained matter of which only hints are to be found in Aristotle.

knowledge - law as well as philosophy and theology. There was no free inquiry whatsoever. Soon printing and the manufacture of cheap books were fatal to the oral method of teaching. Henceforth the students might begin to think for themselves.

Out of these conditions - the torpor of man's intellect due to slavish regard for tradition and the ascetic spirit which prevented man from indulging in the national craving for beauty - the Renaissance developed.

There was, to be sure, no sudden change from darkness to light. Obviously, it was a gradual evolution due to many causes, the most important being the invention of printing and gunpowder, the discovery of America and of classical Italy. These discoveries led people to attempt a new evaluation of life and a judging of its accomplishments by new standards. They led to the rejection of the old standards of authority and tradition.

It is with the exponents of these new ideas and their works that we are concerned, and primarily with Rabelais, whose thought marks the apogee of the French Renaissance.

Chapter I

THE OPINIONS OF RABELAIS ON INTELLECTUAL, RELIGIOUS AND SOCIAL FREEDOM

Rabelais is the greatest name in the French Renaissance, the perfect expression of this period as it appeared in France. "His incommensurable and indescribable masterpiece of mingled humor, wisdom, satire, erudition, indecency, profundity, levity, imagination and realism represents the whole age in its mirror of hypo-Aristophanic farce. What Ariosto is for Italy, Cervantes for Spain, Erasmus for Holland, Luther for Germany, Shakespeare for England, that is Rabelais for France."[1] The Renaissance cannot be comprehended in its true character unless one becomes familiar with this central figure.

Of the characteristics which make Rabelais so thoroughly representative of his age, the most striking are his devotion to learning, his many-sidedness, his love for travel, and his gusto for life.

Rabelais's learning is remarkable for its wide range. He quoted and borrowed from a vast number of Greek and Latin authors. He had also a

---

1. Tilley, History of French Literature, p. 41.

knowledge of other humanistic, or rather "inhumanistic," subjects such as Hebrew and law. But to the studies of the ordinary humanist Rabelais added others. He had a considerable knowledge of architecture,[1] though he was most interested in its technical side. He was widely read in French and Italian literature. He seems to have been interested in music since, in the prologue of the Fourth book, he gives a list of fifty-nine musicians of his day, chiefly those who belong to what is known as the Netherlandish school.[2] Although Rabelais had visited Italy, he seems to have taken little interest in sculpture or painting. The bent of his mind was not so much artistic as it was literary and scientific.

In science, the accomplishments of Rabelais are remarkable. He had a considerable knowledge of anatomy, physiology, botany,[3] and zoology and was

---

1. See for example the description of the Abbaye de Theleme. This description of the abbey is of considerable interest as showing at once the style of architecture prevalent in France at the time when Rabelais wrote and his own ideas on the subject.
2. Chief among these are Adrian Willaert, a native of Bruges and a choir master of St. Mark's, Venice, John Okeghem and his pupil Josquin Des Prez, both in their turn heads of the royal chapel in Paris, Pierre Certon, choir master of the Sainte-Chapelle, and Clément Jannequin, a composer of popular songs.
3. Book III, Ch. LXIX.

very skillful as a practising physician. He was acquainted with the technical terms of various arts and crafts.[1] It seems, however, that his famous account of the storm, in Panurge's and Gargantua's quest of the Divine Bottle,[2] betrays ignorance rather than knowledge of naval matters.

Furthermore, Rabelais shows himself to be representative of his age in his love of travel and his restlessness. His journeys to Rome, as well as those to Turin and Metz, may have been motivated by necessity. But in addition to making these forced trips, Rabelais travelled over a large part of France and seldom remained in one place very long.[3] In his book there are many places mentioned so definitely that it seems that Rabelais must certainly

---

1. For example in the prologue to the Third Book where Rabelais gives a veritable dictionary of words relating to fortifications and military matters.
2. Book IV, Ch. XVIII.
3. The love of travel was entirely at variance with Medieval thought. "'It is strange madness,' said Petrarch, 'this desire to be forever sleeping in a strange bed.' Seldon would have agreed with Petrarch. Both his and Petrarch's ideas on the subject of travel were in accord with the ideas of the church.

   "The Medieval church had never much approved of wandering, 'Sit in thy cell,' said Anthony, 'and thy cell shall teach thee all things. The monk out of his cell is a fish out of water.' Stabilitas, perseverance in that place where a brother had made his profession, was one of the three obligations of the Benevictine vow. Although a man might be sent to different places on duty, the natural state of the clerical soul is static." H. Waddell, The Wandering Scholars, The Ordo Vagorum, pp. 161-174.

have visited them at some time, notably Saint Malo, the port from which the expedition sailed in quest of the Bottle; and the Channel Islands of Herm and Sark, which Panurge says he has seen.[1]

In this love for travel can be seen also Rabelais's ardent thirst for knowledge. Wherever he went he was eager to learn. At Rome, he became deeply engrossed in the study of ancient ruins. At Turin, he took a keen interest in the work of fortification; at Saint-Malo and La Rochelle he learned from pilots and sailors what they could tell him of the New World. In every town that he visited, he carefully observed constructions and noteworthy objects.

Finally, Rabelais represents his age in his gusto for life. This intense interest in living was perhaps due to the fact that his youth really began at the age of forty since then he left the convent. He had really not yet lived at all; the world was entirely new to him. Other men of his age had lived, enjoyed, and been sated with the pleasures of life; other men by the time they had reached middle age had tried, proved, and found their own weakness and strength. Rabelais had reached this age with the

---

1. Book I, ch. LXVI. Rabelais often records his own experiences in those of Panurge.

vague aspirations, the credulity, the hope and the confidence of a man of twenty. He felt sure that outside the convent, all men must be good.

Even at the age of sixty-three, when he wrote his Third Book, Rabelais is not disillusioned or disappointed. He is full of hope and gaiety. He still believes in men, in the future, and in the glorious prospects of liberty and learning. In the Fourth Book, however, written six years later, one can perceive that Rabelais has lost some of his spontaneity and has become more calmly philosophic.

Could there have been a man better prepared to represent his age than Rabelais? During the Renaissance there were a few men who were superior to him in scientific knowledge; there were possibly a few who rivalled him in the knowledge of books, and there were many men, perhaps, who surpassed him in the variety of their artistic achievements. But it would be difficult to find a man equal to Rabelais in the combination of scientific and literary knowledge with artistic achievement.

Let us now turn to the works of Rabelais and consider the ideas found there which are in turn truly representative of the spirit of the Renaissance: his ideas on matters pertaining to intellectual,

religious, and social liberty.

As regards free thought, Rabelais says that man has the liberty to think and reason for himself and further that he should utilize this liberty. A brief review of the portion of the plot which leads up to the assertion of the supremacy of human reason will show the full significance of that declaration: Panurge desires to marry, but wants to be assured that it will be a wise thing to do. In his search for definite answers to his questions as to whether his wife would be faithful to him or whether she would beat him or rob him, Panurge resorts to various methods of foretelling the future and consults with various classes of men. However, not having obtained satisfactory answers to his questions in his own country, he determines to consult the Oracle of the Bottle. Rabelais wants Panurge to find the answer not by seeking authority, but by drinking deep from the experiences of life itself. The answer of the bottle is the single word, "Trinch."[1] The ensuing explanation of the priestess Baccbuc is of great importance in the determination of Rabelais's

---

1. "Lors feut ouy ce mot: 'Trinch.'" Book V, Ch. XLV.

philosophy since it deals with the question of liberty of thought.[1]

Pantagruel had said to Panurge at the very beginning of the inquiry, "N'estez vous asceuré de vostre vouloir? Le poinct principal y gist, tout le reste est fortuit et dependent des fatales dispositions du ciel."[2] Again, the reply of Raminagrobis to the question as to whether or not Panurge should marry, pleased him more than any other since Raminagrobis means that in the enterprise of marriage every man must be arbiter of his own thought and take council of himself.[3] At the end of his long quest, then, Panurge

---

1. "Et icy maintenons que mon rire, ains boire, est le propre de l'homme. Je ne dy boire simplement et absolument, car aussi bien boivent les bestes; je dy boire vin bon et frais. Notez, ames, que de vin divin on devient, et n'y a argument tant seur, ny art de divination moins fallace. Vos academiques l'afferment redans l'etimoligie de vin, lequel ils disent en grec οἶνος, estre comme vis, force, puissance: car pouvoir il a d'emplir l'ame de toute verite, tout scavoir et philosophie. Si avez note ce qui est en lettres peu entendre qu'en vin est verite cachee. La Dive Bouteille vous y envoye, soyez vous mesmes interpretes de vostre entreprinse."
   "'Possible n'est,' dist Pantagruel, 'mieux dire que fait ceste venerable pontife; autant vous en dy - je lorsque premierement m'en parlastes.'" Book V, Ch. XLVI.
2. Book III, Ch. X.
3. Book III, Ch. XXII.

had found no definite answer to his question. His success in matrimony must depend on his own choice and on his own conduct. He must be "l'interprète de sa enterprinse." It is his intelligence, not any authoritative oracle which must guide him.

Another assertion of the freedom of thought is found in the Oracle of the Bottle. No authoritative revelation will convince the reason of man. He must work out his own destiny; he must make his own choice; he must act for himself. Man can and must reason without the restraint of authority. "Vostre vouloir," says Pantagruel, "est le poinct principal tout le reste est dependent des fatales dispositions du Ciel."[1] Thus, it can be seen that Rabelais believes in the free will of man. He realizes that it is in man's belief in his own power to will that the success of human endeavor depends to a great extent.

Man is invited to act in accord with the conclusions of reason. No definite answer is given to Panurge. If there had been given a favorable one, Panurge would perhaps have married the first woman to whom he took a fancy and might have continued

---

1. Book III, Ch. X.

in his evil, thoughtless ways, feeling sure of happiness because of the prophecy. On the other hand, if the answer had been unfavorable, he would probably not have married at all. In either case, action as the result of free choice would have been paralyzed. The lesson has a broader application. If man were granted a clear revelation of his destiny, all progress and all human endeavor would come to an end. Rabelais, then, contends that man himself is free to decide as he pleases. The priestess told the drinkers: "I do not say drinking simply, but drinking fresh wine. . . If you have noticed what is written over the gate of the temple, you may understand that in wine is hidden truth."[1] The old saying was "Wine is truth," but she interpreted it in a new way: "Wine fills the soul with all truth, all knowledge and all philosophy." The word of the bottle, "the most joyous, most divine, most certain word," that the priestess had ever yet heard, is a command to strive after truth.

(It seems that Rabelais means that man should strive after scientific truth. He is a humanist, eager for everything which might expand the

---

1. Book V, Ch. XLVI. See note 2, p. 7.

limits of human knowledge and aid human progress. He is vitally interested in scientific discovery as shown by his carrying his studies in botany, physiology and anatomy almost to the farthest point reached in his day;[1] also by his foreshadowing, with the help of his imaginative insight, some of the discoveries of modern science. His thought of scientific progress makes the future seem bright to him: "venus en vostre monde," says the priestess in her parting speech to Pantagruel and his companions, "portez tesmoignage que sous terre sont les grands tresors et choses admirables."[2] And again she says that the philosophers who complain that all things have been described by the ancients and that nothing new has been left to them to invent are very clearly in the wrong, since "ce que du ciel vous apparaist, et appelez phenomenes, ce que la terre vous exhibe, ce que la mer et autres fleuves contiennent, n'est comparable à ce qui est en terre caché."[3] In the description of the herb

---

1. "Et, quand à la congnoissance des faictz de nature, je veuex que tu te y adonne curieusement; qu'il n'y ayt mer, riviere ny fontaine dont tu ne congnoisse les poissons, tous les oyseaulx de l'air, tous les metaulx cachez au ventre des abysmes, les pierreries de tout orient et midy: rien ne te soit incongneu." Book II, Ch. VIII.
2. Book V, Ch. XLVIII.
3. Ibid.

Pantagrueline the gods themselves are afraid that by the children of Pantagruel may be invented an herb of like energy, by means of which mortals will be able to visit the sources of the hail storms, the flood gates of the rains, and the forge of the thunderbolts, to invade the regions of the moon, and to take the territory of the celestial signs.[1] For Rabelais, the limits of possibility in the realm of science are infinite.

Man is not only commanded to search after scientific truth but also to search after absolute truth. "Ce que vous appelez phenomenes - N'est comparable à ce qui est en terre caché." Here Rabelais refers to absolute truth rather than to scientific discoveries. The search for truth according to the priestess should be made as follows:[2] "Car tous philosophes et sages antiques à bien seurement et plaisamment parfaire de chemin de la cognaissance divine et chasse de sapience, ont estimé deux choses necessaires, guyde de Dieu et compagnie d'homme." (It is, he believes, by the help of God and our fellowman that we can finally attain wisdom and the truth hidden

---

1. Book III, Ch. LI.
2. Book V, Ch. XLVIII.

under the earth. To find this truth is the ultimate goal of man.

Not only in the story of the quest of the Divine Bottle does Rabelais emphasize the freedom of man to reason without first seeking authority. In the description of the Abbey of Thélème[1] he expresses the same idea when he says, "En leur reigle n'estoit que ceste clause: Fay ce que vouldras."[2] In this monastery, which is the world at its best, the Order is a society composed entirely of young people unrestrained by any stupid rules, customs or conventions. The conscience of each Thelemite is to be his guide. "Tout leur vie estoit employée non par loix, statuz ou reigles, mais selon leur vouloir et franc arbitre."[3] There is to be none of the degrading servitude to law which troubles the outside world. It is a society of scholars, students and artists, living together according to the rules of Nature, restrained only by honour, common sense and the love of God. They are to learn, by watching the wants and wishes of others,

---

1. As a reward to Friar Jean for his valour, Grandgousier founded or endowed this abbey which was not called after any Saint in the Calendar, but was called Abbey of Theleme because each one there did as he pleased.
2. Book I, Ch. LVII.
3. Book I, Ibid.

how to live. "Fay ce que vouldras" gives to everyone the right to be arbiter of his own actions and to exercise his judgment.

It can be seen, then, that Rabelais asserts the right of man to reason without the hindrance of authority - but he goes further than this and gives, in his book, many examples of independent reasoning and free thought.[1]

The whole scheme of education as given by Rabelais is remarkable for its entire freedom from the fads and prejudices of the Middle Ages. Considering that seven important chapters[2] in his book are devoted to the question of education, it is manifest how strongly a more enlightened system than that prevailing was impressed upon his mind. His treatment is partly a satire on the old methods of education which prevailed in his childhood and partly an exposition of his own ideas on the humanistic method which was coming into favour when he was writing his first book.

