

Anhang (S. 225–363) diplomatisch getreu abdruckt, kann den Wert seiner Arbeit nur erhöhen. Den Schluß des Werkes bilden eine ausführliche Bibliographie (S. 368 bis 376), die Erklärung einiger Ausdrücke (S. 377–389), sowie je ein Orts- und Personennamen-Register (S. 391–396).

Daß Lampart einige Ungenauigkeiten unterlaufen, kann den Wert seiner Arbeit kaum schmälern. Die Abbasiden hält er (S. 377 u. 388) irrtümlich für eine schiitische Dynastie. Zwar bedienten sie sich um die Mitte des 8. Jahrhunderts in ihrem Kampf gegen die sunnitischen Umajjaden der schiitischen Kräfte des Iraq, vertraten aber dann so entschieden den orthodoxen Islam, daß die Fatimiden in Ägypten gegen sie ein schiitisches Gegen-Kalifat errichten konnten (vgl. z. B. *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, new edition, Bd. 1, Leiden und London 1960, S. 15–23). – Zum Pallium (S. 386) ist ergänzend hinzuzufügen, daß dieses „Symbol der Teilnahme an der vom Papst gewährten vollen Jurisdiktionsgewalt“ ursprünglich eine vom byzantinischen Kaiser allein verliehene Auszeichnung war, die von den Lateinern freilich bereits im 10. Jahrhundert für typisch römisch gehalten wurde (vgl. Anton Michel: *Die Kaisermacht in der Ostkirche 843–1204*, Darmstadt 1959, S. 55). – Wenn Lampart die keineswegs gering zu achtende ärztliche Tätigkeit der Kapuziner im Orient (S. 33) nestorianischen Zauberpraktiken im 17. Jahrhundert gegenüberstellt, so sollte nicht vergessen werden, daß die Abendländer damit gerade eine Tradition der Nestorianer aufnahmen, deren Hierarchen ehemals nicht selten berühmte und begehrte Ärzte der muslimischen Herrscher gewesen waren (vgl. z. B. Arthur Stanley Tritton: *The caliphs and their Non-Muslim subjects*, London 1930, S. 156 f.). – Es erschwert die Benutzung des Registers, daß bei der Transkription orientalischer Namen gleiche Laute unterschiedlich wiedergegeben werden, wie „Djezireh“ neben „Giulamerk“ („Gulamerk“, S. 62, ist wohl ein Druckfehler). – Wenn man schließlich den Übertritt von Nestorianismus zum römischen Katholizismus als „Bekehrung“ bezeichnet (S. 35 u. ö.) und den Grundsatz des ostsyrischen Katholikos, von keinem (anderen) Patriarchen gerichtet werden zu können, rundweg „falsch“ nennt (S. 47 nach de Vries, *Rom und die Patriarchate*, S. 10), dann wirkt solch ein dogmatisches Vorverständnis störend in einem so um historische Akribie bemühten Werk, wie es Lampart uns vorlegt.

Marburg

Wolfgang Hage

J. G. Hamann: *Fünf Hirtenbriefe das Schuldrama betreffend*. Einführung und Kommentar von Sven-Aage Jørgensen (*Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser udgivet af Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab*. Bind 39, n. 5). Kopenhagen (Einar Munksgaard) 1962. 195 S.

This valuable study is carried out largely according to the plan of the well-known series, *J. G. Hamanns Hauptschriften erklärt*, Gütersloh (1956 ff.), under the general editorship of the late Fritz Blanke, and can be placed beside those volumes as a worthy supplement. In addition to an enlightening introduction to Hamann's thought, the volume contains the complete text of *Fünf Hirtenbriefe das Schuldrama betreffend* (1763), notes, and commentary. The text is that of Josef Nadler's historical-critical edition (1950) with any deviations from the first edition indicated in the notes. Unlike the commentaries of the Blanke series, however, the present volume provides a classified bibliography and indexes at the end – a commendable deviation from the model.

