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INTRODUCTION

Of all the creations of belief and fancy, and of all that has been inherited from antiquity, East or West, the devil, and everything which has been assigned to him, has exercised irresistible attraction upon the human mind. From the earliest times man's imagination has persistently dabbled with the idea of evil and its personification. The devil never failed in fascination; he has been a fountain of pathos and poetry, a perennial source of interest, inspiration, and achievement. People have always shown a deep interest for his literary incarnations, whether or not they believe in the devil's spiritual entity; his fitness as a fictional character has been unanimously approved. Indeed, it has generally been admitted that, as a poetic person, the devil has had few equals in history. The idea of good has been relatively free from anthropomorphism. The notion of evil, on the other hand, owes to the very presence of this anthropomorphic element its main value as a literary theme. In military tactics the devil may have been inferior to St. Michael, but he is certainly the arch-angel's superior in literary aesthetics. The perfectly virtuous angels, it may be concluded, are beyond our ken, but the devil and his hosts (the fallen angels), with all their faults and foibles, are definitely our kin.
The concept of the devil and devilish spirits gradually grew in scope in the superstitions of the people. Christianly, for example, took over and accepted superstitions of the older religions, and, as it did so, it put the devil and his servants in a central position in its belief. Jakob Grimm has the following to say about the Christians in this regard:


In the historical change and development of the belief in the devil, the Jewish-Christian personification of evil became more enticing as it was transplanted among the Germanic tribes and here mixed with heathen elements of all kinds. For it was the "conversion" of the German heathens that helped, more than any other factor, to further extend, enlarge, and multiply the prevailing conception of the devil and his influence. The old gods of the Germanic tribes were sent by the preachers of the new religion to Satan in hell - from a celestial abode they were transferred to a corresponding devilish hierarchy. However, although Christianity soon succeeded in suppressing the old "Götterglauben," it was less powerful in the face
of the numerous and deep-seated popular superstitions which, as it turned out, were of greater endurance. An example of this is the transformation of the old Germanic giants into Christian devils. Originally they seemed to be plain personifications of the crude forces of nature. Germanic mythology represented the giants as stupid, and they were frequently conquered by the wisdom of the gods or by human cunning and invention. Numerous legends and tales preserve the old conception and simply replace the names of giants by devils. Indeed, it has been clearly pointed out by many that Christianity took on Germanic myths, and that myths took on Christian covers. And, as Gustav Freytag states, "keine von allen Gewalten des neuen Glaubens aber erhielt eine so grosse Erbschaft als der Teufel." The devil absorbed all the hostile powers and accepted into his infernal court the multi-varied characters of pagan tradition, e.g., the wild and stupid giants, the destructive storm and water demons. In addition, he gained rule over the boundless number of smaller, harmless, and often charming nature spirits, e.g., the elves, fairies, goblins, urchins, imps, brownies, water-sprites, and dwarfs. Freytag (p. 170) notes that the superstitious notions about these evil spirits could and did easily and swiftly develop to a system within the medieval church.

Jakob Grimm (p. 575) observes that the elements of superstition concerning the devil and his servants were
abundant and the sources extremely diverse. He notes that the German devil was "jüdisch, christlich, heidnisch, abgöttisch, elbisch, riesenhaft, gespenstig, alles zusammen." His character thus received a charming mixture of the burlesque with which terror, "das Entsetzen," was fused. On the other hand, the dreaded enemy of mankind became a favorite object for the good humor of the faithful. He became ever more colorful, more diverse, and more popular.

During the late Middle Ages people imagined the devil abiding on earth in the most varied forms; and the people thought that a pact with evil powers was completely in the realm of possibility. Sustained by these notions and in defiance of the exorcists, famous magicians, sorcerers, wizards, and conjurers roamed the land. The witches, with the support of the devil, harmed the intimidated and terrified people and, in painful hours of torture, reaped their reward for their despicable deeds. A superstitious fear of harm and calamity of all kinds, indicated in dreams and extraordinary occurrences in nature, filled the people. This fear furthered superstitious ideas and stimulated some of its peculiar results in the occult sciences of some of the educated. Heretics, who gradually and in increasing numbers, rose up against the Church, also appeared to the faithful Catholics as servants of the devil. On the other hand, the arrogant and worldly priest and the merciless and unfair judge were likewise looked upon by the masses
as good acquaintances of Satan.

The large collection of ideas concerning the devil could not be without effect on German literature. Before Goethe, for example, created and presented his great negative spirit, the devil appeared at various times and places with a multiplicity of attributes and in various characterizations. Essentially, he appeared quite naturally where the popular element was especially strongly represented. And as this element became ever more prominent after the decline of medieval literature, the Prince of Hell with all his infernal hosts attained an ever greater importance in the minds and literature of the people. Countless humorous tales, jokes, and witty anecdotes which circulated among the people tell of unusual events in which "Junker Voland" took part. In the development of the religious plays, for example, Lucifer played an important role (initially, most of the scenes in which he appeared were based on the Bible). In the shrovetide plays, the devil evolved into an indispensable character. In these two types of drama he appeared under a variety of guises, e.g., as a rebel against the Godhead, as tempter, seducer, as avenger of sin, and then as the "lustige Person," as the buffoon (even in the later religious plays in order to heighten the effect of the serious scenes).

Consciously or unconsciously, most schools of
literature in various times and languages have tried to interpret and represent the devil; and each school has treated him in its own characteristic manner. Each generation has had, to varying degrees, a special and sometimes distinct devil related to its own temperament. The devil has often even reflected the faith and philosophy, superstition and imagination, the people and personalities of the period. Such was definitely the case with the German Reformation, in particular with the protestant literature during the fifty years following Luther's death.

The protestant works with which this study is concerned comprise the devil-books, the so-called "Teufelbücher," which were written primarily during the second half of the sixteenth century. For want of a better designation, the terms "devil-book" and "devil literature" will be used throughout this study. And since this body of literature will be referred to as a literary type, it is here necessary to describe briefly those elements which differentiate these works from the other literature of the time.

The form of the devil-books is quite varied. It includes moral tracts, published sermons, compendiums, dramas, open letters, didactic poems, and anecdotes. The size of the works varies greatly, and the themes are manifold. The authors attack social abuses or treat theological questions;
they describe and satirize the vices of their contemporaries and admonish to renunciation, or they advise against magic, sorcery, and other superstitious practices. The literary value of the devil-books is also diverse; besides some excellent works which deserve mention in a literary history, there are also long-winded, dry, and tedious religious tracts. Taking everything into consideration, the devil-books did not play an overwhelmingly important role in German literary history; but they are characteristic of the spirit of the post-Lutheran sixteenth century, and they did create an attitude and atmosphere out of which, and a basis on which, an important literary tradition developed, i.e., the idea of a pact as we know it since Luther, e.g., the Faust tradition. Didacticism is the main element, for the authors, with few exceptions orthodox Lutheran pastors, were primarily interested in moral improvement. They sincerely considered their battle against the multiplicity of vices as an office or a calling; and among the devil-books there are even several published sermons.

The authors' common point of departure, i.e., their similar convictions, attitude, intention, and endeavor to teach and preach to the people, does not in itself distinguish the devil-books as a separate literary type. These characteristics are shared with much of the other contemporary literature. At that time the people often designated
social critical works as "Spiegel." With some of the devil-
books "Teufel" could easily be exchanged for "Spiegel" to
show a close relationship with the moral literature of the
era. The themes of the devil-books also show how intimately
connected they were with other moral and social critical
works: the various vices and abuses, for example, "Saufen,"
"neue Moden," and "Seuchen,"

Only the specific conception of the devil, represented
by the many "Spezialteufel," justifies the distinction of
a separate genre for the protestant devil literature. What
is important for this study is to indicate here the separate
and distinct similarities of all the devil-books. Bernhard
Ohse summarizes these most efficiently:

1. Zur Teufelliteratur gehören solche Schriften,
denen die Vorstellung zugrundeliegt, dass jedes
Laster, jeder Missstand von einem Spezialteufel
herrührt oder durch ihn verkörpert wird.
2. Diese Schriften haben jeweils einen Spezial-
teufel oder das dazugehörige Laster zum Thema.
(gelegentlich sind in einer Schrift mehrere
Unterteufel zusammengefasst.)
3. Die Schriften sind jeweils nach einem Spezial-
teufel benannt.
4. Der Spezialteufel und sein Laster werden gewöhn-
lich als Hauptgrund für die allgemeine Verkehr-
heit der Welt angesehen.
5. Der Spezialteufel wird dabei im weitesten Sinne
religiös verstanden, d.h. als Widersacher einer
Gottesordnung aufgefasst.9

During the second half of the sixteenth century there were
thirty-two pastors who made up the group of authors who
created a total of thirty-nine devil-books which went
through well over one hundred further editions before the end of the century.

The first section of this study is concerned with the specific devil of the devil-books and with some possible sources and influences from which the protestant authors created their works. First of all the study includes a brief discussion of Luther whose ideas made such a decisive contribution to the development and popularization of the notion of evil and its manifestations and personifications. The discussion indicates what role the devil played in Luther's life and concepts and shows what connection these ideas had to popular superstition. Luther was the impetus for the devil literature of the sixteenth century, but was he the sole source of influence as has been traditionally thought? Was the reformer the direct inspiration for the authors of the devil-books? This study points out that the devil literature was not entirely an emanation or emulation of the Lutheran devil, rather that it consisted much more of a modified adaptation and development of individual characteristics of the Lutheran notion. If Luther was not the sole source of influence and material for the works in question, then who and what were these other sources? The moral didactic nature of the devil-books leads us to seek possible points of reference, sources, or elements of influence in the other moral literature of this
and the pre-reformation period. For example, the discussion of the fool literature, especially Brant's *Narrenschiff*, is an attempt to show what relationships might exist between the social critical fools of Brant and his followers and the protestant devils. In considering particular devil-books other sources of these works will be pointed out.

This study also discusses a concept inherent in the general topic, i.e., the idea of the pact. During the sixteenth century when the devil was so popular, the notion of a pact with the devil also became extremely widespread. A chapter of this study is concerned with the tradition of the pact and what role it played in the devil literature.

The second section of this study discusses Sigmund Feyerabend's anthology, the *Theatrum Diabolorum*, and five representative and influential devil-books, their particular ideas and sources of material and inspiration other than Luther. This section is also concerned with the manner of composition, the style, language, and purpose of these works. The reception and significance of the devil-books during the second half of the sixteenth century are discussed, and some possible reasons for the success of these works are mentioned. The question is also asked: Are the devil-books "Volksbücher?" Finally, at the end of this study an extensive bibliography of the devil-books printed between 1545 and 1604 is included.
NOTES

Introduction


3 See, e.g., Jakob Grimm, p. 574. Cf. Carus, pp. 245-246, who states the following: "Christianity to-day is essentially a Teutonic religion. The ethics of Christianity, which formerly were expressed in the sentence 'Resist not evil,' began, in agreement with the combative spirit of the Teuton race, more and more to emphasise the necessity of struggle. Not only was the figure of Christ conceived after the model of a Teutonic war-king, the son of the emperor, while his disciples became his faithful vassals; not only did the archangels assume the features of the Asas, the great northern gods, Wodan, Donar, Fro, and others; not only were the old pagan feasts changed into Christian festivals; the Yuletide became Christmas and the Ostara feast in the spring was celebrated in commemoration of Christ's resurrection; but the individual features of the evil powers of the North were also transferred to Satan and his host."

5 Freytag, pp. 168-169. See also Bächthold-Stäubli, ed. Handwörterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens, 9 vols. (Berlin & Leipzig, 1927-1942) for numerous examples of the devil in the life, legends, and tales of the people, e.g., I, col. 1482, 1662; II, col. 1748; III, cols. 475, 956, 970, 979; IV, col. 184; VI, cols. 402ff, 777f, 1072, 1468; VII, cols. 971f, 1004, 1010, 1012, 1014; VIII, cols. 944, 1383; see also Index, IX, 347-350.

6 See, e.g., August Wünsche, Der Sagenkreis vom geprellten Teufel (Leipzig & Wien, 1905).


8 See Bibliography of primary Works.

SECTION I

THE DEVIL IN LITERATURE DURING THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY
CHAPTER I

LUTHER AND THE REFORMATION

If the thirteenth century had been the height of the devil-superstition, then the century of the Reformation was the high point for Satan's literary importance. It was a time when people knew how to imagine and represent through the various literary types and the plastic arts all the evils of the world in the idea and illustrations of the devil. Here was added to the growing power of the popular literature the fresh and enormous impetus which the religious element in the life of the people received and the profound effect which this element exercised on everyone and everything, including literature, during that theological era. Here, also, the devil found potent help, even promotion, in the powerful personality which in the whole long development of these ideas so decisively intervened with its wide-reaching influence: namely, in the personality of Martin Luther.

It is well known that the notion of the devil played an important role in the life and teachings of this reformer. Some critics like Bernhard Ohse maintain, however, that the conception of the devil was merely peripheral to Luther's theological writings and that this devil was
basically not a result of folk tradition. On the other hand, Harmannus Obendiek, for example, although only dealing with the reformer's theology, clearly shows that Satan was a substantial component of all Luther's beliefs and inseparably connected to his whole system of ideas and conception of the world. My intention in this chapter of this study is to give a brief but clear picture of Luther's belief in the devil, and to show the reformer's connection to popular German superstitions on the basis of a study of the Tischreden; for it is here that one best becomes acquainted with Luther. Under the circumstances in which the Table Talks originated, not in his theological writings, is where Luther was least inhibited in expressing his views on this and other topics. I shall also indicate Luther's influence on the following body of devil literature, the so-called devil-books, which flooded middle and northern Germany after Luther's death.

I do not intend to give an exhausting conceptual definition of Luther's and the Volksaberglaube, for that is not the essential theme of this study. I have, however, found it necessary to briefly characterize some of the important manifestations of superstition during the reformation era in order to be able to explain why Luther's idea of the devil could establish itself so successfully.

The fear-filled feeling of a dependence on mysteriously ruling evil powers led to a devil and demon belief which
found its most frightful expression in the witch and magician fancy. A dependence on supernatural powers expressed itself in mild form in the belief in all sorts of omens; the pseudo-sciences of astrology and alchemy then tried to codify this dependence into specific formulas. Finally, the belief in the possibility to guard and defend oneself against the power of evil through the use of old, handed-down customs found support in the religious illusion that through purely outward, cultish acts one could extort something from God.\textsuperscript{6}

During and at the turn of the fifteenth century, these various manifestations of superstition were in full bloom. The many sermons and works of the clerics and the many edicts, ordinances, or the decisions and statements of the secular or ecclesiastic judges of the time indicate this.\textsuperscript{7} And even with that one has not penetrated to the depths of superstition which the \textit{Hexenhammer}, for example, (a sort of reference book of superstition, in particular with regard to witches, edited by Heinrich Institoris and Jakob Sprenger and printed at Strassburg in 1487) could reveal. In the works of such men as Reuchlin, Erasmus, Hans Sachs, and others, a ridicule of various particular superstitious views can be detected. In doing so that which existed could be recognized immediately.

The foregoing indicates approximately the sum of the superstition of the time into which Martin Luther was born. For an analysis of his notion of the devil it is of importance
to consider when and how well the superstitions of the time could, and did, establish themselves in Luther's way of viewing things. And precisely for the first strong, childhood impressions we are not merely directed by vague assumptions, for even today there exist clear, however few, self-testimonies of Luther. If perhaps the frequent passages in which Luther claims to have heard tales of the devil and witches in his youth do not signify a great deal, then an account of a personal experience must carry greater weight. One such tale is that of the evil neighbor woman who by means of sorcery harmed Luther's family, tormented the mother and so bewitched the children that they cried and screamed. This experience must have left behind an indelible impression on the mind of the impressionable boy. When Luther in later years pronounced a strong damnation on witches, his recollection of this experience might well have been showing its effect. Nevertheless, such an experience of his youth throws some more light onto the otherwise scanty and only outlined knowledge of the surroundings in which Luther grew up.

Were not these surroundings, after all, particularly suitable to the susceptibility and early establishment of superstitious ideas in the mind of the boy? The following example should suffice to bear this out. Until his fourteenth year Luther lived in the Mansfeld mining district. In such circles people had enough leisure time and oppor-
tunity to pursue all sorts of superstitious thoughts. The atmosphere of the work deep in the darkness of the earth seldom let a light-hearted or sunny disposition prevail among the miners, and this easily made the melancholy and pensive people susceptible to superstitious fears. Besides, sudden and frequently violent natural forces sufficed to give a foundation to those fears. Moreover, the men would not have kept such thoughts to themselves; their disposition certainly had its influence on wife, children, and society. If it was not Luther's father, who was at one time a miner and who was descended from rural folk (another very productive field for superstition), then it was certainly Luther's friends and acquaintances who, with their tales of ghosts and evil spirits in the air, on and under the earth, supplied his youthful and easily excitable fantasy with abundant nourishment. Although there is little evidence, except a few utterances about ghosts and the devil's activity in and around the mines so that many particulars are still lacking, nevertheless the conclusion may be drawn that the whole spirit of the environment of his youth was of lasting importance for his later conception of the existence of demonic powers. The introduction into the gay world of fairy tale and fable and the dark, gloomy world of spirits was also just as indelibly impressed on the boy's mind as the above mentioned experiences. After his departure from his father's house these first impressions were undoubtedly
strengthened and deepened by new experiences.

In order to better understand his idea of the devil Luther's study years should be considered. For during this time of outwardly happy and carefree existence the great inner change occurred which motivated him to become a monk. The outward cause, which is here important, of the decisive step was a superstitious state of fear evoked by an unexpected "Schicksalschlag." On July 2, 1505, as Luther was returning to his studies from a visit to his parents at Magdeburg, a violent storm overtook him not far from Erfurt. Near the village of Stotternheim lightning struck in his immediate vicinity and prostrated him. Fearful of death, he cried out to St. Ann for help and vowed, if his life be saved, henceforth to serve God. After his return to Erfurt, having happily escaped the danger, he decided to keep his vow at once and thus on July 17 presented himself at the Augustinian Convent. "A terrible manifestation from heaven," which the frightened Luther interpreted as a sign that he should become a monk, had forced him to flee to the "peace and silence" of the monastery. It is not easy to answer whether this incident could later be explained on the basis of superstition. In any case, Luther must have been especially susceptible to such unusual influences, particularly in questions of superstition, in times of such states of fear and inner vexation. It would also be difficult to examine the personal impressions and
influences of his brothers in the Order. 11

The reformer must have found in the Bible a strengthening or confirmation of his own views. Luther was a man of the people and had a close relationship with common superstitions, and as a Bible scholar he did not see himself in any contradiction to scripture. What Luther read and understood to the best of his ability in the Bible, i.e., the manuscripts or the original texts, was binding for him. Through the scriptures Luther became acquainted with a devil who first of all represented the fundamental principle of evil; then, conceived in a more materialistic manner, there was the fallen angel and servant of God as he is depicted in Job and who with God’s permission tempts mankind: "... die Gewalt, so er übet, ist ihm nicht befohlen; sondern unser Herr Gott wehret ihm nicht, siehet durch die Finger, lässt ihn machen und rumoren, doch länger und weiter nicht, denn er will: denn er hat ihm ein Ziel gesteckt, darüber er nicht schreiten darf noch kann" (TR, 24:51). Although Luther found no specific established dogma concerning the devil, he was well aware of the passages in which Christ speaks again and again of the Fiend; in addition, Luther felt a close kinship to Paul who had been made to suffer punishment inflicted by the devil (II Cor. 12:7). Quite often Luther mentions the scriptures in the Bible where Christ casts demons out of the possessed and where Paul, for example, warned the Corinthians against association
with demons and the Ephesians of evil spirits. Luther knew well that the Old Testament had warned of demons which inhabit the air and are present in every violent storm, and that such demons could indeed take possession of an individual, for example:


Ideas and examples of demonology continue in that vein, for example, the belief in witches and their persecution as initiated by Moses and recorded in Exodus), but we are already able to discern that in such a manner everything could be explained and justified, indeed, all of the German superstitions with which Luther was acquainted or that which had happened to him personally. When he made the Bible his sole authoritative norm for his views, Luther bound himself forever, even in small, seemingly insignificant matters. It became almost impossible for him to escape any particular superstitious notion which found any kind of support, however weak, in scripture. For that reason it also follows that in that moment the "development" of the Lutheran notion of the devil and also superstition must
appear completed. No substantial change of his views in connection with the devil and superstition occurs afterward. The dates of Luther's works which significantly deal with the question of superstition will attest this: already in 1516 the catechism sermons, the many Table Talks of the 1530's, and the *Genesis Commentary* finished in 1544. The utterances on the topic span almost the entire period of Luther's public activity. Thus, there can be little talk of a development in Luther's superstition, and, consequently, there is justification in starting this discussion with Luther's early impressions which had their roots in tradition.14

The conception of an anthropomorphized devil, supported by the authority of the Bible and intensified by the old ecclesiastical and popular point of view, dominated the widest circles in the waning Middle Ages.15 Here it will be well to review Luther's notion of the devil. All of his other superstitious views either stand or fall with this belief.

If Luther, because of his character and individuality, did not completely clarify his conception of an anthropomorphic devil, it may partially be a result of his speech in which he was ever seeking after more concrete images and similes. Thus he talks to the people about an abominable, loathsome, anthropomorphic evil, the "Junker Teufel," the "schwarzer Tausendkünstler," the well-known "Moloch."16
His description of the devil as "Kuckuck" is of popular origin. His anthropomorphic devil conception is better recognized as Luther gradually enumerates in different places and expressions almost all parts of the devil's "body." The following example from the Table Talks should suffice; it also shows how easily and in which manner Luther could imagine his devil:

Wie Gott die Thesis des Decalogs \[ \text{der heiligen zehn Gebote} \] ist, so ist der Teufel die Antithesis . . . desselben. Wer daher den Teufel sehen will, der sehe den umgekehrten Decalog an. Sein Haupt ist gegen die erste Tafel, dass wir Gott nicht vertrauen, nicht lieben, nicht fürchten sollen, was er von uns im ersten Gebote fordert. Im zweiten verlockt er uns zur Lästerung, zum Murren wider Gott und zum Missbrauch seines Namens mit dem Munde und mit der Zunge. Gegen das dritte reizt er, dass wir Gottes Wort nicht hören, sondern es in Zweifel ziehen und dasselbe nebst seinen Dienern verachten, das Wort öbel gebrauchen. Das sind die Oren und der Hals des Teufels. Die zweite Tafel enthält seinen Leib. Im vierten Gebote lehrt er, die Eltern verachten, ihnen nicht gehorchen, sie nicht unterstützen, sich ihrer schämen und unehren, aufrührerisch sein gegen die Obmächtigkeit, das ist die Brust des Teufels. Das fünfte Gebot des Teufels ist tödten, zürnen, hassen, übelwollen, jedermann beneiden und schaden, das ist das Herz. Das sechste, dass man ein Hurer sei, ein Ehebrecher, ein Blutschänder, ein Weichling, schamlos in Worten und Geberden; das ist der Bauch. Das siebente: niemandem helfen, alle mit List und Gewalt berauben, stehlen, wuchern, falsche Waare verkaufen oder theuerer, als es werth ist; da sind die Hände, sein grosser Finger. Das achte ist, das gute Leben der Menschen herabsetzen, in Zweifel ziehen und besudeln; das ist sein Wille. Ein solch freundlich Bild ist der Teufel.

Dannach, wer den Teufel kennen lernen will, der stelle sich einen ganz verzweifelten Menschen vor, vom bösesten Leben und Gewissen, da siehest du den leibhaften Teufel, wie Christus den Buben mit sehr wenigen Worten abmalt, indem er spricht: Er sei ein Lügner und ein Mörder. Ein Lügner gegen die erste Tafel, weil er ohne Unterlass die Menschen reizt zu falschen Lehren und Meinungen. Je heiligere Leute,
Indeed, with Luther that is also more a symbolic manner of expression for the contemptuousness of the devil. In this Table Talk the reformer further points with the "Schleichen" of the devil, not to a cloven foot, but to devilish cunning. We would also not be surprised to hear from Luther of the devil's lyre or to hear that he sits in a dark nook and laughs at man's weakness.

Luther only wants to describe the "flotten Junker" justly when he calls this "Weltfürst, Weltherrschér" (TR, 24:15), this powerful, wrathful, and pernicious enemy, a "leibhaftigen Dieb," "Räuber," "Mörder," "Bösewicht," "Ketzer," "Rottengeist," etc. (TR, 24:19, 41, 134). The devil's activities on earth are thereby partially indicated. Furthermore, one can also find a devil as he is recognized from the fairy tales and legends and as he was intimately known in Luther's time from the many anecdotes, chap books, and shrovetide plays. It is the devil who appears outspoken on earth while in hell is henpecked by his mother or grandmother. Besides the biblical conception of hell, Luther apparently had the idea of a large "Wirtshaus" (TR,
24:132). There the "Höllenwirt" dwells and waits for his guests.

The devil usually comes uninvited and not with good intentions when he appears. He has a predilection for showing himself to men as an enticing woman, to women as a seducer in the form of a handsome man. Other modes of devil appearances also prevail with Luther. It had already seemed quite clear to the narrators of the legends of saints that the devil liked to appear to man in a pious and holy fashion in order to be all the more sure of ensnaring man in his net. St. Martin was thus tempted by Satan in the form of Christ; others, for example, were tempted by Satan in the form of Moses (TR, 24:48). It is nothing new for Luther to mention the devil's delight in putting on a monk's cowl, for people already had heard of devil appearances as priests and monks in the Dialogus miraculorum of Caesarius von Heisterbach. For polemic reasons Luther took a special delight in relating precisely such tales as those of the Pope as the Antichrist (TR, chap. 27). Luther even claims to have heard in his youth that a sick priest once had been represented at the pulpit by the devil.\textsuperscript{18} All of these ideas are of popular origin. Luther calls this, and some other tales, "eine der Wahrheit nicht unähnliche Historie," for he would not overtly maintain that it was true. It must be noted, however, that he seldom hesitated to tell and even to popular-
ize such alleged accounts.

In any case, Luther's conviction of devil appearances in human form is established, indeed, so certain that the phrase *Satanas transformat se in diversarum species personarum* is as valid as canon law. More than on the not-so-clear conceptions of the Bible, Luther could base his anthropomorphic notion of the devil on tradition which made it possible for him to set forth his ideas in the generally valid phrase: *diabolo permissum est invadere bestias*. Luther also follows tradition with his representation of the devil as a snake (TR, 24:66), or, what was essentially the same for the reformer, as a dragon or "Ungeheuer" (TR, 27:157). Both the biblical account of the temptation in paradise and the legends of the dragon protecting treasures could well have been the influence for such statements. Biblical influence might also be discerned in Luther's idea of the devil as a "Bock."19

The reformer also follows popular superstition when he assigns other animals to the devil, e.g., parrots, apes and monkeys, ordinary cats, and rabbits. He found the first three especially appropriate because of their imitative talents; and this aping was considered a main characteristic of their patron, the devil, who knows nothing better than ape God and His kingdom everywhere and in every manner. Luther was fond of using the long popular designation of the devil as "des Herrn Gottes Affen."20
For Luther it is very clear what the devil intends with all his tempting: he desires to bring the souls of men under his power and destruction. Already at the time of his temptation of Christ, Satan believed there to be no better way of reaching his goal than to make a pact with man. This idea of a pact was further developed in the legends.\textsuperscript{21} Luther speaks again and again of "Teufelsbeschworungen" and "Verschreibungen" in the \textit{Table Talks} and in other writings.\textsuperscript{22} What seemed to arouse Luther's greatest interest was the precise wording of such a pact. This is indicated in the case of the young Wittenberg student Valerius Glockner, the son of the mayor of Nürnberg (\textit{TR}, 24:103). Valerius had suddenly changed his way of life, and had abruptly refused obedience to his teacher Georg Major. The Table Talk recounts the hearing of the case which took place in the sacristy in the presence of deacons, the teacher, and Luther. There the student confessed that five years previously he had given himself to the devil with the following words: "Ich sage dir [Christe] deinen Glauben auf und will einen andern Herrn annehmen."

The reformer questioned the youth expressly "ob er auch was mehr geredet hätte;" however, the account of this event does not instruct us any further in this regard. What is significant is that Luther, contrary to folk tradition, regarded such a pact and the manner in which it was made as thoroughly serious. That becomes quite clear when the
many and various passages on the subject found in the Table Talks are considered. The account of the student also shows the reformer's belief that such vows and ties to the devil were not to be kept; however, Luther assures everyone that the devil, on the other hand, stands steadfast to the agreement and cannot easily be tricked. Luther thus deviates from the popular folk view that the devil is almost always "der Geprellte" or "der Dumme" in such alliances.23 In one deceptive and humorous manner or another people circumvented the contract, dissociated themselves from the unpleasant obligations; and at death the soul could ascend into heaven unhindered. An example of this would be the often related fairy tale in which every year the cunning farmer, after making a pact for agricultural success, cheats the "stupid" devil out of the best half of the harvest. There are countless tales of villages, etc., making a contract with the devil to construct a bridge (or churches, etc.) for the price of the first soul to cross. The people always dupe the devil by sending a chicken or dog across the completed bridge.24 Luther, however, sees such a pact as a contract with hell, and the individual who makes such a compact as an unpenitent sinner (according to the Augustinian - Lutheran theory of original sin), without grace and prey for the devil. Thus, it could develop that since the sixteenth century those who made a pact with hell were generally fetched away by the prince of that place.25
So it is in fact in many of the cases mentioned by Luther. The sinner should be punished in the end, and hell should so triumph when man commits this sin. The more or less probable anecdotes by Luther are intended only to prove this point. If the individual does not earnestly repent and dissolve the pact with the devil, of course in the proper manner, then these tales end with Satan taking possession of the individual's soul (e.g., TR, 24:106). The mere fact that the reformer rejected the Catholic view of the Mother Mary and the traditional saints, and thus their last-minute intercession on behalf of a pleading soul, suffices to show the protestant influence on the pact tradition.

A very serious characteristic also lies in the method in which Luther, in this case unaffected by the customs of the people and church tradition, practiced his "Exorzismus," if one can use such an expression with Luther, for it was the Catholics who used it; Luther used prayer. At that time exorcism was demanded of a man of God, and people could refer to Christ and his apostles and a long line of successful exorcising saints to substantiate that demand. Luther considered the Catholic manner ineffective and any other mode forbidden. He indicates that in his day one could not act as Christ and his apostles—in such matters, but only pray (TR, 24:16, 28).

Luther had several opportunities to drive out devils
(evil spirits, demons, devils were all quite the same to the reformer); however, his simple manner of exorcism is clearly indicated in the account of the Wittenberg student Valerius who, according to his own admission, had given himself to the devil and now was brought to Luther to be freed from the Fiend. Luther asks Valerius if he regrets his wrong deed and if he wishes to mend his ways with true repentance and acceptance of Christ. After the youth promises this, Luther lays his hands on Valerius' head, kneels with the others present, says the Lord's Prayer and commends the "armen Sünder" into God's grace. Then Luther pronounces and has Valerius repeat the following "Abschwörungsformel":

Ich Valerius bekenne vor Gott und allen seinen heiligen Engeln, und vor der Versammlung der Kirche: dass ich Gott meinen Glauben habe aufgesagt, und mich dem Teufel ergeben; das ist mir von Herzen leid, will nun hinfort dem Teufel ein abgesagter Feind sein, und Gott, meinem Herrn, willig folgen und mich bessern, Amen. (TR, 24:103)

After this public renunciation and with some good counsel Luther considered the student healed and released him. That is Luther's complete "Exorzismus": God's word, prayer, and a cheerful Christian confession are the best weapons against the devil. Thus, from a feeling of security a certain contempt for the devil also develops. This contempt, scorn, or ridicule is often expressed by Luther in sometimes drastically insulting speech and in often crude gestures. Luther certainly had also been able to hear in the monastery of drastic measures for driving out devils.
For Luther, the devil is also the cause of all sickness, misfortune, and unhappiness (TR, 24:9, 37, 72). Naturally he thought of Job whom the devil smote with horrible afflictions. It should not be surprising, then, when Luther attributes all evil to the devil, for example, "Ungewitter," "Hagel," "vergiftete Luft," "verdorbenes Getreide und krankes Vieh," all sins, injustice, ingratitude, evil thoughts, disdain, disunity, unrest, pestilence, and war (TR, 24:5, 10, 37). The devil is simply the incarnation of wickedness and the source of all sin and vice.

Since the devil has so many varied functions to perform, one devil does not suffice; and Luther actually speaks of the devil in the plural. In the representation of officialdom and the papacy, for example, the notion of many devils is most sharply pronounced. He regarded the Pope as an incarnation of Satan, the Antichrist, and the Roman Church as the kingdom of the devil. Just as many people and offices belong to a kingdom or state, so there are also similar offices among the devils. This dualism is, of course, very old. Several categories of devils as Luther envisioned them might be mentioned here. There are, for example, the "Haus-, Hof-, Kirchen-, Wallfahrts-, Ablass-, und Bullenteufel" (with these, we recognize Luther's pointed satire and criticism of Catholicism), or the "Ehe-, Fluch-, Sauf-, Mord-, und Selbstmordteufel." This Lutheran view of many and specialized devils, more than any other reason,
inspired the devil literature that followed.27

The question now arises how people should defend themselves against the evil enemy. A great part of Luther's *Table Talks* have this as their theme, for Luther not only wanted to warn of the devil and his activities, he also wanted to instruct the people how they should protect themselves (e.g., TR, 24:5, 33, 42, 67). "Der Satan kann durch Verachtung überwunden werden, aber im Glauben, nicht in Vermessenheit" (TR, 24:67). Therefore, Luther says, man should pray the devil does not deceive and lead him astray into "Missglauben, Verzweiflung und andere grosse Schande und Laster." However, whoever wants to pray in such a manner must also believe there are devils and demons. Individuals must not imagine Satan and his hosts to be distant but must be aware of their closeness. This, simply, is what Luther wanted the people to believe. People must be emphatically aware of the fearful proximity of the devil in order that they all the more diligently seek their refuge in God's goodness.

Also, for Luther it did not matter so much what the people thought the devil looked like. That they believed in him was the reformer's essential concern. It is precisely in this point that Luther furthered popular superstition. He let the people imagine and conceive the devil for themselves, although he himself had concrete conceptions of Satan and his activities. The following devil literature
bore this out quite clearly. Luther also unwittingly furthered popular notions in attacking superstitions ideas. The "Katechismuserklärungen" of the first and second commandments are indeed basically an intentional manifesto against what Erich Klinger calls "den praktischen Aberglauben" of the time. On the other hand, one must not overlook "was sich uns - gerade auch in diesen Manifestationen - für eine Menge an abergläubischen Anschauungen Luthers dargetan hat. Was Luther als Sünde verurteilt, das hält er deswegen noch nicht für etwas Unmögliches. Wer die Sünde nicht scheut, der kann sich mit dem Teufel verbinden und so eine grosse Macht erlangen, kann sich schützen und kann anderen Schaden tun. Diesen Unterschied von Erlaubtem und Möglichem müssen wir festhalten und von einem theoretischen Aberglauben können wir Luther nicht freisprechen." The reformer did fight against superstition, but by doing so he especially popularized what he did not reject and made superstition in general a subject of concern.

