

Middle Ages— Reformation— Volkskunde

Festschrift for John G. Kunstmann

Edited by
Frederic E. Coenen

Middle Ages—Reformation—*Volkskunde*



COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Germanic and Slavic Languages and Literatures

From 1949 to 2004, UNC Press and the UNC Department of Germanic & Slavic Languages and Literatures published the UNC Studies in the Germanic Languages and Literatures series. Monographs, anthologies, and critical editions in the series covered an array of topics including medieval and modern literature, theater, linguistics, philology, onomastics, and the history of ideas. Through the generous support of the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, books in the series have been reissued in new paperback and open access digital editions. For a complete list of books visit www.uncpress.org.



Middle Ages—Reformation—
Volkskunde

Festschrift for John G. Kunstmann

EDITED BY FREDERIC E. COENEN

UNC Studies in the Germanic Languages and Literatures
Number 26

Copyright © 1959

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons CC BY-NC-ND license. To view a copy of the license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses>.

Suggested citation: Coenen, Frederic E. *Middle Ages—Reformation—Volkskunde: Festschrift for John G. Kunstmann*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1959. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5149/9781469658551_Coenen

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Coenen, Frederic E., editor

Title: Middle ages — reformation — volkskunde : Festschrift for John G. Kunstmann / edited by Frederic E. Coenen.

Other titles: University of North Carolina Studies in the Germanic Languages and Literatures ; no. 26.

Description: Chapel Hill : University of North Carolina Press, [1959]

Series: University of North Carolina Studies in the Germanic Languages and Literatures.

Identifiers: LCCN 60062592 | ISBN 978-0-8078-8026-5 (pbk: alk. paper) | ISBN 978-1-4696-5855-1 (ebook)

Subjects: Kunstmann, John Gotthold, 1894-. | Philology. | German literature — History and criticism.

Classification: LCC PD25 .N6 NO. 26

T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S

	Page
Dedication	ix
<i>Tabula gratulatoria</i>	xi
<i>George F. Jones</i> , The Ethos of the <i>Waltharius</i>	1
<i>Edwin H. Zeydel</i> , Prolegomena to an English Translation of <i>Waltharius</i>	21
<i>Urban T. Holmes, Jr.</i> , Notes on the French Fabliaux	39
<i>Stuart A. Gallacher</i> , Frauenlob's Bits of Wisdom: Fruits of his Environment	45
<i>Carl F. Bayerschmidt</i> , Hermann Körner's <i>Weltchronik</i>	59
<i>John H. Fisher</i> , The French Versions of the <i>Ancrene Riwe</i>	65
<i>John Esten Keller</i> , King Alfonso's Virgin of Villa-Sirga, Rival of St. James of Compostela	75
<i>Astrik L. Gabriel</i> , The Foundation of Johannes Hueven de Arnhem for the College of Sorbonne (1452)	83
<i>Robert W. Linker</i> , Charles d'Orleans and Medicine	95
<i>James E. Engel</i> , The Stage Directions in Schernberg's <i>Spiel von Frau Jutten</i>	101
<i>Eli Sobel</i> , The Tristan Romance in Hans Sachs' Meisterlieder	108
<i>Lewis W. Spitz</i> , The <i>Theologia Platonica</i> in the Religious Thought of the German Humanists	118
<i>Theodore Silverstein</i> , On the Source of an English Thunder-Treatise of the Fifteenth Century	134
<i>Murray A. Cowie</i> and <i>Marian L. Cowie</i> , Rudolph Agricola and Peter Schott	141
<i>Helmut Motekat</i> , "Was mein Gott will, das gscheh' allzeit"	156
<i>Josef Rysan</i> , Mythological Solution of Crisis—A Parallel between Luther's and Hitler's Germany	177
<i>Berthold L. Ullman</i> , Joseph Lang and his Anthologies	186
<i>Wayland D. Hand</i> , A North Carolina <i>Himmelsbrief</i>	201
<i>Oscar F. Jones</i> , "Art Thou He Who is to Come. . .?"	208
<i>Fritjof A. Raven</i> , Aspect as a Prominent Factor in the Survival of the Third Weak Conjugation in Old High German	215

DEDICATION

To Professor John G. Kunstmann this volume is dedicated on his sixty-fifth birthday, October 25, 1959, by his students, colleagues, and friends.

Perhaps there is no scholar in America today who, through his vast learning, his unselfish willingness to assist and guide the efforts of graduate students and younger scholars, and through his devotion to scholarly excellence, has had greater influence in the teaching of German and especially of the literature and culture of the German Middle Ages than John Kunstmann has had. It is therefore most fitting that we should on this occasion make some small acknowledgment of our great indebtedness to him.

Frederic E. Coenen
Werner P. Friederich
George S. Lane
Ralph P. Rosenberg

TABULA GRATULATORIA

- Jacques Abramowitsch*
College of the Holy Names
- Theodore C. Appelt*
Concordia Teachers College
(River Forest, Illinois)
- Karl J. R. Arndt*
Clark University
- Walter W. Arndt*
University of North Carolina
- Ann Arthur*
University of North Carolina
- Ieva Ašmyte*
University of North Carolina
- Isaac Bacon*
University of Colorado
- Mr. and Mrs. Gerhard Baerg*
DePauw University
- Asta Ingeborg Ball*
Bristol, Connecticut
- Adriaan J. Barnouw*
Columbia University
- Erminnie W. Bartelmez*
Western Reserve University
- Harold A. Basilius*
Wayne State University
- Carl F. Bayerschmidt*
Columbia University
- Jean R. Beck*
University of Arizona
- William H. Bennett*
University of Notre Dame
- Gerald E. Bentley*
Princeton University
- Harry Bergholz*
University of North Carolina
- Philip E. and Mary Alice A. Blank*
University of North Carolina
- Ida Walz Blayney*
Carleton College
- Hermann Boeschenstein*
University of Toronto
- Donald F. Bond*
University of Chicago
- Richmond P. Bond*
University of North Carolina
- Marianne Bonwitt*
University of California (Berkeley)
- Francis W. Bradley*
University of South Carolina
- Wallace R. Brandon*
Gallaudet College
- Francis J. Brooke, III*
University of Virginia
- Walter E. Buszin*
Concordia Seminary (St. Louis)
- T. Moody Campbell*
Northwestern University
- C. Whitney Carpenter*
New York University
- Allen H. Chappel*
University of North Carolina
- Frederic E. Coenen*
University of North Carolina
- Carl Colditz*
Wayne State University
- James C. Cornette, Jr.*
Austin College
- Marian L. Cowie*
University of British Columbia
- Murray A. Cowie*
University of British Columbia
- Hardin Craig*
University of Missouri

- Dieter Cunz*
Ohio State University
- R. S. Dunham, Jr.*
University of North Carolina
- Martin Dyck*
University of Michigan
- Florence P. Eckfeldt*
Chicago, Illinois
- Frances H. Ellis*
Indiana University
- James E. Engel*
University of Illinois
- Barker Fairley*
University of Toronto
- Seymour L. Flaxman*
New York University
- Else Mentz Fleissner*
Wells College
- Elmer E. Foelber*
Concordia Publishing House
(St. Louis)
- Werner P. Friederich*
University of North Carolina
- Astrik L. Gabriel*
University of Notre Dame
- Stuart A. Gallacher*
Michigan State University
- Dr. & Mrs. Frank E. E. Germann*
American Association for the
Advancement of Science
Boulder, Colorado
- G. E. Giesecke*
University of Chicago
- Walter H. Gross*
Flossmoor, Illinois
- Lorraine M. Gustafson*
Butler University
- Mr. & Mrs. L. Marshall Hall, Jr.*
University of North Carolina
- Wayland D. Hand*
University of California
(Los Angeles)
- Ernest C. Hassold*
University of Louisville
- Roe-Merrill Secrist Heffner*
University of Wisconsin
- Robert R. Heitner*
University of California
(Los Angeles)
- Claude Hill*
Rutgers University
- Jeanette Hills*
Harvey, Illinois
- John L. Hodges*
Stetson University
- Erich Hofacker*
Washington University (St. Louis)
- Victor Hoffmann*
Valparaiso University
- Urban Tigner Holmes*
University of North Carolina
- Lucyle Hook*
Barnard College
- Raymond Immerwahr*
Washington University (St. Louis)
- Lucille Itter*
University of Rhode Island
- Robert T. Ittner*
University of Akron
- George Fenwick Jones*
Princeton University
- Oscar F. Jones*
University of Florida
- Robert L. Kahn*
University of Washington
- Robert Kauf*
University of Illinois
- Kenneth E. Keeton*
Wake Forest College

<i>John E. Keller</i> University of North Carolina	<i>Helmut Motekat</i> University of Munich, Germany
<i>Ruth J. Kilchenmann</i> Southern Illinois University	<i>Anna Klassen Neufeld</i> Southern Illinois University
<i>William P. Kitaj</i> Idaho State College	<i>Fred O. Nolte</i> Washington University (St. Louis)
<i>George S. Lane</i> University of North Carolina	<i>Henry W. Nordmeyer</i> University of Michigan
<i>Victor Lange</i> Princeton University	<i>Dr. Orlando E. Overn</i> Madison, Wisconsin
<i>Clara Lawin</i> Chicago, Illinois	<i>Herbert H. J. Peisel</i> Syracuse University
<i>Herbert Lederer</i> Ohio University	<i>William K. Pfeiler</i> University of Nebraska
<i>Winfred P. Lehmann</i> University of Texas	<i>Harry W. Pfund</i> Haverford College
<i>Robert W. Linker</i> University of North Carolina	<i>Rev. Arthur Carl Piepkorn</i> Clayton, Missouri
<i>C. Grant Loomis</i> University of California (Berkeley)	<i>Thomas O. Pinkerton</i> Trinity College
<i>Andrew Louis</i> William M. Rice Institute	<i>Mary G. Porter</i> University of Alabama
<i>Ernst Moritz Manasse</i> North Carolina College	<i>Fritjof A. Råven</i> University of Alabama
<i>Hubert J. Meessen</i> Indiana University	<i>Herbert W. Reichert</i> University of North Carolina
<i>George J. Metcalf</i> University of Chicago	<i>Louise Reiter</i> Indianapolis, Indiana
<i>Esther Metzenthin</i> Randolph-Macon Woman's College	<i>Walter LeRoy Robbins</i> University of North Carolina
<i>Carl S. Meyer</i> Concordia Seminary (St. Louis)	<i>Walter L. Robinson</i> Davidson College
<i>John H. Meyer</i> University of Illinois	<i>Melanie R. Rosborough</i> University of Miami
<i>Robert T. Meyer</i> Catholic University	<i>Ernst Rose</i> New York University
<i>Arthur H. Moehlenbrock</i> Furman University	<i>Ralph P. Rosenberg</i> Yeshiva University

- Josef Rysan*
Vanderbilt University
- Herman Salinger*
Duke University
- George A. C. Scherer*
University of Colorado
- Alice Schlömbach*
Rutgers University
- Mariana A. Scott*
Xavier University
- Alfred Senn*
University of Pennsylvania
- Walter Silz*
Columbia University
- Sister Catherine Teresa Rapp*
Nazareth College
- Sister Mary Gretchen, O. P.*
Rosary College
- Sister Mary Juliana*
Mount Mary College
- Jane Stuart Smith*
University of North Carolina
- Eli Sobel*
University of California
(Los Angeles)
- Franz René Sommerfeld*
University of Washington
- Lewis W. Spitz, Sr.*
Concordia Seminary (St. Louis)
- Lewis W. Spitz*
University of Missouri
- Ria Stambaugh*
University of North Carolina
- Taylor Starck*
Harvard University
- Henri Stegemeier*
University of Illinois
- Carl E. Steinhauser*
University of North Carolina
- Friedrich W. Strothmann*
Stanford University
- Archer Taylor*
University of Texas
- Ransom T. Taylor*
University of North Carolina
- James C. Thomas*
University of North Carolina
- Esther C. Tillman*
St. Louis University
- †*John V. Tillman*
St. Louis University
- Berthold L. Ullman*
University of North Carolina
- George J. Wack*
University of Notre Dame
- Herman J. Weigand*
Yale University
- Walter H. Wentz*
Concordia Senior College
(Fort Wayne, Ind.)
- George Williamson*
University of Chicago
- Otto Wirth*
Roosevelt University (Chicago)
- J. D. Workman*
University of Wisconsin
- Frederic S. Youkstetter*
Los Angeles, California
- Edwin H. Zeydel*
University of Cincinnati
- A. E. Zucker*
University of Maryland
-

Department of German, Indiana University
Germanic Seminar, Yale University
Library, University of Cincinnati
Library, Clark University
Library, Concordia College (Austin, Texas)
Library, Connecticut College for Women
Library, Cornell University
Library, University of Florida
Library, Harvard College
Library, Indiana University
Library, Muhlenberg College
Library, Seattle University
Library, Stetson University
Library, The College of Wooster
William M. Rice Institute

THE ETHOS OF THE *WALTHARIUS*

GEORGE FENWICK JONES

The Late-Latin poem *Waltharius* is now one of the most controversial works in European literature. After nearly a century of agreement, or at least of repressed disagreement, scholars are beginning to question the authorship, date, and significance of the work.¹ Ekkehard IV, an eleventh-century monk of the Swiss monastery St. Gall, wrote that a predecessor of his, Ekkehard I, had composed a school exercise entitled *waltharius manu fortis* and that he himself had corrected its errors.² Since the discovery of his statement more than a century ago, most scholars, but not all, have attributed the *Waltharius* to Ekkehard I, even though several of its manuscripts have a preface by a monk named Geraldus, who dedicated his work to a certain prelate (*pontifex maximus*) named Erchamboldus.³ Karl Hauck has recently argued that Erchamboldus was Bishop Erchambald of Eichstätt and that Gerald was probably a monk of that monastery.⁴ The latest and most definitive discussion of this whole problem is the article in this volume by Edwin H. Zeydel, who again champions Ekkehard I as the real author. Because the question of authorship does not immediately concern my contribution, I shall merely refer the interested reader to Professor Zeydel's excellent study.

Whether by Gerald or by Ekkehard, the *Waltharius* was written near the turn of the ninth century by a Christian monk, who treated traditional Germanic matter in Latin hexameters. It is evident that many of his verses were lifted bodily from, or at least strongly influenced by, the works of Vergil, Prudentius, and other Roman writers. Jacob Grimm, Hermann Althof, and other early scholars generally assumed that the author had merely translated an existing German epic; and they even tried to reconstruct the alliterative verses lurking behind the Latin hexameters. In recent years there has been a tendency to stress the importance of the classic sources and to discredit the belief in a German original. Perhaps the most extreme proponent of the latter view was the late Friedrich Panzer, who denied the existence of a German original and maintained that the *Waltharius* was an original creation (*Urlied*).⁵ This was inspired by the second book of Statius's *Thebaid*, in which a hero is waylaid by superior numbers in a narrow pass, and by

the story of Perseus in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Although Panzer's theory has been more attacked than accepted, no one can deny classic origins for many episodes in the poem and for many of its attitudes.

This modest contribution will join neither camp. Instead it will scrutinize a single element in the work as a possible clue for judging whether the tenor of the poem is more classic or Germanic. For this purpose it will select the subject of honor, that is to say, the whole complex of attitudes revolving around honor and shame. First it will try to define honor as it appears in the *Waltharius*, and for this purpose it will investigate the word-field dealing with *honor, honorare, pudor, pudere, laus, laudare, dedecus, infamare, probrium, convicium, nefas, nefandus, inclitus, and infandus*. Then it will evaluate those goods of fortune and personal virtues by which honor is won, such as power, rank, wealth, strength, victory, courage, oath-keeping, and largess. For this purpose it will investigate the words *virtus, virum, triumphus, victoria, fides, pactum*.

Although these Latin terms were taken directly from ancient sources, we must remember that the *Waltharius* poet used them in the meaning that they had acquired in Central Europe at the turn of the ninth century. This is particularly apparent in the case of words for arms and armor; for naturally he visualized his heroes accoutered like the warriors of his day.⁶ The *framea* (1016, 1376), for example, denoted a sword rather than a javelin as it had in Tacitus's *Germania* (6, 11, 13). The *tridens* (983) is probably not a trident, but a triple-barbed (i.e., three-toothed) harpoon, a weapon known in the vernacular as an *ango*.⁷ On the one occasion that our poet wished to introduce an obsolete weapon, he expressly states the fact. Wishing to introduce a two-edged battle-ax like that used by Camilla in Vergil's *Aeneid*, he explains that such weapons were formerly used by the Franks (*istius ergo modi Francis tunc arma fuere, 919*).

Not only military terms but also other words had acquired new meaning. The word *comitantes* (1071), instead of meaning just any fellow travellers, probably renders the thought *gashinbjan* (vassals).⁸ The word *accubitus* (296) clearly refers to seats, not reclining places, being used in connection with *solium, considerare, and assidere* (293-295). In view of such apparent changes in meaning of some Latin words, we must be on our

guard for others. The word *nefas* (1260) probably means shameful rather than sinful or impious.⁹

The word *honor*, the chief clue to our problem, is used only objectively. That is to say, it denotes a good of fortune rather than a moral virtue. The word appears in its oldest and basic meaning when, near the end of the poem, Walther is received into his kingdom with great *honor* (1447); for *honor*, or *honos* as it was written earlier, originally meant respect or tokens thereof.¹⁰ The word also appears in a somewhat transferred sense when Hagen says that Walther will concede to the king's *honor* and surrender his treasure (*vestro concedere honori*, 580). Here honor means the status enjoyed by the king, Gunther, by virtue of receiving *honor* in its earlier sense. The usual Latin terms for this concept were *dignitas* and *dignatio*, which, strangely enough, do not appear in the *Waltharius*. Gunther's *honor* could also be translated as his majesty, authority, or kingship, an idea expressed a few verses later when Walther offers to honor the name of the king (*nomen regis honorare*, 614). This transferred sense of name, reputation, or fame also appears when Hagen remembers that the fame of his courage (*honor virtutis propriae*, 1094) will be lost if he shirks danger. The word can imply either authority or reputation, or both, when Hagen's grief gives way to his king's *honor* (*dolor succumbit honori regis*, 1109-1110).

As Thomas Hobbes observed in the seventeenth century, honor is the recognition of power. Because Gunther lacks personal courage and strength, it is clear that he owes his *honor* to his royal rank, a rank inherited—not merited. Good birth is not greatly stressed in the *Waltharius*, perhaps being taken for granted. Attila, Gunther, Walther, and Hildgund are all of royal blood, and even Hagen is of distinguished birth (*indoles egregia*, 28).

The most impressive sign of power in medieval Europe was wealth: in a period of fist-law the strong are free to dispossess the weak; and poverty indicates weakness, cowardice, or laziness. When Attila tries to persuade Walther to marry, he promises to enrich him so that no prince will be ashamed (*pudere*, 139) to give him his daughter. Because wealth proved virtue, the *Waltharius* poet praises manifestations of wealth, such as conspicuous consumption and lavish entertainment.¹¹ Power was also revealed through victory, and therefore victory brought honor and defeat brought shame. Gunther realizes

that, to retain his honor and not to return *inglorius* (946), he must defeat Walther at any cost, even by using foul means.

Aristotle maintained that honor is, or at least should be, the reward of virtue (*timē*, the prize of *aretē*).¹² This holds true of *Waltharius*, in which *honor* is the reward of *virtus*, as is shown by the fact that Attila's vassals have an opportunity to win lasting fame through their virtue (*virtute sua laudem captare perennem*, 411) if they will pursue Walther. It appears that our poet understood the word *virtus* only in its basic sense of manliness, particularly as shown through strength and bravery; for the word *virtus* appears only in an objective and amoral sense. The Hunnish nation, which conquered all Europe, flourished in strength and arms (*virtute vigeat et armis*, 6), and King Heririch does not think that the Burgundians have the power (*virtus*, 59) to resist them. Walther's horse is called Lion because of his strength (*virtus*, 327), and Attila's empire loses its power (*virtus*, 377, cf. 525) when Walther flees.

Remembering the reputation of his bravery (*virtutis honor*, 1095), Hagen hopes that he and Gunther can lure Walther from his stronghold and perform a deed of prowess (*virtutis opus*, 1121). When he finally brings Walther to bay, he wishes to see if Walther alone has *virtus* (1277). In one case *virtus* is contrasted with moral stamina. When Trogus has been wounded and can not show *virtus* through deeds, he at least shows manly bearing (*habitum virilem patefacere*, 1038-1039) with his heart and his face.¹³

In his preface Gerald refers to God as a lover of highest virtue (*summæ virtutis amator*, v.1), in which case he is following clerical tradition. Possibly he understood the words to mean no more than "lover of greatest power", since the only epithets he gives to God, the ruler of heaven and earth (15), are "almighty" (*omnipotens*, 1) and "all-thundering" (*omnitonans*, 13), attributes just as suitable for Jove or Wotan as for the Christian God.

A man who enjoys *honor* is *inclitus*. This word, which originally meant "talked about", was related to the Germanic stem *hlōþ* (famous) found in names like Ludwig, Luther, and possibly in the name Eleuthir, one of the warriors in the *Waltharius*.¹⁴ Gunther, as king, receives this epithet, but only from his subjects (*rex inclitus*, 452; *inclitus princeps*, 1098). The author himself uses it more appropriately of Walther (217) and Hagen (518). It will be noted that the words *honor* and *inclitus* tell

nothing objective about a person: they tell only what other people feel or say about him. Nearly all characters in the *Waltharius* are motivated by desire to win fame and avoid shame, since people were judged by their reputations rather than by their intrinsic merits. It will be noted that, except for adjectives referring to strength and bravery, most complimentary epithets in the *Waltharius* refer to social recognition rather than to inner quality. Among these are *inclitus*, *illustris*, *celeber*, and *clarus*.

Desire for social recognition (*Geltungsbedürfnis*, as the Germans call it) is universally human. It is certainly universal in children: witness the noise that they make to attract attention. This need is innate in the human mechanism, as deep-rooted as hunger or will to survival. It takes many forms, expressing itself as desire to be accepted, recognized, liked, loved, respected, feared, or obeyed, depending upon personal, social, or religious factors and influences. Some cultures, such as that of the Pueblo Indians, damn the will to superiority and domination as a human weakness. Other cultures, like that of the Kwakiutl Indians, praise the will to superiority as an admirable virtue.

Since the will to superiority was admired by both heathen Teutons and pagan Greeks and Romans (the Stoics excepted), its treatment in the *Waltharius* may be a clue to the degree of Christianity in the poem. The poem is nominally Christian: it begins with an invocation to God and ends with an invocation to Jesus. Most of the characters in the poem invoke God; and both they and the author give God credit for their successes. Hildgund wins the Hunnish queen's favor through divine help (*deo praestante supremo*, 110) and Gunther says that the Almighty (*cunctipotens*, 472) has brought Walther's treasure to Franconia. Walther hopes to withstand Hagen with God's help (*volente deo*, 570) and later he thanks God for having defended him from his enemies' unequal weapons (*iniqua tela*, 1163) and from disgrace (*probris*, 1164). Being literary commonplaces, these pious invocations need not indicate deep piety. Whereas Gunther thanks the Almighty on one occasion, he elsewhere entreats Hagen by the gods (*superos*, 1075) to help him attack Walther.

All translators and commentators have assumed that Walther is referring to God when he says that he who has often saved him in peril will also confound his enemies (552-553). Whereas this may be true, I contend that he is just as likely, or more likely, referring to his trusty sword, which he has just men-

tioned (549-550). This is suggested when he later thanks his shield for protecting him from his enemies (804-809). He also addresses an apostrophe to his right hand, asking it to repel his enemies (812-817), and later he gives his right hand entire credit for having killed all his enemies (1215). In any case, it is clear that, regardless of any pious platitudes, Walther relies upon self-help, like the protagonists of the heroic epics, rather than wait for divine intervention, like the passive heroes of most hagiographies.¹⁵ Even before the conversions it was not unheard of for the heathen Teutons to attribute their courage to divine favor,¹⁶ nor was such self-abnegations too much to demand of warriors who were expected to give their leader credit for their own deeds of daring.¹⁷ After the conversions it became commonplace to attribute personal success to God. Whereas such humility was self-debasement before God, it was actually self-exaltation before other men, because it implied that the individual and God were on especially intimate terms.

There is evidence that Christianity is only skin-deep in the *Waltharius*. Walther asks divine forgiveness for boasting (561), yet he continues to boast thereafter without further apology.¹⁸ It is to be noted that one of the sources of the *Waltharius*, the *Psychomachia* of the Christian poet Prudentius, allowed the Virtues not only to defy their enemies arrogantly but also to gloat over their victims. Even though Walther crosses himself (225) and invokes and thanks God, he shows no Christian mercy to his defenseless and imploring victims, whom he slays without compunction and at times with malicious taunts. In other words, Christianity is not strong enough to interfere with literary tradition or secular custom. The only truly Christian character in the poem is Hildgund, whose humility and obedience make her more suitable to be a bride of Christ than the bride of a Germanic chieftain. Yet even she, at Walther's command, robs Attila's wife, who has treated and trusted her as her own daughter.

In the entire poem there are only two references to a hereafter, and these could suggest pagan as well as Christian origins. When Walther is about to kill Trogus, he advises him to tell his friends in Tartarus that he has avenged them (1057); and this, as we shall see, alludes to Greek beliefs. After killing his eleven opponents, Walther prays to God to let him see them again in heaven (1161-1167); but such a reunion of old enemies would be just as fitting in Valhalla as in heaven. At the end of the

poem, the author states that Walther lived to rule successfully for many years and to win many battles; but he does not tell whether or not he ever reached heaven. There is scarcely any Christian terminology in the poem, even the word *salus* refers only to physical safety.¹⁹ To be sure, Hagen declaims against greed for wealth and power (849-875); yet these goods are affirmed elsewhere in the poem.

Gerald is frank in admitting that the *Waltharius* was written for entertainment rather than for praying to the Lord,²⁰ even though this was against the admonitions of St. Paul in his *First Epistle to Timothy* (4,7). In view of Gerald's own statement and the apparent superficiality of the Christian elements in the poem, I cannot agree with von den Steinen when he says that the *Waltharius* is entirely Christian even if not monastic in any one trait.²¹ Perhaps it would be better to say that the poem is monastic in many traits, but hardly Christian at all. Although ninth-century monks in Central Europe accepted Christian dogma and ritual, it is doubtful whether they ever really comprehended or appreciated Christian values. In this respect they were nearer to the values of pagan Greek and Roman literature than to the Sermon on the Mount. German crusaders still behaved like barbarians in the Holy Land in the twelfth century and in Prussia and Lithuania in the fourteenth.²²

Whereas the *Waltharius* poet betrays familiarity with Christianity, he seems to show no familiarity whatever with Stoic ideas of honor. The term *honestum* does not appear even once in his poem. There is no mention of virtue for its own sake, and no suggestion that a man's true value may lie within himself and not in the opinions of other men. Such Stoic thoughts, usually via Cicero and Seneca, were available in patristic writings; for example, Boethius's *De Consolatione Philosophiae* and St. Martin of Braga's *Formula Vitae Honestae* were both found in medieval monasteries. Nevertheless, their ideas on internalized honor either failed to reach or failed to impress the *Waltharius* poet.

On the other hand, there are faint indications of national honor, a Roman concept that was later to reach unfortunate proportions in Europe. As long as the Teutonic people were partially nomadic, their loyalties were solely to their kinships or, at best, their tribe or tribal group. After the Franks became established, they were able to borrow the concept of fatherland from Latin authors. When Attila advances, King Heriric does

not think that he can defend his sweet fatherland (*patria dulcis*, 60); and Walther and Hildgund flee from Attila's land because of hate of exile and love for their fatherland (*odium exilii patriaeque amor*, 354). When Walther tells Camalo that he wishes to see his fatherland and sweet nation (*Concupiens patriam dulcemque revisere gentem*, 600), he is concurring with both the regional loyalty of the Romans and the tribal loyalty of the Germans. Later he assures Hagen that their friendship had even made him forget his fatherland (1258). A feeling of national honor, in the sense of tribal pride, may be suggested when Gunther fears that Francia will never recover from its disgrace (*dedecus superare*, 1085) and that people will speak disparagingly of the Frankish army (1087); yet this may just be personal vanity.

The frank admiration of power and fame in the *Waltharius* does not stamp it as predominantly classic or as predominantly Germanic. Nevertheless, by analyzing the poem's many references to honor, it may be possible to discover whether they conform to the Germanic "code of honor". By this term is meant the conduct and the sentiments by which Germanic heroes could win the respect and the admiration of their peers. Although no Teuton ever systematized or codified the rules of honor, Germanic lays and sagas are amazingly consistent in their views, even those written down hundreds of years and hundreds of miles apart.

To win fame and to avoid shame a Teuton had to fight bravely and successfully, to share his booty generously, and to be loyal to his leader and kinsmen. To retain his good name he had to avenge any slur upon it, preferably in single combat. Above all, he had to avenge every offence to his dignity, including all offences to his kinsmen and to people allied to him by formal oath. With regard to honor, it may be said that Germanic heroes differed most markedly from ancient Greek and Roman ones in the intensity and frankness of their pursuit of fame; for a considerable portion of Germanic literature concerns this subject.

To understand the Teutons' craving for fame, we must not be misled by the classic concept, expressed by Aristotle, that honor should be sought only to assure one of his virtue.²³ The Teutons frankly pursued fame for its own sake and boasted that it, and it alone, motivated their deeds of prowess. Although hopelessly outmatched, Patavrid fights Walther because he is

burning with ardor to win praise (854). Even after Gunther has lost half of his men, he resumes the attack, because he would rather die than return home *inglorius* (946), and he tells Hagen to rage against Walther for bringing his king into ill repute (*infamare*, 1082-1083). He shows similar solicitude for his reputation by fearing that people will *say* (*dicere*, 1087) that the entire army of the Franks was destroyed by one unknown person.

Walther kills Randolph to prevent him from *boasting* of cutting two locks from his head (979-980) and later he remains in his redoubt rather than have Gunther *say* (*dicere*, 1153) that he has fled his land in the dark like a thief. Here we see that it was not repugnance at a craven act, but rather fear of slanderous tongues, because Walther seems to have felt no regret at having fled in the dark like a thief from Attila's land (419). Perhaps Walther had inherited his praiseworthy concern for public opinion from his father. As soon as Attila threatens, King Alpher agrees to surrender, because he knows the Aquitanians will not be blamed (*incusare*, 88) for doing what the Franks and Burgundians already have done. Such regard for public opinion causes Walther to stand his ground rather than to flee and thereby to lack praise and to suffer shame (*laus, dedecus*, 1216).

The Germanic peoples, even more than the Greeks and Romans, believed that earthly renown was the most important form of immortality.²⁴ This belief is reflected in the *Waltharius*, when Walther gives Attila a goblet engraved with pictures of the deeds of his ancestors (309). Many of the demands made of Germanic men of honor were also made of the heroes of Greek and Latin antiquity; yet there are some factors peculiar to, or at least more prominent in, the Germanic code of honor. An important theme in Germanic literature is the contrast of wealth and honor as incentives to military effort. When Attila conquers the western lands, he does so to renew ancient triumphs (12); yet he returns laden with booty (*gazis onerati . . . multis*, 93). The word *triumphus*, which emphasizes the glory won by the victor and the humiliation suffered by the vanquished, appears far more often in the *Waltharius* than the neutral word *victoria*.²⁵ Whereas both wealth and honor were fitting rewards for bravery, a truly admirable hero preferred honor and desired wealth only as a means to enhance his prestige. The praiseworthy hero was always liberal, practicing lar-

gess frankly to gain influence and honor. The *Waltharius* often treats of the conflict between wealth and honor as the proper incentive for good deeds. When Attila wishes his vassals to pursue Walther, he first offers them money and then fame and then he again promises them wealth (403-417). Some of Gunther's men, such as Eckivrid, fight for spoil, while others, like Patavrid, fight for praise (781-854). Camalo fights for treasure until his uncle is killed, then he renounces spoil, and seeks only revenge (700-701). Walther himself seems just as interested in wealth as in fame, if we may judge by his efforts to retain his stolen treasure. Perhaps the author observed the ignominy of such behavior, because he later vindicates him by letting him say that it is better to seek a beautiful death through wounds than to flee and to lose one's belongings (1218). In other words, Walther is implying that he values the treasure only as a proof of his courage.

Judged by the principle of wealth versus honor, Hagen is the most virtuous character in the poem. He not only prefers honor to wealth, but he even attributes a generous nature to his king: when Walther offers a hundred armbands, he advises his king to accept them so as to be able to give them to his retainers (617-618). In order to keep his pact with Walther, Hagen remains out of the battle even at the cost of renouncing his share of the spoils (*nec consors sim spoliorum*, 637). After apologizing for insulting him, Gunther first offers to dissolve his anger with many rewards (*benefactis multis*, 1078) if he will help. Because Hagen is unmoved by hope of gain, Gunther must appeal to his sense of honor and ask him if he is not ashamed to conceal his manhood (*virum*) when so many of his kith and kin have been slain (1080). When Walther tries to bribe him into keeping his friendship pact by promising to enrich him and to fill his shield with gold (1262-1263), Hagen refuses and demands his nephew's blood (1278). In view of Hagen's honorable attitude toward wealth, the poet is inconsistent in letting him assume that his nephew is spurred into battle by hunger for wealth rather than hunger for fame (549-575).

If, in Germanic terms, Hagen is the most commendable character in the poem, Gunther is the most despicable. Because he shows more greed than courage, he naturally assumes that his men have been fighting for wealth rather than for honor (*arsistis hominem spoliare metallis*, 950). Although Germanic chieftains were supposed to lead their troops,²⁸ Gunther stands

by and shames his men into battle by saying that they should take him as a model, him who would rather die than return without victory (947-948). Because he is contemptible as a warrior, our poet also gives him some qualities that were scorned by clerics, even if not by laymen.²⁷ Our poet fails to mention that he is still a youth, since he was still an infant when Walther, Hildgund, and Hagen were old enough to be taken as hostages (29-30).

As mentioned, a Germanic warrior had to keep his given word, particularly his oath to fight for his leader or followers. This problem of fealty, which concerns Hagen primarily, will be discussed later. At this point one should note that friendship, to be binding, was not just an inclination, affection, or loyalty resulting from close association or common experiences. To be binding, friendship had to be solemnly and publicly sworn, just like international treaties, which were usually validated by visual acts such as clasping right hands (71). The friendship between Walther and Hagen is such a bond; the poet constantly refers to it as a sworn pact. Seeing his king's disgrace, Hagen is deterred from action by his memory of the faith which he has so often promised Walther (*sponsa Walthario plerumque fides*, 1089-1090). Walther later reminds Hagen of the often sworn alliance (*fides saepissime pacta*, 1259) and Hagen justifies himself for entering the fight against him by claiming that Walther first broke their pact (*pactum alium*, 1275).

After they have mutilated each other, the former colleagues again renew their often-made pact (*pactum renovare iterato coactum*, 1443), a word previously used of military treaties (61, 73, 75). Walther elsewhere refers to this pact as a *foedus* (1261), another word used earlier of military treaties (9); and Hagen refers to it as a *promissa fidei norma* (1113). In view of such expressions, it is safe to say that the word *fides* in the *Waltharius* should be rendered as pact or treaty rather than as friendship or loyalty, as it usually is. Therefore *antiqua fides* (478) can best be rendered as "old friendship-pact" and *fidus amicus* (1240) should be rendered as "sworn ally". Perhaps even the term *collega* (558) was understood literally as "one mutually bound to another". At the end of the poem Walther says that Hagen is a good warrior (*athleta bonus*), if he keeps the law of faith (*fidei si iura reservet*, 1411). This may be either a compliment or a malicious insinuation; but in either case it shows

that *fides* belonged to the realm of law more than to that of friendship in the modern meaning of the word.

It may be characteristically Germanic that honor is greater when received from or in the presence of women. To be sure, the Trojans fought more bravely when watched by their women on the walls, and Paris was doubly degraded when even Helen could not shame him into battle. Nevertheless, while women in classic literature occasionally inspired deeds of daring, those in Germanic literature played a far greater role as spurs to manly virtue. Tacitus relates that Germanic women accompanied their men into battle to give them courage; and Icelandic sagas tell how women shamed their husbands or sons into wreaking vengeance.²⁸ When Walther resists the Franks, he does so to keep them from boasting to their wives that they have robbed him (562); and he kills Randolf to stop him from boasting to his bride (979-980). Although Walther does not know these women, he dreads the thought that they may hear of his disgrace. Although our author fails to mention it, Walther's bravery is probably enhanced by Hildgund's presence. Germanic women also served as receptacles of their menfolk's honor. This may be reflected in the *Waltharius* when Hildgund is accepted as a hostage (62). Tacitus saw fit to comment in his *Germania* (8) that the Germanic peoples accepted female hostages, and this would suggest that the Mediterranean peoples were less inclined to do so.

When Walther is fleeing with Hildgund, the poet calls him praiseworthy (*laudabilis*, 427) for containing himself. At first glance, this would suggest monastic influence; yet this attitude is also in keeping with Germanic sentiments, if we may believe Julius Caesar. In his *Bellum Gallicum* (VI, 21) Caesar states that those Germanic youths who remained chaste longest won the greatest praise (*maximam inter suos ferunt laudem*), because it was considered most disgraceful (*in turpissimis rebus*) to have knowledge of a woman before the age of twenty. It is to be noted that Walther's continence was praiseworthy rather than righteous or godly. In other words, it was good in the eyes of man rather than in the eyes of God. Moreover, the poet does not suggest that Hildgund would have resisted Walther, even though the Church generally stressed feminine chastity as much as masculine. The old motif of the struggle between love and honor had already appeared in the *Waltharius* when Attila tried to persuade Walther to marry. Although deceitfully

planning his escape, Walther answers that, if he marries, he will be chained by cares and by his love for the girl and will be hindered from his service to his king. He will have to build houses and to cultivate fields and he will be unable to bear the labors of war once he has tasted luxury. Nothing is sweeter than obeying one's lord. If he remains single, he will never be persuaded to flee from danger because of wife or children (150-164). These arguments seem derived from Theophrastus and St. Paul,²⁹ yet they concur with sentiments expressed in many early Germanic works.³⁰

Although Walther's speech would imply that he wished to serve his king out of his sense of duty, it is more likely that he wished to do so because that was the best way to win honor and to avoid the shame resulting from uxoriousness.³¹ This may be the way in which Hildgund interpreted his speech, which she seems to have overheard. When he proposes marriage, she thinks that he is being ironic, because she believes that his heart would reject the great shame of taking such a bride (*talem pudor ingens ducere nuptam*, 239). All translators and commentators assume that it would be the shame of marrying a hostage instead of a rich princess; but, since Hildgund is really a rich princess, it may be that she thinks that Walther, as a young vassal, would consider it shameful to marry and thus to neglect the pursuit of honor in war. Or at least this may have been the meaning in the original source of this episode.

Because men set such store by their reputation, they were ever ready to avenge any slur upon it. When Gunther calls Hagen a coward and the son of a coward for not fighting (623-631), he is committing the most grievous injury known to the Teutons.³² To make matters worse, he rebukes Hagen in front of his peers, as Hagen later complains (*inter te comitantes*, 1071). As a vassal, Hagen cannot demand satisfaction, but he is at least released from serving Gunther, who has first violated their feudal pact by not defending his honor. Instead of fighting, Hagen withdraws to sulk like Achilles, maintaining sarcastically that he cannot fight because of his infamous ancestry (*genus infandum parentum*, 1067). He reconsiders only after Gunther has restored his honor by apologizing (1076).

Germanic men often reviled each other to enhance their own honor at the cost of their fellows. Typical of this custom is the raillery near the end of the poem, when Hagen chides Walther

for lacking a hand and Walther ridicules Hagen for lacking an eye and six teeth. Such scurrilous banter (*scurrilia certamina*, 1424) was not unusual in the flitings popular among Germanic scopos. Monastic ideas of Christian humility are probably reflected in the more chivalrous behavior between Walther and Hagen a few moments earlier, when they vie in praising the other as the more courageous (1409-1420).

Insults, which were often hurled as a means of shaming and angering an opponent into precipitating a battle, appear often in the *Waltharius*. Gunther insults Walther when he has Camalo demand his treasure (646-648), because that imputed inferiority. Hadawart insults Walther even more by demanding his shield (798), since that was an imputation of cowardice as well as weakness.³³ Trogus, although wounded, reviles Walther and diminishes his honor by saying that fortune, not illustrious strength, has given him the victory (*fors tibi victoriam de me, non inclita virtus contulit*, 1042). Before Walther can kill him, Trogus's friend Tanast comes to his aid. Indignant at the interference, Walther disembowels the would-be rescuer. Thereupon Trogus scorns to ask mercy, reviles Walther, and incites him through bitter reproaches (*conviciisque amaris*, 1055) either through the strength of his spirit or through desperation (*virtute animi, seu desperaverat*, 1056). Walther insults Gunther deeply by ignoring him after the battle and speaking only to his vassal (1237), for refusal of recognition is the most grievous insult of all.

The best way to expunge an insult was to defeat the insulter in a duel, that is, in a fight with equal weapons. Werinhard is acting shamefully when he uses unequal weapons (*haud aequo Marte*, 731) by standing at a safe distance and shooting arrows at Walther. On the other hand, Walther praises Hadaward for dismounting and choosing his opponent's method of fighting (*aequa pugnandi sors*, 789-790). When Trogus throws a barbed spear into Walther's shield and tries to pull it out of his grasp, his three comrades assist him. Because it was shameful for two or more to fight against one,³⁴ the poet calls the rope shameful (*funis nefandus*, 1021). When Gunther withdraws, Walther thinks that he is fetching reinforcements in order to renew the shameful battle (*bellum nefandum*, 1145). Gunther also acts shamefully in refusing to let Walther rest between bouts (722-744, 1349), because it brought little honor to defeat an exhausted man.³⁵ Although it was shameful to defeat a man in

unequal combat, it was nevertheless better than not to defeat him at all.³⁶

When Gunther fears that people will say the Franks were killed with impunity (*impune*, 1088), he is alluding to the shame (*Pro pudor!*, 1088) which he will suffer if he fails to avenge the injury. This raises the subject of blood-revenge (*Blutrache*), a concept unknown to the ancients. To be sure, the ancients sought vengeance for insults, but they generally regarded it as retaliation rather than as satisfaction. This seems to be Walther's sentiment when he gets revenge (*vindicta severa*, 1392) on Hagen for cutting off his right hand. When he thereupon strikes out Hagen's eye and six of his teeth (1393-1394), the poet may be subconsciously remembering, or purposely twisting, the Hebrew precept of an eye for an eye.³⁷

The ancients considered it their duty to avenge their murdered kinsmen and thus to put their shades to rest. An allusion to this belief appears in the *Waltharius*, when Walther, who is about to dispatch Trogus, sarcastically advises him to tell his friends in Tartarus that he has avenged them (1057). To be sure, a Teuton was expected to kill the slayer of his kinsmen, but the deed was considered a satisfaction to his own injured honor rather than a service to his dead kinsman. The *Waltharius* poet does not indicate whether Gerwit is following classic or Germanic tradition in wishing to avenge his fallen comrades (*caesos mundare vindicata sodales*, 926).

In general, the action of the *Waltharius* follows the exact rules of Germanic blood-revenge, even if the poet does not always seem to understand their motivation. Gunther alludes to the custom by avowing that Walther must surrender his treasure and pay penance for blood (*luere et pro sanguine poenas*, 724, cf. 820). The thought of blood-revenge is expressed again, when Gunther, fearing that Walther will return home as victor without shedding blood (*sine sanguine*, 949), urges his men to avenge the blood that has been shed (*fusum mundare cruorem*, 951), so that death may atone death and blood may atone blood (*ut mors abstergat mortem, sanguis quoque sanguem*, 952).

To pass for a man of honor, a Teuton had to avenge insults not only to himself but also to his kinsmen, since the kinship had a common honor.³⁸ When Walther kills Camalo, the latter's nephew, Scaramundus, says that it is incumbent on him to avenge his uncle (*haec me prae cunctis heu respicit actio rerum*, 690). Interpreted from a classic point of view, this would sug-

gest that it was his duty to avenge his uncle; but, interpreted from a Germanic point of view, it would suggest that it was his privilege, since his honor would remain blighted until his uncle's slayer was killed.

When Walther kills Patavrid, this is a particularly grievous insult to Hagen, who is his mother's brother (844); for, as the *Germania* (20) and many Germanic stories attest, the bond between uncle and sister-son was especially binding. Therefore, it comes as a surprise when Hagen assures Gunther that he will aid him from his sense of fealty rather than in order to avenge his nephew (1112-1114). Notwithstanding this assertion, he later tells Walther that he could have borne everything except the death of his dear nephew (1272-1275). As mentioned, when Walther tries to bribe him into renewing their pact of friendship, Hagen refuses and demands his nephew's blood (1275-1276), just as Scaramundus demands his uncle's life (701). By this gesture he shows admirable concern for his reputation; although it was permissible to accept a blood money for the death of a kinsman, it was considered more praiseworthy to refuse it and to insist upon washing out the injury with blood.³⁹

Although the action of the *Waltharius* largely accords with Germanic notions of blood-revenge, the author sometimes seems to give classic rather than Germanic motivation. Camalo wishes to avenge his dear friend (*carum ulciscar amicum*, 691) and Hagen speaks of the sorrow (*dolor*, 1272) which he feels when Walther mows down his "only beloved, blond, lovely, precious, tender flower (*unice . . . carum rutilum blandum pretiosum . . . florem . . . tenellum*, 1273-1274).⁴⁰ Such affection was irrelevant in the sagas, in which a man had to erase an insult to a kinsman even if he was more fond of the offender than of the offended. The "point of honor" remained sovereign over personal feelings, in literature at least, until well in the seventeenth century: witness Chimène in Corneille's *Cid*, whose sense of honor requires her to demand satisfaction from the man whom she loves.

Judging by the various references to honor in the *Waltharius*, it is easy to agree with Professor Zeydel (*sup*, p. 34) that "the crux of (this) epic is Hagen's quandary and double allegiance." This was probably the nucleus around which the book-epic grew. Like Hildgund, Walther's eleven opponents are not essential to the plot. In fact, these opponents, especially Patavrid,

actually detract from the dramatic moment, which is by rights the psychological dilemma. When Walther warns Hagen that it will be shameful (*nefas*, 1260) to break their often-sworn pact by attacking him, Hagen can justify his own actions by reminding Walther that it was Walther who first broke their pact (*fidem abscidere*, 1267) by killing so many of his kith and kin (*socii, propinqui*, 1268), and especially his nephew, even while seeing him present. Because Walther broke their pact first (*pactum irritare prior almum*, 1275), Hagen is free to perform his feudal duty. From a Germanic point of view, the *Waltharius* would have been far more moving if Hagen's fealty to Gunther had compelled him to lose his honor by attacking Walther while their friendship-pact was still binding.

Because the *Waltharius* poet has shifted his focus to Hagen's need for vengeance, he minimizes his obligation to Gunther. As von den Steinen notes, there is no mention of allegiance to the king.⁴¹ Such allegiance, however, is inherent in the fact that Gunther is expressly called his lord (*dominus*, 120, 633); and this was surely the chief motivation in earlier versions of the story. In the *Waltharius* Hagen is free to refuse service after his lord has insulted him; yet, once Gunther has entered the battle, Hagen has to come to his rescue, because a vassal won everlasting ignominy if he survived his lord in battle.⁴² Hagen himself makes it clear that his basic incentive is to protect his good name, for he says that he will die or do something memorable (*en aut oppeto sive aliquid memorabile faxo*, 1279).

In conclusion we can see that the definition of honor in the *Waltharius* is like that in most Germanic lays and sagas and shows little Christian and no Stoic influence. The word *honor* is used only objectively, and neither the term nor the concept of *honestum* appears in the work. Whereas honor in the *Waltharius* does not differ greatly from that in the Latin classics, it is stressed more intensely, is specifically associated with women, and is contrasted with wealth as an incentive to manly deeds. It is particularly associated with the keeping of feudal and friendship-pacts and with the vengeance of insults.

Although blood-revenge in the *Waltharius* follows the rules common to Germanic literature, the poet sometimes seems to motivate it wrongly; and a study of the subject in the *Waltharius* leads one to agree with Wilhelm Lenz and Felix Genzmer that the ethos of the poem is not heroic.⁴³ Gustav Ehrismann seems to have been correct in saying that the chief difference between

the *Waltharius* and the national heroic epic lay in the ethos: the *Waltharius* is conceived ironically, the poet no longer believes in his heroes.⁴⁴

The poet seems to have impugned the old value system, but he does not really substitute another. His attitude cannot be interpreted as a beginning of a new era, for the old values still appear undiminished and unadulterated in the *Lay of the Nibelungs* three centuries later. Instead, we may look at his poem as an expression of the dualism so striking in medieval literature, in which men could alternately adore and parody holy things. When medieval clerics used scriptural and liturgical terms for erotic verse, this does not prove them irreligious.⁴⁵ Because our poet gives a "trick ending" to a story that demands tragic fulfillment, we need not assume that he entirely rejected heroic values. Perhaps he and his clerical public merely enjoying toying with the values held sacrosanct by their secular acquaintances.

NOTES

1. For an account of *Waltharius* scholarship, see Wolfram von den Steinen, "Der Waltharius und sein Dichter", *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, 48, 1952-53, pp. 1-46.

2. See Gustav Ehrismann, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*, München, 1932, pp. 395-406.

3. Found in *Waltharii Poesis*, ed. Hermann Althof, Leipzig, 1899, I, p. 64; also in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Poetae*, V, No. 2, p. 407. All references in this study to the poem itself are based on edition by Karl Strecker in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Poetae*, VI, No. 1, pp. 24-83.

4. Karl Hauck, "Das Walthariusepos des Bruders Gerald v. Eichstätt," *Germanisch-romanische Monatsschrift*, Neue Folge, 4, 1954, pp. 1-27.

5. F. Panzer, *Der Kampf am Wasichenstein*, Speyer, 1948.

6. Such lack of historical awareness prevailed throughout the Middle Ages and Renaissance, as can be seen in illustrations to ancient stories. Cf. "Es gibt für diesen Kleriker Gerald keinen Gegensatz von alter Sage und selbsterlebtem Bild, von heidnisch und christlich, von Geschichte und Mitzeit. Er stellt alles griffsicher in die ihm gegenwärtige Welt hinein . . ." (von den Steinen, p. 21).

7. See illustration in Johannes Hoops, *Realexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde*, Strassburg, 1911-13, I, p. 104. In Wittenwiler's *Ring* (vv. 7956, 9093) the heathens actually use a barbed pitchfork fastened with a thong.

8. See *Germanische Altertumskunde*, ed. Hermann Schneider, p. 142.

9. As we shall see, this word is used in an episode that concerns worldly honor rather than righteousness. When Tacitus said that the Teutons considered it *nefas* to turn any man away from one's door (*Germania*, 21), he assumed that they considered it sacrilegious. It is more likely that they considered it shameful. Hans Kuhn explains Germanic morality by saying, "Sittlichkeit und Religion haben bei den heidnischen Germanen nicht viel

miteinander zu tun gehabt. Ihre sittlichen Forderungen waren keine göttlichen Gebote" (in *Germanische Altertumskunde*, p. 177).

10. See F. Klose, *Die Bedeutung von honos und honestas*, Breslau Diss., 1933.

11. Note the conspicuous consumption at the banquets (*sumptu per-magno*, 279, *magnis sumptibus*, 289) and also leisure-class symbols such as spiced wine, fish, purple cloth.

12. *Ethics*, IV, 3 (trans. Ross). Cf. "cum honos sit praemium virtutis" (Cicero, *Brutus*, 281), quoted by Dante, *De Monarchia*, III, 3.

13. Most translators believe *virtutem* here to mean his valor (Magoun and Smyser) or his worth (*seinen Wert*, Langosch); but I think it more logical to understand the word in the sense in which it is used everywhere else. Trogus could not show strength through deeds, but he could show fortitude through his deportment.

14. "includus, inclitus (in-clueo; cf. Greek *klutós*)", Alois Walde, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, ed. J. B. Hofmann, Heidelberg, 1930, II, p. 691. For Eleuthir (1008, 1017) see Althof, II, p. 278.

15. In other words, Walther is not much more Christian than the Old Norse converts, of whom Andreas Heusler says, "Den Kern der heidnischen Sittenlehre tastete man nicht an: das Ehrgefühl des auf Selbsthilfe gestellten, kriegerisch erzogenen Mannes; die Hochschätzung des Besitzes, der Macht, der Rache" (*Germanentum*, 4th ed., Heidelberg, n.d., p. 128).

16. In the saga about Hålf, the hero says that Odin gave him a brave heart in his youth (*ibid.*, p. 66).

17. "illum defendere, tueri, sua quoque fortia facta gloriae eius adsignare praecipuum sacramentum est" (*Germania*, 14). Tacitus seems to use the word *sacramentum* in the meaning of *trüwe*.

18. vv. 607, 744, 752, 775, 807, 885, 979, 1057, 1220, 1353. The Anglo-Saxon fragments of the Walther legend, although generally monastic in tone, also let Walther give a boastful defiance (II, 13-14).

19. This is apparent in vv. 648, 1110, and 1219. I think that it is just as true of v. 955, even if Wilhelm Lenz believes it to mean *Seelenheil* (*Der Ausgang der Dichtung von Walther und Hildegunde*, Halle, 1939, p. 9).

20. "Ludendum magis est, Dominum quam sit rogitandum" (prologue, v. 19, ed. Althof).

21. "Der Waltharius ist christlich ganz und gar, aber mönchisch oder spezifisch kirchlich in keinem einzigen Zuge" (von den Steinen, p. 31).

22. For an account of the godly depredations of the Teutonic Knights against the Prussians and the Lithuanians, see Nikolaus von Jeroschin's *Die Kronike von Pruzinlant*, ed. E. Strehlke, *Scriptores Rerum Prussicarum*, I, Leipzig, 1861, pp. 291 ff.

23. *Ethics*, I, 5 (trans. Ross).

24. "Der Ruhm, die 'gute Nachrede nach dem Tode', ist dem Heiden, was dem Christen die ewige Seligkeit: das höchste Gut" (Heusler, p. 103).

25. *triumphus*, vv. 12, 108, 176, 206, 928, 988, 1451; *victoria*, v. 1042. Possibly *triumphus* was favored for metrical reasons.

26. This Germanic practice is echoed in the *Nibelungenlied* (2020) when Hagen says, "Ez zaeme . . . daz die herren vaehten z'aller vorderöst".

27. Gunther's chief epithet is *superbus* (468, 573, 628, 720, 1153) and he speaks *affatu superbo* (1229). Although pride was a Christian sin, it was a Germanic virtue which gradually developed into the medieval concept of *höchgemuot*. Gunther is also *miser* (943) and *infelix* (488, 1062, 1092), which would indicate that he lacked the *heil* necessary in a king. He is also *caecus* (870, 943), *demens* (754, 954), *male sana mente gravatus* (530).

28. *Germania*, 7, 8. Many examples of women shaming men into gaining vengeance are given by W. Grönbech, *Kultur und Religion der Germanen*, Darmstadt, 1954.

29. *Adversus Jovinianum Libri Duo*, Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, XXIII, 276 ff. Many of St. Jerome's views, which originated with Theophrastus,

appeared in medieval works, for example, in Wittenwiler's *Ring*, vv. 2688-2782. "Qui autem cum uxore est, sollicitus est quae sunt mundi, quomodo placeat uxori, et divisus est" (*I Cor.*, 7, 33).

30. See *Saxonis Grammatici Gesta Danorum*, ed. A. Holder, Strassburg, 1886, pp. 58-59, 216; *The Saga of the Jömsvíkings*, trans L. M. Hollander, Austin, 1955, p. 97.

31. For the conflict of love versus honor, see G. F. Jones, "Lov'd I Not honour more", *Comparative Literature*, forthcoming.

32. See Jacob Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsaltertümer*, ed. Andreas Heusler, Darmstadt, 1955, II, 206-208.

33. *Germania*, 11, 13, 6.

34. See story of Ket and Wig in *Gesta Danorum*, ed. Holder, pp. 110-113. Cf. "Zwêne bestuonden einen: daz was hie vor niht site. Witege und Heime swachten ir êre sêr dâmite, daz sî ûf einer warte vrumten grôzen schaden an dem jungen Alpharten. des wurdens lasters überladen" (*Alpharts Tod*, 15, in *Deutsches Heldenbuch II*, ed. Ernst Martin, Berlin, 1866). Note that the stress was not on the wickedness of their act, but on the honor that they would lose and the reproach that they would win.

35. In the *Nibelungenlied* (2351), Dietrich refuses to kill Hagen when he is exhausted because, "du bist in nôt erwigen. ich hâns lützel êre, soltu tôt vor mir geligen".

36. Although Ket and Wig killed Athisl two against one, their king shows them high honors (*primi honores*) because they have performed a most useful (*utilissimus*) task. He prefers to see the *gloria* in the death of a rival than the ill repute (*fama*) of the inglorious deed (*admissum obprobrium*; *Gesta Danorum*, ed. Holder, pp. 110-113). Hans Kuhn states, "Eine Rache auf krummen Wegen war ehrenvoller als keine Rache" (*Germanische Altertumskunde*, p. 193).

37. There are several occasions where the poet seems to be trying to gain humor by citing authorities out of context. When he says that Hagen was rightfully angry at Gunther, if one is allowed to be angry with his lord (*si tamen in dominum licitum est irascier ullum*, 653), Lenz (p. 9) sees an allusion to the Benedictine Rule, 4, 22.

38. C. von Schwerin, *Germanische Rechtsgeschichte*, Berlin, 1944, p. 22.

39. Heusler, p. 43.

40. When Hagen mentions the *dolor* that he feels, this may represent the word *leid* in an oral source of this episode, because *leid* could mean either sorrow or insult, either *Leid* or *Beleidigung* (see Friderich Maurer, *Leid*, Bern, 1951). The word *dolor* appears later in the sense of pain or injury when Hagen, unmindful of his own *dolor* (1369), thrusts out his head to guard his king from Walther's blow.

41. "von einer Treupflicht gegen den König ist mit keiner Silbe die Rede; auch später nicht" (von den Steinen, p. 16).

42. See *Germania* 14; *Beowulf*, 2884-2891.

43. Lenz, *op. cit.*, p. 21, *et passim*: Felix Genzmer, "Wie der Waltharius entstanden ist", *Germanisch-romanische Monatsschrift*, Neue Folge, 4, 1954, pp. 161-178.

44. "Im Ethos liegt der tiefgehendste Unterschied zwischen dem Walthariuslied und der altnationalen Heldenepik: die Auffassung ist ironisch. Der Dichter glaubt nicht an seine Helden, er ist nicht von sittlicher Erhebung durch ihre Grosstaten durchdrungen, er lebt nicht mit ihnen, er steht ausserhalb ihrer Welt" (Ehrismann, I, 402).

45. See Paul Lehmann, *Die Parodie im Mittelalter*, Munich, 1922.

PROLEGOMENA TO AN ENGLISH TRANSLATION
OF *WALTHARIUS*

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL

There is a great wealth of literature throughout Central Europe written in the Latin language during the tenth and eleventh centuries. It is now generally recognized that much of this, long neglected as barbarous and of inferior quality with regard to language, form, and content, has literary merit and is of value not only for a study of the development of letters, but also for the history of civilization and culture in the European countries. In a recent article¹ Heinz Rupp is one witness among many to the truth of this assertion.

Among such works well worthy of translation into English, it seems to me, are 1) the Song of Walther, or *Waltharius manu fortis*, 2) the dramas of Hrotsvit, 3) the Escape of the Captive, or *Ecbasis Captivi*, and 4) *Ruodlieb*. Of these the Hrotsvit plays have twice been turned into English satisfactorily enough, once by Christopher St. John² (a pen-name for Christabel Marshali), and again by H. J. W. Tillyard,³ while *Ruodlieb* is scheduled to appear in these Studies during 1959⁴ in what is the first English translation ever to be essayed, and the first critical edition of the text since the edition of Seiler in 1882. As for the other two works, *Waltharius*, together with documents pertaining to it, has appeared in an English prose version as Connecticut College Monograph No. 4 by F. P. Magoun, Jr. and H. M. Smyser. But it was published under the misleading title *Walter of Aquitaine: Materials for the Study of his Legend*.⁵ Although scholarly, the work has hardly penetrated the general book market. Another English translation (in blank verse), which omits ll. 572-1332, is in *Medieval Literature in Translation* by Charles W. Jones (New York, 1950, pp. 192-208). Snatches found in *Poets and Poetry of Germany* by Mme. Davésiès de Pontes (vol. 1, London, 1858) and in Julian Hawthorne's *The Masterpieces and the History of Literature* (vol. 1, New York, 1906) are insignificant. A new, more easily accessible translation, with perhaps a fuller introduction, would therefore be in order, preferably with the Latin text facing the translation. *Ecbasis Captivi* (the full title: *Ecbasis cuiusdam captivi, per tropologum*), the first beast epic in northern European literature, written by a monk (Humbert, later cardinal of Silva

Candida?) in Lorraine between 1043 and 1046, has to my knowledge never been translated into English.

A word is in order on the relative merits of the two last-mentioned works. In the Foreword to the epoch-making volume *Lateinische Gedichte des X. und XI. Jahrhunderts*, which he published jointly with Andreas Schmeller in Göttingen in 1838, Jacob Grimm compares *Waltharius* and *Ecbasis* (also *Ruodlieb*) and reaches the following results: "Dieser Einfachheit einer dennoch reichen Fabel wegen wird man kaum anstehen, der schönen und fesselnden Gleichmässigkeit des *Waltharius* den ersten Rang unter den drei Dichtungen einzuräumen. Es ist epische Wärme darin, deren Kraft selbst ältere formgewaltigere Werke der Römer überbieten könnte . . . Weit geringeren Wert in Anspruch nehmen darf die *Ecbasis* . . ." (p. XI)⁶

As usual in his estimate of medieval literature, Grimm shows impeccable good taste and judgment. No German work between 900 and 1100 reveals as much epic power, lively action, warmth, and stylistic excellence as does *Waltharius*. None assimilates subject matter so well to the heroic language in which it is couched. And in dealing in an independent vein (it would seem) with native Germanic saga material, it is quite unique for its age and deserves attention as the earliest complete epic in the known literature of the German peoples.

If these were not reasons enough to make another English translation of *Waltharius* desirable, the many fascinating problems which the work poses for the Germanist, the historian, and the Latinist alike would be still further motives for intensive occupation with it. These problems are so fundamental and so far-reaching that upon our answers to them will depend the very interpretation of the Carolingian and Ottonian periods themselves.

Briefly, they concern the authorship and, connected with it, the date and place of composition, as well as the sources upon which it depends. And clustered around each of these problems is a whole nest of related unanswered questions, which make *Waltharius* an outstanding problem child in European literary criticism, rivalling the *Lay of the Nibelungs*, *Parzival*, and *Tristan* in this respect. Since it is my hope in the next pages to add my mite to the solution of these problems, it is necessary to present them here succinctly.

Until the middle of the twenties of our era it was generally assumed that *Waltharius* was the work of the St. Gall monk Ekke-

hard I, and that its date was about 930; as its source a German poem, long lost, belonging to the cycle of the German heroic sagas was usually assumed.⁷ Beginning about thirty years ago, these beliefs were re-examined bit by bit, by a succession of scholars, among them Reeh, Sievers, Alfred Wolf, Strecker, Otto Schumann, Minis, Langosch, Karl Hauck, and Genzmer, to name but a few.

As early as 1926 Reeh published the article "Zur Frage nach dem Verfasser des Walthariliedes",⁸ which revealed the writer's limitations yet succeeded in reaching the heart of the problem. He maintained that not Ekkehard I, but Geraldus, the writer of a 22-line prolog appearing in some of the manuscripts, was the author of *Waltharius*. Schumann, Stach, and von den Steinen agreed with him, at least for a while.⁹ But it was the Sudeten-born scholar Wolf, in Upsala, Sweden, who stirred up *Waltharius* scholarship to its depths in a lecture before the Germanistic Seminar of the University of Berlin in 1938 by a reconsideration of the statements of Ekkehard IV in the *Casus Sancti Galli*,¹⁰ leading to the conclusion that Ekkehard IV does not refer to our *Waltharius* at all, but to a lost poem on a Christian knight who retired to a monastery, as described in the *Chronicon Novaliciense* of the monastery of Novalesse in northern Italy. The reason for Wolf's claim is that Ekkehard IV cannot have corrected our excellent poem, as it bears no trace of any corrections; his statement about corrections must refer to the aforementioned lost poem, probably an insignificant work of Ekkehard I, full of Germanisms. Ekkehard IV, Wolf continues, speaks of a *Vita*—a life of a saint or other devout Christian; and such a *Vita* is what we would expect Ekkehard I to have written—not an epic of pagan battles—, for we know that later he wrote sequences, antiphonies, and other ecclesiastical verse. Moreover, the library catalog of Toul (1084) mentions a work about a Walther among the *Libri divinorum poetarum*, as well as one among those of the *gentilium poetarum*. Finally, says Wolf, the *Chronicon Novaliciense* expressly alludes to recorded *acta* and a *vita conscripta* of this Christian *Waltharius*. Our poem then, according to Wolf, has nothing to do with Ekkehard I or IV, but is the work of an unknown writer of the Carolingian era—about one hundred years before the traditional date.

Some noted scholars have accepted Wolf's theories, at least in part and with some scruples—prematurely, it seems to me.

Among them are Strecker, Erdmann, Stach, von Kralik, and von den Steinen, Strecker going so far as to publish his fine posthumous edition of *Waltharius*¹¹ among the writings of the *Poetae Aevi Carolini*. Prominent among those *not* subscribing to these startling theories is Karl Langosch in the aforementioned *Verfasserlexikon*, as well as in periodical articles and his popular edition of *Waltharius*.¹²

At the risk of repetitiousness, I must reprint once more the cento-like Prolog to *Waltharius* by a Geraldus, which appears in the three so-called Northwestern and Western manuscripts (Brussels, Paris, Trier), appending my own English translation.

- Omnipotens genitor, summae virtutis amator,
 Jure pari natusque amborum spiritus almus,
 Personis trinus, vera deitate sed unus,
 Qui vita vivens cuncta et sine fine tenebis,
 5 Pontificem summum tu salva nunc et in aevum
 Claro Erckambaldum fulgentem nomine dignum,
 Crescat ut interius sancto spiramine plenus,
 Multis infictum quo sit medicamen in aevum.
 Praesul sancte dei, nuc accipe munera servi,
 10 Quae tibi decrevit de larga promere cura
 Peccator fragilis Geraldus nomine vilis,
 Qui tibi nam certus corde estque fidelis alumnus,
 Quod precibus dominum iugiter precor omnitonantem,
 Ut nanciscaris factis, quae promo loquelis,
 15 Det pater ex summis caelum terramque gubernans.
 Serve dei summi, ne despice verba libelli,
 Non canit alma dei, resonat sed mira tyronis,
 Nomine Waltharius, per proelia multa resectus.
 Ludendum magis est, dominum quam sit rogitandum,
 20 Perlectus longaevi stringit inampla diei.
 Sis felix sanctus per tempora plura sacerdos,
 Sit tibi mente tua Geraldus carus adelphus!¹³

Translation

"Almighty Father, lover of highest virtue, born in equal prerogative and nourishing spirit of both, threefold in person but one in true deity, who livest in all life and holdest sway without end, bless Thy highest priest now and forever, glorious Erckambald worthy of illustrious name, that he may grow within, full of the Holy Spirit, that he may be a genuine tonic to many at all times. Now accept, representative of Holy God, the

gifts of your servant, which the fragile sinner Gerald, humble of name, has resolved to bring forth from long nurture. He is steadfast to you in heart, and your loyal son. This I pray constantly to the All-Thundering Lord that you may attain in deeds what I bring forth in words; may the Father who rules on high over heaven and earth grant it. Servant of the highest Lord, do not look down upon the words of this book, it does not sing the nourishing deeds of God but echoes the wonders of a tyro, Walther by name, hemmed in by many battles. When pastime is more to be sought than prayers offered to the Lord, then, when read, it can restrict the boredom of a long life's day. Be happy, holy priest, in times to come, let brother Gerald be dear to you in your mind."

Typical of those whom this Prolog, with its ponderous, awkward language, convinced that it proves the authorship of a Geraldus, von den Steinen remarks: "Liest man den Prolog, wie er da steht, so besagt er klipp und klar, dass Geraldus das Epos verfasst hat."¹⁴ However this may be, it is incidentally worth noting that any attempt to make Geraldus the author tends to play into the hands of certain chauvinistic scholars in France who, relying on a statement of later date in the Paris catalog 4 (1744), 532, still call Geraldus a monk of Fleury on the Loire—a possibility refuted by the Frenchman M. Prinet as early as 1921.¹⁵ But what evidence have we in the Prolog that Geraldus was actually the author, and not merely the one who sent *Waltharius* to a high church dignitary named Erckambaldus? *de larga promere cura* (v. 10) refers not to authorship but to editorship after long nurture, like the later "to see through the press," and *cura* would be the care or nurture given a manuscript entrusted to a *curator*. And vv. 16-18 merely beg Erckambaldus not to take the work lightly even though it is not of a spiritual nature, but rather echoes the remarkable deeds of a young knight, Walther, who was *resectus*, hemmed in, through many battles. (Incidentally *resectus* may allude to the Wasgenstein). The final lines (19ff.) may simply refer to Geraldus' advanced years. I see no reason whatever, then, to prompt von den Steinen's "klipp und klar." The test of "Schallanalyse" to which Sievers put the Prolog in 1927¹⁶ also indicated that it was not by the same man who composed *Waltharius*. Stylistic tests of Langosch have brought similar results. Who Geraldus and Erckambaldus may have been and the reason why the former sent the latter *Waltharius* will be discussed later.

