

GS
NA

Goethe Yearbook



Officers of the Goethe Society of North America

Ellis Dye, *St. Paul, Minnesota*, President
Simon Richter, *University of Pennsylvania*, Vice-President
John B. Lyon, *University of Pittsburgh*, Secretary-Treasurer
Astrida Tantillo, *University of Illinois at Chicago*, Executive Secretary
Burkhard Henke, *Davidson College*, Webmaster/Newsletter Editor

Directors-at-Large

Clark Muenzer, *University of Pittsburgh*
Karin Schutjer, *University of Oklahoma*

Members of the Editorial and Advisory Board

Ehrhard Bahr, *University of California, Los Angeles*
Klaus L. Berghahn, *University of Wisconsin, Madison*
Benjamin Bennett, *University of Virginia*
Fritz Breithaupt, *Indiana University*
Jane K. Brown, *University of Washington*
Ulrich Gaier, *University of Konstanz*
Cyrus Hamlin, *Yale University*
Susanne Kord, *Georgetown University*
Catriona MacLeod, *University of Pennsylvania*
Thomas P. Saine, *University of California, Irvine*
Helmut J. Schneider, *University of Bonn*
David E. Wellbery, *University of Chicago*
W. Daniel Wilson, *University of California, Berkeley*

Goethe Yearbook

Publications of the Goethe Society
of North America

Edited by Simon Richter
and Daniel Purdy

With Martha Helfer
Book Review Editor

Volume XV

CAMDEN HOUSE

Manuscripts for consideration by the *Goethe Yearbook* should be directed to
Daniel Purdy (dlp14@psu.edu) at the Department of Germanic and
Slavic Languages and Literatures, 311 Burrowes Building, Pennsylvania State
University, University Park, PA 16802.

Books for review should be sent to Catriona MacLeod (cmacleod@sas.upenn.edu)
at the Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures, 745 Williams Hall,
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104-6305.

Additional information on the Goethe Society of North America can be found on the
World Wide Web at <http://www.goethesociety.org>.

Copyright ©2008 Goethe Society of North America
All Rights Reserved. Except as permitted under current legislation,
no part of this work may be photocopied, stored in a retrieval system,
published, performed in public, adapted, broadcast, transmitted,
recorded, or reproduced in any form or by any means, without
prior permission of the copyright owner.

First published 2008 by
Camden House

Camden House is an imprint of Boydell & Brewer Inc.
668 Mt. Hope Ave., Rochester, NY 14620, USA
www.camden-house.com
and of Boydell & Brewer Limited
P.O. Box 9, Woodbridge, Suffolk, IP12 3DE, UK
www.boydellandbrewer.com

ISBN-13: 978-1-57113-3144

ISBN-10: 1-57113-314-3

ISSN: 0734-3329

Set in Garamond Book and Garamond Ultra type
and printed on acid-free paper.

Manufactured and bound for maximum durability.
Printed in the United States of America.

Designed and Typeset by Mizpah Publishing Services Private Limited

Contents

YASSER DERWICHE DJAZAERLY	1
Goethe's Reception of Ulrich von Hutten	
JOCELYN HOLLAND	19
The School of Shipwrecks: Improvisation in <i>Wilhelm Meisters theatralische Sendung</i> and the <i>Lehrjahre</i>	
ELIZABETH POWERS	35
The Sublime, "Über den Granit," and the Prehistory of Goethe's Science	
DANIEL L. PURDY	57
The Building in <i>Bildung</i> : Goethe, Palladio, and the Architectural Media	
ROBERT GERMANY	75
Virgilian Retrospection in Goethe's <i>Alexis und Dora</i>	
ALBERT E. GURGANUS	99
Typologies of Repetition, Reflection, and Recurrence: Interpreting the Novella in Goethe's <i>Wahlverwandtschaften</i>	
PETER J. SCHWARTZ	115
Why Did Goethe Marry When He Did?	
BØRGE KRISTIANSEN	131
Zum Verhältnis von Selbstsein und Miteinandersein in Goethes <i>Urworte. Orphisch</i>	
CHRISTOPH E. SCHWEITZER	161
Schiller's <i>Die Räuber</i> : Revenge, Sacrifice, and the Terrible Price of Absolute Freedom	

EHRHARD BAHR	171
<i>Wallensteins Tod</i> as a "Play of Mourning": Death and Mourning in the Aesthetics of Schiller's Classicism	
PETER UWE HOHENDAHL	187
The New Man: Theories of Masculinity around 1800	

Book Reviews

John Armstrong, Love, Life, Goethe: Lessons of the Imagination from the Great German Poet. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2006. xv + 483 pp. (Elizabeth Powers)	217
Richard Block, The Spell of Italy: Vacation, Magic, and the Attraction of Goethe. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 2006. 310 pp. (Kamaal Haque)	219
W. Daniel Wilson, ed., Goethes Weimar und die Französische Revolution: Dokumente der Krisenjahre. Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 2004. 746 pp. (John Blair)	220
Hartmut Fröschle, Goethes Verhältnis zur Romantik. Würzburg: Königshausen und Neumann, 2002. 564 pp. (Erlis Wickersham)	222
Gabriele Blod, "Lebensmärchen": Goethes Dichtung und Wahrheit als poetischer und poetologischer Text. Würzburg: Königshausen und Neumann, 2003. 335 pp. (Catriona MacLeod)	223
Nicholas Rennie, Speculating on the Moment: The Poetics of Time and Recurrence in Goethe, Leopardi, and Nietzsche. Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2005. 359 pp. (Simon Richter)	225
Florian Krobb, Die Wallenstein-Trilogie von Friedrich Schiller: Walter Buttler in Geschichte und Drama. Reihe Literatur- und Medienwissenschaft, Bd. 99. Oldenburg: Igel Verlag Literatur, 2005. 122 pp. (Ehrhard Bahr)	227
Simon Richter, Missing the Breast: Gender, Fantasy and the Body in the German Enlightenment. Seattle: U of Washington P, 2006. 353 pp. (Elisabeth Krimmer)	228

- John Pizer, **The Idea of World Literature: History and Pedagogical Practice**. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 2006. 190 pp.
(William H. Carter) 229
- Maike Oergel, **Culture and Identity: Historicity in German Literature and Thought 1770–1815**. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2006. viii + 297 pp.
(Angus Nicholls) 231
- Geoffrey Atherton, **The Decline and Fall of Virgil in Eighteenth-Century Germany: The Repressed Muse**. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2006. xx + 312 pp.
(Thomas L. Cooksey) 233
- Johannes Birgfeld and Claude D. Conter, eds., **Das Unterhaltungsstück um 1800: Literaturhistorische Konfigurationen—Signaturen der Moderne** (= Forum für deutschsprachiges Drama und Theater in Geschichte und Gegenwart, vol. 1). Hannover: Wehrhahn Verlag, 2007. xxiv + 271 pp.
(Uwe-K. Ketelsen) 234
- Gudrun Loster-Schneider and Gaby Pailer, eds., **Lexikon deutschsprachiger Epik und Dramatik von Autorinnen (1730-1900)**. Tübingen and Basel: A. Francke, 2006. xii + 492 pp., with CD-ROM.
(Arnd Bohm) 236
- Paul Fleming, **The Pleasures of Abandonment: Jean Paul and the Life of Humor**. Würzburg: Königshausen and Neumann, 2006. 170 pp.
(Robert Combs) 238
- John B. Lyon, **Crafting Flesh, Crafting the Self: Violence and Identity in Early Nineteenth-Century German Literature**. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell UP, 2006. 280 pp.
(Walter Stewart) 240
- Roger F. Cook, ed., **A Companion to the Works of Heinrich Heine**. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2002. xiv + 373 pp.
(Robert Combs) 241

