Language, Race, and Church Reform: Erasmus' *De recta pronuntiatione and Ciceronianus*

JUDITH RICE HENDERSON
University of Saskatchewan

L'examen des volumes des éditions Froben qui contiennent le dialogue caustique du Ciceronianus, suggère qu'Érasme et ses imprimeurs répondaient à des attaques italiennes et espagnoles dirigées contre les contributions rhénanes en recherche biblique et patristique. L'édition de mars 1528 et sa révision d'octobre 1529 / mars 1530 s'ouvrent sur le dialogue De recta Latini Graecique sermonis pronuntiatione dialogus, dans lequel Érasme surpasse les études sur la prononciation des langues anciennes effectuées par les humanistes ayant collaboré avec les Presses Aldine, entre autres Girolamo Aleandro. La révision de mars 1529 a été publiée rapidement, avec ses Colloquia, en mars 1529 par les éditions Froben en réponse à la réaction française. D'autres ouvrages, reconnaissant la contribution d'humanistes germaniques faisant partie du cercle d'Érasme, accompagnent chaque édition du Ciceronianus. L'édition d'octobre 1529 ajoute également une lettre adressée à Karel Utenhove de Gand, dans laquelle Érasme fait allusion à d'autres humanistes importants qui le soutiennent en Europe, de l'Angleterre à l'Italie. Karel Utenhove avait aidé Érasme à gagner la faveur du cicéronien Pietro Bembo, à Padoue et Venise. Considérés ensemble, ces deux dialogues et les autres documents annexés, constituent un manifeste du programme réformateur d'Érasme, ainsi qu'un plaidoyer adressé à l'Église afin qu'elle modifie son attitude négative envers la « Germanie », et qu'elle résolve le schisme en cours en réajustant son approche des langues anciennes, ecclésiastiques et internationales que sont le grec et le latin. Il propose de ne pas distinguer les barbares du nord d'un club d'élite de cicéroniens italiens, et propose que les savants chrétiens devraient plutôt modifier la Babel européenne des dialectes latins et grecs et promouvoir l'unité de l'Église à travers la transmission à la génération suivante d'une prononciation ancienne restaurée.

In March 1528, the firm of Froben published at Basel a “fat volume” (464 pages) consisting of two dialogues by Erasmus and “a considerable number of very minor pieces in Greek and Latin by various hands”¹ described on the title page as new: *Cum aliis nonnullis, quorum nihil non est novum*. They include tributes by various scholars to associates of Erasmus who had died within the previous ten years

(Johann Froben, d. 26 October 1527; Bruno Amerbach, d. 22 October 1519; Maarten van Dorp, d. 31 May 1525; and Jacob Volkaerd, d. before March 1528) followed by a recently discovered oration of Rodolphus Agricola.² The two dialogues, *De recta Latini Graecique sermonis pronuntiatione dialogus* and *Ciceronianus*, have been considered important by scholars from Erasmus' time to the present, the first as a learned reconstruction of the ancient pronunciation of Greek and Latin and as a witness to Erasmus' knowledge of vernacular languages, the second as a contribution to the Renaissance controversy over the imitation of Latin models, especially Cicero. The genesis of *De recta pronuntiatione* has been found in Erasmus' annotations on the New Testament, and both dialogues have been related individually to the religious controversies in which he had become embroiled.³

While the secondary bibliography on each dialogue is therefore substantial, the relation between the two dialogues and the role they play in the volume as a whole have received comparatively little attention.⁴ Erasmus and his publishers often selected or wrote letters, poems, and other occasional works to frame the major products of their scholarly collaboration, but scholars have only just begun to explore their strategies of self-presentation, in part because modern critical editions remove works from their original contexts to rearrange them by chronology, discipline, or genre.⁵ Studying as parts of collections the first and subsequent editions of Erasmus' *De recta pronuntiatione* and *Ciceronianus* proves fruitful. The two dialogues and appended minor works form a complex, intertextual web of commentary and debate on central issues of humanist scholarship and Church reform while satirizing Italian hubris that would dismiss as "barbaric" the contributions of northern Europeans, particularly those whose first languages were Germanic. Changes to both major and minor works in subsequent editions appear to strengthen the response that Erasmus and his colleagues were making to criticism of their biblical scholarship by Church leaders, especially in Italy and Spain.⁶ Not just the dialogues but all the works included should be read together against the background of the religious controversies that plagued Erasmus during the last two decades of his life. They amount to a manifesto of the Erasmian program of reform, as well as a plea to the Church to amend its divisive attitudes toward "Germania" and to heal the current schism by revising its approach to humanist restoration of Greek and Latin, that is, of the languages at once ancient, ecclesiastical, and international. Instead of distinguishing an elitist club of Ciceronian Italians from northern barbarians, Christian scholars should amend the European Babel of Greek and Latin dialects by teaching restored ancient pronunciation to the next generation.

John J. Bateman has argued for the integrity of the first edition of *De recta pronuntiatione* and *Ciceronianus* from a careful examination of the typographical evidence. He concludes that the volume was carefully planned, with major divisions beginning “on the right-hand page even when this meant some special adjustments in composition” and “a common title page for all the contents of the book with no evidence of cancellation or of postponement of the typesetting of the initial gathering.” Manuscript copy for all except perhaps Erasmus’ survey of contemporary authors in *Ciceronianus* must have been ready before printing began. Erasmus saw the volume through the press, with three brief interruptions in printing.⁷ Furthermore, “Since Agricola’s oration takes up an entire gathering (Sig. F), it is not simply filler used to round out a book, but evidence of the sincerity of Erasmus’ feelings about Agricola and of his desire to see all of Agricola’s writings published.”⁸ During the summer of 1528, Erasmus heard from Louis de Berquin and Germain de Brie about French fury over his fictional Ciceronian Nosoponus’ disparagement of their great humanist Guillaume Budé in comparison with the scholar-printer Josse Bade of Ghent. Bateman attributes to this French reaction the publication of “a rapidly revised edition of the *Ciceronianus* which was attached to a new edition of the *Colloquia* being published by the Froben house in March 1529.”⁹ Erasmus’ concern about French anger must also have been complicated, as we shall see, by his engagement in religious controversy with the Sorbonne and with Alberto Pio, Prince of Carpi, who by 1529 had settled in Paris following the Sack of Rome in 1527. Although the second edition of *Ciceronianus* appeared with the *Colloquia*, in October 1529 the Froben press once again published the dialogues together, with Erasmus’ further revisions to both.

A kinship between the dialogues is implied by their titles. *Pronuntiatio* is a rhetorical term for delivery of an oration, so Erasmus is referring to more than “pronunciation” of a language here, and the subtitle of *Ciceronianus*, *sive, De optimo genere dicendi* means literally “On the best kind of speaking,” that is, style, or in rhetoric, *elocutio*. When the dedicatee of *Ciceronianus*, Johann van Vlatten, sent the author a silver cup in thanks, Erasmus blamed the printers for publication of this work with *De recta pronuntiatione*, rather than separately as such a patron might feel he deserved.¹⁰ However, in another letter to Vlatten added to the second edition of *Ciceronianus*, Erasmus expressed surprise at the different receptions of the two dialogues, which he described as twins.¹¹ Bateman would have us “take with a grain of salt” Erasmus’ initial disclaimer of responsibility for the joint publication. Citing as evidence a passage in *De recta pronuntiatione*, he observes that “for Erasmus... the way one spoke was something which could not be separated from the way one

wrote, and both in turn from the way one lived... Foolish writing and defective pronunciation are alike varieties of the same pestilence and require similar cures.”¹² Indeed, the animal interlocutors of *De recta pronuntiatione* see linguistic excellence as defining humanity. Moreover, in Erasmus’ religious works, rhetoric is central to Christian theology and Church reform.¹³

Erasmian Theology in a Divided Europe

Debates about correct speaking of the ancient languages Greek and Latin went to the very heart of theological debate and the Papacy’s claim to spiritual supremacy. Bateman traces the genesis of *De recta pronuntiatione* to Erasmus’ annotations on the New Testament. In the first edition (Basel: Johann Froben, 1516), Erasmus takes occasion in a note on the Vulgate spelling “Paraclitus” in John 14:26 to make fun of Christians who are overly scrupulous about canonical prayers, but who nevertheless “cheat God’s ears of two whole syllables” when they mispronounce “Kyrie eleeson.” In revising this note in 1518, Erasmus becomes more serious about the issue of pronunciation, and in the fourth edition (March 1527) he “adds a dozen sentences which report virtually the content of the section on pronunciation in the Dialogue.”¹⁴ The issue of pronunciation came up also in Erasmus’ controversy with Jacques Masson over the linguistic training of theologians when the humanists of Louvain were trying to found the Collegium Trilingue. Reviewing works from the beginning of Erasmus’ career, Bateman shows that the learned Dutchman considered himself a descendent of the barbarians who had destroyed the Roman Empire, took responsibility for the inadequacies of contemporary European society, and worked for its reform through restoration of the ancient languages. However, being *Latinus* by scholarship and not by birth, he was sensitive to the taunts of Italians, who “often thus distinguished themselves from the hated Germans.”¹⁵

Erasmus’ collaboration with the Froben press to publish an edition of the New Testament fed Europe’s national rivalries. Consisting of the *editio princeps* of the Greek text, a revised version of the Vulgate, and annotations, the Froben edition of 1516 competed with two other editions engaging the scholarship of humanist theologians in Spain and Italy. First, the Complutensian Polyglot New Testament, prepared at Alcalá under the direction of Cardinal Francisco Jiménez de Cisneros, had been printed in 1514 but was not circulated until it received papal approval in 1520. Second, an edition planned by the Aldine press was published finally in 1518.¹⁶ S. Diane Shaw thinks that Erasmus may originally have intended for Aldus the notes for a bilingual Greek-Latin New Testament that he had prepared in England,

primarily at Cambridge, between his return from Italy in 1509 and his trip up the Rhein in 1514.¹⁷ Whether or not the planned destination of his 1514 trip was Italy, the printers of southern Germany convinced him to work with them instead.

Lisa Jardine emphasizes the role that the Strasbourg *sodalitas literaria* led by Jakob Wimpfeling played in that process. Wimpfeling's compatriots from Sélestat—Beatus Rhenanus and the printer Matthias Schürer—were members of this literary society. Wimpfeling's preface to the reader on the title page of the first edition of *Moriae encomium* (Strasbourg: Matthias Schürer, 1511) "celebrates Erasmus as a 'German,'" as does his letter in the same volume to Erasmus "German to German, Theologian to Theologian, Student to Teacher" (*Germanus Germano, Theologo Theologus, Discipulus Preceptoris*) at the end of this edition.¹⁸ Beatus contradicts French claims to cultural superiority by praising Erasmus as German in a prefatory letter to a 1512 Schürer edition of Gregory of Nyssa: "Nor do we lack men here who have overcome their barbarity by covering it with the splendor of Latinity. *Germania inferior*, indeed, possesses Erasmus of Rotterdam, who is an outstanding practitioner of both Latin and Greek, even if he is unreasonably attached to France, and persists obstinately in depriving us of the credit."¹⁹ In 1513, Schürer reprinted *De copia* with a preface by the younger Sebastian Murrho "celebrating Erasmus as the first master of eloquence to give Germany an equal to Cicero and Demosthenes."²⁰

Wimpfeling and his humanist circle enthusiastically received and hosted Erasmus in 1514. In turn Erasmus revised for Schürer the *Moriae encomium* and *De copia* and gave him the first edition of *Parabolae*, dedicating it to Pieter Gillis (*Ep.* 312). In the letter dedicating *De copia* to Schürer, Erasmus reminds the Strasbourg publisher that he is eagerly awaiting the works of the fifteenth-century Frisian humanist Rodolphus Agricola.²¹ *De copia* and *Parabolae* were printed together, separated by an epistolary exchange between Erasmus and Wimpfeling in which, Jardine argues, "Erasmus elaborated the *Germanus* compliment from Wimpfeling into a full-blown framework" for the volume as a "staged geographical event." Many later editions of *De copia* would reprint Erasmus' letter to Wimpfeling addressed "German to German, Theologian to Theologian, the Most Thirsty to the Most Skilled in Letters": *Germanus Germano, Theologus Theologo, Literarum Scientissimo Literarum Sitientissimus*.²²

Just up the Rhein at Basel, Bruno Amerbach prepared a reprint of the first edition of Erasmus' *Adagia* (Venice: Aldus, 1508), published August 1513 with a preface signed by the printer Johann Froben but probably written by Bruno himself. The volume's title page describes Erasmus as "*Germaniae decor*." Even though this edition was unauthorized, the quality of the publication seems to have impressed Erasmus.

