

---

# Which Faustus Died in Staufen? History and Legend in the *Zimmerische Chronik*

**Frank Baron**  
**University of Kansas, Lawrence**

---

Although prominent scholars like Robert Petsch and Ernst Beutler discounted the *Zimmerische Chronik* as a reliable source for the biography of the historical Faustus, there has been a tendency in recent times to argue that this work supplies accurate information.<sup>1</sup> Because the popular chronicle is the only early source giving detailed information about the time, place as well as manner of Faustus's death, this tendency is understandable. But if we examine the chronicle carefully, we discover a neglected wealth of stories closely related to the topic of Faustus. The nature of these stories seriously undermines the value of the *Zimmerische Chronik* as a reliable historical source. The Faustus we find here is not the historical Faustus who was known to Johannes Trithemius, Mutianus Rufus, the Bishop of Bamberg, Joachim Camerarius, and Philipp von Hutten. We discover here another Faustus, whose origins point to certain developments in Wittenberg, the Faustus who made a pact with the devil, the Faustus of the legend. Thus, whatever we may lose in certainty about the death of Faustus is outweighed by the valuable insights into the process of legend formation and into the mysterious origins of the most important Faustus publication, the anonymous *Historia* of 1587.

1. Günther Mahal, *Faust. Die Spuren eines geheimnisvollen Lebens* (München: Scherz, 1980), pp. 323-325; Hans Henning, "Faust als historische Gestalt," *Jahrbuch der Goethe-Gesellschaft*, N.F. 21 (1959), 107-139. Georg Witkowski maintained that there is no doubt about the reliability of the chronicle. Georg Witkowski, "Der historische Faust," *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichte*, 1 (1896/7), p. 340.

Due to the publication of Wolfgang Brückner's *Volkserzählung und Reformation*, we have today a much better idea about the context in which the legend of Faustus evolved. There is a wealth of evidence here that a new image of Faustus was inspired by and drawn from numerous exempla or story collections.<sup>2</sup> These works provide information about the life of this particular diabolical magician, and they relate other stories that eventually found their way into the *Historia* of 1587. An early example of this kind of publication is Johannes Gast's *Sermones conviviales* in 1548; in the 1560s, these works proliferated to an unprecedented degree. Although the *Zimmerische Chronik* was not published in the sixteenth century, it is assumed that it was written down and completed in 1564-1566.<sup>3</sup>

The *Zimmerische Chronik* is not the first report about how Faustus died. Without stating where or when it occurred, Johannes Gast tells us that "... he (Faustus) was strangled by the devil and his body on its bier kept turning face downward even though it was five times turned on its back."<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, about fourteen years later, Johannes Manlius was able to provide a location for Faustus's death: "... in a certain village of the Duchy of Württemberg . . . In the middle of the night the house was shaken. When Faustus did not get up in the morning, and when it was now almost noon, the host with several others went into his bedroom and found him lying near the bed with his face turned toward his back. Thus the devil had killed him."<sup>5</sup> According to the *Historia* of 1587, Faustus died in Wittenberg. The *Zimmerische Chronik* contradicts Manlius as well

2. Wolfgang Brückner ed., *Volkserzählung und Reformation. Ein Handbuch zur Tradierung und Funktion von Erzählstoffen und Erzählliteratur im Protestantismus* (Berlin: Schmidt, 1974).

3. Karl Barack, ed., *Zimmerische Chronik*, published on the basis of the second edition by Paul Herrmann (Meersburg and Leipzig: Hendel, 1932), 4 vols. Hansmartin Decker-Hauff's new but incomplete edition, available now in three volumes promises improvement in reproducing the text as it was originally conceived. Since most of the passages I discuss will be in the fourth volume, which is not available, I refer consistently to Barack's edition. Cf. Hansmartin Decker-Hauf, *Die Chronik der Grafen von Zimmern* (Sigmarigen: Thorbecke, 1972-1973), 3 vols. In volume I, p. 10 Erna Huber indicates that the manuscript was completed in 1566.

4. "... a satana suffocatus, cuius cadauer in feretro facie ad terram perpetuo spectans, etsi quinques in tergum uerteretur." Philipp Mason Palmer and Robert Pattison More, *The Sources of the Faust Tradition from Simon Magus to Lessing* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1936; repr. by Octagon Books in 1966), p. 98.