In his demonology Luther was a real child of his time. He saw the devil everywhere; he struggled with him constantly and overcame him by his confidence in God. Max Osborn, pp. 5-6, quotes Luther as follows on this point:

"Ich fühle oft des Teufels Rasen in mir . . . Alle Nacht, wenn ich erwache", so erzählt er 1533, "so ist der Teufel da und will an mich mit dem Disputieren". Und zuweilen hat er furchtbar zu leiden: "hie brach mir wahrlich der Schweiss aus", so berichtet er einmal, "und das Herz begonnst mit zu zittern und zu pochen" . . . das ganze Leben stellt sich ihm dar
als ein Krieg gegen den Satan; dies erkannt zu haben, ist ihm schon der Anfang des Sieges, denn da hebt bald ein Strahl göttlicher Barmherzigkeit an hervor-

The states of fear which came and went alternated with unrestrained desire to do battle with his enemy or periods of repose and clear thinking. In peaceful moments his notion of, and utterances about, the devil were milder. In the Table Talks, however, such moments were relatively few compared to those occasions and comments of rage, scorn, ridicule, and fear of Satan. In times of doubt and discouragement his rich fantasy let him see behind all temptations a real and embodied devil, behind all anxiety a world of demons. In the struggle with evil powers he solidified the fancies of his imagination; and if the scorn strongly expressed in his insulting language and coarse gestures (e.g., TR, 24:15) and fervent prayer were unable to free him from the oppressing burden - at such a time he may well have grabbed for the inkstand. The story has obviously been doubted, yet, considering the character of Luther, it is not only possible but probable. If Luther did not throw the inkstand at the devil, the anecdote is, to say the least, ben trovato; it characterizes excellently his attitude toward Satan. This is one reason why this tale
was so readily accepted and maintained for centuries.

Everything good has its source in God and his angels; everything evil is instigated by the devil and his servants, be they supernatural, demonic beings or human witches and sorcerers (TR, 24:17). For Luther the devil is thus the principle of evil and is a spirit. But people cannot grasp or comprehend a spirit. Thus, for an individual like Luther, the most spiritual element gains inner meaning when he makes it objective and tangible. And so Luther gladly made use of old ecclesiastical and popular notions that the devil could appear on earth incarnate or in all sorts of other forms. He also believed in a pact with Satan; and he deepened this belief in, and preoccupation for, such a pact by considering such a deed extremely serious and rejecting all lighthearted exorcism or tricks used to get out of the contract. In the multiplicity of temptations and in bodily and spiritual possession the frightful power is expressed which God granted the devil over man. Although there are variations, misunderstandings, and contradictions in Luther’s notions and expressions, it is quite clear that specifically in the specialized Lutheran personification of the devil the total conception of Satan was intensified, deepened, and spiritualized.\textsuperscript{31}

Finally, Luther lived with the devil on terms of mutual obstinacy, an inability to let go of each other, as
tenacious as any fixation Luther ever had, even his later fixation on the Pope. The degree to which he participated in the demonology of the era has been debated; he did, however, actually impart Protestantism's diabolical preoccupation. And if there is a tragedy of this ideological leader it is that he exploits in all sincerity, only to have his sincerity exploited by both followers and opponents.

Luther's rich fantasy, which was active in a time when almost everything was a symbol for something else, this abundant imagination, which exposed all thoughts as things and forms, quite understandably led him to poetic exaggerations. It should not surprise us that Luther populated the world, the earth, the air, and the water with living spirits and demons; and the protestant pastors, as shall be shown, went vigorously about describing them.

Osborn's specified task in his book is to treat the literary importance of the devil. He points out (p. 7) the following:

Der Luthersche Teufel erfreute sich in der Litteratur bald einer ungeheuren Beliebtheit. Er war dem Gelehrten wie dem Mann aus dem Volk gleich vertraut; er liess sich zum Zweck der Belehrung wie der Unterhaltung gleich gut benutzen; er verlor niemals seine Anziehungskraft. Im Kirchenlied hatte ihm Luther selbst schon eine wichtige Rolle zugewiesen; Volkslied und Drama, die ihn schon lange bei sich aufgenommen hatten, griffen mit erneutem Mut zu der Gestalt des gern gesehenen Bösewichts, der kaum mehr fehlen durfte; überall, wo es anging, wurde er eingefügt, und mit besonderer Vorliebe bemächtigte sich seiner die didaktische Litteratur.

Völlig als Hauptperson aber, als Alleinherrscher trat er in einer grossen Zahl von Schriften auf, die
Goedeke unter dem Namen "Teufellitteratur" zusammenfasst. Ihre Eigenschaft war "die dämonische Personifizierung aller Laster und anstößigen Gewohnheiten, die durch Teufelnamen geächtet wurden", und sie bildeten eine weitverbreitete erbauliche Unterhaltungslitteratur, die lange Zeit hindurch einen wichtigen Teil der Lektüre des Volkes gebildet hat . . .

In the following chapters this study will discuss a few literary activities of some of Luther's adherents who wrote the so-called devil-books, tracts, dramas, sermons, and satires which took up the cause of stamping out what Luther, the people, and these protestant pastors thought existed.
NOTES

Chapter I


2See Oswald A. Erich, Die Darstellung des Teufels in der christlichen Kunst (Diss., Berlin, 1931), for an iconographic history of the devil.

3Teuffellitteratur zwischen Brant und Luther. Ohse’s approach is theological and philosophical and not literary.

4Der Teufel bei Martin Luther. Eine theologische Untersuchung (Berlin, 1931). See also Obendiek’s article "Die Satanologie im Sinne Luthers und die Predigt," Pastoralblätter für Predigt, Seelsorge und kirchliche Unterweisung (Dresden), LXIX (1926/27), 484-494.

5Dr. Martin Luthers Sämtliche Schriften, ed. J. Georg Wasch (St. Louis, 1887), Vol. XXII, Colloquia oder Tischreden. Subsequent references to this work will appear as TR, then the chapter and number of the Table Talk.


8TR, 25:1. In a supplement to the tale found in his commentary of 1531 on Galatians he mentions that a brother died in youth, and, indeed, according to the general view because of the sorcery of a witch.

9Luther relates tales of the Mansfeld miners, with particular emphasis on the devil who is very active in such circles, in TR, 24:24.

10Cf., e.g., Frantz Funck-Brentano, Luther, trans. E. F. Buckley (London, 1936), pp. 33-35. The "Stille" of the monastery was a disappointment in the sense that Luther there had more to do with the "Lärm" of the devil who constantly annoyed the monk. We learn of this in the TR, e.g., 24:40.
There is no extant proof that Luther's ideas had any dependence at all on the Hexenhammer, for example. The book was, however, commonly known and its ideas current among the people. On the other hand, the influence is quite clear which the studies of Augustinian literature and the Saints-legends literature had on Luther's superstitious notions. In his conversations he often mentions Augustine, Jerome, and Gregory.

TR, 24:18; I Cor. 10:19-20, and Eph. 6:12.

Cf. also TR, 24:59, 86, 94.

Contradictions might naturally arise, but these could well be explained in an analysis of Luther's character, which, however, does not lie within the scope of this work. Erik H. Erikson, Young Man Luther: A Study in Psychoanalysis and History (New York, 1958) makes some interesting observations about Luther's character.

E.g., the monk Caesarius von Heisterbach in his Dialogus miraculorum (ca. 1220), a storehouse of motifs as well as an entertaining record of Christian credulity and persistent superstitions, told many stories in which the devil appeared to men in many different forms, sometimes as a human tempter and seducer, and sometimes as an animal-like "Schreckgespenst." Osborn, pp. 13-15, mentions other tales written about the turn of the fifteenth century; cf. also Peuckert, Deutsche Sagen (see Index).

Cf. TR, 24:96.

Cf., e.g., TR, 24:59.

See Johannes Bolte, "Der Teufel in der Kirche," Zeitschrift für vergleichende Literaturgeschichte, II, 249-266.

TR, 24:42, and Leviticus 16:3-10. See also Jakob Grimm, Mythologie, pp. 573-597.

TR, 24:38, 66. Naturally Satan is also very well known as the evil wolf as described in the Bible, and by Luther in TR, 24:44. Cf. Jakob Grimm, pp. 577-579.

Immediately the Theophiluslegende comes to mind; see Carus, pp. 415-417; Rudwin, Der Teufel in den deutschen geistlichen Spielen des Mittelalters und der Reformationszeit (Göttingen, 1915), p. 71; Lampe, Darstellung des Teufels in den geistlichen Spielen, pp. 86-96.
22E.g., TR, 24:17 and almost the complete 27th chap. of TR. When talking about "Zauberei" he talks of, e.g., women who for the sake of supernatural powers make a pact with the devil, and thus become witches and sorceresses. It was common practice to attribute all sorts of unnatural activity to the devil, in particular those deeds of the "Zauberer," or, as mentioned by Luther, those who "become" witches, magicians, sorcerers, etc. because of their activities.

23See Wünsche, Sagenkreis, and J. Grimm, Mythologie, chap. 33, for several tales of trickery.

24Cf., e.g., Bächthold-Staubli, Handwörterbuch, I, col. 1662; see also Warkentin, Devil in German traditional Story, and Lampe, Darstellung des Teufels in den geistlichen Spielen.


26Cf., e.g., TR, 24:40; Luther often speaks of thousands of devils everywhere.

27Osborn's Teufelliteratur des XVI. Jahrhunderts shows quite well how widespread this branch of the Lutheran devil notion became. The step from a belief in a devil, or a multiplicity of specialized devils, to a belief in a spirit and demon world was not very large.

28"Luther und der deutsche Volksaberglaube," Palaestra, LVI (Berlin, 1912), 133.

29Klinger, p. 134.


CHAPTER II

PERSONIFICATION OF VICE - VICE AND THE DEVIL

The personification of vices, wicked attributes, human folly, and vicious practices must always have appeared to didacticism as a welcome means to enliven dry pedagogical writings. If one adorned the vague, abstract conceptions with tangible substance, then these abstractions appeared much more plastic, understandable, and acceptable. Everything had a more direct effect, and thereby the results were not only more artistic but also, as didacticism would have it, much more impressive. An individual's corruptible activity and the open resistance and opposition to it could be represented more vividly than the evil results of an attribute and the battle one inwardly or psychologically wages with that vice.

This battle was presented allegorically very early in Christian literature as a war of man and his virtues against the vices. The Bible, as well as some conceptions of classical antiquity, furnished the points of departure. The motif was popular in the patristic literature of the late Roman era, in the secular and ecclesiastic works of Carolingian times, and in the theological writings of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, all eras which vividly
described the battle as follows: "die feindlichen Heere lagern einander gegenüber, sie stellen sich in Schlachtlinien auf, und die Tugenden scharen sich um eine Fahne; entweder in offener Feldschlacht oder um eine belagerte Burg tobt der Kampf."\(^1\)

From the universal Latin the idea of an allegory of a war between virtues and vices and the personification of human attitudes, characteristics, and foibles entered into the different national literatures, for example, the didactic drama adapted this manner of presentation. The German, Italian, and English literature took up the practices; but, as Osborn (p. 9) points out, the motif appeared most developed in the French "Moralités," "wo die fleischgewordenen Abstrakta scharenweise auftreten, wie etwa in dem Schauspiel 'Bien advisé, mal advisé', oder 'L'homme pêcheur' oder 'L'homme juste et l'homme mondain' von Simon Bourgeois (1476) . . ."

Personification of virtues and vices was very evident in the paintings and sculptures of the late Middle Ages. These arts had to personify if they wanted to represent virtue and vice. Thus appeared the seven cardinal virtues (fides, caritas, spes, prudentia, justitia, fortitude, and temperantia) and the seven cardinal sins, i.e., the ruling vices (known to the late medieval German as Hoffart, Geiz, Neid, Unkeuschheit, Frass und Völlerei, Zorn, and Trägheit), with little modification in the church paintings and sculptures. Quite often in pictures of the Last Judgment, for
example, the damned were distinguished according to their vices.

When we discuss the motif of personification of vices, we quickly recognize the close interrelationship between the arts. The typical representation of certain human vices and shortcomings as personified in the plastic arts had a strong influence on literature; and likewise, literature exercised influence on the plastic arts, for example the painters of the Renaissance received encouraging stimulus from Dante whose animals (e.g., *Inferno* I) certainly represent sins and passions, and who groups his sinners in Hell according to their vices.

This example of Dante indicates how early the physical or personified forms of vice were connected with the idea of the devil, who, as has been pointed out, was the ideal of all wickedness. In him everything base, vile, and vulgar was concentrated, and in the corporality in which he was always conceived in spite of his spirit nature, he represented the personification of the sum of all evil. All the incarnate abstractions became the devil's servants and members of his hellish retinue. Heinrich Grimm (p. 514) says the following concerning this idea:

Vorstellungen der patristischen Literatur der spät- römischen Zeit, in der das Motiv der Allegorisierung der menschlichen Tugenden und Laster in ihrem Kampf untereinander sorgfältig gepflegt wurde, wie etwa in der "Psichomachia" des Prudentius, trugen bei dem im Mittelalter dem "überall seienenden Teufel" zugelegten dämonischen Wesen - das "ubique daemon" hielt die
"Phantasie der Sünden wach und gespannt" - stark dazu bei, eine in dem Menschen teufelähnlich wirkende Torheit, Leidenschaft und Laster mit dem an Attributen und Verwandlungsmöglichkeiten überreich ausgestatteten "Teufel" persönlich zusammenzubringen. "Der Teufel selbst" spaltete so schliesslich in viele Arten und Gestalten auf, in zahlreiche höllische und irdische Diener, darunter oft recht subalterne Hofstaatsbeamte, die in der Wahrnehmung ihres jeweiligen Speziallasters aufgingen.

Osborn (p. 13ff) lists several pre-reformation works in which, or writers with whom, the devil appears as the leader of the personified vices or the various individual, specialized "Lasterteufel" play a part, e.g., in Heinrich von Melk; in the seventh "Seifrid-Helbling" poem; in Ulrich von Eschenbach's "Alexandra" the deadly sins serve Satan as "portenaere" of the underworld; Berthold von Regensburg had "zwolf juncharen des teuvels"; in writings of Lamprach von Regensburg, Mechtild von Magdeburg, Peter Suchenwirt, and at the beginning of the fifteenth century "Junker Hoffart, Neid, Geiz, Frass, Zorn, Unkeuschheit, und Mord" appear in the long satirical, didactic poem Des Teufels Netz as the seven servants who help Satan tighten the net around mankind.

One went a step further in the devil-scenes of the religious dramas and distributed the various sins to the many particular individuals of the infernal kingdom. In these plays the devils appeared, stated their attributes and characteristics, and thereby formed a picture in the minds of the viewers of their threatening and ominous activ-
ties. Rudwin gives literally hundreds of examples of this.\footnote{2} Often in the name of the devil the specific activity itself was well described;\footnote{3} besides the biblical names of Belial, Belzebub, etc., many names for specialized devils were invented, e.g., "Spiegelglanz" (i.e., the "Schmuck- oder Eitelkeits-Teufel"), "Lasterbalck," "Kauwenzorn," "Machadantz," (all of these for women), "Seltenfrum," "Neid-stifter," "Blendelust," "Fürsthetzer," "Blutdurstmacher," "Seelmörder," "Geltkratzer," "Ehrsucher," "Leutschenderax," "Scherbrant" (for deception and lies), "Helhundt" (for perjury), "Berinth" (for murder). All are practical personifications or allegorizations of vices which are here active as servants with specific commissions from hell. Often Satan himself takes the role of "Hoffart." Many of the specializations are mentioned when the devils sometimes meet at conventions before important undertakings.

This motif was also used in social satire. One assigned, for example, devils as representatives of specific sins to the various professional classes, each of which was thought to be especially susceptible to, or guilty of, those specific vices.\footnote{4} Likewise, one applied this idea of personification of vices as devils in the designation of evil, harmful people whom one inferred to be incarnate wickedness and simply designated them as "Teufel," for example, merciless judges mentioned in Chapter I of this study.
Thus, a "Spezialteufel" is a devil who participates in and directs a specific activity with which, in most cases, his name corresponds or which it describes, i.e., a tempter for a specific vice. This name is, so to speak, his "Aus-
hängeschild" which the medieval mind loved to give. As soon as evil appeared in the plural, the people were con-
fronted with specialized devils; in other words, behind every evil deed stood a highly qualified specialized devil who was just carrying out his specific task on commission from hell. This tendency to individualize and the love for cataloguing are typical late-medieval, bourgeois ele-
ments. 6

The differentiation and specialization within Satan's retinue naturally brought with it a certain coarseness of form and number. "Übersteigerte Teufelsangst und unend-
lliche Deutungssucht liessen allmählich eine ganze Armee von wohlausgerüsteten Spezialteufenl entstehen. Die Geister, die man auf solche Weise rief, hatten viel von der furcht-
erweckenden Distanz des alten bösen Feindes verloren. Sie bewirkten aber, dass sich der Teufelsglaube unausrottbar tief in die Seele des mal. Menschen einsenkte." 7

Luther later only further strengthened the belief in the omnipresent Lastertaufel. 8 The Spezial- und Laster-
teufel experienced their greatest peak of popularity in the devil literature of the sixteenth century, i.e., in the didactic, satirical works of the protestant pastors
who, roused, incited, and encouraged by Luther's diabolology, in the battle against evil created demonic personifications of vices and follies of their time and made these devils the title heroes of their writings. *Das Theatrum Diabolorum*, the huge devil-compendium of 1569, presented a multiplicity of specialized devils such as the late Middle Ages never knew.

The literary idea of the devil, or the literary representation of the devil, as it was presented in the second half of the sixteenth century, developed to a great degree out of the foregoing and out of the "Spiegel-Literatur" (which grew out of the sermon) and the numerous writings of the "Ars moriendi" of the fifteenth century. The "Spiegel" and "Ars moriendi" sources joined, more out of humanistic reasons, the so-called "Narrenliteratur" which about 1500 was widely read and very effective, and in which the devil played a prominent role. Joachim Westphal's *Hoffartsteufel* clearly indicates how much the Narrenliteratur, especially Sebastian Brant's *Narrenschiff* (1494), participated in the rise of the devil-books. On almost every page Westphal quotes from Brant and others who participated in that genre. Heinrich Grimm (pp. 514-515) adds the following:

Um Tod, Narr und Teufel als Zentralgestalten kreisten jahrzehntelang das dem Zeitstil gemäss sich solcher "Masken" zum Ausdruck bedienende literarische Wollen und Können - häufig verdeckt und am Ausbruch gehindert durch die hemmungslosen kirchlichen Auseinandersetzungen
mit ihrer verderblichen, grobianischen Polemik - bis in die Zeit von Luthers Tod, als der Anschluss an die alte gegenständliche, ständige literarische Überlieferung wieder sichtbar aufgenommen wurde, wobei man sich zwar gewisse Errungenschaften des inzwischen wirksamen Humanismus zu eigen machte.

What Luther contributed to the idea of the devil then served the waiting protestant authors, so to speak as a dernier cri, somewhat as a spring-board for the literary treatment of the devil; and the popular, metaphorical, often pictorial, and utilitarian prose of the time was well suited to the material. Through most of the second half of the sixteenth century these so-originating devils were to captivate the minds of many and to play a significant role in the middle and northern German literature.
NOTES

Chapter II

1 Osborn, pp. 8-9. See also Osborn's footnotes 1-5, p. 9.


3 Teufel in den geistlichen Spielen. See also Stapff, Meister Reuaus, esp. pp. 55-64, 92-94. (The devil "Meister Reuaus," a didactic satire written ca. 1400, "treibt die Reue aus" after the abstinence-filled Easter weeks and leads people back into their normal lustful way of life.)


5 Osborn, p. 16, lists the Redentiner Osterspiel as an example of this.

6 See Wolfgang Stammler, "Die bürgerliche Dichtung des Spätmittelalters," ZfdPh, LIII, 24, concerning "Bürgertum als geistige Kraft in der spätmal. Dichtung."

7 Stapff, Meister Reuaus, p. 64.

8 This only confirms the previous statement that Luther did not create the Spezialteufel, but that he was following tradition. Individual devils were indeed, in many cases, new, but the idea was not.

9 THEATRVM Diabororum, Das ist: Ein sehr nutzliches ver- stenndiges Buch / darausz ein jeder Christ / sonderlich vnnd fleissig zu lernen / wie dasz wir in dieser Welt / nicht mit Keysern / Königen / Fürsten vnnd Herrn / oder andern Potentaten / sondern mit dem aller mechtigsten Fürsten dieser Welt / dem Teuffel zukempffen vnnd zustreiten . . . Getruckt zu Franck- furt am Mayn, etc. im Jar 1569, ed. Sigmund Feyerabend. Two other editions appeared in 1575 and 1587/88. See Introduction to Section II of this study for complete bibliography. In this study A, B, and C will be used in the notes to designate the edition quoted.

10 Wider den Hoffarts Teuffel / der jetziger zeit solchen pracht / vbermut / vnmasz / vppigkeit vnnd leichtfertigkeit /
in der Welt treibet / mit vberflüssiger vnd vnziemlicher Kleydung . . . Durch Joachimum Westphalum Iszlebiensem /
Kirchendiener zu Sangerhausen, ed. Urban Gaubisch (Eis-
leben, 1565); in Theatrum Diabolorum, A, fol. 425a-501a;
B, fol. 365a-430a; C.2, fol. 1a-56a.
CHAPTER III

SEBASTIAN BRANT'S NARRENSCHIFF AS A POSSIBLE SOURCE OF INFLUENCE ON THE DEVIL LITERATURE

"Die Alleinherrschaft über die Lastern indessen streitig gemacht durch die seit dem Ende des 15. Jahrhunderts und hauptsächlich seit Sebastian Brant in heilen Haufen in die deutsche Litteratur einmarschierenden Narren."¹

It has already been pointed out what connection the devil literature had with the development of the sin and vice personifications. The moral, didactic nature of the devil-books also allows us to seek possible points of reference, sources, or elements of influence in the moral literature, in particular the fool literature, of the pre-reformation period. Because of the protestant pastors' satirical approach to their subject, this chapter shall attempt to determine what outward and inward relationships there might exist between the two groups of social, critical works. Osborn, as indicated in the above quote, also touched upon this question in his study. However, Osborn was not aware of any dependence of the devil literature on, or significant connection to, the Narrenliteratur. The possible relationship was superfluous to him primarily because of his main thesis of the complete dependence of the protestant
authors on Luther and of the identity of the Lutheran devil with that of the devil literature; thus, a search for any significant associations of devil tracts with the Narrenliteratur, for example, seemed unnecessary to him.

Any direct dependence of the devil literature on any specific group of late-medieval literature is difficult to establish. The prime reason for this, as Ohse (Zwischen Brant and Luther, p. 46) points out, is simply that the pastor's moral tracts are teeming with a multiplicity of materials, ideas, and images, and produce freely and abundantly anecdotes and quotes from all areas and times and from most diverse models and sources, all of which are frequently placed one after the other in an attempt to establish authority, authenticity, and acceptability. An excellent example of this is Westphal's Hoffartsteufel (1565). One thus finds in these works a whole mountain of material out of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; and it can therefore be concluded that the authors of the earlier periods did indeed contribute to the moral publications of the reformation and post-reformation era.

One notable exception to the above exists and does carry some weight. There is a definite, direct dependence of Andreas Musculus' Fluchteufel on the Narrenschiff of Sebastian Brant. The title of the first edition of Musculus' tract was Vom Gotslestern. The success of his previously published Hosenteufel and that of Matthäus Friderich's
Saufteufel\textsuperscript{6} probably prompted Musculus to change to the efficacious title \textit{Wider den Fluchteufel}, although the word "Fluchteufel" does not appear in the text.\textsuperscript{7} The original title is a direct derivation of the 87th chapter of the \textit{Narrenschiff} which has the title "Von gottes lestern."

Ohse (pp. 47-48) points out that besides the title, there are a few parallels in the texts of the 87th chapter of Brant's work and Musculus' \textit{Fluchteufel}. In addition to the first few editions of the \textit{Narrenschiff}, it might be mentioned here, at least six current editions were available to Musculus.\textsuperscript{8} Both authors embrace the idea that to curse, revile, or utter blasphemy against God is the most wicked of all sins. Brant calls such "Gotteslästerer" "Die grössten narren ich och kenn / Die ich nit weisz wie man sie nenn / Die nit benügt an aller sünd / Vnd das sie sint des tufels kynd" (87:1-4). Musculus expresses the same thought and then designates blasphemy as the most wicked and coarse sin and as a special and definite cause for all unhappiness and misfortune: "Welche letzte vnd aller ärgste sünde / Gott am heftigsten zuwider / ist one allen zweiffel die erschreckliche vnd gewliche Gotteslasterung" (B, fol. 207b).\textsuperscript{9} Musculus says that this sin had until his time been locked in hell, but now it has broken out in all fury: ". . . dasz sie gantz Teutschland . . . [especially in the Chruch buildings] also eyngenommen vnd erfület hat / dasz auch nu ferrner fast bey jedermaniglich das dritte oder ja vierdte
wort ein grewliche Gotteslästerung ist / vnd die Teutsche Sprache nicht mehr sich wil reden lassen / oder lieblich lauten vnd Klingen . . ." (B, fol. 207b). He does not believe "das ein grössere sünde seyn kan / oder auch an tag kommen / als diese jetzige regierende Gottszlästerung / welche doch in keinem wege / vnd fast von niemand / für eine Sünde wirdt gehalten" (B, fol. 207b).

In the 87th chapter Brant indicates that those people are highly esteemed who go beyond the usual profanity in their swearing and cursing and utter an "vngewonlich schwür" (87:11): "Der hebt gott syn omächtikeyt / Der ander, jm syn marter für / Syn myltz, syn hyrn, syn krösz, vnd nyer" (87:8-10). Musculus describes the situation similarly. The Jews crucified Christ anciently; now one crucifies Christ anew with every blasphemy. Musculus believes that the Christians know how "den Herrn Christum viel ärger zu martern vnd zereissen / der doch für sie gestorben ist / welches Wort vnd Ewangelium sie doch mit dem Mund bekennen / Dass jetzunder nun mehr kein Gliedmasz an dem heyligen vnd gebenedeyten Leib des Herrn Christi sein (welcher auch vō den Juden vnversehret blieben) die jetzunder von den Christen nicht zereissen / verwundt / vnd zumartert werden" (B, fol. 209a). Musculus desires to show how blasphemy has increased. Using similar words as Brant, he says: "dasz jetzunder auch bey dem Ingeweid des Herrn Christi / weil die andern Gotteslästerung bey den andern gliedern Christi nun etwas gebräuch-
lich vnd alt seyn / geflücht vnd gelästert wirt . . ." (B, fol. 209a). Musculus then takes up the discussion of Brant's "syn marter . . . Syn myltz, syn hyrn, syn krösz, vnd nyer." 10

There is another parallel in a reference to the "fluchende Kriegsleute." Brant notes the following: "Wer yetz kan vngewonlich schwür / Die dann verbieten dünt all recht / Den hallt man, für eyn frieschen knecht" (87:11-13).

Musculus ironically suggests punishing blasphemers (because the authorities do not) by sending them to war against the Turks, "daz dieselbigen der Türck an jrer statt mordet / würget vñ zusebelt / damit ja solche grausame Gotteslästerung vngestrafft nicht bleibe / Denn was sind jetzunder vnsere Kriegszleut anders / als ein hauffen lästerer vnd schänder / daz auch niemand jetziger zeit sich selber für ein Kriegszmañ helt / es sey denn daz er nun wol wunden / martern / vnd lästern kan / vnd wer im Gotteslästern am fertigsten ist / der ist der beste . . ." (B, fol. 212a).

Frightful punishment will be forthcoming for the "Gotteslästerer," for Brant, for example, maintains that cursing has increased so much that a sudden judgment by God would not be surprising because: "Gott mags die leng vertragen nycht / Dann er entpfalh, das man solt dün / Versteynen, der Israhelyten sün" (87: 29-31). Brant makes a reference here to Leviticus 24: 10-14, and it is no mere coincidence that Musculus describes fully the stoning of a blasphemer in Moses' time. 11
Brant and Musculus not only use this old account as a warning; they also indicate that the plagues, catastrophies, and natural occurrences of their own day are signs of anger and judgment of God. Brant states the following in the 
Narrenschiff:

Nit wunder wer, ob gott die welt
Durch solche schwür, liesz vnder gon
Oder der hymel brach dar von
So lästert, vnd geschmächt man gott

Des lyden wir vil plag, vnd roch
Dann es so öfflich yetz geschycht
Das es all welt merckt, hört, vnd sicht
Nit wunder, ob gott selber rycht. (87: 19-23, 25-28)

Musculus also believes that severe storms and other signs which occurred in 1556 indicate God's increasing anger, and that these events foreshadow an approaching judgment; thus he writes that "ich mich nit darff mit frembden sünden beladen / oder derselbigen durch ferrner still-schweigen theilhaftig mache." He then states the reason for publishing his tract: "hat mich mein Beruff / Ampt vnd Gewissen / auch die grausamen erschrecklichen Zeichen / so in diesem neumten Jar anfenglich etliche tage an vielen örtten geschehen vnd gesehen / neben der erschrecklichen zunahung des Türcken / darzu vervrsacht / dass ich ausserhalb meiner Kirchen / nach dem vns Gott so vielfeltig seinen zunahenden grossen zorn anzeigt vnd weiset / auch mit einem öffentlichen schreiben mich meins Ampts hab müssen verwaren . . ." (B, fol. 209a). Musculus feels it absolutely
necessary to warn the people of the great danger in the submissi\textit{\textbf{n}} to the devil's tempting to join the current fad of cursing and committing blasphemy.

When the woodcuts of the 87th chapter of Brant's work and Musculus' \textit{Fluchteufel} are compared, the latter's dependence on the \textit{Narrenschiff} is immediately recognized.\textsuperscript{12} Both woodcuts are leitmotifs for the texts. The particulars of the two are different; however, the differences are due to Musculus' manner of adaptation of his source material. He obviously gave directions for the changes to his engraver. The main features of the woodcuts and texts concur, however, so that there is little doubt that Musculus was stimulated by Brant's \textit{Narrenschiff}.

In both woodcuts the crucified Christ is presented; and in both cases one sees how Jesus is being wounded by thrusts from spears wielded by men. In Brant's woodcut Christ is wounded by a fool holding a three-pronged spear; in the case of Musculus' woodcut, it is a group of mercenaries\textsuperscript{13} out of whose mouths the spears protrude and behind whom the devil as the real power and impetus of cursing, vile language, and blasphemy is clearly visible. Both pictures bear out the idea that every blasphemy crucifies Christ anew. The texts also indicate this.\textsuperscript{14} Musculus emphasizes the devil as the source of such action.

The affinity between Musculus and Brant, which is expressed in the adoption by Musculus of the title and
theme of the 87th chapter of the Narrenschiff, in the parallels of the expressed ideas, and in the leitmotif presented in the woodcuts, is important in that Musculus (along with Spangenberg) exercised by far the greatest influence on the other authors of devil literature. Many of Musculus' thoughts, images, anecdotes, and formulations and definitions reappear in the later devil-books. His writings serve most of this colleagues as examples, although in several cases the originality of the model is hardly recognizable anymore; long-winded and broad descriptions quite frequently finished that freshness and originality.

Although Johann Chryseus with his drama, Der Hofteufel, and Friderich with his Sauffteuffel, each for different reasons and each in his own particular manner, represent the commencement of the protestant devil literature, it was Musculus with his three devil tracts, i.e., Der Hosenteufel (1555), Der Fluchteufel (1556), and Der Eheteufel (1556), who inspired the other protestant pastor-authors to try their skills at the composition of a devil-book. "Ihm eifern die lutherischen Prediger nach. Erst mit der Herausgabe seiner Schriften also - unter ihnen eben der Fluchteufel, der sich in so unmittelbarer Nähe zum Narrenthema befindet - beginnt die Flut der Teufelliteratur das Land zu überschwemmen."

In another respect it is significant that there exists a firm connection between the Narrenschiff and the Fluch-
teufel, i.e., simply by means of a small change in the title, a piece of literature finds its way into the devil literature - a tract which is directly modeled on a specific chapter of the Narrenschiiff and is composed in the same spirit. The fact that the Fluchteufel was not considered foreign to this body of literature, but, on the contrary, accepted as typical, indicates that a singular language is spoken here, that both groups were born out of one and the same frame of mind.\textsuperscript{18}

When one considers the significance of the Narrenschiiff, which indeed was typical evidence for the spirit of its time, it is evident that the central importance does not rest so much on its originality; first of all because Brant was no creative genius. Neither the presentation of numerous wicked individuals as fools occupying a ship, nor the conception of vice as folly,\textsuperscript{19} nor the vivification of human error and sin through their personifications,\textsuperscript{20} nor the use of drawings of fools as title pages for the individual chapters, are Brant's creation. The German Brant uses is also typical of the literature of the time.\textsuperscript{21} The sober, pedantic manner of his didactic rhetoric offers little disguise for the scholar of his era.

Brant's strength rather lies above all therein,

\ldots dass er dem Streben seiner Zeit nach Vollständigkeit und Ordnung entgegen kam und mit glücklicher Hand die unorganisierte Fülle der menschlichen Schwächen und der bereits vorher vorhandenen Narren auf umfassende Weise, wenn auch in einem vollkommen

The Theatrum Diabolorum, with its intention to collect all current expressions about Lasterteufel, was inspired by the Narrenschiff.

Also essential to the theme of this study is Brant's attempt to unite or compromise two active, medieval conceptions of evil and to grasp the spirit of his time in the figure of the fool. On the one hand, there are the metaphysical notions of evil in Brant's work. The author, because of moral, didactic reasons, occasionally expresses the traditional threat and fear of eternal suffering as a result of sin. 23 On the other hand, it is evident that the Narrenschiff was written during the heyday of the shrovetide plays whose coarse, sometimes lewd, clumsy and stupid, deceived, and derided devils also left their mark on the man and his work. 24 However, Brant, according to chapter 72 and his generally moderate tone, apparently rejected the all-too-present "Grobianismus" of his day. Likewise, he seems
to have disagreed with the superficial understanding of the devil which the "shrove tide plays propagated among the people. Brant's frugal use of Satan in his work indicates this. Indeed, the seldom appearance of the devil in the Narrenschiff is conspicuous, especially in a time when the devil was eagerly and efficaciously utilized, among other reasons, for didactic purposes. Brant does say, however, that the devil did create dancing and the "Fastnacht" (61: "Von dantzen," cf. 5-9; 110b: "Von faschacht narren," e.g., 40: "Der tufel hat das spiel erdacht." and incites man to vice and sin.25 Astrology is designated as "des tufels kunst" (65:92), blasphemers and ganblers are called "des tufels kynd" (84: 4; 77:95); the arrogant are in the firm custody of the devil (92:45-46; 98:23-24), and "als wän der tufel bschissen wil, / Dam gibt er glück, vnd richtum vil" (23:23-24). The only specialized devil mentioned by Brant is the "tufel Asmodeus" who "hat / Vil gwalt jetzt jnn dem eelichen stat" (52:29-30). These few passages indicate that Brant's presentation of the devil does not coincide with the predominant, late-medieval notion of the devil as the frequently laughed at and deceived personification of evil, but that it rather agrees more with the theological tradition.