Goethe's Reception of Ulrich von Hutten

TOWARD THE END OF THE SEVENTEENTH BOOK of *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, Goethe recalls his discovery of the works of the humanist Ulrich von Hutten (1488–1523): “Die Werke Ulrichs von Hutten kamen mir in die Hände und es schien wundersam genug daß in unsern neuern Tagen sich das Ähnliche, was dort hervorgetreten, hier sich gleichfalls wieder zu manifestieren schien” (FA 14:773). This remark is followed by a long quotation from Hutten’s autobiographical letter to the Nuremberg humanist Willibald Pirckheimer (1470–1530). In the cited part of the letter, Hutten expresses the desire to be ennobled on his own merit and criticizes the aristocratic attitude towards education. The immediate context of the quotation seems to restrict the significance of Hutten’s work to the relation between the nobility and the third-estate. However, Hutten’s life and work were of importance not only to the Germany of the *Sturm und Drang*, but also to Goethe’s own life and work, particularly *Götz von Berlichingen*.

This study will historically and culturally situate Goethe’s reception of Hutten. The first part outlines what Hans Robert Jauss calls the *Erwartungshorizont* by describing the historical forces that made Goethe’s reading of Hutten’s work possible.¹ It seeks to answer the questions: why was Hutten’s work relevant to *Sturm-und-Drang* Germany and what were the events that Goethe thought were repeating themselves? In the second part, I will examine *Götz von Berlichingen* in the light of some of Hutten’s dialogues, pointing out possible influences of the humanist on the young Goethe. The success of Goethe’s *Götz von Berlichingen*, which contributed to the revival of interest in Renaissance Germany and to the creation of Hutten as a German site of memory, will be the theme of the third part. The fourth part will analyze the politics of Goethe’s long citation from Hutten’s letter to Pirckheimer, while the final part will follow the metamorphosis of Goethe’s “horizon of expectation” which made different aspects of Hutten’s work and life come to the forefront. Hutten’s presence in Goethe’s late work demonstrates the lasting impression the humanist left on him.

I. Cultural Confrontation in Renaissance and *Sturm-und-Drang* Germany

Understanding Goethe’s wonderment at how some events of Hutten’s time were repeating themselves in the second half of the eighteenth century

requires a closer look at certain political and cultural currents that influenced both Hutten's life and Goethe's youth. The reaction of the *Sturm-und-Drang* generation to French cultural hegemony is common knowledge to scholars of eighteenth-century Germany, just as the response of German humanists to Rome's exploitation of the German states is well known to scholars of the German Renaissance and Reformation. These two conflicts will be revisited here because no scholar to date has pointed out the similarities between them and because it is probably the parallel between these two cultural confrontations that made Goethe's reading of Hutten possible.

The Italian claim to cultural superiority over the "Barbarians" forced Hutten to reflect upon his own identity.² At a time when German humanists still looked to Italy as the model of accomplishment in the liberal arts, this was no easy task. Albrecht Dürer's statement comparing his social position in Venice to that in Nuremberg, "Hier bin ich Herr, daheim ein Schmarotzer,"³ gives an idea of the difficulty a German artist faced in identifying with the Germany of 1500. Before the Reformation, Hutten thought his task as a humanist was "to rid Germany of its barbarity" by spreading learning and culture, as he wrote to Pirckheimer: "Deutschland soll sich mit Kultur bekleiden und die Barbarei über die Garamanten und das Baltische Meer hinaus ausgezischt und verstoßen werden."⁴ This was the aim of his contribution to the *Epistolae obscurorum virorum* (1515–17).

However, this attitude changed radically with the beginning of the Reformation.⁵ Rome, not ignorant German theologians, became the enemy. Hutten's battle cry became the centuries-old complaint that Rome was exploiting German states to finance its luxury.⁶ This exploitation was possible because Germany lacked a centralized power capable of resisting papal will. While in France the central monarchy grew stronger because fiefs left vacant upon the death of their occupants were subsumed by the crown, in Germany they were accorded to claimants based on rights of heredity. This, as Niccolò Machiavelli had observed, was the main reason why Germany, unlike France, was incapable of developing a centralized monarchy.⁷ Therefore, the German emperor was unable to exploit the weakening of papal power through the Council of Basel (1415)—which established the supremacy of a council over the authority of the pope—as the French monarch did. In 1438 Charles VII decreed the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, affirming the Council of Basel and establishing the "liberties" of the Gallican Church.⁸ The authority of the German emperor was limited by the increasing power of territorial princes who were seeking independence from the emperor and by princes of the church who recognized the pope—not the emperor—as their sovereign. In his *Germania*, Enea Silvio Piccolomini (1405–64), later Pope Pius II, counts more than fifty bishoprics in Germany.⁹ Since Pope Boniface IX (1389–1404), church offices were made purchasable and became a considerable source of wealth for Rome.¹⁰ Albrecht von Brandenburg, the archbishop of Mainz and for a few years Hutten's patron, paid Rome 48,236 Rhine Gulden for his archbishopric.¹¹ In *An den christlichen Adel deutscher Nation* (1520), Martin Luther aimed to put an end to these practices.

The German humanists' awareness of being exploited and called "Barbarians" by Rome contributed to the awakening of German national

identity. Pius II wrote *Germania* (1457–58) in response to a letter written to him in 1457 by Martin Mayer, a secretary to the archbishop of Mainz, in which Mayer complained: “Tausend Möglichkeiten werden ersonnen, mit denen der römische Stuhl mit raffinierter List aus uns ‘Barbaren’ Geld herauslockt.”¹² The assertion by the future pope that Germans had ceased to be “barbarians” was disingenuous since, like other Italian papal envoys, he praised the Germans in public writings in order to garner support for Roman causes while persisting in calling them “barbarians” in his private correspondence.¹³

The public discourses that Pius II in 1454 and his court poet Giantoni Campano in 1471 presented to encourage German princes to pledge their financial and military support for crusades against the Turks played a pivotal role in the rise of German national identity.¹⁴ They introduced German humanists to the writings of Roman historians about ancient German tribes, particularly the *Germania* (98) of Cornelius Tacitus (55–120), discovered in the mid-fifteenth century.¹⁵ Though Tacitus criticized the Germans for indolence, gluttony, drunkenness, and aversion to labor, he praised their sexual morality, hospitality, bravery, and love of liberty. As Hutten turned his pen against Rome, the discovery of Tacitus must have been particularly inspiring, since certain observations of the Roman moralist could be applied to Reformation Germany. Tacitus maintained that the greatest threat to Roman hegemony was German unity and love of freedom: “The freedom of Germany is a deadlier enemy [to Rome] than the despotism of Arsaces.”¹⁶ The disunity of the German tribes, he added, was the only guarantee of Rome’s dominance over them: “Long, I pray, may the Germans persist, if not in loving us, at least in hating one another; for the imperial destiny drives hard, and fortune has no longer any better gift for us than the disunion of our foes.”¹⁷ The papal policy of playing German emperors and princes against each other was one instance that must have struck German humanists as a tactic benefiting the ancient Roman Empire and the contemporary Roman church.

