

INTRODUCTION – MANIFOLD READER RESPONSES:  
THE RECEPTION OF ERASMUS IN EARLY MODERN EUROPE

Karl Enenkel

Erasmus provides one of the most interesting cases not only for the processes of early modern image and reputation building through publishing in print,<sup>1</sup> but at the same time – and certainly not to a lesser degree – for the *impossibility of controlling one's reception* before an audience that was continually growing, was increasingly emancipated, heterogeneous, and fragmented, and was, above all, constantly changing. This loss of control is especially striking, since Erasmus had been so successful in building up his literary and scholarly fame by shrewdly utilizing both the hierarchical organization of early modern intellectual life and the means of the new medium of the printed book. From the second decade of the 16th century onward, Erasmus succeeded in gaining an immense, hitherto unrivalled fame spread over the whole of Latin-writing and Latin-loving Europe. Erasmus fought his crusade for fame by means of his Latin works – which he had printed at such important publishers as Josse Bade (Paris), Aldus Manutius (Venice), Johannes Froben (Basel), and Mathias Schürer (Strasbourg) – especially the *Adagia*; *De duplici copia*; his translation and paraphrases of and commentaries on the *New Testament*; his edition of Hieronymus, including a new *Life of St. Jerome*; the *Ciceronianus*; and the *Laus Stultitiae*. By their very appearance, all of these works caused serious earthquakes in intellectual life with respect to philological criticism, authentic Latin style, and religious, ethical, and social criticism.

Since Erasmus was so successful in spreading his fame all over Europe that almost all intellectuals of that era were, in some way or another, acquainted with his name (even if they did not have the opportunity to carefully study his works), one could be tempted to think that “Erasmus” or “Erasmian” became a kind of intellectual *trademark* or *brand*. That, however, would be misleading. A trademark's main characteristic is that it is registered and legally protected: Erasmus's name was neither

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the groundbreaking study by Lisa Jardine, *Erasmus, Man of Letters: The Construction of Charisma in Print* (Princeton: 1993).

registered nor protected. Thus, for some of his contemporaries, Erasmus's name meant advanced, hitherto unsurpassed and perfect humanist scholarship; for others, however, it meant unbridled and arrogant hypercriticism, even heresy, that would lead to religious upheaval and to the destruction of millennium-old sacrosanct traditions. Some saw Erasmus's name as the equivalent of the powerful *cohesive force* of the modern, humanist republic of letters, of which he was considered the prince, or even emperor; others saw it as representative of a belligerent quarreler and *polemicist* who unreasonably fought out his conflicts to the disadvantage of the common good. Some perceived the name to be the equivalent of progress in early modern religious thinking and of pious Catholic criticism; others equated it with the dangerous propagation of Lutheran thoughts; and still others (adherents of the Reformation) linked it with backward and counterproductive indecisiveness in religious matters. For some contemporaries, Erasmus's name signified a virtuoso creator of a new and authentic Latin style; for others, it represented a light-minded and even careless pen-pusher who always preferred quantity to quality. Some saw him as the great reformer of theology; for others, however, he was a complete *ignoramus* in academic theology.

The many and massive reactions to Erasmus's works and as a person, both during his lifetime and in the centuries after his death, have drawn the attention of modern scholarship and have brought forth a couple of important monographs and two collective volumes.<sup>2</sup> One of the first monographs was the groundbreaking, almost visionary, and most influential study by Marcel Bataillon on Erasmus's 'influence' in Spain in the 16th century (1937).<sup>3</sup> From its first appearance onward, but even more so starting with its translation into Spanish (first edition 1950), Bataillon's study had an impact that surpassed the normal level of most modern scholarly works. As Silvana Seidel Menchi pointed out in a more recent assessment of the work, it seems to have contributed to the construction

---

<sup>2</sup> For the two collective volumes, see Mout M.E.H.N. – Smolinsky H. – Trapman J. (eds.), *Erasmianism: Idea and Reality* (Amsterdam: 1997), *Verhandelingen Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen. Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks; Revuelta Sanudo M. – Morón Arroyo C. (eds.), El Erasmismo en España* (Santander: 1986).

<sup>3</sup> *Erasme et l'Espagne* (Paris: 1937; new edition ed. D. Devoto – C. Amiel, 3 vols., Geneva: 1991); cf. Nuttall G.F., "Erasmus and Spain: The Vision of Marcel Bataillon", *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 46 (1994) 105–113.

of 20th-century Spanish identity.<sup>4</sup> Bataillon considered Erasmianism to be the most important feature of intellectual life in 16th-century Spain. Bataillon's broad spectrum of Erasmianism and its seemingly massive appearance (described in three volumes [!]), however, also show the difficulties with this way of studying Erasmus's "influence". "Influence" is indeed a problematic notion for reception research, since it is not only ultimately vague, but it also entirely neglects the active role of the reader or recipient. In fact, it prevents us from understanding the processes of reception, and it works against critical analyses. "Influence" may mean anything. Thus, small wonder that Bataillon comes to his view of Erasmianism as a *universal feature* of 16th-century Spanish culture. As Seidel Menchi rightly criticized, in Bataillon's book 'wherever one finds Greek, theology linked to humanism, attempts at mediation between various confessional orientations, there is Erasmianism. In this way, 16th-century Spain erasmianized harmoniously and triumphantly: *there was an Erasmianism before Erasmus, an Erasmianism without Erasmus, and even an Erasmianism against Erasmus*',<sup>5</sup> which of course unmasks this usage of the term Erasmianism as an absurd exercise. Bataillon's overestimation of Erasmianism also appears in his study on Portuguese humanism (1952).<sup>6</sup> Although Bataillon later – in two small articles – came to the fore with an attitude that was a little bit more cautious (1969/72 and 1970),<sup>7</sup> the damage was done. His theory was established, and it had a tremendous impact both at the time and on further research on the topic, as can be seen, for example, in the collective volume edited by Revuelta Sanudo and Morón Arroyo, *El Erasmismo en Espana* (1986).<sup>8</sup>

Different from Bataillon, the historian Andreas Flitner tried to pin down the reception of Erasmus (1952) by selecting a much smaller group

<sup>4</sup> Seidel Menchi S., "Do we need the 'Ism'? Some Mediterranean Perspectives", in Mout – Smolinsky – Trapman (eds.), *Erasmianism: Idea and Reality* 47–64, here 49.

<sup>5</sup> Ibidem, 48–49 (italics mine). For an Erasmianism before Erasmus cf. Huerga A., "Erasmismo y alumbradismo", in Revuelta Sanudo M. – Morón Arroyo C. (eds.), *El Erasmismo en Espana* (Santander: 1986) 339–356. For an Erasmianism against Erasmus cf. Bataillon, *Erasme et l'Espagne* (Geneva: 1991), 3 vols., vol. I, 229–231.

<sup>6</sup> Bataillon M., *Études sur le Portugal au temps de l' Humanisme*, Acta Uniuersitatis Conimbrigensis (Coimbra: 1952). On Erasmus's influence on Portuguese humanism, see the contribution by Catarina Barceló Fouto, in Barbara M. – Enenkel K.A.E. (eds), *Portuguese Humanism and the Republic of Letters*, Intersections 21 (Leiden – Boston 2012) 129–148.