Froben had excellent Greek type and the expertise of the Amerbach brothers, educated in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. Their father, the printer Johann Amerbach (ca. 1443–25 December 1513), had prepared them well to work on the edition of the Church Fathers that he began. Froben was continuing the project, and Erasmus had editorial contributions on the letters of his beloved St. Jerome to offer. Beatus Rhenanus was also prepared to work with him at Basel.²³ James D. Tracy suggests that only on his 1514 journey up the Rhein did Erasmus realize how enthusiastically his works were being read in Germany. Thus Erasmus, a native of lower *Germania*, chose in upper *Germania* to become a German.²⁴

Surprisingly, the first published controversy over the Froben New Testament came not from Spain or Italy but from Louvain. Even before the Basel *editio princeps* appeared, Maarten van Dorp wrote Erasmus in late 1514 or early 1515 to discourage his plans for publishing corrections to the Vulgate and to outline objections of the Louvain theologians to *Moriae encomium*. Allen notes that Erasmus' reply "formed one of the pieces regularly printed with the *Moriae Encomium*, and appears in all the early editions of that work from 1516 onwards,"²⁵ after Froben first printed a revised version of it in 1515–16. After Dorp wrote to Erasmus again on August 27, 1515, Thomas More, the English host that Erasmus had honored by the Latin title of *Moriae encomium*, wrote to Dorp from Bruges in late 1515 and convinced him to suppress the second letter. Although More's letter to Dorp no doubt circulated, it was first printed posthumously in his *Lucubrationes* (Basel, 1563).²⁶ Daniel Kinney finds it a sophisticated, systematic defense of humanist method, "encompassing a critique of Scholastic grammar, dialectic, and theology, as well as a tightly argued defense of the new philological theology."²⁷ Thierry [or Dirk] Martens's press at Louvain would soon publish More's satirical *Utopia* (written in Bruges and London 1515–1516) "at a key moment in the Erasmians's struggle with the theology faculty there."²⁸

Dorp was a former Latin teacher, at the College of the Lily in Louvain, who was working toward his doctorate in theology. He would receive the degree in August 1515. He was also one of the scholars working for Martens, one of Erasmus' publishers. Shaw explains that when Erasmus resided in Louvain,

mainly between the years 1503 and 1504 and again for most of the time between 1516 and 1521, he frequently offered Martens manuscripts of his writings and authorized revisions of previous editions. Martens was the first to print Erasmus' *Enchiridion Militis Christiani* (1503) and his *Institutio Principis Christiani* (1516), among other first editions, and Martens often chose to compete with Froben, Bade, Schürer, and other contemporary printers in the market for reprinting Erasmian works.²⁹

Dorp's history of collaboration with the Erasmian circle at Martens's press in Louvain, the good will with which he concluded his first letter to Erasmus, and his publication of their initial exchange in a volume of Erasmus' work that Dorp himself saw through the press have convinced Jardine that the controversy of Erasmus and More with Dorp was staged as a debate to publicize and defend the humanist approach of the Erasmian circle to theological interpretation. The seeming opponent of Erasmianism at Louvain was actually a humanist colleague who could present for refutation the position of their scholastic opponents from within the Faculty of Theology.³⁰

The humanists gathered around Martens's printing house, which "moved between Antwerp and Louvain whenever he changed his residence,"³¹ were also engaged in the recovery of the works of Agricola, a humanist born near Groningen whom Erasmus credited with bringing Italian humanism to Germany and the Netherlands. Agricola was acquainted with Alexander Hegius, headmaster at Deventer when Erasmus was a schoolboy there, but Jardine suggests that Erasmus exaggerated the link to establish a pedigree for his own intellectual program. In 1511, with Erasmus' encouragement, Pieter Gillis edited for Martens's press at Antwerp a volume of Agricola's *opuscula*, "apparently a compilation of scattered, already published works," with a prefatory letter to Dorp. He was later the editor of More's *Utopia* for Martens's press at Louvain,³² as well as one of the speakers in the dialogue, and he remained for years a close friend of Erasmus.³³ Alardus of Amsterdam, another corrector for the Martens press, actively sought manuscripts of Agricola's works and located his missing papers in 1516. Eventually he would edit the two-volume edition of Agricola's *De inventione dialectica* and *Lucubrationes* (Cologne: Joannes Gymnicus, 1539). He also participated in preparing the *editio princeps* of Agricola's *De inventione dialectica* (Louvain: Martens, 1515), which appeared with Dorp's endorsement on the title page. Agricola developed topical dialectic as an alternative approach to scholastic logic. Jardine argues that Dorp collaborated with the Erasmian circle (chiefly Gerard Geldenhauer) in correcting the first book of Agricola's treatise, but was embarrassed by subsequent theological reaction against the emphasis, especially in the second and third books, on plausible as opposed to certain argument.³⁴ The debate between Erasmus and Dorp grew acrimonious after their first exchange of letters, but they were eventually reconciled and maintained an uneasy friendship.³⁵

The controversy with Dorp was followed by more serious challenges from the theological faculty of Louvain, prompting Erasmus in late 1521 to move from Louvain to Basel, where he could also see through the press the third edition of his New Testament and work closely on other publications with Froben. Theologians in other universities and members of the monastic orders—especially the Dominicans,

Franciscans, and Carmelites—had joined in the controversies, some of them linking Erasmus with Luther. “Either Erasmus lutheranizes or Luther erasmianizes” and “Erasmus laid the egg that Luther hatched” circulated as popular slogans. To demonstrate his orthodoxy, Erasmus in 1524 reluctantly entered into a controversy with Luther over the issue of free will. Nevertheless, in March 1527 the Spanish Inquisition began investigating Erasmus (*Ep.* 1814). Its proceedings at Valladolid had the blessing of Pope Clement VII and were tolerated by Erasmus’ patron the Emperor Charles V (*Epp.* 1846, 1920), but they were halted in August by plague. In France, Erasmus was less fortunate. The Sorbonne’s investigation of Erasmus’ works culminated in an official condemnation on 17 December 1527, although the faculty’s decision was made public only in July 1531.³⁶ Moreover, his controversy with the faculty of theology at Paris was interwoven with their pursuit of Louis de Berquin, who had translated some of Erasmus’ works but had also been accused of possessing writings by such reformers as Luther, Melanchthon, Karlstadt, and Hutten. In spite of royal intervention, Berquin was finally strangled and burnt on 17 April 1529.³⁷

While many of the opponents of Erasmus’ philological approach to correcting the Vulgate and interpreting Scripture were scholastic theologians, some humanists also objected. They shared Erasmus’ interest in original Greek manuscripts of the New Testament but were opposed to using them to correct the Vulgate, or at least were more cautious than he was about doing so. Diego López Zúñiga or Stunica, one of the Complutensian scholars in Spain, generally agreed with Erasmus’ method, but disliked his format and questioned his motives. Their quarrel, beginning in 1520 over Erasmus’ New Testament annotations, descended to “nationalism and even racism”: Erasmus labeled Stunica Jewish and Stunica called Erasmus “a Dutch fool” and defended Spain against an alleged Erasmian slur.³⁸ Their debate included issues of pronunciation. For instance, Stunica took offense at Erasmus’ suggestion for changing the traditional pronunciation of “Timotheus” in Philippians 1:1, and at Erasmus’ remarks on Spanish pronunciation in a note on Romans 15:24. Stunica praised the virtues of Spaniards as descendants of the ancient Greeks and Romans, in contrast to “Dutch pusillanimity, sluggishness, and dull-witted barbarity.”³⁹ From the papal curia, Jakob Ziegler in 1522 defended Erasmus against Stunica in *Libellus... pro Germania* and praised the Germans (including the Dutch) at the expense of the Spaniards. Stunica continued his quarrel with Erasmus by accusing him in print at Rome of blasphemies, impieties, and Lutheranism.⁴⁰ Italians were also associating Erasmus with Luther, but on grounds that Silvana Seidel Menchi has described as peripheral to central Reformed doctrine. Italians thought Erasmus

had initiated the schism by criticizing everyday religious practices and appealing to the laity with his humanist rhetoric: Luther merely followed him. Nevertheless, the official stance of the Papacy was to temporize to avoid driving Erasmus to support the schism openly.⁴¹

Erasmus in the Ciceronian Controversy

A letter from Pedro Juan Olivar to Erasmus of 13 March 1527, reporting on the Valladolid proceedings, mentions disparaging comments on the “barbarian” style of the Germanic or Batavian Erasmus made by Italian humanists. They included Benedetto Tagliacarne of Sarzana (Benedictus Theocrenus), who was preceptor to the French princes being held hostage in Spain, and Baldesar Castiglione, who was papal nuncio to the imperial court.⁴² Clearly the Ciceronian controversy, originally a debate among Italians about whether to imitate a variety of classical models or Cicero alone, had begun by the late 1520s to reflect the broader religious and political tensions of Europe. John F. D’Amico demonstrates the close connection between Ciceronianism and the claim of the Roman Catholic Church to continue the cultural if not the military supremacy of the Roman Empire, now defined by the boundaries of Latin as a living language.⁴³ This claim took on new poignancy after Rome was sacked (beginning 6 May 1527) by Imperial troops that had been left without discipline following the death of their commander Charles de Bourbon.⁴⁴ For his part, Erasmus had for some years been expressing publicly his distaste for Ciceronianism, associating it with paganism in the Church.⁴⁵

Erasmus’ efforts to reclaim ancient languages from barbarism were based on the vision of Lorenzo Valla, whose *Elegantiae* he epitomized and whose annotations on the New Testament he published.⁴⁶ In *Elegantiae*, Valla had seen Latin as a basis of the Papacy’s claim to cultural hegemony over Western Europe but had based his standard of Latinity on an eclectic selection of ancient authors. Valla was critical of some aspects of the Papacy (e.g. the Donation of Constantine), and his quarrel with the influential papal secretary Poggio Bracciolini over Latin style initiated the Ciceronian controversy. The posthumous publication of Angelo Poliziano’s epistolary exchanges with the Ciceronians Paolo Cortesi and Bartolomeo Scala (*Omnia opera Angeli Politiani*, Venice: Aldus, July 1498) also influenced Erasmus even before his sojourn in Italy, as pirated early notes for and quotations from Erasmus’ manuscript treatise on letter writing show.⁴⁷ Poliziano’s arguments predisposed Erasmus to disparage a sermon delivered in Rome before the Pope on Good Friday 1509, an experience that Bulephorus describes vividly in *Ciceronianus* (CWE 28: 384–86).

Erasmus grumbled publicly as early as 1511, in *Moriae encomium*, about the arrogance of the Italian, especially Roman, claim to superiority in good letters and eloquence.⁴⁸ He first attacked Italian Ciceronianism in print in 1516 in his edition of Jerome (*CWE* 61: 7, 54–60, 86).⁴⁹ In *Paraclesis* in the first edition of the New Testament that year, he wished for “an eloquence far different from Cicero’s...much more efficacious, if less ornate than his” to exhort Christians.⁵⁰ By 1517, Erasmus was complaining of the apes of Cicero, among them Giovanni Pontano, in a letter to Budé.⁵¹ In March 1519, Erasmus saw a letter that Christophe de Longueil had written praising Budé at his expense, and he subsequently published both Longueil’s letter and his own response in his letter collections (*Epp.* 914, 935). Longueil was born at Mechelen, although descended from a noble family of Normandy and educated in France and Italy. Having fled from a trial at Rome for *lèse majesté* after he sought citizenship there for his Ciceronian style, he visited Erasmus at Louvain in October 1519.⁵² Erasmus disliked the young man’s interruption to his work and found Longueil’s complaints about his Roman trial ludicrous (*Ep.* 1026; cf. *Epp.* 1023, 1024, 1187, 1706). At about the same time, Longueil’s supporter in his quest for citizenship at Rome, Giovanni Battista Casali,⁵³ claimed in an invective that Erasmus had defamed Casali himself and other members of the Roman Academy:

... you rashly—as you always do—devised the plan to proclaim openly far and wide that I did not know any Latin or Greek and that I manifestly was the most boorish of men, that, moreover, Roman letters and eloquence had migrated with you to Germany, and that in the city of Rome you in fact found no one who knew literature, and, finally, that Marcus Tullius seemed to you to be sordid and an utter barbarian.⁵⁴

John Monfasani, who has edited and translated this unpublished work from Casali’s papers in Milan, convincingly dates it 1518–1519, when, as Casali says, he had been professor of rhetoric at the University of Rome for twenty-two years. The invective mentions neither Luther nor Stunica and seems rather to reflect Roman reaction to Erasmus’ editions of Jerome and the New Testament. Erasmus heard from Haio Herman in 1524 about an invective against him circulating in Rome but attributed it to Angelo Colocci. Erasmus mentioned Casali in the same letter but claimed that he knew neither.⁵⁵

By June 1526, Erasmus assumed that “the leaders of the anti-Erasmian pagan band in Rome” were Girolamo Aleandro and Alberto Pio, Prince of Carpi.⁵⁶ Erasmus had known Aleandro since 1508, when they had been roommates and bedfellows at the Aldine press in Venice. They remained friends for some years, until Aleandro was sent as papal legate to Germany and the Low Countries to promulgate the papal bull *Exsurge Domine* excommunicating Luther in 1520.⁵⁷ Reflecting the tensions

between them at that time, Erasmus may have written an anonymous *Acta Academiae Lovaniensis contra Lutherum*, which calls Aleandro a Jew.⁵⁸ Pio was a learned diplomat in the papal court with a reputation throughout Europe. He was also both a former student and a patron of Aldus. Although Pio proposed the establishment of an Aldine Academy for humanist study at Carpi, his difficulty maintaining control of his principality against attacks from kinsmen made this dream impossible. Instead, the “Aldi Romani Academia” was announced at Venice in August 1502 in an edition of Sophocles.⁵⁹ In *De recta pronuntiatione*, Erasmus alludes to its rules when his spokesman, Bear, describes “a dining club of select philhellenes” in which “everyone who lapsed from Greek at dinner should pay a fine” (CWE 26: 474).

Soon after the first edition of *De recta pronuntiatione* and *Ciceronianus*, in a letter to Pope Clement VII dated 3 April 1528, Erasmus boldly complained about Pio and Aleandro (Ep. 1987). He attributed to these critics two works that he had apparently seen in manuscript: the Prince of Carpi’s *Responsio paraenetica* to a letter that Erasmus had written him after hearing rumors that, in the papal court, Pio was slandering him as unlearned and Lutheran,⁶⁰ and the anonymous “Racha,” a response to Erasmus’ annotations on Matthew. Erasmus ascribed the latter attack to Aleandro.⁶¹ Josse Bade had published the *Responsio* by 7 January 1529 at Paris, where Pio settled following the Sack of Rome and the loss of his principality. Ironically, the publication was forced on Pio by friends who had read Erasmus’ allusion in the first edition of *Ciceronianus* to an unpublished letter that Pio had written in a style nearly Ciceronian.⁶² In the passage below, Erasmus added the first bracketed phrase to the March 1529 edition; the other bracketed phrases to the October 1529 edition (Knott, CWE 28: 585–86):

Bulephorus In my opinion Alberto Pio, Prince of Carpi, comes closer to Cicero’s style of expression than Aleandro does. As yet he hasn’t published anything, [as far as I know]. Oh, there is one book I’ve seen, though it might be better to call it a very long letter, [written in response to Erasmus—but it’s said by some to be a known fact that the work was shaped by another’s hand].

Nosoponus The author does certainly come close, [whoever he is,] in so far as anyone can who has involved himself from his youth with theology and philosophy. (trans. Knott, CWE 28: 419–20; my brackets.)

