Erasmus in translation (16th-17th centuries)

Smith, P.J.; MacPhail, E.

CHAPTER 11

Erasmus in Translation (16th–17th Centuries)

Paul J. Smith

> Few single authors can have been as much translated, at such different times and for such different purposes as Erasmus.[1]

∴

The international fame of most writers can be measured, to a large extent, by the number of translations of their works. If we now look at the Erasmus translations in early modern Europe—the subject of this chapter—, this assumption turns out to be only partially true: in Erasmus' case, translation is not a reliable indicator of his reputation. The overwhelming amount of translations is merely a faint echo of his real reputation, first of all because of the large number of his humanistically trained readers, who did not need a translation. Another problematic point lies in the definition of the notion of "translation." In the early modern period, by no means all translations, of Erasmus and others, are translations in the modern sense of the word. This becomes apparent, for example, when we look at the early modern translations made of Erasmus' most famous work: the *Praise of Folly*. As we will show further on in this chapter, several of them were "naturalized," that is to say: more or less adapted to the intended audience, not only in content but also in form. There are rhymed "translations" of the *Praise of Folly*, and adaptations in the form of a dialogue, just as there are rhymed versions of the *Apophthegmata* and the *Colloquies*. Therefore, it is often difficult to draw clear lines of demarcation between translation, adaptation, and imitation.

The problem of what a translation is, incidentally, already arises in the work of Erasmus himself: in addition to integral translations of complete texts from the Greek into Latin (New Testament, Euripides, Plutarch, Lucian), Erasmus'

1 Margaret Mann Phillips, "Erasmus and Propaganda: A Study of the Translations of Erasmus in English and French," *The Modern Language Review* 37 (1942) 1.

 | DOI:10.1163/9789004539686_013

work has numerous Latin paraphrases and quotations of varying length from these authors. Should these textual borrowings also be counted as translations? And, a Latin paraphrase of a Greek Bible text, whether or not accompanied by annotations, is that another translation? And what about a vernacular translation of a Latin translation by Erasmus of a Greek text (as can be seen in a number of Lucian translations in the vernacular, which are based on the translations by Erasmus and Thomas More)? A special case is Erasmus' Latin translation of the New Testament, published in 1516 under the title *Novum Instrumentum*, and in later editions under the title *Novum Testamentum*. According to Henk Jan de Jonge, Erasmus' translation "was the most widely used Latin text of the New Testament next to the Vulgate. Erasmus' translation was printed in about 220 editions and reprints in several countries in Europe."[2] For Bible translations into the vernacular, this *Novum Testamentum* is of exceptional importance, as it led many in Europe to make their own translations of the Bible, which may or may not be based on the translation of Erasmus. We find such (partial) translations for the first time in German (1521), and then in Dutch (1522), English (1525), Swedish (1526) and Czech (1533).[3] Most of these translations are more or less inspired by Erasmus (although it is usually not clear whether the Erasmus translation is the only source) and often of Lutheran nature (and therefore immediately condemned in Catholic circles). In short, also in the case of the derivatives of the *Novum Testamentum*, it is often problematic to speak of "Erasmus translations." This brings us to a provisional, practical delineation of our corpus: by "Erasmus translation" we mean a substantial piece of text by Erasmus himself that has been transferred from Erasmus' Latin to another language and that is presented as a separate, demarcatable text.

In this chapter we limit ourselves to the period preceding the major Erasmus editions and French translations published by the Leiden publisher Pieter van der Aa in the early 18th century—publications that had a major impact in the European Erasmus reception. In order to gain insight into this immense and complex area, we base ourselves on the extensive literature on Erasmus translations, which is mostly language specific. Basic bibliographic works are the publications by Heinz Holeczek and Christoph Galle for the German language

2 H.J. de Jonge, "The character of Erasmus' translation of the New Testament as reflected in his translation of Hebrews 9," *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 14 (1984) 81.

3 Simon Willem Bijl, *Erasmus in het Nederlands tot 1617* (Nieuwkoop: B. de Graaf, 1978) 10–13.

area,[4] S.W. Bijl and A.J.E. Harmsen for the Dutch translations,[5] E.J. Devereux and Christoph Galle for the English,[6] Margaret Mann Phillips and the bibliography by Andrew Pettegree and his collaborators for the French,[7] Silvana Seidel Menchi for the Italian,[8] Marcel Bataillon and Jorge Ledo for the Spanish.[9] There are two useful reference works that provide an overview of the entire area: the monumental, but understandably very outdated *Bibliotheca Erasmiana*,[10] with many columns of Erasmus editions, and the above-mentioned work by Bijl, devoted to the Dutch Erasmus translations. For each Dutch translation he studies, Bijl provides a brief overview of the non-Dutch translations. A major disadvantage of all these studies is that, insofar as quantitative data is provided at all, it is not obtained and presented in a comparable and unambiguous manner—that is why the reader cannot expect a comprehensive quantification of all early modern Erasmus translations in this chapter.

After a brief overview of how Erasmus himself felt about translations of his work into the vernacular, we start with the translations into Dutch—not only because Dutch is Erasmus' mother tongue (although he never seems to have written in Dutch), but also because the Dutch translations form a clear cor-

4 Heinz Holeczek, *Erasmus Deutsch, Bd. 1: Die volkssprachliche Rezeption des Erasmus von Rotterdam in der reformatorischen Öffentlichkeit 1519–1536* (Stuttgart—Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 1983); Christoph Galle, "Katalog deutschsprachiger Übersetzungen erasmischer Texte im 16. Jahrhundert" in *Erasmus-Rezeption im 16. Jahrhundert*, ed. Christoph Galle and Tobias Sarx (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2012) 177–188.

5 Bijl, *Erasmus in het Nederlands tot 1617*; A.J.E. Harmsen, *Desiderius Erasmus*, database https://www.let.leidenuniv.nl/Dutch/Latijn/Erasmus.html. Another useful database is set up by the Rotterdam Public Library: https://www.erasmus.org/index.cfm?itm_name=erasmusonline-EN.

6 E.J. Devereux, *Renaissance English Translations of Erasmus. A Bibliography to 1700* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983); Christoph Galle, "Katalog englischsprachiger Übersetzungen erasmischer Texte im 16. Jahrhundert" in *Erasmus-Rezeption im 16. Jahrhundert* 189–196.

7 Margaret Mann Phillips, *Érasme et les débuts de la Réforme française (1517–1536)* (Paris: Champion, 1933); Andrew Pettegree, Malcolm Walsby, and Alexander Wilkinson, *French vernacular books: books published in the French language before 1601* (Leiden: Brill, 2007).

8 Silvana Seidel Menchi, *Erasmo in Italia 1520–1580* (Torino: Bollati Boringhieri, 1987).

9 Marcel Bataillon, *Érasme et l'Espagne. Nouvelle édition en trois volumes*, ed. Daniel Devoto and Charles Amiel (Geneva: Droz, 1991); Jorge Ledo, "Which *Praise of Folly* Did the Spanish Censors Read? The *Moria de Erasmo Roterodamo* (c. 1532–1535) and the *Libro del muy illustre y doctíssimo Señor Alberto Pio* (1536) on the Eve of Erasmus' Inclusion in the Spanish Index," *Erasmus Studies* 38 (2018) 64–108, Appendix 3 "Sixteenth-century translations of Erasmus into Spanish."

