Several references to freedom of religion as well as differences of religion occur in the novel (e.g., 284-85, 505, 1148, etc); these would tie in well with an investigation into Zesen’s overall stance with regard to tolerance and freedom of religion. In his Adriatische Rosemund, it plays a central role, and in his other novels it has an important place, too. Furthermore, his two works on “Glaubenssachen” (1665) would add to the study, as would occasional references in several other works, including his historical writings.

We are grateful to de Gruyter for continuing to make works like this one available through its “Ausgaben” series. Let us hope they keep up the work!

University of Illinois at Chicago Circle Karl F. Otto, Jr.


This is the first volume of lyric poetry to be published in the Sämtliche Werke of the German Baroque Philipp von Zesen (1619-1689). Previous volumes in the planned eighteen volume series brought novels and theoretical works. The present volume contains Zesen’s earliest poetic works: Melpomene (1638), Himmlische Kleio (1641), FrühlingsLust (1642), Gebundene Lob-Rede von der [...] Buchdrückerey=Kunst (1642), Lustinne (1645), and Dichterische Jugend=Flammen (1651). Missing in chronological order, however, are several individual printings of occasional poetry (e.g., wedding and funeral poems). Such individual poems will no doubt be forthcoming in a separate volume after the collections have been edited. Also not included is the Gebundene Dank- Lob- und AbschiedsRede vom Nutz und Wert des Salzes (Halle 1639), to which van Ingen did not have access; there were no copies listed in the 1972 bibliography of Zesen, and only very recently did a copy of this extremely rare work surface (it will be treated in a forthcoming article in the Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg). This lyric volume includes reproductions of the title pages and one engraving is reproduced on glossy paper.

In Melpomene, van Ingen has correctly included variants which were handwritten in the Göttingen copy. It is perhaps of interest to note that the same variants are handwritten in the Zwickau copy, which was originally owned by Zesen’s teacher in Halle, Johannes Bohemus. There
can be no doubt as to the accuracy of those handwritten notations; it might be interesting to see whether they were written by the same hand — perhaps Zesen's own?

The *Himmllische Kleio*, a collection of eight Christmas poems on the birth of Jesus, was discovered by van Ingen in the uncatalogued holdings of the University Library of Würzburg. It seems to have survived in only this one copy, which I was unable to locate when preparing the Zesen bibliography (1972). Such finds are becoming increasingly rare, but they really do increase the usefulness of a standard edition: most of the works reproduced here in edited versions are extant in only two or three original copies.

The *FrühlingsLust* (1642) printed here is based on the earliest edition, but since variants from the other editions are printed, one wonders why the two poems at the end of the third edition (ca. 1650) are not printed at all? Where, if at all, will these two poems be reproduced?

There is only one basic editorial decision regarding this otherwise excellent volume to which I object. Van Ingen states (reference is to the *Dichterische Jugend-Flammen*): "Im Variantenverzeichnis werden die orthographischen Varianten der AR-Fassung [i.e., *Adriatische Rosemund*] im allgemeinen nicht berücksichtigt" (S. 425). It is the "im allgemeinen" with which I take issue, because it automatically leads to the question of which ones are listed, and why these and not others? Are there, for example, specific kinds of variants listed, or is it a random selection? I found, too, that the eighth poem from the appendix to the *Adriatische Rosemund*, which also appears in the *Jugend-Flammen*, has many variants, not orthographic in nature, which are also not listed; for example, p. 336, line 41 contains: "Drüm kan ja keine schöner sein/" with no variants listed, while the AR has the following wording: "Drüm kan und mag nichts schöners sein" or on p. 337, line 47 we read "Drüm kan ja nichts beliebters sein/" whereas the AR has "Drüm kan ja nihmand hübscher sein." These differences could easily be explained if we were dealing with cancelled leaves, which were, after all, quite common in the seventeenth century. Van Ingen used the Wolfenbüttel copy for his edition; my variants are from the Yale copy.

The editorial decision noted above regarding separate printings of occasional poems resulted in at least one rather unusual situation: on p. 418 we find the notation: "Das Glückwunschgedicht beginnt im Separatdruck mit einem Einleitungsgedicht. Das Ganze wird mit lateinischen Verszeilen abgeschlossen," but unfortunately this volume contains neither the introductory poem nor the concluding verses in Latin. What will happen when the separate printing is given? Will it reproduce, again, the middle poem, or will it simply refer the user to the appropriate page of this volume?