At first Rabelais satirizes the processes of teaching common in the Middle Ages. Gargantua, the

---

1. Free thought - reasoning without basis of authority.
2. Gargantua, Chaps. XIV, XV, XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV; and Book II, Ch. VIII.

hero of the story, is delivered over to the care of Thubal Holofernes, a sophist or theologian. After the death of Thubal, Gargantua is put under the instruction of "Maistre Jobelin Bride." These teachers let Gargantua apply himself to laziness and gluttony, demanding nothing of his own intelligence, overloading his memory and exacting as the supreme result of his studies that he be able to repeat his lessons backwards. Great emphasis is laid on his duties to the church while little importance is given to the time actually spent in study.[1] There follows then not only a racy catalogue of books[2] which Gargantua used, but

---

1. "This education is such as the old regime would bestow on a young prince. First and foremost are the duties owed to the Church; and that these may be more deeply impressed, masses, Ave Marias, and paternostres are multiplied. Also since the ignorance of the princes makes the power of the priests, care is taken that no real knowledge is taught. Nor have his teachers even the sense to see that their pupils should be drilled in manly exercises. Nothing is taught at all. He is left to the brute instincts of his nature; he eats, drinks, gambles, and sleeps, without a thought of anything noble or anything even useful."
   W. E. Besant, Foreign Classics for English Readers, p. 59.
2. The standard grammars and textbooks of medieval education were as follows:
   The Latin Grammar of Donatus
   De Modis Significandi of Jean Garland
   Doctrinale Puerorum of Alexandre de Ville.

a vivid criticism of his education.[1]

His father saw that although Gargantua studied hard and spent all his time in school work, yet he profited nothing. "Il en rien ne prouffitoit. Et, qui pis est, en devenoit fou, niays tout resveux et rassoté." Pantagruel thought it better that his son learn nothing rather than to study under such teachers, "car leur scavoir n'estoit que besterie, et leur sapience, n'estoit que moufles abastardisant les bons et nobles esperitz, et corrompent tout fleur de jeunesse."[2]

A further criticism of this scheme of education is noted in the comparison of Eudemon with Gargantua. Eudemon had studied for only two years, yet he makes a much better showing than does Gargantua. His speech was excellent. "Le tout feut par icelluy proferé avecques gestes tant propres, pronunciation tant distincte, voix tant eloquente et languaige tant aorné et bien latin, que mieulx resembloit un Gracchus, un Ciceron ou un Emilius du temps passe qu'un jouvenceau de ce siecle."[3]

---

1. Francois Guizot in 1812 wrote in the Educational Review these notes:
   "Rabelais recognized and pointed out the vices of the systems and methods of his day, at the beginning of the 16th century he perceived almost everything of any sense and value in the works of modern philosophers, amongst others of Locke and Rousseau."
2. Book I, Ch. XV.
3. Ibid.

Consider the contrast of the appearance of Gargantua. "Mais toute la contenance de Gargantua fut qu'il se print a plorer comme une vache, et se cachoit le visaige de son bonnet, et ne fut possible de tirer de luy une parolle."[1] (Rabelais, as it can well be gathered from the above explanation, is not at all in favor of the old form of education.)

Where Rabelais gives widest scope to his ideas on free thought is in the new type of education prescribed for Gargantua.[2] The pupil began by getting up at four o'clock in the morning instead of at eight as he was accustomed to do. While they were rubbing and dressing him[3] a page read aloud a chapter of the Bible, then a prayer was offered and Ponocrates

---

1. Book I, Ch. XV.
2. It should be remembered that when Rabelais was writing, probably in the year 1533, the new studies had just begun to get a firm foothold in Paris, although, at that time, there was great objection to their being accepted. In March, 1530, the new Regius professors had entered on their duties. Even in the University itself some of the colleges were distinguished for enlightened views, especially the college of Sainte-Barbe, under the headship of Jacques de Gouvea, and his nephew Andre, who succeeded him. Maturin Cordier, in 1530, published a treatise in which he waged war against the monkish jargon which passed for Latin among the students. Then there was the famous German humanist, Jean Sturm, who opened a school, after 1529, in which education was conducted along humanistic lines
3. Rabelais insisted on personal cleanliness. Eudemon was described as being impeccable in appearance, "Au soir, en soupant, ledict des marays introduict un sien jeune paige de Ville Gongys, nomme Eudemon,

expounded the meaning of the chapter they had read and repeated the lesson of the preceding day, after which his pupil deduced for himself conclusions bearing on the conduct of life. Gargantua listened, then, to the reading and expounding of a book for a period of three hours. This was followed by some form of moderate exercise such as tennis. After this diversion the pupil and his companions returned home to dinner, which was probably served at 10 o'clock. During the meal a book was read and everything on the table made a subject for instruction, passages from ancient authors, bearing on the subject, being learned by heart. The hour just after dinner was devoted to the four subjects of medieval education: arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music - but these were taught in an amusing and interesting fashion; problems in arithmetic, for instance, were solved with the aid of dice and cards. Then came hard study again for three hours, consisting partly of a repetition of the morning lesson, partly a continuation of the book read in the morning, and partly a writing lesson.

---

tant bien testonné, tant bien tiré, tant bien espoussete, tant honneste en son maintein, que trop mieulx resembloit quelque petit angelot qu'un homme." Book I, Ch. XV.

This differed from the medieval idea, since the pupil following the old method of education did not take time to even comb his hair but hastened to breakfast. . . "Car ses precepteurs disoient que soy aultrement pigner laver, et net toyer estoit perdre temps en ce monde." Book I, Ch. XXI.

There followed a period of instruction in every form of exercise. On some days there was swimming and diving, instruction in the arts of rowing and sailing, followed by gymnastic exercise.[1] Next they botanized in the meadows on their way home. At six o'clock supper, which was the principal meal of the day, was served. This meal was accompanied by reading and intelligent conversation.

The evening was spent in games, music and occasional visits to learned men or travellers. There followed a lesson in practical astronomy, and the pupil briefly recapitulated everything he had read, seen, done or heard during the course of the day. After praying to God and recommending themselves to His clemency, they went to bed.

When the weather was rainy they exercised indoors and amused themselves by trussing hay, splitting and sawing wood, threshing corn in the barn, and, instead of herborizing, they visited various tradesmen, druggists, apothecaries, and even montebanks and quacksalvers. Once a month there was a whole holiday spent in an excursion into the country. Even on these

---

1. An amazing description follows, with all the exact extravagances with which Rabelais liked to illustrate a point and show his encyclopaedic knowledge.

days, although there were no books or lectures, instruction was not forgotten. They recited passages pertaining to country life from Virgil, Hesiod, or Politian, or they composed Latin epigrams and then translated them into French ballads or rondeaux.[1]

This new type of education shows Rabelais's freedom of thought[2] in several respects, the most striking being his emphasis on certain phases of instruction. There was much attention given to the training of observation. In the afternoon, the pupil had to compare the plants in the fields with their descriptions by ancient writers. ". . . passans par quelques prez ou aultres lieux herbuz, visitoient les arbres et plantes, les conferens avec les livres des anciens qui en ont escript, comme Theophraste,

---

1. Book I, Chaps. XXIII and XXIV.
2. "Observe that the education which Rabelais prescribes for a young prince embraces every kind of knowledge, and every sort of exercise. No trade or handicraft is too humble for him to learn or practise. No single moment of the day is left unemployed; no faculty of the body or the mind is left untrained; play is rational, and confined within fair limits; study is real, and yet not excessive - six hours a day does not seem too much for books; no time is wasted over services, masses, rosaries; all the religious training is the exposition of a chapter of the Bible, with prayers, and there are no vain disputations according to the forms of a barbaric logic.

Dioscorides, Marinus, Pline, Nicander, Macer et Galen. . ."[1] Morning and evening the pupil has to note the face of the sky and the position of the stars. "Eulx consideroient l'estat du ciel, si tel estoit comme l'avoient noté au soir precedent, et quelz signes entroit el soleil, aussi la lune, pour icelle journée."[2] And again, "En plein nuict, devant que soy retirer, alloient au lieu de leur logis le plus descouvert veoir la face du ciel, et là notoient les cometes, sy aulcunes estoient, les figures, situations, aspectz, oppositions et conjunctions des astres."[3]

"Can there be, one reflects, a more sensible, a more rational method of education? All is orderly, as becomes the training of a gentleman; nothing is immoderate; and even the games are made to serve some end of education. What end in education, we might ask, is served by the immoderately long hours given to football and cricket? What boy in modern England, where half the day seems given up to games, or in modern Germany, where all the day seems given up to books, is so well educated as the pupil of Ponocrates? Rabelais was not only before his age in the sixteenth century, he is even before the age of the nineteenth."
Walter Besant, Foreign Classics for English Readers, pp. 61-62.

1. Book I, Ch. XXIII.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.

On wet days the pupil visits the druggist and the apothecary to see how they adulterate the goods; or he visits the workshops of all kinds of artisans, as clock-makers, jewellers, dyers, and printers. "Et, au lieu de arboriser, visitoient les bouticques des drogueurs, herbiers et apothecaires, et soigneusement consideroient les fruictz, racines, feuilles, gommes, semences, axunges, peregrines, ensemble aussi comment on les adulteroit."[1]

While this training in observation falls short of modern ideas of science, in that there are no experiments, it was far in advance of the time of Rabelais. In the period of the humanistic movement, all wisdom and all knowledge was supposed to be contained in the works of Greek and Latin authors. The students of natural science - botanists, physiologists, anatomists, and zoologists - for the most part confined themselves to the work of collecting and classifying

---

1. Book I, Ch. XXIV.
Rabelais continues:
"Sembablement, ou alloient veoir comment on tiroit les metaulx, ou comment on fondoit l'artillerye, ou alloient veoir les lapidaires, orfevres et tailleurs de pierreries, ou les alchymists et monoyeurs ou les haultelissiers, les tissotiers, les velotiers, les horlogiers, miralliers, imprimeurs, organistes, tinturiers, et aultres telles sortes d'ouvriers, et partout donnans le vin, aprenoient et consideroient l'industrie et invention des mestiers."

the ancient lore on their respective subjects. Rabelais, then, brings forth the new idea that things as well as books should be studied and a pupil's powers of observation should be trained as well as his memory.[1]

Not only did the student learn by observation, but he also improved his knowledge by coming in contact with learned men. This is a new phase in the method of instruction since the medieval ideal was to learn from the ancients rather than modern people.[2] The pupil was permitted to associate with learned men so that he would be inspired to study. " - l'introduisoit és compaignies des gens sçavans que là estoient, à l'emulation desquelz luy creust l'esperit et le desir de estudier aultrement et se faire valoir."[3]

---

1. The training of the memory is not neglected, however. Early in the morning the pupil goes over with his tutor the work of the previous day. "On luy repetoit les lecons du jour d'avant. Luy mesmes les disoit par cueur." Several times a day he repeats by heart some passages of the books that have been read to him. "Là attendens, recitoient clerement et eloquentement quelques sentences retenues de la leçon. - Eulx arrivez au logis, repetoient quelques passaiges de ce qu'avoit este leu."
2. It should be noted, however, that the pupil did study the ancients also. "Ce que faisant aprint en peu de temps tous les passaiges à ces competens en Pline, Athene, Dioscorides, Jullius Pollux, Galen, Porphyre, Opian, Polybe, Heliodore, Ariostoletes, Elian, at autres. Iceux propres tenus, faisoient souvent, pour plus estre asseurez, apporter les livres susdict à table. . ."
3. Book I, Ch. XXIII.

He visited learned men. "Quelque foys alloient visiter les compaignies des gens lettrez, ou de gens qui eussent veu pays estranges." The pupil went to hear lectures and sermons. "Alloient ouir les leçons publicques, les acts solemneiz, les repetitions, les declamations, les plaidoyez des gentils advocatz, les cancions des prescheurs evangeliques." He is instructed also to take efficient men as his examples. "Tu es à Paris, tu as ton precepteur Epistemon, dont l'un par vives et vocales instructiones, l'aultre par louables exemples, te peut endoctriner."[1] Again, Rabelais praises the learning of men and emphasizes the fact that a pupil is fortunate to be able to come in contact with such enlightened people as those of the sixteenth century. "Tout le monde est plein de gens savans, de precepteurs tres doctes, des librairies tresamples, qu'il m'est advis que ny au temps de Platan, ny de Ciceron, ny de Popenian, n'estoir telle commodite d'estude qu'on y veoit mantenant."[2]

Another noticeable feature in the method as given by Rabelais is the interesting way in which very difficult subjects were presented. The pupil

---

1. Book II, Ch. VIII, letter of Gargantua to his son.
2. Book II, Ch. VIII.

learned from cards and dice as well as books. "Ce faict on apportant des chartres non pour joven, mais pour y apprendre mille petites gentillesses et inventions nouvelles, les quelles toutes yssaient de arithmetique."[1] By this method Gargantua grew to like some of the most difficult subjects. "En ce moyen entra en affection de icelle science numerale." He profited well by this method of study. "A tant sceut d'icelle et theoricque et practique si bien que Tunstal, angloys qui en avoit amplement escript, confessa que vrayement en comparaison de luy il n'y entendoit que le hault alemant."[2]

Rabelais has new ideas concerning the schedule as well as the method of instruction. The time of the student was carefully allotted so there was no hour in the day lost. "Apres en tel train d'estude le mist qu'il ne perdoit heure quelconques du jour, ains tout son temps consommoit en lettres et honeste sçavoir." Gargantua learned while he was being dressed, while he was eating, walking, or playing, and even when he was taking a holiday. This

---

1. Book I, Ch. XXIII.
2. The passage continues: "Et non seulement d'icelle, mais les aultres sciences mathematicques, comme geometrie, astronomie et musique." Book I, Ch. XXIII.

is quite a contrast to the older method of instruction in which most of the student's time is spent in eating, drinking, and sleeping, with little emphasis placed on instruction.

Another feature of the schedule is the fact that the pupil is offered a well-rounded course of instruction. The curriculum embraces practically every kind of knowledge. The subjects which formed the quadrivium of medieval education were arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and music, but Rabelais believes that the student should be instructed in additional subjects. "Somme que je voy un abysme de science." The pupil was instructed to learn languages; history; liberal arts such as geometry, arithmetic, music, and astronomy and laws of astrology; civil law; natural sciences; anatomy, including a study of the microcosm called man; the Bible; and finally, warfare.[1]

---

1. "J'entens et veulx que tu aprenes les langues parfaictement: premierement la Grecque, comme le veult Quintilian, secondement la Latine, et puis l'Hebraïcque pour les Sainctes Letres, et la Chaldaïcque et Arabicque pareillement; --- Qu'il n'y ait historie que tu ne tienne en memoire presente, à quoy te aydera la cosmographie de ceulx qui en ont escript. Des ars liberaux, geometrie, arismeticque et musicque, --- poursuys la reste, et de astronomie saiche en tous les canons, laissi moi l'astrologie divinatrice et l'art de Lullius comme abuz et vanitez. Du droit civil, je veuex que tu saiche par cueur les beaulx textes et me les confere avecques

Just how thorough a knowledge the pupil should have concerning his studies may be inferred from the following: "Et quand à la congnoissance des faictz de nature, je veulx que tu te y adonne curieusement; qu'il n'y ayt mer, riviere ny fontaine dont tu ne congnoisse les poissons, tous les oyseaulx de l'air, tous les arbres, arbustes, et fructices des foretz, toutes les herbes de la terre, tous les metaulx cachez ou ventre des abysmes, les pierreries de tout orient et midy; rien ne te soit incongneu."[1]

The program of study which Gargantua followed under the direction of Ponocrates differs from that of medieval education in that it is free from a large number of religious ceremonies. Religious principles are not neglected, however, and time is devoted to prayer and worship. "Ce pendant qu'on le frotoit, luy estoit leue quelque pagine de la divine

---

philosophie. Puis songmeusement reviste les livres des medicins grecs, arabes et latins, sans contemner les thalmudists et cabalistes, et par frequentes anatomies acquiers toy parfaicte congnoissance de l'aultre monde, qui est l'homme.

"Et par lesquelles heures du jour commence a visiter les Sainctes Lettres. Premierement en grec, Le Nouveau Testament et Epistres des Apostles, et puis en hebrieu le Vieulx Testament.

"Somme, que je voy un abysme de science, car doresnavant que tu deviens homme et te fais grand, il te fauldra yssir de ceste tranquillité et repos d'estude, et apprendre la chevalerie et les armes pour deffendre ma maison et nos amys secourir en tout leurs affaires contre les assaulx des mal faisans." Book II, Ch. VIII.

1. Book II, Ch. VIII.

Escripture. . . Selon le propos et argument de ceste leçon souventes foy se adonnoit à reverer, adorer, prier et supplier le bon Dieu duquel la lecture monstrait la majesté et jugemens merveilleux." Gargantua prayed to God. "Si prioient Dieu le createur en l'adorant et ratifiant leur foy envers luy, et le glorifiant de sa bonté, immense et, luy rendant grace de tout le temps passé, se recommandarent a sa divine bonté pour tout l'avenir." The Bible was one of the subjects for study. There were, however, no paternostres to say or to be heard.