10 Ferdinand van der Haeghen, "Bibliotheca Erasmiana. Bibliographie des œuvres d'Érasme" in *Bibliotheca Belgica. Bibliographie Générale des Pays-Bas*, ed. Marie-Thérèse Lenger, vol. 2 (Brussels: Culture et civilisation, 1964) 272–1049.

pus: starting from Harmsen's database, we arrive for the Northern and Southern Netherlands at a total of 28 works by Erasmus that were translated before 1585 (the year of the Fall of Antwerp), published in 102 editions,[11] a corpus that can be used as a point of comparison for the other language areas. We continue our overview with the translations into German, as this language area has the most translations of all countries: in his overview *Erasmus Deutsch*, Holeczek counts no less than 80 translated works of Erasmus in 275 editions for the first half of the 16th century. Then it is the turn of the translations into English and French, in this order, because the English situation resembles the Dutch and German more than the French, and because of the German-English situation there is a recent comparative bibliographic overview by Christoph Galle.[12] In the next part of our overview, we focus on Spain and Italy, countries where the growing production of Erasmus translations came to an abrupt halt around 1550, when Erasmus' work was put on the Index. We end our overview with a brief consideration of Erasmus translations into Czech, Polish and the Scandinavian languages.

1 Erasmus on the Translations of His Works[13]

Although Erasmus spent his entire life, in theory and practice, translating from Greek, and regularly reflected on this in his writings,[14] he is taciturn about translations into the vernacular. Only the translation of the Holy Scriptures into the vernacular receives a lot of his attention in his *Paraclesis ad lectorem pium* (1516) and especially in the preface to the edition of his Matthew Paraphrase (1522): the Holy Scriptures should be accessible to everyone in all languages, not only to professional theologians, with the restriction that the vernacular reader take a humble and pious attitude. Erasmus is always aware of the danger of interpretations not intended by the translator—a danger which, however, does not outweigh the importance of making translations. He constantly had to defend his views against attacks from the Parisian theologians, notably Noël

11 http://www.let.leidenuniv.nl/Dutch/Latijn/ErasmusVertalers.html

12 Galle, "Erasmus-Rezeption im Reich und in England: Ein diachroner Vergleich volkssprachlicher Übersetzungen" in *Erasmus-Rezeption im 16. Jahrhundert* 23–37.

13 Most of the information in this section comes from Egbertus van Gulik, *Erasmus and His Books*, tr. J.C. Grayson, ed. James K. McConica and Johannes Trapman (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2018) and Bijl, *Erasmus in het Nederlands tot 1617* 377–398.

14 See for instance Erika Rummel, *Erasmus as a Translator of the Classics* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985).

Béda and Petrus Sutor—the latter he answered in his much-quoted *Apologia adversus debacchationes Sutoris* (1525).

Erasmus is remarkably silent about the translations of his own work, and he appears to be only partially aware of them. This is understandable, not only because of the large number of translations spread over vast linguistic areas, but also because most translations were published anonymously, without mentioning the name of the author, translator, or printer. Erasmus' silence on translations of his work, especially those from the early 1520s, can also be interpreted as a sign of approval.[15] Erasmus does not comment on them in his printed works; his opinions on these translations can only be found in his correspondence, which is often informative both on specific translations and on general translation topics. For example, in a letter of 1527 addressed to Jan Laski, he claims that the monks fear they will lose their reputation among the people through his criticism-in-translation.[16]

There is one translation known to which Erasmus probably actually contributed, namely the French translation of *Exomologesis* by Claudius Cantiuncula, which was published in the same year 1524, two months after the publication of the original, under the title *Manière de se confesser*. According to Allen,[17] in view of the short time between the publication of the original and the translation, Cantiuncula must have had access to the manuscript of *Exomologesis*. An indication of the strong connection between original and translation is that both books were bound in a joint binding to be given as a gift by Erasmus to the influential François du Moulin, the spiritual adviser to the French king.[18]

Another example is Erasmus' sharp reactions to what he sees as a distorted interpretation of his work by the Swiss translator Leo Jud.[19] According to Jud's interpretation, Erasmus would agree with Luther that the altar sacrament would be nothing more than a memorial meal. Jud's misinterpretations were in German (1526); in the same year, Erasmus replied sharply in the *Detectio praestigiarum*, and made sure that this writing was immediately followed by a translation into German.[20]

---

15 Heinz Holeczek, "Erasmus von Rotterdam und die volkssprachliche Rezeption seiner Schriften in der Deutschen Reformation 1519–1536," *Zeitschrift für historische Forschung* 11 (1984) 158.

16 Ep. 1821 Allen lines 33–42.

17 See Ep. 1426 and Allen's commentary, quoted by Van Gulik, *Erasmus and His Books* 38.

18 ASD V-8: 326–328. See Van Gulik 38.

19 Jud translated much of Erasmus: all his *Paraphrases* (1535) as well as the *Enchiridion*, *Querela pacis*, and *Institutio principis christiani*.

20 See Christine Christ-von Wedel, "Erasmus und die Zürcher Reformatoren [...]" in *Erasmus in Zürich. Eine verschwiegene Autorität*, ed. Christine Christ-von Wedel and Urs B. Leu (Zurich: Neue Zürcher Zeitung Verlag, 2007) 125–134.

In his correspondence with his admirer and translator Louis de Berquin, Erasmus warns of the danger that may lie in translation of his work—danger coming from the repressive Catholic corner, of whom the aforementioned Noël Béda is one of the most polemic representatives. Erasmus not only fears bad consequences for Berquin but is also apprehensive of uncontrollable and harmful animosity against himself.[21] Erasmus' warnings turned out to be justified: Berquin was sentenced to the stake in 1529, and Erasmus' entreaties to François I and his sister Marguerite (later Marguerite de Navarre, Erasmian-minded author of the *Heptaméron*) were to no avail.[22]

Occasionally Erasmus speaks about the quality of the translation, including in the case of the French translation of the *Praise of Folly*, as we will see later. Sometimes Erasmus also gives good advice. In a letter from 1529, for example, he advises Emilio de' Migli (Aemilius de Aemiliis) to omit his letter to Paul Volz, which was published as a preface in the Latin original of the *Enchiridion*, because it turned out to be too controversial for many readers.[23] Erasmus feared commotion if this letter appeared in an Italian translation. Migli followed this advice: his Italian translation appeared in 1531 without the preface in question. This is the only translation of which it can be established with certainty that Erasmus had a copy in his library.[24] Erasmus was so satisfied with Migli that he advised him in the same letter about six other works that could be considered for translation, remarkably enough exclusively works of an edifying nature, which *conducunt ad pietatem*.[25] Erasmus apparently felt the need to give some direction to his translators. In 1528 he drew up a similar list in his letter to Alonso Fernández, the Spanish translator of the *Enchiridion*.[26]

In later letters, Erasmus states that several translations of his books are in the works. He does not elaborate on this, except that he insists once again on the ultimate goal of these translations: the promotion of piety among the readership. Remarkable and understandable is the caution with which Erasmus expresses himself: as said, he only speaks about his religious writings, not about his educational, satirical and literary works.

