

## THE PSALM TRANSLATION OF HEINRICH VON MÜGELN

By F. W. RATCLIFFE, M.A., Ph.D.

**H**Einrich von Mügeln's translation of the Psalms with the commentary of Nicholas de Lyra still awaits publication. It remains perhaps the least well-known and the least well documented of his works. This is in itself curious, for if Mügeln comes to mind primarily as a fourteenth-century poet, as a *Meistersinger*, his poetic work has yet to be assessed as an outstanding contribution to late medieval German literature. Yet his Psalm translation, extending from the earliest preserved copy of 1372 down through numerous manuscript copies to its printing in 1475 and 1504, was an immensely important contribution to pre-Lutheran Bible translation history in German-speaking Europe, to say nothing of its linguistic significance as a document of that still largely uncharted period of German philological history, Early New High German. This article sets out to remedy in some measure this deficiency, by reviewing the manuscript situation and considering briefly the translation as a pre-Lutheran and ENHG phenomenon.

There are few positive facts about Mügeln's life beyond the works which are left to us and even here there are few dates. The early postulations of Schröer<sup>1</sup> and, in particular, Helm,<sup>2</sup> still provide the essential background to the accepted account of Mügeln's life and works in the literary histories. The recent works of Stackmann<sup>3</sup> are the first real steps forward since those earliest investigations. His examination of Mügeln's treatment

<sup>1</sup> K. J. Schröer, *Sitzungsberichte d. K. Akad. d. Wissensch., Phil.-hist. Kl.*, Iv (1867), 451-8.

<sup>2</sup> K. Helm, "Zu Heinrich von Mügeln", in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, xxi (1896), 240-7.

<sup>3</sup> K. Stackmann, *Der Spruchdichter Heinrich von Mügeln: Vorstudien zur Erkenntnis seiner Individualität* (Heidelberg, 1958), and *Die kleineren Dichtungen Heinrichs von Mügeln herausgegeben von K. Stackmann* (Berlin, Teilbde. 1-3, 1959, in progress).

of his literary inheritance, the MHG lyric and *Spruchdichtung*, is rewarding. He points to the key position occupied by Mügeln in this neglected period of German literary history and, in consequence, to the significance of his work in the understanding of the MHG lyric in its completeness.

The Psalm translation was one of Mügeln's last works. There is uncertainty as to its exact date, but it most likely preceded his translation of the *Valerius Maximus* of 1369 and followed the German version of the *Ungarnchronik*.<sup>1</sup> It was produced then between c. 1361 and 1369,<sup>2</sup> and not—as was still being maintained in at least one reference work<sup>3</sup> in the last decade—in 1371. The work on which his reputation as a Mastersinger rests is thought to belong to the earlier part of his life. The best known of his poetic works, *Der meide kranz*, dates, it is postulated, from the year of the Golden Bull, 1356. His last two patrons, Rudolf, Archduke of Austria, and Hertnit of Pettau, indicate Austrian, Viennese circles for his later years and it is interesting that the majority of the manuscripts containing the Psalm translation originated in the South German area. His early life was doubtless spent nearer to his own place of origin, that is, Mügeln in the the district of Meissen in Upper Saxony.

An account of the research into the non-literary works of Mügeln is one of repeated postponements. Even on the literary side Stackmann's researches must be considered long overdue. The hopeful note sounded by J. Klapper<sup>4</sup> in his review of two dissertations in 1938 is only now approaching fulfilment. Apart from an article by Bergeler<sup>5</sup> shortly after his dissertation, the only material published dealing with the Psalm translation has occurred in general works on German medieval studies, and none of

<sup>1</sup> H. Ludwig, *Heinrichs von Mügeln Ungarnchronik* (Berlin, 1938). Stackmann, op. cit. p. 11, indicates that an extensive survey of Mügeln's life is being prepared by Ludwig.

<sup>2</sup> The dating of the translation will be discussed in another article.

<sup>3</sup> H. O. Burger, ed., *Annalen der deutschen Literatur* (Stuttgart, 1951/2), p. 228.

<sup>4</sup> *Anzeiger für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur*, lvii, 98-103. He reviews Ludwig's work and A. Bergeler, *Das deutsche Bibelwerk Heinrichs von Mügeln* (Berlin, 1938). He notes too the misfortunes which have attended the research into Mügeln.

<sup>5</sup> A. Bergeler, "Kleine Schriften Heinrichs von Mügeln" in *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, lxxx. 177-84.

these can claim to add much to our knowledge of Mügel's translation as found recorded in the pre-war *Verfasserlexikon* of Stammer.<sup>1</sup>

None of the published work relating to the translation advances in effect either a critical or a diplomatic edition. The early contribution of Khull<sup>2</sup> is self-evident from the title. It is a substantial if not completely accurate word list compiled from the Psalm text and commentary as found in the earliest preserved copy, the Rein Codex 204. Schönbach's<sup>3</sup> contribution is almost entirely negative and misleading; some aspects of it are referred to later. Bergeler's is the outstanding contribution, but he was led into fields which really go far beyond the immediate translation and the all-important edition. He contended that Mügel not only translated the Psalms with Lyra's commentary, but that he was responsible for other Biblical commentaries, perhaps extending over the whole Bible. His dissertation aims to prove this. It need only be noted here that his hypothesis appears to have been accepted by many scholars, even though lack of editions of the texts compared by Bergeler obviates any real investigation of his claims. The most important published work, therefore, towards an edition remains that by W. Walther<sup>4</sup> and H. Vollmer,<sup>5</sup> both general works, but both indispensable in considering the Mügel translation.

Mügel's choice of Lyra is in keeping with the immense reputation and influence of this Franciscan in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. He was an important scholastic to whom Reuchlin, Erasmus and Luther all refer. His insistence on the literal meaning of the text, his knowledge of and reference to the Hebrew text, his fourfold interpretations of the Scriptures, these are among the features which make his lengthy commentaries on

<sup>1</sup> W. Stammer, *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters : Verfasserlexikon* Bd. ii (Berlin, 1936). Cf. also post-war supplement, 1955, p. 348.

<sup>2</sup> F. Khull, *Beiträge zum mittelhochdeutschen Wörterbuche* (Graz, 1884).

<sup>3</sup> A. E. Schönbach, "Miscellen aus Grazer Handschriften" in *Mittheilungen des Historischen Vereins für Steiermark*, xlvii. 38-48.

<sup>4</sup> W. Walther, *Die deutsche Bibelübersetzung des Mittelalters* (Braunschweig, 1889-92).

<sup>5</sup> H. Vollmer, "Die Psalmenverdeutschung von den ersten Anfängen bis Luther", in *Bibel und deutsche Kultur : Veröffentlichungen des deutschen Bibel-Archivs in Hamburg*, vols. ii and iii (Potsdam, 1932-3).

the Bible a substantial landmark of the fourteenth century. The Psalter appeared first in 1322, then again in 1326.<sup>1</sup> Lyra died in 1349. His contribution to late medieval theology and to the whole pre-Reformation scene has still to be evaluated in its entirety.