5. "... in quodam pago ducatus Vuirtembergensis. . . . Media nocte domus quassata est. Mane cum Faustus non surgeret, et iam esset fere meridies, hospes adhibitis alijs, ingressus est in eius conclauē, inuenitque eum iacentem prope lectum inuersa facie, sic a diabolo interfectus." Palmer and More, p. 102.

as the *Historia* with regard to the place where Faustus died, and we need to understand why and how these and other contradictions developed.

The *Zimmerische Chronik* also sees Faustus as a practitioner of the black arts (“Schwarzkünstler”): “Derselbig ist nach vilen wunderbarlichen sachen, die er bei seinem leben geiebt, darvon auch ain besonderer tractat wer zu machen, letztlich in der herrschaft Staufen im Preisgew in großem alter vom bösen gaist umbgebracht worden” (*Zimmerische Chronik*, I, p. 577). To understand the specific problem of the new location of Staufen an awareness of the context in which the Faustus narrative appears is helpful. The *Zimmerische Chronik* treats the black arts frequently. Johann Werner von Zimmern as well as Froben Christoph von Zimmern were keenly interested in the black arts, but both realized finally the danger and evil in this practice and resolved to abandon it. The first mention of Faustus follows a narrative describing how before his death Johann Werner had most of his valuable books burned. He also made sure that his sons had ample warnings about these “arts” that had caused him great harm. With this background the introductory statement about Faustus is more easily understood: “Das aber die pratik solcher kunst nit allain gottlos, sonder zum höchsten sorglich, das ist unlaugenbar, dann sich das in der erfarnus beweist, und wissen, wie es dem weitberüempten schwarzkünstler, dem Fausto, ergangen.”<sup>6</sup> In a wider context, the references to Faustus are part of a series of anecdotes or exempla warning about the dangers of black magic. In my studies concerning the evolution of the Faustus legend in Wittenberg, I have treated the history of three such exempla from the

6. *Zimmerische Chronik*, I, p. 577. Cf. III, pp. 250-256. The passage in volume III shows how the books finally found their way into the hands of Froben Christoph von Zimmern, the author of the chronicle. These books (which, strangely enough, even include Agrippa's *De occulta philosophia*, a sixteenth century work) were taken to Cologne from Regensburg by Albert the Great. Before these books reached Froben, they were in the possession of the Archbishop Hermann von Wied. This information is of special interest because the papal legate Minucci wrote in a report of the year 1583 that Hermann von Wied associated with Faustus and Agrippa at the time that he had lost his faith. The Archbishop, having Reformation sympathies and having had some contacts with Agrippa, became the victim of attacks from Catholics. The *Zimmerische Chronik* and Minucci linked the opponent of the Catholic faith with black magic in order to discredit him, just as Luther discredited enemies like Eck by the claim that they had made pacts with the devil. I cannot accept Hans Henning's assertion that Minucci is reliable (“... die historische Genauigkeit des Minucci [gilt] als erwiesen. ...”) Henning, p. 123. Cf. Baron, *Faustus*, (Munich: Winkler, 1982), p. 80.

*Zimmerische Chronik* briefly.<sup>7</sup> The story of the *Zimmerische Chronik* about a nobleman of Almanshofen capturing a devil in glass can be found in many variations. It was published in 1562, for example, next to Manlius's biographical sketch of Faustus. We find that it was a popular story that was told about Vergil in the Middle Ages and, subsequently, about Faustus's contemporary, Paracelsus. Then, following a passage about the diabolical Faustus, the *Zimmerische Chronik* tells us about a magician who flies and falls to the ground: "So hat der doctor . . . zu Marggrafen-Baden sich dieser kunst auch verschwunden; als im aber die kunst felet und den gaist in ainem experiment wolt übertreiben und netten, ward er in die höche gefüert; da ließ er ine herab wider fallen; doch belib er bei leben" (*Zimmerische Chronik*, I, p. 577). In this reenactment of Simon Magus's attempt to fly, the *Zimmerische Chronik* is clearly under Manlius's influence. His *Collectanea* (1562) describes the situation in the following manner: "(Faustus) wolte hinauff in Himmel fliegen. Alsbald füret in der Teuffel hinweg, und hat jn dermassen zermartert unnd zerstoßen, daß er, da wider auff die Erden kam, vor todt da lag. Doch ist er das mal nicht gestorben."<sup>8</sup> The chronicle unmistakably preserves Manlius's unusual formulation of the close call with death; Simon Magus is said to have been killed under the same circumstances. Finally, there is the story of the Cologne doctor, whose violent death at the hands of the devil follows in the *Zimmerische Chronik* after the story of the doctor from "Marggrafen-Baden." But this story is very similar to the one told by Melanchthon about a Regensburg nobleman, also a practitioner of magic and also victim of a violent death caused by the devil. We find, in other words, a consistent tendency to borrow anecdotes from other sources; these anecdotes reappear in the *Zimmerische Chronik* with changes in detail and in new geographical settings.