<sup>7</sup> Bataillon M., "Vers une définition de l'Erasmianisme", in *Colloquia Erasmiana Turonensia, Tours 1969* (Paris: 1972), 2 vols., vol. I, 21–34; also in idem, *Erasme et l'Espagne* (Geneva: 1991), 3 vols., vol. III, 141–154 [1969/1972]); and idem, "À propos de l'influence d'Erasme" (1970), ibidem 305–312.

<sup>8</sup> As quoted above.

of sources but using a much larger chronological and geographical frame.<sup>9</sup> He also took into account the 17th century – finishing up with the appearance of the Leiden edition of Erasmus's *Opera omnia* by Jean Le Clerc (1703–1706) – and various (but not all) European countries as well.<sup>10</sup> In this respect, Flitner's study is a 'Pionierleistung', of which he was well aware.<sup>11</sup> He limited himself to the "Nachwelt" (posterity) only, and to certain types of sources, especially biographies of Erasmus, works of reference, and polemical writings. Flitner's work has both the advantage and the disadvantage of a reductive approach: on the one hand, it is clearly arranged and always focused on what he considers to be his core business, but on the other hand, it depends too much on fixed ideas (if not prejudices), on historical mainstream thinking, and especially on some well-known 'judgments' Flitner considers to be 'authoritative' [!].<sup>12</sup>

Unfortunately, however, Flitner uses a very small-scale, if not narrow-minded, definition of reception: in fact, he is only interested in reception if it reflects the "headline trends" of the historical development of the 16th and 17th centuries. According to him, all other aspects of reception are arbitrary, "unzusammenhängend", "müßig", and therefore it does not make sense to take them into account: 'Allerdings wäre es müßig, die Vielfalt der Meinungen über Erasmus auszubreiten, wollte man *nur* die *seltsamen Verzerrungen* [sic] eines *historischen* Portraits durch die Jahrhunderte verfolgen'.<sup>13</sup> Methodically, Flitner's study suffers from an inclination toward positivism and truisms. He does not show awareness of the various problems, orientations, goals, and options of reception research. He thinks that with his reductive approach he will produce a 'fester und greifbarer Stamm' (*sic*) with respect to the 'Betrachtung der Person und der Vita des Erasmus'. This seems illusory, especially when applied to a person who provoked as many different reactions as Erasmus did. Furthermore, the terms/notions Flitner works with are somewhat problematic, if not misleading: 'Urteil' (judgement) and 'Bild' (image). The second term is not even vaguely defined, and in fact may mean anything. A severe problem, however, is that 'Bild' suggests a close, albeit undefined, connection to the "historical" or "true" Erasmus, especially if the persons that

<sup>9</sup> Flitner A., *Erasmus im Urteil seiner Nachwelt. Das literarische Erasmus-Bild von Beatus Rhenanus bis zu Jean Le Clerc* (Tübingen: 1952).

<sup>10</sup> Most noteworthy, Flitner left out the Italian reception of Erasmus.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. his remark *Erasmus im Urteil seiner Nachwelt* 3: 'Das Thema scheint bisher noch fast unbearbeitet zu sein'.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. below.

<sup>13</sup> Flitner, *Erasmus im Urteil seiner Nachwelt* 1 (italics mine).

produce this ‘Bild’ are authorities. A similar problem appears with the term ‘Urteil’: it suggests something “justified”, “correct”, and “authoritative”, if not “objective”; in other words, that the ‘judges’ speak the truth and will put to the fore “true” and authoritative verdicts on the subject of Erasmus.<sup>14</sup> This is very unfortunate, since in its essence reception is anything but this. Flitner’s fixation on ‘authoritative judgments’ and historical prejudices may be illustrated by the way in which he deals with Luther. ‘Luther’s Urteil über Erasmus soll nicht in den Einzelzügen seiner Entstehung verfolgt, sondern nur so umrissen werden, *wie es in das Luthertum als autoritativ gültiges einging*’.<sup>15</sup> This has little to do with reception studies, but more resembles the style of dogmatic manuals. In general, in his search for ‘authoritative judgments’, Flitner tends to neglect the remarkable independence and freedom which early modern readers made use of to apply texts to the most different purposes. In general, readers create and construct meaning; it does not matter whether that meaning reflects the “author’s intention” (whatever that may be) or not. This goes especially for the early modern period. It may well be that exactly the ‘seltsame Verzerrungen’ could be of special interest if one aims to analyze the processes of reception.

The most comprehensive works on the reception of Erasmus are the three impressive volumes by Bruce Mansfield (1979; 1992; 2003),<sup>16</sup> which display profound scholarship and cover the time from shortly after Erasmus’s death up to the year 2000. For us, volume 1 is the most important, since it deals with the years 1550–1750. Although Mansfield clearly builds on Flitner’s study, he shows more awareness of the differentiations inherent in reception. It makes sense that – as he claims, in marked difference to Bataillon – he does not attempt to write a history of the ‘influence’ of Erasmusianism, but of the ‘interpretations of Erasmus’.<sup>17</sup> Nevertheless, in other respects Mansfield seems a bit overambitious: for example, he tends to identify the ‘history of writing about Erasmus’ with ‘a history of important

---

<sup>14</sup> The ancestry of ‘Urteil’ demonstrates the inadequacy of the term: it goes back to the well-known “iudicia”: paratexts that were usually added in the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries to the editions of classical authors. The “iudicia” were meant to be authoritative statements underpinning the value of a certain text and to serve as guidance for the reader, showing him or her how to understand and evaluate a certain text.

<sup>15</sup> Flitner, *Erasmus im Urteil seiner Nachwelt* 2 (italics mine).

<sup>16</sup> Mansfield B., *Phoenix of His Age: Interpretations of Erasmus, c. 1550–1750* (Toronto etc.: 1979); idem, *Man on his Own: Interpretations of Erasmus c. 1750–1920* (ibidem: 1992), and idem, *Erasmus in the Twentieth Century: Interpretations c. 1920–2000* (ibidem: 2003).

