

DER ARME HEINRICH IN GERMAN LITERATURE

APPROVED:

Lee M. Hollander

Emmon Bail

THIS IS AN ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPT
IT MAY NOT BE COPIED WITHOUT
THE AUTHOR'S PERMISSION

DER ARME HEINRICH IN GERMAN LITERATURE

by

SHOGO IGUCHI B.A.

THESIS

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
The University of Texas in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements

For the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS
January 1964

PREFACE

Any work is possible to the extent that it relies on its predecessors and on many men of good will. Besides acknowledging my debt to works by the predecessors in this field, I should like to thank particularly Professors Dr. Lee M. Hollander and Dr. Emmon W. Bach for their kindness in reading the manuscript and giving me useful suggestions. Without their help, I could not have finished the work. I also owe deep appreciation to Professor Dr. Stanley N. Werbow, who gave me a chance to study in the United States and has been encouraging my study all the time.

S.I.

The University of Texas

December, 1963

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE111
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION1
II. <u>DER ARME HEINRICH</u> BY HARTMANN VON AUE12
III. THE FIRST REVIVAL42
IV. THE SECOND REVIVAL60
V. CONCLUSION	90
BIBLIOGRAPHY	96

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

In this thesis I propose to study German works based on the legend of Der Arme Heinrich, focusing attention especially on each writer's treatment of his source.

Analysis of a literary work is practised mainly on two aspects: the source or content, and the form. Considering one more element, that is, the writer's experience, which connects these two elements with each other and unifies them, Julius Petersen presumed a pyramid-shaped scheme of construction of a work to indicate the inner process of literary creation. His scheme has the three elements at the base: the source, the writer's experience, and the form, which must be unified and shaped to an individual work with the writer's idea, through his introspection and spiritualization.¹ His scheme might be compared to an equation with three variables: $y=f(X,Y,Z)$.² In case of the equation, if we could fix the variables the structure of the equation can be made clear. Can we not

¹ J. Petersen, Die Wissenschaft von der Dichtung (2nd ed. Berlin, 1939) pp. 110-12.

² X,Y,Z mean the three variables. There may be more, e.g. $y=(X,Y,Z, \dots)$, according the situation.

analyze the structure of a work objectively and minutely likewise by fixing some variable elements of the work? This is the starting point of my study. A study of works which have a common source may be the first step to fix the variables. We know, in addition, the other elements, i.e. literary forms in general and the writers' experience, through a philological study of them.

From the same point of view as ours, Wolfgang Kayser emphasizes the study of a source, saying:

Die Änderungen werden damit (a study of the source) um so aussagekräftiger für die neuen Formkräfte, die am Werke sind. Die sorgfältige Analyse der Art, wie die Quelle im Ganzen oder in Einzelheiten benutzt wird, die eingehende Beobachtung und Ausdeutung aller Änderungen versprechen reiche Erkenntnisse für das Werk einerseits und darüber hinaus für das Wesen des Poetischen, andererseits für die Erkenntnis des Dichters, der Strömung, der Epoche.³

However, source study has not been valued highly by some literary critics, especially by those who advocate Literaturwissenschaft als Geisteswissenschaft,⁴ perhaps because of the former historicism in source study, and perhaps partly because of various diverse conceptions of the meaning of the so-called Stoff. I would like to examine the situation here before my study.

Source study was developed first by Wilhelm Scherer

³ W. Kayser, Das sprachliche Kunstwerk, (7th ed. Bern and München, 1961) p. 58.

⁴ They will be discussed later in this chapter.

and his school, but their study of source had a special character. Elisabeth Frenzel justly explains this character for us as follows:

Die Schererschule stellte die Literaturgeschichte unter die Frage nach dem Erlebten und Ererbten, und unter dieser Devise musste die Klärung der stofflichen Grundlagen, der Quellen, des Überkommenen, der Abhängigkeiten entscheidend werden. Diese Bemühungen um die kausalgenetischen Zusammenhänge sind dem Einfluss der Theorien Taines zuzuschreiben und dem Bedürfnis, die Schlüssigkeit der übermächtigen Naturwissenschaft nachzuahmen und "exakten" Ergebnissen zu kommen. Exakte Ergebnisse lassen sich aber immer nur ausserhalb des dichterischen Kunstwerkes, im Vorfeld, erziehen, und so versuchte man, jede Schöpfung von ihrer Entstehungsgeschichte her zu analysieren.⁵

Scherer and his school performed a remarkable achievement in their study, i.e. in their historical study of literature, but on the other hand, their treatment of sources induced a kind of mechanistic historicism which sometimes makes too much of historical data and not infrequently forgets the dynamic development of the literary creation of each writer. In short, their study was attended with the danger of finishing only in the Vorfeld of a literary work. This fact caused some critics to feel dissatisfaction with the studies by the Scherer school.⁶

⁵ E. Frenzel, "Stoff- und Motivgeschichte", Deutsche Philologie im Aufriss, ed. by W. Stammer (Berlin, 1957), vol. I, 322. cf. W. Scherer, Poetik (Berlin, 1888), pp. 208-11.

⁶ cf. R. Unger, Literaturgeschichte als Problemgeschichte (Berlin, 1924), p. 144. Also, E. Elster, "Weltliteratur und Literaturvergleichung", Archiv für Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literatur, 107 (1901), pp. 33-47.

Negligence of source study was induced also by another fact, viz. by various diverse conceptions of the meaning of Stoff. As Frenzel says, Scherer and his school regarded Stoff as something outside of a writer. Their method of study was based on a historical conception of Stoff and developed on this basis. Julius Petersen and Wolfgang Kayser also think that Stoff is outside of a writer at first, i.e. historical in a sense. Kayser, for example, gives a clear definition of Stoff in Das sprachliche Kunstwerk: "Was ausserhalb eines literarischen Werkes in eigener Uberlieferung lebt und nun auf seinen Inhalt gewirkt hat, heisst STOFF."⁷ But these two excellent critics have not overlooked the deep and complicated relation between the Stoff and the writer's experience. Petersen studied this relation in his Die Wissenschaft von der Dichtung. He and Kayser try to study the relation between Stoff and the writer's creation. Kayser's so called Werkinterpretation is carried on by his deep interest in the effect of a Stoff in the writer's inner world and in his creation of a new work with a new form, style and idea. Petersen and Kayser's interest in a writer's creation distinguishes them from the Scherer school.

Some other critics think that Stoff is not outside of a writer, not something historical, but that it is within the writer's perception or mind. Here I am referring to the psychological school's conception of Stoff based on Sigmund Freud's views. For example, Josef Körner, strongly influenced by Freud's

⁷ W. Kayser, Das sprachliche Kunstwerk, p. 56.

psychoanalysis, makes this statement:

Diese Empfindungen bestimmen und erklären die äussere Welt. Der im Zusammenstoss mit ihr entstehende Affekt des Dichters ist das zu Gestaltende. Objektiven poetischen Stoff gibt es gar nicht. Jede Fabel wird subjektiv erfasst. Das, was man üblicherweise mit Stoff bezeichnet, ist allenfalls dem Marmor vergleichbar, dessen Bedeutsamkeit erst mit dem Zugriff des Künstlers entsteht, der also der Bemühung wissenschaftlicher Betrachtung nicht wert ist. ⁸

If Scherer's conception of Stoff could be called historical and Körner's, psychological, another kind of conception could be called a philosophical conception. It was introduced first by Wilhelm Dilthey and exemplified in articles by Friedrich Gundolf, Rudolf Unger, Fritz Strich, Oskar Walzel, Wilhelm Korff and others. They destroyed the old historical study of sources and established the study of literature as Geisteswissenschaft. Source study was absent from academic literary study for about twenty years before World War I. The critics who advocated Literaturwissenschaft als Geisteswissenschaft saw in literature only the ideas which had influences upon people and periods, and studied the history of literature especially with regard to the change and development of ideas. To them, source study was a minor subject, because, according to them, Stoff itself was a fortuitous element of a literary work. The history of the treatment of

8

J.Körner, "Erlebnis-Motiv-Stoff. Vom Geist neuer Literaturforschung", Festschrift für Oskar Walzel (Wildpark-Potsdam, 1924), p.80. Also, cf. W.Kohlschmidt and W.Mohr. "Motiv", Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturgeschichte, ed. by W.Stammer and others, (2nd ed. Berlin, 1961) pp.427-32.

Stoff had a meaning to them only when it pointed out "Wieweit die dem Zeitalter des einen oder anderen eigentümliche Welt von Ideen, Lebenserfahrungen und Formen die besondere Gestaltung bedingt."⁹

The confusion in the conception of the meaning of Stoff was not favorable for the further development of source study. However, the problem of Stoffkomplex is extremely complicated, too complicated to be explained from only one point of view. Each conception of Stoff we have examined is partially true but does not cover the entire problem, which is historical, psychological and philosophical at the same time. Rudolf Unger, one of the philosophical group, soon noticed the complex character of Stoff. He evaluated the source study by the Scherer school in his Literaturgeschichte als Problemgeschichte justly, which cannot be said of other critics of the group, stating that it found a way "zu einer auf sachliche Zusammenhänge jenseits einseitigen Biographismus und Psychologismus gestützten literaturhistorischen Synthese."¹⁰ In spite of Unger's favorable evaluation, I think, source study as practised by the Scherer school was not enough by itself. The zigzag course of development was necessary for source study to be deepened.

⁹ O. Walzel, Das Wortkunstwerk (Leipzig, 1926) p. 21.

¹⁰ R. Unger, Literaturgeschichte als Problemgeschichte.
p. 15.

The Scherer school observed the Stoffkomplex from outside of a writer, and the psychological group studied it from inside of a writer, and the philosophical group tried to evaluate the meaning of Stoff in connection with ideas, forms, and the so called Zeitgeist of a period.¹¹ All of these points of view are necessary.

It was Robert Petsch, Julius Petersen and Wolfgang Kayser who put source study on the right track. They began to study the source of a work by a synthetic method. A new stage began with them, but Petsch's conception of Stoff, which was the first one in the new stage, still show a confusion, especially in his use of terminology. He states first that the Stoff is not historical nor suitable for adaptation by a writer, in the same manner as the psychological group said; it must be created by each writer. For example, Homer's Illiad-Stoff is completely Homer's Stoff which cannot be passed along to other writers, cannot be changed by anyone. Accordingly, Goethe's work with Homeric theme is one completely created by Goethe, in other words, a work independent to Homer. Therefore, the stories in Illiad, such as the abduction of Helena or the destruction of Troy, which Homer used and other writers took over many times, have nothing to do with the

¹¹
cf. F.Gundolf, Shakespeare und der deutsche Geist,
(11th ed. München, 1959)

meaning of the same stories in other works which were written by other writers. Petsch called such things as the abduction of Helena which can be found in many works, Rohstoff. According to him, Rohstoff is not yet a real Stoff. It is something like a marble stone to a sculptor. But this theory seems strange. We know that Goethe was inspired by Homer's work, not by some vague Rohstoff. Homer's Stoff influenced Goethe and was adopted by him. How does Petsch explain this fact? He explains it as follows; though Stoff is independent, unchangeable and unhistorical, there is a changeable historical part in it. He called this part of Stoff the Formel. A writer who takes over the content of another writer's work finds the Formel in the original writer's unchangeable, unhistorical Stoff and creates his own Stoff out of the Formel.¹²

Petsch's concept of Formel is undoubtedly a subsidiary concept to his extremely subjective interpretation of Stoff. He explains the historical character of Stoff by this subsidiary concept or wissenschaftliche Hilfskonstruktion, but it is precisely what is usually called Stoff. It is clear however, that Petsch tries to explain synthetically the complicated, subjective and also objective character of the Stoffkomplex by use of three different technical terms: Rohstoff, Formel and Stoff.

12

R.Petsch, Deutsche Literaturwissenschaft (Halle/Saale, 1940) pp. 87-99, 129-150.

I myself prefer to follow Petersen's clear and distinct definition of Stoff, rather than Petsch's tripartite definition.

Petersen defines thus:

- Wir müssen dabei bleiben, dass, wenn die Dichtung überhaupt ein Stoff hat, dieser in einer zunächst ausserhalb von ihr gelegenen Überlieferung besteht. Sie wird an den Dichter herangetragen oder von ihm aufgefunden und bietet ihm eine lockende Gelegenheit, eine Aufforderung, eine Frage nach der Möglichkeit der Gestaltung. Sobald er sie aufgegriffen hat, ist sie sein Erlebnis geworden, und er spiegelt sich selbst in ihr: nun beginnt die persönliche Formung, und damit ist die Eigenexistenz des Stoffes vorbei.¹³

Kayser is basically of the same opinion as Petersen.¹⁴ Petersen's statement of "eine lockende Gelegenheit, eine Aufforderung, eine Frage nach der Möglichkeit der Gestaltung" of Stoff is especially significant. It suggests a power inherent in the Stoff.

We can find some statements of the power of Stoff, of a symbolkräftiger Inhalt of Stoff, also in Petsch's Deutsche Literaturwissenschaft¹⁵ but Emil Ermatinger deals with this problem better than Petsch.

Es gibt nicht Stoff als blosse ungebildete Masse. Auch der Zeitungsbericht ist schon gestaltet, wieviel mehr erst Chronik und Sage. In der Tat dringt ja selbst ein eigenes Erlebnis unter einer gewissen Brechung in das Innere des Dichters ein und organisiert sich dort zu einer Vorform, die durchaus nicht der späteren Gestaltung zu entsprechen braucht, aber doch auch, wie in den Fällen eines sekundären Stofferlebnisses, von bleibendem Einfluss auf sie sein kann. Stoff ohne diese Vorform gibt es nicht.¹⁶

¹³ J.Petersen, Die Wissenschaft von der Dichtung, p.118.

¹⁴ cf. Note 6.

¹⁵ R.Petsch, Deutsche Literaturwissenschaft, p.90.

¹⁶ E.Ermatinger, Das dichterische Kunstwerk(Leipzig,1935)

However, we should not forget here that a writer has complete freedom in the selection of a Stoff and in his creation based on it.

Der Feststellung einer Stoff- und Motivübernahme hat die-- über das Wesen des jeweiligen Dichters aussagende-- Frage nach dem auslösenden Reiz des Stoffes auf den Bearbeiter, nach dem Grund der Wahl, zu folgen. Als einfachste Erklärung bietet sich zunächst die, dass der Stoff ein Geheimnis in sich trug, das nach Lösung verlangte, dass er einen "Fall" darstellte, der den Dichter zu einem Urteilsspruch aufrief.¹⁷

This description of source study by E.Frenzel is quite instructive and states well the basic motivation for my study of Der Arme Heinrich in German literature. What kind of influence did the legend have upon later writers? What problem did they find in the legend and how did they try to approach and solve it? And in what form? These problems are to be studied in the following chapters. The character of the legend is unique. It provokes pity and commiseration. It is both charming and cruel. Hartmann's treatment of the legend is extremely beautiful and his language is crystal-clear. But Goethe did not like it at all when he read it in Büsching's translation for the first time. Of course, there is here a special problem of Goethe and his attitude to sickness, of classicism and the medieval literature and, in addition, a problem of the translation, all of which must be studied in the following chapters. But Goethe's unusually strong expression of dislike of the work¹⁸ proves the unique and

¹⁷ E.Frenzel, "Stoff- und Motivgeschichte", Deutsche Philologie im Aufriss. ed. by W.Stammler. vol. I. p. 296.

¹⁸ Weimar Ausgabe. vol.XXXVI. pp.72-73(Annalen 1811)

powerful character of the legend which has been used by other writers so many times that we cannot be indifferent to the legend as Stoff when we think that Stoffgeschichte is also Problemggeschichte.

CHAPTER II

DER ARME HEINRICH BY HARTMANN VON AUE

Der Arme Heinrich by Hartmann von Aue has an important bearing on other works, because later writers were all inspired directly or indirectly by Hartmann and adopted the legend as their source, even if they created almost a new work out of it. Hartmann on the other hand, composed his work completely for himself, using rather scattered traditional legends. He fused the diverse sources into one work and passed it on to later generations as the sole source for them. Therefore, Hartmann's work has a double significance in our study, first as a work based on diverse sources and then as a source for later writers.

Though he states in the introduction to Der Arme Heinrich that he had sought in many books for a subject that would be both to the glory to God and please his fellow-men(v.6-15) and found a written rede(v.17), it is difficult for us now to identify the written source. rede in M.H.G. as a technical term at that time meant an epic or an unstrophic didactic poem with rhyme.¹ However, he used another word, maere, for it in verse 29, which meant a poetical story in general.² Thinking that rede

¹ M.Lexer, Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1872-78)

² Ibid.

meant also a common poetical narration in a broad sense,³ he seems to have used this word for a poetical narration in this broad sense. He states further that he begins to duiten it to his fellow-men(v.16). duiten means: to interpret, to explain, and also to translate into German.⁴ Therefore, if we take his statement to be true, there must have been a written source either in German or in a foreign language, probably in Latin or in French, which he seems to have understood well. He seems to have explained or interpreted the source to his fellow-men, if we are to trust his statement. Of course, one could also think that his statement might have been the same conventional form to assume an air of importance as Wolfram von Eschenbach did in his Parzival,⁵ i.e. he might have composed the epic without using any source or model. However, we must remember that Wolfram was a special case among German epic poets in the medieval age. Though Wolfram used such a device, generally speaking, it was quite unusual for a German epic poet at that time to compose an epic without using some source or model. In most cases there was a direct model.⁶ In Hartmann's case it is known that he used French and Latin works, for example, in Erec, Iwein and Gregorius. J.K.Bostock says, therefore, that it is improbable for

³ M.Lexer, Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch, 3 vols.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ W.von Eschenbach, Parzival, ed.by E.Martin(Halle/Saale, 1920) pp.416, 20 ff.