Mügelin's translation is a work of quite considerable substance. In most of the preserved copies we find simply psalm text interspersed in the *postilla*, but there is evidence that originally another continuous translation of the Psalms preceded that within the *postilla*, differing from it in varying degrees. This would be in accordance with many of the printed copies of the Latin Lyra at least, where a continuous Bible text usually occurs. The presence of such a text in the Rein Codex 204 was first noted by Walther as appearing for the first fifteen Psalms. It has been ignored by later investigators except Schönbach, who denied that it could stem from Mügelin. Apart from its importance as a second translation of the Psalms, it is a particularly important factor in establishing a stemma. Further validity is added to Walther's suggestion by recording that it reappears in the Rein Codex 204 for Psalms 73-6. Moreover, my examination of these nineteen Psalms in the other preserved copies has revealed distinct traces of the influence of this continuous Psalm text. This additional text, which is perceptible in the very earliest as in the very latest copies, is not to be confused with continuous translations for all the Psalms found in some later copies. These are largely reconstructed from the text interspersed in the *postilla* and they reflect the early complete translation only when this has been substituted in the body of the text for the commentary translation.

Beyond this there is little to note about the outward appearance of the translation. Each Psalm and commentary, with the exception of Psalms 1 and 134, is preceded by a short preface relating the name of the Psalmist, the significance of the Psalm and such like. The preface to Psalm 1 is different, since it is clearly introductory to the whole.<sup>2</sup> The lengthy passage preceding

<sup>1</sup> Cf. P. Glorieux, *Répertoire des maîtres en théologie de Paris au XIIIe siècle*, tom. 2 (Paris, 1933), 218. "In psalmos (1<sup>e</sup> édit. : av. 1322 ; 2<sup>e</sup> édit. 1326.)"

<sup>2</sup> Since there has been much discussion about the type of preface to the Psalter actually supplied by Mügelin, this will be discussed, along with the continuous Psalm text mentioned earlier, in a separate article. Some idea of the problems involved emerge later in this article in the paragraphs on the Graz MS.

Psalm 134 is called a *Chürtze Auzlegung* and, in effect, it recapitulates and interprets Psalms 119-33, a popular medieval selection like the Penitential Psalms. It follows the same pattern as the commentary generally.

The first essential is to record the number of preserved copies. The most complete list published hitherto is to be found in Bergeler, but unfortunately it contains a number of errors. Prior to Bergeler lists appeared in Walther and Vollmer. The present list includes references to these three works.

1. Basel Univ. Bibl. A. III. 26. 15th cent. (*Vollmer* III, p. 265 ; *Bergeler*, p. 2.)
2. Berlin Staatsbibl. MS. Germ. fol. 43. 1435. (*Walther*, p. 593 ; *V.* III, p. 265 ; *B.* p. 2.)
3. Berlin Staatsbibl. MS. Germ. fol. 655. 1466. (*W.* p. 593 ; *V.* III, p. 265 ; *B.* p. 2.)
4. Berlin Staatsbibl. MS. Germ. fol. 1145. 1472. (*V.* II, p. 7 ; *B.* p. 3.)
5. Berlin Staatsbibl. MS. Germ. fol. 1146. 15th cent. (*V.* II, p. 7 ; *B.* p. 3.)
6. Berlin Staatsbibl. MS. Germ. fol. 1310. 1470. (*V.* III, p. 265 ; *B.* p. 3.)
7. Berlin Staatsbibl. MS. Germ. fol. 1320. 1426. (*V.* II, p. 7 ; *B.* p. 2.)
8. Donaueschingen Hofbibl. 187. 1455. (*W.* p. 593 ; *V.* III, p. 265 ; *B.* p. 3.)
9. Freiburg i. B. Univ. Bibl. MS. 469. 15th cent. (*B.* p. 3.)
10. Graz Univ. Bibl. 194. 15th cent. (*B.* p. 3.)
11. Hamburg Staats- u. Univ. Bibl. Cod. Theol. 1010. 15th cent. (*V.* III, p. 4 ; *B.* p. 3.)
12. Heidelberg Univ. Bibl. Pal. Germ. 32. 1470. (*W.* p. 595 ; *V.* III, p. 265 ; *B.* p. 3.)
13. Ilfeld Bibl. d. Klosterschule. (*W.* p. 595 ; *V.* III, p. 265 ; *B.* p. 3.)
14. Klosterneuburg MS. 11. 1437. (*B.* p. 3.)
15. Klosterneuburg MS. 593. 15th cent. (*B.* p. 3.)
16. Leipzig Univ. Bibl. MSc. 1502. 15th cent. (*W.* p. 593 ; *V.* II, p. 9 ; *B.* p. 3.)
17. Merseburg Archiv d. Domkapitels MS. 45. late 14th/early 15th cent. (*B.* p. 3.)
18. Merseburg Archiv d. Domkapitels MS. 46. 15th cent. (*B.* p. 3.)
19. Munich Staatsbibl. Cod. Germ. 506. 1470. (*W.* p. 593 ; *V.* II, p. 11 ; *B.* p. 3.)
20. Munich Staatsbibl. Cod. Germ. 525. 1473. (*W.* p. 593 ; *V.* II, p. 11 ; *B.* p. 3.)
21. Munich Staatsbibl. Cod. Germ. 526. 1424. (*W.* p. 592 ; *V.* II, p. 11 ; *B.* p. 3.)
22. Munich Staatsbibl. Cod. Germ. 527. 15th cent. (*W.* p. 595 ; *V.* II, p. 11 ; *B.* p. 3.)
23. Munich Staatsbibl. Cod. Germ. 3894. 1458. (*W.* p. 593 ; *V.* II, p. 11 ; *B.* p. 3.)
24. Munich Staatsbibl. Cod. Germ. 5064. 1442. (*W.* p. 593 ; *V.* II, p. 12 ; *B.* p. 3.)
25. Rein b. Graz Stiftsbibl. Cod. 204. 1372. (*W.* p. 588 ; *V.* II, p. 12 ; *B.* p. 3.)

26. Salzburg Studienbibl. M. III. 20 (old sig. VI. B. 20). c. 1400. (*W.* p. 592 ; *V.* II, p. 12 ; *B.* p. 3.)
27. Schaffhausen Stadtbibl. MSc. Gen. 25. 15th cent.
28. Schlägl Stiftsbibl. Cpl. 65 old, 454. a. 65. new sig. 1478. (*B.* p. 3.)
29. Schottenstift, Vienna, Stiftsbibl. 209 (old sig. 206). 1413. (*V.* III, p. 266 ; *B.* p. 3.)
30. Solothurn Zentralbibl. S.I. 144. 15th cent.
31. Stuttgart Würt. Landesbibl. H. B. II, Bibl. 29. 1430. (*V.* II, p. 13 ; *B.* p. 4.)
32. Vatican Bibl. Apost. Ross. 687. 1405. (*B.* p. 3.)
33. Vienna Nationalbibl. Pal. Vind. Cod. 2671. 1456. (*W.* p. 593 ; *V.* II, p. 14 ; *B.* p. 3.)
34. Vienna Nationalbibl. Pal. Vind. Cod. 2783. 14th cent. (*W.* p. 591 ; *V.* II, p. 14 ; *B.* p. 3.)
35. Vienna Nationalbibl. Pal. Vind. Cod. 2847. 15th cent. (*W.* p. 595 ; *V.* II, p. 14 ; *B.* p. 3.)

## PRINTED COPIES

36. Strassburg (?) 1475. Attributed by the British Museum to the unknown printer of the *Henricus Ariminensis*. (*W.* p. 595 ; *V.* II, p. 12 ; *B.* p. 3.)
37. Worms 1504. Printed by Peter Drache. (*W.* p. 595 ; *B.* p. 4.)

