



Isabelle Stauffer\*

# Grobian Trouble: Grobianism and “Invectivity” in Thomas Murner and Martin Luther

<https://doi.org/10.1515/jemc-2023-2038>

**Abstract:** Thomas Murner’s verse satire *Von dem grossen Lutherischen Narren* (1522) and Martin Luther’s pamphlet *Wider das Papsttum zu Rom, vom Teufel gestiftet* (1545) are known as particularly grobian texts. This paper examines the grobian as a historically new key figure in these two pamphlets and views it in relation to the concept of “invectivity.” Both are performative, violent, and in need of an audience. Moreover, their shared epistemic function is to question the existing order. The grobian also shows the contagiousness of “invectivity”: both Murner and Luther profess grobianism – which they say they were forced into because their opponents adopted it. These attributions of grobianism raise the debate to the level of the metainvective. As a transmedial figure, the grobian helps to make debates about religious conflicts more figurative and visual. As a ridiculous figure, he challenges not only pejorative ridicule but also liberating laughter, and *ex negativo* demonstrates the utopia of polite behavior – thus going beyond “invectivity.”

**Keywords:** grobianism, Thomas Murner, Martin Luther, invectivity, Reformation

The grobian entered literature with Sebastian Brant’s *Narrenschiff* (1494).<sup>1</sup> There a fictional saint named “Grobian” is one of the fools and satirically described as the patron saint of a new order of drunkards and gluttons.<sup>2</sup> His heraldic animal is the pig, and his behavior consists of rudeness, selfishness and intemperance. The fact that Brant satirically refers to him as a saint of his time points to the prevalence of such

---

1 The more common term in English for “grobian” is “ruffian.” I, however, use “grobian,” since I examine German texts.

2 See Frank Fürbeth, “Grobianismus,” in *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, ed. Gert Ueding, vol. 3 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1994), 1192–96, here 1193; Dieter Gutzen, “Grobianismus,” in *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, ed. Horst Robert Balz et al., vol. 14 (Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 1986), 256–59; see also Horst Langer, “Die Wittembergisch nachtigall, die man yetz höret überall (Hans Sachs): Zum Luther-Bild in literarischen Texten der Reformationszeit,” *Informationen aus dem Ralf-Schuster-Verlag* 11 (2019), 45–70, here 50.

---

\*Corresponding author: Isabelle Stauffer, Catholic University of Eichstätt-Ingolstadt, Eichstätt, Germany, E-mail: [isabelle.stauffer@ku.de](mailto:isabelle.stauffer@ku.de)

negative behavior, says Dieter Gutzen.<sup>3</sup> With Brant's book, the grobian enters not only literary but also theological discourse. As a perverted saint, he is associated with the devil. The fools in Brant's book were models for the grobian figures in Thomas Murner's satires.<sup>4</sup> Already in his pre-Reformation text *Schelmenzunft* (1512), Murner wrote about clerical irregularities using the grobian. In his anti-Lutheran verse satire *Von dem grossen Lutherischen Narren* (1522), Murner continues to write in a grobian way, characterizing himself as a grobian, but refers to Martin Luther, who was famous for his grobian style. Already in 1520 Murner had published several texts against Luther: *Eine christliche und briederliche Ermanung zu dem hochgelehrten Doctor Martino Luter* (1520), *Von dem babstentum das ist von der höchsten oberkeyt Christlichs glauben wyder Doctor Martinum Luther* (1520) and *An den Großmechtigsten und Durchlüchtigsten Adel tütscher nation das sye den christlichen glauben beschirmen* (1520).<sup>5</sup> Luther, who did not consider Murner worthy of a reply, answered him only incidentally on the last few pages of his texts against Emser *Auf das überchristlich, übergeistlich und überkünstlich Buch Bock Emsers zu Leipzig Antwort. Darin auch Murnarrs seines Gesellen gedacht wird* (1521).<sup>6</sup> In this answer to Emser, Luther's invective is still moderate; although he compares Murner's theological knowledge to that of the "roughest peasant"<sup>7</sup> and says that "natural fools could also teach me that,"<sup>8</sup> he also still refers to him – albeit ironically – as "dear Murner."<sup>9</sup> However, certain metaphors – such as the coarse donkey and the bagpipe donkey – which play a central role in Luther's very rude publications later, already appear in this text.<sup>10</sup>

3 See Gutzen, "Grobianismus," 256.

4 See Barbara Könnecker, *Satire im 16. Jahrhundert: Epoche – Werke – Wirkung* (Munich: Beck, 1991), 68.

5 See Könnecker, *Satire*, 135; Anja Lobenstein-Reichmann, *Sprachliche Ausgrenzung im späten Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit*, *Studia Linguistica Germanica* 117 (Berlin and Boston, MA: De Gruyter, 2013), 182; Ernst Thiele and Paul Pietsch, "Kommentar zu Martin Luther: *Auf das überchristlich, übergeistlich und überkünstlich Buch Bock Emsers zu Leipzig Antwort. Darin auch Murnarrs seines Gesellen gedacht wird. 1521.*" in *D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe (WA)*, ed. Paul Pietsch et al., vol. 7 (Weimar: Böhlau, 1897), 614–20. Murner is considered as "fiercest publicist opponent of Martin Luther and the Reformation," Rainald Fischer, "Thomas Murner," in *Historisches Lexikon der Schweiz*, <https://hls-dhs-dss.ch/de/articles/012177/2010-09-02/> (accessed 3 May 2022).

6 This method is rare according to Kai Bremer, *Religionsstreitigkeiten: Volkssprachliche Kontroversen zwischen altgläubigen und evangelischen Theologen im 16. Jahrhundert*, *Frühe Neuzeit* 104 (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2005), 30.

7 "gröbist pawr," Martin Luther, *Auf das überchristlich, übergeistlich und überkünstlich Buch Bock Emsers zu Leipzig Antwort. Darin auch Murnarrs seines Gesellen gedacht wird*, *WA* 7 (1897), 621–88, here 681. All translations, if not otherwise indicated, by I.S.

8 "das mich [...] auch die natürlichen narnn lernen kunden," *WA* 7 (1897), 681.

9 "lieber Murner," *WA* 7 (1897), 686.