⁶ J.K.Bostock, Der Arme Heinrich(Oxford, 1941) p.17.

Hartmann to have invented a story, especially in the case of Der Arme Heinrich.⁷ B.Nagel affirms also that "Das Dichten des mhd. Epikers war ja zuvörderst nicht schöpferische Stoffgestaltung, ...der eigenwillige Märenfinder wurde vielmehr als ein 'vindaere wilder maere, der maere wildenaere' verpönt."⁸ Gottfried von Strassburg who blames Wolfram for his wild invention of a story did not blame Hartmann but praised him for his courtly manner.⁹ For these reasons, I also think that it is really improbable for him to have invented the story positively against the courtly manner of that time, because he was especially a man of máze with some didactic character, whom H.Kuhn in his article called a kind of Biedermann.¹⁰

To our regret, however, no possible immediate source has been identified until now, though we know some similar stories of miraculous cure of leprosy. None of these stories is exactly the same as Hartmann's Der Arme Heinrich. The

⁷ J.K.Bostock, Der Arme Heinrich, p.17.

⁸ B.Nagel, Der Arme Heinrich Hartmanns von Aue. Eine Interpretation(Tübingen, 1952) p.19. The Middle High German quotation is out of Tristan by G.von Strassburg, v.460ff.

⁹ G.von Strassburg, Tristan, ed. by F.Ranke(Berlin, 1930) v.460ff.

¹⁰ H.Kuhn, "Hartmann von Aue als Dichter", Der Deutschunterricht, 1953. pp. 11-27.

nearest approach to Hartmann's work is a legend in Latin, preserved in two manuscripts, which were found in Breslau and seem to be of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.¹¹ Except for the fact that the hero in one manuscript (MS.A) is called Albertus pauper and in another manuscript (MS.B), Heinricus pauper(!), the stories in the two MSS. are same in the essential point.

The legend runs as follows:

"Miles strenuus circa Rhenum Albertus nomine, ...casu, quem passus est, pauper cognominatus est. Hic erat dives et mirae pietatis, sed vanitati militiae supra modum deditus." After his affliction he spent all his money in vain on doctors; when it was all gone his friends deserted him; he hid himself from the world for fourteen years. A doctor heard of him and undertook to heal him if he would give him gold, which Albertus promised to do, relying on the generosity of his relations. When the doctor found he was leprous, he said only the blood of a chaste human being would cure him. A girl, to whom Albertus had given clothes, offered her life out of gratitude. Albertus accepted her offer with joy, but when he saw the preparations he repented. In the night the Lord appeared, healed him, and revealed to him the place where his relatives had hidden the treasure they had stolen from him. He married the girl and after a long time he died in peace.¹²

The content of the manuscripts has too much similarity to Hartmann's work to be carelessly put aside. It is obvious

11

cf. G.Ehrismann, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters, (München, 1927) Vol.II,2,1. p.198f. Also, J.Klapper, Die Legende vom Armen Heinrich, (Breslau, 1914) and Introduction of Der Arme Heinrich, ed by Wackernagel-Stadler (Basel, 1911)

12

J.K.Bostock, Der Arme Heinrich, pp. 17-18.

that the story in the manuscripts was for less educated people, perhaps for the average audience of the Sunday service.¹³ The girl's motive of self-sacrifice is her recollection of the clothes which the knight had given her. The manuscripts contain no scene of the woodland farm and the peasant family, nor the scene of a journey to Montpelier and Salerno, nor the girl's enthusiastic argument for her self-sacrifice. The knight in the manuscripts lives alone for fourteen years. However, the girl's pride and his kealing as a reward for renouncing life are the same as found in both the manuscripts and in Hartmann's work. The gratitude of the peasant in Hartmann's work is parallel to the gratitude of the girl in the manuscripts, even though Hartmann's work is more explicit about the reason of the girl's impulse: it was an inspiration from God.

The manuscripts originated in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries there were many booklets(exempla) in the form of manuscripts, which contained legends, miraculous and religious short stories, and were used for the purpose of religious and moral training mainly in church.¹⁴ The manuscripts seem to have been such books as these. Judging from a fact that the manuscripts differ

¹³ G.Ehrismann, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters , vol.II. 2,1. p.119.

¹⁴ Ibid. vol. II. 2,1. p.119.

slightly in details,¹⁵ we can presume that there must have been an archetype of the story in the preceding century, i.e. in the thirteenth century when Hartmann was still working. If there should be such archetype it could be regarded as the source Hartmann claimed to have used.

Interpreting the word duiten positively for "to translate", J.Klapper claimed that an archetype of the manuscripts in Latin must be Hartmann's source.¹⁶ H.Sparnaay, on the other hand, thinks that both Hartmann's work and the manuscripts must have come from an unidentified common source.¹⁷ According to Sparnaay, both Hartmann and writer of the manuscripts composed their own stories using an unattested source. H.Paul, A. Leitzmann and L.Wolff said of the problem that Hartmann's work and the manuscripts were not genealogically related but were works independent of each other and were perhaps based on the same kind of widespread popular story, not on a story composed by a writer but on folklore.¹⁸ A.Schönbach says that Hartmann's images and composition, especially in the introduction and

¹⁶ J.Klapper, Die Legende vom Armen Heinrich, pp.18-20.

¹⁵ P.Wapnewski, Hartmann von Aue (Stuttgart, 1962) p.91.
e.g. name of the hero, etc.

¹⁷ H.Sparnaay, Hartmann von Aue. Studien zu einer Biographie. 2 vols.(Halle/Saale, 1933-39). Vol.II. pp.5-9.

¹⁸ H.Paul and A.Leitzmann(ed.), Der Arme Heinrich(Halle, 1949). cf. Einleitung.

the girl's speeches, are quite similar to those of ecclesiastical writers in the Middle Ages.¹⁹ Though these diverse opinions of Hartmann's source are nothing but probable hypotheses, they at least agree assuming that Hartmann might not have invented the story but used such stories as his source.

C.von Kraus says of the manuscripts that the contents of the manuscripts were adapted from Hartmann's work,²⁰ but his opinion is denied by Sparnaay and H. de Boor for the reason that the contents of the manuscripts are too primitive to be thought of as an adaptation of Der Arme Heinrich.²¹

According to de Boor and J.K.Bostock,²² we can imagine another probability for the source. Hartmann's story concerns the lord Heinrich von Ouwe(v.49-50) who waere ze Swaben gesezzen (v.30-31). In addition, the poet introduces himself to the audience at the beginning of the epic:

Ein ritter sô geleret was
daz er an den buochen las
swas er dar an geschriben vant,
der was Hartman genaht,
dienstman was er ze Ouwe. (v. 1-5)

19 A.Schönbach, Über Hartmann von Aue. (Graz, 1894)

20 C.von Kraus, "Armer Heinrich", ZfdA. 82(1948) pp.73-76.

21 H.Sparnaay, Hartmann von Aue. Studien zu einer Biographie. Vol.II. pp. 5-9.

22 H.de Boor, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart. (5th ed. München, 1962) Vol.II. pp.77-78.

The story, therefore, seems to be of a knight of the family which the poet served as a vassal. Bostock says:

It has been suggested that some ancestor of the family had disgraced himself by contracting a loathsome disease and by marrying beneath, so Hartmann was concerned to 'white-wash' him, and did so by representing him as a proud man humbled by God, and his low-born wife as a saint.²³

H. de Boor says the same thing:

Ob sie(exempla) wirklich den Rohstoff darbieten, den Hartmann zu seinem kleinen Meisterwerk gestaltet hat, ob mithin das 'Buch', auf das sich Hartmann als quelle beruft, eine Sammlung lateinischer Predigtmärlein war, ist nicht so sicher, Denn schwerlich hätte der Dichter diese Geschichte von dem aussätzigen Ritter, der eine unebenbürtige Ehe schliesst, mit dem Geschlecht seines freiherrlichen Dienstherrn verbinden dürfen, wenn es nicht in der Tradition dieser Familie sachliche Anknüpfungspunkte gegeben hätte. Man wird daher in der uns nicht mehr erreichbaren Familienüberlieferung die wichtigste Quelle Hartmanns suchen müssen und erwägen, ob jene jüngerer Predigtmärlein nicht zweckbedingte Vereinfachung sind.²⁴

As for this kind of opinion, Sparnaay keeps himself negative to it, saying that, if the story was really of Heinrich von Aue who had been alive in Swabia, the poet could not read it first in books. If the poet should have read it in a book for the first time, what kind of book was it? For there must have been few house-chronicles at that time.²⁵

23

J.K.Bostock, Der Arme Heinrich, p.17.

24

H. de Boor, Geschichte der deutschen Literature von Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart (5th ed.) Vol.II. p. 77.

25

H.Sparnaay, Hartmann von Aue. Studien zu einer Biographie. Vol.II. p.2.

The assumption of G.Ehrismann²⁶ and B.Nagel²⁷ seems most probable, viz. that Hartmann had read the story not only in an exemplum but in several exempla which contained the same story as the manuscripts did, presumably in Latin, because there were numerous exempla in the Middle Ages and these had almost the same content. He must have been quite familiar with the story before he began to write the epic. And composing his own story from a well-known source, he must have given his own ideas, view of life and style to the source, because it was a common practise for German epic poets of the Middle Ages to use a popular, well-known source and to form it into their own work with a special character.²⁸ Though Hartmann named the hero Heinrich von Ouwe, it was also a quite common literary custom at that time for a popular legend or story to be connected with a certain person with a certain name familiar to the audience.²⁹ We should remind ourselves here of a special character of the medieval epic. It was recited in the presence of an audience. The effect of the recitation must have been greater when the audience had some previous knowledge of the story.

26

G.Ehrismann, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters. II.2,1, p199.

27

B.Nagel, Der Arme Heinrich Hartmanns von Aue. pp. 18-21.

28

G.Ehrismann, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters. II.2,1. pp. 199-200.

29

Ibid. p.199.

The principal motif of this epic is the miraculous healing of leprosy, which was also a well-known motif at that time. In the Middle Ages, leprosy had a special meaning, which we must consider before we examine Der Arme Heinrich in detail.

Almost every literary work about Der Arme Heinrich emphasizes the spiritual meaning of the disease in the Middle Ages. It was not merely a physical sickness but was regarded as a spiritual one, a punishment by God, because it could not be healed by human power. The patient was so much feared and segregated from society that he had to wear a special kind of clothes and sound a rattle as he moved, so that people might identify him and avoid him easily.³⁰ Hartmann called the disease diu miselsuht (mlat. misellus and M.H.G. suht). misellus is related to miser, and der ûzsaeze, which meant someone who was ejected or expelled from society, i.e. der auswärt wohnende or ansässige.³¹ According to Ehrismann, and especially P.Cassel,³² it was a widespread disease in medieval Europe, which perhaps had been brought from the Orient to Europe through Egypt, and newly introduced again to Europe by crusaders who had been in the Orient. We find many references to lepers in the old documents of the

30

G.Ehrismann, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters. II.2,1. p.198.

31

M.Lexer, Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch.

32

G.Ehrismann, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters. II. 2,1. p.198. and P.Cassel, Die Symbolik des Blutes und Der Arme Heinrich Hartmanns von Aue (Berlin, 1882)

Orient, e.g. in the Bible.³³ The Bible treats the patients as those who had committed a sin and were punished by God, that is to say, "spiritually". For example, Job in the fourth book of Mose, got the disease and the Bible explains that it was a punishment by God. In the Bible, every sickness is understood spiritually in this manner. Disease is a mark of spiritual poisoning. Job, however, was healed by God, after having proved his devotion to God. This kind of spiritual view of the disease seems to have widely infiltrated the whole Orient and Europe with the spread of Christianity. It was believed that only God was able to cure it because it was caused by His will.

However, it was also believed that there was a secret cure for it in the world, not through God's will. The medicine was human blood, especially that of children. Although some beliefs in the magic power of blood can be found in every primitive society,³⁴ in medieval Europe the belief comes apparently from Christianity, especially from the New Testament, because it was so closely connected with the religion. In fact, blood plays a great rôle in Christianity. The symbolic cult of blood and wine is a good example. Therefore, belief in the beneficial uses of blood in Europe has in most cases a religious character which I cannot find among the beliefs in Far Eastern countries where Buddhism and Confucianism abhorred blood. Both the

33

P.Wapnewski, Hartmann von Aue(Stuttgart, 1962) p. 89

34

P.Cassel, Die symbolik des Blutes und Der Arme Heinrich Hartmanns von Aue.

spiritual interpretation of leprosy and the idea of a blood cure for it seem to come from the Orient. Originally they were not connected but separated from each other because blood meant something sacred and leprosy meant something evil. But people in medieval Europe connected them with each other, of course, by their own imagination. This is an interesting idea because the divine power of blood began to be used for magic, that is to say, began to be under human control. According to Ehrismann, both Pliny and Paracelsus wrote something of the blood cure of leprosy in their books.³⁵ The idea seems to originate in the early medieval era.

As far as we know, there were two kinds of stories based on the blood cure of leprosy in the medieval era. One is the so-called mercy-type or legend-type. A legend of Pope Sylvester at the end of the fifth century represents this type. The Emperor Constantine once contracted leprosy. People advised him to take a bath of children's blood in order to be cured but he rejected the advice because he did not want to kill innocent children for that purpose. Pope Sylvester who heard of him healed him by his baptism. We can find this story in the Kaiserchronik and Trierer Sylvester of the twelfth century. It is clear in this story that leprosy is a symbol of disbelief and that God is still the healer. The legend is obviously related to the story of Job in the Old Testament. The writer of the archetype of the legend must have taken the source directly

35

G. Ehrismann, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters. II.2,1. p.198.

from the Bible, because Pope Sylvester is not a historical figure, and the legend is a kind of fiction.³⁶

Another type is the so-called friendship-type represented by the Amicus und Amelius of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The original story comes from the Orient but already in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries there were many translations of it in Latin, French, German, English and Swedish.³⁷ One of the two intimate friends contracts leprosy. The sick man or leper needs the blood of children for the medicine. His friend offers his daughter to the man and so proves his friendship. God also in this story helps the leper and the girl. We can find this type in Engelhart und Engeltrut by Konrad von Wurzburg and other works.³⁸

Thus, we see that Hartmann's work was not an isolated one at that time but one which had a long tradition. It might have been impossible for the poet to compose Der Arme Heinrich if there had been no available source. The verses 1360-70 prove that he used a source with a long tradition.

Sî er durch sinen sîezen list
an in beiden des geruochte
daz er sî versuochte
reht also volleclichen,
sam Jôben den richen,

36

G.Prochnow, "Mhd. Sylvesterlegenden und ihre Quellen",
ZfdPh. 33(1901) pp. 145-212.

37

H.Sparnaay, Der Arme Heinrich. Studien zu einer Biographie. Vol.II. p.4.

38

G.Ehrismann, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters. II.2,1. p.197.

dô erzeigte der heilige Krist
wie liep im triuwe und bärnde ist,
und schiet si dô beide
von allem ir leide
und machete in dô zestunt
reine und wol gesunt.

He composed a local story of his native land Swabia out of the source and gave it a unique meaning.

What is this idea? Formerly, according to the study by K.Zwierzina,³⁹ it was thought that Hartmann wrote this epic before he wrote Iwein, but now with A.Schirokauer⁴⁰ we think that the work was written after the poet had finished the first 1,000 verses of Iwein and that it belongs to the last stage of Hartmann's literary career. Hartmann experienced a deep sorrow at his master's death and composed Kreuzlieder and the legend of Gregorius. His experience of the crusade must have cleared up his spiritual crisis. Before his composition of Iwein he seems to have mastered techniques of epic composition. He was ready to write his life-work with the best of his ability, both as to technique and spiritual idea. It was at this time that he began to write Der Arme Heinrich. He seems to have put his heart and soul into this small epic. The epic is composed of only 1520 lines in a modest and lovely form like the poet himself. It does not have the form of a great life-work but it is nevertheless his richest, most mature work.

39
K.Zwierzina, "Mittelhochdeutsche Studien", ZfdA. 44(1900), 45(1901) and "Beobachtungen zum Reimgebrauch Hartmanns von Aue", Festgabe für R.Heinzel(Halle/Saale, 1898)

40
A.Schirokauer, "Zur Interpretation des Armen Heinrich", ZfdA. 83(1951) pp.59-78. Also, cf. "Hartmann von Aue", in Verfasserlexikon. vol. V. and P.Wapnewski, Hartmann von Aue. pp. 12-24.

Since the setting of the epic is Swabia in the Middle Ages, the starting point is the Wunschleben of knights at that time, as Ehrismann rightly pointed out.⁴¹ The poet, however, does not praise the Wunschleben but tries to inform the audience of a crisis in it. He does not say in the epic anything of knightly fighting, tournament, adventure, of küener recken striten. It is obvious that the poet expected another sort of audience than that of his Artusromane. He seems to have expected an audience that had an especially religious need. According to H.Naumann,⁴² das Ritterliche and das Höfische in the life of the knights contradicted each other. Therefore, we could say that the poet is emphasizing das Höfische in the epic, but we cannot find any conventional Minnedienst in this case. The heroine is a poor peasant girl. It is against the conventional idea of Minne that a knight praises a low-born girl and marries her. The content of the epic rather entails a significant denial of the conventional manner of medieval chivalry from a biblical point of view. F.Maurer, who studied medieval thought in epics through the meaning of Leid in each work, explains the character of the epic from another point of view.⁴³

41

G.Ehrismann, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters. II.2,1. p.201.

42

H.Naumann, Deutsche Kultur in Zeitalter des Rittertums(Potsdam, 1936) p. 78.

43

F.Maurer, Leid (Bern, 1951) p. 46.