As the Reformation dawned, Hutten spoke rather of cultivating German martial values than of correcting German “barbarity.” His dialogue *Arminius*¹⁸ initiated the long history of the reception of Hermann that would reach its zenith during Goethe’s time. The humanist discovery of the man who resisted imperial Rome awakened national identity in the Renaissance just as it would in the period of the *Sturm und Drang*. Four of Friedrich Gottlob Klopstock’s works were on Hermann.¹⁹ Of his *Hermanns Schlacht* (1769) Goethe wrote: “Die Deutschen, die sich vom Druck der Römer befreien, waren herrlich und mächtig dargestellt, und dieses Bild gar wohl geeignet, das Selbstgefühl der Nation zu erwecken” (FA 14:582). Hutten chose Arminius as the greatest hero of Antiquity because he freed his people from subjugation. Freedom would be the last word uttered by Goethe’s Götze.

As in Hutten’s generation, Goethe and his contemporaries were confronted by a culture which claimed superiority over theirs. In his *Lettres françaises et germaniques* (1740), Éléazar de Mauvillon, who had spent ten years in Germany, spoke of the “barbarity” of the German language—“une langue rude et barbare”²⁰—and challenged Germany to identify one of its writers who could compare to Racine, Tasso, or Milton.²¹ French language and literary standards were well established in German courts, as Friedrich II’s *De la littérature*

allemande (1780) demonstrates. From Berlin Voltaire wrote: "La langue qu'on parle le moins à la cour c'est l'allemand; je n'en ai pas encore entendu prononcer un mot. Notre langue et nos belles-lettres ont fait plus de conquêtes que Charlemagne."²² Mauvillon noted: "Il y a quelques années qu'on ne disoit pas quatre paroles d'allemand sans en dire deux en français, c'était le bel usage."²³ Like Mauvillon, Friedrich II finds German "à demi-barbare"²⁴ and what he says about *Götz von Berlichingen* is not much different from what Voltaire had said of Shakespeare. If Germany, Friedrich believed, was to have its golden age in literature, it would be by following French models and norms.

While German courts continued to follow French aesthetic standards, German authors were espousing new aesthetic values in the second half of the eighteenth century. Herder called for a new philosophy of history freed from the perspective of the French *philosophes*. Racine was rejected in favor of Shakespeare, English landscape was praised over the French style, and Gothic architecture, which since Giorgio Vasari (1511–74) had been condemned as "monstrous and barbaric,"²⁵ was eulogized. In words reminiscent of Hutten's language, Goethe wrote that Gothic architecture expressed the "starke, rauhe, deutsche Seele." Against rococo painting, Goethe appeals to the style of Hutten's contemporary Albrecht Dürer: "Wie sehr unsre geschminkte Puppenmahler mir verhaßt sind," writes Goethe in *Von deutscher Baukunst*, "mag ich nicht deklamieren. . . . Männlicher Albrecht Dürer, den die Neulinge anspötteln, deine holzgeschnitzteste Gestalt ist mir willkommner" (FA 18:117–18).

Justus Möser's essay "Über die deutsche Sprache und Literatur" (1781), written in response to Friedrich II, demonstrates this difference between bourgeois and court culture in Germany. Defending *Götz von Berlichingen* against the critique of the Prussian king, Möser wrote that having favored French literature for such a long time, people of the courts were no longer capable of judging German literature and their opinion should be dismissed: "Der Zungen, welche an Ananas gewöhnt sind, wird hoffentlich in unserem Vaterlande eine geringe Zahl sein, und wenn von einem Volksstücke die Rede ist, so muß man den Geschmack der Hofleute beiseite setzen."²⁶ The cause of the decline of German literature after the *Minnesänger*, he argues, lies in the favor accorded to foreign languages, whether Latin, French, or Italian.²⁷ In *Wilhelm Meisters theatralische Sendung*, written between 1777 and 1786, Goethe shows a German court that is willing to put up with German theatrical groups only as a bad substitute for a French one. When the count hears of the group of actors, he laments that they are not French, for he could have prepared a pleasant surprise for the prince who was about to visit him: "Wenn es Franzosen wären, sagte er zu der Gräfin, so könnten wir dem Prinzen eine unerwartete Freude machen, daß er bei uns eine Lieblingsunterhaltung anträfe" (FA 9:232). If the Berlin court, as Voltaire reported, spoke not a word of German, so the circle of the young Goethe in Strasbourg made it a point to speak German only: "An unserm Tische ward gleichfalls nichts wie Deutsch gesprochen" (FA 14:525).

The awareness of the young generation of *Stürmer und Dränger* of the arrogant French attitude towards their culture, lead to a counter reaction that overthrew the dominance of French standards of taste.

Was uns aber von den Franzosen gewaltiger als alles andere entfernte, war die wiederholte unhöfliche Behauptung, daß es den Deutschen überhaupt, so wie dem nach französischer Kultur strebenden Könige, an Geschmack fehle. Über diese Redensart, die wie ein Refrain sich an jedes Urteil anschloß, suchten wir uns durch Nichtachtung zu beruhigen. (FA 14:526)

Goethe responded to French arrogance toward German culture by dismissing French literature as “*bejabrt* und *vornehm*,” unappealing to young people seeking freedom and joy of life (FA 14:527, original emphasis).²⁸ His circle of German students in Strasbourg turned its back on French culture and its Enlightenment: “So waren wir denn an der Grenze von Frankreich alles französischen Wesens auf einmal bar und ledig. Ihre lebensweise fanden wir zu bestimmt und zu vornehm, ihre Dichtung kalt, ihre Kritik vernichtend, ihre Philosophie abstrus und doch unzulänglich” (FA 14:536).

II. A Rehearsal of the Reformation

Another event made Hutten even more relevant to Goethe’s time. A new debate within the Catholic church figured as reminiscent of several Reformation controversies. In 1763 Johann Nikolaus von Hontheim (1701–90), under the pseudonym Justinus Febronius, published his *De Statu Ecclesiae et Legitimate Potestate Romani Pontificis*.²⁹ As auxiliary bishop and vicar-general of Trier, Hontheim challenged papal authority in a manner similar to that of the Basel Council of 1415. By maintaining that sovereigns and bishops must resist the authoritarian initiatives of Rome, he sought with his efforts to establish “liberties” for the German Catholic Church, much as the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges (1438) had done for the Gallican church.³⁰ In Austria the movement to subordinate the church to the state was called *Staatskirchentum* or Josephism.³¹ Despite being condemned by the pope a year after its publication, Hontheim’s book went into a second edition and was soon translated into German, French, Italian, and Portuguese.

Hontheim’s critique of Rome coincided with several events that greatly undermined the authority of the pope and increased that of the state. First Portugal (1759) then France (1763), and Spain (1767) expelled the Jesuits. These Catholic states pressured the pope to suppress the Society of Jesus, which he finally did in 1773. Then in 1765 Joseph II of Austria was crowned Roman Emperor and embarked on many radical reforms that lead to a historic confrontation between the German emperor and the pope. The conflict between the two escalated to such a point that Pope Pius VI was obliged to cross the Alps (1782), something no pope had done since 1414. Although the Hontheim debate began as a question within the Catholic church, it became a matter that interested Protestants as well, as demonstrated by the anonymous book *Kaiser Joseph und Luther*, whose author considered Joseph II’s reforms the completion of what had been started by Luther.³²

Among those who were enthusiastic about Hontheim’s work was Georg Michael Frank von La Roche (1720–88), husband of Sophie von La Roche. Like Hontheim, La Roche was a Catholic in the employment of the bishop of Trier. In his *Briefe über das Mönchswesen* (1771–81), La Roche praised Hontheim’s

work and hailed Joseph II's unflinching opposition to the pope as an epic moment in German history. Repeating the complaint voiced during the Renaissance by Martin Meyer, Jakob Wimpfling, Hutten, and Luther, La Roche writes: "Kein Volk wurde von Rom so tief gebeugt, als wir Deutschen."³³

Completing his studies of law at Strasbourg University, Goethe felt inclined to pursue as a dissertation topic his long-standing interest in the conflict between church and state (FA 14:516). His professors, however, were opposed to the subject of the dissertation which, never printed, was consequently lost.³⁴ Goethe argues that in order to end the constant struggle between the church and the state, the latter not only has the right to, but is even obliged to exercise its jurisdiction in the area of religion. The university maintained that Goethe could publish his work as a private person, but not as doctoral candidate at Strasbourg. It is likely that the university did not want to become entangled in the Febronius debate which was raging at that time and would not subside until 1789.

