Joyce always planned every revision of *Finnegans Wake* very carefully by going over/harvesting his earlier notebooks and by extra reading and gathering new first-hand material in a new notebook. So with Joyce announcing his intention to finish the revisions of “The Hen” and of “Here Comes Everybody” before his seventh eye-operation in April 1925, a new and important stage in the evolution of Joyce’s work began with the compilation of VI.B.7.

The notebook described by David Hayman as ‘a pocket-sized oblong (about 53/5 x 33/4 inches) black imitation snake-skin notebook’ (*JJA* 30:xv) contains jottings that Joyce had taken down from different sources together with entries on books, music, plays and notes on former acquaintances, friends or family. The notes are written in all directions, sometimes at random, in different pencils and in ink. Maybe as a result of Joyce’s poor eye sight, out of the total of 240 pages, there are twenty-four scattered blank pages, three sets of upside down inscribed ones: numbered 105/104; 107/106 and 115/114, together with several other pages containing overwritten material.

Although in *The Textual Diaries* Danis Rose argued that between March – April 1925 Joyce ‘did little or no basic composing, busying himself instead with tidying up some of his earlier pieces for publication in little magazines’ (*TD* 79-80), in the evolution of *Finnegans Wake*, VI.B.7 plays an important role not only as the place where Joyce collected notes from the sources he had harvested, but mostly as a primary source for the revisions, whether they were a first sketched version for some of the additions to the 1923 typescript of “The Hen” (Joyce used more than ninety entries from VI.B.7) or only some individual jottings that he later used.

As will be argued in a future publication in the *Genetic Joyce Studies*, for the publication of “The Hen” in Eliot’s magazine in 1925, Joyce resorted to an earlier notebook, the lost (and untranscribed) notebook VI.X.2, which he filled in December 1923. After a careful analysis of the drafts and of some of the entries that Joyce jotted down in VI.B.7, three sources could be identified as coming from the missing notebook. Furthermore, it became clear that notebook VI.X.2 was not only the source for writing “The Hen” and for many other additions in “Work in Progress”, but also the first-hand source that Joyce used in compiling the first part of notebook VI.B.7. Corroborated with the five other sources that could be identified in the process of editing VI.B.7 (Boldt, Mawer, M. Kennedy-Fraser & Kenneth McLeod, Vico, Haliday) the newly found sources in VI.X.2, reveal Joyce’s skillfulness in adapting the new material to suit his literary needs. But more of this mystery notebook and of the entries that make up the first part of VI.B.7 in a future instalment of the *Genetic Joyce Studies*.

**Sources**

Separate indexes of newly identified sources have been published in previous issues of the *Genetic Joyce Studies*, to which the reader here is referred:
In Issue 13 (Spring 2013), Viviana Braslasu published an index (with an introduction) of the *Songs of the Hebrides*, the second of three volumes of Scottish songs collected by Marjory Kennedy-Fraser and Kenneth Macleod, with the title “A New Source in Notebook VI.B.7, *Songs of the Hebrides*”.

In Issue 16 (Spring 2016), the index of the VI.B.7 notes concerning A. Mawer’s study *The Vikings* was published, with an introduction, as “How the ‘offsprout of vikings’ went ‘east-viking’” (by Viviana Braslasu and Robbert-Jan Henkes).

In the same issue and by the same authors, the index of Charles Haliday’s much-consulted book appeared, as “The meanderthalltale of the *Scandinavian Kingdom of Dublin* in Joyce’s notetaking”.

Here we publish two further indexes of source books in VI.B.7, both of them found – as the previously published sources in VI.B.7 – by Viviana Braslasu.


**From Luther to Steiner**

Ernst Boldt was a member of the henhouse of the German Anthropological Society, centering around Rudoph Steiner, who fell out with the coop after publishing his controversial book on ‘Sexualprobleme’ in 1911. He remained involved, however, and wrote his first book about the great master in 1921, with the Nietzschean title *Rudolph Steiner - Ein Kämpfer gegen seine Zeit*. Nietzsche pervades his next book as well, *Von Luther bis Steiner: ein deutsches Kulturproblem*, from the same year.

*From Luther to Steiner* – as it was translated in 1923 by Agnes Blake, who was also out of favour with the anthroposophical incrowd – is an unpalatable nationalistic work, teeming with sweeping statements about the historical mission of the German Volk and the unique German Kultur, with Steiner as a ‘latterday’ (054(a)) Luther in the Kampf against Roman bigotry and French foppery, nailing heads to coffee tables and theses to church doors, if only the country would get healthy again under the spirited guidance of Steiner.

The notes were first put to use for the revisions of “The Hen” and “Here Comes Everybody” for *Contact Collection*, but why Joyce would have read this book is a mystery. He had been interested of course in Theosophy and the outpourings of Mme. Blavatsky, but this is a different piece of delusion altogether. The nature of the notes that Joyce took gives us some hint, as it becomes clear that Joyce wasn’t particularly taken in by the rethorical flourishes and the nationalistic braggadocio, but instead, and as usual in his notetaking, pierces through the hollow words and phrases. He picks out highfalutin’ words like ‘quaff’ (029(c)) and ‘held up to contumacy’ (030(a)), ‘inner path’ and ‘dross’ (034(a)), and slightly ridiculous Shaunish phrases like ‘Let us consider that we are this year about to celebrate anniversaries’ (026(a)), ‘one even greater’ (022(a)), and ‘all too soon’ (060(f)). If he was interested in Luther as a foul-mouth, he must have been dissapointed; the only word he picks up is ‘stinking goat’ (070(i)).

Still he made about 84 notes, 22 of which made it into *Finnegans Wake*, among which relatively innocuous ones, like the names of Lucifer as Lousyfear (see 114(c)) and Gutenberg as ‘gutenmorg’ (see 070(h)), but also the famous ‘great Beyond’ of FW 049.25, as well as the lost
‘petrified’ (069(b)) that was to add to HCE’s ‘patriarchal shamanah’ (FW 075.14) originated in Joyce reading this book. So there is a lot to discover.

**Principj di una scienza nuova**

Joyce first read Vico’s *Scienza Nuova*, the famous ‘trellis’ for his Working Process, while compiling notebook VI.B.2 ‘Nativities’, late August-late September 1923. It appears that Joyce did not read the expanded second (1730) and third (1744) editions of the work, that also came out during Vico’s lifetime, but the first one from 1725. Not only is the first edition much shorter, but one could argue that it is an entirely different work, with different arguments, different examples and a whole new texture or ‘feel’ to the text. The English translator, Léon Pompa, without delving very deep into textual comparisons, calls the first *New Science* more optimistic than the later ones, especially in the concluding chapters. In the first edition Vico hadn’t committed himself to an ‘Ewige Wiederkehr des Gleichen’ after a period of degradation, whereas in the later editions he didn’t see how final ruin could be stopped for the cycle to start again.

To what extent Joyce’s familiarity with the first edition coloured his perception of Vico’s theories, is a moot point which will not be broached in this short introduction. Just as in VI.B.2 and in VI.D.2, Joyce seems to have read the *Scienza Nuova* in a very haphazard way. The chapter and paragraph numbers jojo back and fro, almost like he was flipping the book. But: which book? The precise edition of the *Scienza Nuova* has not yet been ascertained: the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century saw a row of different publications, of all three editions that appeared *zur Lebzeiten*.

That is why we have chosen, as in the genetic representation of VI.D.2 in this same issue of the *Genetic Joyce Studies*, to use a facsimile reprint of the very first edition that came out in Naples in 1725 (‘Ristampa anastatica a cura di T. Gregory, Edizioni dell’ Ateneo & Bizzarri, Rome, 1979). The translations have been lifted from *The First New Science*, edited and translated by Leon Pompa, Cambridge University Press, 2002. For more introductory matter to the *Scienza Nuova* in Joyce’s notebooks VI.B.2 and VI.D.2, as well as to the problem of pinpointing the exact edition that Joyce consulted, the reader is referred to the articles in the *Genetic Joyce Studies*, here¹ and here².


VI.B.7.022

(a) ‘One even greater

From Luther to Steiner v-vi: The practice commonly adopted in professional circles of treating Steiner’s great work as worthless by the very simple process of ignoring it has not, in the long run, been successful. And this being so, Steiner himself has now become the target for both slander and abuse. It would seem, indeed, as if his opponents were determined not to understand him; they go even further, for, since his work by no means suits their reactionary ideas, they put every difficulty in the way of others who may be interested in it. Slander is, of course, an old and well-tried weapon resorted to in all ages. Was it not said of One yet Greater: “He has blasphemed God—what need we of further testimony?” And how many a brave fighter of the Middle Ages has not paid the price of his “heresy” with his life? If, then, to-day a Great One bears within him the Living Power of the Christ, and seeks to revivify our present civilization and our immediate future... what easier than to dub him [v] a traitor to the German Spirit, a Hungarian Jew, an Indian Juggler, a Rabbi dabbling in Occultism, a Romish Jesuit, a Russian Bolshevist, a Bourgeois Capitalist?

From Luther to Steiner viii: “For, see” to quote the words of the Christ, “here is one greater than Solomon”, Here is one who is more than a Luther, Goethe, or a de Lagarde; ... here is, indeed, the sum total of them all at their highest and best.
MS missing: see JJA 45:001 | April 1925 | I.2§1.4
Note: The point-of-entry draft is missing. The unit is first found in: Contact Collections-136, PrMT: and years afterwards, writes one, even greater, seemingly dropped dead | JJA 45:022 | Mar-Apr 1927 | 1.2§1.5' | FW 034.05

(b) her place in the dark  
*From Luther to Steiner* xiv: For, as Germany has hitherto striven for material riches, striven to maintain the outward bulwarks of her so-called culture, struggled to maintain her supremacy in trade and manufacture, in industry and mechanics, and as she has fought to maintain her “place in the sun,” so will she now turn her energies and bend her will to acquiring the riches of the spirit—those inner bulwarks of her civilization, and of her German Christianity—to the end that she may establish and retain the power of her position in Science, Art, Morality, and Justice, as applied to life, doing so against every “ism” in the world.

VI.C.5.226(i)

(c) Ahriman >  
VI.C.5.226(j)

(d) Satan >  
VI.C.5.226(k)

(e) Mephisto / that which does not / love light >>  
VI.C.5.226(l)-227(a)

VI.B.7.023

(a) Ormuzd >  
VI.C.5.227(b)

(b) Ahura Masda  
*From Luther to Steiner* xv: Two grave dangers have long threatened and undermined the structure of German character—dangers which must also inevitably bring about the “downfall of the Western world,” if the movement to prevent it were not already in full swing. These dangers are known in the language of Spiritual Science as the “Ahrimanic and Luciferan dangers,”¹ and can be combated only by the active, regenerating power of the Christ Force within our own souls.

xvii: “Ahriman,” according to the Persian Mysteries, is the Spirit of Darkness, or of “World-Evil,” being identical with *Satan*, or *Mephistopheles (that which does not love the Light)*. He is the contrary to “ORMUZD” or “AHURA MAZDA,” the the [sic] Cosmic Spirit of the Sun. “LUCIFER” is known in the Rosicrucian Mysteries as the “Light-Bearer,” being identical God of Light, who—together with CHRIST—is identical with with [sic] Prometheus, as also with the Serpent of Paradise. He is the Inspirer of human freedom and of knowledge, giving Personality, with both its good and bad aspects. LUCIFER has also another side when he acts as the Tempter to the human soul where matters appertaining to Mysticism, Egoism, and the senses are concerned.

VI.C.5.227(c)

(c) Sticklers  
*From Luther to Steiner* xvi: From the East comes no less a danger in the guise of Lucifer, as exemplified in the “religiosity” of the day, personified in the equally un-German Pharisees and Scribes—called by Nietzsche the “Good and Righteous”—slaves to reaction, *sticklers* for “historic values,” and nothing, in fact, but unproductive parasites, heralding the beginning of the end.