---

21 Ep. 1599.

22 See especially Ep. 1722 to François I, Allen lines 80–81.

23 Ep. 2165 Allen lines 30–32.

24 See the so-called *Versandliste*, analysed in Van Gulik, *Erasmus and His Books*, chap. 2.

25 Ep. 2165 Allen lines 38–41: *Commentarii in quinque Psalmos*, *Comparatio Virginis et Martyris*, *De misericordia Dei*, *De matrimonio Christiano, Vidua christiana*, *Paraphrases*. Quoted and commented on by Bijl, *Erasmus in het Nederlands tot 1617* 392.

26 Ep. 1969 Allen lines 24–31.

2 Erasmus in Dutch

The corpus of Erasmus translations into Dutch is quite large, but well-organized, and excellently documented, first by W. de Vreese,[27] then by Bijl, who gives an overview of the Erasmus translations up to 1617 (this end point was chosen because a collection of ten translations published by Matthijs Bastiaans in Rotterdam marks a new period),[28] and recently by Harmsen, who includes all translations up to now in his database. Harmsen mentions 317 editions for the period 1620–1700 (it should however be noted that no copies are known of a number of editions mentioned by him). Harmsen's database beautifully shows the clear division between the Northern and the Southern Netherlands. The editions of the Southern Netherlands (mostly from Antwerp) stop abruptly in the year 1585 with the Fall of Antwerp. And this while the production of Erasmus translations in the Southern Netherlands was larger than in the Northern Netherlands (56 editions against 37). Only one Antwerp edition is known from after 1585: namely *De Civilitate morum puerilium* from 1587, printed by Jan van Waesberghe, who by the way had already fled to the North by then. There appear to be no significant differences between North and South in the choice of the translated works. What are those translated works? Until 1585 it turned out to be 28 works. The seven most frequently printed translations are the following, in order of the number of editions: *Enchiridion* (13 editions), *De praeparatione ad mortem* (12), *De immensa Dei misericordia* (9), the paratexts to the *Novum Testamentum* (8), *De civilitate morum puerilium* (7), *Lingua* (6) and *Adagia* (6 not counting the separately published *Sileni Alcibiadis*).

Let's take a closer look at these seven translated works. Apart from the abovementioned *Novum Testamentum*, it is striking that these are mainly works of a practically oriented, edifying and educational nature. Most of these works are not offensive because of their content, are acceptable to most religious denominations, and are therefore printed in both the Northern and Southern Netherlands. An example of this is *De immensa Dei misericordia*: the Delft translation from 1526 was printed in Leiden, Amsterdam and Kampen as well as in Antwerp and Louvain.[29] It is remarkable that two translations of the *Enchiridion* were published simultaneously independently of each other in 1523, one in Amster-

27 W. de Vreese, "De Nederlandse vertalingen van Desiderius Erasmus," *Het Boek* 24 (1936–1937) 71–100.

28 *Opuscula Desiderii Erasmi* [...] (Rotterdam: Matthijs Bastiaans, 1616).

29 Bijl 123–124.

dam and one in Antwerp. According to Bijl, the simultaneous appearance does not seem to be a sign of financial competition or religious contradiction, but rather of cooperation between the printers from North and South. Bijl shows that the Amsterdam translation is somewhat freer, and that of Antwerp more faithful to the text. The Kampen printer printed both versions: the Amsterdam version four times and the Antwerp version only once.[30] Two other Northern Netherlandish translations appeared in the 17th century, those by Dirk Pietersz. Pers (1636) and Frans van Hoogstraten (1677). In his preface, Pers criticized the freedoms that the Amsterdam translation of 1523 afforded itself. In the case of *Lingua*, it is also a translation that will be corrected later. In 1555 a translation by the rhetorician Cornelis van Ghistele was published, which, however, left many church-critical passages untranslated. In 1583 a translation was published based on that by Van Ghistele, but which translated the untranslated passages.

Bijl rightly remarks about the *Adagia* that a real "complete translation" has never been published in Dutch. Less rightly, he asserts that "only in the 17th century" separate adages appear in Dutch—this in contrast to the situation in Germany and England, among others.[31] Harmsen's database, however, shows a different picture: around 1520 a Dutch translation, now lost, of *Sileni Alcibiadis* is said to have been published in Zwolle. This could even be the very first Dutch translation of Erasmus' work. And from the 1540s, some adages appear in Dutch translation in the Southern Netherlands. In the 17th century several adages appear separately (notably *Dulce bellum inexpertis* and *Sileni Alcibiadis*), in anthologies, or in more or less complete editions of the *Adagia*.

The *Praise of Folly* is certainly not one of the seven works most published in Dutch up to 1583. Nevertheless, the translations of this work occupy an exceptional place, especially in the 17th century. The first translation appears quite late: in 1560 by Johan Geillyaert, a southern Dutchman who had fled to Emden. In his monograph devoted to the Dutch translations of the *Praise of Folly*, Hans Trapman[32] shows how Geillyaert used the German translation from 1534 by Sebastian Franck for his translation from Latin (about Franck, see below). Geillyaert's translation is reprinted 9 times up to 1666.

30 Bijl 74–75.

31 Bijl 180.

32 Hans Trapman, *Wijze dwaasheid. Vijfhonderd jaar* Lof der Zotheid *in Nederland* (Amsterdam: Balans, 2011) 53–54. The information in this and the next paragraph, devoted to the *Praise of Folly*, is largely taken from Trapman's study.

FIGURE 11.1
Cornelis Huyberts, Fontispiece of Erasmus, *Moriae Encomium. Of de Lof der Zotheid,* tr. Frans van Hoogstraten (Amsterdam: Willem Linnig van Koppenol, 1700).

The translation by the Catholic Rotterdam printer Frans van Hoogstraten is published in 1676. In his Preface the translator argues that the *Praise of Folly* is acceptable to both Catholic and Protestant readers.[33] He does so by including a translation of the correspondence on the topic between Erasmus and Jacopo Sadoleto (February–May 1530). Van Hoogstraten's translation was successful, as it was reprinted until 1738. The 1700 edition is important for the image of *Praise of Folly*, as it is the first Dutch edition of the *Praise* to be illustrated, and in which Folly gets a face (Fig. 11.1). The engravings, by Cornelis Huyberts, were made independently of the well-known drawings that Hans Holbein made in his personal copy of the *Praise of Folly*, and which have been used extensively since the 1676 Basel edition of the *Praise*, among others in the Leiden editions of Van der Aa from the early 18th century.