The *Zimmerische Chronik* illustrates this characteristic pattern, furthermore, by a series of anecdotes told about a certain Ludwig von Liechtenberg, an Alsatian nobleman of the fourteenth century. These stories are, once again, borrowed from other sources, and they are very closely related to stories that are destined, eventually, to find their way into the *Historia* of 1587. This fact, like the direct link between the *Zimmerische Chronik* and

7. My essay on "The Evolution of the Faustian Devil Pact in Luther's Wittenberg" will be published in the Renaissance issue of the journal *Paideia* in 1983.

8. Johannes Manlius, *Loci communes* (Frankfurt: Feyerabend, 1574), fol. 9r-9v, based on the 1562 Latin edition of the *Collectanea*.

Manlius's *Collectanea*, has been overlooked in recent Faust scholarship.

There is, for example, the lavish banquet with expensive foods on silver plates with the French royal coat of arms. On the same day the king of France holds a banquet from which the food and dishes mysteriously disappear (*Zimmerische Chronik*, I, p. 469). Barbara Könniker discovered a related story about the Jewish magician Rabbi Adam, who prepares a similar banquet for the Emperor Maximilian II (1564-1576) in Prague, and in this instance the food and dishes are mysteriously stolen from the king of Spain.<sup>9</sup> These stories are strongly influenced by legends concerning Albertus Magnus, and it is appropriate that the *Zimmerische Chronik* also refers to his feats immediately after the banquet story. Among the stories about Albertus — available from another source — we also find the narrative that must have been the source of these magical banquet feats in the sixteenth century. When a prince once asked for oysters, Albertus knocked at a window and someone immediately handed him a full plate, and the plate itself was decorated with fleur-de-lils. Since one made inquiries, it was learned that a plate with oysters had been taken from the kitchen of the French king.<sup>10</sup> In other words, it appears that the *Zimmerische Chronik* simply substitutes the name of Ludwig von Liechtenberg for Albertus Magnus, slightly revising and expanding on the older narrative.

9. It is not known when these stories, in which the Jewish magician is seen in a positive light, originated. The versions available were written down in the seventeenth century. Barbara Könniker, "Die Geschichten von Rabbi Adam und der Fauststoff," *Frankfurter Judaistische Beiträge*, 6 (1978), pp. 91-106.

10. A related story is found in Augustin Lercheimer, *Christlich bedencken und erinnerung von Zauberey*, ed. by Carl Binz in *Augustin Lercheimer und seine Schrift wider den Hexenwahn* (Straßburg: Heitz, 1898), pp. 35-36. Cf. Robert Petsch, *Das Volksbuch vom Doctor Faust* (Hale a.S.: Niemeyer, 1911), p. 214. The story about Albertus Magnus and the meal of oysters is related by Joseph Goerres in 1807: "Wie Faust dem Kaiser Maximilian, so bewirtete Albertus Magnus im Jahre 1248 in dieser Sage den Kaiser Wilhelm um Weihnachten, wo alles von Froste starrete, in einem grünen Garten mit belaubten Bäumen, die alle blühten beim Gesang der Nachtigallen. Als ein andermal ein Fürst von ihm Austern verlangte, klopfte er ans Fenster, da reichte gleich jemand eine Schüssel voll dar, auf welcher die französischen Lilien gestochen waren. Da man deshalb nachfragte, war zur selbigen Zeit eine Schüssel mit Austern in des Königes Küche weggenommen. (Thersander.)" Jo. v. Görres, "Die teutschen Volksbücher," *Ausgewählte Werke und Briefe* (Kempten: Kösel, 1911), I, pp. 206-207. I have been unable to discover the source that Görres used. Therefore, I am not certain that this story was attributed to Albertus as early as the middle of the sixteenth century. Cf. Joachim Sighart, *Albertus Magnus* (Regensburg: Manz, 1857), pp. 67-83.