We return now to Wolf and to Ekkehard IV's statements about a *Waltharius* in the passage of *Casus S. Galli* already referred to in note 10. The passage reads:

Multa de eo (*i.e.* Ekkehardo I) post dicenda sunt; sed prius a quo spiritu ductus sit, ex verbis ipsius nosci licet. Scripsit enim doctus ille sequentias 'Prompta mente canamus', 'Summum praeconem Christi', 'Qui benedici cupitis', 'A solis occasu'. De Sancta Afra antiphonas, ut reliquias eius mereretur, Luitoldo episcopo et sequentiam dictavit. Ymnum 'O martyr aeterni patris', 'Ambulans Hiesus', 'Adoremus gloriosissimum.' Scripsit et in scholis metricè magistro, vacillanter quidem, quia in affectione non in habitu erat puer, vitam Waltharii manu fortis, quam Magontiae positi, Aribone archiepiscopo iubente, pro posse et nosse correximus; barbaries enim et idiomata eius Teutonem adhuc affectantem repente Latinum fieri non partiuntur. Unde male docere solent discipulos semimagistri dicentes: 'Videte, quomodo disertissime coram Teutone aliquo proloqui deceat, et eadem serie in Latinum verba vertite'. Quae deceptio Ekkehardum in opere illo adhuc puerum fefellit, sed postea non sic, ut in lidio Charromannico 'Mole ut vincendi.' 'Ipse quoque opponam'.¹⁷

Translation

Many things are to be said about Ekkehard I later; but before then we may learn from his own words by what spirit he was led. For that scholar wrote the sequences 'Prompta mente canamus', 'Summum praeconem Christi', 'Qui benedici cupitis', 'A solis occasu'. About St. Afra he wrote for Bishop Luitold antiphonies and a sequence, in order to earn some relics of hers. He composed the hymn 'O martyr aeterni patris', also 'Ambulans Hiesus', 'Adoremus gloriosissimum'. In school he wrote metrically for the teacher, in an uncertain manner, to be sure, because in disposition but not in outward appearance he was still a lad, the life of Walther strong of hand, which we, when stationed at Mainz, corrected according to our ability and knowledge at the behest of Archbishop Aribo. For the barbarisms and speech patterns of a man do not permit him suddenly to become a Latinist when all along he has been playing the part of a German. Hence the half-teachers are wont to teach their pupils badly when they say: 'See how you can best express a thought to any German, and then turn the words into Latin in the same sequence.' This fallacy misled Ekkehard in that work when he was still a lad, but later not so, as in the case of the Song of Carlmann, 'Mole ut vincendi.' 'Ipse quoque opponam.' "

On the face of it, this seems evidence enough that Ekkehard I, while still young in his ways, but less so in actual years (if he was born in 909, let us say between 930 and 932),¹⁸ wrote a *Waltharius manu fortis* for a teacher, which was full of "barbarous" Germanisms, and which one hundred years later (between 1026 and 1031) Ekkehard IV "corrected" in Mainz under orders from Archbishop Aribo. Later in life, though, Ekkehard I, who subsequently became dean of St. Gall, improved his Latin, says Ekkehard IV, and wrote fine sequences, hymns, etc.

Nevertheless, for reasons given above, Wolf and his followers (to some extent even Strecker) deny that Ekkehard IV refers to our poem. Besides what has already been said, points in Wolf's favor are: 1. In no manuscript of *Waltharius* is Ekkehard I mentioned as the author of our poem, only by Ekkehard IV in the passage above (which Wolf disputes), and in a later passage by the so called Anonymus Mellicensis (Wolf von Prüfening): "Ekkehardus . . . gesta Waltharii metro conscripsit heroico, tertio regnante Henrico;"¹⁹ 2. No manuscript of the work was ever found in, or traced directly to, St. Gall; 3. What would induce so prominent a monastic as Ekkehard I to write so warlike and gory an epic, so different in nature from his other works? 4. Why would an archbishop want a copy of it? 5. To judge by his extant works, Ekkehard IV was utterly incapable of correcting the excellent Latin of our poem—in a sense a cento of Vergil, Ovid, Statius, Prudentius, Boethius, Valerius Flaccus, etc.; 6. The phonology of the proper names could all date from the ninth century (*Alphere* and *Gunthere* after 850, *Walthari* and *Hagano* 750, *Hagathien* about 800); 7. Three of the most important manuscripts come from a region whose center, more or less, is Aachen and is on a line west of Mainz—Strassburg; was the home of the work therefore in that region? 8. The home might be a ruler's court instead of a monastery, although there is also evidence for an ecclesiastical background (cf. *fatres* in l. 1, and occasional Christian references); 9. Leonine rhyme has not yet penetrated as much as one might believe it had done in the tenth century.

On the other hand, the following points are against Wolf: 1. The tests of Sievers show that the other known works of Ekkehard I correspond in melody and rhythm to those of our poem; 2. The term *Vita* need not raise questions because in the catalog of the ecclesiastical library of Stablo near Liège (1105), the epic is also called a *vita*; 3. In his *Casus St. Galli*, which

constitutes the chief evidence in trying to prove Ekkehard I's authorship, Ekkehard IV uses three expressions for which rather close parallels can be found in *Waltharius*, indicating that he was familiar with the poem: a. *Casus* (*Mon.*, p. 98): *per silvam latronibus aptam. Walth. 496; apta quidam statio latronibus*; b. *Casus* (*Mon.*, p. 110): *se duce, qui illorum mores in armis iam nosset. Walth. 568f.: namque ille meos per proelia mores iam didicit*; c. *Casus* (*Mon.*, p. 118): *Waltharii manu fortis. Walth. 1381: recidebat dextera fortis*. When we consider to what extent medieval authors depended upon memory and association, these similarities acquire increased significance; 4. If Ekkehard IV is referring to a Christian *Vita Waltharii*, as Wolf claims, we must presuppose two last works, the original Christian poem of Ekkehard I, and the revision of which Ekkehard IV speaks; it strains probability to discard one extant work in favor of two non-existing ones.

We are now ready to present our own evidence bearing upon the question involved, including those raised by the Geraldus prolog. I preface it with the assurance that in spite of Wolf's arguments I, like Langosch, believe that Ekkehard I wrote *Waltharius*. In order to establish that conviction I must prove 1) that Ekkehard IV's testimony is not altogether reliable, 2) that the Novalesse Chronicle, whether intentionally or not, introduces a confusion which alone has made Wolf's erroneous deductions possible, 3) that this confusion also crept into the catalogs of Toul and Stablo and into the Prüfening work, and 4) that Ekkehard I, although a monk, had ample motivation for writing *Waltharius* as we know it, and Erckambaldus as well as Aribo had good reason to desire copies. Minor matters, such as the absence of a manuscript in St. Gall and the presence of them elsewhere, the phonology of the names, and even the incomplete leonine treatment, will, I hope, find plausible explanations as a natural consequence.

What was the purpose of Ekkehard IV in writing his continuation of the *Casus St. Galli* between about 1046 and 1057, some 150 years after Ratpert had begun the task? On this question the *Casus* themselves give us ample testimony. Ekkehard's chief purpose was to utter a sharp protest against the designs of the new abbot, Norpert, sent by Emperor Conrad II in 1034 to introduce the highly unpopular reforms of Cluny.²⁰ It should always be borne in mind that the Cluniac system is the very antithesis of the Benedictine polity. Thus Ekkehard

IV's contribution is colored from beginning to end. Even though his account goes only to 972, his endeavor is to show that life and conditions in St. Gall were always satisfactory and not in need of reforms of the Cluny type. His account, which throughout is more in the nature of a running commentary on persons than a history, must therefore be treated with caution.²¹ Ekkehard, in his awkward, obscure, heavy, unclassical Latin, often does violence to chronology and depicts persons to suit his prejudices. The abbot Salomon is painted in glowing colors, so that his vices seem virtues (*Mon.*, p. 88f.; v. Knonau, ch. 23f., pp. 33ff.), the character of Cralo is deliberately blackened (*Mon.*, pp. 112ff.; v. Knonau, ch. 69ff., pp. 105ff.), and Ruodman of Reichenau, the noble friend and confidant of Otto I, is maligned as a cruel, false scheming villain (*Mon.*, pp. 123f., v. Knonau, ch. 91f., pp. 139ff.). So too Sandrat of Gladbach, the able reformer, is treated (*Mon.*, pp. 143ff., v. Knonau, ch. 137, pp. 206ff.). All this is done to show that the critics and foes of St. Gall were wrong—an attempt that involves the writer in curious inconsistencies and leads him to suggest that any criticism against St. Gall embodies a vicious lie prompted by envy (see esp. the chapters on Ruodman and on the visitation by Otto I at the end of the work).

The work of Ezzo (inspired by Bishop Gunther of Bamberg) and those of Heinrich von Melk, as well as the Song of Anno, all from the period when Cluny's influence was strong in Central Europe, show how these reforms helped directly or indirectly to gain for the vernacular a certain literary standing. This too was distasteful to Ekkehard IV, who, though his own Latin is poor and full of Germanisms, uses the term *barbaries* in the above passage on Ekkehard I to characterize bad Latin diction.

One other incident in the *Casus* is particularly informative in this respect. It is in *Mon.*, p. 98 (v. Knonau, ch. 41, p. 63f.) and describes how Notker Balbulus chastizes the devil who had assumed canine form and who in "barbaric language"—i.e. in the German vernacular—shouts "Au weh, mir weh!" when he is beaten: "Tandem vero cum ad speram sanctissimam cedendo caedentem fugiens venisset, ultra iam progredi non valens constitit, et tot iam ictus et incussiones ferre non sustinens, barbarice clamans au wê! mir wê vociferavit."—"When at last (the devil), in yielding, fled before the one who was dealing the blows and reached the most holy sphere, he stopped,

unable to advance, and not enduring so many blows and cuffs, shouted *au wê! mir wê!* in the barbaric language." Impelled by this same contempt for the vernacular, Ekkehard translated the "carmen barbaricum" of his teacher Ratpert into Latin to save from oblivion the melody to which it was sung.

Other characteristics of Ekkehard IV, besides his inaccuracy, instinct for misrepresentation, self-deception, gross inconsistency (e.g. v. Knouau, p. 181, note 3), and dislike of the vernacular, are pride in his own Latin for little good reason, and pedagogic impatience with "half-teachers" who encourage word-for-word translation from the "barbarous" vernacular into Latin, as the passage on Ekkehard I reveals. He thinks highly of this distinguished predecessor who was once even honored by the Pope, and praises Ekkehard I for his zeal and "sweetness of love" (*natura et studio caritatis dulcedine pleno*—cf. note 10 above). His gratuitous criticism is levelled not at him personally, but at a certain method of teaching.

Ekkehard IV's contention, then, that he "corrected" the Latin of Ekkehard I's *Waltharius* may be questioned for other reasons than that the work bears no traces of correction. He is unreliable in general and twists the truth to suit his purpose. With feigned modesty he wants to plume himself on his excellent Latin and to brag that he was capable of correcting such a master as Ekkehard I. He finds this a good occasion too to express his contempt for the vernacular and for teachers of Latin who use the "barbarous" vernacular (the devil's language) as a starting point. With impunity he could make rash statements based upon hearsay evidence, for who was left to contradict his story now—some thirty years after Aribo (dead since 1031) had called upon him for the manuscript of *Waltharius*?

We may believe then that Ekkehard wrote *Waltharius* when he was between 21 and 23 years of age (not a mere schoolboy),²² still young and maturing in his ways, but in appearance and ability already a man, and that one hundred years later Ekkehard IV gave the work to Archbishop Aribo. But the story that he corrected it is suspect for good reasons.

The other points mentioned above (p. 27) as being in Wolf's favor must now be taken up. 1) That the manuscripts fail to mention Ekkehard I's name is nothing unusual. Countless medieval manuscripts have the same anonymity. Besides, with all the confusion attending upon Ekkehard's poem, this is nat-

ural. Perhaps the copyists themselves did not know the name. 2) As for the absence of any manuscript in St. Gall, there was probably at least one present at the time of Geraldus' Prolog (which, as will be shown below, I date in or after 973) and one up to about 1031, the date of Archbishop Aribo's death. The one that Geraldus sent to Erckambaldus went to Strassburg (I conjecture that this Erckambaldus was the bishop there from 965 to 991),²³ the manuscript that Ekkehard IV gave to Aribo went to Mainz. Since we know that one of the lost manuscripts was in Metz (No. 5 according to Strecker's list) and that manuscripts exist or were known to exist along a line from Mainz to Strassburg, we can understand how Geraldus and Ekkehard IV may have been in a sense responsible for the present situation. 3) The reason why Ekkehard, a monk, wrote so un-Christian a poem must be explained by his two-sided love for Germanic hero-lore and for the literature of classical antiquity and early medievalism, especially Virgil, Statius, and Prudentius (30 B.C.-400 A.D.). The influence of his teacher Geraldus should no doubt be taken into account too. Most importantly, though, in my opinion, he was motivated by the desire to furnish reading in good Latin for Benedictine and other monastery schools, as Felix Genzmer points out in his article "Wie der *Waltharius* entstanden ist."²⁴ This explains too why an archbishop and a bishop were eager to receive the work. When they obtained it no doubt they had copies made for wider school use (point No. 4), so that it easily spread to the northwest as well as to the south (point No. 7).

This leaves only points 6 and 9. As for No. 6—the matter of the proper names—Ekkehard I probably took them over bodily from earlier sources, as Genzmer says. As for No. 9—the incomplete penetration of leonine rhyme—, some tenth-century poems show even less leonine influence than *Waltharius*. Strecker himself, who assigned *Waltharius* to the Carolingian age after much hesitation, admits: "Es ist wahr, es kommen im *Waltharius* verhältnismässig viele Leoniner vor."²⁵ Besides, it should not be overlooked that, if *Waltharius* contains fewer leonine verses than Ekkehard's later works, this is a cento of Roman writers from his youth for school purposes, in which the practise of leonine verse was not appropriate.

There remain the questions: Who were Geraldus (and Erckambald), and what is the significance of the *Chronicon Novaliciense*? If Ekkehard I is the author of *Waltharius*, there can be

little doubt as to the identity of the author of the Prolog, and its recipient. Geraldus, then, was the famous teacher of St. Gall, somewhat older than Ekkehard I—born perhaps around 900 and died at a high age (as the Prolog indicates—see also Ekkehard IV below). Perhaps his death occurred soon after Ekkehard's, who died in January, 973.²⁶ Ekkehard IV writes in the *Casus*:²⁷ Geraldus ab adolescentia usque ad senilem vitae finem semper scholarum magister." (Geraldus from youth to the hoary end of his life, always a schoolteacher). The puzzling question that remains and cannot be definitely answered is: Why does he not mention Ekkehard I in the Prolog as the author of *Waltharius*? Did he himself have so prominent a part in its writing that he did not care to give his pupil Ekkehard credit? Or could Ekkehard IV's words "ad senilem vitae finem" suggest that after forty years Geraldus did not remember? I would prefer to explain the silence by suggesting that Ekkehard I's authorship was well known to everyone by 970, and that Bishop Erckambald had asked for the work by author, making further reference to authorship unnecessary on Geraldus' part.

Allusion has already been made to the *Chronicon Novaliense* and the important part it plays in *Waltharius* research.²⁸ In my opinion this Chronicle, the pertinent second book of which was written before 1027 in the Piedmont cloister of Novalese, near Susa in Turin—about twenty years before Ekkehard IV began his continuation of the *Casus*—is the basis for the confusion that has arisen about our poem. In Book II, chap. 9, the Chronicle quotes from and summarizes the first third of *Waltharius* (ll. 93-577) and alludes briefly to the later events of the poem. But it identifies with our hero *Waltharius* a devout royal hero named *Walther* (II, 3, 7-12), who entered the Novalese monastery during the reign of King Desiderius (757-74). He performs many deeds of valor and strength (e.g. shattering a marble column with his sword, ch. 11), and shows his prowess against the foes of the monastery. The chronicler quotes the hero's eight line leonine epitaph (Ch. 7)²⁹ and adds that the son of *Walther* and *Hiltgund* was *Rather*, and their grandson *Rathalt*; the latter was buried in his grandfather's grave (ch. 12).³⁰ We are assured by the chronicler (Ch. 3) that there used to be a *Vita* of this *Walther* in Novalese:

"Scimus ergo in veritate nonnullas fuisse quondam vitas in illo loco (i.e. Novalese) conscriptas de illorum abbatum seu monachorum [gestis] . . . sicut legimus de Asinario et Waltario

. . . atque de aliis pluribus." In ch. 12 there is another reference to written records about this Walther: "in actibus vitae suae." But as L. Wolff proves in the Helm *Festschrift* (note 28 above), the source of the Novalesse chronicler must have been a prose account, not a poem.

That a hero named Walther may actually have existed in Piedmont and that after a life of adventure he entered the monastery and performed more deeds there, is not impossible. But the writer of the Chronicle confused him wittingly or unwittingly with the hero of our poem, a copy of which came there by chance. This obvious confusion which makes an entirely different person the protagonist of our poem, may well have led to the double listing in the catalog of Toul (1084)³¹ and to the statement (already quoted) in the Prüfening *Liber de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*: "Ekkehardus . . . gesta Waltharii metro conscripsit heroico, tertio regnante Henrico." (Heinrich III ruled in the time of Ekkehard IV—from 1039 to 1056). Perhaps too that is why the catalog of Stablo (1105) speaks of a *Vita Waltharii* and does not necessarily mean a saint's life. Certain it is that the confusion helped Wolf formulate his thesis and assume a saint's life in poetical form.

This brings us to what in my opinion is the strongest argument against Wolf's contentions. If, as he says, Ekkehard IV is referring to the *Vita* of a Christian Waltharius by Ekkehard I, who else could that Waltharius be but the Christian hero referred to in the *Chronicon Novaliciense*? Surely we cannot be expected to assume still a third Waltharius! But how could Ekkehard I of St. Gall have learned of this local Italian hero, and what would have prompted him, or any other German, to write about him almost one hundred years before the *Chronicon*? This is quite unlikely, especially since the author of the *Chronicon* quotes about one-third of *our poem* and wrongly links it with his local Italian hero, thus making Waltharius Christianus and Waltharius gentilis identical.

Our contention, then, is that Ekkehard I, born about 909, wrote *Waltharius* between 930 and 932—not exactly a schoolboy any more, and quite expert at composing Latin verse. His teacher, who may have helped him but whom he far excelled, was Geraldus, about ten years his senior. However, the work was not a school exercise, but a poem growing out of natural enthusiasm and written to supply reading for the schools. Not long after Ekkehard's death in January, 973, Geraldus, who survived

him, sent the work to Bishop Erckambaldus in Strassburg, who was eager to have it for use in schools. If this was the original, there existed by that time at least one other copy (perhaps even several) in St. Gall. Some may already have been sent to other monasteries. Then between 1026 and 1031, while he was in Mainz, Ekkehard IV gave Archbishop Aribo a copy, but later, when he wrote his tendentious contribution to the *Casus*, claimed, for downright false but shrewd reasons, that he had revised its poor Latin. How could it have been poor Latin, when we know that other pupils of the same school, no brighter than Ekkehard I, could improvise perfect Latin hexameters? Some time before 1027 a copy of this manuscript reached Novalesse, and there the story of our Walther was used to suit the chronicler's own purpose and linked with the prose account of an entirely different person.

Evidence now available does not make possible a solution of the question whether *Waltharius* is a so-called "Urdichtung" or not. In his little pamphlet *Der Kampf am Wasichenstein* (1948), Friedrich Panzer, then 78, made a valiant effort to prove that it was, on the basis of the *Thebais* of Statius (II, 482ff.) and the metamorphosis of Perseus in Ovid (*Metam.* V.). But his proof has not been generally accepted. What Statius describes is an ambush, and the passage in Ovid reminds me more of the final carnage in the *Lay of the Nibelungs* than of *Waltharius*. True, there are lines and situations in the latter that bear striking resemblance to some in Ovid and Statius (Panzer, pp. 17ff. and 24ff.), but that applies also to Prudentius and even more to Vergil. Of course Ekkehard knew and used all these writers, but not as primary sources. The crux of his epic is Hagen's quandary and double allegiance.

Nor do the differences in the account of the *Waltharius* plot as told in the *Lay of the Nibelungs* (Bartsch—de Boor, Strs. 1755-6, 1797, and 2344),³² the thirteenth-century *Walther and Hiltgund* fragments, the *Thidreksaga*, *Biterolf*, and other minor works prove conclusively that these works go back to another source older than our poem. Yet if they have no other source, it is hard to explain the disappearance of Ekkehard's one-legged Gunther and one-eyed Hagen from the tradition as known around 1200.³³ On the answer to the question, "Urdichtung or no?" will also depend our treatment of the Anglo-Saxon *Waldere* fragments.³⁴ Do they date from the eighth century or

from around the year 1000? If the latter, how did the story reach England?

One question which has not been stressed in recent *Waltharius* research, should be briefly touched upon. It is whether Hrotsvit, the Gandersheim nun, who wrote her *Gesta Oddonis* some thirty-five years after *Waltharius*, knew the latter and used it in that work. Strecker was loath to believe she did,³⁵ yet in his posthumous edition of *Waltharius* (see note 11 above) he admitted this possibility, since one manuscript of our epic (S) was written in Emmeram, where the Hrotsvit codex was found.³⁶ I cannot help but believe that the *Gesta Oddonis* shows traces of a knowledge of *Waltharius*. Hrotsvit's description of the flight of Queen Adelheid from Berengarius resembles Ekkehard's flight of Walther and Hiltgund closely enough in situation and detail to suggest that Hrotsvit was acquainted with *Waltharius*. But she used it so discreetly that, among several closely parallel situations, only a single fairly close verbal parallel can be found. Attila's wrath at learning of the escape of Walther and Hiltgund is thus treated by Ekkehard (vv. 380-1):

Iam princeps nimia succenditur efferus ira,
Mutant laetitiam maerentia corda priorem.

Hrotsvit describes the anger of Berengarius as follows (vv. 566-7; cf. also v. 722):

Detulit ad regem Berengarium timidus rem.
Hic quoque, continuo nimiam conversus in iram . . .³⁷

Once it is proved that Hrotsvit was acquainted with *Waltharius*, there would be no doubt that this remarkable work was well known and established as early as 965 or thereabout, less than two generations after it was written.

We have found that only one little noticed complete English translation (in prose)—the one by Magoun and Smyser—exists. In German the situation is quite different. *Waltharius* has probably been translated into German more often than any other medieval Latin work. Strecker (p. 11ff.—see note 11) lists twelve translations: Molter (1782, blank verse), Klemm (1827, hexameters), Schwab (1829, Nibelungen stanza), Simrock (1839, Nib. st.), Scheffel (1853, free Nib. st.), Drees (n.d. same meter as Scheffel), San Marte (1853, hexameters), Geyder (1854, Nib. st.), Linnig (1868, 5th ed. 1936, Nib. st.), Althof (1902, 2nd ed. 1925, hexameters), von Winterfeld (1913, four-

foot unrimed iambs), and Ronge (1934, prose). He also lists an Italian treatment by Napione (1784), one in French by de Reiffenberg (1841), and one in Flemish by Simons (1914). Two German renderings may be added to the list: a prose translation by Vossen (1947)³⁸ and the literal version in free-verse long lines by Langosch, already referred to (1956). If one is seeking an hexameter version, Althof's seems preferable. As an out-and-out prose rendering, Vossen's is good. Langosch's simulated verse translation merits praise, too, for its readability and accuracy.

A new English translation would probably serve its purpose best if it were in prose, reproducing and facing the Latin text line for line. The text should follow Strecker's posthumous edition of 1951 in the *Monumenta*, which, at least so far as text is concerned, seems definitive.

NOTES

1. *Germanisch—Romanische Monatsschrift* N.F., VIII, 1 (January, 1958) pp. 19-34.

2. *The plays of Roswitha* translated by Christopher St. John, London, 1923. Individual plays have been essayed by others, too.

3. London, 1923. Hrotsvit's less discussed other works have also been Englished: Sister M. Gonsalva Wiegand, *The Non-Dramatic Works of Hrosvitha*; text, translation and commentary. St. Louis, 1936, also *Liber Tertius* by Sister Bergman, *ibid.*, 1943.

4. "*Ruodlieb, the Earliest Courtly Novel* (ca. 1050). Introduction, Text, Translation, Commentary, and Textual Notes." By Edwin H. Zeydel. With 7 Illustrations. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.

5. *New London*, 1950. It contains: The *Waldere* fragments, *Waltharius* (already in the same series, 1941, but out of print), a section from the *Chronicon Novaliciense* (incomplete), three stanzas from the *Lay of the Nibelungs*, passages from the Middle High German poem on Walther and from the *Thidreksaga*, and four passages (others are omitted) from Polish treatments of the saga. Karl Langosch, *Die Deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters. Verfasserlexikon*, V, Berlin, 1955, col. 1114, has a wrong date and two misprints in alluding to it: 1952, *Magrun*, and *Connectient*.

6. For further appraisal see *ibid.*, p. 97.

7. For a brief statement on research up to about 1930, see Hans Bork's article on Ekkehard I in Stammmler's *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters, Verfasserlexikon* I, Berlin and Leipzig, 1933, cols. 527-32.

8. *Zeitschrift f. deutsche Philologie* 51, pp. 413ff.

9. On *Waltharius* problems since 1926, see Schumann's article in *Anzeiger für deutsches Altertum*. 65 (1951), pp. 13ff.; Langosch's article in his own vol. IV of the *Verfasserlexikon*, Berlin, 1953, cols. 776-788, and his *Nachtrag* in vol. V (1955), cols. 1114-15.

10. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores* II, p. 117f. In the German translation of G. Meyer von Knonau, *Ekkeharts IV. Casus Sancti Galli* (in *Die Geschichtschreiber der deutschen Vorzeit*, 10 Jhd., 11 Band).

Leipzig, n.d., it is in Chap. 80, p. 123f. This passage will be reprinted below.

11. *Mon. Germ. Histor.* VI, 1 (*Die lateinischen Dichter des deutschen Mittelalters*), Weimar, 1951.

12. *Waltharius, Ruodlieb, Märchenepen. Lateinische Epik des Mittelalters mit deutschen Versen.* Berlin, 1956.

13. Reprinted from *Monumenta*, Poetae VII, 407f. See Strecker's notes.

14. *Zeitschr. f. deut. Altertum* 84, 1952, p.6.

15. *Romania* 47, 382f.

16. *Paul-Braune-Beiträge* 51, 222ff.

17. A long Latin note in the *Monumenta* to this passage by Pertz expresses his belief that *Waltharius* was dictated by his teacher and turned into verse by Ekkehard I, who seems to be the author, unless we would assume that the monk Geraldus of Fleury wrote the work; it probably existed first in German and was then turned into Latin by Geraldus and Ekkehard; the German pun on Hagen's name (l. 1351) among other things proves the German origin of the poem. I follow the text as given in the *Monumenta* (see footnote 10 above). Strecker's version in *Deutsches Archiv* IV, 358, is erroneous.

18. Schwietering in *Anzeiger* 46 (1927), p.36, strives to make Ekkehard older than a "school boy." See Hermann Schneider, *Zeitschr. f. deut. Altertum* 62, p.111.

19. *Liber de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis* (ed. Ettlinger), chap. 70.

20. See the scathing remarks, *Monumenta*, loc.cit., p. 121 (von Knonau translation, chap. 87, p. 133): "Si aliqui apud nos in his scismatum tempestatibus coelum, ut vere quidem faciunt, adipisci nituntur, acrius quam in patrum serenitatibus, ut aciem satanae perrumpant, assurgere habent in clipeum, validius torquere spicula, acutius iacere tela."—"If some among us, in these storms of schisms, strive to win heaven, as in truth they do, they have to rise on their shields more sharply than in the serene days of our fathers, in order to break through the lines of Satan, and hurl their shields more strongly, and throw their weapons more sharply."

21. Since Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen*, 3rd. ed. I, 288 (7th ed., I, 441ff.), there has been a tendency to overrate Ekkehard IV's contribution to the *Casus S. Galli* as an important historical source.

22. Whoever would doubt that young Ekkehard I in his early twenties, or earlier, was capable of a poem such as *Waltharius* need but read *Mon.*, p. 91 (v. Knonau, ch. 26, p. 41f.), where much younger lads in St. Gall improvise smooth Latin hexameters for Bishop Salomon; or p. 125 (v. Knonau, ch. 94, pp. 144f.), where the same is done for Duchess Hadwig by Purchard (later abbot Purchard II).

23. Without agreeing, I call attention to Hauck's belief in *Germ.-Rom. Monatsschrift* N.F. IV, 1-27, and elsewhere, that the poem was written in Eichstätt by a Geraldus in the employ of an Erckambaldus, who was bishop there from about 883 on and was succeeded by a Starchand (≥Starkhand?).

24. *Ibid.*, N.F. IV, 178: "Der Waltharius . . . ist kein Lied, sondern ein Buchepos . . . (das) Werk wurde rasch beliebt und weit verbreitet: die lateinische Sprache machte es zu einem geeigneten Lehrgegenstand in den Klosterschulen, so dass sein Inhalt von Italien bis Norwegen bekannt wurde."

25. *Deutsches Archiv f. Geschichte des Mittelalters*, IV, 1941, p.366. I may point out here that *Ruodlieb* (date ca. 1045-50) has fourteen non-leonine verses.

26. This contradicts von Knonau, who sets Geraldus's death around 954 (p. 113). My reasons: 1. Geraldus sends the Prolog to Erckambald, whom I take to be the bishop of Strassburg, a post he did not assume until 965 (see above), 2. Geraldus, about ten years Ekkehard's senior, seems to have sent it after Ekkehard I's death, 3. in the Prolog Geraldus seems to confess his old age.

27. *Mon.*, p. 114 (v. Knonau, ch. 74, p. 112).

28. See the article of L. Wolff, "Der Waltharius Ekkehards unds das Chronikon Novaliciense" in *Erbe der Vergangenheit*, Festgabe für Karl Helm, Tübingen, 1951, pp. 71ff. For the *Chronicon* itself see C. Cipolla, *Fonte per la storia d'Italia* 32, 1901, also *Monumenta Script.* VII, 73ff.

29. "quidam sapiens versicanorus" is given as the author.

30. In the chronicle of Boguphalus (14th century) Walther (Walcerz) is described as a Polish count who marries a Frankish princess Helgunda. His rival and foe is an Alemannic prince, with whom Walther duels successfully. For other Polish treatments cf. Magoun-Smyser, *Walter of Aquitaine* pp. 51ff.

31. In this case the confusion is patent, as no *poeta gentilis* is involved under any circumstances. Both Ekkehard I and the author of Wolf's suppositious *Vita* would qualify as *divini poetae*.

32. The chief difference in the *Nibelungenlied* are: 1. Hagen's father is Aldrian, 2. Attila's wife is Helche, 3. Walther is from Spain, 4. Etzel voluntarily sends Hagen home, 5. the Waskenstein is mentioned, 6. Walther scores a victory against Hagen's friends without Hagen taking part.

33. Genzmer, *loc. cit.*, like Panzer, 65ff., considers our poem an "Urdichtung" and the date of *Waldere* around 1000. B. H. Carroll in *Germanic Review* 28, 34ff., also in Florida State University Studies 5 (1952), believes the Walther tale arose around 600, but that our epic is the earliest known literary treatment; the legend he thinks, came to England before 1000 through a High German source, already of epic proportions, which served as the source of our poem. Langosch (*Waltharius, Ruodlieb, Märchenepen*, p. 367) believes in an anterior "Urlid" of perhaps 150 lines, whose plot began at the point where Walther and Hiltgund reach the Rhine.

34. The two extant *Waldere* fragments, discovered in Copenhagen in 1860, reveal Hiltgund encouraging Walther before his battle with Gunther, Gunther praising his sword, and Walther his coat of mail. On this work see G. Zink in *Études germaniques*, 11, 3, 198ff. In *Waldere* Hiltgund seems to be a valkyrie; in *Waltharius* she is a fearful, anxious girl.

35. *Deutsches Archiv f. Gesch. d. Mittelalters* IV, pp. 374ff. There are also possible verbal echoes of *Waltharius* in other writings of Hrotsvit.

36. *Op. cit.*, p. 4. The influence of *Waltharius* on *Ruodlieb*, one hundred years later, is more certain.

37. On this subject see my article "Ekkehart's Influence upon Hrotsvitha, a Study in Literary Integrity," *Modern Language Quarterly* VI, 3 (1945), pp. 333ff., where other resemblances are also noted. For other echoes of *Waltharius*, see the notes in Strecker's *Monumenta* edition of the latter.

38. *Waltharius* herausgegeben von Karl Strecker. Deutsche Übersetzung von Peter Vossen. Berlin, 1947.

NOTES ON THE FRENCH FABLIAUX

URBAN T. HOLMES, JR.

Joseph Bédier, and others who have written on the fabliaux, have been mostly concerned with plots and their interrelationships; they have passed rather swiftly over the social history that is written in these pages.¹ There is poignancy and fascinating information on some of them. Such a tale is the one entitled *Du vallet qui d'aise a malaise se met*.² A young couple enter into marriage without realizing the financial problems involved. The youth finances the ceremony by borrowing in anticipation of the *revidaille* (wedding gifts) in cash that he expects to receive. Alas, the gifts fall short of the sum he has estimated, and he falls deeper into insolvency. On a similar theme, but not an actual fabliau, is *L'Oustillement au vilain* which, in his *Recueil*, M. Raynaud places directly before the story *Du vallet*.³ This is a list of all the gear which a couple of the peasant class will need to have in setting up a household.

There is no question that some of the fabliaux were circulating in the twelfth century.⁴ There is the *Equitan* of Marie de France which should be designated as a fabliau in type even though it lacks humor. (The *Vair Palefroi* also has little humor). Bédier assigns the date 1159 to what he calls the oldest fabliau of them all, the *Richeut*. This he dates from reference to the English king who is gobbling up Toulouse.⁵ A few fabliaux are assigned to the fourteenth century, but by far the most of them are lumped together as belonging in the thirteenth century and little attempt has been made to distinguish between those of the earlier part and those that came late in that period of a hundred years. In assigning dates only two criteria have been sparingly used: linguistic data and the identification of the individual named as author. In this paper we are suggesting that other helps for dating have been overlooked. A knowledge of numismatics, for instance, often makes it possible to be more precise. In 1204, after Philip Augustus had taken possession of Normandy he issued a decree which tolerated for a while the money of the English regime, but made it clear that the parisis and the deniers tournois, French royal money, were to be preferred.⁶ We doubt that after that date sterling pennies and the angevin deniers could have circulated in any quantity. Fabliaux, which, from their place names, can be accepted as Norman are

datable from these monetary facts. Furthermore in 1223, when Louis VIII became king, the parisis were discontinued, and the denier tournois took over.⁷ (This last applied to all of France). One of the Norman tales is *Le prêtre et Alison*.⁸ A reference to the Oise river places the scene of this in the Vexin, a territory constantly in dispute between the English and the French until the death of Richard in 1199 when the French king seized it permanently. A chaplain covets a young girl named Maret; her mother makes a bargain with him. He must bring much money—and he does. (She deceives him by putting him to bed, in the dark, with a “professional” named Alison). The money which he brings consists chiefly of fifteen pounds of English sterling pennies, which he places in a leather belt. He has also a purse which holds twenty sous (one pound) of parisis, which he presents to the family servant. The author adds that had the chaplain only known he could have had this Alison for a single denier of Senlis. This last was a French royal coin not struck after 1179. Surely the readers will agree that this combination of sterling and parisis in the Vexin, with a slighting reference to a Senlis penny, reflects the money situation of about 1200, if not earlier. The author of this story was Guillaume le Normand.⁹

One of the most delightful of the narratives is the *Houce Partie*, where an old father is cast into the street by his son, at the constant urging of the latter’s wife.¹⁰ The grandson brings the old man half a horse blanket, reserving the remainder for his father when he too shall be cast forth disowned. The house which belonged to the wife “valoit de loier .xx. livres de parisis l’an” which was a considerable rental, 4,800 parisis a year. This estimate must date from the first quarter of the thirteenth century, or earlier. Another item of great interest is introduced when the son tells his father to make his living as best he can in the city, designated as Paris. “Vous en irez en cele vile; encore en i a .x. mile qui bien truevent lor chevance”. This is a reference to the *taille* list, the number of those who worked for a living in the city. There were about 10,000. Michaelsson found 14,500 names in the Paris *taille* of 1292.¹¹ Professor J. C. Russell estimates there were some 25,000 living within the walls of Paris at the beginning of the thirteenth century.¹²

The chaplain in *Le prêtre et Alison* brought his intended lady’s family a belt with fifteen pounds of sterling pennies—a

heavy load but one that could be carried. In the *Dit dou Segretain* (first version) a sacristan promises a hundred pounds and brings a few more in his enthusiasm.¹³ Obviously he could not have carried in a belt 24,000 deniers, weighing approximately one hundred pounds. This means that the sum mentioned had to be in coins of a larger value: the *denier gros*, or *gros*, which was struck after 1266.¹⁴ This *gros* weighed from 3.5 to 4 grams. The generous suitor could store 2000 of these *deniers gros* in his belt; they were worth the hundred pounds in value and weighed from fifteen to seventeen pounds. From these facts we should judge that this tale was composed after 1266. As was the case with the *Houce Partie* this *fabliau* also offers a population estimate. It mentions that in the "boune vile" where the action took place "Du pule i ot plus de .xx. mile". The poet Jean le Chapelain in a later version of the tale sets the scene at Cluny in Burgundy.⁵ The reader is tempted to speculate upon the "boune vile". The sacristan swears "par mon ordre de saint Vincent" that he will bring the money. There was no religious order of this designation; an individual monastery must have been intended. Monasteries of this dedication were in Nevers, Senlis, Laon, and close to Chartres. (We omit two others in the south of France).¹⁶ Senlis and Laon could never have had as many as twenty thousand people, judging by their present-day area and population. The choice would lie between Chartres and Nevers, and we prefer Nevers. The sacristan swears by St. Leger also, and he was a saint of the Nièvre region. Nevers is not very far from Cluny, which was specified by Jean le Chapelain.

Money was a favorite theme in the *fabliaux*, so we could continue at some length with applied numismatics as an aid to dating. We limit ourselves to one more example of this. In *Le roi d'Angleterre et le jongleur d'Ely* the king exclaims "Atant usse je de or real com il se tient valer fient de cheval" which can be rendered: "Would that I had as much in royal gold as he values himself in horse manure".¹⁸ There were abortive attempts to introduce gold—in France in 1266, and in England in 1257; but the first gold royal was the *Petit royal d'or assis*, originated by Philip IV in 1290.¹⁹ The English king of the *fabliau* had French money in mind and thus he dates the poem very late in the thirteenth century.

Using a different type of argument it may be possible to suggest a twelfth century date for still another *fabliau*, *Les deux Anglais et l'ânel*.²⁰ Bédier refers to this somewhat slight-

ingly: "Je n'ai retrouvé nulle part cette insignifiante histori-ette".²¹ Two English minstrels are in France where one of them falls sick and wants to eat some lamb. His companion goes to purchase the animal from a farmer where he has difficulty in making himself understood. He uses bad, broken French. He cannot pronounce the palatal *n* in *aignel* 'lamb' and says *asnel* instead.²² The farmer is amazed but sells him a little ass, just foaled, probably thinking that all Englishmen are crazy. The sick companion feels better until he discovers the mistake: he has eaten a *fitz hi-han* instead of a *fitz bé-bé*. A variant of *asnel* is *asnon*; *-el* and *-on* are equivalent diminutive suffixes. There is a section in the *Roman de Renart*, Branch one, which can be associated with this fabliau. Renart has fallen into a dyer's vat and is no longer recognized by his enemy Ysangrin. He poses as an English minstrel, talking a bad variety of French—exactly similar to the language used by the minstrels in the fabliau. In this conversation Ysangrin asks if his "English" friend has seen a certain scoundrel, referring to Renart himself. The disguised fox replies in his jargon:

Par foi, fait il, dant Isangrin,
mauvés lecher fout il desvez;
comment fout il donques pelez?
dites moi comment il a non,
fout il dont apelez Anon?²³

This may be translated: 'By my faith, sir Isangrin, he must be an evil lecher; what's he called? Is he called Asnon? Ysangrin finds this terribly amusing and bursts into a guffaw:

Isangrin rit qant celui ot,
et por le non d'Anon s'esjoÿ . . .²⁴

Mario Roques, the most recent editor of the *Roman de Renart*, explains the joke in part, in his glossary. He sees in this a humorous cross up of *asnon* and *a non* 'has name'. But we would go further. If we imagine that Ysangrin, and the listeners, saw an association with the fabliau where the English minstrels talk the same bad French and where the key word is *asnel*, or *asnon*, Ysangrin's amusement has more point. At the same time this would suggest that the fabliau antedated the composition of the Renart episode, and this Branch is dated 1175. Bédier is a bit hard on this fabliau. He is aware of the connection between the extant poems where this bad French is used as a comic device, but he misses the point when he says of Renart that he was "déguisé en jongleur anglo-normand".²⁵ An Anglo-Norman was a French speaker; his dialect was not broken English-

French. Perhaps we moderns of the English tongue can appreciate this jargon better than our modern French contemporaries, even after a lapse of eight hundred years.

Mediaeval vernacular authors wrote largely for local consumption, and this is particularly true of the poets of the *fabliaux*. They inserted local allusions which the listeners interpreted as best they could. Nowhere is this better illustrated than in the *Lais* and the *Testament* of François Villon which, of course, were composed two hundred years and more later than the *fabliaux* which we have under consideration. Despite the fact that folklore materials were utilized in the *fabliaux* it is quite probable that actual characters and unfortunate but amusing episodes were recalled, exaggeratedly, in some of these narratives.

Some may argue that *Les deux Anglais et l'ânel* could not be earlier than August 1279 when the English king first minted round farthings. The Englishman who buys the lamb says to the farmer:

Mi chatera moult volentiers
Et paie vos bones deniers
Et bones maailles frelins . . .²⁶

These *maailles frelins* were farthings.²⁷ This is to forget that since early times the English penny could be split into four pieces and each fourth circulated as a farthing. The rate of exchange was such that one of these quarters was worth as much as one denier angevin or a dernier tournois. Any considerable sum in such farthings looked like a heap of minute metal trash and would not be welcomed by any French farmer.

It is with warm pleasure that we show our respect and esteem for Professor Kunstmann on this his birthday. We know that he is one of the first to agree with us that mediaevalists should pay more attention to civilization factors, in analyzing the texts which they edit with so much expertness.

NOTES

1. Joseph Bédier, *Les fabliaux*, 5 ed. (Paris: Champion, 1925). On pp. 436-440 he lists the 147 poems which he accepts as genuine *fabliaux*. The only complete edition of all these tales, and more, is that of Anatole de Montaiglon et Gaston Raynaud, *Recueil général des fabliaux*, 6 vols. (Paris, 1872-90). The lines are not numbered in the individual poems, so we will cite by volume and page.

2. Montaignon-Raynaud II, 157-70. Bédier, no. 135.
3. M-R II, 148-50. 4. Bédier, pp. 40-41. 5. pp. 304-09.
6. F. de Soulcly, *Recueil de documents relatifs à l'histoire des monnaies* (Paris, 1879), 117-18.
7. Jean Lafaurie, *Les monnaies des rois de France*, I (Paris: Bourgey, 1951), 22.
8. M-R II, 31. Bédier, no. 95.
9. Our dating would support the theory that this was the same Guillaume who wrote the *Bestiaire d'Amour*, etc. Others have tried to place this fabliau in the second half of the thirteenth century. See Bédier, 481.
10. M-R I,5. Bédier, no. 74.
11. Karl Michaëlsson, *Etudes sur les noms de personne français d'après les roles de taille parisiens* (Uppsala, 1927), I,42.
12. *Late Ancient and Medieval Population*. Transactions Am. Phil. Soc., n.s. XLVIII, 106.
13. M-R V,115-31. Bédier, no. 118. 14. Lafaurie, *op. cit.*, 23.
15. M-R VI, 117-37. Bédier, no. 120.
16. Mas Latrie, *Trésor de chronologie* (Paris, 1889), col. 1925.
17. This was St. Leger, bishop of Autun (d. 678).
18. M-R, 52. Bédier, no. 117.
19. Lafaurie, *op. cit.*, 28, 23; George C. Brooke, *English Coins* (1932), 110.
20. M-R II, 46. Bédier, no. 4.
21. *op. cit.*, 442.
22. John E. Matzke in *Modern Philology* III (1905), 47-60. This little article has an excellent treatment of the occurrences of this English-French and of the phonology involved.
23. vss. 2466-70. 24. vss. 2471-72. 25. *op. cit.*, 442-43.
26. M-R II, 179.
27. Round farthings were created in Ireland by Prince John, but did not exist in England until the reign of Edward I. See Brooke, *op. cit.*, 116.

FRAUENLOB'S BITS OF WISDOM: FRUITS OF HIS ENVIRONMENT

STUART A. GALLACHER

Frauenlob, Heinrich von Meiszen, has left posterity very little concerning his idiosyncrasies, personal life, or vital statistics. We can only surmise some details of such things from his extant writings. Thus, we accept generally that he was born about 1250. An important testimonial, however, in behalf of his chronological existence is the monument stone that was found in the Cathedral in Mainz.ⁱ This stone was almost totally destroyed, but was later restored in an inaccurate manner. The information on it, fortunately, was preserved. From it we learn that Frauenlob died apparently on the 29th of November, 1318.

Since Frauenlob was fairly talented in making verses while still in his early teens, it is thought that his special training must have begun at an even earlier age. This special training most likely began in Meiszen, for this he added to his name and went from there, while still a comparatively young man, to many courts of the nobility in the north and east of Germany and was known at the time as Heinrich von Meiszen. The masters of these courts who were related to one another seemingly took a liking to him, for he spent quite a sizable period of his life at one court or the other.ⁱⁱ During this time he was constantly absorbing elements indicative of such an environment from which he drew much of his material for his expressions of his philosophical attitude toward life. Frauenlob did not remain entirely in the north and east, for he found his way into Bohemia and Bavaria on at least one occasion and perhaps two. His exact travels, however, have never been determined. His school yard from what evidence we possess does show, however, that it was fairly large and his opportunities for broad experiences were decidedly favorable.

Frauenlob was most productive in the waning decades of the 13th century and the first decade of the 14th. Several sources show us that these decades were years when learned laymen, such as Frauenlob, were dabbling in the art of *Lieder* writing and varied other literary forms.ⁱⁱⁱ These men were learning more about life and their place in it than ever before. They were beginning to feel more free and at the same time more cognizant

of themselves as individuals and of their actions. They were tangible evidence of the rise and early development of what one might call a type of 'rugged individualism', beginning as early as for example, Gärtner's *Meier Helmbrecht* and all that for which it stands. The earlier concept of the Gott-Welt Problem, though still much in evidence, was growing considerably weaker. The attitude was shifting to the emphasis on man as a vital member of humanity.^{iv} He was now a sensitive, separate individual who felt himself capable of passing judgment and of evaluating the facets of life on a broad mundane scale that was rather inaccessible to him previously. Frauenlob associated with such individuals on noble, clerical and knightly levels as well as those of a lesser station in life. He learned something from all walks of life and the works of his predecessors. He was, as we often lose sight of six centuries later, human. It is rather normal for observant humans, especially writers, to make use of materials, some very cleverly others not so cleverly, that make up their environment. In this way later generations are able to enhance their understanding of the ages that preceded them. Thus, in Frauenlob's expressions we have a fund of varied gems that help us grasp more fully the picture of his times.

Frauenlob has never been considered a very original poet, but rather as one who followed in the wake of greater talents of his time. To be sure he is credited with having exercised an influence upon the Mastersingers who followed him, and on their special art for constructing intricate verse forms. However, since no great weight is placed on such a contribution to literature, we simply look upon his as *Epigone*.^v As such, it is expected that he make use of expressions provided by better known figures. That he does. Nevertheless, in borrowing from his betters he does not borrow verbatim. He treats basic concepts and ideas of the time in his expressions in such a way that they take on a touch that shows him to have a 'talent for originality', so to speak, that is very much like Benjamin Franklin's talent for 'coining wise-sayings'.^{vi} Evidences to this end we shall find in his often picturesque middle-high-German language.

In our comments on a number of expressions representing his attitude toward apparent truths of his time, no attempt will be made to establish an absolute proverbial status for them, for collections of middle-high-German sayings are not sufficient in number nor adequate in scope for such a purpose.^{vii} Even

Wander,^{viii} in his monumental collection, has buried his middle-high-German examples as supplementary material for his entries in such a way that one would search far beyond the worth of the task to ferret them out. Nevertheless, whenever possible we shall indicate a Wander citation of our material and others as well at times.

Even though many of the expressions are in bona fide proverbial forms, we still shall not vouch for an absolute proverbial status. The form alone is not sufficient, for clever manipulators are aware of the power of the form and often seek to couch their own ideas in an accepted form in order to lend more weight to their expressions. A proverb must have two basic elements other than form, namely, it must be a concise statement of an apparent truth and have currency among the people. It is this currency that is so extremely hard to determine in the case of the expressions taken from the Middle Ages. Who are the people? They may be in any level of society at any given time and the apparent truth represented may be that which is indicative of the rational level the society may have reached. The more the apparent truth is universally known and repeated, the better its chances of becoming accepted as an unquestioned proverb. For this reason one will readily feel that several of Frauenlob's items could have sprung from our twentieth-century experiences. At the same time, however, one also becomes aware of the phenomenon that this crystalizing of apparent truths into cript expressions is an excellent device for a specific age to reveal to us its basic ideas, even though the expression may never become proverbial. This is the light in which we examine Frauenlob's offerings.

Since proverbial forms are fairly evident in Frauenlob's expressions, it will be expedient for us to start with those that illustrate several forms and note how they help to point up elements of his environment. In the period between 1250 and 1310 the four cardinal virtues of the previous era *triuwe*, *staete*, *milte* and *kiusche* are still very much in evidence. These four played a potent role in the setting-up of patterns as standards of behavior for the higher levels of society. A person noble in character certainly practiced all four. Reckoned as somewhat subordinate to the above are the ethic-aesthetical concepts of *zuht* and *mâze* to which belonged the inner control and harnessing of one's passions, as well as the external maintenance of elegant behavior in all situations occurring in the life of the

'noble' person. The acquiring of all these virtues was to be accomplished through a rigorous training aimed at developing a noble bearing, and, as it were, to be manifest at all times, i.e., while one was still at ease, or in action, on horse back, at table in conversation, and so forth. The total result of such training was a sort of *Schönheitskult*, *Weltfreudigkeit* or *Ausformung* of the noble, élite person. At first it was associated with the *Minnedienst*, but later was acknowledged and exercised in ALL conditions and walks of life.^{ix} Yet, even all this was not sufficient for a fine citizen of the 13th century. *Êre* and *muot* (with the connotations of courage, spirit, attitude and their equivalents) had to be part and parcel of the character of man. Students of this period are already aware of these elements for the literature of the era re-echoes them time and again. How, then, does Frauenlob measure up to them? Very well. His bits of wisdom hew amazingly close to the line.

Since much of Frauenlob's material exists in rhyming verses, it is expected that the largest number of his expressions in proverbial forms will occur in rhymes. The first, e. g., (1) *swâ muot bî guot niht missetuot, dâ hât vrou Êre ir wünschelruot*, (41,17) is probably a bona fide proverb and is the earliest example found to date for Wander's citation for which he has no source. (2) "*Gip unt gip! habt ir den grât, ich nim den visch vür missetât!*" (53, 17) was probably also current and is cited by Zingerle. (3) *Bî edelen vürsten edel tât stêt als daz golt bî siden stât* (55, 13) is a definite reflection of the time. The first part is proverbial. The second is a Frauenlobian addition to show that both ideas are like two peas in the same pod. Noble deeds and noble princes go together just as silk is associated with gold. (4) *Ein edelz tier, ein edeler boum diu habent von art ouch edelen goum* (60, 13) has fine rhythm and is an extension of the previous idea but is more philosophical than proverbial. (5) *Derwîsen rât gên vînden stât* (82, 15) is a crypt, philosophical observation. (6) *Man twînget herze und ouch den muot vil baz ûf guot wan ûf unguot* (101,13) is rhythmical, true and sounds as though it should have been proverbial. The basic idea, kindness accomplishes more than unkindness, is as old as the concept of good and evil, but seems not to have been boiled down into a pithy saying in Frauenlob's time. We, however, have accomplished it in our "You can catch more flies with honey than with vinegar." (7) *Lieb unde lust gelücke treit, lieb unde wol ist saelikeit* (118,13) is decidedly at home in a *Minne* atmos-

phere. (8) *Er hat sich selbe tót geslagen, swer sinen vint sich hilfet jagen* (157,13) is opposite to the idea expressed in the second above, but unfortunately has been too often true. (9) *Wip sunder last ein bliüender ast* (162,15) is vouched for in any age. (10) *Den rehten vogt kan nieman übergelten; verzeret wirt ein guoter herre selten* (294,15) is really two sayings falling together because of the need of the rhyme. Both are timely, but not proverbial. (11) *Vil maneger zucker rîfet, der doch mit seneve slîfet* (317,11) is cited by Wander and was probably proverbial. (12) *Swer sündet uf die riuwe, der ist der sêle untriuwe* (347,1) concludes the rhymes, is for good Christians, but is not a proverb.

The second form is that of contrast. This form usually results in a sharper, crisper portrayal of an idea and therefore seems to attain a proverbial status without too much difficulty. All the following expressions have parallels. They are indicative of rational man. (13) *Swem alliu dinc grôz dem alliu dinc ze klein* (47,7) illustrates the contrast between *grôz* and *klein* and at the same time shows that Frauenlob's age had its chronic nothing-ever-satisfies person as well as all other ages have had. (14) *Got gap, got nam* (99,19) is self explanatory to any God fearing soul. (15) *Ein kleiner muot erwirbet selten hohiu dinc* (104,1) with the contrast of *kleiner* and *hohiu* is an interesting basic idea that can be expressed in a variety of ways, such as, *little minds, little things, no will, no way, faint heart n'er won fair lady* and the like. (16) *Kleiniu wasser vliezen ouch gerne in diu grôzen her* (104,4) is especially indicative of a society that has extreme differences in rank or status. (17) *Swer staete an boesen dingen ist, er minnt unstaete zaller vrist* (381,11) is double barreled with the contrast of *staete* and *unstaete* and the rhyme of *ist* and *vrist*. This is probably Frauenlob's way of treating the Biblical "for whatever a man soweth, that shall he also reap."

A not uncommon way to introduce an expression so that it may seemingly bear more weight or fix one's attention is to begin with *man soll* or have it within the expression in reversed order *soll man*. In this way the expression connected with it assumes almost the proportions of a commandment and one may be fooled into thinking he has an old, proven proverb, whereas in reality it is but a clever ruse on the part of the coiner of the expression. (18) *Durch lieb sô sol man leit bewarn* (58,12) is just a change in the outward appearance of the wide

spread and popular *Keine Liebe ohne Leid*. (19) *Uz guoten kriutern sol man lesen diu boesen mit den semden* (77,19) is good advice and is more effective in this form than it would be were *man sol* first. It is, however, not nearly so potent as the basic idea of something bad spoils the good as expressed in "the rotten apple spoils the lot." (20) *In stolzem ernste sol man vînde rîten an* (85,7) likewise is good advice for a knight of his time, and, despite the *sol man* is most certainly not proverbial. (21) *Des guoten muotes sol man walten* (101,1) is an admirable practice now as well as then. Here the *sol man* implies that the practice perhaps was not so frequent as it should have been. (22) *Man sol den tac niht gar volloben, die wil noch ein stunde er hât, er sî dan vollebraht: so wirt er denne geprîset* (103,5) is colorful, but definitely less striking than the shorter *Eynen gutten tag sol man uff den obynt loeben*.

Another common form of the proverb exemplified in *Frauenlob's* material is that of the use of the correlative *je—je*. This type usually keeps the expression in a rather short form. (23) *Je hôher muot ie swinder val* (65,5) is a bona fide proverb with an illustrious history. (24) *Swie diu tât beklîbet, ie hôher man, ie wîter komt swaz er dinge trîbet* (65,10) is too long to be effective. It is, nevertheless, a good summation of an existing condition. (25) *Je reiner golt, ie sneller valsch, swâ sich daz gemüete* (71,11) shows that 'bribery' or 'each man has his price' is not limited to our generation. Also, as has been suggested to me, 'the purer the gold, the easier it may be altered' which then would parallel *Wander's Je reiner Gold, je weicher ist es*.

Three other forms occur. They are not frequent. There are three instances of simile, e.g., (26) *wîz sam der snê* (36,8); (27) *der hof nâch unart verwet sich, alsam der vîrst nâch rouche* (54,19) and (28) *diu werlt ist sam ein gougelspûl* (400,9). There is but one instance of personification, (29) *triuwe ist der wâren minne swester* (121,1). This is representative of the many expressions in this age centered around *triuwe* and is very likely a bona fide proverb. The last form is that concerned with word play, (30) *Swâ sich der herre knehtet, dâ hêrt sich der kneht* (67,1). The word play here involves *Herr* and *Knecht* as nouns and verbs. The expression is effective.

Examples representing the cardinal virtues of fidelity, constancy, compassion, and self control, as well as the so-called lesser ones of honor, courage, breeding, moderation and so forth

have been made use of to a limited extent in the above expressions illustrative of proverbial forms. The expressions now to follow are especially in the vein of the cardinal and lesser virtues just enumerated. In them we recognize Frauenlob's age as it is customarily presented to us. They are Frauenlob's substantiation of the conventional concept of his period. This is as it should be. However, not to be completely parrot like in his reflections of his day, he treats us to an embellishment occasionally of common, well-established maxims. (31) *Des kristen walstap triuwe ist* (121,13), (32) *diu triuwe ist breit unt reht an allen dingen* (122,8), (33) *diu triuwe ist zwischen gote und uns ein süenerîn* (121,7), (34) *ein ieslich dinc muoz triuwe haben unt reht nâch sinen ahten* (122,6), (35) *swâ triuwe niht gên triuwen stât dâ hât der valsch gedinget* (70,6), (36) *swaz triuwen ir dort wellet haben, daz selbe reht iuch twinget* (70,19), (37) *triuwe ist der heilekeit ursprinc und aller guoten witze* (121,12), (38) *triuwe ist ein schrîn der grôzen hoffnunge* (121,8), are the age-old *deutsche Treue* shifted to a religious and broad didactic background. Of interest here are two regarding infidelity: (39) *untriuwe ie vant ir meisters lant* (74,15), an élite version of the modern "the chickens always come home to roost" and (40) *Untriuwe veiget* (123, 1).

In (41) *Daz helfenbein ist milter dan vil herren sîn* (47,1) the severity or lack of compassion on the part of many masters is simply but effectively expressed, while (42) *er hêret ouch mit sinnen wol swer waltet sîner knehte* (69,19) is a word of praise for the compassionate one. (43) *Diu êre ist aller tugent ursprinc, der heilikeit ein umberinc* (27,13) falls into a pattern similar to (37), but is rather picturesque in its embellished form. Reflect upon it a moment, "Honor is the source of all virtue, a halo to holiness." Then back to earth we come with (44) *man siht ein ieslich mensche wol an tugent und an êren* (27,6). (45) *Ein ieslich milter muot versmaehet kargen sîn* (61,7) points up the difference between *muot* (spirit, courage) and *sîn* (intellect) with *milt* and *karg* as adjectives respectively. (46) *Sit guoter muot is aller tugende krône* (101,2) and (47) *swaz sichert muot in kurzer vrist daz ist wol halp gescheiden* (376,8) stamp the importance of the concept of *muot* in a person's makeup in a positive way, whereas (48) *lûge unde truge unt valscher muot diu driu niur unart schenken* (374,3) testifies for it in a negative way.

Breeding in the sense of cultivation of good habits is apropos to any age, but in Frauenlob's time one thinks of great emphasis on this point. His expressions, however, do not abound with such examples. Actually they are rather few in number, e.g., (49) *ein ieslich adel man siht an edelen dingen* (374,5), (50) *der edelen art ist edeliu tât* (374,11) and (51) *der schanden meil muoz swinden, swer adelhaft sîn kan* (414,19) are the most representative of his examples. On the other hand the attribute of moderation is well represented with examples from a wide variety of situations in which moderation is desired, e.g., (52) *ze gach wil afterriuwe* (270,13, which is almost as crisp as our "Haste makes waste," (53) *ze vruo gemacht tuot gerne afterriuwe* (297,15), (54) *ze lange unruo dem leben ist untriuwe* (297,16) (55) *ez sol ouch sînes liebes niemen sîn ze vrô* (109,7), (56) *lob mit der vuoge ist wolgevar* (186,8), (57) *die mâze ist zwischen guot und arc ein keiserin* (110,1), (58) *halt mâze ie liep zuo aller vrist* (111,18), a version of the Delphic Maxim "Nothing too much" which is the idea underlying all the expressions here concerning moderation, (59) *swer âne mâze erbarmic ist, daz tregt vil wênic sâmen* (111,13), and (60) *swer minnen wil, der sol ouch dâ bi mâze gern* (148,1).

In the thirteenth century the status of woman undergoes a change. The word to designate her fluctuates between *Weib* and *Frau*. The situation at one time became grave enough for Frauenlob to lend his voice to the discussion. For this reason over the years a few scholars have voiced their opinion on the subject as to whether Frauenlob got such a name from his songs to the Virgin Mary, or because in his *Streitgedichte* he championed so gallantly the cause of the elegance of the word *Frau* as opposed to the more common *Weib*, that the latter activity led to the nickname.^x The problem, however, is not weighty enough for any deep concern, but is passingly interesting. Supporters of *Frau* from the Virgin Mary point of view also point to the bevy of lovely women who bore his coffin as additional evidence in their favor, since the women pallbearers all have the appearance of *fine* ladies and not that of the more common housewife. On the other hand, the *Streitgedichte* enthusiasts use this same evidence as support for their view, for such fine ladies, housewives or otherwise, would not have carried him to his grave in such a manner unless he had said nice things about women as a whole, and not solely because he had sung the praises of the Virgin Mary. His expressions on this score

are few and do not settle the issue. They are, nevertheless, interesting and enlightening on the subject of the opposite sex. Call it what you will as we see in (61) *Magt, wîp unt vrowe, dâ lit aller saelden gôm* (150,1), it is a source of deep concern to all men. (62) *Vrowe ist ein name, der menschen sin treit zuo der lust bejegede* (150,19) and (63) *wîp ist ein name, der al ir art mit einem nennen decket* (151,6) show that *vrowe* is more restricted in its meaning, i.e., such a one as she who spurs man on to great desires or heights, and that *wîp* means *any* woman, the species, as it were. This is corroborated by (64) *wîp diu vröuwent baz dan aldes meijen bluot* (XIII, 1,16).

A few expressions reveal a subtle rational aspect indicative of a person reared in a god-fearing atmosphere, e.g., (65) *boes unde guot ist uns gezalt uf erden hie . . . gar manecvalt* (307,4), (66) *got gap gewalt: gewalt ist guot den liuten unt den geisten* (97,6), (67) *von einer kerzen tûsent lieht wol zunden mugent* (73,7), (68) *swie lancsein gotes rihte komt, sin zorn doch swinde erkreischet* (65,19) and (69) *swer sîner schult ze bihte komt, der vluht der helle gliete* (23,19). *Minne*, too, is carefully considered as illustrated in (70) *lieb unde leit muoz beidiu liden schône ein ieslich minnendiep* (XII,2,6), (71) *diu minne ist aller tugenden gar ein voller hort* (147,1)—graphic, indeed—and (72) *swer rechter minne welle pflegen, dem sî unminne swaere* (36,12).

Since people are exposed to the multitude of little things in life as well as life's main currents in each era, the picture of *Frauenlob's* period becomes considerably sharpened through his expressions based on life in general and its colorful varied aspects. Out of these contributions come many astute observations from our rather active arm-chair philosopher of the thirteenth century. (73) *Wirt apfelmuoz ûz bônen bluot?* (196,5) is what we would call nowadays a smart-aleck retort. (74) *Swer vremden acker âne urloup bâwet wol ze rehte er sol sin arebeit verliesen* (77,1), (75) *in armuot wirt manc man unwert mit rât der boesen kluogen* (75,19), (76) *seht, swaz der affe vor im siht, daz tuot er alles nâch* (448,5) is a rather old version of a well known phenomenon boiled down to "Monkey see, monkey do," (77) *swâ man liez eben daz dinc nâch sînen art bekleben, sô kaem ez niht uf widerstreben* (54,16), (78) *ein guot beginne gît ein rîchez hoffen* (398,1), (79) *ein guot begin hât ie daz lop, daz man im lieplich lachet* (398,3) (80) *swie man die biderben siht, si sint doch wol gekleit* (48,1), (81) *man beizet mit*

dem raben unt mit der bunten krâ (57,1), a gentle piece of sarcasm, (82) *verdienter dienst gesiget wol, dâ twanc ein velt verlür* (334,21), (83) *in boeser herren dienste wirt man selten vrô* (394,13), (84) *ieslich dinc sîn zeichen hât* (217,5), (85) *an allen dîngen sol man spürn zît unde stat die welnt die sât* (100,1), (86) *vîl dicke ein grimmer stiller ernst in senften siten grîset* (103,19), and (87) *daz ende sagt volkomenheit der dinge* (399,1) could all be applied to our day as basic elements of our own rational thoughts.

Continuing in the same vein are, (88) *swelch man die vînde noeten will, der darf wîser lère* (85,11), (89) *ich spür in der lère, gewalt tuo wol, gewalt tuo we, swelhen wec si kêre* (97,5), (90) *nieman ka wider schaffen daz geschehen ist* (115,1), (91) *gewalt dem rehte niur zeiner zuht gegeben* (96,7), (92) *swie küene ein swîn ouch sî, doch vîl der hunde ziehent ez ze grunde* (103,2), (93) *swelch hunt diu leMBER vliuwet, von im der eber niht wirt bestrouft* (269,16), (94) *swer über houbet vaehet, daz enist niht guot* (443,5), and (95) *der hôhest unt der beste hort sint biderbe man* (66,7). In the matter of pride, however, Frauenlob differs from the concept entertained by Freidank fifty years earlier. For Freidank pride was not a desirable thing, but witness Frauenlob's view of it in (96) *hôchfart diu kan niht komen in snoeder herzen wesen* (60,1), (97) *hôchvart ist aller guoten dinge ein zeichen wol* (61,1) and (98) *hôchvart und übermuot die sint vîl ungelîch* (62,1).

A rather large number has a homely, everyday philosophy behind it, so that one wonders a little why all the expressions in it did not become more or less proverbial. Many of these expressions will be easily recognized for their universally basic elements, e.g., (99) *ein jager sol wol jagende hunde haben wert* (56,1), (100) *man strîchet eine katzen schön, umb daz si miuse jaget* (334,13), (101) *kneht âne herren ist kein kneht* (68,6). (102) *ez wart nie leit, swer weiz, im volge ein vreude, ob man in stiuret* (109,6), (103) *nâch quoter lère strebent ie die wîsen* (347, 10), (104) *ein lop, daz mit der volge ûz wîsem munde gât, daz lop bestât* (64,7), (105) *lop dir wol stât, swie alt dîn wât sich rüste* (48,19), (106) *lop wart ie vûl, dâ manz dâ heime vant* (270,12), (107) *meilmuot kumt von geberden* (269, 13), (108) *ez missehîlet ofte ein horn* (70,13), (109) *swer ze vrenden nîesen sich rimphet, daz ist ouch verlorn* (77,4), (110) *vrîschez obez enbaere wol, daz ein obez von vûler art bî im niht enwaere* (55,10), (111) *ieslîchez obez man smecket nâch sînes stammes art* (412,9),

(112) *ein ieslich orden hât gemach bi êren wol* (50,7), (113) *kein orden herter mac gesin dan ritterschaft* (50,1), (114) *man muoz diu pfert durch riten haben in wierde* (56,2), (115) *ein rât, der selbe tugent hât, des rât wol zimt* (73,1), (116) *vil rede muoz dicke lüge ûz lân* (270,18), (117) *reht ist in allen dingen vollekomenheit* (122,7), (118) *rost daz îsen zert* (XIII, 3,1), (119) *der rouch tuot kunt des viures wesen* (65,12), (120) *sol der schuz gedien, man muoz den bogen ê schicken eben* (56,10), (121) *einvaltec sin ist schier betrogen* (71,11) and (122) *der slüzzel vromt, swâ man sol slôz ûf sliezen* (56,12).

The final few expressions likewise give the impression that they were really a conscious part of the stock-in-trade observations of man's actions and beliefs of the times. A few are touched with a mark of subtlety worthy of any aphorist, e.g., (123) *ûz zorne ein strâf naet hazzes kleit* (270,5), (124) *reht sam der strûz das îsen tuot sô slindent si den meil* (335,5), (125) *des vrumen tât von herzen gât* (188,5), (126) *eins biderben mannes tât sich nieman lât verdriezen* (56,19), (127) *twanc selten holden dienest gît* (191,8), (128) *daz vederspîl man schône ernert* (56,6), (129) *wolveil hât wirde vil verkouft* (269,18), (130) *der schaz treit allen êren haz* (222,8), (131) *nâch zît, nâch stat gar alliu dinc sich wandelt ûze und inne* (100,19), (132) *wîz unde swarz die varwen sint gar ungelich* (14,1), (133) *vil manegem wol geschicht, der daz niht kan gewegen* (119,1), (134) *wort sint der dinge zeichen, sam der meister giht* (59,1) and (135) *ein zîtlich zît sich tempert mit gezierde* (268,11), which is appropriate for a finishing note.

From all the expressions given here it is not difficult to see that Frauenlob had broad experiences and noted them well. Since human nature changes practically not at all, and since bits of wisdom center so closely on fundamental commonplaces, we find the above offerings in some instances not too original, but still thought provoking specimens of didactic materials of this type, which emanate from rational man. They show rather picturesquely in many instances that Frauenlob was indeed sensitive to his environment, and had his ear close to the heart of things. Thus, he was able to preserve for us a fairly large fund of expressions that reiterate that all of us mortals are very much the same, and that we react to and reflect our times remarkably faithfully.

NOTES

i. The edition used is that of L. Ettmüller, *Heinrichs von Meissen des Frauenlobes Leiche, Sprüche, Streitgedichte und Lieder*, (Bibliothek der gesamten deutschen Nationalliteratur, Quedlinburg—Leipzig, 1843, Vol. 16). Cf. G. Rosenhagen, "Frauenlob", *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters. Verfasserlexikon* (Berlin und Leipzig, 1933), I, Cols. 644ff. Footnotes concerning the expressions will bear the number of the expression.

ii. Cf. Rosenhagen, *ibid.*

iii. Johannes Hadlaub, Ulrich von Lichtenstein, Konrad von Würzburg and others.

iv. Friedrich Ranke, *Gott, Welt und Humanität in der deutschen Dichtung des Mittelalters* (Basel, 1953), pp. 11-108.

v. Gustav Ehrismann, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters* (München, 1918-35), II, pt. 2, 203.