The religious controversy between Erasmus and Pio continued even after the death of the influential Prince of Carpi on 7 January 1531. Erasmus clearly feared this opponent more than most and, perhaps to diminish the effect of Pio’s attacks on him, persisted in attributing them to a conspiracy by Aleandro against all evidence to the contrary.⁶³

A Dialogue between Dialogues

Given Erasmus' fear of Pio and paranoia about Aleandro, it seems hardly a coincidence that the dialogue that precedes *Ciceronianus* in the 1528 volume—*De recta pronuntiatione*—displays the erudition of this Dutchman on an issue, the pronunciation of ancient languages, that concerned the Aldine circle during Erasmus' sojourn there. Both Aldus and Aleandro were among Erasmus' predecessors in the discussion of ancient pronunciation. Latin, as a living international language, had evolved into many local dialects in Western Europe, strongly influenced by the vernacular languages, while Greek had been learned from Byzantine refugees fleeing the Ottoman invasion. Ancient orthography suggested that sounds once differentiated had been lost. The Spanish linguist Elio Antonio de Nebrija, in a lecture at the University of Salamanca at the end of the academic year 1486, had begun to catalogue discrepancies between ancient texts and contemporary European pronunciation of ancient languages, and he continued to develop these studies up to at least 1516.⁶⁴ Bateman, citing the second edition of Aldus's Latin grammar, suggests that Aldus had become interested in pronunciation by 1501. Aldus apparently finished about 1507–08 a work on the subject that he called *Fragmenta*, which is not extant.⁶⁵ Certainly in 1508, when Erasmus and Aleandro were working with him in Venice, Aldus published an appendix to a Latin grammar in which he questioned contemporary pronunciation of Latin and Greek diphthongs. He addressed the subject again in a note in the grammar of Lascaris that he published in 1512.⁶⁶ In 1508, Aleandro left the Aldine press for Paris, on the recommendation of Erasmus, and through 1514 he gained renown for his teaching there and for editing a series of Greek texts and grammatical works.⁶⁷ In 1512, he included four leaves on pronunciation in his edition of the Greek grammar of Chrysoloras but stopped short of demanding a change in usage in response to scholarship.⁶⁸

Erasmus' *De recta pronuntiatione* is in part an answer to accusations of critics that he wrote carelessly and hastily and used "words invented by theologians, and sometimes even words of very low origins," as Nosoponus remarks in *Ciceronianus* (CWE 28: 425). Treating a philological topic of interest to those southern European humanists who were condemning his scholarship as incompetent, in the first of the two dialogues in the 1528 volume, Erasmus proved his diligence and established his credibility by demonstrating his astounding knowledge of the ancients. He built on Quintilian's principle that spelling should reflect sounds and drew his evidence of correct pronunciation of Greek and Latin from multiple sources: 1) classical grammarians, including Terentianus Maurus and recently discovered works of

Marius Victorinus; 2) scattered remarks in other ancient authors; and 3) words from vernacular languages in multiple dialects.⁶⁹ Not altogether satisfied, he carefully revised and corrected *De recta pronuntiatione* for its second edition. He lacked the concept of language families that comparative linguists would develop in the nineteenth century, as well as most of the evidence from inscriptions that philologists cite today, yet he achieved a reconstruction of ancient Greek that “soon began to influence the practice of pronunciation in the schools of England, France, Germany, and elsewhere. Undoubtedly it has been the single greatest influence on the tradition of Classical pronunciation, even if its tenets are now so taken for granted that the essay itself is rarely read and barely known” by classicists today.⁷⁰

Erasmus differed from his predecessors on two counts: first, he urged that pronunciation of the ancient languages be reformed rather than merely studied, although as in the *Ciceronianus* and other works he gave highest priority to good communication (CWE 26: 472); second, he emphasized Latin more than his predecessors had done because of its practical importance.⁷¹ Reform of pronunciation could be achieved only through education. Thus *De recta pronuntiatione* treats at length the pedagogical principles and methods that Erasmus has previously taught in such books as *De copia*, *De ratione studii*, and *De conscribendis epistolis*. He dedicated it to a noble boy, Maximilian of Burgundy, the teenage son of Adolph of Burgundy, a patron who in his own youth had been the intended recipient of Erasmian textbooks.⁷² The speakers are the gentlemanly, sword-bearing animals Lion (*Leo*) and Bear (*Ursus*), engaged in an amusing discussion about how to educate Lion’s cub to be fully human. Thus Erasmus’ classical dialogue might equally be called a beast fable, a genre popular for teaching children. Another feature of the dialogue reminiscent of schoolbooks is Erasmus’ use of examples from vernacular languages (although only in the margins). While they help to reconstruct classical pronunciation, Erasmus also tells Maximilian, who had been born in Bergen op Zoom and was studying at Louvain, “I have drawn a good proportion of the examples from the vernacular speech of the Dutch, Brabanters, and French, with all of which I knew you to be familiar.”⁷³

The companion dialogue *Ciceronianus* also has, in part, a pedagogical aim. Erasmus had already criticized tedious studies wasted on producing Ciceronians in “Echo,” added to his *Colloquia* in June 1526 (CWE 40: 796–801). In the revised second edition of *Ciceronianus*, writing to its dedicatee Vlatten about the controversy it aroused, Erasmus suggests that the dialogue’s survey of contemporary style was intended to teach through example:

Now if I had only praised the people whose names I mention, and if I had praised them without exception, I would have spoiled the fruits I wanted this work to produce—the young learn a great deal from critical assessments like the one here, as they get into the habit of reading always with discrimination and recognizing what to avoid and what to try to do. There is a vast difference between criticism and eulogy. (*Ep.* 2088, trans. Knott, *CWE* 28: 339).

Nicola Kaminski has observed that Erasmus argues against Ciceronianism partly on the pedagogical principle of encouraging the *aptum* and *ingenium* of the individual student. She suggests that the logical conclusion to this argument would be to write in the vernacular.⁷⁴ However, Renaissance men such as Erasmus learned Latin as a second language from childhood and often used it with as much comfort as their mother tongues. Erasmus recognized that good Latin communication throughout Western and Central Europe was vital to the Church unity that he craved. Although Latin was the international language not only of worship but also of education, scholarship, law, and diplomacy, Europeans could barely understand each other. Erasmus illustrates the problem in *De recta pronuntiatione* with an anecdote about speakers from various countries welcoming the Emperor Maximilian (*CWE* 26: 472–73). His spokesman Bear in *De recta pronuntiatione* laments that humans now make only animal noises because languages degenerate through common use. Bear asserts that only the scholarly languages Greek and Latin can be preserved, although they must be restored after having been corrupted by the vernaculars. Unlike the Ciceronians, Bear offers no unchallenged standard. Scholars can learn from all ancient authors and must bow at times to modern usage to be understood.

In keeping with their pedagogical purposes, both dialogues are grounded in the principle of *utilitas*. If, as has been observed, Erasmus in *De recta pronuntiatione* pays less attention to Greek than previous studies of ancient pronunciation had done,⁷⁵ the reason is that Latin was more useful to Christians who recognized the leadership of the Roman See. Utility has also been identified as a principle underlying the satire of *Ciceronianus*.⁷⁶ Ciceronians were not as interested in the practical use of Latin as in the powerful status symbol of mastering pure Ciceronian style, a feat they thought a northerner could rarely do.⁷⁷ Erasmus must have found such an attitude especially damaging to a Church suffering from the Lutheran schism. Although Italians expected their own speech to be taken as the standard, *De recta pronuntiatione* suggests that they are not much less barbarous than other Europeans in their pronunciation of ancient Latin and Greek.⁷⁸ The *Ciceronianus* goes further, equating Ciceronianism with Church corruption. The linguistic purity that Papal Rome hails as a sign of its cultural hegemony—and by implication, spiritual

authority—actually threatens Christianity with paganism, for it is impossible to speak of Christ, Christian doctrine, or the contemporary Christian Church using only the words of Cicero. The *Ciceronianus* is one of Erasmus' most severe critiques of the spiritual leadership of Rome.

To warn the Church against dangerous hubris and paganism, Erasmus chooses a genre—the dialogue—often used by Cicero and revived in Renaissance Italy for the purpose of debating both sides of a question.⁷⁹ He takes full advantage of the dialogue's deliberate inconclusiveness to offer a complex response to his critics. Some issues that Erasmus raises in *De recta pronuntiatione* are left unresolved, for instance, the realist-nominalist debate behind his treatment of etymology. Likewise the reader of the dialogue *Ciceronianus* must judge the achievements of Erasmus' humanist contemporaries. Are those who fail Nosoponus's tests for Ciceronian style the better or worse for their freedom from the Ciceronian disease? The irony of attacking diseased Ciceronianism in a dialogue imitating Cicero's catalogue of orators in *Brutus* must have amused Erasmus.⁸⁰ He had already expressed his admiration for Cicero himself when he dedicated to Vlatten his edition of *Tusculanae quaestiones* (Basel: J. Froben, November 1523).⁸¹

The dedication of *Ciceronianus* to Vlatten follows naturally from this earlier letter, but like the dedication of *De recta pronuntiatione* to Maximilian of Burgundy, it also asserts Erasmus' connections with the Rheinland. Vlatten was councillor to Duke John III of Cleves.⁸² Although Lion and Bear dream of a Republic of Letters in *De recte pronuntiatione* (CWE 26: 372), both dialogues divide and critique the humanists of Europe by the vernacular languages they speak. *De recta pronuntiatione* establishes a hierarchy of speech in which no race escapes some barbarity: the Italians (especially the Romans) are not perfect, they are merely better than others, followed by the English, the Spanish, the Germans, and at the furthest extreme from ancient speech, the French.⁸³ In *Ciceronianus*, following a survey of ancient and medieval writers, Bulephorus leads Nosoponus through a catalogue of contemporary humanists divided by nations (defined, of course, by Latin place names rather than by contemporary political boundaries): Italy, France, Britain, Denmark, Zeeland, Holland, Frisia, Westphalia, Saxony, other parts of Germany, the Swiss, Hungary, Poland, Spain, and Portugal.

Nosoponus's rejection of their candidates for the true Ciceronian leads to a consideration of Longueil and others more likely to qualify. Bulephorus discusses at length the "man born in Brabant and educated in France" who aspired to be a Roman by speech and citizenship at a time when "Rome is not Rome" (trans. Knott, CWE 28: 430–31). At his trial, "Longueil's side was at a disadvantage because of Luther,

on whose account anything from the German area, not to say everyone from north of the Alps, was in bad odour at Rome." Accusations against Longueil included his "praise of Erasmus and Budé, a barbarian praising fellow barbarians," and helping them obtain books from Italy, "so that they could dispute with the Italians the first place in the world of scholarship" (*CWE* 28: 432–33). Erasmus' anger at Italian dismissal of northern scholarship is palpable here, and he sees Longueil's real treason as turning his back on Brabant and France for a Rome that impedes and dismisses the contribution of northern scholars. Through his spokesman Bulephorus, he gloats, "How many more people thumb the *Colloquia*, the light-hearted nonsense of the Dutch word-spinner, than the writings of Longueil" (*CWE* 28: 435). Here he seems to be answering what Charles Fantazzi calls Longueil's "scathing remark" about Erasmus to Marcantonio Flaminio published posthumously in Longueil's letters.⁸⁴ But Longueil was dead, and his Italian and French admirers would quickly respond to Erasmus' rather spiteful promotion of himself and his "Germanic" colleagues.

Erasmus' changes to later editions of *Ciceronianus* in response to complaints from humanist colleagues were often grudging. In the second edition he modified only slightly the passage in which he had compared his great French rival Budé with his own former printer Bade, whose birth at Ghent also made him a Germanic compatriot of Erasmus.⁸⁵ His addition on Juan Luis Vives, a converted Jew born in Valencia, Spain, who frequented Erasmian circles in Bruges, Louvain, and England, was an insultingly cool treatment of a humanist whom posterity has recognized as brilliant and original. In the March 1529 edition, Erasmus corrects his oversight of Vives but without enthusiasm. Nosoponus recognizes Vives's potential to become a true Ciceronian because he "improves on himself daily. He has a talent that can be turned to anything." Vives remained hurt.⁸⁶ By contrast, Erasmus included a flattering reference to Haio Herman (Hermannus Phrysius) in exchange for the loan of "the precious Treviso Seneca, copiously annotated by Agricola" that he needed for his own work.⁸⁷

However, Erasmus' ungenerous treatment of French and Spanish colleagues is less brutal than the timing of his attack on Italian Ciceronians. If he was as serious about promoting European peace and Christian concord as his works often suggest, he could not have chosen a worse moment to publish his satire. *Ciceronianus* further divided the Republic of Letters and the Church after both had been bombarded by the Lutheran reform and just when they were reeling from the Sack of Rome. Did he sense that the moment had come for the North to break free of its idolatry of Italy, to seize leadership of the Renaissance and humanist reform of theology and Church practice from the scattered remnants of the Roman Academy and the Papacy? Were

he and his Germanic publishers pious? patriotic? prophetic? or merely opportunistic? Or was Erasmus simply losing prudence and self control, the qualities of effective rhetoric that his own textbooks taught, under the pressure of religious controversies that might, after all, have led to his death at the stake?⁸⁸ No doubt his motives were mixed and not altogether clear even to himself.

The Intertextuality of the Minor Works

The minor works that accompany *De recta pronuntiatione* and *Ciceronianus*—letters, epitaphs, and a recovered work of Erasmus’ compatriot Agricola—contribute to the rich intertextuality by which the Froben editions weave their message. In the changing appendices to the dialogues, Erasmus and his collaborators at the press marshal evidence of northern, especially “Germanic,” excellence in humanist scholarship and publishing and remind readers implicitly of other publications that have developed an Erasmian vision. A few of the published works linked intertextually with these appendices are the Erasmus-Dorp correspondence, Erasmus’ *Moriae encomium* and thus More’s *Utopia*, editions of Agricola, Jerome, and the New Testament, Wimpfeling’s patriotic and pedagogical works and correspondence with Erasmus, Erasmus’ *De copia* and other pedagogical works, an earlier Dutch contribution to scholarship on ancient pronunciation, and the Bembo-Pico debate in the Ciceronian controversy.

