

Multiple Authorship in 17th-Century German Lyric Poetry – the Example of Constantin Christian Dedekind’s *Aelbianische Musen-Lust* (1657)

Abstract

Using Constantin Christian Dedekind’s *Aelbianische Musen-Lust* (1657) as a case study, this chapter demonstrates how specific forms of plural authorship play a role and are enacted in 17th-century lyric poetry, which was widely understood as song poetry. Numerous constellations and aspects of plural authorship can be identified in *Aelbianische Musen-Lust*. One may assume that Dedekind, the organizing and coordinating author, plays with these constellations and aspects self-consciously, that the multiplication of constellations and aspects of plural authorship is an essential part of his aesthetic conception. Poetry emerges here essentially as an effect of plural authorship: many actors are involved in its creation; originality and profundity are not relevant categories here; instead, conceptual simplicity, witty imitation and emulation, creative linking to predecessors, a poetics of sociability, and musicality form aesthetic guidelines.

Keywords

Constantin Christian Dedekind, *Aelbianische Musen-Lust*, 17th Century, Lyric Poetry, Song Poetry, Gottfried Finckelthaus, Paul Fleming

1.

17th-century German literature is characterized by multiple authorship with regard to at least three levels. *Books* are not produced by their authors alone but are also products of strategic programmes by the printer-publishers that manufacture the books. Moreover, through their paratexts – dedicatory poems, dedicatory addresses, frontispieces – the books are often marked as products of multiple authorship. *Works* are often not original products but rather translations or elaborations related to translations, adaptations of earlier texts, or products of the processes of *imitatio* and *aemulatio*, as well as the result of revisiting and recomposing existing works and texts. *Texts*, however, are often components of a network of other texts to which they are genuinely related. In the following chapter, I would like to present an example of this multi-dimensioned form of multiple

* Translated by Alexander Wilson. Quotations for which no other translation is cited have also been translated by Wilson.

authorship, and to investigate its literary-historical as well as aesthetic implications and consequences.

The example is a book, a work, and a text that appeared in 1657 under the title *Aelbanische Musen-Lust*.¹ The print is still preserved in the libraries of Wolfenbüttel, Leipzig, and Dresden; according to the bookplate, the Dresden copy was the property of Luise Adelgunde Gottsched.² A copy of the second edition from 1665 can be found in the Badische Landesbibliothek and comes from the holdings of the library of Josef von Laßberg, the famous collector of books and manuscripts.³ The full title of the work, as found on the title page, provides information about its content and conception: *Aelbianische Musen-Lust / in unterschiedlicher berühmter Poeten auserlesenen / ahnmuhtigen Melodeien beseelten / Lust- Ehren- Zucht und Tugend-Liedern / bestehende* (The Elbian Passion for the Muses, Consisting in Exquisite, Graceful Melodies Inspired by Pleasure, Honor, and Virtue of Various Famous Poets; Fig. 1).

We are thus dealing with a selection and collection of poetry to be sung that has been furnished with musical scores. The name of the author is not given on the title page; the only names that appear here are those of the printers in whose Dresden print shop the book was developed: Wolfgang Seyffert and Antonius Meißner. According to Christoph Reske's reference work "Die Buchdrucker des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts im deutschen Sprachgebiet," Wolfgang Seyffert's Dresden print shop existed from 1630 to 1653;⁴ the printing of the *Aelbianische Musen-Lust* shows that it was active for at least four more years. As per Reske, Seyffert was the son-in-law of Gimel Bergen II and had, through him, become a member of a widely branching network of printers, largely connected by familial relationships, who were integrally involved in cultural life in Dresden and beyond in the middle of the 17th century. On the subject of Antonius Meißner, no

- 1 Dedekind: *Musen-Lust* 1657 [1991]. For a description and characterization of the work, see Harper 2003, pp. 190–196. – The present chapter draws on suggestions from the discussion held at the conference *Ästhetik pluraler Autorschaft* (Aesthetics of Multiple Authorship, November 2020) at the conclusion of the presentation delivered there. I would like to thank all participants for their comments and Sandra-Madeleine Wetzels for the instructive transcript of the discussion.
- 2 [Dedekind:] *Musen-Lust* 1657. See the copy in the Sächsische Landesbibliothek / Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Dresden 14: Mus.1805.K.1, and the information following its note of provenance in the *Verzeichnis der im deutschen Sprachraum erschienenen Drucke des 17. Jahrhunderts* (VD17 14:635857F), URL: <http://digital.slub-dresden.de/id177644681X> (last accessed: 28 November 2024).
- 3 Dedekind: *Musen-Lust* 1665. See the copy in the Landesbibliothek Karlsruhe 31: 100 B 76044 RH, and the information following its note of provenance in the *Verzeichnis der im deutschen Sprachraum erschienenen Drucke des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Catalogue of 17th century prints published in the German-speaking world; VD17 31:749985P), URL: <https://digital.blb-karlsruhe.de/id/6053306> (last accessed: 24 November 2024).
- 4 Reske 2015, pp. 179f.