III. Hutten's Dialogues and Goethe's *Götz*

Hutten's works might have figured among the sources Goethe used for his *Götz von Berlichingen*. Such influence seems at first unlikely since Goethe speaks of his discovery of Hutten's work after having discussed the reception of his *Götz*. However, some of the major themes discussed in Goethe's play pertain to issues that concerned Hutten and were treated in his works, particularly, the dialogues *Inspikientes* (1519, *Die Aufschauenden*) and *Praedones* (1521, *Die Räuber*).

Praedones is a dialogue between Ulrich von Hutten, Franz von Sickingen, and a merchant. It deals with the same issue presented in Goethe's play: the right of knights to carry out feuds. A remnant of Germanic laws which entitled knights to take justice into their own hands for their own cause or that of any other who appealed to them, feuds were declared illegal at the Reichstag in Worms, in 1495. As the emperor lacked the forces sufficient to impose the decree, some knights maintained the practice of feuds which they considered to be their ancient privilege. Amongst this group of knights were Franz von Sickingen and Götz von Berlichingen. The occasion for *Praedones* was another Reichstag at Worms (1521) where merchants appealed to the new German emperor, Karl V, to put an end to the robber barons. In Goethe's play two Nuremberg merchants appeal to Emperor Maximilian I³⁵ during a Reichstag at Augsburg for justice against Götz and Selbitz, who had robbed them. In both works merchants are presented negatively, and pejoratively associated with pepper. Hutten threatens to beat the merchant until "Pfeffer pfundweis und Safran lothweis von [ihm] geht" (317), while Goethe has Maximilian I say: "Wenn ein Kaufmann einen Pfeffersack verliert, soll man das ganze Reich aufmahnen, und wenn Händel vorhanden sind, daran Kaiserliche Majestät und dem Reich viel gelegen ist, daß es Königreich, Fürstentum, Herzogtum und anders betrifft, so kann euch kein Mensch zusammen bringen" (FA 4:331).

Even Goethe's method of debating feuds is similar to Hutten's. Both make the reader compare the robber barons to those who, while doing damage to

society, were nevertheless respected. In response to the merchant's accusation that knights are robbers, Hutten argues that there were far more dangerous robbers in Germany. The list includes bishops, jurists, and merchants. Highway robbers, of whom some are knights, come only at the end of the list. Both bishops and merchants are seen as depriving Germany of its wealth: the bishops by paying Rome immense bribes for their bishoprics, and the merchants by exporting German money to import the luxury goods which weakened German Spartan virtues (327).³⁶ In their quest for profit, merchants deceive and employ all kinds of tricks; they rob, but in different ways (322). Likewise, the peasant marriage in Goethe's *Götz* serves to illustrate that those who are supposed to establish law and order are themselves robbers. The judge forces the father of the bride to empty his pocket just as a highway robber would do, using not arms, but his position and authority as judge. Upon hearing the story, Selbitz, like Götz, a robber baron, exclaims: "Götz! Wir sind Räuber!" (FA 4:329).

Like other sixteenth-century humanists, Hutten was sharply critical of Roman law and its practitioners.³⁷ Hutten believed that law should be a part of and proceed from the tradition and customs of the land. He attacks lawyers who:

Ohne Uebung oder Einsicht in Regierungsgeschäften, ohne Kenntniß der Geschichte und des Herkommens, ohne Erfahrung und Fleiß, endlich ohne Redlichkeit und Gewissenhaftigkeit, nur auf Reckheit, Unverschämtheit und die schlechtesten Kunstgriffe gestützt, zur Leitung von Sitte, Gesetz und Staat sich herandrängen. Fürwahr, so lange die Sachen so stehen, wird es nirgends gute Fürsten geben können, um jener Kanzler willen, aus deren Schranken, wie aus einem göttlichem Orakel, die Entscheidungen über öffentliche und Privatangelegenheiten hervorgeholt werden. (345–46)

Goethe's Olearius is one such lawyer. Like Hutten, Olearius studied at the University of Bologna, where scholars in the late Middle Ages strove to revive Roman law, explaining and separating it from Germanic law which had been introduced into Italy after the Gothic invasions. According to Olearius, experience without knowledge of Roman law is not enough for a sound juridical system. Unless fixed universal and unchangeable principles are established, the justice system would be founded upon arbitrary rulings. Justinian's *Corpus Juris* is for Olearius what Hutten describes as a "göttliche Orakel," which, along with its commentaries, suffices for a good justice system: "Man mögts wohl ein Buch aller Bücher nennen," says Olearius "eine Sammlung aller Gesetzter, bei jedem Fall der Urteilsspruch bereit, oder was ja noch abgängig oder dunkel wäre, ersetzen die Glossen, womit die gelehrtesten Männer das fürtrefflichste Werk geschmückt haben" (FA 4:301). Hutten points out in *Praedones* (355) that jurists had been excluded from the council in Nuremberg, and in *Inspikientes* he praises the Saxons for chasing all jurists out of their land (201). This, indeed, is what happens to Olearius when he returns to his native Frankfurt. Upon hearing that he is a jurist, the people wished to chase him out of the city with stones (FA 4:301).

According to Hutten and Goethe, the justice system is undermined not only by the introduction of foreign law, ill adapted to the circumstances and

the tradition of each state, but also through the corruption of its practitioners. According to both authors, jurists intentionally drag out lawsuits, bringing litigants to ruin while enriching themselves through verdicts contingent upon the wealth of the interested parties. Of course, such a system only aggravates the oppression of the poor: "diese haben Gesetz und Recht selbst zu Grunde gerichtet," writes Hutten "saugen den Armen das Blut aus und machen aller Gemüthsruhe ein Ende" (355).³⁸ This same ineffectiveness of Roman law is demonstrated in the peasant marriage scene in Goethe's *Götz*. The two peasants have been litigating for eight years without the Italian judge, Sapupi, coming to a ruling. In fact, he does not want to adjudicate the matter since he is using the case to become richer (FA 4:329).

