and predestination in Hooker's works" (xxxvii). Together, the Fragments outline an important treatise on free will, grace, and predestination, the most vexed topics raised by *A Christian Letter*. This material is an expansion and clarification of Hooker's earlier work rather than a new departure, but it represents the cause to which Hooker fervently devoted his last energies. He clears himself especially of the charges of urging too great a freedom of the will, and of teaching the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation. He shows a reverence for Calvin along with a profound distrust of Calvin's followers who, like many Roman Catholics, make of their church an institution that professes to be above human error.

Hooker's marginal notes, at times very difficult to read, are here scrupulously transcribed with the help of two seventeenth-century transcriptions, themselves not always reliable. The sole sixteenth-century quarto of *A Christian Letter* itself poses no special textual difficulties. The copy text for the Dublin Fragments is evidently a seventeenth-century transcription. Variants between copy text and adopted reading throughout this volume are nonsubstantive, such as the correcting of obvious misprints or changing italian font to roman. An appendix records all such departures from copy text. A learned and thorough commentary deals chiefly with Church authorities and clarification of doctrinal points. The editor is sympathetic toward Hooker but without scholarly bias. The volume is handsomely and generously illustrated with sample pages, chiefly showing Hooker's careful writing in the margins and his alteration of words as he proceeded. This is an attractively prepared volume, and a fitting commentary on those that have gone before.

DAVID BEVINGTON, *University of Chicago*

Collected Works of Erasmus, Volume 6, The Correspondence of Erasmus: Letters 842 to 992 (1518 to 1519). Translated by R.A.B. Mynors and D.F.S. Thomson, annotated by Peter G. Bietenholz. Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 1982. Pp. xxii, 448. \$75.00.

The glory of this volume is the quality of the translation, for which the Preface assigns specific responsibility to R.A.B. Mynors. Only a few of these letters have been translated into English previously, some by Francis M. Nichols (*The Epistles of Erasmus*, 3 [New York: Longmans, 1918]), by Marcus A. Haworth, S.J., (in *Erasmus and his Age: Selected Letters of Desiderius Erasmus*, ed. Hans J. Hillerbrand [New York: Harper and Row, 1970]) and by Barbara Flowers (appended to the English edition of Huizinga's *Erasmus of Rotterdam* [New York: Phaidon, 1952]). These earlier versions involve intelligent scholarship and writing. However, in comparison with them Professor Mynors' work clearly stands out as that of an exceptionally gifted English stylist, whose talent for English fluently transmits Erasmus' for Latin.

Mynors continually produces a vivacious English that corresponds to the stylistic regions through which these letters mainly range. Many sentences come fast, with syntax that (only) seems unstudied. Over four and a half centuries later, the reader feels the impulse of that "running hand which I use to keep pace with the

flow of my ideas" (letter 990: 65). The translator shares with his author a taste for breadth, raciness and vividness of diction, and Mynors reaches for drama and concreteness when he can. "Eloquentia, quam divus Augustinus non vult usquam ab hera sua [i.e. sapientia] digredi" is for Nichols "that eloquence" which is "never to be parted from" Mistress Wisdom (p. 435); for Haworth, a maid who "never wants to be separated from her mistress" (p. 131); for Mynors, a handmaid whom Augustine "wishes never to leave her mistress' side" (862: 49). Mynors exploits more than the other two the phrase's physical, imagistic possibilities, including those in *digredior*'s etymology. (The Latin, of course, is that of P.S. Allen's *Opus Epistolarum*, 3, [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913]; letter numbers in Allen and the volume under review correspond.) An even smaller variation: "hic meus labor . . . molitur mendas sacrorum voluminum"—my labor "corrects the mistakes" in Scripture for Nichols (p. 431), "removes the errors" for Haworth (p. 129)—becomes "this labor of mine . . . removes blemishes from" Scripture in Mynors (860: 55). Again, physical presence in the translations arises, in *echt* Erasmian fashion, from comprehension of all a word's meanings: "menda" is a blunder in writing for Aulus Gellius but a defect of body for Ovid (see Lewis and Short). Small choices like these, much more than renderings of developed metaphors, make Erasmus' normal epistolary text in Mynors' English what it is in Latin: a lively, peopled scene.