Fig. 1. [Constantin Christian Dedekind:] *Aelbianische Musen-Lust* / in unterschiedlicher berühmter Poeten auserlesenen / mit ahnmühtigen Melodeien beseelten / Lust- Ehren- Zucht und Tugend- Liedern / bestehende (The Aelbian Passion for the Muses in Various Famous Poets, Consisting in Exquisite, Graceful Melodies Inspired by Pleasure, Honor, and Virtue), Dresden: Wolfgang Seyffert [1657], title page [unpaginated].

further information is to be found in Reske's work, and the index of 17th-century prints published in the German-speaking world also gives only a few bibliographical references to books published by Meißner in addition to the *Musen-Lust*; these were all published well after the printing of 1657. With regard to the question of multiple authorship, the following can be determined when considering the title page: if one assumes that the entity marked on the title page as responsible for the production of the book is actually the author, then among the authors of the *Aelbianische Musen-Lust* are the two printers, but no writer of any kind whatsoever. Yet it is in any case unclear who the writer could possibly be if one relies on the information given on the title page, since we are dealing with a collection of poems by "famous poets" not yet mentioned by name. Following the title page in the printed book is a dedication of the work not to a single addressee but to

ten.⁵ The multiplication of the dedicatees is instructive with regard to the question of multiple authorship, since this is after all a case of multiple ‘addressee-ship’, and thus in some measure the inverse of multiple authorship. The dedication to ten addressees is followed by a “response” that apostrophizes those very dedicatees and which is signed “The Elbian muses.”⁶ Here, the muses accordingly appear as authors who pledge the work to the dedicatees.

Placed before the title page is an artfully constructed frontispiece (Fig. 2). It shows a landscape modelled in an idealized manner after the Elbe Sandstone Mountains, with their precipitously towering sandstone cliffs and the Elbe flowing between them. Pegasus, the steed of poets, hovers over the scenery; he is surrounded by a scroll on which the title of the work can be read. To the left and right in the foreground of the frontispiece, two mountains can be seen that are populated with figures. The left mountain is recognizably a Saxon Helicon, on which Apollo sits at the very top and below him the nine muses – possibly the ‘Elbian muses’ already mentioned – furnished with different instruments. The mountain located to the right of the picture is, in a sense, the mirror image of the muses’ mountain, upon which sits Martin Opitz – the German master-poet presented as equal to Apollo and, like him, depicted with a lyre – and, analogously to the nine muses, nine German poets equipped with corresponding instruments whose songs are included in the *Aelbianische Musen-Lust* alongside those of Opitz.⁷ As a reader’s preface, the *Aelbianische Musen-Lust* contains a “preliminary account to explain the title of the copperplate, from which the organization of the entire work is likewise obtained,” also signed by the Elbian muses.⁸ From this, it becomes apparent why Paul Fleming and the Saxon song-poet Gottfried Finckelthaus come to be seated directly below Opitz on the mountain of poets, on its “highest echelons.” The poets who have already died are positioned at the very top in “memory of [their] honour”; below them follow the authors still alive in 1657.⁹ A number of authors are depicted on the frontispiece who have not received a place on the Saxon Helicon of poets but who rove about in the Elbe meadows, including Enoch Gläser, who is portrayed as a shepherd with his flock and is therefore suggestive of the bucolic dimension of the song-poetry offered in the *Musen-Lust*. In this illustration, realistic and idealizing images interact with one another. On the one hand, the representation of the Elbe landscape and the mesas of Saxon Switzerland is appropriately ‘true-to-life’,

5 Dedekind: *Musen-Lust* 1657 [1991], dedications [unpaginated].

6 Dedekind: *Musen-Lust* 1657 [1991], response [unpaginated].

7 On Dedekind’s frontispiece in the context of contemporary stagings of Opitz, see Aurnhammer 2015; on the development of an intermedial program on Dedekind’s frontispiece and in the ‘preliminary account’, see Dröse 2017, pp. 269–274.

8 Dedekind: *Musen-Lust* 1657 [1991], fol.)(1r.

9 Dedekind: *Musen-Lust* 1657 [1991], fol.)(1vf.



Fig. 2. Peter Troschel: copperplate engraving on title page, in: Constantin Christian Dedekind: *Aelbianische Musen-Lust* / in Ein hundert und Fünf und Siebenzig unterschiedlicher berühmter Poeten auserlesenen / mit ahnmuhtigen Melodeien beseelten / Lust- Ehren- Zucht und Tugend-Liedern / bestehende (The Aelbian Passion for the Muses in One Hundred and Seventy-Five Different Famous Poets, Consisting in the Exquisite, Graceful Melodies Inspired by Pleasure, Honor, and Virtue), Dresden/Leipzig: George Heinrich Fromann, 1657, SLUB Dresden, shelfmark Mus.1805.K.1.

as anyone who has ever travelled in this landscape can confirm. On the other hand, the Elbe meadows with the shepherds grazing their flocks stand for a utopian landscape, a counterworld to reality.

The Opitzian school of poets is presented on the frontispiece, and especially on the Helicon of poets, primarily in its Saxon variety but also comprising its immediate context, including Johann Rist of Hamburg and Simon Dach of Königsberg. The frontispiece thus stages German poetry as an orchestra and therefore as a hierarchically organized group context. By portraying those poets who are included with their poems in the collection of the *Aelbianische Musen-Lust*, and also naming them concretely through explanatory titles, the frontispiece construes the poets as the result and staging

of multiple authorship.¹⁰ The representational coordination of muses and poets alone is nothing unusual in the early modern period, but the positioning of events in the landscape of the Elbe Sandstone Mountains attests to a poetic self-awareness constructed on a group basis and aiming at the constitution of a poetic tradition.

The concept of authorship staged here is that of the poet as singer, yet not as soloist and rather as part of a coordinated musical ensemble. Analogous to Clio – the muse of history, who plays the organ at the base of the mountain of muses – at the base of the Helicon of poets sits Constantin Christian Dedekind at the organ. The decision to furnish the poet Dedekind with the organ is explained in more detail in the “preliminary account to explain the title of the copperplate”:

Was lätslich unsern Dedekinden belanget / und das solchem das Positiv geeignet worden / geschiehet nicht dahrum / als wänn er für einen Organisten geachtet sein wolle / sondern / weil wihr ihn seine Lieder / niemahls / oder doch gar sälten / anders / als in das Clavier singen hören / und er hierüber der Grund und Werkmeister ist welcher diese AElbianische MusenLust befördert.¹¹

Finally, concerning our Dedekind and that the positive organ has been assigned to him, this is not because he wants to be esteemed as an organist, but rather because we never, or but very rarely, hear him sing his songs other than into the piano, and above this, he is the agent and artificer who raises up this *AElbianische Musen-Lust*.

