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Abstract

The purpose of this dissertation is to compare the attitudes of the anonymous authors of the four commentaries or glosses on the Reineke-Fuchs poem, the first of these, the only pre-Reformation gloss, being written in Middle Low German and printed in 1498 in Lübeck, the second, again in Middle Low German, in 1539 in Rostock, the third, in High German, in 1544 in Frankfurt, and the fourth in 1650 again in Rostock, and to investigate how far these commentators' treatment of the work reflects the cultural history of the period. The three main cultural influences on sixteenth-century writers were, in the literary field, that of moral-didactic literature - where so-called Speculum, "Spiegel" or "Mirror" works were common - and that of Humanism, and, in the area of religion, that of the Roman Church initially and later that of Luther. Taking into consideration the socio-historical background against which the individual glosses were written, the attempt is first made in Chapter 1., based on the authors' prefaces to their glosses, to establish their intention in writing these and the audience they were probably addressing. This is followed in Chapter 2. by a comparison of glosses from all four editions on the same chapters in the narrative text, showing how the 1498 commentator reveals his dependence on his Dutch source for many of his general remarks, and, with regard to religious interpretation, on contemporary works printed in Lübeck in the same decade; how the 1539 commentator, while embodying most of
his predecessor's general commentary in his own, illustrates this with material from a range of different sources, mostly High German; how the 1544 commentator, for his part, eschews literary illustrations and appears to be drawing from his own personal experience in what he writes, and how the 1650 commentator, on the other hand, embroiders his gloss with both Biblical quotations and tales from folklore. The main part of the investigation, however, comprises a comparison of the chapter-glosses under subject-headings: in Chapter 3. that of Government, where their content is compared with that of contemporary Humanist works dealing with the instruction of princes and with princely courts - the so-called "Fürstenspiegel" and "Curials" - and also with Luther's teaching regarding temporal authority and the obedience due to this, and, too, of Law, where attention is drawn particularly to the reflection in the glosses of how the practice of Roman law was superseding that of customary law at that time; in Chapter 4. that of Church, where, based primarily on Luther's writings, an investigation is first made of the difference between the teaching of the Roman Church and that of Luther regarding Church practice - confession, the ban, indulgences, veneration of the saints and pilgrimages - and the status and conduct of the clergy - both of the religious orders and the secular clergy - and of how far both the differences established here and other concerns voiced in contemporary documents are reflected in the glosses; in Chapter 5. that of Society, where the attitude of the individual commentators to the social structure, to women and the family and to the economic conditions of the time are examined
against the background of Humanist writing and that of Luther and
the glosses considered as "Ständespiegel"; in Chapter 6, that of
Literary Influences, where those of Humanism and of moral-didactic
literature are given special study and the glosses assessed as
"Sittenspiegel." Finally, in Chapter 7, a comparison is made
between each commentator's attitude to the fox-figure and
consideration given to how far this attitude reflects his outlook
on life and his social status.
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Introduction

"O vulpis adulacio nu in der werlde bicklet / Sic hominis est racio ghelik dem vosse gheschicket" ("O fox-like fawning now manifest in the world / Thus is the thinking of man fashioned on that of the fox"). These two lines of macaronic verse, which form the caption to a woodcut showing a scribe seated writing at a desk, introduce the Middle Low German epic poem Reynke de vos, printed in Lübeck in 1498, and establish in convincing fashion the tone of a work concerned primarily with the (literary) fox's salient characteristics of cunning, deceit, mendacity, malice and hypocrisy and the success he attains, or alternatively the havoc he wreaks, thereby - a story that was to engage the attention of four separate German commentators between 1498 and 1650. Constituting as they do the unique and peculiar German contribution to the Reineke Fuchs tradition, it is these glosses or commentaries that will be the principal object of my study.

With the RV glosses of 1498, 1539, 1544 and 1650 we are in fact presented with notably different commentaries on basically the same story, commentaries which, while on the one hand displaying similarities in the themes treated, on the other reveal diverse interpretations of these themes, as well as vastly different stylistic methods of presentation.

At the end of the last century Alexander Bieling made the following statement concerning the "Glossierung" as a whole: "sie entrollt...im ganzen ein recht anziehendes Bild von der geistigen Entwicklung unseres Volkes im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert; sie ist
It is assertions such as these concerning the continually changing nature of the glosses that I will be examining here. Basing my findings on the prefaces to the individual works, I will begin by considering the attitude of each commentator towards his work, why he should have decided to write a commentary, what appear to be his main emphases and the audience he seems primarily to be addressing. This will be followed by a detailed examination of two individual chapter-glosses to indicate the way in which the four commentators deal with their text. The main part of this investigation, however, will comprise sections devoted to the commentators' attitudes towards aspects of the times in which they lived. These sections will comprise a) Government, where their attitude to the duties of a ruler, to court life and officialdom and to the relationship between the ruled and the rulers will be examined; b) the Law, which section will constitute an investigation of the extent to which Roman Law had taken over from customary law, as this is revealed in the glosses; c) the Church, where an attempt will be made to show the way in which the glosses reflect the difference in the religious teaching and practice of the Roman church and that of Luther; d) Society, where the emphasis will be on the commentators' attitudes to the social structure in general and to the individual classes of society in particular, also to the economic conditions of the time and to women and the family; e) Literary influences, where the contribution of Humanism and the moral-didactic literature of the
later Middle Ages will be studied. A summing-up dealing principally with each individual commentator's attitude to the fox-figure will return the investigation to the point at which it began.

Generally considered for three centuries as an original German work, the 1498 incunable's direct link with the Dutch epics of the twelfth through the fourteenth centuries and through them with the Latin and Old French poetry of the twelfth century was not finally established until the nineteenth - by Jacob Grimm, no less. The reason for this, as far as the Dutch connection is concerned, is not far to seek, no further in fact than the inclusion at the Duke of Alba's behest of all literature pertaining to "Reinaert de vos" in the Index librorum prohibitorum of 1570. Only "Volksbücher" and what were obviously intended as school textbooks continued to be printed after that, two of the former, from 1564 and 1566 respectively, having survived from the period prior to that date, but here the text has already been expurgated to the point where it could give no possible offence to the Roman Church. One envisages, however, a series of editions/reprints of this work - no longer extant due to the above-mentioned prohibition - from the 1490s onward.

To discover the nature of this offensive material we must trace the history of the Beast Epic from its beginnings in Western European literature. The earliest two works are in Latin, the former, Ecbasis cuiusdam captivi..., dating from the eleventh century if not earlier, deals with the escape of a young monk from his cloister in Toul and his eventual return to it. An apparent
"roman à clef," indecipherable after the lapse of a millennium, its chief interest for us lies in the fact that the story within the story is based on the Aesop fable of the sick lion, where the lion is cured on the advice of the fox by enveloping himself in the wolf's pelt and where the animosity of the fox and the wolf was first introduced as a literary topos. The latter work, Isengrimus, provides no similar dating problems, the anguished reaction of the author - named in one manuscript as Magister Nivardus - to the failure of the Second Crusade giving us a date of around 1150. Here, too, the fable of the sick lion forms the central point of the story. In this case, however, it is largely a stylistic device, and the chief interest of the work lies in its being the first written record of stories concerning the fox and the wolf - both of whom are given names - some of which stories, two or three decades later, were to form the subject matter of a group of Old French poems, the earliest of these attributable to Pierre de St Cloud. These early stories, or "branches" as they are called in French, continued to be composed over a number of years, but remained in manuscript form until the nineteenth century when they were published under the collective title of Le Roman de Renart. (Opinions differ as to whether there exists a direct link between the Latin work and the early French "branches," or whether they derive independently from oral tradition.)

What sets Isengrimus apart from the rest of the tradition, be it French or Dutch, is that it is not the fox Reinardus but the wolf Isengrimus, as the title implies, who is the chief
protagonist and very much the villain of the piece. Furthermore, whereas the French work - using the term generically - is a light persiflage of current feudal conditions and court life, its Latin predecessor - also considered in recent years to be a "roman à clef" - is a grim and biting satire primarily on current conditions in the Church. The wolf-monk Isengrimus is represented as the epitome of greed and stupidity, the ideal foil for the clever cunning of the fox Reinardus. In addition to the satire on the Church, which predominates, there is also an element of social criticism, with the fox Reinardus depicted here as the champion of the underdog.

The next work to deal with this subject matter was written in Middle Dutch sometime before about 1270 - possibly as early as the 1180s - when a datable Latin version, Reynardus Vulpes, was composed. The work of one author, Willem, or of three - opinions differ here - and known variously as Van den vos Reinarde, Reinaert I and Willems Gedicht, it is best described as an imaginative and skilful adaptation of Branche I of Le Roman de Renart, sometimes referred to as "Le Plaid." This "branche" depicts the initial lodging of complaints against the fox before the king, the summoning of the fox to trial by three messengers consecutively - two of whom exhibit regrettable flaws of character in the performance of their duties - the trial itself and Renart's eventual condemnation to death on the gallows, followed by his subsequent pardon - as the result of the supplication of his friend and close relative, the badger - on the condition that he undertake a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. Having thus escaped
his doom, he proceeds to repudiate his vow in full view of the court, discarding his pilgrimage paraphernalia and making for his castle-burrow, where, in the following "branche," he is besieged by the lion-king and his followers.

The Dutch work is written in the same light vein but with greater psychological insight, tighter construction and the use of fewer characters. The plot, however, is given a new twist, a twist that, introducing as it does the theme of venality—present, as we have seen, in Isengrimus but absent from Le Roman de Renart—has profoundly influenced the development of the tradition. Fox Reinaert namely, in order to save his skin, invents the story of a treasure discovered by his father, which led the latter to initiate a conspiracy against the king involving the wolf, the bear, the badger and the tomcat, to give the crown to the bear, a plot which Reinaert claims he was able to foil by discovering the hiding-place of the treasure and removing it elsewhere. The king is taken in by this story, forgives Reinaert and imprisons the wolf and the bear. Reinaert here, too, undertakes to go on a pilgrimage, but in this version, although similarly unrepentant and lacking any intention of carrying out the undertaking, comes to the conclusion that he is no match for the king, whose wrath will know no bounds once he finds out that he has been duped, and that his, Reinaert's, only recourse is to withdraw into the wilderness with his family. Meanwhile, at court, Reinaert's perfidy has been revealed—he had murdered one of the animals who accompanied him home, the hare, and inculpated the other, the ram—the wolf and the bear are released from
his doom, he proceeds to repudiate his vow in full view of the court, discarding his pilgrimage paraphernalia and making for his castle-burrow, where, in the following "branche," he is besieged by the lion-king and his followers.

The Dutch work is written in the same light vein but with greater psychological insight, tighter construction and the use of fewer characters. The plot, however, is given a new twist, a twist that, introducing as it does the theme of venality - present, as we have seen, in Isengrimus but absent from Le Roman de Renart - has profoundly influenced the development of the tradition. Fox Reinaert namely, in order to save his skin, invents the story of a treasure discovered by his father, which led the latter to initiate a conspiracy against the king involving the wolf, the bear, the badger and the tomcat, to give the crown to the bear, a plot which Reinaert claims he was able to foil by discovering the hiding-place of the treasure and removing it elsewhere. The king is taken in by this story, forgives Reinaert and imprisons the wolf and the bear. Reinaert here, too, undertakes to go on a pilgrimage, but in this version, although similarly unrepentant and lacking any intention of carrying out the undertaking, comes to the conclusion that he is no match for the king, whose wrath will know no bounds once he finds out that he has been duped, and that his, Reinaert's, only recourse is to withdraw into the wilderness with his family. Meanwhile, at court, Reinaert's perfidy has been revealed - he had murdered one of the animals who accompanied him home, the hare, and inculpated the other, the ram - the wolf and the bear are released from
imprisonment and there is a general reconciliation.

If this first Dutch vernacular work bears a general resemblance to *Le Roman de Renart* in mood, over its continuation the spirit of *Isengrimus* broods darkly. This anonymous work of the late fourteenth century, known variously as *Reinart II* and *Reinaerts Historie* and embodying *Reinaert I*, derives loosely from Branche VI of *Le Roman de Renart*, itself to a large extent a repetition of Branche I. The principal feature of Branche VI is the provision of an alternative ending for the animosity between the fox and the wolf, namely a judiciary duel, where, in the French version, the wolf is triumphant and Renart saved only by the last-minute appearance and intercession of a monk, Frère Bernard, who gains permission from the king to make a monk out of the fox. The ending of *Reinaert II* is very different, however. In the first place the author had to alter the ending of the first part of the story. *Reinaert* does not repair to the wilderness but remains at home until the badger arrives with a warning that preparations are being made to capture him, when he agrees to return to court and once again face his accusers. This time he manages to hoodwink the king with a story of lost treasures from his hoard intended as presents for the royal couple, which the ram, now dead, is presumed to have embezzled - a ring with magical qualities for the king and a comb and mirror engraved with stories from Greek mythology and Aesop for the queen - so that the king eventually agrees to free him to go in search of them. This is too much for the wolf, who challenges *Reinaert* to a duel, primarily to defend his wife's honour - as in *Le Roman de Renart* -
where the fox, by means that can scarcely be considered as honourable, wins the day. The triumphant Reinaert is restored to the king's favour and to his council, and is appointed to high office in the land.

From the above it will be readily apparent that the adversarial relationship between fox and wolf has been considerably intensified in this work. Furthermore, the author has at the same time attempted to retain - from Isengrimus - the image of the fox as the poor man, in this case, that is, a member of the lesser nobility, a prey no doubt to vaulting ambition and fully convinced that the end justifies the means, but a figure nonetheless dependent only on his wits and his rhetorical ability, battling an avaricious, overbearing, violent, essentially stupid and unlearned member of the higher nobility, represented by the wolf. We find the same criticisms here as in Isengrimus of money making the world go round, particularly, in this work, in the ecclesiastical courts in Rome. What we have here in Reinaert I, in fact, is essentially a power struggle, with the clever, crafty, deceitful, unscrupulous, extremely intelligent and articulate underdog fox coming out on top, largely due to the venality and consequent gullibility of a corruptible ruler surrounded by courtiers whose own flaws of character are only too apparent.

I have devoted so much space to this particular work as it is the ultimate, though not the immediate, source for the 1498 Middle Low German Reynke de vos (RVA). Reinaert I in its original continuous verse form remained in manuscript until 1836 when it was edited and published for the first time.10
adaptations of this work with divisions into chapters with summarizing headings\(^{17}\) were however printed in 1479 and 1485 in Gouda and Delft respectively, and an English translation by William Caxton was printed by him at his Westminster press in 1481.\(^{10}\) This prose version will be referred to as the Prose Reinaert.

The immediate source for the German adapter in 1498 would appear to have been an edition of Reinaert \(^{11}\) prepared by someone calling himself Henric van Alckmaer,\(^{17}\) who divided the work— with some probable revision of the text— into four books, the books into chapters with summarizing headings, and who then furnished the whole work with a preface and with moralizing glosses to the majority of the chapters.\(^{20}\) Unfortunately, the only extant copy of such an edition is a remnant of 222 lines, known as the Culemannsche Reinaert-Bruchstücke or Cambridge Fragments.\(^{21}\) Judged to have been printed in Antwerp between 1487 and 1490, this is not however considered to have been the edition used by the Lübeck adapter. It is to the earliest extant Dutch "Volksbücher" that we must in fact look for the form the glosses might have taken in the source (Vorlage) used by the author of the 1498 incunable, particularly to the one printed in Antwerp in 1564, which has both a preface and rudimentary moralizing glosses, here called "moraels." As will be seen, the wording of these "moraels" bears in many instances a remarkable resemblance to that of the RVA glosses, suggesting a common source.

Before considering the relationship and development of the glosses, however, we must turn to the story-text of the 1498
edition (RVA) where we will see that, with certain exceptions, it follows very closely the plot of *Reinaert II* that I have already briefly sketched. This applies particularly to Book I, which comprises the whole of *Reinaert I* with the altered ending. Here, in Book I, the fox's accusers, including the wolf, Isengrimus, appear before the lion-king with their complaints against him, complaints which the badger, Grimbart, skilfully refutes, only to be confounded himself by the arrival of a funeral procession bearing the body of Reinke's latest victim - a dead pullet whom he had attacked the day before during a publicly-proclaimed peace. Three messengers are despatched consecutively to summon the fox to appear before the court, the first two, the bear and the tomcat, falling victim to Reinke's subtle manipulation of their lust for honey and mice respectively. Following their return to court in a chastened condition consequent upon confrontations with the angry villagers - including the priest and his family - from whom they were attempting to purloin these coveted objects, Grimbart is appointed as third emissary and manages to persuade Reinke to return to court with him. On their way there Reinke confesses his sins, chiefly tricks he has played in the past on the wolf but also unspecified transgressions against the king and queen, from all of which he is duly absolved by the badger. A subsequent attack on a hen outside a nunnery, however, gives the lie to his professed contrition. At court Reinke is condemned to death but manages to escape with the trumped-up story of a treasure and a conspiracy and a promise to go on a pilgrimage, as we have seen, only eventually to reveal his perfidy by despatching the unwitting
ram, who had accompanied him home, back to court with the head of the murdered hare concealed in his satchel in the place of letters which Reinke had told the ram to pretend that he, Reinke, had written at the ram's dictation. Thus inculpated in the hare's murder, the ram is forthwith given over to the wolf and the bear together with his whole clan in perpetuity as atonement for their false imprisonment, and Reinke, too, is declared an outlaw, along with all his blood relations, all this being followed by a general reconciliation at court.

The only major change here is an addition describing a visit paid by Reinke to the wolf's lair - it is interpolated into the episode of the tomcat's pursuit of the mice - and his subsequent rape of the she-wolf in circumstances resembling those related in Isengrimus and Branches II and Va of Le Roman de Renart, so that what had hitherto been only reported evidence - Isegrim had accused Reinke of an adulterous relationship with his wife in his original complaint before the king - becomes part of the narrative.

Book II opens with fresh accusations against Reinke before the king, comprising reported attacks upon the rabbit and the crow's wife, the former unsuccessful, the latter ending in murder, and both occurring during a public peace and at a time when all animals have been granted safe-conduct. A full-scale military assault is planned, as we have seen, but Grimbart manages to warn the fox in time and to persuade him to return to court. Here follows a second confession, where Reinke acknowledges his most recent attack on the rabbit and his murder of the crow's wife. He
includes also another story about the wolf, this time concerning the latter's dealings with a mare, where he, Reinke, knowingly allowed the wolf to be duped. (This story bears some resemblance to one in Isengrimus and to another in Branche XIX of Le Roman de Renart.) The main part of this confession, however, is devoted to a description of the evils of the church. Not only is the conduct of the prelates castigated here by Reinke, but also that of rulers' chaplains who fail to tell their employers the truth, and also that of the village priests, almost all of whom set a bad example to the laity, he maintains, enabling the latter to excuse their own misdoing thereby. (This section, almost certainly the work of the Lübeck reviser, replaces a less specific description in Reinaert I of the necessity for inventive mendacity on the part of lawyers and of the populace in general as well). Outside the court they meet Marten, the ape, who is on his way to Rome and who commends Reinke to his wife, a protégée of the king and queen, the subsequent conversation constituting a biting satire on the simony and general corruption rampant in the Papal court in Rome. (Here, in RVA, where this conversation forms part of the narrative and is even expanded, the criticism is direct, whereas in Reinaert I, where it appears in reported speech as part of the fox's defence of himself before the king, it could be considered as one of Reinke's fabrications).

Book III opens with the arrival at court proper. Inwardly apprehensive but outwardly defiant, Reinke manages to refute the accusations of the crow and the rabbit, both of whom, since there were no witnesses to the deeds of which he is accused, he
challenges to a judiciary duel, a challenge they are obviously unable to take up. This time, as we have already seen, Reinke talks himself out of the dangerous situation he is in by inventing the story of the magical ring and the engraved comb and mirror, which he claims that the ram had embezzled, but not before the she-ape has played an important part by interceding for him with the king, not only reminding the latter of the size of Reinke's clan, but also by recalling a case concerning a man and a perfidious snake - also deriving from Aesop - which Reinke was called on as a last resort to settle when the king had been unable to do so. (This section is considerably shortened here compared with *Reinaert II*, where the she-ape actually called the roll of Reinke's relatives. Here, by contrast, the king is not swayed to the same extent by this argument.) Reinke follows this up with two reports of personal service rendered to the king in the past, both stories deriving from Aesop. The first of these is that of the sick lion. Here Reinke's father is supposed to have cured the lion's father by prescribing the ingestion of the wolf's liver instead of envelopment in the wolf's pelt. This story, as we have seen, has a long association with the Western European Beast Epic and is also referred to in Branche VI of *Le Roman de Renart* at the same point in the narrative. (In contrast to *Reinaert II*, this story is also described by the narrator as being engraved on the mirror - along with four other fables from Aesop - thus reducing it to the status of a myth and obviating the necessity for any explanation as to how such a true servant of the king could later stoop to conspire against him.24) The second self-
justifying report is that of the division of the prey after a hunt involving the lion, the wolf and the fox, where Reinke sees to it that the lion is allocated the largest share. This is based on another fable from Aesop.

Although the king, influenced primarily by his desire for the lost treasure, and also the assembled court are ready to forgive Reinke a second time, the wolf is not, and he produces further evidence concerning Reinke's misdoings.

Book IV begins with a recital of this evidence, the first accusations against the fox comprising stories from Branches III and IV of *Le Roman de Renart*, the first also in Isengrimus, except that in the French stories they were adventures that happened to the wolf, while here it is the she-wolf who is the victim. In the first of these she gets her tail stuck in the ice after being persuaded by Reinke to go fishing on a frozen pond, giving him the opportunity to violate her. The second is similar to the French "branche" - Branche IV - known as "Le Puits," where the fox makes the mistake of stepping into a well-bucket in pursuit of what is really his own reflection. Quickly transported to the bottom, he is saved in this RVA version only by the chance arrival of the she-wolf, whom he tempts with the fabrication of an abundance of fish to join him. As she goes down, he comes up and thus escapes, leaving her to face the wrath of the peasants - in the French version it is that of the monks - in the morning.

The duel eventually takes place, preceded by the customary ceremony of the proffering of a glove by the wolf to Reinke, the appointment of referees, the naming of sureties and the swearing
of oaths. Profiting by the advice of the she-ape, who also
pronounces an incantation over him (in Branche Va of Le Roman de
Renart the ape is described as a magician), and by additional
devilry of his own, Reinke is eventually successful, leaving the
wolf minus one eye, wounded in twenty-six places and castrated to
boot. The fox is restored to the king’s favour and, furthermore,
made chancellor of the realm, so that from now on what Reinke
says, goes. A triumphant procession of the clan back to his
home, with Reinke leading the way, brings the poem to a close.
(The principal textual alterations introduced here, in contrast to
Reinaert II, are a skilful abbreviation of the details of the duel
and an expanded description of the wolf’s state after it was
over.26)

This original 1498 Lübeck edition (RVA) was reprinted only
once: in 1517 in Rostock (RVB),27 the next extant edition of the
work not appearing until 1539, again in Rostock (RVC).28 Here the
text of the poem remains to all intents and purposes the same,
apart from some dialectal variations and some filling out of the
lines, but the gloss, while based primarily on that of 1498, is of
an entirely different nature. This 1539 edition was swiftly
turned into High German and published five years later in 1544 in
Frankfurt29 with numerous omissions from and some alteration to
the text of the poem and an entirely different kind of gloss.
Not counting the reprintings of the editions already mentioned,
there followed a gap of over a hundred years until the appearance
of the so-called baroque edition of 1650, again emanating from
Rostock.30 Here the text, based on that of the 1544 edition, has
been transformed from the original rhyming couplets (retained in 1544) into stanzaic verse, the metre varying from chapter to chapter. The gloss, though based primarily on that of 1544, contains much new material and is the last to have been written. A German "Volksbuch" was compiled from this edition, complete with almost the entire gloss.\textsuperscript{31} The year 1711 saw a reprinting initiated by F.A. Hackmann of the original 1498 text and gloss—the first since 1517—this being the edition that Gottsched used for his 1752 prose translation of both text and gloss, together with the gloss of the 1539 edition.\textsuperscript{32}

The disappearance from circulation of the original text and gloss for all of two centuries has been more than compensated for in the following three, since, with the exception of that of 1544—recently published in a facsimile edition, as we have seen—it remains the only text and gloss to have been edited. As a result of this, more has been written about RVA, both text and gloss, than about any other edition.

Confining my remarks as far as possible to the secondary literature concerning the latter, I would divide this, allowing for overlaps, into four categories: a) conjectures as to the identity of the author; b) linguistic comparisons of the author's vocabulary, phraseology etc. with that of other vernacular works printed in Lübeck around the same time, and also detailed textual comparison of this Low German gloss with the "moraels" of the Dutch "Volksbuch"; c) descriptive and analytical articles dealing with the content of the gloss and the attitude of the commentator towards the poem; and, finally, d) secondary
literature concerned with reception.

As far as the first category is concerned, nineteenth century scholars were not as ready as Gottsched had been to accept at face value the bald statement in the first preface that the book was the work of Henric van Alckmaer, soon coming to the conclusion that this first preface was merely a translation by the Lübeck reviser of what was written in his source (Vorlage). Various names were suggested, but by the end of the century his anonymity had been generally accepted, and interest shifted to his profession, both Bieling and H. Brandes suggesting that he was a member of the Brethren of the Common Life. Counter-arguments to the effect that he was a member of the secular clergy were put forward by L. Baucke in 1933 and W. Foerste in 1960. Meanwhile, as a result of articles written by K. Neumann in the early twenties concerning the ecclesiastical history of Lübeck in the late Middle Ages, interest had begun to shift to the mendicant orders - as a matter of fact W. Stammler in 1919 had already put forward the suggestion that the author might have been a member of one of these orders - with the result that in 1965 O. Schwencke was to advance convincing arguments to the effect that he was in fact a Franciscan, one of a number engaged in writing works of a didactic and admonitory nature, a theory that has yet to be successfully challenged and to which I myself subscribe.

Some of the most informative comparisons of RVA with other contemporary works, indicating what would seem to be a close relationship between them, come from secondary literature not primarily devoted to this work. Thus H. Brandes in his
introduction to his 1914 edition of the Middle Low German version of Sebastian Brant's *Das Narrenschiff* - here called *Dat Narrenschyp* (NS) - gives examples of what appears to be a direct connection between passages from the RVA gloss and similar ones from the "Plenar" printed in 1492 at the same press, the "Mohnkopfverlag." These examples were confirmed and added to in 1954 by W. Kämpfer in his study of six of these "Plenarien" printed between 1475 and 1493, five of them in Lübeck. Baucke, too, in his 1933 article already referred to, which is mainly concerned with a comparison of NS with its High German original, devotes a section to examples showing similarity in moral intention, style, artistic conception, syntax and vocabulary between RVA and NS - here, of course, he is dealing with the work as a whole - all of which lead him to support Brandes's thesis that the adaptations of NS and RVA were the work of the same man. Both these scholars, and here they are joined by Kämpfer and Schwencke, draw attention to the close relationship that exists not only between these two works, but also between these and similar didactic and devotional works such as *Des Dodes Danz* (1489 and 1496), *Speygel der Leyen* (1496) and *Dat Henselin Boek* (after 1497), all emanating from the same press.

Similarly technical I would class literature dealing with the derivation of RVA from its Dutch source, F. Prien in 1882 being one of the first to suggest that the so-called Cambridge Fragments were not the 1498 adapter's immediate source. He was followed in 1960 by Foerste who was inclined to accept direct derivation, and who was in his turn refuted by W. Krogmann four years later.
Eventually, in 1972, Niklas Witton was to devote a whole dissertation to this subject alone, coming to Prien's conclusion that the *Fragments* represent an earlier version (at two removes in his view) of the 1498 Low German adapter's immediate source.

The first scholar to draw attention to the connection between the "moraels" of the Dutch "Volksbuch" and the RVA chapter-glosses was F. Latendorf in 1865. He was followed by F. Prien, in his already mentioned 1882 article, who was able to take advantage of the recently published (1876) edition by E. Martin of the 1564 Dutch "Volksbuch" to make a minute examination of this relationship, as a result of which he was able to show close correspondence in wording in seven instances and some similarity in about thirty others. Another eighty or so years were to pass before Foerste in 1960 made a similar examination, subjecting Prien's findings to close scrutiny and adding some further examples of his own.

Turning to the content of the gloss, which he investigates carefully according to topic, Foerste finds that the RVA commentator's purpose is primarily salvational and to show the way to true wisdom, which tends to make the gloss "geradezu zu einem Sündenspiegel," another concern being "den Armen zu ihrem Recht zu verhelfen." Both Foerste and L. Schwab - in the latter's comparison of the 1498 work with Goethe's adaptation of it three centuries later - stress in addition the obvious intention of the commentator to treat the work he was glossing as a collection of fables and short stories rather than as an epic poem with a message of its own, Schwab emphasizing even more strongly than
Foerste the salvational aspect of the gloss. In a recent dissertation on six works of the later Middle Ages, including Reynke de vos, J. Nanninga, for her part, seeks to prove nominalist influence on the commentator, which prevents him, in her view, from presenting a consistent viewpoint as regards the work he was commenting upon. Finally, H. Kokott in his recent book on the work as a whole also criticizes the arbitrary nature of some of the commentaries, many of which appear to him to be at best banal and at worst to distort the "Erzähllogik des Verstexts."*

As primarily descriptive I would class Bieling's 1884 article on all five glosses (this includes a Latin version of the 1544 edition published by Hartman Schopperus or Schoppers in 1567*), since the scope of his work does not allow for close investigation of any one gloss.

As regards the audience addressed and the reception of this work, L. Okken argues in a 1977 article that the principal addressees must have been the wealthy patriciate of Lübeck, many of whom had recently been buying up estates outside the city.* From an economic point of view, this argument is reinforced by what C. Schleffler says in a 1976 article - an article chiefly concerned with the development and continuation of the Reineke Fuchs tradition over the years - regarding the price of such a book, namely that it would have been far beyond the means of any but the wealthiest people.* This point is confirmed by H. Menke in his article of the same year "Ars vitae aulicae oder descriptio mundi perversi?" although, as the title implies, this article is concerned primarily with the intellectual response throughout
the centuries to the Reineke Fuchs story. Since the complete 1539 edition (RVC) is available only on photocopy and Brandes’s 1891 edition of the gloss only in a few libraries, it is not surprising that much less has been written about this work. Initially, as with RVA, interest was mainly centered on authorship, Bieling in 1884 suggesting some form of joint authorship under an editor, being followed by A. Hofmeister in 1893 and W. Stammler in 1919, each championing his respective candidate. In this regard, what eventually turned out to be a red herring had been thrown across the trail by Georg Rollenhagen in his introduction to his Froschmeuseler of 1595, where he referred to a 1522 edition, naming Nicolaus Baumann as the author of the poem and Ludwig Dietz, the printer, as the author of the gloss. Brandes was able to show, however, that this statement was based on the misleading information of a Rostock chronicler, and – particularly as no such edition was extant (Gottsched also, in 1752, had been unable to trace it) – declared Rollenhagen to be in error in his reference to such an edition.

The second most disputed aspect of this gloss was its definition. It is perhaps not surprising that Bieling, who had claimed in his introduction that "die Rostocker Fuchsglosse hat in hervorragender Weise der Ausbreitung des Protestantismus gedient,“ should have called it quite simply "die protestantische Glosse" to distinguish it from "die katholische Glosse" of 1498, although he did also refer to it later in the body of his text as "fast eine Chrestomatie des damaligen
Wissens," thus paying tribute to the extraordinary variety of topics dealt with in the gloss. Brandes, however, challenged these adjectives, deciding on "die jüngere Glosse" as the best way of distinguishing between the two. He played down the exclusively "Protestant" nature of the gloss, supported here by H. Moltzer who, in an 1891 article, also stressed its richness and variety, declaring the main difference between the two commentaries to lie in their authors' attitude to the poem, the 1498 commentator, in his view, sticking more closely to the text and the 1539 commentator using it for his "besondere Absichten." These latter he described as being first and foremost to write a "Fürstenspiegel" and, secondly, to indulge the predilection of the age for collections of proverbs and didactic verse. As far as the authorship of the gloss was concerned, Brandes supported Dietz's claim to this without reservation.

Brandes's greatest merit, however, lies in his detailed analysis of the commentator's sources. Although attributions for most if not all of the verse quotations are given in the gloss, naming either the author, or the work or both, Brandes discovered that the main part of the prose, too, where there is little or no direct attribution, was taken from other works, Johannes Agricola, Johannes Brenz and Sebastian Franck being three of the commentator's preferred authors in this respect. The first preface also Brandes found to consist almost solely of extracts from the prefaces of five separate works used in the gloss, quoted consecutively, all without attribution.

The other work devoted entirely to this gloss is a 1933
dissertation by E. Schafferus entitled Der Verfasser der jüngeren Glosse zum Reinke de vos,\(^7\) the chief purpose of which is to prove Dietz's authorship, or at any rate — since this is virtually impossible in view of the dearth of convincing evidence — to demonstrate that he could have been the author. This she endeavours to do by discussing the style of the writing, the way in which the author treats his sources and his choice of these, going on to analyse his attitude to both the Reformation and the temporal authorities, his sociological views and his conception of the world as a whole. To this she adds a further section on historical happenings, particularly in Mecklenburg, to which she feels oblique reference may have been made in the gloss and which she considers strengthens Dietz's claim to authorship.

She challenges, furthermore, Brandes's assertion regarding the principal difference between the two glosses of 1498 and 1539 and also his view of the 1539 commentator's intentions, claiming that the "Fürstenspiegel," "Ständespiegel" and "Sittenspiegel" elements of the gloss are, in modern parlance, "werkimmanent." Posing the question "ob er [der Glossator] die Glosse als Selbstzweck und die Dichtung nur als Ausgangspunkt und zur Anknüpfung nimmt, um bestimmte Ideen auszusprechen, oder ob er dem Werke mit den Stilmitteln seiner Zeit dient?"\(^7\) she comes to the conclusion that the latter is the case.\(^8\)

As far as reception is concerned, two articles should be mentioned here. The first is H.H. Munske's of 1970 concerning the translation of the 1539 gloss into Danish (1555) and Swedish (1621)\(^9\) and the second Menke's of 1980 giving details of the
reception and commercial success of this particular 1539 edition.

The High German edition of RV was given short shrift, generally speaking, by nineteenth century scholars. Bieling, for example, referring to it as "eine zuweilen sogar fast unsinnige übertragung" of the 1539 text and gloss. Prien, however, is kinder. Submitting the changes made in the gloss to close scrutiny, he comes to the conclusion that the extent of the omissions, the numerous changes and equally numerous additions to the gloss make it a virtually independent work. In his introduction, furthermore, he declares the reason for the popularity of this work to lie in the interpretation given to the text - i.e. the gloss - "die mit ihrer moralistischer Reflexion dem Geschmack des Zeitalters, das wie kein anderes an moralischen Lehren und Sprüchen Gefallen fand, in der ausgedehnsten Weise entgegenkam." The most recent scholar to occupy himself with this gloss is Menke in his introduction to the facsimile edition, where his criticism of the commentator has a familiar ring. Complaining that he fails either to give "eine Über den Einzelfall hinausreichende Orientierung" or to interpret "die Erzähl episoden auch nur einheitlich," he comes to the conclusion that "die Glosse bleibt damit ein missglückter Versuch, dem Erzähltext eine authentische noch von der Ordo-Vorstellung geprägte Wirklichkeitssicht zu unterlegen."

As far the author of this commentary is concerned - he also prefers to remain anonymous - the 1567 Latin translator states in his preface that he thinks it was Michael Beuther. Although
Bieling appears content to accept Beuther's authorship, Prien challenges it, stressing Beuther's youth at the time (he was born in 1522) and the fact that other works (in Latin) published in the same year indicate a man with a very different temperament and personality from that of 1544 commentator, as he reveals this in his gloss. Prien is also concerned about the absence of any confirmation of Beuther's authorship either by himself, his friends or his family during the twenty years between the publication of the 1567 Latin translation and Beuther's death in 1587. Menke, for his part, while pointing out that whereas Beuther's authorship may not have been confirmed neither was it explicitly denied, appears generally speaking to agree with Prien's findings. (A dissertation by H.Borgmann of 1908 purporting to be a comparison of this edition with that of 1539 and also with the Latin edition of 1567 makes no mention of the gloss, the obvious reason for this being that the text he was using for comparison was that of 1498 not that of 1539.) Finally, as regards the 1650 edition - available only on photocopy - Bieling's treatment of this gloss is somewhat perfunctory and his characterization of the commentator as a Zesianer belies close reading of the preface. A dissertation of 1910 by E.Posca, however, does include a section on the gloss, although Posca limits his discussion to the commentator's profession, coming to the conclusion that he was a Lutheran pastor.

This brief summary of the secondary literature pertaining to the RV glosses will have shown that, except perhaps for Bieling's
article and those on reception, very little has so far been written on the "Glossierung," or commentary, as a whole - an omission which it is my intention here to remedy.
Chapter 1.

Before turning to the attitudes of the individual commentators towards their work, we must first consider - and this naturally applies most particularly to the first of these, the author of RVA - why this tale, as a secular work, should have been chosen for such treatment as the glosses represent. As we have seen, religious works, such as the 1492 "Plenar," Des Dodes Danz (DD), and Speygel der Laien (SpL) predominate among those emanating during this decade from the same Lübeck press.

The answer is, I submit, threefold. Firstly, the RVA reviser found in place in his source (Vorlage) both a preface and also rudimentary commentaries on the majority of the chapters in his text. Secondly, he realized the possibilities offered by the narrative text for a method of treatment similar to that given in the "Plenarien" - that is, as a vehicle for moralization, sermonizing and allegorical interpretation. Lastly, he was well aware of the "Fürstenspiegel" aspect of the text as well as of many of the existing comments in his source and was anxious to adapt these to his particular purposes.

Since the preface to this type of work, if such exists, is the obvious place to seek the author's intention, we will begin by comparing that of RVA with that of the Dutch "Volksbuch" (VB). (As we have already seen, the comments or "moraels" in this latter work are thought to derive from Aickmaer).

As regards the first preface in RVA, for which there is no
real comparison in VB, this is almost certainly a fairly close translation of the reviser's source, although possibly not as slavish a translation of this as has been generally thought."

Linking the original writer of the fable of Reynke de vos, which is full of wisdom, good instructive anecdotes (exempel) and teaching (lere) and very entertaining to read and to listen to (seer ghenochlik to lesen unde to horen), to the naturally wise (naturlyk wyse) writers of the pre-Christian era, some of which writers taught virtue and wisdom in verse by means of parables (bysprobe) and fables - since these are better remembered than plain books and treatises on these subjects - the RVA commentator goes on to emphasize the value and importance of a true understanding of such a poet's teaching. Presenting himself as Hinrek van Alckmaer, house tutor and instructor to the noble prince, the Duke of Lotharingen, he states that he has translated the work from the Italian and French (uth walscher unde franzosescher sprake) to the praise and glory of God and for the salvational instruction (heylsame lere) of those who read it, and that he has, furthermore, divided the work into four parts and added a short interpretation (korte uthlegginge) of each chapter, this interpretation comprising the poet's meaning (mennige des sulffsten poeten), so that the real sense/meaning (den rechten syn) of each chapter may be understood.

There is no direct equivalent to this first preface in VB, where the preface is not divided into two. However, the title given to the work as a whole - Reynaert de vos, een seer ghenuechlijke und vermakelijke (amusing) Historie, met haer
Moralisationen ende korte uthleggingen - would appear to correspond to the "seer ghenoechlik to lesen unde to horen" and to the "korte uthlegginge" quoted above. Moreover, the second sentence of the VB preface - the first is an exhortation to the "goetwillige leser" not to reject the work on account of its jocular title - admonishes him to read it with understanding, in order to discern the purpose for which "elck dinck" (each thing) has been written. He will find "groote leeringen ende underwijsingen" (valuable lessons and instruction) therein. We have here, then, in the first RVA preface, the concept of the fable as a fitting vehicle for the teaching of virtue and wisdom to the praise and glory of God and for the salvational instruction of the reader. It was probably very necessary for the Lübeck commentator to point this out - to emphasize, that is, the serious nature of the work - since the author of a book printed in 1496, Sunte Birgitte openbaringe, while contending that the new printed works on sacred topics were divinely inspired, had commented disparagingly on the "fabeln und ock andere boeke, de nicht vele doghen (taugen)" and which do nothing to further "der sele salieheit."^10^1

As far as the second RVA preface is concerned, a much closer comparison is possible with that of VB, one which leaves very little doubt that both prefaces do in fact derive from the same source.^10^2 This is not to say, however, that the order in which the various points are presented is the same. This is very far from being the case - something which only goes to reveal the RVA commentator's originality, as I shall hope to show. In this second preface, too, we have the first references to "de meyster,"
"de lerer" and "de poete" - terms used apparently indiscriminately to refer to the author of the poem - which recur throughout the chapter-glosses.

The following table will illustrate the different order in which the items are dealt with in VB and RVA:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VB</th>
<th>RVA (second preface)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Content of work</td>
<td>1. Description of classes of society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) Peasants and artisans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Burghers and merchants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) Clergy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iv) a) Nobility - greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) &quot; - lesser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Description of classes</td>
<td>2a Summary of Book I of society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) Clergy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Nobility - greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) &quot; - lesser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iv) Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Final remarks</td>
<td>3. Description of animals' names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. List of animals' names</td>
<td>4. Final remarks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To deal first with VB, after the instruction to the reader to discern the purpose for which "elck dinck" has been written, we are given (VB 1.) under the headings: "In den eerster...Ten tweeden...Ten derden...Ende ten lestten" what can fairly convincing be accepted as summaries of the four books. Since, however, VB is not divided into books but only into chapters (which correspond neither to those in RVA nor to those in the Prose Reinaert), it has been suggested that the compiler of VB
was forced to use the words "elck dinck" as a substitute for the probable original of "elck boek." Not that there is any direct confirmation of this theory to be derived from RVA, where the subject matter is introduced at a later stage in the preface (RVA 2b) and somewhat vaguely, without any mention of books and with agreement of only the first two headings. There is, however, indirect confirmation from the prefaces to the last three books:

**VB (1.)**

In den eersten hebt ghijer in den staet van den prince ende van zijn hof.

Ten tweeden den staet van den gemeynen volcke.

**RVA (2b)**

Alsus is dyt boek van eynem vorsten unde syneme houe.

Ok is yd van deme state der ghemenen sympleen.

(Preface to Book II) In desseme anderen boeke sprickt de poete sunderlyken van deme state der mynschen unde ereme ghebreke...

Unde is ok van den logeneren unde bedregers, de myt loszheyt mannygen schenden, so hyr na wert gheschent van deme sneydygen lystygen vosse, de mannygen schendede unde to plasse brachte unde denne noch myt syner loggen unde valscheit by macht bleff.
(Preface to Book III

... Doch is de meeste
syn desses drydden
boekes de valsche
kloke entschuldynge
des vosses yegehen alle
klaghe in yegen-
wordichheyd der, de he
bedrogen hadde).

Ende ten lesten wordter
geleert dat de wijsheyt ende
cloechheit des gheests alle
lasten verwint ende to bouen
gaet. Oock dattet den prince
orbaerlijcker is, wijse liedhen
in sijn hof te hebben, dan
ghierighe liedhen; ghemerckt
dat des princen hof gheensins
en can prospereren, sonder den
raet van wijse ende veruaren
lieden.

(Preface to Book IV

... So wyl de poete nu
bewysen in desseme
veerden boke... wo de
wyszheyt de ghrycheyt
vorwynt...)

We note here the way in which, after the second heading, the comments diverge, VB giving us under the third heading a
noncommittal description of the fashion in which liars operate and
how little credence should be given to what they say, and then -
under "Ten lesten" - referring in the first sentence to the
ultimate victory of intellectual superiority on the part of those
who are wise and shrewd over all attempts to slander (laster)
them, and in the second sentence to the necessity for such people
to be represented at court among a prince's counsellors. In RVA,
on the other hand, after a pejorative reference to liars in
general, there is a specific one to the fox, who is accused of
bringing disgrace and ruin to many, yet who remained in power on
account of his lying and falseness.

The following section in VB (2), which corresponds to the first in RVA (1), deals with the classes into which society is divided, and here, too, a close comparison is possible.

The classes of mankind, we are told in VB, are represented by the animals named in the book. Here the division is into three classes, the first being that of the clergy, represented by the badger (de Dasse), who are accused covertly (bedectelijck) of avarice and unchastity. After the clergy come the nobility, divided into the greater nobility comprising "sommighe groote personagien" such as kings, dukes and counts who are compared to the wolf, the bear, the lynx and the leopard, and the lesser nobility, compared to the fox, the ape, the dog and the cat and suchlike. Finally, we have the class of the workers (arbeyders) who are compared to working animals such as horses - both those used for riding (peerden) and those used for heavy labour (ossen) - and suchlike.

In RVA, by contrast, we have a very different picture, for here we begin with the workers (arbeyders), who sustain themselves by their heavy work, such as peasants (bure) and artisans (amptlude) who have to work for their living. The commentator adds here the explanation that God Almighty, at the time of Adam's transgression, placed us in this class and ordered us to earn our bread when He said to Adam: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." That is, he explains, man must sustain himself by his labour. Here, in RVA, this class is compared to the same animals as in VB.
The RVA commentator then goes on to explain that the other three classes derive from this first one - the first of these (second overall) being that of the burghers and merchants (borgerye unde koplude), who sustain themselves by trading and who live off their profits (de syk ener en mit ummeslach unde leuen van deme ghewynne), this class being compared with the squirrels, rabbits, hampsters, hares etc. which collect corn, peas, beans, nuts and apples and hide them away in the earth, in trees and in stone fissures - in other words, hoarding animals.

The third class overall for the RVA commentator, the second to derive from the first but which lives off the first two (i.e. off the peasants and the artisans, the burghers and the merchants) is that of the clergy, compared here to the badger (de greuynge de in etliken landen wert gheheten de dasz). Not much is said about this class, he maintains, but the poet rebukes the members of it covertly (myt vordeckeden worden) for two sins, namely those of avarice and unchastity, as will be revealed, he explains, later in the story.

The fourth class overall, the third to have derived from the workers, the RVA commentator continues, is that of the princes and lords of this world - he does not, here, mention kings - who consider themselves noble (de syk eddel holden) and who also live off the first two classes. There follows the same division of this class into upper and lower nobility with the same examples given for both, with the added qualification, however, of the latter as platoon-leaders (banreheren) and the like. He also adds the servants and supporters of this noble class, their grooms
and shieldbearers, which he compares to the small animals which bite, such as the pine-martens, polecats, ermines, weasels etc.

From this detailed description it is obvious that this RVA commentator is intent on producing a picture of society as a whole, irrespective of the text he is commenting upon, and, secondly, but no less importantly, his concern is to emphasize the contribution of the lower classes of society, in particular that of the peasants and artisans, but also that of the burghers and merchants, whom he includes, it will be remembered, among those who sustain the clergy and nobility.

To all intents and purposes, the description of the classes marks the end of the VB preface, apart from a short address to the reader and a list of the animals' names. In the RVA second preface, however, there is an additional section (2b) coming immediately after the one dealing with the classes, a section which shows a close connection with the wording of some chapter-glosses in Book I as well as the prefaces to Books III and IV.

Here we are told that in the first book the "lerer" shows 1) the necessity for a head of state (eyn houet, eyn here) with the power to govern all classes of people, who should bring justice and peace to all those under him, this ruler being compared here to the lion. He also shows, we are told, that 2) no person shall overpower another suddenly and unjustly with force or any kind of trickery (andere loszheyt), how 3) the evil-doer, the accused person, shall nevertheless be allowed to defend himself and shall be summoned to court (for this purpose), so that his guilt or innocence may be the better judged. The poet also
shows, we are told, that 4) princes are led astray by liars from the path of righteousness and that 5) many a man deceives himself who is out to obtain large fiefs and benefices (grote leene unde prouene) from his lord - his avarice cannot be satisfied. He shows also, we are told, that 6) it is more profitable for princes and lords (heren) to have a wise man in their councils than an avaricious one, for no prince's court can retain honour and respect for long (in eren blyuen) without wisdom and shrewdness (wyszheyt unde klockheyt) being represented. It will be noted here that whereas points 2) - 5) are substantiated in the chapter-glosses of Book 1, point 6) is a translation of the second sentence under the heading of "Ten lesten" in VB and deals with events at the very end of the story. We will be returning to point 6) later.

The last few sentences of the VB preface comprise an address to the reader and may derive from the compiler himself. In view of the fact, he states, that people learn better when they enjoy their instruction, he will be satisfied if the content of the book has given them some amusement. He then commends his readers to God and bids them pay attention to what "de goede Reynaert" wants to tell them. There follows a list of the characters in the book arranged in the same way as the *dramatis personae* of a play.

In RVA, however, in a section (3) that would fit much better, in the way in which it is introduced, after the description of the classes, as occurs in VB, the commentator states that names will be given to the king and his supporters and to some others, partly on account of the rhyme and partly to make it more
entertaining for readers and listeners, and there follow German versions of the animals' and birds' names.

Following this, the commentator again exhorts his readers to mark the meaning of the words they read or listen to, for that is where wisdom is to be found (dar lycht de wyszheyt in.111)

Having demonstrated the close relationship that exists between the preface of VB and the second RVA preface, it remains to discuss the difference in emphasis in these two prefaces, as this has been revealed in the comparison, and also the significance of the additional material provided in the RVA preface.112

With regard to emphasis, the RVA commentator's positioning of the section dealing with the classes of society right at the beginning of the second preface underlines, I submit, the importance he ascribes to this section. Although at first glance this very elaborate division of society may seem strange in view of the content of the narrative text - one, namely, that is primarily concerned with a king and rivalry within the ranks of the nobility and only peripherally even with the clergy - it seems obvious that the commentator's main purpose here is to place the strongest possible emphasis on his personal attitude to class structure and the importance here of the lowest classes, an attitude deriving, it seems to me, from the Franciscan tradition.

Franciscan preachers of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries stressed, for example, the plight of the peasants, who find particular favour with God, partly on account of their unceasing labour, which is pleasing to Him, partly on account of
the oppression to which they are unjustly subjected by their overlords.\textsuperscript{113} Artisans are also mentioned - cobblers, butchers, weavers and workers with wool, metal and wood - who likewise by working day and night find favour with God,\textsuperscript{114} although the preachers are certainly not blind to the sins which beset these classes and which will prevent them from gaining eternal bliss. Berthold of Regensberg, too, criticized in strong terms the lack of mercy shown by those in authority, and championed the cause of the poor and lowly.\textsuperscript{115} Finally, emphasis is also laid on the way in which the clergy, bishops, kings, soldiers, monks, men and women are all sustained by the labour of the peasants.\textsuperscript{116} We have, furthermore, the testimony of a twentieth-century Franciscan, Kajetan Esser, who wrote in 1952:

\begin{quote}
Durch sein Leben der Nachahmung des armen und demütigen Christus, hat der Minderbruder immer die Möglichkeit, alle Gesellschaftsschichten zu erfassen und mit dem Geist des Evangeliums zu durchdringen, besonders aber die jeweils unteren Schichten. Die Geisteshaltung des "frater minor" verlangt von ihm und treibt ihn dazu, beim einfachen Volk, bei den sogennanten "untersten" Gesellschaftsschichten seinen eigentlichen Wirkraum zu suchen und zu finden.\textsuperscript{117}
\end{quote}

The theory that the RVA reviser might have been a member of the Brethren of the Common Life dies hard nonetheless.\textsuperscript{118} This is founded very largely on the known connection between the Brethren and the printing trade. In Rostock, for example, where they had settled in 1462, they had set up a printing press.\textsuperscript{119} In Lübeck, however, there was no such settlement, although a group of about thirty women, originally beguines occupying the Michaeliskonvent, had reorganised themselves around 1463/64 according to the spirit of the Devotia Moderna. Although engaged
primarily in work with wool, these Sisters are also known to have copied manuscripts, to have built up an excellent library and to have been on good terms with members of the mendicant orders.\textsuperscript{120} Kämpfer, too, writes of the "Einwirkung der deutschen Mystik und der Devotio Moderna in geistlichen Kreisen aber auch bei gebildeten Laien und im aufstrebenden Bürgertum" from the fourteenth century onwards.\textsuperscript{121} He also refers to the way in which the author of the 1492 "Plenar" identifies with thoughts expressed in the \textit{Betrachtungen des Jordanus}, from which he quotes extensively, a work that is known to derive from Dutch \textit{Devotio Moderna} circles.\textsuperscript{122} Other indications, however, in particular the emphasis laid by the author of the "Plenar" on the immaculate conception and undefiled state of the Virgin Mary,\textsuperscript{123} led Kämpfer to the conclusion that the author was a Franciscan.\textsuperscript{124}

Having thus established the close connection between the Franciscans and the lowest classes of society, it may seem strange to learn that in Lübeck, according to Käthe Neumann, the situation was apparently different. It was rather with the upper, the ruling-class that the Franciscans here had the closest ties, almost certainly functioning as spiritual advisers to the leading families.\textsuperscript{125} This tie had been formed, it seems, through the establishment in the Franciscan Katharinenkloster of a private chapel and burial ground by the "Zirkelgesellschaft," originally known as the "Bruderschaft zu heiliger Dreifaltigkeit" (founded 1379), to which the leading families in the city belonged.\textsuperscript{126} (The importance of this society or confraternity is evidenced by the fact that in 1483 only one member of the City Council was not also
a member of the "Zirkelgesellschaft". Can we, however, take it for granted that this close connection formed between the ruling class in Lübeck and the Franciscan order necessarily included all the friars resident in the Katharinenkloster? Referring in her first article to the "Geschichtsschreibung der Bettelorden" - she had previously related the contribution made by both Franciscans and Dominicans to the chronicling of the city's history - Neumann describes this contribution as "der einzige zusammenhängende Ausdruck der politischen Tendenzen des Gemeinwesens in jener Zeit," going on to include Reynke de vos among such works, on account of the picture it gives of the ecclesiastical and social conditions obtaining in Lübeck at the end of the fifteenth century as seen from the standpoint of a member of the clergy.

There are, in fact, included in the narrative text of the poem - as part of "Reinke's second confession, which, as we have seen, is considered to be the work of the RVA reviser - eighteen lines of verse, which, by the use of such terms as "lesemester," "custode," "prior etfe guardian" can only refer to the Franciscan order. Here we are told how the "bekappeden" (monks) spend their time begging, many of them preferring to be with the rich (meyst synt se leuer by de ryken). When one is invited, two appear, and as they know how to say the right thing, they are always welcome (Se konen ere worde so lytlich kleden / Und also lycht synt se ghebeden). Those who have a way with words (synt...best van worden) are the ones to be promoted to high office. (The "lesemester" was in charge of the friary school which served the
"custos" - a term used to denote both the area and the person in charge of this. Lübeck was the centre of one of the twelve "custodes" of the province of Saxonia. The "gardian" was the name given to the head of each individual friary, the equivalent of the Dominican prior. Finally, in the refectory (reventer), these monks/friars are accused by the writer of taking advantage of those who have to get up at night to sing, read and process around the graveyard, so that "De anderen eten (essen) de guden morseel (Bissen) / Und krygen wech dat beste vordeel (Vorteil)" (4053-64).

Moreover, Jannasch reports disagreement in the early part of the sixteenth century between the Observantines and the Conventuals within the order, Lübeck also being affected by this, with the former - that is, those who favoured the stricter rule - being victorious.

To return to the prefaces, we have, in the second place, with regard to emphasis, the obvious difference in the attitude of both authors towards the fox. In RVA this is a decidedly negative one, shown in the first instance by the commentator's direct reference to him as one of those liars and deceivers who cause the ruin of others yet remain in power by their lying and falseness - a sentence, it will be remembered, that has no parallel in VB and which appears to replace the one there under "Ten derden" describing the way in which liars operate and what little credence should be given to what they say. There is also the omission in RVA of the first sentence in VB under "Ten lesten," where we are told how wisdom and shrewdness of intellect surmount all slander and come out on top (de wijsheyt ende clocheit des gheests all
lasten verwint ende to boven gaet), an obviously benign reference to the fox. Furthermore, by his insertion of the translated last sentence in VB under "Ten lesten" concerning the importance of having wise and experienced counsellors at court at the end of his summary section (2a), and by omitting the first sentence, the RVA commentator manages to avoid a congratulatory reference to the fox, and is also able to maintain the generalizing tone of his summary, thus presenting a fairly positive picture of the contents of the story he is about to interpret.130

The attitudes of Alckmaer and the RVA commentator to the fox thus appear to be diametrically opposite, an opposition intimately connected with the meaning of the word "wyszheyt." We have found this word, and the adjective "wyse," used several times in the two RVA prefaces - the wise writers of the pre-Christian era, for example, and the wise counsellors at court, also the use of the fable for the teaching of wisdom, and, too, the wisdom that should be sought behind the words of the text. But what is meant by the word as it is used here? For Alckmaer it had obviously already degenerated into the attribute possessed (here) by a shrewd fast-talker such as the fox who could get ahead by his wits, such people being needed, in his opinion, in the councils of the mighty, whereas for the RVA commentator the word still appeared to possess something of the idealistic quality of a divine attribute. We will be exploring more closely what appears to be his definition of wisdom at a later stage when we come to consider the chapter-glosses.

In her book concerning the change in the conception of the
fool during this period, Barbara Künneker discusses the meaning that the word "wisheit" had acquired as a result of mankind's discarding of an exclusively religious scale of values:

Denn in dem gleichen Masse, in dem der Mensch sich der Welt zuwandte und sich in ihr zu bewahren strebte, begann sich das humanum das divinum zu verdrängen, wurde die Erlangung der "wisheit," einst Zeichen besonderer göttlicher Begnadung, das Ergebnis eigener Leistung und sittlicher Anstrengung, zum persönlichen Verdienst also des einzelnen, das ihm sowohl Belohnung von Gott eintrug als auch Erkennung in der Welt sicherte.¹³¹

Later, referring to Freidank's Bescheidenheit (probably late thirteenth century), she claims that even at this early date wisdom had become a "bereits nicht mehr ausschliesslich höchstes, in Gott gegründetes, und nur in ihm sich erfüllendes Ideal, sondern zugleich sichere und nützliche Führerin auf dem Weg durch die mannigfaltige Fallstricke und Gefahren des Lebens."¹³² Nanninga, too, examines the meaning of this word in the longer works of the later Middle Ages that she is investigating, particularly in Pfaff Amis, coming to this conclusion: "Als positiver Wert, der in allen Werken zum Erfolg führt, lässt sich so etwas wie Lebensklugheit heraukristallisieren, die sich in den einzelnen Episoden auf vielfältiger Weise bewährt. Die Fähigkeit ist moralisch indifferent."¹³³

As regards the audience addressed by this RVA commentator, a man whose profession is the cure of souls and who is concerned with the propagation of "heylsame lere" can obviously exclude no one, however great his concern for one particular class of society may be. We must note in addition the "Fürstenspiegel" element.
which is built into the narrative text and which is also present in the 6-point summary in the second preface, which brings us to the conclusion that although the author was obviously concerned with the salvation of all, from a social point of view his principal appeal was directed on behalf of the poor and powerless to the rich and powerful.

A digression is in order here for the purpose of giving a brief sketch of the social conditions in Lübeck at the turn of the century (i.e. c.1500). "Kurz, was es überhaupt Gutes und Schönes gibt, ist hier in glänzender und in grösserer Fülle vorhanden als in anderen Städten, so dass man Lübeck mit Recht ein zweites Paradies nennen kann." 134 This description of the city of Lübeck by a visitor from Prussia dates from the middle of the fifteenth century and gives some idea of the impression made on an outsider by this magnificent, prosperous, free imperial city, third largest in the Holy Roman Empire (after Wien and Köln) with a population estimated as between twenty-two and twenty-four thousand and the centre of the Wendish quarter of the Hanseatic League. One is forced, however, to ask oneself: a paradise for whom? For Lübeck was an oligarchy, a city ruled by a small number of families, from which, as we have seen, the members of the City Council were drawn. Ahasver v. Brandt has estimated the rich and well-off at that time to have constituted ten to twenty percent of the population - this would include, beside the patrician families, the merchants and shopkeepers, shipowners and brewers. Next comes a middle group consisting of artisans and members of guilds, whom he estimates as constituting thirty to forty-two
percent of the population; and finally we have the least well-off, few if any of whom would have enjoyed citizens' rights (Bürgerrecht). This section he estimates to have formed between forty and fifty-six percent of the population, of whom fourteen percent (in 1460) were indigent, a percentage that by 1502 had probably risen to seventeen percent.\textsuperscript{135}

Brandt confirms the possession of extensive land-holdings outside the city on the part of the wealthier members of society, which they had acquired during the course of the later Middle Ages, but feels that these should be considered only a capital investment, since there is no evidence that any of these property-owners transferred their principal dwellings from the city to the land during the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{136} As the main reason for this he refers to the "ausserordentlich dürftige und ständisch wie wirtschaftlich sehr unvollkommen ausgebildete Sozialstruktur des landsässigen Kleinadels in Holstein, Lauenburg and Mecklenburg."\textsuperscript{137} Nevertheless, resident or not, it seems to me, the owners would still have been ultimately responsible for the managements of their estates. And it was, in fact, not only from their property outside the city that the wealthy members of Lübeck society drew their rents, but to a very great extent from property within the city walls as well. In many cases they had withdrawn from the world of business and rents were now their only source of wealth.\textsuperscript{138}

As far as the administration of the city was concerned, the Council usually summoned only the "Altersleute," the chief representatives of the guilds, if they needed guidance on any
point. They were compelled to appeal to the citizenry at large (and then just to those with citizens' rights) only if they needed to impose special taxation, as for example in times of war.\textsuperscript{139}

With regard to the religious life of the city - Brandt estimates the total number of clergy to have been between three hundred and three hundred and fifty\textsuperscript{140} - this was controlled by the Dean and Chapter, except of course for the Mendicant Orders, who were independent. Relations between Council and Chapter were excellent. Apart from family connections, "die Ratsherren waren gute Katholiken und die Domherren gute Lübecker."\textsuperscript{141} Moral decadence was nevertheless as rife here as elsewhere during the same period.\textsuperscript{142}

Thus, from a social point of view at least, the RVA commentator would appear to have been addressing primarily the members of the City Council and wealthy property-owners, who, besides being the only people, generally speaking, who could afford such a book,\textsuperscript{143} were also the only ones in a position to right the wrongs being perpetrated on the lower classes of society, both those members of these classes living within the city walls - the urban proletariat - and those living and working on the large estates outside on the land - the peasants.

The following textual comparison between VB 1. under "Ten lesten" and RVA (2a) under point 6 appears to indicate a difference in the type of government that the two authors had in mind:\textsuperscript{144}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
    \textbf{VB} & \textbf{RVA} \\
    Oock dattet den prince & He bewyset ok dat den \\
oorbærljicker is, wijse & vorsten unde heren dat \\
lieden in sijn hof te & vele nutter is, to hebben \\
hebben, dan ghierighe & den wysen in ereme rade
\end{tabular}
Alckmaer is concerned with a prince, the RVA commentator with princes also, certainly, but with "heren" as well. And there is, too, the mention of a city here and of a council rather than a court. The difference between the opportunistic Alckmaer and the idealistic RVA commentator is also apparent in the former's emphasis on prosperity as the principal benefit, the latter's on the court or city retaining honour and respect.

The real epilogue to RVA is to be found in the last three items in the chapter-gloss to IV,10:

He continues:

These last two items summarize very largely II.6831-39 of the text - these are not in Reynaert II and are generally thought to be the
work of Alckmaer - where we are told that each one of us should turn to wisdom, in order to avoid evil and learn virtue, this being the real meaning of the book, taught here by fables and parables (bysproke). The book is worth the price, the text continues, for there is much in it concerning the way of the world and the state of same:

Eyn yslyk schal syk tor wyszheyt keren,
Dat quade (Böse) to myden unde de dogede (Tugend) leren

Dar umme is dyt boek ghedycht.
Dyt is de syn unde anders nicht.
Fabelen unde sodaner (solche) bysproke mere
Werden ghesath to unser lere,
Uppe dat wy undöget scholen myden
Unde leren wyszheyt to allen tyden.
Dyt boek is seer gud to deme koep (Kauf),
Hir steyt vast in der werlde loep (lauf). Wultu wetten der werlde stad,
So koep dyt boek, dat is rad.
Alsus endyget syk Reynkens ystorien.
God helpe uns in syne ewygen glorien (6831-39).

Immediately following the end of the text we have an incomprehensible direction to the reader to pass over the chapter-interpretations if these irritate him (so eft eме vordrote to lesende de lere unde de uthdudyngе, de up de capitelle synt gheseth) and just read the story (sproke) and the fables - an extraordinary recommendation by a writer whose sense of commitment to his interpretation of the text would seem to have been so strong. The simplest explanation would be that these are rather the words of the printer or business manager, as part of his advertising. There is also the possibility that the reviser of the text and the commentator were two different people - improbable, however, on account of the close relationship between both text and gloss and other "Mohnkopf" productions of the same
period. One should also bear in mind the known unwillingness of the contemporary reader/listener to occupy himself with admonition and exhortation.\textsuperscript{152}

The only scholar so far to have come up with an original suggestion here is L. Schwab, who, while agreeing that the commentator considered the glosses obligatory reading for most people, nevertheless distinguished between his readers:

Gerade ein solcher Rat geht davon aus, dass der geistliche Sinn der Verserzählung offen zutage liegt und von jedem wahrgenommen werden kann, der verständig ist. Die Glosse ist für jene geschrieben, die der Anleitung zur rechten, d.h. christlichen Erkenntnis bedürfen: für die Laien, insbesondere die Angehörigen der unteren Schichten.\textsuperscript{153}

This explanation seems, however, to overlook the fact that the lowest classes of society, on account of their lack of money and reading skills,\textsuperscript{153a} could not possibly have had direct access to such a book, as also the fact that from a social point of view, as we have seen, the audience he was primarily addressing was much more likely to have been the rich and powerful. With regard to the former, the lower classes, I personally envisage the RVA gloss - in particular the sermonizing portions - being used as a kind of preaching manual by the clergy, in the same way as the famous contemporary Strasbourg preacher, Geiler von Kaisersberg, used his friend Sebastian Brant's Narrenschiff for a series of sermons in the cathedral there.\textsuperscript{154}

We must now turn to the 1539 edition, to RVC, where we find that here the first RVA preface has been replaced by a long introduction composed - as we now know from the careful research of H. Brandes - of extracts from the prefaces to five of the works
which the commentator subsequently used in his chapter-glosses.155

Despite the difference in composition, some of the points taken up here are nevertheless the same as those we found emphasized in the first RVA preface. In the first paragraph, based on the preface to Cyrillus's *Spigel der wyssheit*, we have a reference to Aristotle's dictum that it is more entertaining (lustich) to absorb moral instruction (sydtlike underwysungen) if this is given by means of pleasant instructive anecdotes (bequeme Exempel), this being applied here to the representation of wisdom and morality, as these pertain to people's lives (de wyszheyt und guden sede / der menschen leuent belangende), through parables (gelicknisse) and the characteristic behaviour of animals (egenschop der creaturen). It is as if one were seeing experience (Erfarenheit), which is a mistress of all practical transactions (eyne meysterynne aller dyne und. geschøffe), portrayed before one. In this way human beings can be guided and governed by the natural inclinations and characteristic behaviour of animals (nha den natuurlichen thonegungen / und egenschoppen der deerte) in a living illustration (leuendyge bylde), as it were. The whole visible world should, in fact, be an institute of moral instruction for mankind (schal dem menschen eyne tuchtschole syn), since all things therein are ordained by the wisdom of God (nadem alle dynck darynne / nha Gödtyker Wëyszheyt vorordent synt).

For this reason, the commentator continues, in an original entry, the fable of *Reynke de vos*, which follows, was translated from the French (uth Walscher und Frantzösysscher beschriuunge)156...
into German and then made use of for crude purposes (upt grőueste gebuket) - a presumable reference to the Roman Church teaching included in the gloss - and has now been reprinted and enhanced by means of many fine, appropriate and productive pieces of writing and instruction (mit velen schonen / tapperen / und fruchtbaren schryfften und underwysungen / vorbetert), from which everyone can attain a clear understanding of and well-founded instruction in what goes on amongst all classes of society in the present evil, faithless world (up dat ein yder / uth der sľuigen / den Standt und handel der ytzigent bösen untruwen werlde / sampt alle eren Stenden / ynt gemeyne / klarlich vorstan / und grundtlick erfaren mach). All this had in fact been summarized on the title page, where we read:

De Warheyt my gantz fremde ys /
De truwe gar seltzen / dat ys gewisz.

Reynke Vosz de Olde / nyge gedrucket /
mit sidlikem vorstande und schonen figuren / erluchetet und vorbetert.

In der lauelyken Stadt Rosztock /
by Ludowich Dyetz gedrucket.

M.D. XXXIX

Overleaf, prior to the beginning of the preface, we are told that the story is about Reynke de Vosz, his manifold cunning and ingenuity (behendicheyt), a story which is full of wisdom and good instructive anecdotes (exempel), in which almost all that pertains to the human condition - man's faithlessness, cunning, violence (geswindicheit), envy and hatred - is represented and described.

This is then followed by an obvious reference to the gloss:
"Darneuen is hyr ock entdecket / de sydtlyke vorstandt (sittlichen Sinn) / und gebruck / desser Fabel. Sampt etlicken guten Leren und underrichtungen / eynem ydern menschen / in dessen varlyken (gefährlichen) tyden / gantz denstlick und fruchtbar." There follows a reassurance (in verse) - taken from Morsheim's Spiegel des Regiments - from the commentator that he is addressing only the knaves (schelcken) not the virtuous people (framen). Anyone who cannot tolerate what he says is without doubt such a person, he states. He will take up his work in God's name, he assures us, with anger and envy set aside, helping to defend justice and fidelity (recht und truwe), not seeking his own self-interest thereby.

Continuing with the preface, it soon becomes apparent that the "Fürstenspiegel" and curial aspects inherent in the RVA second preface, as we have seen, will be developed further here. This fable will show, the commentator states - here illustrating the curial aspect in an extract from the preface to the Buch der Beispiele der Alten Weisen - the secret envy and hatred that exists among counsellors and officials at princely courts, with the false flattery and treachery of the evil-intentioned (mith valscher smeychlyere und vorrederye der böszhaftigen) pitted against the loyal and upright (getruwen und framen) members of same. This can be seen, he states, as if in a mirror - this simile will be repeated in this and subsequent glosses - for all to read about and listen to, not only for their profit and entertainment (fruchtbarlich und kortwylich) but also as amusement and to take seriously (schymplick und ernstlick).
Developing the "Fürstenspiegel" aspect in an extract from Morsheim's *Spiegel des Regiments*, he speaks of the many upright, virtuous and God-fearing princes and rulers who have been led astray by imprudent, false, disloyal counsellors (unvorstendigen, valschen und ungetruwen Rede) and other fawners (Ogendenern) to forget the fear of God and to adopt wicked ways, causing them to seek thenceforth only their own advantage and worldly honour, which results in the eventual ruin of the whole land.

In addition, the commentator issues a warning not only to princes and rulers, but also to all good and upright people to beware of these toadies and sycophants (Voszschwenzer und Spytzhode). It is for this purpose, he states, as a warning and as a service, that the fable of *Reynke de vos* is presented here.

The definition of a fable, taken from the preface to Johann Adelphus's *Esopus*, follows: it is not a work, namely, that is concerned with things which have really happened, but only with fictional events (mit worden erdichte dynge). Through the words spoken by unreasoning animals, he states, a person can come to a better understanding of the nature and behaviour of human beings (der menschen wesent und sede), so that in this way he may eventually attain the truth that all desire.

Disclaimers regarding any intention of attacking a particular person or group appear twice in this preface, the first time in the words: "Ick wil auers (aber) mit dessem meinem arbeyde nemande int besunder / angetastet / vorumglimpet edder gesmehet hebben," the second time - in a section based on Schwarzenberg's preface to his *Memorial der Tugend* - including himself among the
frail (Gebrecklichen) who need exhortation, warning and improvement, even as upright people require strengthening in their good and virtuous behaviour. Commending the work to the Almighty, he asks that it be understood in no other way.

The second preface to RVC is concerned primarily with the classes of society, the arrangement following closely that in RVA, as far as the order and the derivation of one class from another is concerned and the animals represented in each, but providing in addition scathing criticism of all members of society save the ruler himself. Although he retains the description of the peasants - there is no mention of artisans - as sustaining themselves by means of heavy work according to the command of God and so on, the commentator nevertheless describes them, although originally simple and without deceit, as having become a wild and cunning people without self-control (eyn wild, hynderlystich, ungetemmet volck), whose hard work has not made them better men, since they are guilty of sharp practice when it comes to selling their wares. He has a peasant say, for example:

Und wat ick in untruwe kan erdencken
Dat ick darmit de Bürger beschyte
Daran spare ick nenen flyte (Fleiss).

The burghers and merchants, who consider themselves superior to the peasants - although in his view "Bürger und Bure / Scheidet nichts den de Mure" - he accuses similarly of sharp practice, a merchant/shopkeeper boasting of how he buys cheap and sells at the highest prices, so that

Im slape hebbick nene rechte rouwe /
Gedencke alle tydt / wo ik my erfrouwe /
und de andern alle möge vorderuen.
In addition to avarice and unchastity, the clergy - whose estate he describes as that of "der jennen / de syck laten nomen / de Gheystliken," the first clear indication of the commentator's Protestant persuasion - are accused here of usury\(^{160}\), but the sins primarily targeted are those of unchastity and worldliness, including worldly ambition. After admitting that he serves the devil, "und do nicht vele umme Gades eer (Ehre)," a member of the clergy is made to claim in an attributed Schwarzenberg quotation: "Na hogem Stande ick stedes trachte / Up dat ick hyr werde hoch geachtet."

By far the harshest criticism, however, is reserved for the nobility, "de syck Eddelachten" - he takes over this qualification from his predecessor. The situation that obtained in the olden days is described - this section is based on Sebastian Franck's *Geschichtsbibel* - when men on account of their individual virtue or prowess were elected by the people to serve as leaders to keep order and peace within the community and to guard it against external enemies and when they displayed their nobility by their deeds and not by membership of a particular family (nicht allene des Adels stamme und namen voren / sunder eren Adel / mit dogeden und eddelen daden / bewysen und kundbar maken). Further, a comparison is made between the true nobleman, who is a just and generous father and protector of his people, and the present nobility, who are boastful, rich and tyrannical and who take all they can from their subjects, by force if necessary. "Summa summarum," he states, "Doget maket Eddel / auers Eddel maket nicht doget," ending with lines by Freidank expressing the
The subject of usury is introduced again, the first definition of a usurer being someone who not only practises this but who dreams all the time of being rich, this indicating, according to the commentator - this portion is based on Agricola (224) - someone who has fallen into the snares of the devil and who can think only of damaging others with his tricks, a definition which, in his opinion, fits Reinke the fox. The other definition given here of a usurer - a more technical one - is of a man who loans money but who does not share the misfortune of the borrower, if, for example, there is a bad harvest. This section of the second preface ends with an attributed excerpt from NS (93) condemning usury in the strongest terms, including the practice of "Vorkope (Vorkauf)," that is of buying up commodities (it is usually a question of foodstuffs) when the price is low to sell in times of need at the highest price that can be obtained:

Woker und vorkop / der armadt (den Armen) deyt hynder (schaden).  
Mennich vorderuet (verdirbt) also mit wyff und kinder.  
De Ryke den armen also heymliken eruet (beerbt)/  
Achtet nicht / dat mennich des hungers steruet (stirbt).  
Men leth (lässt) de vüste (ohne weiteres) schrien /  
bidden und ropen (rufen).  
Ryst (im Preise steigen) de ware / men wyl en nicht vorkopen (verkaufen).

Here, in RVC, this section is followed quite logically by a list of the animals with their respective names in dramatis personae form, and after this we have a repetition of the RVA commentator's admonition to seek the wisdom that is hidden in the words of the text.

Finally, again with some logic, we have the so-called summary.
of Book I placed immediately before the beginning of the narrative text. The points made are the same, with the exception of the substitution for the general term liars in 4) of flatterers and fawners (Smeychler und Ogendeners) and the insertion at the end of this section of the RVA commentator's remark in his content section concerning the cunning fox's bringing so many to shame, disgrace and misfortune, yet still remaining in power and great honour through his lying and falseness, this being prefaced here by a warning regarding the liars, deceivers and slanderers who defame, slander and calumniate many a man with their falseness and dirty tricks (bös / nüken). In such a way, remarks the commentator, are the cunning toadies, fawners and sycophants (Spitzhode / Ogendeners und Voszwentzer) tolerated and made welcome at court.

What then is new here in the 1539 RVC prefaces? We shall also be concerned, it seems, as before in RVA, with wisdom and morality, which is better taught through fables, here defined, as in RVA IV,10,4, as fictional works concerned with the interaction of animals, which allow people better to understand human nature and in this way to attain the truth which all desire. We must therefore expect moralization here in RVC as well.

The "Fürstenspiegel" and curial aspects of the work will be more fully developed, certainly. This is further emphasized by the substitution in the summary just mentioned of the specific term "flatterers," along with the manifold synonyms for this word, such as "Ogendener, Spitzhode, Finantzer, Voszwentzer," for the generalized "liars" in RVA, the typical disloyal, fawning servant,
in other words, against whom princes in particular are warned. This singling out of the faithless flatterer, coupled with the mention of truth which all desire, shows the distinctive emphasis this commentator lays on this quality of truth and to a lesser extent on that of loyalty. The very first words of the title-page, which we have already noted ("De Warheyt my gantz fremde ys De Truwe gar seltzen / dat ys gewisz") confirm this.

There is also the reference in the section concerning the author's intentions to the present-day evil, faithless world, including its various classes of society, which both suggests a pessimistic view of life - the impression given by the RVA commentator in his prefaces was generally speaking optimistic, as we saw - and also introduces a new element, namely that of a "Standespiegel," which is illustrated shortly thereafter in the stringent criticism meted out to all classes of society in the second preface, where the principle of "Tugendadel" versus "Geburtsadel" is also touched on. Moreover, although the text of the RVC second preface follows that of RVA very closely as regards basic content, the outlook is different in at least one important respect. The RVC commentator has absolutely no sympathetic interest in the lowest class of society - the artisans are not mentioned at all, as we saw. As far as he is concerned, they can look after themselves; they are just as corrupt as everyone else. A curious omission is any reference to the social status of the fox in the story - it will be remembered that in RVA it was expressly stated that he was a member of the lower nobility, a platoon-leader - the only somewhat abrupt reference to him being
as a usurer in an extended sense.

This linking of usury with the fox - which in a purely technical sense is misleading, since Reynke was opposed to and managed to oust the avaricious nobles at court, he was not one of them - only serves to stress the commentator's detestation of both liars and usurers, the importance he attaches to the vice of usury being underlined by the marginal Freidank quotation at the beginning of the second preface. Here, referring to the first three classes of society as the nobility, the peasants and the priests, Freidank claims "Dat veerde syn wôkener genannt / De schinnen börge / Stede / Dörper und Landt."

Lacking, too, in the preface is any specific reference to religion. We have very little intimation of the change in doctrinal teaching to be found in the RVC chapter-glosses, except perhaps for the cryptic reference to the crude way in which the RVA commentator had treated the text and to the clergy as those who have themselves called the spiritual estate.

To sum up, it is the lack of truth and fidelity in an evil world, in other words the dishonesty to be found in all classes of society, the perfidy - particularly among courtiers - and the practice of usury which appear to be the negative elements emphasized most strongly by the RVC commentator in his prefaces and which we can expect him to dwell upon in his chapter-glosses.

As far as his audience is concerned, this RVC commentator claims to be addressing all people, as we have seen, but in the same way as the RVA commentator, who was living in a free, imperial city, almost certainly, from a social point of view
at least, had the "heren," the councillors and leading men of that city in mind, so this RVC commentator, as a resident of a territorial state, was most likely addressing first and foremost the Dukes of Mecklenburg.

In 1539 the Duchy of Mecklenburg was ruled by two brothers - Heinrich, known as the Peacemaker, and his younger brother Albrecht, known as the Handsome - who had ruled jointly since 1508 with no division of the territory. Albrecht had in fact pressed for such a division, but had had to be content with an agreement whereby the brothers ruled jointly in sixteen larger towns, including Rostock, Wismar and Schwerin and separately in a total of twenty-two other places. During the reign of their father, Magnus II, efforts had been made to centralize the administration of the duchy both fiscally and juridically, as a result of which ducal authority had been strengthened and measures eventually taken to put an end to the "wüste Fehdewesen" practised by the landed nobility during the preceding century.

As far as religion was concerned, both brothers had initially shown an interest in the new faith, but by the mid-twenties Albrecht, whose opportunistic ambition and decisiveness matched his good looks, had chosen - to some extent under the influence of his father-in-law, Elector Joachim I of Brandenburg, the older brother of the Archbishop of Mainz - to turn his back on this. Heinrich, with his less forceful personality and innate conciliatory bent, faced with this situation, hesitated for many years to take any far-reaching steps, despite distinct Protestant leanings. He did, however, appoint Protestant tutors - Konrad
Pegel and Arnold Burenius - for his son Magnus, who had been elected bishop of Schwerin in 1516 at the age of seven, the proviso being made by the then pope (Leo X) that his father be responsible for the administration of the diocese until the boy reached the age of twenty-one. Although slow to commit himself outright either to Lutheranism - he did not officially take Communion in both kinds until 1533 - or to the Lutheran cause politically - he did not join the Schmalkaldic League of Protestant princes formed in 1531 - Heinrich nevertheless assisted the Protestant cause in his duchy as much as he could by supplying preachers to those towns under his direct control who requested them and sometimes to those in the jointly-controlled towns as well, these being immediately replaced by his brother's appointees. Eventually, in 1534, an agreement was reached whereby in the jointly-controlled towns where there were two churches, one should be given over to adherents of the new faith, the other remaining in the possession of the supporters of the old one, and where there was only one church, this should be shared by them both. In the same year, in fact, in order to acquire the support of the Hanseatic cities for his attempt to gain the Danish crown, Albrecht with his customary opportunism assured them that his only concern was to protect the Gospel like his brother, not to forbid it, only to revert to his former conduct once his political schemes had come to naught. Furthermore, he proceeded to raise once again the question of a geographical division of the duchy, requesting the assistance of the Emperor both to achieve this end and also to wrest control of the bishopric of Schwerin
from his Protestant nephew Magnus, who had taken over full responsibility for the administration of the diocese in 1532.107

As far as Rostock itself is concerned, although with a population of between eleven and thirteen thousand about half the size of Lübeck, the distribution of wealth was much the same as it was in the larger city. Johannes Schildhauer gives a figure of sixty-three percent for the least well-off for the year 1533, twelve percent of these being without means. Rostock was also an oligarchy, the Council being termed by its opponents, the excluded burghers, an "Erfrat edder Sweegerrat (Erb- oder Schwägerrat") rather than a "Kürrath,"171 and for nearly two years, from June, 1534 until March, 1536 the burghers as a body forced the Council to consult constantly with an advisory committee of sixty-four of their members. (There were similar developments in both Wismar and Stralsund, and also Lübeck.)

Here the comparison with Lübeck ends, however, for Rostock, although an important member of the Hanseatic League, had to be constantly on guard against any encroachment on the city's privileges on the part of the dukes of Mecklenburg. A recent bitter struggle, lasting for seven years and ending in 1491, had resulted in the eventual success of Duke Magnus in promoting one of the city churches to cathedral status, principally in order to provide remuneration for three university professors.172 (The university had been founded in 1419 as a result of ducal initiative but with the assent of the city and in the first two decades of the sixteenth century had enjoyed a period of academic
excellence under Humanist influence and also of great popularity, with students flocking there from the whole of Northern Europe.\textsuperscript{173}

As far as the introduction of the Reformation in Rostock was concerned, Duke Heinrich's role had been a supportive one, for it was he who in 1523 had appointed to the Petrikirche a native Mecklenburger, Joachim Slüter, who had studied at the university there, a man who, by the force of his personality, his eloquence and his staying-power, practically single-handedly introduced the new faith into the city.\textsuperscript{174}

The Reformation in Rostock, as also in Wismar, was in fact a popular movement which eventually managed to carry the City Council along with it, with the invaluable assistance of the talented jurist and syndic, Johann Oldendorp. Eight years later Duke Heinrich also played a part, by his failure to give decisive support to the Cathedral Chapter, in enabling the Council, with Oldendorp in charge of negotiations, to present an ultimatum to the Chapter, as a result of which, in Lisch's colourful terms, "die Hauptschlacht für das Luthertum in Mecklenburg...ward geschlagen"\textsuperscript{175} on April 1, 1531.

Four years later, in 1535, theologians representing the Hanseatic towns of Hamburg, Bremen, Lübeck, Rostock, Stralsund, Lüneburg and Wismar reached agreement regarding both the upholding of the Augsburg Confession and also the form of service for mass, baptism etc.\textsuperscript{176} Another aim of these meetings was to urge action against Anabaptists and Zwinglians - this had become especially necessary as a result of the Anabaptist uprising in Münster in
1534 - which caused problems for the city of Wismar, since the initiator of the Reformation there, an extremely popular figure in the town named Heinrich Never, a former Franciscan, was a man who displayed pronounced Anabaptist leanings. It was not until 1541 that he was eventually forced to give up his post.\textsuperscript{177}

Meanwhile the university had fallen on evil times, but after Duke Heinrich, in 1532, had dispatched there his son's two former tutors, Pegel and Burenius - the latter a former pupil and friend of Melanchthon's - to take charge, its fortunes improved.\textsuperscript{178}

The situation in 1539 in Mecklenburg, therefore was by no means straightforward. Although the two important seaboard towns of Wismar and Rostock, together with the university there, were by that time predominantly Protestant, this was by no means the case in the whole duchy, where the machinations of Duke Albrecht gave continual cause for alarm.

To return to the commentator's audience, from a purely religious point of view one can perhaps envisage the same three categories of people whom Hans Sachs claimed to be addressing with his \textit{Wittenbergisch Nachtigall} in 1523, namely those who knew nothing of the new faith, to teach them something of it, those who already adhered to this faith, to strengthen them in it, and those who had so far refused to accept it, to bid them reconsider,\textsuperscript{179} although, as we shall see, his work contains more negative - i.e. anti-Roman - elements than positive Protestant ones, when it comes to religious teaching. Schafferus refers to the printing of this work at this particular time in these words: "1539 war der protestantische Reinke noch ein protestantisches
Bekenntnis."\textsuperscript{180} This is true up to a point, although Dietz had revealed his Protestant leanings as early as 1524 when he had printed a Low German hymnbook for Slüter,\textsuperscript{181} and, as we have seen, Rostock itself was predominantly Protestant by 1539. Similarly, Scheffler's description of Dietz's printing of this work in that year as a "mutige Tat" seems somewhat exaggerated.\textsuperscript{182} Bieling's claim, too, that "die Rostocker Fuchsglosse hat in hervorragender Weise der Ausbreitung des Protestantismus gedient,"\textsuperscript{183} is also somewhat difficult to accept, in view of the fact that Lutheranism was already, as we have seen, the predominant faith in the German Hanseatic towns by the mid-thirties and had also by that time been accepted in addition in Husum, Goslar, Magdeburg, Braunschweig and Göttingen.\textsuperscript{184} In Brandenburg, too, since the death of Joachim I in 1535, the new faith was beginning to spread. It seems, therefore, as if it might have been the other way round, namely that it was the existence of this new gloss with its Protestant affiliation that ensured the work's ready acceptance.

In a general sense, however, the RVC commentator was obviously writing primarily for the cultivated middle class of Northern Germany, the "kulturtragende Eliteschichten im hanseatischen Raum," to use Menke's phrase,\textsuperscript{185} and it should be remembered in this connection that the middle class, the bourgeoisie, had been for some considerable time a good deal better educated than the nobility.\textsuperscript{186} The fact that this 1539 edition of Reynke de vos was printed a total of ten times between 1539 and 1660\textsuperscript{187} attests to its popularity, despite the Low German dialect in which it was written. Initially at least this
popularity may have been to a large extent due to the introduction of so much recently printed material of South German provenance - the "vele schonen / tapperen / fruchtbaren Schryfften" that the commentator refers to in his first preface, such as extracts from works by Alberus, Brenz, Cyrillus, Franck, Hutten, Morsheim and Schwarzenberg and the "Olden Wysen," some of them available for the first time in print (High German) during the course of the 1530s. (Agricola's name has been omitted from this list, as the commentator so seldom attributes his authorship.)

In his interesting article on the translations of this 1539 edition into Danish and Swedish H. Munske reports that up to the date of the first Danish translation of this work in 1555 only the Bible and some devotional literature had been available in the vernacular, so that "nicht die Reineke-Fuchs-Fabel allein wird hier also in die nordische Literatur gebracht, sondern ein ganzes Kompendium spätmittelalterliche-humanistischer Literatur, das sich um dieses Werk gerankt hat und das ihm einen hohen literarischen Rang und Bildungswert sicherte."  

As far as the epilogue to the 1539 edition is concerned - it is based on a passage from the Alten Weisen - this commentator, ignoring not unexpectedly the instruction of his predecessor to pass over the chapter-glosses at will, takes up the main theme of the last lines of the poem when he writes:

Besluthlick is tho mercken / wo ock vorhen angetagen / dat dyt Boek van Reynken / vornemlick darumme gemaket / dat men weyszheyt und vorstandt / daruth leren / dat qauete vormyden / und dat gude don schole.

The poet, he goes on to say, desires to represent to us reason,
wisdom and prudence (vornufft / wyszheyt und vorsychticheyt) by means of parables and the speech of animals and birds for three reasons: so that he need not reveal his name, to make the story more interesting and thus sharpen the reader's wits, and so that young people will be able to remember better what they have learnt. He then likens the book, with its double meaning, to a nut which has to be cracked open to reveal the hidden part inside - a possible reference to the function of the gloss. Careful reading increases understanding, he continues, and he who understands, attains wisdom.

Only five years separate this 1539 Low German edition of Reynke de vos from the 1544 High German version of both text and gloss. Although the author, again anonymous, begins by slavishly translating his predecessor's chapter-glosses, he ceases to do this during chapter 9 of the first book, and from chapter 16 onwards he shows increasing originality.

An original preface we do most certainly possess here, one which differs considerably from the two we have just been studying and which owes little to its predecessor. Perhaps the most striking aspect of this preface is its personal nature and the importance the author obviously attaches to it, the title-page reading:

Ander Teyl des Büches Schimpf und Ernst welches nit weniger kurtweilig denn Centum Novella / Esopus / Eulenspiegel / Alte Weisen Weise Meyster und all andere kürztweilige Bücher / Aver zulernen weiszheyt und verstand weit nützlicher und besserer. Wie aus der Vorrede zuvernemen ist.
Zu Franckfort truckte Cyriacus Jacob im Jahr M.D.XXXXIII
Cum Gratia © Privilegio Caesare Ma.

(The first mention of any title occurs some six pages later where we find the heading "Von Reinicken Fuchsz / Das erste Capitel.")

His professed aim here in fact seems to be to reduce the task of commentator to that of a moralist on a very simple level, in comparison with his predecessors, that is. He begins his preface with these words:


His chief concern therefore is that his readers should learn from this work how to conduct themselves in all situations. In his commentary (sind daneben) he has censured the wrong-doing demonstrated in the story, he states, thus exhorting these readers to virtuous and honourable conduct.

He further suggests that each reader, as he goes through the work, both text and gloss, compose his own "Gedenktbuch," which will undoubtedly be of great advantage to him, whatever his station in life or his occupation, if he can live accordingly,
"denn er lernete daraus der gantzen welt lauff und sinn / und wie er sich gegen jedermann / in allen dingen / wie obgedacht / halten sollte." To this end he has shortened the glosses of his predecessor, he claims, some of which he considers irrelevant, his main aim being to give guidance on the study of the text rather than to write a commentary on it (das ich mehr anleytung gebe dem text nachzudencken / denn ein comment zuschreiben / denn es hatt grossern nutz / wie ein jeder bedencken kan). He has, generally speaking, retained the opinions expressed by his predecessor, he explains - later in the preface he admits to having toned down, altered or omitted some of the latter's chapter-glosses - at the same time expressing great satisfaction with his own commentary, which he hopes will inspire others to make their own.

The main teaching of his commentary he states to be:

> das ein jeder seinen nehesten soil lieben als sich selbs der oberkeit unterthan sein /seines berüffs ehrlich und trewlich warten / und Gott für und uber alle ding fürchten / lieben / vertrauen und gleuben / und werden die jenigen die solchs nicht thun gestrafft,

precepts which bear a pronouncedly Lutheran stamp.¹⁷¹

The usual disclaimer is given as regards his intentions - they cannot be disadvantageous or injurious to any "erbarn frommen auffrichtigen menschen / wes standes er auch sei." As far as the vices he castigates are concerned, if any of his readers feel his censures have found their mark, he should "wie der Kukuck seinen eigen namen auszruffen" - in modern terms he should say to himself "touché." With regard to his desire to remain anonymous, he pleads both lack of originality for what he has written and also
the anonymity of his good friend and predecessor the Saxon commentator. Furthermore, he does not seek any glory for his work, he states, just his own and others' profit. If anyone wishes to contact him, he declares, they can do so through his printer.

He ends by commending the book to all "die Weysheit und verstand lieb haben und gern lernen wolten," at the same time belittling any praise, blame, favour or disfavour that it may receive from schoolmen. "Ja," he writes, "will lieber von einem Erbarn / Ehrlichen / verstandigen man underricht und gestrafft / denn vonn einem solchen gelobt werden."

What kind of man does this 1544 commentator appear to be from this and what kind of audience was he addressing? The way in which he despises schoolmen marks him as a Humanist, also the encouragement he gives to his readers to think for themselves and in addition, his emphasis on morality. Although a convinced Lutheran, he would not necessarily appear to be a pastor. As regards his audience, compared with his predecessors this 1544 commentator was addressing - potentially at least - a considerably larger number of people, namely the whole of the comparatively thickly-populated High German speaking area of South Germany. Specifically, however, despite his reference to society as a whole (wes standes er auch sei), his prime target, as with the 1539 commentator, was obviously the educated middle class, although, as Menke points out, the coupling of the work with Pauli's immensely popular Schimpf und Ernst would have considerably widened its appeal. Menke describes this as "ohne Zweifel ein erfolgreicher,
verkaufsstiegender Verlegertrick mit der Absicht, im Schlepptau der noch breiteren Leserschichten erfassenden Buhl-, Lust- und Volksbücher zu fahren." Between 1544 and 1617 a total of twenty-one editions of this work were in fact published, making it, in Scheffler's words, "ein wahrer Bestseller seiner Zeit." There is also the fact that the distinctly less critical attitude towards the nobility, which becomes evident in the chapter-glosses, would have made the work a good deal more palatable in these circles also. Nevertheless, the emphasis this 1544 commentator places on the reader's gaining from the work his own pointers as to how he should conduct himself on his path through life, "das es ihm ehrlich nutz und ohne fhar sei," surely betokens, in his mind at least, a predominantly bourgeois audience. Referring to the fable, as a literary, specifically didactic form, Kônneker stresses its primary function as "eine positive erzieherische," which serves first and foremost die spezifisch bürgerlichen Tugenden wie Vorsicht und bescheidene Zurückhaltung, Sparsamkeit und unermüdlichen Fleiss, anspruchloses Sichzufriedengeben und nüchtern leidenschaftsloses Urteilsvermögen in das rechte Licht zu stellen, um zu zeigen, dass allein diese Tugenden Sicherheit und Erfolg gewährleisten, während hochfahrendes Streben, stolzer Geltungsanspruch und leidenschaftlich ausgespannte Leistungswille zum Unheil ausschlagen.

Although Frankfurt is the town in which the work was printed, this does not necessarily indicate any particularly close connection on the author's part with this city; it was merely the largest book distribution centre in South Germany. In Scheffler's words:
Der Absatzmarkt für Frankfurter Drucke erstreckte sich über das ganze Reich...Zweimal im Jahr kamen Verleger und Drucker, Gelehrte und Bücherlieberhaber aus allen Ländern Europas nach Frankfurt am Main, um Bücher zu kaufen und zu tauschen, um die literarischen Neuerscheinungen zu sichten. 170

Nevertheless, the struggles that took place there before the Reformation was finally accepted - it was not until 1536 that Frankfurt joined the Schmalkaldic League and formally accepted the Confessions of Augsburg 171 - were typical of those in other South German imperial cities, where pressure from above by way of loyalty to and fear of the Emperor on the part of members of City Councils vied with the pressure from below put on these bodies by the population in general, the members of which, as in North Germany, were almost always the first to embrace en masse the new faith.

Given this situation in 1544, eleven years before the Peace of Augsburg in 1555 gave official imperial sanction to Lutheranism in the places where it was already established, it is obvious that any commentary on the Reineke-Fuchs epic would have to be such as to give the least possible offence.

The epilogue here is to all intents and purposes a repetition of what the commentator described in his preface as being his primary purpose and which he feels he has fulfilled, namely to give guidance to each of his readers as to how he should make his own comments on the text, in order to learn "wie er sich in allen seinen handeln und wercken halten / was er sich versehen und gewarten / was er loben und schelten / rhaten und widerrhaten / tun und lassen soll uund mag." It was never his intention, he
states, "diss Buch gar aus zu studieren," something which, in his view, would have taken another whole book.

The longest period of time separating two commentaries on the Reineke-Fuchs story is the hundred and six years between 1544 and the publication of the baroque edition in Rostock in 1650. (The preface is dated 5 May, 1649). As might be expected, this preface is of a very different nature from its predecessor of 1544 and appears in fact to be wholly concerned with the work itself and the reviser's decision to turn the "Knüttelvers" of the original into accepted baroque metrical forms. The only direct reference to his intentions as a commentator, in fact, is given on the title-page, where we read:

Reineke Fuchs Das ist ein sehr Nützliches / Lust- und Sinn-reiches Buchlein / Darein auf verblümete / jedoch lübliche / schreibart / unter den Namen desz Löwen / Bahren / Fuchses / Wolfes etc. Das Hofe / wie auch aller Stände der Welt Leben und Wesen / so wohl nach ihren Tugenden / als auch insonderheit nach denen darein vorfallenden Lastern / mercklich beschrieben / und gleichsam mit lebendigen Farben bezeichnet wird.


In Verlegung / Joachim Wilden / Buchhändlern zu Rostock

Im Jahr M.DC.L.

We have here, then, on the title-page, the intimation that this work is a fable, that it may contain a "Fürstenspiegel" element (Das Hofe) as well as that of a "Ständespiegel" (wie auch aller Stände der Welt Leben und Wesen) and the certainty in the
commentary of a good deal of moralization (mit unterschiedlichen Sitten und Lehr-Satzen verbessert). A close examination of the preface brings confirmation of some of these elements.

Describing this preface as a "Kurtzer Vorbericht / An den Teutschgesinneten wohlwollenden Leser," the commentator begins by distinguishing between great works dealing with such topics as Holy Scripture, Law, Medicine and "Weltwysheit" and lesser works by the kind of author who does not expect the same profit and reward from his labours but who nevertheless "von schlecht- und geringschätzigem Sachen / weys klüglich zu reden solches ruhmlich heraus zustreichen / und demselbigen einen Schein und Hoheit anzugewinnen." But how is one to consider, he asks, works which, damit Sie der in Geitz / Wucher / Hofarth / Hurerey / Blutdurstiger Unbarmhertzigkeit und anderen Sünd und Lastern gleich bisz Über beyde Ohren stekkenden Welt / desto besser und füglich machten / solche ihre stükke / tükke und nükke vor die Augen mahlen und unter die Nase reiben / sich allerhand schöner von den wilden und zahmen unvernunftigen Thieren / als von Löwen / Füchten / Wolfen / Hunden / Katzen Ratzen / Mäusen / Fröschen etc. genommenen Gleichnüs- und Eygenschaften gebrauchet / und in derer Auf und Anführung die Welt-Laster gewaltig und hefftig durchgezogen und durchgehechelt?

He then proceeds to defend this way of writing - i.e. the fable - by stating that it has been used from time immemorial and has always proved beneficial. Listing writers of antiquity who have used the fable and thus "die höchste Welt Weisheit unter derer Dekke gleichsam verborgen, verdékktet und gehalten," he turns to "der teure Mann und teutsche Prophet Lutherus," quoting examples from his "Tischreden " and mentioning tracts and sermons where he has used fables, and to Melanchthon, mentioning the latter's
preface to an edition of Aesop's fables, where he, Melanchthon, refers to examples of Biblical metaphors using animals, contending "dass Gott viele und grosse Dinge mit solchen Gemeldern habe bezeichnen wollen."

After further examples of Biblical allegory the commentator eventually introduces Reinke Fuchs / als welches verfasser auch in seinem gantzen Buchlein sich solcher dunklen und verdeckten Schreib Art gebraucht / und unter den Nahmen des Löwen Bären Wolfes / Fuchses etc. die hohen / vielen und schandlichen Hof-Laster / die alda häufig im Schwange gehen beschreibt und abmahlet.

He then describes Georg Rollenhagen's reference to the work in the preface to his *Froschmeuseler*, where the latter states that "das gantze Politische Hof Regiment / und das Römische Pabstthumb ist unter den Nahmen Reinken Fuchses uberaus weiszlich und kunstlich beschrieben."

Having been drawn for this reason among others to "ein so herlich schönes und ausbündig-nützliches Buchlein" and deploring as he does its "hart und übel-lautenden Reymen," he has often wished, he says, that someone would be found, who, by means of the present-day "Teutsche Sprach Steigerung" would turn it into "die jetzt üb- und lobliche Versz und Reimarten" Commending "den Edlen und mit seinen lieblich schönen Teutschen Buchern Himmel übersteigenden Harsdorfer" for his services to the German language, which he himself hopes to emulate, however poorly, and wishing that "ein so edles teutsches hochprangendes Gemuth und aufsteigender Geist" had undertaken the task, he nonetheless hopes that what he has done will encourage others to follow in his
footsteps and other "unausgearbeitete Bücher ...zur höchsten Stuf Teutscher Zierlichkeit weysen und verhelfen."

Although, as has been illustrated here, this preface is completely taken up with the story itself, including both an apologia on the part of the reviser for presenting a fable in the first place and also the details of how he intends technically to present it, we nevertheless have confirmation of most of the elements intimated on the title-page, namely that it is a fable, that it is to be concerned with the "hohen / vielen und schandlichen Hof-Lastern / die alda häufig im Schwange gehen" - there will likely be "Fürstenspiegel" and curial elements in the gloss therefore - and in a general way with the "in Sund und Lastern gleich bis über die Ohren stekkenden Welt" - so moralization will be called for, and the author's outlook will most probably be a pessimistic one.

