THE WILD MAN, CHARLEMAGNE AND THE GERMAN BODY
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A very strange image of Charlemagne appears in the frontispiece of the Vita et Gesta Karoli Magni, the first printed edition of Charlemagne’s biography, published in 1521 in Cologne by Johann Soter (plate 1). Shown next to Charles V, Charlemagne represents the oldest ancestor of the Holy Roman Emperors, unifier of the Latin and Germanic nations. Despite these impressive credentials, he is not dressed in attire appropriate either to his office or to a dignified genealogy of the German peoples. Here Charlemagne appears in anachronistic garments, his leggings gathered loosely about his waist and ankles, and on his head a reed-like crown so unlike the jewel-encrusted ones he was rumoured to have worn. With his long hair, beard and loose tunic draping his outsized frame, Charlemagne represents an inventory of barbaric attributes that portray a figment of European lore, the wild man.

This essay explores the iconography that defined this primitivism in early German printed materials and then examines the underpinnings of its use in imperial imagery. The Charlemagne illustrator’s use of a ‘wild man’ to establish a connection with Charles V appears to the modern viewer a highly unorthodox and peculiar strategy. In the visual tradition, the wild man typically represented the rejection of all the effects of civilized man and embodied his alter ego. Here, Charlemagne shares characteristics of the German wilde Mann, a folkloric creature who lurked in the margins of civilized society and in the iconographic margins of late medieval art. While early modern audiences understood the wild man as an undomesticated, if decorative, contemporary of the late medieval European, here, personified as Charlemagne, he represents a stage in the evolution of the contemporary German. This essay argues that the rediscovery in Germany c. 1473 of Tacitus’s first-century Germania transformed the wild man into the ur-German described in the ancient Latin text and gave him a national identity.

This essay first examines the wild man as the subject of a vernacular iconographic tradition that featured him in roles ranging from an ornamental protector of coats of arms to a civic symbol on the Augsburg town hall. It then explores the conflation of this wild man with Tacitus’s promotion of the early German as a wild man. Tacitus excavated the wild man from his liminal presence in folkloric tales and transformed him into the subject of a seminal ethnographic
work. In German humanist circles of the early sixteenth century, self-examination sparked by Tacitus’s ethnography of the German peoples determined the methodological practice by which primitive peoples were investigated. Humanists spearheaded and organized the effort of examining the German past as a national one and did not shy away from the ambivalence that interpreting themselves through Tacitus entailed.

WILD MAN IN THE FOLKLORIC TRADITION
The wild man was a conceptual entity that thrived during the medieval period in the German-speaking territories. His widespread presence in Germany, even today in carnival incarnations and in restaurant advertisements promising authentic provincial cuisine, stems from his participation in several traditions. Folkloric representations of the wild man mark the intersection of a Christian tradition of hermit saints with the mythological Hercules. Christian wild men, such as the Egyptian anchorite Onuphrius, were rehabilitated by Bavarian artists and Alsatian humanists. The attention Onuphrius received in works like Sebastian Brant’s broadsheet In praise of Onuphrius and other Hermits in 1494 indicates the particular vogue enjoyed by hermit saints in humanist Germany. Brant’s broadsheet praised the anchorite saints for their retreat from worldliness and foreshadowed future polemical works in which other forest dwellers lamented the questionable progress made by civilization.

The wild man’s roots were tenaciously embedded in the Alpine regions of Germany and Switzerland. The raw and rugged mountainous habitat gave him a robust character and provided several attributes for his own survival. An indigenous denizen of the Alps, the wild man enacted his role as an appendage of nature by wielding the tree trunk he tore from the ground, his sole defence against the savage beasts. Despite his prodigious physical strength, heavy armaments and at times menacing scowl, unprovoked he posed no threat to mankind but watchfully patrolled the borders of his world.

The wild man’s graphic life reinforced the metaphor of the periphery he was believed to inhabit. He thrived in manuscript marginalia, served as an ornamental finial for vessels, and as a decorative functionary in book bindings and tapestries. He roamed quietly and slumbered peacefully in the Hercynian forest. Sometimes the heraldic wild man was invoked to lend his legitimacy to more civic genealogical constructions, as he does on a stone relief on the Augsburg Rathaus (plate 2). Made for the town hall c. 1450, this relief features two wild men heraldically supporting the city’s emblem, the Pyr, a modified pine cone on a pedestal. Above the wild men, angels unfurl a banderole that reads ‘Christi tibi gloria in Augusta Retia, Urbe vere Regia.’ This was a carefully constructed tribute to Augsburg’s Roman heritage: the wild man here literally supports local claims to Roman genealogy by propping up a standard bearing the Roman symbol of the Pyr. By way of the Pyr, the provenance to which the Rathaus relief alluded was a Roman one.