Up to this point, nowhere in the paratexts of the *Aelbianische Musen-Lust* has the entity that functions as the work’s ‘main author’ been named.¹² The Optizian poets, the Elbian muses, and the printers have been mentioned as authors, but it is only at this juncture in the “preliminary account” that Dedekind’s name is foregrounded as the one who is the ‘base and artificer’ (“Grund und Werkmeister”) of the whole and who has ‘promoted’ (“befördert”) the work. *Augere* is the Latin word for ‘increase’ or ‘promote’, and from it is derived the Latin *auctor*, which one could translate in the 17th century as ‘artificer’ – the literal translation into Latin would be *artifex*. Dedekind is thus portrayed on the frontispiece as the organist, because he is the one who organized the entire work; as the organizing author, he coordinates the chorus of muses and of poets as well as acts as an intermediary between the world of the work and the world of the book by conveying to the printers what the work should eventually look like. Dedekind takes up the position on the mountain of poets that Clio occupies on the muses’ mountain. As the artificer of the collection of lyrics, he ensures that the poets collected within are not forgotten; as

10 See also Werle 2019, pp. 107–109.

11 Dedekind: *Musen-Lust* 1657 [1991], fol.)(2^r.

12 This only applies, however, to the first edition of the work from 1657. In the second edition, Dedekind’s name is included on the title page as the author, which tends to reduce the form of multiple authorship analyzed here for the first edition as a result. See Dedekind: *Musen-Lust* 1665, title page [unpaginated].

an author, he accordingly fulfils the longstanding function of securing the fame of those who appear in his work.¹³ At the bottom left, the frontispiece inconspicuously includes the signature “P. Troschel Scul[psit]”; it was hence engraved by one P. Troschel. Behind this is concealed the copperplate engraver Peter Troschel of Nuremberg, who was also active in Breslau for some while.¹⁴ He is thus another author among those mentioned in the text, namely the author of the frontispiece, who is not identical with any of the authorial entities previously mentioned.¹⁵

Another reader’s preface, with the corresponding title “Nach-Erinnerung. Neidische Jungfer Mißgunst / und stichelhafter gEsell Tadelgern!” (Subsequent reminder. Envious maiden Resentment and insulting CriticAsster!), follows the “preliminary account” that explains the frontispiece.¹⁶ This “subsequent reminder” addresses resentful readers – as the “preliminary account” addresses benevolent readers – and is again signed by the Elbian muses, who thus appear here once again as authors.

Dedekind is mentioned explicitly and decidedly as the author of the *Aelbianische Musen-Lust* for the first time in the following paratext, an “expert opinion” on the *Aelbianische Musen-Lust* by the Saxon electoral chapel master Heinrich Schütz, who attests of Dedekind that he “wrote down the work at hand and prefixed it with a title.”¹⁷ As an author, Dedekind is also addressed in the “poems of honour and praise” following Schütz’ evaluation, which were in part penned by the very poets whose poems can be found anthologized in the *Aelbianische Musen-Lust*, namely by Johann Rist, who had also crowned Dedekind a poet, and by Justus Sieber.¹⁸

2.

Evidently, the *Aelbianische Musen-Lust* is staged in its paratexts as a product of multiple authorship in various senses. Numerous author figures come to light: Apollo and the muses, the Opitzian poets, the printers, the engraver, and finally Constantin Christian Dedekind. Accordingly, different author concepts are invoked in the paratexts:

13 For biographical and bibliographical information on Dedekind’s life and work, see Eggebrecht / Braun 2008; Scheitler 2020; and the earlier work of Stege 1925/1926.

14 Troschel is mentioned in passing on various occasions, but not treated in detail in Tacke 2001.

15 At the time, copper engravings were often engraved following different illustrations, paintings, other engravings, or even woodcuts. In such cases, there was another form of multiple authorship in the way that one engraver cited the other or simply reused them. As far as we know, however, this does not apply to the present engraving, which seems to have been entirely individual in its time. In recent times, it has been reproduced on various occasions, probably because of its illustrative power; see, for example, Braun 2004, p. 271; Aurnhammer / Detering / Martin 2013, p. 39.

16 Dedekind: *Musen-Lust* 1657 [1991], fol.)(1^rf. /

17 Dedekind: *Musen-Lust* 1657 [1991], fol.)(02^r.

18 Dedekind: *Musen-Lust* 1657 [1991], fol.)(0(1^r-)000(2^v.

the concept of authorship as inspiration through the Muses, the concept of collective authorship of a group or school, the concept of technical-material authorship, the concept of authorship as the co-operation of different arts, and finally the concept of the author as organizer and anthologist. If it becomes clear, on the whole, that Dedekind plays a preeminent role in this concert as conceptional author, this is because he is represented as the coordinating entity of the overall enterprise. In the dedicatory poems, he appears as the individual who secures the fame of the dead poets through his achievement in collecting and organizing their work:

Dedekind erwäckt / durch Lieder /
die verstorbnen Dichter wieder.¹⁹

Dedekind awakens / through songs /
the deceased poets once again.