33 Trapman 116–118.

While the translations by Geillyaert and Van Hoogstraten can be called literal, the three other early modern Dutch translations of the *Praise of Folly* are characterized by the aforementioned tendency towards "naturalization" and adaptation: all three are in fact rhymed.[34] The first of these translations was by the translator and poet Jacob Westerbaen (1659), who transcribed Erasmus' Latin in 5500 Dutch alexandrines, while keeping thematically close to the original. In 1689 the rhymed translation by Adriaen Stikke appeared posthumously, which was written independently of Westerbaen and probably before his translation. Trapman demonstrates how Stikke's translation is freer and more personal than Westerbaen's: in particular the themes of war, love, scholastic ingenuity, monks and greed are elaborated by Stikke satirically. In 1706 the third rhymed adaptation appeared, by a certain Cornelis van der Port, who is otherwise unknown. This work does not excel in its poetic quality, but is nevertheless interesting because of the very numerous elaborations, for which a large number of 17th-century sources are used, which the translator is proud to mention in the preliminary work: from the poets Constantijn Huygens and Willem Godschalck van Focquenbroch to the physician Johan van Beverwijck. And later in his translation, Rabelais is also mentioned. Under the translator's pen, not only Folly, but also four of her companions are given the floor: Self-love, Lust, Flattery and Abundance—Lust even gets a 30-page monologue. Another interesting aspect is that this adaptation made use of the illustrations taken from the 1700 edition of Van Hoogstraten's translation.

The reception and image of Erasmus in the 17th-century Republic have not been systematically investigated. Some notable things should be mentioned here. The 17th century, for example, sees some specific developments in the range of Erasmus translations. While in the 16th century the attention to the *Paraphrases* in translation is rather limited, its translation, published by Ellert de Veer, is extremely successful, partly because this translation was used in ministerial training.

Also interesting are the five translations which Jan Hendriksz Glazemaker produced in 1651 and in 1663, among others the *Annotationes* (1663)—Glazemaker was the first one in the world to have translated the complete *Annotationes*. Glazemaker has the reputation of translating difficult authors such as Montaigne, or authors heralding the Radical Enlightenment, including Spinoza and Descartes. It is, however, unlikely that with his translations Glazemaker wanted to place Erasmus in the corner of Montaigne, Descartes or Spinoza—it was probably a translation assignment.

34 About these verse translations, see Trapman chap. 5.

The image of Erasmus in the 17th century is reflected in the illustrations. Many 17th-century Erasmus editions and translations published in the Netherlands have an illustrated title page. Paula Koning demonstrates how these title pages provide insight into the reception of Erasmus in the 17th century.[35] Further and broader research on this iconographic perspective would provide an interesting entrance to the reception of Erasmus in the Netherlands and beyond.

3 Erasmus Deutsch

In accordance with the Dutch situation, the majority of German Erasmus translators are anonymous, and the choice of the translated work often coincides with a particular theological, socio-educational and / or political view. The importance of Erasmus translations in this respect is shown by a fiercely anti-Catholic pamphlet from 1521 with a long title, quoted by Bijl:[36] *Why Erasmus of Rotterdam is translated. Why Luther and Ulrich von Hutten write in German. How useful and necessary it is that these matters are made available to the common man*.[37] An important difference with the Dutch situation is that, as far as non-anonymous translators are concerned, these are often persons of name, such as Leo Jud, Conradus Pellicanus, and Georgius Spalatinus—who, among other things, tried to take a stand in the rapidly changing relationships between Luther, Zwingli and Erasmus. In order to get a grip on the enormous amount (approx. 270) of German-language editions that were published during Erasmus' lifetime, Heinz Holeczek makes the following thematic subdivision, with the corresponding numbers of editions—a classification of which Holeczek is the first to admit that this cannot always be done consistently.

1. Bible translations, including the *Paraphrases* and the *Annotationes*: 110 editions;
2. Position within the Reformation movement and the church-political situation: 45 editions;
3. The life of the Christian citizen: 100 editions;
4. Political Writings: 15 editions.

35 Paula Koning, *Erasmus op de markt* (Rotterdam: Ad. Donker, 2009).

36 Bijl 366.

37 Johann Eberlin von Günzburg, *Warumb man herr Erasmus von Roterodam in Teütsche sprach transeriert. Warumb doctor Luther und herr Ulirich von Hutten teütsch scriben. Wie nuss un not es sy das sollich ding den gemeinen man für kom* [...] (Basel: Pamphilus Gengenbach, 1521).

Ad 1. This primarily concerns the four Gospels, which are published both separately and together, plus the Epistles. This production is only short-lived because of the publication of the German translation of Luther's New Testament (1522). The *Annotationes in Novum Testamentum* were published separately or bundled in the form of pamphlets (Holeczek counts 34 editions from 1521–1523). The *Paraphrases* were also partially translated from 1520–1523 on. The chief translator of the *Paraphrases* was Leo Jud, who published his work from 1521 in Zurich at the printer Froschauer before publishing the collected *Paraphrases* in 1542.

Ad 2. The second group distinguished by Holeczek also appeared largely in pamphlets. In the first instance, these are Erasmus' positions about Lent and the Christian holidays, and a little later, from 1525, the freedom of the will and the sacrament of the Eucharist—a position criticizing the translators Conradus Pellicanus and Jud—and a little later again, after the Speyer protestation (1529), his position about the persecution of heretics.

Ad 3. This is a group that is so heterogeneous that it forces Holeczek to make a further subdivision into no fewer than 5 subgroups: 1. Texts relating to Christian doctrine—in this, as in the Netherlands, the *Enchiridion* is the most successful: in 1520 a translation by Joannes Adelphus was published, which was revised by Jud (1521). In 1543 a new translation by Onnoferus Pirchinger appeared—all these translations and adaptations took place in Reformed circles. 2. An edifying text, such as the *Expostulatio*, also appeared in two translations, again by Jud and by Hieronymus Ernser. 3. German translations of the Lord's Prayer, one of which is illustrated. Furthermore, some separately translated colloquies on the theme of marriage. 4. The education of children, such as *De civilitate* with a dozen editions alone between 1530 (the year of the original Latin edition) and 1542. *Lingua* was also published in the 1540s. 5. On the theme of dying, in particular *De praeparatione ad mortem*, published in Latin in 1534, and translated into German in the same year by Caspar Hedio, and later retranslated by Jacob Salwechtern (1546).

Ad 4. The political writings include the two peace texts, the adage *Dulce bellum* and *Querela pacis*—the latter again in two translations, and the *Institutio principis christiani* also in two translations, again by Spalatin (Augsburg) and Jud (Zurich).

Due to its anti-Lutheran attitude, it is not surprising that *De libero arbitrio* hardly led to a German translation in the 16th century. To avoid escalation, Erasmus forbade the publication of the translation in preparation by Cochlaeus and Emser, two Roman Catholic theologians. The only German translation appeared in 1526. Although rarely translated, the work was often quoted in Latin as part of the debate on free will between Lutherans and Catholics.[38]

In his quantitative bibliographic study, Galle observes that the years 1520–1521 saw an explosive increase in the number of Erasmus translations, followed by a sharp decrease. An important part of the increase lies in the translation of those *Annotationes* that can be related to the papal bull *Exsurge Domine* and Luther's subsequent excommunication in 1520. An anonymous pamphlet published in 1521 in five different editions, of which Holeczek and Galle suspect that the text is by Erasmus,[39] certainly plays a role in Erasmus' increasing popularity in the early 1520s.