Archeological finds from Roman Augsburg excavated in this period substantiated claims for the free imperial status of the city. Examples of the Pyr excavated in Augsburg in the 1460s inspired rapidly proliferating emblems that adorned the city gates, the armoury and other public buildings. Believed to have marked legal jurisdictions in Roman times, the Pyr’s power to convey sovereignty was revived in
the second half of the fifteenth century when it was used by local chroniclers to argue for Augsburg’s status as a Reichsstadt, or imperial free city of Roman origin. The Pyr’s popularity in late medieval chronicles supported the contested independence of the city that answered directly to the Emperor, rather than to a local bishop or prince. According to the German genealogy proposed by this relief, the late medieval view championed the Roman past, to which the Augusta Retia of the inscription was an unmistakable reference, and on which the Holy Roman heritage depended.

Roman ancestry was the direct grant of kinship that legitimated Augsburg’s sovereign status in the Holy Roman Empire as a free imperial city. The Pyr concretized a racial genealogy within a framework of an historical awareness of self. On the relief, the wild men, as spatial and conceptual analogues to Rome, protect the civilized centre. Two distinct traditions are juxtaposed: one, a classical symbol alluding to the city’s Roman past, and the other, a folkloric strain fiercely guarding it. In the late 1470s Augsburg’s uncontested Roman heritage, so carefully constructed by the relief, was complicated by the discovery of an ancient treatise in which an older Germanic past eclipsed the Roman one. Among humanists, Tacitus’s recently rediscovered Germania promoted a new historical consciousness in which Germanic ancestry more closely resembled the wild men supporting the shield in the Augsburg relief than the Roman provenance they advertised. Long upstaged by his Roman heritage, the wild man would soon emerge from the margins and assume a central role.
TACITUS AND THE NATIONALIZATION OF THE WILD MAN
The discovery of Tacitus’s *Germania* linked humanist exploration of the past in the early decades of the sixteenth century to a search for the origins of the Germans themselves. The humanists’ embrace of Tacitus’s work forced a reconsideration of the truth of a genealogy in which Germans were imagined as reincarnated Romans, and put such local legends into historical perspective. In his centralized and methodological approach to the study of primitive peoples, Tacitus offered the German humanists a tactical strategy. Rather than viewing Tacitus’s ambivalent portrait of the early Germans as threatening to their modern identity, they promoted it as ethnography. According to the *Germania*, the folkloric wild man was the historical image of the *ur*-German. With the evidence supplied by Tacitus, humanists Conrad Celtis and Ulrich von Hutten nationalized the conceptual wild man and turned him into a German citizen nonpareil.

Although the state of German antiquity was the starting point for most medieval German chronicles, local chronicles written before the rediscovery of Tacitus provided for the Germans remote myths of origin and legendary ancestors. According to these, Germany was founded by mythical heroes who took root there after migrating from far-flung territories. Legends like the *Alexander Romance* of Pseudo-Callisthenes and Guido of Columna’s *Book of Troy* traced German history to the diaspora of the Trojan heroes and provided source material for early German folk chronicles. The *Reimchronik* (1437–1442), a history in verse of the founding of Augsburg, traced the path of the Trojan heroes northwards along the Rhine, as they picked up women in Cologne, founded the city of Trier with their new brides, and gave rise to a race of Germani.

According to the *Reimchronik*, one secessionist group of Germani, the Suebi, settled the area of present-day Augsburg. In 9 CE Augustus sent his legions under the command of the praetor Quintilius Varus, accompanied by two Macedonian legions, to conquer this barbarous tribe. The Suebi, under the Cheruscan chief-tain Hermann (literally, in German, ‘man of the army’, known as Arminius in Latin), proved more mettlesome than both the Romans and the Macedonians. The heroes of the *Varusschlacht*, as the battle became known, overwhelmed three Roman legions and massacred the Macedonians, reserving the grimmest end for the Macedonian king, whom they butchered ‘like a cow’. The *Reimchronik* portrayed Augustus despairing in an unseemly rant upon hearing the news, banging his head, tearing at his garments, and pleading with Varus to restore his lost legions to him.

Sigismund Meisterlein’s *Chronographia Augustensium* of c. 1456, contested this Trojan origin for Augsburg, establishing in its place an older, but equally foreign, originary myth. Meisterlein traced the true provenance of the Germans to a period before the destruction of Troy and one that predated the founding of Rome by more than five hundred years. He identified the Amazons, a race of female warriors from the Caucasus, along with the Swabi and Vindeliker, as the original indigenous peoples of Bavaria. Although Meisterlein’s sources were predominantly Roman (Suetonius, Vegetius), he established an origin too far beyond their purview for their authority to contest it. Meisterlein manufactured folk etymologies in order to situate the celebrated *Varusschlacht* in Augsburg: Augustus’s lost legions, *perdita legiones*, were commemorated in the name of the river ‘Perlach’, and the site of the battle, the location of which was under dispute, was cemented.
to Augsburg by situating it beneath the Rathaus. Hermann emerged from this battle as the true progenitor of the German peoples – his group formed the first united resistance against the Roman Empire. The tightest definition of Germanic identity to date was, thus, a collective of Amazon-born ‘wild men’ united in their ambition against Rome.