In this way, he also procures fame for himself:

Er muß unsterblich sein weil dieses sein beginnen
die Todten lebend macht / und auff die Himmels-Zinnen
die Lebenden versätzt. [...] ²⁰

He must be immortal, because his beginning of this
makes the dead alive, / and on the pinnacles of Heaven
places the living. [...]

With his work, Dedekind is depicted as the one who opens up access to the muses and to the works of the poets:

hier ist der Musen Schar und der Poeten Kohr;
zu diesen öffnet uns mein Dedekind das Tohr.²¹

here is the throng of muses and the choir of poets;
For us, my Dedekind opens the gate to these.

- 19 Christoff Bernhardt: An Seinen geträuesten und brüderlichen Freund/Herrn Dedekinden, in: Dedekind: Musen-Lust 1657 [1991], fol.)(0(3^v-)00(4^v.
- 20 Justus Sieber: Über Herrn Constantin Christian Dedekinds/Kaiserl. Ristischen Poetens und Kuhrfürstl. Sächsischen Kunstreichen Hof-Musici/Wohlgesezte Aelbianische Musen-Lust, in: Dedekind: Musen-Lust 1657 [1991], fol.)(0(1^r-)00(2^v.
- 21 Justus Sieber: Über Herrn Constantin Christian Dedekinds/Kaiserl. Ristischen Poetens und Kuhrfürstl. Sächsischen Kunstreichen Hof-Musici/Wohlgesezte Aelbianische Musen-Lust, in: Dedekind: Musen-Lust 1657 [1991], fol.)(0(1^r-)00(2^v.

As the conceptional author of the collection, Dedekind is more than an editor or a compiler. Above all, however, the staging of the author is different; this staging situates itself in the context of a new self-awareness of German poetry after Opitz, here presented programmatically as an anthology. In addition, as conceptional author, Dedekind distinguishes himself by striving for a certain degree of faithfulness in representation of the text; that is, he does not take free rein with the earlier texts as it pleases him, as was indeed customary at the time in the context of other genres and other literary practices. Instead, a proto-philological ethos can in some measure be discerned in his anthological activity. The extent to which Dedekind shapes the anthology as an organizing and coordinating entity is evident when one looks at its structure more closely: it embeds the compiled poems in a multi-dimensioned order. The collection consists of four books, the first three parts of which each contain four groups of ten poems: invariably three groups of ten poems by a particular author – in the first part, for instance, ten ‘Opitzian’, ten ‘Finckelthausian’, and ten ‘Flemingian’ – in each case followed by a group of ten ‘mixed’ (“vermängelt”) poems, i.e. poems by different poets. Each ‘ten’ is concluded by a “content-song” from the pen of the conceptional author Dedekind, which, according to Gary C. Thomas – the editor of the facsimile reprint of the *Aelbianische Musen-Lust*, published in 1991 – summarizes “the facts of the respective group in a programmatic way,”²² and in doing so takes up the epigraph-shaped titles of the respective ten songs, which also originate with Dedekind. The sequence of groups of ten based on poets that thus emerges in the first three books contains, in this order, the names of Opitz, Finckelthaus, Fleming, Rist, Andreas Tscherning, Simon Dach, David Schirmer, Justus Sieber, and Heinrich Held. Thomas has put forward a plausible suggestion as to why Dedekind selected these very authors and arranged them in precisely this configuration.²³

The first book includes representatives of the first Opitzian generation of poets, the second book those of the second, and the third book contains those of the third. Moreover, the first book begins with Opitz as the Silesian progenitor of the new German lyric poetry, followed by Finckelthaus and Fleming as his two preeminent Saxon adepts. The third book is arranged exactly in a mirror image, beginning with the two Saxons Schirmer and Sieber and ending with the Silesian Held. These two books, as part of a ring composition, enclose the second book, which accommodates another Silesian at its centre with Tscherning, flanked by Rist of Hamburg and Dach of Königsberg, and therefore by representatives of the other important centres besides Saxony, in which the movement of the new German lyric poetry originating from Silesia spread. The first three books of the *Aelbianische Musen-Lust* are thus symmetrically constructed with regard to the origins of the poets presented there. The fourth part, which follows the first to third parts, contains twenty songs from the pen of Dedekind and a series of

22 Thomas 1991, p. 21*.

23 See Thomas 1991, pp. 22*–27*.

‘blended’ canzonettas. Dedekind thus concludes the collection as a poet of songs. The individual groups of ten in the collection are, as Thomas has pointed out, cyclically structured, meaning that this is not merely a matter of unordered collections of poems by the authors in question, but that the texts are arranged in such a way that they relate to each other in thematic variation and sometimes even in narrative succession. Here, too, Dedekind emerges as the mastermind, as the organizing meta-author of the collection; he does so, firstly, in that he provides all the poems with their own titles that each consists of rhymed couplets, and that he, secondly, concludes each group of ten with the “content-song,” which again emphasizes the connection between the ten respective poems in a synoptic verse.

What is stressed relatively little in the collection’s paratexts, but which immediately catches the eye in a more thorough analysis of the same sections, is a further point that makes evident Dedekind’s status as the main author in the framework of multiple authorship which structures the collection of the *Aelbianische Musen-Lust*. The *Aelbianische Musen-Lust* is a book of songs; the poems of the anthologized authors are presented as being made for musical performance. The melodic notations that are underpinned with basso continuo and for which the poems serve as lyrics originate, however, with Dedekind. He thus emerges as the composer of the collection in two ways: as a conceptual composer who composes the anthology of poems by Opitzian lyric poets, and as a musical composer who, as the one setting the musical notes, furnishes the poetic texts with musical notation and therefore makes it possible to perform them.²⁴ That the *Aelbianische Musen-Lust* is a songbook, which was designed for performance, i.e. musical recital, is visible in the format: the staves with the stanzas placed underneath are presented in a landscape format, which can be easily placed on a music stand and which makes it possible to turn the pages less frequently during the musical performance.

