doute place ici pour une étude de l'écriture en tant que médiation, et non pas seulement en tant que source et résolution des problèmes de filiation textuelle ou encore en tant que miroir d'un "écrivain d'humeur" (p. 226) soucieux de bien ménager ses patrons. De la part de l'analyste, ceci ne saurait que déboucher sur une vague étude psychologique de l'auteur ou, pis encore, de l'époque; comme semble le laisser entendre, en particulier, le dernier paragraphe du livre. Telle n'était pas, bien sûr, l'intention première du livre de J. Abéard. N'empêche que, à quelques reprises, l'auteur souligne le caractère double des Illustrations, "oeuvre majeure de la rhétorique et de l'historiographie" (p. 7). Survient une seconde division qui ne recouvre pas la première, celle en deux thèmes majeurs: "la grandeur 'herculienne' de la maison de Charles le Téméraire, et la sauvage beauté des invasions barbares" (p. 226-7). Ces réductions paraissent d'autant plus abusives que J. Abéard lui-même, dans un article intitulé "La composition des 'Illustrations de Gaule' de Jean Lemaire de Belges" (in l'Humanisme lyonnais au XVIe siècle, Presses de l'Université de Grenoble, 1974), tout en soulignant le double aspect de l'œuvre, récit romanesque ou historique (mi-bucolique et mi-homérique) et documentaire (mais n'est-ce pas là le récit historique?), insistait à juste titre sur le fait que le clivage histoire-roman, tel que nous avons l'habitude de le penser, n'avait aucun sens pour Lemaire de Belges. Se pose ici avec évidence le problème de nos catégories d'analyse. Sans doute y aurait-il nécessité d'une étude des contraintes de toutes sortes qui ont pesé sur la rédaction d'un texte qu'on considérera comme définitif (ce à quoi le livre de J. Abéard contribue grandement par l'analyse détaillée qu'il fait des colophons, des gravures, des ajouts et des retraits, etc.). Sans doute aussi y aurait-il place pour une étude des phénomènes textuels en eux-mêmes. Et, entre les deux, peut-être y aurait-il moyen de reposer la question du rapport de l'auteur et du texte ainsi que celle des limites de nos méthodes actuelles d'analyse sémiotique. Mais c'est là un problème qui dépasse les limites du livre de J. Abéard, auquel on peut tout juste reprocher l'implicite d'un rapport direct entre la contrainte matérielle et le fait textuel, entravant par là toute compréhension des "incongruités" du texte de rhétoriqueur.

LUCIE BRIND'AMOUR, Université de Montréal


We left Erasmus at the end of the last installment of his letters determined not to return to the monastery at Steyn, where he would have to exchange his studies for drinking bouts and play chaplain to nuns. The outcome of his resolution is chronicled here in a wonderfully translated and annotated volume. Here is Erasmus finally off to Basel for the press of Johann Froben where he would strike an alliance resulting in the publication of one of the most splendid chapters in the history of scholarship.
The mood of these letters, their editor James K. McConica writes, is one of "incessant scholarly work accompanied by high optimism." And indeed Erasmus lives out on these pages the caricature of scholars he had once voiced through Folly: "They add, change, remove, lay aside, take up, rephrase, show to their friends... And their futile reward, a word of praise from a handful of people, they win at such a cost — so many late nights, such loss of sleep..." Approval came more surely to Erasmus than to most scholars, however, and from the handful of them that numbered among the best. This volume is enhanced by the correspondence of those who were magnetized to him, Budé, Lefèvre d'Étapes, Reuchlin, Wimpeling, Zasius, Witz, Hutten, Zwingli, More, Fisher, Warham, Lupset and others, all clamouring "for the genius of the divine Rotterdam, no man of mortal clay but fire come down from heaven."