VI.C.5.227(d)

(d) Roarbach at —  
*From Luther to Steiner* xvi-xvii: Yet, such great men as Nietzsche here referred to… where are we to look for them? Are we to turn to Eucken at Jena, to Graf Keyserling at [xvi] Darmstadt,¹ to Wille at
Berlin, Müller at Elmau? Or, again, to Driesch, Scheler, Rohrbach, Troelsch, Spengler, Blüher, Schlüter, to Steinbach, or to Louis Hänser?—Guides and Prophets. Leaders such as these we have in abundance—and to spare! They are themselves the victims of either Ahriman or Lucifer, where it is not a case of their being a prey to both, and for this reason they can but lead us out into the Wilderness.

xvi: “Schule der Weisheit” founded by Graf Keyserling in 1922, under the patronage of the ex-duke of Hesse-Darmstadt.

VI.C.5.227(e)

(e) O’Mara at —

Not found in From Luther to Steiner.

Note: Possibly inspired by (d) above.

MS 47473-51, ScrMT: God & O’Mara has it with his bloody old King | JJA 47:360 | Feb-Mar 1925 | 1.5§1.3+/4.3+ | Early notes for the late additions -> MS 47473-43v, ScrTsILA: God & O’Mara has it with his bloody +ruddy+ old King +Villain Rufus+ [...] O’Mara where are you! | JJA 46:346 | Feb-Mar 1925 | 1.5§1.3+/4.3+ | FW 122.16 and FW 122.19

VI.C.5.227(f)

VI.B.7.024

(a) beautifully / evinced / Jesuitry / Irish land

From Luther to Steiner xvii: Those whose inspiration partakes of the Luciferan variety swear fanatically by “Moses and the Prophets,” and their utmost concessions to modernity reach no farther than Luther or Schelling: they resolutely refuse to accept aught that is really new. So, too, with religious orthodoxy, even where this is presented in its most liberal and enlightened form; where piety and religious fervour are plainly evinced, with a genuine striving after “experience of God,” or a “communion with God”: even there is the taint of the Luciferan spirit. In considering this question we have to bear in mind how great a portion of our German lands is still subject to Catholicism and Jesuitry. Catholic Germany, of which the politically active representative is the Centre Party, is one of the greatest dangers to Spiritual Germany, whose mission consists in bringing to active fulfilment the Living Impulse of Christ—and through Germany to all the rest of Europe.

VI.C.5.227(g)-(j)

VI.B.7.025

(a) I. ch.

From Luther to Steiner xviii: And this true Soul of Germany is nothing less than the living Christ, as is witnessed by the genius of German speech, which uses I.CH. (“Jesus Christus”) for the first person, instead of the Englishman’s “I”, or the Frenchman’s “je,” thereby appealing to every German to reveal the immense depths and sublimities of the human soul.

VI.C.5.227(k)

(b) i

Note: Possibly entered to mark the difference in capitalisation of the first person singular pronoun in English as opposed to the French one, as the source indicates. See (a) above.

Not transferred.

VI.B.7.026

(a) Let us consider / the fact that we are this year / about to celebrate / anniversaries

From Luther to Steiner 1: Let us consider the fact that we are this year about to celebrate the anniversary of the Reformation, and that we cannot honour our Luther in a better manner than by giving open expression (even if we should, in so doing, encounter personal danger), to those things
which we hold to be right and requisite to the welfare of the nation and the Age.—GOETHE TO ROCHLITZ, 1817.

VI.C.5.227(l)-228(a)

(b) Wd. we >

VI.C.5.228(b)

(c) 95 theses >>

VI.C.5.228(c)

VI.B.7.027

(a) Boniface 680

*From Luther to Steiner* 1-2: **Would we** estimate the effect of the spirit of the Reformation on civilization as a whole we may liken it to those blows with which Luther—in the year 1517—nailed his famous **ninety-five theses** to the church door at Wittenberg—hammering them to it with a force which reverberated throughout the length and breadth of the land, and rousing Germany to all those revolutionary changes which, collectively taken, constitute the more modern period of European history. But for the heroic activity of this great German, history must have run another, yet, assuredly, no better, course; for all those religious and civilizing forces of regeneration, which both before and after Luther had been concentrating in [1] Germany for the purpose of rescuing Christianity from its Romanized conditions and inspiring it with a more Germanic force, centring in the German race, would not have proved strong enough for so stupendous a task as that of breaking the power of the Romish Church within the confines of the German Empire, and erecting in its place a Church of their own.

For seven centuries—from the time of Charles the Great to that of Luther—had the German spirit struggled within the souls of our princes, poets, and mystics, struggled that it might bring about the Germanization of Christianity, the Greco-Roman form of which as introduced by Boniface (680) it had felt to be so unsatisfying.

VI.C.5.228(d)

(b) Guelphish >

VI.C.5.228(e)

(c) 'held up to contumacy >>

*Note:* Hold up to contumacy. To **perform quarantine.** Strength of character; firmness, resoluteness.

(OED)

MS 47473-45v, ScrTsLMA: ++(often held up to /cass/ )+our+^ contumacy)+^+$ | JJA 46:350 | Feb-Mar 1925 | I.5§1.3+4.3+ | FW 115.27-28

VI.B.7.030

(a) ^quaff >

*Note:* Quaff. To drink deeply; to take a long draught. Also: to drink repeatedly in this manner. (OED)

MS 47473-43, ScrTsILS: have **drained ^+quaffed ^+quaff'd+^+^ | JJA 46:345 | Feb-Mar 1925 | I.5§1.3+4.3+ | FW 122.12

(b) capon

*From Luther to Steiner* 4-5: Among our great poets of the Middle Ages, Walter von der Vogelweide (1170-1230) may be cited as pre-eminent in the struggle to assert the German character. Never did he tire in his campaign for the defence of Germanism against Guelphish deceit and treachery—the "trickery of the Romish priests." So great was his spirit of independence that he only sided with the Hohenstaufens when they opposed the Pope; and he even expressed his deep sorrow at the manner in which the German tribes were torn asunder owing to the action in war of those who owed their power to the papacy, kindred
German blood being thus driven to fight against a German emperor. So also did this singer hold up to contumacy the materialism and immortality of the Roman hierarchy, who “filled their Guelphish coffers” with German gold and silver, in order that their “priests might eat capons [4] and quaff wine,” while Germans “prayed and fasted for them.” The farce of Absolution came equally under the sting of his lash, von der Vogelweide solemnly asserting that God alone had the power to forgive sins, and that a Pope who dared to assume this right, without first having convinced himself of the sinner’s penitence, deserved to be stoned as soon as ever he consigned one man to hell.

VI.C.5.228(f)

(c) Heartburn / (Herzeleide) >

VI.C.5.228(g)

(d) galaxy A >

MS 47483-113, ScrTsILA: Now then ^+my galaxy “/” girl, quiproquo+^ JJA 57:179 Mar 1926 | III§1A.5/1D.5//2A.5/2B.2/2C.5 FW 432.05

(e) litter

From Luther to Steiner 6: A similarly profound meaning pervades the German epic of “Parsival” in which Wolfram von Eschenbach (1200) attempted the germanization of Christianity. The evident sense of conviction permeating this deep mystery causes it to glow with a radiant and poetic fervour. In this poem it is the German who is the “pure fool”: a knightly hero, who, like Siegfried, guileless and eager for action, sets forth to seek his match in single combat … in order to slay “the faithless one,” the “Host of Hell” (Satan), whom his mother, Herzloide, so fears, to the end that he may find God, Who, “purer than the day, had once borne a human countenance.” In the course of his wanderings, Parsival comes to the Castle of the Grail, where the grandeur of the scenes enacted before his astonished gaze fill him with wonderment. Yet he is quite incapable of interpreting their meaning. How pitiful is the sight of the stricken king upon his litter, of the bloodstained lance amid this galaxy of knighthood! Yet Parsival, mystified moves on, returning, nevertheless, on a Good Friday and desecrating the sanctity of that holy day, moreover, by appearing armed cap-a-pie.

VI.C.5.228(h)

VI.B.7.031

(a) Augustin † 430 >>

VI.C.5.228(i)

VI.B.7.034

(a) inner path / dross

From Luther to Steiner 8-9: The authority of the Roman Church, as defined by St. Augustine (367-430), was far from satisfying the requirements of the souls of the German Mystics, for it lacked that which stood for their fundamental conception of the Christian Faith. Nor did they lay much store by the activities of the Scholastics, who sought to emphasize the “reasonableness” of doctrinal teaching by an appeal to Aristotelian logic—in which, for instance, Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) was so distinguished.

While, therefore, Rome was entirely imbued with the historical aspect of the Christ—the “Crucified One”—and beheld in the Church the Mediator between Him and Humanity, the German Mystics yearned for the Presence of Him Who had risen from the Dead—for the living Christ—and sought this union by means of the “inner path” in the depths of their own souls, seeking thus to breathe new life into the revelations of tradition.

Such were the first and tentative growths of a German form of Christian religion, which, independent of all clerical authority or external tradition, sought the living roots and sources of Christianity, drawing thence its strength in rich abundance.

To these Mystics the Christian religion was a personal matter—one to be kept undefiled from all surrounding dross. “I should not believe in the truth of the Gospels, did not the Authority of the
Catholic Church compel me to do so”! were the words of St. Augustine, and they are typical of the attitude assumed by the Romish Church with regard to Christianity—an attitude against which the German belief in Christ had since the beginning of the Middle Ages most emphatically rebelled. Christianity was to these Mystics inevitably bound up with personal experience, and could not be based upon the authority of the Church.

Note: Unit crossed out in black ink.

VI.A.984

VI.B.7.035

(a) ²they call them / the [nights]

²From Luther to Steiner 89: But even within the ranks of Steiner’s adherents we now and again meet those who are inclined to quibble at his grand range of vision, although they call him their master. But the reason for this hesitation is generally to be found in a lack of all the qualities which are so necessary for arriving at a full and sympathetic understanding of their teacher. Inabilities of this kind have their origin more often than not in the mental and spiritual tumult occasioned in the souls of men by the times in which we now live.

Not located in MS/FW.

VI.B.7.048

(a) ²generality

²From Luther to Steiner xviii-xix: We have a leader among us in the person of Rudolf Steiner—Steiner, who with forty years of untiring pioneer work to his credit, has blazed a track where hitherto no road was known to the traveller. Nor has he attempted this by means of fine words and phrases, by generalities, speculative arguments, and metaphysical assertions as to the “world beyond,” but [xviii] by personal, matter-of-fact, and first-hand experience of the spiritual worlds. It is thus that those who elect to follow Steiner by seeking within may find the way to their own innermost selves—to the Christ-Power—the I-AM-I—which is latent in all men.

MS 47484a-49, ScrTsOS: the generality ^+generality?+ | JJA 58:189 | Jan 1925-Apr 1926 | III§3A.4/3B.4 | FW 523.04

(b) ²cult S. S.

²From Luther to Steiner 141: The reason why Gnostics of the Schmitt school, for all their lofty modern attainments in the form of acquired knowledge and in spite of their high-minded endeavours, elect to remain in the “intellectual antechamber” of all true and intimate knowledge as to the Soul and Spirit, and do not attempt to probe the Holy of Holies, may be ascribed to the intellectual culture of recent centuries having weighed heavily upon their spiritual powers.¹

¹41n1: Steiner’s “Lucifer,” No. 2: “Die Kultur der Gegenwart im Spiegel der Theosophie.” (Out of print.)

VI.C.5.229(g)

(c) ²if for no other

²From Luther to Steiner 88: THOSE who are inclined to bestow no more than superficial attention on Steiner’s writings (both philosophical and spiritual) are likely to find in them what they will take to be many a contradiction. It should, however, be borne in mind that here is a man of outstanding genius and originality—fearless withal—who is proceeding along a path of his own making, and that for this reason, if for no other, no common and hitherto accepted “theories” or catchwords can be expected to explain his meaning.