According to him, there were two sorts of Leid in the medieval epic. Though these two sorts of Leid are usually mixed in a work, one can be found clearly in the Nibelungenlied, or Germanic Volksepos. The Leid is caused by insult or contempt by other people of a man in their society. The man takes revenge on them so that he may regain his lost honor in society. It is an old Germanic Blutrache, is played entirely in their human world, and has no connection with God. The basic idea is bloody fatalism. Maurer indicated it by the following scheme:

Ehre-----Leid-----Rache-----Ehre

Doubtless it originates in barbarous primitive Germanic thought which had been fostered in their tribal life full of savage battels. Another sort of Leid has a connection with God. It can be found typically in Der Arme Heinrich. The Leid is caused by sin. If a person wants to regain his lost happiness he must repent and turn to God for His mercy. Maurer indicates this Leid as follows:

Ehre-----Sünde-----Leid-----Busse-----Gnade-----Ehre

Needless to say, this sort of Leid comes through Christianity. The story of Job in the Bible is a model. Maurer points out thus the Germanic element and the Christian or biblical element in the medieval epic. Der Arme Heinrich belongs to the latter. I would rather follow Maurer's analysis than Naumann's, because it seems to me that the most important element of Der Arme Heinrich is Christianity. Besides these two sorts of Leid which Maurer discusses, we can find another one in classical

thought, where Leid is caused by hybris to gods, but the classical Leid has no connection with sin, which distinguishes it from the biblical thought.

During the period of O.H.G. literature, the German people were Christianized considerably but their heroic tradition was not yet extinct. The Christianized society of knights was still full of things antagonistic to Christianity. For this reason, Hartmann begins the epic with warning of insecuritas humana or fragilitas humana. The beautiful harmony of the courtly world might have seemed to the poet to be only an appearance. We can find many passages in the epic, in which the poet emphasizes the transitoriness of the world.

"Mêdiâ vitâ
in morte sūmus";
daz bediutet sich alsus,
daz wir in dem tôde sweben
so wir aller beste waenen leben.
Dirre werlte veste,
ir staete unde ir beste,
unde ir groeste magenkraft,
diu stât âne meisterschaft. (v. 92-100)

This basic idea of the transitoriness of the world comes from the Bible and his conception of God is quite akin to that of Job, i.e. a mighty, personal God.⁴⁴ He cites the name of Job several times and compares the hero's suffering to that of Job.⁴⁵ At the

⁴⁴
A.Schönbach, Über Hartmann von Aue (Graz, 1894) pp. 130-56.

⁴⁵
H.de Boor, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von Anfängen bis zum Gegenwart. Vol.II. p. 78. and C.von Kraus, "Parzival und Der Arme Heinrich", Festschrift für Singer (Tübingen, 1930) pp. 7-19.

beginning of the epic we see Heinrich in the society of knights without any dissatisfaction. He was an ideal knight according to a standard of worldly virtue. He was almost a perfect knight (v.29-132). The only thing he lacked was deep devotion to God, the understanding that he owed all to God, which was revealed by the fact that he contracted leprosy, a punishment by God according to the conception of the disease at that time. The Bible says, one cannot serve two masters at the time. In the modern time, the problem of "Entweder - oder" is decided by the human will but in the Middle Ages the decision was made by God, one had no right to decide "Entweder - oder".

F.Maurer explains the significance of the words "in ergreif diu miselsuht(v.19) as follows:

Es handelt nicht bloss um unheilbare Krankheit zum Tode, sondern es bedeutet zugleich Ausschluss aus der menschlichen Gemeinschaft, aus der ritterlichen Gesellschaft. Mit einem Aussätzigen will niemand verkehren, die Krankheit nimmt ihm die Voraussetzung seines ritterlichen Daseins, den gesunden Körper; sie bedeutet Auslöschung seines ritterlichen Daseins.⁴⁶

W.Fechter also says,

Was dies für einen mittelalterlichen Adligen bedeutete, dessen ganzes Wesen auf die Öffentlichkeit und auf sein Aussehen gerichtetete, kann sich der heutige Leser kaum vorstellen.⁴⁷

He was thus deprived of everything in the world. However, we should not overlook one fact, a Christian paradox: God tries only his beloved. The nearer one is to God, the more he must be tempted. The punishment does not mean an absolute one.

⁴⁶

F.Maurer, Leid. p. 39.

⁴⁷

W.Fechter, "Über den Armen Heinrich Hartmanns von Aue", Euphorion 49(1955) p. 1.

In fact, there is no hint of fatalism in the epic though it is a rather cruel story. Everything is planned by Him. In addition, the poet explains many times to the audience why God punished him⁴⁸ he had gone too far in the Wunschleben and lost his way. The poet says, "der in dem hoesten werde/ lebet uf dirre erde/ derst der versmãhte vor gote.(v. 113-16). Way to the salvation is suggested already in the epic, unlike the Nibelungenlied. Heinrich, however, did not at first understand the meaning of the sickness and visited doctors one after another, but he comes to understand it at last, and decides to obey His will. Thereafter, his suffering has a dual meaning, one spiritual and another physical. With obedience he enters the second phase of his life in a peasant's farm. The poet points out that the hero in his second phase is not yet completely obedient to God. The poet calls him still der arme Heinrich.⁴⁹ The word arm in the work means "spiritually poor", together with "physically poor", and contrasts to guot which is used for the girl who is also rein.⁵⁰ He still lacks the will for atonement. We can see the lack in the fact that he accepts the girl's self-sacrifice for him. Even though the audience of the epic may have thought that such self-sacrifice of a peasant girl for her master was not strange, the poet's description of the peasant family tells us that it is wrong. The description suggests to us that the peasant and his family are the same creatures as Heinrich

⁴⁸ cf. v. 120-21, 383-40, 404-8, 409-11.

⁴⁹ cf. v. 350 until v. 1372.

⁵⁰ cf. v. 305, 344 ff.

himself under God, but the peasants are more pious than Heinrich. Hartmann writes, "Got hete dem meier gegeben/ nächw siner ahte ein reinez leben(v.296). They are pious enough to offer their daughter to God'will, saying. "der sin si ir von gote komen." (v. 875). Hartmann's thought of this equality of human beings before God is noteworthy, if we consider the attitude of the feudal Middle Ages.⁵¹

In the peasant's farm, Heinrich comes to be under the care of a girl, the peasant's daughter. He sees her for the first time when she is eight years old. She decides to sacrifice herself at the age of eleven. These three years are the only peaceful years in the epic; she takes care of him with her whole heart and he calls her gemahel without any deep meaning.⁵² As we see later, this scene gave fresh impression to later writers. Her age seems to tell us that she is so small a girl that she is not able to judge anything for herself. However, According to de Boor⁵³ and Schirokauer,⁵⁴ a girl at the

51

F.Beyerle, "Der Arme Heinrich Hartmanns von Aue als Zeugnis mittelalterlichen Ständerechts", Kunst und Recht, Festgabe für H.Fehr(Freiburg, 1948). Also, W.Fechter, "Über den Armen Heinrich Hartmanns von Aue", Euphorion 49(1955) p.7. J.Kleinstück says, "Der Bauer diente dem Ritter als Negativ, wie der Barbar dem Griechen, der Rusticus den urbanen Römern." cf. J.Kleinstück, "Zur Auffassung des Todes im Mittelalter", Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift. 28(1954) p.49.

52

cf. v. 341.

53

H. de Boor, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart. Vol. II. p. 78.

54

A.Schirokauer, "Zur Interpretation des Armen Heinrich", ZfdA. 83(1950) p.74.

age of eleven was at that time regarded as a person of maturity. It is with this girl that the epic begins to show its uniqueness. The girl speaks 362 verses in the epic, while Heinrich speaks only 182 verses. She is undoubtedly the leading character of the story, who acts in rôle opposite to Heinrich and leads him to a higher stage of life. As the poet describes it, man möchte wol genôzen/ ir kintlich gemüete/ hin zuo der engel guete(v.464-66), she has an ideal Christian character, and sâ dient si ime alle wege/ mit ir gütlichen pflege(v.309-10). Her service is not merely a nurse's care of patient in modern humanity, nor a servant's to his master through loyalty, but the service to the poor coming from the caritas of Christianity. The poet writes:

iedoch geliebte irz aller meist
von gotes gebe ein suezzer geist. (v. 347-48)

ich(the girl) wil mich alsus reine
antwürten in gotes gewalt. (v. 698-99)

On the other hand, Heinrich is only resigning to his fate, lamenting and sighing, even when he explains to the peasant why he got the sickness(v. 378-82). That is to say, the girl is able to feel the other's sorrow as if it were her own, while Heinrich feels only his own sorrow and is perhaps ready in his mind to accept another's sacrifice for him.

The girl's religious character is emphasized by her self-sacrifice for the poor sinner following Jesus and the saints. The self-sacrifice by her own will is the very thesis of the epic, together with Heinrich's later self-reproach and self-denial

by his own will. Attention must be paid to "love" between these two people. It is not a direct human love but an indirect love, caritas through God. When Ehrismann says that it is too modern an interpretation to see a worldly love in this epic,⁵⁵ I can agree with him. The worldly love, amor, was contrary to medieval legendary stories in general. Though the girl cannot express it well, she always has in her mind an image of a transcendent world(v. 688-736), which drives her to do something following Jesus. The girl's view of life is of the clear, stereotyped dualism which the poet seems to have had, for example, the transient world versus a brilliant crown in heaven, Satan versus God, etc. Her extraordinary eloquence in reasoning about her self-sacrifice to her parents also comes from her religious enthusiasm, because she is of a rather untalkative disposition at other times. Her love for Heinrich is thus a religious one while Heinrich's for her is not so purely religious. Of course, he comes to understand caritas by her self-sacrifice but he seems to have loved the girl at first by amor, at least when he called her gemahel. This difference in the character of love is interesting and was taken up again by R.Huch.

However, it is obvious that Hartmann emphasized caritas rather than amor. We can see Hartmann's treatment of love best in the climax scene of the epic.

Nû lac dô bî ein
harte guet wetzestein.
da begunde erz an strichen

⁵⁵
G, Ehrismann, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur. II.2,1.
p. 202.

harte unmuezelichen,
da bî wetzen, daz erhôrte,
der ir froude stôrte,
der arme Heinrich hin fur
da er stuont vor der tur,
und erbarmete in vil sere
daz er sî niemer mêre
lebende solte gesehen.
nu begunde er suochen unde spehen,
unze daz er durch die want
ein loch gânde vant,
unde ersach sî durch die schrunden
nacket unde gebunden.
¶ ir lip der was vil minneclich.
nu sach er sî an unde sich
und gewan einen niuwen muot: (v. 1217-35)

J.K. Bostock interpretes the motive of change of his mind as follows: "The sight of her beauty working on his latent virtues of pity and triuwe converted him to complete self-negation."⁵⁶ Against this interpretation, Schirokauer says that this is a mistake, a naked girl in the medieval times does not mean beauty but ugliness:

Dem Mittelalter galt erst der bekleidete Leib als schön. Hier aber durchschönt und durchstrahlt die Verzückung der Seele den armen blossen Leib, hier erscheint innere Güte als körperliche Schönheit.⁵⁷

Without doubt, Heinrich at the sight of the naked and bound girl on an operating table might have reminded him of Jesus on the cross.⁵⁸ She is not merely beautiful but holy, which moved Heinrich. If we read the epic carefully we will find how she truthfully followed the way Jesus walked, who, according to her explanation, is in heaven in the form of a rich farmer.

56

J.K.Bostock, Der Arme Heinrich. p.18.

57

A.Schirokauer, "Zur Interpretation des A.H.", ZfdA. 83 (1950) pp. 71-73. And, "Die Legende vom Armen Heinrich", GRM. 33.
58A.Schirokauer, "zur Interpretation des A.H." pp.71-73.

Heinrich now understands the meaning of her sacrifice and his own egoism(nu sach er si an unde sich/ und gewan einen niuwen muot.). This is the motive for his change of mind.

F.Maurer and A.Schirokauer emphasize the religious character of the epic and caritas between the hero and heroine.⁵⁹ They say that everything in the epic comes from religion. Of course, it is true that only Heinrich's religious motive could persuade the audience to admit his marriage with a peasant girl, a marriage against courtly custom, because devotion to the will of God was one of their courtly virtues, perhaps the highest virtue; and they could not help admitting it when the hero dared marry a low-born girl by the highest virtue, otherwise the audience would not have admitted it. As Schirokauer says,⁶⁰ the epic might be a German vita nova which was written a hundred years before Dante, for Heinrich's regained Ehre is no longer the same Ehre that he had before, the girl is no longer a peasant girl but the same symbol of divine being as Maria. To an audience which had a background of feudal thinking, Heinrich's spiritual change might have been shocking.⁶¹

The epic thus rests on a religious basis. However, we

59

F.Maurer, "Über das Leid in den Dichtungen Hartmanns von Aue", Euphorion 45(1960) pp. 165-85. And, Leid. p.39. A.Schirokauer; "Zur Interpretation des Armen Heinrich", ZfdA. 83(1950) pp. 58-78. "Die Legende vom Armen Heinrich", GRM. 33(1951/2) pp.262-68.

60

A.Schirokauer, "Die Legende vom Armen Heinrich", pp.262-68.

61

W.Fechter, "Über den Armen Heinrich", Euphorion 49(1955) pp. 1-28.

cannot deny a nuance of amor. W.Fechter and H. de Boor point out this nuance.⁶² For example, de Boor says:

Hier richten sich Wille und Tat, höchste Opfertat, auf den Einzelnen, der nicht nur als Person gestaltet, sondern als Person gemeint ist. Das Kind will nicht irgendeinem Aussätzigen helfen, sondern dem aussätzigen Ritter Heinrich.⁶³

De Boor interprets further the motive of Heinrich's spiritual change both by caritas and amor, human love. He says, therefore, the end of the epic is not Legendenschluss but Märchenschluss.⁶⁴

I agree with de Boor so long as it concerns Heinrich because Heinrich called the girl gemahel and saw her also as minneclich. But I cannot agree with de Boor's judgment of the girl. De Boor says:

Die caritas des Kindes ist nicht absolut, sie ist zugleich gesteigerter, entsinnlicher amor. Beides ist unlöslich verschmelzen, und in dieser Verschmelzung und Durchdringung liegt der wundersame Reiz dieser Figur... So wird "Der Arme Heinrich" künstlerisch zum harmonischen Ausgleich der Spannung zwischen den beiden Polen, humanitas und religio, ausgedrückt in der wundersamen Durchdringung von himmlischer und irdischer Liebe im Tun.⁶⁵

I think that this is rather a modern interpretation from a modern

62. H.de Boor, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur. Vol.II. pp. 79-80. And, W.Fechter, "Über den Armen Heinrich". pp. 1-28

63. H.de Boor, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur. Vol.II. p. 79.

64. Ibid. p. 79.

65. Ibid. p. 79.

way of thinking. Of course, I would not deny a modern reader's right to apply his modern interpretation, but it seems to me that Hartmann did not put accent on amor. He seems not to have taken balance of humanitas and religio. I rather follow Schirokauer, Maurer and Ehrismann, who interpret the epic religiously. Heinrich's and the girl's lonely journey to Salerno, which is a traditional travel-motif of the epic, popular in the medieval age, would become extremely beautiful if we remind ourselves of their amor besides her caritas, imagining her in the full dress of a bride and him in the sadness in losing his love. But the effect on a reader and a writer's intention are two things. We must draw a sharp line between them, at least while studying a work.

Suppose Hartmann emphasized only caritas, how can we explain the nuance of amor in the work? E. Rose, an American Germanist, explains it by medieval gradualism.⁶⁶ In the same way as Hartmann's view of life, i.e. a world of gradual structure, a religious life and a heavenly life, medieval love had a gradual structure. Amor is a starting point of love, it must be replaced by caritas for religious people. Was it not amor that Hartmann successfully tried to overcome in his Kreuzlieder

66

E. Rose, "Problem of medieval psychology as presented in the klein gemahel of Heinrich the Unfortunate". Germanic Review. 22(1947) pp. 183-87.

cf. G. Müller, "Gradualismus, ein Vorstudie zur alt-deutschen Literaturgeschichte". Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift. 2(1924) pp. 681-85.

and Gregorius? Amor is the basic structure of caritas and can be found in Der Arme Heinrich as the base, which appears as a charming feature to modern readers who are too much accustomed to amor.

In order to present this religious story as an intimate experience, and one easy to understand to the audience, Hartmann exerts his ingenuity in various literary techniques. For example, the girl's motive of self-sacrifice is explained again and again, using religious expression and also worldly reasoning which even some unreligious audience could have understood and by which they could have begun to understand the real meaning of her self-sacrifice. The kingdom of heaven which she is supposed to enter is explained in realistic, rustic words (v. 775ff.). According to Schönbach, people in the Middle Age often imagined the kingdom in Heaven as a peaceful pastoral country. St. Augustine, Paulus von Nola and Anselm of Canterbury called God agricola.⁶⁷ Therefore, to the audience at that time, the kingdom with its pastoral features which the girl talks of might have been a familiar paradise. It is not a paradise invented by the girl's naive imagination but a quite intimate kingdom to the audience. J. Schwietering says, "Die Gestalt des freien und reichen Bauers, in der himmlische Brautigam erscheint, ist Anpassung an die

67

A. Schönbach, Über Hartmann von Aue. p. 143.

Existenz des Mädchens."⁶⁸ In addition, the poet's description of pastoral life and characterization of the peasant and his wife are so naive and realistic that we could imagine a couple of peasants on a medieval German estate. Description of the social situation is also reasonable, names of places in the story are all familiar ones. All these literary devices might have helped the audience understand the epic.