Concerning the author, his devout remarks concerning Luther and Melanchthon and his Biblical references denote a Lutheran pastor, many of whom were, of course, members of the various poetic and language societies of the time - for example, Rist, Klaj and Dilherr, who is also referred to at one stage in the preface.

There is also a definite probability that this commentator may have been associated with a movement which Erika Vogt in her dissertation published in 1932 describes as "die gegenhöfische Strömung" in German baroque literature during the first half of the seventeenth century, whose chief representative was the Alsatian, Johann Michael Moscherosch, long extracts from whose
Gesichte des Philander von Sittewald appear in the latter part of this gloss. This movement or tendency was fostered in their heyday by two of the language societies, the very important "Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft," later known as the "Palmenorden," founded in 1617 and centered on Weimar, and the "Aufrichtige Tannengesellschaft," founded in 1633 and centered on Strassburg. Vogt describes this tendency as a counter-weight to the growing influence, which was eventually to predominate, of French and Spanish ideas, particularly in the image of the courtier as the "Weltmann," whose ideal was success, no matter by what means this was to be attained. "Erfolgsethik bleibt also die höfische Ethos in jedem Falle," she writes. For such a man the end justified the means - a tenet she ascribes to Jesuit influence. With this she contrasts the efforts of men like Moscherosch to emphasize the intrinsic German qualities of the "Altdeutschen," as these qualities had been described by Tacitus in his Germania, such as loyalty, integrity, simplicity and the exercise of conscience: "Tüchtigkeit statt Repräsentation, Mannhaftigkeit und Redlichkeit statt politische Künste fordert er," she writes. For Moscherosch, in fact, according to Vogt, "redlich und gut" became the equivalent of "teutsch." As far as his attitude to authority is concerned, Vogt stresses here the Protestant, particularly Lutheran, nature of his views. He saw the ruler, namely, as the father of his subjects, not as some unapproachable dignity, a man who was concerned for the common good, not his own self-interest.

So far we have had only one direct intimation of this
commentator's inclinations here and that is at the very beginning of his preface, where he addresses his reader as "Der Teutschgesinnte wohlwollende Leser."²⁰⁸

As regards his audience, although from a linguistic point of view this would have been potentially the largest for any Reineke-Fuchs commentary, since by then the use of High German as a literary language had spread throughout all Germany,²⁰⁷ it is difficult to imagine from such a literary preface that he was addressing any people other than his fellow poets and language-reformers. Such a work, to quote Menke, "war kaum für eine breitere Leserschicht berechnet; sie entsprach eher schon dem unerhörten Luxusbedürfnis und der asthetisierenden Stilfähigkeit einer gelehrten, akademischen Elite der Zeit."²⁰⁸ It is also a fact that there were only two editions published of this particular work, the original of 1650 and a second in 1662. It cannot be overlooked, however, that it was this baroque version of the Reineke-Fuchs story that became the basis of the German "Volksbuch," which began to appear in undated editions later in the century²⁰⁹ and of which this preface, together with the chapter-glosses, only slightly curtailed, formed an integral part, thus providing the gloss at least with a vastly enlarged readership.

Summary

In the four RV commentaries we have, therefore, certain points stressed which are common to most if not all of them:

a) the fable: all commentators except the author of the 1544
edition stress that they are presenting a fable - fables being concerned with fictitious happenings (RVA IV.10.4 and RVC first preface), or, in the 1650 preface, equivalent to allegories - where human beings can learn from unreasoning animals how they should or should not conduct themselves. Fables, in other words, are suitable vehicles for the teaching of wisdom and understanding and for presenting moral instruction, since this type of teaching is made more palatable when it is presented in such a manner.

b) the "Fürstenspiegel" and curial elements, which are present in the RVA second preface (2a and 2b) are even further pronounced in RVC (both prefaces), and present also in the 1650 edition.

c) the "Ständespiegel" aspect, which is largely absent from RVA, is pronounced in RVC and also stressed in the title of 1650, while in the 1544 preface we have a reference to the work's being addressed to all people, "wes stande er auch sei"

d) the "Sittenspiegel" element which is common to all four prefaces, most pronouncedly in that of the 1544 edition

e) the optimistic/pessimistic attitude of the authors to the work and the world, both the author of RVA and of the 1544 edition presenting a largely optimistic view, while the RVC commentator and the author of the 1650
gloss see both work and world in the blackest colours

f) all commentators choose anonymity, only the 1544 commentator giving his reasons

g) their respective audiences: except for the author of RVA, who appears to have had a smaller and more specific one, the other commentators were appealing primarily to the educated bourgeoisie, the author of the 1544 commentary having a wider audience than his predecessors on account of i) the language in which he was writing, ii) the way in which the work was presented, i.e. being coupled with a highly popular book. The author of the 1650 gloss, by comparison, appears to be addressing an intellectual élite, initially at least; after the publication of the "Volksbuch" he would obviously have had a much enlarged readership.

A word must be said concerning the use of the word "Spiegel" here, both in the sense in which it is used in the "Fürsten-, Stände- und Sittenspiegel" connotations and to its use by the commentators themselves, as in the RVC second preface, where we have the reference to the opportunity to see life at court as if in a mirror. The use of the term speculum, "Spiegel" or "Mirror" in this connection, this type of literature being very popular from the twelfth through the sixteenth century, derives ultimately from St. Augustine, who used it both in the sense of a set of directions and also for a work which shows readers what they are and what they might be and in an extended way the kind
of conduct and behaviour which should be emulated and that which should be avoided.212

With regard to the four editions of the Reinke-Fuchs epic, both text and gloss, one can say, therefore, that the sense in which I have used the term "Fürstenspiegel" etc. refers to the first of these definitions - as a set of directions. On the other hand, the way in which the term is used by the commentators themselves, as in the RVC first preface, is an illustration of the second definition. I suggest therefore that in general terms we can regard the commentators' task to be that of compiling the first type of "Spiegel" - a set of directions, maxims or precepts - from what they found reflected in the second type, that is, in the text of the story they were interpreting.
Chapter 2.

We must now turn to the way in which the individual commentators treat the narrative text, to the nature of their commentaries or chapter-glosses, that is, and the composition of these, something that can best be achieved by a direct comparison of the treatment given by all four to particular chapters in the text.

As far as the 1498 commentator is concerned, we have already learnt from the RVA prefaces that his intention was to give short interpretations (korte uthleggings) after each chapter, interpretations which purport to be the poet's meaning/intention in writing what he did, so that the real meaning/sense of the text may be understood (first preface), for in this meaning lies the wisdom contained in the work (second preface). In his last chapter-gloss also (IV,10,4) the commentator refers to this fable or these fables (here meaning little stories) which are presented parabolically (umme eyner lykenysse wyllen) to teach us wisdom and understanding, so that we may learn virtue and how to avoid vice.

From the above it is hardly possible therefore to expect from the chapter-glosses in RVA anything but commentaries on individual episodes rather than a treatment of the Reineke Fuchs story as a whole. To this we must add here the author's professed salvational intention - that is, that he was writing for the "heylsame lere," the salvational instruction, of his readers/listeners - which often accounts for his individual contribution to the chapter-glosses over and above what he found
in his source.

A good example of the way in which the RVA commentator uses material obviously present in his source, to which he adds his own particular contribution, is to be found in the chapter-glosses to Book I, chap. 7. This is also a useful chapter because it is one where all commentators are covering the same material, so that a direct comparison can be made. In the case of VB the material comprises the whole of chap. viii and the first part of chap. ix. The fact that the RVA chapter-glosses often cover two or three chapters instead of just one impedes direct comparison in many instances. Since the author of the 1544 gloss was still engaged in translating word for word what his predecessor had written, this gloss can be ignored here. With the 1650 commentary, however, it is a different matter, and this one must be included in the comparison.

The part of the story we are concerned with here in Book I, chap. 7 (11.517-608) is Reinke's reception of Brun, the bear, the first messenger despatched by the king to summon Reinke to court to answer the charges brought against him. First flattering Brun by wondering aloud why the king should have chosen him, the most renowned nobleman at court (De eddelste unde grotste van loue / De nu is in des konnynges houe) (537-38) for such a mission, Reinke subsequently tempts him with the prospect of honey in abundance to accompany him to a neighbouring peasant's property, pretending not to know that honey is the bear's favourite food.
De dwaze (Toren) en en cmanen
niet (betrugen) dan met prijzen ende
sulcke ghiften (Gaben) gheuen
(gehen) als sy gheerne hebben
(haben), oft daerse meest
ghenuechten (Genuss) in hebben.
Den hoouerdighen (Hoffartigen)
verleytmen met tijtlijcke
(zeitliche) gloria, den gulsighen
(Gefrassigen) met spijse ende
dranck, den ghierighen met gout
(Gold) ende siluer, den
luxurieusen (Wollustigen) met
schoone vrouvven etc.

(1) (a) In dessem Cap. mercke
dre Lere. De erste. De grauen
(groben) unvorstendygen und
vormethen (vermesenen)
menschen / werden van den
erfaren / lysigen und behenden
(schlagen) vele mall bedragen
(betrugen) uund dorch twe
wege/ jnn schaden geuort
(geführ). Vorerst / wen se van
den liistigen bedregeren
(Betrügern) valschlick und
unvorschuldes (ohne Schuld) /
wo den (wie denn) der
Smeichler art ys / gelauet
(gelobt) und hoch gepryset
werden. Darna wen men en
(ihnen) int besunder dat vorholdt
(vorhält) dartho se upt meyste
geneget syn. Also den
hofferdygen / tydlige eere. Den
gyrygen / gelth und gudt. Den
vratzygen / spyyse und gedrencke.
Also pryset ock hyr Reinke den
grauen Baren / thorn ersten uth
(aus) valschem gemöthe
(Gemut). Und dewyle (derweilen)
he mith em redet / erdencket he
ein orsake (Mittel) / wordorch he
togheneget was, also myt
honnighe, dat eme doch
duel(ubel) bequam (bekam).

(Zweierleiweise). Erst, dat de
lystyge bedreger den dammen
prysel unde louet (lobt), ghelyck
(sowie) hir Reynke louet den
grouen (groben) baren. Tom
anderen male, wan men em
(lhm) vorbrynget (vorhalt) dat,
dar he meyst to gheneget
(zugeneigt) is: als den
houerdyggen doren (Toren) myt
tyllicker ere. Den vratzygen myt
spysse unde dranckke. Den
ghyrygen myt gheule unde
ghauen. Den unkusschen
(Ükeuschen) myt vrouven.
Unde hir unme beghynnet
Reyneke erst desten grouen
baren to prysen unde na der hant
(nachher) vorleydet (verleitet) he
ene myt spysse, dar he meyst
togheneget was, also myt
honnighe, dat eme doch
uel(ubel) bequam (bekam).
(b) Wente (denn) de vyentschop (Feindschaft) nydt und hatt (Neid und Hass) / tohsamendedragen zusammen genommen) / weken (rächen) syck nicht alwege (immer) / mit gewalt / und apenbar (öffentlich) / sunder (sondern) mit list und vorbetrachtunge (Vorbedacht) / wo ock (auch) hir de listige Voss deit (tat). Derhaluen (deshalb) schőien de wysen und vornufligen / vorsichtich syn / mit bescheydenheyt und vornuft / syck wol bewaren.

Denn die jenigen die da Feindschaft Neid und Hass zusammen tragen/ dieselbigen suchen nicht allemalien mit Gewalt und eüszerlicher Macht sich zu rechen / sondern auch oftermauls durch gute Worte und falscher List.

(2) Dat ander, dat de poete hir leret, is, dat eyn dor (torichter) mynsche draden (schnell) is to plasse (zu Fall) bracht, so wan de vort lőuet (glaubt) schonen worden, der de werlt nu vul is.

(2) (a) Dat ander / Wen eyn unvornufllich und vormethen (vermessener) mensche / schonen worden / de uth einem valschen Herten (Herzen) herfleten (herfliessen) / wo nu gemeinlich der werlt gebrauk (Gebrauch) ys / gelouen stelt (Glauben schenkt) / so wert he balde voruőret (verführt) / dartho in schaden / angst und noth gebracht. Wo ock hyr dem Baren / do he dem listigen Vosse gelőuede (glaubte) / wedderuart (widerfuhr).

(b) Darumme spreken de Olden Wysen / dat syck dät herte der menschen tho den söten (sussen) und zu gedenken der Speise die Reinkę wohl wuste / dasz Sie dem Bären zu essen geluste etc.
Lekernije (Leckerbissen) doet menighen mensche dickwils (oft) vallen in groot quaet (Ubel) ende dangier: Ende soo wie (wer) den quaden (Ubeltatern) gheloolt (glaubt), hy vinter hem dickwils af bedroghen.

(3) Dat drydde, dat men hir schal merken, ls, so we (eger) den quaden (Bo'sen) geiouet unde volget, dat de ynt ieste unde ok gantz draden (schnell) wert bedrogen unde schendet, so hir na wert ghesecht.

worden synes vyendes (Feindes) / und tho dem, de syck mehr erbuth (erbitten lasst) / also he syck suluest werdich weth (weiss) nicht negen (neigen) noch hengeuen (hingeben) schölle / upp dat (dami) ydt nicht bedragen werde. Dan in nyte und hate (Neid und Hass) wert gudt geloue (Treu und Glaube) nicht gefunden.

(3) (a) Dat drudde. Wol (wer) dem valschen rade / der böszhaftigen/ungetruwen und listigen / volget de wert balde bedragen und geschendet.

(b) Wente (denn) in der werldt ys nicht schedelykers / also den gelouen (versprechen) / in welkeren noch geloue edder (oder) truwe ys Woll (wer) den guden anhanget und volget / der erlanget dath gude. Derhaluen (deshalb) schal syck eyn yder (jeder) vor val sche und untruwe worde / höden (hüten) / und nenen gelouen darup setten (aufsetzen) edder he wert bedragen. Dan de Olden Wysen spreken: De gesellschop (Gesellschaft) der untruwen / schölle men fliegen (fliehen) / ock in den angebaren negesten frunden (nächsten freunden). Unde eft (wenn) se woll (wohl) vann wyßen raden syn / dennoch hêde dy (hute dich) vor
Ok is gheystliken hir betekent by deme vosse, de duuel (Teufel), de boze gheyst, wente he seer lystych unde behende (schlau) is, unde eme god to ghelaten heft (zugelassen hat), dat he den mynschen bekoren (versuchen) mach, up dat (damit) de mynsche in der bekoringe ouerwynne (gewinne), unde also umme des wedderstandes wylien des to grotter (grosser) ion moghe (mochte) entfangen in der salicheit (Seligkeit).

Unde de (wer) deme bedreger (Betrüger), deme duuel, volget unde vulbordet (zustimmt) den bekoryngen, unde deyt (tut) als e me de synne todregen (eingeben), de wert vorloren, unde dar to van deme vosse, ere (ihre) ungetruwe tucke und anslege (Anschläge). Auerst (aber) van den / de truwe unde erenfast syn/ unde de rechterderkeit leeft (lieb) hebben / schaltu dy nummer scheiden. Und wowol (obwohl) dy nicht vele nüftes (Nutz) vann en (ihnen) wedderuaret (widerfahrt) / so schaj dy doch daran genögen (genügen) / dat ere geloue und truwe denst (Dienst) / dy kunt und tho geneten (geniessen) / tho vorhapen (erwarten) sy. Auerst (aber) de valschen / untruen und listigen / vormyde (vermeide)See Fennyn (Gift).
deme duuel, bespottet unde belachet in den pynen der vordomenysse (Verdamnis), gelyck hir Reynke vosz den baren to syneme schaden bespottede unde belachede, so gy (Ihr) horen scholen. Algsus gyft uns de duuel vor (hält vor) ysilkem (einem jeglichen), alze he in syner klockheyt merket dat, dar eyn alder meist (zumeist) togheneget is. De denne weddersteyt (Widerstand leistet) unde bruket (gebraucht) der ghauw (Gaben) des hilgen (heiligen) geystes, de (welches) is de geystlike starkheyt, unde blyft (bleibt) in deme wedderstande vuelderich (beständig) wente (bis) in den ende, desse wert salich (selig); wente (denn) unse leuent (Leben) is hir eyn vechtent (Streit) unde eyn wedderstant, eyne rydderschoop (Kampf), als Job secht (sagt): De hir nicht vechtet (kampt) wedder undöget (Untugend), en derff (darf nicht) syk nener krone vormoden (vermuten), unde volget he der synlycheyt, so volget he deme vosse, deme bozen geyste, ghellik hir na wert ghesecht van deme baren.

[Compare with the above the following passage from the 1492 "Plenar."

Job secht: Des mynschen leven

Und ist hiren der Teufel dem Fuchs gleich; als welcher auch zum offtten dahin strebet / wie Er die Menschen mit guten Worten muge fangen: Er giebet genaue acht worzu Sie und ihre Seele am meisten Lust un
Is eine ridderschop. Sunte Pavel secht: Niemand wert ghekronet in deme hemmel, id en sy, dath he trueleken (voll Zuversicht) hebbe gestredden (gestritten). Unse sallgmaker (Sellgmacher) secht in dem evangelio: Dede vulherdich blyfft wente in den ende, de wert salich. 214

Begierde nachtragen / daszelbige mahlet Er ihnen vor Augen damit er sie also in sein verfrührisches und verdampftes Netze bringe/ Mann sehe nur an und lese nach / wie er unsere erste Eltern und denn auch Christum unsern Heyland versuchet habe etc. Gen. 2. Math. 4.
As far as RVA is concerned, we note from the above that two of the three items here, namely (1) and (3), appear to derive from VB.

With regard to item (1), where the resemblance is closest, we note nevertheless certain changes in the wording of the text. The substitution of "ghelt unde ghauen" for "gout ende silver" was probably done for alliterative purposes, and that of "den unkusschen myt vrouwen" for "den luxurieusen met schoone vrouwen" because this seemed to the commentator more realistic and better suited to the local conditions. Lübeck was more familiar with unchaste clergy than with dissolute courtiers. In 1,3,3 this RVA commentator had already referred to the adultery that went on among noblemen in "etliker heren lande...in lomberdyen unde in wallant, dar dyt boek ersten ghydychtet is," but not in his country, God be praised, he continued. In 1,14,7, by contrast, he is to criticize concubinage among the clergy, as also in 11,6,3. The four sins targeted - gluttony (gula), arrogance (superbia), avarice (avaritia) and lust (luxuria) - are of course four of the seven deadly sins, the remaining three being anger (ira), envy (invidia) and sloth (accidia).

Most interesting, however, is the section (4) beginning "Ok is gheystliken betekent (bezeichnet) by deme vosse de duuel, de boze gheyst." The word "gheystliken" here indicates, namely, the sensus spiritualis that Biblical writings were considered during the Middle Ages to possesses in contrast to heathen literature, as Friedrich Ohly explains. "Jedes mit einem Wortklang in die Sprache gerufene Ding," he continues, "alle von Gott geschaffene
Kreatur, die durch das Wort benannt wird, deutet weiter auf einen höheren Sinn, ist Zeichen von etwas Geistigem, hat eine significatio, eine bezeichenunge, eine Be-deutung. Over and above the basic literal or historical sense, the sensus spiritualis provides three extra dimensions, as it were, the first of these being the allegorical sense, the second the tropological or moral sense and the third the anagogic or eschatological sense.

Irmgard Meiners, in her work dealing with knaves and fools in the Middle Ages, applies these categories to item (4) here, pointing out that the historical or literal sense is to be found in the narrative text itself, the allegorical sense in 1,7,1-3, where Reinke and Brun signify the cunning deceiver and the simpleton, the tropological sense at the beginning of 1,7,4, where we are told that the fox "betekent" the devil, the evil spirit, and the anagogic sense in the statement at the end of 1,7,4 that everyone will be rewarded in the after-life according to his conduct on earth.

Another important aspect - important, that is, for an understanding of the RVA commentator's bezeichenliches denken, as Meiners describes it - is the great variety of definitions that can be given to each object identified by a certain word. As Ohly states: "Jedes mit dem Wort gemeinte eine Ding hat selbst eine Menge von Bedeutungen, deren Zahl mit der Summe der Eigenschaften eines Dinges identisch ist." The lion, for example, can denote either Christ or the devil, a just man or a heretic, the meaning becoming obvious from the context. In Meiners's words: "Eine einzelne bezeichenunge erfasst aber immer
nur einen bestimmten Aspect eines Gegenstandes, und so kann
dieselbe Person (Sache, Eigenschaft) durch eine Reihe verschiedener
Personen (Sachen, Eigenschaften) bezeichnet werden...und umgekehrt
eine einzelne Person (Sache, Eigenschaft) als Bezeichnung für
verschiedene Gegenstände verwandt werden."^{222} Applied to Reynke de
vos, this indicates that the fox-figure is unlikely to receive
consistent interpretation.

What, then, do we learn otherwise from this particular
chapter-gloss about the commentator's methods? In the first
place we observe that he apparently followed his source very
closely - see items (1) and (3) - while at the same time - in item
(1) - applying the impersonal comment that he found there to the
characters and events in the narrative text. We find, too, that
he is prepared to use every opportunity that the narrative-text
presents for salvational instruction - as in item (4). Also, we
observe his tendency to refer forward to later events in the story
in his interpretations.^{223} Finally, there is a good example here
at the end of item (4) of his close dependence on the 1492
"Plenar" for Biblical exegesis.

To turn now to the 1539 chapter-gloss, here again we note a
basically close dependence for subject-matter on this
commentator's source (**RVA**), but how, he, too, takes the
opportunity to adapt the material in the narrative text to his own
particular purposes. An example of this is his insertion in item
(1) (a) of the phrase "wo den der smeichler art ys," thus
emphasizing the function of the fox here as the false flatterer.
Likewise, in his remarks concerning both Reinke's "valsches
gemote" and the latter's cogitating over a way to lead the bear into danger while he was speaking with him, the commentator is giving his own interpretation, since the chapter consists almost entirely of direct speech.

His omission of the reference to the temptation of the unchaste by women is unexpected, since he is prepared to censure whoring both among nobles (I,24,4 and IV,5,3) and among priests (I,14,1 and 1,33,3). Adultery he also describes as a "grote sware sünde" (I,13,1), which is in full swing among the highest in the land (I,2,5), a sin from which no good has ever come (III,6,2).

In item (2) we note, too, the substitution of the "unvornufftich und vormeten (vermessener) mensche" for the "dor mensche" (in RVA), suggesting the more specific picture of a man with unassailable though unmerited confidence in himself rather than just a simpleton. Also the substitution of counsel given by the "boszhafftigen / ungetruwen und listigen" for that given by the "quaden" is more specific. Such people can be found in all walks of life, naturally, but one thinks of these terms as being particularly applicable to courtiers and court officials.

With regard to the items I have marked as (1)(b) and (2)(b) and the whole of item (3), these comprise quotations from various parts of the Olden Weisen\textsuperscript{224} from which he has made a skilful selection for the purpose of enhancing the textual interpretation.

In general, then, we find here in RVC a tendency on the part of this commentator also, while following the subject-matter of his predecessor's glosses closely, to adapt events in the
narrative text to his particular purposes, namely, here, censure of the evil, cunning, disloyal flatterer or other faithless person. At the same time he makes constant reference to the narrative text to the extent of adding his own interpretation of events, rounding out his comments by quotations - here from one of his most often employed sources, the book we know today as Das Buch der Beispiele der Alten Weisen.

The contribution of the 1650 commentator is extremely interesting on account of the similarity demonstrated here between the attitude of the Roman priest of 1498 and that of the Lutheran pastor of 1650. Besides the restoration here in the 1650 gloss of the temptation of the lustful (Geilen) by frivolous, beautiful women - actually the resemblance here is rather with the wording of the Dutch VB - we note more significantly how, Roman or Protestant, the devil remains the great tempter, whose function it is to cause mankind to stray from the path which leads to eternal salvation, although the added dimensions of interpretation are, of course, absent from the later gloss.228

We must turn now to a consideration of the works used by the RVC commentator and his reasons for presenting the work as he did, in other words, for illustrating his commentary with such a magnificent array of quotations from contemporary works, or at least from works which had found their way into print in the recent past. Basing her findings on those of Günther Müller, Schafferus maintains that the sixteenth-century writer "empfindet die Kompilation nicht nur als sein gutes Recht, sondern sogar als ein besonderer Verdienst, als Arbeitsleistung, die einer für viele
übernimmt," so that "das Zeitalter diese renaissancehafte Glossenform als Kunstform besass." She points to two of the works used by the commentator, namely Johannes Brenz's *Prediger Salomo* and Johannes Agricola's *Sprichwörtersammlung* as instances of works employed by their authors to give, in the case of Brenz, theological and moral instruction, and, in the case of Agricola, for moralization, criticism and story-telling, considering the latter's collection of proverbs to have been the commentator's stylistic model.

The works the commentator employs can be divided into the following categories:

1) Collections of fables in verse and prose
   (i) Johann Adelphus, *Esopus Leben und Fabeln*.
   (ii) Erasmus Alberus, *Etliche Fabeln Esops*.
   (iii) Antonius v. Pforre, *Der Alten Weisen Exempel*.
   (iv) Cyrillus, *Spiegel der wyszheit*.
   (An anonymous translation from the Latin *Speculum Sapientiae Cyrilli*).

2) Moralizing verse on the evils of the time
   (i) Sebastian Brant
      a) *Das Narrenschyp* - the Low German adaptation of *Das Narrenschiff*
      b) Freidank - an edition of this author's *Bescheidenheit*
      c) Preface to Ulrich Tengler's *Laienspiegel*
      d) *Richterlich Clagspiegel*
(ii) Das Fastnachtspiel
Henselina

(iii) Johann v. Morsheim
New Kriegsrüstung

(iv) Vincentius Obsopeius
Ars bibendi, translated
Georg Wickram under the
title Die biecher
Vincenti Obsopeiii vonn
der kunst zu trinken
(1537)

(v) Johann v. Schwarzenberg
Three works from his
Teutsch Cicero, a
collection of works
published posthumously
in 1535.
   a) "Ain Büchle wider das
      zutrinkenn" (1512)
   b) "Memorial der Tugent"
   c) "Kummertrost"
      (1502)

Officia M.T.C. (1531)
A verse translation of
Cicero's De Officiis

(vi) Anonymous poem beginning
"Untrew Vinantz und
Argelist" usually
referred to by the
commentator as Frouwe
untrewen denst

(vii) "De Schwytzer" (All
efforts made so far to
identify this writer
have failed)

3) Contemporary prose
works

(i) Johannes Agricola
Sybenhundert und Funffzig
Teutsche Sprichworterr
(1534)

(ii) Johannes Brenz  
Der Prediger Salomo

(ii) Sebastian Franck

a) Chronica Zeitbuch  
Geschichtsbibel (1536)

b) Weltbuch (1534)

c) Das Theur und  
Künstlich buchlin  
Morie Encomion (1534)

d) Paradoxa (1534)

(iv) Johann v. Schwarzenberg

Preface to "Wider das mordlasten des raubens" (from Teutsch Cicero)

(v) Ulrich v. Hutten

Vadiscus oder die römische Dreifaltigkeit (1520)

(vi) Erasmus of Rotterdam

a) (included at the beginning of Book II is a description of court life, entitled Van der Havetucht by the commentator, which purports to be a letter written by Erasmus to a friend who had become ensnared in court life, but no original has yet come to light)

b) Institutio principis christiani

As regards the provenance of these works, all except Dat Narrenschyp and Das Fastnachtspiel Henselin are High German
writings, never previously translated into Low German. From the standpoint of religious affiliation, only Erasmus Alberus, Johannes Agricola and Johannes Brenz were professed Lutherans, a faith which Schwarzenberg also adopted in his later years (c.1524-28). Sebastian Franck was a Protestant certainly, but according to his own peculiar spiritualist persuasion, and Hutten a nationalistic, anti-Roman-church propagandist.

We must now turn to another example, this one involving all four German commentators, to indicate the similarities and the differences in their methods of treating the narrative text, bearing in mind that whereas the RVA and RVC commentators were using the same text, the 1544 and 1650 commentators had each adapted his afresh. The chapter we shall be considering is Book I, chap. 21 (ll. 1827-1938 in the original text), which relates how, when the sentence of death by hanging had been pronounced on Reinke, his relatives decided to ask permission to leave the court, not wishing to witness this degradation: "Wente Reynke was eyn banreherre / Unde ward ghewyset (abgesprochen) van aller ere / Dar to in eynen schendygen doet (Tod)" (1837-39). This gave the king food for thought. However bad Reinke may be, he remarks to one of his counsellors, there are many among his relatives of whose services the court can ill be deprived:

De konninck betrachte desse dynck,
Dat mannich knape van em ghynck,
Der vele was uth Reynken slechte.
"Id were gud, dat ick bedechte,"
Sprak he to eynem uth syneme rad,
"Al were ok Reynke noch so quad,
In synem gheschlecht is doch mannich man,
De dat hoff ouel (übel) entberen kan" (1843-50).

The equivalent passage in the 1544 edition runs:
So bald der König des ersahe
Zu einem seiner Räthe er iahe.
Fürwahr solt ich mit ernst ietzt schweren /
So fürcht ich all diese Herren.
Denn sie sind all weise und reich /
Uund man find nicht viel jren gleich.
Wer Reinicken schon noch so bösz /
Werd ich der Herren nicht gern losz.

And in the 1650 edition it runs:

8. Dem König / wie er dies ansahe:  
der Muth entfie bey nahe  
Er kehrt sich zu den Räthen um  
mit halb-verzagtem Grimm.

9. Er sprach: sol ich die Wahrheit sagen /  
so dürft' ich bald verzagen:  
Vieleicht dasz die auf Reinkens Seit /  
anheben einen Streit.

10. Und wenn daszelbe solt beschehen /  
so wird es schwer hergehen:  
Denn man sicht nicht viel' ihnen gleich /  
seyn alle klug und reich.

11. Wenn Reinke gleich gantz überheufet'  
und mit List und Boszheit treufet /  
wolt' ich ausstehen nicht den Stos /  
Der Herren gehen bios (chap.20, stanzas 8-11).

Isegrim, the wolf, Hinze, the cat, and Brun, the bear, are allotted by the king the task of carrying out this sentence. On reaching the gallows, Hinze reminds the other two of Reinke’s previous misdeeds, both recent and in the past, urging speed, since if Reinke gets away this time, they will never again have the opportunity to avenge themselves. This warning is reiterated by Isegrim in his instructions to his wife and to his relatives who have followed them and are now assembled around the gallows, to hold Reinke fast (1851-1918). Reinke counters by protesting about their treatment of him, referring at the end of his speech to his father, who had also died in great trepidation, although in
his case things went more speedily and he was not attended by so many people:

Myn vader starff ok in sorgen groet,
Men do he nam synen doet,
Do was yd kort myt em ghedaen;
Ok volgede em nicht so mannich man (1931-34).

The 1544 edition runs:

Mein vatter must sein leben lan /
Uund volgt ihm nicht so mannich man.

In the 1650 edition there is no reference made by Reinke to his father at this stage.
In diesen Kapitel werden zwei Stücke genannt. Das erste ist der Gruft (Furcht), der keiner Rolle im Gericht kommt; was der König nicht ansehen oder fürchten sollte, sei der Urlaub (Urlaub) von seinen Freunden, der er zum Verzicht nehmen.

(a) In diesem Kapitel merken drei Stücken. Vorerst zeigt das, dass der Richter, wenn er gerecht urteilt, nicht von seiner Entscheidung abweichen soll. Auch mehrere Rechte werden in den Gerichten geschehen lassen und geschützt.

(b) Das rechte Recht sieht weder Gunst, Gabe, Freundschaft, noch Egenutz an. Und das Gottes Recht, von dem David sagt, der Szepter deines Reiches ist ein Szepter der Gerechtigkeit. Das heisst, ein Szepter, den man nicht aufgeben soll, und Gott wird ihm helfen und ihm seinen Willen erweisen, damit er gerecht urteilt.


(1) Merken muss man hinaus, dass die Entscheidung in einem Fall, wenn der König wegen Reinkens grosser Freundschaft will, von seinem erst recht abweichen soll. Das sollte ein Zeichen für eine unverantwortliche Furcht sein. Denn ein Richter oder Obrigkeit sollte von seiner Entscheidung nicht abschrecken lassen, schon vor grosser Freundschaft und Gewalt / ja er sol viel lieber sterben / denn ein unrechtes Urteil festzulegen. Er steht nun fast in seiner Gerechtigkeit / Gott wird ihm schon helfen und ihm seine Hertzen erweken / die mit Ihm werden darüber halten, dass Gericht und Gerechtigkeit gehandhabt werde.
richtigkeit, das einem jeglichen recht / richtig richtet/ unangesehen die person der menschen"

(c) D. Sebastianus Brandt spricht

Ein yder (jeder) schal betrachten wol / De (wer) urteilen (urteilen) und Recht spreken schal. 
Dat nicht erbarment / fründschop und leydt / 
Noch torne (Zorn) vyentschop (Freundschaft) / hat (Hass) und nydt (Neid).
In synem gemőte syck etwas (etwas) rege / Und van dem wege des rechten bewege. 
Wo stůcke (Geldstůcke) eins njmp den auerhanck (Überhand) 
So kricht (krlegt) de warheit und dat rechL#inen swanck (Streich).

D.S.Brand spricht.

Wer urteil und Rechtsprechen soll / Soll alle zeit betrachten wohl. 
Das nicht erbarmen freundschaft / leydt 
Kein zorn / feindschaft hass oder neidt. 
Inn seinem gmőt sichetwasregen/ Llund von dem Weg des Rechten bewegen. 
Wo der stůck eins nimpt ubberhangk / Nimpt warheit und das Recht ein schwanck.

D.S.Brand spricht also:

Wer Recht und Urtheil sprechen soll / Mus alle zeit betrachten wohl; 
Das kein Erbarmen / Freundschaft /Leid / Nicht Feindschaft / Zorn / Hass oder Neid. 
Sich regen wo in seinem Sinn 
Und so das Urtheil rezizen hin 
Wo der Stück eins nimmt überhand / 
da kommt das Recht aus seinem Stand.

(2) Zum andern sol keiner sich freuen über des andern Unglůk und Todt; Denn wer eines 
derunglůk / dem kommt es wieder zu Haus. Es heisset ja: 
Einen betrübten sol man nicht mehr betrüben. Hörtet was Solomon sagt. Prov. 31. das er 
aus den Lehren der mutter behalten. v.6. gibt stark 
getrēnke / denen de umkommen 
soßen und den Wein den 
betrübten Seelen / dass sie 
trinken und ihres Elendes
en myt speyen (hohnischen) reden nicht vele logits(zugab); darby vorstan (verstanden) wert, dat eyn vorordelter schal arger werden edder myszmodich (missmutig) dar van.

[Compare VB "Morael" to ch. xxiv: Als yemant in den noot is, vint hijer ghemeynlijck meer, die hem met strathyet ouervallen, dan vrienden die hem in voorden oft (oder) vvercken eenich onderstant willen doen (Beistand leisten wollen)]

(2 b) De Swytzer sprech:

Do (tu) recht / und fórchte dy doch darby /
Frage nicht / eft einem andern belh (besser) sy.
De gelücke volget na (nach) /
vele nydt und hatt /
Kümpt ydt (es), dy sq swych (schweig) / röme (rühme) dy nicht dat.
Den armen / und dem gelücke gebrist (gebracht)
Den late (lass) men blyuen gelick wo (wie) he ist.

(c) Henselin sprecket:

Wenn itzundt einem framen / syne sake ummeschlecht (umschlagt) /
So spreken de andern / em (ihm) geschee gantz recht.
Und dencken doch nicht / de dullen (törichten) lüde (Leute)
En (ihnen) sy also morgen wo (wie) my ys hüden (heute).

vergeszen / und ihres Ungluks nicht mehr gedenken. Hiraus mein ich sey der Gebrauch kommen / dasz man noch heute zu tag bey ausführung der Übertäfer / ihnen vor ihrem Tode Wein zu trinken gibet etc.
So gheit en auer (über) den Buck
ock ein radt /
Dan (denn dat gelücke beweget
syck / frohe (früh) und spadt
(spät).
Fart snelle up (auf) / und balde
wedder nedder.
Regert hüden gelücke / morgen
unglucke wedder.
Nemandt synen negesten
(Nächsten) Böszlick ordelen
(urtellen) schal /
Wol (wer) dar steit (steht) / de
wachte syck / dat he nicht fall
De synl nocht nicht alle auer den
berch (Berg) /
Den (denen) lztund von steden
(vonstatten) gheit er werck /
Na ihrem synne / und up alle
Ordt (Ort) /
Ick hebbe von jöget (Jugend)
up wol gehör't:
Weinen up leste / dat deit also
wehe seer /
Als de geweinet heeft (hat)
yörmals ehr (eher).
Darümme darf niemandt spotten
myn /
Wer weth (weiss) / wol (wer) de
leste wert syn.

(3) Dat drydde is de lystighe
klockheyt Reynkens, wo he
begunde to pysen (auf etwas
sinnen), syk losz to dedyngen
(befreien durch Verhandlung), in
deme he van synes Vaders dode
edere (sagte) al in behenden
(schlau en) vor deckereden
(verhüllten) worden, unde doch
up synen eghenen (eigenen)
vader loch (log), so hir na wert

(3) (a) Thorn drudden / ys hyr tho
mercken de hinderlistige wyszheit
Reinkens / in dem he mit
behenden und vor deckereden
wörden / van synes Vaders dole
seekt / und daror ein ersake
(Mittel) und inganck
(Veranlassung) süket (sucht) /
syck loes tho reden. Welckes he
meisterlick anfanget / in syner
valschen Bycht (Beicht) / und em
(ihm) endlich gelückt / daß he
vamm Galgen gefryet und erlöset
wert.

(b) Also ys noch gemeinlick by
Hau (Hofe) / und allenthalben
(überall) / de gebrauch (Gebrauch)
Wenn einer umme syne
missedadt / schal gestraft
werden / dat he alsdan / durch list
logen (Lügen) und behendicheit /
im schyne (Schein) syck
entschuldiget / Und durch grot
gleßte (Versprechen) schatze
(Schätze) geldt und gauen / de
Haren syck wedderumme
günstlich maket. So wert he denn
unschuldich geachtet / und syne
angeuer (Angeber) / in vare
(Gefahrt) gestellt.

(c) De Swytzer spreckt.

Wo wol (wiewohl) vele der harden
Orden syn /
Darinne men vindt (findet) /
Vele Geistliche strenge personen.
Nochdan (jedoch) ick vor (für) de
strengsten acht /
De die(diejenigen, die) beide
dach (Tag) und nacht /
Der Fürstens Hau (Hau) bywanen
(beiwohnen).
Dan wol (wer) syck begeuen deit
in solcher streit /
Haren hauen anthohangen.
De settet (setzt) gar
syne sake in gefahr/
Is stedes mit sorgen ummefangens
Das dritt / Soll kein
scharfrichter den sinn haben /
das er frolocke inn der armen
verurteilt tod / und nicht sein
Zum dritten sehen wir an dem Fuchs eine wunderliche Natur die je näher dem Tode / je spimpf- und spöttlicher Sie sich erzeiget / und ist gleichsam auch mitten im Tode lustig: Gleich wie jener guter Kerl sagte wie er hängen solte: es würde noch hohe Luft-springe mit ihm setzen / und jene Zauberhexe wie sie solte gebrand werden / sprach: es werde einen heissen Tag geben. Ein grober Pferde-Dieb / wie er nunmehr auf der Leiter stehend solte angeknüpft werden / wurd er lauter Stimme lachend / und wie er um die Ursache gefragt Sprach er: es fiele ihm eine seiner begangenen Poszen im Sinn / darüber musze er herzlich lachen: Nemlich er habe auf eine Zeit eine Kuh gestolen und dieselbige einem Bauern verkauft / und ihm hingegen ein Pferd gestolen / welches er / dem er zuvor die Kuh gestolen / wider verkauft / und weil er ihm die Beraubung seiner Kuh geklaget / habe er gesaget / er wüste gar wohl / wo dieselbe stünde; hab ihn auch mit dem gekauften Pferd / zu dem / dem ers gestolen gefütet / und den stal darein die Kuh gestanden gewiesen etc. Er aber sey darvon gewischet; mochte dennoch vor seinem Tode gerne wissen / wie sich die beyden
Zum dritten / Soll man alle verurteilten / nicht also hinführen wie ein ander ass / oder ein unvernünftige thier zur schlachtbank / sonder wol unterrichten lassen / in Gottes wort / und ob einer nicht wol bericht ware / oder selzame wort uund geberden triebe / soll man ihn ehe ein tag oder etliche sitzen lassen / prediger und verstandige leut zu ihm schicken / die ihnen (sic) unterweisen / denn das rechthat ihm den leib wunde nicht die seel abgesprochen. Die oberkeit soll hierinn sonderlich sorgfältig sein. Nicht aber sag ich / das man einen jden buben / der sich aus falschem herzten auff list / also absinnig oder unwissend erzeigt soll sitzen lassen bisz ihm ein tag gefalle / sonst würd er eben ein tag weilen wie Marcolphus den baum. Man soll auch solche arme leut wol erinnern / sie müssen doch fort / sie sollen sich unserm herrn gott bekümmern uund all andere gedanken faren lassen / wie denn gelerte priester solche leut sollen zutrösten wissen.

(b) Aber die Richter sollen gleichwohl dabei erinnert seyn / dass sie ihre verurteilt nicht den unvernünftigen Tieren und Aas gleich hinführen / sondern zuvor in Gottes Wort wohl unterweisen lassen: und wenn einer nicht wohl in seinen Glauben gegründet ware / oder sonst selzame Geberden und Worte führte / so sol man ihn lieber etliche Tage sitzen lassen einen prediger oder andere verstandige Leute hinbeyrufen / die ihn unterrichten / und auf den rechten Wege der wahren Gott angenehmer Bekehrung und Busse wiederum leiten und also seine Seele Christo gewinnen / als der Sie mit seinem teuton Blute zu seinem Eigenthum erkaufet hat I Cor. 6.c.7. I.Pet.1. Das Recht aber das hat ihnen nur das Leben / nicht die Seele abgesprochen: jedoch wird dieses nicht gesagt darum / als sollte man einem jeden Buben/ der sich aus falschem Herzen und aus lauterer Schalkheit also absinnig und unwissend stellet / so lange sitzen lassen bisz ihm ein Tag gefalle/ darein er sterben wolle / denn sonst noch geht es wohl gehen wie mit Marcolphus / der / wie
ihm erlaubet war sich einen Baum
im Walde auszusehen, daran er
hängen wolte, keinen finden
könnte / sprach: Es gefiel mir
keiner etc.
As far as the RVA commentator is concerned here, it is interesting to note how in item (1) he introduces a fear motive on the part of the king which is not expressly spelled out in the text, using this as grounds for the abstract statement that fear should never play any part in the administration of justice.

Item (2) is a further example of this commentator's practice of relating a generalized comment in his source - that any person in distress finds more people who will turn on him than those who will give him support - to specific events described in the narrative text. These events then provide him with the opportunity to bring up a point - an obviously important one for him in view of his concern for the downtrodden of society - regarding the treatment of condemned prisoners and the results of this treatment. Secondly, we have here the example of an incident, where, for the purpose of illustrating a particular lesson, Reinke is represented as the victim of the wrong-doing of others, not the perpetrator thereof, although here this commentator's attitude was probably dictated primarily by the remark in his source.

In item (3) we return to the customary description of Reinke's "lystige klockheyt" and here again there is an example of textual interpretation, which, in the commentator's reference to Reinke's cryptic words concerning his father's death, is based on subsequent events, since it is not until the beginning of Book I, chap. 22 that Reinke's thoughts are described by the narrator - how, in his trepidation Reinke determined to think up a "nyen funt" (new invention), in order to gain his own release and cause the disgrace of the other three (1939-44). For this commentator
Reinke's lie regarding his father's death, to which he refers later, in Book I, chap. 26, Reinke explains how his father took his own life: "Wente he van torne (Zorn) syck suluen hinck" (2347) — would obviously have been a violation of the fourth (fifth) commandment: Thou shalt honour thy father and thy mother.

To sum up, we note again, then, in 1,21, this commentator's application of the impersonal comment of his source to events in the story, using it here as an illustration of a social evil of particular interest to him. Also we observe once more how he refers forward to later events in the story to assist his interpretation of the chapter in question.

Turning now to RVC, we note the way in which this commentator reverses the order of his predecessor's first gloss, beginning item (1) (a) with the concrete statement that a judge who judges justly should fear no one, and following this in (b) with his adaptation of Agricola's text in order to illustrate the abstract concept by means of the personification of justice. This adaptation is in itself extremely interesting — no attribution here, we observe. In the first place he adds fear to the favour, gifts, friendship and self-interest mentioned by Agricola, and otherwise shortens the passage considerably, eliminating the rhetoric while retaining the principal elements of the original, though at the same time providing a more specific reference to the Biblical quotation, namely "David secht" instead of "die heylig schrift sagt." In the Brant quotation in (1) (c), on the other hand, which is attributed, he makes no attempt to alter the text by insertion of the word "fear."
The most significant aspect of item (2) (a) here – generally speaking it is merely an elaboration of RVA 1.21.2 – is the insertion of the "unglücksalige mensche" by the commentator in addition to the condemned person, giving him the opportunity to introduce a topic dear to the Humanist heart, namely Fortuna. It is interesting, too, to note the progression of thought from one quotation to another. Following the introduction of the Fortuna theme in the "Switzer" quotation – a warning to those who have good fortune to keep quiet about it, in order to avoid the envy and hatred of others, coupled with the admonition not to taunt those who are down on their luck – we have in the "Henselin" quotation an extension of the latter point, namely, that it is foolish anyway to do this – to taunt people in this situation, that is – because the turn of the taunters will come next, this being linked with the familiar wheel-of-fortune motif.

In item (3) (a) we note that the RVC commentator follows his predecessor’s interpretation of Reinke’s remarks concerning his father’s death, projecting even further into the future to Reinke’s eventual release, this giving him the theme for item (3) (b), the only apparently original item in the entire chapter-gloss. This constitutes a return to his favourite theme of the evil-intentioned courtier, who, in this instance, lies himself back into favour by making his overlord promises regarding money and gifts, thus endangering the person who first drew attention to his misdeeds. Item (3) (c) appears to provide a play upon words with regard to the epithet "streng," which had a much wider meaning in both MHG and MLG than it does today, including that of
What we find here, then, is that in *RVC* 1,21 the treatment of both text and *RVA* gloss by this commentator is similar to his treatment of both in 1,7. With regard to all three items of this gloss, he follows his predecessor's remarks with some elaboration, adapting in (1)(b) unattributed material to the demands of his commentary and in items (2) (a), (b) and (c) extending the idea of a person condemned to death by judicial means to one condemned by misfortune to misery, adding further elaboration by means of attributed verse-quotations, which he develops thematically from one to the other. He also projects into the future, to later events in the story, that is, as does the *RVA* commentator, for an explanation of events in the chapter in question, for the apparent purpose, here, of introducing a favourite topic, namely the evils of court life.

As far as the 1544 gloss is concerned, we note a return to the more impersonal type of comment that we found in the Dutch *VB*, with no reference to the narrative text and also a much tighter construction. By coupling the verbs "ansehen" and "fürchten" in item (1), for example, he is able to express the main themes of *RVC* (1)(a) and (b) in one sentence, in which he also emphasizes the abstract conception or personification of justice as a force acting of itself: "dann er [der Richter]hats nicht getan / sondern vielmehr das Recht." Similarly, in item (2) he is able in a short sentence: "Es weisz keiner an wem es morgen ist," to introduce a veiled reference to the Fortuna theme, which he does not, here, seek to elaborate.
His failure to follow RVC (3)(a) in a condemnation of Reinke's cunning wiles with respect to his cryptic reference to his father's death illustrates this commentator's desire to distance himself from the events of the story. As he explained in his introduction, his aim is rather to give guidance on the study of the text than to write a commentary upon it, and for him the purpose of this study, it will be remembered, is for his readers to learn from the story how to conduct themselves in everyday life. Thus, here, in what is really an extension of item (2), we are told that no hangman should either rejoice in a condemned man's death or vent his wrath on him, nor should a man's execution be entrusted to his enemy - all recommendations pertinent to the daily life of those times. His strictures in "Zum dritten" regarding the leading away of condemned prisoners as animals to the slaughterhouse were also probably well-merited, and his recommendations regarding having such prisoners visited by clergymen similarly necessary. The phrase: "denn das Recht hat ihm den leib und nicht die seele abgesprochen" derives probably from Luther. Finally, this commentator's use of proverbial phrases should be noted - such as "sein mutlin kulen," - as also his reference to Marcollfus. This story, a "Spielmannsepik" dating from the twelfth century, and originally known as Salmon und Morolf, had recently appeared as a "Volksbuch"; for this reason he must have judged the figure of Marcollfus to be sufficiently familiar to his readers as to need no further explanation.

To sum up, then, the 1544 commentator's approach to his work
is entirely different from that of his predecessors of 1498 and 1539. Since his aim is to derive from the narrative text pointers for day-to-day conduct, he is more concerned to provide maxims in his glosses, such as that a judge must not respect persons etc. He is also at pains to give illustrations taken, one imagines, from his own experience, concerning what should and should not happen. A condemned man should not be led to the place of execution like an animal to the slaughterhouse, for example. He should, on the other hand, be allowed visits in prison from the clergy, the better to prepare him for his end. We note also his use of proverbial expressions and his reference to current literature.

Turning now to the 1650 gloss, we observe in item (1) a closer connection with the story, since in the first sentence there is a reference to both the king and Reinke. In items (1) and (2) this commentator, in fact, treats the glosses of his predecessor in much the same way as the RVC commentator treated those of RVA - namely, by elaboration, with the substance remaining the same. New here is the introduction of Biblical quotations whenever the opportunity presents itself - in section (2) from the book of Proverbs and in item (3) (b) from the Epistles. In instances where his 1544 predecessor is more concerned with giving concrete examples than with abstract maxims, he follows the former's text very closely indeed, as in item (3)(b) with regard to the treatment of condemned persons. We note also his use of proverbs and folk-tales to emphasize particular points.
In the 1650 commentator we have, then, a man who was not so much concerned as his predecessor had been with rules of conduct to be derived from a study of the narrative text, but who was willing by contrast to pay more attention to it \textit{per se}. His peculiar contribution to the R\textsubscript{V} commentaries, as demonstrated here, is likely to lie in frequent references to the Bible and also to folk-tales to illustrate the points he wishes to make.

Summary

a) There is a fair degree of dependence of one commentator on the work of his predecessor, most noticeable between RVA and RVC.

b) From the RVA commentator onwards, none of them attempts to comment on the text as a whole, but only on isolated incidents, which serve, generally speaking, to illustrate the particular purpose or purposes of each of them:

i) In the case of the RVA commentator, this purpose would appear to be primarily salvational and thus also moralistic, but not exclusively so, since he was also concerned with justice and good government, particularly with regard to the underprivileged. As regards the subject-matter and its presentation, this commentator was obviously influenced by both the impersonal Aesop-like moralizations he found in his source - Alckmaer's "korte uithleggunge," in other words - which he sought to personalize and to apply to events in the narrative text, and also by his
bezeichnetes denken, where, as we have seen, a person/thing/quality can be used to signify whatever the writer wishes to illustrate at any one time. Comments therefore which appear to run counter to the "Erzählogik des Vers-texts," as Kokott maintains, only do so because the commentator was intent on concentrating on a single incident in the narrative text - such as the other animals' taunting of Reinke on the way to the gallows - which he needed to illustrate a point he wished to make, without regard for its relationship to the course of the narrative text or importance therein. As regards Nominalist influence causing him to see things from more than one angle, as Nanninga maintains, this influence, if such existed, is likely to have been only indirect, through that of the didactic literature of the period, a point we will be considering at a later stage. The principal direct influence on this commentator was certainly his bezeichnetes denken, which had its roots in the patristic period and underwent full development in the High Middle Ages.

ii) As far as the RVC commentator is concerned, his purpose would appear to be principally, though by no means exclusively, governmental, since he was at the same time concerned to adorn his comments with quotations from almost exclusively High German sources, with which his
readers would be unfamiliar, material which offers for the most part, as we have already seen, trenchant criticism of the mores of the time. In the abstract, then, he had a moral purpose - he wished to improve people's behaviour, starting at the top - but concretely he desired at the same time to present a gloss that would be a work of art in its own right. All in all, I would nevertheless be inclined to agree with Brandes that this RVC commentator imposed his purpose - that of writing a "Fürstenspiegel" and also, as far as the text allowed, a "Ständespiegel" - on the work rather than with Schafferus's view that his main aim was to serve the narrative text with the stylistic means of his time.

iii) The 1544 commentator, as we have seen, mapped out his purpose, which can be described as primarily moralistic, in his preface, where he stated that it should be possible for the reader to learn from the work "der gantzen welt lauff und sinn / und wie er sich gegen jedermann / in allen dingen/...halten sollte," so that his comments on it would be in the form of guidance as to how to achieve this end, which he considered of greater benefit than writing a commentary. In other words, his aim in general terms was to present a gloss that would more resemble the impersonal "korte uthlegginge" of the Dutch tradition. To judge therefore, as Menke does, that "die Glosse bleibt ein
missglückter Versuch, dem Erzähltext eine authentische
noch von der Ordo-Vorstellung geprägte
Wirklichkeitssicht zu unterlegen" seems to be misplaced,
since it was never the commentator's intention to
provide this.254

iv) As far as the 1650 commentator is concerned, the absence
of any mention of the gloss in the preface to the work
makes judgement of his purpose more difficult. The
reference to the "unterschiedliche Sitten- und
Lehrsätze" on the title-page indicates, however, a
principally moral purpose in composing the gloss, which
he will illustrate - to judge from the chapter we have
just been studying - primarily by Biblical quotations
and examples from folklore. (This is, however, not
borne out in later glosses, since from the end of Book I
onwards he comes to depend, apart from the Bible,
almost exclusively on J.M.Moscherosch's Gesichte des
Philanders von Sittewald for his illustrations.)
Chapter 3.

As far as the topics dealt with by all four commentators are concerned, it will have become apparent from the examples given in the preceding section that the weight accorded to these topics or themes is in no way influenced by their connection with the development of the narrative plot. An example of what I mean would be the equal weight accorded in 1,21 (RVA, RVC, 1544; 1650 1,20) to the reaction of the king to the departure of Reinke's relatives from the court, which is important to the plot, and that given in the glosses on the same chapter to the treatment accorded Reinke by those who were conducting him to the scaffold, which has no particular relevance to it. Topics and themes selected here for comment, therefore, will be those of special interest to the commentators, however remote their connection with the plot may be. Here, in this section, we will be concerned with government and the law under the following headings:

(i) the status and duties of a ruler: the RV glosses as "Fürstenspiegel"
(ii) the obligations of subjects towards those in authority
(iii) the princely court and its officials
(iv) the law and its executants

(i) The duties of a ruler: the RV glosses as "Fürstenspiegel"

Here we must concern ourselves initially with the first chapter-gloss in RVC. This follows the first thirty-two lines of
the narrative text, which, after a *locus amoenus* type of introduction, deal with the summons issued by the king to all birds and beasts to attend court. Reinke, however, "hadde in den hoff so vele myszdan / Dat he dar nicht endorste komen noch gan" (23-24), we are told, and in fact the badger was the only member of the court to have no complaints to lodge against the fox.

Unencumbered here by the comments of his predecessor - the RVA commentator does not begin his chapter-glosses until 1,3 and of the seven items dealt with here none refers specifically to the first chapter of the narrative text - the RVC commentator in an apparently original entry gives us under the title "Inholdt (Inhalt) und gemeine bericht desses bokes" the following statement, which is reproduced to all intents and purposes word for word in the 1544 and 1650 editions:


A marginal reference to "Rom.13" is placed alongside the last few lines of the text. 

There follows a four-line attributed quotation from Erasmus Alberus concerning the indispensability of temporal government:
So weynich alse wy können syn /
Ane brodt / ane water und wyn.
So weynich köne wy ock entberen /
Der Könige / Fürsten und Heren.

We then have an elaborated unattributed passage based on *Agricola* (263) on the duties of those in power:

Aller wertlyken auericheit / vornemlike Ampt ys: Uthwendigen frede holden / recht richten / de framen handauhen (beschirman) / und de bösen straffen / de bedrückten (Betübten) van der wreueler (Frevler) hande / redden (retten) nemande gewalt donn / nen unschuldich bloed vorgeten (vergiessen) / de fremdelinge / wedewen (Witwen) / wesen / und armen beschütten (beschützen) / en güdich und milde syn.

Accompanied by a marginal reference to "Deutero 16," the passage continues:

Solckes gebüt Godt und sprecket: Richter und Amptlûde schaltu setten / in alle dinen Steden dat se dat volck richten / mith rechtem gerichte. Du schalt dat Recht nicht bögen (biegen) / und ock nene persone anseen / noch geschenecke nemen / Wente de geschencke vorblenden de ogen (Augen) der wesen/ und vorderaren (verderben) de rechte sake. Wath recht ys / dem schaltu nauolgen etc.

There follows an attributed quotation from "de Switzer" describing the four walls - the first righteousness, the second a benevolent ruling power, the third protection of orphans and widows, the fourth punishment of wickedness by whomsoever this may be committed - and the tower representing the fear of God, that every kingdom must have in order to survive for any length of time.

Against the first part of this second passage quoted above the commentator has noted marginally "Ampt der Auericheit," which the 1544 commentator has expanded to read "Doch fûnemlich und zu
erst auff Gottes wort sehenn / dasselb mitt ernst fur dern / uund
darob halten." For his part, the 1650 commentator has added the
phrase: "Nechst Beforderung gottlicher Ehr / der Christlichen
Kirchen wachsthumliches Aufnehmen" at the beginning of the passage
and substituted Biblical references in place of the second
section.

What do we learn from this affirmation of temporal authority
on the part of the RVC commentator and his two successors? It is
surely an unmistakable endorsement of Luther's position concerning
the importance of temporal authority and the part it plays in a
world ordained by God. This emphasis on the temporal arm was a
natural concomitant of Luther's proclamation in his "An den
christlichen Adel deutscher Nation" (1520) of the priesthood of
all believers: "Dan alle Christen sein warhafftig geystlichs
stands, uund ist unter yhn kein unterscheyd, denn des ampts halben
allein" (WA 6.407). "Die weyl dan nu die weltlich gewalt ist
glech mit uns getauft, hat den selben glauben uund Evangely," Luth-
er continues, "mussen wir sie lassen priester und Bischoff
sein, und yr ampt zelen als ein ampt...das da gehore und nutzlich
sey der Christlichen gemeyne" (WA 6,408). Since, too, "wir alle
ein corper sein des heubts Jesu Christi, ein yglicher des andern
glidmasz" (WA 6,408), the difference between the so-called
spiritual and temporal authorities lies only in their office, the
former being concerned with the Word of God and the Sacrament, the
latter with wielding "das schwert uund die rutenn ..die boszen
damit zustraffen, die frummen zuschutzen" (WA 6,409).

Christian temporal authority, Luther maintains, should be
permitted to exercise power unhindered over everyone, popes, bishops and priests included, "den also sagt sanct Pauel allen Christen: 'Ein ygliche seele (ich halt des Bapst's auch) sol unterthan sein der ubirkeyt, den die tregt nit umbsonst das schwert, die dienet got damit, zur straff der bosen, und zu lob der frumen,' auch sanct Petrus 'Seyt unterthan allen menschlichen ordnungen umb gottis willen, der es szo haben wil'" (WA 6,409).

It may be argued that the duties and functions of a ruler were also spelt out in RVA. They constitute in fact the first item of the Summary of Book I in the preface, where the necessity for a head of state is emphasized who should bring justice and peace to all under him. However, we have also seen that the author of RVC has reproduced this entire summary in RVA under the title "Argumentum und inholdt des Ersten Bokes," which he places immediately before the commencement of the narrative text. His statement at the end of the first chapter at the beginning of the first chapter-gloss therefore - "Inholdt und gemeine bericht desses bokes" - must refer to the work as a whole and must be taken as the author's personal avowal of the status of temporal authority as expounded by Luther. We also note in this first chapter-gloss the use after the first paragraph, quoted above, of material by two out of the four (including Schwarzenberg) professed Lutherans, from whose works the RVC commentator draws throughout his gloss, namely Alberus (attributed) and Agricola (unattributed), also the verse by the unidentified "Switzer," the tone of whose utterances in these and other verses quoted in the course of the RVC gloss suggest that he was a Lutheran.
Having said all this, it is important not to overlook the "Fürstenspiegel" aspect of the glosses, which, as we have seen, has been identified by Brandes as being an integral element of the 1539 gloss. This type of writing - a treatise on the art of rulership - derives from antiquity, both Plato's Republic and Aristotle's Politics containing elements thereof. The collective mediæval view of the duties of a prince has been summed up as follows:

The perfect prince must be wise, self-restrained, just; devoted to the welfare of his people; a pattern of virtue for his subjects; immune from flattery; interested in economic developments, an educational programme and the true religion of God; surrounded by efficient ministers and able advisers; opposed to aggressive warfare, and, in the realization that even he is subject to the law and that the need of the prince and his subjects is mutual, zealous for the attainment of peace and unity.  

The advent of Humanism led to a renewed interest in this type of treatise, beginning with Aeneas Sylvius' two letters, the first of 1443 addressed to Duke Sigismund of Austria. Here Aeneas seeks to instil into the prince the importance of wisdom, which he can gain only from a study of the philosophy to be found in classical writings. Instructing the prince to be sure to select the right teacher - one with as good a knowledge of profane writings as of Holy Scripture - Aeneas proceeds to impress upon him the value of these classical writings in providing him with the information to deal with all types of problems with which he will be confronted and the eloquence to express his views, as well as with the ability to weigh up his counsellors' opinions and to make his own judgements. Rejecting outright the writings of the
scholastics - Aquinas, Albert the Great and Nicholas of Lyra are named among others - who, although they might have been learned men, did not know how to impart learning, Aeneas recommends nevertheless the patristic writings and advises constant reading of the Bible. At the same time he implores the prince not to hide himself away. An exceptional prince will devote as much time to affairs of state, he asserts, as he will to learning.

Some seven years later, in 1450, Aeneas was to write another letter along similar lines for the young prince Ladislaw, titular prince of Hungary and Bohemia. This particular ruler died young, but Empress Eleanor, the wife of Frederick III, made use of it for the education of her son, the future Emperor Maximilian I (b. 1459), who became during his reign the strength and stay of the German Humanists.

A half-century later Erasmus, the best-known of these Humanists, was to include in the 1515 edition of his Collectanea adagiorum a brief, generalized "Fürstenspiegel" in the form of an explanation of the adage "Aut regem aut fatum nasci oportere" ("One ought to be born a king or a fool")264, and, in 1516, greatly to enlarge on this in his Institutio principis Christiani, addressed to the future Emperor Charles V, Maximilian's grandson, then a boy of sixteen. (This latter work was obviously known to the RVC commentator, I have discovered, as two quotations from it, the one attributed, the other not, are to be found in the gloss). The good prince, writes Erasmus in his comment on the adage, should follow King Solomon in his choice of wisdom as the highest boon to a ruler, which wisdom, in Erasmus' view, consists not
only in a knowledge of truth, but also in living and striving for what is good and measuring everything by this. Erasmus also emphasizes the value of a good teacher, as Aeneas did before him, but in Erasmus’s view this teacher’s influence should be above all moral. He should teach his pupil, namely, to distinguish between tyranny and a beneficent rule which seeks only the common good, to guard against flatterers and to keep an eye on his officials, to be ready to pardon but also be prepared to cut out what is bad, and, above all, to avoid war at all costs. In the *Institutio* Erasmus was to confirm and amplify what he had written in the adage, particularly the role of the tutor, laying greater stress, in addition, on a knowledge of the principles of Christian dogma and of the true meaning of Christianity: if a prince is not a philosopher, he will be a tyrant; his chief function is to be both a model and a father to his subjects and to dedicate himself to the state. Exhortations to work always for the common good are also an important element of the first part of this treatise. Later in the work Erasmus becomes more specific - the earlier theorizing was based to a large extent on classical writings, as his editor shows - and in special sections, apparently based to some extent on personal experience, he turns his attention to the steps a prince should take in regard to flatterers, taxation, the legal system, the delegation of authority and the choice of servants, particularly magistrates, ending the work with a plea for peace among nations.

As far as Luther is concerned, the function of temporal government, including the duties of a ruler, was a subject
frequently dealt with by him in his tracts. Two of these are of particular importance, namely "Von weltlicher Oberkeit" (WA 11,245-81) of 1523 and "Ob Kriegsleute auch ynn seliger Stande seyn konnen" (WA 19,623-62), of 1526, the former inspired, according to Luther's editors, by questions posed to him by Schwarzenberg. In addition we have two interpretations, the first of Psalm 82 dealing in general terms with the functions and obligations of both rulers and subjects, dating from 1530, the second of Psalm 101, which is more specifically concerned with the pitfalls of rulership, dating from 1534 (WA 51,200-64).

The following passage from the first of the works mentioned above sums up Luther's general, non-specific views regarding the functions of a ruler:

Das eyn furst sich ynn vier ortt teylen soll: Auffs erst, zu Gott mitt rechtem vertrawen uund hertzlichem gepett. Auffs ander, zu seynen unterthanen mitt liebe und Christlichem dienst. Auffs dritte, gegen seyne Rethe und gewaltigen mit freyer vernunfft und ungefangenem verstanden. Auffs vierde, gegen die ubeltheter mit bescheydenem ernst und strenge (WA 11,278).

Seven years later in his interpretation of the 82nd psalm Luther develops this theme further, referring here to the "heroic virtues" of a ruler as those of "Hellfen, Neeren, Retten," for the dutiful exercise of which he deserves to be called "Heiland, Vater, Retter." Through the first "virtue," - that is by furthering the teaching of God's Word - he assists his subjects to attain eternal salvation, through the second he sustains them as a father his children and through the third - by punishing the evil-doers - he protects the poor and keeps the peace (WA 30:1,205).
With specific reference to flatterers, Luther remarks in "Von weltlicher Oberkeit": "Denn das ist der grösstist schade in herren hoffen, wo eyn furst synen synn gefangen gibt den groszen hanszenn und schmeychichern" (WA 11,274).

Turning now to the glosses, it is obvious both from the nature of the story as related in the narrative text and the fact that at this point in history there was no real separation between the judicial and administrative functions of a ruler, that many of the comments made in the glosses - particularly RVA - concern the ruler qua judge. Where technicalities of the legal system are concerned, these glosses will be omitted here and considered at a later stage under the heading of "law."

As far as the duties, in general terms, of a ruler are concerned, we have already noted the passage in 1,1 (RVC,1544,1650), based on Agricola (263), where these are spelled out in no uncertain fashion, and these duties and obligations are confirmed and added to throughout the four glosses. In RVC 1,19,2, for example, in an attributed Agricola (259) passage, these duties are once again emphasized:

Auerst alle Auericheit / ys wedderumme tho vorschaffen schändig / dat de underdanen fredesam leuen / recht und billicheit / upt vorderlikeste bekamen / und ere nerung soken mögen; De bösen straffen / und de framen beschütten. Wente daruan heten (heissen) se Benefici / dat ys / Gnedige heren / de den lüden gnade und gunst ertogen (zeigen) schölen.

Power is given to rulers (Potentaten) not for their own benefit or to do what they like with, we are told in RVC III,13,3 - in an entry apparently written by the commentator himself - but to do
God's will. He has given them the power and if they obey His will, He will reward them. In IV,12,5 we are also told by this commentator in an unattributed Brenz passage that a ruler (ein regerender Here) should treat his people like a shepherd his sheep.

In passages peculiar to the 1650 commentator and deriving from allegorical interpretations of the ring and the mirror which Reinke, in the story, claims he despatched to the king and the queen respectively, this commentator emphasizes the indestructible love that those in authority (hohe Obrigkeit) should bear towards their subjects, in and through which the carbuncle stone of God's Word and the true fear of God must shine and radiate (1650 III,6,4). In the following chapter (III,7,2) he tells us that the mirror represents the Word of God, that is, the Ten Commandments, in which rulers (Fürsten, Führer und Könige des Volks) can see themselves and follow the examples of their Biblical counterparts.

Returning to the attributed Agricola passage (RVC 1,19,2), quoted above, the commentator states that those who do not fulfil the functions listed here are tyrants. Previous to this, in 1,4,3 (also 1544 and 1650), where his predecessor had referred to the "quaden," the evil-doers (RVA 1,4,3), who, once they have tasted blood and begin to take pleasure in evil deeds seldom improve, the RVC commentator mentions a tyrant, from whom improvement can hardly be expected once he has become accustomed to oppressing the common people. Later, too, in RVC III,13,2, this commentator, following Erasmus's Constitutio, compares tyrants with wild animals such as lions, bears, wolves and eagles, who live from
robbery and murder. Moreover, he explains, tyrants are worse than wild animals, because, unlike the latter, they exercise their tyranny out of self-interest and their victims are their fellow human beings.

Stress is also laid in the first chapter-gloss, in a passage apparently written by the RVC commentator himself, on a ruler’s setting a good example to his subjects:

In der Keiser / Könige / Fürsten und aller Potentaten Häuen / schal ein recht gerichte geholden / alle billicheit und Eerbarlike dogede (den andern menschen thom vorbilde) stedes geüet (geübt) und gehandthauet. Auerst itzundes werden darsüluest / de Egen nutt (Eigennutz) / untruwe und gyricheit (eyn wörtele aller laster) gemeinlick gesocht und gebraukt (RVC, 1544, 1650 I.1).

In 11,7,1, also, the RVC commentator extends his predecessor’s reference to the bad example that prelates give (RVA 11,7,3) to include temporal rulers (Potestaten), whose subjects excuse their own misdeeds by following the example set by those in authority, a point taken up by the 1544 commentator in 11,7,5 with regard to "oberkeit." For his part, the 1650 commentator refers in this connection specifically to the bad example set by rulers (Fürsten und Herren) in taking bribes, quoting Moscherosch, who states: "die Geldsucht sey die welt / das Fleisch und der Teufel selbstten" (1650 11,7,4).

Turning now to the relationship between the ruler and his counsellors, we are told in RVC 1,5,4 (also 1544 and 1650) that rulers (Könige, Fürsten und Stede) should have upright, judicious, loyal, experienced men in their councils, who are wise, honest, godfearing and strangers to greed, so that they, the
rulers, may take pleasure in governing and coming to just
decisions regarding all complicated matters, including disputes
among their subjects. (This expands RVA 1,6,1-2, where the
comment is restricted to "eyn vorste, eyn here efte eyn ander
rychter" in his judicial capacity.) This is followed in RVC by a
quotation from the Alten Weisen (followed in substance in 1544 and
1650) to the effect that the good fortune of the king and the
expansion of his kingdom depend on wise and loyal counsellors:
"Wente de wyszheit / ys nicht düchtich (taugt nichts) ane de
truwe. Noch de truwe und leffhebbung ane de wyszheyt." In
111,4,15, the 1544 commentator stresses again that "Herren und
Fürsten" cannot do without loyal, wise, well-educated and
experienced counsellors, but warns them against "überflussige
Müttwillen" on the part of any one of these, for this is a sign of
"kleiner weiszheit / und trew."

A king or other ruler (Potentat) should, however, pay
attention to what these wise and loyal counsellors advise him,
says the RVC commentator in 1,11,2, and not listen to those who he
knows dislike him (Alten Weisen), and it is further recommended
that he establish a privy council (vorswegen Rede hebbe) (RVC, 1544
1,11,2; 1650 1,11,3), so that state secrets may be kept from the
public at large - Agricola (307). There follow in the Agricola
passage examples from classical history and literature where such
secrets have not been kept, and the 1650 commentator, too, adds his
own illustrations here. A ruler should also allow himself to be
rebuked by his counsellors (Alten Weisen) (RVC 1,14,2) and should
listen to those who are tried and true rather than to those who
advise only what he wants to hear (1544 1,15,1). The 1650 commentator in 1,15,4 advises getting rid of slanderers and gives examples from history where this was done. Rulers (ein yder Potentat / Fürste / und Here) should be on their guard, however, regarding disloyalty and conspiracies among their servants (RVC, 1544 1,17,1), and in RVC 1,24,2 usurpers are warned against, whose machinations should be foiled (Alten Weisen).

With regard to the choice of those serving under him, the ruler (Fürste) is advised in RVC 1,15,1 to be careful what type of man - meaning his personality - he chooses as a servant. He should not overlook those from a lower class of society: "Und ein vornufftich gemote (Gemüt) / eddele dadt / uund getruwen wandel / by nemande vorachten / so he ock solckes / by einem unachbarn geringen manne / funde" (Alten Weisen), advice repeated in RVC III,12,3, where the ruler is nevertheless advised to look into the man's background (again Alten Weisen), and not admit the avaricious to his Council, advice repeated in 1544 III,12,6. In RVC 1,15,1, too, in an attributed Schwarzenberg quotation, we are told that the type of ruler a country has can be detected in his servants, while in RVC II,7,5, in an apparently original entry, the commentator advises the employment of counsellors who will tell him the truth. In a marginal comment at the end of 1,1 the 1544 commentator brings up the question of the ruler's readiness to retain such worthy counsellors and servants in his service: "Es sind wohl lobliche Herren und Fürsten / die einen erlichen uund getrewen diener wol zuhalten wissen / es ist aber rara avis in terra," the 1650 commentator adding here in the body of his
text that such rulers are as rare as white ravens and black swans.

A ruler (Koninchn) should not, however, let his counsellors rule the land, while he enjoys himself gaming, hunting etc., since this leads to the counsellors' acquiring means to fleece the poor, which, in turn, causes unrest in the country (RVC, 1544 1,15,1) - this passage derives from Brenz's Prediger Salomo - the 1544 and 1650 (1,15,4) commentators adding that the people often get the idea that this treatment is the ruler's doing. For their part, the 1544 and 1650 commentators are also concerned here that the ruler (Herr) should have some consideration for those who will succeed him. It is difficult for a new ruler when he finds "widderige Leut" in the government he has to take over, the 1544 commentator states.

The fear of a particular family that a judge or other authority should never display we have already noted (RVA, RVC, 1544 1,21,1; 1650 1,20,1), and this applies also to friendship, which should never sway a judge (RVC 11,9,8), repeated in RVC III,4,2 - Agricola (64). Nor should rulers (Fürsten und Heren) believe flatterers and talebearers (RVA, RVC I,22,1), particularly when this results in their becoming suspicious of those they have previously trusted. Flattery is something that rulers (Fürsten and Heren) are particularly prone to, maintains the RVC commentator (1,28), the 1544 (1,28) and 1650 (1,26) commentators advising rulers (grosse Herrn / es seien oberkeiten / oder sonst grosse leute) to investigate very carefully the words of such flatterers and slanderers, since otherwise a faithful servant may perish.
Delegation of authority is a subject that worries all four commentators. The problem of a ruler's being blamed by his subjects for the outcome of such delegation is brought up again by the 1544 commentator in 1,39,1, where he states that no ruler (Potentat) should delegate so much authority that the result is oppression of the poor, and should therefore be extremely careful to whom he grants this power. In RVA III,13,1; RVC III,13,4 we are told that rulers (Furste und Heren) should punish disloyal officials who exploit the poor for their own benefit. Both the two latter commentators (1544 1,15,1; 1650 1,15,4) urge the ruler to take matters in his own hands to a greater extent. Also in both 1544, 1650 III,1,4 and 1650 III,1,5, these commentators encourage the ruler ("Regent" in 1544, "Fürsten und Herren" in 1650 III,1,5, "Landes Herr" in II,1,4) to sit in the judgement seat himself from time to time and listen to his subjects himself, the 1544 commentator urging further in III,4,9 that only honourable people be given judicial appointments. If this were so, there probably would not be so many people flocking to the ruler's court (1544 as above; 1650 III,4,7), although both commentators agree that it is good that the subjects have this recourse. In 1,18,2 the 1650 commentator had already referred to temporal authorities as men created by God, "zu denen ein jeder in seiner Noth seine Zuflucht nehme."

In both RVA and RVC II,1,1 fear is expressed that a ruler (RVA 'vorste' RVC 'Fürste effte Here') loses his respect with the people if he lets guilty persons go free and does not punish those who break the law, since this also encourages such a person to
commit other and greater crimes. Both latter commentators (1544, 1650 11,1,1) are in agreement with the second point, the 1544 commentator urging in addition, in 11,1,6, that rulers (die Oberkeit) punish any act that challenges temporal government and leads to uproar and destruction, such as breaking safe-conduct and disrupting a publicly-proclaimed peace or in any way failing to observe "der oberkeit gebott und verbott." No one will be safe otherwise, this 1544 commentator claims, and later, in 11,3,5, he maintains that if this does not take place, the country will either be punished by God or will be ruined. In 1650 111,13,1 this commentator also informs us that those in authority (Obrigkeit) must get rid of evil-doers in order to protect the rest of society. It is this commentator also who is particularly concerned that the ruler (Landes Herr) avenge any affront to ambassadors (11,1,4), whom he should be protecting along with his counsellors, courtiers and servants. The ruler (Furst oder Herr) is attacked though his servants, he contends (1,11,1).

Specifically, the rulers (Heren) are warned to punish robbery, the RVA commentator pointing out that the poor are often punished for a crime that the high and mighty get away with (RVA 11,7,6). The RVC commentator concurs, quoting Marcus Cato: "Der Deue (Dieb) der egen und besundern (eigenen und privaten) guder / leuen in gefenknissen und keden (Ketten). Auerst der gemeinen guder Deue / in golde und purpuren kledern (Kleidern)" (RVC 11,7,7).

In connection with the above, rulers (Keiser/Köninge/fürsten und alle Potentaten) are also warned against accepting bribes.
In the first chapter-gloss (1,1) the 1544 and 1650 commentators follow RVC in condemning bribery: "Dan de tho Haue wat hebben wyl/ de moth wath bringen. Geschencke und gaue (Gaben) maken / dath einem de heren gunstich synt" Agricola (262). Also in RVC 11,7,6 we are told that rulers (Könige und Potentaten) favour those who bring gifts, this statement being accompanied by illustrations from ancient history based on Cyrillus and Agricola (115). The difference in the type of judgement accorded to rich and poor is also referred to in the glosses of I,22. While the first two commentators remark here on how a noble (Here) or judge may be led astray from the path of righteousness by gifts and the hope of acquiring riches, (RVA, RVC 1,22,2), the RVC commentator adding that this infringes both divine and temporal law and will be punished by God, the 1544 commentator observes:

derhalben sollen die potentaten / nicht also gesinnet sein / das sie die grossen dieb inn den beutel / die armen aber an galgen hencken. Aber es ist leider dahin kommen / wer gelt und gunst hat / der kan thün / treiben durchbringen uund erlangen was er wil. Aber wehe denen die umb gaben willen das recht beygen / wie die schrifft sagt (1544 1,22,2).

Again in 1544 11,1,4 the ruler (Regent) is warned not to succumb to bribery and judge unjustly.

It is this 1544 commentator, too, who, in IV,1,5, urges the ruler (oberkeit) to punish adultery severely, since if it is not checked and the authorities indulge in it themselves, things will get out of hand and all must expect the punishment of God.272

The ruler is also warned by all four commentators not to listen to women or to take their advice (RVA 1,31,3; RVC, 1544
1,27; 1650 1,25). The RVA commentator, for his part, allows intercession in a just cause - for prisoners and for the poor but not, as is the case here, out of greed for treasure. The prince should make sure before he grants such a request that it is for the common good. (The reference is to the treasure that Reinke has persuaded the king and queen that he has in his possession.) The RVC commentator, who also stresses the necessity of working for the common good, points out, in addition, the danger of a guilty man being protected if the ruler (Fürste, Here effte Richter) is swayed by this wrongly-motivated intercession, while an innocent one is robbed of his life and goods, the 1544 commentator urging close examination by rulers (solche leut / die regieren sollen) of the facts of the case, before they accept such a plea. The 1650 commentator, however, labels rulers (hohe Potentaten) "rechte Weichlingen und Memmen," who prefer the advice of their wives over that of their counsellors.

Nor should a ruler (ein Fürst edder Here) believe too quickly where complaints against his servants are concerned, but investigate carefully, warns the RVC commentator (1,38,2) (Alten Weisen), a warning echoed by both latter commentators (1544 1,38,2; 1650 1,36.1).

Above all, a ruler (Fürste, Here edder Richter) is advised to restrain his anger (RVC 1,14,2) (Alten Weisen), advice confirmed in 1544 1,14,2 regarding "Herren und Fürsten" and repeated in 1,38,2 for "Potentaten," echoed in 1650 1,36,2 regarding "hohe Herren."

Specifically, rulers (Herren und oberkeiten) are required by
the 1544 commentator (III,4,13) to take a hand in regulating economic conditions in the country, particularly as this applies to the price of grain, which should be bought up and preserved for the poor. Similarly, in a comment in RVC III,8,1, apparently original, we read that rulers are often led astray by stories of enterprises that might bring them profit, for example building ships and brewing beer.

Finally, the two latter commentators urge compassion on the part of rulers (Regenten und Oberherrn) vis-à-vis their subjects (1650 II,2,1, repeated regarding "Obrigkeit" in III,23,2). In 1544 III,2,2 the commentator remarks that if authorities (die oberkeit) allow themselves to be affected as much by the injustice that a poor, insignificant man suffers as by that inflicted on a rich and mighty one, they are acting according to God's commandment and will gain the affection of their subjects. After all, he remarks, "nach Gott / alles glück und gedeien / unglück uund verderben / an den Regenten stehet" (III,6,6).

Two pronouncements concerning the ruling class made by the 1544 and 1650 commentators respectively do not fit well into the above classification and must be treated separately. The first of these occurs in 1544 II,1,3, where this commentator comes to the defence of rulers (Herrn, Fürsten, König und andere Potentaten und Regenten) with regard to their recreational activities - "essen / trincken / singen / dantzen hofieren und ander ehrlichen kurtzweil" - which he justifies on account of the heavy responsibilities they bear. The 1650 commentator concurs here, while at the same time urging moderation, comparing the ruler (wer
am Regiment sitzet) to the man at the rudder of a ship at sea (1650 11,1,3).

Later in the work, in 11,6,4, the 1650 commentator, in a quotation from J.M.Moscherosch's Die Gesichte Philanders von Sittewald satirizes the tendency of rulers to hoodwink their subjects into thinking that their policies are something other than they really are. The metaphor he uses here is the wearing of what he calls state-cloaks for the imparting of information concerning these policies, cloaks which are splendid-looking garments on the outside but very poorly-lined inside, and which bear grand-sounding names such as *salus populi* - the prosperity of the people - *bonum publicum* - the common good - *conservatio religionis* - the protection of the true faith. In addition to these fine cloaks, there is also one called *intentio*, shabby and well-worn, which represents the disastrous policies which have not worked out but which were thought to have been excellent ideas originally. And there is more in this vein.

**Summary**

a) Although there is little difference between the four commentators regarding the principal functions of a temporal ruler - what he should be and do and what he should avoid being and doing - there is nevertheless a considerable difference and variety in the way in which these views are expressed.

b) As we have already established, the RVA commentator appears to have had two main purposes, the first salvational, and the
second social. With regard to the latter, it can be expected therefore that in a gloss such as this, which, in addition, has no pretensions to being a work of art in its own right, the references to the ruler's duties would be closely connected with events in the text, where the king is presented primarily in his judicial capacity. There is also the writer's own situation to be taken into account, namely that he was an inhabitant of a free city rather than of a territorial state ruled by a prince and, moreover, appears to have been addressing primarily the governing authorities of this city, as we have seen. The "Fürstenspiegel" element therefore, although built into the narrative text, as we have noted, is not pronounced here.

c) With RVC, however, it is a very different matter. In the first place, he was an inhabitant of a territorial state, and, too, the primary result of this commentator's affirmation of the Lutheran position with regard to temporal government is the implicit enhancement in this gloss of the position of the ruler as the highest temporal authority. Turning to the literary aspect, we must consider how this "Fürstenspiegel" element of the gloss compares with similar works of this genre. With respect to its form - by which I mean here a part, even if an integral one, of a larger commentary on so many aspects of life - it is not typical. Nor is there a great deal of similarity with the other two or three works nearest to it in date which we have considered.
Aeneas Silvius, as we saw, urged the study of classical writers who would provide the prince with all he needed to know about government, and Erasmus, while treating the subject somewhat differently, can be seen nevertheless to have relied to a great extent—in the first part of his treatise at least—on classical works, together with Christian teaching. We have observed, however, that the work most favoured by the RVC commentator to illustrate his remarks concerning the duties of rulers and the pitfalls of rulership is Das Buch der Beispiele der Alten Weisen, a work of Indian origin, first composed in Sanskrit between 300 and 500 AD. This work, translated first into Persian, reached its German form via Arabic, Hebrew and Latin translations, this last, dating from c.1270, forming the basis of the German version.

Holland writes of the original work: "Die Absicht, in welcher der Verfasser geschrieben, war unzweifelhaft keine andere, als herrschern lehren zu bieten; sein Buch sollte, in unserer Weise zu reden, ein Fürstenspiegel sein." What could be more appropriate then than the use of a book which itself constituted a collection of fables related for the purpose of enlightening a ruler to illustrate a commentary on a beast epic, which commentary was intended—in part at least—to fulfil a similar purpose? Is it still possible, however, to consider this "Fürstenspiegel" element of the RVC gloss as an essentially Humanist piece of writing? To my mind it is. While Das Buch der Beispiele der Alten Weisen is
not a work of Greek or Roman literature, it is a work of similarly ancient literature, which, for the purpose for which it is used here, deserves equal status. Nor must it be overlooked that this commentator does also introduce—usually, but not always, through Agricola's *Proverbs*—a good deal of material from classical sources as illustration of the points he is making with regard to rulership. Nor is the Christian element lacking. We have noted, for example, the commentator's affirmation in 1,1 of the importance Luther ascribes, based on Biblical texts, to the temporal arm. In this way the two principal elements required for a post-classical, Humanist "Fürstenspiegel" are present here, namely Christian teaching and ancient wisdom.

d) With the 1544 gloss, however, we have a different picture again. The first thing we note is that the ruler is no longer, as a general rule, referred to as "Konig" or "Furst" as is usual in *RVC*, but, except at the beginning of the work when this commentator was translating his predecessor's remarks practically word for word, either as "Herr" alone (1,15,1) or "grosse Herren" or "Herren und Oberkeiten" (1,28 and 111,4,13), "Potentat" (1,39.1 and 1,22,2), "Regent" (11,1,4), "oberkeit" (11,1,6; 11,7,5 and 111,2,2), "solche leut / die regieren sollen" (1,27), to name some examples.

Not only is the nomenclature different in this gloss, however, once the commentator has become more independent of his source, but also the nature of his comments. While the nomenclature used becomes less specific and more
comprehensive, the comment becomes more specific and also more down-to-earth and realistic. For instance, it is this commentator who introduces the suggestion that subjects may consider any increase in the burdens imposed on them by a ruler's officials as the ruler's doing and that a ruler should have some consideration for those who succeed him (1,15,1). His comment regarding the necessity for authorities to punish any action which threatens temporal government (11,1,6) has also a specific connotation, as it appears to reflect the historical situation of the time, namely the - from a Lutheran point of view - seditious teaching and actions of the Anabaptists who were questioning temporal authority as such. This commentator's reference to the necessity for the authorities to intervene in economic matters (111,4,13) also reflects his readiness to relate his gloss to specific conditions prevailing at the time of writing. It is hardly possible, nevertheless, to consider this element of the gloss here as a "Fürstenspiegel" in the sense that it is addressed exclusively to princes and nobles and is also largely theoretical. This commentator has, in fact, modernized the concept and brought his remarks into line with the Lutheran concept of "die Obrigkeit," the authorities, or powers-that-be. It must also be remembered that in his preface he was the only commentator of the four to make no mention of this element. We note, in addition, a tendency here to emphasize the paternalistic functions of rulers - as Luther did, too, in his interpretation of the
82nd psalm as we saw - when the commentator refers to the authorities as persons to whom their subjects have ultimate recourse in legal matters (III,4,9) and also as those who should show compassion to their subjects (III,2,2).

e) With regard to the 1650 commentator, it is possible to discern here an even more pronouncedly paternalistic view of authority over and above what he found expressed in his predecessor's gloss in the examples already listed, something which tends to support his allegiance to the "gegenhöfische Strömung," which Vogt describes. In 1,18,2, for example, we have his reference to temporal authorites as people "zu denen ein jeder in seiner Noth seine Zuflucht nehme." Likewise his urging of compassion on the part of rulers vis à vis their subjects in 11,2,1 and III,23,2 are additions of his own. We have also the emphasis he lays on the indestructible love that a ruler should bear his subjects (III,6,4). With this last-mentioned remark we have, of course, an example of this commentator's allegorizing tendencies which become a hallmark of the chapter-glosses to Book III particularly. Another new note struck here is the introduction of Moscherosch's satire - here with regard to rulership and government. This commentator also from time to time makes reference to Greek, Roman and German history to illustrate his points, as the RVC commentator had done but which seldom occurred in the 1544 gloss once the commentator had achieved his independence. Nevertheless, taking all this into consideration, the
"Fürstenspiegel" element, although to some extent revived here - we note a return in this commentary now and then to the nomenclature "Fursten und Herren" (IV,1,5) and the introduction of that of "Landesherr" (II,1,4), for example - does not appear to form the predominant element of this gloss that it did of RVC.  

f) With regard to the postulated function of the glosses - to formulate precepts or maxims based on the events of the narrative text - it would seem that here in respect of the "Fürstenspiegel" the commentators have largely fulfilled this function.
(ii) The obligations of their subjects towards those in authority

We must now turn to the other side of the coin, so to speak, namely to the obligations of subjects vis-à-vis their rulers, and study the way in which the individual commentators deal with this question.

In RVA there are, in fact, only three references to this relationship. In 1,20,2 there is mention of the "reverencie und Demüt, den men eynem heren eftie richter sal beden (bieten)" and in 11,3,6 we have a reference to the "horsam, den in rechtferdygen sake de undersaten (Untertanen) syn schuldich eren heren." Also, in a somewhat different context, this commentator, in 1 17,3, deals with the question of wicked authorities.

As regards the "rechtferdyge sake" mentioned above, Aquinas, basing his stand, as he states, on that of Augustine, writes as follows with regard to waging war: in the first place, it must be waged only on the authority of a sovereign; secondly, it must be in a just cause, the intention, namely, must be good - those who are to be attacked must have deserved it because of some wrong they have done - and, thirdly, those who wage war must intend peace.392

We have already noted the emphasis that Luther in his "An den christlichen Adel deutscher Nation" laid on the obedience due to all those in authority on the part of their subjects, which teaching he based on the Biblical texts of Romans 13 and 1 Peter 2. This he repeated constantly in the tracts he wrote during the
1520s and was to reaffirm it as a tenet in his "Kleiner Katechismus" of 1529 in a section addressed to "allerley heilige orden unde stende, dadurch die selbigen als durch eigen lection yhres ampts und diensts zu ermahnen." Here it is stated:

Von weltlicher Oberkeit

Jedermann sey der Oberkeit unterthan. Denn die oberkeit, so allenthalben ist, ist von Gott geordent. Wer aber der Oberkeit widderstrebt, der widderstrebet Gottes ordenung. Wer aber widderstrebt, wird sein urteil empfahen. Denn sie tregt das schwert nicht umb sonst, Sie ist Gottes dienerin, eine Racheryn zur straffe uber die, so boses thun, zum Romern am dreyzehenden Capitel (WA 31:1,330)

There is very little difference in the attitude of the three latter commentators - RVC, 1544, 1650 - to this question, except perhaps in the extent to which it is referred to in the individual glosses and enlarged upon there. Accepting, then, this statement made in RVC 1,1 (repeated in 1544 and 1650) as a given, namely "Alle Auericheit ys van Godt verordent / und de der weddersteyt / de wedderstreuet Gades ordenung," we will examine from various viewpoints what the three commentators have to say on this subject.

First of all (a) we shall consider their views concerning the institution of authority and what they consider obedience thereunto comprises, then (b) we will concern ourselves with wicked rulership and whether this, too, must be obeyed. Following this, (c) the question will be discussed as to whether this obedience is an absolute command or whether there are occasions when it can, or alternatively must, be denied. Finally, (d) with
regard to the condemnation of any kind of revolt against authority and the deposing of rulers, we will pay some attention to the aspects of this question that are presented in the glosses.

a) With regard to the first point, we read in RVC 1,19,2:

Den Fürsten / Heren / Richtern und aller ordentlichen Auericheit / ys ein yder mensche / uth natürlichen und Göttlichen Gebaden / Eere / werdicheit / gehorsam / Schott (Schoss) und Toll (Zoll) / umme rechtes und gemeinen fredes willen tho erholden / willichliken tho geuen schuldich.

This theme is taken up by the 1544 commentator in 1,19,3 (followed in substance by the 1650 commentator in 1,18,2) who waxes lyrical concerning the need for this authority: "Tolle magistrum e mundo et solem substulisti" ("Remove authority from the world and you have taken away the sun"), going on to explain that without it there would be nothing but robbery, murder, adultery, whoring and all other kinds of vice. For his part, the 1650 commentator adds here, as we have already seen, that God created such authority so that people might have somewhere to take refuge in their hour of need (1650 1,18,2).

Besides mere obedience to authority, the two latter commentators emphasize in addition that subjects should always be ready to assist those in authority in every way possible, such as - and this applies particularly to "die gewaltigen," states the 1544 commentator - in punishing crime and vice, helping to protect the upright and maintaining peace, calm, discipline etc. (1544 11,2,3). In 11,3,5-6 this 1544 commentator is more specific as to the crimes he has in mind, namely "offene laster / mord /
rauberei / fried / und geleit brechen." The obligation of the subject is expanded here by the 1650 commentator to read: "Unterthanen gebühre den Befehl ihrer Obrigkeit zu gehorsamen / und ihr gegen ihre Feinde die hülfliche Hand bieten / auch gern und willig vor ihnen den Todt leiden und ausstehen" (1650 11,3,5). He confirms this later in 111,11,10 when he writes that loyal subjects should place themselves at all times at the service of their overlords, even if they have to put all they have at risk.

Further, in 111,1,6, the 1544 commentator introduces a quotation from the 82nd psalm - a psalm of which Luther wrote an interpretation, as we have already noted, with which this commentator would appear to have been familiar. He writes: "das man Kunig und Fürsten / uund alle Oberkeit ihr gebührlich ehr thun / denn Gott selber spricht: 'Siehe ich sags selber ihr seit Gotter.' Weil sie denn Gott ehret / werden sie billich auch von den menschen geehret." He then returns to this theme in 111,13,5, where he states

das ein frommer unterthan all sein vormagen
bei seiner Oberkeit auff setzen soll/denn sie
ist sein irdischer Gott / wie Gott selber / von der Oberkeit spricht: Ich sage ihr seit
Gotter / denn sie müssen vermittelst
göttlicher hülf / iren unterthanen leib und
got / ehr / weib und kind etc. für dem
ubermüt der bösen / schützen / bewaren /
handhaben und retten.

Both latter commentators emphasize the need for prayer by subjects on behalf of their rulers: for good ones, for whom God should be thanked (1544 11,8,3), this prayer should be for a long life (1544 111,6,6) and that God should sustain them and direct
their hearts, so that they never come to set aside justice or disregard the well-being of their subjects (1650 III,1,3). If they are wicked, the prayer should rather be that God may turn their hearts and endue them with a pure spirit (1650 as above). The 1544 commentator also considers that displaying obedience, fear and honour towards rulers might encourage them to provide good government, combining this with the prayer that God may grant them grace to rule in a Christian way according to His will and not be led astray by evil counsel (1544 III,6,6).

Finally, in III,22,4, the 1650 commentator makes reference to the cursing and censure of their rulers that subjects resort to, urging instead, in a paraphrase of 1 Tim 2 regarding the need for prayer on behalf of those in authority, that subjects beseech God that He, "der die Hertzen der Könige in seinen Händen hat / und lenket sie wohin er wil / auch ihre Sinne möge zum Guten an und vor allem Bösen und unrechten ableiten."

The question of censure and criticism of those in authority is also brought up in an attributed quotation of Erasmus Alberus in RVC III,13,2:

Men redet von bösen hyr alleine /  
Dat de gemeine hupe nicht meine.  
Men möthe also de Heren vorachten /  
Ein yder schal syck süluest betrachten  
Dat he syck holde / wo em gebört (gebührt) /  
Efft schon sein Here ein leuent fort (Leben führt)  
Dath bouisch (bübisch) ys / so hüth dy dyck /  
Idt ys mit dem genoch / dat syck  
Dyn Here also vorsündyget sere /  
Bydde du Godt / dat he syck bekere.

For his part, the 1544 commentator, too, censures criticism of those in authority. The latter should not allow it, he says,
Neither does he countenance subjects excusing their own misdeeds by pleading that they are only imitating what their superiors are doing (1544 II,6,3).

b) This brings us to the question of whether evil authority, too, must be obeyed. The answer given here, particularly in the 1544 gloss, is a distinct affirmative: "So hat Gott von anfang der welt an König / Fürsten / Richter und oberkeyt gesetzt und geordnet / und dieselbe böß und gut / zu ehren gebotten" (1,19,3). This he repeats in I,24,5: "Aber sind beide von Gott gute und bosen," and in II,2,2 he tells us that even if those in authority do not do what they are supposed to do, "so ist und bleibt sie doch oberkeit / und soll auch bleiben für irren unterthanen." In RVC II,3,3, also, in an attributed Schwarzenberg quotation, we are told: "De schrifft gehorsam tho syn gebuth / De auericheit sy böse edder gudt."

c) Is this command regarding obedience absolute, or are there occasions when obedience to an overlord can, or alternatively must, be denied? We have already noted the remark of the RVA commentator (II,3,6) that this obedience was due only in a just cause, and this is confirmed in RVC II,3,3, where we read:

As regards the two latter glosses, the 1650 commentator, for his part, recognises such a restriction, remarking in II,2,5:
"Unterthanen sollen der Obrigkeit in ihrer gerechten Sache beyspringen." The 1544 commentator also, in 11,8,3, adds a qualification when on a related topic he writes that "jederman soll die oberkeit inn ehren halten / sie sei wie sie wölle / Ich sag inn allen weltlichen /ehrlichen sachen."

d) Turning now to the different aspects from which revolt against authority is considered in the glosses, two of these are introduced in an unattributed Brenz quotation in RVC 1,17,1:

Men schal öuerst sölicke bōse Regenten / dorch upror edder ander bōse middel nicht entsetten/ Dann dat were Godt in syn Ampt gefallen / sunder men schal Gades Ordenung / gedülden / und en mit biddende anfallen / dat he uns unse sündde vorgeue / darmit wy einen bosen Regenten tho dülden / vordent (verdient) hebben / Und dat he uns in der wedderdicheit (Widerwärtsigkeit) erholden wille.

The first of these aspects is revealed in the words: "Dann dat were Godt in syn ampt gefallen." In other words, it is God, who ordained all authority, who will administer punishment. This is corroborated at some length by the 1544 commentator in 1,19,3 (reproduced word for word in 1650 1,18.2), where he summarizes: "Sie [die Herren] sollen wissen / das sie auch einen Herrn im himel haben / derselb ist ihr oberherr / hat sie zustraffen und nicht du." This he repeats in 11,2,2: "denn alle Oberkeit ist von Gott und derselbe hat sie zustraffen," and likewise in 11,8,3, while in 1,24,5, again attributing what he writes to St.Paul, he delineates, as it were, areas of competence: "Alle oberkeit ist von Gott /thustu unrecht / so hat dich die Oberkeit zustraffen / thut die selb unrecht / so hat Gott zustraffen und zürchten und du nicht." Both latter
commentators - 1544 1,19.3 and 1650 1,18.2 - give examples from both the Old Testament and from recent history of how God himself has punished such revolts, instancing the outcome of the Peasants' War in 1525 (both glosses) and the Münster Anabaptist uprising of 1534 (1544 here, 1650 I,22).

Another aspect of this question is to be found in the second part of the Brenz quotation, where we learn that wicked rulers are inflicted by God on a people for the punishment of their sins: "dat he uns unse sünde vorgeue / darmit wy einen bosen Regenten tho dulden vordent hebben." This idea had, in fact, already been put forward in RVA in I,17,3, where we read:

```
God kastiet vaken syne leffhebbers unde syn volck dorv boze ummylde voghede (Vögte) efte heren, efte andere vorwesers; unde dat is umme mannygerleye sake wyllen, doch de meyste sake ys umme der sünde wyllen.
```

This RVA commentator then goes on to describe how, when the people repent, they call upon God, who acts in the same way as a father who has been using the cane on his children. When they are prepared to do his will, he breaks the cane in two pieces and throws it into the fire:

```
By der roden is betekent eyn ummylde boze vorweser eynes landes efte stad, de is de rode, dar god almechtich mede tuchtyget (züchtigt) und sleyt (schlägt) syne kynder, de syk uth deme dwange betern in den sunden unde bekennen, dat god se rechtferdigen tuchtiget; unde wan god denne sued (sieht) de beterynge synes volckes, so bryckt he de rode entwey unde werpet se int fur, dat is, he nympyt van hir den ummylden vorweser unde werpet syne sele int fuer der hellen. Ok kumpt yd vaken (oft), dat eyn ghyrich vorweser kumpt in de hande der yennen, den he dat er heft aff gheschattet (Steuer entrissen), unde denne varen se myt em alze hyr de bure myt deme vulue, et cetera.
```
This theme of a people deserving a wicked ruler on account of their sins is introduced again by the RVA commentator in I1,8,2 regarding prelates and others and applied by the RVC commentator to "Heren" alone, the sin here, in both glosses, being that of slander in particular. The 1544 commentator confirms this in his parallel gloss, I1,8,3, which begins: "Es ist war / das die welt so ßosz ist / das sie schier keiner rechten guten Oberkeit mehr werdt ist," stating later in the same gloss "das sag ich auff das, .dasz wir alle der oberkeit die uns Gott gebenn hat, kaum werdt seind / Denn sie kan so ßosz nicht sein / wir habens verdient." A comparison of the last sentence of RVA I, 17,3 quoted above - which is repeated practically word for word in RVC with regard to "eyn Regent" - with the teaching of the two latter glosses is extremely interesting. In RVA we note that as soon as the people repent, God rids them of their persecutor, who often subsequently falls into their hands. This teaching is, of course, completely different from that in the two later glosses, where no hope is held out for any improvement in the situation - that is, that the people may repent and that God will intervene as a result - the only instruction appearing to be to endure all suffering that is imposed, since this is richly deserved. As Luther states in the course of his exegesis of the 82nd psalm: "Niemand unter winde sich, die Götter zu richten, zu straffen noch zu meistern, Sondern sey stille, halte friede, sey gehorsam und leide" (WA 31:1,193).