The last thing to be noted concerning the new method of instruction is the fact that there is nothing at all said concerning punishment. Here Rabelais differs from the sixteenth century idea of very severe punishment as a means of obtaining obedience. The emphasis of Rabelais is not on coercion but on freedom.

It is evident, then, that Rabelais gives an example of his free thought in his scheme of education. Many other examples of his reasoning without basis of authority are found in his books. A few of these may be briefly mentioned here.

Rabelais satirizes the library of St. Victor. While in Paris, Pantagruel visited this library which

was a collection of medieval, scholastic books over which former generations had spent their lives and labors. Rabelais gives the ridiculous catalogue of these books at length.[1] Although some of the absurd titles were invented by the imaginative mind of Rabelais, others are the titles of actual books, copies of which may still be found in forgotten corners of old libraries.[2] Here, then, Rabelais is condemning what he considers useless books, regardless of whether they were generally considered valuable or not.

Another example of Rabelais's free thought is found in his criticism of law and justice. He satirizes the administrators of the law. This is most clearly shown in the story of Judge Brideoie who has to attend a higher court in order to give

---

1. For a complete list of these titles, see Book III, Ch. VII.
2. "It must be owned that a list of titles, written to satirize and bring into deeper contempt than that in which they already languished the books on which former generations had spent their lives and labours, does not offer much prospect of amusement to the modern reader, and yet the extravagance, the overflowing imagination, and the boundless copiousness displayed in the list, have preserved the humour of this old-fashioned catalogue, so that the old monastic collection of rubbish known as the Library of St. Victor seems familiar to us who have never seen and laughed at it. Many of the titles, and those not the least absurd, are titles of real books, copies of which may still be found forgotten and dust-covered in corners of old libraries. The

reasons for a certain judgment. This famous judge, having reached old age, has decided, in his official capacity, about four thousand cases, and his decisions, for the most part, had been accepted as just and proper. He was accustomed to make a decision in a case by means of dice. It was, therefore, a very embarrassing thing for him to be summoned in his old age to explain and defend his judgment. His only excuse for his unjust decision in a particular case, however, was that he had grown old and that his sight was not as good as it used to be. He could not, therefore, distinguish the pips of the dice as clearly as he had done in the past. In the case in question he might have mistaken a four for a five: "Dont povoit estre qu'en la façon que Isaac vieulx, et mal voyant, print Jacob pour Esaü, ainsi, à la decision du procés, il auroit prins un quatre pour un cinq."[1]

In point of fact, the old judge had never used any other method in his decisions than to throw dice, a plan which he believed to be followed by all his brethren. Chance had always ruled his verdict so

---

following are among the least extravagant:-
The Mustard-Pot of Penitence
The Boots of Patience
The Mummery of Ghosts and Will-o'-the-Wisps
The Chimney-Sweeper of Astrology."
Besant, Foreign Classics for English Readers, pp. 83-84.

1. Book III, Ch. XXXIX.

he demonstrated how every kind of case can be decided by chance.

Again, Epistemon speaks of the corrupt administrators of the law, ". . . la fraule du calumniateur infernal, lequel souvent se transfigure en messagier de lumiere, par ses ministres, les pervers advocatz, conseilliers, procureuis et aultres telz suppoz, tourne le noir en blanc."

But Rabelais's most violent criticism of the law is that of the "chatz-fourrez." They have a great greed for money. When Panurge threw some coins among them there was a great clamor for it, " - tous les chats-fourrez commencerent jouer des griphes comme si fussent violins demanchez. . ."[1] They live on corruption. "Ils, doncques, de corruption vivent, en generation periront."[2] They are mad and thirsty after Christian blood. "Ces chatz-fourrez sont tant enragez et affamez de sang chrestion."[3] Rabelais not only gives violent expression to his dislike for the administrators[4] of the law, but he satirizes the judicial

---

1. Book V, Ch. XIII.
2. Book V, Ch. XIV.
3. Ibid.
4. So, for example, the following: "Les chatz-fourrez sont bestes moult horribles et espouventables; ils mangent les petits enfans, et paissent sus des pierres de marbre -- Ont aussi les griphes tant fortes, longues et asserees, que rien ne leur eschappe depuis qu'une fois l'ont mis entre leurs serres." Book V, Ch. XI.

procedure ". . . tout leur directoire en judicature usuale a esté baillé, par un Fribunian, homme mescreant, infidele, barbare, tant maling. . . qu'il vendoit les loix, les edictz, les rescriptz, les constitutions . . à la partie plus offrant; et ainsi leurs a taillé leurs morseaulx par ces petitz boutz et eschantillons des loix qu'ilz ont en usaige."[1]

Finally Rabelais says, in summarizing his opinion of the process of law, that it would be better for the parties in a controversy "marcher sus chausses trapes que de son droict soy deporter in leurs responses et jugemens, comme soubhatoit Caton de son temps, et conseilloit que la cort judiciaire feust de chausses trappes pavée."[2]

All of these were very bold statements for a man of the sixteenth century, but Rabelais is a champion of freedom. He exercises this freedom to think and reason and commands others to do likewise.

Rabelais's affirmation that man has the freedom to think as he chooses extends to religious belief and ritual as well as to intellectual activity. Formally, at least, he was a Catholic. He entered the cloister when he was very young. He gained his

---

1. Book V, Ch. XIV.
2. Book III, Ch. XIV.

education in the monastery and served as a Franciscan monk until he was forty years of age. Nowhere in his book does he dare openly to reject French Catholicism. Nowhere is there any satire, open or disguised, on the principal doctrines of the Roman Catholic church concerning purgatory, confession, the mass, or on the worship of the virgin and the saints. Moreover, even when Rabelais was wandering from university to university, practically an outcast from the church, he occasionally celebrated Mass or performed other offices of the church. For two years he held a position as a parish priest. Even when it was necessary to make a choice between Catholicism and the new type of religious principles brought forward by Calvin, Rabelais chose to adhere formally to the church of his forefathers. He was apparently, at least, loyal to the church, but not overly submissive to authority, holding his own opinion on certain matters of belief.

Although he was formally a Catholic, Rabelais criticised Catholicism. Like the majority of his fellow humanists, he saw clearly the evils from which the church was suffering in France - an idle and ignorant clergy, a materialized and mechanical ritual, and a secularized and non-resident episcopate. He hated the corruption of the monks. He calls them

outcasts of the world, "les moynes sont de tous refuys, et des vieuex et des jeunes."[1] He says that they mumble out great stores of psalms and legends which no one understands. They are idle and are abhorred by everyone. "Semblablement un moyne, j'entends de ces oiseux moynes, ne laboure comme le paysant; ne guarde le pays, comme l'homme de guerre. . . c'est la cause pourquoy de tous sont huez et abhorrez."[2] There are many other expressions throughout the entire book of Rabelais which show his dislike for the evils of the monastic system[3] and for the monks.[4]

The dislike for practices carried on in monasteries is shown in Rabelais's description of the formation of the Abbey of Theleme. This abbey is a complete negation of the monastic system. Because

---

1. Book I, Ch. XL.
2. Ibid. He also adds: "Le cinge ne garde poinct la maison comme un chien, il ne tiré poinct l'aroy, comme le beuf, il ne produict ny laict ni laine comme la brebis, il ne porte pas le faiz, comme le cheval. Ce qu'il faict est tout conchier et degaster qui est la cause pourquoy, le tous relçeoyt mocqueries et bastonnades."
3. Book V, Ch. II.
4. Book III, Ch. XXI. Raminagrobis, one of the characters in the third book, speaks thus of priests: "J'ay ce jourd'hui, qui est le dernier de may et de moy, hors de ma maison, à grande fatigue et difficulté, chassé un tas de villaines, immondes, et pestilents, bestes, noires, guarres fauves, blanches, cendrées, grivolées, les quelles laisser ne me vouloient à mon aise mourir, et par fraudulentes poinctures, gruppemens harpyiacques, importunitez freslonnicques, toutes forgées en l'officine de ne sçay quelle insatiabilité

all monasteries were regulated by fixed hours, it was to have no clocks; because men were not admitted to the convents of women there were to be no men in the abbey without women and no women without men; because they placed in religious houses no women save those who were ugly, ill-favored, or stupid, and no men save those who were silly or sickly, no women should be admitted to the abbey who were not fair and of good disposition, and no men who were not handsome and well-conditioned; because monks and nuns, after the year of probation, had to remain monks and nuns all their lives, the brothers and sisters of Thelema were to be at liberty to depart when they pleased; because the members of the religious orders took a three-fold vow of chastity, poverty, and obedience, at Thelema everyone might marry, everyone might be rich or live as he pleased; because all abbeys were strongly walled, this monastery was to be built without walls.[1]

Rabelais criticized not only the monks, but the whole hierarchy as well. In the allegorical passage concerning the Isle Sonante, we find that this land was populated by birds living in cages. The

---

1. Book I, Ch. LII.

interpretation of the story is as follows: The birds in the cages, the "Clergaux, Monagaux, Prestresgaux, Abbesgaux, Evesgaux, Cardingaux, et Popegaux," are the monks, nuns, priests, bishops, cardinals, and the great Pope himself, recruited from all the world and kept well fed and fat by the world, "voyez ceste perchée d'oiseaux, comment ils sont douillets et en bon pinct des rentes que nous en viennent."[1] They are kept sacred from all violence, living lives of pure gluttony and self indulgence without a hint of religion, morality, learning, or work of any sort. This was all the church as Rabelais saw and knew it and painted it after a period of seventy years. The world was crushed, thought Rabelais bitterly, by the church.[2] Humanity is enslaved by the priests.

---

1. Book V, Ch. VI.
2. "It is little wonder if Rabelais determined, on reflection, not to print this bitter and rather heavy handed satire. To attack the Roman curra and even the pope was quite permissible to a good Frenchman, especially in the year 1551, when the relations between France and the papacy had been strained to the breaking point. But it was another thing to attack the whole hierarchy of the Catholic church. Not that Rabelais had not considerable justice on his side. In the opinion of many competent observers, snoring bishops, or, in other words, bishops who neglected their dioceses, were the most fruitful source of the evils from which the church in France was suffering. If we compare Rabelais's picture with that drawn by the Cardinal de Lorraine, a highly orthodox churchman, in a conversation which he had with the papal nuncio in October

This criticism of the hierarchy is followed by a violent condemnation of the Pope. He satirizes the great reverence which the people had for the Pope. He was to them "unique en son espece."[1] On the way to Lantern Yard the pilgrims went ashore at the Islands of Papimaines. They were royally received because they had once looked at the Pope, the "le Dieu supreme qui reigne en le ciel." "Comment! dirent ilz, gens peregrins, ne cognoissez vous l'Unique? - Nous ne parlons mie, de celluy boult Dieu que domine par le cieulx, nous parlons de Dieu en terre."[2] These people living on this island explained that by merely looking at a picture of the Pope they could gain remission of all their sins which they remembered having committed and even for the sins which they did not remember having committed. Rabelais not only ridicules the absurd beliefs concerning the religious power of the Pope, but he also thinks that the hierarchy is harmful politically. Rabelais conducts his readers to a Papimane

---

1548, we shall see that they do not differ very much. According to the cardinal, 'bishops were ignorant and uncharitable; a large number of the priests were worthless; canons refused to pay their bishops, and monks their abbots; and benefices were held by absentees at the Papal court, who, out of the yearly income of 30 or 40 crowns, took 25 and left the rest to some poor cure.'" Tilley, pp. 255-56.

1. Book V, Ch. II.
2. Book IV, Ch. XLVIII.
3. Book IV, Ch. XXI.

who is mad upon the subject of decretals. These decretals are the decrees in which the Pope, by deciding a question submitted to him, gives a solution concerning a particular instance which is applicable to all analogous cases. Sometimes false ones were produced in order to create favorable precedents. Rabelais here seizes the opportunity to mock abundantly these texts, real or false, upon which the Sovereign Pontiff pretended to establish his rights over people and princes. Rabelais further objects to the fact that monks pay no taxes and are exempt from law.

Rabelais also hates the Sorbonne, the pillar of orthodoxy at that time. He ridicules the clergy of the Sorbonne, the Sophists.[1] Gargantua's first teacher was a Sophist who taught him no practical knowledge whatsoever. Again, Rabelais ridicules the way in which Gargantua spent his day according to the discipline of his schoolmasters, the Sophists.[2] What he opposed most strenuously, however, was the repression which Catholicism exercised. It is for this

---

1. Rabelais in editions prior to that of 1537 generally speaks more plainly of the Sorbonne than in subsequent editions. For example, he had written "par un theologien" where later, to avoid difficulties, he used the term Sophiste. Hence the terms, Sophiste, Sorbonagre, and un theologien may be considered synonymous.
2. In all this criticism, acrid as it sometimes appears in view of the intolerance of the age, Rabelais is

reason that he welcomes the reform movement as a declaration of freedom from the practices of the Catholic church and from the restrictions made by the Sorbonne. Although Rabelais and Calvin were not at all identical in their religious beliefs, they agreed for the most part on one point, their revolt against traditional authority. However, Rabelais revolted for a different reason than did Calvin in that he was interested in freedom, while Calvin was intolerant. The emphasis of Rabelais was on tolerance, proclaimed at a time when it had not even a name in the French language. It will be noted, however, that Rabelais also favors certain Protestant doctrines and forms. He believes in direct communion with the Infinite. Gargantua, when a student of Ponocrates, prayed to God directly. "Se adonnait à rever, adorer, prier et supplier le bon Dieu."[1] Again, he says that all true Christians pray, in the afternoon as well as the morning. "Si prioient Dieu le createur en l'adorant. Tous vrays chrestians le tous estatz, en tous lieux, en tous temps prient Dieu."[2] And the intermediary is one's self, not a priest, "et l'esprit prie et

---

careful to limit himself to points on which there was difference within the church, and not to attack the fundamental basis of the teachings of the Church.

1. Book I, Ch. XXIII.
2. Book I, Ch. XL.

enterpelle pour iceulx." Furthermore God will have mercy on him "et Dieu les prend grace." In the letter from Gargantua to his son is found another expression of the direct relationship between God and man: "Car nous pechons tous et continuellement requerons a Dieu qu'il efface nos pechez."

Rabelais, like Calvin, believes in a free and independent interpretation of the Bible. He continually emphasized its study and the importance of its knowledge. The student was commanded to read the Holy Scripture. Gargantua wrote to his son that he study the Scriptures "et par lesquelles heures du jour commence à visiter les Sainctes Lettres." In the story of the little devil and labourer of Papefigland the little devil complains that the students have recently added Bible to their studies.[1] Rabelais's belief is, then, that man should study the Bible so that he may search out the truth for himself without having to depend on the one interpretation as given by the Church. It will be remembered that the meaning of the oracle was to search after truth and not to rely on authority.

---

1. Book IV, Ch. XLVI.

Certain expressions having a decidedly Protestant flavor are to be found in the books of Rabelais. One of these is the phrase "grace divine" which is to be found repeatedly in his book. In the letter of Gargantua to his son is found the phrase, "moyennunt l'ayde et grace divine non sans peché -- car nous pechons tous."[1] And elsewhere, "et Dieu les prend en grace."[2] When Pantagruel related the story of the perplexity of human judgment, Brideoye "invoquerait a son ayde la grace divine."