Brant basically wants to bring about moral improvement. And for that reason any radical metaphysical conception of religion and satanology has little relevance for him. His striving for betterment, nevertheless, has a highly ethical
content. For that reason he could not identify himself with any superficial, contrary conception of religion and of the devil. The _Narrenschiff_ thus becomes a compromise which avoids the extremes and is a tolerant work which preaches the virtue of moderation. Brant's fool is the incarnation of this attitude (tolerant because of the lack of theological radicalism). His fool possesses something of the mischievous, prankster character of the devil of the shrovetide plays. At the same time, his fool has traits similar to the more serious devil of the passion plays, who, however, in the later works appeared as harmless and comical instead of tragic and who, in his shortcomings, accepts light-hearted ridicule.26 "Dadurch, dass Brant anstelle des teuflischen Antreibers den von Lastern geplagten Menschen selbst in die Hauptrolle einsetzt, treten die teuflischen Anklänge zurück."27

The fools of Brant's _Narrenschiff_ also reveal associations with medieval vice-personifications (as discussed in the preceding chapter of this study); but Brant's personifications are usually livelier or more human than earlier presentations. His fools are in some cases related to representations of various social classes as they are frequently found in the "Höllenszenen" of the late-medieval passion plays. There are indeed elements of social satire in Brant's work.28

Into the figure of the fool, which already existed,
Brant not only introduced his tolerant theology and whatever satanology he possessed, he also associated his fools with the earlier conceptions of the problem of sin. The folly is first of all based on the false evaluation of the situation and is found in the lack of insight into the individual's own sinfulness; and secondly, it is based on the lack of will to self-improvement. The fool does not realize he is not the center of all happening (e.g., 54: 20-23). "So ist doch das eyn grosser tor / Der jn sym synn wygt so gering / Das er will wissen frömde ding / Vnd die erkennen eygentlich / Vnd kan doch nit erkennen sich" (66:18-22).

He also does not recognize divine justice which will one day make him account for his actions (e.g., 11: 1-5). Brant's fools, as Bernhard Ohse explains (p. 52), "macht er zum negativen Vorbild, das teils mit satirischem Spott, teils mit wohlwollender Mahnung, teils mit ernster Drohung moralisch geläutert werden soll, - und dieses Vorbild hält er spiegelgleich dem Menschen vor." Thus, the "Narrheiten" which the vices and sins symbolize, can be used for good by the will of man.

It is not difficult to see how easily the authors of the later devil literature were influenced by the Narrenschiff, for it was an easy step for them to change Brant's approach. Indeed, with Luther's direction and Brant's work (especially individual chapters) as one of their models, the change from the emphasis on the folly to the cause of
that folly or vice was made. It was still folly (i.e., sin in the eyes of the protestants) to indulge in such vices, but it was the specialized vice-devil who was now in the lime-light. They simply emphasized or preached against the tempter, or cause, of the folly; they warned the people against the special devil, his activity, and the results of such indulgence, and indirectly satirized the folly or the individual fallen to that vice. They were also very descriptive in doing so. The one said that whoever engaged in such activities was a fool; the other said that that activity was directed by a devil and thus changed the emphasis. Both were preaching, teaching, and satirizing. Further, while humor dominated the didacticism of the fool literature, the metaphysical idea that "niemand seiner Sünden Straff entfliehe" prevailed in the devil literature. Finally, "was Brant als Narren geisselte, waren jetzt Teufelsbesessene." 29

Besides Westphal's and Musculus' works, the devil-books show their affinity to the fool literature, especially to the Narrenschiff, by their similar themes; the same basic ideas were discussed and preached although the theology and approach may have been different. "Von zwytracht" (NS, chap. 7), "Von buolschafft" (chap. 13), "von fullen vnd prassen" (chap. 16), "von vil schwetzen" (chap. 19), "Von wider gott reden" (chap. 28), "Von eehruch" (chap. 33), "Von Eigenrichtikeit" (chap. 36), "Von wollust" (chap. 50), "Von nyd vnd has" (chap. 53), "Von Narrechter artzny" (chap. 55),
"von im selbs wolgefallen" (chap. 60), "Von dantzen" (chap. 61), "Von nachtes hofyeren" (chap. 62), "Von achtung des gstirns" (chap. 69), "Von vnnutzem jagen" (chap. 74), "von Spylern" (chap. 77), "von tragkeit vnd fulheit" (chap. 97), and "Von falsch vnd beschiss" (chap. 102), for example, all have their special fools in the Narrenschiff. In the period following Luther's death the personifications or allegorizations of these vices had their individual, specialized devils and experienced eager treatment and publication at the hands of the protestant authors.

2. Wider das unchristliche / erschreckliche vnd grausame Fluchen vnd Gotteslästern / trewe vnd wolmeynende Vermahnung vnd Warnung (n.d., n.p.). Woodcuts indicate the editor to be Johann Eichorn of Frankfurt an der Oder; the date was probably 1556. In *Theatrum Diabolorum*, A, fol. 243b-251a; B, fol. 207a-215b; C.1, fol. 168b-175a.


4. (N.p., n.d.) The woodcut is dated 1556; most likely ed. by Eichorn, Frankfurt/O.


7. The Fluchteuffel, nevertheless, belongs to the devil literature because it fulfills the five characteristic requirements mentioned in the introduction to this study; cf. note no. 9 of Introduction.


9. Musculus further maintains that "kein Laster mehr dahinder sey / welch's der Satan noch für dem Jüngstentag (so lange seine zeit noch währret) aus der Hellen mag / oder kann herfür bringen . . ." (B, fol. 207a). Musculus believes that the devil after his three assaults on the foundation of the Church (i.e., through the attempt to kill Christ,
through the open persecution of the early Christians, and 
through the apostasy of the papacy) had reserved the "offent-
liche Lästerung" as his last assault against the Church (cf. 
B, fol. 207ff).

10B, fol. 210b; also: "Wie kan oder vermag sich auch am 
Son Gottes / insonderer ein Mensch / verdämlicher ver-
greifen / als das ein Gotteslästerer den Leib / das blut 
vnd fleisch / vnd alle Gläedmasz / so am Herrn Christo 
nur seyn mögen / . . . nimmet vnd brauchest dieselbigen zur 
maledeyung vnd verdamnusz / mit einem vnuerschämpten vnd 
verlogen Maul . . ." 

11"Da es sich erstlich zuträgt / . . . Dass sich ein 
Israeliter mit einem andern hadert / in der Wüsten im Ge-
zelt / vnd den Namen Gottes lästert / wirt er also bald vnd 
grimmel gefangeng angenommen / für Mosen bracht / Da Moses 
noch nicht wusze / mit was marter oder pein er solche 
Sünde straffen solte / liesz er jn gefencklich eynsziehen / 
vnd wol verwaren / bisz er sich bey dem Herrn erkündigst / 
was er jm für straff aneigen solte / da gibt jm Gott den 
bescheid / vnd antwort / dasz er solchen Lästerer soll ausz 
dem Läger führen / vnd alle die Leut / so solche Gottsz-
lästerung von jm gehört haben / sollen jre Hände auff seinen 
Kopff legen / vnd alles Volck soll jn mit steinen zu todt 
werffen." (B, fol. 213b)

12See Bobentag, Narrenschiff, p. 238, and Heinrich Grimm, 
"Teufelbücher," p. 541, for photocopies of the two original 
woodcuts discussed here.

13Musculus indicates in his preface that his tract is 
mainly directed against soldiers, although he says it should 
be solemn warning to all.

14See Narrenschiff, 87:6, and Fluchteuffel, B, fol. 207a-
207b, 211b-212a.

15Hoffteufel. Das sechste Kapitel Danielis / den Gott-
fürchtigen zu trost / den Gottlosen zur warnung / Spielweiss 
gestellt vnd in Reimen verfasst (Wittenberg, 1545). In 
Theatrum Diabolorum, A, fol. 516b-530b; B, fol. 443a-456a; 
C.1, fol. 271a-283b.

16Wider den Echteuffel. Ein sehr nützliches Büchlein / 
wie man den heimlichen listen / damit sich der leydige Satan 
wider die Ehestiftung aufflehnet / . . . (Frankfurt/O., 
1556). In Theatrum Diabolorum, A, fol. 340b-350b; B, fol. 
293a-301b.

17Ohse, Zwischen Brant und Luther, p. 49.

See Zarncke, Narrenschiff, p. LVI: "Wie Sebastian Brant darauf gekommen sei, so unter dem bilde einer narrenschiffsfart das leben der thörlichen menschen darzustellen, bedarf keiner erklärung. das ganze mittelalter kennt dieses bild, Hugo a St. Victore gebraucht es, ... und im Spanischen finden wir eine moralität, die von 2 schiffern handelt, deren eines zum himmel, das andere zur hölle färt [sic]."

See Zarncke, Narrenschiff, p. XLVII.

It has been pointed out, e.g., Zarncke, p. LXXV, that one reason for the popularity of the Narrenschiff was that it was written in German, an unusual practice at the time for those of humanistic background.


E.g., Narrenschiff, 3:14; 11:3f and 20ff; 14:14ff; 24:25; 29:15ff; 50:15ff; 106:1ff; 122:52ff. It might also be mentioned that the idea "memento mori" and the "Totentänze" had some influence on the Narrenschiff, e.g., chap. 85.

E.g., Narrenschiff, 52:29f, 23:23f.

Three woodcuts of the Narrenschiff depict the devil (in each case in the sense of the later devil-books) as the origin of the folly: chap. 20, "Von sehazt finden" (using a bellows on a fool seeking and finding a treasure), cf. Bobentag, p. 59; chap. 92, "Überhebung der hochfart" (devil behind a woman looking into a mirror), cf. Bobentag, p. 249; chap. 103, "Vom endkrist" (again with a bellows as a symbolic instrument to incite enmity), cf. Bobentag, p. 283. Cf. also Narrenschiff, 66:105-108.

See Rudwin, Der Teufel in den geistlichen Spielen.

Ohse, Zwischen Brant und Luther, p. 52.

E.g., chapters 55 ("Von narrechter artzny"), 79 ("Ruter vnd schriber"), 81 ("von burchem vffgang"), 93 ("wucher vnd furkouf").

CHAPTER IV

THE IDEA OF THE PACT

The tradition of the pact with the devil is very old. Dualism, evil opposing good, can logically be traced back to Persia by way of the Christians and the Jews. The devil, opposing God in a struggle for the domination of mankind, was thought to have a special passion for seizure of souls. Pacts are mentioned in the Book of Enoch, the Talmud, and the Kabbala. By Christ's time the devil was accepted as the prince of this world and thus could easily grant even the most extravagant wishes, and indeed was willing to pay a high price when a man promised to be his for eternity. The temptation of Christ in the wilderness is based on the possibility of an agreement of reciprocal obligations or relations between Christ and Satan upon the recognition of the devil's position and great power in the world (Matth. IV:9; Luke IV:6-7). This information, and the belief that Christ made a new covenant with man, led people to accept the idea that the devil could also make a covenant with man for opposing reasons. The term "New Testament," which meant to the early Christians a "new contract" or "New Covenant," supported this contractual possibility with Satan. The adversary of God would naturally want to counteract God's
deeds. Early Church Fathers, St. Augustine and St. Jerome, for example, treated the subject, and by doing so helped solidify the concept.

It is worthy of note that in these pacts the devil is very careful in the Middle Ages to establish his title to the soul of man by a faultless legal document. It will be shown that he has sufficient reason to distrust the promises made him by men. Until the Reformation period the devil is almost always duped. And having profited by experience, the devil insists upon having his rights insured by an unequivocal document, signed, in later versions, by man's own blood. It is interesting to note that, although the devil insisted that the human partner in the pact sign the deed with his blood, he himself never was required to sign it even in ink. Satan is always fearlessly trusted to keep his side of the promise; and this is a fact which must be mentioned to his "honor," for although he is said to be the archdeceiver, it would be difficult to find a case in devil-lore in which the devil cheats his stipulators, whether he gives them five, ten, twenty, or twenty-four years of his service. Gustav Freytag (p. 141) says "dass der Teufel bei den Verträgen, welche er mit Menschen schliesst, seinerseits den Vertrag eifrig und pünktlich zu erfüllen sucht, der Betrügende ist der Mensch." If it can be said in his behalf, the devil indeed appears as a most unfairly maligned person and as a martyr of simple-minded "honesty."
It is not known exactly how and when the idea of the devil-pact penetrated into Europe and was possibly merged with beliefs that were similar and perhaps even originally related. It is not always easy in folk-lore to detect what is indigenous and what is foreign. According to Jakob Grimm, the "heathen" devil of the north also sought advantageous contracts with men but never demanded a formal written document, which Grimm says "scheint unheidnisch, und erst erdacht, nachdem die römische Form der Chirographie in Europa überhand genommen hatte."\(^1\) The idea of the pact in the north included several elements. First of all, the pact seemed to evolve from the manner in which men negotiated in early heathen times with the ever present "hearth spirits." The ancient Nords seemed to deal with sprites, for example, just as today's farmer deals with his hired help. Cobolds were "hired" and "fired" on terms of service arranged as the need presented itself or ceased to exist.\(^2\) When the north was Christianized and the demons of hell generally assumed the heritage of the ancient household-spirits, those Christian demons also entered into contracts of mutual service and promise. For stipulated periods they served man in return for certain rewards, the prize of which was of course man's soul. It is also interesting to note that the services exacted from the demons increased in proportion to the increase of the devils' power. The demands placed upon the devil and his servants knew no limitations
after Satan and his hosts were given unlimited dominion over the world.

Another element in the conception of the pact might partially be explained by the old blood-bond with the tutelary gods or spirits. Both spirits and humans, it was believed, could perform blood transfusions. This source could possibly explain the usage of blood in the formal pact. Also, to sign a document required by the devil with one's own blood as stipulation for later full payment, i.e., his soul, might have grown out of a misconception of an original meaning of his covenant with the trusted divinity. The Old Testament idea that the blood is the seat of all life, strength, and feeling may further explain the use of blood in a pact to bind man's promise to Satan. It was Christianity which interpreted the dedication by man of his soul to any tutelary divinity as the loss of his salvation.

The idea of the pact was, however, not prevalent in the Christian West until the Middle Ages, when it took a great hold on the minds of men. During the same time that the devil was so popular, the notion of the pact also became extremely popular. For about three centuries the idea was universal; it was solidified by Pope Innocent VII, who, in his famous bull, "Summis desiderantes" (1484), officially recognized the possibility for man to form, of his own free will, a pact with the powers of hell. The Reformation strengthened this belief. In fact, the sixteenth century even brought satan-
ology to its height.

Gustav Freytag (p. 171) indicates three ways a person may be bound to the devil:


During the sixteenth century another method was prominent, i.e., man made a pact with the devil, however informal in this case but just as surely, simply by committing sin and not repenting. If one indulged in a vice, that person was said to be under the influence and direction of the specialized devil for that particular vice. Both this and the third method mentioned by Freytag are those most directly associated with the protestant devil tracts. The formal pact was secondary in the pastors' books, but the idea of the pact was absolutely necessary for, and basic to, the Lutheran notion of the devil and was the impetus for the pastors' literary production.

During the late Middle Ages the belief was essentially that one could enter into a pact with the devil by which one obtained from hell whatever one desired for a certain period (later fixed at twenty-four years, e.g., as we know it in the Faustbuch) at the expiration of which the individual was to deliver his soul to the devil. It was thought that Satan
wanted to entice man away from God, entered into pacts with man, and thus, by this means, assured for himself man's soul while its owner was still living. The individual who wanted to make such a contract often sought the services of a Jew to act as intermediary. People believed that Jews, by means of magic, had communication with Satan. An example of this procedure is found in the Theophilus legend in which the Jew, who acts as an intermediary, is a sorcerer and an apostate of his own religion.  

The shadow was quite often considered as an extension, a "part" of the personality, and a symbol for the soul which was sold to the devil for various reasons; for example, Peter Schlemihl of Chamisso's work of the same name sells his shadow for the purse of Fortunatus. Satan took formal possession of the soul at the expiration date by destroying the individual's body. Thus, in addition to eternal damnation, man paid the penalty for his deed by suffering a violent death. The devil apparently had little interest in the individual's physical body; he killed the person only to take possession of the soul. Faust's departure, his body being torn limb from limb and his brains splattered on the wall, and his physical remains tossed onto the dung-heap, is a good example of this popular notion. It may be noted that the devil did not possess the power to kill man unless man renounced and blasphemed against the Lord. The Old Testament account of Job and New Testament references, e.g., Hebrews II:14 and
I Corinthians V:5, probably furnished the material for this notion. The devil, in view of this limitation of his power over man, began to exact from his partner in the contract, which assigned the man's soul to hell, a formal renunciation of the Christian faith, a rejection of Christian symbols and sacraments, and a denial of Christ and His saints.6

The individual who entered into a contract with the devil demanded a variety of objects, chief among which were wealth, learning, position, power, and protection. Money and learning were generally intended to be used for power, sometimes for the purpose of surpassing the limitations of ordinary human activity and capability. The individual was quite often discouraged because of these natural limitations imposed upon all mortals. If someone wanted to gain mastery of the world, he logically went to the prince of this world and made a deal. The devil, without any difficulty, could grant even the most extravagant wishes of man. In the case of sorcerers and witches, for example, he even placed his magic powers at their disposal.

To sign a contract with hell usually meant eternal damnation. However, the devil was not always successful in his designs, for quite often he met a man who was clever enough to outwit the purchaser of his soul.7 As noted earlier, the devil could easily be hoodwinked. Popular belief, in fact, often represented the devil as a trusting fool who was then outwitted by the shallowest forms of trickery and dishonesty.
It seems that the pious deception of the devil was common practice. Man had no qualms when it came to a breach of contract with his partner; he felt no reservation whatever in avoiding his part of the obligations. Simply by technical quibbles, man, in violation of the written contract, would often cheat the devil out of the latter's legal due. Before the Reformation period, man seemed to consider the legal document signed with his own blood as "a scrap of paper." Such practice was just the ethics of war.

If we seek the source of such a practice, we do not have to look very far, for the medieval Church itself provided man with the means of evading the terms of his contract with the devil. Man knew full well that he could count on the Church to force the devil to surrender any rights on a man's soul and thus save him from hell. Prior to the Reformation, the devil was nearly always cheated out of his due by the instrumentalities of the Church and the trickery of man. Indeed, the surest way for medieval man to avoid paying the penalty of his bold and rash action was to appeal to the Holy Virgin who was always ready and willing to do battle with Satan. An individual could count on the Virgin to help him break the contract with the devil if he omitted her name in his general renunciation of the Christian faith. In the Middle Ages the Mother Mary had almost as much power as the Trinity. She appears, in connection with the devil-pact tradition, as a sort of valkyr or amazon, always at war with
hell and ready to snatch the pacts and the souls of the repentant sinners from waiting demons. An example of this is again Theophilus, also the Frau Juta legend.8

During the sixteenth century the idea of the pact was further strengthened by the ideas of Luther and his followers, and even by the Catholics; however, it was not necessary to make a pact in order to be directed, possessed, and carried away by the devil. Most people realized, as the devil himself should have but didn't, that Satan could possess the human soul without a formal contract or any special document and without paying a penny for it. Thus, legendary figures such as Don Juan lost their souls to the devil through their bad deeds and not necessarily by way of a contract. This is the general attitude of the devil-books. When a man commits a sin, he falls into the power of Satan, i.e., into the power of a specialized devil who directs that particular vice under the supervision of Satan. Each evil deed is an act of acquiescence to the devil's will, which is equivalent to an alliance with him.9

A brief comparison of the Theophilus and Faust legends will illustrate the foregoing. A short recount of both myths is as follows:

Theophilus, a pious officer of the church in the sixth century at Adana, a town of Cilicia in Asia Minor, was unanimously selected by the priesthood and the community as their new bishop. He declined the honor from sheer modesty. The new bishop represented the fact that he was second choice and had Theophilus deprived of his position in the church.
After his dismissal Theophilus regretted his former humility and sought by means of a pact with hell to regain his position. He enlisted the service of a Jewish wizard who secured for him an appointment with the devil. The devil demanded a signed document in which Theophilus promised to renounce his faith and to deliver to Satan his own soul at the expiration of the terms of the contract. Satan at once caused the bishop to reinstate Theophilus to his old position; but after several years of riotous living, Theophilus realized the end was near and desired to repent and be saved. For forty days and nights he fasted and prayed to the Virgin Mary for forgiveness of his sins. At the end of this period he was rebuked by her for his deeds but not comforted, for he had broken faith with her. He fasted and prayed for thirty more days until the Virgin finally pardoned him on the condition that he deny the devil and return to Christ. Satan, however, refused to give up his claim on Theophilus, but the Virgin actually castigated the devil so severely that he finally surrendered the fatal document which Theophilus later burns. Theophilus then related the whole story to the bishop and the assembled congregation, and after having given all his possessions to the poor he died peacefully and entered into Paradise. The Church later inscribed his name on the roll of saints.

The story of Theophilus was purported to have been told by one of his pupils. After its ninth century translation from the original Greek into Latin by Paulus Diaconus, the legend appeared in a variety of versions in both Eastern and Western Christendom and eventually became a treasure of saintly legend. The first poetic treatment (in Latin hexameters), Lapsus et conversio Theophili, was made in the tenth century by Hroswitha von Gandersheim.

The figure of Dr. Faustus grew out of the historical character, the many stories of some of the great naturalists and thinkers of the time whom the people regarded as wizards (and thus in league with the devil), witty anecdotes from the
folk, and the influence of such legends as that of Theophilus. Some of the tales about, e.g., Albertus Magnus, Agrippa von Nettesheim, Paracelsus, Nostradamus, Servetus, and Galileo, and many of the popular anecdotes about such characters as Till Eulenspiegel were retold of Faust. Johannes Faustus, an industrious student, has exhausted the sources of intellectual satisfaction in the ordinary departments of human knowledge. Wearied and worried, but unsated, Faust turns to magic. He finally conjures up the devil Mephistopheles and makes a pact with him. Faust is bound to deliver his soul to Mephistopheles at the end of twenty-four years during which Mephistopheles is bound to Faust's slightest command to provide any knowledge, miraculous exploits, and sensual delights he might desire. The manner of Faust's violent death has already been mentioned.¹⁰

Protestantism and Catholicism, with regard to the devil-pact, are contrasted in the comparison of the legend of Dr. Faustus with that of Theophilus. Theophilus succeeded by way of intervention of the Virgin Mother in preventing his destruction and damnation. Faust was duly carried off to hell by way of payment for his deeds at the expiration of the contract with Mephistopheles. Luther's rejection of the Catholic view of the Virgin and her power of intercession on behalf of a last-minute penitent soul was basic to the outcome of the Faust story, and even influenced the change in the Catholic attitude toward such pacts. Faust did not re-
pent and was irrevocably damned, lost and fallen into the power of Satan; he belonged to hell and met with the traditional doom. Freytag mentions this sad ending of Faust, but indicates (which is also important for this study) that Faust was not the "einzige Beute des Satans. Es wurde ganz gewöhnlich zu glauben und in Flugschriften verbreitet, dass Menschen von zweideutigem Charakter, ruchlose Säufer, Spieler, Flucher oder solche, welche als Feinde bitter gehasst wurden, in das unterirdische Reich abgeholt seien. Dann war die Hand des Teufels am verdrehten Genick des toten Sünders deutlich zu erkennen."\(^{11}\)

It might be stressed here that in the **Faustbuch** (1587) the pact with Mephistopheles is not the root but the fruit of Faust's sin, which essentially consists in the abandonment of sacred for secular learning. Orthodox Protestantism created the Faust legend and expressed through it its disapproval of the humanistic movement of its day. Dr. Faustus had that interest in secular learning and the love of beauty of the ancients which was common to the men of the Renaissance. Faust shared with the humanists of his day the wish to know all things, to do all things, and to enjoy all things. He forfeits his soul as payment, not so much for the pact with the devil, but for his revolt against the Word of God.

When one considers the various tales, legends, poems, novels, and dramas collected or discussed by such men as Rudwin, Stith Thompson, Bächtold-Stäubli, Grimm, Ranke,
Peuckert, Bach, Lampe, and others, i.e., the mass of material in which the motif of the pact is directly or indirectly treated, one obtains a vivid impression of the meanness of man. Almost invariably the devil is represented as thwarted by the trickery and treachery of man. Only in the Reformation period and until the Enlightenment was the devil successful in his endeavors in regard to the idea of the pact. Man writes the stories, and quite naturally the devil would have difficulty collecting his debt. The treatment of the subject is also quite without variety. The literary accounts of the devil-pacts, for example, do not give Satan's side of the story. Man cherishes the perennial hope of swindling the devil after man has done his worst and enjoyed it. In fact, if the stories had been more conscientiously written, most of the characters who cheated the devil would certainly have gone to hell solely for the methods they used in getting out of the pact and saving their souls. "The Devil should be complimented at the attention given him by the best writers of all ages and languages. He should be offended perhaps at the flippant and audacious manner in which his power is flouted in this world. But he may certainly be satisfied with his influence on earth, manifested . . . by the devilish ingenuity of the heaven-bound mortals."
Chapter IV

1 Mythologie, p. 589.


3 Innocent’s bull was mainly directed against such acts as those indulged in by people designated as witches. It thus caused an unprecedented number of witch-hunts and burnings. The secondary effect was the strengthening of the belief in the devil and the possibility of a pact. See, e.g., Freytag, Teufel im 16. Jahrhundert, pp. 170-171; see also Otto Henne am Rhyn, Der Teufels- und Hexenglaube; Rossel Hope Robbins, The Encyclopedia of Witchcraft and Demonology (New York, 1959); Arne Runeberg, Witches, demons and fertility magic: analysis of their significance and natural relations in Western-European folk religion (Helsingfors, 1947).


6 See the account of the student Valerius in the chap. on Luther and the Reformation, pp. 27-28, 30.

7 See Wünsche, Sagenkreis vom geprellten Teufel; cf. Warkentin, Devil in German traditional Story, pp. 14-22; Stapff, Meister Reaus, pp. 70-79 ("Der fromme Betrug").

8 Other examples of this influence are, e.g., Cyprian in Calderón’s play El Mágico prodigioso (1663) who is saved through the intercession of a woman whose spirit of innocence defies and defeats Satan’s power. See Teatro selecto de Calderón de la Barca, ed. Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo (Madrid, 1910), pp. 211-328. Goethe, in Faust II (1832), has "das Ewig Weibliche" draw Faust onward and upward in the end and redeem him from Mephistopheles and hell.

9 This idea is prevalent in the post-reformation Catholic
works, esp. in the Jesuit drama, e.g., Jakob Biderman's Cenodoxus. Der Doktor von Paris (München, 1958); Cenodoxus was first produced at Augsburg in 1602.

10 See Rudwin, "The Devil-Compact in Legend and Literature (I & II)," Devil in Legend and Literature, pp. 181-221, for a discussion of several adaptations and different versions of the Faust legend in literature up to the present day.


12 Rudwin, Devil in Legend and Literature, p. 221.
CHAPTER V

LUTHER'S DISCIPLES - THE AUTHORS OF THE DEVIL-BOOKS

"Etliche Geistliche machen den Himmel umb jres Geitzes willen also eng / vnd wo wir Teuffel vnd Wölffe im Wald nicht weren / kündten sich die Pfaffen vnd die Hirten nicht ernehen."

The protestant authors of the devil-books brought the devil and his ruling position in the world strong reinforcement. Luther's writings were the basis for that reinforcement, for in them the evil power divided and subdivided itself into as many manifestations as there were vices. Protestantism then gradually demonstrated the rationalistic inclination of discovering the devil in the various vices of men. This tendency exchanged the principle of evil as a personified ghost for the less personal but all the more real moral abstractions with which most everyone could cope, i.e., the reformer and his disciples filled the country with devils by diabolizing all the vices. It will be quite evident that the disciples outdid their leader. For if Luther threw an inkstand at the devil, the protestant pastor-authors poured ink all over him; indeed, they began about the middle of the sixteenth century to wage a bitter war with their pens against all the hosts of hell.

The idea of a kingdom of hell and a multiplicity of
special devils populating that place was not, as has been shown, entirely new with Luther; but he did after all set the trend and suggested the manner in which one should deal with such evil forces. Rudwin observes, for example, that the Kabbala mentioned special devils for the different illnesses, and adds that there have always been as many devils conceived in the human mind as there have been ideas of evil. Goethe's Mephistopheles notes: "Es ist doch lange hergebracht, / Dass in der grossen Welt man kleine Welten macht" (Faust I, 4044-45); and everywhere the protestant authors began discovering, creating, and describing little devils to populate those worlds. We even read in the eighth chapter of Jodocus Hockerm’s Der Teuffel selbs that, according to Professor Martinus Barrhaus' census of hell, there were at the time legions of demons, in fact, exactly 2,665,886,746,664 devils in that infernal kingdom.

Luther is the impetus for the devil literature of the sixteenth century but is not the sole source of influence (as was pointed out with the fool literature, for example), although the authors attempt to give the impression that the reformer was their only model for doctrine, language, and manner of treatment. In fact, there is little doubt that many of the authors were inspired by their contemporaries rather than by Luther. This study will further point out that indeed the devil literature is not entirely an emanation or emulation of the Lutheran devil, rather that
it consists much more of a modified adaptation and development of individual characteristics of the Lutheran notion. The pastors simply emphasized those elements in the reformer's statements and writings which suited their cause; and had Luther been alive, it is most probable that he would have rejected much of what was written by his disciples. That may also be one reason why the devil-books were written only after Luther's death. On the other hand, if Luther had still been alive, he may not have been able to stop the change anyway, for in his old age, the control of the movement he had started was slipping from his grasp.

Compared to the fool literature, the sinner of the devil literature is no longer simply "ein Betörter," but a wicked person. The representation of the iniquitous as fools appears almost sacrilège to these pious authors. The old, evil enemy, with whom everyone must do battle for his salvation, steps forward again, this time as the protestant subdivided special devils representing all the vices of men. "Luther" gab die Parole: 'Satan ist ein Geist, er hat weder Fleisch noch Bein, darumb wird man jhm nichts mit Eyse, oder mit der Faust thun. Wir müssen ihm die Hertzen zuuor abreissen, durchs Wort der Wahrheit, das ist vnser Schwert vnd Faust, der niemand widerstehen kann'. So sprach der Meister, und die Jünger folgten . . ." In their war against the vices the eager protestant pastors first looked to the various statements of their leader as points of departure.
Osborn (pp. 22-23) lists several such expressions of the reformer: e.g., Luther made a distinction between "den höheren Geistern, die anfechten mit Unglauben, mit Verzweiflung, mit Ketzereien" and secondary devils "die mit Hurerei, Geiz, Ehre und anderem dergleichen anfechten;" he believes the Pope was associated with "Poltergeistern vnd Walfartsteufeln;" he is also acquainted with "A-B-C Teuffel," "Schuel Teuffelin," "ein gramatisches Teuffelin," "Hofteuffel," "Fürstenteuffel," "Sauffteuffel," and "der Ehe-teuffel Asmodeus." Except for the "Sauffteuffel" and "Hofteuffel," these devils were not treated in any of the devil-books; they did, however, support the general attitude of the authors and were used to justify the pastors' own creations which, as stated earlier, were generally inspired more directly by their contemporary pastors and not by Luther.

The earliest written work accepted by Feyerabend into his anthology, Das Theatrum Diabororum (1569), was Johann Chryseus' Hoffteuffel which was completed in 1544 in Alldorf in Hessen and published in Wittenberg by Veit Creutzer in 1545. Chryseus' drama, an exception among the devil-books, can be traced directly back to Luther. First of all, it is quite possible, but not yet proved, that Chryseus studied in Wittenberg and received direct inspiration for his work while there. The fact that the first two editions (1545 and 1546) were published there indicates he had a certain
relationship with that city. Secondly, Chryseus was a pupil of Paul Rebhun who knew Luther well (for a time Rebhun lived in the reformer's home in Wittenberg)⁶ and thus could have passed on many of Luther's thoughts. Rebhun used the Lutheran "Eheteufel Asmodeus" in his Hochzeit zu Cana (1538), and this special devil may have been the impetus for Chryseus' title character in his Hoffteuffel. At any rate, it is quite likely that Chryseus stood under the direct or indirect influence of Luther who himself often spoke of "Hofteufeln" in the Table Talks (e.g., 45:59). The Hoffteuffel and its use of a special devil as a title figure did not immediately find imitators, although, as the second edition indicates, it enjoyed some success itself.

The best known Lutheran passage which was adopted and developed into a devil tract, was that found in Matthäus Friderich's Sauffteuffel of 1552, the only other exception, i.e., a special devil mentioned by Luther and treated by one of his disciples. This pastor became, if not the leader, then the first (apart from Chryseus) in a long line of devil-book authors. In fact, it was Friderich and Andreas Musculus, and not Luther directly, who inspired many of the other twenty-nine protestant pastors to try their hand at creating a devil-book. The Sauffteuffel was so popular that it went through at least ten editions before 1569.⁷

Friderich writes in the dedication of his Sauffteuffel to Erasmus von Künritz the following:
Viel haltens dafür / vnd befindet sich auch wol im
werck / das ein jeglich Land seinen Landteuffel / ein
jegliche Stad jre Stadteuffel / ein jeglich Dorff
sein Dorffteuffel / ein jeglicher Herrnhoff seinen
Hoffteuffel / ein jeglich haus seinen Hausteuffel /
Ja auch wol ein jeglicher Stand / ein jeglich Mensch
seinen eigenen Teuffel hab / der sie zu sünden reizet
vnd plaget / wie man sihet / das ein Land / eine
Stand / ein Haus / ein Mensch / mit jrgend einem
Laster sonderlich mehr angefochten wird / denn andere.
Also hat Deudtschland vor andern Lendern / sonder-
lich je vnd je den Sauffteuffel gehabt / der uns
Deudtschen tag vnd nacht zum Sauffen treibt / vnd vns
keine ruge lest / wir sind deñ vol vnd toll.8

Fridrich leaves no doubt concerning his source, for at the
end of his work he quotes in full Luther's interpretation
of the 101st Psalm in which the following is stated: "Es
muz aber ein jegliches Land seinen eygnen Teuffel haben /
Welschland seinen / Franckreich seinen / Vnser Teutscher
Teuffel wirdt ein guter Weinschlauch seyn / vnd musz Sauff
heissen / dasz er so dürstig vnd hellig ist / der mit so
grossem Sauffen /Weims vnd Biers / nicht kann gekület werden.
Vnd wird solcher ewiger Durst / vnd Teutschlands Plage blei-
ben (hab ich sorge) bisz an Jüngstentage" (B, fol. 292a).
Luther was not Fridrich's sole source, for "Trinkliteratur"
of the time, for example, offered him abundant material.