10 See *WA* 7 (1897), 637, 651, 666, 677. On the insult of Emser as a donkey, see Bremer, *Religionsstreitigkeiten*, 78.

Murner characterizes his *Großen Lutherischen Narren* himself as grobian and asks for forgiveness for this: “If I approach the matter roughly and would be indecent with the words, out of anger here in some places, so I ask you to understand this” (ll. 147–50).<sup>11</sup> He claims that his grobianism was necessitated by Luther’s:

This objection of mine Martin Luther has answered in a special book [...] and received my writing highly in evil and with much untruthful invective and mocking change of my paternal name.<sup>12</sup>

The mocking change of his paternal name is the use of “Murnarr” for “Murner.” This contains the word play of calling Murner a “grumbling fool”<sup>13</sup> or a “foolish cat.”<sup>14</sup> Luther’s followers took this even further, they made “a cat and a dragon out of me, put me a pair of underpants in both hands.”<sup>15</sup> They have overdone it with this, says Murner and concludes: “I must resist you. Patience is now at an end” (ll. 77–78).<sup>16</sup> At the same time, Murner’s characterization of Luther’s book is a metainvective remark, since “the invective itself is thematized.”<sup>17</sup> Moreover, metainvective remarks are themselves invective: “The strategic claim of having been insulted pushes the counterpart into the role of the perpetrator.”<sup>18</sup> In this respect, Murner makes it clear that Luther and his

---

11 “Wa ich die sach greiff groeblich an | Vnd wer unzüchtig mit den Worten | Vs zorn hie an etlichen orten | So bit ich euch verstanden das,” Thomas Murner, *Von dem grossen Lutherischen Narren* (1522), ed. Thomas Neukirchen (Heidelberg: Winter, 2014), 24. In the following, all references to passages are according to this edition.

12 “Solch mein widerfechten hat Martinus Luther in einem besondern buoch wider mich verantwortwurt/ [...] und mein schreiben hoch in vblem empfangen vnd vff genummen mit vil vnwahrhaftiger schmehung vnd spöttlicher verenderung meins vätterlichen namens,” Murner, *Lutherischer Narr*, prologue, 14.

13 “murrender Narr,” Jean Schillinger, “Narr und Narrheit in der konfessionellen Symbolik: Thomas Murners Großer Lutherischer Narr,” in *Der Narr in der deutschen Literatur im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Jean Schillinger (Bern et al.: Peter Lang, 2008), 83–102, here 83.

14 “närrische Katze,” Schillinger, “Narr und Narrheit,” 83. The name “Murr-narr” goes back to Jakob Wimpfeling; see also Thomas Neukirchen, “Nachwort,” in Murner, *Von dem grossen Lutherischen Narren* (1522), ed. Neukirchen, 357–81, here 367. Luther drew on that.

15 “ein katz und ein drachen vs mir [...] / ein bruoch in beide hend geben,” Murner, *Lutherischer Narr*, prologue, 14; see also Könniker, *Satire*, 138.

16 “Jch muoß euch thun ein widerstruß | Dem gedult ist ietzt der boden vß.”

17 “das Invektive selbst thematisiert wird,” Dagmar Ellerbrock et al., “Invektivität – Perspektiven eines neuen Forschungsprogramms in den Kultur- und Sozialwissenschaften,” *Kulturwissenschaftliche Zeitschrift* 2 (2017), 2–24, here 17. On metainvectivity, compare the introduction to this issue and the essay by Antje Sablotny.

18 “Die strategische Behauptung, beleidigt worden zu sein, drängt das Gegenüber in die Rolle des Täters,” Joachim Scharloth, “Hassrede und Invektivität als Gegenstand der Sprachwissenschaft und Sprachphilosophie: Bausteine zu einer Theorie des Metainvektiven,” *Aptum* 2 (2017), 116–32, here 122.

followers are the offenders, thus soliciting understanding for his grobian reaction to the inappropriate behavior of Luther's party.

Luther was and is famous – much more so than Thomas Murner – for his grobian writing.<sup>19</sup> Luther was aware of this, for he jokingly wrote of himself in the third person that he was “a rough fellow.”<sup>20</sup> In this respect, the grobian and the grobian style are often attributed to the opponent,<sup>21</sup> but also affect one's own behavior.

*Wider das Papsttum zu Rom, vom Teufel gestiftet* (1545) is considered Luther's “probably coarsest text” with a “rude way of speaking.”<sup>22</sup> In this text, he superimposes the image of the pope with the figure of the grobian. There is a woodcut sequence to go with it, ten mocking pictures, which Luther had conceived and provided with Latin headings and German verses placed underneath. Lukas Cranach, with whom Luther was friends, executed the woodcuts.<sup>23</sup> The opponents Murner and Luther were equal to each other in wordplay and ingenuity, says Kai Bremer.<sup>24</sup>

Not only Luther and Murner, however, used the grobian style and described each other and some others as ruffians. It was generally a rhetorical device in the religious and political conflicts of their time.<sup>25</sup> Alexander Kästner and Gerd Schwerhoff even speak of an “epoch of ubiquitous invective and disparagement in public communication.”<sup>26</sup> Nevertheless, grobianism has been repeatedly noted – especially in Luther's case – but hardly studied.<sup>27</sup>

---

19 Thomas Neukirchen considers Murner as “coarser even than Luther” (“derber sogar als Luther”), but as less famous. Neukirchen, “Nachwort,” 357.

20 “ein grober gesell,” Martin Luther, *Wider das Papsttum zu Rom, vom Teufel gestiftet*, WA 54 (1928), 195–299, here 237.

21 Norbert Mecklenburg says the same about the fool. Norbert Mecklenburg, *Der Prophet der Deutschen: Martin Luther im Spiegel der Literatur* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 2016), 46.

22 “wohl derbeste Schrift,” “grobe[n] Redeweise,” Helmut Zschoch, “Streitschriften,” in *Luther-Handbuch*, ed. Albrecht Beutel (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 318–36, here 331.

23 See Martin Brecht, *Martin Luther*, vol. 3 (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1987), 356; Heiko Oberman, “Teufelsdreck: Eschatology and Scatology in the ‘Old’ Luther,” *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 19 (1988), 435–50, here 444; Gerd Schwerhoff, “Radicalism and ‘Invectivity’: ‘Hate Speech’ in the German Reformation,” in *Radicalism and Dissent in the World of the Protestant Reform*, ed. Bridget Heal and Anorthe Kremers (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017), 36–52, here 41–44.