But Hartmann's realism is not an ugly naturalistic one, his religious idea is not a dogmatic one. They match well the naive' religious content. He does not forget mâze at any time and does not expose ugliness directly. He does not persuade the audience to follow the story by a strong church dogma, but by an innocent girl's behavior. He seems to have tried to soften this extremely shocking source. For example, he does not describe the operation. Everything bloody and ugly is simply but carefully suggested to the audience, while other poets, say Konrad von Wurzburg who treated the same source, describe leprosy exactly and palpable.⁶⁹ Realism and doctrine are adopted by Hartmann in such a way that they serve to explain well the spiritual situation and process of the hero and heroine. B.Schwarz's evaluation of the style is right when she says, "Hartmann hält auch in der Stilweise die

68

J.Schwietering, Die deutsche Dichtung des Mittelalters. (Potsdam, 1960) pp. 150-60.

69

K. von Wurzburg, Engelhart. ed. by M.Haupt (Leipzig, 1884) v. 5150ff.

Mitte zwischen realistischer und idealistischer Darstellungsweise.⁷⁰ W. Fechter points out that the girl's speech shows an influence from the language of medieval mysticism.⁷¹ It is interesting that Hartmann adopted the language of mysticism in the girl's speech. It seems to me, Der Arme Heinrich stands at a turning point from the courtly epic to medieval mystical prose.

The epic, or rather, Novelle according to Ehrismann and W. Fechter,⁷² thus became a precious jewel of medieval literature and induced many later writers to fashion a story or drama with the same content. But they often were faced with the difficulty of reshaping it because of its too religious content. It is a story based on the blood cure of leprosy and rejects the blood cure from a purely religious point of view. If Heinrich had had the girl killed in the same manner as Engelhart by Konrad von Wurzburg, the miracle would not have occurred. Everything is concentrated on the spiritual process. Therefore, later writers changed all the content by their own view. How they changed the content, will be the subject of my study in the following chapters.

H. Tardel explains the later Writers' reason of change by the too strong biblical character of the original.⁷³ According

⁷⁰ B. Schwarz, "Hartmann von Aue", Verfasserlexikon. Vol. II.

⁷¹ W. Fechter, "Über den Armen Heinrich". pp. 1-27.

⁷² G. Ehrismann, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur. II. 2, 1. p. 146. W. Fechter, "Über den Armen Heinrich" p. 27.

⁷³ H. Tardel "Der Arme Heinrich in der neueren Dichtung", Forschungen zur neueren Literaturgeschichte. Vol. XXX. (1905) pp. 1-4.

to him, there were two kinds of interpretation of sickness in the western world, classical and biblical. One is represented by the Philoctetes of Sophokles, another by Job. In the former, injury is a result of natural causality, the result of venomous serpent's bite. In the latter, disease is a symbol of sin, as we have seen. Der Arme Heinrich belongs to the latter. Since the culture of later Europe, especially after the Renaissance, has been a synthesis of the biblical and the classical, this source must have been in the process of the synthetization.

CHAPTER III

THE FIRST REVIVAL

Hartmann von Aue died in the golden age of medieval literature,¹ receiving tributes of praise from his contemporary poets,² and then a waning of interest in the medieval age gradually took place. Der Arme Heinrich, a lovely and precious jewel of the medieval literature, shared this fate and was almost forgotten.

It was in the Age of Enlightenment that German people turned their eyes again to their own literature of the medieval age, inspired by the humanists' study of some ancient books on their country, e.g. De Bello Gallico by Caesar or the Germania by Tacitus. However, their chief interest still lay mainly in historical facts or the philological study of these, not always in medieval literature as art. A real renaissance of the medieval literature came with German Romanticism. The revival of interest in medieval sources of literature, which are in folklore, knightly and spiritual-legendary literature of the medieval age, is closely related to Romanticism and to the flourishing of German philology in the first half of the nineteenth century. During this period, several translations and a drama of Der Arme Heinrich were produced.

¹ He seems to have passed away between 1210 and 1220. cf. Verfasserlexikon. Vol. V. "Hartmann von Aue".

² eg. G.von Strassburg, Tristan. ed. by F.Ranke. v.4621ff.

The first translation, as far as we know, was made by J.Büsching in Zurich in 1810. It was his translation that the old Goethe happened to read in 1811, and he stated his impression as follows:

Den Ekel gegen einen aussätzigen Herrn, für den sich das wackerste Mädchen aufopfert, wird man schwerlich los; wie denn durchaus ein Jahrhundert, wo die widerwärtigste Krankheit in einem fort Motive zu leidenschaftlichen Liebes- und Ritterthaten reichen muss, uns mit Abscheu erfüllt. Die dort einem Heroismus zugrunde liegende schreckliche Krankheit wirkt wenigstens auf mich so gewaltsam, dass ich mich von blosser Berührung eines solchen Buches schon angesteckt glaube.³

This is Goethe's only extended expression of feeling concerning medieval literature.⁴ Unfortunately, no copy of Büsching's translation is available to me. According to A.Schirokauer,⁵ it was a miserably modernized paraphrase of the original and full of misunderstandings. For example, he translated one of the most important passages of the original as follows:

Ihr müsst haben eine Magt,
Die, vollkommen ehrbar,
Dennoch des Willens war,
Dass sie den Tod durch Euch litte.

These are the doctor's words, whom Heinrich visited at Salerno so that he might get cured of leprosy by his advice. The original read:

³ Weimar Ausgabe, vol.XXXVI. pp.72-73.(Annalen 1811)

⁴ A.Schirokauer, "Die Legende vom Armen Heinrich", GRM.

33(1951/2) p.262.

⁵ ibid. p.262-68.

ir m̄ezet haben eine maget
diu vollen vribære
und ouch des willens waere
daz si den tot durch iuch lite. (v. 224-27)

We will not blame Bűsching for his use of the word ehrbar because we can read either vribære, hibaere, erbaere or manbaere in the manuscripts,⁶ but und ouch means und zwar, über dies, dabei noch, never dennoch. The doctor tells him in the original that the first requirement of the victim must be virginity (magettuom), the second, her free choice of self-sacrifice, i.e. self-sacrifice without any compulsion, In addition, she must be willing to suffer death for him. Bűsching's translation implies that the girl must be respectable, honorable, nevertheless (the self-sacrifice in this case means something against her honor?) she must be willing to suffer death by him (Heinrich kills her for himself?). The real meaning of this passage is clearly indicated by the girl's word in the original:

so bin ich zarzne guot;
ich bin ein maget und hân den muot. (v.561-62)

Heinrich in the original says the same thing again to the peasant.

ich m̄eize hân ein maget
diu vollen vribære
und ouch des willens waere
daz si den tot durch mich lite. (v.446-49)

Bűsching translates again,

Ich musste haben ein Magt
die voll mannbar
und auch des Willens war
dass sie den Tod durch mich litte.

6

F.Ranke, "Mhd. vribære 'frei im Entschluss, freiwillig'",
ZfdA. 79(1912) p. 178ff.

Though we have four choices in the reading of vribaere as mentioned, Büsching's selection of manbaere is his mistake, it is contrary to Hartmann's aestheticism. Goethe read a very poor translation indeed. However, not only the translation is responsible for Goethe's abhorrence against Der Arme Heinrich. We should think more about his abhorrence.

As we know, the old Goethe did not like sickness, something gloomy and sombre, or a romantic mood. Of course, he knew quite well what sickness meant, its extreme and eccentric character, perhaps better than any romanticist. His early work proves it. But as he became older, he came to hate it. He would not reread his Werther and he gave a high regard only to classical clarity and healthiness. The story of Der Arme Heinrich is full of unhealthiness, gloominess, and has no golden mean which the old Goethe thought much of. Schirokauer's analysis of Goethe's abhorrence is short but excellent. I agree with him on this problem. It reads as follows:

Der Zustand der Gesundheit war somit der einer mittleren Lage, einer Art von störrbarer Balance zwischen einem Zuviel und einem Zuwenig. Wo aber war die gesunde und heilsame Mittel-lage bei diesem Heinrich von Aue? Hoch über dem gewöhnlich-menschlichen lebt er in Hofesglanz und Daseinswonne, ein grosser Herr und Ritter ohne Tadel, bis ihn die widerwärtigste Krankheit unter alles Menschliche erniedrigt. Zu seiner Heilung wird ein Menschenopfer verlangt und wirklich dar-geboten. Das alles ist der Ebene des realen Lebens, der Lebenstatsachen, der normalen Umstände durchaus entrückt, spielt in einer sowohl über- als unter-, mithin unirdischen Sphäre und trägt nichts bei zur Bewältigung der Forderung des Tages, worin für Goethe das moralische Wesen wahrer Poesie bestant. Und so sein Nein, Ekel und Abscheu.⁷

⁷
A.Schirokauer, "Die Legende vom Armen Heinrich", GRM.
33(1951/2) pp. 262-68.

Goethe saw in medieval literature only such people as were absorbed in an extrem passion and requested other people to do extreme servitude when they needed it. If we read the medieval literature from such a point of view, almost every medieval epic would appear to be full of extremes, gloominess and unhealthiness. The Gralkönig in Parzival has an incurable wound and his castle is always in sadness. Tristan was named so in memory of his parents' sad fate and the epic proves that the name was appropriate to his life which ended under a sad destiny such as the name suggests. Thinking thus, the old Goethe might have seen a prototype of the medieval literature in Der Arme Heinrich. We can understand the old Goethe's abhorrence for the medieval literature. But didn't he himself have the wrong attitude of approaching medieval literature? We know at least that he did not read the original epic which avoids carefully any gloomy and bloody situation. In addition, the original treats the disease as a symbol of sin, not as a schreckliche Krankheit in a modern sense. If the Bible had some other kind of disease as a motif of impressive allegory, Hartmann might have used it, because he simply followed a traditional source. The real main motif of the story is not the disease and its cure, but the spiritual progress of the hero and the heroine. If Goethe had read the original which emphasized the spirituality in a crystal-clear language, he would have understood it better, because he had a keen interest in a beautiful mind and kalokagathia

that Hartmann tried to show us in his medieval way. G.Ehrismann writes as follows, touching on Goethe's error.

Das MA. war ihm nicht innerlich verwandt. Was Hartmann gerade sorgfältig verhüllte, das Ekelhafte der Krankheit, das schuf er mit seinem alles plastisch sehenden Auge sinngreiflich nach. Die mittelalterliche Gedankenwelt lag ihm zu ferne und so sah er in der Todeshingabe nur das Opfer eines wackern Mädchens, nicht ein Symbol der Erlösung. Er selbst hat uns ein solches, ein unvergleichliches, geschaffen. Eine reine Jungfrau hat die tobenden Furien des Orestes beschwichtigt. "Alle menschlichen Gebrechen sühnet reine Menschlichkeit." Die reine Menschlichkeit ist mittelalterlich triuwe. Aber hier nun klappt der Riss zwischen unsren ethischen Empfinden und dem des MA.s; nicht der autome Wille des erlösenden Menschenkindes, die unmittelbar vor dessen sittlicher Reinheit ausströmende Beseligung vollbringt das Heilungswunder, sondern die Gnade Gottes erst schafft die sühnende Kraft der triuwe.⁸

H.Tardel mentions with respect to Goethe's abhorrence that it was a conflict between classicism and biblical thought.⁹

After Büsching's translation in verse, W.Grimm translated the original carefully into prose and published it in 1815 with his brother. This is perhaps the oldest and the most faithful translation of the original both as to content and to tone. The book has an introduction on the spiritual and cultural background of the epic, especially on the motif of blood cure of leprosy, written by the brothers. Considering that both Uhland and Chamisso were inspired by Grimm's translation, the book must have been popular and have had an influence upon that time. The translation

⁸
G.Ehrismann, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur. II.2,1.
pp. 204-5.

⁹
H.Tardel, "Der Arme Heinrich in der neueren Dichtung";
pp. 1-2, 16-17.

is worked out in simple and elegant enough German to convey the original tone. The book was republished in 1904 as one of Wiesbadener Volksbücher(No. 51) with an introduction by R. Steig, and again in 1905 in an ornamental edition by E.Liebermann in Hamburg. After Grimm's translation, many translations of the epic appeared in close succession: Matlath and Koffinger's in 1817, Lachmann's in 1820, Rassmann's in 1821, Simrock's in 1830, Wackernagel's in 1835, G.Schwab's in 1836, W.Müller's in 1842, Haupt's in 1842, F.Koch's in 1848, Henneberger's in 1849, H.von Wolzogen's in 1852, Schatz's in 1871, G.Barnak's in 1849, Hagedorn's in 1898, T.Ebner's in 1899 and others. Some of the translators tried to transrate the original into prose in the same manner as Grimm according to their philological study of the original. Others tried to translate it into verse, aiming to restore the original verse form or the original tone. All these translations (some of them are paraphrases, e.g. G.Schwab's.) have shared a common character, that is to say, they tried to be as truthful as possible to the original. Therefore, I shall pass over them here. The only thing that might be said about them is that it is very difficult to restore the original tone in modern German. For example, Simrock tried to translate it into the original verse form, i.e. into four beat epic verse with rime pairs, using carefully archaic words but he could not succeed. We can indeed learn something about the original verse form by it, but we cannot be satisfied from the aesthetic point of view. In addition,

Simrock's verse form is not carried through according to the principle of versification of the original. Ebner tried to put his translation into octet rime in order to let the original somewhat monotonous tone match the modern readers' taste with effect, but the octet rime sounds too heavy to convey the simple and naive content. It does not seem successful. In addition in his translation, Heinrich condemn God and people when he got the disease, which is against Hartmann's idea. Among the translation in verse, Hagedorn's seems to be relatively well done. It has the same verse form as the original, i.e. four beat verse with rime pair in most cases.

Apart from these translations and some paraphrases, I would like to study now some adaptations of the original, which seems more pertinent to my subject. Shortly after the Grimm brothers published their translation, L.Uhland who was devoted to the study of medieval literature tried to compose a drama based on Der Arme Heinrich. According to his diary, he read the translation by Grimm on February 6th and 7th, 1818, and studied the original in his library.¹⁰ Uhland's wife also states that he was working on Der Arme Heinrich in the spring of 1818.¹¹ We see here the first example of the influence of the Grimm-translation. Uhland, however, did not finish the drama. A. von

¹⁰
T.Hartmann, Uhlands Tagebuch 1810-1820(Stuttgart, 1897)
p. 288.

¹¹
Frau Uhland, Ludwig Uhlands Leben.(stuttgart, 1874)p.140.
Also, H.Schneider, Uhland. Leben, Dichtung, Forschung(Berlin, 1920)
p. 240.

Keller printed the fragment of 24 verses. It deals with the doctor's monologue in Salerno, who had seen the girl with Heinrich.

Die Blume wird geknickt, das fromme Lamm
Geschlachtet; hat allein der Menschenstamm
Ein Recht auf Leben? Ein gelehrter Streit
Ist's selbst noch, ob ihr Weiber Menschen seyde.
Seyd ihr bestimmt, uns Menschen zu gebären,
Mit eurer Brüste Säfte uns zu nähren,
Warum, wenn unsre Rettung drauf beruht,
Nicht auch, zu lassen euer Herzensblut?
Die Königin der Blume ist die Rose,
Sie ist die recht vollkommene, makellose,
Und hab'ich je mit Zagen sie gepflückt,
Mit Zittern je ihr heilend Öl gedruckt,
Und hier ein halbes, mangelhaftes Wesen,
Ein Weib, ein Mädchen nur, lass ich genesen,
Indess verschmachten muss der Mann, der Held?
Was ist im weiten grossen All der Welt
Ein Mädchenleben? Zu Salerno nur
Sind Mädchen zahllos wie das Gras der Flur.
Ein Mädchenleben ist ein Sehnsuchthauch,
Ein Liebesseufzer. Wärest du besseres auch,
Tödt'ich dich, ich opfere dich in Kraft
Der göttlichen erhabenen Wissenschaft,
Der mächtigen, der mein Leben angehört,
die gleich dem Weltgeist schafft, wenn sie zerstört.¹²

This is all of the fragment. What it means is, however, quite interesting, though we cannot know Uhland's idea of the whole drama. In this fragment, Uhland directs his attention to the doctor. The doctor has a long monologue and affirms his operation for the sake of Wissenschaft. In the original epic, the doctor speaks only professional words in order to test the girl's

12

A. von Keller, Uhland als Dramatiker, mit Benutzung seines handschriftlichen Nachlass (Stuttgart, 1877) p. 409.

will, while in the fragment he thinks deeply about the meaning of the operation and affirms it positively, so as to serve göttliche erhabene Wissenschaft. That is to say, Uhland as a dramatist directed his attention first at a magician, a man who used a miraculous power. A magician is different from a priest. A priest is a servant of God, he asks God to do something for men. To him God is the only one who has a mighty power. In the original epic, God plans and manages everything. We could say that it is written from the priest's view of the world. The human being is powerless in it. On the other hand, the doctor in the fragment has a power and used it for himself in the name of science. This connection of a human being with a miraculous power is one of the great characteristics of Romanticism, which emphasized in Longfellow's Golden Legend.

When Uhland read the original for the first time, he was attracted by the religiosity of the content.

Ich habe diese Erzählung hier eingereiht, nicht bloss, weil die endliche Wendung ein Gnadenwunder ist,¹³ sondern weil das Ganze in religiösem Sinne aufgefasst ist.

and he understood the original quite well:

Der mildeste und innigste unter altdeutschen Dichtern hat durch seine Behandlung über das schroffe der alten Sage ein so sanfte, gedämpfte Licht ausgegossen, dass dieses Gedicht als eins der gediegensten und anmutigsten des deutschen Mittelalters dasteht. In keinem seiner Gedichte hat wohl Hartmann von Aue diese klare, anmutige Beredsamkeit schöner dargelegt, als im Armen Heinrich.¹⁴

¹³
L.Uhland, Schriften zur Geschichte der Dichtung und Sage.
8 vols.(Stuttgart, 1886). Vol.IV. p.63.

¹⁴
ibid. pp. 63-64.