VI.C.5.229(h)

VI.B.7.049
increasingly lack / of interest

From Luther to Steiner 89-90: Those who have been most deeply stricken and who, unlike Haeckel and Nietzsche, feel themselves unequal to casting from them for good and all the faded remnants of a religious and moral code that has outlived its day, have indeed failed to understand either Steiner the Philosopher, or Steiner the Anthroposophist in the manner in which he desires to be understood. In spite, therefore, of their [89] “Card of Membership to the Anthroposophical Society” such members remain practically at the same level—mentally and spiritually speaking—at which they were when first joining, save, possibly, for such crumbs of superficial knowledge they may have picked up from the teachings of spiritual science. Indeed, such members are (and will in all probability increasingly prove themselves to be) unsuited to co-operate in the great work of the present and the near future, for they are wanting in the most elementary qualifications needed. Persons of this kind have often not the faintest interest in philosophy: they may be deficient in scientific training, or again they may lack the ability to think “logically.”

MS 47474-26, ScrTsILA: who meanwhile ^+with increasing lack of interest^ allowed | JJA 47:405 | Apr-Jun 1925 | 1.7§1.3/2.3 | FW 173.31-32

point of view / = person

?From Luther to Steiner 102: It is possible for a person to regard some action as right and carry it out, although in so doing he is stifling all his own personal feelings, as in the case of a surgeon performing an operation (or an Initiate, putting tests to his pupils). As, however, there is no such thing as absolute right judgment, the validity of all truth being relative and dependent upon the standpoint of the person expressing it, so, too, the judgment of any person with regard to what he may, in any given case, consider to be the right thing to do is obviously bound to be in accordance with his relations to the world. (As, however, the personality of an Initiate stands in an entirely distinctive relationship to the world, it will readily be seen that the judgments of an Initiate will be very different from those of ordinary men.) Two different people will approach the same set of circumstances from entirely opposite points of view due to their characters, experience, and education.

VI.C.5.229(j)

VI.B.7.050

1 extreme to / other / (Dante / to Ibsen)

From Luther to Steiner 95-6: Here we have had the edifying sight of Seiling himself giving evidence of his own want of [95] loyalty to men and to ideas; of the way, too, in which he made the attempt to foist all his own wavering, changes, and “abandonings” on to Steiner—whose World of Ideas had become vaster and more profound as time progressed, but who has never fallen from one extreme into the other, as Seiling would like to make his readers believe.

VI.C.5.230(d)

VI.B.7.052

Meister Eckhardt >

VI.C.5-230(f)

Mr Aile >

Not found in From Luther to Steiner.

Note: Possibly a corruption of the name ‘Tauler’ in the source.

VI.C.5.230(g)

mediate

From Luther to Steiner 9-10: It is easy enough to understand that German men, who had set themselves such tasks as we have above indicated, were bound to come into many a bitter conflict with the Church, ever jealous of her own authority in such matters: torture, persecution and death at the stake were
oftenest their lot. **Meister Eckhart** (1260-1327), a Dominican monk, whom we may call the Father of German Mysticism, was repeatedly accused of heresy and prosecuted before the Inquisition. Yet, before he could be sentenced, the struggles and excitement he had undergone so preyed upon his health that death mercifully claimed him before his enemies had a chance of doing so. But within two years (1329) Pope John XXII pronounced the dead man’s excommunication on the score of heresy, banning his writings as “heretical.”

In spite of these things, however, the German spirit continued its struggle. Eckhart’s teaching and example lived on and worked through his pupils, among whom we need only mention the most renowned, namely, the Dominican, Johannes **Tauler** (1130-1361). He, too, courted danger by his freedom of speech and his undaunted demeanour, and, indeed, the papal ban launched against him appears to be more excusable in his case; for Tauler had gone a step further, and had, so to speak, initiated the pious layman into those methods by which he might “find Christ”—whether Jew, Gentile, or heathen—and thus attain salvation without the mediation of either priest or Church. It was therefore but human if action which threatened to render the priesthood and its offices superfluous was viewed with some trepidation in Rome!

**VI.C.5.230(h)**

**los von Rom**

*From Luther to Steiner* 10-11: All the religious and political efforts of those princes, [10] poets, and mystics who had striven so valiantly in earlier days we now find concentrated in the personality of Luther. As a politician his war-cry was, “Away from Rome!” (“**Los von Rom!**”), and as such he declared himself for the independence and sovereignty of emperor and empire.

**Note:** Ger. **Los von Rom.** Free from Rome: Political anti-Papist movement in Austria having as main objective the unification of Austria, free from the Pope, with the German Reich under the protection of the Hohenzollern emperors.

**VI.C.5.230(i)**

**VI.B.7.053**

(a) **¶¶ I protest / my 1st business >**
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(b) **papal crook >**

*From Luther to Steiner* 11-12: The question may be put as to why such fusion of politics and religion should have been necessary. The reply is that, had not the papacy in so sinister a manner made this fusion a point of contention, it is hardly likely that a political protest would have been made by a German theologian. For several centuries the political system of Rome had rendered abortive any religious advance such as Germany desired. The German Mystics and Folk-Theologians, who had so bravely made the attempt, had on every occasion been put down with a high hand. There remained, there-[11]fore, but one way of breaking Rome’s political system, and that was by setting up another in opposition, and it was this that Luther made it his **first business** to do. We must therefore, in the first place, regard him in his capacity of political hero, for his initial act was to free the German people from the slavery of Rome. He brought about the emancipation of the German crown, hitherto dependant on the “Papal Crook,” and separated politics from religion.

**Note:** Crook. The pastoral staff of a bishop, abbot or abbess, shaped like a shepherd’s staff, a crosier. ([OED](#))

**VI.C.5.230(j)**

(c) **the crook of <Galway> Tuam**

Not found in *From Luther to Steiner*.

**Note:** Probably inspired by the ‘Papal Crook’ above.

**VI.C.5.230(k)**
(d) Syllabus

*From Luther to Steiner* 12-13: Pius IX gave expression to this mediaeval standpoint with regard to “direct and indirect temporal power” over citizens of the State in his “Syllabus” dated December 8, 1864, and his Secretary of State, Cardinal Antonelli, expounded the same, by desire of his Holiness (March, 1870), as [12] follows: “The subjection of civic power to that of the Church is due to the pre-eminence of the priesthood over the State, since the Calling of the former transcends that of the latter. The authority of the State is, therefore, dependent on the priesthood, even as human things depend on things divine, and worldly things on things spiritual.”

V.I.C.5.231(a)

(e) divorce >>

V.I.C.5.231(b)

V.I.B.7.054

(a) latterday

*From Luther to Steiner* 13-14: And that no rebuff experienced in “some quarters” should deter the princes of the Church from emphatically declaring it to be their “duty” to make politics also part of their business, for “every reasonable person must recognize that the Pope of Rome cannot possibly divorce his Sacred Office from the domains of politics.” It is, therefore, evident that the spirit of Gregory VIII [13] still survives in our latter-day Popes, who remain theoretically true to their reactionary traditions, and do not hesitate also to put them into practice where the “Centre” party is concerned.

V.I.C.5.231(c)

(b) dullard

*From Luther to Steiner* 14-15: And in the same spirit Goethe too exclaimed: “We hardly know how much we have to thank Luther and the Reformation in general for. We have been freed from the fetters of spiritual incompetency, and—as a consequence of our increasing civilization—we are able to return to the source and apprehend Christianity in all its purity”; for “there is much that is foolish in the decrees of the Church. Yet she desires to reign and must therefore need have a crowd of dullards who bow down, and who, indeed, like to be governed. The church dignitaries, enjoying their rich stipends, fear nothing so much as the enlightenment of the masses. They denied them access to the Bible as long as they were able to do so. What is a poor parishioner likely to think when he reads the Gospels and notes the poverty of Christ—humbly going His way on foot amidst His disciples—while the princely Bishop dashes by in his coach-and-six!”


Note: A stupid fellow; dull of wit. *(OED)*

V.I.C.5.231(d)

V.I.B.7.055

(c) the Divine’s Comedy

*From Luther to Steiner* 25: In the same manner did Goethe feel repelled by the “Divine Comedy.” “To my mind,” he says, “the picture of Hell is horrible; that of Purgatory equivocable, and that of Paradise dull” (July 20, 1787).

V.I.C.5.231(g)

V.I.B.7.059

(a) Δ Consolation / Mass

Note: For source see (d) below.

Partially transferred.

V.I.C.5.233(j)
Luther trans / gospels

From Luther to Steiner 15: Side by side with the political action which he has found inevitable, Luther worked actively and seriously in the cause of religion, and if in the course of his work he gave no actual proofs of striking originality, he, nevertheless, knew well how to find the right sources from which he could draw strength and satisfy his own and his countrymen's religious needs.

Such sources were, in the first place, the Gospels, and these he translated into his own tongue and studied with tireless energy. In these he seems to breathe a free and invigorating air, free from the miasma of Roman Catholicism, which had so long hung like a pall about the souls of his fellow-countrymen.

VI.C.5.233(i)

read it before

Not found in From Luther to Steiner.

Note: Possibly inspired by the source.

VI.C.5.233(k)

puts note in / mouth of

From Luther to Steiner 16: In a very beautiful manner has Max-Müller, in his story, “Deutsche Liebe,” testified to the abiding worth of the unknown author of the “Theologia Germanica,” where he puts into the mouth of the heroine of his tale the following words: “I have derived much consolation and strength from his book”; and further, “I have much to thank him for, since here, for the first time, I have come to know the true secret of the Christian Doctrine in all its simplicity. I felt I was free to believe or not believe this old Teacher, for his teaching laid no external obligation upon me, yet, nevertheless, took so powerful a hold on me that it seemed to me that I now for the first time understood the meaning of Revelation. But what bars the way of so many to the Truth of Christianity is putting the doctrine of Revelation before the Revelation that must take place first within us. It is this that has so often disquieted me. Not that I have ever actually doubted the Truth and Divinity of our Religion, but what I felt was that I had no right to a belief given me by others: I felt as if a belief could not rightly belong to me if I had done no more than learn it as a child, and that without understanding its import. For, after all, none can believe for us, just as little as they can die in our place.”

Partially transferred.

VI.C.5.233(l)

good things >

VI.C.5.233(m)

liquidation

From Luther to Steiner 22: In his “Conversations” with Eckermann, Goethe made the following observations: “only those things are good for a nation which evolve from its innermost being, and which are the result of its own needs without aping of others. For what may prove goodly food for one people at one period of its age, may well act as a poison to another. Should, however, some great Reform be really needed by a people—then God is with them, and it will succeed. This was true of Christ and His first Followers; for the coming of the new Doctrine of Love was a need for the people. So, too, was it true in the case of Luther; for a clean sweep of the distortions with which priestcraft had overlaid that doctrine was no less requisite. Neither of these great forces was the friend of that which is stationary; indeed, both were alive to the fact that the old yeast must be got rid of, and that things could no longer proceed upon a basis of falsehood, injustice, and inadequacy.”
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(h) "the Belief

From Luther to Steiner 44: But the drawback is to be found in the dualism arising from the hard-and-fast division of Belief and Science in the intellectual life of modern times, upon which Kant laid his finger with so much acumen, and upon which he expended so vast an amount of dialectics that it has in the present day come to be accepted as the most natural and reasonable thing in the world.
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VI.B.7.060

(b) *Rome Veesb

?From Luther to Steiner 5: He is bidden return to the Venusberg, there to await the Day of Judgement, since as little as it were possible for the staff in the hand of his Holiness to quicken and bloom again, so little, too, was there hope of the penitent’s sins being forgiven. Thus, broken, does Tannhäuser leave Rome to seek the Venusberg, once more.

Note: See reproduction. Overwritten unit (a).

VI.C.5.233(n)

(f) *all too ^+soon+^

From Luther to Steiner 21: This Church, grounded by Christ on Peter, “the Rock,” and which was not to be overcome “by the Gates of Hell,” had, indeed, succumbed to them all too soon.

Note: See reproduction: ‘all too’ overwritten the last part of unit (e).