In the *Historia* the magical summoning of exotic foods appears in a number of passages; for example, in chapter 46, where Faustus declares to his guests in Wittenberg: "Nun wisset jr, daß in vieler Potentaten Höfen die Faßnacht mit köstlichen Speisen und Geträncken gehalten wirdt, dessen solt jhr auch theilhafttig werden. . . ." <sup>11</sup>

It is difficult to believe that the author of the chronicle made this radical adaptation unconsciously. He shows, after all, that he had access to texts containing stories about Albertus Magnus (*Zimmerische Chronik*, I, pp. 469-470). This tendency to transfer stories from one magician to another is a common phenomenon in the sixteenth century; the evolution of the Faustus legend provides numerous examples. The question remains: Why did this occur? Why did the author of the chronicle attach stories that were told about Albertus Magnus to Ludwig von Liechtenberg? A partial explanation may be possible with a reference to the witchcraft persecutions. The witch trials of the sixteenth century convinced many people that there were certain consistent elements in the conditions, rewards, and punishment of diabolical magic. This awareness guided the work of lawyers and judges. Being exposed to the same influences, the author of the chronicle could have been convinced that in any particular instance of diabolical magic one could reasonably expect the same kind of behavior or feats as in previously recorded instances.

The *Zimmerische Chronik* relates that on another occasion Ludwig von Liechtenberg reluctantly sells his beautiful horses to a horse trader, whom he then punishes by having the horses turn into straw while crossing a stream. In the *Historia* a close parallel story can be found in chapter 39: "D. Faustus betruget einen Roßtäuscher." There is also the more distantly related chapter 43, in which the pigs sold by Faustus turn into straw as they are driven into water. This transformation of animals into straw was a popular idea that the *Zimmerische Chronik* certainly borrowed from a contemporary source; such a story can be documented in a Prague source as early as 1552.<sup>12</sup>

11. Hans Henning, ed., *Historia von D. Johann Fausten* (Halle a. S.: Sprache und Literatur, 1963), p. 102.

12. Ernst W. Kraus, "Faustiana aus Böhmen," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Literaturgeschichte*, 12 (1898), 61-62. Martinus Montanus tells the story concerning geese instead of horses; significantly, the tricked person is a Jew, who, being angry at the magician who tricked him, tugs at the magician's leg, which then ends up in his hands and frightens him. This story combines two anecdotes that appear separately in the *Zimmerische Chronik* but which are found together again in chapter 39 of the

Ludwig von Liechtenberg, like Faustus, has the unpleasant experience of being in a certain inn and being annoyed by a group of noisy peasants. Ludwig addresses one of the peasants and asks him to help him pull off his boots; when he consents, he succeeds in pulling off an entire leg. Thus, the noisy peasants are driven away with fright (*Zimmerische Chronik*, I, p. 474). The *Zimmerische Chronik* combines elements that appear separately in the *Historia*: In chapter 39 the angry horse trader tugs at the leg of the sleeping Faustus and succeeds in pulling it out in its entirety and in chapter 42, entitled "Ein Abentheuer mit vollen Bauern," we find the noisy peasants whom the magician is resolved to silence. The magical trick that causes the apparent loss of a leg is also found in a less closely related form in chapter 38, entitled "Wie D. Faustus Gelt von einem Jüden entlehnet, und demselbigen seinen Fuß zu Pfand geben, den er jhm selbst, in deß Jüden beyseyn, abgesäget." The earlier history of at least one of these stories leads, once again, back to Wittenberg. In Luther's table conversation of July 1537, in which we find one of the two known references the Reformer makes to Faustus, there are stories exemplifying diabolical magic. One of these appears to be the catalyst responsible for later developments: "Dergleichen ließ ihm ein Schuldner ein Bein von einem Jüden ausreißen, daß der Jude davon lief, und er ihn nicht bezahlen durfte, etc." It is significant that as early as 1537 we encounter a group of exempla, which despite variations, persist and are recognizable in works as different in character as the *Zimmerische Chronik* and the *Historia* of 1587. At least one story about Rabbi Adam undoubtedly originated under the influence radiating from Wittenberg: When the Jewish magician encourages the servant of

