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Receiving Rist’s theatre – a literary-historical challenge

A claim in Die AllerEdelste Belustigung Kunsst- und Tugenliebender Gemüther (1666) indicates that Rist may have composed as many as 30 dramas. There are now only five dramatic works attributed to him: *Irenaromachia* (1630), *Perseus* (1634), *Das Friedewünschende Teutschland* (1647), *Das Friedejauchtzende Teutschland* (1653), *Depositio Cornuti Typographici*. The best estimate claims that only a further two had been published, a *Herodes* and a *Wallenstein*. The others have since been lost, perhaps even destroyed during Rist’s lifetime as his home was sacked twice by invading troops. Of the five that remain, *Irenaromachia* does not bear Rist’s name, while the *Depositio* differs greatly in conception and execution from the others and may not have numbered among the 30 claimed theatrical compositions. Thus the surviving dramas do not constitute a more or less unified body of works challenges German literary studies to engage with these discontinuities – a task which consistently avoids. The problematic nature of the surviving corpus is compounded by the fact that this was only a fraction of what was produced, a situation which invites an (albeit speculative) attempt to contextualise the surviving dramas in a wider sphere of literary-theatrical activity. This leads to the next difficulty, considering that the composition of dramas, even when these number 30 rather than four or five, was just one area of Rist’s prolific activity as a writer. This presents the problem of how to relate Rist’s dramas to his other writings and activities. This task is itself complicated by the tendency to focus on Rist’s verse compositions, which in the twentieth century emphasised his secular compositions. The current focus of much of Rist scholarship lies in his religious songs, from a theological, hymnological, and musicological perspective. He has also maintained a presence in the lay
imagination, as several of his songs have been included in Protestant hymnbooks since the 18th century.

Scholarship is now, however, turning its attention again to Rist as a dramatist and this thesis is part of this renewed attention. It is difficult to know what to do with Rist’s dramas. The problems they present are considerable, but this thesis will show that Rist’s dramas exist in the context of a concept of dramaturgy and a theory of acting that is much more sophisticated than has often been thought and that goes beyond the narrowly poetic into performance practice.
1. Rist and his Contemporaries

This essay seeks to sketch certain key relationships between Johann Rist (1607-1667) and his (near-)contemporaries, both as a means of highlighting determining factors in the production of his works as well as providing an indication of the manner in which he and his works were received during his lifetime. Chronologically speaking, this study extends in practice from shortly before Rist’s birth, dealing in the first instance with the Duke of Brunswick-Lüneburg’s drama *Von Vincentio Ladislao* (prose 1594, verse 1601), to shortly after his death, when he is praised by the schoolboy Quirinus Kuhlmann in a 1670 poem to the *Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft*. Within this eighty-year span, a picture should emerge not only of the networks of literary influence surrounding Rist, but also of some of the acquaintanceships, friendships, and indeed enmities he maintained with his contemporaries. As soon becomes apparent, it is unhelpful to limit the area of inquiry to concerns of a strictly literary nature – even Rist’s relationships to the other writers of his day were to a great extent determined by social, not to mention geographical, factors, and it will also be necessary to address his not inconsiderable relationships with figures outwith the literary field.

That being said, the appropriate starting point is nevertheless the situation of Rist’s literary production in the context of contemporary literary developments. Rist’s famously vocal support for the Opitzian programme of poetological reform will prove hugely significant when it comes to contextualising his person and works in the dominant literary trends of his day, but before turning to this it is worth lingering briefly on the influences from another, in many ways contradictory, literary sphere. Against the example of the tragedy *Perseus* (1634), Mannack has demonstrated
Rist’s reliance on the theatrical traditions of the English *Wanderbühne*. The *Monatsgespräche* suggest that Rist had direct experience of such performances:

[e]s begab sich / das in einer grossen / und uns sämtlich wolbekandten Stadt / etliche fürnehme Englishe Komödianten waren angekommen […] und daselbst zu spielen anfiegen.\(^2\)

In identifying *Von Vincentio Ladislao* as a source for *Perseus*, however, Mannack further establishes an indirect influence of the *Wanderbühne* on Rist. Heinrich Julius, Duke of Brunswick-Lüneburg (1546-1613), is seen as an early supporter of the English comic players,\(^3\) and in *Ladislao* the English tradition is brought into contact with the commedia dell’arte, and, ultimately, the ancient *miles gloriosos*.\(^4\) Qua source for *Perseus*, then *Ladislao* is of manifold relevance for our literary contextualisation of Rist. First, the function of his drama as a source for Rist’s provides an at least nominal literary mediation of the *Wanderbühne* tradition, in addition to his direct experiences of the players. This, secondly, means that, to the extent to which he drew on *Ladislao*, Rist was operating within an existent literary trend (however unfashionable this might have been in the context of Opitz’s reform). Furthermore, contact is thus established with the theatrical tradition of the Italian comic players and their heritage in Roman comedy. Investigation into Rist’s

---


\(^3\) E. Mannack, 141–49 (pp. 146–7).

\(^4\) Meid, v, p. 334.
immediate literary context therefore instantly establishes him in a tradition reaching back to antiquity. The significance of the rank of the Ladislao author also cannot be overlooked, not only as demonstrating that the formally chaotic dramas of the Wanderbühne had their supporters amongst those whom Opitz’s Ständeklausel would mark out as the appropriate subjects and consumers of tragedy, but also as providing an authoritative precedent for Rist’s practice in the context of the Standesgesellschaft of the time.⁵

The relationships to Heinrich Julius and the traditions of the traveling players clearly bear more detailed investigation in their own right, but to continue to direct attention here at this stage would be to detract from what can be seen as the most important relationship Rist had to any of his contemporaries. Rist was so successful in the cultivation and propagation of an image of himself as a representative and guardian of strict Opitzian poetological standards that, although well-known as a writer of hymns, it is overwhelmingly thus that he is seen even today. Arguably, this emphasis on the Opitzian is often to the detriment of Rist’s. The close resemblance in wording between Rist’s Widmungsschreiben to Perseus and that of Opitz’s Vorrede to his Trojanerinnen translation (1625) is a clear instance of Rist’s appeal to Opitz as an authority, even though the latter is not mentioned by name.⁶ What is interesting in respect of Rist’s fervent Opitzianism is the possible motivation for it, which illuminates not only Rist’s relationship with Opitz but also goes some way to accounting for his relationships with the other big literary names of his time.

---

⁵ Erich Trunz demonstrates the cultural phenomenon of the early modern period which fixated upon the importance of social rank, see ‘Der deutsche Späthumanismus um 1600 als Standeskultur’ in R. Alewyn (ed.), Deutsche Barockforschung: Dokumentation Einer Epoche (Cologne: Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 1965), pp. 147-81.

Dammann contends that, in taking up the Opitzian cause, Rist, who barely left Wedel after becoming pastor there in 1635, is in fact developing a strategy by which he can attain supraregional significance. In other words, Rist sought to become the literary figure in Holstein, employing the modern artistic programme of Opitzianism to trump any challengers to this title. From his provincial context, Rist sees himself as an active member of a supraregional union of Opitzians.7

Dammann’s argument is compelling in itself, and is furthermore a fine illustration of the difficulty, and indeed counterproductivity, of studying Rist’s relationships to his contemporaries purely to the extent that such relationships are of strict literary significance. Not seeking to deny Rist’s literary admiration for the poetic reformer, the geographical particularities of Rist’s situation nevertheless also had their role to play in his advocacy of Opitz’s programme. Indeed, this second dimension of his relationship to Opitz goes some way towards accounting for the glaring fact that, in terms of his literary production, Rist was anything but a die-cast of Opitz. As far as Rist’s Opitzianism was a means of self-assertion and legitimation, he need not have been bound absolutely to Opitz’s precise prescriptions.

The claim that Rist’s extant dramas are formally indefensible by Opitz’s standards is uncontroversial. Yet alongside the literary-generic reform of the Buch von der deutschen Poeterey (1624) there runs a polemic against the preponderance of foreign loan-words in the German language. Opitz’s concern for the purity of the German language in fact precedes the Poeterey, dating back to his Aristarchus speech (1617) delivered while still a student at the Schönaichianum in Beuthen.

---

This common concern situates both Opitz and Rist in the wider context of the drive in the seventeenth century to establish and maintain the purity, and dignity, of the German language. This double goal was formally institutionalised in the \textit{Sprachgesellschaften}, which adopted it explicitly into their official articles. Rist became a member of Harsdörffer and Klaj’s \textit{Pegnesischer Blumenorden} in 1645, and of Fürst Ludwig von Anhalt-Köthen’s prestigious \textit{Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft} in 1647. In 1658 he founded his own society, known as the \textit{Elbschwanenorden}\footnote{Leonhard Neubaur notes that Rist only ever referred to the ‘Schwanenorden’ or ‘Elbischer Schwanenorden’. See ‘Zur Geschichte Des Elbschwanenordens’, \textit{Altpreußische Monatsschrift}, 47 (1910), 113-82 (p. 117 n1).} and conceived of as a feeder society for Fürst Ludwig’s.\footnote{E. Mannack, ‘Hamburg Und Der Elbschwanenorden’, in \textit{Sprachgesellschaften, Sozietäten, Dichtergruppen.}, ed. by Martin Bircher and van Ingen, Ferdinand, Wolfenbütteler Arbeiten Zur Barockforschung, 7 (Hamburg: Dr Ernst Hauswedell & Co., 1978), pp. 163-79 (p. 167); K.F. Otto, \textit{Die Sprachgesellschaften Des 17. Jahrhunderts} (Metzler, 1972), p. 53.} Thus, Rist relates doubly to his contemporaries through the issue of the German language: in both following the example of his authority, Opitz, and participating with him in a dominant cultural discourse of the time.
The Fruchtbringende was the most significant of the Sprachgesellschaften, with the others founded in response to it. Its achievements are also recognised as the most significant by modern scholarship (to the extent that they are recognised at all). What is apparent, even before consideration of modern appraisals of the Fruchtbringende, is that it was not conceived of solely as a literary institution. The purity of the German language was not solely, or indeed primarily, a literary issue. At least equally important were both the moral implications of its use and abuse, as well as the general moral standards to which society members were held. Ludwig had founded the Fruchtbringende following the model of

Academien, die in frembden Landen / beydes zu erhaltung guten vertrawens / erbauung wolanstendiger Sitten / als nützlicher außübung jedes Volcks LandsSprachen/ auffgerichtet.\(^\text{12}\)

Furthermore, the admonition to the use of German vocabulary in place of foreign loan-words was not directed solely at the composers of literary works. Rather, the call went out to all Germans, and what was at stake was their very morality. This concern is neatly summed up in Logau’s epigram ‘Fremde Tracht’, which serves our purposes here as no more than a convenient expression of an underlying current of the language movement of the seventeenth century:

Alamode-Kleider / Alamode-Sinnen

Wie sichs wandelt aussen / wandelt sichs auch innen.\(^\text{13}\)

---


Scholarship since the twentieth century has increasingly acknowledged the significant role played by moral concerns in the formation of the *Sprachgesellschaften*. As such, criticisms of the limited extent of their literary output or achievements for the German language, such as that of Gundolf, who insists that any such achievements were made by individuals at least outwith their capacity as society members, if not indeed in opposition to the societies, appear as inadequate, resting upon an incomplete understanding of to what end the societies were formed. Indeed Berns, pointing out that the term *Sprachgesellschaften* is itself a construct of nineteenth-century scholarship, prefers to speak instead of a ‘Sozietätsbewegung’ in the seventeenth century, as such widening the field of investigation beyond the handful of groups usually examined by literary scholars. Berns demonstrates not only that the *Fruchtbringende* was hardly a literary-linguistic society, the Protestant princes who dominated its membership never utilising their authority to establish seats of German language and literature at universities, but also that the other so-called *Sprachgesellschaften* bore key structural and constitutional similarities to apparently non-literary societies, for example the scientific *Academia Naturae Curiosorum*. All the while, however, it should be borne in mind that even to the extent that the societies themselves were far from purely literary, they were nevertheless hugely influential in shaping the literary scene during Rist’s lifetime.

---

14 This insight was most notably made by Ferdinand van Ingen, ‘Die Sprachgesellschaften Des 17. Jahrhunderts. Versuch Einer Korrektur’, *Daphnis*, 1 (1972), 14–23.
The above discussion has strayed briefly from focus on Rist in the interests of establishing his context qua member of three Sprachgesellschaften as one that is significantly determined by motives of a non-literary nature. It now remains to elaborate his precise relationship to these societies and their members. Concerning membership of the Pegnesischer Blumenorden, the main point of interest here is Rist’s relationship with its founder, Harsdörffer, whose Frauenzimmer Gesprächspiele are seen as having influenced the Monatsgespräche of Rist’s later years. The two writers are held to have been on good terms. Rist was already an established writer by the time he was accepted into the society in 1645, and Harsdörffer was instrumental in his acceptance into the Fruchtbringende two years later. Contact with Harsdörffer would have been of great importance to Rist in the context of his ambitions to establish himself as the German literary representative of Holstein. Similarly, Harsdörffer is likely to have mediated the initial acquaintance between Rist and the Birken, in the expectation that Rist would provide encouragement to the younger poet. This sketch indicates that, in addition to a relationship of literary influence between two literary figures, they participated in the practice of reciprocal recommendation in the pursuit of social prestige. Harsdörffer was in a position to advance Rist’s career, and Rist in turn was in a position to advance Birken’s.

20 T. Mast, ‘Patriotism And The Promotion Of German Language And Culture: Johann Rists Rettung Der Edlen Teutschen Hauptsprache (1642) and the Language Movement of the Seventeenth Century’, Daphnis, 30 (2001), 71–96 (p. 71 n2).
22 Schuster, p. 575.
Schuster’s analysis of the correspondence between Rist and Birken provides illuminating insights into their personal relationship, which is of interest here to the extent that it is further indicative either of the practice of establishing a network of literary contacts in the interests of self-promotion, or of the manner in which membership of the Sprachgesellschaften was conceived. In relation to the former, it appears that while Birken stood to gain from Rist’s expertise and reputation, Rist was in a position to exploit Birken’s connections at the Wolfenbüttel court, asking him to request an honorific poem from Schottelius. Thus when Birken left Wolfenbüttel, he was of significantly less use to Rist.23 Schuster supposes that Birken’s less than gracious response to Rist’s acceptance into the Fruchtbringende in 1647 led to the latter breaking off their correspondence. The relationship appears to have warmed somewhat after Birken was made Imperial Count Palatine in 1656, and from 1665 until Rist’s death they were again in regular correspondence, Birken being since 1658 member of the Fruchtbringende and as such at least equal in cultural and social status to Rist. Furthermore, Birken was by this point based in Nuremberg, and the significance of having a contact in this literary and publishing hub, particularly since the death of Harsdörffer in 1658, is unlikely to have been lost on Rist.24

The nature of the relationship between Rist and Birken, as interpreted by Schuster, indicates that the practice of cultivating acquaintanceships, and even friendships, amongst literary figures was determined by social prudence as well as literary admiration. The necessity of this state of affairs becomes clear in the context of the Standeskultur. Herein lies the significance of Rist’s acceptance to the Fruchtbringende. It was a society founded and dominated by the nobility, already disadvantaging Rist in terms of social rank. It was furthermore reluctant to admit

23 Schuster, pp. 582–3.
members of the clergy – Rist was one of only two clerics out of an eventual membership of some 900.\textsuperscript{25} Today recognised as a key literary figure from the mid-seventeenth century, his membership of the most well-known Sprachgesellschaft was thus anything but a matter of course. Rist himself demonstrates awareness of the exceptional nature of his admittance. In dedicating his 1647 drama, \textit{Das Friedewünschende Teütschland}, to the society, he remarks that he

\begin{quote}
 zwahr eine so hohe Begnädigung niemahls dörpern hoffen / wie sie denn auch noch zuer Zeit keinem einzigen meines Standes (den Mürben außgenommen) wiederaffen /Jn diesen Ihren hochlöblichen Orden auff und anzunehmen.\textsuperscript{26}
\end{quote}

This is an instance in which the mediating influence of Harsdörffer (of Nuremberg patrician stock\textsuperscript{27}) came in usefull.

In light of this, let us return to Dammann’s argument about Rist’s utilisation of Opitz’s reform programme – and the esteem which accompanied it – in the interests of asserting himself as \textit{the} literary Holsteiner. Now more familiar with the social climate in which Rist was writing, we can quite straightforwardly make sense of Dammann’s argument that Rist followed a literary-political strategy when choosing the dedicatees of his works, successively developing a circle from Holstein outwards as his success grew.\textsuperscript{28} This practice reaches its pinnacle with the dedication of the \textit{Friedewünschendes Teütschland}. What is further noteworthy about this drama is the plenitude of honorary poetry from Rist’s peers, in pride of place as the first to be printed an offering from his esteemed colleague ‘dem Spielenden’ (Harsdörffer).\textsuperscript{29}

\textsuperscript{25} The other was Johann Valentin Andreae. See Otto, p. 18.
\textsuperscript{27} Berns, p. 67.
\textsuperscript{28} Dammann, p. 57.
\textsuperscript{29} Johann Rist, II, 1-203 (p. 30).
In demonstration of Dammann’s argument, contrast this to the more modest dedication of *Perseus*, and note that the young writer’s early offering was not accompanied by respectful verses from literary worthies.

A final note on Rist’s personal relationships to his literary contemporaries: just as Schuster demonstrated the social tensions permeating Rist’s relationship to Birken, so Dammann’s account of Rist’s literary-political strategy of self-promotion sheds light on his relationship with Zesen. Zesen was a controversial literary figure in his time, provoking the criticism of Fürst Ludwig for his radical orthography and disagreeing with the prince on the acceptability of the use of the word ‘Durchleucht’ in relation to a poet. Yet Rist’s eventual attitude towards Zesen is characterised by an extreme of vitriol. The contempt in which he held his peer is demonstrated particularly forcefully in *Das Friedejauchtzende Teutschland* (1653), where Zesen appears in the figure of Sausewind and the conclusion is reached ‘daß in der Welt kein grösser Phantast / als er sey zu finden.’ According to Dammann, it is likely to have been Rist’s ambitions to establish himself in a position of high regard in German literary circles that drew him into the feud with Zesen, since the latter’s criticism of Opitzianism threatened the very basis of Rist’s claim to modernity. Faced with a younger generation of poets and poetological development, Rist was concerned with seeming passé.

---

30 This is re-imagined in Grass’s *Das Treffen in Telgte* (Rowolt, 1979).
34 Dammann, p. 62.
Beyond the admiration of his literary peers and his acceptance into the *Fruchtbringende*, further key indications of Rist’s success were his crowning as poet laureate in 1646, at which point he also became a member of the nobility, and his appointment as Imperial Count Palatine in 1653. As Berns suggests, these honours were not simply feathers in Rist’s cap. Berns highlights the necessity of such accolades for the very existence of the non-princely societies. Palatines, such as Rist and Birken, had the power to crown poet laureates, and it was prescribed in the articles of both the *Elbschwanenorden* and the *Pegnesischer Blumenorden* that members should be laureates. These distinctions provided the societies with the social validation necessary for survival, and as such were largely irrelevant to the *Fruchtbringende*, whose princely leadership could do as it pleased and which, particularly during the Thirty Years’ War, was anti-Imperial in attitude.

Furthermore, Lohmeier and Unsicker argue that Rist’s position as Palatine is relevant to his continued ability to publish secular poetry, even as a pastor.

Reflecting his Imperial appointment, within his own society Rist bore the name ‘Palatin’. Mannack notes that, despite the intentions with which the society was formed, only two of its members ever went on to join the *Fruchtbringende*. In fact, beyond the society’s emphasis on the status of its members, its construction further differed from that of its alleged model in respect of both clerical and confessional matters. Almost a third of its members were clergymen, and

---

35 Schuster, p. 580.
36 Mast, p. 72.
37 Berns, pp. 66–8.
membership appears to have been restricted to Lutherans. This is remarkable in light of studies by Garber and Béhar which establish the significance of Calvinist and esoteric contexts in the development of German literature in the seventeenth century. With the exception of the Monatsgespräche, literary production associated with the Elbschwanenorden does not appear to have been noteworthy, so what is at this stage of interest about the society is that in it, Rist drew a circle of like-minded individuals about himself. Mannack identifies some of the key characteristics of its members: North German Protestants, with an interest in the relationship between poetry and music and a fascination for the developing empirical sciences and technology.

The foregoing has sought to situate Rist amongst his contemporaries both in terms of literary influence and the structures within which contact between literary personalities was cultivated. This far from fully provides a complete contextualisation. There is more to be said about his geographical location, his influence outwith Germany, and his later reputation.

Rist’s significance as a Holstein poet has already been touched upon to the extent that he used this status as a basis for a claim to national reputation. Further, the relevance of his relationships to Harsdörffer, and later Birken, was clarified in terms of Nuremberg’s importance as a city of literature and publishing. That is, Rist’s geographical situation has so far only been considered in terms of the overcoming of provinciality. Yet in Wedel, Rist was positioned between Hamburg

---

41 ‘Hamburg und der Elbschwanenorden’, pp. 169–70.
and Denmark, and his literary practice also bears contextualisation in respect of these.

Moerke’s idyllic representation of Rist’s ‘patriarchalisches Leben, wirkened als Seelsorger, Dichter, Arzt, Blumenzüchter und Naturwissenschaftler’ in Wedel is countered by the more prosaic accounts of Mannack and Dammann. Both point out that a determining factor in Rist’s remaining in Wedel was the proximity of Hamburg. As ‘der Rüstige’, his society name in the Fruchtbringende, Rist declares in Das AllerEdelste Leben (1663) that regards it ‘einen gahr grossen Theil meiner irdischen Glükseligkeit […] / das ich der weltberühmten Statt Hamburg so nahe wohne.’ Hamburg had flourished during the war, indeed providing refuge for Rist when troops came to Wedel, and was culturally significant both in terms of the standard of music associated with its churches and its nascent newspaper industry. Rist was aided in his drive to make a name for himself nationally by the particular advantages of his own situation. According to Dammann, his dedicatory strategy was particularly successful in relation to Hamburg and its upper classes, which brought Rist the reward not only of repute but of not inconsiderable financial gratification.

Wedel fell under Danish jurisdiction when the Schauenburg dynasty died out in 1640, and Rist cultivated relationships with influential Danes just as he has been seen to do with Germans – among them the archbishop of Bremen, later King

---

43 ‘Hamburg und der Elbschwanenorden’, p. 167; Dammann, p. 63.
46 Dammann, pp. 57–8.
Frederik III of Denmark and his wife, Sophie Amalie. Yet more interesting than the esteem in which he was held by Danish royalty is Rist’s influence on the development of Danish literature. He was greatly admired by Søren Terkelsen who, despite not having a Humanist education, was able to bring contemporary literary developments to Denmark under Rist’s influence. He did this through a programme of translations, thereby addressing in an Opitzian manner the condition of Danish literature in the middle of the century, which was comparable to that of German literature at the time when Opitz introduced his reform. Terkelsen, as Celadon, wrote an honorary poem for Rist’s *Friedewünschendes Teütschland*, while Rist composed one for his *Astree Siunge-Choer*. In this work, Terkelsen explicitly stayed close to the German models of his translations, citing a lack of a Danish prosody or orthography which might have permitted him to translate more freely. Rist’s poetry thus has a largely unmediated influence upon contemporary developments in Denmark.

Rist also had a contemporary admirer in the Swiss Confederation: the playwright Josua Wetter (1622-56). This is remarkable given the Swiss cultural condition, strongly influenced in Catholic areas by Latin Jesuit theatre, as in Germany, but in Reformed areas characterised by puritanism and a distrust of the arts. Like Terkelsen in Denmark, Wetter sought to bring Swiss literature into line with the developments in the supraregional European Baroque, a project hindered by the limited contact in Switzerland to the *Sprachgesellschaften* and their members. Nevertheless, Wetter was brought into contact with the German literary scene as a

---

48 Schuster, 571–602 (p. 582); Dammann, pp. 47-66 (p. 59); W. Friese, *Nordische Barockdichtung* (Francke, 1968), p. 84.
49 Lohmeier and Unsicker, pp. 50–1.
50 *Friedewünschendes Teütschland*, pp. 40–1.
51 Friese, p. 86.
52 Friese, p. 203.
student in Strasbourg, where he was clearly influenced by Moscherosch and reaped the benefits of the close literary and personal relationships between Strasbourg and North Germany and Silesia. As well as providing an indication of the extent of Rist’s reputation, this demonstrates the seventeenth-century chain of literary influence and communication at work.

The success with which Rist overcame his provincial condition and became a serious and respected figure in German literature is well-illustrated in his reception in Silesia, the undeniable heartland of German literature in the seventeenth century. In 1670, students at the St Maria Magdalenen-Gymnasium in Breslau performed an *Actus Von der Hochlöblichen Fruchtbringenden Gesellschaft*. Composed by the students themselves in prose, it concerned the famous deeds of Silesian poets. Quirinus Kuhlmann (1651–89), the schools most gifted rhetorician, was permitted to compose and deliver his own work in verse. After portraying the genesis of the *Fruchtbringende*, the first poets Kuhlmann deals with are Harsdörffer and Rist – two non-Sileans, yet for this he is no less effusive in his praise. The two deceased poets ‘spilen rüstig schon auff Hoch-teutsch Sieges-Lieder’, this a recognition of their accomplishments that includes a clever reference to their society names. What is interesting about Kuhlmann’s appreciation of Rist is that he explicitly singles out his work on the philosopher’s stone and his first *Monatsgespräch, Das AllerEdelste Nass*, for praise. Andreas Gryphius, on the other hand, is praised as a dramatist.

---

55 Bircher, p. 197.
56 Bircher, p. 317.
57 Bircher, p. 318.
Thus the poem indicates the reception of Gryphius as an authority in dramatic practice, apparently to the exclusion of the validity of Rist’s own dramatic output.

A key influence of Rist’s literature upon his contemporaries was in his emphasis on and ideal of peace. This has been observed in the work of Wetter, and Mannack has demonstrated that Grimmelshausen was influenced by the reading of Rist’s peace plays. This is clearly seen in the so-called Jupiter episodes in *Simplicissimus*, which closely resemble the structure and concern of *Friedewünschendes Teütschland*, with a god coming to earth only to have his belief in the morality of humankind deeply shaken by the depravity he encounters. In *Simplicissimus*, however, Rist’s understanding of the war as a divine punishment to be lifted only in the face of moral improvement is rendered problematic. In Grimmelshausen’s text, published twenty years after the Peace of Westphalia, it is observed that those targeted by the punishment ‘haben sich nit allein nit gebessert, sondern seind viel ärger worden als sie zuvor jemals gewesen!’ In *Simplicissimus* enters into a critical dialogue with the peace plays, and, sceptical of the divine punishment understanding of war, is brought to consider other conditions under which it might be brought to an end.

Having begun with a contextualisation of Rist’s literary work in terms of the developments at the beginning of the seventeenth century, this essay thus concludes with an illustration of his successors engaging with his literary heritage. Along the

---

58 Bircher, p. 328.
way, particular social and geographical factors that determined his influence upon, and interaction with, his contemporaries have been elucidated. It is clear that Rist was a respected figure of his day, and that this respect was not restricted to literary circles, nor even particularly to literary matters. His reputation as an alchemist, for instance, extended as far west as British America, and as far east as Constantinople. Yet for all this, his renown was fading by the end of the seventeenth century, the Elbschwanenorden having already rather petered out of existence following his death. The manner in which Rist engaged with his contemporaries coincided with enormous personal success during his lifetime, but did not contribute to establishing him as a significant player in the history of the development of German literature. For all his intentions, he appears to have made a greater contribution to the Danish national literature than his own.

---

64 Schiewek, pp. 145-251 (p. 147); Neubaur, 113-82 (p. 115 n8).
2. Rist’s dramatic theory – the concept of Fuerstellung.

Dramaturgy in the Belustigung and its relevance to Rists published dramas.

In the preface to his fourth Monatsunterredung, that is, Die AllerEdelste Belustigung Kunst- und Tugendliebender Gemuehter, Rist admits that the discussion of drama and theatre upon which the dialogue itself embarks does not reflect in its breadth and detail the full scope of its subject-matter. This he seeks to excuse through appeal to ‘Der vernuenftiger Leser’, who is capable of discerning for himself ‘wohin ich ziele / und das ich den Kunstliebenden / nur etlicher mahssen wolle Anleitung geben / wie sie dieser schoenen Wissenschafft / immer mehr und weiter sollen nachforschen’.65 He immediately cites Scaliger’s Poetices as a fundamental work for understanding drama to which the reader should refer. Similarly, he excuses himself from a full discussion of poetry by directing his reader to the works of Schottel, which are so thorough in their treatment of poetry ‘das schwehrlich ein mehreres zu wuenschen [wäre].’66 The Belustigung does not primarily seek to provide a full exposition from first principles of the art forms it discusses (theatre, music, poetry, and painting), but to explain what is entertaining, enjoyable, belustigend about them.

The Monatsunterredungen are six (of a planned twelve) works, presenting a discussion, almost certainly imagined, between Rist (‘der Ru"stige’)67 and three members of his Elbschwanenorden. Beginning in January, each is set in a new month

---

66 Belustigung, p. 214.
of the year, with an opening discussion between der Rußstige and his gardeners providing the seasonal context. As the fourth Monatsunterredung, the Belustigung is set in April. Although the titles and the opening botanical discussions imply a periodic publication practice akin to a proto-journalistic form, the works were in fact published over six years, and not in alignment with the months in which they are set. There is some indication, particularly from the prefatory material to the first two Unterredungen, that Rist had initially intended a monthly publication of the works, and in the later works he complains of delays at the publishers’ holding back their appearance. However, it is impossible to be certain of his intentions, and the fact remains that the production of the Monatsunterredungen, both in terms of their composition and publication, eventually fell behind the timeframe that was initially proposed and which the works themselves continued, in part to imply. The first was published in 1663, the last posthumously in 1668, and while on the one hand the fiction of 1663 was maintained throughout, the later works began to show awareness of contemporary developments. The series was continued by Erasmus Francisci (1627-1694), proof-reader at Endter in Nuremberg, where Das friedejauchtzende Teutschland had been published in 1653, and the complete series remained in print until 1703. Since the exact relation of the Monatsunterredungen to journalistic form is impossible to quantify, it can be claimed that the monthly ordering of the

---

68 For a discussion of the timescale of publication and the likely intention behind the Monatsunterredungen, see Alfred Jericke, Johann Rists Monatsgespräche (Berlin & Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1928), pp. 185–7.

69 While the Belustigung contains a denial of the existence of black tulips, for example, the subsequent Unterredung, Die alleredelste Erfindung (1667), acknowledges that these had been discovered in the intervening period.

dialogues constitutes an ‘ästhetisches Kompositionsprinzip’,\textsuperscript{71} without committing Rist to any, potentially anachronistic, journalistic intent. In each of the

Monatsunterredungen, the four interlocutors present for discussion their own cases in support of a particular subject as the ‘alleredelst’ form of whatever broad area is under discussion. Thus in the Belustigung cases are presented in support of theatre, music, poetry, and painting. Der Rußtige is always last to make his case, and his position is always taken as definitive and agreed by all participants to be correct. Thus in the Belustigung, painting is ultimately established as ‘alleredelst’. The participants in the discussion are Ingeniander (Daniel Neuberger), Artisander (Matthäus Merian, artist and publisher) and Phoebisander (Jeremias Erbe, a Hamburg musician).

In addition to the general, indeed generic, difficulties encountered in the attempt to engage with the Monatsunterredungen, the Belustigung presents specific problems when it comes to the question of its relevance to Rist’s own dramatic production. As his only work, beyond the dramas themselves (inclusive of their paratextual apparatus), to discuss drama and theatre in any great detail, it has the potential to offer insights into his dramas and perhaps provide guidance on how to engage with them. Yet it was almost certainly composed a significant period of time after his last surviving drama (not counting the Depositio of 1655, the most recent of Rist’s dramas to have survived is Das Friedejauchtzende Teutschland, 1653). As such, it cannot straightforwardly serve to shed light on his dramatic production. At most, the Belustigung could function as a post hoc explanation of the earlier works, and so would have a limited capacity to directly account for the features of these dramas. A further methodological constraint is the fact that only four of an estimated

\textsuperscript{71} Stockhorst, p. 85.
thirty dramas by Rist have survived (discounting the *Depositio* and ignoring the lack of clarity on his contribution to *Irenaromachia*), meaning that any claims made in the *Belustigung* can necessarily only be related to an incomplete body of work. However, the potential applicability of claims made in the *Belustigung* to Rist’s earlier dramas is augmented by the fact that the discussion of theatre as a form of entertainment focusses on dramaturgical principles, performance techniques and contexts, not the poetic norms of e.g. a Scaliger. This stands to illuminate Rist’s understanding of theatre, not drama as a cluster of poetic genres, indicating the performance contexts and traditions in which he was operating and encouraging an analytical foregrounding of the performance aspects of Rist’s theatre, not the literary aspects of his individual dramas.

Of course, any attempt to use the *Belustigung* as a source for detail on Rist’s understanding of theatre, and to draw conclusions in respect of the composition of his dramas from this, relies upon a basic understanding of personal identity which meaningfully incorporates the role of psychological continuity. Minimally, this allows in principle for the ideas about theatrical practice expressed in the *Belustigung* to have already been held by Rist during the composition of his own dramas. There is a sense in which any similarities between the dramas and the *Belustigung*, or their capacity to be mutually illuminating, can be derived from their all having been composed in a single, broadly continuous, cultural and intellectual context. This accords little significance to the fact that a putative biographical, psychological unit, Rist, who existed over the period 1607-1667, composed all of the works under consideration. Yet the *Belustigung* provides useful detail on Rist’s own reading – he references Scaliger’s *Poetices*, for example, but also, in respect of theatre, draws on Tomaso Garzoni’s *Piazza Universale* (1585, first published in German in 1619) and
Harsdörffer’s *Frauenzimmer Gesprächspiele* (1644-57). These are all works to which Rist conceivably had access during the composition of his own dramas. The assumption of psychological continuity and identity of authorship between the dramas and the *Belustigung* is also important as the *Belustigung* seems to engage in reflection upon Rist’s previous works and past attitudes. As such, and although these reflections are relatively brief, the *Belustigung* is a valuable document of Rist’s own concept of himself as an artist – as someone whose involvement with theatre stretches back over almost his whole life. These reflections are not limited to consideration of the published dramas but also take in the unpublished works as well as Rist’s own experiences of theatrical performance, as both actor and audience member, and lend powerful support to the case for approaching his dramas through consideration of their performance.

By considering art under the aspect of its entertainment value, the *Belustigung* is able to adopt a striking perspective on theatrical practice. In practice, it enables and even justifies a decoupling of the Horatian *delectare* from its *prodesse* requirement. This contrasts with the approach taken in the standard treatises on codified poetics (Rist references Scaliger, further relevant examples would be Opitz’s *Poeterey* and Harsdörffer’s *Trichter*), which insist upon the conjunctive relationship in dramatic works between the two elements, laying the onus upon the dramatist to compose a work that, in compliance with generic convention, serves some (social, religious, political, but certainly moral) purpose. The drama must be appropriately edifying, and within the bounds of this has permission to entertain. Underlying this concept of drama and its remit is a neo-Stoic philosophy, by which drama functions to cultivate certain appropriate dispositions, and human psychology is understood in a way that
such cultivation is possible. This is the basis of the Baroque theory of *katharsis*, which reinterprets the Aristotelian category in neo-Stoic terms, conceiving of drama as a school for affects. It is productive to take a poetological approach to such drama, focussing on the role of the dramatist and the text he produces and evaluating his ability to relate form and content. The *Belustigung*, however, does not concern itself with the dramatic text, but with the techniques of a successful theatrical performance. It asks not so much for the *what* of drama as for the *how* of performance. Its dramaturgical approach entails greater scope for discussion of the role of the actor and his (or her) craft, staging, costume, machinery, music – the elements that contribute to the spectacle of theatre, that make it entertaining.

The discussion of theatre as ‘Belustigung’ is in a crucial respect categorically indistinct from the poetic discussions of theatre, in that both conceive of their subject matter as a *technē*, or set of *technai*. The relevant difference lies in their respective means of presentation. Poetics present their material as doctrine available for study and acquisition as such – Harsdörffer’s *Trichter* provides a vivid conception of the learnability of normative poetics, while it was Scaliger himself who made the most decisive contribution to the ‘*Szientifizierung der Poetik in der Frühen Neuzeit.*’ In directing his readers towards Scaliger, Rist is recommending to them a work with an explicitly different project from that of his own, namely the explication of the principles governing poetic composition. This is not to say that no principles in fact underlie theatrical performance. While the *Belustigung* does not seek to
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programmatically set such principles out in a format supporting their acquisition by
the reader, they are nevertheless discoverable through analysis. Herein lies a key
source of the Belustigung’s relevance for and potential applicability to Rist’s
surviving dramas: as a repository for the sorts of principles, here in terms of the
actor’s craft and stagecraft in general, that might help account for their composition.

The difference in the Belustigung’s approach to theatre from that of a
codified poetics is less a matter of a fundamentally different conception of its subject
matter than it is a function of its underlying psychological theory, which is
substantively Epicurean in character. It is important to understand how the
Belustigung conceives of enjoyment in order to understand how it sees theatre as
enjoyable. It might seem unexpected to attribute Epicurean attitudes to a writer
operating in an intellectual context of a well-established neo-Stoic character, but the
Belustigung indicates Rist’s participation in the broad 17th-century Epicurean
inheritance, which attempted to integrate the ‘refreshing energy’ and ‘humane
materialism’ of Epicureanism into the ‘Christian realm of intellectual
responsibility.’

Enjoyment in the absence of rational mediation is available as a
legitimate experience, and individual disposition has a role in determining which
experiences an individual will find enjoyable. This acknowledgement of the
essential subjectivity of preference creates a conceptual difficulty for the
Belustigung’s project of identifying a superlative (‘alleredelst’) form. In dealing with
this, Rist anticipates elements of the 18th-century taste discourse. The attribution of
Epicureanism, with its foregrounding of immediate sensory experience, is less

75 Paddy Bullard, ‘The Epicurean Aesthetics of the “Philosophical Enquiry”’, in Edmund Burke and
the Art of Rhetoric (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 79–108 (p. 90); Epicureanism
provided the philosophical basis for the ‘vindication of pleasure’ in early modern thought, and an
understanding of human welfare that extended beyond the fulfillment of intellectual requirements, see
Catherine Wilson, ‘Epicureanism in Early Modern Philosophy’, in The Cambridge companion to
276–7).
surprising given the Epicurean heritage of 17th-century empiricism.\textsuperscript{76} The underlying epistemology of the *Monatsunterredungen* (‘Daß dieses wahr sey / bezeuget die Erfahrung’\textsuperscript{77}) has functioned in scholarship to locate the works in the context of contemporary scientific discourse, with reference to both the botanical discussions and the descriptions of Rist’s own scientific pursuits, as well as identifying elements in them of an early journalistic form.\textsuperscript{78} The epistemological bent of the *Monatsunterredungen* invites their interpretation as a source of historical and biographical detail, and the potential of this approach to yield insights, particularly in respect of drama and theatrical practice, will be discussed below. In the first instance, it is necessary to further unpack the ‘Belusting’-concept in use, in order to understand its application to theatre.

What is the relevant enjoyment which the various art forms are claimed to bring about? How can we expect to relate this to Rist’s general understanding of theatre? A brief comment in the preface ‘An Den Aufrichtigen und Teu\-tschgesinneten Leser’, relating to the ensuing discussion of theatre, suggests a very broad concept of enjoyment, with little evidence of any substantive moral element. Rist explains:

> Daß ich unterdessen etlicher na\lnderischer Komedianten und ihrer hahsierlichen Auffzu\lge / in diesem meinem Gespra\lche etwas Meldung gethan; Solches


\textsuperscript{77} *Belustigung*, p. 187

\textsuperscript{78} Niefanger identifies a chain of significant forereunners of critical journalism in Germany from Rist via Francisci and Harsdörffer to Thomasius, see ‘Von allen Kunstverständigen hoch gepriesen’, p. 158.
wird der auffrichtiger und kunstliebender Leser nicht zum a°rgsten
deuten ... 79

To this point, this reads like an apology, perhaps akin to that contained in the
dedicatory letter to Perseus, in which Rist apologises for offence against the
‘Legibus Tragediarum’ by explaining
daß ich mit gegenwertigen Intersceniis dem gemeinem Manne (als der mit
solchen vnd dergleichen possirlichen Auffzu°gen am allermeisten sich
belustiget) vornemlich habe gratificiren vnd dienen […] wollen. 80

Farcical elements in Perseus are acceptable. However, the fact that they are strictly
improper is acknowledged, and worthy judges with an accurate sense of aesthetic and
moral propriety, such as the drama’s dedicatees, are aware of what rightly belongs in
a drama. There is less generic normative convention governing the content of
Monatsunterredungen such as the Belustigung. Although in terms of form Rist’s
works are not without precedent, for example in Harsdörffer’s Gesprächspiele, 81
they do not belong to a genre whose content is as circumscribed by norms and
convention as drama in general or tragedy in particular. If Rist was worried about
offending the ‘auffrichtiger und kunstliebender Leser’, or being misunderstood by
him, through the farcical elements in the Belustigung, this cannot have been as a
result of knowing offence against generic expectation. Rather, with this comment he
acknowledges a certain outward anxiety among social and cultural elites about
confrontation with the farcical and ridiculous.

79 Belustigung, p. 208
81 Jericke, pp. 163–6.
Rist does not address this, but immediately provides an alternative example of a non-ideal response to the descriptions of farcical performances in the *Belustigung*:


The autobiographical-psychological testimony is relevant here to the extent that it illuminates Rist’s understanding of enjoyment. Argumentatively, Rist’s description of his psychic turmoil functions as a foil against which the assertion can stand out that farcical drama is available to be enjoyed legitimately and without need for apology. The relation of ‘possirliche Auffzuöge’ can be perceived, however mistakenly, to reflect ‘ein lustiger oder froölicher Mensch’, creating an association between finding such anecdotes entertaining and the possession of attributes that are evaluated as more straightforwardly positive or desirable. Rist then designates the comic content of his writing as ‘lustig’, a positive attribution unlike the ambiguous or morally questionable ‘naörrisch’, hahsierlich’, or ‘possirlich’ as applied to the theatrical anecdotes. This further dispels any suggestion that we might be expected to question the propriety of these accounts and their inclusion in the dialogue. It also
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82 *Belustigung*, pp. 208-9
decisively shifts the discourse into the immediate semantic field given by the
dialogue’s interest in ‘Belustigung’.

At this stage, the argument still, at least potentially, conflates farce as
dramatic genre with ‘farcical’, i.e. comedically unsuccessful, performance. The
dialogue’s ‘possirliche Auffzuˈge’, the basis for Rist’s concern that readers might
misjudge his character, in fact fall into both categories. Some of the performances
described are in some way, often comedically, inept, without being generic farces:
the example, originally from Harsdörffer, of a performance of the parable of Lazarus
and Dives, and the description of a performance of a Judith drama are accounts of
serious subject-matter transformed through inept actors and suboptimal performance
conditions into farce. It seems likely that these also qualify as the ‘possirliche
Auffzuˈge’ alluded to, as the only intentionally farcical performance described is
that of the metatheatrical Pyramus and Thisbe performance, embedded in another
drama à la A Midsummer Night’s Dream. The introduction of and to these farcical
elements in the preface establishes them as there to be enjoyed, in a general and
apparently uncontroversial sense, without providing further explication of the exact
nature of this enjoyment.

This leads to the heart of a central conceptual complexity in the Belustigung,
one not encountered in the other of Rist’s Monatsunterredungen. For while
‘Belustigung’ is the stated subject of the discussion presented, it is also at least one
of the work’s ends. The copperplate engraving on the title page of each of the
Monatsunterredungen depicts a vase of flowers bearing the Horatian motto, ‘sie
nuˈtzen und ergetzen.’ 83 It is important to hold distinct, when reading the Belustigung,

83 This is a motif more usually associated with Georg Neumark. See e.g. the title page to his
Fortgepflanzter Musicalisch-Poetisches Lustwald (Jena: Georg Sengenwald, 1657); Also Felicitas
Gelegenheitsschriften’, in Stadt und Literatur im deutschen Sprachraum der frühen Neuzeit: Studien
what the work is trying to do from what it is trying to discuss, without thereby denying that the one might productively inform the other. So, while there is some onus on the *Belustigung* to be itself edifying or in some way useful, it is not required to explicitly examine the art forms it discusses for their edifying potential. Likewise, it may itself be a source of amusement or enjoyment without in virtue of this making any particular point about what the ‘alleredelste Belustigung’ might be. Yet any information that helps characterise the general nature of ‘Belustigung’, may at least be grist to the mill, while there exists also the possibility of informative or productive self-referentiality. The prefatory remarks on farce do not anticipate in any detail the conclusions reached in the dialogue, but do help reconstruct the relevant understanding of ‘Belustigung’ within which the delineation of its ‘alleredelst’ forms can take place.

The immediate motivation within the narrative for the debate about which art form is the ‘alleredelste Belustigung’ provides further clarification of the ‘Belustigung’-concept. Ingeniander admires the great variety of plants in der Rußtige’s garden and remarks ‘So viel ich spüre / hat unser Palatin sein höheste zeitliche Ergetzlichkeit / an diesen anmuhtien Geschoßpfen Gottes.’ Der Rußtige confirms ‘daß die Kraut / Bluhmen und Gahrten-Gewächse / mein Gemühten u̇ber die Mahsse sehr belustigen’ but denies that this might indicate that flowers and gardens can lay general claim to being the greatest source of pleasure. Citing Virgil, ‘Trahit sua quemque voluptas’ (*Eclogues* II, 65), he attests to the personal nature of enjoyment, in which individual character has a hand in determining what an individual might enjoy. This notion indicates an Epicurean ethics, understanding

___


volition as determined by individual disposition. An Epicurean may enjoy with impunity, as this is ultimately grounded in his character, which, unlike the neo-Stoic, he is not expected to cultivate towards virtue. Many things might be enjoyable to a variety of people, but when discussion is to be comparative, as required of the *Monatsunterredungen*, and inquire ultimately after the superlative, the personal element in enjoyment provides a significant obstacle to meaningful debate. The field of inquiry must be delimited in order for the discussion and the conclusions reached to be meaningful. As der Rußtige points out, while a variety of activities are enjoyed by a variety of people, none of these constitutes the ‘wahre Ergetzlichkeit eines Kunst- und Tugendliebenden Gemußtes.’

Inquiry, then, is directed towards discovering ‘was das eigendlich sey / das ein ehrliches Kunst und Tugendliebendes Gemußte recht können belustigen. ’ By making a minimal claim about the appropriate character of the individual experiencing enjoyment, the task of identifying a superlative form is made manageable. Without an identification of precisely whose enjoyment is relevant, a comparative discussion of the arts will be trapped in a relativist toing and froing between the various positions. However, asking a lover of art to make a comparative assessment of four art forms risks begging the question, since the inquiry might be conceived as ‘which is the art-form most loved by an art-lover?’ Because enjoyment is inherently subjective, rooted in individual disposition, the conclusion reached does not stand to meaningfully explain the relationship between the victorious art-form and the enjoyment of it. The fact that, ultimately, painting is declared ‘alleredelst’
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85 Bullard, p. 91.
87 *Belustigung*, p. 271
88 *Belustigung*, p. 272
does not explain what particularly commends it as an art-form above the others, only that it has been identified as such by a postulated individual characterised as a lover of art. This does not carry with it any binding recommendatory implications: the outcome of the discussion will simply be the positive identification of the ‘alleredelste Belustigung Kunst- und Tugendliebender Gemüehter’, with no requirement that anyone whose artistic preferences lead them elsewhere should seek to conform. The interlocutors acknowledge this even before embarking on their debate, as der Rüestige expects that in answering the question,

so wuërde Herr Ingeniander dieses / Herr Artisander ein anders / Herr Phœbisander abermahl ein anders / und ich vieleicht gahr etwas sonderliches auff die Bahn bringen / und wuërden kaum unser zwene einerley Meynung haben.89

From the outset, then, the outcome of the debate is not conceived of as binding, and the ultimate subjectivity of preference in matters of art and entertainment is assured.

The empirical investigation of theatre for its enjoyability means that the Belustigung can engage in a dramaturgical analysis, describing performance techniques and evaluating their effectiveness. This argumentative foregrounding of theatrical performance over textual exegesis suggests that Rist’s own understanding of theatre and the dramatic work gave primacy to the performed aspects, and that a fruitful way of engaging with the dramas would be as performed works rather than objects of literary analysis. The current discussion of Rist’s dramaturgy takes this as a working hypothesis which it will demonstrate as appropriate to the extent that it sheds meaningful new light on Rist’s dramas. Giving primacy to the performed aspect of Rist’s dramas, however, raises both methodological and ontological difficulties.

89 Belustigung, p. 272
Methodologically, considering Rist’s dramas in performance requires some method of working imaginatively from the playtext in order to speculate on what a probable or ideal performance of the drama in question might be like. This task should be eased to some extent by working with the dramas in the context of the descriptions of the performances in the *Belustigung* and the underlying assumptions that govern their evaluation, treating stagecraft as a set of *technai* that can be mastered to a greater or lesser extent. The ontological problem concerns what type of thing a theatrical performance is, and how this can, or should, be related to a written text. This problem in fact cuts in two directions. First: what is a performance of a drama, and how does this relate to the text of a drama? This is the question that will underlie the discussion of the performance aspects of Rist’s dramas specifically. The second problem is of particular relevance for understanding the *Belustigung*: what is a theatrical performance, and how does this relate to the description of it? What happens, that is, when performance is mediatized?

The *Belustigung* contains several descriptions of performances, drawn from Garzoni and Harsdörffer, ‘von Hohrsagen’, and, putatively, from Rist’s own experience. In their immediate contexts in the discussion, these descriptions function as *exempla* to support the point being made, usually instantiating either exemplary or deficient theatrical technique. In two ways, these descriptions are engaged in the task of making the absent present, of recovering, however incompletely or imperfectly, an event that would otherwise long since have been lost entirely. Taking the less fundamental of these ways first, the one that is not integral to the text’s composition or the understanding of theatre it presents, the recovery work the *Belustigung* engages in is of great historiographical significance, as evidence of past performance.
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90 *Belustigung*, p. 287
techniques and their effectiveness. This is a way in which the Belustigung is valuable or of interest to a modern reader, as a mediation between historical past and present. Secondly, however, the Belustigung is engaged in a recovery project with the potential to illuminate the nature of performance itself.

The Belustigung’s potential as a source of data on theatre history has long been acknowledged in scholarship. Largely, its relevance in this respect has been seen as a document of what performances, i.e. of what plays, were taking place when and where. Thus, the description of the metatheatrical Pyramus and Thisbe performance is a document of the reception of this Shakespearean material in Germany, in a reception tradition likely to be largely independent of the one in which Gryphius’ Absurda Comica is located.91 A further description of a performance by strolling players of a drama ‘von einem Ko’nige / der seinem Sohn / den Printzen mit des Ko’nigs von Schottland Tochter wolte verheirahten’,92 provoked mild scholarly controversy after it was suggested that this might be evidence of a production of Hamlet in Hamburg in Spring 1625 – over a year before the earliest ascertainable production at the Dresden court in June 1626.93 The performances to which these accounts refer (if indeed they do straightforwardly describe single performances and are not either deliberately imagined or unintentionally misremembered amalgams of
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91 See Fritz Burg, ‘Über die Entwicklung des Peter-Squenz-stoffes bis Gryphius’, Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur, 25 (1881), 130–170. Gervinus was the first to draw attention to Rist's description of a Pyramus and Thisbe performance, and denies it a place in the reception sequence that led to Absurda Comica (p. 133). Tittmann, on the other hand, sees Rist's performance as inhabiting a mediatory position between Shakespeare and Gryphius (p. 134). Burg himself concludes that Rist is likely to have been unfamiliar with Gryphius' work, even though it had appears around nine years prior to the Belustigung (p. 168).

92 Belustigung, p. 314

several performances attended over the years) would all have occurred several decades prior to the composition of the Belustigung. However, the Belustigung also responds to (more or less) contemporary theatrical events, for example performances by the Dutch troupe led by Jan Baptista van Fornenbergh, and as such is a potential source for details of performances in North Germany, probably specifically Hamburg, over a period of three or four decades in the mid-17th century.

In reference to the discussions of Fornenbergh performances, Niefanger has identified a second, largely overlooked, sense in which the Belustigung has value as an historical document: as evidence of contemporary responses to performances and theatrical techniques, as theatre criticism avant la lettre. While the approach of seeking to identify the text’s external reference points in terms of actual historical performances seems unlikely to provide satisfactory answers to the questions it poses itself, reading the Belustigung as response to theatre is more promising as it is less reliant on speculation about specific details of external historical reality. It matters less, say, that an actual performance took place exactly as described than that the Belustigung describes and responds to certain theatrical techniques. It is interesting as a text not as a primary source for data on actual historical performances but as evidence of critical and reflective engagement with theatrical practices. The historical credibility of the accounts of performances narrated in the Belustigung is of little direct relevance. Rather, from the perspective of theatre studies, the text is significant first as evidence of a practice of viewing theatrical performances, reflecting on their strengths and weaknesses, and using this as a basis for formulating hypotheses about correct practice. Secondly, the Belustigung is an instance of such dramaturgical reflections being written down, and published for broad dissemination.

As Niefanger notes, these reflections appear in the *Belustigung* in the narrative or dialogic mode, a characteristic he attributes to the text’s status as an early or ‘pre-’ form of theatre criticism. Without engaging with the implicit teleological trajectory of this characterisation, the idea that the theatre discussion in the *Belustigung* could constitute an early form of theatre criticism is of heuristic value when it comes to identifying what function the descriptions of performances are fulfilling within the text, and what their value is for modern scholarship. As written reflection upon experienced theatrical performances, the *Belustigung*’s theatre discussion qualifies as a manner of theatre criticism. However, it differs from what is straightforwardly recognisable as theatre criticism not only in the mode of its presentation (narrative/dialogic) but also, precisely in light of this, in that the main concern of the narrative, ‘Welches doch wol die Alleredelste Belustigung sey kunstliebender Gemußhter’, informs the end to which the discussion of theatre is carried out and the content of this discussion. This is not yet theatre criticism proper, and indeed if it were the *Belustigung* would be of more value than it is as primary evidence of historical performances. However, the combination of theatre-critical tendencies in the *Belustigung* with the investigative intention of the whole narrative produces a third way in which it is a significant document, namely as evidence of practices on the North German stage in the mid-17\textsuperscript{th} century and contemporary receptivity to these.

By ‘receptivity’ is understood the *Belustigung*’s favourable response to the performance techniques it describes, through which it provides an indication of what contemporary audiences found effective on the stage. Niefanger has paid particular attention to the references to performances by Fornenbergh’s troupe, citing these as
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evidence of production standards on the contemporary German stage. Dutch players had travelled to Germany throughout the first half of the 17th century as members of English troupes, but following the end of the Thirty Years’ War exclusively Dutch troupes began to tour northern and western parts of Germany. Fornenbergh’s troupe came to Gottorf and Hamburg in 1649, they performed Calderón’s *La vida es sueño* in Dutch translation in Hamburg in 1654, and the account in the *Belustigung* may indicate their presence in Hamburg (Altona) again in 1665.97 In the narrative, the discussion of theatre and begins with a reference to these Altona performances, which had been ‘von allen Kunstverständigen hoch gepriesen’.98 Indeed, Fornenbergh’s troupe is roundly praised in the *Belustigung* for its performance technique, and Niefanger uses this positive response to argue for a reassessment of the dominant understanding of 17th-century German theatre semiotics. He describes the Dutch performance technique as attested to in the *Belustigung* as ‘ein bestimmtes körperbetontes und naturnahes Auftreten von Schauspielern’, and aligns this with what is commonly held to have been theatrical practice in Germany only from the 18th century. Niefanger suggests that Dutch performance techniques and styles of acting may have influenced the development of German practices in a way not previously appreciated, such that developments taken to have occurred in the 18th century were already identifiable in the 17th.99 Niefanger’s thesis indicates the need for a revision and nuancing of the influential scholarly opinion that the shift in the semiotics of theatre from artificial to natural signs occurred in the 18th century, in association with the theories of Diderot, Lessing, and Engel. Indeed, to see the

98 *Belustigung*, p. 275
developments on the 18th-century stage as constituting this manner of paradigm shift relies upon a tendency to provide a unified and largely monolithic picture of 17th-century theatrical practices, which Niefanger’s characterisation of the Dutch technique and German receptivity to this would contest.  

Reading the Belustigung as theatre criticism has clear historiographical value, providing the modern reader with insight into both production standards on the mid-17th-century German stage and audience reactions and expectations. In terms of Rist’s own production, the insights gained from this approach have the potential to explain certain compositional elements of his own dramas. But the Belustigung’s function as theatre criticism also enables it to engage in conceptual reflection on theatre and performance. This is a function that retains its relevance irrespective of the passage of time: it does not matter whether the performance in question occurred a week ago or three hundred years ago, it was still in a crucial sense lost to time at the moment of its completion, after which point it only remains available through its documentation.

The Belustigung represents a variety of performances to its readers. From Garzoni, it relates performances from antiquity as well as from the contemporary commedia dell’arte, from Harsdörffer it offers a brief description of a contemporary performance in Germany, and there are several detailed accounts of performances which Rist might be supposed to have experienced personally. Crucially, these performance descriptions align with the empiricist approach taken in the Belustigung, as in all the Monatsunterredungen in the discussion of their subject matter. Functioning as exempla, they and their discussion provide the empirical evidence to support the case for theatre as ‘alleredelst’. Further, their deployment reflects the
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reality of contemporary engagement with drama – as theatrical performance not printed playtext. While the practice of publishing theatrical works was well established by the mid-17th century, the consumption of these texts as reading material was not a common pursuit. So in its descriptions of performances, the *Belustigung* is providing its readers with something they can relate to, recounting an enjoyment they are likely to have experienced themselves.

However, the *Belustigung* does not advance actual performances as part of its defence of theatre. Even at the level of the narrative the interlocutors do not engage with actual performances – they do not attend a performance and discuss it afterwards. The interlocutors, the contemporary reader, and the modern reader all stand in a crucial respect in the same relationship to the performance described, in that their only access to it is mediated through its narration. We are all, then, at the mercy of performance’s narrator. In the context of the discussion presented amongst the four *Elbschwanenorden* members, theatre is not at a disadvantage compared to the other arts as none of them are directly presented, even those where it might have been more practical to allow them to speak for themselves. At the level of the narrative, for instance, it might still have been practicable for the participants to directly access a performance of music, for example, or a poem, or a painting. *Qua* written text, clearly the only of the art forms discussed capable of direct presentation is poetry. However, the *Belustigung* knowingly discusses poetry in prose, part of a deliberate intermedial strategy underlain by Rist’s understanding of art forms and their interrelationships. This goes some of the way towards explaining the import of the described performances, but leaves certain ontological issues unaddressed.