*Other manuscript copies less important for an edition*

38. St. Florian b. Linz Stiftsbibl. MS. XI. 68. 15th cent. (*W.* p. 595 ; *V.* III, p. 265 ; *B.* p. 4.)
39. Stuttgart Würt. Landesbibl. Cod. Bibl. 4°. 17. 15th cent. (*W.* p. 595 ; *V.* II, p. 13 ; *B.* p. 3.)
40. Würzburg Univ. Bibl. Mp. th. q. 67. Early 15th cent. (*V.* III, p. 9 ; *B.* p. 4.)

It has been possible to examine and in part collate almost all these copies. Where this has not been the case, I have been able from information already available to assign those inaccessible with some accuracy to the group of manuscripts within the whole to which they belong. It is not my intention, however, to enter into the very complex relationships of the various copies here and now.<sup>1</sup> It is sufficient to note at this stage that the Rein Codex 204 is not only the oldest preserved copy, but from the stemma constructed, textually the most reliable and nearest to the source.

Other manuscripts have been suggested as copies of the Mügeln translation which are not in this list. Vollmer<sup>2</sup> includes "Leipzig Universitätsbibl. MS. 59", but this is refuted by Bergeler,<sup>3</sup> who assigns it to a different source. I hope to verify this

<sup>1</sup> Reference to textual relationships is from time to time unavoidable. The stemma will appear in the introduction to my edition.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.* II, p. 9.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 6.

later. Another, Stuttgart Würt. Landesbibl. MS. H.B. II. 28 is described by Vollmer<sup>1</sup> as having some connection with the Mügeln Psalter. Like nos. 38-40 it gives simply Psalm text without commentary, but while the connections of these with the Mügeln text can easily be seen, those of this manuscript are so distant as to render its consideration in an edition of the work unnecessary. A manuscript fragment excluded here is fully described and in part published by A. Schönbach.<sup>2</sup> It formed the end-paper to the *incunabulum* 188/2D of the Innsbruck University Library. It contains Psalm 99 and part of Psalm 100, appearing identified as Mügeln's translation first in Bergeler.

Bergeler<sup>3</sup> queries the existence of a manuscript at Rostock: "Früher Privatbesitz des Professors Walther. Wo befindet sich die Handschrift jetzt?" It is referred to by Walther<sup>4</sup> himself somewhat casually, to illustrate how many copies of a work might be extant in private or public hands, unknown to those interested. He makes no mention of it when actually discussing the translation, as Schönbach notes.<sup>5</sup> According to the Librarian of Rostock University it has never belonged to their manuscript collection, nor could it be traced at Rostock elsewhere. Some seventy years have elapsed since Walther mentioned it. It could already be included among those listed, having found its way into a large collection. Walther, omitting it when discussing the translation, can hardly have set much store by it.

The last three copies in the list, nos. 38-40, are described as less important for an edition. They comprise merely a continuous Psalm text, one reconstructed from the text within the commentary. By dispensing completely with the exegesis they have undergone a very considerable change, a change tantamount to an edition. Since the commentary is often so illuminating in revealing textual relationships, it is obviously more difficult and less important to fit these abbreviated copies into the main picture with the same degree of accuracy. As far as establishing the

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit. II, p. 13.

<sup>2</sup> *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, xxxv. 225-7. It is significant in view of Schönbach's confident appraisal of the respective merits of the Graz and Rein MSS. discussed below, that he does not recognize this fragment as deriving from the Mügeln translation.

<sup>3</sup> Op. cit. p. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Op. cit. p. 709.

<sup>5</sup> Op. cit. p. 46.

text is concerned, they play a very subsidiary rôle. No. 40,<sup>1</sup> dated hitherto on palaeographical evidence alone as of the second half of the fourteenth century, has been revised to a later date. The content and the stemma make the earlier date suspect. The Keeper of Manuscripts at Würzburg considers that the palaeography would allow dating up to the first third of the fifteenth century.

The inaccuracies in Bergeler's account of the manuscripts need some comment. Apart from an obvious error for no. 9 (Bergeler Freiburg UB. 468) he cites a manuscript "Stuttgart H.B. VI. 24 (aus Weingarten)" which neither derives from Weingarten nor contains MHG. Psalm texts. This must refer to H.B. II. 28 which belongs to the Weingarten collection, is quoted by Vollmer,<sup>2</sup> but which, as already noted, is only distantly related to the translation.<sup>3</sup> Further, page 4, Bergeler states: "Berührungen mit dem Text Mügeln hat Würzburg U.B. 67 . . . der oberdeutsche Psalter Stuttgart Landesbibliothek H.B. II. 29, a. 1430, ferner die HS. XI. 61 in der Stiftsbibliothek zu St. Florian." Of these, Würzburg is in the words of Vollmer<sup>4</sup> "zu Heinrichs von Mügeln Text gehörig" and is in fact related to the translation in much the same way as Stuttgart Cod. Bibl. 4°17, which Bergeler lists as a copy. Both manuscripts provide simply a continuous Psalm text. The second of these three, Stuttgart H.B. II. 29, is not only early, but comprises a good copy of the translation as contained in the Rein Codex 204. Finally, the St. Florian HS. XI. 61. must refer to HS. XI. 68, the signature cited earlier by both Walther and Vollmer.<sup>5</sup>

The appearance of the Schaffhausen<sup>6</sup> and Solothurn manuscripts emphasizes that there may be more copies still to come. A circular requesting notification of copies in German (?) libraries,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A. Reuss, *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, iii. 443.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, p. 13.

<sup>3</sup> W. Stammer, *Deutsche Philologie im Aufriss* (Berlin, 1954), Bd. ii. p. 1614, cites a Stuttgart manuscript Bibl. fol. 24 containing a German translation of Lyra. The brief passage quoted from the preface resembles strongly prefatory matter found in one group of Mügeln copies. This manuscript I hope to examine later.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.* III, p. 9.

<sup>5</sup> Walther, *op. cit.* p. 595; Vollmer, *op. cit.* III, p. 265.

<sup>6</sup> First recorded by W. Stammer, *Deutsche Philologie im Aufriss*, Bd. ii, p. 1426.



in view of a critical text being prepared by K. Burdach and V. Dollmayr, was issued in 1910. A clear obstacle to identification of such copies in the absence of any published edition is the complete lack of details of the translator in all the preserved copies but the Rein Codex 204, where Mügeln is named in the colophon.<sup>1</sup> The most recently identified copy, the Solothurn MS.—both “new” copies, it will be noted, are preserved in Switzerland—has not been recorded previously in works directed to the Mügeln translation, but it is cited by Stegmüller.<sup>2</sup> Against these discoveries must be set the loss, temporary it is hoped, of three hitherto established copies, nos. 11, 13 and 16, all having disappeared in the Russian zone of Germany.<sup>3</sup> It must be added that from the descriptions of two of these manuscripts already available, the edition will not suffer unduly. It is clear to which group of manuscripts no. 11 belongs and even possible to suggest further more detailed relations within the group. This is not true of no. 13, but it drew from Walther a description of a most defective copy.<sup>4</sup> Since efforts are still being made to trace these copies, I am hoping to give further information about them in the edition. No. 16 may well be restored when the revision of the Leipzig University manuscript holdings is completed. Fortunately, Walther<sup>5</sup> comments extensively on this manuscript.