VI.C.5.234(d)

(h) *not a friend of

From Luther to Steiner 22: Neither of these great forces was the friend of that which is stationary; indeed, both were alive to the fact that the old yeast must be got rid of, and that things could no longer proceed upon a basis of falsehood, injustice, and inadequacy.”
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VI.B.7.062

(g) on this side / of Impression

From Luther to Steiner 34: This reaction on the side of thought will be the development of Spiritual Philosophy, and in the world of affairs will be realized by bringing about the “Threefold State,” or threefold division of the Social organism.

VI.C.5.235(b)

VI.B.7.063

(b) *Well

Units (a) and (b) partially transferred.

VI.C.5.235(c)

(c) What were lands / made for ~

VI.C.5.235(d)

(d) Well, it might be / better than it’s ~

VI.C.5.235(e)

(e) *scenery that / on darkest / [long/ experience[s]] / of Dublin street
From Luther to Steiner 36: Those who are now so desirous of dealing Germany her death-blow, stricken and wounded as she is, still bleeding from her many wounds—be they Russians, Italians, French, English, or Americans—each and all, when their brutal lies and policy of force shall have finally and fearfully spent itself, will come in their absolute helplessness to thank heaven that a people will be living in Central Europe from the purity of whose spiritual source they may yet be enabled to drink the golden Elixir of Life, as from a Fountain of Youth. Repeatedly have our great German thinkers and Poets drawn attention to this fact, more particularly Friedrich Hebbel, who said: “It may come to pass that the German will once more vanish from the world’s stage: for he has all the qualities needful for conquering Heaven, but none with which to assert himself upon Earth, and all nations hate him, even as the Bad hate the Good; yet should they ever actually succeed in dispossessing him, a state of things will arise that will cause them to try and dig him out of his grave with their nails.”

VI.B.7.067

(a) in sickself
   Note: Possibly a pun on ‘in itself.’ For the source see (e) below.
   V.I.C.5.236(d)

(b) overthrow
   From Luther to Steiner 34: Against the French influence, again, Germany reacted, and her reaction triumphed on the side of literature in our classical poets and philosophy, and on the side of politics in the overthrow of Napoleon.
   V.I.C.5.236(e)

(c) talk of things
   From Luther to Steiner 21: But if we regard this curious “Rock” more closely we shall see that it could not have happened otherwise, for in the Gospels according to SS Matthew and Mark (see xvi, 23, and viii, 33, respectively) we find Christ saying to Peter, who was unable to apprehend His Mission: “Get thee behind me Satan: thou art an offence unto Me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men.” And so, too, the “Church,” as also the “Rock” whereon she stands, has been quick to deny that which is godly, and assents to what is human—all too human. For this reason, could Luther, with some show of right on his side, hurl the following hard words at the Pope: “Thou art not God’s, but the Devil’s Deputy.”
   V.I.C.5.236(f)

(d) 843 Verdun
   From Luther to Steiner 35: The words of Wilhelm Jordan, uttered with respect to the Thousand-year Anniversary of Germany’s Birth (1843), when he alluded to the Treaty of Verdun (843), ring far truer in their application to the present day, without giving the least cause for pessimism; for Spiritual Science is giving us the power to reach for the third time in the direction needed.”
   V.I.C.5.236(g)

(e) gnosis
   From Luther to Steiner 131-2: Gnosis was originally associated with knowledge [131] relating to the inner conditions, or World of Ideas, and served to elucidate the esoteric basis of Religion in contradistinction to “Pistik,” which was applied to the exoteric and popular Belief—the “edifice” erected by the church for the purpose of imparting instruction. There were “heathen”—that is, pre-Christian—as well as Christian Gnostics. The Manicheans were Gnostics who united the ancient mysteries of Persia with Christian occult teachings. In the same way there were Jewish, Greek, Syrian, and Egyptian Gnostics, so named according to the mysteries which they had made their special field of research.
Gnosis, therefore, is no Philosophy of Religion in itself, but may rather be called a philosophical method, applied to the elucidation of personal and other information and revelation; in short, its aim is to penetrate religious experiences by the aid of thought. The term, “Gnosis” is now, by general consent, applied only to the Christian occult teachings of the first three centuries A.D., in the form in which they were known to the well-known Church Father, Clement of Alexandria (who died about 220), and to his disciple, Origen (184-254). The exoteric Church of Rome, then aspiring to imperial power, did its utmost to crush this essentially spiritual movement in the earliest days of its inception, for it persecuted its representatives with the greatest severity, accusing them of heresy.

From Luther to Steiner 148-9: Though Jellinek does not go so far as to subscribe literally to all that the Swami was, in [148] his pride and ignorance, pleased to observe, namely, that “If the Occident desired to know anything about Soul, Spirit, and God; about the meaning and mysteries of the Cosmos, then, indeed, must the Occident sit at the feet of the Orient”; yet do his sympathies incline so strongly that way that he would seem hardly conscious of the extent to which he practically admits the poverty of Western and, more particularly, of German thought and spirit.

VI.C.5.236(h)

From Luther to Steiner 26: Much as Goethe admired the English for their initiative and their practical adaptability to life, the absence of both of which qualities he so much deplored in his countrymen, yet could he clearly visualize the drawbacks of both these virtues: “While we Germans worry ourselves with philosophical problems, the English, with their intensely practical minds, laugh us to scorn—and capture the world! All are acquainted with the declaration they made against slavery, but—while they sought to impress us with their humane maxims for the extermination of the iniquitous Slave-Trade—it now transpires that their true motive was a practical one, without which, as is well known, an Englishman never acts, as we ought to have known all along” (1829).
other task awaiting them than that of ‘breaking’ Rome, they would have gone under long ago. But since they continue in being, displaying so much strength and thoroughness, they must, according to my way of thinking, have a great future before them—a goal which will be far greater than the destruction of the Roman Empire, or that of giving form to the Middle Ages, since they are now standing at a higher grade of civilization. But, the time, the opportunity [28] for this no human eye may foresee; nor is it for human power to hasten it, or bring it about. In the meantime it is for us, individual Germans, each—according to his talents, his leanings, and his position—to further the education of the people, strengthening it in every direction; from beneath and also mainly from above, so that the spirit may not wither, but remain fresh and bright: so that it may not lose heart but may remain capable of every great deed, when the day of its greatness shall dawn!” (1813).

VI.C.5.237(c)

VI.B.7.069

(a) 'R.C. / petrified

From Luther to Steiner 49: NOW, when we gaze down to the point of vantage offered by esoteric knowledge, and survey the two popular and exoteric forms of historical Christianity—Roman Catholicism and Protestantism—the first thing to disclose itself is that the former presents a state of absolute petrifaction, while its rival is undergoing a process of total decay and dissolution: that, in short, each is approaching a sure and certain end.
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(b) Gregory VII / 1074 / ban on / marriage

From Luther to Steiner 54: Indeed, for our part, we would forfeit the entire fund of Mysteries, as possessed and put forward by the Romish Church, rather than give up the ethical values gained by Protestantism—even should we not yet have attained to those new forms so imperatively necessary both for our scientific education and for our religious advancement.

The roots of these tendencies are essentially to be found in Luther. He was ready, in principle, to meet actual and natural life half-way, doing this, moreover, with so complete a naiveté that there was no hint of a bad conscience—far less of sin—about it. As we know, he removed the ban which Gregory VII (1074) had placed upon the marriage of the priesthood, and married Katherine de Bora in order to carry his own convictions into practice.

VI.C.5.237(d)-(f)

VI.B.7.070

(a) ⬤ monism/ [??]

From Luther to Steiner 57-8: Some indication of the path which is being travelled in this quest may be gathered from a lecture delivered by Dr. Paul Trestorpf, a Munich Nerve Specialist, first before an assembly of the German Monisten-Bund and later to the “Gnosis” Society. The title of the lecture was “Monism and Christianity,” and the [57] “Muenchner Neueste Nachrichten” referred to it as follows:

“Christo-monism.—In a lecture delivered before the German Monisten-Bund on Monism and Christianity, Dr. Paul Trestorpf urged that the two should be reconciled under the one form of ‘Christo-monism,’ a suggestion in aid of which, as the speaker showed, Paul Deussen, Eduard Schüré, and Frensen of Hilligenlei have already rendered much preparatory service. The speaker further pointed out how greatly philosophy, natural science, and religion show the need of being united in one form of expression, such as Monism has already assumed. Monism, with its positivism, he observed, might be said to stand nearest to neo-Confucianism, while Christianity and Buddhism sought life in Negation. The philosophical efforts of all the centuries might be summed up as a continuous seeking after unification. In this sense, too, were Socrates and Plato both disciples of Monism; while the Church Fathers showed their recognition of a monistic plan of the universe, and the Scholastics also did the same. Spinoza’s ideas, also, said Dr. Trestorpf, are permeated through and through with Monism. Indeed, we might say
that all human efforts are, fundamentally speaking, directed towards overcoming dualism and according the supremacy to one undivided Cosmic Principle.”

Not transferred.

(b) letter of / return

From Luther to Steiner 44-5: Such one-sidedness on the part of Luther, with its reactionary effect on the development of German science, has been deplored by both Goethe and Lessing, the latter, indeed, exclaiming:

“You released us from the yoke of tradition, but [44] who is going to release us from the even more intolerable yoke of the letter!”

Partially transferred.
VI.C.5.237(g)

(c) Luther >
Not transferred.

(d) Kath. Debora

Note: For the source see 069(b).
VI.C.5.237(h)

(e) Prot/ father >
Partially transferred.
VI.C.5.237(i)

(f) Monistenbund >
Not transferred.

(g) Ostwald

From Luther to Steiner 40: The exoteric direction is marked by all that is associated with those early theological differences which arose among the Lutherans, the followers of Zwingli, and the Calvinists, and which, in due time, have also crystallized into Confessions of Faith, into Dogma in the Protestant Church, and which, by way of Kant, Feuerbach, and Strauss, have led to Jatho, Traub, Harnack, Frenssen, and Drews, finally reaching the Nature-Religion of Haeckel, and culminating in the German Monisten-Bund of Oswald.
VI.C.5.237(j)

(h) Gutenberg

From Luther to Steiner 41: The invention of the printing press by Gutenberg (1400-1467) was another powerful accessory to the furtherance of Luther’s cause.
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(i) that stinking goat >
VI.A.251

(j) scholastic gets / sarters/

From Luther to Steiner 43-4: Reason was for Luther a “stinking goat,” a “deaf fool,” whenever she took upon herself to seek contact with the supersensible. It was also on this ground that he declined to have anything to do with the Scholastics, who—more especially in the person of Thomas Aquinas—were ever appealing to reason. Aristotle, to whom, by the way, he owed his logic, [43] he curtly dismisses as a “hypocrite,” a “sycophant,” a “stinking goat”!

It may be therefore be seen that Luther drew a rigid line between Knowledge and Faith, between Philosophy and Religion, and this inflexible attitude of mind may be said to have had its good as well as its bad side. Its advantage lay in that it drew him towards the Mystics (who also turned aside from the
Scholastics), causing him to seek a more intense degree of religious fervour in the hope of achieving Communion with the Divine than did the Scholastics, working in the Scientific Light kindled for them by Aristotle. But the drawback is to be found in the dualism arising from the hard-and-fast division of Belief and Science in the intellectual life of modern times, upon which Kant laid his finger with so much acumen, and upon which he expended so vast an amount of dialectics that it has in the present day came to be accepted as the most natural and reasonable thing in the world.

VI.C.5.237(k)

VI.B.7.071

(a) Faust

VI.C.5-238(a)

(b) Celestial

*From Luther to Steiner* 45-47: The “Faust” Legend which first became known about that time, is intimately associated with these efforts. The “Faust” book appeared in 1587, and a contemporary of Melanchton, alluding to this remarkable man (Faust), says that he had for a time “laid the Holy Scriptures beneath a bench behind the door,” turning from Theology to Medicine. This [45] Faust represents the very type of the human soul, which, as the outcome of the Reformation, found itself enmeshed in the struggles inseparable to the dawn of a New Era. This Faust did indeed typify the German—seeking and yearning for universal cognition, for a more elevated sense of existence, and for the attainment of his independence as a thinking individual. Indeed, it is symptomatic that it should have been Goethe of all men who seized on this old legendary theme from which to fashion a garment for his masterwork. But, while the folk-tale of the Middle Ages consigned his hero—bent on storming heaven—to the devil, Goethe’s “Faust” does ultimately attain salvation: a termination which points to a significant advance. So that, whereas Kant took the negative spirit of the Reformation as the basis of his principal work, Goethe grounded his masterpiece in the positive spirit of the same historical event. The “Criticism of Pure Reason” is the very reverse of the positive and practical cognition which is displayed in “Faust,” and we are, indeed forced to recognize that Kant and Goethe are in the most real sense at absolutely opposite poles.