Rist refers to the art forms as ‘diese vier Schwesteren / (welche gleichsahm nothwendig bey einander sein muß)’.\textsuperscript{102} This understanding of art forms as essentially related enables the intermedial approach to their discussion, in which one art form is discussed in the medium of another. From statements made in the preface it is clear that this is a deliberate argumentative strategy. Rist’s conception of the essential relationships amongst art forms is supported by the manner in which the discussion proceeds as well as its content. Elaborating upon an \textit{ut pictura poesis} motif, he forges connections between the artistic media. The case for poetry, presented in the dialogue by Artisander, is ‘in ungebundener Rede / heraus gestrichen’, in response to which ‘die Herrlichkeit der Schilder-Kunst’ is described in gebundener Rede […] dieweil die Dicht- und Mahler-Kuënstne so fest mit einander sind verknuëpfet / daß diese ein stillschweigendes Gedichte / jenne ein redendes Gemaëhlsde fuëglich kan genennet werden.\textsuperscript{103}

With this talk of sister arts and \textit{ut pictura poesis}, Rist expresses what has been termed by Mitchell ‘ekphrastic hope’ – the hope that the literal impossibility of mediation between visual and verbal arts can be figuratively overcome through metaphor.\textsuperscript{104} Rist extends the traditional pairing of painting and poetry to include his other two arts, music and theatre, affirming his confidence in his intermedial approach and the essential similarity of the art forms he discusses. He does not succumb to Mitchell’s ekphrastic fear, the fear that the metaphorical bridging of medial gulfs may lead to actual intermedial miscegenation.\textsuperscript{105}

\textsuperscript{102} \textit{Belustigung}, pp. 209-10
\textsuperscript{103} \textit{Belustigung}, p. 219
\textsuperscript{105} Mitchell, p. 154.
What is at stake here is not Rist’s understanding of the arts in general but the implications this has for both his understanding of theatre specifically and his presentation of this. Rist’s understanding of the ‘vier Schwesteren’ introduces a tension into the nature and course of the discussion in the *Belustigung*. The dialogue’s explicit aim is the identification of one art form as ‘alleredelst’ above all others. The essential similarity amongst the art forms and the intermedial argumentative strategy conceptually undermine any suggestion that the ‘victory’ of painting over the other art forms is absolute. Theatre, music, and poetry have some participation in this victory in respect of their essential similarity. On the one hand, then, the discussion of theatre in the *Belustigung* is set up to present it as little more than a candidate for the ultimate title of ‘alleredelst’. Yet in light of Rist’s understanding of art forms and his intermedial approach to their discussion, the ‘belustigend’ quality of theatre is not merely that of an art form that is in some crucial respect inferior.

While the *Vorbericht* explicitly draws attention to the *Belustigung*’s ekphrastic approach to the discussion of poetry and painting, it does not engage with the medial issues raised by the discussion of theatre. Niefanger sees this discussion as crucially intermedial, as here the experience of theatrical illusion is recreated through narrative technique.\(^{106}\) The success of this recreation project is attributed to Rist’s narrative technique, his ‘lebhafe Erzählweise, bei der etwa bei den dramatischen Schlüsselszenen erzählte und erzählende Zeit deutlich angenähert werden.’\(^{107}\) This technique, with its hints of literary naturalism, achieves the double transformation that takes place in ekphrasis: from the visual (here, specifically the theatrical performance) to the verbal, and back again in the reader’s experience of the

\(^{106}\) Niefanger, ‘Erzähltes und erzählendes Theater’, p. 120.
\(^{107}\) Niefanger, ‘Erzähltes und erzählendes Theater’, p. 127.
The import of the intermediality in the discussion of theatre is that it sheds light on where the boundaries between narrative and drama lay in the 17th century. The *Belustigung*’s strategy was not possible in the same way after the theatre of Diderot and Lessing in the 18th century. Intermediality in the form of narrative theatre, where the plot is advanced through narration rather than action, can extend the range of the portrayable onstage. This only constitutes a medial deficit from the perspective of the modern understanding of theatre with its substantive origins in the 18th century. While the intermedial shift impedes the generation of illusion on the modern stage, in premodernity it had the capacity to contribute to the generation of illusion. In the *Belustigung*, the narration of theatrical events enables the thematisation of the limits of the portrayable and the nature of theatrical illusion.

This is achieved through the function of the narrator as a mediating instance between performance and addressee. This function is essentially the same regardless of whether the narrator-addressee relationship is conceived of at the level of the narrative, between e.g. Ingeniander or der Rußstige and their interlocutors, or between the narrative itself and its reader. Through their mediatisation, the performances are evaluated and their generation of illusion analysed. The *Belustigung* thus provides details of appropriate performance techniques through accounts of their implementation, whether or not this implementation is successful. As the analysis of the *Belustigung*’s content will show, it is precisely at this point of intersection between narrative and drama that the evaluation of performance practice can take place.

Appeal to intermediality as a heuristic for engaging with the discussion of theatre in the *Belustigung* provides an extensive, but not comprehensive, account of
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what this discussion achieves. While its function as narrated theatre draws attention to the dramaturgical principles underlying its evaluative practice, approaching the discussion solely under this aspect sidesteps the question of the indexicality of the performance descriptions. Further, theatre is a medially complex art-form, not only with regard to the relationship of the performance to any underlying texts (playtexts, scenarios, etc.) but also in terms of the various aspects of theatrical performance that are also artistic media in their own right – music, visual imagery etc. Indeed, part of the Belustigung’s proposed relevance to Rist’s dramatic oeuvre proper is that it can offer detailed insight into contemporary performance techniques and Rist’s engagement with these, with the potential to significantly account for the composition of the dramas themselves. The mediatisation of performance in the Belustigung achieves far more than the identification of the limit of theatrical illusion.

The difference between the discussion of a painting and the discussion of a theatrical performance is that while a painting can be discussed and indeed represented in its absence, it is still potentially available as an external reference point. Unless it has been lost, it still exists, somewhere. A theatrical performance, on the other hand, is lost at the moment of its conclusion, after which point it is only available through its documentation. In the 17th century, this documentation might be the Periochen, pamphlets, illustrations, or indeed descriptions such as those contained in the Belustigung. Performance documentation performs an additional function to that of ekphrastic description of visual art, as the sole trace of the performance after its completion. This calls into question the status of the original performance and its relation to its documentation. Straightforwardly, it might be assumed that a performance qua performance exists independently of and prior to its documentation. The existence of the documentation is therefore predicated on that of
the performance. This is the view that would underlie the exploitation of the
Belustigung as a source for details of actual historical performances. Understanding
an ‘actual’ performance as primary and independent epistemologically privileges it
over its documentation, but in a way that does not align with the ekphrastic hope of
mediation between visual and verbal.

This is an idea-in-progress. What I’m hoping to achieve by unpacking the
conception of ‘performance’ in the Belustigung is pin down its applicability to the
dramas. The more straightforward sense in which it is applicable, as a source for
Rist’s favoured performance techniques, remains valid. But it seems to me that the
Belustigung is potentially complex in ways that have not been fully explored. I think
some of these conceptual issues are available to be unpacked: what is a performance?
How does this relate, conceptually, to other art-forms? There is a discussion of
tableaux vivants and their theatricality that could be referenced here. The issue of
performance documentation also relates to the illustrations we discussed last time
(but which I have not yet pursued further).

The remainder of the discussion will follow the argument in the Belustigung.

The discussion of theatre in the Belustigung can be broken down into five stages.
Ingeniander initially sets out his case, referring to the recent Fornenbergh
performance in Altona but drawing also on his memories of
unterschiedlicher anderer Komedien und Tragödien / die ich hiebevor an
Kaüserlichen / Königlichen und Fürstlichen Höfen / wie auch bey den
Herren Patribus der Societät Jesu, (als welche in dieser nützlichen Übung übertrefflich sind erfahren /) mit Lust habe angeschaut.  

From his wide experience of theatrical performance, Ingeniander has observed ‘das dergleichen Spiele die Gemüther der Zuhofer nicht allein belustigen / sondern auch vielfältigen nutzen’, and so he identifies ‘eben diese Traur und Freuden-Spiele’ as the ‘alleredelste Belustigung’. At this stage, der Lustige takes up the argument, providing Ingeniander’s empirically-based claim with an underpinning in classical thought. The first stage in the discussion of theatre is the argument from esteem, in which der Lustige demonstrates that ‘auch die Traur- und freudenspieler ehemahlen bey den großmaechtigen Kayseren und Potentaten in hohen Ehren sind gehalten worden.’ He provides examples of the esteem in which Nerva, Julius Caesar, and Cicero held certain actors to support his point. This recalls the opening sentence of Rist’s dedication to Perseus, composed over three decades previously, in which he invokes ‘die Exempla derjenigen Comicorum, welche ihrer Arbeit und Muhe halber von den hohesten Potentaten reichlich und mildgich sind begabet worden.’ Before all else, Rist recognises the importance of the actor in drama, conceiving of drama, then, as a thing that is performed. The Perseus dedication clearly takes its lead from Opitz’s preface ‘An den Leser’ to his Trojanerinnen, which advances a similar argument from esteem. Opitz’s point, however, differs from Rist’s precisely in its foregrounding of the written aspect of drama. Opitz argues: ‘Trawler-Spiele tichten ist vorzeiten Keyser / Fürsten / grosser Helden vnd Weltweiser Leute Thun gewesen.’ Rist, it should be noted, also follows Opitz in this point, remarking ‘daß die gewaltigste Monarchen selber / sich nicht geschewet haben / die Feder
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anzusetzen.’ Yet what distinguishes Rist, in both the *Perseus* dedication and the *Belustigung*, is that his first thought is for the actor in theatre, not the composer of the drama. This aligns with the *Belustigung*’s argumentative foregrounding of theatrical performance as the relevantly enjoyable aspect of drama.

In fact, the discussion of the emperors Nerva and Julius Caesar, and of Cicero’s esteem for the actors Sextus Roscius and Clodius Aesopus, is drawn almost exactly from the 103rd Discourse of Tommaso Garzoni’s *Piazza universale* (1585). Rist’s reliance on Garzoni, as opposed to, say, Opitzian poetology, for his discussion of theatre again demonstrates that it is theatrical performance that is primarily at stake in the *Belustigung*. However, while Garzoni opens his discourse ‘De' comici, e tragedi, così auttori, come recitatori, cioè degli histrioni’ (in the 1641 translation ‘Von Comicis, und Tragödis, beydes denen / so sie beschreiben / unnd denen / so sie spielen’) with an admission of the low esteem in which actors are commonly held, the discussion in the *Belustigung* begins more positively, establishing actors as appropriate objects of esteem. When Garzoni’s opening point is subsequently advanced by Artisander, its potential to impact upon the success of Ingeniander’s case has been substantively reduced, and it functions instead to motivate consideration of why actors might be held in esteem.

This constitutes the second stage in the *Belustigung*’s discussion of theatre, and is an argument from the effect of the actor’s craft. Again, there is initial reliance on Garzoni. Ingeniander repeats his example of an ancient Greek actor performing in
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Sophocles’ *Electra* who, bearing the urn purported to contain Orestes’ ashes, ‘hat [...] sich dermassen wissen klaßlich anzustellen und zu geberden / das alle Zuseher übelaut zu Heu¹len und zu Weinen angefangen.’ ¹¹¹⁷ Artisander then picks up Garzoni’s argument, recounting the affective skill of an actor (Fabius) and two actresses (Isabella¹¹¹⁸ and Victoria). The relevantly estimable element of the actor’s craft is their ability to fulfil the *movere* requirement of drama. This is an area in which the author’s role is seen as minimal. Sophocles, for example, must bear some responsibility for having composed a drama that lent itself to such a successful performance, but the real achievement is seen as the actor’s. *Movere*, unlike *prodesse*, is not inscribed in the dramatic text but realised by the skilled actor in performance.

The introduction of instances of good practice from the *commedia dell’arte*, specifically, reinforces the discursive foregrounding of performance. For this was actor-driven theatre, with the performers composing and keeping their own repertoires of texts for their characters. Plots were character-driven, and performances easily improvised by actors who were keenly familiar with their characters and could avail themselves of a wide range of appropriate speeches.

It is only Artisander’s contribution that explicitly acknowledges the reliance on Garzoni as a source. Not only does Artisander name the *Piazza universale* when recounting the skill of the *commedia dell’arte* performers, he acknowledges a further source from which the argument from the effect of the actor’s craft might derive legitimacy. He identifies a correlation between the accounts in the *Piazza universale* and his own experience of Italian actors. In Italy he has seen ‘wie nicht nur Mañner / sondern auch Weiber / auff der Schaubühne / oder Theatro so klaßlich sich zu


¹¹¹⁸ Isabella Andreini was an influential *commedia dell’arte* actress. Her husband was Francesco Andreini, whose *Le bravure del Capitano Spavento* Rist translated, via a French version, as *Capitan Spavento, Oder Rodomondades Espagnolles* (1635).
geberden wissen / daß der grössteste Theil der Zu'schauer die Thraenen müssen vergessen,’ and actors of this ilk are now also to be found in Germany.\textsuperscript{119} With this observation, Artisander moves the discussion of theatre into its third stage, the argument from experience. Concerning contemporary theatrical practices, he does not straightforwardly take Garzoni at his word, but can confirm Garzoni’s observations from his own experience. Ingeniander, however, takes the analysis of theatrical performance for movere and, in returning to the Fornenbergh performance with which he began his case, applies it to a context beyond the commedia dell’arte.

In this, the Belustigung progresses from engaging with writing about performance to engaging with performance (in writing). The initial reliance on Garzoni, then, functions to provide the groundwork and relevant conceptual underpinnings for the substantive part of the Belustigung’s theatre discourse. This is an instance of a pattern that recurs throughout the Monatsunterredungen, in which the discussions become increasingly lengthy and detailed as they tend towards the character of testimony from personal experience.

Having recently attended Fornenbergh’s Altona performance, Ingeniander is in a position to engage in an empirical discussion of the actor’s craft. By approaching the performance by way of Garzoni, the Belustigung introduces the critical apparatus necessary to appreciate Ingeniander’s initial remark that the performance by Fornenbergh’s troupe was ‘von allen Kunstverstaendigen hoch gepriesen.’\textsuperscript{120} What was admirable about the Fornenbergh performance was the ‘beweglich’ acting of the troupe members. This skill is in evidence when the actor, ‘durch seine Rede / Sitten und Bewegung’, can bring the audience to imitate him ‘fast in allen Dingen.’\textsuperscript{121}

Returning to Niefanger’s thesis about the need for a revision in the historiography of
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theatre semiotics, this passage in the Belustigung provides further indication that the
German stage of the 17th century may have borne more of a resemblance to the 18th-
century stage than is commonly acknowledged. For, as Niefanger points out, the
immediate psychic effects of theatrical performance attested to in Ingeniander’s
report (that the audience should laugh with the actor ‘wenn er lachet / mit jhme
Weinen / wenn er weinet / mit jhm Zu’rnen / wenn er zu’rnet…’122) are more
normally associated with Enlightenment theatre.123 Yet it is precisely the actors’
capacity to achieve movere that leads Ingeniander to conclude ‘das ich die
Komœdianten in sonders hohen wehrte halte.’124 It is the central plank of his case.

Ingeniander’s argument at this stage glides almost seamlessly from elucidation of the
actor’s skill to consideration of those who lack it and so are unsuited to theatrical
performance. This sets off the relation of three accounts of unsuccessful, comedically
inept performances. The first is drawn from Harsdörffer’s Frauenzimmer
Gesprächspiele,125 from which Ingeniander recounts a performance of the parable of
Lazarus and Dives by a group of ‘Akker-Studenten’. In this performance, the
dialogue was unengaging, ‘[e]tliche wendeten den Zusehern den Ru’kken / wider die
eigentliche Gesetze dieser Kunst’, and the troupe lacked the relevant props.126 The
fundamental failure in the performance however, to both Rist and Harsdörffer, is to
be found in the performance of the Lazarus role itself. For all of the production’s
other shortcomings, the actors did succeed in providing an appropriate costume for
Lazarus, ‘denn seine Hohsen und Hembd dermahssen durchlo’chert waren / daß er

122 Belustigung, p. 281
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125 Georg Philipp Harsdörffer, Frauenzimmer Gesprechspiele, 8 vols. (Nuremberg: Endter, 1647), VII,
CCLXX, pp. 362ff. (a typographical error in the original has led to p. 326 being marked p. 362).
Available online at <http://diglib.hab.de/drucke/lo-2622-7/start.htm> [accessed 18 October 2013].
126 Belustigung, p. 282
seine Armuht nicht konte bedekken.’ Yet the success in this aspect of performance brought with it farcical consequences:

Die Hunde / welche auff der Brückken waren / belleten Lazarum an / und als sich derselbe niederlegen wollte / beisset ihn der eine Hund in den Fuß / daß er ohne falsch / ja’immerlich zu schreyen angefangen.\textsuperscript{127}

This performance failed in a number of fundamental practical respects: dialogue, stage etiquette, setting and props. Neither Rist nor Harsdörffer is making a revolutionary point about theatrical performance in highlighting these flaws, and so these criticisms do not illuminate the particulars of Rist’s theatrical practice. Yet while the relation of the Harsdörfferian anecdote is on the one hand the first of three accounts of sub-standard theatrical technique, it also thematises, in the episode with the dog, the issue of the experience of illusion.

In part, the dog biting ‘Lazarus’ functions as a humorous illustration of the risks accompanying the involvement of animals in theatrical performance. Yet the actor’s reaction was to cry out, almost certainly involuntarily, ‘ohne falsch’, and thereby definitively shatter whatever theatrical illusion the troupe’s meagre skills had managed to generate. The argumentative import of this is emphasised by the fact that it occurs in the context of the otherwise relatively successful performance of the role of ‘Lazarus’. In his analysis of the intermedial argumentation of the \textit{Belustigung}, Niefanger identifies that an important capacity of the narration of theatrical events is that it enables this thematisation of the experience of illusion.\textsuperscript{128} This opens ‘illusion’ up to discussion as a dramaturgical issue, as a problem that directly affects the production and reception of theatrical events, in addition to its more usual framing in

\textsuperscript{127} \textit{Belustigung}, p. 283; See also Harsdörffer, \textit{Frauenzimmer Gesprechspiele}, p. 329.

\textsuperscript{128} Niefanger, ‘Erzähltes und erzählendes Theater’, p. 127.
17th-century theatrical discourse as a moral, and ultimately ontological, issue underpinned by the *Sein/Schein* opposition. When the dog bites ‘Lazarus’, the performance goes wrong for reasons not wholly within the actors’ control, but the narration of this event highlights as dramaturgically relevant the question of the generation of theatrical illusion.

To come:

- *A continuation of the discussion of poor performances* – Judith, Pyramus and Thisbe. What do these say about a) enjoyment and b) theatre? What do they tell us about performance techniques.

- *The discussion of theatre in the Belustigung concludes with a lengthy reflection by der Ru’stige on his career in relation to the stage – as an actor, dramatist, and long-time theatre goer.* There are strong indications that this is straightforwardly autobiographical. There is explicit reference to Rist’s dramatic works, by name, and brief discussion of their composition and elements of their reception. There is discussion of Zwischenspiele, tableaux vivants and backdrops and stage machinery, as well as of the question of poetry versus prose in drama.

- *The remainder of the Belustigung – music in theatre, discussion of tragedy in poetry.*
2. Rist’s dramas in performance

As the discussion of the Belustigung demonstrated, Rist possessed a keen understanding of the capacity of theatrical performance to move and entertain its audience, and was highly sensitive to the sorts of practical considerations that can determine the effects of performance. Contextualising Rist’s dramatic production in respect of the various theatrical and performance traditions in which it is located provides a substantive and necessary basis for making sense of the surviving works. Investigating the performance of Rist’s dramas also helps explain the survival of four dramas (Irenaromachia, Perseus, and the two Teutschland dramas) in particular when the names of a further 12 are known, and Rist claims to have composed more than 30. Exploring the various theatrical traditions in which Rist’s dramas stood and locating them within this theatrical context can help account for many of their compositional features, which might otherwise appear idiosyncratic or puzzling when viewed under the aspect of solely poetological analysis. There are also a few tantalising indications of how Rist viewed his own dramas in respect of actual performances of them and their location in their performance context, which provides further grist to the mill. What emerges is an understanding of Rist’s dramas that shows them to be very much products of their context. Rist is no innovator or poetic visionary, but he has seen how theatrical performances can work well and has purposefully incorporated successful techniques from these performances into his own production.

A key characteristic of Rist’s dramatic production is that it is a theatre of continuity with theatrical practices that had come before as opposed to of differentiation from these, and does not seek to assert itself as an independent
tradition. This continuity provides the initial justification for the attempt to approach his dramas through their theatrical context, and is confirmed by the results yielded. Bernhard Jahn has identified Rist’s continuity with the theatre of the 16th century, the strolling players, and the Jesuit stage, traditions which are not wholly discrete. Where the Opitzian poetic reform represented a watershed moment in the German literary tradition, conceived of historically and traditionally historiographically as marking a programmatic break from the poetic practices that had come before,129 Rist’s theatre affirms his reliance on previous practices. Perhaps it is the multifaceted and multidimensional nature of theatrical performance that makes absolute innovation or a complete break with the preceding tradition difficult to achieve. A wholly innovative drama must be more than a new type of poetic work; this would require new performance techniques as well, which requires asking the audience to engage with the work differently from how they were expecting. This is the challenge presented by experimental and avant-garde theatre of the 20th century and beyond. Making passing comparative reference to the differences between poetic and theatrical innovation illuminates Rist’s compositional methodology and confirms his empirical approach. He incorporates performance techniques that he knows from experience to be effective. He demonstrates his considerable skill as a dramatist not in his innovation but in his successful application and combination of tried and tested techniques such as the inclusion

129 Katrin Kohl has analysed the cognitive and thus historiographical utility of conceptualising watershed moments in literary history and highlighted the danger that this can lead to a streamlining and over-simplification of complex and nuanced historical events. See esp. the introduction, ‘Die Macht der Metapher im Diskurs um Sprache, Dichtung und Poetik’ in Poetologische Metaphern: Formen und Funktionen in der deutschen Literatur (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2007).
of comic interscenia, clown figures, effective utilisation of front and rear stages and the use of music in performance.

Rist’s debts to the English strolling players and their reception in Germany, the practices of Protestant school drama, and the specific tradition of Low German theatre demonstrate him to be a playwright of his context. The theatrical influences on Rist’s dramas are much the same as those shaping the theatrical situation in 17th-century Hamburg, with performances by troupes of strolling players as well as grammar school boys performing pieces with Low German interludes. Influences on Rist from further afield, including from the dramas of Frischlin and potentially also the Jesuit stage, will be illuminated in Chapter Five below in the discussion of the portrayal and performance of peace in Rist’s dramas. The present concern is to sketch the theatrical conditions in Hamburg and Northern Germany at the time when Rist was composing his dramas in order to provide an overview of the sorts of theatre with which he and his audiences were familiar. Rist’s sensitivity to what was successful and popular with audiences informed his own practice. By locating Rist’s dramas in their theatrical context, it will be possible to make sense of the interdependent relationship between their composition as works and the social structure of the audiences they attracted, which informed how they functioned as performances. This will offer an explanation of the purpose Rist saw his Zwischenspiele as fulfilling, and what he meant when he referred to the gemeiner Mann.

A – Context

I – The Wanderbühne context, an historical overview
The basic details of the arrival of English strolling players on the continent in the late 16th century and their subsequent impact upon the practices of the German stage are well known, and can be ascertained independently of reference to evidence from Rist’s own writings. The first players arrived in the Netherlands in the company of the Earl of Leicester in 1585, after which some travelled on to the Danish royal court. The favourable reception with which the players were met on the continent enabled them to return in 1592, where they found employment at German courts such as the Wolfenbüttel court of Duke Heinrich Julius. The marriage of Anne of Denmark to James VI forged dynastic and cultural ties between Denmark and Scotland, and later England, leading to a rapid improvement in Anglo-Danish relations and providing conditions favourable to the spread of strolling players from the British Isles to the continent.130 Dynastic ties between the Danish royalty and the princely houses of North Germany provided the players with a framework for their transit and thus a means for the spread of English theatrical models to German court culture. The role of these dynastic ties in transcultural exchange can be observed in the career of the violinist and composer William Brade, who was employed for three spells at the Danish royal court and otherwise active at German courts with dynastic links to Denmark: Brandenburg, Schleswig-Holstein-Gottorp, Mecklenburg-Güstrow, and Magdeburg.131 The Anglo-Danish influence on cultural life in Germany is particularly evident in Hamburg, which

---


131 Spohr, How chances it they travel?, p. 56.
was one of the most important centres in Germany for the publication of instrumental music in the first half of the 17th century. This tradition was maintained by new generations of German composers even after the deaths in 1628 and 1630 respectively of key English figures such as Thomas Simpson and Brade.132 Hamburg was, within Germany, uniquely oriented towards English trends. Where music published in Nuremberg, for example, was heavily weighted towards Italian vocal music, with no particular emphasis on English or Anglo-German styles, in Hamburg the preference for genres such as the pavane and galliard demonstrates a clear stylistic orientation towards England.133

The English players quickly found favour at court and with civic authorities in Germany. Markus Paul’s study of theatrical conditions in 17th-century Nuremberg demonstrates that the growing practice of granting permits to English troupes corresponded to a growth in hostility from civic authorities towards lay or Meistersinger performances at the beginning of the century.134 In their first years on the continent, the theatre of the English players was a novelty for German audiences, who appreciated the spectacle of costume, setting, effects, and physicality as a contrast to the declamatory theatre performed by laymen and schoolboys.135 Yet the enthusiasm for the performances of the strolling players endured long after these ceased to be a novelty, as demonstrated not least in Rist’s praise for the professional theatre in the Belustigung, published almost a century after the arrival of the English players on the continent. The strolling players set the theatrical standard, and

133 Spohr, How chances it they travel?, pp. 228–30.
135 Paul, p. 27.
Rist, crucially, both appreciated the quality of their performances and saw their popularity with audiences. He also began to consider how these two might interrelate, and in looking to audience response as an indication of performance success attributed to the audience, even those members drawn from lowly social strata, a degree of relevant critical acumen. This point will become important below, when considering Rist’s concern to entertain the ‘common man.’

Rist’s insistence on the popular success of performances by English strolling players exists in a certain tension with the courtly and noble structures that facilitated the troupes’ arrival on the continent and supported the early reception of their techniques in the German cultural sphere. This may be a straightforward reflection of the development of English itinerant theatre and its place in German culture in the decades following the arrival of the first troupes, as the second and third generation troupes were able to branch out from their role as court entertainers. In this sense, through emphasising the broad popularity of English techniques with audiences Rist is responding to the contemporary theatrical situation during his formative years and at the time he was writing his dramas. On the other hand, the noble favour enjoyed by the troupes was still available as an indication of prestige, and it is telling that Rist chooses to dwell on their mass rather than elite appeal. To Rist, the common man is a relevant member of the theatre audience, whose response or projected response to performance can have a decisive influence on dramatic composition. I will explore below the clues that might help identify the common man and his function in Rist’s thought.
Certain of the theatrical techniques employed by the strolling players that led to their popularity with German audiences were born of necessity. Non-verbal performance elements such as music, dance, physicality, costume and props enabled the performers and audiences to circumvent the language barriers that in the early years made them largely mutually unintelligible. In this, English theatre in its specific continental incarnation is shown to be particularly oriented towards and receptive to the entertainment needs of its audience. The clown role in the interscenia was among the first to be performed in German, which again contributed to the popularity of this figure.  

The strolling players were, for practical reasons, multi-talented. In order to keep troupe sizes to a minimum, actors were also acrobats, dancers, and musicians. The peripatetic character of Brade’s career, for example, closely resembles that of a troupe of strolling players, and there is compelling evidence that he worked for a while in collaboration with a company under the direction of John Spencer.

II – School drama, and a methodological problem

Musicians were a key component of acting troupes. Music was an integral feature of Wanderbühne performances, and Hamburg benefitted from an active and nationally and internationally renowned musical scene which, as noted above, was characterised by a preference for English styles. It will be seen that by the time Rist was composing his early dramas the strong cultural presence of English musical styles had been integrated into the tradition of Protestant school drama as practised at Hamburg’s institutes of secondary education: the

137 Spohr, How chances it they travel?, p. 23.
138 Spohr, How chances it they travel?, p. 54.
Johanneum, which Rist had attended, and the Akademisches Gymnasium. Rist’s career as a playwright, in his dramatic output as well as his theatrical conception, bears the character of a synthesis of these traditions. Rist’s dramas emerge as skilful and deliberate compositions firmly rooted in the North German theatrical context, with a tradition of school drama and a popular preference for the theatre of the English players.

Where general remarks about theatre in 17th-century Germany can be drawn from other sources, for example in the information available about the practices of the English strolling players, Rist himself is the source of key primary data on theatrical conditions in Hamburg around 1630. It is largely necessary to turn to Rist’s own writings for details of the theatrical impulses to which he had been exposed, which demonstrates the at times inestimable value of Rist’s written reflections as rare sources of otherwise little-known information about cultural life in 17th-century Hamburg. If Rist’s description of his theatrical context does not capture all facets of theatrical life in Hamburg and North Germany, it both delimits this broad field to what he considered relevant to his production, and shows him to be a self-aware playwright who situated his own work in in a defined context. Nevertheless, this introduces an ultimately unsurmountable methodological difficulty: the dearth of independently verifiable data on theatrical conditions in Hamburg mean that conclusions drawn from Rist’s own pronouncements on the matter retain a certain speculative and provisional character.

Rist’s lifelong association with Hamburg locates him in a theatrical context with close ties to educational institutions, and as such with drama produced in the context of rhetorical education. School drama was one of the forms in which
rhetorical skill was practised and presented by pupils. In this, it integrated the pedagogical ends of the rhetoric lesson with the fulfilment of the ends of theatrical performance. Faced with competition from the \textit{Wanderbühne} and the theatre of the Jesuit schools, Protestant school theatre was obliged to meet the expectations of their audience and increase the theatrical elements of their rhetorical presentations. In so doing, they began to incorporate costumes, props, curtains and music.\footnote{Barner, \textit{Barockrhetorik}, pp. 302–3.} The lack of a permanent theatrical institution in Hamburg until the founding of its opera in 1678 has been attributed to the popularity of the strolling players – in the first instance the English companies, then the Dutch troupes who came to Germany following the Thirty Years’ War – who were able to cater to the theatrical needs of Hamburg’s population.\footnote{Herbert Junkers, \textit{Niederländische Schauspieler und niederländisches Schauspiel im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert in Deutschland} (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1936), p. 70; Manfred Brauneck and Alfred Noe, eds., \textit{Spieltexte der Wanderbühne}, 6 vols. (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1970), VI, xviii; W. Gordon Marigold, ‘Aspekte der Komödie und des Komischen in Hamburg 1600-1708’, \textit{Daphnis}, 17.1 (1988), 15–35 (p. 21).} Yet it seems that what theatre Hamburg did have was located in, or at least associated with, its educational institutions. The Johanneum and the Akademisches Gymnasium had at least one stage between them,\footnote{Marigold, p. 19.} and in the \textit{Belustigung} der Rüstige recalls having

\begin{quote}
wie ich noch ein Knabe war / meine Person vielmahls auff den Schauplätzen dargestellet / welches auch hernach / wie ich schon eine geräume Zeit auff Universitäten oder hohen Schuhlen gelebet / mehr denn einmahl geschehen.
\end{quote}

This reference is vague and as such does not conclusively support the claim that Rist performed in drama as a schoolboy at the Johanneum, yet it does render this

possibility plausible. Both *Irenaromachia* and *Perseus* bear close formal
resemblance to the contemporary school dramas of Northern Germany. By the end of
the 16th century, with the increasing role of High German both as a literary language
and as the language of education, the composition of Low German school dramas
was in decline. Such works were now composed in High German or, after the
example of Omichius’ 1577 *Newe Comoedia, von Dionysii Syracusani, und Damonis
und Pythiae Brüderschaft*, included Low German Zwischenspiele within a High
German main drama. The majority of Low German dramatic production in this
period occurred in the context of school drama, composed by teachers to pedagogical
ends.143 These High German pieces with Low German Zwischenspiele remained the
dominant form of North German school drama for over half a century: Rist’s
Friedejauchzendes Teutschland was first performed in 1652 by students at the
Lüneburg Gymnasium.144

The history of the performance and publication of *Irenaromachia*, such as
this can be reconstructed, certainly supports the claim that, around 1630, there was a
performance space available for use by Hamburg’s schoolboys. The drama was
published in this year under the name of Ernst Stapel, Rist’s schoolfriend and later
brother-in-law. There remains a degree of uncertainty over the details of the drama’s
authorship, which will be explored in Chapter Four below. Stapel died in 1635, and
in an explanatory note to his lament for him, which was later published in the
Poetischer Lustgarte (1638), Rist describes *Irenaromachia* as a drama ‘welches […]
wr im Jahr 1630 auff öffentlicher Bühne haben vorgestellet / worauf es auch kurz

143 Agathe Lasch, ‘Die literarische Entwicklung des Plattdeutschen in Hamburg im 17. und 18.
Jahrhundert’, *Nordelbingen*, 5 (1926), 422–49 (p. 431).
144 Artur Gabrielson, ‘Das Eindringen der hochdeutschen Sprache in die Schulen Niederdeutschlands
hernach durch den Druck jederman gemein ist gemachet worden.\footnote{Rist, \textit{Johannis Ristii Holsati poetischer Lust-Garte, das ist, allerhand anmahtige Gedichte auch warhaftige Geschichte...: Allen der teutschen poeteri vernünftigen Liebhaberen zu sonderbaren Gefallen hervor und an den Tag gegeben}, (Hamburg: Rebenlein, 1638), Oi.} A continuation of Adam Tratziger’s chronicle of Hamburg gives details of one, if not the first, performance of \textit{Irenaromachia}. This occurred at some point between the Winter at the beginning of 1630 and the arrival of King Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden in Stralsund in June: ‘In Ostmanß Hause in S. Johansstrassen wahren schone Comedien agiret, insonderheit v. Friede un Krieg. Autores waren Ristius und Stapel.’ It has been suggested that the house was that of councilman Albert Ostmann, whose son would have been sixteen years old at the time and probably attended the Johanneum,\footnote{C. Walther, ‘Die “Irenaromachia” von Rist und Stapel’, \textit{Korrespondezblatt des Vereins für niederdeutsche Sprachforschung}, 8 (1883), 66–67 (p. 66).} which was at that time located in the same street.

It is, on the other hand, possible that Rist’s comment in the \textit{Lustgarte} and the chronicle entry refer to distinct performances. For them to refer to the same performance would require an identity between the ‘öffentliche Bühne’ and Ostmann’s house, an assumption which may be misplaced. It may be that the performance at Ostmann’s house served a different, or at least additional, purpose, from that of enabling schoolboys to perform drama – even if Ostmann’s own son had indeed been among the performers. Ostmann’s house may have functioned as a venue for a trial performance before the civic authorities, who would then legislate on whether it could be performed publicly. In this case, the performance ‘auf öffentlicher Bühne’ from the \textit{Lustgarte} would be an indication that \textit{Irenaromachia} found a favourable reception with the council members. The subsequent publication of \textit{Irenaromachia}, through which the drama ‘jederman gemein ist gemachet worden’, indicates the development in parallel of school theatre with the sort of drama as was popularly available to a reading public. This suggests, at least in Rist’s specific
Hamburgian context, a plural implementation of what is in the first order school theatre – dramas composed and performed in a pedagogical context acquired a life of their own in the popular realm as objects of entertainment. Such theatre served the ends of rhetorical education and fulfilled the theatrical needs of a theatre-going public. The subsequent publication of the drama, and Rist’s gloss on this in the Lustgarte, indicates its utility beyond the classroom.

An anecdote from the Belustigung provides further detail on how the theatre in Hamburg was organised around 1630, which suggests how school theatre might have interacted with and responded to influences from the English itinerant stage. In the performance described by der Rüstige, in which he performed the role of a ‘grausahmer Tyrann’ which had moved the female members of the audience to tears, the ‘Kapel-Meister’, responsible for the production’s music, was ‘der berühmte Engeländer Wilhelm Brade.’ (Belustigung, 318) Although many of the precise details of Brade’s biography are uncertain, he is generally taken to have come to Hamburg around 1625/6, perhaps because the city offered security from the turbulence of the war. Brade died there in 1630, and while he is not known to have held any official position in the city in the intervening period, the reference in the Belustigung suggests that he spent some of his final years providing music for theatrical performances. Although a potential affinity to the English strolling players was suggested through the mobility which characterised Brade’s career and the exchange and overlap between travelling actors and travelling instrumentalists, Rist’s account in the Belustigung provides the first piece of compelling evidence that Brade worked in collaboration with the theatre. This collaboration, however, was precisely not with the theatre of the English strolling players but with a (semi-)permanent German
stage. After Brade’s death, laments were composed by pupils at the Akademisches Gymnasium, providing further indication that he may have been involved with this institution during his final years in Hamburg.

III – Theatre in Hamburg, a provisional overview.

The 1630 *Irenaromachia* performance in ‘Ostmanß Hause’, the poems to Brade from the Gymnasium pupils, and the account from the *Belustigung* of Rist’s (or der Rüstige’s) involvement in a performance under Brade’s musical direction do not themselves combine to provide a comprehensive overview of the theatrical context in Hamburg around 1630, or even a full picture of how school theatre was conducted. However, taken together, these details plausibly suggest that there was a semi-permanent stage in Hamburg around 1630, in association with its grammar schools, for which Brade provided musical direction and with which Rist, and probably also Stapel, were involved as both writers and actors. In the anecdote in the *Belustigung*, Rist also names Brade’s ‘Gehülffe’, David Cramer, who was ein gelehrter Studiosus und stattlicher Musicus dabey / wie das die schönen Stücke / welche er zu den Komödien und Tragödien selbiger Zeit gesetzt / nunmehr aber in offnen Drukke sind zu finden / genugsam bezeügen.

(*Belustigung*, 318)

This collection of musical accompaniments for comedies and tragedies has been identified as a 1631 Hamburg publication, *Allerhand musicalische Stücke von Pavanen, Courante, Intraden, Balletten ... auff drey Discant Violinen und ein*

---

147 Spohr, *How chances it they travel?*, p. 84.
Violdagamba.\footnote{149} Cramer’s collection has since been lost, but the Erster Theil newer Paduanen (1633/1640) by Johann Schop survives. Rist’s relationship with the violinist Schop was one of his most fruitful musical collaborations, with Schop providing music for Rist’s Himlische Lieder (1641/1642) as well as for Des Daphnis aus Cimbrien Galatheen (1642) and contributing to the Alltägliche Hausmusik (1654). Schop was another of Brade’s pupils, and his collection of pavanes is an important document of the engagement of the second, German generation with the English musical tradition and repertoire.\footnote{150}

English music, as transmitted particularly by Brade and his pupils, was a key influence on the development of musical trends in Hamburg. Rist encountered Brade and his music in the specific context of theatrical performance, indicating if not fully demonstrating that the close relationship between music and drama, maintained by the English strolling players as an effective performance technique, was continued and developed in the context of the static or semi-permanent stage in Hamburg, which likely existed in association with the city’s schools. In his study of the work and reception of English musicians on the continent, Arne Spohr points to der Rüstige’s recollection in the Belustigung of Brade’s work for theatrical performance some 36 years after Brade’s death as evidence of the fame and esteem Brade enjoyed as a musician during his lifetime, and the influence he continued to exert after his death. Indeed, in a world where instrumentalists were still regarded with a degree of disapprobation, the social advancement that Brade experienced throughout his career was unprecedented, preparing the way for future

\footnote{149} Braun, p. 101.  
\footnote{150} Spohr, How chances it they travel?, p. 227.
generations of musicians such as Schop himself.\textsuperscript{151} However, the anecdote about Brade’s music in the \textit{Belustigung}, published in 1666, can also be read in another way: as providing clues about what Rist saw as important and effective in theatrical performance. That for this he turns to a performance that took place over three decades previously, as opposed to referring to some more recent and as such potentially more up-to-date production, shows the extent to which theatre in Hamburg was determined by English itinerant practice as well as the English influence on Rist’s own views on excellence in performance and indeed on his own practice. Just as the young Rist was beginning to compose his own dramas, and have them performed and published, he had the good fortune to be able to work with one of the most talented and influential musicians of his age. As the anecdote in the \textit{Belustigung} shows, the impression left upon him by Brade’s musical skill and its effects in the economy of performance remained with him for the rest of his life.

In 1630, the year of Brade’s death and the performance and publication of \textit{Irenaromachia}, Rist was 23 years old. He had long since left school and had spent the intervening years studying at the universities of Rostock and then Rinteln. Yet it is clear that he maintained his connection to Hamburg school theatre in this time. In his dedication of his 1651 collection of religious song, \textit{Sabbahtische Seelenlust / Daß ist: Lehr- Trost- Vermahnung- und Warnungsreiche Lieder über alle Sontägliche Evangelien deß gantzen Jahres}, to the civic authorities in Hamburg ‘benebenst der gantzen hochlöblichen Bürgerschaft / der trefflichen und weit-berühmten Statt’,\textsuperscript{152} Rist refers to the specific

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item See Spohr, pp. 86–9.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
opportunities Hamburg had afforded him to participate in theatre. He recalls how,


(Sabbahtische Seelenlust, 9)

In Rist’s view, the city of Hamburg played an important role in supporting his theatrical pursuits by enabling him to stage productions of his own dramas. Interestingly, that Rist should draw attention to his activities as a playwright and the receptivity of Hamburg’s civic authorities and populace to his dramas in the Sabbahtische Seelenlust of all works, a collection of devotional songs organised according to the set Gospel reading for each Sunday of the year, indicates that he was not troubled by the potential for his dramas or his enthusiasm for the theatre in general to impact negatively upon his responsibilities as a pastor or indeed his work composing devotional songs.

Excursus: The pastor and his dramas.

The diverse areas in which Rist operated – pastoral, theological, linguistic, literary, theatrical, alchemical – could not in practice be straightforwardly reconciled to each other. This is as much a matter of the prejudices and preoccupations of those who responded to Rist and his works as it is of any
essential incommensurability amongst his various realms of activity. While in
the *Sabbatïsche Seelenlust* Rist can base his affection for the city of Hamburg in
part on its support of his theatrical pursuits, without thereby undermining the
devotional use for which the collection was intended, only two years later, in the
preface to *Das Friedejauchtzende Teutschland*, he writes of the biting criticism
and personal attacks he has endured from some of his fellow clergymen. In the
religious work, theatrical activity is presented as a worthwhile pursuit and one
which civic authorities do well to support. In a published drama, this argument
would emphatically function as a self-legitimising strategy, yet here Rist’s
argumentative tack is different. He highlights the criticism directed towards him
by other clergymen as an instance of the sinfulness encountered in this group. This
is one of the key points made by *Das Friedejauchtzende Teutschland*, where vice
in all sections of the German population is seen as a key impediment to peace.
As such, however, Rist’s account of the criticism from clergymen gives no details of
what, exactly, they are criticising. His aim is rather to establish that their attacks
are unjustified and indicative of their sinfulness: ‘Meine grösseste und hefftigste
Verfolgung habe ich gantz unverschuldeter Weise von den Geistlichen müssen
erleiden.’ These clergymen, he writes, are consumed with jealousy,

wenn siesehen / daß andere von dem grundgütigen Gott mit einem
Pfündlein auß lauter Gnaden sind begabt / welches sie billich zu des
Allerhöchsten Ehren / Erbauung seiner Kirchen / Aufmunterung vieler
Christlichen Hertzen / und ihnen selbst zu erwebung eines rühmlichen
Namens anlangen. (FJT, 223)
Rist attests to the fact that his position as pastor has exposed him to criticism, but denies the legitimacy of this criticism with the claim that it is born of vice. For as long as this is the case, he need not address the conflict, perceived or otherwise, between ecclesiastical or pastoral and other pursuits. If his dramas, or indeed his secular verse, can further the ‘Aufmunterung vieler Christlichen Hertzen’, even if he achieves personal fame through them, they serve appropriate ends commensurate with his responsibilities as a clergyman.

In the *Katechismus Andachten* of 1656, Rist directly addresses the difficulties he encountered as a result of writing both dramas and religious works. He has been subjected to criticism

\[
\text{Dieweil ich in der jugend bisweilen weltliche Lieder geschrieben / nachgehendes auch unterschiedliche Schauspiele / Komedien und Tragedien oder Freüd- und Traurspiele herfür gegeben / ja so gahr Balletten und Aufzüge verfertiget / so könten Meine Geistliche Sachen so hoch nicht geschätzt werden.}^{153}
\]

The reference to his dramas being products of his youth is somewhat misleading – it had only been three years since the performance and publication of both *Das Friedejautzende Teutschland* and the ballet *Triumphirende Liebe*. Yet if this might be viewed as an attempt to put some rhetorical distance between himself writing as the composer of the *Katechismus Andachten* and the person who composed the dramas, Rist is wholly unrepentant about the moral import of his dramas. Of these he writes

---

so kan ich Eüch Neidern und Missgünern gleichwol nicht bergen / das
derselben Inhalt ja viel wichtiger / ja viel weiter aussehend ist / als das
Sie von Eürem dummen Verstande recht könten begriffen oder
gerurthelet werden.

Nur dises müget Ihr inmittelst wissen / das solche Spiele vielmehr
Geistlich als Weltlich sind. (KA, 24)

Rist sees to the core of these criticisms of his dramatic writings. They are not in
fact born of moral concern about a pastor and composer of religious texts also
being involved in the production of dramas and ‘secular’ literature, but are a
reaction by those who object to his portrayal of the world and its sinfulness in
these works: ‘dieweil ich die Wahrheit alzu nackend aufgeführt / [Rist has]
schier ungläublichen Haß und Ungunst dadurch [...] verdienet.’ (KA, 24)

Rist’s lengthy prefaces give exhaustive accounts of these disputes he
viewed them, but the positions of his critics or a third party are harder to come
by. Yet the possibility that Rist might here be tilting at windmills, or
misrepresenting the reality of an actual dispute, is less significant for our
present purposes than the means he finds to head off any conflict between the
ecclesiastical and the theatrical.

B – Performance

IV – Reconstructing Rist’s dramatic oeuvre, and its performance history.

By giving methodological primacy to the performance of Rist’s dramas, rather
than to their existence as published texts which have subsequently formed the
basis of the modern critical edition, it is possible to incorporate in a constructive manner a significant portion of his writings which is otherwise largely ignored: the lost dramas. Investigating clues about these works and exploring the reasons for their loss, to the extent that any of this can be reconstructed, sheds light on how Rist viewed the interrelationship between text, both as manuscript and in its eventual published form, and performance. This will help us answer the question of how to conceive of the relationship between the text, to which we still have unmediated access, and the performance to which we do not.

Beyond the four dramas that have survived and are included in Mannack’s edition of Rist’s works, as well as the printer drama Depositio Cornuti Typographici (1655) and the courtly ballet Die Triumphirende Liebe (1653), Rist claims to have composed over thirty dramas.\textsuperscript{154} Of the c.26 that are now lost, at least one was in fact published, at least one was performed but apparently never published, and of the rest there is no indication that they were even performed. The oldest of the lost dramas seems to have been a Herodes, which was published.\textsuperscript{155} The dedicatory preface to Perseus lists a further 3 dramas, Polymachia, Irenochorus and a Guiscardus, this last drawing, presumably, on the Decameron (IV, 1) (Perseus, 124). The Poetischer Lustgarte (1638) names a Berosiana and a Begomina. It also names two ’Tragædien’ dealing with the lives of two important and recently deceased figures who had wielded enormous influence over contemporary military and diplomatic affairs: Gustavus Adolphus

\textsuperscript{154} Belustigung, p. 304.
and Wallenstein. Most of these dramas were never performed.\textsuperscript{156} The preface to the second volume of the \textit{Neues Musikalisches Seelenparadis} (1662) claims that \textit{Berosiana}, \textit{Begomina}, and \textit{Irenochorus}, along with a drama \textit{Augustus Euricus}, about a Visigoth king, were lost in the ‘erster Schwedischer Krieg’ of 1644, that is the Torstenson War between Sweden and Denmark-Norway.\textsuperscript{157} These events are referenced again in the ‘Nohtwendiger Vorbericht an den Teutschgesinneten Leser’ in \textit{Das Friedewünschende Teutschland}, where Rist reports that several of his dramas had been

\begin{quote}
bei dem jüngsten feindlichen Einfalle [...] dergestalt zerrissen /
vernichtet und verderbet / daß von etlichen nicht die helffte / von den meisten aber kaum das vierte theil übrig geblieben.\textsuperscript{158}
\end{quote}

Here we learn of another drama, \textit{Probe der beständigen Freundschafft}. Unlike the other lost dramas, this is mentioned as a work that was performed, not a manuscript that gathered dust in Rist’s house in Wedel for years until it was eventually destroyed by invading forces. \textit{Beständige Freundschafft} was performed by a troupe of students led by Andreas Gartner, who had come to Hamburg from Königsberg to put on theatrical performances.

It was for performance by Gartner’s troupe that Rist composed \textit{Das Friedewünschende Teutschland} and, a few years later, \textit{Das Friedejauchtzende Teutschland} (although Gartner did not return as promised to perform it and the drama was eventually performed by pupils at the Lüneburg Johanneum). The

\textsuperscript{156} See \textit{Lust-Garte}, O1ir.
\textsuperscript{157} The relevant quotations are reproduced in Otto Heins, ‘Johann Rist und das niederdeutsche Drama des 17. Jahrhunderts: Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Literaturgeschichte.\textit{[Diss. Marburg]}’, 1930, pp. 9–10. I can consult the original in the British Library.
preface to *Das Friedejauchtzende Teutschland* itself provides an indication of Rist’s practice when it came to publishing his dramas, where he explains that he did not wish to publish this particular piece ‘ehe und bevor ich dasselbe auf der Schaubühnen öffentlich hätte vorgestellet oder sehen lassen.’ That this might have been Rist’s general practice in respect of all his dramas is supported by the evidence, or at least not contradicted by it. There is, thus, a probable coincidence of published and performed dramas.

The only true gap in the available source material is left by the loss of *Herodes*, which was published, presumably performed, but lost. Writing in the *Belustigung* towards the end of his life, and more than two decades following the loss of some of his dramas in the Torstenson War, Rist recalls only the published dramas as well as his ‘fast neulichste / Traur- und Freuden-Spiele / als das Glückselige Britannien / das Tyranniserte und das wieder befreite Engeland.’ These most recent efforts, dealing with contemporary events in British politics, are unlikely to be published, ‘denn meine / durch so vielfältige / müheselige Verrichtunge ziemlich geschwächete Augen / können das Täg und Nächtlliche Schreiben nicht mehr so wol vertragen.’ (*Belustigung*, 305) These dramas are not publication-worthy in their current condition, and there is no mention of the question of their performance.

This reflection in the *Belustigung* provides a valuable indication of Rist’s own conception of the relationship between his dramas as written texts and as works performed. As Rist repeatedly asserts throughout his works, the activity of writing dramas itself is for him enjoyable and a welcome leisure-time pursuit. Lamenting the wartime loss of his manuscripts, he claims to regret losing

---

The loss of these dramas is Rist’s, not the world’s. Combining Rist’s sparse allusions to his publication practice in respect of his dramas, it might be supposed that those that survived as published texts did so either because they had been performed or because they existed as texts in a publishable condition. It may be that, in practice, these two conditions coincided, such that a drama that had been performed would also exist as a text suitable for publication.

The above reflections offer compelling, if provisional, grounds for distinguishing between Rist’s surviving and lost dramas that do not rely on the sheer expedience of restricting inquiry to those works that are available as texts to the 21st-century scholar precisely because those are the works that are available. We might regret the loss of Herodes, and the fact that Beständige Freundschaft apparently never made it to publication, but, as Bernhard Jahn has pointed out, there is little indication that access to any more of Rist’s dramas would shed any new light on his practices and capabilities as a dramatist. In this sense, the loss of Rist’s dramas is more valuable than their survival would have been, or at least their survival as published works. Their loss gave Rist scope to reflect on his own practices and motivations regarding the composition, performance, and publication of his dramas.

Interestingly, while performed dramas may have been in virtue of this publication-worthy, this does not seem to have been for Rist an absolute
indication of quality *qua* work. Rist’s comments on *Perseus* indicate that, although performed and published, he does not himself seem to have rated it particularly highly within his body of work. As mentioned above, Rist’s *Klaggedicht* to Stapel, published in the *Lustgarte* (1637), refers to his own dramas *Herodes*, *Wallenstein*, and *Gustav*. An explanatory note expands upon this reference:


Here, Rist makes a distinction not between published and unpublished, or performed and unperformed, works, but a typological or even generic distinction between his *Tragædien* and the dramas he identifies as ‘studentisch’. This designation is ambiguous. It may mean that *Perseus*, *Guiscardus*, etc. date originally from Rist’s student days, and are therefore to be discounted as *Jugendstücke*. Yet this explanation seems improbable since, as analysis particularly in Chapter Four below will show, there is much in the conception and composition of *Perseus* that identifies it as the work of a more adept and mature playwright than *Irenaromachia*, even if it does not attain the levels of theatrical finesse that characterise the later *Teutschland* dramas. Further, given the circumstances of its publication, as well as the borrowings in the Copenhagen *Irenaromachia*, it seems likely that *Perseus* was composed in
1634, as it is claimed on its title page: ‘ACTA HEIDÆ DITMARSORUM. ANNO MDCXXXIV’. (Perseus, 117) Perseus does stand out amongst Rist’s surviving dramas as the only non-allegorical piece, but again, this cannot be what is meant but ‘studentisch’, as Herodes was presumably also not allegorical.

A straightforward, if nonetheless entirely speculative, explanation for ‘studentisch’ might rely on the Zwischenspiele. Perseus clearly has a tragic plot, but the presence of comic and farcical elements may be what precludes its inclusion amongst the Tragædien. None of these having survived, it is impossible to say whether these also contained farcical Low German interludes. However, a comment in the Belustigung suggests that Rist’s earlier dramas were not met with a generally favourable response ‘allein darum / weil keine sonderliche Pickelherings-Possen mit untergemenget wurden.’ (Belustigung, 306) Suppose, then, that the distinguishing characteristic of ‘studentisch’ dramas is their inclusion of farcical interscenia, the designation deriving, presumably, from the type of drama performed by student troupes. A feature that is taken to be characteristic of Rist’s theatre can be seen as in fact not holding of his serious Tragædien.

This comment on Perseus is significant because it introduces an interesting fracture into the interrelationships amongst Rist’s surviving dramas that complicates the attempt to view them as a meaningfully cohesive body of work. While Perseus is already exceptional in being the only surviving drama with a tragic and non-allegorical plot, it does not wholly stand apart from the other three works and is demonstrably reliant upon the same set of traditions and techniques that informed Rist’s theatrical conception overall. It sits nicely with Irenaromachia as an example of Rist’s early writing, and indeed has so much in common with this work that scenes were exchanged for the 1634 Copenhagen publication. It also
shares many of the thematic concerns and compositional properties of the later *Teutschland* dramas. In spite of its differences, there is much about *Perseus* that integrates it into the set suggested by the other three of Rist’s surviving dramas. The distinction Rist draws between *Perseus* and *Guiscardus* and his other dramas is in a sense provisional, predating the composition at least of *Das Friedejauchzende Teutschland* by over a decade, yet it is noteworthy that he decided to draw it at all.

In the dedicatory preface to *Perseus*, Rist expresses the hope to publish ‘mehr andere vnd vielleicht bessere Inventiones, als meine Polymachia, Irenochorus, Herodes, Guiscardus et cætera.’ (*Perseus*, 124) Here, there is no suggestion of any distinction between different types of drama, beyond the hint that these unpublished works might be of a higher quality. It is interesting that *Perseus* was performed and published when the others were not. This again may help account for the designation ‘studentisch’ he later attached to it. Perhaps *Perseus* made it to publication because it was more immediately conceived for performance in a way that the *Tragædien* were not. As the achievements of a writer, Rist would perhaps prefer to draw attention to his tragedies, even though these works were not assured the success in performance that *Perseus*, on account of its integrated comic interludes, attracted.

V – The performance of Rist’s dramas

The ‘Nohtwendiger Vorbericht an den Teutschgesinneten Leser’ that prefaces *Das Friedewünschende Teutschland* provides a detailed account of the

---

160 The potential complexities in the composition history of *Das Friedewünschende Teutschland*, and the possibility of an *Ur*-version composed by Stapel, will be explored in Chapter Four below.
circumstances that led to its first performance. This indeed is Rist’s primary explicit motivation for writing the preface, which opens:

DEnnach Ich ausser zweiffel lebe/ du werdest eine kleine Begierde haben etlicher massen zu wissen / was mich doch habe gereitzet dieses mein Friedewünschendes Teutschland auffzusetzen und vor etlichen Monaten auff öffentlichem Schauplatze vorstellen zu lassen / auch was die Zusehere / so wol andere / vornemlich aber die Mißgünstige von diesem Schauspiele etwan geredet [...]; Als kan Ich nicht unterlassen / dir nachfolgenden zwar kurtzen / aber jedoch warhafften Bericht hievon zu ertheilen. (FWT, 14)

Compare this, briefly, to the more apologetic stance taken some 13 years previously in the preface to Perseus. Relying heavily on Opitz’s preface to his Trojanerinnen, here Rist explicitly sought to justify his dramatic writing in the eyes of his learned patrons. When it comes to publishing Das Friedewünschende Teutschland, however, Rist can confidently rely upon his readership’s interest in the story of how the drama came to be composed and performed, and demonstrates Rist’s tendency to view his dramas with an eye on their performance.

The preface to Das Friedewünschende Teutschland is unique among Rist’s writings in that it contains explicit, if brief, reflection on an actual performance of one of his dramas. The other prefaces tend to make general points about the exigencies of performance, while the reflections in the Belustigung, for example, contain too few details to be positively identified as referring to any drama in
particular. The comments in *Das Friedewünschende Teutschland* indicate how Rist saw a specific performance as relating to the text that underlay it.

