from the Alcatraz to the Cuckoo. Aldrovandi intended that his treatise should be *utile et dulce* and he endeavoured to treat each bird from all aspects giving "Aequiuora, Synonyma, Genus, Differentiae, Locus, Cognominata, Denomenata ... Moralia, Vsus, Mysteria, Hieroglyphica, Historica, Symbola, Numismata, Icones, Emblemata, Fabulae, & Apologi." As the editors remark in their useful introduction, "nothing ancient, medieval, or modern wherein the bird is named does he consider extraneous to his purpose. As the English parson confronted the task of abridging this huge tome, it is little wonder that he concluded only three letters of the alphabet." Topsell's work is a repository of ancient, medieval and renaissance ornithological lore, faithful to the authority which he is anglicizing. For this reason the publication is an important event even though the editors observe that had it been published at the time "it would have popularized the subject through the pious eyes of the translator but affected the serious study of birds very little."

This volume took some years to prepare. According to the preface, Professor Hoeniger was concerned chiefly with the text, glosses and variant readings; Professor Harrison with the other editorial matters. The simple statement minimizes the monumental task which the editors undertook. Besides establishing the sources of innumerable quotations in classical and medieval authors, the editors give locations for each bird in the first editions of Topsell's three main authorities—Aldrovandi (his chief source), Belon, and Gesner. They note where Topsell deviates from such authorities, making use of other writers such as Turner, for example, or adding—comparatively rarely—a personal observation. They give useful negative evidence when a quotation attributed to a certain author cannot be traced. They include their own valuable identifications and observations on birds. They also provide variant readings, and appendices consisting of further identifications of birds in Topsell's projected list (from *dabchicke* to *yelamber*), a glossary of heraldic terms, and a catalogue of proper names.

In addition, *The Fowles of Heauen or History of Birdes* is outstanding in terms of book production. While placing proper emphasis on the work's scholarly nature, the design is exceptionally artistic. The elegant typography, the arrangement of the illustrations on the page, the muted colorings are splendidly appropriate, and are in themselves a tribute to the importance of this first edition and to the fine achievement of the editors.

BERYL ROWLAND, *York University*

Albert Hyma. *The Life of Desiderius Erasmus*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1972. Pp. 140.

The reader looking for the mature deliberations of the author of *The Youth of Erasmus* in this book will be disappointed, as will the reader looking for a biography of Erasmus. Far from expanding on his original work, Professor Hyma is usually content to restate it, with some modifications and some pungent remarks on those he feels gave it insufficient respect. Not a great deal of close study is given to the late Erasmus, though we are assured that its author in his teaching "always emphasized the enormous change in the character of Erasmus between 1525 and 1536." The change in question is seen in terms of a Pauline conversion, in fact a turning away from humanism and back to the *devotio moderna*—very interesting indeed if one accepts the argument that he had ever really left it.

Though we can but envy the equanimity with which he footnotes his own earlier work,

almost as proof texts, it would have been valuable to see a fuller and wider survey of more recent material on Erasmus's life and thoughts, and a great deal less sniping at "the admirers of A. Renaudet," Charles Bené, "the admirers of Johan Huizinga," and R.R. Post. What are we to make of the claim that Professor Post, after disagreeing with Professor Hyma on a point of attribution, "retracted his error, no doubt as the result of admonitions by certain officials in the Roman Catholic hierarchy"? Can the differing views on how long Erasmus stayed at Oxford be all that important, in view of his lifelong attachment to Colet and More, both of that University? Can *De Contemptu Mundi* really be so vital a book, when Erasmus himself called it "the other part" of the *Encomium Matrimonii*? Can it be such a devastating blow to hear that Frederic Seebohm withdrew the first edition of *The Oxford Reformers* and uttered a new one, "having corrected some of his errors"?

Other scholars and their work aside, there is much more that can only be called eccentric in the book. That the *Enchiridion* was written to dissuade a good man from entering a monastery, rather than a bad man from beating his wife, came as news to me. That Colet studied Aquinas is no doubt true, but Erasmus tells us that Colet studied a lot and particularly disliked Aquinas, on rather questionable grounds. Professor Hyma still holds to his original view of a worldly and irreligious Erasmus, admiring Lucian, and like him "sarcastic, cynical, eager to expose abuses, and devoted to elegant literature as an end in itself"—in which he is joined by an equally worldly More "from 1503 to 1506." In *Moriae Encomium*, he thinks, Erasmus "imitated Lucian, rather than some author recommended by John Colet." Indeed? What of St. Paul, as an author very prominent in *Moriae Encomium*? Or Colet's own scorn for the *Summa Theologica* and all "blotterature," or More's rejection of Latin in Utopia as a language in which little good philosophy had been written? Seebohm may well have exaggerated the "fellow work" of these men, whether Oxford or (as Professor Hyma would have it) London reformers, but their friendship is fact, and a work like *The Praise of Folly* shows that they enjoyed an ironic vision of life and salvation through a subtlety of wit that seems lacking in this book.

More examples could be drawn, but a short review should not lapse into rhetorical questions. Although it is of considerable interest in many ways, and although one must admire Professor Hyma's learning and his rather appealing irascibility, the book is erratic in its interpretation, selective in its choice of information, and marred by its contrast between the worldly young Erasmus and the saintly old Erasmus; with due deference to an older man who has read more, I still can see no significant change in religious sincerity between the *Enchiridion* at the beginning of his career and the *De Praeparatione ad Mortem* near its end.

E.J. DEVEREUX, *University of Western Ontario*

Richard L. DeMolen (ed.). *Erasmus of Rotterdam: A Quincentennial Symposium*. New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1971. Pp. 152.

The *raison d'être* of this little book lies in an "Erasmus Symposium" held at Ithaca College in 1969. Four of the papers there delivered are included; one published elsewhere (in *Scriptum Erasmusianum* vol. 2, 1969, pp. 106 - 131) is omitted, and in its place is printed a paper delivered by R.J. Schoeck in December 1969. To these is added a "diplomatic reprint"