We now come to Copernicus (1473-1543) and Kepler (1571-1630), both approaching Nature by means of their instruments from without, in order to investigate her secrets. Nor was the science they stood for to be checked by the “letter” of the Bible, which they had the courage frankly to contradict. Luther had been less courageous: he had narrowed his reason down until it came within the confines of Holy Writ, and had been ready to accept this thraldom of the “letter.” It is therefore a matter of no surprise if we find that modern astronomy was almost as accursed [46] in Luther’s sight as it was in that of the Church of Rome. Galileo, as we know, suffered torture owing to his adherence to this form of celestial science, while Giordano Bruno was burned at the stake.

47n1: The Copernican Teaching ranked as “heretical” until the year 1827.

VI.C.5-238(b)

(c) vid

Not found in *From Luther to Steiner*.

VI.C.5-238(c)

(d) Nche

*Note:* For the source see (f) below.

VI.C.5-238(d)

(e) Base/nos/

Not found in *From Luther to Steiner*.

VI.C.5-238(e)

(f) go to well
From Luther to Steiner 99: But in appraising both the mind and the character of a strong and outstanding personality, who by reason of special and peculiar endowments stands outside the common run of everyday humanity, we cease to have any right to apply commonplace and average standards. To do so, indeed, is as often as not tantamount, not only to damning the individual, but to setting up a barrier to all human progress upon the path to a higher civilization. “This much I have learnt,” observes Nietzsche, “had our supply of great men depended upon a ‘majority vote’ as to their qualifications (allowing for the sake of argument that the majority is able at all to appraise ‘greatness’ and the qualifications which go to make it possible), well, it is extremely unlikely that there would have been such a thing as a great man at all. For it is owing to the fact that evolution is independent of the consent of ‘the many’ that anything worthy of admiration ever happens at all upon our earth.”

99n1: “Der Wille zur Macht,” Book IV.

VI.C.5-238(f)

(g) August

From Luther to Steiner 54: It is, of course, impossible for historical research, upon which Liberal Protestantism bases its Christianity, to master the true mystery contents of Religion, which are entirely super-historical. Not that in saying this we would desire to suggest that historical research should be discontinued. Far from it! Such work contains much that is good, since as a civilizing factor its influence on the ethical side has valuable contributions to make. And this cleaner code of Ethics, even if bought at the price of some worn-out and discarded articles of Belief is well worth the price paid, for, as Goethe observed in a letter to Karl August, written in 1787, “religious anachronisms” that have been reduced to “mere soulless impressions” have no driving power.

VI.C.5-238(g)

VI.B.7.078

(a) puts forth

From Luther to Steiner 55: But these early tendencies, as evinced by Luther, have evolved far beyond what was known in his day, and have put forth their good and their bad fruit, as the example of Professor Drews, given a few pages back, will have served to indicate.

VI.C.5.239(j)

(b) slinking / Lifful

Not found in From Luther to Steiner.

VI.C.5.239(k)

(c) מַהֲפָּבָא / goat / Goat – god

From Luther to Steiner 55-6: Ludwig Feuerbach, in the closing words of his [55] lecture on “Das Wesen der Religion,” sums up these tendencies in the following words: “My task is to change you from being the friends of God to being friends of man; from Believers to Thinkers; from Worshippers to Workers; from Candidates, awaiting a future life, to Students of this one; from Christians, whom, by their own confession, acknowledge themselves to be ‘half beast,’ ‘half angel,’ to men: to complete human beings.”

VI.C.5.239(l)

VI.B.7.079

(a) Confucius

?From Luther to Steiner 58: “[...] The speaker further pointed out how greatly philosophy, natural science, and religion show the need of being united in one form of expression, such as Monism has already assumed. Monism, with its positivism, he observed, might be said to stand nearest to neo-Confucianism, while Christianity and Buddhism sought life in Negation.[...]”

VI.C.5.240(a)
(b) **Beyond / Behind**

*From Luther to Steiner* 56: Indeed, what Max Stirner has said of Feuerbach applied to the whole of Liberal Protestantism. “It seizes,” he observes, “upon the whole contents of Christianity with a force begotten of desperation: not in order to throw it aside; no, in order to embrace it—to hold it tight, this thing from which it has so long been kept asunder; putting out its last effort of strength, as it were, to drag it from the heavens and hold it from henceforth and for ever in its own keeping. Is not this, then, the final effort of desperation?—a drowning man’s clutching at a straw?—and does it not imply, at one and the same time, the Christian Longing for the **Beyond**? Heroes do not seek to pass to the Beyond, but would rather compel it **hither**; and does not the whole world cry out—doing so more or less consciously—that everything depends on ‘this side,’ and that ‘heaven’ should be brought to earth and experienced even here?”

MS 47472-173, ScrMT: in a state of nature propelled from behind into the great Beyond by footblows | JJA 45:201 | Mar 1927 | I.3§1-84/2.14/3.14 | FW 049.25
VI.C.5.240(b)

(c) **power**

*From Luther to Steiner* 59: It is for us to leave this ground and press forward—upward...in order that the losses due to perfectly legitimate nagations which have been recorded and admitted may now be attoned for and richly compensated by the power and will to recognize how, for equally legitimate reasons, such losses may, by modern and scientific means, be once more made good. And it is this question which we would consider in the following pages of this book. In this introductory portion we have sought to prove, we trust, without prejudice that the Soul of German Culture stands and falls with the spirit of the Reformation and that of our country’s Classic Age. May it therefore gain increasingly in power, so that it may be equal and ready, as in Luther’s and in Goethe’s days, to deliver its blow for the third time against reaction and decadence both within and without the confines of our lands.

VI.C.5.240(c)

VI.B.7.092

(j) **philanderer with / the / Reborn / of Dublin**

*From Luther to Steiner* 25: This man of mature years confesses to the fact that, when in Rome, he had to “go back to school” and “entirely relearnt”; indeed, that he was bound “to discard his earlier self” in order to learn how to “return to Germany in a reborn state” (March 22, 1787).

Not located in MS/FW.

VI.B.7.114 – [upside down] instead of 115

(b) **dare to from >**

MS 47480-58, ScrTsILA: ^+He deared me to it and he dared me do it, as bold and as madhouse a bull in a meadows.+^ | JJA 55:116 | 1937 | II.2§1.4 | FW 353.10-11

(c) **Lucifer put / out of heaven / for playing with fire**

*From Luther to Steiner* 140: But that Anthroposophy is related to and in a way embraces Gnosis may be gathered from a purely mundane consideration, namely, from the affiliation of the two journals which were for some time separately devoted to the services of these two classes of literature. Until the year 1903 there had been issued in Berlin and Vienna, independently of each other, two monthlies—“Gnosis,” published by George Kohler in the latter city, and “Lucifer,” edited by Rudolf Steiner in Berlin. But in January, 1904, the eighth issue of “Lucifer” appeared in conjunction with “Gnosis,” and their joint publication continued henceforth, under the editorship of Steiner, with the title of “Lucifer-Gnosis”—a proud name indeed, since **Lucifer** was the great Angel who lit his Torch of Knowledge at the very Heart of God, that he might be the bearer of Wisdom to humanity, yet who, as a punishment for his daring, was hurled from Heaven to Earth, whence he will rise again, to sit at the Right Hand of GOD.
MS 47482a-64, ScrEM: ^+May+^ Maledictions ^+of Lucifer lousy ^+Lousyfear+^ fall heavy on ^+the white friar’s father that converted+^ the fostermother of the first Nancyfree that went off with the bloodtempered trumpadour that mangled melodies that turned the daft ^+tub’s+^ head of the ^+daft+^ journal writer on him to inspire the prime minister to fell the firtree out of which Jeeny Cooper made the bumb of the beerbarrel on which my grandaddy’s eldest sat ^+took his seat of wisdom+^ with my ^+grand+^ aunt’s ^+niece+^ for a playgirl ^+the cause of his joy+|^  JJA 57:192 | Mar 1926 | III§2A.5├/2B.2├/2C.5├ | FW 439.06-14

VI.B.7.128

(a) sacred music / never repeated / nobody wants a / second edition / of universe

From Luther to Steiner 70-1: Conceptions of the Universe must therefore be readjusted, or, better still, revolutionized, before a new code of Ethics can be evolved. But such Ethics, opined Haeckel, would no longer be found to agree with the old and time-honoured Religions and Creeds, and the Jena savant closed his article with the following very illuminating words: “... More particularly do I concur with many of the objections which Herr Rudolf Steiner has put forward, and I feel that I must adhere to my conviction that the great ethical questions cannot be solved without consideration of their relation to Religion and the Universe as a whole. It is not the absolute and mystical dogmas of the Church, but the rational and reasonable knowledge derived from science, which promises in the present day to provide us with foundation stones for the long-needed new Conception of the Universe.” [70]

The Society for Ethical Culture has, in fact, proved itself to be reactionary, for its founders and principal supporters—while honouring Natural Science “with their heads,” so to speak—cling with their hearts to the old moralities of the Christian Church. It is really impossible for them to reform “ethics” on the lines laid down by scientific knowledge, so long as they believe that “ethics” can only be derived from entirely different and “religious” sources.

It does not seem to occur to those who maintain these views how untenable their arguments really are. They are not even aware, for instance, that such ethical teaching can, as to its meaning, appeal solely to those who believe in the Christian Cosmogony, and therefore that all those who decline to accept this particular conception of the Universe (including, we may add, Steiner, who never did subscribe to it) cannot very well talk of a reform so far as Christianity’s conception of ethics is in question, but solely of a new birth in the matter of life’s ethics in general—a new birth conceived and evolved in accordance with the spirit of the modern scientific view of the Universe.

VI.C.5.256(k)-257(a),(b)

VI.B.7.216

(a) artist & rich / women

From Luther to Steiner 98: Richard Wagner (for whose sake Seiling was ever ready to go through fire, as long as there was no fear of its burning) has in his capacity of German artist identified himself most ardently with the German Monism which treats the person and the thing as one and indivisible. How much more must not this have been the case with the German Mystics of the Middle Ages, as we have attempted to show in the earlier pages of this book, to say nothing of the German spiritual thinkers of the present day? “To separate the artist from the man,” says Wagner, “is about as thoughtless an idea as to talk of separating soul and body. No artist could be loved—never could his art be comprehended—were it not that he, at all events, unconsciously and involuntarily, is also beloved as a man, and that—along with his art—his life has also come to be understood.”

VI.C.7.009(h)
VI.B.7.051

(a) **no but with / help of God**

La Scienza Nuova 1725, Book II, Ch. XLI: E qui si scuopre il *Principio delle Vendicazioni* fondato nel Diritto Ottimo de' Campi delle Genti Latine, che in antica lingua significò Diritto fortissimo: detto ottimo dallo implorare *opem Deorum*, che facevano i Forti, pregando i Dei, che dessero loro *Forza* di uccidere i ladroni: [...] [Book II, Chapter XLI. *Optimum law as the principle of revenge and the origin of heraldic law*]

The principle of revenge is also discovered here, founded in the optimum law of the fields of the Latin peoples. In the ancient language this meant ‘the strongest law’, but it was called ‘optimum’ from the practice of imploring *opem deorum* (‘the help of the gods’), which the strong did by praying to them for the force with which to kill the thieves.]

