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depuis 1978, n’ait pas empêché cette résurrection de l’Utopie de Marie Delcourt, n°13 dans “les Classiques de la pensée politique.” Prévost reste indispensable à qui veut accéder à un texte plus pleinement critique, et en raison de lacunes chez Marie Delcourt, par exemple les neufs lignes omises dans sa traduction, p. 51. Le lecteur studieux les ouvrira parfois ensemble sur sa table, et leurs divergences suffiront à lui rappeler que le dernier mot n’est pas dit dans l’interprétation de l’opusculum vere aureum d’où est sorti l’immense fleuve de la littérature utopique.

GERMAIN MARC’HADOUR, Université Catholique de l’Ouest, Angers


Should we posit that the greatness of historical figures is proportional to the number of re-assessments to which their efforts have been subjected by successive generations of scholars? If we do, we might expect Erasmus, that epitome of complexity, that master of nuances, to come out near the top. Perhaps he does. His legacy through the centuries has remained controversial. On the other hand, one of the many merits of Bruce Mansfield’s book is to show the remarkable continuity of certain positions within the spectrum of differing interpretations. Perhaps it is again a token of Erasmus’ complexity that those who wrote about him were so eager for the proverbial ride on the shoulders of their predecessors. Even a cliché metaphor such as calling Erasmus a phoenix, first used, it seems, by Sebastian Franck in 1531, proved irresistible to subsequent writers. Apart from admiration, did it convey a sense of mystery and even disconcertment? Although this is not what these early authors meant, it is certainly true that after the confessional age when Erasmus had been habitually ‘subdued to a purely polemical purpose’ (p. 22), he rose again from his own ashes like the legendary bird.

Mansfield, a professor emeritus of Macquarie University, Australia, has had a modern predecessor in his enterprise and has nothing but praise for him. Andreas Flitner’s Basel dissertation on Erasmus im Spiegel seiner Nachwelt (Tübingen 1952) did not pursue the investigation beyond the end of the seventeenth century, but his supervisor, Werner Kaegi, had previously published an essay on Erasmus in the eighteenth century. Mansfield’s book differs from these earlier studies both quantitatively and qualitatively. For the earlier sections of the book under review, Flitner provided much valuable guidance and the reader is occasionally referred to him for fuller treatment, but later on, starting with his brilliant pages on Hugo Grotius, Mansfield breaks new ground and discusses material not examined before in this context, for instance a lively debate in the learned journals of the Enlightenment, started by a passionate attack on Erasmus in the Jesuit Journal de Trévoux. Mansfield also succeeds in imposing a clearer structure on his material, devising sections that have both a chronological and a topical focus. Just after his death Erasmus still retained, as he had done in his lifetime, the favour of many influential Catholics, but after 1550 Catholic judgements of him grew more severe. In 1559 the Index of Paul IV put him into the first class of heretics together with the Reformers, although a more
moderate and balanced perception of him prevailed in the Catholic Netherlands. On the side of the Protestants the differences of opinion were less dramatic, the predominant attitude being one of unease. In Basel his memory was treasured, however, while the Anglicans rediscovered the merit of his sweet moderation and seekers and sectarians fathomed the depth of what they perceived to be his camouflaged radicalism. In a way, it was the radical interpretation of Erasmus that gained momentum after 1650 when he was restored to respectability as an honoured citizen of the "république des lettres." Harrassed Arminians found solace in reading his works, and despite his stand on free will, so did equally harrassed Jansenists. Full-length biographies and, above all, Jean Le Clerc’s careful edition of his works and his correspondence (Leiden 1703–06) placed a wealth of solid information at the disposal of those who chose to examine it.

Mansfield’s book offers particularly careful and enlightening discussions of some themes that have recently retained the attention of Erasmus scholars. Erasmus had always been known to be born out of wedlock, but the traditional assumption that, at the time of his birth, his father was a priest in Gouda, has recently been challenged (see J.K. McConica in Collected Works of Erasmus IV, 188–90). Mansfield shows that it had been challenged before (pp. 47, 185, 243f.), but also that it originated in 1582 with Cornelius Loos, who was himself from Gouda, knew the local gossip, and had no axe to grind. The essential point of Loos’ story was confirmed at about the same time by the better-informed Petrus Opmeer (pp. 43–44, cf pp. 9, 129). Another subject of much recent debate is the meaning of Ortensio Lando’s dialogue In Des. Erasmi Roterodami funus (Basel 1540). This reviewer has thought for some time that the dialogue is primarily a satire, not on Erasmus, but on those who, in Lando’s view, tended to overrate him and reacted to his death with either adulation or anathematization. Mansfield seems to move in the same direction: Lando’s “incoherence and ambiguity,” he says, “are genuine and presumably deliberate” (p. 107). Let us hope that Mansfield’s excellent and elegantly written book will soon encourage a full-length study of the interpretations of Erasmus from Voltaire to Huizinga. Contemporaries sometimes unfairly called Erasmus a chameleon. It is not so much that he himself keeps changing his colour, but rather that he forces those who write about him to show theirs.

PETER G. BIETENHOLZ, University of Saskatchewan


Beyond idolatry Shakespeare has always inspired a zeal to explore and explicate his “beauties,” a pattern established by Dryden and Pope and so continued through the centuries. Thus at first glance it may seem quite unremarkable that a book of 277 pages should be devoted entirely to citations of books, articles, films and recordings concerned with teaching the work of one author. Indeed, in the past decade there has been a veritable movement established for this purpose.

Andrew McLean’s articles and bibliographies have been in the forefront of this