<sup>17</sup> Ibidem, vol. I, xiii.

strains in the making of modern civilisation'.<sup>18</sup> In this sense, and surprisingly similarly to Bataillon, the reception of Erasmus changes into something universal and indefinite, and it loses much of its specificity. As in Flitner's study, historical headlines dominate Mansfield's 'interpretation', while other aspects tend to be excluded. In general, Mansfield's study is focused on historical and religious developments, such as the impact of confessionalism, and it shows much less of an interest in literary, philological, or other aspects. Thus, with respect to the early modern period, Mansfield discerns two major changes in the 'interpretations of Erasmus' that he identifies with 'changes in the moral and intellectual climate' – one ca. 1560 and the other in the late 17th and early 18th centuries:

The first of the larger changes in the moral and intellectual climate was the slide of the first two generations after Erasmus's death into murderous religious war. The lines [...] were drawn ever more sharply. Early catholic controversionalists like Cochlaeus still used Erasmus's witness against the Reformers; by the 1560s, Catholic polemic damned him, with them, beyond recall. Similarly, Protestant controversionalists abandoned the middle ground. The atmosphere of the last quarter of the 16th century was somber, brutal; Erasmus, as we know, was then the possession of a minority who saw themselves as outsiders. The second change – in the late 17th and early 18th centuries – makes Erasmus again a figure of the cultural majority. We have come into the vestibule of the Enlightenment. [...] Their purpose is to defend the Catholicism of Erasmus, but how different a Catholicism from, say, Bellarmine's. Religion, reason, sensibility must live together. In that atmosphere, Erasmus's reputation takes on a new lease of life.<sup>19</sup>

Mansfield's judgement along the "headline trends" of historical development certainly makes sense. Nevertheless, it does not explain everything. It seems that the reception of Erasmus was much more complex and diverse than that. For example, in the period of the 'somber' and 'brutal' climate of the religious wars, the philologist and philosopher Justus Lipsius in his autobiography (1600) used Erasmus's name in order to authorize himself as an intellectual: Lipsius, however, did not regard himself as an 'outsider'.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>18</sup> Ibidem. Cf. also vol. I, 4: 'The primary interest of this study is in Erasmus' reputation as a barometer of the changing atmosphere'.

<sup>19</sup> Ibidem, vol. I, 300–301.

<sup>20</sup> For Lipsius' autobiography, see Enenkel K., *Die Erfindung des Menschen. Die Autobiographik des Frühneuzeitlichen Humanismus von Petrarca bis Lipsius* (Berlin-New York: 2008).

Important progress was made by Seidel Menchi's study of the reception of Erasmus in 16th-century Italy (1987).<sup>21</sup> The intellectual historian Seidel Menchi not only explored an area of the reception of Erasmus that was until then largely unknown, but, even more importantly, she took into account book history. The advantage of her approach is that she left out most of the vague notions used thus far in the study of Erasmus's reception – "influence", "Erasmianism", "judgement", "Bild" – but turned to the 'material reality of the book', as she later stated in a reassessment: 'the book as a container of ideas, but also as a manufactured item, an object of use, the reference point of a concrete action: reading'.<sup>22</sup> By a close analysis of the printing history of Erasmus's works in Italy, which comprises the impressive total of 186 book-scale editions and some 250 titles, she discerns three phases of Erasmus's reception in Italy from 1514 to 1580: a first phase from 1514 to 1528, a second from 1531 to 1555, and a third from 1556 until the end of the 16th century.

As Seidel Menchi plausibly demonstrated, although in the first phase Erasmus had a large number of readers in Italy (so many editions were printed that he represented a considerable economic interest), they were generally not at all interested in the 'main message' of his works. Instead, they focused on his writings about religious and political topics, and they used them as a source of information on the religious debates in Germany. 'For curious, restless learned Italians, the great scholar from Basle served as a special correspondent from the battlefield of the Reformation'.<sup>23</sup> According to Seidel Menchi, Italian readers were less interested in Erasmus as a philologist and textual critic, and hardly at all as a literary writer. Some readers bluntly identified Erasmus with Lutheran heresy. Erasmus's religious works were printed in enormous numbers, especially in Venice, generally in smaller formats than the authorized Basel editions, and particularly in pocket formats on low-quality paper – cheap editions for scholarly and ephemeral use. In this period in Italy, Erasmus's most important works were the *Enchiridion militis Christiani*, the *Ratio verae philosophiae*, the *Paraclesis*, the *Novum Testamentum*, and the *Paraphrases*, supplied by *De libero arbitrio*, the *Modus orandi*, the *Exomologesis*, the *De lingua*, and other writings. The reception of these religious works was not purely negative. Some readers were impressed with

---

<sup>21</sup> Seidel Menchi S., *Erasmus in Italia: 1520–1580* (Torino: 1987; Germ. trans. *Erasmus als Ketzer: Reformation und Inquisition im Italien des 16. Jahrhunderts*, trans. U. Hartmann, Brill's Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought 49 [Leiden – Boston: 1992]).

<sup>22</sup> Seidel Menchi, "Do we need the 'Ism'?" 49.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibidem* 52.



those of Erasmus's religious ideas that seemed close to the Reformation, and they took him as an exemplary writer of the Reformation. For them, Erasmus replaced Luther, so to speak. This large reception of Erasmus as a heretical author, interrupted shortly by the effects of the Sacco di Roma, was prolonged on a larger scale in the second phase, when Erasmus's religious writings were translated into Italian, and thus reached an even larger audience comprising not only scholars, but all kinds of people who were able to read. Italian 'readers around 1550 deconstructed Erasmian texts, pulled out certain elements, and put them back together in an independent form that the Erasmus of the 1520s and 1530s probably would not have recognized as his'.<sup>24</sup> This phase, of course, ended when Erasmus was put on the *Index* in 1559. From then on, reactions were largely negative and polemical, and only a few editions were issued over the course of the rest of the 16th century.

A very useful and rich collective volume, edited by Nicolette Mout, Hans Smolinsky, and Hans Trapman in 1997,<sup>25</sup> went back to a conference held in Amsterdam in 1996 and, engaging in "Begriffsgeschichte", tried to clarify the frequently used notion of "Erasmianism". The central aim of the volume was to explore 'whether Erasmianism and Erasmian Humanism existed as a recognizable attitude during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries' and 'whether Erasmianism represented a definable middle way between the confessional conflicts in the early modern times'.<sup>26</sup> As was to be expected, the various contributors gave different answers. The overall impression is that the notion of "Erasmianism" has some legitimization, although it is not easy to define and has meant different things at different times to different people. One of the most critical voices came from the author of a surveying essay, Cornelis Augustijn.<sup>27</sup> By analyzing the different meanings of the notion, Augustijn comes to the conclusion that he can very well do without it – in other words, that the term fails as an analytical tool. Augustijn discerns three variant meanings of Erasmianism: (1) a 'wissenschaftliche Partei' (something like a 'school' or 'direction of scholarship'); (2) a 'Reformbewegung' ('movement of religious reform');

<sup>24</sup> Ibidem 54.

<sup>25</sup> *Erasmianism: Idea and Reality*.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Nicolette Mout's "Introduction", ibidem 2.

<sup>27</sup> "Verba valent usu: was ist Erasmianismus?", ibidem 5–14; 5–6: 'Wenn ich mir das Programm des Colloquiums ansehe, komme ich zu dem Schluss, dass der Terminus Erasmianismus auf eine Menge von unterschiedlichen Phänomenen anwendbar ist. [...] Er gilt für religiöse, kirchliche, theologische und politische Vorstellungen, Ideale und Verhaltensweisen. Alles zusammen ist es eher ein Mischmasch als ein klar umgrenztes Gebiet'.



and (3) a 'Politischer Erasmianismus' (political attitude). These meanings are not necessarily connected with each other. In this sense, numerous, totally different intellectuals with extremely divergent opinions and convictions – may be labeled "Erasmians". Moreover, the term suggests that the attachment of these intellectuals with extremely different convictions with regard to Erasmus is rather close – close enough, anyway, that they may be regarded as his adherents or followers.