The expression "election" is to be found in the works of Rabelais also, "--ja touchant et guoustant le bien et felicité que le bon Dieu a preparé a ses fidèles et esleuz en l'aultre vie."[3] In both this and the following passage it seems that God chooses the ones to be saved - "et parler de la puissance et praedestination de Dieu."[4]

Some of the forms of worship described have a Protestant character. When Pantagruel started in quest of the Divine Bottle a Protestant[5] religious

---

1. This seems to be a contradiction of his teaching elsewhere.
2. Book I, Ch. XL.
3. Book III, Ch. XXI.
4. Book IV, Prologue l'autheur.
5. M. Le Franc pointed out that this was a Protestant ceremony. Tilley, p. 339.

service was held on board the ship. There was a brief exhortation, a prayer and a Protestant psalm. "La Pantagruel leurs feist un briefe et saincte exhortation tout auctorisee des propous extraictz de la saincte Escripture."[1]

Although Rabelais did seem to favor both Catholic and Protestant doctrine, he was an independent, since he adopted neither single set of dogma. One cannot say he was a Catholic, neither was he a Protestant. His religious stand was based on individual conscience and intelligence. He made his religion for himself.

The individual has the right to interpret religious truths in the light of fact and reason. In her exploration of the meaning of the oracle of the bottle "Trinc" Bacbuc commanded man to search after truth. Rabelais believed that a man should not accept blindly any religious practise just because others do so, but he should be guided in his beliefs by reason. His own free use of reason is demonstrated in his criticism of the priesthood and the monks. This raillery was very daring and very bold in his day, but he was too much of a thinker to continue to regard

---

1. Book IV, Ch. I.

with favour the corruptness of the monks just because it was customary to regard them in this manner.

He believes that the individual has the right to worship according to the dictates of his conscience. In the Abbey of Thélème there was no common place of worship, but the only rule which the Thelemites had was "fay ce que vouldras." There were no chapels, no masses, no beads, no bells - every brother communicated alone in his cell with his God.

This raises another question - Can man choose between right and wrong? Can his conscience direct him in his religious life, or should he be given so much liberty? Rabelais thinks that a person brought up in the right kind of environment has within him a guide which leads him to virtuous actions "parce que gens libres, bien nez, bien instruictz, conservans en compaignies honnestes, ont par nature un instinct et augillon qui tousjours les pouese à faictz verteux en retire de vice, lequelz ilz nonmoient honneur. Iceulx, quand par vile subjection et contraincte sont deprimez et asserviz, detournent la noble affection par laquelle à vertuz franchement tendoient, à deposer et enfraindre ce joug de servitude. Car nous entreprenons tousjours choses deffendues, et convoitons ce que nous est denie."

choses deffendues, et convoitons ce que nous est denie."[1]

The first thing to notice in this remarkable passage is that there are three requirements for the man, he must be well-born, educated, and must associate with good men.[2] Man has by "nature" an instinct which causes him to choose the good. However, if he has this liberty of choice taken from him he is inclined not to choose that which is good so much as that which is forbidden him. Man should have the liberty to choose between right and wrong, but this idea of what is right and what is wrong is not strictly based on tradition. In other words, the morals of men who are brought up in the proper surroundings should be based on individual conscience and not on tradition or custom.

What, then, are Rabelais's beliefs? In the first place, he believes that man is free to make his own choice in matters of religion: "fay ce que vouldras" applies to religion as to thought and social conduct. It is also demonstrated in his raillery against the corruption of monks and the Pope. In his own religious belief, Rabelais exercised this freedom of choice in

---

1. Book I, Ch. LVII.
2. These requirements are similar to those for "de parfait homme" or "el honnete homene" of Cortiego's Castiglonie.

that he adopted neither the Protestant nor Catholic doctrine, but built up a religion of his own.

Rabelais has an optimistic view on the subject of human nature. Far from accepting the doctrine of original sin, he was ready to believe, like Rousseau, in the perfectibility of man. He speaks of man as being good, "bonnes gens."[1] He thinks that they are trustworthy enough to do as they like in the Abbey of Thélème. They were not ever to be guided by laws because each person is good and his conduct does not need to be restrained by laws.

He thinks also that the purpose in life is the fullest possible development of all of man's powers. This has already been pointed out in his scheme of education where the body was developed as well as the mind. The schedule of study included a study of practically every subject - music, history, languages, science - and many others. He lays great stress also on the importance of the development of Christian beliefs "et science sans conscience n'est que ruine de l'ame." In short, he thinks that man should be cheerful, should eat, drink, sing, laugh, enjoy the sunshine, talk with his fellows, study and

---

1. Book B. Prologue de l'autheur.

have faith in the Divine Creator.

From the above consideration it can be seen that Rabelais was neither a heretic nor a reformer, but a pagan.[1] He used clerical formula for the purpose of expressing his ideas. He wished to enlarge and penetrate antique wisdom and adoration of nature.[2] To search after truth was his constant preoccupation.[3]

Rabelais not only believes in intellectual and religious liberty, but he emphasizes social freedom as well. He attacks or modifies the old ideas on the relationships between men and women. As shown in discussion of the Abbey of Thélème where, contrary to custom, women and men live in the same monastery and marriage is permissible. Love among

---

1. "It is impossible to avoid a comparison, in the matter of religion, between Lucretius and Rabelais. Both were profoundly impressed with the order and magnificence of creation, both were deeply indignant with religious abuses of the day - 'Tantum religio possit suadere malorum!' Both had the same thing to offer in its place - physical science. But Rabelais superadds the trust and faith of the creator that was wanting in Lucretius. Both, at an interval of fifteen hundred years, anticipated the nineteenth century in its restless discontent of old beliefs, its fearless questioning, its advocacy of scientific research." Besant, p. 187.
2. Thus also J. J. Rousseau, but with this difference, that the culte of Rousseau was morose, while that of Rabelais was joyeux.
3. Like his attitude toward knowledge and science, Rabelais's attitude toward religion is based on freedom and tolerance. In his opinion man is a trustworthy individual and should be given freedom to interpret his own religious beliefs.

these Thelemites is free, and marriage is the natural outcome of their life. Moreover, the monastery itself is to be a place suited for the highest development of art, refinement and luxury, thereby making the social atmosphere more favorable. There are stately fountains, spacious galleries, riding courts, theatres, tilting yards, swimming-baths, the Garden of Delight by the river-side, a labyrinth, tennis and ball courts, statues, parks full of deer, and an orchard planted with fruit trees, while outside the abbey are rows of houses in which dwell, for the convenience of the Thelemites, all sorts of artisans, such as jewellers, goldsmiths, lapidaries, tailors, embroiderers, gold beaters, tapestry makers, weavers, upholsterers, and others who worked for the monks and nuns in the new order. Inside this abbey also there are such luxuries as mirrors and perfumes. The people themselves dress beautifully. All these things help to make social life more pleasant, noble, and elevated.

The description of the foundation of the Abbey provides Rabelais with an opportunity for showing his taste for art and his knowledge of architecture. Unlike many of the humanists of his time, who were little concerned with beauty of form and charm of color, he lived as much by his eyes as by his mind.

His attention was particularly captivated by the art of building, which had been restored[1] by the Italian Renaissance, deriving its inspiration from Vitruvius and the ruins of antiquity.

Rabelais modifies the old idea of marriage. In his opinion there may be two reasons for marriage, namely, for the propagation of the species or for the sake of companionship. Marriage for either of these reasons is permissible. Rabelais again and again reiterates the statement that marriage is to be honorable.[2] Panurge wanted to marry an honorable lady. Rabelais points out the fact that parents desire an honorable marriage for their daughters. "Pour parvenir à ceste felicité de mariage que d'eulx ilz veissent naistre lignaige raportent et haereditant non moins aux moeurs. . ."[3]

What Rabelais attacks most strongly is the practice of children's marrying without the consent of the their parents. He describes these parents as "noyez, pendez, tuez" by despair. Rabelais thinks that a father who learns that his daughter has married

---

1. The Renaissance brought about a new interest in life, so among other considerations there was a great enthusiasm for art.
2. Honorable marriage, it should be noted distinctly, is one in which the parties are equal socially.
3. Book III, Ch. XLVIII.

without his consent should be permitted to kill both his daughter and her husband and not be punished by the law for it. Such a death seemed to be right since the parents had reared their daughters with care and with the hope that they would some day marry men of whom the family could be proud.[1]

In this connection, Rabelais is especially indignant against monks who suborned daughters and married them off without the knowledge and against the wishes of their parents. This was one of the most greatly feared plagues threatening the homes in Rabelais's time. These monks, moreover, based their detestable practise on canon law. "For several hundred years certain monks, patching together ancient glosses, have insinuated the brutal and barbarous opinion that, according to canon law, the consent of the parents to the marriage of their children was required only as a point of honor and not as a matter of necessity."[2] It is against these suborners and clandestine marriage-makers that Rabelais protests vehemently.

One can see that Rabelais is many centuries in advance of his time in dreaming of the extinction of war. His opinion is based on humanistic principles.

---

1. Book III, Ch. XLVIII.
2. Pasquier, Recherches sur la France.

He thinks that war should not be fought except in self defense. In fact, he thinks that peace should be preserved at the price of the greatest sacrifice. This idea is an entirely new one, since the poets had always, in accord with the common opinion, glorified the warrior, the conqueror, whom they called Achilles, or Alexandre, Roland or Charlemagne, or even Attila or Genseric. Such a person was held in great admiration. Peace-loving kings never awakened such sentiments. Their prudence was considered as being due to fear, or even deceit. The crowd was always for Ajax against Ulysses, for Turnus against the pious Aeneas.

Rabelais has the boldness to attack these ancient adorations. Picrochole is painted as a horrible, cruel person, while the true hero is Pantagruel, the calm, wise, peaceful king who dared to say, "Toute ma vie n'ay rien tant procuré que paix."[1] Here Rabelais

---

1. This idea of his difference in views is clearly shown in the following passage: "Les temps n'est plus d'ainsi conquister les royaulmes avec domiaige de son prochain frère christain, ceste imitation des anciens Hercules, Alexandre, Hannibalz, Scipions, Cesars, et aultres telz est contraire à la profession de l'evangle par lequel nous est commandé guarder, saulver, regir, et administer chescun ses pays et terres, non hostilement envahir les aultres. Et ce que Sarazins et Barbares jadis appelloient prousses, maintenant nous appellons brigmauderies, et meschancetz."
Gargantua, Ch. XLVI.

departs not only from the ideas of the Middle Ages, but also from antiquity in order to emphasize the most imperative but least observed precepts of Christianity.[1]

It is interesting to note Rabelais's idea of what a king should be. It seemed that the people might always be proud of the kings whom Rabelais put over them in his work. These kings were very courageous, but prudent; they made war only to defend the country and never for the sake of conquest, leaving such follies to the adversary, Picrochole, whose weakness shows off their wisdom. Grandgousier, Gargantua, and Pantagruel realized successively Rabelais's ideal of what a king should be, but to each generation its ideal was broadened in such a way that the last ruler is the most perfect of the three.

The absolute confidence of Rabelais in his utopian kingdom reposes on a deliberate conviction; Rabelais never recognized the divine right of a privileged family. He explains very bluntly, "Je pense que pleusieurs sont aujourd'huy empereurs, Roys, ducz, princes et Popes, en leur terre les quelz sont decendez de quelques porteurs de rogations et de coustretz."[2]

---

1. Gargantua, Ch. XXVIII.
2. Ibid., Ch. I.

What he admires in kings are their good qualities more than their noble birth. He admires merit, which, he thinks, should be the true souvereign of the world. However, his projects of amelioration and of reform brought only the most intellectual and most cultured minds to sympathize with his belief.

In addition to the attack on old standards of society, Rabelais adds that men and women have a right to choose their own social state. In the interpretation of the Oracle of the Bottle the priestess Bacbuc says: "La divine Bouteille vous y envoye, soyes vous mesmes interpretes de vostre enterprense." After all his quest to find out whether or not he should marry Panurge was thus told to decide this social question for himself. It was not for others to advise him what to do, but rather he must choose his own social state.

In the Abbey of Thélème the only command given to the monks and nuns is that they should do as they willed, because being well-born and living in good environment they "ont par nature un instinct et aguillon qui tousjours les poulse à faictz vertueux et retire de vice, lequel ilz nommoient honneur," they should be able to choose their standard in society.

Rabelais thinks that one should develop his talent to the fullest extent. Self-expression and full development are very strongly emphasized in his book. He thinks the body should be trained as well as the mind, so Gargantua spent five hours a day in physical education.[1] Gargantua was taught self-expression in music. Not only did he buy one musical instrument but many. He sang and played a lute, spinet, German flute, violin, and sackbut.

He also learned self-expression in oratory. At first he went to hear famous lecturers and orators, but later he began to make speeches himself.

In the episode of Eudemon and Gargantua[2] it can be seen that the personality of Eudemon was developed to such an extent that he made a very favorable impression on those with whom he came in contact, while Gargantua was unable to express himself intelligently in any way. This contrast brings out very distinctly Rabelais's liking for self-expression.

---

1. One sees Rabelais here not only as an educationalist, but as a physician. The noon meal of the pupil was light, while the supper was "copious and plentiful." The hour of digestion was spent in gentle instruction, such as music and games. The pupil changed his clothes after exercise, and was rubbed and dried. Never before this time had the training and care of the body played so important a part in the educational system.
2. Book I, Ch. XV.

In the Abbey of Thélème[1] also the people lived a well-rounded life. Their time was not spent in idleness but rather in self-development. They were taught so that everyone could read, write, sing, play upon several musical instruments, speak several languages, and compose in these languages both prose and verse. The men were noble and worthy knights, skillful in arms, on foot and on horseback. The ladies were dextrous with the needle and were ready to do with their hands any honorable work which woman is accustomed to do. The life of the Thelemites was not a narrow one. On the contrary, it was very broad and the social element constituted a large part of their program.

Social interdependence is emphasized by Rabelais. He emphasizes the idea that men are dependent on each other. The priestess Bacbuc told the voyageurs that the company of man was necessary in order to follow safely and pleasantly the road of divine knowledge and search for wisdom. She pointed out the fact that many an ancient philosopher took some friend as the companion of his search. She had already expressed the same thought, pointing out by a reference to the fable of Aesop that all men have

---

1. Book I, Ch. XLII.

need of one another: "Roy souz le ciel tant puissant n'est qui passer se puisse d'autruy, pauvre n'est tant arrogant qui passer se puisse du riche."[1] A somewhat similar idea is expressed in the words she uttered just before making the travellers write their names in the book of ritual ". . . establissons le bien souverain non en prendre et recevoir, ains en eslargir et donner, et heureux nous reputons non si d'autruy prenons et recevons beaucoup."[2]

This idea of social interdependence is in accord with Rabelais's teaching elsewhere, especially as it is expressed in the discussion of debts and debtors, where Panurge praises human fellowship, painting an ideal world in which all are debtors and all are lenders. It seems there that Rabelais introduces a distinctly social element into the exaggerated individualism of Renaissance thought. It is, he believes, by the help of one's fellow men and by helping one's fellow men that one can most securely follow the path of wisdom and truth.

We have seen, then, that Rabelais, a free-thinker, lays great stress on the social, intellectual and religious liberty in the Renaissance. Let us now turn to other representative writers of the sixteenth century and compare their ideas with those of Rabelais.

---

1. Book V, Ch. XLVI.
2. Book V, Ch. XLVIII.

Chapter II

MONTAIGNE AND RABELAIS

Michael de Montaigne, as a representative of the Renaissance, stands in close relationship with Rabelais as a liberator of the mind. A generalizer, he was the solvent of the conflicting forces of his time. Rabelais, Ronsard, and Calvin, to mention only the greatest names, were enthusiasts. Each pressed and exaggerated his particular views. Each saw in antiquity an image of himself and expressed his ideas accordingly, so that by 1557 the libre examen had taken such a foothold that hostility had been aroused to such a degree that Montaigne came as a pacifist. By comparing and leveling ideas he objectivized human experience, the result being that he humbled the pride of man very much as Calvin did; but, unlike Calvin, he himself yielded to the conclusion he had reached. From his worldly and bourgeois standpoint, he submitted to the authority of Rome as one convinced of the validity of authority. In Montaigne's opinion the human mind is a "dangerous vagabond," in whose footsteps misfortune is bound to follow if it is not

held in check and prevented from forming personal opinions dangerous to tradition ("opinions communes"). This is the doctrine of a peace-loving man frightened by the excesses of civil and religious wars. Indeed, this idea is far removed from the spirit of the Renaissance. With Montaigne begins the reaction of the seventeenth century, in which free inquiry is replaced by the opinions generales.