*Historia*. The *Zimmerische Chronik* and the *Historia* agree on the figure of the horse trader. Montanus's story presumably appeared in the first edition of his *Schwänkbücher* in 1557. Some uncertainty about this lingers, however, because no copy of this edition has survived. The earliest dated edition is that of 1565. Johannes Bolte ed., *Martinus Montanus. Schwänkbücher (1557-1566)*, in: *Bibliothek des literarischen Vereins in Stuttgart* (Tübingen, 1899; repr. in 1972 by Olms), vol. 217, pp. 29-30 and 566. Finally, in his *Promptuarium exemplorum* Hondorff presents the story of the horse trader and the pulled-out leg very much as does the *Historia* in chapter 39. But Hondorff contends that a magician in Naumburg confessed to these tricks of diabolical magic, for which he was hanged. Stories such as that of the horse trader were evidently taken very seriously and could be elicited in trials for magic with the aid of torture. Petsch, pp. 203-204. Karl Goedeke recognized the relevance of the Liechtenberg stories to the Faust topic. Erich Schmidt, "Faust and Luther," *Akademie der Wissenschaften in Berlin. Sitzungsberichte. Philos.-hist. Kl.*, 25 (1896), p. 589. Barack also makes the link between Liechtenberg and Faust. *Zimmerische Chronik*, p. 469.

the emperor at the court in Vienna to pull off his boot, the latter ends up with the magician's leg.<sup>13</sup>

The experience of tracing the colorful and everchanging history of any one of these anecdotes teaches that it is risky to draw firm conclusions about relationships, influence, and, least of all, about historical content. For example, despite the numerous parallels, it would be wrong to conclude that there was a direct line of influence between the unpublished *Zimmerische Chronik* and the *Historia*. Countless anecdotes relating to Faustus circulated in printed books, manuscripts, and by word of mouth. We can no longer trace every step in the complicated process that produced the *Historia*. But the *Zimmerische Chronik* appears important as a relatively early documentation for the convergence of numerous stories about magic in the proximity of narratives about the diabolical activities of Faustus. I have shown elsewhere that such proximity tended to encourage reciprocal influence, so that in the process of being written down the stories borrowed and acquired features from each other.<sup>14</sup> Faustus proved to be a powerful magnet that drew into its orbit stories involving magic.

The *Zimmerische Chronik* must not be ignored in the series of events in the evolution of the Faustus legend. In this context, it antedates the 1566 publication of Luther's table talks. Significantly, it also precedes the manuscript of Rosshirt's Nuremberg Faustus stories (written down about 1575); here, together with Luther's table talks, we encounter a familiar cycle of stories in which the actor is not Ludwig von Liechtenberg but Faustus himself (e.g., the banquet at the court of England; tearing Faustus's leg out; swine turning into straw as they are driven into water). On the other hand, the *Zimmerische Chronik* could not entirely have escaped the influence of earlier Lutheran publications like those of Gast and Manlius.

Count Froben Christoph, considered today to be the author of the *Zimmerische Chronik*, was hostile to the Reformation movement and understandably did not admit having used Protestant sources. The strong religious fervor in those sources is less evident here; some of the stories, especially the ones about

13. Luther's conversation is recorded by Antonius Lauterbach. Martin Luther, *Werke. Tischreden* (Weimar: Böhlau, 1912-1921), conversation no. 3601. The first published edition of the table conversations in 1566 omitted in this context the reference to Faustus. The fact that the trick with the leg reappeared again and was identified with Faustus indicates that the influence emanating from Luther was powerful.

14. See footnote 8 above. Cf. Wilhelm Meyer, "Nürnberger Faustgeschichten," *Akademie der Wissenschaft in München. Abhandlungen*, 20 (1897), pp. 325-402.



Ludwig von Liechtenberg, appear to be designed solely to entertain rather than to instruct. But the *Zimmerische Chronik* is serious about the dangers of magic. In writing about black magic in general and Faustus's death in particular, the chronicle faithfully adheres to the fanatical condemnation Luther and his followers favored.