However, if one tries to figure out what the term "Erasmianism" contributes to our understanding of the underlying processes of reception, it is almost impossible to give an answer. The term certainly does not cover the whole of the reception of Erasmus, but only of those intellectuals who were very close to Erasmus and subscribed to his central ideas. Reception, however, is broader and richer, and above all, it mostly comes into being via different processes. In the volume itself, Seidel Menchi rightly states: 'the category "Erasmianism" does not adequately convey the richness of creative energies that Erasmus unleashed and the multiplicity of intellectual and moral experiences that found nourishment in his work. The application of this category, therefore would produce considerably hermeneutic inflexibility, for the largest group of Erasmus's disciples and interlocutors would have to be cut out of his legacy'.<sup>28</sup> One may add that this applies to not only Erasmus's disciples and interlocutors, but his recipients in general.

The present volume, of course, does not have the ambition to replace the above-mentioned comprehensive studies and monographs, or to provide a new, complete overall survey of the reception of Erasmus. Needless to say, both of these goals would be illusory ones for a moderately sized collective volume. Rather, via a number of case studies, it aims to increase our knowledge with respect to the underlying processes of the reception of Erasmus, and to shed light on aspects and texts that have not been taken into account or not understood in this way. In particular, literary aspects, and some philological ones as well, thus far have received little attention in studies on the reception of Erasmus. Several contributions in the present volume deal with those aspects. Literary reception is central to the contributions by Dirk Sacré (on the German Neo-Latin poet Eobanus Hessus), Philip Ford (on the French poet Pierre de Ronsard), Paul Smith (on the French monk Jean Thenaud and the satirical writer

---

<sup>28</sup> Seidel Menchi, "Do we need the 'Ism'?" 57.

François Rabelais), and Reinier Leushuis (on the Venetian writer and protestant Antonio Brucioli). Leushuis analyzes the first Italian adaptation of Erasmus's *Laus Stultitiae*, Brucioli's dialogue *Della sapientia et della stultitia* (1526), a work that had not yet received much attention. In Seidel Menchi's studies, Brucioli figured only as a transmitter of Erasmus's religious ideas,<sup>29</sup> whereas she did not pay attention to literary aspects in the process of reception. In the present volume, Leushuis demonstrates that literary aspects, however, were of great importance. He argues that Brucioli was inspired by 'Erasmus's artful dynamics of dialogue, speech, and mimetic language'.<sup>30</sup> According to him, 'Brucioli was intrigued by "Folly's eloquence", i.e. her theatrical staging as a paradoxical mock orator who, in a serio-comic speech to her audience, adopts, intertwines, and transforms a multiplicity of voices, whereby the artful and ludic handling of *verba* (words and their meaning) takes precedence over *res* (the orator's argument)'.<sup>31</sup>

Since Erasmus's fame was not based on poetry, and poetry is not considered to have played an important part in his reception, it seems interesting to have a look at the way in which his work was included in early modern poetry, both Latin and vernacular (contributions by Sacré and Ford). Dirk Sacré researches a special case: the manner, style, literary means, and verse technique the Neo-Latin poet Eobanus Hessus (who was hailed as the German Ovid) applied in transferring a prose *declamatio* of Erasmus (on medicine) into Latin verses.<sup>32</sup> Philip Ford analyzes the way in which the leading Pléiade poet Ronsard used Erasmus's prose

<sup>29</sup> Cf. above; see also Seidel Menchi S., "La circolazione clandestina di Erasmo in Italia: i casi di Antonio Brucioli e di Marsilio Andreasi", *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 9 (1979) 573–601 and eadem, *Erasmo in Italia* 88–90.

<sup>30</sup> See his contribution in this volume oo.

<sup>31</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>32</sup> A similar but also different case is represented by the Portuguese humanist Diogo de Teive, who drew heavily on Erasmus's prose mirror of princes (*Institutio principis Christiani*) when composing his Latin didactic poem in iambic trimeter verse on the same topic – *Institutio Sebastiani Primi*, dedicated to the Portuguese prince Sebastião, the future king of Portugal (1552–1578). An article on this work has been published recently by Caterina Barceló Fouto, in Maria Berbara and Karl A.E. Enenkel (eds.), *Portuguese Humanism and the Republic of Letters, Intersections* 21 (2011), Brill, Leiden-Boston 2011, 129–148 ("Diogo de Teive's *Institutio Sebastiani primi* and the Reception of Erasmus' Works in Portugal"). As Barceló Fouto demonstrates, de Teive borrowed a considerable number of ideas, arguments, and sometimes even phrases from Erasmus's treatise. Nevertheless, the fact that Teive used *Erasmus* as a literary model does not mean that he was an Erasmian or a close follower of Erasmus: unlike his literary example, Teive was above all eager to follow in every detail the requirements of Catholic orthodoxy dictated by the Counter-Reformation, and he left no room at all for the favoured discursive mode of Erasmus in his *Institutio*

essay (adage) “Dulce bellum inexpertis” in two French poems, “Exhortation pour la Paix” (1558) and another one dedicated to – of all people – the warrior king Henry II (1559). As Ford demonstrates, there is massive intertextuality between Erasmus’s adage and the two poems, both on the level of ideas and on the verbal level. The Flemish humanist Franciscus Thorius is another case that testifies to the meandering ways of Erasmus’s reception: Thorius transferred Ronsard’s “Exhortation pour la Paix” into a Latin poem, published in the same year.<sup>33</sup> Thus, a heterogeneous audience consisting of Latin and vernacular readers could receive Erasmus’s ideas via a French poem and its Latin reworking, even without having read Erasmus’s adage.

Our volume is based neither on the methods of the above-mentioned monographs (Bataillon, Flitner, Mansfield, and Seidel Menchi) nor on the term “Erasmianism”. It deliberately does not confine itself to reception(s) by “Erasmians”. True, Beatus Rhenanus (contribution by Enenkel), Eobanus Hessus (Sacré), Theodor Bibliander (Lucia Feliciano), and possibly Antonio Brucioli (Leushuis) and Ronsard (Ford) as well, might be called “Erasmians”, albeit in different senses and for different reasons, but the Jesuit Petrus Canisius (contribution by Hilmar Pabel), the star philologist and Neo-Stoic philosopher Justus Lipsius (contribution by Jeanine De Landtsheer), the English Bishop Edward Stillingfleet, and the caustic polemicist and opponent of religious tolerance Roger L’Estrange<sup>34</sup> (contribution by Gregory Dodds) certainly cannot, and hardly can the Dutch soldier and patriot Jan van der Wyk be considered an “Erasmian” (article by Hans Trapman).<sup>35</sup> Rabelais – most spectacularly, and possibly not without a satirical touch – called Erasmus ‘his father and his mother’, but it is still not clear exactly how and along what lines his reception of Erasmus came into being. In his contribution, Paul Smith sheds light on this question regarding the earliest reception of Erasmus in the French vernacular. Smith presents a new thesis in which he recognizes another author as the first vernacular recipient of Erasmus: the Franciscan monk Jean Thenaud,

---

*principis Christiani* viz. his criticism of the Church, its institutions, its organization, and its rituals.