*Das Friedewünschende Teutschland* was first performed by the troupe of Andreas Gartner who had come to Hamburg from Königsberg 'mit etlichen feinen / gelahrten und wolgeschikten Studenten.' In Hamburg, Gartner's troupe would perform dramas on an 'öffentliche[r] Schauplatz [...] mit Bewilligung der gebietenden Obrigkeit dieser hochlöblichen Stadt.' (FWT, 14) This brief description provides further detail on the theatrical context for which Rist's dramas were composed: an itinerant student troupe, a public stage in Hamburg, the necessary approval from the civic authorities. Gartner approached Rist for some dramas to perform, and was in the first instance provided with the now lost *Probe der beständigen Freundschaft*. (FWT, 15) Eventually, however, Rist composed for performance by Gartner's troupe 'ein gantz neues Spiel', *Das Friedewünschende Teutschland*. This drama

ist nun bald darauff von mehrgedachtem Herren Gartner auff offenem Schauplatze sehr fleissig und nachdenklich vorgestellet / wobei denn viel tausend Menschen / ja eine solche Anzahl der Zuseher sich befunden / daß einer den anderen schier erdrukkt hätte. (FWT, 16)

Since we know so little about the actual theatrical provision in Hamburg at the time, it is impossible to assess whether Rist’s claim of an audience of many thousands is accurate or an instance of the hyperbolical self-aggrandisement of which he has so often been accused in scholarship. The claimed audience size and the designation ‘offen’ indicate that the performance is likely to have been open air, which introduces certain performance conditions, to be discussed
below, that impinge upon theatrical technique. In the description of the performance as ‘fleissig und nachdenklich’ there is a rare, if fleeting, reflection on the page-stage relationship that sees performance as some form of implementation of written text. This is also a rare instance of Rist recording his opinion of the performance of one of his own dramas.

It is a pity that the account of the performance by Gartner’s troupe is so brief – the remainder of the lengthy preface is a detailed response to an unnamed critic of the drama. There is little evidence that Rist recorded his explicit reflections on the performance of any of his dramas. This might surprise, or even be felt to be a regrettable gap in Rist’s writings, given that the discussion of theatre in the Belustigung demonstrates his ability to respond critically to theatrical performance and his sensitivity to what can make performance successful or unsuccessful. However, the idea that Rist, as the writer of the dramas, might be able to comment meaningfully and at any great length on their performance may rely too strongly on a certain understanding of an implementary relationship between the written text and the performance. This understanding posits a clear direction of fit\textsuperscript{161} running from the text to its performance, the page to the stage, whereby the text precedes the performance. The written text functions as an order or set of orders, issued by the writer to the performers, and the extent to which what emerges onstage deviates from the written word is a measure of the success of the performance.

From the discussion of theatre in the Belustigung, it is evident that Rist has other criteria for assessing the success of a performance. These relate to the performers’ ability to generate and maintain theatrical illusion, appropriately

\textsuperscript{161} See Anscombe on Intention.
perform affects and evoke the desired emotional response in the audience, and make effective use of props, scenery, music, etc. These are all elements that can be assessed independently of any underlying dramatic text. The written text, and with it its author, stands in a less explicitly authoritative position over the performance, meaning that comparing performance with text is not straightforwardly a meaningful method for assessing performance success. Rist has no more claim over the performance of one of his own works than he does for any other. He inhabits two different roles, as the writer of a dramatic text and an expert who responds to theatrical performance, and while he lets his expertise in performance matters inform his compositional practice, there is less evidence that he draws upon his activities as a composer of dramatic texts when evaluating theatrical performance. The assessment that Gartner’s performance of *Das Friedewünschende Teutschland* was ‘fleissig and nachdenklich’ asserts that it was appropriately attentive to Rist’s text but does not examine its success as a function of this.

Rist made the explicit claim that he would not publish a drama ‘ehe und bevor ich dasselbe auf der Schaubühnen öffentlich hatte vorgestellet oder sehen lassen’ (*FJT*, 220) in respect of *Das Friedejauchtzende Teutschland*, the publication of which was held back by his promise to allow it to be first performed by Gartner’s troupe. Of course this decision to have performance precede publication may have had a pragmatic or principled basis in the desire to prevent others from seeing or even benefitting from the drama’s performance before Rist had a chance to. It may also be that some of the text as published arose in light of the performance, as opposed to giving rise to it. This, however, further indicates the complex of factors that surround the relationship between
text and performance and prevents a straightforward understanding of how they interact. Text and performance are enmeshed both as works, that is, as aesthetic objects, and as commodities.

That Rist agreed to hold *Das Friedejauchtzende Teutschland* for Gartner, until six years after his performance of *Das Friedewünschende Teutschland*, is another indication of the esteem in which he held the troupe and their performance capabilities. This esteem is of great discursive relevance, and may help explain why it was only in respect of this drama that Rist commented on its actual performance. This time from Danzig, Gartner had written to Rist asking him to hold back the play until he could come to Hamburg ‘da er denn die Ehre zu haben verhoffte / selbiges ebenmäßig zum allerersten male auf die Schaubühne zu bringen.’ (FJT, 220) The idea that the opportunity to give the first performance one of Rist’s dramas should be seen as an honour may be in part rhetorical formality, yet it may also indicate the esteem in which Rist is held precisely as someone who writes for performance and the attractiveness of performing, indeed ‘premiering’, one of his dramas. There is a strong case for seeing this esteem as distinct from Rist’s reputation as a composer of poetic works for publication and participant in the intellectual networks and cultural discourse surrounding the dignity of the German language and its appropriateness for use in poetry. The honour by association, and likely also material gain, that Gartner expects to achieve through having his troupe perform Rist’s drama, is thus typologically and structurally distinct from that sought, for example, by the young Birken. Still without a permanent position and source of income, Birken established a relationship with Rist through their
mutual friend Harsdörffer and visited him in Wedel in 1646, seeking Rist's support, as an established literary figure, in the early stages of his career.\textsuperscript{162}

The honour of performing one of Rist's dramas was not seen as a means of integration into an illustrious network providing the opportunity to establish many prestigious and beneficial contacts. Theatrical association with Rist would bring benefits of a different order. It is easy to suspect that the main motivation would be financial – that the journey from Danzig to Hamburg would be worth it for the opportunity to stage a drama which, following the success of Das Friedewünschende Teutschland, was sure to be popular. For reasons unknown, however, Gartner and his troupe never arrived in Hamburg, meaning 'daß die Beförderung zum Drucke dieses meines Friedejauchtzenden Teutschlandes / länger als ein gantzes Jahr [...] ist gehemmet und zurücke gehalten worden.' (FJT, 221) Performance is critical in Rist's theatre – the publication of Das Friedejauchtzende Teutschland, a follow-up to an enormously popular and influential drama that was reissued several times, was cast into doubt by problems encountered in organising its performance.

The preface to Das Friedejauchtzende Teutschland is remarkable because, while it discusses the Gartner performance that did not, ultimately, take place, it does not discuss the performance that did. In relating how he was disappointed by Gartner's failure to come to Hamburg as promised, Rist both deflects blame from himself for the delay in the drama's publication and publicly criticises Gartner for his unreliability. As much as it would have been an honour for Gartner's troupe to have received such glowing praise for their performance of

\textsuperscript{162} For an analysis of the interpersonal dynamics between Rist and Birken, see Ralf Schuster, ‘“ Jst Es Hier Nit Eitelkeit!”: Der Briefwechsel zwischen Sigmund von Birken und Johann Rist als Beispiel für literarisches Konkurrenzdenken im Barock’, Daphnis, 34 (2005), 571–602.
Das Friedewünschende Teutschland and to be granted to opportunity to conduct the first performance of Das Friedejauchzende Teutschland, it must have been damaging to be named in such a critical manner by Rist, who otherwise in his prefaces preserved the anonymity of even the most insistent critics of his work.

It seems that the work was in the end performed by pupils at the Lüneburg Johanneum in September 1652. The Lüneburg cantor, Michael Jacobi, had composed the music for the drama, and had sought permission from the civic authorities to have it performed. This performance signalled the resumption of school theatrical performances following the end of the war.163 Thus the performance of Das Friedejauchzende Teutschland sees Rist once again collaborating with an influential musician, both aiding the organisation of the performance and contributing to its success as theatre. Overall, it is clear that Rist’s dramas were performed in a variety of contexts in his lifetime, both with and without his direct involvement. In this way, the dramas developed lives of their own, independent of the efforts of their creator. They emerged from and into a theatrical context characterised by a plurality of theatrical traditions and a wide range of practical conditions governing theatrical performance.

Briefly, a summary of some known performances of Rist’s dramas. Such details as I have are not the outcome of systematic research into performance records but have been accumulated incidentally. These details derive from a variety of source-types, and provide evidence that Rist’s dramas were performed in a variety of contexts: by schoolboys, at court, by strolling players. As such, the data on historical performances functions as a sample, illustrating the flexibility

of the playtexts which enabled them to be adapted to performance in a variety of contexts. The discernable compositional principles underlying Rist’s dramas will be discussed in Chapter Four below. At present, an overview of the various performances of Rist’s dramas known to have taken place will demonstrate his dramatic output to be embedded in a theatrical culture characterised by a plurality of traditions and impulses:

- 1630. *Irenaromachia* in ‘Ostmanß Hause’, potentially identical with performance ‘auff öffentlicher Bühne’ referenced in *Lustgarte*. Probable association with school theatre, performance before civic authorities. It was posited that these details supported the broader function of school theatre as a form of public entertainment, particularly in Hamburg.

- 1634. A performance of *Perseus* is likely, given the conclusions drawn about Rist’s performance and publication practice, but currently unverifiable. A plagiarised conglomeration of *Irenaromachia* and some Low German scenes from *Perseus* was published, and may have been performed, in Copenhagen around the time of the ‘Great Wedding’ between Prince-Elect Christian of Denmark and Magdalena Sybille of Saxony.

- 1638. *Perseus* in Stockholm. The pupils of the German school there performed the drama in the mayor’s house in February, and again in April at the castle for Maria Eleonora, the daughter of elector Johann Sigismund of Brandenburg and consort of Gustavus Adolphus (d. 1632 at Lützen).¹⁶⁴ This performance, which the queen received ‘summa cum laude et applausu’, provides evidence of the openness at court to Rist’s theatre. This should

not surprise, given the favour the English strolling players had found at the German courts – and indeed the courtly basis and patronage from princely houses that had enabled them to come to Germany in the first place. Relying on the assumption that the drama as performed in Stockholm was a faithful realisation of the drama as recorded in the only surviving edition of it, this performance can be viewed as a combination of *Wanderbühne* techniques and motifs with the ends of school drama in the context of rhetorical education, performed as courtly entertainment. This claim, far from asserting *Perseus* as a visionary work, demonstrates it as an adept composition, embedded in concrete theatrical contexts which are interrelated.

- **1647. Das Friedewünschende Teutschland**, Hamburg, by Gartner’s troupe. Composed for this performance. The subsequent addition of songs in the 1649 edition indicates a slight reworking of the drama for a performance not by Gartner’s troupe.\(^{165}\)

- **1652. Das Friedejauchtzende Teutschland**, Lüneburg Johanneum. Huck has suggested that the comparatively high number of songs, relative to the original *Friedewünschendes Teutschland*, indicates that Rist reworked the drama for school performance in Lüneburg after Gartner failed to return with his troupe to Hamburg.\(^{166}\)


\(^{166}\) Huck, p. 602.
VI – Rist's dramas as a response to theatrical traditions and performance contexts.

Evidence from the texts of the dramas themselves clearly demonstrates their performance contexts and highlights the various theatrical traditions upon which Rist drew. The use of prose throughout, apart from in the song texts in the *Teutschland* dramas, is a feature that gives an immediate indication of what performances were like. The issues surrounding the use of prose as a compositional concern will be explored in more detail in Chapter Four below, with the examination of Rist’s explicit reasons for writing dramas in prose rather than verse. The performance of the dramas in prose, however, enables them to be located in the complex of performance traditions and conditions that make up Rist's theatrical context.

The use of prose in German-language drama of the 17th century demonstrates the influence of the English strolling players. Since the beginning of modern scholarship on Rist, such as it is, his use of prose has been seen as one of the indications of his debts to the English tradition.\(^{167}\) Among the pragmatic implications of the use of prose is its suitability for outdoor performance. Where the performance venue had sub-optimal acoustic conditions – for example, outside, with a large and raucous audience, perhaps where 'eine solche Anzahl der Zuseher sich befunden / daß einer den anderen schier erdrucket hätte' (*FWT*, 16) – a prose text meant that if some of what was said was lost in the general noise, the action onstage could still be followed. In this respect, prose has a clear advantage over verse, where the loss of even a

---

\(^{167}\) See for example an early article by Eberhard Mannack, ‘Johann Rists “Perseus” und das Drama des Barock’, *Daphnis*, 1 (1972), 141–49 (p. 147).
couple of lines has the potential to alter or even obscure the sense of the speech or action onstage. Key compositional characteristics of such prose are the length and repetitiveness of the speeches. In *Irenaromachia*, for example, the speeches made in the council of the gods in Acts I and III on the whole run to several octavo pages in length. The content of each of these monologues could be expressed in a few lines, but in making the fundamental point at length and several times over, the speeches allow the actors to respond to the performance conditions. They have the option of shortening or altering what they say without affecting the content, or indeed, in a noisy performance venue, making a single point at length or repeatedly is a pragmatic technique that stands to aid the audience in following the plot.

Exchanges of lengthy monologues characterise the court scenes, particularly in the early dramas at the council of the gods in *Irenaromachia* and at Philippus’ court in *Perseus*. The *Teutschland* dramas also contain scenes with longer monologues, although these scenes are interspersed with shorter exchanges that show a development in theatrical style and compositional technique, to be discussed in more detail in Chapter Four below. In general, however, these court-type scenes, as a succession of interacting monologues each describing at length a straightforward point or affective state, contrast with the shorter exchanges and punchier dialogues of the comic scenes. The comic scenes communicate and entertain visually as well as verbally, through the movement and physical interaction of the actors onstage. This contrast in communicative strategy between stage and audience may reflect the contrasting communicative practices in the courtly and peasant milieus – or at least may indicate the perception or assumption of such a contrast.
The standards set by generic convention also function to govern what is portrayed onstage, and the manner of its portrayal. The lengthy monologues of the main dramas are clearly capable of serving the ends of rhetorical education, as Rist argues in the preface to *Perseus*, 'so wird [...] die Gedenknisse mercklich dadurch verbessert' and 'so wird auch mancher dadurch sehr expedit vnd fertig im Reden.' (*Perseus*, 122) The comic scenes draw motifs and figures from the *Fastnachtsspiel* tradition as well as the theatre of the English strolling players, where physical farce and slapstick comedy both entertain as well as provide a medium for overcoming language barriers between performers and audience. The portrayal of peasants as communicating through shorter verbal exchanges as well as through their physicality, both amongst themselves and to the audience, reflects the perception of them as existing in a realm apart from the court. Generic and performance conventions mingle with social commentary, as the communicative strategies and performance techniques of the peasant figures contribute towards their social identification.

This point extends beyond theatre semiotics to the historical study of folk culture. Unmediated access to documentation of peasant culture is far harder to come by than evidence about the social elites and the literate classes. Some exceptional documents, such as the chronicle of Hartich Sierk (1588-1664), are evidence both of literary skills and documentary intent in certain sectors of peasant community, and as such constitute a rare instance of a surviving document in which peasant life is represented by a member of the peasant community.168 Yet memorable contemporary presentations of peasant

---

culture come from literary or dramatic works – Grimmelshausen’s
*Simplicissimus*, for example, or precisely Rist’s *Zwischenspiele*. The relative
inarticulacy of these peasant figures, in comparison to figures drawn from
courtly or learned circles, has been seen as evidence that communication
amongst peasants in fact relied more on physical than verbal interaction, with
recourse taken to spoken exchanges only in exceptional circumstances.169 Among the
educated classes, literate forms of articulation and the values of sociability meant that
there was a text-centred culture of reading, discussion, and reflection,170 and the
exclusion of the peasant classes from this culture is more than a linguistic matter.

This consideration has implications for the performance of Rist’s dramas as it
marks the intersection between the theatrical elements that the works have inherited
from the traditions in which they are written and Rist’s brief but explicit reflections
on what would later be called the sociology of the theatre. Acknowledging the
deviation of his theatrical practice from generic expectation, Rist justifies his
inclusion of farcical scenes and coarse humour through appeal to the social
constitution of his audience. In the preface to *Perseus* he explains

daß ich mit gegenwertigen Intersceniis dem gemeinen Manne (als der mit
solchen vnd dergleichen possirlichen Auffzügen am allermeisten sich
belustiget) vornemlich habe gratificiren vnd dienen […] wollen. (*Perseus*,
125-6)

---

Rist repeats this justification in the *Belustigung*, introducing some non-specific reflections on, it seems, actual performances of his dramas to validate this compositional principle.

Als ich meine erste Tragödien spielele / ward zwahr dieselbe von Verständigen und dieser Kunst erfahrenen Leüten nicht weinig gelobet /

This detailed explanation is crucial for understanding the relationship between Rist, his dramas, and their audiences. The reliance on Pickelhering scenes as a means of achieving a broad favourable response from a large and diverse audience reflects the practices of the English itinerant stage and the specific conditions of their reception in Germany. Pickelhering/Jean Potage/Hans Suppe was a popular figure or figure type whose inclusion in a production was seen as a major draw for audiences from all social backgrounds. Pickelhering’s prominence on the title page of the 1630 *Engelische Comedien und Tragedien* indicates that his theatrical success carried over from the stage to the page: what was attractive onstage was also attractive in print. His popularity on stage was so great that he could be transported intermedially and employed, for
example, in broadsheets as part of a strategy to attract more buyers that mirrored his theatrical ability to draw large audiences. In these political broadsheets, Pickelhering features as the main figure onstage, directly addressing the audience and interpreting contemporary political events for them. Here, he is presented in his theatrical milieu, the figurative ‘political stage’ being reinterpreted as recognisably, physically theatrical. In the second broadsheets, Pickelhering has left the life of an actor behind in order to seek his fortune as an itinerant trader instead. This may be a reference to the curriculum vitae of Heinrich Julius’ clown Thomas Sackville, who ended his days as a cloth merchant in the Duke’s service in Wolfenbüttel, and yet is a perversion of the respectability Sackville achieved through this career move. These Pickelherings are unscrupulous and mercenary, driven by their desire for financial gain, which they can achieve through exploiting their onstage popularity. In the second of the broadsheets this is accompanied by a marked anti-Jewish sentiment. The physical similarity between the two Pickelherings is an indication of the successful reception of the first broadsheet and the attempt by the second to capitalise on this and repeat its success. Pickelhering sells broadsheets, and, as Rist learned through the performance of his dramas, attracts bigger crowds and greater praise.\footnote{The relevant illustrations for this section have been included on pp. 45-7 of this document.}

That Pickelhering enhances a drama’s popularity only provides a partial explanation for Rist’s use of Zwischenspiele, farce, and lowly characters. While these elements were demonstrably popular with theatre audiences from all social strata, he explicitly associates them with the ‘common man’. In the case of
Perseus in particular, with its tragic plot, this has serious generic consequences, as it directly against the Ständeklausel. The full title of Perseus is:

Eine newe Tragœdia, welche in Beschreibunge theils warhaffter Geschichten / theils lustiger vnd anmuhtiger Gedichten / einen Sonnenklahren Welt- vnd Hoffspiegel jedermänniglichen præsentiret vnd vorstellet. (Perseus, 117)

Perseus breaks the restrictions set by poetologically correct tragedy by presenting a Welt- as well as a Hoffspiegel, while through the designation jedermännlich Rist broadens the scope of the drama’s primary intended audience. Thus, the common man is included in both the content and intent of Rist’s tragedy, featuring among those the drama portrays and those it addresses. The reflection in the Belustigung confirms the importance of linking what a drama contains to its intended group of addressees and the effect it is intended to have on them. The Welt beyond the courtly milieu or educated elite responds favourably to Jean Potage, and Rist, observing this, altered his compositional practice accordingly.

VII – Who is the common man, and why does he matter?

There remain two issues to be cleared up. The first concerns the identity of the ‘common man’: who is he? Does he correspond to any real-world social group? What is his discursive relevance in Rist’s thought? The second issue is ethical: why should it be important for Rist to please the common man? Why should concern for his preferences inform Rist’s compositional practice? The answers to these questions, to the extent that they are ascertainable, will inform each
other, and will shed further light on Rist’s ideas about entertainment and enjoyability.

Rist’s ‘common man’ terminus seems to designate a cohesive, clearly delineated group. In conception, this differs fundamentally from the prevailing intellectual view of the people who can be properly described as ‘common’. This view, which asserts that the group ‘common people’ is varied and diverse, is at root a Pythagorean principle with an Aristotelian gloss. In the *Nicomachean Ethics* (II, 6), Aristotle explains that

one can miss the mark in many ways (since the bad belongs to the unlimited, as the Pythagoreans portrayed it, and the good to the limited), but one can get things right in only one.¹⁷²

For Aristotle, this is part of his explanation of the Doctrine of the Mean, in which excellence is one and deficiency many. Sebastian Franck’s *Chronica* (1531) unites the intellectual tradition of Ancient Greece with Christian thought, referencing writings pseudonymously attributed to Pythagoras and Cato (in this case the *Disticha Catonis*). Cato, Franck explains, admonishes

mit Christo vnd Pythagora / wer recht wöll thun oder gehen / der sol diß / das die Welt hoch acht / für nicht halten / vnd was sie für schnöd hinwirfft / diß als Helythumb auffheben. Quod uile est charum, quod charum uile putato, &c.¹⁷³ Diß ist eben der Spruch / den Christus Luce am sechzehenden anzeucht: Was vor der Welt hoch und groß ist / das ist ein greuwel vor Gott.¹⁷⁴ Pythagoras: Gehe nit in die gemein wolbekannt

---


¹⁷³ Disticha Catonis (I, 29). Full quotation: ‘Quod vile est, carum, quod carum, vile putato;_ Sic tibi nec cupidus nec avarus nosceris ulli.’

¹⁷⁴ Lk 16:15
Straß / halt es nicht mit dem Hauffen / sondern biß gesinnet als wenig.

Damit stimpt Christus Matth. am sibenden.\textsuperscript{175} Weit ist der Weg der zur
verdammnis leyt / vnd vil wandeln den / eng aber der zum Leben fürt /
vnd wenig tretten jn an.\textsuperscript{176}

There is a strong basis, founded in the authoritative teachings of ancient figures,
for deliberately distancing oneself from the common people and their
preferences, which in the Christian context acquires marked soteriological
overtones. What purpose does Rist’s inclusive gesture serve?

Straightforward appeal to influence from the practices of the English
itinerant stage will not redeem Rist here. Hamlet himself is wary of attaching
any significance to the good opinion of the masses, precisely in the context of
theatrical performance. He speaks of a drama which ‘pleased not the million;
‘twas caviare to the general: but it was – as I received it, and others, whose
judgements in such matters cried in the top of mine – an excellent play.’\textsuperscript{177} To
Hamlet, as indeed to the actor to whom he addresses this remark, there are at
least some elements of drama and theatrical performance which the common
man simply cannot hope to appreciate.

This is not, I venture, a position that Rist would directly contest. In the
\textit{Belustigung}, he draws on Harsdörffer in highlighting the wide range of skills
required by someone who would compose and stage a drama:

\begin{quote}
Ein solcher Poete nun / […] muß die Baukunst / die Perspectiv oder
Sehe-Kunst / die Mahlerey / die Musik / den Dantz / auch sonst noch
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{175} Mt 7; 13-14
\textsuperscript{176} Sebastian Franck, \textit{Chronica: Zeytbuch vnd Geschichtbibel von anbegin bis in diß gegenwertig
1565 jar verlengt(etc.)}, 1565. CXXVIII.
\textsuperscript{177} William Shakespeare, ‘Hamlet, Prince of Denmark’, in \textit{The Complete Works of William
viele andere Dinge mehr verstehen / auch endlich aller Personen
Geberden zierlich nachzuahmen wissen / woraus erhellet / das
gewißlich zu der Poeterey gahr ein grosses gehöret / [...] und dieses
bezeugt klärlich / daß die Poeterey kein Handel für den gemeinen
Mann / die weil sie seinen Vestand weit weit übertrifft / und er davon zu
urtbeilen pflegt / wie der Blinde von der Farbe. Einem Zahnbrecher /
einem Taschenspieler / einen Gauker / einem Pritschenmeister und
Spruchsächer kan der gemeine Mann wol verstehen und mit Belieben
anhöhren / aber ein recht Poetisches Gedicht / gehöret nicht für den
einfältigen Pöbel / sondern für geleharte und mehrverständige Leute.

(Belustigung, 309)

Strong words, and a position which owes nothing to the insistence on a
distinction between poetry and dramaturgy. In the commentary to Der Adeliche
Hausvater (1650), his translation of Tasso’s Il padre di famiglia, Rist expresses
serious doubts about the intellectual and critical capacity of the common man.
Describing a performance by an ‘Elephanten Weibliches Geschlechtes’, perhaps
the famous Hansken (1630-1655), Rist expresses disdain for the credulity of the
common man in response to the elephant’s tricks,

[wo]rüber sich der gemeine Mann dergestalt verwundert / daß man
auch vielmal hörete sagen: Eß were dieses Theire viel vernünftiger als
Ein Mensch und was dergleichen unbesonnen Urtheil mehr waren. AH

315-6

Are these the people Rist is seeking to attract to performances of his dramas
through the inclusion of Low German peasant scenes? By definition, these
people lack the relevant intellectual, cognitive, and critical abilities that would allow them to take appropriate pleasure in the appropriate objects. Does this then force Rist to make an unfavourable assessment of his own dramas? This could certainly account for his apparent reservations about the quality of *Perseus*. Yet it still leaves the most important question, the *why* of it all, unaddressed. Why compose admittedly substandard dramas in order to attract the acclaim of people who are incapable of passing appropriate judgement on them?

The most compelling solution to this puzzle is also the simplest. Rist is neither deliberately composing defective dramas, nor is he doing so with the aim of gratifying people he despises. This also removes, or at least tempers, any suggestion that the lowly figures in the *Zwischen spiele*, or the audience members for whose benefit they are included, are straightforward objects of ridicule. If the common man is the butt of the joke, it is hard to see why he should find it particularly funny.

The *Perseus* preface provides key details about Rist’s understanding of the common man, his needs, and his relationship to theatre. In contrast to the discursive tradition in which the common man features as a trope, a negative foil to the man of virtue and intelligence, in respect of his dramas Rist acknowledges the common man’s claim to be represented and addressed in theatre. The somewhat mercenary motives of itinerant theatre troupes, for whom broad appeal was reflected in the financial returns from a production, carry less weight here. Similarly, the fact that the comic interludes are explicitly identified as being for the benefit of the ‘common man’ does not preclude the
possibility that they might also be enjoyed by others – perhaps even by those who know their *Poeterey* verbatim. The popularity of the English players at court, indeed the fundamental role played by the structures of noble patronage in enabling English theatre to gain a foothold on the continent, demonstrates that the social elites were not above the apparently lowbrow entertainment they provided. More compellingly, the discussion in the *Belustigung* showed members of the educated bourgeoisie, representatives of the cultural elite, taking obvious delight in farce and slapstick. In this sense, Rist’s insistence that the interludes are for the benefit of the common man is somewhat disingenuous, relying on the common man’s status as an object of disparagement both in social reality and as a discursive trope.

The *Perseus* preface relies heavily on Opitz’s preface to his *Trojanerinnen* translation. Following Opitz, Rist draws on Epictetus’ definition of tragedy as ‘ein Spiegel grosser vnd gewaltiger Leute / die in allem jrem thun vnd lassen auff das blosse Glück fuessen vnd bawen.’ (*Perseus*, 121) Yet while Opitz uses this image as the basis of a Baroque *kathartic* theory, whereby tragedy brings about recognition of the *vanitas* of the world and encourages *Beständigkeit* in the audience members, Rist proceeds to the intended effect common to both tragedy and comedy: the arousal of ‘Lust und Ergetzlichkeit’ in the audience. These emotions are evoked when a drama is ‘recht vnd wol agiret’, that is, they provide an indication of the drama’s success, and are further seen as fulfilling a fundamental human need: ‘Vnmüglich ists / daß [...] der Mensch ohne Ruhe vnd Ergetzung leben könne.’ Here we have the basis for the claim in *Perseus*’ extended title that it is a tragedy for everyone: Rist understands the function of all drama, the arousal of ‘Lust und Ergetzlichkeit’, as relevant to all human beings. The common man, just as much as the king or indeed the educated
patron, can be exhausted by his work and require the refreshment afforded by drama through the use of music, the portrayal of a range of characters (including comic figures), and variety in costume, speech and behaviour.

The ‘Lust und Ergetzlichkeit’, although themselves emotions that are of general use in human nature, have primacy over the more specific uses that drama otherwise has. Specific, since they do not necessarily apply to everyone – Rist divides his discussion of the uses of drama into those pertaining to the actors, of which he identifies five, and those pertaining to the audience, of which he identifies only two, although it should be remembered that the ‘Lust und Ergetzlichkeit’ are evoked in the audience. The primacy of the pleasing over the useful further becomes apparent when one contrasts the detail with which Rist explains not only the effects of the pleasing aspect but also how this is to be achieved with the rather summary manner in which he lists the uses that drama offers.\(^{178}\)

Rist identifies the second use of drama for the audience as the fact that it encourages them ‘die Laster so viel ihnen immer möglicher zu meiden / die Tugend aber hochlich zubelieben / vnd anzunehmen,’ (Perseus, 123) which recalls Opitz on satire: ‘die harte verweisung der laster vnd anmahnung zue der tugend.’\(^{179}\) Thus, Rist attributes to drama in general a function conventionally associated with satire. He later denies the inappropriateness of the comic elements in a purported tragedy with the claim that all comedy should be satire, thereby claiming a redeeming element of truth for the comedy he includes.

The first use that drama, as defined in the Perseus preface, has in respect of its audience explicitly concerns its impact on the common man, who

\(^{178}\) Volker Meid, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart: Die deutsche Literatur im Zeitalter des Barock (Beck, 2009), V, p. 375.

kan dadurch [...] zu einer feinen wissenschaafft allerhandt denckwürdiger
vnd nützlicher Historien gelangen / welche wann sie also öffentlich in
den Schawspielen vorgebracht warden / desto leichter von jnen
eingenommen / verstanden vnd behalten werden. (Perseus, 123)

This is a balanced assessment of the common man’s cognitive capacity and the
manner in which, in light of this, he might be expected to engage with theatrical
performance. Just as in fact the common man is not the only person to be
entertained by the comic interludes, so it is also not the case that other elements
of the drama are properly inaccessible to him.

In order to further clarify the question of how the common man and the
Zwischenspiele interrelate, it is helpful to explore the extent to which the
‘common man’ and the lowly peasant figures might identify with each other.
Obviously, any identification could not be absolute: the peasant figures and the
plots in which they feature have a demonstrable heritage in the theatrical
contexts of Northern school drama, Low German farce, English theatre and
Fastnachtsspiele. Yet Rist imbues these two-dimensional figures with a degree of
subtlety and psychological nuance, and thus allows them to take on a
representative function for the common man. The common man is not the
outrageous comic stereotype, the object of coarse humour and the victim of
slapstick comedy. The elements of the interscena that go beyond the belly
laughs produced by expertly conceived farce demonstrate Rist’s ability to create
a theatrical reality that is a Welt- as well as a Hoffspiegel, accessible and relevant
to the common man.
The language of the peasant figures convincingly demonstrates Rist's commitment to them as having a relevance beyond the realm of crude and coarse humour. Rist’s dramas actively engage with the conditions of Low German usage, with the result that they are often much more than a cruel joke at the expense of the lowest social ranks, where Low German has the straightforward function of characterising peasants as uncouth. This sensitivity to the reality of the linguistic situation extends neither to a Laurembergian apology for written Low German culture, nor to an appeal against the dialectization of Low German. The role of High German as the language of culture and educated discourse is uncontested and even supported through the use of Low German in Rist’s dramas. Equally, however, the dramas acknowledge and comment upon the fact that ‘Low German’ was far from a homogeneous entity.

In the *Bawren-Auffzug in Irenaromachia*, a subjunctive situation of linguistic inversion arises when the peasants strip the High German-speaking quartermaster of both his literal power and its linguistic manifestation. The peasant Sivert seizes the quartermaster’s sword and turns it against him; the peasants strip the quartermaster down to his shirt and send him on his way. In an attempt to secure immunity from retaliation, Sivert has the quartermaster swear an oath never to return. This oath is composed by Sivert in Low German, but sworn by the quartermaster in High German:

SIVERT: So geue Godt /

QUARTIERMEISTER: So gebe Gott /

S: Vn möte Godt

QM: Vnd müsse Gott /
S: Vn wolle Godt /
QM: Vnd wolle Gott /
S: Dat ick nümmer komme /
QM: Daß ich nimmer komme … (Irenaromachia, 52)

The oath gives linguistic expression to the new social order the peasants have created. It is not enough that they have stripped the quartermaster of his clothes and weapons; through the oath they enact their victory and new authority by demonstrating the primacy of Low over High German. Of course, this new state of affairs does not and cannot last, as the actions of the peasants constitute not so much a social revolution as the unhorsing of an individual authority figure. The quartermaster breaks his promise and returns, in the second half, to have the peasants executed. Yet Low German is not completely irrelevant, it has not lost all its potency and expressive breadth. ultimately hopeless reaction against relentless, societally sanctioned oppression. The High German world order is restored, but the peasant perspective is not silenced. It is Low German voices who have the final say. Sivert is an object of genuine pity as he bemoans his fate, ‘O ick arme Kerl’, and his son is left alone onstage pleading pathetically, ‘O Gott / O Gott / lathet my doch mynen Vaer / ick hebbe yo men den einen Vaer.’ (Irenaromachia, 98)

Regarding language use in Perseus, it is worth returning to the full passage in the preface in which Rist justifies his inclusion of the Zwischenspiele. He explains:

daß ich mit gegenwertigen Intersceniis dem gemeinem Manne (als der mit solchen vnd dergleichen possirlichen Auffzügen am allermeisten sich belustiget) vornemlich habe gratificiren vnd dienen / mit nichten aber dieses
This sentence is at best unclear, at worst misleading. It makes two distinct points. First, that the Zwischenspiele were included to accommodate the tastes of the ‘common man’; second, that this was not intended to mock the culture of any specific region. The first point concerns the social status of a portion of Rist’s projected audience. The second speaks to the regionality of dialect. It would be illegitimate to simply combine these points into a claim about Rist’s intentions in respect of society’s lowest ranks, i.e. those for whom dialect-speaking was a matter of socioeconomic status. The point about regional culture in part constitutes a reaction against the practice in Low German drama of placing a non-native variant in the mouths of the peasants in order to heighten the impression of their uncouth nature.¹⁸⁰ In Perseus, premiered in Heide, Rist departs radically from this technique by having his peasants speak a dialect with a clear Holsteinian basis. This does not itself mean that his peasant figures are not coarse, only that their coarseness is not portrayed through their use of a foreign language variant. Rist’s linguistic technique in the Low German parts of Perseus is remarkably sophisticated, and the peasants, although they are again treated with a degree of sympathy, they are not beyond reproof for their conduct – particularly, it will be seen, as regards language. However, with this comment in the preface Rist is making his dedicatees aware that the comedy in his language use is not regionally-targeted, and does not rely on an encounter with non-native dialect for its effect.

In comparison to Irenaromachia, which strongly bore the marks of influence from the Middle Low German written tradition, the language of Perseus’ peasant

figures is more strongly dialectally and, apparently, sociolectally marked. This can be demonstrated against the treatment of the consonant \(-d\ (-t)\). Where this occurs intervocally, Rist’s peasants tend to leave it unpronounced and replace it with a semivocal \(-i\). For example (relevant instances highlighted in bold):

LABAN: Wat skollick? Deenen? Dat hebbick Gaie sy danck noch alitydt
nicht nöig / so lange alß myn Vaier unde Mőme leuen. (Perseus, 136)

This reflects a real-life phenomenon of rural speech. Writing in 1894, Bernhardt describes this as a feature of contemporary speech among rural populations, which he can backdate to the 17\(^{th}\) century through explicit appeal to the forms encountered in Rist’s works.\(^{181}\) This argument has a clear methodological flaw, as it treats data derived from a 17\(^{th}\)-century literary-dramatic object as meaningful in a sense comparable to 19\(^{th}\)-century empirical data. It is also question-begging to use Bernhardt’s argument to support the analysis of Rist’s peasant-speech, since Rist serves as a prop for Bernhardt’s argument. However, it is equally clear that Low German with pronounced \(-d\)’s was available, at least in written practice. A brief return to *Irenaromachia* shows Rusticus, composed in the written Middle Low German tradition, asking Irene ‘Wat bringestu godes?’ (*Irenaromachia*, 62) The form ‘god’ is also preferred by the peasants of the *Bawren Auffzug*, however in other contexts the intervocal \(-d\ (-t)\) is beginning to disappear from their speech. Thus ‘brüden’ becomes ‘brühen’; (*Irenaromachia*, 43, 46, 51, 53) ‘vöten’, ‘vöhen’ (*Irenaromachia*, 43). The suggestion that this \(-h\) form is non-standard is supported by the fact that Lowack, perhaps without explicitly intending to, corrects to ‘vöthen’

---

in his reproduction of the text.\textsuperscript{182} This indicates that there was a distinction to be made between pronounced and unpronounced \(-d\ (-t)\), even if this coincided with a distinction between written and spoken language (or, more accurately, written language and written language as a stylised representation of spoken language, to some extent bound by generic convention). Further, Lasch claims that the representation of unpronounced \(-d\ (-t)\) through \(-h\) indicates influence from High German,\textsuperscript{183} which, since this is not the practice of Rist’s later Low German writings, supports the characterisation of the Low German technique in \textit{Irenaromachia} as the product of an early stage in Rist’s development as a dramatist.

In light of the above, it is probable that the presence of unpronounced \(-d\ (-t)\) forms is intended to indicate a usage that is degenerate or sub-standard. Its location among the rural population is equally probable. Richey’s \textit{Idioticon Hamburgense} of 1755 notes

\begin{quote}
In etlichen Wörteren spricht der Bauer das \textit{d} gar nicht aus [...] Also : Vaer, Moer, Broer, Fohr, brüen etc., an stat Vader, Moder, Broder, Fohder (Fuder), brüden etc\textsuperscript{184}
\end{quote}

The anonymous drama, \textit{Tewesche Hochtydt}, the earliest surviving copy of which dates from 1640, features a peasant, Tewes, who must travel to a city clearly identifiable as Hamburg to obtain permission to marry. Upon his return to the village, he comments on precisely this difference in speech,

\begin{footnotes}
\end{footnotes}
Thus there are indications from three centuries of a Stadt-Land divide regarding the pronunciation of -d (-t). In practice, the speech of the rural population is the speech of the peasant classes, and so the pronunciation of -d (-t) is in this way a sociolectal marker. The language of Tewes demonstrates this, as he adopts a feature of a prestige variant in his own usage. Lasch supposes that the lower ranks of the city population were influenced by rural speech, but that for as long as some form of Low German remained the spoken language of the urban social elite there was also the potential of influence from above, the prestige of pronunciation of -d (-t) limiting the spread of the rural variant.

The use of this semivocal -i in place of -d (-t) specifically following an –n is a key indicator of Rist’s growing linguistic independence from the Zwischenspiel tradition. Older Zwischenspiele were heavily reliant on written Middle Low German, which was more conservative than its spoken variants and for a long time did not orthographically register the assimilation of -d to a preceding -n (or -l). This is noted by Richey:

Gehet mitten im Worte ein l oder n vor dem d her, so verwandelt sich das d in das vorhergehende, und wird dasselbe verdoppelt. Also sprechen wir [...] Hannen, wennen, finnen, [...] für Handen, wenden, finden.

---

187 Richey, p. 391.
The Low German of *Perseus*, however, not only reflects this development, it also manifests the sociolectal coarsening of the new form, in which the -<i>d</i> becomes -<i>i</i>. Again, Richey notes

Unsere Bauren machen aus dem <i>d</i>, wenn es auf ein <i>n</i> folget, ein <i>j</i>, und sprechen für gebunden bunjen, Kinder Kinjer, gewunden wunjen...<sup>188</sup>

This is well-documented in Laban’s speech in his first appearance: *Lanie*, (*Perseus*, 133) faldtswunien, (*Perseus*, 134) *Huniesfott*, (*Perseus*, 136) even vanier from van der (*Perseus*, 133). Lasch notes a marked increase in these coarser forms from *Irenaromachia* to *Perseus*,<sup>189</sup> which not only indicates Rist’s development and growing confidence as a composer in Low German but also, relatedly, supports the case for Rist’s developed metalinguistic awareness. The coarseness of these forms identifies the speakers as belonging to the rural poor. Lasch supposes that Rist’s use of these coarse forms in the *Zwischenspiele* was a deliberate exaggeration of their real-life usage.<sup>190</sup> Thus, Rist recognises a characteristic of the language use of a certain social group, and magnifies this in order to clearly identify for his audience the social context of his figures.

The discussion of language use in the *Vorbericht* to *Das Friedejauchtzende Teutschland* prepares the way for its employment in the drama as a means of characterisation, and in this gives an indication of Rist’s perception of his dramatic technique in its relationship to the expectations and prejudices of his projected audience. Where the *Vorbericht* is largely concerned with deflecting the anticipated criticisms of Rist’s ‘Neider’ and ‘Tadler’, in the discussion of language use ‘der

---

<sup>188</sup> Richey, p. 391.
auffrichtige Teutsche Leser’ is explicitly addressed. This demonstrates Rist’s awareness that his technique here is unconventional, his intentions liable to be misconstrued. The reader is requested

daß er sich an der ungewöhnlichen Art zu reden / welche in unseren Zwischenspielen vielleicht befindlich / ja nicht ärgeren / noch ein ungleiches Urtheil von derselben wolle fällen. (FJT, 228)

This ‘ungewöhnliche Art zu reden’ is the Low German which is spoken by the peasant figures in this drama. In the first instance, the characterisation ‘ungewöhnlich’ enables identification of who is foreseen as a reader of the drama, namely those who are not accustomed to using or even encountering Low German speech. This was certainly the case among the educated upper circles in Lüneburg by the time of the premiere of Friedejauchzendes Teutschland by pupils at its Gymnasium in 1653.191 ‘Ungewöhnlich’ also betrays a nuanced metalinguistic stance, almost defensive in its neutrality. Spoken dialect is not primarily, straightforwardly ‘grob’, as Knapkäse in Perseus would have it, nor is it conceived of as deviant or substandard in relation to a posited linguistic norm. It is spoken by people outwith the group of the Vorbericht’s primary addressees, but the recognition of this fact does not itself carry any evaluative implications. On the contrary, it anticipates such a negative reaction to the Low German passages and rejects it as an inappropriate response. This demonstrates both that Rist was familiar with the metalinguistic preconceptions of his social peers, who would adopt an unreflectively dismissive stance towards the speaking of dialect, and that he had gone to some effort to counter this tendency in warning even ‘den auffrichtigen Teutschen Leser’ not to overreact to his use of spoken dialect.

191 Gabrielsson, p. 43.
The explicit intention to provide an accurate portrayal of the world as it is experienced provides the justification for the presence of dialect:


This point is particularly interesting as it provides details of the metalinguistic categories to which Rist had access and of which he availed himself. High German is available as ‘Hochteutsche Sprache’, and this in its sense of being the normative language of the social and cultural elite. The opposition manifested in the contrasting languages spoken in the drama is not drawn along regional lines, between Central, or Upper, and Low German. It is a contrast between initiates into educated High German society and uneducated peasants. However, while High German is of itself normative, and the mastery of it socially desirable, Low German does not thereby carry the complementary negative connotations that would render it inherently undesirable. Rist uses an exclusively topographical designation for the language spoken by his peasants, even though a designation such as Plattdeutsch, in an increasingly pejorative sense, was already available to him. Almost two decades following the publication of Perseus, and now a renowned member of the High German cultural elite, Rist retains an understanding of dialect as in itself primarily a marker of regional background.

Dialect use in the drama is in principle supported through the presence of characters representing real-world dialect speakers. It also represents a trade-off
between two oppositional expectations held by (posited) audience members/readers: on the one hand only to encounter language to which they are accustomed, on the other to be presented with a recognisably accurate representation of the world. A High German-speaking Low Saxon peasant is laughably implausible, owing to the social preconditions accompanying competent High German usage in Northern Germany. Note the change in perspective from *Irenaromachia*, where the innkeeper, Nickel, spoke High German in spite of belonging to the peasant community. In *Irenaromachia*, Low German had functioned to identify the three main peasant figures, and their family members, in the context of a social structure in which authority correlated with High German use. Since Nickel had not joined them in their crime, he belonged on the High German side of the binary. In *Friedejauchtzendes Teutschland*, on the other hand, the language use of the peasants is explicitly governed by the requirement that this meaningfully reflect real-life conditions, with nothing thereby implied about their moral character.

Chapter Five below will examine in more detail the implications of this linguistic strategy and metalinguistic discourse for the performance of peace in Rist’s dramas. Rist’s use of Low German, and the lengths to which he goes to justify this, are fundamental to his achievements as a dramatist and thus offer a valuable insight into his understanding of theatre, its capacities, and its role in society. In light of this, Chapter Four will examine how Rist actively sought to promote this theatrical conception through the composition of his dramas. He owes much to the various theatrical and performance traditions to which he was exposed throughout his life, and he drew on these in an intelligent and deliberate way in order to create captivating dramas that were effective in performance.
Illustrations
As the discussion of the *Belustigung* demonstrated, Rist possessed a keen understanding of the capacity of theatrical performance to move and entertain its audience, and was highly sensitive to the sorts of practical considerations that can determine the effects of performance. Contextualising Rist's dramatic production in respect of the various theatrical and performance traditions in which it is located provides a substantive and necessary basis for making sense of the surviving works. Investigating the performance of Rist's dramas also helps explain the survival of four dramas (*Irenaromachia, Perseus*, and the two *Teutschland* dramas) in particular when the names of a further 12 are known, and Rist claims to have composed more than 30. Exploring the various theatrical traditions in which Rist's dramas stood and locating them within this theatrical context can help account for many of their compositional features,
which might otherwise appear idiosyncratic or puzzling when viewed under the aspect of solely poetological analysis. There are also a few tantalising indications of how Rist viewed his own dramas in respect of actual performances of them and their location in their performance context, which provides further grist to the mill. What emerges is an understanding of Rist’s dramas that shows them to be very much products of their context. Rist is no innovator or poetic visionary, but he has seen how theatrical performances can work well and has purposefully incorporated successful techniques from these performances into his own production.

A key characteristic of Rist’s dramatic production is that it is a theatre of continuity with theatrical practices that had come before as opposed to differentiation from these, and does not seek to assert itself as an independent tradition. This continuity provides the initial justification for the attempt to approach his dramas through their theatrical context, and is confirmed by the results yielded. Bernhard Jahn has identified Rist’s continuity with the theatre of the 16th century, the strolling players, and the Jesuit stage, traditions which are not wholly discrete. Where the Opitzian poetic reform represented a watershed moment in the German literary tradition, conceived of historically and traditionally historiographically as marking a programmatic break from the poetic practices that had come before,192 Rist’s theatre affirms his reliance on previous practices. Perhaps it is the multifaceted and multimedial nature of theatrical performance that makes absolute innovation or a complete break
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192 Katrin Kohl has analysed the cognitive and thus historiographical utility of conceptualising watershed moments in literary history and highlighted the danger that this can lead to a streamlining and over-simplification of complex and nuanced historical events. See esp. the introduction, ‘Die Macht der Metapher im Diskurs um Sprache, Dichtung und Poetik’ in Poetologische Metaphern: Formen und Funktionen in der deutschen Literatur (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2007).
with the preceding tradition difficult to achieve. A wholly innovative drama
must be more than a new type of poetic work: this would require new
performance techniques as well, which requires asking the audience to engage
with the work differently from how they were expecting. This is the challenge
presented by experimental and avant-garde theatre of the 20th century and
beyond. Making passing comparative reference to the differences between
poetic and theatrical innovation illuminates Rist’s compositional methodology
and confirms his empirical approach. He incorporates performance techniques
that he knows from experience to be effective. He demonstrates his
considerable skill as a dramatist not in his innovation but in his successful
application and combination of tried and tested techniques such as the inclusion
of comic interscenia, clown figures, effective utilisation of front and rear stages
and the use of music in performance.

Rist’s debts to the English strolling players and their reception in
Germany, the practices of Protestant school drama, and the specific tradition of
Low German theatre demonstrate him to be a playwright of his context. The
theatrical influences on Rist’s dramas are much the same as those shaping the
theatrical situation in 17th-century Hamburg, with performances by troupes of
strolling players as well as grammar school boys performing pieces with Low
German interludes. Influences on Rist from further afield, including from the
dramas of Frischlin and potentially also the Jesuit stage, will be illuminated in
Chapter Five below in the discussion of the portrayal and performance of peace
in Rist’s dramas. The present concern is to sketch the theatrical conditions in
Hamburg and Northern Germany at the time when Rist was composing his
dramas in order to provide an overview of the sorts of theatre with which he
and his audiences were familiar. Rist's sensitivity to what was successful and popular with audiences informed his own practice. By locating Rist’s dramas in their theatrical context, it will be possible to make sense of the interdependent relationship between their composition as works and the social structure of the audiences they attracted, which informed how they functioned as performances. This will offer an explanation of the purpose Rist saw his Zwischenspiele as fulfilling, and what he meant when he referred to the gemeiner Mann.

A – Context

I – The Wanderbühne context, an historical overview

The basic details of the arrival of English strolling players on the continent in the late 16th century and their subsequent impact upon the practices of the German stage are well known, and can be ascertained independently of reference to evidence from Rist’s own writings. The first players arrived in the Netherlands in the company of the Earl of Leicester in 1585, after which some travelled on to the Danish royal court. The favourable reception with which the players were met on the continent enabled them to return in 1592, where they found employment at German courts such as the Wolfenbüttel court of Duke Heinrich Julius. The marriage of Anne of Denmark to James VI forged dynastic and cultural ties between Denmark and Scotland, and later England, leading to a rapid improvement in Anglo-Danish relations and providing conditions favourable to the spread of strolling players from the British Isles to the
Dynastic ties between the Danish royalty and the princely houses of North Germany provided the players with a framework for their transit and thus a means for the spread of English theatrical models to German court culture. The role of these dynastic ties in transcultural exchange can be observed in the career of the violinist and composer William Brade, who was employed for three spells at the Danish royal court and otherwise active at German courts with dynastic links to Denmark: Brandenburg, Schleswig-Holstein-Gottorp, Mecklenburg-Güstrow, and Magdeburg. The Anglo-Danish influence on cultural life in Germany is particularly evident in Hamburg, which was one of the most important centres in Germany for the publication of instrumental music in the first half of the 17th century. This tradition was maintained by new generations of German composers even after the deaths in 1628 and 1630 respectively of key English figures such as Thomas Simpson and Brade. Hamburg was, within Germany, uniquely oriented towards English trends. Where music published in Nuremberg, for example, was heavily weighted towards Italian vocal music, with no particular emphasis on English or Anglo-German styles, in Hamburg the preference for genres such as the pavane and galliard demonstrates a clear stylistic orientation towards England.

The English players quickly found favour at court and with civic authorities in Germany. Markus Paul’s study of theatrical conditions in 17th-century Nuremberg demonstrates that the growing practice of granting permits
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194 Spohr, How chances it they travel?, p. 56.


to English troupes corresponded to a growth in hostility from civic authorities towards lay or *Meistersinger* performances at the beginning of the century. In their first years on the continent, the theatre of the English players was a novelty for German audiences, who appreciated the spectacle of costume, setting, effects, and physicality as a contrast to the declamatory theatre performed by laymen and schoolboys. Yet the enthusiasm for the performances of the strolling players endured long after these ceased to be a novelty, as demonstrated not least in Rist’s praise for the professional theatre in the *Belustigung*, published almost a century after the arrival of the English players on the continent. The strolling players set the theatrical standard, and Rist, crucially, both appreciated the quality of their performances and saw their popularity with audiences. He also began to consider how these two might interrelate, and in looking to audience response as an indication of performance success attributed to the audience, even those members drawn from lowly social strata, a degree of relevant critical acumen. This point will become important below, when considering Rist’s concern to entertain the ‘common man.’

Rist’s insistence on the popular success of performances by English strolling players exists in a certain tension with the courtly and noble structures that facilitated the troupes’ arrival on the continent and supported the early reception of their techniques in the German cultural sphere. This may be a straightforward reflection of the development of English itinerant theatre and its place in German culture in the decades following the arrival of the first

---


198 Paul, p. 27.
troupes, as the second and third generation troupes were able to branch out from their role as court entertainers. In this sense, through emphasising the broad popularity of English techniques with audiences Rist is responding to the contemporary theatrical situation during his formative years and at the time he was writing his dramas. On the other hand, the noble favour enjoyed by the troupes was still available as an indication of prestige, and it is telling that Rist chooses to dwell on their mass rather than elite appeal. To Rist, the common man is a relevant member of the theatre audience, whose response or projected response to performance can have a decisive influence on dramatic composition. I will explore below the clues that might help identify the common man and his function in Rist’s thought.

Certain of the theatrical techniques employed by the strolling players that led to their popularity with German audiences were born of necessity. Non-verbal performance elements such as music, dance, physicality, costume and props enabled the performers and audiences to circumvent the language barriers that in the early years made them largely mutually unintelligible. In this, English theatre in its specific continental incarnation is shown to be particularly oriented towards and receptive to the entertainment needs of its audience. The clown role in the interscenia was among the first to be performed in German, which again contributed to the popularity of this figure.199 The strolling players were, for practical reasons, multi-talented. In order to keep troupe sizes to a minimum, actors were also acrobats, dancers, and musicians.200 The peripatetic character of Brade’s career, for example, closely resembles that of a troupe of

---

strolling players, and there is compelling evidence that he worked for a while in collaboration with a company under the direction of John Spencer. 201

II – School drama, and a methodological problem

Musicians were a key component of acting troupes. Music was an integral feature of Wanderbühne performances, and Hamburg benefitted from an active and nationally and internationally renowned musical scene which, as noted above, was characterised by a preference for English styles. It will be seen that by the time Rist was composing his early dramas the strong cultural presence of English musical styles had been integrated into the tradition of Protestant school drama as practised at Hamburg's institutes of secondary education: the Johanneum, which Rist had attended, and the Akademisches Gymnasium. Rist's career as a playwright, in his dramatic output as well as his theatrical conception, bears the character of a synthesis of these traditions. Rist's dramas emerge as skilful and deliberate compositions firmly rooted in the North German theatrical context, with a tradition of school drama and a popular preference for the theatre of the English players.

Where general remarks about theatre in 17th-century Germany can be drawn from other sources, for example in the information available about the practices of the English strolling players, Rist himself is the source of key primary data on theatrical conditions in Hamburg around 1630. It is largely necessary to turn to Rist's own writings for details of the theatrical impulses to which he had been exposed, which demonstrates the at times inestimable value of Rist's written reflections as rare sources of otherwise little-known

201 Spohr, *How chances it they travel?*, p. 54.
information about cultural life in 17th-century Hamburg. If Rist’s description of his theatrical context does not capture all facets of theatrical life in Hamburg and North Germany, it both delimits this broad field to what he considered relevant to his production, and shows him to be a self-aware playwright who situated his own work in in a defined context. Nevertheless, this introduces an ultimately unsurmountable methodological difficulty: the dearth of independently verifiable data on theatrical conditions in Hamburg mean that conclusions drawn from Rist’s own pronouncements on the matter retain a certain speculative and provisional character.

Rist’s lifelong association with Hamburg locates him in a theatrical context with close ties to educational institutions, and as such with drama produced in the context of rhetorical education. School drama was one of the forms in which rhetorical skill was practised and presented by pupils. In this, it integrated the pedagogical ends of the rhetoric lesson with the fulfilment of the ends of theatrical performance. Faced with competition from the Wanderbühne and the theatre of the Jesuit schools, Protestant school theatre was obliged to meet the expectations of their audience and increase the theatrical elements of their rhetorical presentations. In so doing, they began to incorporate costumes, props, curtains and music.\textsuperscript{202} The lack of a permanent theatrical institution in Hamburg until the founding of its opera in 1678 has been attributed to the popularity of the strolling players – in the first instance the English companies, then the Dutch troupes who came to Germany following the Thirty Years’ War – who were able to cater to the theatrical needs of Hamburg’s population.\textsuperscript{203} Yet it seems that what theatre Hamburg did have was located in, or at

\textsuperscript{203} Herbert Junkers, \textit{Niederländische Schauspieler und niederländisches Schauspiel im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert in Deutschland} (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1936), p. 70; Manfred Brauneck and
least associated with, its educational institutions. The Johanneum and the Akademisches Gymnasium had at least one stage between them, and in the Belustigung der Rüstige recalls having

wie ich noch ein Knabe war / meine Person vielmahls auff den Schauplätzen dargestellet / welches auch hernach / wie ich schon eine geraume Zeit auff Universitäten oder hohen Schuhlen gelebet / mehr denn einmahl geschehen.  

This reference is vague and as such does not conclusively support the claim that Rist performed in drama as a schoolboy at the Johanneum, yet it does render this possibility plausible. Both Irenaromachia and Perseus bear close formal resemblance to the contemporary school dramas of Northern Germany. By the end of the 16th century, with the increasing role of High German both as a literary language and as the language of education, the composition of Low German school dramas was in decline. Such works were now composed in High German or, after the example of Omichius’ 1577 Newe Comoedia, von Dionysii Syracusani, und Damonis und Pythiae Brüderschaft, included Low German Zwischenspiele within a High German main drama. The majority of Low German dramatic production in this period occurred in the context of school drama, composed by teachers to pedagogical ends. These High German pieces with Low German Zwischenspiele remained the dominant form of North German school drama for over half a century: Rist’s
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Friedejauchzendes Teutschland was first performed in 1652 by students at the Lüneburg Gymnasium.\textsuperscript{207}

The history of the performance and publication of Irenaromachia, such as this can be reconstructed, certainly supports the claim that, around 1630, there was a performance space available for use by Hamburg’s schoolboys. The drama was published in this year under the name of Ernst Stapel, Rist’s schoolfriend and later brother-in-law. There remains a degree of uncertainty over the details of the drama’s authorship, which will be explored in Chapter Four below. Stapel died in 1635, and in an explanatory note to his lament for him, which was later published in the Poetischer Lustgarte (1638), Rist describes Irenaromachia as a drama ‘welches […] wir im Jahr 1630 auff öffentlicher Bühne haben vorgestellet / warauf es auch kurz hernach durch den Druck jederman gemein ist gemachet worden.’\textsuperscript{208} A continuation of Adam Tratziger’s chronicle of Hamburg gives details of one, if not the first, performance of Irenaromachia. This occurred at some point between the Winter at the beginning of 1630 and the arrival of King Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden in Stralsund in June: ‘In Ostmanß Hause in S. Johansstrassen wahren schone Comedien agiret, insonderheit v. Friede un Krieg. Autores waren Ristius und Stapel.’ It has been suggested that the house was that of councilman Albert Ostmann, whose son would have been sixteen years old at the time and probably attended the Johanneum,\textsuperscript{209} which was at that time located in the same street.