Among the available copies it should be noted that no. 1 provides but half of the translation, i.e. Psalm 1-74, an important point previously overlooked. The other half is not at Basel, nor did it ever belong to the former owners of the first part, the monks of the neighbouring Carthusian monastery, according to their manuscript catalogue, which is also preserved in the University Library at Basel. No. 20 bears the name of Hans Stupff no less than four times and is curious for the dating. The scribe writes clearly “m<sup>o</sup>cccc<sup>o</sup> und im lxxiiij jare”. Below this Stupff records :

<sup>1</sup> “. . . und dar nach von dem getrewen Mann Hainreichen vom Mügellein in dewtzech gepracht ist. . . .”

<sup>2</sup> F. Stegmüller, *Repertorium biblicum medii aevi*, tom. iv (Matriti, 1954), p. 60, no. 5857.

<sup>3</sup> The Hamburg MS. was “evacuated” to the East during the war.

<sup>4</sup> Op. cit. p. 595, “vorne und hinten defekt, auch sind manche Blätter hinausgeschnitten”.

<sup>5</sup> Op. cit. p. 593.

“Hanns Stupffen ist das geschriben im LXVj jar.” Walther comments: <sup>1</sup> “So dürfte doch entweder der Kopist mit seiner Zahl 1473 oder der Besitzer mit 1466 ein Versehen begangen haben.” Stupff states merely LXVj: 1566 would not be impossible. As this is a common enough occurrence in early printed books, the scribe’s dating cannot seriously be questioned.

Walther <sup>2</sup> makes the obvious relevant remarks about no. 22 with its complex scribal character. This manuscript contains two different works: a continuous Latin-German Psalter without commentary, quite unrelated to the Mügeln translation, and the Mügeln translation. The latter is in two parts: first come Psalm 77-150 in the same hand as the unrelated work preceding it, then Psalm 1-77, v. 45, itself written by two hands (Ps. 1-70, v. 11, Ps. 70, v. 12-77, v. 45). Walther observes that the two passages by the one hand have been brought together, so that the first part of the Mügeln Psalter follows the second. He does not, however, comment on the contents of the two parts of the Mügeln Psalter. In fact, the textual examination revealed that, as the duplication of the Psalm 77, vv. 1-45 suggests, we are dealing with a made-up copy, with two copies of one translation bound together to make a whole. As it is, though two different copies are involved, they do belong to the same group within the stemma.

The Merseburg MS. 45 provides a second example of a made-up copy. Three hands are involved in this manuscript. The first two give us an extraordinarily important copy, one not only very close to the Rein Codex 204 but also in the East Middle German dialect of the area where Mügeln was born. Despite his later sojourn in South Bavarian dialect areas, he might be expected to write his own dialect. Unfortunately this copy ends with Psalm 105. The remainder of this manuscript attempts to complete the translation by including text from another copy. This part too is important. It offers us the version of the translation which seven other manuscripts contain and among these it occupies again a key-position. A much more significant dating of the first and most important part has been possible than the earlier vague fifteenth century. A palaeographical examination of a microfilm copy pointed to a period not later than 1420.

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit. p. 593.

<sup>2</sup> Op. cit. p. 595.

The archivist in Merseburg has confirmed that the arms of *Dompropst* Peter Sparnow (d. 1429) on the first leaf date it at least prior to his death. A comparison of this hand with other documents in the Merseburg Library would allow a dating from the mid-fourteenth century. Other important features, not relevant to this brief survey, endow this manuscript with an importance never suspected before, apart from adding, like no. 22, yet another partially preserved copy for inclusion in the stemma.<sup>1</sup>

As the only manuscript ever suggested as an earlier and better copy of the translation than the Rein Codex 204, no. 10 is significant. Schönbach<sup>2</sup> dated it in the second half of the fourteenth century. A comparison of a very brief selection of vocabulary from the Rein Codex 204 and the Graz manuscript is offered to support his suggestion and he concludes: "Es wird also, wenn man das Werk Heinrichs von Mügeln zutreffend würdigen will, eine alte gute Handschrift zugrunde gelegt werden müssen: zur Zeit am besten der Grazer Codex Nr. 194." The official description in the manuscript catalogue<sup>3</sup> of the Graz University Library dated the manuscript as fourteenth century.

Bergeler<sup>4</sup> gives the date as (?)1442 and this seems more appropriate, but Klapper<sup>5</sup> still preferred the earlier dating. There are certain decorative features more in keeping with the fifteenth century, though the book hand with no traces of cursive could be either fourteenth or early fifteenth century. The Keeper of Manuscripts at Graz concurred in revising the dating. There is, however, much more substantial and reliable material within the manuscript, apart from evidence provided by a close textual comparison with the Rein Codex 204, that not only supports redating, but drastically revises Schönbach's appreciation. At Psalm 6 there is an abortive attempt to group together the penitential psalms along with the others from various parts of the psalter with

<sup>1</sup> I should like to express thanks to the Archivist in Merseburg, Herr Müller, for his help in dealing with my many queries and also to Dr. M. Tyson of Manchester University for his comments on this and other manuscripts.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.* pp. 38 and 48.

<sup>3</sup> *Die Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Graz* (Leipzig, 1939).

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 3.

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 103: "Die Grazer Psalmenkommentarhandschrift Nr. 194 stammt noch aus der 2. Hälfte des 14. Jhs. und ist St. Lambrecht Ursprungs."

consequent distortion of the normal psalm order. This rearrangement is unique among all known preserved copies. As a result the end of the psalter—"Hye hat der psalter ein ende"—is followed by ten psalms accidentally omitted earlier. Included along with the penitential psalms is Psalm 24. Later the scribe commences giving it again in its proper place only to break off abruptly. The flavour of originality about this error points to the scribe as the source of some of the irregularities at least.

That the source of the Graz copy was not perfect is made quite clear by one piece of conclusive evidence, which also invalidates Schönbach's contention that the Rein Codex 204 and the Graz manuscript are derived independently from the same source, "die entweder das Original Heinrichs von Mügeln selbst war, oder ihm ganz nahe stand".<sup>1</sup> Following Psalm 94 (which follows directly Psalm 91, Psalm 92 being omitted entirely) is found in the Graz manuscript: "Deus ultionum dominus. Das ist der xciiij psalm, *Deus Ultionum* und ist nicht gancz da und hebt sich an an dem vers, Quia non repellit dominus plebem."—The 93rd Psalm commences accordingly at v. 13 and passes on from Psalm 93 to Psalm 95. It is certain from this that the source of the Graz manuscript had the same imperfection. This was not in the source of the Rein Codex nor does it appear in any other copy known to me.

The importance of the preface to the Mügeln translation was mentioned earlier. In some copies, in addition to the usual Lyra preface to the Psalms, a defence of Bible translation into German is found, sometimes called the Mügeln *apologia*. It plays an important part in Bergeler's thesis about Mügeln's authorship of other Biblical glosses. A version of this preface occurs in the Graz manuscript and Schönbach discusses it in some detail. In not having it, the Rein Codex 204 forfeits, apparently, considerable prestige, a point which Schönbach is anxious to make. Since the preface in the Graz manuscript appears to him to be incomplete,<sup>2</sup> he assumes that the missing part would have provided details of the translator. An examination of other copies which

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit. p. 42.