"Frauenlob ist Vollender einer ungesunden, überspannten *expressionistischen* Richtung in der Lyrik des 13. Jahrhunderts, die dunkles Raunen für hohe Wissenschaft, Wortemachen für Kunst hielt. So ist seine Dichtung sozialpsychologisch begreifbar. Sie beruht aber auch auf einer individuell psychologischen Veranlagung, auf einem *philosophischen* Trieb." Also page 304, "Wir erkennen in ihm einen vorgeschobenen Vertreter des Zeitgeistes."

vi. Cf. S.A. Gallacher, "Franklin's Way to Wealth: A Florilegium of Proverbs and Wise Sayings," *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, XLVIII (1949), 229ff.

vii. I am not unmindful of the very excellent studies by, Richard Jente, *Proverbia Communia*, (Indiana University Publications: Folklore Series No. 4, Bloomington, 1947); Joseph Klapper, "Die Sprichwörter der Freidankpredigten," *Wort und Brauch* (Breslau, XVI [1927]); Friedrich Seiler, *Die Entwicklung der deutschen Kultur im Spiegel des deutschen Lehnwortes*, pts. 5-8: *Das deutsche Lehnwort* (Halle, a.S., 1921ff); F. Seiler, "Deutsche Sprichwörter in mittelalterlicher lateinischer Fassung," *ZfdPh*, XLV (1913); F. Seiler, "Die kleineren deutschen Sprichwörtersammlungen," *ibid.*, XLVII (1916); Samuel Singer, *Sprichwörter des Mittelalters* (Bern, 1944-47), 3 vols.; and Ignaz v. Zingerle, *Die deutschen Sprichwörter im Mittelalter* (Wien, 1864), as well as several others. Jente and Singer have excellent bibliographies for the period. We still need, however, more studies covering individual authors of the Middle Ages. A great deal more proverbial material would then turn up. Currency then could be better attested.

viii. Karl F.W. Wander, *Deutsches Sprichwörter-Lexikon* (Leipzig, 1867ff). Hereafter abbreviated to Wa.

ix. Ranke, *ibid.*, pp. 73ff.

x. A.F.C. Vilmar, *Geschichte der deutschen National-Litteratur* (Marburg und Leipzig, 1898), p. 203, "Seinen Beinamen erhielt er von dem Lobe, welches er, der nun fast verbrauchten Sitte gemäsz, den Frauen, oder auch den Namen Frau im Gegensatz gegen Weib zollte;" H.A. Frenzel, *Daten deutscher Dichtung* (Köln—Berlin, 1953), p. 44, "Verswettkampf mit dem Fahrenden Bartel Regenbogen um die Bezeichnung *wrouwe*—*wip*, daher der Beiname;" and Karl Bartsch in his article in *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie*, VII (1878), 321, where he expresses the opinion that Frauenlob had that name before his *Streitgedicht* with Regenbogen.

NOTES—EXPRESSIONS

1. Wa, II, 203, Gut 380.

2. Wa, I, 1039, Fisch *268 (similar); Zingerle, 34, Fische.

3. Wa, I, 720, Edel 3 & 7; IV, 1138, That 21; 1141, 98.

6. For catch more flies etc. see B. Stevenson, *The Home Book of Proverbs, Maxims and Familiar Phrases* (New York, 1948), p. 1158, 14.
8. Wa, I, 972, Feinde 177, 178 & 187; *ibid.*, 1318, Galgen 46.
11. Wa, V, 614, Zucker 8. Cites Frauenlob in note.
13. Zingerle, 11, Alles.
14. Jente, No. 353; Wa, II, 23, Gott 493.
15. S.A. Gallacher, "The Proverb in Scheidt's *Grobianus*," *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, XL (1941), 498, no. 75.
16. Oskar Saechtig, *Über die Bilder und Vergleiche in den Sprüchen und Liedern Heinrichs von Meissen, genannt Frauenlob* (Diss.; Marburg, 1930), p. 72; Wa, IV, 1809, Wasser 231. Cites Frauenlob.
17. Jente, No. 558; Wa, I, 438, Böse 82; III, 1827, Säen 42ff; Galatians, 6:7.
18. Wa, III, 129, Liebe 20 & 277; Zingerle, 89, Liebe.
21. Wa, III, 797, Muth 40.
22. Wa, IV, 1008, Tag 375; Zingerle, 145, Tag.
23. Proverbs, 16:18; D.E. Marvin, *Curiosities in Proverbs* (New York and London, 1916), p. 110; Wa, III, 800, Muth 113.
25. Wa, I, 1793, Gold 135.
26. Wa, V, 148, Weisz *41.
27. Saechtig, 67.
29. Wa, IV, 1311, Treue 48.
30. Zingerle, 83, Knecht.
35. Wa, IV, 1313, Treue 97 (Cites Frauenlob in note); Zingerle, 151, Treue.
36. Wa, IV, 1311, Treue 60, 61 & 77.
40. Wa, IV, 1484, Untreu 5.
43. Wa, I, 735, Ehre 73; Zingerle, 27, Ehre.
46. Wa, III, 796, Muth 18.
47. Wa, I, 293, Beginnen, 5; III, 798, Muth 62.
49. Wa, I, 724, Edelthat.
50. Wa, I, 29, Adelig 5 & 6; 720, Edel 7; Zingerle, 10, Adel.
52. Jente, No. 372; Singer, III, 78 (116,19); Wa, I 1315, Gach 2.
54. Ecclesiastes, 10:18; I Timothy, 6:10; Wa, III, 791, Müsiggang 17.
56. Wa, III, 204, Lob 65.
58. Gallacher, *Grobianus*, No. 52; Jente, No. 469; Wa, III, 490, Masz 54; Eliza G. Wilkins, *The Delphic Maxims in Literature* (Chicago, 1929), pp. 18ff.
69. Wa, IV, 966, Sünde 181.
74. Saechtig, 68; Wa, I, 25, Acker *65 & *66; Zingerle, 9, Acker.
79. Wa, I, 293, Beginnen 17; Zingerle, 18, Beginnen.
81. Cf. Singer's remarks pertinent to evil effects of the raven as a hunting bird, III, 104 (142, 17).
82. Wa, I, 601, Dienst 27; V, 663, Zwang 5. Cf. also expression 127.
84. Wa, I, 639, Ding 897.
85. Jente, No. 63; Wa, I, 633, Ding 736.
87. Jente, No. 436; Singer, I, 106 (I 8); III, 33 (63,20) & 140 (II,12); Wa, I, 815, Ende 33.
88. Wa, I, 973, Feind 185.
90. Wa, I, 1584, Geschehen 34, 48, 49, 50 & 51; Zingerle, 51, Geschehen.
92. Wa, II, 860, Hund 984. The old pattern of "Vil hund seind der hasen todt."
94. Singer, III, 87 (126,2); Zingerle, 64, Haupt.
99. Saechtig, 67; Wa, II, 980, Jäger 12 & 27.
100. Wa, II, 1183 Katze 355; Zingerle, 79, Katze.
102. Wa, III, 15, Leid 2.
104. Singer, III, 29 (60,23) calls it a reversal of Freidank's "Merket, swer sich selbe lobet âne volge, daz er tobet."
106. Singer, III, 30 (60,23); Wa, III, 202, Lob 27; Zingerle, 94, Lob.
109. Cf. Claudia de Lys, *Treasury of Superstitions* (New York, 1957),

pp. 178-183); Wa, III, 1029, Niesen 6 & 7. Both have interesting notes on sneezing.

110. Wa, I, 107, Apfel 33, 34 & 35.

111. Jente, No. 299; Matthew, 12:33; Wa, I, 106, Apfel 14 & 15.

114. Saechtig, 67.

116. Jente, No. 193 (excellent parallels); Wa, III, 1561, Reden 188 & 272.

118. Singer, III, 26 (58, 5); Wa, III, 1740, Rost 1; Zingerle, 124, Rost.

119. Wa, III, 1499, Rauch 41.

120. Singer, III, 67 (108,1) (Not too close, basic idea); Wa, I, 423, Bogen 1 & 5.

121. Jente, No. 317; Wa, I 787, Einfältiger 4.

123. Wa, IV, 886, Strafe 26.

124. Wa, IV, 898, Straussenmagen *3.

127. Singer, III, 65 (107, 14); Wa, V, 663, Zwang 5.

128. Saechtig, 68.

129. Wa, II, 1217, Kauf 19; V, 335, Wohlfeil 12 & 14.

131. Zingerle, 163, Wandel.

133. Zingerle, 175, Wohl.

HERMANN KÖRNER'S *WELTCHRONIK*

CARL F. BAYERSCHMIDT

The Middle Low German literature of the 15th and 16th centuries is particularly rich in historical writings. This is not surprising when one considers the great tradition of historical and annalistic writings in Latin from this very area during the Middle Ages. Gerhard Cordes has called attention to the wealth of this material, both in Low German and in Latin, from the Eastphalian territory.¹ It was here that the *History of the Saxon Wars* was written by Bruno, and it was here also that the Annals of Quedlinburg, Hildesheim, Pöhlde etc. were compiled. Furthermore, it was in the southeastern corner of the Harz between Lower Saxony and Thuringia where Eike von Reggow wrote his monumental *Sächsische Weltchronik* which was to serve as the foundation of a Middle Low German prose.

The Low German historical writings are similar in scope to those written in Latin and in High German. They begin with the creation of the world and continue through the usual six periods of world history according to the Eusebian scheme. However, the emphasis is on the early Christian era and the roles which popes and emperors played in their political and religious struggles. Furthermore, there is an intense interest in local contemporary events, so that these Low German historians motivated by great local pride glorify the virtues of their native cities, be it Braunschweig, Hildesheim, Halberstadt, Goslar, Lübeck or Münster.

One of the most important histories of this type is the *Weltchronik* of Hermann Körner, a Dominican monk of Lübeck (1365-1438). Körner was a skillful and careful writer who recast his work at least four times in Latin for his clerical colleagues and learned patricians and then rewrote it in Low German, this time on a more popular level for the unlearned laity. The Latin redactions have been published by Jakob Schwalm as *Die Chronica Novella des Hermann Korner*, Göttingen, 1895. On pp. 535-572 Schwalm gives excerpts from the Low German version, but these are quite disconnected and selected merely as specimen texts from the standpoint of the historian. Körner makes use of every possible source, although it is quite evident that he draws particularly from Vincent of Beauvais' *Speculum historiale*, Heinrich of Herford's *Liber de*

rebus memorabilioribus and Martin of Troppau's *Chronicon pontificum et imperatorum*. For local Lübeck history he seems to be particularly indebted to the *Detmarchronik*, to which the "cronica Lubicensum" refers. Körner's listing of sources is, however, quite confused, so that Schwalm with good reason refers to him as the "Proteus unter den Historiographen des Mittelalters" (p. XVII). Such references as "secundum Wilhelmum" or "secundum Egghardum" or "secundum cronicam Saxonum" ("na der Sassen kronicke") must not always be taken at face value. These sources are all rather vague concepts to Körner. He was without doubt a most learned and widely read scholar, but he was also very casual in his use of sources, so that it is most difficult to check them all.

For the later period (1416-1433) one must also consider the possibility of oral informants, such as traveling members of his order or even personal observations of his own. In telling the story of Stephan of Portugal at Sepa in 1416, for example, he writes in the Low German version: *Dit gheschefte horede ik van deme munde des predikers broders, de in des koninges heere mede was vnde de ersten myssen in der stad las, do se gewonnen was. Des broders name hete Engelbrecht vnde was vte der marke van Zehusen*. He recalls his own earlier experiences in Erfurt when he describes the hard times of 1433: *En sunt mynsche at do lichtliken brot to ener maletyd dat groff was vor iiiii lubesche penninghe, men zembrot vor sos penninge, wente dat dede ik suluen dikke to Erforde*. He learned of the pestilence of 1351 from the statements of chronicles and also from reliable informants: *Des to ener enkeden tuchnisse der warheit so vant ik dat in den croniken vnde horde ok dat van lofwerdighen luden, de des groten dodes enkede dachten, dat to der tyd to Lubeke storuen vtghenomen kindere neghentich dusent mynschen*. He goes on to tell of a strange happening in Lübeck as told to him by a certain Johann Westphal: *To der tyd was in deme vorsecreuenen klostere² eyn vrom leybroder, Johan Westphal ghenomet, de sach in desseme iare in ener nacht sodan en ghesichte, dat he my dikke na sede mit synem munde*. He then tells of the death of 38 of the brothers of the monastery as prophesied in a very weird and mysterious fashion.

It is the wealth of short stories and anecdotes suggested by this incident which gives particular interest and value to the two Middle Low German manuscripts. Among them we find a whole cross section of medieval legends, tales of wonder and

miracles and all types of popular stories which must have had a tremendous appeal to the people of that day. Körner believes most profoundly in the scholastic principle of *historia ancilla ecclesiae* and hence selects those tales which are concerned with the wonder working effect of Christian relics and the powerful factor of the sacrament of communion through which all sins may be forgiven.

Because so little of Körner's Middle Low German material has been published it seems appropriate to present the text of the following two tales.³ They are both taken from the two Middle Low German manuscripts: MS H listed as XIII, 757 in the Niedersächsische Landesbibliothek, formerly Königliche Bibliothek in Hannover, and MS W in the Codex 3048 of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek in Vienna. I have copied from MS H (241 leaves) which covers the year 1435.⁴ Brill and Pfeiffer have both made use of MS W which was apparently completed in 1431. Although not an original, MS H seems to be the slightly better text. However, the introduction, in which Körner expresses his purpose in writing the chronicle, is found only in MS W and has been printed by Brill.⁵

I have selected the following two tales not because they are the best, but because they are rather typical of most of the miracles described by Körner. Furthermore, they are two of some dozen stories which are found in a Latin *Viaticum narrationum* in MS 380 of the Royal Library in Copenhagen. This may very well be the source to which Körner makes reference in his Latin *Chronica Novella: narratur in quodam libello narrationum*. A comparison between Körner and the Latin *Viaticum narrationum* offers ample evidence that Körner is an excellent story teller. In some cases he may have watered down the original somewhat, but for the most part he has improved on his Latin source and has thus made a significant contribution to the Middle Low German prose of the 16th century.

The Miracle at Claremont⁶ (1005)

Do sulues wrok vnse here God den vnhorsam der geystliken lude an (*W* in) desser wijs. En kloster licht an deme berge Claremont genomet van Sunte Benedictus orden. Dat heft schone kameran inwendich vnde gemaket vor de oldesten brodere gebuwet. Manck den was ene kamera bij deme gemenen slaphuse, des syn inwoner was gestoruen. Vmme desset (*W* desses) gemack

begunden de monnike vnder sick to kyuende, we se besitten scholde. Desse twidracht wart to deme lesten schoten vor den abbet, dat he id richtede, weme van rechte de kamera scholde tohoren. Do dat abbet Iohan horede, de vrede lef hadde, dat syne brodere schelaftich weren vmme dat gemack, he dachte: "Weme du de kameren todelest, de anderen nemen dar van orsake to kyuende." Darvmme so dachte he dancken des vredes vnde vorbot de cameren allesweme vnde (56r) vormallyede se. Do de monnicke den ban vnde de maledygunge horeden der cameren, do gresede en vor se vnde wolden dar nicht mer na arbeyden, men broder Sifridus, en sone des vnhorsames, de des abbates cappelan was, de vruchtete de maldigunge nicht vnde brachte syn gerede an de cameren, vnde in der anderen nacht slep he darynne. Men hore en greselick dinck! Do dat quam by mydder nacht, do begunde sick to vorheuede alsodan vnstur vnde bulderent, dat id alle de monnicke vorweckede vnde in vruchten brachte. To deme greseliken styme stund vp de abbet myt alle synen monnicken vnde quam myt kersen vnde dorttyssen vnde ok hilgedome dar to gande. Wol dat nu dat gantze hus vorluchtet was van dortyssen vnde kersen, de stede doch dar de broder vppe deme bedde lach blef gans duster. Do se de stede myt wygwater besprengeden, vnde de letanyen vnde anderen ynnigen sanck sungen vnde lesen, dat en vorsloch nictes iegen dat vnstur, men dat wart io swarliker vnde greseliker. Men do halede de abbet dat hilge sacrament, vnde do legerde sick de styme. Des segen se do den vnhorsamen monnick liggen vor deme bedde so swart also ene kale, vnde alle syne lede weren eme vnttwey.

Saint Peter of Milan⁷

(1252)

In deme anderen iare Wilhelmi do men screff na Godes bort mcc vnde lii iar, do wart de gude hilghe vader Sunte Peter van Meylan, eyn broder des predikers orden, gemartert vor den cristenen louen van den ketteren. Desse leue merteler, Sunte Peter, was prior in deme clostere to Cuma vnde wart ghesant van pawese Innocencio, dat he prediken scholde wedder de kettere, der dat gantze lant vul was, vnde wart dar ouer ghemordet.

To ener tyd do he prediket hadde in der stad Cuma, dar he prior was, do quam eyn ketter van den vppersten to eme vnde vil eme to vote vnde bath ene, dat he ene wolde to gnaden nemen.

Des settede he eme de bute vnde losede ene van synen sunden. Dar na so vort wart de bekerede ketter wedder vorkeret van den anderen ketteren. Do quam to ener tyd Sunte Peter to eme vnde wolde seen, wo id em ghinghe. Do sprack de kettere eme vrueliken to vnde vorboet em syn hus. Sunte Peter vraghede, wur he dat mede vordenet hadde. Do sede de ketter: "Du hefst my bedroghen mit diner valschen lere." "Wo is dy dat witlick," sprak Sunte Peter, "dat ik dy bedroghen hebbe?" Do antworde de ketter: "Myne broder brochten my in enen tempel, de vtermaten hoch vnde schone is. Dar sach ik *Christum* vnde sine moder mit al deme hemmelschen here sitten vppe vorghuldeden stolen. De heft my to gnaden ghenomen vnde de sede my, dat du valschliken de lude lerest vnde vorleydest." Do sede Petrus: "Is dat so, also du my sechst, vnde kanstu my dar ok bringhen, so wil ik (*W adds* dy vnde) dynen broderen bliuen vnde wil wedder ropen allent dat ik gheleret hebbe." Do dat de ketter synen broderen sede, do vrouweden se sik alle vnde seden em, dat he den Petrum des anderen daghes to en brochte. Also he dat Sunte Peter sede, he stunt des anderen morghens vro vp vnde las missen vnde consecrerede twe hostien; de enen nuttighede he in der missen vnde de anderen leyde he erbarliken in ene bussen. De nam he do mit sik vnder sine cappen vnde ghink mit deme kettere to sinen broderen. De brochten ene in den tempel, dar he sach grote clarheyt des pallasen vnde ok der yennen, de dar ynne seten vppe den vorghuldenen stolen. Do wart Sunte Peter griflachende. Do sede de Sunte Peter de de moder Godes scholde wesen: "Wurvmme bedruchstu, vormalediede Peter, myt dyner dwelinghe mynes kindes creaturen, de he vorloset heft myt sinem dode?" Do sede der Petrus: "We bistu, de alsodane rede spreken dar (*W darst*)?" "Ik bin," sprak se, "de moder Godes, vnde dit is myn kint *Ihesus Christus*, vnde dit sint vnse engehele, de vns denen." Do toch hemelken Sunte Peter den licham *Christi* vte der bussen vnde sprak: "Bistu de moder Godes, vnde sint dit juwe engehele, so bede deme kinde ere vnde lof vnde ambedet den. Sich, dit is de ware Godes sone vnde Marien der reyen iuncvrouwen." Do se dat sacrament segghen, do vorswant dat duuels droch mit grotem brasche vnde vulem stanke, vnde se stunden alle in ener vulen stinkenden stede. Do dat de kettters segghen, do vorsworen se alle ere erredome vnde gheuen sik to deme cristenen louen.

NOTES

1. *Ostfälische Chroniken des ausgehenden Mittelalters*, "Jahrbuch des Vereins für niederdeutsche Sprachforschung" LX (1934), pp. 42-62.
2. The Lübeck Predigerkloster zur Burg was Körner's "conventus nationis".
3. Richard Brill has published *Hermann Korner als Erzähler. Von Karl dem Grossen und seinen Paladinen*, "Jahrbuch des Vereins für niederdeutsche Sprachforschung" LXVII (1941), pp. 138-183 and Franz Pfeiffer has published twelve short anecdotes as *Niederdeutsche Erzählungen aus dem XV. Jahrhundert*, "Germania" IX (1864), pp. 257-289.
4. Permission to publish this material has been granted by Dr. S. Meyer, Director of the Niedersächsische Landesbibliothek in Hannover.
5. Brill, *op. cit.*, p. 138: vnde so hebbe ick my vnderwunden to der ere goddes vnde ok syner leuen moder Marien vnde ok sunte Dominici, mynes ordens vaders, to scriuende ene croneken in deme dudesschen, den leyen to tijdvordriue vnde kortewyle (W 16r).
6. In Copenhagen *Viaticum narracionum*, fol. 51 (Monasterium Clarimontis).
7. In Copenhagen *Viaticum narracionum*, fol 8 (Corpus Cristi potestatem dyaboli dirimit). Cf. also Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum historiale*, XXXI, 103 and the *Detmarchronik* under the year 1250.

THE FRENCH VERSIONS OF THE *ANCRENE RIWLE*

JOHN H. FISHER

The original language of the *Ancrene Riwle* seems no longer in question. As the Early English Text Society editions appear, their editors and users continue to pile up evidence of the priority of the English version. The editor of the Latin version has concluded "with some confidence" that Latin was not the original language,¹ and the two most recent comparisons of the French text of MS. Cotton Vitellius F. vii² with various English versions have supported the priority of the English.³ Both of these articles take their departure from the opinion expressed in 1940 by Miss Hope Emily Allen⁴ that she had not found in the textual studies up to that time "positively conclusive" proof as to the original language, evidently on the assumption that in this statement she left open the question of the original language. Actually, of course, she did not. Her own discovery of a second, independent translation of the *Riwle* into French, discussion of which was one of the objects of the 1940 essay, carried with it, as she put it, "the strong presumption that the original was not French."⁵

In the same essay in which she discussed the significance of the independence of the Trinity Coll. Camb. MS. 883 French version of the *Riwle* (found also, with variations, in MS. Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds français 6276, and MS. Bodley 90),⁶ Miss Allen likewise announced the discovery of another derivative of the *Ancrene Riwle* through the French in *The Tretyse of Loue*, printed by Wynkyn de Worde in 1493.⁷ Like the excerpts running through the compilations found in MS. Trinity 883, the excerpts in the *Tretyse* are imbedded in a series of instructive and devotional tracts. The first part of the statement of the compiler, that the "tretyse was translatis out of frenshe Into englyshe the yere of our lord Mcccclxxxiiij," is supported by the language,⁸ and a series of tracts not connected with the *Riwle* appended to the end of the *Tretyse* compilation appear to be traceable to the Low Countries—perhaps to the court of Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, whose third wife was Margaret of York, Caxton's patroness during the continental period of his printing.⁹ Two questions are thus raised by the text and context of the *Riwle* excerpts in the *Tretyse*: Was the French original translated directly from the English and did

it thus represent a third independent translation of the *Ancrene Riwe* from English into French? And in view of the Burgundian associations for the appended tracts, could the Tretyse compilation likewise have been made in the Low Countries? (If so, it would offer the first evidence we have that the *Ancrene Riwe*, which circulated so extensively and so influentially in England, was likewise known on the continent during the medieval period.) The collations which follow offer a fairly conclusive answer to the first question, and by indirection cast some light on the second.

It will be observed that the portions of the *Riwe* which Tretyse and Trinity have in common are from Part VII treating of the love of God (Nero 174/31 ff.)¹⁰ upon which the whole of the Tretyse compilation is based, and from Part IV concerning the remedies against the seven deadly sins (Nero 111/7 ff.) upon which the first tract in the Trinity compilation is based. All of these passages are found in the Vitellius French and other complete texts of the authoritative version. Of these the Nero and Latin have been collated as controls; in every case, the Nero may be regarded as being nearest to the original.

Nineteen instances of agreement are found between the Tretyse and Trinity texts in the material from Part VII (Section I below). Of these 9 are verbal agreements. Nos. 1, 7, 9, 15, and 17 may be reasonably significant since in them Tretyse and Trinity agree against the common tradition as represented by Vitellius and at least one of the two controls. However, in view of the limited number of synonyms available to a translator, this sort of evidence must be regarded with caution. For example, in no. 4 we find the Latin agreeing with Tretyse and Trinity; in no. 11 we find different synonyms in Tretyse and Trinity contrasted with a common term in Nero and Vitellius; and in no. 18 different terms in all five texts, save that those in Tretyse and Trinity imply passion and those in the other three texts unwillingness. Of this whole group, perhaps only no. 19 is really significant, since here the verbal agreement of Tretyse and Trinity against the other three is not merely a choice of synonyms but implies a different and perhaps more accurate concept.

More significant than the verbal agreements are the 10 instances (2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, and 16) in which the agreements between Tretyse and Trinity involve matter not found in Vitellius or the control texts. Here it must be admitted at

least that Tretyse and Trinity represent a common tradition independent of the authoritative text as represented by Nero and Vitellius, and a comparison of the language makes it difficult to believe that the English translator of the Tretyse did not have before him a French text closely resembling that of the Trinity.

The seventeen instances of agreement between Tretyse and Vitellius in Part VII (Section II below) are evidence of a quite different sort. Nos. 2, 6, 16, and 17 are verbal agreements whose significance I have no desire to minimize, but which represent merely the choice of different synonyms. No. 10 is more important since the change of *rois* to *homme* in Trinity implies a different concept. However, since Trinity here is unique, we might assume that this change was made by the Trinity scribe or his source. Nos. 1 and 9 represent unique additions of material in Trinity, and nos. 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 12, 13, and 15 unique omissions by Trinity, again presumably by the Trinity scribe or his source. Agreement by Trinity and Nero against Tretyse and Vitellius in 11 and 14 presents an insoluble problem. In no. 11 the Latin agrees with Trinity and Nero, and in no. 14 the Latin agrees with Tretyse and Vitellius; so here we have examples of the kind of distribution of readings that makes completely scientific textual analysis in the end impossible.

Passing on to the 24 instances of agreement between Tretyse and Trinity in the material on the seven deadly sins (Section III below), we find even more conclusive evidence of relationship between the two texts. Simple verbal agreement of the inconclusive sort accounts for only three (6, 15, and 20 with a unique omission by Trinity). No. 8 represents a longish and complex verbal agreement; no. 9 may account for a curious misleading in Tretyse (although the Vitellius evidence is not clear, the very absence of *lime* in that text argues for a closer relationship to Trinity); and no. 16 represents the common omission of a proper name found in the other texts.

Even more significant are the 18 common additions of words and phrases by Tretyse and Trinity. Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, and 24 require no comment. No. 13 is poorer evidence since Tretyse and Trinity are partially supported by Nero and the Latin, so that the vagueness in Vitellius may be scribal. Again, in no. 18, Tretyse agrees with the common tradition at the end of the sentence where Trinity diverges. But against this marked body of agreement, there

are only two agreements in this material (Section IV below) between Tretyse and Vitellius against Trinity, both unique additions by Trinity, and hence presumably scribal.

In view of the Tretyse compiler's statement that he was translating, the general evidence of the language, and the number and nature of the agreements between the texts of Tretyse and Trinity, we may conclude with some assurance that the French translation of the *Ancrene Riwe* which found its way first into the Trinity compilation and later into the French original of the Tretyse was ultimately from the same original, and hence that so far we have evidence of only two translations of the *Riwe* into French.

Our application of this conclusion to the question of the continental circulation of the *Riwe* can be only tentative. However, in view of the fact that all three of the manuscripts containing all or part of the Trinity compilation are of insular origin,¹¹ the weight of evidence now would seem to indicate that the Tretyse original, based on the same materials, was likewise made in England, and the appended materials brought over from the Low Countries and combined with it at the time of its translation in 1493.¹² If, as is suggested by the handwriting of a notice of sale,¹³ the Bibliothèque Nationale manuscript of the Trinity compilation got to France in the fifteenth century, it could have been there in time to be used in making an original for the Tretyse compilation. The dates are possible. But against this possibility stands the fact that the Tretyse could not have made use of the *Riwe* excerpts from the Trinity version itself, and that both sets of excerpts must therefore have been drawn from an Anglo-Norman French translation of the *Riwe* now lost and (on the evidence of the Trinity version manuscripts) known only in England. Furthermore, we have so little information as to the continental provenience of either the B.N. manuscript or the Tretyse that speculation must go no further. As matters now stand, there were apparently two translations of the *Ancrene Riwe* into French. One is preserved virtually intact in the Vitellius manuscript. The other is represented by excerpts in the three manuscripts of the Trinity compilation and the translated excerpts in the Tretyse. And all of these translations and retranslations were evidently made in England; so that we have as yet no evidence that the *Ancrene Riwe* was known on the continent during the period of its influence.

Collations from *The Tretyse of Loue* (ed. J. H. Fisher, EETS, OS, 223 [1951]), the French Text of the *Ancrene Riwe* from MS. Cotton Vitellius F.vii (ed. J. A. Herbert, EETS, OS, 219 [1944]), the French Text of the *Ancrene Riwe* from MS. Trinity College Cambridge 883 (ed. W. H. Trethewey, EETS, OS, 240 [1958]), the English Text of the *Ancrene Riwe* from MS. Cotton Nero A.xiv (ed. Mable Day, EETS, OS, 225 [1952]), and the Latin Text of the *Ancrene Riwe* (ed. Charlotte D'Evelyn, EETS, OS, 216 [1944]).

I. Points at which Tretyse and Trinity agree against Vitellius in Part VII, "Of Love."

1. Tretyse 3/21 ouyr alle other thynges be *coryous*] Trinity 140/3 *curius*] Nero 175/33 *bisie*] Vitellius 281/20 *ententiuës*.

2. Tretyse 4/1 thus as mete and *drynke*, man or woman] Trinity 140/6 *uiandes. boiuëres*. drap. homme ou femme] Nero 176/3 *mete. & cloth*, and mon other wummon. Vitellius 281/28 like Nero.

3. Tretyse 4/12 Augustinus. Non diuturnitas temporum, non vniuersitas honorum operum auget meritum. Sed maior caritas maior quoque voluntas auget meritum] Trinity 157/12 E seint augustin dit . . . Non numerositas inquit operum nec diuturnitas temporum auget meritum; sed maior caritas, et pocior uoluntas. The quotations are not just the same nor in the same context, but there are no parallels in Vitellius 301/30, Nero 187/15, or Latin 163/20.

4. Tretyse 4/17 Loue is the *Cenygyall*] Trinity 140/22 Ceste amur est *senescal*] Latin 152/15 *senescallus*] Nero 176/16 *stiward*] Vitellius 282/16 *despenser*.

5. Tretyse 7/3 byrdys, bestis, & *fyshys*] Trinity 141/8 oiseaus. e bestes. e les *peissons* de la meer] *fishes* omitted in Nero 176/24 and Vitellius 282/28 except in the Latin verse. Note that the fishes are not included in the Latin verse in Tretyse 7/6 or in Latin text 152/22.

6. Tretyse 9/24 Jn the same maner dyde our lorde Ihesu] Trinity 141/25 Ceo fu li rei du ciel ke tant ama nostre alme] Nero 177/1, Vitellius 283/14, and Latin 152/30 give no explicit identification of the "king" with Christ.

7. Tretyse 10/8 mani fair *Jowellys*] Trinity 142/7 *ioeaus* mouz e bons] Nero 177/14 *beaubelez*] Vitellius 283/36 *beaubelez*] Latin 153/8 *donaria*.

8. Tretyse 10/23 with thys that she wolde gyf hym hyr loue wythoute more] Trinity 142/18 si ele lui uousist leaument amer] Lacking in Nero 177/25, Vitellius 284/17, and Latin 153/18.

9. Tretyse 11/13 woundys *pl.*] Trinity 142/28 plaies *pl.*] Nero 177/35 wunde *sing.*] Vitellius 284/35 plaie *sing.*

10. Tretyse 14/9 Myght he no lightlyer redeme vs *fro helle*] Trinity 143/30 ne nus poeit il ou meindre greuance auer sauue de la mort *de enfern*] Vitellius 286/21 Ne poeit il od meindre gref nous auer rescous. Nero 178/32 and Latin 154/26 like Vitellius.

11. Tretyse 15/5,7 colour] Trinity 144/8,10 teinture] Latin 154/33,24 color] Nero 179/3,5 peintunge] Vitellius 286/34,37 peinture.

12. Tretyse 15/15 hys loue, whyche is our sowle] Trinity 144/18 sa amie ceo est nostre alme] Clause lacking in Nero 179/9, Vitellius 287/8, and Latin 155/6.

13. Tretyse 15/16 how *dere* he hath bought her] Trinity 144/18 com *cher* il achata sa amur] *dere-cher* lacking in Nero 179/11, Vitellius 287/11, and Latin 155/6.

14. Tretyse 17/8 but the swete *Ihesu* put hym self in place in leyd hys tendyr body to aquyte hys loue, *whyche is our soule*, owte of the pryson of *helle*] Trinity 145/4 Mes *iesu crist* li haut rei du ciel e deu memes tut puissant mist sei pur nus en gieuerie. e soen precious cors pur aquiter sa amie. *cest nostre alme hors de la gieuerie de enfern*] Vitellius 287/29 Dieus tout puissant. mist soi meismes pur nous en gieurie et mist son precious corps en gage pur aquiter hors samie des mains des diables. Nero

179/22 same as Vitellius, but it ends: acwiten ut his leofmon of giwene honden. Latin 155/16 like Nero.

15. Tretyse 38/22 whan they shall *departe*] Trinity 147/20 *departie*] Vitellius 290/21 *seuerance*] Nero 180/36 *twinnunge*] Latin 157/1 *separatione*.

16. Tretyse 38/24 And there was neuyr body that soo moche louyd soule, nor soule body, as dyde the body of Ihesu cryst his soule and his soule his body] Trinity 147/21 E de ceo apert clerment ke il mus ama plus ke onkes cors fist alme. ou alme cors] No reference to Christ's love for us or of his own body for his soul in Nero 181/1, Vitellius 290/22, or Latin 157/2.

17. Tretyse 81/6 the beaute of absolon] Trinity 149/2 la beaute de absolon] Nero 182/2 absalones schene wlite] Vitellius 292/19 Le cler vout absolon] Latin 158/11 Absalonis clarus decor.

18. Tretyse 81/16 soo enraged] Trinity 149/14 si deue] Nero 182/10 so swuthe onwil] Vitellius 292/35 si tresuolentriue] Latin 158/18 valde voluntarius.

19. Tretyse 81/20 *departe body & soule*] Trinity 149/16 de partir uostre alme de uostre cors] Nero 182/13 to dealen lif & soule] Vitellius 293/3 seuerir *vie* et alme. So also Latin 158/21.

II. Points at which Tretyse and Vitellius agree against Trinity in Part VII.

1. Tretyse 4/23 hys chambyrleyn, hys counsellour, hys spouse. To these three (found also in Nero 187/5, Vitellius 301/6, and Latin 163/9), Trinity 156/6 adds: e sa chere amie.

2. Tretyse 5/4 Naye in no maner] Vitellius 301/13 nanil en nule maniere] Trinity 156/9 Nenil pur ueir fet il en nule guise. Also, as is usually the case in Trinity, translation precedes Latin, in contrast to Tretyse-Vitellius-Nero.

3. Tretyse 5/10 Dimisi iuxta verbum tuum. Latin found in Nero 186/24, Vitellius 300/16, and Latin 162/27. Omitted by Trinity 155/20.

4. Tretyse 5/21 In genesi ad loth. Found in Nero 186/34, Vitellius 300/33. Omitted here by Trinity 156/2 although found five lines above in the translation.

5. Tretyse 10/6 wyth suche faruence] Nero 177/12 so vnimete swuthe] Vitellius 283/32 si tresademesure] Latin 153/5 ita in inmensum. This phrase lacking in Trinity 142/5.

6. Tretyse 10/18 swete wordys & delycious] Vitellius 284/11 paroles si deliciouses] Trinity 142/14 paroles si merueilleuses.

7. Tretyse 15/8 The thyerde reson of thys shyld is that] Vitellius 287/2 Dereschief la tierce raison apres la mort de pruz chivaler le pent] Nero 179/5 eft þe þridde reisun] Trinity 144/13 omits phrase: the third reason.

8. Tretyse 17/4 *passeth & surmounteth*] Nero 179/20 ouergeth ham alle uoure. & *passed*] Vitellius 287/24 *surmunte* touz ices quatres touz les *passe*] Latin 155/14 hos *transcendit* amores, *excellit* omnes] Trinity 144/33 *passa* tutes cestes quatres amurs (but cf. 147/28).

9. Tretyse 76/3 Si dimiserit vir vxorem suam &c. Nero 179/34, Vitellius 288/15, and Latin 155/28 end the quotation here] Trinity 145/20 continues with the connecting matter leading into: Tu autem fornicata.

10. Tretyse 79/23 the *kyng* of alle *kyngis*] Nero 181/12 *kinge* richest] Vitellius 291/5 le plus riche *rois*] Latin 157/11 *regum* ditissimus] Trinity 148/4 plus beaus *homme*.

11. Tretyse 80/16 so *good chepe*] Vitellius 291/35 si *bon marche*] Nero 181/27 *solihht* cheap] Trinity 148/22 si *leger marche*] Latin 157/28 ita *leuiter* curas.

12. Tretyse 80/18 Wyll ye *castelles*. *Castles* found in Nero 181/30, Vitellius 292/3, and Latin 158/3] Omitted by Trinity 148/25.

13. Tretyse 81/1 doon in heuen, in erth, and in *helle*. And in *helle*

found in Nero 181/36, Vitellius 292/13, and Latin 158/7] Omitted in Trinity 148/32.

14. Tretyse 81/3 wythoute ony comparyson, wythoute ony rekenyng, and without ony ende] Vitellius 292/16 desmesurement. desowelement definablement] Latin 158/9 in inmensum inequaliter, sine fine] Nero 182/1 vnmeteliche and vnendeliche] Trinity 148/33 plus desmesurablement. e plus des ouement.

15. Tretyse 81/9 þat wolde stryue wyth the hertes in rennyng] Nero 182/5 þet strof with heortes ouervrn] Vitellius 292/24 qi estriua od les cerfs de curre] Latin 158/13 qui cum ceruo sepius contendebat] Trinity 149/6 ke corut com cerf.

16. Tretyse 81/11 The renomme of alexandre] Vitellius 292/29 le renoun alisandre] Trinity 149/8 le los du rei alisandre] Latin 158/15 Alexandri fama.

17. Tretyse 81/16 ye refuse so grete a gayn] Vitellius 292/37 refusez tiel gaing od toutes manieres de beneuretez] Trinity 149/15 refusez si ourus doun] Nero 182/12 uorsakest swuch bigeate] Latin 158/19 respuis tale lucrum.

III. Points at which Tretyse and Trinity agree against Vitellius in the section on the "Seven Deadly Sins."

1. Tretyse 90/16 whiche is soo grete that heuen & erthe maye not comprehende hym] Trinity 23/22 quant il ke fu si grant ke ciel e terre ne poeit pas comprendre] Lacking in Nero 111/8, Latin 91/20; evidently lacking also in Vitellius 168/14, although there is an illegibility at this point.

2. Tretyse 91/23 the eye of *ferme fayth*] Trinity 23/25 le oil de *ferme fei*] Nero 111/10 mid eien of bileaue] Vitellius 168/19 od eoiz de creance] Latin 91/23 oculis fidei.

3. Tretyse 91/23 Ihesu, very god & man] Trinity 23/25 iesu crist uerai deu] Latin 91/24 Christus Ihesus Dominus] Vitellius 168/20 iesu crist (no attributive). Nero 111/10 like Vitellius.

4. Tretyse 92/8 Wherfore yf ye wyl be one of his, ye must be of that marke] Trinity 24/17 E si vos uolez le soen estre; de cel singne et de cel merche vos coueint estre seigne e merche] This clause lacking in Nero 111/36, Vitellius 169/30, and Latin 92/13.

5. Tretyse 92/10 And in loue restyth hymselfe. Soo as saynt Johan sayth, Deus caritas est. &c.] Trinity 24/21 e en amour se repose. Si com dit seint Iohan, Quia deus caritas est; et qui manet et cetera.] Quotation from St. John lacking in Nero 112/4, Vitellius 170/2, and Latin 92/18.

6. Tretyse 92/19 *grete oostes*] Trinity 25/4 *grant ostz*] Nero 112/15 *stronge uerdes*] Vitellius 170/22 *fortz hostz*] Latin 92/26 *simul fortiter*.

7. Tretyse 92/22 *dysceue & departe* our hertes] Trinity 25/7 *deseuerer e de partir* uos quers] Nero 112/19 *unuestnen* heorten] Vitellius 170/28 *seuerir* les queorz] Latin 92/28 *corda separare*.

8. Tretyse 93/4 This temptacion is stumbling, that makyth many to falle in the myre of synne, yf he be not susteined by other with tru charyte, and soo sayth saynt gregorye] Trinity 25/22 temptacion est escrillement e glacement; ke fet meint homme chair einz en la boue de pecche. si il ne seit sus tenu par autri en ueraie charite. Sic enim dicit Gregorius] Vitellius 171/12 Temptacion; est escrilleure. par alasseure sunt signifiez les messafeitures. Ces sunt les vices contenues desouz persece qe sunt auant nomez la sus. Cest ceo qe seint gregoire dit. Nero 112/32 and Latin 93/6 like Vitellius.

9. Tretyse 94/5 what man wrongeth you . . . is your *lighte*. This reading could derive from a misreading of minims as, for example, in Trinity 7/28 *lime* as *lumere* (Nero 128/3 *uile*, Latin 107/2 *lima*). However, it is hard to judge the relationship with the Vitellius text here (198/32), since a line or so, containing the first part of the "file" figure, has disappeared and the passage been made to read right along.

10. Tretyse 94/10 As whan a man hathe trybulacyon or aduersite & takyth it impaciently, he dooth ayenst nature and as euyl metall, For

that thyng derkyth him that of his nature sholde gyue hym lighte & cleernes] Trinity 8/4 Ausi homme entribulacion siil queut roil de in-pacience. il fet en contre nature. kar la chose li obscurcit; ki de sa nature esclarcit] This concluding sentence lacking in Nero 123/7, Vitellius 199/3, and Latin 107/8.

11. Tretyse 96/4 that beholde by true fayth how Ihesu cryst was in erthe in gooyng, in prechyng, and in all well dooyng] Trinity 29/8 ke regarde par ueraie fei com curius nostre duz seignur iesu crist fu en terre; en currant e en prechant, en bien fesant. e ensanant toz] Vitellius 176/13 qi regarde coment nostre seignour fut peniblement affaire en terre] Nero 115/21 and Latin 95/19 essentially like Vitellius; but note that Trinity and Latin have Latin verses omitted in the other three.

12. Tretyse 96/6 After all this beholde how in the ende of his lyfe he was trauelyd, whanne he prayed soo that wyth his swette ranne from hym droppes of blood, rennyng down on his blessid body to therthe. And after beholde whan he was at the pyler, how sorrowfully he was scorged of the felon Iewes, not only on his legges but ouerall his fayr body. And at the last, beholde how he vpon the harde crosse was sore traueyled the daye of his letyng blood] Trinity 29/12 A pres toz iceo regarde coment il en la fin de sa uie trauailla. quant il oura issi ke la suur raa de lui ausi come goutes de sanc decorant de soen cors aual deske la terre. E apres vncore regardez; quant il esteit al piler lieu. com dolerusement il fu batuz e iarsez par les es corges des felons gius ke si le fiaelerent. batirent. e iarserunt. *e ne mie sulement sur les iambes mes sur tot soen cors.* A pres au derein regarder coment il sur la dure croiz mout trauailla le iour de sa seignee] Vitellius 176/15 apres tout laltre coment il en le vespree de sa vie trauailla en la dure croiz] Nero 115/23 and Latin 95/22 likewise omit the extensive development of this idea; however, in Nero, Vitellius, and Latin the italicized bit is found a few lines later in connection with the crown of thorns.

13. Tretyse 96/16 But our *blessyd lorde Ihesu criste* went vpon the mount of caluarie, & yet more on the crosse, & was lete blood in *v places*] Trinity 29/21 e *nostre douz seignur* mounta le mont de caluarie . . . il seigna de *cinc lius*] Nero 115/25 *he othe* munt . . . o *uif halue*] Latin 95/25 *Sed ipse* in monte Caluarie ascendit . . . ex *quinque partibus*] Vitellius 176/21 il monta sur le mont de caluarie . . . qil seigna grantz courantz de *mult larges plaies*. Here the agreement is most specifically against Vitellius which omits the number of wounds, and to a lesser extent against Nero and Latin which omit the attributives. It should be noted that Trinity contains considerable material at this point which is not found in the Tretyse.

14. Tretyse 96/20 Than who by the eye of the true fayth beholde wel this traueyle of Ihesu cryst wolde Ioyefully traueyle for his loue & neuer wolde be ydle] Trinity 29/30 ke par oil de ueraie fei regardast iceo deuant dit grant trauail de nostre tres douz seignur iesu crist ke suffri en sa passion; uoluntiers pur lui traualiereit. e accidie du tot de sei remuereit] Not found in Nero 115/33, Vitellius 176/35, and Latin 95/31.

15. Tretyse 97/17 and therefore the fende dredeth moche *be charytable prayer*] Trinity 21/13 e pur ceo li dyable de enfern doute mout *prieres e oreisons*] Nero 109/5 so fulitowune, the deuouel of helle duted *ham swuthe*] Vitellius 164/29 si mesafaitees li diable denfer *les doute* mult.

16. Tretyse 97/20 We rede that *a holy man* was in his prayers, & the fende came fleying ouer hym in the eyre, sholde passe towards the occydent by the commaundement of Iulian, the emperour of Rome] Trinity 21/17 kar nus lisom ke *vn seint homme* fu en ses preieres. e vint li dyable uolant outre li en le eir. e deueit passer en uers le occydent du mound par le commaundement iulian le emperur de rome] Vitellius 164/36 *Puplius vn seint hom* fu en ses proieres et vint lenemi desus lui volant par les nues. et deuerait sei hastier vers la partie del West del siecle par le comandement Julian lempereur. Nero 109/8 and Latin 90/3 like Vitellius.

17. Tretyse 98/1 And of a nother fende rede we in the lyf of saynt bertylmew, bat as he was in his prayers the fende sayd to him, 'Grete pane haue I wyth you, for your priers brenne me sore'] Trinity 21/24 E de vn autre dyable lisom nus en la uie de seint bartholomeu. ke fit en criaunt a seint bartholomeu ke mout fut en prieres. bartholomeu dit il a apostle deu; grant peine en ai ieo; kar uos oreisons me ardent. *Incendunt me inquit oraciones tue*] Vitellius 165/13 Dun altre list len qil cria haut a seint bartholomeu qu mult fu en oroisons. *Incendunt me orationes tue. Bartholomeu mal mest voz oroisons mardent*] Nero 109/16 and Latin 90/10 like Vitellius.

18. Tretyse 98/11 Who shold be coueytous or scarce, as ben thei that will for the purchasyng & receyuyng of erthly weles trespace ayenste god, yf they beholde by true fayth the grete pouertee that was in the swete Ihesu that conteyned from the begynnyng of his lyf more & more vnto thende] Trinity 30/6 En countre coueitise; e auarice. ke serreit coueitous ou auers ki par ferme fei regardast la pouerte ki crut sur nostre seigneur en terre le haut rei du ciel du comencement de sa uie plus deske a sa fin (cf. Trinity 10/18] Vitellius 177/1 Encontre couoitise est sa grant pouerte qe court touz iours sur lui plus et plus. Nero 115/34 and Latin 96/1 like Vitellius. All of these last three agree with Tretyse (and Trinity 10/21) in reading *more and more* at the end of the passage.

19. Tretyse 98/20 betyx an oxe & an asse] Trinity 30/10 Cest a sauer la creche du buef e del ane (cf. Trinity 10/26)] Reference to ox and ass lacking in the other texts (Nero 116/2, Vitellius 177/10, Latin 96/6), but they are actually nearer to the Tretyse reading than is the Trinity.

20. Tretyse 98/21 Yet after this was he more pour, so as he hymself sayd, that he had not soo moche place wheron he might rest his hede, so pour was he of erthly loggyng] Trinity 30/12 Mes en apres fu il vnore plus pouere; si com il memes dit. kar il ne auait liu ou il poet sa teste reposer (cf. Trinity 11/6] Nero 116/7, Vitellius 177/15, and Latin 96/8 phrase this differently and include other material. Note that Trinity at 30/15 lacks the third degree of poverty, the cross, found in different words at 11/20.

21. Tretyse 99/28 Suche that ben thus accustomed ben the glotons that are ofte grutchyng for mete & drynke. But who that by true fayth beholde well the poure petaunce that our lorde Ihesu cryst had the day bat he was lete blood on the crosse, they sholde haue lityll appetyte to that glotenie] Trinity 30/18 kar ke serreit glut; ou ki pur pouere pitance glucereit. ki par ueraie fei regardast la pouere pitance de iesu crist ke il auoit le iour ke il fu seigne sur la croiz] Vitellius 178/26 Encontre glotonie. estsa pouere pitance qil auoit en la croiz. So likewise Nero 116/30 and Latin 96]30.

22. Tretyse 100/9 his pour petaunce was thenne but a draught of eysell & galle, as the gospel sheweth] Trinity 30/23 ne fu sa pitance nule autre chose fors vne beuee de fiel melle oue eisil e oue vinegre si come la euangelie dist. *Dederunt ei bibere vinum cum felle mixtum* (cf. Trinity 12/7)] Vitellius 178/33 ne fu sa pitance en la croiz fors vne esponge de fiel. Nero 116/34 and Latin 97/1 like Vitellius.

23. Tretyse 100/12 For the seruauant ought not to be better seruid than his lord] Trinity 30/28 e nomement com li sergant ne deit pas mieut estre puz de soen seigneur. *Non est enim seruus maior domino suo*] Lacking in Nero 116/36, Vitellius 178/38, and Latin 97/3.

24. Tretyse 101/3 Ayenst *lecherye* is to be noted the clenness of the pure vyrgyn mary. For he sholde be ouer vyle of his body that by tru fayth beholde the clene byrth of Ihesu cryst & of his rihte clene & pure moder, the blessyd vyrgyn, saynt mary, and the clenness of the lif that thei ledde in erthe and all theyrs] Trinity 30/30 en countre *luxurie*. est la nette porture de la tresnette e de la tresduce virgine nostre dame seinte marie. kar ki serreit lecheor ke par ueraie fei regardast la tres nette nesaunce de nostre duz seigneur iesu crist. e de la tres nette virgine pucele nostre dame seinte marie; e sa nette uie. ke li douz

iesu demena en terre. e sa douce mere ausi. e quanke lui en suirent] Vitellius 179/1 Encontre *lecherie*; est sa nissance de la nette pucele. et toute sa nette vie qil mena en terre et touz ceus qe li siwerent. Nero 117/1 and Latin 97/4 like Vitellius. But note that only Trinity and Latin read *luxurie*.

IV. Points at which Tretyse and Vitellius agree against Trinity in "Seven Sins."

1. Tretyse 93/26 yf ye suffre payne humbly for your good dede. Vitellius 198/15 si vous soffrez pur vostre bien fet. Nero 127/31 and Latin 106/27 like Vitellius] Trinity 7/16 si vus la suffrez pur uostre bien fet; si come nostre seignur iesu crist fit.

2. Tretyse 94/4 For his grete bounte was cruelly hanged on the crosse] Vitellius 198/26 pur sa grant bountee fu pendu en la croiz. Nero 128/1 and Latin 106/32 like Vitellius] Trinity 7/23 pur sa tre grant bounte; e par sa grant de boneirete; e especiaument fu il pur nus en la croiz pendu.

NOTES

1. Charlotte D'Evelyn, "Notes on Some Interrelations Between the Latin and English Texts of the *Ancrene Riwe*," *PMLA*, LXIV (1949), p. 1179, and *The Latin Text of the Ancrene Riwe* (MSS. Merton Coll. 44 and Cotton Vitellius E.vii), EETS, OS, 216 (1944), cited as Latin.

2. Edited by J. A. Herbert, EETS, OS, 219 (1944), cited as Vitellius.

3. M. L. Samuels, "Ancrene Riwe Studies," *Medium Aevum*, XXII (1953), pp. 1-9, a study of the function of alliteration, treatment of English proverbs, English wordplay, and awkwardness and mistranslation in the French; Hans Käsmann, "Zur Frage der ursprünglichen Fassung der *Ancrene Riwe*," *Anglia*, XXV (1957), pp. 134-156, an analysis of 17 readings in the Vitellius which are best explained as derived from the English.

4. Hope Emily Allen, "Wynkyn de Worde and a Second French Compilation from the 'Ancren Riwe,'" *Essays and Studies in Honor of Carleton Brown* (New York, 1940), pp. 182-219, esp. pp. 213 ff. The principal textual studies prior to 1940 were those by G. C. Macaulay, *MLR*, LX (1914), pp. 63 ff., which argues for priority of the French; and J. Hall, *Selections from Early Middle English* (Oxford, 1920), II, 377 ff., and D. M. Dymes, *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*, IX (1924), pp. 31 ff., which argue for priority of the English.

5. Allen, p. 213.

6. Edited by W. H. Trethewey, EETS, OS, 240 (1958), hereafter cited as Trinity. In "The Seven Deadly Sins and the Devils Court in the Trinity College Cambridge French Text of the *Ancren Riwe*," *PMLA*, LXV (1950), pp. 1233-1247, Professor Trethewey established fully the independence of the Trinity version and its relation to the Titus version of the English *Riwe*. I should like to acknowledge Professor Trethewey's generosity in making available to me typescript of his transcriptions before the appearance of his edition and for reading over and commenting shrewdly on the significance of the collations.

7. Edited by J. H. Fisher, EETS, OS, 223 (1951), cited as Tretyse.

8. Tretyse 1/11, and Introduction, pp. xvi-xviii.

9. J. H. Fisher, "Continental Associations for the *Ancrene Riwe*," *PMLA*, LXIV (1949), pp. 1180-89.

10. The English text of the *Ancrene Riwe* from MS. Cotton Nero A.xiv, edited by Mable Day from transcriptions by J. A. Herbert, EETS, OS, 225 (1952), cited as Nero.

11. Trinity, Introduction, pp. xii-xvi.

12. For discussion of circumstances facilitating such a combination see Allen, p. 188.

13. Trinity, Introduction, p. xv.

KING ALFONSO'S VIRGIN OF VILLA-SIRGA, RIVAL OF ST. JAMES OF COMPOSTELA

JOHN ESTEN KELLER

During the second half of the thirteenth century King Alfonso X seems to have undertaken to belittle the shrine of St. James at Compostela. Such a course of action is more understandable in later times when such writers as Mariana went so far as pen what we now regard as downright vilifications of the saint.¹ During the reign of Alfonso, however, the reasons are not so clear, and there is a need for more definite study as to why this king wrote, or caused to be written, verses that seem to belittle Santiago, the Patron Saint of Spain.

Generations of Spanish kings had revered the shrine of St. James. Indeed medieval Europe had from the early ninth century, when the body of the saint had been discovered in Galicia, held his tomb in reverence and veneration. Untold thousands of pilgrims had marched out of Paris by the Rue St. Jacques to make their way through Orleans, Tours, and Pamplona to the city of Santiago de Compostela. Long after the death of King Alfonso (he ruled 1252-1284) pilgrims made the long journey. St. James remained Spain's patron and the battle cry of Spanish armies even in the time of Charles V was "*Santiago, y cierra España.*"

King Alfonso X was certainly not ignorant of the popularity and attraction of St. James. The king's own history, the *Crónica General*,² relates the facts concerned with the siege of Coimbra by Ferdinand III, his father, when St. James' aid alone was enough to overcome the city. Both Alfonso and Ferdinand must have realized, as their ancestors had realized earlier, that Santiago was a kind of focal point of resistance during the long years of the Reconquest. Without the belief in St. James, sent down from heaven to champion their cause, many Spaniards might have slipped out of the orbit of Christianity and into that of Islam. Indeed, even with the saint's protection, the influence of the East and of Moslem beliefs was strong and traces of this influence may still be seen in Spanish customs and folkways. Américo Castro³ even suggests that Spanish catholicism has been to some degree colored by aspects of Islam. But that is another story.

One has a good right to wonder, in view of St. James' status in medieval Europe, what could have led a king to question

his greatness and to belittle the efficacy of his cult in the Iberian Peninsula. Why had Santiago fallen from grace with the King of Spain? Had Alfonso decided, as some have suggested, to attempt to curb the political influence of the Francophile monks of Cluny who had become entrenched along the Way of St. James?⁴ Cluny owed allegiance to the royal house of France, and King Alfonso may have feared the widespread influence of this Benedictine brotherhood. Could Alfonso have looked with disfavor upon the clergy at Compostela who refused to abide by clerical regulations set up in Rome, who avoided the tonsure, dressed in brilliant colors, lived lives not seemly and disregarded official decretals?⁵ It is known that in Compostela there existed a feeling in ecclesiastical circles that no allegiance was owed to Rome. And what of the hordes of foreign pilgrims many of whom were the riffraff of the roads and cities? Did Alfonso regard Compostela as a den of iniquity that drew to Spain great multitudes of undesirables?

During the reigns of Ferdinand and Alfonso long strides had been made in regaining territory from the Moors. The great cities of Cordova and Seville had surrendered. The province of Murcia had been captured. Could King Alfonso have thought that the need of St. James as a warrior saint had run its course? Or had certain mystical experiences of the royal family and of Alfonso personally, in which the Holy Virgin figured, caused the king to belittle the saint?⁶

We may never know the answers to these questions. But we know that Alfonso X carried a miraculous image of the Virgin on his saddle when he rode into battle; we know that he believed that the Virgin had intervened in his behalf when he was ill;⁷ and we know that he called himself her troubadour and caused to be written in her honor a remarkable and extremely valuable book, the *Cántigas de Santa María* (Canticles of Holy Mary).⁸ Indeed, many scholars suspect that the king actually composed a number of these songs. It is among these *cántigas* that one may find some interesting facts that illustrate the rivalry between the shrines of the Virgin and the shrine of St. James. King Alfonso's views, as stated in the *cántigas*, are unmistakable.

The *Cántigas* are, as most scholars know, a great compilation of miracles of the Virgin, written in verse and set to music. In the better codices full-page sets of illuminated miniatures accompany the songs,⁹ and these pictures are an impor-

tant step in the development of Hispanic art and may be regarded as one of medieval Europe's great art works. The music of the *Cántigas* has attracted the attention of such musicologists as Higinio Anglés, Willi Appel and Julián Ribera.¹⁰ Sociologists and historians find the *Cántigas* a vast and rich repository of daily living, actually portrayed in a multitude of phases. Folklorists and thematologists are beginning to realize how great a reservoir of motifs and themes these songs contain.¹¹ In the four hundred-odd poems, written in Galician-Portuguese (the favorite vehicle of lyric verse in Spain during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries)¹² there is a whole world preserved in words, music and picture.

At least three of the *cántigas* seem to belittle the efficacy of the shrine of St. James. *Cántiga* 218 bears the following title or explanatory caption written in prose: *Esta é como Santa Maria guareseu en Vila-Sirga*¹³ *un ome bõo d'Alemanna que era contreiro*. After this appears the first stanza which reveals that the shrine of the Virgin there was the site of miracles.

Ed'est' en Villa-Sirga
miragre mui fremoso
mostrou a Vírgen, Madre
de Deus, Rey grorioso,
et entr' os seus miragres
é d'oyr piadoso
de que ela faz muitos
nobres et mui preçados.

The canticle then goes on to relate that a rich merchant of Germany fell ill and was paralyzed completely, that his feet and his hands were contracted and twisted:

foi tan mal parado,
per que ficou tolleito
d'anbos et dous lados

.....
foi end' atan maltreito
que de pees et mãos
de todo foi contreiro.

He persuaded some pilgrims who were about to depart on the pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostela to take him with them, although they did not wish to do so. After the long trip they deposited him before the altar of the saint and the man received no cure. What was even worse, he suddenly went blind. At this the pilgrims who had carried him from Germany decided to leave him!

el quando en Carron foron
 ar cego o acharon,
 et de o ý lexáren
 todos s'acordaron;

... ..

The spot in which they had left him was not far from the church of Our Lady of Villa-Sirga, and as the poor man lay weeping, the Virgin heard him. She cured him of his paralysis and of his blindness, and he returned to Germany to sing her praises:

mas a Madre
 do que da agua uynno
 fez, ouue d'él mercée
 et oyú seus braados.

... ..

o oyú et saõu-o
 como mui poderosa,
 e póis a poucos dias
 foi-sse para ssa terra
 por prazer da que nunca
 sa mercée én serra;

The *Cántiga* ends with a stanza in which the listener is advised to visit the shrine at Villa-Sirga and to make offering there. *Cántiga* 218, then, shows that an afflicted man went to Compostela, prayed, and was not heard: in the Virgin's shrine at Villa-Sirga his prayers were answered.

Cántiga 253 continues the praise of Villa-Sirga to the discredit of Santiago de Compostela. The title or explanatory caption here reads as follows: *Como un remeu de França que ya a Santiago foi per Santa María de Vila-Sirga, et non pod' én sacar un bordon de fero grande que tragía en pēdença.*

A certain Frenchman sinned and as a penance was sent to the shrine of St. James by his abbot:

recebeu en pēdença
 que fosse logo guisado
 pora ýr a Santiago,
 ca lle mandou seu abade.

He was to carry a twenty-four pound staff of iron all the way and was to place it on the altar. On the way he passed through Villa-Sirga and he asked the people about the place. In their answer one can read something of King Alfonso's sentiments about the shrine there:

—Alí chaman Vila-Sirga
 logar mui maravilloso
 en que muito bon miragre

sempre faz et saboroso
 a santa Vírgen María,
 Madre do Rey poderoso;
 et a eygreia é sua
 et derredor a erdade.

The man calls upon the Virgin for aid, as he is weary of the iron bar. At this prayer the bar falls to the ground and breaks into two parts. Neither the pilgrim nor anyone else can lift it. He prayed for assistance to the Virgin of Villa-Sirga who made the bar weightless:

solto de ssa pēdença,
 pois que lle tolleu tan fera
 carrega que él levava
 do ferr' e de ssa maldade.

As can be seen, he recovered his bar. He hastened on then to Santiago de Compostela and carried out his pilgrimage, but he was thereafter a greater devotee of the Holy Virgin than of St. James:

Des í log' a Santiago
 foi conprir sa romaría;
 et pois tornou a ssa terra
 serviú muy ben todavía
 en quanto uiueo de grado
 á Vírgen Santa María.

These two miracles—*cântigas* 218 and 253—give some indication of the preference of King Alfonso for the shrine at Villa-Sirga. Number 278 goes even farther. The very title is a little story in itself: *Como hũa bõa dona de França que era cega, ueó a Vila-Sirga et teue y uigia, et foi logo guarida et cobrou seu lume; et ela yndo-se pera sa terra, achou un cego que ya en romaría a Santiago, et ela consellou-lle que fosse per Vila-Sirga.*

This miracle took place at a time when the Virgin was beginning to work miracles at the little shrine:

Esto foi en aquel tempo
 que a Vírgen começou
 a fazer en Vila-Sirga
 miragres, por que sãou
 a muitos d' enfermidades
 et mortos ressocitou;
 et porend' as gentes algo
 començauan d' í fazer.

The blind French woman went first to Santiago where she received no cure:

mas a vē-ll' assý

que no sãou de sa ida
que sol podesse veer.

On the way back to France she stopped at Villa-Sirga and received her sight. Later on the road she met a blind man traveling toward the shrine of St. James and she advised him not to go there, but to stop at Villa-Sirga where there was a better chance of cure. The woman is definite in her criticism of Santiago as a miracle-working shrine:

E contou todo seu feito
cómo fora con romeus
muitos pera Santiago,
mas pero nunca dos seus
ollos o lum' y cobrara;
mas póis a Madre de Deus
ll'odera en Vila-Sirga
pelo seu muí gran poder.

The blind man gave up his attempt to reach Compostela and made his way to Villa-Sirga where he called upon the Mother of God and was given back his sight:

et pois foi en Vila-Sirga
fez ssa oraçon et uyú;
ca non quis Santa María
en o ssar detêer.

One could argue that the *Cántigas de Santa María* were written to laud the miracles of the Holy Virgin, but such an argument does not explain satisfactorily why it was necessary to laud these miracles by belittling those of St. James, Spain's patron. In the four hundred-odd songs it is not the practice to criticize or cast aspersion on other shrines. Only St. James' shrine at Santiago de Compostela is the object of such aspersion.

Villa-Sirga was apparently, in the mind of King Alfonso, a favorite shrine, and Evelyn Proctor has listed fourteen *cántigas* that relate miracles performed there.¹⁴ But other shrines were also the sites of miracles: Puerto de Santa María, which was settled by Christians sent by King Alfonso who also built its church, was the site of twenty-four miracles in the *cántigas*; Salas in Aragon was the site of seventeen; Terena in Portugal has twelve; and there are occasional miracles in other places, such as Montserrat with no more than six. The shrine of Our Lady of the Pillar in Saragossa is not mentioned, a strange fact, for the Virgen del Pilar has always been in the minds of Spaniards, one of the most important, if not the most important of all. One might hazard the guess that since the founding of this shrine was a kind of collaboration between

the Virgin and St. James, Alfonso thought it unwise to use it as the site for miracles. After all, the Blessed Virgin appeared at Saragossa, in the first century the city of Caesar Augusta, to St. James who had been carrying on there his missionary activities. It was she who reminded him that she had asked him to build a shrine to her in that part of Spain in which he had made the largest number of converts (there were eight men converts). Saragossa was that place and there at the Virgin's direction St. James constructed the shrine, which has since become one of the most important in all the Spanish-speaking world.

Pilgrims to Compostela continued to flow into Spain, and as we have seen, the cult of St. James survived into the sixteenth century. The beginnings of its decline, however, seem to have been inaugurated much earlier. Strange to say, it seems that King Alfonso the Wise laid the foundations of this decline.

NOTES

1. Padre Mariana, the great historian, stated that the tales of St. James were "*cuentos de viejas*." Quevedo in his *Su espada por Santiago*, however, defended the belief in the saint. In 1618 Pope Paul V, at the insistence of the Carmelites, decreed that St. Theresa was co-patron of Spain with St. James. Américo Castro (*España en su historia*, Buenos Aires, 1948, 182) states that "*los salones favorecían a la Santa y las masas, al Apóstol*."

2. R. Menéndez Pidal, *La Crónica General de España* p. 488a, as cited by Américo Castro, *op. cit.*, 135.

3. *Ibid.*, 183.

4. See Georgiana G. King, *The Way of St. James*, New York, 1920, for an extensive treatment of the pilgrimage route and its history; see also Américo Castro, *op. cit.*, 107-152.

5. Américo Castro, *op. cit.*, 169.

6. A number of the *Cántigas de Santa María* relate miracles performed by the Holy Virgin for King Alfonso or for members of his family or friends. In all, there are twenty-eight poems that belong to this class.

7. *Cántiga* 209 is notable. Its title reads: *Como el rey Don Alfonso de Castella adoeceu en Bitoria e ouu' hía door tan grande, que coidaron que moresse ende; e posseron-lle de suso o liuro das Cantigas de Santa María et foi guarido* (How the king Don Alfonso grew ill in Vitoria and had a sickness so grave that they thought he would die; and they placed upon him the book of the *Canticles of Holy Mary* and he was cured).

8. *Cántigas de Santa María*, ed. Leopoldo A. de Cueto, Marqués de Valmar, 2 vols. (Madrid, 1889). All citations of miracles by number refer to this edition.

9. The codices that contain the full-page sets of miniatures are Escurial MS. T.I.I and MS. Banco Rari 20, formerly II.I.2.13, of the National Library of Florence.

10. Higinio Anglés, *La Música de las Cantigas*, II, (Madrid, 1943); Julián Ribera, *La Música de las Cantigas*, (Madrid, 1922).

11. John E. Keller has finished a Motif-Index of the *Cántigas* which is awaiting publication.

12. Three great books of songs written in Galician-Portuguese have been preserved containing some two thousand songs by two hundred poets. These song books are: *Cancioneiro da Ajuda* (ca. 1280); *Cancioneiro da Vaticana* (mid-14th century), and *Cancioneiro de Colocci-Brancuti* (mid-14th century).

13. Villa-Sirga lay a few miles off the Way of St. James and was quite close to Carrión de los Condes.

14. Evelyn Proctor, *Alfonso X of Castille*, Oxford, 1951, 29.

THE FOUNDATION OF JOHANNES HUEVEN DE ARNH HEM FOR THE COLLEGE OF SORBONNE (1452)

ASTRIK L. GABRIEL

I. *Sources.* By the middle of the fifteenth century the enthusiasm of the previous century for founding colleges and fellowships connected with university studies had diminished considerably. No wonder that the records of the English-German Nation at the University of Paris in the second half of the fifteenth century reveal an anxious search into a foundation made by an alumnus of the Sorbonne for certain *bursae* intended for members of the English-German Nation.

The *Liber procuratorum*¹ and the hitherto inedited *Liber receptorum*² of the English-German Nation do not furnish full information on the nature of this foundation. The officers of the Nation themselves apparently did not have a complete picture of the circumstances of this foundation, because on December 23, 1478 all that they knew about these *bursae* was that they had been established "a long time ago by a respectable man in Germany who lived in the College of the Sorbonne."³ Although the English-German Nation was very much concerned about this donation, the name of the testator and benefactor does not appear in the books of the Nation until 1487, when he is referred to as *magister Johannes de Hewen, doctor in Theologia*, founder of the *bursae*.⁴

If the earlier records of the English-German Nation are uncommunicative about the foundation, a clear picture can be obtained from the *regesta*⁵ of the University of Cologne, the Archives of the City of Arnhem, and from the hitherto inedited minutes of the Priors of the Sorbonne, the *Liber priorum Sorbonae*.⁶

The purpose of this article is to complete the brief history of the founding of these *bursae* given by Keussen⁷ and Van de Ven,⁸ by using, first, the references found in the *Liber procuratorum (1466-1492)*,⁹ published since the appearance of those excellent studies, and secondly hitherto unknown passages of the *Liber priorum Sorbonae*.