24 See Bremer, *Religionsstreitigkeiten*, 36, 35.

25 See Gutzen, “Grobianismus,” 257.

26 “Epoche allgegenwärtiger Schmähungen und Herabsetzungen in der öffentlichen Kommunikation,” Alexander Kästner and Gerd Schwerhoff, “Der Narrheit närrisch spotten: Mediale Ausprägungen und Invektive Dynamiken der Öffentlichkeit in der frühen Reformationszeit,” in *Reformation als Kommunikationsprozess: Die böhmischen Kronländer und Sachsen*, ed. Petr Hrachovec et al., Norm and Struktur 51 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2020), 37–74, here 74.

27 See Markus Hundt, *Sprachliche Aggression bei Martin Luther: Argumentationsformen und -funktionen am Beispiel der Streitschrift “Wider das Papsttum zu Rom vom Teufel gestiftet” (1545)*, *Lingua Historica Germanica* 27 (Berlin and Boston, MA: De Gruyter, 2022), 1.

This paper examines the grobian as a historically new key figure in combat pamphlets by Thomas Murner and Martin Luther and views it in relation to the concept of “invectivity.”<sup>28</sup> In my juxtaposition of “invectivity” and grobianism, I am concerned with the functions of rudeness in times of historical change and how it is embodied and personalized in literature and what role literary structural elements such as characters play in this process.

According to Gerd Schwerhoff, “invectivity” comprises verbal and nonverbal acts of communication by means of which “evaluations of persons and groups are made that are capable of negatively altering their social position, discriminating against them, and possibly excluding them.”<sup>29</sup> It is realized in a triadic constellation of perpetrator, insulted person and audience. Sometimes it is reflexive, that is, by insulting it exposes its own act of insulting.<sup>30</sup> As an “act of disparagement,”<sup>31</sup> it is integrated into a web of enactments and is thus performative. Also to be emphasized is its “proximity to violence.”<sup>32</sup> Jean Schillinger even speaks of a “symbolic murder”<sup>33</sup> in the case of Murner and his opponents.

## 1 A Coarse Talking Cat: Murner’s Verse Satire

Murner’s satire *Von dem grossen Lutherischen Narren* (1522) responds to Luther’s 1521 text about Hieronymus Emser and Thomas Murner, namely *A. das überchristlich, übergeistlich und überkünstlich Buch*.<sup>34</sup> Murner’s text was confiscated shortly

---

28 The concept was developed by the research group *Invektivität: Konstellationen und Dynamiken der Herabsetzung* (Invectivity: Constellations and Dynamics of Disparagement) at the Technical University of Dresden (2017–2022), see Dagmar Ellerbrock, Lars Koch, Sabine Müller-Mall, Marina Münkler, Joachim Scharloth, Dominik Schrage, Gerd Schwerhoff: “Invektivität – Perspektiven eines neuen Forschungsprogramms in den Kultur- und Sozialwissenschaften,” in *Kulturwissenschaftliche Zeitschrift* 2 (2017), 2–24, <https://doi.org/10.2478/kwg-2017-0001> (last accessed: 8 August 2022).

29 “Bewertungen von Personen und Gruppen vorgenommen werden, die geeignet sind, ihre soziale Position negativ zu verändern, sie zu diskriminieren und gegebenenfalls auszuschließen,” Gerd Schwerhoff, “Invektivität und Geschichtswissenschaft: Konstellationen der Herabsetzung in historischer Perspektive – ein Forschungskonzept,” *Historische Zeitschrift* 311 (2020), 1–36, here 12.

30 See Schwerhoff, “Invektivität und Geschichtswissenschaft,” 13–14.

31 “Akt der Herabsetzung,” Schwerhoff, “Invektivität und Geschichtswissenschaft,” 14.

32 “Nähe zur Gewalt,” Schwerhoff, “Invektivität und Geschichtswissenschaft,” 16. These are five of the six cornerstones of Schwerhoff’s concept of “invectivity.” The sixth consists of the effects on the social order, which for me play a less important role.

33 “symbolischen Mord,” Schillinger, “Narr und Narrheit,” 102.

34 See Neukirchen, “Nachwort,” 363.

after its appearance.<sup>35</sup> But a second edition appeared on the book market. In this verse satire, the allegorical figure of a giant fool stands for the Reformation and its negative sides.<sup>36</sup> In this way, Murner picks up where his pre-Reformation fool's satires left off.<sup>37</sup> In Murner's work, the concept of the fool is associated with evil and sin from the very beginning.<sup>38</sup> Murner himself, dressed in a monk's habit and with the head of a cat, evokes this fool. He calls his satirical technique the "art of conjuring" in reference to the ecclesiastical exorcism of the devil: "That I want to teach my old art again how to conjure the fools" (ll. 129–30).<sup>39</sup>

The huge body of the Lutheran Fool contains other fools who form an army with Luther as its captain.<sup>40</sup> This army includes fifteen confederates. This is an allusion to Johann Eberlin von Günzburg's Reformation pamphlet *Die 15 Bundesgenossen* (1521).<sup>41</sup> Luther's army in Murner's text undertakes three attacks. The first is directed against churches and monasteries, the second against a castle, and the third against the main fortress. After these battles, Luther offers Murner his daughter for marriage to make peace. Murner accepts, but immediately annuls the marriage when he discovers that Luther's daughter is suffering from stinking head scabs. Since marriage is not a sacrament for Luther, Murner argues, it can be dissolved. Then Luther dies and Murner arranges for him to be buried as a heretic.

In the first chapter, which deals with the question how to summon the Lutheran arch-fools, Murner asks for understanding that he must be "crude" (l. 147)<sup>42</sup> in his approach. He claims that as a fool, one does not know any better and is allowed to do things in his fool's garb that one would otherwise be sorry for. Where there are fools, decency and honor are forgotten (ll. 151–54, 157–58). In the following chapters, the great fool is described in more detail and then the confederates and their concerns are introduced. The second confederate in Luther's army behaves like a grobian as a glutton. He wants to eat and therefore pleads for the abolition of Lent. To argue for this abolition, he asks many rhetorical questions. For example, he notes that wolves

---

35 See Neukirchen, "Nachwort," 359. Barbara Könniker assumes that the effect Murner achieved with his satire was extremely small, but that this was not due to the confiscation but to the low success on the literary market. Könniker, *Satire*, 137.

36 See Neukirchen, "Nachwort," 361.

37 See Könniker, *Satire*, 142.

38 See Langer, "Die Wittembergisch nachtigall," 58.

39 "Meine alte kunst wil wider leren | Wie man die narren sol beschweren." See also Barbara Könniker, "Thomas Murner," in *Deutsche Dichter: Leben und Werk deutschsprachiger Autoren*, ed. Gunter E. Grimm and Frank Rainer Max, vol. 2 (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1988), 21–32, here 26.

