Rebellion Within the Household: Hans Sachs's Conception of Women and Marriage

RICHARD M. ALLEN*

After God had created the heavens and the earth, day and night, the seas and the mountains, the fish and the animals, He decided that His newest creation needed a helpmate. So God put Adam to sleep and removed a rib. While God was closing Adam's wound with earth, a dog stole the rib. God pursued the dog, grabbed the dog's tail and cut it off with a knife. The dog, however, escaped with Adam's rib. God, left standing with a dog's tail instead of Adam's rib, used the tail to create the first woman, Eve.

This is how Hans Sachs presents the creation of Eve in his *Schwanck. Der hundsschwantz.*[1] Hans Sachs, a Protestant Nuremberg shoemaker who lived from 1494 to 1576, wrote twenty-four volumes of Biblical and classical stories, Fastnachtspiele (Shrovetide plays), Schwäncke (anecdotes), and other pieces of moral edification in his spare time. This represents one of the richest sources for the sixteenth-century conception of women and marriage. In addition, Sachs is generally regarded as one of the greatest sixteenth-century literary figures to write in German. The Fastnachtspiele, since they were written to appeal to a large urban audience, are especially important as gauges of popular urban opinion.

The result of Eve's creation from the tail of a dog was that a certain affinity exists between women and dogs. Like the dog which wags its tail and is very friendly when it wants something, the woman is all pleasantry and flattery when she wants something. If, however, the woman does not get what she wants from her husband, she will complain, and rant and rage like a barking dog. Furthermore the woman, like the dog, provides the

---

*Mr. Allen, third prize winner, earned his B.A. at the College of William and Mary and his M.A. at the University of Virginia. He is working toward his Ph.D. degree in sixteenth-century German history. Mr. Allen wishes to express his thanks to Professor H.C.E. Midelfort for his many helpful suggestions.

perfect environment for fleas. Fleas only afflict women and dogs; all other creatures are free of fleas, but each woman harbors at least a few thousand fleas. Because of their continual biting, these fleas are largely responsible for the grumpy disposition of women. Like dogs, women are constantly searching themselves for fleas, which if found are mercilessly killed.

To be sure, Sachs at least twice presents the more traditional story of the creation of Eve from Adam's rib.[2] While the Jahvist's story of Eve's creation from Adam's rib implies the subordination of women to men, it does not contain the potential for misogynistic attacks which are so evident in *Der hundsschwantz*. Both the Jahvist's story and *Der hundsschwantz* indicate that woman was created as an afterthought to satisfy man's needs; she exists only as "an accessory to man." Besides the absence of a discussion of the Fall, the chief difference between *Der hundsschwantz* and the Jahvist's story is that in the latter woman is created in man's image [3] while in the former woman is created in the image of a dog. Significantly the Elohist's story in *Genesis*, which describes the creation of Adam and Eve at the same time in terms that imply the equality of the sexes as necessary complements to each other,[4] is not mentioned by Sachs.

The story of the creation of Eve from an animal's tail was not unique to Sachs. Variations of this story have been found throughout Europe. According to Thomas More, for example, Eve was created not from Adam's rib, but from Adam's ape tail. Both Sachs and More indicate that their tail stories are rabbinical in origin.[5]

Sachs's tail story is presented as part of a debate at a feast between men and women concerning which sex is the nobler. After the tail story is presented, the women point out how much they help the men with their work, and how they keep the house, and raise the children. Both sexes then agree to consider the story as a joke and leave the feast in good spirits after drinking much wine. As Sachs concludes *Der hundsschwantz*: "The joke remains a joke, so wishes Hans Sachs." [6]

Der hundsschwantz indicates two currents of thought about women in the sixteenth century. One current says that women are bad, they are essentially dogs. The other current maintains that women are important helpers of men, perhaps even nobler than

men. In *Der hundsschwantz* Sachs comes down on the side of the latter, and treats the former in a humourous manner. This is not a posture that Sachs was always able to maintain, but he invariably thought in terms of the good or the bad woman.

Stories about the creation of the first woman, such as the Jahvist's story in *Genesis* and *Der hundsschwantz,* have traditionally provided men with an opportunity to speculate about the nature of women. Creation stories are especially suited to comment on the nature of women because they expose the archetypal woman to scrutiny. The essence of woman is revealed and distinguished from secondary appearances. This basic nature of women, unaltered by attempts at moral education and character-building, is significant because it indicates the potential a man and woman have for living happily together. However women are such complex creatures, that even the Biblical stories of creation and their rabbinical additions did not completely explain the phenomena. In *Die neunerley heud einer bösen frawen sambt ihren neun eygnenschafften,*[7] Sachs has discovered a useful method for determining the nature of a woman. Simply put, it is this: if you beat a woman, her different natures will be exposed in much the same way as a butcher would expose different layers of skin. As one of Sachs's characters explained, when he came home from Vienna he asked his wife a question. She remained silent and thus revealed by her shyness and timidity her *stockfish-hawt* (stockfish skin). So he hit her, and she growled and grumbled revealing her *bernhaut* (bear skin). Since this was no satisfactory answer to his question, he hit her on the shoulder. This exposed another layer of skin, her *gensshaut* (goose skin). She just cackled, chattered, gossiped, and poured insult and scorn upon her husband. Soon she was barking at her husband and calling him *ein esel, narr und tropff* (an ass, a fool and a ninny) — a sure sign of the *hunds-haut* (dog skin). So he hit her on the head. Her *hasen-balck* (hare skin) now appeared as she ran away screaming that her husband was a wife-chaser and a drunkard. He ran after her and hit her on the ears. Her *rosshaut* (horse skin) manifested itself as she hit back and forced her husband to retreat. Then she revealed *die haut der katzen* (the skin of the cat) by scratching her husband. The husband was able to save himself only by hitting his wife with a stick. This revealed his wife's *sewhawt* (sow skin);

she danced around. Finally her *menschen-haut* (human skin) was exposed. She begs for mercy, promises to be obedient, and not to let her neighbors lead her astray.

The lesson is clear: women are, for the most part, animals; their human core is surrounded by layers of animality. The human core within women can only be reached by beating the brute natures out of women. The narrator, who has been listening to this story, is horrified. He protests that:

> A man must not rule his house with war,
> but rather with peace and friendship.
> Paul gave us men a teaching
> to govern wives with intellect,
> not by painful crude tyranny,
> because they are the weakest things.[8]

The narrator disagrees with the means used, not the end sought. Women are supposed to be obedient to their husbands. The narrator's remarks are also revealing for what they say about man. Man is more intellectual than woman, and his moral and physical strength is superior to woman's.

Die neunerley heud einer bosen frawen sambt ihren neun eygnenschafften does not contain the last word about the nature of woman, especially since it is specifically about the nine skins or hides of a bad woman, and all women were not bad, in Sachs's opinion. In *Schwanck und poeterey: Die vier natur einer frawen*,[9] Sachs presents the four natures, not just of bad women, but of all women as described by the ancient poet Phocilides. Sachs, following Phocilides, divides the nature of woman into four parts: the *pferd* (horse) nature of woman, the *hund* (dog) nature of woman, the *schwein* (pig) nature of woman, and the *honigwaben* (honeycomb) nature of woman. Of these four parts of a woman's nature only the honeycomb nature of woman is good, and it is very good. A chaste, faithful, obedient wife is a joy to her husband; she is as sweet to him as honey. She keeps the house, cooks, cares for the children, makes clothes — in short she makes a home, a honeycomb, for her husband and his family.