In the first edition, Erasmus addresses a letter (*Ep.* 1900) with the running title *Deploratio mortis Ioannis Frobenii* to Emstedijs Cartusianus (Jan Symons of Heemstede, near Haarlem) and appends two epitaphs praising Johann Froben. In addition to these verses in Latin and in Greek by Erasmus, the first edition publishes Latin verses on Froben by Henricus Glareanus and Hilarius Bertholf, two of Erasmus’ colleagues at Basel.⁸⁹ This collection is followed by Erasmus’ Latin epitaph on Bruno Amerbach. Although Bruno had died almost a decade earlier, in 1519, he represents here the publishing legacy of the Amerbach family in Basel. Bruno had collaborated with Erasmus on the Jerome edition, for which Erasmus wrote the “Life,” edited the letters and other minor works in four volumes, and served as editor-in-chief.⁹⁰ In *Ciceronianus*, Bulephorus calls Bruno “the most generous-souled man that nature ever formed,” and Nosoponus laments, “As far as one can tell from just a taste, he would have been great if a premature death had not snatched him away from his studies while still in his youth” (*CWE* 28: 428).

The letter to Symons also introduces a collection of tributes to Dorp and his friend Jacob Volkaerd of Louvain. Symons, who had been on good terms with

Erasmus and his humanist friends, was a monk in the Louvain Charterhouse where Dorp was buried in 1525.⁹¹ Erasmus had already sent him on 8 November 1527 (*Ep.* 1646) his epitaph for Dorp's tomb, printed in this volume. Now Erasmus hopes that because Symons is finally receiving "with interest" the epitaphs that he has been expecting, he will excuse Erasmus for not sending them in a more timely fashion.⁹² Symons may have supplied some of the epitaphs on Dorp,⁹³ but the phrase "*cum foenore*" implies that Erasmus had assembled others through his own network.

Erasmus' apology for late publication of the collection masks his ambivalence about Dorp. In *Ciceronianus*, Erasmus' spokesman Bulephorus says of him, "A gifted mind able to turn to anything, and a not unattractive personality, but he preferred to follow others' judgments rather than his own. In the end theology alienated him from the Muses" (trans. Knott, *CWE* 28: 425). When the Froben press in October 1529 and March 1530 published together the revisions of Erasmus' dialogues, it added to the appended works a new letter from Erasmus to Karel Uutenhove (*Ep.* 2209).⁹⁴ There Erasmus reports bitterly that many think Dorp finally died a true theologian after wasting his time in vain (that is, humanist) efforts. Those comments remind Erasmus of the woman (Socrates' wife, Xantippe) who complained that her husband died innocent. Better to die innocent than guilty. Better to die a scholar than a beast. If, as this remark suggests, the theologians of Louvain were celebrating their conversion of a humanist who had collaborated on the philological projects of the Martens press, Erasmus would need to frame his recognition of Dorp within his own approach to theology. The strategy proved less than successful, to judge not only by Erasmus' remark to Uutenhove but also by the omission of the tributes to Dorp from subsequent Froben editions of *Ciceronianus*.

The large collection of tributes to Dorp that Erasmus finally published in 1528 opens with verses in Latin and in Greek by Jacob Volkaerd, a teacher of both these languages at Louvain,⁹⁵ and with Erasmus' Latin verses on Volkaerd, who died soon after Dorp (*paulo post defunctum*). The remaining tributes to Dorp—in Latin or Greek, verse or prose—are by Conradus Goclenius, Frans van Cranevelt, Erasmus himself, Adrianus Barlandus, Juan Luis Vives, Germain de Brie, and Alaard of Amsterdam.⁹⁶ Most of those named in this impressive, international list of northern humanists were Erasmus' colleagues at Louvain.⁹⁷ However, Erasmus met the French humanist Germain de Brie of Auxerre not in Louvain but at the Aldine press. In *Ciceronianus* Bulephorus calls Brie a versatile writer whether of "Greek or Latin, poetry or prose" and even Nosoponus has "high hopes" of his future perfection.⁹⁸ Including him in the volume proved wise: Brie advised Erasmus when the dialogue offended Budé and his supporters, attempted to act as a peacemaker, and

when Erasmus died in 1536, composed an obituary and three epitaphs on him.⁹⁹ The collection of tributes to Dorp by prominent humanist churchmen as well as laymen implicitly celebrates the Erasmian program and attempts to reclaim for it a friend, Dorp, within the predominantly hostile theological faculty at Louvain.

The final three tributes to Dorp, by the editor of Agricola's works, Alard of Amsterdam, segue into *Oratio in laudem Matthiae Richili*, which Jardine believes is the only first edition of a work by Agricola that Erasmus had been able by 1528 to publish in a volume of his own works.¹⁰⁰ It must have reminded some readers that Dorp had supported Erasmus' philological approach to biblical study through his endorsement of Agricola's *De inventione dialectica*.¹⁰¹ Jardine observes of the 1528 collection:

In neither this nor any of the three subsequent editions of this volume does Agricola's name, or the title of his oration, figure on the title page. But Erasmus includes another textual note expressing his earnest desire that more of Agricola's works should be brought to light, and the *Ciceronianus* itself contains another fulsome tribute to Agricola's standing as a Ciceronian and a humanist, in the roll call of great 'modern' figures in humane learning.

She notes that Erasmus also includes Hegius, his headmaster at Deventer and friend of Agricola, with other Netherlanders, in his survey of possibly Ciceronian writers in the *Ciceronianus*: "So the same roll call which caused such offense for slighting French scholars is extremely careful in its mention of 'German' humanists who provide Erasmus with his own immediate pedigree."¹⁰² Moreover, Agricola's oration is the last of the minor works appended to the dialogues in 1528, and the note that follows it, prominently concluding the first edition, almost defiantly apologizes for Agricola's fifteenth-century style on the grounds of the near "divinity" of his argument:

We have added this oration to others luckily found by chance because there may be nothing written by this man, at whatever time, with whatever alien taste, that may not at times display divinity. Thus I wonder all the more that there are some who either suppress his scholarly works or allow them to perish. Several times he uses the pronoun too harshly. Since I know that fault has not been committed by the carelessness of scribes, I have preferred not to change it.¹⁰³

The publication of an oration by Agricola and this concluding note reinforce the celebration of the Frisian humanist in *Ciceronianus*, where Nosoponus speaks of him as "a man of superhuman mentality, of deep learning, with a style far from commonplace, solid, vigorous, polished, controlled." In spite of "a touch of Quintilian in expression and of Isocrates in word arrangement, ... he rises to greater heights than

either of them.... If he had stayed in Italy, he could have been one of the greatest, but he preferred Germany" (CWE 28: 425–26).

The enlarged edition of *Colloquia* published by the Froben press in March 1529 appends the revised *Ciceronianus*. The pairing is appropriate in genre—colloquies are miniature dialogues—and thematically: both major works teach the correct use of Latin and both satirize the weaknesses of European society that Erasmus is eager to reform. This edition also appends a slightly revised version of *Deploratio mortis Ioannis Frobenii*, removing the reference to the tributes to Dorp in that letter along with the tributes themselves. The collection of tributes to Froben is expanded and tributes to Wimpfeling (died 15 November 1528) are added. The most strategic additions to the minor works accompanying *Ciceronianus* here are a Latin epitaph on Froben by Andrea Alciati, epitaphs on Wimpfeling by Beatus Rhenanus and Janus Cornarius, and the previously mentioned apology to Vlatten, a letter in which Erasmus sandwiches a tribute to Wimpfeling between opening and closing remarks on the Ciceronian controversy (*Ep.* 2088).¹⁰⁴

Alciati's epitaph on Froben amounts to an Italian humanist endorsement of both the Basel printing enterprise and Erasmus. Bruno's brother, Bonifacius Amerbach, was their connection with the famous Milanese interpreter of Roman law. In the early 1520s, he had studied for three years at Avignon with Alciati before returning to Basel to teach law.¹⁰⁵ Through Bonifacius, Erasmus had begun writing to Alciati in 1521, and Alciati had proved such a sympathetic correspondent that, in a letter of May 1526, Erasmus had complained to him about attacks from a new sect of Ciceronians (*Ep.* 1706). Alciati had been pleased with Erasmus' tributes to his erudition in the 1526 *Adagia* and in the 1528 *Ciceronianus*. He had moved back to France in 1527,¹⁰⁶ and Erasmus might have hoped in March 1529 that he could defend Erasmus there both to the French supporters of Budé and to Alciati's own Italian compatriots. However, Erasmus' letter to Uutenhove appended to the October 1529 edition, together with other letters written soon after, reports that "our Alciati" has also been targeted by Erasmus' critics (*Epp.* 2209, 2223, 2329). In 1530 and 1531, Alciati would unsuccessfully advise Erasmus to remain silent in response to the attacks by Pio of which Erasmus had complained (*Epp.* 2329, 2394, 2468,¹⁰⁷). Some of Alciati's well-known emblems allude to Erasmus.¹⁰⁸

The tributes to Wimpfeling by Beatus Rhenanus, Cornarius, and Erasmus himself remind the reader of Germanic admiration for the Erasmian program. Ari Wesseling argues that Erasmus dropped the epithet "German" when it became associated with Lutheranism after 1520. If so, Erasmus appears to be reclaiming it by paying tribute to Wimpfeling in March 1529 and again in the October 1529/March

1530 revision of the 1528 *De recta pronuntiatione* and *Ciceronianus*.¹⁰⁹ The prose epitaph by Beatus praises Wimpfeling's pedagogical works (especially *Adolescentia*, *Isidoneus Germanicus*, and *Elegantiarum medulla*) and celebrates his efforts to reform education, his moral works, and his pious life. Educational reform, ethics, and piety are planks in the Erasmian platform. The Latin verse epitaph by Cornarius calls Wimpfeling "happy in fatherland" (*Felix in patria*) and summarizes his eulogy in lines that claim, "Thus noone was more famous in the Teutonic world for good character and language refined for the age."¹¹⁰ Erasmus' own tribute, sandwiched between the two sections of the letter to Vlatten that discuss *Ciceronianus*, likewise emphasizes Wimpfeling's Germanic roots: his birth at Sélestat in Alsace, education at Freiburg and Heidelberg in canon law and theology, benefice at Speyer, and tutelage of such leaders of "Germania" as Jakob Sturm. Likewise, Erasmus mentions Wimpfeling's retirement to a monastic life, pedagogical and pious writings, and dangerous quarrel with the Augustinians, over which Wimpfeling was summoned to Rome (*Ep.* 2088, trans. Knott, *CWE* 28: 339–41).

Erasmus strategically juxtaposes this tribute to Wimpfeling with his discussion of the Ciceronian controversy in the letter to Vlatten. The comments on Wimpfeling follow his description of angry reactions to his own *Ciceronianus* and precede his claim to have discovered only recently the Bembo-Pico exchange on Ciceronianism. The letter excuses his omission of some names from Nosoponus's catalogue of contemporaries on several grounds, among others: "there are so many young men now in Germany, France, England, Hungary, and Poland who can both speak and write in good Latin." Yet, Erasmus asserts, he has not begrudged deserved praise even to "enemies like Hutten and Zúñiga." Some now regret their angry response to his perceived slight of Budé. Others have the "effrontery" to accuse him of jealousy of Longueil, whom, Erasmus replies, he has mentioned with more honour than Longueil has shown Erasmus. Alluding again to the infamous slur in Longueil's letters, Erasmus wishes that "there were many Longueils to joke about the Dutch word-spinner [*oratorem Batavum*], provided they did good service to Christian learning and Christian life" (trans. Knott, *CWE* 28: 338–39).

Erasmus ends the letter by claiming that he did not know the controversy between Bembo and Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola when he wrote the *Ciceronianus*. The truth of this claim has been questioned,¹¹¹ but as Fantazzi observes, while Nosoponus has "faint praise" for most Italian writers that he surveys in *Ciceronianus*, he has "real praise only for Bembo and Sadoletto, who were in fact excellent Ciceronians but, more significantly... papal secretaries, whom Erasmus was careful not to offend."¹¹² Erasmus was on good terms with Sadoletto but seems

not to have known Bembo well before 1529, in spite of the connections of both men with the Aldine press, for in *Ciceronianus* he mentions that he has seen only a few letters by him. On 1 October 1528, Erasmus wrote Sadoleto (*Ep.* 2059), expressing concern for Bembo's safety following the Sack of Rome and asserting that he had come to admire Bembo from reading Longueil's correspondence with him.¹¹³ Erasmus' vigorous efforts to win Bembo's approval, then, date from the controversy over *Ciceronianus*. On 22 February 1529, when Erasmus recommended to Bembo Karel Utenhove, a young man from Ghent who had been living in his household since at least July 1528,¹¹⁴ he must have been sending not only a student to Venice and its university town, Padua, but also an ambassador. The effort paid off: Bembo's "cordial answer (*Epp* 2144, 2290) marks the beginning of an epistolary relationship that was always dignified, became increasingly warmer, and was terminated only by the death of the Dutch scholar."¹¹⁵

Erasmus reinforced and announced his success in part by his revisions to the October 1529 edition of his dialogues. To the third edition of *Ciceronianus*, he added to his praise of Bembo and Sadoleto, "I can bear this kind of Ciceronian—men endowed with the finest intellects, thoroughly accomplished in every branch of learning, gifted with discrimination and powers of judgment, who, whether they set up Cicero alone as their oratorical ideal, or a few outstanding exemplars, or all scholarly writers, cannot help speaking in the best possible way" (*CWE* 28: 436). Moreover, this edition and its later reissue with the reprinted Sig. H containing a new colophon dated March 1530 not only reprint the appended works of the March 1529 edition but add a new letter from Erasmus to Utenhove at Padua.¹¹⁶ This letter, dated from Freiburg, 1 September 1529, seems to be little more than familiar conversation on a variety of unrelated subjects, that is, the *mixta epistola* ("mixed letter") described by Erasmus in *De conscribendis epistolis*.¹¹⁷ However, it is a masterpiece of humanist strategy and self-promotion, deftly crafted for this publication.