40 In this respect, it is a grotesque body in Bakhtin's sense, since it is closely connected with other bodies, see Michail Bachtin, *Rabelais und seine Welt: Volkskultur als Gegenkultur*, ed. Renate Lachmann (Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp, 1987), 76; Schillinger, "Narr und Narrheit," 99.

41 See Neukirchen, "Nachwort," 368–70.

42 "groeblich."

do not fast either and asks: “Shall a wolf have more freedom than a devout Christian” (ll. 949–50).<sup>43</sup> He also recommends that Lent be moved to hell, arguing ironically that even a devil died because of it (ll. 967–68).

The heraldic animal of the grobian, the pig, appears several times in Murner’s text. The third confederate of Luther’s army wants to close the convents. In rude language, he compares the nuns in the convent to a pig in a sty: “What should they lie trapped like a sow in a sty” (ll. 975–76).<sup>44</sup> He says that the nuns must be freed and raped: “It would be much better to have them tanned. [...] The leather wants to be tanned” (ll. 978, 980).<sup>45</sup> In addition to the confessional difference, a misogynistic moment resonates, which is also typical of grobianism. Grobian texts “are written for and about men.”<sup>46</sup> In her book *The End of Conduct*, Barbara Correll explains that grobianism is also essentially about “the shaping of masculine behavior.”<sup>47</sup> Securing the “standards of manliness”<sup>48</sup> developed in the process goes hand in hand with the control of women’s social position and behavior.

Murner goes on to say that with the abolition of fasting commandments and the sacrament of marriage, Lutheranism allows people to indulge uninhibitedly in the pleasures of life and promises them the land of milk and honey – the land where Sebastian Brant and also Hans Sachs located the grobian.<sup>49</sup>

The eighth confederate in Murner’s *Von dem Lutherischem Narren* claims to always use the German language to address the common people. In grobian fashion, he lists German swear words such as “muckraker,” “arch-pointed jack,” “shorn turnip-head” (ll. 1290–91)<sup>50</sup> and claims they cannot be translated into Latin. In ironic exaggeration, he goes on to say that books in German can and should be read by every village slut and drunkard:

That is why we write in German. [...] So that every village slut can have one of our little books, which we send out to the new Christians for their benefit. And so that they [...] may also remember us at the wine tavern (ll. 1295, 1297–1300, 1302–3).<sup>51</sup>

---

43 “Sol ein wolff me freiheit han | dan ein frumer cristen man.”

44 “Was sollen sie gefangen ligen | Als die saw in einer stigen.”

45 “Vil besser wer es man ließ sie gerben | [...] Das leder will doch gegerbt sein.”

46 Barbara Correll, *The End of Conduct: Grobianus and the Renaissance Text of the Subject* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1996), 14.

47 Correll, *The End of Conduct*, 163.

48 Correll, *The End of Conduct*, 47.

49 See Murner, *Lutherischer Narr*, ll. 2628–30; Schillinger, “Narr und Narrheit,” 95. See also Hans Sachs, *Das Schlauraffen Landt* (1530).

50 “schmutzkolb,” “hippenbuob” and “beschorne ruob.”

51 “Darumb wir schreiben tütsch damit | [...] Das iede dorffmetz ein moeg hon | Von vnsern büchlin die wir lon | den nüwen cristen zuo guot vß gon | Vnd das sie [...] vff den stuben bei dem wein | Vnser auch gedenken fein.”

In addition to the aforementioned grobian cursing, the pig appears again here: namely, the eighth confederate criticizes the restriction of the German language to the German-speaking countries and compares it ironically to a pig trough that can only be used by the pigs:

That is why I am writing this down in German, so that it will remain in the German country. Oh, if it had been written down in the sow's trough, so that it would have remained with the pigs (ll. 1309–12).<sup>52</sup>

After the confederates, other components of the army are described and then the great fool is discussed in more detail again. The allegorical figure of the great fool in Murner's text contains further small fools everywhere in his body. One of them is the Karsthanß. He is located – as a typical grobian custom<sup>53</sup> – in the butt of the great fool and is to be excreted: “The learned Karsthans, this is probably such a lovely read. That is why I am heartily sorry that I found it up in the butt. The Karsthans shall be shat” (ll. 2636, 2638, 2654–55, 2661).<sup>54</sup> The butt is considered the place of the devil.<sup>55</sup> *Karsthanß* is known to be not only a character of Murner, but also a Reformation pamphlet that attacked Murner, published anonymously in 1521.<sup>56</sup> On the title woodcut, Murner is depicted with a cat's head and monk's cowl.<sup>57</sup>

In his *Lutherischen Narren*, Murner responds by appropriating this defamation. He says that he is a cat and therefore has no sense, which is why he uses foul language. If his opponents had let him be a man, he would not use such coarse words: “I am a cat and have no brains, so I am rough with words. If they would have let me stay a human, I didn't want to do it with the rough words” (ll. 2664–67).<sup>58</sup> Again, Murner metainvectively ascribes the perpetrator role to his opponents and solicits

---

52 “Darumb ich das zuo tütsch beschreib | Das es im tütschen land bleib | Ach wer es im sawtrog beschriben | Das es bei den schweinen wer bliben.”

53 See Mecklenburg, *Der Prophet der Deutschen*, 47.

54 “Der gelehrt Karsthanß [...] | Es ist wol so ein lieblichs lesen | [...] Darumb ist mir von hertzen leid | Das ich in in dem hindern fant | [...] Das karsthanß sol geschissen werden.”

55 See Ingo Breuer and Svjatlan Lacko Vidulic, “Schöne Scheiße – Konfigurationen des Skatologischen in Sprache und Literatur,” *Zagreber germanistische Beiträge* 27 (2018), 5–25, here 13.

56 *Karsthans* (Strasbourg: Johann Prüß d.J., 1521); see Langer, “Die Wittembergisch nachtigall,” 47. For the numerous replicas see *Thomas Murners “Hans Karst” und seine Wirkung in sechs Texten der Reformationszeit*, ed. Thomas Neukirchen (Heidelberg: Winter, 2011). In Swabian-Alemannic “Karsthans” means a backward, coarse peasant block, who is convinced of the Reformation. For the usage of the word during the Reformation see Langer, “Die Wittembergisch nachtigall,” 47 and 52.