II. *The Founder.* Johannes Hueven (Hoven) de Arnhem, in the diocese of Utrecht, the founder of the *bursae*, must have been born around 1380, since to begin one's university studies, one had to be at least 16 years old, and he was *intitulatus* at the

University of Cologne in 1395.¹ From there he went to Paris, where he became *bacc. Art* in 1400, *lic.* and *mag. Art.* in 1403.² In 1416 we find him in the College of Sorbonne,³ where, from 1416 to 1418, he had free access to the Library.⁴

In 1419 he was inscribed at the University of Heidelberg as *bacc. formatus in Theologia Parisiensis*.⁵ Three years later, in 1422, he was back in Paris, and became receptor of the English-German Nation. In 1423 he was one of the ambassadors of the University of Paris to the council of Pavia.⁶ On March 15, 1424, he earned the degree of *bacc. Theol.*, and, on June 27 of the same year, that of *mag. Theol.* at the University of Paris.⁷

He went to Rome in 1427 as ambassador of the English-German Nation, in the case of Paulus de Sclavonia, a rebellious member of the Nation.⁸

In 1428 the University of Paris requested the Holy See to grant Johannes de Hueven de Arnhem a benefice, to reward him for his many services to the University.⁹

Johannes left Paris in 1429 to join the University of Cologne as *mag. Art. Paris, bacc. Decr., doctor Med. prof. Theol.*¹⁰ He was elected Dean of the Faculty of Theology there on April 30, 1441, and was rector for the term of June 28-December 20, 1444.¹¹

In 1452 he was a canon of Liège, and at that time must have been around 70 years old. On September 23, 1452, he decided to make his will.¹²

III. *The will of Johannes de Hueven.* In his will, Johannes de Hueven established two distinct foundations, one for the benefit of the College of Sorbonne, the other for the Faculty of Arts of the University of Cologne.

For the Sorbonne, he bequeathed a rent of 60 Rhinish florins (equivalent to 40 *antiqua scuta Francie*) to establish three fellowships, each limited to six years and each worth 20 florins annually. He stipulated that the beneficiaries must be relatives of his or, if no such candidates could be found, inhabitants of the city of Arnhem or the county of Velva or the duchy of Gelre (Gelria, Gelderland). After their six years of study in the College of Sorbonne, six new students were to receive the fellowships. If the *bursarii* were found to be unworthy of the fellowships awarded, the College of Sorbonne and the English-German Nation were empowered to remove them as negligent (*discoli*), and replace them with qualified candidates.¹ Six named persons from the duchy of Gelre were ap-

pointed executors.² They were authorized to handle Johannes' books and to loan them to the recipients of the *bursae* on sufficient security that they would not sell them or give them away.³

For the University of Cologne, Johannes de Hueven donated 50 Rhenish florins for the support of five students in the Faculty of Arts, in honor of the "five wounds of Christ." The same stipulations were made as for the Sorbonne, except that each student was to receive 10 florins annually.⁴

Three years later, on August 27, 1455, Johannes already very weak and on sickbed, changed some of his former dispositions and added the stipulation that the candidates for the Paris and Cologne fellowships must themselves bear all the expenses connected with the acquisition of the *bursae* and not cause any inconvenience to the executors.⁵

In a note left with Johannes de Broichusen, notary of the Cathedral Chapter of Liège, Johannes appointed new executors, namely Mag. Theodoricus Dyck (Dijk), *lic. Decr.*, Johannes Begants, *doctor Decr.*, and Nicholas Wechs (Voeghs), *doctor Med.*, all canons of Liège. But Nicholas Wechs, in a letter dated September 26, 1455, referring to his bad health, declined this honor.⁶

IV. *Reaction of the Sorbonne.* We do not know the immediate reaction of the Sorbonne to Johannes' founding of the three *bursae*. The first extant reference is found in 1457, when the rector of the University of Paris invited the executors to present suitable candidates.¹ The *Liber receptorum* of the English-German Nation in February 1458 reports 6 sol. paid to a certain Petrus Hoeck who was going to take some deeds to Arnhem in the duchy of Gelre.² This mission may well have had to do with Johannes' bequest.

But the Sorbonne, it seems, was not eager to accept the foundation in its original wording. On October 4, 1460, the executors, on the occasion of a visit to Paris, were informed by the fellows of the Sorbonne that according to their Statutes one could not be admitted into the Society of the Sorbonne unless they were graduates from the University of Paris and were teaching at the Faculty of Arts. Furthermore, the College could not take up such a burden as the support of three *bursarii*, unless the executors left 200 gold *scuta* to the College for construction purposes and for the repair of the rooms of the mem-

bers,³ besides assigning certain rents for the upkeep of the rooms where the new *bursarii* would live.

The next day the fellows of the Sorbonne decided that the three candidates would be admitted only as guests, *hospites*, with the stipulation that they would pay 200 *scuta* and a certain amount of yearly rent for the rooms.⁴

Two years later, on November 29, 1462, the successors of the executors, R. Wyn de Arnhem and Gherardus Vaick, canon of Saint Walburgis of Arnhem, came forward with another positive proposal. They presented three candidates for the fellowships,⁵ Paulus de Cimeterio and two members of the English-German Nation, namely Johannes Riet,⁶ *mag. Art. Paris*, and Arnoldus Michaelis, a student.⁷

After due deliberation, the final answer of the Sorbonne was expressed by Johannes Chenart, prior, in a letter of June 13, 1463. The Sorbonne decided against the admission of Paulus de Cimeterio as *bursarius* but did not raise any objection against his reception as *hospes*. The Sorbonne regretted that the testator had not consulted the Statutes of the College before making his provision for the establishment of the three fellowships.⁸

The objection of the prior and the fellows were really based upon a regulation of the Statutes that distinctly stated:

*Nullus admittatur in socium Collegii, de quacumque natione fuerit, sive Galliae, sive Picardiae, sive Normandiae, sive Germaniae, nisi rezerit cursum artium integrum, Parisius responderit de questione tentativae.*⁹

V. Efforts of the English-German Nation. The English-German Nation, in its quality of "quasi" executor of the will of Johannes de Hueven concerning the *bursae*, on June 13, 1463, inquired of the prior the reasons for not admitting one of the applicants. The very same day, the Sorbonne wrote to Arnhem. The prior also gave a diplomatic answer to the Nation, excusing himself on the grounds that the final decision was not his to make and that he, therefore, had "neither refused not admitted" the applicant.¹

By 1469 the University of Cologne had become interested in the foundation established in favor of the Sorbonne. The Officialis of the Cologne Curia obtained copies of the will, the letter of presentation of the *bursarii* to the Sorbonne, and the latter's deed of refusal²

On September 26, 1476, a delegation came to Paris, probably from Arnhem, concerning the establishment of the long

disputed fellowships. But we know nothing of what happened on this occasion except that a generous banquet was given by the English-German Nation.³

On December 23, 1478, two decisions were reached by the English-German Nation. They decided to get in touch with the executors and to send a delegation composed of Johannes Scriptoris,⁴ Cornelius Oudendick,⁵ and Martinus Johannis de Delft⁶ to Johannes Lhuillier,⁷ bishop of Meaux, provisor of the College of Sorbonne, to ask his agreement to the acceptance of the *bursae* by the Sorbonne itself.⁸

Three years later, on December 15, 1481, the matter was still not settled. Cornelius Oudendick, Richardus Murhed,⁹ Thomas Ruscher,¹⁰ receptor, and Martinus J. De Delft were requested again to see the provisor of the Sorbonne.¹¹

In order to have a complete record of the obscure situation of these fellowships, the University of Paris decided to obtain copies of all the deeds pertaining to this foundation. On May 6, 1482, the Nation asked the provisor of the Sorbonne to persuade the executors to yield the right of presentation entirely to it.¹² The Sorbonne also wrote to the executors on August 18, 1483, inviting them to present qualified candidates for the *bursae*.¹³

VI. *Transfer of the fellowships to Cologne.* While the College of Sorbonne and the English-German Nation, handicapped by the distance between Paris and Arnhem, were endlessly hedging and debating how to establish these fellowships given to the Sorbonne, the University of Cologne acquired the foundation originally made for Paris. The English-German Nation, thirty years after the foundation of the *bursae*, still did not seem to have copies of the original will; while Cologne, two and a half years after the death of the testator, had already requested copies of the will and the rents.¹

Because of the devoted services of Tilmannus Slecht de Roermund, provost of St. Aposteln,² and Arnoldus Bragman (Braeckman) de Kalker,³ Pope Innocent VIII on June 14, 1485 transferred the Sorbonne foundation to Cologne.⁴ The conveyance of the deeds took place on October 26, 1485, in the presence of the rector and deputies of the Universtiy of Cologne and the executors of Johannes de Hueven: Petrus Wynck, canon of Xanten, Hymannus de Capella, vicar of the same Church, Joacobus Vack, vicar of Saint-Martin in Arnhem. The representatives of the University of Cologne read the papal bull and

the executors acknowledged it by handing over the rental deeds.⁵

The Nation must have been informed of the transfer of the *bursae* before August 5, 1486,⁶ for on August 10, 1486 it sent a letter "to those who retained the benefit of the *bursae*." The selection of the envoys shows that the Nation wanted to send scholars familiar with Cologne, because the two proctors sent on this mission, Vynandus Bell and Ricardus Dunzen, were from the diocese of Cologne.⁷ Shortly afterwards, on November 8, 1486, another letter was sent to Arnheim.⁸ Finally, on December 20, 1487, the English-German Nation decided to appeal to Rome to recover the transferred fellowships.⁹

VII. *Hopeless applicants.* Trusting in the effectiveness of the appeal of the Nation to Rome, Gherardus Militis Ruremundus (Roermund) immediately applied on the same day, December 20, 1487, for one of the fellowships.¹ The obtaining of a fellowship for the members of the English-German Nation became a pressing problem for the Nation, because by 1488 the English-German Nation not only had lost the *bursae* founded for its members, but there were no members of the Nation in the College of the Sorbonne.

Aegidius Delft² complained on April 16, 1489 that in his time there were no subjects from the Nation in the Sorbonne, though according to the constitution each Nation should have a *bursa*: "ut singuli ex quattuor Nationibus magistri bursam illic haberent." He requested the Nation to support his application for admission, addressed to the provisor of the Sorbonne.³

Beyond scattered complaints against those who "alienated" the fellowships,⁴ the Nation did not take any measures to recover the lost foundation. It praised Aegidius Delft for his efforts in trying to get a Sorbonne *bursa*, but made it clear that under no circumstances could he count on the financial assistance of the Nation.⁵

A slight hope of regaining the *bursae* appeared when envoys of Charles, the Duke of Gelre, visited Paris in 1492. On November 8, 1492, the Nation dispatched a delegation of four masters, imploring the envoys to intercede with the Duke for the reinstating of the *bursae* in favor of the Nation.⁶

On November 12 of the same year, it was decided that those subjects who were from the neighborhood of "villa Arniensi Velua" should press the matter for further action. Because there was no candidate from this area, the Nation assigned three of its members to the non-existing *bursae*, Harbartus de

Veda ex Campis,⁷ Mag. Gherardus Militis,⁸ and Scribandus (Isbrandi) de Delft.⁹ They, also, were reminded that no financial help could be expected from the Nation¹⁰ and that their claims should be made at their own expense.¹¹

Conclusion. The foundation of fellowships for the Sorbonne by Johannes Hueven de Arnhem failed to materialize because the testator had not consulted the Statutes of the Sorbonne. In his will, he used the word *bursarius*, which term, for the powerful members of the College, could not cover the coveted honor and title of *socius Sorbonicus*. For the Sorbonne in mediaeval times, as for Oxford today, the Statutes were the sole governing power above the administrative body of the fellows. The Sorbonne Statutes were quite clear about the requirements for the admission of a *socius* and concerning the differences between a *socius* and a *hospes*. Only those who had previously excelled in scholastic achievements in the classrooms of Paris, the *Parens Scientiarum*, could be admitted as *socii*.

On the other hand, the Pope was fully justified in his transfer of the *bursae* to Cologne. The futile negotiations of the English-German Nation for the recovery of the fellowships clearly showed that since Paris was so far from Arnhem, it was very difficult and impractical to collect from such a great distance the revenues supporting the fellowships.

The glory of the mediaeval Sorbonne consisted in the observation of its tradition and sound principles. No money, no benefit, no alluring foundation could make it overlook or discard the precious heritage of its predecessors, so well expressed in the *Liber priorum Sorbone* (1459) at the time of the refusal of the Arnhem fellowships: the strength of the Sorbonne rested in its social, collegiate, moral, and scholarly life—*vivere socialiter, et collegialiter, et moraliter, et scholariter*.

NOTES

1. I. C. Samaran-Ae. A. Van Moé-S. Vitte, ed., *Liber procuratorum Nationis Anglicanae (Alemanniae) in Universitate Parisiensi* (Auctarium Chartularii Universitatis Parisiensis, III) Parisiis, 1935 [henceforth referred to as *Auct. III*].

2. Paris, Archives Nationales H 2587: September 21, 1425-September 21, 1460; Arch. Nat. H 2588: September 21, 1460-September 19, 1494. The *Liber receptorum* will be published by Astrik L. Gabriel, Director, The Mediaeval Institute, University of Notre Dame, Indiana, and Gray C. Boyce, Chairman, Department of History, Northwestern University, Evan-

ston, Illinois, as volume X of the *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*.

3. Auct. III, 406, 29: "super avisione quarumdam bursarum in collegio Sarbone longis peractis temporibus constitutarum a quodam venerabili viro in Alemania quondam in collegio Sarbone morante."

4. Auct. III, 659, 13.

5. E. Kuphal, "Die Archive der Universität Köln (1388-1798)" *Festschrift zur Erinnerung an die Gründung der alten Universität Köln im Jahre 1388*, Köln, 1938, pp. 548-637; cf. p. 554; H. Keussen, *Regesten und Auszüge zur Geschichte der Universität Köln, 1388-1559*, Köln, 1918 [reprint from *Mitteilungen aus dem Stadtarchiv von Köln* 36 and 37 Hefte 1918] p. 129, n° 1044; p. 137, n° 1092; p. 169, n° 1326. I am very grateful to Dr. E. Kuphal, Director of the *Stadtarchiv*, and Dr. Gerig, Archivist, in Cologne, for their most appreciated assistance during my research in Cologne.

6. Paris, Bibl. Nat. Ms. Lat. 5494A. The *Registrum autographum Priorum Collegii Sorbonae* (Book of the Priors) (1431-1484) sheds important light upon the internal operations of that institution founded in 1257 by Robert of Sorbone: cf. Astrik L. Gabriel, "Robert de Sorbonne," *Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa*, 23 (1953) 473-514. A seventeenth-century copy of the original is in Bibl. Nat. Ms. Lat. 16070.

7. H. Keussen, *Die alte Universität Köln. Grundzüge ihrer Verfassung und Geschichte. Festschrift zum Einzug in die neue Universität Köln*, Köln, 1934, 365-368, where the foundation made by Johannes Hueven de Arnheim for the University of Cologne is discussed.

8. A. J. Van de Ven, "Een Arnhemsche Studiebeurs," *Bijdragen en Mededeelingen* (Gelre, Vereeniging Tat Beafening van Geldersche Geschiedenis, Oudheidkunde en Recht), 30 (1927) 39-60.

9. See note 1.

II. 1. H. Keussen, *Die Matrikel der Universität Köln*, Bonn, 1928, I, 79.

2. H. Denifle-Ae. Chatelain, *Liber procuratorum Nationis Anglicanae (Alemanniae) in Universitate Parisiensi* (Auctarium Chartularii Universitatis Parisiensis, I) Parisiis, 1937), p. 810, 19; 858, 14, 41 [henceforth referred to as Auct. I].

3. Paris, Bibl. de l'Arsenal, Ms. Lat. 1021, p. 147.

4. Paris, Bibl. Mazarin, Ms. 3323, fol. 65 recto-verso.

5. G. Toepke, *Die Matrikel der Universität Heidelberg von 1386 bis 1662*, Heidelberg, 1884, I, 144.

6. H. Denifle-Ae. Chatelain, *Liber procuratorum Nationis Anglicanae (Alemanniae) in Universitate Parisiensi* (Auctarium Chartularii Universitatis Parisiensis, II) Parisiis, 1937, 997; 295, note 1 [henceforth referred to as Auct. II].

7. Bibl. Nat. Ms. Lat. 5494: "Iste compotus est redictus (*sic*) magistrorum nostrorum reuerendorum facultatis theologie ex parte Johannis Bachereti bedello ejusdem facultatis de omnibus misis et receptis" [1411-1439], p. 27, 35.

8. H. Denifle-Ae. Chatelain, *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, IV, Parisiis, 1897, p. 428-29, n° 2234, note 12; Auct. II, 385, 41 note 4; 391, 5; A. L. Gabriel, *Martin de Bereck, Receptor, Proctor, and Rector at the University of Paris (1423-1432)*, Roma, s.d., 8-12.

9. Auct. II, Intr. xii-xiii.

10. E. Wickersheimer, *Dictionnaire biographique des médecins en France au moyen-âge*, Paris, 1936, 420.

11. Keussen, *Die alte Univ. Köln*, p. 416, n° 39; p. 390, n° 222/23.

12. I used *Reg. Univ. Coloniens.* 32 [63 (a 7. 3*)] *Liber Universitatis Studii Coloniensis pro rectore eiusdem studii pro tempore*. (Ff. 243, 200 X 280). The material on Johannes Hueven de Arnheim is on ff. 17 recto-36 verso. The text of the will is on ff. 25 recto-31 recto; cf. also Keussen, *Regesten*, p. 129, n° 1044; Van de Ven, *op. cit.*, 51-54.

III. 1. *Reg. Univ. Coloniens.* n° 32 (63), fol. 26 verso: "Item volo, quod quadraginta antiqua schola Francie, valente sexaginta florenos Renens., hereditariorum reddituum habeant perpetuis temporibus Collegium et magistri de Collegio Sarbone pro tribus bursariis de linea mea, si reperiri poterint, qui sint apti, et si non sint de Arnheim si apta reperiantur; si non, de Velya vel ducatu Gelrie de diocesi Trajectensi, Leodinensis vel natione instituens Collegium Sarbone Parisius vel Nationem Anglicanam heredes istorum sexaginta florenorum Renens. ad exequendum meam ultimam voluntatem ut premittitur; et est quod sint tres studentes apti ad proficiendum in Sacra Theologia quorum quilibet habeat in supplementum et subsidium expensarum suarum viginti florenos Renens. quos [executores] levabunt de illis sexaginta florenis Renens., quos emi ab Vdone Tailhardt, sicut in litteris hereditariis latius continetur. Illis autem sex annis elapsis, alii succedant, et post sex annos alii. Et si discoli [fol. 27 recto] vel inutiles fierent Collegium Sarbone et Natio Anglicana habet potestatem admovere inutiles et ponere bonos. Et si nulli reperirentur ad proficiendum utiles, dentur ille penunie annuatim pauperibus, quousque boni reperiantur." Cf. Van de Ven, *op. cit.*, 52.

2. "nomino venerabiles et generosos viros et dominos Winandum (de) Arnhem, Everardum de Wilpe, milites, Egidium Uten Nuwlant, armigerum, Gerardum Wack, presbiterum, necnon priorem de Monychuysen, Carthusiensis ordinis": Van de Ven, *op. cit.*, 53.

3. "Item volo et ordino, quod omnes libri mei maneant sub manibus executorum meorum ad usus pauperum scolarium, et signentur ad usus illorum, qui habent bursas, et ponant fideiussores, quod non alienabunt vendent ac destruent illos. Et volo, quod maneant in liberaria, in Arnheim fienda vel in Monichusen, et capiant prior de Monichusen et executores stipulationem ab ipsis studentibus": Van de Ven, *op. cit.*, 53.

4. *Reg. Univ. Coloniens.* n° 32 (63), fol. 27 recto: "Item volo et ordino quod in honore quinque vulnerum Christi sint quinque studentes in artibus in Studio Coloniensi de progenia mea, si reperiantur apti ad proficiendum, et si non sint de Arnheim, de Velwia vel de patria ducis Gelrie et si non reperiantur, instituuntur alii per executores et Studium Coloniense secundum quod ipsis videbitur expedire in ratione, et hoc ad exequendum ultimam meam voluntatem et testamentum. Et habeat quilibet eorum annuatim per triennium in subsidium expensarum suarum decem florenos Renens. de bonis meis hereditariis que habeo in Avezet prope Tyell que emi ab Johanne Voes et Henrico de Bronckhorst, qui solvunt michi quadraginta quinque florenos Renens.; alios quinque levabunt de bonis meis que habeo in Huesden quousque alibi assignavero eis," cf. Van de Ven, *op. cit.*, 52.

5. *Reg. Univ. Coloniens.* n° 32 (63), fol. 30 recto: "Johannes sensuum suorum bene compos et intellectu et ratione vigens licet corpore debilis et infirmus in suo lecto decumbens addendo suo testamento . . . et ordinavit . . . atque dixit sue finalis voluntatis intentionem existere, quod omnes studentes Parisienses et Colonienses, quibus aut eorum collegiis legata quecumque fecit, teneantur et debeant legata hujusmodi prosequi, petere et habere suis propriis laboribus et expensis, absque aliquibus vexationibus, prosecutionibus, laboribus aut expensis executionis sue et suorum executorum." Cf. Keussen, *Regesten*, p. 129, n° 1044; and cf. Van de Ven, *op. cit.*, 55.

6. Keussen, *Regesten*, p. 137, n° 1092.

IV. 1. Keussen, *Die alte Univ. Köln*, p. 367.

2. Arch. Nat. H 2587, fol. 113 recto: "Item pro quodam cursore dicto "Petrus Hoek" ferente quasdam litteras ad opidum de Arnheim in ducatu Gelrie. . . vj sol. par." Cf. *Auct.* II, 917, 35.

3. Bibl. Nat. Ms. Lat. 5494A, fol. 43 verso, *Registrum autographum Priorum Collegii Sorbonae*: "Primo sc. quod non vellent nec possent quouscumque recipere nisi ydoneos et qualificados juxta formam statuti et consuetudinem Collegii, sc. quod fuerint graduati Parisius et quod rexerint

in Artibus. 2° quia non esset rationabile Collegium obligari ad tantum onus sine vtilitate et commodo, voluerunt conformiter ad alias pristinas fundationes, quod illi executores haberent primo legare collegio ducenta scuta auri ad edificandum vel reparandum cameras, 2° [sic] quod haberent assignare aliquot redditus pro manutentia et conservatione camerarum pro libertate et commoditate quas haberent illi scolares."

4. *Ibid.*: "Quod dicti scolares numero tres reciperentur solum ut hospites et ad onera hospitum quolibet anno persolvenda et quod in primis darent illa ducenta scuta pro edificatione camerarum et quod singulis annis haberent solvere pro camera aliquam summam ultra alios hospites communes pro eo quod Collegium esset obligatum illos recipere."

5. *Reg. Univ. Coloniens.* n° 32 (63), fol. 32 recto-verso: "[Executores] presentant venerabilibus egregiis et honestis viris Domus ac magistris, Priori, doctoribus magistris et scolaribus Collegii de Sarbone Paris. honorabiles et discretos viros magistros Paulum de Cimiterio et Johannem Riet in Artibus magistros ac Arnoldum Michaelis pro nunc in Alma Universitate Parisiens. studentes." Cf. Keussen, *Regesten*, p. 167, n° 1310.

6. Johannes Riet [Rijt, Rheidt] *lic. and mag. Art.* in 1461 (*Auct. II*, 940, 27; 941, note 2).

7. Arnoldus Michaelis, *intitulatus* in Cologne 1458, Determinans Nov. 23, (Keussen, *Matrikel*, I, 630, n° 38). *Lic. and mag. Art.* in 1463 (*Auct. II*, 948, 11).

8. *Reg. Univ. Coloniens.* n° 32 (63), fol. 33 recto: "Coram venerabili et circumspetto viro magistro Johanne Schenart presbitero, in Artibus magistro et in Theologia baccalario, Priore venerabilis Collegii de Sarbona quod servando statuta Collegii non possent recipi ad bursas Collegii sed solum ad hospites sicut et non regentes recipiuntur." Cf. Keussen, *Regesten*, p. 169, n° 1326.

9. P. Feret, *La Faculté de Théologie de Paris, et ses docteurs les plus célèbres*, Paris, 1896, III, 596, n° 10.

V. 1. Bibl. Nat. Ms. Lat. 5494A, fol. 48 recto: "Secundum formam conclusionis quod . . . non habebam plenam potestatem et ita neque eum refutabam neque admittebam."

2. Keussen, *Regesten*, p. 194, n° 1472.

3. *Auct. III*, 332, 3.

4. Johannes Scriptoris de Buyren, *intitulatus* Basel, 1464 (H. G. Wackernagel, *Die Matrikel der Universität Basel*, Basel, 1951, I, 48 n° 52); *lic. and mag. Art.* Paris, 1465 (*Auct. II*, 957, 9; 958, 24); proctor 1467 (*ibid.*, III, 925); receptor 1471 (*ibid.*, 831); rector 1474, June 23 (*ibid.*, 276, 50); 1478, March 25, prior of the Sorbonne (Bibl. Nat. Ms. Lat. 5494A, fol. 74 recto); 1480, March 28, *lic. Theol.*; Dec. 12, *mag.* (Bibl. Nat. Ms. Lat. 5657A, fol. 26 recto).

5. Cornelius de Oudendick de Veteri Aggere de Rotterdam, proctor of the English-German Nation in 1467 (*Auct. III*, 60, 32); 1489 (*ibid.*, 829-830); 1474, December 16; 1479, March 24, rector of the University of Paris (*ibid.*, 288, 34; 414; 48); from 1467 in the College of Sorbonne (Bibl. Mazarin, 3323, fol. 125 recto); 1480, March 25, prior of the Sorbonne (Bibl. Nat. Ms. Lat. 5494A, fol. 77 recto); *licentiatius* in Theol. 1482, March 4 (Bibl. Nat. Ms. Lat. 5657A, fol. 26 verso). Died in 1492 as "principalis collegii parvae Sorbone" (Bibl. Nat. N.a. Lat. 535, fol. 10 recto).

6. Martinus Johannis de Delft, *lic. and mag. Art.* Paris, 1467 (*Auct. III*, 40, 31; 42, 14); proctor of the Eng.-German Nation 1468 and 1477 (*ibid.*, 825, 827); receptor 1478 (*ibid.*, 831); rector Univ. Paris 1479, June 23 (*ibid.*, 423, 35); 1482 in the College of Sorbonne (Bibl. Nat. Ms. Lat. 1021, p. 191). Praised by Robert Guaguin (L. Thuasne, ed., *Roberti Guaguini Epistolae et Orationes*, Paris, 1903, I, 381-382).

7. *Auct. III*, 406, 30. The editors of the Auctarium mistakenly took Johannes Scriptoris for provisor. He was only prior. The provisor was the

highest ranking superior of the College. A. Franklin, *La Sorbonne*, Paris, 1875, p. 229.

8. *Auct.* III, 357, 17; cf. *ibid.*, 413, 21.

9. Richardus Murhed, from the dioc. of Whitehall in Scotland. 1473 *lic.* and 1474 *mag.* Paris (*Auct.* III, 256, 12); 1476, February 2, *intitulatus* Louvain in Canon Law, J. Wils, *Matricule de l'Université de Louvain*, Bruxelles, 1946, II, 339; returned to Paris, where proctor same year September 23 (*Auct.* III, 827). Concerning his career in Scotland, as dean of Glasgow, of Saint Andrew, etc., see A. I. Cameron, *The Apostolic Camera and Scottish Benefices, 1418-1488* (St. Andrews Univ. Publication, 35), Oxford, 1934, 222, 254, *passim*; same author, "Scottish students at Paris University, 1466-1492," *Juridical Review* 48 (1936), 244; 254.

10. Thomas Ruscher de Gomundia (Gmünd) *lic.* and *mag. Art.* Paris 1470 (*Auct.* III, 144, 15; 147, 19); 1474 *intitulatus* Univ. Heidelberg (Toepke, *Matrikel*, I, 343); 1479 proctor Paris, (*Auct.* III, 827); 1481 receptor (*ibid.*, 832); 1483, December 16 rector Univ. Paris (*ibid.*, 538, 16); 1502 tit. bishop *Venecomp.* (Eubel, *Hier. Cath.* II, 264).

11. *Auct.* III, 488, 1; the editors of *Auct.* III, mistakenly took Petrus Voleau for provisor. He was only prior of the Sorbonne (Bibl. Nat. Ms. Lat. 5494A, fol. 81 recto). Cornelius Oudendick brought the matter before the assembly of the University on January 5, 1482 (*Auct.* III, 490, 34).

12. *Auct.* III, 500, 44; on June 15, 1482, the German Nation agreed that the letters to be sent to the executors of the will of Johannes de Hueven be sealed with the seal of the proctor of the Nation: *Auct.* III, 503, 16. C. E. Bulaeus, *Historia Universitatis Parisiensis*, Paris, 1670, V, 730-731: "Bursae Germanicae Nationis in Sorbona."

13. Bibl. Nat. Ms. Lat. 5494A, fol. 89 verso: "Johannes de Monte, prior of the Sorbonne, wrote: "Quod erat bonum rescribere exsecutoribus fundatoris dictorum bursariorum quod si mitterent pecunias pro expensis duorum vel trium sociorum quod deputarentur aliqui ad eundum supra; cf. Bibl. Nat. Ms. Lat. 16070, fol. 158 recto.

VI. 1. Keussen, *Regesten*, p. 146, n° 1161.

2. Tilmanus Slecht from the dioc. of Liège matriculated in Cologne on May 26, 1470 (Keussen, *Matrikel*, I, p. 803, n° 48); in 1471 *bacc.*, in 1473 *mag. Art.* On November 18, 1477 inscribed at the University of Ingolstadt as magister (G. Freiherrn von Pölnitz, *Die Matrikel der Ludwig-Maximilians Universität Ingolstadt-Landshut-München*, München, 1937, p. 78). In 1473 *bacc. leg.* in Copenhagen, in 1479 *doctor leg.* (Keussen, *Die alte Univ. Köln*, 367).

3. "Consiliarius domini graciosi Clivensis . . . qui fideliter laboravit pro Universitate nostra . . . fuit in causa bulle trium studentum facultatis Theol." (Keussen, *Matrikel*, II, p. 183, n° 67); *intitulatus* in Cologne in 1472, (Keussen, *Matrikel*, I, p. 838, n° 42); 1473 *bacc.*, 1475, *mag. Art.*

4. Keussen, *Regesten*, p. 243, n 1808. Orig. Köln, Stadtarchiv, Pergm. n° 13961, Van de Ven, *op. cit.*, p. 59-60.

5. Cologne, Stadtarchiv, *Farraginis Gelenianae* [Gelenii Farragines], T. 27, fol. 113. *Aufzeichnung über die Übertragung der Stiftung Joh. Hueven von Paris nach Köln, 1485, Okt. 26*: "presentaverunt et tradiderunt ipsis dominis rectori et deputatis Universitatis [Coloniensis] litteras reddittum illarum trium prebendarum pro tribus scolariibus in Theologia."

6. *Auct.* III, 612, 38.

7. *Ibid.*, III, 613, 6.

8. *Ibid.*, III, 619-620.

9. *Ibid.*, III, 658, 26; 659, 15; 707, 15.

VII. 1. *Ibid.*, III, 659, 12.

2. Aegidius Delft, 1479 *lic.* and *mag. Art.* Paris (*Auct.* III, 415, 18, 39); 1479 proctor (*ibid.*, 419); 1481 *hospes* in the College of Sorbonne 1484 *bacc. Theol.* (*Auct.* III, 561, 18); 1486, December 16 rector (*Auct.* III, 623, 7, 31) 1492, March 21 *lic. Theol.*, June 7 *mag.* Paris. (Bibl.

Nat. Ms. Lat. 5657A, fol. 28 verso) 1501 Prof. Theol. Cologne (Keussen, *Matrikel*, II, 517). 1519 at the Univ. of Louvain (Elie, "Quelques maîtres de l'Université de Paris vers l'an 1500," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen-âge*, 35-36 [1950-51] 193-243.

3. *Auct.* III, 702, 16; Bulaeus, V, 730-731.

4. *Auct.* III, 722, 41. Johannes Nigel requested a sentence of excommunication on December 21, 1489, "super omnes illos qui bona illarum bursarum detinebant."

5. *Auct.* III, 734, 1.

6. Charles was son of Adolphe and Catherine of Bourbon. He regained Gelre with the help of Charles VIII from Maximilian of Austria: *Auct.* III, 811, 35, note 2.

7. Herbartus de Veda, alias Wilsem, 1492, *lic.* and *mag. Art.* (*Auct.* III, 793, 3; Arch. Nat. H 2588, fol. 131 recto) proctor in the same year.

8. Gherhardus Militis "or Chevaller . . . de Villa Ruremundensi" (*Auct.* III, 654, 6); 1487 *lic.* and *mag. Art.*, proctor (*ibid.*, 634, 4 and 829); 1488 receptor (*ibid.*, 832); 1496 ca. October 10 rector Univ. Paris (Archives, Sorbonne, 91 [85] fol. 12 verso).

9. Judocus Scribrandus [Isbrandi] de Delft, dioc. Utrecht, *bacc. Art.* 1459, Paris (Arch. Nat. H 2587, fol. 124 verso); *lic.* and *mag. Art.* 1461 (*Auct.* II, 941, 13, note 2) proctor of the Engl.-German Nation 1462 (*ibid.*, 995).

10. *Auct.* III, 814, 13-34; Bulaeus, V, 731.

11. The *bursae* remained firmly in the hands of the University of Cologne until the end of the sixteenth century. Adolphus Huesselinck enjoyed it in 1510 and 1516-1518. After him some 58 fellows were given the Sorbonne *bursae*, which later on, under modified conditions, were administered by the city of Arnhem: Keussen, *Regesten*, p. 543, n^o 2842a; Keussen, *Die alte Univ. Köln*, p. 368; Van de Ven, *op. cit.*, 57-58.

CHARLES D'ORLEANS AND MEDICINE

ROBERT W. LINKER

Charles d'Orléans has long been represented in anthologies by such poems as "Le temps a laissé son manteau", and in critical writings as a princely poet whose rank and work put him at the other end of the scale from the lowly Villon. Even the latest reading of his poetry discovers in him chiefly respect for the courtly traditions, facility, aristocratic moderation, allegory, and a high degree of impersonality.¹

From Lanson to Montagna, critics have used his poetry to prove his impersonality or to condemn him for failure to measure up to expected princely standards. He is blamed for insufficient concern over the loss of his wife, the troubles of his country, the fate of Jeanne d'Arc. Surely a prince should have furnished great poetic inspiration to his country! Since, obviously, he did not, then is he merely an aristocratic poet of allegory and nature, a polished trifle, qualified for the title of last poet of the Middle Ages, whose failure to express real personal feelings leaves the field to the first modern poet, François Villon?

It is the purpose of this paper² to call attention to another side of Charles d'Orléans' poetry which is deeply expressive of his personality. The reader will have to judge whether it is the reasonable concern of a man in poor health or that of a hypochondriac, but it is unmistakably true that Charles d'Orléans was interested in medicine and medical books, and that he used medicine as poetic material.

When he returned from his captivity in England he brought with him at least three books of medicine:³

1. *La Tour de grant richesse*, a chart form physician's handbook (Paris, B.N.ms.fr.222).
2. Ibn Butlan, *Tacuinum sanitatis*, from the library of the Duke of Bedford (B.N.ms.lat.6977).
3. Several quires and other papers containing the prescriptions of Pierre Regnier, Jacques Boucher and others.

To these must be added:

4. Galen, won in a chess game from Jehan Caillau (B.N.ms. lat.6868).
5. *Regime de Medecine*, gift of P. Sauvage.
6. Another medical book, gift of Fuzelier.

7. Bernard de Gordon, *Lilium medicinae*, by exchange with J. Caillau (B.N.ms.lat.6964).
8. Simon de Couvin, poem on the plague of 1348 (B.N.ms. lat.8369).
9. Pietro di Habano, *De Venenis* (B.N.ms.lat.930 or 11230).
10. *Remede contre poisons*, which he gave to Charles VII.
11. Ypocras (Hippocrates), gift of J. Caillau.

Many a physician of the day practised his profession for a lifetime without such a medical library. But Charles had more than a medical library, he had a physician who was physician, friend, counselor, and poet. With visiting poets he engaged in poetic contests, but one of the cosiest and clearest pictures we can evoke of Charles d'Orléans and his entourage shows him exchanging poems and books with Maistre Jehan Caillau, or even sharper focus is afforded us by the chess game, where a copy of Galen was at stake. Caillau's professional activity at the court of Orleans consisted chiefly of serving the duke's wife, Marie de Clèves, at each of her confinements, and thereafter as physician to her and pediatrician to her children. Besides the medical books mentioned, Caillau gave Charles a volume of Seneca's letters and declamations (B.N.ms.lat.7796) and received a copy of the glossed Epistles of Saint Paul. It is interesting to note that Caillau also wrote poetry, but unlike the duke, used no medical material as subject matter. One of his six poems was on the theme "Je meurs de soif auprès de la fontaine", subject of a poetic contest⁴ in which he competed against Charles d'Orléans, François Villon, Montbeton, Robertet, Berthault de Villebresme, Gilles des Ourmes, Simonnet Caillau, and others.

Let us now turn to the poetry of Charles d'Orléans to see what medical learning he uses. In his earliest poems, chiefly *ballades* and *chansons*, Charles makes only conventional use of terminology that might be classified as medical:⁵

His heart can not recover, must endure ills (24), is his master. His reading in the romance of Pleasant Thought causes him to give up sleep, even though his eyes demand a rest. He suffers from love and can not be cured (27). Again, Thought and Desire combine to give him insomnia and he hugs his pillow and calls on Love to lighten his painful, grievous ills. At times, his heart upsets our strict notions of anatomy by moving about dressed in black (36), and by causing Charles to cry for help when the Greek fire of ardent desire sets his heart's lodgings

ablaze (44-45). His beloved's heart Charles keeps wrapped in the kerchief of *Plaisance*, washed in the tears of Piteous Thought, dried in the fire of hope, and enclosed in the coffer of Memory under the key of Good Will (51). In other poems Charles and his heart engage in dialogue (52). On one occasion his heart, banished from Joy by an alliance between Fortune and Sadness, becomes a hermit in the hermitage of Thought, and, renouncing Pleasure and Sweet Thought, puts on the habit of Discomfort (64).

This type of conventional imagery could be multiplied by examples from both his youthful and later writings, but about 1435 a deeper note is added. In a series of *ballades* (78-98), he lamented the illness and death of his lady. At the same time, he was becoming melancholic over his captivity. Two of these poems, one on the *ubi sunt* theme, one a short *testament*, remind us of Villon. He ended this period of his life by asking and receiving his heart from Love, who returned it wrapped in black silk (112), and gave Charles an honorable dismissal, charging Comfort to lead him where he wanted to go: to the old manor where he lived in his youth, the manor of Nonchaloir (114-15). Here Charles settled down and put in oblivion *Balades, chansons et complaintes* (119). Soon, however, he decided to take them up again, although he knew he would find his language rusted by Nonchaloir. His first poem thereafter (120) states that the *emplastre* of Nonchaloir has cured his heart, and he can never again suffer from the malady of love.

From this point on, medical references appear in ever increasing quantity, used both in referring to his own health and for general poetic purposes. He noted that Garancières has not turned pale or lean from the malady of love, then a few poems later (130), said that he was like unripe fruit, knocked from the tree by folly and put on prison straw to die or ripen. He repeated the lament of old age (132), in the well known "the mouse is still alive" reference to rumors that he has died in prison. Specifically he says that Youth has him, but Old Age is pursuing him, but he wants to spare his heir grief, and black, because grey cloth is cheaper. Another, and bawdy reference to his old age is contained in his poem to his cousin:

Quant aux connins que dittes qu'ay amez,
 Ils sont pour moy, plusieurs ans a passez,
 Mis en oubly; aussi mon instrument
 Qui les servoit a fait son testament

Et est retrait et devenu hermite;
Il dort tousjours, . . . (136)

At about this point in his poetry, he is freed from prison, and returns to Blois.

The next *ballades* concentrate on eyesight: When he was younger (150) he saw much prettier girls than he does now; anyway, now "that I am becoming old, when I read in the book of Joy, I take spectacles", and again, he must keep his eyes closed against the heat of love, by order of Nonchaloir, his physician, and avoid the epidemic air of love (151-52). In advice to Fradet, he mixes Latin and French, medical terms and Philomena:

Bon regime sanitatis
Pro vobis, neuf en mariage;
Ne de vouloirs effrenatis
Abusez nimis en mesnage;
Sagaciter menez l'ouvrage,
Ainsi fait homo sapiens,
Testibus les phisiciens.

Premierement, caveatis
De coitu trop a outrage;
Car, se souvent hoc agatis,
Conjux le voudra par usage
Chalenger, velud heritaige,
Aut erit quasi hors du sens,
Testibus les phisiciens. (163)

At this point we have the first of a series of poems to and from M^e Jehan Caillau, Fayete, Gouffier.

In *Ballade* CVII he puts into the mouth of a girl this diagnosis for her lover who claims to suffer the malady of love: "It isn't necessary to feel your pulse; you have only the fever of melancholy, nor also to look at your urine: a light malady is soon cured. You must take the medicine of forgetfulness . . ." (167).

An even more striking medical poem is *Ballade* CXI, which lists eighteen diseases, from red eyes to gout, caused by the wind of melancholy, which can not be cured by physic, surgery, astronomers or enchanters (172).

On Saint Valentine's day, he wakes early, but his physician, Nonchaloir, feels his pulse and advises him to go back to sleep (292). May Day is worse: he doesn't lift his head from his cushion (311). A little later, he advises, against the malady of the eyes smitten with the dust of Pleasure, staying away from crowds (399).

One of a series of *rondeaux* on the troubles of love written by Charles and his entourage, is this by the Duke:

Pour tous voz maulx d'amours guerir,
Prenez le fleur de Souvenir
Avec le just d'une ancollie,
Et n'obliés pas la soussie,
Et meslez tout en Desplaisir.

L'erbe de Loing de son desir,
Poire d'Angoisse pour refreschir,
Vous envoie Dieu, de vostre amye,
Pour tous voz maulx d'amours guerir.

Pouldre de Plains pour adoucir,
Feille d'Aultre que vous choisir,
Et racine de Jalousie,
Et de tretout la plus partie,
Mectés au cuer, avant dormir,
Pour tous voz maulx d'amours guerir. (358)

Rondeau CCLXXXIII parallels contemporary advice on diet for the sick:

Dedans l'amoureuse cuisine,
Ou sont les bons, frians morceaux,
Avaler les convient tous chauds,
Pour reconforter la poitrine.

Saulce ne faut, ne cameline,
Pour jennes appetiz nouveaux,
Dedans l'amoureuse cuisine,
Ou sont les bons, frians morceaux.

Il souffist de tendre geline
Qui soit sans octz, ne veilles peaux,
Mainssee de plaisans cousteaux;
C'est au cuer vraye medecine,
Dedans l'amoureuse cuisine . . . (453)

By the time we reach *Rondeau CCCXLVIII*, we find him quoting God's prescription as fire and hot food in winter, drink and cold foods in summer. (491) This is followed shortly by an appeal to God as the sovereign physician, who "will do better than one desires" (505).

For the end of his work, references to Melancholy and Old Age increase slightly, and we find him

Asourdy de Non Chaloir,
Aveuglé de Desplaisance,
Pris de goute de Grevance,

and helpless unless Doctor Hope, the best in France, helps him (536).

Finally, we find him, about four years before his death, in

his last three poems renouncing the pleasures of the eyes (542), preferring to all else staying by the fire (543), dressed in the livery that Old Age has thrust upon him, a livery decreed by Nature, embroidered with *annuy*, and unadorned with the silver of pleasure.

His last poem, written in 1461, bids farewell:

Salués moy toute la compaignie
 Ou a present estez a chiere lye,
 Et leur dites que volentiés seroye
 Avecques eulx, mais estre n'y pourroye
 Pour Viellesse qui m'a en sa baillie.

NOTES

1. Gianni Montagna, "En relisant Charles d'Orléans", *Les Lettres Romanes*, VII (1954), 303-28; p. 327: "Charles d'Orléans fut le dernier poète de l'amour courtois."

2. Part of a paper presented before the Philological Club of the University of North Carolina.

3. Pierre Champion, *La Librairie de Charles d'Orléans*. Paris, Champion, 1910.

4. Lucien Foulet, "Villon et Charles d'Orléans," *Mediaeval Studies in Memory of Getrude Schoeperle Loomis*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1927.

5. Numbers in parentheses are pages of poems in Champion's edition: *Charles d'Orléans; Poésies éditées par Pierre Champion*. Paris. (Cfmâ), Champion, 1923.

THE STAGE DIRECTIONS IN SCHERNBERG'S *SPIEL VON FRAU JUTTEN*

JAMES E. ENGEL

Although Dietrich Schernberg's *Spiel von Frau Jutten* has had four different editors at various times since it was written in 1480 and although there has been a number of commentaries on the play, there are still some features of it that have not been adequately discussed and there is at least one feature that has been overlooked. Schernberg's adaptation of the legend of the female pope, for instance, deserves further discussion, but one point in particular—the method of dividing the play into segments of action—has never been discussed at all. The fact that this aspect of Schernberg's drama has never been discussed seems closely connected with the fact that the first three editors of the play were not interested in it for its own merits, but for its subject matter or its date.

Hieronimus Tilesius, the reformer of Mühlhausen in Thuringia, was Schernberg's first editor. Both the subject matter and the date of the play motivated Tilesius' edition, for Tilesius published the play in 1565 as an example of the teachings perpetrated by the Roman Church before the Reformation; in his foreword he mentions specifically that the play was written by a priest in 1480.¹ It should be observed that in Tilesius' edition the play itself is only a part of a larger scheme; the play is preceded by Tilesius' own strongly polemic foreword and is followed by an even more polemic conclusion. The next editor of the Jutta drama was Gottsched and he too was motivated by a polemic spirit. Unlike Tilesius, though, he was primarily interested in the date of the play and apparently saw nothing alarming or striking in its subject matter. Gottsched's polemic was purely literary, and in his notes to the play he emphasizes that its age makes it worth preserving, that despite its crudities of dramatic structure and its disregard for the unities it is older than anything the French might offer and is no worse in its construction than the dramas of Shakespeare.²

Adelbert von Keller, the third editor of Schernberg's play, seems to have been interested in it solely because of its date. According to his note on the first page of his text, he reprinted Gottsched's edition because it was becoming rare and because he did not want to omit from his collection of *Fastnachtspiele*

any available play from the fifteenth century.³ The last and most recent edition of the *Spiel von Frau Jutta* is that by Edward Schröder in 1911.⁴ Although he, unlike his predecessors, seems to be interested in the play itself, his notes do not go beyond a valuable, but brief summary of the bibliographical history of the play. Schröder's lack of further commentary is understandable if it is assumed that his interest in the play derives from his association with Richard Haage who had written his doctoral dissertation on Schernberg's drama under Schröder's supervision.⁵ But even Haage seems more interested in the relationship of the Jutta play to other plays than in the Jutta play itself.

The first three editors of Schernberg's drama had, then, no real interest in the play itself, and Schröder's interest in the play can be said to have been tempered by Haage's dissertation. Under these conditions it is hardly surprising that the Jutta play has not been given a close enough reading for any one to have observed the segmental structure of the play, much less the method of dividing the play into clearly defined episodes or segments of action. Moreover, only the first of the editors, Tilesius, ever saw the author's manuscript and only he could have been aware of an attempt on Schernberg's part to indicate or to have indicated in his manuscript, perhaps by different kinds of writing or ink, any distinction between two types of prose inserts, that is, between true stage directions and narrative statements of content. Whether or not Schernberg made such a distinction in his manuscript must, of course, remain an unanswered question unless the manuscript should come to light. The important point, however, is that apparently Tilesius and certainly none of the subsequent editors or even commentators on the play made any distinction between narrative passages and true stage directions;⁶ any part of the text as a whole which could not be considered a part of the drama proper has been considered a stage direction.

If the prose inserts or "stage directions" in Schernberg's drama are read in terms of what is actually happening in the play, nine narrative, general statements stand out from the true, specific stage directions. Contrary to the pattern of the true stage directions in this play, these statements describe neither a single action nor the actions of a single individual in conjunction with a specific speech; instead, they describe large segments of the action and summarize the events which follow

them. When contrasted with such typical stage directions as "Hie bringen die vier Cardinel Frawen Jutten vnd *Clericum* für den Bapst (506-507)" or "Der Bapst füuchtet sich für dem Teufel" (710-711) which clearly express actions to be carried out by the actors concerned, the narrative quality of the following general statements becomes quite apparent:

1. Nu kompt Jungfraw Jutta mit jhrem bulen/ welcher hie *Clericus* genennet wird. (216-217)
2. Da ziehen Jutta vnd *Clericus* mit einander nach Pariss/ vnd komen zu einem *Magister*. (258-259)
3. Fraw Jutta vnd *Clericus* ziehen mit einander nach Rom zum Bapst. (394-395)
4. Der Bapst macht Fraw Jutten vnd jren *Clericum* zu Cardinelen. (542-543)
5. Bapst *Basilius* ist gestorben/ vnd Jutta wird zum Bapst erwelet. (606-607)
6. Hie füret ein Römischer Rathsherr seinen Sohn/ welcher mit dem Teufel besessen war/ zu Bapst Jutten/ mit Gott den Teufel aus zu treiben/ vnd der Teuffel offenbaret es/ das Bapst Jutta ein Kind tregt und schwanger ist. (700-701)
7. *Christus* klaget seiner Mutter uber Bapst Jutten. (784-785)
8. Allhier ratschlagen die Cardinel/ wie die grosse schweren straffen/ damit Gott vmb Bapst Jutten sünde willen die stadt Rom geplagt/ abzuwenden. (1286-1287)
9. Nu folget/ wie Bapst Jutten Seel durch der Jungfrawen Marien vnd S. Nicolai fürbitt aus dem Fegfewr erlöset sein sol. (1340-1341)

Once the narrative quality of these statements is recognized and it is agreed that these statements are not true stage directions, then the question as to their function or purpose arises.

It seems fairly obvious that most of these statements cannot be interpreted as stage directions because the action described by them requires for its completion an extensive segment of text. If the action described were the only criterion for grouping these statements together, the inclusion of the first three and the seventh would require further justification and explanation. However, all four of these statements have enough elements in common with the remaining five to admit their classification as narrative statements and to rule out their interpretation as true stage directions. Taken together, these nine

statements form a summary of the action of the play, and all nine provide information necessary or useful to the audience but not to the actors. Moreover, each statement occurs at a point in the text where there is a logical break in the action or where there is a change of scene. It would seem, then, that the function of these statements is to inform the audience and at the same time to delimit segments of action.

In general the information supplied to the audience by these statements anticipates information it will gain from the dialogue, but some of the statements supply information not provided by the text proper. The relationship between Jutta and the Clericus is expressed only in the first statement, and the fact that he is a Clericus is expressed only in the first four statements. The second and third statements serve as pre-staging devices, telling the audience in advance where Jutta and the Clericus are going: to Paris to a Magister and to Rome to the pope. While the second through the fifth statements are alike in that all of them supply information contained in the subsequent dialogue, the fifth statement is different from the others in that it reports an event which has already taken place. Pope Basilius' death does not occur on the stage and is mentioned only in the dialogue following this statement, but the report of his death is in a past tense. This statement illustrates, perhaps more clearly than any of the others, why it and the others in its pattern cannot possibly be interpreted as true stage directions.

The expository function observable in the first five statements is developed extensively in the remaining statements, excepting the seventh which provides scarcely any information at all. Indeed, there would be some hesitation about including the seventh statement in this group if it were not for the facts that it occurs at an obvious break in the action and that in its context it cannot readily be interpreted as a stage direction. The seventh statement is immediately followed by a speech heading "*Saluator*;" such a heading is in this drama a typical method of indicating that an actor is to deliver his speech. If the word "klaget" were to be interpreted as a direction, the heading "*Saluator*" would be superfluous. Still, it seems strange that this statement makes no reference to Jutta's encounter with Death or to her giving birth, both of which occur in the text following this statement. The remaining three statements, however, contain a wealth of expository material, some of which is not available in the subsequent dialogue and most of which is of an explana-

tory nature. The explanatory aspect of these three statements is particularly well illustrated by the wording of the ninth statement. Although the other statements and some of the true stage directions are introduced by such adverbial expressions as "nu, da, hie," and the like, the ninth statement is unique in its usage of "Nu folget/. . ."

Since these nine statements serve an expository and explanatory function and since the information they provide is more useful to the audience than to the actors, the conclusion suggests itself that these statements were read to the audience. This is not an unusual device, particularly in the *Fronleichnamsspiele* and in the longer *Passionsspiele* where the action, extending over a number of days, was previewed or summarized in speeches delivered by the precursor or a similar figure. Since Schernberg's play has no precursor and no provision is made in the list of characters for such a role, it cannot be determined who read these statements in the production of the play. Actually, the problem as to who might have read these statements is irrelevant as long as it is agreed that they were read. The real problem—not so much for Schernberg's play as for medieval drama in general—is whether the predominant function of such statements or speeches is to inform the audience or to divide the action. Speeches that introduce or conclude a whole play or one day's performance of a longer play offer no particular problem in this respect; only when these speeches delimit smaller segments of action within a larger framework does the question of function arise. If such speeches are purely explanatory and their presence is not felt as an interruption of the action, then the drama is conceived of as a continuum in which the single episodes are arranged in an arithmetic sequence whose members bear no relationship to each other but contribute to the whole. On the other hand, if such speeches are intended to interrupt the action, then the interruption itself, not the completeness of an event, would define the episode; consequently, several events could be taken together to constitute a segment of the action and to convey a single idea.

The nine statements in Schernberg's play offer a nearly perfect illustration of this point and its significance. If these statements are meant to divide the play into distinct segments of action, then those events which occur in any given segment are to be associated with each other and are to form an episode regardless of its complexity. If the function of the seventh

statement is to describe an episode rather than to give information, the events which follow it should then constitute a whole. Jutta's encounter with Death, her giving birth, and her being carried off to hell are all intimately associated with each other and all express a common idea. These three events should not, therefore, be considered as isolated events in a continuum of action, but as the components of an episode which expresses Jutta's punishment and the result of Christ's complaint about her behavior. Similarly, if the ninth statement describes an episode, then all of the activity concerned with Jutta's redemption is to be felt as a single block of action regardless of the fact that the action takes place in both heaven and hell. From this point of view, it is not a question of the scene shifting from heaven to hell; the scene is both heaven and hell together.

It is necessary now to determine whether these statements in Schernberg's drama can, in fact, be interpreted as devices to interrupt the action and to define the individual episodes. If it is borne in mind that the information supplied to the audience by these statements could just as easily have been included in the text proper or in a general prologue to the whole play, then it seems likely that Schernberg did intend that the audience receive this information in the form of statements additional to the text. It can hardly be accidental that each statement occurs at a point in the text where there is a logical break in the action or a change of scene; the second and third statements, for instance, do not supply any information not available in the subsequent dialogue, but they do indicate a change of scene. Moreover, if Schernberg were following a random process of informing his audience, there would have been no need to make the sixth, eighth, and ninth statements so extensive; he could have divided this material so that each part of it would immediately precede the event described. The conclusion is, then, that Schernberg did intend these statements to divide his drama into segments of action. This conclusion explains, incidentally, why the seventh statement contains so little information; its real function is to define an episode.

If what is true of Schernberg's drama is true of other forms and examples of medieval German drama, then the patterns represented by the *Frankfurter Passionsspiel* and the *Alsfelder Passionsspiel* need some examination. Are Augustine's speeches in the former play meant to interpret or to interrupt the action, and does the *Silente* pattern in the latter play group single events

into larger episodes? Further, such statements as the following need some revision, "Der Gang der eigentlichen Handlung wird dabei unterbrochen, um der Zwischenbemerkung Raum zu gewähren. Diese fördert den Lauf der Dinge auf der Bühne in keiner Weise. Sie will nur erklären und verdeutlichen."⁸

NOTES

1. Reinhold Bechstein, "Das Spiel von Frau Jutten," *Deutsches Museum für Geschichte, Literatur, Kunst und Altertumsforschung*, NF I (1862), 32. Bechstein reprints in this article (pp. 25-58) the foreword and the conclusion to the Tilesius edition of the text. Since the two known copies of Tilesius' edition were apparently lost during World War II, this article is at present the only available source for Tilesius' foreword.

2. Johann Christoph Gottsched, *Nöthiger Vorrath zur Geschichte der deutschen dramatischen Dichtkunst: zweiter Theil, oder Nachlese aller deutschen Trauer- Lust- und Singspiele . . .* (Leipzig, 1765), pp. 81-83, 139-142.

3. Adelbert von Keller, *Fastnachtspiele aus dem fünfzehnten Jahrhundert*, Bibliothek des litterarischen Vereins in Stuttgart, XXIX (1853), p. 900.

4. Edward Schröder, *Dietrich Schernbergs Spiel von Frau Jutten (1480) nach der einzigen Überlieferung . . .*, Kleine Texte für theologische und philologische Vorlesungen und Übungen, No. 67 (Bonn, 1911).

5. Richard Haage, *Dietrich Schernberg und sein Spiel von Frau Jutten*, Dissertation: Marburg, 1891.

6. Siegfried Mauermann, *Die Bühnenanweisungen im deutschen Drama bis 1700*, Palaestra, CII (1911), for instance, reads as stage directions any part of Schernberg's play that is not part of the text proper.

7. The line numbering follows Schröder. Stage directions and prose inserts, which are unnumbered in Schröder's edition, are indicated here by giving the numbers of the lines immediately preceding and following the directions.

8. Eva Mason, *Prolog, Epilog und Zwischenrede im deutschen Schauspiel des Mittelalters*, Dissertation: Basel, 1949, p. 25. For similar or related views see also the following: Carl Hagemann, *Geschichte des Theaterzettels*, Dissertation: Heidelberg, 1901, pp. 49-50, "Erklärende, den Inhalt des Kommenden zusammenfassende (grösstenteils auch erbauliche) Prologe finden sich manchmal auch vor grösseren Szenen innerhalb des Stuckes, . . .," Otto Koischwitz, *Der Theaterherold im deutschen Schauspiel des Mittelalters und der Reformationszeit*, Germanische Studien, Heft 46 (1926), p. 10, "Je mehr sich das Schauspiel aus seiner Gebundenheit löst und zu freierer Selbständigkeit entwickelt, desto weiter wird die Predigt, die zuerst Trägerin des liturgischen Dramas war, in den Hintergrund gedrängt. Sie schrumpft, wenn man so sagen darf, zu Prolog, Epilog und gelegentlicher Zwischenbemerkung zusammen," and Edwin Zellweger, *Prolog und Epilog im deutschen Drama* (Leipzig und Wien, 1906), p. 5, "Eine weitere Notwendigkeit war die mehr oder minder genaue Angabe der Fabel des Dramas. Die epische Einleitung musste die sonst mitunter unverständlichen Vorgänge vorweg erzählen."

THE TRISTAN ROMANCE IN HANS SACHS' MEISTERLIEDER

ELI SOBEL

Among poets who have sung the romance of Tristan and Isolde the position of Hans Sachs is a lonely one. Sachs (1494-1576) has precursors but he does not know them. He has successors, but they did not think of him, although he was the first to write a Tristan and Isolde drama. There are various misconceptions extant about Hans Sachs' poetic treatment of the Tristan story, and we lack in published form certain important facts concerning this treatment. Therefore the following principal points will be presented: the establishment of the number of Meisterlieder Hans Sachs wrote of Tristan and Isolde and a description, for the first time, of their contents; a discussion of Sachs' source for the Meisterlieder and the tonal patterns he employed; the complete text of the one Meisterlied on Tristan and Isolde written by Sachs *after* he wrote his Tristan and Isolde drama, the poem not previously noted by scholars of Arthurian romance.

Modern scholarship has had available, since 1879, a published text of Sachs' drama: *Tragedia mit 23 personen, von der strengen lieb herr tristrant mit der schönen königin Isalden, unnd hat 7 actus*.¹ The play has frequently been described, portions have been quoted, and Sachs' dramatic approach and technique discussed.² Sachs, who dated all his works and kept complete records of his prodigious literary output (6169 known items), dates the Tristan and Isolde tragedy: *Anno salutis 1553, am 7 tag Februarii*.

Practically every scholar concerned with Arthurian romance in Germany has noted that, in addition to the Tristan tragedy, Sachs also wrote Meisterlieder about Tristan and Isolde. Uniformly the reference is to five Meisterlieder, written in the space of eight days—December 4 to December 11, 1551—a year and three months before the seven-act tragedy was written. But there are six Tristan Meisterlieder by Hans Sachs, not five.

The sixth poem was written on March 13, 1553, a month and a week after the drama was completed. Wolfgang Stammier considered the first five Meisterlieder of Sachs a kind of single, long poem, broken into a cycle of five separate Meisterlieder.³ But the sixth, of which Stammier and other scholars were un-

aware, is necessary to complete the story—the deaths of the lovers. Sachs, the good burgher of Nürnberg, was impelled to end with a final moral about such a love affair from which only sorrow and pain must come. The last poem, “Das ent Herr tristrancz,” was written, therefore, about sixteen months after Sachs first used the material in song. It is almost as if, by writing the tragedy, Sachs reminded himself that he had not treated in a Meisterlied the final and most tragic part of the story, and so, soon after, he set about correcting the omission.

There can be no question about the existence or authenticity of all six poems. Each of them exists in holograph in the Sachs manuscript volumes of his Meisterlieder.⁴ The first five are in two holographic copies, and two of the first five are in four holographic copies.⁵ The sixth Meisterlied is in Sachs' thirteenth manuscript volume of Meisterlieder (MG 13), written and dated in his own hand. There is a copy of the sixth poem, in Georg Hager's hand, in MS Dresden M 195. The Dresden manuscript is an anthology compiled by Sachs' young friend and neighbor, Georg Hager (1552-1634). For Hager, who was also a Meistersinger of Nürnberg, Sachs wrote out many of his Meisterlieder and Sachs also permitted Hager to make copies of many of his poems. The Tristan poems in MS Dresden M 195 are three in Sachs' own hand, and three in Hager's, the latter properly ascribed to Sachs.⁶ To check on the existence or authenticity of any Sachs Meisterlied is almost infallible. Sachs meticulously kept a register and index by *Ton* (metric pattern) and first line of all his Meisterlieder. In the case of the six Tristan poems the two original manuscript volumes of his Meisterlieder that contain the poems (five poems in MG 12 and the sixth in MG 13) have survived. They are in the municipal archives in Zwickau, Saxony.⁷

Having made the point of the composition and authenticity of not five but six poems on Tristan and Isolde, let us proceed to their contents, for up to now the five poems have been described only by title, *Ton*, and date of composition, and, in one instance, by first line.⁸ The Meisterlieder are described below in chronological order, by date of composition and position in Sachs' original manuscript volumes (MG 12 and MG 13), rather than by sequence of contents as the poems would correspond to episodes in the Tristan romance as known by Sachs.

The first poem is dated December 4, 1551, and is titled: “Tristrant der liebhabent.” It is written “In des poppen langen

Thon," and begins: "Ains Königs sün von Jonois genent tristrant." (MG 12, folios 219^v-220^v.) The poem consists of three *Gesetze* of twenty lines each. In *Gesetz* 1, Tristan is sent to Ireland by King Mark to fetch Isolde, who is promised to Mark. The old queen has sent along a love potion with a court maiden, the potion to be effective for four years. Tristan and Isolde drink the potion in all innocence, and they begin to lie together.⁹ Before turning Isolde over to Mark, Tristan is concerned about the problem of Isolde's loss of her maidenhood, and the court maiden is substituted for Isolde for the first night. In *Gesetz* 2, a court dwarf tells Mark of the illicit love and Mark tells Tristan to take a vacation from the court. Mark and the dwarf climb up into a linden tree to spy on Tristan and Isolde. Tristan arrives first and, by the moonlight shadows, is aware of two persons in the tree. Isolde arrives, catches Tristan's guarded wink, also becomes aware of the two in the tree, and asks why Tristan has sent for her. In *Gesetz* 3, continuing under the tree, Tristan says the king mistrusts him, and he wants Isolde to tell Mark that Tristan is innocent and that he wants to return to the court. Isolde says she knows their innocence and has herself suffered disdain and been shamed by the courtiers, and she wishes Tristan had never come to their court. Tristan laments being driven from the court—such is the fate of the faithful and the pious, he laments. Isolde leaves and Tristan sets out alone along the road. Thus is Mark fooled and now he believes Tristan and Isolde innocent. Mark recalls Tristan to court, but after a few days:

Ergrieff man in an Warer that
Darnach er hat
vil gfar erlieden durch ir lieb
thut sein history sagen.

Poem number 2 is dated December 5, and is titled: "Herr tristrandt im wald." It is written "In dem senften thon Nachtigals," and begins: "Als herr Tristrant die Künigin Zart." (MG 12, folios 220^v-221^v.) The poem consists of three *Gesetze* of nineteen lines each. In *Gesetz* 1, Tristan is caught with Isolde and both are thrown into prison. Mark orders that both be burned. Each is to be brought to a chapel, but Tristan escapes and swims to where his servant awaits with a horse. When Isolde is brought to the chapel, Tristan seizes her and both go into the forest. In *Gesetz* 2, the three (including the servant) find a miserable hut, live on water, wild fruits and berries.

Thus two years go by. By chance Mark, separated from his hunting party, comes to the hut and sees Tristan and Isolde sleeping, with a naked sword between them. In *Gesetz 3*, the first impulse of Mark is to strangle them both, but the sword and their back-to-back position remind him they might be innocent. Mark replaces Tristan's sword with his own and also leaves his glove. Tristan awakens, is frightened, and has the horses saddled so that they may flee. Thus, deeper in the forest they live on:

In der ainöd sein Zeit vertrieb
mit Seiner Kunigin
Also nempt noch die wuetig lieb
Dem menschen muet vnd sin
Stöst in in Sorg angst vnd gefert.

The third and fourth poems are both dated December 7, 1551, and are here presented in the same order in which they appear in MG 12. Poem number 3 is titled: "Herr tristrancz kampf mit morholt." It is written "In der kelber weis Hanns Heiden," and begins: "Morholt ein Helt der vier mannes Sterck het." (MG 12, folios 221^v-222^v.) The poem consists of three *Gesetze* of twenty lines each. In *Gesetz 1*, Morhold is sent to Curneval to get the tribute from King Mark. Morhold is to take all boys and girls fifteen years old, because the tribute is past due. However, the alternative is to let a champion meet with Morholt, the loser's king to become the vassal of the victor's king. Mark chooses Tristan, who sails to the island selected for the duel, and arrives there alone and armed. In *Gesetz 2*, Morhold and Tristan fight, after an exchange of words. Tristan is wounded by a poisoned spear, Morhold is unseated. They continue on foot and Morhold is forced to his knees but gets up again. The fight continues into *Gesetz 3*, and Tristan then strikes off Morhold's right hand. Morhold flees but Tristan catches and kills him. Mark is delighted at the news and Tristan is greatly honored. But none can cure him of his poisoned spear wound, and, half-dead, he sails to Ireland. Incognito, he comes to the king's daughter:

Die häilt in doch
Die im doch war von herzen feint
Vmb morholcz willen da erscheint
Das pschert glüeck nimant wenden mag.

Poem number 4 is titled: "Herr tristrant mit dem trachen." It is written "In dem vergessen thon Frauenlobs," and begins: "Als der Kuen Helt Tristrant für in Irland." (MG 12, folios

222^v-223^v.) The poem consists of three *Gesetze* of fifteen lines each. In *Gesetz* 1, Tristan is told of a dragon who kills people and cattle, and the successful dragon-killer is to be rewarded with the king's daughter. Tristan puts on his armor (his helmet is of pure gold) and goes after the dragon. He goes into a dark and gloomy place, a cave near a stream, and the dragon spies him. In *Gesetz* 2, the dragon attacks and Tristan's spear breaks against the dragon's horny armor. Tristan draws his sword, but his horse dies of the dragon's fire and he must fight on foot. Tristan finally kills the dragon. In *Gesetz* 3, Tristan cuts out the dragon's tongue as proof of his conquest and, his armor black from the flames, he lies down exhausted. He is found by Isolde, the king's beautiful daughter, who takes him back to court and tends him back to health. Tristan is told the daughter is his as his bride, but he says she should be given to King Mark. On the trip home to Mark they:

Druckens paide im schiff vnwissent ein puel dranck
 Wurden wuedende liebe Vol
 Durch aus ir ganzes leben.¹⁰

The fifth poem is dated December 11, and is titled: "Her dristrant in dem narren Klaid." It is written "In dem plaben thon Regenpogen," and begins: "Als herr tristrant vertrieben wuer." (MG 12, folios 226^r-227^r.) The poem consists of three *Gesetze* of sixteen lines each. In *Gesetz* 1, Tristan, banished from Queen Isolde's presence and in exile from Curneval, runs along a shore shouting, screaming and whistling, and dressed in fool's garb. He is picked up by merchants in their ship, is taken to Curneval, and given as a present to the king who fails to recognize him, and Tristan runs about the court as a fool. In *Gesetz* 2, Tristan reveals his identity to the queen who gives him a hiding place under the stairs and almost nightly he comes to her. By day a fool, by night a knight, for almost a month he and the queen enjoy their love. In *Gesetz* 3, two servants note the state of affairs and set out to trap Tristan. Tristan knows he is discovered, says his sad farewell to the queen, and sees her nevermore:

Also die lieb nach mals
 noch manchem puler straißt gar
 Die narren Kapp an hals.

The sixth, the last of the Tristan Meisterlieder, is dated March 13, 1553. It is titled: "Das ent Herr tristrancz," and is written "In dem güelden thon Canczlers." (MG 13, folios 116^r-117^r.) The poem consists of three *Gesetze* of nineteen lines

each. In *Gesetz* 1, many years have passed since Tristan was with his beloved Isolde, and he, in Carochs, has been sorely wounded by the poisoned spear of Nampetenis. Tristan sends for Isolde to come and cure him, for she is well versed in curing poisoned wounds. Isolde sets sail secretly, with her drugs, fearing neither harm nor shame—only love for Tristan is important. In *Gesetz* 2, Tristan has told the messenger to Isolde to use a white or black sail code if Isolde is or is not coming. Tristan asks what the color is, is told (an anonymous, *man*, construction) it is black, turns pale and dies. All the bells toll and all the people weep. In *Gesetz* 3, Isolde comes ashore, hurries to the court, but is told Tristan is dead, goes to his bier and laments greatly over his body, then dies. They are buried together in one grave. Sachs ends with the moral that bitter love is the beginning of the heart's sorrow.