But one he begins to compose a drama of Der Arme Heinrich, his romantic Titanism takes a clear form. Religiousity is undoubtedly the most important characteristic of Uhland, it is the essence of his view of life, but he saw divinity always through nature¹⁵ A magician who serves nature and knows a secret power, therefore, becomes a romantic Titan to him. We should remind ourselves that Romanticism is a mysticism which took place after the Renaissance, i.e. after the establishment of human autonomy. The original epic lacks the idea of human autonomy.

It is said that K.L. Kannegiesser composed an one-act drama called Der Arme Heinrich in 1836, whose text is, however, not available to us. Krumpelmann says, "This play was probably not widely circulated and entirely without influence on subsequent treatment of the theme."¹⁶

In 1837, A.von Chamisso translated Der Arme Heinrich and made a paraphrase of it, which was dedicated to the Grimm brothers in the Musenalmanach, 1839. Chamisso's paraphrase is composed in rhymeless five beats trochaic verse which is much better than Simrock's but, nevertheless, far from the natural freshness and simplicity of the original. The paraphrase is shorter than the original but relatively truthful to it except in one part. It seems that he made use of Grimm's translation

15

O.Burger, Schwäbische Romantik. Studien zur Charakter des Uhlandkreis(Stuttgart, 1928) p. 76.

16

J.K.Krumpelmann. "Longfellow's Golden Legend and the Armer Heinrich theme in modern German literature", JEGPh.25(1926) p. 188.

Und die Hände ringend warf und weinend
Sich vor Gott der Arme; seine Worte
Quellem schier verkehrt aus seinem tiefern,
Bessern Herzen, und er schrie zu Gott auf:
"Herr, barherz'ger Gott, gieb Kraft mir Sünder,
Kraft zu dulden, was du selbst verhängt hast;
Lass in Demut mich mein Siechtum tragen,
Aber nicht, in deinem Zorn, der Unschuld
Schreiend Blut auf meine Seele laden!"¹⁷

The knight rushes into the room and has the operation stopped. This part of the original is, as I quoted at the beginning of this chapter, very short and concise. The hero does not say anything but gets a glimpse of the girl on the operating table. That is all. Walzel put a note on this scene as follows, "Hartmann lässt die Umkehr in Heinrich ganz naiv durch die sinnliche Wirkung beim Anblick seines Opfers vor sich gehen; bei Chamisso wirkt allein die Schwere des Augenblicks."¹⁸ And perhaps the scene of a naked, bound girl might have been too cruel for readers at that time, just as for English readers at that time, a point which will be discussed later in connection with D.G. Rossetti's translation of Der Arme Heinrich.

In the same manner as Uhland's fragment, Chamisso's paraphrase has a strong character of Romanticism. For example, his emphasis on nature is a feature of it.

¹⁷ Chamisso's Werke. ed. by O. Walzel (DNL) pp. 269-70.

¹⁸ ibid. p. 269.

Wessen ist die Burg, die dort verödet
Mitten in dem schönen Schwaben trauert?
Gras und Parrenkraut bewachst die Stiegen
Und die Eule nistet in den Türmen.¹⁹

We can find also strong emotional expressions in it.

Nach Salerno! nach Salerno! Prächtig
Schmuckte Heinrich zu der Fahrt das Opfer,
.....
Nach Salerno! Wohl nach schwerem Abschied
Zogen nach Salerno jetzt die beiden.²⁰

The original reads simply as follows,

Sus fuor gegen Sâlerne
froelich unde gerne
die maget mit ir herren. (v. 1051)

Though we cannot deny that Chamisso's interpretation was somewhat romantic, the paraphrase is relatively truthful to the original, which distinguishes it from later adaptations of the epic.

During the two decades after Chamisso's paraphrase there appeared no work on Der Arme Heinrich in Germany. The works which were written after these two decades differ in their character remarkably from those which were made before. Therefore, these two decades, i.e. the 1840's and 50's, mean a period of demarcation between the first revival and the second revival of Der Arme Heinrich. Germany in this period was in a hard political situation. Moreover, people's interest in literature was leaning towards realism, which was evidently not favorable to

¹⁹ Chamisso's Werke. (DNL) p. 259.

²⁰ ibid. p. 265.

such a legendary source as Der Arme Heinrich. It is quite interesting to me that during this period of absence the source was transported into England and America, where two works were composed, by D.G.Rossetti in England and by H.W.Longfellow in America. These two works are quite different from each other in character. Rossetti's is truthful to the original and belongs to the work in the period of the first revival while Longfellow's is a work completely different from the original and belongs to the type of the second revival. In addition, Longfellow's work has a remarkable influence upon later treatments of the source in Germany.

Rossetti's work is a paraphrase of the original. It was made in 1846 when he was only eughteen years old. He did not publishe it while he was alive, but his brother incorporated it later in his collected works for the reason that Rossetti "was not dissatisfied with it in later years and more than once thought of putting it into print."²¹ According to W.M.Rossetti, the brother, D.G.Rossetti "learned German at home, beginning towards 1843, under the tuition of an exeellent teacher and excellent man, Dr. Adolf Heinemann, the Professor in University College,"²² about whom no details are known.²³ W.M.Rossetti says:

²¹
The Collected Works of D.G.Rossetti. ed. by W.M. Rossetti. 2 vols.(London, 1930) Vol.II. p. 519.

²²
ibid. p. 519.

²³
L.A.Willoughby, D.G.Rossetti and German literature. (London, 1912) p. 19.

"He was fired with a wish to translate some German poems. He Englished Bürger's Lenore; and, beginning in 1845, the earlier portion of the Nibelungenlied. These translations have perished." He then took up the ancient poem by Hartmann von Aue, Der Arme Heinrich. It is not strange for a boy who was learning German to have translated a modern German poet at first and the Nibelungenlied, then Der Arme Heinrich, because even at present the Nibelungenlied and Der Arme Heinrich are being used for an elementary text of Middle High German on almost every German department of university. However, there is no doubt that Der Arme Heinrich was a favorite with the boy of eighteen years who later became a leader of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, because the work is not actually a translation but a paraphrase made with effort. A characteristic of the Pre-Raphaelites come out already in the lines of his Henry the Leper: breadth or diffuseness of the narrative, vivid coloring of the sentences. Let us compare the paraphrase with the original.

er was ein bluome der jugent,
der werlte fröude ein spiegelglas,
staeter triuwe ein adamas,
ein ganziu krône der zuht. (v. 61-64)

A blossoming branch of youthfulness,
A looking glass to the world around,
A stainless and priceless diamond,
Of gallant 'haviour a beautiful wreath,
A home when the tyrant menaceth,
A buckler to the breast of his friend,
And courteous without measure of end.²⁴

The original four lines are expanded to seven lines full of color. Though we cannot see by this example, riming is not completely carried through. As for the content, a modern poet betrays himself in it. The girl is ten years old when she sees Heinrich for the first time, instead of the eight years of the original. Therefore, she decides to sacrifice herself at the age of thirteen. In the same manner as Chamisso's Heinrich, Rossetti's Henry does not peer into the room where the naked girl is lying on the table. Henry utters a long philosophical monologue instead and comes to change his mind by himself, that is to say, Rossetti's treatment of the scene is ethical rather than religious, just as was Chamisso's. Willoughby says, Rossetti's early Victorian prudishness caused him not to present a naked and bound girl to the readers.²⁵ He also omits the description of the father who is beating his daughter. In addition, Rossetti puts the girl's long speech of explaining her self-sacrifice into the paraphrase. We can see here a modern character of logical and ethical meditation, and Rossetti's philosophical reflection. Because of this modern reflection, the paraphrase lacks the original pure, naive simplicity. Concerning his understanding of Middle High German, L.A. Willoughby says that the paraphrase is too skillful to be a work done by a boy of eighteen years, perhaps he used some German translation for

²⁵

L.A. Willoughby, D.G. Rossetti and German literature

p. 19ff.

reference, presumably Haupt's translation, because Rossetti chose the word erbaere both in verse 225 and 447 of the original epic, where we have four choices, i.e. erbaere, vribaere, manbaere and hibaere by the manuscripts. Haupt reads exactly as Rossetti, and Haupt's translation was published in 1842.²⁶ With Rossetti's paraphrase the first revival of Der Arme Heinrich comes to an end. His manuscript of the paraphrase was sold at auction and came to America, where it was published in facsimile in 1905.²⁷

²⁶ L.A. Willoughby, D.G. Rossetti and German literature.
p. 19ff.

²⁷ Henry the Leper paraphrased by D.G. Rossetti, with
introduction by W.P. Trent (Bibliophile Society of Boston, 1905)

CHAPTER IV

THE SECOND REVIVAL

In 1851, H.W.Longfellow published a drama based on the legend of Der Arme Heinrich. It was actually an epical and lyrical arrangement of the original epic, with the title of The Golden Legend. This rather poor arrangement of Der Arme Heinrich nevertheless made an amazing impact on the history of the theme. The drama did not become popular in his country but did in Germany through translations by K.H.Keck in 1850, by E. von Hohannhausen in 1880 and others¹ and had a considerable influence upon the German people. The influence upon R.Huch and G.Hauptmann will be discussed later in the chapter.

Though he did not state that he took the source from Hartmann, it is obvious that he made use of Hartmann's work as his source, for the reason that the place names and the plot in general are the same in both. As for the content, however, this drama is a work independent of the original epic. Therefore we can say that this is the first and typical work which belongs to the second revival. The composition of the drama reminds us of Goethe's Faust, but the hero is a sentimental and hypochondriacal youth unlike Faust. Longfellow shows his extraordinary pedantry in the drama with his own learned notes. It is clear that this drama is not for presentation on the stage but a kind

¹
cf. A.I.Roehm, Bibliographie und Kritik der deutschen Übersetzungen aus der amerikanischen Dichtung(Leipzig, 1910)

of Lesedrama. The composition of the drama is as follows;

- Prologue In night and storm, Lucifer, with the power of the air, tries to tear down the cross. Lucifer's monologue. The bells and voices.
- Act I The castle of Vautsberg on the Rhine. Henry who wakes nights and reads in books is worrying about his restless life. A flash of light out of which Lucifer appears, in the shape of a travelling physician, and teaches a magic cure for Henry's hypochondria. A maiden's blood is the medicine. Walter of the Vogelweide sympathizes with him outside of the castle.
- Act II A farm in the Odenwald. Elsie, a farmer's daughter, takes care of Henry. The girl decides to sacrifice herself for Henry. Her parents oppose her but agree at last. A church scene. Lucifer appears as a priest.
- Act III Henry, Elsie and their attendants on the way to Salerno meet Walter at Strassburg. He is also on his way to the Crusade. They study the Cathedral and together watch a nativity.
- Act IV They stop at Hirschau. A scene of the convent of Hirschau. A scene of the cloister. Lucifer appears in a chapel as a Frenchman on a pilgrimage to Rome. Elsie sees Irmgard, former fiancée of Henry, in a neighboring nunnery.
- Act V They stop at Lucern. Lucifer under the Devil's Bridge of Lucern looks at them crossing the bridge. Scenes of the St.Gothard pass, the Alps and the sea. Lucifer appears at times and watches their travel.
- Act VI The school of Salerno. Lucifer appears as a doctor, who is about to kill Elsie by operation. Henry, reflecting on his sin, delivers Elsie from Lucifer by force. Her parents who are worrying about their daughter's fate are informed that she was saved. The marriage of Henry and Elsie.
- Epilogue The angel of good deeds and the angel of evil deeds discuss human deeds. The latter says, "It is Lucifer,/ The son of mystery;/ And since God suffers him to be,/ He, too, is God's minister,/ And labors for some good/ By us not understood!

In spite of being full of the religious mood, the Golden Legend is actually an imitation of the Faust drama, especially that by Goethe. The hero is a learned youth with unsatisfied desire. He accepts a human sacrifice by suggestion of an evil spirit, Lucifer-Mephistopheles, so that he may be saved from spiritual frustration but he is saved rather by a girl's pure and stainless wish to sacrifice herself for her lover. Henry's first monologue reminds us of Goethe's prologue to Faust:

Come back! ye friendship long departed!
That like o'erflowing streamlets started,
And are now dwindled, one by one,
To stony channels in the sun!
Come back! ye friends, whose lives are ended
Come back! with all that light attended.²

The evil angel's speech in the epilogue is similar to Mephisto's speech in Faust. In addition, the scene of a cloister where Lucifer talks of the monks' behavior in Abelard's cloister in St. Geldas de Rhuys reminds us of Auerbachs Keller in Goethe's Faust.

Elsie is a girl of fifteen years and full of piety, but her self-sacrifice is not motivated by caritas but apparently amor for Henry, because her speeches to Henry are full of human love. The reason for Henry's frustration is not made clear to the audience. The only part which suggests the reason is this:

A smouldering, dull, perpetual flame,
As in a kiln burns in my veins,
Sending up vapours to the head;
My heart has become a dull lagoon
Which a kind of leprosy drinks and drains.³

² H.W. Longfellow, The Golden Legend (Boston, 1861) p. 12.

³ ibid. p. 17.

He has a disease but it is not exactly leprosy, though it seems to be something like leprosy. He later watches a nativity among the people and appears in cities with his attendants. If he had leprosy this would be impossible. Therefore, it is not always necessary for him to take a human sacrifice. We had better understand that he wants a human sacrifice only because of the suggestion of Lucifer, an evil spirit. Elsie decides to sacrifice herself, therefore, for reason of her amor for him, so that he may recover his health and rule again the country with authority. The biblical background of leprosy is completely neglected by Longfellow. We could say, accordingly, the drama is a romantic ethical love-drama in a religious setting. Of course, Henry does not see the symbolic figure of the girl on the operating table. He changes his mind for himself by his own reflection. H.Tardel says of Longfellow's understanding of Der Arme Heinrich:

Longfellow sah das mittelalterliche Kulturleben in der einseitigen, verklärenden Auffassung der deutschen Romantik, deren gelehriger Schuler er während seines längeren Aufenthalts in Deutschland gewesen war.⁴

Longfellow's motivation of Elsie's self-sacrifice and of Henry's change of mind are thus quite humanistic and ethical, completely different from the original. The original is an epic of sin and Providence, while the Golden Legend is a human drama of Henry,

⁴
H.Tardel, "Der Arme Heinrich in der neueren Dichtung."
p. 10.

Elsie and an evil spirit Lucifer. Besides these facts, Longfellow's dramatization is sometimes unreasonable. For example, A.Schönbach says:

Wie wenig hat ein Dichter den Sinn dieser frommen Legende gefasst, der dem guten Mädchen erst das bunte Schauspiel der Welt zeigen lässt, bevor er es dem Opfertod vorwirft!⁵

Henry and Elsie's travels to Salerno with many attendants seems to be a kind of sight-seeing journey; they stop at many historical sites and the poet explains minutely the sites and customs of the people. We cannot imagine that they are going to Salerno where Elsie must die.

This drama, however, had a strong influence upon later works in Germany. Translations of it were published several times. Hohenhausen's translation went into a second edition. It is quite interesting to see that many later versions of Der Arme Heinrich showed the influence of the Golden Legend, an American edition, so to speak. It seems to me that the source was transported once to America and imported back again to Germany. I am not talking here of A.Sullivan's cantata of the Golden Legend, nor W.Raabe's Des Reiches Krone. The former is an operabaud on Longfellow and the latter cannot be regarded as a work based on the source, though they contain the same motif as the original epic. I am talking here of the dramas written by an anonymous writer in 1861, by J.Weilen in 1874, by B.Fischer in 1881, by

- 5
A.Schönbach, Gesammelte Aufsätze zur neueren Literatur (Graz, 1900) p.256.

H.Pöhl in 1887, by K.Schultes in 1897, by H.Hanau in 1900, by K.Becher in 1900, by G.Hauptmann in 1904, an opera by H. Pfitzner in 1895, and a short story by R.Huch in 1899.

To my regret, copies of these works are not available to me except R.Huch's and G.Hauptmann's work. However, H.Tardel made relatively minute excerpts of the anonymous writer's work, Weilen's, Fischer's, Pöhl's, Schultes', Hanau's, Becher's and Pfitzner's work.⁶ I shall make use of these when I discuss the works.

Der Arme Heinrich seems to be a good subject to be made into a drama. The story is divided into three phases: Heinrich's courtly life, his life on a peasant farm with a girl, and his new start. Each phase has a special character and there is a startling event between the phases. The only thing which seems to be difficult to be presented on stage is his leprosy. Therefore, Longfellow already did not describe leprosy, he changed it to something else. But if one changed the disease to another his work could become weak and lose the symbolic meaning of the original legend, as we saw in Longfellow's Golden Legend. This is the most interesting and difficult problem for the dramatization of it. We should remember that Chamisso and Rossetti did not even describe the naked girl or the beating scene.

In 1861, i.e. eleven years after Keck's translation of the Golden Legend was published, an anonymous writer published a drama titled Der Arme Heinrich. This drama shows a clear

6

H.Tardel, "Der Arme Heinrich in der neueren Dichtung", pp. 18-35, 41-42, 58-68.

feature of Longfellow's drama, being an ethical love-drama. But Lucifer's place is taken by Guy de Chaulis, an assistant to the doctor. He comes to a German farm to see the sick Heinrich, who is living there with a peasant family. The assistant takes Heinrich and Agneta (the girl) to his master in Salerno but he comes to love Agneta and tries persistently to gain her love. Agneta loves Heinrich with all her heart and rejects Guy's love. Shortly before the operation, Guy asks for her love again but she rejects him in the same manner as before. Guy tries to kill her in the operating room, taking the place of his master. Heinrich who has heard Guy declare his love, kills him and saves her. In the next act we see Heinrich reporting to Father Agidius that he has been cured by a miracle.