The other three parts of a woman's nature are essentially bad. Woman's horse nature is high-spirited and proud. She desires

clothes, likes to dance and feast. She pretends to be and wants to be rich. The horse nature of woman resists her husband's efforts to control and bridle her. The horse-woman rebels.

Woman's dog nature is characterized by barking. A dog-woman is always barking at her husband for something. It is impossible to avoid her nagging and shrieking. When no one is around she murmurs and curses secretly at home. Her barking often breaks into a raving anger which approaches a seizure in intensity. All control is lost. The reasoning faculty, which at its best is very weak in woman, ceases to operate. She is possessed by pure anger and hostility, and of course the dog-woman will bite.

In the sixteenth century the pig was the symbol of lust. The pig-woman is unable to control her sexuality; her reason is simply too feeble. Sachs's conception of the pig nature of woman is very similar to the view expressed in the *Malleus Maleficarum*, that the intellect of a woman is of a "different order from men," and that a woman is "more carnal that a man." [10] In Sachs's Fastnachtspiele, sexual infidelity is far more common among women than men.

While each woman has these four natures, one nature tends to predominate in most women, although the balance between natures does change slightly from day to day. With three natures tending toward evil and only one toward goodness, woman needs to be subordinated to a man who will rule and control her through his reason. For the husband, the possession of a wife whose horse-, dog- or pig-nature predominates could be a horror.

Sachs's treatment of women tends toward a two-valued orientation.[11] That is to say, Sachs thinks in terms of polar opposites: good-bad, wet-dry, black-white. The good woman is chaste; the bad woman is a whore. The good woman is obedient and submissive to her husband; the bad woman is disobedient and self-willed. The good woman is silent; the bad woman never stops nagging her husband. The good woman does not gossip; the bad woman is always gossiping. The good woman is diligent; the bad woman is lazy. The process is simple: take any good or bad quality and just think of its opposite.

The fifteenth and sixteenth century view of the nature of women, to which Sachs contributed so much, raised serious questions about the institution of marriage. While there had been

a long tradition of concern for celibacy especially for the clergy, the first expressions of anti-matrimonialism in German popular literature occurred in the fifteenth century.[12] This marriage debate gave popular expression to an adult single life outside the Church for the first time since antiquity.

The marriage debate was stimulated, at least in part, by classical influences. In Sachs's *Ein spiel mit dreyer personen: Zwyer philosopher disputation von dem ehstande, ob besser sey ledig zu bleiben oder zu heyraten ainem weissen mann,*[13] the marriage debate takes a classical form. Two philosophers, Thales and Solon, argue for and against marriage. Solon points to the comfort and joy a wife can bring to her husband. She can provide him with children which not only are a joy in themselves, but provide a kind of immortality for the father, and insure the continuation of the human race. Solon's argument in a sentence is:

> Your [Thales's] life is a half death
> because you live without a wife.[14]

Thales has different ideas. A wife is a disturber of the peace and tranquility which is necessary for the study of philosophy, learning, and astrology. In short, a wife is a nuisance to a scholar. Thales has more. To Solon's contention that a wife through her children gives her husband joy and immortality, Thales asserts that children bring ridicule, shame, and misery. By arranging for a fake message to arrive which announces the death of Solon's son, Thales wins the argument by trickery.

Ob einem weisen mann ein weib zu nemen sey odern nit [15] and *Ob ein weiser man ein weib sol nemen oder nit* [16] also show evidence of classical influence (Theophrastus), but appeal more directly to the sixteenth-century man. The advice is practical. Should a man marry? If the bride is virtuous, healthy, young and of good birth, the answer is yes. The unwise man, however, may pick a wife that will be a curse to him. *Ein weib mit reichen* (a rich wife) will try to be *herr. . .in allen*[17] (the master in everything), even in bed. *Ein arme* [*weib*] (a poor wife) is just as bad. She will force her husband into hard work and debt so that she can live like a rich woman. *Ein schönes weib* (a beautiful wife) will attract other men, thus making her husband miserable with

jealousy. *Ein hessliche fraw* (a spiteful wife) is odious, malicious, and troublesome. Her husband will have to put up with her unfaithfulness, her complaining and her gossip. *Ein weib vernascht* (a wasteful wife) will live a life of pleasure spending and wasting money on food, drink, and amusements. If a man marries *ein weib geschwetzig* (a babbling wife) he will not have a quiet moment in his home, but will have to put up with a continuous flow of gossip and nonsense. Such a wife can only bring ridicule and mockery to her husband. Just as bad is *ein unheussliches weib* (a wife unable to keep house). Besides being a bad, self-willed, and angry woman, she can not cook, buy food, or keep house. *Ein zenckisches weib* (a nagging wife) is such a daily pain in her husband's life that she literally drives him from his house by nagging. A wife who dislikes children (*von kinder wegen im ein weib*) either produces no children or bad children of whom one must be ashamed. A man would be better off single than to have *ein weib von wollust wegen* (a wife who hates sex). In the process of making her husband forget his sexual passions, she will make him sick and miserable. Sachs draws from this list of horrible wives two conclusions. The classical conclusion is:

> When someone had asked Diogenes
> When a man may marry well,
> He answered: "The young should delay,
> The old should refuse." [18]

In 1563 when Sachs rewrote and expanded this story, he tacked on a Christian conclusion. The ancients had only reason to follow; they did not understand God's will. We have his commandment to be fruitful and multiply. Marriage is God's means to cool the passions of the flesh. The addition of this Christian conclusion would seem to indicate that between 1542, when he wrote his first version of this story, and 1563, when he rewrote the story, Sachs's attitude toward marriage underwent a change. However in addition to adding this Christian conclusion to the 1563 version, Sachs more than doubled the length of his description of the bad types of women. Hence while this Christian conclusion indicates that one should marry, the entire thrust of his argument points to the classical conclusion that one should not marry.

These three pieces pose the question directly: should a man

marry or not? They are, to be sure, a minute portion of the entire *corpus* of Hans Sachs's work. Indirectly and implicitly, however, a large segment of Sachs's writings deals with this question, especially the popular Fastnachtspiele. The Fastnachtspiele, moreover, take the question out of the context of a 'wise' man and universalize it to every man.

The Fastnachtspiel *Der pawren knecht will zwo frawen haben,*[19] for example, presents not an old scholar interested in spirit and intellect, but a young, materialistic farmer boy named Heintz Lötschen. Heintz, who was at the peak of his physical development, is asked by his father if he wants to marry. Heintz responds affirmatively as his father expected, but then Heintz shocks his father and cousin with the pronouncement that he wants to marry two girls, Gretn and Cristn. The two older men are horrified, not because of any religious scruples, but because of the terrible fate that would befall young Heintz if he were to take two wives. His father tries to argue Heintz out of this desire. He points out that he only has one wife, and that he can hardly live peacefully with her because she makes daily life so difficult. Heintz, however, is unconvinced. As he explains he has chosen his two potential brides with great care.

> Yes, father, that is true.
> Mother is too big and strong for you
> And also is too caustic and bad to you;
> But these two are very small.[20]

Clearly Heintz is a reasonable young man and not a victim of sexual passion. His two wives will bring him two dowries.