57 The design of Murner with a cat's head alludes to the fact that “Murner” was the onomatopoeic term for cat or tomcat in the sixteenth century. See Langer, “Die Wittembergisch nachtigall,” 49.

58 “Jch bin ein katz vnd hab kein sin | Darumb ich grob mit worten bin | Hetten sie mich lon ein menschen bleiben | Jch wolt die groben wort nit treiben.”



understanding for his coarse writing, which he claims is only a reaction to the attacks of his opponents.

After various preparations, the attacks of Luther's army take place. During the second attack on the castle, the attackers find the castle empty, with only a pig in the stable: "I have now descended into the castle, I find a sow there in the stable. Otherwise there is neither man nor beast here" (ll. 3284–86).<sup>59</sup> The coarse pig is their only prey: "We have won a rough sow" (l. 3293).<sup>60</sup> The army accuses Murner of having put the pig there to show them that their cause will bring them only a pig, symbolic of their shame: "That the Murrnar and the Murmau have put the big fat baker's sow into the fortress, as if to indicate that our cause will not comply" (ll. 3308–10, 3312, 3314).<sup>61</sup> The pig symbolism thus remains dominant. At the end of Murner's satire, when Luther dies and rejects the sacraments, he is buried in the shithouse. Luther dies with the words: "In short, I am departing from this world. None of the sacraments pleases me" (ll. 4424–25).<sup>62</sup> Murner reacts to this: "So, into the shithouse with this man who does not want to have a sacrament" (ll. 4444–45).<sup>63</sup> It is very grobian that Murner has the dead Luther thrown into the shithouse. The symbolic dimension behind this is the privy as the seat of the devil.<sup>64</sup> Following Jean Schillinger, Murner's grobian language is meant to evoke disgust and revulsion for everything connected with Luther.<sup>65</sup>

## 2 Pope Donkey and Epicurean Swine: Luther's Crude Way of Speaking

"[T]he scatological language of feces and urine [has been] so long associated with the old Luther,"<sup>66</sup> states Heiko Oberman. But Luther's grobian language cannot be limited to the "old" Luther.<sup>67</sup> David Bagchi also postulates, "we cannot dismiss

59 "Jch bin ab | in das schloß gestigen | Ein suw find ich da in der stigen | Sunst ist hie weder mensch noch fihe."

60 "Wir hon ein grobe suw gewonnen."

61 "Das der murnar vnd murmauw | Die grose feißte beckersaw | Jn die festin hat gethon | [...] Als wolt er damit zoegen an | [...] Das vnser sach sich nit würd fügen."

62 "KVrtz ab ich scheid von diser welt | Der sacrament mir keins gefelt."

63 "Als ins scheidhuß mit dem man | Der kein sacrament wil han." Behind the ambiguity of Luther's statement about whether he disliked the sacraments of this world or the sacraments in general is the dispute between the Catholic and Protestant positions about the role of the sacraments, whether they are given by God or made by the Church.

64 See Mecklenburg, *Der Prophet der Deutschen*, 48, 77.

65 Schillinger, "Narr und Narrheit," 87–88.

66 Oberman, "Teufelsdreck," 441.

67 See David Bagchi, "The German Rabelais? Foul Words and the Word in Luther," *Reformation and Renaissance Review* 7 (2005), 143–62, here 147.

Luther's foul-mouthedness as a symptom of senility."<sup>68</sup> Since 1520, the fundamental alternative for Luther was pope or gospel. "In the quarter century until his death, he made only minor changes to the convictions he had gained in 1520,"<sup>69</sup> writes Bernd Moeller regarding Luther's attitude toward the papacy. Oberman also notes continuities between the early and late Luther with regard to Luther's polemics.<sup>70</sup> Already in a sermon of 1515, scatological elements can be discerned that are indebted to the same apocalyptic background as those in *W. das Papsttum zu Rom, vom T. gestiftet* (1545): "In the thirty years between the election sermon 1515 and the pictorial satire 1545 [...] [t]he association of the devil with defecation, and the use of feces to combat him have remained the same."<sup>71</sup> Bremer counts these "coarse grobianisms" among the success factors for Luther's writing, since, among other things, these enabled him to "make himself understood by his readers."<sup>72</sup>

Luther's pamphlet *W. das Papsttum zu Rom, vom T. gestiftet* (1545) responds to Pope Paul III's breve of censure to Emperor Charles V, which the latter received for being too friendly to Protestants in the 1544 Diet of Speyer. The breve urged the emperor to wage war against the Protestants. "By refusing to negotiate religion, the pope seemed [...] to ally himself with the devil in order to evade a reformation by God's word."<sup>73</sup> Luther excuses his rude language with the actions of his opponent:

Ah my dear brother in Christ give me credit when I speak so rudely here or elsewhere of the tiresome, accursed, monstrous monster of Rome. Knowing my thoughts, someone must admit that I do him much, much, much too little, and with no word nor thought equal the shameful, desperate blasphemy, which he drives with the word and name of Christ.<sup>74</sup>

---

68 Bagchi, "The German Rabelais?," 147.

69 "In dem Vierteljahrhundert bis zu seinem Tod hat er seine 1520 gewonnenen Überzeugungen nur noch unwesentlich verändert," Bernd Moeller, "Luther und das Papsttum," in *Luther Handbuch*, ed. Beutel, 131–40, here 138.

70 Oberman, "Teufelsdreck," 439.

71 Oberman, "Teufelsdreck," 444.

72 "derbe[n] Grobianismen," "seinen Lesern verständlich zu machen," Bremer, *Religionsstreitigkeiten*, 29.

73 "Mit der Ablehnung der Religionsverhandlungen schien der Papst sich [...] mit dem Teufel zu verbünden, um sich einer Reformation durch Gottes Wort zu entziehen," Brecht, *Martin Luther*, 353.

74 "Ah mein lieber Bruder in Christo, halt mirs ja zu gut, wo ich hie oder anderswo so grob rede von dem leidigen, verfluchten, ungeheurem Monstro zu Rom. Wer mein gedanken weis, der mus sagen, das ich jm viel, viel, viel zu wenig thu, und mit keinem worten noch gedanken erlangen kan die schendliche, verzweivelte lesterung, die er treibt mit dem Wort und Namen Christi [...]," *WA* 54 (1928), 261; see also Zschoch, "Streitschriften," 331; Marina Münkler, "Luthers Rom: Augenzeugenschaft, Invektivität und Konversion," in *Transformationen Roms in der Vormoderne*, ed. Christoph Mauntel and Volker Leppin, Studien zur christlichen Religions- und Kulturgeschichte 27 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer; Basel: Schwabe, 2019), 213–41, here 219.