VI.B.7.058

(i) **be/stial/**

La Scienza Nuova 1725, Book II, Ch. VIII: *Disperazione di ritruvarne il Progresso, ovvero la Perpetuità.*

Ma come per l’empietà andarono essi nello stato dell’*Huomo* di Grozio, che’il pone solo, e perchè solo, debole e bisognoso di tutto; anzi in quello dell’*Huomo* di Obbes, nel quale a tutti era lecito tutto contra di tutti, e così in quello dell’*Huomo* del Pufendorfio gittato in questo Mondo, ma abbandonatovi da sè, non dalla cura, ed ajuto di Dio; qual Principio conviene a *Filosofo*, e *Filologo Cristiano*, e perchè
Cristiano, si dà *non per* Ipotesi, ma di fatto: e come poi dalla loro *bestiale* libertà essi si ricevettero a vita civile con le false Religioni: [...]  
[Book II, Chapter XXXIV. *The difficulty of discovering the progress or continuity [proper to this Science]*: But how did the impiety of the worshippers of the God of Adam lead them to the state of Grotius’s man, in which he was solitary and, accordingly, weak and in need of everything, or that of Hobbes’s man in which, on the contrary, all was allowed to all against all, or that of Pufendorf’s man, in which he was thrown into the world and abandoned there alone, without the care and assistance of God? [This difficulty must be resolved] since it is a principle necessary to any Christian philosopher or philologist and, therefore, since it is Christian, is given not as hypothesis but as fact. And how, later, through their false religions were they received into civil life from their bestial liberty?  
21n31: Vico is here referring to the necessity of showing the continuity of the biblical account of the Fall with the origins of gentle history.  
21n32: This is a conventional expression of the time, though there is a somewhat similar expression, ‘of everyone against everyone’, in Hobbes, *Leviathan*, 14.  
21n33: Though Vico dissents from these thinkers with regard to their explanation of man’s emergence from such a bestial state of nature, he does not wish to deny that humanity originated in some such state.]

VI.C.5.233(e)

VI.B.7.180

(a) curiosi >

VI.C.5.275(c)

(b) avvenire

*La Scienza Nuova* 1725. Book I, Ch. I: [...] il qual senso, quanto è riposto nella cagione, tanto palese produce quello effetto, che negli estremi malori di morte desideriamo, esservi una forza superiore alla natura per superarli; la quale unicamente è da ritrovarsi in un Dio, che non sia essa Natura, ma ad essa Natura superiore, cioè una *Mente Infinita, ed Eterna*: da qual Dio gli uomini diviando, essi sono *curiosi* dell'avvenire.  
[Book I, Chapter I. *Reasons for our meditation on this work*. But however hidden this cause, its effect is equally evident: that, when faced with the final afflictions of death, we wish for a force superior to nature by which to overcome them, a force that is to be found only in a God who is not identical with, but superior to, nature herself, i.e. an infinite and eternal mind. And when men stray from this God, they become curious about the future.]  
VI.C.5.275(e)

(c) venere canina >

VI.C.5.275(d)

(d) avvenire >

*Note:* See VI.B.180(c).  
VI.C.5.275(f)

(e) divinazione >

VI.C.5.275(g)

(f) 1) prommesso >

VI.C.5.275(h)
2) connubio

Note: It. Connubio. Marriage, union. See also 222(c).
VI.C.5.275(i)

3) sepolture

La Scienza Nuova 1725, Book I, Ch. I: Quindi le false Religioni tutte sursero sopra l’Idolatria, o sia culto di Deitadi fantasticate su la falsa credulità d’esser corpi forniti di forze superiori alla Natura, che soccorran gli huomini ne’ loro estremi malori; e l’Idolatria nata ad un parto con la Divinazione, o sia vana scienza dell’avvenire a certi avvisi sensibili, creduti esser mandate agli uomini dagli Dei. Si fatta vana Scienza, dalle quale dovette incominciare la Sapienza Volgare di tutte le Nazioni gentili, nasconde però due gran Principi di vero; uno, che vi sia Provvedenza Divina che governi le cose umane; l’altro, che negli uomini sia Libertà d’arbitrio, per lo quale, se vogliono e vi si adoperano, possono schivare ciò che, senza provvederlo, altramenti loro appartenerebbe. Dalla qual seconda verità viene di seguito che gli huomini abbiano elezione di vivere con giustizia: il quale comun senso è comprovato da questo comun desiderio, che naturalmente hanno gli huomini delle leggi, ove essi non sien tocchi da passione di alcun proprio interesse di non volerle. Questa, e non altra, certamente è l’Umanità: la quale sempre e dappertutto resse le sue pratiche sopra questi tre sensi comuni del Genere Umano: primo, che vi sia Provvidenza: secondo, che si facciano certi figliuoli con certe donne, con le quali sieno almeno i Principj d’una Religion civile comuni; perché da’ padri e dalle madri con uno spirito i figliuoli si educino in conformità delle Leggi e delle Religioni, tra le quali sono essi nati: terzo che si seppelliscano i morti. Onde non solo non fu al mondo nazioni d’Atei, ma nemmeno alcuna, nella quale le donne non passino nella Religion pubblica dei loro mariti; e se non vi furon Nazioni che andarono tutte nude, molto meno vi fu alcuna che usò la Venere canina o sfacciata in presenza di altrui; e non celebresse altri, che concubiti vaghi, come fanno le bestie: né finalmente vi ha nazione, quantunque barbarica, che lasci marcare insepolti sopra la terra i cadaveri de’ loro attinenti: il quale sarebbe uno stato nefario, o sia stato peccante contro la natura comune degli huomini: nel quale per non cadere le Nazioni, custodiscon tutte con inviolate cerimonie le Religioni natie; e con ricercati riti e solemnità sopra tutte le altre cose umane celebrano i matrimonj, e i mortori: che è la Sapienza Volgare del Genere Umano; la quale cominciò dalle Religioni, e dalle Leggi, e si perfezionò e compiè con le Scienze, con le Discipline, e con l’Arte.

[Book I, Chapter I. Reasons for our meditation on this work: Whence the false religions all rose from idolatry, i.e. from the worship of imaginary deities, falsely believed to be bodies with supernatural force, who give succour to men in their final afflictions. Idolatry shared her birth with that of divination, which was a vain science of the future, through which men believed that the gods sent them certain sensory warnings. Yet this vain science, in which the vulgar wisdom of all the gentile nations must have begun, hides two great principles of truth: first, that there is a divine Providence which governs human affairs; second, that men possess freedom of the will, through which, if they so choose, they can escape that which, without their foreseeing it, would otherwise befall them. It follows from this second truth that men can choose to live in justice, a common sense that is confirmed by the common desire men naturally have for laws when they are not moved otherwise by the passion of some self-interest.

This, and no other, is certainly the human nature whose practices, always and everywhere, have been governed by these three common senses of mankind: firstly, that Providence exists: secondly, that certain children be bred by certain women with whom they share at least the principles of a common civil religion, in order that they be brought up by their fathers and mothers in a single spirit and in conformity with the laws and religions amidst which they were born; and thirdly, that the dead should be buried. Hence not only has there never been a nation of atheists in the world, but neither has there been a nation in which women did not adopt the public religion of their husbands. And if there has never been a nation that lived in total nakedness, even less has there been one in which people practiced canine or shameless venery in the presence of others or indulged it, like beasts, only in stray matings. Nor, finally, has any nation, no matter how barbaric, ever left the corpses of its members to rot unburied on the ground, for this would be a nefarious state, i.e. one that sins against the common nature of men. Hence, to avoid falling into such a state, the nations protect their native religions with inviolable ceremonies, celebrating marriage and burial, above all other human institutions, with elaborate rites and solemnities. This is the vulgar wisdom of mankind, which began in religions and laws and reached its perfection and completion in the sciences, disciplines and arts.

10n3: These three conditions provide the basic hypothesis of the whole of the New Science, which Vico later claims to have proved. Cf. 526.
VI.C.5.275(j)

VI.B.7.186

(d) bestione

La Scienza Nuova 1725, Book I, Ch. III: [...] e sì con un dotto abbaglio, nel qual è stato fino al di d’oggi seguito, ci vuol approvvuovere, essere stati sapientissimi di Sapienza Riposta i Primi Autori dell’ Umanità gentilesca: i quali, come di razze d’huomini empi e senza civiltà, quali dovettetero un tempo essere quelle di Cam, e Giafet, non poterono essere, che bestioni tutti stupore, e ferocia.

[Book I, Chapter III. The defect of such a Science if based upon the maxims of the Epicureans and Stoics or the practices advocated by Plato: Thus, through a scholarly error, in which he has been followed to the present day, it became necessary for him to prove that the first authors of gentle humanity were sages, replete in a recondite wisdom, whereas, since they came from races of impious and uncultured men, such as those of Ham and Japhet must once have been, they could only have been huge beasts, wholly bewildered and ferocious.]

La Scienza Nuova 1725, Book I, Ch. X. [Come da ’Filologi]: Rimossi i sapienti, ci rimangono i bestioni, che sono i primi uomini che pongono il Grozio e l’ Pufendorfio, da’ quali debbe aver incominciata l’Umanità gentilesca: di che non potendo seguir noi le ragioni che ne hanno disputate i Filosofi; saremmo costretti seguire le autorità che ne hanno arrecato i Filologi, sotto il cui nome si comprendono qui Poeti, Istorici, Oratori, Gramatici, i quali ultimi si dicono volgarmente Eruditi.

[Book I, Chapter X. The difficulty of discovering the origins of humanity] from the philologists: Having rejected the sages [of the philosophers], we are left with the great beasts, the first men posited by Grotius and Pufendorf, as those from whom gentle humanity must have arisen. And since we cannot accept the reasoning adduced by the philosophers, we must turn our attention to the authorities gathered by the philologists, under which term we include here the poets, historians, orators and grammarians, the last of whom are called ‘scholars’ in the vulgar.]

VI.C.5.276(h)

(e) born in / 7 cities

La Scienza Nuova 1725, Book I, Ch. X: I Greci, da’ quali abbiamo tutto ciò che abbiamo d’Antichità, bruttamente ignorarono le Antichità loro proprie; di che vi sono tre gravissime pruove; due di Omero, primo certo Autor greco, e primo certo Padre di tutta la greca Erudizione: la prima è una confession pubblica di tutti i popoli greci che non ne seppero la patria; che tutti il volevano lor cittadino; quantunque finalmente a favor di Smirna restò dicisa la lunga lìte: la seconda è un’altra confession pubblica di tutti i Filologi; de’ quali le oppinioni dintorno all’età che Omero visse, sono cotanto tra loro varianti, che l’divario si calcola di quattrocesessanta anni da quelli che l pongono a’ tempi di essa Guerra Trojana, allì più oppressi che ver rebbono a porlo ne’ tempi di Numa; le quali cose, massime ignorate di esso famosissimo Omero, ci danno molto da compassionare la vanità diligenza de’ Critici, così minuta, ove determinano nonché allo ’ngrosso i paesi, ma i sassi e le fontane; nonché i secoli, e gli anni, ma i mesi, e i giorni, dove e quando avvennero le anco menomose cose dell’ultima oscurissima Antichità: la terza pruova è una testimonianza di Tucidide, primo storico della Grecia veritiero, e grave, il quale nello incominciare della sua Storia ci attesta; che i Greci del suo tempo fino all’età de’ loro padri nulla seppero delle antichità loro proprie: e questo al tempo della Grecia ne’ due suoi Imperi di Sparta, e di Atene più luminoso, che è quello della Guerra Peloponnesiaca, di cui fu contemporaneo scrittore Tucidide; che sono da venti anni innanzi della legge delle XII. Tavole data a’ Romani: or quanto egli resta ad intendere che infino a tai tempi essi nulla, o poco sapessero delle cose straniere?