<sup>33</sup> *P<etri> Ronsardi ad Pacem exhortatio Latinis versibus de Gallicis expressa a Francisco Thorio Bellione* (Paris, Andreas Wechel: 1558).

<sup>34</sup> L’Estrange Roger, *Toleration Discuss’d, in Two Dialogues* (London, Henry Brome: 1679).

<sup>35</sup> Cf. the contribution by Hans Trapman in this volume, 269: ‘We may conclude that Van der Wyck’s fundamental ideas are diametrically opposed to those of Erasmus. Over and against Erasmus, the biblical humanist advocating a spiritual form of Christianity, stands Van der Wyck, the enlightened materialist and atheist’.

who was closely linked to the court of the French King. Smith argues that it was Thenaud who linked Rabelais with Erasmus. Here, again, the meandrous courses of Erasmus's reception come to the fore: in his *Triumphe de Prudence*, Thenaud reworked the first printed French translation of Erasmus's *Laus Stultitiae*, the *De la Declamation des Louanges de la Folie*, generally ascribed to Georges Haloin and anonymously printed in 1520.<sup>36</sup> Rabelais was acquainted with Thenaud's work. These intermediary sources are probably responsible for the great number of verbal quotes of and allusions to the *Laus Stultitiae* in Rabelais's work. Justus Lipsius, very different from Rabelais, refrained from including *verbatim* quotations from Erasmus in his writings. But, as Jeanine De Landtsheer tries to show, he nevertheless used Erasmus's writings in other respects – for example, the *Institutio principis Christiani* for certain passages in his famous manual *Politica*. It is still not totally clear why Lipsius largely avoided verbatim quotations of Erasmus. Was it due to (his) ambivalent attitude toward the Roterodamus; scholarly competition, envy, and a striving for originality; difference in political insights; a reluctance to ascribe to a recent author the status of *auctoritas*, or a reluctance to mention intermediary sources at all; or a fear of quoting an author who figured in the *Index librorum prohibitorum*?<sup>37</sup>

In the present volume, unlike in the works by Flitner and Mansfield, reception is not limited to the headlines of historical and religious development – although those are certainly taken into account (cf. the section on religious ideas, with contributions by Lucia Felici, Gregory Dodds, and Hilmar Pabel) – to Erasmus's *genuine* thoughts and ideas, or to something like the “historical Erasmus” (whatever that term may mean). In our view, reception is a more complex phenomenon. Of the greatest importance is the *active role of the reader or recipient*, who may construct meanings that differ greatly from the so-called “author's intention”. In search of the active role of the reader, we apply, albeit not in a dogmatic way and not as an exclusive method,<sup>38</sup> reception theory: *Rezeptionsästhetik*,

<sup>36</sup> See Smith's contribution in this volume.

<sup>37</sup> In her contribution in this volume, Jeanine De Landtsheer tends to adhere to the last reason. However, the *Politica* were written and first published in Leiden (1589), in a Calvinist context where authors generally were not bothered by the *Index*. It is a telling detail also that in the first edition of the *Politica*, Lipsius did not mention Erasmus a single time. Thus, he probably had other reasons as well.

<sup>38</sup> It is self-evident that the contributors to this volume have applied a number of the traditional, commonly known methods of historical, literary, and philological research. With respect to the topic, there is no special need to discuss them in detail.

*Wirkungsästhetik*, or *Reader Response theory*. In the discussions surrounding the term “Erasmianism” (1997), Seidel Menchi thought that this method might be especially adequate for studying the reception of Erasmus,<sup>39</sup> although in her own approach she adhered to book history. In our experience, the method of Reader Response, or *Rezeptionsästhetik*, has turned out to be useful and fruitful with respect to other early modern key figures as well, such as Petrarch (2006). In *Petrarch and his Readers in the Renaissance*, which appeared in the same series, it could be demonstrated how *independently* early modern readers operated.<sup>40</sup> In the introduction to *Petrarch and his Readers*, we tried to elaborate upon the concept of the early modern “independent reader”.<sup>41</sup>

It is not necessary to repeat that argument in detail here, but it seems useful to point out the most important notions/terms, problems, and necessary adaptations. The *Rezeptionsästhetik* or *Wirkungsästhetik* was invented at the end of the 1960s by Wolfgang Iser and Hans Robert Jauß as a challenge to traditional, all too hierarchical, all too author-centred text interpretations.<sup>42</sup> In its radical form, the theory states that the meaning of a given text is *only* construed by and during the process of reading. No meaning of a text exists outside of this process. Reading is described as an interplay between the ‘effect of a text’ (‘Textwirkung’) on the reader and the ‘active’ role of the reader (‘Leseraktivität’) who reacts to the text. In order to define and analyze this process, Iser developed various notions: ‘der implizite Leser’ (‘implied reader’),<sup>43</sup> ‘Leerstelle’, ‘Realisation’, ‘Unbestimmtheit’,<sup>44</sup> and so on. These notions, however, are a bit unclear

<sup>39</sup> Seidel Menchi, “Do we need the ‘Ism?’” 57: ‘In my view, the concept of “reader response” elaborated in literary theory during the last few decades [...] is better suited to interpreting the Erasmus phenomenon’.

<sup>40</sup> Enenkel K.A.E. – Papy J. (eds.), *Petrarch and his Readers in the Renaissance* (Leiden-Boston: 2006).

<sup>41</sup> Ibidem, “Towards a New Approach of Petrarch’s Reception in the Renaissance – the ‘Independent Reader’”, ibidem 1–10.

<sup>42</sup> Iser W., *Die Appellstruktur der Texte. Unbestimmtheit als Wirkungsbedingung literarischer Texte* (Konstanz: 1970); idem, *Der implizite Leser* (Munich: 1972); idem, *Der Akt des Lesens* (Munich: 1976); Jauß H.R., *Literaturgeschichte als Provokation der Literaturwissenschaft* (Konstanz: 1967); idem, *Literaturgeschichte als Provokation* (Frankfurt a.M.: 1970); idem, *Kleine Apologie der ästhetischen Erfahrung* (Konstanz: 1972); idem, *Ästhetische Erfahrung und literarische Hermeneutik* (Frankfurt a.M.: 1982); idem, *Die Theorie der Rezeption – Rückschau auf ihre unbekannte Vorgeschichte* (Konstanz: 1987); Link H., *Rezeptionsforschung* (Stuttgart: 1976); Müller J.E., *Literaturwissenschaftliche Rezeptionstheorien und empirische Rezeptionsforschung* (Frankfurt a.M. – Bern: 1981).

<sup>43</sup> See Iser, *Der implizite Leser*.