Andreas Musculus, pastor and professor at Frankfurt
an der Oder, entered the battle against the vices and their
special devils in 1555 by attacking the new foreign fashions
popular in Germany about the middle of the century, specifi-
cally the "Pluderhosen" from the Netherlands. Inspired by
Fridrich, he created a specific devil for "diese modische
Sünde" and preached a sermon in church on the subject.
Later the same year Johann Eichorn published Musculus' homiletic work in Frankfurt/O. with the title *Vom Hosen Teuffel*. A second edition the same year and at least three more editions the following year indicate the immediate popularity of the book.

The success which Musculus experienced with his first devil-book encouraged him to attack in a like manner other vices which he considered serious social ills. In the spring of 1556 he assailed the Fluchteuffel and the people under his influence; in the fall of the same year he published his book entitled *Wider den Ehteuffel*. In 1561 Musculus sent to press a comprehensive and curious presentation of Satan and the inhabitants of his infernal kingdom under the title *Von des Teuffels Tyrannen*. Osborn (p. 29) indicates that Musculus' manner of expression had its effect on listeners and readers: "Wenn er die Sünde geisselte und die Strafen des Himmels verkündete, so war er freilich nicht so tief ergreifend wie Luther, aber doch immer mächtig packend und voller Wucht, und wenn der ernste Predigerton, was oft geschah, ins Volksmässig-gemütliche, ins Komische übergäng oder gar, was auch nicht fehlte, ins Burleske umschlug, so war er des allgemeinen Beifalls erst recht sicher."

Musculus' activity inspired the protestant pastors who had something to say on the topic, or at least believed they did; and for the creation of new *Spezialteuffel*, Friderich furnished the pastors with a model and set up a program for
the coming devil literature when he wrote in his Sauffteuffel the following:

Wenn nu der Sauffteuffel einen Menschen eynnimpt / so sind die andern Lasterteuffel auch nicht weit von jhm / Als da sind / der Hoffartsteuffel / Zornteuffel / Lästerteuffel / Fluchteuffel / Traurteuffel / Neidteuffel / Hasszteuffel / Mordteuffel / Hohnsteuffel / Schmachteuffel / Schandteuffel / Hurenteuffel / Geizteuffel / Diebszteuffel / Wucherteuffel / Fraszteuffel / Spielteuffel / Haderteuffel / Lügenteuffel / vnd dergleichen. Diese alle legen Hand zu werck bey einem trunckenen Menschen / bisz sie jhn in jammer vnd not bringen / vnd gereht jn offt allda ein schantz / dasz sie das bey jhn ausrichten / welches sie sonst nicht vermögen. (B, fol. 294b)

With this program and the knowledge of the success of Musculus' books, pastors from various places found motivation enough to seek out a special demon from the infernal kingdom Luther so emphasized, and thus tried their literary fortune with the description of that devil's characteristics, power, his specific activity, and the means by which one should meet and protect oneself against this Lasterteufel. Quite often the authors were pastors about whose lives very little is known; others were energetic theologians active in the ecclesiastic polemics of the time and who wandered or were driven from place to place. Still others were known because of their activities in other fields. All felt called upon and felt qualified in their endeavor. All competed against one another in their battle against the devil. All the pastors cited or referred to the example of the other author or authors. And every author declared that he wanted to do his bit for the deliverance of the world out of the
power of Satan and his hosts.

The most influential author in the development of the devil literature after Musculus was the many-sided Cyriacus Spangenberg. Besides his numerous sermons, Bible commentaries, and polemic tracts (which caused his frequent removal from almost every city he visited), Spangenberg was very active as the author of church hymns, church plays, and an Ehespiegel (seventy "Brautpredigten"), as the editor of Makropedius' Hekastus, as a historian, and as a theoretician of Meistergesang. Spangenberg, like Musculus, spent some time in Wittenberg which probably contributed to his familiarity with the Lutheran demonology. He only wrote one devil-book, Der Jagteuffel, but he influenced his contemporaries and encouraged his friends, who went to battle against the various devils, to have their tracts published. He also wrote most of the prefaces to their devil-books and furnished in his other didactic and historical writings these authors, and much of the popular literature in general, a truly inexhaustible source of historical and unhistorical accounts, funny tales, jokes, and anecdotes.

In the 1560's a flood of devil tracts appeared throughout protestant Germany. One author inspired and encouraged another, for almost every pastor was well acquainted with the previous published devil-books. And with the typical sixteenth century ingenious approach, they freely took, for example, the disposition from one preceding author, Bible
quotes from another work, anecdotes from another, and historical references from even another work, and based almost everything on what their ultimate authority, Luther, may have said or written. Thus, along side excellent works such as the Jagsteuffel, Hosenteuffel, and the Sauffteuffel, there are several honest and industrious but very dry works; or another may be a pieced-together hodge-podge or an unskilled, shoddy piece of work. This fact cannot be overlooked because of the authors' approach and the enthusiasm of several untalented pastor-authors who wanted to join the bandwagon. It must also be noted, however, that their works were sold and read, and, with few exceptions, experienced great success.

In addition to Hocker's Der Teuffel selbs, which was based on Musculus' Von des Teuffels Tyranney, two other "dämonologische Teufelsbücher" were written with the intention of describing in general terms the devil's activities, although, from the viewpoint of two specific professions, i.e., Der Zauberteuffel (1563)\textsuperscript{14} by Ludwig Milichius and Wider den Bannteuffel (1564) also by Jodocus Hocker. Following Musculus' lead with his Ehteuffel (1556), who takes the unfaithful husbands to task, Nicolaus Schmidt concentrates on the vices of married women in his tract Von den zehen Teufeln oder Lastern / damit die bösen vnartigen Weiber beessen sind (1557). A better treatment of the same subject and in better poetic form is Adam Schubart's humorous Hauss-
teuffel (ca 1564) in which the author uses material from Musculus but nowhere mentions his source. Also attacking a devil who seeks through his specific activities to destroy adherence to the sixth commandment is the Hurenteuffel (1565) of Andreas Hoppenrod who fights for virtue, modesty, and chastity in the home. With possible inspiration from Musculus, Peter Glaser of Dresden turned from the husband and wife to the vices of the servants in his Gesind Teuffel (1564): for example, the servants' laziness, unfaithfulness, and coarseness, and the devil who too frequently directs these characteristic traits.

Literary opposition in Germany began early against the popular foreign fashions, the increasing unvirtuous "Putzsucht," haughtiness, and extravagance of any kind in dress, especially among the middle class. Musculus' Hosenteuffel (1556) was the first devil-book to attack the cause of such indulgence, i.e., one of a group of special devils who tempts people to wear the "immodest" baggy pants from the Netherlands. The pastors tended to reject any new fashion and maintained that the devil was behind wearing such clothes. One of these authors who followed Musculus' lead was Johannes Strauss who created a Pluder-, Pauss- und Krauss-Teuffel in 1581. Strauss' work is a direct result of the Theatrum Diabolorum and in particular the Hosenteuffel. These "Kleiderdämonen" belong to the larger domain of the "Hoffartsteuffel" whose powers, intrigues, and wiles Joachim
Westphal describes in his tract _Wider den Hoffartsteuffel_ (1565).

Directly dependent upon Friderich's _Sauffteuffel_, or rather upon Schwarzenberg's satirical "Sendbrief" (1512) quoted in full by Friderich, is Eustachius Schildo's _Spilteufel_ (1557). Schildo attacks the gluttons whose idol is the "epikurische teuffel" and his infernal comrades among whom the "Spielteufel" is to be found. He attacks gambling and all the other vices that accompany it. With the _Spilteufel_ and the _Sauffteuffel_ we can associate Florian Daul von Fürstenberg's _Tantzteuffel_ (1567) who, with these other two devils, applies his trade in the _Wirtshäuser_. For some time dancing had been a problem to both secular and ecclesiastical authorities, who unsuccessfully tried to suppress it by occasionally issuing restrictions.\(^15\) With the increasing "coarseness" and "vulgarity" in dancing, such restrictions were more frequent and oppressive; and quite early the moralistic literary opponents called in the assistance of the devil to be more effective. In Daul's case it is a special devil who directs the social vice of dancing. To the devils who attempt to entice men away from their professions into a vulgar life of pleasure and amusement belongs the special devil who robs men of any desire to work: the _Faulteuffel_ who found his creator and biographer in Joachim Westphal in 1558.

Along with Chryseus' _Hoffteuffel_ there are several
special devils who busy themselves with the affairs of public life and who experienced literary recognition at the hands of a few protestant pastors. The *Schraptteuffel* (1567) of Ludwig Milichius, the author of the *Zauberteuffel*, is a book concerning the national economic system. The author is embittered because, although the oppressing financial practices of the Catholic Church have disappeared from the ecclesiastical scene, the "Schrapperey" of the civil authorities has become just as bad or worse. Milichius takes pains to generalize and to avoid being labeled a revolutionary. He emphasizes the unjust practices of the high-living nobility and civil authorities, the extravagance of the courts, and all the vices he can think of in connection with such a way of life. Cyriacus Spangenberg's *Jagteuffel* (1560) likewise assails an "evil" and "unnecessary" practice of the nobility. Christoph Obenhin attacks the prevailing practice of light-hearted oaths, the often committed perjury, and especially public oaths and practices connected with such a vice. In his tract, *Der Eydteuffel* (1574), he describes "was Schweren sey vnd heisse" and the ceremonious custom when one makes an oath: "Bey vns Teutschen ist jetzunder der Brauch / dasz man im Eydschweren pflegt zween Finger / beneben dem Daumen auffzuheben / oder in die höhe auffzurecken" (B, fol. 494a). Other devil-books belonging to this group are Hermann Strack's *Wider die zween Pestilenzteuffel Derber vnd Cheteb genannt* (1569), Georg am Waid's
Gerichts Teuffel (1580), and Ambrosius Pape's Bettel vnd Garte-Teuffel (1586).

Andreas Fabricius presents a devil who does not necessarily lure men into any particular vice, rather who seeks, in general, the faithful Christian's apostacy from his religion, i.e., "der christlich-dogmatische Teuffel." Fabricius' Der Heylige / Kluge vnd Gelerte Teufel (1567) represents the devil who, through centuries of experience, is clever enough to make man feel proud and secure in his wisdom, knowledge, and convictions, and who then leads the good Christian from the right path. To the same active group of "theological" devils belongs Caspar Faber's "Sabbaths- teuffel." Faber criticizes "alle Heuchler vnd Werckheiligen" in his Einfeltige vnd kurze Erinnerung vom Sabbathsteuffel (1572), a tract in which he personifies everything that hinders a person from following the precepts for keeping the Sabbath holy. Johannes Schütz's book, Serpens antiquvs. Die alte Schlange / das ist Der Sacraments Teuffel (1580), is an interesting witness of the fanatic religious battles between the Lutherans and the opponents of the Lutheran concept of Holy Communion. Schütz is well read in the polemic literature and presents a good picture of the literary battle; however, he states emphatically that the devil is behind the "Sakramentieren" of those such as the followers of Zwingli. Indeed, the devil is behind the polemics of the theologians engaged in such a waste of time and energy.
Christoph Marstaller had earlier taken to task the bickering of the Church with the secular authorities and nobility when he wrote Der Pfarr vnd Pfründ Beschneiderteuffel (1575).

There is also a group of devil tracts which deals more with the vices and sins of individuals apart from a wider social context. Envy and greed, both sources of much evil, could not be absent from the company of the devil, and in fact, found more than one pastor willing to give them literary treatment. The first was Albrecht von Blankenburg who attacked usury and all that accompanies that evil practice in his tract Vom Juncker Geitz vnd Wucherteuffel (1562). Johannes Brandmüller's Geitz Teuffel (1579) is no improvement on Albrecht's poor work. The author criticizes the greedy and covetous who use their means to travel "des Teuffels Rollwagen" and who live in sensual pleasure. Much better is the Neidhard / oder Neidteuffel (1582) of Johannes Rhodius (Rödinger) who says he was inspired by the Theatrum Diabolorum, and especially by Musculus, to write and participate in the devil literature. Rhodius discusses with fresh and delightful satire the different social and age classes and the envy, covetousness, and hatred that exist among them.

Individuals who are of a pessimistic frame of mind are also subject to the temptations of the devil; for Luther and his followers taught that God wants His faithful to be happy and cheerful. Any disturbance of this "normal" happy disposition was obviously the work of the devil. In fact,
Andreas Lanng describes the activities of this devil in his Sorgen Teufel (1573). The impetus for Lanng's devil-book may have come from Simon Musäus who, a year earlier, wrote his Melancholischer Teuffel / das ist Nützlicher Bericht vnd heylsamer Raht / ... wie man alle Melancholische / Teufflische gedancken / von sich treiben sol (1572); for since Luther even melancholy was considered a sin. Other vices and their corresponding devils found literary treatment at the hands of such pastors as Conrad Porta whose Lügen vnd Lesterteuffel was published in 1581 and Hermann Heinrich Frey whose Schmeichelteuffel appeared in the same year (1581) as a similar tract by Johannes Rhodius entitled Schmeichler oder Fuchsschwentze Teufel.

The success of these works was such that several publishing houses made the printing and sale of devil-books almost a specialty, e.g., Johann Eichorn in Frankfurt/O., Georg Rab and Wilhelm Hann in Frankfurt/M., Sigmund Feyerabend and Simon Hüter also in Frankfurt/M., Urban Gaubisch in Eisleben, Nicolaus Henricus in Ursel, Georg Baumann in Erfurt, and Georg Hantzsch in Leipzig.\textsuperscript{16} All the title pages of the works are garnished with an enticing woodcut which, in most cases, in the most frightful manner shows the devil in question active at his specialty. The wide acceptance of the devil-tracts also inspired the enterprising Frankfurt publisher Feyerabend to venture collecting most of the previously published devil-books and printing
them in an anthology under the efficacious title Theatrum Diabolorum. The venture was so successful that Feyerabend's three editions (1569, 1575, and 1587/88) dominated the field for twenty-five years.
NOTES

Chapter V

1From Schwarzenberg's satire on Maximilian's 1512 edict against drinking ("Sendbrief an die Zutrinker") quoted in its entirety by Matthäus Friderich in his Sauffteuffel, B, fol. 284b.

2Devil in Legend and Literature, p. 24.

3Der Teufel selbs / Das ist / Warhaftiger / bestendiger vnd wolgegründter bericht von den Teufeln / Was sie sein / Woher sie gekommen / Vnd was sie teglich wircken / Darbey ire grosse Tyranney / macht vnd gewalt . . . (Ursel, 1568); in Theatrum Diabolorum, A, fol. 1b-146b; B, fol. 1b-126b; C.1, fol. 1b-100a.

4Osborn, Teuffelliteratur, p. 23.

5See also chap. 24 of the Table Talks and the chap. of this study concerning Luther.


7Heinrich Grimm, "Teufelbücher," pp. 542-543, lists eleven editions in all other than the Sauffteuffel's appearance in the three editions of the Theatrum Diabolorum.

8Quoted according to Chse, Zwischen Brant und Luther, pp. 25-26; cf. Osborn, p. 25.


11Von des Teufels Tyranney / Macht vnd Gewalt / Sonder- lich in diesen letzten tagen u nterrichtung (Erfurt, 1561); in Theatrum Diabolorum, A, fol. 147a-164b; B, fol. 127a-141b; C.1, fol. 100b-113a.

Der Jagteuffel. Bestendiger und Wolgegründeter bericht
wie fern die Jagten rechtmässig und zugelassen / Und
widerumb / warinn sie jetziger zeit desz mehrentheils Gott-
losz / gewaltsam / unrecht und verdamlich sind / Und der-
halben billigh vnterlassen / oder doch geändert werden
solten (Eisleben, 1560); in Theatrum Diabolorum, A, fol.
287a-316b; B, fol. 247a-272a; C.l, fol. 202b-223b.

The complete bibliography for this and all following
works mentioned in this chapter is given at the end of this
study in the Bibliography of primary Works.

See Osborn, Teufelliteratur, p. 83.

See Josef Benzing, Buchdruckerlexikon des 16. Jahr-
hunderts (Deutsches Sprachgebiet) (Frankfurt/M., 1952).
SECTION II

THE THEATRUM DIABOLORUM
INTRODUCTION

Enthusiastic about the success he experienced at the book fair in the fall of 1568, Sigmund Feyerabend (1528-1590), "Buchhändler zu Frankfurt am Main," decided to collect the previously published devil-books and to print them in a huge folio volume. Peter Schmid, who in 1565 had printed a pirated edition of Westphal's Hoffartsteuffel for Feyerabend, was chosen to print the anthology. In 1562 Feyerabend joined the retail book dealer Simon Hüter in forming a publishing firm which, from 1563, printed and sold pirated editions of many of the devil-tracts (e.g., Der Faulsteuffel in 1563, Der Gesind Teuffel and Der Bannsteuffel in 1564, Der Hausstefaffel and Der Hurenteuffel in 1565). Feyerabend published only two first editions, i.e., Milichius' Zauberteuffel (1563) and Florian Daul's Tantzsteuffel (1567). As soon as a devil-book appeared elsewhere "in der Provinz" which promised success, this literary pirate in Frankfurt reprinted it, usually with a more enticing title woodcut but in smaller and poorer print to save paper and almost always with poor editing. The sales Feyerabend made at the 1568 Frankfurt fair consisted almost entirely of such pirated editions of the pastors' devil-tracts.

Feyerabend's plan with his devil-book anthology was
simply to eliminate all competition, to prevent other printers and publishers from printing and publishing individual editions of the devil-tracts, and thereby to centralize the devil-book business under his control. The product of this speculation appeared in 1569 under the title THEATRVM Diabolorum. (See the following two plates.) The 1569 edition of the anthology contains twenty devil-books in the following order: Der Teufel selbs, Von des Teufels Tyrannen, Der Heylige / Kluge vnd Gelehrte Teuffel, Wider den Bannteuffel, Der Zauber Teuffel, Wider den Fluchteuffel, Tantzteuffel, Gesind Teuffel, Der Jagteuffel, Wider den Sauffteuffel, Wider den Eheteuffel, Wider den Huren Teuffel, Vom Juncker Geitz vnd Wucherteuffel, Schrap Teuffel, Der Faul Teuffel, Wider den Hoffartsteuffel, Voß Hoseñ Teuffel, Der Spilteuffel, Der Hoffteuffel, and Wider die zween Pestilenzteuffel.

The clever Feyerabend was successful in his speculation, for six years later, in 1575, he found it necessary, desirable, and profitable to publish a second edition (B) of his Theatrum Diabolorum. This edition included the addition of the Sabbaths-teuffel, Der Eydteuffel, Der Sorgen Teuffel, and Der Melancholische Teuffel.

The third edition appeared in two folio volumes, the first volume in 1587, the second in 1588. This edition, unknown to Goedeke, contains eight new devil-books, i.e., Der Pfarr vnd Pfründ Beschneiderteuffel, Gerichts Teuffel, Der Sacraments Teuffel, Schmeichelteuffel, Kleyder / Pluder /
Title page of the 1569 edition
of the *Theatrum Diabolorum*

(Title woodcut made by Jost Amman)\(^4\)

On the last folio page of the anthology above Feyerabend's signet the following is printed: "Gedruckt zu Franckfurt am Mayn / durch Peter Schmid / in verleg- und Hieronymi Feyerabend. M.D.LXIX.\(^5\)
Ein Geistlieblicheres Versteendiges


Allen frommen Christen, so ihrer seelen und seeligkeit angelegen, in dieser letzten Zeit, da allerley Leiber graumählich im schweigen geblieben, mit gänzen erhebt und fleißig zu wandern.

Die Namen der Autoren und Schreiber, findet man vorziehet nach der Verlaffung,

Gezeitten und geschaffen mit einem neuen persönlich. Untertan, worauf noch niemand so aufgegangen, kommt einem unendlichen Reigen.

Gedruckt zu Frankfurt am Mainnet, im Jahr 1569.
Title page of the 1575 edition of the *Theatrum Diabolorum*
Pausz vnd Krausz Teuffel, Lügen vnd Lestertuefel, Neidteufel, and Bettel vnd Garte-teuffel. Schmid made the mistake of printing Simon Musaeus' work twice in the second volume (1588), first under the title Spekulationischer Teuffel (fol. 129b-136a) and again at the end as Der Melancholische Teuffel (1572) (fol. 374a-380b), an oversight which indicates poor editing on Feyerabend's part. The title page of the third edition has only a few minor changes (the title to the second volume (1588) lists the new devil-books in this publication).

Feyerabend's plan to dominate the devil-book business succeeded, for with the appearance of the Theatrum Diabolorum he almost stopped, with a few exceptions, further editions of those works found in his anthology. Indeed, between 1569 and 1594 (the publication date for Andreas Celichius' Vonn des Sathans letzten Zornsturm) only first editions of new devil-books appeared. Even the works not in the anthology had less success than they might have had otherwise. Feyerabend achieved his goal even though the folio volumes, especially the second two editions, were far from being free of printing mistakes and certainly not inexpensive. Feyerabend felt his venture was psychologically sound. He believed that the book-buying public would rather purchase his anthology than many individual publications. A characteristic of the era was an attempt at completeness, an endeavor to collect and codify all the material on the subject, an effort to know as much as one could. Feyerabend not only recognized
this trait in his potential customers, he capitalized on it. In this same enterprising manner, he also made a wise choice for the title of his work, Theatrum Diabolorum, i.e., "Schau-
platz und Schaustellung der Teufel." Such a designation was not entirely new but certainly modern and good advertisement. Jost Amman's excellent woodcut further enticed purchasers.

Feyerabend defends his choice of title in his undated "Vorrede an den Christlichen Läser." Among other reasons he remarks that since the devil is the cause of all sin, why not attribute the sins to him and put his name openly above them, as the title of his collection: "Warumb solt man sich nicht so wol seinen / desz Teuffels / als der Sünden selbs fein erklären vnd bekennen" (B, fol. IIb). He observes that the scriptures call the devil by many names, e.g., Satan and Diabolus; "wir teutschen begreiffen die beyde mit dem einigen wort / Teuffel / . . ." (B, fol. IIb). Nor would a person believe in the devil had it not been for the Bible. Man should fear the devil's teachings and activities "von welchen dann in diesem Buch nützliche vnd heilsame erriner-
ung vnd vermahnung . . . reichlich dargethan wirdt" (B, fol. IIIa). On the other hand, no one should shun the Theatrum Diabolorum because of the title or the material in it, for to read of the devil and his hosts and their deeds is to be informed, which is absolutely necessary in such times. Thus, the pious Frankfurt publisher maintains that his title is justified and is neither "annoying" nor "unchristian."
Feyerabend feels his book is not only useful for the lay Christians but also for the pastors, chaplains, other church officials, and the learned; for here is shown how the devil not only seeks possession of the body and soul of man, but also fights for control of almost everything and seeks to confuse worldly law, order, and reason. Many examples and cases from history and daily experience are given — all this from active, educated, and concerned men of God. He contends that his book is a sort of register for all sorts of information:


In the 1575 edition Feyerabend points out that he ordered the twenty-four devil-books as close as possible to the sequence of the Ten Commandments in which warning against most sins is contained. "Vnd ist das alles mit mancherley lustigen Historien / Sprüchen / Sprichwörtern / Reimen / vnd Gleichniszreden / vermengt vnd geschmücket / dass es auch Weltleuten / so der H. Schrifft vnd der Kirchenlehrer Bücher leichtlich vberdrüssig werden / lieblich vnd kurzweilig zu lesen seyn mag" (B, fol. IIIb). Not only the lay people, but also the educated should read the *Theatrum Diabolicorum* industriously "vnd stets zur hand haben," indeed,
learn from it daily just as from the catechism. Feyerabend concludes that the prefaces to the individual works were not reprinted in his anthology because, after his own preface, they were superfluous and would only increase the cost of his work.

In the preface to the second volume of the third edition, dated February 8, 1588, Feyerabend states the reason for adding the new devil-books to his anthology, i.e., the success of the previous publication. Since all the copies of the 1575 edition were "nun mehr alle abgangen," he feels his expensive third edition would be no financial risk. He was right; the copies all sold by 1594 at the latest. The number of copies of the three editions of the Theatrum Diabolorum does not seem to have been recorded; nevertheless, we can make a careful and conservative estimate on the basis of Feyerabend's statements and the fact that the book went through three editions in less than twenty years. With works of this nature 1000 copies for the first printing was the practice of the time. If Feyerabend limited himself to this number in 1569, the enterprising publisher certainly increased the number of copies for the second and third editions because of the success of the first printing. (Poor editing of the third edition indicates Feyerabend rushed to get his book on the market, which in itself anticipates a higher number of copies.) And even if only 1500 copies of the Theatrum Diabolorum were printed in 1575 and 1587/88, the
result would be at least a total of 4000 copies for the three editions. Heinrich Grimm (p. 532) observes that this would mean, "dass 20 Teufelschriften je 4000mal, 4 fernere Teufelschriften je 3000mal und 10 (9) weitere Teufelschriften je 1500mal im Druck vervielfältigt wurden. Das war einer Gesamtverbreitung von rund 107000 Teufeleinzelschriften gleichzu setzen, wobei damals die Wirkung einer Teufeleinzelschrift im Rahmen eines Kompendiums auf längere Zeit hin anhaltender und intensiver gewesen sein dürfte als die eines leicht in Verlust kommenden und schnell zerlesenen Traktätchendruckes."

This collection of widespread and popular books also furnishes a picture, although limited, of a segment of life in protestant Germany in the second half of the sixteenth century. After the assignment of devils to sins and vices of men had become almost a custom, people did not limit the devil's activities to the individual; for the activities of public life in general, even the religious polemics, were associated with demons against which an unceasing battle was waged. And just as the devil and his comrades were active everywhere, so also were the books about him and his hests incessantly read.

There are three main groups of devil-books in the Theatrum Diabolorum. The first group consists of the works which deal with the personal sins and vices (the Sauff-, Hosen-, Fluch-, Spil-, Jag-, Hoffarts-, Kleyder-, Geitz vnd Wucher-, Faul-, Tantz-, Lügen vnd Lester-, Schmeichel-, Neid-,
and Melancholie-Teuffel). The second group is made up of those books in which the devil is active in the family circle (the Ehe-, Haus-, Weiber-, Gesind-, and Sorgen-Teuffel); works concerning demonology in general (Der Teufel selbs, Von des Teufels Tyrannney, the Zauber-, Bann-, and the Heyliger / Kluger und Gelehrter-Teuffel), and those tracts concerning church and public life (the Sacrament-, Sabbath-, Pfründ Be- schneider-Teuffel and the Evd-, Schrap-, Pestilenz-, and Ge- richts-Teuffel) comprise the third major group. In this study we will discuss briefly the following representative works: Der Sauffteuffel, Der Hosen Teuffel, Der Ehteuffel, Der Jagteuffel, and Der Teuffel selbs. If the emphasis here is on the first major group, it is because the emphasis of the devil literature in general is on the personal sins and vices, i.e., on the "privaten Teufeln." The choice of works to be discussed is also significant, for in the retinue of Friderich, Musculus, and Spangenberg as the leading authors of the protestant devil literature followed almost all the other pastors who tried their luck at writing a devil-book. Indeed, it will be shown that the individual authors found inspiration in the works of other pastors and in other literature which dealt with the same topics. Luther, as has been noted, was the ultimate authority, but his statements and writings were used more in the capacity of substantiating what the authors had already written or wanted to write. The devil-tract authors certainly found much in the reformer's
works to support and further their ideas, but we should not be mistaken as to the sources of their material - quite often it was not Luther.
NOTES

Introduction


2See Benzing, pp. 55, 123.

3See Benzing, pp. 52, 54.

4Amman (1539-1591), a famous engraver, provided Feyerabend with woodcuts for most of the twenty-four years the two were associated; see ADB, I, 401.

5²₀; 5 unnumbered folios which include the preface by Feyerabend, 542 folios of text, and 5 folios including register; title is in red and black.

6²₀; 6 unnumbered folios including preface by Feyerabend, 1568 folios of text; above the signet same as A except "in verlegung Sigmund Feyerabend."


8See Osborn, p. 35 and footnote no. 2. The title, Osborn says, was in the same spirit as the Early Baroque with its "Welttheater."

CHAPTER I

MATTHÄUS FRIDERICH'S WIDER DEN SAUFFTEUFFEL

Matthäus Friderich began the protestant pastors' war against the various vices and their special devils. It is interesting to note that the first protestant devil-book, Friderich's Sauffteuffel of 1552, did not even mention Luther who, according to Osborn (p. 170) was supposed to have been the impetus, the guiding light, and the source of ideas and material for the devil literature. Only in the preface to the fifth edition of his Sauffteuffel (Frankfurt/O., 1557) did Friderich call upon the reformer's statements on the topic, i.e., Luther's interpretation of the 101st Psalm, for authoritative support. It is also in the fifth edition that Friderich first gave recognition to the real source of his material, i.e., the "Trinkliteratur," and especially Johann Schwarzenberg's (1463-1528) humorous parody Der Zutrinker vnd Prasser Gesatze, Ordenung vnd Instruction which appeared anonymously in 1512. Friderich reprinted within his own work Schwarzenberg's entire satire. Until the fifth edition Friderich probably wanted to give the impression that he was the creator of the "Sauffteuffel" but in 1557 found it advantageous to liven up his dry tract with Schwarzenberg's witty satire. Be that what it may, it is obvious that
Friderich originally created his work quite apart from any direct influence from Luther, whose statement, "Unser Teutscher Teuffel wird ein guter Weinschlauch seyn / vnd muss Sauff heissen," was only used at a later date to give author-ity to Friderich's thesis. It is in this same light, as noted earlier, that the other pastor-authors approach their subject. Luther is used as an authoritative reference, in some instances as the initial inspiration, but in most cases not as the primary source of material.

Friderich maintains he is well informed on the subject of drinking, drunkenness, and the accompanying vices: "Denn ich den Sauffteuffel zu guter masz kenne / vnd ziemlich weisz / was er im schilt fuhret / Als der ich vorzeiten jm auch gedianet / vnd vnter seinem Fehnlin (aber als ich hoffe / zu seinem grossen schaden) gelegen bin" (B, fol. 287a). "Sauffen aber heisst," Friderich adds, "(wie es alle ver-nunftige Menschen verstehen) weñ man mehr in Leib geuszt / denn die Notturfft erfordert" (B, fol. 282b), a situation which leads to additional bad habits. He is not against "essen vnd trincken" but against "fressen vnd sauffen." He thus maintains that the excesses are the sins, and fights for moderation. If Friderich says he is well informed about excessive drinking because of experience, in his attack against this vice, he is likewise well acquainted with the literature on the subject. In fact, when he first published his tract in 1552, he joined a long line of authors who created a
body of literature by writing either for or against drinking.

In the second half of the thirteenth century, two poems, for example, from the middle class were written and sung in favor of wine, i.e., "Der Weinschwelg" and the satirical "Wiener Meerfahrt." Among other things they are both good descriptions of tavern drinking parties, a description of an activity that most authors, up to and including Fischart, for example, enjoyed making, even if the authors were against drinking. Adolf Hauffen, in his article on "Trinkliteratur," mentions several late medieval works in which the subject is discussed. Meier Helmbrecht's son, for example, tells how knights, among other vices, now sit around all day and drink wine. The thirty-fifth chapter of Freidank's Bescheidenheit ("von trunkenheite") discusses the results of being drunk. Ulrich von Lichtenstein, Ulrich von Türheim, and Friedrich von Sonnenburg all complain of the loss of "Frauendienst" in favor of drinking. Many satirists, notably Der Stricker, deal with the subject; also many "Sittenprediger" like Bertold von Regensburg feel moved to attack what they believe to be an increasing social evil. The satirical Meister Reuau (ca 1400) contains a good description of the effects of intoxication. Other didactic poems, Des Teufels Netz, for example, and many of the "Sittenspiegel" deal with the topic.

Toward the end of the fifteenth century, a voice of warning arose against drinkers and their bad habits. Sebastian
Brant devoted two chapters to the subject (16: "von fullen vnd prassen" and 72: "von groben narren") in his Narrenschiff. Wine, says Brant in the sixteenth chapter, makes the head wobbly and the hands shaky, shortens one's life, makes the wise stupid, engenders immodesty and unchastity, and creates an atmosphere where all sorts of other vices are indulged in. Then Brant describes the activities of "Zutrinker" and their language. With these motives, the tavern types depicted on the woodcut, and the description of tavern drinking parties in chapter 72, Brant offered the sixteenth century good material for further literary activity on the subject. The eighteenth chapter of Murner's Narrenbeschworung (1512) and the twenty-first chapter of his Schelmenzunft (1512) are directly dependent on Brant.

The noise and activity, language and songs of drinking parties in the taverns were well described in the sixteenth century, e.g., by Sebastian Franck in Von dem grewlichen Laster der Trunkenheit (1531), by Hieronymus Bock in Der vollen Bruder orden (1538), by Leonard Schertlin in Künstlich Trinken (1538), and by Johann Fischart in the eighth chapter of Die Geschichttklitterung (or Gargantua, 1575), his version of the first book of Rabelais' comic romance.

The vice of drunkenness was increasingly a problem, so much so that in Germany imperial edicts were pronounced against "das Zutrinken," (and what that practice usually leads to - inebriation), at diets in Köln (1512) and Augsburg
(1530 and 1570). "Mässigkeitsorden" were even established. 4 The "Sauflust" was so great in the sixteenth century that a body of literature (for and against) grew rapidly. Most of the poets "for" drinking wrote parodies and were really for improvement of the situation. Others preached moderation. Usually it was "das Zutrinken, welches die Dichter befehden, jene bekannte Sitte, sich Halbe oder Ganze vorzukommen, die im 16. Jahrhundert von allen Ständen, ja von Frauen und Jungfrauen betrieben wurde. Nicht nur in Gläsern und Bechern, sondern auch in Kännern und Kübeln, in Küchengefäß, in Stiefeln und Hüten, ja in den unsaubersten Gefäß setzte man einander die grössten Mengen Wein oder Bier, . . . die unterm Titel des Bescheids, oder des Willkommen- und Abschiedstrunkes auf einen Zug geleert werden mussten . . . . 5

Friderich's original tract (1552) was first of all based on one of the best satires of the whole group of works on the subject, on Johann Schwarzenberg's Der Zutrinker vnd Prasser Gesatze, Ordenung vnd Instruction (1512). Secondly, Friderich freely used the ideas which Brant expressed in the sixteenth chapter of the Narrenschiff. Thirdly, the author of the Sauffteuffel used expressions common to the other literature on drinking; and finally, he made no reference at all to Luther.