3.

For a number of texts contained in the *Aelbianische Musen-Lust* yet another aspect of multiple authorship is important: they are not infrequently parodies or contrafactures of texts by other authors. This is the case, for example, with some of the poems of the ‘Finckelthausian ten’. The final one of these poems bears the characteristic title given by Dedekind: “Der hat für der Lieb ein Grauen / will nuhn nach den Büchern schauen” (Who is in horror of love, / now wishes to look to his books). The first stanza of the text reads as follows:

24 See Werle 2019, p. 63. See also Thomas 1991, p. 21*. From a musical-historical perspective on Dedekind’s *Musen-Lust*, see Braun 2004, passim, but esp. pp. 271–274. Braun also goes into Dedekind’s musical-conceptual reference to Rist.

Ich empfinde fast ein Grauen /
 daß ich / Liebe / für und für /
 bin gewesen eigen Dühr /
 Es ist zeit einmahl zuschauen /
 was doch meine Bücher machen /
 die ich lange nicht gesehn:
 Alles soll bei Seite gehn /
 von den süßen LiebesSachen.²⁵

I almost feel a horror
 that I, Love, forever and ever
 have been your own.
 It is time now to see
 what my books are doing
 which I have not seen for long.
 Everything shall fall aside
 of love's sweet stuff.

This is recognizably a parody of Martin Opitz's model ode *Ich empfinde fast ein Grauen*, which he invokes in the *Buch von der Deutschen Poeterey* as an example of a *lyricum*, an ode, a poem that "one can use especially for music."²⁶ Finckelthaus reverses the message of Opitz's poem with his parody: where the speaker in Opitz states that he has sat over books long enough and now wants to enjoy the pleasures of life instead, the speaker in Finckelthaus articulates that he has grappled with matters of love long enough and now wants to return to his preoccupation with books.²⁷ Finckelthaus' parody is contained in the *Aelbianische Musen-Lust*, but Opitz's earlier text is not. As the earlier text shines through the parody, as it were, Finckelthaus' text also invokes Opitz as a kind of second author.

It is a similar case for the Finckelthaus poem that is titled by Dedekind with the following verses:

Beides ist ihm einerlei
 ob es nicht sei oder sei.
 Ihr Damen lasst das wählen /
 nach wählen kömmt das Kwählen.

25 Dedekind: *Musen-Lust* 1657 [1991], fol. H1^vf.

26 Opitz: *Buch von der Deutschen Poeterey*, pp. 33 f. The Finckelthaus poem was printed first in the anonymously published prose eclogue [Finckelthaus:] *Floridans Lob- und Liebes-Gedichte*, fol. D3^rf., and later in the collection Finckelthaus: *Deutsche Gesänge*, fol. F1^r-F2^r.

27 On the Finckelthaus parody, see Werle 2019, pp. 39-51; in the context of other contemporary parodies, see also Otto 1990 and Haberland 2003.

To him, it's all the same
 whether it be not or be.
 You ladies let it be chosen;
 anguish follows choice.

The first stanza of the poem reads as follows:

Will sie nicht so mag sies lassen /
 Lisilis das stolze Tier /
 was frag ich denn viel nach ihr!
 Liebt sie oder will sie hassen /
 ich gesteh es rund und frei /
 beides ist mihr einerlei.²⁸

If she won't want it, let her leave it,
 Lisilis the proud beast;
 why then should I so care for her!
 Whether she loves or wants to hate –
 fully and freely, I confess –
 it's all the same to me.

In this poem, a speaker enters the scene who claims to be unaffected by the lack of affection of his beloved woman. This statement is proffered in such a way that the reader may initially doubt whether this is not a matter of a self-serving declaration on the part of the speaker. In the further course of the poem, however, it becomes clear that, in matters of love, the speaker is someone who does not really give thought to failed romantic relationships but who is in any case polyamorous in orientation and who, if one lover turns him down, can console himself with many others. The example is a parody of Paul Fleming's ode *Will sie nicht / so mag sies lassen*.²⁹ An identical opening situation is described there: a speaker has been rebuffed by his beloved and now claims not to care. Fleming's speaker is a deeply faithful and monogamous personality, and his consolation consists in the neo-stoic striving for freedom from troubling feelings. In his parody, Finckelthaus sets the Flemingian persona – who is characterized by loyalty in *eroticis*, and who consoles himself over rejection by his beloved by rejoicing that he must no longer grapple emotionally with matters of love – against a persona who, in consolation for the rejection by his beloved, throws himself into his love life all the more and who deems the virtue of fidelity as non-binding for himself. Finckelthaus was a personal friend of Fleming; various lyrical configurations exist in which the two authors stage

28 Dedekind: *Musen-Lust* 1657 [1991], fol. G2^vf.

29 Fleming: *Teütsche Poemata*, pp. 496f. As far as I can tell, the first printing of the Finckelthaus parody appears in [Finckelthaus:] *Lustige Lieder*, leaves C3^vf.

themselves as figures differently disposed in matters of love, the lusty, polyamorous Finckelthaus set against the monogamous, faithful Fleming.³⁰ Through Dedekind recording this poem by Finckelthaus in his collection and within the relevant group of ten, the author Fleming, as it were, shines through the text by the author Finckelthaus in this case as well. This is all the more remarkable as the earlier text behind Finckelthaus' poem is not contained in the preceding group of ten poems by Fleming.

4.