<sup>44</sup> See Iser, *Die Appellstruktur der Texte. Unbestimmtheit als Wirkungsbedingung literarischer Texte*.

and a bit hard to apply, especially in historical research. This is possibly one of the reasons why the *Rezeptionsästhetik* has brought forth less of a result on the level of detailed empirical research than one might have hoped. For instance, it is not easy to pin down in a concrete text what exactly a 'Leerstelle' would be or what one should ascribe to the 'implied reader'. The fact that Iser identified the 'implied reader' with the (vague) notion of the 'Wirkungsstruktur des Textes' did not help to clarify the problem.<sup>45</sup> Iser, in fact, moved in the direction of more traditional text interpretations by explaining the reception processes by certain *qualities of the text* ('Wirkungspotential'). This suggests that the way readers interpret a text is somehow due to the text itself. Another notion in that direction is that of the 'competent reader': a 'competent reader' will understand the text in a 'competent' way, and this means that he will let himself be guided by the text as organized by the apparently *eo ipso* competent author. Another problem is that some critics – particularly Iser but others as well – have limited the applicability of the *Rezeptionsästhetik* to *fictional* texts only.<sup>46</sup> According to Iser, only fictional texts have the special quality that enables readers of various historical epochs to put their own experience into the interpretation of the text. Only fictional texts provide the 'Leerstellen' and 'Unbestimmtheiten', and thus the indispensable pre-dispositions for diverging interpretations. Here, again, Iser focuses more on the qualities of texts than on the reader's activity.

All of this does not imply that the Reader Response theory would be inadequate, but rather that certain adaptations are necessary if one wants to apply it in a fruitful way. First of all, the focus on the reader and the process of reading is too precious to reduce it to certain qualities of the text or to limit it to a certain group of texts ('fiction'). This seems especially relevant for reception studies concerning the early modern period.

Early modern times are characterized by a more and more heterogeneous, diverse, fragmented, and changeable audience. Compared with the Middle Ages, new intellectuals entered onto the scene: various groups of new lay and religious intellectuals inspired by Humanism, lay spirituality, the Reformation, technical innovations, urban life, and so on. Even bakers, surgeons, carpenters, merchants, and soldiers counted. In view of this changing and ever-changeable audience it is difficult to speak of a 'competent reader'. What would a 'competent reader' even be? Early modern

---

<sup>45</sup> Iser, *Der implizite Leser* 60.

<sup>46</sup> See, for example, Iser, *Der Akt des Lesens*, *passim*.

readers were no modern historians, philologists, or “Literaturwissenschaftler”. According to their cultural disposition, interpretation was not limited to a kind of historical or philological research. When reading and interpreting a text they would not search for ‘Leerstellen’, ‘Unbestimmtheiten’, the ‘implied reader’, or similar things – or even for the “author’s intention” – but would first search for anything that was interesting or useful to them. Early modern readers felt legitimized to *use* texts in the way they *liked*. Therefore, for early modern reception research it is better to altogether avoid the (vaguely defined) notions of certain qualities of the text, such as ‘impliziter Leser’ (implied reader),<sup>47</sup> ‘Leerstelle’, ‘Wirkungspotential’, and ‘Textwirkung’, or exclusivist qualifications of the reader, such as the ‘competent reader’. They do not really help us to understand the processes of early modern reading and interpretation. Moreover, it does not make sense to limit our interest to ‘fictional’ texts or to ascribe exclusively to them the quality of poly-interpretability. As is generally known, in the early modern period there was no clear distinction between ‘fictional’ and ‘non-fictional’ literature.

This also goes for Erasmus, who – if one applies those modern categories – has written ‘fictional’ and ‘non-fictional’ texts as well. The *Laus Stultitiae*, the *Colloquies*, and some letters would probably be labelled ‘fictional’; the *Apophthegmata*, *Institutio principis Christiani*, the *Enchiridion militis Christiani*, and the *De libero arbitrio* would probably be considered ‘non-fictional’.<sup>48</sup> However, with respect to reception there is no essential difference. It is certainly not the case that the ‘non-fictional’ works were interpreted more closely to the author’s intention than the ‘fictional’ ones. For example, Italian readers, as Seidel Menchi has demonstrated, were inclined to interpret the *Enchiridion militis Christiani* and other religious works, but also the *Laus Stultitiae*, in terms of Lutheran heresy. Some readers identified Stultitia’s speech with the person of the author Erasmus, and some did not; the *Laus Stultitiae* was also interpreted variously as a Protestant attack on the Catholic Church, pious Catholic criticism, a pamphlet arguing in favour of atheism (cf. the contribution by Hans Trapman in this volume), a rhetorical exercise (Antonio Brucioli; see the

---

<sup>47</sup> Ansgar Nünning proposed in a paper published in 1993 to dismiss the notion of the ‘impliziter Leser’. See Nünning A., “Renaissance eines anthropomorphen Passepartouts oder Nachruf auf ein literarisches Phantom? Überlegungen und Alternativen zum Konzept des ‘implied author’”, in *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* 67 (1993), 1–25.

<sup>48</sup> Some texts, such as the *Adagia*, would not fit in either of the two categories.



contribution by Leushuis), a playful and witty satire, a mock encomium, or an autobiographical statement. For some receptions more than one interpretation is relevant, as is the case with Rabelais (contribution by Smith). It is a telling detail that Erasmus himself gave mixed signals in this regard. In his preface to the work he emphasized that it was a playful rhetorical exercise, but in his *Opera omnia* he included it in the *ordo* of serious ethical writings. The same poly-interpretability goes for a number of Erasmus's 'non-fictional' religious writings in which he argued for religious tolerance. The English religious writer Roger L'Estrange,<sup>49</sup> who also edited Erasmus's *Colloquies*, and Bishop Edward Stillingfleet<sup>50</sup> used Erasmus as an authority for exactly the opposite, viz. *intoleration* (see the contribution by Dodds). It is clear that early modern readers connected both categories of texts, 'fictional' and 'non-fictional', with their personal experience, used them in various ways, and attached to them remarkably divergent meanings. As Erasmus's case in particular proves, *poly-interpretability was certainly not reserved to 'fictional' texts*.

Thus, in the present volume, in researching Erasmus's reception, *many completely un-Erasmian ideas and ideals come to the fore*: atheism (Trapman on Jan van der Wyk); radical enlightenment (the same); radical Lutheranism (as one of the aspects of Antonio Brucioli's reception); religious intolerance (Dodds on Roger L'Estrange and Edward Stillingfleet); anti-irenism (the same); radical universalism (Felici on Bibliander); political pragmatism; realism and utilitarianism that either annihilate the ideal of the 'Christian Prince' or, at best, regard it as insignificant background noise (De Landtsheer on Justus Lipsius); a princely ideal without a certain religious belief or confession (the same); a pragmatic sanctification of war (the same); Jesuit education, propagation, and catechization (Hilmar Pabel on Petrus Canisius); Marianism/Marian devotion (the same, although also anti-Marianism); reluctance to admit institutional Church criticism (Enenkel on Beatus Rhenanus); "pure" scholarship without literary writing, irony, and playfulness (the same); and, last but not least, even a personal, autobiographical preference for the profession of medicine (Sacré on Eobanus Hessus), which Erasmus, of course, did not share.

<sup>49</sup> L'Estrange Roger, *Toleration Discuss'd, in Two Dialogues* (London, Henry Brome: 1679).

<sup>50</sup> E.g. Stillingfleet Edward, *A Rational Account of the Grounds of Protestant Religion* (London, Henry Mortlock: 1665); idem, *Several Conferences Between a Romish Priest, a Fanatic Chaplain, and a Divine of the Church of England* (London, Henry Mortlock: 1679); *A Discourse Concerning the Idolatry Practised in the Church of Rome* (London, Henry Mortlock: 1671).