First, Erasmus rejoices that Utenhove has arrived safely in Padua, finds the Academy flourishing with excellent professors in every discipline, has been welcomed by Giambattista Egnazio and Pietro Bembo, two extraordinary luminaries of the age, and even introduced to their friends.¹¹⁸ By making a good impression, Utenhove has brought credit to Erasmus himself, who had recommended him to Egnazio and Bembo. Erasmus fears that Padua will not remain the tranquil seat of studies that Utenhove has found it but will be caught up in new wars. He is not sure whether Utenhove's invitation to him to come there is serious; although the thought of that literary environment attracts him, Erasmus reports that he has moved to Freiburg im Breisgau, ruled by Ferdinand of Austria and just a day's journey from

Basel. The university at Freiburg has Udalricus Zasius, noted for his eloquence and his knowledge of law.¹¹⁹ Although Ferdinand had again invited Erasmus to Vienna, offering a large salary, Erasmus protests that his health is delicate and is improving in Freiburg. Rumours of his death have been spread, probably by those who wish him dead. When he was at Basel, he was accused of supporting heresy. He has received invitations from kings, princes, bishops, and scholars to diverse regions. Some have sent him travel money, others gifts, in promise of ongoing patronage. Levinus Ammonius and Omaar van Edingen have invited him to Uutenhove's homeland, Flanders. Uutenhove's kinsman Karel Sucket has gone to Bourges, eager, like many other young men, to study jurisprudence with Alciati, who enjoys a large salary and even greater honour there. Erasmus laments the death of Jacobus Ceratinus. Next he recalls the death of Dorp and the laments of some that Dorp had wasted his time on the arts before turning to true theology. Erasmus grieves the Fury (*Megeram*) that has disturbed public affairs and religion and now scholarship, unnaturally separating the Graces from the Muses. Some in France too great to stoop so low have suborned little versifiers of more humble fame against him, and some craftily attack Alciati too. After such tumult in the world, such carnage, so many plagues, after inflationary prices and poverty, a new evil that was formerly confined to England has migrated to Germany and leapt up the Rhein to Strasbourg. Erasmus gives a long description of the sweating sickness, recalling that it had killed John Colet, whose health was broken even though he recovered from recurrent attacks (died 16 September 1519), and Andrea Ammonio (died 17 August 1517). With so many plagues, God invites us to amend our lives and to live prepared to die.

Through this friendly but sombre conversation, Erasmus has offered evidence of support of his work from Europeans on both sides of the Alps. At Venice, Egnazio and even the famous Ciceronian Bembo have responded warmly to the Dutchman's letters and the scholarship of his Flemish protégé Uutenhove, even though in France Budé and his circle have been raising a tumult over *Ciceronianus* and may be alienating such friends as Alciati. His orthodoxy questioned because of his residence in Basel, Erasmus has been warmly received at Catholic Freiburg by Zasius and the University, having accepted their hospitality only after rejecting many prestigious invitations. The other names that Erasmus manages to drop in the letter also reinforce the message of the dialogues in the same volume. The death of Jacobus Ceratinus (Jacob Teyng, of Hoorn) turned out to be a rumour at this time, though he would die soon after (20 April 1530).¹²⁰ Erasmus says that Ceratinus was tutor to Henry of Burgundy, youngest son of Adolph of Burgundy (thus brother of the patron of *De recta pronuntiatione*). Ceratinus, also a Dutchman, had written his

own treatise on the sounds of Greek letters, *De sono literarum praesertim graecarum libellus* (Antwerp: J. Grapheus, 1527), with a preface addressed to Erasmus (*Ep.* 1843). Perhaps Erasmus' choice of Maximilian of Burgundy as his own dedicatee, or even his decision to work up his New Testament annotations on pronunciation into a dialogue, was inspired by Ceratinus's work. It is difficult, though, to know who influenced whom. Erasmus had written several recommendations to help Ceratinus get professional positions, as tutor, professor, and editor for Froben, and Ceratinus published a Latin translation (Antwerp: M. Hillen, 1526) of Chrysostom's *De sacerdotio*, a work published in Greek by Erasmus in 1525. Erasmus had included Ceratinus in Nosoponus's survey of contemporary writers in the *Ciceronianus*, praising him as "A man who generated high hopes, but one who is far from being Ciceronian" (trans. Knott, *CWE* 28: 425).

The long passage on the sweating sickness in the letter to Uutenhove allows Erasmus to remember the English circle that supported his work. Erasmus had prepared the first edition of *De copia* and many other pedagogical works for the school of Dean John Colet at St. Paul's Cathedral, yet he had not included Colet in the list of English scholars—William Grocyn, Thomas Linacre, Richard Pace, Thomas More, William Latimer, Reginald Pole—mentioned in *Ciceronianus*' survey of writers (*CWE* 28: 422–24). Erasmus had paid tribute to Colet in so many other contexts that mention of him in *Ciceronianus* might have seemed merely repetitious.¹²¹ However, the handsome tributes to Wimpfeling in the current edition might remind some readers that Erasmus had given his revised *De copia* to Schürer at Strasbourg rather than dedicating it again to Colet, for whose school it was first published. Thus Erasmus might have mentioned Colet here to avoid appearing to slight him. The other plague victim mentioned, Ammonio, was an Italian Churchman born into an old family of Lucca who had made his career in England in the service of the Papacy and had been one of Erasmus' closest humanist friends and supporters there. They had lived together in the household of More, and in 1517 Ammonio had represented Pope Leo X in absolving Erasmus from all censures caused by his failure to wear the Augustinian habit.¹²² The mention of the deceased Colet and Ammonio no doubt would remind Erasmus' readers of his other friends still living in England.

Conclusion

In the two editions of *De recta pronuntiatione* and the three of *Ciceronianus* that came from the pen of Erasmus and the press of Froben, the *Orator Batavus* and his printing house were weaving a complex web of intertextuality, not only with the

products of their own press such as the *New Testament* and the edition of the Church Fathers but also with works issuing from other presses of northern Europe (at least Paris, Louvain, Antwerp, and Strasbourg). Through verse and prose tributes and letters, they were marshalling the forces of a Transalpine, especially a “Germanic,” approach to theology and Church reform, supported by a sturdy philology that humanists close to the Papacy had been trying to dismiss as “barbaric.” They made full use of the flattery of the epitaph, the malleability of the letter, the defense of pedagogical purpose, and the fictional and literary potential of the dialogue. When the volume generated controversy, Erasmus reached out to those in the Italian humanist community, such as Alciati, Egnazio, Bembo, and Sadoletto, who might understand his vision and support his philology. He seems to have been successful in developing these relationships, but he expressed surprise at the French reaction and could not appease Budé and his friends through the good offices of supporters in France such as Alciati and Brie or through subsequent revisions of *Ciceronianus*. The later editions of the dialogues and minor works reinforced the function of the first edition as a manifesto of Erasmianism while attempting to clarify and extend its foundations. They did not fundamentally temper Erasmus’ expression of his anger at the religious controversies in which he found himself engaged and at the related dismissal of northern scholarship by some Spanish and Italian theologians and Church leaders. *Ciceronianus*, especially, proved to be too bitter to promote his goal of Church unity.

From the perspective of almost five centuries, however, the Froben editions of Erasmus’ dialogues *De recta pronuntiatione* and *Ciceronianus* and the minor works that accompanied them can be understood as a failed effort to put Erasmian philology to the service of concord in the universal Church. Reconciliation of the warring sects and nations of Christendom was one of Erasmus’ principal goals throughout his life. He conceived the reform of language as fundamental to Church unity. Thus his dialogues on language imply a harsh critique: the humanists of the Papal Curia had been calling for reform of the universal language of the Church, Latin, through a return to the diction and syntax of the pagan orator Cicero, but they had set an impractical and even dangerous goal that might dismiss Patristic Latin along with medieval “Germanic” barbarism. As an assertion of the linguistic supremacy of Rome over the rest of Europe, Ciceronianism threatened to divide Christians and reduce even the learned to triviality or silence. Latin was losing its power as a spoken language, to be replaced by the Babel of the vernaculars. At the same time that they set an impossible standard of style, Church leaders had been refusing to reform the variety of pronunciations of Greek and Latin throughout

Christendom, even though these dialects impeded communication and led (in the process of dictation to a scribe) to textual corruption. Aleandro and other philologists acknowledged the corruption of these ancient languages through common use but would not encourage restoring them through education. Complutensian scholars acknowledged the corruption of Scripture through time, but supported the authority of the Vulgate. Church authorities had been reminded by Erasmus and others of the need for Church reform but were failing to listen. In the Froben editions of dialogues debating language issues central to the Renaissance and Reformation, and in the minor works carefully assembled to accompany them, Erasmus and his collaborators and printers both admonished their contemporaries and offered a complex apology for their philological theology.

Notes

An earlier version of this paper, entitled "A Dialogue Between Dialogues: Erasmus' *De recta pronuntiatione* and *Ciceronianus*," won the Montaigne Prize for the best non-student presentation to the Canadian Society for Renaissance Studies (CSRS) at its annual convention with the Congress of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Western Ontario, 29–31 May 2005. On the basis of subsequent research at the Folger Shakespeare Library, I presented an expanded argument on 9 February 2006 to faculty in Classical, Medieval, and Renaissance Studies (CMRS) at the University of Saskatchewan. I wish to thank my CSRS and CMRS colleagues for their encouragement and comments. They should not be held responsible for my errors. I am also grateful to the librarians of the Folger, the Bibliothèque Humaniste de Sélestat, and the Herzog August Bibliothek [HAB] for their assistance, the University of Saskatchewan for an administrative leave and research funding, the HAB for a fellowship, and my in-laws Eugene and the late Rose Henderson for their hospitality in Washington, D.C. This study is dedicated to the memory of Rose (d. 11 April 2007).

1. Betty I. Knott, in Desiderius Erasmus, *The Ciceronian: A Dialogue on the Ideal Latin Style*, trans. and annotated by Knott, *CWE*, vol. 28, pp. 323–448, 542–603, n.b. p. 334. Throughout this paper, *CWE* refers to the *Collected Works of Erasmus* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press): vols. 9 [based on Allen], 1989; 24, ed. Craig R. Thompson, 1978; 25–26, ed. J. Kelley Sowards, 1985; 27–28, ed. A.H.T. Levi, 1986; 39–40, ed. Craig R. Thompson, 1997; 61, ed. James F. Brady and John C. Olin, 1992; 84, ed. Nelson H. Minnich, 2005. Some references to *CWE* will appear in the main text in parentheses, e.g. (*CWE* 28: 384).
2. See John J. Bateman, "The Text of Erasmus' *De recta Latini Graecique sermonis pronuntiatione dialogus*," in *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Lovaniensis*, J. IJsewijn and E. Keßler, eds. *Humanistische Bibliothek: Abhandlungen*, 20 (Louvain: Leuven University Press and Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1973), pp. 49–75. See also introductions and

notes to critical editions of the dialogues in *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami* [ASD] (Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1969–) and in *CWE*: M. Cytowska, ed., *De recta latini graecique sermonis pronuntiatione*, ASD I-4, pp. 1–103; Maurice Pope, trans. and annotator, *The Right Way of Speaking Latin and Greek: A Dialogue*, *CWE*, vol. 26, pp. 348–62, 580–625; Pierre Mesnard, ed., *Dialogus Ciceronianus*, ASD I-2, pp. 153–579; Knott, *CWE*, vol. 28, pp. 324–36, 542–603. I have consulted the Froben press editions of March 1528 (Folger 219–706q; HAB H: P2048.8° Helmst. (1)), March 1529 (Sélestat 1145a–b; HAB 96.1 Rhet.), and March 1530 (Folger 186–319q, HAB S: Alv.: Cb 241 (1)), and the Scolar Press facsimile of the March 1528 edition in the Bodleian Library, Byw U 3.17 (2) (*De recta latini graecisqui [stet] sermonis pronuntiatione 1528*, European Linguistics 1480–1700: A Collection of Facsimile Reprints, selected and ed. by R. C. Alston, 1, Menston, Yorkshire: The Scolar Press Ltd., 1971). For the reader's convenience, I cite where appropriate the modern critical and/or facsimile editions. The *CWE* and *ASD* editions of the dialogues omit most of the works by Erasmus and others that originally accompanied them, but some of these minor works have appeared in other scholarly editions and studies, as noted below. Knott, *CWE*, vol. 28, p. 334, claims that Erasmus' *Epistola consolatoria in adversis* to the nuns of Denny, near Cambridge, was included in the first edition of the dialogues, but I find it neither in the Folger copy nor in the facsimile; and Allen (notes to Erasmus, *Ep.* 1925, an abridged edition of this letter), Bateman ("Text"), Cytowska, Mesnard (ASD, "Introduction"), and Pope do not mention publication of *Epistola consolatoria* with the dialogues. F. van der Haeghen (*Bibliotheca Erasmi* [Ghent 1983; rptd. Nieuwkoop: B. de Graaf, 1961]) dates its first edition 1527, a second edition 1528, both printed separately by the Froben press; Allen cites this 1528 edition, printed probably in time for the March fair at Frankfurt, and adds that Erasmus revised the letter slightly to appear with *De pueris instituendis* (Basel: Froben press, Sept. 1529). Perhaps Knott saw a copy of an early edition bound with the first edition of the dialogues, as it is in HAB H: P2048.8° Helmst.