Because no data comparable to that of Holeczek and Galle is available on Erasmus' reception after the sixteenth century, it is difficult to obtain a general picture. From the important but outdated data of the *Bibliotheca Belgica*, one may conclude that in both Lutheran and Roman Catholic Germany the theological writings of Erasmus are much less translated and reprinted. However, a work like the *Praise of Folly* gets continuous attention. The *Praise of Folly* was translated by Sebastian Franck, and embedded in a number of other paradoxical eulogies, some by Franck himself, others paraphrased, such as Henricus Cornelius Agrippa of Nettesheim's *De incertitudine et vanitate omnium scientiarum et artium*. The whole translation was published in 1534 and reprinted until 1696. It was not until 1719 that a second translation of the *Praise of Folly* appears, which incidentally is based more on the French translation of Gueudeville (see below) than on the Latin original.

4 Erasmus in England

The general history of Erasmus translations in England and France is briefly summarized by Margaret Mann Phillips as follows:

38 See Bijl 310–311.

39 Holeczek, *Erasmus Deutsch* 135; Galle, "Erasmus-Rezeption" 31–32. The anonymous pamphlet in question is [Johannes Faber?], *Consilium cuiusdam ex animo cupientis esse consultum et Romani Pontificis dignitati et christiani religionis tranquillitati* (Basel: Johann Froben, 1520). Text in Ferguson 352–361.

> [...] The translators call on all these [i.e., Erasmus' works, subdivided by Mann Phillips in "devotional works, classical learning, social and religious reform, and light literature"]. As a general rule, it may be said that the interest of the sixteenth century was centred on the devotional side and on those writings which should be used as weapons by the reformers; that the seventeenth century used Erasmus for vulgarization of learning and the *Colloquies* as a school book, but also roped him into their religious and political controversies, and on opposing sides; that the readers of the eighteenth century found the *Praise of Folly* exactly the sort of gilded pill they liked, and enjoyed the *Colloquies* for their funny side; and that the early nineteenth century gave great publicity to Erasmus pacifist.[40]

This general observation is correct, but of course requires some nuance, which will be given in this section on the English translations and in the next section on the French translations.

As Devereux, Dodds, and Galle demonstrate, the Erasmus translations are a reflection of the great political upheavals in early modern England. At the time of Henry VIII, it is mainly Erasmus' short writings which are translated, because they lend themselves easily to use in pamphlets. For example, the use of Erasmus in pamphletary publications was promoted by the translator and publisher Richard Taverner, who was financially supported in his advertising activities by Thomas Cromwell. Some *Colloquies* and *Adagia* in particular lend themselves to publication in pamphlet form. A well-known example of this is the anonymous translation *Pilgrimage of Pure Devocyoun*, probably printed in 1536 by order of Thomas Cromwell. The situation in this colloquy was recognizable to the English reader, as the colloquy tells in dialogue form the plans for a pilgrimage to Walsingham and to Canterbury. The two main characters are Erasmus himself and a second person who is probably John Colet.[41]

In his study, Dodds shows the importance of the English translation of Erasmus' *Paraphrases* in the changing political-religious contexts under Edward VI, Mary I, Elizabeth I and the Restoration respectively. During the reign of Edward VI, the *Paraphrases* were made a legalized part of the English Reformation, with the underlying idea of preventing uncontrolled Bible reading. In 1547 it was decreed that in every parish church the *Paraphrases* should be accessible, both in the Latin version and in the English translation. It goes without

40 Mann Phillips, "Erasmus and Propaganda" (note 1 above) 2.

41 Mann Phillips, "Erasmus and Propaganda" 4, referring to H. de Vocht, *The Earliest English Translations of Erasmus'* Colloquia*, 1536–1566* (Louvain, 1928).

saying that in this Anglican context Erasmus was not seen as a Roman Catholic writer, and that Luther's criticism of the *Paraphrases* went unmentioned.

During the Catholic reign of Mary I, there was a ban on Protestant literature, which logically, given the preceding period, should also include Erasmus. However, Erasmus was somewhat of an exception, partly because his friend Thomas More, who was put to death by Henry VIII, was rehabilitated. Moreover, at the instigation of Catherine Parr, Henry VIII's last wife, Mary herself had begun to translate Erasmus' Paraphrase of the Gospel of John. Unlike in the Catholic countries of Southern Europe, Erasmus continued to be read by the English Catholics. For example, Catholic-minded Thomas Payne dedicated Erasmus' *Complaint of Peace* to Elizabeth at the inception of her government, hoping for a tolerant regime.[42]

At the time of Elizabeth I, the *Paraphrases* were restored; in 1559 the Royal Injunction of 1547 was renewed. However, it is remarkable that between 1580 and 1606 hardly any more translations of Erasmus were published.[43] According to Dodds, this is because Elizabeth developed more and more towards Calvinism over time, which ruled out any form of official Erasmianism. In fact, the decline in Erasmus translations applies to the entire period from Elizabeth's accession to the throne up to the Restoration. The few translations from that time concern works that can be used in education, such as certain colloquies and adages. Only from 1660 there is a turnaround. New translations of Erasmus are appearing, but now mainly because of their literary value.

Remarkable, in this respect, is the number of translations and editions of the *Praise of Folly*. The first translation by Thomas Chaloner, published in 1549, and reprinted the same year and in 1577, was due for renewal in the 17th century. A translation by Thomas Wilson was published in 1668 and one by White Kennett in 1683. The latter was reprinted in 1709 and provided with illustrations based on the Holbein-inspired illustrations from the Basel edition of 1676. In addition to the literary value of the work, the political motivation of the translators also played a role. As Devereux succinctly summarizes: "Both seventeenth-century translations were clearly inspired by the sectarian squabbling of the age, as Chaloner's had been directed against the religious tendencies of the reign of Edward VI."[44] Erasmus' writings were also translated in the second half of the 17th century to serve as carrier of political-religious messages. *Julius exclusus e coelis* (1673) was thus translated as an anti-Catholic pamphlet. And Roger

42 Gregory Dodds, *Exploiting Erasmus* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009) 62.

43 Galle, "Erasmus-Rezeption" 30; Dodds 64.

44 Devereux, *Renaissance English Translations of Erasmus* 134.

L'Estrange translated a number of colloquies (1680), according to Devereux, "in an effort to restore order and some sense of toleration,"[45] not without success because they were reprinted several times.