Tacitus’s first-century Germania was the first historical narrative centred on German soil. This first-century Roman ethnographic study of the Germani made a systematic record of their civic institutions and customs. The text was based on a series of rhetorical inversions that posited Rome as the point of departure, a methodology that became known as interpretatio romana. Tacitus contrasts the Germanic tribes with the civilized centre of Rome, analysing the differences in their lifestyles by comparing their living spaces, such as the German field dwellings versus the urban culture of Rome; and their modes of worship, such as the absence of temples and anthropomorphic deities in Germany as opposed to their profusion in Rome. Tacitus’s comparison of techniques of warfare also breaks down into opposed dualities, as do practices more difficult to quantify, such as eating and hygiene. The text of the Germania was lost throughout the Middle Ages, rediscovered by the persistent manuscript hunter Poggio Bracciolini in a monastery in Fulda in 1420, but did not really come to light until its arrival in Rome in 1455, when Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, soon to become Pope Pius II, epitomized it. After its mid-fifteenth-century rediscovery, it would become the subject of patriotic and nationalistic encomium for the next half-century.

Tacitus’s Germania entered the consciousness of German humanists somewhat unofficially and unexpectedly in the text of Aeneas’s rebuke of Martin Mayer, the Chancellor of Mainz, in August 1457. Mayer’s vituperative resistance to papal taxation prompted this attack on the German character, whose worst excesses, according to Aeneas, were exposed by Tacitus and whose subsequent improvements owed a substantial debt to Christianity:

Tacitus . . . writes even more ferocious things about Germany. Indeed, the life of your ancestors in that time was scarcely different from that of beasts. Indeed, most of them were shepherds, inhabitants of forests and groves . . . in this manner of living, there was no knowledge of letters, no discipline of laws, no study of the fine arts. Even the religion was stupid and barbarous, fosterer of idols and, in fact, tottering with illusions of demons – so that it ought not to be doubted that human enemies were often sacrificed among them (Germania IX) to obtain favorable omens. Robberies were praised. Everything was foul; everything was abominable, harsh, barbarous, and to use the proper words, savage and brutal.

A transcript of this letter to Mayer was published in Leipzig in 1496 as Aeneas’s De ritu, situ, moribus et condicione Germaniae descriptio. It is no small irony that so obviously Italocentric a work should become the source book for numerous sixteenth-century cosmographers of Germany. The second part of Aeneas’s three-part moral history, however, was a glowing review of modern Germany, albeit a Germany that owed its prosperity to the favour of the Church. Chorography and geography became something like a national pastime among sixteenth-century German humanists whose cosmographies were among the most universal and encyclopedic. Humanists in Germany drew on Aeneas, ergo Tacitus, for method, as well as form and content. Although Aeneas’s negative
characterizations painted an unflattering portrait of the ur-Germans, what the cosmographers who paraphrased his *Germaniae descriptio* relied on most was the methodology he introduced.28

Aeneas’s moral history linked the traditional coupling of history and geography to the origins and customs of peoples. He dispensed with mythological progenitors like Jove and Saturn, as well as legendary ones such as Romulus or Alexander the Great, and rewrote the prehistory of the Germans on the authority of Caesar and Tacitus.29 Implementing an historical method inherited from Strabo, Aeneas addressed matters such as types of government, laws and the behaviour of individuals and related them to behaviour exhibited by groups. By inspecting these areas, he linked the old world to the present time and thus developed the first local picture of Germany as a unified concept. Until that time, national identity within Germany had been defined by either pan-Christian commonality that linked countrymen as subjects of a Holy Roman Empire or a tight local ‘Heimatsinn’ which bound loyalties to a particular city.30 With what began as a thinly veiled insult, Aeneas, in the specificity of his descriptions, unwittingly created the first instance of definitive German national consciousness on record.

By the time the *editio princeps* of Tacitus’s *Germania* actually emerged from Vindelinus de Spira’s Venetian press in 1470, with a Nuremberg edition following from Frederick Creussner’s press in 1473, the *Germania* had already been widely cited in Germany to substantiate claims that vices were imported there from Italy.31 Anti-papist humanist discourse proved a fertile venue for the reception of Tacitus. Humanists deployed Tacitus to defend claims that Germany’s corruption postdated Roman (read papal) contact and the *Germania* became grist for the rhetorical mill of German nation building.