In the autobiography of the imperial knight Gottfried von Berlichingen, *Lebensbeschreibung des Ritters Götz von Berlichingen* (1560), the conflict with the bishop of Bamberg is just one among many other episodes. Goethe turns this episode into the central conflict of the play, establishing a parallel with what Hutten writes of the quarrel between knights and bishops. In Goethe's play, the bishop of Bamberg wants to subordinate Götz and reduce him to vassalage as he did with Weislingen. Hutten places bishops at the top of the list of robbers not only because they rob Germany of its money in order to purchase offices from Rome, but also because they seek to expand their territory and wealth by robbing the knights of their property: "Denn wir haben ja Krieger unter unsern deutschen Bischöfen, vor denen beinahe Keiner mehr seines Erbguts sicher ist; so gierig sind sie auf den Vorteil ihrer Kirche aus, unter so gewissenlosen Vorwänden suchen sie ihre Besitzungen zu vermehren" (375). Knights particularly hated bishops because the two shared an identical social background. Ecclesiastical careers were often the lot of younger sons in noble families. But those who pursued a clerical career came into such power as to rival knights, much as territorial princes were doing:

Denn die Ueberzeugung haben wir und es zeigt sich oft genug, daß alle uns untreu werden, die von uns in jenen Stand treten, und daß sie Niemanden mehr zur Last fallen als ihren Schwägern und Verwandten, denen sie nie genug entziehen zu können glauben, um es ihren Kirchen zuzuwenden. Gemeiniglich hat es schon viel Geld gekostet, ihnen zu Rom Pfründen zu kaufen, und gleichwohl wollen sie hernach die väterliche Erbschaft gleich mit uns theilen. (358)

Hutten might also have influenced Goethe's depiction of the abbot of Fulda as the ignorant monk at the Bamberg court. The monastery of Fulda, the oldest in Germany, was founded in 744 and became the first center of learning in medieval Germany. In the fifteenth century Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini cited it as one of the abbeys that was as powerful as states.³⁹ Hutten, whose family's estate was in the proximity, was sent at the age of eleven to study at the seminary in the imperial abbey in Fulda.⁴⁰ It was believed that he escaped from the monastery in 1505, but scholarship has cast doubt on this story saying that Hutten had already left Fulda to study in Erfurt in 1501. During the Reuchlin vs. Pfefferkorn debate, Fulda sided with Cologne against Reuchlin. Crotus Rubianus, Hutten's friend from Erfurt, was the director of the school of the Fulda monastery for seven years, which gave him ample acquaintance with the monks of the monastery whom he called

“ignorant and almost illiterate.”⁴¹ This experience is also reflected in Rubeanus’ and Hutten’s *Letters of Obscure Men*. Goethe’s abbot of Fulda seems to be one of these obscure men. Upon hearing Olearius’ description of *Corpus Juris* as a book containing all laws, he exclaims: “Eine Sammlung aller Gesetze! potz! Da müssen auch wohl die zehn Gebote drin sein.” To which Olearius responds: “Implicite wohl, nicht explicite” (FA 4:301). In the second part of the *Letters of Obscure Men*, it is debated whether Johannes Pfefferkorn implicitly or explicitly implied that the church erred and that Pfefferkorn thought that the emperor had implicitly, not explicitly thought of burning Reuchlin’s book.⁴²

In addition to the dialogues and the *Letters of Obscure Men*, one finds similarity between Goethe’s play and Hutten’s letter to Willibald Pirckheimer, parts of which Goethe was to quote in his autobiography. Both believe in the aristocracy of merit and the insufficiency of inherited titles. The bishop of Bamberg in *Götz von Berlichingen* asks Olearius, a bourgeois lawyer: “Studieren jetzt viele Deutsche von Adel zu Bologna?” Olearius responds:

Vom Adel- und Bürgerstand. Und ohne Ruhm zu melden, tragen sie das größte Lob davon. Man pflegt im Sprichwort auf der Akademie zu sagen: So fleißig wie ein Deutscher von Adel. Denn indem die Bürgerliche einen rühmlichen Fleiß anwenden, durch Talente den Mangel der Geburt zu ersetzen: so bestreben sich jene, mit rühmlicher Wetteiferung, ihre angeborene Würde, durch die glänzendste Verdienste zu erhöhen. (FA 4:300)

Olearius’s claim that aristocratic students seek to enhance their nobility of birth through merit is reminiscent of that part of Hutten’s letter to Pirckheimer quoted by Goethe: “Nun aber streb’ ich nach Ehren, die ich ohne Mißgunst zu erlangen wünschte, ja welcher Weise es auch sei; denn es besitzt mich ein heftiger Durst nach dem Ruhm daß ich soviel als möglich geadelt zu sein wünschte” (FA 14:774).

By placing his discovery of Hutten’s work after the publication of *Götz von Berlichingen*, Goethe seems to rule out possible influence.⁴³ However, it is likely that Goethe might have encountered Hutten’s work earlier, since his interest in the history of the German late Middle Ages and the Renaissance started in his early youth. His interest in the German Renaissance and political issues related to the constitution of the German empire began before his departure to Leipzig and dates back to his acquaintance with Johann Daniel von Olenschlager (1711–78) and Court Consular Wilhelm Friedrich Hüsen (1692–1766). Olenschlager wrote a commentary on the *Goldene Bulle* and Hüsen introduced Goethe to Agrippa von Nettesheim’s (1486–1535) *De vanitate scientiarum* (1531). Speaking of German history around 1500, Goethe writes: “Die dunkleren Jahrhunderte der deutschen Geschichte hatten von jeher meine Wißbegierde und Einbildungskraft beschäftigt. Der Gedanke, den Götz von Berlichingen in seiner Zeitumgebung zu dramatisieren, war mir höchlich lieb und wert” (FA 14:570). The work on *Götz von Berlichingen* and *Faust* lead to further study of that epoch: “*Faust* war schon vorgerückt, *Götz von Berlichingen* baute sich nach und nach in meinem Geiste zusammen, das Studium des fünfzehnten und sechzehnten Jahrhunderts beschäftigte mich” (FA 14:552–53). Goethe must have read

about Hutten while researching his play. During the last three years of his life, Hutten lived in the Ebernhardt castle of Franz von Sickingen, who, in Goethe's play, is Götz's powerful ally and brother-in-law. It is impossible to read about the knights' revolt of 1522 without coming across Franz von Sickingen and Ulrich von Hutten, who was on the knights' side. Some of his writings, particularly *Inspikientes* and *Praedones*, were propaganda for the knights' cause and for the Reformation. During the eighteenth century Hutten was not a forgotten figure. He was still the controversial figure he had been since the Reformation, attacked and defended by Catholics and Protestants: "Hutten gehörte—und dies kann mit Nachdruck festgehalten werden—zum Bildungsgut der gelehrten Öffentlichkeit jener Epoche."⁴⁴ Hutten scholarship received new impetus through Jakob Burckhard's publication of three volumes of Hutten's works between 1717 and 1723. Furthermore, an article on Hutten appears in Pierre Bayle's (1647–1706) *Dictionnaire historique et critique* (1697) which Caspar Goethe owned and which was frequently used by the son throughout his youth (FA 14:262, 728).⁴⁵ Therefore, based on the similarities outlined, Goethe was most probably already familiar with Hutten's writings before or during the composition of *Götz von Berlichingen*, and not after, as he indicates in *Dichtung und Wahrheit*.⁴⁶

Goethe might also have been introduced to Hutten by Herder or Georg Michael Frank von La Roche. Few months after Christoph Martin Wieland's essay "Nachricht von Ulrich von Hutten" (1776), Herder published an essay that shows in-depth knowledge of Hutten's life and work.⁴⁷ He begins by saying that he had for a long time been thinking about writing an essay on Hutten. However, it is not clear whether Herder was familiar with Hutten's work before he met Goethe in Strasbourg in 1771. On his way from Wetzlar to Frankfurt, Goethe was introduced in Koblenz to the La Roche family and was their guest for a few days in 1772. The preceding year La Roche had published his *Briefe über das Mönchwesen* whose success encouraged him to expand the project into four volumes by 1781. Goethe describes La Roche's hostile attitude toward the monks:

Ein unversöhnlicher Haß gegen das Pfafftum hatte sich bei diesem Manne, der zwei geistlichen Kurfürsten diente, festgesetzt, wahrscheinlich entsprungen aus der Betrachtung des rohen, geschmacklosen, geistverderblichen Fratzenwesen, welches die Mönche in Deutschland an manchen Orten zu treiben pflegten, und dadurch eine jede Art von Bildung hinderten und zerstörten. (FA 14:609)

The influence of the *Letters of Obscure Men* on La Roche's work is evident.⁴⁸ La Roche uses the same genre as Rubeanus and Hutten: the epistolary expression wherein a monk betrays his extreme ignorance and uncharitable faith.