3. On *De recta pronuntiatione*, see Augustin Renaudet, "Érasme et la prononciation des langues antiques," *BHR* 18 (1956), pp. 190–96; John J. Bateman, "Text" and "The Development of Erasmus' Views on the Correct Pronunciation of Latin and Greek," in *Classical Studies Presented to Ben Edwin Perry*, Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 58 (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1969), pp. 46–65; Cytowska; Jacques Chomarat, *Grammaire et rhétorique chez Erasme*, 2 vols. (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1981); Pope; Matthew Dillon, "The Erasmian Pronunciation of Ancient Greek: A New Perspective," *Classical World* 94 (2001), pp. 323–34. The evidence *De recta pronuntiatione* offers for Erasmus' knowledge and opinion of vernacular languages is discussed by Rachel Giese, "Erasmus' Knowledge and Estimate of the Vernacular Languages," *Romanic Review* 28 (1937), pp. 3–18; and Léon-E. Halkin, "Érasme et les langues," *Revue des langues vivantes*, 35 (1969), pp. 566–79. I have not had access to the seminal early studies of Ingram Bywater and Engelbert Drerup. On *Ciceronianus*, see: Remigio Sabbadini, *Storia del Ciceronianismo e di altre questioni letterarie nell'età della Ri-*

- nascenza (Torino: Ermanno Loescher, 1885), pp. 1–74; John Edwin Sandys, *Harvard Lectures on the Revival of Learning* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1905); Izora Scott, *Controversies Over the Imitation of Cicero in the Renaissance*, Contributions to Education 35 (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1910; rptd. David, CA: Hermagoras Press, 1991); Hermann Gmelin, “Das Prinzip der Imitatio in den romanischen Literaturen der Renaissance,” *Romanische Forschungen* 46 (1932), pp. 83–360; Carlo Angeleri, “Osservazioni critiche al ‘Ciceronianus’ di Erasmo,” *Atene e Roma*, ser. 3, vol. 6 (July–Sept. 1938), pp. 176–91; Walter Rüegg, *Cicero und der Humanismus* (Zurich, 1946); Mario Pomilio, “Una fonte italiana del Ciceronianus di Erasmo,” *Giornale italiano di filologia* 8 (1955), pp. 193–207; Angiolo Gambaro, ed., “Introduzione” to Desiderio Erasmo da Rotterdam, *Il Ciceroniano o dello stile migliore: Testo latino critico, traduzione italiana, prefazione, introduzione e note* (Brescia: La Scuola Editrice, 1965), pp. xix–cxii; Mesnard, “Introduction,” ASD I-2, pp. 583–96, and “La religion d’Érasme dans le ‘Ciceronianus,’” *Revue Thomiste* 68 (1968), pp. 267–72; Margaret Mann Phillips, “Erasmus and the Art of Writing,” *Scrinium Erasmianum* (Leiden, 1969) vol. 1, pp. 335–50; Emile V. Telle, ed., *L’Erasmianus sive Ciceronianus d’Étienne Dolet (1535)*, Travaux d’Humanisme et Renaissance 138 (Geneva: E. Droz, 1974); G. W. Pigman III, “Imitation and the Renaissance Sense of the Past: The Reception of Erasmus’ Ciceronianus,” *JMRS* 9 (1979), pp. 155–77; Chomarat, *Grammaire* and “Sur Erasme et Cicéron,” *Présence de Cicéron : Actes du Colloque des 25, 26 septembre 1962, hommage au R. P. M. Testard*, ed. R. Chevallier, Caesarodunum, 19 bis. (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1984), pp. 117–27; G. Chantraine, “Langage et théologie selon le Ciceronianus d’Érasme,” *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Bononiensis* (Binghamton: MRTS, 1985), pp. 216–23; Silvana Seidel Menchi, *Erasmus in Italia 1520–1580*, Nuova cultura 1 (Torino: Bollati Boringhieri, 1987); John W. O’Malley, “Grammar and Rhetoric in the ‘Pietas’ of Erasmus,” *JMRS* 18 (1988), pp. 81–98; Erika Rummel, *Erasmus and His Catholic Critics*, 2 vols. Bibliotheca Humanistica & Reformatorica 45 (Nieuwkoop: De Graaf, 1989), vol. 2, pp. 140–46; Luca D’Ascia, *Erasmus e l’Umanesimo romano*, Biblioteca della Rivista di Storia e Letteratura Religiosa, Studi 11 (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1991); Kenneth Gouwens, “Ciceronianism and Collective Identity: Defining the Boundaries of the Roman Academy, 1525,” *JMRS* 23 (1993), pp. 173–95; John Monfasani, “Erasmus, the Roman Academy, and Ciceronianism: Battista Casali’s Invective,” *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook*, 17 (1997), pp. 19–54; J. D. Müller, “Warum Cicero ? Erasmus ‘Ciceronianus’ und das Problem der Autorität,” *Scientia poetica* 3 (1999), pp. 20–46; Christine Bénévent, “Singes et fils de Cicéron (Érasme et Scaliger),” *Nouvelle Revue du Seizième Siècle* 19.2 (2001), pp. 5–23.
4. The studies by Bateman discussed below are a notable exception to this generalization.
 5. Allen’s *Opus epistolarum* is only one of many critical editions that arrange humanist correspondence chronologically. See Erasmus, *Opus epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami*, eds. P. S. Allen, H. M. Allen, and H. W. Garrod, 11 vols. and index (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906–58). Editors are now questioning such arrangements

- and beginning to analyze and edit the humanists' own letter collections. See Peter G. Bietenholz, "Erasmus and the German Public, 1518–1520: The Authorized and Unauthorized Circulation of his Correspondence," *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 8.2 (1977), pp. 61–78; Helene Harth, "Eine kritische Ausgabe der Privatbriefe Poggio Bracciolinis," *Wolfenbütteler Renaissance Mitteilungen*, 2 (1978), pp. 71–75; Lucia Gualdo Rosa, "La pubblicazione degli epistolari umanistici : bilancio e prospettive," *Bullettino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo e Archivio Muratoriano*, No. 89 (Roma 1980–81), pp. 369–92; Léon-E. Halkin, *Erasmus ex Erasmo : Érasme éditeur de sa correspondance* (Aubel, Belgium: P. M. Gason, 1983); Jozef IJsewijn, "Marcus Antonius Muretus epistolographus," in *La Correspondance d'Érasme et l'épistolographie humaniste : Colloque international tenu en novembre 1983*, Travaux de l'Institut Inter-universitaire pour l'étude de la Renaissance et de l'Humanisme, 8 (Brussels : Editions de l'Université de Bruxelles, 1985), pp. 183–91; Lisa Jardine, "Before Clarissa: Erasmus, 'Letters of Obscure Men', and Epistolary Fictions" in *Self-Presentation and Social Identification: The Rhetoric and Pragmatics of Letter Writing in Early Modern Times*, eds. Toon Van Houdt, Jan Papy, Gilbert Tournoy, Constant Matheussen, Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia, 18 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), pp. 385–403. On Erasmus' collaboration with his publishers, see S. Diane Shaw, "A Study of the Collaboration Between Erasmus of Rotterdam and His Printer Johann Froben at Basel During the Years 1514 to 1527," *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook*, 6 (1986), pp. 31–124; Lisa Jardine, *Erasmus, Man of Letters: The Construction of Charisma in Print* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993). On the strategic selection of works for a book, see also Lisa Jardine, "Penfriends and Patria: Erasmian Pedagogy and the Republic of Letters," *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook* 16 (1996), pp. 1–18; Charles Witke, "Erasmus Auctor et Actor," *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook*, 15 (1995), pp. 26–52.
6. The March 1530 edition is the last to which Erasmus made major changes. Some scholars describe this as the third Froben press edition of *De recta pronuntiatione* and the fourth Froben press edition of *Ciceronianus*, but Bateman ("Text," p. 61) asserts, "The sheets of all the gatherings or quires except the last one are the unsold sheets of the October 1529 edition." The printers reprinted Sig. H "in order to incorporate in it three pages of errata" and in the process "produced a new colophon." Thus Erasmus had a hand in "only two editions of the *De Recta Pronuntiatione* and three editions of the *Ciceronianus*," including the one published with his *Colloquia*.
 7. Bateman, "Text," pp. 52, 54–56. Bateman explains these interruptions as caused by Erasmus' need in January and February 1528 to deal with Heinrich Eppendorff's charge against him of character defamation.
 8. Bateman, "Text," p. 60. More precisely, Agricola's oration fills E8v–F7v. Without this oration, the colophon (F8r, verso blank) could have occupied E8v.
 9. Bateman, "Text," p. 60.
 10. Epp. 1964, 1975. (Throughout this paper I will be citing the *Opus epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami* [Allen, Allen, and Garrod, eds] for Erasmus' letters, with the ab-

- breviation *Ep* or *Epp*, followed by the letter number(s)—at times in parentheses in the main text. Letters from other sources will be given more complete references). To Vlaten, Erasmus wrote, “Qvod pro Pronunciatione dicarim Ciceronianum, consilio factum est; id arbitror tibi probari. Quod autem separatim excusus non est, incuria typographorum factum est; sed nihil refert. Opinor enim hos libellos frequenter ab aliis excudendos: tum id poterit corrigi...”. *Ep*. 1975, ll. 1–5.
11. “Simul, atque eodem, vt ita loquar, nixu, nuper emisimus duos libellos” (*Ep*. 2088, ll. 3–4). Knott translates, “I recently published two books at the same time, both at the one birth so to speak” (*CWE*, vol. 28, p. 338).
 12. Bateman, “Development,” pp. 46–47 and n. 3. “Scripturam enim ineptam eadem sequuntur incommoda, quae malam pronuntiationem. Vel Ciceronis orationem scribe literis Gotticis, soloecam dices ac barbaram”. (*ASD* I-4, p. 34, ll. 654–55; trans. Pope: “Again, the consequences of a clumsy handwriting are much the same as the consequences of a faulty pronunciation. Write a speech of Cicero’s in Gothic letters, and even Cicero will seem uneducated and barbarous” (*CWE*, vol. 26, pp. 390–91).
 13. Manfred Hoffmann, “Language and Reconciliation: Erasmus’ Ecumenical Attitude,” *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook*, 15 (1995), pp. 71–95.
 14. Bateman, “Development,” p. 59; cf. his appended edition of the note, recording all variants, pp. 61–65.
 15. Bateman, “Development,” pp. 55, 49.
 16. Rummel, vol. 1, pp. 2, 191.
 17. Shaw, pp. 50–51.
 18. Jardine, “Penfriends,” p. 12 and n. 26; *Ep*. 224. As Allen notes, Wimpfeling expresses his approval of Erasmus’ satire in spite of his own “recent defence of theology... against poetry in its less moral forms,” *Contra turpem libellum Philomusi Defensio theologiae scholasticae et neotericorum* (s.l. et a.; preface dated 28 July 1510).
 19. Translation by Jardine, “Penfriends,” p. 13; her italics.
 20. James D. Tracy, “Erasmus Becomes a German,” *Renaissance Quarterly*, 21 (1968), pp. 281–82. Jardine (“Penfriends,” pp. 14–15) suggests there may be several “unauthorized” Schürer editions before the 1514 revised edition of *De copia* and notes that Murrho’s letter asserts the claim of *Germania* to Erasmus over *Gallia*, where he studied at Paris. That Alsace belonged to ancient *Germania* was a theme of Wimpfeling’s *Germania*: see Barbara Könniker, “Jakob Wimpfeling of Sélestat, 25 July 1450–15 November 1528,” Bietenholz and Deutscher, vol. 3, pp. 447–50. (Throughout this paper, “Bietenholz and Deutscher” refers to *Contemporaries of Erasmus: A Biographical Register of the Renaissance and Reformation*, eds. Peter G. Bietenholz and Thomas B. Deutscher, 3 vols. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985–87). On a debate about whether the island of the Batavians was part of ancient *Gallia* or *Germania*, see two articles by Ari Wesseling: “Are the Dutch Uncivilized? Erasmus on the Batavians and His National Identity,” *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook* 13 (1993), pp. 68–102; “Or Else I Become a Gaul: A Note on Erasmus and the German Reformation,” *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook*, 15 (1995), pp. 96–98.

21. *Ep.* 311, trans. Knott, *CWE*, vol. 24, pp. 288–89. On Schürer's project to publish Agricola, see Jardine, *Erasmus*, pp. 88–89.
22. Jardine, "Penfriends," pp. 3, 6, 13; *Epp.* 302, 305.
23. Shaw, pp. 47, 53–57; John C. Olin, "Introduction to Erasmus," *CWE*, vol. 61, pp. xix–xx.
24. Tracy, p. 281.
25. Allen, *Ep.* 337.
26. The surviving letters are in *Epp.* 304, 337, 347; St. Thomas More, *Selected Letters*, ed. Elizabeth Frances Rogers, The Yale Edition of the Works of St. Thomas More, Modernized Series (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961) 4 [15]. Erasmus drafted his first reply in late May 1515, revising it for publication with *Damiani Senensis elegeia*, Basel, August 1515. Dorp supervised the publication of his own first letter and Erasmus' reply in the second printing of Erasmus' *Enarratio in primum psalmum* (Louvain: Th. Martens, October 1515). See Jardine, *Erasmus*, pp. 111–12.
27. Daniel Kinney, "More's Letter to Dorp: Remapping the Trivium," *Renaissance Quarterly*, 34 (1981), pp. 179–80. On the professional convenience of the Erasmus-More friendship, see: Thomas I. White, "Legend and Reality: The Friendship Between More and Erasmus," *Supplementum Festivum: Studies in Honor of Paul Oskar Kristeller*, eds. James Hankins, et al., Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 49 (Binghamton, NY: MRTS, 1987), pp. 489–504.
28. Jardine, *Erasmus*, pp. 118–19.
29. Shaw, p. 35.
30. Jardine, *Erasmus*, pp. 110–22.
31. Shaw, p. 35.
32. Jardine, *Erasmus*, pp. 55–56, 85–95, 38.
33. Marcel A Nauwelaerts, "Pieter Gillis of Antwerp, c 1486–6 (or 11) November 1533)," Bietenholz and Deutscher, vol. 2, pp. 99–101.
34. Jardine, *Erasmus*, pp. 95–128.
35. Jozef IJsewijn, "Maarten van Dorp of Naaldwijk, 1485–31 May 1525," Bietenholz and Deutscher, vol. 1, pp. 398–404.
36. Rummel, my principal source for this survey, provides a useful "Chronological Chart of Erasmus' Controversies," vol. 2, pp. 193–95.
37. Gordon Griffiths, "Louis de Berquin d 17 April 1529," Bietenholz and Deutscher, vol. 1, pp. 135–40.
38. Rummel, vol. 1, pp. 146–47, 152.
39. Bateman, "Development," pp. 56–58.
40. Rummel, vol. 1, pp. 161–64.
41. Seidel Menchi, *Erasmus*, pp. 41–67.
42. *Ep.* 1791; see Gambaro, pp. xxx–xxxi. Olivar, born in Valencia, had met Erasmus at Louvain and had been warmly received in England by members of the Erasman circle there. By January 1524 he had entered the service of a diplomat, "conceivably Girolamo Aleandro," at the imperial court in Brussels and in 1527 had followed the