Mynors responds not only to Erasmus' most characteristic note but to his and his correspondents' full stylistic range (see e.g. 850, 914). Most worth quoting, Mynors can rise with Erasmus to eloquence, for instance in characterizing St. Paul:

He maintained the rights of the kingdom of heaven with heavenly weapons and fought the battles of the Gospel with the resources which the Gospel supplies. Tentmaker and pontiff, offscouring of the world and chosen instrument of Christ, who picked this sublime humility, this tongue-tied eloquence . . . to spread the glory of his name. . . . (916: 237-242)

The intelligence, and the power of figured balances in the passage not only carry over the strong Latin frame Erasmus had constructed:

Coeleste regnum coelestibus armis asservit, et Evangelicam militiam Evangelicis opibus gessit. Coriarius pontifex, peripsema mundi, sed electum organum Christi. . . .

Mynors' practice summarizes much of what English gained, from the sixteenth century on, from its writers' sharing in Latin classical tradition.

Almost the only slightly troubling feature of the edition related to the translation is the absence of systematic notice of uses of Greek in the letters. Even for the non-specialist audience whom the Toronto edition should reach, the sense of the texts' participation in a non-modern world of learning, their pastness and absence from us, needs to be suggested as well as their potential immediacy. It should quickly be said that many other aspects of the edition do help with this historical task, and the Greek is a tricky problem: regular indications in the letter introductions or footnotes might help, for letters containing substantial Greek passages. (Sometimes especially sensitive passages appear in Greek, e.g. 911: 58ff., 872: 13ff.; sometimes the footnotes indicate these. Would it be worthwhile for the editors to

Central among the activities that these letters portray is the clear sequence of tasks related to the promulgation of the Gospel. The bulk of actual revision of the 1516 New Testament text had been finished when this volume opens. The next step, equally important for the Humanist orator-in-print, was insuring that the text reached its audience in the clearest and most potent form possible. Hence the work of the summer of 1518, the trip up the Rhine to supervise the work of Froben's press whose types were "the clearest and most elegant and agreeable that one can image" (925: 20). Hence also the pursuit through several letters of a papal brief, which should undermine the new work's possible opponents (860, 864, 865, 905). Back in Louvain, while he waits through the winter for publication, and while he consider an appendix on such use of Greek for a future volume of the correspondence?)

In other respects besides the translation, this volume is adapted to the range of purposes and audiences the Toronto editors have set for themselves. The very few emendations of Allen's datings of letters and identifications of correspondents are sensible. In the notes, Professor Bietenholz does a good job of boiling down available data to what most readers need to know, but also supplements what could be gained from Allen with revised citations and cross-references and selected references to recent secondary works. He is especially strong on the historical articulation of controversies that increasingly enmeshed Erasmus in 1518-1519.

The volume could be better served by its index. Careful use of the text (not a specific check of the index) yielded about a dozen cases in which the index missed page references or gave wrong ones. The volume's two really important references to St. Cyprian (pp. 385-386, 396) are not indexed under the saint's name, but only in the listings of Erasmus' works. One wonders why Erasmus' servant Hovius goes by the name Thomas under the index entry for Maarten Lips, while everywhere else in the volume he is Johannes. About another dozen misprints similarly emerged in and immediately around the text itself. For instance, the date of Ulrich of Württemberg's conquest of Reutlingen given in a note on p. 263 clearly should be 1519, not 1518; a cross-reference in the introduction for letter 926, concerning Erasmus' stay in Mechelen, should be to letter 952, not 951.

The scholarship of Professors Mynors and Bietenholz has in this volume been engaged on letters that document continuity and a culmination in Erasmus' intellectual life, but also an early stage in the second great clearly-defined modification of its course. About twenty years earlier, Erasmus had definitely set out on his intellectual and spiritual way of choice, that of ethical and rhetorical Humanism oriented by Christ's philosophy, the Gospel. The work of publishing his revised edition of the New Testament controlled Erasmus for the first half of the period this volume reflects. He regarded the edition as his career's triumph: with Froben completing the printing, Erasmus could say "I have . . . built a monument to bear witness to posterity that I existed" (867: 293). Fulfillment was qualified in 1519, however, by some vicissitudes of fairly familiar kinds, but increasingly by the more and more distinctive impact of Luther. Change generated by Luther and his associates began to invade Erasmus' life, unlike the earlier change that had been chosen, and Erasmus began clearly to figure in his ultimate rôle as maker and subject of a complex period.

undergoes illness and is jolted by new traditionalist attacks, nevertheless Erasmus moves on to sequels and postscripts of the climactic New Testament publication: more paraphrases to simplify access to Scripture for many (916, 952, 956); further editorial work on the Fathers, guides to Scripture's meaning whom Erasmus has used and now will introduce to a wider public (844, 860, 916, 975). Perseverance with Christian Humanism's essential positive program, in spite of distractions and controversy, is Erasmus' basic course over these months—one he repeatedly advises younger scholars also to pursue (941, 967A).