IV. Hutten as a Site of Memory

Goethe's play contributed to the revival of interest in the German Renaissance and indirectly initiated a new phase in the long history of the reception of Ulrich von Hutten.⁴⁹ Goethe points out how readers of the play

visited Franconia seeking the places where the historical events of the play had taken place: "Nun erhielt auf einmal das Flößlein Jaxd die Burg Jaxdhausen eine poetische Bedeutung; sie wurden besucht, so wie das Rathaus zu Heilbronn" (FA 14:773). Three years after the publication of *Götz von Berlichingen*, Wieland, who had founded the critical review *Der Teutsche Merkur* in 1773 and in the following year had defended the play against criticism, began in 1776 a series of essays about famous men of the German Renaissance: Sebastian Brant, Ulrich von Hutten, Hans Sachs, Willibald Pirckheimer, among many others. Wieland's essay on Hutten led to Herder's, who called for the publication of Hutten's collected works.

It is remarkable that both Wieland and the reading public made an association between Goethe's work and Hutten. Wieland concludes his essay on Hutten with the last two lines from Goethe's *Götz*. Speaking of Hutten he writes:

Kurz, ein Mann, der es werth ist, daß wir den Ausruf auf ihn anwenden, womit Goethe seinem Götz von Berlichingen parentirt: Edler Mann! Wehe dem Jahrhundert das dich von sich stieß! Wehe der Nachkommenschaft die Dich verkennt.⁵⁰

Herder's essay, which was published anonymously, was for a long time attributed to Goethe, even appearing in a pirated edition of his works. Its authorship was not clarified until Herder included it in the 1793 edition of his works. In it, Herder calls upon German youths to go on pilgrimage to Hutten's grave, just as Goethe had called upon Germans to visit the Strasbourg cathedral in "Von deutscher Baukunst." Caspar David Friedrich seems to have had Herder's essay in mind when he set out to create the most lasting monument to Hutten's memory. His *Huttens Grab* (1823–24), painted for the tercentennial of Hutten's death, shows a young German answering Herder's call.

V. The Politics of Citing Hutten

After speaking of his encounter with Hutten's works, Goethe quotes Hutten's letter to Pirckheimer at length, and at precisely this point of his autobiography, in order to corroborate his positive representation of the German nobility around the 1770s. The letter is quoted within the framework of Goethe's discussion of the relations between the nobility and the bourgeoisie and the influence of his own works on his relation to the nobility. Goethe's main point is that it became a credo that nobility had to be earned through merit. However, Goethe does not quote one of his aristocratic contemporaries. Instead he reaches out to a humanist who lived at the beginning of the sixteenth century to make a statement about meritocracy in his native Frankfurt in the second half of the eighteenth century. In his letter, Hutten is very critical of the nobility for despising education as a pursuit of the lower classes who raised themselves to high positions of honor through hard work. In Hutten's opinion it is not enough to be born into titles, as aristocrats believed; one has to merit them through one's own achievements (FA 14:774–75).⁵¹

Goethe describes the social and political situation in Germany in the 1770s as “beruhigt.” At that time, he claims, the bourgeoisie hardly envied the nobility its privileges, turning their attention rather to trade and education, acquiring thereby the influence which enabled them to put “a scholars’ bench” opposite the “nobles’ bench” in the highest imperial courts.⁵² Opposite the nobility of birth there appeared the nobility of merit. He assures the reader that there was “durchaus keine Spur von Rivalität” (FA 14:772) between the two classes. Yet four pages later, he adds “und zeigte sich in jenen schönen Tagen irgend eine Rivalität so war es von oben herunter” (FA 14:776). However, Goethe’s presentation of the relations between the bourgeoisie and the nobility in *Die Leiden des jungen Werther* (1774) was far from the harmony he wishes to present to the reader of his autobiography. “Was mich am meisten nekt,” writes Werther, “sind die fatalen bürgerlichen Verhältnisse” (FA 8:130).⁵³ In order to neutralize what he wrote in *Werther*, Goethe attributes the tense class relations to the passionate character of the protagonist, not to any objective existence of class conflict.⁵⁴

In dieser Zeit war meine Stellung gegen die oberen Stände sehr günstig, wenn auch im Werther die Unannehmlichkeiten an der Grenze zweier bestimmter Verhältnisse mit Ungeduld ausgesprochen sind, so ließ man das in Betracht der übrigen Leidenschaftlichkeiten gelten indem jedermann wohl fühlte daß es hier auf keine unmittelbare Wirkung angesehen sei. (FA 14:772)

It is perhaps instructive to compare the following description that Werther gives of the aunt of the Fräulein von B. to what Hutten had said of vain ignorant aristocrats. Indeed, one finds that not much has changed.

[D]ie liebe Tante in ihrem Alter, und dem Mangel von allem, vom anständigen Vermögen an bis auf den Geist, keine Stütze hat, als die Reihe ihrer Vorfahren, keinen Schirm, als den Stand, in dem sie sich verpallisadirt, und kein Ergötzen, als von ihrem Stokwerk herab über die bürgerlichen Häupter weg zu sehen. (FA 8:132)

It may be asked, if the aristocracy of his youth was really so open-minded, why did Goethe not quote one of his contemporary enlightened aristocrats? Why did he have to refer back to an aristocrat who had lived two and a half centuries earlier to support remarks on the aristocracy of his day?⁵⁵

VI. Brother in Arms

The fact that Goethe recalled Hutten so late in his life in order to make a point about the aristocracy of the 1770s underscores the impression Hutten’s writings had made on him during his youth. In addition to his autobiography, Goethe mentions Hutten in several works written after 1815. At this point, Hutten’s life and work gained personal importance for Goethe, who became primarily interested in Hutten as one of the authors of *The Letters of Obscure Men*. After Friedrich Schiller’s death, Goethe found himself more and more isolated in confronting and fending off critics. This isolation was keenly felt during the negative reception of his *Farbenlehre* (1810). Since his view on the nature of light and colors contradicted Newton’s,

Goethe found himself entangled in a controversy which he compared to those of the Reformation. He found in Hutten, similarly isolated after the death of his friend and protector Franz von Sickingen, a fellow companion in the struggle against obscurantist writings:

Hafis auch und Ulrich Hutten
 Mußten ganz bestimmt sich rüsten
 Gegen braun' und blaue Kutten;
 Meine gehn wie andre Christen. (FA 3.1:54)

In confronting his critics, Goethe adopted the angry and vindictive tone that had characterized many of Hutten's writings, even naming one of the books of the *West-östlicher Divan* (1818) "Buch des Unmuths." Indeed, in expressing his anger Goethe employs the coarse language that was the order of the day during the Reformation. Using one of Luther's proverbs, he speaks of *antichambre* where people cannot distinguish coriander from the dirt of mice:

Und so fand ich's denn auch juste
 In gewissen Antichambren,
 Wo man nicht zu sondern wußte
 Mäusedreck von Koriandern.⁵⁶ (FA 3.1:53)

In the polemical *Zabme Xenien* (1815–20), which "an Schärfe, Agressivität, und sogar Derbheit nichts zu wünschen übrig [läßt],"⁵⁷ he compares the debate concerning his *Farbenlehre* to that over Johannes Reuchlin's *Augenspiegel* (1511). Portraying his detractors as the ignorant theologians of Reuchlin's times, Goethe warns them that he too can have people take on his cause, as did Ulrich von Hutten and Franz von Sickingen with Reuchlin.