- court to Valladolid. See Milagros Rivera and Peter G. Bietenholz, "Pedro Juan Olivar of Valencia, d after 8 January 1553," Bietenholz and Deutscher vol. 3, pp. 31–32.
43. John F. D'Amico, *Renaissance Humanism in Papal Rome: Humanists and Churchmen on the Eve of the Reformation*, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983), pp. 115–43.
 44. Kenneth Gouwens, *Remembering the Renaissance: Humanist Narratives of the Sack of Rome*, Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, 85 (Leiden: Brill, 1998).
 45. Gambaro, pp. xxx–xxxi.
 46. See Charles Trinkaus, "Lorenzo Valla of Rome, 1407–1 August 1457," Bietenholz and Deutscher, vol. 3, pp. 371–75. Trinkaus observes, "It seems incontrovertible that, of all the Italian humanists, Lorenzo Valla's influence on Erasmus was the most complete and most profound" (p. 374).
 47. On Erasmus' notes pirated as *Brevissima maximeque compendiaria conficiendarum epistolarum formula* (Basel? Adam Petri? 1519–20?) and the extracts from a manuscript draft of Erasmus' *Opus de conscribendis epistolis* (Basel: Froben, 1522) in Johannes Despauterius's *Syntaxis* (Paris: Josse Bade, 1509), see my two papers: "The Enigma of Erasmus' *Conficiendarum epistolarum formula*," *Renaissance and Reformation*, n.s. 13 (1989), pp. 313–30; and "Despauterius' *Syntaxis* (1509): The Earliest Publication of Erasmus' *De conscribendis epistolis*," *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 37 (1988), pp. 175–210.
 48. ASD IV-3, p. 128, ll. 64–67.
 49. Cited in John Monfasani, "Erasmus, the Roman Academy, and Ciceronianism: Battista Casali's Invective," *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook*, 17 (1997), p. 27.
 50. Translation by John Olin, cited in Laurel Carrington, "Impiety Compounded: Scaliger's Double-Edged Critique of Erasmus," *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook* 22 (2002), pp. 58–59.
 51. *Ep.* 531, ll. 445–48; published in Erasmus' collection *Aliquot epistole* (Louvain: Th. Martens, April 1517). See Guy Gueudet, *L'Art de la lettre humaniste*, Textes réunis par Francine Wild (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2004), p. 594, n. 702.
 52. Marie-Madeleine de la Garanderie, "Christophe de Longueil c 1488–11 September 1522," Bietenholz and Deutscher, vol. 2, pp. 342–45.
 53. Thomas B. Deutscher, "Battista Casali of Rome, c 1473–13 April 1525," Bietenholz and Deutscher, vol. 1, pp. 276–77.
 54. MS Milano, Ambros. MS G 33 inf., Part II, fols. 82v–87v, edited and translated by John Monfasani in "Erasmus, the Roman Academy, and Ciceronianism: Battista Casali's Invective," *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook*, 17 (1997), pp. 31–54 (the quotation in the main text is from p. 43). Monfasani corrects Seidel Menchi who ascribed to Casali the anonymous letter to Erasmus—in the same manuscript, Part I, fols. 137r–138r—acknowledging receipt of Erasmus' paraphrase of Matthew and promising to help Erasmus at Rome against charges that he supported Luther. See Silvana Seidel Menchi, "Alcuni atteggiamenti della cultura italiana di fronte a Erasmo (1520–1536)," *Eresia e riforma nell'Italia del Cinquecento*, Corpus reformatorum italicorum, Miscellanea 1 (Florence: G. C. Sansoni and Chicago: The Newberry Library, 1974), pp.

- 71–133. Monfasani believes that Casali composed the letter, but on behalf of someone in the College of Cardinals; he accepts Seidel Menchi's date of spring 1522 for the anonymous letter but not her date of 1524 for Casali's invective. For the text of the letter, see Monfasani, p. 24 n. 27; Seidel Menchi, "Alcuni atteggiamenti," p. 129; trans. R.A.B. Mynors and D.F.S. Thomson, *CWE* 9: *Ep* 1270A; *La correspondance d'Erasmus*, traduite et annoté sous la direction d'Aloïs Gerlo et Paul Foriers d'après... Allen, 10 vols. (Brussels: Presses académiques européennes; Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval, 1967–84), vol. 5, pp. 49–51.
55. *Ep* 1479; cf. 1482. Erasmus' description of Casali in *Ciceronianus* is not unflattering (*CWE*, vol. 28, p. 436), but neither is his description of Pontano immediately following.
 56. Chris L. Heesakkers, "Erasmus' Suspicions of Aleander as the Instigator of Alberto Pio," *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Torontonensis*, ed. Alexander Dalzell, Charles Fantazzi, and Richard J. Schoeck, *Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies* 86 (Binghamton, NY: MRTS, 1991), pp. 371–83, esp. p. 373 where Heesakkers cites Erasmus, *Ep* 1719.
 57. M. J. C. Lowry, "Girolamo Aleandro of Motta, 13 February 1480–1 February 1542," *Bietenholz and Deutscher*, vol. 1, pp. 28–32.
 58. Heesakkers, "Erasmus' Suspicions," p. 375.
 59. Martin Lowry, *The World of Aldus Manutius: Business and Scholarship in Renaissance Venice* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1979; rpt. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979), pp. 195–96; on Colocci's support of this academy, see p. 204; on Pio, see two articles by Myron P. Gilmore: "Erasmus and Alberto Pio, Prince of Carpi," in *Action and Conviction in Early Modern Europe: Essays in Memory of E. H. Harbison*, eds. T. K. Rabb and J. E. Seigel (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969), pp. 299–318; and "Italian Reactions to Erasmian Humanism," in *Itinerarium Italicum: The Profile of the Italian Renaissance in the Mirror of Its European Transformations*, ed. Heiko A. Oberman with Thomas A. Brady, Jr., *Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought*, 14 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975), pp. 70–84. See also Sem Dresden, "'Paraphrase' et 'Commentaire' d'après Erasme et Alberto Pio," in *Società, politica e cultura a Carpi ai tempi di Alberto Pio: Atti del Convegno Internazionale (Carpi, 19–21 maggio 1978)*, ed. Cesare Vasoli (Padua: Editrice Antenore, 1981), vol. 1, pp. 207–24; Jean-Claude Margolin, "Alberto Pio et les cicéroniens italiens," in Vasoli, vol. 1, pp. 225–59; Seidel Menchi, "La discussione su Erasmo nell'Italia del Rinascimento: Ambrogio Flandino vescovo a Mantova, Ambrogio Quistelli teologo padovano e Alberto Pio principe di Carpi," in Vasoli, vol. 1, pp. 291–382; Marco Bernuzzi and Thomas B. Deutscher, "Alberto Pio prince of Carpi, 23 July 1475–7 January 1531," *Bietenholz and Deutscher*, vol. 3, p. 87; Nelson H. Minnich, "Some Underlying Factors in the Erasmus-Pio Debate," *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook*, 13 (1993), pp. 1–43, and *CWE*, vol. 84.
 60. See Bernuzzi and Deutscher, pp. 87–88; Lowry, "Aleandro," pp. 31–32; Rummel, vol. 2, pp. 115–23.

61. Eugenio Massa found "Racha" in the papers of Giles of Viterbo. See Massa, "Intorno ad Erasmo: Una polemica che si credeva perduta," *Classical, Medieval, and Renaissance Studies in Honor of Berthold Louis Ullman*, ed. Charles Henderson, Jr. (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1964), pp. 435–54. See also Rummel, vol. 2, pp. 111–12. On Aleandro, see Lowry, "Aleandro"; Rummel, vol. 2, pp. 108–13; Heesakkers, "Erasmus' Suspicions."
62. Minnich, "Introduction to Erasmus," *CWE*, vol. 84, pp. lvi–lviii, lxxv.
63. Lowry, "Aleandro," pp. 31–32; Minnich, *CWE*, vol. 84, pp. xcix, cix–cx.
64. Chomarat, *Grammaire*, vol. 1, pp. 347–51. Nebrija took a philological approach to biblical study similar to Erasmus' own and experienced some difficulties in Spain as a result. However, he was invited by Cardinal Jiménez to join the Complutensian editors. Erasmus praised him to Juan Luis Vives and in the controversy with Stunica: see Arsenio Pacheco, "Elio Antonio de Nebrija, 1441/1444–2 July 1522," Bietenholz and Deutscher, vol. 3, p. 10.
65. Bateman, "Development," pp. 51.
66. Bateman, "Text," pp. 49–50; Chomarat, *Grammaire*, vol. 1, 352–53.
67. Lowry, "Aleandro," pp. 29–30.
68. Chomarat, *Grammaire*, vol. 1, pp. 353–54.
69. Chomarat, *Grammaire*, vol. 1, pp. 358, 365–70.
70. Dillon, pp. 324–25.
71. Chomarat, *Grammaire*, vol. 1, p. 356.
72. Peter G. Bietenholz, "Adolph of Burgundy d 7 December 1540," Bietenholz and Deutscher, vol. 1, pp. 223–24; and "Maximilian (II) of Burgundy 28 July 1514–4 June 1558," Bietenholz and Deutscher, vol. 1, pp. 227–28.
73. Trans. Pope, *CWE*, vol. 26, p. 365. Evidence from vernacular languages is central to this dialogue's argument, but the element of animal fable depends on little more than the names of the interlocutors, which could easily have been a late addition. The discussion between animals about how to make Lion's cub fully human is at best whimsical, at worst inconsistent. Perhaps, as Bateman speculates in "Text," p. 53, Erasmus' decision to dedicate the work to Maximilian was "a last-minute thought," since in Erasmus' previous letter to him of January 4, 1528 (*Ep.* 1927) "there is not the slightest hint of this possibility." On the other hand, as noted toward the end of my paper, Erasmus had been collaborating with the Dutch scholar Jacobus Ceratinus, tutor to Maximilian's youngest brother Henry of Burgundy and author of a brief treatise on ancient pronunciation. Moreover, not all Erasmus' correspondence was published, and some messages were no doubt communicated by the letter carriers.
74. Nicola Kaminski, "'Initio Davum agam' oder Die folgenreiche Verwechslung von simulatio und dissimulatio. Inszenierung humanistischer imitatio-Diskussion im *Ciceronianus* des Erasmus von Rotterdam," *Künste und Natur in Diskursen der Frühen Neuzeit*, Wolfenbütteler Arbeiten zur Barochforschung 35 (Weisbaden: Harrassowitz, 2000), p. 314. Kaminski cites Thomas Greene (*The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982], p. 183)

and Pigman. See also Kees Meerhoff, *Rhétorique et poétique au xvr^e siècle en France: Du Bellay, Ramus et les autres* (Leiden: Brill, 1986). On the other hand, Ciceronianism was compatible with championship of the vernacular, as the example of Pietro Bembo demonstrates. Moreover, Erasmus must have recognized that Luther's powerful vernacular rhetoric was exacerbating the Church schism.

75. Chomarat, *Grammaire*, vol. 1, p. 356.
76. Benoît Beaulieu, "Utilité des lettres, selon Érasme," *Études littéraires* (August 1971), pp. 163–74.
77. Gambaro, pp. xxix–xxxi.
78. *CWE*, vol. 26, p. 472; Chomarat, *Grammaire*, vol. 1, p. 356.
79. David Marsh, *The Quattrocento Dialogue: Classical Tradition and Humanist Innovation* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980).
80. Erasmus alludes to Cicero's *Brutus* when he describes his Italian humanist friend Andrea Alciati in the catalogue of contemporary authors in *Ciceronianus*: "They [scholars] are prepared to apply to this man in both its parts the compliment that Cicero divided between Quintus Scaevola and Lucius Crassus, calling Crassus the speaker with most knowledge of the law, and Scaevola the lawyer with most ability as a speaker" (*CWE*, vol. 28, p. 419).
81. *Ep.* 1390. Monfasani suggests, "Erasmus had expressed his reservations about Cicero in comparison with St. Jerome as early as 1500," but "in the early and mid-1520s, Erasmus had started to express a more favorable view of Cicero, if not of Ciceronians. That all changed after 1524" when he first learned of Italian reactions to his editions of Jerome and the *New Testament* (Monfasani, pp. 27–28, citing *Ep.* 1479 to Hajo Hermann). Monfasani's chronology of Erasmus' response to Ciceronianism is important. On Erasmus' fundamental admiration for Cicero, especially his moral philosophy, see however, Mesnard, "La Religion"; Charles Béné, "Érasme et Cicéron," in *Colloquia Erasmi Turonensia: Douzième Stage International d'Études Humanistes, Tours 1969*, ed. Jean-Claude Margolin (Paris: J. Vrin; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972). vol. 2, pp. 571–79; Giulio Vallese, "Érasme et Cicéron: Les lettres-préfaces au 'De officiis' et aux 'Tusculanes,'" in Margolin, ed. vol. 1, pp. 241–46; Pigman; Chomarat, "Sur Erasme et Cicéron"; Albert Rabil, Jr., "Cicero and Erasmus' Moral Philosophy," *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook*, 8 (1988), pp. 70–90.
82. In subsequent years Vlaten would work toward Erasmian educational and religious reform: see Anton J. Gail, "Johann von Vlaten d 11 June 1562," Bietenholz and Deutscher, vol. 3, pp. 414–16.
83. *CWE*, vol. 26, p. 472; Chomarat, *Grammaire*, vol. 1, p. 356.
84. To Marcantonio Flaminio, Longueil writes, "... insigni illa batavi oratoris stultitia": cited by Charles Fantazzi, "Vives versus Erasmus on the Art of Letter-Writing," in Van Houdt, et al. eds, p. 52 n. 47, from *Christophori Longoli orationes duae pro defensione sua. Eiusdem epistolarum libri quattuor* (Florence: heirs of Philippus Junta, 1524), fol. 148.