Among the seven reasons why people should not drink, Friderich asserts that there awaits eternal punishment for those who indulge excessively: "Gott will Säufferey mit
Krieg / hunger väh durst / straffen . . ." (B, fol. 273a; cf. Brant, 16:41-42). No one is safe for a minute from death, and imagine what would happen to you if death surprises you and carries you away when you are drunk. The fifth reason is "dasz es einen Menschen zum vnverständigen Narren macht" (B, fol. 274a; cf. Brant, 16:9-15); drinking simply prevents clear thinking, etc. The sixth reason to avoid drinkin is "dasz Trunkchenheit ein vrsach ist zu allerley Sünden" (B, fol. 274a; cf. Brant, 16:18-19). Drinking is the author of many other vices, e.g., swearing, cursing, gambling, dancing, lewdness, and unchastity. When a person has lost his sense of reasoning through drinking, all the above mentioned things happen, and the various devils are present to make the person indulge in such vices: "Wenn nu der Sauffteuffel einen Menschen eynnimpt / so sind die andern Laster-teuffel auch nicht weit von jhm . . ." (B, fol. 274b).

Friderich gives many examples of the effects of drinking, i.e., Noah, Alexander the Great, and all the others that Brant listed (cf. Brant, 16:21-44). 6

Friderich's "Beweisung / dasz das halb vnd ganz sauffen Sünde . . . sey" follows the "Vrsachen" (B, fol. 276b-277a); then he follows the traditional method with "Etliche Eyn-reden der Sаuffer / mit jren Verlegungen." Agreeing with Schwarzenberg, Friderich has his drinkers pose such questions as "Sol mann denn nicht essen noch trincken? Antwort: Essen vnd trincken würdt nicht verbotten / sondern fressen vnd
sauffen" (B, fol. 277b). Again the "Säuffer" ask if a person has to become a monk to live a Christian life. No, Friderich answers; we should seek "Mässigkeit," moderation in all we do.7 Drinkers also maintain they have to participate in the parties because of friends and social pressures, in order to avoid being laughed at (a statement directly out of Schwarzenberg's work; cf. B, fol. 282b). Friderich feels people should obey God and suffer the social inconvenience (B, fol. 279a).

In 1557 Friderich published the fifth edition of his Sauffteuffel in which he included for the first time a copy of Schwarzenberg's satire, although even now he does not mention the author's name. The satire begins with a reprint of the "Edict des Keysers Maximilianai / vom Zutrincken" which was written and proclaimed at the imperial diet at Trier and Köln in 1512 and which banned social toasting; for the custom most frequently lead to drunkenness and other vices. Nobles, for example, should only make one toast at a diet or at court functions. Should the nobles engage in more than that, they are to be socially reprimanded but not physically punished. The lower classes, however, can be punished even with their lives.

The edict so concerned the hosts of hell that a meeting was called to discuss the problem, i.e., the possible loss of their earthly servants and future co-inhabitants of hell. The decision was made to publish a circular and send a
"Postbote" to deliver it. Thus, at the conclusion of the imperial diet at Köln, an infernal messenger, dressed in black and on a black horse, appeared in that city late at night, a wine flask as "Büchslein vorn auff den Rock gehfftet," and with "eine grosse zal Sendbrief / mit beygeschlossener Instruction darzu gehörig / vō den Hellischen Ständen / an jre förderste Räht vnd Diener / die fleissigen Zutrincker" (B, fol. 28lb). The instructions to all drinkers, servants, and devils explained what they should do concerning the ban and what they should do to further drinking in spite of the ban. Several of these "Dyner" on earth are listed, e.g., "Schlemmer," "Spyeler," "Rassler," "Puffel," "Toberer," "Prasser," "Fülwein," "Rebenhans," "Speyenwein," "Oessenwein," "Schlorkdenwein," "Sauffaus," "Kreichdemwein," "Weinschlauch," "Flaschenzapf," and "Trumkenpelz."

The introduction of "Desz Hellischen Satans / vnd der Stände seines Reichs / Sendbrief / an die Zutrincker" is a parody of the imperial edict and the social elite:

Wir öbersten Fürst / Regierer / vnd Stände desz Hellischen Reichs / Entbieten allen vnd jeden vnd vnsern vnd unsers Reichsz liebsten Getreuwen / die noch lieblich auff Erden leben / vnd sich in unsern merkligsten gescheffen vnd befelch desz Zutrinckens vben / der aller Titel wir hierinnen / nicht ausz vnwissenheit oder verachtung / sondern ausz guten ehrlichen vrsachen / zu setzen vnterlassen. Vnser Freundschaft / Gnäd vnd alles Guts / darmit wir vnsere fleissig Diener begaben / zuvor. (B, fol. 28lb)

The letter states that the hosts of hell have long used toasting and drinking in Germany in their valuable "service" to mankind. In Swabia, Franconia, Bavaria, and
Upper Rhineland, groups have formed "sober societies;" the servants will have to be extra diligent in those areas. Furthermore, the "Zutrincker" should follow the enclosed instructions for success in their noble and courageous endeavor. Then, in seventeen chapters, follow the advice from the devils in hell to drinkers and servants on earth: "Instruction / was die geübten Zutrincker / von den Ständen der Hellen / zu handeln in Befelch haben" (B, fol. 282b ff). There are instructions, for example, how they should move "die Leute mit süßen falschen worten zu dem Zutrinckken" (B, fol. 282b), how they should answer those who preach against, even ban, drinking, how drinkers should sing and dance, swear and curse, and have their wives and daughters along for the fun. In the chapter "Von Gesellschaft wider das zutrinckken" (B, fol. 283a), the drinkers are told to establish their own societies in favor of drinking and they will soon find that more people will join their groups than will ever belong to the "sober" societies.

Young men should not be concerned with the restrictions their parents might place on their social activities. The sixth chapter (B, fol. 283b) points to the bad examples of the high clerical and secular nobility. Do not heed anything a doctor might say concerning the ill effects which drinking is supposed to have on your health; simply maintain that drinking is not harmful, in fact, how would the country get along without it? Instructions are also given concerning
the best reactions to the excuses of old drinkers in favor of moderation, the excuses women and young ladies make up for not joining in the fun, and moralistic statements that drinking is not virtuous. In addition, a person does not lose his senses when drunk, rather, he really begins to understand the secrets of life. In the "Widerlegung / dasz das Zutrincken der Seelen schaden sol" (B, fol. 284b) it is stated that "Etliche Geistliche machen den Himel vmb jres Geitzes willen also eng / vnd wo wir Teuffel vnd Wölffe im Wald nicht weren / könnten sich die Pfaffen vnd die Hirten nicht ernehmen." A person should also view the imperial ban in its true light - that Maximilian really did not mean it. In the sixteenth chapter we read:

Jr wisset auch / wie vnd dies Euangelium Zeugnisz gibt / dasz der Wege gen Himmel eng vnd schmal ist / vnd wenig dadurch wandern / Aber die Strassen zu vns / weit vnd wol erbauwet / vnd durch viel gewandert werde. Wer wolte denn nicht lieber weite ebene Strassen mit guten Gesellen / denn vnfertige Wege mit geringer anzal / ziehen. (B, fol. 285a)

Just as Christ and his disciples worked many wonders, so have the devil and his servants through drunkenness; in fact, these miracles have always been greater than those of Christ, the "Widersacher." The chapter "Von den Hellischen Wunderwercken im Zutrincken" gives a long list of the marvelous deeds accomplished by people under the direction of both the devil and alcohol. The list is a good description of what many people frequently maintained actually occurred while they were drunk:
So machet die Trunkenheit die Geraden lahm / vnd die Lahren springen vnd tantzen / die Wohlörenden taub / die Redenden stumb . . . die Sehenden blind / die Empfindlichen vnempfindlich / die Gesunden kranck . . . die Alten werden zu Kindern / die Bescheidenen vngebärdig / die Züchtigen vnverschämpt / die Stillen schreyend . . . die Nacht wirdt gebräucht für den Tag / vnd widerumb der Tag für die Nacht / die stillstehenden Brätter vnd Häuser lauffen vmb / vnd eines wirdt geachtet für zwey . . . Vnlust wirdt nicht gescheuhet / desz Menschen Mund verweisezt den Arsz / vnd der Kopf die Füsse / Geistlich werden Fleischlich / die Weiber Männer / die Menschen zu Thieren / die Schafe zu Wölfen / die Füchsz zu Eseln / die Helffant zu Möcken / Vnd in summa / die Engel zu Teuffeln. (B, fol. 285b)

Dabey ein jeder wol mercken kan / was grossen ernst vnd fleisz wir mit solchen Wunderwercken gebrauchen / damit wir das Zutraiccken / als vnserer aller nützlichsten Dienstbarkeit eine / eynbringen / erhalten vnd mehren" (B, fol. 285b). Finally, it is stated that all the foregoing instructions are given in good faith to help further this great and good cause. The circular is signed "Chirographum ex Cancellaria Infernali." The instructions end with the following "Datum in versamleten Raht / vnter vnserm auffgetruckten falschen sigill / Am ersten tage desz Weinmonats / nach wehrung vnser Reichs / im Jar 5472" (B, fol. 286a).

"Eine Engelische Bottschaft" ends Schwarzenberg's satire. It is reported that an angel on a white horse appeared in Cologne the following morning with a letter of warning from heaven, but most people stayed up so late the night before at banquets and parties and became so drunk that they slept through the arrival of the angelic messenger. Others tore up the divine letters in disgust.
In his own "Sendbrief an die vollen Brüder" which follows Schwarzenberg's satire, Friderich complains that drinking and the vices that accompany it have only increased. Friderich says that drinking has never been so bad as it is now. Even "Saufforden" have been founded which, according to Friderich, should actually be called "Sauworden" in which "fressen vnd sauffen vnd ein wüstes Leben getrieben werden." The members are "Epicurische Säuwe / welcher Hirte der Sauffteuffel ist" (B, fol. 287a-287b). Friderich wants to warn everybody of the impending dangers of drinking, rejects all arguments of the drinkers, and gives all sorts of references, mostly classical, biblical, and from early church fathers, to support the fight against drinking. To give further authority and acceptance to his work he now, in the fifth edition, quotes in full Luther's interpretation of the 101st Psalm in which the reformer maintains Germany's national vice is drinking.

Friderich partially destroyed the effect of Schwarzenberg's satire by placing the "Sendbrief des Engels" (originally in the initial position in 1512), his own "Sendbrief an die vollen Brüder," Luther's statement, and a very poor "angelic hymn" at the end of the Sauffteuffel. Nevertheless, the book was very popular, obviously because of Schwarzenberg's work. The Sauffteuffel went through at least eleven editions besides its three appearances in the Theatrum Diabolorum. An earlier chapter noted what influence
Friderich's work had on the other devil-book authors. Directly dependent upon the *Sauffteuffel*, i.e., upon the "Sendbrief" of Schwarzenberg, is Eustachius Schildo's *Spilteufel* (1557) - another example of independence from Luther in terms of inspiration and source material. Other authors, outside the devil literature, also imitated Friderich's work, e.g., Georg Knorr's *Saufteufel* (1563), a "Zechbrüder-Spiegel" which appeared in 1612 in Konstanz, and Heinrich Ammerbach's *Sauffteuffel* of 1669. Concerning Friderich's *Sauffteuffel* and its influence, Heinrich Grimm (p. 544) adds the following:

Wie stark die Figur des Saufteufels in der Vorstellungswelt des 16. Jahrhunderts lebte, tun auch ihn darstellende erhaltene Trinkgefäße kund, wie sie auf den Kredenztischen jener Zeit standen:

"Man schaute da von Silber fein
Den Junker und das Jungfräulein
Mit seiner Schale in den Händen,
Ein Narr, der tut die Buxen wenden,
Den Bär, die Sau, den Aff, fürwahr,
Mit Horn und Klau den Teufel gar."
NOTES

Chapter I

1Cf. Goedeke, II, 234, no. 2.


3"Die Trinkliteratur in Deutschland bis zum Ausgang des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts," Vierteljahrschrift für Litteraturgeschichte, II (1889), 481-515.


5Hauffen, pp. 491-492.

6Brant observes that even Noah could not control alcohol, that Lot sinned because of wine, that the sons of Aaron were forbidden to drink it, that Holofernes lost his head because of it, that Cyrus lost the war against Thamyris because of it, that Bennedab lost all his wealth and Alexander his honor because of wine.

7Cf. Brant, Narrenschiff, 16:16-17, 20, 87-88; e.g., "Eyn drunckner mēsch gar nyemās rūht / Vnd weisz keyn mosz noch vnderscheit / . . . / Eyn wiser ist, wer syttlich drinckt." and "Eyn narr mūsz vil gesoffen han / Eyn wiser māszlich drincken kan."

8Heinrich Grimm, "Teufelbücher," p. 544, points out that the addition of the "Sendbrief an die vollen Brüder" "fand Anschluss an Sankt Grobian, wie es die Zeitmode wollte." The first four editions of the Sauffteuffel were, however, relatively free of the "Grobianismus" of the "Trinkliteratur" in general.

9The Spilteufe begins in a manner similar to Schwarzenberg's satire: "Wir Spitzbuben / Dopler / vnd alle Spielbrüder / sampt vnsern treuwen Gehülffen / den Kartenmahlern / Würfelschnitzern / vnd den Kunstreichen Meistern des Schachts / Brätspiels . . . thun in dem Namen vnsers Abgotts / desz Spiel-Teuffels . . . kundt vnd offenbar / dasz wir nicht vmb Gewinsz willen / sondern vmb Kurtzweil willen / spielen / auff dasz wir vns desz Sauffens enthalten" (B, fol. 435b). The "Spieler vnd Rassler" and the other types used by Schildo were found in the Sauffteuffel.

10See H. Grimm, "Teufelbücher," p. 543.
CHAPTER II

ANDREAS MUSCULUS' VOM HOSEN TEUFFEL
AND WIDER DEN EHTEUFFEL

On a Sunday in 1555 the pastor of the Oberkirche in Frankfurt an der Oder gave a sermon in which he preached against the new and popular men's fashion of wearing baggy trousers. He warned against the arrogance, vanity, and the economic wastefulness of the younger generation which had made the "Pluderhosen" popular. The pastor asked his listeners to desist from participation in this sinful style of dress. The pastor and congregation were shocked the following Sunday to find a pair of the condemned baggy trousers hung in clear view on the pillar directly opposite the pulpit. Andreas Musculus, the church's general superintendent for Brandenburg and professor at the university in Frankfurt, heard of the prank and demanded an immediate investigation from both civil and academic authorities and punishment of the guilty. He thought it was an arrogant and irreverent student joke. Apparently nothing came of the investigation. The following Sunday, however, Musculus prepared and gave a thunderous speech "Vom zuluderten / Zucht vnd Ehrerwegenen pludrichten Hosenteuffel / Vermahnung vnd Warnung."¹

The "Pluderhosen" came into Germany from the Netherlands about the middle of the century and quickly became a domi-
nating fashion, especially among the young people. Max Osborn (pp. 96-97) gives the following description of the baggy trousers:

Diese Pluderhosentracht, wie sie sich in ihrer Blütezeit entwickelte, ist sicherlich eine der seltsamsten Ausgeburten erfinderischer Kleiderphantasie. Entstanden war sie wohl aus dem Bestreben, sich von der unbequemen Enge der früheren Beinkleider zu befreien; man erreichte dies sehr einfach durch Schlitze in der straff anliegenden Gewandung, welche eine freiere Bewegung ermöglichten. Die Blosse der Beine, die dadurch zum Vorschein kam, zu verdecken, füllte man die Schlitze zunächst durch ein Futter von dünnem Zeuge aus, das man bald in viele Falten zusammenlegte. Allmählich aber ward mit der Quantität dieses Futterstoffes ein ganz ungeheuerer Aufwand getrieben; bis zu 130 Ellen brauchte man ... Das Tuch als eigentlicher Hosenstoff wurde jetzt natürlich viel zu schwer, und man nahm infolgedessen eine Art Rasch oder sogar Seide, so dass nun aber die Mode bald riesige Summen verschlang. Die Beinkleider hingen jetzt vom Gürtel beinahe bis auf die Schuhe herab, und waren nach der Länge wie in die Quere vielfach aufgeschnitten. Landknabenh und Studenten sorgten dafür, dass die neue Tracht bald in die Höhe kam.
During the early 1550's a body of literature grew as a result of the new fashion. Many witty anecdotes speculated about the origin of the new dress. Osborn, in the introduction to his 1894 edition of Musculus' *Hosenteuffel*, gives a long list of chronicles, anecdotes, songs, and other literary works in which the Pluderhosen were discussed. Fischart, for example, writes about them in 1554 and later dresses his hero Gargantua in baggy pants. Most of the literature, however, was written as an attack against the new fashion. Johann Walther wrote a didactic poem from which the following is quoted:

Wer jetzt nicht Pluderhosen hat
Die schir zu erden hangen
mit zotten, wie des Teuffels wat
Der kan nicht höfflich prangen.
Es ist solchs so eine schnöde tracht
Der Teuffel hats gewis erdacht
wird selbs sein also gangen.

This was not the first instance where the devil was considered the source of such an "evil and immodest" costume. The folk songs of the time said essentially the same, that the devil either directly created the fashion or was having a hearty laugh at what man had made. The fool literature had earlier made fools of those arrogantly fond of dress. Brant, for example, shows in the woodcut to the 92nd chapter of the *Narrenschiff* the devil as the source of this and accompanying vices. Hans Sachs (e.g., "Der Teuffel lest kein Landsknecht mer inn die Helle faren") and Hans Wilhelm Kirchhoff (in his *Wundunmut*, 1565-1603) recount anecdotes in which the
devil is the inspiration behind such a custom. Both Melanchthon and Ludwig Milichius wrote tracts "wider die unmässige Pludertracht." Obviously, many of the pastors also preached from the pulpit against the baggy pants and the waste of money for them as the account at the beginning of this chapter indicates. The champions of simplicity and thrift used any means at their disposal to discount the new fashion. Osborn indicates (Musculus, pp. XI-XV) that all the noise was not in vain, for the civil authorities in some cities and districts began to pass ordinances prohibiting the wearing of Pluderhosen.

There had always been opposition, especially clerical, to some degree against new fashions or arrogant dress. Satire frequently mentioned the "foolish" fashions of the day. In the fourteenth century the authorities themselves took up the battle against arrogance and extravagance in dress and passed stricter ordinances dealing with the dress of the various social classes. Since that time, didactics, satirists, and especially the clergy have said and written a great deal on the subject. The Pluderhosen fad of the mid-sixteenth century was just another example to the pastors that the devil was leading Germany with this and other vices more rapidly down the road to hell.

Andreas Musculus (1514-1588), the author of the published sermon Von Hosen Teuffel (1555), was well acquainted with the current discussion of the new costume; he was likewise, as
his tract points out, well read in the long development of literature on fashions and dress. Heinrich Grimm (p. 545) cites the works Conrad Summenhart and the sermons of Geiler von Kaisersberg as sources for some of Musculus' ideas. We have already noted in another chapter what part Brant's _Narrenschiff_ played in Musculus' tracts. Musculus studied in Wittenberg where he was a close friend to Luther and Melanchthon and where he became well acquainted with the Lutheran demonology. The Frankfurt pastor was likewise well-read in the religious dramas in which the devil often played a major role. Musculus had also read Chryseus' _Hoffteuffel_ and Friderich's _Sauffteuffel_. In fact, it was the success of Friderich's work that inspired Musculus to entitle his sermon as he did and to publish it. Indeed, it is clear that Musculus, when he was motivated in 1555 by the prank recounted at the beginning of this chapter to raise his voice against _Pluderhosen_, created under the leadership of Friderich, not Luther, the "Hosendämon für diese modische Sünde."

It can be concluded from the foregoing that the sources of inspiration and material for Musculus' tract were the following: first of all, the prank in the Oberkirche in Frankfurt was the most direct motivation; secondly, the many literary statements about _Pluderhosen_ in particular and about arrogance and extravagance in fashions in general formed the background material; thirdly, Musculus was well
aware of the many current sermons being preached against the new costume, e.g., the sermon which inspired the above mentioned prank; fourthly, Friderich's successful lead in creating in literature a special devil for a specific vice prompted Musculus to write his tract; fifthly, there had long existed in literature and among the folk the association of extravagance in dress with the devil as the author of that and accompanying vices; finally, and closely connected with the fifth source, there was the prevailing protestant atmosphere in which the Lutheran idea of devils and their activities was associated with whatever was considered evil. It is clear, as has been stated concerning Friderich's Sauffteuffel, that Musculus' Hosenteuffel was only indirectly influenced by Luther. In fact, neither Luther nor any specific statement by the reformer is mentioned by Musculus.

Musculus begins his Hosenteuffel with an introduction in which he laments the following:

So wir gar fromb / vnd keine Sünde sonst hetten / ver- dienet Deutschland jetzunder nit allein den zorn Gottes / vnd disz gegenwertige Vnglück / darinnen wir bisz vber die Ohren stecken / Sondern were kein wunder / dasz vns auch die Sonne nicht ansehe / die Erde nicht mehr trüge / vnd Gott mit dem Jüngstentage gar dreyn schlüge / vö wegen der grewlichen / Vnmenschlichen / vnd Teuffelischen Kleydung / damit sich jetzunder die jungen Leute zu Vnmenschen machen / vnd so schändlich verstellen / dasz nicht allein Gott / die lieben Engel / vnd alle fröme ehrbare Leute / sondern auch die Teuffel selber / einen eckel vnd grewel dafür tragen. (B, fol. 430b)

Musculus then relates a supposedly true story of a painter who wanted to represent the Last Judgment. In order to
depict the devil in the most shocking manner, the artist dressed the devil in the fashionable Pluderhosen. The devil, however, "sey ... kommen / vnd dem Mahler einem gewaltigen Backenstreich geben / vnd gesagt: Er habe jm gewalt gethan / mit vnwarheit also gemahlet / denn er nicht so scheuszlich vnd grewlich sey / als er jn mit den Luderhosen abconterfeyet habe" (B, fol. 43la). Thus, it should be well understood, Musculus adds, that the devil himself was ashamed to wear the baggy trousers. If the end of the world does not come soon, our descendants will have it worse than those in hell because of today's youth. In fact, Musculus maintains that the "Hosenteuffel" "der sich in diesen tagen vnd jaren / allererst ausz der Helle begeben / den Jungengesellen in die Hosen gefahren / vnd in sechsz tausend jaren nie sich hat dürffen herfür machen / Dasz ichs gewisslich dafür dem Jüngstentag in der ordnung / als der letzte / auch das seine auff Erden thun vnd auszrichten sol" (B, fol. 43la).

In eight chapters dealing with eight major sins, which the author feels are the result of the "Hosenteuffel's" domination of the younger generation, Musculus attacks this latest rage in men's fashions. First of all there is the encouragement of immodesty and unchastity since "ein boszhafftiger vnd vnverschämteter Teuffel jetzunder die jungen Leut regieret / die so vergesslich mit kurzzen Röcken / die nicht recht die Nestel erreichen / vnd mit Hellischen flammen das entblössen / vnd jederman so vnverschämpt das für
die Augen stellen / zum ärgerniss vnd anreitzung böser be-
gierde vnd lüste / das auch die Natur bedeckt vnd verborgen
haben wil" (B, fol. 431b); also because "vnsere Jungegesellen
jhnen so lassen so kurtze Röcke vnd Mäntel machen / die nicht
die Nestel / geschweige denn den Latz bedecken / vnd die Hosen
so zuludern lassen / den Latz fornen also mit Hellischen
Flammen vnd Lumpen vnmenschlich vnd gross machen" (B, fol.
432b). Wearing such a costume is mockery of the simple,
"zugethane" clothes of our ancestors (cf. B, fol. 432a-432b,
434a). The new fashion, and all that goes with it, has also
tarnished the prestige of the German nation:

Alle Nation / Wahlen / Spanier / Frantzosen / Polen / Vngern / Tattern / Türcken / haben ihre Kleider / vnd
gewöhnliche zudeckung desz Leibes / wie sie es von
ihren Eltern empfangen / behalten / allein Teutsch-
land hat der vnsverschämpte Teuffel gar besessen / vnd
eyngenommen / dass jetzunder mehr zucht / scham vnd
ehbarkeit im Venus Berg / vnd vorzeiten in den Hinder-
häusern / gewesen ist / als bey vns Teutschen / die
wir doch vns alle jetzunder Ehrbar / Ehrsam / vnd Ehr-
veste schreiben vnd nennen / vnd nicht so viel Ehrbar-
keit / Ehr vnd Zucht / haben / als eine Mücke mag auff
dem schwantz wegführen" (B, fol. 433a).

Musculus complains of the new style in trousers for
various reasons, e.g., he protests because of the embarrass-
ment which the parents will suffer; secondly, "wegen der
ärgernisz vnd anreitzung zu allen bösen begierden. Zum
dritten / von wegen der vnkost / dass jetzunder ein junger
Rotztöffel / ehe er noch das gele vom schnabel gar abge-
wüschet / mehr Gelts zu einem par Hosen haben musz / als
sein Vatter zum Hochzeitkleyd" (B, fol. 433a). Musculus
remarks that the waste of money and the arrogance that young
men show when they buy and wear the baggy pants are typified in the account of the mercenary "der sich habe lassen 99. Elen unter füttern / da ist er gefragt worden / warum er nicht hab 100. Elen genommen / hat er geantwortet / 99. sey ein lang wort / vnd gut Landesknechtisch / 100. aber sey kurz / vnd nicht so prächtig zu reden" (B, fol. 433a).

Germany and its virtues are lamentable; indeed, "wir hetten es wol verdient / dasz GOTT ein frembd Volck vber das ander vber vns Teutschen hereyn führet / vnd sie mit Krieg vnd Blutvergisesung vns ausz der Welt gar ausztiletgen vnd trieber . . . als Leut / die nicht wehrt sind . . . Wie denn Gott zuvor in der Sündflut / von wegen vnzüchtigkeit der Kinder Gottes mit den Töchtern der Menschen / gehandelt hat / welcher Sünd doch Kinderspiel / on allen zweifel / gegen offt vnd vielgenaüter jetziger Vnzucht gewest ist" (B, fol. 433a). This and the other foregoing statements are typical of the devil literature in general. Each of the special devils is considered the cause of the deplorable moral situation. Musculus, for example, further maintains that one can tell a man's virtue and thoughts by the clothes he wears: "An deinen Federn / zerlapten Hosen keñt man dich / was du für ein leichtfertiger / bübischer / vnd vnzüchtiger Mensch seyest" (B, fol. 434a). Each devil-book asserts that its title figure tempts, takes possession, and directs the individual's actions, and thus creates a situation in which the other "Lasterteufel" are able to go to work. Musculus,
following Friderich's example in the *Sauffteuffel*, expresses this thought several times, for example: "Ich meyn ja / das heisse sich schön schmücken / das mögen ja schöne Hosen seyn vnd heissen / Aber hier hilfft kein sagen / der Teuffel hat jetzunder die Jugend gar verblendet / vnd sitzet jnen mit gantzen Legionen in den Lappen vnd Lumpen" (B, fol. 434a).

Musculus realizes the ultimate solution to the problem lies with the hoped-for action on the part of civil authorities. He makes the satirical suggestion: "Ich achte auch / eine Oberkeyt thete nicht vbel daran / wenn sie sonst solche Vnzucht night straffen wolten / dasz sie böse Buben bestell- eten / die jnen / als Meewunder vnd Fasznachts Narren / nach- lieffen" (B, fol. 434a). He admits that "mit vns predigern ist es umsonst / wir sind diesem Teuffel allein zu schwache / wo die Weltliche Oberkeyt nit jre Hand mit anlegen," and expresses the hope "dasz Fürsten vnd Herrn solchem Fürnemen Nachsetzten / vnd den Hosenteuffel wider zu der Hellen ausz Teutschland jagten vnd trieben" (B, fol. 434b). In the hope that his warning and suggestions will be heard, he dedicates his tract to the two mayors of Frankfurt, Caspar Witterstadt and Michael Bolfrass.

The first edition of the *Hosenteuffel* (1555) was introduced by Gregorious Wagner's "Reime vom zötlichten Hosen Teuffel." None of the other editions, including those in the *Theatrum Diabolorum*, reprint these verses. The poem presents a summary of the development of dress, which amounts to
a statement that clothes have become increasingly more sinful through the years until now the highest degree of vulgarity, immorality, and licentiousness has been attained in the Pluderhosen.

Musculus' Hosenteuffel is in general the model for almost all the following devil-books; in particular, it is the direct source of inspiration and material for those tracts which deal with the devil and fashions, e.g., Joachim Westphal's Wider den Hoffartsteuffel (1565) which attacks arrogance and extravagance in dress, and Johannes Strauss' Wider den Kleyder, Pluder, Pansz vnd Krausz Teuffel (1581) which on almost every page quotes or refers to Musculus' work. Heinrich Grimm (p. 545) lists several seventeenth century works that use the Hosenteuffel of the 1588 edition of the Theatrum Diabolorum as an important source, e.g., Johannes Ellinger's Allemodischer Kleyder-Teuffel (1629) and Johann Ludwig Hartmann's Allemode-Teuffel (1679). 8

Musculus' Wider den Ehteuffel (1556), which was written shortly after the same author's Fluchteuffel (1556), was just as influential as the Hosenteuffel, for it was the model for a group of devil-books concerning the various devils active within the family and marriage circle. Musculus' material, topic, and approach were in general not new. A Lutheran influence is more apparent here than with the Hosenteuffel, but the influence is at best only indirect; for Musculus composed his book almost entirely in a similar style
and with the same content and organization as the preceding works on the topic.

Waldemar Kawerau observes that there were two general literary approaches to the subject of women and marriage in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, i.e., the literature in favor and the many satirical works against married life. First of all, within the realm of the so-called "Grobianismus," which was prevalent at the time, marriage was satirized, women in particular, in the many anecdotes, tales, jokes, etc., that the people loved to tell, write, and read. In fact, the "böse, lasterhafte, putzsüchtige, kokette, und untreue Frau" developed within this literature to a definite, satirical type. Women were simply a "viel belachtes Thema." Kawerau gives several examples of works in which the "weiberverfeindliche Satire" occurs, e.g., in Thomas Murner's Narrenbeschwörung (1512), Mühle von Schwindelsheim (1515), and Gäuchmatt (1519), in many of Sebastian Franck's collected "Sprichwörter," and in the countless anecdotes of the era.

The Lutheran notion of marriage created an attitude quite in opposition not only to the Catholic view but also to that of the preceding satires. Luther taught that marriage was a divinely instituted ordinance and, of course, rejected the Catholic idea of celibacy as well as any light-hearted approach to the subject. Fifty years earlier, Albrecht von Eyb in his Ehebüchlein (1472), with which Luther was well acquainted, had given stimulus for a more thorough and serious
treatment of married life. Until Luther, however, "Sankt Grobian" dominated the subject. Luther and his orthodox followers founded an "Eheliteratur" in which a battle was waged against all the vices which create an unhappy home, e.g., infidelity, immorality, bickering, drinking, etc. (Luther was not the first to do this but the first to be taken seriously. Brant, for example, had discussed the topic in the Narrenschiff: chapters 13, 32, and 33.)

Some of Luther's followers who wrote about the ideal virtues of marriage also furnished Musculus with material for the Eheteufl. Leonhard Culmann in his Unterweisung für Junggesellen, Jungfrauen und Witwen (1532) laments that marriage is so evilly slandered that young people are often frightened away. He preaches in favor of matrimony stating that it is a creation, institution, ordinance, and commandment of God. Musculus uses that exact terminology. Erasmus Alberus, often blunt and coarse, praised matrimony and family life in several of his works, although he did not deny the "leidenschaftliches und stürmisches Temperament" of marriage. In his Ein gut buch von der Ehe (1536), a very free translation of the Venetian Franciscus Barbarus' De re uxoria (completed 1416, published 1513 in Paris, 1533 in Hagenau), and his Ehebüchlein (1539) Alberus declares that Satan will never rest until he has destroyed the divinely instituted marriage which from the beginning had aggravated and disgusted the devil. Alberus uses some of Erasmus von Rotterdam's
dialogues on the topic even though Erasmus was not always favorably disposed toward marriage. In Alberus' *Ein Predigt vom Ehestand, vber das Evangelium, Es war ein Hochzeit zu Cana* (1546) all the best witnesses of the sixteenth century in favor of marriage are included. After Alberus, almost all the works on this topic either are based on the marriage at Cana (John, Chapter II) or the creation scene of Adam and Eve in Genesis, Chapter II. Alberus gives eight reasons why we should praise marriage, and thus eight reasons why the devil is so against it and seeks by all means to destroy it. The organization of Musculus' *Eheteuffel* is a direct copy of Alberus' *Ehebüchlein* and *Predigt vom Ehestand*, and thus is not original as Osborn leads us to believe. Musculus was also well acquainted with Johann Freder's *Ein Dialogus dem Ehestand zu Ehren geschrieben* (1545), Petrus Praetorius' *Christlicher Unterricht vom Ehestand* (1549), and Erasmus Sarcerius' *Buch von dem heiligen Ehestande vnd von allen Ehesachen, mit allen vmstendigkeiten* (1553).

It must be noted that the convention of misogyny was certainly not dead. In fact, the Reformation furthered a segment of the satirical literature on the topic of marriage, women, and family life in general. The Protestants, including Luther, never hesitated to criticize and satirize, as was done for centuries, the Catholic celibacy and the alleged immoral practices of the priests and nuns. On the other hand, the Catholics never lost the opportunity to
criticize protestant marriage, e.g., Murner's *Von dem grossen lutherischen Narren* (1522) makes a crude joke of Luther's and other protestants' marriage ideals, and Simon Lemnius' bitter attack *Ein heimlich Gespräch* (1539). Concerning satires on marriage in the sixteenth century Kawerau (p. 771) observes the following: "Pantoffelhelden und zanksüchtige böse Weiber wurden mehr und mehr die stehenden Lieblingsfiguren in den Schwänken und Spottliedern; immer zahlreicher wurden die Schilderungen unglücklicher zerütteter Ehen; derbe Zank- und Prügelszenen wurden mit Behagen ausgemalt. Sankt Grobian herrschte eben im Hause und auf der Gasse; er herrschte auch in der Litteratur und trieb selbst auf den Kanzeln sein Unwesen." Women's extravagance in clothes, the drinking of the men, and unfaithfulness were important causes of family trouble.