Heintz's father, Herman Lötsch, and Heintz's cousin finally persuade Heintz to take just one wife this year. If after a year of marriage, he still wants to take a second wife he can. Heintz agrees because he is reasonable and is confident that he will get his way in the end. The marriage takes place, and Heintz obtains enough land, animals, and tools from his father and his wife's father to make a good living as a farmer.

A year later Heintz is a changed man.

> God, there is only much misery, sorrow,
> Fear and pain in marriage,
> So much poverty and hunger.

Fatigue and work winter and summer!
I did not believe what my father said.
The marriage state has bombarded me
with heart-pain and a burning fever.
All young men should know,
what kind of diet marriage is,
then no one would take a wife.[21]

Herman Lötsch, can hardly recognize his *blaich und gelb* (pale and yellow) son now. The father asks his son if he still wants a second wife. Not only does Heintz definitely not want a second wife, he does not even want the one he has.

Oh God, if only I did not have this wife
If only she were a wolf and ran away into the woods.[22]

Once started Heintz cannot stop. He wishes that the farmer's worst enemy the wolf had a wife. Then the wolf would be so tormented by his wife that he would become skinny and weak and no longer plague the farmer. As if this were not enough, Heintz refers to his wife as a devil.

She is a devil and no wife
She torments my life daily
with bad temper, quarreling, and brawling.[23]

If a strong young German like Heintz Lötschen found his wife and the institution of marriage unbearable, who then could cope with women and marriage? The answer is only someone as bad as the bad wives, obviously the devil. Sachs takes up this theme in a Fastnachtspiel *Der teufel nam ein alt weib zu der ehe* [24] and *Schwanck. Der teufel nam ein alts weib zu der eh.*[25] The devil comes to the surface of the earth because he has heard such wonderful things about marriage.

I have heard, how in marriage
All things are so good and full of joy.[26]

The devil, however, is not what he used to be. Less than a century before, the monks Heinrich Institoris and Jacob Sprenger had envisioned in the *Malleus Maleficarum* a devil that could satisfy the lustful pig-nature of witches. The devil sent out succubi to collect semen at night from men and incubi to seduce women.[27]

Now having decided to marry, Sachs's devil decides to marry an old woman.

> A young woman would be too lusty for me;
> I am simply too old;
> A young wife would do me no good.[28]

The devil finds and marries an old woman whom Sachs refers to as an old woman and an old witch. Once married she keeps the devil busy obtaining money for her. Her greedy horse nature and her nagging dog nature predominate over her lusty pig nature. Far from finding happiness in marriage, the devil decides to return to hell to find some peace and quiet.

It is a commonplace that people do not always say what they really mean. Sometimes they are lying, sometimes they are jesting, and sometimes they do not know their own feelings. In times of emotional stress, people often discover feelings or depths of feelings of which they were previously unaware. So what better way is there to discover a man's true feelings for his wife than to have her die? In *Ein klag-gesprech dreyer kleger mit dem man ob seinem verstorben bösen weib,* [29] Sachs does just that. A man's wife dies, and three men come to sympathize with the widower over his loss. After conversing with the widower, all three men leave with the regret that their wives had not died as well. To the first sympathizer the widower explains that his wife was better off dead since she had been sick and suffering. Moreover, now that she is dead, he will not have to put up with her barking and cursing, nor will he have to pay any more doctor bills. The first sympathizer remarks that he wishes his old wife, who torments him, were dead. To the second sympathizer, the widower's brother-in-law, the widower points out all the money he is saving now that he is alone. The brother-in-law comments that he too would be better off without a wife who spent so much money on clothes. The third sympathizer, the widower's brother, also agrees that he would be better off if a holy death would take his wife away. The widower tells his brother the problem with wives:

> Your wife can not love you.
> You love her, as I did mine.[30]

In short, husbands love their wives, but wives do not love their husbands.

In the Fastnachtspiel *Der todt mann* [31] the situation is reversed with a twist: the husband pretends to be dead in order to discover his wife's true feelings about himself. The wife was especially bad; she always did what she wanted in complete disregard of her husband's wishes. So when the husband decided that he had had enough, he announced that he was going to leave her. She begged him to stay, insisting that she loved him. To test her love he pretended to be dead. His wife far from being upset decides to drink some wine so that she can put on a better show of crying when her neighbors come. Also, as she calmly reasons, she had better get something in her stomach before all her neighbors come and eat and drink all the food that is in the house. Within minutes after the arrival of her first neighbor, she is discussing plans for a remarriage. At the suggestion that she join in making a sacrifice for the soul of her departed husband, she replies that since he never made a sacrifice while he was living why start now that he is dead. In the words of the husband, his wife's love is *ein kalte lieb* (a cold love).

Not just wives, but the institution of marriage was viewed in a negative light. In *Die neün verwandlung im ehlichen stant*,[32] Sachs lists the nine changes that marriage brings to the life of a man. First the new husband is transformed into a bull. He is a creature of lust; marriage reduces men to animals. The sexual urge soon cools, and since within a year his wife is pregnant, man enters his second transformation and becomes an ass. He must help his wife in the kitchen, especially by carrying wood and water into the kitchen. When the baby is born, the husband enters his third transformation; he becomes a Joseph. He must sleep on straw and help take care of the baby. After the baby is one year old, the husband enters his fourth transformation; he becomes a cuckoo to entertain his baby. In the fifth transformation the husband becomes a monk, a barefoot friar. All his marriage money has been used up, and his master-work has been severely criticized. The household furniture, the servants, and the house rent all have to be paid for. In order to support his family, the husband enters his sixth transformation. He becomes a martyr, condemned to a life of days and nights filled with hard work. The husband, in his seventh transformation, becomes a fighter. He must struggle against the bad fortune which rules all things. In

his eighth transformation, the husband becomes a Simon; his wife now rules the house and orders her husband about. Finally in his ninth transformation, the husband, now old, becomes a patient Job. He must put up with every kind of work, sickness, misery and misfortune, until with death man receives God's blessing and deliverance from misery.

This story of the stages of married life, except perhaps for the stage of the bull and the stage of the cuckoo, presents a most unattractive picture of marriage. Except for the eighth stage of the Simon, it is the condition of marriage and not a bad wife which is to blame for the misery of married life. Part of the problem of marriage was that it meant the establishment of an independent household, and consequently put considerable pressure on the husband to earn the family bread. Marriage, in short, meant more than taking a wife, it meant taking on all kinds of new responsibilities.

The rising expression of anti-feminism and anti-matrimonialism in the literature of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries [33] may be a reflection of the development of a unique European marriage pattern at about this time. Previously nearly everyone had married, and usually at a young age. Now men and women tended to marry later, in their mid-twenties, and a high proportion of people never married. Up to twenty per cent of the female population might now remain single.[34] *Ein Kürtzweylig fasnacht-spiel von einem bösen weib* [35] suggests that this stereotype of the bad wife may not only reflect but may even have helped create the European marriage pattern. In this Fastnachtspiel a young man who had been thinking about marriage decides, after witnessing what a *Siemann* (a particular type of bad wife) can do to family, not to marry in order to escape the disgrace and unhappiness that marriage brings to a man.