As we can see, numerous configurations and aspects of multiple authorship may be identified in the *Aelbianische Musen-Lust*. It is possible to speculate that Dedekind, the organizing and coordinating author, plays precisely with these configurations and aspects in a self-confident manner, that the multiplication of configurations and aspects of multiple authorship represents an essential component of his aesthetic conception. The various configurations and aspects of multiple authorship mentioned here are not entirely individual peculiarities of Dedekind's collection; they are frequently found in songbooks, in lyric poetry, and in 17th-century German literature.³¹ What is exceptional about the *Aelbianische Musen-Lust*, however, is the accumulation and variety of configurations and aspects of multiple authorship that come to bear on the collection. To take up the terminology proposed in the introduction to this volume, this concerns collaborative or collective authorship only in certain respects, as the realization of the collection is not achieved through the actual collaboration of several authors.³² Instead, multiple authorship is present in a broader, but no less significant, sense, not least because the *de facto* interaction of producers of cultural artifacts – poets, musicians, visual artists, printers, anthologists – appears to be accompanied by a staging of different levels and facets of authorship: the interplay of muses and poets, the notion of a group or school of poets, the staging of an intertextual network of authors. Perhaps one can go yet even further

30 For example, two related sonnets penned by the two authors, which stage the two different author personae in this sense, are found in Finckelthaus: *Deutsche Gesänge*, leaves G6^v–G7^v. Adam Olearius, as editor of Fleming's posthumously published German poems, later also recorded the pair of sonnets in this collection: Fleming: *Teütsche Poemata*, pp. 597f.

31 These are an integral part of what Max von Waldberg, with a view to 17th-century lyric poetry, described comprehensively (albeit with a pejorative intention) as "literary communism." See Waldberg 1888, p. 205.

32 Stockhorst 2016 describes such a form of concrete collaboration, in the sense of proto-philological co-operation, for the projects of the *Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft* (Fruitbearing Society). For the concept of collaborative authorship in general, see Spoerhase/Thomalla 2020. For the contexts reconstructed here, Gamper 2001 is less useful as regards terminology.

and speak of relational authorship because the authorial roles and concepts that surface in the text are placed in a coordinated relational framework.³³

Dedekind emerges as the coordinating author and is also staged as such. It is noteworthy that he is not named on the title page as an author; the *Aelbianische Musen-Lust* here appears to be without an author. The frontispiece, however, portrays him as the organist who organizes and orchestrates the entire undertaking, and he is also staged as such in the dedicatory poems. By contrast, it is striking that he appears less markedly as the composer who creates the music for all the texts in the collection but almost exclusively as the one who deems himself responsible for the enterprise as its conceptional author and coordinating entity.

This concept of the coordinating author can be elucidated more precisely from different perspectives, first of all with a view to the collection's poetics. A coordinating author, as the anthologist and organizer of a work, always comes forward when a literary work possesses the character of a collection. The coordinating author is then responsible for the selection and arrangement of the various texts and voices and is thus seen as the chief authorial entity, perhaps a little more during the early modern period than in later periods. Two aspects are important in this context with a view toward questions of transmission and canonization. The function of the coordinating author is particularly vital with regard to collections of lyric poetry, because poems, as objects 'corded' in a specific way in terms of form and content, are on the one hand transportable to a special degree and can migrate from mouth to mouth, but also from text to text or from work to work. As a rule, however, they are not received as individual texts but rather jointly with other poems as parts of collections in the form of books.³⁴ Collections of various kinds are thus assigned a central role in the history of the transmission and canonization of lyric poetry; if a text is not handed down in collections of any kind, then its continued existence is at risk. Accordingly, it is no wonder that the coordinating author Dedekind is dignified in the dedicatory poems as the one who ensures the fame of the deceased and the still living poets, and who in doing so becomes famous himself. This dual function of praising has been a recurring aspect in European literary history since antiquity of the reflection on fame, the semantic unit on the basis of which the significance of literary history has been conceptualized as a process of canonization, the complex conditions of reception, and the diverse manner of transmission.³⁵

33 For another case study along similar lines on a later collection of poetry, the *Singende Muse an der Pleiße* (Singing Muse on the Pleiße, first published in 1736), see Werle 2020.

34 On the example of Hans Jacob Christoffel von Grimmelshausen's *Nachtigallenlied* (Nightingale Song), see Werle 2017. For the description of poems as 'corded' ("verschnürte") structures, see Eibl 1992, p. 173.

35 On this topic, see Werle 2014, esp. pp. 27–31.

In his 1981 book “Autorschaft ist Werkherrschaft: Über die Entstehung des Urheberrechts aus dem Geist der Goethezeit” (Authorship is Sovereignty over the Work: On the Emergence of Copyright Law from the Spirit of Goethe’s Time), Heinrich Bosse developed the thesis that the development of copyright law at the end of the 18th century established modern authorship as dominion over the work as one’s economic and intellectual property.³⁶ Perhaps, in the case of Dedekind as the coordinating author of the *Aelbianische Musen-Lust*, one can also speak of dominion over the work, albeit not in the tangible sense referred to by Bosse. Within a framework of playing with notions of multiple authorship, Dedekind stages himself as the main author of the work as he has command over the work, specifically as the coordinator of the multiple roles and functions of authorship. Multiple authorship appears in Dedekind’s *Aelbianische Musen-Lust* not as a provocation or an annoyance but rather as a concept that is affirmatively asserted, that is emphatically staged and celebrated.