The motive of Agneta's self-sacrifice is not clear. Since she loves Heinrich so much, we understand that she dies for him because of her love for him. Longfellow covered her love with a religious mood but this anonymous writer does not do so. Her love is pure amor. Heinrich's change of mind is not clearly explained either. We understand that he comes to love her by having known her permanent love for him. Longfellow had Henry change his mind as the result of deep philosophical reflection while the anonymous writer has Heinrich change his mind simply by knowing her love. It is a vulgarization of the original epic. The fact that Guy takes the place of Lucifer means that a mystical element in Longfellow's treatment is replaced by

a vulgar love-conflict. We cannot know either how Heinrich has been cured. The Guy-Lucifer relation and Father Agidius reveal that the writer made use of the Golden Legend, because we cannot find them in former paraphrases. In addition, Agneta in the drama is a woman of seventeen years.

J.Weilen's Heinrich von der Aue(1874) is quite complicated. The hero of the drama does not contract leprosy but suddenly becomes blind. Weilen hated to present leprosy on the stage, because he was, according to Tardel,⁷ a follower of classicism. In the drama, Heinrich has a conflict with his brother over ownership of his castle and is defeated by the brother. In his frustration, he becomes blind. This motivation is that of classical tragedy. A girl who has been kicked by Heinrich's horse but, nevertheless, is keeping a feather of her generous master's barret as a treasure, takes care of him in her home in the obedient manner of a Kätchen von Heilbronn. She is a shy and timid country girl but so loves him that she climbs bare-foot up a steep cliff in order to fetch an herb for the sick Heinrich. Having heard that a doctor in Salerno can cure him, she decides to go to Salerno with him. Heinrich who knows that the medicine is her blood cannot decide what to do. After a deep and hard reflection, he decides no to go. His disease is cured at the moment of his decision.

⁷ H.Tardel, "Der Arme Heirnich in der neueren Dichtung", p.18.

In this drama, there is no shadow of the legend. This is a real human drama influenced by Kleist and Schiller. Heinrich recovers from blindness by his own will-power. The recovery is rather a symbol of human will-power. In spite of the content, which is quite different from that of Longfellow, we can find the influence of the Golden Legend. First, the name of the girl is Elsbeth (the girl in the original epic has no name.) Secondly, Hieronymus, Heinrich's former tutor and herbalist, appears at times and advises as does a parish priest in Longfellow. Thirdly, the character of Elsbeth seems to be developed from Elsie, because there is no such girl in the former paraphrases, who loves Heinrich and serves him passionately in her home before the decision of her self-sacrifice, except Elsie in the Golden Legend.

In 1881, B. Fischer under the pseudonym of E. Rutenberg published a dramatic poem named Verwundet und Geheilt. We see here again the difficulty of motivation by leprosy. The hero Heinrich loves Hildegard, a daughter of the duke of Zähringen but she hesitates to give an answer to him because of her shyness. Heinrich's friend and vassal, Gottfried wins her love before Heinrich does. In despair, Heinrich contracts leprosy. He retires to a farm house. Thereafter, the drama follows the original epic, except that the girl's brother checks her self-sacrifice. In Salerno, Heinrich changes his mind by his reflection. God heals him. Leprosy in the drama is an

infectious disease in a modern sense and the girl is fifteen years old. Her love for Heinrich is apparently amor. Her name is Else. We see in the drama that Heinrich loved Hildegard before he has leprosy in the same way as Henry in the Golden Legend loved Irmingard. How Heinrich contracts leprosy is not clear.

H. Pöhl's *Armer Heinrich* (1887) shows a content quite similar to the original epic, in spite of its miserable modernization. Heinrich, a rich and proud earl, contracts leprosy. The disease is a punishment by a fairy. She punishes him because he is too proud. Heinrich is expelled from his castle, wears black clothes and shakes a rattle while walking. The writer describes minutely the medieval ceremony of expelling a leper from a castle and how the expelled leper lived at that time. The sick Heinrich on his lonely way of pilgrimage, which he had planned several years before, happened to stop in at a farmer's house. The farmer's daughter Hadwig who has just become the Bohnenkönigin by having found a lucky cake with a bean and has won the right to ask her father for anything she wants, asks the father for permission to follow Heinrich and sacrifice herself for him. In Salerno, Heinrich sees her naked body and changes his mind. The plot is rather faithful to the original epic but what a modernization! Hadwig wins the right to sacrifice herself by a folkloric custom of Bohnenkönigin. We cannot find any influence of Longfellow in the drama. I think, perhaps the writer read the original in translation and modernized it on purpose, for his motivation of leprosy, his understanding of medieval custom, show that he read Grimm's or Wackernagel's translation at least,

which contain the explanation of the blood cure of leprosy and life of lepers in the medieval age in their introductions. Pöhn1 follows the explanation exactly and shows an unusual liking of the medieval customs. This is a kind of modern paraphrase in the form of a drama.

Heinrich-drama by the anonymous writer, J. Weilen, B. Fischer and H. Pöhn1 are rather minor works. Except Pöhn1, all the writers seem to have made use of Longfellow or have influenced by him. The anonymous writer tried to make a story of love-conflict out of the Golden Legend. Weilen tried to make a story of absolute love in the same manner of Kleist's Kätchen von Heilbronn under the influence of classical dramaturgy. Fischer wanted to make the same kind of love-drama as the Golden Legend. All of them are alike in interpreting love humanistically. Their works are actually dramas of amor. The disease need not be leprosy (Weilen changed it to blindness). We could say, the legend was changed to a love story in the dramas and lost the special religious meaning of the original epic. The only drama which reminds us of the original is that by Pöhn1, but his was terribly modernized and became a drama for children.

However, these dramas have love and miracle as their main motif, except Weilen's, in which the motif is love and power of will. We can say at least that writers of these dramas had an interest in the spiritual side or in the content of the

legend, even though they changed the original caritas to amor and the original leprosy with a religious background to a kind of contagious disease or blindness in a modern sense (except Pöhl where leprosy meant a punishment by a fairy).

In the next stage, some writers neglected the content of the legend almost completely. They directed their eye only to dramatic elements of the legend. As I mentioned, the legend has some dramatic elements, e.g. tripartite structure and some symbolical events. In addition, the medieval age is a good setting for a spectacle drama. We could add some oriental scenes to the spectacle if we connected the story with the crusade.

From such point of view, C. Schultes composed a spectacle action drama in 1894 out of the legend. His Der Arme Heinrich is composed for theatrical effects only.

In this drama, Heinrich is a proud, obstinate and vigorous man who is supposed to marry Renata, a proud and egoistic Italian lady. The emperor Heinrich VI happened to stop at Heinrich's castle on his way home from Rome, when a farmer named Hanfried comes to see the emperor and complains to him that Heinrich has occupied his land by force. The emperor gives Hanfried a right to keep the land. Heinrich manaces Hanfried, threatening that he will kill him. Der Triesdorfer, a minnesinger, tries to make Heinrich stop the farmer by reciting an old story of King Rotbart but Heinrich gets angry and fights with him. Heinrich who has been wounded by the fighting, looks for a bandage. A leper who has come to the town in order to

touch the emperor and to be healed, put a piece of his clothes upon Heinrich's wound. Thus, Heinrich contracts leprosy. Heinrich who is now living in a cave with lepers, receives a letter from Renata, and comes to know that a doctor in Salerno can cure him with a maiden's blood. He turns his eye to a girl who is carrying food to him out of sympathy. She is a daughter of the farmer Hanfried. Heinrich blames the egoistic Renata's behavior when the girl is with him and he wins her love. Heinrich and the girl go to the doctor in Salerno, who does not believe in a blood cure of leprosy but wants to kill Heinrich because Heinrich's father killed the doctor's parents and brothers when he occupied the city of Salerno. The doctor, however, is deeply moved by Maria's love for Heinrich and tries to the blood cure. Heinrich happens to catch a glimpse of the beautiful, naked girl on the operating table and orders the doctor not to operate. Having changed his mind, he gives half of his property to the city of Salerno and another half to Maria. He declares then that he will break with Renata. Renata, enraged, tries to take revenge on Heinrich with the help of her friend, the owner of an inn where Heinrich and Maria are staying. Heinrich is wounded by Renata and her friend, while Maria is also about to be killed by them, when the doctor comes and saves them. In the last act Heinrich reports to the emperor in Reichenau that he has been cured by the doctor's care and saved by Maria's love.

This is not a miracle drama. Leprosy in the drama means simply a contagious disease and it is cured by medical treatment. Even the doctor does not believe in the blood cure. This is not a love drama either, because Maria's love of Heinrich is merely a part of the drama, and is not the main part. The main accent of the drama is put on action, for example on fighting. This is quite a new treatment of Der Arme Heinrich. We could call it Der Arme Heinrich in Italian style, a sign of which can be found already in the drama by the anonymous writer.

H.Hanau's Der Arme Heinrich(1900) belongs also to the amusement type, though it has a more religious setting than Schultes'. The writer emphasizes an oriental exotic and grotesque element of the story. Heinrich in the drama is a kind of proud playboy. He is indulging in pleasures. He has brought an oriental girl called Suleima when he joined a crusade, and orders people to kiss her feet in the oriental manner. A farmer and his daughter refuse and are banished by him. It is from Suleima that Heinrich gets leprosy, she has been a leper. Having got the disease, he comes to recover his reason and begins to live alone in a forest near the expelled farmer's cottage. Heinrich's friend Johannes who loves the farmer's daughter and visits her at times, tells her scornfully of Heinrich's disease and miserable life. She, on the contrary, looks down upon Johannes who despises his friend and sympathizes with Heinrich. There is a cloister in the forest where a monk lives

who can cure leprosy by his charms. Gertrud(the girl) asks the monk to cure Heinrich. The monk tells her that she must carress the leper if she wants him to be cured. His explanation of leper and leprosy is so vividly exact that she feels it impossible to caress Heinrich, but she does decide to do so. Heinrich who has heard of her decision, wanders in the stony forest. He sees there a woodman who advises him to take off his drenched clothes and dry them by the fire. Heinrich, believing himself a leper, hesitates to do so but when the clothes are taken off, he finds himself healed. He comes to Gertrud and kneels down before her as before a saint.

As we see, the reason for Gertrud's decision is not love for him but sympathy. Considering the writer's description of Heinrich's sensual life and leprosy, he has as strong an interest in the grotesqueness and extremes as is obvious from hhe fact that the writer used the motif of caressing a leper. In addition, Gertrud's self-sacrifice does not mean death in the drama.

Now, we can classify the modern dramas we mentioned into two types: romantic, sentimental love-drama and the amusement drama of action or grotesque, though some of them have an element of love conflict. The romantic type seems to have come from Longfellow. The element of love conflict seems also to have come from the situation of Irmingard of the Golden Legend. The exotic and grotesqueness is a new element. The only exception is Weilen's Der Arme Heinrich which has a classical

character, and is quite different from the original epic.

In 1900, K. Becher (pseudonym of H. Erdmann) composed a drama of Der Arme Heinrich, which is a modernization of the original epic in the same manner as that by H. Pöhl. She (Becher) follows the original epic and describes the customs relating to leprosy in the medieval ages correctly, perhaps with the help of Grimm or Wackernagel. In the drama, the girl is a real country girl such as is found everywhere. She is healthy and joyful, but sometimes becomes serious, especially when she takes care of Heinrich. The writer seems to have aimed to bring about some dramatic effect by the girl's dual character as Shakespear often did. Heinrich is a soft-minded leper of a modern type such as can be found in present-day sanatoriums. They fall in love. In the second act, the writer introduces Heinrich's recollection of his former love affair with a lady (Mechtild), and tries to explain Heinrich's situation, because otherwise the audience might imagine the drama as romantic pastoral drama. As we see from the fact that the writer emphasizes Heinrich's life on the farm, this is also a love-drama. When they have heard that a doctor in Salerno can cure him, the girl offers her life to Heinrich. Heinrich's change of mind is quite modern. He has a glimpse of the girl on the operating table and discusses her self-sacrifice with his page outside of the room. The audience cannot know how the

operation is going on. In the next act, Heinrich comes home in a dark night and sees his mother. They discuss his miraculous healing and the possibility that the healing might have taken place not from the mercy of God but rather because of the girl's love. Although the writer followed the original in plot, modernization of the latter half of the drama is extreme.

At the end of the nineteenth century, when modernization or vulgarization of the legend was thus being practised, two interesting treatment of Der Arme Heinrich were produced. One is an opera by H.Pfitzner (1895), another is a short story by R.Huch(1899). These two great artists' interpretation of the legend are unique, as might be expected. Pfitzner comes back completely to the original religiousity, while Huch tried to see the legend as an historical event.

The text of Pfitzner's opera was written by James Grun, an English-German friend and classmate of Pfitzner in his school-days. According to Tardel⁸, the versification of the text is extremely bad. However, we are talking now of the dramatic composition and their interpretation of the original epic. I think, because it is usual for a musician and a writer to compose a text of an opera in collaboration, that they might have interpreted the original and composed the work together. Therefore, the interpretation of the original in the text seems to be due not only to Grun, but also to Pfitzner.

The composition of the opera Der Arme Heinrich is very simple. The first act consists of two scenes: Heinrich's

8

H.Tardel, "Der Arme Heinrich in der neueren Dichtung".p.41.

castle and his vassal Dietrich's room. We see at first Heinrich in sickness and delirium. His sickness is not clearly explained. The writer uses only the word Siechtum. Dietrich's wife Hilde and his daughter Agnes are taking care of Heinrich. Then Dietrich comes from Italy and tells of his travels through Germany, especially along the Rhine, and of the Alps. He sings of sunny Italy and tells of the terrible blood cure of the disease. In the next scene, Agnes appears in her parents' bedroom and tells them that she wants to die for Heinrich because of her love for Christ. She does not know herself whether she loves Heinrich or not. The parents are surprised but cannot help agreeing with her because her attitude is remarkably pious and shows an unworldly faith. The second act and the last is a scene in a room of a cloister. The doctor is a monk. In the room stands a crucifix with an emaciated bloody Christ. There are ropes and a bloody lash in the room. Monks sing: dies ira, dies illa, and ask Agnes about her resolution, while Heinrich on a stair squates down in blank surprise, half stupified. No sooner has Heinrich heard a noise - the sharpening of a knife - and seen the monk(doctor) taking up the sharpened knife than he rushes into the room with a torch-light. Heinrich then, having found himself healed, reports to monks that a miracle has occurred.

Pfitzner and Grun are the first to interpret the story religiously, after Hartmann. No one had interpreted it so religiously as they did. We could say that the spirit of the legend

returns first with the opera. The age of the girl seems to be younger than that of former paraphrases and dramas, because Agnes in the opera does not say anything about her love. She is too young to talk about love. Her motive of self-sacrifice is at least not amor, neither is it sympathy. The setting of the opera tells clearly that her motive is something other than amor. Heinrich does not see the naked Agnes but a crucifix with a bound, naked, and bloody Christ, which means that the writers had interpreted the legend as truthfully as Hartmann. Moreover, in Hartmann we have found some shadow of amor which gives his work a bewitching power and we interpreted it as a trace of medieval gradualism. The opera has no such gradual structure. Everything is interpreted from a strictly religious point of view, which gives a special character to this modern legendary opera. Though Pfitzner affirmed in his article that they interpreted the epic truthfully,⁹ his statement is not correct, at least concerning the gradualism.

As I mentioned, R.Huch's Der Arme Heinrich shows the writer's realistic approach to the legend. It was written in 1899, when she was in the slum of Trieste and was beginning to show a realistic tendency. Her first novel Erinnerungen von Rudolf Urslau dem Jüngeren(1893) was a kind of romantic novel written at the time when George and Hofmannsthal were producing their early works. It described in melodious language the rise and fall of North German patrician family. Having written this

⁹
H.Pfitzner, Gesammelte Schriften. Vol.II(Augsburg, 1926) pp. 75-88.

novel, her interest was directed gradually to history. Even before she began to write a novel she had an especially strong interest in history. Her dissertation presented to the University of Zurich in 1891 was on Die Neutralität der Eidgenossenschaft. Her knowledge as a student of history and her talent as a novelist began to reinforce each other after her first novel. At first, her interest in history took the form of short story and then of the novel. During this period she was under the strong influence of Gottfried Keller. According to E.Hoppe:

Die Grundeinstellung gegenüber der mittelalterlichen Legende, die Ricarda Huch einnimmt, ist die gleiche, von der Gottfried Keller in seinen Legenden ausgeht. Keller verfolgt, wie er einleitend mitteilt, das Primzip, aus den überlieferten Sagen die Spuren einer ehemaligen profanen Erzählungslust, die durch die kirchliche Fabulierkunst hindurchschimmern, herauszulösen und das dadurch gewonnene fragmentarische, rahmenartige Gebilde von sich neu zu füllen, wobei er das Antlitz der Legenden einer anderen Himmelsgegende zuwendet als diejenige war, nach der sie in der überkommenen Gestalt schauten.¹⁰

Keller found a prototype of the Novelle in legends and made use of it for his own Novellen, while Huch rather looked at legends as such with the eye of a historian. Her Der Arme Heinrich was written from a historical point of view. However, it is clear that she made use of Keller's technique of the short story when she wrote Der Arme Heinrich and other short stories at that time.¹¹

¹⁰

E.Hoppe, Ricarda Huch(Stuttgart, 1951) p. 148.

¹¹

ibid. pp.120-50.