<sup>2</sup> Op. cit. p. 47: "mit einem Satze wie: *Hie weredet . . . kann ein Werk nicht anfangen.*"

have the omitted part with no such details makes it most unlikely that such a postulation is valid. Moreover, to judge from the large capital with which it commences in the Graz manuscript, it is most likely that the beginning of the work is preserved. It gives the impression of a deliberate, planned beginning, either making good a fragmentary beginning, or much more likely in this manuscript, an innovation providing some sort of start to a preface that has been deliberately altered by the scribe. Schönbach's remarks that the decoration of the first leaf presupposes necessarily "ein anderes reichlich geschmücktes (Blatt)" to precede it are without any foundation. Rich decoration is not a feature of the Graz manuscript anywhere: on the contrary, it is a substantially plain manuscript.

Many more features which cannot be recorded here mark the Graz manuscript as an unreliable copy. The stemma reveals clearly that it belongs to a group in which nos. 32 and 29 are the oldest dated manuscripts. In this group it is outstanding for its irregular, unique readings, brought about by changes in the Graz manuscript from a common source and reminiscent of an unsuccessful attempt to edit the translation. Far from being the good copy portrayed by Schönbach, it is probably the least valuable text for assessing this work of Mügelin.

The longer preface already noted, with its vehement defence of translation into the vernacular, is considered a valuable document in the pre-Lutheran struggle for a German Bible. Such it is and it would be pleasing to accept with Bergeler, and others before him, that this most important evidence of the feeling on this subject, coming as it does from the Bohemian and South East German areas, derived from Mügelin. Since I hope to discuss this elsewhere, I will confine myself to the observation that if it does come from Mügelin the textual evidence offered by the Psalm translation precludes any consideration of its being issued with the Psalm translation itself. In other words it has been incorporated into some later copy of the translation from another work (? of Mügelin) by a scribe. My immediate concern lies not, however, with this preface, but with the translation of the Psalms, which the scribe of the Rein Codex, Johannes vom Hoff, attributes definitely to Mügelin. The forty extant copies, forty-two

from the made-up copies described, are themselves most important evidence that this work was a more than ordinary pre-Lutheran document. I do not believe that my list of extant copies will be the final one. What can be the reason for this extraordinary popularity?

The Latin Lyra text is extant in very large numbers. Writing before the war Bergeler referred to the numerous copies.<sup>1</sup> The complete commentary on the Bible was quite a favourite with early printers. In England Purvey<sup>2</sup> incorporated portions of Lyra's prologue into his own work. In Germany Reuchlin revered him as a teacher and Luther was well acquainted with his works.<sup>3</sup> It may be simply as Miss Deanesly<sup>4</sup> wrote in 1920: "Von Mügeln's choice of Lyra's postill for the gloss made his work fairly popular and simple, since Lyra made no attempt to give a fourfold interpretation to each passage: but there is no indication that his translation was made specially for lay people." Burdach<sup>5</sup> attached significance to Mügeln's choice of Lyra and assumed that it was intended for the layman. He concluded: ". . . Heinrich gab ja kein Gebetbuch, sondern ein populäre Kommentierung und einen verständlichen deutschen Text der Psalmen." Burdach believed that the *apologia* was Mügeln's work.

It is right to emphasize the value and popularity of Lyra as Mügeln's subject of translation for this would certainly be transferred to the German text. There seems to be, however, more to it than simply this; indeed, that there is in Burdach's and Walther's<sup>6</sup> enthusiastic accounts some substance. If the *apologia* is ignored, we do not know that the translation was intended for the layman. It is not difficult to imagine that some medieval clergy were not completely happy with the Latin Lyra. As it is, the text with the commentary goes into German with not altogether

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit. p. 1: ". . . anderthalb Hundert Handschriften . . . Durch ganz Europa ging der Einfluss Lyras. . ."

<sup>2</sup> Cf. M. Deanesly, *The Lollard Bible and other medieval Biblical versions* (Cambridge, 1920), p. 166.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. W. Schwarz, *Principles and problems of Biblical translation* (Cambridge, 1955), pp. 150, 176, 189, 197.

<sup>4</sup> Op. cit. p. 85.

<sup>5</sup> K. Burdach, *Die nationale Aneignung der Bibel, etc.* (Halle/Saale, 1924) p. 33.

<sup>6</sup> Op. cit. p. 590.

unattractive results. In most copies some attempt is made to distinguish the Psalm text from the commentary. Quite often commentary consists of but a brief phrase, two or three words. If on these occasions the commentary is included as Psalm text, the result is a finished translation which it would be hard to equal among contemporary translations. It is in fact possible to read the Psalms from these commentaries, including such odd phrases, without any reference to the main and often uninspired body of commentary, and arrive at a translation which is both palatable in its reading and challenging in its apparent freeness. Add to this the fairly high incidence of occasions where commentary amounts simply to an alternative translation and we have evidence of rewarding reading. It is important in this connection that the printed copy of 1475, which supplies a continuous Psalm text made up from that within the commentary, very frequently includes commentary in error. It was a popular incunable of which many copies are extant.<sup>1</sup> Other copies with similarly constructed continuous texts for the Psalms and those copies reduced simply to a continuous text of the Psalms make similar inclusions, just as those copies with text and commentary indicate frequently commentary as text. The examples which follow can only convey the briefest suggestion of what is a common occurrence. The text is cited from the Rein Codex 204, and only Psalm text is indicated, even where this is not the case in the manuscript. The Latin Psalm text is given from the modern Vulgate.

Ps. 21, v. 23.

Qui timetis Dominum, laudate eum ; universum semen Jacob, glorificate eum.  
*Die got fürichten mit lieb und mit chintleicher voricht, die loben in mit münd und mit hertzen ; aller Jacobs sam eret in. . . .*

The first piece of commentary here is included by the Strassburg incunable in its continuous text of the Psalms. Several manuscripts indicate the whole passage as Psalm text.

<sup>1</sup> The present number of extant copies of the printed texts is not known. Walther, op. cit. p. 595, was already aware of twenty-seven copies. Bergeler persisted in describing the Strassburg incunable as " a. 1477 bei Heinrich Knoblochzer ", that is, adopting Walther's description. It had long been more usual to ascribe it to the unknown printer of the *Henricus Ariminensis*. G. Eis, *Frühneuhochdeutsche Bibelübersetzung* (Frankfurt a. M., 1949), pp. 62-4, quotes extensively from this copy without identifying it as the Mügeln translation.

Ps. 34, v. 22, 23.

Vidisti, Domine, ne sileas ; Domine, ne discedas a me. Exsurge, et intende iudicio meo, Deus meus, et Dominus meus, in causam meam.

*Herre, du hast gesehen die unrechtichait, di si an mir tuent, Herre, sweig nicht, daz ist, übersiech in dis unrechtichait nicht, Herre, cher von mir nicht, das du deinen scherm von mir icht czihest und dein hilfe. Stand auf, Herre, und achte meinen gerichte alzo, das du seu verdampnest. Herre und mein got, bedenche mein sache, wann ich han chainen richter hintz dem ich fliehe, n<sup>o</sup>r hintz dir alain.*

Ps. 43, v. 6.

Non enim in arcu meo sperabo ; et gladius meus non salvabit me ; salvasti enim. . . .

*Ich hab nicht geding an meinen pogen und mein swert tuet mich nicht hail, sunder dein genad hilfet uns. Wand du hast uns hail getan. . . .*

Ps. 51, v. 9.