With regard to RVC, it is somewhat of a contradiction that this commentator should reproduce both the Brenz passage quoted
above (1,17,2) which speaks of patient endurance of the suffering imposed by a wicked ruler as a deserved punishment for sin, and also the passage from RVA with regard to a penitent people's having a wicked "vorweser" (RVA), "Regent" (RVC) delivered into their hands, as it were. In this connection Schafferus provides another example of this RVC commentator's seeming inability to accept the idea of mute suffering under tyranny. This is the Alberus verse in RVC III,13,1, the first part of which is quoted above, where, after the line "Bydde du Godt / dat he syck bekere," the commentator inserts four lines of his own to the effect that the overlord will otherwise find himself condemned to sup with the devil in eternity. In the original, however, after a warning not to revolt, Alberus instructs his readers; "So leid, wie Christ gelitten hat / Dat wirdt gereden nimmer dich / Und wirt Gotts Kindt sein ewiglich."

Finally, we have the concept that if subjects are somehow or another relieved of a wicked ruler, they will not necessarily acquire a better one in his stead. This is introduced by the 1544 commentator in I, 24,5 in reference to the Aesop fable of the frogs and the stork, which, in the narrative text, Reinke has just related. The commentator states: "Leret das Exempl der Frösche das man nicht leichtlich einen andern Herrn begere. Man soll ein jhede Oberkeit / streng oder gutig gern leiden / haben / vertragen / uund ehren / denn sie ist dir von Gott geben / uund kumpt ja so bald ein ärger als ein besser." The RVC gloss provides us with two passages on the same theme, the first based on an unattributed Agricola (128) passage: "Sus / wo se dersuluen
[der Auericheit] wedderstreuen / so vorschaffet Godt / ein ander / und vellichte böser Auericheit / de den begangen ungehorsam / wreket und straffet" (RVC 11,3,3). The second passage, apparently written by the commentator himself, is more concerned with the common good:

wowl dennoch dem gemeinen besten / nicht thodrechlich (zutraglich) ys / dat men solcke egennützige / gyrige und modtwyllige Regenten entsette. Uth orsaken / dat se swerlick betere / sunder gemeinlick noch ungeschickeder und schedlyker / bekamen (RVC 111,13,3).

There are two passages in the 1544 gloss on the subject of good and wicked rulers which are somewhat difficult to understand and which we must study in greater detail. After remarking in 1,24,5 that people obviously prefer a ruler of integrity who will be a father to them to an evil tyrant who will overtax them etc. he qualifies his statement "aber sie sind beide von Gott göte und bösen" with the following: "Niemand weisz ob sie dir oder inen selbs zur straff oder gnad gegeben sind." Then, in 11,6,3, he writes: "Ist sie [die Oberkeit] gut, so hastu es Gott zudancken / Ist sie bössz / so weistu nicht ob dir sie Gott zur straff oder gnad gesetzt / uund steht dir drumb solch urteil nicht zu."

Now we know that the 1544 commentator firmly believed, following Luther, that authority per se should be considered a divine institution, whose primary purpose is to keep the peace among mankind. Further, at the end of his tract "Ob Kriegsleute" Luther describes the institution of authority as "die grosze gnade" that God Almighty shows us by establishing this authority "als ein eusserlich mal und zeichen seins willens...da
wir gewiss sind, das wir seinem Gottlichen willen gefallen und recht thun, so oft und wenn wir der oberkeit willen und gefallen thun" (WA 19,660). Now while it would appear obvious that a virtuous, upright ruler would be of benefit to his people, there might, on the other hand, be circumstances when this would not be the case. Luther comes in fact to the conclusion in this tract that tyrants have their uses, since they are better at controlling the mob: "Es ist ein verzweifelt, verflucht ding umb einen tollen e pofel, wilchen niemand so wol regiern kan als die Tyrannen" (WA 19,639-40). Luther argues, in addition, that, after all, the probable harsh lot that may befall a subject under such rule cannot harm his, the subject's soul, whereas through his misdeeds the tyrant is incurring eternal damnation: "Kan sie doch deiner seelen nicht schaden und thut yhr selbs mehr schaden denn dir, weil sie yhr selbs seelen verdampt, da denn nach folgen mus auch leibs und guts verderben" (WA 19,636). In his Schmalkaldic Articles (1537) also Luther remarks concerning "das leiblich Regiment" that "Gott auch wol durch einen Tyrannen und Buben lesst einem volck viel gutes geschen" (WA 50,214).

Both types of rulers, then, good and bad, would appear to have their advantages and disadvantages for the people. Wicked rulers, or tyrants, who will always incur their own damnation in the hereafter on account of their misdeeds and who may, furthermore, have been imposed by God as a punishment for the people's sins, can nevertheless sometimes provide a benefit to their subjects by being better able than good, virtuous rulers to secure peaceable conditions.
Summary

a) There is a marked difference between RVA and the other three glosses with regard to the question of obedience to authority, the RVA commentator giving this only passing reference, as it were, the other three hammering it home, in accordance with Luther's teaching. All glosses, however, allow exceptions to this rule, where the cause is deemed "unjust," as did Luther also.

b) There is unanimity among all three later commentators - RVC, 1544 and 1650 - with regard to revolt against authority, which is categorically forbidden by all of them. Both the RVC commentator in the Brenz quotation and the 1544 commentator stress the necessity for suffering as a well-deserved punishment for sin. Only the 1544 commentator, however, goes out of his way to emphasize that wicked authorities must be tolerated, although this is naturally implicit in the prohibition to revolt.

c) With regard to RVC, this commentator presents contrasting views here: in the Brenz quotation the concept of patient suffering under a wicked ruler (1,17,2) with no hope held out for remission of punishment as a reward for improvement as also the RVA commentator's statement of the possibility of a people's eventually having such a ruler delivered up to them after they have repented of their sins. His alteration of the Alberus quotation, moreover, in III,13,2, is further evidence of his apparent inability to accept the concept of
mute suffering under a wicked ruler. It also provides a good example of the way in which this commentator very often gives contrasting views in his glosses.

d) There is also the fact that the RVC commentator accepts, by repeating them in essence, the views of his RVA predecessor concerning the possibility of repentance, in other words, improvement on the part of a people, for which they would be rewarded by the removal of their wicked ruler. The fact that these ideas are not reflected in the 1544 gloss reveals the gulf that separated those who believed in man's capacity for improvement - the Roman church and the Humanists - and those who, like the 1544 commentator, followed Luther in his pessimism concerning human nature. As an example of this latter we have the passage from the beginning of "Von weltlicher Oberkeyt" justifying the existence of temporal authority as primarily a restraining force: "Denn wo das nicht were, sintemal alle welt bose und unter tausent kaum eyn recht Christ ist, würde eins das ander fressen...damit die welt wuste wurde" (WA 11,251). The RVC commentator reveals himself here, therefore, as someone who has not fully accepted all the facets of Lutheran teaching.

e) It is the 1544 commentator who is obviously most directly influenced by Luther's teaching and writing, particularly by the latter's interpretation of the 82nd psalm (1530), and he would also appear to have a general knowledge of the contents of "Von weltlicher Oberkeyt" and "Ob Kriegersleute."
His acceptance of Luther's views here would appear to be complete.

f) Writing one hundred years later, a year after the Peace of Westphalia (1648) had confirmed the recognition given to the Lutheran faith by the Peace of Augsburg (1555), this 1650 commentator does not express the same immediacy as his predecessor. Nevertheless, he corroborates the most important points stressed in the 1544 gloss, his most striking individual contribution being the stress he lays on the importance of subjects praying for their rulers, good and bad, and of their being prepared to forfeit all they have to support the latter against their enemies, this suggesting the close kind of relationship between subject and ruler which would exist under a paternalistic regime.
(iii) The princely court and its officials

The third aspect of government which we must now consider is the princely court, whence all administrative decisions stemmed. As regards the curial, or treatise on court life, the fifteenth century examples of this type of writing present themselves principally as negative alternatives to the simple life. As one typical fifteenth century example of this type of writing Huizinga instances the French poet Alain Chartier's *Le Curial*, which was translated into English by William Caxton in 1484. Although considered by Caxton to be Chartier's original work, Huizinga has shown that it is actually a translation of a contemporary Latin work by an Italian author.

In no way comparable to the "Fürstenspiegel" in importance - there was no question here of exerting influence on a powerful personage - a curial tends to take the form either of a lament or of a satire, and if the former, it is often written as a comparison of courtly with country life, emphasizing the disadvantages of the former against the advantages of the latter. Chartier's work is one of these. Purporting to be a letter written by a member of a princely court to his friend in the country who is anxious to join him, the author begins by addressing his friend as one desirous of leaping from a haven of security in order to drown in the sea. Courts are full of deceit, flattery, envy and lies, he writes, where the virtuous man is mocked and hated, "car il n'est reins tant desplaisant a malvaises gens que ceulx qu'ils coignoissent estre vertueuz, saiges
Corruption, including bribery, is the way to success in court life, he maintains, but Fortune sees to it that when a man reaches the top he will soon face ruin, for when someone acquires the highest office, this arouses the envy of others at court and he is soon humbled, after which he is reviled by everyone. "Car multitude de gens mesprise toujours ceulz que fortune a plus ravalez, et si est envieuse de ceuix qu'elle voit eslevez."\textsuperscript{310}

Fortune is given quite expansive treatment in this treatise: she is particularly concerned, we are told, with the high and the mighty, for whom she sets traps and laughs out loud and claps her hands when they are brought down. Yet it is possible for those of stout heart to resist her: "Mais l'homme qui a grant et vertueux courage, mesprise ses riz et sa moe et ne doubtte (craint) riens ses menaces."\textsuperscript{311}

The usual result, the author continues, is that a man becomes corrupted by the behaviour of those around him. In addition, as regards his physical life, he has to fit in with the manners and customs of the court, where, for example, meals are seldom served regularly. No one, furthermore, can be sure of his position at court, or of how long his luck will last, for "la court, affin que bien l'entendes," the author writes to his friend, "est ung couvent de gens qui soubz faintise du bien commun se assemblent pour s'entretromper."\textsuperscript{312} Warning his friend that by joining the court he will lose his freedom and pointing out in addition that people who have served the court best will often be forgotten, while those who are unworthy and have served it poorly will be the
ones who will gain from it, he gives this damning description of court life: "Est se me demandes que c'est que la vie curiale, je te repons, frere, que c'est une pouvre richesse, une habondance miserable, une haultesse qui chiet (tombe), ung estat non estable, une seurete tremblant et une morvieuze vie."\textsuperscript{313}

If Chartier's \textit{Curial} can be considered conventional in that it deals with the basic tension between the \textit{vita activa} and the \textit{vita contemplativa} and with the former on both the spiritual and the physical level, that of Aeneas Silvius - \textit{De curialium miseriis}, written in 1444 - is primarily concerned with the physical drawbacks of court life and the complete lack of freedom.\textsuperscript{314} He, too, instances the irregularity of the meals and mentions in addition the filthy eating and drinking utensils at table, the ignorance both of when a call might suddenly come to get saddled up and be off and also of the ultimate destination, and suchlike.

Closer to our period is Ulrich v.Hutten's \textit{Aula} of 1516, which is a different work again.\textsuperscript{315} This time the topic is once more the comparative advantages and disadvantages of the active and the contemplative life written from the Humanist viewpoint, the work taking the form of a dialogue between Misaulus, who rejects court life, and Castus, who supports it. (For Hutten this was a very real predicament, since he both lacked the means to finance further study or writing without some remunerative employment - he was in 1518 in the service of Albrecht von Hohenzollern, the Prince-Archbishop of Mainz - and also possessed a nature that was more in tune with the active life than that of most of his
Humanist contemporaries.\textsuperscript{316})

With regard to satire, two good examples of this are works, extracts from which appear in the RVC gloss. The first of these is Johann v. Morsheims's \textit{Spiegel des Regiments inn der Fürsten Höfe, da Fraw Untrewe gewaltig ist}, to give the work its 1515 title, the address to the reader stating:

\begin{quote}
Küngin bin ich der nüwen hant,
Untrew binn ich genant
Und bin durch faren alle land.
Neyd und Hasz sein mir wol bekand
Die ich zu Hauptmann han erkorn.
Recht Trew, dy hat den streit verlorn.\textsuperscript{317}
\end{quote}

The second of these satires is a short piece, quoted apparently \textit{in toto} and placed by the RVC commentator at the beginning of Book II, where he describes it as a posthumous work of Erasmus. "Wert nicht vor unbillick geachtet," he writes, "desulue syne underrichtung und Lere / den Hauedenern / thom Spegel und vorbilde / myt im anfange des andern bokes / tho stellen." Erasmus did not mean the work to be taken seriously, he explains, but rather as an illustration of the customary goings-on at court.

The work in fact takes the form of a perverted curial, as it were, a distorted mirror image, and again purports to be a letter written by one friend with a long experience of court life to another whose parents are forcing him to enter princely service.

Beginning with the advice to trust nobody, however friendly he may seem to be, and to give his friendship to no one, the recipient of the letter is counselled nonetheless to pretend to be a loyal friend to all and to adopt exaggeratedly ingratiating gestures when greeting people. No natural feelings should ever
show on his face, he is told, the expression on which should always match his words: "Dyt synt der Hauschen (höfischen) Philosophie und kunst / ersten anfenge und grundt," writes his mentor.

As far as the prince is concerned, the courtier should always do his best to keep in favour by agreeing all the time with what the former says and does, at the same time praising those who are in his favour. Small gifts are, moreover, recommended in contrast to large ones, accompanied by much flattery and protestation regarding lack of means and of good fortune. He should in fact constantly seek his own advantage, the writer advises him, aiming always to be part of the faction nearest to the prince, while at the same time avoiding becoming an enemy of the faction that is out of favour: "Dan der Fursten gunste und gnade / plecht (pflegt) syck vaken (oft) tho vorandern / gelick wo de wyndt vaken ummegheit."

On the practical side he is advised against having his own kitchen; instead he should always eat out at others' tables, making himself an agreeable guest by always being prepared to take lightly any and every remark made to him and to turn it into a jest. At the same time, however, he should avoid gaming, the ruin of so many men, and always conduct himself so that his life is above reproach, doing his best the while to amass as large a fortune as he can. Once he has achieved this end, he should try to leave the court for a while, preferably by being named to a legation or sent on a mission.

With regard to Luther, he wrote his interpretation of the
101st psalm in 1534 with a particular court in mind, namely that of the Elector Johann Friedrich of Saxony, where, in his opinion, the nobles were now ruling the roost. Here he uses a glorious metaphor to describe the relationship between a ruler and his courtiers, describing the ruler as a man

der reitet grosse thewre hengste, die wollen des besten futters vol sticken, den Zaum frey und lang haben, die sporn nicht leiden, auff der gassen die quehr gehen, umb sich schlachen, stossen, beissen, daruber ganz hoch geehrt und gefurchtet sein unter dem satel und schmuck ires herrn (WA 51,220)

In this interpretation, too, Luther echoes points which have been made in the curials we have been considering, for instance that "gar mancher feiner man trewlich und wol dienet, und dar nach jemerlich verlassen oder auch wol verstossen wird. Und ein ander schalk an seine stat kompt, der darnach alles nimpt, das ihener verdienet hat" (WA 51,228). He also remarks that very often courtiers fill the ears of a king or a prince with their own spiteful counsels, so that he becomes deaf to a faithful servant. Lastly, Luther, too, joins the chorus of those who recommend that men keep away from princely courts (WA 51,247).

Turning now to the glosses, we have in RVC, 1544 1,5,4; 1650 1,5,3 in an Alten Weisen quotation the picture of a good counsellor: he should be capable of thinking a proposition through to its conclusion, should not conceal from a ruler any danger involved in its execution, nor keep silent with regard to its advantages for him. And if he sees that the ruler is about to act unjustly, he should point out to him the path of righteousness and give him advice on which he would be prepared to
stake his own life and soul. In one of his later glosses, IV,11,1, the 1544 commentator, too, refers specifically to the duties of a counsellor (Hofrath):

Erstlich / was das ampt eines Hoffrhats ist / nemlich ehrlich und auffrichtig in allen dingen sein / alle ding dahin handeln / das sie zum besten gekrt werden / dem Herrn uund den unterthanen zu nutz und forderung / ehr und glimpff gereyche / und zu gutem end komme.

For the rest, however, the glosses are mainly concerned with censorious criticism of courtiers and court life - in the manner of the conventional curial - beginning with the ways in which courtiers seek to get the better of one another, as, for example, when the mightier among them make complaints regarding those below them in rank, in order to obtain fiefs for themselves which they begrudge others (RVA 1,3,1 - following the Dutch VB - RVC, 1544, 1650 1,2,1). In the case of courtiers who are, we are told, mainly in service at court for their own self-interest in order to seek wealth and favour, there are more conventional methods of taking advantage of one another, such as making a pretence of being loyal servants when they are not and putting the blame on someone else in order to avoid the ruler's wrath, even if this results in the victim's losing his life and goods (RVC III,3,1), and always making a point of telling the ruler what he wants to hear. The RVC commentator illustrates this type of behaviour in lines attributed to Morsheim:

Vor ogen (Augen) tho denen / ys myne kunst /
Damit make ick my vele gunst /
Tho Haue / by dem Heren myn /
Valschlick dene ick / in gudem schyne
(RVC, 1544, 1650 1.1)
All commentators regret the hypocrisy in the courtiers' treatment of one another. All courtiers become hypocrites, states the 1544 commentator (1,36,1), echoed by the 1650 commentator (1,36,1), if a faithful servant is punished. Later in the work also the RVC commentator remarks on the way in which they give each other their hands in effusive greeting but it is not their hearts they are giving (RVC IV,11,1), while the 1650 commentator, too, quoting Drexelius, draws attention to the difference between what the tongue is saying and what the mind is thinking (1650 III,20,1) in respect of courtiers.

It is also easy to complain with regard to an absent member of the court, the RVA and RVC (11,3,1) commentators tell us, particularly if those present are angry with him.

From the foregoing it will be obvious that, in the opinion of the commentators, envy, hatred and deceit are rampant among courtiers, a state of affairs that was mentioned in the RVC second preface, it will be remembered, and is repeated again specifically in the preface in Book IV in RVA and RVC. In RVC 1,17,1 the commentator refers to the "dubbelde herten" that so many courtiers have: they say white when they mean black and yes when they mean no. A quotation from the Alten Weisen in RVC 1,22,1 puts it this way: "Wente dat gifft (gibt) des Kóninges Hoff / dat syck de dener under einander / nyden umme eren standt / Itzlicher (jeder) ys geneget / den andern tho vordrücken und tho vordrengen." Towards the end of the work, in IV,10,1, the RVC commentator returns to this theme, condemning the envy and jealousy that prevail at court where all jostle for advantage.
Another sin, already touched on, to which courtiers are particularly prone is avarice - in RVA 1,3,1, for example, and RVC, 1544,1650 1,2,1, as we have seen. Also in the prefaces to Book IV in RVA and RVC both commentators refer to the enmity that exists between avaricious courtiers and those who are cunning (RVA "lozen"), the RVC commentator referring to these latter also as "Vosswentzer und Spytzhöde," who are, both of them - that is, the greedy and the cunning flatterers - struggling for the fool's cap. When the avaricious gain power at court, remarks the RVC commentator, the good and upright courtiers suffer if they do not join forces.

A further sin particularly stressed by the commentators is drunkenness, in which the ruler himself is often involved. In RVC, 1544 1,5,4 - based on Agricola (282) - lack of moderation in both eating and drinking is censured, and in RVC 1,24,4 the commentator quotes these lines by Obsopaeus:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Solck laster ys tho Haue gantz gemein} / \\
&\text{Mit drunkenheit / ys men gar unrein.}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Drunkenheit sittet bauen (oben) an der spytz /}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Desûue regert dar bauen alle witz.}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Tho Haue kan keiner denen wol /}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{He supe (saufe) denn vele / dat he werde voll.}
\end{align*}
\]

The 1544 commentator, for his part, is in general agreement - for some perverse reason, he states, Germans think that the greatest honour they can do a man is to get him drunk - stressing particularly the difficulty of keeping anything secret under these circumstances: "Nun ist kein schedlicher im Regiment / denn ein unterschwiegener Rhat," his thoughts here being echoed by the 1650 commentator in 1,22,3. A man who does not get drunk, continues the 1544 commentator in 1,24,3 is a priceless possession, and
rulers should be prepared to pay a high price for such people, where this can be achieved with fairness.\footnote{18} He sums up:

\begin{quote}
Trunkenheit ist ein ursach zur verdamnuszu
 ein dieb des lebens. Ein gift der
gesundheit. Ein offenbererin aller
heimlicheit. Ein feind der ehren, Ein mutter
vieler verderblicher laster. Ein geldtrach.
Ein verderberin gutter vernunft / witz /
verstand / gedechnis / sitten / uund der
gantzen menschlichen natur.
\end{quote}

Turning to the relationship between the courtiers and the ruler, the former are warned in \textit{RVC}, 1544, 1650 I,1 - \textit{Agricola} (267) - that they should not necessarily expect the reward of a ruler's favour because they have served him faithfully; they will very likely obtain less than someone who has not served half so faithfully. The ruler's favour should be regarded as a gift, not as a reward. Nor should a courtier expect an error to be overlooked, particularly as his enemies at court will soon cause him to come into disfavour on account of it (\textit{RVC} preface to Book II). The prince, we are told in \textit{RVC} 11,3,1, has one favourite after another (\textit{Alten Weisen}).

The commentators all agree as well that flatterers have always been the ruin of princes and, through them, of the land and the people. This is introduced in \textit{RVC} I,15,1 by a Sebastian Franck quotation (unattributed, from his edition of Erasmus's \textit{Moria}) where such people are referred to as "Hüchler / smeichler / glynszner / Jaheren / Spytzhöde / Orenklower / Vedderlesers und Leffkosers," names repeated by the 1544 commentator in the same gloss. For his part, the 1650 commentator is concerned here (1,15,4) with slanderers. History is full of examples of such
ruin, all commentators agree, the 1650 commentator drawing attention to the situation in England at the court of the recently beheaded Charles I.  

With such emphasis laid on the hypocrisy and deceit rampant in the courts, it is obvious that the virtue representing the opposite of these, namely truth, must suffer. This is pointed out in RVC, 1544 1,5,4; 1650 1,5,3, where we learn "Ok kan desse böse welt / de warheit nicht erdulden." In RVC 1,17,1 we have, too, the picture in lines by Morsheim of truth being shot to death by arrows constructed of envy, hatred and pride, and in RVC 11,4,3 - again Morsheim - we learn that truth is seldom avowed at court.

The constant state of anxiety that is the lot of courtiers is brought out initially in the "Switzer" quotation in RVC 1,21,1, which we have already noted, likewise in RVC 1,32,1, where service to a king is reckoned as one of the four things that only a fool is bold enough to undertake and from which only the reasonable man can free himself (Alten Weisen). In RVC 1,39,1 also, the possibility of a ruler's being influenced against a courtier by the whispers of false, cunning, faithless people is emphasized (Alten Weisen), and in RVC 1,39,2, it is stated that the courtier lives in continual anxiety, surrounded as it were by snakes and poisonous animals from which he seldom escapes without danger to his life and honour (Alten Weisen).

As might be expected, this precariousness of a courtier's life is linked from RVC onwards with the Fortuna motif. In RVC 1,31 we are told that courtiers are sitting as if on a wheel-
fortune, those who are at the top of the wheel and have the ear of
the ruler calumniating others who will soon replace them and repay
them in the same coin. We also have the simile given here of
those who fall into a trap themselves which they have set for
others. For his part, the 1544 commentator here (1,31) advises a
courtier to consider who he is and what could become of him,
stating "Gunst und ungunst / hasz und gnad / gedeien und
verderben steht alles auff einem Rhat / das stettigs umbherlaufet
ietz unden / ietz oben steht." In 1,32,2 the 1544 commentator
also states that "der meister dieses Büches" obviously wanted to
warn those at court of the inconstant nature of a ruler's favour
and of that of luck herself: a courtier should not risk too much
and should try to keep in favour. Finally, in 1,27,1 the 1650
commentator compares the fate of courtiers to a ball being tossed
up and down: "Also seyn die Hoflinge bald in hohen Ehren und den
Himmel an gehoben; bald aber werden Sie der Erden zu geschlagen"
and reviled by all. "Denn Herrn Gunst ist ein laufendes
Queksilber." All this leads the 1544 commentator to conclude
that since court life is so precarious and hardly enjoyable, no
one should begrudge another the experience (1544 IV,10,3). The
1650 commentator in his parallel gloss, 111,20,2, finds also that
courtiers are to be pitied, since their life is not easy and they
scarcely ever leave the court without damage to their reputations,
urging them in 111,22,3 to try always to leave on a high note
with goodwill and with honour. In 111,6,3 this commentator also
regrets their lack of learning, as far as languages are concerned,
which makes it difficult for them to deal with foreign embassies.
The only requirement, he says, is that they should be rich and
know French: "Wer nicht Französisch reden kan / Der ist am Hof
kein nutzer mann."

It will be obvious from all that has been said that the
commentators will be likely to agree that it is difficult for a
good and virtuous man to survive at court, and this difficulty is
in fact stressed in RVC, 1544, 1650 1,1, where, in a Renner
quotation - Agricola (266) - we learn that: "Selden ys de lange
tho Haue gebleuen / De eintfoldich was / und nicht durchdreuen
(durchtrieben)" and likewise in 1,5,4 (RVC, 1544, 1650) we learn
from Renner again - Agricola (282) - that, "Wo rechte leue (Liebe)
tho Godt haet / Den nimpt men selden in der Fursten raet." This
opinion that a court is no place for a man of integrity is
summarized by the 1650 commentator in a quotation he attributes to
Cusanus: "Exeat aula qui volet esse pius," which he translates as
follows: "Wer sich genommen vor in Gottes furcht zu leben / Der
musz mit allem Fleiss dem Hoffe sich entheben" (1,5,3).

From the above it is a small step to the idea that court life
should be avoided at all costs, a theme which is, in fact,
introduced at at the end of 1,1 (RVC, 1544, 1650) in a quotation
from the Alten Weisen: "Wol (wohl) deme, de buten (ausserhalb) der
Köninge Haue / syne neringe (Nahrung) heeft," the commentators
going on to explain that kings pay little attention to the loyalty
of their servants, being more concerned with what they can get out
of them. Finally, at the end of the work in RVC IV,10,1, this
commentator first - Agricola (271) -, using the simile of hens in
and outside the henhouse, describes how those who are not members
of a princely court are forever wishing that they were, whereas those who are members are always wanting to get away, because they find that their freedom has been taken from them. Then, using the Alten Weisen again, he remarks that it is much better to live in one's own individual fashion in a small dwelling than in a king's court, envied and hated by the majority of those around one:

Dan wowol in solcker waninge (Wohnung) / nicht stedes (immer) de völle und auerfloth (Überfluss) / so ys doch genoch / dath fredesame leuget. Wente wol (wer) ane sorge und forchte leuven mach / dem genoget an water und brode. Wol (wer) augrst gewalt und beuvel (Befehl) hefft / in des Könings Haue (Hofe) / dem beyegent (begegnet) vele mehr wedderwerdicheyt / alse andern menschen.

It is not that entering a ruler's service is bad in itself, the RVC, 1544(1,5,4);1650(1,5,3) commentators assure us - Agricola (282) - instancing Old Testament characters who have held such office, but it is nevertheless difficult for a virtuous man to remain in office in these circumstances.

In connection with government we must now consider the officials, although it is often difficult to separate the three groups of counsellors, courtiers and officials, since their functions at court and in the country were, generally speaking, interchangeable.

The RVA commentator, in 1,17,3, mentions, for example, concerning the wolf - who in the narrative text ate so much that he could no longer get out through the hole into the storeroom by which he had entered - that

darby syn to vorstande alle de, dede komen by eyn leen (Lehen) efte prouene (Pfründe), voghedye (Vogtei), efte wat yd sy, dar rente efte vordeel (Vorteil) to boren (einzunehmen)
is, edder ok eyn ander ghyryger, de wes to hope sleyt (zusammenbringt) unnochsam (ohne gesättigt zu werden) edder ane nöghge (Befriedigung) unde alleyne syn gewinn socht unde syne bathe (Vorteil), unde nycht der meenheyt.

The substance of this gloss is repeated in RVC 1,17,1 where such people are referred to as "alle de / so by grote Lehene / Herschop / Vagdyen / edder ander beuel / dar vordel by ys," who enter through the hole hungry, that is, are inordinately desirous of obtaining an office or position, either ecclesiastical or temporal. Once installed, however, their performance falls far short of what is required. By this is meant, both commentators explain, that they do not think of the welfare, profit, advantage or salvation of the subjects under their jurisdiction but are concerned only with their own gain and profit. The RVA commentator adds a quotation here from the Beatitudes in Latin with an added commentary in German. They tax their subjects to a grossly unfair degree, continues the RVC commentator, so that they themselves become rich and mighty and those under them poor, needy and wretched. The 1544 commentator echoes these strictures (1,17,2) with regard to "Hoffschranzen / amptleuten und Vogten."

Needless to say, avarice is the principal sin of which officials are accused. This occurs again in both RVA II,7,5 and RVC II,7,4 where in both glosses we are told that the wolf represents officials who are like rich and powerful robbers and the bear those who consume the sweat and blood of their subjects and assist in oppressing justice. In RVA III,13,1, RVC III,13,4, likewise we hear of how some avaricious, disloyal officials not
only have secret understandings with the ruler, but even keep the best for themselves, the RVC commentator warning in addition that rulers prefer such employees. Good, upright officials do not stay long in their posts, he maintains, since they do not bring enough profit to their masters, illustrating what he has just said by quotations from the Alten Weisen and from Morsheim. Finally, in IV,13,2, the RVC commentator returns once more to the attack, accusing officials specifically of dirty dealings in the way in which they keep their accounts, naming particularly the "Vögede" and "Renthemeister" in this regard. Often, he maintains, they become so rich that the ruler has to borrow from them.

A different note is struck, however, in RVC III,9,3 in an attributed Franck quotation, where the latter asserts that the office reveals the man: "Nemandt kent den Man / beth (bis) dat en (ihn) syn beualen Ampt / toget an (zeigt)." The two latter commentators, for their part, treat this subject somewhat differently, maintaining instead that people should stay in their offices or professions and not begrudge others their positions, for which they will probably not be suited anyway (1544 III,9,1-2; 1650 III,8,2).

The only two other government professions mentioned in the glosses are those of scribe/notary/clerk and chancellor. With regard to the former, these are referred to four times in the RVC gloss, the three latter times in connection with their legal functions, which we will be considering elsewhere. In RVC I,37,4 the commentator states in connection with the "Notarien und Schryuver" that it is of the utmost importance that they should be
trustworthy and steadfast, that they should in fact be prepared to risk their lives rather than betray the faith and trust put in them. Other desired qualities he mentions are a good memory, a good reputation, efficiency, experience, together with a reasonable lack of avarice, arrogance and self-interest. Schwarzenberg, however, is well aware of the temptations of this profession, which temptations he lists, but ends his verse with the comment: "Jedoch / welcker recht holden eren standt / De tzyren (zieren) wol ein Regiment und Landt."

The scribe, clerk or notary is introduced into the narrative text by the king, who, in Book I, chap. 37, sends for his "notarius unde syn klerk," who "las de breue van swarer sake" (3117-19) - in this case in order to read the fictitious letters that Bellin, the ram, had been given to believe were contained in the satchel that Reinke had handed to him (3057). Here, in the 1544 edition, the commentator has changed the narrative text to read: "Der war Cantzier in grossen sachen," and he proceeds in his gloss, 1,37,4, to describe the skills needed by a chancellor in his diplomatic capacity. He should be able not only to interpret correctly all incoming correspondence, but also to compose suitably subtle replies himself: "Summa also schreiben / wie oder was immer furfallen / wurde aus seiner Schrifft / das er ihm ein gute farb anstreichen konne / Da gehort kunst und witz zu." He goes on to stress the enormous benefit of a good chancellor, not only to the ruler but also to the country and people as well. The prosperity or the ruin of all are in fact in his hands, the latter being particularly likely to be the case, implies the 1650 commentator.
(1,35,3) - who otherwise agrees with his predecessor's summary - if the ruler allocates to him too much power.

As for the RVC commentator, he is concerned in IV,13,1 only with the latter kind of chancellor, whom he accuses of financial double-dealing, and, through Morsheim, addresses as follows: "Juwe (Eure) Ja / könne gy (Ihr) uthdüden (ausdeuten) dorch Nein / Van rechter truwe synt gy gantz reyn."

Summary

a) We have seen that in RVC particularly the main points are emphasized which we have noted from the earlier curials - the envy and hatred at court, for example, the self-interest, the corruption, the jostling of courtiers for favour, likewise the deceit and hypocrisy in their treatment of one another and in their dealings with the ruler, their constant flattery of the latter and the lack of freedom which they experience.

b) With regard to the ruler's relationship with the courtiers, the latter should never expect to be rewarded for their services - the reward will probably go to someone unworthy. The ruler's favour - which is inconstant - should rather be regarded as a gift.

c) Avarice and drunkenness are the chief additional sins targeted, the latter not included in the previous curials we have studied and an interesting illustration of the extent to which this vice had come to be considered during this period as the besetting sin of the German nation.³²²
d) The problem of the "good" man at court is also mentioned, who is unlikely to stay long unless he becomes corrupted, the commentators agreeing that he is unlikely to stay long unless he becomes corrupted.

e) The Fortuna motif of the ever-revolving wheel is linked in RVC and 1544 to the precariousness of the courtiers' lives and fates. (We will be dealing with the Fortuna theme at a later stage.)

f) The tension between the attractions of the active and contemplative life is illustrated in all four glosses (1,1) in the Alten Weisen quotation extolling the simple life.

g) With regard to the individual glosses:

(i) In RVA the main emphasis is on courtiers qua officials, which is only to be expected from a commentator who was both a resident of an imperial city and also particularly concerned with the social evils of his time.

(ii) Only the RVC gloss can be considered to possess a real curial element, with the majority of the points we have observed raised in the other curials being emphasized here also. These are often put forward by the commentator himself with illustrations from the Alten Weisen, Morsheim and Agricola.

(iii) Discounting early glosses, where, as we already know,
this commentator was following RVC very closely, the main emphasis in the 1544 gloss and as also in 1650 is on the precariousness of court life, linked with the Fortuna motif or one similar to it, and including practical advice to courtiers to consider carefully their position (1544) and to know when to leave (1650).

In the 1650 gloss we noted also the disparaging remark to the effect that all that was required of a courtier on the educational level was a knowledge of French (11,6,3), a further illustration of this commentator's detestation of the inroads being made by French culture in the Germany of his time.

A word should be said here, at the end of this section, regarding the first chapter-gloss (1,1), translated practically word for word, as we have noted, in the two subsequent glosses, for here we have presented one after the other the three main elements of government we have been considering here, namely temporal authority - including the statement that this authority must on no account be resisted - followed by a positive description of the duties of those exercising this authority, coupled with a negative picture of the principal abuses of this power - for example, avarice leading to the acceptance of bribes in the administration of justice - and, finally, an account of the current shameful state of princely courts, ending with the advice to avoid these.
(iv) The law and its executants

My principle though not exclusive purpose here in this section on law will be to show the evidence reflected in the glosses of both the extent to which the practice of customary law still prevailed in the individual commentator's immediate vicinity and that to which Roman law had gained acceptance. Roman law—in the RVC gloss at least—being usually referred to as Imperial law (Keyserliches Recht).\textsuperscript{325}

German customary law was essentially a local affair, the old "Schöffengerichte" being tribunals of lay jurors where justice was administered by men of high standing in the community, of proven wisdom and with practical experience, who embodied the conscience of the community.\textsuperscript{324} There were no written records of the proceedings in such a court. Under Roman law, on the other hand, which was based fundamentally on reason, judgement was given by professionally trained academics and legal experts.\textsuperscript{326} Jurors and judges were no longer separate entities, and communal relations tended rather to become a set of obligations between individuals.\textsuperscript{326} To quote Rupprich:

Mit der Durchführung der Rezeption [vom Römischen Recht] nun traten im Rechtswesen und in der Verwaltung anstelle der nach der alten Volksrechten, aus Erfahrung und Überzeugung urteilenden Schöffen römisch gebildete Juristen, anstelle des mündlichen, öffentlichen Verfahrens trat ein schriftliches und geheimes. Öffentliches und Privatrecht werden getrennt, die Einheit von Recht und Sitte aufgehoben.\textsuperscript{327}

The old German customary law was not, however, uniform throughout the Empire, although the customs and procedures
codified in Low German by Eike von Repgow in the thirteenth century under the title Der Sachsenspiegel and reproduced in High German under the title Der Schwabenspiegel, were representative of legal procedures in a large part of the country. There was also a Lübisches Recht, the area in which it was applied extending from the Holstein border in the north west to the Polish border east of Stölp and including the region surrounding Danzig.

Pressure to adopt the Roman system appears to have come from both above and below. The establishment of the Imperial Chamber Court (Reichskammergericht) at the Diet of Worms in 1495, with its provision that half of the assessors must hold a doctorate in law and that the court must reach a verdict in accordance with the common law of the empire, encouraged the territorial princes to model their own courts on the higher one. There is evidence, however, that at the same time litigants in lower courts where customary law prevailed were seeking the advice of trained lawyers.

It is interesting, nevertheless, that it has not been possible to trace any connection between the early reception of Roman law and the growth of trade and commerce, large and wealthy trading towns such as Lübeck, Hamburg, Köln, Nürnberg and Augsburg, for example, resisting its adoption for many years.

As far as the Humanists are concerned, perhaps surprisingly they were not generally in favour of the introduction of Roman law. Most of all they deplored the glosses, without which the original provisions of this law were not generally accepted in the courts: "Quidquid non agnoscit glossa, nec agnoscit forum" ("What
is not recognised by the glosses will not be recognised by the courts".\(^{332}\). As with their desire to return always to original texts - of Scripture, the classics, early manuscripts - here it was for them a case of back to Justinian.\(^{333}\) An example of a Humanist who attempted to do just this is Ulrich Zasius in the statutes he drew up for the city of Freiburg i.Br. in 1520.\(^{334}\)

With regard to criminal law, a certain fusion between customary and Roman law - something that usually ended in failure in places where it was tried\(^{335}\) - was achieved in the German penal code, the *Constitutio criminalis Carolina* of 1532, which itself was based on the Bamberg penal code (*Halsgerichtsordnung*), drawn up by Schwarzenberg in 1507 and introduced in all Hohenzollern territories in 1516.\(^{336}\)

As far as the jurists are concerned, it will be obvious that anyone so named will have had some formal training in Roman law. Men with this formal training - initially acquired in Italy - had in fact already been employed in the service of princes and in the ecclesiastical courts for more than two centuries.\(^{337}\) The term jurist can cover, of course, a wide range of occupations from chancellor down through judges and attorneys to clerks and notaries,\(^{338}\) and as a class they had tended to be the butt of adverse criticism from the later Middle Ages onwards, as previously in ancient Rome.\(^{339}\) With regard to the writers from whose work the *RVC* commentator draws, Sebastian Brant was in fact a "Doktor beider Rechte," in other words he had studied both civil and canon law, acquiring a doctorate in both from the University of Basel in 1489.\(^{340}\)
With regard to Luther, it is interesting to note how his original preference for customary over Roman law developed over the years. In his "An den christlichen Adel" (1520), for instance, he writes: "Es dunckt mich gleich, das landrecht und land sitten den keyszerlichen gemeynenen rechten werden furgetzogen, und die keyszerlichen nur zur not braucht" (WA 6,459). In the same vein, a few months later, he expresses his firm belief in the superiority in the juridical field of the naturally gifted man over the expert. A state is never governed successfully by means of law, he writes in his "De captivitate Babylonica" (1520). It should rather be governed by a natural sense of justice, with more stress laid on putting wise men in office who will judge with equity (WA 6,554; LW 36,98). Luther returns to this theme in his two tracts "Von weltlicher Oberkeyt" (1523) and "Ob Kriegsleute" (1526), in the first of which we read:

Eyn recht gut urteil das musz und kan nicht ausz büchern gesprochen werden sondern ausz freyem sinn daher als were keyn büch. Aber solch frey urteil gibt die liebe und naturlich recht, des alle vernunft voll ist. Ausz den büchern kommen gespannen und wanckende urteyl (WA 11,279).

And in the second tract in much the same way he pleads for an emphasis on equity, which he calls "Billicheit," in examining every aspect of a case, including motivation:

Denn weil das recht mus und soll einfeltiglich mit dürren kurzen worten gestellet werden, kan es nicht alle zufelle und hindernis mit einfassen... Also müssen und sollen alle rechte, wilche auff die that gestellet sein, der Billicheit als der meysterin unterworfen sein umb der manchfaltigen, unzelichen, ungewissen zufelle willen, die sich begeben können und niemand sie kan zuvor abmalen odder
By his own admission, however, Luther had by 1530 become reconciled to Roman law, since in this year in his "Kinder zur Schule halten" he writes of "unser regiment jnn deudischen landen," which "nach dem Römischen Keyszerlichen recht sich richten mus und sol" (WA 30:2,557). There is evidence, too, that by 1534, as we learn from his interpretation of the 101st psalm, he had been forced to accept a general lack of wise men among the ruling class — men whom in the past he considered to have been divinely inspired — so it is better that those men available, in their judicial capacity at least, "der stummen meister (das ist der bucher) schuler sein und bleiben" (WA 51,214).

As regards jurists, while well aware how much havoc they could cause in princely courts — he remarks at one point in the course of the first of the tracts mentioned above regarding counsellors at court who exercise this function that "das wort Rethe nicht weit von wort Verrether ist" (WA 30:2,559) — Luther is nevertheless also aware that such people have a vital function to perform in the temporal world: "So sind nu die Juristen und gelehrten jnn diesem welltlichen reich die personen, so solch recht und da durch das welltlich reich erhalten" (WA 30:2,558).

Regarding judges, he remarks on the qualifications necessary for fulfilling this office in his interpretation of the eighth (ninth) commandment in his "Grosser Katechismus" as follows: "Denn es gehoret fur allen dingn ein fromer man zu einem Richter und nicht allein ein fromer sondern auch ein weiser, gescheider, ia auch ein kuner und kecker man" (WA 30:1,169).
As far as litigation is concerned, Luther had a good deal to say about this in his "Grosser Sermon von dem Wucher" (1520):
"Haddernn vor gericht strafft widder Bapst noch Keyser, Es strafft aber Christus und seyn lere" (WA 6,39). And later:

Alszo musz man auch noch dulden, die umb zeytlich gutt rechen und fechten...Aber, man soll yhn sagen, das das selb nicht Christlich noch verdinstlich wol than sey, sondernn ein menschlich und yrdisch werck, vorhinderlich zur selickeit mehr den forderlich...Nu ist das mit der weg zum frid, suo ydermann das seyne widder foddert, uund nichts unrecht leiden will...Es musz ein teyl dem andern still halten und leyden, soll frid bleyben, und ob man lange zeponckt und haddert, musz es doch zuletzt auffhören mit vielen erlitten schaden und ubell (WA 6,40).

We must now examine the glosses for references which will give some indication of the kind of law - customary or Roman law - the individual commentator had in mind when compiling his gloss, beginning with those concerned with

a) the necessity for securing a fair trial for the accused.

The first glosses on this topic derive from the following verses in RVA:

De konynck leet beden al, de he kende,
De kloeksten van rade, syck wol to bespreken,
Wo he desse undaet best mochte wreken (rachen)
Up (auf) Reynken....(446-49)

Here, in the glosses, we note that the RVA commentator derives the first three of the items in 1,6 from Alckmaer:

Dutch VB ("morael" to ch.vi) RVA 1.6

Al is dat de Rechter somtijts (manchmal) clachten (Klagen) hoort over eenighe van sine onderzaten (Untertanen), nochtans (dennoch) en sal hijer gheen (keine) haestige vvrake (Räche) over doen;

Dat erste is, al yset so, dat eyn vorste, eyn here efte eyn ander rychter waraftige klage horet van synen underzaten over eynen, de deme suluen ghelyck is,
maer sal hem regeren nae den Raet ende segghen van zijne vvijse ende goede Raetslieden, roepende (indem er fordert) den misdadighen tsijnen verantvwordenen ende defencien.

dedder ok bouen (über) deme edder benedden (unter) deme, dat he nochtans nene hastyge wrake ouer em don schal.

Dat ander is, dat he hebben schal kloke, wyse radeslude, de wyszheyt wetten unde sake, dede lastich (verwickelt) is, de in rechtferdicheyt to underscheden (richtig beurteilen und entscheiden)

Dat drydde, datmen neemande schal vorordelen (verurteilen) unghes-esschet (ungefordert) edder unghervoiragen.

The RVC commentator, in 1,5,2 and 3, reproduces almost word for word the glosses quoted above under RVA 1,6,1 and 3, while changing the second gloss in RVA (his fourth) regarding the counsellors who are advising the king. By means of this alteration he makes this particular gloss, which we have already considered above, much more general, so that it can refer to the administration as a whole, with disputes between subjects mentioned only secondarily. In RVC 1,5,2 and 3, furthermore, he adds extracts from Agricola (198) (unattributed) where, in 1,5,2, he stresses the function of the judge, how it is a foolish and wicked judge who does not hear both sides. God has given them (Heren und Richtern) two ears, he writes, so that with the one - the left - they can listen to the accuser, and with the other - the right - they can listen to the accused. In the extract from the same Agricola proverb, moreover, which he quotes in 1,5,3, he
is even more explicit in a legal sense:

Dan de Kayserlyken rechte seggen: Defensio est de jure naturali. Dat ys: Idt ys recht und natürlich / dat syck eyne vorandtwerde und jegenwére (Verteidigungsmittel)söke (suche) / so he wormith beschuldiget wert.

(In the Agricola original this last phrase reads: "wo yhm ettwas unbillichs wirt auff gelegt".)

What we have therefore in RVA, following the narrative text and the VB "morael," is the picture of a prince or noble in his capacity as judge taking counsel with his nearest advisers regarding his next step. In RVC 1,5,4, however, as we have already seen, the commentator has expanded his predecessor's particular reference to counsellors engaged in giving judicial advice in a difficult case (RVA 1,6,2) to a general reference to counsellors in all their functions (RVC 1,5,4). Moreover, his use here of Agricola (198) with the reference both to the judge hearing a case alone (apparently) (1,5,2) and also to the "Keyserlyken rechte" in 1,5,3, would appear to indicate familiarity with the new legal codes and procedures.

As far as the two later RV glosses are concerned, the 1544 commentator translates all three RVC glosses (1,5,2-4) word for word. The 1650 commentator, however, reproduces only 1544 1,5,2 and 3, omitting the fourth gloss altogether. (Generally speaking, by 1650 the practice of Roman law had spread throughout Germany, the first reliable account of its reception in the country having been printed in 1643. There is therefore no point in paying too much attention to what is written here in this commentary in this connection.)
Two separate points made here, although they are part of the same concept, namely that the accused should not be overcome by a surprise attack and that he should be given a chance to defend himself in court, receive further treatment in the glosses. In RVC 1,11,1, for example - following RVA I,11,6 - the commentator states that an accused man who has not answered the first summons should be summoned a second time and not attacked suddenly through anger, hatred or favour (to others). Both points are taken up by the 1544 commentator, though without specific mention of a second summons. It is "naturlich und recht," this 1544 commentator states in 1,11,1 that the accused's arguments should be heard, so that no one should suffer injustice and be undeservedly and precipitately condemned, although innocent. The 1650 commentator, in 1,11,2, substitutes here for "naturlich und recht" the words "denn dasz ist der Natur gemes (gemäss) und der Billichkeit ehnlich."

The necessity for the other side to be given a hearing is stressed again in three out of the four glosses of 11,3, where, in RVA II,3,4, we learn "datmen den beklageden to worden schal steden." This point is not taken up, however, by the RVC commentator, but is mentioned in 1544 II,3,3: "soll man allweg in gerichten und straffen / den spruch bedencken / Audi alteram partem." (These Latin words take up a full line of the original RVA text -1.3460 - where they are spoken by the queen at the beginning of Book II in defence of Reinke, appearing in the 1544 narrative text as "Uund hor auch alteram partem." ) In the parallel gloss in 1650 - II,3,2 - the concept is rendered as: "Man
muss nicht einen Theil/ sondern beide verhören." For his part, the 1544 commentator returns twice more to this subject in his commentary - in III,2,6 urging "die Oberkeit" to hear both "klag und antwort../ und darnach richten" and in IV,2,1, where he states that "man nicht urteilen oder richten soll / man hab dann beide teil gehört."

The fact that the Latin quotation mentioned above appears originally in Reinaert II - "Alteram partem audite" (3678) - appears to confirm the evidence that already exists for the early employment in the Low Countries of men with formal training in Roman law to speak in court on behalf of litigants.₃₄₃

b) Summonsing to court

With regards to the three-time summons to court, we have the following parallel passages in RVA and RVC:

RVA 1,14,9

Dat negede (neunte) artikel
dat hir de poete menet (meint)
is andrepente (befasst sich mit)
den heren unde den richterenn, dat
se nemande ouervallen, wo vele
dlage dar ok kumpt, yd en sy
dan, dat he sy drewerff(dreimal)
gheschet (gefodert)tho rechte.

RVC 1,14,2

Thom andern. Ein Fürste
Here edder Richter /
schal nemande
ouerfallen effte vor-
richten (verurteilen)
wo vele klagenn ock
jegen jemadene / ange-
bracht werden. Sunnder
na rade syner wysen
Rede / und vermoge
der Rechte / dre mael
tho rechte vordern
laten.

Following this passage in RVC we have a quotation from the Alten Weisen to the effect that a prince or noble should keep his anger in check and take advice from his loyal counsellors as to the course of action he should follow.

In 1544 1,14,2, however, which otherwise follows RVC quite
closely, there is no mention of the three-time summons, only that the accused should be summoned "vermöge der Rechten." Later in the gloss, after a summary of the Alten Weisen quotation, this commentator mentions in addition the "abgunst, geschencke oder freundschaft" which can cause a man to be condemned "on Rechtliche / fürladung und verhör." This gloss is not taken up by the 1650 commentator.

Here we have, then, in RVA, the statement that the accused must be summoned three times to appear in court to defend himself - an obvious reference to customary law - this passage being repeated in RVC with the additional phrase "na rade syner wysen Rede / und vormöge der Rechte." As regards the "Rechte" referred to here, then, these must be customary law, as in RVA. In the 1544 gloss, on the other hand, there is no mention of the three-time summons, and this commentator had also, as we saw, omitted mention of the second summons in 1,11,1. It is significant also that the RVC commentator illustrates his statement regarding the summons with a passage from the "ancient" Alten Weisen rather than from the "modern" Agricola. In his gloss here, then, the RVC commentator would seem to be reflecting the procedures of customary law, while the 1544 commentator, by avoiding reference to the three-time summons, reveals his unfamiliarity with the concept.

c) Witnesses

With regard to witnesses - references to the presence or alternatively to the absence of which are quite frequent in the
narrative text, where their presence or absence plays quite a large part in the plot - we will note that there is no very great difference in the commentators' descriptions of either the function of these or of the requirements for their moral make-up.

They are first introduced into the narrative text in a brief description of Reinke's first trial, where we read:

Int leste (dat ich korte desse wort)
Quemen (kamen) etlyke tueghe (Zeugen) dar vort,
Dat waren uprychtyghe waraftyghe (Wahrheit-liebende) 
mans:
Se tughenden ouer Reynken heel unde ganz
Schuldich to wesen in der myssedaet (1811-15).

In the 1544 edition the passage runs:

Aber die zeugen kamen dar /
Denen auch wol zugleuben war.
Die zeugten all es wer also /
Wie man ietz hett geklagt aldo.

In his gloss of l,20,5 the RVA commentator states that "eyn here efte richter nicht louen (glauben) schal allen klagers, men myt waraftygen tuegen de warheyt soeken unde dar na rychten...," a gloss which is reproduced in RVC l,20,1 with regard to "warhafftige unpartyesche tuge (Zeugen)" through whom "Heren und Richter" should " de warheit der sake...gründtlick erforschen / und darop (darauf) dorch ein rechtmetig (rechtmässig) ordel (Urteil) / ernstlick vortfaren." The 1544 commentator, in l,20,1, concurs here with regard to the necessity for "glaubwirdiges gezeugnusz," particularly in "blüt sachen," urging the "Richter oder Herr" to take stern measures with regard to evil-doers. (Here the 1650 commentator has altered the narrative text to read that the witnesses "zeugten dasz es wahr gesaget / was geklaget / Weil Sie wohl mit gelt beschmirt," so his gloss regarding
dishonest witnesses can be disregarded.)

The next reference to witnesses in the narrative text refers rather to the lack of them, when, that is, at the end of Book III, chap. 2, Reinke cannot be condemned for either the female crow's death nor for his attack on the rabbit, since the latter and the male crow are not able to produce witnesses to these deeds. There is no comment in RVA on this passage in the text. The RVC commentator, however, describes in minute detail how Reinke, here, was basing his stand on the law in demanding that his adversaries produce "loffwerdige tüge (glaubwürdige Zeugen)"

Dan eyn kleger/de wat up eynen andern klaget / schal datsüue bewysen. Und wo he syne klage nicht bewyset / so schal dat yegendel (Gegenteil = Angeklagte) dersüuegen klage haluen / leddich (frei) erkant werden. So och dat beklagede part / nichts daryegen verbröchte edder bewysede. Wedderumme so de kleger / syne klage genochsam bewysen kan / so schal vor (für) densüuegen geordelt (geurteilt) werden. Idt were dan / dat de beklagede klar und apenbar bewys daryegen vorbröchte / dat nicht twielhafftich (zweifelhaft) were (RVC III.2.3).

The 1544 commentator makes no attempt to follow his predecessor here in his minute description of the legal background, although what he writes in III,2,18 accords with the first part of it, namely "das einer der klagen will / mit beweisungen geschickt sei / denn wenn er nicht beweist / so wirt der Beklagt absoluiert / ob er wol nichts zur unschuld einbracht." Later, in a further gloss on the same chapter (III,2,19), this commentator is concerned that there should be close scrutiny of the evidence presented, particularly in the case of "befreiheits hohen personen," apparently questioning the motives of some
witnesses: "Drumb ist wol acht drauff zu haben / was einer beweist / der einen umb sein leben gedenckt zu bringen."

Finally, in the last chapter of Book III, it is again a question of producing witnesses to come forward to attest to the means of Lampe's, the hare's death, the king stating in the following lines:

Doch efft jemand welke tughe brochte
De waraftich syn, van gudeme rochte (Ruf),
De komen vort, so hir is ghesecht,
Und geuen (geben) syck hir myt Reynken int recht

(The substance of this passage is reproduced in the 1544 and 1650 narrative texts.)

This brings forth from the RVA commentator the remark that "eyn rychter richten schal na klaghe unde na antworde unde schal vaste umberochtyge tugen lüen (zuversichtlichen, unbescholtenen Zeugen glauben)" (III,14,1). The RVC commentator omits a direct reference here either to his predecessor's comment or to the text. For his part, however, the 1544 commentator requires "gut gezeugnisz in schweren und besonder in peinlichen sachen" (III,14,1). And he is followed here by the 1650 commentator in his parallel gloss (III,11,2), who states that the king in calling for witnesses is fulfilling the office of an "aufrichtigen und unparteischen Richters / welcher nicht sol sehen was diser oder jener ordnet / sondern wie er solches beweise." He then makes reference to 1.2.ff. de testibus, where it is enacted, he states, that attention should be paid to what kind of people are called as witnesses, "ob sie auch glaubwürdig / ehrlich von guten sitten und der Erbarkeit beflissen / denn Zeugen an derer Treu und Glauben
man zweifelt / dieselbige sol man nicht zulassen." Following this, in RVA 111,4,6; RVC 111,4,3, in reference to the story the she-ape tells based on the Aesop fable of the snake and the man, both commentators agree that a judge should not accept as witnesses those who are of evil repute.

As far as witnesses are concerned, therefore, we observe here that the qualities required of such people under customary law (RVA) - that they should be lovers of truth, be reliable and have a good reputation - have apparently found their way into, or more probably were already present in codified Roman law. (It has already been pointed out that the 1532 Carolina, the German penal code, was an amalgamation of customary and Roman law.)

Most interesting here, however, is the long passage, quoted above, by the RVC commentator under 111,2,3, which would appear to be an extract from codified customary law (the Lübisches Recht?). Yet in another item in the same chapter-gloss (111,2,2), which we will be considering soon in another connection, this commentator is obviously conversant with Roman legal procedure, or at any rate with the executants of this law, the jurists. Add to this the fact that among the sources Grimm lists in his book Deutsche Rechtsaltrtümer he includes the fourth edition, published in 1700, of an apparent Latin commentary on the Lübisches Recht, and we are left with the picture - in Rostock, that is - of customary law, or at some point a Latin gloss of this, being applied in the courts of law by jurists with legal training in Roman law.

The last reference to witnesses occurs in the preface to Book
IV in RVA and RVC with regard to the duel between the wolf and Reinke, with which the poem ends. Here the RVA commentator explains that where it was impossible to prove a case by means of witnesses - this being especially difficult in cases of adultery, as he states later - "so plach (pflegte) man oldynges (in alten Zeiten) de warheyt unde de rechtferdicheit to beschermen myt eyneme kampe." This reference to such an event occurring in the old days (wandages) is retained in RVC, where the commentator provides additional motivation for such a step, namely defence of the wronged party's "Eere und Adel."

The main interest here is the obvious antiquarian aspect of the duel. It was for both commentators something that had happened in the olden days, as opposed, one can argue, to the other references to customary law which we have just been considering. The above adds in fact to the impression of a co-existence over a long period, at least in the northern part of the German Empire, of both kinds of law.

An isolated remark of the 1544 commentator's in 11,1,8 is also of interest on account of the reference he makes to codified Roman law. Here he points out that whoever is in a position to anticipate, ward off or punish an evil deed (wer ein ubelthat furkomen / weren und straffen kan und soll) and does not, shall be held to have committed the deed, referring to Recht 1 adigere.ff. de patron.

We will now turn to the commentators' treatment of jurists, a term which, as we have already noted, covers all those engaged in the administration of the law.
With regard to judges, we have already noted most of the things a judge should and should not do in the previous section on the duties of a ruler. Those of a judge in particular are well summed up by the RVC commentator in 1,20,1 where he writes in an apparently original entry:

Uth dessem Capitel ys vornehmlich tho leren / dat alle Heren und Richter up erden /nicht der menschen / sunder Gades Gerichte foren. Und gelick wo se richten / also werden se gerichtet werden. Se schollen in dem fruchten (Furcht) des Heren handeln / und alle dinck mit vlyte utrichten. Dann by dem Heren unserm Gade / ys nen unrecht noch anseent der personen / noch annement der gauen etc.

There is a marginal gloss here to 2 Para. (Chron) 16.547

One of the most interesting glosses regarding judges for the light this throws on the RVC commentator’s knowledge of Roman law is RVC 111,14,1 where, against a marginal note "Straffe der unrechtferdygenn Richter. Codi. de pena Judicis / qui male judi(cat)"...he describes in an apparently original entry the punishment laid down in both civil law (Borgherlyken saken) and criminal law (pynlyken saken) for a judge found intentionally guilty - particularly if he took bribes - of giving an unjust judgement. In a civil case he will be completely dishonoured and must indemnify the wronged party threefold, in a criminal case he must forfeit all his possessions and suffer banishment into the bargain. And even in a case where false judgement was not intentional, he must indemnify the wronged litigant for damages sustained. In his parallel gloss (111,14,2) the 1544 commentator considers that such judgements given against judges themselves provide a healthy deterrent to others and, likewise, encouragement
to judge justly and impartially for both their own and the common
good.

Otherwise the chief concerns of the 1544 commentator are,
firstly, for careful investigation in criminal cases - in
1,19,4, when the accused proclaims his innocence, and, in 1,20,1-
3, in general - a life being something that cannot be restored if
it is subsequently discovered that a mistake has been made. This
he repeats in III,4,5 (1650 III,4,4), where he suggests that a
judge should not preside alone over a capital case (das sich einer
allein nimmermehr soll uber blut zurichten). Secondly, he is
concerned about the type of person appointed as a judge - he
should not be under the Christian ban, for example, that is,
living openly in vice (II,9,9), or a stupid person who may owe
his appointment to his wealth or family connections: "Drumb soll
man nicht ungeschickte tolpel / sonder erbare verstendige ßmanner
zu solchem ampt brauchen / und nicht ansehen / ob jener grosses
geschlechts oder Reich sei" (III,4,7). The 1650 commentator in
III,4,3 changes the meaning here. Judges should not seek to
enrich themselves by their judgements, he states; it is dangerous
when "geitizige und neidische" judges pass sentence.

Twice, also, the 1544 commentator stresses the importance
that a judge should attach to being praised for his work, "das men
sprechen: Es were nie kein unrecht urteil von ihm erfharen worden"
(III,1,10). The second time he admonishes a judge to consider
his honour, since it is honourable to gain a reputation for
many just, impartial judgements, but "nicht einn geringe schand /
das man spricht 'O / kumpts an den / so gehet das Recht den
Krebsgang. "Geschweig seines gethanen Eides'" (III,4,10). With regard to a judge's treatment of the accused, the 1544 commentator recommends that this should be friendly (I,19,2: 1650 I,18,1). He should not turn on him like a lion, or the accused might become too confused to defend his innocence: "Ist er [der Angeklagte] unschuldig / so ruhmet er des Herren gute. Ist er schuldig / so hat der Herr die schuld mehr mit rhat denn mit that erlernet uund erfaren." On the same topic this commentator in III,2,17, brings up the question of "scharffe fragen," stating that he has himself experienced more than one case where a man has confessed under "de grosse marter" to a deed of which he was innocent. If a man loses his life in this way, he maintains, the judge should lose his head. He is also concerned in III,1,7 that every judge before going into court should pray for wisdom and understanding to judge aright.

The examples given here from the 1544 gloss with regard to judges and their functions suggest, it seems to me, a process of law carried out by one man alone unassisted by jurors, in other words the practice of Roman rather than of customary law. The fact, however, that things were still in a state of flux even in the area of the country where this 1544 commentator was active, is borne out by his lament in III,3,7 regarding the lack of trained jurists in nobles' courts.

Turning to jurists in general, the commentators who are the most critical regarding these are those of RVC and 1650. With regard to notaries and clerks, these are lambasted by the former commentator in II,9,6, where he describes them as men empowered by
both parties in a lawsuit to draw up the case in the required formal way but who take bribes in order to perform this function for the benefit of one side. "Dan solche konnen gemeinlick slipen und wenden (glattzuegig sein) / Und hebben dat spel (Spiel) in beyden henden." He returns to this type of attack in IV,13,1. The notaries (Schrueryen) delay proceedings, he alleges, and the litigants on the one side are left wondering how much bribery is taking place on the part of the other side. In RVC III,2,2 also he accuses them (Scribente) of aiding and abetting the attorneys.

These latter (Advocaten und sakewaldygen) come in for the worst criticism in this gloss, which is apparently an original one, their main purpose being, according to this commentator

\[
de \text{Richten} \text{the \ vorgifftigen} / \text{de Richter the} \text{bedr} \text{egen (betrugen)} / \text{de gemeinen frede und} \text{wolstandt / tho vorhindern / löfflyke} \\
\text{(löblische) Gesette the vorkeren / und derwegen van Godt und den mynschen / vorhatet (verhasst) syn.}
\]

This they do, of course, for money, he maintains, seeking also delays in the legal process to this end. He accuses them, furthermore, of instigating lawsuits: "Dan vele mynschen wurden numéro the rechte gan / ock vele leuer (lieber) was unrechtes er dulden / so de velheyt und willige denst der Vorspraken (de stedes lauen to wynnen) nicht vorhanden," and much less damage would be done to the "Christlyken Gemeine," for the multiplicity of suits and attorneys leads to the cooling and the eventual disappearance of brotherly love. He goes so far in fact as to compare the confusion caused by all the lawsuits to arson, the result of which is the destruction and devastation of the common good. Having introduced quotations from Plato, Cato and Augustine
in support of his views with regard to attorneys, the commentator ends with one from Brandt's *Narrenschyp*, whose remarks are no less uncomplimentary.

One hundred years later, the 1650 commentator, quoting Moscherosch, is saying much the same thing:

Were keine Advocaten /
So waren keine Proces;
keine Proces / keine procuratores
keine procuratores, keine Triegerey /
keine Triegerey kein Unrecht;
kein Unrecht / kein Klager
kein Klager / kein Richter
kein Richter kein Schergen
kein Schergen / kein Henker.

No sooner has an attorney (Advocat) heard half a case, he maintains, than he is certain he can win it. "Geld das stum ist / macht recht / was krum ist" (1650 11,7,4).

On another point also the opinions of the RVC and 1650 commentators coincide, namely regarding legal glosses. In RVC 111,4,2, for example, the commentator holds the jurists and legal scholars (Juristen und Rechteszuvorstendigen) responsible for complicating written laws (de geschreuen Rechte) through too many interpretations, which alter the meaning of the original law. Quoting Franck's edition of Erasmus's *Moria* (unattributed), he writes:

Und dewyle se glose mit glosen / eyne opinion
mit des andern meininge / vormeren und
thosamende dragen (zusammenbringen)..maken se/
dat de sülue kunst und ûüinge (Übung) der
Rechte / vor de alder swareste
(allerieschwierigste) wert geachtet.

As far as the 1650 commentator is concerned, in the same gloss as the one from which we have already quoted (11,7,4), he
also inveighs, again through Moscherosch, against the quantity of legal glosses, quoting Justus Lipsius in Latin, which passage he translates as follows:

Almely alte Klag' und Schimpfspruch
ist gewesen /
dasz der Juristen Schrift und übermachtes lesen
Kamelen Bürde sey. Nun werden Elephant / aus Indien kaum kaum ertragen ihren Tand.

With regard to litigants, in RVA III,2,4 and RVC III,2,5, both commentators remark on how, when "eyn sympel mynsche" (RVA). "geringen und framens minschen" (RVC) lay complaints against "eyneme grote heren" (RVA), "de lystigen, geweldigen und ryken" (RVC), the former often become intimidated and do not follow through. Otherwise it is the 1544 commentator who is particularly concerned about litigants and whose remarks are somewhat more censorious than those of his predecessor. In 11,9,4, for example, he suggests that they should be made to swear that they will not mischievously start quarrels and arguments in court, and thus delay proceedings, by relying on their "geschwinde / listige Procuratorn odder selbs eigne fundlin." He continues: "Dann einer hab ein sach so bosz er wol / so macht er sich damit ans Recht / uund hofft noch damit zubestehen." In III,11,4 the 1650 commentator has much the same advice, counselling here the plaintiff (Kläger) and defendant (Angeklagte) that they should "das Recht nicht hemmen / sonder demselbigen seien freyen Lauff lassen." In III,12,2 the 1544 commentator also advises litigants never to conceal anything from their attorneys.

In III,1,6 the 1544 commentator advises litigants not to be defiant in front of "die Oberkeit," especially judges,
recommending further in III,12,1 that they should not become impatient regarding delays in princely courts, for the "grosse Heren und Regenten" have much to do, an appeal echoed by the 1650 commentator in his parallel gloss, III,9,1: "Darum Unterthanen und die an Hofen etwas zu schlichten haben / nicht sollen alsobald überdrüssig werden / wenn sie nicht in einem mal ihren Abschied und Ausspruch erhalten." They should remember, he urges, that they are not the only people with matters to settle. The 1544 commentator is also very scathing about people who complain about others in court behind their backs, since what is related under these circumstances is seldom the truth and should not be believed (III,2,3 and 6).

Generally speaking, there are few favourable comments on the administration of justice in any of the glosses, many points concerning which have already been covered, and this applies to RVC particularly. Quotations from two of this commentator’s most often used sources must serve to illustrate this. The first of these from II,9,8, the last gloss of Book II, includes an extract from Brandt’s Narrenschyp (46), the last part of which runs:

De Rechtferticheit ys blindt und dodt.
Alle dinck ys underdan dem gelde /
De gelt hefft / krycht ock wol gewelde (Gewalt).
Dat ys nu worden sere gemeine /
Men vindet der Stede mer dan eine
Dar men hantsmeringe gerne upnemet (einnimmt)
Und dartho vele deyt (tut) dat nicht temet (ziemt).
Gelt / nydt/ Fründschop / Gewalt und gunst /
Thobreken (zerbrechen) nu / Recht / Breue
Segele (Siegel) und kunst.

Brant, as we know, was an academically trained jurist who held important judicial positions in Strasbourg at the turn of the
century (c.1500).

The most violent condemnation of the administration of justice, however, in RVC 1,33,2, comes from the pen of Johannes Brenz, the Lutheran pastor and preacher of Schwäbisch Hall, in an attributed quotation from his Prediger Salomo:

De Radthüser und Cantzelyen / synt de stede / darin men gerichte und gerechticheit / vinden scholde...Is ydt auerst nicht ein jamere und elende / dath men nergendt jnn der werlt / mehr ungerechticheit und godtloser lüde (Leute) vinde / alse up (auf) den Radthüşern und Cantzelyen / dar nichts den frame lüde / und dat Recht suluest / erfunden scholden werden: Wor vindet men / mehr schattinge (Schatzung) und underdrückinge der armen / denn euen an dem orde (Ort) / dar hülpe und radt der armen / syn scholde.

In his very last chapter gloss the RVC commentator again returns to the attack in an attributed Brenz quotation, where, in IV,13,1, we read:

By der Försten Rede / und in der Geweldygen Cantzelyen / scholde men billich Rechtferdicheyt vinden. Ja wol Rechtferdicheyt. Wen Tyrannye Rechtferdicheyt were / so wyl ick gelöuen (glauben) / dath menninges Försten und Heren Cantzelye / de hilligste Tempel Gades were.

None of these outbursts has any equivalent in either of the two subsequent glosses, where both commentators, generally speaking, confine their remarks to practical advice and comment.

Summary

a) We have noted in RVA 1,6,1-3 (following Alckmaer as recorded in the Dutch VB "morael") both the reference here to the ruler or judge's consulting with his counsellors before giving judgement and not taking precipitate action against an
accused man without giving him a chance to defend himself, as also the subsequent reference (1,14,9) to the accused’s having to be summonsed three times, all of which suggests that this commentator was certainly referring to customary law. The question must be raised, of course, as to whether these references should be considered historical. The fact, however, that the commentator lays particular emphasis at a later stage - preface to Book IV - on the antiquarian nature of the judiciary duel seems to suggest that the other points raised in his commentary which can be directly related to customary law must have been familiar to him and to his readers. On the other hand, the use of the term "Audi alteram partem" in the narrative text (deriving from Reinaert) suggests the probable use of Latin terminology in the courts of law over a long period preceding this one.

b) As far as RVC is concerned, this commentator’s repetition of most of the points raised in the RVA gloss with regard to customary law as well as his own reference in III,2,3 to the law regarding the necessity for the plaintiff to produce witnesses to the deed of which the defendant is accused, coupled with the listing by Grimm in his Deutsche Rechtsaltertümer of a gloss on the Lübisches Recht, make it seem probable that in Rostock at least the law there was an amalgamation of customary and Roman law. The commentator’s direct reference to the latter, furthermore, in III,14,1,
concerning the penalties for judges found guilty of malpractice, indicates his familiarity with this law, as do also his pejorative description of tactics used by jurists in III,2,2 and his reference to the "Keyserlyken Rechte" in I,5,3.

c) The importance attributed to witnesses throughout all four glosses attests to the important function they continued to perform in legal procedure, whether customary or Roman.

d) As far as the 1544 commentator is concerned, there seems little doubt that the only legal procedure with which he was familiar was based on Roman law. Most interesting here, from the point of view of authorship particularly, is that so much of what he writes in this connection would appear to be based on personal experience.

e) We are left then with the conclusion that, as far as the RVA commentator is concerned, the legal points he specifies are based on customary law. In RVC, however, we have the picture of a transitional stage - one which nevertheless may have lasted a considerable length of time - with direct reference in this gloss to both customary and Roman law. The examples given in the 1544 gloss, by contrast, show that exclusively Roman legal procedure was already in force in the area in which this commentator was active, while the acceptance of Roman law throughout the German Empire must be generally assumed for the period in which the 1650 commentator was writing.
f) Luther would appear to have had little or no direct influence on the 1544 commentator here, who, as we have seen, seems to be drawing primarily from his own experience in the points he makes, although his insistence on an examination of motivation (ll.2.19) might owe something to Luther, who also stressed this, as we saw. With RVC, however, there seems to be a possible link between what Luther has to say about litigation in general in his "Grosser Sermon von dem Wucher" (1520 and 1524) and RVC III.2.2, where the commentator deplores the influence of attorneys in instigating litigation between unwilling parties with the consequent cooling of brotherly love and damage to the "Christlyke gemeine." (That this commentator would have been familiar with this tract - at least as a result of its second printing in 1524 as part of "Von Kaufhandlung und Wucher" - I hope to show in another connection.)

g) The Humanist detestation of legal glosses, as expressed in RVC III.4.2 and 1650 11.7.4, should also be noted.

h) We have also in RVC particularly a continuation of the age-old criticism of the practice of law and of jurists in particular.
Chapter 4.

With the consideration that follows of the religious viewpoints of the four commentators and the way in which these are reflected in the glosses, we have reached what appeared to the late nineteenth century scholar Alexander Bieling to constitute, as we have seen, the main difference between the first two glosses, the "katholische" of 1498 and the "protestantische" of 1539, as he termed them. In this connection, too, we must bear in mind the religious persuasions of the individual commentators, in so far as we have been able to establish this, namely that the author of the 1498 RVA was almost certainly a Franciscan friar, the author of the 1539 RVC gloss a Protestant layman, and the authors of the 1544 and 1650 glosses a Lutheran layman and a Lutheran pastor respectively.

It will be realised, too, that we are likely to be dealing here with a variety of standpoints - in the first place that of the old, the Roman Church, secondly, that of the Humanists and of the Reformists generally, thirdly, that of Luther and possibly that of other forms of Protestantism as well and, finally, that of the German nation, as this was reflected in the reform proposals submitted to the Imperial Diets (Reichstage) by the "Reichsstände," the seven Electors, that is, together with the princes and the representatives of the free cities.

It will therefore be my purpose here to examine the glosses for the evidence they give of support for a particular position, a particular dogma or a particular point of view. First I will
quote the passage or passages in the narrative text (RVA) which gave rise to the gloss or at any rate provided an incentive for it. Then I will show, where relevant, how the text throws light on Roman Church practice. Following this I will both review what has been said on the subject in contemporary sources, where these are relevant, and explain Luther's teaching in this same regard. Finally, I will investigate and compare the treatment given the subject under discussion in the individual glosses.

The subjects will be examined under the following headings:

(i) confession and absolution
(ii) the ban
(iii) indulgences, pilgrimages and veneration of the saints
(iv) the religious orders - monks and nuns
(v) the secular clergy
(vi) the papacy

(i) Confession and absolution

Here Reinke's two confessions to his relative Grimbart, the badger, in Books I and II provide the commentators with their opportunity to deal with the subject of confession. Before beginning his first confession Reinke gives as his reason for wanting to confess: "Van anxste unde sorge ick beue (bebe) / Ik vruchte (furchte), ik gha nu in den doet (Tod)" (1374-75). Grimbart points out to him, however, that he must be prepared to give up his wicked practices or "Juwe bychte helpet anders nicht eyn kaff (gar nichts)" (1386). Reinke assents to this and proceeds to confess his sins, which he has committed, he states,
"Jegen alle deren (Tiere), de nu leuen" (1397), mentioning specifically recent events regarding the tom-cat, the bear and the rooster - these have already been related in the narrative text so are not elaborated upon here - and also nonspecific injuries he has inflicted on the royal couple, ending with long accounts of three occasions in the past on which he has tricked the wolf Isegrim, including an admission of adultery with his wife. He ends with these words:

See, dyt ysset, dat ik van al mynen synnen
Unde up desse tyd kan bedencken,
Dat myne sele mochte krencken.
Up dat myn sele kryge quyteren (Erlösung von Sündenschuld),
So bydde ik seer umme absolueren,
Unde settet my, dat yw duncket gud (1588-93).

Following this, Grimbart orders Reinke to break a twig from the hedgerow, strike himself on the head with it three times, then lay it on the ground and make three clear springs over it sideways without stumbling, then kiss the twig without reluctance as a sign of obedience. Grimbart closes with these words:

Desse penitencie ick yw sette:
Hir myt sy gy van aire smette (makel)
Quyd (quitt) unde van allen sunden,
De gy ye deden vor dessen stunden;
Wente ik vorgheue se yw alle,
Wo vele der ok is in deme tall (Zahl) (1603-08).

Then, on completion of his penance, Grimbart admonishes him:

Dat gy yw betteren myd guden wercken;
Leset yuwe salmen unde ghaet tor kerken,
Vastet de rechten setteden tyd (verordnete Zeit),
Vyret de hylgen daghe myt vlyt,
Trostet de krancken in alle yuwen dagen.
Wyset de to weghe, de dar na vragen.
Yuwe almynse (Almosen) schole gy gerne geuen
Unde vorsweren (verzichten auf) yuwe boze leuen,
Alze rouen, stelen unde vorraden;
So kome gy ane twyfel to gnaden (1611-20).
(The falseness of Reinke's contrition is revealed, of course, in chap. 18, in ll.1627-40, where we learn that very soon afterwards he purposely leads Grimbart out of his and the latter's way, in order to pass by a nunnery where he knows there are some hens, and where, once arrived, he proceeds to lunge at one of them.)

With regard to the second confession, this is of interest to us only for the opening lines in which Reinke refers to something he had forgotten to confess to Grimbart the first time:

Noch hebbe ick eyn dynck uth ghericht,
Dat ik latesten hadde vorgetten (vergessen),
Leue om, dat schole gy ok wetten (wissen),
Unde wyl dat nu ok seggen mede (3730-33).

All the lines quoted here from the narrative text give a good illustration of the practices of the Roman Church with regard to penance. In Hans-Joachim Schoeps's words: "Im katholischen Sinne besteht sie [die Busse] aus contritio cordis (Herzenszernischung)" - here we note Reinke's admission that he knows his confession will have no effect if he does not intend to mend his ways, in other words, if he is not truly contrite - "confessio oris (mündliche Beichte) und satisfactio operus (Werke der Genugtuung)" - here, Reinke's performance with the twig - after which absolution can be granted, as Grimbart granted it here, coupling this with with the assurance that if Reinke performed good works, such as reading psalms, going to church, fasting, caring for the sick, and forswore his wicked ways, he could be sure of salvation. Another stipulation of the Roman Church was that all mortal sins had to be confessed, including the circumstances of their commission - we note here in the narrative text Reinke's full account of his earlier dealings with Isegrim -
and if the penitent remembered something later, he had to return to the priest — this explains the meaning of Reinke’s remarks to Grimbart at the beginning of the second confession.

Luther’s contrary view to that of the Roman Church with regard to penance stems from his antithetical conception of the human condition and of the means whereby man can attain salvation. For him man’s nature is essentially evil and remains so throughout his life on earth. In the closing sentence of his "Von den guten Werken" (1520) Luther writes of "die erbsund uns vonn natur angeborn, die sich dempffen leessit, aber nit gantz ausz rotten, an durch denn leyplichen tod" (WA 6,276). Only a full recognition of his sinfulness through self-examination by means of the Ten Commandments, he states in his "Von der Freiheit eines Christenmenschen" (1520), can lead man to faith in God’s grace and in the promise of forgiveness of sins through the Redemption (WA 7,22-24). In his view, therefore, as he explains in the same tract, contrition, confession and satisfaction are only of value insofar as they lead to faith:

Denn die rew fleusst ausz den gepotten [dem Dekalog], der glaub ausz der zusagung gottis, und also wird der mensch durch den glauben gotlicher wort gerechtfertiget und erhaben, der durch die furcht gottis gepottis gedemutiget und ynn seyn erkentnisz kummen ist (WA 7,34).

For Luther therefore the good works such as Grimbart prescribed for Reinke, by means of which — including of course the renunciation of his evil ways — he would come "ane twyfel to gnaden," are useless. In Luther’s eyes the Roman church had the wrong understanding of sin:
Denn...sie halten von der Erbsunde nicht recht Sondern sagen, Die naturlichen Kreffe des Menschen seien gantz und unverderbt blieben, die vernunft künnde recht leren, und der Wille künnde recht darnach thun, das Gott gewislich seine Gnade gibt, wenn ein Mensch thut, so viel an im ist, nach seinem freien willen.

Consequently:

Wo der Mensch recht rewet, beichtet, gnugthet, So hette er damit vergebung verdienet und die sunder fur Gott bezalat. [Die Papisten] weiseten so die Leute inn der Busse auff zuversicht eigener werck...Hie war kein Christus und nichts vom glauben gedacht, Sondern man hoffete mit eigenen wercken die sunde fur Gott zu uberwinden und zu tilgen (WA 50,228-29).

These quotations are from Luther's Schmalkaldic Articles. In his "Von der Beicht, ob der Papst Macht habe zu gebieten" (1521) Luther had explained:

Nu mag solcher glaub [an das päpstliche Gesetz] nit bestehen mit Christlichem glauben, wilcher nit auff unszer thun, sondernn auff Christus thun sich bawet, und hellt fest dafür, der Mensch sey darumb frum, das Christus fur ihn allis than habe, und seyne werck hynfurtt seyen nur frey folge und frucht solchs glaubens uund frumkeyt (WA 8,172).

Or, as Luther had already explained this in his "Von der Freiheit": "Gutte frum werck machen nymmer mehr ein guten frumen man, sondern eyn gutt frum man macht gutte frum werck" (WA 7,32).

Luther's teaching regarding confession and absolution in "Von der Beicht" and subsequent tracts can be summarized as follows:

(a) There should be no compulsion where confession is concerned:"Furwar, wer willig und lustig datzu ist, darff keynis gepottis, wer unwillig und unlustig datzu ist, dem hilfft keyn gepot noch tzwang, ya machts nur erger" (WA 8,168). It should take place only as a result of heartfelt need, when the
individual should be guided by his own conscience, as opposed to submitting himself to human laws which prescribe that confession take place at a particular time and to a particular priest, "den ynn den gewissen wil er [Gott] alleyn seyn uund seyn wort alleyn regieren lassen, da soll freyheit seyn von allen menschen gesetzen" (WA 8,152). Later in the same tract Luther writes:

Eyn iglicher prufe sich zuvor, warumb er beychten wolle. Thut ersz nur umbs gepottis willen, und seyn hertz ringet und seuffzet nit noch (nach) hulff gotlicher gnaden, der bleyb nur davon frey, lasz Pabst mit seynem gepott sich nit yrren, bisz das er sich fule hungerig und begirig gotlicher hulff, uund der sunden ausz grund feynd werd (WA 8,170).

(b) There should not only be no compulsion as to when a person confesses, but also none as to what he confesses or to whom. As far as the what of confession is concerned, Luther denied completely the need for confessing all sins - the penitent should concentrate only on those which which were the most burdensome to him - or for bothering about any that had been forgotten, or for cataloguing them in any way. In this regard he refers in his "Von der Beicht" to the three freedoms:

Die erst, das du dyr nitt furnehmist alle sund tzu peychtenn, szondernnu nur die dich ym gewissen beyssen uund druckenn...Die ander..das niemant mutwillig seyn beycht teyle, der do willig beychtet, ob er aber etwas vorgesse, ist er dannach gar nit schuldig, dem selben beychtiger tzu beychten, szondernnu mag dasselb gar nitt beychten odder wilchem er will (WA 8,182).

(c) With the third "freedom" we come to the to whom in regard to confession, where Luther stipulates that people can confess to whomsoever they will:
Die drytte freyheit: wo du nit mochtest eynen pfaffen odder Munich (Mönch) beychten, szo nym fur dich eynen man, er sey ley odder priester, tzu dem du dich gutts vorsihest, und thu nit andersz, denn alsz wolltistu trewen radt und trost deynr seelen holen, wartten, was got dyr durch yhn sagen wollt, und wie dyr der sagt ynn gottis namen, szo folge und lasz dyrsz eyn absolution seyen und bleyb drauff, such keyn ander absolution (WA 8,182).

Later Luther adds this warning: "Ja ich sag weytter und warne, das yhe niemand eynen priester alsz einem priester heymlich beycht, szondernn alsz eynem gemeynen bruder uund Christen" (WA 8,184).

(d) While acknowledging in his "Predigt am Palmsonntag" of 1524 that private confession into the ear of a priest is not ordained by God (WA 15,484), Luther nevertheless maintained throughout his life a preference for private confession (Ohrenbeicht, heimliche Beicht) to another person, as opposed, that is, to confession to God alone in private or a general confession, since, as he writes in "Von der Beicht," the penitent needs consolation and reassurance from a second person:

Denn ob woll eyn iglicher bey yhm selb got beychten mag und sich mit gott heymlich vorsunen, szo hat er doch niemand, der yhm eyn urteyl sprech, darauff er sich tzu frieden stell und seyn gewissen stille (WA 8,178).

By the time he came to compose the section entitled "Wie man die Einfeltigen sol leren Beichten," which forms part of the 1531 edition of his "Kleiner Katechismus" and which provides simple questions and answers for the penitent and his confessor (WA 30:1,363-87), Luther appears in fact to have accepted private confession to a minister of the church as the norm, although in his "Grosser Katechismus" of 1529 he was a good deal less exact.
(e) As regards absolution, both in his sermon of 1524 and in his "Grosser Katechismus" of 1529 Luther had emphasized the fundamental importance of the words of absolution and the vital necessity for faith in these words: "Denn die summa des Evangelii ist die: Wer an Christum glaubt, dem sollen seyn sund vergeben seyn..." When the priest speaks the words "'Pax vobis,'" Luther explains, this means "'ich verkundige euch von Gott, das yhr fride habt und vergebung der sunden durch Christum'" adding "das ist auch eben das Evangelion und die absolutio" (WA 15,485-86). In his "Grosser Katechismus" he sums up as follows:

So mercke nu...das die beichte stehet ynn zweyen stücken. Das erste ist unser werck und thuen, das ich meine sunde klage und begere troost und erquickung meiner seele. Das ander ist ein werck, das Gott thuet, der mich durch das wort, dem menschen yn mund gelegt, los spricht von meinen sunden (WA 30:1,235).

In his Schmalkaldic Articles Luther refers to this absolution as the Absolutio privata (WA 50,244) which is to be distinguished from the church's ban - with which we will be dealing next - although they both derive from the same source, namely the power of the "keys."

Turning now to the glosses, the RVA commentator, as might be expected, has the most to say on the subject of confession. In five glosses that are not taken up by the RVC commentator we learn in 1,14,1, for example, that God sometimes makes it difficult at the end for those who have committed and enjoyed committing sins and have even boasted of this to confess these sins. Then, in the long gloss of 1,17, this commentator in 1,17,3 brings up the subject of retribution, advising the man who has fraudulently
amassed riches to seek out a wise confessor to help him rid himself of his burden. He continues:

Unrecht gud schalmen dem suluen to keren, deme yd is aff ghetogen (weggenommen); machmen de nicht hebben, so horet (gehört) yd den rechten negesten eruen (Erben); kamen de al nicht hebben, so horet id den armen na rade eynes wysen bychtfaders. Vor alle sunde machmen bothe (Busse) setten ane allene vor unrecht gud, dat mod (muss) men wedder geuen so vern men dat heft unde vormach. *Quia peccatum non dimittitur, nisi ablatum restituatur.*

Similarly, in 1,17,8, this commentator emphasizes that a confessor should console a sinner and teach him to avoid sinning (in the future).

In Book II he recommends in 11,6,6 that those undertaking dangerous journeys by land or sea - in other words, those who are facing death* - should confess first and repent their sins. Then, in 11,8,5, he points out that no one should confess the sins of others as an excuse for his own, as this constitutes a false confession. (This last is a reference, of course, to Reinke's second confession in the narrative text, where he expatiates on the evil ways both of those in temporal authority and of the clergy in particular).

Only two chapters provide parallel glosses in other editions. With regard to 1,18, although the RVC commentator does not take up RVA 1,18,1 - a gloss describing the care that those who have confessed should exercise to prevent themselves from falling back into sin, since "de duuel (Teufel), de werlt unde unse egen fles (eigen Fleisch)" give us no peace - the second of the two, 1,18,4, he reproduces in 1,18,3 in his own words practically in
its entirety. In RVA it runs:

Dat verde is, dat manich sunder syne sunde bichtet unde dar bote (Busse) vor (dafür) entfanget, men (allein) de ruwe (Reue) is in em nicht warhaftich; wente etlyke syn, de bichten ere sunde unde entfangen bothe dar vor, men de beleuen (haben lieb) noch etlyke vorgangen sunde unde hebben nene waraftyge ruwe vor alle, unde seen to rugge (zurücksehen), so reynke hye dede na den honren (Hühnen). Nicht en is de gheschychcket dar to, dat he kryghe vorgheuyngge syner sunde van gode, dem noch etlyke sunde beleuen; wente de sued (sieht) tho rugge alze reynke dede. Van dessen secht de here in de me hylgen ewangelio, alze sunte Lucas beschryft in deme ix capittel alsus:"De syne hant lecht (legt) an den ploch (Pflug) und sued to rugge, de en is nicht gheschicket, dat he moghe ghan int ewyge leuent (Leben);"

The RVA and RVC commentators here, then, are both content to give the text a religious, sermon-like interpretation. The 1544 commentator, however, while making a précis of the above gloss in 1,18,5, in which he includes the Gospel quotation, adds another gloss of his own, 1,18,2, which addresses head-on an issue which was undoubtedly one of very great moment at the time in which he lived, namely that Luther's teaching of justification by faith rather than by works and his emphasis on the Bible, the Word of God, rather than the Pope's "laws" had not brought about a spiritual regeneration of society. Hypocrisy, it seems, was as rampant as ever. The fact, too, that the 1650 commentator takes over the main part of his predecessor's criticism shows that not much had changed over the ensuing hundred years! The 1544 gloss runs:

Zum Andern / Rhumet sich mancher seines glaubens uund Gottfurchtigen lebens / aber der glaub jest sich doch endlich sehen / wie hier am Fuchsz. Baw oder traw nur niemandt auff
seinen glauben / das er meyne er soll ihm seeligkeit erlangen / soll ihm in aller anfechtung / uberwinden helffen / wenn er nicht das warzeichen hat / das er ein begird zu guten wercken habe. Ich habe deren wol viel gesehen / die meynen sie haben das wort Gottes und die heiligen gar fressen / wissen uund seiens gar / wissen mehr von guten wercken / rew und bûsz / und von Gottes wort zu reden / denn zehen andere / Gehen dieweil dahin / wiichern / schinden / schaben uund kratzen / treiben hurerei / Ehebrecherei und andere jaster / tag uund nacht / meynen wenn sie für der welt könn en verschlagen / uund verblumen / Gott sehe es auch nit. Wird das stündlin kommen / werden sie wol befinden was sie für ein glauben gehabt / wie sie das wort Gottes wissen / uund mit was ernst sie es gehört / uund darnach gelebt haben (1544 1,18,2).

The 1650 commentator reproduces the above text from "Ich habe" to auch nit," providing, however, his own prologue and epilogue, as it were:

Vors ander / wann der Fuchs alhie nach beschehener Busze und Beicht in seine alte Sünden wider tritt etc. so werden hiemit angedeutet die Menschen / die auch zwar mit groszem Schein sich bekehren / den Glauben an Christum vorgeben / aber hernach widerum in ihre alte Sünden Fusztapfen steigen / und also die vorige Gnade vergeblich empfangen / und das Blut Christi mit Füßen treten / die seyen gleich dem Hunde / der wieder friszt was er gespeitet / und den unflettgen Schweinen / die sich nach der Schwemme wieder in den Koth walzen...

The last lines of his gloss run as follows:

Wird dermahlen eins ihr letztes Stundlein kommen / so werden sie wohl zu kundte kommen / was sie für ein Glauben gehabt haben / wann sie wegen Verachtung des Worts Gottes / desto grossere Verdammusz empfinden werden / denn es were ihnen besser / dass sie es nimmer mehr erkant hätten etc.(1650 1,17,2).

Most interesting, however, for a general comparison are the glosses of 1,16, the chapter which contains the textual examples
of confessional practice, which we have already noted. Since the
glosses reflect so well the changes in attitude to confession, I
will quote them in full:
Dat verde is uns eyne lere, dat eyn yslyk, de In wurchten (Furcht) is, dat he schal bichten unde beruwen syne sünde unde de vullenkommen uthspreken myt aller ummestandichkeit, so se syn gescheen, wodoch (obwohl) id van noden (nötig) is allen unde eynem yslikem cristenen mynscben, de to synen vorstenlikem yaren komen is, alle tyd, dat is to velen tyden, lutter bicht spreken (laut beichten) schal. Men (aber) wan sus vorsumynge (Versaumnis), efte vortogeringe (Verzögerung) schege (geschehe), so schalmen doch meyst denne lutter bicht don, so wan eyn is in wurchten.

Ihom drudden / wert hyr gelert / dat einer / dem syne sutide und missedadi van herten leedt ys / und löffelt / dat he derhaluen in vare (Gefahr) der salichkeit kamen möchte / De schal alle syne auertredinge (Übertretungen) vor Gott bekennen / und umme vorgeuing (Vergebung) syner sünde / och umme gnade / syck henfurder (von nun an) vor sünde tho bewaren / ernstlick bidden. Darna einem framen und getruwen Bichtuader / syne anliggende nodt und swackheit ock entdecken / hüpe / trost und radt / uth der hillygen Schrift / up dat (damit) he nicht in wyder (grösser) angst und vortwiuelung (Verzweiflung) vallen müge / van em begeren: Desfüue (Dieser) schal en trosten mit Götlichen thosagen (Verheissung) / und absolutionen etc. Wol (wer) auerst valschlick bichtet / wo hyr de untruwe Reinke dede / de wert ock also (genauso) absolution: Dan syne sünde / synt em van herten grundt nicht leedt (leid): Derhaluen ys syne ruwe und bote (Busse) / und vorsaet (Vorsatz) nicht mehr tho sundigen ock valsch und unduchtich (untauglich). Und derwegen (deswegen) / ys noch bycht (Beicht) noch absolutioner/ behülplick (behilflich) edder vorderlick. D. Sebastianus Brandt sprekt.

Das Dritt / Leret das ein jeder / dem syne sünde leid sind / die selben Gott bekennen / und umb gnd britten soll / mit fürsatz sich zu bessern / soj auch dasselbige von herzen thun. Sunst wie die Beicht ist / also is auch die Absolution / du kannst Gott nicht betriegen.

Das Vjerdt / Das nicht von noten/ alle sünde zuerzelun / sondern eine oder zwo etc. welche dir am heftigsten anlig. Denn sollt dir Gott keine sünde vergeben / denn die du erzelsest / wo bleiben die / die du vergessen hasttest / Item die du für keine sünde gehalten hast. Item alle böse gedancken / die dir unmöglich in gedechnusz.


Zum fünften wann der Fuchs etliche seiner schwersten Sünde bekennen etc. so erinnern wir uns dabei / dass man nicht alle und jede Sünde dem Beichtvater erzehle und endekke / wie die Papisten streiten und lehren. Denn das ist ein rechter Marter der Seelen und selbst den menschlichen Gedanken.
Wol uth valschem herthen gheit thor Bicht /
De wert doch recht absoluert nicht.
Wowi he meint / he sy der sünde quydt /
Ja also de hundt der Floye (Flöhe) thor Meygetydt
(in in der Maienzzeit).
De vast (zuversichtlich)
blichtet / und in den sünden blifft /
Gott em (Ihm) nümmer syn synde vorglifft.

As marginal glosses we have at the side of the first sentence: "Bichten syne sünde van herten ys heilsam und nütte" and against the sentence beginning" Wol auerst": "Valsch und im schyne gebichtet / wo gemenlick im geburke / ys unfruchtbar."

zubehalten / darzu würdest du nimmer inn deinem gewissen sicher oder zu friedien / die weil du immer sorgen must / du hetest doch eitlich vergessen.Bekenne Gott deine sünde von herzen / ist dir nützer denn wenn du ein eigen schreiber hieltest / der dir sie alle aufzeicnnet / und recitierst ein gantz Register voll und werest sorgfältiger für die erzelung / denn für den ernst deiner bekentnusz.

welcher / wie er auf eine Zeit hingeng sich bey den Göttern auszusöhnen und dieselbe um Rath zu fragen / der Priester aber begehrte / dass er bekennen solte seine grösste Sünde / die er in seinem Leben begangen / fragte er wiederum: ob er dasselbe solte thun auf sein / oder auf der Gotter Gehels? und er antwortete / auf der Götter / da sprach er: Wohl / so gönne mdr / dass / wenn sie fragen / ich es ihnen sage; Oder sie arten nach dem Antalcidas / derselbige wie er gefraget ward von einem Priester / womit er seine Zeit und Leben hengebracht hette / sprach er: Es sey nicht notig / dass er ihn das sagen / sondern habe er böses gethan / so sey es den Götern unverborgen. Aber Christen müssen hierinnen nicht so halstarrig seyn / sondern auch ihren Lehrern die an Cristi Stelle in dem Beichtstuhl sitzen / ihre Sünde bekennen / denn von denen heists / was geschrieben steht: Was ihr auf Erden loset / sol auch im Himmel los seyn. Und gleichwie die Auszetzigen altes Testaments sich mussten den Priestern zeigen: Also auch die mit geistlichen und verderblichen Sünden Aussatz behalten seyn etc.
Summary

a) With regard to RVA 1,16,4 we observe three points emphasized here which can be considered necessary elements of the practice of confession in the Roman Church, namely (1) that a person should confess when he is fearful of death, also stressed in 11,6,6,363 (2) that this confession should be as circumstantial as possible (myt aller ummestandichkeit) and (3) that every person who has reached the age of discretion (to synen vorstentliken yaren komen is)363 should confess frequently. The gloss on restitution - 1,17,3 - is of particular interest for the evidence it provides of the close relationship between the RVA gloss and the other "Mohnkopf" publications of the same decade. Finally, we note the little sermon in miniature - a true "exempel" - that the gloss 1,18,4 provides, an illustration surely of the way in which Reynke de vos could have been used by the Lübeck clergy in their preaching and teaching.366

b) As far as RVC is concerned, we observe a change at once. In the first place, the compulsory aspect of confession is missing. A person now need only confess when his sin "van herten ledt ys" and he feels his eternal salvation is in jeopardy, first acknowledging his transgressions before God. It is also possible to perceive here in the use of the quasi-legal words "bekennen" and "auertredinge"366 a reference to the Decalogue. He should then confide his distress to his confessor,366 who will give him help, consolation and counsel from the Bible to prevent him from falling into
despair, comforting him with the assurance of God's promise, and then absolve him. This commentator's reference to how Reinke "valschlick bichtet" - or, as the marginal note says "valsch und im schyne gebichtet" - concerns, as the following remarks both in the text of the gloss and the Brandt quotation show, his lack of contrition. His sorrow for his sins is not heartfelt, we are told. Both from a literary point of view and as an example of confessional practice, what Reinke confessed on this occasion was the simple, unvarnished truth. Finally, this commentator's taking over in substance the RVA gloss 1,18,4 regarding Reinke's looking back at the hens is an interesting example of his willingness to incorporate his predecessor's religious teaching into his own work, providing there was no contradiction expressed to Protestant doctrine.

Before commenting on the glosses of 1,16 in the 1544 and 1650 editions it should be noted that in the former the narrative text has been altered in a significant way. Where in RVA/RVC, that is, Reinke is made to say at the end of his confession: "See dyt ysset dat ik van al mynen synnen / Unde up desse tyd kan bedencken" (1588-89) with the implication that he had confessed everything he could think of, the 1544 narrative text runs: "Des dinges hab ich vil begangen," and the 1650 text: "Noch mer Schelmstucke seyn begangen," where the implication is rather that the confession had been incomplete.

c) Here, then, the 1544 commentator's remark regarding the lack
of necessity to confess all sins does derive from the narrative text. For the rest, this commentator's failure to mention a confessor may indicate that he came from a part of the country where a general confession had been instituted in the place of private confession. Otherwise he follows Luther's teaching quite closely concerning confession - that not all sins need to be confessed, only those which are the most burdensome, suggesting that in the former case too much concentration on the performance may detract from the earnestness of the intention.

Much more interesting is this 1544 commentator's gloss of 1,18,2, where he calls into question not, of course, the doctrine of justification by faith per se, but rather what appears to have been with some people their apparent understanding - or lack of it - of what acceptance of this teaching entailed. Both in his "Von der Freiheit eines Christenmenschen" (1520) and his preface to St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans (dating originally from 1522) Luther had stressed the importance of an individual's revealing that he had in fact become a changed person through his faith, which would be apparent thenceforth in his works and ways. In the first of these writings, for example, Luther states:

alszo das allweg die person zuvor musz gut und frum sein vor allen gutten wercken, und gutte werck folgen und auszghahn von der frumen gutten person. Gleych wie Christus sagt 'Ein böser bawm tregt keyn gutte frucht. Ein gutter bawm tregt keynn böcke frucht.'...Alszo seyn die werck des menschen auch wie es mit yhm steht, ynn glauben oder unglauben, darnach seidend syne werck gutt oder böcke (WA 7,32).
In his Preface, moreover, Luther uses the word "zeichen" in the same way as the commentator uses "warzeichen" here, stating:

Also sind alle gute werck nur eusserliche zeichen, die aus dem glauben folgen, und beweisen, als gute Früchte, das der Mensch schon für Gott inwendig gerecht sey (WA DB 7,17).

At the beginning of this Preface also Luther had stressed how "Gott richtet nach herzens grund" (WA DB 7,3). He cannot, in other words, be deceived. This point is made by the commentator, too, in his reference to people who think that because the world does not know how they are behaving, God does not know either.

d) The 1650 commentator's two glosses 1,16,4-5 are good illustrations of how he takes over the substance of his predecessor's glosses and then elaborates these with illustrations not only from religious sources - St. Augustine and St. Bernard (of Clairvaux) - but also from Greek history and literature. 1650 1,16,5 is also of historical interest in that it points to the practice of confession as one of the principal points of difference between the adherents of the Roman church and the Lutherans and the Calvinists, the commentator here echoing Luther's criticisms, which we have already noted, of Roman Church practice on the one hand and on the other attacking the Calvinists' complete elimination of confession in their church. 371 We learn also that by the mid-seventeenth century private confession would appear to have been accepted as the norm in the Lutheran church,
although the reference here to confessors as "Lehrer, die an Christi Stelle in dem Beichtstuhl sitzen" rather than "Pastoren" or "Prediger" or "Beichtväter" may reflect Luther's desire that confessors should not be functioning as spiritual authorities.