It is, on the other hand, possible that Rist’s comment in the Lustgarte and the chronicle entry refer to distinct performances. For them to refer to the same

\textsuperscript{208} Rist, Johannis Ristii Holsati poetischer Lust-Garte, das ist, allerhand anmuhtige Gedichte auch warhaftige Geschichte…: Allen der teutschen poeteri vernünftigen Liebhaberen zu sonderbaren Gefallen hervor unnd an den Tag gegeben, (Hamburg: Rebenlein, 1638), Oi.
performance would require an identity between the ‘öffentliche Bühne’ and Ostmann’s house, an assumption which may be misplaced. It may be that the performance at Ostmann’s house served a different, or at least additional, purpose, from that of enabling schoolboys to perform drama – even if Ostmann’s own son had indeed been among the performers. Ostmann’s house may have functioned as a venue for a trial performance before the civic authorities, who would then legislate on whether it could be performed publicly. In this case, the performance ‘auf öffentlicher Bühne’ from the Lustgarte would be an indication that Irenaromachia found a favourable reception with the council members. The subsequent publication of Irenaromachia, through which the drama ‘jederman gemein ist gemachet worden’, indicates the development in parallel of school theatre with the sort of drama as was popularly available to a reading public. This suggests, at least in Rist’s specific Hamburgian context, a plural implementation of what is in the first order school theatre – dramas composed and performed in a pedagogical context acquired a life of their own in the popular realm as objects of entertainment. Such theatre served the ends of rhetorical education and fulfilled the theatrical needs of a theatre-going public. The subsequent publication of the drama, and Rist’s gloss on this in the Lustgarte, indicates its utility beyond the classroom.

An anecdote from the Belustigung provides further detail on how the theatre in Hamburg was organised around 1630, which suggests how school theatre might have interacted with and responded to influences from the English itinerant stage. In the performance described by der Rüstige, in which he performed the role of a ‘grausahmer Tyrann’ which had moved the female members of the audience to tears, the ‘Kapel-Meister’, responsible for the production’s music, was ‘de[r] berühmte[en] Engeländer Wilhelm Brade.’ (Belustigung, 318) Although many of the precise details
of Brade’s biography are uncertain, he is generally taken to have come to Hamburg around 1625/6, perhaps because the city offered security from the turbulence of the war. Brade died there in 1630, and while he is not known to have held any official position in the city in the intervening period, the reference in the Belustigung suggests that he spent some of his final years providing music for theatrical performances. Although a potential affinity to the English strolling players was suggested through the mobility which characterised Brade’s career and the exchange and overlap between travelling actors and travelling instrumentalists, Rist’s account in the Belustigung provides the first piece of compelling evidence that Brade worked in collaboration with the theatre. This collaboration, however, was precisely not with the theatre of the English strolling players but with a (semi-)permanent German stage.\textsuperscript{210} After Brade’s death, laments were composed by pupils at the Akademisches Gymnasium, providing further indication that he may have been involved with this institution during his final years in Hamburg.\textsuperscript{211}

III – Theatre in Hamburg, a provisional overview.

The 1630 Irenaromachia performance in ‘Ostmanß Hause’, the poems to Brade from the Gymnasium pupils, and the account from the Belustigung of Rist’s (or der Rüstige’s) involvement in a performance under Brade’s musical direction do not themselves combine to provide a comprehensive overview of the theatrical context in Hamburg around 1630, or even a full picture of how school theatre was conducted. However, taken together, these details plausibly suggest that there was a semi-permanent stage in Hamburg around 1630, in association with its grammar schools, for which Brade provided musical direction and with which Rist, and probably also

\textsuperscript{210} Spohr, How chances it they travel?, p. 84.
Stapel, were involved as both writers and actors. In the anecdote in the *Belustigung*, Rist also names Brade’s ‘Gehülffe’, David Cramer, who was ein gelehrter Studiosus und stattlicher Musicus dabey / wie das die schönen Stükke / welche er zu den Komödien und Tragödien selbiger Zeit gesetzt / nunmehr aber in offnen Drukke sind zu finden / genugsam bezeugen. (*Belustigung*, 318)

This collection of musical accompaniments for comedies and tragedies has been identified as a 1631 Hamburg publication, *Allerhand musicalische Stücke von Pavanen, Courante, Intraden, Balletten ... auff drey Discant Violinen und ein Violdagamba.* Cramer’s collection has since been lost, but the *Erster Theil newer Paduanen* (1633/1640) by Johann Schop survives. Rist’s relationship with the violinist Schop was one of his most fruitful musical collaborations, with Schop providing music for Rist’s *Himlische Lieder* (1641/1642) as well as for *Des Daphnis aus Cimbrien Galatheen* (1642) and contributing to the *Alltägliche Hausmusik* (1654). Schop was another of Brade’s pupils, and his collection of pavanes is an important document of the engagement of the second, German generation with the English musical tradition and repertoire.

English music, as transmitted particularly by Brade and his pupils, was a key influence on the development of musical trends in Hamburg. Rist encountered Brade and his music in the specific context of theatrical performance, indicating if not fully demonstrating that the close relationship between music and drama, maintained by the English strolling players as an effective performance technique, was continued and developed in the context of
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the static or semi-permanent stage in Hamburg, which likely existed in association with the city's schools. In his study of the work and reception of English musicians on the continent, Arne Spohr points to der Rüstige's recollection in the *Belustigung* of Brade's work for theatrical performance some 36 years after Brade's death as evidence of the fame and esteem Brade enjoyed as a musician during his lifetime, and the influence he continued to exert after his death. Indeed, in a world where instrumentalists were still regarded with a degree of disapprobation, the social advancement that Brade experienced throughout his career was unprecedented, preparing the way for future generations of musicians such as Schop himself.\(^{214}\) However, the anecdote about Brade’s music in the *Belustigung*, published in 1666, can also be read in another way: as providing clues about what Rist saw as important and effective in theatrical performance. That for this he turns to a performance that took place over three decades previously, as opposed to referring to some more recent and as such potentially more up-to-date production, shows the extent to which theatre in Hamburg was determined by English itinerant practice as well as the English influence on Rist’s own views on excellence in performance and indeed on his own practice. Just as the young Rist was beginning to compose his own dramas, and have them performed and published, he had the good fortune to be able to work with one of the most talented and influential musicians of his age. As the anecdote in the *Belustigung* shows, the impression left upon him by Brade’s musical skill and its effects in the economy of performance remained with him for the rest of his life.

\(^{214}\) See Spohr, pp. 86–9.
In 1630, the year of Brade’s death and the performance and publication of *Irenaromachia*, Rist was 23 years old. He had long since left school and had spent the intervening years studying at the universities of Rostock and then Rinteln. Yet it is clear that he maintained his connection to Hamburg school theatre in this time. In his dedication of his 1651 collection of religious song, *Sabbatstische Seelenlust / Daß ist: Lehr- Trost- Vermahnung- und Warnungsreiche Lieder über alle Sontägliche Evangelien deß gantzen Jahres*, to the civic authorities in Hamburg ‘benebenst der gantzen hochlöblichen Bürgerschafft / der trefflichen und weit-berühmten Statt’, Rist refers to the specific opportunities Hamburg had afforded him to participate in theatre. He recalls how,


(*Sabbatstische Seelenlust*, 9)

In Rist’s view, the city of Hamburg played an important role in supporting his theatrical pursuits by enabling him to stage productions of his own dramas. Interestingly, that Rist should draw attention to his activities as a playwright and the receptivity of Hamburg’s civic authorities and populace to his dramas in the *Sabbatstische Seelenlust* of all works, a collection of devotional songs
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organised according to the set Gospel reading for each Sunday of the year, indicates that he was not troubled by the potential for his dramas or his enthusiasm for the theatre in general to impact negatively upon his responsibilities as a pastor or indeed his work composing devotional songs.

Excursus: The pastor and his dramas.

The diverse areas in which Rist operated – pastoral, theological, linguistic, literary, theatrical, alchemical – could not in practice be straightforwardly reconciled to each other. This is as much a matter of the prejudices and preoccupations of those who responded to Rist and his works as it is of any essential incommensurability amongst his various realms of activity. While in the Sabbahtische Seelenlust Rist can base his affection for the city of Hamburg in part on its support of his theatrical pursuits, without thereby undermining the devotional use for which the collection was intended, only two years later, in the preface to Das Friedejauchtzende Teutschland, he writes of the biting criticism and personal attacks he has endured from some of his fellow clergymen. In the religious work, theatrical activity is presented as a worthwhile pursuit and one which civic authorities do well to support. In a published drama, this argument would emphatically function as a self-legitimising strategy, yet here Rist’s argumentative tack is different. He highlights the criticism directed towards him by other clerics as an instance of the sinfulness encountered in this group. This is one of the key points made by Das Friedejauchtzende Teutschland, where vice in all sections of the German population is seen as a key impediment to peace. As such, however, Rist’s account of the criticism from clerics gives no details of what, exactly, they are criticising. His aim is rather to establish that their attacks
are unjustified and indicative of their sinfulness: ‘Meine grösste und hefftigste Verfolgung habe ich gantz unverschuldeter Weise von den Geistlichen müssen erleiden.’ These clerics, he writes, are consumed with jealousy,

\[
\text{wenn sie sehen / daß andere von dem grundgütigen Gott mit einem Pfündlein auß lauter Gnaden sind begabt / welches sie billich zu des Allerhöchsten Ehren / Erbauung seiner Kirchen / Aufmunterung vieler Christlichen Hertzen / und ihnen selbst zu erwebung eines rühmlichen Namens anlangen. (FJT, 223)}
\]

Rist attests to the fact that his position as pastor has exposed him to criticism, but denies the legitimacy of this criticism with the claim that it is born of vice. For as long as this is the case, he need not address the conflict, perceived or otherwise, between ecclesiastical or pastoral and other pursuits. If his dramas, or indeed his secular verse, can further the ‘Aufmunterung vieler Christlichen Hertzen’, even if he achieves personal fame through them, they serve appropriate ends commensurate with his responsibilities as a clergyman.

In the *Katechismus Andachten* of 1656, Rist directly addresses the difficulties he encountered as a result of writing both dramas and religious works. He has been subjected to criticism

\[
\text{Dieweil ich in der jugend bisweilen weltliche Lieder geschrieben / nachgehendes auch unterschiedliche Schauspiele / Komedien und Tragedien oder Freüd- und Traurspiele herfür gegeben / ja so gahr}
\]
Balletten und Aufzüge verfertiget / so könten Meine Geistliche Sachen so hoch nicht geschätzt werden.\textsuperscript{216}

The reference to his dramas being products of his youth is somewhat misleading – it had only been three years since the performance and publication of both \textit{Das Friedejauchzende Teutschland} and the ballet \textit{Triumphirende Liebe}. Yet if this might be viewed as an attempt to put some rhetorical distance between himself writing as the composer of the \textit{Katechismus Andachten} and the person who composed the dramas, Rist is wholly unrepentant about the moral import of his dramas. Of these he writes

so kan ich Eüch Neidern und Misgönnern gleichwol nicht bergen / das derselben Inhalt ja viel wichtiger / ja viel weiter aussehend ist / als das Sie von Eürem dummen Verstande recht könten begriffen oder geurtheilet werden.

Nur dises müget Ihr inmittelst wissen / das solche Spiele vielmehr Geistlich als Weltlich sind. \textit{(KA, 24)}

Rist sees to the core of these criticisms of his dramatic writings. They are not in fact born of moral concern about a pastor and composer of religious texts also being involved in the production of dramas and ‘secular’ literature, but are a reaction by those who object to his portrayal of the world and its sinfulness in these works: ‘dieweil ich die Wahrheit alzu nacktend aufgeführt / [Rist has] schier ungläublichen Haß und Ungunst dadurch [...] verdienet.’ \textit{(KA, 24)}

Rist’s lengthy prefaces give exhaustive accounts of these disputes he viewed them, but the positions of his critics or a third party are harder to come by. Yet the possibility that Rist might here be tilting at windmills, or misrepresenting the reality of an actual dispute, is less significant for our present purposes than the means he finds to head off any conflict between the ecclesiastical and the theatrical.

B – Performance

IV – Reconstructing Rist’s dramatic oeuvre, and its performance history.

By giving methodological primacy to the performance of Rist’s dramas, rather than to their existence as published texts which have subsequently formed the basis of the modern critical edition, it is possible to incorporate in a constructive manner a significant portion of his writings which is otherwise largely ignored: the lost dramas. Investigating clues about these works and exploring the reasons for their loss, to the extent that any of this can be reconstructed, sheds light on how Rist viewed the interrelationship between text, both as manuscript and in its eventual published form, and performance. This will help us answer the question of how to conceive of the relationship between the text, to which we still have unmediated access, and the performance to which we do not.

Beyond the four dramas that have survived and are included in Mannack’s edition of Rist’s works, as well as the printer drama Depositio Cornuti Typographici (1655) and the courtly ballet Die Triumphirende Liebe (1653), Rist
claims to have composed over thirty dramas. Of the c.26 that are now lost, at least one was in fact published, at least one was performed but apparently never published, and of the rest there is no indication that they were even performed. The oldest of the lost dramas seems to have been a *Herodes*, which was published. The dedicatory preface to *Perseus* lists a further 3 dramas, *Polymachia*, *Irenochorus* and a *Guiscardus*, this last drawing, presumably, on the *Decameron* (IV, 1) (*Perseus*, 124). The *Poetischer Lustgarte* (1638) names a *Berosiana* and a *Begomina*. It also names two ‘Tragædien’ dealing with the lives of two important and recently deceased figures who had wielded enormous influence over contemporary military and diplomatic affairs: Gustavus Adolphus and Wallenstein. Most of these dramas were never performed. The preface to the second volume of the *Neues Musikalisches Seelenparadies* (1662) claims that *Berosiana, Begomina, and Irenochorus*, along with a drama *Augustus Euricus*, about a Visigoth king, were lost in the ‘erster Schwedischer Krieg’ of 1644, that is the Torstenson War between Sweden and Denmark-Norway. These events are referenced again in the ‘Nohtwendiger Vorbericht an den Teutschgesinneten Leser’ in *Das Friedewünschende Teutschland*, where Rist reports that several of his dramas had been
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219 See *Lust-Garte*, Oir.
bei dem jüngsten feindlichen Einfalle [...] dergestalt zerrissen /
vernichtet und verderbet / daß von etlichen nicht die helffte / von den
meisten aber kaum das vierte theil übrig geblieben.\textsuperscript{221}

Here we learn of another drama, \textit{Probe der beständigen Freundschaft}. Unlike the
other lost dramas, this is mentioned as a work that was performed, not a
manuscript that gathered dust in Rist’s house in Wedel for years until it was
eventually destroyed by invading forces. \textit{Beständige Freundschaft} was
performed by a troupe of students led by Andreas Gartner, who had come to
Hamburg from Königsberg to put on theatrical performances.

It was for performance by Gartner’s troupe that Rist composed \textit{Das Friedewünschende Teutschland} and, a few years later, \textit{Das Friedejauchtzende Teutschland} (although Gartner did not return as promised to perform it and the
drama was eventually performed by pupils at the Lüneburg Johanneum). The
preface to \textit{Das Friedejauchtzende Teutschland} itself provides an indication of
Rist’s practice when it came to publishing his dramas, where he explains that he
did not wish to publish this particular piece ‘ehe und bevor ich dasselbe auf der
Schaubühnen öffentlich hätte vorgestellet oder sehen lassen.’\textsuperscript{222} That this might
have been Rist’s general practice in respect of all his dramas is supported by the
evidence, or at least not contradicted by it. There is, thus, a probable
coincidence of published and performed dramas.

The only true gap in the available source material is left by the loss of
\textit{Herodes}, which was published, presumably performed, but lost. Writing in the

Belustigung towards the end of his life, and more than two decades following the loss of some of his dramas in the Torstenson War, Rist recalls only the published dramas as well as his ‘fast neülichste / Traur- und Freuden-Spiele / als das Glückselige Britannien / das Tyrannisierte und das wieder befreite Engeland.’ These most recent efforts, dealing with contemporary events in British politics, are unlikely to be published, ‘denn meine / durch so vielfältige / müheselige Verrichtunge ziemlich geschwächete Augen / können das Täg und Nächtliche Schreiben nicht mehr so wol vertragen.’ (Belustigung, 305) These dramas are not publication-worthy in their current condition, and there is no mention of the question of their performance.

This reflection in the Belustigung provides a valuable indication of Rist’s own conception of the relationship between his dramas as written texts and as works performed. As Rist repeatedly asserts throughout his works, the activity of writing dramas itself is for him enjoyable and a welcome leisure-time pursuit. Lamenting the wartime loss of his manuscripts, he claims to regret losing

nicht so gahr sehr die saure Arbeit / so ich daran gewendet / sondern vielmehr die edle Zeit / welche nachdem mir diese geschriebene Traur- und Freudenspiele so liederlich hinweg gerissen / gänzlich ist verlohren gangen. (Belustigung, 304)

The loss of these dramas is Rist’s, not the world’s. Combining Rist’s sparse allusions to his publication practice in respect of his dramas, it might be supposed that those that survived as published texts did so either because they had been performed or because they existed as texts in a publishable condition.
It may be that, in practice, these two conditions coincided, such that a drama that had been performed would also exist as a text suitable for publication.

The above reflections offer compelling, if provisional, grounds for distinguishing between Rist’s surviving and lost dramas that do not rely on the sheer expedience of restricting inquiry to those works that are available as texts to the 21st-century scholar precisely because those are the works that are available. We might regret the loss of Herodes, and the fact that Beständige Freundschaft apparently never made it to publication, but, as Bernhard Jahn has pointed out, there is little indication that access to any more of Rist’s dramas would shed any new light on his practices and capabilities as a dramatist. In this sense, the loss of Rist’s dramas is more valuable than their survival would have been, or at least their survival as published works. Their loss gave Rist scope to reflect on his own practices and motivations regarding the composition, performance, and publication of his dramas.

Interestingly, while performed dramas may have been in virtue of this publication-worthy, this does not seem to have been for Rist an absolute indication of quality qua work. Rist’s comments on Perseus indicate that, although performed and published, he does not himself seem to have rated it particularly highly within his body of work. As mentioned above, Rist’s Klaggedicht to Stapel, published in the Lustgarte (1637), refers to his own dramas Herodes, Wallenstein, and Gustav. An explanatory note expands upon this reference:

Diese sind alle gantz Newe / vnnd erst vor weniger Zeit erfundene vnnd außgearbeitete Tragædien, zu welchen noch gehören meine Polymachia,
Here, Rist makes a distinction not between published and unpublished, or performed and unperformed, works, but a typological or even generic distinction between his *Tragædien* and the dramas he identifies as ‘studentisch’. This designation is ambiguous. It may mean that *Perseus*, *Guiscardus*, etc. date originally from Rist’s student days, and are therefore to be discounted as *Jugendstücke*. Yet this explanation seems improbable since, as analysis particularly in Chapter Four below will show, there is much in the conception and composition of *Perseus* that identifies it as the work of a more adept and mature playwright than *Irenaromachia*, even if it does not attain the levels of theatrical finesse that characterise the later *Teutschland* dramas. Further, given the circumstances of its publication, as well as the borrowings in the Copenhagen *Irenaromachia*, it seems likely that *Perseus* was composed in 1634, as it is claimed on its title page: ‘ACTA HEIDÆ DITMARSOERUM. ANNO MDCXXXIV’. (*Perseus*, 117) *Perseus* does stand out amongst Rist’s surviving dramas as the only non-allegorical piece, but again, this cannot be what is meant but ‘studentisch’, as *Herodes* was presumably also not allegorical.

A straightforward, if nonetheless entirely speculative, explanation for ‘studentisch’ might rely on the *Zwischenspiele*. *Perseus* clearly has a tragic plot, but the presence of comic and farcical elements may be what precludes its inclusion amongst the *Tragædien*. None of these having survived, it is impossible to say whether these also contained farcical Low German interludes. However, a comment
in the Belustigung suggests that Rist’s earlier dramas were not met with a generally favourable response ‘allein darum / weil keine sonderliche Pickelherings-Possen mit untergemenget wurden.’ (Belustigung, 306) Suppose, then, that the distinguishing characteristic of ‘studentisch’ dramas is their inclusion of farcical interscenia, the designation deriving, presumably, from the type of drama performed by student troupes. A feature that is taken to be characteristic of Rist’s theatre can be seen as in fact not holding of his serious Tragödien.

This comment on Perseus is significant because it introduces an interesting fracture into the interrelationships amongst Rist’s surviving dramas that complicates the attempt to view them as a meaningfully cohesive body of work. While Perseus is already exceptional in being the only surviving drama with a tragic and non-allegorical plot, it does not wholly stand apart from the other three works and is demonstrably reliant upon the same set of traditions and techniques that informed Rist’s theatrical conception overall. It sits nicely with Irenaromachia as an example of Rist’s early writing, and indeed has so much in common with this work that scenes were exchanged for the 1634 Copenhagen publication. It also shares many of the thematic concerns and compositional properties of the later Teutschland dramas. In spite of its differences, there is much about Perseus that integrates it into the set suggested by the other three of Rist’s surviving dramas. The distinction Rist draws between Perseus and Guiscardus and his other dramas is in a sense provisional, predating the composition at least of Das Friedejauchtzende Teutschland by over a decade, yet it is noteworthy that he decided to draw it at all.
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223 The potential complexities in the composition history of Das Friedewünschende Teutschland, and the possibility of an Ur-version composed by Stapel, will be explored in Chapter Four below.
In the dedicatory preface to *Perseus*, Rist expresses the hope to publish ‘mehr andere vnd vielleicht bessere Inventiones, als meine Polymachia, Irenochorus, Herodes, Guiscardus et cætera.’ (*Perseus*, 124) Here, there is no suggestion of any distinction between different types of drama, beyond the hint that these unpublished works might be of a higher quality. It is interesting that *Perseus* was performed and published when the others were not. This again may help account for the designation ‘studentisch’ he later attached to it. Perhaps *Perseus* made it to publication because it was more immediately conceived for performance in a way that the *Tragædien* were not. As the achievements of a writer, Rist would perhaps prefer to draw attention to his tragedies, even though these works were not assured the success in performance that *Perseus*, on account of its integrated comic interludes, attracted.

V – The performance of Rist’s dramas

The ‘Nohtwendiger Vorbericht an den Teutschgesinneten Leser’ that prefaces *Das Friedewünschende Teutschland* provides a detailed account of the circumstances that led to its first performance. This indeed is Rist’s primary explicit motivation for writing the preface, which opens:

DEmnach Jch ausser zweiffel lebe/ du werdest eine kleine Begierde
haben etlicher massen zu wissen / was mich doch habe gereitzet dieses
mein Friedewünschendes Teutschland auffzusetzen und vor etlichen
Monaten auff öffentlichem Schauplatze vorstellen zu lassen / auch was
die Zusehere / so wol andere / vornemlich aber die Mißgünstige von
diesem Schauspiele etwan geredet [...]; Als kan Jch nicht unterlassen / dir
nachfolgenden zwar kurtzen / aber jedoch warhafften Bericht hievon zu ertheilen. (FWT, 14)

Compare this, briefly, to the more apologetic stance taken some 13 years previously in the preface to *Perseus*. Relying heavily on Opitz’s preface to his *Trojanerinnen*, here Rist explicitly sought to justify his dramatic writing in the eyes of his learned patrons. When it comes to publishing *Das Friedewünschende Teutschland*, however, Rist can confidently rely upon his readership’s interest in the story of how the drama came to be composed and performed, and demonstrates Rist’s tendency to view his dramas with an eye on their performance.

The preface to *Das Friedewünschende Teutschland* is unique among Rist’s writings in that it contains explicit, if brief, reflection on an actual performance of one of his dramas. The other prefaces tend to make general points about the exigencies of performance, while the reflections in the *Belustigung*, for example, contain too few details to be positively identified as referring to any drama in particular. The comments in *Das Friedewünschende Teutschland* indicate how Rist saw a specific performance as relating to the text that underlay it.

*Das Friedewünschende Teutschland* was first performed by the troupe of Andreas Gartner who had come to Hamburg from Königsberg ‘mit etlichen feinen / gelahrten und wolgeschikten Studenten.’ In Hamburg, Gartner’s troupe would perform dramas on an ‘öffentliche[r] Schauplatz [...] mit Bewilligung der gebietenden Obrigkeit dieser hochlöblichen Stadt.’ (FWT, 14) This brief description provides further detail on the theatrical context for which Rist’s dramas were composed: an itinerant student troupe, a public stage in Hamburg,
the necessary approval from the civic authorities. Gartner approached Rist for some dramas to perform, and was in the first instance provided with the now lost *Probe der beständigen Freundschaft*. (FWT, 15) Eventually, however, Rist composed for performance by Gartner's troupe 'ein gantz neues Spiel', *Das Friedewünschende Teutschland*. This drama

ist nun bald darauff von mehrgedachtem Herren Gartner auff offenem Schauplatze sehr fleissig und nachdenklich vorgestellet / wobei denn viel tausend Menschen / ja eine solche Anzahl der Zuseher sich befunden / daß einer den anderen schier erdrucket hätte. (FWT, 16)

Since we know so little about the actual theatrical provision in Hamburg at the time, it is impossible to assess whether Rist's claim of an audience of many thousands is accurate or an instance of the hyperbolical self-aggrandisement of which he has so often been accused in scholarship. The claimed audience size and the designation 'offen' indicate that the performance is likely to have been open air, which introduces certain performance conditions, to be discussed below, that impinge upon theatrical technique. In the description of the performance as 'fleissig und nachdenklich' there is a rare, if fleeting, reflection on the page-stage relationship that sees performance as some form of implementation of written text. This is also a rare instance of Rist recording his opinion of the performance of one of his own dramas.

It is a pity that the account of the performance by Gartner's troupe is so brief – the remainder of the lengthy preface is a detailed response to an unnamed critic of the drama. There is little evidence that Rist recorded his explicit reflections on the performance of any of his dramas. This might surprise,
or even be felt to be a regrettable gap in Rist’s writings, given that the discussion of theatre in the Belustigung demonstrates his ability to respond critically to theatrical performance and his sensitivity to what can make performance successful or unsuccessful. However, the idea that Rist, as the writer of the dramas, might be able to comment meaningfully and at any great length on their performance may rely too strongly on a certain understanding of an implementary relationship between the written text and the performance. This understanding posits a clear direction of fit running from the text to its performance, the page to the stage, whereby the text precedes the performance. The written text functions as an order or set of orders, issued by the writer to the performers, and the extent to which what emerges onstage deviates from the written word is a measure of the success of the performance.

From the discussion of theatre in the Belustigung, it is evident that Rist has other criteria for assessing the success of a performance. These relate to the performers’ ability to generate and maintain theatrical illusion, appropriately perform affects and evoke the desired emotional response in the audience, and make effective use of props, scenery, music, etc. These are all elements that can be assessed independently of any underlying dramatic text. The written text, and with it its author, stands in a less explicitly authoritative position over the performance, meaning that comparing performance with text is not straightforwardly a meaningful method for assessing performance success. Rist has no more claim over the performance of one of his own works than he does for any other. He inhabits two different roles, as the writer of a dramatic text and an expert who responds to theatrical performance, and while he lets his
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224 See Anscombe on Intention.
expertise in performance matters inform his compositional practice, there is less evidence that he draws upon his activities as a composer of dramatic texts when evaluating theatrical performance. The assessment that Gartner’s performance of *Das Friedewünschende Teutschland* was ‘fleissig and nachdenklich’ asserts that it was appropriately attentive to Rist’s text but does not examine its success as a function of this.

Rist made the explicit claim that he would not publish a drama ‘ehe und bevor ich dasselbe auf der Schaubühnen öffentlich hatte vorgestellet oder sehen lassen’ (*FJT*, 220) in respect of *Das Friedejauchtzende Teutschland*, the publication of which was held back by his promise to allow it to be first performed by Gartner’s troupe. Of course this decision to have performance precede publication may have had a pragmatic or principled basis in the desire to prevent others from seeing or even benefitting from the drama’s performance before Rist had a chance to. It may also be that some of the text as published arose in light of the performance, as opposed to giving rise to it. This, however, further indicates the complex of factors that surround the relationship between text and performance and prevents a straightforward understanding of how they interact. Text and performance are enmeshed both as works, that is, as aesthetic objects, and as commodities.

That Rist agreed to hold *Das Friedejauchtzende Teutschland* for Gartner, until six years after his performance of *Das Friedewünschende Teutschland*, is another indication of the esteem in which he held the troupe and their performance capabilities. This esteem is of great discursive relevance, and may help explain why it was only in respect of this drama that Rist commented on its actual performance. This time from Danzig, Gartner had written to Rist asking
him to hold back the play until he could come to Hamburg ‘da er denn die Ehre zu haben verhoffte / selbiges ebenmäßig zum allerersten male auf die Schaubühne zu bringen.’ (FJT, 220) The idea that the opportunity to give the first performance one of Rist’s dramas should be seen as an honour may be in part rhetorical formality, yet it may also indicate the esteem in which Rist is held precisely as someone who writes for performance and the attractiveness of performing, indeed ‘premiering’, one of his dramas. There is a strong case for seeing this esteem as distinct from Rist’s reputation as a composer of poetic works for publication and participant in the intellectual networks and cultural discourse surrounding the dignity of the German language and its appropriateness for use in poetry. The honour by association, and likely also material gain, that Gartner expects to achieve through having his troupe perform Rist’s drama, is thus typologically and structurally distinct from that sought, for example, by the young Birken. Still without a permanent position and source of income, Birken established a relationship with Rist through their mutual friend Harsdörffer and visited him in Wedel in 1646, seeking Rist’s support, as an established literary figure, in the early stages of his career.225

The honour of performing one of Rist’s dramas was not seen as a means of integration into an illustrious network providing the opportunity to establish many prestigious and beneficial contacts. Theatrical association with Rist would bring benefits of a different order. It is easy to suspect that the main motivation would be financial – that the journey from Danzig to Hamburg would be worth it for the opportunity to stage a drama which, following the success of Das
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225 For an analysis of the interpersonal dynamics between Rist and Birken, see Ralf Schuster, “‘Jst Es Hier Nit Eitelkeit!’: Der Briefwechsel zwischen Sigmund von Birken und Johann Rist als Beispiel für literarisches Konkurrenzdenken im Barock’, Daphnis, 34 (2005), 571–602.
Friedewünschende Teutschland, was sure to be popular. For reasons unknown, however, Gartner and his troupe never arrived in Hamburg, meaning ‘daß die Beförderung zum Drucke dieses meines Friedejauchzenden Teutschlandes / länger als ein gantzes Jahr […] ist gehemmet und zurücke gehalten worden.’ (FJT, 221) Performance is critical in Rist’s theatre – the publication of Das Friedejauchtzende Teutschland, a follow-up to an enormously popular and influential drama that was reissued several times, was cast into doubt by problems encountered in organising its performance.

The preface to Das Friedejauchtzende Teutschland is remarkable because, while it discusses the Gartner performance that did not, ultimately, take place, it does not discuss the performance that did. In relating how he was disappointed by Gartner’s failure to come to Hamburg as promised, Rist both deflects blame from himself for the delay in the drama’s publication and publicly criticises Gartner for his unreliability. As much as it would have been an honour for Gartner’s troupe to have received such glowing praise for their performance of Friedewünschende Teutschland and to be granted the opportunity to conduct the first performance of Friedejauchtzende Teutschland, it must have been damaging to be named in such a critical manner by Rist, who otherwise in his prefaces preserved the anonymity of even the most insistent critics of his work.

It seems that the work was, in the end, performed by pupils at the Lüneburg Johanneum in September 1652. The Lüneburg cantor, Michael Jacobi, had composed the music for the drama, and had sought permission from the civic authorities to have it performed. This performance signalled the
resumption of school theatrical performances following the end of the war.\textsuperscript{226} Thus the performance of Das Friedejauchtzende Teutschland sees Rist once again collaborating with an influential musician, both aiding the organisation of the performance and contributing to its success as theatre. Overall, it is clear that Rist’s dramas were performed in a variety of contexts in his lifetime, both with and without his direct involvement. In this way, the dramas developed lives of their own, independent of the efforts of their creator. They emerged from and into a theatrical context characterised by a plurality of theatrical traditions and a wide range of practical conditions governing theatrical performance.

\textsuperscript{226} Karl Theodor Gaedertz, Das niederdeutsche Drama von den Anfängen bis zur Franzosenzeit (Berlin: A. Hofmann & Comp., 1884), p. 56, n. 1.
3. Rist and his works in their relation to the German language.

Rist’s works were produced in and into a context in which linguistic conditions were changing drastically. A unified High German written language was beginning to coalesce out of the multiple regional variants, a development given significant impetus by the programme and activities of Opitz and the *Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft*. In this, High German was also established as the language of Northern German written culture, replacing written Middle Low German and producing an obvious dichotomy with the Low German variants which continued to function as spoken language. Rist is likely to have been among the first generation of middle-ranking Northern Germans to have received an education in High German, and as such lived and wrote in a context of linguistic transition. In several of his works, he explicitly engages with changing state of the High German language and aligns himself with the unifying and codifying efforts of the *Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft*. A development in this regard can be observed from the *Rettung der Edlen Teutschen Hauptsprache* (1642), to the *Friedewünschendes Deutschland* (1647), which he dedicated to the *Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft* after having been accepted that year as a member. *Der Adeliche Hausvater*, a translation of Tasso’s *Il Padre di Famiglia*, followed in 1650, through which Rist explicitly sought to participate in the translation work of the society. These are all works which explicitly address the contemporary condition of the High German language, and can be contextualised through detailed discussion of the history of High German during the 17th century and the historiography of this topic. Further, evidence of the processes of
stabilisation in High German manifests itself in Rist’s writings, which are thus
documents of the period of transition in which they were produced.

The present study is, however, more concerned with the relationships between
High and Low German writing and culture, the extent to which this linguistic
distinction aligned with social boundaries, and the engagement in Rist’s writings
with language difference. Four of Rist’s five surviving dramas, namely
Irenaromachia (1630), Perseus (1634), Friedejauchtzendes Teutschland (1653) and
Depositio Cornuti Typographici (1654) feature Low German speaking figures, and
through these provide comment on the contemporary conditions of language use.
In the late 17th and early 20th centuries there was some scholarly interest in 17th-
century theatrical writing in Low German, which treated these as a source of data
on the actual linguistic conditions of the time. This scholarship functions here as a
useful resource, providing much detail of regional variation in linguistic forms.
However, its findings can be applied much more critically in respect of Rist’s dramas,
which provide interesting comment on the social conditions governing language use
and, in spite of generic convention, do not straightforwardly contribute to the
pejoration of Low German in the context of an increasingly High German culture.

Rist’s works were produced at a time when conscious efforts were being made to
establish a codified German language for use in the entire German-speaking
territory. A language was needed which would serve the needs of the presumed
cultural community and political unity of ‘Germany’.\textsuperscript{227} This is not only an insight gained retrospectively\textsuperscript{228} – 17\textsuperscript{th}-century language theorists were acutely aware of this fact, and there was intensive discussion about which variety of German was to serve as the basis for the new, unified language. Some were also produced in the direct context of these codification efforts, albeit without substantively contributing towards them. Through a network of poetic and linguistic contacts, and (from 1647) membership of the \textit{Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft}, Rist had access to the figures, ideas, and debates that were influencing the processes of language standardisation. His \textit{Rettung der Edlen Teutschen Hauptsprache} (1642) constitutes a deliberate alignment with the linguistic ideology of the \textit{Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft}, thereby supporting Rist’s suitability for membership (Mast art.). The drama \textit{Friedewünschendes Teutschland} (1647) is dedicated to the society, although it is unlikely to have been written as a creative response to his acceptance into the society.\textsuperscript{229} Mast diss pp. 58-9 on question of dedication. The drama is clearly, and undoubtedly deliberately, in alignment with both the linguistic and moral preoccupations of the society. Furthermore, although Rist is generally held to have composed more dramas than have survived, \textit{Friedewünschendes Teutschland} is his only extant drama not to feature Low German-speaking figures, tending to confirm its alignment with the specifically High German concerns of the society. Finally, \textit{Der


*Adeliche Hausvatter* (1650), a translation, via Jean Baudoin’s 1632 French version, of Tasso’s dialogue *Il Padre di Famiglia*, is a clear attempt to participate in and contribute to the activities of the *Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft*, composed in light of the fact

daß die Herren Geselschafter / welche fremder Sprachen in etwas kündig
zum Theil verbunden weren / einige Bücher auß denselben in unsere / nie

Rist and his peers undoubtedly saw themselves as working to demonstrate that German is worthy of being seen and used as a poetic language. This is one aspect of a broader cultural-patriotic agenda which they pursued through their works, and it has been the work of late 20\textsuperscript{th}-century literary scholarship in particular to investigate this phenomenon of cultural patriotism among 17\textsuperscript{th}-century writers in its fullness. The programmatic attempt to elevate the German vernacular to the status of a literary idiom is often accompanied by an appeal to characteristically ‘German’ virtues, rooted in mythologised historical German figures. Both German language and morality are portrayed as under attack from dangerous foreign influence, most notably in the many alamode satires. *Das Friedewünschende Teutschland*, for example, clearly addresses all three cultural patriotic concerns – language purity, German morality, and alamode influence. The identification of this rhetorical strategy in pursuit of cultural-patriotic ends among 17\textsuperscript{th}-century writers contributes significantly to the understanding of their works. Equally, undue emphasis on this rhetoric can obscure the underlying reality, namely that there was in practice no
single German language to serve as a focal point for the efforts of the cultural patriots.

II – The Regionality of Written High German in the 17th Century

The codified linguistic norms of modern standard High German can make it difficult to appreciate the historical variability in the linguistic forms used.\textsuperscript{231} Written German varied greatly on a regional basis, owing largely to the political pluricentrism of the German-speaking territory which lacked an administrative and cultural centre providing a model for normative linguistic practice. It is thus helpful to view the development of this linguistic variation on the context of cultural orientation. In respect of this, Maas distinguishes between hetero- and autocentred development. Heterocentred language development proceeds in accordance with a foreign model, or at least one that is conceived as foreign: thus are the 13\textsuperscript{th} and 14\textsuperscript{th} centuries characterised by a universal heterocentring towards written Latin culture. Autocentred development, on the other hand, is oriented towards a language that is, or is conceived as, native.\textsuperscript{232} From the initial situation of the dominance of the foreign, Latin norm, a process of decentralisation was necessary in order to successfully transition to a native, German one. Thus the new, autocentred approaches at first had to occur on the small scale. Note that this is distinct from the explicit programme of the Sprachgesellschaften to establish linguistic norms on the national level. The Sprachgesellschaften posited a national community that required a unified language, and they set about achieving this through positing and


imposing external linguistic norms. The process of regional autocentred
development, on the other hand, took as its basis the actual linguistic potential of a
given region. Written German culture, in the first instance, manifested itself on
the local or regional level. These regionally-bound variants, which in spite of
disparities in orthography and vocabulary were mutually intelligible, developed
around centres of political and economic power. In Northern Germany, at least until
the first half of the 16th century, this meant that variation occurred in written Low
German, although by 1600 there was something of a standardised written
Hanseatic language on a Lübeckian basis. In the rest of Germany, the variation
was in written High German, with the Catholic South retaining the use of its own
variant, ‘gemeines Teutsch’, until the mid-18th century. The regional variants were
not identical with the spoken dialects of their respective areas, although there
was an extent to which interference from spoken language determined the scribal
practice of a given region: grammarians before Schottel largely used a phonetic
orthographical system, on the basis of which regional variation in pronunciation
could manifest itself orthographically. Indeed, the ‘Hoch’ in ‘Hochdeutsch’ has its
origins as a topographical designation for an Upper German variant, it only gaining
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its axiological sense in the course of the 17th century.\textsuperscript{239} The 17th century was the
site of a number of processes of linguistic accommodation between the regional
varieties of written German, only some of which were explicitly mobilised by, or
consequences of, the deliberate efforts of grammarians and poets to achieve
linguistic unity. The transferral of political power to Prussia in the wake of the
Treaty of Aachen was decisive in overcoming the essential regionality of written
German.\textsuperscript{240}

The history of the publication of Rist’s works during his lifetime situates them in this
context of linguistic accommodation. The orthographical changes made to
subsequent editions of the same work can represent the development of
orthographical standards within a given locale, and indicate the participation of Rist,
his works, and above all his publishers, in the process of orthographical
modernisation. Alternatively, orthographical variation between editions can reflect
the continuing regionality of written German, where these editions were published
in different locations. Controversy continues to abound concerning the role of the
publishing industry in the spread and standardisation of written High German.\textsuperscript{241}

The cases discussed here support the argument that the publishing industry tended
to reflect, rather than actively contribute to, the processes of accommodation
among the variants of written High German.

\textsuperscript{239} Reiffenstein, ‘Metasprachliche Äußerungen’, p. 2220.
The *Rettung der Edlen Teutschen Hauptsprache* was first published in Hamburg in 1642, only to be reissued shortly thereafter by the same publisher (Heinrich Werner). The second edition made certain orthographical changes which bring the text into line with modern standard orthography. Nouns were capitalised, and long vowels signified through an –h. A consistent distinction was made between β and s, meaning that auß became aus and the conjunction daß was distinguished from the pronoun das. In accordance with the etymological principle of orthography, e was replaced with ä (hette > hätte). The dominant characteristic of these changes is a tendency towards greater orthographical clarity, adhering to norms which were as yet uncodified. The changes indicate the prevailing orthographical standards expected on the Hamburg book market in the 1640s. The swift reissuing of the book to incorporate these changes, then, indicates Hamburg’s speedy acculturation to the orthographical standards of the High German area. There is evidence of written High German in Hamburg from as early as 1530,242 but, as the discussion of the history of education in Hamburg will demonstrate, a broad High German readership be spoken of can only by the time of Rist’s generation. There is an important distinction between the ability of individuals to write in High German in official documents, and the practice of composing texts in this language to be published in print and sold to the reading public. By the 1640s, the reading competencies and cultural expectations of those who consumed printed texts demanded a certain orthographical standard from the publishers. This is key, because the changes made for the *Rettung’s* second edition do not reflect Rist’s personal engagement with the
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contemporary processes of orthographical standardisation. Rather, they situate him, his works, and their production and reception in these processes. To the extent that the orthographical shortcomings of the first edition can be attributed to Rist, and the improvements made in the second to his publisher, this lack of concern on Rist’s part for orthographical standards which were obviously available, if not yet authoritative and binding, contrasts sharply with the Rettung’s explicit thematisation of language. This allows a preliminary delineation of the nature of Rist’s interest in language, which, in respect of High German, is clearly cultural-political. He does not demonstrate familiarity with, or even interest in, contemporary developments in inner-German orthography and grammar, but enthusiastically engages with the alamode discourse and the attempt to distinguish German language and culture from their foreign cultural and political rivals.

The publication history of the Monatsgespräche demonstrates the both the regionall-bound nature of the German publishing industry and the ongoing reality of regional variation in written German. Hamburg editions of the first four Monatsgespräche survive. The death of Rist’s Hamburg publisher, Johann Naumann, in 1668, may account for the fact that the final two did not appear there. Yet all six exist in Frankfurt editions – the first four from around the time of their initial publication (Das alleredelste Leben appeared in Frankfurt in 1663, the same year as its Hamburg publication), the last two, Die alleredelste Erfindung and Die alleredelste Zeit-Verkürzung, in 1667 and 1668 respectively. It is not hard to imagine how the Gespräche came to be published in Frankfurt, which, with its
important book fair, was the centre of the German publishing industry. Rist excuses the errata in Die alleredelste Torheit (1664) by explaining that he could not oversee the printing process in Hamburg, being kept in Wedel by his duties there, and ‘mein Herr Verläger auch nicht / alsder auff den Frankfuhrter und Leipziger Messen seine nohtwendige Geschäfte hat zu verrichten.’ It was the work of a publisher to travel to the fairs in Frankfurt and Leipzig, and so it could be that Rist’s texts found a Frankfurt publisher through Naumann’s professional. Rist was known to the Frankfurt industry – his Alltägliche Hausmusik and Friedejauchtzendes Deutschland both appear in the catalogue for the 1654 book fair. After Rist’s death, the Monatsgespräche, conceived as a series of twelve dialogues, one for each month were continued by Erasmus Francisci. Francisci was proof-reader at Endter in Nuremberg, the publisher of Friedejauchtzendes Deutschland, and his work on the Monatsgespräche required professional contact with Schiele, Rist’s Frankfurt publisher. This concretely locates Rist’s works in the professional networks of publishing houses throughout the German-speaking territory.

Where the Frankfurt editions of the Monatsgespräche follow an initial Hamburg publication, they have been subjected to a thorough orthographical overhaul. It is improbable that this occurred at Rist’s explicit request. If the distance between Wedel and Hamburg was too great for Rist to have been involved in the printing process there, then it is all but inconceivable that he made editorial decisions for

the Frankfurt publications. Rather, as with the two Hamburg editions of the *Rettung*,
the changes reflect an attempt to accommodate to the local orthographic standard.
To a great extent, these changes accord with modern orthography. In respect of
vowel length, for example, the vowel-lengthening –*h* is removed in instances where
it would now be incorrect (zwahr > zwar; Ohrt > Ort), and *ie* is used to signify a long
*i* (di > die; liben > lieben). However, several of the changes constitute a deviation
from the modern norm: including the gemination of *f* (auf > auff), the replacing of *ei*
with *ey* (zwei > zwey; meinen > meynen) and of the initial *t* with *d* (tapffer > dapffer).
These changes, which appear retrogressive to the modern reader, counter any
interpretation of the process of textual alteration as one of straightforward
modernisation. The anomalies reflect the 17th-century linguistic reality, which still
lacked a unified written German language. Rist’s texts were adapted for the
Frankfurt market, which, owing to its prominent role in the German book trade, was
both a more significant location for their publication and home to a further-reaching orthographical standard. However, Frankfurt standards were not
universally-binding, and the alterations to Rist’s texts represent not deliberate
modernisation but accommodation to one of several regional standards.

III – The transition from Low to High German written culture in the North

Towards the end of the 20th century, scholarship in the history of the German
language turned to regional language history in order to more fully explain the
relationships both amongst the regional varieties of German and between these
and the eventual standardised norm. This constituted a change in emphasis both from an earlier teleological approach, which only showed an interest in historical linguistic phenomena to the extent that these positively featured in the development of modern standard German, and from older linguistic geography, which had sought to discover the roots of standard German in the historical language of one region or another. The situation in Northern Germany was subject to an additional complication in light of the fact that its regional variants of High German, which developed from the mid-16th century, had replaced the native tradition of written Low German. Elsewhere, in Upper and South-Western areas, the acceptance of an increasingly normalised written High German constituted not a replacement but an alteration of current practices in written language. The transition of Northern Germany to the new written High German was a decisive development in the establishing of a supraregional written language. The reasons for this transition to High German in Northern Germany were not inherently different from the reasons why the other German regions also adopted this idiom. That is to say, there were no specific Low or Northern German motivations for the switch – the whole German-speaking territory was involved in the same development, which was a linguistic manifestation of cultural-political processes on the basis of a perceived common German identity. From this point on, the linguistic
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248 For example, Burdach (1884) argued for the role of the Imperial court of Charles IV in Prague after 1350, while Frings emphasised the colonisation of East Central Germany from North, West, and South between the 11th and 13th centuries, which forced the colonisers to accommodate their language towards each other. See Besch, ‘Entstehung und Ausformung der neuhochdeutschen Schriftsprache/Standardsprache’, pp. 2256-8.


history of Northern Germany is considered part of the history of the German language overall, not the history of Low German.\textsuperscript{251}

The transition to High German progressed gradually from the South-East of the Low German area, which bordered East Central Germany, to the North-West.\textsuperscript{252} This timeline was proposed by Gabrielsson in 1983,\textsuperscript{253} and has not since been convincingly refuted.\textsuperscript{254} The language of the courts switched to High German before that of the city authorities, with the nobility representing a progressive element in relation to the conservatism of the middle social ranks. Furthermore, the switch occurred first in the external communication of the Kanzleien – to the princes and cities of central and southern Germany, and, following the introduction of Roman Law, to the Reichskammergericht in Speyer. Following the decline of the Hanseatic League, and in the context of new trade routes to the Americas and the Orient, Northern Germany was obliged to realign its political and economic priorities.\textsuperscript{255} It was now more important to communicate with Central and Upper German cities such as Leipzig, Augsburg, and Nuremberg, which were developing their economic potential. In this context, the communicative limitations of Low German were clear, and High German offered the opportunity to participate in these new economic

\textsuperscript{253} Gabrielsson, p. 149.
developments. The transition to High German only took place later in terms of internal affairs, in some cases after many years. In respect of Hamburg, according to Gabrielsson, High German was introduced in 1530, and by 1650 had fully replaced Low German. By 1565, all external communication was being conducted in High German, and Hamburg’s charter of 1603 was drawn up in High German. This meant that by 1610, internal affairs were also beginning to be conducted in High German, and from 1620 this was the language of all internal documents in Hamburg. The developments in Hamburg occurred roughly a century after they had in Berlin and Mark Brandenburg.

Everyday spoken language throughout Germany remained largely unaffected by the work on the development of written language. This confirms the current scholarly consensus that it was developments in written, not spoken, language which form the basis of the development of the German standard language. Long term, the transition from Middle Low to High German in the North signalled the end of written Low German culture. Beyond a few 17th-century offshoots from the written Middle Low German tradition, all subsequent instances of Low German in writing are (more or less stylised) transcribed dialect. More immediately, a situation of medial diglossia emerged, in which the new High German established itself as the language of written culture, while the relevant Low German dialect continued to be spoken, and this by all ranks of society. A survey of the conditions under which High

258 Gabrielsson, p. 149.
German was adopted by Northern German culture provides insight into Rist’s linguistic background as well as the prevailing social conditions and attitudes towards language, themselves in flux, at the time he was composing his dramas.

The history of High German in schools in the 16th and 17th centuries provides further contextualisation of the spread of High German into Northern Germany. The school was a key normalising and socialising authority, and its changing position on the relation between Low and High German reflects its function as a bearer and transmitter of language ideology. When High German was adopted as the language of internal government in the northern cities, it also became the language of official school documents and communication. This did not initially affect either the language or content of the lessons. In the 16th century, the German language was not the subject of any school lesson, and in the upper years was not even the language in which the lessons were taught. However, the lower and middle years were taught in German, or Low German in the North, and this was the language of religious education for all years.  

By the turn of the 17th century, in the context of growing national-cultural consciousness amongst the educated classes, reformers such as Wolfgang Ratke called for education both in and about the native language. Ratke did not take as his native language the Holsteinian dialect of his own native area, but the East Central German written language.  

This, to employ Maas’ model, represents a heterocentring of language use towards a non-native idiom. Yet Ratke presents his position as an autocentred approach, now on a cultural-national basis,
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whereby a High German variant is taken as the native language of Northern Germany and contrasted favourably with the heterochthonous Latin.\textsuperscript{262} Ratke’s proposals did not immediately influence education policy. In Hamburg, more so than anywhere else in North Germany, the clergy had an enormous influence on school practice. This meant that the transition of the schools to High German was closely tied up with that of the clerical authorities. Until the first years of the 17\textsuperscript{th} century, Hamburg’s clergy was predominantly composed of Low Germans, who, even when they had studied at Wittenberg, continued to use this language and were either indifferent to the prospect of a switch to High German or zealous defenders of the Low German cause.\textsuperscript{263} In 1613, however, the Thuringian Johann Schellmacher became Senior of the Hamburg \textit{Geistliches Ministerium}, and two years later the ordinance of the \textit{Johanneum} read:

\begin{quote}
Unterweisung in der teutschen Sprache. Es kann auch eine Classis angeordnet wenden, die Knaben in \textit{teutscher Sprache und Schrift} daselbst zu üben, zu welcher Behuief in dieser Classe ein teutscher Schulmeister verordnet werden muß, welcher die Knaben, so gerne guth teutsch schreiben lernen wollen, sie bleiben denn bey den Studien oder nicht, darinne unterweisen kann.\textsuperscript{264}
\end{quote}

As with Ratke’s pedagogical reforms, the German language in question is a High German variant. Crucially, the provision of instruction would be subject to demand,

\textsuperscript{264} Gabrielsson, ‘Das Eindringen der hochdeutschen Sprache in die Schulen Niederdeutschlands im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert’, p. 27.
and the focus of the class would be the acquisition of written High German, with no mention of an ability to speak it. Skills in spoken High German were acquired through the rhetoric lessons, which in the first instance continued to be conducted in Latin. The transition from Low to High German as the language of instruction occurred gradually, and both idioms existed alongside each other for a number of years. Confirming the interrelationships in language use between school and church, educational and clerical authorities, the first area in which the switch was made was commonly choral singing, so that Gymnasium pupils could provide music for church services. Thomas Selle, Rist’s musical collaborator, was among the first Central Germans (born in Zörbig in 1599) to teach at the Johanneum, as cantor between 1636 and 1663.265 Not only an influential role within the school, this was a prestigious position in Hamburg society.266 To fill it with a Central German both provides a gauge of the receptivity of the Hamburg population to High German and provides a programmatic indication of the future of High German in Hamburg life. After singing lessons switched to High German, dedicated lessons in written High German were often established, and then the other subjects gradually also made the switch.267 As a rule, the German schools retained the use of Low German for a decade or two longer than the Latin schools.268

It is now possible to provisionally locate Rist in the context of these processes. From the above, it can be surmised that Rist belonged to the first generation of pupils to

attend the Johanneum at the time in which the school was beginning to switch its lesson language from Low to High German. Equally, he was among the first generation with access to a dedicated course of study in written High German. The conditions in Bremen, where he studied at the Gymnasium illustre, were much the same. However, in the case of an individual, biographical details, to the extent that these are knowable, are relevant in addition to the broad social developments. In Rist’s particular case, it does not immediately follow that his access to High German in the school context presented a radical departure from the language of the family home. Rist’s father, Caspar, was from Nördlingen in Bavaria and had studied at Wittenberg. He had apparently come to Hamburg in 1600, travelling with a Greek who employed him as an interpreter. In 1602, he took over the school in Ottensen, and became pastor there in 1606. Caspar Rist was an educated man who could write High German and whose native idiom was an Upper German variant. Rist’s mother was from Braunschweig, but it is by no means self-evidence that Low German was the exclusive language of the family home. This would mean that Rist did not encounter the relationship between Low and High German as strictly and exclusively medially diglossic, since he had access to a manner of spoken High German. In the context of the changes in educational practice in Northern Germany at the beginning of the 17th century, Rist’s career as a High German writer appears very much as a natural product of his background. He was certainly a prominent North German writer, and clearly aligned himself with the explicit Opitzian reform and the concerns and activities of the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft. The

development by which the Low German cultural sphere joined the new High
German development was already underway before Rist was even born, and by the
time he was writing, Low German literary voices, such as Lauremberg, were very
much in the minority. Rist was a prominent North German writer in a context
dominated by East Central Germans,271 but he wrote for a whole German audience,
and it is doubtful that there was any acculturation left for his works to achieve.

Rist’s linguistic context clearly informs the metalinguistic discussion engaged in by
his dramas. Yet as theatrical works, these also stood in the contexts of generic and
theatrical expectations and conventions, and so were governed by additional sets of
criteria. In the context of Humanist rhetorical education, it was in school drama that
the use of the vernacular first established itself in place of Latin.272 According to
Barner, school drama was at the top of a sliding scale of forms in which rhetorical
skill was practised and presented by pupils. Faced with competition from the
Wanderbühne and the theatre of the Jesuit schools, Protestant school theatre was
obliged to meet the expectations of their audience and increase the theatrical
elements of their rhetorical presentations. In so doing, they began to incorporate
costumes, props, curtains and music.273 In Schottel’s preface to his Friedens Sieg
(1648), performed in 1642 by his tutees at the Wolfenbüttel court, including the
future Duke Anton Ulrich and his brother Ferdinand Albrecht, the advantages to the
performers are identified as being fully within the context of their rhetorical
education. Barner notes with interest that the advantages identified by Rist in the
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271 Werner H. Veith, ‘Die deutsche Literatursprache und die sprachliche Herkunft der Literaten. Ein
272 Wilfried Barner, Barockrhetorik: Untersuchungen zu ihren geschichtlichen Grundlagen
Perseus preface are much more general, including some which are associated with the ends of rhetorical education but extending beyond these. The rhetorical advantages listed by Rist are the development of judgement and reason, a good memory, and a general skill in speaking, while the other two advantages speak to the affective properties of drama, through which the performers learn moral lessons about good and evil, and are taught to overcome fear of suffering. Rist also claims such an affective benefit for the audience. While Schottel’s focus on the pedagogical advantages of drama is clearly related to his position at Wolfenbüttel and the context of his work’s original performance, Rist’s more wide-ranging account of the benefits of drama is noteworthy in that Perseus is unique among his extant dramas in dating from his time as a Hauslehrer in Heide.