The charges levelled by Conrad Celtis, Germany’s first national poet laureate, against Rome were numerous but nicely distilled in an epigram of 1485, written from the point of view of the corpse of a Roman girl recently discovered on the Via Appia:

A thousand years I have lain immured beneath this stone; now, released from the grave I will give the Romans this message: I see no citizens now as the Romans were, outstanding in justice/ and sense of duty, but sad at heart I look upon ruins only, now but a memorial to the men of the past. And if after another hundred years I see you again, next to nothing I think will be left of the glory/that was Rome.32

Celtis was among the first to praise and widely publicize the new account of the Germans, initially as a sideline to his reproach of Rome. Appointed to the faculty of rhetoric at the University of Ingolstadt in 1492, Celtis delivered his renowned *Oratorio* which exhorted German scholars to revive classical rhetoric, philosophy, historical and geographical studies in order to reclaim their reputation for posterity.33 The Germans’ reputation had suffered for many centuries at the hands of Italians who not only dismissed them as barbarians, but also harboured the precise textual sources that would have presented a defence to this claim.34

The *Germania* also came to the aid of rhetorical nation building; humanists tried to buttress a crumbling Germany by evoking the mettle of the ancient Germans. Celtis plundered Tacitus to support then-archduke Maximilian’s
campaign to quell peoples whose shaky German kinship was compromising their allegiance to the empire. He rallied around the idea of an incipient nation of wild men: ‘Assume, O men of Germany, that ancient spirit of yours, with which you so often confounded and terrified the Romans, and turn your eyes to the frontiers of Germany, collect together her torn and broken territories.’

Celtis attributed the foreign land grabs to fraying allegiances at the borders and characterized the dissolution as a threat to national security:

Let us be ashamed to have placed upon our nation the yoke of slavery, and to be paying tributes and taxes to foreign and barbarian kings. O free and powerful people, O noble and valiant race, plainly worthy of the Roman Empire, our famous harbor is held by the Pole and the gateway of our ocean by the Dane! In the east also powerful peoples live in slavery, the Bohemians, the Moravians, the Slovaks and the Silesians, who all live as it were separated from the body of our Germany.

After Maximilian became emperor in 1493, Celtis continued patriotically to shape this ‘body of our Germany’, in his cosmographic work. Humanist cosmography, though encyclopedic in scope and scientific in nature, had rhetorical foundations. Celtis planned an ambitious work that he intended to dedicate to Maximilian: *Germania illustrata*, a four-volume cosmography of Germany incorporating chronological and topographic description. Celtis would divide Germany into four quadrants and then describe the customs, languages, religion and disposition of the German tribes. The *Germania illustrata* was to include descriptions of the cities and reports of Maximilian’s wars, solicited from civic leaders and other humanists throughout the land.

Still waiting at the close of the century for recensions of primary sources and straggling submissions of regional descriptions, Celtis shelved the project. Instead, Celtis produced in 1500 the *Germania generalis*, a work that abridges his intention for the *Illustrata*: a verse description of the creation of the world and the place of a fertile and harmonious Germany in it. As research for these projects, Celtis published two editions of Tacitus and other important recently rediscovered German works, like those of the tenth-century nun Hrosvitha von Gandersheim, repairing the gap left by their absence in the curriculum of Germanic literature. These works, he hoped, would tacitly make the case for German cultural autonomy.

Hoping to inaugurate a new golden age, Celtis endeavoured to revive latent Tacitean qualities in contemporary Germans, seeking to temper these traits with philosophy and the study of classical literature. In lectures he delivered at the University of Vienna in 1501, he championed the *ur-German* as a field- and wood-dweller, dressed only in animal skins, unspoiled by civilization and in search of simple joys. Celtis celebrated him for his warrior-like strength, chivalry, hospitality and robust nature. In addition to content provided by Tacitus, Celtis also utilized the *Germania* as a textual model for relaying information about geographic detail, customs, language, conduct and even the contours of the German body. Of the Greeks’ and Romans’ remarkable accuracy in interpreting the Germans, Celtis says ‘and though it seems rough and wild, I imagine, in comparison with their own climate, they have expressed our customs, our emotional makeup, and our spirits as graphically as a painter might delineate our
bodies,’ suggestively alluding to the unique potential of visual testimony to convey racial difference.42

Celtis borrowed the techniques of geographic and ethnographic investigation from Tacitus and made consideration of these a methodological mainstay of his other works. Celtis’s tendency to elide closely observed topography with ethnography produced some interesting, if unorthodox, results. His variation on Ovid’s Amores (1502) was a bit of geographic erotica that paid tribute to his four lovers, each a saftig lady who embodied one of the four German regions.43 He inherited from Ptolemy a belief that climatic influences produced ethnic differences and was therefore especially interested in ethnographies of the various climatic zones.44 The twin pursuits of shoring up topography and ethnography along national boundaries produced new criteria for determining German-ness. It turned the search for ancestors into a search for a German body located in a German landscape.