Other important publications of these months were also revised editions, of the *Institutio principis christiani* and the *Enchiridion*, strengthening one's impression of this as a time of culmination and completion (853, 858). On the other hand, Erasmus for the first time tries to grapple with publication of his colloquies (909). Besides prefacing or alluding to publications, the letters also embody other kinds of Humanistic activity, notably interaction with fellow scholars. Erasmus fulfills a growing responsibility to encourage a whole movement finding inspiration in him, particularly, as Professor Bietenholz points out, to German Humanists, who receive over a third of the letters (see p. xvii). Erasmus' prestige by this time is such that men travel across Germany simply to see him. He deprecates these pilgrimages in the same terms as he did those to religious shrines: he tells the young men from Erfurt that they could see more of him in his writings than in his physical presence, just as in *Paraclesis* (1516) he had told Christians to meet Christ in Scripture instead of going to touch His relics (*LB* VI, *4*f*).

Although a climax for Erasmianism in some ways, however, 1518-1519 brought no resolution of conflicts between it and the older intellectual and religious forms; instead, battle on long-fought lines intensified. A surprisingly major worry was criticism from Edward Lee. Erasmus' major letter to the intermediary Lips (843) suggests little in the content of this disagreement that did not go back through the 1514-1515 exchange with Dorp (see *CWE* 3)—indeed the issues were essentially still the ones addressed in Erasmus' 1505 letter to Christopher Fisher defending Valla (letter 182, in *CWE* 2). The difference with Lee drags on through these months' letters and beyond. Early in 1519, basically more serious problems arise, a series of attacks by Louvain theologians directly or indirectly threatening the Collegium Trilingue, with which Erasmus was identified. The rather sudden upsurge of menaces could seem to make Erasmus' whole achievement insecure: repeatedly in early 1519 he portrays the good new studies as jeopardized (930, 936).

A letter of 1518 expresses a rather non-specific, floating sense that "a great change in human affairs is under way, and there must be danger in it" (855: 78). Luther's work, which was to affect powerfully Erasmus' affairs as well as Europe's, first becomes a frequent topic in this volume's letters. The complexity of Erasmus' attitude towards Luther becomes evident quickly. In the first place, Erasmus expressed support especially for Luther's early writing on indulgences, and still make favorable comments on Luther's ideas even as the latter's conflict with Rome developed greater implications (858, 872, 939, 947, 980). In May 1519 Erasmus expressed sympathy with "Luther's idea of liberty" (983: 11); as Professor Oberman has pointed out, Humanists found common ground with Lutherans in the idea of freedom from medieval ecclesiasticism, whereas the will's

bondage was later to appear clearly as the Lutheran certainty that Erasmus could not accept (*Luther and the Dawn of the Modern Era*, ed. Heiko Oberman, Leiden: Brill, 1974, pp. 46ff.).

In the 1518-1519 letters, that intellectual opposition had not explicitly developed; however, Erasmus (and Luther) already knew there was difference as well as some sympathy and overlap between their positions (for Luther, cf. Allen, introduction to letter 933). Specifically, Erasmus knew Luther's basis was not "the ancient tongues and good writing and humane culture" (939: 57, 948: 96). Luther notices that he is a stranger to the correspondences' sphere of stylistic exactness and classical learning, as he comes into it for the first time in a letter of March 1519 (933). Furthermore, Erasmus is highly critical not only of Luther's intemperate, obscurantist opponents (939, 980, 983) but also of Luther's own combativeness, because of its potential for disruption of Christendom (872, 947, 980, 983).