5 Erasmus in French Dress

We are well informed about the general reception of Erasmus in France and the place of the translations therein thanks to Margaret Mann Phillips' thesis (1933) and her additional articles from 1942 and 1971.[46] It is regrettable, however, that they do not provide a clear bibliographic overview of the translations and editions found by her. For example, she mentions in her 1971 article that she found 21 French editions, which appeared between 1539 and 1574—but without unambiguously describing all these editions. Be that as it may, these figures have now turned out to be outdated. The bibliographic survey *French vernacular books: books published in the French language before 1601* by Andrew Pettegree, Malcolm Walsby, and Alexander Wilkinson lists 114 editions of French Erasmus translations and, in comparison with the 21 editions of Mann Phillips, 80 editions that were published between 1539 and 1574. These figures do not include manuscript translations. A recent general bibliographic overview for the sixteenth (and seventeenth) centuries, as it exists for England, Germany, the Netherlands, and Spain (see below), is missing for France.[47]

Despite their bibliographically outdated nature, Mann Phillips' publications are still of great value to the overall picture of Erasmus translations in France. In the 1520s, the reception of Erasmus' writings was strongly determined by his relationships with Luther—at least as they were perceived by the Sorbonne,

45 Devereux 17.

46 The thesis is *Érasme et les débuts de la Réforme française (1517–1536)* (note 7 above), and the articles are "Erasmus and Propaganda" (note 1 above) and "Erasmus in France in the Later Sixteenth Century," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 34 (1971) 246–261. In the supplementary articles, Mann Phillips used some publications that zoom in on the translations of specific works by Erasmus: James Hutton, "Erasmus in France: the Propaganda for Peace," *Studies in the Renaissance* 8 (1961) 103–127 about the translations of *Dulce bellum* and *Querela pacis*, and Dietmar Fricke, *Die französischen Fassungen der Institutio Principis Christiani* (Geneva: Droz, 1967).

47 There are, however, a number of articles that discuss the translations of specific works. For example, five French translations of the *Paraphrases* were recently identified and analyzed by Sarah Cameron-Pesant and Jean-François Cottier, "Les traductions françaises manuscrites des *Paraphrases* d'Érasme au XVI^e^ siècle" in *Érasme et la France*, ed. Blandine Perona and Tristan Vigliano (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2017) 355–381. See also G. Bedouelle, "Les *Paraphrases* d'Érasme en français," *Moreana* 39 (2002) 7–20.

especially Béda, and the French king. The most tragic proof of this is provided by Berquin, who brought out translations of both Luther's and Erasmus' work, and despite previous condemnations he persisted in this. After his books were burned, he himself ended up at the stake. Erasmianism and Lutheranism were lumped together. This explains why, unlike in Germany or in England, at that time hardly any satirical writings of Erasmus appeared in translation in contemporary France. The only exceptions are the 1520 translation of the *Praise of Folly* (more on that later) and three colloquies, which were translated by the poet Clément Marot, who was also suspected of Lutheran sympathies. Marot himself was never able to see these translations in print: two translations were published posthumously in 1549, the third not until the 19th century.[48]

This does not mean that Erasmus remained untranslated. For example, a devout work such as *De praeparatione ad mortem* had a translation that was reprinted five times, and in 1592 there is a second translation by B. de Troney. Mann Philips demonstrates how politically biased this last translation was.[49] That is, the Catholic Troney deleted some irenic passages from the end of the *De praeparatione ad mortem*, to replace them in his translation by a virulent anti-Protestant passage. There were also translations of some politically harmless works, such as the two educational pieces *De pueris* and *De civilitate morum puerilium* by Pierre Saliat, secretary to the influential cardinal Odet de Châtillon (1537). Saliat's version was reprinted several times, as well as new translations of *De civilitate*.[50] Antoine Macault published a translation of the *Apophthegmata* in 1539, preceded by a poem by his friend Marot. This was followed by two rhymed translations of the *Apophthegmata* by Guillaume Haudent (1557) and Gabriel Pot (1570).

Mann Phillips points to the large share of the printing city of Lyon in the publications of Erasmus' work and of French translations. Lyon is at a relatively safe distance from the Paris Sorbonne. The printer Gryphius played an important role in this Erasmian production, especially in the Latin editions of Erasmus. In the 1530s, François Rabelais worked as a print corrector for Andreas Gryphius. Although Rabelais did not directly translate Erasmus, Mann Phillips sees in him an exceptionally Erasmian writer, who "understood Erasmus, not patchily but as a whole."[51] As an example of this, we can mention Rabelais' use of the *Ada-*

48 Jean Céard, "Marot, traducteur d'Érasme" in *Clément Marot 'Prince des poëtes françois' 1496–1996*, ed. Gérard Defaux and Michel Simonin (Paris: Champion, 1997) 107–120.

49 Mann Phillips, "Erasmus in France" 258–260.

50 Bijl 187–188. See also Herman de la Fontaine Verwey, "The first 'book of etiquette' for children. Erasmus' *De civilitate morum puerilium*," *Quaerendo* 1 (1971) 19–30.

51 Mann Phillips, "Erasmus in France" 248.

gia. M.A. Screech counted some 45 borrowings from the *Adagia* alone.[52] In his thesis, Raphaël Cappellen arrives at a total of more than 200 borrowings from the *Adagia*.[53] After Gryphius, there were other Lyon publishers who published translations of Erasmus, including some well-known names: Jean de Tournes, Guillaume Rouille, Benoît Rigaud.

A special case is the Lyon printer and publisher Étienne Dolet: he was a fierce opponent of Erasmus in the Ciceronian quarrel around Erasmus' *Ciceronianus*. However, after Erasmus' death, he changed his position and became an Erasmus translator and publisher. In 1543 he was almost convicted in Paris for his publication of "heretical" books, including translations of the *Enchiridion* and the *Exomologesis*. He was acquitted, but in 1546 he was sentenced to death and hanged for spreading heresy.

In French, but outside France, some bilingual translations (French-Dutch) of the *Colloquies* were published which served as pedagogical materials for teaching French. A lost edition from Antwerp is known from 1559.[54] In 1592 the Antwerp publisher, bookseller, and poet Zacharias Heyns, who had fled to Amsterdam, published a translation of the dialogue *Coniugium*, intended for education at the girls' school of his father Peeter Heyns at Staden in Northern Germany.[55]

In the 17th century, Erasmus was hardly read anymore for his theological or political ideas, but rather for his pedagogical and grammatical work, which was appreciated for its literary qualities. This is especially true of the *Colloquies* and the *Praise of Folly*. The great driver of Erasmus' popularity was the prolific man of letters Samuel Chappuzeau, who anonymously translated a first selection from the *Colloquies* in 1653 during his wanderings in Europe. The Leiden publisher Adrien Vingart (Van Wijngaarden) mentions that, according to him, the *Colloquies* had not been published in French before (which is not entirely correct). In the 1660s Chappuzeau published the complete *Colloquies*. This translation continued to be read until it was replaced by the translation of Nicolas Gueudeville, who, strengthened by the enormous success of his trans-

52 M.A. Screech, *Rabelais* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1979) 443–444, 487.

53 Raphaël Cappellen, *"Feueilleter papiers, quoter cayers". La citation au regard de l'*eruditio ludere *des fictions rabelaisiennes*, Thèse de doctorat, Université François-Rabelais de Tours, 2013, 57–61.