The *Siemann* or she-man first appeared in the popular literature of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The *Siemann* is not simply a bad wife. She does not simply passively resist her husband's rule by laziness, bad cooking, nagging, or poor management of the household. She does not simply commit adultery. She inverts the traditional sex-roles. The *Siemann* declares war on her husband and attempts to subdue him. While Sachs's phrase *Siemann* won general acceptance in Germany, this

type of woman could appear under many names; Luther called her the *Frauenmann*.[36]

The *Siemann* created the battle of the trousers, a favorite theme in European literature during the Renaissance and Reformation.[37] In *Siemann* literature, marriage appears as a scene of open warfare; the wife rebels and attempts to win the trousers, the symbol of authority in the family. Sometimes this warfare takes the form of formal combat in which the *Siemann* beats her husband with a stick and extracts a sworn statement from him that henceforth she is to be the man in the house and to wear the pants in the house as in *Der böss rauch*.[38] The *Siemann* wants to and usually does become the head of the family. She gives the orders, and the husband obeys. The husband becomes a fool in his own house. In *Der böss rauch* the husband even agrees to do the cooking and washing. Taken seriously, the *Siemann* is the most dreaded nightmare imaginable to a partriarchal society. The *Siemann* represents complete chaos in which the reason and intellect of man is subdued and dominated by the emotional and animal (dog, pig, and horse) nature of woman.

Taken less seriously, the *Siemann* represents a humorous portrayal of the gap between the pretensions of male authority and the realities of married life. In the Fastnachtspiele *Das Kelberbruten*,[39] a farmer agrees to change roles with his wife for one day because she has been complaining that he does not make enough money. The wife goes off to town and the husband promptly falls to sleep. He wakes up just before his wife returns. Beside himself with fright at the prospect of his wife returning to find a messy house with no dinner ready, the husband decides to pretend that he has been turned into a goose to escape his wife's wrath. If the figure of the *Siemann* is meant to be taken humourously, it is a kind of humour that blends laughter with violence (*Der böss rauch*) and fear (*Das Kelberbruten*).

Behind most of Sachs's *Siemänner*, one finds the figure of the hen-pecked husband or, to use the German expression, the *Pantoffelheld* (slipper-hero). At times Sachs seems to be saying that if the husband would act as a husband ought to, then there would be no rebellion and discord in the family. At other times, as in *Ein kürtzwelig fasnachtspiel von einem bösen weib*,[40] the husband is a perfectly rational, reasonable man; his wife is just demented because of her nature.

The victory of the *Siemann* in *Der böss rauch* represents one solution to the rebellion within the household. The husband had simply to resign himself to his fate. As the neighbor says in *Der todt mann*:

> One wife is just like another.
> So let wives be wives,
> and we'll go together and drink wine. . . .[41]

Yet no amount of wine seems to have resigned Sachs to life with a bad woman. He is constantly giving advice on how to make a bad wife become a good wife.

Sachs's first and frequently mentioned method to change a bad wife into a good wife was: change thyself, a good man will naturally produce a good wife, and vice versa.

> Because people say: A pious man
> can make a wife pious,
> so, on the other hand, may a pious wife
> make a husband honest and pious. . . .[42]

Such advice, good as it might be, was insufficient, and so Sachs presented additional methods such as those in *Das böss weyb mit den worten, würtzen und stein gut zu machen*.[43] The story opens with a conversation between a husband and his neighbor. The husband no longer cares what will happen to his soul; his wife is so bad, he is ready to commit suicide. The neighbor suggests that the husband follow Solomon's advice and use words, herbs, and stones to pacify his wife.

First, the husband tries the good words with no success.

> The wife speaks:
> Shut up and stop trying to fool me,
> You are a real intriguer.
> I mean, you want to become a Carthusian monk,
> You want me to first easily learn to pray,
> You can hardly feed a goldfinch,
> You dishonest wanton man,
> I don't want to see you any more.[44]

Second, the husband approaches his wife with herbs and attempts to get her to smell them. The wife responds:

> Why do you want to anger me with those herbs?
> You are raving mad, so you will have to be
> put in the madhouse in irons.
> Go Away! What do I want with spelt [German grain]?
> Go away in the name of the devil!
> And take your druse and herbs with you!
> Go away and leave me in peace! [45]

The husband persists in the vain hope that the herbs will work. The wife, accusing her husband of trying magic, again refuses. At this point the wife realizes that her husband is trying to change her into a good wife. But her husband has waited too long to tame her. Now that she has become used to being the master of the house, she will not surrender her dominant position.

The husband now tries stone. He has a golden ring made with a ruby, a sapphire, and a diamond, and presents it to his wife. She tells him to give the tin ring to a whore. Having failed with precious stones, the husband goes to the stream and gets some common stones. After returning to his wife, he throws the stones at her head, thigh, back, and shoulder. The wife then falls to the ground, pleads with her husband, and promises to be a good, obedient wife in the future.

Thus the husband learns that flattery, magic, and gifts fail to make a good wife, but that violence works. The husband decides to keep a supply of stones ready in case his wife gets nasty. The story ends with the husband's comment that he will lend his stones to any man who needs them and his observation that there seem to be many bad wives in the world. The husband further notes that a big stick will work just as well as stones.

Among the many vices of Sachs's bad wives, one of the most common was adultery. Sachs's world, where women had lusty pig natures, was quite different from the world of Samuel Richardson's *Pamela* and the double standard.

Keith Thomas has argued that a fully developed double standard including the "total desexualization of women" did not exist in literature until the eighteenth century.[46] In the sixteenth century women were sexual creatures; fear of female sexuality

was widespread.[47] While fear of female sexuality is not a dominant note in Sachs's writings except for the case of the old man with a young wife as in *Der teufel nam ein alt weib zu der ehe*, Sachs's women were sensual. In fact they were usually more active sexually than Sachs's men.

One measure of sexual activity in Sachs's writing is extra-marital sexual relations. Adultery is more prevalent in Sachs's women than in his men. In *Die listig bulerin genandt*,[48] as soon as the man of the house leaves, the wife sends her maid out to fetch her lover. Before the husband returns later in the day, the wife has had visits from two lovers. In *Das heiss eysen* [49] a wife accuses her husband of fornication. He protests his innocence. Have you seen me do it, he asks. His wife answers:

> No, in truth I am able to say I have not.
> But you have been unfriendly to me,
> Not loving as in our first year of marriage.
> Therefore my love for you also diminished,
> So that I almost have no more love for you.
> This is the fault of your fornication.[50]

The husband protests that he is pious, but his wife remains unconvinced. To prove his innocence, she says he must carry a bar of red hot iron. The husband agrees and tricks his wife. He carries the hot iron with a handle, and hence does not actually touch the hot iron. After he carries the hot iron around a circle, his wife looks at his hands, which of course are not burnt, and is forced to admit that he must be innocent. Then the husband turns to his wife and tells her that it is her turn to carry the hot iron. The wife pleads with her husband with no success. Bit by bit he drags out of her the admission that she has committed adultery with seven different men. After this confession the husband orders his wife to carry the hot iron in order to purify her guilt, or he will hit her. She picks up the hot iron, takes a few steps, screams and drops the hot iron.

This story tells us a number of things. It is a variation on the theme of making a bad wife into a good woman by violence. The double standard does not seem to exist in Sachs's writings; extra-marital sexual relations are bad; there seems to be no distinction between the male and female offender. There is no

indication that adultery is a minor offense for the man, but an unforgivable, completely polluting offense for the woman. Adultery is no excuse for murder or divorce. Also in the above quotation the wife seems to be complaining about the quantity of her husband's love making. The pig-nature of woman is insatiable.

