

already know: "What and how much of reality is known is already from the very beginning given by intuition. For it alone can see reality [phenomena], and therefore know. This is the logical consequence of the principle of intuition, according to which only an act like intuition (looking) can reach the object. In order to know something (not merely to work on it afterwards, or conceptualize it, or unify and order it, but in order first of all to know it!), one must see it" (49-50). Thus, thought stands in the service of sensible intuition, determining the meaning and range of reality (79).

For Lonergan, the opposite is true. Reality, as humans know it, is in the judgment (*ens iudicio rationali cognoscitur*). On this account, so-called sensible and intellectual intuition serve the intending operations of understanding and judgment, which Lonergan clearly demarcates: the former is an act of consciousness propelled by questions for intelligence (*Quid sit?*) which culminate in conceptual objectifications; the latter, too, is an act but one guided by qualitatively distinct questions, questions for reflection (*An sit?*) which intend a noetic grasp of the conditions that ground affirmative or negative judgments. This allows Lonergan to collapse Kant's antithetic distinction of a reality proper (noumenon), about which nothing can be known, and appearances (phenomena), toward which *Verstand-Vernunft* tend: "It is just as much a matter of judgment to know that an object is not real but apparent, as it is to know that an object is not apparent but real" (75; cf. 71). Sala feels justified, then, in characterizing Kant's intellectual move as a *return* to sensibility, which alone mediates the object as phenomenally real, and Lonergan's as a *forward movement* of intentionality to the judgment of fact, which satisfies the question of the object as noumenally, "really" real (cf. 132).

Lonergan and Kant is a masterly piece of work that is required reading for scholars working in the areas of epistemology and philosophy of religion. Its claim that Lonergan is "the philosopher of human subjectivity" should elicit the critical attention such claims usually summon (xii). Sala handles himself well in terms of his capabilities as a Kant scholar. One only hopes that future contributions to this series can maintain similar levels of scholarship, but perhaps in a less comparative way. What is also needed, to borrow Bernard McGinn's recent description, is the ability "to think along with" Lonergan, which takes one beyond exegesis and preferential comparisons.

Jim Kanaris

McGill University

Collected Works of Erasmus. Volume 11: Letters 1535 to 1657, 1525. Trans. Alexander Dalzell. Annotated by Charles G. Nauert, Jr. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994. ISBN 0-8020-0536-5. Pp. xxiii+476.

Twenty years have passed since this reviewer subscribed to Volume 1 of the *Collected Works of Erasmus*, a work which covered a sixteen-year span of the scholar's life from 1484-1500. Since then several more volumes of Erasmus's extensive

Correspondence, as well as of his many writings, have appeared in English translation. The current eleventh volume contains letters 1535 to 1657—one hundred and twenty-two letters written by and to Erasmus between January and December 1525. Although a mere fragment of the extant correspondence, these letters reflect the network Erasmus maintained during a crucial year in Reformation history—ample proof in itself of his reputation as a man of letters. The approximately seventy-five correspondents came from communities as far as London in the northwest, Dresden in the East and Rome in the south, with some nineteen localities in between these.

To browse in this volume is to read a veritable “Who’s Who” of central Europe in 1525. Among the seventy-five correspondents whom we meet through these pages we find the reigning pope, notable scholars and patrons of *belle lettres*, such as Willibald Pirckheimer of Nuremberg. There are bishops and cardinals, theologians and doctors of the church, like Reginald Pole, reformers like Pelican and Zwingli, and persons of influence and power in the affairs of state, as well as lesser known individuals.

The letters were translated by Alexander Dalzell and annotated by Charles G. Nauert, Jr., who together have achieved a superb piece of scholarship. Its good prose style and informed critical apparatus do justice to the ideals of the great humanist and make his letters, as well as those addressed to him, a most readable and informative collection of sixteenth century epistolary writing.

Following in what now has become accepted procedure in the *Collected Works of Erasmus*, this volume is equipped with a table of correspondents, a list of frequently cited works, a list of short titles for Erasmus’s works, and a detailed general index. The footnotes to the text are not copious, but wholly adequate in helping to clarify references which would otherwise not be readily accessible to the reader. Each letter is introduced by a brief comment which puts it into context.

The editors further enhanced the volume by a few well-chosen illustrations. Dürer’s satirical victory column aptly reminds the reader of the larger significance in the fortunes of German-speaking lands of the peasants’ revolts of 1524–5 and some of the other illustrations depict prominent persons who figure in the correspondence. Among the chosen sketches are likenesses of Marguerite D’Angouleme, Queen of Navarre, Oecolampadius, the reformer of Basel, Reginald Pole, Martin Luther and his wife Katherina von Bora, the prominent Nuremberg humanist Willibald Pirckheimer, and the Spanish humanist Juan Luis Vives.

The fluidity of relationships strikes one as a significant feature of the letters. Not yet have party lines become so hardened as to make literary friendships across the religious divide impossible. For example, Erasmus can lash out at misrepresentations of his person or his opinions by Dominicans, as he does in his correspondence with Noel Beda or with the theologians of Louvain. At the same time he does speak of “respect and admiration” for Luther, admitting at the same time his use of “discretion when reading his writings and weighing what he says.”

As might be expected from a seasoned communicator and prince among humanists the letters make for exciting reading and offer insights into the character of Erasmus and those issues which enticed him away from strictly academic

pursuits into exhorting, cajoling, pleading, defending his honor, or simply engaging in playful banter. No one interested in the early modern period in general and humanists in particular should ignore this superbly fashioned volume.

E.J. Furcha

McGill University

Collected Works of Erasmus. Volume 56: Annotations on Romans. Trans. & Annotated by John B. Payne, et.al. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994. ISBN 0-8020-0536-5. Pp. xviii+480.

Volume 56 of *Collected Works of Erasmus* is an annotated translation of Erasmus's *Annotations*—a triumph of scholarship twice over. In the true spirit of the great humanist, those who worked on this part of the formidable Erasmus Corpus have almost outdone their master. Not only did the translators have to contend with the subtleties of Erasmus's original *Annotations*, but they also had to examine all of the five editions which he published between 1516 and 1535, carefully noting the changes he made and bringing them together in one critical text. In addition, the translators/annotators undertook to explain literary and historical allusions and to identify the numerous references Erasmus made to biblical, patristic, medieval and classical sources. Obviously, such a monumental undertaking required the combined resources of a team of four scholars who, in addition, called on a host of other skilled support—gratefully acknowledged in the Translators' Note.

The end product is a superb volume of 480 pages. To retain the flavor of the *Annotations on Romans*, as Erasmus intended them, the translators give Erasmus's Latin text and its English translation as well as the text of the Vulgate, again carefully translated. Equally helpful to serious scholars of the volume are the Greek references Erasmus included in his annotations which again have been translated into English. Thus a clear picture emerges of the carefully nuanced meanings of the text without forcing the reader to Latin and Greek dictionaries. Relegated to footnotes, rather than endnotes, are clarifications and/or editorial comments and, of course, the variations found in subsequent Erasmus editions of this work.

Anyone who may have had doubts about Erasmus's erudition in matters philological will have these dispelled at once. Furthermore, diligent readers will be rewarded by the profound theological insights Erasmus brought to the annotations of one of St. Paul's most significant epistles as he proceeded to translate the Greek text at his disposal into Latin. If in the sixteenth century the work was accessible only to scholars who had mastered Latin, Erasmus is now at the disposal of anyone who can afford to purchase the volume, thanks to the meticulous scholarship of the translators and annotators.

E.J. Furcha

McGill University