INDIGENOUS ANCESTRY: NATIONALIZING HERCULES
Celtis had already tapped Tacitus as the source of German autochthony, and with it, argued for the pure-bloodedness of the German body.45 Tacitus not only helped to outline that body, but also provided a specific one: Hercules, an ancestor whose historical traces were avidly pursued by Renaissance historians. Humanists not only scanned texts for citations of Hercules as an avatar of the Germans, but also sought archeological evidence of his cult in field and forest.46 In his Odes, Celtis told where old cultic sites, now Christianized by the worship of new saints, were located: a shrine to ‘Hercules Germanicus’ had been traced to Herglesholz, a place near Regensburg on the Danube, not far from the ‘old oak trees (Obern und Nidern Altaich) . . . where our forefathers worshipped’.47 In Celtis’s genealogy, Druids formed the source from which the culture of Greece and Asia issued, and Germans were merely Druids driven out of Gaul in the reign of Tiberius. Tacitus identified the rousing battle cry of the ancient Germans as an result of Hercules’s presence there.48 Celtis entreated contemporary Germans to ‘return to the ferocity of their predecessors who had caused the world to tremble’.49

The folklorist Heinrich Bebel (1472–1518) likewise championed the autochthonic origins of the Germans in his essay ‘Quod Germani sunt indigenae’ and substantiated Hercules’s nationality with an archeological find.50 Bebel identified a figure excavated on the island Reichenau, the Idolum Alemannum aureum, as an idol of Hercules. With this material evidence in hand, he endorsed the accuracy of the accounts of Tacitus and Berosus that argued for the worship of Hercules in Germany.51 Under Hercules, the fierce Suebi broadened their territories, subduing notably Prussia, Britain and Spain.52 Here, the German sources intersected with classical ones that supported a Spanish sojourn for Hercules.53 In the course of his labours, Hercules wandered prodigiously, and his commentators were as likely to find him at home, with his Suebi, as abroad.54

With Hercules’s German itinerary secured, Emperor Maximilian, the beneficiary of this humanist research, could easily claim him as an ancestor. Capitalizing on the cachet of the legendary Hercules as the original wild man, Maximilian fashioned a tendentious and fairytale pedigree for himself in a woodcut c. 1496, Maximilian as Hercules Germanicus (plate 3), probably produced under the guidance of Conrad Celtis, who had directed the Herculean rhetoric of
Maximilian since 1492. In this emblematic image Maximilian announces his own role as vanquisher by adopting the attributes of Hercules’s labours and the symbols of his victories. Clad in the lion’s pelt, Hercules wears the popular crown, and carries a club in one hand, a bow in the other. Modelling the wild man’s role in heraldry, Maximilian both claims his legendary Herculean ancestry by proping up a shield emblazoned with the hydra of Lerna in the upper part of the illustration, and preserves his Hapsburg lineage with the imperial eagle in the


Maximilian since 1492. In this emblematic image Maximilian announces his own role as vanquisher by adopting the attributes of Hercules’s labours and the symbols of his victories. Clad in the lion’s pelt, Hercules wears the popular crown, and carries a club in one hand, a bow in the other. Modelling the wild man’s role in heraldry, Maximilian both claims his legendary Herculean ancestry by proping up a shield emblazoned with the hydra of Lerna in the upper part of the illustration, and preserves his Hapsburg lineage with the imperial eagle in the
shield below. This particular piece of propaganda might have been deployed in support of his campaign against the French king Charles VIII, whose troops had entered Rome and Naples in 1494. Maximilian spearheaded this effort in response to Pope Alexander VI’s call for help to drive the French out of Italy; this woodcut promotes Maximilian as Hercules Germanicus, distinct from Hercules Gallicus.56

Maximilian tended aggressively to his Herculean pedigree, commissioning numerous poets laureate – Heinrich Bebel, Ulrich von Hutten, in addition to Conrad Celtis – to cement and allegorize the bonds of their kinship.57 A drama of 1497 by court historian Joseph Grünpeck portrayed Maximilian in the role of Hercules at the crossroads.58 In a dedicatory inscription to Maximilian in a tract on Cicero, Celtis calls the emperor ‘alter Hercules’, a kinship Celtis revived in his panegyric drama of 1501, Ludus Diane.59 With additional support provided by Tacitus, Maximilian elevated this demigod and virile barbarian to an acceptable template for any respectable German emperor.60

Conrad Celtis and Ulrich von Hutten broke the ground for this type of allusion; with textual justification, they turned the legendary Hercules into the historical Hercules Germanicus. This German Hercules was cloaked in a mythological mantle voluminous enough also to enclose the historical person of the other local hero, Arminius, or Hermann, the Cheruscan chieftain who decimated the Roman legions in the Varusschlacht.61 Arminius was essentially a Hercules without the allegorical trappings.