IV – Theatre in Hamburg

Rist’s lifelong association with Hamburg locates him in a theatrical context with close ties to educational institutions, and as such with drama produced in the context of rhetorical education. However, we are not well-informed about the details of theatrical provision in Hamburg and Northern Germany in the early 17th century. Marigold suggests that, while Hamburg was an important centre for the publication of Low German drama, it lacked a permanent theatre in which these dramas could be performed. He attributes this to the popularity in the first instance of the English travelling players, then, from 1649, of their Dutch

274 Barner, Barockrhetorik, pp. 306–7, p. 307 n 261
276 Herbert Junkers, Niederländische Schauspieler und niederländisches Schauspiel im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert in Deutschland (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1936), p. 70; Spieltexte der
counterparts, which delayed the foundation of Hamburg’s own theatre.\textsuperscript{277} In fact, the earliest dramas which can be claimed with any certainty to have been performed in Hamburg are Rist’s.\textsuperscript{278} However, it does seem likely that what theatre Hamburg did have was located in, or at least associated with, its educational institutions. It is known that the \textit{Johanneum} and the \textit{Akademisches Gymnasium} had at least one stage between them.\textsuperscript{279} Further, if claims made in the \textit{Monatsgespräche} can be subject to straightforwardly autobiographical interpretation, then it seems that Rist was involved in productions here in his youth.

\begin{quote}
Der Rüstige recalls that he
\begin{center}
wie ich noch ein Knabe war / meine Person vielmals auff den Schauplätzen
dargestellet / welches auch hernach / wie ich schon eine geraume Zeit auff
Universitäten oder hohen Schuhlen gelebet / mehr denn einmahl
geschehen.\textsuperscript{280}
\end{center}
\end{quote}

Der Rüstige later makes the specific claim of having performed in a play under the musical direction of the Englishman William Brade (1560-1630) and his assistant David Cramer. He explains that Cramer was

\begin{quote}
\textit{Der Rüstige,} ed. by Manfred Brauneck and Alfred Noe, 6 vols. (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1970), vi. xviii
\textsuperscript{277} Marigold, p. 21.
\textsuperscript{278} Karl Theodor Gaedertz, \textit{Das niederdeutsche Drama von den Anfängen bis zur Franzosenzeit} (Berlin: A. Hofmann & Comp., 1884), p. 34.
\textsuperscript{279} Marigold, p. 19.
\textsuperscript{280} \textit{Belustigung}, p. 304.
\end{quote}
ein gelehrter Studiosus und stattlicher Musicus dabey / wie das die schönen
Stücke / welche er zu den Komödien und Tragödien selbiger Zeit gesetzt /
nunmehr aber in offnen Drukke sind zu finden / genugsahm bezeugen.  

The reference to an actual publication provides a basis in historical fact for the 
anecdote. Braun identifies the work, now lost, as the 1631 Hamburg publication 
Allerhand musicalische Stücke von Pavanen, Courante, Intraden, Balletten ... auff 
drey Discant Violinen und ein Violdagamba. Reconstructing its contents as far as 
possible, Braun argues that the book supports Rist’s claims of Cramer’s work for the 
stage. This publication suggests the existence of a ‘quasi stehende Bühne’ in 
Hamburg around 1630 which, while lacking a building of its own and unlikely to 
have existed for longer than a couple of years, must, Braun argues, nevertheless 
have been of sufficient merit to be worthy of recall in the Belustigung, over thirty 
years later. Drawing attention to poems written in Brade’s honour by students at 
the Akademisches Gymnasium following his death in 1630, Braun suggests that the 
age stage was associated with this school.

The composition and premiere of Irenaromachia also dates from this period. In an 
explanatory note to his lament for Stapel, published in the Poetischer Lustgarte 
(1638), Rist describes Irenaromachia as a drama ‘welches [...] wir im Jahr 1630 auff 
öffentlicher Bühne haben vorgestellet / worauf es auch kurz hernach durch den
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281 Belustigung, p. 318
282 Werner Braun, Britannia abundans. Deutsch-englische Musikbeziehungen zur Shakespearezeit. 
283 Braun, pp. 103–4.
Druck jederman gemein ist gemachet worden." A continuation of Adam Tratziger’s chronicle of Hamburg gives details of one, if not the first, performance of *Irenaromachia*. This occurred at some point between the Winter at the beginning of 1630 and the arrival of King Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden in Stralsund in June: ‘In Ostmanß Hause in S. Johansstrassen wahren schone Comedien agiret, insonderheit v. Friede un Krieg. Autores waren Ristius und Stapel.’ It has been suggested that the house was that of councilman Albert Ostmann, whose son would have been sixteen years old at the time and probably attended the *Johanneum*, which was at that time located in the same street. This would support the location of Hamburg’s German theatre at its educational institutions.

Additionally, both *Irenaromachia* and *Perseus* bear close formal resemblance to the contemporary school dramas of Northern Germany. By the end of the 16th century, with the increasing role of High German both as a literary language and as the language of education, the composition of Low German school dramas was in decline. Such works were now composed in High German or, after the example of Omichius’ 1577 *Newe Comoedia, von Dionysii Syracusani, und Damonis und Pythiae Brüderschaft*, included Low German *Zwischenspiele* within a High German main drama. The majority of Low German dramatic production in this period occurred in the context of school drama, composed by teachers to pedagogical ends. These High German pieces with Low German *Zwischenspiele* remained the dominant form
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285 The issues surround the authorship of *Irenaromachia* will be discussed below.
of North German school drama for over half a century: Rist’s *Friedejauchzendes Deutschland* was premiered in 1652 by students at the Lüneburg Gymnasium.\(^{288}\)

**V – Low German in the 17\(^{th}\) Century**

Discussion of the conditions of High German usage in the North, with a particular emphasis on the school context and related dramatic practice, has necessitated a more detailed characterisation of the conditions of Low German usage. In order to fully appreciate the treatment of Low German in Rist’s dramas, it is important to have a detailed account of how Low German was used in reality. It is the social conditions of Low German usage, rather than a characterisation of its formal linguistic features, that is primarily relevant here. There is little documentary evidence of sociolectal variation in Low German usage before the 17\(^{th}\) century, although such variation was undoubtedly present.\(^{289}\) Low German remained the everyday spoken idiom of all ranks of society in the 17\(^{th}\) century. At the same time, in the context of the increasing metalinguistic reflection being carried out by intellectuals, a conceptual distinction was beginning to be formed between a (written) language variety conceived of as normative, and dialect. It was in the context of this discussion that the term ‘Mundart’, initially having the straightforward, non-pejorative sense of ‘pronunciation’, and the antonym to ‘Schreibart’, emerged in the 1640s.\(^{290}\) Previously, the speaking of dialect had been treated as a regional marker, not in itself informative of the speaker’s social or


\(^{290}\) Reiffenstein, ‘Metasprachliche Äußerungen’, p. 2224.
situative context.\textsuperscript{291} As attempts were made throughout the German-speaking lands to define and delimit the new High German language against the regional variety in spoken language, Low German was increasingly seen in explicit association with the lower social ranks. In the North, High German was sufficiently different from the native idiom that it had to be learned as a foreign language, making the ability to write, and later also (in elite groups) speak, High German a mark of social distinction. From the beginning of the 17\textsuperscript{th} century, Hamburg patricians had sent their sons to school in Leipzig, in order to acquire High German. As the century progressed, access to High German in Northern Germany through formal education was widened from the upper ranks of society, where High German was introduced into the curricula of the Latin schools, downwards, with the German schools switching to High German lessons a couple of decades later.\textsuperscript{292} The acquisition of High German by those without access to formal education – members of the lowest social ranks, particularly in rural communities, and women – was seriously impeded by the instrumental role of the school in this process.

Among those privileged enough to learn High German, Low German remained in the first instance the language of everyday speech. This fact helps clarify the socially-restricted nature of High German acquisition, since this language was tied to certain situative uses – as the language of official writing, literature, education and religious instruction – which meant that the lower classes as well as higher-ranking women, who were embedded in a domestic context, had little use for it.\textsuperscript{293}

\textsuperscript{291} von Polenz, ‘Deutsche Sprache und Gesellschaft in historischer Sicht’, p. 49.
\textsuperscript{292} See above, and Gabrielsson, ‘Das Eindringen der hochdeutschen Sprache in die Schulen Niederdeutschlands im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert’, p. 43.
\textsuperscript{293} Lasch, ‘Literarische Entwicklung des Plattdeutschen in Hamburg’, p. 424.
produced a situation of exclusive medial diglossia, in which the educated were able to speak Low German and write High German as appropriate, while those without access to formal education were restricted to the use of Low German. The language barrier developed along socioeconomic lines, not as an opposition between the Low German of the lower classes and the High German of the upper classes, but as a socially-restricted multilingualism. The educated and socially privileged were in a position to tailor their language choice to the communicative competencies of their interlocutors, through which practice they demonstrate their awareness of the social and situative implications of dialect use. This also highlights the imbalance inherent in the linguistic situation, where low-class dialect speakers, not having a variety of languages at their command, are not in a position to likewise tailor their language choice.

Leonora Christina Ulfeldt, a daughter of Christian IV of Denmark, portrays this practice of language selection in her *Jammers Minde*, an account of her imprisonment between 1663 and 1685. She narrates in Danish, but reproduces (or purports to reproduce) some of her conversations in direct speech, from which it is clear that High German was spoken with the royal family, nobility, and clergy, Danish or Low German with those of lower social rank. Leonora Christina’s linguistic practice in interacting with the servants and wardens was driven by a need to make herself understood, such as in fending off the drunken advances of a

---


warden (‘Wan Ji dûn sît, so blivt van mi und komt hir nicht binnen, dat seg ik Ju’) or in arguing that she should be permitted to keep her clavichord (‘Ji söllen mi dat stân laten, bit Ji min Gelt wedergeven, dat ik daarf gegeven hebbe’). She does not have distinct categories for Low and High German, designating both simply as ‘Deutsch’, but she distinguishes in her linguistic practice between the two, and when she composes a song in German, it is High German. This indicates a working distinction between the two languages in respect of their appropriate uses.

However, the actual extent of the receptive competence of uneducated Low German speakers in respect of High German is difficult to quantify. Yet in spite of the fact that it was the upper, educated classes who possessed multilingual capabilities, Rist’s peasants are capable of understanding High German speech. The dramas treat the two languages as in practice largely mutually intelligible.

There is some reason to suppose that this might have been the case. The memoirs of the barber Meister Johann Dietz, of Halle, detail two instances, probably occurring between 1684 and 1694, in which he encountered Low Germans with a high level of receptive competence in respect of High German. First, he met a woman in Hamburg, ‘so eine Mecklenburgerin, und gerne hochdeutsch reden gehöret.’ In a further anecdote, he recalls spending the night at the home of a shepherd couple, having arrived at Glückstadt after the city had been closed. He relates the following exchange with the husband:

---

297 Ulfeldt, p. 235.
298 Winge, p. 82.
299 Ulfeldt, pp. 103–4.
Endlich fragete er stark: „Wat is den buten“ – Ich sagt: „Ach, lieber Freund, ich habe mich verirret, laßt mich doch diese Nacht in eurem Haus liegen.“ – „Ei wat, sagte er, wie machen nich open, wer wees, wer ju bindt?“

The memoirs were composed some forty or fifty years after this event may be supposed to have occurred, and so even on this count cannot be straightforwardly considered a reliable documentation of what happened. Indeed, the inclusion of a High German form (‘machen’) undermines any suggestion that this could be an exact reproduction of the exchange as it actually occurred. However, this anecdote reflects Dietz’s awareness, as a High German speaker, that his speech will be understood by Low Germans even where these cannot themselves be expected to speak in High German. Indeed, as occurred with the Mecklenburg woman, having been let into the house Dietz ‘fing an, den Leuten etwas zu erzählen. Denn sie höreten die hochdeutsche Sprache gern.’ The conclusions that can be drawn from such a fleeting engagement with Dietz’s text are at best provisional, but appear to indicate that, by the end of the 17th century at least, even the rural poor in North Germany could understand spoken High German, and that this was a competence of which the High German speakers were aware.

The chronicle of the peasant Hartich Sierk (1588-1664), from Wrohm, Dithmarschen, is in several respects a more reliable, relevant, and informative source than Dietz’s memoirs. Sierk kept this chronicle between 1615 and 1664, and, while not strictly a journal, it was also not the wholly retrospective work that Dietz’s was. Sierk added new entries from time to time, reflecting upon such events in the intervening period
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301 Dietz, p. 188.
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as seemed significant to him. This is an important document as it is evidence of peasant written culture, traditionally overlooked in scholarship in favour of the characterisation, dominant since the Enlightenment, of the rural population as illiterate and in need of education. In fact, this view underpins the paternalistic approach taken in the Enlightenment to the question of peasant literacy, which led to education campaigns which tended to stifle, rather than enhance, peasant written culture. In light of this, Sierk’s chronicle is a rare and valuable document of a culture which has never been fully understood by the educated elite. Sierk represented the upper levels of rural society in Dithmarschen, which still to a large extent bore the character of the peasants’ republic which had existed there until the mid-17th century. As such, his testimony constitutes an important counterbalance to, and expansion upon, the culturally and linguistically High German perspectives on Low German and peasant culture of Leonora Christina, Dietz, and Rist. Finally, and most happily, his location in Wrohm places Sierk in the vicinity of Rist at the time of the composition and premiere of Perseus in Heide. Any insights that can be gained from Sierk’s account regarding the linguistic and literary conditions among Dithmarschen peasant communities will provide relevant contextualisation for the discussion of Rist’s peasant figures.

Sierk, notably, writes in the Middle Low German written language, from which it may be surmised that he received some formal education at a local school. This
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informs us not only about Sierk’s social context but ultimately also about the
standard of education available to the rural population even a generation before
Rist. Attendance at school also means that Sierk underwent some for of
socialisation and, both during his education and afterwards, as a literate man,
would have had contact with the other literate members of his community, notably
the teacher and the pastor. As part of his education, he would have learned how to
engage with such texts as the Bible, Catechism, postils, pamphlets, and calenders,
meaning that he had some manner of access to the intellectual currents of his day.
The limits of Sierk’s education are also apparent, as any attempt to introduce Latin
or foreign vocabulary results in the most fanciful of spellings – addefent for Advent,
Trappetten for Trompeten, muscheterers for Musketen.307 Remarkably, Sierk can be
observed from as early as 1638 attempting to incorporate High German elements
into his writing. Markers such as tz (Mertz, Schatz), Haber for haver, appear with
increasing frequency, and he is particularly insistent upon using the adjective ending
-er, irrespective of whether it is grammatically appropriate. This is likely to indicate
exposure to primarily written rather than spoken High German, in which he
incorporates graphic characteristics of the texts he encounters into his own usage.
As interference from spoken language, the use of these forms would indicate an
implausibly acute metalinguistic awareness, necessary to allow Sierk to transcribe
non-native phonemes into the appropriate non-native grapheme. Yet that he is
capable of engaging with High German texts in such a way as to influence his own
scribal practice is illustrative of the extent of his literate ability. Clearly, Sierk
belongs to the upper reaches of peasant society, and not all peasants were as
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linguistically adept. Yet he has a potential cognate in *Irenaromachia*’s Marten, a figure who, it will be seen below, may on the one hand demonstrate Rist’s sensitivity to the complexities of peasant society, while at the same time showing the limits to this. Beyond the characterisation of literate peasants, however, Sierk’s chronicle serves to counter the inclination to see peasant society as having existed in absolute isolation and exclusion from written and High German culture.

The case of Sierk highlights the inadequacies of attempting to model 17th-century society around the opposition *gelehrt-volkstümlich*. To seek to interpret the social dynamics along these lines commonly foregrounds, according to a distinction drawn by Maas, the way the language is materialised over the forms of its articulation. The materialisation of language through speech or writing is not in itself informative of the form of the linguistic articulation, where Maas distinguishes between orate and literate. The obvious difference between the two forms of articulation is syntactical, where literate articulation is more complex than orate articulation, and a similar distinction is likely also at the lexical level. Once attained, literate articulation influences spoken language practices. At the level of the individual, this does not presuppose actual literacy, as it is conceivable that written forms of expression could be picked up under influence from the speech of others. However, literate articulation is fundamentally underlain by textual discourse, and so requires the formal education which governs access to this. Literate culture is not defined by the constant reference to or explicit focus upon written texts, but by the privileged access to them. In this culture, these texts function as a fixed canon, providing the
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initiates with criteria for action. Here, ‘oral discourse effectively began to function within a universe of communications governed by texts’, as distinct from oral discourse with a non-written, i.e. orate, basis. The peasant Sierk is clearly participating in this literate culture. In the first instance through use of the Middle Low German written language, then through his concerted attempts to incorporate High German elements into his scribal practice, he attests to the textual basis of prestige culture and the symbolic value attached to the ability to access and participate in this. Literate culture, in Maas’ sense, was not the preserve of the social elite, and neither were the peasant classes absolutely excluded from it. It was, however, dependent on access to formal education.

This is particularly apparent in the treatment of Missingsch, above all in Perseus. The diglossic situation in the North had led to a sustained period of contact and interference between Low and High German, and the development of Missingsch. The term, for the forms of hypercorrect High German which emerged among Low German speakers through contact with the prestige idiom, is a corruption of the original ‘Meiẞnisch’. Use of Missingsch was a social marker, indicating not necessarily the lowest ranks of society, such as the rural poor, but also city dwellers with little or no formal education. Missingsch is characterised in Rist’s work as the language of misdirected social pretension, the result of an ignorant attempt by the uninitiated to speak High German.
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The central difficulty in engaging with portrayals of peasant culture is that the relevant data overwhelmingly comes from non-peasant sources. As the cases of Dietz and Sierk indicate, the major sources of data on peasant culture are either outsiders or exceptional individuals. If peasant culture was largely oral, if not also orate, any claims about the linguistic competence of an ‘average’ peasant must be of a somewhat speculative and provisional character. This is an obstacle also encountered by Schenda, who uses Johann Beer’s 1680 novel *Jucundus Jucundissimus* as a source for evidence of the discourse of the lower classes.\(^{314}\)

Explicitly seeking to avoid the uncritical perpetuation of a view of peasants as uncouth, verging on animalistic,\(^{315}\) he hypothesises that communication among the lower ranks of the rural population was more likely to be physical than verbal, with recourse taken to spoken exchanges only in exceptional circumstances.\(^{316}\) Among the educated classes, literate forms of articulation and the values of sociability meant that there was a text-centred culture of reading, discussion, and reflection,\(^{317}\) and the exclusion of the peasant classes from this culture is more than a linguistic matter. To the extent that peasant culture, as both oral and orate, lacked any textual basis, there was a conceptual barrier to meaningful communication with the educated classes. Of course, a member of one social group was likely capable, in a trivial sense, of making themselves understood to a member of the other, in light of the socially-restricted multilingualism by which the educated classes had a command of both written High German and the local dialect. The
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mutual inaccessibility of the two cultures was matter not of idiom but of differing subjects and ends of discourse, which were determined by the presence or absence of a textual basis. Again, the story that can be told about this inaccessibility is largely one-sided. As Schenda comments,

Die Gelehrten machen sich lustig über die Mißverständnisse und Unverständnisse, die beim Zusammenprall zweier Sprach- und Wissenskulturen entsehen, aber sie haben noch keinerlei Interesse an einer Demokratisierung ihres Wissens.\(^{318}\)

From the scholarly perspective, the confrontation of peasant with educated culture clearly would constitute a ‘Zusammenprall’, yet it is far from self-evident that the same thing would be experienced and conceived of in the same way by a peasant. This ridiculing is the humour of the peasant farces, meaning that such works have a generic disposition to be condescending towards the peasant figures. This holds, in essence, of Rist’s \textit{Zwischenspiele} also. These, it will be seen, are in many respects extraordinarily sympathetic to the plight of their peasant figures, but this is the sympathy of the literate High German perspective, and the peasants are peasants as conceived of by literate High German culture. Even in portraying peasant figures, Rist’s dramas cannot hope to offer a peasant perspective.

There were two forms of Low German available to Rist for his portrayal of peasant culture. These reflected the changing situative and social functions of the language. On the one hand, the Middle Low German literary tradition continued into the 17\textsuperscript{th} century. In some cases, such as in Lauremberg’s \textit{Scherzgedichte}, this constituted a

\(^{318}\) Schenda, ‘Orate und literarische Kommunikationsformen’, p. 454.
defence of the Low German tradition against its perceived usurpation by the new High German language. Such attempts were ultimately untimely and presented no serious obstacle to the spread of the High German sphere. Yet the work of a Lauremberg is noteworthy, demonstrating that even in the context of widespread acceptance of High German as the language of writing and elite discourse, Low German was not thereby the subject of universal scorn. That is to say, the pejoration of Low German did not as a matter of necessity accompany the acceptance of High German as a written language, it was just perhaps a highly likely side-effect of this cultural realignment. In any case, the Low German literary tradition gradually died out, its publications vastly outnumbered by High German works, and the portion of society which found representation in this tradition was ever-declining.\(^\text{319}\) In this process, High German became the sole language of literate culture.

On the other hand, transcribed Low German dialect was featured in written works to comic or (supposedly) realistic ends. Rist’s *Zwischenspiele* are largely composed in this tradition. This language, as it is manifested on the page, has its basis in written Middle Low German, but also displays evidence of dialectal developments and certain specific characteristics of spoken language. This is evident in the contrast between the Low German of *Irenaromachia*, which still owes much to written Middle Low German, and that of *Perseus*, which bears more the character of a transcription of spoken language. This practice of transcription demonstrates the general cultural heterocentring towards High German. As written Middle Low German falls out of practice, the language is increasingly only available as spoken

dialect, as language which manifests itself orally. The sense of this being the
language of uncouth peasants was often heightened in the Zwischenspiel tradition
through the technique of borrowing the dialect of a neighbouring area. Eastphalian
Low German was a common choice, which notably distinguished itself through the
use of mik/dik as opposed to the mi/di of the rest of the Low German area. This
usage had been a characteristic of 15th and 16th-century Eastphalian, which had in
fact by the 17th century accommodated to the western forms. The
preponderance of Eastphalian forms in the Zwischenspiel tradition attests to the
influence dramatic production from this area had on the development of the genre,
such that by the 17th century Eastphalian dialectal forms had become a defining
stylistic feature of these works. In this usage, Low German has a multi-layered
connotative function within a drama. Stylistically, it refers to the dramatic tradition
in which the work stands. As a means of characterisation, it functions to locate its
speaker within the social hierarchy, and guides the audience to react with scorn
through the use of alien forms. Lasch notes that the language of the Zwischenspiele
was not a straightforward transcription of any actual dialect, but a mixture on the
basis of spoken language and the written Low German tradition. Thus what led in
effect to the presentation of peasant culture as uneducated and non-literate was in
practice still underlain, to some extent, by scribal tradition. The technique of
including non-native linguistic elements, in particular the affinity for Eastphalian,
was based on the humour of encounters with the foreign. This three-way

combination of written Low German, dialect, and foreign elements was characteristic of the linguistic style of the Zwischenspiele.\footnote{Lasch, ‘Literarische Entwicklung des Plattdeutschen in Hamburg’, p. 432.}

An overview of the linguistic conditions in Northern Germany during Rist’s lifetime makes it clear that divergence in language use was increasingly accompanied first by situative, then also by socioeconomic distinction. The spheres of High and Low German within Northern German society became ever better defined. At the time when the multiple regional models for written High German were beginning to coalesce, this development was mobilised in pursuit of social demarcation. The heterocentred cultural orientation towards Latin had excluded the uneducated masses from participation in supraregional economics, politics, and culture. The transition to High German had a demoticizing potential, which the educated classes needed to counteract in order to retain their hegemonic status. Just as with Latin culture, formal education was necessary in order to join the High German political and cultural elite.\footnote{Maas, ‘Der kulturanalytische Zugang zur Sprachgeschichte’, p. 100; Frédéric Hartweg and Klaus-Peter Wegera, Frühneuhochdeutsch. Eine Einführung in die deutsche Sprache des Spätmittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1989), p. 34.} This demarcation was a phenomenon of Protestant Germany. The Catholic South did not join the new language movement, retaining its own ‘gemeines Teutsch’ with its own literary tradition. This was a language and literature for literate and illiterate alike, in contrast to which the Protestant pursuit of a national literary idiom appear forced and elitist.\footnote{Breuer, ‘Raumbildungen in der deutschen Literaturgeschichte der Frühen Neuzeit’, p. 191; Besch, ‘Dialekt, Scheibdialekt, Schriftsprache, Standardsprache’, p. 980.}

V – The Dramas

1. \textit{Irenaromachia}
Scholars have only counted *Irenaromachia* among Rist’s dramas since 1881, when his likely contribution to its composition was pointed out by Gaedertz. This is in spite of a claim in the *Belustigung*, where Rist counts it among his own dramas as ‘meine *Irenaromachia*, oder Friede und Krieg / (für welches Spiel ich gleichwohl eines anderen Namen gesetzt /).’ According to Gaedertz, Rist suppressed details of his involvement in the drama for most of his life both in order to avoid attacks from his fellow clergymen, and out of respect for his friend Ernst Stapel, who died in 1635 and under whose name the play was known. Further, Gaedertz identifies the Low German used as specifically Holsteinian, which made Rist a more likely author than the Westphalian Stapel, and supports this through textual comparison with *Perseus* and *Friedejauchzendes Deutschland*. Finally, through comparison with Pfeiffer’s *Pseudostratioticae*, which includes a versification of the *Irenaromachia Zwischenspiele*, Gaedertz concludes that Rist likely originally wrote in verse and then later transformed this into prose. Gaedertz is undoubtedly correct in identifying Rist’s involvement in *Irenaromachia*, but was overhasty in denying Stapel’s. His explanation does not fully account for the years between 1630 and 1635, when Stapel was still alive and before Rist’s appointment as pastor at Wedel. Contemporary sources treat the drama as a joint effort. The continuation of Tratziger’s chronicle of Hamburg asserts that ‘Autores waren Ristius und Stapel.’
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Irenaromachia’s belated inclusion in the canon of Rist’s works has not meant that it had previously been neglected by Rist scholarship. Scholars did not seriously engage with Rist’s dramas until the late 19th century, and so Rist’s likely contribution to Irenaromachia was discovered just as the first attention was beginning to be turned to Perseus, the Deutschland plays and the Depositio. Much of this early discussion of Rist’s dramas came from scholars associated with the Verein für niederdeutsche Sprachforchung, and a dominant concern was the characterisation of the Low German used in these works. The linguistic insights gained by scholarship conducted in this context provide much of the groundwork for the analyses of the dramas to follow here, without their conclusions having been uncritically accepted as valid.

These early studies of Rist’s dramas are often flawed in respect of their argumentation, as indicated by Gaedertz’s argument. This will be further demonstrated as more of this early scholarship is drawn under consideration below. However, without the thorough attempts to identify and categorise the Low German forms encountered in Rist’s works and the broader traditions of the Zwischenspiele and Low German drama, the current critical analysis of the language use in Rist’s dramas would be unthinkable.

The study of Irenaromachia occupies a unique position in Rist scholarship, reflecting its status within his oeuvre (according to received scholarly opinion) as the sole collaborative work. The exact nature of this collaboration, however, remains the subject of debate. The early scholarship conducted in association with the Verein für niederdeutsche Sprachforchung has been particularly influential in setting the tone for subsequent studies of Irenaromachia. The linguistic analysis of Irenaromachia
has been utilised in order to establish the nature and extent of Rist’s contribution to
the drama: indeed, this would appear to be the only approach available to
scholarship for ascertaining who, exactly, wrote what. The surviving explicit claims
on the matter present a conflicting picture: it was published under Stapel’s name,
apparently recognised by contemporaries as a collaborative effort, and later
claimed by Rist as his own. There are no surviving works of Stapel’s to which
Irenaromachia could be compared, even though Rist informs us that Stapel had
composed other dramas:

Herodes, Wallenstein und Gustav waren mein/

Der Teutschen Fried’ und Krieg und noch mehr andre dein.  

The question of Rist’s contribution to Irenaromachia is crucial to the situation of this
work in his oeuvre, and one on which there remains little meaningful scholarly
consensus. However, it is only once we possess an accurate picture of this that we
can meaningfully relate Irenaromachia to Rist’s other works.

A collaboration between Rist and Stapel does seem to be the most plausible
explanation. This is the position taken by Lasch, in light of the variation in the use of
Low German even within Irenaromachia. Where Gaedertz’s argument focuses on
the Zwischenspiele, Lasch also engages with the dialogue in the second act between
Irene and a Low German-speaking peasant, Rusticus. The Low German spoken by
this character is not the spoken dialect of the Zwischenspiel figures, but stands
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331 Johann Rist, Johannis Ristii Holsati poetischer Lust-Garte, das ist, allerhand anmuhtige Gedichte
auch warhaftige Geschichte...: Allen der teutschen poeteri vernünftigen Liebhaberen zu sonderbaren
Gefallen hervor und an den Tag gegeben (Hamburg: J. Rebenlein, 1638), p. 192. These dramas of
Rist’s are now lost, although Gaedertz (‘Johann Rist als niederdeutscher Dramatiker’, pp. 102-3)
supposes that Herodes and Wallenstein may have come to publication.
broadly in the tradition of written Middle Low German. In this, it shows some evidence of interference from High German, such as the use of *keen* (*kein*) for Low German *neen*,

332 and the use of *dick* (*dich*) only in the accusative as opposed to as an *Einheitsakkusativ*, as in Eastphalian, or the more usual *Einheitsdativ di*. 333 However, Lasch points out, Rusticus’ language also has some Holsteinian characteristics, such as *unse* (High German *uns*) and the formation of plural verbs in the present tense in *-et* as opposed to the *-en* of written Low German. The *Zwischenspiele*, by contrast, are more straightforwardly, generically Eastphalian in character.

Lasch’s proposed solution to the authorship question is that the peasant *Zwischenspiele* were a collaborative effort, while Rist composed the Irene-Rusticus dialogue alone. 334 Her argument is easier to critically engage with than Gaedertz’s, as she is careful to provide examples which support her characterisation of the Low German used, be that as Holsteinian, Eastphalian, or as a continuation of the Middle Low German written tradition. Gaedertz had not provided textual substantiation for his claim that the dialect in *Irenaromachia* was characteristically Holsteinian.

However, Lasch’s hypothesis that the *Zwischenspiele* were a collaboration between Rist and Stapel is founded solely on the Eastphalian elements in these scenes, which it is presumed cannot have been contributed by Rist. It is unclear, however, that it should be preferable to see these as the work of a Westphalian rather than a Holsteinian. The influence of Low German dramas from Eastphalia upon the

333 Første, pp. 12–3.


*Zwischenspiel* tradition means that the use of Eastphalian dialect is likely to be a matter of generic convention, without thereby implying anything about the regional background of the text’s composer.\(^{335}\) Granted, the language of *Irenaromachia* is much more Eastphalian than that of any of Rist’s other dramas, but as his earliest extant drama it could also stand at the beginning of a process of refinement of his linguistic technique. The more strongly Holsteinian character of *Perseus* may indicate the work of a more experienced and confident writer, while the Rist of *Irenaromachia* remained beholden to the generic convention of Eastphalian peasant farces. Further, Lasch’s study of the contemporary use of Low German in non-literary texts reveals that far from being specifically Holsteinian features, the use of *uns* and the formation of present plural verbs in *–et* were in fact characteristic of western, or Saxon Low German, in contrast to that of the eastern colonial territory, including Eastphalia.\(^ {336}\)

The argumentation is clearly fallacious – the language is only identified as Holsteinian because Rist is supposed to have written it. The linguistic argument for Rist’s authorship is thus inherently circular. This is a general flaw encountered in all discussions of the *Irenaromachia* authorship question. These are by their nature question-begging, their basis for establishing Rist’s contribution to the drama having been, in some form, an initial assumption of it. This places scholarship, for the time being, at an intriguing impasse – on the one hand it is almost certainly correct to claim *Irenaromachia* for Rist, on the other it is apparently impossible to provide sufficient evidence for this. That this issue continues to attract new hypotheses is in
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no small part testament to the enduring scholarly fascination with Rist. As the work of Stapel, *Irenaromachia* would likely have remained consigned to a footnote in literary history (if indeed that), such as Gervinus’ comment

Wir hören schon vor Rist’s Auftreten von einer Tragicomödie vom Frieden und Krieg von Ernst Stapel in Lemgo, die 1630 schon in Hamburg Aufgeführt ward.\(^{337}\)

The likelihood of Rist’s involvement in *Irenaromachia* piqued scholarly interest, offering the chance to add to the tantalisingly small canon of his extant dramas.

An interesting recent development in *Irenaromachia* scholarship opens up a new dimension to the debate. Wade has found an edition published in Copenhagen around the time of the 1634 ‘Great Wedding’ between Prince-Elect Christian of Denmark and Magdalena Sybille of Saxony, entitled:

Eine Newe TRAGICO COMOEDIA DE BELLO, ET PACE. Vor diesem durch Ernestum Stapeln in Lateinischn/an jetzo aber nach der Engelischen Manier, auff jetzigen Zustand dirigiret. Durch Joachim Cliqueum [von Kleppen], St. HAFNIAE, Sumptibus Authoris. Anno 1634.\(^{338}\)

Wade sees that this opens up the possibility of a different story about the nature of the Rist-Stapel collaboration, that Stapel composed a Latin drama which Rist then translated into German, perhaps introducing the Zwischenspiele in the process.\(^{339}\)

Since a German version exists from 1630, any Latin original would predate this,
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however in the absence of further information it remains uncertain whether the 1630 Hamburg performance, attested to in the continuation of Tratziger’s chronicle, took place in German or Latin. It is also unclear whether Stapel’s Latin original has survived in any form, which is regrettable since a comparison of Latin original and German translation would be highly illuminating, particularly in respect of the Irene-Rusticus dialogue in Act II. Was there some differentiation in the Latin used? In short, how did Rist (if indeed it was he) approach the translation of his friend’s work? It is undoubtedly relevant that this translation, if Wade is correct about the authorship of *Irenaromachia*, would be in the spirit of friendly collaboration in order to stage a performance according to the current fashion. As such, it would be categorically distinct from the translation projects of the *Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft*, including Rist’s own translation of Baudoin’s Tasso, with their explicit cultural-political focus on enriching the High German language. Yet without the prospect of comparison with the Latin original, any further comment on this matter must remain highly speculative.

A second interesting, and slightly more fruitful, point about the Copenhagen *Irenaromachia* is that the *Zwischenspiele* it contains are not those of the 1630 *Irenaromachia* but come from *Perseus*: namely I,2 and the first *Zwischenspiel.*\(^{340}\)

This is the subplot about Laban’s recruitment by Knapkäse to join his band of soldiers. Three potential motivations for this swap present themselves: an attempt to capitalise, somehow, on the recent publication of *Perseus*; a conviction that the *Perseus* scenes are more artistically accomplished than the *Irenaromachia Zwischenspiele*, which is uncontroversially the case; or indeed a judgment that the

\(^{340}\) Wade, p. 267.
Perseus scenes are more appropriate to the festive atmosphere surrounding a state wedding than the comparatively angry and violent Irenaromachia Zwischenspiele.

On the basis of Lasch’s position on the authorship of Irenaromachia, this swap would also constitute the replacement of scenes collaboratively composed by Rist and Stapel with scenes generally taken to be Rist’s independent work. However, since Rist is not named in association with the publication, it is difficult to be sure of the extent of his involvement with it. It may have been an act of plagiarism, but why credit Stapel and not his friend Rist? The publication of the Copenhagen version sumptibus authoris makes plagiarism a highly unlikely explanation, as does Wade’s supposition that Rist was in Copenhagen at the time of the wedding. From the evidence currently available, it is not clear what to conclude about the Copenhagen Irenaromachia. Formally speaking, however, the swap indicates the extent of the intended or perceived embeddedness of the Zwischenspiele within their respective dramas. Perhaps the original Irenaromachia Zwischenspiele relate just as well to the main plot of that drama as the scenes from Perseus. And even though the Low German scenes in Perseus are to some extent integrated into its High German plot, such that they could not straightforwardly be swapped for something else, it does no great violence to these scene themselves to lift them out and insert them into Irenaromachia.

No subsequent work has followed up on Wade’s discovery and discussion of the Copenhagen Irenaromachia, meaning that the weight of critical opinion on the matter of the drama’s authorship still favours a collaboration where Stapel composed some elements, Rist others. A basic, frequently encountered, and largely
agreeable characterisation of this collaboration is that Rist composed the Low German Zwischenspiele to Stapel’s High German main drama. This, however, does not directly address the question of the authorship of the Irene-Rusticus dialogue, embedded in the drama’s second act. If we may assume, on the basis of its supposed Holsteinian tint, that it is the work of Rist, then there is an interesting comparison to be made with the Zwischenspiele. The language of Rusticus, the peasant of the main drama, is written Middle Low German, historically not a spoken but a written language, spoken only when texts were read aloud. Assuming the drama is a cohesive unit, albeit one composed by two writers, the difference between the Low German of the Zwischenspiele and that of the Irene-Rusticus dialogue is evidence of a metalinguistic awareness which recognises both the potential relevance of genre distinction to language use and the variety of Low German languages at the writer’s disposal. The first point aligns with the Latin speaking name given to the peasant, in virtue of which he is a plausible player on the mythical-allegorical plane of the main drama otherwise populated by Roman gods and national allegories. Thus the peasant is ‘Rusticus’ and not, for example one of the characters from the Zwischenspiel. An individual character, instead of an embodiment of a type, would contrast radically, and not necessarily productively, with the allegorical figures surrounding him. As ‘Rusticus’, the peasant can represent peasanthood in his interaction with Irene. His use of a written Middle Low German is consistent with this representative function – his language use is not that of an individual but functions connotatively to highlight the social divide between the peasant and the other figures of the main drama, without furnishing Rusticus with characteristics which would serve to further individualise him.
By contrast, and to great effect, the Low German of the peasants in *Perseus* varies in accordance with their individual character. That the linguistic distinction between the written Middle Low German tradition and the dialectal Low German of peasant farces maps onto the generic distinction between main drama and *Zwischenspiel* in the case of *Irenaromachia* is not in itself a reflection on the generic requirements of these two elements. Rather, according to the internal logic of *Irenaromachia*, written Middle Low German is the appropriate Low German idiom for an allegorical figure. There is a tension in this. On the one hand, the choice of written Middle Low German for the allegorical drama reflects its more dignified status when compared to the dialectal varieties. On the other, placing this language in the mouth of a peasant, thereby creating a contrast to the High German of the other figures, reflects the ongoing pejoration and dialectization of Low German in general. Awareness of tradition competes with awareness of the new sociolectal implications of the use of Low German. The tension between these two demonstrates, thirdly, an awareness that there was a choice to be made between Low German varieties and trends. By 1630, the popular association of Low German with uneducated, unsophisticated peasants was all but cemented. Yet Rist’s dramas actively engage with the conditions of Low German usage, with the result that they are often much more than a cruel joke at the expense of the lowest social ranks, where Low German has the straightforward function of characterising peasants as uncouth. This sensitivity to the reality of the linguistic situation extends neither to a Laurembergian apology for written Low German culture, nor to an appeal against the dialectization of Low German. The role of High German as the language of culture and educated discourse is uncontested and even supported through the use
of Low German in Rist’s dramas. Equally, however, the dramas acknowledge and comment upon the fact that ‘Low German’ was far from a homogeneous entity.

*Irenaromachia* constitutes an interesting document of the process of pejoration of Low German, in that even its literate articulation could be utilised in the expression of peasant speech.

The *Zwischenspiele* in *Irenaromachia* are two parts of a single *Bawren Auffzug*. The language spoken by the peasants is, more than in any of Rist’s other Low German *Zwischenspiele*, the Eastphalian dialect which had become the standard idiom for works of the genre. Characteristics of this generic language, which has its roots in the language of the region but is also tied to the dramatic tradition, include the *Einheitsakkusativ* and use. Its use has clear sociolectal implications within the drama – it is only spoken by the peasant figures, while the quartermaster, the stranger Jäckel, and even the innkeeper speak High German. However, despite being unmistakably marked through their language use as belonging to the lowest social ranks, the peasants are not treated by the drama as objects of ridicule or disdain but enjoy a considerable amount of sympathy, even in light of their undeniably immoral behaviour. Further, the peasant community is presented as having its own distinctions in terms of authority and education, even though these are ultimately superseded by the interests of the High German culture. Language functions within the drama as a means of social identification and of establishing and maintaining a structure of authority. This is a stylised portrayal of its real-world function. The use of High German connotes (relative) social prestige, which within the drama means
that it is, somewhat improbably, placed in the mouths of such figures as the innkeeper.

The *Bawren Auffzug* opens with a monologue by the peasant Meves, who curses the Soldateska as ‘Galgen’ for plundering the resources of the peasant community and leaving them with nothing. The bitter irony of this epithet, which is repeatedly employed by the peasants in reference to their material oppressors, is revealed at the end of the piece when the peasants are led off to be hanged. However, in the first place Meves’ monologue establishes the peasant community as having been so thoroughly oppressed and being so powerless to contest this that there is little else for them to do beyond go to the inn and ‘drincken de Sorge vom Harten’. In the context of this pitiful state of affairs, the arrival of the quartermaster, with his contemptuous ‘Horch hie Bawr wo hin du Dieb?’ seems particularly aggressive, not least since the soldiers have just been established as equally guilty of thievery, and this with arguably more serious consequences.\(^{341}\) This opening exchange presents the prevailing, and ultimately unassailable, social conditions, in which the peasants must submit to a socially sanctioned campaign of aggression and oppression from the upper social ranks. When the quartermaster’s tactic of verbally and physically abusing Meves in pursuit of provisions for his troops is not immediately successful, he attempts a different approach with the second peasant, Sivert, cynically feigning politeness:

\[\text{QUARTIERMEISTER: guten Tag jhr Leute / guten Tag / wisset jhr warumb ich bin hier gekommen}\]

SIVERT: Wo du bist jo wol ein dummen Düuel / kanst dencken wann wy dat wüsten / datwe hier nich kommen dörsten / wat mangelt deck den? Wat istr?

Wat wultu hebben?342 P. 48

Sivert’s response indicates that the peasants are fully aware of how they fit into the structure of social power, and can be little else but resigned to this. The quartermaster explicitly sets out this social structure, along with the duties owed by the members of its lower ranks to those of its upper ranks:

Mein Herr ist der discretion, daß er einen jeglichen nach Standes gebühr halten vnnd respectieren kan / auch diejenigen so jhm contribuiren müssen / mit solchen manieren anredet / daß ein jeder gern vnnd gutwillig seines Vermügens nach giebet

The injustice of the situation is that the contributions demanded of the peasants far from accord with what they are in a position to provide. The system is set up in such a way that it is not the benefactors, but the beneficiaries, who decide upon the nature and extent of an appropriate contribution. The power structures again manifest themselves in the quartermaster’s language use. His introduction of alamodisms either functions as a rhetorical technique to reinforce his own authority over the peasants, or reflects his subordinate position in relation to his own master, in which case he would be here repeating the orders he has received. Either way, the use of foreign vocabulary is intended to signal a superior authority, implying a higher level of education as a mark of social status.

In this instant in which the social hierarchy is expressed through language use, it is in reality, if only temporarily, turned on its head. Sivert seizes the quartermaster’s sword and turns it against him; the peasants strip the quartermaster down to his shirt and send him on his way. In an attempt to secure immunity from retaliation, Sivert has the quartermaster swear an oath never to return. This oath is composed by Sivert in Low German, but sworn by the quartermaster in High German:

SIVERT: So geue Godt /

QUARTIERMEISTER: So gebe Gott /

S: Vn möte Godt

QM: Vnd müsse Gott /

S: Vn wolle Godt /

QM: Vnd wolle Gott /

S: Dat ick nümmer komme /

QM: Daß ich nimmer komme ...\(^{343}\)

The oath gives linguistic expression to the new social order the peasants have created. It is not enough that they have stripped the quartermaster of his clothes and weapons; through the oath they enact their victory and new authority by demonstrating the primacy of Low over High German. Of course, this new state of affairs does not and cannot last, as the actions of the peasants constitute not so much a social revolution as the unhorsing of an individual authority figure. The

---

\(^{343}\) Rist, ‘Irenaromachia’, p. 52.
quartermaster breaks his promise and returns, in the second half, to have the peasants executed. These two incidents, in which the quartermaster is stripped of and then subsequently reasserts his authority, demonstrate that while authority can manifest itself in language use, and this to great effect, it does not inhere in language. Language can be an effective tool of social control, but the authority itself is ultimately derived from elsewhere.

Amongst the peasants, Marten is recognised as an authority figure. He is their ‘Buhrmeister’, and ‘kan so wol lesen als de Köster vnde Priester’. It is on this basis that Sivert suggests he would be the best person to negotiate with the quartermaster.  

Sivert draws a comparison which associates literacy within peasant culture with official and clerical positions, not general social prestige. By 1630, the professional restrictions on literacy were beginning to be dissolved, even in rural areas. Sivert’s relation of literacy to professional functions means that he can be located in a rural population still relatively unaffected by general demoticization of written culture. In this respect, the peasant community of *Irenaromachia* can be seen to be far removed from the social and cultural developments occurring among the upper social ranks and in urban areas. Equally, however, Marten’s literacy, even though this stands in some (unspecified) relation to his role as representative of the peasant community, makes it clear that the peasants are not to be conceived of as existing in some isolated rustic backwater. Further, in identifying literacy as a relevant skill qualifying Marten to lead the negotiations, Sivert recognises the prestige it carries in society at large and the

---

peasants’ own disadvantage in this respect. Yet it is not clear exactly what Marten’s role in the peasant community is, and his literacy, while clearly a mark of distinction amongst the peasants, is of little relevance in wider society.

Unlike the quartermaster, Marten has some manner of mandate from his community, which willingly defers to him and nominates him as an authority figure. By contrast the peasants are forced by external power structures to submit to the quartermaster. Yet Marten’s authority is much more limited in scope than that of the quartermaster. He leads the peasants from within their ranks, not a position of marked social superiority, and he lacks the authority of foreign idiom. Marten speaks like the peasants, and largely acts like them – he robs with them and drinks with them. His social status is well demonstrated in his interactions with the High German-speaking innkeeper, Nickel. Nickel is at first reluctant to serve them beer as he doubts Sivert’s ability to pay, when Marten intervenes:

MARTEN: Höret Naber Nickel Stabi / gy möget nu wol intappen / ick wil yuw bethalen:

NICKEL: Ja Bawrmeister / wenn jhrs bezahlen wolt / so wil ich euch was langen.346

This exchange allows three conclusions to be drawn. Two concern the social structure of the peasant society portrayed: in addressing Nickel as ‘Naber’, Marten indicates that they are peers in some relevant sense, drawn from the same social milieu. Further, Nickel’s response indicates the respect commanded in the community by the position of ‘Bawrmeister’. In light of these two insights, it is apparent that Nickel’s use of High German is highly improbable. The third

conclusion that can be drawn therefore addresses the function of Low German within the *Bawren Auffzug*. It is spoken only by the three main peasants, as well as Sivert’s wife and son. It functions as a marker of their unity as a group and identifies them, whatever distinctions they might make amongst themselves and however pitiable the material conditions of their lives, as, ultimately, criminal.

Marten’s response to conflict between Sivert and Nickel over payment for beer is illuminating of both his status within society and his understanding of this. He informs Sivert:

> Ick vorbede yuw by uses G. Heren högsten straffe / dat gy usen Kröger Nickel
> Stabi gewehren lathet / un doht ehme neen gewalt in synem Huse / scheme
> gy yuw nich / vor dyssen frembden Gesellen [i.e. Jaeckel] de hier sitt?\(^{347}\)

Marten demonstrates that he has power to exercise official authority over the peasants. Beyond this, he posits ‘dyssen frembden Gesellen’ as having a further element of authority over Sivert’s behaviour. He thus sets limits to his own authority, enshrined in his official position within the peasant community, through reference to the structures of power and prestige in society at large. These supersede the authority he bears within the peasant community, which is not recognised outwith it. Marten receives the same treatment as the other peasants, and is hanged with them. While from the perspective of the peasants he is a distinguished member of their community, the perspective of High German culture barely registers this distinction.

In the second half of the *Bawren Auffzug* the social order, which the peasants had upset temporarily and on a local level, is restored through their executions. Within the immediate context, their treatment at the hands of the quartermaster is not obviously wholly unjust – after all, they had robbed him with his own weapon. However, their actions were also a desperate and ultimately hopeless reaction against relentless, societally sanctioned oppression. The High German world order is restored, but the peasant perspective is not silenced. It is Low German voices who have the final say. Sivert is an object of genuine pity as he bemoans his fate, ‘O ick arme Kerl’, and his son is left alone onstage pleading pathetically, ‘O Gott / O Gott / lathet my doch mynen Vaer / ick hebbe yo men den einen Vaer.’

Around 1639, *Irenaromachia* was published at Breslau, and soon thereafter reissued ‘Sampt einem lustigen Paurenauffzuge, welcher anders ubersetzt worden.’ In this version, the Low German Zwischenspiele had been translated into Silesian dialect. The peasants were also given more local, or less obviously North German, names. Sivert Schwalgebütte became Matz Stürtzebrecher and Marten Möhrkoke became Feit Schnitzer. Meves, interestingly, became Hanß Wurst, despite barely conforming to the type and being a much more minor character than both Sivert and Marten. It would be interesting to compare the original to the Breslau version to see if there has been any substantive difference brought about by the translation. Providing a

---

sample from Meves/Hanß Wurst’s opening monologue, Lowack argues that the (unknown) translator stuck closely to the Low German original.\textsuperscript{349}

MEVES: Pfuy de bösen Vögel / Godt
loff unde danck / hefft se de grote Ule
einmahl wechgeföhret / de losen
Galgen unde Schrobbers / de us hyr
ein Jahr efft etlyke hebbn wat tho
brühen vatet / unde de wy met ehren
Horen unde Jungens haben möthen
groth vöhen.

HANß WURST: Nu Gautt lob a danck,
dar Toiffl hot ju a mol die diebß Vaugl
waig gefuhr, die lusa Galgaschwengal,
die üns a Johr andr etliche
ehlemantsch ding sihr gebrüth, und
die ma noch derzu mit ihre Hura und
Junge inde gruß hot Respculira müssa.
In comparing the versions, it would also be worthwhile to engage with whether, and how, the Irene-Rusticus dialogue was translated. Answers to these questions would shed further light on to what end(s) the *Bawren Auffzug* was translated and perhaps, through this, enable a more accurate analysis of the original. For while the original was argued above to have provided insight into, and even comment upon, the contemporary conditions of spoken Low German, if it could bear straightforward translation into Silesian dialect, the historical conditions of which were quite different, then any claim that the use of Low German was of specific relevance would be mitigated. In this case, the dialect use would be a superficial feature of the play and a means to the characterisation of the peasant figures, but it would not greatly matter *which* dialect was used, and this could unproblematically be swapped around depending on the regional background of the play’s audience. The Irene-Rusticus dialogue, bearing in the original much of the character of written Middle Low German, provided a key point of comparison and contrast for the more dialectal Low German of the *Bawren Auffzug*. This functioned as a document of the double existence of the language, recalling its status as a language of writing while reflecting the contemporary processes of dialectalisation, and the attendant sociolectalisation, to which it was subjected. There is no straightforward analogue to written Middle Low German in Silesian culture, only a Silesian written High German which, one ventures, would not have provided a fruitful, or even particularly meaningful, contrast to the language spoken by Irene. The options which remain are to leave Rusticus’ speech untranslated or to translate it into Silesian, which would probably be the same idiom as that spoken by the peasants in translation. Even if the first approach did not present insurmountable obstacles to comprehension, it would certainly alter the nature of the comedy as experienced by the audience. The second
approach would necessarily lose some of the specific Low German relevance, but retain the general, generic comedy.

2. Perseus

The existence of prefatory material for Perseus provides more scope for discussion of the drama’s treatment of language than was possible in the case of Irenaromachia. Perseus is prefaced by a letter to the drama’s three dedicatees. Of particular interest in respect of language is Rist’s apology for the Zwischenspiele, in which he explains

\[
\text{daß ich mit gegenwertigen Intersceniis dem gemeinen Manne (als der mit solchen vnd dergleichen possirlichen Auffzügen am allermeisten sich belustiget) vornemlich habe gratificiren vnd dienen / mit nichten aber dieses oder jenen Landes sitten / gebräuche sprache vnd geberde dadurch auffziehen oder verspotten wollen}^{350}
\]

This sentence is at best unclear, at worst misleading. It makes two distinct points. First, that the Zwischenspiele were included to accommodate the tastes of the ‘common man’; second, that this was not intended to mock the culture of any specific region. The first point concerns the social status of a portion of Rist’s projected audience. The second speaks to the regionality of dialect. It would be illegitimate to simply combine these points into a claim about Rist’s intentions in respect of society’s lowest ranks, i.e. those for whom dialect-speaking was a matter of socioeconomic status. The point about regional culture in part constitutes a reaction against the practice in Low German drama of placing a non-native variant in the mouths of the peasants in order to heighten the impression of their uncouth

nature. In *Perseus*, premiered in Heide, Rist departs radically from this technique by having his peasants speak a dialect with a clear Holsteinian basis. This does not itself mean that his peasant figures are not coarse, only that their coarseness is not portrayed through their use of a foreign language variant. Rist’s linguistic technique in the Low German parts of *Perseus* is remarkably sophisticated, and the peasants, although they are again treated with a degree of sympathy, they are not beyond reproof for their conduct – particularly, it will be seen, as regards language. However, with this comment in the preface Rist is making his dedicatees aware that the comedy in his language use is not regionally-targeted, and does not rely on an encounter with non-native dialect for its effect.

This leaves the undoubtedly more complex task of deciphering who is understood by the ‘gemeiner Mann.’ Such a person is characterised as particularly enjoying the ‘possirliche Auffzüge’, which themselves contain figures who speak in dialect, although nothing is hereby said about the common man’s dialect use. Given both the tradition of Protestant school drama and the emphasis the preface lays on tragedy being otherwise the genre of kings and rulers, the ‘gemeiner Mann’ clearly belongs neither to the nobility nor to the Latin school-educated, professional classes. This still leaves a large portion of society in consideration, up to and including those educated at the German schools. The generic proximity of the ‘possirliche Auffzüge’ to the drama of the itinerant stage provides positive indication that the projected audience for *Perseus* includes those without a formal education, who would also have attended and enjoyed the marketplace performances of the *Wanderbühne*. Such theatre was also enjoyed at court, and influenced the dramatic production of Heinrich Julius of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel. So, while the *Zwischenspiele* are conceived of as particularly appealing to the ‘gemeiner Mann’, they do not thereby
neglect the interests of the educated and ruling classes. In spite of the *Wanderbühne* character of the *Zwischenspiele in Perseus*, it is unclear how far down the social hierarchy the term ‘gemeiner Mann’ could have extended in practice. Whoever was attracted by the ‘possirliche Auffüge’ would still have had to sit through the main drama. Unlike in *Irenaromachia*, the *Zwischenspiele* do not in themselves constitute a dramatic unity, but refer to and are integrated amongst the events of the main drama. While their farcical and slapstick comedy could certainly be enjoyed in its own right, someone seeking such entertainment alone would likely do better to attend a *Wanderbühne* performance. It is important not to simply conflate the figures portrayed in the *Zwischenspiele* with the audience to whom they were intended to appeal. This is crucial since the distinction is not maintained in the *Perseusvorrede*, which offers a generic definition of comedy, namely

> das die Comœdien, nur bloß von schlechten und wolbekanten Sachen handelen sollen [...] so fast täglich unter dem gemeinen Manne passiren und vorlauffen.351

Analysis of the peasant figures in *Perseus* indicates that the ‘gemeiner Mann’ of comedy is not identical with the ‘gemeiner Mann’ of the audience – if, indeed, such a historical individual could ever have existed. Their language use locates them in the lowest ranks, and their real-life equivalents can hardly come into serious consideration as potential audience members.

This point can be supported on the basis of evidence both external and internal to the drama. Externally, it seems improbable that the lowest members of society would rub shoulders at a theatrical performance with, say, the parents of the Latin school pupils. This need not even be a function of explicit social stratification so much as a reflection on the

351 Rist, ‘Perseus’, p. 120.
different lifestyles associated with the different ranks. Attending a performance by Latin school boys would not constitute a leisure activity for the peasantry. Where the peasants in question are the rural poor, their attendance at a school theatre production is even less likely. In 1638, pupils from the German school in Stockholm performed *Perseus* for the queen consort, Maria Eleonora, at her explicit request.\(^{352}\) This performance supports the proposed context for *Perseus* within the theatrical tradition, as a drama suitable for school productions, probably as conducive to the ends of rhetorical education, with audiences drawn primarily from the upper ranks of society. The issue of audience composition is not encountered in the same way in respect of *Wanderbühne* performances, which often took place in open public spaces with the troupes owing their economic survival to attracting large audiences. Internally, there is little to attract such peasants as are portrayed in *Perseus* to the drama itself. Some of the humour, such as the slapstick comedy of the Telsche scene, is crude and superficial. Beyond this, however, it is improbable that a peasant could meaningfully recognise himself in any of the drama’s peasant figures. This would be an important step in establishing any intended identification between the characters in the drama and its projected audience. The fundamental obstacle to such an identification lies in the language use of *Perseus*’ peasant figures.

Interestingly, there is little reason to suppose that this exclusivity was explicitly intended. By deliberately including the ‘gemeiner Mann’ in his projected audience Rist demonstrates commitment to the principles of inclusivity and accessibility, just without consideration for their real-world implications. His peasant figures remain the peasant images of the educated classes. This corresponds to the conventions governing the physicality of peasant

---

portrayals in the theatre, which required grotesque movements and positions reflecting the stereotypes of the cultural elite. Rist sympathises greatly with the peasants – an important point which can scarcely be overstated, since generic convention demanded an otherwise cruel portrayal. However, he is unable to fully empathise with them, with the consequence that his portrayal of their lives is more a scholarly imagining of wherein these might consist based on the generic figures of the peasant farces, with little hope of accurately or meaningfully reflecting their material reality. Further, the sympathy expressed in Perseus for the peasants’ lot does not concern their disadvantaged position within the social hierarchy but the particular suffering brought about by the effects of the war. This suffering is of course largely a result of, or at least compounded by, their social position, but Rist’s is not a socially radical perspective. Rather, he shows concern for the welfare of the peasants within the existing social structure, while utilising their wartime experience to vividly draw attention to the human cost of the war.

There may have been little malicious intent underlying this – indeed it will be seen that Rist could certainly have portrayed his peasants in a much crueler light, had he so wished – yet it is neither realistic in effect nor particularly respectful. Of course, there is little reason to suppose that Rist would, or even could, be attempting any sort of ‘respectful’ treatment of the peasants, yet, again, this would be a key prerequisite for seriously and meaningfully including them as part of his projected audience.

Schiewek singles out the figure of Laban as the most interesting of the Zwischenspiel characters. This is arguably true, although her reasoning is flawed. According to Schiewek, Laban is the drama’s only mimetically-constructed character, and is inductively developed

---

on the basis of the reality of peasant life and the circumstances that befall him.\textsuperscript{354} This point is made through contrast with the characterisation in the main drama, where the action is minimal, the plot essentially borne by a series of monologues, and the outcome largely a foregone conclusion. The characters of the Zwischenspiel, by contrast, are seen engaging with each other and productively interacting in a manner which influences the course of events. Yet the attribution of realist technique or effect to the characterisation of Laban is clearly misplaced, as can be demonstrated through analysis of Laban’s language use. The significance of this is lost on Schiewek who, for the sake of her argument, translates the Low German passages into High German.