Since he wrote during the latter part of the Renaissance it will be interesting to compare his ideas on freedom with those of Rabelais. Montaigne believes in the freedom of the intellect as long as the opinions formed are not dangerous to tradition. Like Rabelais, he emphasizes the fact that man should reason and judge freely and that he should invariably withdraw his mind from the crowd and give it the power of free thought. He says that man should weigh opinions by the testing of reason and not by common report.[1] Even the pupil should be taught to form an independent judgment and to take nothing on trust. "Qu'il leur face tout passer par l'estamine, et ne loge rien en sa teste par simple auctorite et a credit."[2] If, however, by his own thinking the

---

1. Book I, Ch. XXXI.
2. Book I, Ch. XXV.

pupil embraces the opinions of some philosopher, as Plato, the opinions will be no longer his but will be those of the pupil. "La verité et la raison sont communes a chascun et ne sont plus a qui les dictes premierement. . ." Montaigne advocates that the teacher should, from the beginning of a pupil's education, have him to choose discriminatingly for himself, some times opening the way for the pupil but more often allowing the child to open the way for himself. Neither would he have the tutor be the one to originate ideas. In other words, the teacher listens to what the pupil has reasoned out from his study, not to what he has memorized. He contends that study should make one wiser, but the mere memorizing of another's reasons without original thinking on the pupil's part is useless. "Sçavoir par coeur n'est pas sçavoir. Ce qu'on sçait droictement, on le dispose, sans regarder au patron, sans tourner les yeulx vers son livre. Fascheuse suffisance, qu'une suffisance pure livresque!" (Here again, (Rabelais and Montaigne agree on the point that the training of memory is not so important as the training of the mind.)

Not only does Montaigne emphasize the fact that man should think independently, but he is himself eminently a free thinker. Like Rabelais, he draws up

a scheme of education, concerning which his views are not only in advance of his own age, but, in some respects, of the present time as well. Let us consider a few of these ideas which are similar to the ideas of Rabelais.

One might be sure that Montaigne would have his young gentleman made, like himself, a citizen of the world and raised above the pettiness and narrowness of mere national prejudices. He would have him learn from men as well as books. He pictures the world as a mirror into which man must look if he is to know himself. In short, the world is the school book. "Ce grande monde, somme, ie vieulx que ce soit le livre de mon escholier." The variety of opinions, laws and customs, sects and judgments, leads one to judge rightly his own actions and to correct his own faults.

A child instructed in this way does not adopt the narrow views of the vulgar. "Il se tire un merveilleuse clarté pour le iugement humain, de la frequentation du monde: Nous sommes touts contraincts et amoncelez en nous, et avons la veue rasccourcie à la longueur de nostre nez." He cites Socrates as an example of a person whose country was not Athens but the whole world. Since his imagination was rich and

expansive, he embraced the whole world as his country and extended his society, knowledge and friendship to all of mankind, instead of doing as most people who can look no farther than their immediate surroundings.

Montaigne believes that mere bookish knowledge is a poor knowledge, indeed. It should serve as an embellishment but not as a foundation. For this reason intercourse with men and the visiting of foreign countries are wonderfully useful, not merely to bring back, after the fashion of the French nobility, an account of the richness of dress worn by some personage, but to carry away a general knowledge of the manners and humors of the people and to sharpen one's wits by coming in contact with others. It is interesting to note here that Montaigne wants the child to begin travelling at an early age. He wants him to visit adjoining nations whose language differs most from his own and which he would never learn to speak unless it were through necessity such as this visit would present.

Travel

Moreover, Montaigne would have the pupil consult every type of person in order to gain a wider knowledge. He should consider the special capabilities of every man whether he be a cowherder, a mason, or a

casual passenger.[1] He should visit all and borrow from each according to his trade, for all will help in his instruction. Even the weaknesses in others will serve as a lesson for the pupil.

Again, he says that the pupil should have implanted in his mind an honest curiosity to inquire into everything. If there is anything remarkable in his neighborhood he should visit it, whether it be a fountain, a person, or the site of an ancient battle. In this respect Montaigne agrees with Rabelais, since the latter himself was a careful observer.

Montaigne thinks, as does Rabelais, that one should be taught morals as well as books, but his idea is new in one respect, that the pupil should not be required to assimilate facts but rather gain from study that which would help to shape his life and govern his conduct. "Mais que mon guide se souvienne où vise sa charge, et qu'il n'imprime pas tant à son disciple tant où mourut marcellus, que pourquoy il feut indigne de son debvoir qu'il mourust là." History is important, then, as a cultural study. He adds that in the study of Livy he had read many things

---

1. Here Montaigne failed to carry out his theories in his own practise. He confessed elsewhere that he "envies those who can find pleasure in chatting with a carpenter or a gardener."

which other people had not, but Plutarch had read many more than Montaigne could find. Livy could be made either a mere study of language or a perfect philosophy.

Like Rabelais, Montaigne attaches a high value to athletics. "Ce n'est pas assez de lui roidir l'ame; il luy fault aussi roidir les muscles." The educational program should have as one important item the exercises and recreations of the pupil. He mentions such sports as running, wrestling, music, hunting, dancing, the management of a horse, and the handling of arms.

Perhaps Montaigne's most important idea, in accordance with Rabelais, is his attempt to place the emphasis in education upon fitness for practical life. "Ayant plustost envie d'en reussir habile homme qu'homme sçavant."

Both Rabelais and Montaigne are modern in their attempt to belittle mere parrot-learning and to place the emphasis upon fitness for practical life, upon ability to use one's judgment, and upon morality and virtue. They would have large use made of the motor side of humanity - in the language of our decade, "Learn to do by doing" - as is shown by their advocacy of educational games. Things should come before words,

through using the senses or by direct experience. In this connection travel is of the greatest importance.

It is to be noted, however, that Montaigne goes farther in his educational reform than Rabelais; that he adds new ideas to those of Rabelais. He objects to corporal punishment which was carried to brutal excess in his day. "Ostez moy la violence et la force: il n'est rien, à mon advis, qui abastardisse et estourdisse si fort une nature bien nee." He says that by this too-frequent punishment the pupil becomes hardened and has no fear or shame for chastisement. Consequently harsh methods do not produce the best results. "J'accuse toute violence en l'education d'une ame tendre, qu'on dresse pour l'honneur et la liberté."[1] He criticizes the colleges in this respect as being mere jails for the purpose of punishing youths before they have committed a crime. "Mais, entre aultres choses, cette police de la plus part de nos colleges m'a tousjours despleu." Montaigne scorns such a method of forcing young people to love their books - "les mains armeez de fouets! Inique et pernicieuse forme!"[2] This leads him to express

---

1. Book II, Ch. VIII.
2. Montaigne's description of the brutality of his time is corroborated by the testimony of others. Erasmus says that the whip, imprisonments, and fasts were the fundamental principles of the education he remembered. Rabelais gives his opinion of the college

another idea of vital significance in the educational system of the twentieth century, that of attractive surroundings in the schoolroom.

"Combien leurs classes seroient plus decemment ionchées des fleurs et de feuilles, que de troncons d'osier sanglants!" Montaigne said that if he were in charge of the schools he would have the schoolroom decorated with bright pictures to make the pupils joyful. Our present growing custom of decorating schoolrooms was anticipated by Montaigne in order that "où est leur proufit, que la feust aussi leur esbat." He was in advance of his age in his theory that the school life and surroundings should be pleasant.

On the other hand, Montaigne's views are in contrast to the luxurious habits of pupils. (This idea could probably be well taken in the twentieth century.) He maintains that the pupil should be discouraged from all luxury and fastidiousness in dress and lodging,in eating and drinking. On the other hand, he should be trained to become hardy and vigorous.

He disbelieves in home education since it makes the child tender. A child should not be spared in his youth as he will be if his parents try to keep

---

of his time in these words: "Think not, my sovereign lord, I would place your son in that low college they call Montagu. I would rather place him among the grave diggers of Saint Innocent, so enormous is the cruelty and villainy I have seen there. The

him from all hardihood. The authority of the tutor is also hindered by the presence of his parents.

He is in advance of the sixteenth century thought in his foreshadowing of apperception and co-ordination. The instructor was to ask the pupil not to recite the words of a lesson but rather the sense and substance of the lesson. The pupil should also be led to set forth in various ways what he has recently learned, then apply it to as many different subjects as possible to determine whether or not he has made it a part of himself. In this respect, Montaigne is the first to break away from the Renaissance conception of parrot-learning and give more consideration to the learner.

It seems again that Montaigne has in mind a sixteenth century germ of a kindergarten in his emphasis on games as being very important in the education of children.

One of his most important educational ideas is a modern one. He realizes that children should be

---

galley slaves are far better used among the Moors and Tartans - yea, the very dogs in your house - than the poor, wretched students in the aforesaid college." Rabelais, Book I, 37. Not only were the schoolmasters excessively cruel, but the schools were reprehensible for the general immorality of the students. Lord Chesterfield seemed to think that a boy could not live a virtuous life at school (see Letters). The colleges of France were improved after a king of France had himself enrolled among the boys of the college of Navarre. (Arnstädt, Francois Rabelais).

educated according to their ability, that there are individual differences in pupils. Montaigne never loses sight of the fact that methods must be varied in order to accommodate different individuals.

But most important of all Montaigne's ideas is that the individual human soul has a transcendent value which the teacher should not overlook. Educate not men only, but man; educate him not by pouring in, nor even by drawing out; surround him with conditions favorable to growth, the unfolding of a complete man - a strong, self-reliant individuality.[1]

In addition to the scheme of education there are many other examples which illustrate Montaigne's free thought. He, like Rabelais, rails against pedantry and the display of learning. It must be inferred, however, that he does not think learning is of importance. On the contrary, it is highly commendable. What he dislikes is the accumulation of a stock of useless learning and a pedantic display of it. This is, he thinks, a very deplorable circumstance connected with education. To see the remedy for darkness so managed as to create no life in the soul - to see wisdom turned into pedantry - is a very pitiable

---

1. It is interesting to note that from an intellectual point of view, Montaigne esteems ignorance "Beaucoup savoir apporte occasion de plus douter."

condition in education.

He agrees with Rabelais that the chief end of life is pleasure, but a different kind of pleasure from that of Rabelais. The type of pleasure suggested by Montaigne is mere enjoyment of beauty, recreation, and work, while that suggested by Rabelais seems to be pleasure of a more gross kind. It is best expressed in the word, "buvez."

Although one usually thinks of Montaigne as selfish, there are points in which his human sympathies stand out to his credit. And in contrast with the strong and narrow dogmatism of his age, Montaigne could appreciate the patience of the poor. One of the worst curses of the feudal system was that it ignored not only the liberties but the feelings of the humble classes. To the nobility of the sixteenth century, the slaves of the soil were only instruments which cultivated the land and from which they drew their yearly revenues. They were the body from which kings got their taxes, and the material which they employed in war. If such beings had human hearts and human affections, society took no cognizance of them. Here Montaigne differs in this belief. Keen observer of life in all its aspects as he was, his continued residende at his country home gave him opportunities

of noting traits and characteristics of the peasantry. He recognized there another kind of philosophy than that of the schools. He wonders why one should continue to fortify himself with the aspirations of science when, if he will only look down upon the earth, he will see poor people at work who know nothing of Aristotle or Cato, of example or precept - "de ceulx là tire nature touts les iours des effects de constance et de patience, plus purs et plus roides que ne sont ceulx que nous estudions si curieusement en l'eschole."[1] Many of them disregard poverty and even meet death without terror or regret. They give simple names to their diseases and endure their sicknesses cheerfully. "Cette vertu simple et sincère à été changée en un science subtile et obscure."[2]

He speaks in a praiseworthy manner of the fortitude displayed by his peasant neighbors during the pestilence, when he and his family were forced to go away from home. "Or lors, quel exemple des resolutions ne veismes nous en la simplicité de tout ce peuple?"[3] Again, he says he would much rather

---

1. Book III, Ch. XII.
2. Here Montaigne quotes from his favourite Seneca, Epist. 95. "Simplex illa et aperta virtis in obscuram et solertem scientiam versa est."
3. Book III, Ch. XII. Montaigne goes further and says that one may gain lessons from these poor people - ". . . en la vie de cette tourbe rustique d'hommes impolis touts les iours empruntant pour en faire patron, a ses disciples de constance, d'innocence et de tranquillité."

have resembled a herdsman, an artisan or a hundred laborers than the rectors of universities because the former are wiser and happier.

This same kindly nature of the man shows itself in the tone in which he always speaks of animals. Not only does he have such a moral hatred of cruelty both by nature and principle that it would pain him to see the neck of a chicken wrung,[1] but he has a kindly interest in dumb fellow creatures which is very exceptional among men of his generation. "Si y a il un certain respect qui nous attache, et un general debvoir d'humanite non aux bestes seulement qui ont vie et sentiment, mais aux arbres mesmes et aux plantes." We owe justice to man, he thinks, and to other created things such favour and kindliness as they may be capable of receiving, for "il y a quelque commerce entre elles et nous, et quelque obligation mutuelle."[2]

In the matter of politics, Montaigne says that man should be free. The people should be loyal subjects to the prince and every individual should be an affectionate and courageous gentleman in all that might concern the honor of his sovereign and the good

---

1. Book II, Ch. XI.
2. Book II, ibid.

of his country; but he should not have any other tie to the king's service than public duty. "Oultre plusieurs aultres inconvenients qui blecent nostre liberté par ces obligations particuliers."[1]

Thus one can see that on many subjects this writer is a free-thinker - in his general tolerance of political opinions, his hatred for cruelty in all shapes, and his sympathy with the poor. One can trace also ideas utterly foreign to the spirit of the sixteenth century which have since won their way into modern legislative practise. He saw clearly what seems now to be the most obvious truism, that judicial torture was a trial of patience rather than truth. He wonders why pain should make a man confess a fact rather than make him assert what is not the fact. The practical result in many cases was that "celui que le iuge a géhenné, pour ne le faire innocent, il le face mourir et innocent et gehenné."[2]

The arguments which he uses against the horrible cruelties perpetrated under cover of the law sound unnecessary at the present time; but they were then political and religious heresies when he dared to print them. It was not until two hundred

---

1. Book I, Ch. XXV.
2. Book II, Ch. V.

years afterward that this judicial "question" was finally abolished in France. Montaigne is bold enough to follow Plato and to insist that all punishment is for correction, not for revenge; that we do not correct the man we hang, but correct others through him. This principle is sufficiently familiar to modern legislators; but it had been too much forgotten in the long interval between Plato and Montaigne.

He wants to go even further than our legislation has yet ventured, though many steps have been taken in that direction; for he seems to hold that capital punishment is altogether a mistake, - that the worst penalty one could put on a man is not to hang him.