Most extraordinary, however, is this commentator's reference at the end of 1, 16,5 to the parallel between the Old Testament passage describing how lepers had to show themselves to the priests and penitents revealing the spiritual leprosy of their sins. In the first place it was those who had recovered from, who had been cleansed of their leprosy, who had to show themselves to the priests. Secondly, in his "Von der Beicht" (1521) Luther was at great pains to prove that this passage together with the Gospel passage which refers to it, on which, according to him, the Roman church bases its confessional practice, provides in fact no such foundation. There is no mention here, Luther avers, of confession of sins, neither was the priest of the Old Testament empowered to forgive sins (WA 8,152-53). Admittedly the false Biblical reference was probably a slip, and for the rest, one must take this as evidence of a lack of familiarity with Luther's tracts on the part of the average seventeenth century Lutheran pastor.

Finally, this commentator's treatment in 1,17,2 of his predecessor's gloss (1,18,2) reveals in the additions he makes to it a different emphasis. As far as the 1544 commentator is concerned, he was describing people who had
completely misunderstood what the faith they claimed to profess really entailed, as they were revealing in their way of life. There had been, in other words, no religious conversion. From what this 1650 commentator writes in his additional passages, however, one obtains the impression that he is describing people who had formally accepted the tenet of justification by faith as part of their religious instruction, but had failed to live up to this teaching. This is a good illustration of the difference that existed between Luther's own thoughts, convictions and experience here, as he explained these in his writings, and the application of his teaching in the following century. Zeeden writes concerning this:

(ii) The ban

There were two types of ecclesiastical ban, both mentioned in the narrative text. The first of these is excommunication, which cut an individual person off entirely from the benefits of the church. Reinke claims to be a victim of this on account of his having assisted the wolf, Isegrim, to escape from a monastery: "Ik gaff (gab) eme rad, dat he quam von dan / Hir umme byn ick in des pawes (Pabstes) ban" (2541). Later in the narrative text, in the course of the conversation between Reinke and Marten the ape, the latter, having previously explained, "Al were de sake noch so krum Myt ghelde wyl ick se kopen (kaufen) um" (4163-64), assures Reinke that he will see to it when he reaches Rome that he, Reinke, is released from this ban: "Seet, oem, dar umme ghy (Ihr) syd in deme ban / Alle de sake the ick my an (nehme ich auf mich) / Ick neme de up my und gheue (gebe) se yw quyd" (4167-69).

The second type of ban was the interdict, which was placed on a whole village, town, region or even country. This, too, is illustrated a little later in the narrative text where Marten assures Reinke that if he does not get justice at the royal court he, Marten, will see to it that the whole country is placed under interdict, so that people will no longer be able to bury their dead or have their children baptized etc:

Alle de int lant syn beseten (ansässig),
Isset konynck, vrouwe, kynt ete man,
Alle wyl ick se bryngen in den ban,
Unde senden en interdict so swar,
Men schal dar wer (weder) hemelyck ete openbar
Syngen, grauen (graben), dopen (taufen),
wat yd ock sy (4186-91).
From these textual quotations it will be obvious that corruption was rampant with regard to the imposition of both ban and interdict. Here we are dealing in fact with a subject that was attacked on two fronts: on mainly temporal grounds by the Humanists, other reformers and the German Diet as a means whereby the Roman Church was extorting money from the German people, and on religious grounds by Luther. Criticism of both types of ban, which was age-old, can be found, for example, in the *Gravamina* of 1521, where, with regard to excommunication, it is pointed out that the true purpose of this weapon, namely spiritual censure, has been abandoned and that it has become instead a means of levying fines for inconsequential debts. The threat of excommunication of the neighbours of such an excommunicated person, unless they move away or pay their way out of it, is also mentioned. With regard to the interdict, once again the comparatively trivial nature of the reasons for its imposition are condemned, such as non-payment of debt or the murder of a priest, the latter being something which could have occurred in self-defence.

As far as Luther is concerned, his primary attack was on theological grounds. He rejected, that is, the Pope's claim to the exclusive right to impose the punishment of excommunication, to exercise, that is, the power of binding and loosing, the power of the "keys," which power the Roman church based on three quotations from the Gospels. In the first of these St. Peter is singled out, and it was on this quotation that the Pope based his exclusive authority. Luther, however, based his challenge to the
Pope on the basis of the two latter quotations, where St. Peter is not singled out, claiming that the right to use this power lay rather with the whole church: "die Christliche kirche, das ist, die vorsamlung aller glewbigen Christi," which is sanctified by the Holy Spirit: "Heylig ist sie umb des heyligen geysts willenn, den sie gewiszlich hatt" (WA 8,163).

In his "Sermon von dem Bann" (1520), too, Luther is concerned with the ban's spiritual nature, "dann seyn vornehmlich eygentlich ampt und macht ist, das er eynem schuldigen Christen menschen beraubt und yhm vorbeutt das heylige sacrament" (WA 6,63). The excommunicate is in fact excluded from the fellowship (Communio) of his fellow Christians. Luther calls this here "der kleyne bann," giving the interdict the title of "der grosse bann" (WA 6,64). In "An den Christlichen Adel" a few months later Luther returned to the attack both on the interdict and on excommunication, referring to the former as a practice, "wilch on allen zweyffel der bosz geyst erdacht hat" (WA 6,445) - here he was censuring the prohibition of church services imposed by such a measure on account of the murder of a priest. Regarding excommunication he wrote: "Den Bann must man nit ehr geprauchen, den wo die schrifft weyszet zuprauchen, das ist widder die so nit recht glewben odder in offentlichen sunden leben, nit umbs zeytlich gut" (WA 6,445). Then in his tract of the following year "Von der Beicht" Luther describes the procedure which should be followed:

Das ynn eyner iglichen Pfarr oder gemeyn, wo yemand offentlichen sundigete, von seynem nehesten brüderlich gestrafft wurd, darnach
ordendlich mit mehr tzeugen gestrafft, tzu letzt öffentlich in der kirchen unter der mesz nach dem Evangelio fur dem Pfarrer und yderman und gantzem gemeyn erfurtzogen, vorklagt und ubertzeugt, wollt er sich denn bessern, ynn gemeyn for yhn bitten eynrechtlich, wie hie der herr leret und erhorung zu sagt. Wollt er nit, das man yhn von der gemeyn thett und hett niemant mit yhm tzu schaffen: das heyst hie der herr "gebundenn werden," und das ist auch recht ynn den bann gethan (WA 8,173-74).

Sixteen years later, in his Schmalkaldic Articles (1537), Luther was to sum up as follows:

Vom Bann

Den grossen Bann, wie es der Bapst nennet, halten wir fur ein lauter weltliche straffe, und gehet uns Kirchendiener nichts an. Aber der kleine, das ist der rechte Christliche Bann, ist, das man offenberliche halstarrige sunder, nicht sol lassen zum Sacrament, oder ander gemeinschaft der kirchen komen, bis sie sich bessern, und die sunde meiden. Und die Prediger sollen inn diese geistliche straffe oder Bann nicht mengen die weltliche straffe (WA 50,247).

Turning now to the glosses, we note that in his only reference to the ban, in 1,33,2, the RVA commentator is concerned to point out - à propos of Reinke's decision to go on a pilgrimage - that those under the ban are not permitted to enjoy the benefit of any function performed by a priest (here, the blessing and handing over of the pilgrim's staff is meant), and in general that they are unfit "de gnade der hylgen kerken to entfangen."

In RVC also we have only one reference to the ban, the commentator remarking in 1,29,3:

Thom drudden / wert hyr des Bans gedacht / auerst (aber) vele daruan tho reden / ys unnödich / na dem ydermennichlick apernbar (da es jedermann bekannt ist) / das ydt ein groth miszbruck / und der Papisten Geitstrick unde bedrouwinge (Drohung) gewesen.
This passage he accompanies by an unattributed quotation from Franck/Erasmus Moria listing the various methods by which the Roman Church threatens to condemn the souls of those involved and despatch them "yensydt der hellen" - unless they pay up.

The glosses of the two latter commentators are of a completely different nature, however. In 1544 I,29,3 and the parallel gloss, 1650 I,27,3, both commentators refer to the earlier abuse of the ban by various Popes:

Denn durch diese Mittel haben Sie Könige und Kayser / Fürsten und Herren / Arm und Reiche / grosz und kleine also gefaszt / dasz Jederman ihr Liedlein hat singen müssen / und keiner / er habe auch seyn mugen / wer Er wolle / wieder sie üppen noch mücken müssen (1650 I,27,3)

The 1650 commentator then gives historical examples of a pope's excommunication of an emperor and, as a consequence of this, of the former's releasing the emperor's subjects from their obedience to him to the point of assuring them that they would earn heaven if they killed him. The commentator considers nevertheless that no one should desire altogether to do without "den Bindeschlüssel und den Bann...denn der ist ein Schlüssel zu der gantzen Kirchenzucht und dem geistlichen Regiment." The 1544 commentator sums up as follows:

Es ist ein gross ding / umb den rechten Christlichen Bann / nemlich / wenn die diener des heiligen worts gottes / einen (der in offenen lastern / als Ehebruch / mord / reuberei / Seuferei / ungläuben und ketzerei lebet und wandelt / und nach ermanung nicht abstehen will) in den ban thun / das ist aus der Christlichen gemein schliessen / kirchen / tauff und sacrament verbieten und weigern / uund solcher Bann eines armen dorff pfarrers gilt mer für got / silt auch mer
After further comment to the effect that church and state are two separate entities, the 1650 commentator adds:

Der Bann ist eine geistliche Strafe / und beraubet eben so wenig einen König seines Reiches / als einen Privat Menschen seiner Güter. Denn das ist der Ausschlag und der Endzweck des Bannes / damit der sündige Bruder widerum bekehret / und als aus irrendes und herumschweifendes Schaflein / möge widerum zu dem Schafstal der Christlichen Kirchen gebracht werden.

With regard to the 1544 commentator, apart from his long and explicit gloss which covers most of the points raised by Luther, he also recommends, as we have already seen, that no man should be appointed a judge who is under the Christian ban (11,9,9) and, further, in 111,2,4, that no one under the Christian ban should be able to bring an accusation in court, although he should be allowed to answer any charge laid against him.

Summary

a) Here the RVA commentator, as we have seen, makes only brief reference to the ban in the context of basic Roman church dogma and practice - an excommunicated person cannot receive the benefits of the church for whatever purpose.

b) For his part, the RVC commentator appears here to be representing the Humanist viewpoint and the Reformist stand in general. In other words, he criticizes the threat and use of the ban by the authorities in Rome in the strongest
terms - their seemingly exclusive use of it, that is, as a money-raising measure - but does not question the dogma involved.

c) With the two later glosses of 1544 and 1650, however, we have a very different picture, for here we have a careful representation of Luther's position with regard to the "small" or Christian ban, that is, the excommunication of the individual person at the local level for sins he is generally known to have committed and for which, if he refuses to reform, he will be excluded from the Christian community by the pastor acting on behalf of this community. The use of the term "Christliche Bann" by Luther occurs only - as far as I have been able to determine - in his Schmalkaldic Articles, and this, coupled with other similarities which we will be noting later in other connections, suggests that this 1544 commentator may have had access to this work.

d) From a purely theological point of view, a comparison of RVA 1,33,2 with 1544 1,29,3 and 1650 1,27,3 might appear to indicate a parallel between the RVA commentator's description of the shutting out of the excommunicate from the benefits of the church and Luther's exposition of virtually the same doctrine as this is reflected in the two latter glosses. Here, however, the parallel ends, for, it must be remembered, Reinke states that he is in the Pope's ban, and it is in Rome that Marten is going to negotiate his release from it, whereas for Luther the Christian ban was essentially
a local affair, involving only the individual concerned and his pastor representing the congregation of the church, which exercised the power of the "keys" to "bind" the sinner who refused to repent and to "loose" him when he showed repentance.
(iii) Indulgences, Pilgrimages, Veneration of Saints

We will concern ourselves with these three subjects at one and the same time, since they are, generally speaking, dealt with in this way in the glosses.

With regard to the narrative text, indulgences (Ablass = Afflat) are mentioned on five occasions in the original RVA/RVC text, the first three deriving from Reinaert I. The first of these occurs in the burlesque scene in Book I, chap. 9, where the priest's housekeeper has fallen into the river and he offers two kegs of beer, "dar to aflat unde gnade groet" (761) to anyone who will fish her out; the second when Reinke says in chap. 29 that he intends to go "Na rome umme gnade unde aflaet" (2546), his intention expressed here being repeated by the king in the following chapter, where the latter explains that Reinke is going to the Pope in Rome,

\begin{verbatim}
Van den nen wyl he ouer dat meer
Unde kumpt ock nicht wedder heer
Er, dan dat he heft vulle aflat
Van alle der sundichlyken daet (Tat)
(2605-08).
\end{verbatim}

The last two examples come from Books II and IV, the first particularly interesting from a textual point of view, since it is unique to RVA, being part of Reinke's second confession in Book II, chap. 8, which, as we know, is almost certainly an interpolation or substitution of the 1498 reviser. Here, with regard to the secular clergy, whom he criticizes for not practising what they preach, he writes:
Der kerken deyt (tut) he [der pape=Priester] suluen neen gud
Men (allein) to uns sprickett he 'ya, legget man uth!
Buwet (bauet) de kerken, dat is myn raet,
So vordene gy gnade unde afflaet (4029-32).

The second reference derives from *Reinaert II* and occurs during the duel in Book IV. Isegrim has Reinke at his mercy, and the latter pleads for his life with all manner of extravagant promises, beginning with that of going To allen kerker int hylghe lant.
Unde bryngen dar van to yuwer hant
Breue (Briefe) unde des aflates so vele
Vor yw unde yuwer olderen (Eltern) sele (6389-92).

Indulgences had developed over the years since the Crusades into an integral part of the third element of penance, namely that of satisfaction (Genugtuung). Hauschild describes the dogma behind the granting of indulgences in the following way:

Der theologische Grundgedanke des Ablasses war der des apostolischen Schlüsselamtes.... verbunden mit der Fegefeuerlehre und mit der 1343 zur offiziellen Lehre erklärten Vorstellung, dass die überschüssigen Verdienste der Heiligen, die sie für Tilgung ihrer eigenen Sünden nicht benötigten, den sündigen Gliedern der Solidargemeinschaft Kirche zugute kommen könnten. Diese Verdienste bildeten den Kirchenschatz, aus welchem der Papst als Haupt der Christenheit Anteile an die reuigen, absolvierten Christen vergab, um deren Sündenstrafen zu ermässigen oder ganz zu löschen oder um die Seelen bereits Verstorbener kraft der kirchlichen Fürbitte von der Strafabbüssung im Fegefeuer zu befreien.

Referring specifically to the situation around 1500, he continues:

Typisch für die Entwicklung im 15. Jahrhundert wurde die Verwildерung durch die immer stärkere Konzentration auf die Fegefeuerstrafen, durch die Lösung vom Bußsakrament, durch die massive Häufung, durch die Käuflichkeit, die den Ablass von einer religiösen Leistung abkoppelte, und
Leaving aside the initial mention of indulgences in RVA - part of a burlesque scene, as we have already noted - the four other examples show two of the methods by which indulgences could be obtained, namely by taking part in a pilgrimage - here to Rome or the Holy Land - or by contributing to the building of a church.

General opposition to indulgences, principally on account of the way in which money was thus siphoned off, as it were, to Rome, had been widespread for many years prior to 1498. The author of the Reformatio Sigismundi (1438), for example, couples them with simony, describing both as terrible sins, and in Martin Mair's 1457 letter to Aeneas Silvius (who had just been appointed a Cardinal) he states categorically that indulgences are approved by the Papal Curia for one purpose only, namely for the profits that they bring to Rome. In the Gravamina that Jakob Wimpfeling drew up in 1510 at the behest of Emperor Maximilian he, too, complains that the income from them is divided between the Holy See and its officials. Later in his tract Wimpfeling also criticizes from a religious point of view the granting of indulgences: there is such a multitude of explanations about them that the faithful become confused and this leads to immorality.

Finally, in the 1521 Gravamina, there is a complaint with regard to the use made of the money collected: the simple folk, this document claims, are being misled and cheated of their savings. (It should not be thought, however, that all money collected in this way went to Rome. The temporal authorities in Germany saw to that! To take Lübeck as an example, the City Council there
generally managed to specify that a proportion of the money collected be diverted to local building projects).  

Luther's stand with regard to indulgences, which he initiated by means of the ninety-five theses he drew up in late October, 1517, is well-known and need not be repeated here. His basic position, as this developed later, was that only God could forgive sins - provided, of course that the penitent had sufficient faith to believe this - as he explains very clearly and simply in his "Wider den falsch genannten Stand des Bapsts und der Bischofe" (1522):

Inn allen ablas bullen verspricht er [der Bapst] vergebung der sunden allen denen, die berewet und gebeychtet haben. Das ist die ergist vergiift und schedlichst verfurung, die ausz dem hewbt verfurfer Bapst und seynen larven (=Bischofe) kompt...

He goes on to explain that Christ in the Gospel did not say to the paralysed man "'lege gellt ynn den kasten, szo sind dyr deyne sund vergeben,'" but "'sey getrost,' oder 'traw fest, szo sind dyr deyne sund vergeben.'" The people, Luther claims, are seduced by indulgences from the sacred faith and trust in God's grace which alone brings forgiveness of sins, and directed to "bullen papyr und gellt eynlegen, das die eynfelltigen hertzen wollen lernen, nit auff gottis gnade szondernn auff yhr eygen werck bauwenn" WA 10:2,137-38).

In the Schmalkaldic Articles Luther sums up his position thus:

Zum sechsten: Hie gehoret her das liebe Ablas, so beide den Lebendigen und Todten ist gegeben (doch umb geld) und der leidige Judas
oder Bapst die verdienst Christi sampt den übrigen verdiensten aller Heiligen und der gantzen Kirchen darinn verkeufft etc. Welches alles nicht zu leiden ist. Und auch nicht allein, on Gottes wort, on not, ungeboten, zu wider ist dem ersten Artikel, [Das Jhesus Christus, unser Gott und Herr sey umb unser Sunde willen gestorben, und umb unser Gerechtigkeit willen auff erstanden..] Denn Christus verdienst nicht durch unser werck oder pfennig, sondern durch den glauben aus gnaden erlanget wird, on alles geld und verdienst. Nicht durchs Bapsts gewalt, sondern durch die predigt oder Gottes wort furgetragen (dargeboten) (WA 50,209).

To turn now to pilgrimages, we have already noted in the narrative text Reinke's resolution to embark on one (chap.29) and the king's reference to this at the end of chap.30. Then, in the following chapter, after he has requested that the wolf and his wife should provide him with two pairs of "shoes" and the bear with enough pelt to make a knapsack, Reinke explains:

Wente yd is yslykens pelegrymen recht,  
Dat he vor de to bydden plecht, (für diejenigen zu bitten pflegt),  
De em helpen myt ychteswes (irgend etwas).  
Dat do gy vlytich, god lone yw des (2657-60).

Generally speaking, there was no widespread criticism of pilgrimages per se among temporal authorities, the 1521 Gravamina, for example, including a complaint only of the clergy's demand in some bishoprics for a fourth or even a third part of all offerings collected from pilgrims who came to visit a shrine. This avaricious attitude on the part of the temporal powers is further illustrated in Joseph Lortz's criticism that in Germany they went out of their way to encourage pilgrims to visit German shrines particularly, in order to keep the money in the country, and in general terms to make it flow more freely. Ecclesiastical
authorities, however, became worried about the situation, particularly in respect of such phenomena as the bleeding host at Wilsnak in Brandenburg. A modern Franciscan, Ludger Meier, writes of the "religiöse Massenpsychose," which church leaders were unable to do anything about, and Lortz of the almost epidemic character of the urge to go on pilgrimages.

As far as Luther was concerned, he criticized pilgrimages primarily on the following grounds:

a) They were not commanded by God. This Luther stresses both in his "Von den guten Werken" (WA 6,276) and in his "An den christlichen Adel" (WA 6,437).

b) A man's proper place was at home looking after his family, as God commanded him. Going on pilgrimages was a sign of lack of faith, Luther contended, otherwise he would realise that he had everything he needed in his own parish (WA 6,437-38). A man was, in fact, forsaking everything that should have meaning for him, as Luther stated in his "Warnung an seine lieben Deutschen" of 1531:


(c) The devil was at work here. It was "teuffels vorfuhrung," Luther maintained, which caused a man to waste his money on a pilgrimage (WA 6,437). The bishops did not see that places of pilgrimage were the devil's work: "Es hilft auch nit das wundertzychen da geschenn, da der boze geist kann wol wunder thun" (WA 6,447).
Luther's summary in his Schmalkaldic Articles runs thus:

Zum dritten, die Walfarten...Nu ist das ia gewis das solch Walfarten on Gottes wort uns nicht geboten, auch nicht von nötten, weil wirs wol besser haben mögen, und sie on alle sunde und fahr (Gefahr) lassen (unterlassen) mögen. Warumb lesst man denn daheimen eigen Pfarr, Gotts wort, weib und kind etc. die nötig und geboten sind, und leufft den unnötigen, ungewissen, scheidlichen Teuffels irrwischen nach? On das der Teufel den Bapst geritten hat, solchs zu preisen und bestetigen, damit die Leute ja heuffig von Christo auff jre eigen werck fielen und Abgöttisch wurden, welches das ergeste dran ist (WA 50,207).

Finally, with regard to the veneration of saints, there is no direct reference to this in the narrative text, as might be expected. It is introduced into the glosses with reference to pilgrimages, since it was to worship at the shrine of a certain saint that most pilgrimages were instituted. This was not, of course, the only occasion on which the saints were venerated. They had, in fact, come to play a much larger part in the everyday life of the community in the later Middle Ages, in the system of patronage by individual saints, for example, both as this applied to particular groups in society, such as guilds and confraternities (Bruderschaften), and to special diseases and emergencies. Veneration of the Virgin Mary, too, was intensified during this period, together with that of her mother, St. Anne.

With regard to this practice Luther is no less vehement in his criticism, condemning (a) the idolatry that resulted when the saints were venerated. In his "Warnung an seine lieben Deutschen" (1531), for
example, he writes of the "grewliche abgottereien" that resulted
when it was not thought enough "die heiligen zu ehren und Gott jnn
in zu loben," but instead to make "eitel Göttter" out of them and
to put "das edle kind, die Mutter Maria" in Christ's place
(WA 30:3,312).

(b) this veneration of and supplication to the saints for
their intercession as something not ordained by God in Scripture.
This Luther expands on in his "Sendbrief vom Dolmetschen" (1530),
where he also censures the patronage allotted to individual saints
over the natural elements such as fire and water, and also over
all kinds of pestilence and fever, "das Gott selbs hat gar mussig
sein müssen, und die Heiligen lassen an seiner stat wircken und
schaffen"(WA 30:2,643). It is, he goes on, "ein fehrlicher,
ergerlicher dienst, das die leute gewonen gar leicht sich von
Christo zu wenden, und lernen bald mehr zuversicht auff die
Heiligen, denn auff Christo selbs zu setzen" (WA 30:2,644).

Luther sums up in his Schmalkaldic Articles in this way:

Von Heiligen anruffen

Anruffung der Heiligen ist auch der End
Christischen Misbreuche einer und streitet
wider den ersten Hauptartikel*** und tilget
die erkennnis Christi. Ist auch nicht
geboten, noch geraten, hat auch kein Exempel
der schriftt, Und habens alles tausent mal
besser an Christo, wenn jenes gleich köstlich
gut were, als doch nicht ist. Und wiewol die
Engel im Himel fur uns bitten (wie Christus
selber thut) Also auch die Heiligen auff
Erden, oder vielleicht auch im Himel. So
folget daraus nicht, das wir die Engel und
Heiligen anruffen, anbeten, jnen fasten,
feiren, Messe halten, opffern, Kirchen, Altar,
Gottesdienst stifften und ander weise mehr
dienen und sie fur Nothelffer halten und
allerley Hülffe unter sie teilen, und iglichem
ein sonderliche zu eigen solten, wie die Papisten leren und thun. Denn das ist Abgotterey, Und solche ehre gehoret Gott alleine zu...(WA 50,210).

As far as the glosses are concerned, it is interesting to note, in the first place, that there are no references to indulgences at all in RVA, despite the various occasions on which they are mentioned in the narrative text, which we have already noted. Nor are there any to the veneration of the saints, which is not so surprising, as this practice is not mentioned in the narrative text. Pilgrimages, however, this commentator does refer to on two occasions, the first of which we have already observed, where, that is, in 1,33,1, he states that in the old days (oldinges) if anyone wanted to go on a pilgrimage, the priest was accustomed to give him a staff with his blessing. The term "oldinges" may seem strange coming from the pen of someone writing in 1498, when pilgrimages were in full spate, as it were. It could, however, also be taken as an indication that at this particular time the special custom to which he refers had died out on account of the tremendous number of people now involved, whose motivation was, moreover, often questionable.

The second mention, this time of false pilgrims, to some extent bears this out. Concerning these he writes in 1,34,1 as follows:

Dat erste is de boszheyt mannyges valschen pelegryms unde mannyges geistlyken boszaftigen ghefynseden (heuchlerischen) schalkes alze de faryseen dar de here van secht in deme hyllgen ewangelio: se synt unde schynen buitenwendich hylllich, men (allein) van bynnen syn se grypene wulue; by erer vrucht schalmen se kennen spryckt de here.
The above indicates, I submit, an attitude towards the current pilgrimage mania which accords well with that of the more thoughtful members of the contemporary clergy, which we have already noted.

In RVC there are three references to indulgences - in 1,29,4; 1,30,2 and IV,6,2 - only the second of which is taken up by the 1544 commentator, although the topics of pilgrimages and the veneration of the saints are dealt with by all three commentators in their glosses to 1,29 (1,27 in 1650) and in the RVC glosses 1,33,1; 1,34,1 and IV,6,2. Beginning with the glosses to 1,29 - this is the chapter in which in the narrative text Reinke explains to the king that he cannot accompany him to look for the treasure because he is under the Papal ban, and subsequently announces his intention of going on a pilgrimage to Rome and over the sea (to the Holy Land) - the RVC commentator uses here in 1,29,4 two Agricola proverbs to state his case, beginning

In der Christenheit / weren twe grote Bedeuarde (Wallifahrten) / de sünde der leuendigen uund der doden / (wo men valschlick gelouede) dardorch tho boten (bussen) alse tho S. Jacob und tho Rome.

Because too many people began to favour the former pilgrimage, he goes on, the Pope decreed that Jubilee Years, which had up to that time been celebrated every fifty years, should henceforth be celebrated every twenty-five. When he began to feel, however, that these years were coming round too slowly - in order, that is, not to lose out in this respect - he issued indulgence bulls to absolve the people from the long journey, decreeing that they should put into the collecting boxes the sum of money they would
have spent on the journey (to Rome). The commentator continues:

Uund ys aalso mit den Bedefarden und Afflate / ydel bütery (Büberei) und bedroch (Betrug) gewesen. Der haluen wert dadorch nemandt framer (frommer) / entfanget ock van Godt / jnn syner conscientie / nenen trost wedder den Düuel (Teufel) / sunder ys ergerlick und vorforisch.

The above is a virtual translation of *Agricola* (719). Continuing, he writes:

Wente Godt regeret syne Christlicke gemeine / de an em gelöuet / dorc synen hilligen Geyst/ und gifft er nen ander måteken (Wahrzeichen) van vorgeuinge / der sünde / aise syn Wordt. Dat / wol (wer) gnade bedarff / wenner und wo vaken (oft) de schal se men (nur) begeren / na lude (laut) Gödtlikes Wordes / van Godt / und nicht van den hilligen jnn Bedefarden / so schal se em wedderfaren.

The power to forgive sins, he maintains, has been incorporated by the devil in the Pope and in the pilgrimages to Rome and other places, the devil having created a people of his own, namely monks, priests and nuns, to whom he whispers this enticement, which these persons proceed to instil into people's consciences and thus lead the whole world astray. (The above is based on *Agricola* (25) with few alterations.)

The following points have been made here:

(a) a rejection of pilgrimages as part of penance for sin, whether on the part of the sinner himself or on behalf of the dead (in purgatory)

(b) a rejection of the seductive power of both indulgences and pilgrimages: they do not make a man better, nor do they console his conscience in its struggle with the devil

(c) that Christ rules the Christian community through His
Holy Spirit

(d) that God's Word gives assurance both of forgiveness of sins and also that His grace can be obtained by direct supplication; there is no need to seek this through saints in pilgrimages

(e) that it is the devil who has given the Pope power to forgive sins and who has also created for himself a people of his own in monks, priests and nuns, who are leading the whole world astray.

The following texts of the 1544 and 1650 glosses are an interesting illustration of the way in which, on the one hand, the 1544 commentator takes over points from the 1539 gloss (RVC), but creates out of them a completely new gloss of his own, and, on the other, of the way in which the 1650 commentator takes up the points made by his predecessor, clarifying here, altering there, and adding his own - largely stylistic - material.

2) Aber Christus kund es da nicht thun / so kunt das gebett auch nichts thun. Christus must ein iugener sein das er gesagt hett: Alles was ihr den Vatter bitten werdet in meinem Namen / das wird er euch geben. Nein sie mustens selber thün / oder aber solts Christus thün (als doch schier kein wallfart zü Christo/ sonder viel mehr zu diesem oder jenem heillgen gewest) so kund es doch nicht daheim thün / denn er war nicht alles in allen / uund allenthalben / wie die Schrift von Gott redet / sonder war an eigen ort / da man galt bracht gebunden und gefangen / ja man sagt lechlich es ist aus guter meynung gescheen. Ja es soll wol ein güter fursatz sein / aber nichts destminder ist Gott darurch gelügen gestraft wie obgedacht / uund ist Gott selbs verlassen / und auff die lieben heillgen gelassen / dadurch die lieben heillgen gross geunehret sind / denn es ist ihn kein ehr / begerens auch gar nicht dass man die eher (Ehre) ihrem schöpffer / erlőser selig und heillgmacher neme / und jnen gebe.


(There follow here illustrations of this, such as, that a thief who
3) So will man auch bald antworten / ja es ist manchem geholffen worden / als wo Wallfahrten für mancherlei Krankheiten gewest sind. Ja ist manchen geholffen worden / wer weisz ob es Gott oder der Teuffel geholffen hat / Soll es darumb recht sein. Es ist ein ware histori / das ein fahrender schofter / einer frawen ein zettel fürs fieber angehengt / sie hat daran geubt / und wart gesund / do sie in dern nach wolt lassen abschreiben / stunden eitel Teuffels namen darinn / hat es Gott darumb gethan. Item die zeuberer helfen / und schaden machen mit jren gesegnen / Beschliessen gemeiniglich mit dem namen der heiligen dreifaltigkeit / und vorhin haben sie die Teuffel geremete / wie man im babpstumb die heiligen reimete / Wissen selber oft nicht was die selztamen Wort bedeuten die sie brauchen / so sind eitel Teuffels namen / und darnach hat gleich wol Gott gethan / und ist ein heiliger Christlicher segen gewest. Der Teuffel und der leidige unglaw habens gethen. Das es aber Gott geschehen ist / lasz dich mer schrecken / denn tröst / denn es geschicht den jenen der es braucht zür straff und verdamnus. Es were hievon viel zuschreiben / aber es haben andere gnügsam davon geschrieben. Ein jder sehe für sich.

3) Ja sprichstu weiter: Es hat gleichwohl diese Wallfarth ihrer vielen geholffen / und sie ihrer Krankheit ausstehen. Also hilft auch vor Gott nicht / das man sagt / es ist guter Meinung geschehen / und wird dennoch Gott dadurch geschrumpft / Wie denn durch die Wallfahrten ist geschehen: Denn dadurch wird Gott lügen gestraftet / als wolte der nicht thun / was er in seinem Worte versprochen; Die lieben Heiligen werden dadurch verunglimpft: Denn Ihren ist das keine Ehr / und sie begehren auch gar nicht / das man die Ehre den Schöpfen / Erlöser und H. Geist entziehe / und sie ihnen zukehr: Behüte Gott / wie solten sie zu solcher Sünde kommen / das ist ihnen ein Gewel in ihrem Augen / ein Elter in ihren Beinen / und ein Schwert in ihrem Herzen.

had stolen something might claim that he had done this with the good intention of providing his family with sustenance etc. etc.)
sey. Der Teufel und der Unglaube der Menschen seyn die eigentlichen Merkmeister dieses thuns. Das es aber Gott zulässt / das geschicht. Dem der es thut zum Schaden / und werden dermahlen eins davor müssen in der Helle / mit Ach und Weh! davor büßen etc.
A comparison of the 1544 gloss with RVC/Agricola shows that in section 1) the former commentator would appear to owe more here to Luther directly than to his predecessor, as, for example, his stress on the fact that, by going on a pilgrimage, a man was forsaking his home, his family and his job (WA 6,437-38; WA 30:3,316 and WA 50,207), and likewise his emphasis on a pilgrim's denial of the Redemption by what he was doing. This last, coupled with his reference to "den aller grossten heupt Artikel unser Christlichen glaubens," which Luther invokes, as we have seen, in connection both with indulgences and with veneration of the saints in his Schmalkaldic Articles, suggests a reference here to this work, although the commentator admittedly widens the definition that Luther himself had given to the "heupt Artickel."

With regard to section 2), this commentator takes over here the RVC/Agricola reference to the assurance to be gained from Scripture of a ubiquitous God who is prepared to answer prayer directly when and wherever requests are made - there is no need to undertake a pilgrimage to have this request granted though the mediation of a saint - although here again he appears to be confusing his Bible texts. He seems, namely, to have John 14,13-14 in mind, whereas Agricola was almost certainly quoting from Matt. 18,19-20:
The argument mentioned in item 2) that such things were carried out with good intention was most probably one that was often heard at that time, for Luther himself refers to it in connection with veneration of the saints in his "Predigt am 20. Sonntage nach Trinitatis vonn der heyligen erhe" (1522), where he says: "So sagen sie den: 'ey ich thusz in eyner gutenn meynung,'" continuing that God was not interested in this, only in having His commandments kept (WA 10:3,408). With regard to section 3), the 1544 commentator's reference here to the part played by the devil in cures performed at places of pilgrimage may derive in part from RVC/Agricola's mention of the workings of the devil with regard to the Roman church, but probably more directly from Luther's convictions with regard to the part played by the devil in inspiring people to take part in pilgrimages and in what went on at the place of pilgrimage with regard to the miracles performed.
With regard to the 1650 commentator's treatment of his predecessor's text, we note how, in section 1), he clarifies the text here, first filling it out and making it more comprehensible by his differentiation between Christ's merit and work and the pilgrim's own, on which he was falsely relying. His omission of the 1544 commentator's reference to "den allergrosten heupt Artikel" probably denotes lack of familiarity with the work (Schmalkaldic Articles) from which the reference probably derives.

As regards section 2), we note that he repeats his predecessor's apparently misquoted Gospel text. His mention, moreover, of Christ's rather than of God's ubiquity seems to confirm a reference to Matt 18,20. He agrees with him also regarding the good intention with which pilgrimages were often carried out and with his predecessor's negative judgement of this, as, too, with the former's view that the saints were being dishonoured by the attention being paid to them, which they had not sought.

This 1650 chapter-gloss, in fact, gives a good illustration of the way in which this commentator treats his predecessor's work and of his own presentation of the same material. In the first place, he makes the former's somewhat elliptical writing more comprehensible, enlarging, omitting and correcting where he feels this is necessary, and filling out his gloss with typically baroque devices such as "Häufung," as illustrated here by his listing of the saints' reaction to the dishonourable honour accorded them by misdirected veneration.

To return now to other references in the glosses - primarily
in RVC - to the subjects under review here, we note two further references in this gloss to indulgences. The first of these occurs in 1,30,2, where, following the chapter in the narrative text in which the king repeats Reinke's resolution to go to Rome "umme aflat unde gnade," the RVC commentator quotes lines of verse which he attributes to Hutten - this attribution remains unconfirmed, however - which cover a number of points, the first of these constituting a complaint regarding indulgences on financial grounds:

Dat dem Paweste umme gelt ys veil /
Gnade / Afflath und dat ewige Heil.
Wol (wer) meist gifft / de hefft den besten deil.

He then turns to the religious aspect, the lines here being based, so the marginal notes inform us, on verses from Isaiah and St. John's Gospel:

Derhaluen kan he nicht ein Stadtholder syn
Des truwen Gades / de melck und wyn
Ane Goldt und Süluer gifft tho kope (zum Kauf) /
Und heth (heisst) uns thom gnaden borne lopen (laufen).
Begert nichts davor / dan ein danckbar herte /
He hefft süluest gedragen unse smerte,
Syn Blodt und Dodt / betaide (bezahlte) unse schülde /
Dorch en ellene / kumpt des Vaders hülde.

The Pope, however, is still demanding money for this, the writer claims, although everyone is denying it to him. Rome would have drained the German nation completely dry and made off with all the money, he maintains,

Hedde Godt Allmechtich / nicht gesehen darin /
Und uns gegeuen synes Wordes hellen schyn
In welckerem doch gantz klarlick staet /
Wor de richte døre (Tür) jnn den hemmel ghat.
Nicht dorck de Römische gulden port (Pforte) /
Sunder dorck Christum / der Gnaden Hort.

In 1544,1,30 this commentator translates this verse into High
German, prefacing it with what is apparently a personal reminiscence:

Ich hab gesehen / der hette zwen zutodt geschlagen / uund allweg nur ein gulden oder etlich gen Rom getragen / und Ablasz bracht / das man jm weitors darumb nicht dorfft besprechen / uund war dennoch ein wirdiger pfaff / uund seelsorger. Wol hin ins Teuffels namen.

Although the above illustrates very well the attitude of this commentator towards the practice of the Roman Church in respect to both indulgences and to the administration of justice in the Curial courts, the story he tells appears somewhat far-fetched, unless one understands the word "Ablasz" here in the sense of pardon alone. The clergy in the Roman church were, namely, by virtue of their consecration considered *indelibilis*, that is, marked out for life as holier people than the rest of mankind, for which latter, as perpetual sinners, indulgences were devised.

The 1650 commentator omits here in his narrative text any mention of "Ablasz," so makes no attempt in his gloss to repeat either the pseudo-Hutten verse or his predecessor's comments.

The final reference in *RVC* to indulgences is in IV,6,2, following the chapter where the she-ape has murmured an incantation over Reinke before he embarks on the duel, where, in an unattributed extract from Franck/Erasmus *Moria*, indulgences are included among the antics people indulge in, alongside veneration of the saints for special purposes. Regarding indulgences he writes:

Etlyke können sych süluest / mit dem erdichten Afflate so gar smeichlen und kettelen (kitzeln) und ihre sunde söte (süss) maken. Dartho de tydt unde hitte (Hitze) des Fegefurs
Here the RVC commentator is reproducing the Humanist point of view. Generally speaking, they regarded the Roman Church's manipulation of indulgences as laughable and nonsensical, but they were not prepared to go so far as to challenge the practice on theological grounds.407

With regard to pilgrimages, in 1,33,1 the RVC commentator takes over from RVA 1,33,1 that commentator's reference to the former practice of the pilgrim's receiving his staff from a priest with the latter's blessing, but adds to this an apparently original entry, as follows:

Auerst (aber) desse Benedyunge / dar dor by de lude up valschen Gades denst vorfört synt / ys im gründe eine vormaledyunge gewesen. Wovoi vele mensen / solckes nicht hebben vorstan willen / sunder angstlick begert/ Daruan secht de hillige Davuid: 'Se hebben de vormaledyunge beleuet / und ys en gekamen. De Benedyunge hebben se nicht gewolt / und de ys verne van en geweken.408

Finally, in IV,6,2, in the same gloss - based on Franck/Erasmus Moria - as we had the reference to indulgences, we learn about the wondrous lies that are told concerning miracles which are supposed to have taken place on pilgrimages, also regarding wandering souls and poltergeists, all these being the more firmly believed, we are told, the further they are from the truth. These tales serve, Erasmus adds:

nicht allene / de vordrethlicheyt (Verdriesslichkeit) des lüendes darmit tho bötten (büssen) und de tyde wegh to bringen / sunder drecht (trägt) ock den offer papen (Messpriestern) und Buck(Bauch)prediger / gewinst in de köken (Küchen).
Erasmus also makes fun here of the veneration of the saints, relating how, for example, most people feel that if they see an image of St. Christopher they will be spared misfortune on that particular day, or if they say a special prayer to St. Barbara they will be spared both injury in battle and the worst kind of death, and other such examples.

Finally, in 11.8.4, at the end of an entry referring to all kinds of offences perpetrated by the clergy - we will be dealing with these later - this RVC commentator mentions also false preachers who lead astray poor Christians "van dem ewigen / eigenen schepper (Schöpfer) und Gade / up de creatur und hylligen."

Summary

a) With regard to RVA, the points already made here give rise to the supposition that this commentator can be numbered among the concerned clergy of his time - concerned, that is, about the way in which church practices were deteriorating. The first of these points is his failure to mention indulgences, which, as we have seen, was also a feature of other contemporary Mohnkopf publications. Also we have not only his pejorative remarks regarding the wickedness of many a false pilgrim, but also his reference to the former custom of the priest's blessing of the pilgrim's staff, this suggesting a much looser connection around 1500 between church authorities and pilgrims. With regard to indulgences, his failure to mention these, while not directly
confirming that he was a Franciscan, points nevertheless in this direction, since it was the Dominicans who were chiefly concerned with peddling these.

b) The RVC gloss presents us once again with a variety of viewpoints. In the first place, we have that of Luther (through Agricola) with the representation of indulgences and pilgrimages as knavery and deception and the latter particularly as the work of the devil. The Humanist viewpoint is represented here in the Franck/Erasmus passage representing indulgences as arrant nonsense and suggesting that the accompanying clergy derive the most benefit—and this financial—from the pilgrimages, and that veneration of the saints is a similarly idiotic practice. This type of criticism was devastating in itself, of course, but does not strike at the theological root of the problem, which was Luther’s concern.* It must, however, be added here, as far as the commentator himself is concerned, that at the end of this long passage he adds an original remark: "solckes ungelounens myszbruck ys nu klar am dage." Then, too, we have the nationalist attitude—held also by many Humanists—presented in the pseudo-Hutten verse: the Pope is sucking Germany dry by means of indulgence sales, touched on also in the Agricola passage, 1,29,4, regarding the Pope’s Golden or Jubilee Years.

c) With regard to the 1544 gloss, we note here less interest in indulgences and even a possible misunderstanding of their
application, suggesting that he was a younger man who had grown up in a Lutheran environment. His criticism of pilgrimages and veneration of the saints, however, follows Lutheran lines, and there is further evidence here that he was probably familiar with Luther's Schmalkaldic Articles. Once again, he displays inaccuracy with regard to a Biblical text.

d) The complete absence of any reference to indulgences in the 1650 gloss appears to show that at least the abuses with regard to this practice were now a thing of the past. The fact, however, that he takes over the substance of the 1544 gloss, and even expands it, with regard to pilgrimages and veneration of the saints - practices confirmed by the Council of Trent in 1563\textsuperscript{410} - might seem to suggest that he had some familiarity with these practices in his own day, if his use of the past tense here did not tend to rule this out. Stylistically, we have noted the use of the baroque "Häufung" here and also the rhetorical device of providing copious illustrations of any particular point the author wishes to emphasize.
(iv) The religious orders

Turning now to the people involved, we will deal first with the religious as opposed to the secular clergy, members, that is, of religious orders.

With regard to both monks and nuns, the references in the text are peripheral only. In the case of nuns we have the passage already referred to, where Reinke and Grimbart pass by a nunnery on their way to court the first time (Book I, chap. 18). Then, in the case of the monks, we have the passage already considered in detail, where Reinke refers, in the course of his second confession, to the "bekappeden" (4047-64), this passage being omitted entirely from the 1544 narrative text.

Generally speaking, criticism of the clergy, particularly of the mendicant orders, had been on the increase for sometime. In the *Reformatio Sigismundi*, however, while condemning the preference given by the Papacy to the regular orders, the author was harsher in his criticism of the monks - they should stay in their cloisters, where their numbers should be limited, and observe their rules and not usurp the duties of parish priests - than of the friars, whose service to the poor he acknowledged while at the same time criticizing many of them for breaking their own rules. In the 1521 *Gravamina*, however, the mendicant orders are treated far less gently. Complaints are made, for example, regarding the oppression of the poor by begging friars, since alms that should by right go to the poor are finding their way into the friars' pouches, a practice the bishops condone in exchange for a
portion of the money collected, it is alleged. 413

Regarding Luther's views, his concerns with respect to monks differed somewhat from those with respect to nuns, particularly as far as the reasons which caused them to withdraw from the world were concerned. With regard to the former, Luther felt this was often because they preferred to be sustained by others, rather than having to fend for themselves, as he writes in "An den christlichen Adel" (WA 6,468), nor, he counselled in the same tract, should men or women take vows until they had reached the age of thirty. By the time he came to write his "De votis monasticis Martini Lutheri judicium" (1521), he had, of course, completely rejected the concept of the creation of a class of people who were deemed holier than other men and women. 414 Here, in this tract concerning monastic vows, after contending that these contravene the Word of God, the Gospel, faith, Christian freedom and the Commandments of God (WA 8,639; LW 44,354), Luther goes on to explain how the vows of poverty, chastity and obedience are all untenable per se, summarizing his findings with the judgement that monastic vows are null, unlawful and blasphemous, so that, trusting in the Gospel, men may abandon them with complete confidence and return to the freedom of the Christian faith (WA 8,668; LW 44,399).

In the glosses there is no detailed treatment of monasticism in the 1544 and 1650 editions, where, in the latter, monks are not mentioned at all. For his part, the RVA commentator also contents himself with one gloss, 11,8,4, obviously referring to the lines concerning the "bekappeden," where he merely remarks on
the envy and hatred that is caused by the unequal sharing out of the food supplies.

With regard to RVC, we have already noted in the Agricola (23) passage in RVC 1,29,4 the author's claim that priests, monks and nuns are the devil's own creation, so to speak, a concept that he repeats in the following proverb (24) with particular reference to the creation of the monks, a passage reproduced (unattributed) by the RVC commentator in 11,6,5. After inserting a few words of his own with regard to what he has just written being "schimplick geredet" - that is, not to be taken seriously - the RVC commentator then remarks: "so ys ydt doch warhafftich / dat alle ere ankumpst (Ursprung) / dondt (Tun) und handel / der hillygen schrifft nicht gemete (gemäss)".

He then launches into the Franck/Erasmus Moria passage - very well-known - regarding the monastic orders, particularly the mendicants. They lead a very unreligious life, Erasmus claims, becoming far too concerned about the orders they belong to, "alse were ydt tho weinich / ein Christen genomet werden." They forget entirely, he claims, that Christ's chief commandment was one of love. Instead of paying attention to this, all they can boast of is how many psalms and canonical hours they have murmured and how many vigils and masses for the dead they have recited. Christ will surely, he says, disown them in the next world.

This the commentator follows by fourteen lines of verse attributed to Schwarzenberg, from his "Memorial der Tugend," where the latter summarizes much of the criticism that was being made concerning the religious orders just prior to the Reformation.
Putting the words into the mouth of a monk, Schwarzenberg excoriates their pretense of holiness, which served to deceive some people into giving them money, particularly the latters' ill-gotten gains when they were on the point of death, although the monks knew very well who the true heirs of this money were. They condone wickedness and also know how to seduce fine ladies, the monk admits. He continues:

Achte mer wat in der werlt geschicht / 
Alse myner Regel hoge plicht 
Dan wowol ick Godt ergeuen byn / 
So steit doch in der werlt all myn synn.

There are two glosses in the 1544 commentary in which monks are mentioned. In 11,7,4 the commentator refers to the eating and drinking, whoring and gaming "uund alle wollust" that is still going on "in den Stifften und klostern," which bring Christian teaching into disrepute. Then, two chapters later, he questions particularly the circumstances surrounding the entrance of young people into cloisters, complaining what an

unbesinnen / unweiszlich ding es gewest / das man die jungen leut on allen unterscheid in die Kloster gesteckt / unbedacht und unbetracht /was sie fur ein natur und gemut an jnen gehabt / dardurch man die Kloster inn solche grosse miszbreuch bracht hat / mit sünden und schanden (1544 11,9,6).

With regard to nuns we have a different picture entirely, both as regards the extent of the coverage in the glosses, except for RVA, and the nature of this coverage.

Here Luther emphasizes in particular the denial of a woman's natural right to bear children through confinement in a nunnery. In his "Wider den falsch genannten geistlichen Stand des Bapsts
und der Bischoffe" (1522), for example, he writes:

Luther feels that nuns such as these, who have not been endowed with natural chastity, are made to be chaste against their will; they do not wish to forgo sexual relations. His judgement here, however, is harsh: "Sind sie aber unwillig drynnen, szo verlieren die ditz und ihenes leben, müssen auff erden die helle haben und dort auch" (WA 10:2,156).

Later in the same year in his "Von ehelichem Leben" Luther returns to the attack, claiming that a nun's life is not so well-pleasing to God as that of a woman who has born a child, whether legitimate or illegitimate (WA 10:2,297). He sums up: "Darumb ist yhe keyn gleychen tzwisschen eym ehe weyb und klosterfrawen, wo ihene ym erkentnusz und glauben yhrs stands, und disze on glaube ynn vermessenheyt yhrs geystlichen stands lebt" (WA 10:2,298). Luther repeats this idea in his "Traubüchlein für die einfältigen Pfarrherrn" (1529), where he again praises the married state as ordained by God comparing it with that of the religious orders: "Denn obs wol ein weltlicher stand ist, so hat er dennoch Gotts wort für sich und ist nicht von menschen
ertichtet odder gestiftet wie der Münch und Nonnen stand" (WA 30:3,75).

His chief censure, however, Luther reserves for the noble relatives of the women they consign to and confine wholesale in nunneries - for the reason that there are no men of equal birth available as husbands - these relatives having no intention of restraining themselves in the same way: "Sie liegen bey weybern, wenn sie wollen, und geben yhrer natur lufft und rawm gnug, aber der arm hauff (=die Nonnen) musz ynn seyner hellen drob verderben" (WA 10:2,156).

The glosses to Book I, chap.18 provide us with a variety of points of view (RVC, 1544, I,16.1; 1650 I,17,1), the RVC commentator writing in an original entry:

Dann der Nunnent ys ydel / unfruchtbar
und gar nen nütte / ock der hillygen Schrifft
nicht gemete (gemäss) / wo genochsam apenbar.
Dartho den Nunnent suluest vordretlick (verdriesslich) / unangeneme und nicht
weinich beswerlick. Na dem se in eren
unvorstendigen kindtlichen jaren / dartho
auerredet und begeuen. Ock süluest / so se
eren willen gehatt/ weinich darhen gedacht /
effe vorwilliget hedden.

The marginal gloss here reads: "Der Nunnent stand und handel / ys
nicht schriftmetich."

This the RVC commentator follows with twelve lines from Schwarzenberg's "Memorial der Tugend," in which a nun complains that she "nicht werltlick werden möge." If she had taken a husband, she laments, "Godt und my süluest / hedde ick geeret /
und ock dartho de werlt vormeret." As it is, she is full of envy, hatred and impatience. Her body may be confined, but she longs for the world. "In twyuele (Zweifel) steit all myn thovorsicht /
Efft ick Godt gefalle / dat weth (weiss) ick nicht." There follow six lines by another, unknown author - although included by the RVC commentator in the Schwarzenberg attribution - where the nun states that they go dancing before mass, thus worshipping the devil. She continues:

Hyr hebbe ick schande / und namals de Hell /
Up fleischliche lust / mynen trost ick stell.
Dem wünsche ick ewige noth und quail /
De my hefft gebracht in dessen vall.

The 1544 commentator begins his gloss, 1,16,1, by repeating these eighteen lines in full. Most people would agree, he remarks in his comment on these, that more young people who long for the world have entered nunneries than old ones who long for God,

Was für andacht bei den selben gewest / und wie Got solch gespott hab gefallen können /
mag ein jheder wol ermesen / der weisz was Gott für Gottesdient / uund gehorsam von uns fordert.

Later, in 11,9,6, this commentator, as we have seen, condemns the practice of putting young people into cloisters without regard for their dispositions.

For his part, the 1650 commentator in 1,17,1, treats the matter somewhat differently, tracing the history of nunneries back to the early church, when only those who desired to serve God entered them. Basing his judgement on what St. Paul writes in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, chap. 7, this commentator maintains that, according to St. Paul, those who remained virgins had chosen the better path: "Item welcher verheiratet / der thut wohl / welcher aber nicht verheiratet / der thut besser," since the latter care more for what belongs to God, whereas the former
are more concerned with the world and pleasing their husbands. He admits, however, that problems arose under the Papacy when girls were forced into nunneries against their will at a time when it was generally held that members of religious orders would gain eternal salvation by virtue of this membership alone. This, according to the commentator, runs contrary to St. Paul's statement that all have their particular gift from God and that those who marry are not sinning. He then quotes his own baroque version of the eighteen lines of verse reproduced in the 1544 gloss, and follows this with a reference to a book entitled "Das Buchlein der Himmlischen Ehescheidung," which, he claims, "die Romische Kirche durch verübte Ungebuhr verursachte."

This book describes the visit paid by an angel, disguised as a young foreigner, to a nunnery in Italy, where, having been led to believe that nuns were holy angels in human bodies, he is severely disillusioned during a conversation with one on earth. To his remark as to what bliss it must be never to have to leave the paradise of their holy walls, where they resemble the angels of God, the nun replies:

Ach! Wie viel seyn under uns / welche dieses Paradies gegen ewerer Wanderschaft von Hertzen gern vertauschten / etc. Wir seyn hie herein zusammen verschlossen durch unser Böses Glück/ und die grausame Ohnarmhertzigkeit unserer Eltern / mit Hülfe und Vorschub der Romischen Kirchen / welche den Schein und Vorwand / so man darzu gebraucht / gut heiszt. Es ist eine grosse Sache / zu einer ewigen Gefängnis geboren zu werden / indem man doch sihet / dasz all anders was da lebet von der Natur eine gantze Welt bekommen hat / sich darein zu ergetzen.

She goes on to describe how their natural desires are not
quenched when they don their habits, and so on and so forth. The
commentator concludes that only those who have the gift of natural
chastity should enter nunneries. There should be no compulsion.

Summary

a) Owing primarily to the reproduction in all glosses except RVA
of the eighteen lines of verse regarding a nun’s life, there is unanimity concerning the points raised here, which
conform in great measure to Luther’s views:

(aa) Nuns would have a more honourable status as wives bearing
children than they have as nuns.

(bb) They are filled with envy of those who are in the world.

(cc) Their life is a hell on earth on account of their
unsatisfied sexual yearnings, for which they will
suffer in hell in the afterlife.

(dd) They blame those who brought them to this pass.

b) As far as the individual glosses are concerned, only the RVC
commentator gives extensive coverage to the monks, once again
presenting us with more than one viewpoint – the general
Reformist point of view in the Schwarzenberg lines,
Agricola’s highly pejorative, fanciful fable-like description
of the devil’s creation of monks and the Humanist criticism
of Erasmus. With regard to the last mentioned, however –
for which there is no attribution – we have seen that at the
end of it the commentator himself remarks that it has all
now been found to be false. He does here also, as we have
noted, confirm Luther’s position with regard to the monastic
orders in his introduction to the Erasmus passage, where he states that neither the origin of monasticism nor the activities of the monks were ordained in Scripture. With regard to nuns, over and above what we have already observed, he also makes particular reference to the fact that girls were sometimes packed off to nunneries in their earliest years.  

In the 1544 gloss (1,18,6) we note the commentator’s remark concerning the apparent continuation of abuses - over-eating and drinking, whoring etc - in the monastic foundations that were still in existence and the way he appears to attribute this to the young people’s having been placed in such institutions without any attention being paid to their dispositions. One misses criticism of the fact that they were so placed, although "stecken" is certainly a pejorative word here. In general, as far as nuns are concerned, what he has to say here lacks the urgency and personal involvement we have noted in much of his work. Obviously things had settled down considerably by 1544 with regard to the monastic orders. This was no longer the burning question it had been in the 1520s. It is also possible to conclude that this commentator had no personal involvement here where his own immediate family was concerned.  

The contribution of the 1650 commentator here is extremely interesting. After a hundred years he is in a position to put the question into historical perspective. While decrying
in the strongest terms both the compulsory aspect of entrance into a nunnery and the idea that membership in a religious order confers a higher degree of sanctity *per se*, he does not appear to condemn such institutions outright, although he does stress that only those women with the natural gift of chastity should take up such a life.
(v) Secular clergy

The principal places in the narrative text where the lower clergy are mentioned are the burlesque scene in Book I, chap. 9, which we have already noted, and also in chap. 14, where we learn of the tom-cat Hinze's experiences with the priest and his family in the former's pursuit of the fictitious mice. Then in chap. 33 we have a reference to the ram Bellin's being the king's "cappellan / De de geystliken dynck plach (pflegt) to vorstan" (2711-12), and to his subsequent kow-towing to the king in the matter of giving the excommunicated Reinke the church's blessing. There is also a further general reference in Reinke's second confession to the king's confessor and his chaplain (Book II, chap. 7) who do not dare to tell him the truth regarding his conduct, followed by Reinke's censure of the clergy in general in chap. 8, both for their conduct and for the poor example they are setting.

With regard to bishops and other members of the higher clergy, the references are even more peripheral, beginning with those in Book I, chap. 33 where Bellin refers to his superior, Bishop Anegrunt (1.2729), who he is anxious should not come to hear of what he had done where Reinke was concerned, along with the bishop's colleagues, the provost, Herr Losevunt (1.2730) and the dean, Rapiamus (1.2731). The bishop is then mentioned again by Reinke in Book III, chap. 2 as having been Marten the ape's employer for ten years (4345-55). Prelates are also included, of course, in Reinke's indictment of the clergy as a whole in his
second confession.

As far as opinion in general is concerned, the author of the *Reformatio Sigismundi* puts forward definite proposals with regard to the parish priests: they should be allowed to marry and should also have a regular salary, the collection of rents and tithes to be put into the hands of a curator.\(^{23}\) Wimpeling's *Gravamina* of 1510 attack absenteeism among some parish priests resulting from the number of benefices that they held, which in itself leads to the impoverishment and maltreatment of other clergy.\(^{24}\) The 1521 *Gravamina* also contain protests regarding the lack of education and the immorality of some priests as also their misuse of excommunication, which we have already noted, and other fiscal extortions, including fees charged parishioners for illicit cohabitation, and the practice of usury.\(^{25}\)

With regard to the bishops and higher clergy generally, however, the situation was very different. The author of the *Reformatio Sigismundi* criticizes them in the first place for their function as temporal lords, which includes waging wars, ownership of castles and large incomes, insisting that they should aim at being an example to the clergy under them and that they should hold annual visitations in their dioceses. Bishops should also have reached a required educational standard themselves and appoint as priests only those who had done likewise. A bishop, moreover, should be in charge of all ecclesiastical appointments in his diocese - no one should be beneficed directly from Rome - and he should not allow pluralism.\(^{26}\) Presumably on account of the number of prince-bishops who were members of the Princes' chamber
of the Imperial Diet, the 1521 Gravamina are muted on this subject, although a recommendation is included for more frequent calling of synods.*

Luther's proclamation of the priesthood of all believers in his "An den christlichen Adel" (1520) has already been noted. In his "De captivitate Babylonica" of the same year he explained further that priesthood implied nothing more than the ministry of God's Word, for which ministry, however, a man had to have the consent of the community (WA 6,566-57; LW 36,116). Ten years later, when a community church such as he had originally envisaged had failed to materialize, Luther stressed rather the appointment to such an office as being the most important factor, as he writes in his interpretation of the 82nd psalm:

Es hilft auch nicht, das sie fürgeben, Alle Christen sind Priester, Es ist wahr, alle Christen sind priester. Aber nicht alle Pfarrer. Den über das, das er Christen und priester ist, mus er auch ein ampt und ein befohlen kirchspiel haben. Der beruff und befelh macht Pfarher und Prediger (WA 31:1,211).

Luther had already come out in favour of married clergy in his "An den christlichen Adel"; they should have a choice, for the Pope does not have the right to impose celibacy as it is not ordained by God (WA 6,440). However, the precarious state of the married clergy under the Reformation, when many of the previous sources of revenue had dried up, was a constant source of worry to him. He refers to their plight in his "Kinder zur Schule halten" (1530), where he upbraids those who claim to be Evangelicals and Christians yet who give nothing towards the maintenance of pastors and preachers (WA 30:2,583).**
Not that the clergy themselves escaped Luther’s criticism, particularly those who were close to temporal authorities and who did not stand up to them and speak openly and boldly. Some, in fact, as he claims in his interpretation of the 82nd psalm, play the hypocrite and flatter wicked rulers. Others are fearful for their skins and are afraid to lose their lives and goods (WA 31:1,196). They should remember, however, that

das predig ampt ist nicht ein hofe diener odder baurn knecht. Es ist Gottes diener und knecht und sein befel gehet uber herrn und knecht...das er [der Prediger] es thu, wie sichs geburt und recht ist, nicht nach eigener gonst odder abgonst, sondern nach dem recht, das ist nach Gottes wort, welchs kein unterscheid noch ansehen der person achtet (WA 31:1,198).

As far as bishops are concerned, Luther is particularly vehement in his criticism. He attacks on the one hand their sins of omission:

(a) They do not preach the Gospel. What kind of a bishop is he, Luther inquires in his "De captivitate Babylonica" (1520), who does not preach the Gospel or practise the cure of souls, except an idol having only the appearance and name of a bishop (WA 6,550; LW 36,91)? Returning to the same figure of speech in "Von der Beicht" (1521), he complains that bishops nowadays are not bishops, "szondernn wie die gemalte und hultzene Bischoff, denn es treybt yhr keyner Bischoffs ampt und werck, nemlich das predigen, nit eyn yglich predigen, szondernn gottis wort predigen" (WA 8,165-66).

(b) They overlook the vice that is rampant - the guzzling and the gluttony in the taverns, the swearing, immorality, murder,
adultery, whoring and usury etc. And "was tun sie?" he inquires in "Von der Beicht," "sie reytten hubsch hengst und tragen gulden stuck, hallten fursten hoffe, oder sind sie gantz heylig, szo hallten sie mesz und betten yrs sieben getzeyt" (WA 8.174). In Luther’s view, however, bishops are appointed to fight such sin and to maintain Christian order.

(c) They fail to administer to the needs of their flock. In his "Kleiner Katechismus für die gemeine Pfarherr und Prediger" (1529), for example, Luther demands: "0 yhr Bisschoffe, was wolt yhr doch Christo ymer mehr antworten, das yhr das volck so schendlich habt lassen gehen und ewer ampt nicht ein augenblick yhe beweiset?" (WA 30:1,266).

(d) They lack the requisite learning (WA 10:2,131).

Regarding the bishops' sins of commission, Luther attacks in his "Wider den falsch genannten geistlichen Stand des Papsts und der Bischöfe" (1522)

(a) their immorality, not only in their own lives, but in their condoning of that of the priests under them through the levy of cradle and concubinage fees.

(b) their function as false prophets for their teaching that people will be saved by their good works.

(c) their "wolfishness" in the way in which they murder souls (by the above teaching), in the way in which they rob people of their property (over-taxation), in the way in which they preach the Pope's Bulls instead of God's Word and even require money for this last - i.e. for indulgences.

(d) their worldliness - a bishop cannot be a prince at the
same time (WA 10:2,108 et seq).

In his "Von weltlicher Oberkeit" (1523) Luther sums up as follows:

Denn meyn ungnedige herrn, Bapst und Bischoffe sollen bischoffe seyn uund Gottis wortt predigen. Das lassen sie und sind weltliche fursten worden und regirn mit gesetzen, die nur leyb und güt betreffen. Feyn haben sie es umbkeret: ynnenlich solten sie regirn die seelen durch Gottis wortt, so regirn sie auszwendi schlesser, stedt, land und leutt und martern die seelen mit unseligicher mörderey (WA 11,265).

As regards the glosses, we will deal with the topics covered here in the following order:

a) clerical unchastity and celibacy

b) the bad example the above sets the laity, the conduct of the clergy generally and their relationship with the laity

c) clerical avarice

d) the relationship of the spiritual to the temporal authorities

e) bishops and the clergy generally

a) As far as the unchastity of the clergy in concerned, this was mentioned in the second prefaces to both RVA and RVC, as we noted. The first chapter-glosses that are concerned with the clergy - those to Book I, chap. 14 - deal with clerical concubinage, which the RVA commentator in 1,14,7 roundly condemns, while admitting that "in der olden ee," meaning in the Old Testament, priests had wives, and that they are still allowed to have them under the ecclesiastical law of the Jewish, Greek and
Russian churches. Perhaps, he muses, the priest in the narrative text is "nicht van der krystene ee."430

For his part, the RVC commentator in 1,14,1 represents the opposing point of view. "Desse geistlick genannte Standt," he thunders, "ys van synem rechten wege / Christliken und schriftmētigen gebuke (Gebrauch) / den ock de erste Christlike Kercke / reine. und unuoruelschet (unverfälscht) / ernstlick geholden / gantz und gar affgetreden (abgetreten)," since in the early Christian church, according to Christ’s teaching, clerical marriage was permissible. It was the Pope who took it upon himself, the commentator states, to change this, whence the present immorality has originated, since instead of lawful wives the priests now keep as many whores as they like.

He then proceeds to quote from a passage in Franck’s Geschichtsbibel (unattributed) giving the historical background and examples of the Early Fathers who had wives, mentioning Paphnutius’s intervention at the Council of Nicaea (325) in favour of clerical marriage, and quoting, in addition, references to Canon Law providing for the dismissal of bishops from the church who either kept concubines themselves, or, against payment of a fee, allowed the clergy under them to do so.431 Nor should the congregation hear a mass read by a priest with a concubine.

The 1544 commentator, in 1,14,1, takes over much of the sense of his predecessor’s gloss here, using even more emphatic language. Referring to the Roman church authorities, he declares: "Aber umb jhres mutwillens und babilonischen hurn / und wollust willen / achten sie weder Gottes noch der heiligen Vätter und
Concilien gebott" by enforcing celibacy. They pay no attention to Holy Scripture, he maintains, over which they claim to have mastery, on the grounds that they, according to them, are the head of the Christian church, although this position, the commentator states, belongs to Christ alone according to Scripture.432

The 1650 commentator, in 1,14,2, while agreeing with his predecessor also makes a point of emphasizing the fact that the Roman Church authorities appear to prefer their clergy to keep concubines rather than legal wives, since by allowing the latter they would upset the whole Christian church which had ordained this celibacy. His general criticism made after a hundred years have elapsed is a surprisingly strong echo of that made previously at the height of the Reformation:

So geht es bey den Bapstlern / Sie halten höher der Menschen Gebot und Satzungen / denn des höchsten Gottes Befehl; Was der Babst sagt dasz musz uund sol steif und feste gehalten werden: Aber was Christus sage und dessen Apostel / dasz lasse sich thun auch nicht etc.

In the second part of his gloss 11,8,5 - the first part of this we shall be considering in another connection - the 1544 commentator comes out strongly in defence of clerical marriage. Here he turns to the argument - posed initially by St. Paul in 1 Cor 7 - that men without wives, freed from the care of a household, can the better attend to their spiritual duties.433 This he counters with another quotation from St. Paul from the same chapter, similar to the one used by the 1650 commentator in respect of nuns, namely that it is better to marry than to burn with desire,434 and that true chastity is granted
only to a few, using these quotations to argue that a clergyman who has a lawful wife can the better carry out his duties than one who has been forbidden to marry but who is plagued with sexual desire.

b) What appeared to disturb the RVA commentator most in his long gloss 1,14,7 was the bad example that the unchaste priests were setting - their light should rather shine before men - thus providing their parishioners with an excuse to follow their example: "Ya were yd so grote sunde, so deden yd de papen nicht," he has the latter saying. Then, while emphasizing that imitating someone else's misdeeds is no excuse for one's own misdoing, he nevertheless admits that the clergy's sin is the greater. "Wente yo hogher grad, so deper ghevallen, wan se sundigen, unde mothen mer rede (Rechenschaft) gheuen vor andere, de syk an se argeren, wan ein leye." (This is a reference, of course, to the holier state that the clergy in the Roman church were held to be in by virtue of their consecration as priests.) Laymen should follow the example and teaching of good priests, he maintains, not their bad practices. Furthermore, again emphasizing the difference in status, he declares that the laity are not obliged to the same extent (so sere plichtich) to rebuke the clergy as the latter are obliged to rebuke the laity and to give them a good example.

For his part the RVC commentator here takes over the initial part of his predecessor's gloss regarding the necessity for the clergy to set a good example, including the Gospel quotation, but omitting, as one would expect, the reference to the higher state
of the clergy.

This problem regarding the conduct of the priesthood and the example its members set is brought up again in the glosses to 11,7 and 11,8, the RVA commentator (11,7.4) repeating his warning that blaming one's own sins on other people will not excuse them, using Adam as an example of this. The RVC commentator (11,7,1) here mentions "grote Heren" besides prelates, while the 1544 commentator remarks in 11,7,4 that "geistliche personen" should rather "mit predigen und lehren / und mit ihrem ehrlichen / züchtigen / Gottfürchtigen / uund gerechten leben uund wandel / jederman gen himel führen," stating moreover that everyone must agree, "er sei so gut pfarrisch als er wolle," that a few years ago (ettlich jar her) there was much whoring, adultery, abuse of power and the ban among ecclesiastics. Those who still act in this way will go to hell, he states, which should terrify others to such an extent that they beseech God to preserve them from falling in the same way. The 1650 commentator here (11,7,4) is more concerned with the bad example princes and nobles set their subjects and officials than with that set by the clergy.

With regard to the glosses of 11,8, the conduct of the clergy is attacked even more forcefully here than in the glosses of 1,14. Here, in 11,8,3, the RVA commentator quotes St. Jerome's strictures on this topic including the quotation that "eyn gud leuent unde nicht gheprediket is beter, wan alze eyn quad (böses) leuent unde vele gheprediket efte leret," following this with more severe censure regarding the criticism of the clergy by the laity than he had made in the gloss of 1,14: "doch is hir
eyne lere, dat neyn leye alsodanen prester schal beseggen (beschüldigen) efte quad von eme spreken, wente de leyen synt nicht rychters der gheystlyken." The RVC commentator here, (11,8,3), takes over the St.Jerome passage, adding further illustrations to the topic of the importance of the clergy's setting a good example in lines from Brandt's Narrenschyp:

Wolgeschicked worde / dar by quade wercke / Maken nicht dat volck in dogeden (Tugenden) starcke. 
Dat best Exempel dat du kanst geuen / Dem gemeinen volcke / mercke dat euen. 
In eynem guden leuende / ga du en vor / So volgen se dy / yn de rechte dør. 
Lerestu se flitich (fleissig) / und bist ym leuende feyl / So bystu ein groth dore (Tor) gantz und heel.

In 11,8,4 also this commentator chides those members of the clergy who do not practise what they preach, claiming that they are useless to the Christian community and that they, in fact, "breken vele mer mit den wercken / alse se mit dem worde buwen."

Most interesting here is the 1544 commentator's revival, as it were, in 11,8,7, of the RVA commentator's rebuke of the laity for their criticism of the clergy, though he gives, of course, a different reason: "Er [der pfarherr] hat seinen bescheid / sein bevolhen ampt." It is up to the temporal authorities to deal with him if he is sinful and wicked, and God will punish him. Here again the layman is urged to follow the pastor's good teaching rather than his wicked deeds and be more concerned with his own misdoing than rebuking the pastor for his. Over and above this, another of this commentator's concerns is that "nicht ein jeder rültz (roher Mensch) und Bawr / der ehe und besser ein furch an einem acker ziehen / denn ein zeil schreiben oder lesen" should be
able to dispute with the clergy "von hohen geistlichen sachen." For his part, the 1650 commentator is more concerned in 11.8 with morality, remarking here that "ein jeder klugling" should rather examine himself to see how far he has strayed from the right path than condemn the clergy. It is of concern to him nevertheless that the clergy of his day appear to be accused of absolutely everything bad that anyone can think up. For this reason, he says, they must be extremely careful in their behaviour: "Ein jedweder wird danach sehen / dasz er mit seinem Exempel nicht den Lasterer selbsten in das Maul und auf die schneidende Zunge falle," following this up with examples of the ways in which they have erred in a colourful antithetical baroque passage provided by Moscherosch:


All this brings a final exhortation at the end of the gloss to the clergy to realise that they are not holy angels but subject to human frailty.

Finally, in III.2.11, the 1544 commentator chides the "Geistlichen" - here obviously meaning the Roman Church clergy - with regard to their idea of fasting, accusing them of eating more splendidly on fast days than on others. This gloss the 1650 commentator takes over in substance in III.2.5 with the addition of Biblical quotations.
c) With regard to avarice, we have noted the references in the RVA/RVC second prefaces to the avarice of the clergy. As far as the chapter-glosses are concerned, however, it is the 1544 commentator who in 11,8,5 gives this criticism the most detailed treatment. After stating that he is diverging somewhat from his text (whether he means from his predecessor's gloss or from the narrative text is unclear: he diverges from both!), this commentator refers to the complaints that are heard on all sides with regard to the clergy. For purposes of clarity, he explains, he will divide the clergy into two groups, firstly, the married ones who are accused of being greedy and insatiable, of being ambitious for their children, of teaching much but doing little and of being filled with envy, hatred and anger. Secondly, there are the unmarried ones who are accused of keeping whores, whom they regularly cast off, even sometimes of violating burghers' wives and daughters, and of accumulating prebends in order to be able to sustain these "families" in a grand manner.

This 1544 commentator then jumps to the defence of the married clergy, among whom, he says, he personally knows none who are arrogant, avaricious or full of envy and hatred or who do not practise what they preach, maintaining, on the contrary, that the situation with many is "бавфеллаг." This he proceeds to elaborate. Complaints are made, he states, about the insatiability of pastors when they receive 100 gulden a year, or 200 in a town. Also, when a pastor either demands payment of the tithe, or when this is denied him, there are the same criticisms. Yet, compared with parish priests in former times,
pastors now receive no payment for services such as vigils and private masses (for the dead). Nowadays, he states, "gibt keiner allen heiligen Gottes / wie man pflegt zu sagen / nicht ein heller / er muss es dan thun / uund thuts dazu nicht gern." This is particularly bad, he states, in the current inflationary times. Yet is the labourer not worthy of his reward, he asks Should he have to go begging with his wife and children? Should it be considered better to be sustaining a man with children galore who cannot console you in your last hour, and who would as soon read you a fable as the Gospel? There is really no cause for complaint regarding the country clergy, he assures his readers, and everyone knows what the economic situation is like in the towns. Finally, he claims, no one can blame these men for wanting to do the best for their children.

d) Turning now to the relationship between the temporal and the ecclesiastical authorities, the glosses to 1,33 present an interesting contrast. The first two, RVA 1,33,3 and RVC 1,33,2, in comments on Bellin's eventual agreement to do what the king desired and give the excommunicated Reinke the church's blessing, maintain that this shows how

de gheystliken, aize presters, schryuers efte cappelans, deye syn by den heren unde vorsten, desse don (tun) vaken (oft) dat umme der vorsten willen dat syck nicht entemet (ziemt), eyn deel (Teil) umme vruchten wyllen (aus Furcht), eyn deel umme eynes leens (Lehens) wyllen, eyn deel umme den vorsten to wyllen, etcetera (RVA 1,33,3).

The RVC commentator omits the mention of priests here though leaves the chaplains, adding that because rulers tolerate this
attitude they are no better than their servants. (He seems, in
fact, to be more concerned with temporal matters here, as he
follows this up with the Brenz passage concerning chancelleries,
which we have already noted in connection with the law.)

In the two latter glosses (1544 1,33 and 1650 1,31,1) however
- the 1544 commentator prefaces his story with the statement that
the chapter is about "Gottesdiener" who fear men rather than God -
the scene of action, as it were, is removed from a ruler's court
to a country parish, where the lord of the manor - an honourable
man, the 1544 commentator assures us - requests the parish priest
to introduce Protestant practices into the church services with
regard to the mass and the singing of hymns in German, to preach
about the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, Baptism and the
Sacrament, instead of relating fables, and to take a wife instead
of a concubine. To this the priest replies: "ei Herr, weil ichs
nur weisz das jrs also haben wolt / so will ichs wol thun / Ich
wils machen wie jrs haben wolt." This answer the 1544 commentator
censures most severely as being typical of what happened under the
Papacy, and thereupon proceeds to inveigh against both "Herrn und
prediger." With regard to the latter, it will do such a man no
good at the end to say, like Adam, that he had had to do it. If
his living (prebend) means more to him, the commentator goes on,
than his parishioners' souls and his lord's disfavour more than
God's punishment and eternal damnation, then he should go to the
devil. Instead, he continues, preachers should "leren was sie in
ihrem gewissen für Gott / recht erkennen und zuverantworten
wissen." The authorities (Obrigkeit) he also upbraids for
causing pastors and preachers thus to deny God's Word and those of Jesus Christ himself, addressing them as follows in Christ's words:

Wohlann / du hast diesen / dich selbs / uund viel der deinen / durch die gewalt / die ich dir zu meiner ehr / dein uund der deinen nutz schutz / schirm und forderung gegeben / zur Hell geiagt und gezwungen.

It will be observed that in the second part of this gloss the commentator has switched from the account of a Roman priest's acquiescence - although admittedly insincere and undertaken for the wrong reasons - in the lord of the manor's request for changes to be made in the church services according to Protestant teaching to a castigation of what appear to be temporal authorities who still belong to the Roman Church presuming to dictate to the clergy under their sphere of influence who have become Lutherans and also of the clergy thus affected for kow-towing to them. Luther had in fact dealt with facets of this problem at the beginning of his interpretation of the 82nd psalm, a work with which we know this commentator to have been familiar.

The above is an example of the way in which this 1544 commentator sometimes gets carried away and appears to lose the thread of his gloss. This thread the 1650 commentator in 1,31,2 manages to reestablish. After repeating the story of the country clergyman's dealings with the lord of the manor and the former's reply, he states:

Ob nun zwar / dasz er dies gethan nicht unrecht gewesen / dennoch aber so musz es nicht allemahlen heiszen: weil ihrs so haben wollet / denn er kunte wol / was ungebührliches begeren etc. sondern weil es recht und billich ist / auch mit Gottes Wort
Plenty of preachers are still to be found, he continues, who do what their listeners want them to do. But, he states—echoing his predecessor—for them to say on Judgement Day that they were merely obeying their princes will help them not one whit.

The relationship between temporal and ecclesiastical authorities is dealt with a second time in RVA and RVC in the glosses to II,7. Here they are in response to Reinke’s statement to Grimbart in the course of his second confession that the king turns a blind eye to the robbery that his nobles are engaging in and that nobody is prepared to tell him the truth:

Neen is, de eme de warheyt secht (sagt).
Edder de dor (wagt) spreken 'yd ist ouel (übel) ghedan,'
Nicht syn bychtfader, noch de kappellan.
Wor umme? Wente se ghenetens al mede (3872-75).

These lines the RVA commentator regards, in fact, as the core of the chapter:

Ok is de meyste syn desses capittels van den heren dede upholden de unrechtferdigen rōuers,
unde dat ere bychtvaders unde ere cappelans efte nemant alsdanen heren dor straffen, unde
dyt laten (unterlassen) se umme dat se den heren wyllen behagen efte vordeel (Vorteil)
to erkrygen (RVA II,7,6).

Expanding on the above, the RVC commentator (II,7,5) refers to confessors, chaplains and court preachers as being usually flatterers and hypocrites, who, besides conniving at the oppression of the poor, tell rulers what they want to hear for their own advantage. Princes and nobles, however, should not tolerate such flatterers, he states, but should be employing "frame (fromme) / Christlyke und warhafftige menner," who will dare to tell them the truth. Such people would let the king know
where he had failed and would not conceal the truth. This commentator then continues with a Brenz passage (unattributed) concerning the Old Testament prophets - Nathan and Isaiah - who had not held back from telling the Israelite kings the truth. "Wenn auers (aber)," he laments, "de valschen smeichlerischen Propheten edder Predicaten / der Fürsten und Herren / de auerhandt (Überhand) gewinnen/ so voruoren se de Heren / dartho Landt und lude."

The 1544 commentator omits this passage concerning the chaplains etc. from his narrative text, so no comment of this kind is to be expected here, or in the 1650 edition either.

In this latter, there is, however, an independent gloss on this subject. So far we have noted in all four glosses emphasis on the compliance of rulers' and nobles' chaplains etc. as regards the behaviour of the former, whether out of fear or from a self-serving desire to please, this being represented both in the narrative texts and in the glosses as the state of affairs that obtained prior to the Reformation. The 1650 commentator, however, in 1,31,1, represents a different point of view of this situation:

Vor diesem in dem Bapstum da hatte der Bapst mit seiner Geistlichkeit die Herrschaft allein: Ein Fürst / ein von Adel etc. muste seinen Prediger zu Dienste liessen / und wenn sie das nicht thun wolten / so thaten sie sie also bald in den Bann / stieszen sie zu der Gemeine hinaus / bisz sie gerne und willig zusagten in allen zu gehorchen und ihnen zu willen zu leben.***

Nowadays, he goes on, preachers have only scorn and derision as their reward. Rulers take no notice of their preachers, claiming that they are in their pay, and even seek to control them and to
dictate to them how they should conduct themselves. If a Lutheran or a Reformed preacher\textsuperscript{445} were to put his prince or noble under the ban and forbid him to attend church, he would be dismissed at once or even lose his life.

e) Finally, with regard to the bishops, it is the RVC commentator who has the most to say here. Returning in 1,33,3 to the attack he had launched in 1,14,1, this commentator in an original entry and once again quoting specific articles of Canon Law and giving numerous Biblical references criticizes bishops for not attending to their first office, namely reading the Bible and preaching.\textsuperscript{446} He continues:

\begin{quote}
Christus ys unse H\öuet (Haupt) / Herde (Hirt) und Bischof allene / Auerst (aber) de andern Bischoffe / synt dener des Wordes / und scholen im Wyngarden des Heren arbeiden / und uns weyden / mit dem Worde Gades / und gude vorbilden / eres leuendes. Dan ein Bischof / na der lere Pauli / heth (heisst) ein Upseher (Aufseher) / derhaluen gebort em / dat he acht und sorge hebbe / up dat leuent und handelent syner Schape. Wente eines Bischippes Ampt / ys ein name des denstes / und nicht der werdicheit.
\end{quote}

Returning to his marginal references to Canon Law, the commentator then states that a bishop should be permitted adequate sustenance and "mit dem vörbilde des gelouens und synes leuendes / de gewaldt am Worde Gades / und den rhom (Ruhm) syner werdicheit söken (suchen)." He should not be concerned at all with temporal government, neither as a judge, advocate or surety, "up dat he nicht / dorch tydtlike saken / am Worde Gades vorhindert werde."

The points he has just made, the commentator advises, are in accordance with the Gospel and are based on Holy Scripture, and
anything that is brought forward against them is false and comes from the devil.\textsuperscript{447}

Bishops nowadays do not act according to these stipulations, he maintains. They not only fail to teach and read Holy Scripture, but ride around and become engaged in temporal affairs, although St. Paul has expressly forbidden this for anyone who serves God. Nor do the bishops preach, and they pay no attention to the sheep committed to their care, but are addressed as "gnedige Heren"\textsuperscript{448} and tax and oppress their subjects contrary to God’s ordinance.

Moreover, they openly protect and permit whoring and despise the married estate,\textsuperscript{449} contrary to God’s ordinance and Christian freedom, protecting the drunken, whoring, foolish priests and appointing them to office, to the shame and great disservice of the whole of Christendom.

Nor do they live as pious bishops and ministers should, but take up with the wrong kind of people and associate with whores, both male and female, which is forbidden by their laws. He then sums up to the effect that it is because "der jetzigen Bischoppe / standt und handel" has deteriorated to the extent that it has from "der ersten olden / framen Bischoppe / vorbilde und gudem leuende," to be transformed into the present "ungegründen / valschen und ergerliken standt / de ock nicht Schriftmetich noch Christlick," as is now obvious everywhere, that the bishop in the narrative text is given the name of Herr Anegrundt. This means, he explains, someone "de van dem rechten grundtlichen Ampte eines Bischoppes / vorfallen / und einem grundtlosen donde (Wesen) /
This moral interpretation of the Bishop's name here makes an interesting comparison with that in RVA, where we learn in 1,33,4 that the author of the narrative text, "de lerer," is here rebuking the "Geystliken prelaten" for their avaricious ways which are not consistent with their station in life, and for this reason calls the bishop, Anegrunt (which might be translated "bottomless pit"), the provost, Herr Lozevunt, and the dean, Rapiamus.

As far as the provost and the dean are concerned, the RVC commentator's criticism also runs partially along financial lines. They resemble the bishop, he states, in the way in which they do not carry out their offices in the way ordained by Scripture, but are continually thinking up new ways in which they may take advantage of, oppress and fleece not only those under them but also their equals, such as the cathedral canons and other "Geistlick genannten," whom they should be protecting. All this they do, he claims, in order to become rich and lead lives of luxury.

For the 1544 commentator the bishops have ceased to be very important. He contents himself in 1,33 by saying that they obviously do not believe in heaven or hell, the Last Judgement or God's judgement, or otherwise they would carry out their offices in a different manner. "Aber die weltlich ehr / wollust ihres leibs hat sie besessen. Sie geben das zeitlich umb das ewig und lassens Gott (ja iren Gott den Teuffel) walten." Their office should rather consist in prayer, in preaching and in teaching, he maintains. For his part, the 1650 commentator makes no reference
to bishops at all.

Turning now to RVC 11,8,4, what this commentator has to say here in an apparently original entry applies to the whole of the clergy. Accompanied by references in Latin in marginal glosses to Biblical texts, he begins on a positive note by stating that a shepherd or preacher who faithfully leads the sheep entrusted to his care, particularly where the Word and teaching are concerned, is worthy of double honours. The false pastors, however, should be separated from the true shepherds and recognized for what they are.

He then introduces the wolf metaphor for all false clergy, a metaphor which we have observed that Luther used in respect of the bishops in certain circumstances, and which is also used in a Reformation pamphlet entitled Das Wolfsgesang to apply to any person or group of people expressing views contrary to Lutheran teaching. All are wolves, this RVC commentator states, who do not preach God's word, be they called pastors, bishops or princes. This includes those who preach their dreams, and those who, although they preach the Word of God, do not do this to God's glory and honour but rather for their own and that of their head, the Pope, in order to protect their fictitious positions. These latter he proclaims to be harmful wolves who come in sheep's clothing.

Flattering wolves he terms those who preach the Word of God but who do not rebuke those in power for their wicked lives, and false shepherds those who do not practise what they preach, as we have already noted.
Turning to temporal matters, where he is obviously more concerned with bishops than with the clergy in general, this commentator censures as false shepherds all those who have no concern for the poor and allow them to be oppressed and overtaxed. Likewise, he states, those who bear the name of shepherds but who function as temporal rulers are the wickedest werewolves. Then, in a possible reference to the mendicant orders, he censures those who fill their chests, their sacks and their kitchens with money and goods but still preach in order to be able to eat. "Dat synt Buck(Bauch)dener und gelt Prediker," he states, "denn er predekent velt mit dem gelde." Those, too, who in their teaching intend to plant anything but the knowledge, love and childlike fear of God among the people are false shepherds, he states.

He then summarizes with the stricture that we have already noted, namely that those are false preachers who lead poor Christians astray from their eternal creator and God to His creatures and saints.

Mention must also be made of the unique and unclassifiable contribution of the 1650 commentator to the topic of the clergy in general. In III,7,2, for example, in a reference to the lost mirror which Reinke claimed was destined for the queen, he states that this represents the Word of God in which all different kinds of people can see themselves and through themselves. Here he begins with the teachers and preachers, whom he exhorts with the aid of Biblical quotations to show the people their transgressions and to warn them, while at the same time being sure that they themselves are leading blameless lives.
Difficult also to classify under the headings we have is the contribution of the 1650 commentator in the gloss of 111,6, where Reinke introduces the Aesop fables which are illustrated, he claims, on the frame of the lost mirror, the first of which illustrates how, on account of his envy of the hart, the horse became the slave of man. Envy, this commentator declares in 111,8,1, is still to be found among churchmen, who become envious of and attack any person who tries to find a compromise between the warring parties - that is, between the Roman and Lutheran churches - calling such a person a turncoat. In the end, the temporal authorities are called in by the envious parties, but the little hart - representing for this commentator the good, right-thinking Lutheran - escapes with the swift feet of his good conscience into the forests of the Divine Word, and the envious ones - the horse - are left with the temporal authorities on their backs. The commentator also refers in this gloss to the disagreements between the Roman Church, the Lutherans and the Calvinists - between the first two on the subject of good works and between the two latter on teaching regarding the Sacrament - all of which represents, he states, a veritable Tower of Babel, with neither side understanding the other.

**Summary**

a) We are dealing here, then, as far as the lower clergy are concerned, with differing views in three separate fields:

   aa) Celibacy of the clergy. The RVA commentator, as one would expect, defends this, while the other three, basing their stand on the Bible and the situation that
obtained at the time of the Early Fathers, condemn it. In a later gloss the 1544 commentator defends marriage of the clergy on physiological grounds. This is all in accordance with Luther's teaching, as we have noted.

bb) Criticism of the clergy by the laity. The RVA commentator roundly condemns this, on the grounds that the clergy are on a higher level than the laity. The RVC commentator omits these passages from his glosses of both 1,14 and 11,8, while not openly challenging the concept. The 1544 commentator, however, gives the Lutheran viewpoint, namely that the pastor "hat seinen bescheid, sein bevolhen ampt," and it is up to the temporal authorities to deal with him if he transgresses. His parishioners should be more concerned with their own misdeeds than with rebuking their pastor.

cc) The necessity for chaplains etc. to upbraid their rulers, whether princes or nobles. Both examples in the narrative text (in Book I, chap. 33 and Book II, chap. 7 respectively) give illustrations of the clergy's subservience here, but while the first example leads to a sin of commission (against Canon Law), the second can be classed rather as a sin of omission. Bellin, in other words, agreed to do what he was not supposed to do under Canon Law, the chaplains etc. in not rebuking the temporal authorities for their conduct were failing to
do something they should have done. Only the first example is treated by all four commentators, since the 1544 commentator omitted the second one from his narrative text. Here, in the glosses of 1,33, the first three commentators agree that under the Roman church a subservient clergy was the rule in princely courts, and this is confirmed by the RVA and RVC commentators in their glosses of 11,7, where the chaplains fail to rebuke the rulers for condoning the nobles’ misconduct, although the RVC commentator does suggest here that the ruler should instead be employing godly, Christian and trustworthy men who will tell him the truth — meaning here, one assumes, Protestant preachers rather than priests of the Roman church — instead of flatterers. Was this, however, the situation under the Papacy? Was the priesthood so submissive to the temporal authorities? The 1650 commentator thought otherwise, as did Luther. In his interpretation of the 82nd psalm, in fact, Luther covers all except one of the situations given here. He chides, on the one hand, those rulers whom he claims to have rescued from their subservience to the ecclesiastical authorities for now proceeding to dictate to the clergy how they should preach and teach God’s Word, over which they have no authority whatsoever. They should, moreover, not raise any objection to being rebuked themselves by the clergy. These latter he then exhorts to do just this, since it
is both their right and their duty (WA 31:1,197-98). What he omits here is to spell out specifically what the attitude of the clergy should be to those temporal authorities who interfere in spiritual matters, although this would have been only too clear, since Protestantism had already claimed its first victims.457

b) With regard to the individual glosses, evidence of the RVA commentator’s social conscience, which has already been established, is further strengthened here by his censure in 11,7,6 of the “heren, dede upholden de unrechtferdygen rouers,” followed by that of their confessors and chaplains who do not reprimand them for this. In the previous gloss (11,7,5) he had spelt out clearly what he meant by this robbery, as we have already noted in another connection:

Dat vyfte is van deme baren unde wulue, dar de lauwe konynck synen rad mede hadde, betekent de ghyrygen rouers by deme wulue unde by deme baren, dede mede (zusammen) umme guder daghe vorteren (verzehren) ende vordrucken dat sure (saure) arbeyt, dat swed (Schweiss) unde bloet der undersaten (Untertanen).

Is it possible here to see a reference to the situation in Lübeck? We have already noted what appears to be a split in the Franciscan ranks in the lines of Reinke’s second confession concerning the “bekappeden.” Is the commentator here in his reference to “bychtvaders unde cappelans” criticizing his fellow friars for turning a blind eye to the misdeeds of the members of the City Council to whom they acted as confessors? For the rest, this commentator’s
attitude towards clerical celibacy and towards the criticism of the clergy by the laity conforms to what one would expect of an ordained priest of the Roman church, and his own censure of the secular clergy in particular to what one might expect from a member of a religious order.

c) As far as the RVC gloss is concerned, we have here the most trenchant criticism of the Roman clergy expressed. With respect to clerical celibacy and concubinage, he represents the Lutheran viewpoint. While omitting, as one would expect, his predecessor's thunderings with regard to lay criticism of the clergy, he does, however, follow the RVA commentator in this latter's opinion of the spinelessness of the clergy attending on a ruler - under the Papacy at any rate. As regards the bishops, where of all four commentators he is practically alone in his criticism, he attacks particularly, in addition to the lack of attention they pay to preaching, their opposition to clerical marriage and the resulting immorality both among themselves and among the lower clergy, which they condone against payment of a concubinage fee, as also their function as temporal rulers and their oppression of the poor by the over-taxation which results from this. From a similarity in the points expressed, though not in the wolf metaphors, one can assume a familiarity on the part of this commentator with Luther's tract "Wider den falsch genannten geistlichen Stand des Papsts und der Bischöfe" (1522), including probably his constant use of the term "geistlik genannten" to denote the clergy of the Roman
church.

d) As for the 1544 gloss, once again this commentator's contributions display the urgency of personal experience, whether he is attacking servile Roman priests who introduce Protestant practices on demand without conviction, as was usual under the Papacy according to him, or, following from this, temporal authorities who presume to dictate to spiritual ones regarding their teaching, or whether he is defending Lutheran clergy against the charge of avarice, or providing Biblical and physiological arguments in support of clerical marriage. Bishops and their failings are no longer of particular moment for him, although his one comment on them is certainly couched in fairly vehement terms. The picture presented here, in fact, is of a church still in its developmental stage, in which development this commentator had a personal emotional involvement.

e) The picture of the Lutheran Church in its developed stage as presented in the 1650 gloss one hundred years later is not, however, a favourable one. Naturally, the exaggeration inherent in all satire - here that of Moscherosch - must be taken into account. But the commentator's own strictures with regard to the treatment of court preachers by the temporal authorities are not edifying either. For the rest, this commentator once again performs here the same function vis à vis his predecessor which we have already noted, namely the clarification of views which have been over-hastily
With regard to his allegorizing tendencies, we have already established from his preface this commentator's connection with Harsdörffer and thus with the "Pegnitz Schäfer" of Nürnberg, where, in the "Gesprächspiele" and "Hirtendichtung," which were a hallmark of this society, allegory predominated, as we know.
(vi) The Papacy

The Pope himself is mentioned directly only twice in the narrative text, in RVA/RVC Book II, chap. 9 by Marten the ape in the course of his conversation with Reinke, where Marten seeks in the first place to exonerate the Pope from what is going on around him in Rome by explaining: "De Pawes is eyn old kranck man/He nympt syck nenes dynges meer an" (4193-95). Later in the conversation, too, he remarks: "Alsus is dar mannyghe lyst / Dar an de pawes unschuldich ist" (4215-16). Only the first of these references is repeated in the 1544 narrative text.

With regard to the practices of the Roman Curia, Marten proceeds to describe to Reinke, in a passage which is reproduced with one or two insignificant omissions in the 1544 narrative text, how he will cite the provost, as the person presumably instrumental in having Reinke excommunicated, to Rome and bring a case against him, as a result of which he, Marten, will obtain absolution for Reinke, even against the provost's will. Marten then goes on to list other people he knows in Rome, who are his friends, such as his uncle Simon, "De mechtich is, unde seer vorheuen (hochgestellt) / He helpet deme gherne, de wat mach geuen" (4153-54), Herr Schalkevunt (einer, der listige Anschläge macht), Doktor Grypto (Greif-zu), Her Wendehoyke (Dreh-den-Mantel) and Her Lozevund (einer, der durchtriebene Streiche macht). He has sent money in advance, Marten states, because with money one can do everything: "De gelt brynget, krycht to hantes (sofort) gnade / De dat nicht heft, de kumpt to spade (spät)"
Instead of the Pope, who, as we have already learnt, is out of the picture, Cardinal van Unghenoghe holds sway, who can be approached through a lady, well-known to Marten, who has great influence with him.

There follow seventeen lines giving further information about personalities at the Papal court which have no equivalent in Reinaert I. Here we learn about the cardinal’s clerk, Johannes Partye, who is an expert when it comes to coinage, also Horkenauweto (Hore-genau-zu) who is one of the Papal courtiers - the ill-famed "Curtisanen" - and Slypen unde Wenden (Schleichen und Drehen), the notary, "In beyden rechten eyn bacalarius" (4206). Whoever stays a year in Rome, Marten remarks, becomes a "mester in practiken schrift" (4210) - legal documents drawn up mostly for purposes of deception. Lastly he mentions Moneta (Münze) and Donarius (einer, der sich Geschenke geben lässt), these being two judges whose judgements are always accepted as binding, "Dorch se vorghyftmen nu de sunde / Unde loset dat volck uth deme ban" (4218-19). The references we have already noted in the narrative text to Reinke’s excommunication and to the interdict which Marten claims he can have placed on Reinke’s native land, if necessary, form an earlier part of this conversation.

As far as general criticism is concerned, the author of the Reformatio Sigismundi traces the deterioration of the Papacy from the time when popes and cardinals came to be selected from the regular orders rather than from the secular clergy, and goes on to attack specific Curial practices such as simony primarily, but
also the petty charges levied for such small items as seals and documents. Cardinals, he considers, should be salaried and not beneficed.\textsuperscript{402}

Wimpfeling in 1510 complained about the number of people employed at the Papal court - the "Curtisanen" - attacking particularly the citing of legal cases to Rome, most of them for petty matters, which could quite well have been tried in Germany. He also inveighed against Papal reservations of prelacies and benefices, which resulted in the appointment of unworthy men (often unqualified, low-born Italians) and against excessive taxation, against which the German people, he maintained, were beginning to grumble.\textsuperscript{403} The 1521 Gravamina echo Wimpfeling's criticisms regarding the citing of legal cases to Rome - sometimes occurring in the first instance for purely temporal matters - also concerning the various methods of taxation which were draining the country dry, and, too, the Papal conferment of benefices in Germany.\textsuperscript{404}

With regard to Luther, his initial denunciation of Papal authority came in his denial of its divine ordination, as he states in his "Von dem Papstthum zu Rom" (1520):

\begin{quote}
Alszo das es erlogen und erstuncken ist, und Christo als einem lugener widderstrebt, wer do sagt, das die Christenheit zu Rom odder an Rom gepunden sey, vil weniger, das das heupt uund gewalt da sey ausz gotlicher ordnung (WA 6,293).
\end{quote}

His principal attack on the Papacy and the Papal Curia was to come, however, in his "An den christlichen Adel" later the same year. Here, in between - at the beginning of this tract - denying Papal superiority over temporal authority and the right of the
Pope alone both to interpret Scripture and to call a council of the whole church (WA 6,407-15) and - towards the end of the tract - declaring the Pope to be Anti-Christ (WA 5,434,454), he repeated in detail the complaints included both in Wimpfeling's Gravamina and to be included in those of 1521 concerning, for example, citation of legal cases to Rome and other forms of Papal taxation. Concerning the litigation he writes: "den es liigt yhe zu Rom niemandt etwas dran, was recht oder unrecht, sondern was gelt oder nit gelt ist" (WA 6,431). He also attacks here the innumerable Curial offices in Rome, and the splendour of the Papal court, writing:

Zum siebenden, das der Romische stuel die officia abthue, das gewurm und schwurm zu Rom wenigere, auff das das Bapsts gesind muge von des Bapsts eygen gut ererneret werden, and lasz seinen hoff nit aller kunigen hoff mit prangen und kosten ubirtreten (WA 6,432).

With regard to the glosses, in RVA there is only one direct reference to the Pope in 1,39,6, where he is coupled with and placed before the Emperor as an example of persons in high places who nevertheless often need the consolation and encouragement of those around them. As far as RVC is concerned, we have already noted this commentator's reference in 1,30,2 in the verse attributed to Hutten to the impossibility of the Pope's being considered God's representative (statthalter) on earth because of the way in which he sells salvation for money - a reference to the sale of indulgences - salvation which is ours for free through the Redemption. The 1544 commentator, meanwhile, in his gloss 1,29,3 had also mentioned how Popes "wollen Vicarien Christi sein/
Return to RVA, we have an interesting reference in 11,9,2 to the fact that "eyn mach soeken gheystlik recht, de in wertlykenrechte nicht kan manen (Anspruch erheben)," although this remark has little relevance to the narrative text, since here Marten is stating his intention of citing an ecclesiastic (the provost) to appear in Rome before an ecclesiastical court in an ecclesiastical matter (Reinke's excommunication). All in all, the RVA chapter-gloss of 11,9 does not offer much in the way of a commentary on the chapter. In a presumable reference to Aickmaer — the Dutch VB "morael" to chap. xlviii reads: "Also langhe als Symon (dats symonie) ende Grijpet-al het Hof hanteren sullen, soo salter alqualijck gaen" — this commentator remarks:

Dat veerde is andrepende (betrifft) der gheystlicheyt, de myt dem rechte ummehgan, de he nomet Symon unde Her Lozervunt unde Johannes Partie et cetera. Van dessen secht he nicht vele in desser uthleggyngs, yodoch is de menynge, dat yd in der heren houe (Hofe) is to donde (tun) umme den pennynck; de den myldichlyken uthgyhyft, kricht eer recht eer eyn ander by gheystlyken unde by wertlyken in etlyken landen. Dar umme nomet he sunderlyken symon, dat is simonye etc. (RVA 11,9,4).