The *Zimmerische Chronik* relates a story about Faustus playing tricks on the monks at Lûxhaim (Luxeuil) in the Vosges mountains; Johannes Gast tells a similar story without giving the location of the monastery. It is doubtful that the *Zimmerische Chronik*, written more than fifteen years after Gast's *Sermones conviviales* had access to accurate information about the location of a monastery that Faustus perhaps never visited in the first place. The details provided in this case may reflect simply more effective storytelling rather than accurate historical information. At any rate, the influence of the Wittenberg image of Faustus, clearly evident in the publications of Gast and Manlius, survives in the *Zimmerische Chronik* despite the difference in religious orientation.<sup>15</sup>

In general, we discover that the *Zimmerische Chronik* often changes and rearranges the details of the stories it borrows from other sources, and it does not hesitate to assign new names and locations. The new names and locations created a new context with which the author of the chronicle felt familiar and comfortable.<sup>16</sup>

Does the reference to Staufen as the place of Faustus's death represent an exception to the characteristic pattern of change? Is the name Staufen the key to the historical puzzle for which the earliest sources provide no clues? Recent efforts to produce a

15. Mahal, pp. 209-210 and Henning, "Faust als historische Gestalt," p. 130. Cf. Paul Burckhard, "Die schriftstellerische Tätigkeit des Johannes Gast," *Basler Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Altertumskunds*, 42 (1942), p. 190. The similarity of the stories about Faustus's visit to a monastery in reports by Gast and the *Zimmerische Chronik* has been used to prove the historical reliability of both works. There is no proof that Faustus was in Lûxhaim. Gast does not mention the name of Lûxheim at all; there is no evidence that Musculus, formerly at Lûxhaim and an acquaintance of Gast, ever spoke to Gast about Faustus! Even if he had, we have no guarantee that the information was not distorted in some way. Moreover, Gast's report is unreliable in a historical sense; he tells a story about the unusual kinds of birds he gave the cook in Basel, reminiscent of the story we have just seen attributed to Albertus Magnus. See footnote 10.

16. The *Zimmerische Chronik* sees Faustus as a learned magician, and is the first source that speaks of his books. It should be noted, however, that the *Zimmerische Chronik* associates the practice of magic with excessive reading of books. This becomes clear in the hostile remarks about the books of Johann Werner and Froben Christoph. *Zimmerische Chronik*, I, p. 577 and III, pp. 251-256.

complete biography of the historical Faustus have favored the *Zimmerische Chronik* as a serious historical source. The works of Gast and Manlius have been beneficiaries as well. Hans Henning and Günther Mahal, prolific writers about the Faust topic today, find that Manlius is reliable as far as the birth of Faustus in Kundling (=Knittlingen?) is concerned; they discard this source, however, as inaccurate reporting about the death of Faustus, in favor of the *Zimmerische Chronik*.<sup>17</sup>

The cause of Faustus scholarship would be far better served if the efforts to salvage the exempla collections as a source for the biography of the historical Faustus were completely abandoned. The Faustus depicted in the geographical settings of the exempla is certainly not the same Faustus who died two or three decades before. The Faustus of the exempla is the magician of the legend, born of the fear of magic and strangled by the devil who was thought to make his magic tricks possible. Ironically, today there are many who consider it an honor to be closely associated with the man whom the sixteenth century condemned and persecuted.

The process of transmission can cause the irretrievable loss of historical detail. The willingness to accept this makes it possible to focus on the concerns that really mattered to those who told these stories: the dangers of diabolical magic. In this sense, there was no contradiction from one story to the next. Hence, while the location of Faustus's death changes (Württemberg — Staufen — Wittenberg), the manner of his death does not. This consensus about the Faustus whose image developed first in Wittenberg suggests the deeper significance of his treatment in the *Zimmerische Chronik*: the origins of the Faustus legend in the context of the attempts to warn against and to eradicate the diabolical magic Faustus was thought to stand for.

17. Henning, "Faust als historische Gestalt," pp. 131-132; Mahal, pp. 328-329. Barack makes the following observation about the tendency of the *Zimmerische Chronik* to assign new settings for the stories from other sources: "Oft begegnet man auch Sagen, die schon in älteren Quellen stehen, in der Chronik aber lokalisiert, in die Zeit und die Nachbarschaft des Chronisten versetzt sind." *Zimmerische Chronik*, IV, p. 323. On the basis of the stories we have discussed, the new names and locations are not necessarily in the immediate vicinity of the author.