"Doktor Sieman" (i.e., "die das Hausregiment führenden herrschend zanksüchtigen Weiber") was also a favorite figure of both popular wit and moralistic, didactic preachers. Kawerau (p. 773) adds that "... bald schelten und polternd, bald mit feinerem oder roherem Witz ging man ihm zu Leibe, aber, wie das Sprichwort lautete, 'den Sieman kann man nicht vertreiben, er will doch Herr im Hause bleiben'." Hans Sachs, for example, often satirizes the evil and domineering wife and at the same time scoffs and makes fun of the henpecked husband in several of his shrovetide plays, e.g., in the *Spiel vom bösen Weibe* (1533) and in the play *Der böse Rauch*
(1551), the moral of both being no matter how diligently the husband tries, or whatever means he might employ, the situation usually stays the same. These elements and ideas of "Grobian" satire appear in Musculus' Eheteuffel in the description of the devil's activities in the family and in Musculus' sixth chapter (cf. B, fol. 299b) in which he expresses, among other similar notions, the idea that women are inferior to men.

Finally, this idea of the devil being actively engaged in family affairs in order to destroy marriages was certainly not new with Musculus, or even with Luther, who often mentioned the devil in connection with the problems of matrimony. Nor was the creation of a specific "Eheteufel" new, as Osborn indicates. "Der Teufel ist im Hause los" was a common statement among the people long before the Reformation. The domineering wife is also frequently considered the personification of the "Eheteufel" in satires and anecdotes. Furthermore, this devil is used in several late medieval religious plays and also appears in shrovetide plays of both the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, such as those by Sachs. Protestant authors gladly employ the devil, who is often supported by an old witch-like woman, in the biblical dramas which deal with a pious marriage. The plays of the Susanna group are a good example. A special devil is used by Paul Rebhun in his Hochzeit zu Cana (1538), in this case the Lutheran "Eheteufel" Asmodeus which also
appears in Chryseus' *Hoffteuffel* (1545). Musculus was well acquainted with these works; in addition, he was well aware of the many marriage sermons in which the devil was certainly almost always mentioned and the foregoing protestant and popular ideas on matrimony were discussed.

"Mit was heymischen Hertzen vnd schilfenden Augen . . . mit was listen vnd Bubenstückten" this devil rages against the bonds of marriage, became the theme of Musculus' *Eheteuffel*. Just like Culmann and Alberus, Musculus also begins by maintaining that there is no other divine ordinance so repulsive to the devil and which he is so determined to destroy. Satan's enmity also extends to those who praise marriage in word or writing. There are indeed eight points of the divine ordinance, as with Alberus, against which the special devil concentrates his attack, i.e., against which he tempts man to sin. Musculus arranges these eight points into chapters and uses as the basis for the work the second chapter of Genesis (18-25).

The "Eheteufel" first of all plants all sorts of evil thoughts in the minds of men (e.g., anyone in his right mind would not want to live in such bondage, toil, and degradation) and thereby fosters an antipathy towards marriage. These thoughts create such evil sayings as: "Es ist kein Weib gut / auch die aller best nicht;" "Wer wil einen Feind zu Tisch vnd Bett haben / wer mit zanck vnd hader sich wil niderlegen / vnd auffstehen / der nemme ein Weib;" for "Ein Eheweb ist
nicht anders im Hausz / als ein dick / schwartz / vnd vn-
gestüm Wetter am Himmel;" also, if you marry a beauty, you
will not have her·to yourself; if you marry "eine scheuss-
liche," you will always have "eine gewisse straffe für augen"
(B, fol. 293b). And so men think that taking a wife means
nothing other than "vnglucks hosen anziehen." Others reject
marriage categorically as something evil to avoid. The devil
puts thoughts into the minds of men that all is bad that God
creates or considers good. The devil has succeeded to the
point that: "Wie denn wir Teutschen auch sagen: Dasz der
glückselig sey / dem die Weiber wol abgehen" (B, fol. 293b).
Musculus admits that marriage is at present not an ideal
situation, "es läuft viel böses mit vnter," but in spite
of that, the good Christian is obligated to fulfill the
commandment of God to marry. To seriously pose the question
whether one should take a faithful wife or not, as Albrecht
von Eyb had done, was blasphemous in Musculus eyes.

The "Eheteufel" has been very successful among the
heathens who often practice polygamy and among the priests
and nuns who theoretically practice celibacy. Monasteries,
convents, and the papal court comprise a devil's paradise of
immorality. The Catholic Church bases its concept of celibacy
on devilish not biblical reasons (B, fol. 294a).

Since the fall of Adam the devil has created a situation
in which man marries more out of "vnmenschliche, vnordentliche
vnd viehische brunst" than out of a desire to multiply and
replenish God's kingdom (B, fol. 295a). On the theory that true divine love did not exist when marriage was created, the devil sows all sorts of "Vnkraut" in marriages after the first few days or years. "Wenn die erste hitz ein wenig ge-tilget" the devilish saying becomes true which states: "Wer wil einen Tag wol leben / der würg ein Gansz / Wer wil acht Tag wol leben / der schlacht ein Schwein / wer aber wil vier Wochen ein gut leben haben / der nemme ein Weib" (B, fol. 295a). The devil creates disunity by various means, e.g., by driving the man into the tavern to drink and gamble and by tempting the woman with arrogance and extravagance in clothes. As an example, Musculus recounts the tale of the devil who, by means of an evil old woman and her lies, provokes a happy couple to fight each other until the wife is finally murdered. 16

Many young people get married only because of passions, drunkenness, or other light-hearted reasons (a "zugreiffen one Gottes schickunge," B, fol. 297a). The devil is delighted with these marriages because he can easily make "ein kuræs ende" of such bonds. The devil makes young people set their sights on "Schönheit / Geschlecht / Gelt / Essen / Trincken / Kleyder vnd Freundschaft" and living only for each day. Musculus says that God should be the "Freyersmann" as He was with Adam. One should pray to God and then thank Him for the wife one receives. The husband should love his wife as his own being on which he covers "was schäbig / grindig vnd vnrein ist" (B, fol. 298b).
In the sixth and seventh chapters (B, fol. 299b-301a) the traditional "Grobianismus" is easily recognizable in Musculus' discussion of women and the "Kampff um die hosen." The author maintains that woman was made a "Gesellin / Hel-fferin / Mitherrin vnd Regiererin" and not man's master; after the Fall she was made subject to man (his "vnderthan"). The old idea that women are not worthy of equality and all the satire that goes with that shows up here. The devil, however, has enticed her "dasz sie sterbe [sic, = strebe] / denckte vnd trachte / wie sie zugleich regiere vnd herrsche / vnd Adam das Regiment ausz der Hand neμe" (B, fol. 300a). Musculus notes that in their quest to rule men, women have seldom failed; indeed, their success has been so great that it is difficult to find a home "da nicht Doctor Sieman inne regiert" (B, fol. 300a). The tyranny of wives, one result of the endeavors of the "Eheteufel," has had compounding effects on the marriage bond. Husbands, for example, who come home from a drinking party, are too frequently driven back to the taverns by "Doctor Sieman." The final result is the ultimate success of the "Eheteufel" of whom we should all be well informed and against whom we should all take precautionary measures to protect and perpetuate a divinely instituted ordinance and, of course, our own happiness.

In conclusion it can be stated that Musculus probably took the title for his Eheteuffel from Paul Rebhun's Hoch-zeit zu Cana. The content of Musculus' tract is drawn from
the works of Albrecht von Eyb, Leonhard Culmann, Petrus Praetorius, Erasmus Sarcerius, Johann Freder, Erasmus Alberus, and the many current sermons on the topic. Eyb's role in the development of this literature, it should be noted, is significant. While in Italy (1453-1459), where marriage literature began with Barbarus' *De re uxoria* (1416), Eyb collected many copies of humanistic and classical works on the topic and brought them back to Germany. His *Ehebüchlein* (1472), for example, is based on those materials. The Eyb-Barbarus-classical sources had a direct effect on the above mentioned authors, especially on Alberus who was Musculus' most immediate source for his *Eheteuffel*.

Satirical elements come from those such as Sebastian Brant, Thomas Murner, Hans Sachs, many sayings from Sebastian Franck, and the "Grobianismus" from the many anecdotes, satires, etc. of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The organization of the *Eheteuffel* is a direct copy of that found in Alberus' *Ehebüchlein* and *Ein Predigt vom Ehestand*. Finally, there is the Lutheran influence, the atmosphere in which much of the above developed and could be said.

Musculus' *Eheteuffel* was the model, as was the *Hosensteuffel*, for the protestant devil literature in general and in particular for several devil books on the home and the devil's activities there. Nicolaus Schmidt's satirical, misogynous tract *Von den zehen Teufeln oder Lastern / damit die bösen vnartigen Weiber besessen sind* (1557) was the first
to model a devil-book after Musculus' *Eheteuffel*. Whereas Musculus emphasizes the vices of men (except for the sixth and seventh chapters), Schmidt emphasizes the follies of women. Schmidt actually continues where Musculus left off. Other works modeled on the *Eheteuffel* are Adam Schubart's *Sieman / das ist wider den Hausteuffel* (1564), Peter Glaser's *Gesind Teuffel* (1564), Andreas Hoppenrod's *Wider den Huren Teufel* (1565), Johannes Sommer's *Malus Mulier* (1609), and Balthasar Kindermann's *Die bösen Sieben* (1662). Cyriacus Spangenberg's *Ehespiegel in 70 Braut-Predigten* (1561) should also be mentioned with the above works, although it is not a devil-book.

The style, language, and content of the seventy-odd literary works which Musculus wrote had an immediate and noticeable effect upon his contemporaries; the two devil-books discussed here are good examples of that influence. Musculus studied in Wittenberg and became, as his works attest, an intolerant, often obstinate and stubborn, orthodox Lutheran. Heinrich Grimm (p. 547) describes quite well the Lutheranism to which Musculus belonged:

Das Gnesioluthertum wollte und konnte keinen Finger breit von dem abgehen, was das "electum dei organon" gesagt und geschrieben hatte; an Stelle der päpstlichen Dekretalen traten bei ihm die lutherischen. Es gestaltete streitbare, von abergläubischen Todesahnungen und Vorstellungen des Teufels und des jüngsten Gerichts erfüllte und bestimmte Theologen, die vom Katheder und mit Gänsekiel und Druckerschwarze gegen alle anderen Lehren als Irrlehren eiferten. Anziehend wirkte bei diesen Altlutheranern die aus humanistischer Wurzel kommende, stete Betonung ihres Deutschtums, ihre Sorge um das deutsche Vaterland.
Musculus, along with Luther and his other disciples, felt that vice was rampant and that Germany was certainly being led by Satan and all his special devil-servants down the road to hell and divine destruction. Not only the devil-books (Hosenteuffel, Fluchteuffel, Ehteteuffel, and Des Teuffels Tyrannney) but also other works by Musculus, which were not published under the title of the devil but which nevertheless belong to this same general category, inspired the development of devil-tracts and contributed to that literature's color and direction. Musculus' tract Unterrichtung Vom Wucher, Geitz vnd Reichtumb (Frankfurt/O., 1556), for example, served as a model for Albert von Blanckenberg's Vom Juncker Geitz vnd Wucherteufel (1562). In Lutheran church affairs the Frankfurt professor's contemporaries considered him "der brandenburgische Papst." Just as dominant in literature, Musculus was the main initiator and promoter of the devil-books.
NOTES
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CHAPTER III

CYRIACUS SPANGENBERG'S JAGTEUFFEL
AND JODOCUS HOCKER'S DER TEUFEL SELBS

Es ist zu Mäyland ein Artzt gewesen / der sich der thörichten vnd wahnsinnigen menschen hab angenommen / vnd denselbigen zu helfen sich unterstanden / vnd war dieses sein Artzney / Er hette einen grossen tieffen stinkenden sumpff oder Pfütz in seinem Hof / dareyn setzet er di vnsinnigen Leut / vnd band sie an darzu bereytet Pfeil oder Seulen / einen tieffen denn den andern / dannach jre gebrechen waren / etlich bisz an die Knie / etliche bisz an nabel / etliche bisz an den halsz / vnd liesz sie darinnen baden vnd hungern / bisz sie gesund wurden. Nu hette er einen vnter den andern / mit dem es sich nach 15. tagen geändert vnd gebeesert hatte / den liesz er losz / doch dasz er nit aus dem Hof ginge. Hierinn waren jm der arme Mensch gehorsam. Da er nu einmal an der Thür stund / kompt ongefehr einer daher geritten mit zweyen Hunden vnd einem Habich auff der Hand / denselben rieff er an / als hett er jhm etwas nötigs anzuseigen. Da er nu zu ihm kam / fraget er jn / was das sey / vnd wie es heisse / darauff er sitze (denn in seiner vnsinnigkeit war er also vergessen worden / dasz er nichts bey seinem rechten Namen nennen konnte) Der Reutersmann antwortet ihm / es sey ein Pferd / welches er zum beissen halte. Jener fragt weiter / was denn das auff der Hand sey / vnd warzu ers brauche? Er sagt: Es sey ein Habich / da fahe er Wachteln / Rephüner vnd andere Vögel / mit. Der arme Mensch fraget vber das / wer denn die sind / die neben jhm herlaufen. Das sind Hunde (spricht jener) die ich zu beissen haben musz / dasz sie mir die Vögel aufftreiben. Lieber sag mir (sprach der Thor) was sind wol die Vögel wehrt / die du das gantze Jar vber fahest / vnd darüber so viel zeit verleurst / so viel mühe vnd arbeit darzu hast? Der Reuter sagt / etwan ein vier / fünff / oder auffs meist ein sechsz gülden. Da fragt er weiter: Was kostet aber wol das Pferd / der Habich / vnd die Hunde? Der Reuter antwortet / sie kosten ein auffs wenigste ein füntzig gülden / on was sie zu erhalten gestehen. (O sprach der Thor) Ich bitte dich vmb Gottes willen / seume dich hie nicht lang / sondern reit auffs eylends du
Cyriacus Spangenberg's (1528-1604) *Jagteuffel* (1560) is not directed against hunting *per se*; it is, however, a very candid and often blunt attack against the rampant abuses of this traditional practice of the social elite. The above is an example of Spangenberg's attitude and his use of all the historical sources he could find for a witness against the vices of hunting; in the above example, the anecdote satirizes in particular the foolish waste of time, energy, and money for a sport which should either be improved or abolished. Spangenberg prefaces the tale by the following statement: "Eins hat mich vber alle masz wunder / dasz die grossen Herrn vnd Junckern / die doch sonst all jre siñ auff den eygen nutz vñ grossen gewiñ gerichtet haben / so gar nit mercken vnd sehen / was ihnen für vnträgliche vnkosten järlich auff die vnmässigen Jagten geht" (B, fol. 269a).¹

In the introduction Spangenberg gives a brief history of the development of hunting, including the passage from honorable hunting to the current dominant abuses of the sport. Indeed, it is the abuse of the poor people and their property which has caused Spangenberg to write his book. "Denn viel grosser Herrn . . . sich mit solcher grausamkeit gegen arme Leute / vnd beschwerlicher unterdruckung der Vnderthanen also
gebrauchen / dass es auch wol möchte ein tyranisch Jagen genannt werden" (B, fol. 249b). He declares that he does not want to stop hunting, but rather the "evil" conduct of most of its participants. He wants to explain to the nobility, "wie ferrn das Jagen recht vnd one Sünd künne gebraucht werden / damit sie jre kurtzweil vnd Herrligkeiten mit gutem gewisen halten vnd vben mögen. Vnd wil darnach dagegen anzeigen / warinnen vnd warmit sie leyder jetziger zeit jnen die Jagten selbst verdammlich machen / damit sie / was vnrecht ist / meiden vnd bessern / vnd also ewiges ver- derben jrer eygen Leibs vnd Seelen verhüten mögen" (B, fol. 248b).

Spangenberg establishes the rules according to which "rechtmässige Jagten" should take place. Introducing twelve short chapters in which these rules are described and supported by anecdotes, and strongly implying that hunting is seldom practiced in such a manner, the author expresses the following:

Rechtmässige vñ vom Gott zugelassene Jagten sind / da die Oberkeiten / oder wer es sonst macht / fug vnd recht hat / in vnd auff dem jren / oder auff eines andern grundt vnd boden / mit bewilligung desselbigen / die wilden / schädlichen / oder sonst vnzame Thier / jagen / hetzen / fahen / fellen vnd würgen / one Gotteslästerung / one versäumnisz vnd hinderung desz Gottesdiensts / one schaden vnd beleydigung des Nächsten / oder der Vnderthanen / one nachtheil desz Ackerbauwes / Entweder sich noch viel gehabter mühe zu erlustigen / oder ander wollüsten zu meiden / anderer Leute schaden zu verhüten / vnd für sich vnd andere etwas in die Küchen zu verschaffen / etc. solches Jagen kan Gott wol dulden / ist auch von der Natur vnd allen Rechten nachgelassen. (B, fol. 294b)
Spangenberg recognizes the value of a properly conducted hunting-party, to refresh one's mind and disposition, for example. In addition to the above, hunting should serve "zu vermeiden Geilheyt / Vnkeuschheit / vnd andere fleischliche Wollust" (B, fol. 253a-253b).

Speaking of the "Gottlosen vnchristlichen vnbillichen Jagten / so leyder jetziger zeit in aller Welt bräuchlich sind / vnd billich solten abgeschafft / oder doch geändert werden" (B, fol. 255aff), the author maintains that the current hunting practices will be an important cause of the nobility's eventual damnation. Spangenberg proceeds to explain why the authorities should stop illegal and immoral hunting. The twenty reasons given in the following chapters should also help the nobles save their souls and, if the suggestions are implemented, prevent further abuses and destruction of persons and property. All the reasons for abolishing or changing hunting practices, and thus the causes of the abuses, are supported by historical or contemporary examples. Swearing and cursing and animosity to neighbors, for example, are shameful enough; "Vnderdruckung vnd be-schwerung armer Leut / sonderlich der Vnderthanen" (B, fol. 255b-257a) are inexcusable. Many a hunting-party has ruined peasants' gardens, vineyards, and fields just to chase some unimportant animal. Concerning this destruction of property that puts the souls of nobility in danger, Spangenberg quotes the verse: "Wer Land vnd Leut durch vnrecht drengt // Ob dem
das Schwerdt am Faden hengt" (B, fol. 256b). The devil is indeed behind such action as the following saying attests: "Der Teuffel manchen Ritter hat // Der dort musz leiden ewig not" (B, fol. 256a). The author further quotes Hans von Schwarzenburg's poetry which attacks the immorality of both the hunting-parties and the participants: "Wer jagt nach lust / mit armer leyd // Das ist von art desz Teuffels freud" (B, fol. 256a). The "Verseumnisz der Predigt / vnd anderer Gottesdienst" and the neglect of one's authoritative position and duties are further examples of the devil's influence.

Spangenberg is especially upset with the "tyrannische Greuwligkeit" of the social elite:


All this and many more "tyrannical" practices take place just so a select few can hunt. The nobility actually fine the peasants for such "illegal" actions as driving off or killing destructive animals or building fences (B, fol. 259a-260a). One way or another the peasants lose in the matter. Spangenberg lists several of the many restrictive laws against peasants and asks the nobles why they have to be so merciless
and unreasonable. There seems to be no end to the tyranny, and Spangenberg gives several unpleasant accounts of nobles employing peasants instead of dogs or using the peasants as game after whom the dogs were sent.  

Spangenberg now lists all the famous hunters of antiquity he can find in literature, e.g., Chiron, Achilles, Nestor, Hippolytus, Pollux, Jason, Darius, and Alexander, all of whom were virtuous compared to the hunters of today (B, fol. 261b). The vices of hunting and hunters today show a parallel to the devil who is hunting for souls; indeed, just like Satan, the hunters employ the same methods and tools: "da brauchet man Hund vnd Gewalt / vnd strick zu list" (B, fol. 262a, 270b). Spangenberg quotes the opinions of historical figures, Augustin, for example, who calls "das Jagen die aller schalckhafftigste kunst" (B, fol. 262a); others have called hunting "Blutdurstige wollust," "eine wilde greuwligkeit der Menschen" (B, fol. 262b). Hunting, some nobles say, is their heaven on earth. The author sarcastically adds: "Vnd das wolt auch folgen / wenn desz Menschen lust sein Himmelreich ist / das fressen / sauffen / Hurerey treiben / geitzen / steien / Hoffart / Todschlag / vnd dergleichen Laster / darinnen viel Leut jre lust suchen / jr Himmelreich seyn müszte. Fürwar ein schön Himmelreich / dareyn solche vnrüwige Engel vnd Heiligen gehören" (B, fol. 262b).

"Geilheyt," "hinderlistige verrähterey vnd Todschlag," "Ehebruch vnd Hurerey," the "Gefehrligkeiten auff den Jagten"
(examples, e.g., from Maximilian's Theuerdank [1517]), "Betrug," "Arglist," "Vndanckbarkeit," and other vices of hunters are discussed in detail (B, fol. 263a-271a). In conclusion, Spangenberg simply states that hunting would be acceptable in its proper form, but it has seldom ever been practiced properly or "righteously."

The author remarks that he will now end his book, "denn ich mich auch gleich müde gejaget hab" (B, fol. 272a). Spangenberg contends that he has not said anything that is not true; in fact, most of the tract came from other authorities, and so no one should condemn or persecute him for attacking the abuses of a practice of the social elite.

Spangenberg points with pride to his Jagteuffel. He knows that his work is pleasing in the sight of God, for he has the clear proof that it is unpleasant to the devil:

Ich weysz sehr wol / dasz es dem Teuffel hefftig entggen gewesen / vnd ja trefflich verdrossen / dasz ich disz Buch zu schreiben fürgenomen / hat mich auch auff mancherley weisz daran verhindert / vnd da ich es das erstemal gefertigt vnd vollendet hatte / auff den vierdten tagen desz Jenners / dieses 1560. Jars / hat er ausz grimmigen zorn so viel zu wegen bracht / dasz vnter der Abendmalzeit in meinem Studierstüblin von einer Liechtputzen ein Feuwer auskommen / welches mir alle die Bücher / so dazumal auff demselbigen Tisch gelegen / verbrennet vnd verderbet hat / vnd in etliche Gülden wehrt schaden gethan . . . vnd ist von allen Büchern / die beschadiget worden / etwas vberblieben / dasz man erkennen mögen / was es gewesen / Aber vom Jagteuffel / wie ich denselben gestellet . . . hatte man doch nicht eine Zeil oder einen Buchstaben funden / sondern hatte es der Teuffel beydes so reyn auffgezehret / als were zuvor nichts da gewesen. (B, fol. 272a)

The courageous pastor, however, states that he did not want
to succumb to the devil's designs, "sondern was ich im sinne gehabt / wider auffs Papyr bracht / vnd diese Arbeyt von neuwen förgenommen / vnd zum andermal vollendet" (B, fol. 272b) - and fortunately this time got the book to the printer!

Compared with Musculus' more rhetorical devils, Spangenberg's Jagteuffel denotes a new style in the devil-books. Before he began to write, Spangenberg systematically gathered all the literature of antiquity, the Middle Ages, and his own time that he could find or get his hands on that dealt with hunting and its evaluation as a vice. The Jagteuffel constitutes the most scholarly approach to creating a devil-book. Spangenberg, compared to Musculus who never gave recognition to his sources, documented everything he wrote and attached an alphabetical list of those sources, which, as he himself stated, should also help prevent any severe repercussions for his attack on the nobility. This "Scribentenverzeichnisz," which lists more than 145 authors and works, indicates the secure foundation and the depth of Spangenberg's education. This "bibliography" and the text itself also show that he did not turn to Luther as a source of information; he only used statements and examples from the reformer in a few cases and then only to support or add more authenticity to what he had already substantiated by other authorities.

Spangenberg's popularity and success as a poet, and in particular as a devil-book author, is attested by the literary circle in Mansfeld and the many imitations of his style.
Devil-books by Westphal, Milichius, Hocker, Porta, and Obenhin directly reflect that influence. From the time of the first edition of the *Jagteuffel* (1560), the devil-book, in most cases, is no longer more or less the result of a favorable poetic-rhetorical moment. Almost all the authors of these works about specialized devils adopt the same method, often with the result that the tracts were very dry and boring, especially if the author had little literary talent. Spangenberg, however, as noted earlier, had had a great deal of literary experience before he wrote the *Jagteuffel*, a factor which probably contributes most to the work's success and influence, especially in terms of style. Spangenberg suggested to one or another author specific devils and directed their work. This influence is clear from the approach and style of the following devil-books and from the prefaces which Spangenberg frequently wrote for these books. Besides these works or authors mentioned above, Andreas Angelus' *Jäger-Hörnlein, oder was man von Jägern halten sol* (1598), for example, was directly inspired by the *Jagteuffel*.

Sigmund Feyerabend reprinted Jodocus Hocker's (d. 1566) *Der Teufel selbs* (1568) at the beginning of his *Theatrum Diabolorum* as a demonological prologue to the following devil-books. Hocker's work is not a devil-book *per se* but, as it turns out, a comprehensive reference book of protestant demonology. Hocker's scholarly approach to the topic is a
direct result of Spangenberg's influence on the authors of the devil literature. Unfortunately, Hocker died before completion of his work. Before succumbing to the ravages of the plague, however, Hocker commissioned his good friend and fellow pastor Hermann Hamelmann to finish *Der Teufel selbs*. Hamelmann published the work in three parts; he was responsible for the preface, chapter 37, 40, 41, 42, 44, 46, and 47, several commentaries to other chapters, and for the entire third part in which his own "Segen wnd Wickerteuffel" appears. Hocker, following Spangenberg's example, introduces his work with an alphabetical "Verzeichnisz der Scribenten vnd Bücher / ausz welchen disz Buch / Der Teuffel selbs / zusammen gezogen," which contains more than two hundred names and titles. Hocker's approach to each question concerning the devil and his activities, i.e., the scheme to each chapter, is the following: the author in each case bases his answers or statements on scripture, then gives examples from scriptures, then furnishes supporting illustrations from early church fathers and other acceptable authorities.

There have always been those who do not believe in devils, and some people say that hell is not as hot as the pastors describe it, nor is the devil as black as the painters paint him. Others maintain that the pastors only want to frighten people for such purposes as obtaining money from congregations. In the light of such notions, Hocker declares it his task to prove the existence of devils and evil spirits (and that
there are even more than one would imagine), so that man can better understand and judge them and their works. The author says he will present his proof (1) by Bible witnesses and examples of devils and their deeds, (2) with scriptures and other literature from the heathens (the heathen gods were devils, of course), (3) from historical records, (4) from daily experiences which bear witness, e.g., war, pestilence, bloodletting, unhappiness, hunger, and the many illnesses, and (5) from an analysis of man's own nature (B, fol. 1b-3b). Man must assume that devils surround him even if he does not see or hear them. Hocker furnishes numerous illustrations from each of the above sources; among these, Hocker cites Luther's sermon on angels in which the reformer maintains the following:

\[
\text{Aber ein Christ sol das wissen / dass er mitten vnter den Teuffeln sitze / vñ dass jm der Teuffel nñher / denn der Rock oder Hembd / ja nñher / denn sein eigene Haut / Dass er rings vmb vns her sey / vnd wir also stäts mit jm zu haar ligen / vnd vns mit jhm schlahen müssen / wie das gemeine Sprichwort bezeuget: Man dürffe de Teuffel nicht vber die Thur malen. Das ist das erst / dass wir gewislich dafür halten / dass Teuffel seyn / vnd so nahend bey vnd vmb vns / dass sie die Gottlossen ihres gefallens in allerley Sünden treiben / etc. (B, fol. 3a)
\]

Luther is now (in Hocker's work) cited extensively, but by this time the pattern for the devil-books had already been set by Friderich, Musculus, and Spangenberg. However, Hocker still uses the reformer's utterances in the usual manner found in the devil literature - in a supporting role to that
which has already been illustrated by quotes from the Bible, church fathers, and other sources. This also indicates that Luther's demonology was indeed rooted in tradition, as was pointed out in an earlier chapter.

Hocker discusses the names, nature, and number of devils, for example: "Was die Teuffel seyn," "Ob die Teuffel Creatures seyn," "Wenn sie geschaffen seyn," "Wie sie geschaffen seyn," and "Wie viel jrer geschaffen sein" (B, fol. 3b-16b). Concerning the number of devils, Hocker cites various estimates among which that of Martin Borrhaus is mentioned who places the number at 2,665,866,746,664. These and other chapters agree in general with what we stated earlier about Luther's beliefs.

Neither the time nor the cause of the fall of these evil angels is certain; however, many have speculated, e.g., because of lust, envy, the will for power, and especially pride which Luther emphasizes (B, fol. 18a-24b). The intention of Satan and his hosts is to destroy or harm any creation of God, including man; the devils seek to lead men away from good works, and to entice the godless to be tools or servants to lead others into vices. Examples of specific activities are given. The devils, for instance, are active in three main classes of endeavor: in the spiritual, the worldly, and the marriage circle. Devils attempt to prevent members from performing their church duties, incite secular rulers to war and destruction, and the "Eheteufel" (Luther's "Asmodeus") is always busy
(B, fol. 28a-33b). Hocker gives numerous examples of "Abgötterey," "Gotteslästerung," "vonzucht vnd vnflätigkeit," "Dieberey," "Wucher vnd finanzerey," "seufferey vnd fresserey," "liegen vnd triegen," and "Begierde." Man, the author says, should know of the åmpeing danger day and night. "Sonderlich aber in diesen letzten gefehrlichen Zeiten / darinn der Teuffel / wie man sihet / vil grimmiger vnd hefftiger ist / vil mehr tobet vnd wütet / als je zuvor / vnd das vmb zweyer vrsachen willen." First of all, people of late are weaker and have less wisdom and serve the devil with their unorderly "schwelgen / fressen vnd sareffen" which, unfortunately, now dominate society: "Wievol wir Teutsche dennoch sonderlich mit dem Sauffteuffel besessen sind." The devil certainly knows well how to capitalize on the situation; there abound examples before our eyes of the devil directing people's activities and snaring their souls. Secondly, the world is old and Christ's day is soon at hand; therefore, the legions of devils are working overtime to succeed before being cast off forever (B, fol. 29b).12 The above quote from Luther is but one example of support Hocker employs from his authoritative sources. The Ten Commandments, for example, were primarily given to combat the forces and activities of hell that are opposite to these ten rules of righteous conduct; indeed, man can recognize many of the devil's attributes by considering Luther's interpretation of these commandments. "Bilde dir gar einem verzweifelten Manschen für / der ein
gar bösz Gewissen vnd Leben führet / da sihestu den Teuffel Leibhaftig," the author adds (B, fol. 39b).

There is order among the devils just as among the angels. Hocker maintains that there are nine classes or levels of devils: (1) "Pseudo Götter," (2) "Lügengeister," (3) devils who are the instruments of all lusts and vices, (4) "rach-girige Geister," (5) "Zuebergeister" of whom Satan is the prince, (6) "Luftgeister" (e.g., in thunder, lightning, storms, etc.), (7) the Furies, (3) "Schmehegeister," and (9) "die Versucher vnd arglistigen Geister" (B, fol. 48b). Learned theologians have established these classes. There are, however, as many differences among the devils as among the angels, for the infernal kingdom is an imitation of the divine order. "Etliche Teuffel sind verordnet zu dieser Sünd / andere zu andern Sünden / als etliche böse Geister sind / hoffart Teuffel / etliche neid Teuffel / etliche Hurenteuffel / etliche Spielteuffel / etliche Sauffteuffel / etliche Geitz vnd Wucherteuffel / die Menschen dazu zureitzen / vnd damit zu blenden" (B, fol. 49a). Hocker says that vice has a hord of devils. Each province, state, or nation, for example, has a special devil: "Derhalben wie Welschland der hoffart Teuffel / Teutschland der Fresz vnd Sauffteuffel / Griechenland der Lügenteuffel / Franckreich der Huren vnd Meineydgige Teuffel reitet / Also hat in einem jedem Menschen ein jedes Laster seinen Teuffel / vnd sonderlich desz lasters Teuffel / zu welchem Laster der Mensch am meisten geneigt ist." These
statements are supported by man including Luther.

In chapter twenty-one and twenty-two Hocker poses the questions: "Wo die Teuffel wohnen," and "Wo vnd was die Helle sey" (B, fol. 50b-52b). "Everywhere" is his answer; "Da schweben sie wie die Wolken vber vns," for example. They also reside in forests, swamps, deserted places, old homes, grave yards, and with the sinful wherever such people go. Hell per se will be created as a definite place after the Last Judgment. In the meantime it is wise, as Luther suggested to the pastors, "dasz man für den gemeinen Mann aufs einfeltigste auch von der Helle rede / vnd sie dem jungen Volck aufs gröbste fürbilde / wie man jämmer kan / damit man jhnen ein schrecken dafür machen möge" (B, fol. 51b). The devils are not yet in hell but all around us here on earth; they and the people who indulge in the vices are going to create and inhabit that place after the judgment. Actually, man carries hell with himself as long as God's grace is not with him and he remains in sin.

The devils were originally the creations of God who still has power over them in their fallen state. In other words, devils can only do that which God allows them to do (B, fol. 44b-46a). This point is important for the protestant devil-belief. Just as with Job, God proves man in this world to see if he will succumb to the adversary or remain true to heaven; and it is the grace of God that will bring
salvation. God lets the devil accomplish some things in order to show man the devil's power and to keep man alert. Hocker instructs his readers in the manner of protection man must employ against the evil forces (B, fol. 55b-58b). Spiritual weapons, i.e., the "armor of God": true faith, fervent prayer, and contempt for the devil are the best means of defense. 14

In his endeavor to snare souls, the devil can also work miracles; indeed, the history of the Catholic Church is full of wonders, all of which are of devilish origin (B, fol. 61a-71b). The author maintains that some popes were "Zäuberer" and "Schwartzkünstler" and thus able to accomplish miraculous deeds (B, fol. 72b-73a). As for magic, Hocker maintains, for example, that the devil so deftly steals milk, butter, and other things and so especially strives to have one believe that magic is involved. Hocker gives countless other examples of "Zauberey vnd Verblendung" of the devil (B, fol. 72b-79a, 112b). To this category of devilish deeds belongs, as the author remarks, "die vieljährige Lügen der Hexen" (B, fol. 99b-106b). Their magic is nothing other than pretense and deception with which the devil dupes these "arme Närrinnen." The "Zäuberer" are no different. Hocker shows some tolerance in his discussion of witches. He feels that judges should be careful not to be too cruel to old and feeble women who are most likely not witches at all but perhaps just a bit out of their minds or
have accepted talk of such things and may think themselves witches when under torture. Hocker maintains it is better to free a thousand guilty witches than to condemn one innocent woman. The authorities should recognize the true source of evil, that the devil is the cause of the wicked deeds of real witches; and therefore it should be the duty of these authorities to fight that enemy. Furthermore, judges themselves should avoid resorting to magic in obtaining confessions or in determining who is a witch or sorcerer (B, fol. 104a).