85. On Erasmus' comparison of Budé and Bade, its contexts, the reactions it produced in France, and his modification of the passage in the second edition of *Ciceronianus*, see Knott in *CWE*, vol. 28, pp. 330–32, 420–21, and 586–87 nn. 672–76.
86. *CWE*, vol. 28, pp. 429; 595 nn. 757–59; Fantazzi, "Vives versus Erasmus," pp. 50–54.
87. Jardine, *Erasmus*, p. 138; *CWE*, vol. 28, pp. 426; 592 nn. 721–22.
88. On the gap between Erasmus' ideals and his behaviour in controversy, see especially Rummel; and Hoffmann, pp. 71–95. On the effects of the Sack of Rome on Italian scholarship, see Gouwens, *Remembering*.
89. Glareanus was a prominent Swiss humanist and director of a private residential school at Basel. He strongly supported Erasmus' theological writings and religious views. See Fritz Büsser, "Henricus Glareanus of Glarus, June 1488–27/8 March 1563," Bietenholz and Deutscher, vol. 2, pp. 105–08. When the Reform movement conquered Basel, Glareanus left to seek refuge in Freiburg im Breisgau on 13 April 1529 and was followed soon after by Erasmus, whom Glareanus calls "*parens ac praeceptor noster*" (cited in Jean-Claude Margolin, "Un échange de correspondance humaniste à la veille de la Réforme : Henri Glaréan—Oswald Myconius (1517–1524)," in *La Correspondance d'Erasmus et l'épistolographie humaniste : Colloque international tenu en novembre 1983*, p. 151 n. 43). In *Ciceronianus*, Erasmus mentioned his efforts in "philosophy and mathematical disciplines" (*CWE*, vol. 28, p. 428; cf. n. 745). Bertholf, born at Ledeberg near Ghent, had served for many years as one of Erasmus' *famuli* but by 1527 had returned to Ghent and married: see Franz Bierlaire and Peter G. Bietenholz, "Hilarius Bertholf of Ledeberg, d. c. August 1533," Bietenholz and Deutscher, vol. 1, pp. 141–42. In *Ciceronianus*, Erasmus used the names of Bertholf and another of his assistants, Lieven Algoet, in an example of an epistolary salutation that was un-Ciceronian because it referred to "everlasting salvation" (*CWE*, vol. 28, p. 372; cf. notes 215, 216), but neither name appears in Nosoponus's review of contemporary candidates for the title "Ciceronian."
90. Olin, *CWE*, vol. 61, pp. xix–xx; Manfred E. Welte, "Bruno Amerbach of Basel, 9 December 1484–22 October 1519," Bietenholz and Deutscher, vol. 1, p. 46.
91. Common friends of Erasmus and Symons included Vives and Conradus Goclenius: see Peter G. Bietenholz, "Jan of Heemstede documented in Louvain 1520–33," Bietenholz and Deutscher, vol. 2, p. 171. Vives was serving in 1527 and 1528 in the English Court as tutor to Princess Mary under Queen Catherine of Aragon's patronage, until King Henry VIII's "Great Matter" of divorce led to Vives's house arrest from 25 February to 1 April 1528 and his eventual return to Bruges. See Thomas B. Deutscher, "Juan Luis Vives of Valencia, 6 March 1492–6 May 1540," Bietenholz and Deutscher, vol. 3, pp. 409–13. Goclenius was a professor at the Collegium Trilingue and Erasmus' "closest friend in Louvain": see Godelieve Tournoy-Thoen, "Conradus Goclenius of Mengerlinghausen, d. 25 January 1539," Bietenholz and Deutscher, vol. 2, pp. 109–11.
92. *Epitaphia Dorpiana serius accipis fortasse quam expectaras, sed tamen cum fœnore, quod moram excuset* (D7v : *Ep.* 1900, ll. 130–31). C. Reekijk, *The Poems of Desiderius*

- Erasmus* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1956), edits Erasmus' epitaphs on Dorp and Volkaerd, 113–14, as well as on Froben, 116–17, and Amerbach, 108.
93. Bateman, "Text," p. 60.
 94. Allen edits the letter to Uutenhove from the edition in its March 1530 state. Bateman, "Text," p. 74 n. 36, notes that in both the October 1529 and March 1530 states, "the letter to Utenhoven ends on page H2v."
 95. Ilse Guenther, "Jacob Volkaerd of Geertruidenberg, d before March 1528," *Bietenholz and Deutscher*, vol. 3, p. 417.
 96. One *Epitaphium* is "wrongly ascribed to Vives" and another is "by him, but wrongly printed as a running text," according to Henry de Vocht, who catalogues publications of the tributes to Dorp in *Monumenta Humanistica Lovaniensia: Texts and Studies about Louvain Humanists in the First Half of the XVIth Century*, Humanistica Lovaniensia, 4 (Louvain: Librairie Universitaire, 1934), p. 286 n. 55. Vocht cites the epitaphs Vives himself sent to Frans van Cranevelt and Vives's objection to the incorrect ascription to him of the first of the epitaphs published by Froben: for these, see Vocht, ed., *Litterae virorum eruditorum ad Franciscum Craneveldium, 1522–1528, A Collection of Original Letters Edited from the Manuscripts and Illustrated with Notes and Commentaries*, Humanistica Lovaniensia, 1 (Louvain: Librairie Universitaire, Uystpruyst publisher, 1928), epp. 175–76; 261 ll. 31–35. As Vocht's *MHL* note shows, Cranevelt's correspondence includes several letters discussing Dorp's death, including one in which Alaard of Amsterdam sends Maarten Lips a "*carmen*" on Dorp in 1525, suggesting that Lips also publish a tribute. Erasmus replied in June 1525 to Adrianus Cornelii Barlandus's report of Dorp's death (*Ep.* 1584).
 97. On Goclenius and Vives, see note above; on Alaardus, see Peter G. Bietenholz, "Alaard of Amsterdam 1491–c 28 August 1544," *Bietenholz and Deutscher*, vol. 1, pp. 19–21. Cranevelt was a member of the grand council at Mechelen who had formerly lived and probably taught privately at Louvain. He met Erasmus through Dorp and was in turn introduced by Erasmus to More. In his friendly correspondence with Cranevelt, Erasmus discusses the controversies and financial difficulties that plagued him at Louvain, as well as Luther's marriage and King Henry VIII's divorce. See C. G. van Leijenhurst, "Frans van Cranevelt of Nijmegen, 3 February 1485–8 September 1564," *Bietenholz and Deutscher*, vol. 1, pp. 354–55. Barlandus, who since February 1526 had been professor of eloquence (*rhetor publicus*) at Louvain, was a prolific writer whose works show strong Erasmian influence, not least of all in his anthology of Lucian's dialogues in Erasmus' translation (1512), catalogue of Erasmus' writings (1516), edition of Erasmus' letters (1520), and *Epitome* of his *Adagia* (1521).
 98. *CWE*, vol. 28, p. 422. In the 1528 *Ciceronianus* Erasmus also praises Goclenius and Barlandus. Bulephorus comments on "the lucidity and ease characteristic of Cicero's style" in the writings of Barlandus. Nosoponus calls Goclenius "an ornament" to the Collegium Trilingue at Louvain and to "the whole university, fine centre of learning that it is" (*CWE*, vol. 28, pp. 424, 426).

99. Brie had also initiated friendships with Aleandro and Bembo in Venice. In Italy he became archdeacon of Albi through the patronage of Louis d'Amboise, bishop of Albi, and after returning to France in 1510, served the chancellor, Jean de Ganay, and the queen, Anne of Brittany. Erasmus had worked with Budé to patch a quarrel between Brie and More over Brie's poem celebrating French naval warfare against England. He had also encouraged Brie's translations of St. John Chrysostom after having read his translation of *De sacerdotio* in May 1525. See Marie-Madeleine de la Garanderie, "Germain de Brie of Auxerre, d 22 July 1538," Bietenholz and Deutscher, vol. 1, pp. 200–02.
100. Jardine, *Erasmus*, p. 90.
101. Bateman comments that Erasmus seems to have discovered and edited this work himself, but notes that "he may have received the manuscript from Alard along with the latter's poems on Martin Dorp which are also printed in the book" ("Text," p. 60 and p. 73 n. 26). Erasmus' relations with Alard had soured about 1519 (Bietenholz, "Alard"). That perhaps makes the inclusion of his poems on Dorp all the more remarkable as an expression of unity among the humanists associated with the Martens press at Louvain.
102. Jardine, *Erasmus*, p. 90 and p. 239, n. 51, citing his *Opera omnia*, ed. Clericus, Leiden 1703–1706, I, 1013D–1014A.
103. "Hanc orationem forte nacti cæteris adiecimus, quod nihil sit eius uiri, quamuis ex tempore, quamuis alieno stomacho scriptum, quod non diuinitatem quandam præ se ferat. Quo magis admiror esse qui lucubrationes illius uel premant uel perire sinant. Aliquoties durius utitur pronomine. Id quoniam sciebam librariorum incuria non esse commissum, mutare nolui." See Scholar Press facsimile, F7v, p. 462; translation mine.
104. See Allen's notes (*Epp.* 1900, 2088). The March 1529 edition adds by Cornarius two tributes to Froben—one in Latin, one in Greek—as well as his Latin epitaph on Wimpfeling. The Greek epitaph on Wimpfeling that follows this is signed only *Ἀντοσχεδιῶς* ("improvised"). A scholar originally from Zwickau who had immersed himself in Greek medicine, Cornarius was in Basel from 1528 to 1530 obtaining what work he could find from its printers. See Ilse Guenther, "Janus Cornarius of Zwickau, c 1500–16 March 1558," Bietenholz and Deutscher, vol. 1, pp. 339–40.
105. Bonifacius was the brother of Bruno and son of Johann Amerbach, the Basel printer who had planned the edition of Church Fathers that the Froben press continued through the work of Erasmus and others: see Manfred E. Welte, "Bonifacius Amerbach of Basel, 11 October 1495–24/25 April 1562," Bietenholz and Deutscher, vol. 1, pp. 42–46.
106. Virginia W. Callahan, "Andrea Alciati of Milan, 8 May 1492–12 January 1550," Bietenholz and Deutscher, vol. 1, pp. 23–26.
107. Cited by Callahan in "Alciati."
108. Virginia W. Callahan, "Erasmus: An Emblematic Portrait by Andrea Alciati," *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook*, 9 (1989), pp. 73–90.

109. Jardine, "Penfriends," p. 11 n. 24, alerted me to Wesseling, "Are the Dutch Uncivilized?" Cf. his subsequent note, "Or Else I Become a Gaul."
110. *Nomine sic morum, linguae & pro aetate politae/Nullus Teutonico notior orbe fuit*: Erasmus, *Familiarium colloquiorum opus*, Froben, March 1529, q6r. My translation of "pro aetate politae" fits Erasmus' comment on Wimpfeling in *Ciceronianus* that like Reuchlin, "his style was redolent of his age, which was still rather rough and unpolished" (CWE, vol. 28, p. 427). The version of Beatus' epitaph in *Briefwechsel des Beatus Rhenanus*, Adalbert Horawitz and Karl Hartfelder, eds. (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1966 [facsimile of the Leipzig, 1886 edition], pp. 621–22, is taken from "Riegger, Amoenit. liter. Friburg. II. p. 166" and differs from the March 1529 and March 1530 Froben editions.
111. Mario Pomilio, "Una fonte italiana del *Ciceronianus* di Erasmo," *Giornale italiano di filologia* 8 (1955), pp. 193–207.
112. Fantazzi, "Vives versus Erasmus," p. 50.
113. Danilo Aguzzi-Barbagli, "Pietro Bembo of Venice, 20 May 1470–18 January 1547," Bietenholz and Deutscher, vol. 1, pp. 120–23.
114. See Allen, *Ep.* 2106; Franz Bierlaire, "Karel Uutenhove of Ghent, documented c. 1524–77," Bietenholz and Deutscher, vol. 3, pp. 362–63.
115. Aguzzi-Barbagli, "Bembo," p. 122.
116. In order of contents, this edition in its two states contains the original dedication to Maximilian of Burgundy, the revised *De recta pronuntiatione*, the dedication to Vlaten (revised according to Allen, *Ep.* 1948), the *Ciceronianus* revised yet again, the revised *Deploratio mortis Ioannis Frobenii* with epitaphs on Froben, including a new one in Hebrew by Sebastian Munster, Erasmus' epitaph on Bruno Amerbach, Agricola's *Oratio* with the appended note, Erasmus' letter of explanation to Vlaten, the tributes to Wimpfeling, and finally, the letter to Uutenhove, *Ep.* 2209. Except for adding the Hebrew epitaph and letter, it follows the order of the March 1529 edition.
117. Erasmus, *De conscribendis epistolis*, ed. Jean-Claude Margolin (1971), ASD I-2, pp. 301–09; trans. Fantazzi, CWE, vol. 25, pp. 65–70.
118. Egnazio was one of the original members of the Aldine Academy and assisted with the 1508 Aldine edition of the *Adagia*. Public lecturer at Venice since 1520 and active as a scholar and orator, he seems to have maintained a cordial relationship with Erasmus through many years. See M. J. C. Lowry, "Giambattista Egnazio of Venice, 1478–4 July 1553," Bietenholz and Deutscher, vol. 1, pp. 424–25. In *Ciceronianus*, Nosoponus praises his "uprightness and integrity as well as erudition and eloquence" (trans. Knott, CWE, vol. 28, p. 419).
119. Erasmus had not mentioned Zasius, a friend of long standing (Hans Thieme and Steven Rowan, "Udalricus Zasius of Constance, 1461–24 November 1535," Bietenholz and Deutscher, vol. 3, pp. 469–73), in the previous two editions of *Ciceronianus*, but in this October 1529/March 1530 revision he added a warm tribute emphasizing the "high praise" accorded Zasius in Germany (trans. Knott, CWE, vol. 28, pp. 427–28).

120. Erasmus had heard a false report of Ceratinus's death in the summer of 1529 (*Ep.* 2197, cited by Marie-Thérèse Isaac and Peter G. Bietenholz, "Jacobus Ceratinus of Hoorn, d 20 April 1530," Bietenholz and Deutscher, vol. 1, p. 289).
121. See J. B. Trapp, "John Colet of London, 1467-d 6 September 1519," Bietenholz and Deutscher, vol. 1, pp. 324–28.
122. Thomas B. Deutscher, "Andrea Ammonio of Lucca, c 1478–17 August 1517" Bietenholz and Deutscher, vol. 1, pp. 48–50.