Confitebor tibi in seculum, quia fecisti ; et expectabo nomen tuum, quoniam bonum est in conspectu sanctorum tuorum.

*Herre, ich wird dir veriehend in die werlt mit lob, daz ist, ich wurde dich lobend, wann du hast getan mir parmherczichait in disem leben und ich wird wartend deins namen in der chünftigen werlt, da den gerechten gelont wirt, wann ez ist guet zdem anplikch deiner heiligen, die deinen namen ewichleich lobend. . . .*

Ps. 58, v. 4/5.

Sine iniquitate cucurri, et direxi. Exsurge in occursum meum, et vide. Et tu, Domine, Deus virtutum, Deus Israel, intende. . . .

*An unrechtichait hab ich gelauffen den wech ditz lebens und hab gelaittet meinen werch an daz ende. Stand auf gegen mir ze chomen und hilf mir, e das si mich tötten und sihe mein unschuld und ir übel und du, Herre der chrefte, daz ist, Herre der heiligen got dez israhelischen volchs, die du besonderleich erwelt hast dir ze dienen, nim war. . . .*

Ps. 118, v. 40.

Ecce concupivi mandata tua ; in aequitate tua vivifica me.

*Sich, Herre, hab ich begert deiner gepot ze wizen, ze versten und ze wurikchen : erchükche mich in deiner rechtichait.*

Ps. 118, v. 41.

Et veniat super me misericordia tua, Domine, salutare tuum. . . .

*Herre, und dein parmhertzichait chöm über mich, daz du mir rechten gelauben gebst dein hail nach. . . .*

In the last two examples the commentary again appears as Psalm text in the continuous Psalms provided in the Strassburg incunable. Instances of this are common in all these copies where such a text occurs. They are certain pointers to the way in which the Psalm text within the commentary was read. This



is made clear in any case in all the copies which indicate Psalm text within the commentary. Failure to distinguish Psalm text from commentary is found to some extent in all of them. Passages such as those quoted are of course frequent. On these occasions the commentary acts as a natural expansion of the Psalm text, supplies objects to verbs and fills seeming deficiencies in the German where the meaning may be implicit in the Latin. By ignoring large passages of commentary it is possible, as noted earlier, to read the Psalm in an often almost completely narrative setting, in a manner absent certainly in any contemporary translation. Just as illuminating are occasions when commentary amounts, as it very often does, to an alternative translation. These sometimes show a freeness of translation that is not found again until Luther.

Ps. 16, v. 2.

De vultu tuo iudicium meum prodeat.

*Von deinem antlütz gē mein gerichtē her für*, sam ob er spraeche, ich bin beraitt ze leiden swas dein wil ist.

Ps. 21, v. 1.

Deus, Deus meus, respice in me.

*Got, mein got, sich an mich*, daz ist, du, vater in der gothait, sich mich an in meinen nöten.

Ps. 30, v. 15.

In manibus tuis sortes meae.

*In deinen henden sint meineu loz*, daz ist, mein leben und mein tot stent in deinen handen. An der Jüden psalter stet also : *Herre, in deinen handen sint mein zeit*, daz ist, daz ich leb als lang du wilt und nicht mer.

Ps. 34, v. 3.

Effunde frameam.

*Geuzz auz, Herre, dein swert*, daz ist, tzeuch es auz der schaiden.

Ps. 36, v. 9.

Sustinentes autem Dominum, ipsi hereditabunt terram.

*Di aber unserm herren wartent, die werdend das erdreich erbend*, daz ist, die gedultlich unsers herren willen peitent, die besitzend daz erdreich der lebenden.

Ps. 55, v. 6.

Ipsi calcaneum meum observabunt.

*Si werdent mein fűezz behaltend*, das ist, si werdent mein geng war nemend.

There are very many similar instances of these alternative translations. These, along with fortuitous inclusion, indicate the advanced translations available to anyone interested in a vernacular text of the Psalms. At a superficial level it is easy to connect this aspect of the translation with the much quoted saying ascribed to the later reformers: *Si Lyra non lyrasset, Lutherus non saltasset.*<sup>1</sup> What, however, of the actual Psalm text itself, that is, the text stripped of commentary? How does it compare with those translations which do not stem, as far as is known, from the hands of important literary personages. Compared for example with the translation contained in the twelfth-century Cod. Pal. Vind. 2682<sup>2</sup> or with the Psalms of the so-called *Erste deutsche Bibel*,<sup>3</sup> the Mügeln Psalm text presents a generally more interesting, but by no means consistently better translation. There are occasional flashes of what might be termed inspired translation for odd words and even whole verses, but nothing, it must be admitted, which would convey the stamp of a literary hand on the work generally. It falls in other words into the general pattern of pre-Lutheran translations, without the monotony of the interlinear version, but not advancing much either in syntax or vocabulary on the techniques of all pre-Lutheran translations.

This is naturally a generalization, for there are in such a large text quite a number of exceptions, which if produced together might appear to disprove it. In their proper perspective, however, they are not impressive. Paradoxically, more "inspired" readings are often to be found in those copies where a version of a sort has been attempted; that is, in the less reliable copies of the translation. Thus, in the Graz manuscript the attempt to be different results in some unusual contemporary renderings. Similarly, no. 32, with its more limited attempt at a version, provides readings which are certainly different. The favourite device employed in this manuscript is to change the word-order. Nonetheless, a complete examination of the two printed copies, which themselves belong datewise on the doorstep of the great Lutheran

<sup>1</sup> Also cited as *Si Lyra non lyrasset, nemo doctorum in Bibliam saltasset.*

<sup>2</sup> *Cod. Pal. Vind. 2682, I: eine frühmittelhochdeutsche Interlinearversion der Psalmen . . . Herausgegeben von N. Törnqvist* (Malmö, 1934).

<sup>3</sup> "Die erste deutsche Bibel . . . Herausgegeben von W. Kurrelmeyer" in *Bibliothek des litterarischen Vereins in Stuttgart*, Bd. ccliv (Tübingen, 1910).

upheaval, leads to the conclusion that even drastic alterations are not sufficient to raise the translation from the general flatness which seems to characterize most pre-Lutheran Biblical translations. Rearrangement of words from time to time, changes in vocabulary, do not convert the translation into something approaching Luther's translation of the Psalms. Indeed, the two main versions of the translation, comprising half of the preserved copies, are still identifiable as the Mügeln work without difficulty.

Such criticism of this kind of translation is all too easy without paying due regard to its background and with the Lutheran text as a means of comparison. But it is altogether wrong to expect the inspired approach and attitude to translation which is associated with Luther's translations. As Schwarz<sup>1</sup> has made so clear in his admirable book, Luther's work goes far beyond any simple translation of the Bible into German. It reflects a revision of traditional attitudes, the new freedom of the text reflects the new freedom of the mind. In the same way previous translations reflect the limits of their orthodoxy, so that it is probably more legitimate to compare the Mügeln and contemporary translations with post-Lutheran Roman Catholic translations than it is to compare them with Luther's. The word-for-word translation with preservation of context retained the divinity of the original and the dignity and any departure from this could imply loss of spiritual content. "Medieval Bible translators up to, and including, the fifteenth century follow, generally speaking, this method and no blame should be attached to them for doing so. . . . For the method of word-for-word translation was considered to be the surest safe-guard against any alteration of the original thought. It was considered to render the contents of the Bible in its entirety without any mistake, and to protect the translator from a change of God's word and from heresy."<sup>2</sup> In the Mügeln work we might be justified in expecting the closest interpretation of the original, for it is hardly likely that one so intimately connected with Lyra's work should be unacquainted with his insistence on the value of the literal translation and escape its influence.