The third and final part of Der Teufel selbs is comprised of Hamelmann's "etliche erinnerungen" and "ein kurtzlich bedencken vber etliche vorige Capitel," "eine erinnerung von der Helle / vnd auch die Namen der Helle," and his "Segen vnd Wickerteuffel. Jtem / der Chrystallenteuffel / das ist / Ein bericht von dem Segen / Büssen / Wickern / Nachschweysern / Teuffelsbeschwerern / Chrystallensehern / vnd Schwartzkünstlern" who, as Hamelmann maintains, are currently too numerous. Something has to be done about them, for they travel around Germany with their "Zauberbriefen," "Charten," and "Bleyen Tafeln" deceiving the people with the help of these and other devilish tricks (B, fol. 117b-112a). The whole "Segen vnd Wickerteuffel" is really only a compilation of what Musculus, Luther, and others have already said on the topic. The conclusion of Hocker's work is a discussion by Hamelmann "vom denen / so sich selbs
vmbbringen / Ob die auch alle verdampt sind" (B, fol. 122b-126b). Suicide is of course condemned as devilish; only those "die jhrer nit mächtig sind vnd durch Tollheit / Melancholey / vnverstand solchs thun / die werden hie billich excipirt" and those who die to preserve honor and to defy tyranny have hope of salvation.

Osborn (pp. 48-49) evaluates Der Teufel selbs in the following manner:

Das ganze Buch ist äusserst unübersichtlich geschrieben, alles ist sehr breit ausgesponnen, die Gliederung der einzelnen Auseinandersetzungen sehr ungeschickt, manches, was zusammengehört, auseinandergerissen, die von Hamelmann geschriebenen Kapitel sind nicht einmal an ihrer Stelle eingefügt, sondern folgen den von Hocker verfassten. Dabei war eine Stilungleichheit keineswegs zu befürchten; denn die beiden Verfasser sind gleich trocken und unoriginell. In den Gang der sachlichen Erörterung ist wenig Abwechslung gebracht. Hintz kommt ein wunderliche Mischung von krassem Aberglauben und ernstem Streben, der natürlichen Deutung zum Rechte zu verhelfen. Durch die Anhäufung gelehrten Ballastes und die Einfügung langer lateinischer Citate wird sich die Schrift schwerlich Popularität erworben haben . . .16

one must note, however, that the significance of Der Teufel selbs does not lie so much in the work's organization or style, but in the position or role the book played in the devil literature in general.17 Indeed, in spite of its diffusion and lack of effective organization, the work offers a summary of those elements on which the devil-belief of Luther's followers was based. Hocker received from Spangenberg's Jagteuffel (1560) and Musculus' Von des Teufels Tyranneny (1564) strong stimulus for the scholarly research
and the content; the result, however, was not so much literary effectiveness but "eine Art Praktischer Ideologie in literarischer Form für alle Teufelsfragen der lutherischen Orthodoxie ...".18 Therein lies the value and significance of Der Teufel selbs.
NOTES

Chapter III

1 Cf. Brant, Narrenschaft, 74: "Von vnnutzem jagen."

2 E.g., B, fol. 253a: "Also dasz sie oft kein lust weder zu essen noch zu trincken / noch zu schlaffen haben / mögen sie sich wol desz rechtmâssige Jagens gebrauchen / jr Hertz / so etwam mit sorg / trauwrigkeit / oder andern bewegungen / gekrencket / widerumb durch solche kurtzweil zu erfrischen und zu erquicken. Doch sol solche kurtzweil und ergetzung auch sein masz haben / dasz man nicht ein schâdliche wollust daraus mache."

3 He recounts, B, fol. 261a, the tale that occurred in 1557 when the Archbishop of Salzburg made a peasant wear a bear skin, then sent dogs after him. Many other examples are given.

4 B, fol. Va-Vb, "Folgen die Namen der Gelehrten Leut / ausz welchen Schrifften dieses Buchs Jagteuffel zusamen gezogen."

5 Spangenberg resided in Mansfeld from 1553 until ca. 1563. Most protestant pastors who tried their hand at a devil-book and who lived in this middle German area came under Spangen-berg's influence. The success of the Jagteuffel itself is shown by the ten editions of this book between 1560 and 1566; see H. Grimm, "Teufelbücher," pp. 549-550.

6 Spangenberg wrote the preface to, e.g., Hoppenrod's Hurentueffel, Westphal's Hoffartsteuffel, Fabricius' Der Heylige, Kluge vnd Gelehrte Teuffel, and Daul's Tantzteuffel. Spangenberg's general importance or contribution to the arts is also indicated by the 1861 edition of his book Von der Edlen vnd hochberühmten Kunst der Musica; cf. note 12 of chap. 5, Sec. I.

7 See note 3, chap. 5, Sec. I; also bibliography.

8 See Osborn, Teuffelliteratur, p. 41.

9 Spangenberg, a friend of Hocker, also wrote the preface to Hocker's tract Von beyden Schlüsseln der Kirche (Ürsel, 1568); cf. ADB, XII, 534.

10 See also Rudwin, The Devil in Legend and Literature; Warkentin, The Devil in the German traditional Story; Carus,
History of the Devil, esp. pp. 338-369; Freytag, "Teufel im 16. Jahrhundert," and others, most of whom use Hocker's work as a main source of information for their discussions of the devil in the sixteenth century.


12 The didactic purpose is obvious. In all the devil-books the authors try to impress upon their readers that the people of the sixteenth century are as wicked as people will ever be, a fact which signals the approaching end of the world.

13 See Wiemken, pp. XLVII-LII, for names of those devils in the hierarchy of the kingdom of hell.

14 Cf. chap. about Luther, pp. 30, 32.

15 See Wiemken, pp. XXXVII-LII, for a brief description of "Schwarzkünstler" (e.g., Faust) and the magic practiced at the time.

16 Besides its shortcomings, Hocker's work was almost immediately accepted by Feyerabend into the initial position in the first edition of the Theatrum Diabolorum and thus could not have been published otherwise. Only after Feyerabend's anthology was long out of print could one expect another edition of Der Teuffel selbs; H. Grimm, p. 551, mentions a 1627 Frankfurt/M. edition.

17 H. Grimm, p. 552, points out: "Wenn das von Höcker inaugurierte Gesamtwerk trotz solcher Mängel seinen Weg machte, so wies das darauf hin, dass es, da es der neuen Lehre an einer geschlossenen durchschlagenden Moraltologie mangelt, für die Lebenspraxis notwendig war und offenbar trotz seines geringen literarischen Wertes eine Lücke ausfüllte."

18 H. Grimm, p. 552.
CONCLUSION

THE CHARACTER AND POPULARITY OF THE DEVIL-BOOKS

Reference has already been made in this study to several distinguishing features of the devil-books which characterize a specific devil literature in the sixteenth century. In spite of the varying degrees of talent among the authors, in general there is a uniformity in the manner of composition of their works; and in this mode of composition the devil-tracts are more closely associated with late medieval literature than they are with Luther's works. A brief discussion of a few prominent elements in the pastor-authors' approach will further illuminate the character of this literature.

With few exceptions, a basic principle for the composition of the devil-books appears to be to compile and to arrange superficially and arbitrarily into chapters all the material on the topic.¹ It was common to collect effective expressions, aphorisms, and phraseology from as many sources as possible and to use these to insure success for the individual work. This was done first of all to increase the persuasive power of the author's own statements.² Secondly, the author also employed this practice to protect himself against any possible negative reactions on the part of the
readers. In addition, the list of authors and works (the "bibliography"), which is attached to some works, formed a sort of witness for the abundance of material cited or referred to within the text and thus also for the author's "learnedness." Works like Der Teufel selbs, Der Jagteuffel, and Vom Juncker Geitz vnd Wucherteuffel proceed from one quote or learned illustration to the next. Almost every statement or opinion is supported and protected by a long series of expressions and anecdotes from the scriptures and from ancient and modern authorities.

The frequent use of quotes and anecdotes in the devil-books seems to be extremely varied as far as the sources are concerned. "Alles, was nach damaligem Verständnis Anspruch auf Allgemeingültigkeit hat oder doch mindestens zum Bildungsgut der Belesenen gehört, wird herangezogen." Besides the Bible and Luther, the works of earlier church authorities (Augustine, for example) are frequently cited. The devil-books, as Feyerabend states in his preface to the Theatrum Diabolorum, were not only written for the lay masses, but also for the "christliche Gelehrte." It was necessary at that time to recognize the works of antiquity which those with a humanistic education would naturally expect. So the pastors incessantly cite Latin and Greek authors, the latter almost always in Latin translations. Unfortunately, the devil-tract authors frequently overburden a simple and clear statement with numerous and often unnecessary illustrations.
and utterances from these ancient sources. Certainly, a few of these pastors, Musculus, Hocker, Spangenberg, Musaeus, and Westphal, for example, could justifiably boast of a good humanistic education. The other devil-book authors unfortunately had little understanding of antique culture or ideas. Actually, except for the above mentioned authors, the display of erudition is only borrowed, second or third-hand wisdom. Plato, Aristotle, Socrates, Homer, Euripides, Pindar, Aesop, Ovid, Cicero, Vergil, Horace, Seneca, Tacitus, and countless others are frequently cited. Seldom do these Latin or Greek quotes remain in the original and thus only for the learned; they are followed by a free translation, frequently versified. More often that not the thought expressed briefly and clearly in the original becomes verbose and confused in the translation. In many of the aphorisms the witty idea is often lost altogether because of this verbosity. Westphal, for example, translates "Multi pervenirent ad sapientiam, nisi iam pervenisse putarent" (Seneca) in the following manner:

Viel weiser Leut die Welt wol hett/
   Ja wenn der leidige Stoltz nicht thet/
Der die Leut also vberredt/
   Als ob sie jetzt zu dieser stätt
Schon allbereyt sind gelehrt vnd klug/
   So es doch ist eitel lug vnd trug/
Der gleichwol hindert trefflich sehr/
   Das viel nicht wolln lernen mehr:
Wer aber meynt er kann es gar/
   Der bleibt ein Narr jammardar. (Hoffartsteuffel, B, fol. 377b)

There are various reasons for this tendency to collect
examples and frequently to versify them. One obvious reason is to break the monotony of the prose text. In fact, several of the authors even write hymns and poems of their own (e.g., Caspar Faber, Sabbathsteuffel). Likewise, these didactic pastor-authors were well aware of the effective use of anecdotes, the "Predigtmärlein," tales, etc., which had long been employed to incite or retain interest; and because of this same feeling Feyerabend states in his preface to his anthology of devil-books "dasz es auch Welteuten / so der H. Schrifft vnd der Kirchenlehrer Bücher leichtlich vberdrüssig werden / lieblich vnd kurzweilig zu lesen sei." The anecdotes, allusions to and tales from both tradition and current history often outnumber the quotes from the classical authors. The sources for these tales are numerous, e.g., the many so-called "Tatsachenberichte" of the time, chronicles, collections, Petrarch, Poggio, Hans Sachs, Johann von Schwarzenberg, Sebastian Brant and other fool literature, Maximilian's Theuerdank, Friederich Dedekind, Jakob Wimpfeling, Erasmus von Rotterdam, Willibald Pirkheimer, Philipp Melanchthon, and many others are cited. Also many German legends and fairy tales are employed. The pastors had plenty of opportunity to become acquainted with the many popular expressions and aphorisms and never hesitated to use them. In addition, many of the pastors claim to have studied such collections as Johann Agricolas' 300 Sprichwörter (1528) and Sebastian Franck's anonymously published
Frankfurter Sammlung (1548) of aphorisms. This abundance of interesting illustrations, which the devil-books offered, was certain to be successful; and the enterprising Feyerabend had good reason to add that everything in the Theatrum Diabolorum is "mit mancherley lustigen Historien / Sprüchen / Sprüchwörtern / Reimen vnd gleichniss reden vermenget vnd geschmückt."

It should also be noted that the authors of the devil-books occasionally employ statements from Catholic theologians and other reformers such as Calvin and Zwingli. These sources are found when their utterances fit into the scheme of the tract or in those cases where the protestant author can point out, for example, that even this or that Catholic is of the same opinion. It becomes clear that the essential criterion for the employment of quotes is not based on religion, be it Protestant, Catholic, or non-Christian. The quotes and illustrations are essentially used because they support that which the particular tract wishes to express. The adoption of classical passages, for example, indicates this approach. On the one hand, references are made to sustain the notion that the heathens are wicked and certainly directed in their vices by the devil, and to draw a parallel to unrighteous Christians. On the other hand, quotes are used to show pre-christian wisdom which can well be heeded today. If the moral of the antique example fits the protestant-christian attitude expressed in the devil-tract, then the author praises
the "wise heathen." If the moral does not fit, then the Greek or Latin sources are labelled "heathen nonsense" and its author referred to as a "hochmütiger auffgeblasener Heide." Clearly in the medieval manner, these devil-book authors consider everything written before them as raw material with which they can do whatever they wish; they pick the sources apart and, in the form of individual aphorisms (often quite out of context), employ them in their own books.

This manner of composition, which can be observed in almost every devil-book and which is quite similar to the late medieval literary approach, supports the argument against the notion that the devil literature is extensively dependent upon Luther. Certainly, in many respects Luther did exercise a strong influence upon the authors of the devil-tracts; however, are not the numerous quotes, thoughts, and illustrations found in these works (especially those of Friderich, Musculus, Spangenberg, and Hocker) actually more than just evidence that the authors were well-read? Is not the employment of these elements more than just an attempt to garnish the works with the names of famous men and thereby lend more authority to these works? Luther is certainly considered the ultimate authority by the protestant pastor-authors, and so it is only natural that these men would refer to the reformer; and it is indeed the Lutheran atmosphere in which the devil-books appear. In view of the mode of composition of these works, however, that does not necessarily have to
mean that in its design, in its intention, and in its basic thought this body of literature is derived from Luther, that it bears foremost the imprint of the reformer's personality. Luther gave impetus to the expression of many latent ideas. Are not the devil-books similar to a mosaic of whose parts a great number originate in Luther and help determine the appearance of the whole, but, in terms of distinguishing character and peculiarity, are quite dependent on other influences? At least the medieval manner of composition indicates this.

Another characteristic which contributes substantially to the form of the devil-books is what Huizinga (p. 212) calls the medieval "tendency to isolate each thing as a special entity."\(^9\) For example, Luther's theoretical assumption that every nation, every class, and every vice has its own devil, becomes in the hands of most of the devil-book authors not only an exhaustive description of the individual vice and its particular devil, but also an assertion that precisely this "Lasternteufel" is the source of all wickedness in the world.\(^10\) In the Sauffteuffel, for example, we read "dasz Trunckenheit ein vrsach ist zu allerley Sünden;" in fact, Friderich says, "Ich wolt gern ein Laster hören / das nicht aus Trunckenheit zu folgen pflegte / ob sie schon nicht alle auff einmal bey etlichen Säuuffern folgen." He further observes: "Nun ist kein Teuffel allein / wo einer ist / da sind jhr viel bey ğhm ... So ist kein Lästerteuffel
/ vmb welchen die andern so gern sind / als der Sauffteuffel"
(B, fol. 274a-274b). Westphal's **Hoffartsteuffel** is likewise the source of all evil:

Seine werck vnd früchte aber sind verachtung / verfolgung vnd missbrauch des Göttlichen worts / Eigennutz / Wucher / Geitz / Hader / Zanck / Zwytracht vnd Vneinigkeit / krieg vnd mord / verachtung / hon / schmach / fluchen / lästern / fressen / sauffen / pancketieren / schlemmen / prassen / spielen / toppeln / bauwen / kleyden / schültige wort vnd geberd / allerley fürwitz / leichtfertigkeit / mutwill / vergessung vnd vntertrukung der Armen / hurerey / büberey / faulheit / müsiggang / list / böse falsche tücke vnd practiken / vntrew / verrähterey / vnd was desz Teuffels kot vnd vnflats mehr ist . . . (B, fol. 365b)

The traditional meaning of arrogance and pride as Satan's initial sin, which dominated the medieval conception of the devil, is found in Westphal's characterization of the "Hoffartsteuffel" and his activities. Most of the other authors express the same idea. They become so intensely involved in their own special devil that they incessantly seek to magnify that particular devil's power. This tendency seems to be the result of concentration on details.¹¹ The special devil is further particualrized, individuated, or subdivided until out of this process the specific devil has a large retinue of classified special servants, e.g., the "Sauffteufel's" many servants (the names of a few of these were mentioned in an earlier chapter).

The tendency to individuate and the emphasis on details corresponds to a further characteristic of the devil-books, i.e., the endeavor for completeness and perfection. This
is partially the result of the desire to perceive the world in a religiously founded complete system. It is also the result of an insatiable desire to know everything about a particular topic, or for that matter, to gain all the knowledge one can. The devil-books comprise one of the later vestiges of that ambition. The protestant authors quite often justify their compositions on the fact that the special devil which they discuss in their work has not yet been treated. Spangenberg, for example, encouraged Joachim Westphal to write the Hoffartsteuffel simply because no one else had given this particular devil literary treatment. On the other hand, this striving for completeness is easily seen in the devil-books themselves. Hocker's Der Teufel selbs and Westphal's Hoffartsteuffel are good examples of the authors' attempt to exhaust all possible aspects of the subject. In the fourth section of the Hoffartsteuffel Westphal has seventeen chapters in which he refutes every conceivable "Einrede damit man vermeinet den Pracht vnd Hoffart grosser kleidung zu verteidigen / oder die auff das wenigste zu entschuldigen" (B, fol. 406b-417a). Hocker's work is no different; the nineteenth chapter, for example, presents eleven reasons "Warumb Gott dem Teuffel biszweilen etwas verhenget" (B, fol. 46b-47b). Another result of the above mentioned emphasis on details is the seemingly endless enumerations found in the devil-books. Again, the numerous specified servants of the "Saufteufel" serve as an example.
Except for Der Teufel selbs, Von des Teuffels Tyrannney, the Gerichts Teuffel, and the Schrap Teuffel, the devil-books are quite similar in their organization. Almost all of these works begin with a chapter describing either the particular vice, i.e., the activity or the specific devil in question, or the specialized devil himself:

Zauberteuffel: chap. II, "Was Zäuberey sey" (B, fol. 176a-177a); chap. III, "Wie manichfaltig die Zäuberey sey" (B, fol. 177a-177b); chap. IV, "Vom Vrsprung der Zäuberey" (B, fol. 177b-179b).
Tantzteuffel: "Was Tantz sey / vnd woher er komme" (B, fol. 230b).
Jagteuffel: "Wie mancherley das Jagen sey" (B, fol. 248b-249b).
Hoffartsteuffel: Part I, "Was hoffart in gemein sey vnd heisset / wie mancherley er sey / woher er anfenglich komme / vnd in vns entstehe" (B, fol. 369a-376a).
Eydeuffel: "Von dem Eydshweren" (B, fol. 492a-492b).

To quell any doubts that a particular activity is a vice, most authors either state this in their introductions or devote a chapter to this subject, e.g., Bannteuffel, Part I, "Dasz das Teuffel Beschweren wider Gott / vnd falsch sey" (B, fol. 168b-173b), Fluchteuffel, chapter I, "Dasz die Gotteslästerung eine Sünde sey" (B, fol. 209b-211a), and the Tantzteuffel, "Ob Tantzen Sünde sey" (B, fol. 230b-231a).

Following the above descriptions there is a discussion of the harmful consequences of association with the special devil or the corresponding vice, all of which, according to the tendency mentioned above, are numerically listed and which are at the same time the reasons why people should
avoid such indulgence, i.e., the enumerated warnings to man. These chapters concerning the corruptible activities also form the basis for the organization of the book as a whole. In the *Eheteuffel*, for example, there are seven major abuses of the scriptures by the devil; the *Fluchteuffel* discusses five main sins against the Holy Ghost; there are eight prominent sins committed by wearing the "Pluderhosen;" the *Sauffteuffel* presents seven significant reasons why one should shun drinking; the *Gesind Teuffel* is divided into seven chapters each dealing with an evil activity; and Westphal gives six important incentives "Stoltz zu meyden." The authors usually further subdivide their chapters into the corruptible effects upon the body and those upon the soul, the consequences of drinking given in the *Sauffteuffel*, for example. The certain physical and divine punishment for the individual vices is illustrated in the many anecdotes. Also, in the form of a dialogue there is frequently a long list of all possible excuses to the advice of the tract in general or individual ideas within the work (another result of the attempt at completeness), all of which the author refutes, e.g., *Sauffteuffel* ("Etliche Eynreden der Säuffer / mit jren Verlegungen," B, fol. 277b-280a) and the fourth section of the *Hoffartsteuffel* (B, fol. 406b-417a) mentioned above.

At the end of each devil-book a positive, didactic attitude usually replaces the author's lament of the deplorable, wicked situation in the world. First of all,
everyone is encouraged to shun particular vices and to fight
the specific devil. Then instructions are frequently given
how the individual can accomplish this task. The following
are examples of this:

**Melancholischer Teuffel**: "Wie dem Melancholischen
Teuffel zu begegnen / vnd widerzustehen sey"
(B, fol. 563a-564a), and "Von den eusserlichen
Mitteln wider den Melancholischen Teuffel zuge-
brauchen" (B, fol. 564a-565a).

**Bannteuffel**: Part II, "Wie man sich mit den Besessenen
Menschen halten möge" (B, fol. 173b-175b).

**Hurenteuffel**: Part II, "Was heurwiderumb die Leute vom
Huren Teuffel abschrecken / vnd wodurch ein jeder
nach seinem Beruff sich vnd andere von solchen
Lastern mit gantzem ernste abhalten soll" (B,
fol. 307a-319a).

In addition, all the power of parents, the clergy, and the
civil authorities is sought to quell the specific activities,
Musculus' plea in the **Hosenteuffel**, for example.

Common to all the tracts is the notion that evil is
spreading rapidly in the world. The most abominable vices
have gained the upper hand. This detestable situation is
summarized for all by Feyerabend in his preface to the **The-
atum Diabororum** where he speaks of "allerley grewlichen /
schrecklichen vnd abscheulichen Laster / so in diesen letzten
schweren vnd bösen Zeiten an allen orten vnd enden fast
bräuchlich auch grausamlich im schwang gehen." Such a con-
dition can only be interpreted as an indication that these
are the last days (e.g., B, fol. 206b). The accelerated
program of the devil and his hosts to snare as many souls
as possible bears the same witness. "Zeichen am Himmel,"
severe storms, floods, fires, wars, pestilence, etc., also
support this notion. Never has man been as wicked as now. Musculus (B, fol. 127a-127b) observes that Germany has "nun mehr fast den höchsten Grad aller vntugend erstiegen," and that other countries are experiencing the frenzied activities of the devils and that the old standards of virtue do not exist any more:

Im Hauszregiment vnd gemeinen Stenden ist nichts gantz mehr / zucht vnd erbarkeit ist nirgendt mehr zu finden / Lieb vnd trew ist gantz vñ gar verloschen / Mit hoffart / vnzucht / boszheit / hat der Teuffel alle winckel der Welt also vberschüttet / dasz sich nicht zu vermuten/ dass er etwas vbrigs / vnd in vorraht in der Hell behalten / wie wir es denn alle bekennen / vnd sagen: Es sey nicht möglich / dasz erger in der Welt werden kan / wie es denn auch ohne allen zweiffel mehr denn zuwar ist.

There is no question in the minds of these authors, however, that the devils with their special vices are concentrating on Germany where they have experienced the greatest success. Westphal (B, fol. 365b) also observes that "vnsere liebe einfeltige Vorfahren / wenn sie jetzt ... wieder kommen solten / Teutschland vnd seine Eynwoner nicht kennen / sonder gar für ein frembdes Land vnd Volck ansehen / vnd achten würden / denn es ist doch gar vmbgekeret / sitten / geberde / kleydung / wort / vnsprach / gebew / vnd alle Teutsche art / an trew / glauben / warheit / auffrichtigkeit / demut vnd dergleichen Tugend / sind seltzam / vnd ist schier alles Welsch / Spanisch / Frantzösisch / vnd halb Türkisch worden." In opposition to these forces, the pastor-authors preach a return to a high moral code, the virtues and ideals which Germany has almost forgotten.14
Humor is not lacking in the devil-books, even though it often results in the "Grobianismus" of the time. Musculus is a good example, and actually was a model for many of the other authors. Besides the numerous witty anecdotes and other humorous examples used as illustrations, there are occasionally some humorous verses interspersed to break the monotony of the prose. 15 "Makkaronisches Latein" is sometimes used for the same effect. Puns are frequent, e.g., "hellisch" for "heylig" or "Suppenattendent" for "Superintendent." Satire, of course, also plays a role in a few of the devil-books, e.g., in the Sauffteuffel and the Spielteuffel. Quite often satire was simply the best means of didactic communication.

Finally, when we consider the atmosphere in which the devil literature was written, it is not difficult to imagine the influence Luther might have had on these authors who were first of all Lutheran pastors; and the protestant ideals are certainly an underlying force in their works. It has been shown, however, that in many respects these authors sought their material elsewhere; even the mode of composition is basically not Lutheran. On the other hand, there is one element of influence from the reformer which is indeed quite obvious to the reader of the devil-books, i.e., the language. 16 It is Luther's German which the pastor-authors attempt to write. It is also Luther's German which resounds from the quoted Bible passages, for these references are almost
exclusively taken from the reformer's translation of the scriptures. The pastor's mode of expression is also full of idioms similar to those used by Luther in the Catechism, the hymns, the many polemic tracts, and especially the Table Talks.

When Caspar Obenhin speaks of "dem verfluchten vnd von dem Teuffel gestifften Bapstthumb" (B, fol. 499b), or others talk of "das schadliche / heyllose / kindische / hurische / verteuffelte" or "vermaledeyte / verfluchte / verdamppte / verzweyfelte Bapstthumb" (B, fol. 423b), they are following the pattern set by Luther, e.g., in the twenty-seventh chapter of the Table Talks ("Von dem Antichrist, oder Pabst"). Hocker reminds us of Luther's manner of expresseion when he states:

Denn ob wir vns wol desz Teuffels eyngeben vñ bösen listen nicht allerding erwehren können / dasz sie nimmer an vns kommen solten / Wie wir auch den Vogeln nicht vermögen zuverbieten / dasz sie vns nicht vber den Kopff her fliehen / Dennoch / gleich wie wir den Vogeln wol wehren können / dasz sie vns nicht auff vnsere Köpff vnd in die Haar nesteln / also vermögen wir den eyngebungen desz Teuffels auch wol zu wehren. (B, fol. 59b)

In Peter Glaser's Gesind Teuffel there is the following typical Lutheran phrase: "Gott hat im viertten Gebott befohlen / dasz man Vatter vnd Mutter ehren sol / auff dasz es vns wol gehe / vnd wir lange leben auff Erden. Vnter Vatter vnd Mutter aber werden nicht allein begriffen die natürliche vnd leibliche Eltern / sondern auch alle Weltliche Oberkeite / vnd vnter andern die Herrn vnd Frauen."17
Not only similar phraseology but also several "grobianische" passages found in the devil-books suggest the Lutheran influence. When Friderich, for example, maintains that the newly founded "Saufforden" should be called "Sauworden" whose members are "epicurische Säuw / welcher Hirte der Sauffteuffel ist" (B, fol. 287b) or refers to the sixteenth century inhabitants of Germany as "armen elenden sterblichen Madensecke / die wir gegen Gott nicht wol einer Fliegen oder Ameysen zuvergleichen sind" (B, fol. 273a), or when Westphal ironically calls man an "edelen Kohtsack," an "armen klumpe koths" or that water, "ist dem stinchenden Madensack viel zu gering" (B, fol. 387b), one could well imagine Luther speaking. Finally, the reformer's influence on Hocker is also recognized who issues the following warning:

Darumb lasset vns lernen / dasz wir in grosser fahr

The devil-books made a lasting contribution to the German language by creating new vocabulary and by further popularizing individual words, idioms, and expressions of Luther and most of these authors who were very close to, and influential on, the people. 

The question of dissemination and significance of the
devil-books now arises. Between 1545 and 1604 thirty-nine devil-books were published. Well over one hundred further editions of these works are known. This relatively high number of reprints indicates the general popularity of the devil literature in the second half of the sixteenth century.

Initially it might be asked how many copies were printed for the first and subsequent editions. There are no precise figures extant; however, several individual records of sales and inventories can suggest a good approximation. The Hermann Gülfferich firm's inventory after the fall 1568 book fair of Frankfurt am Main, for example, lists among other works over 6,000 devil-books. Obviously the Gülfferich firm had already sold many devil-books at the 1568 fair, for the acceptance of these works was considerable. Sigmund Feyerabend's list of sales at that same fair indicates this. On January 24, 1574 Sigmund Feyerabend sold a large number of books to his cousin Johann Feyerabend and Melchoir Schwarzenberger (both book dealers from Schwäbisch-Hall) among which 3,411 devil-books were included. These figures and other statistics indicate that around the middle of the sixteenth century the first edition of a work comprised at least 600 copies. When the demand was great enough, i.e., when the printer or publisher felt secure enough to print a second edition, there were seldom less than 1,000 copies printed. Some of the more popular works had further editions comprising as many as 2,000 copies on occasion. Various
other inventory lists support these figures.\textsuperscript{23} Also, statistics for works other than devil-books in the above mentioned lists indicate that the figures of 600 for the first edition and 1,000 for further editions are conservative estimates. It should also be noted that in the second half of the sixteenth century the book market was in a state of rapid growth.

Applied to the devil-books, the conservative figure of 600 for each of the thirty-nine first editions would result in at least 23,400 copies; 110 further editions at 1,000 copies each means 110,000 additional devil-tracts. With the 107,000 individual appearances of the various tracts in the three editions of the \textit{Theatrum Diabolorum},\textsuperscript{24} there was an approximate total of 240,000 devil-books in circulation during the second half of the century. If the percentage loss of books for various reasons is taken into consideration, e.g., possible confiscation, fire, etc., (H. Grimm, p. 538, gives the figure of one-fifth to one-fourth for the period prior to 1618), it must be concluded that the total figure is indeed conservative. Without doubt whole editions were lost. It can be concluded further that this body of devil literature was strikingly significant for this period.

Beginning with the publication of the \textit{Sauffteuffel} in 1552 in Leipzig, the devil literature spread throughout Germany except those regions where the sale of these books was forbidden. Such territories were obviously Catholic, e.g., Bavaria, Würtzburg, Bamberg, and the Rhine area.
Apparently the devil-books were well accepted and read with pleasure. Not only the number of editions and the figures for those editions substantiate this, but also the fact that these books were banned again and again in such Catholic areas as Bavaria; apparently a continual stream of devil literature was secreted into those lands.²⁵ The vociferous literary opposition on the part of the Franciscan monk Johannes Nas, for example, also shows that the devil-books were not entirely limited to Protestant Germany. Nas, active in Ingolstadt and München in the latter part of the century, created in his Warnungsengel (Ingolstadt, 1588) several opposing "Spezialengel," e.g., the "Fasten Engel," the "Dienst vnd Ehehalten Engel," the "Ehe Engel," the "Kriegsengel," the "Straffengel," and the "Warnungsengel" which he made the title hero of his work.²⁶ Another indication of the general popularity of the devil-books in the second half of the sixteenth century is their approximate percentage of total sales. Feyerabend, at the 1568 fair, sold a total of 13,012 books of which almost 10% (1228) were devil-books. The same percentage seems to have held for other book dealers. Inventory lists show anywhere from 5% to 15%,²⁷ a fairly large sum when one considers the number and variety of books printed and sold during that time.

The total estimated number of devil-books in circulation, which for various reasons was certainly somewhat higher, gains more significance when this figure is placed into per-
spective with that of the literate population of the time and area of major influence. The total population of Germany during the period of consideration was approximately fifteen million. The Catholic areas in which the sale of devil-books was prohibited would reduce the figure to about ten million. The literacy rate was certainly no more than 50% (most likely much less), thus further reducing the figure to about five million which would include women and children. If a family at the time comprised an average of five members, then the 240,000 devil-books would have been sold to about one million possible purchasers. There are obvious risks in making such calculations. Be that what it may, it is evident that under the existing circumstances the devil-books were circulated in relatively large numbers and the reception of these works among the reading public was great. In addition, people read these books to small groups and obviously made the works available to others by passing them around, so that this body of literature had even greater effect.

An example of the popularity of these works is furnished by the success of Feyerabend's anthology. The printing errors and the poor editing, especially of the third edition (1587/88), indicates the fact that Feyerabend was rushing his book to market to satisfy an obvious demand.

There are several reasons for the success of the devil literature. For example, reference can be made briefly to
the sociological side of the favorable reception and effect of this literature as a direct result of the taste of the reading public, i.e., the relationship of author, his literary work, and the public. First of all, it may be assumed that the work, behind which the author stood, and the more or less influenced readers have a certain generally common understanding in order to effect such success. That understanding was evident in that the author was generally acquainted with, and most frequently followed, the desires or inclinations of the readers, in a word, the author wrote what the public wanted to read. Heinrich Grimm (p. 553) mentions a popular trait of the time on which the authors capitalized: "Der Autor war sich bewusst, dass der einfachere Leser besonders von der wunderbaren Seite der Dinge genommen werden muss und durch die Teufelsvorstellungen in seiner Phantasie selbst bis zu einer gewissen intellektuellen Hemmung angeregt und gefördert wurde." People were indeed interested in strange happenings and unusual adventures, to which the activities of the devil could certainly be included. An underlying tone of sorrow and fear of the undeniable approach of the end of the world, in which the devil would play a major part, also contributed to the acceptance of this literature. The veneration of the virtuous ancestors and the concern for the current morality of Germany were also involved. Heinrich Grimm (pp. 553-554) adds the following:

So sehr einerseits das Lesepublikum die Unveränderlichkeit bestimmter Gesamtüberzeugungen forderte, wie etwa
den unbedingt reformatörischen Standpunkt, und gerade
Einsichtigkeit in dieser Hinsicht Stärke verlieh, auch
mit Überreibungen und Wiederholungen grosse Wirkungen
erzielt wurde, verlangte es anderseits, veränderliche
Meinungen zu hören, die Spannung gaben.

The many devil-books, although similar in organization, were
certainly varied in content, which, of course, contributed
to their sale. The authors, in their general attempt at
completeness, sought to deal with the widest range of un-
treated topics which could be connected in any way with their
concept of the devil.