Luther also acts metainvectively by claiming that the pope offends Christ much more than Luther himself could ever do to the pope. Luther filled the role of contentious theologian with stylistic devices of literary polemics. These devices include targeted rudeness and slurs that were common in contemporary disputes. The accusation that Luther was excessively crude was a topos at the time.<sup>75</sup> It continues to this day when Gerd Schwerhoff writes of Luther's "hate speech."<sup>76</sup> According to Schwerhoff, a quarter of Luther's text consists of a "firework of invective against the pope and the Roman Curia."<sup>77</sup>

Luther's pamphlet *W. das Papsttum zu Rom, vom T. gestiftet* is divided into an introduction and three parts: the introduction is about the pope calling a council. The first section then questions the pope as the head of the Church; the second deals with the question of who may hold court over the pope; and the last is about whether the pope legitimized or founded the Roman Empire.<sup>78</sup> The main sections are "of widely varying length and argumentative detail" and "arguments are partially repeated in irregular succession."<sup>79</sup> I am concerned below with the grobian highlights of this heterogeneous text.<sup>80</sup>

In his grobian style, Luther writes that the pope was born out of the devil's butt.<sup>81</sup> And he licks the devil's butt: "Come here, Satan, I want to lick you in the butt."<sup>82</sup> The decrees of the pope are "dirty decrees" or "filthy stuff."<sup>83</sup> This play on language indicates what is to be thought of the papal decrees according to Luther: "They just contain or are just dirt."<sup>84</sup> They were "written with pope donkeys' farts" and "sealed with devil's dirt."<sup>85</sup>

---

75 Zschoch, "Streitschriften," 318.

76 "Hassreden," Schwerhoff, "Invektivität und Geschichtswissenschaft," 21. See also Schwerhoff, "Radicalism and Invektivity." Mecklenburg also writes about hate speech. Norbert Mecklenburg, "Sakramente und Exkremete: Martin Luthers Abtrittsreden," in *Marginalistik: Almanach für Freunde fröhlicher Wissenschaft*, ed. Walter Hömberg (Munich: Allitera Verlag, 2019), 135–48, here 144–45.

77 "Feuerwerk von Schmähungen gegen den Papst und die römische Kurie," Schwerhoff, "Invektivität und Geschichtswissenschaft," 21.

78 See Hundt, *Sprachliche Aggression*, 15–16.

79 "von sehr unterschiedlicher Länge und argumentativer Ausführlichkeit" and "Argumente werden z.T. in unregelmäßiger Folge wiederholt," Hundt, *Sprachliche Aggression*, 16.

80 On Luther's invectives in various texts, see the article by Markus Wriedt in the present volume.

81 WA 54 (1928), 260.

82 "Kom her, Satan, [...] ich wolt [...] Dich [...] im hindern lecken," WA 54 (1928), 265.

83 "Drecketale" or "drecketen," WA 54 (1928), 224, 228, 252.

84 "Sie enthalten eben nur oder sind eben nur Dreck," Hundt, *Sprachliche Aggression*, 20.

85 "mit Bapstesels förtzen geschrieben" and "mit Teufels dreck versiegelt," WA 54 (1928), 265.

In addition to these scatological elements that characterize the pope as a grobian, the pig, the heraldic animal of grobians, also appears in the text. Thus, Luther calls the pope and his sons, cardinals and Roman court officials, Epicurian pigs.<sup>86</sup> He also says that they live like pigs.<sup>87</sup> But other animal images also play an important role, especially the donkey. Markus Hundt even claims that the donkey is “the main metaphor of the text.”<sup>88</sup> Already in Brant’s *Narrenschiff*, the donkey appeared alongside the pig; Brant’s grobians smear themselves with donkey lard and sing in “donkey sound.”<sup>89</sup> Disparaging, insulting animal comparisons were generally not unusual for controversies in the sixteenth century.<sup>90</sup>

As with Brandt, the pope in Luther’s text shouts in donkey tone.<sup>91</sup> And Luther calls him a coarse donkey who farts.<sup>92</sup> This culminates in a word play with the words pope, fart and donkey, in which “all the formative possibilities of the three components of insult [donkey, pope, fart] are fully exhausted.”<sup>93</sup> Luther mentions several doctrinal phrases at a time, always beginning with “God wants” and “God gives,” and then continuing refrain-like with “No, says the fart donkey pope,” “No, says the pope fart donkey,” “No, says the donkey fart pope,” and “No, says the donkey pope fart.”<sup>94</sup> Anja Lobenstein-Reichmann suggests that a fart donkey is a “person so stupid in a

86 WA 54 (1928), 226.

87 WA 54 (1928), 220. The pig also played a role in Luther’s Antisemitism. Luther had referred to the “Jewish sow” motif on the Wittenberg town church in one of his late works, see Schwerhoff, “Invektivität und Geschichtswissenschaft,” 28–30; Brecht, *Martin Luther*, 341. Since among Cranach’s woodcuts there is also one where the pope rides a pig, Gerd Schwerhoff sees the pope exposed to “the same social stigma as the Jews” and “the unclean animal being equated with the pope and the Jews,” Schwerhoff, “Radicalism and ‘Invectivity,’” 44. The invectives against the pope and the Jews would be mixed. Nevertheless, Jews are thereby not so much typecast as grobians as generally devalued. In pejorative animal comparisons, the Jews were also frequently compared to dogs, see Lobenstein-Reichmann, *Sprachliche Ausgrenzung*, 317–18. On the attitude toward the Jews on the part of the Catholics, see the essay of Bernward Schmidt in the present volume.

88 “die Hauptmetapher des Textes,” Hundt, *Sprachliche Aggression*, 23.

89 “esel thon,” Sebastian Brant, *Das Narrenschiff*. Studienausgabe. Mit allen 114 Holzschnitten des Drucks Basel 1494, ed. Joachim Knape (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2005), 352.

90 See Johannes Schwitalla, “Brutalität und Schamverletzung in öffentlichen Polemiken des 16. Jahrhunderts,” in *Gewalt in der Sprache: Rhetoriken verletzenden Sprechens*, ed. Sibylle Krämer and Elke Koch (Paderborn and Munich: Fink, 2010), 97–123, here 113. Animal comparisons were widely used to degrade someone, see Schwerhoff, “Radicalism and ‘Invectivity,’” 41. In the case of the Grobian, only certain animals play a role, and the pig, as his heraldic animal, has the biggest.