Das weib im brunnen [51] is another Fastnachtspiel about a pious husband, Steffano, concerned about his wife, Gritta, who goes out at night drinking and lusting after men. He decides to shame his wife into behavior becoming to a wife. His plan is to lock her out of the house, so that when morning comes everyone in the whole town will see her and know what she has been up to. Gritta comes home after a night of carousing and carnal activity to find the door locked. She pleads with her husband to let her in, but he refuses. After a prolonged exchange of vituperation, Gritta says that since her honor is about to be destroyed, she no longer wants to live. Then she throws a stone down the well. Steffano, thinking that his wife had fallen down the well, runs out to save her. Gritta runs inside the house and locks Steffano out to face the ridicule of his neighbors in the morning. This story is interesting for its image of female sexuality and the absence of a double standard. There is no doubt that Steffano will face the same ridicule that his wife would have. *Das weib im brunnen* presents another method for making a bad woman into a good woman, public shame.

Another characteristic of the double standard is the view that "men have property in women and that the value of this property is immeasurably diminished if the woman at any time has sexual relations with anyone other than her husband." [52] Thomas points to the use of the "language of the commercial market" to describe virginity. L. Vives in *The Instruction of a Christian Woman* described a woman who had lost her virginity as "unthrifty." [53] In the Fastnachtspiel *Die späch bulerey genandt* [54] a noble lady reminds her niece that "Heyraten ist ein langer kauff." [55] (Marriage is a long purchase.) Yet as the context makes clear, the property being considered for purchase is not the wife, but prospective husbands. Clearly both partners are viewed as the property of each other. The emphasis is on the permanent nature of marriage. As *Das heiss eysen* and *Das weib im brunnen* demonstrate, a wife who has committed adultery will be readily

accepted by her husband if she reforms herself. Some punishment is usually involved, the physical pain of burning in *Das heiss eysen* and public shame in *Das weib im brunnen*, but this is part of the process of making a bad wife into a good wife. After the bad wife is converted into a good wife in *Das heiss eysen*, she is as good as new. In short, Hans Sachs has no conception of the double standard.

The overwhelming bulk of sixteenth-century literature was written by men and from a male perspective. If women had written half the literature of the sixteenth century we might expect to find as much talk of bad men as bad women. Occasionally Hans Sachs serves as the spokesman for women as in *Wie siben weiber uber ihre ungeratne mender klagen*.[56] In this conversation we find six bad husbands and only one good husband. The first wife is married to an unfaithful husband. After less than two years of marriage, he sleeps with other women including the housemaid. The second wife is a young girl married to an old man. Her husband is so greedy that she has to eat bad food. He beats her and is so jealous that he even prevents her from mixing socially with other women. Consequently she is slowly wasting away. The third wife has to live in poverty because her husband is a bad worker, and does not properly provide for her. The fourth wife's husband is a drunkard. The fifth wife is married to a card playing gambler. He has lost the dowry and now beats her.

The sixth wife's husband is the worst of all. He has all the bad qualities of the previous five husbands. He is unfaithful, jealous, lazy, and he drinks and gambles. This combining of many bad qualities to make a caricature of human vice is characteristic of the sixteenth century. The same process is at work in the types of bad women. According to Franz Brietzmann, bad women in German medieval literature are types each representing one fault or another. One is an emblem of bad-temper, another of unfaithfulness, and another of laziness. Not until the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries do women appear in German literature who contain within themselves all the bad qualities imaginable.[57]

The seventh wife in *Wie siben weiber uber ihre ungeratne mender klagen* has a very good husband. He stays at home with his family instead of running around. He is serious about and

energetic in his work. He is kind to his wife. The seventh wife concludes the conversation with advice to her friends to be more understanding of their husbands instead of complaining. The purpose of this conversation, like much of Sachs's writing, is didactic. Yet the ratio of six bad husbands to one good husband serves to point out the dangers of marriage from a female perspective. It should also be noted, that other works such as *Schwank. Die hausmaid im pflug* [58] point out the dangers a girl can encounter if she does not marry.

Sachs wrote a companion piece to *Wie siben weiber uber ihre ungeratne mender klagen*, entitled *Ein gesprech zwischen siben mendern, darinn sie ihre weiber beklagen*,[59] in which seven men discuss their wives. A comparison of these two works is revealing. With slight modifications the same categories used to describe the seven husbands in the first work can be used to describe the seven wives in the second. The same basic categories or concepts apply to both sexes. The good-bad dichotomy and the categorization of vices may not be so much a quality of sixteenth-century men or women as sixteenth-century thought, at least as reflected by Hans Sachs.

The good wife deserves separate treatment because she is not just different in degree, but is different in kind from the various categories of bad women we have met so far. That is to say, the bad woman and the good woman are not so much two different members of the same species as two different species. They are of course related. As Sachs stated in *Die vier natur einer frawen*, all women have some degree of the horse, dog, and pig nature in them. However, the true image of the good woman is the polar opposite of the bad woman; the good woman is the personification of virtue.

In *Der ehren-spiegel der zwölf durchleuchtigen frawen dess alten testaments* [60] Sachs presents a detailed picture of the good woman. What he has done is to rummage through the Old Testament and pick out the twelve best women, each with a specific virtue. Eve's virtue is the production of children; Sarah's virtue is the raising and educating of children to honor God; Rebecca's virtue, obedience and submission to her husband; Rachel's virtue, pleasantness and sweetness to her husband; Leah's virtue, patience; Jael's virtue, consciousness of duty;

Ruth's virtue, kindness; Michal's virtue, true service to her husband; Abigail's virtue, intelligence; Judith's virtue, moderation; Hester's virtue, gentleness; and Susanna's virtue, chastity. All these virtues belong to a good woman, although this list does not exhaust the number of virtues that the good woman possesses. Sachs devoted an entire anecdote to the qualities of beauty a good woman should possess, *Schwanck. Die 18 schön eyner junckfrawen.*[61] An image Sachs often used in discussing the good wife is *perlein* or *edelgestein*[62] (precious jewel). The comparison of a good woman with a jewel points out the value of a good woman. And just as precious jewels and good women are valuable, they are rare.

Two common observations about Hans Sachs's writings, and much of sixteenth-century literature, are that they are moralistic,[63] and that they deal with people as categories.[64] The evidence for Sachs's moralism is overwhelming. Most of Sachs's writings end with the narrator or one of the characters explicitly spelling out the moral. In addition, the *Summa all meiner gedicht vom MDXIIII jar an biss ins 1567 jar*,[65] Sachs's literary last will and testament, provides Sachs's own words. Sachs describes all the various kinds of literary forms he has written: histories, Fastnachtspiele, fables and miscellaneous other works. And in all these literary works we find:

> The praise of all morals and virtues
> Is highly commended and celebrated,
> The shameful and coarse outrages
> Are, on the other hand, scorned and despised. . . .[66]

Moralism in the sixteenth century took the form of satire. The satirist disapproves, ridicules, and chastises in order to improve — *castigat ridendo mores*. The character in the literary work is punished by ridicule and invited to reform himself and avoid such sins in the future.[67] The reader is to participate in and learn from the experiences of the character in the literary work. The aim is the moral improvement of the reader, or in the case of the Fastnachtspiel, the viewer. Art is a means of moral reform; 'Art for Art's sake' did not exist in the sixteenth century. Professional writers in the modern sense did not exist. Most writers were lawyers, civil servants, schoolmasters, cobblers, parsons, and

shoemakers, "whose literary pursuits were incidental to their real occupations." [68]