Focusing on the example of Dedekind’s *Aelbianische Musen-Lust* reveals the close interaction of (multiple) authorship and (different) aesthetics. The ‘aesthetics’ of Germanophone lyric poetry in the 17th century is not based on the notion that the poem comes into being through the autonomous creation of individual poetic geniuses, as is the aesthetics of modern lyric poetry since the end of the 18th century, but rather on ideas of social interaction,³⁷ network-based production and a “literary communism”³⁸ of “referring and borrowing,”³⁹ the notion of a poetic network of themes and ways of speaking in which all speak with one voice. Poetry thus emerges essentially as an effect of multiple authorship: many actors are involved in its genesis, and originality and profundity are not relevant categories here; instead, conceptual simplicity, witty imitation and attempts to outdo others, creative connections to one’s predecessors, and a poetics of sociability and musicality provide the aesthetic guidelines. In this context, the multifaceted interaction of especially the arts of poetry and music, and not least the playful staging of multiple authorship, play a role, as presented on various levels in Dedekind’s work.

36 Bosse 2014 [1981].

37 On this subject, see generally Adam et al. 1997; Bremer/Voigt-Goy/Werle 2021.

38 Waldberg 1888, p. 205.

39 “Referring and Borrowing” is the title to the last chapter of the pioneering book by Waldberg 1888.

Bibliography

Primary Literature

- [Dedekind:] *Musen-Lust 1657* = [Dedekind, Constantin Christian:] *Aelbianische Musen-Lust / in unterschiedlicher berühmter Poeten auserlesenen / mit ahnmuhtigen Melodeien beseelten / Lust-Ehren- Zucht und Tugend-Liedern / bestehende*, Dresden: Wolfgang Seyffert [1657] (VD17 14:635857F).
- Dedekind: *Musen-Lust 1665* = Dedekind, Constantin Christian: *Aelbianische Musen-Lust / in Ein hundert und Fünf und Siebenzig unterschiedlicher berühmter Poeten auserlesenen / mit ahnmutigen Melodeien beseelten / Lust- Ehren- Zucht und Tugend-Liedern / bestehende*, Dresden/Leipzig: Georg Heinrich Fromann, 1665 (VD17 31:749985P).
- Dedekind: *Musen-Lust 1657* [1991] = Dedekind, Constantin Christian: *Die Aelbianische Musen-Lust. Faksimiledruck der Ausgabe von 1657*, ed. and introd. by Gary C. Thomas, Bern et al. 1991 (Nachdrucke deutscher Literatur des 17. Jahrhunderts 47).
- [Finckelthaus:] *Floridans Lob- und Liebes-Gedichte* = [Finckelthaus, Gottfried:] *Floridans Lob- und Liebes-Gedichte / Bey Besprächung Seiner beyden Wolbekanten Am Ersten Tag gesungen / Und nachmals zu Pappir gebracht*, Leipzig: Henning Grosse, 1635.
- Finckelthaus: *Deutsche Gesänge* = Finckelthaus, Gottfried: *Deutsche Gesänge*, Hamburg: Tobias Gundermann [1640].
- [Finckelthaus:] *Lustige Lieder* = G.F. [Gottfried Finckelthaus]: *Lustige Lieder*, Lübeck: Lorenz Jauch, 1648 [first 1645].
- Fleming: *Teütsche Poemata* = Fleming, Paul: *Teütsche Poemata. Reprografischer Nachdruck der Ausgabe Lübeck [1642] [recte: 1646]*, Hildesheim 1969.
- Opitz: *Buch von der Deutschen Poeterey* = Opitz, Martin: *Buch von der Deutschen Poeterey (1624)*. Study edition, ed. by Herbert Jaumann, Stuttgart 2002.

Secondary Literature

- Adam et al. 1997 = Adam, Wolfgang/Kiesant, Knut/Schulze, Winfried/Strosetzki, Christoph (eds.): *Geselligkeit und Gesellschaft im Barockzeitalter*, 2 vols., Wiesbaden 1997 (Wolfenbütteler Arbeiten zur Barockforschung).
- Aurnhammer 2015 = Aurnhammer, Achim: *Dichterbilder mit Martin Opitz*, in: Achim Hölter/Monika Schmitz-Emans (eds.): *Literaturgeschichte und Bildmedien*, Heidelberg 2015 (Hermeia 14), pp. 55–76.
- Aurnhammer/Detering/Martin 2013 = Aurnhammer, Achim/Detering, Nicolas/Martin, Dieter: *Einführung*, in: Ernst Christoph Homburg: *Schimpff- und Ernsthafft Clio. Historisch-kritische Edition nach den Drucken von 1638 und 1642*, ed. and annotated by Achim Aurnhammer, Nicolas Detering and Dieter Martin. Kommentarband, Stuttgart 2013 (Bibliothek des Literarischen Vereins in Stuttgart 346), pp. 1–49.
- Bosse 2014 [1981] = Bosse, Heinrich: *Autorschaft ist Werkherrschaft. Über die Entstehung des Urheberrechts aus dem Geist der Goethezeit*. With an epilogue by Wulf D. von Lucius, Paderborn 2014 [1981].
- Braun 2004 = Braun, Werner: *Thöne und Melodeyen, Arien und Canzonetten. Zur Musik des deutschen Barockliedes*, Tübingen 2004 (Frühe Neuzeit 100).
- Bremer/Voigt-Goy/Werle 2021 = Bremer, Kai/Voigt-Goy, Christopher/Werle, Dirk (eds.): *Formen der Geselligkeit und ihr historischer Wandel als Herausforderung der frühneuzeitlichen Kulturgeschichte. Das Beispiel Leipzig*, in: *Daphnis* 49 (2021), pp. 1–263.