Whether or not the *Fünf Hirtenbriefe* are as important as Jørgensen argues (and they are certainly not one of Hamann's *Hauptschriften*), they have nevertheless provided him with an effective springboard for a fruitful discussion of Hamann's aesthetics. A basic weakness of the *Hirtenbriefe* is the fact that in them Hamann undertook to come to the defense of the indefensible literary productions of a friend, and this primarily because he reprobated the kind of criticism to which they were subjected. The friend was Johann Gotthelf Lindner (1729–1776), and the work under fire was his *Beytrag zu Schulhandlungen* (Königsberg, 1762). Here

Lindner argues on behalf of school-dramas as pedagogical devices and includes his own attempts at model plays, which can only be described as woeful failures. (Jørgensen summarizes them briefly in a supplement. See pp. 172-173). In his review of Lindner's work in the *Briefe, die neueste Litteratur betreffend* (1762) Thomas Abbt had rejected Lindner's arguments in favor of the school-drama as well as the latter's dramatic efforts. Hamann, after advising Lindner to desist from the controversy with Abbt which he had unwisely entered upon, took up the attack on the *Literaturbriefe* by means of his „pastoral letters.“ His strategy was not to deal, with Lindner's plays directly but with the notion of a school-theater in general. In the first of the letters he makes a number of veiled references to personal matters, which are intended to explain his tardiness in entering the lists of the present controversy. Jørgensen stresses that the first letter contains important allusions to Hamann's involvement with the woman who was to become his common-law wife, and in so doing he undergirds his contention that the *Hirtenbriefe* are biographically important documents.

In the remaining letters Hamann addresses himself to the subject at hand. His main argument is that school-theaters are to be recommended, provided the dramas which they present appeal to feeling and to the poetic imagination. In order to do this they must avoid such sterile rules of the neo-classicists as, for example, the close observance of the dramatic unities. Characteristically, Hamann equates a renunciation of rules with a renunciation of self, thus grounding his aesthetics in Christian theology. Although Jørgensen is primarily interested in explicating Hamann's aesthetics, he is nevertheless thoroughly aware of the essentially theological roots of Hamann's thought on the subject.

Especially valuable is Jørgensen's discussion of Hamann's relation to Aristotle. He argues convincingly that the Magus may not be properly described as categorically anti-Aristotelian, and shows that he must always be regarded as favoring some kind of *mimesis*, since he never fails to emphasize our dependence on external experience. "Dies Angewiesensein auf die 'äußere' Natur vergißt Hamann nie" (p. 48). Yet Jørgensen recognizes that Hamann's aesthetic principles contain another emphasis: "Bei Hamann darf von einer Überwindung der aristotelischen Nachahmungslehre nur insofern gesprochen werden, als er das Schwergewicht auf das Schöpferische legt, auf die menschliche Schöpfungskraft als ein Analogon zu der Gottes" (p. 47). He points out that it is this pole of Hamann's thought which became decisive for the *Sturm und Drang*, especially as filtered through the thought of Herder, and Goethe (though he makes a vital distinction between what amounts to the theistic and humanistic backgrounds of Hamann's and Goethe's thoughts on creativity respectively) (p. 48). The present reviewer would have preferred that Jørgensen had stressed somewhat more the striking polarity which characterizes Hamann's thought at this point, and had discussed somewhat its broader implications; but it must be conceded that in general his discussion of imitation is quite sound, operating as it does with the distinction between *mimesis* and *imitatio*. He rejects Unger's conclusion that Hamann was irreconcilably anti-Aristotelian in regard to his theory of imitation (p. 44).

Jørgensen calls attention to the lack of studies which treat Hamann's relation to tradition in general and to classical antiquity in particular, pointing out the fact that almost every page of his formal writings fairly bristles with classical quotations and allusions. He says further: "Gerade Hamann kann nicht aus deutscher, nur aus gesamteuropäischer Perspektive verstanden werden, denn die ganze antik-christliche Tradition war ihm gegenwärtig und lebendig, wie auch die englische und französische Literatur" (p. 163).

A number of misprints occur in this volume, but a far as this reviewer can tell the scholarship is quite scrupulous. One can only hope that the author will continue to devote himself to Hamann-research. His approach to the problems involved affords a needed emphasis.