The satirist teaches morals by working negatively,[69] that is by providing examples of what not to do. To condemn fornication, the artist must provide a picture of fornication. The sixteenth century satirist thus is faced with a potential paradox, he tries to teach the wicked morality by providing him with examples of vice. The teaching is achieved by showing the bad consequences of immorality, but the immoral, preferring immorality, may not get the point. Ordinarily this is no problem, the point is obvious. The bad wife in *Das böss weyb mit den worten, würtzen und stein gut zu machen* is stoned into good behavior. But what is the moral in *Der böss rauch* where the wife beats her husband? The husband is not really at fault; he tried to resist his wife's efforts to wear the pants, he just was not strong enough. Such a play might encourage *Siemänner*. And the Fastnachtspiel *Die listig bulerin*, in which a wife is able to commit acts of adultery and deceive her husband, might be viewed as encouraging adultery. Hugo Beck has argued that the audience was an active participant in the Fastnachtspiel, and hence although her husband was deceived, the audience knew that she was an adulterer.[70] But Beck is forced to admit that the adulterous wife's triumphant last words point in the opposite direction.

> From one I have honor and profit
> From the other lust, pleasure, and entertainment.[71]

In some of Sachs's writing, especially the Fastnachtspiele, there seems to be an undercurrent that runs counter to moralism and toward the frank enjoyment of the material life. This undercurrent may be a residual element from the origins of the Fastnachtspiele in spring fertility rites.[72] Sachs purged most of the sexual and obscene elements out of the Fastnachtspiele. As Edmund Goetze said of Sachs: "Durch ihn wurde das Theater aus dem Unflat des 15. Jahrh. erhoben." [73] (Through him the theater was lifted out of the filth of the fifteenth century.) That Sachs felt the need to defend his literary works in his *Summa all meiner gedicht vom MDXIIII jar an biss ins 1567 jar* may indicate that some of his contemporaries questioned the moral value of some of his literary works.

Invective was an extremely popular form of satire in the sixteenth century; the sixteenth century produced many masters of invective from Sachs to Shakespeare. Eric W. Gritsch has recently discussed [74] the violence and invective in Luther's and Müntzer's language, concluding that Luther's crudeness of language was "more than just a linguistic neurosis; it was a means by which he exposed the roots of ecclesiastical and political satanism." [75] Similarly Sachs used violent language to explore the emotional contours of married life much as geologists used to explore the topography of the bottom of the ocean by setting off blasts of dynamite. Sachs developed an image of marriage as rebellion and warfare; the physical violence is only surpassed by the violence of the speech.

Hans Sachs and sixteenth-century literature in general portrayed women as types or categories. This categorization was not limited to women, but, as we have seen, was also applied to men. What we have here is moralization by categorization. Perhaps the most famous example of moralization by categories is Sebastian Brant's *Ship of Fools*. The specific vice, sin, or form of folly is isolated and labeled so that it can be identified. Brant gives detailed descriptions of over one hundred different kinds of folly. The *Ship of Fools* was intended to serve as a kind of mirror in which everyone could see his particular brand of folly. Before one can become a good person, one must know that one is bad. Once the reader recognizes his particular brand of folly, he can correct it. The problem seems, in Brant's view, to be ignorance. Sachs also embodies vices in characters for the same purpose, to aid the reader in identifying the vice. However Sachs's use of moralism by categorization differs from Brant's in three significant ways. First, as we have already noted Sachs frequently combines several vices in one character to create the archetype of the bad wife or husband. This might be considered a new category of complete moral corruption. Second, Sachs's bad characters are frequently unwilling or unable to reform themselves — their nature is essentially bad. Something more is needed than the mirror Brant provides. This appears especially in the Fastnachtspiele concerned with making a bad wife into a good wife. The husband must do things to his wife. He must become pious in the hope that it will rub off on her, he must flatter her, bribe her with presents, beat her or shame her. Hence Sachs uses

categories to enable one spouse to recognize faults in himself or in his spouse and provides a program to change the bad spouse. Ultimately, however, the husband or wife may have to resign himself to his fate. When all else fails Sachs suggests the use of wine. Third, these categories can be used to pick out a wife, or to decide not to marry.

To this point, we have concentrated on the development of stereotypes of women in Hans Sachs's literary works. The question of the relationship between these stereotypes and reality is beyond the scope of this paper. However the question of the relationship between Sachs's life and his literary work cannot be avoided. Did Sachs's marriages affect his views of women? Did Sachs's views of women affect his marriages?

The consensus of Sachs biographers is that he had two happy marriages. This view is based on Sachs's own writings. After the death of his first wife, Kunigundt, Sachs wrote in *Der wunderliche traum von meiner abgeschiden lieben gemahel, Kunigundt Sächsin* [76]

> When I think that she
> is dead and no more,
> my heart-ache starts anew; [77]

As Sachs explained, he had reason to mourn Kunigundt. She was an ideal wife, faithful and a good housekeeper. Sachs soon remarried another good wife, Barbara Harscherin. As Sachs explained in *Das künstlich frawen-lob* [78] Barbara was virtuous, had a sweet personality, a friendly face, was obedient, chaste, silent, gentle, she brought order to his house, and raised his children to be good Christians.

It seems incredible that a man could have two happy marriages to two good women, and at the same time write such horrible things about women — that they are, for the most part, bad wives, whores and *Siemänner*. This is a contradiction only if one assumes that Sachs's literary works were autobiographical in nature. While this may be a common feature of twentieth century literature, it was not in the sixteenth century. Authors not only reflect the times they live in, they are also influenced by the literary tradition within which they work. The grip of literary tradition was especially strong on sixteenth-century authors. For

example, *Ein klag-gesprech dreyer kleger mit dem man ob seinem verstorben bösen weib* in which a husband rejoices to his three friends when his wife dies is a rewriting of an earlier piece by another author.[79]

Moreover we must remember that Sachs thought in terms of good and bad women with very little middle ground. In *Der wunderliche traum von meiner abgeschiden lieben gemahel, Kunigundt Sächsin, Das künstlich frawen-lob,* and *Summa all meiner gedicht vom MDXIIII jar an biss ins 1567 jar,* Sachs's wives appear as stereotypes of the good wife. The only element of reality in these works is the mention of the deaths of Sachs's seven children, all of whom preceded Sachs to the grave.

The only evidence that Sachs had two happy marriages is contained in these three pieces, and they describe Sachs's wives in the same kind of language that Sachs used to build his stereotype of the good wife. One might say that Sachs built his image of the good wife from his experience of marriage to two good women. This argument is hard to defend since the stereotype of the good wife was already well developed in the literature of the fifteenth century. Sachs merely expanded and built on this foundation.

What we need to know — and probably never will know since we lack the necessary sources — is Sachs's motive in writing these three pieces. Perhaps he considered them, like his other works, as works of moral edification. If he wanted to teach good morals, then he might not have been too concerned about a little twisting of the truth. All in all, his picture of his two wives seems too good to be real. *Der wunderliche traum von meiner abgeschiden lieben gemahel, Kunigundt Sächsin* was written after Sachs's first wife had died, obviously not the time for an objective analysis of her character — virtues and vices. *Das künstlich frawen-lob* was written while Sachs was married to Barbara. Who knows? Sachs might even have had a fight with Barbara the day before and might have written this piece to pacify her. *Summa all meiner gedicht vom MDXIIII jar an biss ins 1567 jar* was written to justify Sachs's artistic works. His defense was to assert that his art and his life served to teach good morals.