[Book I, Chapter X. [The difficulty of discovering the origins of humanity] from the philologists: The Greeks, from whom we have all that we have concerning antiquity, were also grossly ignorant of their own antiquities. On this point we have three weighty proofs, two of which relate to Homer, the first certain Greek author and the first certain father of the whole of Greek erudition. The first of these is a public confession, on the part of all the Greek peoples, that none of them knew Homer’s native land, since they all claimed him as their own citizen, a long dispute that was finally decided in favour of Smyrna. The second is another public confession, this time by all the philologists, whose beliefs about the time in which Homer lived vary so greatly that a difference of four hundred and sixty years can be
calculated between those who locate him at the time of the Trojan War, and their most extreme opponents, who would put him at the time of Numa. Indeed, given ignorance of this order in relation to Homer, the most famous figure of all, we cannot fail to pity the vain diligence of the critics who determine with such minute precision not merely countries as a whole but their very stones and fountains, not merely their centuries and years but their very months and days, the very where and when of the occurrence of things in the furthest, most obscure antiquity. The third proof is provided by the testimony of Thucydides, the first serious and truthful historian of Greece, who states, at the beginning of his history, that the Greeks of his time knew nothing of their own antiquities before the age of their fathers. And this in her most enlightened period, when Greece, with her two empires of Sparta and Athens, engaged in the Peloponnesian War, of which Thucydides was a contemporary writer, and some twenty years before the Law of the Twelve Tables was [supposedly] given to the Romans! What more, then, need be said to show that up to this time the Greeks knew little or nothing of anything foreign?

Note: Joyce equates III to Homer.

VI.B.7.187

(a) il promesso

?La Scienza Nuova 1725, Book II, Ch. I: Perché non possono gli umani in umana società convenire, se non convengono in un senso umano che vi sia una Divinità, la qual veda nel fondo del cuor degli huomini. Imperciòohé società d’huomini non può incominciare né reggere senza mezzi, onde altri riposino sopra le altrui promesse, e si acquetino alle altrui asseverazioni di fatti occulti. perché spessissimo avviene nella vita umana che ne bisogna promettere ed esserci promesso; e succedono sovente de’ fatti che non son occulti delitti, de’ quali bisogna accertare altrui, e non ne possiamo dure alcuno umano documento.

[Book II, Chapter I. The first principle of the nations is Providence: For men cannot unite in a human society unless they share a human sense that there is a divinity who sees into the depths of their hearts, since a society of men can neither begin nor remain stable without a means whereby some rely upon the promises of others and are satisfied by their assertions in secret matters. For it frequently happens in human life that promises need to be made and accepted, and actions undertaken, with regard to things for which, though not wrong in themselves, others need some assurance, but which lack the support of any human documentation.]

44n4: Cf. 8-10.

VI.C.5.276(k)

VI.B.7.188

(d) Sermo

?La Scienza Nuova 1725, Book III, Ch. XXV: [...] che Omero istesso in cinque, o sei luoghi di tutti e due i suoi Poemi, ove fa menzione di una lingua antica di Grecia, che si era parlata innanzi de’ suoi eroi, la chiama Lingua degli Dei: alla qual lingua corrispondono i Geroglifici degli Egizj, ovvero i loro caratteri sacri, de’ quali s’intendevano i soli sacerdoti, che Tacito, quasi odorando queste nostre cose, chiama sermonem patrium parlar natio, di quell’antichissima Nazione: [...] [Book III, Chapter XXV [XXVI]: The mode in which the poetic language that has come down to us was formed: And in the five or six places in his two poems where he mentions an ancient Greek language that was spoken before that of his heroes, Homer himself calls it ‘the language of the gods’. The hieroglyphics, or sacred characters, of the Egyptians, which were understood only by their priests, correspond to this language, which Tacitus, almost as if he scented our claims, calls sermonem patrium, i.e. the native language of the oldest nation.]

MS 47473-233, ScrPrILA: ^+when e have to sermo+^ | JJA 47:185 | late Aug 1927 | 1.6§1.5/2.3/3.2/4.4 | FW 152.07

VI.C.5.277(f)
**VI.B.7.214**

(a) **nexus (nodo)**  
La Scienza Nuova 1725, Book II, Ch. XLI: Diritto del Nodo, Principio delle Obbligazioni; ed Abbozzo delle Represaglie, e della Schiavitù.

Altra Principla Parte di tal Diritto Divino fu quello appellato del **Nodo**, che gli stessi Pareggiatori Attici non osan dirlo essi tragitto di Grecia in Roma; che pur nella Storia Favolosa de’ Greci fu detto Nessos, come qui appresso si truoverà, come **Nexus** fu detto da’ Latini; e restò a’ Romani, nel famoso capo della Legge delle XII. Tavole, concepito con questi vocaboli di prigionier, e schiavo. **Qui nexus faciet mancipiunque;** per lo quale i Creditori, implorata prima la fede degli Dei, che fu il primo, e proprio implorare Deorum fidei; e la Fede intesa per la Forza, bisognò esser in quel rozzissimo tempo una corda di vinchi; ché tal dovette prima nascere ne’ tempi che non vi era altro arte che villereccia, e ne restò *vimen* pur a vi detto a’ Latini; con la qual corda strascinati a forza i debitori, li ligavano veramente in certi campi, perché loro soddisfasessero i debiti con le fatighe; e in questo **abbozzo di ripresaglie** si ritrova il Princípio delle Obbligazioni, che cominciò col carcere privato in casa, e si spieò con la schiavitù poi fuori nelle guerre.

[Book II, Chapter XLII. *The law of the bond as the origin of obligations and the first outlines of reprisals and slavery:* The second principal part of this divine law was that ‘of the bond’, which even the Attic commentators dared not say was shipped over from Greece to Rome. This bond was the Latin *nexus*, which, as we shall discover below [465-6], was called the ‘nexus’ even in the fabulous history of Greece. It survived among the Romans in the meaning of the words ‘prisoner’ and ‘slave’ in the famous chapter of the Law of the Twelve Tables, *Qui nexus faciet mancipiumque* [*Whoever makes a bond or solemn transfer of property*], in which, with the first and proper implorare deorum fidei, the creditors had first implored the protection of the gods, where by ‘protection’ they meant ‘force’. In those very rough times the nexus must have been a rope made of withie, which the Latins continued to call *vimen* [*’withe’], from vi, [*’force’, ‘strength’*], for the nexus must have been born in a period when the only arts were rural. This was the rope with which debtors were dragged along by force and literally tied to certain fields, in order to discharge their debts through labour. In these first outlines of reprisals the origin of obligations is discovered, beginning with private imprisonment at home and then developing through slavery in war abroad.

110n161: Cicero, *De nat. Deorum*, I, 6, 13.]

*Note:* Nexus. A bond, link, or junction; a means of connection between things or parts; (also) the state of being connected or linked. (OED)

VI.C.7.008(m)

(b) **fabbro delle nazioni**  
La Scienza Nuova 1725, Book II, Ch. III: L’Umano Arbitrio, regolato con la Sapienza Volgare, è ’l Fabbro del Mondo delle Nazioni.

Il **Fabbro** poi del **Mondo delle Nazioni**, che ubbidisce a tal *Divina Architetta*, egli è l’*Arbitrio Umano*, altrimenti ne’ particolari huomini di sua natura incertissimo, però determinato dalla Sapienza del Genere Umano con la misure delle utilità o necessità umane uniformemente comuni a tutte le particolari nature degli huomini: le quali umane necessità, o utilità, così determinate, sono i due Fonti che i Guireconsulti Romani dicono di tutto il Diritto Natural delle Genti.

[Book II, Chapter III. *The artificer of the world of nations is human will regulated by vulgar wisdom:* Subservient to this divine architect, the artificer of the world of nations is human will. Though uncertain by nature in particular men, it is here determined by the wisdom of mankind concerning the measure of human utilities and necessities uniformly common to all the particular natures of men. These human necessities and utilities, thus determined by the wisdom of mankind, are the two sources of the whole natural law of the gentes of which the Roman jurisconsults spoke.]

VI.C.7.009(a)

(c) **patrimonio**  
La Scienza Nuova 1725, Book II, Ch. XXXV: Questo è, in quanto il Regno Romano finora in capo a’ Filologi ha avuto del Monarchico: vediamo ora, per quanto egli è slato da’ medesimi mescolato di libertà popolare, sopra il Censo ordinato da Servio Tullio: del quale è forte da dubitare non sia una
Decima d’Ercole imposta a’ campi de’ signori, più tosto che l’estimamento de’ Patrimonj, quale fu quello della Repubblica libera.

[Book II, Chapter XXXV. The discovery of the heroic or aristocratic nature of the Roman kingdom: This, then, is the extent to which the Roman kingdom had the monopolarchical character in which the philologists have hitherto led us to believe. Let us now see how far these same philologists have also mixed [elements of] popular liberty into [their account of] the Roman kingdom, on the basis of the census of Servius Tullius.]

What is almost impossible to doubt here is that it was a tithe of Hercules that was imposed on the fields of the lords rather than an evaluation of patrimony as in the case of the census appropriate to the free republic. 98n130: Livy, I, 42, 4-5. Contrary to the philologists, Vico wants to establish that the census was intended to consolidate an aristocratic form of government. Livy offers an account of Servius’ census of the sort that Vico wants to deny was possible at this stage, i.e. that it was administered on the basis of wealth, compensated by political privilege and involved the abandonment of universal suffrage which, Livy says, had obtained since Romulus.]

La Scienza Nuova 1725, Book II, Ch. LXI: E così Ercole, della cui razza furono i nobili Sparta, che ne serbarono il patrimonio di Eraclidi, succedè ad Atlante nel peso di sostenere gli Dei della loro Nazione.

[Book II, Chapter LXI [LXI]. New historical principles of geography: Thus Hercules, from whose race came the noble Spartans who preserved the patronymic ‘Heraclid’, succeeded Atlas in bearing the burden of sustaining the gods of their nation.]


VI.C.7.009(b)

VI.B.7.216

(a) Auspicious

La Scienza Nuova 1725, Book II, Ch. VII: Così nelle persone de’ Monarchi si unirono gli antichissimi auspicij, che si dice la Fortuna delle condotte; si unirono i nomi delle nazioni, che è la Gloria dell’Imprese; e per gli auspicij, e i nomi, in loro si unì il Sommo Impero dell’Armi; con le quali essi difendono le propie Religioni, e le propie Leggi; dalle quali si distinguono, e si conservano le Nazioni: [...] [Book II, Chapter VII. The natural order of ideas concerning the law of the nations [as it proceeds] through their own religions, laws, languages, marriages, names, arms and governments: Vico The First New Science 56: 78 Thus in the persons of the monarchs were united the oldest auspices, called ‘the fortune of the guides’, the names of nations, called ‘the glory of their exploits’, and, as a result of their auspices and names, the supreme command of arms, with which they defended their own religions and laws and separated and preserved their nations.
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VI.B.7.222

(a) Agnates /i/}

La Scienza Nuova 1725, Book II, Ch. VII [Corollario]: Impennino pur i nostri Ingegni tutta la loro acutezza, o più tosto arguzia, per poter mantenere la riputazione alla nostra memoria già invecchiata in ciò, che l’ Governo Romano sotto i Rè fu Monarchico mescolato di liberta popolare; che Bruto, col cacciare da Roma i re, la fondò tutta; che la Legge delle XII. Tavole venne da Atene, Città certamente a que’ tempi libera, e che stabili in Roma affatto l’egualità; che resteraccia questa pubblica testimonianza d’incontrastata Istoria, che i plebei fino a sei anni dopo essa Legge non solo non erano cittadini Romani, siccome quelli che non avevano le cose divine comuni coi nobili; ma nemmeno della stessa Romana
Nazione; a’ quali i Padri oppongono che essi, i quali eran nobili, avevano la Gente che certamente era la Romana: ma ciò che sbalordisce, eran tenuti di una specie diversa dagli uomini; che agiarent connubio more ferarum; che duravan sol tanto, quanto durava la coabitazione con le loro donne. Le quali cose, se non si può riprendere Modestino aver falsamente diffinito le nozze; se non si può rinnegare questo comun costume dello Nazioni, che nonna Città è divisa in parti per Dei; perchè ogni città divisa in parti per cagion di Religione, o è già rovinata, o è presso alla rovina: se non si può sconoscere questa troppo strepitosa testimonianza di Romana Storia certa, di un Diritto, che con pubbliche arringhe e con popolari movimenti in Roma ben tre anni si contrastò; ci vediamo gittati in una necessità, se non più tosto sollevati in una libertà di troppo sconfidare della tanta accuratezza de’Critici, che a ciascheduna delle Tavole hanno fissi i propj Capi di cotal Legge: e’l Capo dove i plebei sieno Padri di famiglia, che non possono essere che cittadini; e quello dove facciano solenni Testamenti, e diano i tutori a’ figliuoli; che non è permesso ad altri fare, che a’ Padri di famiglia; e l’altro dove i loro retaggi vadano ab intestato agli eredi suoi, in difetto agli agnati, e finalmente a’ gentili; i retaggi diciamo, di que’ plebei che, sino a tre anni dopo tal Legge data loro, non avevano gente, o casato.