She thought that people in the Middle Ages might have seen every historical event from their own subjective point of view, which was conditioned by environments around them, e.g. religion, politics, and others. She removes all medieval thought from the legend and makes it an event which might happen even now. There is no shadow of mysticism in her story. Mystical elements and miracle are treated in her story as strange events which happened but cannot be explained rationally. They are indeed strange but are nothing more than that. She does not explain nor interpret them religiously. The girl in her story dies for Heinrich, perhaps from a religious enthusiasm. She dies for Heinrich, and Heinrich is healed. (If Heinrich had not been healed, people could not have made such a legend. This historical event is the source of legend to R.Huch.) God does not save her life. Heinrich, who was saved by the sacrifice of another's life in the same way as Barabbas in the New Testament, lives on. But what happens to his life after he made a human sacrifice? This is the main problem in her story. H.Tardel says that it is a story of romantic irony in a realistic form.¹² I think, moreover, that the realism in the story is much nearer to her Triumphgasse, sketches of people who were forced to live in miserable conditions, though Der Arme Heinrich still has a strong romantic element. The story is a work which belongs to a transitional stage between her romantic first novel Rudolf Ursiau and the realistic second work Triumphgasse, and a story

¹²

H.Tardel, "Der Arme Heinrich in der neueren Dichtung", p.37.

of a legend seen by a modern historian. In short, she changed the legend to a story of the superstition of a blood cure of leprosy, that is, a story before Hartmann.

In the story, Heinrich, a proud, handsome and rich knight, is touched by a leper in front of a chapel on the day of his marriage with beautiful proud Irminreich. The leper has come to the chapel in order to touch the happy pair and be healed. In the evening, he feels ill but holds his unwilling bride in his arms. He finds in the morning some spots on his arms and leaves his wife in order to live alone in a forest. Liebheidli, a farmer's daughter, who is full of piety and religiosity, presents a plateful of blackberries to Heinrich and asks him to live with her family so that she may take care of him better. They begin to live together. He is, however, still a proud knight in sickness while she is a religious country girl. Though we can know from her behavior that she loves him, she does not say anything about it. She thinks by herself that her service to him is religious. Heinrich who knows that she is serving him through her love of him rather than through any other motives, does not say anything about love either. There is a barrier of status between them. One day, Heinrich hears of the blood cure for leprosy from other lepers whom he has been acquainted with. He begins to love her positively. He tells her of the cure, she decides to sacrifice herself, believing that her self-sacrifice is a religious one. We understand that she is going to sacrifice herself through her unconscious love of him under a romantic slogan of religiosity. The young girl

does not notice it, Heinrich takes advantage of her romantic and imagined religious enthusiasm. Her parents who are not pious nor wise but stubborn, ignorant old farmers, scold her, beat her, but do not know what to do. On the other hand, the girl's imagined enthusiasm for Christ gradually becomes a real one after she decided to die for him. On their way to Salerno, Heinrich wants to kiss the poor girl but she rejects him. Heinrich who cannot understand the meaning of her rejection, looks on the spots on his arms. As we see, motivation of her self-sacrifice is amor at first and then changes to caritas after her destiny was decided. This is a modern psychological motivation. Heinrich is not pious at all, he is rather taking advantage of the girl's ignorance. They visit a school in Salerno but no professor knows of the blood cure. They visit then an Arabian magician who is supposed to know about it. The magician kills her with a narcotic. The poor girl dies, dreaming of Paradise and without saying anything to Heinrich. Thus, Heinrich is cured by her blood and other medicines. He begins to live again with the proud Irminreich but cannot forget the poor girl who dies for him. On his way to Jerusalem on a crusade, he stops at the magician's house, because he has heard that the magician can make the spirit of a dead person appear in the world. He wants to see the girl's spirit and ask her whether she loved him or not when she was on the ship for Salerno with him. The magician cannot make the dead appear again. The magician's daughter who

loves Heinrich and knows that her father cannot make the dead appear, lies naked on the operating table in a dark room in the place of the dead girl. Heinrich, having understood her trick, holds her in his arms and caresses her, thinking of the killed girl. He takes her to Jerusalem, where he sees a beautiful Persian slave girl who is making efforts to save her captured master and appeared in Heinrich's camp at times. Heinrich, who knows what the slave is doing, reminds himself of the dead girl by the slave's loyalty to her master and her behavior. He comes to love this enemy girl. While he is caressing the beautiful Persian on a blooming hillside of Jerusalem, the magician's daughter appears and kills him with a sharp knife. Heinrich dies, thinking of the poor German girl who rejected his kiss.

Heinrich in the story is a proud, strong and vigorous but unhappy youth, who does not become sorry for the girl's death until the end. He has not loved her at first, though he has not hated her. We could say that he liked her as a knight likes a peasant girl. He accepts her self-sacrifice as a master accepts his servant's service. Her death for him causes him to love her really but she is no longer in the world. He begins to follow her image and changes his mistresses one after another in vain. At last, he dies in the arms of a woman who reminds him of the dead girl, killed by the girl of the magician who killed the German girl. On the other hand, the girl loved him at first but her love of him changes to another one as her death comes nearer. On the way to Salerno, she no longer loves him in a worldly

sense. She rejects his kiss. There is no trace of the medieval gradualism in the story. When she has begun to love him with caritas, she is no more a woman of amor. Heinrich cannot understand it until his death.

This is not the romantic love story which can be found in many dramas of Der Arme Heinrich before R.Huch, nor is it a religious legend like Pfitzner's, but a romantic story of a miserable self-sacrifice which took place in the mediæval age. The event is extreme but people in the story are all common people whom we can find even at present day life. Huch's realistic description of German medieval life and the crusaders' camp in Jerusalem presents this somewhat romantic story of a miserable death with realism. Her realism becomes clearer in the next work, Triumphgasse. In the story, we can find a monk who is always thinking philosophically of God. He appears with Heinrich in the forest, in the camp in Jerusalem and is watching Heinrich carefully. According to Huch's attitude to the legend, he is supposed to be the writer who made a legend out of Heinrich's life from a spiritual point of view.

Huch's story seems to have taken over the source which was changed by Longfellow and adopted by many of her predecessors. The roles of Irminreich and the monk Baldrian in her story proves that she made use of the Longfellow tradition rather than the original epic. Besides them, influences of Schultes(Heinrich's first attitude to the girl), Hanau(exoticism) and others can be found clearly in the story.

As for source, Hauptmann's Der Arme Heinrich(1902) shows a closer relation to Longfellow. However, according to W.A. Reichart and P.Diamond, Hauptmann became acquainted with the story first through Chamisso's paraphrase, when he was fourteen years old.¹³ But it was in 1897 that he began to give the story dramatic form, that is, after the success of Hanneles Himmelfahrt and Die versunkene Glocke. In Hannele(1893) he initiated a new development; it bore witness to his growing dissatisfaction with consistent realism, though before he had been one of its most earnest followers. In Hannele his former repellent picture of proletarian misery was alleviated by the romantic mysticism of a dying child's feverish dreams. In Hannele we can see some similarities to Ottegebe of his Der Arme Heinrich. It seems to me, accordingly, that when he had composed Hannele, he was already trying to find a similar source, either in folklore or history, or legend. In 1896, he published an allegorical Märchendrama in verse, Die versunkene Glocke, the popularity of which showed how the German public was to be spared the drab world of every day. Hauptmann, who was a follower of the public rather than a leader, and changed the character of his art, adjusting to requests of the public like a sensitive chameleon, seems to have decided in his mind to compose one more drama of such a tendency. His Der Arme Heinrich in verse

13

W.A.Reichart and Ph.Diamond, "Die Entstehungsgeschichte des Armen Heinrich", G.Hauptmann Jahrbuch I (1936) p. 59ff.

is apparently in a line with Hanneles Himmelfahrt and Die versunkene Glocke. He began to compose it in 1897 and finished it in 1902.¹⁴ During these five years he wrote also Fuhrmann Henschel and Michael Kramer, and showed that he was still by no means untrue to naturalism. Therefore, I see Hauptmann in this period trying to find a new way but still keeping his old art. Der Arme Heinrich reveals clearly the character of his art in this period. It is a mystical legendary drama in verse composed according to the dramatic techniques of realism.

In spite of his statement that he had known the story from his boyhood, the drama tells us that he made use of some adaptations of the Longfellow-type, not the original epic. As Krumpelmann pointed out, the drama has other dramatis personae and plot than those of the original epic, most of which can be found in the Golden Legend.¹⁵ H. Tardel affirms only that the name of the peasant (Gottfried) was taken from Hohenhausen's translation of the Golden Legend.¹⁵ According to Krumpelmann, the use of a minnesinger (Hartmann von Aue in Hauptmann, Walter of the Vogelweide in Longfellow), of a priest (Pater Benedict in Hauptmann, a parish priest in Longfellow), of a fiancée (Kaisers Tochter in Hauptmann, Irmgard in Longfellow) are the same in both. Further, the characters of the doctor in Salerno and of Heinrich himself are considerably akin in either poem. But we cannot say from these facts that Hauptmann made use only of

¹⁴ J. Gregor, Gerhart Hauptmann (Wien, 1944) p. 329.

¹⁵ H. Tardel, "Der Arme Heinrich in der neueren Dichtung", p. 48.

the Golden Legend, because we know that there were many adaptations of the Golden Legend in Germany before Hauptmann's composition. The only thing we can say is that Hauptmann had read the Golden Legend in translation as a reference before he composed the drama. He must have read the adaptations too, during the five years of composition.

His drama is written in brilliant German verse and has a splendid construction but did not become as popular as he expected. The structure of the drama is as follows.

- Act I The peasant Gottfried's house. Ottacker, Heinrich's vassal, comes to see Heinrich who is living there under the care of the peasant family, but Ottacker goes away without seeing him. Gottfried and his wife Brigitta talk about their sick master Heinrich. Heinrich appears as a knightly figure, with graceful looks and a pointed beard. He is still a proud knight. He thanks the peasant with dignity but his restless eyes reveal the state of his mind. He is brooding. Ottegebe appears. She is a timid country girl. Heinrich expresses his miserable state of mind to her.
- Act II The kitchen in the house of Gottfried. Priest Benedict appears and talks with Ottegebe. From the conversation we learn of Ottegebe's unusual religiosity and Benedict's deep devotion to God. She is already ready to sacrifice herself for Heinrich. Her parents who have known of their daughter's decision are surprised, and oppose her. Hartmann, a loyal vassal of Heinrich, comes to see him. Heinrich knows how his status and situation are changing. He becomes frustrated. Ottegebe appears as naive and pretty as an angel.
- Act III A rocky wilderness. Heinrich, wild, ragged and unkempt with unshorn hair, with a bandaged left hand. It is an evening in autumn. He is digging his own grave. Ottacker comes to see him but cannot come near him. He speaks to Heinrich at a distance. Heinrich's monologue about his desperate, lonely situation. Benedict appears and shows him his constant attention.

Act IV Benedict's chapel. Before the crucifix, Ottegebe tells Benedict of her secret decision. Ottegebe shows her unusual devotion to Christ. Both exeunt. In the empty chapel Heinrich appears. He is now a real outcast begger. His desperate nihilistic monologue. Benedict reappears and is shocked at the sight of the changed miserable figure of Heinrich. He advises him to have faith in God. Ottegebe reappears and approaches Heinrich, rests on one knee, raises his head with her hands and kisses his forehead. He stares at her, obedient as a child in all his gestures as though he saw a heavenly vision. Ottegebe tells her decision, he follows her like a sleepwalker.

Act V A hall of the castle of Aue. Benedict, Hartmann, Ottacker and other vassals are talking about their healed master Heinrich. Heinrich appears, leading Ottegebe. She is pale and worn. Her feet are bare. She support herself with a staff. She appears to be timid and quite at a loss. Going through the people, Heinrich and Ottegebe come near the throne. She asks him where she is. He replies, she is now in her home and he leads her to the throne. She sits down on it but falls into deep sleep because of her fatigue. Heinrich crowns her. While sleeping, Ottegebe speaks of her happiness. Benedict replies.

As we see, the structure of the drama is very modern. Heinrich in the drama does not become poor suddenly but gradually; Ottegebe also becomes angel-like, gradually. In the first act, Heinrich is a proud but sick knight and Ottegebe is a common, naive country girl. They love each other without knowing it. In the second act, Ottegebe shows her religiosity, while Heinrich shows his desperation in the third act. The fourth act is the climax of the drama where Ottegebe's love for Heinrich is elevated to cariats. The fifth act is a kind of epilogue in which Ottegebe becomes a hal-
lowed being. Benedict leads and is present in the dramatic action from the beginning to the end, Hartmann acts as a representative figure of human faith. The peasant couple and Ottacker act as

human weakness and honesty.

The drama seems at first to be a faithful interpretation of the original epic, but nonetheless, we can find some fatal modernizations. Ottegebe in the drama is fourteen years old, who is no longer an innocent girl but a girl who knows love. In fact, she talks of a love romance in the second act which imply Heinrich's former love affair. If Ottegebe were played by an elderly actress, the effect of amor would be emphasized more than Hauptmann expects, despite his efforts to provide a religious motivation. She is a girl who knows love but is enthusiastic for Christianity. This is a fatal modernization of the epic, just as in Büshing's poem. In addition, she consults about her behavior, with Benedict, a priest. In the epic, we cannot find any priest, the girl herself is in touch with God. This direct connection with God is the most important character of medieval mysticism. There need not be any priest in this story. Heinrich in the drama is also excessively modernized. He is a modern youth in a medieval setting. He thinks too much and becomes desperate as easily as young men of the present. We could not imagine any courtly virtue in this figure. Hauptmann seems to have modernized the story purposely, because leprosy in the drama is just an infectious disease. The modernization is given impetus by his realism. By realistic characterization of the peasant, Hartmann, Ottacker causes the audience to imagine that the drama is something of a modern event. Well, suppose this is a completely modern drama

with modern settings, how then could the infectinal disease be healed without medicine? It cannot be healed without medicine in the modern world. Therefore, Hauptmann could not present the scene of Salerno on the stage. He avoided the scene and put an accent on psychological process of the people, and tried to analyze it by dramaturgy of realism. His technique contradicts content of the drama. Though some German critics, e.g. Tardel, Gregor, say that this is one of Hauptmann's masterpieces,¹⁶ I am quite opposed to such an opinion. The more Hauptmann describes the scenes in a realistic manner and the more minutely he explains the psychological process, the more unreasonable and miserable the drama becomes. He used his realistic techniques fully in this drama and tried to produce a symbolic effect of a miracle. Besides this contradiction, the tragical first, second, third and fourth acts contradict the last Märchenschluss. It is not strange that the modern audience did not follow this play. If we may exaggerate, Hauptmann was a great dramatic technician, whose realistic presentation and psychological motivation are excellent that no one could compete with him at that time, but his proper idea of dramatization seems to have not as deep as his understandings of the techniques. In Der Arme Heinrich, he showed the weakness and presented a legendary source in a wrong technique.

16

H.Tardel, "Der Arme Heinrich in der neueren Dichtung", pp. 43-57.

S.Gregor, Gerhart Hauptmann . p.331ff.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

In the preceeding chapters, I have studied Der Arme Heinrich by Hartmann von Aue and the later adaptations of it. My attention was especially focused on their sources and the treatment. The source itself is a biblical one, perhaps the story of Job in the Old Testament. The idea of a blood cure also has its origin in the Bible. However, the story of leprosy and the idea of a blood cure had no association in the Bible. The disease was regarded as a result of sin and the cure was a symbol of holy power. In the Bible, these two things were opposed to each other. Every disease in it was regarded as a symbol of spiritual poisoning which must be healed by God's will through repentance. There was no medicine in the world except God's mercy. On the other hand, holy power is a divine power, which must be used only by God. Therefore, in the Bible it was impossible that human beings used the holy power for themselves. There is no medicine in the world except the mercy of God, is the teaching of the Bible. If any but God used the holy power, it was Satam whose power should be rejected by righteous men.

It was medieval Europeans who connected the story of leprosy with the power of blood. Here, the holy power of blood was already regarded as a magic power which was available to human beings. Perhaps in the early Middle Ages they invented a story of the blood cure of leprosy. It was a story of magic.

In the medieval Europe, there were two kinds of magical cure for leprosy: the legend-type and the friendship-type. The former emphasized the spiritual element of leprosy. In this story, the leper at first tries to rely on the magic power of blood, but he is cured rather by the mercy of God after his repentance. The latter emphasizes more the magic power of blood, the idea of which seems to have come to Europe through some non-Christian people. In this story, the leper really tries the blood cure and cured, but God who has been pleased by Friendship between the leper and his friend saves the victim and the leper. The latter half of the story is obviously an addition by medieval Christianity. The essence of the story is the blood cure of leprosy, because the story lacks the idea of leprosy as a spiritual poisoning. Both these feature of the blood cure of leprosy, i.e. religious character and magical character, seem to have been attractive to some writers, they began to make an adaptation of it. Hartmann von Aue was one of these adapters.

His story belongs to the legendary type, for the leper is healed by God. However, Hartmann gave personality to the people in the story. The hero is a knight of Swabia, the sacrifice is a lovely and innocent country girl. Unlike other legends of this type, the people in his story decide for themselves and act for themselves. These independent decision and actions were the main thesis of his story. We can say that it

is a story of the spiritual development of the characters and nearest to the story of Job in its content. Hartmann gave the story elements of medieval gradualism and put the highest value on caritas. The people in his story ascend the stairway of life one by one by their own decision and arrive at the highest stage, the life of caritas where everything is blessed by God. Therefore, this is in a sense a story of the vita nova. Important is the fact that every decision is made by a divine inspiration, by a symbolic experience without any philosophical reflection. The main idea of the story is that God helps those who strive. We see here medieval optimism supported by Christianity.

In the Age of Romanticism, the story was revived, but it was a time when people believed in human autonomy, even if they were longing for eternity and mystical power. People at that time saw the most important and beautiful element of the legend in amor, which was a lower stage of love in Hartmann and must be overcome by caritas. In addition, the decision in this age of revival was made from philosophical reflection, and not brought about by a direct, divine inspiration. We can see in the paraphrases or adaptations of this time, persons who trust in human power but are not satisfied with it and are still longing for the blessed life in the original epic. We can see at the same time that, when they try to compose Der Arme Heinrich with amor as the chief motivating power, it becomes a romantic fairy tale and loses the original religious power. The

adaptations of this time hover between a legend and a fairy tale in their content.