54 Bijl 293.

55 Bijl 282–282 and J.M.J.L. Noël, "L'école des filles et la philosophie du mariage dans les Pays-Bas du XVI^e^ et du XVII^e^ siècle" in Werkgroep Achttiende Eeuw, *Onderwijs en opvoeding in de Achttiende Eeuw / Enseignement et éducation dans les Pays-Bas au dix-huitième siècle* (Amsterdam—Maarssen: APA—Holland University Press, 1983) 137–153 (151–152).

lation of the *Praise of Folly* (1715), published his translation with the Leiden publisher Van der Aa in 1720.[56]

As in the Netherlands, the *Praise of Folly* has an eventful history in France. The *Praise of Folly* was translated three times in 16th-century France.[57] The first translation, or rather adaptation, is by Jean Thenaud, attached to the court as *précepteur* of Louise de Valois' two children, the future king François Ier and his sister Marguerite. Around 1517, Thenaud was commissioned to write a long allegorical pedagogical treatise, entitled *Triumphe de Prudence*.[58] The ending of this treatise contains a partial translation of the *Praise of Folly*. Relative to the Latin text, its last part, in which Erasmus elevates Folly to the mystical level of Pauline folly and the Folly of the Cross, is rewritten into a blunt condemnation of Folly. Folly is thus presented as unambiguously negative: she is expelled by Dame Prudence. This translation did not appear in print, but came to us in three splendid manuscripts, one with illustrations.

The second translation, published in 1520 under the title *De la Declamation des louenges de follie*,[59] is also shortened at the end: the Pauline wisdom is twisted into a song of praise to Francis and his teachings. This version is also illustrated, with the woodcuts of the *Narrenschiff* or the *Ship of Fools* by Sebastian Brant—which shows how closely the names of Erasmus and Brant are linked for the contemporary readers. Brant's woodcuts have been specially adapted for this translation. The third translation is only known to us from Erasmus' correspondence. It is a translation by Joris van Halewijn (Georges d'Haloin), which Erasmus had seen, and about which he was not at all satisfied.[60] For a long time it was thought that this translation must be identical to the anonymous translation of 1520, but this appears to be incorrect, as has

56 Aubrey Rosenberg, *Nicolas Gueudeville and his work* (*1652–172?*) (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1982) 114–116.

57 See Paul J. Smith, "The First French Translations of the *Praise of Folly*," *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook* 32 (2012) 7–26.

58 See Jean Thenaud, *Le Triumphe des Vertuz. Premier traité. Le Triumphe de Prudence*, ed. Titia J. Schuurs-Janssen and René E.V. Stuip (Geneva: Droz, 1997).

59 See Blandine Perona, "*De la declamation des louenges de Follie*. Une illustration de la réception de l'*Éloge de la Folie* en France," *Babel* 25 (2012) 171–195.

60 See Ep. 739 to Antoon van Bergen, CWE lines 5–10: "Afterwards I heard from various people something that greatly troubled me—that your Lordship was somewhat displeased with me, I suppose on account of my *Moria*, which a distinguished man, Joris van Halewijn, in spite of my reluctance and my threats, has turned into French; in other words, has made it his book instead of mine, adding, subtracting, and altering at his good pleasure."

been convincingly demonstrated by Constant Matheeussen.[61] The 17th century has two translations.[62] The first, the most literally translated, was created by the French Huguenot Héli Poirier. This translation was printed in 1642 in the Netherlands, and partly as a result of this it went virtually unnoticed by contemporaries. The second translation is by a certain "Monsieur Petit," about whom nothing else is known. Here too we are dealing with an adaptation rather than with a translation: Dame Folie transforms into a (male) Parisian *flaneur*, inserting observations pertaining to the follies of 17th-century Parisians—a critique that is reminiscent of the satirical works of Molière or La Bruyère, without ever approaching the wit of these authors. This translation is also unsuccessful—only one edition is known. The great success comes with the above-mentioned translation by Gueudeville from 1715, which is illustrated with engravings based on the Basel 1676 edition of the *Praise of Folly*. Gueudeville's translation would be reprinted 22 times, in pirated editions or otherwise, with continuous adaptations in language and style, and accompanied from 1751 by new, fashionable, and elegant illustrations by Charles Eisen.

6 Italy and Spain: Erasmus before the Index

The impact of the Papal Index of 1555[63] on Erasmus editions in Latin and in the vernacular in Italy and Spain is evident from the figures. In her overview study, Seidel Menchi arrives at the impressive number of 55 editions from 1520 to 1524 and 37 more from 1525 to 1529. The figures for the period 1530 to 1554 are on average 20 editions per five years, including translations. Focused on the translations, Seidel Menchi notes one translation in Italian for the period 1530–1534, and 27 for the period 1535–1554.[64] This production of both the Latin editions and the Italian translations comes to an abrupt end: in the period 1555–1559 only one publication is noted, which is still a translation. A notable highlight is the *Enchiridion*, in the 1531 translation by Emilio de' Migli, which, printed

61 Constant Matheeussen, "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.

62 On these translations and the one by Gueudeville, see Paul J. Smith, "Folly goes French. The French Translations of the *Praise of Folly* in the 17th and 18th Centuries," *Erasmus Studies* 35 (2015) 35–60.

63 For a general survey of Erasmus' presence on this and other Indexes, see Marcella and Paul Grendler, "The Survival of Erasmus in Italy," *Erasmus in English* 8 (1976) 2–22. For the situation in Spain, see Bataillon, *Érasme et l'Espagne*.

64 Seidel Menchi, *Erasmo in Italia 1520–1580* 340.

with the aforementioned exhortation by Erasmus, was edited five times.[65] The *Praise of Folly* is widely read in Italy. Although the first Italian translation dates from 1539, there are many partial translations and imitations.[66] One of them is by Faustino Perisauli, who gives a rhymed translation of the *Praise of Folly* in Latin: *De triumpho stultitiae* (Venice, 1524).[67] Another is by the polygraph Antonio Brucioli, who turns the *Praise of Folly* into a dialogue in his *Dialogo della sapientia e della stultitia* (1526, second edition 1538). Reinier Leushuis argues that this dialogue format fits in with the general interest in this literary genre in Italy in the 1520s.[68]

The situation in Spain is similar, only here the numbers of translations and imprints are higher: according to Marcel Bataillon, the number of Spanish Erasmus translations was even higher than anywhere else in Europe during Erasmus' lifetime.[69] From the recent survey that Jorge Ledo gives,[70] we can conclude that there were approximately 25 translated works, in 31 different translations, published in 67 editions between 1516 and 1556. It should be noted here that most of the editions from 1555 and 1556, that is, after the Index, are published in Antwerp—Antwerp being home to many Spanish-speaking people at that time. The rupture was therefore a little less abrupt here than in Italy. But it was equally important: after 1556, no translations of Erasmus were published in Spain.

The most successful Erasmus translation into Spanish is the 1526 translation of the *Enchiridion* by Alonso Fernández which is printed 8 times. Bataillon reconstructs the lost version of a letter sent by Fernández to Erasmus—a version so enthusiastic that it was toned down by an intermediary, Alfonso de Valdés, who feared Erasmus would receive the panegyric with suspicion:[71]

> At the Emperor's court, in towns, in churches, in convents, even in inns and on the roads, everyone has the *Enchiridion* in Spanish. Until then it had been read in Latin by a minority of Latinists; still they did not quite

65 Seidel Menchi 388, n. 70.

66 See B. Croce, "Sulle traduzioni e imitazione italiane del' 'Elogio' e dei 'Colloqui' di Erasmo" in *Aneddoti di varia letteratura* (Bari: Laterza, 1953) 411–414.