Although there are innumerable indications of Montaigne's free thought, it should be noted that he was in many respects a conservative.[1] "Selon mon humeur, et affaires publicques, il n'est aulcun si

---

1. "It was this conservative spirit which made him regard the Protestant reformers with an unfavourable eye. Their principles were subversive to the established order of things: and that order, whether in church or State, he was stout in upholding. The same feeling shows itself in an amusing way as to a minor ecclesiastical reform - that of the calendar. France had just made a sudden step (in 1582) by order of Pope Gregory XIII, from the 9th to the 20th of December; on which Montaigne writes - 'This late cutting out of ten days by the Pope has brought me

mauvais train, pourveu qu'il aye de l'aage et de la constance, qui ne vaille mieulx que le changement et le remuement." He says that although manners are corrupt and many of our laws and uses are barbarous yet they should remain as they are rather than be torn up with meddling. "Le pis que ie treuve en nostre estat c'est l'instabilité."[1] It is easy to tear down laws, but it is difficult to establish better ones in their place. Change alone gives shape to injustice and tyranny; nothing presses so hard on a state as innovation.[2]

What are Montaigne's ideas concerning religion? Is he Christian or is he skeptic; sounding all creeds and embracing none, noting the weak side in every form of human faith as well as human philosophy; or is he the secret enemy of all faith?

He is, in the first place, a son of the Church. He said his paternostres every night before he went to bed; he held the sign of the cross in constant use and reverence.[3] It was his habit to take communion and go to confession. Furthermore, he

---

so low that I cannot well get used to it. I belong to the years in which we kept another reckoning.'" Collins, Foreign Classics for English Readers, pp. 162-163.

1. Book II, Ch. XVII, p. 87.
2. Book III, Ch. IX.
3. Book I, Ch. LVI.

always speaks of the church with reverence and expresses, in very natural and simple language, his desire to adhere to it in life or death. ". . . l'Eglise Catholique, apostolique et romaine, en laquelle ie meurs, et en laquelle ie suis nay."[1] He thinks that the church is right in prohibiting the use of the songs of David. "Que l'Eglise deffend l'usage promiscue, temeraire et indiscret, des sainctes et divines chansons que le sainct Esprit a dicte en David." It seems to Montaigne that the study of the scripture is important, but the study should not be for the purpose of playing with the ideas there expressed, "Ce n'est pas raison de voir tracesser, par une salle et par un cuisine, le sainct livre des sacrez mystères de nostre creance."[2] Rather the reading of the Scripture should be a deliberate and settled act, "a laquelle on doilct tousiours adiouster cette preface de nostre office, Sursum corda, et y apporter le corps mesme dispose en contenance qui tesmoigne une particuliere attention et reverence." He would have the general study of the Bible permitted only to priests, and even

---

1. Book I, Ch. LVI.
2. Ibid.

doubts the wisdom of having it translated into the vulgar tongue.[1]

Montaigne shows not only outward adherence to the rule of the Church of Rome: one finds indications in his book of a religious faith of a profounder kind. He always quotes or alludes to the Books of the Scripture in what seems to be a reverent spirit. He mentions sacred names such as "Our Divine and Celestial King" and "Our Blessed Guide". He speaks of the Lord's prayer in a remarkable way. He says that it was dictated to man by the mouth of God and that man should make more use of it than he does - that he should say it each morning and night and before each meal. ". . . que le peuple l'eust continuellement en la bouche; car il est ceitain qu'elle dict tout ce qu'il fault, et quelle est tres-propre à toutes occasions."

As to his church preference, because he had been so brought up and because he was an enemy of all innovations which only engender unrest, Montaigne lived and died a Catholic, and condemned the Reformation as a presumptuous revolution. Moreover, his

---

1. It will be remembered that this opinion is exactly opposite to that of Rabelais. Rabelais thought everyone should not only study the scripture but interpret it according to his own free will.

skepticism is not extreme.

His religious ideas make an interesting comparison with those of Rabelais. In his religious views, Montaigne is very circumspect, never attacking any doctrine as Rabelais so often does. In questions of controversy he confined himself to arguments, but rarely gave an opinion. In his Essays one important omission will be remarked - not a word is breathed of any religious duty or principle to be inculcated, any religious foundation on which morality is to rest. In the great issues of life, philosophy is to be the only guide. As to anything higher than that, Montaigne is silent, because he has nothing to preach. His constant philosophy is, "Que sais-je?"

Another omission is to be found in Montaigne's works; he maintains always a marked silence concerning the future state of man - concerning any life but the present. Unlike Rabelais, who believes in the immortality of the soul, Montaigne gives an argument which seems almost destructive of personal identity in any future state. In fact, he thinks there can be no sense of happiness common to the mortal and the immortal. "Si les plaisirs que tu nous promets en l'aultre vie sont de ceux que i'oy sentis çà bas, cela n'a rien de commun avec l'infinité." He says that all

which satisfies mortals must be mortal: the recognition of our parents, children, and friends, - if one can still retain that kind of gratification, he is still in the sphere of earthly and finite pleasures. Man can hardly conceive of the grandeur of those divine promises, for in order to have a worthy idea of them man must imagine them to be past imagination, speech, and comprehension, and quite other than what belongs to his wretched experience. He quotes St. Paul, "O'Eil ne sçauroit veoir, et ne peult montes en coeur d'homme, l'heur que Dieu prepare aux siens." If, to make man capable of these good things, his being were reformed and changed, it must be such an extreme and total change that by physical laws it will be no longer the same man - "Ce sera quelque aultre chose qui recevra ces recompenses."[1] Montaigne seems to place the notion of a life to come so far out of the region of man's knowledge as to make it practically beyond his hope and fears.

Montaigne believes, as does Rabelais, that man has liberty of will - that he is free to choose between good and evil. One makes his life good or evil, just as he disposes it.[2] He says that if evils

---

1. Book II, Ch. XII, p. 397.
2. Book I, Ch. XX.

have no entrance in man's heart but by his judgment, it lies within his power either to continue or to turn them to his good. If what man calls evil and torment be neither torment nor evil, but man's fancy only gives it that quality, it is within his power to change it. It would also seem from the above discussion that Montaigne disbelieves in predestination, since man has absolute freedom of choice.

He thinks, however, that what constitutes good and evil depends on choice. It will be remembered that Rabelais has somewhat the opposite opinion since he thinks that a man's conscience determines what is good and what is bad. Moral laws, in Montaigne's judgment, are formed by public opinion. He thinks that although society at large has little concern with man's thoughts, all the rest - his acts, works, fortune, and even his life - must be abandoned to the service of society and to public opinion. The universal law is that everyone must obey the customs of a place where he lives.[1] Montaigne goes further and mentions certain practises such as the murdering of children and of parents; the communication with women; robbing and stealing; free license to all manner of sensuality; in fact, there is nothing so extreme and horrible but is found to be received and allowed by the custom of

---

1. Book III, Ch. XII.

some nation.[1] Even the laws of conscience, he thinks, are born of custom.[2] That which determines what is good and what is bad, in Montaigne's opinion, is what man is accustomed to consider as such.[3]

Montaigne differs from Rabelais, however, in that he does not emphasize the innate virtue of man. On the other hand, it seems that he has the opinion that man is corrupt. "La plus calamiteuse et fragile de toutes les creatures, c'est l'homme, et quand et quand la plus orgueilleuse."[4] Here Montaigne is at one with Calvin, though this attack is against the intellect and not the will.[5] There follows a long discussion on defense of the Catholic church. Here it will be well to go into detail in order to explain Montaigne's ideas concerning this matter.

The Apology to Raymond Sebond was drawn to defend Catholic faith by arguments drawn from human reason, using as its support the very arguments which the religious reformers had brought up against it. The book did not find favor, so Montaigne undertook to

---

1. Book III, Ch. XII.
2. Book I, Ch. XXIII.
3. Book I, Ch. XL.
4. Book II, Ch. XII.
5. Again, he speaks of man as being "cette miserable et chestife creature, qui n'est pas seulement maistresse de soy, ... exposee aux offenses de toutes choses, se die maistresse et emperiere de l'univers, duquel il n'est pas en sa puissance de cognoistre la moindre partie, tant s'en fault de la commander?"

answer certain objections to the arguments found in the book. To those who had objected that it was setting up a dogmatic principle to refer to reason what might be a matter of reverence and faith Montaigne admits that the true faith ought to be sufficient without the aid of reason, but where is such faith to be found? There follows a contrast between the professed Christian faith and the actual Christian morality; between the purity of Christian doctrine and the evil passions evoked in its defense.

To the objection that Sebond's reasoning was weak and insufficient to prove the case which it supported, Montaigne says that these arguments may be weak, but so also are all such arguments in such a matter; human reason is powerless and the wisdom of the wisest is but folly in the sight of Heaven. In fact, he wonders if man really has the power to know anything at all. Concerning this Apology then, "He was a free lance in the field of creed and dogma (bating a formal allegiance to the Catholic Church), and struck pretty sharp blows wherever he thought he saw a weak point in the harness of philosopher, priest or reformer, but he was hardly a man to stab in the dark."[1]

---

1. Collins, Foreign Classics for English Readers, p. 182.

One might say concerning Montaigne's religious views, then, that he has a mind in which Christianity finds little place. Although he does not actually reject it, he practically ignores its influence. His creed, in religion and philosophy, is doubt. He can not solve for himself the great riddle of life, nor does he try to do so. He believes strongly in human nature and the doctrine of its utter corruption, but he cannot accept the sovereign efficacy of divine grace.

As to the quarrels between Catholics and Protestants, Montaigne considers that dogmatic religion is just a pretext for enlisting partisanship, and that it touches the hearts of neither one party nor another; that nothing but the fear of being deserted by the Protestants kept the King of Navarre from returning to the faith of his ancestors and that the Duke of Guise would have made little objection to the Confession of Augsburg, if he could only have adopted it without prejudice to his interests. If one were to select those people who had taken up arms out of a pure zeal for religion, Montaigne thinks there would be a very small number.[1]

---

1. Book II, Ch. XII.

In conclusion, one may say that Montaigne seems to be Catholic in his balance of mind, his contentment with the good and his perception of a possible better in matters of religious faith and opinion. He differs from Rabelais in his dislike of controversy and dread of innovation. He says not a word against monks; he believes it is not for a wise man to decide the extent of obedience which he owes to ecclesiastical authorities because one must not tamper with it.

It is manifest that in matters of religion Montaigne was a conservative. Although he is reverent and outwardly in harmony with the orthodoxy of his day, the very principles of his philosophy declare him a skeptic. "The Church would have been more reasonable, from its own point of view, in trying to suppress Montaigne than either Rabelais or Marot."[1]

Montaigne favors social as well as intellectual and religious freedom. He agrees with Rabelais that the talents of man should be well developed. Not only was the pupil to study from books, but he was to take part in outside activities. ". . . les ieux mesmes et les exercises seront une bonne partie de l'estude; la course, la luicte, la musique, la danse,

---

1. Van Laun, History of French Literature, pp. 306-7.

la chasse, le marriement des chevaulx et des armes." He would have the manner, behavior, and bearing of the pupil cultivated at the same time with the mind. In short, it is the whole man who is to be trained, "ce n'est pas une arme, ce n'est pas un corps, qu'on dresse; c'est un homme; il n'en fault pas faire à deux." He cites Plato who said that the mind and body should both be trained.[1]

Like Rabelais, also, he believes in an honorable marriage, and one which will bring happiness to both families concerned. He praises marriage as being a religious and goodly union.[2] Again, he says that marriage is the most necessary and beneficial matter of human society.[3] However, he goes further in the discussion than does Rabelais and says that marriage must be concluded on a more solid foundation than that of mere beauty and for the realization of amorous desires. Marriages made on these conditions often fail and cause much trouble.[4] He says that wedlock has its share of honor, justice, and constancy.[5]

Montaigne is far in advance of his age in his idea of divorce. The divorce courts of the twentieth century, whose effect upon public morals is a

---

1. Book I, Ch. XXV.
2. Book I, Ch. XXX.
3. Book III, Ch. II.
4. Book III, Ch. V.
5. Ibid.

disputed question, would certainly have commended themselves to Montaigne's liberal judgment. He does not believe in the principle that the recognized indissolubility of marriage will lead both parties to make the best of it. He says that we have thought to tie the knot more firmly by taking away all means of dissolving it, but the tie of the will and the affections is relaxed and loosened the tighter the obligation is drawn. What kept marriage "honorable" and "sacred" so long in Rome was the liberty given to those who could dissolve it. Men took the more care of their wives, the more risk there was of losing them; consequently, with this full liberty of divorce, they passed about five hundred years before anyone availed himself of it.[1]

Montaigne does not believe in divorce, however, but insists that marriage is a bargain of which the entrance only is free, its continuance being constrained and compelled, resting upon other things than our will.[2] A man should then wisely keep his liberty, but after he has submitted himself to the bondage, he must stick to his vows by the laws of common duty.

Another expression of Montaigne's free thought is his conception of the value of man. In his opinion

---

1. Book II, Ch. VIII.
2. Book I, Ch. XXVIII.

a person should be judged by his merits rather than by his possessions or family standing. "Il le fault iuger par luy mesme, non par ses atours."[1] Put aside his riches and external honors and judge man as he is. If one considers a cottager and a king, a noble and an artizan, or a rich and a poor man, it may be found that men differ only in their clothes. He goes so far as to say that if the Emperor, who is considered in such glorious pomp in public, could be seen behind the curtain, he is only an ordinary man and "a l'adventure, plus vil que le moindre de ses subiects." He is afflicted with such qualities as irresolution, cowardice, ambition, anger, spite, and envy, just as any other person. Even when he comes to die, his bed all adorned with gold and pearls does not prevent him from suffering the pains of death.

He also believes in the single standard for men and women, since, in his opinion, both male and female are cast in the same mould.[2] He says that even the philosopher Antisthens took away all difference between the virtue of women and that of men. The only difference, he says, is that it is much more easy to accuse one sex than the other.

---

1. Book I, Ch. XLII.
2. Book III, Ch. VI.

Thus one can see that Montaigne shows good judgment in his strong attachment to existing institutions and in his opposition to popular agitation. Although he is impatient of abuse and wrong, he is satisfied to let things rest, for want of firm belief in the power of any man to improve them. He thinks that long discussions on the best form of society and the regulations best fitted to unite people are discussions suited only to the exercise of the mind.[1] "Montaigne shows for the sixteenth century, the essence of fine satire and delicate raillery. How different from the knock-down blows of Rabelais, and yet the age demanded both the club and the rapier."[2]

---

1. Book III, Ch. IX.
2. Van Laun, op. cit., pp. 306-307.

Chapter III

MARGUERITE OF NAVARRE AND RABELAIS

Representing the Renaissance from a viewpoint quite distinct from that of Rabelais, Montaigne, or Calvin, Marguerite of Navarre, a woman of highly intellectual ambitions, inclined to favor all that would promote the advancement of learning and religion, is an extremely interesting character. While neither a reformer nor an innovator, she is well qualified to represent the early Renaissance in France. With her extensive and varied culture, she was interested in all movements of ideas which were transforming the social, religious, and intellectual ideas in her country. Moreover, she was interested in ancient literature - she was acquainted with Italian works and was inspired by the Divine Comedy. She liked Plato and even encouraged people to translate the Dialogues. She likewise favored Evangelism. Because of her wide knowledge and her sincere interest in questions pertaining to freedom Michelot calls her "l'amiable mere de la Renaissance."

Whether the characters in her book, L'Heptameron, are real or not, there can be no doubt

that they are admirably selected as representatives of the society of Marguerite's day. For this reason, the Heptameron is a typical work of the early French Renaissance, yielding as it does the best picture of the social and intellectual atmosphere, the coarseness and refinement, the cynicism and enthusiasm, the irreverence, piety, and delight, the vigorous living and the love of meditation which marks that period of transition between the medieval and modern world.

Since Marguerite is chiefly interested in the society of her day, she has little to say concerning intellectual liberty. One may note, however, a few indications which show that she is in accord with free thinkers like Montaigne and Rabelais. In her book all of the characters who give opinions concerning different questions raised by the stories which were being told exercise liberty of thought to discuss freely the questions of the sixteenth century.