The treatment given to this chapter in RVC is considerably more expansive, although the commentator concentrates primarily on the points stated or implied in the above RVA gloss, namely simony, the power of money per se and bribery. Basing his comments very largely on attributed extracts from Hutten’s Vadiscus oder die Romische Dreyfaltikeit, he proceeds to castigate the Papal Curia. The sin of simony had already been
singled out in RVA, as we have seen, and the RVC commentator begins in 11,9,2 with an attack on this. We are told that

*Wowol nu de Paweste / und geystlick genanten / de Simonye / mit worden höghlick vordomen / so gebunden se desüuen doch / mit den wercken / so mennichfoldigen / dat tho Rome und in allen Stifften / nichts gemeiner.*

He goes on to explain that the Popes have sold to the Fuggers the permission to traffic in ecclesiastical benefices.

For his part, the 1544 commentator makes a brief reference in 11,9,11 to "Symonia / der geistlichen wücher und schinden mit iren pfründen," which is being censured here. One gathers, however, that by the time he came to write his gloss the situation had become so well-known with regard to what was going on in Rome that he did not feel the necessity to comment on this, for he continues: "und wird vil von dem Römischen hoff gesagt / Welch aber alles im Text klar / und ietz der gantzen welt bekannt ist. Sonderlich lese das buch Troias Rome / als ich halt das es heisse." An alternative explanation might be that he was anxious not to cause additional offence; he had, after all, as we have already noted, reproduced the original verse-text here very faithfully. As far as the 1650 commentator is concerned, his attitude is similar. Referring in 11,9,3 to the power of money to corrupt justice, he remarks "Und konte man hievon weitleuftig etwas hinbeysetzen / wann nicht der Text ohne dasz klar genung davon redete / und es schon an einen andern Ort weitleuftig berüret und durchgezogen wer." (One presumes that this "andere Ort" is a reference to Hutten's work, with which he would appear to be unfamiliar.)
To return to RVC 11,9,2, following his remarks with regard to simony, this commentator proceeds with his extracts from Hutten's work: that the rich in Rome, for example, have three courses for their meals, namely, the sweat of the poor, goods they have acquired through deceit and usury and also their robbery of Christian people; that, too, there are three most important kinds of people in Rome: usurers, the Papal courtiers (Curtisanen) and the procurers; that there are three types of wares in Rome: Christ's merit, ecclesiastical benefices and common women. The RVC commentator adds to this on his own account that there are three distinguished doctors in Rome: Doctor Gryptho, Doctor Wendehoyccke and Doctor Loseuund.

This RVC commentator then launches, in 11,9,3, into an attack on money *per se*, or rather the power of money: "Gelt sterket den gelouen / Maket fründe / Eddel wysz und wolgeschicket," illustrating this with three stanzas by "de Swytzer" which include such lines as:

> Up doget (Tugend) achtet men kleine.  
> Hedde ick men (nur) gelt / so were ick ein Heldt /  
> Und vorgetzgen (vorgezogen) up erden.  
> ...........................................  
> Men leth (lässt) nicht aff / beth (bis) in dat graff (Grab) /  
> Gelt gelt ys men ere leuvent.  
> Gelt ys er Godt / jn all erer nodt /  
> Wol (wer) kan doch nu fram werden.

This dependence on money this commentator reasserts in 11,9,4, again quoting Hutten, where he confirms how necessary money is for the prosecution of lawsuits - with money one can achieve anything and everything.

In 11,9,5, in reference to the deceit and falseness of the
Pope, the cardinals and the judges (officiales), we have further illustrations from Hutten's work concerning conditions in Rome; for example: three things are despised in Rome, namely, poverty, the fear of God and righteousness; there are three ways in which Rome has gained mastery over everything: force, deception and false holiness, and three things which few believe in in Rome: the immortality of the soul, the community of saints and the pains of hell. The commentator then ends this gloss item with twelve lines of verse by Hutten explaining how Peter has been driven out by Simon, "De alle dinck hefft in syner handt," so that he "Dryfft (treibt) dartho seyn schimpf und spot / Mit Christo dem warhaftigen Godt." There is less faith to be found in Rome than in any other city on earth, he maintains, and yet the church there is called the head of all churches, "Darumme schal men den Simon driuen aus / Up dat Sant Peter wedder dar holde haus."

Finally, the RVC commentator remarks in 11,9,7 on the bribery that takes place, in reference to the two judges in the text called here "Gelt und Gauen (Gaben)." Referring specifically to the RVA gloss 11,9,4: "Dan de mildichlick uthgyfft / krycht balde recht," the RVC commentator here quotes from Tengler's Laienspiegel, where the author regrets how people nowadays rate money above wisdom, so that injustice is on the increase, and how, despite the oaths they have sworn, the jurists give the rich more favourable treatment than the poor.

This last gloss the 1544 commentator (11,9,12) renders as follows:
Zum zwolfften / das Munegra uund favor / das ist / gab und gunst / zu Rom Richter seien / das ist an andern orten / uund schier an allen orten auch / uund derhalb das Recht (der Text sagt) das ist / wie viel einer rechts hat / wol hülf uund rhat / uund gross glück da zu bedarff / das er dabei bleibe / Aber wehe den selben Richtern / sie werdens all zu teur bezalen müssen.

**Summary**

Here again it is the RVC commentator who has the most to say. As far as RVA is concerned, this commentator is not prepared to go much further than censuring in general terms the simony and avarice that is practised by the Papal Curia. He seems, in fact, somewhat desirous of hiding behind Alckmaer, although he no doubt also feels that the narrative text has said it all. The 1544 commentator is also not disposed to criticize in detail here, except in the passage just quoted which is concerned with the conduct of the judges, otherwise referring his readers to Hutten's work, which work forms, of course, the basis of the RVC commentator's strictures here. Obviously the condition of the Papacy at the time of the Reformation was past history for the 1650 commentator and a subject on which he did not feel it necessary to pass any comment. For him, too, the narrative text - which he reproduced in his own way fairly accurately - had said it all.
Chapter 5.

An inquiry into social attitudes and economic conditions as these are reflected in the glosses

The subjects we shall be examining here as as follows:

(i) the social structure: nobles, middle class, peasants, soldiers

(ii) the economic background to the glosses: the merchants and the practice of usury

(iii) the RV glosses as "Ständespiegel"

(iv) women, children, the family and the household

(i) The social structure: nobles, middle class, peasants, soldiers

As far as Luther is concerned, there can be no doubt about his conviction regarding the divine ordination of the social structure, however sharp his criticism may have been of the individual classes and however much he may have emphasized the importance of every single individual's worth as such and his contribution to society. As he writes in his "Wider den falsch gegangen geistlichen Stand" (1522), "ob wir für der welt ungleich sind, svo sind wyr doch für Gott alle gleich Adams kinder, Gottis Creatur, uund ist ye ein mensch des andern werd" (WA 10:2,157); likewise in his "Grosser Katechismus" (1529), he states: "Sonst sind wir zwar fur Gottes augen alle gleich, aber
unter uns kan es on solche ungleichheit und ordenliche unterscheid nicht sein" (WA 30:1,148). Concerning each individual's contribution he writes in his "Kinder zur Schule halten," as we have already noted: "Ein iglichs hat seine ehre von Gott so wol als seine ordenung und werck...man soll alle stende und werck Gottes auffs hohest loben als man jmer kan und keins umb des andern willen verachten" (WA 30:2,568-69). He was, in fact, extremely distressed by the signs he saw of confusion here, of nobles, for example, acting in ways which did not befit their station in life, as he explains in his interpretation of the 82nd psalm (1530):


Turning now to the glosses, we have in the RVA/RVC second prefaces both the statement that "der mynschen state is ghedelet an veer state" and also the reference with regard to Book I that there must be a head of state, "eyn houet, eyn here, de bouen alle desse state der lüde de macht der herschoppye hebbe." Moreover, the emphasis that Luther places on the contribution of each one in society is echoed, as we have already noted, in the 1544 preface, where this commentator states that "ein jeder...soll...seines berufes ehrlich und trewlich warten." And the fixed nature of society - the so-called "Ordo-Gedanke" - is confirmed also by the 1650 commentator in 1,22,2 with the rhyme: "Er bleib in seinem Beruf und Stand / Und werd davon nicht abgewand."
This conviction concerning the importance of maintaining one's station in life the RVC commentator confirms in III,12,2 in the course of a diatribe on merchants - to which we shall return later - where he laments the results of their growing wealth and ostentation: "so balde nu de kramer und koplude / also de auerhand (Oberhand) genamen / ys de Adel vordoruen / de Borger in den Steden / werden geswecket / und dat Landt volck moth bedelen (muss betteln)." For his part, the 1544 commentator corroborates this conviction, first in III,6,5, where he writes: "Das ein unterscheid unter den personen sein musz. Darumb soll sich ein jeder halten / das man die hohern vor jhm erkennen kan." This he repeats at greater length in III,9,1 - this constitutes a comment on the Aesop fable of the donkey and the dog, which Reinke claims was one of the fables illustrated on the frame of the lost mirror - where he stresses that everyone should remain in the occupation he has and not begrudge anyone else his estate or his good fortune. "Wir sind nicht alle zu einerlei Ampt geschaffen," he states, adding the following rhyme:

Denn wenn wir alle waren Reich /
Und einer wer dem andern gleich.
Und waren denn zu Disch gesessen /
Wer wolt uns auffragen das essen.

One person must serve another, he declares, and there must be a differentiation between people and offices: "Drumb bleib ein jeder in seinem beruff / do er zu verordnet ist / und lasz ein andern in seinem." Many think they are capable of anything and everything and even aspire to government office and to association with "grossen Herrn," he states, but it is usually a case of the donkey who tried to dance. The 1650 commentator in III,8, takes
over here the substance of this gloss, including the verse quotation, adding Old Testament illustrations of people who perished trying to carry out what they were not authorized to do.

Beginning in reverse order to the one in which the classes are considered in RVA/RVC, namely with the nobles, we will examine what is said here from two aspects, criticism of the class per se and the question of "Tugendadel" versus "Geburtsadel."

With regard to Luther's outright criticism of the nobility, he most certainly did not hold this class in very high esteem, while, however, considering the estate good, as he explains in his "Kinder zur Schule halten": "Es sind in allen Göttlichen ampten und stenden viel böser menschen. Aber der stand ist und bleibt dennoch gut, wie hoch auch die menschen des misbrauchen" (WA 30:2,572). People's thoughts, he considers, should rather be directed to the good members of the nobility whom they know: "Warumb woltestu nicht auch den gantzen Adel ehren umb vieler redlichen eddel leute willen, der du on zwieuel viel fur dir hast?" (WA 30:2,571). Specifically he accuses the nobles of spending too much time on feasting, drinking, gaming and indulging their tastes in superfluous clothing; it was high time they fulfilled their office and demonstrated their nobility, as he states in his "Heerpredigt wider die Turken" (1529) (WA 30:2,181). "Es ist Zeit," he cautions, "das sie auch yhren stand und ampt beweisen, und ein mal mit ernst sehen lassen, das sie vom adel sind" (WA 30:2,181). Nor did he spare his criticism of the young nobles at court in his sermon on the 101st psalm of 1534, accusing them of greed, practising usury, of theft, oppression, murder,
carousing and unchastity (WA 51,260).

With regard to the glosses, there are three very forthright criticisms of the nobility in RVA, the first of which occurs at the end of Book I (1,39,7), where the commentator accuses nobles and princes of making treaties at the end of hostilities at the expense of their subjects (myt deme gude der undersaten, myt ereme suren swete unde blode), the textual reference here being the decision to hand over Bellin the ram and his clan to the wolf and the bear in perpetuity (3211-14). The other two we have already noted in other connections, namely in 11,7,5 the oppression of the poor by the "robber" nobles represented by the wolf and the bear and, in 11,7,6, how the poor are punished for small crimes while the high and mighty get off scot-free.

As might be expected, the RVC commentator is most lavish with his censure. He takes over the three RVA glosses mentioned above, having initiated his criticism in 1,24,4, with special reference to the nobility's drinking habits, in lines by "De Swytzer":

Dith synt des Adels groste doget (Tugend)
Dat se slömen (schlemmen) up van jogent (Jugend).
Und thorsneden (zerschnittene) kleder an dragen /
Dach (Tag) und nacht na horerye jagen.
Barde hebben lanck gelick den Czegen /
Hauke (Habichte) up den henden dregen.
Jagen / stelen / wolleuen / und brassen.
Leddich (unbeschäftigigt) und stolt ghan up der gassen.
Stedes handeln wedder Gades geheet (Geheiss) /
Leuen van der armen lüde sweet (Schweiss).

Later in the work he turns to a consideration of the nobility's role in the social structure and voices the same
criticism as Luther had with regard to the nobles taking part in the kind of activities which do not befit their station in life. In a reference in IV,5,3 based on Agricola (127) dealing initially with the withholding of the right from any noble to take part in a tournament who was guilty of adultery, whoring, or of practising usury or engaging in commerce, he writes:

Itzundes auerst (aber) ys dat alles uthe / und gelt nene Eerbarheyt mehr: dan ytzundes kan keyner ein Riddermetigher man syn / he sy dan ein Eebreker. Dartho so driuen (treiben) de Heren van Adel / ytzundes apenbar Kopenschop (Handel) / und synt wëken. Idt were auerst vele beter / dath syck ein yder Standt helde na synem gebor. Ein Buer bleue (bliebe) ein Buer. Ein Eddeman / ein Eddelman. Ein Kopman ein Handeler / so stunde ydt vele beth (besser) / dan also / dat ein ytzlikler deyt (tut) / wat em men (nur) suluest gelustet.

This commentator repeats the substance of these views once again in IV,7,1, remarking in regard to tournaments that if they were still being held and the same restrictions applied, very few nobles would qualify as participants. In an attributed Agricola (153) quotation he refers in addition to Imperial law, where it is stated that the nobility should not take part in any kind of commerce, as their nobility is besmirched thereby. Yet, he states, they have become not only merchants and shopkeepers, but also usurers, who should also be punished according to Imperial law. In IV,8,1, basing his gloss on Agricola (653), this commentator adds brewing and tavern-owning to the occupations in which he accuses the nobility of participating, both of which activities take away from the poor their sustenance, both directly and also indirectly, by the way in which the nobles can
now control prices, something they should rather be preventing than participating in. He feels, in fact, that the nobility is losing respect and forfeiting obedience by acting in this way: "Wat ydt auerst vor gunst und gehorsam / und gudes blodes maket / ys wol erfaren," he remarks cynically.

As regards the 1544 gloss, in III,2,21 this commentator is also concerned that the nobility should not forfeit the respect due to their class, for the differences that exist in society must be upheld:

\[
\text{das aber der Adel in ehren zuhalten / damit}
\]
\[
\text{ein unterscheid bleibe unter den personen und}
\]
\[
\text{nicht ein gemeng ung unordnung werde / dadurch}
\]
\[
\text{die Regiment zerstört werden.}
\]

Nobles should behave in a friendly fashion towards the peasants, he states, but not try to appear as their equals, or the peasants will despise them, "denn es musz ein achten und forcht bei den unterthanen sein / das die Regiment bestehen / und nicht ein viehisch unordig leben werde."

A peculiarity here of the 1544 commentator in regard to the nobility is his enthusiasm for tournaments, which he considers a much-preferred alternative to engaging in commerce, even going so far as to say in IV,5,4: "Es ist ein erbar / mannlich ding gewest mit dem Turnieren / und wenn sie nicht wider auffbracht werden in jrer alten gerechigkeit / ist kein besserung in der welt zu hoffen." His objection to the nobility's engaging in commerce is the same as that of his predecessor, namely their resultant impotence with regard to the regulation of the economic situation, which should be their real task, when they are tainted in the same way themselves: "Was soll aber straffen / der selbs bisz über die
ohren befleckt ist / und sorgen musz das man den balcken erst heisse ausziehen."

For his part, the 1650 commentator, in a parallel gloss to the one above, I11,15,3, treats the matter of tournaments from a purely historical point of view, also stressing, however, the restrictions that were placed on participants and even adding to these, lamenting at the same time that few nobles these days would qualify to take part.

The more abstract aspect of nobility, that is, the question as to who is truly noble, the man born into a noble family or the man who displays his nobility in his deeds and in his conduct generally, is of some moment to the commentators, particular to the author of RVC. In the most recent past - it was, of course, by no means a new idea, having been discussed in the Early Church, by Boethius and also by Trimberg in Der Renner, to name some examples - this question had been posed by the Humanists. In his translation of Boccaccio's story of Sigismunda and Guiscardus from Boccaccio's Decameron as part of his Ehebuchlein - a work to which we shall be returning later - the early Humanist Albrecht von Eyb has Sigismunda saying to her father:

Und als du mir fürheltest, wie Gwiscardus nicht edel geboren sey, ist nit sein schulde, sunder des glückes: wir haben alle von ein menschen Adam ein ursprung; allein die tugent hat uns unterschaidlich gemacht, und wirt der edel geheissen, des tugenthafftige werck werden gesehen.

Konrad Celtis, too, in his inaugural speech to the University of Ingolstadt in 1492 had made this claim: "Der wahre Adel ist ein Adel der Seele und besteht nicht in Halten von zahlreichen Hunden und Pferden oder im Besitz zahllicher geistlichen Pfründen,
sondern in der Bildung des Charakters." Erasmus, also, in his *Constitutio* writes of three kinds of nobility, the first derived from virtue and good actions, the second from the acquaintance with the best of training and the third from an array of family portraits and the genealogy of wealth, considering only the first to be truly valid. In the next generation of Humanists Ulrich v. Hutten, thirty years younger than Celtis and himself an imperial knight (Reichsritter), also touches on this question in his letter to Willibald Pirckheimer of October, 1518, which, in Goethe's translation, reads:

"Es würde schlecht mit mir stehen...wenn ich mich schon jetzt für einen Edelmann hielte, ob ich gleich in diesem Rang, dieser Familie von solchen Eltern geboren worden, wenn ich mich nicht durch eigenes Bestreben geadelt hätte."

As far as the glosses are concerned, the RVA commentator gives us an inkling of his feeling with regard to this topic in his description of the nobility in the second preface, where he refers to "de vorsten unde heren der werlt, de syk eddel holden." A quotation also from the narrative text which is included in that part of Reinke's second confession which is peculiar to RVA appears to confirm this: "De ghebort make nicht uneddel efte gud / Men doghede efte undoget de yslyk doet" (4019-20). There is also the possibility that with this phrase "de syk eddel holden" this commentator might have been thinking particularly of the members of the Lübeck City Council, who, as we have already seen, had recently had their quasi-noble status recognised by the Emperor.
As far as RVC is concerned, this commentator took over from his predecessor the wording "de syck Eddel achten" concerning the nobility and proceeded to build on this and develop it, as we have seen, into a discussion on the origin of nobility, based on unattributed extracts from Franck's Geschichtsbibel and Weltbuch. Here we learn that the nobility was first created to keep order and peace within the land and to guard it against external enemies, so that a brave, upright man was chosen as leader who would be a father to his people. Formerly such people had made themselves beloved of their people, he states, now they oppress them, ending with the statement: "Doget maket Eddel / auers Eddel maket nicht doget." He returns to this topic in III,2,4 with a passage based this time on Agricola (264), giving as his incentive for introducing it Reinke's appeal to his rights as a nobleman to be convicted by means of valid witnesses, "so yd syck behörd up eynen eddelen man" (4423), and, failing this, to be challenged by one "de my ghelyck gheboren sy" (4428). The time has now come, states this commentator, to deal with this question of nobility, "welcker van dessen beyden / dat vornehmste sy. Van eddelen Oldern gebaren syn. Edder vele eddeler dade / gedan hebben/ ane de Eddel gebort." He claims that the "Olden Wysen" posed this question - this work, however, is not quoted here - and answered it to the effect that "de Eddel sy / de adelich leuet (lebt) und vele redelyker dade deyt (Taten tut) / he sy von Eddelen oldern / edder van geringen luden (Leuten) / gebaren." It is certainly an advantage, he states, to be born into a noble family of virtuous parents, but, on the other hand, that much
worse a dishonour to one's parents not to follow in their footsteps. He then gives examples from Roman history of the election of leaders on account of their suitability for the task in hand not because of their birth, ending with Tacitus's account of the ancient Germans selecting their leaders by virtue of their bravery in battle. He sums up: "De doget und Eerlyke dadt / maket Eddel / Eddel gebaren syn / maket nicht doget." A man is noble, he maintains, who acts nobly, as a man who acts ignobly is ignoble, even though he may be a king's son. He follows with a quotation he attributes to Schwarzenberg, falsely according to Brandes:

\[
\text{Dat Eere und vele doget / wurde vullenbracht} \\
\text{Darumme ys ook de Adel vorneymlick erdacht.} \\
\text{Des gemeinen besten tho frede und Recht} \\
\text{Bystu vor Godt ein vorplichtet Knecht.} \\
\text{Geit ydt dy hyr jn homode wol} \\
\text{So werstu doch namals ewiges yamers vull.}
\]

The final word is given to the well-known saying: "Do Adam radede / und Eva span / Wol (wer) was do ein Eddel man?"

For his part, the 1544 commentator in his parallel gloss to this one, 111,2,20, allows both kinds of men their nobility, though leaving no doubt as to which type of nobility he considers superior:

\[
\text{das der nicht allein Edel ist / der vonn} \\
\text{geburt ein Edelman ist / sonder viel mer der /} \\
\text{der ehrlich und erbarlich lebt / uund ehrliche} \\
\text{thaten thut. Jener ist ein Edelmann umb eines} \\
\text{andernd verdienst willen / nemlich / umb seiner} \\
\text{Eltern willen / dieser umb sein selbs} \\
\text{verdienst.}
\]

As far as the 1650 gloss is concerned, on Reinke's request to be confronted with someone of equal status this commentator (111,2,9) remarks as follows:
Hiemit wird auch der vom Adel Hochmut gescholten / als die sich allemahlen mehr einbilden denn andere Menschen die wenn sie nur ein haufen Ahnen und Wapen herzelen konnen vermeinen sie seyn die vornehmsten der Welt. Da man doch vielmehr dahin solt sehen / ob man auch adelige Thaten gethan.

He continues with a quotation from Moscherosch, where the devil rebukes a nobleman for being more concerned with his patent of nobility, with vice and arrogant boasting than with honour and virtue. "Bauren schinden / rauben / sengen macht keinen Junkern," he states.

We must now turn to the two intermediate classes between the nobles and the workers, namely the ecclesiastical class and the middle class, the latter represented in the prefaces to both RVA and RVC by the burghers and merchants and the former by the clergy of the Roman church. It will be remembered that the RVC commentator refers to the clergy almost always as the "geistlick genannten" - in his second preface and elsewhere - and the whole of his criticism, as we have previously noted, deals in fact with members of this church.

As far as the social structure of Germany is concerned, all this was soon to change. It will be apparent from an examination of the four classes as they are formulated in the RVA/RVC prefaces that no provision is made for what has come to be known as the professional upper middle class, the reason being that, apart from lawyers - and very many of them in the later Middle Ages were clerics studying Canon law, as we have seen - higher education was limited almost exclusively to the clergy.

All this the Reformation, with its denial of clerical
privilege both in the religious and in the strictly legal area and with the break-up of the monasteries, was to affect dramatically. It soon became apparent to the reformers, namely, that something had to be done immediately to establish lay schools with curricula that would be in accordance both with the teaching of the Protestant faith and with Humanist educational values. Although the organisational work here was carried out very largely by Melanchthon alone - the Praeceptor Germaniae, as he came to be called - there can be no doubt about the inspirational value of Luther's two tracts, his "An die Ratsherrn aller Städte" (1524) to urge the setting up of such schools and his "Ein Predigt, das man Kinder zur Schule halten sollte" of 1530 to urge parents to send their children to them. "Es ist itzt eyn ander wellt und gehet anders zu" (WA 15,46-47), he writes in the former tract. The point that the post-Reformation world needed new kinds of people as teachers and pastors and temporal administrators which Luther had made in the 1524 tract he developed more forcefully in the latter tract of 1530 addressed to the parents of boys with the right aptitude to fill these posts. With regard to the temporal world, he referred to the fact that "Cantzler, Stadtschreiber, Juristen und das volck jnn seinen amptern mus mit oben an sitzen, helffen raten und regieren...und sie sind mit der that die herren auff erden, ob sie es wol der person, geburt und stand halben nicht sind" (WA 30:2,567). He looked forward in fact to the time when the children of the common people, "das dein und mein son," would rule the world in both spiritual and temporal estates (WA 30:2,577).
It is beyond the scope of this investigation to determine to what extent Luther's prognostications proved correct with regard to government. It can be documented, however, that one result of the Reformation was the formation of an intellectual class in Protestant Germany comprising primarily academic jurists, the clergy, Latin teachers and degree-holding medical doctors, who vied as a nobilitas literaria with the nobilitas generis for equal status, a status which by 1617, for men with doctoral degrees, had been recognized in law.

How much of this is reflected in the glosses? In RVA of 1498 obviously nothing at all. In RVC, however, which also, as we have seen, keeps to the class structure as this is delineated in RVA, there is one brief entry in III,12,2, at the end of a passage deploping the topsy-turvy state of society as a result of the rise of the merchants and shopkeepers, where the commentator couples "de Eddeln und Gelerden lüde," complaining that they will soon be found among "de Saffran kremer." In the 1544 gloss there are no references at all, and in the 1650 edition, where one might expect to find them, very few, apart from odd references to the number of doctors there are in existence. There is one of these references in III,7,4 with regard to doctors of law, whom the commentator - through Moscherosch - blames for the enormous number of legal glosses. However, the listing this commentator gives in III,7,2 of the groups of people who may see themselves in the Mirror of God's Word - the teachers and preachers; princes, leaders and kings; judges; parents and children, masters and servants; buyers and sellers; widows and orphans - appears to owe
more to Luther's definition of "stende" than anything else. It could also of course be argued here that by 1650 the professional upper middle class had become so firmly established that one should not expect any particular comment on it.

With regard to the treatment of professional men in the glosses, we have already noted the commentators' attitudes to the clergy, both Roman and Protestant/Lutheran and also to the jurists, largely pejorative with regard to the latter in RVC and 1650, seemingly experiential and both measured and fair in 1544. As far as physicians are concerned, in his "Kinder zur Schule halten" (1530), Luther had declared that experience tells us that we cannot do without them, and that Scripture shows their estate to be a salutary one, comforting, acceptable to God, made and founded by Him (WA 30:2,580). The criticism of physicians in the glosses, however, apart from that of the author of the 1544 gloss, follows much the same pejorative pattern as that accorded to the jurists. In RVC, for example, it is trenchant. Referring in 111,12,1 to the passage in the narrative text where Reinke relates how, after his father had cured the king's father of his illness, the latter "gaff (gab) em, so ick wol weet (weiss) / Eyn guldene span (Ring) unde eyn roet bereyt" (5347-48), the RVC commentator remarks on the number of physicians, who, after they have cured one illness, claim to be famous. Those who were yesterday only herb-sellers or apothecaries, he remarks cynically, are today distinguished doctors, likewise barbers suddenly become famous doctors, and apothecaries' assistants become private physicians to princes. Quoting St. Jerome, the commentator remarks on the fact
there is no apprenticeship for medical doctors as there is for cobblers, for example, or for tailors and goldsmiths; they are not even forced to become masters of their trade. The commentator even accuses them of welcoming ill-health and pestilence so that they may gain by this, and of prolonging illness to the same end. He finishes his tirade with a Schwarzenberg quotation where, although the latter admits that there are some good, honest doctors, he judges nevertheless that the best thing is to be able to avoid them altogether:

Men spreckt: dat sy ein salich man /
De der Arstedye entberen kan.

............................................
Doch ein Arste / de lange hefft practicert /
Der kunst und framicheit nicht enbert
Den soke de krancke / doch nicht ane nodt
Sunder gar metich (mässig) lēuen / ys myn Radt.

The 1544 commentator, however, again presents us with a different and much more positive point of view. Commenting in III,11,1 on the preceding chapter where Reinke relates the Aesop fable of the wolf and the stork (5213-52 in RVA), he states that a doctor should be honoured, since he is created by God for our benefit, as Scripture says. Nor should medicine be despised, he maintains, for it has prolonged many lives. To say also, he declares, that if one's turn has come to die, no medicine will be of use, or that that if God wishes one to live longer, He will provide the cure, is equally false and is tempting God, for He wants to have the means He has provided used; He will not make a new cure for each individual. Then, in III,11,4, he chides those who refuse the doctor his reward for curing them, or for at any rate doing his best. Such a man must be "von natur ein grober /
In the parallel gloss to RVC III,12,1, this commentator, after advising in III,12,2 that nothing should be concealed from a doctor, remarks in III,12,3 that such inexperienced doctors as his predecessor has referred to in his "Text" should not be trusted, particularly since there are experienced doctors available. He also emphasizes that it is often the patients who are at fault in not reporting all their symptoms and even refusing to take the medicine prescribed, reiterating that a doctor should have his reward, "denn das leben ist edel and lieb / und gesunder leib ubertrifft alle reichthumb" (III,12,4).

For his part, the 1650 commentator in his parallel gloss (III,9,2) to those in 1544 and RVC similarly recommends following the doctor's advice when ill and not despising herbs, flowers, fishes or animals that can provide a cure, advice which he follows up with examples of some medicines made from animal organs which are excellent as cures for certain sicknesses. He then turns, however, for adverse criticism of doctors, first to St. Ambrose - their advice is sometimes contrary to the rules of the church - and then to Moscherosch. He ends, however, on a more positive note with the already-noted quotations from Ecclesiasticus, which apply, he states, to those doctors "die ihre Kunst wohl gefasset," and follows this with examples from the Bible where cures have been effective.

With regard to the middle-class, as this is described in RVA/RVC, namely the burghers and the merchants, we will defer an
investigation here in order to consider them in connection with the economic background to the glosses, and pass directly to the lowest classes, in particular the peasants.

The attitude to this class as recorded in the literature of the later Middle Ages was decidedly ambivalent. In the first place there were those writers who, as Bezold has pointed out, depicted the "gute, fromme Bauer" as the necessary complement to the clergyman and the knight. To illustrate this he quotes the following lines from a "Meisterlied" of the period:

Die pfaffen, ritter und der bûman sollent siñ 
gesellen.
Nu dar, ir edeln drê gesellen werden;
Und stêt ir dri einander bî, so lebe wir wol ûf 
erden.*

Bezold also quotes the Nürnberg poet Hans Rosenplüt's description of the peasant as the most noble of God's creatures compared with laymen and priests, a man who with his plough sustains the whole world: "Mancher ist den Bauern gram, der da nie besseren Freund gewann, ohne Gott nur allein." Zeeeden has also drawn attention to the Kölner Chronik of 1499 in this connection, where, since the peasants sustain the other classes, they are compared with God the Father; and he mentions also an engraving by Hans Weidlitz of 1520 where this illustrator depicts a "Ständebaum" with the peasants not only at the bottom of the tree but also at the top, complete with their manure forks and bagpipes, above, that is, the Pope, the Emperor and the knights.  

Secondly, we have the picture of the "grobe Bauer" portrayed best probably in Felix Hemmerlin's De nobilitate et rusticate
dialogus of 1444:

Ein Mensch mit bergartig gekrümmtem und gebuckeltem Rücken, mit schmutzigem verzogenem Antlitz, tölpisch dreinschauend wie ein Esel, die Stirn von Runzeln durchfurcht mit strupigem Bart, graubuschigem verfilztem Haar, Triefaugen unter den borstigen Brauen, mit einem mächtigem Kropf; sein unförmlicher, rauher, grindiger, dicht behaarter Leib ruhte auf ungefugten Gliedern, die spärliche und unreinliche Kleidung liess seine missfarbige und tierisch zottige Brust unbedeckt.

To a very great extent this grotesque picture of the peasant was prompted by the fear of imminent revolution, a fear fuelled by events in Bohemia during the Hussite wars at the beginning of the century and the uprising of the peasants around Worms in the winter of 1431/32.

Thirdly, we have the attitude of those who were concerned about the way in which the peasants were threatening to upset the social order in a more subtle way. An example of this point of view can be found in Sebastian Brant's Narrenschiff, where, in "von burschen uffgang" (82), he laments the way in which the peasants now drink wine, wear the latest fashion in clothes and are, in fact, better dressed than their social superiors. Also, even though their sales of corn and wine have made them rich, their luxurious living consequent upon this has led to the piling up of debts which they do not pay. They are, in fact, teaching the townsfolk wicked ways:

Das statt volck yetz von buren lert
Wie es jnn boszheit werd gemert
All bschysz yetz von den buren kunt (kommt)
All tag hant sie eyn nuwen funt (19-22).

He ends with what is obviously his main concern: "In allen landen ist grosz schand / Keynen benugt me (mehr) / mit sym stand /
Nyemans denckt wer syn vorderen waren" (60-62).

Fourthly, we have the idea of the peasant and the lower classes generally as the people who are destined to set the world aright, an idea represented, for example, by the author of the Reformatio Sigismundi in Bezolt's view, who describes this document as "das erste revolutionäre Schriftstück in deutscher Sprache." Here one finds combined, Bezolt states,

der prophetische Glaube der Nation, der Einfluss des Hussitentums, die Verzweiflung an einer Reformation von oben, und die Hoffnung auf die lebenskräftigen und begeisterungsfähigen unteren Schichten der schwerkranken Gesellschaft.

Finally, in the early 1520s, prior to the outbreak of the Peasants' Revolt in the early summer of 1525, there emerged yet another type of peasant in the current literature, namely the simple, uneducated man with the capacity, nevertheless, to understand the new teaching and to reject that of the Roman Church. One can imagine that this attitude owed something both to Heinrich Bebel's Facetiae (1512 and 1514) where "der gemeine Mann zeigt sich... dem gelerten Priester oder dem verschlagenen Scholaren gegenüber von angeborenem Mutternitz und gesunder Lebensauffassung" and to the self-portrayed "pfiffige Bauer" in Till Eulenspiegel (printed for the first time in High German in 1515). Yet as Könneker points out with regard to the best-known of the Reformation pamphlets of the early 1520s, Der Karsthans, which appeared early in 1521, every effort was made to impress upon its readers that although the authority of the Roman church should be rejected on religious grounds, "die im sozialen Bereich
existierende Ordnung jedoch, da von Gott selbst eingesetzt, aus ebendiesen Gründen nicht antastbar sei."

This differentiation failed in the long run to make the desired impression, however, and it was on this very point, namely their attack on the existing social order, whereby the peasants became for him a mob, that Luther with complete consistency turned against them. It had, in fact, not taken him long to realize the problems that would arise should "Er Omnes" take matters into his own hands, as he explains in his "Eine treue Vermahnung zu allen Christen" (1522): "aber wen Er omnes auffstehet, der vormag solch unterscheyden der boszenn und frumen wyder treffen noch halten, schleget yn den hauffen, wie es trifft, und kan nit on grosz greulich unrecht tzu gehen" (WA 8,680). (The "frumen" here are the innocent bystanders, whom Luther in this tract considers always to get the worst of any unauthorized - by higher authority, that is - uprising.) In his tract of 1525, directed mainly against Karlstadt, "Wider die himmlischen Propheten," Luther also wonders aloud what the former will do when "Er Omnes" throws in his face what he has said about murdering the godless: "Lieber, es ist nicht zu scherzen mit Er Omnes" (WA 18,88). Likewise, in his "Ob Kriegsleute," written one year after the Peasants' Revolt, Luther states that the mob (das pöfeli) is not interested in improving government, only in change, and should not be encouraged, "er toilet sonst gerne" (WA 19,635); the mob is a desperate, accursed thing (WA 19,639-40).

With regard to the glosses, we have already examined at some length the RVA commentator's attitude to the lower classes - and
in his case this is the description one must use, for it will be remembered that in his second preface he does not concentrate solely on the peasants but speaks rather of "Arbeyders" (as in the Dutch VB) "de syk neren eres swaten (schweren) arbeyde, unde bruken ere kunst myt arbeyde, alze bure, amptlude (Handwerker) unde andere, de ere neringe unde vodynge (Erhaltung) alzo weruen (erwerben)." We have examined in addition the possibility that this respect for the lowest classes, from which, he states, the other three have sprung, derives from the Franciscan tradition, which embodies, of course, what we have noted above as the first attitude to the peasants, namely that of those who considered the peasant as the "gute, fromme Bauer," the foundation of society. We have also noted this RVA commentator's remarks with regard to the exploitation of the poor and the difficulty they have in obtaining justice and have explored the suggestion that the commentary is addressed primarily to the members of the Lübeck City Council who were, most of them, not only councillors but also landowners both within and without the city walls.

As far as RVC is concerned, we find a distinction made in the second preface between the peasants - and it is only peasants he mentions here, there is no reference to artisans or workers generally - and the later references to "Herr Omnes," the common man. With regard to the former, his criticism was, as we have seen, incisive. Although originally simple and without deceit, the peasants are now wild, cunning and undisciplined, accustomed to using sharp practices when it comes to selling their wares, he states, illustrating this with lines from the anonymous work
"Untrew, Vinantz und Argelist" where in his own words a peasant describes how he is always trying to get the better of the burghers in the town - "De Bürger synt uns Buren vyendt / Wedderumme wy en nicht truwe synt" - by selling them rotten wares at the highest prices.

With regard to this commentator's later references to the common man, "Herr Omnes," which are based on Franck's Geschichtsbibcl and his Weltbuch (first printed in 1531 and 1534 respectively), the remarks and observations made here are obviously coloured by the experience of the Peasants' Revolt of 1525, when both the fears of those who dreaded a complete upheaval of society and the hopes of those who were pinning their faith on this were nearly realized.

The first of these passages, in 1,9, 1, taken from Franck's Geschichtsbibcl, form a commentary on Book i, chap. 9, where we have the burlesque scene of the villagers trying to catch the bear who has managed to free himself from the felled tree-trunk, and where the priest's housekeeper (as she is termed here in RVA) falls into the river in the general skirmish. This is the last of the RVC chapter-glosses reproduced almost complete in the 1544 gloss and also in that of 1650. The RVC commentator informs us that "de meister desses Bokes" wants to illustrate here "de grote hupe (Haufen) des gemeinen volckes HER OMNES," which knows no moderation. It is, in fact, he goes on, a many-headed monster, vacillating and inconstant, believing one lie only until it hears another and following one leader after another. Here he gives an example of the Israelites who were constantly changing with their
kings, a remark which the 1650 commentator omits! The mob gives way to the passion of the moment, he states, and allows itself constantly to be persuaded to change its mind, going on to give examples from Greek history as to how Lycurgus managed to deceive the mob. Who can relate all the stupidity and superstition of the credulous, vacillating mob, he inquires, where there is no understanding, nothing in fact but complete imbecility? Sentences comparing the mob to a wild beast which knows no moderation and to a swarm which alights on some object one moment only to fly away somewhere else the next and which wants to be ruled and managed with all strictness while appearing to be free and doing everything without compulsion are omitted by the 1544 commentator, probably motivated by the first flickerings of independence rather than by any principle! The RVC commentator ends by stating that what the mob first raises to the heavens through its unconsidered praise, it later throws into hell with similarly un-thought-out scorn. In fact, the nearer something is to a lie, the more it is believed, he declares. Additions made in the 1650 gloss here are further examples from Greek and Roman history, including a similar description by Cicero of the common man.

The inclusion of the second onslaught by Franck on the common man in RVC 11,8,1 - this time from his Weltbuch - is inspired by the passage in Reinke's second confession where, referring to the prelates, he says that there are both good and bad ones amongst them, but people follow the example only of the bad ones: "De meenheyt sud (sieht) der prelaten stad (Stand) / De vormenget syn beyde gud unde quad / Nicht volgen se den guden, men den quaden"
This calls forth the comment in RVA 11,6,1, followed closely by the RVC commentator, that "de staet gheystlyck unde wertlyck is vormenget myt prelaten unde vorweseren, beyde gud unde quad," but the "ghemenen mynschen" see only the sins of the wicked ones and sin with them.

Franck is a very repetitive writer and this passage of fourteen paragraphs is really only an elaboration by means of numerous illustrations from both current happenings and ancient history, both Biblical and otherwise, of what he said before in the Geschichtsbibel regarding the "unbestendige dorheit" of the common man, "Herr Omnes."

Quoting first the dictum of Pythagoras, which amounts to a statement of Franck's own personal philosophy: "Man schal den gemeinen wegh / nicht wandern. Dat ys. Nicht gesinnet syn / wo vele / sunder wo weynich," Franck proceeds to attempt to show why Herr Omnes, the common man, should not be trusted:

(a) He changes his beliefs too often, as Moses's experience showed, claims Franck, in many instances to suit his rulers, even when these change: "Ein Evangelisch Fürste / hefft ein Evangelisch volck / Behemen (Böhmen) gyfft vele Hussiten / orsake dyt ys de munte (Münze) aldar." Later in the passage he writes again: "Wor hen de Furste geneget / dar ys dath dulle volck schon voran. Is de Fürste / wo he jummer mach Evangelisch / so regent ydt Christen / und keiner wil de leste syn / an dem Evangelio / dem Fürsten tho leue (zuliebe)." Towards the end of the passage also Franck uses examples from the Roman public's attitude to the early Christians to prove the same thing. Up to the time of Nero,
he states, the Romans left the Christians alone, but were then prepared, under Nero, to wash their hands in their blood. Under Domitian also they turned against the Christians, while under Constantine "vormeren syck de Christen / wo de Muggen ym Sommer," as, too, all at once the whole country turned Christian with the king of England.

(b) He is unable to understand the truth - he prefers lies - which results in lack of judgement. Franck claims that this was responsible not only for the death of Christ and the apostles, but also previously of Socrates among others. Yet the Christian faith is not for everyone, claims Franck later in the passage, the world can neither accept the spirit of truth nor understand truth; one does not find the Gospel among the common people. As regards the common man's lack of judgement, Franck declares that all those who are really praiseworthy the mob despises and those whom it praises have a bad name. Its judgement is therefore not to be trusted.

(c) He always wants something new, of which he soon tires. If he encounters misfortune through his stupidity or lack of faith in one belief, he blames another, as, says Franck, the Papists blame the Lutherans, the latter the Pope, the fanatics (Schwermer) or the Anabaptists. Everything the common man becomes convinced about "ys ydel Evangelium und gerechticheit," as was seen with the peasants (1525), he declares, who would not listen to the other side.

Franck also has a word of warning for those who have the idea that the common man is wise and upright and wants to live peacefully. He is, rather, turbulent, stupid and senseless. The
conviction that he is something sacred and full of good sense (ydel hillygedom / und steke vull vorstandes) is completely false, he claims, as the classical writers discovered and as incidents in the Old Testament prove. "Und ys in summa / de Schrifft / schyr nichts anders / dan eyn ydel allermen (Lärmen) und uproer / des gemeynen dullen volckes." At the end of the passage, too, Franck warns against those who rely on their servants - the common people should never be relied on - stating that more leaders of the people, including Emperors and Popes, have lost their lives at their servants' hands that at those of their enemies.

Along the way Franck also manages to include a criticism of those members of the clergy who do as the authorities dictate rather than abiding by and preaching God's Word and making the authorities follow this. "So willen se ydt maken / wo ydt ere Lehenherrn gerne horen / und dessuluigen liedt (Lied) syngen / des brodt se ethen (essen)." Some clergy, too, claims Franck, trim their sails to whichever way the wind is blowing, in order to curry favour with the common man and to win his respect. Clergy and people are thus birds of a feather, he laments.

The 1544 commentator in 11,8,2 contents himself with this comparatively brief remark:

wirt aber von dem gemeinen pöbel gesagt / wo der ettwas sihet / das ihm gefellt / da felft er mit hauffen hin / Aber wenig sind die güten Exempeln volgen. Drumb soll sich einer nicht nach dem grosten hauffen richten / denn gemeinlich der meist teil arg ist / uund wie obgesagt / wenn einer alles also mit macht zur Heile sihet gehen soll er erschrecken / uund dencken / die straff ist nicht weit / sghe du für dich / handel das du verantworten könnest.
There is no direct commentary on this in the 1650 gloss.

The influence of Luther here cannot be overlooked, particularly of his "Eine treue Vermahnung zu allen Christen" (1522), from which Franck appears to take over the term "Herr Omnes" to describe the common man, and also Luther's innate distrust of the mob. From this tract, too, most probably, Franck derives the way in which he calls all Protestants - that is, all those who are against the teaching of the Roman Church - Christians. For it was here in this tract of 1522 that Luther stated his objection to his own name being used to denote his followers, pleading that they were all Christians: "Tzum ersten bitt ich, man wolt meynes namen geschweygen und sich nit lutherisch, sondern Christen heyssen...Nitt alszo, lieben freund, last uns tilgenn die parteysche namen uund Christen heyssen, des lere wir haben" (WA 8,665). It is possible also to see the influence on Franck's strictures regarding the clergy, some of whom strive to please the authorities, others the common man, of Luther's interpretation of the 82nd psalm, where he censures the clergy for not rebuking both rulers and people, referring here particularly to Münzer and Karlstadt who had supported the people against the rulers (WA 31:1,198). In his "Ob Kriegsleute," too, as we saw, Luther had also referred to the mob's continual desire for change (WA 19,635).

This same passage where Franck censures the clergy in this way most probably inspired the 1544 commentator for his story in 11,8,5, which we have already noted, where the village priest agreed to have his tune called, as it were, by the lord of the
manor.

Franck's criticism of those who believed the common man to be "ydel hillygedom / und steke vull vorstandes" was typical of the post-1525 years when the peasants lost all the ground in public acceptance they had gained prior to the revolt. They no longer had any chance of being considered either as "gute, fromme Bauern" or as "pfiffige, verständige Bauern." Those days were over for good.

In the first point made above regarding the varying attitudes with regard to the peasants in the later Middle Ages we noted the linking together of the priest, the peasant and the knight as the three foundations of society. They represent of course the "Lehrstand," the Nährstand" and the "Wehrstand" on which in the later Middle Ages people (including Luther) considered that society was based.

Having dealt already with the first two of these, it remains to consider the third, the "Wehrstand," and it is immediately apparent from the three later glosses - RVC, 1544 and 1650 - that a change has occurred. We are no longer concerned with the knight as the representative of this foundation, but with the paid mercenary or "Landsknecht," the infantryman, who had come into his own during the wars waged by Emperor Maximilian, who reigned from 1493-1519.

Although in his tract "Ob Kriegsleute" Luther was principally concerned with the justice or injustice of warfare in given circumstances, he did also pay some attention to the mercenaries. These he censured in the strongest terms if all they did was to
wander about the countryside seeking to engage in war for its own sake, so that they could live a free, wild life, when they should have been plying some trade or other until summoned to serve a prince. Only then could they fight with a good conscience (WA 19, 660).

The event in the narrative text to which the RVC commentator refers in his remarks regarding the mercenaries is Reinke's fictitious story of the men his father managed to recruit to fight for the bear against the king:

Do myn vader al umme myt pyne
Twysschen der Elue (Elbe) unde deme Ryne (Rhein)
Hadde gholopen dor och de lant,
Dar he mannigen tzoldener vant,
De he wan (gewann) myt syneme golde,
De Brunen to hulpe komen scholde,
Alze de sommer queme int lant (2305-11).

Here the poet is rebuking "Rüter / Soldener und Landesknechte," the commentator states in 1, 26, 1, who only want to work in the summertime when it pleases them to do so:

Dann ydt ys ein modtwillich Orden / seeloser lüde / welcker ungeachtet eere edder billicheit / Lopen an de orde (Orte) dar se vorhapen (verhoffen) gudt tho auerkamen (bekommen) / geuen syck modtwillich jnn varlicheit (Gefahr) erer seelen / und jn vorderffnisse (Verderbnis) angebarener erbarheit / und guder Landtszede.

They are guilty of all kinds of vice, he claims - cursing, swearing, blasphemy, whoring, adultery, guzzling, gluttony, stealing, robbery and murder, which latter they perpetrate on poor people. They desert their parents, wives and children, their fatherland, the tasks (feudal obligations) they have sworn to carry out and the work they are obliged to do and "lopen der
sünde / dem dode / dem Düuel (Teufel) uund der Helle / jnn den mundt henin."
When they return home they behave just as badly and others follow their example, so they end up harming their own country more than the enemy, squandering what their parents have earned.

The 1544 commentator (1,26,1) is equally censorious. The mercenaries "nemen geld uund hullfen dem Teufel den himel sturmen wens jnen möglich were. Ist kein sach so bose / wo geld ist / da find man Landsknecht mit hauffen." The mercenary should make sure that the cause is a good one before he agrees to take part in the campaign, and never serve anyone who is intending to shed the blood of innocent Christians. It would be more honourable for him to beg for a living, he states, things would be sure to go better for him later on.

As might be expected of someone who had lived through the Thirty Years War, the 1650 commentator in 1,24 has much to say on this subject in connection with the broader context of peace and war. Generally speaking, however, the same points are made with regard to the attitude of the fighting man. (Here the word 'Soldat' is used, it is no longer the former term 'Landsknecht'):


The commentator then laments bitterly the recent reciprocal shedding of Christian blood and the fighting that went on against
duly constituted authority and against the fatherland:


Summary

a) With regard to the social structure - to the fact, that is, that there must be differentiation between the classes - there can be no doubt that all the commentators basically accepted this view, which was also affirmed by Luther himself.

b) As far as the idea of nobility is concerned, the Humanist espousal of the "Tugendadel" theory, which had a long history as we saw, is supported with differing degrees of emphasis in all three later glosses - RVC, 1544, and 1650 - and quite possibly also by the RVA commentator as well, although here it is not expressed in so many words in the gloss.

c) The change in the social structure that came to pass in the Protestant areas of Germany as a result of the elimination of the Roman Church hierarchy, with the subsequent emergence of a professional upper middle class, is hardly reflected in the glosses at all, except for the coupling by the RVC commentator of "de Eddeln und Gelerden lude." By 1650 the position of the professional middle class had obviously
become so firmly established that no particular comment on it should be expected in this gloss.

d) As far as the lowest classes of society are concerned, the positive attitude of the RVA commentator here we have already considered at some length. With regard to the RVC commentator, his negative attitude both to the peasants (second preface) and to the "common man" (I,9,1 and 11,8,1) was typical of the general reaction following the failure of the Peasants’ War (1525) and reflects, as we have seen, Luther’s own. The chief interest of the 1544 commentator’s remarks here (11,8,2) is the way he uses this opportunity, following Franck’s train of thought as expressed in RVC, to stress once again the importance of individual responsibility for one’s actions.

e) With regard to the mercenaries, not only do the RVC and 1544 glosses (I,26,1) reflect the change that had taken place in the methods of warfare since the previous century, with paid foot soldiers now forming the main part of a fighting force replacing the knights in importance, but also the price that had to be paid for this, particularly by the country folk. What the 1544 commentator has to say about mercenaries’ making sure of the justice of a campaign before offering their services appears to reflect Luther’s demand in his "Von weltlicher Oberkeyt" that a man should be assured of the justice of his overlord’s cause before being willing to join him. As for the 1650 commentator, his lament
concerning the internecine slaughter that went on during the Thirty Years War serves only to confirm what we learn from other contemporary works such as Grimmelhausen's *Abenteuerlicher Simplicius Simplicissimus* concerning the behaviour of the "Soldateska" during this war.
(ii) The economic background to the glosses: the merchants and usury

The late Middle Ages had seen many changes in the economy of the whole of Europe, when the great Northern European trading partnership of the Hansa lost ground, to be replaced in importance by the trading companies of Southern Europe, themselves called into being by the increased commercial activity south of the Alps, and, after 1500, by the increasing importance of Spain and Portugal as trading nations following their conquest of the West Indies. The European economy was becoming increasingly a money instead of an agricultural economy, which is why usury and the complaints concerning this came to play such a large part in the scheme of things and usury to be accounted one of the deadliest ills of the period, from an economic point of view.

What is evident to us now was not so, of course, to those who were living in those times. Luther's views being a prime example of this. His American editors write:

Luther's frame of reference was of course that of the Middle Ages. He held to the long scholastic tradition, which, following Aristotle, taught that money does not produce money. He agreed with the canonists, who for years had taught that usury is something evil. In common with the vast majority of his learned contemporaries, he knew very little about economic laws. Of the far-reaching economic revolution which was gradually transforming Germany from a nation of peasant agriculturists into a society with at least the beginnings of a capitalist economy, he had no conception whatsoever.***

The following remark from his "An den christlichen Adel" in fact
sets the tone for his subsequent comments:

Aber das vorstehe ich nit, wie man mit hundert gulden mag des jarisz erwerben zwentzig, ja ein guld den andern, und das allis nit ausz der erden odder von dem fihe, da das gut nit in menschlicher witz, szondern in gottis gebenedeyung stehet (WA 6,466).

With regard to the money supply, this had increased greatly twice in the last two centuries, the first increase occurring in the last half of the fourteenth century as a result of the tremendous death toll the Black Death brought about at that time, following which the capital available to commerce, manufacture and investment at interest increased to a tremendous extent. It was this, of course, which had led to the burgeoning of the cities during this period and the enrichment of the bourgeoisie at the expense of the rest of the population. The second increase was brought about by the growth in the output of precious metals from the mines and also by the influx of gold and silver from the Americas, which led to a rise in prices in Western Europe, for which the inhabitants, ignorant of the true causes, blamed moneylenders and the big trading companies.

Luther wrote four tracts concerned with the economic conditions of the times. Of the first two of these, the "(Kleiner) Sermon von dem Wucher" (WA 6,3-8) of 1519 and the "(Grosser) Sermon von dem Wucher" of 1520, the second was reprinted, considerably extended, in 1524 under the title of "Von Kaufhandlung und Wucher" (WA 15,293-322; WA 6,36-60). Then, in 1540, towards the end of his life, Luther wrote "An die Pfarrherrn wider den Wucher zu predigen" (WA 51,331-424). The most important points he made in these four tracts are as follows:
(a) According to the Gospels, if anybody takes anything from us by force, we should be prepared to let it go; we should also give people what they desire and ask of us, and we should willingly lend anything without any expectation of compensation (WA 6,3).

(b) With regard to usury, Luther's basic attitude remained throughout his life that, as he writes as late as 1540, "wer ettwas leyhet, und nimpt dafur etwas druber odder (das gleich so viel ist) etwas bessers, das ist Wucher. Denn Leyhen sol nichts mehr wider nemen, sondern eben dasselb, das gelihen ist" (WA 51,333-34). When, however, there was some other commodity involved besides money, such as land, he was prepared to treat the matter in a different way - see (e) below. He was also more ready to come to terms with a low interest rate where needy people were concerned, people who would be living off this money and not reinvesting it, suggesting that they be allowed 5% or 6% (WA 51,374).

(c) As far as buying and selling were concerned, in general terms Luther was principally concerned that merchants should not aim always to sell their wares as dearly as they could - there should be a ceiling on profits, in other words - nor should one merchant stand surety for another. Specifically, he targeted such practices as: (aa) selling goods at a higher price on credit than for cash - he considered that all transactions should be in cash; (bb) selling goods at a higher price than the market price when there was, or the seller knew there was going to be, a shortage; (cc) buying up the entire stock of some commodity in order to fix
the price - (bb) plus (cc) constitute the much-criticized "Vorkauf"; (dd) selling goods dirt cheap to undercut competitors; and (ee) storing goods in places where they would increase in bulk etc. and, generally, cheating customers with regard to measurement, dimensions or weight, or adding artificial colouring to goods offered for sale, or putting the best specimens on the top or at the bottom of the pile (WA 15,295-311).

(d) Concerning trading companies, Luther considered these to be pure monopolies and guilty of price-fixing (WA 15,312-13).

(e) As for "zinskauff," this was a procedure principally concerned with land, comparable to, but by no means the exact equivalent of our present-day mortgage arrangements, which was not technically considered usury by the Canonists, but which Luther, generally speaking, maintained should be so considered (WA 6,8). Here, in these arrangements, the creditor - usually but not always the feudal lord - became the purchaser in the contract and the debtor the seller. The method for payment - or repayment - differed from case to case. What Luther objected to specifically was that no provision was made for the element of risk, which fell exclusively on the seller - the man, that is, who had received the loan - considering that the purchaser should take his share of the losses that occurred naturally. In this case Luther was prepared to accept that such a contract was not usurious (WA 6,55-56).

(f) With regard to foreign trade, Luther censured the buying of silks, golden articles and spices, which only served to drain money from the country in payment for goods which had no useful purpose (WA 15,293-94).
Turning now to the middle-class, the burghers and the merchants, as this class is described in the RVA/RVC prefaces: "de borgerye unde kopliute unde alle, de syk ereren myt ummeslach (Umsatz) unde leuen van deme ghewynne," this class did not have a very good reputation among writers of the period. Zeeden mentions, for example, Bartholemeus Sastrow as writing that merchants were bankrupts who borrowed money and left their creditors to pay for their mistakes, and Erasmus as taking the bad character of all merchants for granted and considering that they pursued the most contemptible of all trades. In addition to his technical comments, as these might be termed, Luther also in his "Heerpredigt wider die Turken" (1529) accused burghers and merchants in general of squandering their wealth on jewellery and clothing and of practising usury (WA 30:2,181). In his 1540 address to the clergy regarding preaching against usury he also censured the great majority of burghers - those in a principality who were real Christians could be fitted into one town, "die auch nicht sonderlich gross waer," he alleged - for fleecing pastors and poor burghers and for being, in fact, masters in teaching others how to suffer for God's Word (WA 51,405).

As regards the glosses, both the criticism of the merchants and the information we obtain about the economic situation of the time come in great measure from RVC. We have already noted the remarks made in this commentator's second preface to the effect that he does not see very much difference between peasants, burghers and merchants - although the latter consider themselves superior - as they indulge in the same sharp practices and seek to
deceive everybody in the same way that peasants do. These practices, described in a quotation from "Untrew/Vinantz und Argelist," are those of "Vorkauf" and also the differentiation a merchant makes between the simple inexperienced buyer, whom he charges four times what the article is worth, and the "wise" buyer, whom he charges half as much, the author censuring in particular the merchant's constant anxiety to get the better of everyone else.

The first reference to merchants and to economic conditions is in the chapter-glosses to RVC 1,29,2, where, in reference to the hare's mention in the verse-text of Simon, the counterfeiter — "Wente Symonet de krummer munte dar / Syn valsche gelt so mannich yar" (2511-12) — the commentator states:

wi1 hyr de Poeta / mit vorborgen worden /
dorch den valschen Münter / antōgen / dat
grothe gebreck / jnn allen Nationen jtzunęes
vast gemeine / al̈e de böse mūnthe / sampt der
hinderlistigen / tückischen / und bedregliken
Wesselye (Wechsel).

He accuses merchants of being masters at adapting the situation to their own advantage by bringing bad money into the country and taking good money out. Only the bad money stays in circulation, he maintains, the good is brought out only to serve usurious purposes. Other people melt down the good coins to make a greater number of bad coins from them, he states. Formerly, people guilty of these practices would have been ashamed of themselves, now, however, they are generally admired: "Wol (wer) nu auerst in solcken Practiken und schalken stücken / am geschicksten ys / den
holdt de werlt vor einen fynen redlicken gesellen / dem ein
Itzlicher syn dochter geuen will," following this with excerpts from Brandt’s Narrenschyp beginning "De Munthe ys nu geswecket nicht klein / Valsch gelt / ys nu worden gemein."504

Although the 1544 commentator does mention Simon the counterfeiter in his narrative text—"da Simon der Krum / muntzt sein gelt / Damit betrogen ward die welt"—he makes only a passing reference in 1,29,2 to false currency, which, he states, "einn grosser gebrech in allert welt ist. Es geht in den Fürstenthumen uund Stetten / do gute muntz / uund viel kauffhandels ist seltzam zu." For his part, the 1650 commentator in 1,27,2 calls such falsifiers of money "offentliche Diebe die da verfortheilen ein gantzes Land / Statt und Regiment," continuing with a historical survey of the use of other commodities, such as leather and stones, as currency, adding the proviso that these were only officially-introduced emergency measures; this type of currency must always be redeemable later for the real thing.

The second reference to economic affairs comes in RVC III,12,2, where, following the introduction: "Is hyr ock wol to mercken / dat Reinke secht: 'Egen nutte und gewyn / men nhu betrachtet'" (5355), this commentator launches into a diatribe against the vice of self-interest (egen Nuth) which is to be found in all countries, he states. With assistance from Agricola (272) he begins: "Der Römer ryke / ys allene uth egen nutte / vorfallen welcker so hoch gekamen was / dat ydt syck süluest / nicht mehr erdragen konde." Then, in a passage deriving from Agricola (226 and later 227 and 228) he refers to Cicero’s views regarding honest business dealings as the latter formulates these in his De
ending this section with the statement that according to imperial law all buying and selling should be "ane alle geferde (Gefahr) und argelist (sine dolo malo) angefangen und gehalten werden," and anyone caught being dishonest should be forced to pay damages to the person he has thus harmed. "Auerst," he laments, "unrecht / ys nu recht wurden / undōget ys leyder edōget / und schande ys Eere wurden."

With the introduction "Beyde Koplude und Kramers / ys ein böszlistich und bedrechlick volck. Yo se ryker synt / yo ere ware vordechtlicher (verdächtlicher) / und so vele dusterer Kramboden und stellsteden (Lagerhäuser) se hebben," he launches into examples of their malpractices. In the first place, he claims, they refuse to take back dyed goods they have sold in dark quarters, and, secondly, older merchants employ only those younger ones who agree to do things their way. This has now come to such a pass, the commentator then remarks, that people now openly acknowledge that they have deceived others, "und solckes wer alszdan / eine geschicklichcet genomet," continuing with lines of verse from Schwarzenberg's "Memorial der Tugend" put into the mouth of a merchant:

Mit legen (lügen) / sweren / und valscher ware
Hebbe ick my ernert mennige yare.
Woker / vorkoep (Vorkauf) / und bōse gewicht /
Is nicht myne geringeste thouorsycht.
Guder münthe der tehe ick aue (ziehe ab) /
Prale hoch mit frembder lūde Haue (Habe).
Wen ick dan in schuldēn blieu steken
So borge ick up / und moth syn geweken (Flucht nehmen).

So far this commentator has relied principally on others' works - Agricola's Proverbs and Schwarzenberg's verse. The
following thirteen paragraphs appear to be his own - there is a considerable increase in what appears to be this commentator's personal input towards the end of the work - and the direct influence of Luther, through his "An den christlichen Adel" and "Von Kaufhandlung und Wucher" can be perceived.

He begins by claiming that

> in unsem Dudeschen Lande / hebbe wy aller nodtrofftiger und lustiger dinge genoch / und dartho lüde / de uns sölckes / na aller nodt und lust / bereiden / also dat nen Landt / in dessen stücken / uns vast gelyck ys. Daran hebbe wy auerst nicht genoch / sunder laten uth den enden der werlt / tho uns fören / so vele köstliche unbekande Laken / Eddel Steine / allerleye Syden gewandt und specerye / wyne etc.

This is where all the money is going to these days, he claims. Everyone wants to be a merchant or shopkeeper, he declares, and import "seltzame dinge." "Also werde wy arm / dat gelt suget men uns uth / und föret dat in fremde Lande und auer Meer / dar men de ware her halet." Their forefathers were content with the clothes they had, he maintains, but merchants and shopkeepers now want only the best. We have already noted this commentator's anxiety here with regard to this class getting the upper hand and his fear that the nobles would be ruined thereby and the burghers degraded. "Alszdann settet man Rykedom vor Eere" he remarks here, "de geslechte werden vormenget." This remark serves to confirm the distinction he had already made between the two classes, burghers and merchants, and suggests that the burghers he may have had in mind here were those members of the patriciate families in Rostock who governed the city. It is in fact possible to read into this lament a reference to the recent unrest among
the excluded citizens and their subsequent successful attempt during the mid 1530s to force the City Council to consult with their committee.  

This whole situation he blames for the "schentlyken / schedelyken unde vorderfflyken Tynszköpe (Zinskauf) und de Woker / darmit ytzundes Düdesche Landt / tho mercklykem schaden des gudes/ der eeren / und Seelen / gantz behafft (in Haft genommen)."  

He goes on to emphasize the pernicious nature of the imported goods, claiming that they are particularly attractive to women, "der seltzenheyt und wollust haluen," not at all necessary but only "thor auerfloth (Überfluss) und prale / thor tzyringe und geylheit denstlick," whereby not only is money drained from the country, but these imports "verstören de guden Lantsede / infören fremde laster / und stedes nye und uthlendische gebrüke / an kledingen (Kleidern) und allen andern nygeringen (Neuerungen) / wordorch de yoget (Jugend) grünstlick vordoruen wert."  

He then proceeds to blame the trading companies (gemakede geselschopyen) which "wedder recht / gesette und alle billicheyt / vorkoperye (Vorkauf) driuen (treiben) / alle dinck vorsoken (versuchen) / erdencken und erforschen / darmit se alles volckes gelt / by syck tosamende bringen." He further accuses them, by means of the wealth they have amassed, of outbidding and generally taking advantage of and frightening off their competitors when it comes to acquiring wares, "welcker se namals / na erem gefalle / upt dürste (teuerste) vorkopen (verkaufen)."  

He further accuses the merchants of tampering with the currency, increasing and decreasing its worth at will, and
generally seeking to despoil princes, nobles, lands and people: "Umme geldes wyllyen vorsöken / er dulden (zulassen) und hebbet se feyl alle dinck. Alle ere vornement ys / legen und dregen (lügen und betrügen) / vorborgen rede / erforschyng / hinderlist / bedroch / weickere se ock apenbar gebruken." For this reason, he states, people in former times - the Greeks and the Carthaginians - put restrictions on the movement of merchants, allowing them to sell their wares only in the marketplace. Aristotle, too, he says, advised that merchants should never acquire citizenship rights.

With regard to the necessity for some form of merchandizing per se he writes:

Idt ys ock wol war / dath de köpenschop (Handeltreiben) (wo etlyke syck bedûcken laten) nütte und nödich /und ein unvorachtlick stand der menschen sy. Auerst by dem bescheide (Bedingung) / dat dat ende der Köpenschop / tho erholinge und erstadinge (Verschaffung) der dinger /der dat gemeine beste nottrofftich ys / gelangen und hengewendet.

When, however, it is undertaken from the evil desire to become rich, to amass wealth and goods and to be esteemed, "ock thom egen nutte / mit schaden des negesten / und gemeinen besten / gebruket" - as is usually the case, he claims - then it is dishonourable and cannot be carried on without inflicting damage.

He then cites some of the merchants' failings: false praise for the goods they have for sale, fictitious discrediting of those they import. He continues: "Wo (wie) mennigerleye vorberginge der valschen güder: Wo vele valsche und lychtte wychte und mathe: Wo vele valscher vormenginge / der bösen waren mankt de gude: Wo
This he follows with a quotation from St. Ambrose along the same lines: Why do merchants try always to profit from others by taking advantage of them in times of need? etc. He continues: "Desses handels vornement ys / stedes gewynnen / wolfeyle inköpen düre uthsellen/ und den negesten bedregen," and ends with lines of verse by Freidank to be found in *Agricola* (698) lamenting that few merchants are interested in anything but profit, followed by lines which constitute the proverb heading of *Agricola* (272):


This lengthy gloss of his predecessor the 1544 commentator, in III,12,7, remarks on succinctly as follows:

das es wol war ist / das man ietz eigennutz uund gewin mer acht denn Recht und weiszheit, Aber es hat doch gemeinlich ein bösz end. Man sieht es täglich an manchen grossen kauffman/ der sein güt mit unrecht / betrug und übersatz/ hat in kurtzen jaren zusamen gerafft unangesehen was recht / billich / menschlich oder göttlich sei / und zuletzt / wenn man meynt er steht am aller besten / so ligt er im treck.²¹

For his part, the 1650 commentator in his parallel gloss III,9,3, is not concerned here with merchants specifically, but in connection with "Eigennutz" treats the matter more generally. In III,13,3, however, he chides merchants for risking too much for the sake of worldly things.

To turn now to usury, this was, generally speaking, condemned
by all, church, state, and public opinion alike, although recently, in 1514, Johann Eck had drawn up a series of theses justifying an interest rate of 5% on capital investment.\textsuperscript{17} In the recent past also practices had grown up which the Roman Church authorities were not disposed to consider as usury, particularly that of "Zinskauf," Luther's contrary opinion here being the principal reason for his two sermons on usury of 1519 and 1520.\textsuperscript{18} We have already noted that Luther, although basically for religious reasons hostile to the idea of any interest being charged at all, had come towards the end of his life to accept a figure of around 5% in cases where the money would be used for living expenses and not reinvested.

We have already noted, too, the statement in the \textit{RVC} second preface defining a usurer as a man who loans money but who does not share the misfortunes of the borrower, if such should occur. This passage is based on Agricola (225), where it would seem to derive from Luther's "Von Kaufhandlung und Wucher." A tract Agricola refers to by name in subsequent proverb.\textsuperscript{19} The text in \textit{RVC}, which follows Agricola's very carefully, is as follows:

\begin{quote}
Wor nu slight mit gelde / wert gehandelt / dat de uthlenere (Ausleihers) nene vare (Gefahr) steit / de he doch stan mőste / so he süñuest mith dem gelde gedecht tho handeln / dat ys gemeinlick woker. Dan de vare licht (liegt) allene up dem / de dat gelende gelt entfangen hefft. He gedye (gedeihe) edder vorderue / gewinne edder vorlese (verliere) / so moth he de Renthe geuen. Eerlick und gödtlick were ydt / dat man up Landtgut gelt uth dede (liehe aus) so vele alse dath gudt erdragen konde. Und so dat korne und andere frucht / nicht wol gereden (geraten) / dat alszdan / de uthlener / gelyken schaden dragen mőste.
\end{quote}

Agricola's text here appears to derive from one of Luther's
basic ideas with regard to the taking of what we call today interest, namely that any risk involved should be shared by both parties to the agreement, only then was it not usurious. In the earlier part of his tract "Von Kaufhandlung und Wucher," where he is listing the principal abuses in the merchandizing of goods, Luther refers to a case where

\[\text{es legt eyn Burger sechs jar lang zu eym kauffman eyn zwey tausent gulden, damit soll der kauffman handeln, gewynnen odder verlieren, und dem burger jerlich zwey hundert gulden gewisser zinse davon geben. Was er daruber gewynnet, ist sein. Gewynnet er aber nichts, mus er doch die zinse geben.}\]

Although he admits that the burgher and the merchant are doing one another a service with this transaction, Luther’s judgement is still: "Wie dis gemeyne stucklin unrecht sey und eyn rechter wucher, hab ich ym Sermon vom wucher gnugsam erzelet" (WA 15,310). The connection here, as far as the RVC passage is concerned, is obviously with what Luther had had to say about "zinskauff" and the necessity for the sharing of losses between both parties to the transaction: "Und disz ist die eynige enthaltung diszes kaufs, das er nit eyn wucher sey...das der zinsz juncker (Ausleiher=Kaufer) seyn zinsz hab in aller fahr (Gefahr) und yhr ungewisz sey" (WA 6,56). Luther then goes on to list the calamities that can occur to the "zinszman" - death, illness, fire, storms, also foulplay - "Disze fahr allesampt sollen den zinsz hern betreffen, dan auff solchen und nicht andern grund stehen seyne zinsz" (WA 6,56-57).

After this initial introduction in the second preface, where, it will be remembered, the ecclesiastical class is also accused of
practising usury, this topic does not get specific treatment again in this RVC gloss until Book IV. There is, of course, the occasional reference to usury, two of which references we have already noted, such as the practice of putting good money, as opposed to debased coinage, aside for usurious purposes (1,29,2) and the statement that the import of superfluous wares is responsible also for this practice (111,12,2). In IV,2,1, however, we have an entry based on Agricola (127), with regard to the acquisition of riches, where he records that both the Romans and the Germans in olden times punished usury four times as severely as robbery. The self-degradation of nobles who practise usury, as recorded in RVC IV,5,3, has also been noted elsewhere.

The only other long entry on usury occurs in RVC IV,7,1 and is particularly interesting in that here the commentator diverges to a much greater extent than is usual for him from his source — generally he translates Agricola very faithfully — the passage in Agricola itself being based on one from Luther’s "Von Kaufhandlung und Wucher," where it is added on at the very end of the tract, following the reprinting of the "(Grosser) Sermon von dem Wucher."
1) Aber dahynden ynn Sachsen umb Luneborg und Holsteyn, da macht mans recht grab, das nicht wunder ist, ob eyner den andern fresse.

2) Da nympt  man auffs hundert nicht alleyn ix, x odder wie viel man ymer mag. Sondern haben auch eyn besonders stucklin daran gehenet: Nemlich soll myr eyner tausent gulden thun auff zinse, so mus ich an stat bahrs gellts so viel pferde, true, speck, korn etc. nemen (des er sonst vielleicht nicht mag los werden odder nicht so theur verkeuflen), das myr kaumet der sumen die helfft, als funfhundert gulden bahrs gelts wird, und mus doch fur tausent gulden zinsen, ob myr schon die wahr und vieh nichts nutze odder kaum auff eyn hundert oder zwey gulden mag zu tragen.

1) AlseupdenschentlykenWoker/denmendenUmmerslach nomet.

2) Ung erholt syck also: Wen eyner eynem Heren eddern Junckhern / de benodiget ys / gelt lenet / so moth dersüflige / dem dat gelt geient wert / etlyke ware / als Olde Perde / vordoruen Korge / Madich Speck Garstrige Botter / und vorlegen rustinge / up dat dürste und bauen ere werde / angeslagen / mit tho nemen / Solcke nichtige Ware / de se süss nicten nicht vorkeffen / setten so up eynen summen geldes / und lenen dem benodigedem veer dusent (Tausent) gulden an gelde. Unde wyl he de veer dusent gulden haben / so moth he vor dath feffte dusent / upgemelte undüchtige ware annemen / de süss nict wol / ymme twe eder dre hundert gulden / mochte vorkeffen werden.

3) Danach musz er sich verschrieben auffs hundert jerlich zehen gulden zu verzinsen zu geben / bisz so lang er die hauptsomma widerumb ablege / wenn nun das geldt uberantwort wirt / so nimpt von stund an der darleger die selbige zinse davon / gleich als were schon das jar verlaufen / und nach verlaufen des jars musz der zinss gleich noch eynmal gefallen.
The addition in the *Agricola* passage regarding the necessity for payment from day one of the agreement, which is absent from Luther's tract, may quite likely have been in the latter's source, to which Agricola would have had access, as he was still living in Wittenberg in 1524. (Although his *Proverbs* were not published until 1529, it is obvious that he must have been working on them for a number of years prior to this.) As regards the RVC commentator, however, one is left wondering whether his inserts regarding "Madige Speck" etc. and the exhorbitant interest rates charged are flights of fancy, or whether he was filling in details here that he had heard about. One wonders whether this usurious practice was also common in Mecklenburg.

With regard to the other glosses, there is a mention of usury in 1544 11,8,1, where it is listed along with other vices which God will punish. In 11,4,13, however—the textual reference here is the she-ape's mention of the part played by the bear and the wolf in her adaptation of the Aesop fable of the man and the snake: "Beren und Wolff / verderben das land / Sie achten nicht wes hausz da brandt"—this commentator writes:

```
das Beren und Wolff / das ist / geitz und wucher die land verderben. Man siehet täglich wol / was fur schwere keuff / inn frucht / uund anderer notturfft / durch die geitzigen / hellrachen eingefürt / uund gemacht werden.
```

He then criticizes the buying up of foodstuffs which God has provided but which they, the "geitzigen hellrachen," proceed to sell "umb zwei oder drei gelt." "Wo soll der arm Man hinnaus der notturfftig ist," he questions, "keiner wirt satt vonn klahen
sagen / Er muss dem hellhund seine angestalte twrung helffen machen / uund seinen blut uund schweisz dran hencken." He then chides the "Herrn und Oberkeiten" for not preventing "solche verkeuff" - this is of course an example of "Vorkauf," of the buying up, that is, of essential commodities and selling them for what the market will bear - and particularly for being guilty of it themselves. He suggests that such necessities should be bought up from whose who are forced to sell them for economic reasons and set aside for the benefit of the poor. But no one does anything for nothing, he laments, and the poor lack the means to help one another. The rich could and should provide assistance and might do it with the right incentive, but as it is, nobody helps anybody else and things go downhill.

The 1650 commentator in III,4,9 takes over the substance of this gloss, referring to those who practise "Vorkauf" as "Geitzhalse," who nevertheless know that they are the "Fluch aller Leute und die Strafe Gottes ihnen selbst auf den Hals binden und laden."

Summary

a) With regard to usury and the economic conditions generally, any specific mention of these is entirely absent from the RVA gloss. For the RVC commentator, however, this was a burning issue, much of what he has to say concerning usury in the second preface and in IV,7,1 appearing to derive indirectly from Luther through Agricola, and much of the substance of his remarks on the general economic situation in III,12,2, to derive directly from the same source. The chief complaint of
the 1544 commentator in III,4,13 and of the 1650 commentator in III,4,9 concerns the practice of "Vorkauf," not in itself technically usury, of course, but also condemned in the strongest terms by Luther, as we have seen. With regard to the debasement of the coinage, while both latter commentators are aware of the problems here (1544 I,29,2; 1650 I,27,2) they neither of them afford them the same extensive coverage given them by the RVC commentator in I,29,2, which has been summarized.

b) With regard to the merchants, once again, after his initial reference in the second preface, the RVA commentator has nothing further to say about them, which is to be expected from a commentator who adhered so closely to the narrative text. As far as the RVC commentator is concerned, it seems strange that an inhabitant of a seaport town such as Rostock would have attacked the merchants with such vehemence. It would definitely appear from this that his sympathies were with the burghers in so far as these can be separated from the merchants in such an environment, indicating that he probably came from such a family himself. His general attitude here, however, is rather that of an outsider looking in, such as one might expect, for example, from an official at court.
(iii) The RV glosses as "Ständespiegel"

We have already established that there are two meanings of the term "Spiegel," using this word in a literary sense, namely works which portray situations in which readers can mirror themselves, and those which provide a set of instructions or precepts, as it were, as to how people should conduct themselves. Further, it has been suggested that, here, the story of Reynke de vos can be considered to fall into the first category, the glosses into the second. In other words, it has been postulated that the function of the glosses here may be to provide a set of instructions, precepts or maxims based on the events of the narrative text.

We have also seen that as far as providing a "Fürstenspiegel" is concerned, the narrative text and the glosses fulfil here their respective functions, to a greater or lesser degree in the case of the latter depending on the edition. With this "Ständespiegel" aspect, however, we run immediately into a problem, for here no part of the narrative text, with a few exceptions, deals with people and events unconnected with the court. The exceptions are, firstly, the early stories in Book I of the bear's encounter with the villagers (chap. 9) and of the tom-cat's with the village priest and his family (chap. 14); secondly, the general references in Reinke's second confession to erring priests, prelates and potentates (Book II, chaps 7-6); and, thirdly, Marten the ape's more specific ones to the practices of the Roman Curia (Book II, chap. 9). Here, therefore, it may devolve on the commentators to
perform both functions, to set the stage, as it were, and to formulate instructions or precepts.

First of all, however, we must decide whether there was a conscious effort on the part of the commentator to present such a "Ständespiegel" element in his work. As far as RVA is concerned, this would in fact appear to be lacking. One can hardly understand his statement in the second preface (2b) that the work is also "von deme state der ghemenen sympelen" as constituting such an intent. Nor does this commentator, as one would expect from an author who adheres so closely to the narrative text, mention more than a few classes of society. Also the glosses concerning those that he does mention are, generally speaking, rather interpretations of the text than formulated precepts. This applies to his remarks, for example, concerning nobles and princes who make treaties at the end of hostilities at the expense of their subjects (1,39,7), or of the robber barons who squander the blood and sweat of those under them (11,7,6), and likewise to his criticism of officials who oppress the poor (1,17,3) or who cheat their employers (Ill,13,1). The "mirror" here, then, is provided by the text itself together with his interpretation of it.

With regard to the clergy, there is one instance where he does provide positive instruction, when he writes in 1,14,7: "welkere gheystliken in der hylghen krystenheyt scholen wesen vorgengers der leyen in eyneme uprychtynghen, unstrafliken leuende." For the rest, however, it is mainly interpretation and criticism, as for example in his second reference to the
immorality of the clergy (11,8,3) and his strictures regarding a subservient clergy (1,33,3 and 11,7,6).

As far as judges are concerned, here this commentator does, of course, formulate precepts, as we have already noted: a judge must not take vengeance on the accused without a proper hearing (1,6,1), must allow for a three-time summons (1,14,9), should not believe all he is told (1,20,4; III,2,3), particularly if the people in question have a bad reputation (III,4,6), but judge according to the evidence (III,14,1) and not allow himself to be influenced by the fear of a particular family (III,4,7) or by the hope of riches (1,22,2), nor fail to punish evil-doers (1,20,4). Since, however, under customary law, the judges were almost exclusively noblemen, these precepts are hardly directed to career lawyers from the middle class. In fact, being comments which apply to the conduct in the narrative text of the king in his judicial capacity, they form part of the "Fürstenspiegel" element. Surprising here, perhaps, when one considers the emphasis he put upon them in his second preface, is the absence of any mention of the peasants in his gloss, his strictures concerning those who follow the bad example given by the clergy rather than their good example applying rather — as the term "de gemeynen menschen" (11,8,1) implies — to the laity as a whole.

As far as the RVC commentator is concerned, the situation is somewhat different, for here we have in the first preface his formally-expressed intention that his readers should learn from his chapter-glosses "den Standt und hande1 der ytzigen bosen untrewen werldt / sampt all eren stenden ynt gemeyne," a promise
he does his best to fulfil.

With regard to the nobles, his strictures in 1,39,2, 11,7,4 and 7 follow those recorded in RVA and relate quite closely to the narrative text. His excoriation of the nobility's drinking habits in 1,24,4, however, bears only a peripheral relationship to the text, where Reinke relates how Grimbart, the badger, gave away to his wife the secret of the conspiracy against the king while he was in his cups. Likewise, in his chapter-glosses to Book IV, his censure of the nobility for taking part in activities which do not befit their station in life, such as commerce (IV,5,3) is only tangentially related to the chapter in the narrative text, which chapter is concerned only with the technical details of Isegrim's challenge to Reinke, their respective formal speeches and Reinke's thoughts concerning his chances of success. His continuation of these criticisms in IV,7,1, where he attacks particularly the nobles' present participation in specific commercial enterprises and for practising usury, has similarly no base in the narrative text, which, apart from an exchange between the she-ape and Reinke, is concerned solely with the formalities attending the start of the duel.

As far as officials are concerned, on the other hand, this commentator takes up and embellishes in 1,17,2 and III,13,4 his predecessor's comments on the same chapters, which we have already considered, where government officials are castigated for avarice, oppression and fraud, which comments must, however, be considered as interpretations of the narrative text.

With respect to judges also this commentator takes over all
those glosses of his predecessor listed above, which, as we saw, all relate to the narrative text, although often adding embellishments. As we have just seen, however, these comments constitute a large part of the "Fürtenspiegel" element. Nevertheless, he does also introduce further comments of his own in this regard, which again have a basis in the text, namely to Marten's description in Book 1, chap 9 of what goes on in Rome and the Papal Curia, stating in 11,9,7, that there are two dangerous judges in Rome, money and gifts, and in 11,9,8 that judges often pay too much attention to friendship and to the people involved in lawsuits.

In respect of notaries and advocates, on the other hand, of whom there is no mention in the RVA gloss, this commentator is dealing with persons whose activities are referred to only peripherally in the narrative text, if at all. His practice here is often to invoke "de Poeta," attributing to him the intention of censuring a certain group of people by his introduction of a particular character into his text. In 11,2,2, for example, in respect of advocates, this commentator states that with his, the poet's, mention of the bishop's advocate as Marten's former employer, he meant to rebuke all advocates for their false practices, for twisting the law, as he states, in which they are aided and abetted by the notaries, and for seeking delays in legal practice and for instigating lawsuits. His second reference to advocates or attorneys (11,4,2) has virtually no connection at all with the text, the chapter in question being principally concerned with the she-ape's story of the man's case against the
snake who wanted to kill him after he had saved her life, which case Reinke was called upon by the king to help him settle. Here the commentator accuses attorneys of complicating written laws by their interpretations and thus confusing the judges. The notaries he singles out in II,9,6 for favouring one side over the other - this is based on Marten's description of what goes on in Rome - and in IV,13,1 for delaying proceedings and being generally untrustworthy - this is in connection with Reinke's promotion to chancellor at the conclusion of the narrative text.

As far as the clergy are concerned, this commentator takes over his predecessor's glosses with regard to the subservience of the clergy to the temporal authorities (I,33,2; II,7,5) turning, however, the former's censure of clerical concubinage into a censure of clerical celibacy (I,14,1), agreeing nevertheless with his predecessor's strictures concerning the bad example the former set the laity (as above and II,8,2). His criticism of the bishops - in particular their own immorality and their condoning of it among the lower clergy - that he began in I,14,1, he continues in I,33,3 in much the same vein. Here again we have a reference to "de Poeta." In connection with the difficulties Bellin, the ram, claimed he would have to encounter if the bishop, the deacon or the provost came to hear of how he had given the excommunicated Reinke the church's blessing, the commentator remarks: "Thom drudden, straffet hyr de Poeta de Bischoffe und den geistliken standt." (There is an element of criticism in the text of course through the names given to the officials, which the RVA commentator picked up, as we have seen, accusing them of avarice,
so the RVC commentator’s line of criticism here, largely moral, is his own invention.) Finally, his criticism of the clergy as a whole in 11,8,4 stems from Reinke’s strictures concerning the clergy in his second confession, and, with regard to the Papacy and Papal officials in 11,9, from Marten’s account of what goes on in Rome. As far as the regular orders are concerned, however—that is, the monks and the nuns—the relationship of his comments to the text is merely peripheral—to Reinke’s detour via the nunnery in Book I, chap. 18 with respect to the nuns, and to his reference to the "bekappeden" in his second confession (Book II, chap. 8) with respect to the monks.

The other principal profession he mentions is that of the physicians in III,12,1, where his trenchant criticisms—they are promoted too quickly and easily, they make out they know more than they do and they undertake too much—is based on Reinke’s mention of his father’s services to the king’s father, "worumme en de Koninck groth und werdich geachtet / eynen Doctor hefft nomen laten / und rycklich begauet." He even manages to slip in the astronomers and astrologers here: "By den Doctorn der Medicin hebben ock platz de Astronomi und Astrologi," making fun of the former as star-gazers who fall into holes in the ground watching the skies, but at the same time quoting lines of verse from Schwarzenberg’s "Memorial der Tugend" in praise of the science. For astrologers neither he—through Franck/Erasmus Moria—not Schwarzenberg have a good word, the latter calling astrology full of "logen und fantasye." Other professions or occupations this commentator manages to introduce in a somewhat roundabout fashion
include jewellers, whom he links to Reinke's mention in 111,6,1 of the wonderful properties of the "lost" ring intended as a present for the king. Jewellers, he maintains, give stones wonderful names in order to sell them for more than they are worth. Similarly, in 111,6,2, he accuses alchemists, whom the links to Meyster Abrion, the only person capable of reading what was written inside the ring, of trying with secret skills to transform the nature of things, metals particularly. Lines by Schwarzenberg, which he includes, begin with the words: "De entlyke kunst der Alchimye / Is stelen / lügen (lügen) und bedregerye."

With regard to the merchants, his criticisms of them in 1,29,2 for sending good money out of the country and importing bad money in return derives from the hare's mention of Simon, the counterfeiter. Through this man, he asserts, "de Poeta" wants to censure the disastrous results of this practice. His long gloss of 111,12,2 regarding the merchants, the main thrust of his censure here being economic, moral (they are corrupting society) and ordo-related (their wealth and ostentation is threatening the social structure) derives, as we have seen, from Reinke's remarks to the effect that nowadays self-interest and the urge for profit-taking are the driving forces in the world.

Finally, as far as the peasants are concerned, we have noted that this commentator's strictures in 1,9,1 and 11,8,1 with regard to the common man derive in the first instance from the description of the peasants in the narrative text and in the second from Reinke's remark in his second confession that the
majority always follow the bad examples of both prelates and
temporal authorities. His excoriation of the mercenaries meanwhile
in 1,26,1 derives from Reinke's account of his father's recruiting
drive in Saxony to gather troops to help the bear to supplant the
king. "In dessem Capitel," he writes here, "straffet de Poeta de
Ruter, Söldener und Landesknechte..."

Here, then, in this gloss, the "Spiegel" element is provided
very largely in the commentary itself. There is, however, very
little effort made to formulate precepts here from the material
presented, which mostly constitutes negative criticism of the
people concerned.

To turn now to the 1544 gloss, we notice at once a difference
in intention, as this is outlined in the preface. Whereas the RVC
commentator had declared this to be that his readers should learn
from the chapter-glosses the works and ways of the present
faithless world and of all classes of society in general, the 1544
commentator urges instead each reader to make a "gedenckbuch" from
his own study of the text, from which he "on zweiuel mit grossen
ehren und grossem nutz / jnn was wirden oder stands er were / inn
seinem beruff danach leben kunte." This is, of course, his own
intention here. As he states, he is merely showing the way to
such a study of the text, and his remarks, compared with those of
this predecessor, have the enlivening and refreshing ring of
personal experience, as we have seen, even when they are based on
the latter's gloss.

With regard to the nobility's drinking habits, for example,
he emphasizes here (1,24,3) particularly the danger of betrayal of
trust that can occur under these circumstances, and while he, too, 
deplores the nobility's participation in commercial enterprises, 
he recommends a revival of tournaments as an alternative (IV,5,4). 
We also have his censure of the nobility for not keeping their 
distance from the peasants (III,2,21).

As far as jurists are concerned - here judges - we have 
already had occasion to note examples of his remarks regarding the 
necessity for full investigation, particularly with regard to 
capital offences (III,2,17; III,4,5) and the type of man who 
should be appointed to this post (II,9,9 and III,4,6-7), and his 
encouragement of judges to endeavour to gain a good reputation 
for their work (III,1,10; III,4,10). With regard to other members 
of the legal profession - notaries and attorneys - he has no 
comment whatsoever. As far as the chancellor is concerned, his 
comments are, as we have seen, solely concerned here with this 
official's diplomatic functions (I,37.4).

As for the clergy, we are concerned here primarily with the 
Protestant (in his case undoubtedly Lutheran) clergy - except, 
that is, for his censure of the Roman priest who was too ready to 
obey the lord of the manor (I,33,1) - whom he defends to the hilt 
against the charge of avarice, deploring by contrast their 
pitiable economic conditions, and regarding whom he makes an at 
onece reasoned and impassioned plea for clerical marriage on 
physiological grounds (II,8,5). With regard to bishops, he echoes 
his predecessor's strictures regarding their immorality (I,14,1) 
as also in I,33,3, suggesting in the latter gloss that they have 
gone over to the devil. With regard to monks and nuns, his
criticisms concerning the latter follow very largely those expressed by his predecessor, the principal one being that many young women who were shut away in nunneries at an early age long for the world (I,18,1; II,9,6). He also deplores what is still going on in the existing monastic institutions (II,7,4).

His judgement regarding physicians is overwhelmingly positive, as we saw, as compared with that of his predecessor. They should be rewarded for their work, he states, adding that patients can often err in their relationship with their physicians by not telling them the truth with regard to their symptoms or by refusing to take the medicine prescribed (III,11,4; III,12,2,4.) He omits entirely his predecessor's reference to astronomers, astrologers and jewellers.

As for the merchants, here he is concerned in III,12,7 with their emphasis on profit-taking and in particular with their practice of "Vorkauf." Discounting his repetition of most of his predecessor's first Franck passage in I,9, which took place before he had established his independence, this commentator has little to say about the lowest classes of society, the thrust of his remarks on the second Franck passage (II,8,2) being rather a plea, which was also Franck's, for personal responsibility in decision-making and actions generally. With regard to the mercenaries, he is also principally concerned in I,26,1 that they should consider carefully the cause for which they have pledged themselves to fight, instead of caring only about the money to be earned.

The material here, then, bears, generally speaking, the same lack of connection with the narrative text as did that in RVC, and
there is also here, too, little formulation of precepts.

As far as the 1650 commentator is concerned, it is impossible to draw much of a parallel here, in the first place because "Spiegel" literature was not a feature of the baroque era, and, secondly, because we have here no remarks in his preface to build on. The only reference to the classes of society is to be found on the title-page, where we read that this is a story where, using the names of various animals, "das Hofe / wie auch aller Stände
der Welt Leben und Wesen / so wohl nach ihren Tugenden / als auch
insonderheit nach denen darein vorfallenden Lastern / mercklich
beschrieben / und gleichsam mit lebendigen Farben bezeichnet wird," in itself a gross exaggeration if the reference to "aller Stände
der Welt Leben und Wesen" is to be taken to apply to the narrative
text alone, as seems to be the case.

Moreover, this commentator's dependence for his illustrations from the end of Book II onwards on Moscherosch's Gesichte
Philanders von Sittewald gives his remarks a satiric edge that is lacking almost completely in the other glosses. For the rest, his remarks are of a similarly wide-ranging variety to those of his predecessor, and are, generally speaking, negative, as in RVC. As examples we have his criticism of the nobility for their boasting and their dependence on their ancestors and their coats-of-arms (III,2,9), of attorneys who think they can win any kind of case, and thus encourage litigation for their own benefit (II,7,4) of the Protestant clergy, for whom he has few good words (II,8,1) and whose sorry situation as court-preachers he describes with a good deal of personal feeling (I,31,1), of the Roman Church clergy for
enforcing celibacy on the priesthood and generally for preferring to obey the laws of men rather than those of God (1,14,2) and of the compulsory aspect of the nuns' entrance into cloisters (1,17,1).

With regard to physicians, he seems willing here to weigh the pros and cons, to pit, as it were, the Bible against St Ambrose and Moscherosch, coming down in favour of the former (111,9,2). As for the merchants, he has very little to say about them - a reflection possibly of the decrease in importance of this class since the preceding century. With regard to the lower classes he has very little to say either, apart from his repetition of the first Franck passage of 1,9,1, while his lament in 1,24,1 on the situation in which soldiers were placed during the Thirty Years War betrays the personal experience of someone forced to live through those dreadful years.

Summary

a) We are concerned here with four basic criteria:

   aa) whether any work which introduces so few examples, comparatively speaking, of people from the various walks of life can be considered to present a "Ständespiegel" element

   bb) the intention of the individual commentator

   cc) how far the glosses fulfil their postulated function of providing instructions or precepts based on events in the narrative text.

   dd) how far the glosses fulfil both functions - that is,
both provide the background, which is in some cases absent from the narrative text, and formulate instructions or precepts.

b) With regard to RVA, as we have seen, all this commentator's remarks do derive from the narrative text. However, the comparative paucity of the classes of society he considers, compared with his fellow commentators, and the apparent lack of intent to include a "Ständespiegel" element in his gloss appears to rule out this element here. There is likewise little formulation of precepts. It is up to the reader to mirror himself in the events of the narrative text and their interpretation in the gloss.

c) The situation with regard to RVC is completely different, however. Here we have both the intention expressed in this commentator's first preface to present a "Ständespiegel" as also his obvious effort to introduce as many professions and occupations as he possibly can, however flimsy their connection with the narrative text may be, although the number of professions and occupations included is admittedly minimal. From these two points of view, then, intent and content, this gloss can be considered to possess a true "Ständespiegel" element. With regard to the two latter criteria mentioned above, we have noted that he takes over all the RVA glosses concerning the nobles and the officials and likewise those concerning the immorality and subservience of the lower clergy, while giving the question of celibacy a
different interpretation, but, as with his predecessor, there is no attempt made to formulate precepts, except for exhorting the clergy to set a good example (1,14,1). With regard also to those professions and occupations where the connection with the narrative text is peripheral at best, his treatment is similar. It is mostly a torrent of negative criticism, whether his target is the bishops, jurists (notaries and attorneys), physicians or merchants. Readers of this RVC gloss in this respect, therefore, must mirror themselves in the commentary alone.

d) As far as the 1544 gloss is concerned, here we have a different picture again. This commentator, as we have seen, urges each reader, "jnn was wirden oder stands er were," to compile his own precepts, as it were, from the material presented in the narrative text, his own - i.e. the commentator's - function here, as he sees it, being to set an example. We have noted the topical nature of his glosses to which this approach gives rise, so different from the literary approach of his predecessor. The question, however, of whether this gloss possesses a true "Ständespiegel" element is debatable. There are comparatively few classes, professions or occupations covered and the positive intent seems here to be lacking, except in so far as he is to all intents and purposes encouraging his readers to compile their own "Ständespiegel," so to speak, by mirroring themselves in the text and recording their observations.
e) As regards the 1650 gloss, the absence here of intent - in his preface, that is -, the changed literary conventions and the introduction of so much satire through the Moscherosch quotations rule out consideration of a "Ständespiegel" element.
Here in this section we will be examining the current attitude to women, to marriage, children and the family before and after the Reformation and how far this is reflected in the glosses.

With regard first of all to women, during the Middle Ages the general attitude had been that women were tools of Satan, bent on man’s perdition, inferior beings, incapable of understanding and prone to weaknesses of which they were constantly being reminded, beings who should be restrained and ruled first by their fathers and brothers and later by their husbands. In other words, they were chattels, a necessary evil for the continuation of the species. Stammler notes the difference in attitude that was making itself felt, however, in Humanist literature compared with the popular literature of the time. "Gegenüber der Frauenverachtung, die sich gerade in dem volkstümlichen Schrifttum jener Zeit breit machte," he writes, "verdient diese Anschauung als Ausfluss humanististischen Geistes immer wieder festgehalten zu werden." A work in which the popular attitude was certainly reflected was Heinrich Bebel’s Proverbia Germanica - proverbs from both Germany and the Netherlands which he had translated into Latin - which first appeared in 1508. (It is true that in courtly literature the woman was placed on a pedestal, so to speak, but this applied only to noblewomen, and there is, too, a conventional element present in this type of literature).

The principal inspiration for this altered attitude towards
women on the part of the Humanist writers derives from south of the Alps, from Boccaccio particularly. This author's *De claris mulieribus* - mini-biographies of approximately a hundred famous women - was first translated into German by Heinrich Steinhöwel of Ulm in 1473. Whereas Boccaccio, however, retained a somewhat ambivalent attitude towards women - they could achieve greatness but this required a greater effort on their part than on a man's since they were by nature inferior in both ability and capability, Steinhöwel, by means of additions here and there in his translation, placed women on the same level as men and in some respects higher. Approximately ten years before this, someone using the pseudonym Arigo had translated Boccaccio's *Decameron* into German:

> da mit die beschwerten und betrübtenn freulein auch ir ein teyle irer verporgen traurikeit mugen ein klein fride geben, und die auch mit zucht in freude kern, han ich Arigo in (ihnen) das wercke machen und in teutsche zungenn schreibenn wollen. Als ir mit zucht lesent vernemen wert. Auch do pey euer liebe, rate, troste und hilffe on zweiffel finden wert, und das getun habe da mit ich zu liebe werd den die eins sölchen zu mir begert haben.

(Boccaccio originally dedicated his book to women, as he writes in his "Proem," because he considered that they have less opportunity to work out their emotional problems than men, who can indulge in a variety of recreational activities for this purpose.)

The work which had the most lasting influence here, however, was Albrecht von Eyb's *Ehebüchlein* of 1472, its full title reading *Ob einem manne sey zu nemen ein eelich weib oder nit*, dedicated to the city council of Nürnberg "zur Stärkung der Politzei und des
Regiments." This was certainly no new question, as Eyb himself shows in his summary of opinions on the subject ranging from those of Socrates to those of Petrarch, but had recently developed into "ein echt humanistisches Thema," according to Stammler. His own positive attitude to marriage Eyb summed up as follows:

Between his introduction and his summing-up Eyb inserts four stories about women, two of them from the Decameron, dealing with the subject of marriage. Then in his last section, entitled "Das lob der Ee," he bases his praise of the institution firstly on religious grounds, that marriage namely, was divinely established for the purpose of peopling the universe and that Christ Himself honoured it by performing the miracle of turning water into wine at a wedding. Secondly, he states that it is a natural institution and thirdly, that it is recognized in written law. It is also an honourable institution, he claims, "ein muter und meisterin der keuscheit," and a useful one in that it creates harmony between lands and peoples. He ends with these words:

So ist auch de Ee ein fröhlichs, lustpers und süß ding: was mag fröhlicher und süßer geseen, dann der name des vaters, der muter und der kinder, so die hängen an den heisen der eltern und manchen süßen kus von in empfahen? und so beide eeeúte solliche lieb, willen und freundschaft zueinander haben, was eines will, das es auch wolle das ander, und was eines radt mit dem andern, das es verschwigen 8, als het es mit imseihb geredt, und in beiden gutes und übel gemein ist, das gute derfrölicher und das widerwertig dester leichter. Solliche und ander mer ursachen, die oben sein auszgefürt,
preyszen und loben die heilligen, widdigen Ee
und anzaigen die antwort auf die furgenomen
frage, das einem manne sey zunemen ein weyb,
die ich hiemit beschloszen und hingleqt will
haben.\textsuperscript{531}

The reason for the enduring interest in this work — it was
printed twelve times in all between 1472 and 1540 — is presumably
the absence in it of any material that ran counter to subsequent
Protestant teaching. Eyb went so far in fact as to deny the
sacramental character of marriage, considering that it should be a
matter for the secular authorities.\textsuperscript{532}

Luther, too, was to deny the sacramental character of
marriage in his "De captivitate Babylonica," of 1520, claiming
that it was not ordained in Scripture and also that it had existed
from the beginning among unbelievers, so that there was no reason
why it should be considered a sacrament of the church (WA 6,550;
LW 36,92). In his "Von ehelichem Leben" of 1522 Luther covers much
of the same general ground as Eyb, such as the divine and natural
institution of marriage, the curb that marriage puts on unchastity
and the advantages of matrimony, although Luther's emphasis here
is rather on the opportunity it gives to parents to influence
their children for good than on their relationship with one
another:

Das aller best aber ym ehelichen leben...ist,
das gott frucht gibt und befihlt auff tzuizhen
tzu gottis dienst, das ist auff erden das
aller edlist theorist werck, weyll gott nicht
libers geschehen mag denn seelen erloszenn
(WA 10:2,301).

He also makes much of the fact that the institution of marriage is
pleasing to God, and of the necessity of realizing this (WA
10:2,294). There are religious overtones even in his reference to
the difference between "Ehelich seyn und ehiich leben erkennen," where he claims that "wer es aber...erkennet, der hatt lust, liebe und freude drynnen on unterlass," and likewise his mention of Solomon's dictum "wer eyn weyb find, der find was gutts." All this is brought about, namely, Luther maintains, by recognizing marriage as a divine institution (WA 10:2,294). Eyb's worldly, as one might term it, approach to matrimony was entirely foreign to Luther at the time that he wrote this tract.