The six *Töne* chosen by Sachs were used by him for numerous other Meisterlieder. If there is any noteworthy aspect of Sachs' choice of tonal pattern devised by or attributed to a particular Meistersinger, it is that in these particular six *Töne* he chose, preponderantly, to write poems of secular content, specifically *weltliche Erzählungen*.¹¹ I find no evidence to support Wolfgang Stammmler's statements that it was Sachs' intention to write a Tristan cycle in several parts, nor that his having written several songs on the subject (each three *Gesetze* in length) in any way reflects an effort on Sachs' part to avoid writing overlong songs.¹² Stammmler's position that Meisterlieder of fifteen or more *Gesetze* would be monotonous even to the most ardent, enthusiastic Meistersinger, here serves as an erroneous premise. It distorts one of Meistergesang's chief characteristics, the overwhelming use and prevalence of Meisterlieder with three *Gesetze*. In addition, the *sixth* Tristan Meisterlied eliminates the cycle-of-parts possibility. No Meisterlied known consists of an even number of *Gesetze*, and with the sixth Tristan Meisterlied the total number of *Gesetze* equals eighteen. There is, however, one major point of possible confusion when studying the metrical aspects and tonal ascriptions of the Tristan Meisterlieder. With some frequency in Meistergesang, certain *Töne* are identical in metre and rhyme-pattern; the melodies differed. Among the six Tristan poems there are two for which a dual designation is possible: for number one, Poppe's (Boppe's) *langer Ton* is identical with Mügling's *langer Ton*, and in MS Dresden M 195 is listed under Mügling's *Ton*;

poem number five, Regenbogen's *plaber (blauer) Ton* is identical with Frauenlob's *Ritterweis*, and in MS Dresden M 195 is listed under Frauenlob's *Weise*.

There is no dispute about the source for Sachs' drama of 1553, namely the fifteenth-century prose *Tristan*.¹³ The five *Meisterlieder* of 1551 and the one of 1553 were undoubtedly also inspired by Sachs' reading of the prose *Tristan* romance, and I would agree with earlier investigators that Sachs probably read the Worms edition of the prose romance, which, although undated, is usually identified as having appeared in 1549 or 1550.¹⁴ But at least four other, earlier, printings were available, the first published in Augsburg, 1484.¹⁵

Comparison of the contents of the prose *Tristan*, Sachs' tragedy, and his *Tristan Meisterlieder* leaves no doubt that the Sachs source is from what has been designated as the Eilhart von Oberge-Béroul group.¹⁶ Sachs did not know the classical Gottfried von Strassburg *Tristan*. However, Gottfried's continuators, Ulrich von Türheim and Heinrich von Freiberg, influenced the fifteenth-century prose romance. Unlike earlier treatments, in Sachs' poems the warning, the moral, is the dominant final note. For Sachs, the solid citizen of bourgeois Nürnberg, the love play was not the thing. Rather, a disorderly love was described in highly orderly *Meisterlieder*.

For several reasons, it seems worthwhile to reproduce the complete text of the sixth poem. First, unlike both the prose *Tristan* and Sachs' own drama, there is no Isolde of the White Hands, although Sachs had used this figure (*Tristan's* wife) in his tragedy a short time before. This omission simplifies and thereby emphasizes the fatal disorder of the lovers. Secondly, the sixth *Meisterlied* is the one which all the scholars of Arthurian romance have failed to examine along with the five in MG 12. This can only be explained by the isolation of the sixth in time and place which caused one researcher after another to overlook it. Finally, this poem very neatly summarized the attitude of Sachs the bourgeois toward illicit love. As he ended his drama of 1553:

Das stäte lieb und trew aufwachs
Im ehling stand, das wünscht Hans Sachs.

The sixth *Tristan Meisterlied* is reproduced below exactly as found in MG 13, except that three asterisks replace the scribal symbol regularly employed by Sachs to mark the end of each *Stollen* and the *Abgesang* in each of the three *Gesetze*.

In dem güelden thon Canczlers
Das ent Herr tristranz

1

Nach dem tristrant vil jare
isald die schenin kunigin
lieb het von herzen gare
auch vil groser geferlichkeit
Vmb sie erlieden het ***

Als in Carochs dem reiche
mit gifting sper verwundet in
Nampetenis schwerleiche
schickt er hin nach isalden weit
Das sie in Hailen det ***

Wan sie war wolgelert der kunst
Zw hailen vergift wunden
Zu Hant trieb sie der liebe prunst
sas in das schieff Zw stunden
Heimlich mit irr arzneye
Vnd fuer hin in Carechs das lant
Von dot zu machen freye
iren herzen lieben tristrant
Forcht weder schad noch schant ***

2

nun het tristrant mit fleise
Dem poten pefolchen das er
Auffpant ein segel weise
Wenn er die Kunigin precht herwarcz
Wo nicht solt er schwarcz sein ***

Als das schieff kam da fraget
tristran was farb der segel wer
On gfer man im da saget
Am schieff so wer der segel schwarcz
Da sanck er hin allein ***

Sprach nun ist hie main leztes ent
Vnd verkeret sein varbe
Vnd keret sich vmb zw der went
streckt sich vnd gechling starbe
in herczlichen mit leiden
So trauret alles hoffgesind
Weil ir Herr war verscheiden
All glocken leutet man geschwind
Es want man weib vnd Kind ***

3

In dem sties auch Zw lande
isald die schone Kunigin
Vnd Kam gen Hoff zo hande

hert die cleglichen mer gericht
Das Herr tristrant wer dot ***

Sie trat hin zw der pare
petruebt war ir Hercz muth vnd sin
Want ir hent rauft ir Hare
sanck nider auf sein angesicht
in groser angst vnd not ***

ir Hercz ir auch vor leid ze prach
Vnd iren gaist auf gabe
Also man sie paide dar nach
Zw sam legt in ain grabe
So sie paide dot lagen
Dar zw die piter lieb sie Zwang
war duet das sprich wort sagen
lieb sey herz laides ane fang
Es ste kurz oder lang ***

Anno salutis 1553
am 13 tag marci

Although Sachs' Tristan poems have nothing of the poetic grandeur of a Thomas or a Gottfried von Strassburg, the shoemaker-poet of Nürnberg does rightfully belong among the important poets who sing of Tristan and Isolde. He should be considered in any extensive treatment of the Tristan story.

NOTES

1. *Hans Sachs*, Vol. 12, ed. A. von Keller, Bibliothek des Litterarischen Vereins in Stuttgart, CXL (Tübingen, 1879), pp. 142-186.

2. See Reinhold Bechstein, *Tristan und Isolt in deutschen Dichtungen der Neuzeit* (Leipzig, 1876), pp. 15-34; Wolfgang Golther, *Tristan und Isolde in den Dichtungen des Mittelalters und der neuen Zeit* (Leipzig, 1907), pp. 254-258; Friedrich Ranke, *Tristan und Isold* (München, 1925), pp. 254-262.

3. See P. Merker and W. Stammler, *Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturgeschichte* (Berlin, 1931), IV, p. 62; cf. W. Stammler, *Von der Mystik zum Barock*, 2nd. rev. ed. (Stuttgart, 1950), p. 233.

4. Five poems are in MS MG 12, fol. 219^v to fol. 223^v and fol. 226^r to fol. 227^r; the sixth poem is in MS MG 13, fol. 116^r to fol. 117^r.

5. A listing of the MS copies is in *Hans Sachs*, Vol. 25, ed. E. Goetze Bibliothek des Litterarischen Vereins in Stuttgart, CCXXV (Tübingen, 1902), p. 384, under nos. 3707, 3708, 3709, 3710, 3714. The sixth poem, no. 3989, for which Goetze indicates no other copy, is listed on p. 412.

6. See the unpubl. diss. (California, Berkeley, 1948) by William A. Roecker, "Georg Hager's *Zweites Leiderbuch*, pp. 613-614.

7. On the present status of the MSS see Mary Beare, "Hans Sachs MSS. : An Account of their Discovery and Present Locations," *Modern Language Review*, LII (1957), 50-64.

8. I possess photo prints of all six Meisterlieder, obtained from MG 12 and MG 13, and I am presently engaged in preparing the complete poems for a critical edition.

9. In all the brief descriptions of narrative contents proper names have been used only where they are used in the Meisterlieder. Where such words as "queen," "maid," "dwarf," are used it implies that Sachs did not refer to the character by proper noun in the verse being described.

10. Here the love potion is to last the duration of their lives, whereas in the first Meisterlied it is to be effective for only four years. This discrepancy occurs also in Sachs' Tristan drama (see note 1, above): on p. 142, ll. 22-23, "So müstens denn durch-auss ir leben / Einander haben hertzlich lieb," but on p. 156, ll. 22-23, "So müsens einander haben lieb / Vier jar lang so in starcken trieb" and also on p. 158, ll. 33-34, "Nun müssen sie vier gantzer jar / Einander liebhaben allein."

11. Eugen Geiger, *Der Meistergesang des Hans Sachs* (Bern, 1956), pp. 34-74, has provided a convenient, although necessarily long, statistical table of Sachs' choice of *Töne* for all his Meisterlieder. Metrical analyses of the *Töne* of the Tristan poems will be provided in my critical edition of the six Meisterlieder.

12. Cf. Stammler, note 3, above.

13. See Eduard Walther, "Hans Sachsens Tragödie Tristrant und Isalde in ihrem Verhältnis zur Quelle" (München, 1902), *Progr. kgl. Luitpold-kreisrealschule*, 29 pp.

14. See Bechstein (note 2, above), pp. 17-24, and W. Golther, *Tristan und Isolde in der französischen und deutschen Dichtung des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit* (Berlin, 1929), pp. 48-49; August Closs, *Tristan und Isolt: A Poem by Gottfried von Strassburg* (Oxford, 1947), p. xxxii.

15. For the complete text of the anonymous prose Tristan see F. Pfaff, *Tristrant und Isalde: Prosaroman des fünfzehnten Jahrhunderts*, Bibliothek des Litterarischen Vereins in Stuttgart, CLII (Tübingen, 1881); see especially pp. 203-212 for the history of the various early printings.

16. See Edwin H. Zeydel, *The "Tristan and Isolde" of Gottfried von Strassburg* (Princeton, 1948), pp. 12-13, and August Closs, *Medusa's Mirror* (London, 1957), pp. 68-72.

THE *THEOLOGIA PLATONICA* IN THE RELIGIOUS THOUGHT OF THE GERMAN HUMANISTS

LEWIS W. SPITZ

In the entire range of problems associated with Renaissance humanism there is none so controversial and difficult to penetrate as that of the precise nature of the religious thought and sentiments of the period. The range of scholarly opinion is wide indeed, from Burckhardt's own reference to "religious indifference" to Toffanin's ordination of a "great lay-priesthood of the humanists." Thanks to the work of the revisionists, scholarship has moved far from the judgment of Milman in his *History of Latin Christianity*: "Between the close of this age [scholasticism], but before the birth of modern philosophy, was to come the Platonizing, half Paganizing, school of Marsilius Ficinus: the age to end in direct rebellion, in the Italian philosophers, against Christianity itself."¹ Ficino's efforts to develop a constructive theology, synthetic in character, attempting to conciliate divergent philosophies in a "great peace" is at last understood in something near its true terms. The conciliatory formula in his commentary on the *Timaeus* can now be correctly appreciated in the light of Ficino's high regard for Thomas: "The peripatetics have positive reasons, the Platonists superior reasons."² The new evaluation of the Florentine's *religio docta* has implications also for northern humanism which have not as yet been fully assessed.

The changes which Renaissance ideas underwent as they crossed the Alps offer an instructive object lesson in intellectual history. Now that the theories of the autochthonous origin and development of northern humanism have been laid to rest, there remains the task of studying more closely the nature of the Italian influence in a cultural milieu which lacked most of the antique-aesthetic elements everywhere present in the Latin homeland. The task of evaluating the cultural amalgam resulting from the combination of northern and southern influences presents a real challenge. The present study is intended to be a contribution toward the solution of one facet of the larger problem, namely, the effect of the *Theologia Platonica* on a select number of representative German humanists, who were really German men of letters who happened to write in Latin.³ It will be a kind of intellectual spectral analysis revealing the

Platonic coloration of northern humanists resulting from the dispersion of the pure white light of Florentine philosophy upon entering the northern atmosphere.

Egidio da Viterbo, who was named a cardinal in the fateful year 1517, believed that the triumph of the Platonic theology marked the return to a golden age. This faith in the validity and power of the *philosophia pia* was characteristic of the verve of the Italian Platonists. The influence of the Florentine Academy in Germany was in part a direct result of conscious zeal for the propagation of the faith, as well as of their earnest, subjective, contagious enthusiasm. The most popular Italian humanists among their German counterparts, in fact, were Valla, Ficino, Pico, and Baptista Mantuanus, possibly in that order. One reason for the sympathetic hearing accorded Ficino was his high regard for the ultramontanes, in contrast to the pose of superiority adopted by Poggio, Antonio Campano, or Aeneas Silvius.

Ficino maintained many personal contacts with German men of letters. In Florence he played host to a good many of the German savants on their *Italienische Reise*, a tradition of medieval standing. In March, 1482, for example, he welcomed the learned retinue of Duke Eberhard of Wuerttemberg including Ludwig Vergenhaus, Matthias Preninger, Gabriel Biel, and Johannes Reuchlin. Ficino carried on an extensive correspondence particularly with Preninger, a noted canon lawyer, and also wrote to Vergenhaus and Reuchlin.⁴ Though he informed the minor German humanist Martin Uranius in 1492, who had asked him for a list of his students, that properly speaking he had no students, only Socratic *confabulatores* and younger auditors, the Germans recommended to him many young men aspiring to Greek learning *et dona ferentes*.⁵ In Basel Paulus Nivius, the "German Filelfo," expounded on Ficino's writings. Konrad Pellican, the pioneer Hebraist, was inspired both by Ficino's and Pico's writings. Both Froben and Amerbach published various works of Ficino. In Augsburg Georg Herivart always cherished the memory of his visit with Ficino in Florence and commemorated the day he learned to know him. The list of Germans who knew Ficino and Pico, read their works, or were influenced at least indirectly by them might be extended to great length to include such lesser humanists as Nicolaus Gerbellius or Nicolaus Ellenbogen, the Benedictine prior who assembled an anthology of passages from Plato, and more

illustrious figures as Konrad Peutinger, Mutianus Rufus, Conrad Celtis, Willibald Pirckheimer, Albrecht Dürer, Beatus Rhenanus, Trithemius, Agrippa of Nettesheim, and many leading reformers such as Zwingli as well.

It would be pretentious indeed to undertake to discuss in brief compass the impact of all phases of the *Theologia Platonica* on the entire humanist movement. Prudence would dictate a more modest course. To that end it will be necessary first to epitomize the key ideas of the Platonic theology and then to examine the role these ideas played in the thought of a few representative German humanists. The *sedes doctrinae* are, of course, Ficino's *Theologia Platonica*, *De religione christiana*, and in a more literary philosophical garb, the *Commentarium in convivium platonis de amore*.⁶ Pico's popularity in the North was perhaps due to the appeal of that theme in his writings to which he intended to give full expression in the *De concordia Platonis et Aristotelis*, a hope never realized. For Pico's humanist-scholastic synthesis was sure to find a sympathetic response wherever the *viae*, especially realism, still showed some vitality. His famous letter to Ermolao Barbaro, June 5, 1485, defending scholastic philosophy, would have found many sympathetic recipients in the North.

Ficino, an ordained priest, considered himself a fisher of men like Peter, using the Platonic philosophy to catch especially the intellectuals. The apologetic goal determined to a large degree the structure of his theosophy. He was interested in exploiting the Platonic and Neoplatonic philosophies in the interest of a constructive theology. In one passage he has Plato say to Plotinus, "This is my beloved son in whom I am well pleased." But Ficino read Plotinus, whose *Enneads* and other works he knew well, as translator and editor, to a degree through the eyes of Dionysius the Areopagite, as had the long medieval tradition before him. The result was not a lifeless repristination of the thought of Pletho, Dionysius, Plotinus, or Plato, but Ficino's own system tuned to the needs of his time. Certain features of his thought are particularly characteristic and readily identifiable.

The *religio docta* presupposed an epistemology of poesy and faith. Divine poetry provides a veil for the true religion. Formally Ficino's theory of knowledge was premised on Plato's doctrine of innate ideas. In the religious area Ficino tended to the rhapsodic and mystical. True poesy is theology encompassing

more than can be included in a precise intellectual formula. "I certainly prefer to believe by divine inspiration," wrote Ficino, "than to know in human fashion." It is interesting to discover that the term *sola fide* was a favorite expression of Ficino's, though with it he meant essentially merely a tool for the apprehension of trans-empirical reality, and not Luther's faith that moves mountains. True religion is identified closely with wisdom and is not coterminous with Judaeo-Christian revelation. Truth is revealed in many forms and wisdom has been transmitted through a long tradition from the ancient philosophers. All the elements of this *prisca gentilium theologia* are to be found in Plato and the Platonic tradition. The border between revealed truth and inspired wisdom was quite indistinct in the *philosophia pia*. It might even appear from the arguments that the Christian faith found authority in its wisdom rather than the reverse. There is, then, clearly a tendency discernible toward a syncretistic universalism.⁸

Basic to the cosmology and anthropology of the Florentine Platonists was their conception of the hierarchy of being. The basic concept is that of God as the ultimate unity of all things. Plotinus, building on Philo, described the "One" as the absolute and uncontradicted original essence, prior to any specific beings which imply pluralities. The relationship of the "One" embracing in itself numberless numbers to the lesser creatures is to be understood in terms of the great chain of being. There is a stepladder of bodies, qualities, soul and heavenly intelligences to the eternal "One" which marks the way of ascent to God. Man's position in the universe is a guarantee of his dignity and moral worth. Yes, God's immanence in man should lead man to trust his own divinity. The goal of life is to enjoy God (*Deo frui*) and to make this possible for men, Christ became the intermediary (the *Tò metaxú* concept) between God and man. Christ is the archetype of the perfect man serving as example. At the same time he demonstrates God's love for man, freeing the soul for the ascent to God. Here church and sacrament, priests and saints, above all Mary, play their part in the highly spiritualized understanding of dogma and ecclesiology. Some day man will enjoy God's presence without mediation.

Certain prominent threads run through the entire texture of Florentine Platonism. The light metaphysic is exploited for literal and symbolic representation. Involved in this problem

besides questions of general ontology is the notion of astral influence and Saturnine melancholy. The theory of love directing man's preferences in terms of good and evil, beautiful or displeasing, for the problem of aesthetics runs parallel to that of ethics in his thought, is intimately related to his epistemology, since it is harmony with an innate idea in man and its correspondence in quality to that unity which binds the world together, turning chaos into cosmos, which determines man's judgment. The Platonic assumption of a substantive soul involving the issue posed by the Averroists and Alexandrists of the nature of immortality is a major concern of the Florentines. These are basic themes of Ficino and his *conphilosophi* which should reappear in the assumptions of the German humanists who came under their influence.

It is common knowledge that Neoplatonism had been a major ingredient of the medieval intellectual tradition. It was important in the thought of the Dominican mystics as well as being frozen in formalized scholastic structures. The temptation for the "revisionists", therefore, is to write off the evidence of Neoplatonic influence on the thought also of the German humanists as merely a carry-over of medieval Neoplatonism. On the surface this seems plausible enough and a measure of continuity can in the course of things be assumed, particularly among those humanists who came from the Rhenish areas where mysticism was common or had been trained in the *via antiqua*. To isolate the distinctive influence of the Florentine *Theologia Platonica* requires a close examination of the particulars, therefore, since merely asserting arguments *a priori* must in the nature of the case be unrewarding. Wessel Gansfort illustrates neatly how a man who moved naturally within the traditions of medieval Platonism can not possibly be associated with the Florentine variety. A comparison of his Platonism with that of the humanists under Florentine influence reveals the differences between a late medieval reformer type and more distinctively "Renaissance" personalities.⁹

Significantly, many outstanding members of the older generation of humanists, nearer in point of time and intellectual background to the main line medieval tradition, are practically devoid of Platonic or Neoplatonic philosophy. A case in point is the "father of German humanism", Rudolf Agricola, the first man of major stature after such poet-rhetoricians as Peter Luder, Albrecht van Eyb, the old-time scholastic Konrad Sum-

menhart, or the half-literary jurist Gregor Heimburg. Agricola, like Petrarch, opposed scholasticism because its abstractions covered over the real heart of Christianity. Agricola set strict limitations to speculative knowledge and ascribed new value to example over precept as depicted by historian, poet, and rhetorician, echoing the tenets of his teacher, Battista Guarino. He is a prime example of how the basically non-speculative, practical, and moralistic aspect of the *Devotio Moderna* coincided with the corresponding emphases of his pious Italian teachers. The familiar Neoplatonic themes, medieval or Florentine, are not to be found in his thought. He illustrates what German humanism might have remained if it had not been for the impact of the Villa Careggi.¹⁰

That even a knowledge and a certain enthusiasm for the Florentine Platonists might leave a humanist's thought not greatly altered is evident from the case of Willibald Pirckheimer. He typifies the patrician-humanist with deep roots in the imperial city of Nuremberg and a distinguished family with three generations of Italian travel and education. In his twentieth year he went to Italy where he spent almost seven years, mostly at Padua and Pavia, and absorbed a variety of intellectual influences which he never succeeded in integrating into a unified philosophy.¹¹ At Padua in addition to contact with Scotism and nominalism, he learned to know Averroistic Aristotelianism. The philosophy of Platonism was represented by Giovanni di Rosellis and Gabriel Zerbus. Like the Florentines, they were interested in harmonizing Platonic and Aristotelian teaching in support of Christianity. Pirckheimer once described Ficino as "a man who was most meritorious because of his work on Plato and one worthy of eternal memory."¹² Moreover, his personal feeling toward Pico developed out of his friendship with Pico's nephew, Francesco. Pirckheimer's major literary efforts went into translations of Greek into Latin and both into German. For moral and metaphysical edification he translated the pseudo-dialogues *Axiochum* and *Clitiphon*, in the manner of Ficino, he observed. He also did the *De Justo*, *Eryxias*, *Num virtus doceri possit*, *Demodocus*, *Sisyphus*, and *Definitiones*, as well as a translation of Proclus' *Sphaera*. He gave preference in his translating to Plato and Plutarch, who, he asserted, had not wandered far from the path of truth, but also did many of the church fathers, church history, and education. The true theologian, Pirckheimer declared in the letter to

Lorenz Behaim preceding his edition of Lucian's *Piscator seu Reviviscentes*, must have studied the divine philosophy of Plato, to whom the palm must go. In 1511 at Maximilian's request Pirckheimer translated the *Hieroglyphica* of Horapollon which had intrigued Ficino and which Pico had exploited for his theosophical speculation. Pirckheimer associated them with the Christian moral teaching of the basic virtues. The wind-up is there, but one looks in vain for the follow-through, a distinctively Neoplatonic or at least mystical pitch in his religious philosophy. The fact is that Pirckheimer was much more conservative in his religious thought than he has generally been portrayed and much less imaginative in exploiting Platonism in the interest of Christianity than might be expected. For the grand superstructure of the *Theologia Platonica* one looks in vain in the works of Wilibald Pirckheimer, who complained all his life about how official public duties prevented his full devotion to thought and letters.

The three leading humanists who best illustrate the positive and varied effect of Florentine Platonism on religious thought are Mutian, Celtis, and Reuchlin. Mutian, the prince of the Erfurt humanists, ranked with Luther, Erasmus, and Reuchlin in the opinion of Crotus Rubeanus and the younger humanists. Educated in Deventer, Erfurt, and Italy in the essentials of the *devotio moderna*, the intricacies of the *via moderna*, and the wisdom of the *philosophia platonica*, he absorbed in one mind the impress of three major intellectual systems. In addition to contact with the medieval Neoplatonic constructs through his encounter, for example, with Johann Wesel, strongly under the influence of Wesel Gansfort, he was deeply impressed by the Florentine Platonists during his long stay in the home of the Renaissance.¹³ Mutian's ambition was to transcend literary humanism to the level of philosophy. While Agricola, as a philologist-rhetorician, had a predilection for Cicero, Petrarch, and Quintilian, Mutian preferred Plato, the *philosophus sanctus*.¹⁴ His ideas everywhere reveal the philosophical marks of Florentine Neoplatonism. Very different in personality traits from the tentative, reflective Mutian was that gregarious propagandizer of humanism in the North, Conrad Celtis, the German arch-humanist.¹⁵ He best illustrates the potential contribution of poetic culture for the Renaissance of Christendom. He learned to know Ficino personally in Florence, where at the time Ficino was working on his *De vita triplici*, that "diatetic

of the Saturnine man." There Celtis met at first hand a philosophy closely attuned to his poetic spirit. He was himself only a dilettante in philosophy, as a glance at the disparate list of titles which he edited makes plain. But the poetic theosophy of Neoplatonism appealed very strongly to his aesthetic nature.¹⁶ Reuchlin's Neoplatonism came through various channels. Melanchthon in an oration in honor of Reuchlin recalled that he had at first used the Greek works collected by Nicolas Cusanus in Basel.¹⁷ On his first visit to Florence he had met Ficino (1482), on his second, Pico (1490), and was deeply impressed by both. Ficino had urged Hebrew as a most important source and element of wisdom. But from Pico Reuchlin acquired his interest in Cabalism, for in his *Conclusiones* and *Apologia* Pico had advanced the idea that the Cabala provided sure support for Christian dogma and the divinity of Christ. In his *Heptaplus* Pico pointed to the parallel between Pythagorean theosophy and Cabalism. Reuchlin, sharing Ficino's notion that Greek philosophy was derived from the wisdom of Moses and the Hebrews, believed that Pythagoreanism had developed out of oriental philosophy in great antiquity. On such a premise he could easily conclude that Pythagoreanism corresponded to the tradition of the Jewish Cabalists. He determined to exploit the Cabala in the interest of Christian apologetics. But the medieval Cabala was itself steeped in Neoplatonic lore and indeed shared its basic structure. In his early period and in his first philosophical work, *De verbo mirifico* (1494), before he had mastered Cabalism, Reuchlin's Platonic amalgam was basically medieval and Florentine. In his major work, *De arte cabalistica* (1517), his Platonism was structured more extensively on the pattern of Cabalism. For Reuchlin was conscious of the special role he was to play in intellectual history, when he wrote: "Marsilio [Ficino] brought forth Plato for Italy; Lefèvre d'Étaples restored Aristotle to France; and I shall complete the number, for I, Capnion, shall show to the Germans Pythagoras reborn through me."¹⁸

The shift in Florentine thought from a literal exegesis and the *nuda veritas* of the dogmatic traditions to an epistemology of poesy and faith and a consistent "spiritualization" of the theological heritage was reflected also in the poetic-symbolic approach to religious concepts of Mutian, Celtis, and Reuchlin. Mutian's wisdom ideal tended toward the spiritualization of the Hebraic-Christian inheritance. He once suggested, for example, that the spiritual nativity of Christ took place before all ages

so that Christ as the true wisdom of God was with the Jews, the Greeks, the Italians, and even the Germans, though they celebrated their religions with different rituals and had various priesthoods.¹⁹ Mutian was as critical of the formal sacramentalism as of the sacerdotalism of the late medieval period. He protested strongly against mere outward ceremonies and the dependence upon sacramental efficaciousness *ex opere operato*. The tone of his criticisms of fasts, rote prayers, veneration of relics, benefice seeking, abuse of the office of the keys as a power instrument and control device, and similar strictures against the church is similar to that of many late medieval critics and rebels but in some cases seems to have been inspired not so much by moral indignation as by a philosophical consideration that viewed the spiritual meaning as the essence and the outward act as a thing of tertiary importance. Mutian found the essence of the Eucharist not in corporeal transubstantiation but in love. Like Ficino, who may have first used the phrase "Platonic love", Mutian urged the universal validity of the law of love and grew rhapsodic over the theme of love as the eternal law and the basic reality in this "great and most beautiful and best arranged world." He protested the externalization and vulgarization of spiritual meaning and emphasized subjective personal responsibility against the objectivization of religion within the institutionalized framework.²⁰ Celtis, too, when not in a skeptical mood, urged the spiritualization of the sacramental system and of formalized ecclesiastical dogma.. He struck near the heart of the medieval sacramental-sacerdotal system with his jibes at the gross interpretations of transubstantiation. Some of his demurers against the externalization and formalization of dogma seem to suggest that he did not feel bound by the inner dogma of the church, though in reality he held the spiritual essence of the faith to the end.²¹ Similarly Reuchlin, though he was himself a poor poet and was least in his element when rhapsodizing on light, love, and beauty, much preferred the poetic approach to theology of the Platonists to the syllogistic aridity of those scholastics uninspired by Platonism. His epistemology was precisely the Neoplatonic formula with its familiar theory of innate ideas and process of illumination.²² Only knowledge reinforced by faith is certain knowledge.²³ Like Ficino, he frequently used the phrase *sola fide* in an epistemological sense. His was preeminently a *philosophia*

supernaturalis in which faith was both a tool for knowledge and the elixir of eternal life.

The tendency toward a syncretistic universalism in the *philosophia pia* is in evidence also in the thought of Mutian, Celtis, and Reuchlin. Mutian's wisdom ideal combined with his spiritualization of the Hebraic-Christian inheritance and stress on moral influence over the vicarious atonement implied a universalistic element reducing the uniqueness of Christianity. Mutian discovered the basic moral imperative in various traditions. He wrote: "Moses, Plato, Christ taught it. This is present in our hearts."²⁴ He believed that although Christ had most fully revealed natural moral law, it was partially set forth by Draco, Solon, Lycurgus, Moses, Plato, Pythagoras, the decemvirs and similar law givers.²⁵ He concluded that the higher religions viewed morality rather than ceremony as the essence of true religion. He cited from the Alcoran the saying: "Who prays to the eternal God and lives virtuously, he may be a Jew, Christian, or a Saracen, he receives the grace of God and salvation." "Therefore," he asserted, "he is religious, right living, pious, who has a pure heart. All else is smoke."²⁶ Mutian derived a substantial measure of his universalism from his strong sense of God's immanence and the activity of the Spirit inspiring men to wisdom and virtue. Ficino had based the historical claim to validity upon the Alexandrine myth that theological truths before Christ were derived from the Hebrew revelation. It is reflected as well in Pico's idea of the unity of truth which presupposed a syncretism of philosophical and religious truths. Celtis, too, learned from the *theologia prisca* that the philosophers and poets of old had achieved a proper harmony of nature and grace. Like Mutian, he regularly substituted classic names and phrases for Christian. In his *Carmen saeculare* he addressed God as an abscondite Being and in various odes revealed a surprising development toward universal theism.²⁷ Celtis' projected work, the *Parnassus biceps*, harmonizing the views of poets and theologians was reminiscent of the apologetic motif of the Florentines. As in Ficino's case, Reuchlin derived a tendency toward religious universalism from the exploitation of a wide variety of non-Christian sources of wisdom, in line with Pico's suggestion in the *Heptaplus* that the cabalists and Pythagoreans shared a common fund of wisdom.

The characteristic marks of the theology proper of Mutian,

Celtis, and Reuchlin indicate affiliation with Florentine thought rather than mere analogy. Mutian's conception of God as a dynamic Spirit, a *deus vivus*, in and with all life and being, followed Ficino's reformulation of theological ontology of Aristotelian scholasticism.²⁸ Similarly Mutian's image of Christ as the intermediary was a reflection of Ficino's. Christ's true significance lay in his spiritual qualities, for he descended from heaven as righteousness, peace, and joy. Mutian privately went so far as to approximate the ancient Docetic heresy in his abnegation of the human nature of Christ and the veneration of his earthly relics.²⁹ The poet Celtis was as mercurial theologically as he was temperamentally. On one level he stood securely on the formal dogmatic definitions. He died in the arms of the church and was laid to rest with due honors. In his poetry, however, he often reflected his immediate source of inspiration, Apuleius, Macrobius, Lucretius, Ovid, or Boccaccio. In one passage fate like a blind goddess strides across the earth. In another, man's fate rests securely in God's hands. Doubtless these wild vacillations reflected also his personal perplexity over questions of God's nature, his concern for the universe, or a deistic withdrawal.³⁰ But the predominant conception of God and his relationship to man and nature corresponded in idea and tone to the views of Florentine Neoplatonism. There is the emphasis upon God's immanence, the enlivening of every part of the universe by the omnipresent Spirit, the binding power of Love, the Neoplatonic Eros, as the cosmic principle uniting God the Creator to the creature, the love to which the philosophers ascribed creative power. These expressions all leave the impression of superficiality, of being mere poetic effusions, but they also show in pale reflection the religious mystique and theological notions of the aesthetic Florentines. Reuchlin was far superior as a religious philosopher. His two major works reveal his constructive theology as basically the familiar Neoplatonic system. In the first he was concerned with demonstrating the centrality of Christ as the divine intermediary, exploiting writers from St. John to Ficino. The conception of Christ (the cabalists' Messiah) as the mediator (tò metaxú) between the abscondite God and man is central for Reuchlin. As in Ficino, Christ's revelatory role is more prominent than his redemptive action. He is the Word who illumines men and opens the last gate of understanding.³¹ In

the second work the Neoplatonic structure stands completed with a true cabalistic facade.

A strong affinity to Neoplatonic anthropology is evident in the place which Mutian, Celtis, and Reuchlin assigned to man as an intermediary being in the universe, bound by the sensate, but drawn towards God and the celestial ideals. In all three man appears as the mirror of the macrocosm, a divine reflection of God himself, a little world, a little god.³² Man's moral potential and his immortal destiny are his chief claims to glory and preeminence. The goal of man as the microcosm at the midpoint in the universe is to ascend upward to the One, Reuchlin pronounced, using the precise Neoplatonic terminology.³³ Like Ficino, he developed every available argument against Aristotle (Averroes) to prove the immortality of the soul.

Like Ficino, who viewed the world of nature with mystical sentimentality as a living organism, Mutian, Celtis, and Reuchlin hailed the earth as holy, beautiful in form, and reflecting brilliance and soul like the sun. Ficino's cosmology, the macro-microcosm, the bonds of sympathy of the upper and lower worlds, the light metaphysic reappear in them. Like Pico, both Celtis and Reuchlin were intrigued by Pythagorean number mysticism. Reuchlin discovered in the Cabala (Opus de Bere-shith) an elaborate cosmic theory which corresponded in basic outline to that of the Neoplatonists.³⁴ In the first decades of the sixteenth century representative German natural philosophers were highly receptive to the mystical teachings of Pico. Paracelsus, for example, had a strong feeling for the unity of the cosmic order penetrated by the immanent God.

Literary and civic humanism from Petrarch on had evidenced a trend against over-intellectualized and formalized religion. Many Platonic elements in the medieval heritage and many facets of preceding humanist thought pointed toward and contributed to the building up of the mystical metaphysical synthesis of the Florentine Academy. The erudite and poetic spirituality of the Neoplatonic philosophy clearly responded to the religious aspirations of many men in the fifteenth century. This approach, with its frequent recourse to allegory and myth was well designed to capture the imagination and allegiance also of some *literati* in the humanist tradition in the North. Cosimo d'Medici reportedly said to the father of Ficino: "Your business is to care for our bodies, but your son has been

sent by Heaven to cure our souls." The philosophical concerns of these northerners, like those of their Italian cultural heroes, were essentially theological.

Establishing lines of influence is, of course, one of the more difficult problems in intellectual history. In this case, however, there are controls which establish a high probability for definite conclusions. It is clear that the literary humanists of the older generation like Agricola, who had a long Italian experience, even with a first-hand exposure to medieval influences and with access to such philosophers as Cusanus, did not move in the direction of a *Theologia Platonica*. A careful biographical examination, moreover, reveals that humanists like Mutian, Celtis, and Reuchlin showed no serious inclination toward Platonic theology prior to their first contacts with the Florentines in their persons and writings. Finally, their contemporaries like the great Erasmus, who had direct contact with the medieval piety and thought of the *devotio moderna* and the *via antiqua*, but only indirectly and at a maturer age with the world of Neoplatonic speculation, did not show the same understanding of or enthusiasm for the *Theologia Platonica*. Erasmus' primary contact with the Florentine Academy had had been through Colet and Oxford, where his theological interests received a new orientation. The author of the *Enchiridion* knew Pico's works, but basically retained only his ideas about the dignity of man, detaching them from the metaphysical system in which they were imbedded. Even these faded away into the peculiar amalgam of his own *philosophia Christi*. Valla was his true inspiration.³⁵

In Mutian, Celtis, and Reuchlin the presence of the *Theologia Platonica* in varying degrees is unmistakable. There is the greater inwardness and individualism, the spiritualization of the sacramental system, the emphasis on wisdom (*sapientia*) and the attendant universalism, as well as the distinctive Neoplatonic nexus of ideas and characteristic terminology in the areas of theology, anthropology, and cosmology. These northerners, who were selfconsciously the *conphilosophi* of the Florentines, failed to produce a closed system of philosophy which could be reproduced as such at any time in a later age. In fact, the lack of such a system is exactly one of the major differences between Renaissance thought in general and the closed quality of scholastic philosophy.

The philosophical conceptions of the German humanists

were not merely repetitions of a received tradition, but were expressions of a living intellectual response to challenging novel ideas. Agricola was typical of the literary humanists with a long Italian experience, but under no Neoplatonic influence of the Florentine type. Pirckheimer scarcely appropriate Florentine ideas into an integrated philosophy, remaining very much intellectually what he was socially, a conservative patrician. To assert that in view of the Christian apologetic aim of the Florentines the Italian Neoplatonic influence was basically Christian in nature and fused harmoniously with northern piety would yield a pat revisionist solution and the case would be closed. But even the present small sampling suggests that in the case of Mutian and Celtis the heady ideas and broader horizons of the Florentine philosophy served to upset their religious equilibrium and proved to be more disturbing than reassuring. Reuchlin alone had the mental stamina not only to take the Florentines' measure but to go beyond them into a new area of thought toward which they had, to be sure, pointed. There can in any event be no talk of sterile formalism or of northerners as mere epigoni. Ficino was said to have appeared after his death to his student Michael Mercatus to bring him news of the other world. "O Michael, O Michael, vera, vera sunt illa!" he intoned. If only he could add an authoritative affirmation also to this present analysis!

NOTES

1. Henry Hart Milman, *History of Latin Christianity*, VIII (New York, 1871), 287. Credit is due above all to Paul Oskar Kristeller for his careful technical analysis of Ficino's thought, *The Philosophy of Marsilio Ficino* (New York, 1943), and for his various studies seeking to put Florentine Platonism in its proper place in relationship to its philosophic antecedents and to literary and civic humanism, "Florentine Platonism and Its Relations with Humanism and Scholasticism," *Church History*, VIII (1939), 201ff.; "Humanism and Scholasticism in Renaissance Thought," *Byzantion*, XVII (1945), 346ff.; "Diacetto and Florentine Platonism in the Sixteenth Century," *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, IV (1946), and other articles. A sprightly essay defining Pico's dependence upon scholasticism is Avery Dulles, *Princeps Concordiae: Pico della Mirandola and the Scholastic Tradition* (Cambridge, Mass., 1941), revealing a positive correlation drawn already by Leon Dorez and Louis Thuasne, *Pic de la Mirandole en France* (Paris, 1897). Dr. John Kunstmann contributed to my initial interest in German humanism with a lecture which he delivered on Niklas von Wyle at the University of Chicago many years ago.

2. *Opera*, II, 1438, cited in André Chastel, *Marsile Ficin et l'Art* (Geneva, 1954), 15. The most recent study of this general problem is Michael Seidlmayer, "Religiö-ethische Probleme des Italienischen Humanismus," *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift*, N.F. VIII (1958),

105-126. I am grateful to Dr. Hans Baron for drawing this article to my attention. For detailed bibliography on this whole question, cf. Carlo Angelieri, *Il Problema Religioso de Rinascimento. Storia della critica e bibliografia* (Florence, 1952), especially 178ff.

3. Hans Baron, "Zur Frage des Ursprungs des deutschen Humanismus und seiner religiösen Reformbestrebungen," *Historische Zeitschrift*, CXXXII (1925), 446, called for a study which would isolate a number of cultural types and thereby clarify more concretely the nature of northern humanism, a program still not realized.

4. Henri Johan Hak, *Marsilio Ficino* (Amsterdam, 1934), 143-153, gives details on the many personal contacts of Ficino with the Germans.

5. A. Chastel, *op. cit.*, 24.

6. Sears Jayne, *Marsilio Ficino's Commentary on Plato's Symposium, University of Missouri Studies*, XIX, no. 1 (Columbia, 1944), 24, argues that the *Commentary* was intended to epitomize Ficino's whole philosophy. Eugenio Garin, *Der italienische Humanismus* (Bern, 1947), 105ff., contains an excellent statement of some of Ficino's basic tenets, though he makes no effort at completeness.

7. *Epistolae, liber V*, fol. 783: "Ego certe malo divine credere, quam humane scire." For a high idealist interpretation of the *religio docta*, cf. Giuseppe Saitta, *Il Pensiero Italiano nell' Umanesimo e nel Rinascimento*, I (Bologna, 1949), 509ff., "La Filosofia di Marsilio Ficino," especially 514ff.

8. Ivan Pusino, "Ficinos und Picos religiös-philosophische Anschauungen," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, XLIV, N.F. VII (1925), 504ff., stresses the universalist element in Florentine Neoplatonism. Cf. *Marsilio Ficini Florentini, insignis Philosophi Platonici, Medici atque Theologi clarissimi, Opera*, etc. (Basel, n.d.), 98: "Unity, truth, goodness are the same, and beyond these there is nothing" (*Theologia Platonica*, 79ff.).

9. Gerhard Ritter, "Romantische und revolutionär Elemente in der deutschen Theologie am Vorabend der Reformation," *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte*, V (1927), 342-380, especially 373.

10. Cf. J. Lindeboom, *Het bijbelsch Humanisme in Nederland* (Leiden, 1913), 58ff., observes that Agricola never belonged to Ficino's circle. The association of Agricola with the promotion of Neoplatonism is a common error in the general literature, as, for example, L. Häusser, *Geschichte der Rheinischen Pfalz* (Heidelberg, 1845), I, 437: ". . . auch bei Agricola wird die neuerblühte antike Philosophie, jener florentinische Platonismus . . . hineingezogen." A complete biography of Agricola is that of H. E. J. M. van der Velden, *Rodolphus Agricola (Roelof Huusman) een nederlandsch Humanist der vijftiende Eeuw* (Leiden, 1911). Melancthon already reported Agricola's constant preoccupation with Aristotle, *Corpus Reformatorum*, XI, col. 443.

11. Hans Rupprich, "Willibald Pirckheimer. Beiträge zu einer Wesensfassung," *Schweizer Beiträge zur Allgemeinen Geschichte*, XV (1957), 64-110, gives a precise detailed account of Pirckheimer's travels, studies, and literary activities. He concludes that Pirckheimer was basically far more conservative than has been traditionally held. Yet C. J. Burckhardt "Willibald Pirckheimer," *Neue Schweizer Rundschau*, N.F. IV (1936/37), 577ff., depicts Pirckheimer as a bird of paradise in the conservative Nuremberg upper bourgeoisie. The completion of the definitive edition of Pirckheimer's correspondence is a boon to Pirckheimer scholarship, *Willibald Pirckheimers Briefwechsel*, I (Munich, 1940), A. Reimann and Emil Reicke, eds., II (Munich, 1956), Siegfried Reicke and Wilhelm Volkert, eds. For his works we are still dependent upon the old Melchior Goldast, ed. *Bilibaldi Pirckheimeri Opera* (Frankfort, 1610).

12. Letter to Bernhard Adelman, Sept. 1, 1521, Goldast, ed., *Opera*, 234. Cf. Exkurs III: Pirckheimer und Marsilius Ficinus. Einflüsse auf Dürers Melancholie. Zu P'S Aufenthalt in Rom, E. Reicke, ed., *Pirck-*

heimers *Briefwechsel*, I, 10f. On May 29, 1517, Adelman wrote to Pirckheimer: "That your father ascribed great significance to Marsilius you know perhaps best of all." Pirckheimer had from his father Ficino's Plato translation and the manuscript translation of *Pymander*, Hermes Trismegistus' work on the power and wisdom of God. Cf. *Pirckheimers Briefwechsel*, I, ep. 1, p. 1: "Opus Marsilii Ficini affinis dedi, qui id se transmissuros dixerunt. Theologiam Marsilii seu Platonis non reperio." A Vienna manuscript which Pirckheimer wrote himself in Italy contains a letter from Ficino in 1472 and his *Commentarium in conviviam Platonis de Amore*, Nationalbibliothek Handschriftensammlung, *Bibl. Pal. Vind.*, Codex 12466.

13. Cf. Carl Krause, *Der Briefwechsel des Mutianus Rufus* (Kassel, 1885), ep. 85, p. 93; ep. 137, p. 175; ep. 392, p. 460; ep. 548, p. 616; ep. 557, p. 626; ep. 311, p. 385. "At quoniam sine sacris et Christo philosopharis, stulto stultior esse et ab academia Platonisque meis aberrare videris neque nostrae Musae Congruis."

14. *Ibid.*, ep. 233, p. 289.

15. For an account of Celtis, cf. my biography, *Conrad Celtis the German Arch-Humanist* (Cambridge, Mass., 1957), especially pp. 106ff.

16. Celtis criticized the scholastics sharply for not knowing the divine books of Plato, *Amores* III, 10, lines 49ff.; and urged his students to the study of Plato, the Stoics, and Pythagoras. Hans Rupprich, *Der Briefwechsel des Konrad Celtis* (Munich, 1934), ep. 11, pp. 20ff., a student thanks Celtis for extending to him his "deep understanding of Plato."

17. *Corpus Reformatorum*, XI, col. 1002.

18. *De arte cabalistica in Opera omnia Ioannis Pici Mirandulae* (Basel, 1557), 734.

19. Carl Krause, *op. cit.*, ep. 26, p. 32.

20. On the interpretation of the Eucharist, cf. *ibid.*, ep. 85, p. 93. See also, *ibid.*, ep. 596, p. 636; ep. 73, p. 79.

21. Cf., for example, Celtis, *Epigramme* IV, 17; *Ode* III, 15, lines 29ff.; *Ep. IV*, 23; *Amores* III, 9, lines 47ff.

22. Reuchlin, *De arte cabalistica* 739, 740, 747, 765, 782.

23. Reuchlin cites Plotinus, Porphyry, and Iamblichus on the power of God, *ibid.*, 891. On faith, cf. *De verbo mirifico* (Tübingen, 1514) fol. cviv.

24. Carl Krause, *op. cit.*, ep. 52, p. 57.

25. *Ibid.*, ep. 69, p. 75.

26. *Ibid.*, ep. 268, pp. 330f. On veneration for churchyards, cf. *ibid.*, ep. 488, p. 552.

27. Cf. *Ode* I, 16; *Ode* I, 19.

28. Carl Krause, *op. cit.*, ep. 233, p. 291; ep. 10, p. 11, etc.

29. *Ibid.*, ep. 85, pp. 93f.; ep. 27, p. 35.

30. *Amores* IV, 4, lines 89ff.; *Ode* I, 15, lines 137ff.

31. *De verbo mirifico*, fol. hvv; *De arte cabalistica*, 842.

32. Carl Krause, *op. cit.*, ep. 85, p. 94; Celtis, *Briefwechsel*, ep. 275, pp. 494ff., lines 121ff.; ep. 101, pp. 165ff., line 22; *De verbo mirifico*, fol. dv: . . . homo migret in deum et deus habitet in homine; fol. biiii, *Est deus in nobis*, a phrase taken from Ovid; *De arte cabalistica*, pp. 738f., 740, 773, 820.

33. *De arte cabalistica*, 874.

34. On cosmology, cf. *Marsilii Ficini . . . Opera*, 1082; Carl Krause, *op. cit.*, ep. 25, p. 28; ep. 488, pp. 551ff.; ep. 75, p. 80; Celtis, *Amores* I, 11, lines 49ff.; *Amores* IV, 14, lines 29f.; *Ode* I, 29. In his *De vita coelitus comparanda*, Ficino urged people to remain in the free heaven, in high and pleasant places, so that the stars' rays might work on them without interference.

35. Cf. Augustin Renaudet, *Érasme et L'Italie* (Geneva, 1954), 7, and the superb studies by the same author, *Érasme, sa pensée religieuse et son action, d'après sa correspondance* (1518-1521) (Paris, 1926); *Études érasmiennes (1521-1529)* (Paris, 1939). Louis Bouyer, *Autour D'Érasme* (Paris, 1955) has more recently argued for Erasmus' consistent orthodoxy.

ON THE SOURCE OF AN ENGLISH THUNDER-TREATISE OF THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY

THEODORE SILVERSTEIN

Among the miscellaneous works, of folk or other association, gathered together in *MS 775* of the Pierpont Morgan Library, Curt Bühler has described a previously unnoted brontological treatise written in English in a hand of the late fifteenth century.¹ A prognostication according to the signs of the zodiac, it is in itself rather novel among English thunder-books and, besides, represents a type not printed, though referred to, among the various tracts on astrological prediction collected by Max Förster.²

Its source, according to Bühler,³ is probably to be found in the Latin *Summa astrologiae judicialis* by the fourteenth-century astrologer John of Eschenden, known also as Joannes Eschuid and John Eastwood.⁴ A comparison of the relevant parts of both works amply proves their similarity.⁵

But need this also mean that the Morgan text is actually based on Eschenden's? The fact is that the *Summa* is here embodying a brontological piece which was already known during the twelfth century, as is witnessed by a manuscript of that date, *Hertensis 192*, where, in a miscellany of medicine, charms and prognostications of different origins, it appears as an independent work entitled simply *Dicta cuiusdam*.⁶ An excerpt will show the character of its contents:

Si in a[rrietem] intonauerit . luna flagellabitur et herbę habundabunt . et angustia erit filiis homminus. . . . Si in taurum. . . Si in aquarium . pluuię magne erunt et error erit in filiis hominum . et uentus qui eo anno uenerit portabit tussim filiis hominum et scabiem . et una pars hominum incipiunt contendere . et illa contentio magna erit in seculo.⁷

Now this is evidently the work which lies behind Eschenden's passage, but it is not the direct source. For Eschenden himself tells us what he drew on: *hermes trimegistus libro quarto, capitulo 3. et leopoldus in libro suo tractatu sexto*.⁸ Leopoldus is, of course, the thirteenth-century astronomer called Leupoldus or Lippoldus *ducatus Austrie filius*, and the author of *Compilatio de astrorum scientia* (written perhaps ca. 1271⁹), the sixth tract of which, 'De mutatione aeris,' contains a section very like that of the *Summa*.¹⁰ But Bühler was unable to find the passage referred to in the works of Hermes Trismegistus.¹¹

It can, however, be precisely located. The book in question is the pseudo-Hermetic *De vi principiis rerum*, a curious cento-like *libellus* probably written in the mid- or later twelfth century.¹² In its Fourth Part occurs a section, "Quod tonitrua in diversis signis diversa significant," based on some form of what *MS Hertensis* calls the *Dicta cuiusdam*¹³ and in language very close to that reproduced by Eschenden:

*De vi princ.*¹⁴

In quocunque¹⁶ signo tonuerit¹⁷ siue in die siue in nocte quicquid notauerit eodem anno uerum erit¹⁸ nisi alter tonitruus in .ii⁰ . signo ab eo uenerit et tunc prioris nota peribit. Si in Ariete tonuerit¹⁹ herbe habundabunt, angustia filiis hominum ueniet,²⁰ quadrupedia multiplicabuntur, bestie agri minorabuntur.²¹ Si in Tauro tonuerit²² annonae montium prosperabuntur, in ualle deficiet et uinum, bestie agri multiplicabuntur. Si in Geminis pluuiarum habundancia erit et grandinum,²³ frumenta multiplicabuntur et legumina,²⁴ lanigere pauca, reptilia multa. Si in Cancro fames et commocio hominum,²⁵ locuste fructus terre²⁶ uastabunt. Si in Leone sedicio erit²⁷ inter regnum et regnum,²⁸ annona cara in principio, uilis in nouissimo, populi sedicio, morietur magnus homo. Si in Virgine lupi²⁹ hominibus insidiabuntur, quadrupedia morientur. Si in Libra siccitas erit³⁰ in ualle, in principio³¹ anni descendunt pluuiæ, annona cara in fine.³² Si in Scorpione racemi pauci, oleum³³ uile, marini³⁴ pisces morientur et pecudes,³⁵ femine abortiuos³⁶ facient, uenti magni erunt, Luna in oriente obfuscabitur.³⁷ Si in Sagittario pluuiæ erunt congrue, fructus arborum cadent, serui regibus preliabuntur. Si in Capricorno multe gentes dispergentur, magna pestis in filiis hominum et³⁸ mortalitas per totum

*Summa*¹⁵

in quocunque signo tonuerit siue in die siue in nocte. unum [= uerum] erit quicquid notauerit anno eodem nisi alter tonitruus in secundo signo ab eo uenerit et tunc prioris non peribunt. Si in Ariete tonuerit herbae habundabunt: angustia erit in filiis hominum quadrupedia multiplicabuntur. Sed bestiae agri minorabuntur. Si in tauro tonuerit annonae montium prosperabuntur et in uallibus deficiet uinum et bestiae agri multiplicabuntur. Si in geminis pluuiarum et grandinum copia erit. et fulmina [sic = frumenta] legumina habundabunt lanigeræ paucae et reptilia multa. Si in cancro erit fames hominum et commotio: locuste quoque fructus terrae uastabunt. Si in leone seditio erit inter regna: annona cara in principio in fine et erit populi seditio et morietur aliquis magnus homo in fine anni. Si in uirgine ferae bestiae hominibus insidiabuntur quadrupedia morientur. Si in libra siccitas erit in ualle in principio anni: deinde descendunt pluuiæ et erit annona cara in fine anni.³² Si in scorpione racemi erunt pauci: oleum uile: pisces et pecudes morientur foemine abortiuos faciunt. uenti magni erunt clima [sic = luna] ab oriente obfuscabitur. Si in Sagittario pluuiæ erunt congruae: fructus arborum cadent: serui regum praeliabuntur. Si in capricorno multae gentes disper-

seculum.³⁹ Si in Aquario pluie magne, terror filiis hominum,⁴⁰ uentus confert tussim et scabiem, et contencio⁴¹ magna in seculo. Si in Piscibus gelu et siccitas in terra, fructus terre deficient, uinum tamen habundabit, diuicie erunt in populo, homines infirmabuntur non⁴² tamen⁴³ morientur. In hiis igitur⁴⁴ canonum capitulis temporum et temporalium mutaciones quam maxime⁴⁵ considerantur.

gentur magna pestis erit in filiis hominum et mortalitas undique. Si in aquario pluuiæ magnæ erunt etiam terror in hominibus uentus infrigidet: tussis et scabies et commotio magna erit in seculo. Et si in piscibus tonuerit erit gelu et siccitas in terra et fructus terræ deficient. uinum tantum habundabit. diuitiæ erunt in populo: et homines infirmabuntur nec tamen morientur. In his ergo canonum capitulis temporum et temporalium mutaciones quam maxime considerantur.⁴⁶

The variant readings among the manuscripts of the Hermetic book are significant in a special sense for the *Summa*, as they have been found to be also for Eschenden's contemporary Bishop Bradwardine, who knew the book well.⁴⁷ For the textual tradition of the *De vi principis rerum* divides into three distinct groups or types, of which one, β , produced the codices *B* and *U*, whose readings and division of the work into parts seem to come closer than any of the others to Eschenden's text, at least as it appears in its early printed version.⁴⁸ And this is confirmed by the more extensive among the further quotations of the Hermetic book which occur throughout the *Summa*.⁴⁹ It would be pleasant, therefore, to be able to believe that Eschenden copied one of these two exemplars, both of which are English and fourteenth century; but particularly *B*, the better of the two and once the property of Dan Michael of Norgate, author of the *Agenbytt of Inwit*.⁵⁰ Unfortunately, each of these in turn is faulty at points where the *Summa* is evidently sound.⁵¹ Hence Eschenden must have read at some other copy than *B* or *U*, though one which clearly belonged to the β family.

Of this character also is the text to be found in Leopoldus (ed. 1489), who, despite a general tendency to abbreviate, sometimes represents the Hermetic readings more accurately than the *Summa* does.⁵² Yet, because of the possible separate circulation of this brontology, we cannot be certain where the *Compilatio* got it from: the Austrian astronomer fails to specify his authority.⁵³ One circumstance does exist, however, in favor of the *De vi principis*, that Leopoldus begins the entire chapter in question with a distinctive definition of *uentus* which is vir-

tually word for word in the Hermetic book: 'Item alius dicit: ventus est aer densus vsque ad offensionem tempestuosam excitatus . . .'⁵⁴ The text then continues after a short space with the thunder-book proper, which takes the following form:

Si in signo secundo a primo tonuerit significatio primi peribit. In [Ariete] si tonuerit herbe abundant: angustia erit filiis hominum: suspendia multiplicabuntur. In [Tauro] annona bona in montibus: pauca in vallibus: vinum et bestie agri multiplicabuntur. In [Geminis] pluuię erunt multe et grandines: frumentum et legumen multum aues pauce: reptilia multa. In [Cancro] fames et commotio: locuste fructus terre fastabunt. In [Leone] seditio erit inter regna: annona cara in principio: in nouissimo populi seditio: et morietur magnus homo. In [Virgine] fere hominibus insidiabuntur et quadrupedia morientur. In [Libra] siccitas in principio: in fine anni pluuię: et annona cara in fine. In [Scorpione] racemi pauci pisces et pecudes morientur femine abortient: venti erunt magni: [Luna] in oriente obscurabitur. In [Sagittario] pluuię erunt congrue: fructus arborum cadent: serui regis preliabuntur. In [Capricorno] multe gentes dispergentur: et erit magna pestilentia in filiis hominum mortalitas vndique. In [Aquario] pluuię magne: terror hominibus: ventus affert tussim et scabię: et erit commotio magna in seculo. In [Piscibus] gelu et siccitas in terra: fructus terre deficient vinum multum abundabit: diuitie erunt: homines infirmabuntur: non tamen multi morientur.⁵⁵

With this evidence in hand it is now possible to examine the English treatise in *MS Morgan 775* and determine its character more accurately. Such an examination shows, first, that it is a fairly literal translation of its original, and, second, that the original was unlike Eschenden and Leopoldus in one fundamental way: its readings followed, not those of *BU* and the β family, but those of *MSS D₁* and *D₂*, which together represents the *De vi principii rerum* in what is frequently a superior descent of texts, which may be called type *a*.⁵⁶ Since Bühler has printed the Morgan English treatise in full, it is only necessary here to set down some of those passages which demonstrate this peculiar relationship:⁵⁷

Whenne it thundreth in Ariete . . . moche desese to monkynde shall come [= *MSS D₁D₂* ueniet, *BU om.*; contrast *Summa and Compil. erit*]

Whenne it thundreth in Virgine thenne it signifyeth that *Weluus* [= *MSS D₁D₂* lupi; contrast *BU and Compil. fere, Summa ferae bestiae*] shullen doo desese to men. . . .

Whenne it thundreth [in] Scorpione . . . *ffysshes of the see* [= *MSS D₁D₂* marini pisces; *BU, Summa and Compil. om. marini*] shullen deye and beestes [= *MS D₂* morientur et pecudes; contrast *BUD₁, Summa and Compil. pisces et pecudes morientur*]

Whenne it thundreth in Capricornu . . . grete pestylence [thurz]

all the world [= MSS D_1D_2 , per totum seculum; contrast BU, *Summa and Compil.* undique]

Whenne it thundreth in Aquario . . . the wynd shall engendur the couz and the scabbe [all MSS and *Compil.* uentus confert (*B* conferet, *Compil.* affert) tussim et scabiem; contrast *Summa* uentus infrigidet: tussis et scabies . . . erit] and grete stryfe [= MSS D_1D_2 , contencio; contrast BU, *Summa and Compil.* commotio] shall be

In what signe þat eyur it thundreth . . . as it is notified it shall be soth [= MS D_2 , quicque notauerit . . . uerum erit; contrast BU and *Summa*, which change order of words; *Compil.* abbreviates]

Like the other surviving manuscripts of the *De vi principis rerum* D_2 is occasionally flawed, D_1 both flawed and 'improved,' and these imperfections occur at several points where the English treatise is better.⁵⁸ Whether this means that the writer of the Morgan text had a more correct copy of the a-type at hand or knew the brontology from an independent collection, remains in doubt. In support, perhaps, of whatever claim the Hermetic book may have is its constant association with and currency in England, especially from the late thirteenth century on.⁵⁹ But unless a study of the manuscripts of the *Summa* discloses another textual type in its transmission, Eschenden himself cannot be the source. Let us add that, whatever the source, it is plain that in the Morgan treatise we have a piece of prognostication which found a fairly considerable circulation, Latin and vernacular, during the High and Later Middle Ages.

NOTES

1. 'Astrological Prognostications in MS. 775 of the Pierpont Morgan Library,' MLN, LVI (1941), 351-55.

2. *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, CX (1903), 346-58, but especially 350-52; CXX (1908), 43-52; and CXXVII (1912), 285-91.

3. MLN, LVI, 352.

4. See Lynn Thorndike, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, III (1934), 325, which lists other forms of his name as well. For the date of the *Summa*, see p. 329.

5. Bühler, MLN, LVI, 352-54.

6. Karl Sudhoff, 'Codex medicus Hertensis (Nr. 192),' *Archiv für Geschichte der Medizin*, X (1917), 265-313. The manuscript is in two parts: fols. 1-20, ninth century; fols. 21-96, twelfth century. The piece in question, listed by Sudhoff as no. 36, is on fols. 93v-94.

7. Sudhoff, *Archiv*, p. 313.

8. *Summa*, ed. Venice: Johannes Lucilius Santritter, 1489, fol. 145v.

9. See F.J. Carmody, 'Leopold of Austria "Li Compilacions de le Science des Estoilles," books I-III,' *University of California Publications in Modern Philology*, XXXIII (1947-51), 37. Cf. Hellmann, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Meteorologie*, II, 176-79.

10. Ed. Augsburg: Erhard Ratdolt, 1489, sig.[f8]; ed. Venice: Melchior Sessa et Petrus de Ravanis socii, 1520, sig.[f6].
11. MLN, LVI, 352, n. 5.
12. Ed. in *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge*, XXII (1956), 217-302. For date see pp. 234-37.
13. The same, pp. 278-79, sent. 325-39.
14. In the footnotes to this extract which follow, is given a selection of manuscript variants interesting for the present comparison. *MS D₁*, which though early contains an "improved" text, has many additional differences not recorded here.
15. Ed. 1489, fols. 145^v-46.
16. *MS U* quoque
17. *MS U* tonet .i. sit tonitruum
18. quicquid . . . erit] *MSS BUD₁* uerum (*U* vtque) erit quicquid notauerit anno eodem (*B* eodem anno, *D₁* eodem annus)
19. *MS U* donauerit
20. ueniet] *MSS BU om.*
21. bestie agri minorabuntur] *MS B* Sed bestie etc., *MS U om.*
22. tonuerit] *MSS BU om.*
23. habundancia . . . grandinum] *MS D₁* copia erit et grandinum, *MSS BU* et grandum (*U* grandinis) copia erit
24. frumenta . . . legumina] *MSS BUD₁* frumenta et legumina habundabunt (cf. Leopoldus: frumentum et legumen multum).
25. fames . . . hominum] *MSS BU* fames hominum et commocio
26. fructus terre] *MS U om.*
27. erit] *MSS BUD₁ om.*
28. regnum et regnum] *MSS BUD₁* regna
29. lupi] *MSS BU* fere
30. erit] *MSS BU om.*
31. *MSS BUD₂* fine
32. For the entire sentence cf. Leopoldus: In [Libra] siccitas in principio: in fine anni pluuiæ: et annona cara in fine (ed. Augsburg, 1489, sig.[f8]; ed. Venice, 1520, sig.[f6]).
33. *MS B* olerum
34. marini] *MSS BU om.*
35. pisces . . . pecudes] *MSS BUD₁* pisces et pecudes morientur
36. *MS B* abortos, *MS U* aborsus
37. *MS U* obfuscabit, *MS D₂* obscurabitur (Cf. the entire clause in Leopoldus: ed. 1489, sig.[f8^v]; ed. 1520, sig. [f6]; [Luna] in oriente obscurabitur.)
38. et] *MSS BU om.*
39. per . . . seculum] *MSS BU* undique
40. filiis hominum] *MSS BU* hominibus
41. et contencio] *MS U* et commocio, *MS B* commocio
42. *MSS BU* nec
43. *MSS BU* tamen multi
44. *MS B* ergo, *MS U om.*
45. temporalium . . . maxime] *MS U* mutaciones temporalium quam multe
46. The *Summa* continues, after repeating the names of its authorities, with an excerpt from Leopoldus on thunder according to the months of the year. Cf. Leopoldus, ed. 1489, sig.[f8^v].
47. See *Archives d'hist. doctr. et litt.*, XXII, esp. 239-40.
48. The same, pp. 242-44, for the development of the Hermetic manuscripts.
49. The more important are these: *Summa*, ed. 1489, fol. 2^v = *De vi princ.*, ed *Archives*, sent. 43; fol. 89^v = sent. 221-23, 231, 512-13, 515-16, and 508-11; fol. 93^v = sent. 221-23, 512-13, and 515-16; fol. 100^v = sent. 272-73; fol. 117 = sent. 276; fol. 117^v = sent. 277; fol. 122^v = sent. 258-59

and 261-62; fol. 143 = sent. 291-95, 300-4, 308-13, and 322-24. Other references occur on fols. 143^v and 159. The citations on fols. 46^v, 47, 103^v, and 157, seem to be a different work.

50. See M.R. James, *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover* (Cambridge, Eng., 1903), pp. 328-29 and 520; and *Archives d'hist. doctr. et litt.*, XXII, 240 and 241.

51. See especially nn. 18, 22-23, 26, 30-31, 36-38, 41, and 43, above.

52. Some of the faults in the printed Eschenden are obviously scribal or compositorial, but not all of them. Unfortunately, we lack a critical study of the manuscripts and text of the *Summa*, and this is true likewise of the *Compilatio*.

53. Though Leopoldus does name, *passim*, such sources as Ptolemaeus, Aomar, Albumazar, Johannes Damascenus, and Zael ben Bischr, he is never precise as Eschenden is, and his various references to Hermes are either too general to be fixed exactly, or apparently to another work.

54. Ed. Augsburg, 1489, sig.[f7^v]; ed. Venice, 1520, [sig. f5^v]. See *De vi principis*, sentence 237, and the footnotes to *MSS BU* (ed. *Archives d'hist. doctr. et litt.*, XXII, 270): the source of the Hermetic book is Adelard of Bath, *Quaestiones naturales*, section LIX (ed. Martin Muller, in *Beiträge z. Gesch. d. Philos. u. Theol. des Mittelalt.*, XXXI.2,[1934], 55, 11. 3-4), but with differences in language favoring the *De vi principis* as Leopoldus' immediate authority: 'Est igitur ventus aer densus usque ad offensionem quidem motus.'

55. Ed. Augsburg, sig. [f8^{rv}]; ed. Venice, sig.[f6]. For special relations with *BU* or points where the *Compilatio* is superior, see above, nn. 20, 22, 28-29, 32, 34-35, 37, and 39-41.

56. *Archives d'hist. doctr. et litt.*, XXII, 242-44.

57. *MLN*, LVI, 353-55.

58. See, e.g., the section on *Libra* in all the texts; cf. above, n. 32.

59. To the evidence of such English currency already gathered together in *Archives* XXII, 238-41, should now be added the quotations *in extenso* by the treatise *De novem scientiis* in a late thirteenth- or early fourteenth-century manuscript from Meaux Abbey, at present in the University of Chicago Library. The present author is engaged in a study of this manuscript.

RUDOLPH AGRICOLA AND PETER SCHOTT

MURRAY A. and MARIAN L. COWIE

Amid the present day hue and cry about the value of the Humanities, it is perhaps salutary and good for the soul to sharpen our perspective by glancing back to another age when the cause of the Humanities for their own sake was being fought by German Humanists of the late fifteenth century against the conservative forces of Scholasticism and the Church. These Humanists, who paved the way for the triumphs of an Erasmus and Melancthon, gave not just lip service to the Humanities; they devoted their lives to furthering the study of the Humanities by editing works, writing, lecturing, correlating information and carrying on a wide correspondence.

Two such Humanists were the Frisian Rudolph Agricola¹ (1442?-1485) and the Alsatian Peter Schott² (1460-1490), both of whom held places of high esteem and authority among the scholars of their day. Each possessed an unimpeachable character, a winning personality and an irrefutable reputation for scholarship. Each belonged to the type of scholar whose greatest impact is on his contemporaries rather than on succeeding generations because his rare ability to inspire those coming in contact with him exceeds the influence he exerts through his works.

Agricola—scholar, translator, lecturer and musician—was a true peripatetic Humanist, almost constantly on the move over a territory extending from his Frisian homeland to Italy. Schott—doctor *utriusque iuris*, poet, editor and educator—did not travel about like Agricola; after nearly 6 years of study in Italy, he settled in his native Straasburg from 1481 until his untimely death in 1490. Yet he, too, through his voluminous correspondence kept in touch with scholars in many places as far removed as Italy, Flanders, Paris and Bohemia.

Both these men believed that the study of the Humanities for their own sake was of inestimable value. Schott believed further that a thorough grounding in liberal arts was essential for the study of advanced disciplines.³ Both men won respect and honor for the Humanities through their mastery of Latin and Greek, as well as through their elegant style of writing and speaking. Indeed, the examples of their lives proved that Hu-

manistic studies develop the individual into a well-balanced, cultured, harmonious personality.

That two contemporaries whose interests and characters were so similar should at some time in their lives know of one another was no doubt inevitable. They, in fact, not only knew of one another, but also exchanged letters. Unfortunately, their correspondence did not begin until 1485, the year of Agricola's death. Although Schott had, since his student days in Italy, admired the famous Agricola, he seems to have felt diffident about writing to Agricola until he was more mature and more sure of himself, for he was at least 16 years the younger.