It is with regard to these limitations that the translation of the Psalm text itself must be judged. Within these it appears as a

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit. passim.*

<sup>2</sup> Schwarz, *op. cit.* p. 51.

work more remarkable for its continued reproduction in an age when vernacular translations were illegal than for any spectacular innovations in translation techniques. It is hardly likely, moreover, that there would be any great concern as to the quality of the translation, when a vernacular text at all was still an achievement. The text that is found in the Rein Codex 204 could be described as an easily readable, inoffensive but unambitious translation, from the point of view of language a reasonable example of the prose of the day. The influence of the Latin text is on occasion undeniably present in the syntax, but this is not a dominant feature of the translation. The real point of contact with the Latin lies in the use of vocabulary—not in loan-words or even loan-translations, although the latter are frequent enough—but in the almost regular rendering of one German word for one Latin.

The extent of this will be seen from the selections of vocabulary which follow. The course of the translation through the century and a quarter following the Rein Codex 204 is particularly interesting. The printed copies of 1475 and 1504 present substantially the same picture in general terms as the Rein Codex 204, despite the many changes that have taken place. It seems profitable, therefore, to base this selection of vocabulary on the copy of 1504, itself within ten years of Luther's *Lecture on the Psalms* of 1513-15 and in a reasonable proximity to his commentaries and translations of the following decade. There are two selections. The first short one contains a number of words frequently recurrent in the Bible. The second larger selection arranges words wider in scope in semasiological groups. The numeral following the German indicates the number of occurrences.

- Beatus : selig 26, heylig 1.
- bonum : gut 12, gutes ding 13.
- bonus : gut 26.
- circumdo : umbgeben 25.
- diligo : lieb haben 40, lieb sein 1, wol bewarn 1.
- do : geben 85, setzen 1.
- dolor : schmerz 17, not 1, strit 1.
- impius : ungut 14, ungutig 2, ubel 1.
- invenio : finden 20.
- peccator : sunder 68.

salus : heil 31.

salutaris : heil 39, heiland 4, heiliger weg 1.

sanctus : heilig 80, heiligkeit 2, heilige stat 2, der heilige got 1.

servus : knecht 52.

The fact that several of these words are so firmly established in ecclesiastical usage as to admit of no variants is a possible argument. On the other hand the occasional exceptions to the usual reading point clearly to the possibilities within the translator's reach. A complete linguistic analysis of both printed copies gives only a very slightly different picture from the selection given above. The following groups reaffirm this. The comparative presentation shows the possibilities open to the translator.

- (i) Adjutorium : hilfe 10, hulffen 1.  
auxilium : hilfe 10.  
ops : hilfe 1.
- (ii) Mandatum : gebot 43.  
praeceptum : gebot 8.
- (iii) Abscondo : verbergen 21.  
occulto : verbergen 1, verhelen 1.
- (iv) Deprecatio : gebet 13, andacht 1, anruf 1.  
oratio : gebet 28, andacht 2, wort 1.  
petitio : gebet 3.  
prex : gebet 4.
- (v) Colloco : setzen 4, stellen 1.  
constituo : setzen 8, besetzen 1, stellen 1, bauwen 1, stiften 1.  
pono : setzen 53, legen 9, einlegen 1, stellen 1, neigen 1, geben 1, machen zu 1.  
statuo : setzen 9, stellen 4.
- (vi) Dico : sprechen 97, sagen 12.  
enarro : sagen 3, kuntmachen 1.  
loquor : reden 58, gereden 1, sprechen 3, sagen 1, gerecken 1.  
narro : sagen 13, kundigen 2, offenbaren 1, trachten 1.
- (vii) Egenus : durftig 2, arm 1, an gut betelisch 1, der weyse 1.  
inops : arm 3, durftig und arm 1, ane gut 5, der nicht gutes hat 1.  
miser : arm 2.  
pauper : arm 48.
- (viii) Accepto : nemen 1.  
accipio : nemen 13, entfahen 1.  
assumo : entfahen 3, nemen 1.  
concipio : entfahen 3.  
sumo : nemen 4.  
suscipio : entfahen 20.

- (ix) *Aqua* : wasser 51, mer 1.  
*fluctus* : fluss 4, flut 1, wasser 1, des meres fluss 1.  
*flumen* : wasser 11, fluess 1, fluss 1, starker floss 1.  
*fluvius* : wasser 1.
- (x) *Atrium* : bethaus 7, wonunge 3, haus 1.  
*domus* : haus 53, geschlecht 1.  
*habitaculum* : wonunge 2.  
*habitatio* : wonunge 8.  
*penetral* : wonunge 1.  
*sanctificium* : wonunge 1.  
*tabernaculum* : wonunge 22, gezelt 3, haus 2, bethaus 1, haus oder wonunge 1.
- (xi) *Delictum* : missetat 9.  
*impietas* : unguete 2, ungerechtikeit 1, bosheit 1.  
*iniquitas* : ungerechtikeit 87, bosheit 3, unrecht 2, sunde 2, bose lere 1, die bosheit und die ungerechtikeit 1.  
*injuria* : ungerechtikeit 1, unrecht 1.  
*injustitia* : ungerechtikeit 9, gewerde 1.  
*peccatum* : sunde 22.
- (xii) *Cognatio* : geschlecht 1.  
*generatio* : geschlecht 48, volck 1.  
*gens* : diet 50, volck 15, heide 4, leute 1.  
*natio* : geschlecht 9.  
*plebs* : volck 13, menschen 1.  
*populus* : volck 99, volck oder leute 1.  
*progenies* : geschlecht 4.  
*tribus* : geschlecht 6.

The forms given here have been normalized to some extent. Apart from a few special cases every occurrence of the words listed is given for the Psalm text with no reference to the commentary. Had the list been compiled from the Strassburg copy it would have differed little from this. Brief though the selections are, the translation technique as revealed by the vocabulary differs in no way from its contemporaries. An examination of the whole of the Psalms in the printed copies confirms emphatically the impressions given by this selection. The fact that the whole Psalm text can be reduced to a glossary in this manner with no difficulty whatsoever is itself significant. It is not that it is simply one Latin word for one German word for so much of the time, but the preference of one German word for various Latin words, even when these have, as witnessed by the translation, a more adequate German equivalent. *Wasser* (no. ix) illustrates this particularly well. The preference of *arm* (no. vii) for epithets relating to poverty,

wretchedness, is equally instructive. The rendering *wonunge* for *penetral* barely suffices as a literal translation. There are many translations that only approximate to the Vulgate, without conveying its real significance, and since metonymy is not a feature of the translation, these cannot be explained in this way. It would be quite wrong to expect the variety in vocabulary of a modern translation, but it is permissible to anticipate a more enterprising distribution of the vocabulary, which an analysis shows to be already available within the text.