When he first appears in I,2, Laban speaks the coarse Low German, characterised above, of a peasant. Knapkäse speaks High German, albeit with some traces of Missingsch, hypercorrect High German. Tellingly, the mistakes Knapkäse makes with his High German concern military vocabulary. When Laban mentions a ‘Hoppenföhrer’, Knapkäse responds scornfully: ‘Ey du grober Narr / was Hoppenföhrer? Du wirst ein Hopffman meinen / oder Cafitzen / wie ich einer bin.’\textsuperscript{355} His mistake is to hypercorrect $p$ to either $pf$ or $f$, and $t$ to $tz$, which show his linguistic background to be in Low German even though his High German is otherwise largely convincing, from a phonological-lexical perspective. There is an interesting comparison to be made to the linguistic competence of Hartich Sierk, who particularly struggled with the orthography of foreign vocabulary. In the cases of muscheterers for Musketen and, conceivably Trappeten for Trompeten,\textsuperscript{356} this was of military origin.

Knapkäse struggles with both the High German Hauptmann and the foreign Kapitän. Laban,

\textsuperscript{356} See above p. 19
however, initially retains the Low German *Böuerste* (High German *Oberst*) when addressing Knapkäse. This means that there are three different words, of differing linguistic origin, for the same thing in use at one time – two of which are also subject to variation in form as a result of the speaker’s linguistic incompetence. However, only the Low German variant is used appropriately.

The joke in this instance is obvious – Knapkäse corrects Laban’s language use, but gets it wrong himself, his pretensions to authority exposed through his linguistic ineptitude. Yet there are more serious implications. First, Knapkäse’s mistakes draw attention to military words as being particularly alien to his vocabulary, signalling this as a world in which he does not really belong. This could yet be a minor point about his unsuitability for a position as an officer in respect of his social background, but the drill scene of the first *Zwischenspiel* raises more serious concerns about military life, and the drama as a whole is seriously pessimistic about the potential of armed conflict to solve problems. Second, Knapkäse demonstrates the role played by High German in supporting the social hierarchy. Even though he is at the lower end of High German society, he can still assert himself over the Low German classes. In turn, members from these ranks, such as Laban, can only turn to such figures as Knapkäse as their models to find their way into High German society.

When Laban agrees to join Knapkäse’s company, he is warned:

> dieses must du wol in acht nehmen / daß du dich hinfohrt nicht mehr so grob vnd Bäwrisch haltest / in Gebehrdn / Kleidung / Reden / alse du bißher gethan: Du must

Knapkäse reinforces the association between ‘grob’, ‘Bäwrisch’ and Low German while contrasting it with the alamode High German culture, presented as more desirable. Note that Laban must also cast off peasant physicality and garb, as well as speech, in order to enlist. However, it is upon the speech that Knapkäse places most emphasis, through the provision of examples. The pejoration of Low German here relies heavily on its association with language of peasants. It is not treated as inherently undesirable but is rendered as such through the increasing solidification of its new status as sociolect.\footnote{Ulrich Knoop, ‘Zur Begrifflichkeit der Sprachgeschichtsschreibung: Der “Dialekt” als Sprache des “gemeinen mannes” und die Kodifikation der Sprache im 18. Jahrhundert’, in Deutscher Wortschatz. Lexikologische Studien. Ludwig Erich Schmitt zum 80. Geburtstag von seinen Marburger Schülern, ed. by Horst Haider Munske and others (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1988), pp. 336–350 (p. 343).} In making the conceptual association Low German-peasant-coarse, Knapkäse supports his own position of social superiority over the peasant class while presenting Laban with the means of upwards social mobility. Laban’s acceptance into the life of a soldier depends on his ability to master alamode High German. To both Knapkäse and Laban, this is the language of the military in the contemporary wartime conditions. Knapkäse’s translation of ‘Jch wil tho Huß gahn’ replaces the Low German civilian vocabulary with alamode High German military vocabulary. In this, the act of going home is transported from the realm of native, familiar experience to the essentially foreign and impersonal: the native ‘Huß’, which is in some sense one’s own, becomes foreign ‘Quartier’, where one only lodges. Laban, meanwhile, claims that he will be able to pick up alamode High German with relative ease: ‘den frömden Schnack hebbick all lange / lange van de Rüters lehret.’ Again, alamode language is recognised as the language of military life. It is particularly relevant that Laban identifies this language as a ‘frönder
Schnack’, and not a sophisticated, prestige, or even normative variant of his own language. His identification of Knapkäse’s language norms as foreign highlights the divergence in perspective between the two figures. Knapkäse contrasts coarse, peasant Low German with (implicitly) sophisticated alamode High German, while Laban casts the difference between the languages in terms of the binary native – foreign.

Their differing perspectives on language and language use are informative of the different spaces – physical, social, cultural, institutional – they inhabit. Laban speaks the language spoken by the members of his immediate community (really, a somewhat stylised version of a spoken rural Holsteinian variant). He defines and produces this community through identifying the language of outsiders as ‘foreign’. The opposition between native and foreign idiom is particularly noticeable to Laban and his community in the contemporary wartime conditions, which bring an increase in troop movements and the practice of billeting soldiers in peasant houses. In this, a relatively stable, static community, conceived of as rooted in a single, delineated geographical location, is confronted by an essentially rootless, mobile group of people. Laban describes the situation in his community:

Use Nabers / de eene hader ein süluern Garfe van im Huse / de anner ein Lütlandt / de drüdde ein Carnettet / de verde einen Feldttwifeler […] Myn Vaer hader ock yo ein Haluncken van im Huse.359

The peasants are forced to open their homes to foreign soldiers, who, on the other hand, are unable to treat these as homes, only as a ‘Quartier’. The soldiers seize the external, physical reality of the peasant community, their shelter and material resources, and then move on. This is the condition in which we are introduced to the peasants of Irenaromachia,

having been exploited by the Soldateska for all (what little) they were worth. Yet *Perseus*
makes plain that the soldiers’ lot is not without its own sadness. Their material needs are
catered to (at the expense of those of the peasants), but they lack much meaningful sense
of belonging.

Laban, on the other hand, is clearly embedded in not only a local peasant community (with
‘Nabers’), but also a family unit. He makes repeated reference to his parents, as in the
above quotation, where he explains that his ‘Vaer’ had a soldier billeted in his house. Until it
is clear he will be paid, his objections to joining Knapkäse are primarily informed by
consideration of his relationship to his parents. He has no need to serve under Knapkäse ‘so
lange alß myn Vaier und Môme leuen.’\(^\text{360}\) To Schiewek, this identifies Laban as the son of
relatively independent and well-off peasants.\(^\text{361}\) However, since Laban is ultimately tempted
by the money, his objection here need not be on purely financial grounds. His prediction of
how his mother would respond were he to become a soldier reveals a close relationship
between the two: ‘ehr dat use Môme lede / dar blared se veel leuer den Halß vor
entwey.’\(^\text{362}\) In becoming a soldier, Laban would be giving up close family bonds and security.
This is a sacrifice which the current soldiers have already made. While Laban still lives at
home, Knapkäse stays ‘zum blawen Jammer / nictweit vom grossem Ellende / gerade
gegen der Hungergassen über.’\(^\text{363}\) The designation ‘frömbd’ goes beyond a straightforward
characterisation of the soldiers’ language as foreign to a point about their being. Unlike
Laban, in his family and community, they live a life of alienation. Knapkäse himself betrays

\(^{360}\) Rist, p. 136.
\(^{361}\) Schiewek, p. 197.
\(^{363}\) Rist, ‘Perseus’, p. 139.
this, even as he tries to recruit Laban, in his use of military vocabulary which is either hypercorrect or alamode.

To the extent that Knapkäse’s metalinguistic stance involves the prescription of certain types of vocabulary, it is clearly influenced by his position in the military. By contrast, the proscription of vocabulary that is ‘grob’ and ‘Bäwrisch’ signals participation in the broader trend of the increasing pejoration of Low German through its explicit and exclusive identification as the language of the peasants. With his Missingsch-tinged speech, Knapkäse’s background is clearly in Low German, yet his requirement is notably not that Laban speak this language in a more refined manner (perhaps through taking care to pronounce his d’s). Refined, urban Low German was still available as a viable standard, but to Knapkäse the relevant linguistic norm is High German. It is not clear whether he perceives this as foreign – although his use of it clearly betrays that it is – since he primarily presents it as an implicitly more sophisticated language than Low German. The figure of Knapkäse reflects two dominant concerns of contemporary metalinguistic discourse, namely the establishment of High German as a normative standard and the concern that this should be correct High German. In this, Knapkäse is a complex figure, correctly identifying High German as normative, but using it poorly. Laban’s initial metalinguistic stance reflects the reality that High German, in the absence of the cultural products available to the educated classes, must appear foreign to the peasants, a perception which is compounded by the fact that the only High German to which they have access is the corrupted alamode High German of the roving Soldateska. His next appearance, in the first Zwischenspiel, shows him engaging with Knapkäse’s linguistic norms and attempting to speak the High German required of him.
It is at this point that Laban’s language use becomes highly improbable, in a manner that casts serious doubt on the claims both that he is a truly mimetically-composed figure and that the comedy of the Zwischenspiele could be any more than superficially accessible to the peasant classes. When Laban returns to the stage in the first Zwischenspiel he is speaking a comprehensive Missingsch. He has identified many principles governing High German morphology and phonology and has overwhelmingly failed to apply them correctly. This switch in his language use from ‘grob vnd Bäwrisch’ to outrageous Missingsch is improbably drastic and clearly played for laughs. Laban’s earlier claim to have picked up the ‘frömbden Schnack’ from the ‘Rüters’ does not fully prepare his language use in this scene. While he goes to great effort to High-Germanise his language, he does not alamodise as Knapkäse had demanded. In fact, the only characteristic of soldier-speech he has successfully introduced into his own usage is the cursing, but this was something he had in fact learned from his mother, ‘de plagse mynem Vaer by 20. Treden Tunnen vull interm Liue tho flöken.’

Laban’s mistakes in High German are to greater comic effect than Knapkäse’s in the earlier scene, not only because they occur in a far greater volume but also because the audience has Laban’s previous Low German as a point of comparison, in light of which his sudden transition to Missingsch seems all the more implausible. His High German is thoroughly disastrous. Martens has identified all of Laban’s mistakes in High German speech and categorised these in respect of the rule Laban had misapplied. The overview this provides makes it clear that Laban has identified many distinct differences between Low and High

German, and these predominantly in respect of phonology. His misguided attempts to put the recognition of these differences into practice go wrong in different ways. Much of the time, his High German is hypercorrect: Korporal > Kapfrall; Degen > Zegen; or he hypercorrects his Low German by High German standards wat/dat > watz/datz. Other times, he fails to fully and correctly apply all of the rules that would pertain to a given word, with the result that one element of the word is transformed into High German, which might itself be hypercorrect, while another retains the Low German form. Low German altiet (High German allzeit) becomes alteitz, in which the Low German vowel correctly becomes a High German diphthong, but the second t, not the first, becomes [-ts]. Martens’ study highlights a catalogue of rules misapplied in many and various ways by Laban. It is highly improbable both that he could have developed this language use from one appearance to the other, and that we should seriously entertain the notion that he had. His Missingsch is hyperbolically incompetent and evidence of a highly stylised, not mimetic, characterisation.

Laban’s linguistic shortcomings comically complement the physical impairments of Knapkäse’s other two recruits, the one-eyed Cocles and the bow-legged Loripes. These physical inadequacies reflect the generic requirements of portrayals of peasant figures, yet it is Laban’s faulty language use that is furthest developed. And while the slapstick comedy of Cocles and Loripes is generally accessible, the comedy of Laban’s language use is only apparent to those who know better – i.e. competent High German speakers. In the North German context, this means those with access to formal education, and so excludes from consideration members of the lower social ranks. The restriction to those who have productive competence in respect of High German, excluding the broader set of those whose competence was solely receptive, is warranted since even Laban does not display any

---
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difficulty in comprehending High German, or at least Knapkäse’s approximation of this. The joke is on those who cannot transform a working ability to comprehend High German into an independent ability to speak it, and yet persist in the attempt. This excludes Laban’s fellow peasants from having been seriously intended as members of Rist’s projected audience. On the other hand, the humour relies upon the perspective of a competent High German speaker. Laban’s outrageous linguistic incompetence is a reflection of Rist’s own competence, in which he demonstrates awareness both of correct High German forms and Low German usage, as well as an ability to creatively interrelate these two to comic ends.

The humour of Laban’s language use both relies on and reproduces the existing social structure, in which High German is the prestige language of the educated classes. Their exclusive status is tied to their productive competence in respect of High German, and is brought into sharp relief by the unsuccessful attempts of the non-competent to speak the prestige idiom. It is primarily through such attempts that the inaccessibility of High German culture is exposed. All of the peasant figures can understand High German, but not even Knapkäse, who comes closest, can fully and convincingly reproduce it. Rist does not seek to redress the imbalance maintained by the linguistic demarcation, but equally he does not outright and unreservedly condemn the Low German speakers. Laban is not genuinely ridiculed for speaking Low German, but for failing in his attempt to speak High German. The truly ridiculous figure is Knapkäse, whose social pretensions manifest themselves in his language use.
3. *Friedejauchtzendes Teutschland*

In addition to a dedicatory preface as included in *Perseus, Das Friedejauchtzende Teutschland* contains a *Vorbericht an den auffrichtigen Teutschen Leser*. This additional level of prefatory material is in essence an apology, addressed primarily not to the reader who is ‘teutsch und redlich’ but ‘meinen Neidern’ and those ‘welche gern alles mügen tadeln’. This preface contains Rist’s most detailed and informative explicit discussion of language use and its implications. The drama itself does not engage in much further exploration of these issues. However, the Low German spoken by the peasants here is evidence of a refined dramatic technique. The Low German, and particularly the *Missingsch*, of *Friedejauchtzendes Teutschland*, is no longer the object of discussion it had been in *Perseus*, but figures more straightforwardly as a tool of characterisation.

The discussion of language use in the *Vorbericht* prepares the way for its employment in the drama as a means of characterisation, and in this gives an indication of Rist’s perception of his dramatic technique in its relationship to the expectations and prejudices of his projected audience. Where the *Vorbericht* is largely concerned with deflecting the anticipated criticisms of Rist’s ‘Neider’ and ‘Tadler’, in the discussion of language use ‘der auffrichtige Teutsche Leser’ is explicitly addressed. This demonstrates Rist’s awareness that his technique here is unconventional, his intentions liable to be misconstrued. The reader is requested
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daß er sich an der ungewöhnlichen Art zu reden / welche in unseren Zwischenspielen vielleicht befindlich / ja nicht ärgeren / noch ein ungleiches Urtheil von derselben wolle fällen.  

This ‘ungewöhnliche Art zu reden’ is the Low German which is spoken by the peasant figures in this drama. In the first instance, the characterisation ‘ungewöhnlich’ enables identification of who is foreseen as a reader of the drama, namely those who are not accustomed to using or even encountering Low German speech. This was certainly the case among the educated upper circles in Lüneburg by the time of the premiere of *Friedejauchtzendes Teutschland* by pupils at its Gymnasium in 1653.  

‘Ungewöhnlich’ also betrays a nuanced metalinguistic stance, almost defensive in its neutrality. Spoken dialect is not primarily, straightforwardly ‘grob’, as Knapkäse in *Perseus* would have it, nor is it conceived of as deviant or substandard in relation to a posited linguistic norm. It is spoken by people outwith the group of the Vorbericht’s primary addressees, but the recognition of this fact does not itself carry any evaluative implications. On the contrary, it anticipates such a negative reaction to the Low German passages and rejects it as an inappropriate response. This demonstrates both that Rist was familiar with the metalinguistic preconceptions of his social peers, who would adopt an unreflectively dismissive stance towards the speaking of dialect, and that he had gone to some effort to counter this tendency in warning even ‘den auffrichtigen Teutschen Leser’ not to overreact to his use of spoken dialect.

The explicit intention to provide an accurate portrayal of the world as it is experienced provides the justification for the presence of dialect:

---
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This point is particularly interesting as it provides details of the metalinguistic categories to which Rist had access and of which he availed himself. High German is available as ‘Hochteutsche Sprache’, and this in its sense of being the normative language of the social and cultural elite. The opposition manifested in the contrasting languages spoken in the drama is not drawn along regional lines, between Central, or Upper, and Low German. It is a contrast between initiates into educated High German society and uneducated peasants. However, while High German is of itself normative, and the mastery of it socially desirable, Low German does not thereby carry the complementary negative connotations that would render it inherently undesirable. Rist uses an exclusively topographical designation for the language spoken by his peasants, even though a designation such as Plattdeutsch, in an increasingly pejorative sense, was already available to him. Almost two decades following the publication of Perseus, and now a renowned member of the High German cultural elite, Rist retains an understanding of dialect as in itself primarily a marker of regional background.

Dialect use in the drama is in principle supported through the presence of characters representing real-world dialect speakers. It also represents a trade-off between two oppositional expectations held by (posited) audience members/readers: on the one hand

\textsuperscript{370} Rist,'Das Friedejauchtzende Teutschland', p. 228.
only to encounter language to which they are accustomed, on the other to be presented
with a recognisably accurate representation of the world. A High German-speaking Low
Saxon peasant is laughably implausible, owing to the social preconditions accompanying
competent High German usage in Northern Germany. Note the change in perspective from
_Irena oromachia_, where the innkeeper, Nickel, spoke High German in spite of belonging to the
peasant community. In _Irena oromachia_, Low German had functioned to identify the three
main peasant figures, and their family members, in the context of a social structure in which
authority correlated with High German use. Since Nickel had not joined them in their crime,
he belonged on the High German side of the binary. In _Friedejauchtzentes Teutschland_, on
the other hand, the language use of the peasants is explicitly governed by the requirement
that this meaningfully reflect real-life conditions, with nothing thereby implied about their
moral character.

This is relevant because in _Friedejauchtzentes Teutschland_, more so than in Rist’s other
dramas, the peasants are irredeemably immoral, negative characters, brutalised by the war
and lacking any decent, Christian desire for peace. However implausible a High German-
speaking Low Saxon peasant would be,

    noch viel nährischer aber würde ein solches Zwischenspiel den Zuschaueren
    fürkommen / darin man einen tollen / vollen Bauren und fluchenden Dreweß / als
    einen Andächtigen betenden und recht Gottseligen Christen aufführte. \(^\text{371}\)

This is a point about the morality of the peasants, not their language use. A distinction is not
drawn between High German Christians and Low German heathens. Through the peasant

\(^{371}\) Rist, 'Das Friedejauchtzende Teutschland', p. 228.
figures, Rist explicitly intends to portray what he sees as the reality of peasant depravity in wartime, which he has experienced first-hand:

davon können wir / die wir auf dem Lande wohnen / und die Kriege Beschwerlichkeiten selber ziemlich hart gefühlt haben / zum allerbesten Zeugnisse geben / also / daß der Bauren Gottlosigkeit in diesen Zwischenspielen noch gar zu gelinde ist fürgebildet.\(^{372}\)

The point is a complaint about the behaviour of the peasants. This is only directly related to the issue of language use in the matter of swearing, but swearing is far from the extent of the peasants' immorality. The relevance of Low German to the portrayal of the peasants is that it is the language they speak – a convincing peasant figure in Northern Germany must speak Low German. There are no moral implications of Low German use.

The discussion Rist devotes to his peasants' language use addresses the potential complaint that they 'gebrauchen sich gleichwol gar unhoflicher Reden'.\(^{373}\) This is not primarily a High German-Low German issue, i.e., not one concerning idiom choice. Rather, it is the choice of specific words and expressions that is at issue – the specific intentionality that accompanies the use of profanity and the moral implications of this. It is undoubtedly the case that the perception of the peasants' vulgarity is increased by the fact that they curse and swear in Low, as opposed to High, German. Yet nowhere does Rist make a necessary connection between profanity and Low German. Profanity is treated as characteristic of peasant conduct, and the peasants of Northern Germany necessarily speak Low German. Maas supposes that Low German in the Zwischenspiel-genre functions as a 'Maske, die vor allem im derbobszönen Bereich Lizenzen einräumt, die in der hochdeutschen Schriftsprache nicht

\(^{372}\) Rist, 'Das Friedejauchtzende Teutschland', p. 228.
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riskiert werden können.\footnote{Maas, ‘Die „Modernisierung“ der sprachlichen Verhältnisse in Norddeutschland seit dem späten Mittelalter’, p. 50.} It is necessary to deliver profanities in spoken dialect not because this is itself inherently profane but because this is not permitted by the programmatic development of the written High German language. The discussion of language use in the Vorbericht suggests that Rist is on the one hand at pains not to condemn Low German, while on the other avoiding entering into an apology for it. It would seem an incredibly easy rhetorical move to emphasise the peasants' vulgarity by drawing attention to their language use, but Rist does not do this. Equally, the furthest he will go in explicitly defending Low German use is to point out that it is the language in fact spoken by certain sections of the population, and that it continues to function as a regional marker alongside its growing sociolectal implications. It seems that Rist is maintaining a studied neutrality on the question of Low versus High German in spoken language, refusing to be drawn on the explicit prescription of one over the other. Yet even in this, he demonstrates an awareness that the Low-High German issue was a topical one.

Before turning to the formal elements of Rist’s language use in Friedejauchtzendentes Teutschland, one brief exchange in the first Zwischenspiel bears closer examination as a reflection of educated perspectives on peasant culture. Degenwehrt, according to the stage directions, is ‘ein versuchter / gelehrter/ verständiger und muhtiger Soldat.’\footnote{Rist, ‘Das Friedejauchtzende Teutschland’, p. 286.} He explicitly establishes his moral and scholarly credentials in his opening monologue, declaring that he,
bey Herantretung des lieben güldenen Friedens / den mühseligen Kreigs-harnisch
gänzlich abzulegen / und den edlen Schulsak [...] wieder herfür zu langen / gantz
und gar kein Bedenken trage.\textsuperscript{376}

Degenwehrt encounters the peasants Drewes and Beneke, singing in Low German, dancing
and playing the bagpipes (oder was man dergleichen Bäurischer Instrument eins zum besten
kan haben\textsuperscript{377}), and is impressed not only by their apparent gaiety in times of great material
hardship, but also by their artistry. He remarks that Beneke ‘muß [...] wol kein gemeiner
Mann seyn / dieweil er solche treffliche schöne Lieder weiß zu dichten.’\textsuperscript{378} This comment is
unironic, and demonstrates that peasant culture, in the narrow sense which refers to the
activities and artefacts associated with artistic creation, was not treated with outright
derision by the educated and elite classes. Indeed, Drewes elaborates

unde wenn de Stadtlüe herut kamet / unde höret synen künstigen unde kortzwiligen
Schnack an / unde dat he so rimen unde limen kan / so seggen se / dat he ook ein
Paut ys / dat vorstah wy nu hyr im Dorpe so even nicht / wat dat vor Tüg ys.\textsuperscript{379}

Drewes presents Beneke’s poetic and musical skills as an attraction to those he identifies as
‘Stadtlüe’, although he is unable to grasp exactly why. He conceives of the ‘Stadtlüe’ as both
socially and culturally distinct from his own community, yet Beneke’s art is evidence that
there is some relevant common ground between the two groups. ‘Stadtlüe’, it is clear, is
used to denote those city-dwellers of a higher educational niveau, who have access to
concepts such as ‘Poët.’ On the other hand, Drewes speaks for all the peasants ‘hyr im
Dorpe’ when he denies them the ability to make sense of this designation.

\textsuperscript{376} Rist, ‘Das Friedejauchtzende Teutschland’, p. 288.
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Referencing this passage (and this passage alone), the Grimm *Wörterbuch* lists ‘Paut’ under its entry for ‘Poét’ as a *plattdeutsch* variant.\(^{380}\) However, beyond the apparent lack of any further Low German record of this word, the internal logic of Drewes’ speech and its context within the scene suggests an alternative interpretation. ‘Paut’ is not Low German for ‘Poët’ but the outcome of an attempt by uneducated Low German speakers to reproduce a word encountered among the educated social elite, the semantic content of which is beyond their conceptual grasp. Given the context of the drama’s composition and performance, it may be implicit that the ‘Stadtlüe’ are High German-speakers. This would be supported by the specific reference to Beneke’s ‘künstigen unde kortzwiligen Schnack’, which indicates that Beneke’s language was part of the attraction for the ‘Stadtlüe’ and in this suggests that it differed from the language to which they were accustomed. It is probable that Drewes picked up the adjectives ‘künstig’ and ‘kortzwilig’ from the comments made by the ‘Stadtlüe’. ‘Künstig’ is High German, ‘kortzwilig’ a *Missingsch*-form of the High German ‘kurzweilig’, with Drewes reverting to the Low German vowel *o* for *u* and not diphthongising the first *i*, while introducing a High German -*tz*. Drewes presents a picture of city-dwellers who clearly belong to the social elite, as they speak High German, and are educated, as they have the concept ‘poet’, enjoying the song of Low German peasant culture.

There is no indication that this enjoyment is not genuine. As Degenwehrt remarks, ‘so viel Künste hätte ich hinter diesem euerem Nachbarn mit keinem Knebelspiesse gesuchet.’\(^{381}\) Peasant culture is admittedly not an obvious place to seek artistry, but the educated High German-speakers who encounter Beneke are pleasantly surprised by his work. This indicates that while social division correlates to division in education, and is increasingly accompanied


\(^{381}\) Rist, ‘Das Friedejauchtzende Teutschland’, p. 293.
by division in language use, art and poetry tend to counteract the increasing distinction between educated High German and rural, uneducated Low German culture. In attesting to the value of peasant culture and its relevance to educated, High German culture, this goes beyond the more frequently-encountered defence of the peasantry in respect of their necessary function within the social order, as exemplified in Grimmelshausen’s ‘Du sehrverachter Baurenstand.’ In fact, this recognition that social, educational, and linguistic barriers do not in fact preclude peasants from relevant artistic creation is encountered here over a century earlier than where one might, classically, expect it. It also sits rather uneasily with the remainder of Rist’s vast output as a scholarly poet. Yet it is lent extra weight by the dominant concern of the peasant scenes in the drama, which characterises them as thoroughly immoral, brutalised by the wartime experience. Just as Rist resists the association of Low German with profanity, he presents a peasant society which is crude, uncouth, and depraved without seeking to strengthen this characterisation by presenting its artistic products as such.

An important caveat is introduced when one considers this point at the level of the performance. Here, the songs are not artefacts of peasant culture, but the work of Rist, an established High German poet with a university education and a pastor. He is not drawn from the same social milieu as the peasants he portrays, and could at most be said to belong to the group of people who find peasant song ‘künstig unde kortzwilig’. Likewise, music was composed by the Lüneburg cantor Michael Jakobi. It is clearly simpler in its composition and instrumentation than, for example, the ‘Jauchzende Beschluß-Lied’, and is to be played
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on a typical peasant instrument, ‘Sackpfeiffe oder Schalmey / oder Leire.’ It would be interesting to investigate the extent to which the music could be seen as approximating actual contemporary peasant practices, or whether it constitutes an upper class parody of these. It would then be necessary to relate the outcomes of this investigation to the drama’s discussion of peasant culture, which may lead to a revision of the conclusions reached above. Provisionally, however, the actual composition history of the peasant songs in *Friedejauchtzendes Teutschland* highlights the conceptual limits of Rist’s sympathy for peasant culture. There are no peasant voices in the drama, only the peasants of the educated classes. Peasant culture is engaged with wholly on terms dictated by the social and cultural elite, indeed on terms (*künstig, kurzweilig, Poët*) to which the peasants have no access. The educated appreciation of peasant culture is at the same time a usurpation of it, and so cannot constitute a basis for unity in the face of social division. This defence of peasant culture excludes the peasants themselves.

*Friedejauchtzendes Teutschland*, like *Perseus*, features a *Missingsch*-speaking soldier, Hans Hun. *Perseus* had thematised language use, such that there was a relevance to which words presented difficulty for Knapkäse (predominantly those from the military semantic field), while Laban’s *Missingsch* was presented in the context of his native Low German, the humour arising through the contrast between the two. *Friedejauchtzendes Teutschland* does not treat language as a primary concern – Hun is a philandering solider and possible father of Drewes’ wife’s child, and the *Missingsch* he speaks has a clear function to characterise him as a laughable figure. Since his language itself is not the point at issue, serving rather to bring some additional hilarity, it is not as comprehensive a *Missingsch* as Laban’s had been, with various mistakes in respect of multiple vowel and consonant sounds. Laban’s
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Missingsch had functioned to highlight his inability to live up to the linguistic demands (inappropriately) made of him by Knapkäse, Hun’s serves to add some colour to his characterisation. He speaks a more ‘streamlined’ Missingsch, with the occasional remnant of Low German (skal\textsuperscript{385}) and difficulty with High German verbs (seided\textsuperscript{386}).

Hun makes mistakes with a small group of related High German consonants: -s, -t, and -d. His primary problem seems to be an uncertainty over High German words featuring -t and -d, in respect of which he exhibits a tendency to substitute -(t)z: Zeufel, Wirtz, Kintz, Vatzer.

Low German hete becomes heitze instead of heiße, which introduces confusion about the use of -s in High German. Gott then becomes Goss,\textsuperscript{387} and the same mistake is made in reverse, with küßen becoming kützen.\textsuperscript{388} This is the only context in which Hun makes mistakes with his High German pronunciation, and he makes a mistake of this ilk whenever he uses a word open to it. Thus his linguistic ineptitude is indicated through a stylised Missingsch, which enhances the comedy without inviting consideration of the actual conditions of his language use. In this, Rist demonstrates a refined theatrical technique – the creation of a stage Missingsch.

4. Depositio Cornuti Typographici

Rist’s Depositio relies heavily on Paul de Vise’s 1621 original for its plot and content, which are in turn largely determined by the actual practices of depositioning. The ceremony was based on university deposition rituals, but had been transferred into the context of the end
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of a printer’s apprenticeship. The events are highly ritualistic. The apprentice is led in horns, and subjected by the Depositor and his servant to a series of tests – first given a letter to read, then asked a series of ‘allerhand seltzahme und kurtzweilige Fragen’, ordered to sing, challenged to a game of dice, measured, and washed before having his horns knocked off. The play concludes with a baptismal rite in which the erstwhile apprentice is encouraged to improved conduct. Rist had been commissioned by the Stern publishing house in Lüneburg to provide an improvement upon de Vise’s original, a ‘fürlängst verfärtigte[s] und schlechte[s] Spiel[ , ] wie es dazumahl anderswo gedrucktet und nur von gemeinen Pritschreimen ist zusammen gesetzt.’ With the basic elements of the plot prescribed by the nature of the ceremony and de Vise’s original, Rist’s creativity is largely limited to the content of the speeches. In improving on de Vise’s ‘Pritschreime’ he exhibits great linguistic independence, and mobilises the dynamic between the High German speakers, the Depositor and Cornute, and the Low German-speaking servant to provide comment on the social conditions of language use.

The Low-High German relationship portrayed in the Depositio is unique among Rist’s surviving dramas in that it does not contrast Low German speaking rural peasantry with soldiers who, depending on their level of education, speak High German with a greater or lesser degree of competence. Nor does it rely on the contrast suggested in Friedejauchzendes Teutschland between rural peasant and urban, educated social elite. The Depositio is set in a publishing house, which implies an urban location, and there is no indication that all of the figures in the Depositio are not drawn from the urban milieu.

Specifically, the city in question in Rist’s version is likely Lüneburg. This reflects the external fact that the drama was commissioned by Stern, but is also suggested internally through the use of specifically Lüneburgian forms such as ‘öhm’ for ‘ihm’, which were alien to Rist’s own local dialect. A more relevant and productive insight, however, is that the Depositio’s Low German-speaking servant is Rist’s sole dramatic portrayal of the urban lower classes. The Depositio is unique among Rist’s works in creating a confrontation between different social strata from the same physical location in a city in which the speaking of dialect is a mark of social background.

That the High-Low German contrast is generated in a different social context in the Depositio to in Rist’s other extant dramas may offer a degree of provisional insight into Rist’s own way of thinking about social boundaries and language distinction. It certainly throws the import of the peasant settings of the other dramas into sharp relief. The content of the Depositio forces Rist into an urban setting, while the other dramas indicate a preference for engaging with dialect among the rural poor and contrasting their language use with that of various outsiders to their community. The setting of the peasant scenes is to some extent a matter of generic convention but, as the Vorbericht to Friedejauhtzendes Teutschland indicated, Rist considered himself at least in this drama to be responding to the actual conditions of peasant existence. Dialect has a function in the peasant dramas beyond distinguishing peasant from non-peasant (indeed, in Irenaromachia it does not even fulfil this role), and is used to thematise the confrontation of the peasant with another, alien sphere. The Depositio is more claustrophobic, the social distinction indicated through language use presented as a confrontation not between different communities but between
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members of different social strata. Not only is the servant Rist’s sole urban Low German speaker, he is also the only one presented in isolation from his own social context – the other dramas provide a lot of detail about the family and neighbours of the peasants, clearly embedding them in their community. The Depositio offers an examination of the specifically sociolectal implications of dialect use, without having to consider the extent to which this is determined by regional factors or a rural-urban distinction. The servant here can function in isolation from his class but as a representative of it in confrontation with the educated urban classes.

The Depositio identifies access to education as a key factor in dialect use. As part of the ceremony, the Cornute must feign illiteracy when asked to read. This is the first point at which the Cornute speaks, and so it is only at this point that his linguistic abilities become apparent. In de Vise’s version, this exchange plays out as follows:

CORNUTUS: Ich kans nicht lesen, liß selber
KNECHT: Harr, kanstu nu kuervvalsch sprekn?

The servant reacts with some surprise to the Cornute’s language use. Dressed as some unidentifiable beast, it is so unthinkable that the Cornute should be able to speak the prestige idiom that his language is identified as ‘kuervvalsch’. Rist’s servant has a more refined metalinguistic awareness. He can recognise High German for what it is, and is sensitive to the social implications of an ability to speak it. The same exchange in Rist’s version runs:

CORNUTUS: Wie soll ich doch singen nach eüren Verlangen,

    Mein! Bin ich doch nimmer zur Schulen gegangen.
KNECHT: Ey hört doch, wat de Düfel deit,

    He kan nich lesen, und kan spreken

    Up Hochdütsch

The comedy is more successful in Rist’s version because his servant is more astute than de Vise’s. In identifying the Cornute’s language as High German, the servant demonstrates that he has the category for it, even if he cannot speak it himself. This enables him to highlight the implausibility of a situation in which someone could be illiterate yet able to speak High German, and the comedy of the Cornute’s ‘Bin ich doch nimmer zur Schulen gegangen.’ The servant is aware that High German is acquired in the context of formal education, and that this is something to which he has no access. The portrayal of High German as a language of initiates is clearest here among all Rist’s dramas, as there are no regional or rural implications in the servant’s speech. He knows what High German is and who speaks it, and is aware that he does not belong in this social group. Within the context of the drama, this enables him to expose the deceit of the Cornute. Within Rist’s oeuvre, he is the Low German-speaking figure with the highest level of metalinguistic awareness.

---
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Chapter 2  a ‘Ein zu sehr vergessener Dichter’? Rist reception in the 18th and 19th centuries.

During his lifetime, Johann Rist enjoyed a towering reputation. This is ultimately difficult to reconcile with the merit of his works, being rather more a function of various and complex social structures. Section II of this thesis will map out the conditions in which Rist’s works were both composed, and received by his contemporaries. The current concern is to establish both the conditions under which interest was shown in Rist during the 18th and 19th centuries, and any results of this interest. It is necessary to contextualise scholarly (lack of) interest in Rist in respect of the contemporary metaliterary discourses and the changes in the conception of ‘literature’ over the period in question. This period also covers the ‘disciplinisation’ and institutionalisation in German-speaking territory of the study of works of German literature. These theoretical and institutional developments influenced each other, and were themselves impinged upon by political affairs. In particular, both felt the effects of dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire and the Napoleonic occupation. At no point did works of the 17th century in general, let alone of Rist specifically, emerge as a dominant scholarly concern. Initially, substantial interest in 17th-century literature was precluded either theoretically by the concepts of ‘literature’ available, or practically by the general difficulty of accessing 17th-century texts. By the mid-19th century, however, the unfavourable comparison between the literature of the 17th century and that of Weimar Classicism established the former as aesthetically deficient, setting the tone for its reception in mainstream scholarship well into the 20th century. In the context of this denigration, there were few substantive advances made in respect of Rist scholarship proper. It is precisely the fact that Rist was never a dominant scholarly concern in the 18th and 19th centuries that makes the contexts in which he does appear so interesting and worthy of further investigation. While this investigation illuminates the development of Rist reception, it also utilises Rist as a lens through which to analyse and elucidate critical preoccupations.

Klaus Weimar has drawn attention to the difficulties encountered by anyone living in the 18th century who sought to pursue and develop an interest in 17th-century literature. Information on the relevant texts, not to mention the texts themselves, was not readily accessible,

---

394 An exception to this is the work done in the field of Low German studies around the turn of the 20th century. This provided the basis for a significant portion of the current body of knowledge on Rist, and will be dealt with separately.
particularly in the early 1700s. The nature of 17th-century book-production in Germany was such that, in about 95% of cases, books would disappear from the market shortly after their author’s death. This state of affairs continued in some degree until the mid-19th century by which time, Weimar claims, older texts had enough public visibility and presence for contemporary authors to meaningfully be able to reference them in their own work.

Dieter Martin makes a typological distinction between the reception of works through their ‘original’ editions and their reception through later editions, where the presence of an editor is evident in both the selection and treatment of the texts. Given the accessibility of 17th-century texts in the 18th century, recourse to the original was largely an individual pursuit. It is now difficult to establish to what extent and standard such individual research projects were carried out. Yet it is known that they could lead to the publication of a new, and as such more widely accessible, edition of a given work.

This distinction is both helpful and appropriate, yet an anomaly is presented by the data about the actual republication of one of Rist’s works. His Depositio cornuti typographici (1655), a rewriting of a 1621 play by Paul de Vise, was republished several times into the 18th century. Rist’s version was a commission from the Lüneburg publishing house Stern, which was both a first-class institute and a major publisher of Rist’s religious works. The play would be performed at the many depositions carried out by the publishers. The practice of the deposition had itself been taken over from the initiation rites at universities, proceeding ‘[i]n ähnlicher, aber zahmer und humorvoller Weise’.

Das Absehen dabey ist, daß ein jeder, der den Namen eines Gesellens mit Ehren führen will, die Laster der Jugend und alle grobe Sitten ablegen, hingegen der Tugend und nützlichen Wissenschaften sich Zeit Lebens mit allem Ernst widmen soll.

---

396 Weimar, pp. 56–7.
400 Gaedertz, p. 391.
401 Gaedertz, p. 385.
The ceremony would culminate in the shearing of horns off the ‘Cornut’, marking the end of his apprenticeship. Between 1679 and 1743 the play was appended to six typographical textbooks, thus maintaining a degree of visibility, albeit within a conceivably rather restricted audience. Yet at least in the editions from 1679, 1733 and 1743 the Depositio was simply included at the end of the textbook – neither explained nor engaged with. Its subject matter made it an appropriate appendage to typographical textbooks, and yet as the practice of the deposition fell out of fashion, so did the association of the Depositio with the manuals. Ultimately, the sustained association between the play and the textbooks is evidence of Rist’s presence in a specialised yet non-academic context, and as such stands out with Martin’s scheme, which is structured around individual archival research. Historically, of all Rist’s works, it is the Depositio which has enjoyed the least scholarly attention. Indeed, where there is evidence of interest in Rist picking up a few decades after its last publication, the Depositio goes unmentioned. Its relevance into the early 18th century is product of a continuity in social practice, dating back at least to de Vise’s 1621 play, not some reflection of contemporary scholarly concerns. The 18th-century Depositio editions are therefore unique in Rist reception, to the extent that there is no necessary ‘break’ between the texts and their reception. They are the only instances of Rist reception that are not instances of rediscovery.

The manner in which scholars engaged with literature changed substantially over the course of the 18th century. From an analysis of the contents of academic libraries, Martin notes that 17th-century literature was widely possessed by scholars around 1700, irrespective of their discipline. By the late 18th century the possession of such works was the preserve of philologists and enthusiasts. This lies consistently with Weimar’s account of the nature of book production in the 17th century. Yet just as the accessibility of 17th-century texts in an academic context was in decline, so were the modes of thought emerging which enabled the scholarly engagement with texts qua literature.

Historically, poetics had belonged beside rhetoric as an academic discipline, and poetry was correspondingly conceived of as a techne. As such, the interest was in its

403 Gaedertz, p. 386.
406 Martin, p. 31.
practitioners as exemplary, not the works themselves.\textsuperscript{407} This is simultaneously illustrated (and satirised) in Sacer’s \textit{Reime dich, oder ich fresse dich} (1673), which advises the aspiring poet to draw
\begin{quote}
  den Anfang aus dem Opitz / das Mittel aus Risten / und das Ende aus dem Flemming /
  […] er wird sich ja diesen Gelahrten und Weltberühmten Männern nicht vorziehen / 
  und es besser machen wollen als sie es gemacht haben.\textsuperscript{408}
\end{quote}

Until the mid-18\textsuperscript{th} century, scholarly focus on an individual literary work did not extend beyond providing a few details concerning the context of its production, with the writing \textit{about} poetic texts closely tied up with the writing \textit{of} poetic texts. The tasks carried out in respect of Latin literature by philology (commentary, analysis, criticism), were carried out by the poets themselves, and the writers of poetics, when it came to German literature.\textsuperscript{409} This practice-oriented poetic concept still underlies Gottsched’s \textit{Critische Dichtkunst}. Rist features in an exemplary capacity three times in this work: as a writer who knew to make use of poetic words,\textsuperscript{410} as providing a model for sad religious songs,\textsuperscript{411} and as a translator of foreign epigrams.\textsuperscript{412} In each of these cases, he appears in a short list of other writers to whom these descriptions also apply. To engage more thoroughly with Rist’s works would have transgressed not only the remit of the \textit{Critische Dichtkunst} but also the concept of poetry available to it. It was written as an attempt to uphold the concept of poetry in its relation to rhetoric even in an age when poetic works were being written to be read privately, and by a much more heterogeneous audience than the academic community constituted.\textsuperscript{413}

Weimar identifies the mid-18\textsuperscript{th} century as the site of the dissociation of the reading from the writing of literary texts. As the reader decreasingly consumed poetic works with a view to composing poetry himself, so he lost that familiarity with literature that comes from the personal experience of writing. The poetic text became something alien, in need of

\textsuperscript{411} Gottsched, 6,2 p. 18.
\textsuperscript{412} Gottsched, 6,2 p. 519.
\textsuperscript{413} Weimar, \textit{Geschichte}, p. 58.
explanation, and the gulf that opened here between the poet and the reader made the former into a *Genie*. The manner in which the reader engaged with contemporary literature in 1770 differed radically from that of the previous century. Thus is a lack of interest in the literature of the 17th century unsurprising, to the extent that such texts presupposed a conceptual framework far removed from, if not indeed contradictory to, that of the mid-to-late-18th century. Where in the 17th century prose and poetry were disciplines themselves, as rhetoric and poetics, in the 18th they were the object of emergent philological studies.

In this context Zachariae and Eschenburg’s three volume anthology, *Auserlesene Stücke der besten deutschen Dichter. Von Martin Opitz bis auf gegenwärtige Zeiten* (1766-78), was the first, and for a long time the only, anthology concerned with 17th-century literature. It was no critical anthology, intending to have a broader appeal: its selection of works, in its almost complete exclusion of courtly and religious poetry, betrays an Enlightenment agenda. Yet the selection indicated by the title in fact only constitutes Opitz, Fleming, Scultetus, and the then-unknown author of the *Geharnschte Venus*. ‘Der bekannte Johann Rist’, as Eschenburg refers to him, is named only in the third volume, in the context of speculation that the *Venus* author might have been a member of the *Elbschwanenorden*.

The reasons underlying Rist’s absence from the anthology are as unclear as the basis upon which he is claimed to be ‘bekannt’. One might suppose that he was best-known then, as indeed today still in the popular consciousness, as a composer of religious poetry, and as such would fall foul of editorial bias against such works. It is further somewhat incongruous that Rist should only feature in connection with his *Sprachgesellschaft*. This was ultimately a rather personal endeavour which was made possible by the social and literary significance Rist had accrued over his career, as opposed to any contributing factor to this significance. Here again one must recall the realities of 18th-century literary research. It is entirely possible that it was only in respect of these two contexts that the editors had any information on Rist. As Lessing reported the disappointing results of archival work to Eschenburg in a letter from March 1778:

> Von denen beym Neumeister unter *Dach* angeführten Büchern ist nichts da:

---

414 Weimar, ‘*Interpretationsweisen*’, p. 154.
Rist’s name was not unknown in the 18th century. Access to his works was a different matter entirely. Those not in the exceptional position of being able to consult original editions were at the mercy of the aesthetic convictions or editorial preoccupations of the few who were.

Standing out against this background mixture of indifference and inaccessibility is the inclusion of Rist’s poem ‘An eine sehr schöne Bluhme / Als er dieselbe im Frühling mit grosser Verwunderung ansahe. Auff begehren einer vornemen Person / welche eben zugegen war / gesetzet Auff gegentretende Reim-ahrt,’ originally published in his Poetischer Schauplatz (1646), in Herder’s collection of Volkslieder, where it is appears under the simpler title ‘An eine Blume’. Herder presents his selected poems anonymously, providing any bibliographical information in notes at the end. Unhampered by extraneous detail, the reader can approach the poems in their quality as ‘volksartig’, that is, ‘leicht, einfach, aus Gegenständen und in der Sprache der Menge, so wie der reichen und für alle fühlbaren Natur.’ This is a quality primarily of the texts, and is not necessarily a reflection upon the conditions of their composition – there is no requirement that those included be songs of any common ‘Volk’. There is little room in this arrangement for explicit critical engagement with the texts. The fact, however, that a poem by Rist was judged appropriate for inclusion already intimates that it could establish a relevance even in a context where the poetic criteria differed so radically from those of the context of its composition.

Part of the Volkslied collection’s paratextual apparatus is an index providing further details and references for all of the works included. The entry for the Rist poem reads ‘[d]as zarte Lied ist von Rist, einem zu sehr vergessenen Dichter,’ and provides the specific reference in the Poetischer Schauplatz. This tells us a number of things about Herder’s

---

420 Herder, xxv, 311–546 (p. 313).
422 Herder, xxv, 311–546 (p. 535).
Rist reception. First, the  *Schauplatz* reference strongly indicates that Herder had access to the original work, i.e. that his source was not a subsequent anthology. I have been unable to identify any precedence for the inclusion of ‘An eine Blume’ in earlier anthologies and, as will be seen, the anthologising of Rist’s poetry only began in earnest in the early 19th century. The inclusion of this poem by Herder can confidently be said to constitute an instance of first-order Rist reception. It was Herder, then, who selected ‘An eine Blume’, from the hundreds of other poems in the  *Schauplatz*. Secondly, the adjective ‘zart’, ‘tender’ betrays an undeniably 18th-century sensibility and this in a commendatory tone, indicating that Herder perceives something in Rist’s poem that will be attractive to a contemporary readership. Thus, Herder’s Rist reception is not an explicit, programmatic attempt to appreciate Rist qua 17th-century poet. Thirdly, Herder expresses regret at the fact that Rist, specifically, has disappeared from the public consciousness. That is, in spite of suppressing details of the poem’s composition in the main body of the *Volkslied* collection, Herder nevertheless draws attention to Rist’s identity not merely in the pursuit of scholarly rigour and completeness but in a recommendatory fashion.

In spite of this tantalising lack of explicit critical engagement with Rist’s poem, the alterations Herder made to the original provide further insight into the conditions under which Rist could be relevant in the 18th century. The name of the addressee in Herder’s version has been changed from ‘Adelwitz’ to ‘Röschen’, and the sixth strophe has been omitted. These changes, it will be seen, suggest that Herder’s Rist reception can be understood as an appropriation of Rist for 18th-century interests in poetry, as opposed to any attempt to restore him qua 17th-century poet. Braunbehrens identifies this poem as one of a group in Herder’s collection whose main concern is nature.423 This classification helps clarify both the suitability of ‘Röschen’ and why ‘Adelwitz’ might have appeared so objectionable in the first place, seeming to encapsulate the antithesis of bourgeois natural values. Indeed, the full title of Rist’s poem explains that it had been composed ‘[a]uff begehren einer vornemen Person / welche eben zugegen war,’ a detail which would detract from the sense that this is primarily a nature poem. Furthermore, the sixth strophe distinguishes itself from the remainder of the poem, which presents the beauty of the addressee in the context of the beauty of nature, in that it is the only strophe to praise Adelwitz in her own right:

Nein mein’ Adelwitz kann bewegen/
daß sich grimmige Loüen legen
anzuhören die süsse Weisen/

423 Braunbehrens, p. 60.
da sie Dafnis mit pflegt zu preisen.

The omission of this strophe means that the poem as it appears in Herder’s collection is of a decidedly different tenor to that of Rist’s original.

Confirming this, the wording in Herder’s version rather softens the contrast between the addressee and the various natural objects described. Compare the opening two strophes of each version:

Rist
Daß der Himmel dich schön geschmücket /
Daß die Sonne dein Kleid gesticket /
Daß du prangest für Gold und Seiden /
muß mein Adelwitz itz zwahr leiden.

Daß die Bienen dich offtmahls küssen /
Daß die Kranken dich preisen müssen /
und ihr’ Aertzte dich heilsahm nennen /
muß mein Adelwitz zwahr bekennen.

Herder
Daß der Himmel dich schön geschmückt,
Daß die Sonne dein Kleid gestickt,
Daß du prangest vor Gold und Seiden,
Kann mein Röschen gerne leiden.

Daß die Bienen so oft dich küssen,
Daß die Kranken dich preisen müssen,
Und die Aertzte dich heilsam nennen,
Mag mein Röschen gern bekennen.

Rist’s ‘muß’ and ‘zwahr’ are much more confrontational than Herder’s milder ‘gern/e’, anticipating the poem’s unequivocal assertion of Adelwitz as surpassing the multifarious virtues of the natural world. Röschen, on the other hand, can stand in a less competitive relationship to the flower, can afford to be more indulgent of its medicinal qualities. This, along with the omission of the sixth strophe, means that Herder’s version appears to afford more emphasis to the beauties of the natural world than Rist’s original. Herder’s alterations allow him to cast Rist as a poet in an 18th-century mould and shift the emphasis of ‘An eine Blume’ from presenting Adelwitz as ultimately peerless in nature to a portrayal of Röschen and the natural world as standing in a less starkly oppositional relationship.

Herder’s achievements for 18th-century sensibilities come at the price of the metrical precision of Rist’s original. Rist had composed his poem ‘Auff gegentretende Reim-ahrt’,
opposing two trochees with two iambs. The oppositional nature of these feet (stressed-unstressed versus unstressed-stressed) gives the meter its name. This metrical form standardly manifested as trochee-trochee-iamb-iamb, two unstressed syllables meeting in the middle of the line, as in the example Schottel provides in his *Teutsche Vers- und Reimkunst*, (1656).

\[- U \ U \ U \ U -\]

Liebe / Liebe / verwirrte Kraft!
Gallenbitter und Honigsaft /

*Gegentretende Reimart* can also be encountered with falling rhythm, adding an unstressed syllable to the final foot. This is how it is used by Rist in his poem, illustrated here in the last two lines from the first strophe:

\[- U \ U \ U \ U - U -\]

Daß du prangest für Gold und Seiden /
muß mein Adelwitz itz zwahr leiden.

Clearly, Herder’s name change from Adelwitz to Röschen has the potential to disrupt the poem’s metrical order, transforming the last line of the strophe into a straightforward trochaic tetrameter: ‘Kann mein Röschen gerne leiden’. However, the metrical effect of the name change is not uniform throughout the poem, as Adelwitz/Röschen is not named in every strophe. Furthermore, there is one instance where Röschen is named and the original meter nevertheless maintained (strophe 5: ‘Nicht wie Röschen das Herz bezwingen’. Originally: ‘Dies kann keinem das Herz bezwingen’). The metrical change brought about by the name change does not function to afford some manner of distinction to Herder’s Röschen.

As a result of this metrical inconsistency, the poem reads unevenly. Herder, however, explicitly rejects a concept of poetry as ‘Buchstaben- und Sylbenkunst’.\(^{424}\) One of the functions of Rist’s original, on the other hand, had been to demonstrate his skill in precisely this area, and it is unlikely to have escaped Herder’s attention that he and Rist differed fundamentally in their understanding of the essence of poetry. In disrupting the poem’s metrical uniformity, Herder can dispel any suspicion that the composition of the poem was inappropriately determined by regimented formal concerns, and present it in a way that does justice to its perceived *völkisch* character. Yet on the other hand, in taking these formal liberties with Rist’s poem, Herder strips it of a good portion of its original legitimacy. In 1646, the metrical precision of the poem was an important part of it, and this is an importance

\(^{424}\) Herder, xxv, 311–546 (p. 313).
that Herder’s version denies. When he writes that Rist is a much too forgotten poet, this is only in name – Herder’s interest in Rist is determined by his own values and agenda.

Gramberg also includes a version of ‘An eine Blume’ in his 1805 collection, *Blumen deutscher Dichter aus der ersten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts*.\(^{425}\) Like Herder, he alters Rist’s original, but explicitly only undertook such alterations ‘wo ein Ausdruck für den Sinn unsrer Zeit durchaus gemein oder gar ekelhaft war’, and sought replacements in vocabulary appropriate to the 17\(^{th}\) century.\(^{426}\) The alterations to ‘An eine Blume’ do not align exclusively with Herder’s, indicating that Gramberg had access to the original in his father’s extensive library, his resource for the collection.\(^{427}\) The most noteworthy change again concerns the name of the addressee, whom Gramberg calls ‘Rosamund’. This does more than recall Herder’s ‘Röschen’ – ‘Rosiminde’ is a figure from Rist’s *Dafnis* poems.\(^{428}\) Thus Gramberg upholds his commitment not to make unprecedented or anachronistic changes. However, this alteration rather conflates two spheres of Rist’s poetic activity. The attitude of ‘An eine Blume’ to Adelwitz is respectful and distanced, while the *Dafnis* poems are characterised by a comparatively ardent romantic passion. Rist did not consider the latter appropriate for publication. They were initially published anonymously and without his knowledge, and he later attempted to distance himself from his love poetry. Gramberg’s alteration anticipates the 20\(^{th}\) century’s popular interest in the *Daphnis* poetry, in spite of Rist’s own reservations about it. For all of Gramberg’s palpable enthusiasm for 17\(^{th}\)-century poetry, a definite agenda underlies his editorial practice which again serves to alienate the works from the contexts of their composition.

A significant watershed in Rist reception is Matthison’s *Lyrische Anthologie*, begun in 1803 with a volume of 17\(^{th}\)-century poetry. Matthison builds on the work done by Zachariae and Eschenburg, following their lead in the identification of significant 17\(^{th}\)-century writers, while also drawing on discoveries of the later 18\(^{th}\) century. In the cases of Gryphius and Rist,


\(^{426}\) Gramberg, vii–viii

\(^{427}\) Gramberg, x

\(^{428}\) See song no. 11 in Johann Rist, *Des Edlen DAFNIS aus Cimbrien besungene Florabella*. (Hamburg: Michael Pfeiffer, 1666).
however, there was no editorial preparation available. Rist’s inclusion in this anthology is wholly unprecedented. More interesting, however, is Wilhelm Müller’s 14-volume *Bibliothek deutscher Dichter des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts* (1822-38), since the compiler explicitly engages with the nature and extent of Rist’s inclusion. Müller considers his anthology to be fulfilling the need for an adequate collection of 17th-century texts, a requisite for the proper study of German literary history. The focus is on lyrical poetry as providing the best indication of the tastes of the time. Thus for Rist, as for all 17th-century writers, his poetry is the relevant element of his oeuvre. Müller allocates a volume each to Opitz, Fleming and Andreas Gryphius while the remaining volumes each cover two or more poets. Herein lies an implicit evaluation of Rist’s significance: while unworthy of being the sole focus of a single volume, he nevertheless ranks highly amongst the minor poets, sharing his volume with only one other (Morhof) where for example the seventh volume is divided between Zincgref, Tscherning, Homburg and Gerhard.

Müller argues that it is primarily on account of Rist’s great significance during his own day that he should be remembered. Rist’s works are not included by virtue of their artistic merit, indeed Müller goes to great lengths to establish Rist as, at best, a mediocre talent. His poems are characterised by ‘Geschwätzigkeit’ and ‘Oberflächlichkeit’, and, Müller suggests, Rist became carried away by the 17th-century culture of reciprocal praise. Although overwhelmingly negative, Müller’s treatment of Rist is significantly more sophisticated than the other instances of conscious Rist reception encountered so far. Müller demonstrates sensitivity to the conditions of Rist’s historical context, analyses Rist’s work for its poetic (de-)merits and enters into discussion of Rist’s character. That Müller’s conclusions are so unfavourable for Rist excludes any suspicion that this renewed interest in the latter constitutes some manner of rehabilitation programme. Rather, Rist’s inclusion is a product of the intention to accurately portray the 17th-century literary situation, in line with the need to make accessible to scholarship the period and the texts it produced.

Müller concludes his introduction to Rist with a list of Rist’s known works, including his dramas. Until this point, Rist had exclusively been seen and engaged with as a composer

---

429 Martin, p. 81.
431 Müller, i, p. xiii; Martin sees the equal attention devoted to Opitz, Fleming and Gryphius as evidence of a relativisation of Opitz’s position within German literature, see *Barock um 1800*, p. 67.
433 Müller, viii, p. x–xi.
434 Müller, viii, p. xii.
of poems — recall that Lessing had uncovered and immediately dismissed one of Rist’s dramas. Through the list, Müller provides a starting point for future scholars to investigate Rist more thoroughly. Given this potential, there are two relevant points to be noted. First, Müller does not acknowledge Rist’s contribution to Irenaromachia (1630), which was only discovered in the late 19th century. Second, he includes a Wallenstein-Trauerspiel from 1647. Admitting to never himself having seen a copy of this play, he cites Moller’s Cimbria Literata as his authority. Dünhaupt identifies several other scholars who also refer to the Wallenstein play, but crucially notes both that none can account for its location and Moller’s unreliability as a source. This demonstrates that, despite Müller’s efforts in his Bibliothek to make the primary material available, there remained some extent to which Rist reception was dependent upon transmitted data from secondary sources. Rist’s dramas remained under-researched for much of the 19th century.