Three items which throw light upon the relations between Agricola and Schott are contained in Schott's *Lucubratiunculae*:⁴ 2 letters from Schott to Agricola and an elegiac by Schott on the death of Agricola.⁵ Since these items are relatively inaccessible and since they are of interest to scholars in the field of German Humanism, there are below transcriptions (with the abbreviations resolved) of the original Latin texts by Schott and also of the headings added by the editor Wimpheling. Appended are English translations of the 3 items. The 2 letters have been translated as literally as possible. It seemed best, however, to render the elegiac into English elegiac verse because thereby the spirit and style of the original could be in some measure reproduced, though a prose translation would, of course, have been more literal. To make the texts more comprehensible, additional information has been made available in footnotes. For the rest, the elegant style of the original Latin—whether prose or poetry—and the content speak for themselves.⁶

Folios 36b-37b

Cupit scire *flammascat* an *flammescat* dicatur. Aliaque dubia mouet.⁷

Petrus Schottus Rodolpho agricolae: Oratori priscarum eleganciarum. Salutem plurimam dicit. Si Epistolarum genus illud est praecipuum: vt Ciceroni videtur: quo cerciores facimus absentes: si quid sit: quod eos scire: aut nostra aut ipsorum intersit:⁸ veniam mihi dabis vir doctissime qui te mihi nondum plane cognitum:⁹ his meis inepcijs adoriri non erubescam. Nam tametsi faciem tuam nunquam viderim: nec dextera dextram (ut aiunt)¹⁰ contigerim: tamen posteaquam honestissimarum arcium tuarum: quamplures et eos grauissimos testes audiui. Quin et Italos ipsos alioquin gloriam propriam exaggerare: alienam attenuare solitos: te tamen et erudicionem tuam:¹¹ incredibili

quodam peritissimorum assensu mirari et extollere: dum Ferrariae¹² tertium ante annum agerem: presens intellexi. Continuo coepi et amare te quamuis ignotum (id quod virtus efficere consuevit) et in commune gratulari Germaniae nostrae: quam sperarem tanto poliorum litterarum principe: a squalida illa et penitus radicata barbarie: aliquando auferendam liberandamque fore. Itaque et tunc libellos/ qui in manus meas venire poterant: quos tu e graecis latinos foecisti:¹³ exscribere curauisti: et vbiubi occasio preberetur: familiaritatem tuam/ quo erudicior aeuaderem: inquirendam mihi constitui. Tandem Argentinam reuersus: cum a domino Thoma Vuolfio¹⁴ iure consulto: et Adelpho Rusco:¹⁵ viris mihi singulari amicitia iunctis intellexissem: te Heidelbergae¹⁶ iam coepisse purgare et linguas iuuenum et aures: ut illae nil scelerosum balbuciant: hae vero tuis tam peritis et dulcibus aelegantiis delibatae: omnes illas sciolorum insulas et verbosas inepcias: quasi magicas incantationes declinent. Tum ego vehementer sum gauisus: et ilico meditatus: familiaritatem litteris inchoare: si forte (quod deus: ex re tua tamen: faxit) et presens conuictus accederet. Idque eo audencior egi: quo plurimum ad me ore vno perferebatur: te non tam humanitatis artes profiteri: quam ipsum omnium esse humanissimum [humanissimum]. Quia igitur argumentum quaerebam: quo te ad scribendum prouocarem: visum fuit super his tuum requirere iudicium: quae et tu promptissime doces: et ego studio singulari desidero.¹⁷ Ea licet minutissima sint: nec digna quibus doctrina tua sollicitetur: tamen quo videntur abiectiora: eo me vehemencius pudet ipsa negligere: qui sim memor eius quod Horacius mouet. Vilibus in scopis/ in mappis/ in scobe quantus Consistit sumptus? neglectis flagicium ingens.¹⁸ Primum igitur te obsecro vir litteratissime: ne te pigeat cerciorem me facere: quum in hymno quopiam canimus. Os/ lingua/ mens/ sensus/ vigor confessione personent: flammascant igne charitas. Et quae sequuntur.¹⁹ Flammascant an flammescant legendum sit? Inuenio siquidem labasco et ingrauesco.²⁰ Deinde si eam dictionem quam litterae sacrae tociens frequentant: charitatem dico graecam arbitreris an latinam?²¹ Et si graecam: qua deductione [.....] ²² deriuetur. Sin latinam dumtaxat: cur ab his qui erudiciores haberi volunt aspiretur?²³ Auctor per e scribendum sit semper?²⁴ Lachrimae et Pulcher in quo Apuleius et Seruius dissenciant: aspiracionem paciantur?²⁵ Euxenia: vel vt quidam contendunt Enxenia: idonea sint vocabula pro strenis et xenijs.²⁶ Et si quid de morticinis habes: quo accentu proferantur? Et

quam apud priscos significacionem obtinuerint?²⁷ Plura sunt alia: sed vereor obtundere. Tuum igitur erit vir doctissime: ignoscere impudenciae meae. Equidem cum te propter doctrinam maximi faciam: atque ideo mirifice daesiderem a te doceri: inductus sum: ex meo animum tuum expectare: et proinde persuadere mihi ipsi: non passurum te pro liberali ingenio tuo: hanc me spem frustrari. Sic enim habeto: si meum in hac re studium non aspernatus fueris/ fore: ut tibi tanta sim debiturus: quanta ei/ qui me beneficio supra quam dici possit grato affocerit. Vale. Date Argentina ad duodecimum kalendas Marcij. Anno a natiuitate saluatoris. M.cccc.lxxxv.

Folios 45a-45b

Litteris suis se a Febre quodammodo leuatum: gratias agit. Gaudet saluum redisse in Germaniam.

Petrus Schottus Praeclarissimo bonarum Arcium sectatori Rodolpho agricolae: amico carissimo. Salutem plurimam dicit. Agere tibi iampridem debebam ingentes gracias vir humanissime: qui me tuis tam peritis et suauius litteris²⁸ non solum aedocueris: sed eciam incredibili iucunditate affoceris. Nam ut omittam reliqua: febricitantem me forte tempestate illa:²⁹ tam vehementi gaudio affocerunt: ut quem deiectum prorsus animo: ex viribus languidum: Parentes³⁰ mei lugencium instar deflebant: exultantem protinus: subita quadam vultus festiuitate: et alacritate membrorum: non sine magna leticia mirarentur. Verum quo minus id agere tentauerim hactenus: foecit absentia tui: qui prius quam vires reciperem: Romam pecijsses.³¹ Nec nunc tamen vacat mihi id efficere: quum properet Dominus Thomas Vuolfius vir doctissimus[.] Sed neque persuadeo mihi: posthac aliquando dignas a me tibi posse agi gracias: ne referre dicam: adeo vincit acceptissimum illud tuum beneficium: omnem sermonis mei facultatem. Vtinam quandoque Argentinam nostram inuiseres: id quod te Adelphus noster Ruscus: facturum esse sepenumero confirmauit. Ita me profecto tibi officiosum agerem: ut animum tibi deditissimum facile prospiceres. Tum igitur de his coram. Caeterum quod primum esse oportebat: deo diuisque (ut Plautum imiter) ago gracias merito magnas: quum te reducem tuae patriae reddiderunt: quumque et miseris plurimis te exemerunt.³² Plangebam ego maximopere vicem tuam:³³ et patriae nostrae[.] Nunc gratulabundus saluti tuae: et vniuersae Germaniae: te obsecro et obtestor: quando deus claementissimus viuum te nobis seruauit: animum/ et beniuolenciam

in me tuam: vel litteris tuis mihi multo omnium suauissimis: conseruatam esse intelligere possim. Vale. Date Argentina ad sextum ydus Decembres. Anno. M.cccc.lxxxv.

Relatae per Dominum Thomam Vuolfium ad tercium kalendas Ianuarias. M.cccc.lxxxv. narrantem virum praestantissimum morti concessisse.³⁴

Folios 162b-163a

Petri Schotti Elegiacum³⁵ de morte Rodulphi Agricole Germani: ad Adelphum Ruscum Ciuem Argentinensem.

- 1 Ludere iam placidis meditabar Rusce camoenis:
Aptabamque meos ad tua vota pedes:
Hei mihi scribenti: pro lusu luctus³⁶ obortus.
Calliopen moestis compulit ire modis.
- 5 Dulcia nun censes me carmina promere quisse:
Quum fugiat nostrum candida Musa solum?
Quid querar? an totum nudabunt verba dolorem:
Quem vix sustineant pectora nostra pati?
O decus: O nostrae clarissima gloria terrae:
- 10 O qui Germanis vnica lima fuit.³⁷
Qui primus nobis Graiam Ausoniamque Mineruam
Vexit:³⁸ et Aonias ex Helicone Deas.³⁹
Cooperat et iuuenum scabra sartagine liguas [linguas]
Radere: et in nitidos arte polire sonos.⁴⁰
- 15 En tumulo premitur: qui se [sed] nostras quoque saecum
Ingenij vires: condere visus humo.
Post modo forte tibi nostrum deflebo Rudolfum:
Et lugubre nimis carmina mesta canent.
Sic noua plaga mihi praecordia perculit: ut iam
- 20 Scribere singultus: cordaque fracta vetent.

Folios 36b-37b

He wants to know whether he should say *flammascat* or *flammescat*. He brings up other doubtful points.⁷

Peter Schott sends cordial greetings to Rudolph Agricola, an orator of classical elegance.

If, as it seemed to Cicero, that kind of letter is preferable which we write to those who are away to inform them about something they should know either for our or their own good,⁸ you, most learned sir, will pardon me for not being ashamed to approach you, whom I do not yet really know,⁹ to ask about these absurdities of mine.

For, even if I have never seen your face nor touched your right hand with mine (as they say),¹⁰ yet after I heard a great

many witnesses—and those very eminent—to your [knowledge of the] most noble arts, nay more, after I saw in person, while in Ferrara¹² more than three years ago, that even the Italians themselves, who otherwise make a practice of exaggerating their own glory and diminishing that of a foreigner, yet agreed in a way quite incredible among experts in their admiration and praise of you and your erudition,¹¹ I began immediately not only to love you, though you are unknown to me (a situation virtue is wont to create), but also to congratulate in general our land of Germany, which I hoped with the help of so great a master in belles lettres might now at last be diverted and freed from its rude and deeply rooted barbarism. And so at that time I not only made a point of copying such little books of your translations from Greek to Latin¹³ as I could lay my hands on, but I also determined, wherever an opportunity was presented, to seek your friendship so that I might further my education.

When I had finally returned to Strassburg and learned from Dominus Thomas Wolf,¹⁴ the lawyer, and from Adolph Rusch,¹⁵ men bound to me in singularly close friendship, that you had already begun in Heidelberg¹⁶ both to clean the tongues and to wash out the ears of our young men so that their tongues stammer nothing abominable and their ears—delighted by your highly cultured and charming elegance—avoid all the old awkward and verbose absurdities as though avoiding magical enchantments, [when I learned this, I say,] I was overjoyed and thought then and there of initiating a friendship by letter with the hope that this might even lead to my meeting you in person (God grant, however, such a contact might be to your advantage). And this idea I pursued all the more boldly, the more it was unanimously reported to me that you do not so much profess the humanities, as that you are yourself the most humane of all.

Therefore, because I was casting about for a subject with which I might tempt you to write, it seemed proper to ask your opinion on these points which you can not only explain with the greatest of ease, but which I am also singularly eager to have clarified.¹⁷ Although they may be very small points and not worth that [one of] your learning be bothered about them, yet the more trivial they seem, the more deeply ashamed I feel in neglecting them because I am mindful of Horace's scruples: "In trays, in mats, in sawdust, [that are so] cheap, what great expense can there be? But, if they are neglected, it is a heinous shame."¹⁸

First, therefore, I beseech you, who are so very well versed in literary studies, be good enough to inform me [about the following]. When we sing in connection with any hymn: "Let lips, tongue, mind, feelings, strength cry out in confession; let love be inflamed with fire," and what follows,¹⁹ should *flamma-scat* or *flammescat* be read? Since, indeed, I find *labasco* and *in-gravesco*.²⁰

Next, [please let me know], if you consider the above word which is repeated over and over in sacred scriptures, namely *charitas* [love], to be Greek or Latin?²¹ And if it be Greek, how is [.. ..] ²² derived? But if it be Latin, why is it written with an "h" by those who wish to be thought of as rather well-informed?²³

Should *auctor* always be written with a "c"?²⁴

May *lachrimae* and *pulcher*, in [the spelling of] which Apuleius and Servius differ, be spelled with an "h"?²⁵

May the noun *euxenia*, or as some contend *enxenia*, be used correctly in place of *strenae* and *xenia*?²⁶

Also if you have any information on *morticina*, with what accent are they pronounced and what significance did they have among the ancients?²⁷

There are a number of other points, but I am afraid I am making a nuisance of myself. It will therefore rest with you, most learned sir, to pardon my impudence. Since I, for my part, esteem you very highly for your learning and thus have an extraordinary desire to be taught by you, I have been tempted to anticipate your feeling from mine and even to persuade myself that you—by virtue of your generous nature—will not let my hopes be dashed. For be assured, if you should not deny my wishes in this matter, I would be as much indebted to you as to one who did me a favor pleasing beyond words.

Farewell. Strassburg, 18 February 1485 A. D.

Folios 45a-45b

He thanks [Agricola] for freeing him in some measure from fever by his [Agricola's] letter.⁷

Peter Schott sends cordial greetings to the most celebrated scholar of liberal arts Rudolph Agricola, his very dear friend.

I should some time ago have expressed to you, most humane sir, my tremendous gratitude not only for instructing me by your cultured and delightful letter,²⁸ but also for giving me unbelievable pleasure. For—to omit other details—although I hap-

pened to be ill with fever at the time,²⁹ your letter filled me with such overwhelming joy that my parents³⁰ who, like mourners, were bewailing my being utterly dejected in spirit and listless in body, were astounded and not a little glad to see me jump up instantly, lively of limb, my face quite suddenly beaming with happiness.

Yet that I have not tried to thank you until now is due to your absence, for you had gone to Rome³¹ before I regained my strength. And I do not have time to thank you now either, because Dominus Thomas Wolf, the very learned man, is in a hurry [to be off with this letter]. But I am not sure that I can ever in the future thank—I shall not say repay—you as you deserve; so completely does that very welcome favor of yours surpass any power of expression I possess. I wish you might now at last visit our city of Strassburg, as Adolph Rusch has repeatedly declared you would do. I should, I assure you, so perform the duties of a host for you, that you would easily become aware of my devoted feeling toward you. Therefore then [more] about these matters when I see you.

Another thing which I should have mentioned first of all: I am, as is fitting, thanking God and the gods (to imitate Plautus) with all my heart for returning you from exile to your homeland and also for delivering you from many afflictions.³² I was weeping bitterly over your misfortune³³ and that of your fatherland. Now I am congratulating [you on] your deliverance and that of all Germany; and, inasmuch as most merciful God has kept you unharmed and alive for us, I beseech and implore you that I may be able to learn at least through your letters, which are by far the most delightful of all to me, that your feeling and your good-will toward me have remained intact.

Farewell. Strassburg, 18 December 1485.

Returned 30 December 1485 by Dominus Thomas Wolf with the news that the very eminent man had died.³⁴

Folios 162b-163a

Peter Schott's elegiac³⁵ on the death of Rudolph Agricola, the German, [written] for Adolph Rusch, citizen of Strassburg.

- 1 Toying with happy verses, Ruscus, had been my intent, and
Fitting my metres with care, I was obeying your wish.
Woe me! Alas, as I wrote, not lightness but sadness resulted.³⁶

Forced into measures of grief, slowly Calliope moved.

- 5 Think you, I could have written dulsome songs at the moment
 When the radiant Muse flees in haste from our soil?
 What lament shall I pen? Or will words express all the anguish,
 Nearly bursting our breasts, almost too much to endure?
 Oh, the honor was he, the brightest star of our country;
- 10 Oh, the Germans' file, sole one to scrape and refine!³⁷
 He was the first to bring us the Grecian and Roman Minerva,³⁸
 And from the Helicon mount bear the Aonian nine.³⁹
 He had begun to rid our students' speech of its scabrous
 Hodge-podge, and also with skill smooth it to elegant sounds.⁴⁰
- 15 Lo, he is held by the tomb, but he seems to have hidden our very
 Flower of genius, too, down in the earth with himself.
 After a time I perchance shall compose you laments for our
 Rudolph;
 Sorrowful songs will sing all too plaintively then.
 So has the recent shock convulsed my viscera, that for
- 20 Sobs and a broken heart I no longer can write.

NOTES

1. See biographical account of Agricola by Ludwig Geiger in *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie* (Leipzig, 1875-1912), I, 151-156, and that by Michael Seidmayer in *Neue deutsche Biographie* (Berlin, 1953), I, 103-104; Karl Hartfelder, "Unedierte Briefe Agricolae", *Festschrift der Badischen Gymnasien, gewidmet der Universität Heidelberg* (Karlsruhe, 1886), 1-36; P. S. Allen, "The Letters of Rudolph Agricola", *English Historical Review*, XXI (April, 1906), 302-317.

2. For information and bibliography, cf. M. T. Lurwig, *Studies in the Lucubrationes by Peter Schott*, diss. University of Chicago (1946), 7-10, 129-132, and *passim*. (Cited below as Lurwig.)

3. Writing from Bologna, 15 September 1478, to a former fellow student at Paris, Johann Rot of Strassburg, Schott recalls with pleasure the time spent on the study of liberal arts at Paris. He states that whether occupied with dialectic, syllogisms, or natural sciences, "our faculties were constantly being sharpened. The more tenderly I think back on these studies, the more I am inclined to feel that they have taught me to profit in my advanced studies [of law]. . . . No one can attempt. . . the intricacies [of law] who has not been schooled in natural sciences or dialectic. . . . Wherefore I believe the study of liberal arts is exceedingly delightful and vitally necessary." *Lucubrationes*, 4b-fa. Cf. note below.

4. *Petri Schotti Argentiniensis Patricii: Juris vtriusque doctoris consultiissimi: Oratoris et Poetae elegantissimi: graecaeque linguae probe aequidite: Lucubrationes ornatissimae*, edited by Jacob Wimpfeling and

printed by Martin Schott at Strassburg, 1498. (Cited below as *Luc.*) The incunabulum contains letters Schott wrote and received, poems he wrote and received, discussions on legal and religious questions by him and others, and other items which were collected by Geiler von Kaysersberg and Wimpheling after Schott's death. For a fuller description of the work, cf. Lurwig, 1 f., 97.

Since the date of its publication, items and passages here and there have been excerpted from the work (Lurwig, 2 f.), as was recently Schott's encomium to the city of Strassburg, cf. Wilhelm Hammer, "Peter Schott und sein Gedicht auf Strassburg (1486)," *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, 77 (October, 1958), 361-371. We are now working on an edition of the work for future publication.

5. Folios 36b-37b, 45a-45b and 162b-163a. This material has to our knowledge not been published since 1498, with the exception of the first letter to Agricola which was included by Melchior Goldast as number 8 in his collection of letters *Philologicarum Epistolarum Centuria Una* (Frankfurt, 1610). Goldast's work we have not seen; it is cited by Allen, *op. cit.*, 315.

6. This statement does not apply to Wimpheling's rather ponderous headings.

7. Wimpheling's heading.

8. A paraphrase of Cicero *Fam.* ii.4.1: "Epistolarum genera multa esse non ignoras, sed unum illud certissimum, cujus causa inventa res ipsa est, ut certiores faceremus absentes, si quid esset quod eos scire, aut nostra aut ipsorum interesset."

9. Although both Agricola and Schott were in Italy during the period 1475-1478, their paths did not cross. Agricola spent the years of his second sojourn in Italy, to judge from his letters, mostly in Pavia and in Ferrara at the court of Duke Ercole d'Este. Schott went to Bologna in 1475 and, except for 2 visits to Strassburg at the end of 1478 and in the spring and summer of 1479, remained in Italy until 1481.

10. So far as we can ascertain, there is no classical or German proverb like this. *Manum dare* is a common Latin phrase and the custom of giving or raising the right hand is age-old. Perhaps Schott is here translating a peculiarly Alsatian proverb as he does another occasion, cf. *Luc.*, 77a; Lurwig, 47.

11. Like Wimpheling and others, Schott was stung by the taunts of the Italians that the Germans were crude barbarians. In the learning of Agricola he saw proof that the Germans could also produce great scholars who commanded the respect of all, even of the Italians. In this connection Ludwig Geiger, *op. cit.*, 152, says of Agricola: "in ihm wurde zuerst, und vielleicht klarer und schärfer als in einem seiner Nachfolger, der Gedanke lebendig, dass den Deutschen, die nach Italien gingen, eine höhere Aufgabe obliege, als nur für sich gelehrte Kenntnisse zu erwerben, die nämlich, das Gelernte für das Vaterland zu verwerthen, um von ihm den Vorwurf der Unbildung und Verachtung der Wissenschaft abzuschütteln und das 'barbarische Deutschland' berühmter und glänzender zu machen, als Italien selbst. Er ward nicht müde, mit lebhaften Worten Andere zur Erfüllung dieser Pflicht zu ermahnen und selbst an der Verwirklichung des Gedankens zu arbeiten." Erasmus contended that Agricola could have been first in Italy, had he not preferred Germany, cf. Hartfelder, *op. cit.*, 4.

12. From the chronology of Schott's letters before and after his stay in Ferrara, it would seem that he was in Ferrara from at least December 1480 until March 1481 and again in May 1481: (1) Bologna, 14 May 1480 until March 1481 and again in May 1481: (1) Bologna, 14 May 1480 to Johann Rot, *Luc.*, 9a; (2) Ferrara, 20 December 1480 to Geiler, *ibid.*, 7b f.; Lurwig, 14f.; (3) Ferrara, 6 March 1481 to Geiler, *Luc.*, 10b; Lurwig, 20ff. In this letter Schott states that he has spent the pre-Lenten season in Ferrara and intends to go to Rome during Lent. (4) Ferrara, 25 May 1481 to Vitus Maeler von Memmingen, *Luc.*, 11b. Schott mentions his having seen Vitus recently in Rome and his plans to go home via Venice.

(5) Bologna, 29 June 1481 to Vitus, *ibid.*, 9b; (6) Strassburg, 22 July 1481 to Geiler, *ibid.*, 9b f.; Lurwig, 24ff.

13. Some of Agricola's translations known to have been completed by 1481 are: Lucian *De non facile credendis delationibus* (1479), Plato *Axiachus* (ca. 1480), Isocrates *Ad Demonum* (ca. 1480). Schott had access to the *Ad Demonum* in the original text, for he quotes from it in a letter to Brant, 12 December 1478 (*Luc.*, 6a; Lurwig, 68). While in Venice, he bought a great number of books (*Luc.*, 14a), but there is no record of the titles of those he purchased for himself, and those he sent to his former tutor Johann Müller contain no works by Agricola (*ibid.*, 110a).

14. Thomas Wolf, Sr. (1450-1511), a doctor of laws, was another of the Strassburg Humanists who had studied at Bologna. Some of the posts he held were: provost of old St. Peter, canon of new St. Peter and St. Thomas in Strassburg, canon of churches in Basel and Worms, rector in the charge of Rheinsbischoffsheim in Baden. He was a lover of letters and art and gave paintings to several churches in Strassburg. Schott's 7 letters to him indicate that he was a very close friend of the Schott family. In one instance Schott calls him a second father. While Wolf was away in Worms in 1483, Schott lived in his house. Cf. *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie*, XLIV, 51; Gustav Knod, *Deutsche Studenten in Bologna (1289-1562)*, *biographischer Index zu den Acta Nationis Germanicae Universitatis Bononiensis* (Berlin, 1899), #4277; Paul Ristelhuber, *Strasbourg et Bologne* (Paris, 1891), 106; Philippe A. Grandidier, *Nouvelles oeuvres inédites* (Colmar, 1898), II, 590ff.; Charles Schmidt, "Notices sur les humanistes strasbourgeois", *Revue d'Alsace*, VI (1855), 447; Lurwig, 112, 133, 135; *Luc., passim*.

Wolf's nephew Thomas Wolf, Jr. (1475-1509) was Schott's godson. To secure the post of canon of St. Thomas for him, Schott and Wolf fought a lengthy legal battle with opposing factions in Rome 1484-1487. At one time Schott was almost forced to go to Rome on his behalf. Young Thomas became the first Alsatian antiquarian. Contemporaries mourned his early death and no less a person than Beatus Rhenanus wrote his epitaph. For bibliography on Thomas Wolf, Jr., cf. Lurwig, 112.

15. Adolph Rusch (1435-1489), a native of Ingweiler, who became a citizen of Strassburg, was an outstanding printer, book dealer and humanist. He married Mentelin's daughter Salome and inherited Mentelin's press 1477. Rusch was the first to use Roman type and is identified with the "R" printer. In 1470, he stated that he had printed works of Terence and Valerius Maximus. It is interesting to note that Schott was familiar with both these authors (*Luc.*, 8a, 10b; Lurwig, 16, 20). Evidently he kept close track of the works Rusch was publishing. In a letter to him (*Luc.*, 114b), Schott bids him send immediately the works of Livy and promises to return them along with Tortellus.

Rusch was well-known as a lecturer in classics and as an indefatigable searcher for works to publish. Schott seems to have helped him in his search, for writing to Johann Rot, Schott sends Rusch the message that he give more particulars about the "liber rerum memorabilium" which Schott has been unable to locate in the libraries at Bologna (*ibid.*, 9a). On another occasion Schott requests Wimpfeling to help Rusch obtain from the library at Speier the loan of parts of a dictionary (*ibid.*, 78a; Lurwig, 94f.).

From Schott's letters to Rusch we learn that the two sent one another gifts when either was vacationing at one of the many baths in the Rhineland (*Luc.*, 75b). The last letter (*ibid.*, 83b) contains riddles and poems to help Rusch while away the hours at the baths. Unfortunately, Rusch was very ill at the time and died shortly thereafter. The letter was later returned to Schott who added the touching note "ultimæ ad eum litteræ" along with the comment that Rusch's death on 26 May was a sad blow to many, especially to him. Just before hearing of his friend's death, Schott had made arrangements for Dr. Johann Widmann, an eminent professor of medicine at Tübingen and the Schott family's physician, to see Rusch

(*ibid.*, 85a). For bibliography on Rusch and Agricola's correspondence with him, cf. Lurwig, 119.

16. From Agricola's correspondence, as listed by Allen, *op. cit.*, 313-315, it is evident that Agricola visited Heidelberg in early October 1482 and that he came to Heidelberg again 2 May 1484. Except for visits to Worms and Deventer, he remained there until April 1485 when he left with Dalberg for Rome, where he was to greet the newly elected pope Innocent VIII on behalf of the Elector Philipp II, Count Palatinate. It is also evident from Allen's list that between the dates 19 October [1480] and 2 March 1482 there exists only one letter. This is undated and assumed to have been written in the winter 1481-82 in Groningen. Is it possible then that Agricola could have spent some time in Heidelberg during the period late 1480 to early 1482? The phrasing of Schott's sentence seems to suggest that Agricola might have been in Heidelberg before 1482.

17. Schott may have been working on his *De mensuris syllabarum Epithoma sicuti succintissimum itaque fructuosissimum* (edited by Wimpfeling and published by Johann Schott in Strassburg, 1500) and was therefore especially anxious to have Agricola's opinion on certain points. It was quite usual for the Humanists to exchange information on the spelling, accent, quantity, derivation, etc. of Greek and Latin words. Agricola wrote to Alexander Hegius to answer the latter's questions on difficult words (Geiger, *op. cit.*, 153), and several letters of Schott to Wimpfeling explain in detail problems of spelling and accent which troubled Wimpfeling (*Luc.*, 52b, 53a, 53b-55b; Lurwig, 76-91).

18. Horace *Satires* ii.4.81-82. Translation from John Marshall, *Horace's Complete Works* (London, 1953; first printed, 1911), 200.

19. According to the *Liber Usualis*, edited by the Benedictines of Solesmes (Tournai, 1953), 235, the verses quoted below are sung every Sunday at terce:

Nunc Sancte nobis Spiritus, Unum Patri cum Filio
Dignare promptus ingeri nostri refusus pectori.

On solemn feasts, such as the first Sunday of Advent, Christmas, etc., the verses mentioned by Schott are sung immediately thereafter:

Os, lingua, mens, sensus, vigor
Confessione personent:
Flammescat igne caritas,
Accendat ardor proximos.

Praesta, Pater piissime,
Patrique compar Unice
Cum Spiritu Paraclito
Regnans per omne saeculum. Amen.

Schott's use of the word *quopiam* indicates that the above verses were in his time sung after other hymns.

20. Schott's questions on the spelling of inceptive or inchoative verbs show his meticulous care for detail. Since he did not have at his command modern reference material and definitive editions of all Latin works, he could not determine: (a) whether *flammescat* was derived from the verb *flammare*, in which case *flammaecat* would have been correct, or from the noun *flamma*, the correct derivation; (b) whether *labasco* was derived from the verb *labare*, the correct derivation, or from the adjective *labes*; (c) whether *ingravesco* was derived from the verb *gravare*, or from the adjective *gravis*, the correct derivation (cf. *Harper's Latin Dictionary* (New York, 1907)).

Even with the help of present day scholarship, the spelling of inceptive verbs is confusing, and no single reference work we have seen discusses the problem. The following conclusions may be drawn: inceptive verbs derived from verbs of the first, second and fourth conjugations and from *io* verbs of the third conjugation have the endings *asc-*, *esc-*, *isc-* and *isc-*, respectively. Otherwise there seems to be no set pattern for spelling; e.g.: *tremiscere* from *tremere* (3), *alescere* from *alere* (3), *mutescere* from *mitis*,

evanescere from *vanus*, *irascere* from *iratus*, *gemmescere* from *gemma*, *vesperascere* from *vesper*.

21. *Caritas* is Latin, from *carus* (*ibid.* and *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (Leipzig, 1906-1912)).

22. *Lacuna*. Martin Schott, the printer of the *Lucubratiunculae*, had no Greek type. Wherever Greek words or quotations occurred in the original, there are lacunae in the printed text, which were to have been filled in later by hand (cf. Lurwig, 121, note 196). What Greek word or words the original manuscript contained we do not know. Schott was perhaps asking how a Greek noun like *charitas* could have been derived from the noun *kháris*, or from the verb *kháirō*. Cf. Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford University Press, 1925): *kháris*, gen. *kháritos*, acc. *khárin* and *khárita*; E. Boisacq, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, 2d. ed. (Paris, 1923): *kháris* is related to the verb *kháirō*.

23. Schott and his contemporaries may be forgiven for their confusion about the Romans' use of "h", for the practice varied in different ages. The early Romans rarely used "h" even before vowels and avoided it in conjunction with consonants. Later there was a period when "h" was used to excess. Cf. Quintilian *Inst.* i.5.19-20, and Catullus' biting epigram lxxxiv, *de Arrio*. For a good discussion of the subject and for pertinent quotations from classical writers and others, cf. E. H. Sturtevant, *The Pronunciation of Greek and Latin* (Chicago, 1920), 69-74.

24. Yes. Cf. *Harper's Latin Dictionary*: "*auctor* (incorrectly written *autor* or *author*)"; H. Menge, *Lateinisch-deutsches Schulwörterbuch*, 3d. ed. (Berlin-Schöneberg, 1911): "*auctor* (*augeo*)".

25. *Lacrimae* and *pulcher* are the accepted spellings. Cf. *Harper's Latin Dictionary*: "*lacrima* (archaic *lacruma* . . . old form *dacrima*)"; "*pulcher* . . . and less correctly *pulcer* . . . (for *polcer*, root *polire* . . .)"; Walde-Hofmann, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 3d. ed. (Heidelberg, 1938): *pulcher*, "Etymologie unsicher". For Cicero's statement about the spelling of *pulcher*, cf. *Or.* 49.

26. The question here seems to be whether late Latin terms may be used in place of classical. *Strena* and *xenium* are classical Latin words meaning respectively: "New Year's gift" and "presents made to guest". cf. *Harper's Latin Dictionary*. *Exxenium* (also *exxenium*, *exxenium*) is a medieval Latin word meaning "gift" (*munus*, *donum*), cf. Charles Du Fresne Du Cange, *Glossarium mediae et infimae Latinitatis* (Niort, 1886). *Exxenium* is not listed in standard Latin or Greek dictionaries, nor in Du Cange, in J. H. Baxter and C. Johnson, *Medieval Word List* (London, 1934; reprinted 1955), or in other medieval Latin vocabularies we have seen. Is this a case of confusion between *eu* and *en*, or is the word possibly a late Latin derivative from the Greek *euxenos*, "hospitable, kind to strangers"?

27. *morticinium*, *morticina*, *morticinus* are listed in classical and medieval Latin dictionaries, but nowhere is there a meaning suggested which fits this context. Searching through classical and modern discussions of Latin accent, pronunciation, prosody, etc. has yielded no information. We are not justified in hazarding even a guess as to a meaning which would make good sense in both of Schott's questions about *morticina*.

28. This letter, in answer to Schott's letter of 18 February 1485, is not extant. It is, however, mentioned in Agricola's letter of 27 March 1485 to Adolph Rusch: "Respondi litteris tuis, itidem litteris doctissimi hominis Petri Schotti, quas litteras arbitror tibi redditas esse. . ." (Hartfelder, *op cit.*, 31). Writing again to Rusch on 13 April 1485, Agricola sends greetings to Schott and Wolf: "doctissimo uiro Petro Schotto, item Thome Uulfo honestissimis et amantissimis uerbis meis saluta" (*ibid.*, 32). The fact that Agricola took time to answer Schott's letter soon after he received it and the tone in which he writes of Schott to Rusch would seem to indicate that he did not consider Schott's questions "absurdities".

29. Schott evidently became ill very soon after writing to Agricola on 18 February. The next letter in the *Lucubratiunculae* was written 1 March to Dr. Johann Widman (*Luc.*, 38a-39a). In this Schott gives a detailed account of his severe illness and asks Widman either to prescribe for him or to come to Strassburg. He also states that he has already had 4 recurrences of the 3-day fever. Writing 14 April to Vitus Maeler von Memmingen (*Luc.*, 39b-40a), Schott mentions that he has been suffering from fever for almost 7 weeks.

30. The father, Peter Schott, Sr., an eminent Strassburger, was active in civic and foreign affairs. The mother, Susanna von Cöllen, was of unusual intelligence and nobility of character. Since their only son had never been very strong, they tended to be overly solicitous about his health and often made life a bit difficult for him. Cf. *Luc.*, *passim*; Lurwig, *Sff.*, 100, and *passim*.

31. The exact date of Agricola's departure from Heidelberg is not known, but it was after 13 April (letter to Rusch above). He was in Rome by 30 May (letter to John Agricola, Allen, *op. cit.*, 315).

32. A paraphrase of Plautus *Cap.* 922-924:

Iovi disque ago gratias merito magnas
Quom te reducem tuo patri reddiderunt,
Quomque ex miseriis plurimis me exemerunt.

33. Agricola became ill of fever on the return journey from Rome and was left behind by Dalberg and the rest of the party at Trent. From Trent were written his 2 last extant letters, both to Dalberg, on 4 August and 1 September (Allen, *op. cit.*, 316).

34. There is no record of the date when Agricola left Trent, or of the date when he arrived in Heidelberg. We do know, however, that his fever still persisted, for he sent for his friend and countryman, the physician and Humanist Adolph Occo, then at Augsburg. Unfortunately, Occo did not reach Heidelberg until a day after Agricola's death (Hartfelder, *op. cit.*, 9), which, according to Seidmayer, *op. cit.*, 103, occurred on 27 October 1485. Hartfelder, *op. cit.*, 9, states that Occo received honors from Philipp II on 19 November 1485, "also bald nach Agricolas Tod". The news of Agricola's death was certainly long in reaching Strassburg. Communication, to be sure, was slow, yet Schott mentions a letter of his that travelled from Strassburg to Rome in 2 hours less than 7 days.

35. The date of the composition of the poem is not given, but from the general tone we may assume that it was written early in 1486, i.e. shortly after Schott heard of Agricola's death.

36. Note the alliteration in the original poem, particularly in this line and in lines 13, 19 and 20.

37. Here and in lines 13 and 14 occurs the same idea of Agricola's cleansing Germany of its barbarisms as Schott had expressed earlier in his first letter to Agricola.

38. This statement is perhaps somewhat exaggerated. There were before Agricola German Humanists who studied in Italy and on their return home fostered the "humaniora". Notable among these was Albrecht von Eyb (1420-1475), canon at the Cathedral of Bamberg, whose life and works have been the subject of various studies since 1890, e.g.: Max Herrmann, *Deutsche Schriften des Albrecht von Eyb*, Vols. IV-V of *Schriften zur germanischen Philologie* (Berlin, 1890), and *Albrecht von Eyb und die Frühzeit des deutschen Humanismus* (Berlin, 1893); William Hammer, "Albrecht von Eyb, Eulogist of Bamberg," *The Germanic Review*, XVII, no. 1 (February, 1942); M. A. Cowie, *Proverbs and Proverbial Phrases in the German Works of Albrecht von Eyb*, diss. University of Chicago (1942). Eyb, of course, had no Greek. Thus Agricola, who was about 10 years older than the great Greek and Hebrew scholar Johann Reuchlin (1454-1522), was probably the first German to know Greek since the days of Hrabanus Maurus and his successors. Hartfelder, *op. cit.*, 6, says of Agricola: "[Der Ruhm] gilt ihm zunächst als der erste

Vertreter eines besseren Latein, als der Vater des humanistischen reineren Stils in Deutschland."

39. Exigencies of the meter prevented using "goddesses" or "Muses" to translate *Deas*. References to classical lore, as in lines 4, 6, 11 above, abound in Humanistic poetry of this period and in most of Schott's poetry (*Luc.* 154b-176b). Yet fondness for classical allusions obtained before the Renaissance and Humanism in Germany, cf. Gottfried von Strassburg, *Tristan und Isolt*, 11. 4863-70, for a related passage.

40. Contrast the harsh sounding words *scrabra . . . radere*, describing the crudity which Agricola was eradicating, with the smoothly flowing words *et . . . sonos*, describing the polished language which Agricola was teaching.

“WAS MEIN GOTT WILL, DAS GSCHEH’ ALLZEIT”

Herzog Albrecht von Preussen als Dichter der Reformationszeit

HELMUT MOTEKAT

An den Schulen in Ostpreussen wurde bis in unsere Tage ein schöner Brauch gepflegt. Am Tage der bestandenen Reifeprüfung, mit der der Abiturient seine Gymnasialzeit beendet und die Befähigung zum Universitätsstudium erworben hatte, erhielt er von seinen Eltern, Verwandten und von allen Freunden je eine vergoldete oder versilberte Anstecknadel zum Geschenk. Er trug diese Nadeln (soviel er von ihnen erhalten hatte) voller Stolz einen oder auch einige Tage lang auf den beiden Kragenklappen seines Jacketts. In volkstümlicher Sprache die “Alberten” (Sing. “die Alberte”, Betonung auf der zweiten Silbe) genannt, stellten sie eine leicht veränderte Nachbildung des Siegels der Landesuniversität zu Königsberg dar, die in ihrem Namen wie in ihrem Siegel ihren Gründer ehrte: Albrecht von Brandenburg-Ansbach, der als letzter Hochmeister des Deutschen Ritterordens in Jahre 1525 bei gleichzeitiger Einführung der Reformation den Ordensstaat Preussen in ein weltliches Herzogtum unwandelte und als erster Herzog in Preussen (als solcher regierte er das Land bis zu seinem Tod 1568) im Jahre 1544 in der “Haupt- und Residenzstadt Königsberg” die “Albertus-Universität” gründete.

Das Universitätssiegel, das von dem ersten Rektor der “Albertus-Universität,” Georg Sabinus, dem Schwiegersohn Melanchthons, erdacht und entworfen wurde, zeigt den Herzog barhäuptig in ritterlicher Rüstung als Brustporträt. Die Rechte hält das blanke Schwert über der Schulter, die linke Hand ist bei angewinkelterm Arm in die Hüfte gestützt, links vor sich, von der Gürtellinie abwärts, erscheint der Wappenschild mit dem preussischen und dem brandenburgischen Adler. Die Umschrift des Siegels lautet: “Insignia · Academiae · Regiomontanae · 1544 ·” Die “Alberte” zeigt gleiche das Portrait des Herzogs; die um die Siegelumschrift gelegten beiden Kreisbogen aber fehlen bei ihr. Statt dessen befindet sich am unteren Rand ein links und rechts auf halber Höhe spitz zulaufender und endender Kreisbogen mit der Inschrift: CIVIS.ACAD.ALB.

Über das Universitätssiegel hatte Melanchthon zwar sarkastisch zu Camerarius bemerkt:¹ “Ich wünschte, das Symbol sei geeigneter für Wissenschaft und Kunst, aber jenes eisige Küstenland war immer rau und kriegerisch.” Dennoch hat

die Universität über 400 Jahre lang in guten und in schlimmen Zeiten der Wissenschaft und dem Wohl des Landes und der Menschheit unter diesem Symbol dienen dürfen, wie nur je eine deutsche Hochschule es vermochte.

In dem Jahr für Jahr sich wiederholenden Brauch des Tragens der "Alberten" wurde bis in die kleinen Landstädte hinein der Gründer der Universität, der mutige und entschlossene Reformator, der Staatsmann und landesväterliche Förderer der Kultur und Wissenschaft symbolisch geehrt. Dass Albrecht von Preussen zugleich einer der bedeutendsten Dichter evangelischer Kirchenlieder der Reformationszeit war, hat wohl kaum einer der Träger der "Alberten" gewusst. Erst vom Jahr 1908 an ist durch die sehr eingehenden und in ihren wissenschaftlichen Voraussetzungen einwandfreien Darlegungen Friedrich Spittas² auf die Bedeutung Herzog Albrechts von Preussen als geistlicher Liederdichter aufmerksam gemacht worden. Die von Friedrich Spitta aufgewiesenen Tatsachen veranlassten lediglich eine Diskussion in der Fachwelt der Hymnologen. Sie wurden im allgemeinen ohne Widerspruch akzeptiert.³ Wie eine der bedeutenden Textsammlungen zur deutschen Literaturgeschichte eindeutig beweist, hat auch die Literaturgeschichte die Ergebnisse der Arbeiten Spittas in vollem Umfang *als Tatsachen anerkannt*.⁴ Sie hat allerdings bisher den Liedern Herzog Albrechts kaum besonderes Interesse zugewendet.⁵

Wenn es der *Literaturhistoriker* im folgenden unternimmt, *die Dichtungen* und *die dichterische Persönlichkeit* Herzog Albrechts in den Blick zu stellen, so kann das nur geschehen unter der Voraussetzung, dass für die politischen Ereignisse und Vorgänge und die theologischen Auseinandersetzungen im Zusammenhang mit der Einführung der Reformation in Preussen die Ergebnisse der historischen und der kirchengeschichtlichen Forschung zugrundegelegt werden.

Die Liederdichtungen, denen diese Betrachtung gilt, stammen von einer in den Jahren der Reformation "zum Regiramt berufenen" Persönlichkeit. Stärker und intensiver als die vieler seiner regierenden Zeitgenossen war die Persönlichkeit Albrechts in die politischen und religiösen Auseinandersetzungen dieses so bewegten Zeitalters von Amts wegen und auch rein menschlich-subjectiv hineingestellt. Ein richtiges Verständnis der Lieder des Herzogs kann daher nur gewonnen werden, wenn man sie von vornherein begreift als die gläubigen Versuche

des Herrschers und des Menschen Albrecht von Preussen in seiner einmaligen spezifischen politischen und kirchlichen Situation. Es muss daher, um das aufzuweisen, die Situation, aus der sie entstanden sind und auf die sie Bezug nehmen, auch in dieser Betrachtung wenigstens angedeutet werden.⁶

(Dass diese Arbeit weder eine hymnologische noch eine theologische Zuständigkeit beansprucht, versteht sich von selbst. Sie sieht in den Liedern Albrechts *Dichtungen* von bestimmter Eigenart. Sich mit ihnen zu befassen ist die Aufgabe des Literaturhistorikers).

Noch aus Albrechts Zeit als Hochmeister des Deutschen Ritterordens, wahrscheinlich aus dem Jahr 1522, stammt das Lied mit der Überschrift: "Ein liedt wie der Hochmeister in Preusen Mariam anruft." P. Schwenke fand es in den Einband einer Sammlung von Drucken aus der Reformationszeit (im Besitz der Königsberger Universitäts- und Staatsbibliothek) eingeklebt.⁷ Er konnte das als Einzeldruck erschienene Lied aus der Verklebung herauslösen (es diente in mehreren Exemplaren zur Versteifung des Einbandes) und publizieren: Es beginnt folgendermassen:

Allzeit vorleih mir, Herre mein,	der alle Welt zu Fusse stot,
durch Tod und Pein	denn ihr wird ganz kein Bet
die du erleden hast durch mich	vorsagt,
dass ich vordreng den Willen dein	ihr Rede behagt,
und gib mir ein,	dem ewigen Gott;
dass ich nicht handel wider dich.	verlass in Not
Dorzu hilf mir, du höchste Magd,	mich, Fraue nicht, ist all mein Bet.

Das Akrostichon "AL/Brecht/Deutsch/Ordens/Hoch/Meister," gebildet durch die Anfangsilben der sechs Strophen, erweist: Albrecht ist zur Zeit der Entdeckung des Marienliedes noch Hochmeister. Die Verehrung der Heiligen Jungfrau, der Patronin des Deutschen Ritterordens, ist für ihn damals noch ganz selbstverständlich. Eine genaue Prüfung des Liedinhalts zeigt keinerlei Spuren reformatorischer Glaubenslehre. Albrecht befindet sich offensichtlich in Preussen, er scheint in kriegerische Auseinandersetzungen verwickelt, für die er die Hilfe der Schutzpatronin für sich und seine Ordensbrüder erfleht:

In Demut ich dich, Magd, vormahn,	und nimm zu Gnade dein Untertan
sich gnädig an	all Ordensmann
dein Eigentum und stehe mir bei.	ihr Leib und Gut
Ob ich dich wohl erzornet han	hab' jetzt in Hut
loss mich doch jetzt entgelden nicht	und halt' uns all in deiner Pflicht,

so betet er in der 5. Strophe des Liedes. Es ist Not ausgebrochen, heisst es schon am Schluss der ersten Strophe: “. . . verlass in Not mich, Fraue, nicht, ist all mein Bet.” In der zweiten Strophe wird noch einmal die Bitte ausgesprochen: “Lass dir die Sache befohlen sein, sich treulich darein und komm zu Hilfe in Nöten schier.”

Dann wird das Land des Ordens als Eigentum der Jungfrau bezeichnet:

Ach, Fraw, wie magst du erdolden gar
so gross Unrecht an *deinem Land*.

Die dritte Strophe steigert die Bitte zu innigem Flehen. (Zu ihr bildet die vorher zitierte fünfte Strophe eine deutliche Parallele).

<i>Deutsch</i> ich dich ermahnen tu,	Du bist die Fraue und ich der
Frau, schick' mir zu	Knecht,
dein Gnade und Gunst zu aller	dein lieber Sohn der Herre mein.
Stund,	<i>O Herre und Fraue</i> mich nicht vor-
<i>Dweil dich der Handel selbst be-</i>	schmächt
<i>rührt</i>	und halt' bei Recht
und mir gebührt	dein Ritterschaft,
zu loben dich mit Herz und Mund	vorleihe uns Kraft
	denn Land und Leute ist dein eigen.

“Deutsch,” in deutscher Sprache also “ermahnt,” d. h. bittet der Hochmeister um der Heiligen Jungfrau Gnade und Gunst. “Dweil dich der Handel selbst berührt”—es geht um “Land und Leute,” die “eigen dein” sind. Der rührend Ausdruck suchende Beweis, dass es hier doch um das eigenste Eigentum der Gottesmutter geht, findet seine Parallele—(schon P. Schwenke hat darauf aufmerksam gemacht)—in der Umschrift, die Albrecht an jetzt geprägten Talern und Dukaten anbringen liess, die das Bildnis Marias zeigten.

Adiuva nos, virgo, tua res agitur.

Gegen das Ende der Strophe wird auch der Gottessohn in das Gebet eingeschlossen: “O Herre *und* Fraue mich nicht vorschmächt.” . . . Ganz zum Schluss des Liedes wendet sich der betende Hochmeister auch an die Schar der Heiligen und erfleht ihre Fürbitte:

Kumm mir zu Trost, Jungfrau klar,
behüt' mich vor des Teufels Quäl;
dergleichen aller Heiligen Schar
nehmt auch mein wahr
mie euer Bitt
verlosst mich nit
und habt in Hut mein arme Seel.

Die kriegerischen Bemühungen Albrechts hatten keinen Erfolg. Am 10. April 1521 gelang es ihm, von König Sigismund I. von Polen wenigstens einen Waffenstillstand zu erwirken, der für 4 Jahre Waffenruhe brachte. Die Bedingung war, dass nach vier Jahren, am 10. April 1525, entweder ein endgültiger Frieden zwischen den streitenden Gegnern beschlossen würde oder die Feindseligkeiten wieder anheben sollten. Albrecht verliess daraufhin im Frühjahr 1522 sein Ordensland und versuchte persönlich, im Reiche Rat und Hilfe für den Orden zu gewinnen. Die Regentschaft in Preussen lag während Albrechts Abwesenheit in den Händen des Bischofs des Samlandes, Georg von Polentz. Die allgemeine politische Situation in Europa war nicht dazu angetan Albrechts Hoffnung auf militärische und wirtschaftliche Unterstützung zu erfüllen. Manch ungute persönliche Erfahrung mag der junge Hochmeister auf seiner zwei Jahre währenden Reise in Deutschland gemacht haben. Sein ebenfalls das Akrostichon AL/BRECHT/TEUTSCH/ORDENS/HOCH/MEISTER/MARC/GRAFF/ ZU/BRAN/DEN/BURG zeigendes Lied, das *nach 1522 vor 1525* entstanden sein muss, bezieht sich in seiner ersten Strophe wohl auf Albrechts persönliche Erfahrungen und enttäuschende Erlebnisse:

All weltlich trew unnd Zuvorsicht	und pleibt
ist gricht	in ewigkeit
in argen syn,	gibt bscheid:
des pin	all menschen sein verlogen.
ich hoch und vhasst betrogen.	Allein ist got gerecht und war-
Drumb recht der heilig David	haft . . . ⁸
schreibt,	

In Nürnberg, wo Albrecht sich häufig des Längeren aufhielt (Nürnberg war der Sitz der Reichsverwaltung und 1522 Ort des Reichstages) hörte er Osiander predigen. Er selbst hat später bekannt, dass Osiander's Predigt ihn zum evangelischen Gläubigen gewandelt habe. Im November 1523, auf der Reise von Berlin nach Nürnberg, ritt Albrecht mit Absicht über Wittenberg. Als erster regierender Fürst in Deutschland besuchte er den in Acht und Bann befindlichen ehemaligen Augustinermönch Dr. Martin Luther. Luther gab in Beisein Melanchthons den Rat, den Orden aufzulösen, einen weltlichen Staat zu schaffen und in ihm die Reformation durchzuführen. Noch aus dem gleichen Jahr 1523 stammt Luthers Flugschrift: "An die Herren des deutschen Ordens," dass sie "falsche Keuschheit

meiden und zur rechten ehelichen Keuschheit greifen" sollten.⁹

In Preussen selbst war die Einführung der Reformation während Albrechts Abwesenheit schon weitgehend vorbereitet worden. Schon am 27. September 1523 hielt der zur Reformation übergetretene vorzügliche Schüler Martin Luthers, der ehemalige Franziskanermönch Johannes Briessmann die erste evangelische Predigt im Königsberger Dom. Er war nach Königsberg "berufen",¹⁰ offensichtlich mit Einverständnis Albrechts durch dessen Vertreter in der Regentschaft, den samländischen Bischof Georg von Polentz. Zur Weihnacht a 1523 hielt Georg von Polentz, noch als Bischof der katholischen Kirche, jene berühmte reformatorische Predigt, die ein eindeutiges Bekenntnis zur Lutherischen Glaubenslehre darstellte und, in zahlreichen Flugschriften verbreitet, ihre weitreichenden Wirkungen nicht verfehlte. Am 28. Januar 1524 erliess er an den Klerus ein Reformationsmandat in lateinischer Sprache. In ihm empfahl er den Geistlichen die Lektüre der Schriften Luthers. Er ordnete unter anderem an, die Taufe fortan in deutscher Sprache zu halten. Am 12. März erklärte er in einem weiteren amtlichen Schreiben, dass "der Bann nicht mehr gilt." Treu mit Georg von Polentz vereint, handelte der Bischof von Pomesanien, Erhard von Queiss, in gleichem Sinne.¹¹ Zu Briessmann stiess im Juni 1524 der seit seiner Vertreibung aus Iglau bei Luther weilende Dr. Paul Speratus (er ist der Verfasser des bekannten Liedes: "Es ist das Heil uns kommen her".) Bald nach Speratus traf als dritter Geistlicher der Reformation Johann Poliander (Graumann) in Königsberg ein.

Albrechts schwierige Lage gestattete ihm damals noch nicht, die öffentliche Zustimmung zu den Vorgängen in seinem Lande Preussen zu geben. Vor Vertrauten allerdings machte er aus seiner evangelischen Überzeugtheit kein Hehl. Am 16. Mai 1524, als er von den Erlassen des Bischofs von Polentz zu Gunsten der Reformation erfuhr, schrieb er an einen seiner Landesräte, er wundere sich zwar darüber, da er doch (als Herr des Landes) "der Keines beschlossen; er möchte aber wohl leiden, dass damit gute Christen gemacht würden." An v. Polentz selbst schrieb er am 8. November 1524, er möge sein Tun so einrichten, dass "es in alle Wege mit dem Worte Gottes und der Wahrheit bestätigt werde." Er, Albrecht, wolle ihn halten und schützen, solange er selbst in Gnaden von Gott erhalten werde.

So überzeugt von der Richtigkeit des Rates, den Martin

Luther ihm gab, bereit, den Ordensstaat in ein weltliches Herzogtum umzuwandeln, zog Albrecht am 2. April 1525 in Krakau ein. Am 8. April (einen Tag vor Ablauf des Waffenstillstandes) wurde der "Krakauer Vertrag" geschlossen. Der Orden wurde aufgelöst, Albrecht wurde erster erblicher Herzog in Preussen. Er erhielt das Land von König Sigismund I. von Polen als Lehen. An die Stelle des schwarzen Balkenkreuzes auf weissem Grund als Zeichen des deutschen Ritterordens trat nun der schwarze Adler auf weissem Grund als Wappen des Herzogtums. Der "Krakauer Vertrag" war rein politischer Natur. Über die religiösen Fragen wurde nicht verhandelt.

Am 6. Juli 1525 erliess Albrecht das "Mandat" in dem er sich feierlich vor der Öffentlichkeit und vor seinen Untertanen zur reformatorischen Lehre bekannte und die Geistlichen anwies: "zu Lob und Ehre Gottes des Herrn und aller seiner auserwählten Heiligen und allgemeinen christlichen Glaubens willen das Evangelium lauter und rein, treulich und christlich zu predigen." Im Dezember 1525 bereits legte er dem Landtag zusammen mit einer allgemeinen Landesordnung auch eine von seinen drei theologischen Ratgebern Briessmann, Speratus und Poliander entworfene allgemeine Gottesdienstordnung vor.

Die politische Umwandlung vollzog sich wie die kirchliche ohne Widerspruch und in erstaunlich kurzer Zeit. Das lag nicht zuletzt an der Persönlichkeit des Herzogs. "In der Person Albrechts von Preussen, der 15 Jahre lang Hochmeister des Ordens war, danach aber 43 Jahre lang dasselbe Land als Herzog regierte, war ein Teil der Ordenstradition verbürgt. Bemerkenswert ist, dass der Prozess der Säkularisierung in den Brieffolianten, Hausbüchern, Zinsregistern u.s.w. überhaupt nicht in Erscheinung tritt. Die Bücher werden auch nach dem 8. April 1525 (Krakauer Vertrag) in bisheriger Weise, meist von demselben Schreiber weitergeführt, es findet sich keine neue Überschrift, nicht einmal eine neue Seite ist begonnen."¹²

Noch im gleichen Jahr 1525 war der ehemalige Staat des Deutschen Ritterordens ein evangelisches Land. Das Erstaunliche dieses Vorgangs hat seinen wohl schönsten Ausdruck gefunden in Luthers Worten. (Er schrieb sie als Widmung seiner Erklärung des 5. Buches Mose an den nun evangelischen Bischof Georg von Polentz.): "Welches Wunder! In vollem Lauf, mit aufgespannten Segeln eilt das Evangelium gen Preussen, wohin es nicht gerufen und wo es nicht gesucht ward, während es in ganz Deutschland, wohin es von selbst kam und

nahte, mit allem Grimm und Wahnwitz geschmäht, zurückgewiesen und in die Flucht geschlagen wird.“

Dass dieses “Wunder” geschehen konnte, war bei aller Würdigung der reformatorischen Taten der beiden Bischöfe und der Wittenberger Geistlichen im letzten Albrechts persönliches Werk. Bei selbstverständlicher Anerkennung der politischen Notwendigkeit und der momentanen günstigen politischen Konstellation für seinen Schritt,—*die Entscheidung zu ihm war im Innersten eine ganz persönliche.* Ihr geistiger Ort war nicht die Vernunft des Politikers, sondern der Glaube des Christen, der sich zur herrscherlichen Verantwortung berufen weiss. In der dritten Strophe des oben bereits erwähnten zweiten “Albrechtliedes” hatte Albrecht gefordert:

Teutsch Nacion, thu auff dein thür	Got sucht dich heim mit seinem
und spür	Wort,
die göttlich gnad!	man hort
dein schad,	die frölich stim;
wo du es tust verachten!	vornim,
	las ab von menschen prachten!

Er selbst hatte 1525 für sein Land Preussen der Forderung die Tat folgen lassen. Damit aber war es für ihn nicht getan. Als Vater des Landes um seine hohe Verantwortung wissend, blieb ihm die Sorge für das ewige Heil der Bewohner seines Herzogtums sein persönlichstes Anliegen.

In der bereits 1525 erlassenen Gottesdienstordnung “Articel der Ceremonien und anderer Kirchenordnung” ist für den Kenner der Verhältnisse in Preussen während der Reformationsjahre der persönliche Anteil Albrechts deutlich zu spüren. Die Ordnung geht sogar über die Wittenberger noch hinaus, wenn sie anstatt der Perikopen die “lectio continua” (d.h. die fortdauernde Schriftlesung) für die Gottesdienste vorschreibt. Ganz besonders auffällig an den “Articeln der Ceremonien . . .” von 1525 ist die starke Betonung der Wichtigkeit des gemeinsamen Liedes der ganzen Gemeinde in der Muttersprache. Es sei besonders geeignet, den evangelischen Glauben einzuführen und das Bewusstsein der Zusammmmengehörigkeit der verschiedenen Völker (Deutsche, Litauer, Polen) in dem *einen* Glauben zu stärken. Im ersten Abschnitt der “Ceremonien” steht die Anordnung, dass “die Schrift” deutsch gelesen und die Gesänge (— mit Ausnahme der Responsorien in Mette und Vesper —) deutsch gesungen werden sollen, wie es “bereits allhie zu Königsberg und fast an vielen Orten der mehrer Teil

solchs Lesens und Singens in deutscher Zungen, damit es sich jedermann am besten gebessern möge, fürgenommen ist."¹³

Eben dieses Mandat von 1525 über die "Ceremonien" stellt ferner in Aussicht, dass die Gemeinde Bücher erhalten soll: "Item man muss zu solchem Lesen und Singen bequeme Bücher zu gemeinem Gebrauch schaffen."¹⁴ Es war Albrechts lebenslanges inständiges Bemühen, seinen evangelischen Landeskindern die Grundlagen, Voraussetzungen und Möglichkeiten für ein frommes, gottwohlgefälliges Leben zu schaffen, zu erhalten und zu verbessern. Dieses sein Wirken war bestimmt durch seine bewundernswerte persönliche Glaubensfestigkeit. Sie wurde gelenkt durch den ständigen engen persönlichen und brieflichen Gedankenaustausch mit Martin Luther, den der Herzog seinen "Bischof, Papst und Vater" nannte, mit Melancthon und den übrigen Wittenberger Reformatoren. Im Zusammenhang dieses Bemühens war es Albrechts Absicht, ein Andachts- und Gebetbuch für seine Landeskinde selbst zu schaffen. Zahlreiche Aufzeichnungen von seiner Hand, Gebete und erbauliche Betrachtungen und Entwürfe waren im Staatsarchiv in Königsberg/Pr. aufbewahrt. Neben ihnen gab es eine Vielzahl von Abschriften von Kopistenhand, die vom Herzog eigenhändig durchkorrigiert waren. Seine eigenen Niederschriften liessen Korrekturen von der Hand seines Hofpredigers Funck erkennen. Spitta¹⁵ zitiert als Beispiel eine eigenhändige Aufzeichnung Herzog Albrechts, die folgende Überschrift trägt: "Beicht und Bekenntnus einer Fürstlichen Person, mit eingemengter Bitte, umb Vergebung der sunden und umb stercke an leib und Sehle derselben Gott, dem allmechtigen zu lob, und iren armen landen und leuthen zum besten zu gebrauchen." (Ein Teil der Aufzeichnungen Albrechts zu seinem Andachtsbuch wurde im Jahr 1636 in Aarhus von Holger Rosencrantz veröffentlicht unter dem Titel "*Fürsten-Spiegel*. / Das ist: / Schrifften und Sendschreiben / Des Durchleuchtigen . . . / Herrn Albrecht . . . / Marggrafen zu Brandenburg / Erster / Hertzogen in Preussen," etc.)¹⁶

Albrechts Absicht, ein solches Andachtsbuch drucken zu lassen, erweisen u. a. die folgenden, auch von Spitta angeführten Tatsachen: Nach *Fürsten-Spiegel*, S. 127/128 schrieb der Herzog an Funck: (Datum: 3.Sept. 1557) "Ich schicke euch hie meine 4 psalmen / die ich verloren zum Teil gehabt / hab sie wiederumb zusammenbracht / wie mirs durch Gottes Geist verliehen / bitte euch / wollet mir nun weiter helffen / damit sie / wie vermeynet / und ir mein Hertz in solchem kennet / zu Gottes Lob / recht

vollzogen werden." Und dann: "Hab auch denselbigen Tag viel gut Dings / mit ewerer und meiner Handt verzeichnet gefunden / dass mit der zeit / alles noch in ein Buch / darvon ich lang mit euch geredet / ists Gottes Wille / kommen solle."

Zwischen 1525 und 1527 wurden in Königsberg zwei Gesangbücher gedruckt. (Das zweite von ihnen trägt die Jahreszahl 1527.) Beide Bücher stellen in der Geschichte der Reformation eine einmalige—und im eigentlichen Sinne des Wortes merkwürdige Tatsache dar.¹⁷ Sie sind von allen vor 1527 erschienenen evangelischen Gesangbüchern völlig unabhängig.¹⁸ Seit Friedrich Spittas Arbeit "Herzog Albrecht von Preussen als geistlicher Liederdichter"¹⁹ ist jeder Zweifel daran ausgeschlossen, dass der Herzog selbst der Dichter der Lieder der Königsberger Gesangbücher war. (Diese beiden Liedersammlungen stehen demnach im Zusammenhang mit dem geplanten Andachtsbuch.)

Die erste Sammlung trägt den Titel "Etlich Gesang / dadurch Got yun der gebenedeiten muter Christi / und opferung der weysen Heyden / Auch ym Symeone / allen heylgen und Engeln gelosst wirt / Alles ausz grunde goetlicher schrift." Sie enthält ein evangelisches Marienlied, sechs Gesänge für die Weihnachtszeit: Geburt, Beschneidung und Darstellung Christi, die Weisen aus dem Morgenlande, Symeon. Die zweite Sammlung hatte folgenden Titel: "Etliche newe / verdeutschte und gemachte / yn götlicher Schrift / gegründete Christli / che Hymnus und Gesenge."—Damit (laut der Vorrede zu dieser Sammlung) "durchs gantz yahr auff eyn jedes Fest (das christlich gehalten werden mag) solcher deutscher Geseng Got czu lob und bessrung des Volks destermehr czusamen bracht werden mögen."²⁰ Die Sammlung enthält: drei Lieder über den christlichen Sabbath, die Kirche, Fasten und Beten, neun Lieder für die Passionszeit, drei Osterlieder und je ein Lied zu Himmelfahrt und zu Pfingsten. Damit bietet der Herzog mit den beiden Königsberger Gesangbüchern der jungen evangelischen Gemeinde einen vollständigen Liederzyklus für das ganze Kirchenjahr. Diese Tatsache hat in der Geschichte der Reformation den Rang des Einmaligen. Die Lieder sind in aller Eindeutigkeit für den gottesdienstlichen Gebrauch in der Gemeinde gedacht. Die Gemeinde soll sich beim gemeinsamen Singen der Lieder der Heilstatsachen bewusst werden, von denen die Lieder handeln. Es sind also Zweckdichtungen. Und doch spricht aus allen Liedern unverkennbar und in ergreifender Gläubigkeit die In-

dividualität ihres Dichters. Die Zwecksetzung und das glaubensinnige, gottergebene persönlichste Empfinden des frommen Herzogs sind in diesen Liedern nicht voneinander zu trennen. Aus dem ganz persönlichen Glaubenserlebnis, das ihm fortan Anfang, Inhalt und Richtung seines individuellen Lebens wie seines Waltens im ihm aufgetragenen "Regieramt" bestimmte, formten sich ihm die Verse und Strophen seiner Lieder. Sie sprachen das aus, was alle Christenmenschen empfinden mussten, die Gott und das Wunder des Glaubens so erleben durften wie er. Sie sangen in den Worten, wie der Herzog sie setzte, von ihrem eigenen, persönlichen Glauben an Gott.²¹

Eigentümlich und doch auch charakteristisch für die geistige Situation im Zeitalter Luthers, in dem das neue Lebensgefühl der Renaissance und von humanistischer Weltsicht und Wissensoffenheit durchdrungene Reformationsgesinnung einen Menschen wie Albrecht von Brandenburg hervorbringen konnten, der das persönliche Glaubenserlebnis der Gottesbegegnung unmittelbar selbst hineinnimmt in seine Aufgaben als Landesherr. Seit 1525 sind ihm politische und kirchliche Probleme von gleicher Wichtigkeit. Der Herzog widmet diplomatischen Verhandlungen mit den Höfen der Nachbarländer nicht mehr und nicht weniger Aufmerksamkeit und persönliches Interesse als den Kirchenvisitationen, an denen er in den Jahren 1542/43 sogar persönlich teilnimmt.

Für die Geschichte der Reformation in Preussen wie für die persönliche religiöse Haltung Albrechts in den ersten Jahren der Reformation ist von den Liedern des ersten Königsberger Gesangbuches das sogenannte "Heiligenlied" zweifellos besonders aufschlussreich. Es konnte—bei jedesmaliger Änderung der Anfangsstrophe auf 18 Heilige gesungen werden. Seine ersten Strophen lauteten:

In aller Heiligen Schare, Herr Gott dich loben wir,
die ewig rein und klare wohn seliglich bei dir.

Kein Aug gesah noch nie,
ins Ohr noch Hertz nit kommen, was du bereitst für die,
so dich von ganzen Hertzen liebten hie.

Ihr Übung ist, dich loben, Herr Gott, in ewig Zeit
in deinem Haus daroben, alls Mangels ganz gefreit.

Zu dieser Ruh und Rast,
sind sie durch Trübsal gangen, ihr Kreuz auf sich gefasst,
ihr zeitlich Leben hie auf Erd gahasst.

Wiewohl die Schrift hochpreiset, gesiegter Heiligen Kron,
wird doch damit beweiset, dass Gott solchs selbst gethon

Ohn ihr verdienstlich Tat,
kein Hilf durch ihr Verdienen die Schrift uns setzet not,
all Menschen unnütz Knecht genennet hat.

Doch für einander bitten und guts dem Nächsten thon,
ist wahrer Christen Sitten und heisst der göttlich Sohn,
des Wort der Fels genannt,
darauf all Heiligen bauen; die Toren auf dem Sand,
was ihn'n erdichtet menschlicher Verstand.

Christe, der einig Wege, Fürsprech und Mittler bist,
Kein ander Strass noch Stege ins ewig Leben ist.

Ganz dürftig bitten wir
um Lieb, die wirkt durch Glauben, und suchen solchs bei dir,
der du bist aller Heiligen Trost und Zier.

Albrechts persönliche Einstellung zur Reformation zeigt sich in den Worten dieses Liedes: Nicht radikale, theologische Ausschliesslichkeit ist sein Prinzip, sondern ein besonnenes und in seiner Zielbewusstheit bewundernswertes Hinüberführen von dem bisher Geübten zum Neuen. Die Heiligen der Kirche werden nicht geleugnet. Sie sind da. Sie sind im Lob des Herrn mit den noch im Diesseitigen Lebenden vereint: 'Ihr Übung ist, dich loben, Herr Gott, in ewig Zeit.' Sie haben schon hier Gott von ganzem Herzen geliebt. Dafür gingen sie durch Trübsal. Sie nahem ihr Kreuz auf sich. Auf Erden wurden sie gehasst. Nun sind sie "in deinem Haus daroben, alls Mangels ganz gefreit."—Aber: Ihre Taten wurden von Gott selbst getan! Die Schrift hat *alle* Menschen unnütze Knechte genannt. Durch die Heiligen ist keine Hilfe. Doch ihr Leben und Leiden ist den Menschen zum Vorbild gesetzt. Ihnen nachzueifern ist durch das Wort des Gottessohnes der Mensch aufgefordert. Auf eben dieses Wort haben die Heiligen alle gebaut als auf den Felsen.