The emphasis that Luther placed on the married estate and the importance he assigned to it was of course bound up with his rejection of both the Roman priesthood and of monastic vows, a point he stresses in his "Grosser Katechismus" (1529) in connection with the fourth (fifth) commandment. In his interpretation of the sixth (seventh) commandment also Luther confirms the importance of marriage: "Darumb wil er [Gott] yhn [den ehelichen Stand] auch von uns geehret, gehalten und gefuret (gefeiert) haben als einen Gottlichen, seligen Stand" (WA 30:1,161).

There can be no question, however, of the Reformation's having introduced any new and different attitude with regard to women's independence of men, although Luther did his best to introduce a new respect for a woman as wife and mother, emphasizing particularly how her function here was pleasing to God, comparing this with that of a nun which was not (WA 10:2,298). He also condemns the idea, which he traces to classical literature, that "eyn weyb sey eyn nottigs ubel" (WA 10:2,293). Nevertheless, he still insisted on the obedience that a
wife owes her husband. In his "Von den guten werken" (1520), for example, he wrote: "hie solt ich auch wol sagen, wie ein weib seinem man, als seinem ubirsten, gehorsam, unterthenig, weichen, schweygen uund recht lassen sol, wo es nit widder got ist." A husband, however, also had his obligations, Luther maintained, the above quotation continuing "widderumb der man sein weib lieb haben, etwas nachlassen und nit genaw mit yhr handeln" (WA 6,264). These obligations also included providing for the needs of a wife, children and servants, as he explains in his "Von Kaufhandlung und Wucher" (WA 15,303), and in "Von Ehesachen" (1530) he writes: "Nein, lieber geselle, Bistu an ein weib gebunden, so bistu nicht mehr ein freier herr. Got zwinget und heist dich bey weib und kind bleiben, sie neren und zihen" (WA 30:3,243). With regard to sexual relations, Luther contented himself in "Von ehelichem Leben" by quoting the words of St Paul (WA 10:2,290).

Parent/child relationships Luther covered at length in his "Von den guten werken" in connection with the fourth (fifth) commandment, stressing here that honouring is something more than loving, and that children should fear offending their parents more than the punishment that the latter will mete out for the offence: "ein solche furcht, mit lieb vormisch, ist die rechte ehre" (WA 6,251). Parents, for their part, should neither be too strict, nor should they let their children have their own way, for in the latter case their self-will will not be broken (WA 6,255), and the parents themselves will end up being dishonoured (WA 6,252). The whole thrust of Luther's "Kinder zur Schule halten" (1530) was also of course, as we have seen, to urge parents to let their
intelligent sons attend school, so that they could grow up to be the pastors, preachers and civil administrators of the next generation.

The core of what we have already noted with regard to marital and parent/child relationships Luther repeats in his "Kleiner Katechismus" (1529), adding instructions to servants and working people to be obedient to their masters and to the latter not to be too strict with those working for them (WA 30:1,336).

Turning now to the glosses, none of the commentators has a great deal that is complimentary to say about women! Working chronologically, we hear first the time-honoured criticism (a) that women cannot keep secrets and should not for this reason be trusted with them. The narrative text reference is to the secret regarding the fictitious conspiracy that Grimbart blabbed to his wife in his cups and which the latter then passed on to Reinke’s wife who told him (2182-96). This judgement is initiated by the RVC commentator in 1,24,5 by means of extracts from Agricola (201) who gives examples from Roman history as illustration. For his part, the 1544 commentator in 1,24,4 quotes a proverb, which he maintains is a "ware rede":

Was einer will verschwigen tragen
das soll er einem weibe sagenn.
Da ist eben inn verschlossenn
Als hett er wasser inn ein sieb gosenn.

However, this commentator does allow that there are some exceptional girls and women to whom this does not apply. Moreover, he is concerned primarily that secrets should be divulged to no one at all, as the person to whom they are imparted
comes under immediate suspicion if the matter becomes generally known. At any rate, he maintains, an honourable woman should not be inquisitive about things that do not concern her. The 1650 commentator, in 1,22,3, is in general agreement with his predecessor, stressing what a terrible thing it is to betray a secret, the main part of his gloss being taken up with examples of virtuous *men* who have been able to keep them.

We hear further

(b) that a ruler should not listen to his wife’s pleas for mercy for prisoners unless these are genuine and she has no ulterior motives - (RVA 1,31,1; RVC, 1544 1,27,1; 1650 1,25,1) - which we have previously noted. The narrative text reference here is to the queen’s intercession for Reinke after his false confession (2390-99). Generalizing this topic of the need for a king to examine closely his wife’s pleas for prisoners, the 1544 commentator urges in 1,27,1 that a good woman’s advice should only be followed in household matters, maintaining that, in general, a man is better able to weigh the information given him and should be hesitant about taking a woman’s advice in "groszen wichtigen sachen / besonder inn peinlichen sachen." For his part, the 1650 commentator in 1,25,1 describes the woman who wants everything her own way and everyone dancing to her tune as "Ein Schiffbruch des Mannes / ein ungewitter des Hauses / eine Zerstörerin der Ruhe / ein Gefängnisz des Lebens / ein täglichcher Schade / ein fressender Krieg."

In 1,38,3 the RVC commentator returns to this question of taking women’s advice, since this seldom turns out well, he
maintains, quoting Schwarzenberg with regard to Adam and Eve. The narrative text reference is the arrival of the hare's head in the knapsack, in other words, the setback this constituted for the king for having taken his wife's advice to let Reinke go. (Book I, chap. 38). This second reference to a woman's advice the 1544 commentator refuses to take up: "Von frauen rhat ist oben zimlich gnug gesagt," he remarks tersely in 1,38,3.

(c) that an honourable man must be true to and gentle with his lawful wife and be prepared to protect and defend her. This remark of the 1544 commentator in 11,1,7 is occasioned by the male crow's distress at his wife's fate at Reinke's hands: "Uund must das elend sehen an / Bedencks ein jeder erbar mann / Was mir das fur ein jamer war." Taking up these words from his narrative text this commentator states: "soll ein jeder erbar mann / seinem ehrlichen Eheweib / trew und holt sein." He should share her misfortunes, take these to heart, protect and defend her with his life, "und von gewalt soviel jm möglich eretten." In return for her subjection to him, according to God's commandment, "so ist er auch schuldig / ir als seinem eigen leib fürzustehen / lieb / trew schutz uund schirm / zuleisten." The 1650 commentator in 11,1,5 takes up the main point of his predecessor's gloss, adding that a husband should lament his wife's passing and speak up for her if she is insulted and be prepared to avenge this.

(d) that a woman should be wise and prudent and consider well the advice she gives her husband, lest she be shamed when it turns out badly. This refers to the blame the king puts on his wife in the narrative text for her bad advice regarding Reinke:
"Men de schult was by myner vrouwen / Doch ick byn des alleyne nicht / De by vrouwen rade schaden krycht" (3432-34). The above statement that a woman should consider the advice she gives forms the gist of the RVA, RVC, 1544 II,2,1 glosses, the 1544 commentator adding that a distinction should be made between household matters - and even here the wife should alter things if her husband desires it - and public concerns, where the man needs wiser counsel than that of his wife. This remark will not offend "Erbarn frawen," he is sure, he states. The 1650 commentator merely remarks tersely here in II,2,4 that a woman's advice should be disregarded as it is seldom profitable.

(e) that the woman is the weaker sex in all respects, and for this reason more blame should be placed on the man for taking the advice proffered than on her for giving it. This dictum the RVA commentator expounds in II,1,2 as follows:

wente eyn man is van vaster complexion wan eyne vrouwe; dar umme is eyneme manne meer tho vorwyten (tadeln), wan he schaden efte schande kricht by vroyuwen rade, wan alze eyner vrouwen is tho vorwyten, dat se den rad uth ghyft (so vern ere menynge gud is), den se in radende menet, wente vrouwen nicht ensyn so vullenkomen alze de mans...

This opinion of women was, of course, the official church view. The RVC commentator, in II,2,2, takes over the substance of the RVA gloss, adding "dan de Frouwen synt swake / unfullenkamen und unbestendig·creatur. Auerst ein man ys von starker complexien / derhaluen gebort em ock / mehr bestendicheit und vorsichticheit tho hebben." He ends with lines from Schwarzenberg's "Memorial der Tugend":

Ein fraem wysz bidderman /
The distinction made here between men and women is not repeated by the 1544 commentator.

(f) that wives should try to calm their husbands down and to excuse themselves if they have erred rather than cause further trouble. The narrative text reference here is to the queen's words in 3451-75, and this is an interesting example of the commentators' remarks, initially at least, referring to something they obviously felt should have happened rather than to what actually did. For the queen does not excuse herself with fitting words - she does not excuse herself at all - but rather first rebukes her husband for losing his temper and swearing, behaviour which does not accord with his station in life, she says. She goes on to try to persuade him that he does not know the true facts of the case, urging that Reinke's enemies are most probably ganging up on him in his absence and that he, Reinke, is anyway entitled in law to another hearing ("Audi alteram partem" - I.3460). Reinke is wise and clever and his clan is a large one, she states. Her husband should not act hastily and dishonourably, she urges, he is, after all, ruler of the whole country and has complete power over Reinke (3456-75). The RVA commentator in 11,3,2 writes: "Dat ander is eyne lere eyner yslyken vrouwen, wo de myt sachtmodygen worden eren heren efte eren man schal tho freden spreken," continuing in 11,3,5: "dat eyne vrouw syk myt temelyken (ziemlichen) worden wol mach entschuldigen," adding,
somewhat surprisingly, "so hir de konnygynne dede." For his part
the RVC commentator in 11,3,1 interprets the passage more in
accordance with the facts. Although he remarks initially:

Eine Erbar / dogetzame frame frouwe / mach
syck mit tuchtigen / unde gebörligen wórden /
wol / entschuldigen / dartho erten Heren und
man / sachtmôdigen (sanftmutig) und mit voge /
anspreken / und tho freden stellen,

he continues:

Auerst nicht mit trotzigem kuyende / bitterem
und wredem (erzurntem) gemôte / efte mit
stolten forsen (erbitterten) wórden / se wert
sus nicht mehr utrichten / alse wenn se syck
understünde / dat vür mit ole tho dampen.

He ends with a quotation from Der Renner from Agricola (135), the
first lines of which run:

Selden wert synes lydendes radt /
De ein böse wyff genamen hat.
Wente ny nen Deerte (Tier) erger wart /
Alse ein wyff / van böser art.
Dem auerst ein gudt wyff wert besichert /
Wor de jm Lande ummehler vert (fährt)
De moth syn ein gar salich man /
Wente se mit eren tüchten (Zucht) kan
Vormeren erer beyder salicheit /
Und ys eine Krone der werdicheit.

The 1544 commentator (11,3,2) appears to accept his predecessor's
interpretation, urging that an honourable woman "wo sie gefeelet /
gern straffen lest / und mit güten / freündlichen / sanftmütigen
worten sich entschûldigt / uund auch in sachen die ihrem Herrn
schedlich / mildiglich einredt." He continues

Aber pochen / trotzen / scheiten / flûchen /
schweren / gantz gerecht und unschuldig sein /
wort umb streich geben / dem Man in keinen
dingen recht lassen / stehet nicht ehrlichen
Matronen / sondern bösen / gifftigen fetteln
zô.

For his part the 1650 commentator in 11,3,1 adds that men should
cross themselves before such a woman and implore God to rid them of such a burden, adding some herb recipes which some consider may effect a cure!

(g) that a man should not confide his troubles to his wife, however great these may be. This comment is to be found in RVA alone, in 11,6,4, the narrative text reference being to Reinke's reassurance of his wife before leaving home the second time to face the king: "Weset to vreden, des bydde ik yw / Wente yd is al sunder anxst" (3692-93). This commentator's views here seem to derive from his basic belief in the inherent weakness of the female sex in all respects.

(h) that women have their uses as go-betweens, as the RVA commentator explains in 11,9,3: "dat eyn vaken (oft) by etlyken heren mach vorkrigen (bekommen) hulpe efte ghehoer dorch myddele der vrouwen." This remark, which can also be taken pejoratively, is a reference to the function of the lady in the narrative text whom Marten the ape knew in Rome who would take a note to the cardinal: "Ick kenne eyne vrouwen de heft he leeff (lieb) / De schal eme bryngen eynen breff" (4199-4200). This is also related of course to the part that a woman can play in interceding for a prisoner in a just cause, which we have already noted. Also in 111,4,4, with reference to the function of the she-ape in interceding for Reinke with the king, this commentator remarks: "dat yd nutte is, (de dat so don kan), dat eyne vrouwe de wol ghehoret is, eynen vorsten sachtmodich make unde vor eynen spreke, de besecht (beschüldigt) is."

(i) that women are frivolous regarding fashions of one kind
and another. This III,4,3 gloss is one of the most interesting
glosses in RVA, as it is both one of the most personal he writes
and also one in which he refers only peripherally to the text.
The "lerer" mentions the close relationship the she-ape had with
the king, and particularly the queen (4533-35), he states, by
which he, "de leren," means

de kameralken (Kammerzofe), de vrouwen by
den vorstynnen edder ander vrouwen in den
steden, de syck uthmalen unde uthvylen (schön
machen und schmücken) bouen den schreuе (über
das umgeschriebene mass hinaus), desse dat
syn apen, etfe rechte apynnen, ghelyck alge
eyn ape gherne na deyt (nachtut), wat se sud
(sieht).

He goes on to explain the frivolity of the women in the cities and
castles, who always yearn to follow the crowd when it comes to
fashion, whether it is a case of hair-style or headgear. They
want to make themselves different from the way in which God
created them, he remarks severely, including the colour of their
hair and other parts of their bodies. He compares them to owls,
who also have large heads, this betokening for him people who do
not amount to much! The RVC commentator in III,3,3 takes over
this gloss and adds a long passage by Theophrastus from Franck's
Geschichtsbibel comprising some very uncomplimentary remarks about
women. His conclusion is: "Summa. De ym Eelyken stande gegeuen /
ys nummer fryg und leddich / syn herte ys alletydt mit sorgen
befangen." There is no equivalent to this gloss in the 1544
edition. As far as the RVC commentator is concerned, however, one
should add here the gloss III,12,2 in the course of which, as we
have already noted, he refers to women as being those who are
particularly attracted by the goods which are currently being
imported into the country, to purchase which, he implies, men are forced to rob, steal and murder.

(j) that women should not interfere in public affairs. This topic, which has already been touched upon in 1544 I,27,1 and I1,2,1, as we have seen, is introduced here in RVC III,3,3 as an additional complaint with regard to women's frivolity. Women such as the she-ape are, he claims, "unnütte / förwyttige und swetzige wyuer / de men sus Oldtfrouwen nömet," who are "allenthaluen by den Heren ym Regimente," where they "syck uttmalen und heruor don." He continues:

Welcker ock / alle gude vornement und Radtsiege der Heren / mitweten (mitwissen) und meistern willen. Edder vorhyndern / effte gar affwenden können.

(k) that wives should not be feared by their husbands who should be masters of the house. This topic is introduced by the 1544 commentator in III,5,4, apparently inspired by the large part the she-ape played in changing the king's mind with regard to Reinke and in planning the search for the missing comb and mirror in Book III, chap.5. This commentator writes here "das ein Man die Oberkeit in seinem hause haben soll / denn es stehet nicht wol / das sich der Man für der frawen fürchten musz," although, he goes on to say, a wife must not be treated like a servant, but rather as one "die alles des seinen mit teilhafftig sei." They should consult together, he advises, regarding household matters. He continues: "Ein erbars weib / bedencket in dem jhren / auch jr bestes / wie sich ein verstendiger Man darinn wol zuhalten wissen soll / und masz in allen dingen halten." The 1650 commentator in
111,5,4 takes over the substance of this gloss, stressing particularly that the husband should not interfere in household matters without his wife's permission.

(1) that women and girls should not be so credulous and thus so easily deceived. This topic, which is treated in basically the same way by all four commentators is inspired by the story in Book IV, chap. 1 of the she-wolf's getting her tail stuck in the ice - thus giving Reinke the opportunity to violate her - because she believed too eagerly what he told her about the fish in the lake and the easiest way to catch them (5632-5702). The RVA commentator in IV,1,1 refers to Eve as the first example of such a woman, continuing "Vrouwen efte yunckfrouwen, dede draden (schnell) louen (glauben) den lotgeters (Betrügern) unde den schenders, desse werden bedrogen unde draden erer ere berouet, desse nummer konen wedder krygen." For his part, the RVC commentator here omits the references to Eve and a woman's honour, preferring to quote from Brandt's Narrenschyp. The main points of this Brandt quotation are then reproduced by the 1544 commentator in IV,1,1, namely, that a woman should be content to stay at home and be with her husband. Brandt also chides the husband for allowing too many guests in his home, the 1544 commentator in IV,1,2 censuring, too, the husband who allows another man to pay court to his wife in his own home. In IV,1,1 this latter commentator also upbraids women who run from house to house to hear and to circulate gossip. The 1650 commentator, in III, 12,1, agrees with his predecessors here, describing with the assistance of Moscherosch the many ways in which women can deceive
(m) that a woman who "zu falle kumpt," which very often happens, the RVA commentator states, should not despair but protect herself with all the cunning she has. This remark in IV,2,4 is restricted to the RVA commentary.

Criticism of men is not wholly absent, as we have noted, particularly from the 1544 gloss. In this same IV,1,1 chapter-gloss, for example, where he mentions the women's gossiping, he states further that this does not befit a man either, and in IV,1,3 he maintains that "es kein gut zeichen an eim Man ist / das er solche schand / als hie der wolff mit augen siehet / von seinem weib weisz / vertragt und leidet / wie mancher wol dazu hilfft." (The reference here is to Isegrim's coming upon Reinke violating his wife after she had got her tail stuck in the ice on the frozen pond.) He continues with a vehement denunciation of such men, who, he claims, are capable of betraying their countries and should not be trusted by anyone. They are just the same as those who have good, honest wives at home and who commit adultery with other women - these men also deserve no trust. He does not mind whom he upsets by saying this, he explains, as he feels no one will blame him. "Darumb sag ich das einer so gut ist als der ander / der / der es thut / und der / der es wissentlich vertragt."  

Neither is all comment on women negative, particularly in the two latter glosses. In 1544, 1650 III,7,1, for example, both commentators agree that "eine fraw die from von ehren / uund von gutem geschlecht ist / billich von jederman gelobt und gehret
The 1544 narrative text reference here is to Reinke's praise of the queen: "Der kunigen schickt ich die [den Kamm und den Spiegel] her / Umb ihr tugent und ihr eher ...Sie ist von Adel hoch geborn." The 1650 commentator in 111,7,1 then proceeds to quote from Ecclesiasticus⁴¹ continuing with a comparison between the obedience of the sun to God with that which a woman owes her husband, and describing her virtues in terms of the allegorical flowers in the garden of her heart.

With regard to the parent/child relationship, Book I, chap. 16 provides the first incentive for comment on this when in 1353-64 Reinke commends his two sons to their mother's care. In this instance the RVA commentator is silent, but the RVC commentator through Agricola (95) and the 1544 commentator in 1,16,1, and the 1650 commentator in 1,16,2 are united in considering that parents should pay attention to their children, disciplining them while still young. If they fail to do this, they all agree, they must suffer the resulting shame and disgrace themselves. The RVC commentator, through Agricola (651), claims that God will punish this, quoting lines by Schwarzenberg beginning "Wol (wer) yungen kindern sparet de rodt / Der leuent (Leben) vindet men selden gudt," urging early instruction in virtuous living, for "Wol (wer) bösen kindern weeck (nachgiebig) erschynt / De ys er alder groste vyendt / Und lachet nu / des he nama1s weint." For his part, the 1544 commentator quotes Ecclesiasticus: "Wer sein kindt lieb hat / der zuchtigt sie mit der rhüt,"⁴² and the proverb "Je lieber kind / je scherpffer rhüt." It is better for the children to
weep, he says, than for their parents to be brought to this later. The 1650 commentator, for his part, adds in 1,16,2 that parents should educate their children in "aller Zucht / Ehrbarkeit und aller Tugenden / Kunsten und Sprachen," and check their tendency to wickedness early in life, for children are like wax. He then quotes from Aristotle's recommendations regarding the upbringing of children, himself comparing parental admonitions with the stakes to which a gardener binds weak plants.

The second direct reference to children in the narrative text brings different interpretations in RVA and RVC. This is the passage in Book II, chap. 5, where Reinke for the second time leaves home and family, in order to face the music at court. Here, in 3635-56, Reinke tells Grimbart of his sons' progress, how they can already catch hens, chickens, ducks etc. He would send them out hunting on their own more frequently, he states, only first he wants to make sure that they know how to protect themselves "vor de stryke, vor de yegers unde hunden" (3643). They take after him, Reinke states, explaining the way in which they go for the jugular when they are attacking those they hate:

Se byten der vele entwey de kele.
Dyt is de ard van reynkens spele;
Er grypent (Angriff) is ock myt hastyger vard (Gang),
Dyt duncket my syn de rechte ard (3653-56).

Grimbart is impressed, and proud to claim them as his kith and kin (3657-62).

The RVA commentator is also impressed, at least with the way in which Reinke is anxious not to let his children go hunting alone until they have learned more of the dangers involved:

dat eyn syne sones nicht schal von syck
It is impossible not to read into this gloss another example of this commentator's *bezeichenliches denken.* This commentator, namely, presents Reinke here in a positive light as representing a father instructing his sons concerning the dangers, both to body and soul, that will beset them on their path through life.

The *RVC* commentator's reaction in 11,5,1, is completely different: "Thom ersten," he remarks, "ys uth dessem Capitel tho leren / dath de oldern den kindern / eren egen willen nicht laten scholen. Wo hyr Reinke van synen egen kindern römet / dat se erem egen willen und wolgefallen / volgen," following this up with even more vehement language than he had used formerly in 1,16,1. "Der kinder egen mottwille," he states through *Agricola* (652), will not only be punished on the wheel, by the sword and on the gallows in this world, but in the next in hell, going on to lament the present state in Germany with regard to the upbringing of children. The emphasis, he states, is all on having children engage in trade and commerce in order to get rich, the parents quite overlooking the need for a supply of preachers and administrators.

For his part, the 1544 commentator in 11,5,1 censures Reinke for praising his children for something about which he should have kept silent. Although it is a great honour and affords much pleasure to have well-brought-up children, he states, it is stupid
to praise them, particularly in their presence. "Kinder sind wol zu gewenen (gewohnen) / aber vil leichter zuverwenen." God gives people children to bring up to honour and serve Him and also for their own honour and service and for that of the children themselves, he maintains. The children should learn something, so that they can sustain themselves and serve others. "Die natur ist arg," he proclaims, and punishment must begin early in life. It is a wonderful thing and due to the grace of God if things turn out well, but the parents must exercise constant supervision with God's help. The 1650 commentator takes over the substance of this gloss without offering anything very original.

The she-ape's argument in Book III, chap. 3 that the king should recollect Reinke's father's services to him (4545-56) brings forth the comment in RVC III,3,2 (Alten Weisen) to the effect that kings should not love or hate their servants' children on account of their attitude to their parents, but have the former prove themselves. The 1544 commentator (III,3,6) expresses this same idea in a more positive way: princes and nobles should be commended, he states, for cherishing the children of loyal servants, while at the same time he urges that the children's vices should not go unpunished. These children should behave so that their children are loved for the same reason that they themselves were, advice he repeats in III,12,5, the chapter in which Reinke himself mentions his father's services. For his part, the 1650 commentator in III,3,4 advises the promotion of the children of parents who have proved themselves, particularly when the former are clever. (This remark is generalized here; there
is no reference to princes or nobles).

Finally, on a happier note, in a reference to Reinke's triumphant home-coming at the end of the story (6823-28), the 1544 commentator writes in IV,13,2:

Das es wol stehet / auch Christlich und ehrlich ist / wenn sich die Eheleut / und die kinder jre Eltern / lieb haben / uber jren ubel gehen mit einander trauren / und im wolgehen sich mit ein ander frewen / und so einer das an einer Ehepersonen vermerckt / da mag er auch ehr suchen.

For his part, the 1650 commentator in his parallel gloss, 111,23,2, urges in the same way that parents should share their misfortunes and their good fortune with their children.

Summary

The difference that exists between all four commentators in their attitude towards women is readily apparent:

a) In RVA we note the categorical exposition in 11,2,2 of the Roman Church's doctrine of women's inferiority, followed by this commentator's statement that men should not confide their troubles to their wives (11,6,3), and also his outburst with regard to women's frivolity both in following fashion and in not being content with the natural attributes (hair colouring etc.) God has given them (111,4,3). He is, however, willing to allow a woman's useful qualities as an intercessor in a good cause (1,31,3), in calming down her husband (11,3,2) and in acting as a go-between in certain circumstances (11,9,3; 111,4,4).

b) The RVC commentator is likewise ready to accept that women
are essentially weak, imperfect and inconstant (II,2,2). His comments in III,3,3 with regard to women in general and the Theophrastus quotation from Franck's Geschichtsbibel are extremely negative, too, and those on women who interfere in state affairs verge on the abusive. All in all, there is no evidence in this gloss, taken as a whole, either of the more positive attitude towards women displayed by the Humanists or of that put forward in his own way by Luther.

c) With the 1544 commentator, however, we have a completely different attitude represented, one that has certainly been influenced by both Humanist views and those of Luther. We have, too, as we have learnt to expect from this commentator, an emphasis on everyday situations. This last is illustrated particularly by his continual reference to the wife's function in controlling the household in I,27,1;II,2,1 and III,5,4. In general this commentator appears to be appealing to the best kind of woman, to the "ehrbare Matron," as he refers to her. In other words, his function here can be seen to be one of giving positive encouragement to women to behave in a certain way. Such women can keep secrets (I,24,4), for example, they do not indulge in ranting and raving at their husbands and in always insisting that they are in the right (II,3,2), and, one imagines, they would always be content to stay at home caring for their husbands rather than running around spreading gossip (IV,1,1). One feels also in his appeal to women to excuse what he says on the grounds that he is sure they will agree with him - this is in connection with
his strictures concerning women's interference in public affairs (II,2,1), upon which he had already commented adversely (I,27,1) — that he is appealing to what was an accepted social norm.

His failure to comment on points brought up in RVA/RVC should also be noted: firstly, the insistence of these commentators in II,2,2 that women were the weaker sex in all respects, and, secondly, his omission of the diatribe that both these previous commentators indulge in concerning the frivolity of women for always wanting to be in fashion (RVA III,4,3; RVC III,3,3). We have also his unrestricted praise of honourable women of good family in III,7,1.

Most noticeable here, however, is this commentator's remarks about men, and, leading from this, on marriage and the relationship between the sexes in general. He introduces this topic in II,1,7, as we have seen, insisting that the husband should be true to and gentle with his wife and be prepared to protect and defend her, something he owes her, this commentator states, on account of her subjection to him, according to God's commandment. Also, although in III,5,4 he emphasizes the necessity for the husband to be head of the household, he is quick to qualify this by remarking that the wife should not, on the other hand, be treated like a servant, but rather as one who shares all he has. Both the above examples bear a distinct Lutheran imprint. Finally, we have his excoriation in IV,1,1 of husbands who allow their wives to be courted — and maybe more — by other men in the
wives' own homes and of those men who themselves indulge in extra-marital relationships, claiming that such men deserve to have no trust whatsoever put in them.

d) There is not very much of importance that the 1650 commentator adds to his predecessor's remarks on this topic. Although his tendency to accentuate the negative as far as women are concerned is apparent from his descriptions of evil wives in 1,25,1 and 11,3 and his reference in III,12,1, though Moscherosch, to the ways in which women deceive men, he does nevertheless stress in 11,1,5 the husband's role in marital relationships, how he should lament his wife's passing and also be prepared to avenge any insult to her, and in III,5,4 how a husband should not interfere with the running of the household without his wife's permission. We have also the allegorical treatment of womanly virtues in III, 7,1.

e) With regard to the parent/child relationship, there is virtual unanimity among the three later commentators - RVC, 1544, and 1650 - in 1,16 with regard to the necessity to discipline children when young. The remarks in these three glosses of 11,5 are also virtually the same, namely variations on the same theme of disciplining children when young and the results of failing to do this, the RVC commentator emphasizing the negative - the gallows or the wheel in this world and hell in the next - the 1544 commentator the positive - the steps that parents should take to make sure
that this does not happen. The strong emphasis on the part religion plays or should play here reveals this latter commentator's debt to Luther. This is not to suggest, of course, that the theory that children should be disciplined in their early youth was in any way a new idea, as has already been indicated by the reference to Aristotle in 1650 1,16,2 and to verses from the even earlier book of Proverbs. With regard to the glosses to 111,3, we have also the same negative/positive reaction of RVC/1544, the former commentator emphasizing what rulers should not do - they should not love or hate their servants' children according to their attitude towards the parents - the latter stressing what they should do - cherish the children of loyal servants, while not allowing the formers' vices to go unpunished. In RVC too, in the same gloss, we learn that children should be encouraged to prove themselves, in 1544 that they should make themselves beloved. The remark of the 1650 commentator in 111,3,4 that children should be promoted who are clever and in 1,16,2 that they should be educated in "Kunsten und Sprachen" underlines the Humanist insistence, emphasized by Luther also in his tracts of 1524 and 1530, which we have already considered, on the value of a good education.

f) As far as RVA is concerned, as a result of this commentator's failure to deal with family relationships in 1,16 - this is the chapter where Reinke leaves home the first time - and his
personal interpretation in 11,6,3 of Reinke as the representative of the "good" father in the way in which he warns his children of the dangers to which they will be exposed before sending them out into the world, we have virtually no comment in this gloss on the parent/child relationship in a real life context.

g) The only reference to the household occurs in 1650 111,7,2, where all classes of people (in Luther's sense) are urged to see themselves in the Mirror of God's Word, the commentator here urging servants to be obedient to their masters according to a series of Biblical quotations which he lists.
Chapter 6

Literary and religious influences on the glosses

Here, in this final section, we will be investigating literary influences on the glosses from two sources primarily, Humanism and moral-didactic literature (Lehrdichtung), also religious influences, as these are reflected in theory rather than in practice. These influences will be studied under the following headings:

(i) the influence of Humanism on content
(ii) a short survey of the main features of the didactic literature of the later Middle Ages, and a consideration of the RV glosses as "Sittenspiegel" in the light of this literature
(iii) an investigation of the RV glosses, particularly RVA, with regard to their reflection of the religious teaching of the period: the RVA gloss as a "Sündenspiegel."

(i) The influence of Humanism on content

In his essay on Pirckheimer, Rupprich lists among the topics most beloved of the Humanists the following: the benefits and delights of friendship; love of one's country; the problem of Fortuna.544

(a) Friendship

The influence of Cicero particularly on the Humanists is
well-known. In addition, we have already noted the attempt of Schwarzenberg, who was no Latin scholar himself and worked from the translations of others, to bring Cicero’s works to a wider audience, one of the works included in his Teutsch Cicero being the De amicitia. With regard to the nature of friendship, which he declares should be valued above all other things human, Cicero stresses the following points: the advantages of the mutual sharing of joy and sorrow; the necessity for both mutual respect in the relationship and for complete selflessness, for the complete absence, that is, of any element of calculation or expediency - one friend should be the other’s alter ego; the need for complete frankness when it comes to giving advice, when the truth must be told and accepted without resentment; the absence of flattery or hypocrisy - utter sincerity is mandatory; dishonour can play no part in the relationship - no dishonourable request should be made on the one side or acceded to on the other; old friends should be preferred over new ones. Cicero stresses also that friendships should be formed between people who are already mature. Those formed earlier in life tend to fall victim to subsequent changes in disposition and circumstances. In this connection he lists lust for money as the greatest bane of friendship.

Turning to the glosses, the theme of friendship runs through all four, connected initially and primarily with Grimbart the badger’s relationship with Reinke: in the first place his defence of the absent Reinke before the king in Book I, chap 3; secondly, his warning to Reinke in Book II, chap. 4 of the king’s
determination to mount an expedition to capture him; and, thirdly, in Book III, chap. 1, the words of encouragement he gives to Reinke as they are approaching the king for the second time:

"Weset nicht so blöde in desser stunt! / Deme blöden is dat ghelucke dure (kommt selten) / Deme könen (Kühnen) helpet dat eventüre (Glück)" (4247-49). The other friendly relationships in the narrative text are those of Reinke with Marten the ape and with his wife, illustrated by his encounter with the former on his way to court in Book II, chap. 9 and the latter's assistance and encouragement in Book IV, chaps. 6 and 7. Finally, in Book IV, chap. 9 we have the description of Reinke's new-found friends and relations who come running to congratulate him once he has won the duel:

Ja, vele, de up Reynken hadden torn
Unde mochten en to voren nicht nomen,
De sachmen (sah man) alle to eme komen.
Etlyke, de ouer reynken plegen to klagen,
De spreken nu alle, se weren syne magen (6562-65).

Beginning with the glosses of 1,3, which refer to Grimbart's defence of the absent Reinke, the RVA commentator in 1,3,5 remarks that it is good to have a friend at court, "de ene vor antwordet in syneme afwesende," as Grimbart did for Reinke. This remark is expanded by the RVC commentator to include someone who "hinder rugge / van synen miszgûnneren / valschlich besecht / und angegeuen wert," the gloss continuing with the statement based on Agricola (15) to the effect that a true friend is to be valued above gold and silver. This is followed by a quotation from Brant's Freidank introducing two themes: the care to be exercised in choosing someone to trust and the scarcity of friends when
things are going badly. The 1544 commentator at this point is still translating his predecessor's gloss. The 1650 commentator (1,3,1), however, adds here verses from Ecclesiasticus on friendship, ending with a plea that such remarks, particularly those of Freidank, whose verses he reproduces in full, should not be understood to apply to all friendship, "denn sonst wurde noch manchem Herzens-Freunde und aufricht-teutschem Gemüthe unrecht geschehen / der gegen seine Freunde ein unzerbrüchliches Herze führet / und mit Hertzen und Munde spricht:

'Und wenn du warest gleich da wo die Sonn' aufgehet
Und ich im Abende wo Hesperus entstehet /
So scheiden Uns doch nichts / mein
Hertze bleibet dir
In Glück und in Gefahr / dein Hertze bleibet Mir.'"

The second group of remarks concerning friendship begin with RVA 11,6,1, where this commentator states: "neen frunt schal sparen arbeyt (Beschwerlichkeit) efte moye (Mühe) umme synes vrundes wyllen, alze yd noet is," as here, he states, Grimbart undertook the journey to warn Reinke. The RVC commentator in his parallel gloss here, 11,4,1, takes over the substance of his predecessor's remarks, adding "em denstlick und vorderlick tho syn." He then expands the gloss with a quotation from the Alten Weisen extolling friendship: even if one friend cannot help the other, he should console him as much as it is within his power to do; a friend should be prepared to cut the heart from his body and offer it to the other. "Dan wenn gude truwe geselschop wert upgelöset / so ys ere leuent geringert / und ere ogen synt vordüstert." For their part the 1544 and 1650 commentators, in
11,4,1, put their glosses into context, as it were, pointing out that in an assembly where a certain person is being discussed, it is not a good thing if this person's blood relatives or friends are present, agreeing, however, in 11,4,2, that a good friend should warn another and do as much as he can to help him. The 1650 commentator adds here, in 11,4,1, the Biblical example of how Jonathan warned David in similar circumstances.

In 11,6,2 the RVA commentator then stresses the necessity for taking things lightly when it is a case of bad news (lychtsynniheyt in quader tydinge) "Umme dat eyn synen vrunt nicht sachaftich (zaghaft) make." The RVC commentator proceeds to give us two glosses here, the first (11,4,2) stressing that "ein getruwe frundt / schal den andern jnn synen anliggenden nöden / vor synen schaden warnen," as Grimbart warned Reinke, following this with a passage from the Alten Weisen. Here the message is directed to the receiver of bad tidings, who should weigh very carefully, we are told, the news that is brought to him, provided, that is, he is certain of the good intentions of the person who brought it, since the news does not affect the messenger himself who has already done enough for his friend by bringing it. Then, in a second gloss (11,4,3), this RVC commentator repeats the substance of RVA 11,6,2: "Ein wysz man," he states, "schal jnn nöden / lichtsynnich und bedechtich syn / und jnn quader tydinge / nicht vortzagen / up dat he synen fründt / nicht ock czaghafftich make," as Reinke here consoled himself, he states. Another long Alten Weisen passage follows, not specifically about friendship, but rather a comparison of three types of people: those who are
able to avoid accidents and distress by their prudence, those who remain in good spirits in the face of adversity and seek ways to escape from it, and those who fall easily into despair and have no idea how to take the right steps to improve their position. An intelligent (vorstendiger) man, however, shows fortitude, it is stated, and does not despair, for Fortune helps the bold (drysten).

These are interesting glosses for their illustration of how the RVC commentator takes steps to defuse, as it were, the remark of his predecessor in 11,6,2 that the receiver of bad tidings should not make the bearer of them fearful, this bald statement having distinct overtones of the days when the messenger who brought bad news had to fear for his life." This underlying idea the RVC commentator manages to dispel in two ways: by introducing the idea in 11,4,3 that the receiver of the news should do his best to avoid becoming despondent and affecting his friend in the same way, and by the previous quotation in 11,4,2 from the Alten Weisen where the point is expressly made that the news brought is of no concern to the bearer of it, since he has already fulfilled his obligations by bringing it.

As far as the two latter glosses are concerned here, the 1544 commentator in 11,4,3 generalizes the statement introduced by his predecessor: "soll sich ein mann nicht leichtlich erschrecken lassen / das er sich verzagt stell / und sein gemut mercken lasse," the 1650 commentator taking over the substance of this gloss and adding a somewhat irrelevant religious element: Christians should not allow themselves to be intimidated by
persecution and despondency to deny Christ, but be prepared to die for their faith if necessary.

Chronologically, the third occasion for editorial comment on the theme of friendship is provided by the meeting of Reinke with Marten the ape in Book II, chap. 9. The RVA commentator has nothing to offer here, but we are told in RVC 11,9,1 in an apparently original entry that this shows that friends should greet one another in an amicable fashion and counsel one another. If the meeting is unexpected, the one party should not make the other fearful or let it become apparent that he is concealing something from him. He adds a couple of lines from Freidank: "Wente de ys ein wysz und vorstendich man / De frunde und fruntschop wol holden kan."

For his part, the 1544 commentator has only two brief comments here, in 11,9,1 and 2, the first "das ein getrewer freund den andern grussen uund ansprechen / und jm in noten seinen guten Rhat gern mitteilen soll," and "soll man einen betrubten nicht mehr betrübên / sondern trösten und stercken." The 1650 commentator, however, first emphasizes the negative side. Good friends who have not seen one another for a long time, he states in 11,9,1, should greet each other warmly and offer their services reciprocally, but, he warns, this should be done with sincerity, they should not "in hertzen lose tukke und nukke vorhaben," instancing Biblical examples of where this was the case, including Judas's betrayal of Jesus. In his second gloss, 11,9,2, he is more optimistic, stressing the point that people should confide their troubles to one another, this providing them not only with
relief but with the opportunity into the bargain to obtain sound advice. It is up to a friend to give assistance in time of need, he states, and one should count oneself lucky to have such friends. The worth of such a friend, he maintains, can in fact best be tested by the way in which he is prepared to shoulder the other’s burdens, and this should be accepted with the most sincere gratitude and valued for what it is.

The glosses of 111,1 (111,2 in RVA) deal with Grimbart’s encouragement of Reinke as he is about to go before the king for a second time, the RVA commentator stating in 111,2,2 "dat de vrunde des bedrukeden ene scholen konylyken (kühnlich) trosten."

The RVC commentator in his parallel gloss, 111,1,1 adds:

Ock schal ein fründt / vam andern / nicht mer begeren / dan dat he em fründtschop und gelouen holde / syn truwe herte apenbare / und en leff (lieb) hebbe / alse syck suled. Und dat nicht / umme gaue (Gaben) edder vordels (Vorteils) willen (Alten Weisen).

The 1544 commentator stresses here in 111,1,5 that someone can be of just as much use to another by offering good advice as by offering gold and silver, stressing that anyone who has received advice and consolation should show his gratitude for this. For his part, the 1650 commentator in 111,1,2 returns to the main theme, that is is up to a friend to encourage another who is depressed, applying this to a field commander whose job it is to encourage his troops prior to battle.

As regards the glosses of IV,6, where, in the narrative text, the she-ape encourages Reinke before the duel, the RVA commentator confines himself here to remarking in IV,6,2 that one friend should support another in his apprehension and anxiety, as
Reinke’s friend did here. The RVC commentator, however, in IV,6,1 uses this opportunity to enlarge on the subject of friendship, quoting Cyrillus’s Spiegel der Wyszheit and St. Ambrose and Cicero directly. The points he makes are these:

A true friend is one who is "ein herte und seele mit dy."
The most cherished friendships endure over a long period.
An old friend is better than a new one, as with wines.
One should neither fail to rebuke an erring friend nor to stand by an innocent one.

One should confide in one’s friends,"dan ein getruwe fründt / ys eyne arstedye (Artznei) des leuends und eyne undodtlyke gnade"

One friend should not forsake the other in need, but support him and endure adversity, hostility and slander on his behalf.

Friendships should not be of the fair-weather variety.

Against the following sentences the commentator gives a marginal reference to "Cicero" and "Amicus alter ego," and the points that follow we have already noted in the summary of De amicitia: that one should be able to open one’s heart to one’s friend who is to be trusted completely, that there can be no dishonour in friendship and neither money nor profit can play any part in it.

Here, in his parallel gloss, IV,6,1, the 1544 commentator reaffirms that one friend should stay by the other in adversity and advise him well, adding that he should "ihn nicht anders halten denn sein eigen leib / wie man spricht Amicus alter ego," the 1650 commentator adding in III,16,1:
Ein Freund in der Noth / ein Freund in dem Todt / ein Freund hinter dem Rükken
das seyn drey starcke Brücken.

The glosses of IV,7 - RVC, 1544. 1650 - follow much the same pattern: a sensible (vorstendich) man will follow the advice of his friend, however bitter this is for him, and thank him for it, we learn in RVC IV,7,2. There follow lines from Brandt's Narrenschyp, which are reproduced in both 1544 IV,7,1 and 1650 III,17,2, expressing scorn for a man who will not take good advice but is more interested in his dogs and his birds.

Finally we come to the glosses of IV,9 - this is where Reinke's friends and relations all come flocking round once he has won the duel - where the RVA commentator in IV,9 expresses the problem succinctly in these words:

In dessem capittele menet de dychter, dat so der werlde loep (Lauf) is dat deme yd wol gheyt, de krycht vele vrunde, den vaddert unde swagert mannich. Unde sleyt dat aff, so wert he so draden (schnell) nicht ghekant edder gheachtet. Dat is denne eyn teken (Zeichen), dat so nwöerlde (niemals) syne vrunde weren, wan alleyne vrunde des geldes edder des gheluckes, dat denne wech is.

The RVC commentator in IV,9,1 reproduces the substance of this gloss, substituting "egen nuttes und vordels (Vorteils)" for his predecessor's "geldes edder gheluckes," going on to quote from the Alten Weisen. Here two types of friendship are described, the first being where a person gives his whole self, the other his hand. The former indicates those who give their hearts to one another, the latter those who are concerned only with their own self-interest. Pessimistically, the Alten Weisen passage
continues with the remark that it is the way of the world that there is no such thing as true friendship; all seek to terminate it when they see no more profit in the relationship. The RVC commentator ends this gloss with the Aesop fable in the Alberus version of the old hunting-dog and the man who thrashed him and had harsh words for him when he could not longer function as he been able to in his younger days, the dog rebuking his master for his ingratitude and lamenting "dat men dem nicht wyl mehr gnade don / Des men nicht mehr geneten (geniessen) kan." For his part, the 1544 commentator in IV,9,1 expresses the problem even more succinctly than his predecessors had done:

erstlich / das gemein laster der Suppendiener/
das wenn einer Reich ist / und gehet jhm wol /
so hat er viel freund / wenn er unter der banck ligt / so gehen sie mit fussen uber jhn.

For his part, the 1650 commentator here, in III,19,2, uses the term "Weltfreude" to describe those who, when things are going badly, blow away like chaff in the wind and become their former friend's worst persecutors.

Other random references to friendship in the glosses deal primarily with the general problem that friendship and money do not mix. For instance in 1,24,3 the RVC commentator quotes through Agricola (66) what he calls a "gemein Rym":

Fründschop gheit vor alle dinck /
Dat straffe ick / sprack de penninck.
Dan wor ich keer (kehre) und wende /
Dat hefft alle fründtschop ein ende.

This sentiment the 1544 commentator repeats in III,3,5, where he writes: "Wo etwas zu geniessen ist / da hat alle freundschaft ein end."
In III, 2, 9 and 10 the 1544 commentator turns to hospitality, claiming that an honourable man should always welcome guests, even if it's only a case of offering them bread and cheese. No one knows when he will need another's help, and a small sign of friendship when the other is in need is more acceptable than a greater one when there is no necessity for it. Also, one should be readier to eat dry bread with a friend, if that is all he can offer, than to eat splendidly with a rich one. In 11, 9, 10 this commentator is also concerned with specifics, namely that one friend should help another in legal matters to maintain the latter's honour, his reputation or his possessions, but not in a dishonourable cause.

Summary

We have illustrated here once again the pattern we have come to expect when all four commentators gloss an uncontroversial subject such as this one:

a) With RVA it is a case of this commentator's adhering closely to the text and interpreting what he finds there, for the most part in short sentences. There is no evidence whatever of Humanist influence.

b) With RVC we have the frequent addition of material from the Alten Weisen, once from Cyrillus's Spiegel der Wyszheit, and, in an apparently original entry, material from both St. Ambrose and from Cicero's De amicitia, so that this commentator eventually covers most of the points made in the last-mentioned work. In other words,
the treatment of this subject here in RVC shows definite Humanist influence.

c) As far as the 1544 gloss is concerned, there is no attempt here on the part of this commentator to emulate his predecessor's treatment of this subject. As is his wont, he introduces a greater degree of generalization and also concentrates rather on the simpler attributes of friendship, such as the very real importance of a piece of advice when this is urgently needed and on the necessity for being readier to share a poor friend's fare than that of a rich one. There is no evidence of direct Humanist influence here, except perhaps in the originality of the approach.

d) Finally, with regard to the 1650 commentator, we have here a treatment of the theme of friendship that bears a greater resemblance to that in RVC, except that here, by and large, the contributions are more original. His tribute to friendship at the end of 1,3,1 particularly is an indication of the part friendship played in the lives of the educated upper middle class Germans in the century following the Reformation. We should note also here the reference to the "aufricht teutschen Gemüthe" in the passage leading up to the four lines of verse in this gloss, one of the comparatively few indications of the commentator's adoption of this motif of sincerity and uprightness as the basic attributes of
the true German. We should also regard in the same light his reference in III,19,2 to those as "Welt-Freunde" who are only fair-weather friends and turn into enemies when things go badly, these obviously being people who lack the much-prized virtue of sincerity.

(b) Love of one's country

The theme of patriotism or nationalism was to play a great part in German Humanist thought. Initially brought about by the resentment German students felt concerning the condescension shown them by their Italian counterparts, it was fuelled by the discovery during the same period of ancient works both concerning Germany, principally Tacitus's *Germania,* and by German authors, and also by growing irritation over the continuing stranglehold of the Papal Curia in ecclesiastical matters, both financial (excessive obligatory dues of one kind and another) and administrative (church appointments), problems we have already considered in another connection. We had an example of this attitude in the pseudo-Hutten lines in *RVC* I,30,2: "Gelöue (glaub) my / Rome hedde uns gantz uthgesagen (ausgesaugt) / und de budel mit dem gelde entagen (entzogen)," had it not been for the Reformation. (Although Hutten was the chief exponent of this type of political nationalism, the quotations from his work in the *RVC* glosses of II,9 are in fact restricted - as the narrative text requires - to the Papacy itself.)

With regard to romantic nationalism, as he terms it, Paul Joachimsen describes the principal features of this as follows:
"Das Erste ist die Anknüpfung der deutschen Geschichte an die des Germanentums... Das Zweite ist die Erfüllung des Begriffs der deutschen Nation mit einer ethischen Vorstellung... Das Dritte ist die Herausarbeitung eines Idealtypus des deutschen Menschen, für den die Germania des Tacitus fast alle Wesenszüge liefert... Das Vierte ist die neue Unterbauung des Begriffs des Imperiums."

Luther also in his interpretation of the 101st psalm (1534) states that no virtue has been praised so highly among the Germans as the fact that they have been considered as faithful, truthful and trustworthy people who have let 'yes' be 'yes' and 'no' be 'no' (WA 51,259).

How much of this is reflected in the glosses? Apart from RVC, very little. Here, what this commentator has to say occurs mostly in Book IV in connection with the duel and its aftermath. In IV, 7, 1, for example, he remarks concerning judicial duels, in an apparently original entry, that:

dermaten (in der selben Weise) hebben ock unse Olde Düdesch / Adel und Manschop eren Adel und Eere / Landt und lüde / gude geröchte (guten Ruf) / Wedewen und Weisen / jnn aller Rechtferdicheyt to erholden / wandages (in der alten Zeit) manlick gefochten und gekempet. Auerst (aber) ytzundes synt se by na / van den Olden Adelyken, daden / up eynen andern uneerlyken egennüttigen handel / vorgleden und affgeweken (gesunken und abgewichen).

This "uneerlyken egennüttigen handel," to which he refers here, is "den schentlyken Woker / den man den Ummeslach nomet," the following passage concerning which we have considered in another connection. Later, through Agricola (153), he continues:

Wen unse Olden Düdeschen / ytzundt upstünden und lüedten / so worden se syck gewyslick solcker erer nakomelinghe schemen. Dewyle
This passage continues with a description of how the heralds at tournaments had to decide who was qualified to take part and who was not, merchants being included under the latter, a theme pursued further in IV,8,1.

The virtues of the Old Germans are also lauded with regard to their trustworthiness in fulfilling obligations. In IV,11,1, for example, in connection with a passage we have already considered regarding courtiers who offer their hands but not their hearts, we learn through Agricola (277) that in the days of the Old Germans a handshake was respected as a sign of trust and faith. "Wo dan Cornelius Tacitus," he writes, "densuluen tho laue (Lob) und Eeren beschrifft / dat by en / de eere und einfoldicheyt / mehr gegulden (gegolten) hefft / alse by den Römern de geschreuen Rechte." Then, in IV,13,1, through Agricola (733), the title of this proverb being "Vor tyden gaff men korte Breue / und was vele gelouens. ltzundes gyfft men lange Breue / und ys weynich gelouens," the commentator goes on to state that historians praised the former Germans in this respect. But, he laments, "unse ytzigen / lauen se nicht gantz sere," stressing that "unse Olden Dudeschen / weynich wordt gebruket / und vele geholden hebben." The reason for this was that "tho den tyden / de Rechte und Geloue / in der acht weren / dat ein yder vast heelt / wat he redede und thosede (zusagte)." He then cites Friedrich
Barbarossa as an example of such a person, who proclaimed always "Ick wylt holden by mynem barde," and always carried out what he had promised. Now, the commentator states, letters have so many "Clausulen und Exception" included in them that reams of paper are required for one document, "und men holt nichts deste mehr / ya vaken (oft) gar nichts."

From the examples given here it might seem as if the discovery of Germany's past served only to provide a moral basis for the comparison of the simple, honest, trustworthy ancient Germans with their sixteenth century counterparts, to the detriment of the latter. This is not true, however, even of Agricola himself, or of Hutten, and certainly not of the more ingenious historians of the same period, so to this extent the "Zeitklage" function that the RVC commentator assigns to such comparisons is not typical of the Humanist treatment of this subject.

The period of literature in which this type of "Zeitklage" was typical was, according to Vogt, the first half of the seventeenth century, when it in fact constituted a primary element of the "gegenhöfische Strömung," which she is describing. When, therefore, the 1650 commentator in I11,15,3 looks back to the days when "die alten Teutschen Helden" took part in tournaments and other courtly exercises, listing the reasons why someone would not be permitted to participate - sacrilege and blasphemy where the church was concerned, the violation of women and girls, perjury and other dishonourable conduct - and queries "aber heut zu Tage / wie wird dieses in acht genomen?" one can
consider that he was, here, representing the attitude of that movement.

Summary

As far as RVC is concerned, while the choice of subject matter here - a glorification of the ancient Germans - is Humanist in origin, the treatment of it is not and appears to owe more to the influence of didactic literature, which we shall shortly be considering.

The "Zeitklage" of the 1650 commentator, on the other hand, applied to the same topic, can be considered typical of the "gegenhöfische Strömung" of his own era, as this is described by Vogt.

(c) Fortuna


This description of the attitude of the goddess Fortuna towards her victims is provided by Aeneas Silvius in Niklas von Wyle's translation of the former's 1444 treatise describing his dream of this goddess. We have represented here, then, four attitudes displayed by her victims towards the slings and arrows...
hurled against mankind by the outrageous goddess Fortuna: a) that of those who stand up to her in a challenging fashion (that is, those who possess the quality represented by the Italian word *virtù*); b) that of those who show fortitude and endurance in the suffering she inflicts; c) that of those who are timid and lose heart and d) that of those who are able to disdain her and treat her with contempt.

As far as the German Humanists are concerned, Lewis Spitz considers that, generally speaking, they tended to identify fate or fortune with the changeability and transiency of all things and with the incalculability of the powers that preside over life.

Both the foremost poets of this period, Celtis and Hutten, wrote on this theme, as might be expected. Spitz describes the former poet as being haunted by the spectre of a capricious and inscrutable fate, coming eventually to the conclusion that a wise man must with his own vigour of mind both challenge and despise fortune. With regard to Hutten, in his Latin dialogue *Fortuna*, which he composed in 1519, he comes to no clear-cut solution of the problems posed, as both Spitz and Holborn agree, foundering ultimately on the relationship between Fortune and Providence. In this connection Spitz describes a woodcut on the title-page of the dialogue showing the hand of God reaching from the clouds to turn the wheel of Blind Fortune, with an inscription stating that it is terrible for God and Fate to battle.

Someone who had no doubt whatsoever with regard to this relationship was Luther, as he emphasizes both in his "Ob Kriegsleute" (1526) and in his interpretation of the 101st psalm
In this latter work, referring to the divine inspiration that some leaders have had, he writes: "Die Heiden...habens Fortuna, Glück, genannt, und eine Göttin draus gemacht und hoch geehret, sonderlich die klugesten mechtigsten herrn zu Rom" (WA 51,244). Previously, in "Ob Kriegsleute," he had spoken of the heathens' conviction that success or failure depended on Fortune, of whom they were afraid:

"Aber der grund und ursache ist, wie ich gesagt habe, das Gott ynn allen und durch alle solche historien wil bezeugt haben, das er wil gefürcht sein auch ynn solichen sachen, kan und wil keinen trotz, veracht noch vermessenheit noch sicherheit leyden; bis wir lernen, alles was wir haben wollen und sollen, aus seinen henden zu nemen durch lauter gnade und barmhertzikeit (WA 19,650-51).

Before God, writes Luther, a man must be discouraged, fearful and humble, committing his cause to Him to dispose as He thinks fit, according to His grace and not according to man's idea of what is right and just. "Denn warumb," queries Luther, "solten wir das nicht unserm Gotte thun, das die Romer...haben yhrem abgott, dem glück gethan, für welchen sie sich fürchten?" (WA 19,651).

Already, in 1524, in his "Von Kaufhandlung und Wucher" Luther had written of the omnipotence of God: a man is "seynes leybs und guts keyn augenblick sicher...sondern steht alles ynn Gottes hand alleyne, der nicht haben wil, das wyr uns kunfftige eyn harbreyt macht edder recht haben und des keyn augeblick sicher und gewisz sein sollen" (WA 15,299). We should know that "wyr keyne stunde sicher seyen widder lebens nocht gutts, sondern alles aus seyen henden gewarten und nemen, wie denn thut eyn rechter glawbe" (WA 15,300). With regard to misfortune and adversity, Luther had
stated in his "Von dem Bann" (1520) that, whether this was just or unjust, "wir sollen unsz furchten, leyden, lassen faren, und aller ding unsz halten als geschehe uns recht" (WA 6,68). For, as he states in his "Von den guten Werken" (1520), God sends us misfortune, "das er uns lere und treybe, seinen namenn ehren und anruffen, zuvorsicht uud glauben gegen yhm gewinnen" (WA 6,224).

Turning now to the glosses, the only direct reference to this theme in the RVA gloss is called forth by the description the she-wolf gives in Book IV, chap. 2 of what Reinke said to her at their meeting halfway down the well-shaft, when she was on her way down in search of the fish that he had described to her, and he was on his way up: "Alzus gheyt de werlt up unde nedder / Dat is nu so der werlde lope (Lauf)" (5603-04), the commentator remarking here in IV,2,3: "ok weren dat spotworde do he [Reynke] sprack, dat de werlt so up unde nedder ghynge."

There is one other reference, in IV,10,1, to the way in which a person is esteemed, "de hir lucke heft," but when this good fortune is based on ill-gotten gains, the RVA commentator urges, he will suffer for it with eternal damnation in the hereafter. This gloss is also a good illustration of the way in which this commentator here gives a salvational, transcendental interpretation of a story which is given a different one in the narrative-text itself. Here, namely, Reinke tells the story to the king of a dog who appeared to be in favour with the kitchen staff when he emerged from the kitchen bearing a chunk of cooked meat, for which, however, he had actually had to pay dearly by having his rear-end singed so that the hair was falling out (6617-
43). When the dog's companions saw what had happened to him, they deserted him. Reinke likens such companions to Isœgrim's former supporters who have now abandoned him after his defeat in the duel. The commentator, on the other hand, interprets the dog's singed rear-end not as defeat in this world but rather as the fate awaiting him and those resembling him in the hereafter for their purloining of others' goods.

The theme of Fortuna, of both good and bad fortune, that is, is given fairly extensive coverage, comparatively speaking, in the three later glosses. It is dealt with in the following different ways:

a) the motif of Fortune's Wheel to illustrate the inconstancy and fickleness of Fortune.

Dan dat gelücke beweget syck / frohe und spadt (früh und spät)
Fart snelle up / und balde wedder nedder /
Regert hüden (heute) gelücke / morgen ungelücke wedder (RVC 1,21,2, pseudo-Henselin).

In RVC 1,31,1 this commentator also refers in an apparently original entry to courtiers sitting "alse up dem gelücke rade."

Then, in RVC 11,5,2 we hear of good fortune, "dat ungewiszlich kumpt und steit / Und als ein sneller radt ummeher gheit" (Schwarzenberg). And in 1544 Ill,12,8 this commentator tells us to remember that "hie auf erden nichts bestendig ist / das glück rath stets umbleufft," a concept he repeats in IV,13,3: "Es ist der welt laufft / das einer auf und der ander absteiget."

Variants of the wheel are to be found in the 1650 gloss, such as a ball and a sphere (Kugel) in I,27,1 and in Ill,18,1 a person being tossed up and down by the waves.
b) the inconstancy of fortune per se. "Es weisz keinem an
wem es morgen ist" (1544 I,21,2). Fortune can change from one
day to the next; no one should trust good fortune, states the
1650 commentator, I,28,1, "es ist vol unbeständigener nucke und
Tuck," and according to Cicero, "blind / tol unvernunftig oder
viehisch," and in 1544 I,35,5 we are told: "Glück ist miszlich /
wer weisz wie lang es weret." Likewise in III,3,1, this
commentator warns us that no one should rejoice too much in an
enemy's misfortune, "denn gluck ist wanckelbar / ists heut an
einem so ists morgen an einem andern." In III,3,4, also, he
states that change rather than permanence must be expected in all
things and in all people, a sentiment echoed by the 1650
commentator in III,3,3. Both commentators stress here the
necessity for not being caught out in a situation, of the
importance of not having to confess that one has never thought
such a thing would happen - a suggestion, it seems, that one's
misfortune can sometimes be laid at one's own door. In 1650
III,22,2 the comparison is made between the end of misfortune and
a millstone falling off one's neck, "aber man mus gleichwohl nicht
gar zu sicher baden / denn gar leicht ein Wirbel des Unglücks
hervor quillen kan / der einem des Glückes enthebet." Also in 1544
IV,8,1 there is a further warning that "nichts bestendig ist," and
in IV,8,2 this commentator refers to the fact that fortune in war
is "gar wanckelmutig," urging that the first opportunity to make
an advantageous peace should be taken, a gloss repeated in 1650
III,18,2 with the further application of this theme to the paying
of debts: a man who does not accept partial payment offered at an
earlier stage may find himself with nothing at all later on. Further, in IV,10,1, the 1544 commentator again draws attention to the inconstancy of everything on earth, "denn ich ermane abermal/ das auff erden nichts bestendig ist." Power, favour, strength, riches can vanish in an hour, he says.

In this connection too the 1544 commentator urges humility in good fortune (1,39,2) warning in III,12,8 against arrogance when things are going well; promotion can easily be followed by demotion. This type of advice he repeats in the very last gloss in the book (IV,13,3-4): "Es kumpt manch ungeachte und ungeschickte person etwa so seltzam erfur / das es wunder ist. Drumb achts nicht klein / geringe feinde haben." It is the way of the world that one person rises and another falls, this being also the reason for not getting too arrogant in good times. The particular application of all this to courtiers we have already examined, where the part played by the ruler's favour or disfavour is particularly stressed (1544 1,31 and 1,32,3; 1650 1,27,1; also RVC, 1544 IV,10,1. This whole theme is best summed up by the 1650 commentator in III,18,1 as follows:

Darum musz man mit Furcht und Zittern des Glükkes geniszen: uund allezeit gedenkken was Cicero vom Glükke saget: O flüchtiges Gelükk! Wie bald verkehrestu alle Freude und Lust / in trauren und weinen! und : Es ist nichts der Vernunft und der Bestendigkeit sehr zu wider/ als das Gelük.

(c) the need for patience in misfortune, which will not last for ever. Impatience makes misfortune harder to bear, states the 1650 commentator in 1,30,2, quoting Cicero to the effect that people should put up with things that cannot be altered and
remember that there are others in the same boat. In 1,37,2 this commentator also gives the assurance that "unglück weret nicht alle Tage / nach Regen kommt der Sonnenschein." "Gottliebende Menschen," this same commentator assures us in 1,28,1, can console themselves that misfortune will not last eternally, that their enemies will not have power over them for ever, "sondern es könne leicht kommen / dasz die Feinde müszen bedrengt werden."

(d) The Lutheran view is presented by the RVC commentator in 11,5,2. Basing his gloss initially on Agricola (544), he states that, when the heathens found out that something which worked out well for one person had the opposite effect for another, they made Fortune into a god, "de so gantz geweldich alle dinck / wedder alle vornufft und kunst der menschen / vorandert / drifft (treibt) und beweget." But, he states, "agentlick ys dat gelücke/ Gades gewaldt / de Gott euet (übt) / by weme / durch wen / und wen he wil/ also/ dat de wille nene orsake hebbe." Continuing his gloss with an unattributed quotation from Brenz, the RVC commentator goes on to stress that no one through his own reason or wisdom can procure good fortune for himself, or protect himself against misfortune,

Dan Gott allene / schaffet / beide gelücke und ungelücke / up dat men syck up nen ander dinck vortröst / denn up Gott allene...Summa / Gott allene hefft alle dinck / ydt sy gelücke edder ungelücke / gudt und böse / jnn syner handt. Und dewyle alle dinge / also uth Gades handt herfleten (herflissen) / so schole wy...jnn den guden dagen der bösen uund an den bösen dagen / der guden gedencken... Darumme in den guden dagen / so förchte / und in den bösen dagen / so hape (hoffe). Auerst stedes gelücke in den Heren / und werp (wirf) up em / dyne anliggende noth / de wert dy gelücke edder
ungelücke / na synem willen / wedderfaren laten.

After these two quotations the RVC commentator does something extraordinary, for he continues with one from Schwarzenberg's early but later emended work "Kummertrost":

\[\text{Dyne sake / sette nicht up tydtlick gelücke /} \]
\[\text{Dan ydt hefft by syck vele böser nücke/} \]
\[\text{Blifft (bleibt) numéro mehr in einem standt /} \]
\[\text{Und darumme wert ydt gelücke genant.} \]
\[\text{Men sprecket: dem sy gelücke beschert /} \]
\[\text{Dem wat wolgefelliges wedderfert} \]
\[\text{Dat ungewizlick kumpt und steit /} \]
\[\text{Und als en snelle radt ummeher gheit.} \]

Brandes states that against this passage in the Teutsch Cicero the word "Boethius" is printed. The theme of Fortuna does of course dominate Book II of Boethius's *De consolatione philosophiae*, where Philosophy also employs the motif of the wheel-of-fortune.

Is there any point of connection between Boethius and Luther? Within the terms of reference here there is none at all. Although the lack of free-will on the part of mankind is not expressly stated in the Brenz material on which the earlier part of this gloss is based, it is implied, and is moreover formally enunciated in the Agricola phrase: "dat de wille nene orsake hebbe." Boethius, however, rejected the Augustinian solution which makes human free-will dependent on the will of God, to which Luther subscribed, explicitly confirming the existence of free-will in the last section of his work.

Whether the RVC commentator knew what he was doing here in contrasting the Agricola and Brenz material with that of Schwarzenberg it is difficult to know. We have noted occasions previously, however, where he has presented more than one point of view in the same gloss, so this may also be the case here. The
presence or absence of free-will may in fact have been a subject on which he had not yet been able to make up his own mind. He had already, of course, reproduced the pseudo-Henselin quotation in which the motif of the wheel-of-fortune also occurs (1,21,1). Most important for our purposes here, however, is that in his parallel gloss the 1544 commentator displays no reaction whatsoever to the material from Lutheran sources reproduced here.

(e) Fortune helps the brave. We have already noted the passage in the narrative text where these words are spoken by Grimbart to Reinke in Book III, chap 1, on their entrance into the king's presence the second time, and also its appearance in the Alten Weisen quotation in 11,4,3. It is of course an illustration of the first point made by Fortuna in the Aeneas passage, namely that she did show favour to those who challenged her. Basing his remarks in III,1,2 on Agricola (5) and (260), where Julius Caesar is used as an example of just such a person both in his words - he is described as having stated something similar - and in his deeds, the RVC commentator nevertheless states:

\begin{quote}
Auerst gelick wo solcke mutwilliger / Godt vorachten / und achten nicht / wat recht edder unrecht ys / also vorachtet se Godt wedder. Dan Julius wart namals / mit velen wunden ersteken. Wente ere stercke moth (muss) tho nichte werden / Idt gesehe auer (über) lanck edder kort.
\end{quote}

This sentiment is echoed by the 1544 commentator in III,1,4, where he remarks:

\begin{quote}
denn künheit hat nicht allezeit glück inn seinen vermessenen / bösen händeln / und find sichs hie nicht / so find sichs ernach. Wer aber hie bezalen künft / das wer besser /und darumb nicht allzeit kün zusein.
\end{quote}
(f) Man must bear some responsibility for what happens to him. The 1544 commentator, who had hinted at this in III,3,4, as we saw, had made this direct admission in II,9,3: "Das man nicht alles dem glück zuschreibe was einem geschicht / sonder viel mer jm selbst mit / denn mancher eines dings uberhalten sein kont / wenn er sich selbs darnach hielt."

Summary

a) The RVA commentator does not deal with the problem of Fortuna in the conventional sense. He rather denies its existence.

b) In RVC on the other hand, we have an ambivalent view presented. The commentator gives us, in other words, both the fundamental Lutheran position of God's omnipotence and the absence of free-will on the part of mankind based on Agricola (544) and Brenz texts, and also, by contrast, in the pseudo-Henselin quotation in I,21,2, in the reference to the courtiers in I,31,1 and in the Schwarzenberg quotation in II,5,2 the reproduction of the wheel-of-fortune motif. He does, however, in III,1,2, agree that acts of temerity bring their own punishment, which was Luther's opinion also, as we have seen.

c) The 1544 gloss is of particular interest here on account of the commentator's failure to reproduce the two passages in RVC II,5,2 based on the works of the two Lutheran theologians Agricola and Brenz, which represented a view which was obviously totally incompatible with his own. He seems in
fact almost obsessed by the inconstancy of fortune and the methods to be employed to combat this. Apart from the two glosses suggesting some individual responsibility when things go wrong (III, 3, 4 and II, 9, 3), he is primarily concerned, or so it seems, with the necessity of keeping on friendly terms with everyone all the time, since it is impossible to know when somebody will be promoted above oneself (III, 12, 8; IV, 13, 3-4), while at the same time agreeing - in accordance with Luther's teaching - that acts of temerity bring about their own punishment (III, 1, 4). For the rest, there is no sign here whatsoever of Humanist influence, no determination to hurl a challenge at Fortuna, to display the quality of virtù, that is, quite the reverse, in fact; his "Kleinmütigkeit" is only too evident. As we shall see shortly, the influence here is rather that of didactic literature.

d) With regard to the 1650 gloss, this commentator's treatment of this theme offers an interesting parallel to that of his predecessors. In the first place, he never actually uses the wheel-of-fortune motif, those motifs he does use - the ball in 1, 27, 1, the sphere which rolls of its own accord in the same gloss and the waves in III, 18, 1 - being natural phenomena. While, too, he does not specifically repeat the Lutheran view of the divine ordering of all that pertains to mankind's works and ways, he does in his Cicero quotation (1, 30, 2) and in 1, 28, 1 lay stress on the need for enduring all misfortune imposed - a Lutheran attitude, as we have seen.
Furthermore, we should probably take his adoption of the Lutheran belief in the divine ordering of all things for granted. Newald, for example, writes of this period:

Gewiss sahen sich die Menschen der Fortuna ausgeliefert, aber sie wussten, dass die Göttin mit dem Rad...dem Willen eines höheren gehorcht. Deshalb, nahmen sie, was immer über sie hereinbrach, als Schickung des Himmels und als Prüfung entgegen, die es zu bestehen galt; ja, sie dankten ihrem Gott, dass er sie der Prüfung wert hielt. 

Newald reminds us also with regard to this particular generation of writers that their "Fortunavorstellung" was intimately bound up for them with their wartime experiences: "Die Menschen blieben den Lebensmächten hilflos ausgeliefert und konnten die Kraft zu deren Überwindung nur im Gebet finden." This applies particularly to the commentator's gloss, where, even though the war was by that time over, he makes reference to "Gottliebende Menschen," whom he encourages to believe that their misfortunes will not last for ever, that their enemies will be driven off, consoling them with an example from the Old Testament.
(ii) A brief survey of the main features of the didactic literature of the later Middle Ages and a consideration of how the glosses reflect this: the RV glosses as "Sittenspiegel"

In her analysis of the post-courtly didactic literature of the later Middle Ages Könneker describes its principal characteristics - characteristics which set it apart from courtly literature - as follows:

(a) a pessimistic outlook on life due to the general feeling that things were going from bad to worse. "Zeitklage," in fact, was once again the order of the day.

(b) a tendency towards dogmatism and systematization (These tendencies are illustrated by the formulation of behavioural norms and the compilation of "Einzelvorschriften," the purpose here being to ensure proper conduct in all situations, such works being often addressed to the separate classes and sub-classes of society and the holders of the different occupations therein.)

(c) a passionate interest in life in this world and a tendency towards individualization and an emphasis on the concrete (This type of writing had its roots in the emphasis placed by these writers on life in this world: every individual had to be shown how to live. Könneker contrasts this with the conduct and behaviour expected of the protagonists in courtly literature, namely the exercise of personal responsibility in decision-making and spontaneity of action in carrying out these decisions.)
(d) the development of a rationalistic doctrine of vice and virtue based on practical considerations of real life - "Nutz- und Zweckdenken," as Könneker describes it. While churchmen never lost sight of the true meaning of sin, the didactic writers developed an attitude towards vice and virtue where the ability to make the right decision came to constitute wisdom. Könneker traces this back as far as Freidank's Bescheidenheit, a word which, for him, she maintains, meant "Einsicht und Urteilskraft," in other words, an individual's ability to reach his own decisions and goals by weighing up the pros and cons of a situation. With regard to vice and virtue, the emphasis came to be laid on the stupidity of doing evil, this stupidity comprising the inability to acquire self-knowledge or to estimate the consequence of evil-doing. She writes: "Die Weisheit im Sinne der Selbststerkenntnis, der nüchtern abwägenden Besonnenheit wurde dementsprechend zur Quelle der Tugend."³⁷³

In this connection the necessity for consideration of the results of any enterprise was stressed: "Was du tuost, das tuo weiszlich und bedenk das end,"³⁷⁹ and also on the virtue of moderation in all things. Lack of this, in fact, came to be considered the root of all evil. (This emphasis on moderation in didactic literature Könneker considers a sign of timidity, contrasted, that is, with the positive ideal the exercise of moderation had represented for classical writers and the authors of courtly literature.)

Fable literature, Könneker writes, provides a particularly good illustration of the kind of behaviour that these writers
recommended: of adapting to situations rather than issuing challenges, of giving way rather than standing up and fighting and of avoiding danger at all costs.

She mentions also the use of the "bîspel" - the equivalent of the Low German "exempel" - in the later writing of this period, the so-called "true" anecdote, that is, which gives concrete illustration of the stupidity, imprudence or delusion of the sinner and the contrasting success of the righteous man.

Although a distinction has been made here between Humanist themes and the emphases in moral didactic literature, this does not mean that a similar distinction should necessarily be made between the authors of these writings. After all, the didactic work that made such a great impression at the turn of the century (c.1500), namely Brant's *Narrenschiff*, was written by a man with Humanist training, and the year 1474 had seen the appearance of both Steinhöwel's *Spiegel des menschlichen Lebens* (a translation from the Spanish) and of Eyb's *Spiegel der Sitten*. An emphasis on morality rather than religion was in fact one of the hallmarks of Humanist writing, Lortz referring scathingly to morality as the "Religionsersatz der Humanisten."

Turning now to the glosses, we will deal initially with Könneker's first point regarding the increased pessimism in didactic literature. The only direct statement made by the RVA commentator to the effect that the world is an evil place is on religious lines, his remarks in 11,1 constituting a lament concerning the people of his time who are less concerned with the contravention of divine law than with the avoidance of punishment
under human, temporal law: "wente de werlt is so quad, dat umme der leue (Liebe) wyllen, de eyn to deme anderen hebben scholde, nicht so vele na blyft vele quades (in RVC "dat quade nicht so sehr vormeden Wert"), alze umme vruchten wyl len (aus Furcht) des rechtes."

With regard to RVC, however, the situation is very different. In the first preface, for example, where the commentator, apparently in his own words, is describing the contents of the chapter-glosses, we are told, as we have already seen, that we are going to hear about "den Standt und handel der ytzigen bosen untruwen werldt." Also in 1,5,4, as we noted in connection with the courtiers, this commentator remarks: "ock kan desse bese werlt/ de warheit nicht erdulden." The very gloomy gloss, 1,9,2, I will reproduce in full, along with the parallel version in the 1544 edition:

\[\text{RVC} \quad 1,9,2\]

\[
\begin{align*}
thom \text{ andern, alle } & \text{ wesent /} \\
wollust / & \text{ freude / } \\
begerlichkeit / & \text{ desser bosen} \\
werlt / & \text{ ys mit smerte /} \\
truricheit / & \text{ und} \\
wedderwerdicheit / & \text{ vormenget.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{und wol (wer) } & \text{ dessuluigen } \\
\text{honniges soticheit(Süssigkeit) } & \text{ smecket / de vindet darby /} \\
vende und & \text{ grote bitterheit.} \\
\text{Derhaluen } & \text{ ys beter / de} \\
\text{bitterheit der Wormede (Wermut) } & \text{ de by syck hefft / eine } \\
gesunde soticheit. \text{ Also } & \text{ de soticheit des honniges / de} \\
\text{eine lanckwerende bitterheit } & \text{ hinder syck hefft. Dan desse} \\
\text{werlt ys vull wedderwille/} & \text{ droffnisse (Betrübnnise) /} \\
\text{armodt und unlust / na dem de } & \text{mensche / van der tydt syner}
\end{align*}
\]

\[\text{1544} \quad 1,9,2\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Zum andern / alle wollust} & \text{ freude / und begrilicheit} \\
\text{dieser welt / ist mit} & \text{schmerzen / trawrigkeit} \\
\text{und fahr (Gefahr) } & \text{vermenget.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Denn diese welt ist voller} & \text{ widerwertigkeit/betrübnnusz} \\
\text{und ellend / armöd und} & \text{unlust. Wer nun der welt} \\
\text{wollust anhengt /der kompt}
\end{align*}
\]
gebort her / van een
droffnissee / in de ander
geit. Wol nu desser werlt
wollust anhanget / de kumpt
gemeinlich in varlicheit /
gelick wo hyr de Bare / syner
wollust folgende/bedragen wert.

Frygdank secht

Van kranckem sade (Saat) /
de mensche wert /
Syn moder en (ihn) in
angste gebert.
Syn leuent ys moye (Mühe) /
und ydèl arbeyt /
Eyn gewisse todt / ys
em bereit.
Neen Boem (Baum) so bòse
früchte drecht (tragt)
Alse dat bòschaftige
menschlike geschlecht.
Wo schon (schön) de mensche
uthwendig ys /
So ys he doch jnwendich
vull mysz (Mist).

This commentator also takes over in full, in RVC II,1, that
portion of his predecessor's gloss already quoted. Lastly, in
IV,2,4, commenting on Reinke's line in the text: "Wente de werlt
ys der boeszheyt vull" (5838) - this quotation is from the 1539
edition; the original word in the 1498 edition was "loeszheyt" not
"boeszheyt" - he declares that Holy Scripture confirms that the
whole world is sunk into wickedness, giving a reference to "I
Johan 5" in a marginal note. He continues with a description
from the Alten Weisen depicting this. A man, pursued by a lion,
takes refuge in a deep well, securing his foot on a round stone
and holding on with both hands to two bushes growing around the
well. He then catches sight both of four terrifying animals
running towards him with open mouths and also of a dragon
underneath him, as well as of two mice, one white, the other
black, who are gnawing at the bushes. At this point he happens to notice a little honey oozing out from between two stones, which he licks with his tongue, and, forgetting momentarily his anxiety, falls into the well and perishes. The interpretation given is that the well represents the world, the four animals threatening him the four elements, the two bushes a man's life, the white and the black mouse day and night, the dragon a man's grave, the little stream of honey the transient, sensual pleasures of this world, through which a man sinks into eternal confusion. Finally, in IV, 12, 1 he remarks in an apparently original entry that "desser werlt handelinge / mit velem ungelücke und wedderwyllen vorbittert. Und nen mynsche / wert in desse elende werlt getelet (geboren) de nicht moye und sorge / bedruck und verfolginge / erdulden mothe (musste)."

Turning now to the 1544 gloss, we have a completely different picture. Discounting his first entry in 1, 5, 4 with regard to its being an evil world, since he was still translating his predecessor's text here word for word, we come to 1, 9, 2, this being the first chapter-gloss where he begins to show independence from his source. As we see from the two texts reproduced above, his deviation is first and foremost by omission, in the first place of the phrase "desser bösen werlt" in the first sentence, which he replaces by "dieser welt." Then we have his failure to include his predecessor's phrase suggesting that things go from bad to worse from birth onwards, as also his omission of the last four lines of the Freidank quotation with their intensely pessimistic view of human nature. His failure on the other hand
to include the three sentences in his source containing the metaphorical description of the sensual pleasures of this world as honey, the enjoyment of which leaves the bitter taste as of wormwood behind, is important as our first indication that his will not be a literary gloss.

In fact this commentator's only independent reference in his gloss to the world being evil occurs in 11,8,3 in connection with the relationship of the ruled to the rulers: "Zum dritten / ist es war / das die welt so bösz ist / das sie schier keiner rechten guten oberkeit mehr werdt ist," this being a quotation from Luther's "Von weltlicher Oberkeyt," as we have seen. His reaction in IV,2,7 to the long gloss in RVC IV,2,4 is merely to remark that sensual pleasure is a root of all evil and brings many to a shameful end - a very common occurrence, he adds. Do we obtain here the impression of a basically pessimistic writer? I think not.

With his successor, the 1650 commentator, we have a different state of affairs again, beginning with this commentator's reference in his preface to this in "geiz / Wucher / Hofart / Hurerey / Bludunstige Umbarmhertzigkeit und anderen Sünd und Lastern...stekkenden Welt." Then, in 1,18,2 in a reference to the function of authority in the world he remarks, "aber die welt die ist zu böszhafftig, die liget gantz im argen," a sentiment he repeats in almost the same words in 1,33,1, where he declares that everyone knows that "die Welt gantz im argen liegt" - a reference obviously to the same 1 John 5 passage quoted by the RVC commentator. In 11,7,2 in a comment on Reinke's second confession
he also states: "Wird die welt / als eine Grube alles Trubels und
ubels verworfen." Also in 11,8,1 he speaks of the whole world
being "gantz und gar im bösen ersoffen," going on to quote
Moscherosch to the effect that nothing in the world is as it
seems. He concludes here: "Summa: es sey alles Heucheley / es
sey alles Schmeicheley Liebkosen / heimliche Boszheit / heimliche
Arglist / heimlicher Geitz / heimlicher Neid / heimliche
Missgunst / heimlich weis nicht was."

Summary

Close examination of the relevant chapter-glosses of the
four commentators has confirmed the impression we had already
received from the prefaces, namely that the RVA and 1544
commentators have, relatively speaking, an optimistic
outlook, whereas the RVC and 1650 commentators share a
pessimistic one. With regard to RVC, this attitude may well
stem from the influence of didactic literature, since it is
shared by so many of the writers whose works he quotes -
Freidank, Morsheim and Brant particularly. For the 1650
commentator, however, the principal influence is more
probably that of Luther, who, in the same tract - "Von
weltlicher Oberkeyt" - in which he states that the world is
too evil to deserve good rulers, states that people are by
nature sinful and lawless, which is why they have to be put
under the restraint of temporal authority (WA 11,250). It
must also be admitted that this commentator's experience of
the war just concluded would most certainly have served to
strengthen his pessimistic attitude, which was a feature of this particular period.

With regard to the 1544 commentator, leaving aside his solitary reference in 11,8,3 to an evil world, which, as we saw, was a Luther quotation, we appear here to have a writer whose outlook was predominantly optimistic. We saw that he went out of his way to avoid the more pessimistic passages from his predecessor’s 1,9,2 gloss, and we have also his remark in III,12,4, which we have already noted, to the fact that "das Leben ist edel und lieb." His obsession with the inconstancy of Fortune, which we have already considered, can be discounted here, since, although by no means prepared to challenge Fortune or to ignore her, he appears to have devised means - principally, it seems, by keeping on good terms with everyone - of warding off her blows.

As far as the RVA commentator is concerned, despite his one doleful reference to its being an evil world on account of the fact that mankind is paying more attention to the infringement of temporal law than to that of divine law, this is the only reference we have in this gloss of this type of pessimism. This not only serves to confirm the impression given in his preface but also this commentator’s apparent acceptance of Aquinas’s positive view of man and his innate bent towards virtue, which, however, needs cultivation to achieve fulfilment.\textsuperscript{333}

We must now consider the glosses according to Könneker’s two
subsequent points, their reflection, that is, of the tendency
towards dogmatism and systematization on the one hand, coupled
with an emphasis on the individual and the concrete on the other.

With regard to the first of these, which, as we saw, referred
principally to the breakdown of society into classes, sub-classes
and occupations, we must consider the RVA commentator's division
of the animals representing the different classes of society in
his second preface. We noted how exact this was, unnecessarily so
considering the type of work he was commenting upon, a point
which, I submit, reveals the influence upon his writing of this
tendency in didactic literature. Although the original impetus
for this came obviously from Alckmaer, he enlarged considerably on
the latter's model as we saw. The fact that the RVC commentator
repeats in his second preface most of what his predecessor has
written in this regard, initially at least, and even enlarges on it
with his scathing criticism of the members of the classes he is
describing, shows his debt also to this literature. The two
latter commentators, by contrast, reveal much less of this
influence in this particular respect.

What does apply to all the glosses to a greater or lesser
degree is the tendency to formulate rules of individual conduct in
set circumstances - "Einzeltvorschriften," as Könneker calls them.
The RVA commentator in 1,4,1 writes, for example:

int erste, dat de yenne, de wol vorwaret ys in
eyner stede und nochtan (dennoch) vyende heft,
dat de nicht lichtlyken umme syn ghenôchte
(Genuss) schal uth ghan. Alse hir de hane;
de wuste Reynken syner vyent to wesen, unde
denne noch umme syn ghenôchte ghynck uth syner
vesten.
The RVC commentator takes over this gloss but treats it more expansively by adding a "bispel" or "exempel" in the shape of the fable of the fox, the hens and the raven according to the Cyrillics collection of fables. (The raven tries to help the hungry fox by pretending to some hens that she has become a nun - "vulpes" is feminine in Latin. They are only prevented from becoming the fox's victims by a rooster they meet on the way who persuades them that they must always first consider carefully the truth of what is told to them, particularly by a deceitful raven concerning an unregenerate fox.)

At this early point the 1544 commentator is still translating his predecessor's glosses word for word. The 1650 commentator, however, in 1,4,1, deals in general here with the stupidity of giving up an advantage - this was something that happened a thousand times during the Thirty Years War, he claims - which he also interprets on a religious level: if a man deserts the strong walls of the true church of God for the green pastures of this world and indulges in sensual pleasures, the hellish fox, the devil, will snatch up his soul and consign him to eternal death. By contrast, he states, those who remain in the fear of God are in no danger. He ends with the well-known verse from Luther's best-known hymn "Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott":

\[
\text{Der Fürst dieser Welt} \\
\text{Wie sauer er sich stelt} / \\
\text{Thut er Uns doch nicht} / \\
\text{Das macht er ist gericht} / \\
\text{Ein Wortlein kan ihn fellen.}
\]

RVA 1,4,2 contains the same kind of specific advice and this time there is a parallel in the Dutch VB:
Men behoort gheenen viant te ghelouen, in hoe schoonen schijnensel dat hy coemt. Men en sal oock gheen liedien (Leuten) betrouvven (vertrauen) die in heylige cleederen, oft (oder) onder tdecesel(den Deckel) van heylichc yt comen, sprekende, ende hen beroemende van hen heylicheit, want daer niet dan bedroch in ghelegen en is.

To dem anderen male dat nemant syne me vyende louen (glauben) schal to grunde, all ysset ok so dat he eme vele wyssenheyt (Sicherheit) wset eftse secht (sagt), ghelyck hir Reynke dede; ya, al ysset ock so, dat he kumpt under eyneme schyne unde kie de der gheystlichc yt eftse hillicheyt.

The RVC commentator here, in 1,4,2, translated by the 1544 commentator, takes over the gist of his predecessor's remarks, adding a passage from the Alten Weisen, where a man who believes his enemy is compared with one who takes up a snake in his hand, not knowing when it will turn round and bite him. A wise man never believes or trusts his enemy, it is stated, but parts company with him.

The 1650 commentator, in 1,4,2, also stresses that people should be careful whom they trust, applying the Cyrillus fable to this gloss instead of to the previous one, into which he also incorporates the Alten Weisen passage, ending once again on a religious note when he refers to Satan posing as an angel of light and deceiving Adam and Eve and the whole human race with them.

In the narrative text these glosses follow the chapter in which Reinke, clad in a monk's habit and claiming to be a hermit, assures the rooster that he has nothing more to fear from him, with disastrous results for the rooster who believes him (349-504).

Another example comes from RVA 1,12,9 and this gloss is once
again paralleled in the Dutch VB:

VB "morael" to chap. xiii

Die is sot die hem laet leyden in een onbekende plaetse daer de leytsman niet voorgaen en wilt.

This gloss is not taken up by the RVC commentator.

The final example, a little less specific, comes from RVA 1,36,3:

Dat drydde is eyne lere der unsteden (unbeständig) mynschen, alze dat de yenne, de wol syth (einen festen Wohnsitz hat), en schlach nicht upbreken to varen in eyn ander lant efte statth efte husz. Men wed (weiss) wat men heft und wormen is, men (allein) men wed nicht, watmen krycht efte wor men kumpt, alze hir reynkens wyff reed (riet) int beste, dar to blyuen, dar se waren.

The RVC commentator takes over the substance of this gloss in 1,35,3, adding a largely irrelevant quotation from the Alten Weisen to the effect that those who travel from place to place may breathe a different air but their dispositions do not change. Following this, with the help of Agricola (718), he states that mere travelling gives no one understanding; it is only if one pays attention to the kind of people living in a foreign land, to their customs and way of life, that one learns anything.

The 1544 commentator, practical as ever and more to the point, stresses in 1,35,2 the dangers of travelling both to one's life and possessions. A person who is making an honourable living, he states, should not move around: "Wer bleiben kan / der
bleib / halt sich einer mit den leuten / das sie jhn wohl leiden könnten / uund gehe seinem beruff ernstlich uund fleissig nach uund vertraue Gott / so wirt er nicht dürffen bettlen gehen." No one, however, should become so attached to his possessions that he is prepared to give up his life for them. That would be too high a price to pay, he states. This gloss the 1650 commentator in 1,33,2 takes over almost word for word.

Summary

From the four quotations given here from the RVA gloss we note the simple statement of the maxim - in two cases these are obviously taken over from his source - in all of them, maxims for which the narrative text provides the "exempel." In RVC, however, these maxims, together with the narrative text references, are embellished further by passages from secular literature, the Alten Weisen chiefly, but also Cyrillus's Spiegel der Wyszheyt - by further "exempel," in other words. In the only independent 1544 gloss, on the other hand, there is no attempt made to follow this method of dealing with the text, that is, with the provision of further "exempel." Here this commentator's remarks are in the first place practical and in the second, in their encouragement to stay home and keep one's nose to the grindstone, have distinct Lutheran overtones. As far as the 1650 gloss is concerned, we cannot necessarily expect to find here any influence of late mediaeval didactic literature. This commentator seems in fact to content himself here with
religious interpretations and references to the war just ended. He makes no attempt to add further literary illustrations, except in the case of the Cyrilus fable, which he found in his source.

Turning now to the fourth of Könneker's points, the "Nutz- und Zweckdenken," as she terms it - the rationalistic attitude to virtue and vice, that is, based on practical considerations of everyday life - which informed the didactic literature of the later Middle Ages, some of these characteristics have already been noted in other connections, including the last four maxims. The following are of a more generalized nature and illustrate very well Könneker's description of the type of behaviour recommended by the writers of didactic literature of that time - that, namely, of taking in most cases the line of least resistance:

(a) giving way to the angry

The RVA, RVC and 1544 commentators all agree with the necessity for giving way to an angry person. The RVA commentator in 1,14,5 gives as his reason for this that one might otherwise receive a deadly blow (dotslach); in the following gloss (1,14,6) he further suggests that continuing with the struggle for the sake of one's honour may end by bringing additional dishonour instead. These judgements the RVC commentator takes over in 1,13,4 adding a passage based on Agricola (158) where the meek (sachtmögigen) are commended for giving in, "so vindet stedes (immer) / ein gudt wordt / eine gude stede," not only as far as the listeners are concerned, he states, but also the other party will be ashamed
when he thinks the matter over afterwards. "Unde de sachtmödige vorschaffet also mehr / alse hedde he en up dat högeste (höchste)/wedder geschendet und gesmehet." The commentator goes on to point out that much depends on the type of person who starts the argument. If he is a dishonourable person, does it matter what he says? He sums up with lines from Brandt's *Narrenschyp* beginning: "Eine sachtmödige tunge / den torne breckt / Eyn tornich narre /hastigen spreckt," and ending as follows:

De Torne hindert eines wysen modt /
Den de tornige weth nit wat he doet.
Den torne schal men vormiden mith flith /
He körtet (verkürzt) des minschen leuent
und tydt.

For his part, the 1544 commentator in l,13,4 suggests that it is "ein sonderliche tugent" when a person can listen to "schelt uund schmach wort" and not respond in kind. Although such a person should defend his honour, this commentator states, this should not be "mit langem gezengk / uund holhipischen schelten auszurichten sonder mit kürtzen und wenigen worten / und darnach still geschwigen uund veracht." Someone who responds in kind only reduces himself to the other's level, he considers, ending with the last four lines of the Brandt verse quoted above. The textual reference here is to Reinke's decision to run away from the she-wolf: "He leep (lief), unde wolde deme torne entwyken" (1135).

The RVA commentator repeats this same advice with regard to giving way to an opponent on two further occasions: in III,2,5 where this is particularly addressed to those who are harrassed by an oppressor, and in IV,2,2 as a general admonition. The Dutch VB also contains similar advice in the "morael" to chap x, where it
is suggested that a wise man should let his adversary have his say and then walk away in silence.

(b) reconciliation with the enemy

With regard to reconciliation, all four commentators agree that this should be accepted when offered. In IV,8,1 the RVA commentator advises such action since otherwise the enemy might get stronger and the other party might live to regret not having accepted the peace offered earlier. This gloss is taken over by the RVC commentator in IV,8,5, accompanied by a passage from the Alten Weisen to the effect that sometimes adversaries need one another, although such a man should not be trusted in the long run. For his part, the 1544 commentator in IV,8,2 also advises acceptance of an offer of reconciliation, for good fortune in war is "gar wanckelmütig," as has already been noted. Even if weak, an enemy should not be despised, he advises, since in this case there might be "grosser Rhat / vorteil / fursichtigkeit und list," with which he can fell his adversary. The 1650 commentator in his parallel gloss, III,18,2, agrees with this. The textual reference here is to the duel between Reinke and Isegrim in the course of which at one stage Isegrim has Reinke begging for mercy, but fails to make good his advantage.

In parallel glosses, RVC, 1544 IV,5,1; 1650 III,15,1, all three commentators agree that quarrels should be avoided, the 1544 commentator stating with regard to slanging matches, that a man should only resort to fighting to defend his honour. In IV,5,3 this commentator confirms that much can be carried out in this connection "mit Rhat und bescheidenheit" that cannot be settled
by force, a piece of advice he repeats word for word in IV,6,3. The textual reference here is to the challenge issued to Reinke by Isegrim when they were unable to settle their differences by any other means.

(c) taking risks

With regard to taking risks, both 1544 and 1650 commentators advise against this. We have already noted the former’s remark in 1,35,2 that a man should never endanger his life for temporal possessions, and this is echoed in 1650 III,5,5. Previously to this, in 1544 1,17,4, this commentator had advised always being prepared for the worst and taking careful stock of the risks involved in any venture: "Ich mag nicht dreimal mehr aufsetzen / denn der gewinn wert ist." The textual reference here is to Isegrim’s eagerness to climb into the henhouse at Reinke’s direction. In 1650 II,6,1 this commentator, too, advises weighing the risks and assessing the dangers in any enterprise, "den Vorwitz und Vermessenheit thut nimmermehr gutes / sondern stürztet die menschen in Gefahr Leibs und Lebens." Similarly, in 1544 1,35,3-4 and 1650 1,33,3, both commentators declare that it is foolish to take on someone more powerful than oneself or to rely on a fortressed position, which may not be secure after all. In an isolated gloss, IV,2,3, the 1544 commentator pleads for calm reflection before action, "das all ding sein weil haben wil / und mit bedacht / fursichtigkeit und bescheidenheit gehandelt / angefangen und gethan sein."
(d) temerity

It will be obvious from everything that has been said so far that temerity (Vermessenheit) is considered a vice. This is introduced in RVA 1,6,4 and 5 where the meaning is that a man should not undertake anything for which he is not suited, echoed by the RVC and 1544 commentators in 1,6,1 and 2. The textual reference here is to the bear’s undertaking to summon Reinke to court, which ended so disastrously. In RVA 1,39,4, RVC,1544 1,37,3;1650 1,35,2 this type of warning is repeated, but this time it concerns pretending to have done something of which one is not capable, the textual reference being to Bellin’s claim that he had dictated the letters to Reinke which the latter stated that he had put into the sachel. In 11,7,1 the 1544 commentator makes the distinction between the vice of temerity (Vermessenheit) and the virtue of boldness (Kühnheit), provided the latter is tempered with "Bescheidenheit." Again he warns against taking on a stronger foe and declares that if a man undertakes something too big for him "so spricht man nicht / wolan er hats ritterlich gewagt /sondern / Er hett sich auch wol nicht gedürfft / so trag er nun das mit jhm." Here, in his narrative text, the 1544 commentator had referred to Reinke’s "Vermessenheit" with regard to the latter’s sending the hare’s head to the king in the sachel. This theme is actually repeated many times in the 1544 and 1650 glosses. In 111,2,22, for example, the 1544 commentator writes "das sich einer nicht also hart uff seine sterck macht / kunst / gewalt etc. und seiner feinde schwacheit / denn das ist Gott versucht und Gott wurd straffen." He follows this up in the
next gloss, 11,2,23, with the warning that insult will follow injury in a case where anyone attempts anything for which he is not strong enough. He should recognise his own limits. The 1650 commentator covers only the latter gloss, remarking that "wer Gefahr liebet, der kommt darin um." The textual topic here is the challenge Reinke issued to the rabbit and the crow when they had no witnesses to back their accusations against him, a challenge which they could not take up on account of their comparative physical weakness.

In 1544 1,37,3 and 1650 1,35,2 these commentators extend the concept of undertaking something for which one is not suited to include pretending to be or to have done something which one is not or alternatively has not done. The three later commentators in RVC 11,6,1-2: 1544 11,6,1; 1650 11,6,2 also change the noun from the RVA commentator's hypocrisy (gudtdunkelheyt) in 11,6,5 of people pretending to be better educated than they are to the "Vermessenheit" of such people, all three of them expanding their glosses to include students who squander their parents' money, such a student in Brandt's words often coming "wedder to husz erger dor / Alse he was / do he ersten uthfor." In the narrative text Reinke had just described to Grimbart at the beginning of his second confession how Isegrim had claimed that he could read German, Italian, Latin and French (3776) but still the mare had been able to fool him.

(e) "Was du tuost, das tuo weiszlich und bedenk das end"

In her discussion of this quotation, Könneker gives the word "end" a religious connotation, considering that the principal
purpose of this admonition was to turn the reader’s thoughts if not to the Last Judgement at least to the threat of eternal punishment in the hereafter. It is possible, however, to give it a purely secular interpretation, namely, never undertake anything without first weighing carefully what the results of it might be in the here and now, and it appears to be this meaning that the commentators favour. The nearest to a religious interpretation is that of the 1544 commentator in III,1,2, where, in a discussion of false penitence - "galgenrew" as he terms it - he describes a person who always regrets his evil deed immediately after committing it but at once backslides and does the same thing all over again, cautioning such a person: "Bedencks einer für der that / Respice finem et funem etiam" ("Consider what the end may be and that it may involve the rope"), and even here the emphasis appears to be rather on avoiding the gallows in this world than on what is involved in the next. This commentator, too, in the course of an admonition in 1,12,4 not to follow the advice of another too easily, counsels: "Soll auch nicht so bald und leichtlich gleuben / besondern etwas darauff zubawen / oder zuwagen / sondern alles mit gutem Rhat bedencken und bewegen / was es für ein end möcht nemen / uund wie es gerathen möcht." This refers in the narrative text to Hinze, the tom-cat’s willingness to follow Reinke to the place where the latter told him there were mice to be caught.

In the RVC gloss IV,10,1 also, in an apparently original remark on the story of the dog which had its rear-end singed, this commentator applies this admonition to a courtier who is always
envying another's good fortune, or so it seems to him: "Solcken pryst he / suth en vor (sieht ihn von vorne) /und nicht achter an/
dath ys / bedencket den ende nicht."

The same applies to the second quotation in RVC IV,12,5, where the commentator reproduces an attributed quotation from Agricola (87), where the latter had been at pains in a previous passage to rebuke those who act overhastily without thinking a thing through:

In alle dynem donde (Tun) / bedencke dat ende.
Gryp (greif) ydt wyszlick an / wes nicht tho behende.
Wes vorsychtich / und holt dy metich (mässig) und slicht /
Wes nicht tho hastich / sunder bedencke dy recht.
Wol (wer) gantz sere hastich ys / tho untyden /
De schal up ydelen Eseln ryden.
Süs auereylet (Übereilt) syck vaken (oft) ein Man /
De nicht mit synnen handelen kann.

(f) patience and steadfastness

We have already noted admonitions to display these qualities. With regard to Fortuna, for example, we learnt the need for patience in misfortune (1650 I,30,2), which is repeated in 1544, 1650 III,5,2, where we are told that when one has to put up with something, patience is the best remedy, for with impatience, in the words of the 1650 commentator, "richtet man je nichts aus, sondern macht sich selbsten das Creutz nur schwerer." In RVA 1,11,5 this commentator urges patience on those who have to suffer scorn and derision. This gloss the RVC commentator in I,10,2 takes over, illustrating it with an unattributed quotation from Cyrillus's Spigel der Weysheit where the distinction is made between a person who is justly subjected to such treatment, who
should submit patiently and submissively for this reason, and one who has not deserved it but nevertheless suffers and puts up with it. He not only acts magnanimously, we are told, but can also claim victory over himself. This the commentator follows by lines from Der Renner and by Schwarzenberg urging trust in God. The 1544 commentator, for his part, omits in 1,10,2 the second part of the Cyrillus extract regarding self-mastery, substituting the remark that this attitude is "ein lob der gedult," and adding the practical observation that this sort of magnanimous behaviour tends to be irritating to the other party! The 1650 commentator in 1,10,2 adds a quotation from "der spruchreiche Seneca" comparing the insults heaped on a virtuous man with an arrow which rebounds from a fortified wall: scorn and insults cannot hurt him. The Renner and Schwarzenberg quotations are reproduced by both the latter commentators. The narrative text reference here is to the bear's meek acceptance of the insults hurled at him by Reinke after the latter has found him sitting on the river bank in a bedraggled condition.

Steadfastness in adversity we have already seen emphasized with regard to friendship in RVA 11,6,2; RVC 11,4,2 and 1544 11,4,3. In RVA 1,12,4 this commentator also urges putting on a bold face in misfortune whatever one's inward thoughts may be, this gloss being taken over by both the RVC and 1544 commentators in 1,12,3 who add that this prevents one's enemy from gloating! For his part, the 1650 commentator adds in 1,12,3 that this applies particularly to "Boten und Gesanten Gottes," giving other examples, including that of Socrates, of people who had not
allowed themselves to be discouraged. He also makes the statement: "Ein solcher muss seyn / gleich dem Palm Baum / welcher sich gegen die Last aufbeumet: also Sie gegen die verfolger." 

Finally, in RVA 1,20,1; RVC, 1544 1,19,1 we learn of the necessity for a wise man to show courage in adversity and to console himself, the RVC commentator adding a passage from the Alten Weisen to the effect that only stouthearted people get to the top, the 1544 commentator remarking that "trauren / unmut / und verzagen" is "unehrlich und unnutzlich."