With Longfellow, content and form of the adaptation were changed completely. The legend became a story of love but modern pessimism cast its shadow deep on the story. The scheme of

sin ----- repentance ----- salvation

was replaced by another one,

pessimism ----- love ----- happiness

The self-sacrifice which was a motive of repentance and salvation became a mean for gaining human understanding and love. Every writer in this period shows some difficulty in managing the leprosy of the legend. Some changed it to blindness or some other strange disease. Their knowledge of modern medical science and their aesthetic taste seem to have caused them to avoid leprosy as an object of a miraculous cure and as a subject for presentation on the stage.

Hauptmann who courageously took up this source and tried to present it on the modern stage failed first in the interpretation of its content and then in his presentation of it. He put an accent on amor and then tried to change the amor to caritas, but caritas was cloaked by the influence of amor. The end of his drama, therefore, became a Märchenschluss. His dramatical techniques of realism, psychological motivation and his realistic presentation prevented the audience from

understanding the legend. He was too realistic and modern to present this legend on the stage.

Among modern adaptations of the legend, it seems to me, Pfitzner and R.Huch composed relatively good stories. This fact suggests a way of adapting the legend to the modern taste. In the case of Pfitzner, he interpreted the legend justly and composed it into an opera. An opera does not mean realistic drama, it relies mostly on the imagination of the audience, with the help of music. The audience imagines something more than what is seen on the stage. The idea is close to Wagner's presentation of medieval epics or Hofmannsthal's Jedermann. This kind of symbolic presentation seems to me to be the only way to present it as it is. The Japanese symbolic stage of the no-drama in which many Buddhist legends are presented even now and with success is a case in point. As for Pfitzner's stage dramatization, it is really unfortunate that he did not have a good libretto. H.Tardel who because of the poor libretto does not value the opera highly says:

Die eigenartige Musik Hans Pfitzners, der man wirklich eine bessere Textunterlage gewünscht hätte, trifft, indem sie von Wagner ausgeht und über ihn hinauszukommen sucht, jedenfalls den Ton des Schmerzes, des Düstern und Niederdrückenden in genialer Art.¹

The case of R.Huch suggests to us a way of adapting the legend to the form of modern Novelle. She did not interpret

¹
H.Tardel, "Der Arme Heinrich in der neueren Dichtung".
p. 42.

the legend mystically nor changed its content. She regarded it as the story of a strange event. She watches it not through Hartmann's eye, nor Longfellow's, but with her modern eyes. In her story, the girl who sacrifices herself dies and the knight is cured. The reader follows the story and understands all the situations but will not have any explanation of the event from the author. He must interpret it for himself. He is free to interpret it religiously, romantically or philosophically. In this way, the problem is left to the reader. The more the description becomes real, the more serious the problem becomes. I think, this is the only way to adapt a legend to the realism of the modern age, because, when someone explains a legend, life of the legend comes to an end. The miserable failure of former adaptors was caused by the fact that they interpreted the legend for themselves and forced the reader to follow their interpretation. Religion is a problem of the individual and a legend must be interpreted individually by each person.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Texts.

Hartmann von Aue. Der Arme Heinrich. Edited by H.Paul and A. Leitzmann. (Altdeutsche Textbibliothek) Halle/Saale: M.Niemeyer, 1930.

_____. Der Arme Heinrich. Edited by F.Maurer. (Sammlung Göschen) Berlin: Walther de Gruyter, 1958.

_____. Der Arme Heinrich. Edited by E.Gierach. (Germanische Bibliothek) Heidelberg: C.Winter, 1925.

_____. Der Arme Heinrich. Edited by J.K.Bostock. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1941.

_____. Der Arme Heinrich und zwei jüngere Prosalegenden verwandten Inhalts. Edited by W.Wackernagel and E. Stadler. Basel: Schwabe, 1911.

_____. Der Arme Heinrich. Translated by H.von Wolzogen. (Reclams Universalbibliothek 456) Leipzig: R.Reclam.

Hartmann von Aue and others. Waltharilied. Der Arme Heintich. Edda. Translated by W. and J. Grimm, edited by E.Lieder-
mann. Hamburg: Schulze, 1905.

Chamisso, Adelbert von. Chamissos Werke. Edited by O.Walzel. (Deutsche Nationalliteratur) Stuttgart: Union, 1892-93.

Rossetti, Dante Gabriel. The Collected Works of Dante Gabriel Rossetti. Vol.II. Edited by W.M.Rossetti. London: Ellis and Elvey, 1890.

Longfellow, Henry Wadsworth. The Golden Legend. Boston: Ticknor and Fields, 1861.

Huch, Ricarda. Erzählungen. Vol.I. Leipzig: H.Haessel, 1922.

Hauptmann, Gerhart. Das Gesammelte Werk. Vol. IV. Berlin: Suhrkamp, 1943.

Literature.

Baum, Marie. Leuchtende Spur. Das Leben Ricarda Huchs. Tübingen and Stuttgart: Rainer Wunderlich, 1950.

- Beyerle, Franz. "Der 'Arme Heinrich' Hartmanns von Aue als Zeugnis mittelalterlichen Ständerechts," Kunst und Recht. Festgabe für Hans Fehr. Freiburg: Stud., 1958. pp. 27-46.
- Boor, Helmut de. Die höfische Literatur. Vorbereitung. Blüte. Ausklang. München: Beck, 1960.
- _____. Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart. Vol. II. München: Beck, 1962.
- Borchardt, Rudolf. "Der Arme Heinrich," Gesammelte Werke in Einzelbänden. Prosa II. Stuttgart: E.Klett, 1959
- Burger, Heinz Otto(ed.). Annalen der deutschen Literatur. Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1952.
- _____. Schwäbische Romantik. Studien zur Charakteristik des Unlandkreises. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1928.
- Cassel, Paulus Stephanus. Die Symbolik des Blutes und Der Arme Heinrich Hartmanns von Aue. Berlin, 1882.
- Eis, Gerhard. "Der Seuchenspruch des Armen Heinrich," Forschungen und Fortschritte. 25(1940). pp. 10-12.
- _____. "Salernitanisches und Unsalernitanisches im 'Armen Heinrich' des Hartmanns von Aue," Forschungen und Fortschritte. 31(1957) pp.77-81.
- Eggers, Hans. Symmetrie und Proportion epischen Erzählens. Studien zur Kunstform Hartmanns von Aue. Stuttgart: Klett, 1956.
- Ehrismann, Gustav. Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters. II.2,1. München: Beck, 1927.
- _____. "Die Grundlagen des ritterlichen Tugendsystems," ZfdA. 56(1919) pp. 137-216.
- Ermatinger, Emil. Das dichterische Kunstwerk. Berlin: Teubner, 1921.
- Fechter, Werner. "Über den 'Armen Heinrich' Hartmanns von Aue," Euphonia. 49(1955) pp.1-28.

- Fechter, Werner. "Last der Ehren. Zum Armen Heinrich 68-69," GRM. 37(1956) pp. 72-74.
- _____. "möht ez mit iuvern hulden sin," GRM. 39(1958)pp.206-8.
- Fiebach, J. "Die dualistische Weltanschauung in Armen Heinrich," PBB. 44(1919-20) pp. 297-88.
- Fourquet, Jean. "Zum Aufbau des Armen Heinrich," Wirkendes Wort 3. Sonderheft(1961) pp. 12-24.
- Frenzel, Elisabeth. "Stoff- und Motivgeschichte," Deutsche Philologie im Aufriss. Vol I. Ed. by W. Stammler. Berlin: E. Schmidt, 1957. 281-332.
- Gierach, Ernst. "Untersuchungen zum Armen Heinrich," ZfdA. 54 (1913) pp. 257ff.
- Gregor, Joseph. Gerhart Hauptmann. Das Werk und unsere Zeit. Wien: Diana, 1944.
- Grosse, Siegfried. "Beginn und Ende der erzählenden Dichtungen Hartmanns von Aue," Beitr.(Tübingen) 83(1961) pp.152-56.
- Grote, Gertrud. Die Erzählungskunst Ricarda Huchs und ihr Verhältnis zur Erzählungskunst des 19. Jahrhunderts. Berlin: E. Ebering, 1931.
- Hoppe, Else. Ricarda Huch. Weg. Persönlichkeit. Werk. Stuttgart: Riederer, 1951.
- Jungbluth, G. "Zum 'Armen Heinrich' v.225(447)," GRM. 36(1955) pp. 263-65.
- Kayser, Wolfgang. Das sprachliche Kunstwerk. 7th ed. Bern und München: Francke, 1961.
- Keller, Adelbert von. Uhland als Dramatiker. Stuttgart: Cotta, 1877.
- Klapper, J. Die Legende vom Armen Heinrich. Breslau: Programmschrift, 1914.
- Kleinstück, Johannes. "Zur Auffassung des Todes im Mittelalter," Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift. 28(1954)pp. 40-60.

Körner, Joseph. "Erlebnis-Motiv-Stoff," Festschrift f.O.Walzel.
Potsdam: Athenaion, 1924.

_____. Bibliographisches Handbuch des deutschen Schrifttums.
Bern: Francke, 1949.

Kraus, C.von. "Armer Heinrich vs. 226,417," ZfdA. 82(1948-49)
pp. 73-76.

_____. "Drei Märlein in der Parzivalhandschrift G und das
Exempel vom Armen Heinrich," Festschrift f. Singer.
Tübingen: Mohr, 1930. pp. 1-19.

Krumpelmann, John T. "Longfellow's Golden Legend and the Armer
Heinrich theme in modern German literature," JEGPh. 25(1926)
pp. 173-92.

Kuhn, Hugo. "Hartmann von Aue als Dichter," Der Deutschunterricht
1953. pp. 11-27.

Lee, A van der. "noch einmal die Datierung von Hartmanns Werken,"
Leuvense Bijdragen. 51(1951) pp. 110-116.

Lemke, Ernst. Gerhart Hauptmann. Ein Beitrag zur Charakteristik
seiner Zeit und seiner Persönlichkeit. Leipzig: Letsch,
1923.

Langer, Theodor. Der Dualismus in der Weltanschauung und Sprache
Hartmanns. Greifswald: Dissertation, 1913.

Maurer, Friedrich. Leid. Studien zur Bedeutungs- und Problems-
geschichte, besonders in den großen Epen der stautischen
Zeit. Bern: Francke, 1951.

_____. "Die Welt des höfischen Epos," Der Deutschunterricht
1954 Heft 5.

_____. "Das ritterliche Tugendsystem," Deutsche Vierteljahr-
schrift. 23(1949) pp. 74-85.

_____. "Über das Leid in den Dichtungen Hartmanns," Euphorion
45(1950) pp. 165-88.

_____. "Hartmann von Aue," Die großen Deutschen. Vol.II. Berlin:
Propyläen, 1957, pp. 48-56.

McKenzie, D.A. "Hartmann's 'Der Arme Heinrich', some explications
and a theory," MLQ. 11(1950) pp.472-75.

- Müller, Gunther. "Gradualismus," Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift. 2(1924) pp. 681-85.
- Münzer, F. "Die Quellen zu Longfellows 'Golden Legend'," Festschrift d. 44. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner. Leipzig: 1897.
- Nagel, Bert. Der Arme Heinrich Hartmanns von Aue. Eine Interpretation. Tübingen: M.Niemeyer, 1952.
- Naumann, Hans. Höfische Kultur. Halle/Saale: M.Niemeyer, 1927.
- _____. "Hartmann von Aue und Cicero?," Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift. 23(1949) pp. 285-87.
- Neumann, E. "Der Streit um das ritterliche Tugendsystem," K.Helm-Festschrift. Tübingen: M.Niemeyer, 1951/ p.137ff.
- Neumann, Friedrich. "Wann dichtete Hartmann von Aue," Panzer-Festschrift. Heidelberg: C.Winter, 1950. pp. 59-72.
- _____. "Der Arme Heinrich in Hartmanns Werk," ZfdPh. 75(1956) pp. 225-255.
- Petersen, Julius. Die Wissenschaft von der Dichtung. Berlin: Haupt, 1939.
- Petsch, Robert. Deutsche Literaturwissenschaft. Aufsätze zur Begründung der Methode. Berlin: Ebering, 1940.
- Pfitzner, Hans. Gesammelte Schriften.II. Augsburg: Filser, 1926.
- Piquet, F. Etudes sur Hartmann d'Aue. Paris: E.Ledoux, 1898.
- Prochnow, Georg. "Mhd. Sylvesterlegenden und ihre Quellen," ZfdA. 39(1901) pp. 145-211.
- Ranke, F. "Mhd. vribaere 'frei im Entschluss, freiwillig'," ZfdA. 79(1947) pp. 145-79.
- Reichart, W.A. and Diamond, Ph. "Die Entstehungsgeschichte des Armen Heinrich," G.Hauptmann Jahrbuch. I(1936) pp. 59-65.
- Riemer, G.T.L. Wörterbuch und Reimverzeichnis zu den Armen Heinrich Hartmanns von Aue. Göttingen and Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1912.

- Richy, Margaret F. "Die edeln Armen, a study of Hartmann von Aue," London Mediaeval Studies I(1937/39) pp. 265-78.
- Roehm, A.I. Bibliographie und Kritik der deutschen Übersetzungen aus der amerikanischen Dichtung. Leipzig: Hoffmann, 1910.
- Rose, E. "Problem of medieval psychology as presented in the 'klein gemahel' of Heinrich the Unfortunate," Germanic Review, 22(1947) pp. 182-87.
- Saran, Franz. Hartmann von Aue als Lyriker, eine literaturhistorische Forschung. Halle/Saale: M. Niemeyer, 1889.
- Sagara, Morio. Doitsu chusei jōjishi kenkyū (A study of medieval German epic) Tokyo: Ikubundo, 1960.
- Schirokauer, Arno. "Zur Interpretation des Armen Heinrich," ZfdA. 83(1950) pp.59-78.
- _____. "Die Legende vom Armen Heinrich," GRM.23(1951/2) pp. 262-268.
- Schneider, Hermann. Heldendichtung. Geistliche Dichtung. Ritterdichtung. Heidelberg: C.Winter, 1922.
- Schönbach, Anton. Über Hartmann von Aue. Drei Bücher Untersuchungen. Graz: Leuschner and Lubensky, 1984.
- _____. Über Lesen und Bildung. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur neueren Literatur in Deutschland, Osterreich, Amerika. Graz: Leuschner and Lubensky, 1900.
- Schröder, Werner. "Zur Chronologie der drei grossen mittelhochdeutschen Epiker," Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift.31(1957) pp. 264-302.
- Schröder, Fr. R. "Zum 'Armen Heinrich'," GRM. 32(1950/51) p. 78f.
- Schwab, Gustav. Die deutsche Volksbücher. Güterloh and Leipzig: Bertelsmann, 1880.
- Schwietering, Julius. Die deutsche Dichtung des Mittelalters. Potsdam: Athenaion, 1960.
- Sievers, Ed. "Zur inneren und äusseren Chronologie der Werke Hartmanns von Aue," Festgabe f. Ph. Strauch. Halle/Saale: M.Niemeyer, 1932, pp. 53-66.

- Sparnaay, Hendricus. Hartmann von Aue. Studien zu einer Biographie. 2 vols. Halle/Saale: M.Niemeyer, 1933-38.
- _____. Verschmelzung legendarischer und weltlicher Motive in der Poesie des Mittelalters. Groningen: Wolters, 1922.
- _____. Zur Sprache und Literatur des Mittelalters. Groningen: Wolters, 1961.
- _____. "Nachträge zu Hartmann von Aue," Neuphilologus 29(1944) pp. 107-116.
- _____. "Die Einstellung des Armen Heinrich in das Werk Hartmanns von Aue," ZfdA. 67(1930) pp. 27-41.
- Stammler, Wolfgang(ed.) Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters. Verfasserlexikon. 5 vols. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1933-55.
- Stöckli, Pater. Hartmann von Aue. Neue Ergebnisse der Forschung. Basel and Freiburg, Hesse, 1933.
- Tardel, Hermann. "Der Arme Heinrich in der neueren Dichtung," Forschungen zur neueren Literaturgeschichte. 30(1905) pp.1-69.
- Uhland, Ludwig. Schriften zur Geschichte der Dichtung und Sage. 8 vols, Edited by L.Uhland. Stuttgart: Cotta, 1863-73.
- _____. Uhlands Tagebuch 1810-1820. Edited by J.Hartmann. Stuttgart: Cotta, 1897.
- Frau Uhland. Ludwig Uhlands Leben. Stuttgart: Cotta, 1874.
- Unger, Rudolf. Literaturgeschichte als Problemgeschichte. Berlin: Junker and Dünhaupt, 1924.
- Wapnewski, Peter. Hartmann von Aue. (Sammlung Metzler) Stuttgart: Metzler, 1962.
- Walzel, Oskar. Das Wortkunstwerk. Leipzig: Quelle and Meyer, 1926.
- Willoughby, L.A. Dante Gabriel Rossetti and German Literature. London: Frowde, 1912.
- Willson, H.B. "Symbol and reality in Der Arme Heinrich," Modern Language Review. 53(1938) pp. 526-36.

Wislocki, H. von. "Volkstümliches zum Armen Heinrich," ZfdPh. 23(1891)
pp. 217-36.

Wolff, Ludwig. "Hartmann von Aue," Wirkendes Wort Jg. 9(1959) pp. 12-24.

Zwierzina, Konrad. "Beobachtungen zum Reingebrauch Hartmanns und Wolframs,"
Heinzel Festgabe. Halle/Saale: M. Niemeyer, 1897. pp. 437-511.

_____. "Mittelhochdeutsche Studien," ZfdA. 44(1900) pp.1-406, 45(1901)
pp.19-419.

This digital document does not include the vita page from the original.