Die Heiligen werden also nicht aus dem Welt- und Himmelsbild des christlichen Glaubens ausgeschlossen. An die Stelle der Funktion der Fürbitte aber tritt nun die des Vorbildes für den Lebenswandel, den Glauben, das Gebet und die tätige Nächstenliebe des evangelischen Christen im diesseitigen Leben. In fast wörtlicher Übereinstimmung mit dem "Heiligenlied" heisst es im Vorwort zum ersten Königsberger Liederbuch: "Dieweyl durch neulig gnedig wider auffhebung Evangelischs liechts bey den Christen, da das gehört und angenommen, vil unchristlicher geseng, dy davor götlicher Schrifft gantz widerwertig, von der benedeyten muter Christi Maria, und andern lieben heyligen erdicht gewest, abgestellt worden sindt, und aber der heylig geist in 8. 104. 135. und andern mehr psalmen Got nit alleyn

in seynen leblichen, sondern auch yn seynen unleblichen geschöpfen loben lert, wie vil billicher thun wir dann solch göttlich loben der selgen yunckfrawen Maria und andern lieben heylgen und Engeln, denen Got der herr, szo unaussprechliche wunderbarliche wolthat auss lauter gnaden on all yhr verdienen beweist und ym geheyliget hat . . .”²²

Nicht von allen Liedern der beiden ältesten Königsberger Gesangbücher von 1527 kann hier gehandelt werden.²³ Dazu fehlt der Platz. Eines der Lieder aber sei wenigstens erwähnt.²⁴ Es ist eine Variante der schon in der mittelalterlichen Literatur überlieferten Strophe: “O du armer Judas, was hast du getan / dass du deinen Herren also verraten han.” / Martin Luther hat diese Strophe bekanntlich für seine Spottdichtung auf Heinz von Wolfenbüttel verwendet: “Ach du armer Heinze, was hast du getan.”²⁵ Herzog Albrecht entkleidete die Strophe jeglicher subjektiver Hinweise (und betete doch gerade darin für seinen ältesten Bruder Casimir) in der Formulierung:

Ach wir armen Menschen, was hab' wir getan,
Christum, unsern Herren, gar oft verkauft han;
müsst wir in der Hölle leiden grosse Pein,
wolt er selbst nicht Helfer und der Mittler sein.

Das 4-strophige Lied schliesst mit der Bitte:

. . . gib uns rechten Glauben, der die Frücht beweis.

Ob es sich um Lieder mehr epischen Charakters handelt (wie bei den Gedichten zu Weihnacht, Himmelfahrt und Pfingsten), die von dem biblischen Geschehen berichten oder um freie Übersetzungen lateinischer Hymnen oder aber um unabhängige Dichtungen Albrechts über biblische Themen, immer sind sie getragen von der evangelisch-lutherisch ergriffenen Heilsbotschaft und immer ist in ihnen das Persönliche, das Bekenntnishafte des Menschen und des Herrschers Albrecht unverkennbar.

Das gilt in ganz besonderem Masse für jene seine Glaubenslieder, die unabhängig von den Gesangbüchern, Freunden und sehr nahen Verwandten gewidmet sind und als Gebete für diese verstanden sein wollen, wie z.B. die sogenannten “Ungarischen Königslieder”²⁶ und mehr noch die sogenannten “Markgrafeneder.”²⁷ Das Lied für Maria von Ungarn (der auch Martin Luther nach der Schlacht bei Mohacs 1526, in der ihr Gemahl, König Ludwig, das Leben verlor, vier Trostpsalmen widmete) begann mit den Worten: “Mag ich Unglück nit widerstan.” Es hat sich relativ lange in den Gesangbüchern der evangelischen

Kirche gehalten. So war es z.B. noch in manchen Gesangbüchern des 18. Jahrhunderts zu finden. "Glück zu auf unser Seiten" lautete der hoffnungsfrohe Vers, mit dem dieses Lied Albrechts ausklang. Die beiden "Markgrafenlieder," nahe verwandt in Anlage, Inhalt und Form mit dem Albrechtlied (s.o.!) sind Fürbittlieder für Albrechts Brüder Casimir und Georg. (Die Namen beider Brüder sind jeweils im Akrostichon bezeichnet.) Albrechts Herzenswunsch musste es sein, seine Brüder für den Glauben der Reformation zu gewinnen. Von seinem Bemühen zu diesem Ziele zeugen zahlreiche seiner Briefe an seine Verwandten. So schrieb er unter dem 26. Sept. 1527 an seinen Brüder Georg: ". . . Euer Liebden wollen alle Furcht hintansetzen, Land, Leute, Weib, Kind, auch euren eigenen Leib verachten und verlassen . . . Der Euch Leib und Seele gegeben, . . . der kann Euch vor Teufel, König, Fürsten u.s.w. erhalten. Denn wahrlich, den Rittern Gottes gebühret mit dem Schwert des Geistes zu streiten und beständig ohne alle Feldflucht, bei Christo dem einigen Haupt zu stehen."²⁸ Georg wurde im Einvernehmen mit seinem so für ihn betenden Bruder Albrecht auf dem Augsburger Reichstag zum mutigen Bekenner des evangelischen Glaubens. Der älteste Bruder, Casimir, blieb von Albrechts frommem Werben allerdings unbeeinflusst. Das Lied für Casimir aber ist besonders gedrungen, stark im protestantischen Bekennerinn. So schon sein Eingang:

CApitan, Herr Gott vater meyn,
deyn gnad erschein
mir, weyl ich hie ym leben bynn. . .
. . . Entdeck mir, Herr, den rechten
Grund,
die Stund ist hie der grösten not,
verhalt mir nicht deyn göttlichs
wort!
Die Pfort des lebens durch den todt
bist allein, meyn Herr und Gott
sich naht die Zeyt der propherey:
Herr, mach uns frey. . .

. . . MARGKt, stedt und all meyn
unterthan
ich von dir han,
behüt sie all für falsche leer! . . .
. . . Dein göttlichs Wort das teyl
uns mit,
das nit der Teufel uns verführ . . .
. . . Grafen, Herren, Ritter und
Knecht
und all yhr gschlecht,
befehl ich dir, meyn Herr und Got.

Immer inniger wird das Flehen des gläubigen Herrschers. Der Charakter der Bitte für den leiblichen Bruder tritt mehr und mehr zurück. Immer stärker wird das Flehen um das letzte Heil der eigenen Seele und der Kinder des Landes:

Ynn dein erbarmung hoffen wir
ynn treuer gyr . . .

. . . drumb sterk uns, Herr, das
wir ynn dich

hoffen und trawen hie und dort,
deyn wort ist warheit sicherlich,
gib uns das leben ewiglich.
Burgecht gib uns ynn deynem
reich . . .
. . . ach Herr, nit weych,
deyn gnedigs gsicht von uns nicht
wend!

Wenn kompt die zeyt der letzten
nott,
der tod unns greiff mit grymmen
an,
so biss, Herr, unser wehr und schild!
du wilt von uns gebeten han.
ich bit für all meyn unterthan!

Spricht aus solchen Versen der um Glauben flehende Herrscher in der Verantwortlichkeit Gott gegenüber "für all meyn unterthan," so war Albrecht auch der um sein verantwortungsvolles Amt wissende Vater der christlichen Familie. In einer Vielzahl von Gebeten zeigte er seiner im katholischen Glauben erzogenen "Gabe Gottes," seiner Gemahlin Dorothea, wie der Christ beten soll. Seiner Tochter zugeeignet war sein "Glaubenslied," das er mit eigener Hand auf die freien Einbandseiten seines persönlichen Handexemplars des Lutherischen Katechismus eintrug. In sechs kurzen, kräftigen Strophen fasst es das zweite Hauptstück des "kleinen Katechismus" zusammen.²⁹ Das Buch, in das er das Lied eintrug, war das seiner 1547 verstorbenen Gattin Dorothea. Der Platz des Eintrags mag für den persönlichen Wert des Liedes für Albrecht sprechen!) Das Lied findet sich, von Johannes Stobbaeus mit einem fünfstimmigen Satz versehen, als Nr. 39 in dem in Danzig 1634 erschienenen Werk: "*Christliche Lieder* Auf gewöhnliche preussische Kirchen-Melodeyen durchaus gerichtet, und mit fünf Stimmen componieret. Durch Johannem Eccardum . . . Und Johonnem Stobaeum."³⁰

Ich glaub an Gott
der geschaffen hat,
den Himmel und die Erden,
Allmächtiger,
Gott Vater mein,
Der uns hat lassen werden
die Kinder sein,
ja wenn wir leben überein.

Auch Jesus Crist.
sein suen ist
vom heiligen geist empfangen
von einer Junckfraw zart
geboren wart
maria was ir nome—
ist worden fleisch
auf das er unser sund zuereis.

In sechs ähnlich gebauten Strophen beschreibt und erklärt das Lied das Leiden des Herrn Jesus, Auferstehung, Himmelfahrt und die Wirkung des Heiligen Geistes:

Trifaltigkeit
ein gotheit kleit
in ainigkeit thut swewen,

ein Kirch auch ist,
die heylig versammlung jesu crist.

Darauf folgt ein gebetsmässiger Abschluss des Ganzen.

Erst 1885 verschwand das Glaubenslied des ersten Herzogs in Preussen aus dem evangelischen Kirchengesangbuch des Landes, das er reformiert hatte.³¹ Es ist eines jener unscheinbaren Wunder im grenzenaufhebenden Wirken des gläubigen Wortes, dass die evangelischen preussischen Litauer ebenso wie die evangelischen Christen in Polen und Litauen das Glaubenslied des Herzogs Albrecht, in ihre Muttersprache übersetzt, weitersangen bis in unsere Tage.

Nach den beiden ersten Königsberger Gesangbüchern liess Herzog Albrecht noch ein weiteres Gesangbuch, besser ein "Chorbuch" drucken. Es erschien im Jahr 1540 in Augsburg³² unter dem Titel: "*Concentus novi trium vocum. News gesang mit dreyen stymmen / den Kirchen und Schulen zu nutz, newlich in Preussen durch Joannem Kugelmann Gesetzt.*"³³ Item etliche Stück mit Acht, Sechs, Fünf und Vier Stymmen hinzugesetzt.

Die Sammlung enthält neben Liedern von Martin Luther das in der Reformationszeit weitverbreitete Lied Poliananders: "Nun lob' mein Seel den Herren," und ein ebenfalls im 16. Jhdt. in ganz Deutschland bekanntes Lied, das Gottes Hilfe und Schutz gegen die Türken herbeiführt.³⁴ Die Sorge Albrechts für sein Land war berechtigt. Er hatte diplomatische Nachrichten, dass die Türken beabsichtigten, nach der Eroberung Ungarns in nördlicher Richtung vorzustossen und über Polen und Preussen hinweg die Ostseehäfen zu erobern:

Geistlich Lied wider den Türken:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>1. O Herr, ich ruf' dein' Namen an,
da mir sonst niemand helfen kann
in diesen strengen Zeiten.
Schau, wie der Türk so grausam
wüt't,
darvor uns, lieber Herr, behüt,
und hilf uns, ihn bestreiten.
Wir sind sonst ganz und gar
verlorn,
ob wir schon haben deinen Zorn
auf uns schwerlich geladen.
So denk doch, dass wir sind
getauft,
dazu mit Christi Blut erkauf't.
deshalb wollst uns begnaden.</p> <p>2. Und eilends uns mit Hilf erschein!
Herr, lass die Sach' dein eigen
sein,</p> | <p>weils deinen heiligen Glauben
bei deinem Christenvolk betrifft.
De Feind, der allen Jammer
stiftt,
will uns des gar berauben.
Und siehst du zu solcher
Beschwer,
so wird bei uns dein göttlich Ehr
mit allem Lob verschwinden.
Das traue ich dir im Herzen nit;
weshalb ich dich durch Jesum
bitt',
wollst uns der Last entbinden.</p> <p>3. Seit nun der Türk so peinlich tobt
und dich der Toten keiner lobt,
die zu der Höll absteigen,
So leids nicht, dass er uns ausreut
und mach dein christlich Volk zur</p> |
|---|---|

JOHN G. KUNSTMANN *Festschrift*

Beut
wir können ja nicht schweigen.
Wir müssen dich hoch mit
Geduld
armahnen Christi gross
Unschuld,
die er für uns getragen.
Deshalb schrei ich um Trost zu
dir:
hilf meinem Volk, desgleichen mir
ich weiss sonst kein'm zu klagen.
4. Sonst würdest du uns unbekannt,
der Nam' Jesus würd nicht
genannt,

da ihn die Heiden hassen.
Auch würd der heilige Geist
verspott',
sagen: wo ist der Christen Gott,
er hat sie gar verlassen.
Daselb'ge, lieber Herr betracht
und hilf uns jetzt mit aller Macht
dein Ehr und Lob erhalten.
und bleib bei uns bei Tag und
Nacht,
so wird der Türk und all sein
Pracht
von dir uns nimmer spalten."

Wir erinnern uns—alle anderen wichtigen Einzelheiten aus Platzrücksichten unerwähnt lassend—des Marienliedes, das Albrecht noch als Hochmeister des Deutschen Ritterordens schuf. (Vgl. weiter oben!) Die angewendete Argumentation beider Lieder berührt sich im gedanklichen Zusammenhang auf das Engste. Dort: "ob ich dich wohl erzürnet han"—hier: "ob wir schon haben deinen Zorn" . . . ; dort der Hinweis auf das eigenste Eigentum der Gottesmutter in den Versen: "Dweil dich der Handel selbst berührt . . . denn Land und Leute ist eigen dein,"—hier: "Herr, lass die Sach dein eigen sein" und dann im Weiteren die gläubige Beweisführung: "Sonst würdest du uns unbekannt, / der Name Jesus würd' nicht genannt . . . / auch würd der heilige Geist verspott / sagen: wo ist der Christen Gott, / er hat sie gar verlassen." Zwischen dem Marienlied von 1521/22 und dem Türkenlied von 1540 liegen Reformation, politische Ereignisse aller Art und manche bittere Erfahrung. Des gläubigen Dichters Denkweise und Glaubenseinfalt sind von dort nach hier unverändert: In rückhaltlosem Vertrauen auf den Herrn bittet er nicht nur um Hilfe, Gnade, Rettung und Zuversicht, weil es dem Christen kraft des Evangeliums verheissen ist, dass sein Beten erhört werden wird; er macht Gott auch klar, um was es sich eigentlich handelt und welches die Folgen wären, erhörte der Herr das Gebet nicht. Ein erschütternd menschlicher Zug einer der grossen Herrscherpersönlichkeiten des wildbewegten 16. Jahrhunderts wird hier warm und rührend ins Wort des Gebetslieds geformt.

Die ursprünglichste Gebetssituation des Gottessohnes im Garten Gethsemane und die verzweifeltste Stunde jedes Christen sind in des gläubig einfältigen Herzogs Worten gegenwärtig:

Deshalb schrei ich um Trost zu
dir . . .
Hilf meinem Volk, desgleichen
mir . . .
Dasselbig, lieber Herr betracht

und hilf uns jetzt mit aller macht
dein Ehr und Lob erhalten
wir müssen dich hoch mit geduld
ermahnen Christi gross
Unschuld . . .³⁵

Unendliche Enttäuschungen, Niederlagen, Verzweiflungen und Kränkungen musste der Herzog in seinem Leben erfahren. Sie mochten ihn zeitweise in seinem Herrscheramt verzweifeln lassen, nie aber in seinem innigem kindlichen Gottvertrauen. Schlimmer als alle Anfeindung und Schlechtigkeit, die ihm in seiner offiziellen Herrscherfunktion das Leben verbitterten, traf ihn der Verlust seiner "Gottesgabe", seiner ehelichen Lebensgehährtin Dorothea, die 1547 starb. (Dass man von ihr zuzeiten als von der "Heiligen Elisabeth" Preussens gesprochen hat, mag ihre menschlichen Grösse erkennbar machen).

Im Zusammenhang mit diesem herbsten Verlust, der den Herzog traf, entstand das Lied, das dieser Betrachtung den Titel gab:

Was meyn got wil, das gscheh' alzeit.

Bis heute wird es zu den Lieblingsgesängen der evangelischen Kirchengemeinde gerechnet. Der Text lautet nach dem *Kopenhagener Gesangbuch* von 1571 folgendermassen:³⁶

1 Was mein Gott will, das gscheh'
allzeit,
sein Will ist der allerbeste;
zu helfen den ist er bereit,
die an ihn glauben feste.
Er hilft aus Not
der getreue Gott,
er tröst die Welt mit Massen.
Wer Gott vertraut,
fest auf ihn baut,
den will er nicht verlassen.

2. Gott ist mein Trost, mein
Zuversicht,
mein Hoffnung und das Leben.
Was mein Gott will, das mir
geschicht,
will mich nicht widerstreben.
Sein Wort ist wahr
all eure Haar
er selber hat gezählet.
Er hüt't und wacht,
stets für uns tracht,

aufdass uns gar-nichts fehlet.

3. Darumb will ich von dieser Welt
abscheiden in Gottes Willen,
Zu meinem Gott, wenn's ihm
gefällt,
will ich ihn halten stille.
Mein arme Seel
ich Gott befehl
in meiner letzten Stunde.
Du frommer Gott,
Sünd, Höll und Tod
hast du mir überwunden.

4. Lob, Ehr und Dank sei dir gesagt,
o Vater aller Gnaden,
der uns sein Sohn gegeben hat,
damit auf ihn geladen
aller Welt Sünd,
o Menschenkind
thu du das recht bedenken,
schi-ck dich darein,
dankbar zu sein,
was dir Gott selbst tut schenken.

Nur Weniges und auch dieses nur als Andeutung und Hin-

weis konnte im begrenztem Rahmen dieser Abhandlung über Herzog Albrecht von Preussen als Lieddichter der Reformation ausgesagt werden. Vieles musste unerwähnt bleiben. Es mag dem Verfasser, der als später Landsmann aus altpreussisch-lithauischer Familie selbst voller Stolz die "Alberten" trug und als einer der letzten Studenten der "Albertus-Universität" an der von Albrecht gegründeten *alma mater* seine Lehrer und seine weg- und richtungweisenden wissenschaftlichen Begegnungen fand, nicht verargt werden, dass er die Freude nicht verbergen mochte, mit der er bei dem eigenste Tiefen berührenden Werk des frommen Dichters und Herrschers verweilte.

Vierhundert Jahre sind seit Albrechts Lebenszeit vergangen. Die Welt, in der wir leben, hat ihr Gesicht verändert. Nicht verändert hat sich das Verhältnis des Menschen zu den letzten Fragen. Gültig geblieben ist für sie die Tröstung des christlichen Herzens in den Worten des Liedes, das der erste Herzog in Preussen für sich selbst und für "all sein Unterthan" schrieb:

"Was mein Gott will, das gscheh' allzeit, / sein Will' ist der aller beste./ Zu helfen den' ist er bereit, / die an ihn glauben feste."

NOTES

1. Zitat nach: Götz v. Selle: *Geschichte der Albertus-Universität*, Königsberg, 1944.

2. besonders in *Monatsschrift für Gottesdienst und kirchliche Kunst*, 13. Jahrgang, 1908 und auch in späteren Jahrgängen dieser Zeitschrift.

3. Paul Gennrich: "Die ostpreussischen Kirchenliederdichter" in *Die Welt des Gesangbuchs*, Heft 19, wiederholt lediglich die Ausführungen Friedrich Spittas. Damit ist die Anerkennung seiner Forschungsergebnisse von evangelischer kirchlicher Seite gegeben.

4. In Band 4 der Reihe *Reformation* des Sammelwerks *Deutsche Literatur* (Sammlung literarischer Kunst- und Kulturdenkmäler in Entwicklungsreihen, Leipzig 1938), Titel des Bandes: *Lied- Spruch- und Fabeldichtung im Dienste der Reformation* hsgg. von D. Dr. Arnold E. Berger und D. G. Pfanmüller, S. 127 ff., sind die Texte von 8 Liedern mit Herzog Albrecht von Preussen als Verfasser, abgedruckt. Die Einleitung S. 30/31 verwendet in verkürzter Form die Feststellungen Friedrich Spittas als unbezweifelte historische Tatsachen.

5. Eine Stellungnahme von A. M. Wagner erschien in der Zeitschrift für den deutschen Unterricht XXVI, 8, S. 563 ff.

6. Es sei verwiesen auf folgende Arbeiten, die vor allem zugrundegelegt wurden:

a. Bruno Schumacher: *Geschichte Ost- und Westpreussens*, Königsberg, 1937.

b. Götz v. Selle: *Geschichte der Albertus-Universität zu Königsberg in Preussen*, Königsberg 1944.

- c. Paul Tschackert; "Herzog Albrecht von Preussen als reformatorische Persönlichkeit," *Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte*, 11.Jg. 4. Stück, Halle 1894.
- d. Walther Hubatsch: "Kreuzritterstaat und Hohenzollernmonarchie. Zur Frage der Fortdauer des Deutschen Ordens in Preussen," in *Deutschland und Europa*, Festschrift für Hans Rothfels, Düsseldorf 1951, S.179 ff.
- e. Kurt Forstreuter: *Vom Ordensstaat zum Fürstentum*. Geistige und politische Wandlungen im Deutschordensstaate Preussen unter den Hochmeistern Friedrich und Albrecht (1498-1525), Kitzingen, Main 1951.
- f. Paul Tschackert: *Urkundenbuch zur Reformationsgeschichte des Herzogtums Preussen*, 3 Bände, Leipzig 1890.
- g. *Europäische Briefe im Reformationszeitalter*. Zweihundert Briefe an Markgraf Albrecht von Brandenburg-Ansbach, Herzog in Preussen, hggeg. v. Walther Hubatsch, 1949.
7. P.Schwenke berichtet darüber in *Altpreussische Monatsschrift* 1905, Band XXXII, S. 133 unter: "Zwei Lieder für den Hochmeister Albrecht von Brandenburg" und noch einmal in: Karl Dziatko, Beiträge zur Theorie und Praxis des Buch- und Bibliothekswesens, Bd.II, 1895 S. 64 unter: "Zur altpreussischen Buchdruckergeschichte 1492 bis 1523." Schwenke hielt das Lied für das Werk eines Dichters aus Albrechts Umgebung. Erst Friedrich Spitta hat a.a.O. den Nachweis geführt, dass Albrecht selbst der Verfasser des Liedes war. Schwenke und Spitta geben einen Faksimile-Druck des Originals. Der oben zitierte Text entspricht der von Spitta normalisierten Schreibung.
8. Zitiert nach P. Schwenke, a.a.O. S. 153 f.
9. Nach Paul Tschackert, "Herzog Albrecht von Preussen als reformatorische Persönlichkeit." Vgl. Anmerkung 5c!
10. Vgl. Tschackert, a.a.O. S.18.
11. Seine klaren Vorschriften zur Einführung der Reformation im Bistum Pomesien erliess er am 1. Januar 1525.
12. Walter Hubatsch: "Kreuzritterstaat und Hohenzollernmonarchie . . ." a.a.O. S.187 f. Dort auch eine Vielzahl urkundlicher Belege für diese Feststellung.
13. Zitiert nach Paul Gennrich, a.a.O. S. 15 in der von ihm moderisierten Sprachform.
14. ebenda, S.15.
15. a.a.O. S.33 f.
16. Friedrich Spitta teilt a.a.O. S.33/34 die Vorgänge mit, die zur Entstehung dieser Publikation rund hundert Jahre nach der Reformation führten. Er druckt auf folgenden Seiten ein Gebet Albrechts aus dem Jahr 1559 im vollständigen Text ab.
17. Eine genaue Beschreibung der Drucke bei K.E.Ph. Wackernagel: *Das deutsche Kirchenlied*, Bd. 1, S. 386/388, ferner (von Wackernagel abhängig) Paul Gennrich, a.a.O. S. 18ff. Eine selbständige Untersuchung bietet: Ruth Führer: *Die Gesangbücher der Stadt Königsberg*, Königsberg 1927.
18. Die im gleichen Jahr 1527 in Nürnberg erschienene Ausgabe der Königsberger Gesangbücher ist durch Friedrich Spitta (a.a.O.) eindeutig als Nachdruck erwiesen worden.
19. In Bd.13, Jg.1908 der *Monatsschrift für Gottesdienst und kirchliche Kunst*.
20. Zitiert nach Paul Gennrich, a.a.O. S.19/20.
21. Gottvertrauen und Glaubenstiefe Albrechts sind u.a. in rührend anmutiger Weise bekundet darin, dass er auch in seinen Liebesliedern (an die Prinzessin Dorothea von Dänemark, seine spätere erste Gemahlin, gerichtet) stets von der Gnade Gottes und vom notwendigen Vertrauen auf ihn spricht. Raummangel verbietet im Zusammenhang dieser Arbeit

ein Eingehen auf Albrechts Liebeslieder. Doch sei wenigstens erwähnt, dass z.B. in seinem Lied:

Ach Fräulein Zart,
von schöner Art,
lieblich zu allen Stunden . . .

jede der fünf Strophen mit einem Wort der Bitte beginnt: "Ach, Herr, sei uns gnädig!", während ein anderes jede der vier Strophen mit dem Vers abschliesst: "Alleine Gott mein Hoffnung." Die Texte sind abgedruckt in Friedrich Spittas Aufsatz: "Liebeslieder des Herzogs Albrecht von Preussen," in *Monatsschrift für Gottesdienst und kirchliche Kunst*, Bd. XVII, S.321 ff und S.357 ff.

22. Zitiert nach Paul Gennrich, a.a.O. S. 19.

23. Verwiesen sei auf : Ruth Führer: *Die Gesangbücher der Stadt Königsberg*, Königsberg, 1927.

24. Spitta druckt es im vollen Wortlaut ab a.a.O. S.149.

25. Vgl. dazu Wackernagel a.a.O. Bd.III. Nr 45.

26. Abdruck bei Friedrich Spitta, a.a.O. Jg.XIV, S.327f.

27. Abdruck neben anderen in D.L., Reihe Reformation, Bd. 4, *Lied-, Spruch- und Fabeldichtung im Dienste der Reformation*, Leipzig 1938, S.130 ff. Nr. 42 + 43, vgl. Anmerkung 4!

28. Teilabdruck des Briefes bei Gennrich, a.a.O. S.14.

29. Abdruck bei Friedrich Spitta, *Monatsschrift*, Band XIII, a.a.O. S. 73. Fotokopie der Handschrift auf S. 72.

30. Der Ton-Satz von Stobbaeus ist abgedruckt in *Monatsschrift für Gottesdienst und kirchliche Kunst*, Bd.13, 1908, S.92/93.

31. Den Neuerern des Gesangbuches mag zugutegehalten werden, dass sie den Namen des Verfassers nicht kannten, als sie das Lied aussonderten. Albrecht hat seine Lieder ohne Namensangabe gelassen. Das hatte zur Folge, dass man jahrhundertlang nichts von seiner Verfasserschaft wusste.

32. Albrecht sandte die Gesänge samt Notensatz am 22. Januar 1540 an den Syndikus des Hauses Fugger, Sylvester Reidt, in Augsburg, mit dem Auftrag, sie dort drucken zu lassen, da es damals in Königsberg noch keine Offizin für Notendruck gab. (Vgl. Friedr. Spitta, a.a.O. S. 190).

33. Kugelmann war offiziell "Hoftrompeter" in Albrechts Diensten. Er leitete die herzogliche Hofkantorei. Vgl. dazu vor allem: Maria Federmann: *Musik und Musikpflege zur Zeit Herzog Albrechts*. Zur Geschichte der Königsberger Hofkapelle in den Jahren 1525-78, 14. Bd. der *Königsberger Studien zur Musikwissenschaft*, Kassel 1932.

34. Friedr. Spitta ist a.a.O. S. 190f. der m. E. gültige Beweis gelungen, dass Albrecht der Verfasser des Liedes gewesen sein muss. (Text oben in der von Spitta modernisierten Fassung). Der Originaltext ist abgedruckt bei Ph. Wackernagel, *Das Deutsche Kirchenlied von der ältesten Zeit bis zum Anf. d.17.Jhd.* III. Bd. Nr. 972.

35. An Martin Luthers Lied "Erhalt' uns Herr, bei deinem Wort", sei um der Parallelität der Entstehungsanlässe willen erinnert.

36. Den Nachweis dafür, dass das Lied ein Werk unseres Albrecht ist und nicht das seines Neffen Albrecht Alcibiades führt Friedr. Spitta, a.a.O. S.105 ff. mit absoluter Sicherheit.

MYTHOLOGICAL SOLUTION OF CRISIS

A Parallel between Luther's and Hitler's Germany

JOSEF RYSAN

For a student of cultural history and folklore the German Reformation is one of the most rewarding periods for investigation. It was a *saeculum obscurum* of momentous crisis interwoven with an incredible wealth of folklore and of mythological thought and action. This fifteenth century crisis found a remarkable counterpart in the twentieth century. In both cases the emergency was accompanied by a tremendous eruption of mythological behavior.¹ In both cases a prodigious effort was made to resolve the crisis through what I shall term the mythological solution, *i.e.* through a systematized body of myths, legends, beliefs and superstitions, through organized defamation and persecution of the scapegoat and through cult and ritual around the saviors. In this article I propose to explore the parallel attempts at mythological solution of crisis in Luther's and in Hitler's Germany. Such an investigation will shed light on the origin, nature and function of mythological behavior in the situation of crisis and, in addition, illuminate the surprising emergence of this primitive and archaic mode of thought and action in our modern era.

The crisis which engulfed Reformation Germany was not merely religious but affected the whole order. I believe that E. W. Peuckert² is correct when he characterizes this crisis as the birth pangs of a new age, a transition from feudal agricultural society to the modern bourgeois order taking place underneath the turmoil of religious warfare. To a student of mythological behavior, particularly significant are the explosive accumulation of collective fears, hatreds and frustrations comingled with longings and dreams of surmounting the crisis; the state of high emotional tension, the presence of mass hysteria and actual outbreaks of mental epidemics. Likewise significant during this *saeculum obscurum* is the inability of the Church to absorb, transform and provide normal outlets for these emotions and passions. All this resulted in a colossal upsurge of basically pre- and anti-Christian mode of mythological behavior.

The origin, nature and function of the mythological behavior can best be demonstrated in the case of the witch-craze³ which was typical of Reformation Germany. At this period the

peasants were confronted by certain incomprehensible, uncontrollable and threatening phenomena of nature. These might be storms, droughts, floods, fires, insect plagues, sickness and death among human beings and domestic animals or such trivial adversities of life as the inability to churn butter or to obtain milk from a cow. In order to explain the unknown threat, the peasants objectified their collective fears and frustrations, projected them into the surroundings and mistook these objectifications for reality. The origin and nature of these externalizations is obvious from the terms "weather-", "butter-" and "milk-" witch, also spells of sterility, sickness and death. The belief in witches was universal in Reformation Germany, was shared alike by the Pope and M. Luther, by educated and illiterate, by rich and poor. The sinister aspect of mythological behavior is that the objectification of collective fears and frustrations entails their metamorphosis into powerful hatreds which are necessarily acted out in aggression. Thus the witch became the most common scapegoat for certain prevalent evils. A terrible witch persecution ravaged Europe for three hundred years, and witch-hunting became very important in the mythological solution of the crisis.

The case of the witch-craze also clarifies the essential distinction between the Christian and the mythological mentalities. This difference is best exemplified by their distinct approaches to the problem of evil. In Christianity, evil is of metaphysical and moral character, dwells within man himself and manifests itself in the form of sin. By making it inherent in man, Christianity grants man a choice between good and evil and sets him free from the fears emanating from the outside world. In contradistinction, the mythological mentality objectifies its fears and hatreds, projects them into the surroundings and mistakes them for reality. Consequently, it encounters evil externalized in the outside world, experiences it as a powerful social force and becomes enslaved by it. It is therefore not surprising that Christianity for a long time opposed the basically pre- and anti-Christian mode of mythological behavior.

The tremendous upsurge of mythological behavior in Reformation Germany can best be gauged by the belief in the increasing power of the Devil. Gone was the earlier optimistic conviction that Christ had vanquished Satan forever. The Devil allegedly arrogated himself such monstrous power that he dared to challenge God by attempting to overthrow both the Divine

and the secular orders. This new attitude toward the Devil is best exemplified by the views of Martin Luther on this subject.⁴ During the Reformation both the spheres of nature and of society became progressively demonized. In no period of German history were there more numerous beliefs in mountain giants, trolls, watersprites, elves, fiery and wild men, dragons and the monsters of nature. Never were there greater fears and hatreds of witches, heretics, Jews, Gypsies, Turks and other "evil" minorities. However, it should not be forgotten that during this upsurge of mythological behavior positive as well as negative emotional states of the masses became objectified. The collective wishes, longings, hopes and dreams achieved their externalization in the utopian, millenarian and communistic schemes of the various religious sects which sought the establishment of the Kingdom of God on this earth.⁵

The mythological solution of the Reformation crisis which eventually emerged represented the combination and systematization of various mythological elements which had been present in the culture for some time; and also their uneasy assimilation within the framework of Christianity. Contrary to the rational solution which is based primarily on reason, the mythological solution appeals to powerful collective emotions. It must provide a) relief from oppressive emotional tension; b) an explanation of the causes and nature of the crisis; c) the revelation regarding the course and purpose of history; and d) a suggestion of the course of action necessary to hasten the inevitable outcome predicted by the revelation. The relief of emotional tension is achieved by the objectification and projection of collective emotions; the explanation, by the identifications of the archetypes of the archenemy and of the messiah; the revelation concerning history, by employing the archetypes and categories of dualism, secret world, apocalyptic struggle and the millenium; the course of action, by aggression against the archenemy who becomes the universal scapegoat and by cult and ritual centered around the messiah and his organization.

In Luther's Germany, the Devil was identified as the arch-enemy. He could not, however, fulfill his role as the universal scapegoat because, after all, he was a spirit. It was therefore maintained that he was able to perpetrate such monstrous iniquity only because he had the help of a steadily increasing host of human allies. Consequently, heretics, witches, Jews, Gypsies, vagrant people and Turks were branded as children, disciples,

warriors and tools of the Devil and became the scapegoats for the crisis. M. Luther and his partisans achieved the total demonization of their opposition by the famous accusation that the Mother Church was infiltrated by the forces of the Devil, dominated by the "corpus Antichristi;" nay that the Antichrist himself had usurped the papal throne.⁶

The objectification and projection of the collective wishes, longings and dreams of the masses to master the crisis produced the archetype of the messiah who was identified with M. Luther and his movement. In modern times, this archetype has tended to assume a collective or corporate character and has appeared as a messianic body led by a charismatic leader. Closely connected with this archetype is the evolvment of veneration, adoration, sanctification of the leader and of the ceremonies and rituals. Such behavior imbues the members of the messianic body with a new feeling of faith and strength, a new purpose in life and provides the organization with necessary integration and cohesion.

Each mythological solution advances its own *Weltanschauung* which usually has the impact and function of revelation. However, the mythological revelations concerning history are curiously stereotyped through the ages. They contain the same archetypes and categories of dualism, great conspiracy, secret world, the last apocalyptic battle and the millenium. For the mythological mentality which constantly oscillates between fear and hope, all life is characterized by a strange dualism and polarity. All phenomena fall in the category of friendly-hostile, or good-evil. Thus all history becomes a gigantic struggle between the forces of good and evil, between the believers and unbelievers. This leads to the belief that along with the manifest world there exists a secret world where the enemy forces are engaged in constant conspiracy, betrayal and apostasy with the ultimate aim of corrupting and annihilating the forces of good. For M. Luther these two worlds were identified with *civitas dei* and *civitas diaboli*. The notion of the secret world places undue emphasis on the categories of mystery and of symbolic hidden meaning. During the Reformation crisis everything unfamiliar became immediately suspicious; the suspicious was endowed with a dark halo of secrecy and in turn associated with evil. This led to the development of a rich folklore of defamation and to the subsequent persecution of the above mentioned minorities. In no other period of German history, except the Nazi era, did

religious and political symbolism run so wild nor was the search for the hidden meaning of various events as frenzied. The chronicles of the period abound in accounts of various omens and miracles, all extraordinary phenomena were interpreted as symbols and symptoms of the apocalyptic struggle and the impending end. We must not overlook that this kind of symbolism was closely related to the truly astounding amount of propaganda generated during the Reformation. Affective symbols absorb, convey and discharge collective emotions better than any other medium of communication and, moreover, serve as stimuli for action. In fifteenth century Germany myths, legends, prophecies, slogans, songs, caricature and other folklore became effective political weapons.⁷

Every mythological *Weltanschauung* culminates in an apocalypse and millenium. For the mythological mind a compromise between the forces of good and evil is precluded and therefore the last decisive battle, Armageddon, is inevitable. Thereby the old age will come to a close and the long awaited millenium will be ushered in. Luther himself was convinced that the end of the world was at hand. For example, he associated the advancing Turks with the apocalyptic peoples of Gog and Magog.⁸ In evaluating the mythological solution of crisis in Luther's Germany it must be stressed that it was only partially mythological and that it managed to remain within the framework of traditional Christianity.

This was not true of the crisis which engulfed Germany after the First World War although it resembled in many ways the Reformation crisis. This modern crisis was equally all-embracing and it generated a tense psychological atmosphere in which the activities of numerous panic-, fear-, hate-mongers, demagogues and prophets of doom made the objectification of evil inevitable.⁹ In this situation the Nazis advanced their mythological solution of the crisis. It is beyond the scope of this article to analyze how the Nazis, through political alchemy and syncretism, developed their archetype of the archenemy and the universal scapegoat, the International Jew. It must suffice to state that the process was initiated with the birth of the notorious "stab-in-the-back" legend¹⁰ which placed the blame for the German crisis on various individuals and on such groups as Liberals, Socialists, Communists, Jews and Freemasons. The next decisive phase was the myth advanced by General E. von Ludendorff.¹¹ According to this myth Germany was the innocent victim of

the sinister conspiracy of the supra-national powers of World Jewry, the Communist International and the Roman Catholic Church, in their struggle for world domination. The Nazis completed the process by incorporating and assimilating all these previous scapegoats in their archenemy, the International Jew.

Along with the archenemy the Nazis identified their messiah in the Aryan super-race led by the charismatic leader, Adolf Hitler. In this connection a curious development of political cult and ritual took place.¹² One could observe the ever increasing resemblance of the Nazi Party to its ideological foe, the Catholic Church. The Party possessed its tripartite structure, Führer-Party-Volk, its creeds and dogmas (the Führer never errs), the Holy Script (*Mein Kampf*), canonical writings (Rosenberg's *Myth of the Twentieth Century*), prophets (H. Chamberlain), martyrs (Horst Wessel), saints (Henry I, Duke of Saxony), and heretics (O. Strasser). The Party established the category of the sacred as differentiated from the profane and developed its sacred time and space. By the Nazi sacred time I mean not only the *Kairos* in the Nazi revelation of history but the endeavor to evolve the Party calendar. The Party Year with its observance of holidays, saints' days, festivals and commemorations formed a replica of the *Church Year*. By the Nazi sacred space I mean first, that Germany became the mythical land of the center with her holy mission and various kinds of space, such as historical space, *Lebensraum*, *Kulturraum*. Second, that the Party designated its *loca sacra*, i.e. shrines with holy reliques, (the coffins of sixteen blood witnesses near Feldherrnhalle in Munich), places of pilgrimage, of ritual gatherings, and of cult. It is beyond the scope of this article even to enumerate the crypto-religious motifs, archetypes and categories of the Nazi *Ersatz*-religion, not to mention the more secular Party ceremonial and ritual activities such as parades, rallies, torch processions, dedications of banners, etc.

The Nazi *Weltanschauung* conformed to the above-mentioned archetypes and categories of dualism, great conspiracy, secret world, apocalyptic last battle and the millenium. It is amazing in what a short time Hitler's "revelation" spread by propaganda restructured the consciousness of German masses *vis à vis* the crisis. According to this revelation all history consisted in a mortal struggle between the culture-bearing Aryan super-race and the destruction-mad sub-races manipulated by the Interna-

tional Jew. In connection with the category of dualism it is significant that the leading exponent of Nazi political science and jurisprudence, Carl Schmitt,¹³ elevated the category of friend-foe to the dominant principle of all political behavior. For the Nazis along with the visible world there existed a meta-historical underworld where the sinister machinations, great conspiracy and betrayal of the forces of evil held sway. The result of this view was the hypertrophy of the categories of secrecy and of symbolic meaning. To the Nazi mind history presented itself as a book of revelation written in a secret, profoundly symbolic script. Historical documents turned into palimpsests, historical personalities became puppets of anonymous masters, social groups and institutions became mere fronts or dummy projects, clever devices of camouflage and mimicry. Historical events resembled icebergs with four fifths of their substance submerged and invisible. Thus the *Protocols of Zion*¹⁴ represented the blueprints and the timetable of the Jewish campaign for world domination. Freemasons¹⁵ were considered the shocktroops; the Jesuit Order,¹⁶ the Master Spy organization; Rosicrucians and members of occult movements, well camouflaged front organizations; Esperanto, a clever device of the same Jewish masters. The Nazis convinced themselves that the Red, Black, and Golden Internationals of Communism, Catholicism, and Capitalism, were the different arms of the same Jewish octopus.

There is one new aspect of the mythological solution of crisis in Hitler's Germany which was absent during the Reformation, namely, the extensive use of science for the purpose of rationalization and verification of the Nazi revelation. While Goebbels preached "To think means to doubt," Himmler employed thousands of historians, biologists and other scientists to supply the "scientific" proofs for the Nazi *Weltanschauung*.¹⁷ In Nazi Germany science became remythified and in many instances it reverted to the medieval status of *ancilla theologiae*, only this time of political theology.

The Nazi *Weltanschauung* culminated in the Armageddon followed by the millenium of racial purity, and of political and technological miracles. Certain notions and terminology concerning the Third Reich and the Führer exhibited curious parallels to the heretic doctrine of the thirteenth century Abbot Joachim de Fiore and his Franciscan followers. According to this doctrine all history is divided into three aeons, that of the

Father, that of the Son and that of the Holy Ghost. The third age will bring perfection and will be characterized by the appearance of the great leader designated as *dux*.¹⁸

The fact that the Third Reich which was supposed to last one thousand years collapsed in a mere twelve corroborates the negative nature of the mythological solution of crisis. Mythological behavior through the metamorphosis of collective emotions releases tremendous irrational forces. These forces are usually greeted as the beginning of a new heroic age in which life becomes a crusade and a sacrifice. Nevertheless, these forces are in the end expended in preponderantly negative and destructive purposes and result in fanaticism, bloodshed and holocaust.

In conclusion, it can be stated that the mythological solution of the crisis is a pseudo-solution of provisional, stereotyped and, so to speak, prefabricated nature. Essentially it represents an ominous regression from rational and pragmatic behavior to the archaic mythical and magical attitude of individuals and groups to their *Umwelt*. Although the mythological solution never occurs in pure form, its extent depends on the magnitude of the crisis.

The reasons for its longevity and its survival into our modern age of science are that it appeals to the emotional and irrational forces in man. Hence its emergence in any large scale crisis when the masses lose their faith in the possibility of resolving the emergence with the customary methods of thought and action. In such a situation the mythological solution generates ideas and behavior which are immune to rational arguments and refutation because they are, as G. Sorel¹⁹ pointed out, essentially identical with the faith of the masses. The mythological solution likewise counteracts general disintegration in a situation of crisis because it embodies the collective will to believe and act, provides unity of emotions, will and action and creates group coherence and solidarity. The mythological solution due to its emotional nature and its "pan-symbolism" is ominously suited for our age of mass communications and propaganda.

NOTES

1. My concept of mythological behavior and mentality is based largely on Ernst Cassirer, *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms* (New Haven 1953-57).

2. The best treatment of the Reformation from the point of folklore is Will Erich Peuckert, *Die grosse Wende. Das Apokalyptische Saeculum und Luther* (Hamburg 1948).
3. Cf. Wilhelm G. Soldan and Heinrich Heppe, *Geschichte der Hexenprofesse*, Rev. ed., (Lübeck, Leipzig, 1938).
4. Cf. Erich Klingner, *Luther und der deutsche Volksaberglaube* (Berlin 1912).
5. Cf. Jakob Taubes, *Abendländische Eschatologie* (Bern 1947); also Ernst Bloch, *Thomas Münzer als Theologe der Revolution* (Munich 1921).
6. Hans Preuss, *Die Vorstellungen vom Antichrist im späteren Mittelalter, bei Luther in der konfessionellen Polemik* (Leipzig 1906).
7. Cf. Konrad Lange, *Der Papstesel* (Berlin 1890).
8. Cf. Andrew R. Anderson, *Alexander's Gate, Gog and Magog, and the Inclosed Nations* (Cambridge, Mass. 1932).
9. Cf. Rudolf Olden, *Die Propheten der deutschen Krise* (Berlin 1932).
10. Alfred Rosenberg, *Dolchstoss-Dokumente; Zeugnisse der Vorbereitung zur Revolte vom 9. November 1918* (Munich 1926).
11. Erich von Ludendorff, *Die überstaatlichen Mächte im letzten Jahre des Weltkrieges* (Leipzig, n.d.).
12. Thomas Aich, *Massenmensch und Massenwahn. Zur Psychologie des Kollektivismus* (Munich 1947); also Johann Neuhäusler, *Kreuz und Hakenkreuz* (Munich 1946).
13. Carl Schmitt, *Der Begriff des Politischen*, 3rd ed. (Hamburg 1933).
14. Cf. *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia IV*, 46-60.
15. Cf. Friedrich Hasselbacher, *Entlarvte Freimaurerei*, 5. ed., (Berlin 1937).
16. Cf. Paul von Hoensbroech, *Der Jesuitenorden, eine Enzyklopädie* (Bern, Leipzig 1926-27).
17. Cf. H. R. Trevor-Roper, *The Last Days of Hitler* (New York 1947), pp. 20f.
18. Cf. Karl Löwith, *Meaning in History, The Theological Implications of the Philosophy of History* (Chicago 1949); also Herbert Grundmann, *Neue Forschungen über Joachim de Fiore* (Marburg 1950).
19. George Sorel, *Reflections on Violence* (New York 1941), pp. 32 f.

JOSEPH LANG AND HIS ANTHOLOGIES

B. L. ULLMAN

Joseph Lang (Langius, Lange) was born at Kaisersberg, in Alsace, about 1570.¹ He studied and taught in Strasbourg, then in 1604 he took a position at Freiburg i. Br. as professor of rhetoric, later teaching Greek and mathematics. He died in 1615.

In 1596 Lang published his *Adagia*, a collection of Latin and German proverbs based on earlier collections, as he himself tells us. About 1598 he got out his *Loci communes sive florilegium rerum et materiarum selectarum*, etc.² This octavo edition was printed in Strasbourg by Iosias Rihelius (Rihel, Richel). The work immediately became popular and was reprinted a number of times. The editions of 1605, 1613, 1615, 1621, 1622, 1624, 1625, 1631 were printed in Strasbourg by Rihel or his successors with his types. Franck does not include the 1615, 1622, and 1625 editions; the first is mentioned by Michaud (*Biographie Universelle*), who may, of course, be in error, the second is in the Princeton University Library (verified), the third is in the Bibliothèque Nationale catalogue. There may be still other editions; on the other hand, some of those listed may possibly be "ghosts," and some may merely have new title pages. Glaser printed an edition at Strasbourg in 1655. Lang mentions a Philip Glaser as son-in-law of Rihel. It may well be that the printer Glaser was a relative who continued Rihel's business. In a Strasbourg edition of 1662 (which seems to be a copy of the 1655 edition), the printer Iosias Staedel warns against a reprint by his partner Wilhelm Christian Glaser. Other Strasbourg editions are dated 1674 and 1690. About Lang's similar later work, always published in folio, something will be said below.

It is with the original octavo work and its sources that this paper is primarily concerned. The book consists of a large number of Latin quotations arranged according to topics, beginning with *Abstinencia* and ending with *Zelus*. The author, work, and book of each citation are given. Within each topic, the quotations are grouped in nine classifications according to origin: Bible, Church Fathers, poets, philosophers, sayings (*apophthegmata*), similes (*similitudines*), *exempla sacra* (or *Biblica*) *exempla profana*, and *hieroglyphica* (emblems), in this order, but not all

are represented under each topic. At times, indeed, only one class is quoted under a given topic. The purpose of the book was to instruct the young. Lang makes clear in his preface that his big contribution was the combination of the nine types of quotation in one volume. He recalls that in his school days there were separate collections of *sententiae* of philosophers and orators, "flores et versus gnomologici poetarum a diversis collecti," separate volumes of quotations from the Bible and from the Church Fathers by a certain (*quendam*) Thomas Hibernicus, etc.

It is my purpose to show from what main sources Lang drew some of his materials. Actually it might have been inferred from the above what they were. First of all, he used Thomas Hibernicus, *Manipulus florum*, from which he not only took his quotations from the Bible and the Church Fathers but also the very arrangement of material, beginning with *Abstinencia* and going down the list. He omitted some of Thomas' classifications, changed the titles of others, and added a large number, perhaps chiefly from some of his other sources.

First, however, we must say something about Thomas' life and work. His real name seems to have been Palmer or Palmerston. Born in the thirteenth century, he took a degree at the Sorbonne about 1306.³ Among his writings, or rather those attributed to him, was a work called *Tabula originalium sive manipulus florum*, consisting of two parts, one containing quotations from the Bible ("Flores Biblici") the other from the Church Fathers and others ("Flores doctorum"), arranged by general topics. It is now thought that John Waleys did most of the work and Thomas merely finished it, in 1306. The book was popular, as indicated by the number of surviving manuscripts.⁴ The part containing the *Flores doctorum* was printed many times under such titles as *Manipulus florum seu sententiae Patrum* and *Flores doctorum pene omnium, tam Graecorum, quam Latinorum, qui tum in theologia, tum in philosophia hactenus claruerunt*: 1483, ca. 1494, 1550, 1555, 1556, 1558, 1563, 1567, 1568, 1575, 1576, 1579, 1580, 1622, 1664, 1669 (*bis*), 1678, 1699, 1887.⁵ None of these seem to include the Biblical quotations. Separate editions of the *Flores Bibliorum* were published in 1567, 1568, 1572, 1574, 1699.

In compiling his work Lang seems to have started with the Biblical part of Thomas' book and then proceeded to the other.⁶ The justification for this view is that, though under the various

subject headings not all of the nine classes of quotations are always given, Biblical quotations if given come first; if there are none, the *Sententiae Patrum* have first place.

To give an idea of the extent to which Lang borrowed from Thomas, let us examine the first subject head, *Abstinentia*. Under *Sententiae Patrum*, there are seventeen quotations identical with those in Thomas. Also, they come in the same order except that one from Prosper is put earlier without author's name. Seventeen quotations in Thomas (including one group of five and one of ten at the end) are omitted by Lang. Three quotations are added in Lang which are not in Thomas. It should be added that I have not counted two quotations in later editions of Thomas that are marked with an asterisk to show that they are additions to the author's work. They are not in the 1483 and 1563 editions nor in the two manuscripts examined by me.⁷ The printer of the 1606 edition, Bernardus Gualtheri, gives the impression in his preface that he was the one who introduced them, but they are in the 1575 edition. Examination of more editions is needed to determine when they were added.

Two or three additional illustrations will clinch the point about Lang's borrowing. Under *Ira*, Thomas gives fifty-one passages, not including four marked with an asterisk. Lang has twelve of these, in Thomas' order, from the beginning of Thomas' selection. Under *Sapientia* Thomas has forty-four quotations, not counting two that are marked with an asterisk. Lang has fifteen of these, in the same order. The omitted ones are mostly from the end of the section. Under *Voluntas* Thomas furnishes thirty quotations, of which thirteen are represented in Lang, in the order followed by Thomas.⁸

Lang's poetical quotations are easily traced: they come directly from the *Illustrium poetarum flores* of Octavianus Mirandula (Fioravanti). This anthologist from the town of Mirandola was a canon regular of the Lateran, as he calls himself in a letter about his book addressed to the apostolic protonotary Ottaviano Arcimboldi. What seems to have been the first edition of the *Flores* was called *Viridarium illustrium poetarum* and was published at Venice in 1507, Lyons in 1512, Paris in 1513, and Hagenau in 1517.⁹ The first edition under the new title, *Illustrium poetarum flores*, seems to be that of Strasbourg, 1538. The title page reads: "Illustrium poetarum flores per Octavianum Mirandulam collecti et a studioso quodam in locos communes digesti ac castigati. Cum indice locupletissimo." This leads one

to think that the *Flores* differs from the *Viridarium* only in the rearrangement of the quotations by topics (*loci communes*) and that by this time Ottaviano was no longer living. The rearrangement by the anonymous scholar was clearly intended to produce a verse counterpart to Thomas' *Flores doctorum*. They both begin with a list of authors excerpted, the quotations are placed under subject heads that are arranged alphabetically and that in part agree, and each of the two books ends with an *Index locorum communium*. The 1538, 1544, and (probably) 1549 editions were published by Wendelin Rihel of Strasbourg and those of 1559 and 1567 by his son Iosias, who also printed the first and other editions of Lang. Other editions of the *Flores* appeared in 1539, 1553, 1564, 1565, 1566, 1568, 1574, 1576 (*bis*), 1582, 1583, 1585, 1586 (*bis*), 1588, 1590, 1598, 1616, 1653, 1834. Probably there are several more. Obviously a popular and influential book, presumably used largely in the schools, like other anthologies.¹⁰

The editions of Mirandola have an endorsement by Filippo Beroaldo, no doubt the elder and better known Beroaldo, who died in 1505, rather than his nephew, who lived until 1518. I do not know whether this endorsement occurs in the first edition; the catalogue of the Bibliothèque Nationale mentions it first for the edition of 1538. The Ottaviano Arcimboldi addressed in Ottaviano Mirandola's letter is presumably the archbishop of Milan, who died about 1503, before entering upon his office. Tiraboschi plausibly argues that there must have been an edition before Arcimboldi was named archbishop, as Mirandola still calls him a protonotary.¹¹ The Iacopo Antonio Balbi of Piacenza who wrote a poem praising Ottaviano Mirandola, quoted in the front matter of some editions, is unknown to me.

How closely Lang followed Mirandola may be seen from a few examples. Under *Abstinentia* Mirandola gives seven quotations, all of which are repeated in the same order by Lang, who added one after the first and two at the end. These last are from Menander, in Greek with Latin translation. After a quotation from Ovid, Mirandola gives another with the heading "Et infra." Lang does the same. Other examples are more clearly represented in tabular form:

Mirandola	Lang
.....	Admiratio 1
.....	Admonitio 3 ("Ex Comicis Graecis")

De adolescentia 9	Adolescentia 20 (including M.'s in order)
De adversitate 37	Adversitas 24 (19 from M. in order, 5 new at end)
De adulatione 3	Adulatio 3 (from M.)
De adulterio 5	Adulterium 3 (from M.)
De morbis 8	Aegritudo, morbus 14 (8 from M., 6 added at end)
.....	Aemulatio 1
De aetatibus 27	Aetas, aevitas 4 (from M.)
De afflictione 22	Afflictio 17 (19) ¹² (all from M. in order, 5 omitted)
De nobilitate 15	Nobilitas 12 (all from M. in order; first and last three omitted and one, "Ex Comicis Graecis," added)

It will be noted that several of Lang's additions are from the Greek comic poets, in Greek with Latin translation. It is easy to surmise that Lang took these from the book of his friend and guest, as noted above, Henri Estienne (Stephanus), which is entitled *Comicorum Graecorum sententiae, Latinis versibus ab Henrico Stephano redditae*, Paris, 1569. All of the above citations agree with Estienne's Latin version, except the first, which may have been taken from Erasmus.

The *Sententiae philosophorum* were taken almost entirely from Cicero and Seneca. An examination of nearly a third of the volume reveals about four hundred quotations from Cicero, about one hundred and eighty from Seneca, and the rest from Valerius Maximus (5), Vegetius (2), Gellius (1), Solon (1), Solinus (1). The Ciceronian passages are largely from the philosophical works, but the orations, letters, and rhetorical books are well represented. Thomas Hibernicus included several "autores humanitatis" after the Church Fathers, notably Seneca. It is from this source that Lang drew practically all his Senecan material, as well as that from Valerius and the other rarely cited authors.

This is assured by the order of the quotations and by other indications. Sixteen of Lang's Ciceronian passages are in Thomas, but all but one are starred, that is, were added in the sixteenth century. Lang's source for Cicero can definitely be identified either as *Ciceronis ac Demosthenis sententiae selectae*, put together by Petrus Lagnerius (1564, etc.) or a closely related work. Under *Deus* the first eight passages in Lagnerius and Lang are identical and in the same order. There is also another run of seven. Lagnerius has many more quotations than Lang. Under *Servitus* both have the same eight passages, and only these, in the same order; under *Exilium* they have the same seven. They agree in the form of the reference, e.g., "Cicero Paradoxa penult.," the next to the last (fifth) paradox.

The *Aphorismata* seem to have been put together by Lang from several sources. One naturally thinks of Erasmus' work by that title (1531, etc.). In fact, Erasmus is quoted frequently. This very circumstance shows that Erasmus is not his only source. If Erasmus were not mentioned at all he might be thought of as the sole source, though an insurmountable objection is that Erasmus does not give references for his ancient quotations and Lang does, when Erasmus is not given credit. In about one-third of the book, Erasmus is quoted about 75 times, Plutarch over 100, Diogenes Laertius about 60, Stobaeus about 65, Antonius Melissa 25, Maximus Confessor 35. Lang could have read Plutarch in the volume edited and published, with Latin translations, by his friend H. Estienne (Geneva, 1572).¹³ He did not use Laertius in the volume edited and published by Estienne at Paris in 1570, as the translations differ. Stobaeus, Antonius Melissa, and Maximus Confessor were printed together, with Latin translations, at Frankfurt in 1581, and we may be sure that this is the ultimate, though not necessarily the immediate, source that Lang used for these three authors. Brusonio is quoted over forty times, apparently indirectly from his *Facetiarum exemplorumque libri* (1518, etc.). Less often quoted (nine times) is Aelian's *Varia historia*, perhaps from Gesner's edition of 1556, or the Lyons edition of 1587, or the *Exempla virtutum et vitiorum* of J. Herold (Basel, 1555, etc.). Philostratus, *De vitis sophistarum*, is quoted five times, either from the Strasbourg edition of 1516 or the Basel edition of 1563.

But while Lang may have consulted the ancient authors in the editions mentioned, it is clear that he took at least part and

probably all of his material at second hand. He did not use Lagnerius in this part of his book. In his preface, Lang speaks of the "volumina item apophthegmatum et similibus ab Erasmo et Lycosthene inchoata, locupletata post et digesta per Theodorum Zuingerum, cuius etiam incomparabilis viri industria locupletissimam exemplorum penum, opus illud nobile, quod Theatrum vitae humanae inscribitur nobis exhibuit." Erasmus has already been mentioned, Lycosthenes and Zwinger must be considered. The former's innovation was to arrange Erasmus' selections by *loci communes* (Paris, 1564). T. Zwinger revised Lycosthenes' work under the title *Theatrum vitae humanae* (Basel, 1555, etc.). Probably Lang used the latter, which I have been unable to consult. An examination of Lycosthenes shows that Lang took some of his passages from him or his reviser Zwinger. Lycosthenes' *loci communes* often agree with Lang's. Under each the passages generally succeed one another in the chronological order of the persons who are subjects of the stories. Under *Abstinentia* Lycosthenes has twenty-two passages, only two of which (Stobaeus and Plutarch's *Aristides*) were used by Lang. Under *Abusus*, Lang gives two passages, both taken from Lycosthenes' five. The first is attributed by both in the same words: "Erasmus libro septimo Apophthegmatum ex Gellii libro 17, cap. 19." This makes clear that Lang borrowed from his predecessor. Under *Admonitio* Lang has five apothegms, all among Lycosthenes' seven. Under *Adulatio* seventeen out of eighteen passages in Lang are in Lycosthenes' longer collection. Here as elsewhere Lang often cuts the quotation down. A passage about Antisthenes ends with these words in both: "Laertius libro 6, cap. 1, Brusonius libro 1, cap. 7. Hoc alii Diogeni adscribunt." This too shows where Lang found the passage. On the other hand, there are indications that Lang did not draw directly on Lycosthenes, but on an intermediary, such as Zwinger. Under *Aerarium* Lycosthenes fails to give an attribution to an apothegm of Trajan's but Lang gives credit to "Lang. in Nicephori annotationibus." He may have taken this direct from Johann Lang's translation of Nicephorus (1560, etc.), but it is more likely he depended on Zwinger. Probably Lang obtained from Lycosthenes-Zwinger all his quotations of Stobaeus, Erasmus, Plutarch, Laertius, Brusonio, and the other authors mentioned above.

Lang's remark about Erasmus' *apophthegmata* and *similia* was quoted above. The *similia*, or *similitudines*, are *similes*.

Erasmus' *Parabolae sive similia* was published in 1512 at Strasbourg and was used by Lang, at least indirectly. In his preface Erasmus states that in the case of Plutarch and Seneca he merely picked and shortened the passages, whereas he made up the simile himself in passages taken from Aristotle and Pliny. For example, in Seneca, *Epist.* 50, 6 the comparison between the flexibility of oak wood and the soul is already made, and Erasmus quotes it almost literally. On the other hand, Pliny merely reports (37, 98, 194) that some gems become more brilliant when steeped in vinegar, others when treated with honey, but Erasmus adds a comparison with human beings, some of whom are improved by sharp scolding, others by mild admonitions.

Lang's quotations in the *Similitudines* are of two kinds. In the one, he gives merely the author's name; in the other, a more exact reference. Most of the former go back to Erasmus, whose plan was to give the similes by authors and works without identifying them more precisely. He began his book with "ex Plutarchi moralibus." Most of these are also in Lang, distributed according to topics and ascribed merely to Plutarch. Of the first sixty, not over eight at the most are missing in Lang; those used are in identical language. This, of course, identifies the ultimate source as Erasmus, as he made the translation and adaptation. In about a third of Lang's book, the ascriptions in the *Similitudines* are about as follows: Plutarch 210, Erasmus 65, Seneca 40, Pliny (*N. H.*) 25, others 6. Erasmus specifies at least "in Moralibus" for his Plutarch citations, Lang omits this. Lycosthenes' *Parabolae* (1575, etc.) (probably in Zwinger's revision, not seen by me) is clearly the intermediary between Erasmus and Lang. It contains more of the Erasmus material than is found in Lang. The material is classified as in Lang and the order is often the same.

In the second class of Lang's citations, the references are given, indicating that these were not derived from Erasmus but from a different ultimate source. In a third of the volume, they run about as follows: Pliny 65, Seneca and Cicero 25, Plutarch 1, others 8. The immediate source is Lycosthenes, as is shown by the fact that under *Ars* both he and Lang quote Pliny, giving both book and chapter, and under *Avaritia* one passage from Cicero, and five from Pliny are identified in the same language. In one case the reference is to both Pliny and Herodotus, in another to Pliny and Aristotle.

Valerius Maximus is mentioned by Lang in his preface, but it is quite clear that he was not a main source for Lang's *Exempla profana*. In ten topics common to Valerius and Lang, eight are without mention of Valerius, one has one quotation and one has two quotations from Valerius. Either Lang selected his own *Exempla profana* from ancient and later literature or used a contemporary intermediary. Also mentioned in the preface is Marcus Antonius Sabellicus (Coccius). As in the case of Valerius Maximus, it is clear that Lang in his *Exempla profana* took only a few passages from Sabellico; he cites two works, *Rapsodiae* (*Enneades*), published in 1498-1504, and an unnamed book which is probably the *Exemplorum libri decem* (Strasbourg and Paris, 1509; Basel, 1541). *Rapsodiae* and *Exempla* appeared together at Basel in 1538. Lang's quotations from the untitled book are from books 1-10; i.e., within the number of books of the *Exempla*.

The preface also speaks of Ioannes Baptista Campofulgus. This is Battista Fregoso, author of *De dictis factisque memorabilibus*, written originally in Italian and translated into Latin by C. Gilinus. It was published in 1509, 1518, 1541, 1555, 1565, 1578, 1587, and 1604. If it is safe to judge from the British Museum catalogue, only the 1555 edition of Basel by Herold has the name Campofrugosus and would therefore be the edition that Lang presumably used, though in the text he also calls him Frugosius. A book of Ravisius Textor (Tixier) also appears in the preface. This is the *Officina*, for a quotation in Lang from Ravisius among the *Exempla profana* under the heading *Apostata* is found on fol. 18v of the Venice 1584 edition of Textor. Similarly Lang's quotation under *Astutia* is from Textor fol. 71. Marullus Spalatensis too is occasionally quoted in the *Exempla profana*. Marco Marulo (Marsulić) was born at Spalato (Spl̃t) in 1450 and died in 1524. Lang probably drew on his *De institutione bene beateque vivendi*, first printed in 1506. The Basel edition of 1513 has the title *De religiose vivendi institutione per exempla ex veteri novoque testamento collecta; ex autoribus quoque divi Hieronymi, Gregorii, Eusebii, etc.* The Antwerp edition of 1577 has the title *Dictorum factorumque memorabilium libri sex; sive de bene, etc.* Other editions are of 1531, 1555, and 1586. This must be the work referred to by Lang. But he probably found the quotations from Fregoso, Sabellico, and Marulo in Herold's book of *Exempla*, which is simply a collection of editions of these and other writers.

About the origin of the *Hieroglyphica*, the last of the nine

classifications, there is no doubt whatever. Nearly all are marked as taken from Piero Valeriano's *Hieroglyphica sive de sacris Aegyptiorum*, first published in 1556. In five instances the attribution is to "eruditus quidam libro 1 (or 2) hieroglyphicarum," but one of these is fuller (*s. v. Mercator*): "Pier. Val. lib. 2 Erud. cuiusdam hierogl. p. 570. F." In many editions of Valeriano, his work is followed by two books attributed in the earlier editions to C. A. Curio. In later issues the title reads ". . . duo alii ab eruditissimo viro sunt annexi." In the British Museum catalogue the earliest edition with this title is that printed at Lyons in 1602. One quotation is not attributed, but this is an oversight, for it comes from Valeriano. Just one citation seems at first sight to be independent: Under *Ignorantia* Lang cites Hesychius and states that confirmation is to be found in N. T., Acts 9, but this too is from Valeriano. Thus the case stands at 100 per cent use of Valeriano in Lang's *Hieroglyphica*.

At the end of the volume Lang added an index of fables, emblems, and symbols prepared by a young student, Ioannes Philius. These were based on Joachim Camerarius, *Fabellae Aesopicae*, and the *Emblemata* of Alciati and of Camerarius the Younger.

One of Lang's predecessors in producing classified anthologies was Dominicus Nan(n)us Mirabellius, whose very popular *Polyanthea* was first published in 1503.¹⁴ In 1574, apparently, the printer Maternus Cholinus of Cologne got out an edition in which he combined with Nani's work the *Flores celebriorum sententiarum* of Bartholomeus Amantius, originally published in 1556. Later still the *Sententiarum opus absolutissimum* of Franciscus Tortius (1560, 1580) was integrated with it.¹⁵ In 1604 Lang published a revision under the title *Nova Polyanthea* (Lyons, Zetzner).¹⁶ Like the original Nani, this was printed in folio, as were successive editions and revisions.

Nani too made use of Thomas Hibernicus, though sparingly. Under *Abstinencia* fifteen of his quotations from the Fathers are among Thomas'. In the octavo edition only eight of Lang's seventeen from Thomas are identical with Nani's. I see in this Lang's independence of Nani. In the *Nova Polyanthea* nearly all of Thomas' passages are cited, almost four times as many as Nani gives, and some are in the same order as in Thomas. In other words, in his new work Lang integrated his old work with Nani, subtracting some passages from both, adding others from other sources, including Thomas. Under *Ira* Nani has

some thirty passages taken from Thomas. Lang in his octavo volume has twelve, six of which are in Nani. The folio editions have twenty-two, all in Nani. Under *Sapientia* Nani gives eight of Thomas' quotations. In his octavo edition Lang has fifteen, only four of which are in Nani. The folio editions have twenty-two (and none from any other source). Of these seven are in Nani, twelve in Lang's octavo edition. Obviously in the folio editions Lang resorted directly to Thomas. Under *Voluntas* Nani quotes ten of Thomas' examples. Of these, three are among the thirteen from that source in Lang's *Loci communes*. The *Nova Polyanthea* has twelve of Thomas' passages. Seven of these are in Nani, five others in the *Loci*.¹⁷

Nani's book was first published about the same time as Mirandola's but neither drew from the other. In his *Loci* Lang seems not to have used Nani, in the *Nova Polyanthea* he generally follows his earlier selections from Mirandola with those from Nani. In his revision of Nani's book Lang introduced the emblems and fables which he merely indexed in his own *Loci*. He also drew on his first book, the *Adagia*, and added proverbs to his now huge collection of material.

A brief survey of the revisions of the *Nova Polyanthea* may help clarify a confused situation.¹⁸ In 1607 Lang got out a new edition under the same title but with a new dedicatory letter. This (or the preceding) was reissued in 1608, 1611 (Frankfurt and Lyons), 1612, 1626, 1681. In 1613 Lang produced a revision under the title *Novissima Polyanthea*, with a new preface (Frankfurt and Lyons). In this edition additions were made in the preliminary definitions by Franciscus Sylvius Insulanus, who quotes an *Etymologicon trilingue* of 1607. This was reprinted in 1616 and 1617. In March of 1615, a month before his last illness, Lang wrote a preface for his last edition, entitled *Polyanthea novissimarum novissima*.¹⁹ But the end was not yet. In 1619, four years after Lang's death, his Frankfurt publisher issued a revision under the title, *Florilegium magnum*. This was reprinted in 1620, 1621, 1624, 1625, 1628, 1639, 1645, 1648, 1659, 1669, 1681.

In some editions of Thomas' *Flores doctorum* a dedicatory epistle of Bernardus Gualtheri to Gualtherus Xylander (dated Cologne, 1606) states that Thomas' book had strengthened the "orthodox religion of our fathers" and that not only those who were in agreement with the writer in religious matters but "the enemies of our religion" had recognized that fact, for the latter

had for a long time been printing and reprinting this work. But, he laments, they had printed it in mutilated, depraved form, loaded down with spurious additions, as one might expect from a Calvinist shop. The result is no longer Thomas but the spirit of Calvin, not flowers (of an anthology) but poison. Then he notes some of the changes made. Under *Antichristus* those passages have been omitted which show that the pope is the true head of the Church, under *Confessio* all reference to confession to a priest is deleted, under *Ecclesia* quotations favoring the Roman Church have disappeared, under *Eucharistia* everything is changed, under *Maria* all the passages about the Virgin that Thomas had cited are omitted and instead some misleading quotations from Epiphanius are introduced. And so on. Wondering which edition of Thomas was in the mind of the writer, I consulted the *Index librorum prohibitorum* and found it mentioned in the *Index* (editions of 1758, etc. down to 1948) as the one published by Iacobus Stoer at Geneva in 1596. The 1841 *Index* says it was prohibited (in 1642) because it was falsified in many places by this heretical printer.