Marguerite agrees with Rabelais on some points concerning his scheme of education. She commends physical exercise and the care of the body. Lady Osille says, when planning a program for their day, that the care of the body should not be neglected. "Faut-il que vous regardiez que nous ne sommes encore

si mortifiés qu'il ne nous faille quelque passe-temps et exercise corporel." Parlamentene expresses the same idea when she says that the company should choose some "passe-temps qui vous puisse délivrer de vos ennuis." They sought for some exercise which "ne soit pas dommageable à l'âme et soit plaisant au corps."[1] She also lays great emphasis on the moral training and the study of the Holy Scriptures, as does Rabelais.

Marguerite agrees with Rabelais in her attack on the rhetoriqueurs. When the company was gathered together the people decided that each person was to originate ten stories. Afterwards the ten persons considered most capable of telling them were to recite them. No school men or practised men of books were included among the ten, because the tricks of rhetoric might cause the stories to become less interesting. ". . . ne vouloit que leur art y fût mêlé, et aussi, de peur que la beauté de rhétorique fit tort en quelque partie à la verité de l'histoire."[2]

She also shows considerable independence of thought in her attack on justice. "Les sots sont punis et non les vicieux." Again, Saffradent says

---

1. Preface of Heptameron.
2. Ibid.

that the only people punished are those who are not crafty enough to keep out of the way of justice: "je ne vis oncques méfait puni, sinon la sottise," while the real transgressors of the law escape, ". . . car il n'y a meurtrier, ni larron, ni adultère, mais qu'il soit aussi fin que mauvais, qui soit jamais reprins par justice ne blâmé entre les hommes."[1]

When one analyses the religion of Marguerite de Navarre one finds that it has love as its basis and that this love holds first place in her life, as her conduct and writings testify. For her brother who was held prisoner at Madrid, she found no surer consolation than the reading of the Epistles of St. Paul. Her correspondence with Briconnet, for a long time her spiritual director, is full of mystic effusions. The same confidence in the God of love and charity is found in her last poems.

As far as her relation to organized religion is concerned, it is noteworthy that Marguerite protected the Protestants. This, however, does not mean that she adopts their beliefs. Her generous nature might lead her to protect Protestants and to sympathize with them so keenly as to cause her personal anguish, but she did not share their beliefs.

---

1. Nouvelle, XIII.

This exceptional liberality has caused Marguerite's relation to the Reformation to be constantly and greatly misunderstood. Her personal character and her own nature is less akin to the spirit of the Reformation than to that of the Renaissance.

One cannot say definitely whether Marguerite was definitely Catholic or Protestant. The Heptameron has a very noticeable religious tone. One discovers that Catholic forms of worship are observed. Every morning the group of people said mass ". . . allèrent ouïr la messe et recevoir le saint sacrement d'union, auquel tous chrétiens sont mis en un."[1] The characters in the book are entertained and treated well by the abbot and his monks. This abbot gives them their lodging. A story is told of the good monk guided to safety by God "Dieu y amena ce vieil religieux." This story seems to show a decidedly kindly and sympathetic attitude toward the monastic orders. In spite of her apparent Catholicity, however, a noticeable feature in the setting of the queen of Navarre's book is the strong bias in favor of the new religious doctrines, of which Calvin is the chief exponent. The day was begun with an hour's reading of

---

1. Preface.

scriptures and passages were quoted by all the company - even by the cynical Saffredant. The people prayed and gave thanks to God "la nuit leur sembla courte à louer Dieu de la grâce qu'il leur avoit faite." The individual members offered prayers as well, "suppliant Celui qui les avoit assemblés, par sa bonté parfare leur voyage à sa gloire." No priestly intermediary was necessary but each prayed to God himself.

There are indications that Marguerite believes in justification by faith rather than works. This is evident from the story in which people steal in order to be able to give alms. God, like Marguerite, can see the good intent behind the deed and can judge the faith of man rightly. "Car Celui ne jugera pas seulement selon les oeuvres, mais selon la foi et charité qu'on a eue à lui."[1] In discussing the story of an old woman who tried to place a burning candle on the forehead of a sleeping soldier, thinking he was some stone, Orsille says that the heart of the giver is of more consequence than the value of the gift. "Dieu ne regarde point, la valeur du présent, mais le coeur qui le présente." This woman probably had more love and faith in her heart

---

1. Nouvelle, LV.

than the people who had burned many candles.[1]

Marguerite apparently believes also in the doctrine of predestination. God gives His grace according to His good will, not because a man may have gentle blood and great riches. "Les grâces de Dieu se donnent selon qu'il plâit à sa bonté qui n'est point accepteur de personne, lequel élit ce qu'il veut, car ce qu'il a élu l'honore de ses vertus et le courronne de sa gloire."[2] Often He chooses the lowly "ne nous réjouissons point en nos vertus, mais en ce que nous sommes écrits au livre de Vie."[3]

Marguerite believes, as does Calvin, in the sinfulness of human nature. Parlamente said that all men stand in need of God's divine grace, since all are steeped in sin. All should make a confession of their frailty. ". . . mais quant à la chasteté de coeur, nous sommes enfants d'Adam et Ève -- n'avons que faire mais plutôt confesser notre fragilité."[4] Hircan said that both vice and virtue are common to men and women,[5] that man should not trust in his own strength and virtuousness, and think he can overcome

---

1. Nouvelle, LXV.
2. Ibid., II.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., XXVI.
5. Ibid., XXXVI.

love, nature, and all the powers which may lead him astray. It would be better, knowing one's frailty, to betake one's self to God and say with the psalmist, 'Seigneur, je te satisferai; réponds pour moi!'[1] Because man is sinful, then, he stands in need of God's grace.[2]

Marguerite, like Rabelais, openly criticizes certain practises of the clergy and church. She ridicules hypocrisy, using as her example a wicked minister of the church who tried to conceal his sin under the cloak of holiness.[2] This led Geburon to say, "Je pense que vous dites vérité, et que l'hypocrisie, soit envers les hommes ou envers la nature, est cause de tous les maux que nous avons."[3] When covetousness and sin take hold on man's heart they drive out God and love and there enters in their place the love of self, hypocrisy, and deceit.[4]

Marguerite also attacks the vices of the monks. A difference is noted here between her views and those of Rabelais, since she thinks that monks and nuns should be separated because of their corruptness. One finds expressions throughout the entire book condemning the monks. For instance, "Comme ceux

---

1. Nouvelle, XXX.
2. Ibid., XXXIII.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., XLII.

qui aimoient mieux leur plaisir que leurs oraisons,"[1] and "je ne m'arrête point à telles gens."[2] Her hatred of the monks is very conspicuous. No less than ten stories are told against them, the Francisians being specially marked out for reprobation. The chief exponent of this feeling is Guebron. Lady Oisille is hardly less strong in her condemnation. The whole epilogue to the fifty-fifth story is a severe attack on the monks; so severe, indeed, that the first editor thought it prudent to substitute for it one of his own invention.[3]

Still there are to be found some few passages in praise of monks. There is the story of the Grey Friar who, because he told the truth, received a double reward (two pigs instead of one!). As has been previously explained, the group of people who told the stories were lodged comfortably in the house of monks. Parlamente said that he knew many an honest friar who preached the word in all purity and simplicity of heart, who lived without scandal, ambition, or covetousness, and neither feigned nor constrained.[4]

---

1. Nouvelle, XX.
2. Ibid., XXII.
3. Tilley, Literature of French Renaissance, Vol. I, p. 110.
4. Nouvelle, XLIV.

Thus one sees that Marguerite praises as well as scorns monks and that she is an ardent devotee of religion. Hence she attacks abuses in the monastic and clerical system, without condemning it in toto.

It seems that in Marguerite's religion, then, one of her most noteworthy characteristics is a peculiar feminine mysticism, marked by an intense yearning towards the divine. Although in her book she seems to confuse sacred and profane love, actually it is mystic fervor which predominates. In doctrine, she stands on the borderline between the two faiths, - French Catholicism and Protestantism as being introduced by Calvin.

On social liberty Marguerite has much to say. She agrees with Rabelais in her belief in pure chaste love.[1] "Car amour de soi est bon."[2] Love is dangerous when based on vice "qu'il n'y a rien plus cruel qu'amour, quand il est fondé sur vice, comme il n'est rien plus humain ni louable, quand il habite en un coeur verteux."[3] Sensuous love is not lasting.

---

1. It should be remembered that there is a difference between Rabelais the sensualist and Rabelais the moralist. In his serious, formal opinion of marriage he is a good French bourgeois. Thus when Panurge was trying to decide whether or not he should marry he said, "N'est ce le mieulx que je me associe quelque honneste et preude femme qu'ainsi changer changer de jour en jour avecques continuel dangier de

"Car un amour vicieux, de soi-même se défait et ne peut durer en un bon coeur."[1]

She believes, as does also Rabelais, that marriage is a necessary and noble institution. Osille says, "Je tiens le mariage l'un des plus beaux et des plus sûrs etats qui soient en ce monde."[2]

Marguerite believes that children should seek the consent and advice of relatives and friends before marriage, because it is a serious matter "nulle de vous ait envie de se marier pour son plaisir, sans le consentement de ceux à qui on doit porter obéissance." Marriage is a permanent state also and for this reason the youth should be advised before he enters into it. "Car mariage est un état de si longue durée qu'il ne doit être commencé légèrement, ne sans l'opinion de nos meilleurs amis et parents."[3]

She differs from Rabelais, however, since, in her opinion, marriage should be based neither on equality of rank nor on love alone. In marriages where equality of rank alone is considered, man and wife are often so diverse in heart, complexion, and disposition that "en lieu de prendre état pour mener

---

quelque coup de baston, ou de la verolle pour le pire?" Book III, Ch. IX.

1. Nouvelle, XXXI.
2. Ibid., XXXV.
3. Ibid., XXXVII.

a salut, ils entrent aux faubourgs d'enfer." On the other hand, some who have married for love, without regard to rank or lineage, having like hearts, complexions, and dispositions have also repented of their folly. Marguerite's solution is that people should submit themselves to the will of God without regard to rank, riches, or pleasure: "mais, pour une amour vertueuse, et du consentement des parties, désirent de vivre en l'état de mariage, comme Dieu et Nature l'ordonnent."[1]

Marguerite goes farther than Rabelais in her demand for social freedom, and agrees with Montaigne that marriage is a permanent union and should not be broken except in case of death. "Car l'on sait bien que le lien du mariage ne peut durer, sinon autant que la vie, et puis apres on est delié."[2] The love between married people should be steadfastly fixed so that the heart will not change its inclination, no matter what may happen, because "si celle que vous aimez est tellement semblable à vous et d'une même volonté, ce sera vous que vous aimerez et non pas elle."[3] It is possible for the love between husband and wife to be durable, because many persons have

---

1. Nouvelle, XL.
2. Ibid., XXXIX.
3. Ibid., VIII.

loved unto death, "Car je sais qu'il y en a qui ont aimé jusques a la mort."[1] To prove this statement Marguerite tells the story of two lovers in whom love was so equally powerful that when the one died, the other could not live.

Marguerite also believes, as does Montaigne, in a single standard of morality for men and women. ". . . et combien que la loi des hommes donne de si grand deshonneur aux femmes qui aiment autres que leurs maris, si est-ce que la loi de Dieu n'excepte point les maris qui aiment autres que leurs femmes."[2] These words were pronounced by the heroine of the story of Simontault, who became unfaithful to get revenge. Again, Marguerite says that all wives should share their husbands' fortune and misfortune, sorrow and gladness.

Love should not, in Marguerite's opinion, be fickle but should be based on a more substantial foundation than mere physical beauty. Hircan says, ". . . si notre amour est fondée sur la beauté, bonne grâce, amour et ferveur d'une femme, et notre fin soit fondée sur plaisir, honneur ou profit, l'amour ne peut longuement durer."

---

1. Nouvelle, XXXIX.
2. Ibid., XV.

Beauty is ephemeral, and when it fades, love arising from it alone fades also.

Marguerite thinks that man is not able of his own choice to avoid love, and when it does come upon him, he is more or less powerless to overcome it. It is the most blinding of all passions.[1] Even virtuous love takes hold before one is aware of it, and then one cannot escape it. ". . . mais la vertueuse amour est celle qui a ses liens de soie si délies qu'on est plus tôt prins que l'on ne les peut voir."[2]

It can be seen that although Marguerite did not advocate any radical changes in the society of her time, yet she inaugurated a free and frank discussion of the social and intellectual problems of the sixteenth century which had a far-reaching effect.

The Middle Ages, to be sure, had produced satirists and champions of freedom from time to time, but they were not nearly as bold and outspoken as those of the sixteenth century. The sister of Francis the First led the way, and by her example gave encouragement to more timid souls.

---

1. Nouvelle, XLVIII.
2. Ibid., XXXV. Compare also the speech of Parlemente: "Amour de soi est une passion qui a plutôt saisi le coeur que l'on ne s'en est avisé, et cette passion si plaisante que si elle se peut aider de la vertu lui server de manteau, à grande peine sera-t-elle commue, qu'il n'en vienne quelque inconvenient." Nouvelle, XXXV.

Chapter IV

CALVIN AND RABELAIS

"Possibly the most significant outcome of the Renaissance, and certainly the most powerful development of the intellectual revolution which distinguishes the sixteenth century, was the reformation of religion."[1] The age was characterized by intense freedom - by rebellion against all institutions which had endeavored to enslave mankind, rebellion of the intellect against the formulas of tradition and the authority of mere didactic knowledge, rebellion against the conventional teachings and interpretations of a church characterized more by tyranny and persecution than by intelligence and morality. This latter revolt had indeed been working for many centuries[2] in every country of Christendom and in none more vigorously than in France.[3]

---

1. Van Laun, History of French Literature, p. 327.
2. To go no farther back than the thirteenth century, the Albigensian heretics and their merciless punishment bear witness to the persecution of independent religious belief within the Catholic Church. Over and over again the rebellion was begun, only to be stamped out by the cruelty of the vice-regent. Ibid.
3. Ibid.

Jean Calvin is called the"founder of the Reformation" in France.[1] It is true that he was not its original genius, that he belonged only to the second generation of reformers, but he is, despite his own intolerance, the outstanding representative of religious liberty in France, since he is its most distinguished and most articulate defender. Although Calvin built his theology on the foundations laid by earlier reformers, especially Luther, his particular gifts of learning, logic, and style make him pre-eminently the theologian of the new religion. He became for the people of France what Luther was for Germany, and he established his own peculiar type of Protestantism (that is to say, a type congenial to his own disposition and experience) in Switzerland, France, the Netherlands, Scotland, and through the Dutch, to English Puritans and Scotch Presbyterians and to a large portion of the New World.

Although Calvin plays an important part in the Reformation, his revolt against the Catholic Church is not as complete as is that of Rabelais. "Rabelais and Calvin represent the positive and negative poles

---

1. Annie Lemp Konta, History of French Literature, p. 110.

of the Renaissance."[1] They represent the parting of the ways in their conflicting ideas. While Rabelais is the apostle of freedom, Calvin places the greatest emphasis on discipline. This can be seen in Calvin's governorship at Geneva, of which Darmesteter and Hatzfeld write: "Forel le somme au nom de Jésus-Christ, de se consacrer à l'establissement de la nouvelle Eglise. Ses prétentions dommatrices irritent le peuple, qui le bannit avec Farel en 1538."[2] Calvin exercised absolute authority at Geneva. He reorganized the whole government, giving it a political constitution strongly religious in character. He emphasized his confession of faith and his interpretation of it; the family and its habits was regulated by law - even such details as the mode of dressing and the table expenditures were not overlooked.

Rabelais glorifies nature, while Calvin preaches man's need of redemption. If he condemns the asceticism of Catholicism of the Middle Ages, he himself imposes a very hard law. To him natural man, corrupt since the Fall, remains incapable of virtue.

---

1. Nitze and Dargon, History of French Literature, p. 145.
2. Darmsteter and Hatzfeld, Morceaux Choises, des Auteurs du XVI^e Siecle, p. I.