The preface which initiates readers to the historical scope and significance of the volume is excellent. So are the introductions to each of the letters, and notably those to Ep 373 and 384, which together compose a miniature essay on his first edition of the New Testament. In the very first letter of this volume Erasmus writes of his own annotations (to Cato) that they are "very brief but... serviceable," and avoid "pointless points of rhetoric" and "misplaced philosophy." The annotations here are in the same spirit of service, prodigious in their allusions to the classics and equally substantial in their identification of historical personages and issues. The theological annotations are much expanded. This very welcome research seems especially appropriate in the volume containing the prefatory epistles to the editions of Jerome and the New Testament. The reference in the important Ep 373 at lines 138-140, however, cannot be as annotated to Cyril of Jerusalem and his protest of homoousion. Their comparative dates of literary activity would not allow for that Cyril to be writing in John Chrysostom's "footsteps," as Erasmus has it; and the controversy at Nicaea concerning homoousion did not involve any mystical meaning of the Greek article ho, the interpretation Erasmus here discusses. Erasmus again links Chrysostom and a Cyril concerning the theological significance of ho in his annotations to the New Testament, to which this Ep 373 is prefaced, at Jn 1:1 (LB, VI, 337B). From this clue it is probable that he refers in both cases to Cyril of Alexandria's interpretation of the significance of ho before Logos for establishing the divinity of the Son against Arianism, in the patriarch's own commentary on John at 1:2 (PG, LXXXIII, 69D-72A). This correction seems worth suggesting since Erasmus praises the interpretation in question as an exemplar for his own exegetical method. Also, the reference in the introduction to Ep 315 should not be to Dionysius the Areopagite, who was a contemporary and convert of St. Paul (Acts 17:34), but to a theologian of disputed identity writing by the early sixth century, Pseudo-Dionysius; a discovery of the new philology, the Areopagite's authorship was first challenged by Lorenzo Valla in his Annotationes in Novum Testamentum which Erasmus published.

So small a detail as the correct translation of the phrase which Erasmus made emblematic of his New Testament editions, sacra ancora as "sheet anchor," displays how valuable this project is in opening fresh perspective on Erasmus. While every sailor knows the sheet-anchor as the large one employed only in emergency, translators have previously rendered Erasmus' phrase literally as "sacred anchor." In
this has been lost the pun (for the anchor truly is sacred, being Scripture), and
Erasmus' self-portrait as the ancient mariner who casts in high emergency for the
safety of Peter's bark on perilous waters. In this phrase he fuses classical and
Christian metaphors, welding the patristic tradition of the navis ecclesiae and its
navigation to Quintilian's portrait of the venerable orator: "And he as their father
in the art will mould them to all excellence, and like some old pilot will tell them of
the shores whereby their ships must sail, of the harbours where they may shelter,
and the signs of the weather, and will expound to them what they shall do when
the breeze is fair or the tempest blows." So it is that his perceptive friend Thomas
More neatly sums up both Erasmus' purpose and its acknowledgement by his
 correspondents in this volume: "You shall be the captain who navigates the triple-
decker."

There is a helpful appendix on "The Early Publication of Erasmus' Letters" and,
of course, an index. Allan Fleming's handsome design for the series proves itself
with every volume.

MARJORIE O'ROURKE BOYLE, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies

Tristitia Christi, edited by Clarence H. Miller. New Haven and London: Yale Uni-
versity Press, 1976. 2 vols. 1,192 pp., facsimiles and illustrations. $60.

Though Renaissance Literature is becoming a congested area for research, important
discoveries are still being made. One of these is the Ralegh holograph Notebook,
brought to light by Walter Oakeshott, who already had to his credit the identifi-
cation of the Morte Darthur manuscript. Another is the holograph of Thomas
More's uncompleted De Tristitia Christi, which was found by Geoffrey Bullough
in 1963 at the Royal College of Corpus Christi in Valencia, where it had been zeal-
ously preserved for centuries in a sumptuous reliquary.

Formerly known as Expositio Passionis Domini, and mistakenly thought to be
a continuation of More's Treatise upon the Passion, De Tristitia was first published
in an English translation by More's granddaughter, Mary Basset, in the 1557 edition
of his English works. The original Latin was published eight years later in Omnia
Opera, 1565, and also survives in two other manuscripts, housed in the British
Library and the Bodleian. Nevertheless, the Valencia manuscript is of great signi-
ificance to students of More, since it is not only the authoritative text, but is also
the longest and most extensively revised of his extant holographs, thereby throwing
considerable light on his habits of mind and mode of composition. In this respect
there can be few "foul papers" in the Tudor period of comparable importance.

The very composition of De Tristitia is remarkable, written as it was in the
Tower under the shadow of an imminent traitor's death, and, in the circumstances,
it constitutes a wonderfully controlled and sustained piece of work. Appropriately,
it is a commentary on Christ's agony in the garden up to the moment of his arrest.
Including cancellations and a catena of scriptural passages, it comprises 169 small