(g) moderation and the middle way

Generally speaking, the word moderation is used in the glosses in the sense in which we know it today, namely avoidance of excess. In RVC 1,24,4 and 1544 1,24,3, for example, both commentators complain of lack of moderation in drinking habits, particularly at court. In 111,2,16 the 1544 commentator refers particularly to eating habits: "Non vivas ut edas. sed edas ut vivere possesst" ("You do not live to eat, but you rather eat in order to stay alive"), he states. It is outrageous, he declares, when a person has to blame illness on immoderate eating and drinking habits; "Ein jeder sol seine masz wissen und halten."

The 1650 commentator in 111,2,7 agrees with his predecessor, pleading through St. Jerome for moderation in these habits, lack of which leads to unchastity. The textual passage referred to here is Reinke's description of how the crow's wife ate up the bones of the fish as well as the flesh because she was so hungry, and died as a result.

A less concrete example is the 1650 commentator's complaint
in I,31,1 that "die Menschen so gar in keinem Dinge können die Mittelstrasse treffen / sondern sie thun entweder dem Dinge zu viel oder zu wenig." The particular context of this remark is the difference in attitude of the rulers to the clergy before and after the Reformation, which we have already examined. We also have the plea of the 1544 commentator in III,4,14 that a man who has up to a certain point lived a blameless life should not be the object of scorn and derision if he makes one slip. "Welcher e one sünd ist / der werfft den ersten stein auff ihn," commands this commentator, although it would be devilish if he were to continue in this way, he adds. "Modus ist pulcherrima virtus" ("Moderation is the finest of virtues")," he states. Here, in the narrative text, the she-ape has been arguing that even if Reinke has made one mistake, this is the sort of thing that can happen to anyone. For his part, the 1650 commentator in III,6,2 remarks that a person should not go to pieces when he loses his possessions but remember that "mas ist zu alien dingen gut." The "Heydnische Weltwysen," he recalls, threw away their money when they saw that it was injurious to their emotional freedom and the exercise of virtue.

This commentator is also concerned in III,14,1 that where truth is concerned it is difficult to find the middle line. The question had been raised in 1544 IV,4,2 where this commentator had insisted that the truth need not and should not always be spoken in temporal matters, although this naturally does not apply to cases where a person has taken an oath to speak it. The 1650 commentator, however, in III,14,1 is particularly concerned with
this problem in connection with social relationships, where the middle line for him - "die hochste Kunst," as he terms it - means drawing the fine line between using too much flattery and blurting out one's opinion of people to their faces. It is interesting to note that in his parallel gloss, IV,4,1, the RVC commentator, for whom, as we have seen, truth was a matter of vital importance, treats this question quite differently. He denounces, namely, those "welcker nicht van herten grundt meinen wat se spreken," Such "dobbelde gesellen," he maintains, although they pass for "wyse / erfaren und vorstendige kloke Menner," should be avoided.

To return to the virtue of moderation, this is, in fact, a subject of particular concern to the 1650 commentator, as he shows when, in III,23,2, he ends his work with these lines:

Mass ist zu allem gut / Maas halten in den Leyden
Wie auch belobte Maas / erweisen in den Freuden /
Das hat / das helt den Stich / das setzet festen Grund /
Drum nehmet die in acht: zuviel ist ungesund.

Summary

a) We note with regard to the admonitions illustrated here the tendency, which runs from the Dutch VB through the 1544 gloss, to urge a "sensible" course, the one where there is the least danger. With regard to angry men, for example, we are told in the glosses of I,13 (RVA), I,14,(RVC,1544) that a person may otherwise receive a deadly blow or greater dishonour (RVA), the angry man is probably completely out of his mind (RVC), by answering back a person only reduces
himself to the other's level (1544). With regard to quarrels, too, early reconciliation is advised, if complete avoidance is impossible.

b) This sensible attitude is also applied to the taking of risks per se where all matters must be give careful consideration, and in an extended sense to taking on a superior foe, thus committing the sin of "Vermessenheyt," the 1544 commentator here, in 111,2,22, reproducing Luther's view that in such matters God's help must be sought, or the end result may not be the expected one.

c) The admonition "was du tuost, das tuo weiszlich und bedenk das end" appears to be interpreted in a secular sense in the RVC and 1544 glosses of 111,1. The emphasis on the necessity for cool calculation before committing oneself is very evident here.

d) With regard to moderation, we noted the conventional use of this word in the RVC and 1544 glosses, namely, avoidance of excess, applied particularly here to eating and drinking and by the latter commentator also to the behaviour of one person to another. The 1650 commentator's extension of this to include aspects of telling the truth, for example, is interesting but need not concern us in this particular context of the influence of late mediaeval didactic literature.

e) Patience and steadfastness in endurance are also much-prized
virtues by all four commentators. It may be argued that the virtues valued so highly here were also those by which Luther, too, set great store, and this is true, although he actually went further than any of the commentators, for in his exhortations to patience, meekness and endurance he also emphasized the very great importance of doing good to one's enemies, a precept which is not reproduced in any of the glosses! Nevertheless, the particular emphasis that the 1650 commentator lays on these virtues can certainly be attributed primarily to the influence of Luther's teaching.

f) The debt that the 1544 gloss in particular owes to the didactic tradition is indicated, for example, in this commentator's use of the word "bescheidenheit," - having here the sense of insight and good judgement - in I, 7, 1, IV, 5, 3, IV, 6, 3 and in IV, 2, 3 in connection with the need for careful calculation prior to taking action. It is best shown, however, in the last words of this commentator's epilogue, where, in his final sentence, he urges his reader to compile his own "Denckbuch," while reading the work, which should instruct him "wie er sich in allen seinen handeln uund wercken halten/ was er sich versehen / und gewarten / was er loben und schelten / raten und widerrhaten / thun und lassen soll uund mag."

g) All in all, the influence of didactic literature here is very pronounced in the first three glosses, in the emphasis placed on always taking the "sensible" course where there is
the least danger, always considering what the end may be of any proposed action, in avoiding taking risks, and in practising moderation, not only in eating and drinking habits but also in rendering judgement on others and in one's relationship with them.

h) As far as the "Sittenspiegel" aspect of the glosses is concerned, these latter perform very effectively here the function that has been postulated for them. In other words, the events in the narrative text supply the commentators with the material for the maxims they formulate. Reinke's cautious avoidance of the angry she-wolf, for instance, leads to the formulation of the maxim that one should always give way to an angry person; the bear's meek endurance of Reinke's insults supplies the material for the maxim counselling patience and endurance in suffering; the wolf Isegrim's failure to take the opportunity offered him during the duel for reconciliation with Reinke inspires the admonition regarding the necessity for early reconciliation with an enemy; likewise the story of the wolf's climbing into the henhouse at Reinke's bidding leads to the warning against taking risks, and the tom-cat's eagerness to follow Reinke in search of the mice to a similar one concerning the necessity of considering what the final result of such an enterprise might be. In some cases, as we saw, further "exempel" are provided in the glosses themselves.
Finally, we must come to some conclusion with regard to the meaning of the word Wisdom for each of the first three commentators, a word which underwent some considerable alteration in the didactic literature of the later Middle Ages, as we saw.

First of all, we must determine how this word has been defined over the years, taking as examples Cicero and Aquinas - there is no real definition of it in the Biblical book of Proverbs and that given in the Apocryphal Book of Wisdom is too comprehensive for brief summary. In his De officiis - a work known to the RVC commentator - Cicero divided wisdom into practical wisdom (prudentia) meaning the knowledge of what should be done and what avoided, and philosophical wisdom (sapientia), which he calls the first of all virtues, defining it as the knowledge of all things human and divine, adding however that a study of wisdom should be applied to the advantage of human society. In a later passage Aquinas refers also to a kind of evil wisdom.
called worldly (*sapientia saeculi*) because it takes some worldly good to be the highest cause and the ultimate end. It is this worldly wisdom, Aquinas states, that leads us astray and makes us foolish in God’s sight. 

Then in the later Middle Ages we have the alteration — deterioration one might call it, judged by Aquinas’s standards — in the meaning of the word wisdom, where a cool, calculating foresight takes the place of a divinely inspired quality, assuming a meaning more in line with Cicero’s *prudentia*.

How is this reflected in the glosses? We have already established from a comparison of the Dutch *VB* and *RVA* second preface that for Alckmaer the adjective "wysz" had apparently the meaning of some quality which would enable a man to get ahead by his own wits and thus qualify him for employment in high office in the state, a view with which the *RVA* commentator obviously did not agree. But what was this latter’s definition of wisdom and the wise man? This he never spells out. It is nevertheless possible to trace more than one level, as it were, of wisdom in this commentator’s remarks prior to his last gloss. For instance we have in the second preface the reference to the indispensability to princes and nobles of wise counsellors, without whom no court or city would retain its honour for very long, likewise his remark in 1,6,2 that a prince should have "kloken, wyse radeslude, de wyszheyt wetten" to help him settle complicated lawsuits, and that a prince "schal wys wesen," and assess carefully his wife’s intercession on behalf of a prisoner to make sure that acceding to it will be for the common good (1,31,3). On a more impersonal
level we have the statement that a wise man shows courage in adversity (1,12,4), that a wise person prefers to be rebuked and instructed rather than listen to false praise (1,34,3), and that a "wyse und vornuften mynsche" should mirror himself in another's shame and disgrace and thus prevent himself from suffering the same fate (111,13,2).

It is interesting, too, how this commentator when he is specifically referring to the fox manages almost always to avoid applying the adjective "wysz" to him. We noted this in the second preface. It occurs also in the preface to Book IV, where he states in general terms with regards to its contents (the duel) that we learn here how "de wyszheyt de ghricheyt vorwynt." Later, however, he writes specifically of there always being great envy and hatred in princely courts between "den ghyrigen unde den lozen (durchtriebenen), alzus wert hir vorgebracht de ghryge wulff unde de loze vosz." The nearest he comes to it is in 1,20,1 where he states: "schal syck eyn wysz man suluen trosten und vor drysten (Mut fassen), alze Reynke hie dede."

There is one example, however, where we have the coupling together of the words "wysen rad" and "lysticheyt," of what appears to be a more rationalistic use of this word. Here he speaks in IV,4,2 of "groue unlympyge (ungeschickte) mynschen, de vorstan nenlen wysen rad, und lysticheyt wyl en nicht to synne."

The crux for this commentator comes of course at the end of this work, in his last gloss, IV,10, where, as we have already seen, he makes the distinction between "dat gheschlechte van Reynken, dat is der lozen...dat syn alle de, dede wysz syn alleyne
in wertlyken dinghen" - he refers here to St. Paul's words "dat wyszheyt desser werlde dat is dorheit vor gode" and "rechte wyszheyt," which "de lerer" esteems "bouen golt, alze dat in der warheyt is." The influence of Aquinas seems unmistakable here, and it is a pity that the commentator did not make the connection with Aquinas's reference in the previous passage to the man who pursues some other excellence as imitating the pride of the devil. For it would appear that within these terms of reference - of worldly wisdom and the seven deadly sins - a case can be made for the consideration of fox Reinke as the embodiment of superbia, the deadliest sin of the seven.

In summary one can say, then, that this RVA commentator had some inkling of what was meant by pure wisdom, which he refers to in his last gloss as "rechte wyszheyt," although he never defined it, but also appears in one of his glosses at least to have been under the influence of the didactic writers here. For the rest, worldly wisdom was typified for him in the conduct and attitude of fox Reinke and people like him.

With the RVC commentator, on the other hand, we have a different picture. Here is a man who was familiar with Cicero's De officiis, but who is unlikely to have imbibed the teaching of Aquinas, yet who appears also to some extent to have come under the influence of the didactic tradition. It is this commentator nevertheless who gives us our first definition of true wisdom in a Cyrillus quotation in IV,12,5. He had already quoted in the first paragraph of his first preface from Cyrillus's preface to his Spigel der wyszheyt (unattributed) that the whole visible world
should serve as a means of learning divine wisdom. Then, in his
long gloss IV,12,5 - the reference here is to Reinke's words in
the narrative text that he valued wisdom more than gold (6790) -
he launches into a praise of wisdom based on Cyrillus, who,
attributing what he writes to Solomon, states that a wise man
becomes wiser by hearing wisdom, which has no end and which must
be continually sought after. The passage ends:

Wyszheyt / spreckt de hillyge Cirillus / ys de
warheit des gemotes / darmit de högeste gudt /
dat Godt ys / dorchten gelouen erkant
und mit reyner leue (Liebe) / beseten
(besessen) wert. Welcker mit solcker wyszheyt
begauet / de ys ane twiuel (Zweifel) ein Here
der werlt / und erkennet syns süluest.

The RVC commentator continues that such wisdom is given by God
alone, quoting verses from Proverbs in substantiation of this.

He soon, however, reaches the crux of the question, as his
predecessor had before him, writing in an apparently original
entry:

Auerst ytzundes vyndet men vele werltwyser /
hochgelerder / vorstendyger und wolgeschickter
Menner / welckerer wyszheyt (wo apenbar) mehr
eyne arglisticheyt und bedreglyke bøszheyt /
und spytzfündyge hinderlist ys / up untruwe
und schaden tho thofögen (zuzufügen)gerichtet/
alze up rechte wyszheyt.

He continues with an unattributed Brenz quotation to the effect
that the so-called wisdom of such people is just "erer schalckheyt
schandtdeckel," these being the type of people who often cause the
ruin of country and people.

What we have then up to this point is a description of true
wisdom in the Cyrillus quotation and what appears to be considered
wisdom - that of the cunning, the deceitful and the crafty - at
the time this commentator was writing. Towards the end of the gloss, however, he quotes from Agricola (87) (unattributed): "wor ein wysz Radt ys / dar ys nen ylent (keine Eile) sunder vele bedenckens," contrasting such a man with "eyn köner (kühner) Radt," who makes up his mind too quickly. Part and parcel of this proverb are the lines beginning "In alle dynem donde / bedencke dat ende," already quoted in full, which bring the gloss to a close, all of which appears to indicate a conception of wisdom derived from current didactic literature.

For the rest, this commentator's remarks are largely, with two exceptions, taken over from his predecessor - the need for wise, truthful, god-fearing counsellors (1,5,4), that a wise man should show steadfastness in adversity (1,12,3: 1,19,3), not become despondent on the receipt of bad tidings (11,4,3), prefer to be rebuked than falsely praised (1,34,3) and learn from the bad experience of another (111,13,1).

The two exceptions are, however, of particular interest, the first being the distinction this commentator makes in 1,12,4 between "de duckelguden / und de syck wysz achten" - probably the best translation here is men who are wise in their own conceit - who are easily deceived, and the wise man who acts circumspectly, taking advice from those who are tried and true and not risking his life on another's advice, even if there is great profit to be gained from the projected enterprise (Alten Weisen). This also appears to be a description of a somewhat calculating type of wisdom.

The second exception is this commentator's reference in an
apparently original entry, IV,8,2, to Cicer’s example of two
shipwrecked men and the question as to whether the wiser of the
two, because he could contribute more to the common good, is
justified in taking a plank from the foolish one. The answer is
‘no.’ The commentator continues:

Dan einem Christen Manne / de rechtferdich und
wysz ys / gehört nicht / dat he mith eines
fremden dode / syn leúent redden (retten)
schôle. Dan ym wedderlope (beim Wettlaufen) /
eynen by der handt upholden. Effte ynn
waters nöden / eynem eyn bredt nemen / ys
uneeurlick. Und allent wat uneeurlick ys / dat
ys ock nicht nütte noch gud. Derhaluen
schôle wy / ym lope (Lauf) desses leúendes
ane bedrogh hinderlist / und auernüttinge
(üervorteilung) unses negesten / handelen.

With a marginal reference to "Gulden lere Ci. Lib. 3 Officio," the
commentator continues:

Inn den ende gyfft Cicero eyne gulden lere /
de stedes wol anthomercken / und spreckt: Vor
allen dinghen schal desse myn radt / genoch syn
dat van uns nichts gerychlick /
unrechtferdichlick / lichferdichlick / unde
unnynschlick (wo wy solckes vor allen Göderen
und mynschen / vorbergen mochten) / gehandelt
und vullenbracht werde.

Here, then, in the RVC gloss we have a many-levelled, as one
might say, presentation of wisdom: pure wisdom in the Thomist
sense from Cyrillus and from the commentator himself through the
Biblical book of Proverbs; true wisdom in Cicero’s sense, for
whom as we saw, wisdom is the highest virtue, linked here with
Christian teaching; the wisdom portrayed in the RVA glosses which
this commentator takes over; the cool, calculating type of wisdom
one associates with the current didactic writing, and the aberrant
form of this wisdom practised by cunning, crafty, self-interested
people such as fox Reinke.
We have to look to the 1544 commentator for further light on this situation. At the end of his preface we noted that he dedicated the book to "allen die Weiszeyt und verstand lieb haben," What does he mean by this? The two paragraphs that constitute 1,12,3 give us some idea. He begins:

Das dritte. Ein weiser man soll unerschrocken sein / und was er ehrlichs fur hat / sich keine forcht oder schrecken / hindern lassen Sonder bestendig und fest sein / das er durch keinen schrecken / seiner weiszheit vergesse und thu unweislich und unrecht. Soll auch in widerwertigkeit und ungluck / still schweigen/ uund sich nicht mercken lassen / darmit sich seine feinde des nicht frewen / die in darzu gebracht haben.

What follows is based to some extent on the Alten Weisen quotation in RVC 1,12,3, which we have already judged to derive fom a cool, calculating kind of wisdom:

Ein weiser mann soll sich nicht also baldt lassen kennen lernen / dasz jderman wisse / was sein sinn uund gemüt sei / warzu er lust uund gefallen hab / denn darurch wird denn mancher verleidet / sondern soll sich fein stattlich uund ehrlich halten / nicht also gar gmein mache / das er eines jderne leichtfertigen Rath ervolge / oder was er anfange / mit im spiel sei.

He continues with the words already quoted above to the effect that consideration should always be given to the eventual outcome of any enterprise, ending with the words: "und in solchem den argsten weg allweg erst bedencken / was es denn besser wird/ das ist gewinn." The calculating tone, the "nüchtern, abwägende Besonnenheit," to use Könneker's term, seems even more unmistakable here.

Even his statement in III,4,12, which appears on the face of
it somewhat more idealistic — that a man should rather be praised for his "weiszheit und verstand" than for his "gröss / sterck uund künheit," which leads to temerity and which God will punish — still has its roots in the everyday world, for he adds: "Aber durch einen guten weiszlichen Rhat / wirt offt ein gantz land erhalten / Leut die mit grossen händeln täglich umbgehen / werden davon one zweuel wol zusagen wissen."

As with his two predecessors, the crux for this commentator is also reached in the glosses of IV,11 and IV,12. The first of these glosses reads:

Zum andern / das spitzfundigkeit zu betrüg uund list zu allerley schalckheyt nicht weiszheyt ist / sondern der recht weise ist / der sein weyzheyt zu tugent braucht (IV,11,2).

The second:

Zum vierden / das weiszheyt vil besser ist denn gold / denn mit weysheit kan man gold und güt / gunst / gewalt und ehr erlangen. Auch mit weysheit veil ausrichten kan / das mit deren keinem kan ausgerichtet werden (IV,12,4).

The clue here appears to be IV,12,2, for in this gloss the commentator had said that anyone who wants to get on in the world must learn Reinke's skill (Reinkens kunst) or he will not make progress,


For the 1544 commentator, then, the meaning of wisdom was most certainly that of the didactic writers, who, while recognising wisdom as the source of virtue, were nonetheless
concerned that every undertaking should be carefully evaluated as to its purpose and profitability, this in fact constituting its "wisdom." He was, however, at pains to make a distinction here between this kind of wisdom with which he was familiar and viewed positively and the aberrant form where deceit and cunning are the order of the day. But was this latter not "Reinkens kunst"? This is a question we shall have to consider in the next section.

For the rest, this commentator's attitude in this matter is well summed up in the gloss of III,12,9, where, although the word wisdom is not mentioned, one feels that what he says here constitutes wisdom for him:

das ein jeder wol seinen nutz und frommen
dencken soll / aber alle zeit die
gerechtigkeit fur augen haben / wenig wol
gewunnen gut hoher achten / denn viel ubel
gewunnens / und mer betracht den gemeinen nutz
denn seien eignen / davon wirt er ehr und gut
erlangen.

Wisdom in the sense in which it has been discussed here has ceased to be a problem for the 1650 commentator, and his references to it are so few and far between that this gloss can be disregarded here.

Summary

a) The RVA commentator presents us with three concepts of wisdom, the one, which he would surely regard as "rechte wyszheyt," illustrated in his statements regarding the following: wise counsellors, those people who show courage in adversity, those who prefer to be rebuked rather than listen to false praise and those who learn from the bad
experiences of others. The second, a more calculating type of wisdom is demonstrated in the gloss where he appears to link "wyse rad" with "lysticheit." The third, the wisdom of the world, is illustrated in his final remark regarding the wisdom of those cunning people, like Reinke, who are concerned only with the things of this world, this type of wisdom being in St. Paul's words foolishness with God, the equivalent of Aquinas's sapientia saeculi.

b) The RVC commentator, by contrast, illustrates in his glosses - primarily of IV,12,5 - many different concepts of wisdom: pure wisdom in the Thomist sense; true wisdom (sapientia) in the Ciceronian sense, which he links with Christian teaching; the concept of wisdom as this is illustrated in the RVA glosses he takes over; the cool, calculating type of wisdom espoused by the didactic writers of the later Middle Ages, and the aberrant form of the last-mentioned type practised by Reinke and his ilk.

c) For the 1544 commentator, on the other hand, wisdom obviously meant the cool calculation, the "Nutz- und Zweckdenken" described by the didactic writers, which, however, he sought to distinguish - while at the same time describing it as "Reinkens kunst" - from the use of falsehood and deceit to achieve one's ends. Wisdom should always be used, as he said, in the service of virtue.

d) The word wisdom had obviously ceased to have the same importance for the 1650 commentator. For him, in fact,
"Weltwysheit" seemed rather to denote the philosophy of those living in the pre-Christian era such as Socrates (1,12,3), Cicero (1,28,1) and those men who threw away their money when they found it detrimental to the exercise of virtue (III,6,2).
An investigation of the RV glosses, particularly RVA, with regard to their reflection of the religious teaching of the period: the RVA gloss as "Sündenspiegel."

It might be thought that we had already covered this particular aspect of the glosses at sufficient length, but at that time we were concerned primarily with the practices of the church, whether Roman or Lutheran, and with the personnel. Here we will be dealing principally with what I have termed the salvational aspect of the RVA gloss, which is its hallmark, of which, however, we have caught only glimpses, as it were, along the way.

We have noted, for example, in I,7,4, the allegorical interpretation— the sensus spiritualis type of interpretation, that is— of the incident where Reinke tempts the bear to steal the fictitious honey, and in IV,10,1 the religious interpretation the commentator gives to the story of the singed dog. The rest of the purely salvational glosses are mainly centred on the workings of the devil in the world and on sin per se. With regard to the devil, we are told in I,11,4, in what might be described as a follow-up gloss to I,7,4, that "de lerer" is pointing out here that many have to suffer insult in addition to the injury inflicted on them, not only here but in the hereafter. (The Dutch VB here, in the "morael" to chap. x, speaks of a deceiver who has been up to his usual tricks and who has nothing better to do afterwards than to deride those he has deceived.) For in the hereafter, continues the RVA commentator, the silly fool
(geckaftich mynsche) who has followed the honey, that is, the sensual pleasures of this world - which are a delusion anyway, he states, for one never finds what one is seeking - will be derided by the fox, that is by the devil, in his condemnation. He follows this with an allusion to King David's having called the foxes evil spirits on account of their foul smell and with a quotation from Psalm 63 which bears remarkable similarity to one in a psalter printed by the Mohnkopf press in 1493. The narrative text reference is to the bear, who, once he had eluded the villagers by plunging into the river, became the butt of Reinke's scorn when the latter found him sitting on the river bank in a bedraggled condition (840-58).

In the glosses of 1,14 we also have a good deal of salvational instruction, the narrative text here (chap. 13) describing how, after betraying the tom-cat and leaving him stranded in the barn, Reinke paid a visit to the wolf's home and how he not only insulted the latter's children by calling them his step-children but also subsequently violated their mother. In 1,14,3 we are told how a deadly sin, once committed, draws other sins to it, so that it becomes a chain which grows longer and longer. The sinner, in fact, sells his soul to the devil, committing himself to the latter, whom he cannot shake off. The devil then pulls ever more tightly at the chain with which he intends to hold the sinner for all eternity. All this is illustrated, the commentator tells us, by the fox, who, when he had betrayed the tom-cat, went off to commit robbery and adultery. In other words, the fox here represents the sinner, not the devil.
In 1,14,4 the commentator then explains how, by beginning to boast about his sins - by addressing the wolf's children as his step-children, that is - the fox just added to them, making the chain longer. Then, in 1,14,8, he makes the categorical statement that no good remains unrewarded and no sin, however small, unpunished, and that a person is punished on earth in the parts of the body where he has sinned, a punishment which will continue in hell.

The glosses of 1,17, particularly 1,17,3, are to all intents and purposes the last of their kind, the narrative text here constituting the greater part of Reinke's first confession. In 1,17,2 we have a brief reference to the fact that no one should give way to the lusts of the flesh so that he comes to love his body more than God; he must expect punishment for this. The gloss of 1,17,3 is actually divided into four parts, three of which we have already considered in other connections, the specific narrative text reference here being to the way in which the wolf ate so much that he could not crawl out of the hole in the barn wall by which he had originally entered. The first of these parts which we have already considered deals with officials who only take on a job offered to them for what they can get out of it, the commentator ending this section, as we saw, with a Latin rendering of the fourth beatitude, where, in his commentary on this, he targeted the three deadly sins of avaritia, lascivia and superbia. The last two sections of this gloss, the first concerning the necessity for a rich man to obtain the services of a wise confessor and the second concerning the way in which God
chastizes His people by giving them wicked rulers, we have also already considered in other connections.

The remaining section, second overall, deals specifically with the avaricious, high-living person who is interested only in himself, the commentator remarking first on the fate of such a man at the hour of his death when he will be overcome by his enemies, the evil spirits, who will throw him into the pit of damnation where there is only weeping and the chattering and gnashing of teeth. He then refers to the parable of Dives and Lazarus as an illustration of this. Commenting on this parable, he states that the Bible does not tell us that the rich man robbed or stole or committed murder but that he indulged in good living, eating and drinking and wearing fine clothes, and showed no mercy to Lazarus. For this reason he came into the hands of his enemies (the devils) at his death. Following up on his remark in 1,14,8 to the effect that a person is punished on earth and in the hereafter in that part of his body where he has sinned, the commentator states here that when the rich man was not able to have his tongue cooled by even a drop of water, this was because he was being punished in the place where he had sinned. Finally, in 1,17,5, this commentator gives his interpretation of Reinke's story of how Isegrim fell off the beam in the hen-coop before even having got hold of a hen and was captured and beaten by the inhabitants of the farm (1534-82), explaining that it signifies (the word "betekent" is used here) those who work exceedingly hard to acquire something unjustly but run into problems in the process, endangering both body and soul.
The next collection of salvational glosses occur in the commentary of II,7, this being the chapter in which Reinke begins his second confession. They can be quickly summarized: a sinner often makes light of his sins (II,7,1); many a sinner is to such an extent a victim of his sensual lusts that he cannot withstand the temptation to commit a deadly sin (II,7,2); making the excuse that one is only following the example of others makes one's sins weigh heavier rather than lighter; the greater the number of sinners who land up in hell, the greater the fire of their damnation (II,7,4).

Finally, the glosses of III,14 - this is the chapter in which, in the absence of witnesses, the king lets Reinke go a second time - are somewhat more practical and specific. In III,14,2, for example, we are told that if there is any doubt regarding an accused man's guilt, he should be let go rather than condemned, for it is better that a hundred guilty persons should escape than that one person be unjustly condemned; the spilling of innocent blood gives offence to God. Then, looking at the same question from the opposite point of view, the commentator states in III,14,3 that the evil-doer who manages to get away with it through his lies and trickery should not imagine that God will not make him pay for it in another way, as here, remarks the commentator, the fox had later to fight for his life (in the duel.)

All this does not mean, of course, that references to the devil and to sin are confined to the RVA gloss; we have already considered enough references to both in the other glosses to know
that this is not true. The fact, however, that there is fundamentally no difference in the attitude of the commentators to the basic function of the devil in the world - the temptation, that is, of mankind to abandon good in favour of evil - makes comparison of the glosses in this light superfluous. The tendency during and after the Reformation of Protestant writers to consider all the works of the Roman Church as those of the devil - and this attitude was, of course, reciprocal - is represented in all three later glosses in the commentators' attitude to pilgrimages, to name only one example that we have considered.

Two glosses with regard to sin - 1544 11,7,3 and 1650 111,22,1 - are, however, good illustrations of the kind of problems these commentators were faced with in their lives and with which they had to come to terms. One could in fact consider what the 1544 commentator writes here as a confession of his faith:

Istz gewiszlich war das einer ietz nicht wol inn der welt one sünd leben kan / denn der betriegerei / alfantz (Schalkheit) / und list ist so viel / wer nicht geschliffen ist, der musz unter der banck liggen. Es ist darzu kommen / wenn einer frömlich / schlecht uund gerecht leben will / ohn betrug uund argen list sein / So spricht man / Er ist gar zu fromm / er ist nicht ein welt mensch / Er taug nicht inn der welt / Er ist zuschlecht uund zu keinem ampt oder wirden täglich. Das fhüret warlich manchen dahin das er einn Ritt mith wagt.

He then warns of the consequences of this:

Aber das alles unangesehen / soll einer bedencken / das es ein bösz zeichen ist / darauff baldt der grosse unversunlich grim und zorn Gottes volgenn musz / denn Gott kan in
He goes on to confirm the importance that individual responsibility has for him - something we have already noted before. "Ein jeder für sich, Gott für alle," he writes, affirming that the sin and wickedness which is everywhere rampant in the world is no excuse for his own sinning; it does not make his sins any lighter. "Sprung ein ander in ein brunnen / ich wolt nicht hienach." There is no parallel gloss to this one in the 1650 edition. In RVG 11,7,2, however, this commentator also mentions the impossibility of living without sin, but treats the subject in a much more general way, attributing it to the fact that everyone follows his own desires and seeks his own self-interest, even when this causes injury to his fellow-man, or even the latter's ruin, "so uns doch Godt / unsen negesten gelick uns suluest / tho leuen nicht tho auerfallen edder tho besweren / gebaden hefft." In his previous gloss, 11,7,1, he, too, had agreed with his predecessor that no one can excuse his own sin by claiming that others are doing the same thing. Each person much be responsible for his own evil-doing.

For his part, the 1650 commentator in 111,22,1 - there is no parallel gloss in 1544 - is anxious to stress that Christians are concerned about all the sins they commit, not just those which
are apparent to others:


We have here in both these quotations a reference to "weltmensch" (1544) and "Weltkinder" (1650), and the way in which both are introduced seems to indicate a distancing of themselves on the part of both commentators from these other people. It is possible in fact to see here evidence of Luther's insistence on a division of mankind into those who belonged to the spiritual kingdom of God, which is ruled by His Word, and those who belonged to the kingdom of the world, which, since its inhabitants are incorrigible, is ruled by the sword. The former must be thought of primarily as a state of mind or of being; it is this alone which distinguishes these people from their fellow-men and women, as Luther explains in his "Heerpredigt wider die Türken" (1529): "So weisz nu, das Christus reich steht nicht ynn essen odder trincken, auch nicht yn eusserlichen geberden, sondern jm glauben des hertzen" (WA 30:2,190-91), adding a Biblical reference to Luke 17.614.

It is also possible to consider the passage in the 1650
gloss, with its implicit identification of the author of himself as one who was not a "Weltkind," as providing further evidence of his allegiance to the Lutheran, virtuous "Old German," anti-courtly trend which Vogt described.

Summary

a) In what sense can the RVA gloss be considered a "Sündenspiegel"? Not, it seems, in terms of the function we have suggested that the glosses, generally speaking, have fulfilled, namely the formulation of precepts or maxims from the events in the narrative text. For the glosses here are concerned with the religious interpretation of these events, so that it is up to the readers here to mirror themselves in the events of the text as interpreted in the glosses, which interpretation amounts to a good deal more than the formulation of precepts.

b) With regard to the connection of the teaching here with other contemporary religious works, we have corroboration of the very close relationship between this RVA gloss in its salvational aspect and other religious works emanating from the Mohnkopf press during the same decade - the "Plenar" of 1492, the psalter of 1493 and Sunte Birgitten openbaringe of 1496.

c) Does not this somewhat morbid teaching of the RVA commentator belie the optimistic attitude to life that we have claimed for him? Not necessarily, for it will be remembered that Aquinas's belief in man's innate bent towards virtue assumed
the necessity for the requisite training, and the teaching given here can be understood as providing just that. It is interesting, too, that Döring-Hirsch considers it was the mendicants who were particularly concerned with preaching about the torments of hell, in order to induce people to live a good life, which provides added evidence for the theory that this RVA author was in fact a friar.

d) In the glosses of RVC 11,7,1-2 and 1544 11,7,3 we have a good example of the contrast between the impersonal approach of the former commentator, who, while agreeing that no one can put the blame on others for his own sins, points in general terms to self-interest and the lack of consideration for one's fellow-men as the root of sin, and the personal approach of the latter, who, after voicing in vivid terms the age-old problem of the righteous man in an unrighteous world, continues with a confession of his faith that God will succour him - which was Luther's view, as we saw - accompanying this with a personal commitment to responsible action that is subject to no outside influence.

e) Both latter commentators in their separate glosses, 11,7,3 and 111,22,1, emphasize the inevitable punishment in the world to come for those who, in the case of the 1544 commentator, follow the crowd and sin with them, and, in the case of the 1650 commentator, consider only those to be sins which are observed by others. In his preface to the Epistle to the Romans Luther deals with the importance of
pure motives in all one's works and ways when he writes: "Wo nu nicht ist freie lust zum guten, da ist des hertzen grund nicht am gesetz Gottes, Da ist denn gewisslich auch sünde und zorn verdienet bey Gott, ob gleich auswendig viel guter werck und erbars leben schein" (WA DB 7,5).

f) There is the possibility that the 1544 commentator particularly may have had in mind here Luther's teaching of the two kingdoms, while the 1650 commentator, in the comparison he makes between Christians and "Weltkinder," may have been thinking of the difference between those people - Lutherans predominantly - who appreciated and lauded the simple virtues of the ancient Germans and those under French and Italian influence - that is, Roman Church influence - who had adopted other values.
Chapter 7.

This first summing-up will bring us back to where we began, namely to an examination of each individual commentator's attitude to the fox-figure, to see how, if at all, these attitudes differ from one another and how any differences there may be reflect the nature of the gloss in question and the status of its author.

**RVA gloss**

Here it is important to bear in mind the way in which this commentator, as the first of the four, deals with the narrative text, his method, that is, of selecting isolated incidents to serve as examples for the points he wishes to make, a way of treating the text which was consonant with both the *bezeichenliches denken* tradition in which he had been trained and also with the trends in current moral didactic literature. This means *ipso facto* that during the course of his commentary the fox will be referred to countless times, mostly as the perpetrator of some foul deed, when he will be described as guilty of deceit or flattery, of treachery or betrayal, of mendacity, of cunning or of pouring scorn on those he has betrayed and ruined, but where he will also be given credit where credit is due, such as refusing to become despondent when things are going badly for him, of taking flight from an angry person and of wisely taking advantage of the example of another's misfortune to avoid the same fate himself, and will also sometimes be represented as the victim of others' malice, as when he is attacked at court in his absence, for
example, and jeered at in his presence on the way to the gallows.

There are also occasions when he becomes an example of the everyday sinner, as one might term it, where in 11,7,2, for instance, we are told that many make light of their sins and then by falling victim to their sensual lusts cannot withstand the temptation to commit a deadly sin, and likewise in 11,6,5, where he becomes the example of a person who makes a false confession by confessing the sins of others rather than his own. In the glosses of 1,18 (2, 3 and 4) the commentator also criticizes those who "ghelyk hir Reynke dede," do not try to avoid temptation and are also guilty of hypocrisy by trying to conceal their sins with a cloak of false saintliness, whose contrition, that is - although they have confessed their sins - is not sincere, since they have not fully renounced their old ways. They resemble in fact the man in the parable (Luke 9,62) who put his hand to the plough and looked back.

To these, excluding the religious ones where there is a degree of interpretation included, I would give the term narrative comments, where Reinke's name occurs more often than that of any other figure only because he happens to be the chief protagonist in the story. What we must concentrate on here are the explicit references to Reinke by the commentator.

First and foremost here in RVA we have the transcendental glosses, which have already been described in some detail and where the commentator's bezeichenliches denken prevails, where Reinke, that is, is represented both as the devil in 1,7,4 and 1,11,4 and as the sinner in 1,14,3 and 4. Then, as a contrast,
there is the representation of Reinke in 11,6,3 as the good father who gives his sons proper instruction before sending them out into the world.

In addition to this, however, we also have occasions where Reinke is treated by this commentator from a purely temporal point of view. The first example of this occurs in the second preface in the section on content (2b), where, as we have already noted, we are told that the story is also about liars and deceivers who injure many by their cunning, as will be shown by the designing fox who injured and caused the ruin of many yet remained in power through his lies and craftiness. The second example occurs in 1,16,1, where, in a reference to 1.1319 of the text: "Wente de hoff mach ane my nicht staen," the commentator declares that in saying this in his subtle, crafty way Reinke meant either that the king could not do without him, or that it is advantageous to the nobles that he is part of the council, or that, whether it is to the advantage of the community (der meenheyt) or not, Reinke should nevertheless be part of the king's council. (This should, one would have thought, have given this commentator an opportunity of accusing Reinke of superbia, but he does not seem to have been able to make this connection.)

Finally, in his last gloss, we have the reference to the fox clan (dat gheschlechte van reynken), that is, of cunning people (dat is der lozen), which is a very large one, whose members, however, know only the wisdom of the world, which is foolishness with God.

There is no doubt, then, that for this commentator the fox-
figure is a negative one, representing for him transcendentially both the devil himself and the hardened sinner and in the here and now both the designing courtier or counsellor and an exponent of the wisdom of the world, which is to be despised. He abominated, in fact, everything that the fox stood for. However, his identification of the fox's wisdom with that of the world seems a trifle sweeping, even though, within the terms of the narrative text, it would appear as if this aberrant type of worldly wisdom - as we have judged this to be - might be considered the norm. But is this really the case? Does the narrative text give us no alternative sense of this term? An examination of the king's final words to Reinke reveal that a distinction is in fact made here:

RVA/RVC (6679-84) 1544 p. CXIII

1k sette yw wedder in alle Ik setz euch wider in alle macht.
yuwe macht. alle macht /
Seet, dat gy yw vor myssedaet Seht das jr für all unthat wacht!
wacht! wacht.
Helpet alle sake tom besten Helfft alle ding zum keren!
besten keren /
De hoff enkan yuwer nicht Der hoff kan ewer nicht entberen.
entberen /
Wan gy yuwe wyszheyt s^ettet Braucht erw welscheyt zur
tor doget, tugent schier /
So is hir nemant bouen yw So ist niemand höher dann vorhöget jhr.
Van scharpeme rade, van Mit scharffem rhat und nauwen vunden
nauwen funden.

1650 pp. 412-13

2.

Oben an will ich euch setzen.

...............
4.
Alles wollte zum Besten kehren /  
Alles Unglück halft zerstören;  
Lebet stets nach eurer Pflicht /  
alsdenn nichts euch gebracht.  
Braucht die Weisheit und auch Tugend /  
denn die zieren eure Jugend.

5.
Denn durch solcher Klugheit Sinnen /  
Könnt ihr alle Gunst gewinnen /  
Darnach trachtet jeder Frist /  
was dem Reich ersprieslich ist:

The RVA commentator here, however, chose to ignore this distinction, between wisdom - albeit the wisdom of this world - used in the service of virtue and that used for the purpose of deception and treachery. We will end here with the parallel textual passages, beginning with that in Reinaert II, which were reduced by Goethe in his Reineke Fuchs to the well-known three lines:

Also machte sich Reineke fort vor allen begünstigt.  
Manche seines Gelichters verstehen dieselbigen Künste;  
Rote Bärte tragen nicht alle; doch sind sie geborgen.416

Reinaert II 7087-14 RVA/RVC 6754-69

Aldus he vanden conync sciet  
Mit scoenre tael myt reynre goanst  
Die noch al kunnen reynarts const  
Sijn wel geloefte ende liefgetal  
Biden heren ouer al  
Jst gheestelic of weerlic staet  
An reynert sluut nv alden raet  
Hi heeft ghlaten een groet geslacht

Aldus scheydede Reynke van dare  
Myt schonen worden unde groter gunst.  
Ja, de sus noch kan Reynkens kunst,  
Syn wol ghehorete unde lieff ghetal  
By den heren ouer al  
Jsset gheystlyck etfe wertlyk stad,  
An Reynken slut nu meyst de rad.  
Reynkens slechte is grod by macht
Die altoes wassen ende
risen in macht
Wie reyers consten nyet
en p1iet
Die en doech nv ter werlt
niert
Jn ghnen staet van machten
gheset
Mer kan hi crupen in sijn
net
Soe weet hi wel watter toe
hoert
Soe rijst hi ende men ende
trecht hem voert
Van reynert is een groot
saet
Ghebleuen dat nv zeer op
gaet
Want men vijnt nv meer
reynairde
Al en hebben si gheen
rode baerde
Dan men ye dede te voeren
Gherechticheit blijft dic
verloren
Trou ende wairheit sijn
verdreuen
Ende daer voir (dafür) is
one ghebleuen
Ghiricheit loesheit ende
nijt
Dese hebbent al in huer
berijt (Bereich)
Si ende hair conynghinne
hoeueerde
Regneren nv seer opter eerde
Jst yns paus of yns keyers
hoff

Unde wasset alle tyd, ya
dach unde nacht.
De Reynkens kunst nicht
heft gheleerd
De is tor werlde nicht
vele werd,
Syn word wert nicht
draden ghehord;

Men myt Reynkens kunst
kumpt mannich vord.
Dar synt vele reynken nu
in der warde

(Wol hebben se nicht al
rode barde)

Also schied Reincken mit grosser gunst /
Und wer noch kan Reinckens kunst.
Der ist al weg der best im spiel /
Wer sie nicht kan / der taug nicht viel.
Jetzt in die welt / das ist ein wort /
Mit Reinckens kunst kumpt mancher fort.

Wer jetzt kann Reinkens Kunst (das ist ein
wahres Wort)
Der bleibt wol in der Welt und kommet sicher fort.
Wer aber wil frey ausz der Welt die Wahrheit sagen / der kan bey Zeiten nur den Leib zu Grabe tragen / Der Fuschsschwanzt ist der Best der gilt wohl in der Welt / Wer den streicht kommt wohl fort / hat er geleich kein Gelt.

The anguished tones of the author of *Reinaert II* are considerably watered down in the RVA version by the omission of ll.7107-12 of the original, assuredly the work of Alckmaer, who approved of the fox, as we saw. Yet the *Reinaert II* original reflects much more accurately, one feels, the attitude of the RVA commentator. Could he have missed the link between the fox and the deadly sin of superbia had he had this *Reinaert II* text in front of him? I think not.

Who was this man? A member of the clergy definitely and almost certainly a Franciscan, a truly religious man who cared deeply for his parishioners, both as regards their social oppression and their souls' salvation, and one who realized at the same time only too well the abuses that had crept into the Church - worldly prelates, concubinage among the clergy at all levels and the pilgrimage mania - also possibly a man who belonged to a group of younger Franciscans who looked askance at the close relationship of their seniors with the crème de la crème of the Lübeck patriciate.

**RVC gloss**

Where his predecessor's emphasis had lain primarily on his transcendental interpretation of Reinke as the embodiment of the
Evil One and of a sinner steeped in wickedness, and, at the very end, of an exponent of the wisdom of the world, this RVC commentator concentrates almost wholly on the here and now. The fact, however, that he takes over the vast majority of his predecessor's glosses, except for the transcendental ones, indicates his basic acceptance of this type of explication, the concentration, that is, on the individual incident as an illustration of a particular point the author of the gloss wishes to make, where, although Reinke appears generally speaking in a bad light, positive interpretations of his actions or attitudes are not ruled out. It is not, however, that this RVC commentator was incapable of independent interpretation, as we saw in 11,5,1 where he refused to accept his predecessor's interpretation of Reinke as a good father, representing him rather as an over-lenient parent in letting his sons have their own way, something he profoundly deplored and roundly condemned.

As far as linking the gloss to the narrative text is concerned, this commentator goes even further here than his predecessor had done, introducing lengthy passages, particularly at the end of Book I (1,39) and during the course of Book III which describe and to some extent interpret the action of the plot. He adds also two long summarizing introductions to Books II and III, which are not present in RVA, including in that to Book II a reference to the fact that here the "Poeta" is giving an account of the abuses of those in authority, both ecclesiastical and temporal, and of their subjects "under Reinke's persone," repeating this explanation in 11,7,3 at the beginning of Reinke's
second confession.

As in RVA, however, it is to the last point in the content section of the second preface, here placed after the six-point summary of the first book and immediately before the commencement of the narrative text, that we must look for this RVC commentator's basic attitude to the fox, which distinguishes him from his predecessor. Here the fox represents for him, namely, the cunning toadies, fawners and sycophants (Spitzhode / Ogendeners und Voszswentzer) who are these days accepted and made welcome at court. He had previously, too, as we saw, referred to Reinke as a rich and cunning usurer in an extended sense, as a person, that is, who is constantly contriving means whereby he can attain greater wealth and thus falls into the snares of the devil, as a result of which he seeks to deceive and injure all those with whom he comes into contact. This, however, is somewhat misleading, as it is power that Reinke is primarily interested in, not acquiring wealth.

The RVC commentator also takes up his predecessor's gloss 1,16,1, where the latter deals with Reinke's declaration that the court cannot exist without him, summarizing in 1,15,1 what his predecessor had said and adding that by Reinke are meant all cunning, perfidious, false, crafty, knavish rogues (hynderlistige/ untruwe / valsche / lose / schalkhafftige / tückisshe menschen) who are otherwise known as hypocrites, flatterers, yes-men, toadies etc. etc. (Heuchler / Smeichler / Glyszner / Jaheren / Spytzhode / Orenklower / Vedderlesers und Leffkoders), people, in other words, who never say what they mean and always trim their
sails to the wind. All sacred and profane writings, he states, bear witness that such people have always been the ruin of princes and nobles, and when the prince is ruined, the whole country has to pay for it. (This passage is based on one from the Franck/Erasmus Moria.)

This is a long gloss and in the course of it the commentator also remarks that nowadays, because this false foxy type of fellow is usually at the helm (dewyle nu desse valsche Reynkens arth / gemeinlich regeret), the princes have power in name only, and worthy servants are pushed aside. In corroboration of this the commentator adds a passage from Schwarzenberg's "Memorial der Tugend," the words being put into the mouth of a prince, where the latter states that he wants only to hear what pleases him, including praise for his misdeeds; anyone who desires to tell him the truth will fall into disfavour.

Towards the end of this gloss the commentator returns to Reinke's statement that he gives the king the best counsel - presumably this is a reference to the line "Alle de rad slut meyst an my" (1329) - remarking that there is more truth to this claim than one could wish for, and continuing with a delicately-worded statement, which might or might not refer to the story, to the effect that this will be apparent to everyone who thinks back a little and reflects how well things have worked out as a result of Reinke's counsel. To give an example of this would cause only envy and disfavour, he states, since truth is seldom tolerated. The commentator then brings the gloss to a close with lines by Morsheim describing how such a courtier thinks only of himself, no
matter how many people perish in the process, even if it is the ruler himself.

This gloss serves to emphasize in its two references to truth - the first in the Schwarzenberg quotation, the second in his own words - the importance this held for the RVC commentator, and truth is, of course, the absolute opposite of all Reinke stood for with his hypocrisy, his flattery, his deceit and his lying.

The RVA comments of 1,18 have been described above, where the fox is called to account, that is, for his failure to try to avoid temptation and for his sanctimoniousness in pretending to be praying for the souls of the hens and geese he had slain, and for his false contrition, since has had not forsaken his old ways. Here the RVC commentator refers rather to the fox's hypocrisy, knavery and wickedness (de grote heuchelye / schalckheit und boszheit) in going towards the nunnery and his "untruwe list" in pretending he was praying for the souls of the hens and geese. He does, however, take over the whole of his predecessor's gloss with regard to those who confess their sins but lack contrition, including the Luke quotation, adding, however, "dann art leth von arde nicht," so there is no way that Reinke can forgo his knavish tricks.

A further reference to the fox, which is also independent of RVA, is to be found in 1,25,2, where the cunning way in which the fox (here it is Reinke's father) erases his footprints with his tail and his mouth is likened to false people who manage to conceal their actions, however dishonourable these may be, so that others will not detect their deceitful intentions. In his
summarizing introduction to Book IV, also, he remarks: "Auerst de bössinige Reynke / durch syne angebarne hinderlist / vorsnelt und vorfordelt (betrügt und übervorteilt)..den Wulf ym Kampe / und behold dat veldt."

Finally, following up in IV,11,1 on his predecessor’s remarks in IV,10,1 concerning the fox’s clan being that of cunning people (der lozen) - he omits the Biblical reference to the wisdom of the world - this commentator expands this description to include all crafty, perfidious and cunning sycophants who are to be found everywhere in superfluity these days, particularly at court and in the government, such people, since they are considered experienced and sharp-witted, being usually the ones to gain promotion.

To sum up, what we have here therefore is an author whose feet were firmly planted in the temporal world. If his predecessor had abominated everything Reinke stood for on a religious level, as he interpreted this, and as the embodiment of the wisdom of the world, as he chose to define this, the RVC commentator relates Reinke’s conduct and way of life solely to the current emergence of this foxy type of individual in the seats of power, a fact he profoundly deplores. For him, whose watchword is truth, there is no room for "desse valsche Reynkens arth," which kind of people, in addition to their deceit and cunning, consider only their own interest, never the common good - another matter of great importance for this commentator, as we have seen. He does not seem prepared to give any consideration at all to the fact that such skills, such worldly wisdom as the fox possessed, might be used for good.
Who was this author? It is even more difficult to come to a conclusion here, since so much of his work consists of compilation, albeit of works where the opinions expressed are ones with which one must presume he was in sympathy, although in this respect one must also bear in mind his habit of recording contrasting views and observations. However, the increasing number of what appear to be original entries towards the end of the work reveal a man sincerely concerned about the problems of his day, about which he could write with clarity and understanding. As far as his religious views are concerned, Baucke's remark that this gloss is "mehr antikatholisch als ausgesprochen protestantisch," has more than a grain of truth in it, as we shall be discussing later. He appears to have had a good knowledge of Luther's anti-Papal, anti-episcopal tract of 1522, "Wider den falsch genannten geistlichen Stand," as his gloss shows, likewise of Hutten's Die Römische Dreifaltigkeit, from which he quotes in his glosses of 11,9 with attribution. For the rest, the way in which he often states more than one point of view, as, for example, with regard to the Fortuna theme, give the impression of a man who, although he had totally abandoned the teaching of the Roman Church, cannot on the other hand be considered a committed Lutheran. Luther's doctrine concerning the divine ordination of temporal authority he had, however, accepted totally, as is immediately apparent at the beginning of the work in his glosses of 1,1.

Was this author Ludwig Dietz? I find it difficult myself to understand why a printer, even one of Dietz's undoubted eminence,
would have been so concerned with governmental matters. Schafferus, as we have seen, plays down the "Fürstenspiegel" element in this gloss, considering that it is built into the narrative text, as it were, and that "die Ausweisung der Gedanken durch Unterstreichungen, Verdeutlichungen, durch Beispiele in Versen und Prosa geht nicht über das für die jüngere Glosse charakterische Mass hinaus."\(^{20}\) This I find impossible to accept, and it is on account of what I feel to be the predominance of this element in the gloss as a whole that I consider it must have been written by someone who had experienced for himself conditions at court and in government and the havoc wrought there by hypocritical, self-interested, cunning flatterers.\(^{21}\)

Furthermore, this RVC commentator is referred to by the author of the 1544 gloss in his preface as "mein besonder bekandter freundt," which appears to betoken someone from his own station in life, and the author of this latter gloss was most assuredly no printer.

**1544 gloss**

The fundamentally close connection between the 1498 and 1539 glosses has already been established, how, that is, the RVC commentator, while admittedly adding to his gloss an enormous amount of illustrative material and also sometimes introducing some undoubtedly tangential topics, nevertheless takes over the vast majority of his predecessor's basic comments, maintaining and even expanding the close connection between narrative text and gloss.

With the 1544 gloss, however, we have a different picture,
and a break with the previous method of interpretation becomes evident. This break is effected in two ways. In the first place there an even greater fractionating of the text, so that in this gloss it is often individual remarks, rather than incidents, that are commented upon, which leads to a much looser connection between the events in the narrative text and the gloss, and references to the protagonists in the story are in fact comparatively few and far between. For this approach this commentator had of course prepared us in his preface, where he writes that in his gloss he has been at pains to encourage his readers to reflect on the text for themselves and note down their comments, by giving them an illustration of how to do this, rather than to write a commentary on the story. As far as his fractionation of the text is concerned, from 11,9 to 14,10 in the majority of the chapter-glosses he adds numbers to the beginning or alternatively to the end of lines in the narrative text on the verso/recto pages respectively, to which the points he makes in his gloss refer. One example will suffice. To a line in Book III, chap 1, where Reinke says to Grimbart: "Ich dank euch freundt / für guten trost" the number "5" is noted at the end of the line, the corresponding gloss reading: "Zum fünfften / Dienet einer offt einem mit getrewem Rhat oder gutem trost / soviel als mit gelt oder gut..."

Secondly, this commentator's glosses often comprise or include illustrations from his personal experience or at any rate direct reference to the everyday world in which he was living, so that what he writes has an urgency that is mostly lacking in the
glosses of his two predecessors. This also leads him sometimes to give interpretations different from those he found in his source or to add to these.

An example of the latter is in 1,15,1 where he takes over his predecessor's remarks with regard to Reinke's claim that the court cannot do without him, following this, as in RVC, with a comparison of Reinke with the cunning, false flatterers etc. etc. who have no interest in the common good, and who usually edge out the worthy counsellors and eventually cause the ruin of the country. He adds here, however, a human note, namely that a ruler should have regard for his heirs and successors, who will find it difficult to take over a government where such people hold the reins of power, "denn Reinicke musz der fürnehmste Rhat / sein und bleiben. Aber die Oberkeit thut warlich jnen [den getreuen Räten] und jren eigenen kindern / sampt jren leuten schaden damit." He then adds in 1,15,2 an original gloss: "Sihet man wie die selben heuchelrhaté / jre förschlage und angeben schmucken können / wie hie Reincken thut."

Most interesting, however, are the different interpretations he gives to the text, in many cases providing or restoring the religious element that was lacking in RVC. His predecessor's gloss 1,25,2, for example, where this commentator had linked the way in which the fox, Reinke's father, had concealed his footprints with people anxious to conceal their evil intentions, he rejects, remarking instead: everyone knows how to conceal his wickedness, as the fox his footprints, but there is always some small sign. As the saying is, he continues, the devil cannot
disguise himself entirely, he must keep either his foot or his tail. If one pays close attention, he goes on, a lie is seldom so good that it is completely watertight (wenn einer vleissig drauff merckt / ist selten ein luge so gut / sie hinckt.)

Still on the religious level, this commentator's glosses of 1,18 have a special interest, the first providing a different interpretation from that in RVC, the second agreeing with that of his predecessor, the third providing an isolated comment of his own. The first of these, where the RVC commentator in 1,18,2 had regarded Reinke's determination to go out of his way to pass by the nunnery as rather an illustration of his rascality and hypocrisy than of the sin of not making any attempt to avoid falling into temptation, as in RVA 1,18,2, this 1544 commentator in 1,18,2 uses the incident as the basis for his long gloss criticizing his contemporaries who do not show their faith in their works, which we have already considered. "Aber der glaub lest sich doch endlich sehen," he writes, "wie hie am Fuchsz." In 1,18,5 he takes over his predecessors' interpretation of Reinke's looking back towards the nunnery as the conduct of an unrepentant sinner, together with the Luke quotation. In 1,18,4, however, he adds another comment of his own regarding Reinke's growing agitation as he approaches the court:

das ists / das ich ietz gesagt / das wir alle stark im glauben sind / haben alle mit haufen gute werck gethan / sind alle frumb / dieweil kein angst / not / oder anfechtung furhanden / wenn aber die zuge kommen / so sehe ein jeder drauff / so find sichs.

Two further glosses remain which deal with temporal matters:
the one of 11,9,13 where this commentator remarks baldly that anyone can see that "das Fuchs- und Affengeschlecht grosz sei in aller welt," so that no more need be said about it, the second the gloss of IV,12,2, which we have already considered, where he states that anyone who wants to get on in the world must have Reinke's skills, adding a rider to the effect that falseness and deceit should not be connected with these skills.

What then was this commentator's attitude to the fox? Succinctly one can say that, as with the other two commentators, the fox represented for him all that he detested most in mankind: in the temporal world the flatterers and hypocrites who surround a ruler, and on the religious level, the false penitent who lacks true contrition and whose professed faith does not stand the test. Or so it seems. What, then, are we to make of the gloss IV,12,2, where he speaks seemingly with approval of "Reinkens kunst"? The solution here must surely lie in the words of the king to Reinke in the narrative text of the previous chapter, where, in this edition, the king states: "Braucht ewr weiszheyt zur tugent schier / So ist niemand hoher dann ihr. / Mit scharffem rhat und spitzen funden." This commentator must in fact have had in mind someone like the chancellor whose praises he had sung and whose virtues he had dwelt on with such enthusiasm in 1,37,4, a regenerated Reinke, that is, one who will use his worldly wisdom and skills to good effect without falseness and deceit.

Who was this man? As we have already noted, the suggestion that he was Michael Beuther stemmed originally from Hartmann Schoppers's statement at the beginning of his 1567 Latin
translation of the 1544 narrative text and gloss that he thought Beuther was the author of both.\textsuperscript{22} Prien challenged this, as we saw, and Menke by and large accepted his findings, remarking however, vis à vis Prien's charge of excessive timidity on the part of this commentator with regard to his desire to remain anonymous, that this anxiety should rather be attributed to the typical "Autorenängstlichkeit" of the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{23}

However, even if one admits to a certain timidity, or what appears as such, in this commentator's preface - where, for example, he states that he has moderated, altered or left out the more vehement (geschwind) glosses of his predecessor in order to avoid giving offence (ergernis zu vermeiden) - this belies the tone of some of his chapter-glosses. We have only to think of his remarks concerning the justice system in 111,2,17, for example, where he criticizes the "scharffe fragen" directed against accused persons and the fact that many innocent people confess under "die grosse marter," declaring that if a man loses his life as a result of this, the judge should lose his head. Likewise we have his criticism in 1,18,2, as we have just seen, of those who protest too much concerning their faith but show in their deeds the true situation.

Prien contented himself primarily with providing external evidence - Beuther's youthfulness at the time of writing and the tone of his other works - to support his claim that he could not have written this gloss. For me, however, internal evidence weighs a great deal more, and I find it difficult to believe that this is the work of the brilliant scholar, the budding academic
that Beuther was at this time. From his writing I myself picture a well-educated man in the Humanist tradition with some training in and considerable experience of the law, a man moreover who, in his insistence on the consideration of motivation in legal cases, showed considerable psychological insight. (We have already established that in the part of the country where he worked Roman law appeared to have taken over from customary law.) It is perhaps noteworthy that he omits any reference to attorneys or notaries in his gloss, which may suggest he was employed in one or other of these capacities. His detailed knowledge of Luther's tenets concerning temporal authority, his specific references to what a ruler should be prepared to correct - in economic matters, for example, the practice of "Vorkauf" (11,4,13) - or to punish - all publicly-committed crime (11,1,6; 11,3,5) - his jumping to the defence of rulers (Herrn / Fürsten / König und andere Potentaten) with regard to their recreational activities, which he justifies on account of the heavy responsibilities they bear (11,1,3), his enthusiastic praise of the "good" chancellor (1,37,4), and, finally, his pity for the courtiers (IV,10,3) seem to point to a man who was employed at court, where, as we know, the administrative and judicial functions were, in most regions, not yet separated.

One pictures him, in fact, as one of those men from the ranks of the bourgeoisie, who, having enjoyed the benefits of a Humanist education, were seeking employment in rulers' courts in increasing numbers, men whom Luther had prophetically described in his "Kinder zur Schule halten" (1530). Menke's remark that this
author "gehörte ohne Zweifel zum zeittypischen Kreis der schriftstellernden humanistischen Gelehrten" is in my opinion far too narrow a description of a man who had his feet so firmly planted in the everyday rather than in the academic world. He had an undoubted love of proverbial sayings, which can also be ascribed to Humanist influence - the Humanists set great store by these, the practice of using which had of course been widespread throughout the Middle Ages - but to speak as Menke does of "sein mit zahlreichen lateinischen Proverbien bestückter Glossenkommentar" is nevertheless an exaggeration.

Referring to the RVC commentator, Schafferus remarks on "die Gebundenheit des Geistes, in welcher der mittelalterlicher Mensch nicht wagt, eigene Gedanken oder wenigstens allgemein herrschende Gedanken in persönlicher Form zu bringen, sonder in mühseliger Arbeit die Ideen der Autoritäten zusammenliest." Taking it for granted that all entries in the RVC gloss that have not been found to derive from unattributed sources are the commentator's own, I find this remark disputable even in the case of the author of this gloss. For the rest, it only goes to provide further evidence of the new spirit that this 1544 commentator breathed into his work, for this gloss constitutes the personal confession of faith of a sincerely religious man, one who, moreover, understood the meaning of individual responsibility not only in matters of faith but in his whole way of life.

1650 gloss

If it has been possible in at least the first two glosses, RVA and RVC, to provide a definite picture of what the fox-figure
meant to the individual commentators and as regards the 1544 edition to come to some kind of a compromise in this respect, this commentator's attitude remains something of a conundrum owing primarily to his allegorizing tendencies. The borderline, that is, between Reinke the animal and the type of man he represents sometimes becomes blurred.

As far as his attitude to the narrative text is concerned, he goes some way towards restoring the close connection between this and the commentary, something which, as we saw, was lacking in the 1544 edition. We must therefore expect on the one hand the same ambivalent attitude towards the fox in the narrative comments and on the other a commentary which will not follow that in RVA/RVC (except through 1544) since he did not have access to the first two editions. As regards content, however, he does take over much of his predecessor's material, as we have seen, particularly those glosses concerned with religion.

As an example of his even more pronouncedly ambivalent attitude to the fox-figure in a basically narrative comment we have the quite extraordinary gloss 1,15,3. Here, having in his narrative text given us eight stanzas in which Reinke declaims and proclaims "mit keck-vol-gutem Muthe" if not his innocence then at least the comparatively paltry nature of his crime, this commentator remarks: "Zum dritten haben wir an Reinken ein Exempel guter Zuversicht und kekken Muthes etc." going on to compare this attitude on the part of Reinke with Luther's and with St. Paul's in Jerusalem (Acts 21,13), who were both ready to die for Christ! In this same connection we have also the reference
to the "wunderliche Natur" of the fox on account of his plucky and spirited attitude on his way to the gallows (1,20,3), which passage has already been reproduced in full.

At the beginning of the work - it is not repeated subsequently - this commentator also on two occasions compares the fox with the devil. The second of these in 1,7,1, we have already considered, where the comparison is made, that is, between the fox and the devil, both of whom strive to take a person captive by their eloquence, observing carefully how people can best be tempted and then describing these things to them, so that they can the more easily be overcome. In 1,4,1, too, in an extension of the general admonition that runs through all four glosses not to leave a safe place for the purpose of enjoying oneself, this commentator refers to "der hellische Fuchs, der Teufel," who will snatch away the souls of such people and lead them to eternal death.

Generally speaking, however, he seems inclined to apply terms such as "listige Füchse" and "rothe Füchse" to groups of people he has no use for, such as the "listige Füchse dieser Welt, dasz ist der gottlosen," who will not listen to the clergy (1,12,3) and "die rothen Füchse," who will always preach the kind of sermon that a ruler likes to hear (1,31,2). Then, in 1,21,2, after the words "aber bey diesen Zeiten ist es so weit gekommen / wer Geld und Gunst hat / der kan thun und treiben was er wil," he refers to the fact that "die rothen Füchse können die Hertzen der Menschen bald endern," where he appears to be applying this term to those who manage to get the law twisted in their favour by the
use of their position or money.

In a parallel gloss to 1544 1,25,2 with regard to father fox wiping away his footprints, this commentator in 1,23,2 compares such people to the "Weltkinder" who know how to gloss over and explain away their actions, however evil or foolish these may have been, presumably meaning here, as we have noted with regard to III,22,1, those who have no real faith. Alternatively, as we saw with this last gloss, this might have been an implicit attack on a worldliness, a worldly attitude to life, that was completely at odds with the sincerity and truthfulness of the Old Germans which he valued so highly.

In an isolated gloss, III,16,5, this commentator launches into a description of the nature of the fox - this constitutes a commentary on the she-ape’s instructions to Reinke as to how he should conduct himself in his duel with the wolf - in which he relates comments concerning the fox which one identifies in the first instance with Physiologus, how, that is, he lies down and pretends to be dead in order to trick the birds and also other stories of the fox’s cleverness, mostly from folklore. He ends with the words: "Billig aber verwundern wir uns über die Natur / die zuweilen in einem solchen unvernunftigen Thier scharfsinniger und auf ihren Vorteil klüger ist / denn ein Mensche."

In the final analysis, however, we have to come to the conclusion that, as was certainly the case with the RVC commentator, the fox represents for him the evil influence now apparent at court everywhere. In 1,15,4, for example, the gloss where his two predecessors had agreed that by Reinke are meant all
the cunning, perfidious, false flatterers etc. etc., this commentator also confirms how Reinke, although he himself was one of them, was complaining here about the state of affairs at court and about the innumerable "Fuchsschwanter / Verleumbder und untruwe Rathgeber." For this reason, he declares, "komme es / dass es so gar verkehrt / verwirrt und unrechtfertig daher gehe." This he follows with a reference to recent events in England and the resultant spilling of the king's blood there, and then echoes his predecessor's remarks concerning such persons ruining the country and the people, since they do not care about the common good but oppress the people under them to the greatest degree possible. He goes on to urge the nobles and princes to take the government into their own hands, trust loyal counsellors and get rid of the others, quoting examples from Roman and recent German history where rulers had known how to treat such people, and lamenting that it was unlikely that such a thing could happen in his day.

At the end of the work, too, this commentator appears to be subscribing to the view of the RVC commentator with regard to the fox when he writes in his last gloss of III,22 (IV,12 in the other editions) in a comment on the lines of the text quoted earlier

Vors Funffte

Wer heuchlen und Fuszschwentzen kan /
Der ist der Welt der beste Mann.

Who was the author of this commentary? A member of the Lutheran clergy assuredly and almost certainly a member also of
the "Pegnitz Schäfer" and probably of the "Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft" as well. J.M. Moscherosch, whose Gesichte Philander von Sittewald he draws on with increasing frequency to illustrate his commentary in Books II and III, was also a member of both societies. Posca considers from his vocabulary that this commentator was of North German origin, coming probably from the southern part of this general area, from the region, that is, bordered by Hannover and Braunschweig to the north and the Westphalian border to the south. Why this work should have been printed in Rostock it is difficult to say, unless the author was resident in Mecklenburg at the time; it would appear to have had no connection whatsoever with the original appearance there of the 1539 gloss, of which he seems to have had no knowledge at all. Despite the ravages wrought by the Thirty Years War in Mecklenburg as a whole, which served as an assembly point for the Swedish troops travelling to and fro through the port of Wismar and which suffered horrendous atrocities inflicted by both sides in the war, Rostock itself had remained comparatively untouched by this and functioned in fact as a place of refuge for people fleeing their homes in other parts of the duchy, so that the printing presses there would have remained intact. The many references to the war which we have noted in this gloss - and these are only a portion of the total number - appear to indicate an author who had had personal experience of the suffering it had inflicted.

As far as his general attitude is concerned, this commentator fits quite easily into the pattern of those Lutherans who believed in the values of the Old Germans, as they imagined these to have
been - his love of proverbs and proverbial sayings fits in here, too - and who were filled with horror at the French and Spanish influence permeating Germany, the former with regard chiefly to language and clothing (of this there is no trace in the gloss except for his one disparaging reference to the necessity for courtiers to be able to speak French), the latter with regard to court life and the attitude towards the ruler. Any attempt to put a name to this man would obviously require more minute research than has been possible in a survey of this kind.

Final Summary

With regard to the way in which the glosses reflect the cultural history of the period in which they were written, we have traced here the influence on the commentators of didactic literature, of Humanism and of Luther - to name the three principal sources - which influences are reflected to a greater or lesser degree in the individual glosses.

Beginning with Humanism, we noted the revival of interest in the "Fürstenspiegel" by Humanists such as Aeneas Silvius, who stressed the importance of a knowledge of classical writings for a ruler, condemning those of scholastics such as Aquinas, and also by Erasmus, who, while embodying much material from classical sources in his treatise, nevertheless stressed most positively the importance of Christian principles for a ruler and also that he should constantly have the common good of his subjects in mind. The "Fürstenspiegel" element we found at its most pronounced in the RVC gloss. In the 1544 gloss it was both more generalized - here was a commentator who, under Lutheran influence, was thinking
more in terms of all kinds of authority than exclusively of princes and nobles - and more paternalistic. In the 1650 gloss this paternalistic element appeared to be intensified, which can be seen as typical of a writer who was combatting the encroaching influence of a Romance culture with different values and a contrasting attitude towards the role and responsibilities of a ruler. The RVA commentator, on the other hand, who, as we have seen, adhered the closest to the narrative text in his remarks, and who, moreover, was an inhabitant of a free city rather than of a principality, was concerned primarily with the ruler qua judge. The "curial" element, too - revived most recently, as we saw, in Hutten's dialogue - is present in all glosses, again with the exception of RVA, most comprehensively in RVC, the two latter commentators emphasizing especially the precariousness of a courtier's life.

With regard to the influence of Humanism on the content of the glosses, we noted with regard to friendship the emphasis of a Humanist nature put upon this by the RVC and 1650 commentators. The other two by contrast appeared to a great extent unaffected by this influence, the RVA commentator confining himself to strict interpretation of the text, the 1544 commentator emphasizing the simple attributes of friendship. Emphasis on the deeds and high moral standards of the ancient Germans we noted also in RVC, though not in support of the customary nationalistic purposes of the Humanists, but rather in order to contrast these virtues with the vices of the Germans of his day. Here he introduced an element of "Zeitklage," which, as we saw, was a characteristic of
didactic literature. This same "Zeitklage" element, however, which is also in evidence in the 1650 gloss, can nevertheless be considered there as typical of the trend in baroque writing with which we have identified this commentator, one which stressed the contrast between the simple, virtuous ancient Germans and their false and insincere seventeenth-century counterparts. The treatment that the three later commentators - RVC, 1544 and 1650 - gave to the "Tugend" versus "Geburtsadel" theme - which, too, was age-old, as we saw, but had been recently revived by the Humanists - was also in line with Humanist thought.

The way in which the Fortuna theme is handled by the three later commentators - another topic beloved of the Humanists, as we saw - is extremely interesting, for here in none of these glosses do we observe the reflection of what has come to be accepted as the true Humanist attitude to the goddess Fortuna - south of the Alps at any rate - that of challenging and standing up to her, namely, throwing caution to the winds. Of the two German Humanist poets, Celtis and Hutten, we saw that the former came closest to this, while Hutten had difficulty reconciling the roles played here by God and Fortuna. Of the commentators it is once again the author of RVC who gives us the most comprehensive coverage of this theme, reproducing more than one point of view, namely that of the precariousness of fortune, coupled with the wheel-of-fortune motif, as also Luther's view of God's omnipotence here and the necessity for complete submission to His will. The view that Fortune helps the bold - a variant, of course, of the attitude that Fortuna should be challenged - introduced both in
the narrative text and, incidentally, in RVC in a quotation from the Alten Weisen in another connection (11,4,3), this RVC commentator nevertheless categorically denies later in a passage from Agricola (III,1,2), the 1544 commentator being in agreement here. Humanist influence on this latter commentator in this respect would in fact appear to have been completely lacking. He seems, by contrast, to be obsessed by the ups and downs of fortune in his personal life, prescribing keeping on good terms with everybody as the most reliable defence against Fortuna's slings and arrows. His cautious attitude here would seem to owe most to the influence of didactic literature, where the emphasis was on caution rather than taking risks, as we saw. As far as the 1650 commentator is concerned, it would seem that, as a Lutheran pastor, his belief in God's omnipotence must be taken for granted, although it is nowhere explicitly stated. The similes he used for the precariousness of fortune were also, as we observed, natural phenomena.

In the field of religion also we have Humanist views represented, exclusively in the RVC gloss through the extracts from the Franck/Erasmus Moria. Here the criticism that Erasmus makes of the use of the ban by the ecclesiastical authorities, for example, of indulgences, pilgrimages and veneration of the saints and particularly of the members of the religious orders was typical of the Humanist attitude which sought to point out the abuses in these areas without going so far as to challenge either the practices on the theological level or the existence of the religious orders on the same basis.
So far we have considered the influence of Humanism on content. Now we must turn to its influence on intent, which is pronounced, although in entirely different ways, in both the RVC and 1544 glosses. The whole format of the former gloss can in fact be considered typical of this period. In the same way in which Eyb, for example, in his Margarita (1472) — generally considered to be typical of the "Beispielsammlungen" of the period — introduced to his South German contemporaries the best examples, as he judged these to be, of the work of Latin poets and prose-writers, so the RVC commentator introduced to North German readers — albeit with different motives — and later, as we saw, to those in Scandinavia a whole range of High German writing with which they were not previously familiar. As far as the 1544 commentator is concerned, we noted the Humanist influence in his pejorative references in his preface to schoolmen and in his desire to seek approbation for his work from the average reader rather than from them, as also in his fresh and original approach to his work and in his encouragement of his readers to follow his example and make notations of their own on the narrative text.

Lutheran influence, which is particularly noticeable, as one would expect, in the two middle glosses — RVC of 1539 and the 1544 gloss — can be observed in the former in three particular areas: that of political theory, as one might term it, where this commentator affirms wholeheartedly Luther's teaching with regard to the divine institution of temporal authority and its function in the world; in that of economics, where he follows Luther's criticism regarding the import of luxury goods, of merchandizing
in general, of monopolies, of usury and of the practice of "zinskauff," and, to a lesser extent, in the area of religion. With regard to the last-mentioned, this commentator's attitude displays more negative elements than positive ones. He is chiefly concerned here, it seems, to follow Luther's denunciation of the Roman Church and its practices and the conduct of the bishops, rather than to affirm the positive aspects of Luther's teaching, although he does, of course, present this with regard to confession, indulgences, pilgrimages and veneration of the saints and, above all, to clerical marriage, while being apparently unaware of his teaching on the ban. He also affirms Luther's denial of a Scriptural basis for monasticism and, through Schwarzenberg, endorses much of what Luther had to say on the subject of nuns.

Nevertheless, as far as Luther's more abstract, dogmatic religious teaching is concerned, this RVC commentator would not appear to have accepted fully that of patient endurance under oppression and persecution, and we have already noted his ambivalence with regard to Fortuna. As far as Luther's emphasis on love of one's fellow-man is concerned, this commentator appears here to combine this with an insistence on consideration of the common good, a concept derived most probably from Erasmus, if not directly from Cicero - of Humanist provenance in other words.

Although only five years separate the first printing of the RVC gloss and that of 1544, they appear to be worlds apart, as we have already noted in other connections, and the same applies here with regard to Luther's teaching. One reason for this is probably
that the former gloss was written by an older man in a religio-political situation that was far from stable, where, that is to say, the Roman Church and its supporters still posed something of a threat to the Lutherans and where, too, the full extent of Lutheran teaching was not so widely disseminated, whereas the latter was the work of a younger man who appears to have been reared in a Lutheran environment. Although the 1544 commentator's affirmation of Luther's political theory was even more emphatic than that of his predecessor - he reveals, as we saw, a good knowledge of the three most important of Luther's tracts in this area - his remarks concerning bishops, the evils of usury and of "Vorkauf," while similarly vehement, are by comparison with his predecessor very short. An interesting contrast is also provided by the two commentators' treatment of clerical marriage. Where the former is content to trace the historical background here, the latter prefers to bring the question into a more realistic and contemporary setting, launching into a defence of this practice on physiological grounds while at the same time stressing the economic plight of married Lutheran pastors.

With regard to Lutheran dogma, there is no doubt that this 1544 commentator had accepted and understood fully the doctrine of justification by faith and what should be the proper fruits of this, namely that a person must show in his deeds and his way of life what sort of faith he has. Where people do not lead virtuous lives, that is, there can be no true faith, only hypocrisy. Likewise we have this commentator's conviction of the
necessity for personal responsibility both in the profession of one's faith and in all undertakings - his excoriation of the Roman priest for agreeing to introduce Lutheran practices into the church services just because the lord of the manor instructed him to do so is an instance of this - and his belief also both that God will provide for the righteous man and in the necessity for endurance under oppression.

All this makes this commentator's apparent failure to accept complete submission to the will of God when it was a question of his personal fate all the more remarkable. Whether this denotes outright rejection of Luther's teaching here, a denial of free-will, that is, is questionable. It may be an illustration of a general lack of knowledge and understanding of this tenet - although theologically a vital one - outside theological circles. For the rest, his entries concerning confession - indulgences he does not seem too clear about - pilgrimages and veneration of the saints follow Lutheran lines, as one would expect, and this portion of his gloss is reproduced, as we saw, by the 1650 commentator with no alteration of the basic content, only elucidation here and there of his predecessor's somewhat elliptical expression of his views and the addition of stylistic features common to baroque literature.

With regard to society, all commentators subscribe to the "Ordo-Gedanke," the unalterable division of society into classes, that is, as did Luther also, both the RVC and 1544 commentators lamenting the apparent breach made in this by the indulgence of the nobility in commercial enterprises not befitting their station
in life, the RVC commentator stressing in addition the threat that the increase in importance of the merchants posed to this ordered society. With regard to women, however, only the 1544 commentator shows the influence of both Humanism and of Luther in his attitude. While the RVA commentator here, following the teaching of the Roman Church, presents women as in all respects inferior to men and frivolous beings to boot, an attitude reflected also by the RVC commentator, the author of the 1544 gloss, while by no means denying the subservient role of women in the marriage relationship and in society generally, nevertheless goes out of his way to emphasize the role and responsibilities of the husband in the marriage relationship, while his praise of the family where parents and children share their joys and sorrows is reminiscent of Eyb's treatise. After this it is somewhat of a shock to return to the largely pejorative attitude of the 1650 commentator, balanced, it is true, by a more amiable description of womankind (III,7,1) provided by the book of Ecclesiasticus.

So far the RVA commentator has not figured very largely in this summary, not surprisingly when one considers that he was subject to neither of the influences we have considered up to now. After the Reformation there was no acceptance any more of what we have called the salvational teaching of this gloss - the emphasis, that is, on fire and brimstone, on the pains of hell and on the eternal damnation in store for the impenitent and the unshriven - although the view of the devil's basic function in the world remained the same, as we have seen, and the temptations offered by the 'world, the flesh and the devil were as real for Luther (WA
6,225) as they were for the RVA commentator (1,18,1). We have noted, too, the similarity of this salvational teaching with that contained in other religious publications emanating from the same press in Lübeck in the same decade, and have also judged this commentator to be representative of the concerned clergy and in fact of all thinking people of his time, critical, that is, of the pilgrimage mania, critical most probably - since he fails to mention them - of the abuse of indulgences, critical above all of the immorality of the clergy generally, by which they were setting a bad example to the laity, critical also of the avarice of the bishops and of the simony, the bribery and the corruption generally that prevailed in Rome at the Papal court and in the Curia. For the rest, his teaching with regard to confession and the ban accords with the Roman Church practice at that time.

We must turn now to the one influence which is present to a predominating degree of all the first three glosses, namely that of didactic literature. This is reflected, of course, in both the "Standespiegel" and above all the "Sittenspiegel" elements of the glosses, the former element virtually lacking from all except the RVC gloss, where the commentator does his best to include it by mentioning in his gloss professions and occupations which hardly figure in the narrative text if at all. With regard to the "Sittenspiegel" element, however, we considered that the commentators here, beginning with the author of the RVA gloss - here himself obviously influenced by Alckmaer - fulfil the function of formulating maxims from the events in the narrative text. We noted also that the content of these maxims were,
generally speaking, of a nature which Könneker has described as typical of the didactic literature of this era, some of them to be expressly confirmed later by Luther.

Although we have made the distinction between Humanism and didactic literature, considering particularly the influence of the former on both the content of the glosses and on the intent of the commentator, the point has also been made that much of the didactic literature of the period was in fact written by men with a Humanist training and background. This brings us to the criticism of the glosses made in recent years by, for example, Kokott with regard to the fractionation in RVA and by Menke with regard to the 1544 gloss who deplores the fact that there was no attempt made by the commentator to present a unified interpretation of his text. This appears to me, however, to be expecting sixteenth-century writers to produce a twentieth century type of interpretation, one for which there was no precedent whatsoever in the didactic writing of the period. In addition, with regard to the RVA commentator, there was his bezeichenliches denken, the four-fold Scriptural interpretation method, in which he had obviously been trained, to reinforce this approach on his part. Nanninga, as we saw, sought to prove Nominalist influence on the authors of late mediaeval epics, including Reynke de vos, and Könneker also observed a correspondence between the emphasis on specifics, which was a feature of this philosophical system, and a similar emphasis in didactic literature. Be this as it may, the influence of this type of fractionated interpretation on the RV commentators was inescapable.
So far we have had to isolate the RVA gloss as representative, to some extent, of a different culture, a pre-Reformation culture. The 1650 gloss stands in similar isolation, in this case as a work to which sixteenth century cultural standards no longer apply. Since my aim here has been a comparison of the four glosses, the points raised have very largely centred on topics where such a comparison can be made. The allegorizing tendency of this 1650 commentator, which is to a great extent the hallmark of his gloss, has only been given illustration here and there. His longest gloss (III.8), for instance, covers the four Aesop fables which Reinke claimed were to be found engraved on the frame of the "lost" mirror, where, in illustration of the first fable concerning envy, this commentator refers in covert fashion through allegory to events in the war just ended. Allegory of this type was, of course, a feature of the "Schäferdichtung" of the period. For the rest, we have noted along the way instances of his use of typical baroque stylistic devices such as "Häufung," and the use of emblems, as well as the rhetorical device of providing multiple illustrations of points he particularly wants to emphasize. There is also continuing Humanist influence in his attitude to friendship.

Turning now to the most important inter-related topics dealt with by all four commentators, namely their respective attitudes to the fox, to wisdom and to the world at large, we have already noted that, while the author of RVC and the 1650 gloss have a pessimistic attitude, those of RVA and the 1544 gloss are predominantly optimistic. Whence do these attitudes stem?
Taking the \textit{RVC} gloss first, we have found this commentator's pessimism to be all-pervasive, not only in his direct references to the world as an evil place, some of which were vivid, as we saw, but also in his detestation of all that the fox stood for in the seats of government, "desse valsche Reynkens arth," as he describes such people, who represented for him, in addition, the diametric opposite of the quality of truth, by which he set such store. As regards the meaning of wisdom for him, his presentation of this in his gloss was many-layered, as we saw. Nevertheless, there is no indication in the glosses following this one that this commentator has any other wisdom in mind than that practised by Reinke and those like him. He has no expectation, in other words, that as chancellor Reinke will use his wisdom in the service of virtue, as commanded by the king in the narrative text. The caption to the woodcut which prefaces the 1498 edition, which is not reproduced in \textit{RVC}, nevertheless fits this latter commentator's attitude much better. The "\textit{vulpis adulacio}," the fox-like fawning practised by the false flatterer, who was the bane of all Renaissance courts, was for him a very real quality, for which he had nothing but contempt, realizing only too well the power for evil on the part of those practising it. It should also be borne in mind that this \textit{RVC} commentator, although vehemently anti-Roman Church, gives the impression of being essentially a man with his feet very firmly planted in the temporal world, a man with no deep religious faith. Apart from his wholehearted acceptance of Luther's political theory, his use of the latter's writings is for predominantly negative purposes, for his attacks
on the Roman Church, for example, and his diatribe concerning the economic conditions of the time. There is no positive affirmation of Lutheran doctrine. His pessimism therefore, while stemming primarily from his personal detestation of what he saw taking place in the seats of government, would appear to be due in general terms to the influence of didactic literature, the pessimistic attitude to human nature stressed here being subsequently confirmed by Luther himself.

It is impossible to judge the 1650 commentator - the other commentator whom we have found to have a predominantly pessimistic view of life - by these same standards. Extreme pessimism dominated the general feeling in Germany during the war and the immediate post-war years, as evidenced, for example, by Gryphius's sonnets, and to this can be added this commentator's own horror of the inroads being made by Romance culture, the values of which he so profoundly deplored. Defining wisdom was no longer of paramount interest to him, nor is it possible in this century to consider this gloss in its relationship to didactic literature, the virtues he prizes and the vices he deplores being largely those which Luther regarded in the same way. His attitude to the fox, moreover, while showing signs of ambivalence, was ultimately on the lines of that of the RVC commentator. He, too, detested what the fox stood for - the false, scheming, fawning courtier or counsellor - a situation for which he, also, foresaw no immediate improvement. Luther's pessimism with regard to human nature may also have had some influence on him here.

The surprise here is the RVA commentator of 1498. Despite
his threefold negative representation of the fox, firstly, on the transcendental level, as either the devil or the hardened sinner, secondly, on the temporal level, as the false, cunning, deceitful courtier or counsellor, and thirdly - a combination of these two - as a figure representing the wisdom of the world which is foolishness with God, his view of the world is predominantly optimistic. For all his salvational preaching, or one should perhaps say on account of it, he obviously retained his belief in man's innate bent towards virtue.

Of all the four glosses that of the 1544 commentator is the most interesting in the three respects we have considered here. His optimism, which is very real, can be linked in the first place directly to the fox figure, and through this, to the meaning that wisdom had for him. This latter, as we saw, was derived from didactic literature, a wisdom which he appears to equate with "Reinkens kunst," assuring his readers, however, that cunning, knavery and deceit are not to be confused with true wisdom, which is used in the service of virtue. In terms of the narrative text, then, he seems to have believed that Reinke would, as chancellor, use his wisdom in this way.

There is also another aspect from which we can view this commentator's optimistic attitude towards life in general. There is no doubt about Luther's pessimism regarding human nature and his consequent view of the world as an evil place, where the devil, "der Fürst dieser Welt," holds sway. We noted this kind of reference, reproduced in the 1544 gloss, in regard to Luther's political theory, and it is repeated throughout his work in other
connections. But at the same time we have observed the positive attitude towards the world that Luther held, based on his teaching concerning the regenerative power of faith in God and the liberating effect of this faith consequent on the bestowal of God's grace on the true believer. This positive attitude we have also seen reflected in his teaching with regard to the dignity and worth of human labour and the importance of every individual's contribution here, no matter what his profession or occupation, as also in the emphasis he places on marriage, the family and social relationships generally and on the new lay educational institutions.

The 1544 commentator was, as we have seen, a deeply religious man who had also come under Humanist influence. The phrase from his gloss which seems best to sum up his optimistic attitude to life runs: "das Leben ist edel und lieb" (III,12,4). Here we find combined, I submit, Humanist optimism and Luther's fundamental belief in the spiritual regeneration that faith in God and the bestowal of God's grace work in the true believer.

For the rest, Alexander Bieling's assertion that the Reineke-Fuchs glosses provide a good reflection of the cultural history of the period in which they were written has, in my opinion, been amply corroborated in these pages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviations</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARG</td>
<td>Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVjs</td>
<td>Deutsche Vierteljahresschrift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JVMGA</td>
<td>Jahrbücher des Vereins für mecklenburgische Geschichte und Altertumskunde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LW</td>
<td>Luther's works - American edition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NdJb</td>
<td>Jahrbuch des Vereins für niederdeutsche Sprachforschung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NdW</td>
<td>Niederdeutsches Wort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBB</td>
<td>Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNTL</td>
<td>Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Taal-en Letterkunde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>D. Martin Luthers Werke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA, DB</td>
<td>D. Martin Luthers Werke. Deutsche Bibel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZdPh</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZfdA</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZVLGA</td>
<td>Zeitschrift des Vereins für lübeckische Geschichte und Altertumskunde</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reynke de vos. Lübeck 1496. Facsimile ed. introd. T. Sodmann (Hamburg: Kötz, 1976). Quotations from this 1498 text and references to it will be made from the emended edition Reinke de vos nach der Ausgabe von Friedrich Prien. ed. A. Leitzmann (Halle: Niemeyer, 1925). References to A. Lübden’s vocabulary and notes to his edition of this work Reinke de vos nach der ältesten Ausgabe Lübeck 1498 (Oldenburg: Stelling, 1867) will be cited as Lübden Reinke.

A. Bieling, Die Reinke-Fuchs-Glosse in ihrer Entstehung und Entwicklung (Berlin, 1854), 3.

Jacob Grimm, Reinhart Fuchs (Berlin: Reimer, 1834). See especially ch. VIII.

See E. Martin’s emended edition of this work which he published under the title Das niederländische Volksbuch Reynaert de vos nach der Antwerpener Ausgabe von 1564 abgedruckt (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1876).


For a discussion of this, see N. F. Blake’s introduction to his edition of W. Caxton’s translation The History of Reynard the Fox (London/New York, 1970), xvi-xvii.

See Donald Yates. "Isengrimus à clef." Third International
Strictly speaking, the next work to be based on the traditional beast epic material was Reinhart Fuchs, composed by the Alsation Heinrich der Glichezäre after 1181. Since, however, this poem - a biting satire on the Hohenstauffen emperors and feudal values generally - had no influence on the further development of the Beast Epic in Northern Europe, we will not be considering it here.

See, for example, Menke's introduction to the facsimile edition of Von Reinicken Fuchs. Frankfurt 1544 (Heidelberg:Winter, 1981):275. This work will be cited as Menke RV 1544.


For a discussion of this see T.Best. Reynard the Fox (Boston:Twayne,1963) ch. 3.

The Middle Dutch original text of this work has been edited by E.Martin in his Reinaert (Paderborn:Schöningh,1874). There is also a translation by A.W.Barnouw in Reynard the Fox and other mediaeval Netherlands secular literature, ed. E.Colledge (London: Heineman, 1967). For secondary literature see J.M. Muller, Van den vos Reinaerde Exegetische Commentaar (Leiden: Brill, 1942).

This work is to be found in both Martin's Reinaert (as above, n14) and in J.Goossens's Reynaerts Historie Reynke de Vos (Darmstadt,1983).

This was a Dutch edition. Reinaert de vos, episch fabelidicht van de twaelfde eeuw, ed.J.P.Willems (Gent,1836).

In his Herbst des Mittelalters, ed. and trans. E.Köster (Stuttgart:Kröner,1975):430-31, J.Huizinga refers to this practice of making prose versions of poetic works as typical of the late Middle Ages, linking it with the emergence of a reading rather than a listening public. This explains also in his view the division of such a work into chapters with summarizing headings.

See n8 above for information concerning Blake's edition of Caxton's translation of this work. There is also another recent edition by D.B.Sands, The History of Reynard the Fox (Cambridge:Harvard U.P.,1960) where the text has been modernized.

The question of who this was was or even whether he existed at all has occupied scholars throughout the years. For a modern view, see K.Heeroma, "Henric van Alckmaer, Versuch einer neuen Würdigung," Ndjb 93(1970):30. Heeroma identifies him with a Henric van Alckmaer who held an official position in the service
of David of Burgundy, the half-brother of Charles the Bold who had conquered Lorraine (Lotharingen) in 1475. This article will be cited as Heeroma Henric.

This immediate source of RVA will be cited here as Alckmaer.

See The Cambridge Reinaert Fragments, ed. Karl Bruel (Cambridge, 1927). This remnant is also printed as an appendix in the Prien/Leitzmann edition of Reinke de vos, 259-73. See n1 above.

This change is thought to derive from Alckmaer, primarily because the author of RVA would not be so likely to be familiar with the Dutch/French tradition from which it derives. Heeroma Henric, 34, has his own interpretation, namely that this interpolation contributes to the final overwhelming victory of the fox over the wolf - even the latter's offspring, it seems, were not really his own.

In a recent article "Reynaerts und Reynkes Begegnung mit dem Affen Marten," NdW 20 (1980):73-84, J.Goossens pleads for the stylistic superiority of the way in which this episode is handled in Reinaert II - i.e. as part of Reinke's defence before the king. His plea is well-taken on stylistic grounds. From the point of view of the attitude of the reviser, however, the change from reported speech to direct narration here seems to be one of fundamental importance.

On account of the absence of this fable on the woodcut of the mirror (187b and 188b in the original edition), many of which woodcuts are considered to have formed part of Alckmaer (see T.Sodmann's introduction to the 1496 facsimile edition VI-IX), this must have been a common-sense correction on the part of the Lübeck adapter.


Heeroma Henric, 33-34, ascribes this interpolation to Alckmaer as further illustration of Reinke's total victory over the wolf.


Reynke Vosz de olde / nyge gedrucket / mit sidlikem vorstande und schonen figuren / erlichtet und vorbeter. In der
Quotations from and references to this 1539 edition will be made according to the original text.

See n11 above. Since this is a facsimile text and not an emended edition, quotations from and references to this work will be given according to the original text.

30 Reineke Fuchs Das ist ein sehr Nützliches / Lust- und Sinnreiches Büchlein... In Verlegung / Joachim Wilden / Buchhandlern zu Rostock. Im Jahr M.DC. L. Quotations from this work and references to it will be made according to this original text.


34 For example, Grimm, CLXXV and Bieling, 5.

35 Bieling, 10.


40 A reprint of this 1919 article under the title "Die deutsche Hanse und die deutsche Literatur" is to be found in W. Stammler, Kleine Schriften zur Literaturgeschichte des Mittelalters (Berlin: Schmidt, 1953). See p. 238. This collection of articles will be cited as Stammler Schriften.


42 Dat Narrenschyp von Hans van Ghetelen, ed. H. Brandes (Halle: Niemeyer, 1914): LIV-LVII. Brandes's introduction to this work will be cited as Brandes NS. His attribution of this work, based on an acrostic, to Hans van Ghetelen has never found
acceptance among other scholars.

43 "Plenar" is an edition of the epistles and gospels of the Church's Year together with interpretations of the text and sermonlike glosses.


45 See Baucke, 138-52, Brandes *NS*, XXXI.

46 Des Dodes Danz nach dem Lübecker Druck von 1489, 1496. ed. H. Baethke (Tübingen, 1876).


49 F. Prien, "Zur Vorgeschichte des Reinke vos," *PBB* 8 (1882): 50. This article will be cited as Prien Vorgeschichte.

50 Foerste, 106. See also Bruel, xx.


54 Prien Vorgeschichte, 38-51.

55 Foerste, 110-116.

56 Foerste, 130.

57 Foerste, 131.

58 Foerste, 133.


61 H. Kokott, "Reinke de vos" (München: Fink, 1961): 36. This work will be cited Kokott Reinke.
Opus Poeticum. De Admirabile Fallacia et Astutia Vulpeculae Reinikes Libros....Auctore Hartmanno Schoppero.
Frankfurti ad Moenum. Anno M.D.LXVII. Bieling, 20, calls this work "im wesentlichen ein Plagiat" of the 1544 edition. It was reprinted five times and in 1706 translated into English verse under the title Reynard the Fox. The crafty Courtier: Or the Fable of the Fox.


See Menke Ars Vitae, 65, where he speaks of "ein horrender, gewissermassen astronomischer Stückpreis" for this first edition.

H. Brandes ed. Die jüngere Glosse zum Reinke de Vos (Halle: Niemeyer, 1981). This work will be cited as Brandes JG.

Bieling, 13.

A. Hofmeister, "Der Verfasser der jüngeren Glosse zum Reinke Vos," NdJb 19(1893):113-121. Hofmeister puts forward the name of Johannes Freder, a convinced Lutheran and later the first Superintendent of Stralsund.

W. Stammler Schriften, 237, champions the authorship of Johann Oldendorp, also a convinced Lutheran and legal adviser (Syndicus) to the City Council of Rostock during the early crucial years of the Reformation. E. Schafferus, however, in her Der Verfasser der jüngeren Glosse zum Reinke de Vos, Diss. Hamburg, 1933 (Zeulenrode: Sporn, 1933):121, reports that he later withdrew this suggestion partly on the grounds that Oldendorp resembled Reinke too closely!

Gottsched, 54.

See Brandes JG, X-XIX.

Bieling, 3.

Bieling, 11.


Brandes JG, X.

Brandes JG, XIX.

These are as follows - the date in brackets following the
title denotes the edition which Brandes considers the commentator to have used:

Cyrill, *Spigel der wyssheit*... (1520).


For the available modern editions/reprints of the works by Pforre, Morsheim and Schwarzenberg see under n230, n234 and n235.

7See n69 above.

8Schafferus, 12.

9Schafferus, 149.


13Bielung, 19.

14F. Prien, "Ober die hochdeutsche Reineke-Ubersetzung vom Jahre 1544," *Jahresbericht über das Progymnasium zu Neumünster* (Neumünster:Hieronymus,1887). This article will be cited Prien *RVHD*.

15Prien *RVHD*, 3.

16Menke RV 1544, 19-22.

17See Prien *RVHD*, 19, for the wording of the Latin reference to Beuther's authorship.

18Bieling, 17.


20Menke RV 1544, 251-52.

Strassburg, 1908 (Lingen: Acken, 1908).


The kind of glossing used here both in the "Plenarien" and in the RV editions is what Gerhardt Powitz in his article "Text und Kommentar im Buch des 15. Jahrhunderts," Buch und Text im 15. Jahrhundert, (Hamburg: Hauswedel, 1981): 38, describes as the alternating kind, i.e. a passage of text followed by the gloss either in the same sized type (RVA and 1650) or in a smaller variety (RVC and 1544). In these two latter glosses it is about half the size.

Heeroma Henric, 22-26, suggests a reconstruction of this preface - which reconstruction he claims should be considered the original - omitting some of the redundancies. Witton, 96, agrees.

Alckmaer would have been aware of the pre-Christian origin of the Aesop fables. See Heeroma Henric, 26.

See n 19 above.

Heeroma Henric, 26, suggests that Alckmaer here would merely have been following customary practice by reproducing what he found in his source (Reinaert II), where that writer in his preface also followed his source (Reinaert I):

Reinaert I

dat hi die vite (van Reynaerde)  
dede soeken

dende hise na den walchen boeken

in dietsche dus heeft begonnen  
(11. 7-9)

Reinaert II

daer om dede hi die vite

soeken

ende heetse uten walschen

boeken

in dutsche aldus begonnen

The reference here in the RVA first preface to "walsche unde französesche sprake" presumably derives from the more exact distinction made by the end of the fifteenth century between "walsch" (=Italian) and "französesch" (=French). Alckmaer would certainly have been aware of the French Renart tradition.

The word heylsam according to Lübben/Walther, 139, had the meaning in Middle Low German of "heilbringend." Compare, too, the first words of the so-called second preface of the Low German NS, which read: "To nutte unde heylsamer lere, vormanynge unde ervolgynge. der wiisheyt, vornuft unde gude sede.." (NS, 4), themselves a direct translation of the High German original. See Das Narrenschiff, ed. M. Lemmer (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1962): 2.

Menke RV 1544, 276, suggests that the idea of adding short moralizing summaries to the chapters may have been copied from
Aesop.

101 See Brandes (NS), XXV.

102 Witton, 91, is in agreement here.

103 See Heeroma Henric, 21.

104 All biblical translations into English from the original Middle Low German and Latin (Vulgate) in the 1498 gloss are to the King James version.

105 It should also be borne in mind that the division of society into classes and sub-classes and occupations was a feature of the didactic writing of the period. See chap. 6. below.

106 It should be remembered that at this time neither ecclesiastical institutions nor the clergy personally were subject to taxation.

107 This acceptance of the monarchical system derives, one imagines, from three sources: i) it was the customary form of government at the time the commentator was writing; ii) it was familiar from the historical books of the Old Testament; iii) it had been confirmed by St. Thomas Aquinas in his Summa Theologiae (ST 1a2ae, 105, 1). See St Thomas Aquinas Summa Theologiae vol. 29, trans. English Dominican Fathers (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1964): 269. These joint authors will be abbreviated as EDF.

108 Compare 1,6,1-3, which items are based on the "morael" to VB chap. vi. Here in RVA we are told that no prince, lord or other judge should execute speedy vengeance on any person, even if he has been honestly accused by others, be they his peers or persons above or below him in social status; that the judge should have wise and shrewd counsellors to assist him in difficult cases; that no person should be condemned without being first summoned to defend himself.

109 This phrase is used in RVA 1,22,2 and again in the prefaces to Books III and IV, also in VB in the "morael" to chap. xxvi.

110 Compare RVA 1,3,1, where we are told that avaricious people at court often find reasons to lay complaints against others of lesser rank, hoping thereby to gain from the princes fat fiefs and benefices (grote leene unde prouene) which they begrudge the others.

111 Compare the last five lines of the prologue to Reinaert II:

Nu hoort ic sel u voort besceiden
Den syn des woorts na dit prologe.
Mer ic bid u so wat ic toge
Hoort die woorden ende merct den syn
Onthout (ohne Zweifel) daer leit veel wijsheit in
(40-42).

112 This is not to claim complete originality for this summary on the part of the RVA commentator. Witton, 94-95, considers that it was present in some form in Alckmaer, and the similarity with three of the "moraels" in VB bears this out.

113 See Adolph Franz, Drei deutsche Minoritenprediger aus dem XIII und XIV Jahrhundert (Freiburg i.B:Herder,1907):66: "...ut sunt agricultura, qui tam dilecti filii dei sunt tum propter laborem continuum, qui deo placet, tum propter oppressionem, qua a dominis oppressunt iniuste."

114 Franz,69: "sunt artis mechanici,calcifices, carnifices, lanarii, textores, fabri, carpentarii. Isti, quia die et nocte laborant, dilecti filii Domini sunt..."


116 Franz,119: "Laboribus igitur rusticorum clericici, episcopi, reges, militates, clustrales, viri, mulieres, omnes sustenuntur."