Arminius became the subject of a famous dialogue by Ulrich von Hutten, a minor knight and once-itinerant poet newly inducted into humanist ranks.62 Von Hutten was crowned with the poet’s laurel in 1517 for Germanic encomium in general, but won his reputation and the attention of the Emperor from a series of earlier poems in which he alternately entreated Maximilian to true greatness and defended him when he fell short of it, cribbing mainly from Tacitus for his rhetoric. In Ad Caesarem Maximilianum… epigrammata of 1513, a collection of epigrams dedicated to the Emperor, von Hutten encouraged him to develop his own native strength in his skirmishes with foreigners, even cautioning him not to rest too heavily on the fame of the legendary heroes of German antiquity, as was his wont.63 It is likely that von Hutten had to retract these words a few years later, having found inspiration in one such hero for the work that made his career, the Arminius dialogue, published shortly after Maximilian’s death in 1519, and probably written to rally support for Charles v. In this dialogue, modelled on Lucian’s Dialogi mortuorum, Arminius takes part in a Totengespräch with Minos, to whom he introduces Tacitus and praises him as an esteemed witness.64 Von Hutten had fashioned Arminius from the same cloth as Hercules, and associated him retrospectively with Charles v, in support of whose campaign the dialogue was written.65

The two heroes Arminius and Hercules fuse in the persona of Hercules Germanicus.66 In 1519, the same year that von Hutten’s Arminius was written, the Alsatian humanist Hieronymus Gebwiler, in the patriotic work Libertas Germaniae, helped to secure Hercules’s German provenance by making him a direct descendant of Tuisco, the first king of the Teutons, races descended from a union of Trojan heroes and Teutonic women.67 Hercules’s feats in the pagan world did not preclude him from biblical lineages like those created by pseudo-Berosus.68 Berosus, a Chaldean priest who wrote in Greek, was brought to light in the
Renaissance by the scholar and forger Annius of Viterbo in his *Commentaries on Various Authors Discussing Antiquities* (1498). Annius uses Berosus’s text to displace the primacy of Greek sources in the transmission of culture in favour of those from the biblical Orient, Egypt and Near East. Conflating Berosus with Tacitus, Annius’s text featured Hercules Germanicus as the primogenitor of the Bavarians who himself descended from Tuiscon (Teutsch), a son born to Noah after the Flood. The name of this ancestor, ‘Teutsch’, provided the etymological basis for *Deutsch*, or German. Etymological cognates suggested by *Teutsch* and *Tuisco* gave rise to a cottage industry of philological speculation among humanists during this period and formed the bridge between both biblical and mythological foundations and their modern incarnations.

**NATIONALIZING CHARLEMAGNE**

On the frontispiece of the 1521 edition of Einhard’s *Vita et Gesta Karoli Magni* with which I began, next to a very tailored Charles V, Charlemagne cuts a powerful yet primitive silhouette familiar from contemporary depictions of barbarous ancestors (plate 1). Humanists at the helm of Renaissance myth-making produced colourful kinship charts, tangling these legendary and historical lineages with scriptural ones, and nationalizing mythological ancestors. Their fictive etymologies emphasized the autochthonous origins of historical persons of native or indigenous genius around whom cults of hero worship developed. Charlemagne, a more recent incarnation of German heroics, was styled on the ancient Hermann. In this depiction, the newly elected Holy Roman Emperor Charles V appears in contemporary dress, compared and contrasted to his more primitivesly attired *ur*-German ancestor. Charles V makes the same genealogical demands on Charlemagne that Maximilian made on Hercules. Here, Charles V traces his own lineage back to that of his namesake Charlemagne, alluding to the catholic grip he exercised on Christendom, an expanse unparalleled and power dormant since his reign. Charles V sought legitimation for his own imperial and Christianizing ambitions in his allusions to Charlemagne – propaganda to which this printing of Charlemagne’s medieval biography in 1521 undoubtedly contributed.

The *Vita* of Charlemagne published by Soter in 1521 was the *editio princeps* of a biography by Charlemagne’s courtier Einhard written shortly after the death of the emperor in 814. The *Vita* was roughly modelled after Suetonius’s *Lives of the Caesars*, on which it relies for structure and language. In his introduction, Einhard offers his period account of Charlemagne as a corrective to the meditations on past glories presented by those ‘so seduced by their love of the distant past’ that they neglect to tell of the present. This warm portrait of Charlemagne praises him as modest in nature as he was moderate in drink, generous in spirit and just in war. Einhard insists that Charlemagne took the title of emperor and *augustus* only reluctantly, his investiture the result of sly papal plotting (chap. 28). He also dressed modestly, resisting Leo III’s pleas that he wear a long tunic and assume the Greek mantle, the *chlamys*. With the exception of feast days, for which he donned the ‘golden gem-encrusted crown’ (chap. 23), Charlemagne’s dress differed little from the attire customarily adopted by the Franks: a linen shirt and underwear, a silk-fringed tunic and stockings, with his lower legs wrapped in cloth coverings.

This striking physical description of Charlemagne is reproduced in the frontispiece of the Cologne *Vita*, an image that stands out among other contemporary
depictions of Charlemagne for its primitivism. In addition to his dress, the *Vita* also speaks to his physiognomy and his great stature, textual prescriptions also followed by the artist here. The outsized Charlemagne of the frontispiece shares the crowded stage with Charles V, whose form is slight by comparison. This juxtaposition provides visual cues for scale: Einhard tells us that Charlemagne was ‘tall (approximately 1.83 m), but not disproportionately so, his height being seven times the length of his own foot. The crown of his head was round, his eyes were noticeably large and full of life, his nose was grey and handsome, and his face was attractive and cheerful. Hence, his physical presence was (always) commanding and dignified, whether he was sitting or standing.’ (chap. 22) Nothing in the image contradicts these prescriptions, but what motivated the primitive appearance brought by the illustrator to this Charlemagne?