The conclusions which Gervinus comes to on Rist in his Geschichte der poetischen National-Literatur der Deutschen are similar to those of Müller. Both are underwhelmed by Rist’s poetic ability and critical of the disproportionate level of esteem in which he was held by his contemporaries. Yet Gervinus’ work is more comprehensive. He sets no generic limitations and makes it quite clear that he has read all the works he references, despite their ‘Nichtigkeit’. This empirical approach was innovative, carried with it the authority of first-hand knowledge, and set new standards in the practice of literary history. Gervinus provides the first detailed examination of Rist in his historical context, and furthermore expands the field of inquiry beyond sole consideration of Rist’s poetry.

Gervinus objects to the literature of the 17th century to the extent that it is the preserve of the nobility. He is critical of Opitz for his attachment to various courts, and of the formalism of Opitzian reform for its alienation from Volk culture. This concept of the Volksmäßige underpins Gervinus’ evaluations, and he has qualified praise for such works as are relevant in content to the German people of the time. Gervinus credits the Thirty Years’ War with at least providing the conditions under which ‘volksmäßige’ literature could still be
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produced, even if this could not ultimately prevail against the formalism of Opitz’s generic prescriptions. On the other hand, Gervinus approves of the linguistic purism of Opitz and the Sprachgesellschaften, particularly the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft, for its achievements in protecting German language and literature from foreign influence. Yet for all these achievements the Fruchtbringende fostered a culture wherein works with noble protection were critically unassailable, which in turn bred poetic mediocrity. Gervinus singles out Rist as a writer whose often vitriolic Vorreden exemplify the culture of disparagement in the 17th century which made this dedicatory practice necessary. He further indulges in a moral criticism of Rist, condemning in particular the supposedly ‘heimlich und schmählich’ manner in which the latter made an enemy of Zesen as well as ‘seine steten und unausgesetzten groben und gemeinen Ausfälle gegen seine Gegner, deren er nie Einen zu nennen wagt.’

Still, Gervinus is not wholly dismissive of Rist’s writing. He reserves some muted praise for the Poetischer Lust-Garte (1638), suggesting that some of the poems in this collection might serve as a bridge between Hans Sachs and Gellert. More significantly, Gervinus almost approves of Rist’s dramas. He somewhat inexplicably asserts that Rist followed Opitz in his dramatic writings, but then goes on to identify the manner in which they nevertheless retained ‘vieles Volksthümliche’. Gervinus claims that if more of the plays that Rist is known to have written had survived, they would, on account of Rist’s principle of writing in prose, be much closer in kind to English dramas than to the German Kunsttragödien in alexandrines of the later 17th century. He further cites the Teutschland plays as evidence that Rist wrote for a popular audience, and that in this he was influenced by the Volksstück. In light of this, Gervinus’ identification of Rist as an Opitzian dramatist should not be taken too seriously. According to Gervinus’ own categories, much of Rist’s dramatic writing was, precisely, un-Opitzian.

Gervinus’ Geschichte manifests both historicising and politicising trends in the study of literature, which are connected through their preoccupation with the German nation. In the
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context of the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire and the Napoleonic occupation, nascent Germanistik became a discipline determined not by its object (German literature), but by its function in maintaining a cultural nation in lieu of, and as eventual guarantor of, a nation state. Such cultural patriotism was not unique to the 19th century, yet it was not until then that any histories of poetry were produced. Only the 19th century possessed a developmental model for history, which enabled historical events to be ordered into a narrative. What this historical interest meant for the nature of literary studies was that texts became symptoms of the national psyche – no longer in themselves objects of analysis, but as a means of accessing the authors and their lives. This is observable in the evaluations of Rist’s character engaged in by Müller and Gervinus. Politically speaking, the significance of the establishment of a chair in Germanistik in Berlin, as the centre of anti-Napoleon sentiment, in the context of the otherwise slow process of the institutionalisation of the discipline, supports the characterisation of Germanistik as, at least in respect of one aspect of its genesis, a ‘Krisenphänomen’.

Rist was not the focus of institutionalised scholarship in the 19th century. Significantly, however, the first monograph on Rist, Hansen’s Johann Rist und seine Zeit. Aus den Quellen dargestellt, has a clear political concern consistent with the ‘Krisenphänomen’ characterisation of early institutional Germanistik. It dates from 1872, and is thus also consistent with Lepper’s claim that 17th-century studies in the latter half of the 19th century were characterised by the detailed philological and literary-historical study of individuals. Hansen sees his work as fitting into such a tradition. As such, and as the following discussion will demonstrate, this is by far the most thoroughgoing treatment of Rist yet encountered. Hansen makes a serious effort to provide a comprehensive overview of Rist’s oeuvre, and although there are many respects in which the results are unsatisfactory, it must


be recognised that he not only takes Rist’s dramas more seriously than anyone before him had done, offering a more in-depth discussion of the *Teutschland* plays, but also tackles Rist’s rather eclectic prose writings. In the course of this, Hansen occasionally achieves a somewhat startling clarity of insight.

It is necessary to recognise from the outset that this is also the most sympathetic treatment of Rist yet encountered. Indeed, Hansen’s partiality towards his subject matter means that he struggles to maintain the critical distance necessary to support his conclusions. As Rist had been, Hansen is also a pastor in Schleswig-Holstein. The study is clearly addressed at least equally to the inhabitants of that region as it is to literary scholars, and so does not belong under the auspices of institutional *Germanistik*. Rist is referred to throughout as ‘unser Rist’, ‘unser Dichter’, and Hansen is at pains to draw attention to elements of his writings that will be of particular interest to the Schleswig-Holstein reader. Thus the portrayal of Holstein in the *Kriegs- und Friedens-Spiegel* (1640) is attractive to the 19th-century reader as a fairy-tale land, and the 1648 poem ‘Holstein, vergiß es nicht’, commemorating an earthquake of the same year, is primarily of historical, not poetic, interest. In this respect, Hansen’s study straddles the border between academic scholarship and popular-interest literature.

The attempt to rehabilitate Rist in his own region is relatively innocuous, yet some of Hansen’s other judgements betray a more problematic bias. Where Gervinus’ moral criticisms of Rist seem unwarranted by modern standards of literary scholarship, Hansen is concerned to refute claims of a feud with Zesen. This dispute is now generally attested to. There is a general trend in Hansen’s work to establish Rist as morally admirable from a fixed, 19th-century, Christian perspective. As a result of this inclination, Hansen is forced to read Rist’s *Phönix* texts, concerning the serious endeavour to create the philosopher’s stone, as an ironic treatment of such people as seek to be poets without the ‘Gunst des Genius’.

Yet above all else, the political context of Hansen’s writing pervades his work. Its anti-French prejudice is so striking that Hansen is obliged to explain that it had been composed prior to the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war, and request that it be read as if in this context. This apology is clearly necessary. Hansen opens the main body of the text by establishing the historical significance of Rist’s birthplace, Ottensen, by identifying it as the
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site of a mass grave, filled with the bodies of those who died after having been expelled from Hamburg by Napoleonic troops in 1813. In support of this contextualisation, Hansen features a poem from Friedrich Rückert’s, *Gräber zu Ottensen*, which meditates upon the grave and the great injustice perpetrated upon the Hamburg residents. Only once Ottensen is firmly asserted as the location of French cruelty to innocent Germans is it revealed as Rist’s birthplace. This sentiment permeates the text, becoming particularly apparent again in Hansen’s discussion of French cultural influence at German courts in the 17th century, seen as even more threatening through its association with the spread of Calvinism. Later, Hansen suggests that the 1806 republication of *Friedewünschendes Teutschland* by an anonymous pastor in Holstein was motivated by the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire, expressing ‘tiefen heiligen Zorn’ and ‘Grimm gegen die Franzosenherrschaft’ and bearing witness to ‘einer Zeit tiefer Erniedrigung.’

Hansen’s plea that his work be read in the 1860s context of its writing resonates in his own treatment of Rist. This is the value of this study for Rist scholarship – in spite of his bias, Hansen significantly and forcefully argues that Rist’s works be read as a product of their specific time. In approaching 17th-century literature in general, Hansen urges sensitivity to the fact that the writers were ‘Schmerzenskinder des 30jährigen Krieges’, imploring 19th-century readers to take the difficult and often violent circumstances in which 17th-century writers lived into account. This openness to the idea of an historical explanation for the nature of 17th-century literature renders Hansen receptive to that literature in its own right. Similarly, he urges patience with regard to 17th-century attempts at language purification and standardisation, arguing that those who wrote on these topics again had a much more difficult situation to contend with than their descendants in the 19th century: ‘[s]ie zu verachten, dazu ist auch nicht der mindeste Grund und nicht ein Schatten von Recht.’

In this mode, Hansen offers some rather charming pieces of advice to the 19th-century reader of Rist. Regarding Mars’ entrance at the end of Act II of *Friedewünschendes Teutschland* he explains: ‘Die Nerven der Zuschauer waren damals wohl minder zart als heutzutage; auch der lange Krieg hatte die Sinne abgehärtet.’ He also feels obliged to explain Rist’s use of the term ‘Blackscheisser’ (which he reproduces only as ‘Blacksch…’),
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pointing out that ‘Federfuchser’ is the preferred word ‘in unserer mehr zartfühlenden Zeit’ and indeed, later Hansen leaves some of Rist’s Plattdeutsch untranslated, so as to avoid offending the ‘Nervösen’. Regarding the appearance of the character of ‘Gott’ in Friedewünschendes Teutschland, Hansen finds what is blasphemous by 19th-century principles unproblematic by those of the 17th century. He both acknowledges the gulf between the centuries in terms of literary and moral standards and attempts to address this gulf by providing his readers with the data he deemed necessary for them to be able to appreciate Rist’s dramas as 17th-century dramas. He makes his reasons for adopting this approach quite clear:

Wenn gleich unleugbar für unsere Zeit manche Scene unerträglich langweilig sein würde, wenn gleich unser verwöhntes Geschlecht die Zumuthung, einer Aufführung dieser Stücke beizuwohnen, vielleicht weit abweisen möchte, so müssen wir uns vergegenwärtigen, daß unser Rist […] als Schauspieldichter damals seines Gleichen suchte.

Contrast Hansen’s accommodation of the particularly ‘17th-century’ characteristics of Rist’s work with the sensitivity of the early anthologisers to the tastes and expectations of their readers, which had led to varying degrees of editorial intervention. Hansen’s argument might seem rather pedestrian by modern standards, but his point, ‘daß man die deutsche Poesie des 17. Jahrhunderts nicht mit dem Maßstabe der Periode seit 1770 messen darf,’ apparently needed to be made. Ultimately, few of Hansen’s points were not later made in a more thorough manner and upon a more solid foundation by 20th-century scholarship, and so the content of his work is less relevant than his intentions in writing it, in which he attempted a significant break from the dominant critical tradition. As it happened, Johann Rist und seine Zeit did not become a seminal work in Rist scholarship – the tolerance which the 20th century developed for Rist was a product very much of its own trends in the reappraisal of ‘Baroque’ literature.
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Jaumann has identified a two-century long ‘Abwertungstradition’ in the history of the reception of ‘Baroque’ literature. The reception of Rist in the 18th and 19th centuries, such as it was, seems largely consistent with this characterisation, although the lack of any substantial interest in Rist in the 18th century makes it difficult to meaningfully speak of ‘Abwertung’ to the extent that this is a deliberate project. It is only in the 19th century that responses to Rist are utilised in the portrayal of the 17th century as a time of literary degeneracy. These negative appraisals, composed in pursuit of historical completeness, were appraisals nonetheless and helped, as Müller hoped they might, restore Rist to memory. In the later years of the 19th century, Rist scholarship begins to break with the ‘Abwertungstradition’, and the first attempts are made at engaging with Rist in a more positive manner. Hansen’s ambitious attempt at rehabilitation is ultimately too marred by partiality to yield many conclusions of critical import, although it does serve as a fascinating document of the manner in which a 19th-century lay readership might have approached Rist. Throughout these two centuries, Rist maintained a presence, however minimally at times, as a lyricist. Yet, as Rist reception is followed into the 20th century, it will be seen that only once his dramas are seriously attended to is a promising avenue of investigation opened up, with the potential to yield a critically justifiable positive response to his writings.
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Chapter 2 b) The Reception of Rist since 1900

In a chapter on Rist published in a 1984 study of 17th-century German literature, Dieter Lohmeier and Klaus Reichelt make the following observations on 20th-century Rist-reception. First, that Gervinus’ condemnation of Rist’s poetic production as excessive in volume and wanting in quality has been largely maintained to this day. Second, that no work of Rist’s has been so thoroughly interpreted or discussed as have some of e.g. Gryphius’, Grimmelshausen’s and Hofmannswaldau’s, in spite of the handful of studies since 1910 which have taken Rist as their focus. Third, that no work of Rist’s belongs to the contemporary canon of ‘Baroque literature’. This essay will largely confirm these findings, even in the light of almost three decades of subsequent scholarship. Yet while the reception of Rist’s works has not progressed much in recent years, it will be seen that Rist-reception overall looks rather different now than it did in the 1980s, not least in virtue of recent investigations into the Sprachgesellschaften and the interrelationships amongst the organisations themselves and their members. Recent Rist-reception has not had a primarily literary focus, concerning itself rather with an explication of the social structures of which he was a part. It has become clear that knowledge of the relationships of influence amongst 17th-century literary, artistic, and political personalities is desirable for any adequate account of artistic production.

Thus in this respect 20th-century reception will be seen to move away from the predominantly literary focus of the preceding centuries. Similarly, one can observe the modest beginnings of an attempt to come to terms with Rist’s scientific activities. Other new trends in Rist-reception emerge in light of the reevaluation of the ‘Baroque’ concept after Wölfflin and Strich, as well as following Garber’s work drawing attention to the importance of confession and the context of confessionalism for 17th-century literary production. On the other hand, certain approaches to Rist are in evidence before and after 1900 (which, recall,

473 Dieter Lohmeier and Klaus Reichelt, ‘Johann Rist’, in Deutsche Dichter des 17. Jahrhundert. Ihr Leben und Werk, ed. by Harald Steinhagen and Benno von Wiese (Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1984), pp. 347–364 (p. 352). The scare quotes are my own. I endeavour to remain faithful to the critics’ chosen terminology, not least because the decision to designate literature as either ‘Baroque’ or ‘17th-century’ is itself to some extent telling of its reception. I have a preference for the latter designation as more neutral. It will become clear in a later excursus that ‘Baroque’ is a loaded term, the use of which, as far as my own purposes go, is best avoided. It is precisely in light of this, however, that it is important to reproduce its use in the criticism.

was never explicitly posited as a theoretical watershed). The primarily literary inquiry does not disappear from practice, and there is also a clear interest in Rist both from a Lutheran perspective qua pastor and composer of texts for hymns. Furthermore, the investigation of Rist’s utilisation of low German dialect in his dramas continues over the turn of the 20th century. It is here that this essay will begin, picking up where the last left off.

First, however, a note on structure. Where the study of Rist-reception in the 18th and 19th centuries could proceed in a largely chronological manner, this approach makes little sense for the present essay. Certainly, some modes of reception are tied to a given time-period, such as the trend for typologising in the 1920s, but otherwise particular interests in Rist can be observed recurring throughout the century. Here, then, approaches to Rist are categorised and treated in terms of their predominant interest in the man or his work, although this does not of course preclude consideration of such reception in its historical and intellectual context, which will be engaged in as appropriate.

A 1900 article by Seedorf on Rist’s Zwischenspiele and published in a *Festschrift* for the Hansischer Geschichtsverein and the Verein für niederdeutsche Sprachforschung continues in the tradition of Gaedertz’s investigations at the end of the 19th century, approaching Rist from a provincial perspective and writing for a conceivably rather restricted readership of enthusiasts, perhaps specialists. This focus may well provide the necessary conditions to enable such linguistic investigations of Rist, which may not have been possible in the context of high German literary studies, yet it is regrettable that it also necessarily restricted their sphere of influence. Seedorf’s is a solid article, making some interesting suggestions which have not, as far as I can tell, been followed up on by subsequent scholarship.

These suggestions will be addressed below. It is important to first briefly draw attention to Seedorf’s argumentative shortcomings, neither of which is unique to him. First, his praise for Rist’s Zwischenspiele is predicated upon their perceived realism. 20th century scholarship, particularly in respect of Grimmelshausen, has established the necessity of exercising caution in attributing realism to 17th writers and works, not least since to do so risks anachronism and the misinterpretation of the author’s intentions. Second, and likely as a consequence of his first error, Seedorf claims the Zwischenspiele to be the most interesting features of Rist’s dramas.475 This opinion is commonly encountered in the critical literature,
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and has doubtless contributed to the lack of adequate investigations of Rist’s dramas as wholes.

Seedorf’s positive contribution to Rist-scholarship is his claim to have identified various local, i.e. north German, plays as immediate inspirations for Rist’s Zwischenspiele, while not denying the now widely-recognised influence of the commedia dell’arte and especially the English Wanderbühne. Thus he sees the peasant scenes in Irenaromachia as inspired by an 1578 play by Franciscus Omichius, *Ein neue Comoedia, von Dionysii Syracusei, und Damonis und Pythiae Brüderschaft*. Further, he identifies similarities between the second Zwischenspiel in Perseus and a 1616 Fastnachtspiel called *Vitulus*, itself a translation from a 1595 Latin school comedy of the same name.\(^{476}\) Rettler takes exception to Seedorf’s identification of possible sources, not on the basis that these identifications are incorrect but that such identifications obscure the independence of Rist’s construction.\(^{477}\) It should, however, be possible to do justice both to Rist’s sources and to his originality – indeed to neglect the one would risk exaggerating the other. Unfortunately, Seedorf’s identifications of possible sources for Rist’s Zwischenspiele have not yet been addressed, still less confirmed, by subsequent scholarship.\(^{478}\)

Rettler’s study, *Niederdeutsche Literatur im Zeitalter des Barock*, examines how low German literature manifests itself given the context of the concerted efforts of the 17th century to establish high German as a literary language. The investigation is conceived of as contravening canonical preferences in a time when ‘Baroque’ scholarship was focussing on the likes of Optiz, Gryphius, Logau etc. Rettler acknowledges, in terms of her own intellectual context:

> Die Frage nach niederdeutsch sich aussprechender literarischer Selbstbewältigung dieses Jahrhunderts [i.e. the 17th century] wirkt für den nicht volkskundlich Interessierten nahezu grotesk.\(^{479}\)

This reflects the fact that the studies on Rist’s use of low German from around the turn of the 20th century neither occurred in nor seemed to penetrate mainstream literary scholarship.
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Rettler deals with Rist’s use of low German under the heading ‘Hauphandlungsverbundene realistische niederdeutsche Szenen und Einrollen in hochsprachlicher Dramatik’, in the course of a wider study that also takes in literary production entirely in low German. She argues that Rist’s treatment of the low German-speaking figures in his dramas means that the Zwischenspiele cannot be evaluated as independent works, since they serve to provide an appropriate backdrop against which the dramas’ actual concerns can come into sharper focus. The low German figures are not taken seriously – we may well pity their plight, but the dramas themselves afford them no closure.\footnote{Rettler, p. 81.} Rettler’s analysis of Rist’s use of low German flags up certain tensions. She also attributes a certain realism to his characterisation and so sees his low German figures as psychologically composite, belying the comic types of the commedia dell’arte and Wanderbühne that are their supposed roots.\footnote{Rettler, p. 78.} Yet Rist’s adherence to the Ständeklausel ensures that they have no place in the drama proper, with the outcome that, for all the lifelikeness in the portrayal of the low German characters, to Rist low German remains ‘für die eigentliche Dichtung selbstverständlich eine tote Sprache.’\footnote{Rettler, p. 87.} This is a tension that Rettler finds rooted in Rist personally, as a man unlikely to have failed to recognise his ‘volkstümliche Begabung’ but who makes a prefatory apology for the use of low German as a concession to the learned tastes of the time for the benefit of his peers and patrons. Rettler speculates:

Verbirgt sich nicht in diesen allzu laut vorgebrachten Zurückweisungen das nicht standesmäßig beschränkte Interesse für das „Uneigentliche“ [i.e. the inappropriate subjects of drama], das dem Dichter die Feder so leicht führt?\footnote{Rettler, p. 82.}

To pursue such an attempt to psychologise Rist would be inappropriate and highly speculative, not to mention likely impossible. What is relevant about Rettler’s suggestion is that it displays the beginnings of an attempt to come to terms with Rist’s use of low German in the contexts of the high German main dramas and the nascent high German culture, although it is perhaps unsurprising, given the low German focus of her overall study, that she does not follow this contextualisation through to any substantial conclusion.

A final note on Rettler. While her discussion of Rist’s Zwischenspiele led her to new insights about Rist’s compositional abilities which were not fundamentally objectionable, her
understanding of the supposed culture which is the focus of her study at large is based on an outmoded, critically suspect typological psychology. She accounts for the lack of low German tragedies and novels (as the two characteristic genres of the ‘Baroque’) by claiming that these genres have at their base a modern understanding of man as an absolute value, and as such constitute a break from the medieval literary tradition. Yet it is not this distinction itself which is problematic, rather Rettler’s characterisation of the north German ‘Volkscharakter’, whose fundamental attributes are ‘Beharrungsvermögen, Kontemplationsliebe und Naturverbundenheit.’ Irrespective of the nature and validity of Rettler’s distinction between the medieval and modern man, her appeal to some north German character to explain north German literary phenomena is clearly bogus. Further, she identifies such a character as lending itself well to satire and coarse humour – i.e. precisely as feature in Rist’s Zwischenspiele. Given these theoretical assumptions, her attempt to psychologise Rist appears all the more suspicious, appearing now predicated upon invalid psychological categories. Rettler’s analysis of Rist’s work must be taken with caution, given the risk that it is informed not by close reading but by the presupposition of a north German ‘Volkscharakter’.

A 2006 article by a phoneticist, Peter Martens, analyses the dialect in the first Zwischenspiel in Perseus. In the first instance, this is a valuable resource, as the low German passages can be somewhat inaccessible, particularly to the non-native German speaker. Martens reproduces the Zwischenspiel alongside explanations of non-standard vocabulary. Furthermore, on the basis of this he is in a position to analyse the character Laban’s language use, and identify where this figure uses hypercorrect high German (‘Missingsch’), where he corrects either only the consonants or only the vowels, and where his speech remains in low German. Martens largely declines to engage in a literary appraisal of this language use, but his article provides the necessary material for this. His focus on Laban is interesting and informative, since other comments on language in Perseus, which are anyway less detailed and knowledgeable, take Knapkäse as their focus. Additionally, Martens draws attention to the difficulties encountered in the attempt to reproduce Missingsch on the page using standard German orthography. It will be useful to bear in mind that Rist’s writing of dialect
may be at best an approximation of the desired effect, something that a strictly literary investigation may be unlikely to consider.

The studies of Rist’s use of low German have drawn attention to two other approaches that can be taken to Rist and his work, namely to investigate his Zwischenspiele qua Zwischenspiele, i.e. not restricting the focus to language use, and to consider Rist as, specifically, a Schleswig-Holstein writer.

Anent the latter, it is clear that despite certain coincidences in Rist’s use of dialect and his regional background, such as the Zwischenspiele in Irenaromachia demonstrate, the fields of investigation are not coextensive. Recall Hansen, for whom Rist was a Schleswig-Holstein writer but who equally focussed on Rist’s high German production. Schleswig-Holstein research has a clear conceptual advantage over low German research when it comes to Rist’s attractiveness and accessibility, since it can cast Rist as the region’s representative of the developments occurring in high German literature at large. Commonly, he is characterised as the representative of e.g. the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft or Opitzianism in Schleswig-Holstein,\(^{487}\) often claimed as single-handedly responsible for putting the region on the literary map of the 17th century. Indeed, Rist’s success and relevance as a ‘provincial’ poet is determined by the extent to which he transcends provincial borders. Encapsulating this argument, Garber writes of Rist’s role in the acculturation of northern Germany, demonstrable in the fact that, by the time of Rist’s death, even Wedel enjoyed a national reputation.\(^{488}\) Rist’s provincial relevance is not conceived of as relevance to Schleswig-Holstein as such, but to the region in the context of broader German cultural developments.

Thus Moerke’s study of the Anfänge der weltlichen Barocklyrik in Schleswig-Holstein characterises the region as ‘das bisher am Rande europäischer Kultur gelegene Land’, and endeavours to demonstrate how the writings of Rist, along with those of Heinrich Hudemann and Zacharias Lund, successfully integrated into mainstream literary developments. A key component of this lies in the conscious turn from low to high German as the appropriate literary idiom, whereby the use of low German was only permissible ‘wenn es galt, bäurische Schlauheit und Tölpelhaftigkeit zur Erheiterung des Publikums vorzuführen’, precisely as in


Rist’s *Zwischenspiele.* As far as Rist’s use of low German goes, this appraisal lacks nuance, but the underlying dichotomy between low and high German culture is characteristic of approaches to Rist as a Schleswig-Holstein writer. The focus on Rist qua high German writer in a high German tradition might account to some extent for the lack of receptivity to such attempts as Seedorf’s to illuminate Rist’s low German or Schleswig-Holsteinian literary context. Rist scholarship seems comfortable with his characterisation as (more or less) skilfully following the trend in his use of high German, and employing either comic, realistic, or a combination of both techniques in his use of low German.

In fact, the investigation of Rist’s relationship to and participation in German literary development as associated with both other geographical locations such as Nuremberg, Strasbourg or Silesia and the phenomenon of the *Sprachgesellschaften*, especially the *Fruchtbringende* and the *Pegnesischer Blumenorden*, to both of which Rist belonged, is worthwhile and fascinating. Caution is simply urged against the tacit assumption that Rist’s relevance is only measurable in this context. Yet as far as Rist’s function as an ‘Opitz of the North’ goes, Dammann, through close reading of Rist’s dedicatory letters and prefaces, has convincingly demonstrated that Rist successfully pursued a strategy in the dedication of his works to progressively spread and establish his reputation beyond regional boundaries. As a description of Rist’s practice with a strong basis in the primary material, Dammann’s study is highly illuminating. Its particular strength and novelty lies in its demonstration of the role played by non-literary elements, such as the nobility and royalty, in establishing Rist’s reputation.

Herein perhaps lies a key obstacle to any attempt to come to terms with Rist’s identity as a Schleswig-Holstein poet – the fact that he himself seems to have undeniably striven to overcome such an identification in favour of participation in a perceived broader German culture. Yet traces of Schleswig-Holstein are nevertheless in evidence in Rist’s work, even beyond his use of dialect in the *Zwischenspiele*. Take for instance the pseudonym under which his collections of pastoral love poetry, *Florabella* (1642) and *Galathee* (1651) were published: Daphnis aus Cimbrien. An intriguing twist to this identification is added by the fact that both publications occurred without Rist’s foreknowledge or consent – his relationship to his pseudonym would bear closer examination. Further, the name of Rist’s *Sprachgesellschaft*, the *Elbschwanenorden*, evokes his regional context, and in this case there can be no question that Rist intended this strong regional association. Given the currency
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attached to acknowledgement of Rist’s acculturative activities, it would certainly be worth clarifying his relationship to his immediate locality, if only to avoid the risk of overstating his ‘Opitzian’ position. Thus far, attempts to address Rist’s regional identity have done little more than make a brief, naïve statement about the supposed idyllic nature of his parish at Wedel, often with appeal to his ‘Parnassus’. This view has been successfully countered through a more prosaic emphasis on the importance, economically as well as culturally, of Wedel’s proximity to Hamburg, which is valuable as far as it goes but not necessarily exhaustive.

Also related to the study of Rist’s use of dialect, an interest in the wider topic of the *Zwischenspiele* has developed. The focus here has spread from linguistic analysis to an examination of the content of the *Zwischenspiele* as well as their structural relationships to the dramas at large. Hammes’ 1911 survey of *Zwischenspiele* in German drama between 1500 and 1660 provides an overview of Rist’s dramas, while Schiewek in 1984 engages in a fruitful close reading. Hammes downplays the influence of the English players on the German *Zwischenspiel* in general, claiming that they contributed overwhelmingly through their sense of theatricality, but cannot be seen as directly inspiring the pieces themselves, which stand rather in their own, native, tradition. In fact, as far as German drama did adopt elements from the *Wanderbühne*, Hammes asserts, their influence tended to be damaging, rather than improving. Thus Hammes’ position opposes the more recent inclination, represented by e.g. a Mannack, to contextualise Rist’s *Zwischenspiele* in the *Wanderbühne* tradition.

In fact, however, when he comes to consider Rist in the latter’s own right, Hammes is less concerned to establish him in any tradition than he is to assert his original, almost visionary, genius. Rist, we are told, dominates as a dramatist in the 1630s, a period otherwise hardly amenable to dramatic production. Since Hammes can only have had access to two of Rist’s dramas from this decade, this assertion can at best be founded upon claims about the lost dramas – if it is not indeed entirely baseless. Further, Hammes appears to be making the all-too-common assumption of uniformity in experience of the Thirty Years’ War throughout
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its duration and across its geographical spread. Yet there is little reason why the 1630s should have been a difficult time for dramatic production in Hamburg and its environs. Rist’s well-documented experiences of wartime destruction date from the later years of the Thirty Years’ War and the Dano-Swedish War.

Hammes also cites the supposed realism of Rist’s Zwischenspiele, in contrast to the stiff allegory of the main plots, by way of explaining their enduring attractiveness. Yet if one found the attribution of realism to 17th-century texts troubling, Hammes’ equation of Rist’s technique with the naturalism of the 1880s is clearly wholly inappropriate. In light of this, Hammes’ observation that Rist’s use of dialect is not in itself a comic technique must be treated with some caution. It is in principle correct to state that Rist does not employ dialect to mock or caricature the peasantry, and the pursuit of ‘truth to nature’ may indeed best encapsulate his intentions. It is simply fallacious to apply a 19th-century understanding of what constitutes ‘truth to nature’ (let alone the concepts of ‘truth’ and ‘nature’ themselves) straightforwardly to 17th-century texts.

On the other hand, Hammes offers some interesting structural observations on Rist’s Zwischenspiele, hereby exhibiting an attempt to properly come to terms with the concept and appraise them as such. Thus he has particular praise for the second Irenaromachia-Zwischenspiel, noting its well-developed character and dramatic life, and claiming for Rist both an ability to portray the milieu and contemporary conditions as well as formal skill in the construction and execution of the plot. In contrast, the overspill of Zwischenspiel characters into the main plot of Perseus are regarded as unsuccessful, failing to do justice to Rist’s powerful sense of humour as do the Zwischenspiele themselves. Knapkäse’s appearances in the final act are particularly offensive, above all his abuse of the corpses following the triple suicide. In these evaluations lies the suggestion of a formal purism as regards the Zwischenspiele. Interestingly, this does not proceed on the basis of the Ständeklausel or some notion of propriety, perhaps as one might expect given the strict rules about genre designation in the prescriptive poetics of Rist’s day, but on Hammes’ supposition that the comedy of the Zwischenspiele is not successfully transportable to the main plots.

Hammes’ concept of the Zwischenspiel is based largely upon his interpretation of the effect they in fact had, as opposed to any explicit claims by the writers who utilised them concerning their nature.
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Schiwek begins her investigation of Rist’s Zwischenspiele with an observation which rather supports the present study’s identification of the dominant response to his dramas. Since the second half of the 19th century (i.e. since such a time as the dramas were for the first time subjected to serious examination – see the study of Rist-reception in the 18th and 19th centuries), Rist’s Zwischenspiele have been praised for their ‘Lebendigkeit’ and ‘Zeitnähe’, precisely in contrast to the sterility of the dramas’ main plots. Like Hammes, she suggests a prophetic element to Rist’s dramatic production, in that the Zwischenspiele anticipate the non-rhetorical dramas of the 18th century. Schiewek does not so readily invite accusations of anachronism, since she is careful to write in terms of suggesting future developments, not asserting an equivalence between distinct literary phenomena. An explanatory connection between these two observations suggests itself, even if Schiewek does not herself make it – namely that positive receptivity to the Zwischenspiele, to the extent that they are non-rhetorical, is some function of the canonicity of 18th-century drama. Certainly, it is well-nigh undeniable that the rhetorical nature of 17th-century Kunsttragödien presents a significant initial obstacle to their accessibility.

In her explication of Rist’s achievements in his Zwischenspiele, Schiewek closely examines the main plot itself and in its relationship to the Zwischenspiele, taking Perseus as her example. This discussion is a significant contribution to Rist-scholarship – the main dramas were, and indeed remain, under-discussed. To summarise: Schiewek establishes the characters in the main plot as bearers of functions within each scene. As such, they do not carry the plot, which is rather a chain of circumstances to be portrayed and interpreted. These situations represent the thematic aspects that frame the figures. Thus, for example, while Perseus functions as a miles gloriosus in a given scene, this is not intended as an integrated part of his character (this would imply a more modern psychology). In fact, were Perseus to be always characterisable as a miles gloriosus, this would be inconsistent with his status as necessary for tragedy. In the council scenes, he is defined by his hatred of his brother, and this is a characteristic appropriate to tragedy.

It is in this context that the contrastive force of the Zwischenspiele can be understood, which are seen as comically paralleling the events of the main plot. This goes beyond the obvious contrast in terms of content, by which e.g. the Telsche Zwischenspiel brings into focus the idealised love of Demetrius and Eudocia. The Zwischenspiele contrast structurally
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with the main plot, something Schiewek has been able to demonstrate by affording the latter an unprecedented degree of attention. The scenes in the Zwischenspiele are dynamic, the plots character-driven, the characters complex. In particular, Schiewek argues that the character Laban is mimetically constructed, with a personality consistent with his peasant background. In drawing attention to the fundamental differences between the main plot and the Zwischenspiele, she can come to important conclusions about their respective modes of relation to the audience and the demands they place upon it. The rhetorical main plots contain no real dialogue and treat the audience as a receptacle for the information borne in what is, in essence, a series of monologues. The Zwischenspiele make high demands of the audience’s receptive capabilities – the interactions are real dialogues and less explicitly staged for the audience’s benefit. Schiewek all but arrives once again at the well-rehearsed claim of realism, but is largely saved from fallacy through the thoroughness of her method and refraining from treating ‘realism’ as some evaluative category.

This is not to say that Schiewek does not engage in evaluation by other suspect criteria. At times, Rist’s dramatic production is portrayed as the site of a class war. The emergence of the Zwischenspiel in German dramatic practice is cast as a manifestation of increasing democratisation in the face of medieval religious authority. The use of low German Zwischenspiele in high German dramas is seen as correlating to the cementing of a social distinction between the users of the two idioms. Rist challenges theatrical and literary restrictions through including ‘bäuerliche und plebejische Lebenswirklichkeit’ in his dramas., while by affording aesthetic value to these rather unnoticed spheres of existence, he paved the way for the lower classes of the feudal society to achieve human dignity. This goes too far – it is possible to agree that Rist’s portrayal of the peasantry and use of the low German idiom are not intended to mock the social group in question, without claiming Rist as some proto-Marxist. Schiewek’s close readings of Rist’s dramas break much new ground, but care must be taken to isolate ideological bias from valuable insight.

This study will now proceed to consideration of some new trends in Rist-reception in the 20th century. In this context, it is worth briefly sketching the nature of ‘Baroque’-reception after
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Wölfflin and Strich, since even though this itself barely acknowledged Rist it greatly influenced 20th-century responses to 17th-century literature. Sensitivity to the heritage of the ‘Baroque’ concept is urged. As Lepper has demonstrated, the research that occurred under this rubric, which had its heyday in the 1920s and 1930s, was highly programmatic, concerned with establishing a stylistic typology which released the literature in question from the specificities of its historical context.\footnote{See Marcel Lepper, ‘Typologie, Stilpsychologie, Kunstwollen. Zur Erfindung des ‘Barock’ (1900-1933)’, \textit{Arcadia-International Journal for Literary Studies}, 41 (2006), 14–28 (p. 17–8); ‘Die ‚Entdeckung’ des ‘deutschen Barock’. Zur Geschichte der Frühneuzeitgermanistik 1888-1915’, \textit{Zeitschrift für Germanistik}, 17 (2007), 300–21 (p. 309).} Wölfflin identified formal characteristics of the visual ‘Baroque’, which in 1916 Strich transferred to literary studies – overall, the early 20th century displays a deep concern with formal issues.\footnote{Lepper, ‘Typologie, Stilpsychologie, Kunstwollen’, pp. 24–26.} Thus does Benjamin, in his \textit{Ursprung des deutschen Trauerspiels} (1925) characterise the ‘Baroque’ as a period of ‘Kunstwollen’, the deliberate attempt to achieve art – a trait he sees manifested again in the Expressionism of the early 20th century.\footnote{Walter Benjamin, ‘Ursprung des deutschen Trauerspiels’, in \textit{Gesammelte Schriften}, ed. by Rolf Tiedemann and Hermann Schweppenhäuser, Gesammelte Schriften (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1974), 1.1, 203–430 (p. 235).} This illustrates the ahistorical, phaseological tendency of the reevaluation of ‘Baroque’ literature, which sought to establish accessibility through similarity, in line with the trend for metaphorical appeal to ‘Wahlverwandtschaften’.\footnote{Lepper, ‘Typologie, Stilpsychologie, Kunstwollen’, p. 23–4.} It has been pointed out, somewhat unsurprisingly, that any affinity between ‘Baroque’ and Expressionist literature is in fact superficial,\footnote{Paul Raabe, ‘Expressionismus und Barock’, in \textit{Europäische Barock-Rezeption}, ed. by Klaus Garber (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1991), 1, 675–682.} yet equally that the enthusiasm for ‘Baroque’ research at this time would have been unthinkable were it not for this felt affinity.\footnote{Wilhelm Vosskamp, ‘Deutsche Barockforschung in den zwanziger und dreißiger Jahren’, in \textit{Europäische Barock-Rezeption}, ed. by Klaus Garber (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1991), 1, 683–702 (p. 695).} This is an important point, since, whatever the flaws of the ‘Baroque’ research of these two decades, no other period has been as stimulating and productive of further research into 17th-century literature.\footnote{Vosskamp, p. 683.} At the beginning of a second wave of ‘Baroque’ research in the 1960s, Richard Alewyn looked back on the 1920s as a ‘Golden Age’ of ‘Baroque’ scholarship.\footnote{Lepper, p. 307–8.} One can agree on the significance of this period without committing oneself to its theoretical position.

Yet ‘Baroque’-scholarship of the 1920s and 1930s concerned itself little with the works of Rist, and equally seems to have passed Rist-scholarship by, such as it was. Thus, as Lepper notes, a 1921 biography of Rist still operated with the traditional, derogatory
‘Baroque’ concept familiar from Gervinus. This is not to say that the ‘Baroque’ revival was without consequence for Rist-reception, however. The increased interest in the literature of the 17th century occasioned the publication of a spate of poetry anthologies, many of which contained works by Rist. A definitive instance is Cysarz’s Vor- und Frühbarock (1937), which contains 14 poems by Rist in a dedicated section entitled ‘Johannes Rist und der Ausklang des Frühbarock’. Cysarz’s collection became the most important source for other anthologies for the next three decades. Important inclusions of Cysarz’, which recur often in the anthologies and count among Rist’s best-known poems to this day, take in the poem on the death of Wallenstein, ‘Auff die nunmehr angekomme kalte Winterszeit’, and, naturally, ‘O Ewigkeit / du Donner-Wohrt’. Sommerfeld also published an anthology explicitly in the context of contemporary developments in ‘Baroque’ scholarship, intending that it should function as a resource by providing works for critical comparison. Unlike Cysarz, and as such exhibiting more sensitivity to the needs of typological research, he does not arrange his anthology around personalities and a periodisation of the ‘Baroque era’ but according to motifs. As such, his aim is not the presentation of the most beautiful or even characteristic of 17th-century poetic works, but the portrayal of the multifaceted nature of the ‘Baroque’. Here, Rist is represented by two poems from the Galathee, in sections devoted to the eyes of the beloved and the absent beloved. Perfectly consistently with Sommerfeld’s explicit intentions, these poems cannot be said to even approximate a representation of Rist qua poet, and do not feature again in the sample of anthologies discussed here. A 1937 anthology by Hauswedell also seeks its place in the context of advances in ‘Baroque’ research, this time not as a resource but to support findings already made. Again, Rist is represented by a poem from his Galathee, ‘Bekümmerte Liebes-Gedanken’, although this poem has subsequently found more widespread reception. Indeed, this poem and ‘O Ewigkeit’ most commonly represent Rist in the anthologies. What the three anthologies discussed above
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demonstrate, is that Rist did find inclusion in the ‘Baroque’ discussion of the 1920s and 1930s, albeit not as a primary focus.

It is appropriate now to consider which poems, under what conditions, were included in other anthologies of the 20th century, even those not directly associated with theorising about a ‘Baroque’ concept. Many of these were in fact compiled explicitly for a lay readership, and, in the interests of accessibility, orthography would be modernised.\footnote{See e.g. Curt Grützmacher, Liebeslyrik des deutschen Barock (Munich: Winkler, 1965), p. 219.} An early example is Unus’ 1922 anthology, which characterises artistic production in the context of the Thirty Years’ War as hampered by the assumption that art was frivolous, forcing artists to cast their production as a free-time activity, not a primary concern.\footnote{Walter Unus, Die deutsche Lyrik des Barock (Berlin: Reiß, 1922), p. 16–7.} Rist is represented by three love poems, one poem that is a self-reflective turn away from love poetry, and a serious and patriotic reflection upon the war. The poems have been collected and the anthology modernised for readers ‘die diese Gedichte als lebendig empfinden möchten’,\footnote{Unus, p. 24.} a focus which, along with Unus’ concern about the nature of 17th-century artistic production, betrays a modern understanding of poetry and an insensitivity to the prospect of making 17th-century poetry accessible on its own terms. Again, the focus on Rist’s love poetry suggests a selection criterion of poems anyway amenable to modern tastes, as opposed to any serious attempt at representation. Four decades later, an anthology exclusively of ‘Baroque’ love poetry, including the ‘Bekümmerte Liebes-Gedanken’, aimed to redress the fact that this genre had all but faded from memory.\footnote{Grützmacher, p. 219.}

Of all the genres in which Rist wrote, it is somewhat surprising that the 20th century should consistently receive him as a love poet. Out of a sense of propriety, at least in part owing to the expectations attached to his position as pastor, he had distanced himself from the love poetry of his youth, and, as mentioned above, had not sanctioned the publication of the Florabella and Galathe. That the 20th century reacted so favourably to precisely this element of Rist’s oeuvre lends itself well to the suggestion of a lack of concern for Rist in his own right. One anthologist and translator praised the ‘authentic Catullian ring’ of the Daphnis poetry.\footnote{Schoolfield, p. 26.} Interestingly, two further anthologies contain ‘Bekümmerte Liebes-Gedanken’, but not explicitly qua love poem. Milch features it in a representative selection of Rist’s poetry a
la Cysarz under the heading ‘Aus dem Umkreis der Sprachgesellschaften’; while Schöne’s vast anthology of ‘Baroque’ literature reproduces it in the category ‘Ekloge oder Hirten-Gedichte’. In the context of Rist’s oeuvre, the currency of this poem in the 20th century appears incongruous, highlighting the fact that we still lack an adequate Rist-study.

As well as the perceived formal and stylistic affinity to the literature of the 17th century, the 20th century sought to establish a relationship on the basis of content. One obvious connection that could be drawn here concerned the experience of war. This is well exemplified in Ginsberg’s Komm, güldner Friede of 1944, which marries the desire to bring 17th-century poetry to a wider audience with the claim of that poetry’s relevance in the contemporary situation. Given this second element, the poetry by Rist that features is only in extracts, a few lines selected from longer works. The extent to which this in fact brought Rist (or indeed any of the other 17th-century writers featured) to a wider readership is thus questionable, since the relevance not only of Rist as the works’ author but also of the works themselves is subordinated to Ginsberg’s illustrative intention. Overall, while Rist maintains an undeniable presence in the poetry anthologies of the 20th century, this is not accompanied by any substantial contribution to the analysis of his works.

In a brief coda, it is interesting to note that poems by Rist features in two collections of German poetry in English translation. Both aim to familiarise a readership with German poetry even if they have no knowledge of German, Schoolfield’s German Lyric of the Baroque attempts to maintain rhyme and meter, with a result that fails to greatly aid accessibility. Forster’s plain prose translations in The Penguin Book of German Verse are altogether more successful, and what is remarkable here is that Rist is included in a collection that does not solely limit itself to the poetry of the 17th century. There is clearly some extent to which he is considered relevant not only to the non-German speaker, but also to those not specifically interested in the literature of the ‘Baroque’ or the 17th century. Forster observes that, where German poetry is known in the United Kingdom, this is usually through a famous musical setting, and claims to be presenting in this collection poems that can stand independently of music. Despite this, the Rist poem his includes is ‘O Ewigkeit’, which is

the one work by Rist that the non-expert could reasonably be expected to have encountered – precisely in virtue of Bach’s cantata. The musical element and its relation to Rist’s production is important, and will be returned to below.

In 1928, Jericke published a monograph on Rist’s Monatsgespräche. He justifies his choice of focus with the assertion that critical consensus had already been reached on Rist both as a poet and a dramatist, and so the dialogues were the next obvious area of investigation. This is clearly highly debatable – even today there remains much to be done in these areas. Nevertheless, Jericke’s study is thorough and informative, and there have been no subsequent pieces of scholarship to challenge its status as the most comprehensive treatment of the Monatsgespräche to date. In examining their content, he sheds light on both Rist’s use of sources and how he was influenced by contemporary cultural and scientific events and developments, as well as the extent to which the arguments were determined by Rist’s personal and theological convictions. Formally, Jericke establishes the Monatsgespräche in the generic traditions of the dialogues, demonstrating how each functions rhetorically – altogether, the Monatsgespräche are seen as a composite of several dialogic forms.

Before going into more detail on Jericke’s investigation of the Monatsgespräche, the originality of his approach in the context of previous, and indeed subsequent, scholarship should be noted. Jericke’s observation that the Monatsgespräche are primarily consulted as a source of biographical data still holds today. He does not problematise such a use of Rist’s texts, although clearly it would be appropriate, indeed necessary, to do so if one wished to utilise such apparently autobiographical elements as the oft-quoted passage in the Belustigung about Rist’s early encounter with English players. Jericke approaches the Monatsgespräche from the other direction and seeks to use his analysis of their form and content to shed light on Rist’s personality. The extent to which this approach succeeds, or is even valid, is again debatable. In fact many of Jericke’s can insights stand on their own. Yet his psychologising concern should not be lost from view – in particular, he returns often to and lays much significance upon the claim that Rist was moved to write the Monatsgespräche as a means of distracting him from his grief at the death of his first wife.

On the other hand, Jericke seems to touch upon an important point here, which distinguishes the Monatsgespräche within Rist’s oeuvre. They are characterised as personal
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works, in that they do not display the same professional or social ambition amply present, as Dammann demonstrated, in Rist’s other works. Thus Rist dedicates the *Monatsgespräche* to individuals with a connection to the respective subjects of discussion, and in this practice is not primarily seeking some advantageous connection.\footnote{Jericke, p. 14–5.} Further, Jericke’s analysis of the content of the discussions lends support to this identification of the *Monatsgespräche* as a personal project. The discussions never progress beyond the contemporary level of knowledge on a subject, and in some cases even remain behind this. As such, they afford Rist the opportunity to expound at length upon matters of personal interest. To Jericke, this is well demonstrated in the *Torheit*, which brings out Rist’s penchant for superstition and esotericism.\footnote{Jericke, p. 70.} Finally, in the spirit of nascent empiricism but not necessarily one of any modern standard of scientific rigour, Rist often argues from and draws upon personal experience. These are the anecdotes that have often functioned as a biographical source for scholars. In fact, Jericke concludes that, while Rist draws on multiple literary sources, the content of the *Monatsgespräche* nevertheless has the overall character of memoirs.\footnote{Jericke, p. 146, 170.}

Jericke’s formal analysis of the *Monatsgespräche* identifies the botanical discussions, which precede each of the dialogues proper and provide a sense of internal coherence amongst them, so disparate they are in tone and subject matter, as *Schülergespräche*. That is, the interlocutors take on the roles of teacher and pupils, and the primary focus is on the communication of facts. The main dialogues are rather *Streitdialoge*, with a focus on form and an interest in rhetorical achievement.\footnote{Jericke, p. 152–4.} Rist combines this, however, with an element of playfulness taken over from Harsdörffer and the Nurembergers.\footnote{Jericke, p. 157; Harsdörffer’s influence on Rist in this regard is commonly attested to. See e.g. Irmgard Böttcher, ‘Der Nürnberger Georg Philipp Harsdörffer’, in Deutsche Dichter des 17. Jahrhundert. Ihr Leben und Werk (Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1984), pp. 289–346 (p. 301).} In fact, Rist’s choice of the formal *Streitdialog* is ultimately ‘ein barocker Schmuck des Stoffes’, which retains primacy of focus. Here again, the form a means to the transmission of the content.\footnote{Jericke, p. 162.}

Taken together, Jericke’s examinations of the content and form of the *Monatsgespräche* lead him in conclusion to consider the possibility that they might be considered forerunners of the German journal. This is a matter less of their association with calendar months (the *Gespräche* did not appear monthly), than it is of the nature of their content. In their encyclopaedic tendency to transmit knowledge, Jericke sees a relationship to
the first German scientific journal, the *Acta Eruditorum*. Further, Jericke speculates that Thomasius, who had admired both Rist’s *Monatsgespräche* and Francisici’s continuation of them, took the form of his own *Monatsgespräche* from Rist. Ultimately, Jericke subordinates these considerations to his primary claim that the *Monatsgespräche* were Rist’s personal pursuit, born of his grief at the loss of his wife and, in the case of the posthumously published *Zeitverkürzung*, written in full awareness of his own impending death.

Jericke’s study marks the beginning of a new direction in Rist-scholarship. This is not, as one might expect, the concentrated study of the *Monatsgespräche*, but this interest in Rist’s activities and writings as a scientist. Jericke’s discussion of the *Torheit* makes his position in this regard clear – Rist represented on the one hand the progressiveness of empirical science, on the other hand the combination of his fascination for the fantastical and his credulity led to his emphasis on superstitious practices. Recall Hansen’s unease with the *Phönix* texts, which forced an unsupportable ironic reading – Rist’s esoteric interests are glaring and were impossible for the 19th-century pastor to reconcile with his image of Rist as the upright churchman and poet. Writing six decades later, Jericke was more comfortable engaging with this aspect of Rist’s activities, even if this was only to characterise Rist’s approach to science as ‘dilettantisch’.

Jericke’s appraisal of Rist’s scientific activities has been contested by van Ingen, in an article written for Rist’s 400th birthday. The occasional connection is worth noting. Of all the aspects of Rist and his work that could be taken as the focus of an anniversary study, van Ingen chose Rist’s interest in science, demonstrating the increasing awareness that this is an interesting, worthwhile, not to mention necessary, area of investigation. Van Ingen makes more of an effort that Jericke to contextualise Rist’s relationship to science in terms of the contemporary scientific circumstances, pointing out by way of example that perpetual motion, dealt with in the *Torheit*, had been a worthy subject of scientific inquiry for centuries before Rist, and had been widely treated as possible well into the 19th century. In this context, Rist’s discussion seems less fantastical. The fact is that even today there is little consensus on the significance of the hermetic tradition in the early modern period. Further, the 17th century,
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540 Jericke, p. 188–9.
541 Jericke, p. 57.
543 van Ingen, p. 497.
for all its relevance as the beginnings of empiricism, was still comfortable working with the
conceivability of phenomena as yet not the subject of sensory perception.\textsuperscript{544} In light of this,
Jericke’s claims of Rist’s own empiricism appear in need of reevaluation – by van Ingen’s
analysis, Rist is also less scientifically progressive than Jericke had argued. Rist’s scientific
approach was rather that of a soon to be outmoded, but nevertheless acceptable by
contemporary standards, natural mysticism.\textsuperscript{545}

Where an appreciation of the relevance of Rist’s activities in the various branches of science
is a relatively recent development, the practice of approaching him in his capacity as a cleric
is among the oldest. Certainly, as indicated by the study of early Rist-reception, it is in this
respect first of all that readers of Rist were inclined to receive him more sympathetically
(recall Hansen). The interest in Rist as a pastor continued, even after literary scholars began
to show concern for his literary production. A 1936 essay on Rist by Rudolf Alexander
Schröder is collected with other essays under the heading ‘Dichter und Dichtung der Kirche’.
Here, Schröder follows the interesting approach of strongly interpreting Rist’s botanical
activities in the context of his pastoral role in his congregation, paralleling Rist’s love for his
garden with his love for his parishioners by way of demonstrating his simple Christian charity.
He is less enthusiastic about Rist’s dramas, and in this shows himself to be hostage to the
classical standards that had formed the basis of 19\textsuperscript{th}-century attitudes to Rist. Rist, like all
dramatists of his time, had failed to grasp ‘einen eigentlichen Begriff des Dramatischen’.
Bizarrely, however, Schröder attributes to Rist in his use of allegory the same ‘Konzeption
des Bühnenmöglichen und Bühnenwirksamen’ as in acts I and IV of \textit{Faust II}. Above all else,
this demonstrates Schröder’s subscription to the ‘Goethezeit’ as providing an absolute artistic
standard. Finally, Schröder makes the rather snuffy observation that the most attractive
element of Rist’s dramas to the modern reader are the \textit{Zwischenspiele}, ‘in denen Rist ein paar
durch den Krieg heruntergekommenen Bauern in plattdeutscher Mundart ser unverblümt zu
Worte kommen läßt’.\textsuperscript{546} Schröder’s discussion of Rist’s dramas takes place over the length of
one brief page – the remainder of the essay is devoted to an exposition of Rist’s character in
light of his botany and hymnwriting.

\textsuperscript{544} van Ingen, 487–510 (p. 499).
\textsuperscript{545} van Ingen, 487–510 (p. 510); The obverse of the interest of Rist-scholarship in his scientific activities,
namely the interest of the history of science in Rist, is also observable. See e.g. Kocku von Stuckrad, \textit{Western
Esotericism: A Brief History of Secret Knowledge (translation of Was ist Esoterik? Kleine Geschichte des
geheimen Wissens)} (London: Equinox, 2005).
\textsuperscript{546} Schröder, \textit{iii}, 651–85 (p. 660).
In 2007 a volume of essays appeared, commemorating the 400th anniversary of Rist’s birth. The title, 'Ewigkeit, Zeit ohne Zeit', is a line from ‘O Ewigkeit / du Donner-Wohrt’, Rist’s best-known hymn today in Germany and beyond. The volume was edited by Johann Anselm Steiger, Professor of Church History and History of Christian Doctrine at the University of Hamburg, as part of the series Zeugen und Zeugnisse der Wahrheit. These details indicate a theological preoccupation, as does the introduction by the Bishop of Schleswig, who argues that a closer study of Rist and his texts will not lead to alienation from familiar and much-loved hymns but will bring them to affect the believer more strongly and confirm his faith. Further contribution to the book seeks to establish Rist’s hymns in contemporary traditions and theories of homiletics and edification. The volume also reproduces a sermon given by Steiger to mark Rist’s 400th birthday, which reflects upon the relevance of ‘O Ewigkeit’ as a call to penitence and self-improvement, expressing regret at its removal from the hymnbook.

Thus is the only single volume to deal solely with Rist in recent years not conceived of as primarily a contribution to literary scholarship. That it was in respect of Rist’s activity as a cleric and hymnwriter that the 400th anniversary of his birth was celebrated demonstrates that this remains a lively mode of reception and one that is practised with much enthusiasm. What is above all encouraging about the anniversary volume is the awareness it exhibits of the need to contextualise Rist, his activities, and his literary production. Thus it opens with a lengthy article by Garber, which fulfils this function precisely for the reader who is not an expert on 17th-century history, culture, and literature. The chapter is not burdened with footnotes and external references, but in fact presents the results of recent 17th-century research and as such constitutes an accessible and highly informative introduction for the uninitiated. Given this function, the content of Garber’s contribution is not substantively novel.

In fact, what Garber’s chapter does is draw attention to an approach to Rist which is in some ways related to, but nevertheless conceptually distinct from, those approaches that emphasise his role as a pastor. Garber’s own research in the 20th century has sought to

---

550 Although Garber is, I believe, the first to speak of Rist’s writing in relationship to literary developments elsewhere in Germany as ‘acculturation’ (see above, p. 7). It is to be hoped that this will be expanded upon in his promised upcoming study.
establish the importance of the specific confessional context, in particular the spread of Calvinism and Calvinist influence in the German territories, for the development of German literature in the 17th century. This constitutes a shift from the tendency of early responses to 17th-century literature, which had predominantly situated it in the horrors experienced in the Thirty Years’ War. The confessional model is more appropriate, since it is capable of doing justice to the webs of literary and intellectual influence. This has had a significant impact upon research into 17th-century literature generally, not least providing a basis for investigation of the various Sprachgesellschaften, the Fruchtbringende in particular being associated with Calvinist influence amongst its noble founders. Calvinist connections often fostered intellectual exchange, especially in the first quarter of the century between Silesia and Heidelberg. Regarding Rist in particular, Garber is careful to contextualise his educational background in confessional terms in order to illustrate that, even in his professional capacity as a Lutheran pastor, Rist would not involve himself in controversial theological debates – ‘[e]r war akademisch in irenischem Geist erzogen’. Thus Rist has the intellectual constitution and sensibilities congenial to participation in the major trends in German literature.

This is the sphere in which recent advances in Rist-scholarship have been made – the explication of his place in his intellectual context. Schuster’s study of Birken’s correspondence has illuminated the latter’s personal relationship to Rist as well as the culture of prestige and social influence that established a hierarchy amongst the non-noble writers. On the other hand, Mannack has investigated ties of direct literary influence between Rist’s peace plays and Grimmelshausen’s writing. Much of this research has taken place in the wider context of research into the Sprachgesellschaften, not least the ongoing project at the HAB to provide critical editions of all documentation relating to the Fruchtbringende.
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552 See Garber, ‘Literarischer und kulturpolitischer Statthalter’, p. 15.
This essay has thus far touched on all major elements of Rist’s intellectual activity bar one – his relationship to music. This is clearly significant. Rist composed texts for hymns, composed some melodies himself, and utilised music in his plays both to dramatic effect and through song. It would be inconsistent to prescribe thorough investigation of Rist’s scientific activities without insisting upon the same for his musical endeavours. As a matter of fact, Rist enjoys a greater reputation from a musicological point of view than he does from a literary one, as he is regarded as a stimulus for the ‘Hamburger Liedschule’ of the 17th century. Thus is Rist seen as having made a significant and relevant impact upon the history and development of music.