118 This question has been most recently dealt with by Wolf-Dieter Hauschild in his Kirchengeschichte Lübecks. Christentum und Burgtum in neun Jahrhunderten (Lübeck:Schmidt-Römhild,1981):151. This work will be referred to as Hauschild KgL.


120 See Neumann 2:92-95; also Wilhelm Jannasch, Reformationsgeschichte Lübecks vom Petersablass bis zum Augsburger Reichstag 1515-1530 (Lübeck:Schmidt-Römhild,1958):57-58; also Hauschild KgL,148.

121 Kämpfer, 115.
122 Kämpfer, 203.
123 Kämpfer, 194-95.
124 Kämpfer, 204.
125 Neumann 1:186.
126 Neumann 1:117-18.


128 Neumann 1:171-72.


129 Jannasch, 53.

130 Forste, 130, considers that the commentator’s belief in the power of moral forces occasioned this optimistic view. But he could also have derived it from Aquinas who believed that man has an innate bent towards virtue, although for it to come to its fullness, he requires education (ST 1a2ae 90,3). See EDF vol. 29:101.

131 B. Könneker, Wesen und Wandlung der Narrenidee im Zeitalter des Humanismus (Wiesbaden:Steiner,1966):19. This work will be cited as Könneker Wesen.

132 Könneker Wesen, 32-33.

133 Nanninga, 204.

134 Quoted by Hauschild KgL, 136.


136 Brandt, 226.

137 Brandt, 225. See also E. Zeeden, Die deutsche Kultur der Neuzeit (Frankfurt a.M,1968):28, who writes that many of the lesser nobility had been forced by necessity to work their own land. This work will be cited as Zeeden Kultur.

138 Oekken, 23.

139 Jannasch, 11-12.

140 Brandt, 216.

141 Jannasch, 30.

142 See Jannasch, 67, who stresses particularly the keeping of concubines by the clergy, the worldliness of their dress and the feasting that took place both on the part of the members of the Cathedral Chapter and of the clergy in general.
See p. 20 above, especially n64 and n65. See also the article by Ursula Altmann, "Leserkreise zur Inkunabelzeit," Buch und Text im 15. Jahrhundert (Hamburg: Hauswedel, 1981), where she discusses the difficulty of reaching the lower classes of society through printed books they could afford to buy.

I am indebted to Okken, 23, for this example.

The use of the two words "weyszheyt" and "klockheyt" and their derivative adjectives in connection with the deliberations of governmental bodies appears to have been something of a cliché.

Compare the last entry in the official chronicle for the City of Lübeck for 1492: "Hirmede endiget siik dat ander boek der croneken vor de brukinge (Gebrauch) der erwerdigen voersichtigen kloken weyszheyt des rades to Lubecke." Quoted by H. Schmidt, Die deutsche Städtechroniken als Spiegel des bürgerlichen Selbstverständnisses im Spätmittelalter (Göttingen: Vandenhoek und Ruprecht, 1958): 20 n2.

Hauschild Kgl., 106, reports that on the occasion of the Emperor Charles IV's visit to Lübeck in 1375 he recognised the members of the City Council as "Herren" - that is, as equal to those of noble birth - and, furthermore, gave them the privilege of acting as his counsellors while he was in the city. Fink, 273, records also that in 1485 the members of the "Zirkelgesellschaft" were officially permitted by imperial privilege to wear gold chains bearing the insignia of the society - a recognition of quasi-nobility.

Compare NS 107:

Dede is na der werlde wysz,
Vor gode de eyn geck gheachtet is;
Men dat is gheheten rechte wyszheyt,
Darmede men kricht de salicheyt (1-4).

Wertlyke kloekheyt unde wertlyke lyst
Dorheyt vor gode gheachtet ist (59-60).

Compare also 1 Cor. 3, 19: For the wisdom of the world is foolishness with God.

Compare Heinrich Steinhöwel's preface to his Aesopus (1476) where he states that "fabel sind nicht geschehene ding. Sunder allein mit woreten erdichte wort der unvernufftigen thiere..."


This phrase is also something of a cliché. In the fifth book of his Tusculan Disputations Cicero defines ethics as the distinguishing between the things we should do and the things we should avoid - see Cicero Tusculan Disputations, Loeb edition. Trans. J. E. King (London: Heinemann; New York, Putnam, 1927): 498-99. Also see under, p. 467, for his similar definition of wisdom.
as prudentia. The same phrase is also to be found at the end of Boethius's *Consolation of Philosophy*, where Philosophy exhorts him to avoid vice and cultivate virtue - see Boethius *The Consolation of Philosophy*, Loeb edition. Trans. S.J. Tester (Cambridge: Harvard U.P., 1978):434-435. See also Neumann 1:168 where she records the same wording used by the Franciscan chronicler Detmar in the preface to his *Weltchronik* (c.1400) where he refers to history as the "Lehrmeisterin für alle Zeiten." "Wer sie fleißig studiert," he states, "kann daraus lernen, wie man das Böse meidet und das Gute tut...."

101 Compare NS second preface:

Hyr vyndet men der werlde ghantzen loep,
Dyt boeklyn wert ghud to deme koep (59-60).

102 An example of this can be found in the introduction to Wittenweiler's *Ring*, where he writes:

Nu ist der mensch so chläynner stät
Daz er nicht allwege hören mag
Ernstlich sach an schympfes (Scherz) saxe
Und frätet sich vil mangerlây.
Dar umb hab ich der gpawren geschräy
Gemischet unter disew ler,
Daz sey desta senfter uns beker (32-38).


103 Schwab, 8.


104 See Körneker *Wesen*, 3 n9, where she relates how this series of sermons lasted for over a year - from Lent,1498, namely, until Easter, 1499.

105 See n77 above.

106 See n98 above.

107 This adjective is used here according to its now obsolete meaning of "pertaining to a court" (*OED*).

108 Compare NS 111:

De scho drucket unde wrynget my ok;
Darumme, efte men wyl schelden my
Unde spreken: 'artzste, hele sulven dy!
Du bist ghelyk uns in narrem handel!
Ik bekenne yd - god gheve'my des eyn wandel! (102-06)

The work from which these two quotations are taken is referred to by the commentator as Frouwen Untruwen denste. It is a poem beginning with the words: "Untrew Vinantz und Argelist / Der Welt zusammen beschreiben ist.," listed as #697 in Annalen der poetischen National Literatur der Deutschen im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert vol. 2 ed. E. Weiler, 461.

Luther charged the ecclesiastics with practising usury on account of the high interest rates they were charging. See his "(Kleiner) Sermon von dem Wucher" (WA 6,7).

See below chap. 5, section (ii) for a fuller treatment of usury.


Schmaltz, 10.
Schmaltz, 40.
Schmaltz, 45.
Schmaltz, 48.
Schmaltz, 47.
Schmaltz, 55.
Brandt, 216.
Schildhauer, 134.

Vorberg, 3-7.


Vorberg, 27 et seq; Schmaltz, 15 et seq; Schildhauer, 93 et seq.

A good illustration of the accepted lack of reading skills on the part of the nobility in the later Middle Ages is given in the so-called Redentiner Osterspiel of 1464, where Pontius Pilate, here represented as a feudal lord, is urged to have read aloud to him a letter from the Jewish leaders, for which purpose he summons his scribe. See Das Mecklenburger Osterspiel, ed. A. Freybe (Norden:Fischer,1885), 11.982-93, p.76. With regard to the expanding horizons of the middle class, the Stralsunder jurist and diarist Bartholomäus Saxrow is an example of a son of such parents, who, "aus Gründen der Nützlichkeit, der Aufstiegschancen, des Ehrgeizs und des Wissendranges" sent both their sons to university. See Ursula Brosthaus, Bürgerleben im 16. Jahrhundert (KölN/Wien:Böhlau,1972):30 n7. Zeeden Kultur, 77, describes also how the middle classes were able to wrest cultural leadership from the "rebarbarisierende Adel" during this period largely on account of the increase in inter-city and overseas trading.

This collection of "Schwänke" (short, amusing tales) by Johannes Pauli, an Alsatian monk, was originally published in 1522 and became an immensely popular work. A great number of these tales were culled from the sermons of Geiler von Keisersberg. See
Baeumer, 30.

The reference here to *Centum Novella* is presumably to the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*, a collection of French tales probably related to a court audience, comprising jokes and stories of the intrigues of burghers and serving-maids, first printed in 1462. With regard to the *Alte Weisen*, this commentator is presumably referring to the *Buch der Beispiele der alten Weisen*, and as far as the *Weise Meyster* is concerned, to the collection of stories best known in the Latin version *Historia septem sapientium*, probably originating in India in 100 B.C., which appeared during the sixteenth century in a German "Volksbuch" edition.

..das ein jeder seinen nehesten soll lieben als sich selbs...," compare Luther:"das ein jeglich seynis nehesten also annehm, als were ers selb" (WA 7,37); "..der oberkeit untertan sein," compare Luther: "Eyn igliche seele solle der oberkeit unterthan sein mit furcht und ehren" (WA 18,303): "..seines beruffs ehrlich und trewlich warten," compare Luther: "Ein iglichs hat seine Ehre von Gott sowohl als seine ordenung und werck" (WA 30:2,566):"..und Gott fur und uber alle ding furchten / lieben / vertrawen und gleuben," compare Luther in his "Kleiner Katechismus" of 1529: "Wier sollen Gott uber all ding furchten, lieben und vertrawen" (WA 30:1,243) together with his statement in his "Großer Katechismus" of the same year:"Also das ein Gott haben nichts anders ist denn yhm von hertzen trawen und gleuben" (WA 30:1,133); ".und werden die jenigen die solchs nicht thun gestrafft," compare Luther's recommendations in his "Kleiner Katechismus fur die gemeinen Pfarrherrn und Prediger" (1529) where he demands that those who are unwilling to accept the new faith - "die nicht lernen wollen" - and who are thus denying Christ and are no longer Christians, be denied the sacrament and baptism by their pastors, turned over to the Pope and his judges, refused food and drink by their parents and employers and, furthermore, be reported to the ruler for banishment from the country (WA 30:1,270).

In his *Von der Mystik zum Barock 1400-1600* (Stuttgart:Metzler, 1927):38, Stammler mentions a translation of Terence's plays from 1499 where the translator provided an alphabetical index of the virtues and vices and the punishment accorded to the latter for the reader's easy reference. This work will be cited Stammler *Mystik*.

---

Menke *Ars vitae*, 112.

Scheffler, 96.

Könneker *Wesen*, 43.

Scheffler, 96.

It is possible that this avid defence of the fable may have signified more than a mere rhetorical exercise. See Könneker Wesen, 42 n113, where, referring to a theory of A. Shirokauer, she points out that whereas the fable was a particularly favoured literary form in a "bürgerlicher Zeitalter," aristocratic epochs such as the "Staufferzeit" and the baroque era showed little or no interest in it.

The statutes of the "Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft" laid down "das man die Hochdeutsche Sprache in ihrem rechten Wesen und Stande / ...aufs möglichst und thundlichste erhalte / und sich wowol der besten aussprache in reden / als der reinsten art in schreiben und Reimdichten befleissige." Quoted by Marian Syzrocki, Die deutsche Literatur des Barock (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1979):138.


Vogt, 6.

Vogt, 7.

Vogt, 16.

Vogt, 18.

Vogt, 20.

Vogt, 18.

Duke Ulrich of Mecklenburg had directed in 1603, for example, that the new Church Order there should be published in High German, "weil darin nun fast jedermann in diesen Landen kundig und erfahren ist." Quoted by Schmaltz, 136.

Menke Ars vitae, 113.

The vignette at the bottom of the preface to the "Volksbuch" has been identified by E. Spence as that used by the Nürnberg printer Endter.


Bradley, 109.

Bradley, 109, where she refers to Pope Gregory the Great's emphasis on the supreme ability of Holy Scripture to perform this function.

See The Catholic Encyclopedia 14 (1912), 504: "Temptations as such can never be intended by God. They are permitted by Him to give us an opportunity of practising virtue and self-mastery and
acquiring merit..” See also here Job 1,6-12, for God's challenge to Satan.

215Quoted by Brandes NS, LIV.

216See F. Ohly, "Vom geistigen Sinn des Wortes im Mittelalter" ZfdA 89(1958/59):2. As far as the "Plenarien" are concerned, Kämpfer, 76, quotes a passage from "Plenar" A (1475), where the author describes this system of interpretation. Kämpfer comments further: "Die Allegorese und die alttestamentliche Typologie sind Hauptstilmittel fast aller Plenarglossen," noting, however, 77-78, a decrease in the later "Plenarien," particularly in "Plenar" F of 1493.

217Ohly, 4.

218Ohly, 10-11.


219Meiners, as above.

220Ohly, 4.

221Ohly, 7.

222Meiners, as above.

223It is interesting that in the one portion of a gloss included in the Cambridge Fragments the interpretation applies to the following chapter. See Prien/Leitzmann edition of Reynke de vos, 259.

224See under n230.

225Ohly, 2, refers to Luther's renunciation of this type of Biblical interpretation. Luther himself writes in his "Wider die himmlischen Propheten": "Lieber, die natürliche sprache ist fraw Keyserynn, die geht über alle subtile, spitzige, sophistische tichtunge, von der mus man nicht weychen, Es zwinge denn eyn offenberlicher artikel des glaubens" (WA 18,180). Erasmus, too, rejected this system, requiring in his Constitutio principis christiani that a prince should not be tormented by the four senses of the theologian in his study of Scripture. See Lester Born's translation of this work under the title The Education of a Christian Prince (New York:Octagon,1965):200. A German translation of this work by Georg Spalatin appeared in Basel in 1520.

226Schafferus, 14.

227Schafferus, 43.
The edition of the Alberus fables used by the RVC commentator was that of 1534, according to Brandes. The nineteenth century edition prepared by F. Braune and entitled Die Fabeln des Erasmus Alberus (Halle: Niemeyer, 1892) is based on a later edition of 1550 entitled Das Buch von der Tugend und Weisheit.

Holland's edition Das Buch der Beispiele der Alten Weisen (1860; rpt. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1969) is based on an earlier edition of this work than the one used by the RVC commentator, according to Brandes.

See n42 above.

See the appendix to F. Zarncke's edition of Brant's Das Narrenschiff (1854, rpt. Hildesheim: Olms, 1961) for extracts from Brant's Freidank, 164-69, and from the latter's edition/adaptation of Ulrich Tengler's Laienspiegel and also from his Richterliche Clagspiegel, 169-72.

See n48 above. This little work is the only shrovetide play to have survived out of those known to have been performed in Lübeck between 1484 and 1500. See Kokott Reinke, 111-12 for a list of these plays.

Originally composed in 1497, previous editions of this work had been entitled Spigel des Regiments in der Fürsten höfe, da Fraw Untrewe gewaltig ist..., and Spiegel des Regiments is the title given by K. Goedeke to his edition (Stuttgart, 1856), itself based on a later 1545 edition of the work, according to Brandes.

These three works form part of the second half of a work entitled Teutsch Cicero, published in 1535, a posthumous collection of the writings of Johann, Freiherr zu Schwarzenberg (1463-1528), the first part of which consists of German adaptations of a life of Cicero and three of the latter's works: De senectute, Tusculanae Disputationes I, De amicitia. Of the original works in the second part, the "Memorial der Tugend" is the most often used by the RVC commentator, this being a work consisting of 100 verses, mostly "Ständespruche," but also comments on stories from the Bible and from Greek and Roman history. See Brandes JG., XXXVII-XXXVIII, also Willy Scheel's introduction to his edition of Das Büchlein vom Zutrinkenn (Halle: Niemeyer, 1900) and to his similar edition of Trostspruch um abgestorbene Freunde, (Halle: Niemeyer, 1907), VII-XI.

See n159 above.

See Johannes Agricola Die Spruchwörtersammlungen 1 and 2, ed. S. Gilman (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1971). Originally published in 1529, the edition used by the RVC commentator was that of 1534, according to Brandes.
There are no modern editions of these works. A 1551 edition of Franck's *Geschichtsbibel* and a 1534 edition of his *Weltbuch* were available to me on film.


See above n225.

See Gilman 1:53.

This passage constitutes Brant's epilogue to the *Clagspiegel*, see Zarncke, 172.

There is no such passage to be found in *Das Fastnachtspiel Henselin*... For a discussion of the problem - i.e. whether the passage was taken from a work, no longer extant, with a similar title, or whether it was a case of wrong attribution, or whether there was a High German original of this little play, in which this passage might have been included - see Walther, 24-26; Brandes *JG*, XXII-XXIV; Schafferus, 15-16. Personally, I consider that the content of these lines diverges in such a high degree from that of the play that the last-mentioned argument is untenable on that account alone.

Cor. 6, 20: Denn ihr seid teuer erkaufft. Darum so preiset Gott an eurem Leibe. Cor. 7, 23: Ihr seid teuer erkaufft; werdet nicht der menschen knechte. 1 Peter 1, 18-19: Wisset, dasz ihr nicht mit verganglichem Silber und Gold erlost seid, sondern mit dem teuren Blut Christi.

Biblical references in the three post-Reformation glosses - RVC, 1544 and 1650 - will be given to the pertinent volume of Luther's translation of the Bible in the *Weimarer Ausgabe* (*WA* 1-12), where possible from the last 1545/1546 edition of this Bible.

Ps. 45 7:...das Zepter deines Reichs ist ein gerechtes Zepter.

See Lübben/Walther, 385; Lexers *Taschenwörterbuch*, 213.

Compare *Lübecker Kirchenordnung von Johannes Bugenhagen* 1531, ed. Wolf-Dieter Hauschild (Lübeck: Schmidt-Römhild, 1961): 138: "Prestere schal me (man) nycht alleynen laten gaen (lassen gehen) to den misdederen (Übeltätern) / wen se / scholen uthghevoret (ausgeführt) werden / sonder ock vaken (oft) de wyle se sitten / se tho lerende / und mith ehne (ihnen) tho redende / dat se mogen kamen tho der erkentnisse des Evangelio..." This work will be cited Hauschild *LKO*.

Compare Luther in his "Von weltlicher Oberkeyt" (1523):
Das weltlich regiment hatt gesetz, die nicht weytter strecken denn uber leyb und gut und was euszerlich ist auff erden. Denn uber die seele kan und will Gott niemant lassen regirn denn sich selbs alleyne (WA 11,262).

See Rupprich Literatur 4:1, 171.

Kokott Reinke, 36.

Nanninga, 201. Köneker Wesen, 39-40, sees a correspondence between the concentration on specifics and on the particular rather than on the general in the moral-didactic literature of the period and the effect of Nominalism on the scholastic system.


Schafferus, 149.

Menke RV 1544, 22.

Rom 13,1: Jederman sey unterthan der Oberkeit, die gewalt uber jn hat. Denn es ist keine Oberkeit, on vonn Gott, wo aber Oberkeit ist, die ist von Gott verordnet. 2: Wer sich nu wider die Oberkeit setzet, der widerstrebet Gottes ordnung, Die aber widerstreben, werden uber sich ein Urteil empfahen. 3: Denn die Gewaltigen sind nicht den guten wercken, sondern den bösen zu fürchten. Wiltu dich aber nicht fürchten fur der Oberkeit, so thue gutes, so wirstu lob von derselbigen haben. 4: Denn sie ist Gottes Dienerin, dir zugut. Thustu aber böses, so fürchte dich, Denn sie tregt das Schwert nicht umb sonst, Sie ist Gottes Dienerin, eine Racherin zur straffe uber den, der böses thut.

These are the opening lines of the "Morale" to Fable #10 in the original edition, entitled "Von dem Bauch und von den Gliedern." See Braune's edition, 46.


Moses (Deut) 15,18: Richter und Amptleute solt dir setzen in allen deinen Thoren, die dir der Herr dein Gott geben wird, unter deinen stemmen, das sie das Volck richten mit rechtem Gericht. 19: Du solt das Recht nicht beugen, und solt auch kein Person ansehen, noch Geschenck nemen. Denn die Geschenck machen die Weisen blind, und verkeren die sachen der gerechten. 20: Was recht ist, dem soltu nachlügen...

The establishment of this writer's identity has eluded Gottsched, Brandes, Schafferus and presumably Sander Gilman as well, since he does not list him in his tabulation of Agricola's
contemporary sources. See Gilman 2:364-65. I would be inclined myself to agree with Schafferus, 19-22, that he was most probably a "Meistersinger."

---


261 Born, 127.


265 Born notes borrowing - very little of it attributed - from the following authors: Augustine, Cicero, Herodotus, Homer, Isocrates, Plato, Plutarch, Seneca, Suetonius, Virgil, Xenophon.

266 According to Luther's editors (WA 11,229), this tract is based on two sermons that Luther preached in October, 1522 in Weimar in answer to Schwarzenberg's questions.

267 Duke Johann Friedrich had succeeded his father Johann as Elector of Saxony in August, 1532, since when the situation at court had deteriorated. According to his editors, Luther chose this method - an interpretation of Psalm 101 - as a means of registering his displeasure with what was going on there. See WA 51,197-99.

268 "Der König ist überall Richter über alle." This statement constitutes para. 26 of Book III of the Sachsenspiegel. See Eike von Repgow Der Sachsenspiegel ed. C. Schott, trans. R.Schmidt-Wiegand (Zürich: Manesse, 1981):178. See also Balck's article "Mecklenburg im dreissigjährigen Krieg," JVMGA 68(1903):90, where he states that the separation of the judiciary from the administration at the Mecklenburg court was first effected by Wallenstein during his occupation of the duchy, 1627-31, when he used a plan previously drawn up by the court authorities.

269 The RVC commentator's concern that the ruler seek always the common good of his subjects most probably derives primarily from Erasmus's emphasis on this in his Constitutio. Luther stressed the same thing in his "Von weltlicher Oberkeit":

Welcher nu eyn Christlicher furst sein
will, der musz warlich die meinung ablegen, das er hirschen und mit gewalt fahren wolle. Denn verflucht und verdampt ist alles leben, das yhm selb zu nutz und zu gutt gelebt und gesucht wird. Verflucht alle werck, die nit ynn der liebe gehen (WA 11,271-72).

The words in brackets are a quotation from 1 Tim 6,10: Denn Habsucht ist eyne wurzel alles ubels.

270 Compare also Luther in his interpretation of the 101st psalm:

Denn die andern [das Volk] sehen doch mehr auff seinen [des Fürsten] Hof, gesinde und Amptleute denn auf sein gebot, Folgen auch mehr seines hauses exempel denn seinen befeil
Und entschuldigen sich mit seinem Exempel wider sein eigen gebot (WA 51,219).

271 In his "Von weltlicher Oberkeit" Luther writes:

Darumb soll ein furst alszo seynen gewaltigen vertrauen uund sie lassen schaffen, das er dennoch den zaum in der fauszt behalite und nicht sicher sey noch schlaffe, szondernn zu sehe uund das landt..bereytte und allenthalben besehe, wie man regirt. und richtet (WA 11,274).

272 This remark is an illustration of one of the judicial changes brought about by the Reformation, since up to that point adultery had come under the ecclesiastical courts. These had been abolished in Protestant territories as a result of Luther’s teaching.

273 See F. Jacoby, Van den vos Reinaerde (München:Fink,1970):100, where he states that in the later Middle Ages a queen’s intercession was a widespread custom in France and Germany - an extra-legal step, frequently motivated by religious considerations.

274 Aquinas stresses the supreme importance of bearing the common good in mind where legislation is concerned (ST 1a2ae 96,4 and 96,6), EDF vol.28:131 and 139 respectively.

275 With regard to the RVC commentator, the influence here is most likely to have been from Erasmus’s Constitutio. See n269 above.

276 In his tract "Von Kaufhandlung und Wucher" of 1524, Luther had chided the princes and city authorities for not storing grain as they should, something he considered proper Christian foresight for the good of the community (WA 15,306).
Disagreements in commercial matters had existed between the Dukes of Mecklenburg and the coastal cities of Rostock and Wismar over a long period, with the two cities doing their best to prevent their rulers from selling and exporting goods in competition with them. See Schildhauer, 5 and 117-18, Schafferus, 105-06.

See Holland, 243-47. This German version was the work of Anton v.Pforr, court chaplain to the Archduchess Mechthild, mother of Count, later Duke, Eberhard von Württemberg, to whom it is dedicated, see Burger, 187-88; Holland, 251. Duke Eberhard was a patron of the arts who also commissioned several translations of Greek and Roman classics.

Holland, 245.

There were, as we have seen, many editions of the 1544 text and gloss and we have no way of knowing which of these the 1650 commentator was using. In other words, there could have been alterations made to later editions of the gloss. Posca, 17 -18, for example, gives parallel illustrations of a portion of the gloss of 1,9 from the 1592 edition of RVC and the 1593 edition of the 1544 gloss, which suggests that this might have been so, as far as historical illustrations are concerned. Unfortunately no such later edition of this 1544 gloss has been available to me. In view of the fact, however, that these historical references constitute only an infinitesimal part of the gloss as a whole, the main part of which could only have been composed by someone writing in the mid-seventeenth century, I do not feel that this is of any great importance. It is unlikely, I think, that there were alterations made to the text of the 1544 gloss, only additions to it of the nature described above.

It appears also that by 1650 the "Fürstenspiegel" was no longer a recognized literary genre. Newald, 360, suggests that beginning with Opitz’s translation of John Barclay’s Argenis in 1626 it gradually became subsumed in the "Heldenroman."

ST2a2ae 40,1. See EDF vol.35,81-82. R Bainton,99, in his Christian Attitudes to Peace and War (Nashville/New York: Abingdon,1960), considers that Augustine’s definition of the bellum justum has constituted the ethic for both Roman Catholic and Protestant churches up this century. As far as Luther’s views on the subject’s obligation to follow his overlord are concerned, he defined an unjust cause in his "Von den guten Werken" as follows:

Wo es aber keme, wie offt geschicht, das weltlich gewalt und ubirkeit, wie sie heyssen, wurden einen unterthanen dringen widder die gebot gottis odder dran hyndernn, da geht der gehorsam ausz uund ist die pflicht schon auff gehabenn (WA 6,265).
In his "Ob Kriegsleute" Luther also agreed with Augustine regarding the restoration of peace as the principal reason for waging war: "Warumb kriegt man, denn das man fride und gehorsam haben wil?...Denn wo das schwerd nicht werete und fride hielte, so müste es alles durch unfride verderben, was ynn der welt ist" (WA 19,625-26).

What Luther means by "heylige orden und stende" here he explains in the following passage from his interpretation of the 82nd psalm: "Darumb heissen solche stende, so mit Gottes wort gestiftet sind, alles heilige, Gottliche stende, obgleich die personen nicht heilig sind. Als Vater, Mutter, Magd, Son, Tochter, Herr, Fraw, Knecht, Magd, Prediger, Pfarher etc. sind alles heilige, Gottliche stende" (WA 31:1,217).

This is a reference to the "Schoss" tax, a type of income and property tax, including fixed assets in the case of business men. See Schildhauer, 49-50, for details of the levy of this tax in Rostock during the early years of the sixteenth century.

Compare Luther in "Von weltlicher Oberkeit":

Nu aber das schwerd eyn gross nodlicher nutz ist aller weit, das frid erhalten, sund gestrafft und den bösen geweret werde, szo gibt er [der Christ] sich auffs aller willigst unter des schwérd regiments, gibt schos, ehret die überkeyt, dienet, hillft und thut alles, was er kan, das der gewalt fodderlich ist, auff das sie ym schwang und by ehren und furcht erhalten werde (WA 11.253).

Compare Luther in his interpretation of the 82nd psalm:

Wo kein oberkeit ist, oder so die ohn ehre ist, da kan auch kein friede sein. Wo kein friede ist, da bleibt auch keine narung und kan keines fur des andern frevel, dieberey, rauberey, gewalt und untugent leben oder etwas behalten (WA 31:1,192).

This term "offene laster" refers to the preaching of the Anabaptists, which Luther also deals with in his sermon on the 82nd psalm. It was the public preaching of their views that he objected to - he realised that there could be no compulsion where religious belief was concerned - particularly as this concerned obedience to authority, and which he urged the authorities to punish, since this teaching was, in his opinion, "widder einen öffentlichen artickel des glaubens, der kierlich ynn der schrifft gegründet und ynn aller weit gegluebt ist von der gantzen Christenheit" (WA 31:1,208). See also Karl Trüdinger, Luthers Briefe und Gutachten an weltliche Obrigkeit zur Durchführung der Reformation (Münster: Aschendorf, 1975):126-28.
"Von weltlicher Oberkeit": "Und, hyrnnen [einer gerechten Sache] sind die unterthanen schulzig zu folgen, leyd und güt dran zusetzen. Denn ynn solchem fall muss eyner umb des andern willen seyn güt und sich selbs wagen" (WA 11,277).

Psalm 82,1: Gott steht ynn der gemeinde Gottes und, ist richter unter den Göttern. 6: Ich habe gesagt: 'Yhr seid Götter und allzu mal kinder des Höhesten.'

Compare Luther's words in this same sermon on the 82nd psalm:

Aus dem wir wol sehen, wie hoch und herrlich Gott wil die oberkeit gehalten haben, das man yhn also seinen amptleuten gleich wie yhm selbs sollen gehorsam und untertan sein mit furcht und allen ehren (WA 31:1,192).

Tim 2,1: So ermane ich nu, das man fur allen dingen zu erst thue, bitte, gebet, furbit und dancksagung, fur alle Menschen 2: fur die Köhner und fur alle Oberkeit, auff das wir ein geröglicher und stilles Leben furen mögen, in aller Gottseligkeit und erbarkeit.

In his "Ob Kriegsleute" Luther writes: "Ich sehe aber kein bestendiger regimen, denn da die Oberkeit ynn ehren gehalten wird" (WA 19,636).

In his interpretation of the 82nd psalm Luther writes:

Merck dis wol, denn weil die Oberherrn am hohesten sitzen, siihet und hörret yderman yhre laster und feyle am aller meisten. Und weil man sie am aller meisten siihet, so ist auch kein gemeiner laster denn von den Oberherrn reden. Und solchs thut yderman auffs aller liebest. Denn er vergisset die weil seiner eigen untugent (WA 31:1,197).

See n269 above for the probable derivation of this commentator's interest in the common good.

The use here of the adjective "welltlich" appears to reflect Luther's desire in the second part of his tract "Von weltlicher Oberkeit" to limit the competence of temporal rulers: "das sie [die welltlich überkeyt] nicht zu weit strecke und Gott ynn seyn reych und regiment greyffe." Temporal authorities may not interfere in matters of faith. Above all, they should not presume to tell their subjects what they should and should not believe (WA 11,261-62).

These words this commentator ascribes to St.Paul in the Epistle to the Colossians, where, in fact, only the second part of the quotation is to be found. See Col 4,1: Ir Herrn, was recht
und gleich ist, das beweiset den Knechten, und wisset, das jr auch einen Herrn im Himel habt.

Compare Luther (52nd psalm):

Welches teil aber das seine nicht thun wil, sondern, so die gemeine ungehorsam und die oberkeit mutwillig ist, sollen sie beide fur Gott des tods schuldig sein and gestrafft werden, die Gemeine durch die oberkeit, die oberkeit durch Gott (WA 31:1,193).

Aquinas (ST 2a2ae 42,2) considered it to be tyranny for a ruler to govern for his own self-interest rather than for the common good, and that it should not be considered a seditious act to get rid of such a ruler, provided that the disturbance caused was not such that the people suffered more from it than from the tyranny. See EDF vol. 35:107.

Compare Luther in "Von weltlicher Oberkeit": "Die weilt ist zu bose und nicht werd, das sie viel klüger und frumer fursten haben solt" (WA 11,268).

Previously in his "Sermon von dem Bann" of 1520 Luther had dealt with this subject, maintaining that there were more evil rulers than good ones in the world, the latter being granted only through grace, special merit or prayer, "dan bosze unterthanen strafft Gott mit boszen regenten" (WA 6,72). In his tract "Ob Kriegsleute" also Luther writes:

Wie bald hat er [Gott] einen Tyrannen erwurgt?
Er thets auch wohl. Aber unser sünde leidens nicht...Gar fein konnen wir sehen, das ein bube regirt. Aber das wil niemand sehen, das er nicht um seiner buberey willen sondern umb des volcks sünde willen regirt (WA 19,637).

Schafferus, 81-82.

See Die Fabeln des Erasmus Alberus, 55. The passage is taken from the "Morale" to Fable #11.

It is interesting that the 1544 commentator has changed the narrative text here from "Dat he einen Konnynck wolde geuen" (2203) to "Die auch hetten so grosz verlangen / Nach einem andern Kunig und Herrn." This constitutes a return to the original Aesop fable, as this is reproduced, for example, in Steinhöwel's collection (as the first fable in Book II), where Jupiter first dropped a log of wood into the frogs' pond and only sent them the stork when they continued to implore him to let them have a king. Luther himself used this fable in its original form in "Ob Kriegsleute" to illustrate the difference between changing rulers and getting a better one: "Endern mag leichtlich geschehen. Bessern ist mislich und ferlich. Warumb? Es steyt nicht ynn
unserm willen und vermögen sondern alleine ynn Gotts willen und hand" (WA 19, 639).

304 See n130 above for details of Aquinas's belief in this.

305 See Huizinga Herbst chap. X, particularly 176-82.

306 See Le Curial par Alain Chartier ed. F. Heukenkamp (Halle: Niemeyer, 1899). Chartier lived from c.1365 - c.1433, spending most of his life in the service of King Charles VII of France.


308 Huizinga Herbst, 182.

309 Chartier, 7.

310 Chartier, 9.

311 Chartier, 11. In view of the fact that the original author of this work was an Italian it is perhaps not surprising to find here this emphasis on the Italian virtù, the quality that the Renaissance writers of that country considered essential in order to counter the treatment afforded them by the goddess Fortuna. Rupprich Literatur 4:1, 451, translates this word as "geistig ausgeprägte Willenskraft."

312 Chartier, 23.

313 Chartier, as above.


315 For the Latin text see Bücking III, 45-73.


317 See n234 above for details of the various editions of this work. These lines (20-25) appear on p. 2 of the Goedeke edition.

318 This remark should probably be taken literally. It appears to be evidence of how salaried court servants and counsellors with personal obligations to the ruler were taking the place of members of the nobility with feudal obligations to him. See Schildhauer, 4, for a description of how this was being introduced in Mecklenburg as early as the reign of Duke Magnus I (1477-1503).
Charles I was beheaded on January 30, 1649.

Matt 5,6: Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled. This thirst, the commentator adds, should not be only for earthly riches, as with the avaricious, nor for carnal pleasure, as with the lascivious, nor for worldly power, as with the proud. (Here he is targeting the three deadly sins of avaricia, luxuria, superbia).

The viewpoint of these two commentators here would seem to derive from Luther's emphasis on the equal importance of all kinds of work and the necessity of not distinguishing in this regard between different tasks. He writes, for example, in his "Kinder zur Schule halten":"Ein igliches hat seine ehre von Gott so wol als seine ordenung und werck ...Man soll alle stende und werck Gottes auffs hohest loben als man jmer kan, and keins umb des andern willen verachten" (WA 30:2,569).

This was certainly Luther's opinion. See, for example, his reference to this in his "An den christlichen Adel," where he remarks on "der misprauch fressens und sauffens, davon wir Deutschen, als einem szondern laster, nit ein gut geschrey haben in frembden landen"(WA 6,467). Likewise in his interpretation of the 101st psalm (1534) he remarks: "Es mus aber ein iglich land seinen eigen Teufel haben...Unser Deudscher Teufel wird ein guter weinschlauch sein und mus Sauff heissen...Und wird solcher ewiger durst und Deutschlands plague bleiben (habe ich sorge) bis an den Jüngsten tag" (WA 51,257).

According to G.Dahm, "On the Reception of Roman and Italian Law in Germany," Pre-Reformation Germany, ed. and trans. G.Strauss (London:Macmillan,1972):314, Roman law was introduced into Germany as the Emperor's law - that is, the good old law of the Empire transmitted by the Roman to the German Emperors - in order to smooth the path of its reception.

Dahm, 290. See also Schmidt-Weigand's glossary at the end of her translation of the Sachsenspiegel, 395, where, against the term "Gericht," she writes:


Dahm, 289.

Dahm, 310.


Kunkel, 273; Dahm, 287.

Dahm, 292 and 304; Kunkel, 276.

Dahm, 229.

Dahm, 301. Justinian I, Emperor of Byzantium 527 -65, was responsible for the drawing up of the Corpus Iuris Civilis.

See Dahm, 300; Rupprich Literatur 4:1, 699.

For example in Württemberg, see Dahm, 307.


Kunkel, 268-69, suggests that the first German students who enrolled at the universities of Bologna, Padua and Orléans were almost exclusively members of the clergy whose principal study would have been Canon Law. He goes on to point out, 269-70, that in the earliest German universities only Canon Law was taught, whereas in those founded after 1450, such as Basel (1460) and Tübingen (1477), chairs for Roman law were established from the beginning, after which other German universities followed suit. From then on, furthermore, the students tended mostly to be laymen.

See, for example, Luther in his "Kinder zur Schule halten" (1530):"Wenn ich aber von den Juristen sage, meine ich nicht allein die Doctores, sondern das ganzte handwerck als Cantzler,schreiber, Richter, Fursprecher, Notarius und was zum rechte des regiments gehöret" (WA 30:2,559).

Kunkel, 269, refers to Der Renner in this connection. The RVC commentator himself (III,2,2) gives examples from classical literature, and Reinaert II also provides an example of this in 4200 - 4248. For current Humanist criticism see Hutten’s dialogue Praedones, the Latin text to be found in Böcking 4, 363-406. Extracts from this dialogue under the title The Robbers have been translated by G. Strauss, Discontent, 202-07.
For Luther natural law usually meant doing unto others as you would they should do unto you, as this is expressed in both Matt. 7,12 and Luke 6,31 (eg. in WA 6,48). Melanchthon, however, described natural law in his Loci Communes of 1521 as a common judgement to which all men alike assent, and therefore one which God has inscribed upon the soul of each man, see LW 45, 127, n127. For his part, Aquinas (ST 1a2ae 91,2) had written that natural law is nothing other than the sharing in Eternal Law by intelligent creatures, see EDF Vol. 28:23. As far as reason is concerned, Luther has often been portrayed as despising this utterly. This is, however, only true in spiritual matters. In the temporal world, as he explains in his tract "Kinder zur Schule halten," reason holds sway: "Aber inn weltlichem reich mus man aus der vernunft (da her die Rechte auch komen sind) handeln, denn Gott hat der vernunft unterworffen solch zeitlich regiment und leiblich wesen" (WA 30:2,562), confirming here what he had already written seven years before in "Von weltlicher Oberkeit": "und das uberst recht uund meyster alles rechten bleybe die vernunft" (WA 11,272).

The work referred to here is De origine juris Germanici by Hermann Conring, see Kunkel, 264.

See Jacoby, 96-97.

Compare Sachsenspiegel, 1,67,1 in the Schmidt-Wiegand translation: "Wen man vor Gericht anklagt ohne dass er anwesend ist, den soll man zum nächsten Gerichtstag vorladen. Wen man aber eines Verbrechens anklagt, den soll man dreimal vorladen..."

Compare Jacob Grimm, Deutsche Rechtsaltermümer vol.2 (1899; rpt. Darmstadt, 1965): 491-94, who records under the heading of "Beweis": "Zeuge war jeder freie, der bei einem verhandelten geschäft in der absicht zugezogen wurde, dass er es nöthigenfalls durch seine aussage bestätigen könnte (491).... Das abgelegte gültige zeugnis enschied die sache, ohne dass vom gericht noch ein urteil gefunden zu werden brauchte; der zeuge, indem er die warheit sagte war folglich in der that urteilend...In der regel wurden die zeugen vom kläger zum beweis seiner klage beigebracht, doch konnte auch der beklagte durch sie das geschäft bewahrheiten lassen, worauf er seine vertheidigung stützte" (493-94).

The entry under "quellenregister" on p.649 of vol 2 of Grimm's work reads as follows: Lübisches recht: Dav. Mevius commentarii in jus. lubecense. ed. 4 Frankfurt und Leipzig 1700.

2 Chron 19,6: Und sprach zu den Richtern, sehet zu was jr thut. Denn jr haltet das Gericht nicht den Menschen, sondern dem Herrn, und er ist mit euch im Gericht. 7: Darum lasset die Furcht des Herrn bei euch sein, haltet und thut das Recht; denn bei dem
Herrn, unserm Gott, ist kein Unrecht, weder Ansehen der Person, noch Annehmen von Geschencken.

\[\text{See under, p. 230.}\]

\[\text{H. Kokott brings up this question in his article "'Id is recht tyd, wylle wy nu klagen.' Der 'Reynke de Vos' als Prozess," Ndjb 105 (1982):70, where he writes that "die im 'Reynke de Vos' gestaltete Prozessform, das benutzte Rechtsfindenverfahren, in der damaligen Rechtsrealität Lübecks keine Rolle spielte, vielleicht auch früher nie gespielt hat. Hier setzte sich, gerade auch in Strafsachen, zunehmend der inquisitorische Anklageprozess durch. Die Prozessform des 'Reynke de Vos' konnte nur von historischem Interesse sein..." Since, however, Kokott gives no annotation to support these pronouncements, I have been unable to follow this up.}\]

\[\text{See above, p. 184.}\]

\[\text{See Lübben Reinke, 244 note to 1.1601, where he explains that, according to custom, when a child was caned, he/she should kiss the cane and say: "Liebe ruot, trute ruot / en werestu, ich thet niemer guot."}\]

\[\text{Schoeps I, 176-77.}\]

\[\text{These articles constitute both a confession of faith and an apologia in that Luther also explains here in some detail why he has rejected Roman church teaching. He was requested to draw them up for a meeting in 1537 of the members of the Schmalkaldic Alliance, formed in 1531 for purposes of self-defence, in preparation for a General Council of the whole church to be convened later in the year in Mantua by the Pope. Luther's sudden illness, however, prevented discussion of these articles at this meeting in 1537, but they were nevertheless signed by the forty-three theologians in attendance there and later were included in the Book of Concord (Konkordienbuch), compiled in 1580, which constitutes the official confession of the Lutheran faith.}\]

\[\text{The institution of compulsory confession at least once a year at Eastertime for all who had reached the age of maturity was introduced in the decrees of the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215. It gave rise to the composition of numerous "summas" or confessional manuals over the succeeding three centuries. These were learned treatises covering every eventuality imaginable as far as the commission of sin was concerned, compiled first by Dominicans, and then, after 1300, predominantly by Franciscans, as T. Tentler explains in his article "The Summa for Confessors as an instrument of Social Control," The Pursuit of Holiness in late Medieval and Renaissance Religion (Leiden: Brill, 1974): 103-05. After 1400, however, "Beichtspiegel" began to appear, modelled largely on Archbishop Anthony of Florence's \textit{Tractatus de instructione seu directione simplicium confessorum}, which, as the title implies, was composed for the benefit of the lower clergy.}\]
See S. Ozment in his *The Reformation and the Cities* (New Haven/New York: Yale U.P., 1975): 127. The type of instruction given confessors in these manuals provided not only specific questions regarding sins against the Ten Commandments, but also minute questioning on the exact circumstances in which the sin was committed.

Luther was by no means the only reformer to write on the subject of confession. Between 1521 and 1525 three others - Johannes Oec1ampedius, Jakob Strauss and Johannes Bugenhagen - also produced tracts on the subject. In his Lübeck Church Order Bugenhagen provides for both a general confession to be spoken by the assembled congregation - see Hauschild LKo, 87 - and also for private confession to a minister of the church on Saturday evening after the Vesper service - Hauschild LKo, 107. However, according to Ozment, 160, in the Church Order he wrote for the city of Braunschweig, where he devoted a hundred pages to the subject of confession, Bugenhagen recommended communal, congregational confession as the better course.

See under, pp. 231-32.

The similarity of this passage with one at the very end of *SpL* is worth noting. Here on p. 75 we read:

Vor alle andere sunde machmen dy bothe (Busse) setten uthgenomen vor unrecht gud, dar is nene bote vor to setten, eer yd wedder to rechte kumpt dar id hen hort, so vern men de hebben kan effte ere negesten eruen. Kan men se nicht hebben, so horet id den armen na rade eynes wysen bychtvaders.

See also Brandes NS, LVI, and Kämpfer, 111-12, where they both quote passages from the "Plenarien" of 1486 and 1492 and Brandes one in addition from *Sunte Birgitta openbaringe* with very similar wording. *SpL* and the "Plenarien" also reproduce the Latin quotation. This is one of the best examples of the close connection between the "Mohnkopf" publications of this period. With regard to restitution, Tentler, 119-22, points out how important this was in the lives of late mediaeval Christians, referring specifically in this connection to the particularly extensive coverage given to it in one of the last of the "Summas," the so-called *Angelica*, compiled during the 1460s by the Franciscan, Angelus Carletus de Clavisio.

Kämpfer, 136, writes: "Es war wohl eines der Hauptanliegen der Geistlichkeit im späten Mittelalter, den gleichgültig gewordenen Mensch zu einer guten Beichte - vor allem vor dem Tode - zu bewegen."

Luke 9, 62: And Jesus said unto them, No man having put his hand to the plough and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of heaven.
This was certainly true of Sebastian Franck - see H. Weigelt, Sebastian Franck und die lutherische Reformation (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1972): 15-16, where he states that in two of Franck's early writings dating from 1528 he complains of the absence of the improvement in morals he had hoped the Reformation would bring. For his part, S. Ozment, in his chapter on Franck entitled "The Bruised Idealist" in his Mysticism and Dissent (New Haven: Yale U.P., 1973): 136, writes: "Franck's view of the religious life was so intensely ethical in nature that it could be adjusted to the inevitable imperfection of an institutionalized religion only with great difficulty." Writing in 1529 the Humanist Willibald Pirckheimer of Nürnberg also challenged the reformers to show their faith by their works and let men see for themselves that they were good soil by the abundance of fruit that they bore. See H. Rupprich, "Willibald Pirckheimer: A Study of his Personality as a Scholar," Pre-Reformation Germany, ed. and trans. G. Strauss (London: Macmillan, 1972): 422.

Compare this expression with that used by Luther regarding Karlstadt, where he writes that the latter wanted to be seen as "der aller hohest heylinger geyst, der den heylingen geyst mit feddern und mit all gefressen habe" (WA 18, 66).

See n358 above.

See Ozment Cities, 23 and 174 n34. Seven was the age at which the mediaeval church considered a child capable of committing a mortal sin.

With this application of the Gospel text - with the equation, in other words, of Reinke's turning back to look at the hens, that is, to his life of sin, with the man who looked back after putting his hand to the plough - the commentator seems here to be giving a personal interpretation. Since this passage is not included in the Gospel readings for the Church's Year there is no comment on it in the "Plenarien." In DD., however, we have a different interpretation. Here it is worldly honour and glory that the ploughman is looking back to, and the plough itself represents life in a religious order. Here the beguine says to Death:

Wente min bichtvader mi ok kortes sede (sagte)
Dat der here in dem ewangelio heft gesecht,
Dat alle, dede sine hant an de ploch lecht
(Pflug legt),
Sud (sieht) he to rugge na der wertliken ere
He is Godes rikes nicht werdich, sprikt unse
leue here.
Bi dem ploge is ein geistlick leuent bekant,
Daran hebbe ik geslagen mine hant (1219-24).

See Lübben/Walther where on p. 35 the word bekennen is defined among other ways as "anerkennen (eine Schuld)" and, on
The specific mention here of a "bichtvader," which is absent in RVA, where it can be taken for granted, may reflect an incident in local Rostock history. In 1531, namely, problems had arisen concerning a member of the local clergy who was anxious to do away altogether with private confession in the Rostock churches. However, opinions (Gutachten) on the subject sought from Bugenhagen (at that moment in Lübeck) and from Luther and Melanchthon in Wittenberg strengthened the City Council in its conviction that private confession should be retained. See Wiechman-Kadow, "Der Zwist der evangelischen Prediger zu Rostock im Jahre 1531 und Johannn Bugenhagens Gutachten darüber," JVMGA 24(1859):140-55; also Schmalz, 25-26; Vorberg, 48-49.

Luther's instructions in his "Kleiner Katechismus" (1531) under the heading "Wie man die Einfeltigen sol leren Beichten" begin: "Fur Gott sol man aller sunden sich schuld geben, auch die wir nicht erkennen, wie wir jm Vater unser thun. Aber fur dem Beichtiger sollen wir allein die sunde bekennen, die wir wissen und fillen im hertzen" (WA 30:1,384). The instructions end:

Welche aber grosse beschwerung des gewissens haben odder betrubt und angefochten sind, die wird ein Beicht vater wol wissen mit mehr spruchen zu trosten und zum glauben reitzen (WA 30:1,387).

It is usual to distinguish between Reinke's first confession in Book I, his second confession in Book II - both to Grimbart - and his false confession, also in Book I, when he was already on the scaffold and which was, of course, a pack of lies.

Luther gives us an account in his Schmalkaldic Articles of what a torment this practice of confession could be, or certainly had been to him:

Ein iglicher muste alle seine sunde erzelen (welchs ein unmuglich ding ist), das war eine grosse marter, Welche er aber vergessen hatte, wurden yhm so fern vergeben, wenn sie jm würden einfallen, das er sie noch must beichten. Damit kundte er numer wissen, wenn er rein gnug gebeicht, oder wenn das beichen ein mal ein ende haben solt (WA 50,231).

Luther brings up this point in his Confitendi Ratio (1520), where he states that one result of the insistence on cataloguing sins is that the penitent is kept so busy with this and with the effort of memory that is needed that he completely loses his pangs of conscience and thus forgoes the usefulness of a salutary confession (WA 6,163-64; LW 39.37).
According to Rupprich, Literatur 4:2, 66, confession was formally abrogated in Calvin’s Genfer Katechismus of 1542.

Moses (Lev) 14,2: Das ist das Gesetz über den Aussetzigen, wenn er sol gereinigt werden, Er sol zum Priester kommen. 3: Und der Priester sol aus dem Lager gehen, und besehen, wie das Mal des aussatzes am Aussetzigen heil worden ist.

Matt 8,4: Und Jhesus sprach zu jm, Sihe zu, sags niemand sondern gehe hin, und zeige dich dem Priester, Und opffere die Gabe, die Moses befolhen hat, zu einem zeugnis über sie.

E. Zeeden, Martin Luther und die Reformation vol 1. (Freiburg i.Br:Herder, 1950):69. Schoeps 11:55 writes in the same vein on this subject that “das Herzstück der lutherischen Lehre ist bereits ausgebrochen worden, das Finden der Seele zu Gott, das einmal geschiet und das über alles andere im Leben des Menschen ein Licht der Begnadung wirft.”

The Gravamina were complaints against the Papal Curia concerning abuses in the administration of the Roman church in Germany. They had been submitted for the very first time to the Council of Constance in 1417 and then for the first time within the German Empire itself to the Diet of Frankfurt in 1456.

See paras. 43 and 95 of the 1521 Gravamina to be found on p.59 and p.63 respectively in Manifestations of Discontent in Germany on the Eve of the Reformation (Bloomington: Indiana U.P.,1971), ed. and trans. G.Strauss. This work will be cited Strauss Discontent.

Strauss Discontent, 59, para. 47.

Matt 16,18: Und ich sage dir auch. Du bist Petrus, und auff diesen Felsen wil ich bawen meine Gemeine, und die Pforten der Hellen sollen sie nicht uberweldigen. 19: Und will dir des Himmelreichs schlüssel geben, Alles was du auff Erden binden wirst, sol auch im Himel gebunden sein, Und alles was du auff Erden losen wirst, sol auch im Himel los sein.

Matt 18,18: Warlich ich sage euch, was jr auff Erden binden werdet, sol auch im Himel gebunden sein, Und was jr auff erden lösen werdet, sol auch im Himel los sein.

John 20,22: Und da er das saget, blies er sie an, und spricht zu jnen, Nemet him den heiligen Geist, 23: welchen jr die sünde erlasset, den sind sie erlassen, und welchen jr sie behaltet, den sind sie behalten.

Hauschild LKg, 143-44.

Strauss Discontent, 6. The Reformatio Sigismundi is an anonymous document, composed in German c.1438, which purports to be based on the late Emperor Sigismund’s (d.1437) reform
Martin Mair was secretary to the then Archbishop of Mainz who functioned automatically by virtue of this office as Imperial Chancellor. It should not, of course, be thought that complaints such as these were restricted to the later Middle Ages, as Walther von der Vogelweide's two "Sprüche" (L 34,4 and 34,14) testify, where, in the second of these, for instance, he apostrophizes the collecting box that had been placed in all churches: "Saget an, her stoc, hat eich der bäbest her gesendet / daz ir iu rîchet und uns Tiutschen ermet unde pfendet?"
For these and further details see B. Moeller, "Frömmigkeit in Deutschland um 1500," ARG 56 (1965): 12-13, and Huizinga Herbst, 230-32.

See Jannasch, 64; Lortz 1:98-99.

See n387 above.

Interestingly, Kämpfer, 146 n9, remarks on the fact that in the "Plenarien" indulgences are hardly mentioned at all, and in DD there is only one reference to them in connection with the Pope's failure to use the money for the purpose for which it was collected, namely for a crusade against the Turks (ll. 661-68).

Matt 7, 15: Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. 20: Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them.

See n390 above.

The mention here of "S. Jacob" refers to the shrine of Santiago de Compostella in Spain.

The first of these Jubilee or Golden Years was celebrated in 1300, the idea then being that they should fall only every hundred years. In 1350, however, this was shortened to fifty years, and in 1470 to twenty-five years.

See the Hauschild quotation, pp. 239-40 above, for an explanation of what is meant here.

Luther had written in his "Von den guten Werken" (1520):

Aber der böse geist, der nit ruget, wo ehr nit kan uns auff der lincken seyten in die bossen werck furen, sicht er auff der rechten seyten durch eigen, erdachte, scheinend gute werck (WA 6, 223).

Schafferus, 66, has pointed out that the RVC commentator has changed Agricola's "kirche" here to "Christlyke gemeine," which suggests to me a familiarity with Luther's "Grosser Katechismus" (1529), where he discusses these two terms, pointing out that the word "kirche" has come to be associated - albeit erroneously - with a building. "Darumb solts auff recht deutsch und unser mutter sprach heissen 'ein Christliche gemeine oder samlung'" (WA 30:1, 189). Later in the same section of the catechism Luther writes concerning the Holy Spirit: "aber der Heilige geist treibt sein werck on unterlas bis auff den iungsten tag, dazu er verordnet eine gemeine auff erden, da durch er alles redet und thuert" (WA 30:1, 191). (Agricola's Proverbs and Luther's catechism both appeared in the same year, 1529).
The Gospel passage Agricola had in mind is almost certainly Matt 18,19-20. See under p.254.

Para. 31 of the 1521 Gravamina voices the complaint that ecclesiastical courts allow clerics to get off scot-free, no matter what their offence. See Strauss Discontent, 58.

It is perhaps not generally realised that even Luther himself was not disposed to do this initially, as he explains in the opening sentences of his "De captivitate Babylonica" (1520) (WA 6,497; LW 36,11), where he refers to a Latin tract he had written two years earlier, at which time he had not rejected indulgences entirely, but wishes now that he had. A good example of the Humanist attitude in this concern is Erasmus's "A Pilgrimage for Religion's Sake," a colloquy from the 1526 edition of his Colloquia Familiaria. Here Erasmus makes fun of all three subjects we have been dealing with here - indulgences, pilgrimages and veneration of the saints - without, however, condemning them outright. See Erasmus Colloquia 1, ed. and trans. C.R.Thompson (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1980):56-91.

Ps. 109,17: As he loved cursing, so let it come unto him; as he delighted not in blessing, so let it be far from him.

As Lortz reports, 1:135, many of Erasmus's critics accused him of having laid the egg which Luther and Zwingli hatched. Spitz, too, 153, refers to Eobanus Hessus, an Erfurt Humanist, as writing that Erasmus had pointed out what pruning was needed in God's vineyard and that Luther, a greater man for this reason, had taken an axe and done the pruning.

See Rupprich Literatur 4:2, 139.

See Strauss Discontent, 9.

See Strauss Discontent, 16-18.

In his Schmalkaldic Articles, under the title "Von Clostergelubden," Luther writes:

Denn wer da gelobt ein Closterleben, der gleubt, das er ein besser leben fure denn der gemein Christen man, und wil durch seine warck nicht allein jm selber sondern andern zum Himel helfen: Das heisst Christum verleugnen (WA 50,251).

See para. 71 of the 1521 Gravamina, which records the criticism of monks and priests who hover over a man in his final illness, trying to persuade him to leave his money to them.
although they know his estate should go to his heirs. See Strauss, Discontent, 62.

410 See Ozment Cities, 53-54, for his description of this sort of thing in a summarized passage from Johannes Römer's Ein schöner Dialogus von den vier grössten Beschwerinnen eines jeglichen Pfarrers (Schlettstadt, 1521).

417 1 Cor 7,34: Welche nicht freiet, die sorget was den Herrn angehöret, das sie heilig sey beide am Leib und auch am Geist. Die aber freiet, die sorget was die Welt angehöret, wie sie dem Manne gefalle.

418 1 Cor 7,7: Ich wolte aber lieber, alle Menschen weren wie ich bin. Aber ein jeglicher hat seine eigene gabe von Gott, einer sonst, einer so. 8: Ich sage zwar den Ledigen und Widwen, es ist ihnem gut, wenn sie auch bleiben wie ich. 9: So sie aber sich nicht enthalten, so las sie freien. Es ist besser freien, denn brunst leiden.

417 On account of the Italian setting it is tempting to see a connection here between this story referred to by the 1650 commentator and Boccaccio's treatment of the same subject - namely the unfulfilled life that nuns were forced to lead - in the story of Masetto da Lamporecchio and in his Decameron (1349-51) and in his De claris mulieribus (1360-74) in the entry concerning the life of Rhea Ilia, the mother of Romulus and Remus. In the former (III,1), a young gardener posing as a deaf mute finds employment in a nunnery, where he spends the rest of his life "bringing little monks into the world." In the second work Boccaccio uses the figure of Rhea Ilia, who was forced to become a vestal virgin against her will, to excoriate the shutting away of young girls in cloisters before they can know what life has to offer. See Guido Guarino's introduction to Concerning Famous Women by Giovanni Boccaccio (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1963):XX-XXII. It was not only in Italy, however, that such views surfaced. See E. Döring Hirsch, Tod und Jenseits im Spätmittelalter (Berlin: Curtius, 1927):17 for the account of a Nuns' Song inserted into the Limburger chronicle of 1359 where one of the nuns remarks: "Gott gib dem ein verdorben Jahr, der mich macht zu einer Nonnen."

420 Schwarzenberg was personally concerned in this question, having in 1524 removed his daughter Barbara from a convent in Bamberg, an action which he defended in a "Sendbrief" the same year. See Willy Scheel's introduction to Schwarzenberg's Trostspruch um abgestorbene Freunde, X.

421 Katherina von Bora, who became Luther's wife in 1525, was one of these. At the age of five, on the death of her mother, she was placed in a Benedictine convent, and later, when she was twelve, was transferred to a Ciscercian convent at Nimschen near Grimma, taking her vows in 1515 at the age of sixteen. See LW 49,115 n1.
Pirckheimer, for example, had a number of female relatives in nunneries, which certainly influenced his views with regard to the Reformation, in this respect at least. In 1529 he wrote a defence of the Poor Clares - an order for women founded on the same lines as that of the original Franciscans. See Rupprich WP, 423.

Strauss Discontent, 14-16.

Strauss, as above, 44.

Strauss, as above, 60-63.

Strauss, as above, 10-14.

Strauss, as above, 60.

In her informative article "The Economic Position of Lutheran Pastors in Ernestine Thuringia 1521-1555," ARG 63(1972):102-06, Susan Boles quotes numerous letters from Luther to the Saxon Electors and others on the subject of the clergy's income, in one of which he suggests that money from the sequestred cloisters should be used to supplement this.

See n160 above.

It should be borne in mind here with regard to the clergy that, in respect of the early Renart stories in Branche I of the Roman de Renart, on which Book I of Reynke de vos is ultimately based, this was a comparatively recent innovation. Although clerical celibacy had been favoured by church authorities for many centuries, it was not until the twelfth century that the marriages of priests were declared invalid by decrees of the First and Second Lateran Councils of 1123 and 1139 respectively. For a discussion of this, see Paulin Paris's essay "Nouvelle étude sur Le Roman de Renart" accompanying his Les aventures de Maître Renart (Paris: Techener, 1861):337.

See n449 below.

Compare Luther in "Von dem Papsttum zu Rom" (1520):

Die erste Christenheit, die allein ist die warhaftige kirch, mag uund kan kein heubt auff erden haben, uund sie von niemant auff erden, noch Bischoff, noch Bapst, regirt mag werden, sondern allein Christus ym hymel ist hie das heubt und regiret allein (WA 6,297).

Cor 7,32: Ich wollte aber, das jr on sorge weret, wer ledig ist, der sorget was den Herrn angehoret, wie er dem Herrn gefalle. 33: wer aber freiet, der sorget was die Welt angehoret, wie er dem Weiße gefalle...
See n418 above.

As above. See also Luther in his "Wider den geistlich genannten Stand des Papsts und der Bischöfe" (1522): "Die schriftt sampt der teglichen erfarung leret, das keuscheyt ubirnaturlich, eyn szondere gantz ungemeyn gottis gabe ist, die auch wenig grosenn heyligen geben ist" (WA 10:2,126).

Matt 5,16: Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your father which is in Heaven.

This usually occurred on the advice of the ecclesiastical authorities, namely the Visitors. Such visitations were first instituted in Electoral Saxony, for example, in 1527, each visitatorial team, of which there were four, consisting of four members - two theologians and two lay members representing the temporal government, see Trüdinger, 72-76. For an example of such an event, see Luther's letter of August 16, 1538 to the Elector Johann Friedrich where Luther, qua Visitor, reports to him concerning a certain erring pastor who "auf unserem, der Visitatoren Ansuchen...durch den Landvogt zu Sachsen allhier inhaftiert und noch hier auf dem Turm in einem Gemach sitzet," quoted in Reinmar Zeller ed., Luther, wie ihn keiner kennt (Freiburg i.B:Herder,1982):111-12.

In 1543, the year in which Johannes Brenz was confirmed as chief preacher of St. Michael's in the free, imperial city of Schwäbisch Hall, his salary was set in perpetuity at 200 gulden a year, together with free living-quarters and a supplement of 50 gulden p.a. for a tutor for his son. See Hans-Martin Maurer and Kuno Ulshöfer, Johannes Brenz und die Reformation in Württemberg (Stuttgart: Thiess,1974):90.

Basing her findings on a 1545 survey of rural areas, Boles, 96-101, lists eight different sources of income for country pastors - both in cash and in kind - some more productive than others.

Boles, 112, refers to three letters over the period 1539 to 1542, one from Luther's wife, two from Luther himself, complaining to the Electoral authorities and to the Elector himself about rising prices. In his 1540 tract, "An die Pfarrherrn wider die Wucher zu predigen," Luther also mentions the fact that a family which could once get by on 100 gulden a year now needs 200 (WA 51,417).

1 Tim 5,18: Und ein Erbeiter ist seines Lohns werd.

See Ozment Cities, 55-56, for a comparison of Protestant and Roman church practices with regard to the dying. The former he describes as a concentration on salvation through faith in Christ in an effort to neutralize the fear and anxiety
surrounding death. For a description of Roman Church practice, see Döring Hirsch, 19-22.

Referring to the fact that temporal authorities are now free from the tyranny of the church, Luther in his interpretation of the 82nd psalm rebukes these authorities for the way they are now behaving:

O das kutzelt sie so wol, das sie auch schier nicht wissen, wie mutwilliglich sie solcher gnaden und freyheit miszbrauchen wollen, Und vervolgen doch die weil das Evangelion, durch welchs sie sind Götter und herrn über die geistlichen worden, zum schein, als wolten sie den geistlichen stand schutzen und verteydigen (WA 31:1,190).

Compare Luther’s opening sentence in his interpretation of the 82nd psalm:

Vorzeiten, da Bepste, Bischoffe, Pfaffen und Monche ynn solchem regiment sassen, das mit kleinen banbriefen Könige und Fürsten zwingen und trieben kunden, wo sie hin wolten on alles widdersetzen oder gegen wehre, Ja das Könige und Fürsten keinem monche oder pfaffen, wie geringe der selbige brotwurm war, thursten ein har krümen, musten sie darüber das leiden, das ein grober esel auch auff der Cantzel mocht konig und Fürsten ausfilzen und seine lust an ihn büssen nach allem mutwillen (WA 31:1,189).

Originating in the 1520s in South West Germany in and around Strasbourg under the influence of the Swiss Reformer Huldrich Zwingli rather than of Luther, the centre of the Reformed Church transferred later in the century to Heidelberg, whence it spread down the Rhine.

Compare Luther in his "Wider den fälsch genannten geistlichen Stand": "Ein bischoff soll ynn der Biblien geleret sein, studieren tag und nacht, selber predigen seynem volck" (WA 10;2,131).

Compare Luther, as above:

Ists nu Gottis wortt und des heyligen geysts ordenung, alles was Paulus sagt und setzet. So folget drausz: Zum ersten, das alles was widder seyn wort und ordnung ist, gewislich widder gott und den heyligen geyst ist. Ists wider gott und seynen geyst, szo ists gewislich ausz dem teuffell (WA 10;2,139).
Compare Luther, as above: "Wo sollt yemand eyn Bischoff seyn, so er nit hohe hengst reytttet, uund sich nit gnediger herr nennen lessit, wilchs alleyne gnugsam ist, bischoff tzü machen" (WA 10:2,142-43).

See Luther's strictures on this subject in the same tract:


Lübben Reinke, 345, renders this as someone who makes "lose, durchtriebene Streiche."

Compare Luther as above:

S. Paulus hat es vorkundigt, das glelich wie der teuffel an sich nymp eyn larven des engels des liechts, alszo nehmen auch disze teuffells apostel [=die Bischofe] an sich die larven und namen der apostel und diener Christi (WA 10:2,145).

See Oskar Schade ed., Satiren und Pasquille aus der Reformationszeit vols. 1-3 (1863; rpt. Hildesheim: Olms,1966). This work is to be found in vol. 3:1-36.

Referring to the Pope in the same tract, Luther wrote: "Denn er leukett (leugnet) nit gottis wortt, szondernn thut nur alles, was widder ist, unter gottis wortt scheynn uund deckel" (WA 10:2,139).

The Thirty Years War had produced an impetus towards reconciliation among the churches, these efforts being associated primarily with Georg Calixtus, Professor of Theology at Helmstedt University from 1614 to 1656, see NDB (3): 96-97. Harsdörffer, too, was interested in this, according to Syrockzi, 161-62.

See n437 above.

See n444 above.

In 1527, for example, Georg Winkler, a preacher in Halle, a town in the diocese of Halberstadt, of which Archbishop Albrecht of Mainz was Administrator, was ambushed and killed after he had both taken a wife and celebrated Communion in both kinds. See LW 49,182 n10.
See Newald, 217-18.

Compare DD, where Death says to the Cardinal: "Wente to Rome hebbe gi mannige valsche list / Daran de pawest unschuldich ist" (313-14).

The definitions in brackets following this and the other names listed are suggested by Lübben Reinke, 343-47.

Lübben Reinke gives this definition, 313.

Strauss Discontent, 9-10.

Strauss, as above, 43-46.

Strauss, as above, 53-58.

Luther is thought to have used the Gravamina presented to the Diet of Worms in 1518 as his source.

See H. Grimm, The Reformation Era 1500-1650 (New York: Macmillan, 1973):32. Grimm describes how by 1500 the Curia was divided into four departments: a) the rota Romana or consistory court, which also served as a supreme court, b) the cancellaria apostolica, or chancery court, where papal documents and bulls were prepared, c) the poenitentaria apostolica, or penitentiary, which dealt with excommunication, interdicts, indulgences and dispensations, and d) the camera apostolica or chamber, which managed papal finances.

See Böcking IV:149-261 where the text is given in both the Latin and the German versions. The work constitutes a dialogue between Hutten and Ernholt, the title given here being that of the German version, from which the quotations in this RVC gloss are taken. The Trias Romana is actually a separate work - see Böcking IV:262-68 - again with both Latin and German versions, but very much along the same lines.

In the course of a short sketch of this family of merchant bankers, originally textile entrepreneurs, Schoeps writes: "Die Fugger waren nicht blos Bankier der Habsburger, sondern auch der Kurie. Von 1508 - 1539 lag die päpstliche Münze fast immer in ihren Händen." See Schoeps 1:59.

A literary illustration of this stipulation can be found in Friedrich Hebbel's *Agnes Bernauer* where, in III,13, Prince Albrecht is forced openly to declare his legal marriage to Agnes before he is permitted to take part in the tournament.

See Huizinga *Herbst*, 103-110, where he compares the function of tournaments in the later Middle Ages with that of sport in our own century.

See Matt 7,3: Was siiestu aber den splitter in deines Bruders auge, und wirst nicht gewar des Balcken in deinem auge?

Bezolt, 54, for example, mentions "die altkirchliche Anschauung, dass der wahre Adel nicht im Blut, sondern in der Tüchtigkeit des einzelnen liege." See also Boethius in his *Consolation of Philosophy* - pp.254-55 in the Loeb edition - where Philosophy claims that children should not be ennobled through their parents, they should achieve this in their own right. In his *The Discarded Image* (Cambridge: C.U.P.,1967):84, C.S.Lewis writes: "This doctrine had a flourishing progeny in the Middle Ages, and became a popular subject for school debates." Compare also here a passage from Hugo von Trimb erg's *Der Renner* (Frankfurt,1549), composed c.1300, where he writes, Biiliß:

Niemandt ist edel dann den der muht
Edel macht / und nicht grosses gut.
Ein edel kindt das eddel sitte
Hat / dem folget auch tugend mit/
Freundt / und gut gebent keyne tugent /
Man musz die tugent lernn von jugent.

Extracts from Albrecht von Eyb's *Ehebuchlein*, first printed in 1472, are to be found in Rupprich *Hum/Ren* 1:271.

Rupprich *Literatur* 4:1, 525. The Latin original of this speech can be found in Rupprich *Hum/Ren* 2: 226-38.

See the Born translation of this work, 151.

*Dichtung und Wahrheit* IV,17.

The context here for this remark is admittedly a discussion on the illegitimate children of priests, not a reference to nobility as such. However in *DD*, where, towards the end of the work, Death is musing upon the equality of all people when they come face to face with him, the "Tugendadel" claim is emphasized most strongly, with the added argument that those virtues which make a man truly noble are themselves the gift of God, see 11.1631-34 and 1639-44 in the Baethcke edition. Compare here, too, a passage from the 1492 "Plenar," where the writer couples with "de wandernde Lucifer" such people "de sik in homode (Hochmut) vorheven unde segghen efte dencken, dat se sint eddel geboren efte von riken luden efte beromen sik eres states efte rikedomes." See *DD*, 91, note to 1.1639.
"See n146 above.

See Trunz, Weltbild, 15: "Der Gelehrte war noch im späten Mittelalter meist Priester und genoss als solcher das Ansehen seines geistlichen Standes."

Trunz Weltbild, 15, in his longer essay "Der deutsche Späthumanismus um 1600 als Standeskultur," Deutsche Barockforschung, ed. R. Alewyn (Köln/Berlin: Kiepenheuer und Witsch, 1966):150, Trunz traces this theory of the equal value of the scholar and the nobleman to the Italian Renaissance. Huizinga, Herbst, 84, however, finds traces of it in French literature of the same period:


Trunz, Standeskultur, 150.

Trunz, as above, 157-58.

See above n283.

The reference here is undoubtedly to Ecclus. 36,1: Ehre den Arzt mit gebürlicher Verehrung, das du jn habest zur not... 12: Denn der Herr hat jn geschaffen und die Erzney kommt von den Höhsten. 4: Der Herr lesst die Ertzney aus der Erde wachsen, und ein vernünftiger veracht sie nicht. 6: Und er hat solche kunst den menschen gegeben, das er gepreiset wurde in seinen Wunderthaten. 7: Damit heilet er und vertreibt die schmertzen, und der Apotheker macht Ertzney draus. 8: Summa. Gottes werck kan man nicht alle erzelen, und er gibt alles was gut ist auff erden. 9: Mein Kind, wenn du kranck bist, so verachte dies nicht, sondern bitte den Herrn, so wird er dich gesund machen... 12: Darnach las den Arzt zu dir, Denn der Herr hat jn geschaffen, und las jn nicht von dir, weil du sein doch bedarffest.

Bezold, 75.

Bezold, 77.

Zeeden Kultur, 63.

Bezold, 64. Hemmerlin was a canon of the cathedral in Zürich. See Burger, 103-04.

Sebastian Brant. Das Narrenschiff, ed. M. Lemmer (Tübingen:

Bezold, 72. Bezold's views concerning the extreme radicalism of this document have been challenged in recent years. See Burger, 78–79.

See B. Könneker, Die deutsche Literatur der Reformationszeit (München: Winkler, 1975): 21. This work will be cited as Könneker DLR.

Stammler Mystik, 101.

Könneker DLR, 105.

Compare the opening lines of "von burschem uffgang" in Brants Narrenschiff (see n490 above), where he, too, stresses the original simplicity of the peasants: "Die buren eynfalt ettwann weren / Nüwlich jnn kurzt vergangenjen joren / Gerechtikeyt was by den buren."

The Act of Supremacy making Henry VIII Supreme Head of the Church of England was passed in 1534.

Franck made a careful study of the writings of the most illustrious of his contemporaries. In his Geschichtsbibel he devotes eighteen pages to those of Luther (CLIVb–CLXIIIa in the posthumous 1551 edition of this work).

Wenn denn eyn furst unrecht hatte, ist yhm seyn volck auch schuldig zu folgen? Antwort: Neyn. Denn wider recht gepürt niemant zu thun, Sondern man muss Gotte (der das recht haben will) mehr gehorchen denn den menschen (WA 11, 277).

LW 45, 233.


LW 45, 234.

This division is in itself somewhat confusing, since the burghers were mostly merchants. An explanation may be that the commentators here were seeking to distinguish between those who had full citizenship rights and those who had not, or between those who belonged to the patrician families and the others.

Zeeden Kultur, 124.

See Brandes JG, 267, for his account of the state of affairs in Braunschweig during this period.
The question at issue here in De officiis III, is the conflict that sometimes exists between what is expedient and profitable and what is morally right. The examples given are a) whether a corn merchant carrying corn to a famine-stricken city should inform the inhabitants that other ships are following his, or keep silent and get the best price offered, and b) whether a man selling his house should inform the buyer of its defects. Cicero came to the conclusion that in both cases the purchasers should be informed of the true facts.

Compare Luther in "An den christlichen Adel":

Hat doch got uns, wie andern landen, gnug geben, wolle, har, flachsz, und allis das zur zymlicher, erlicher kleydung einem yglichen standt redlich dienet, das wir nit bedurfften, szo grewlichen grossen schatz fur seyden, sammet, guldenstuck, und was der ausziendischen wahr ist, szo geudisch vorschutten (WA 6,465).

Es wechst uns yhe von gottis gnaden mehr essen und trincken, und szo kostlich und gut, als yrgent einem andern land (WA 6,466).

Compare Luther from "Von Kaufhandlung und Wucher":

Aber der auslendische kauffs handel, der aus Kalikut und Indien und der gleichen wahr her bringt, al Isol solch kostlich seyden und golitwerck und wurtze, die nur zur pracht und keynem nutz dienet und land und leutten das gellt aus seuget, sollt nicht zu gelassen werden (WA 15,293-94).

Compare Luther in "An den christlichen Adel":

Szo sehen wir, das dadurch [die Einführung fremder Kleidungsstoffe] ein yglicher wil dem andern gleich sein, und damit hoffart und neyd unter uns, wie wir vordienen, erregt und gemehret wirt (WA 6,465).

See p.62 above.

Compare Luther, as above:

Aber dasgrossist ungluck deutscher Nation ist gewislich der zynsz kauff; wo der nit were, must mancher sein seyden, sammet, guldenstuck, specerey und allerley prangen wol ungebraunt lassen. Er ist nit viel ubir hundert jar gestanden, und hat schon fast alle fursten, stift, stet, adel und erben in armut, jamer
und vorerben bracht (WA 6,466).

\[\text{\textsuperscript{811} Compare Luther, as above: "Ich sihe nit vil gutter sitten, die yhe in ein land kommen sein durch kauffmanschafft" (WA 6,466).}\\
\text{\textsuperscript{812} Compare Luther from "Von Kaufhandlung und Wucher":}\\
\begin{quote}
Von den Gesellschaften sollt ich wol viel sagen... Denn wer ist so grob, der nicht sihet, wie die gesellschaften nicht anders sind denn eytel rechte Monopolia? Welche auch die weltliche heydenische rechte verbeiten als eyn öffentlich scheidlich ding aller welt, ich will des göttlichen rechts und Christlichs gesetz schwegen. Denn die haben alle wahr unter yhren henden, und machens damit wie sie wollen, und treyben on alle schew die obberörten stuck [Verfehlungen, deren Luther die Kauffhändler eben beschuldigt hat], das sie steygern odder nyddrigen nach yhrem gefallen, und drucken und verderben all geringe Kauffleute (WA 15,312).
\end{quote}

\[\text{\textsuperscript{813} Compare Luther, as above:}\\
\begin{quote}
Das kan man aber nicht leucken (leugnen), das keuffen und verkeuffen eyn nottig ding ist, des man nicht emperen und wol Christlich brauchen kan sonderlich ynn den dingen, die zur nott und ehren dienen (WA 15,293).
\end{quote}

\[\text{\textsuperscript{814} Compare Luther, as above:}\\
\begin{quote}
Auch keyne wahr ist, man weys eynen besondern forteyl drauff, Es sey mit messen, zelen, mit ellen, mas odder gewicht, Und das man yhr eyne farbe macht, die sie von yhr selbst nicht hat. Odder man legt das hübsste unden oben und das ergeste mitten ynne, Also das solche triegerey keyn ende hat, und keyn kauffman dem andern weytter trawen thar (wagt), denn er sihet und greyfft (WA 15,311).
\end{quote}

\[\text{\textsuperscript{815} Compare Luther, as above:}\\
\begin{quote}
Erstlich haben die kauffleut unter sich ein gemeyne regel, das ist yhr heuptspruch und grund aller fynantzen, da sie sagen 'Ich mag meyne wahr so thewr geben als ich kan.' Das haliten sie fur eyn recht... Was ist das anders gesagt denn so viel: Ich frage nichts nach meynem nehisten? Hette ich nur meynen gewynn und geytz vol, was gehet michs an, das es zeheen schaden meynem nehisten thet auff eyn
There are overtones here of Luther's conviction, which he expresses in his "Von Kaufhandlung und Wucher," that God will punish those who rely on temporal riches:

Denn Gott ist der sichern ungleubischen vernessenheit feyn, die seyn vergisset, darumb handelt er da widder mit allen seynen wercken, lesst uns feylen und fallen, reysset leyb und gut dahyn, wenn wyrs am wenigsten dencken (WA 15,300).

This reference occurs in Agricola (227), to be found in Gilman 1:174.

It is interesting that in two separate references to the word "Spiegel," used in a literary sense, Luther makes use of this term in the two ways illustrated here, firstly in his "Von den guten werken" (1520), where he writes that there is no better mirror than the Ten Commandments for finding out what one is seeking and what one lacks (WA 6,236), and secondly in his "An die Ratsherrn" (1524), where he refers to history as teaching people to see themselves as if in a mirror (WA 15,45).

See G. Guarino's introduction to Boccaccio's Concerning Famous Women, xxv.

Stammler Mystik, 32.

Of the seventeen proverbs which have women as their subject out of the 600 which Bebel translated, all are the reverse of complimentary, see his Proverbia Germanica (1879; rpt. Hildesheim: Olms, 1969).

Guarino, xxvii.

Stammler Mystik, 32.

Rupprich Hum/Ren 1:41. See also Burger, 156; Stammler, 27.

See the Rigg translation of Boccaccio's Decameron, 2-3.

Stammler Mystik, 79.

This quotation is taken from the extracts from Eyb's "Ehebüchlein" in Rupprich Hum/Ren 1: 267.

See John 30,1-11.
As n529 above, 274.

Stammler Mystik, 34.

Prov 18,22: Wer ein Ehefrau findet, der findet was guts, und kann guter ding sein im Herrn.

So hette man kein Closterleben noch geistliche stende durffen auffwerffen, were ein iglich kind bey diesem gepot blieben und hette sein gewissen kunden richten gegen Gott und sprechen: Sol ich gutte und heilige werck thuen, so weis ich yhe kein bessers denn meinen eltern alle ehre und gehorsam zu leisten, weil es Gott selbs geheissen hat (WA 30:1,148).

Cor 7,4: Das Weib ist jres Leibs nicht mechtig, sondern der man. Desselbigen gleichen, der man ist seines Leibs nicht mechtig, sondern das weib.

Lübben Reinke glosses this word as "Leibesbeschaffenheit," but it would seem to me to have a much wider connotation in this context.

In his Summa contra gentiles III,2,123, Aquinas states that the female requires the male not only for procreation, as in other animals, but also for governance, because the male excels in intelligence and strength. See the translation of the English Dominican Fathers (London:Burns Oates,1928):113. See also Aristotle’s Politics I,12, where he states that the husband rules over his wife, being the fitter for command.

This is an obvious reference to the "Luxusordnungen," which were enacted in Lübeck in 1454, 1467 and again in 1492, to regulate, amongst other things, what clothing and jewellery a woman was permitted to wear, this being determined by the couples’ income. See Urkundenbuch der Stadt Lübeck IX (1893): 210-22 and XI (1905): 316-31. Also see Neumann 2:106.

Regarding this work Franck writes in his Geschichtsbibel (1551 edition) ClXa: "Er [Theophrastus] hat geschrieben ein Buch...von den hochzeitten / darinn fragt er / ob ein man ein weib soll nemen." This is obviously the same work that Eyb is referring to in the first part of his Ehebüchlein, since the extracts he gives there are similar to these here in RVC. This work does not appear to be still extant. It bears no relationship whatsoever to Theophrastus’s Characteres ethici, thirty sketches of reprehensible and mostly ridiculous characters, made famous by La Bruyère’s adaptation of 1686, the first fifteen of which Pirckheimer had translated in 1527 and dedicated to his friend Dürer.
This was apparently a dictum of St. Jerome. See Luther's "De votis monasticis" (1521), where he states that Jerome argued that chastity is of such incomparable worth that God cannot restore virgins after a fall. However, Luther goes on, this theory was refuted long ago by Hugo de St.Victor (WA 8:635-36; LW 44,345).

There are overtones here of Luther's treatment of adultery in his "Grosser Katechismus" (1529), where, in his discussion of the sixth (seventh) commandment, he states that those who turn a blind eye to what is going on are as guilty as those who are committing adultery.

Ecclus 26,21: Wie die Sonne wenn Sie auffgangen ist, in dem hohen Himel des Herrn ein zierde ist. Also ist ein tugentsam Weib eine zierde in jrem Hause.

Ecclus 30,1: Wer sein Kind lieb hat, der hett es stets unten den Ruten. Das er hernach freude an jm erlebe.

See above, pp. 90 - 92.

Trunz Standeskultur, 166-67, stresses the insignificant position that the wives of leaned men occupied during this period: "Die Ehen der Gelehrten waren bürgerlich, einfach, wirtschaftlich. Die Frauen waren Hausfrau und Mutter. Geistig galten sie wenig, sie konnten sogar Versuchung des Teufels sein."

Rupprich WP, 384. See also Burger, 149, for the importance of friendship to the early Humanists.

See n235 above. Since these adaptations were checked by Ulrich v. Hutten - see Brandes JG, XXXV - they probably date from the period around 1518, when Hutten was living a comparatively sedentary life in the service of Archbishop Albrecht of Mainz.


There is an equivalent to this in the Dutch VB "morael" to chap i: "..Maer tis seer goet ende orboorlijck eenen vriendt int hof te hebben, die synen vrient in zijn absentie verantwoorde."


Ecclus. 6,6: Halts mit jederman freundlich, vertrawe aber unter tausent kaum einen. 7: Vertrawe keinem Freunde, du hast jm erkand in der not.

See 2 Sam 4,10.
It should be borne in mind that the Early Fathers were familiar with the works of the classical writers.

Apart from the situation of the author as a member of the clergy and probably of a religious order in addition, there is very little evidence of Humanist influence in Lübeck, see Neumann 2:115-16.

See Trunz, Standeskultur: 166-72, where he describes the strong bonds of friendship that existed among the highly-educated in Germany. One can well imagine that the Thirty Years War wreaked havoc with the exchange of letters and the journeyings that Trunz describes, but the author of this gloss may well have grown up in such an atmosphere.

The Italian Humanist, Poggio Brachiolini, for example, described Germans as "schlafrunkene, blöde, schnarchende Geschöpfe, ob sie leben oder tot sind, kan man nicht unterscheiden," Burger, 182. Celtis was particularly enraged at this attitude, see Burger, 231.

It was Poggio who first discovered the existence of the manuscript of Tacitus's Germania in the monastery of Fulda, and had it brought sometime before 1455 to Rome, where Aeneas Silvius read it and used it as the basis of his letter to Martin Mair in response to the latter's protest to him (see p.230 n381 above). Here, in this letter, Aeneas attempted to show the improvements that the Roman church had brought to Germany, originally a barbarous land, according to Tacitus. The lasting effect of this argument was, however, very different. Burger, 145, writes: "Enea wollte den Deutschen ihre Verpflichtung Rom gegenüber vor Augen führen und weckte in den deutschen Humanisten erstmals das nationale Selbstbewusstsein." Germania was printed in 1472 and 1473 in Bologna and Nürnberg respectively but it was not until 1500 that Celtis had it reprinted and gave lectures on the work—see Burger, 299.

Celtis also discovered and had printed in 1507 an old 1188/87 poem about Barbarossa entitled Ligurinus, and it was he, too, who first unearthed the plays of the tenth century canoness, Roswitha von Gandersheim. See Burger, 345.

P. Joachimsen, "Der Humanismus und die Entwicklung des deutschen Geistes," DVjs 6(1930):443-44.

See Gilman 2:358, where he writes: "Agricola fasste dieses Werk als nationales Zeugnis für die Eigenart der Deutschen auf, weil er damit beweisen wollte, dass die Deutschen eine selbstständige Vergangenheit besassen, die unabhängig von Rom und der von Rom aus regierter Kirche war."

Vogt, 25, considers that the moral virtues of the ancient Germans were only a secondary consideration to the sixteenth century Humanists, the latters' primary interest being political.
With regard to Hutten's Arminius she writes that for Hutten and the other Humanists Arminius constituted the prototype of the German freedom fighter in the country's struggle against Papal tyranny. Holborn, too, 77, writes: "As the champion of such freedom [from Rome] Hutten wished to hold up before the eyes of his people the figure of the German liberator."

In his Deutschlands geschichtliche Quellen und Darstellungen in der Neuzeit. Erster Teil: Das Zeitalter der Reformation (1931; rpt. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972) Franz Schnabel describes, 77, the Humanist historians' use of Tacitus's compilation of a table of the German peoples and their origins to draw up for the princely houses extraordinary genealogical tables and family trees, which extended back to Noah on the one side and to the Roman emperors on the other.

See Vogt, 28, where she refers to a work of Rist's entitled Friedwünschendes Deutschland, in which he describes a visit paid by four ancient Germans to a German court of his day, where they find that the "grosse Manheit," the "einfältige Aufrichtigkeit" and the "Mässigkeit," which characterized the old Germans, has been replaced by a German which is "alamode gekleidet und von der Wollust gefolget, und lässt sich schmeicheln durch die Komplimente fremder Kavaliere." When the kings complain that the country has departed from the "alte Einfalt, Treue, Redlichkeit, Wahrheit und Tapferkeit," they are thrown out.

This work can be found in Rupprich Hum/ Ren 1: 234-46.

See n311 above.

In his Tusculan Disputations V, 28 Cicero lists among the attributes of the truly wise man his ability not to succumb to the belief that this or that future event is predestined to happen, so that no event will cause him surprise, or strike him as unexpected or strange. See the Loeb edition pp. 508-09.

Spitz, 101.

The Latin text of this dialogue is reproduced in Böcking IV: 45-99.

Spitz, 121; Holborn, 133.

Spitz, 122.

The Lutheran attitude here is expressed very well in the words of the nineteenth century poet and pastor, Eduard Mörike:

Herr schicke was du willt
Ein liebes oder leides;
Ich bin vergnügt, das beides
Aus Deinen Händen quillt.
See n150 above.


It was a tenet of Luther's that God leaves no wrong unpunished, as he writes in "Ob Kriegsleute": "Gott...lest unrecht nicht ungestraftet" (WA 19,647). With regard to the Peasants' War, for example, he considered the results of this to be a punishment of the peasants (WA 19,627) and the fact that the war took place at all a punishment of the princes (WA 19,644).

The concept of the freedom of the will, to which Erasmus, for example, subscribed, vis à vis Luther's belief in the complete subjection of this to God's will, was, of course, a point on which many of the Humanists took issue with Luther, some, such as Melanchthon, altering their original opinion on the matter. Schoeps 1:212-13 writes: "das Problem der Willensdetermination wurde Melanchthons Hauptärgernis," explaining how he gradually distanced himself from Luther's radicalism in this respect.

As H.R.Patch, explains in his The Goddess Fortuna in Mediaeval literature (Cambridge:Harvard U.P.,1927):154, it is stressed in both mediaeval and Roman literature that Fortune is in control of her wheel or other symbol at all times.

Newald, 234-35.

Newald, 361.

The analysis that follows is based on Könneker Wesen, 29-49.

Könneker, as above, 46.

Quoted by Könneker, as above, 47. The last fable in Boner's Edelstein, no. 100, describes the story of the king's barber who was stopped from murdering his master by reading these lines. See Der Edelstein von Ulrich Boner, ed. F. Pfeffer (Leipzig: Goschen,1844):183.

Burger, 185.

Lortz l:63.

1 John 5,19: Wir wissen, das wir von Gott sind, und die gantze welt ligt im argen.

See n130 above.

It is interesting that Brandes NS, LXIV and n2, mentions a book he refers to as "Stephans Schachbuch," no longer extant, but thought to have been printed by the Mohnkopf press in 1489. One
must also remember that DD by its very nature is concerned with classes of society and with occupations. Death here addresses twenty-seven different people individually, who are on their death-beds, and in stanza XLVI mentions workers in about eighty occupations who have not carried out their tasks honestly and faithfully.

It is interesting that in the Russian fables, too, the feminine gender is retained for the fox.

Ps. 37,25: Ich bin jung gewesen und alt geworden und habe noch nie den Gerechten verlassen gesehen und seine Kinder um brot bettlen. Luther confirms the necessity for total trust in God in all things when, in his "Kinder zur Schule halten" (1530), he writes: "Er [Gott] wird und kan nicht lassen, die jhm trewlich dienen. Er hat sich zu hoch versprochen und gesagt...: 'Ich will dich nicht lassen noch verseum'en'" (WA 30:2,549).

This is a highly interesting gloss since it appears on the face of it to constitute a criticism of the judicial duel. See Meiners, 105-112, for a discussion of the treatment given to the judicial duel in mediaeval literature with particular reference to Reinke de vos. For the rest, Luther often denounced certain conduct as "vermessert," usually when people were taking on themselves something he considered was God's province. See p.427 above, for example, for the quotation from WA 19,650-61 with regard to Fortuna. As a concrete example, Luther was most anxious in 1529 that the Emperor and the princes should not go to war against the Turks relying on their own strength alone. If such a campaign were not accompanied by urgent prayer, he doubted very much if it could succeed. "Weil man so kindisch, vermessentlich und unfursichtich solche grosse sachen fur nymp, da ich weis das Gott versucht wird und kein gefallen dran haben mag" (WA 30:2,147).

See n578 above. The last lines of this fable in Boner's collection give it a transcendental interpretation.

This is an illustration of the use of emblems by this commentator, very much in the baroque tradition. The palmtree is the symbol of resolution overcoming calamity.

John 8,7:..und sprach zu jhn: Wer unter euch ohne Sünde ist, der werfe den ersten Stein auf sie.

This proverb appears in Lateinische Sprichwörter und Sinnsprüche des Mittelalters, ed. J. Werner (Heidelberg: Winter, 1986):87, as "Omnibus adde modum! modus est pulcherrima virtus."

See "Der grosse Katechismus" (1529): "Da haben wir nu abermal Gottes wort, damit er uns reitzen und treiben wil zu rechten, edlen hohen wercken, als sanftmut, gedult und Summa Liebe und wolthat gegen unsern feinden" (WA 30:1.160).

ST 2a2ae 45, 1. See EDF 35:163.

ST 2a2ae 46, 1. See EDF 35:183.

1 Cor 3, 19. See n147 above.

Prov 2, 6: Denn der Herr gibt weisheit, und aus seinem Munde kommt erkenntnis und verstand. 7: Er lesst den Auffrichtigen gelingen, und beschirmet die Fromen, 8: und behutet die so recht thun, und beweret den weg seiner Heiligen.

Prov 26, 12: Seest thou a man wise in his own conceit? there is more hope of a fool than of him.

De officiis III, 89. The commentator - or possibly his source - does not reproduce this exactly as it is written. The question is merely whether a wise man is justified in taking away the plank from a foolish man if he can. There is nothing in Cicero's text here about the common good, though it can obviously be implied. See Loeb edition, 362-65.

De officiis III: 42. See Loeb edition, 310-11.


It is interesting that Luther also uses the word in the same way when he refers positively in his interpretation of the 101st psalm to the worldly heathen wisdom that is to be found in Aesop's fables (WA 51, 243). Otherwise his references to worldly wisdom are pejorative, as in his "Kinder zur Schule halten," where he states that pastors must battle the wisdom of this world (WA 30:2, 539).

See Brandes NS, LIX, for the quotation from the psalter.

Salter (1493) RVA I, 11, 4 (1498)

Des hebben die viende vorware mine sele vorheues ghesocht, unde dorche boseheit ghan se in de grunt der erden, der vordomnisse, unde alle bedreghers werden ghegeuen in de gewalt des swerdes, des scharpen ordels dynes lesten gheriches, und entfangen deel vor ere valscheyt in den

De bozen ghan dorche ere boszheyt in de grunt der erden der vordomenisse, unde alle bedreghers werden ghegeuen in de gewalt des swerdes alze des scharpen ordels des lesten gherichtes unde entfangen deel (ihren
Compare here a passage from the 1492 "Plenar." Brandes NS, LIV:

De sünde is so unnedel unde so swar alzo dat, so vro alze de minsche hefft gedaen eine doetsunde, so vro telet de sulue sünde eine andere vort.. Sunte Gregorius secht hyrvan alsus: De eine sünde kumpt uth der anderen, unde die eine sünde hanget yn den anderen; alzo dat eine lyt (gleich) van einer keeden (Kette) hanghet in der anderen, so hanghen ock de sünde tohope (zusammen).

Dat drydde unnedde1 heyt boszheyt eyner sünde, wente eyne doetsunde is so boze, so vro alze se wert ghdauen, so wyl se nliche alleynse wesen, men (aber) se telet (erzeugt) unde thuet (zieht) eyne efte vele andere to syk, alzus hanget de eyne sünde by der anderen, ghelyck so eyne keede is tohope hangen van velen leden (Gliedern).

Compare here a passage from Sunte Birgitten openbaringe (1496), Brandes NS, LV n1::

Auer ik bin ein rechtferdich unde eyn barmhertich richter, alzo dat ik nicht de alderkleneste sunde wil laten bliuen ungepiniget noch dat alderkleneste gud wil laten unbelenet.

Wente neen gud blyft unbelonet wo kleyn yd ok is, so enblyft ok neyn quad unghepyignet wo kleyn yd is.

See also SpL p.28: "Syne (Gottes) rechtferdycheit en leth neen quad unghepyignet und neen gud umbelenet."

This refers to the then current belief that at the time of death the soul of the dead person was claimed by either the angels or by the devils. The struggle that took place at such a time was vividly illustrated in the Ars Moriendi pamphlets of that day, made all the more convincing by the use of woodcuts. See Otto Clemen's facsimile edition of such a c.1470 pamphlet (Zwickau: Ullmann, 1910). There are five temptations used by the devil: lack of faith, desperation, self-satisfaction, impatience and avarice, which the angels strive to counter. It is interesting to compare here, too, the Old High German poem Muspilli, where in ll. 1-10 a struggle is described as taking
place between a company descending from the stars and another from
the fire of hell who fight with each other for possession of the
soul. See Althochdeutsche Literatur ed. and trans. Horst Dieter

Matt 8,12: But the children of the kingdom shall be cast
into outer darkness; and there shall be weeping and gnashing of
teeth.


This sounds somewhat strange. The explanation is, however,
provided in the 1492 "Plenar": "He was tho alien tyden in deme
vratze (beim Fressen); hyrumme wart he ghepynighet an syner
tunghen." See Brandes NS, LV.

In this connection, in his Martin Luther und die
Reformation im Urteil des deutschen Luthertums Vol 1.(Freiburg:
Herder. 1952):17, Zeeden writes of the conception at that time of
the devil's function in the world being to hinder "das
Erlösungswerk, das Gott durch Christus begonnen hat und im Ablauf
der Heilsgeschichte vollenden wird," the church's being to
maintain this. Zeeden continues:

Auf diesem geschichtstheologischen Hintergrund
sah Luther sich selbst und sein Werk, auf
 diesem Hintergrund sahen ihn auch seine
Anhänger; und auf diesem Hintergrund sahen ihn
auch seine Gegner, die Papisten, nur mit dem
Unterschied, dass sie in ihm den Satan und
Verführer witterten und die Römische Kirche
als das Zelt Gottes auf Erden verteidigten.

1 Thess.5,2: Denn ihr selbst wisset genau, dass der Tag
des Herrn wird kommen wie ein Dieb in der Nacht.

See n585 above.

Luther writes in his "Ob Kriegsleute": "Ein Christ ist
eine person for sich selbst, er gleubt für sich selbst und sonst
für niemand" (WA 19,648). H. Rosenfeld in his "Entwicklung der
Ständesatire im Mittelalter," ZdP 71(1951-2):207, expresses it in
this way:

Wenn dann durch die Reformation erneut die
Sündhaftigkeit des Menschen und das Heil der
Seele in den Vordergrund gestellt wird, so
ist es doch jetzt der einzelne Mensch, das
freivorantwortliche individuum, um das es
geht, nicht das Glied einer ständisch
gegliederten Gemeinschaft.

Luke 17,21: Man wird auch nicht sagen: Sihe hie, oder da
ist es. Denn sehet, das reich Gottes ist inwendig in
euch. Or, as Luther writes in his "Von weltlicher Oberkeyt":

Denn volkomenheyt und unvolkomenheyt steht nicht ynn wercken, macht auch keynen eusserlichen standt unter den Christen, sondern steht ym hertzen, ym glawben und liebe, das wer mehr glewbt und liebt, der ist volkommen, er sey eusserlich eyn man odder weyb, furst odder bauer, münch odder leye. Denn liebe und glawbe machen keine secten noch unterscheyd euszerlich (WA 11,249).

Döring-Hirsch, 45.

Reineke Fuchs, Zwölfter Gesang.

These lines are quoted from J.Goossens's parallel text Reinaerts Historie Reynke de vos, 520.

If these veiled remarks apply to a historical incident, as they may well do, it is probably to the persuasive powers of either or both Jürgen Wullenweber, the upstart demagogic burgermeister of Lübeck and his henchman, Johann Oldendorp, who had recently sought greener pastures there. The two of them together were largely responsible for persuading Duke Albrecht to become a candidate for the throne of Denmark in 1535, the principal result of this failure of this enterprise being a terrific debt-load which crippled the inhabitants of the duchy for many years to come. See Schmaltz,47-48; Schafferus, 103 and 123; Ranke II:138-40.

Baucke, 164.

Schafferus, 83-84.

See n316 above regarding the early appointment by Duke Magnus of salaried officials at the Mecklenburg court.

See above p.24 n87.

Menke RV 1544, 251.

Michael Beuther was born in Karlstadt in 1522, attending Marburg University from 1536 to 1539 when he transferred to Wittenberg to study under Melanchthon. In 1544 he was appointed Professor of History at Greifswald University on the latter's recommendation. See NDB (2)202.

Menke RV 1544, 252.

Prien RVHD, 20, has counted seventy of these.

See Joachimsen, 444, where he describes how Heinrich Bebel had declared that, failing lawgivers and philosophers among the
Old Germans, the expression of their political and practical wisdom was to be found in their proverbs. Luther, too, often used proverbs in his writings. In his long interpretation of the 101st psalm, for example, his editors counted 170 of these (WA 51,199). Huizinga has also pointed out — Herbst, 332 — the important function that proverbs played in mediaeval thinking. "Die Weisheit, die aus dem Sprichwort klingt, ist manchmal wohltuend und tief," he writes, "der Ton des Sprichwortes ist oft ironisch, die Stimmung meist gutmutig, und immer resigniert. Das Sprichwort predigt niemals Widerstand, immer Ergebung."

Menke RV 1544, 252. There are only thirteen Latin quotations in the gloss, one of which is a repeat, another taken from the narrative text and a third taken over from the RVC gloss.

See Altdeutsche Physiologus, ed. F. Maurer (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1967):42-45. This trait of the fox is also represented in all four editions of the narrative text, namely in Book II, chap. 1, where the crow relates how Reinke had murdered his wife by acting in this way. In this 1650 edition the story is to be found in the first chapter of Book II, stanzas 112-18, pp. 227-29.

Bobertag in his introduction to this work, XII, reports that Moscherosch was accepted into the "Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft" in 1645 under the name of "Der Träumende." Szyrocki, 169, states that he was also a member of the "Pegnitz Schäfer."

Posca, 74.

According to Goedeke Grundriss III:482-83, the last edition of the 1539 version to be printed in Rostock was put out by Stephan Möllemann (Dietz's successor according to Schafferus, 143) in 1592. The last two printings to appear before 1649 emanated from Hamburg and Frankfurt in 1606 and 1608 respectively.

See Balck, 93.

Rupprich Hum/Ren 1:42.

See above p. 20 n61.

See above pp. 117 - 16 and n86.

See above p. 20 n60 and p.116.

Könneker Wesen, 39-40. See also p.116 above.

As Luther writes in his preface to St. Paul's epistle to the Romans:

Der Glaube ist ein göttlich werck in uns, das
uns wandelt und new gebirt aus Gott...Und
tödtet den alten Adam, machet uns gantz ander
Menschen von herzen, mut, sinn und allen
krefften, und bringet den heligen Geist mit
sich. O es ist ein lebendig, schefftig,
thettig, mechtig ding umb den glauben, das
unmöglich ist, das er nicht on unterlas solte
guts wircken (WA DB 7,11).
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