questions to link one part of his work to another. Finally, one wonders whether the book would be more readable with a little less detail, which in some cases could have been relegated to footnotes; certainly this would have smoothed out Whiting’s argument, which at times gets lost in an avalanche of information. But given that Whiting has provided a significant viewpoint on the Reformation in England, these shortcomings may be largely ignored. The maps and charts included in the Appendix are interesting, and serve to summarize the vast quantities of data supplied in the main text.

DAVID W. ATKINSON, University of Saskatchewan


Richard DeMolen’s The Spirituality of Erasmus is based on a series of articles published from 1969 to 1986. As with any collection of essays, those found in this volume are of uneven depth, somewhat repetitious, and occasionally stray from the main theme of the book. Chapter 4, for example, which quickly summarizes twenty of Erasmus’ major works in an effort “to substantiate Erasmus’ declaration that he offered the reading public only works that served to enhance learning and Christian piety” (p. 70), contains less detail than the other chapters. Certain points established early on are reiterated in later essays, as Erasmus’ intention “to write nothing which does not breathe the atmosphere either of praise of holy men or holiness itself” (p. 39), quoted in chapter three, is restated in chapter 4 (p. 71) and in chapter 5 (p. 125). Finally, chapter 6, Erasmus’ views on childhood, written to counter the argument that the concept of childhood was not developed until the seventeenth century, clings only tenuously to the theme of Erasmus’ spirituality.

Still, Professor DeMolen’s point, that Erasmus underwent a religious transformation in the 1480s which influenced the whole of his later life, is clearly voiced in The Spirituality of Erasmus, which presents Erasmus’ spirituality as a fulfilment rather than a development. The author states, “It was at Steyn that Erasmus vowed to write only of holy men and holiness itself. The accomplishment of his resolution was realized in the remaining years of his life and found expression in his pursuits of classical philology, biblical exegesis, children’s textbooks, spiritualia, and patristics” (p. xv). DeMolen in this way counters Erika Rummel’s proposition that Erasmus was converted from a philologist to a biblical scholar. DeMolen, furthermore, argues against Marjorie O’Rourke Boyle’s contention that Erasmus’ theological method of imitation had its roots in the pedagogy of classical rhetoric. For DeMolen, “Erasmus proposed a way of life rather than a method of learning” (p. 36).
DeMolen begins his book with a brief sketch of the life of Erasmus. He then concentrates on Erasmus’ adolescence and his forced entrance into the monastery at Steyn. Referring to Erasmus’ early correspondence, he reconstructs the intensity of Erasmus’ early emotional relationships and his adjustment to religious life. In the chapter entitled, “The Interior Erasmus”, DeMolen describes Erasmus’ spiritual awakening during his time at the monastery and his subsequent commitment to a life of piety. The author goes on to review Erasmus’ major works and indicates how each conforms to Erasmus’ intention to develop religious perfection in his readers. DeMolen then discusses Erasmus’ two early works, Antilibari and De Contemptu Mundi, and how they reflect the period of Erasmus’ religious formation. Chapter 6 deals with Erasmus’ views on childhood, the psychological development of children, and the possibility for a child’s imitation of Christ. In chapter 7, DeMolen considers the expression of love in Erasmus’ writings and surveys Erasmus’ definition of piety and his plan for the achievement of holiness. The Spirituality of Erasmus ends with a short comment on Erasmus’ continual commitment to his religious order, the Canons Regular of St. Augustine, and the perception of Erasmus by posterity.

Throughout his book, Richard DeMolen stresses Erasmus’ own commitment to faith and his courage in maintaining his moral standards, thus asserting his view of Erasmus as a holy person and, at the end of the first third of his book, calling for Erasmus to be recognized as a saint by the Christian church.

JACQUELINE GLOMSKI, University of Toronto


C’est un modèle d’organisation et d’érudition qu’on nous offre ici. Dans l’introduction à son immense étude, Isabelle Konstantinovic souligne que “la recherche structurelle et analytique et la recherche littéraire historique ... sont contraintes de recourir l’une à l’autre si elles veulent aboutir à de solides résultats”. La minutie que l’auteur a apportée à sa recherche est évidente à chaque page et l’ampleur de cette étude le prouve abondamment.

Paradoxalement, nous allons commencer par la seconde partie de cette œuvre, et de beaucoup la plus longue (pp. 119–517), car c’est sans aucun doute celle qui sera le plus souvent consultée par nos collègues seiziémistes. Tenant compte des quatre états du texte (1580, 1582, 1588, Exemplaire de Bordeaux) de même que des corrections manuscrites de Montaigne dans l’exemplaire de Bordeaux et des variantes, elle répertorie tous les “emprunts” à Plutarque dans les Essais. Les références aux traductions de Plutarque que Montaigne avait utilisées (Amyot, Vies des hommes illustres, 1565 et Oeuvres morales et mêlées, 1572) sont aussi clairement indiquées. Les initiales des critiques qui ont signalé certains des emprunts sont