Reuchlin! wer will sich ihm vergleichen,
 Zu seiner Zeit ein Wunderzeichen!
 Das Fürsten- und das Städtewesen
 Durchschlängelte sein Lebenslauf,
 Die heiligen Bücher schloß er auf.
 Doch Pfaffen wußten sich zu rühren
 Die alles breit ins Schlechte führen,
 Sie finden alles da und hie
 So dumm und so absurd wie sie.
 Dergleichen will mir auch begegnen,
 Bin unter Dache laß es regnen:
 "Denn gegen die obskuren Kutten,
 Die mir zu schaden sich verquälen,
 Auch mir kann es an Ulrich Hutten,
 An Franz von Sickingen nicht fehlen." (2:672)

Goethe mentioned Hutten and the Reuchlin debate again a few years later (1825) in the poem, *Cölner Mummenschanz: Fastnacht 1825*, written to commemorate the Cologne Carnival. In the first three strophes, written in

the spirit of Erasmus of Rotterdam's *Praise of Folly*, Goethe says that neither wise nor older people can escape folly. This allusion to Erasmus was to be made clear in a strophe that the poet added later:

Selbst Erasmus ging den Spuren
Der *Moria* scherzend nach,
Ulrich Hutten mit *Obscuren*
Derbe Lanzenkiele brach. (FA 2:540)

Goethe's reception of Ulrich von Hutten is another example that demonstrates "how reading is historically contingent, politically situated."⁵⁸ Hutten's life and work beckoned from afar as the generation of the *Sturm und Drang* strove to define its national identity. Hutten's work became even more relevant because the conflict between church and state that took place in Catholic Germany and Austria called up anew several of the issues of the Reformation. The similarities between themes discussed in some of Hutten's dialogues and in *Götz von Berlichingen* suggest the possible influence of Hutten's work on Goethe's drama. The great success the play enjoyed contributed to the revival of interest in the German Renaissance which was to play a significant role in the search for German cultural identity during the romantic period. More than a withering phenomenon of his youth, the significance of the humanist for the older Goethe is illustrated by repeated mention of him many years after the initial encounter with Hutten's works.

Sam Houston State University

NOTES

1. Hans Robert Jauss, "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory," *New Literary History* 2 (1970): 7-37. "The interpretative reception of a text always presupposes the context of experience of aesthetic perception. The question of the subjectivity of the interpretation and the taste of different readers or levels of readers can be asked significantly only after it has been decided which transsubjective horizon of understanding determines the impact of text" (13).

2. For the rise of nationalism during the Renaissance see Herrfried Münkler, Hans Grünberger, and Kathrin Mayer, *Nationenbildung: Die Nationalisierung Europas im Diskurs humanistischer Intellektueller: Italien und Deutschland* (Berlin: Akademie, 1998). There has been a long debate on whether one can speak of nationalism before the nineteenth century. For an overview of the different arguments, see Reinhard Stauber, "Nationalismus vor dem Nationalismus? Eine Bestandsaufnahme der Forschung zu 'Nation' und 'Nationalismus' in der Frühen Neuzeit," *Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht* 47 (1996): 139-65.

3. Albrecht Dürer, "An Willibald Pirckheimer," 13 October 1506, *Schriften, Tagebücher, Briefe* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1961). 124-27, here 126.

4. Ulrich von Hutten, "Des Ritters Ulrich von Hutten Brief an den Nürnberger Patrizier Willibald Pirckheimer, in dem er über sein Leben Rechenschaft Ablegt," 25 October 1518, trans. Annemarie Holborn, in *Deutsche Schriften* (Munich: Winkler, 1970) 319.

5. On Hutten's nationalism, see Barbara Köneker, "Germanenideologie und die Anfänge deutschen Nationalbewußtsein in der Publizistik Ulrich von Huttens

dargestellt an seinem Dialog *Inspicientes*,” in Peter Laub, ed., *Ulrich von Hutten: Ritter, Humanist, Publizist 1488–1523. Katalog zur Ausstellung des Landes Hessen anlässlich des 500. Geburtstages* (Kassel: Hessischer Museumsverband, 1988) 279–92, and Hans Peter Herrmann, “Nation und Subjekt: Zur Systematik des deutschen Nationalismus anhand von Texten Ulrich von Hutten,” in Nicholas Vazsonyi, ed., *Searching for Common Ground: Diskurse zur Deutschen Identität 1750–1871* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2000) 23–43. I thank the anonymous reviewer for bringing this book to my attention.

6. The complaint that Rome was robbing Germany of its wealth had long ago been voiced by Walter von der Vogelweide (ca. 1170–ca. 1230). In one of his *Sprüche* he has the pope say: “Indessen füllen wir unsere Truhen. / Ich habe sie an meinen Opferstock getrieben, ihr Hab und Gut ist alles mein. / Ihr deutsches Silber wandert in meinen welschen Schrein. / Ihr Geistlichen, eßt Hühner und Trinkt Wein, / und laßt die deutschen [Laien magern und] fasten.” *Gedichte*, trans. Peter Wapnewski (Frankfurt/Main: Fischer, 1971) 51.

7. Compare his essays “Ritratti delle cose francese” and “Ritratti delle cose tedesche,” in *Opere* (Milan, 1804) 1:252–286. Also see Horst Rabe, *Deutsche Geschichte 1500–1600: Das Jahrhundert der Glaubensspaltung* (Munich: Beck, 1991) 112.

8. “Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges” *Encyclopedia Britannica Online*. <http://www.search.eb.com/eb/article-901168>.

9. Enea Silvio Piccolomini, *Deutschland*, trans. Adolf Schmidt (Cologne: Böhlau, 1962) 107.

10. Adolf Schmidt, “Vorwort,” in *Deutschland* (n. 9) 19.

11. Adolf Schmidt, “Vorwort,” in *Deutschland* (n. 9) 27.

12. Martin Mayer, “Brief des Mainzer Kanzlers Martin Mayer an Enea Silvio” in *Deutschland* 34. This complaint was repeated later by Jakob Wimphling (1450–1528). In his *Responsa et replica ad Eneam Silvium* (1515), written against Piccolomini’s *Germania*, he says: “dann werden wir zu Unrecht wie Sklaven und Knechte, von denen aber gleichwohl Geld herausgepreßt werden soll, durch den Schimpfnamen ‘Barbaren’ entehrt.” “Antworten und Einwendungen gegen Enea Silvio zu Heil und Ehren des heiligen römischen Reichs aus Liebe zum Vaterland und zur deutschen Nation,” in *Deutschland* 205. Speaking of the papal legate Cajetan, Hutten writes in *Inspicientes* “er möchete die Deutschen plündern und den Barbaren all ihr übriges Gold abnehmen.” Ulrich von Hutten, *Die Gespräche von Ulrich von Hutten*, trans. David Friedrich Strauß (Leipzig: 1860) 3:195. All future citation of Hutten’s dialogues refer to this volume and will be followed by page numbers.

13. Münkler and Grünberger, 210–20. Also see Schmidt, “Vorwort,” (n. 9) 12–13.

14. Münkler and Grünberger, 163–67 and 263–71. Also see Paul Joachimsen, “Tacitus im deutschen Humanismus,” *Neue Jahrbücher für das Klassische Altertum Geschichte und Deutsche Literatur* 27 (1911): 697–717, here 705.