67 Seidel Menchi 39.

68 Reinier Leushuis, "Antonio Brucioli and the Italian Reception of Erasmus: The *Praise of Folly* in Dialogue" in Karl A.E. Enenkel, *The reception of Erasmus in the Early Modern Period* (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2013) 237–259.

69 Bataillon I, 301.

70 Ledo, "Which *Praise of Folly* Did the Spanish Censors Read?"

71 For the adapted version of the letter that Erasmus eventually received, see Ep. 1904 and Allen's introduction.

> understand it. It is now read in Spanish by people of all kinds, and those who before had never heard of Erasmus learned of his existence from this simple book.[72]

Erasmus is satisfied with Fernández's translation, which is also apparent from the above-mentioned list of other works that Erasmus found eligible for translation. Also successful is the 1531 translation of *Lingua* by Bernardo Pérez de Chinchón, which is published six times. Alonso Ruiz de Virués translated a number of colloquies from 1529, accompanied by an enthusiastic foreword.[73] Also striking is the gap between 1537 and 1545, in which some works are still being reprinted, but in which no new translations were published.

As in other languages, the translation of the *Praise of Folly* plays a special role in Spanish. The first translation originates, quite unexpectedly, from the translation of an anti-Erasmian author. The *Praise of Folly* is quoted extensively in a Latin work by the anti-Erasmian Alberto Pio entitled *Twenty-three books against passages in the works of Erasmus of Rotterdam* (Paris, 1531). Jorge Ledo shows that in the Spanish translation of this work, the passages from the *Praise of Folly* are substantially extended to become a (partial) translation.[74] Moreover, in 2012 a 17th-century manuscript Spanish translation of the *Praise of Folly* was discovered by Ledo.[75] This turned out to be a transcription of a now lost printed edition of a Spanish translation from 1532–1535, of which Bataillon and other scholars already suspected the existence.[76]

7 Erasmus Elsewhere

In addition to the languages discussed above, Erasmus was also translated into Czech and Polish, and more sparingly in the Scandinavian countries. The most notable of these cases is Czech.[77] The data from the *Bibliotheca Erasmiana* and Bijl show that Erasmus was not only translated into Czech frequently, but also at a very early stage. Czech, for example, has a world first with the translation of

72 Bataillon I, 302 (my translation from the French).

73 For a contextualization of the Spanish translations of *Lingua* and the *Colloquies*, see Bataillon I, 309–335, 337–339.

74 Ledo, "Which *Praise of Folly* Did the Spanish Censors Read?"

75 Jorge Ledo and Harm den Boer, ed., *Moria de Erasmo Roterodamo. A Critical Edition of the Early Modern Spanish Translation of Erasmus's* Encomium Moriae (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2014).

76 See Bataillon III, 429.

77 Most information about the Czech translations comes from Bijl.

the *Praise of Folly* by Gregor Hruby of Jeleni in 1513—although this translation was not published in print. Czech translations of *Enchiridion* (1519), *Precatio dominica* (1526), and the *Colloquies* (many translations from 1534) are also early. And in 1534, 1542 and 1571 partial translations of the *Paraphrases* appear. Translations also appear later in the century: *De praeparatione ad mortem* (1563, four reeditions until 1579), *De immensa Dei misericordia* (1558 and 1573) and *Vidua* (1595). The explanation of the Czech interest in Erasmus lies in the correspondence that Erasmus had with some Czechs, including Jan Šlechta and Arkleb of Boskovice. It is not impossible that the Czechs saw something in Erasmus of their 15th-century reformer Jan Hus—from whom however Erasmus always distanced himself.

Erasmus also had warm and early relations with Polish humanists, particularly with Jan Laski, who lived with him in Basel. These relationships probably formed the basis of some Polish translations: *Precatio Dominica* (1533), *Lingua* (1542), *Querela pacis* (1545, translated by Laski). And in the commentary accompanying his translation of the New Testament (1574), Szymon Budny refers to Erasmus' *Annotationes* as an unquestionable authority on issues such as text corruption and interpolation: "But in such a clear case, it is a pity to waste one's time and one's words; therefore, let us listen to what a wise and reasonable man thinks, Erasmus of Rotterdam."[78]

In Scandinavia Erasmus was translated quite late, probably because his work could be read in Latin or German, or because the prevailing Lutheranism made reading Erasmus suspicious. Exceptional are the two early translations into Danish of *Institutio principis christiani* and *De sarcienda ecclesiae concordia*, both from 1534. For Swedish, the translations of *Enchiridion* (1592) and *Paraclesis* (1620) can be mentioned. A number of bilingual editions (1693) of *De civilitate* appeared in the 17th century with the introductory title *Libellus aureus*. Very special is the edition of the Latin text with a threefold translation (in Swedish, German and Finnish) from 1670. The long subtitle of this work expressly indicates what the target group of the book was, namely the school class: *Libellus aureus,* [...] *in usum scholarum et poedagogiorum*.

78 Quoted in French by Claude Backvis, "La fortune d'Érasme en Pologne" in *Colloquium erasmianum. Actes du Colloque international réuni à Mons du 26 au 29 octobre 1967 à l'occasion du cinquième centenaire de la naissance d'Érasme* (Mons: Centre universitaire de l'État, 1968) 191.

8 By Way of Conclusion

As mentioned, the field of Erasmus translations is endless, especially because not only iconic works such as the *Colloquies* or the *Praise of Folly*, but each translated work of his has its own context and follows its own path. While logically our knowledge of the topic is greater than it was in the days of Mann Phillips, we are left with the same sense of helplessness, as she so beautifully expressed it: "I hope no one will expect these notes to be exhaustive: they can be nothing but straws in the wind, sporadic indications of that partial survival which is the fate of even the greatest."[79]

What emerges from the above overview is that Erasmus was usually translated to express the translator's own ideology, usually political or religious, and in this respect translations do not differ from the publishing of Latin editions of Erasmus. The content of the text is regularly altered, parts are omitted or rewritten, and guiding paratexts are added. The translations therefore often say more about the translator than about Erasmus.

Translation becomes difficult if not impossible once the ideology falls into "totalitarianism."[80] Translations, in some cases also the translator or publisher himself (Berquin, Dolet), can end up at the stake. And the Index makes it virtually impossible to translate Erasmus in Spain, Italy and the Southern Netherlands after 1555. Elsewhere in Europe, Erasmus lives on through translations in the 17th century and into later centuries: especially as the admired literary author of the *Colloquies* and the *Praise of Folly*, but also for the translations of his pedagogical and edifying writings. To quote the words of Jean-Claude Margolin, Erasmus endures as the *"précepteur de l'Europe."*[81]

79 Mann Phillips, "Erasmus in France" 246.

80 Term used by Mann Phillips, "Erasmus in France" 247.

81 Jean-Claude Margolin, *Érasme précepteur de l'Europe* (Paris: Julliard, 1995).