These remarks on the printed copies are almost entirely applicable to the Rein Codex 204. Such differences as there are between the earliest and latest preserved copies are not of the kind to elevate it to a different sphere, although, as noted, the Rein Codex 204 presents on balance a more favourable picture. More often than not they amount to nothing more than this, that where the printed copies use one word or phrase constantly, the Rein Codex 204 uses another—almost as constantly. The translation is a literal, not literary production. There is nothing to lead us to believe that Mügeln saw the Latin original as anything but a vehicle for conveying the Scriptures, without any suggestion of literary merit. His sensible but prosaic rendering endorses that. Not surprisingly the parallelism of the Hebrew rarely emerges successfully in the German. It is not omitted as a rule in the Rein Codex 204, as it often is in some of the later copies, but its inclusion often amounts to trite repetition.

If these conclusions seem to strike a completely negative note, it is because Mügeln's aim, like that of his contemporaries, was a vernacular text without any reappraisal of beliefs in the Lutheran sense. Startling innovations in technique are not to be found with the *Meistersinger*. The absence of completely rigid adherence to the word-order and phrasing of the Vulgate, introduction of copulae not in the Latin, occasional inspired departures from the normal translation technique—these do not take the Psalm text from the ranks of pre-Lutheran translations. Yet the somewhat harsh words of Gössel<sup>1</sup> on the "*Erste deutsche Bibel*" could only be applied to the Mügeln work without the superlatives: "Neben den grössten Unsinnigkeiten und vielen

<sup>1</sup> E. Gössel, *Der Wortschatz d r ersten deutschen Bibel* (Giessen, 1933), p. 13.

Zeichen höchster Unbeholfenheit stehen vereinzelt recht ansprechende Übersetzungen." The important point is that to expect "recht ansprechende Übersetzungen" is certainly not justified at this particular time.

There is no reason to assume that Mügeln's treatment of the commentary given in his source should differ from that of the Psalm text, although comparison with the Lyra in the absence of any critical edition of the Latin text is obviously much more difficult. In the Rein Codex 204 the Latin text for the Psalms is supplied verse by verse in the margin, so that we know definitely what Latin text the scribe of the earliest preserved copy had before him.<sup>1</sup> It facilitates a comparison not available for the commentary. Despite Bergeler's observations on the make-up and origins of some parts of the commentary and Mügeln's treatment of it, we are scarcely in a position to decide what is Mügeln. One particular passage for which I can find no corresponding Lyra in the later Latin copies finds an echo in church life down to this day and is worth reproducing at the end of these comments on the value of the translation. Psalm 5, v. 7 ". . . und ich anpette ze deinem heyligen tempel in deiner vorichte, das ist, mit vorichtleichen ern̄. Ey, Herre got, wie sprechent nu genug leüt ir gepët in den geweichten chyrchen, di mit lachen und mit üppigen taidingen da stent. Si mochten vil lieber anders wo sein." It would be gratifying to associate this remark with Mügeln.

As far as the language, the philological side, of the translation is concerned, it is impossible to enter into a detailed account here. I can only point to the possibilities in such a wealth of linguistic material. My edition includes not only a thorough analysis of the principal copy, the Rein Codex 204, but also brief outlines of the main linguistic features of every copy. It is perhaps the real asset of so many preserved copies (of which many, for the purposes of establishing the text, can be eliminated) that by examining them all it is possible to observe the development of one linguistic picture, not only over a crucial period of still largely undocumented linguistic history, but also in three principal ENHG dialects. Their importance lies not in the light they may shed on

<sup>1</sup> There are slight differences from the accepted modern version of the Vulgate: similar variants occur among most of the copies with a Latin text. The implications of this and the influence of such Latin texts will be discussed in a later article.



Mügel's language, but in their massive contribution to the whole conception of ENHG. For though the Latin text produces occasional syntactical abnormalities in word-order, its main effect is to curb imaginative translation, to simplify not distort linguistic data. It influences in no way the phonological and morphological situation, nor indeed the greater part of the syntax. This will be apparent from the passages already cited.

The Rein Codex 204 has the advanced vowel development associated with Middle/South Bavarian, but it is rich in MHG constructions and usage. There is almost total absence of specifically Middle German and even North Bavarian forms, but Middle/South Bavarian traits are numerous. This is not really what is expected from a man who by birth belongs to East Middle Germany, nor from a scribe from the Vogtland. It is much more in accord with Mügel's later residence in Austrian, Viennese circles. In some ways the much later printed copies seem less "modern" than the Rein Codex 204 from the language point of view, particularly the Strassburg copy, where diphthongization of MHG *i*, *û*, *iu* is less extensive than in the Worms copy. This is to be expected from the dialects of these copies, each with the dialect of its own background. In both there is intriguing evidence of modernization of vocabulary, adaptation to their dialect, in the Psalm text itself, but without corresponding changes when the words recur in the commentary. This might indicate an increasing interest in the Psalm text, less attention to the commentary. Unfortunately, the enquiry into all the copies necessary to confirm such possible trends is still to be completed. As is expected, the language is at times very important for establishing the text. Thus, when the Vatican MS. Ross. 687 (no. 32), the oldest preserved dated copy with the *apologia*, has an entirely different, seemingly very free, reading for part of Psalm 36, v. 3, it is disturbing not to know why.

Vulgate : et inhabita terram, et pascaris in divitiis ejus.

Rein 204 : und won auf dem erdreich, so wirstu gefürt in seinem reichtum.

MS. Ross : und wann von dem edreich wirstu gefürt in seinen reichtumb.

The Vatican manuscript has misunderstood its source. A Bavarian *wan* (i.e. *won* from *wonen*, *inhabitare*) has been taken for *wann* and *gefürt* (from MHG *vuoren*, *pascere*) for *gefürt* (i.e.

*vüeren*), with consequent necessary alterations to the rest of the verse. This kind of information is most important in this particular manuscript, which on the strength of its *apologia*, its position in the stemma and its comparatively early date, might be considered more valuable textually than it really is.

These brief comments can do no more than hint at the linguistic worth of the translation. As for the closely related orthography, it can only be noted that all the copies share in some measure what Moser<sup>1</sup> has termed the "Hauptcharakteristikum der frnhd. Orthographie"—the multiplication of consonants for no apparent good phonetic reason. The mid-fifteenth century copies are the worst in this respect. The transition of the translation from scriptorium to printing press can be observed in the group of eleven copies to which the printed copies belong. Especially noteworthy is the closeness of the Strassburg printed copy in text and even in appearance to the Donaueschingen manuscript, which was most likely its source. Such close agreement is rare among the manuscript copies, even where it can be established that two copies stand in the same close relationship as these two. This same group belongs, although several stages removed, to the same branch of the stemma as the earlier, extravagantly decorated Salzburg manuscript (no. 26), which was produced for King Wenceslas. Some thirty years later no. 31 was prepared for the "durchlechtig hochgeborn furstin fraw Anna von Brunswig, von Gotes gnaden Hertzogin von Österreich", attesting further its contemporary importance. Born within Wycliffe's life-time, the translation witnesses the transition from Scholasticism and Mysticism to the Reformation. It survives ordinances forbidding Bibles in the vernacular and lives through the changes from the interpretative approach to the Bible to the direct approach with its return to the sources. It derives from what Burdach has called the "Jahrhundert der Laienbibeln" and, if preserved copies are any measure at all, it must have exerted an influence, which has still to be assessed, among them. So far the most neglected of Mügeln's works, it may prove ultimately to be his most significant contribution to the ENHG scene.

<sup>1</sup> V. Moser, *Frühneuhochdeutsche Grammatik* (Heidelberg, 1929), i. Bd. 1. Hälfte, p. 39.