Charlemagne’s birthplace, directly in the middle of the disputed territory of Alsace, complicated an impeccable pedigree. Throughout the *Vita*, Charlemagne is referred to as a Frank of the Eastern Frankish kingdom which encompassed a sizeable portion of Germany at the time. His native tongue was German and similar to dialects spoken by other tribes he either abutted or conquered, like the Saxons, Bavarians, and Alemannians. Charlemagne did his part to cultivate German patriotism in deeds explicitly set forth by the text: he ordered the first collection and record of unwritten laws of people under his control, and transcribed old Germanic poems celebrating deeds of war and ancient kings. Although he operated on a pan-European scale militarily, his cultural loyalties were fiercely provincial and German; he began a grammar of his native tongue and renamed the months in order to purge Latin from the mix (chap. 29).

Ties to Charlemagne bound the Germans in not only an auspicious legendary kinship, but also served to untangle disputed historical ones. Above and beyond merely generic imperial propaganda, ties to Charlemagne could reinforce rights of succession and were brandished in territorial disputes. Insistent claims to the turf that produced Charlemagne were staked by both the sixteenth-century French and Germans. To counter bids of a French heritage for Charlemagne, Germans revived the lineage Aeneas Silvius had already established for Charlemagne in the fifteenth century. Aeneas parsed medieval etymologies that linked the Germans to the Gauls, putting to rest Strabo’s translation of *germani* as brothers.75 Instead, Aeneas maintained, *Germani* came from *germinare* (to grow or sprout), which referred to the great growth of the Germans.76

The Frankish or Saxon origin of the Holy Roman imperium was hotly debated among humanists as patriotism and succession came to rely on a history with clear geographic boundaries. The particulars of Charlemagne’s genealogy grew increasingly significant in disputes over land claims. After Maximilian’s failure in the Swiss wars and losses against France in Strasbourg, the Alsatian humanist Jakob Wimpfeling’s *Germania* (Strasbourg: Johann Prüss, 1501) claimed Alsace for Germany by establishing the German descent of emperors since Charlemagne.77 Wimpfeling argued that France could exercise no claim over Alsace, as it had been inhabited by Germans since Augustus, and supported this territorial conviction by refusing ever to set foot in Italy or France proper.78

This sparked and sustained a lively debate among the Alsatian humanists to size up the nationality of the region. Wimpfeling asserted that all emperors from Caesar to the present Maximilian ‘kein Franzoß ne dem Römischen Rich vorge-
In fact, all Roman emperors, with the exception of Charlemagne, who was a German, hailed from either Italy, Thrace, Arabia, Hungary, or Windisch territories, but never Gaul. Wimpfeling also relied on medieval sources which argued for Charlemagne’s German nationality. Bebel seconded this by christening Charlemagne a German Frank. The German side of the territorial debate disputed that Gallic peoples had ever inhabited the region of Alsace. Wimpfeling attributed the fraternity he believed to be implied by *germani* to the Romans’ first encounter with the Germans, whom they saw as kin: “the Rhenish people with wild disposition, upright bodies, of pleasing complexions, form and habits which compared favourably to those who lived in our land . . . so named them Germans, that is, our brothers.”

Wimpfeling’s opposition came in the form of Alsatian satirist Thomas Murner’s defence of Charlemagne’s French origins. Murner’s *Nova Germania* gave Charlemagne’s birthplace as France and maintained that claims for his German heritage were anachronistic, as the territory only later became German. Murner could not deny that Charlemagne wrote texts in German, nor that he gave his children German names, but soberly insisted that he was equally proficient in French, and that language preference alone was no measure of nationality. Wimpfeling countered with the claim that Charlemagne, had he been French, would never have let his wealth stray over the Rhine to finance churches, cloisters, fortresses and cities, and ultimately establish his final resting place in Aachen. Murner, less soberly here, finds derisible the notion that the choice of a final resting place could secure anything like citizenship: it was plain enough to Charlemagne that heaven and hell were both equidistant from Germany and France. Two decades later, this debate was revived by Hieronymus Gebweiler’s *Libertas Germania* (1519), which claimed the imperium for Charlemagne, the most prominent German historical hero to whom the empire had passed directly from Roman hands. This note was picked up by Gebweiler’s student Beatus Rhenanus in a critical commentary on Tacitus’s *Germania*. Rhenanus’s later *Rerum Germanicorum libri tres* (1531) also argued for the Frank’s Germanic origins.