These various un-Erasmian ideals testify to the remarkable independence of early modern recipients in the process of reading. They picked out of Erasmus's works whatever was interesting and useful to them, and some of them instrumentalized the authority attached to the name of Erasmus for their own goals. They were not bothered by the question of what was truly Erasmian and what was not, nor were they eager to follow the "author's intention", the "historical Erasmus", or a kind of unmoveable, authoritative, and timeless meaning of his works. They regarded reception as a creative and flexible process – the more creativity, the more flexibility. Flexibility meant survival. Authority was neither denied nor excluded, but it was only a useful instrument in order to achieve certain goals. Roger L'Estrange and Edward Stillingfleet used Erasmus as an authority, but they had no intention of faithfully rendering (or repeating) his central ideas. Hessus appropriated Erasmus's brilliant but light-minded declamation when he was starting a new career as a medical doctor (1523/24). He included his poetic version of the declamation in a publication that was meant to be a self-advertisement for his medical services. Lipsius used the *Institutio principis Christiani* (as Diogo de Teive in his *Institutio Sebastiani primi* had done before) as a literary example because it was handy and partly because it saved him work. Lipsius never intended to render or repeat Erasmus's authentic political ideas. And so on.

All of this is not to say that the early modern readers had an outspoken tendency to "misunderstand" Erasmus. In reception studies I would be inclined to avoid this notion. Early modern readers surely picked up ideas that would today be considered genuinely Erasmian, if those ideas suited their interests and purposes. Several case studies in this volume also demonstrate these lines of reception. Early modern readers would appreciate and appropriate Erasmus's advanced philological humanism (Enenkel on Beatus Rhenanus), masterful and authentic Latin style (the same, Sacré on Eobanus Hessus, and Ford on Ronsard), rhetorical brilliance (Sacré on Eobanus Hessus, Leushuis on Brucioli, and Smith on Thénau and Rabelais), playfulness (the same), tremendous scholarship and learning (Enenkel on Rhenanus, Sacré on Hessus, Ford on Ronsard, Pabel on Canisius, Smith on Thénau and Rabelais, and Leushuis on Brucioli), religious tolerance (Felici on Bibliander), and irenism (Ford on Ronsard).

We hope that the case studies in the present volume shed some light on the processes and the different kinds, lines, usages, options, and shades of Erasmus's reception in early modern Europe. Needless to say, the reception of Erasmus was a truly European viz. international phenomenon. The ten essays deal with reception in the Holy Roman Empire/Germany

(Enenkel, Sacré, Pabel), Italy (Leushuis), France (Ford, Smith), England (Dodds), Switzerland (Felici, Enenkel), and the Southern and Northern Low Countries (De Landtsheer, Trapman). The present volume covers a number of aspects of Erasmus's reception, although certainly not all. Erasmus had as many responses as he had readers. Erasmus's reception is at least as complex, flexible, and manifold as his works. Much more research is required, especially case studies that provide in-depth analyses. We hope the contributions in this volume may stimulate further research in this fascinating field.

Karl Enenkel

(Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster)

Monaci Ecclesiae, XXI<sup>o</sup> Februarii MMXIII,

in die fest. Scti. Petri Damiani

### Selective Bibliography

- AUGUSTIJN C., *Erasmus en de Reformatie* (Amsterdam: 1962).
- , *Erasmus. His Life, Works and Influence* (Toronto etc.: 1991).
- BAINTON R., *Erasmus of Christendom* (New York: 1969).
- BARCELÓ FOUTO CATERINA, “Diogo de Teive’s *Institutio Sebastiani primi* and the Reception of Erasmus’ Works in Portugal”, in Barbara M. and Enenkel K.A.E. (eds.), *Portuguese Humanism and the Republic of Letters*, *Intersections* 21 (2012) 129–148.
- BATAILLON M., *Erasme et l’Espagne* (Paris: 1937; new edition, ed. D. Devoto – C. Amiel, 3 vols., Geneva: 1991).
- , *Études sur le Portugal au temps de l’Humanisme*, Acta Universitatis Conimbricensis (Coimbra: 1952).
- , “Vers une définition de l’Erasmianisme”, in *Colloquia Erasmiana Turonensia, Tours 1969* (Paris: 1972), 2 vols., vol. I, 21–34; also in BATAILLON M., *Erasme et l’Espagne* (Geneva: 1991), 3 vols., vol. III, 141–154.
- , “À propos de l’influence d’Erasme”, in idem, *Erasme et l’Espagne* (Geneva: 1991), 3 vols., vol. III, 305–312.
- BENTLEY J.H., “Erasmus, Jean Le Clerc, and the Principle of the Harder Reading”, *Renaissance Quarterly* 31 (1978) 309–321.
- BARBARA M. – ENENKEL K.A.E. (eds.), *Portuguese Humanism and the Republic of Letters*, *Intersections* 21 (2012).
- BIETENOLZ P., *Encounters with a Radical Erasmus* (Toronto: 2008).
- BOYLE MARJORIE O’ROURKE, *Rhetoric and Reform: Erasmus’s Civil Dispute with Luther* (Cambridge, Mass.: 1983).
- BIJL S.W., *Erasmus in het Nederlands tot 1617* (Nieuwkoop: 1978).
- CHANTRAINE G., S.J., *Érasme et Luther: Libre ou serf arbitre?* (Paris: 1981).
- , “L’Apologia ad Latomum: Deux conceptions de la théologie”, in Coppens J. (ed.), *Scrinium Erasmianum*, 2 vols., vol. II, 51–76 (Leiden: 1969).
- DEVEREUX E.J., *Renaissance English Translations of Erasmus. A Bibliography to 1700* (Toronto etc.: 1983).
- DODDS G., *Exploiting Erasmus: The Erasmian Legacy and Religious Change in Early Modern England* (Toronto: 2009).
- DOLAN J.P., *The Influence of Erasmus, Witzel, and Cassander on the Church Ordinances of the United Duchies of Cleves*, *Reformationsgeschichtliche Studien und Texte* 83 (Münster: 1957).
- ENENKEL K., *Die Erfindung des Menschen. Die Autobiographik des Frühneuzeitlichen Humanismus von Petrarca bis Lipsius* (Berlin-New York: 2008).
- , “The Self-definition of the Republic of Letters and the Epitaphs of Erasmus”, *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook* 21 (2001) 14–29.
- ENENKEL K.A.E. – J. PAPY (eds.), *Petrarch and his Readers in the Renaissance* (Leiden-Boston: 2006).
- , “Towards a New Approach of Petrarch’s Reception in the Renaissance – the ‘Independent Reader’”, in ibidem 1–10.
- FLITNER A., *Erasmus im Urteil seiner Nachwelt. Das literarische Erasmus-Bild von Beatus Rhenanus bis zu Jean Le Clerc* (Tübingen: 1952).
- GERLO A., *Erasme et ses portraitistes: Metsijs, Dürer, Holbein* (Brussels: 1950).
- GRAFTON A.T., *The Defenders of the Text. The traditions of Scholarship in an age of science, 1450–1800* (Cambridge, Mass.: 1991).
- HALKIN L.E., *Érasme parmi nous* (Paris: 1987); Germ. trans. *Erasmus von Rotterdam. Eine Biographie*. Aus dem Französischen von E. Heinemann (Zurich: 1989).
- , *Erasmus ex Erasmo. Erasme éditeur de sa correspondance* (Aubel: 1983), Livre, idées, sociétés 3.