There was indeed a great desire for reading material,
a hunger for knowledge, which also played a role in the suc-
cess of the devil-books. The public was generally tired
of the religious polemics; the reading public wanted to
leave that to the theologians. This hunger for reading
material is partially explained by the incessant search on
the part of independently thinking individuals for knowledge
or understanding of the things of the world and universe;
it is partially based on the urge to explain the often de-
structive forces all around and to answer the question, and
in particular with some reference to the devil-books, whether
God and his angels or the devil and his servants are ruling
the world and controlling these phenomena. With the increase
of frightening physical occurrences, destruction of people
and property by pestilence, war, floods, storms, etc., there
was an increase in the sale of books which offered explana-
tions.29 Thus, at the time of their creation, the vigorous
and effective devil-books were thoroughly consistent with important basic elements of the period. It is precisely this affinity with the people, thoughts, and movements that the devil-books make a major contribution to an understanding of this era. After an analysis of the character of the sixteenth century, Heinrich Grimm (p. 554) concludes with the following thought: "Aus einer Geschichte der Welt- und Lebensanschauung im 16. Jahrhundert - einmal ganz abgesehen von Sitten- und Kulturgeschichte - sind die Teufelbücher nicht fortzudenken."

A final question is raised by the foregoing. Is the devil-book in the category of the popular chapbook, the so-called "Volksbuch?" Only when the term is applied in the manner understood in the sixteenth century can this be said of the devil-books: in contrast to the books written in Latin and read by the learned of the higher social classes, those works written in German and thus intended for the folk in general, although the literate and those able to purchase the books were usually of the middle class, were considered "Volksbücher." The narrower definition given by such men as Josef Görres, Ludwig Tieck, and Clemens Brentano during the Romantic period would certainly exclude the devil-books. In terms of intent, for example, the pastors' works are quite different. Instead of being primarily for entertainment without any intentional moralistic or artistic ideal, the didactic devil-books specifically preach and promote
moral standards. However, the background or environment from which most of these pastor-authors came insures a certain knowledge and affinity with the so-called "Volksseele," an intimacy maintained in part by their language and style in their works, and other elements mentioned in the foregoing paragraphs. The success of the often fine satire of their didactic "Spiegel," which are supposed to bring the people closer to the ideal moral life both within the family and in a wider social context, also indicates this affinity. Furthermore, the use of hundreds of familiar aphorisms helped contribute to the popularity of the devil-books. These elements thus contributed to the sale of the devil literature. In comparison to the superstitious conceptions of devils as they appeared in the popular chapbooks, those of the devil-tracts became somewhat elevated. Also, in comparison to the "Volksbuch," the devil-book was much more periodic, a literary appearance limited essentially to the second half of the sixteenth century. Thus, the devil-books were in some respects certainly "volkstümlich," especially because they emphasized the most varied interests of a wide range of social groups; but in the sense of literary history or criticism these works are not "Volksbücher."
NOTES

Conclusion

1Chryseus' dramatic Hoffteuffel and Schubart's Haussteuffel are exceptions.

2E.g., Westphal's Fauleuffel, B, fol. 359b.

3Spangenberg's Jagteuffel, as noted earlier, specifically states this intention; B, fol. 272b.

4Spangenberg's Jagteuffel, Westphal's Hoffartsteuffel, Hocker's Teufel selbs, Blankenberg's Geitz vnd Wucherteuffel, Milichius' Schrap Teuffel, and Obenhin's Eydteuffel all have a "bibliography" attached. The number of sources in some cases may well be exaggerated, but even with allowance for that the lists are impressive.

5Ohse, Teufelliteratur zwischen Brant and Luther, p. 61.

6Osborn, Teufelliteratur, quotes Luther's statement concerning this matter: "Dem gemeinen Mann und Haufen gefällt nichts besser, denn Gesetz und Exempel predigen, ihm ist auch nichts nutzer. Predigt von Gottes Gnade und vom Artikel der Justifikation ist ihren Ohren kalt ... Wenn man von Artikel der Rechtfertigung predigt, so schläfz das Volk und hustet, wenn man aber anführt, Historien und Exempel zu sagen, da reckts beide Oren auf, ist still und höret fleissig zu."

7See, e.g., B, fol. 183f, 189f, 212f, 227ff, 250, 263f, 300, 307f, 338f, 391f, 401ff.

8See Johan Huizinga, The Waning of the Middle Ages (London, 1937), pp. 206-221, e.g.: "In the Middle Ages everyone liked to base a serious argument on a text, so as to give it a foundation ... In the minds of the Middle Ages every event, every case, fictitious or historic, tends to crystallize, to become a parable, an example, a proof, in order to be applied as a standing instance of a general moral truth. In the same way every utterance becomes a dictum, a maxim, a text. For every question of conduct Scripture, legends, history, literature, furnish a crowd of examples or of types, together making up a sort of moral clan, to which the matter in question belongs." (pp. 207-208)

9Cf., e.g., Ohse, Zwischen Brant und Luther, p. 64: "Die Tendenz zur Aufspaltung ist ein typisches Gestaltungsmerkmal

10 Osborn, Teufelliteratur, p. 189, states: "Jedem der verfasser erscheint das Lasten seines Buches als die Wurzel aller Übel; alle anderen Lasterteufel stellen sich als ein Gefolge des betreffenden Specialdämon dar. Dabei ist man denn ausserordentlich erfinderisch in neuen Teufeln, um diesem einen möglichst grossen Hofstaat zu verleihen."

11 See, e.g., Huizinga, Middle Ages, pp. 255-256.

12 Another who admits this is Rhodius in his Schmeicheltueffel.

13 See also B, fol. 145a-149a, 302a-307a, 359a-360b, 526b-529a, and 561a-563a.

14 See Ohse, Zwischen Brant und Luther, pp. 71-79, for a discussion of the moral character of the devil-books.

15 E.g., B, fol. 357a, 473b, and 475a.

16 See also, e.g., Ohse, pp. 20-22; Osborn, Teufelliteratur, pp. 172-173.

17 B, fol. 240a; cf. Luther's many interpretations of the fourth commandment and the notion of obedience to civil authorities, e.g., TR, 44.


19 See the Bibliography of primary Works at the end of this study.

20 See Appendix, no. I.

21 See Appendix, no. II.

22 See Appendix, no. III. Heinrich Grimm, "Teufelbücher," p. 538, gives the sales list of the publisher Michel Harder who sold among other books a total of 452 various devil-books. Johannes Rhodius also writes in the preface to his Neidteuffel
(1582) that "viel hundert Exemplaria" of his Schmeichler oder Fuchsschwentze Teuffel (1581) had already been printed.

23 Cf. H. Grimm, "Teufelbücher," pp. 132, 138. Simon Hütter, for example, records 1035 Fluchteuffel and 1021 Tantzteuffel in stock in 1571. Hütter had less of the other devil-books, indicating that they were somewhat more popular at the time; see Pallmann, Feyerabend, pp. 163-165.

24 See introduction to this section of this study, p. 112.

25 Cf. Osborn, Teuffelliteratur, pp. 194-197; and Ohse, Zwischen Brant und Luther, p. 10. H. Grimm, "Teufelbücher," p. 540, quotes a 1556 "Catalogus der Bücher vnnd Schrifften, vnser heilige Religion vnnd Geistliche sachen belangendt, welche im Land zu Bayern öffentliche fayl zu haben vnnd zuverkauffen erlautert seindt" (published in München): "Item alle die Neuen Tractätl, die ihn teuffels namen intituliert seindt, als Hosen teuffel, Spil teuffel etc., dann ob wol alle die das ansehen haben, als ob sie allerding politisch, vnnd allain gueter zucht habend geschrieben seyen, so seindt sie doch der ergerlichen exempl vnd anzug halben nit ze-leiden vnd fast also geschaffen, das sie dene, dessen titl sie tragen, zu seinem reich am maisten dienen, vnd ist nit noth, das christliche völcklin durch teuffels buechlin von lastern abezetreiben, weil sonsten der heilsamen guten schrifften bey der Catholischen Christlichen kirchen eben genueg darzu vorhanden."

26 See Osborn, Teuffelliteratur, p. 197.

27 See Pallmann, Feyerabend, pp. 128-171.

28 Marcel R. Reinhard and André Armengaud, Histoire Générale de la Population Mondiale (Paris, 1961), p. 89, estimate the figure to be 12 million in 1500 and ca. 20 million in 1600. Cf. H. Grimm, p. 540, who mentions the heavy losses to pestilence about the middle of the century and thus feels 15 million would be a high estimate for the middle of the century.

29 Note that the woodcuts to the devil-books also played an important part in enticing purchasers. See, e.g., H. Grimm, pp. 555, 559-560, and Ohse, pp. 97-104, for a discussion and description of these woodcuts.

APPENDIX


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fluchteuffel</td>
<td>791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eheuteuffel</td>
<td>1081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauffteuffel</td>
<td>933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geitz Teuffel</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spielteuffel</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffteuffel</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jagteuffel</td>
<td>794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesind Teuffel</td>
<td>1211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Von des Teuffels Tyranney</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6425</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Devil-books sold by Sigmund Feyerabend at the spring and fall book fairs of 1568 in Frankfurt/m. (cf. Pallmann, pp. 156-160).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eheuteuffel</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluchteuffel</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geitz Teuffel</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesind Teuffel</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffteuffel</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jagteuffel</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junckerteuffel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauffteuffel</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spielteuffel</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Von des Teuffels Tyranney</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wucherteuffel</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>851</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>1228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total books sold by Feyerabend: 13012


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bannteuffel</th>
<th>150</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fluchteuffel</td>
<td>1028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesind Teuffel</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurenteuffel</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffartsteuffel</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haussteuffel</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tantzsteuffel</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zauberteuffel</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3411</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sauffteuffel</th>
<th>40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eheteuffel</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geitz Teuffel</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spielteuffel</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluchteuffel</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Von des Teuffels Tyranney 15
Jagteuffel 25

Total 204

All Books 1375

V. Simon Hüter's inventory of devil-books in 1571 (cf. Pallmann, pp. 163-165).

Hoffartsteuffel 64
Hurenteuffel 239
Fluchteuffel 1035
Haussteuffel 197
Gesind Teuffel 168
Tantzteuffel 1021

Total 2724
BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Works

The following is a bibliography of devil-books published during the second half of the sixteenth century. The basis for this list is no. 161, pp. 497-483, of Goedeke's Grundriss zur Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung, 2nd ed., vol II (Dresden, 1886). Other sources include Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie; Benzing, Buchdruckerlexikon; H. Grimm, "Teufelbücher des 16. Jahrhunderts. Ihre Rolle im Buchwesen;" H. Grimm, Buchdruckersignete des XVI. Jahrhunderts; Kirchner, Lexikon des Buchwesens; Ohse, Teufelliteratur zwischen Brant und Luther; Osborn, Teufelliteratur des XVI. Jahrhunderts; and the devil-books themselves. A chronological order has been followed as closely as possible. The titles, in most cases, are those of the first editions. Only a few libraries holding copies of various editions are given. It should be noted that the following list and the information contained in it are not complete, especially with regard to editions and libraries; there is much more research that can still be done. This list is given to facilitate that work.

The following comprises the scheme of the bibliographical information:

Number. Publication year of first edition. Author (no. in Goedeke).
   a. Title (short title underlined).
b. Place of publication (1st ed.), Printer and/or Publisher.

c. Number of further editions (dates of these editions; some have more than one edition in same year).

d. Folio nos. in various editions of Theatrum Diabolorum.

e. Libraries holding copies (dates of editions held).

Abbreviations:

G  Goedeke  ADB  Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie
O  Ohse    Gr   H. Grimm
Os Osborn Dl  Buchdruckerlexikon

* indicates those devil-books in the possession of the author, either in form of a first or further edition or as they appear in the Theatrum Diabolorum.

1See Section B of bibliography for complete information on sources.

#1. 1545. Johann Chryseus (G, 1) (ADB, IV, 253-254).


c. 5 (1546, 1562, 1566).

d. A, fol. 516b-530b; B, fol. 443a-456a; C.1, fol. 271a-283b.

e. Frankfurt/M. (StB), Rostock, Jena, Wolfenbüttel, (1545); München (SB), Strassburg, Wien (NB), (1546); Dresden, Strassburg, (1562); Berlin (SB), (1564); Wolfenbüttel, (1566).

#2. 1552. Matthäus Friderich (G, 5) (ADB, VII, 390).

a. Wider den Sauffteuffel / Etliche wichtige vrsachen / Warumb alle Menschen sich für dem Sauffen hüten sollen . . .


c. 11 (Gr, pp. 542-543; O, pp. 231-232) (1552, 1554, 1555, 1557, 1561, 1562, 1567).

d. A, fol. 310b-340a; B, fol. 272b-292b; C.1, fol. 223b-240b.

e. Frankfurt/M. (StUB), München (SB), (1552); Gotha,
(1554); London (BM), München (SB), (1555); Hohenems, Berlin (SB), Frankfurt/M. (StUB), (1557); Berlin (SB), London (BM), Dresden (SLB), Rostock, Tübingen, (1561); Berlin (SB), Stuttgart, (1562); Tübingen, (1567).

*3. 1555. Andreas Musculus (G, 3.1) (ADB, XXIII, 93-94).
   a. *Vom Hosen Teuffel. Vom Zuluderten / zucht vnd ehr-
erwegenen / pludrichten Hosenteuffel / Vermahnung
    vnd Warnung.
   b. Frankfurt/O. Johann Eichorn (Dl, p. 61).
   c. 9 (Gr, pp. 544-545; 0, p. 232) (1555, 1556, 1557,
      1563) (0, p. 232; 1629, 1630, 1682).
   d. A, fol. 501b-507a; B, fol. 430b-435a; C.2, fol.
      59a-63b.
   e. Frankfurt/O., Wolfenbüttel, Halle (UB), Dresden
      (SLB), Jena, Berlin (SB), (1555); Wolfenbüttel,
      Halle (UB), Dresden (SLB), Augsburg, München (SB),
      Berlin (SB), (1556); Frankfurt/O., (1557); Er
      langen (UB), London (BM), München (SB), (1563);
      Wolfenbüttel, Frankfurt/M., Wiesbaden, (1629);
      Göttingen, Lübeck, Jena (1630).

*4. 1556. Andreas Musculus. (G, 3.2) (cf. no. 3).
   a. *Wider den Fluchteuffel. Wider das unchristliche /
erschreckliche / vnd grausame Fluchen vnd Gottes
   lästern / treuwe vnd wolmeye nende Vermahnung vnd
   Warnung.
   b. n.p. (probably Frankfurt/O.), no printer or
   publisher given (probably Johann Eichorn, cf. no.
   3).
   c. 6 (Gr, pp. 545-546; 0, p. 233) (1559, 1561, 1562,
      1564, 1568).
   d. A, fol. 243b-251a; B, fol. 207a-215b; C.1, fol.
      168b-175a.
   e. London (BM), München (SB), Wolfenbüttel, Frank-
furt/M., Berlin (SB), (1556); Wolfenbüttel, Ber-
lin (SB), Erfurt, Nürnberg (SB), (1559); Tubingen
      (UB), London (BM), Berlin (SB), München (SB),
      (1561); Weimar, Dresden (SLB), Wien (NB), London
      (BM), (1562); London (BM), Nürnberg, Heidelberg,
      Berlin (SB), (1564); München (SB), (1568).

*5. 1556. Andreas Musculus (G, 3.4) (cf. no. 3).
   /wie man den heimlichen listen / damit sich der
   leydigle Satan wider die Ehestiftung aufflehn / ausz
   Gottes Wort begegnen / vñ den Ehestandt
   Christlich anfahren / friedlich darinn leben / vnd
   glücklich vollenden möge.
   b. Frankfurt/O. Johann Eichorn (cf. no. 3).
c. 9 (Gr, pp. 546-547; 0, pp. 233-234) (1559, 1561, 1562, 1564, 1566, 1568).
d. A, fol. 340b-350b; B, fol. 293a-301b.
e. Gotha, Halle (UB), London (BM), München (SB), Paris (BN), Stuttgart (WLB), Wolfenbüttel (HAB), Berlin (SB), Heidelberg, (1556); London (BM), Wolfenbüttel (HAB), Berlin (SB), Augsburg, (1559); Hohenems, Erlangen (UB), Frankfurt/M. (StUB), Tübingen (UB), Wolfenbüttel (HAB), Berlin (SB), Nürnberg (GM), Halle, Rostock, (1561); London (BM), Nürnberg (StB), Wien (NB), Tübingen (UB), (1562); Berlin (DSB), München (SB), Heidelberg, Augsburg, (1564); Frankfurt/O. (Marienkirchb.), (1566); Augsburg (SSb), München (SB), (1568).

6. 1557. Nicolaus Schmidt (G, 4) (ADB, XXXII, 10-11).
   a. Von den zehen Teufeln oder Lastern / damit die bösen vnartigen Weiber besessen sind / Auch von zehen Tügenden / darit die frommen vnnd vrnunftigen Weiber geziert vnnd begabet sind / Reimweis gestelt.
   b. Leipzig. Georg Hantzsch (cf. no. 2).
   c. 2 (1557, 1568).
   d. 
   e. Wolfenbüttel (HAB), Jena, Zürich (Kantonb.), Augsburg, Wien (NB), München (SB), Dresden (SLB), Gotha (LB), London (BM), Nürnberg, (1557); Tübingen, (1568).

≠7. 1557. Eustachius Schildo (B, 15) (ADB, XXXI, 209).
   b. Frankfurt/O. Johann Eichorn (cf. no. 3).
   c. 7 (Gr, p. 548; 0, p. 234-235) (1561, 1562, 1563, 1564, 1568).
   d. A, fol. 507a-515b; B, fol. 435b-442b; C, fol. 264b-270b.
   e. Frankfurt/M. (StUB), London (BM), München (SB), Strassburg, Rostock, Berlin (SB), (1557); Tübingen, München (SB), Stuttgart (WLB), London (BM), Wien (NB), (1561); Erlangen (UB), London (BM), Nürnberg (StB), Heidelberg, (1562); Halle (UB), München (SB), Wien (NB), (1564).

8. 1559. Andreas Musculus (Gr, p. 522) (cf. no. 3).
b. Frankfurt/O. Johann Eichorn (cf. no. 3).
c. 4 (1559, 1561, 1599).
d. -
e. Wolfenbüttel (HAB), (1559); Dresden (SLB), (1561); Slg. Grimm-Balkow, (1599).

c. 9 (Gr, pp. 550-551; O, pp. 235-236) (1560, 1561, 1562, 1566).
d. A, fol. 287a-316b; B, fol. 247a-272a; C.1, fol. 202b-223b.
e. Berlin (Humboldt-UB), Leipzig, Rostock, Halle (UB), Bern, Wien (NB), Strassburg, Wolfenbüttel (HAB), Frankfurt/M. (StUB), München (SB), Tübingen (UB), Stuttgart (WLB), London (BM), Nürnberg (GM), (1560); Bamberg (StLB), Halle (UB), Augsburg, Lübeck, Erlangen (UB), London (BM), Dresden (SLB), (1561); Erlangen (UB), München (SB), Nürnberg (StB), (1562); Tübingen (UB), Dresden (SLB), (1566).

*10. 1561. Andreas Musculus (G, 3.3) (cf. no. 3).
   a. Von des Teufels Tyranney / Macht vnd Gewalt / Sonderlich in diesen letzten tagen vnterrichtung
c. 4 (1561, 1563, 1564, 1583).
d. A, fol. 147a-164b; B, fol. 127a-141b; C.1, fol. 100b-113a.
e. Augsburg (StB), London (BM), Tübingen (UB), (1561); Dresden (SLB), Nürnberg (StB), Tübingen (UB), Wolfenbüttel (HAB), (1563); Wolfenbüttel (HAB), (1564); Frankfurt/O. (Marienkirchb.), (1583).

*11. 1562. Albert von Blanckenberg (G, 7).
   a. Vom Juncker Geitz vnd Wucherteuffel / so jztz in der Welt in allen Ständen gewaltlich regiert. An alle Stände desz Teutschen Reichs geschrieben
   b. Eisleben. Urban Gaubisch (cf. no. 9).
c. 4 (1563, 1565, 1568, 1572).
d. A, fol. 364a-370b; B, fol. 313b-319a; C.1, fol. 258b-263b.
e. Dresden (SLB), Weimar, Leipzig, (1562); Augsburg
(StB), London (BM), Nürnberg (StB), (1563); Berlin (SB), Tübingen (UB), München (SB), Frankfurt/M. (StUB), (1565); München (SB), Wien (NB), (1568); Slg. Grimm-Balkow, (1572).

   a. Faul Teufel / Wider das Laster des Müßigganges / Christlicher warhaftiger unterricht vnd Warnung
   ...  
   b. Eisleben. Urban Gaubisch (cf. no. 9).
   c. 4 (1563, 1564, 1569, 1573).
   d. A, fol. 416a-424b; B, fol. 357b-364b; C.1, fol. 296a-302b.
   e. Dresden (SLB), Frankfurt/M. (StUB), Göttingen (NSUB), Halle (UB), Wien (NB), London (BM), München (SB), Strassburg, (1563); Nürnberg (StB), Augsburg (StB), München (SB), Wien (NB), (1569); Frankfurt/O. (Marienkirchb.), (1573).

*13. 1563. Ludwig Milichius (G, 9.1).
   a. Der Zauber Teuffel. Das ist / Von Zauberey / War- sagung / Beschwehen / Segen / Aberglauben / Hexerey / vnd mancherley Wercken des Teuffels ... 
   b. Frankfurt/M. Johann Lechler (D1, p. 53), ed. Sigmund Feyerabend (D1, p. 53).
   c. 3 (1564, 1565, 1566).
   d. A, fol. 205a-243b; B, fol. 175a-206b; C.1, fol. 142a-168b.
   e. Wolfenbüttel (HAB), Augsburg (StB), Basel, Frankfurt/M., (1563); Halle (UB), Nürnberg (StB), Göttingen, Frankfurt/M., (1564); Frankfurt/O. (Marienkirchb.), (1565); München (SB), Strassburg, Frankfurt/M., London (BM), Nürnberg (GM), Paris (BN), (1566).

   a. Wider den Bannteuffel / Das ist / Eine getreue / Wolmeynende Christliche warnung wider die Gott- losen Teuffelsbeschwerer oder Banner / so in diesen örtern herumb aber schleichen.
   c. 3 (1564, 1566, 1568).
   d. A, fol. 205b-243b; B, fol. 168a-175b; C.1, fol. 135b-141b.
   e. Wolfenbüttel (HAB), Halle (UB), Rostock, London (BM), Nürnberg (StB), Frankfurt/M. (StUB), Erlangen (UB), (1564); München (SB), Berlin (SB), Marburg/L. (WB), Paris (BN), (1566).
1564. Peter Glaser (G, 12).
   c. 6 (1564, 1566, 1598).
   d. A, fol. 273b-287a; B, fol. 235a-246b; C.l, fol. 192a-202a.
   e. Erlangen (UB), Nürnberg (StB), Augsburg, Strassburg, Halle (UB), London (BM), Tübingen (UB), (1564); Nürnberg (GM), München (SB), Tübingen (UB), Berlin (Humboldt-UB), München (UB), (1566); Dresden (SLB), (1598).

   a. Der Sieman, das ist wider den Hausteuffel. Wie die bösen Weiber ihre frome Menner / vnd wie die bösen Leichtfertigen buben ihre frome Weiber plagen . . .
   b. Weissenfels. Georg Hantzsch (cf. no. 2).
   c. 3 (1565, 1568, 1569).
   d. -
   e. Wolfenbüttel (HAB), Berlin (SB), (1564); Halle (UB), London (BM), München (SB), (1568); Slg. Grimm-Balkow, (1569).

17. 1565. Joachim Westphal (G, 8.2) (cf. no. 12).
   b. Eisleben. Urban Gaubisch (cf. no. 9).
   c. 1 (1565).
   d. A, fol. 425a-501a; B, fol. 365a-430a; C.2, fol. 1a-56a.
   e. München (SB), Jena, Dresden (SLB), Göttingen, (1565).

18. 1565. Andreas Hoppenrod (G, 16).
   b. Eisleben. Urban Gaubisch (cf. no. 9).
   c. 4 (1565, 1566, 1568).
   d. A, fol. 351a-364a; B, fol. 302a-313a; C.1, fol. 249a-258a.
   e. München (SB & UB), Paris (BN), Berlin (DSB), (1565); Wien (NB), Tübingen (UB), Berlin (SB), (1568).
*19. 1567. Ludwig Milichiuss (G, 9.2).
a. Schrap Teuffel. Was man den Herrschaften schuldig sey / Womit das Volck beschweret werde / Was solche Beschwerungen für Schaden bringen / Was die Schrift darwider zeuge / Wie Gott straffe / Vnd mit welchen Sünden sie das Volck verdien . . .
b. n.p., no printer or publisher given.
c. 2 (1568, 1570).
d. A, fol. 371a-415b; B, fol. 319b-357a; C.1, fol. 263b-295b.
e. Dresden (SLB), Frankfurt/M. (StUB), München (SB), Berlin (Humboldt-UB), Halle (UB), (1567); Nürnberg (StB), München (SB), London (BM), (1568).

*20. 1567. Florian Daul von Fürstenberg (G, 14).
a. Tantzteuffel: Das ist / wider den leichtfertigen / vnverschämtten Welttantz / vnd sonderlich wider die Gottszucht vnd ehr vergessene Nachttäntze.
c. 1 (1569).
d. A, fol. 251a-273a; B, fol. 216a-234b; C.1, fol. 175b-192a.
e. Marburg/L. (WB), Berlin (SB), Wolfenbüttel (HAB), München (SB), Augsburg (StB), Nürnberg (StB), (1567); Dresden (SLB), München (SB & UB), Berlin (SB), (1569).

*21. 1567. Andreas Fabricius (G, 13).
b. Eisleben. Andreas Petri (Dl, p. 44).
c. 1 (1575).
d. A, fol. 165a-195b; B, fol. 142a-167b; C.1, fol. 113b-133a.
e. Marburg/L. (UB), Dresden (SLB), Berlin (SB), Göttingen, (1567).

b. Ursel. Nicolaus Henricus (D1, p. 141).
c. No further editions in 16th century. (Gr, p. 551; 0, p. 240) 1627 was first ed. after 1568 other than in Theatrum Diabolorum.
d. A, fol. 1b-146b; B, fol. 1b-126b; C.1, fol. 1b-100a.
e. Berlin (DSB), München (SB), Strassburg (UB), Wiesbaden (NLB), Braunschweig (StB), Wolfenbüttel, Wien (NB), (1568); Augsburg (StB), Köln, Göttingen, Jena, Frankfurt/M., (1627).

   a. THEATRUM Diabolorum ... (cf. Introduction to Sec. II of this study).
b. Frankfurt/M. Peter Schmidt (D1, pp. 55, 123).
c. 2 (1575, 1587/88), cf. nos. 28 & 39.
e. Wolfenbüttel, Berlin (SB), Erlangen (UB), München (UB), Göttingen, Halle (UB), Rostock, Tübingen (UB), Augsburg, London (BM).

b. Tham in der Neumark (Neudamm). Christoph Runge (D1, p. 126).
c. 2 (1575, 1579).
d. B, fol. 561a-568b; C.2, fol. 129b-136a (as Spekulationischer Teuffel), fol. 374a-380b (as Melancholischer Teuffel).
e. London (BM), Berlin (DSB), Wolfenbüttel, (1572); Dresden (SLB), München (SB), (1579).

*25. 1572. Caspar Faber (G, 20).
   a. Einfeltige vnd kurtze Erinnerung vom Sabbaths-
      teuffel ... 
c. -
d. B, fol. 466a-491b; C.2, fol. 292a-314b.
e. Dresden (SLB), Berlin (SB), Augsburg.

*26. 1573. Andreas Lanng (G, 21).
   a. Sorgen Teuffel / Das ist / Wider die Heydnischen
      Bauchsorge der leiblichen Nahrung / schöner /
nutzer vnd tröstlicher Unterricht / wie sich ein jeder in seinem Beruff / ausz der Providentia vnd Göttlichen fürsehung / trösten sol . . .
b. Frankfurt/M. Nicolaus Bassé (D1, pp. 54-55).
c. -
d. B, fol. 526a-560b; C.2, fol. 342b-374a.
e. Berlin (SB).

*27. 1574. Christopher Obenhin (G, 22).
b. n.p., no printer or publisher given (Gr, p. 533, probably N. Henricus).
c. -
d. B, fol. 492a-525b; C.2, fol. 315a-343b.
e. Wolfenbüttel, Nürnberg (StB), Dresden (SLB), London (BM), München (SB).

*28. 1575. Sigmund Feyerabend, ed. (G, 23) (cf. no. 23).
a. THEATRUM Diabolorum . . . (cf. no. 23).
b. Frankfurt/M. Peter Schmidt (cf. no. 23).
c. cf. nos. 23 & 39.
e. Erlangen (UB), Berlin (SB), Wolfenbüttel (HAB), München (SB), Marburg/L. (UB), Leipzig, Jena, Zweiibrücken, Augsburg, Chicago (UL).

29. 1575. Christopher Marstaller (G, 24).
a. Der Pfarr vnd Pfürnd Beschneiderteuffel / So vnter dem heyligen Euangelio / sich aus den vntersten Orten der Erden / in diesen letzten Zeiten herfür gethan / Vnd bey den gewaltigen Potentaten dieser Welt teglichcs eynreitet . . . Auch was für Belohnung grosse Herren / so diesen Teuffel zur Herberg auffnehmen / müssen gewertig sein . . .
c. -
d. C.2, fol. 119b-129a.
e. Frankfurt/M. (StUB), Nürnberg (StB), Bern, London (BM).

a. Vom Geitz Teuffel. Ein Christlicher vnd heilsame
c. -
d. -
e. Augsburg, München (SB).

a. Gerichts Teuffel / Darinn angezeigt vnd gehandelt wirt / wie vnd in was massen der leidige Sathan bissweylen vnordnung vnd zerrütting in Gerichten durch die Richter / Cleger / Beklagten / Advocaten / Procuratoren / Zeugen vnd dergleichen Personen / so zu einem Gericht gehören / anrichten thut ...
   Zu End ist auch angehenckt der Gerichtlich Process, wie er ...
   jetziger zeyt in Teutschland üblich ...

c. 4 (1586, 1588, 1597).
d. C.2, fol. 193a-203b.
e. St. Gallen (StB), Frankfurt/M. (StUB), Augsburg, Leipzig, (1580); London (BM), Strassburg (UB), Halle (UB), (1586); Erfurt (UB), Berlin (SB), (1588); Braunschweig, Erfurt (UB), Berlin (SB), (1597).


b. Eisleben. Andreas Petri (cf. no. 21).
c. 2 (1591).
d. C.2, fol. 204a-264a.
e. München (SB), Coburg (LB), Tübingen (UB), Strassburg, (1580); Braunschweig, (1591).

33. 1581. Johann Strauss (G, 28).
a. Wider den Kleyder / Pluder / Pausz vnd Krausz Teuffel.
b. Görlitz. Ambrosius Fritsch (Dl, p. 64).
c. 2 (1581).
d. C.2, fol. 64a-71b.
e. Berlin (DSB), Augsburg, (1581, 1st ed.); Berlin (DSB), München (SB), Dresden (LB), London (BM), (1581).
34. 1581. Conrad Porta (G, 29) (ADB, XXVI, 445).
   a. Lügen Vnd Lesterteufel. Mit seinen Natürlichen
      Farben vnd Eygenschaften. Allen Gifftigen / 
      Verlipten Zungen / Ehrendieben / Vnd Verleumbdern 
      / zur Vermanung / vnd Warnung / abgemahlet / vnd 
      beschrieben.
   b. Eisleben. Urban Gaubisch (cf. no. 9).
   c. –
   d. C.2, fol. 136b-158a.
   e. München (SB), Berlin (SB), Tübingen (UB), Braun- 
      schweig, Augsburg.

   a. Schmeichelteuffel: Das ist / ein kurte Einfältige 
      Erklärung. Was die Placenzt Prediger / So den 
      obschwebenden / mit aller macht regierenden 
      Lastern nicht mit gebüren dem Ernst / vnd Priester- 
      lichem Eiver begegnen / wehren vnd stewren / für 
      schreckliche Sünd / wider Gott / den Nechsten / 
      vnd sich selbs gegehen.
   c. –
   d. C.2, fol. 101a-119a.
   e. Dresden (SLB).

36. 1581. Johannes Rhodius (Rödinger) (G, 30.2).
   a. Schmeichler oder Fuchsschwentze Teulf / Das ist 
      / Klarer Bericht von Schmeichlern / woher sie 
      koma / was für Leute sie sind / wie viel schaden 
      sie thun / vnd wie sie gestrafft / etc.
   b. Erfurt. Esaias Mechler (D1, pp. 49-50).
   c. 2 (1582).
   d. –
   e. München (SB), London (BM), Augsburg, (1581); 
      Nürnberg (StB), Frankfurt/M. (StUB), Berlin 
      (DSB), (1582).

37. 1582. Johannes Rhodius (Rödinger) (G, 30.1).
   a. Neidhard / oder Neidteufel: Das ist: Klarer 
      Bericht / vom Neid / was er sey / woher er kome 
      / wie viel schaden er thu / vnd gestrafft werde / 
      etc.
   b. Erfurt. Esaias Mechler (cf. no. 36).
   c. –
   d. C.2, fol. 72a-100b.
   e. Frankfurt/M. (StUB), London (BM), Augsburg.

38. 1586/87. Ambrosius Pape (G, 31).
   a. Bettel vnd Garte Teuffel. Ein kurzer vnd ein-
      fältiger / doch warhaftiger Bericht / von den
jetzigen Bettlern vnd vermeinten Landsknechten / wie sie vornemlich auff die Dörffer Haushalten vnd die arme Leute plagen / das sie mehr für Türcken / als für Teutsche möchten geachtet werden . . .
c. -
d. C.2, fol. 158b-192b.
e. München (UB), Stuttgart (WLB).

39. 1587/88. Sigmund Feyerabend, ed. (cf. no. 23).
a. THEATRUM Diabolorum . . . 2 vols. (cf. no. 23).
b. Frankfurt/M. Peter Schmidt (cf. no. 23).
c. cf. nos. 23 & 28.
d. München (SB), Lübeck, Wolfenbüttel (HAB), Hanover, Weimar, Leipzig, Greifswald, Dresden, Halle.

40. 1594. Andreas Celichius (Gr, p. 537).
a. Notwendige Erinnerung Vonn des Sathans letzten Zornsturm vnd Was es auff sich habe vnd bedeuete / das nu zu dieser zeit so viel Menschen an Leib vnd Seel vom Teuffel besessen werden.
c. -
d. -
e. Erlangen (UB).

41. 1603. Martin Hayneccius (G, 32).
c. -
d. -
e. Halle, Leipzig.

42. 1604. Heinrich Decimator (G, 33) (ADB, IV, 791).
c. -
d. -
e. Berlin (Humboldt-UB), Frankfurt/M. (StUB).
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