Thus, the Einhard illustrator’s anachronistic juxtaposition of Charlemagne with Charles V can be explained by an inclusive German nationalistic kinship. The frontispiece forges a kinship between two emperors who bookend the Germans’ stewardship of the Holy Roman Empire. Habsburg propaganda, from the time of Charles V’s electoral bid in 1519 to his coronation in Aachen in 1520, rested on his endorsement as a German prince, a fact equally frustrated by his French mother tongue and his Spanish residency. Lobbying for his candidacy against the French contender, Francis I, in 1519, Charles held himself out as a ‘geporner und erzogner Teutscher der auch teutscher sprach zu reden und zeschreiben beticht und gebt’, in the hopes that his victory would ensure the continuity of a German empire. Among the electors, Charles V was hailed as a protector of German freedom against the prospect of French servitude offered by Francis I. Charles V’s propagandistic bid for the *imperium* also depended on the continuity of an office that had remained in German hands since Charlemagne. At his coronation in Aachen in 1519 Charles was hailed as the direct successor of Charlemagne and, by 1521, Charles’s own imperial ambitions were reason enough to invoke the original founder of the western empire in the shape of this primitively attired ur-German ancestor.
The portraits that appear in the Cologne edition of the *Vita et Gesta Karoli Magni* thus trace Charles v’s ancestry back to the beginnings of a German imperium. The mantle of imperator had been inherited by Charlemagne from Augustus, but from a line of descent that had since, visually at least, bifurcated from the line of Roman kaisers. Charlemagne, in his casual coverings, adopts neither the pallium of Caesar nor the cuirass of Augustus; he appears in the unmistakable heft and garb of the ur-German, in the Tacitean idiom.

As a by-product of their own propaganda, both Maximilian and Charles v nationalized the wild man. Both the depiction of *Maximilian as Hercules Germanicus*, as well as Charles v and Charlemagne in the *Vita* frontispiece, functioned as ‘double portraits’ – imperial analogies in which the modern descendant staked the validity of his office on a legitimate claim to kinship. Simultaneously, these two images assert their subjects’ German identity. Hercules recalled the strength of the ancient German, while Charlemagne marked his genius and sovereignty. Maximilian and Charles v each stand in the shadow of legendary figures whose German ancestry was crucial. In both cases, the myth of the imperium was brought, not merely down to earth, but directly to Germany. This Germanic identity prided itself on containing the barbarism and the renunciative delights of the ur-Germans within its wild past. At the same time a contrast and a comparison, the Cologne portraits show the kinship of two Germans separated by historical distance. Charlemagne wears the structural undergarments that underpin the civility of Charles v’s reign. The wildness of the noble ur-German, lurking just beneath the gossamer, could be contained by the improvements offered by Maximilian’s and Charles’ courts.

The illustrator of the Charlemagne image recreated the idea of Germany’s primitive past by recalling the heroic qualities of the original Germans. Charlemagne has literally undergone the transformation from wild man to the original ur-German. The hairy pelt of the wild man has disappeared; what is left is the sheer grandeur, robust strength and rustic naturalism of Tacitus’s ur-German. Depictions of metamorphosed ur-German wild folk abound in works of the Danube school; others reflect the influence of Italian nudes that made it to Germany via the prints of Pollaiuolo, such as a woodcut of 1522 cut by Hans Lützelburger, which relocates Pollaiuolo’s *Battle of the Naked Men* to the German Urwald. Hans Holbein’s emblem of the honorary society ‘Zur Hären’ (plate 4) features such a Herculean wild man, whose scant layer of fur just barely cloaks an articulated classical anatomy.

The vanquishing Hercules, whose nature these images recall, was by this time no longer a mythic figment or a savage character. Erasmus’s Latin translation of Lucian’s *Hercules* (1506) had already transformed Hercules into a model of eloquence and heroism, but Tacitus naturalized him into a German citizen. Hercules, nationalized by humanists in texts, was visually nationalized in the iconography of a contemporary wild man. The connection of Charles v to Charlemagne was likewise established through this ennobled wild man. Charlemagne, in the costume of a native Frank, helps to locate Charles v in a lineage of Holy Roman Emperors whose ancestry was German. Syllogistically, the collapse of the contemporary image of Maximilian on to the iconography of the ur-German also justified the use of the ur-German to represent the historical person of Charlemagne.

In the *Vita* frontispiece, Charlemagne represents not a Roman, but a German emperor, as an embodiment of an inversion of civilized effects. The same principle
of inversion already guided the formal representation of the German wild man, a figure whose alterity in the medieval period was marked by cultural, and later – after Tacitus’s revival – by temporal difference. German humanists championing Tacitus’s ur-German borrowed the image of the wild man, originally a cultural analogue of contemporary civilized society, to represent a German of the historical past. This programme justified the illustrator’s use of the wild man as an iconographic symbol to bridge the temporal distance between sixteenth-century Germans and their oldest, bravest ancestors. The familiar wild man permitted the collapse of temporal distance to forge a universal German character.
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