91 WA 54 (1928), 237.

92 WA 54 (1928), 221, 222, 237, 265, 266, 273, and 295. Luther also insulted Hieronymus Emser as a fool and a donkey, see Bremer, *Religionsstreitigkeiten*, 78.

93 “alle Bildungsmöglichkeiten der drei Bestandteile der Beschimpfung (Esel, Papst, Furz) voll aus [geschöpft werden],” Hundt, *Sprachliche Aggression*, 97.

94 “der HErr will,” “der HErr gibt.” “Nein, sagt der Fartzesel Bapst.” “Nein, sagt der Bapst Fartzesel.” “Nein, sagt der Eselartz-Bapst.” “Nein, sagt der Esel Bapstfartz,” WA 54 (1928), 266.

figurative sense that their verbal utterances are compared to the aforementioned bodily reaction.”<sup>95</sup> Hundt also concludes that in Luther the pope has the metaphorical characteristics of the donkey, he is stupid and stubborn and his statements and assertions are false.<sup>96</sup> These theses are confirmed by the fact that Luther himself writes several times about the unlearnedness of the pope donkey.<sup>97</sup>

The close connection between donkey and pig – also in Luther – is evident in formulations such as: “The pope donkey thinks the Church is a donkey stable or pig sty, since he may rule inside with his filth.”<sup>98</sup> Or Luther writes that the pope donkey’s fart says that “only the pope donkey is the shepherd, and all the apostles remain pig herders.”<sup>99</sup> Unlike the pig, however, the pope donkey is a monster, to be interpreted as an allegory for the corruption of the papal Church.<sup>100</sup> That this donkey is a monster is also mentioned by Luther himself.<sup>101</sup> Since the monster “stood close to [...] the Devil [...]. The monster motif thus associated the papacy with the Devil.”<sup>102</sup> Even though many monsters have grobian habits, not every monster is a grobian. The monster as a sign of divine wrath radicalizes Luther’s criticism of the pope as a grobian and underlines its eschatological dimension.<sup>103</sup>

There is a further reference to the grobian when Luther asks where the papal rank comes from:

Now it is only fair to ask: where does the papal rank come from, because it does not want to be either heavenly [...] or earthly [...]. He cannot come from the land of milk and honey, for who would be so unreasonable and sin so highly against the Holy Father Pope?<sup>104</sup>

---

**95** “im übertragenen Sinn so dümmliche Person, dass ihre verbalen Äußerungen mit der genannten Körperreaktion verglichen werden,” Lobenstein-Reichmann, *Sprachliche Ausgrenzung*, 58.

**96** See Hundt, *Sprachliche Aggression*, 24.

**97** WA 54 (1928), 221, 227, 237, 272, 285–86, and 287.

**98** “[D]er Bapstesel [...] [h]jellt die Kirchen für einen Eselstal oder Sewstal, da er mit seinem dreck innen regiren müge,” WA 54 (1928), 272.

**99** “allein der Baptesel der schefer, und alle Apostel sewhirten bleiben,” WA 54 (1928), 273.

**100** See Irene Ewinkel, *De monstis: Deutung und Funktion von Wundergeburten auf Flugblättern im Deutschland des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1995), 39 and 40. From the floods of a Tiber inundation in 1496, a monstrosity interpreted as a pope donkey had been thrown to the shore of Rome. Already in 1497/48 it had been read as an image of Pope Alexander VI, see Ewinkel, *De monstis*, 39.

**101** WA 54 (1928), 261, 295.

**102** Robert W. Scribner, *Popular Culture and Popular Movements in Reformation Germany* (London and Ronceverte: Hambledon Press, 1987), 286.

**103** See Ewinkel, *De monstis*, 39.

**104** “Fragt sichs nu billich: wo her denn der bepstlich Stand kome, Weil er nicht sein wil weder Himelisch [...] noch jrdisch [...]. Aus schlauraffen kan er nicht komen, Denn wer wolt so unvernünfftig sein, und sich so hoch versündigen an dem heiligen Vater Bapst?,” WA 54 (1928), 237.

Like Murner, Luther ironically mentions the land of milk and honey, where Sebastian Brant and also Hans Sachs located the grobian, and thus associates the pope with the grobian.<sup>105</sup>

Luther also calls for boorish behavior when he says that one should shit on the pope's crest and then burn it: "To do this, we must take his crest with a good conscience along to the toilet and need it as toilet paper, afterwards we throw it into the fire."<sup>106</sup> As with Murner, the privy appears in Luther's writing as a place of the devil. Therefore, the devil is to be fought with his own means – namely scatological ones.<sup>107</sup>

Similar to Murner, sexist insults appear in Luther alongside the scatological ones. These insults have to do with the misogynous dimension of grobianism, but are less dominant than the scatological ones: for example, the pope is repeatedly referred to as "Paula" or "Mrs. Pope"<sup>108</sup> with pejorative intent. This calls into question the pope's masculinity, which is part of the male-centered code of the invective.<sup>109</sup>

Luther's grobian scolding caused discord among his reading public: some approved, like Landgrave Frederick of Hesse; others, like the Strasbourg reformers, were alienated.<sup>110</sup> Luther used invective, "to challenge the existing order of things,"<sup>111</sup> writes Constance M. Furey. For Luther, the invective had an epistemological function: it "served the cause of proclaiming the truth."<sup>112</sup> This certainly had a theological dimension. Since deception was associated with evil, it was necessary to unmask it and point out the truth.<sup>113</sup> In this respect, invectives were allowed to be used to fight evil, the devil.<sup>114</sup> Heiko Oberman argues that the vehemence of Luther's invectives should be viewed in the context of apocalyptic eschatology: Luther saw his time as having reached the third phase, in which the Antichrist would successfully pose as Christ's representative.<sup>115</sup> The pope, against whom all the

---

105 WA 54 (1928), 237, 253, 257. On irony as a stylistic device of Luther at this point, see Hundt, *Sprachliche Aggression*, 159.

106 "Dazu mügen wir sein Wapen [...] mit gutem gewissen auff's heimlich gemach füren und zur unternotdurfft brauchen, darnach ins fewr werffen," WA 54 (1928), 242.