Calvin seems to be an advocate of religious freedom, but he does not champion absolute religious liberty. In his own doctrine he is just as intolerant as the Catholic Church in its dogma. He believed that he alone knows the truth and possesses the absolute right to distinguish, repress, and punish error. The Christian must be in a position to read and interpret the sacred books, but he is forbidden to find in them anything save what Calvin finds in them.

What, then, are some of the dogmas which Calvin would have man believe? The basis on which he establishes his whole doctrine is the principle of justification not by works but by faith and its concomitant, grace. This is the point of departure and the center of Calvin's faith.

Calvin affirms that man is innately a sinful being. Rather than glorying in the goodness of man, as does Rabelais, Calvin chooses to consider him as a debased creature. "Ne sommes-nous pas tous corrumpuz et contaminez en vices?" He quotes St. Paul approvingly, ". . . tous ont decliné, tous sont inutiles; qu'il n'en a poinct que face bien, pas jus'ques à un seul -- c'est en vain qu'on requiert quelque bien à nostre nature."

He thinks that man is sinful from his birth - that sin is inherited: "Je confesse que touts ces meschancetz n'apparoissent poinct en chascun homme, mas nue ne peut nier qu'un chascun n'en ait la semence enclose en soy." Man is blind because of this sin. ". . . le peché originel est une corruption espandue par nos sens et affections - et sommes comme povres aveugles en tenebres." Man is a captive to sin. By the fall of Adam all became sinners. "Pource qu'estans issus de la race maudite d'Adam, nous n'avons pas un seule goutte de vertu à bien faire, et toutes nos focultez sont vicieuses."

Perhaps the greatest emphasis in Calvin's doctrine is placed on election and predestination. Calvin thinks that a person may be rejected or elected. God sets apart those whom He adopts for salvation. Those whom He passes by, He condemns to eternal damnation and that for no other reason than that he is pleased to exclude them from the inheritance which He has predestined for His children. "Le bon plaisir de Dieu dans cette élection et cette réprobation." Calvin bases his doctrine of predestination on the following words of Christ, "Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up."[1]

---

1. Matthew, XV, 13. He quotes also the words of St. Paul in Rom., IX, 22, 23.

In regard to the question as to whether or not God determines the will of man, Calvin agrees with Augustine that when God chooses a man for salvation, he forms him again by the powerful influence of grace. He does not convert everyone because, while grace is always efficacious in those whom God has elected, it requires the assent of the human will for its actual operation.[1]

In justification of the predestination of some to eternal damnation,[2] Calvin says that since all men are by nature sinful and cannot but be hateful to God, it is not tyrannical cruelty but strictest justice that condemns them. God should not be charged with injustice, if by His eternal decree man is doomed to a death to which he himself feels that he is irresistibly drawn by his own nature.

---

1. August. de Praedest. Sanct., Book I, Ch. II.
2. "Nous appelons Predestination le conseil éternel de Dieu par lequel el a détermine ce qu'il vouloit faire d'un chascun homme. Car il ne les crée pas tous en pareille condition, mais ordonne les uns a vie éternelle, les aultres à éternelle damnation -- Selon donc que l'Escriture monstre clairement, nous disons, que le Seigneur a une fois constitue en son conseil éternel et immuable, lesquelz il vouloit prendre a salut, et lesquelz il voulut laisser en ruine. Ceux qu'il appelle à salut, nous disons qu'il les reçoit de la misericorde gratuite, sans avoir esgard aucun a leur propre dignité. Au contraire que l'entrée de vie est forclose à tous ceux qu'il veult livrer en damnation et que cela se fait par son jugement occulte et incomprehensible, combien qu'il soit juste et équitable."

"S'ilz sont tous priz d'une masse corrompue -- ilz sont assubjectz a dampnation -- ilz sont ordonniez a dampnation a laquelle leur nature mesme les meine." It is only God's infinite mercy which makes salvation possible for anyone.

Since God foresees the things which are to happen because He has decreed them, it is vain to debate about prescience, since it is clear that all events take place by His sovereign appointment. It is impossible to deny, therefore, that God knew what the end of man was to be before He made him. God foresaw the fall of Adam,[1] and in him the ruin of posterity, because, of His own pleasure, He had decreed it.

Man therefore, according to Calvin, is not free to choose between good and evil. His destiny is entirely beyond his control. Here Calvin is far from the view of Rabelais. Calvin ascribes to man no freedom whatsoever in religious matters. He believes that, at one time, man was capable of choosing between good and evil. Not only was he free to make

---

1. "Que tous les enfans d'Adam viennent en avant pour contendre et debatre contre leur Createur, de ce que, par sa providence eternelle, devant leur nativite ilz ont este desvouez a calamite perpetuelle!"

this choice, but in his mind and will there was the highest rectitude. But man's powers were perverted by the Fall, and not only body and mind but also will became tainted. Hence, although man still has the power to will what is good, he is incapable of exercising it without the grace of God. "L'homme ne peut vouloir le bien par sa seule volonté, celle-ci étant corrompu par la péché originel. Il n'a pas de libre arbitre. Il incline fatalement au mal."

Hence, Calvin believes that if man is to be saved, it can be only by divine grace, ". . la source et origine de nostre salut est la pure misericorde de Dieu, car il ne se trouvera en nous aucun dignité." This grace is not granted because of merit. Man cannot "prevenir Dieu pour acquerir grace envers luy." Hence God bestows His grace upon whom He wills, His pleasure being the only determinant, for ". . . ils sont tous -- envelloppez en telle calamité, de laquelle ils ne peuvent sortir, sinon que la misericorde de Dieu les en delivre." On the other hand, God has condemned to eternal punishment those whom it has not pleased Him to save. Such is the black predestination of the Calvinistic theory, with its almost complete negation of free will.

Calvin, to be sure, is not widely popular

today, even in those lands which owe him most, for he had little of the human sympathy which colors the best thought and life. But for all of that he has left his mark upon the world, and his influence is not likely ever to be wholly outgrown.[1] "His emphasis upon God's holiness made his followers scrupulously, even censoriously, pure; his emphasis on God's will made them stern and unyielding in the performance of what they thought to be their duty; his emphasis on God's majesty, paradoxical though it may seem at first sight, promoted in no small degree the growth of civil and religious liberty, for it dwarfed all mere human

---

1. Thus it will be seen that while both Calvin and Rabelais are advocates of freedom, their views coincide only in part. Both boldly attack tradition and authority, both assert the right to think for themselves, but the broad independence and tolerance of Rabelais finds no counterpart in the fanatical absolutism of Calvin. Where Rabelais remained within the Catholic fold, in many respects a skeptic and a heretic, Calvin broke with the church but established his own narrow and rigid system. Where Rabelais believes in man's fundamental goodness and his absolute freedom of choice, Calvin asserts man's complete mental and moral impotence and degradation, and propounds the theory of a rigid predestination. Of the two, it is Rabelais who most truly represents the Renaissance in its conviction that man is morally free and perfectible, and should be unrestrained by artificial and conventional shackles.

authority and made men bold to withstand the unlawful encroachments of their fellows. Thus Calvin became a mighty force in the world, though he gave the world far more of law than of Gospel, far more of Moses than of Christ."[1]

---

1. A. C. McGiffert, Library of World's Best Literature, Vol. VI, pp. 3118-3119.

CONCLUSION

This paper has attempted to show that Rabelais, as the representative author of the French Renaissance, exhibits all of the characteristics of this period -- its interest, half-enthusiastic and half-sceptical, in religious and philosophical questions, its devotion to ancient literature and learning, and the ardent zest with which it attacks at once the business and the pleasure of the world. Most important of all, Rabelais is the representative of the spirit of freedom, which is the embodiment of the ideal of the Renaissance. The three most remarkable of the remaining prose writers of the century illustrate this latter characteristic probably as vividly as does Rabelais, but less universally.

Montaigne, indeed, is almost as complete a representative of the entire character of the last half of the century as Rabelais is of the first. But even his sceptic philosophy is no more prejudiced than many ideas to be found in Rabelais. Montaigne stands midway between the pedants and the bigots who begrudged the new light to the masses, and the extravagant rebels against authority who set no bounds

to their consuming desire for freedom. He despises both and it is difficult to say which he dislikes most. No doubt the bent of his mind leads him to sympathize most with the satirical school whereof Rabelais is the leader, yet in his didactic style he resembles the scholastics.

Montaigne represents, if he did not inaugurate, the school of French satire which, standing as it were, between Calvin and Rabelais, avoided both the coarseness and abandon of the latter and the ascetic sternness of the former.

At the same time, Montaigne is pre-eminently a man of wide and prudent judgment, sincerely attached to existing institutions, unalterably opposed to popular agitation or radical change in the state. A theoretical Radical, impatient of abuse and wrong, because of his love of order and settled government, he is actually so much a conservative that is moderately content with existing conditions. He believes in freedom of thought, provided always that this freedom does not lead to contempt for authority. It is in this respect that he is not as much an apostle of freedom as is Rabelais, who believes in freedom as opposed to authority.

Calvin, too, represents his age and its desire for liberty, in his revolt against the authority of

the Pope and the Church. However, it has already been noted that while he pretends to be the apostle of freedom in religious matters, he does not go as far as Rabelais, who demands liberty of worship, conduct, and belief for the individual, while Calvin believes in organization and discipline. Moreover, the latter does not accord to the individual the right to interpret the Bible for himself but insists upon his own personal interpretation.

Marguerite de Navarre is especially the representative of social freedom during the sixteenth century. She was interested in any movement which pertained to freedom. Her house was made a place for gatherings where people discussed freely the problems of the day.

All four of these writers championed the cause of freedom - Montaigne in the intellectual field; Calvin in religion; and Marguerite de Navarre in the realm of social relationships. It is Rabelais who embraces in his thought all three of these domains.

The spirit of the age, whereof Rabelais is the embodiment, was destined often to be obscured, but never again extinguished.

"Rabelais is, in fact, the center of a new system in the literary heavens. He is the focus of

the converging rays which he was destined to gather up and direct, through a new medium, upon successive ages of posterity; the creature of his past who was to assist in the creation of his future. Best-endowed child of the early Renaissance, he was the ablest and most influential teacher of his age, because he was the grandest product of that revived spirit of French satirical philosophy which had already given to the world the author of Pathelin, and which was yet to evolve the author of Tartuffe."[1]

---

1. Van Laun, History of French Literature, p. 295.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Calvin, Jean, Institution de la Religion Chrétienne, Edition of 1541, 2 vols., Meyrueis, Paris, 1859.

Marguérite de Navarre, L'Heptameron, Edition of 1558, Garnier Frères, Libraires-Éditeurs, Paris.

Montaigne, Michel de, Essais, Edition of 1595, 4 vols., G. Charpenter et Cie, Éditeurs, Paris, 1885.

Rabelais, François, Les Cinq Livres, Edition of 1663, Ernest Flammarion, Éditeur, Paris.

Secondary Sources

Bédier and Hazard, Histoire de la Littérature Française Illustré, Libraire Larousse, Paris, 1923, pp. 126-164.

Béranger, Henry, François Rabelais, in Warner's Library of the World's Best Literature, vol. 21, pp. 12001-12026.

Besant, Sir Walter, Rabelais, in Foreign Classics for English Readers, J. B. Lippincott and Co., Philadelphia.

Bocher, Ferdinand, Montaigne, in Warner's Library of the World's Best Literature, vol. 18, pp. 10237-10240.

Collins, W. L., Montaigne, in Foreign Classics for English Readers, J. B. Lippincott and Co., Philadelphia.

Compayré, Gabriel, Montaigne and the Education of Judgment, T. Y. Crowell and Co., New York, 1908.

Dowden, Montaigne, French Men of Letters, J. B. Lippincott and Co., Philadelphia and London, 1906.

Duclaux, Mme. Agnès Mary Frances (Robinson), Margaret of Angoulême, Queen of Navarre, W. H. Allen and Co., London, 1886.

Faguet, E., Seizième Siècle Études Littéraures, Société Française d'Imprimeraire et de Libraire, Paris, 1856, pp. 77-197; 365-421.

Fleury, F. B., Rabelais et Son Oeuvre, Didier et Cie, Paris, 1876, vol. I.

France, Anatole, Rabelais, Henry Holt and Co., New York, 1929.

Freer, M. W., The Life of Marguerite of Angoulême, Hurst and Blackett, London, 1854.

Ives, George B., The Essays of Montaigne, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1925.

Konta, Annie Lemp, History of French Literature, D. Appleton and Co., New York and London, 1910, pp. 105-147.

Lacroix, Paul, Rabelais, Sa Vie et Ses Ouvrages, A. Delahays, Paris, 1858.

Laurie, S. S., Montaigne, the Rationalist, in Teachers' Guild Addresses, Percival, London, 1892, pp. 95-129.

Leckey, W. E. H., Rationalization in Europe, D. Appleton and Co., New York, 1876, pp. 202-405.

Le Franc, Abel Jules Maurice, Grands Écrivains, Français de la Renaissance, E. Champion, Paris, 1914, pp. 63-386.

Lenormant, Charles, Rabelais et l'Architecture de la Renaissance, J. Crozet, Paris, 1840.

Louandre, Chas., Michel de Montaigne, G. Charpentier et Cie, Éditeurs, Paris, 1885, vol. i, Preface, pp. i-xl.

McGifferit, A. C., Biographic and Critical Sketch of Jean Calvin, in Warner's Library of the World's Best Literature, vol. 6, pp. 3117-3120.

Merle d'Aubigné, J. H., History of the Reformation in Europe in the Time of Calvin, Carter, New York, 1880.

Millet, René P., Rabelais, Hachette et Cie, Paris, 1892.

Morley, Henry, Introduction to the Five Books of Rabelais, 2 vols., in Morley's Universal Library, Routledge, London, 1890.

Nitze and Dargon, History of French Literature, Henry Holt and Co., New York, 1927, pp. 127-204.

Nisard, D., Histoire de la Littérature Française, Libraire de Firmin Didot, 1886, pp. 241-308; 421-488.

Nock, A. J., Francis Rabelais, the Man and His Work, Harper and Brothers, New York and London, 1929.

Petit de Julleville, L., Histoire de la Langue et de la Littérature Française, Libraire Armand Colen, Paris, 1911, pp. 1-75; 319-355; 406-471.

Plattard, Jean, Life of François Rabelais, Routledge, London, 1931.

_____, L'Oeuvre de Rabelais, H. Champion, Paris, 1910.

Putnam, Samuel, François Rabelais, Man of the Renaissance, J. Cape and H. Smith, New York, 1929.

Rutherford, Mildred L., French Authors, Handbook of French Literature, Franklin Printing and Publishing Co., Atlanta, Ga., pp. 44-64.

Stapper, Paul, Montaigne, Hachette et Cie, Paris, 1895.

Strachey, L., Land Marks in French Literature, Henry Holt and Co., New York, 1923, pp. 21-34.

Tilley, A. A., Dawn of the French Renaissance, University Press, Cambridge, 1918, pp. 56-182; 375-609.

_____, François Rabelais, J. B. Lippincott and Co., Philadelphia and London, 1927.

_____, Literature of the French Renaissance, An Introductory Essay, University Press, Cambridge, 1885.

_____, Literature of the French Renaissance, vol. I, University Press, Cambridge, 1904, pp. 96-136; 165-237.

_____, Literature of the French Renaissance, vol. II, University Press, Cambridge, 1904, pp. 123-189.

Van Laun, Henry, History of French Literature, G. P. Putnam Sons, New York, 1876, pp. 259-342.

Waterman, E., Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Calvin, Hale, Hartford, 1813.

Woodberry, G. E., Literary Essays of Montaigne, Harcourt, Brace and Howe, New York, 1920, pp. 237-261.

Wright, C. H. E., A History of French Literature, Oxford University Press, New York, 1925, pp. 127-248.