[Book II, Chapter VII. Corollary, A practical test comparing [the results of] our reasoned principles with the vulgar tradition that the Law of the Twelve Tables came from Athens: Let even the most ingenious of our scholars employ all their sharp wit or, rather, cunning, in support of the reliability of our memory, already very old, with regard to the following claims: that under the kings the government of Rome was an admixture of monarchy and popular liberty; that Brutus founded complete popular liberty in Rome when he drove out the kings; and that the Law of the Twelve Tables came from Athens, certainly a free city at that time, and that with it complete equality was established in Rome. For, in contrast to all this, we have the public evidence of incontestable history that, until six years after the Law of the Twelve Tables, not only were the plebeians not Roman citizens, since they did not share the divine institutions of the nobles, but they were not even part of the Roman nation. For the fathers opposed them on the grounds that they alone belonged to a gens, which was certainly Roman, and, astonishing though it may seem, held the plebeians to be of a different species from men, because agiarent connubia more ferarum [‘they mated in the manner of wild animals’], a state which continued only as long as [natural] cohabitation with their women continued. So, unless we are able to criticise Modestinus for providing a false definition of marriage, unless we can deny that it was a common custom of nations not to divide cities into regions on the basis of having different gods, for a city divided by religion is either already in ruins or close to it, and unless we can disregard the all too strident evidence of certain Roman history regarding a law that was in dispute in public debates and popular movements for a good six years, the foregoing points oblige us or, perhaps better, allow us the freedom, not to repose too much trust in the accuracy with which the critics have affixed headings of their own to each of the laws of the [Twelve] Tables: thus, the heading whereby the plebeians were the fathers of families, when this was possible only for citizens; or that whereby the plebeians made solemn testaments and created guardians for their children, when this was permitted only to the fathers of families; and again, that whereby the plebeians’ inheritances descended ab intestato to their heirs or, failing that, to their male relatives or, finally, to those of the same gens: for these, we say, were the inheritances of those very plebeians who, until six years after this law was set down, belonged neither to a gens nor a house!

59n41: Livy, IV, 2, 6.]

Note: Agnation. Descent from a common male ancestor, even though female links have intervened; distinguished from cognation or descent from the same mother, which may or may not include agnation. (OED)
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(c) p. 85 /bro/
VLC.7.013(e)

(d) figliuoli di Dio Seth / — e d’uomini Cain
La Scienza Nuova 1725, Book II, Ch. XII: Così si fanno veri i Giganti: de’ quali la Sacra Storia nārra che nacquero dalla confusione de’ semi umani de’ figliuoli di Dio, che Samuele Bocarto spiega, de’ discendenti di Seto innanzi, e noi supphimo di Semo dopo il Diluvio, con le figliuole degli Huomini, che’l Bocarto spiega con la discendenza di Caino innanzi, e noi anche con quella di Cam, e Giafet dopo il Diluvio: nārra che i Giganti furono huomini forti famosi del secolo: e narrando altresì che Caino fu il Fondatore delle Città avanti, e Nembrot gigante innalzò la gran Torre dopo il Diluvio[...]
[Book II, Chapter XII. Third: through physical demonstrations which prove that the first origin of profane history lay in the giants and that profane history is continuous with sacred history: Thus the giants become true. Sacred history relates that they were born of the confusion of the human seed of the sons of God with the daughters of men.74 According to Samuel Bochart these sons of God were the descendants of Seth and the daughters of men were the descendants of Cain, all living before the Flood. But to the sons of God we would add the descendants of Shem and to the daughters of men those of Ham and Japhet, all living after the Flood. Sacred history describes these giants as ‘the famous strong men of their [71] age’, and goes on to relate that Cain founded cities before the Flood and that the giant Nimrod erected the great tower [of Babel] after it.
71n74: Genesis, 6:4.
Note: It. Figliuoli di Dio. Sons of God.
It. E d’uomini. And of man.
VLC.7.013(f)

(e) p. 89
VLC.7.013(g)

(f) Deucalion’ / “]| Ellen
La Scienza Nuova 1725, Book II, Ch. XII: [...] e vicino al Diluvio ci narra i Giganti, e per Prometeo Gigante Deucalione nipote de Giapeto, e lo stesso padre di Ellen, fondatore della Grecia gente, cui diede il nome di Elleni; che deve essere la razza greca provenuta da Giapet, chi venne a popolare l’Europa, come Cam la Fenicia, e l’Egitto, e per colà l’Africa: ma per le guaste Tradizioni, che n’erano state tramandate ad Omero, essendo stato preso il Caos per la confusione de’ semi della Natura, e creduti l’Ogigio, e ’l Deucalianio particolari Diluvj, che non devettero essere, che Tradizioni tronche del Diluvio Universale; e stimati i Giganti, di corpi e forze essere stati in natura impossibili; l’Origine della Storia Profana, e la sua perpetuita con la Sacra è stata sconosciuta fino al di d’oggi.
[Book II, Chapter XII. Third: through physical demonstrations which prove that the first origin of profane history lay in the giants and that profane history is continuous with sacred history: As we shall see below, Chaos must first have meant the confusion of human seed, and only later the confusion of the seeds of the whole of nature. Greek history also places the giants near the time of the Flood and, through the giant Prometheus, it tells us of Deucalion, the grandson of Iapetus and father of Hellen, the founder of the Greek race,77 who gave his name to the ‘Hellenes’. This must have been the Greek race, descended from Japhet, that went on to populate Europe, just as [that of] Ham populated Phoenicia and Egypt, and then Africa. But because of the ruined nature of the traditions that had been handed down to Homer, Chaos was taken to be the confusion of the seeds of nature, the Ogygian78 and Deucalianian79 Floods were thought to be individual floods, whereas they could only have been mutilated traditions of the Universal Flood,80 and the giants to have had bodies and strength that were believed to have been impossible in nature. Hence the origins of profane history and its continuity with sacred history have lain unknown until now.
72n77: Pausanias, Itinerary of Greece, X, 38, 1.
A flood of the valley of Boeotia, named after Ogyges, traditionally the first ruler of Thebes. The mythical nine-day flood that destroyed all the inhabitants of Hellas, with the exception of Prometheus’ son, Deucalion, after whom it was named, and his wife. This is part of the argument whereby Vico wished to establish the continuity of gentile and Hebrew history through Greek history.
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VI.C.7.013(h)

VI.B.7.238

(a) dividere/ i >

VI.C.7.019(b)

(b) campi i—

La Scienza Nuova 1725, Book II, Ch. XII: E possibile, e dagli effetti, che appresso ragioneremo dintorno alla Giisa della Divisione de’ campi, egli avvenne di fatto che a’ primi fulmini di Giove non tutti si atterrarono, ma in quello loro stupore i più risentitii; e quindi più gentili, per timore del fulmine, nascosti perle spelonche incominciaro a sentire la Venere Umana, o pudica; che spaventati, non potendola usare in faccia al Cielo, afferrarono a forza donne, e a forza le strascinarono, e le tennero dentro le loro grotte: onde incominicia a spiccare la prima virtù negli huomini, con la quale ammendano la natural leggerezza delle femmine; e quindi la natural nobiltà del sesso virile, cagione della prima potestà, che fu quella sopra il sesso donnesco. Con questo primo costume umano nacquero certi figliuoli; da’ quali provennero certe famiglie, sopra le quali sursero le prime Città, e quindi i primi Regni.

[Book II, Chapter XIII. Fourth: by interpreting the fables in the light of physics, it is discovered that the principle of idolatry and divination common to the Latins, Greeks and Egyptians was born at a certain determinate time after the Flood, and that idolatry and divination were born at an earlier time and of a different principle in the East: It is possible, and [we shall show] from the effects to be worked out below in connection with the mode of the division of the fields that this happened in fact, that when Jove’s first thunderbolts struck, not all the giants were driven underground, but only those who were more roused from their stupor, and therefore more noble, who hid in caverns through fear of the thunderbolts. There they began to sense a human or modest venery, for, since they were too terrified to mate under the gaze of the sky, they used force to seize their women and drag them into the grottoes where they kept them confined. Hence the first virtue in men begins to stand out, through which they correct the natural fickleness of women, and with it, therefore, the natural nobility of males, the cause of their first power, which was their power over females. This first human custom was the cause of the birth of certain children, from whom came certain families, through which the first cities, and thence the first kingdoms, arose.]

VI.C.7.019(c)

VI.B.7.239

(a) mä

La Scienza Nuova 1725, Book II, Ch. XII: [...] mä in quello loro stupore i più risentitii; e quindi più gentili, per timore del fulmine, nascosti perle spelonche incominciaro a sentire la Venere Umana, o pudica; che spaventati, non potendola usare in faccia al Cielo, afferrarono a forza donne, e a forza le strascinarono, e le tennero dentro le loro grotte: [...]
modest venery, for, since they were too terrified to mate under the gaze of the sky, they used force to seize their women and drag them into the grottoes where they kept them confined.]

MS 47482a-33v, ScrILA: Ah, Biddles es ma plikflak ^+plikflak^ ah plek wat ^+ma^+ Biddles. | JJA 60:146 | Oct-Nov 1925 | III§4F.*0/4H.*0 | FW 562.03

(b) \textit{marcipins} >
MS 47482a-55v, ScrMT: woman was born without marcipium | JJA 60:198 | Oct-Nov 1925 | III§4L.*0 | FW 576.04

(c) \textit{usucap\textquoteright io/}

La Scienza Nuova 1725, Book II, Ch. XXVI: Determinazione delle prime occupazioni, usucapioni e mancipazioni (2).

Le quali già lunga età innanzi fin da’ primi fulmini del creduto Giove in Egitto, in Grecia, in Italia, erano state occupate da que’ Primi che per timore della Divinità si ristarono dal bestiale divagamento; e da’ lor discendenti erano state dome con la coltura: e sì dalla Religione i postati erano già divenuti e casti e forti. Qui si scuoprono le prime Occupazioni, le prime Usucapioni, e le prime Mancipazioni delle Genti: ed oltre le prime Donne, che erano state tratte a forza da’ Primi Huomini nelle grotte, che furono le prime mogli manucaptae; queste furono le prime terre anche manucaptae; ovvero dome a forza: e le Occupazioni delle Terre Vacue, l’usucapioni e le mancipazioni, ovvero gli acquisti fatti a forza, sono certamente tutte e tre modi di legittimare le sovranie Signorie appo tutte le Nazioni.

[Book II, Chapter XXVI. Determination of the first occupations, usucaptions and mancipations: These lands of the strong had been occupied a long time earlier, i.e. since the first thunderbolts of Jove, as they supposed him to be, in Egypt, Greece and Italy, by those whose fear of divinity had brought them to abandon their bestial wandering, and had then been cultivated by their descendants. Thus, through religion, these settlers had already become chaste and strong. And here we discover the first occupations, the first usucaptions and the first mancipations of the peoples. For, in addition to the first women whom these first men had dragged into their grottoes by force, i.e. the first wives manucaptae, these were also the first lands manucaptae, i.e. lands taken by force. And occupations, usucaptions and mancipations, or acquisitions taken by force, are certainly the three modes through which sovereign lordship becomes legitimate among all nations.]