107 See Mecklenburg, "Sakramente und Exkreme," 144.

108 "fraw Bepstin," WA 54 (1928), 214, 215, 218, 223; see Hundt, *Sprachliche Aggression*, 88.

109 See Constance M. Furey, "Invective and Discernment in Martin Luther, D. Erasmus, and Thomas More," *Harvard Theological Review* 98 (2005), 469–88, here 470.

110 See Schwerhoff, "Invektivität und Geschichtswissenschaft," 28; Schwitalla, "Brutalität und Schamverletzung," 115.

111 Furey, "Invective and Discernment," 471.

112 Furey, "Invective and Discernment," 472.

113 See Furey, "Invective and Discernment," 474.

114 See Oberman, "Teufelsdreck," 443; Furey, "Invective and Discernment," 478.

115 See Oberman, "Teufelsdreck," 440.

invective was directed, embodied for Luther the end-time antichristian principle.<sup>116</sup> And Luther was convinced that the Antichrist had to be fought.<sup>117</sup> Besides all the problematic and perhaps repulsive aspects of Luther's invectives, "Luther the scold always managed to make his audience laugh,"<sup>118</sup> writes Martin Brecht. For invectives, in the form of laughing and ridiculing an opponent, belong to the cultural history of laughter.<sup>119</sup> David Bagchi is also convinced that Luther's scatological language was "meant to be funny and to provoke laughter."<sup>120</sup> For an early modern audience, feces would also have had something funny about it.<sup>121</sup> According to Luther, laughing at the devil was one of the most effective weapons against him, and this was best achieved through foul language that admitted one's own sinfulness and exhibited the devil's depravity.<sup>122</sup>

### 3 Conclusion

To what extent is the grobian a key figure in Murner's and Luther's texts? The grobian can be read as a figure in whom "invectivity" crystallizes in times of change. He belongs in the field of "invectivity" and even embodies it, but is not completely absorbed by it. However, not every form of invective is grobian.

The grobian uses the language typical of invective, degrading other persons. For his shocking actions and "indecent ironies,"<sup>123</sup> he needs an audience, which means he moves in the invective triad. What he does is also performative and violent. The epistemic function of the grobian style, as with invective, is to question the existing order of things.<sup>124</sup> However, by questioning the existing order, the grobian refers not only to a class conflict, as Barbara Correll postulates,<sup>125</sup> but also to a religious and media transformation. On the one hand, there is an affinity between religious

<sup>116</sup> See Brecht, *Martin Luther*, 361.

<sup>117</sup> See Mark U. Edwards, Jr., *Luther's Last Battles: Politics and Polemics 1531–1546* (Leiden: Brill, 1983), 182.

<sup>118</sup> "gelang es dem Schimpfer Luther immer wieder sein Publikum zum Lachen zu bringen," Martin Brecht, "Der 'Schimpfer' Martin Luther," *Luther: Zeitschrift der Luthergesellschaft* 52 (1981), 97–113, here 99.

<sup>119</sup> See Schwerhoff, "Invektivität und Geschichtswissenschaft," 9.

<sup>120</sup> Bagchi, "The German Rabelais?," 154.

<sup>121</sup> Bagchi, "The German Rabelais?," 154.

<sup>122</sup> See Bagchi, "The German Rabelais?," 154, 156, 162, 158.

<sup>123</sup> Correll, *The End of Conduct*, 38.

<sup>124</sup> Schwerhoff, "Invektivität und Geschichtswissenschaft," 27. Münkler speaks of invective as a "weapon in the fight against the old order" ("Waffe im Kampf gegen die alte Ordnung," Münkler, "Luthers Rom," 222).

<sup>125</sup> See Correll, *The End of Conduct*, 33 and 35.

polemics and the invective form. On the other, an expansion of the media system in an invective mode took place during the sixteenth century.<sup>126</sup>

Through mass communication via print media, it was suddenly possible to disparage individuals and entire groups with unprecedented severity, and to do so in front of a broad public with less danger of immediate physical consequences than in person.<sup>127</sup> As is also clear from the woodcut series, the grobian is a transmedial figure with a strong visual language. In religious conflicts, the figure of the grobian and the grobian style help to make abstract debates more figurative and visual.<sup>128</sup> They give the arguments more punch, as it were. At the same time, the figure of the grobian shows the contagiousness of invective: someone is treated roughly, pays back in kind, and thus becomes a grobian themselves. Someone acts like a grobian, but claims that this is only a reaction, since the other is the true grobian. These “inversions that are tactically performed”<sup>129</sup> foreshadow the circle of violence exercised through invective. From the perspective of invective research, too, this metainvective attribution of perpetration serves as a “strategic resource.”<sup>130</sup> This has an intensifying and dynamizing effect on the debate.<sup>131</sup> However, it is not tenable to claim, as Haruo Nitta does, that the Protestant side is coarse, while the Catholic side cultivates urban elegance.<sup>132</sup>

As a ridiculous figure, the grobian challenges not only degrading ridicule but also liberating laughter<sup>133</sup> and shows *ex negativo* the utopia of polite behavior – in this he goes beyond “invectivity.” The grobian thus illustrates how literary figures, as fictional embodiments of religious, social, and media transformation, can shape and concretize the debates accompanying them – but at the same time never become completely absorbed by them.

---

126 See Schwerhoff, “Invektivität und Geschichtswissenschaft,” 33.

127 See Schwerhoff, “Invektivität und Geschichtswissenschaft,” 34.

128 The typification of the opponent in itself does not necessarily promote the personalization of the dispute, as Bremer claims, because typification depersonalizes the opponent. Bremer, *Religionsstreitigkeiten*, 38 and 40.

129 Judith Butler, *The Force of Nonviolence: An Ethico-political Bind* (Brooklyn, NY: Verso Books, 2020), 6.

130 See Scharloth, “Hassrede und Invektivität,” 122.

131 See Antje Sablotny’s contribution in this volume.

132 See Haruo Nitta, “Urbane Eleganz gegen sarkastischen Grobianismus: Ironische Stilmittel in den Streitschriften zwischen Emser und Luther,” in *Strukturen und Funktionen in Gegenwart und Geschichte: Festschrift für Franz Simmler zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Claudia Wich-Reif (Berlin: Weidler, 2007), 555–69, here 567. On invective methods on the part of the Roman Church, see the contributions by Cora Dietl and Bernhard Schmidt in this volume.

133 Grobians also have a liberating function, as they do what is socially forbidden, see Correll, *The End of Conduct*, 34 and 36.