Beyond the sympathy and separateness Erasmus feels towards aspects of Luther's thought and strategy, however, one more factor enters into his complete response: namely, the commitment and fears for Christian Humanism that we have seen him expressing in the rest of his letters. The old interpretation of Erasmus' qualified response to Luther as merely timid (cf. e.g. Huizinga, p. 131) missed the fact that he was defending something he deeply cared for, and which he knew was not Luther's deep concern—also the fact that Erasmus' reform was potentially, like Luther's, a radical and comprehensive new theology (cf. Charles Trinkaus, "Erasmus, Augustine and the Nominalists," *ARG* 67 [1976], pp. 5032). Erasmus repeatedly expresses the fear not just that Luther will disrupt Christendom but that he will provide more opposition to all kinds of reform and thus make Erasmian work more difficult (936, 948, 967, 980)—as in fact began to happen soon after this volume's close. From Erasmus' point of view, Lutheranism was shaping up as another problem like Reuchlinism: thought about which he had reservations (like Reuchlin's interest in the Cabbala), tactics he deplored, a hazard to the large program he himself was pursuing with determination and sophistication (967). The volume ends before it had become clear that the Lutheran problem, while it would remain theoretically aligned towards Erasmus in the way outlined, would grow to have a much larger impact. We know that for Erasmus an unending difficulty is beginning.

The large categories of Erasmus' concern in these letters, with Christian Humanism and its intellectual and religious surroundings, have become the categories of sixteenth-century intellectual history. An attraction of collected letters, as Erasmus pointed out, is that in them concerns that have "gone public" are set back into their original (and, for Humanists, most genuine) context, the *ethos* of an individual (Allen, letter 1206, translated in Hillerbrand, Haworth, pp. 1-3). Undoubtedly the most entertaining letter in Volume Six is 867, in which the Humanistic career goes forward through a mass of irrelevant, lively personal experiences on the road from Basel back to Louvain. The character that may be abstracted from the letters in general is first of all a determined and an extremely energetic one. The achievements and controversies described earlier were efforts made through a "black" year of illness (887). Erasmus' pace of work was not only rapid, but unremitting: a correspondent corroborates our impression of "the indefatigable energy with which you work" (932: 14).

Part of this energy could be otherwise analyzed as unease, and nervousness and sensitivity certainly emerge here. Very little else emerges, indeed, in the long, tedious correspondence with Budé: in substance, these letters consist almost entirely of accusations about what you said about what I said about what you said. Erasmus is working out left-over severe anxiety about his disagreement with Lefevre (see *CWE* 5). Untoward anxiety is also aroused by Edward Lee, after all a very junior figure in relation to Erasmus.

Along with these symptoms of distortive nervous energy, however, there are convincing images in these letters of a much more friendly nature. The letters keep in touch with old friends, and recall happy personal scenes from years before (868). Of course they respond favorably to praise; they also respond warmly. Erasmus is not only gratified, but touched by the enthusiasm of Christoph Eschenfelder, customs officer on the Rhine, who when he discovers he is meeting Erasmus drags him home to be seen by wife, children and neighbors, and bribes the boatmen with wine to make them tolerate the delay (867: 50ff.). Erasmus writes a friendly letter back to him a few weeks after the encounter, telling a good story about the remarkable effects of Eschenfelder's wine on the boatman's wife (879).

The volume portrays not an untroubled but an ultimately positive personality. Through Erasmus' choices and in the midst of his other vicissitudes, Christian Humanism develops to an important point and begins to undergo one of its greatest stresses. Professors Mynors and Bietenholz transmit this material to us as classical *elocutio* directs, clearly, aptly and elegantly. They are excellent students and Humanistic imitators of Erasmus, and encourage us to imitate them.

JOHN F. McDIARMID, *Behrend College, Pennsylvania State University*

George M. Logan. *The Meaning of More's "Utopia."* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983. Pp. xv, 296. \$27.50.

In this boldly titled book, George Logan has set out to solve two of the most vexing problems in Morean scholarship. What were More's intentions in writing *Utopia*? And what kind of work is it? Despite a plethora of studies in the many relevant disciplines, More's *Utopia* has proven so resistant to even the most brilliant and rigorous analyses to which it has been subjected that there is no agreement on a solution for these (and other) problems. Professor Logan begins by telling us what the *Utopia* is not. It is neither a *jeu d'esprit* nor a mirror of normative political ideas, he claims. Nor is it to be viewed as satire, whether directed at England and/or Europe or at itself, and, more particularly, its second book and its narrator, Raphael Hythlodæus. Logan is especially adamant in attacking the latter notion. He takes issue, then, with the many literary critics (who are otherwise too diverse in the critical principles they follow to be called a school in any formal sense) who—aware of the incongruities, real and apparent, in the presentation and substance of *Utopia*—have come to see the work, in part or whole, as undermining the radical idealism that the *Utopia*, read at face value, seems to espouse. If this view is followed to its logical conclusion, indeed, the *Utopia* becomes an anti-