This raises a question about Nani and Lang. Nani's book was not put on the *Index*, but Lang's revision of it in the *Novissima Polyanthea* was prohibited in 1626 and 1627 and still appears in the *Index* (1758, etc., 1948). His earlier work escaped. Lang was born a Protestant but became a Catholic in 1603 or 1604. His first printer, Josias Rihel, was a Protestant and perhaps was responsible through his son-in-law, Philip Glaser, for persuading Lang to undertake the *Loci communes*. Rihel's father Wendelin too was a printer, whose first book was Luther's translation of the Bible. Henri Estienne, who was a guest of Lang's and wrote a Greek poem in praise of his *Loci communes*, was a Protestant. In the preface to the *Nova Polyanthea* of 1607 Suentius says that he cleansed the volume of some things that might offend Catholic ears.

Lang's *Loci communes* seems to have followed the "Calvinized" Thomas in avoidance of Catholic dogma. If we consider the criticism of Bernardus Gualtheri of the Calvinistic edition of Thomas, we find that Lang completely omits the topics *Antichristus*, *Eucharistia*, and *Maria*. Under *Confessio* Lang gives six of Thomas' twenty-five quotations from the Fathers; not included are the two that specifically mention priest or confessor. Under *Ecclesia* Lang has nineteen quotations (including six starred items) of Thomas' thirty, plus three not in Thomas.

Not included is the example omitted in the "Calvinized" Thomas, according to the complaint of Bernardus, a quotation from Peter of Ravenna (Chrysologus) that favors the Roman Church by saying that all churches in the world owe to it what the branches of a tree owe to the trunk, etc.

Nani, on the other hand, gives the topics *Antichristus*, *Eucharistia*, and *Maria*, with many selections taken from Thomas, includes the two under *Confessio* that mention priest and confessor, but omits the one from Peter of Ravenna about the Church at Rome. Lang's various revisions of Nani's *Polyanthea* contain the topics *Antichristus*, *Eucharistia*, and *Virgo Maria*. They omit Thomas' quotation about priests receiving confession, but add a different one. The quotation from Peter of Ravenna about the Roman Church is not included. Lang had become a Catholic by the time he made his revisions of Nani.

In his preface to the *Loci communes* Lang spoke of Zwinger's *Theatrum humanae vitae* as a noble work, an extremely rich storehouse of examples, by a man without a peer. This work was still in the *Index* as late as 1841. In the *Index expurgatorius*, published in 1607 and 1608, over twenty pages are devoted to deletions and changes in the 1586 Basel edition of the *Theatrum* to make it acceptable. Some of Erasmus' works were on the *Index* as late as 1847 but not those used by Lang.

The great popularity of the anthologies discussed in this paper, those by Thomas, Nani, Mirandola, and Lang, give some idea of the influence they must have had on the education and literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, especially in Germany. Many an allusion to or imitation of Plutarch or Pliny may indicate borrowing from Lang or Nani, as today (to use an Erasmian *parabola*) a quotation from Shakespeare or Dante may merely reveal familiarity with Bartlett or Hoyt.

NOTES

1. I take most of my data about him from the *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie*, 17 (1883), p. 602, article by J. Franck. I am indebted to Prof. Archer Taylor for some bibliographical details.

2. According to Franck the title page gives no date, but Lang's *Epistola nuncupatoria* is dated 1598. But the copy that Franck describes was printed by "Iosiae Rihelii haeredes," and Rihel did not die until 1609. Franck also states that the title *Anthologia sive florilegium* began to be used in 1645, but this is an error for 1605, as shown by the biography of Rihel in the *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie*. The British Museum catalogue lists a 1631 copy with the new title. Two editions are available to

me, both unfortunately lacking the title page. In both the *Epistola* gives the date 1598. There is a title at the top of fol. 1 (after the front matter) reading *Anthologia seu florilegium*, etc. The total number of numbered leaves in each is the same as that of the supposed first edition (639). The two copies (one mine, one in the University of North Carolina Library) have the same woodcuts and were evidently put out by the same printer, presumably Rihel, but there are minor typographical differences. My copy has errors not in the other copy. The University copy has on its spine "Loci Communes Sive Florilegium 1625" in ink, but it is uncertain whether this is correct. This title may have been taken from the *Epistola*, which speaks of the book as "Loci communes sive florilegium." Similarly my copy has a title page supplied in ink: *Anthologia sive florilegium rerum, et materiar. . . . Argentorati*, but again it cannot be proved that this was what the original title page had. Franck considers Krebs' statement that there was a 1596 edition more than doubtful. Krebs' error may be due to the fact that the front matter contains a Greek epigram by Henricus Stephanus (Estienne) about Lang, written in 1596 while he was visiting Lang in Strasbourg. Probably Lang showed his guest the manuscript on which he was working. Or perhaps Krebs confused the *Adagia* (published in 1596) with the *Loci communes*.

3. *Dictionary of National Biography*, 19, p. 654; L. Delisle, *Le Cabinet de Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, II (Paris, 1874), p. 176.

4. Without any attempt to achieve completeness I have listed twenty-nine.

5. I have the 1699 edition and have seen the editions of 1483, 1563, 1575, and 1606. My list includes those given by P. Glorieux, *Répertoire des Maîtres en Théologie de Paris*, II (1933), p. 118. T. Georgi, *Allgemeines europäisches Bücher-Lexicon* (1742), lists an edition of 1536 (Vienna, Krauss), but this is an error, as no printer of that name operated in Vienna at that time.

6. I have been unable to consult a copy of this book and therefore my statement that Lang used it is purely a guess.

7. I am indebted to Professor Robert Pratt for lending me his microfilms of Cambridge, Peterhouse 163, 164.

8. M. Iacobus Thomasius includes Lang in his book on plagiarism (*Dissertatio philosophica de plagio litterario*, 1692), merely to prevent an incautious reader of Dieterich from concluding that he was a plagiarist; actually Dieterich and Thomasius criticize Thomas for plagiarism and carelessness, Lang only for trusting Thomas, whose use he acknowledges in his preface. The main point for us is the early recognition that Lang drew on Thomas for the *Sententiae Patrum*.

9. My list of editions, based chiefly on the catalogues of the British Museum and the Bibliothèque Nationale, is probably incomplete. I have the edition of 1590, Lyons, Sybil a Porta, listed in neither catalogue, and have seen that of 1564.

10. I can mention two such poetical anthologies. One is called *Sententiae illustriores ex antiquorum poetarum principibus selectae* and was published by the Jesuits of Bourges in 1667. It bears no resemblance to *Mirandola* or Lang. The other is *Sententiae veterum poetarum per locos communes digestae*, by Georgius Maior (Maier). This is much closer to *Mirandola* and Lang but was not the latter's source. The quotations are arranged topically (*per locos communes*), to be sure, but in a haphazard fashion, not alphabetically, and they are quite different from those of *Mirandola* and Lang. Many editions were published, beginning in 1534.

11. G. Tiraboschi, *Biblioteca Modenese*, III (1783), p. 211.

12. Lang breaks up the first quotation into three. *Mirandola* quotes Ovid, *Met.*, then *Fast.*, then *Fast.* again with the heading *Et infra*. Lang omits the first *Fast.* citation but leaves the heading *Et infra* for the second, making it appear that this is from *Met.* This example alone is sufficient to prove that Lang drew on *Mirandola*.

13. He did not use *Apophthegmata Graeca regum . . . ex Plutarcho et Diogene Laertio cum Latina interpretatione* (H. Stephanus, 1568), for the Latin translation by Raphael Regius (Regio) differs from that quoted by Lang, nor Regio's translation of Plutarch (1508). An occasional passage was taken from Thomas Hibernicus, such as the remark of Fabius Verrucosus under *Beneficentia*.

14. Reprinted 1507, 1508, 1512, 1514, 1517, 1522, 1539, 1556, 1565.

15. I have examined the edition of 1574, printed by Cholinus. His preface is dated 1574, but there are reports of an edition of his in 1567. Other editions are 1576 (Cologne and Dillingen), 1585, 1599, 1600 (Lyons and Geneva), 1604, 1612, 1645. The addition of Tontius seems to have been made in the edition of 1585, for which Cholinus wrote a new preface.

16. A Geneva edition of 1600 is listed by J. G. T. Graesse, *Trésor*, IV (Leipzig, 1900), P. Bayle, *Dictionnaire Historique et Critique*, II (Rotterdam, 1697), p. 282, *Biographie Universelle Ancienne et Moderne* (Michaud), 23 (Paris, 1854), p. 167, and *Nouvelle Biographie Générale*, 29 (Paris, 1859), p. 389. This must be the edition of Nani (before revision by Lang) which we know was published in Geneva in 1600.

17. Another collection, called *Pharetra doctorum et philosophorum* (ca. 1472) agrees with Nani and Lang only where they have passages taken from Thomas. This of course means that neither Nani nor Lang were influenced by *Pharetra* but that it too drew on Thomas.

18. Books such as Graesse's *Trésor* confuse the various editions and titles. Only an examination of a large number of copies in various libraries can straighten out matters completely.

19. I have seen no reference to an edition of 1615, but, to judge from the date of the preface, one must have come out then or the next year. Lang's letter and the new title appear in a Venice edition of 1630. The printer was Paulus Guerilius. In his letter Lang mentions as his printer Ioannes Guerilius (presumably the father of Paul), who published the edition of 1607. The 1615 letter may have been merely a revision of one of earlier date. The 1607 edition has a preface by Ioannes Suentius (Svarz), in which he uses language similar to Lang's of 1615.

A NORTH CAROLINA HIMMELSBRIEF

WAYLAND D. HAND

Although the *Himmelsbrief*, or the "Letter from Heaven," or "Our Saviour's Letter," as it was known in England,¹ is widely known in Europe and elsewhere,² it appears to be little known in the United States. It is for this reason that the "Copy of a Letter Written by Jesus Christ," as recovered in North Carolina, is of considerable value to American folklorists as well as to students of folk religion and of cultural history generally.

The letter reproduced here, if not the standard American variety of such "letters from heaven," is typical of them, and can be used as a point of departure for a more general discussion of the *Himmelsbrief*, and particularly of the forms of this genre as found in America. The text given is one which came from an unknown source into the Frank C. Brown Collection of North Carolina Folklore some time between 1910 and 1940.

"A Copy of a Letter Written by Jesus Christ"³

Glory to God on earth, peace, good will toward all men. This being a true copy of a letter written by our blessed Lord and Savior Jesus Christ,⁴ found eighteen miles from Iconium, sixty-five years after our blessed Lord's crucifixion [our blessed Saviour's Crucifixion], transmitted from the Holy City by a [converted] Jew, faithfully translated from the original Hebrew, copy being in [Hebrew Copy, now in] the possession of the Lady Cuba and family Mesapotama [Lady Cuba's family at Mesopotamia]. This letter was written by Jesus Christ and found under a stone round and large [a great stone both round and large] at the foot of the cross (eighteen miles from Iconium) near a certain village called Mesapotama [Mesopotamia]. Upon that stone was written and [or] engraved [engraven] "Blessed is [he] that shall turn me over."⁵ (All) people that saw it prayed to God earnestly and desired (that) he would make known unto them the meaning of the writing that they might not in vain attempt to turn it over. In the meantime [there] came a little child about six [or seven] years old and turned it over without [any] help [or assistance] to the admiration of all present [all those who stood by], and under the stone was found a letter [this letter which was] written by Jesus Christ which was carried [and was carried] to the city of Iconium and there published by persons [a person] belonging to Lady Cuba's family [the Cuba family], and in that letter was written the express commands [the commandments] of Jesus Christ signed by the angel Gabriel ninety-eight years [78 years] after our Savior's birth:⁶ Who-soever worketh on the Sabbath day shall be cursed! I command you to go to church, and (to) keep the Lord's day holy without doing any manner of work. You shall not be idle and spend your time in be-

decking yourself with superfluous suits of [you shall not idly spend your time with superfluities of] costly apparel and vain desires [dresses], for I have ordained it a day of rest. I will have that day kept holy that your sins may be forgiven [you]. Thou shalt [you shall] not break any commandments [my commandments, but] observe and keep them. (This is) written by [with] my own hand and spoken by [with] my own mouth. You shall not only go to church yourself but (also) your man-servant [men servants] and your maid-servant [maid-servants]; and observe my words and learn my commandments; you shall finish your labor any [every] Saturday by six o'clock, at which hour the preparation for [of] the Sabbath doth begin [begins]. I advise you to fast five Fridays in the year [every year], beginning with Good Friday and continuing [to continue] four Fridays immediately following, in remembrance of five body [bloody] wounds I received for (you and) all mankind. You shall diligently and especially labor [diligently and peaceably labor] in such [in your] respective vocation [callings] wherein it has [hath] pleased God to call you. You shall love one another with brotherly love; and cause them that are (not) baptised to come to church and (to) receive the (holy) sacrament (in Baptism and) the [of the] Lord's Supper, and be made members thereof [of the church]; in so doing I will give you long life (and) many blessings and comfort you in the most grievous temptations, and surely they that do the contrary shall be cursed and unprofitable;⁷ I will also send hardness of heart upon them until [till] I see them; but especially hardened impertinent [but especially upon the impenitent] unbelievers he that hath given to the poor (if not he shall be) [shall not be] unprofitable. Remember to keep holy . . . [the Sabbath day]. For the 7th day I have taken to rest myself, and he that hath a copy of this letter, written with my own hand and spoke by [and spoken with] my own mouth and keepeth it without publishing it to others, [shall not prosper, but he that publisheth it to others] shall be blessed of me, and his sins as oft as the stars in the sky and he shall truly believe in me they shall be pardoned,⁸ and if he believe not this writing and my commandments [and this commandment] I will send my plague [plagues] upon them [him] and consume you and your children and your cattle.⁹ And whosoever shall have a copy of this letter written with my own hand and keep it within his . . . [their own houses] nothing shall hurt them, neither pestilence, thunder nor lightning [lightning nor thunder]. And if a woman be with child and in labor, and a copy of this letter be about her, and she put her trust in me, she shall be safely delivered [of her birth]. You shall have nothing of [no news] me but my holy spirit [but by the Holy Scriptures] until the Day of Judgement, all goodness and prosperity shall be in the house [on the house] where a copy of this letter shall be found. (Amen.)

This letter is alluded to in the Frank C. Brown Collection of North Carolina Folklore, but the text is not given, and it is therefore difficult to identify it as the letter which was in pos-

session of the W. R. Dudley family of Moyock, Currituck County many years ago. About 1914 W. B. Covington, of Norfolk, Virginia, wrote to Professor Frank C. Brown, Secretary of the North Carolina Folklore Society, describing the origin of the letter. In its essential details his account seems to have derived from some correspondence about the letter which was published in a newspaper, and perhaps recopied many times as the account passed from hand to hand. That it is both a copy and a paraphrase of the letter produced in full, above, will be evident from the following extracts:

"That Ancient Letter"

Since we mentioned that mysterious letter last week several persons have wanted to see it, so we publish it so that all who have curiosity may be satisfied.

According to the history of the letter, it was written by Jesus Christ just after his crucifixion, signed by the angel Gabriel ninety years after the Savior's birth and presumably deposited by him under a stone at the foot of the cross.

On this stone appeared the following: "Blessed is he who shall turn me over."

No one knew what the inscription meant, or seemed to have sufficient curiosity to investigate, until the stone was turned over by a little child and the letter which follows was discovered:

Whosoever works on the Sabbath day shall be cursed. I command you to go to church and to keep the Lord's day, without any manner of work. You shall not idle or misspend your time bedecking yourself in superfluities of costly apparel and vain dressing for I have ordered it a day of rest. I will have the day kept holy that your sins may be forgiven you.

The remaining six paragraphs are not given here since they follow the "copy . . ." reproduced above with only occasional verbal deviations and spellings. At the end of the letter, which is indicated "Finished." instead of "Amen.," there begins the interesting account of how the "Ancient Letter" reached American shores:

The story goes that the little child who found it passed it to one who became a convert to the Christian faith. He failed to have the letter published. He kept it, however, as a sacred memento of Christ and it passed down to different generations of his family for more than a thousand years.

During this period the family suffered repeated misfortunes, moved to different countries until finally one of them came to America, bringing the letter with them. They settled in Virginia, then moved farther South, still followed by misfortune when finally the last member, a daughter, approached her death-bed and called a neighbor, a Mrs. Thompson, giving her the letter and relating its history for more

than a thousand years. The Thompson woman began the attempt to have it published and it first appeared in the Rome, Ga., *Tribune*, on October 31st, 1891. It then appeared in the Dalton, Ga., *Citizen*, and Mrs. Wortman, now living in Marion, Indiana, clipped it and kept it in her possession for many years without any effort to have it published. She was followed by misfortune which was attributed to her neglect in trying to have the letter published.¹⁰

Several of the better known varieties of the German *Himmelsbrief* have been treated by Fogel,¹¹ and attest to the favor which this sacred and similar religious writings in German enjoyed in this country. No such circulation and vogue can be claimed for letters from heaven deriving from English sources. That the belief in them was at one time more widely known than now may be inferred from Fawn M. Brodie's account of religious revivalism on the American frontier in the early nineteenth century. Speaking of preachers and evangelists in New York state, Mrs. Brodie writes: "Some would mount stumps to preach to imaginary congregations in unknown tongues; others, making apish grimaces, would speed across fields, returning with revelations which they swore they had copied from pieces of parchment hanging in the night sky."¹² The notion of letters actually fluttering down from heaven is, of course, more simple and childlike than most beliefs having to do with letters from heaven, and is a view which was held in the early Christian community.¹³

The earliest American reference to letters from heaven which I know comes from Herbert Halpert, who has kindly placed at my disposal a copy of "The Letter," which came into his possession in 1956 from Mrs. Minerva C. Hill, Kevil, Kentucky. The original copy of this letter is now in the possession of Mrs. Katie Hill Williams, a granddaughter of Anne Trewalla Kelley, who lives near Heath, McCracken County, Kentucky. Mrs. Kelley's parents, Sam Trewalla and wife, came to America in the late 1820's from Truro, England. Mrs. Williams is quite sure that they brought the letter with them when they came to this country. Halpert writes that Mrs. Williams firmly believes in the charm, and claims that it saved her house from destruction once when a tornado passed over it and destroyed an orchard in front of the house. Mrs. Williams also mentioned an instance reported by her son who was working as a telephone lineman near Nashville, Tennessee, and came upon a house still standing after a tornado. He asked the lady why her house had been missed, and she referred to a letter that protected her house.

The son did not see the letter, but Mrs. Williams wondered if it had not been the same letter she had. The letter is in two parts. The first section counsels the cultivation of various Christian virtues, and promises an increase in lands, protection of the house and property against lightning, thunder, and tempest, and bespeaks the help of God for women in travail. Those failing to make the letter public shall not prosper. The second part of the letter is much like the Herefordshire redaction, but diverges from it in several places.

A text intermediate between the early letter in the possession of the Trewalla family and the North Carolina text comes from Newfoundland where it was current in 1895. Writing on this letter, George Patterson observes: "The most powerful charm is a piece of printed paper called 'the letter of Jesus Christ.' This, in addition to the well-known letter of Lentulus to the Senate, contains many absurd superstitions, such as the promise of safe delivery in child-bed and freedom from bodily hurt to those who may possess a copy of it."¹⁴ Unfortunately there is no text, but since the letter of Lentulus is contained on the same "printed sheet," one is tempted to associate it with the standard Herefordshire broadside.

The letter found in the possession of a servant of Count Phillip of Flanders differs in its efficacy from some of the other letters from heaven, but its currency in America reportedly dates from the time of the Revolutionary War.¹⁵ Protecting one's person from weapons of war, this letter was a favorite amulet of soldiers, secured one against all manner of weapons, ancient and modern, including the tomahawk. Furthermore, it was said to afford protection in legal matters, and once is reputed to have saved the life of a person condemned to die.¹⁶ In the realm of medicine it could be counted upon for help from everything from nosebleed to childbirth, and kept one safe from wild beasts and snakes, from falling trees, flood, from thieves, and even from whoredoms.

Finally, to show the range of protection afforded by these various letters from heaven, one should mention the use of the letter from the Lord to King Abgarus of Edessa, as contained on the Hereford broadside. In the north of England, as reported by Henderson, the letter was pasted to the wall to secure the premises against the ravages of the evil eye.¹⁷

Any treatment of letters from heaven in America, which will afford the same conspectus of the English tradition of these

holy writings which Fogel's study gives for the German development must await the reporting of many more texts, and these in turn from different periods of American history. Actual broadsides from American printing houses, if they exist, will throw light on a practice whose origins are to be found more in journalism and in the printing trade, perhaps, than in religious history or folklore. The North Carolina letter, wanting in detail though it is, fills an important gap in our knowledge of this curious phenomenon of folk religion.

University of California
Los Angeles, California

NOTES

1. The broadside reproduced in facsimile in Ella Mary Leather, *The Folk-Lore of Herefordshire* (Hereford and London, 1912), facing page 112, bears the title "A Copy of a Letter / Written / By Our Saviour Jesus Christ." It was printed and sold by Adams & Sons, 5,6,7 East Street, Hereford, but is without date. A similar letter used by women to expedite childbirth in Hereford some seventy years earlier [ca. 1850] was known as "Our Saviour's Letter" (p. 112). After this article was finished, Mrs. Byrd Howell Granger called my attention to a "Copy of a Letter Written by our Lord Jesus Christ," which circulated in the West Indies at the time of World War I. Printed at St. Kitts, Lesser Antilles, no date, the letter closely resembles the Hereford print. The woman who hawked the broadside on the streets of Tortola, Virgin Islands, at six cents apiece claimed that it was efficacious against the burning down of one's house. (*Folk-Lore*, XXVI [1915], 284-286).

2. R. Stübe, who made a detailed study of the *Himmelsbrief* in its ecclesiastical and literary settings (*Der Himmelsbrief*, 1918), found references to letters from heaven in over twenty European and Oriental countries. I have not seen Stübe, but quote from Richard Beitzl, "Brauch und Glaube der Soldaten" in Bernhard Schwertfeger and Erich Otto Volkmann, *Die Deutsche Soldatenkunde* (Leipzig, 1937), I, 327.

3. Since the North Carolina letter appears to be almost an exact copy of the broadside reproduced in Leather, I shall give comparative readings and otherwise emend the North Carolina text which is copied in run-on style. Readings from the Herefordshire text, where manageable, are given in brackets; otherwise in the notes. Fuller readings in the North Carolina text than in the English source are enclosed in parentheses. I have not tried to smooth out sentences brutalized in manifold copying as the letter moved from hand to hand.

4. The Herefordshire letter lacks the salutation, picking up right after the heading (as listed in note 1) with, "Found 18 miles . . ."

5. The historical account in the Herefordshire letter occupies the first and third columns of the three-column broadside, and encloses a figure of an angel with wings, apparently having alighted, and bearing a letter in the right hand. Then in much smaller type running the whole width of the sheet, and occupying six lines of type in all, begins the further treatise on the purpose and meaning of the letter, and instructions concerning its transmission and publication, as follows: "People that saw it prayed to God, . . ." etc., as in the North Carolina version.

6. At this point the Hereford letter contains the following additional material, to explain, no doubt the four collateral pieces on the broadside, which occupy about one half of the total space, beginning at the middle of the center column, and running to the end: "To which are added, King Agbarus's [*sic.*] Letter to the Saviour and our Saviour's Answer; also His Miracles, and Lentulus's Epistle to the Senate of Rome."

7. Herefordshire: "In so doing I will give you a long life, many blessings, your land shall flourish, and your cattle shall bring forth in abundance, and I will bring you many blessings and comforts in the greatest temptations; and he that doth to the contrary shall be unprofitable."

8. Herefordshire: "... shall be blessed of me. And though his sins be in number as the stars of the sky, and he believes in this, he shall be pardoned."

9. Herefordshire: "... my plagues upon him, and consume both him, his children, and his cattle."

10. Cf. *The Frank C. Brown Collection of North Carolina Folklore* (Durham, N.C., 1952 ff.), I, 642 f.

11. Edwin M. Fogel, "The Himmelsbrief," *German American Annals*, X (1908), 286-311. Treated are 1. Der Himmelsbrief, welcher . . . zu sehen ist in der Michaelis Kirche zu St. Germain, no date; 2. The Holstein Himmelsbrief, 1724; 3. The Mechelburg Himmelsbrief in dem Lande Britania, 1725; 4. Die sieben heiligen Himmelsriegel, 1750; 5. The letter shown to Count Phillip of Flanders; 6. The Magdeburg Himmelsbrief, 1783. Fogel also treats several charms with religious content, but these must be distinguished from the Himmelsbrief *per se*. For a facsimile of No. 1, above (St. Germain), see Adolf Spamer, *Die Deutsche Volkskunde* (2nd ed.; Leipzig, 1934-1935), II, 3. A broadside of ca. 1500, "Das ist die abschrift von dem brief den got selbst geschriben hat," is found on page 4. The most thorough survey of the German letters from heaven is that of A. Abt, "Von den Himmelsbriefen," *Hessische Blätter für Volkskunde*, VIII (1909), 81-100.

12. *No Man Knows My History: The Life of Joseph Smith, the Mormon Prophet* (New York, 1945), p. 99. For further notes on this subject, and for bibliography, see my note in the *New York Folklore Quarterly*, III (1947), 164 f.

13. The Judaeo-Christian sect of Elkesaites (2nd Century, A.D.) claimed that their holy book, *Elwai*, fell from heaven to earth. *Handwörterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens* (10 vols., Berlin and Leipzig, 1927-1942), IV, 24. Letters from heaven, hanging in the air are thought to incline themselves to a person wanting to copy off the message; otherwise they fly away. By other counts magic and holy writings may lose their efficacy when copied off. (*Ibid.*, I, 118). Cf. Beitzl, *op. cit.*, p. 327.

14. "Notes on the Folk-Lore of Newfoundland," *Journal of American Folk-Lore*, VIII (1895), 286.

15. Fogel, *op. cit.*, pp. 304-306, reproduces an English version of "The Letter," which he considers as an English elaboration of the German form of the Count Phillip letter, dating from the fifteenth century. For a copy of a much abbreviated German form of the letter current in World War I, see Beitzl, *op. cit.*, p. 328. "Graf Fielepp" letters were also carried by soldiers in the Franco-Prussian War.

16. On the protection afforded a person in legal matters, see *Handwörterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens*, III, 674.

17. William Henderson, *Notes on the Folk-Lore of the Northern Counties of England and the Borders* (London, 1879), p. 194.

"ART THOU HE WHO IS TO COME. . .?"

OSCAR F. JONES

The question *þu is sa qimanda . . .* occurs three times in the *Codex Argenteus*. Wilhelm Streitberg prints it with a circumflex over the *u*, explaining in his footnotes: "*þû* aus *þu + u* (Fragepartikel) . . ." ¹ A number of the handbooks mention the alleged contraction, presenting it without comment as a theory which has found general acceptance, ² or, with a certain amount of caution, as a plausible hypothesis. ³

Supporting arguments are found in a short article by Wilhelm Schulze, "Zur gotischen Grammatik," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* XL (1907), pp. 563-565, and are concerned with syntactic parallelisms. Schulze adduces nine double questions (eight direct and one indirect) which have *-u* or *-uh* in the first part and suggests that the *þu*-passages can be made to correspond with them by interpreting: (1) *þu* (< *þu-u*) *is sa qimanda þau anþarizuh beidaima* (Matt. 11. 3), (2) *þu* (< *þu-u*) *is sa qimanda þau anþaranu wenjaima* (Luke 7. 19), (3) the same (Luke 7. 20). As a fourth example of the contraction he cites a simple indirect question: . . . *frah ina þuban* (< *þu-uþan*) *gadaupnodedi* (Mark 15. 44). ⁴

These proposals are based on the assumption that the correct patterns for such questions have been discovered ⁵ and that aberrant constructions are corrupt unless means of eliminating the irregularity can be found. The present paper takes a dissenting point of view. It attempts to show that (1) Schulze's interpretation of the *þu*-passages is incorrect and that (2) the contraction in question did not and probably could not take place.

Central to the problem is the shape of the enclitic. Is there reason to believe that the interrogative particle had non-syllabic variants? A study of the orthographic evidence suggests that it did not. There are thirty-two uncontroversial occurrences of enclitic *-u*, ⁶ twenty of which are in post-consonantal position ⁷ where the particle must have been a syllabic. The remaining twelve combinations are: *qimaiu* (Matt. 27. 49, Mark 15. 36), *siaiu* (Luke 14. 31), *habaiu* (Luke 14. 28), *sau* (John 9. 2, 19), *swau* (John 18. 22), *ga-u-laubeis* (John 9. 35), *ga-u-laubjats* (Matt. 9. 28), *ga-u-hwa-sehwi* (Mark 8. 23), *bi-u-gitai* (Luke

18. 8), *hailidediu* (Mark 3. 2). It is generally agreed that here also *u* designated a separate syllable.⁸ *Niu* (sixty-six examples) and *jan* (nine examples) are interpreted in the same way, i.e., they are regarded as compounds involving heterosyllabic *-u*.⁹

These are the attested occurrences of the interrogative particle.⁹ To claim that the *juban*-passage and the three *bu*-passages contain non-syllabic variants¹⁰ is to argue in a circle. The only justification for introducing the supplementary structural detail is to make four supposedly incomplete passages follow a self-imposed rule.

Attempts to discover other examples of the contraction have been made but are not convincing, viz., *bu* (< *bu-u*) is *piudans Iudaie* (Matt. 27. 11), the same (John 18. 33), *nu* (< *nu-u*) *galaubeiþ* (John 16. 31).¹¹ Since these are one-clause direct questions, distributional statistics cannot be used to support the proposed interpretation. Eleven one-clause direct questions containing *-u* occur in the Gothic texts, but there are also thirty-one questions of the same type without *-u* or other apparent means of indicating that interrogative rather than declarative formulations are intended, e.g., *qamt her faur mel balwjan unsis* (Matt. 8.29), *disdailiþs ist Kristus* (1st Cor. 1.13), *swa unfrobans sijub* (Gal. 3. 3, see also Mark 7. 18), *bata nu þiubeigo warþ mis dauþus* (Rom. 7.13), *gasaihwis þo qinon* (Luke 7.44). It is quite clear that the two patterns (with and without the particle) were freely interchangeable under such conditions. If the two-clause sequence were better documented, we would probably find that it resembled the one-clause question in this respect.¹² To assume that the patterning permitted a certain amount of flexibility is surely no less logical than to depend upon an undocumented contraction¹³ as the means of accounting for a missing particle.

The separate syllable concept cannot be reconciled with Schulze's explanation by making minor changes in the latter. We cannot argue, for example, that the four passages may contain interrogative particles in syllabic shape, that the orthography would not necessarily reflect their presence. *Juban* is definitely not a way of writing a three-syllable sequence. If such a reading had been intended, the passage would have been spelled out in the characters which we transcribe *juuban*. If a syllable came between *bu* and *ist*, the characteristic arrangement of the

text would call for six Gothic symbols, the equivalents of *þuūist*.¹⁴

It may be mere chance that compounds bringing *u*'s into juxtaposition are not to be found in the extant texts. And it is possible that the rarity with which this vowel sequence occurs at word boundaries within the sentence results from the relatively small number of forms ending in the vowel *u*. On the other hand, there is some reason to believe that *u-u* was deliberately avoided. In *þu ga-u-laubeis du sunau gudis* (John 9.35), the interrogative particle is placed after the second element in the clause rather than after the first, an arrangement which would have produced *þu-u*.

Unfortunately we have no reliable means of determining whether this was the usual practice. There are no other passages with *þu* (or any other formation ending in *u*) followed by an attested interrogative *-u*. It is quite certain, however, that the "normal" position for the particle is immediately after the first element, in direct as well as indirect questions. Of the thirty-two uncontroversial occurrences of *-u* mentioned above¹⁵ only eight are attached to the second element, the first element in these cases being: *þau* (Luke 7. 19, 20; John 7. 17; 1st Cor. 9. 6; Gal. 3. 2, 5), *manwiþo* (Luke 14. 28) and *þu* (the passage cited in the preceding paragraph). An interrogative signal coming directly after the conjunction *þau*, i.e., before the question is actually under way, would be unlikely, but the particle could have been attached to *manwiþo* and to *þu*. It is reasonable to assume that the position of the particle was deliberately shifted in these passages to avoid an awkward hiatus in the first and to eliminate juxtaposition of two *u*'s in the second.

Schulze's explanation of the *þu*-passage—that interrogative *-u* was not combined with the pronoun because the latter was unaccented—cannot be accepted. In two instances the interrogative particle is appended to unaccented prepositions which come at the beginning of a clause: *uzu* (Gal. 3. 2), *abu* (John 18. 34). The subject pronoun could be expected to have as much stress as these prepositions, especially in a language which does not ordinarily employ subject pronouns in unaccented positions.

Even if we are willing to overlook the possibility of the separate syllable and willing to discount attendant orthographic and syntactic difficulties, a problem remains: what would have been the auditor's reaction to Schulze's version of these pas-

sages? Would *þu* (< *þu-u*) have been equated with the sequence: pronoun plus interrogative particle, e.g., *sau ist sa sunus izwar* (John 9.19)? Or would it have been confused with much more common sequences in which subject pronouns were not accompanied by the enclitic, e.g., *sa ist sa arbinumja* (Luke 20.14)? This difficulty is not eliminated by assuming that *þu-u* yielded *þū*. Since Gothic orthography does not distinguish between /u/ and /u:/, we have no way of knowing which phoneme occurred in the second-person pronoun.¹⁶

For that matter, there is no conclusive evidence to show that unaccented *u* could combine with accented *u* to give *ū* under any circumstances. Only seven occurrences¹⁷ of this contraction have been claimed: the four problematic cases cited by Schulze and the three very dubious combinations which are based upon them.¹⁸ To compound the difficulty there is uncertainty regarding the phonemic status of *ū* in Wulfila's language. We have no assurance whatsoever that *u* and *ū* were separate phonemes.¹⁹

Schulze must have realized that he was confronted with a problem here. The last sentence of his article runs: "Durch die besondere gestaltung des satzakzentes wird die kontraktion und ihre syntaktische funktion für das ohr kenntlich gemacht worden sein." Some such explanation is needed if the passages in question are to be interpreted as he suggests. It would be simpler, however, to abandon the contraction theory altogether and to think of these passages as accompanied by intonation patterns capable of signaling interrogation without extraneous aid.

A rule calling for the enclitic particle (or some variant of the particle) in the first clauses of double questions would be much more plausible if reflexes of a similar rule could be found in the Greek original. Free interchange of patterns (with and without *-u*) in the common one-clause question versus rigid adherence to a single pattern (with *-u*) in the less frequent double question is exactly what we would expect to encounter in translation material which has been strongly influenced by foreign syntactical practices. As it happens, however, there is no factual basis for such suppositions. The Greeks had an interrogative particle *póteron* (*póteron* or *pótera . . . ē . . .* like Latin *utrum . . . an . . .*) which could be employed to mark the first of two alternatives, but use of this construction was never obligatory. It seems to have been quite rare in the *koinē*; there is only one occurrence in the entire New Testament.²⁰ Greek

versions of the double questions we have been discussing are without *póteron* or any other particle capable of signaling the alternative sequence.²¹

Our investigation has shown that arguments in support of an interrogative particle for the *bu is sa qimanda* passages are necessarily circular. Whether *u-u* is thought of as yielding (1) *ū*, or (2) *u* accompanied by a characteristic "satzakzent," the contraction is a linguistic Fata Morgana; it depends entirely on the supposed rule governing patterning of alternative sequences. Here as in so many similar cases it would seem best to accept the manuscript readings at their face value without attempting to make them agree with preconceived opinions as to what does or does not constitute correct usage.

NOTES

1. *Die gotische Bibel*³, I (Heidelberg, 1950), 21, 117.
2. Karl Brugmann and Berthold Delbrück, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*², 2. 3 (Strassburg, 1916), 982; Ferdinand Wrede in *Stamm-Heyne's Ulfilas*¹³⁻¹⁴ (Paderborn, 1920), 292; Wilhelm Streitberg, *Gotisches Elementarbuch*⁵⁻⁶ (Heidelberg, 1920), 222; Ernst Kieckers, *Handbuch der vergleichenden gotischen Grammatik* (Munich, 1928), 287.
3. M. H. Jellinek, *Geschichte der gotischen Sprache* (Berlin and Leipzig, 1926), 96; Wilhelm Braune, *Gotische Grammatik*¹⁵ (Tübingen, 1956), 12.
4. Schulze seems to have been somewhat doubtful about the *juþan*-passage. Although part of his argument turns on this example, he is careful to add a qualifying "möglichlicherweise" when he suggests it.
5. Two patterns are set up: Pattern one calls for an introductory question containing an interrogative pronoun and followed by two alternatives (i.e., the two parts of the double question). The first alternative is regularly "ganz unbezeichnet," e.g., *hwapar ist raihtis azetizo, qipan afletanda þus frawaurhteis þau qipan urreis jah gagg* (Matt. 9.5). Also mentioned: Matt. 27.17, Mark 2.9, Luke 6.9, Rom. 8.35 (involves seven alternatives), John 9.2. (This example does not follow the pattern: the first alternative is accompanied by *-u*. Schulze remarks: "Da mochte das fast körperlose pronomen *sa* einer stütze bedürftig scheinen, um die durch den gegensatz bedingte kräftige akzentuierung zu tragen.") Pattern two does not have the introductory question. Here the first of the two alternatives must be accompanied by *-u* or *-uh*, e.g., *daupeins Iohannis uzuh himina was þau uzuh mannam* (Mark 11.30). The other examples cited: Luke 20.4, 22; Mark 3.4, 12.14; John 18.34; Gal. 3.2, 5; John 7.17.
6. For a list, see my article "The Interrogative Particle *-u* in Germanic," *Word*, XIV (1958), 213-223.
7. Post-consonantal *-uh* occurs in double questions where we would expect to find *-u*: Matt. 11.3, John 7.17, Luke 20.4 (2 occurrences), Mark 11.30 (2 occurrences). This *-uh* may be interrogative *-u* followed by a non-syllabic variant of *-uh* (see W. Sonne, *ZfvS*, XII [1863], 279 ff.; Delbrück, *Grundriss*¹, IV [1897], 515; Brugmann, *IF*, XXXIII [1914], 174 f.). Why the second enclitic should appear in these passages is not clear

(see note 12 below), but there are a number of other "pleonastic" occurrences, e.g., Luke 6.45, 15.26; Mark 8.1; 1st Tim. 6.8. For discussion of a particularly troublesome example (Eph. 4.8), see A. Meillet, *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*, XV (1908), 82 (suggests that the MS reading be corrected).

8. Wrede, *Stamm-Hejnye Ulf.*, 292: "Die enklitische Fragepartikel -u behält immer ihren Vocal. . . ." Braune, *Got. Gr.*, 14: "In *sium* . . . , *niu*, *biugitai* (Fragepartikel *u* = *ni-u*, *bi-u-gitai*) . . . ist *iu* zweisilbig, also *i-ú*"; 20: "Zweisilbig ist wohl das *au* zu lesen, welches durch Anfügung der enklitischen Fragepartikel -u . . . entsteht, z. B. *ja-u* . . . , *ga-u-laubjats* . . ." See also Adolf Holtzmann, *Altdeutsche Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1870), 9; Streitberg, *GE*, 77 f.; Fernand Mossé, *Manuel de la langue gotique*² (Paris, 1956), 45. To my knowledge no one has ever suggested a diphthongal pronunciation for any of these combinations. Hermann Paul, *PBB*, IV (1877), 385 f., discusses the possibility of a monophthongal value for the orthographic sequence *au* in *jau*, but this is based on a divergent etymology, one which does not involve enclitic -u.

9. Some scholars claim that the Gothic digraph -au found in certain verbal endings designates reflexes of Gmc. -ō plus -u and Gmc. -a plus -u. In another article (*Word*, XIV, 213-223), I have tried to show that there are valid reasons for rejecting this theory.

10. Complete absence of orthographic evidence would seem to limit possibilities to (a) lengthening of the preceding vowel, (b) utilization of contrasting intonation patterns. Streitberg and other scholars who accepted the contraction theory assumed that *ū* was involved (see Brugmann, *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der königlichen sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Phil.-hist. Kl.*, LXV [1913], 173). Schulze suggested "satzakzent." Both hypotheses are discussed below.

11. Jellinek, *Gesch. d. got. Spr.*, 96; Mossé, *Man. de la lang. got.*, 81.

12. Two of the nine double questions cited by Schulze (John 18.34, Mark 3.4) are without a particle in the second clause. This makes (counting the three passages beginning with *þu*) five out of twelve double questions which do not pattern with -u or -uh in both clauses. Delbrück, in *Grundriss*¹, V (1900), 270, gives a very interesting explanation: "Der erste Theil hat die Gestalt der einfachen Frage, der zweite Theil ist charakterisiert durch *þau* (*aipþau*). . . . Der primitivste Typus dürfte gewesen sein, dass *u* ohne *þau* in der zweiten Frage stand. . . . Eine Andeutung der Zusammengehörigkeit der Sätze liegt darin, dass dem *u* das verbindende *h* hinzugefügt wird, so dass *uh* entsteht. . . . Dass dürfte zu grösserer Deutlichkeit die Einschlebung von *þau* erfolgt sein, welches schliesslich *u* und *uh* verdrängt hat."

13. Behavior of enclitic -uh has no bearing on our problem. Nonsyllabic variants of this particle do not function as interrogatives (see note 7 above and Jacob Grimm, *Deutsche Grammatik*, III [Göttingen, 1831], 754).

14. No one has ever claimed to have discovered an orthographic simplification of Gothic *uu*. There are single consonants within words where we would expect to find doubling. Most of these are undoubtedly scribal errata; a few may be instances of intentional shortening. See Jellinek, *Gesch. d. g. Spr.*, 78 ff. and Streitberg, *GE*, 54. We encounter similar simplification of *ss*, *þþ*, *mm*, *nn*, *gg*, *hh* (but no cases involving vowels) at word boundaries. See Otto Lücke, *Absolute Participia im Gotischen*, Göttingen diss. (1876), 23.

15. With two exceptions (these follow the Greek word order) *niu* comes (a) at the beginning of the question, (b) directly after an introductory *þau* or *ak*. All attested occurrences of *jau* come at the beginning of the question.

16. R. Bethge in Dieter's *Laut- und Formenlehre der altgermanischen Dialekte* (Leipzig, 1898), 23: "Ob betontes *nū* 'nun' und *þū* 'du' von unbetontem *nu* und *þu* noch lautlich geschieden waren . . . , oder ob eine

lautgestalt verallgemeinert war, ist bei dem mangel einer längebezeichnung im gotischen nicht zu entscheiden. . . ."

17. Not included in this figure is the formulation *buktub þan* < **buktu-uh þan* (1st Cor. 10.29), since this is merely mentioned in passing as an alternative to a more convincing explanation (Jellinek, *Gesch. d. got. Spr.*, 95).

18. See note 11 above.

19. William G. Moulton, *Language*, XXIV (1948), 81: "For /u:/ we have only such etymological evidence as Goth. *fuls* J 11.39, ON *fǫll*, OE OS OHG *fūl* 'rotten.' " James W. Marchand in his review of Mossé, *Man. de la lang. got.*, *Lang.*, XXXIII (1957), 236: "The list of phonemes set down above [Mossé's list which includes both /u/ and /u:/] can be defended only on etymological grounds. If one denies the use of etymological criteria, as Mossé does, one will have to deny the existence of phonemic length in Gothic, since the only evidence for this is etymological." For a detailed and stimulating discussion of this problem see Marchand, *General Linguistics*, I (1955), 79-88.

20. John 7.17: . . . *póteron ek tou theou estin ē egò ap' emautou latō*. This is the indirect double question cited by Schulze. The Gothic translation has *-uh* in the first clause and *-u* in the second.

21. For this reason Hermann Hirt objects to Schulze's proposal. See *Handbuch des Urgermanischen*, III (Heidelberg, 1934), 167: "Da . . . im Gr. *sù ei ho erkhómenos* steht, halte ich das nicht für nötig."

ASPECT AS A PROMINENT FACTOR IN THE SURVIVAL
OF THE THIRD WEAK CONJUGATION IN OLD HIGH
GERMAN¹

FRITHJOF A. RAVEN

In Old High German the principal verb productivity, as repeatedly pointed out, occurred in the second weak conjugation.² This by no means precludes productivity and other activity in the remaining two weak conjugations. At the same time a tremendous drift was in progress from the third weak conjugation to the first.³ New verbs were coined freely according to patterns established, or by forcing Latin verbs into the Old High German mold, though the latter was limited chiefly to the second weak class. However, despite the significant depletion of the third weak conjugation due extensively to shift of verbs to the first, this conjugation survived even down to the time of Williram, whereas it had all but disappeared from the remaining West Germanic and North Germanic dialects some time previous to 750 AD, save for traces. There is a reasonable explanation for this linguistic phenomenon: operation of aspect. It has been frequently observed also, that there was some productivity in the third weak conjugation. This productive activity was not due to the medial character of many representative verbs of this conjugation;⁴ neither was it due to the general iterative and durative aspects of the third weak conjugation,⁵ but rather to a specific type of intransitive function, namely the *inchoative-ingressive* aspect⁶ peculiar to this conjugation. Before discussing the role of aspect, however, let me make a survey to show the great numerical disparity between the third weak conjugation and the other two.

A representative statistical comparison of Tatian, Otfred, and Notker (covering about 150 years of Old High German) shows that in the Tatian there are 262 verbs of the first weak conjugation, 144 verbs of the second, and 62 verbs of the third; Otfred employs 246 verbs of the first weak conjugation, 175 verbs of the second, and 84 verbs of the third; Notker uses about 860 verbs of the first weak conjugation, 620 of the second, and some 238 of the third. I have collected and classified all the weak verb occurrences in all the remaining Old High German extant and a rough estimate indicates a proportionate distribution similar to the foregoing. It will be noted that the third

weak class in each of the above monuments is numerically very small. In Otfrid it is about half as great as the second weak conjugation and a third as numerous as the first, whereas in Notker, it numbers about a third as many as the second and but a fourth as many as the first. Now the time-lapse between Otfrid of Weissenburg and Notker Labeo of St. Gall is but little more than a century. Evidently both the first and second weak conjugations were highly productive: a host of transitive denominatives, including practically all such formations from compounds, were added in the second conjugation, while the first was swollen by a veritable avalanche of verbs, chiefly from the third as mentioned, plus some new causatives coined according to established prototype and a small number of strong verbs; the latter were chiefly from the seventh ablaut, such as *saian* 'sow' (seminare). In some cases, the conjugation remained hybrid, for example: *hruofan* 'cry out loudly, shout' (clamare) and *bi-ginnan* 'begin, start' (incipere). Analogy was almost uninhibited.

Yet, in spite of the large-scale drift of verbs to the first weak conjugation, the third did not die out completely during the Old High German era. This was no accident, for the third weak conjugation served a definite purpose and this purpose was closely associated with aspect. This *aspect*, I repeat, was in general durative—but it was the inchoactive aspect in particular, as I see it, that was chiefly responsible. Those verbs which were durative intransitives by nature, such as *suuigên* 'be silent' (silere, tacere), or iterative intransitives such as the old reduplicating verb *bibên* 'tremble' (tremere, pavitare), *folgên* 'follow' (sequi), *uuoônên* 'dwell' (manere, morari), and many others persisted tenaciously all through the period here concerned, forming a core about which the linguistic phenomena concerned revolved. This activity in the third conjugation was of two main types: (1) as stated, drift towards the first weak conjugation, and (2) formation of denominatives of inchoactive-ingressive or durative aspect, largely designed to translate corresponding Latin verbs.

What kind of verbs shifted from the third to the first weak conjugation? How did this movement begin? These questions troubled and puzzled me for many years. Also, why did these verbs go to the first conjugation, not to the second, the most highly productive? Nowhere in the literature have I found an answer to many of these problems, not based primarily on the

phonology involved. The similarity of the final vowels, for the *-en* and *-ên* endings differ merely in vowel quantity, contributed certainly; this coalescence was indubitably very extensively due to the effect of the Germanic accentuation fixed on the root of the verb, though this influence may be deemed secondary (or almost negligible), compared to that of the semantics involved, which in my estimation triggered the inception and controlled the course of this shift of such widely used verbs as *habên*, *sagên* to the first weak class. Therefore, on the basis of the complete data I sought the reason in the meaning, also the prime factor required to classify Old High German weak verbs, as Theodor Jacobi⁷ pointed out as early as 1843. Reasoning that whenever a large-scale movement is involved, which cannot be explained adequately by principles already established, a more inclusive law must be responsible, I set out to examine the data, to ascertain whether such an inclusive principle might be induced. It was obvious that such intransitive verbs as *folgên* 'follow' (sequi) and *siechên* 'be sick' (languere) did not change, but others as *habên* 'have' (habere, tenere), *sagên* 'speak, announce' (dicere, annuntiare), verbs which were both *transitive* and *intransitive*, did. Stated differently, this signifies that the *durative* aspect of *habên* (i.e., meaning "hold") which is *imperfective* and *intransitive* decreased in significance while the *perfective* aspect (= "seize"), which is *transitive*, increased until by the time of Notker Labeo (950 ?—1022) it had become predominant. Apparently, with time the transitive idea in the case of a number of such verbs became preponderant, probably owing to increased transitive usage. As a result, such verbs passed over to the first weak conjugation which already contained many similar verbs. This feature of sensitivity to aspect differences would account reasonably for the fact that some *ôn*-verbs also have third conjugation forms. Indeed the variation in the latter manuscripts, when the sonorous endings were in a highly confused state, plus the operation of aspect, led Graff and others to postulate many more verbs than actually exist. For example (Graff II, 485) gives *ir-rôtagên* 'aeruginare,' which is not correct, for **rôtagôn* is obviously a compound formed from the adjective *rôtag* 'rubens' (G II, 484).⁸ However, 'aeruginare' may mean either 'become rusty' or "make rusty," again a case where both intransitive and transitive use appear to have influenced the glossator. Another verb of the second conjugation, typical of a goodly number of similar examples, is *gi-ruobôn*

(G II, 361) which signifies 'remember' (*reminisci* = sich erinnern) and also 'enumerate' (*dinumerare* = aufzählen). Note that the medial usage is illustrated by the Latin verb glossed in this instance, a not infrequent reason why some Old High German *ôn-verbs* render Latin intransitives, including inchoatives. An excellent example to illustrate this phenomenon is represented by the second conjugation verb *gi-niuuôn*, found in the glosses from the earliest times down to Notker. It translates the Latin verbs 'renovare, reparare, innovare, refricare, insolescere;' the latter but once in the form *ginuuoe* 'insolescat'⁹ 3 sg. pres. subj., a gloss to the Book of Esther. Of this verb, which occurs three times in Notker,¹⁰ and five times in the "Hrabanic-Keronian Glosses"¹¹ besides the above-mentioned form, an analysis of the meanings shows that it is evident that all the Latin verbs translate the word "renew" except 'insolescere.'¹² However, the latter includes the idea of "to exempt, free, or excuse from; to save oneself the trouble" which is certainly equivalent to the concept of "renew." What was to be renewed? In the Middle Ages the answer was the soul, the all-important entity, the crux of mediaeval thought. Another similar example is *gi-resten* of the first weak conjugation, meaning "rest, repose, blow back, exhale, lag, hesitate, delay," etc. (*requiescere, respirare, cessare*). This verb, just as *gi-niuuôn* discussed above, translates Latin transitive verbs as perfective aspect, a factor which accounts for the use of the perfective prefix *gi-* used in these verbs. However, the simplex in each case was indubitably imperfective, since *insolescere* = 'become arrogant' is clearly ingressive while *requiescere* = 'rest, recuperate' is obviously durative. There was certainly a definite trend for verbs which were both transitive and intransitive in meaning to slide over into the first conjugation, a feature especially true for reflexives, i.e., medial verbs. Examples of Latin inchoative type verbs (*ske/sko*-suffix) rendering the middle voice in the second conjugation occur also. In fact, aspects were operative in both the strong as well as weak conjugations, depending on the meaning. W. Wissmann¹³ comments on this point as follows:

"Es hat den Anschein, als ob das Charakteristische mancher *ôn*-Verben darin liegt, dass sie Intransitiva sind, während die starken Verba entweder beides oder nur Transitiva sind. . . . Aber wenn man bedenkt, wie sehr viele Verba im Altgermanischen, auch solche, die heute nur mit einem Objekt gebraucht werden können, sowohl transitiv als auch in-

transitiv vorkommen, wird man nicht für wesentlich halten, dass ein Verb nur intransitiv oder nur transitiv verwandt wird, wenn die zugrundeliegende Vorstellung beides zulässt. Ausserdem liegt es im Wesen der Iterativa, dass sie vorzugsweise Intransitiva sind. Man wird kaum in die Lage kommen, ein Wort zu brauchen, das eine oft vorkommende Handlung bezeichnet, die sich von einem Gegenstand auf einen anderen erstreckt."

Here Wissman points out a similar phenomenon for strong verbs and *ôn*-verbs, where the transitive/intransitive usage is related to aspect, analogously as I have indicated for the drift from the third to the first weak conjugation. (The iterative aspect became associated with the suffix *-elôn*, save for relics such as *bibên* and the first conjugation verbs ending in the suffix *-zen*.) The third weak conjugation lost verbs evidently which could be used either transitively or intransitively, duratives and iteratives. It has been shown that the third weak conjugation consistently shrank from 750 to 1050 AD; it will now be shown why it did not vanish. I shall recapitulate briefly before proceeding.

The third weak conjugation verb remained very useful and retained a certain productivity peculiar to it as mentioned. This in part offset the losses resulting from drift of verbs to the first weak conjugation. Moreover, this productivity in turn is intimately related to, and a result of, the operation of aspect, specifically and principally inchoative-ingressive aspect.¹⁴ It may well have been influenced materially by the Latin inchoatives and other intransitives being Germanicized. At any rate, we find an appreciable increment of new denominatives, mainly from adjectives, and from nouns to a lesser extent, appearing in the third weak conjugation in Old High German. Such are: *ir-altên* 'become old' (*senescere*), *fastên* 'fast' (*jejunare*), *fir-nên* 'become old' (*senescere*), *ir-frostên* 'become frosty,' *fulên* 'slowly disintegrate, melt, vanish' (*tabescere*), *geilên* 'degenerate, be converted' (*insolescere*), *grauuên* 'become gray-haired' (*canescere*, *canere*), *gruonên* 'become green' (*virescere*), *hazzên* 'be jealous' (*zelari*), *ir-chuolên* 'become cold, cool off' (*frigescere*), *lauuên* 'become warm, get tepid' (*tepescere*), *muodên* 'become exhausted' (*faticere*), *nahtên* 'become night, night fall' (*noctescere*), *rifên* 'ripen, mature' (*maturescere*), *sereuuên* 'become dry, sere' (*arescere*), *slaffên* 'slowly disintegrate, melt, vanish' (*tabescere*), *sleuuên*, same meaning (*tabescere*), *tagên* 'become daylight, dawn' (*inlucescere*), *uuesanên* 'wither, fade away' (*marcescere*), *ir-uuellhên*, same meaning (*marcescere*), *ir-zagên*

'languish, droop, give way' (*languescere*). In numerous instances a transitive counterpart to the third conjugation inchoative is found in the first.¹⁵ For example: *altên* 'age, become old' (*alt werden = senescere*) versus *alten* 'miss, neglect, postpone' (*versäumen, verschieben = differre*): *rôtên* 'blush, redden with shame' (*erröten, rot werden, sich röten, schamrot werden = rubescere*) versus *rôten* 'redden, color red' (*rot färben = rubricare*); *uweihhên* 'wither, fade away' (*verwelken = emarcescere*) versus *uweihhen* 'play the go-between in love affairs, flatter by means of low intrigues and enticements, be abjectly servile, etc.' (*Kuppelei treiben, jmd durch niedrige Ränke und Leckungen schmeicheln, ihm ganz zu Willen sein, einer Sache höheren Reiz geben oder verleihen, ihr durch Kunst oder dgl. zu Hilfe, zustatten kommen = lenocinari*) 'mistreat, scourge, batter to pieces, etc.' (*übel zurichten, übel mitnehmen, misshandeln, zerbläuen, zerpeitschen, zerschlagen, zerstoßen, zerschinden = mulcere*); *uwarmên* 'become hot' (*warm, heiss werden, in Hitze geraten = calescere, salidum fieri*) versus *uwarman* 'make hot, render passionate' (*warm, heiss machen, erwärmen, erhitzen, einheizen, leidenschaftlich aufregen, entflammen = calefacere*).

From these few data it should be evident that the process involved during the Old High German period may be reconstructed somewhat as follows: Productivity in the first weak conjugation consisted chiefly of addition of deverbatives (causatives, factitives) and denominatives according to established patterns, plus an increment of verbs from the third weak conjugation and a handful of strong verbs; the movement of third conjugation verbs to the first was in all likelihood initiated by the development of *superiority* due to the weight of mere numerical frequency of the transitive use and idea over the intransitive in the case of verbs admitting both. Productivity in the second conjugation far outstripped that of the other two, consisting almost exclusively of transitive denominatives, many of which were derived from adjectives constructed by addition of adjective suffixes, later clipped and used to form new verbs independently. For example, the verb *herisôn* 'rule, dominate' (= *herrschen, dominari, principari*) was constructed from the Primitive Germanic comparative **hairiza*.¹⁶ Then, from this and similar formations was clipped the suffix *-isôn* and used to make new verbs such as *blachesôn* 'breathe hard, snort' (= *schnauben, anhelare*), from the strong verb *blahan* 'blow, waft' (= *blasen, wehen, flare, spirare*), either via an unattested noun **bla(c)h-*

or by analogy to established pattern, *ge-meitesôn* 'be lascivious, be frolicsome' (= *luxuriare*) from *ga-meit* (adj.) 'deluded, misled, grotesque, foolhardy, impertinent, saucy, brutal' (= *stultus, stolidus*), *lichesôn* 'copy, imitate, emulate, portray' (= *comparare, simulare*) from *lih* 'body, flesh, similitude, resemblance' (= *corpus, caro, similis, aequalis*), both noun and adjective, and the like.¹⁷ Productivity of the type just illustrated was likely intensified by analogy to the pattern established by the suffixes *-elôn* and *-enôn* of similar origin in general, but of different specific nature. The former developed logically from such nouns as *bital* (m.) 'suitor; ambitious, pushing person or official' (= *procus, petitor*); a denominative *bet(t)alôn* 'beg' (= *mendicare*) developed from the foregoing noun, derived from the strong verb *bittan* 'reach for, seize, grasp' (= *petere*), with influence of the second conjugation denominative *bettôn* 'pray' (= *orare, adorare*). Apparently the suffix *-al/ -el*, as in *bital*, became crossed with the Germanic diminutive suffix *-el -li* as in OHG *farhel-i* 'shoat,' *bendil* 'small band, ribbon' (Notker: *brustpendelôn* 'provide with a small breast-band' = *pectus annectere*, Mcp., II; Notker I, 786.24; cf. Brugmann, Grundriss, II, S. 435, 153), for *bettalôn* really denotes 'a succession of small bids or entreaties,' clearly an iterative; *siechelôn* 'be sickly, suffer a reiteration of minor ailments, waste away' is another apt illustration. The latter of the two suffixes mentioned, *-enôn*, developed more directly by simple addition of the *ôn-suffix* to such nouns as *regan* 'rain.' From the adjective suffixes *-sam*, *-haft*, *-lih* productive verb morphemes also developed. Finally, denominatives made from compounds arose almost exclusively in the second weak conjugation.¹⁸ It is hence obvious why it grew so enormously during the Old High German era. The third conjugation consisted of a small core of intransitives, some of Indo-European origin, e.g., the frequentative *bibên* 'quake, tremble' (= *trepidare, tremere*), an original Indo-European reduplication; others were clearly of Primitive Germanic origin, as *armên* 'take pity on, have compassion for' (*misereri*), *mornên* 'mourn, lament' (*moerere*), *folgên* 'follow' (*sequi*),¹⁹ plus a number of denominatives (mostly from adjectives), coined to translate Latin inchoatives. This productivity, however, was not sufficient to compensate for the depletion caused by the loss of verbs which admitted both transitive and intransitive usage (and others) to the first conjugation. Therefore, the ratio of third class to second and first conjugation verbs decreased dur-

ing Old High German times, although the influence of aspect retarded this movement, thereby contributing appreciably to the survival of the third weak conjugation to around 1060 AD. Thereafter, apparently the force of the Germanic accent accelerated the disappearance of the ending vowels, e, ô, ê (synkope)²⁰ and reduction of the sonorous final vowels to a single, short open e, a phonetic phenomenon in all probability intensified by the numerical preponderance of first conjugation transitives. The fact that a century after Notker's death (1022 AD) it is reported that not a single monk in the monastery of St. Gall could read or write, possibly an exaggeration, may serve to indicate, however, that there had ceased to be any significant effect of erudition as a decelerating or stabilizing factor in linguistic flux.

NOTES

1. Originally read at the Convention of MLA Section I, German I (Germanic Philology), Washington, D.C., December 1956 by Prof. Reinhold Nordsieck, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee, while the writer was in Germany as Fulbright Research Professor at the Sprachatlant-Institut Philipps-Universität Marburg. The author is indebted to the Research Committee of the University of Alabama for grants-in-aid in 1952, 1953, 1956 which enabled him to continue research on OHG weak verbs at Harvard University.

2. W. Wilmanns, *Deutsche Grammatik, Gotisch, Alt-, Mittel- und Neuhochdeutsch, 2. Abteilung: Wortbildung*. (Strassburg, 1899), p. 64.

3. F. A. Raven, *The Weak Verb in Notker Labeo*, (Unpublished Dissertation, The George Washington University, 1944), p. 3.

4. Wilmanns, p. 70 (§ 52, Dritte Conjugation).

5. M. Sweet, *The Third Class of Weak Verbs in Primitive Teutonic with Special Reference to its Development in Anglo-Saxon*. (Dissertation, Bryn Mawr; Reprinted in *American Journal of Philology*, vol. XIV, 1893, pp. 409-455), pp. 9-10.

6. W. Streitberg, *Gotisches Elementarbuch*, 5-6 ed. (Heidelberg, 1920), p. 194; also: W. Braune, *Althochdeutsche Grammatik* 369.

7. T. Jacobi, *Beiträge zur deutschen Grammatik*, (1843), pp. 129-150.

8. E. G. Graff, *Althochdeutscher Sprachschatz*, 6 vols. (1834-42), vol. 2, p. 484. Graff gives three attestations under *irrotagên* (oder *irrotagjan*?) These forms, listed in Steinmeyer-Sievers, *Ahd. Glossen*, I, 786.32, are obviously late analogical scribal errors of Bavarian origin (Mss. Clm. 18140 and Clm. 4606) for the verb *ir-rostagên* and apparently the result of contamination, for both verbs translate Lat. *aeruginare* = 'become rusty' [Epist. Jacobi 5, 3: "*Aurum et argentum vestrum aeruginavit, et aerugo eorum in testimonium vobis erit, . . .*"]. The aspect is here clearly inchoative and reveals the strong feeling for this phenomenon even in late times, as we should normally expect *ir-rotagôn* from a compound. Moreover, it has been pointed out that these late Bavarian forms are back-formations and not true OHG double forms; see J. Schatz, "Althochdeutsche Doppelformen

schwacher Verba," in *Germanica, Eduard Sievers zum 75. Geburtstag 25. November 1925*, (Halle a/S, 1925), p. 366. However, in the same article (p. 365), Schatz classifies *rostagên*, which glosses the same verb form in the New Testament verse cited above, as a third conjugation verb, apparently following W. Schade, *Altdeutsches Wörterbuch*, (1872-82), p. 723, and based on his own classification of *rostagata* as a later Franconian attestation for *rostagêta*; c.f. J. Schatz, *Althochdeutsche Grammatik*, (1937), p. 312, where he apparently accepts the contention of Middle Franconian *a* for *ê*, demonstrated earlier by van Helten, "Zur Sprache des Leidener Williram," *PBB*, 22, (1897), 513, and the classification of this verb by Karsten's reasoning.

9. E. Steinmeyer and E. Sievers, *Die althochdeutschen Glossen*, 5 vols. (1879-1916), vol. I. 493,29.

10. E. H. Sehrt and W. K. Legner, *Notker Wortschatz; das gesamte Material zusammengetragen von Edward H. Sehrt und Taylor Starck* (Halle, 1955), p. 394.

11. Steinmeyer-Sievers, I. 176,2 [twice], I. 240,19 [twice], I. 240,20 [once].

12. K. E. Georges, *Kleines lateinisch-deutsches, Handwörterbuch* (Hannover und Leipzig, 1909); H. Baumann and E. Klatt, *Muret-Sanders, Enzyklopädisches englisch-deutsches und deutsch-englisches Wörterbuch, Hand- und Schulausgabe* (Berlin, 1931), reprint by Ungar (New York, 1944); A. Souter, *A Glossary of Later Latin to 600 AD* (Oxford, 1944); Ducange, *Gl. Infim. Lat.* (1883);

renovare: erneuern; wiederherstellen; ins Gedächtnis zurufen, (mit Worten) = wiederholen; erquicken; erfrischen; sich erholen lassen.

innovare: erneuern; (se ad suam intemperatiam Cic. Pis. 89 = seiner vorigen Zügellosigkeit sich von neuem hingeben [Raum geben]); wiederholen.

reparare: wieder erneuern; wieder erwerben; wieder anschaffen; wiederherstellen; wieder ausrüsten; wieder aufbauen; erganzen; ersetzen; wiederherstellen = erquicken, verjüngen; dagegen (dafür) einkaufen = eintauschen.

refricare: erneuern; wieder reiben = wieder ausbrechen (von körperl. Uebeln).

insolescere: ausarten = sich überheben; übermütig werden. [sich überheben = to exempt (or free, excuse) from]; einer Mühe überheben = save a person the trouble; einer Aufgabe, Mühe, Sorge überhoben sein = to be relieved from a task, spared the trouble, the worry; to injure or rupture with lifting; überheben (= zu sehr rühmen) = to be too proud of a thing; ohne mich überheben zu wollen = without boasting; sich überheben = to be overwhelmingly proud, to presume too much.

13. W. Wissmann, *Nomina Postverbalia in den altgermanischen Sprachen (nebst einer Voruntersuchung über deverbative ö-Verba)* (Göttingen, 1932), p. 31.

14. The term *inchoative* has been disputed and it has been contended that the phenomenon involved deals with the transition to a state and should properly be termed *ingressive* (or the departure from an established state = *egressive*). In all cases an inception is tacit. As both of the foregoing aspects are represented in OHG the term *inchoative* will herein be retained and hyphenated, e.g., *inchoative/ingressive* or *inchoative/egressive*.

See F. A. Raven, "Aspekt und Aktionsart in den althochdeutschen Zeitwörtern," *Zeitschrift für Mundartforschung*, XXVI Jahrgang, Heft 1. (Februar 1958), 57-71, where the theory of aspect is reviewed and also F. A. Raven, "Flexibility in Old High German Weak Verbs," *The Germanic Review*, 32, (1957), 72-73, where the present author points out the existence of the *inchoative* aspect in OHG; also Karsten, T. E., "Zur

Kenntnis der inchoativen Aktionsart im Deutschen. II Denominative \bar{e} -Verba mit intransitiv-inchoativer (bzw. perfektiv-ingressiver) Funktion," *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, Nr. 1/2 (1911), Helsingfors, 1-11; *ibid.*, *Mém. de la société néophil. à Helsingfors*, II, (1897), 169 ff.

15. Wilmanns, p. 72.

16. F. Kluge and A. Götze, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, 15 ed. (Berlin, 1951), p. 317; also: Raven, p. 25; however, in general it may be assumed that the δ -suffix in Germanic second conjugation verbs was part of the nominal stem in Indo-Eur. and that $-ai$ (Got. 3d. class verbs) became $-é$ in OHG, but was originally common to all Germanic dialects. According to G. H. Mahlow (1879) the process which produced the German *én*-conjugation was therefore Indo-Eur. $*e >$ Prim. Germanic $*ai >$ OHG \bar{e} , cf. R. Kögel, "Die schwachen Verba zweiter und dritter Klasse," *PBB* IX (1884), 504-523; G. H. Mahlow, *Die langen Vokale a e o in den europäischen Sprachen (ein Beitrag zur vergleichenden Lautlehre der indo-germanischen Sprachen)*, 2. unveränderte Aufl. (Berlin 1888), pp. 19-26.

17. Raven, pp. 24-25.

18. Wilmanns, II, p. 119, 92; Wissmann, p. 34.

19. Sweet, pp. 12-14.

20. Krüer, F., "Der Bindevokal und seine Fuge im schwachen deutschen Präteritum bis 1150," *Palaestra* CXXV, (1914), 357 pp. Krüer studied and collected the common Germanic weak verbal preterite type as illustrated by OHG *brāhta* and the type resulting from the West Germanic syncope such as *hōrta* and those verb forms produced by syncope in German where we find early MHG *nerite* in contrast with OHG *nerita* or early MHG *frageta* as compared with OHG *fragēta*. Krüer also assumed restoration of sonorous vowels in the endings by *svarabhakti* in the high German dialects of the south and by the influence of low German dialects (Franconian and Old Saxon) from the north. Theodor Frings refuted Krüer's hypothesis of vowel loss and restoration by *svarabhakti* in his review, *Anz. f. deutsches Altertum u. deutsche Literatur*, XL (October 1920), 12-22. Krüer, furthermore, failed to realize that the changes proceeded at varying rates in the several dialects involved and that late glosses in mss. copied in low German areas contain many analogical forms. These were collected by J. H. Gallée in *Vorstudien zu einem altniederdeutschen Wörterbuche* (1903). He was criticized severely by Hermann Collitz, incidentally, for abstracting these forms which Steinmeyer properly retains in his compilation of the OHG glosses. Finally, it was this simultaneous operation of several phonetic and semantic changes that led M. H. Roberts to conclude that no phonetic laws are discernible in OHG; see *Sentence Stress and Consonant Shift in Old High German*, Diss. Yale 1932. On p. 271 Roberts attributes phonetic shifts in OHG to "heavy" and "light" sentence position ("effect of stressed words and sharpening of word-cut" which "begin in Rhine Franconian for example in heavy-stressed words and usually at the end of phrases before an extended pause."). Such vague statements apply to practically any language and are, therefore, inconclusive. This rambling dissertation, however, is unusual in one respect at least, for it contains no bibliography—unless the list of OHG text editions from which Roberts drew his specimens (p. 21) and a half-dozen quotations from E. Prokosch, H. Paul, H. Collitz, H. Schuchardt and A. Noreen (scattered through the introduction and close of the thesis) may be so designated.