- HARTMANN A., "Beatus Rhenanus: Leben und Werke des Erasmus", in *Gedenkschrift zum 400. Todestage des Erasmus von Rotterdam* (Basel: 1936) 11–24.
- HARTMANN U., *Erasmus als Ketzer: Reformation und Inquisition im Italien des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Leiden – Boston: 1992), Brill's Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought 49.
- HEATH M.J., "Erasmus, Desiderius (1609–1536)", in Zegura E.C. (ed.), *The Rabelais Encyclopedia* (Westport, Conn. – London: 2004) 70–71.
- HOLBAN M., "Un témoignage inconnu sur le rayonnement érasmien dans l'entourage immédiat de François Ier", in *Nouvelles Études d'Histoire, présentées au X<sup>e</sup> Congrès des Sciences Historiques, Rome 1955* (Bucharest: 1955) 265–284.
- HOLECZEK H., *Erasmus Deutsch: die Volkssprachliche Rezeption des Erasmus von Rotterdam in der reformatorischen Öffentlichkeit, 1519–1536* (Stuttgart: 1983).
- HUERGA A., "Erasmismo y alumbradismo", in Revuelta Sanudo M. – Morón Arroyo (eds.), *El Erasmismo en España* (Santander: 1986) 339–356.
- HUTTON J., "Erasmus and France: the Propaganda for Peace", *Studies in the Renaissance* 8 (1961) 103–127.
- ISER W., *Die Apellstruktur der Texte. Unbestimmtheit als Wirkungsbedingung literarischer Texte* (Konstanz: 1970).
- , *Der implizite Leser* (Munich: 1972).
- , *Der Akt des Lesens* (Munich: 1976).
- ISRAEL J.I., *Radical Enlightenment. Philosophy and the Making of Modernity 1650–1750* (Oxford: 2001).
- JARDINE L., *Erasmus, Man of Letters: The Construction of Charisma in Print* (Princeton: 1993).
- JAUB H.R., *Literaturgeschichte als Provokation der Literaturwissenschaft* (Konstanz: 1967).
- , *Literaturgeschichte als Provokation* (Frankfurt a.M.: 1970).
- , *Kleine Apologie der ästhetischen Erfahrung* (Konstanz: 1972).
- , *Ästhetische Erfahrung und literarische Hermeneutik* (Frankfurt a.M.: 1982).
- , *Die Theorie der Rezeption – Rückschau auf ihre unbekannte Vorgeschichte* (Konstanz: 1987).
- KAISER W.J., *Praisers of Folly: Erasmus, Rabelais, Shakespeare* (Cambridge, Mass.: 1963).
- MANSFIELD B., *Phoenix of His Age: Interpretations of Erasmus, c. 1550–1750* (Toronto etc.: 1979).
- , *Man on his Own: Interpretations of Erasmus c. 1750–1920* (Toronto etc.: 1992).
- , *Erasmus in the Twentieth Century: Interpretations c. 1920–2000* (Toronto etc.: 2003).
- MARGOLIN J.-C., *Érasme, précepteur de l'Europe* (Paris: 1995).
- MATHEEUSSEN C., "La traduction française de *L'Éloge de la folie* par Georges d'Halluin et la traduction anonyme parisienne de 1520", *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 28 (1979) 187–198.
- MOUT M.E.H.N. – ŚMOLINSKY H. – TRAPMAN J. (eds.), *Erasmianism: Idea and Reality*, Verhandelingen Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen. Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks (Amsterdam: 1997).
- MURRAY R.H., *Erasmus and Luther: Their Attitude to Toleration* (New York: 1920).
- NOORDENBOS O., "Erasmus en de Nederlanden", *Bijdragen voor Vaderlandsche Geschiedenis en Oudheidkunde* (7th ser.) 7 (1936) 193–212.
- NUTTAL G.F., "Erasmus and Spain: The Vision of Marcel Bataillon", *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 46 (1994) 105–113.
- OLIN J.C., *Christian Humanism & The Reformation: Selected Writings; with The Life of Erasmus, by Beatus Rhenanus* (New York: 1965).
- PETTEGREE A., "The Politics of Toleration in the Free Netherlands, 1572–1620", in Grell O.P. – Scribner B. (eds.), *Tolerance and Intolerance in the European Reformations* (Cambridge: 1996) 182–198.
- REMER G., *Humanism and the Rhetoric of Toleration* (University Park, Penn.: 1996).
- REVUELTA SANUDO M. – MORÓN Arroyo C. (eds.), *El Erasmismo en España* (Santander: 1986).
- QUADRI M., "Erasmus' Prince and Shakespeare's King: The Case of Henry V", in Corti C. (ed.), *Silenos: Erasmus in Elizabethan Literature* (Pisa: 1998) 67–85.

- RAMADA CURTO D., “Os Louvores da Parvoíce”, *Revista Península* 1 (2004) 191–200.
- RECHTIEN J.G., “A 1520 French Translation of the *Moriae Encomium*”, *Renaissance Quarterly* 27, 4 (1974) 23–35.
- SCHOECK R.J. “Agricola and Erasmus: Erasmus’s Inheritance of Northern Humanism”, in F. Akkerman F. – Vanderjagt J.H. (ed.), *Rodolphus Agricola Phrisius* (Leiden: 1988), 181–188.
- SEIDEL MENCHI S., *Erasmus in Italia: 1520–1580* (Torino: 1987; Germ. trans. *Erasmus als Ketzer: Reformation und Inquisition im Italien des 16. Jahrhunderts*, trans. U. Hartmann, Brill’s Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought 49 [Leiden – Boston: 1992]).
- , “Do we need the ‘Ism’? Some Mediterranean Perspectives”, in Mout – Smolinsky – Trapman (eds.), *Erasmianism: Idea and Reality* 47–64.
- , “La circolazione clandestina di Erasmo in Italia: i casi di Antonio Brucioli e di Marsilio Andreasi”, *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 9 (1979) 573–601.
- SOUTHCORBE G. – GRANT T., *Restoration Politics, Religion and Culture* (New York: 2010).
- SPURR J., *The Post-Reformation: 1603–1714* (Harlow, UK: 2006).
- TRACY J.D., “Erasmus, Coornhert and the Acceptance of Religious Disunity in the Body Politic: A Low Countries Tradition?”, in Berkvens-Stevelinck C. – Israel J. – Posthumus Meyjes G.H.M. (eds.), *The Emergence of Tolerance in the Dutch Republic* (Leiden: 1997) 49–62.
- TRAPMAN J., “Grotius and Erasmus”, Nellen H.J.M. – Rabbie E. (eds.), *Hugo Grotius Theologian: Essay in Honour of G.H.M. Posthumus Meyjes* (Leiden etc.: 1994) 77–98.