- Dröse 2017 = Dröse, Astrid: Paragonale Relationen? Das Verhältnis von Musik, Bild und Text in Titelpupfern barocker Liedersammlungen, in: Jörg Robert (ed.): Intermedialität in der Frühen Neuzeit. Formen, Funktionen, Konzepte, Berlin/Boston 2017 (Frühe Neuzeit 209), pp. 260–284.
- Eggebrecht/Braun 2008 = Eggebrecht, Hans Heinrich/Braun, Werner: Dedekind, Constantin Christian, in: Killy Literaturlexikon. Autoren und Werke des deutschen Kulturraumes, ed. by Wilhelm Kühlmann et al., vol. 2: Boa – Den, 2nd, completely rev. ed., Berlin/New York 2008, pp. 570–571.
- Eibl 1992 = Eibl, Karl: Sind Interpretationen falsifizierbar? In: Lutz Danneberg/Friedrich Vollhardt/Hartmut Böhme/Jörg Schönert (eds.): Vom Umgang mit Literatur und Literaturgeschichte. Positionen und Perspektiven nach der ‘Theoriedebatte,’ Stuttgart 1992, pp. 169–183.
- Gamper 2001 = Gamper, Michael: Kollektive Autorschaft/Kollektive Intelligenz 1800–2000, in: Jahrbuch der deutschen Schillergesellschaft 45 (2001), pp. 380–403.
- Haberland 2003 = Haberland, Detlef: Opitz’ Ode *Ich empfinde fast ein grawen* zwischen Pierre Ronsard und Siegmund von Birken, in: Mirosława Czarnecka/Knut Kiesant/Andreas Solbach/Jolanta Szafarz (eds.): *Memoriae Silesiae*. Leben und Tod, Kriegserlebnis und Friedenssehnsucht in der literarischen Kultur des Barock. Zum Gedenken an Marian Szyrocki (1928–1992), Breslau 2003, pp. 309–325.
- Harper 2003 = Harper, Anthony J.: German Secular Song-Books of the Mid-Seventeenth Century. An Examination of the Texts in Collections of Songs Published in the German-Language Area Between 1624 and 1660, Aldershot/Burlington 2003.
- Otto 1990 = Otto, Karl F. Jr.: Parodies of an Opitz Poem, in: Barbara Becker-Cantarino/Jörg-Ulrich Fechner (eds.): Opitz und seine Welt. Festschrift für George Schulz-Behrend zum 12. Februar 1988, Amsterdam/Atlanta 1990 (Chloe 10), pp. 391–398.
- Reske 2015 = Reske, Christoph: Die Buchdrucker des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts im deutschen Sprachgebiet. Auf der Grundlage des gleichnamigen Werkes von Josef Benzing, 2nd, rev. and exp. ed., Wiesbaden 2015 (Beiträge zum Buch- und Bibliothekswesen 51).
- Scheitler 2020 = Scheitler, Irmgard: Dedekind, Constantin Christian, in: Frühe Neuzeit in Deutschland 1620–1720. Literaturwissenschaftliches Verfasserlexikon, ed. by Stefanie Arend et al., vol. 2: Bucelin, Gabriel – Feustking, Friedrich Christian, Berlin/Boston 2020, cols. 490–506.
- Spoerhase/Thomalla 2020 = Spoerhase, Carlos/Thomalla, Erika: Werke in Netzwerken. Kollaborative Autorschaft und literarische Kooperation im 18. Jahrhundert, in: Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie 139.2 (2020), pp. 145–163.
- Stege 1925/1926 = Stege, Fritz: Constantin Christian Dedekind, in: Zeitschrift für Musikwissenschaft 8 (1925/1926), pp. 476–481.
- Stockhorst 2016 = Stockhorst, Stefanie: Zur Archäologie der philologischen Zusammenarbeit am Beispiel der Fruchtbringenden Gesellschaft: Programm, Projekte und Praxis, in: Stefanie Stockhorst/Marcel Lepper/Vinzenz Hoppe (eds.): Symphilologie. Formen der Kooperation in den Geisteswissenschaften, Göttingen 2016, pp. 143–165.
- Tacke 2001 = Tacke, Andreas (Hg.): “Der Mahler Ordnung und Gebräuch in Nürnberg.” Die Nürnberger Maler(zunft)bücher ergänzt durch weitere Quellen, Genealogien und Viten des 16., 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts, Munich/Berlin 2001.
- Thomas 1991 = Thomas, Gary C.: Einleitung, in: Constantin Christian Dedekind: Die Aelbianische Musen-Lust. Faksimiledruck der Ausgabe von 1657, ed. and introd. by Gary C. Thomas, Bern et al. 1991 (Nachdrucke deutscher Literatur des 17. Jahrhunderts 47), pp. 9*–133*.
- Waldberg 1888 = Waldberg, Max von: Die Deutsche Renaissance-Lyrik, Berlin 1888.
- Werle 2014 = Werle, Dirk: Ruhm und Moderne. Eine Ideengeschichte (1750–1930), Frankfurt a.M. 2014 (Das Abendland N.F. 38).
- Werle 2017 = Werle, Dirk: Grimmelshausens Gedichte als “Kleinere Schriften.” Am Beispiel des Nachtigallenlieds, in: Simpliciana 39 (2017), pp. 285–301.

Werle 2019 = Werle, Dirk: 'Barocke' Lyrik lesen, Frankfurt a.M. 2019 (Klostermann Rote Reihe 112).

Werle 2020 = Werle, Dirk: Kollaborative Autorschaft in Lyriksammlungen. Sperontes' *Singende Muse an der Pleiße* (1736) im gattungsgeschichtlichen Kontext, ausgehend von dem Lied "Brüder, stellt das Jauchzen ein", in: Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie 139.2 (2020), pp. 187–201.