Still Sachs probably had two good but human wives. On occasion Sachs recognized that all women have their good and bad

sides as when he recognized that all women have horse, dog, pig, and honeycomb natures only in different proportions; but this is rare. Sachs's rhetoric makes a sharp distinction between the good and the bad wife. Given these two categories, Sachs's two good but human wives became idealized when they were translated in art.

Sachs's written statements about his wives do not necessarily contradict his stereotype of the bad wife. The stereotype of the bad wife cannot be separated from the stereotype of the good wife. As these pieces indicate, Sachs and sixteenth-century men in general may not have been able, at all times, to clearly distinguish stereotype from reality. It may be as Shelly said, "Poets are the unacknowledged legislators of the world."

The sixteenth-century mind, as represented by Hans Sachs's literary works, was very systematic. That is especially true when we examine Sachs's view of women. First he divides women into good and bad. Then he subdivides women, especially the bad, into numerous categories representing the specific vices of the bad women. Essentially he splits the bad and the good women down into atoms of vices or virtues. Then he puts them back together, creating a paragon of evil or goodness. The result is an image of women removed from any concrete living woman. The sixteenth-century author improved on nature by idealizing the good and the bad woman. As Katherine M. Rogers has observed, once this split and idealization of women occurs, there is a tendency for the gap between the image of the good and the bad woman, and between the idealization and the reality, to widen. As she notes ". . .some expressions of misogyny, where it is a direct reaction against idealization of women, would not exist without that original idealization." [80]

Sachs's writings contain a number of tensions. One tension is between his predominant moral tone and an undercurrent of the immoral joys of the flesh and the material. Another tension is between the Christian view of marriage and some strands of the classical view of marriage. The result is that Sachs seems to be speaking with two voices; he both urges people to marry and not to marry. The problem is to pick out a good wife, but the stereotype of the bad woman has grown so large and appears so often that trying to find a good wife is as hard as looking for a

needle in a haystack. Marriage is like gambling; the odds are against you, and the game is permanent. Once married to a bad woman, a man was condemned to a life of hard work and of continual struggle for dominance over his wife. Sometimes a bad wife could be changed into a good wife, sometimes a bad wife would die prematurely, but the wise man would not take the risk. The *Siemann*, the personification of feminine rebellion within the household, hung over Hans Sachs's Fastnachtspiele like a dreaded nightmare, and perhaps over the sixteenth-century German male mind.

Having said that, the historian must avoid what Northrop Frye calls "the fallacy of poetic projection" or "taking literary forms to be facts of life." [81] We must avoid projecting the picture we find in literature of a society overflowing with bad wives and weak husbands into our image of sixteenth-century society. After all, the sixteenth-century writer was not trying to present a photographic picture of sixteenth-century society, but was trying to teach good morals. Moreover, if Sachs had filled his Fastnachtspiele with good women and good men, they would have all flopped. Nothing is more boring than a woman of virtue. Yet while the function of sixteenth-century literature was not to provide a realistic picture of sixteenth-century society, it could not fulfill its moral function without some relationship to reality. While sixteenth-century society was probably not overflowing with bad women, we know from studies of the *Charivaris* that women did exist who beat their husbands.[82]

Hans Sachs is sometimes credited with "tolerant humour" which "rarely has the sharp edge of satire." [83] It is perhaps this ironic aspect of Sachs's work — the humourous treatment of the gap between what is, and what is supposed to be — that separates Sachs's work from the more traditional satirical moralists such as Sebastian Brant. The sixteenth-century family was supposed to be patriarchal. The husband was supposed to be in charge, and the wife was supposed to obey; but in practice the situation was probably different; it certainly was in literature. Hans Sachs pictures the family as a battleground in which the husband tried to maintain his authority, and the wife rebelled either passively or actively. Sometimes the wife (the *Siemann*) could overwhelm her husband, usurp his authority by right of conquest, and rule

over him. At other times, while the husband might maintain his authority, his wife would passively resist by bad housekeeping, bad cooking, laziness, nagging, and adultery. Yet alongside this, Sachs gives the image of a family living in complete harmony. Marriage to a good wife is like living in paradise.

In *Der hundsschwantz*, with which this essay began, we find the four principal elements of Hans Sachs's view of women and marriage. The first element is the bad nature of women with their affinity to fleas which is the result of the creation of women from a dog's tail. The second element is the good nature of women. Women create honeycombs for their husbands and their families to live in. The third and fourth elements are humour and wine which enable husbands to live with wives who fall short of the ideal good wife.

NOTES

[1] *Hans Sachs*, eds. A. v. Keller and E. Goetze (1870; rpt. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1964), IX, 303-307.

[2] *Ibid.*, I, 19-51 and 174-77.

[3] Katharine M. Rogers, *The Troublesome Helpmate: A History of Misogyny in Literature* (Seattle, 1966), pp. 3-4.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

[5] Oskar Dähnhardt, "Die Erschaffung Evas," in *Natursagen: Eine Sammlung Naturdeutender Sagen, Märchen, Fabeln und Legenden*. Band I, *Sagen zum Alten Testament* (Berlin, 1907), pp. 121-22.

[6] *Hans Sachs*, IX, 307.

Das schwenck schwenck bleiben, wünscht Hans Sachs.

[7] *Ibid.*, V, 232-36.

[8] *Ibid.*, pp. 234-35.

Man muss mit krieg nicht halten hauss,
Sonder mit fried und freundschafft mehr.
Paulus uns mannen gibt ein lehr,
Die weib mit vernunfft zu regieren,
Nicht pollern, grob tyrannisieren,
Weil sie der schwechste werckzeug sein.

[9] *Ibid.*, XXI, 144-47.

[10] Heinrich Institoris and Jacob Sprenger, *Malleus Maleficarum* (1486), ed. and trans. Montague Summers (New York, 1971), p. 44.

[11] S. I. Hayakawa, *Language in Thought and Action* (New York, 1964), pp. 230-43.

[12] Franz Brietzmann, *Die böse Frau in der deutschen Literatur des Mittelalters*, Sammlung Palaestra, 42 (Berlin, 1912), p. 178.

[13] *Hans Sachs*, XX, 234-48.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 238.

Dein leben is ein halber tod,
Dieweil du lebst on ein weib.

[15] *Ibid.*, pp. 526-31.

[16] *Ibid.*, XXII, 264-65.

[17] *Ibid.*, XX, 526.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 530.

Als man thet Diogenem fragen,
Wenn ein mann möcht heiraten wol,
Er sprach: Der jung verziehen sol,
Das alt sol sich dess weibs enthalten.

[19] *Ibid.*, IX, 60-71.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 61.

Ja, vater, dasselb ist wol war.
Die mutter ist dir zgross und starck
Und ist dir auch zu ress und arck;
Die zwo aber sind gar klein.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 66.

Herr Gott, ist nur in der eh
So viel trübsal, sorg, angst und weh,
So viel armut, hunger und kommer.
Mhü und arbeit winter und sommer!
Was mein vater sagt, glaubt ich nit.
Mich hats hertzleid und der jarrit
Wol mit dem ehling stand beschissen.
Und soltens all jung gsellen wissen,
Was für ein kraut ist umb die eh,
Keinr nem im kein weib nimmer meh.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 67.