15. Joachimsen 701–2.

16. Cornelius Tacitus, *On Britain and Germany*, trans. H. Mattingly (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1948) 131.

17. Tacitus 128.

18. The date of this dialogue is unknown, it was published posthumously in 1527. Many scholars argue that it was written between 1519 and 1520, see Hajo Holborn, *Ulrich von Hutten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968) 188.

19. In addition to Klopstock’s poem *Hermann und Thusnelda* (1752) and his plays *Hermanns Schlacht* (1769), *Hermann und die Fürsten* (1784), and *Hermanns Tod*

(1787), there were in Goethe's lifetime several other works on Hermann: Kleist's *Die Hermannsschlacht* (1809); F. de la Motte Fouqué's play *Hermann* (1818). See "Arminius," *The Oxford Companion to German Literature*. Justus Möser's *Arminius* should be added to this list.

20. Éléazar de Mauvillon, *Lettres françoises et germaniques* (London: F. Allemand, 1740) 334.

21. Mauvillon 362. Speaking of German literature of the 1760s, Goethe wrote: "Wir besaßen nunmehr, wo nicht Homere, doch Virgile und Miltone, wo nicht einen Pindar, doch einen Horaz" (FA 14:298).

22. Voltaire, "Letter to Marie-Louise Denis," 29 August 1750, *Correspondances* (Paris: Gallimard, 1975).

23. Mauvillon 338.

24. Friedrich der Grosse, *De la littérature allemande*, ed. Helmut Buske and Peter Kerner (Hamburg: Helmut Buske, 1969) 42.

25. Quoted by Chris Brooks, *The Gothic Revival* (London: Phaidon, 1999) 10.

26. Justus Möser, "Über die deutsche Sprache und Literatur," in *De la littérature allemande* (n. 24) 125.

27. Möser 126. Similarly, Goethe wrote: "Deutschland, . . . in gelehrten und diplomatischen Verhandlungen an fremde Sprachen gewiesen, konnte seine eigne unmöglich ausbilden" (FA 14:283).

28. Goethe repeats the judgment two pages later, which is exceptional in his autobiography. His attitude towards French culture was more conciliatory a few years later. In the *West-östlicher Divan*, he criticizes the Germans and the French for their mutual hostilities: "Und wo sich die Völker trennen, / Gegenseitig im Verachten, / Keins von beyden wird bekennen / Daß sie nach demselben trachten" (FA 3.1:53). Similar sentiments are expressed in *Zahme Xenien*. In a letter (17 February 1814) to Sara von Grotthuß, he greets the effort of Mme de Staël's *De l'Allemagne* and hopes for more works that favor mutual recognition. Finally, in his conversations with Eckermann, Goethe speaks of Voltaire's influence on his youth and expresses admiration for French literature.

29. *Concerning the State of the Church and the Legitimate Power of the Roman Pope*, *Traité du gouvernement d l'église et de la puissance du pape, par rapport à ce gouvernement*, trans. L.D.L.S. (Venice: P. Remundi, 1767).

30. Owen Chadwick points out that "the book was almost entirely a compilation out of Gallican writers and French Church historians." *The Popes and European Revolution* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981) 409.

31. Derek Beales, *Joseph II* (New York: Cambridge UP, 1983) 1:440.

32. Saul Padover, *The Revolutionary Emperor: Joseph II of Austria*, 2. ed. (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1967) 157.

33. Georg Michael Frank von La Roche, *Briefe über das Mönchwesen* (1781) 4:247.

34. However, he provides a brief description of the theme (FA 14:515-18).

35. The time frame is the same. Goethe has Maximilian live a few years more than he actually did because this emperor enjoyed great popularity and was considered the last emperor from a German house (FA 14:26).

36. Among the causes that Julius Caesar gives for the strength of the Belgae is their being out of reach of merchants: "Of all these people [the Gauls], the toughest are the Belgae. They are the farthest away from the culture and civilized ways of the Roman province, and merchants, bringing those things that tend to make men soft, very seldom reach them." *The Battle for Gaul*, trans. Anne and Peter Wiseman (Boston: David

Godine, 1980) 17. The idea that merchants bring goods that corrupt was widespread in the Renaissance. In his *Commentary on Isaiah* 2:12, 16, Jean Calvin wrote: "For it too often happens that riches bring self-indulgence, and superfluity of pleasures produces flabbiness as we can see in wealthy regions and cities (where there are merchants). Now those who sail to distant places are no longer content with home comforts but bring back with them unknown luxuries." Cited by Simon Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1987) 289.

37. Thomas More does not allow lawyers into his Utopia, see the chapter "Punishments, Legal Procedures, and Customs" in *Utopia*, trans. Robert M. Adams (New York: Norton, 1975). Also see Michel de Montaigne's essay "De l'Expérience," in *Essais* (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1998) 3:425–505.

38. Also see Rabe (n. 7) 123–24.

39. Piccolomini 107.

40. On Hutten and Fulda, see Josef Leinweber, "Ulrich von Hutten und das Kloster Fulda," in *Ulrich von Hutten: Ritter, Humanist, Publizist*, 79–86.

41. "sacrificuli idiotae et paene analphabetae." Quoted by Eckhard Bernstein, *Ulrich von Hutten* (Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1988) 61.

42. Crotus Rubeanus and Ulrich von Hutten, *Letters of Obscure Men*, trans. Francis Griffin Stokes (New York: Harper and Row, 1964) 163 and 167.

43. In her article, "Justus Möser's Social Ideas as Mirrored in Goethe's *Götz von Berlichingen*," *The Germanic Review* 14 (1979): 98–103, Christa Fell discusses the influence of some of Justus Möser's essays on Goethe's *Götz von Berlichingen*. In fact, several of the similarities outlined above can also be drawn between Hutten's and Möser's writings, so it is possible Hutten influenced Möser as well.

44. Wilhelm Kreutz, *Die Deutschen und Ulrich von Hutten* (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1984) 59.

45. The dictionary was translated into German and published under Gottsched's supervision in Leipzig in 1742.

46. Goethe might have been mistaken in dating his encounter with Hutten's work since the part of his autobiography that deals with Hutten was written toward the end of his life, more than fifty years after the publication of *Götz von Berlichingen*. Goethe borrowed the volume of Hutten's works that contained the letter to Pirckheimer from the Duke's library on 10 August 1824. He studied the epistle in February 1825 and translated the part to be quoted in *Dichtung und Wahrheit* in December 1830. See A. W. Cooper, "Goethe's Quotation from Hutten in *Dichtung und Wahrheit*," *Modern Language Notes* 24 (1909): 80–85. There are in *Dichtung und Wahrheit* other instances where Goethe is mistaken about the dates of certain events. One such example is his dating of his interest in Hans Sachs in a passage that follows his discussion of Hutten. The narrative seems to indicate that Goethe became interested in Sachs in 1775 instead of 1772 or 1773. Goethe speaks of Sachs while discussing the rediscovery of *Knittelvers*, which Hutten started using in 1520 (Bernstein [n. 41] 101–02), and in relation to the satirical farce *Hanswursts Hochzeit oder der Lauf der Welt* which he wrote in 1775. But Goethe's interest in Sachs dates to late 1772 or early 1773, when he wrote his first drama in *Knittelvers*: *Das Jahrmarkts-Fest zu Plundersweilen*. In 1773 he dedicated one of his earliest poems in this form to Sachs.

47. Wieland's essay was published in *Der Teutsche Merkur* in February 1776. Herder's was published in the same journal in July of the same year. In 1793 Herder gave it the title "Denkmal Ulrichs von Hutten."