The discussion of Rist’s musical contribution definitely falls under the remit of musicology, not literary studies. What is interesting, from a literary perspective, are the insights gained from the musicological study of Rist’s influences. The remaining chapter from the 400th anniversary volume not yet discussed by this essay is a musicological investigation by a Konrad Küster of Rist’s texts for religious song, which is in places so involved it strains the credibility of the above claim that the volume is primarily aimed at theologians and as such does not presuppose scholarly familiarity with the other fields in which Rist was active. Küster’s achievement for literary studies is to draw attention to the context of the development of Italian song in the 16th century for the development of 17th century German poetry in general, and Rist’s poetry in particular. National-language poetics, such as the Poeterey, had to come to terms with the musical aspects of poetry that had in fact been developed in respect of a different language. As far as Rist himself is concerned, Küster demonstrates that his hymnwriting does not just stand in the tradition of 16th-century German hymns. Where Rist’s hymns are characterised by strophic texts, predominantly melismatic melodies, and basso continuo they show rather the influence of the contemporary aria. The specifics of the musicological analysis need not occupy us too much here, the point is rather Küster’s insight that Rist, above all in the early years of his poetic production, did not solely orient himself towards Opitz. His cooperation with musicians brought him into the field of modern vocal chamber music after Italian models. This adds a further dimension to the webs of influence around Rist.

On the basis of Küster’s argument, appreciation of Rist’s musical context appears necessary, so as to avoid presenting a skewed account of his intellectual background and
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556 Lohmeier and Reichelt, p. 352.
558 Küster, p. 92.
literary production. That is to say, the musicological and music-historical investigation cannot be treated as an interesting, but optional, side avenue. Not only does music interact with the literary and the theological, it also belongs in its own tradition – one that is fundamentally more international than that of secular vernacular poetry. This musical tradition is also supraconfessional – Lutheran music did not reject influence from either the Counter Reformation or even Catholic Italy.\textsuperscript{559} Thus is Rist’s confessional position not determined solely by notions of tolerance, irenicism, or patriotism. It is also a function of his participation in general musical trends. Appreciating Rist’s musical context also aids critical engagement with the claims of Rist’s Opitzianism, the clarification of which is one of the most pressing requirements for an accurate picture of Rist and his work.

Küster focusses on Rist’s hymns, but it is clear that his dramas could yield further musical insights. For one, the \textit{Teutschland} plays contain scored songs, which are as yet underdiscussed. Rist also employed music in pursuit of dramatic effect, for example in the execution scene in \textit{Perseus}. It could be worth investigating the precedent for this use of music, perhaps even with a view to suggesting what Rist might have had in mind.

Further investigation of Rist’s use of music and his position in the context of contemporary musical developments is clearly one of the routes along which Rist-scholarship should progress. This should form part of a wider move to contextualise Rist. Much has been achieved on this front as far as Rist’s relationships to his literary contemporaries goes, by which is meant not only the other major 17th-century writers but also the nobility and royalty associated with literary production, either through the \textit{Fruchtringende} or the practice of dedication and patronage. Considerable interest has also been shown in Rist’s use of low German, and this has yielded valuable insights into his dramas. What is striking is that very little is known about Rist’s relationship to Holsteinian, or broader low German, culture, and in light of this investigation of potential sources or inspirations for the \textit{Zwischenspiele} would surely be worthwhile. The point is that Rist is overwhelmingly approached as a provincial poet latching on to national cultural currents – this he undoubtedly is, but to approach him from other perspectives would help establish the extent to which this characterisation holds. Having widened the scope of the investigation, it is possible to accommodate study of Rist’s non-literary pursuits, such as his various scientific pursuits. There remain many questions to

\textsuperscript{559} Küster, p. 84.
be answered about Rist – in the meantime, caution is urged against pigeonholing him lest this limit the field of inquiry.

Postscript
This study has not engaged with the literary reception of Rist in the 20th century. The character of ‘Rist’ features majorly in Grass’ Treffen in Telgte – this requires detailed investigation in its own right.
In a monograph on the subject, Mannack has studied several 20th-century literary works which deal in some way with 17th-century literature, although in fact little interest is shown in Rist.⁵⁶⁰
On the topic of literary Rist-reception, it is interesting to note that Karl May not only features but engages with ‘O Ewigkeit’ in several of his writings.
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Rist in his religious context.

The scope of this essay is intentionally cast wide, in order to encompass not only such elements of Rist’s writings as directly address religious matters – whether in respect of personal Christian morality, theology or inter/supra-confessional discourse – but also the confessional context and its implications for the general development of Germany poetry in the 17th century. The fact of Rist’s position as pastor in Wedel is primarily relevant only to the former, narrower understanding of religious context, within which there are further non-clerical aspects. The significance of Rist’s religious context is irreducible to a function of his official role. Equally, claims made by Rist as pastor carry a validity beyond his activities in this capacity. Consideration of his religious writings (that is, his collections of religious songs) often provides insight into his position on certain moral or doctrinal matters, but it should be borne in mind both that such texts were not composed with solely his parishioners at Wedel in mind, and that his other writings (dramas, prose, secular poetry) also make relevant religious comment. Investigation under the remit ‘religious context’ does not, in principle, make any generic exclusions regarding relevant objects of study. As such, this essay differs from attempts to grasp Rist in his religious context through analysis of his religious writings alone, as well as any approach to his ‘secular’ writings which conceptually excludes recourse to Rist’s religious works.

The invalidity of demarcating religious from secular writing (or vice versa) in respect of 17th-century literature in general is apparent. Theological and devotional literature still accounted for half of the book production of the period, and the typical oeuvre of a poet would cover both the sacred and the secular. Rist’s poetic production is in this regard a standard example of its time. The works of his literary peers would warrant a similar investigation. Through attending directly to the religious context, it is hoped that some degree of clarity will be reached regarding the attribution of ‘irenicism’ to 17th-century poets, a claim commonly found in discussions of contemporary literary treatments of the Thirty Years’ War. In fact, Rist’s religious context – drawn from his regional background, education, and influences – along with his own claims in religious matters render highly dubious any characterisation of him as strictly ierenic. Rather, such claims seem to follow from an early, and apparently illegitimate, assertion of a link between Rist and the Helmstedt syncretist Georg Calixt, as well as the general inclination to see irenicism in 17th-century literature.

---

Late 20th-century scholarship has increasingly seen the significance of confessionalism in the events and development of the 17th century. To Schilling, a process of confessionalisation in the late 16th and early 17th centuries is crucial for explaining the formation of early modern states, whereby political power was consolidated along confessional, that is Catholic, Lutheran or Calvinist, lines. This position has not found universal acceptance, and is opposed by the thesis that state-formation is a matter of secularisation. However, this issue about the nature of political structures is not immediately relevant to cultural developments. The advantage of viewing this era from the perspective of confessionalism and confessionalisation is that it motivates the comparative study of interconfessional interaction between religion, society, and politics. Without holding religion distinct from any other area of human activity, an investigation can be led into how the religious, social, and civil spheres ‘appropriated religious thought and doctrine, how their use of religious concepts influenced society, and conversely how their social context influenced their interpretation of religion.’

Garber employs the concept of confessionalisation to demonstrate its importance in the Calvinist sphere for the genesis, spread, and development of the new German poetry associated with Opitz. He locates the birthplace of this poetry in ‘einem historischen konfessionspolitischen Kräftefeld’ around Heidelberg, which owing to its university became a site of intellectual exchange between the Palatinate and Opitz’s Silesia, which lacked a university of its own. Heidelberg was itself, until the defeat at White Mountain in 1620, a Calvinist hub, with links to Huguenots, Reformed Christians in the Netherlands and Protestants in England. The confessional-political links between West and East fostered a degree of congruity in literary and high cultural matters. This is particularly evident in the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft, which was founded by Reformed nobility, and which, following the collapse of Palatinate Calvinism, functioned as the great collective of Protestants,

Calvinists above all, in Germany. This is not to assert a confessional-polemical agenda for the society or the literature associated with it. The point is rather that the confessional-political situation associated with Calvinism in Germany before and in the early years of the Thirty Years’ War provided the conditions under which the new poetic concerns could find widespread reception. The young Opitz benefited intellectually from the ties between Silesia, Heidelberg, and beyond, and these ties provided a structure through which he could propagate his reform.

This aspect of confessional-political history is not directly relevant to Rist’s regional background, where Calvinism did not find striking political resonance. That is, Rist’s context was not one from which he could straightforwardly access and participate in literary-cultural developments as were flourishing around and amongst Calvinist cultural and academic centres. Thus, Garber writes of Rist’s preeminent role in the acculturation of northern Germany to the new, Opitzian literature. On this understanding, the new literature is rooted in confessionalism in such a way that it takes a determined effort to connect to its developments from without. Indeed, Garber highlights Rist’s distinction from the mobile Calvinist intellectuals who spread between Silesia and the Netherlands, England and northern Italy while Rist remained in and around northern Germany. That the development of German poetry, particularly in the first half of the 17th century, was to such an extent tied up with confessional-political Calvinism with its own intellectual network was a conceptual hindrance to the Lutheran, Holsteinian Rist.

This is of course not to claim that Opitz’s poetic reform was by its nature incompatible with Rist’s intellectual and confessional background. There is nothing inherently inaccessible to Rist about Opitz’s formal poetic prescriptions, and the former’s enthusiastic reception of these has earned him a reputation as the ‘Opitz of the North’. However, Opitz’s biography is confessionally ambiguous, from a Lutheran perspective not only in light of his association with Calvinism but also, even more troublingly, owing to the long period Opitz spent in the service of the Catholic Karl Hannibal von Dohna. These discrepancies are addressed in the Rettung der Edlen Teutschen Hauptsprache (1642), and it is claimed both that they provide insufficient grounds to doubt Opitz’s Christianity and further that ‘der theure Opitz mit einem seligen christlichen Abscheide diese eitel Welt habe verlassen / daran ist durchauß nicht zu zweifelen.’ The speaker (not Rist here, but his protagonist, Ernst Teutschhertz) is satisfied that Opitz’s faith presents no obstacle to the acceptability of his poetic works – yet it is an issue contentious enough to warrant discussion anyway.

571 The question of whether Rist actually spent time in Leiden and Utrecht, as asserted in the funeral sermon held for him, is yet to be resolved. As Garber notes, however, time spent in these locations would have placed Rist in an interesting theological milieu, where Lutheran theologians were tolerated amidst the official Calvinist confession. See ‘Literarischer und kulturpolitischer Statthalter’, p. 21. The funeral sermon is reproduced in full in Steiger (ed.) ‘Ewigkeit, Zeit ohne Zeit’, pp. 216-277.
In addition to the confessional concerns raised by Opitz’s biography, his writings cast doubt on his religious position in respect of mainstream Christianity itself. Béhar notes that the Calvinist confessional-political links between the Palatinate and Silesia also enabled the spread of esoteric ideas, and that Opitz, while in Heidelberg, became part of a Neoplatonic, hermetic and Kabbalistic circle around Elector Friedrich V.\(^{573}\) These influences are notably present in the opening claim of the *Buch von der deutschen Poetery*, namely that the genesis of poetry is as a ‘verborgene Theologie’. This theology is not Christian, but occult.\(^{574}\) Opitz cites as poetic authorities either ancient heathens or figures from the Neoplatonic tradition, without mention of the figures otherwise appealed to in the 17th century to establish the superiority of the Christian, biblical poetic tradition: Moses, David, Solomon.\(^{575}\) This position is not non- or supraconfessional, in the spirit of essential Christianity, but, as Kemper has demonstrated, is in competition with the confessions. Opitz’s poetry is not of biblical derivation but has its own roots in the work of the first wise men to bring the simple folk to a better life.\(^{576}\) According to Kemper, the novelty of the *Poeterey* is that it pronouncedly binds poetry to magic – to the extent that it is a book of poetics, it makes no contribution that had not already been made in the Renaissance. This is the key point. Opitz’s followers tended to direct their praise towards his other works, and overlooked the occult in the *Poeterey* to focus on the formal poetic prescriptions.\(^{577}\) Thus Rist’s Teutsch-hertz defends both Opitz’s poetry and his Christianity by praising the latter’s ‘übersetzung der Psalmen David.’\(^{578}\)

To suggest that such Opitz reception is wilful misrepresentation of Opitz’s position would likely overstate the case. Rather, Rist brings his own religious/confessional preconditions to his interpretation of Opitz. The remainder of this essay will be devoted to illuminating these, not only to the extent that they are relevant to Opitz but also as ideas that inform his work and perspectives. The above has argued that the poetic situation in Germany was not confessionally favourably to Rist. It remains to be seen how Rist’s own confessional and general religious contexts manifest themselves.

There is an important relationship between confessional and regional identities in the 17th century. Local and regional cultural identities continued to be determined by confessional aspects, while supraregional identities tended to oppose territorial confessional politics. Lehmann observes that artworks were utilised differently in the formation of these identities, with singular art forms such as architecture, sculpture and painting serving local cultural-religious identifications, while multiple artworks such as literature and music could be instrumentalised supra-regionally and -

\[^{574}\text{Hans-Georg Kemper, ‘Religion und Poetik’, in Religion und Religiosität im Zeitalter des Barock, i, 63–92 (p. 66).}\]
\[^{575}\text{Kemper, p. 71.}\]
\[^{576}\text{Kemper, pp. 72–3.}\]
\[^{577}\text{Kemper, p. 78.}\]
\[^{578}\text{Rettung, p. 123.}\]
confessionally.\textsuperscript{579} This is an important point for the receptivity beyond Rist’s immediate locale to his own poetic production, but is primarily relevant here since it draws attention to the importance of regional particularity. As such, it is necessary to provide some detailed historical-biographical information.

Since the Treaty of Ribe in 1460 the political history of Schleswig-Holstein had been closely tied up with that of Denmark.\textsuperscript{580} As a result of this orientation, the dukes of Schleswig-Holstein had little choice but to follow Friedrich II of Denmark (1559-1588) in his opposition to the \textit{Formula of Concord} (1577). The ecclesiastical orientation of the duchies towards Denmark ultimately led to a distancing from German Protestantism.\textsuperscript{581} Influenced from Denmark, the Lutheranism in Schleswig-Holstein was markedly Melanchthonian in character and so open to reform, to the extent that Mager has written of the region’s ‘Lutheran Melanchthonianism’.\textsuperscript{582} This confessional situation is deemed particularly relevant to the intellectual development of Georg Calixt (born in Flensburg), the issue of whose relationship to Rist will be discussed below.\textsuperscript{583} The confessional characterisation of Schleswig-Holstein is demonstrated through contrast with the hostility of Hamburg to Calvinists, in response to which the Schaumburg counts in Pinneberg permitted the foundation of a Calvinist community in Altona – a settlement under the ecclesiastical and administrative jurisdiction of Rist’s birthplace, Ottensen.\textsuperscript{584}

Rist was educated at schools in Hamburg and Bremen, and the universities of Rostock and Rinteln.\textsuperscript{585} Only in Bremen, where Rist attended the prestigious Gymnasium illustre, did he enter a predominantly Calvinist sphere of influence – three of the teachers from the school had represented Bremen at the 1618 Synod of Dort.\textsuperscript{586} Concerning Rist’s university education, Garber notes that both institutions were characterised by measured Lutheran theology, leading to the conclusion that Rist


\textsuperscript{582} Mager, p. 291.


\textsuperscript{585} Garber, ‘Literarischer und kulturpolitischer Statthalter’, pp. 20–21.

\textsuperscript{586} Garber, ‘Literarischer und kulturpolitischer Statthalter’, p. 20.
‘war akademisch in irenischem Geist erzogen’ – which accounts for the fact that Rist would later keep himself out of interconfessional polemics.\textsuperscript{587}

An argument which focusses on establishing the ‘irenic’ credentials of an institution or individual theologian runs the risk of eliding the nature and extent of their Lutheranism. The confessional orientation of a university was the preeminent consideration for the prospective student.\textsuperscript{588} Although it demanded no confessional oath from its students, Rostock was clearly a Lutheran university, and, in spite of the measured confessional stance of the teachings of its theologians in the 17\textsuperscript{th} century, its student body was purely Lutheran.\textsuperscript{589} The university at Rinteln was founded in 1621 as a Lutheran confessional university, the first of its kind in Westphalia.\textsuperscript{590} Characterising Rist’s intellectual context at university as broadly ‘irenic’ both diverts attention from the nature and end of his studies and provides a more drastic characterisation of his confessional orientation than is warranted. There is a difference between a Lutheranism open to reform and the active pursuit of confessional unity on a common theological basis.

In addition to the confessional consideration, Rostock was the natural choice of university for Rist from a geographical perspective – Schleswig-Holstein lacked its own Landesuniversität.\textsuperscript{591} He left Rostock in 1628 as Wallenstein approached the city, eventually continuing his studies at Rinteln.\textsuperscript{592} As well as the doctrinal studies which form the basis for claims of irenicism, Rist’s education would have included instruction in the theory of preaching, involving the reading and relevant exposition of scripture in respect of his intended audience.\textsuperscript{593} The concerns of the early 17\textsuperscript{th}-century Lutheran sermon addressed individual, not institutional reform.\textsuperscript{594} An awareness of these details about the nature of theological education in Rist’s day will help below, in the discussion of Rist’s postil collection, to establish a particular Lutheran-confessional position which provides a different answer to the question of why Rist did not involve himself in interconfessional polemic.

The identification of irenic impulses in texts is a popular pursuit in the field of 17\textsuperscript{th}-century literary studies. These attributions are common wherever a text registers discontent with the ongoing confessional strife, particularly as coupled with a longing for an end to military hostilities. Certainly, the passages quoted often support the claimed irenicism, but this claim proves more difficult to

\textsuperscript{587} Garber, ‘Literarischer und kulturpolitischer Statthalter’, p. 22.
\textsuperscript{588} Asche, p. 185.
\textsuperscript{589} Asche, pp. 88, 186.
\textsuperscript{590} Asche, pp. 167, 288.
\textsuperscript{591} Asche, pp. 250, 423.
\textsuperscript{592} Gerhard Dünnhaupt, \textit{Personalbibliographien zu den Drucken des Barock. Praetorius - Spee}, 6 vols. (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1991), v, p. 3374. In fact, in spite of Wallenstein’s presence Rostock was sought after as a safe place to study during the war. See Asche pp. 7, 62.
\textsuperscript{594} Krēsliņš, p. 65.
uphold in the wider contexts of the whole work and the poet’s oeuvre, or, most problematically, in the attempt to transfer the attribution from passage to poet. Against the example of Logau, Palme demonstrates how misattributed irenicism can distort our image of the poet. By far Logau’s best-known epigram, ‘Glauben’, is frequently cited not only as illustrating his own irenicism, but as encapsulating the irenic character of his peers:

Luthrisch / Päbstlich und Calvinisch / diese Glauben alle drey
Sind verhanden; doch ist Zweiffel / wo das Christenthum dann sey.\(^{595}\)

As Palme points out, this is Logau’s only epigram critical of the confessions, of a vast number of Lutheran-polemical pieces. Further, it is rather directing criticism at all confessions equally, as opposed to attempting to mediate between them.\(^{596}\) It is largely uninformative about Logau’s religious beliefs or his opinion of the confessional dispute, and yet has become the slogan of 17\(^{th}\)-century literary irenicism.\(^{597}\)

The situation as regards Rist is rather more complicated, since there are passages in his works which provide less ambiguous support for the interpretation of irenicism. He clearly had a degree of receptivity for the efforts towards Christian unity, from both a theological perspective and the practical perspective which held that confessional reconciliation would advance progress towards peace. Yet there are various strands to Rist’s religious identity, which currently appears to defy synthesis. It remains to be seen whether there is an appropriate sense in which it can be understood as ‘irenec’.

Kaufmann is similarly sceptical about the common attributions of irenicism to 17\(^{th}\)-century figures and texts. Rather, he accounts for the apparently irenic claims as part of a specifically Lutheran confessional culture. By Konfessionskultur he understands the internal perspectives of each confession – how they defined themselves, and what the effects of the confessions were on the social and cultural environments.\(^{598}\) His thesis is ‘daß Regungen und Ausdrucksformen konfessionsübergreifender Christlichkeit und Religiosität […] in der lutherischen Konfessionskirche ihren Ort hatten.’ A key precondition for this is the supposition that the reception of non-Lutheran literature (for example, in translations from English at the beginning of the 17\(^{th}\) century) need not be taken as evidence of

---


The fact that a Lutheran made appeal to a common ground of ‘true’ Christianity, even explicitly beyond all confessional particularities, is of itself insufficient to support the claim that he was hereby consciously overstepping his confessional bounds and making confessionally radical overtures to the other parties.

An understanding of this requires a clearer notion of what these confessional bounds might be. Since the issue is the confessional culture of all Lutherans, this is unlikely to be a homogenised entity. So, talk of ‘orthodox Lutheranism’ is unhelpful here since, Kaufmann argues, this really only denoted the Lutheranism of the Formula of Concord. This would already throw up problems for Rist’s religious characterisation, given that Schleswig-Holstein did not subscribe to the formula. Yet to Kaufmann, 17th-century Lutheran confessional culture displays an internal plurality, which had in fact been present before the Thirty Years’ War but which multiplied during it. This increasing pluralisation is in fact one of Lutheranism’s distinguishing characteristics – on the other hand, confessional Catholicism and Calvinism tended towards respective unification in teaching.

Recognition of the plurality of Lutheran confessional culture provides a straightforward means of accounting for Rist’s scientific activities in respect of his religion and his position as pastor. Recall the unease with which Hansen, writing from a rather more restricted Lutheran perspective, received Rist’s Phönix writings. Yet while Hansen was forced to read irony into Rist’s genuine instructions for the creation of the philosopher’s stone, Kaufmann can include the Phönix texts in an understanding of Lutheran confessional culture which is open to esoteric influences.

More importantly, Hansen’s monograph appears to be the origin of claims of an association between Rist and Georg Calixt. The latter (1586-1656) was a Lutheran professor of theology at Helmstedt university, and it is primarily in the context of interconfessional mediation that he is now remembered. Calixt believed the early Christian church to have been theologically unified, and based his case for ecclesiastical unity in his own time on the articles of the Apostles’ Creed and the so-called consensus quinquesaecularis, the theological
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consensus amongst the church fathers of the first five centuries. Calixt famously participated in the Colloquium of Thorn in 1645, where he was obliged to advise the Reformed party, the Lutherans not wishing to be associated with him. This set off the Syncretistic Controversy, named for the accusation of ‘syncretism’ attached to Calixt’s efforts towards interconfessional conciliation by his primary opponents, the theologians at Wittenberg. To draw an association between Rist and Calixt is to strongly suggest the former’s sympathy for, if not indeed also involvement with, concrete theological efforts towards interconfessional unity.

In discussing Teutsch-herz’s defence in the *Rettung* of Opitz’s confessional position, Hansen seeks to demonstrate that Rist held himself out of interconfessional controversy and so deny the appropriateness of attempts by 19th-century Lutherans at utilising Rist to establish confessional exclusivity. In the course of this, Hansen claims that Rist was Calixt’s ‘Vertheidiger’, and yet nowhere provides information which would substantiate this claim. Given that a primary concern of the monograph is to establish that Rist represented a conciliatory confessional stance, it is somewhat surprising that Hansen does not engage more comprehensively with Rist’s supposed connection to Calixt, the 17th-century’s best-known representative of interconfessional mediation.

Later scholars have provided some textual evidence in an attempt to support claims of a relationship, or at least intellectual affinity, between Rist and Calixt. Warning against transposing Rist’s zealous opposition to the use of pagan figures in literary works into claims of a polemical stance in respect of the other Christian confessions, Jericke sees Rist on the side of the ‘Weiterblickenden, die, wie Georg Calixt, auf Toleranz in Einzelfragen und christliche Nächstenliebe drangen.’ This characterisation of Calixt’s position in terms of tolerance is anyway a misrepresentation, since his theology, and case for ecclesiastical unity, was rather a matter of fundamental consensus amongst all Christians than indifference to their doctrinal disparity. In support of his claim, however, Jericke directs his reader to two passages from *Die alleredelste Erfindung*, which are to demonstrate Rist’s public support for the syncretists. The characterisation of the syncretists provided in the text gives a clear indication of the nature and extent of Rist’s support for them. They are

---

The syncretistic position is attractive not least as an alternative to theological pedantry and interconfessional polemic, which can lead away from Christian behaviour. This support for syncretism is thus more a reflection on the demands of individual piety than any programme to unite three doctrinally distinct confessions. The passage is far from an explicit endorsement Calixt’s theology – in fact, Calixt is not mentioned by name.

A more recent attempt to link Rist to Calixt has a similarly unsound textual basis. Citing Die alleredelste Torheit, Trepp claims that Rist defended the syncretists as displaying ‘offt mehr Gottseligkeit und ein viel Christlicher Leben’ than some of those who profess to be Lutherans, yet in the context of this quotation there is no mention of syncretists. A passage from Die alleredelste Zeit-Verkürzung is similarly employed as evidence of Rist’s support for Calixt’s views. This passage mentions Calixt’s university, Helmstedt, but again does not name him and is in fact a discussion of the merits and failings of various historians. All attempts to link Rist to Calixt have thus far proved unconvincing. There is apparently little, or no, textual basis for such a relationship, and it is in fact possible to provide an account of Rist’s confessional stance and understanding of Christianity without introducing Calixt or, indeed, ‘irenicism’.

On the other hand, Rist did have some associations with the irenic impulses of his day. He is known to have had contact with John Dury (1596-1680), a Scottish Calvinist who strongly advocated Protestant unity. There is a poem to Dury in the Poetischer Schauplatz (1646), Dury having sent Rist ‘seine zwischen den Evangelischen Kirchen in Europa friedsuchenden Schrifften.’


The key point to draw from this poem is that it praises in principle the project to bring theological unity to the Protestant confessions (‘nach Fried und Eintracht stellen besonders in der Lehr’”) without addressing the fact of the confessional disparity between composer and dedicatee. Thus it does not illuminate Rist’s confessional position, and one can draw no conclusions regarding his views on Calvinists, their doctrines or the particularities of concrete attempts to achieve confessional unity. The poem presents peace as an eminently worthwhile end for a Christian to pursue while declining to detail either the appropriate means by which this might be done or even characterise the nature of the discord that makes such a project necessary. Apart from the descriptive title, the only indications that the interconfessional dispute specifically is at issue are the references to ‘Lehr’” and to Dury by name. The praise of peace is otherwise couched in the most general of terms.

An appropriate characterisation of Rist in respect of irenicism would be that, from a Christian perspective, he favoured the idea of Christian, or at least Protestant, unity, without allowing himself to be drawn on how this might be achieved. In the poem to Dury as with the defence of the syncretists, the primary issue is the behaviour of the individual in interaction with others, where Dury’s actions are praiseworthy since their goal is an end to disunity amongst Christians. It is appropriate to distinguish Rist, to whom peace and confessional unity are desirable state of affairs, from programmatic irenicists, and it would be

inappropriate to posit some real or intellectual alliance between the two solely on the basis of an apparent coincidence in objective.

To cast further doubt on the associations of Rist with irenicism, Kaufmann relativises the significance of both Calixt and Dury for the phenomenon, seeing it more as having grown out of the religious and political conditions in Protestantism in the early- to mid-17th century than as having been borne and primarily propagated by a handful of figureheads. Indeed, Kaufmann explicitly criticises Hansen’s attempt to link Rist to Calixt in light of Rist’s response to Opitz’s death. The increased mobility brought about by the conditions of the Thirty Years’ War meant that death in confessionally ambiguous circumstances had become an everyday problem, and in fact, Kaufmann argues, the ability to distinguish between the true, universal Church and its historical manifestations is locatable within the Lutheran confessional culture as a way of permitting the eternal salvation of non-Lutheran Christians.

The concept of a Christianity which transcends the particularity of the confessional churches and relativises them in the face of a god present in sacrament and scripture originates, according to Kaufmann, in the Lutheran confessional church of the 17th century. The ‘Vorbericht’ to the Sabbahtische Seelenlust (1651) distinguishes in this manner between ‘wahres Christenthumb’ and ‘falsche Schein- und MaulChristen.” This is a distinction observable between individuals, and is not drawn along confessional-doctrinal lines. Rist operates with a concept of Christianity that is primarily a matter of one’s behaviour, not confessional allegiance, and so the Seelenlust, as with his other collections of religious songs, was intended for use in the context of private, domestic devotion, not church service. This is reflected in the passages from the Monatsgespräche otherwise used to support claims of Rist’s affinity for Calixt’s apparently irenic theology – in fact Rist was observing Christian behaviour in individuals who happened not to be Lutherans.

In his capacity as pastor at Wedel, Rist is confronted with a sinfulness amongst his parishioners best combatted through encouragement to such domestic worship, not biting confessional polemicizing. That he does not denounce all non-Lutheran Christians indicates
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neither an irenic overture nor an endorsement of divergent doctrine. Responding in the *Seelenlust* to the criticism that he

fast nimmer / oder doch gahr selten die irrige Meinungen in den unterschiedlichen Religionen angreiffe und bestreite / welches doch von einem Diener Gottes werde erfordert\(^6\)

he draws attention to the specific needs of his own parishioners. Save for the occasional foreign visitor, the parishioners of Wedel do not have false ideas about the Protestant religion, but they do lead a sinful life. Rist

weiß derowegen nicht / zu waß Ende Ich Ihnen von diser oder jenner Ketzei viel verschwatzen oder auff Papisten / Kalvinisten / Widertäuffer / Neüe Propheten / Enthusiasten und dergleichen Leute sol schelten […] warum solte Ich Ihnen den solche fremde Sachen in den Kopff bringen / welche Sie vielleicht künfftiger Zeit gahr balde irre machen / und in ihrer Christlichen Einfalt betrüben könten?\(^7\)

Working with Kaufmann’s location of the concept of universal Christianity within the Lutheran confessional culture, it is possible to view Rist’s disinclination to include his parishioners in the confessional controversy of his day as part of a wider appeal to the general and essentially ‘Christian’. To Rist, guardian of the morality of the congregation at Wedel, there is a meaningful way in which one can be Christian that does not involve the sharp delineation from others who would identify as such. This is a Lutheran position, rooted in Lutheran confessional culture, but not exclusive of the others.

Scepticism about the validity of attributions of irenicism, coupled with increased sensitivity to Rist’s role and activities as pastor suggest that a more promising perspective from which to view his position in respect of religious matters would be that of individual piety. This better accounts for the fact that his comments on religion overwhelmingly concern personal morality, not doctrinal matters. Thus, when it comes to analysis of the dramas, it will be possible to critically approach claims of their irenic sentiment in order to arrive at a more accurate account of their position in respect of religion. The investigation of Rist in his religious context has made plain that the significance of his position as pastor cannot be disregarded, or certain elements of his oeuvre meaningfully isolated from the rest, without this distorting the end result. As a learned man with connections beyond Wedel and indeed Germany, Rist had a fuller view of the religious situation than his parishioners did. Yet while

---
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this means that his activities in his parish cannot provide a complete characterisation of his religious position, his official role is far from irrelevant to his other pursuits. Kaufmann’s plurality in the Lutheran confessional culture is helpful as it allows the various spheres of Rist’s activity and elements of his oeuvre to be taken into account, without providing an obligation to synthesise these. In fact, it permits one to regard attempts at synthesis, such as that which pushes the ‘irenic’ characterisation of Rist’s work, with some suspicion. The view that Lutheran confessional culture is both irreducibly plural and the original location of the modern concept of universal Christianity provides a means of accounting for Rist’s religious context that need neither suppress certain elements of his oeuvre nor illegitimately abstract from others.
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Rist and Music

This essay, where it enters into musicological discussion, cannot hope to provide any new musicological insight into the music that was provided, either by Rist himself or one of his musical collaborators, for Rist’s sacred and secular song. Rather, it is in part through presenting the results of musicological research that a picture can be provided of Rist’s musical context. This context is conceived of in terms of two main elements: the formal musical preconditions for Rist’s song-production, and the social dimension of Rist’s musical context. This latter element covers the identities of Rist’s musical collaborators and his reputation in respect of music amongst his peers, as well as presenting a characterisation of Rist’s personal interest in music. Naturally, the formal and social elements are not wholly distinct categories of investigation, not least since, as musicological studies have amply demonstrated, the nature of the musical settings provided for Rist’s texts varied between the composers with whom he collaborated. However, this essay is not concerned with providing comparative musicological characterisations of each of Rist’s collaborators. It is worth analysing the formal dimension of Rist’s song-writing in isolation as this demonstrates, through tracing the development of German song from Italian influences in the late 16th and early 17th centuries, an additional formal influence on Rist’s compositions to that of Opitz. Meanwhile, the social dimension provides a further perspective on the esteem in which Rist was held by his contemporaries, which can then be compared to his literary reputation, as well as providing clues to his musical heritage and connections which will aid the eventual investigation of the use of music in his dramas.

Two factors enabled the Italian influence on the development of German music in the early 17th century. First, German-Italian cultural and intellectual bonds had been strengthened since the appearance in German lands of the first itinerant humanist scholars around the turn of the 15th century, such that Italian scholars and musicians would regularly travel and work in Germany, and vice versa.620 Heinrich Schütz (1585-1672), the most famous German composer of the 17th century (of whom more below), travelled to Venice on two occasions, where he encountered the latest musical developments.621 Second, the lack of a centralised German state meant that there was a multitude of musical opportunities at the many courts,

churches and ducal chapels, as well as in wealthy private households. These particular transformations in German-speaking areas are part of a wider European phenomenon, by which the increasing acceptance of Italian court culture aided the dissemination of Italian music and musicians. It usually took about ten years from the time of its emergence in Italy for a new musical technique to establish itself in Germany.

In terms of German song production, Dumont distinguishes for the late 16th and early 17th centuries between ‘composer-poets’ and ‘pure poets’. It was not practice for composers to collaborate with poets, and so those who composed song music largely also composed the texts themselves. The work of the pure poets, on the other hand, was not composed to be set to music. The musical setting is key to a divergence in poetic style, since the composer poets, having taken on Italian musical forms, were obliged to find a way to compose German-language texts to fit music which had originally been used to set Italian-language poetry. Thus a German-Italianate poetic style emerged, employing Italian poetic metres and written almost exclusively by the composer-poets. The pure poets continued to write in Latin and Greek, later beginning to compose some religious verse in German, and Opitz’s Poeterey prescribed a poetic system based on French and Dutch, not Italian, poetry. The disparity in the activities of the German composer-poets and pure poets is also demonstrated at a generic level: influenced by Italian models, the former were composing pastoral works in the 1610s, while the pastorals of the German poets all date from after 1630.

Having established the gulf between the practices of poetry and song composition in the early 17th century, Dumont demonstrates that, in fact, the work of the composer-poets had paved the way for the massive receptivity to Opitz’s reform, which anyway brought an end to the poetic influence of the composer-poets. Opitz accessed Italian trends in poetry through his admiration for the Pléiade, and the metrical elements of the French language offered solutions to the problems encountered in attempting to compose German-language poetry in the Italian style. Küster, reading the Poeterey from a musical perspective, sees it as a

---
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response to the Italian developments in song which had created the need to re-evaluate German poetry overall. In effect, Opitz’s reform largely subsumed the work of the last generation of composer-poets, programatically introducing secular German-language verse. Schütz, for example, no longer composed the texts for his songs but collaborated with others, notably Opitz. Rist, while setting some of his works himself, otherwise turned to a circle of musicians around him to provide melodies for his songs, both sacred and secular. Yet the musical perspective on Rist illuminates aspects of his work that are not consciously Opitzian.

Musicologically speaking, Küster emphasises that Rist’s collaboration with other musicians demonstrates his position in the context of modern, Italian vocal chamber music, with his songs bearing much resemblance to the emergent early aria. Analysing Rist’s own compositional practice in respect of his secular poetry, Küster finds that Rist wrote poetry which was ideally suited to musical setting, and that Rist’s own settings closely interrelate text and music. This betrays a level of musical sophistication on Rist’s part, albeit one which, as will be seen below, comes into conflict with religious and liturgical concerns in the context of his sacred song. However, the musical element introduces a further compositional criterion to the otherwise Opitzian prescriptions concerning genre, register, and metre. This enables one to account for certain non-Opitzian elements in Rist’s poetry.

The relationship between musical and Opitzian concerns in Rist’s work can be downright oppositional, as is demonstrated in Rist’s attempt to compose a text for sarabande music. He recalls this in the preface to the third decade of the Himlische Lieder (1642), and reports that

\begin{quote}
ein recht Daktylisch Lied daraus war geworden / unangesehen / ich zu der Zeit noch keinen eintzigen Daktylischen Verß weder gesehen noch etwas davon gehöret hatte.
\end{quote}

At first suspecting that he had himself discovered the dactyl, Rist finds that it is also in use in Dutch poetry long before Opitz, noting that the latter had ‘dieser Art Verß meines wissens nicht sonderlich gebraucht.’ In fact, Opitz proscribed the use of dactyls, restricting German poets to iambs and trochees, yet Rist had, apparently unintentionally, demonstrated

---
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the possibility of dactylic poetry in German. What is relevant here is the primacy of the musical consideration, which had a determining compositional influence.

Concerning the social dimension of Rist’s musical context, it is in the first place important to indicate who the intended and actual consumers of his songs would have been. All of Rist’s song, both sacred and secular, was primarily composed for consumption in the domestic sphere, so there is little question either of public performance of these works or their use in church services. Taking first the secular song, it is clear that these works were really only accessible and desirable to members of the educated middle classes and above. The conditions for the reception of music largely coincided with those for literature, with illiteracy preventing the access of the lower classes to the songbooks, while the necessity to also be music-literate, as well as be able to afford an instrument, further restricted access. As with literature, the producers and receivers were drawn from the same circles, and there was little inclination to reach out to other social strata. The song was a popular genre within these educated circles as a means of engaging in sociability through expressing an interest in the arts. This practice is attested to in the Monatsgespräche, where each dialogue concludes with the interlocutors dining together, after which they sing some of Rist’s songs.

The secular song was particularly anchored in its social context and as such, conversely, was restrained by confessional boundaries in a way that sacred song (as will be seen) was not. Whereas in the central and southern German-speaking areas musical culture was centred around the courts, in the Hanseatic towns of the North, which were oriented towards neighbouring foreign powers, a new musical development emerged out of a specifically Lutheran conception of music. Hamburg in particular became a key centre for the production of the bourgeois song, with a large group of musicians, predominantly church organists, collaborating with both Rist and Zesen in their sacred and secular production.

Yet in spite of the high level of musical activity in the city, until 1660 the only indication of a public musical life in Hamburg was the church music on Saturdays and Sundays. Hamburg’s
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song-production catered to a population of music enthusiasts who expressed this enthusiasm in a domestic setting.\(^{640}\)

Rist was among the first to follow Opitz’s lead in publishing secular poetry, but his early collections, the *Musa Teutonica* (1634) and the *Poetischer Lust-Garte* (1638), do not contain musical settings. Rist’s first secular songbook was *Des Daphnis aus Cimbrien Galathee* (1642), followed by *Des edlen Dafnis aus Cimbrien besungene Florabella* in 1651. He was apparently unsuccessful in maintaining his anonymity in association with these collections, being inducted into the *Pegnesischer Blumenorden* under the name ‘Daphnis’ in 1645.\(^{641}\) By the time of the publication of *Florabella*, everyone in Hamburg knew Rist as the anonymous poet.\(^{642}\) The poetry in Rist’s pastoral songs is clear and simple, with care being given to align natural and metrical stress, while the settings maintain a unity between text and melody. The songs are not merely bourgeois entertainment, but an important cultural means through which the upper and educated middle classes could represent themselves.\(^{643}\)

To some extent, the same restrictions on accessibility apply to Rist’s sacred song as to his secular song. Here again, the songs were intended for use in domestic settings, as part of the practice of domestic piety. For example, the readers of the pericopic collection of songs in the *Sabbahatische Seelenlust* (1651) are to be encouraged

\[\text{nach angehöretem Göttlichem Worte / desselben Sonntages Evangeliumslied für sich zu nehmen / und nebenst Ihren sämtlichen Haußgenossen / Kindern / und Gesinde fein andächtig / Einen Satz nach dem anderen singen / die Wohrte und derselben eigentlichen Verstand und Meinung mit fleissigem Nachdenken erwecken / Sich dabey desjenigen / waß Sie deß Morgens zuvor von Ihrem Seelenhirten gehöret / bedachtsam erinnern.}\(^{644}\)

In the context of the history of Christianity, such songbooks as the *Seelenlust* both support and propagate the internalisation of the Christian experience that took place in the early 17\(^{th}\) century in advance of, but not clearly as a direct precursor to, the later Pietism. The writings

---


of Johann Arndt were key to this development, which saw an increase in the popularity of devotional literature and significant acts of Christian devotion taking place outwith the church, in private households.\(^{645}\)

Music featured in church services either as a liturgical element, through organ solos to which the congregation were expected to listen just as to the sermon, through unaccompanied congregational song led by cantors, or through polyphonic choral song.\(^{646}\) The congregation sang by heart, and so collections of sacred song such as Rist’s cannot come into consideration as hymnbooks for church usage. However, Küster cautions against assigning the songs to any one area of worship, pointing out that the intentions of the poets alone did not determine the manner in which Lutheran church song developed in the 17\(^{th}\) century.\(^{647}\) On the other hand, a long process of editing would be required to bring the melodies into a form that could be sung by a congregation.\(^{648}\)

The format of the sacred songbooks also suggests their domestic usage by the musically literate. As with the secular song, the musical notation for each voice is printed separately with the first verse of each song, with all other verses printed on the following pages. This is as opposed to all of the musical notation being printed together on the page, which meant that the books could be published as smaller volumes easily held in the hand and carried in the pocket. By way of illustration, the frontispiece to the *Alltägliche Haußmusik* (1654) portrays a domestic music-making scene where each figure holds a small book in one hand from which they sing. Krabbe credits Rist with popularising this format, which was then used for other song collections.\(^{649}\)

However, as with Rist’s explicit pronouncements concerning his intended audience for his dramas, the prefaces to the collections of sacred song indicate a concern to cater to a wider audience. By requiring simpler melodies in aid of accessibility, Rist could open up his songs to the lower social strata. In the preface to the collection, *Der zu seinem allerheiligsten Leiden und Sterben hingeführter und an das Kreutz gehelfter Christus Jesus* (1648; 1655), Rist remarks on the receptivity to his *Himlische Lieder* (1641/2), from which some melodies

---


\(^{646}\) Edler, p. 26; Scheitler, p. 134

\(^{647}\) Küster, p. 107.

\(^{648}\) Küster, p. 110.

von Kinderen / die nicht einmahl lessen können / gahr bald sind gefasst und mit männigliches verwunderung richtig und mit Lust daher gesungen worden.\textsuperscript{650}

In his discussion of Rist’s songs, Krabbe treats the requirements of simplicity and accessibility as programmatically governing Rist’s entire production,\textsuperscript{651} whereupon the collaborations with musicians, notably Johann Schop, are cast as struggles between musical invention and virtuosity on the one hand and theological-ethical concerns on the other. However, Krabbe’s own analysis leads to the conclusion that that supposed requirement of simplicity was rarely fulfilled, largely as a result of Rist lacking the musical expertise to both specify the qualities he sought in a setting and recognise when these had been delivered.\textsuperscript{652}

Given that this is no musicological study, the mixed results in the execution of Rist’s intentions are less significant than the intentions themselves. The desire for accessibility is a Christian perspective found only in respect of his sacred song – to the extent that the secular song functions as bourgeois self-expression it cannot aim to be accessible. This is the limit of the relevance of formal musical discussion for the present. That children could pick up Rist’s songs by ear is an instance of Küster’s point that the songs could be used in contexts outwith those explicitly foreseen by their composers, and altered to suit these contexts.

Finally, with the sacred song less bound to specific social contexts than the secular song, it was able to cross regional and confessional boundaries with greater ease. In fact, Rist reports that his \textit{Himlische Lieder} were admired by the empress consort, who, upon hearing one of his Easter songs, declared:

\begin{quote}
Ey dises ist gahr ein schönes und herliches Lied / welches man noch einmahl widerholen müßte / were gleichwol immer Schade / daß der Verfasser desselben noch solte zum Teufel fahren.\textsuperscript{653}
\end{quote}

If Rist’s own reports on the reception of his work are to be believed, then even this survey, which is far from comprehensive, indicates that his songs were sung by both Lutherans and Catholics, illiterate children and royalty.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[650] Johann Rist, \textit{Der zu seinem allerheiligsten Leiden und Sterben hingeführter und an das Kreutz gehefteter Christ us Jesus} (Hamburg: Johann Naumann, 1655), A xv
\item[651] See Krabbe, p. 7.
\end{footnotes}
A key event, not only in respect of Rist’s musical context but also of German cultural history during the Thirty Years’ War overall, was the 1634 wedding in Copenhagen of the prince-elect Christian of Denmark to Magdalene Sibylle, daughter of the elector of Saxony. At this time Denmark was not a belligerent in the conflict, and so had the resources to put on a celebration the likes of which Europe would not see again until the war’s end. Politically speaking, King Christian IV hoped to use the occasion to bring together the European powers and arbitrate for peace, thereby not least improving Denmark’s status on the world stage. In this he was unsuccessful, but the royal wedding was of lasting cultural significance. Denmark’s relative stability made it a ‘home for the German muses’ throughout the war, as is demonstrated by Rist’s later ties to members of the Danish royal family, while Copenhagen itself was a thriving and influential artistic hub.

Schütz, who was at this time Kapellmeister at the Dresden court, was appointed to provide music for the festivities which included two comedies by Johann Lauremberg, a ballet, and a masked ball. This commission came at a time when his financial situation in Dresden was becoming increasingly precarious, musical activity at the court having all but halted following Saxony’s entrance into the war in 1631. In addition to Schütz and Lauremberg, another German artist in Copenhagen at the time was Schop, who had been the chapel violinist in the years 1615-19 and during the 1634 festivities won a competition against the French violinist Jacques Foucart.

Rist was also in Copenhagen, perhaps in association with a group of student actors from Rostock, who may have been the performers in Lauremberg’s dramas. Rist was not yet a well-known literary personality, although it seems that both Irenaromachia (1630) and the only recently-published Perseus were familiar to the people in Copenhagen at the time of the wedding. He was probably present at Schop’s competition, later reporting in the Belustigung (1666):

Ich habe gehöret auff dem sehr prächtigem Beilager / des Königlichen
Dennemarkischen Printzen Christiani / höchstseligsten Andenckens den Frantzosen

---
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658 Dumont, i, p. 258.
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Fuccart, der mit vorwolgedachtem Herren Schopenh / daselbsten concertiren, oder einen musikalischen Kampff halten muste / worinn aber der Frantzose den Kürtzern gezogen.\textsuperscript{661}

The wedding in Copenhagen was important for forging artistic ties.\textsuperscript{662} Rist, who already admired Schop, having written a poem in honour of his arrival in Hamburg in the \textit{Musa Teutonica},\textsuperscript{663} would later engage his services in providing musical settings. The collaboration with Schop, it will be seen below, is widely regarded as Rist’s most successful. Rist is also believed to have met Schütz in Copenhagen, and when the latter returned to Denmark in 1642, he was greeted en route in Wedel with a poem by Rist.\textsuperscript{664}

Schütz contributed relatively few settings for Rist’s poems. Rist’s collaborators were predominantly based in Hamburg, a fact which Haensel attributes less to the expediency of being able to maintain close contact with them than to the expectation that they would be from a musical tradition more likely to reflects Rist’s own ideas about what was appropriate and desirable in a setting.\textsuperscript{665} Hamburg was the key forum for Rist’s musical circle, not, as was the case with his literary activities, his involvement with the \textit{Sprachgesellschaften}. The \textit{Himlische Lieder} and \textit{Galathe}, Rist’s first major sacred and secular songbooks, both predate his first acceptance into a society, the \textit{Pegnesischer Blumenorden}, in 1645. Yet while the \textit{Sprachgesellschaften} did not function to foster Rist’s musical connections, he was clearly concerned to include musicians in his own \textit{Elbswanenorden}.\textsuperscript{666}

By the early 17\textsuperscript{th} century, Hamburg was established as a key musical centre in the North, attracting many virtuosi such as the Englishman William Brade (1560-1630) and his student, Rist’s long-time collaborator Schop, to work as municipal musicians.\textsuperscript{667} The strictly Lutheran confessional identity of the city was also central to the musical expertise at Rist’s disposal. With organ solos featuring as liturgical elements in Lutheran church services,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{662} Wade, p. 249.
  \item \textsuperscript{663} Johann Rist, \textit{Johannis Ristii Holsati Musa Teutonica. Das ist Teutscher Poetischer Miscellaneen}, 3rd edn (Gundemronman, 1640). K iii
  \item \textsuperscript{664} Johann Rist, \textit{Poetischer Schauplatz, Auff welchem allerhand Waaren Gute und Böse, Kleine und Grosse Freude- und Leid-zeugende zu finden}, (Hamburg: Heinrich Werner, 1646), pp. 269–70. The poem’s fourth stanza attests to the fact that it was the war conditions in Germany that led Schütz to seek refuge in Denmark.
  \item \textsuperscript{665} Haensel, p. 213.
  \item \textsuperscript{666} Krabbe, p. 18.
  \item \textsuperscript{667} Moser, p. 83; van Ingen, p. 63.
\end{itemize}
organ-playing had become professionalised, introducing a principle of competition which quickly raised not only the playing ability but also the social status of organists. This phenomenon is bound to its confessional context – it contrasts starkly with Calvinist deprecation of music, and even in respect of the Catholic church nothing comparable is observed until the mid-20th century.\textsuperscript{668} Seven out of Rist’s twelve collaborators were organists.\textsuperscript{669} Finally, some of Rist’s composers were cantors, organisers of church music – in Hamburg the only music for public performance. Cantors had jurisdiction over both the municipal musicians and the organists, who could influence musical life through supporting the cantors.\textsuperscript{670} Having had a typical North German academic education, Rist would have received training as a cantor as part of his theological studies.\textsuperscript{671} The cantors’ role within the church gave them a predisposition to the choral music already in use in the services, meaning they were less receptive to the solo accompanied songs as were composed by Rist and his circle. This, Krabbe ventures, accounts for the dominance of organists among Rist’s collaborators, as they were more open to new musical trends.\textsuperscript{672}

Rist’s collaborations with musicians put him in a position to influence the development of German solo song. His process in these collaborations was deliberate, not simply accepting settings of his texts but specifically seeking out composers to work with on texts that had been written with a view to being set to music.\textsuperscript{673} At least initially, musicians saw it as an honour to be requested to compose for Rist,\textsuperscript{674} although it appears that many of the working relationships broke down over the composers’ frustration with Rist’s requirements or even their alienation in response to his criticism of their work. Indeed, the products of their collaborations are rarely seen as best exhibiting the composers’ abilities and consequently were themselves of little lasting import. What is relevant above all about Rist’s musical collaborators is the reflection their relationships have upon the esteem in which he was held and the contexts in which he was regarded by his contemporaries as significant.

This is best illustrated in the case of Rist’s most significant collaborator, Johann Schop. Schop was the most respected musician in Hamburg at the time,\textsuperscript{675} and was Rist’s sole collaborator on the \textit{Himlische Lieder}, as well as providing settings for some of his other

\textsuperscript{668} Edler, pp. 24–5.  
\textsuperscript{669} Scheitler, p. 145.  
\textsuperscript{670} Krüger, p. 8.  
\textsuperscript{671} Küster, p. 173.  
\textsuperscript{672} Krabbe, pp. 58–9.  
\textsuperscript{673} Küster, pp. 103–4.  
\textsuperscript{674} Krabbe, p. 57.  
\textsuperscript{675} Krüger, p. 214.
collections. The only settings of Rist’s religious song to have remained in use in hymnbooks into the 20th century were by Schop, other Rist texts having been subsequently re-set. Rist’s esteem for Schop was long-standing, first attested to in the poem to his honour in the Musa Teutonica and sustaining for a further twenty years until the work on the Alltägliche Hausmusik. Schop was alone among Rist’s collaborators to have his portrait included on the frontispiece to a collection, accompanying that of Rist himself, in the 1652 edition of the Himlische Lieder. However, it appears that Rist’s extra-musical motivations in respect of his sacred song, seeking simplicity and accessibility through straightforward syllabic settings, frustrated Schop. In the preface to the third decade of the Himlische Lieder Rist reins in Schop’s apparent musical extravagances, with the consequence that there is a difference in compositional complexity from the first two decades. These constraints ultimately led their working relationship to cool, and Schop left Rist’s circle of composers during work on the Hausmusik, which is unique among Rist’s collections of sacred song in being the product of more than one musical collaboration.

Retrospectively, Rist is seen through his prolific song-production and sustained collaboration with prominent Hamburg musicians as having played a significant role in the development of German solo song. In his own time, the renown he achieved through his song was a product of their literary and linguistic qualities. In light of this, his songbooks achieved popularity and esteem throughout Germany, not just in the rather more specific musical context of Hamburg and the North. Harper contrasts this success to that of Rist’s contemporary, Gabriel Voigtländer, whose songs also found reception in performance by professional musicians. The honorific poems prefacing the collections confirms that Rist’s peers primarily received his songs as achievements for German language and literature.

Thus do Rist’s activities either as a songwriter or in collaboration with other musicians locate him in two, largely separate contexts within his lifetime. Geographically speaking, his works spread throughout German-speaking lands, apparently even crossing confessional boundaries to find reception at the Imperial Court in Vienna. Yet the acclaim they found in this respect took little notice of their specifically musical elements. This set the tone for the subsequent reception of Rist’s songs, with literary scholars only towards the end
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of the 20th century looking to provide a musical perspective to their investigations.\textsuperscript{682} The shortcomings of this approach are apparent even if one refrains from subjecting the songs to formal musicological investigation, since the nature of the settings provides clues regarding the manner in which the songs would have been consumed. On the other hand, Rist’s actual musical significance during his lifetime was more localised, primarily centred around Hamburg and the other North German towns from which he drew he collaborators. This is reflected in musicological studies, where Rist features as a key player in the \textit{Hamburger Liedschule}.

Disagreements with his illustrious collaborators notwithstanding, it would be difficult to overstate Rist’s musical significance within the context of Hamburg. In the \textit{Leben} (1663), der Rüstige recalls taking refuge in Hamburg during the Dano-Swedish War of 1658-60. Having lost all of his worldly possessions, he attended the Sunday church service, after which Schop suggested to the organist Heinrich Scheidemann (another of Rist’s collaborators),

\begin{quote}
\textit{lasset uns doch unsern wehrten Rüstigen / als einem grossen Libhaber unserer Wissenschaft / auch längsterkantem Freunde zu gefallen / ein feines Stück mit einander machen / vileicht müchte sein bekümmerter Hertz ein weinig dadurch widrüm erleichtert werden.}\textsuperscript{683}
\end{quote}

In 1660, another forum for public music in Hamburg emerged beside church services. The \textit{Collegium Musicum}, founded by Matthias Weckmann and composed not only of church musicians but of musically-able patricians, merchants, and burghers, gave weekly performances of the best music from within Germany and abroad.\textsuperscript{684} In 1666 this was the forum for a concert held in Rist’s honour, for which Rist travelled specially to Hamburg. The concert was held in the house of Christoph Bernhard, cantor at the Johanneum, Rist’s former school. The following year, Bernhard would compose the music for Rist’s funeral.\textsuperscript{685} Rist’s passion for music may have outstripped his musical abilities, yet it earned him the respect of Hamburg’s musicians.

Throughout his writings, Rist repeatedly attests to the affective properties of music. For example, in the episode described above, der Rüstige, upon hearing the music played by Schop and Scheidemann, ‘ward […] darüber so wehemühtig / das ich / in einen Winkel mich

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{682} van Ingen, p. 53.
\textsuperscript{684} Krüger, p. 98; Rist, \textit{iv}, 121–305 (p. 234).
\textsuperscript{685} Johann Mattheson, \textit{Grundlage einer Ehren-Pforte, woran der Tüchtigsten Capellmeister, Componisten, Musikgelehrten, Tonkünstler etc. Leben, Wercke, Verdienste etc. erscheinen sollen}. (Hamburg: Johann Mattheson, 1740), p. 21.
\end{footnotes}
Elsewhere, he recalls in his youth playing the role of the tyrant in a drama, a role which required him to execute a female character. This scene moved many of the women in the audience to tears, who, upon being asked after the performance, explained that they had been moved less by the execution than ‘durch den kläglichen Tohn der Musik / und das bewegliche Traur-Lied.’ The music for this performance had been under the direction of William Brade, suggesting that the young Rist (Brade died in 1630) was influenced by this important English musician. This anecdote attests to the affective properties not only of song but also of atmospheric music, and indeed in the preface to the Belustigung Rist treats such music as necessary components of dramas.

The English influence in Rist’s use of music in drama is significant. While the importance of the Wanderbühne in respect of plot features and theatrical technique in Rist’s dramas is well-documented, his use of an orchestral ritornello at the end of each act is also derived from the practices of the travelling players. In the course of the investigations of each drama, it will be important to establish the nature of the atmospheric music used.

Formally speaking, it is important to appreciate the musical context of Rist’s writing as this provides further criteria determining his works besides those of the codified Opitzian poetics which Rist was explicitly concerned to follow. In addition, awareness of the works’ status as song, not merely poetry to be read, provides access to explanations accounting for deviance from poetic norm. The fact that Rist and his collaborators were writing music in the new Italian tradition places them in a broad European context that is less obvious when literary investigations are restricted to textual analysis. In conception, Rist’s songs participated in the trend for private music-making, which in the secular sphere was an important social activity for the middle classes, while the sacred songs also played an important devotional role, as well as being more accessible to the lower social strata. Finally, the nature of Rist’s circle of musical collaborators is a document of his significance in his local context. In spite of the strained working relationships he had with his composers, by his own account he was held in high regard by the Hamburg musical establishment. Both formally and on a broader, sociocultural basis, then, to disregard Rist’s musical context is to skew the nature of his poetic works in their genesis and reception. Familiarity with this context, particularly regarding the

686 Johann Rist, iv, 121–305 (p. 233).
individuals with whom Rist collaborated, is a prerequisite for any investigation of the use of music in his dramas.
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