Wolt Gott, das ich dess weibs nicht het.
Wolt, sie wer ein wolff, lieff gen holtz.

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 69.

Sie ist ein teufl und gar kein weib,
Die teglich quelet meinen leib
Mit kieffen, zancken und mit gronen.

[24] *Ibid.*, XXI, 17-33.

[25] *Ibid.*, IX, 284-87.

[26] *Ibid.*, XXI, 18.

Ich hab gehört, wie in der eh
All ding so wol und freundreich steh.

[27] Institoris and Sprenger, *Malleus Maleficarum*, pp. 21-30.

[28] *Hans Sachs*, XXI, 18.

Ein junge die wer mir zu geil;
Ich bin auch alt auff meinem teil;
Ein junge thet mire leicht kein gut.

[29] *Ibid.*, V, 267-72.

[30] *Ibid.*, p. 271.

Dein weib künd dir nit lieber sein.
Du hast sie lieb, wie ich die mein.

[31] *Ibid.*, XIV, 320-32.

[32] *Ibid.*, V, 228-31.

[33] Brietzmann, *Die böse Frau*, p. 176 ff. Waldemar Kawerau, *Die Reformation und die Ehe* (Halle, 1892), pp. 41-63.

[34] J. Hajnal, "European Marriage Pattern in Perspective," in *Population in History*, ed. D. V. Glass and D. E. C. Eversley (London, 1965), p. 101.

[35] *Hans Sachs*, V, 65.

[36] Kawerau, *Reformation und Ehe*, p. 44.

[37] J. R. Hale, *Renaissance Europe: The Individual and Society, 1480-1520* (New York, 1971), pp. 128-29.

[38] *Hans Sachs*, IX, 108-19.

[39] *Ibid.*, XIV, 170-83.

[40] *Ibid.*, V, 47-65.

[41] *Ibid.*, XIV, 331.

Ein weyb gleich wie das ander ist.
Drumb wöl wir weiber weibr lasn sein
Und mit einander gehn zum wein, ...

[42] *Ibid.*, IV, 363.

Weil man doch spricht: Ein frummer man
Ein frummen weib im ziehen kan,
So mag ein frumb weib widerumb
Ziehen ein man ehrlich und frumb. . . .

[43] *Ibid.*, XIV, 262-75.

[44] *Ibid.*, p. 268.

Die fraw spricht:

Schweyg nur und lass mich ungehiet,
Du bist ein rechter dock mauser.
Ich mein, wolst werdn ein kartewser,
Du wilt mich leycht erst beten lern,
Du kanst kaumb ein stiglitz ernern,
Du unehlicher loser man,
Ich mag dich nit mehr sehen ahn.

[45] *Ibid.*, p. 270.

Was wilt mich mit den würtzen freten?
Bist unsinn, so must an ein ketten
Und ins narrn-heusslein spern.
Key weck! was wilt mich darmit kern?
Key weck in aller teuffel namen!
Hab ir druss und den würtzen zammen!
Key weck, und lass mich doch mit rw!

[46] Keith Thomas, "The Double Standard," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 20 (April 1959), 195-216.

[47] Hale, *Renaissance Europe*, p. 129.

[48] *Hans Sachs*, XVII, 17-28.

[49] *Ibid.*, IX, 85-95.

[50] *Ibid.*, p. 87.

Nein, auff mein warheit mag ich jehen
Du aber bist mir unfreuntlich gar,
Nicht lieblich, wie im ersten jar.
Derhalb mein lieb auch nimmet ab,
Das ich dich schier nicht mehr lieb hab.
Diss als ist deines bulens schuld.

[51] *Ibid.*, pp. 96-107.

[52] Thomas, "Double Standard," p. 210.

[53] *Ibid.*

[54] *Hans Sachs*, XIV, 184-97.

[55] *Ibid.*, p. 187.

[56] *Ibid.*, V, 242-46.

[57] Brietzmann, *Die böse Frau*, pp. 195 ff.

[58] *Hans Sachs*, V, 179-83.

[59] *Ibid.*, pp. 237-41.

[60] *Ibid.*, I, 203-10.

[61] *Ibid.*, V, 176-78.

[62] *Ibid.*, XX, 524.

[63] G. Duflou, "Hans Sachs Als Moralist in den Fastnachtspielen," *Zeitschrift fur Deutsche Philologie*, 25 (1893), 343-56.

[64] For a detailed examination of the various categories of women see Rudolf Schmidt, *Die Frau in der deutschen Literatur des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Strassburg, 1917) and Brietzmann, *Die böse Frau*.

[65] *Hans Sachs*, XXI, 337-44.

[66] *Ibid.*, pp. 343-44.

Das lob aller sitten und tugend
Werd hoch gepreiset und perhümt,
Dargegen veracht und verdümt
Die schendlichen und groben laster,. . . .

[67] W. A. Coupe, ed., *A Sixteenth-Century German Reader* (Oxford, 1972), p. 90.

[68] *Ibid.*, pp. 91-92.

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 91.

[70] Hugo Beck, *Das genrehafte Element im deutschen Drama des XVI. Jahrhunderts: Ein Beitrag zu den Wechselbeziehungen zwischen Dichtung und Malereri* (1929; rpt. Nendeln, 1967), pp. 111-12.

[71] *Hans Sachs*, XVII, 27.

Von dem ein hab ich ehr und gut,
Vom dem andren lust, freud und mut.

[72] Coupe, *German Reader*, p. 132.

[73] Edmund Goetze, "Hans Sachs," *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, 30 (1890), p. 123.

[74] Eric W. Gritsch, "Martin Luther and Violence: A Reappraisal of a Neuralgic Theme," *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 3 (1972), 37-55.

[75] *Ibid.*, p. 41.

[76] *Hans Sachs*, XI, 462-67.

[77] *Ibid.*, p. 463.

Wenn ich mich denn bedacht, das sie
Gestorben wer und nicht mehr hie,
So wurdt mein hertzenleidt mir new,

[78] *Ibid.*, XX, 518-21.

[79] Kawerau, *Reformation und Ehe*, p. 42 ff.
In *Die Frau im Fastnachtspiel* (Greifswald, 1911), Hans Gattermann made a comparative statistical analysis of the number of different vices and virtues in the three most famous authors of Nürnberg Fastnachtspiele, Hans Folz, Hans Rosenplüt, and Hans Sachs. While Sachs doubled the number of vices and virtues that are found in Folz and Rosenplüt to one hundred twenty-three and sixty-four, their ratio remained relatively constant — about two vices for every virtue. From this Gattermann concluded that on the whole Sachs, like his predecessors Folz and Rosenplüt, had a negative view of women. However Gattermann's analysis rests on the dubious presupposition that vices and virtues can be quantified, that any virtue is as good as another, and that likewise, any vice is as bad as another.

Actually Sachs had two polar opposite conceptions of women: the good and the bad woman.

[80] Rogers, *Troublesome Helpmate*, p. xv.

[81] Northrop Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays* (Princeton, 1957), p. 230.

[82] Natalie Z. Davis, "The Reasons of Misrule: Youth Groups and Chavivaris in Sixteenth-Century France," *Past and Present*, 50 (February 1971), pp. 45, 52, 65-66, 72-73.

[83] Roy Pascal, *German Literature in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (London, 1968), p. 39.